



Kent Academic Repository

Reading, Frances (2022) *Olive Garnett and Anglo-Russian Cultural Relations from the Crimean War to the Russian Revolutions, 1855-1917*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent,.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/97039/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.22024/UniKent/01.02.97039>

This document version

UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY (Attribution)

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

**Olive Garnett and Anglo-Russian Cultural Relations from the Crimean War to the
Russian Revolutions, 1855-1917**

by

Frances Reading

Submitted in fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

English Literature

School of English, University of Kent

December 2021

Word Count: 99,980

Acknowledgements

There are a few people who need to be thanked for their support and assistance in the creation of this thesis. Firstly, to Barry C. Johnson and Caroline White who have been committed to keeping the legacy of Olive Garnett alive through their preservation and editing of her diaries. I hope I have done Garnett justice. Second, to the staff at Northwestern University for being informative hosts while I spent time in the 'Garnett Family Papers' archive.

Thirdly, my supervisors: Professor David Ayers, for expertise, advice and guidance; Professor Cathy Waters, for insightful comments and encouragement; Professor Vybarr Cregan-Reid, for weekly lock-down Zooms, reality-checks and motivation; and Professor Jennie Batchelor, for knowledge, enthusiasm and empathy and without whom this thesis would not have been completed. Thank you all for believing in Olive Garnett and in me.

Thank you to my parents, Anne and Lee Reading, for unwavering support; my siblings, Alice and Thomas, for making me laugh; Nikki Ellis for her patience and Elizabeth Franchini and Gemma Vaughan for suffering my ramblings and reminding me to prioritise myself.

And finally, to my son Jasper, my stepdaughters, Louisa-May and Amelia, and my husband, Gavin, who have all probably forgotten I exist. Thank you for your patience, encouragement, cups of tea and for giving me the space to work on something for myself in the middle of our busy, lovely lives together. I love you.

Abstract

This thesis analyses the life and work of little-studied writer, Olive Garnett (1871–1958) and makes the case for reassessing her currently peripheral place in literary criticism. It contends that Garnett’s works are substantially more than mere footnotes to those of her contemporaries. Garnett wrote with immediacy about a generation-defining moment in Russian history, with her short story collection, *Petersburg Tales* (1900) and novel, *In Russia’s Night* (1918) charting the trajectory of the collapse of Imperial Russia.

The period 1855–1917 saw instability in Anglo-Russian relations with the British public’s mood oscillating between Russophilism and Russophobia. Garnett’s career was mobilised against the backdrop of rampant tsarist policies on Russification that contributed to the mass exodus of political refugees from Russia who settled in more liberal western European cities, including London. The increase in Russian speakers in London resulted in an explosion of English translations of Russian literature, led by Garnett’s sister-in-law, Constance Garnett (1861–1946), which fuelled the reading public’s appetite for all things Russian. Olive Garnett responded to these developments, drawing in her writing from the experiences of her diverse literary and political network, which included famous translators, authors and Russian émigrés, and writing back to them, producing ambitious texts that both reflect and comment on this pivotal period in history.

This thesis adopts a triangulated methodology, utilising Garnett's diaries, literature and life to perform a biographical and historical analysis of her published literature and some of her unpublished manuscripts to offer the first sustained analysis of Garnett's work. Each chapter is attentive to intertextual connections between the works of Garnett and her predecessors and contemporaries. These include significant political and literary figures such as Fyodor Dostoevsky (1821–81), Anton Chekov (1860–1904), Sergei Stepniak (1851–95), Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921), Henry James (1843–1916) and Katherine Mansfield (1888–1923), whose collective reach spans across Russia, the United States of America and New Zealand. Garnett is not subordinate to these more famous figures, and in placing her work alongside them in a creative and critical dialogue this thesis showcases Garnett's talents as a writer. It also serves to highlight Garnett's overlooked contribution to the mediation of the political turmoil in Russian to British readers at the dawn of the twentieth century. Ultimately this project calls for a re-appreciation of Garnett's literary output and a repositioning of Garnett as an author in her own right, for her own narrative, rather than as part of someone else's story.

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter One – ‘The Case of Vetrova’	55
Chapter Two – ‘Roukoff’	86
Chapter Three – ‘The Secret of the Universe’	128
Chapter Four – ‘Out of It’ and <i>The Princess Casamassima</i>	160
Chapter Five – Olive Garnett and Katherine Mansfield	209
Chapter Six – <i>In Russia’s Night</i>	245
Conclusion	287
Appendix One – Constance Garnett’s Translations	296
Appendix Two – Olive Garnett as A.B.D.	298
Appendix Three – ‘A Man of Principle: A True Story from Russian Life’	303
Appendix Four – ‘Influenza – A Reply to ‘Typhoid Fever’ by Anton Tchekhov’	305
Bibliography	316

Introduction

In the fourth chapter of *Modernism, Internationalism and the Russian Revolution* (2018), 'British Visitors to Russia', David Ayers presents an account of British writers who were either in Russia during the February and October revolutions of 1917, or who travelled after the revolutions to meet the Bolshevik leaders and bore witness to the new Soviet State. These writers include familiar names such as Arthur Ransome (1884–1967), John Cournos (1881–1966), Emma Goldman (1869–1940), Bertrand Russell (1872–1970), Sylvia Pankhurst (1882–1960) and H.G. Wells (1866–1946). Some offered rather dry and journalistic accounts, as Ransome did in *Six Weeks in Russia in 1919* (1919), while others opted for a fictionalised approach, such as Cournos's, 'London Under the Bolsheviks: A Londoner's Dream on Returning from Petrograd' (1919). Regardless of their approach, all of the writers acted as cultural mediators, presenting the changing landscape in Russia from their perspective for the benefit of the British audience. The works of Ransome *et al* were published with the intention to intervene in the British public's understanding and assessment of Soviet Russia and her leaders. Some of these writers were sponsored by left-wing organisations like the Communist Party, others were commissioned by right-wing groups such as the Russian Liberation committee and still others were invited by the Kremlin in the hope that a sympathetic portrayal of Russia would be communicated to the British public. Regardless of the political motivation behind their work, these writers all had the designated purpose of writing and informing the British public about the changing image of Russia.¹

¹ For further information see: David Ayers, *Modernism, Internationalism and the Russian Revolution* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), pp. 93-129.

Twenty-one years before the February and October revolutions irrevocably altered Russia and shook the political and diplomatic relations of Europe to its core, Olive Garnett (1871–1958) embarked on her own journey of cultural mediation that the likes of Ransome, Wells and Bertrand would follow. This thesis is the first sustained study of Garnett and her literary works and pays close attention to her contribution towards the representation of Russia at the end of the nineteenth and the dawn of the twentieth centuries. The thesis brings to light some of Garnett’s unpublished literature and emphasises its potential literary value by placing it alongside the work notable literary figures such as Katherine Mansfield (1888–1923) and uniting the largely forgotten Garnett and the famous Mansfield through their mutual interest in Russia. Finally, this project asserts Garnett’s place within literary history. Her publication dates (1900–18) stand at the intersection of Victorian Realism, Modernism and the more marginalised literary Edwardianism. As this thesis will demonstrate, Garnett mostly finds herself rooted to the literary traditions of her upbringing, utilising elements of realism to portray Russia and Russian people. However, at times she does stray from her mediatory aims and experiments with more avant-garde forms of writing, reflecting the convergence of literary periods she experienced and was influenced by throughout her life. The work Garnett undertakes in presenting Russia to her readership is engaging and deserves recognition beyond a passing mention or footnote within relevant literary criticism. In centering Garnett within the literary marketplace in which she worked, this project presents a critical re-appreciation of the life and literature of Olive Garnett and to lay the foundation for further scholarship on her.

Situating Garnett

Rebecca Beasley's meticulously researched book, *Russomania: Russian Culture and the Creation of British Modernism, 1881–1922* (2020), provides a new and thorough account of the Russian influence on the emergence of British modernism. Beasley offers ample evidence for a strong Russophile genealogy alongside a historically well-documented Francophile line, demonstrating how French, British *and* Russian models dynamically engaged with one another in the formation of British modernism. In doing so, Beasley highlights how important the dissemination of Russian literature and culture by British writers across Britain was to the metamorphosis of Victorian realist literature into experimental modernist fiction.² Garnett was one such writer whose published literature and diaries Beasley references.³ Beasley notes that Garnett and other writers in her social circle were not 'active agents' in the development of modernism, but did produce 'minor works [...that] shed light on this important moment in modernism's pre-history', through the propagation of Russian culture and literature in their daily lives and literary works.⁴ Here, Beasley's key focus is British literature's transformation into modernism, and not elevating under-studied authors, however it is just one example where Garnett and her literature are kept at the margins of criticism. The time in which Garnett was writing (1890–1950s) and the time in which her writing is set (published works set between 1897 and 1905), is more than modernism's 'pre-history'. It is, instead, a dynamic period that witnessed significant developments in literary realism as well as in creative responses to a rapidly globalising and more liberal world. As I will demonstrate in this thesis, Garnett's life

² Rebecca Beasley, *Russomania: Russian Culture and the Creation of British Modernism, 1881–1922* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020).

³ Garnett's published output comprises her short story collection, *Petersburg Tales* (1900), and a novel, *In Russia's Night* (1918).

⁴ Beasley, *Russomania*, p. 73.

and works demand re-evaluating, re-situating within literary criticism and to be recognised in their own right.

Beasley goes on to assert that Garnett's first publication, *Petersburg Tales* (1900), a quartet of short stories, presents 'literary values at odds with its author's personal allegiances'.⁵ Garnett's allegiances are presented, by default, as the same as those of her friends and associates, some of whom were Russian émigrés and members of clandestine revolutionary groups as such the Chaikovtsy Circle and/or *Zemlya i Volya* (Land and Liberty). These individuals had radical left-wing values and were desperately hoping for and working towards a revolution in Russia.⁶ However, as I claim here, Beasley has misidentified Garnett's allegiances and does not offer a full picture of how these allegiances influence Garnett's writing. Garnett was fiercely loyal, dedicated, obedient and faithful to *individuals*, not all of whom were revolutionaries, and in turn, the influence of these individuals can be found within the pages of Garnett's writing, sometimes in the style, sometimes in the plot and sometimes in both. It is to these figures, with their miscellany of political, personal and literary values and their range of advice and constructive criticism for Garnett, to whom she swears allegiance. That does not mean Garnett was not interested in the prospect of a revolution in Russia or against the emancipation of oppressed people, but that it was not the *modus operandi* behind her writing. Garnett wrote for and to people and her body of work is, in many ways, a homage to them.

⁵ Ibid., p. 78.

⁶ The key players and their histories will be introduced shortly.

Garnett's coterie consists of writers, translators, editors and political activists, and this in turn makes Garnett herself worthy of note. However, it is the immediacy with which she writes, dealing with contemporaneous events and people and responding to the literary output of others that makes the study of Garnett and her work valuable. Moreover, Garnett's Russophilism, evidenced in her published work and diaries, fed into the general increase in interest in Russian people, places and culture by the British public. Her work contributed to the dissemination of information about Russian culture and, as such, the argument of the thesis overall will be framed by the context of Anglo-Russian relations and, in microcosm, Garnett's friendship with Russian radicals living in London and the south-eastern counties. Furthermore, this research shall detail how Garnett's work engages with that of more famous literary figures such as Anton Chekhov (1860–1904), Henry James (1843–1916) and Katherine Mansfield, examining how Garnett responds to or writes alongside critically acclaimed texts, noting that her work holds its own against them. This then demands a re-examination of Garnett's work that has hitherto been unfairly neglected. While Garnett has received minor attention in relation to her literary or political networks – either as an aside, or footnote, or for corroborative effect – she has not been placed at the heart of her networks as a figure worthy of individual attention before. This thesis brings Olive Garnett from the periphery to the centre, recognising her presence in a variety of literary and/or political networks and placing her in the middle of them and in doing so demonstrating how and why her literary output is worth analysing. Garnett's work acts as a mediator between the British and Russian Empires, presenting significant historical events, as well as portraits of everyday life, in Russia to the British public. Her texts contribute to Britain's cultural response to Imperial Russia and to the public's perception of Russia during a period of oscillatory Anglo-Russian relations.

In the main body of this introduction, I first outline where Garnett sits within literary criticism, and then I shall offer a summary of the key historical and political events that influenced Anglo-Russian relations between 1855 and 1917. This discussion will offer important contextualisation for the thesis by providing the historical background behind the surge in the British public's interest in Russia during the time Garnett was writing and also explains the significant presence of Russian émigrés in London. I will then introduce Garnett, her family and those of her closest friends who are relevant to this project and give a brief biographical outline of each figure, encompassing the radical activities of the Russian émigrés. Alongside the émigrés, Garnett's sister-in-law, Constance Garnett (1861–1946) had a substantial role via her translation of numerous volumes of Russian literature into English. The biographical detail will clarify where key characters are situated firstly within the historical context and secondly, in relation to Garnett.

The translations of Constance Garnett, alongside dynamic diplomatic relations, contributed to the growing Russophilism in Britain. However, an increased interest in all-things Russian also resulted in misconceptions about the vast half-European, half-Asiatic empire. This was problematic because it inhibited the émigrés' attempts to engage the British public in the realistic portrayal of the political and social situation in Russia, which the émigrés hoped would encourage support and funds for revolutionary activities in Russia. Therefore, a section of the introduction shall also be dedicated to noting how the émigrés tackled the mythologising of Russia in British literature and the press. This is relevant to Olive Garnett, because she was encouraged by the émigrés to help contribute towards the

demythologising process through writing authentically about Russia, which she attempted to do.

Following the historical and biographical context I set out my methodological approach to the thesis, highlighting my key sources and resources for the framing of the argument. I conclude the introduction with a summary of the main chapters within the thesis, each of which explores my central argument that Garnett as a person and as a writer is worth studying, looking out towards her notable literary and political networks within which she operated, influenced and was influenced by.

Situating Garnett: The Canon

One of the impediments to Garnett's reputation as a writer is her limited number of published works, which amount to a short story collection, one novel and a handful of short stories that were published in periodicals such as *The Speaker* (1890–1907) and *English Review* (1908–37). However, Garnett's published writings do not reflect the substantiveness of her literary output. Between 1900 and 1918 alone she wrote at least 40 short stories in manuscript. As will be discussed in Chapter One, Garnett did not write these works recreationally; she actively tried to get her work published and she dedicated space in her diary to her hopes, frustrations, successes and failures as she fought to see her stories in print.

Pascale Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* (first pubd. 1999; trans. 2004) draws on the sociological theories of Pierre Bourdieu to present the concept of a 'world republic of letters', where there are 'lands and frontiers of literature in a 'world in which what is judged

worthy of being considered literary is brought into existence.⁷ Within this world, all literary texts are understood and positioned in relation to one another. Casanova argues that once a writer's name becomes known, they acquire value in the literary market.⁸ The potential for 'known-ness' increased during the nineteenth century, when rising literacy rates widened readership and industrialisation commodified literature, encouraging the mass-production of works.⁹ Given Garnett's limited volume of published literature, she had fewer opportunities to accrue 'value in the literary market' compared to, say, Mansfield who produced multiple collections of short stories and had a substantial body of work published posthumously. Therefore, according to Casanova's theory, Mansfield is more valuable than Garnett. This would be hard to disagree with for it is true that in terms of legacy, Mansfield towers over Garnett. However, when we focus specifically on the presentation of Russia and Russians, as this thesis does, we can place the canonical Mansfield and non-canonical Garnett on more even ground.

The concept of the canon is, of course, notoriously troubled. John Guillory refers to the canon debate as a 'crisis in the form of literature' where you are only deemed worthy to feature in the canon if your social class has allowed you to gain access to linguistic capital: that is, being able to produce, consume and understand literature.¹⁰ Thus, Guillory attests, class is the most significant reason certain social groups do not usually feature within the

⁷ Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. M.B DeBevoise (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 2004), pp. 3-4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁹ Pierre Bourdieu, 'The Market of Symbolic Goods' in *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (New York City [NY]: Columbia University Press, 1994), pp. 1-34 (p. 2).

¹⁰ John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago [IL]: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. viii, p. ix.

canon because they simply did not have the means to write literary texts, let alone gain critical acclaim for them. Guillory builds on Barbara Herrnstein Smith's argument that texts can only be canonical if they reinforce the hegemonic values of the dominant social group.¹¹ He presents the idea that the canon should be seen as a socially significant concept to be used more as a historical artefact that embodies the hegemonic cultural value of the time as opposed to a means to judge what makes 'good' literature.¹² To Guillory, class is more inhibitive to individuals than social biases of judgement based on race and/or gender because these can produce homogenising consequences. For example, he states that a retro-construction of early modern women writers with the intent to recover the marginalised experience of women ignores the difference of experience between aristocratic women and peasant women.¹³

Undoubtedly, an intersectional approach allows for the greatest level of representation, however writers such as Elizabeth Barrett Browning (1806–61), Virginia Woolf (1882–1941) and H.D. (1886–1961) are only now considered canonical because of diligent recovery efforts.¹⁴ Numerous critics including: Hélène Cixous, Elaine Showalter, Sandra M. Gilbert, Susan Gubar, Suzanne Clark, Marianne DeKoven, Celia Marshik and Allison Pease have been arguing since the second wave of feminism in the 1960s that men have publicly devalued women's literature and/or written women out of the canon.¹⁵ Suzanne Clark focuses on

¹¹ Barbara Herrnstein Smith, *Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Literary Theory* (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1988), p. 51.

¹² Guillory, p. 20.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁴ For example, Jane Marcus's groundbreaking work on Virginia Woolf, epitomised in the *New Feminist Essays on Virginia Woolf* (1984) collection of essays.

¹⁵ See: Hélène Cixous, 'The Laugh of the Medusa', trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen, *Signs*, vol. 1.4 (1976), pp. 875-93, Elaine Showalter, *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Bronte to Lessing* (Princeton [NJ]: Princeton University Press, 1977), Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *No Man's Land: The*

literature of the early twentieth century and states that scholars and critics achieved a narrow, largely male, canon by discrediting the increasing influence of women's writing and sentimentalism. For Clark, it is only in the recovery of women writers can a complete picture be seen.¹⁶

To return to Guillory, he does see worth in investigating non-canonical texts because they potentially express transgressive, subversive and/or antihegemonic views. In recovery and examining the non-canonical it then gives a complete picture, or 'metastory' to borrow from Gilbert and Gubar, to provide a rich and full literary narrative for a particular period.¹⁷ In only giving attention to the canonical texts of the period, a substantial part of the literary and historical narrative of the time is absent. This contributes to the continuing over-privileging of canonical texts and undervaluing of non-canonical texts. The very fact that Marshik and Pease stressed the need for new recovery projects to be undertaken in 2019, sixty years after the genesis of second-wave feminism and the revival of many women writers, illustrates that there is still a significant amount of work to be done.¹⁸ This thesis is not aiming to elevate Garnett into the so-called canon, but to recover her and her published texts and to introduce some of her unpublished work in order to facilitate Garnett's entry into the metastory and to assert a place of higher value in the world republic of letters.

Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century Vols. 1-3 (New Haven [CT]: Yale University Press, 1988-1994), Suzanne Clark, *Sentimental Modernism: Women Writers and the Revolution of the World* (Bloomington [IN]: Indiana University Press, 1991), Marianne DeKoven, *Rich and Strange: Gender, History and Modernism* (Princeton [NJ]: Princeton University Press, 1992), Celia Marshik and Allison Pease, *Modernism, Sex and Gender* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019).

¹⁶ Clark, pp. 1-2.

¹⁷ Gilbert and Gubar, *No Man's Land*, vol 1., p. 156.

¹⁸ Marshik and Pease, p. 30.

Situating Garnett: 'Modernism's Pre-History'

Beasley's term, 'modernism's pre-history', feeds into the tradition of marginalising literary works and periods that preceded modernism. Edwardian literature in particular has suffered in comparison to the more canonical modernism.¹⁹ Even when scholars of Edwardian literature, such as Jane Eldridge Miller, call for Edwardian texts to be considered and valued as 'unique expressions of a particular moment in history that needs to be understood on [its] own terms', they still tend to the period as 'antecedent' or a 'precursor' to modernism.²⁰ Of course, the acknowledgement that 'contrary to one of its key myths [modernism] did not suddenly burst forth' either in December 1910 as Virginia Woolf provocatively claimed, or any date, is a welcome one. However, the privileging of modernist studies throughout the twentieth century means that Edwardian literature is still going through a period of recovery and revision in literary studies.²¹ While it is not the purpose of this thesis to assert Edwardian literature's place within literary history, it is worth pausing here to consider some of the dominant characteristics of the literature of the period in order to position Garnett's work more securely in relation to that of her contemporaries. Defining who those contemporaries are depends partly on how the Edwardian period is defined in literary terms. Jonathan Wild, for instance, confines literary Edwardianism to the first decade of the nineteenth century in line with the reign of King Edward VII (reigned January

¹⁹ Jonathan Wild, *Literature of the 1900s: The Great Edwardian Emporium* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017), p. 1.

Jonathan Rose, *The Edwardian Temperament 1895-1919* (Athens [OH]: Ohio University Press, 1986), p. xiv.

²⁰ Jane Eldridge Miller, *Rebel Women: Feminism, Modernism and the Edwardian Novel* (Chicago [IL]: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 8, 7.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Virginia Woolf 'Mr Bennett and Mrs Brown', in *Collected Essays: Volume 1* (London: Hogarth Press, 1966), pp. 319-37 (p. 320).

1901–May 1910).²² Jonathan Rose, however, identifies 1919 as the end of the Edwardian age, claiming philosophical trends, such as attempts to merge religion and secularism, continued throughout the 1910s and were only radically transformed in the post-war period.²³ Rose’s elongated era certainly suits Garnett’s dates of publication, which reaches back to the Victorian period via *Petersburg Tales*, published in Queen Victoria’s (reigned June 1837–January 1901) last full year as monarch and jumps ahead to the end of the Great War (1914–18) and the reign of King George V (reigned May 1910–January 36) with her only published novel, *In Russia’s Night* (1918).

The first decade of the twentieth century was traditionally typified as a peaceful and ‘pre-war’ period, a Eurocentric view that only considers the damage and trauma seen in Europe during the Great War and neglects the brutal and imperialistic Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902).²⁴ This conflict fed *fin de siècle* anxieties regarding the decline of the British Empire while inventions of the day, including the first wireless broadcast across the Atlantic (1901) and the first cross-channel flight (1909), significantly contributed to globalisation and modernisation. As Carola Kaplan and Anne Simpson contend, the Edwardians were writers who ‘responded directly’ to these and other ‘events of their time’.²⁵ Kaplan and Simpson’s claim, as we will see, is of particular relevance in Garnett’s collection of short stories where her immediacy prompts her most favourable reviews. However, paradoxically and in opposition to the Edwardian trend Garnett’s 1918 novel suffers from her belatedness when

²² Wild, p. 1.

²³ Rose, p. xiv, 30-9.

²⁴ Wild, p. 12.

²⁵ Carola M. Kaplan and Anne B. Simpson, ‘Introduction – Edwardian Modernists: Literary Evaluation and the Problem of History’, in *Seeing Double: Revisioning Edwardian and Modernist Literature*, eds. Carola M. Kaplan and Anne B. Simpson (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. vii-xxi (p. xi).

she portrays the Russian revolution of 1905, rather than the revolutions of 1917.

Additionally, Garnett's immediacy pertains to events occurring in Russia and not the advances in technology at home. Another feature of Edwardian literature was the rejection of Coventry Patmore's motif of the 'Angel in the House'. In the angel's place emerged the New Woman who took on various rebellious forms in the works of women writers such as Annie Sophie Cory (Victoria Cross) (1868–1952), Sarah Grand (1854–1943) and Mona Caird (1854–1932). Rebellious women, as subsequent chapters demonstrate, are present across Garnett's work from 'The Case of Vetrova' and to the dream-like and experimental 'Out of It'.²⁶

A further key facet of literary Edwardianism is realism, the notoriously multivalent textual effect that Erich Auerbach documents in, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (first pubd. 1946; trans. 1953). Francis O'Gorman notes that for the Edwardians, realism was a tool with which they could 'resist the unsatisfactory order of the world'.²⁷ This follows on from the Victorian realist tradition where writers attempted to 'reconstruct a world deconstructing', with both periods unsettled by industrialisation and modernisation.²⁸ The focus on the exceptional within the quotidian was widely celebrated in Victorian literature, with key examples seen in George Eliot's (1819–1880) *Middlemarch: A Study of Provincial Life* (1871-72) and William Thackeray's (1811–63) *Vanity Fair* (1847). This focus on the ordinary can be seen in Garnett's 'The Secrets of the Universe', which is a fictionalised

²⁶ Shoshana Milgram Knapp, 'Revolutionary Androgyny in the Fiction of "Victoria Cross"', in *Seeing Double: Revisioning Edwardian and Modernist Literature*, eds. Carola M. Kaplan and Anne B. Simpson (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 3-19 (p. 5).

²⁷ Francis O'Gorman, *The Victorian Novel* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), p. 120.

²⁸ George Levine, *The Realist Imagination: English Fiction from Frankenstein to Lady Chatterley* (Chicago [IL]: The University of Chicago Press, 1981), p. 4.

account of Garnett and her friends helping a Russian philosopher write his autobiography. Barring its ending, to which I return in Chapter Three, this short story is, in many ways, reasonably mundane. Unlike in the rest of her published work, nothing dramatic happens within the tale.

In a departure from the ordinary and in Eliot's pastoral setting, literary realism progressively became more urban due towards the end of the nineteenth century, owing to the influence of French naturalism. French naturalism was championed by Émile Zola (1840–1902) in his manifesto *Le Roman Experimental* (1880) and demonstrated in his *Les Rougon-Macquart* (1871-93) series of novels.²⁹ Sally Ledger comments that within French naturalism the writers focused their 'quasi-scientific lens on the metropolitan poor, many of whom [were] either brutalized, alcoholic or both', taking on the Social-Darwinist view that the urban poor 'were closer in evolutionary terms to the lower animals than their social betters'.³⁰ These elements of naturalism can certainly be seen in Garnett's 'Roukoff' and 'A Russian Girl' (1905), both of which move away from the celebration of the ordinary seen in 'The Secret of the Universe' and progress to a darker and dirtier portrayal of Russian people.

It is in Auerbach's discussion of Russian realism where his words resonate with Garnett's literature in particular. Auerbach states that in Russian realism one often sees 'a strong practical, ethical or intellectual shock', which immediately arouses the characters 'and in a moment they pass from a quiet and almost vegetative existence to the most monstrous

²⁹ Peter Brooks, *Realist Vision* (New Haven [CT], Yale University Press, 2005), p 12.

³⁰ Sally Ledger, 'Naturalism: "Dirt and horror pure and simple"', in *A Concise Companion to Realism*, ed. Matthew Beaumont (London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2010), pp. 86-101 (p. 87).

excesses both in practical and in spiritual matters.³¹ Additionally, the emotions of the characters tend to oscillate between the extreme highs and lows far more frequently and dramatically than in any other European literature; Ivan Karamazov's despair and inner turmoil and Dmitri Karamazov's passion in *The Brothers Karamazov* (first pubd. 1879; trans. 1912), serve as examples of this. As we shall see, Garnett was heavily influenced by the numerous translations of Russian literature produced by her sister-in-law, Constance Garnett and acknowledgements of these texts will appear throughout the thesis. Moreover, owing to Garnett's stay in Russia (1896-7) she was able to observe and share the behaviours of the Russian people in her diaries, letters and writing. In Chapter One it is perhaps unsurprising therefore when we see the Russian people react exactly how Auerbach described, going from torpid to passionate in 'The Case of Vetrova' and madness and horror in 'Roukoff'.

Thus, Garnett writes herself into the multifaceted tradition of literary realism, incorporating trends seen in Edwardian literature, such as immediacy and the rebellious woman into her use of realism. As Auerbach ably demonstrates, realism is ever-changing and the way Garnett deploys realism varies throughout her *oeuvre*, however it remains that she uses it as an exploratory device in order present Russia and Russians in a, to use Simon Dentith's definition, 'flexible and comprehensive way'.³² On occasion she does step outside of the confines of literary realism, which shall be demonstrated predominantly in Chapters Four

³¹ Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton [NJ]: Princeton University Press, 1953), p 522.

³² Simon Dentith, 'Realist Synthesis in the Nineteenth-Century Novel: "That unity which lies in the selection of our keenest consciousness"', in *A Concise Companion to Realism* ed. Matthew Beaumont (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2010), pp. 33-49 (p. 41).

and Five, presenting dream-like short stories that are inspired by the works of canonical writers. However, what does remain constant throughout Garnett's published, and much of her unpublished, texts is her focus on Russia and Russians and it is through this lens this thesis shall approach her work.

Anglo-Russian Relations 1855–1917: A Précis

A brief historical overview is necessary to the development of the project's argument because it helps provide a frame of reference before further detail is given about the central figures within it. It outlines the atmosphere and political climate within which Garnett was living, writing about and responding to. The information will be presented concisely and without the presence of historiographical debate, although there is plenty to consider but that is not the purpose of this project.

Following a rare period of friendly diplomatic relations between British and Russian empires in the eighteenth century, with the two nations allying against the French in the French Revolutionary Wars (1792–1802) and then the Napoleonic Wars (1812–15), the rapport soured owing to anxieties relating to the security of their respective empires. Britain was afraid that Russia would attempt to invade British India, which bordered the Russian Empire, while Russia was in the process of expanding her territory into Central Asia. The tensions surrounding British and Russian interest in Asia became known as The Great Game and spanned most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as both empires reached their prime and headed towards their rapid decline. In 1893, a strip of Afghanistan's territory, the Wakhan Corridor, was created as a buffer zone between the Russian Empire and British

India.³³ Alongside The Great Game, there was also the Eastern Question, which revolved around a British concern that Russia would destabilise Eastern Europe via attacks on the Ottoman Empire. The Crimean War (1853–56) saw Britain and France unite against Russia where the significantly smaller allied forces beat the huge, but ill-trained and disorganised, Russian army. The loss against a smaller force was a significant embarrassment to Russia and Tsar Nicholas I.³⁴

The Crimean War was the first military conflict with sustained reportage, with journalist William Howard Russell (1820–1907), now considered one of the first war correspondents, sending daily articles to *The Times* and Roger Fenton (1819–69), one of the first war photographers, sending photographs to the *Illustrated London News*. The frequent exposure to reports from the front line, alongside war-time propaganda presenting Russia as backward and barbarous resulted in an increase of Russophobia in Britain and contributed to the mythologising of Russia in the British psyche.³⁵ Tensions did ease at times, for example when Prince Alfred (1844–1900), the second son of Queen Victoria (1819–1901) and Prince Albert (1819–1861), married Tsar Alexander II's (1818–81) only daughter, Grand Duchess Maria Alexandrovna (1853–1920), and overall the relationship between the nations with regards to the Far East was stable. Both Russia and Britain were suspicious of Japan and allied together with the French in the First Sino-Japanese War (1894).

³³ For a detailed history of The Great Game see: Peter Hopkirk, *The Great Game: The Struggle for Empire in Central Asia* (New York City (NY): Kodansha International, 1994).

³⁴ For a detailed history and historiography of The Eastern Question see: M.S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question, 1774–1923* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1966).

³⁵ For further details of the press coverage in the Crimean War see: Catherine Waters, *Special Correspondence and the Newspaper Press in Victorian Print Culture, 1850–1886* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).

Socio-politically, Great Britain became more liberal during the nineteenth century, and under the reign of the reformer, Tsar Alexander II (reigned 2 March 1855–13 March 1881), so did Russia for a brief time. Tsar Alexander II granted greater freedoms to the Russian intelligentsia through lifting state censorship, resulting in the emergence of *Narodniks* (Populist) groups in Russia in the 1860s. The *Narodniks* caused social unrest through attempting to radicalise the Russian peasantry, however they were largely unsuccessful and turned towards more extremist and violent methods such as political assassinations and individual acts of terrorism. Britain became an appealing destination for political exiles, particularly after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881, and also for the Russian Jews escaping Tsar Alexander III's (1845–1894) reactionary repressive policies that included Anti-Semitic pogroms in the 1880s. The influx of Russians within Britain helped to reverse the trend of Russophobia and re-orientated the national mood towards Russophilia as émigrés began to disseminate pamphlets and articles and deliver speeches designed to show the realities of the Russian Empire and to generate public support for a revolution in Russia. It is within this climate consisting of social unrest in Russia, anxieties of Empire, a reversal of Russophobia to Russophilia and an oscillatory diplomatic relationship between the two nations that Olive Garnett is writing and that she is trying to make sense of within her literary works.³⁶

The Garnetts³⁷

³⁶ For further information on the Russian populist movement see: Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire, 1552–1917* (London: Harper Collins, 1997).

³⁷ For the purposes of this introductory section, I use the forename and surname to identify the Garnetts (Olive Garnett, Edward Garnett etc.). In the main body of the thesis, Olive Garnett's family appear less frequently so I shall refer to Olive Garnett as 'Garnett' throughout, identifying her family members by using their full names.

In the *Oxford Companion to Edwardian Literature* (2005), Olivia Rayne Garnett, more commonly known as Olive Garnett, has a rather underwhelming entry.³⁸ Indeed the reader learns more about her brother, Edward (1868–1937), and his wife, Constance Garnett, than about Olive Garnett. Edward Garnett was a writer, critic and editor who counted Joseph Conrad (1857–1924), D. H. Lawrence (1885–1930) and W. H. Hudson (1841–1922) among his closest friends, while Constance Garnett is one of the most important translators of Russian literature in literary history.³⁹ On the surface, such circles, connections and achievements seem to dwarf a life of minimal literary output such as Olive Garnett's. This research, however, shall demonstrate that Garnett's contributions to and connections within the literary and Anglo-Russian spheres were significant. Garnett's *oeuvre* attempts to present Russia and its revolutionaries in a knowable and realist way. This is in contrast to the stereotypically mysterious and dangerous Russia and Russians – inclusive of the tsarist state and its revolutionary opponents – as seen in the works of her peers, such as Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent* (1907) and *Under Western Eyes* (1911), and in the increasingly popular translation of Fyodor Dostoevsky's (1821–81) *Demons* (1871–2), which was first published in *Ruskiy Vestnik* (*Russian Messenger*) (1808–1906) and translated into English by Constance Garnett in 1916.

³⁸ Sandra Kemp, Charlotte Mitchell, and David Trotter, 'Garnett, Olive: Olivia Rayne Garnett', in *The Oxford Companion to Edwardian Literature*, ed. Sandra Kemp, Charlotte Mitchell, and David Trotter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), <<http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198117605.001.0001/acref-9780198117605-e-439?rskey=1dUf1d&result=440>> (date accessed: 01/11/2014).

³⁹ See Appendix 1 for a chronological list of Constance Garnett's Russian translations.

Olive Garnett was born in Primrose Hill, London, in 1871 and was one of six children.⁴⁰ She attended the liberal and pioneering independent school for girls, Queen's College, London, between 1882 and 1889. Queen's College was famed, and criticised, for being the first institution to offer qualifications to women when it was founded in 1848. Olive Garnett attended Queen's College until she was eighteen and then, in the year following her departure from formal education, the Garnett family – without Edward Garnett, who had recently married Constance Black – moved into an official residence at the British Museum where Olive Garnett's father, Richard Garnett (1835–1906), had been appointed Keeper of Printed Books.⁴¹ Through Richard Garnett's position in the British Library, the Garnetts expanded their social circle with the painter, Ford Madox Brown (1821–93) and the Pre-Raphaelite, William Michael Rossetti (1829–1919), visiting regularly. Brown's grandson, writer, poet, critic and founder of *The English Review* (1908–37) and *The Transatlantic Review* (1924), Ford Madox Ford (1873–1939) and Rossetti's daughters, Helen (1879–1969) and Olive Rossetti (1875–1960), became great friends with Edward and Olive Garnett.

While Richard Garnett was Keeper of Printed Books he was asked to expand the foreign languages section of the library and, with help from Prince Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921) who made a note of missing materials and suggested what Richard Garnett could acquire, he focussed upon developing the Russian and Slavonic holdings. The Museum's expanding collection, gave the well-educated Olive Garnett access to a range of fiction, history,

⁴⁰ Garnett's siblings were: May Garnett (1864–1939), Robert Garnett (1866–1932), Edward Garnett (1868–1937), Lucy Garnett (1875–1961), Arthur Garnett (1881–1927)

⁴¹ Alan Bell, 'Garnett, Richard (1835–1906)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33334>> (date accessed: 13/10/2015).

periodicals and uncensored revolutionary literature that was banned in Russia and to which she may not have otherwise been exposed.⁴²

The Émigrés

While Richard Garnett's interest in Russian literature captured Olive Garnett's attention, the most significant reason for her growing fascination with Russian literature and culture was her social network. Through Edward and Constance Garnett, Olive Garnett met and became friends with several Russian revolutionaries and émigrés who had voluntarily left or been exiled from Russia because they openly opposed the autocracy of the Russian empire. Russian émigrés were drawn to London owing to the slow but steady rise of socialism in the capital, which the exiles felt they could not only capitalise on but also encourage by delivering lectures, circulating Russian literature and forging new networks.⁴³

The first émigré Olive Garnett met was Feliks Volkhovsky (1846–1914), on 4 November 1891 when she went to Leith Hill, Surrey, to visit Edward and Constance Garnett.⁴⁴ Volkhovsky was living with Olive Garnett's brother and sister-in-law at the time and had already begun tutoring Constance Garnett in Russian.⁴⁵ Volkhovsky was a revolutionary, who, with his young daughter Vera, stayed with Edward and Constance Garnett as a political refugee.

⁴² For further information regarding Richard Garnett's expansion of the foreign languages section of the library see: Ekaterina Rogatchevskaia, 'The Russian Collections at the British Museum Library and the British Museum Staff: Materials of the British Library Corporate Archives, 1840s-1920s', *Solanus*, vol. 23 (2013), pp. 64-102 (p. 72-74).

⁴³ Rebecca Beasley, 'Russia and the Invention of the Modern Intelligentsia', in *Geographies of Modernism: Literatures, Cultures and Spaces*, ed. Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker (Oxford: Routledge, 2005) pp. 19-30.

⁴⁴ Olive Garnett, Wednesday 4 February 1892, *Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett, 1890–1893*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett's Press, 1989), p. 52.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

After being inspired by Nikolai Chernyshevsky's (1828–89) seminal text, *Chto Delat'?* (*What is to be Done?*) (1863) in 1864, Volkhovsky began to move in the same circles as Dmitry Karakozov (1840–66), the first Russian radical who attempted to assassinate Tsar Alexander II in April 1866. After the assassination attempt, Volkhovsky was arrested on three occasions. His first arrest was made in February 1868 for co-founding the Rouble Society, the name of which derived from the monthly membership cost, which was established as an attempt to form relations with peasant groups. Volkhovsky and his associates did this by disguising themselves as peripatetic teachers and then used legal and banned publications to conduct revolutionary propaganda among them. He was arrested for a second time in April 1869 for associating with the revolutionary Sergey Nechayev (1847–82) who authored the radical manifesto, *Catechism of a Revolutionary* (1871), which outlined a programme akin to the Ten Commandments for revolutionary groups and became one of the most influential texts of the radical movement in Russia, promoting nihilism and propagating violence. Volkhovsky was arrested for the third and final time in August 1874 for running an offshoot of the Chaikovtsy Circle in Odessa that sought to print, publish and distribute revolutionary and scientific literature. Additionally, the Chaikovtsy Circle tried to radicalise the proletariat in a bid to send them back to the countryside to create revolutionary groups within the rural population. As a result of his revolutionary activities, Volkhovsky was charged with populist unrest and was one of the defendants in the Trial of the 193; a string of show trials ordered by Tsar Alexander II between 1877 and 1878 designed to demonstrate his power and eradicate radicalism. Volkhovsky was banished to Siberia and escaped in 1888, fleeing the Russian Empire, first for Canada and then for England.

Volkhovsky established himself as a mouthpiece for the Russian revolutionary movement in Western Europe by speaking publicly and writing articles for *The Times* on the Russian penal system. Crime and punishment in Russia were topics of particular fascination in the West after the publication of the explorer George Kennan's (1845–1924) book, *Siberia and the Exile System* (1891), which remains one of the most damning indictments of the autocratic regime in the Russian Empire.⁴⁶ While living with Edward and Constance Garnett, Volkhovsky began to tutor Olive Garnett in Russian.

The second important Russian figure in Olive Garnett's life was Kropotkin. While the diaries do not indicate the exact date that Kropotkin and Olive Garnett met for the first time, the start of a true friendship, rather than mere acquaintance, began when Kropotkin and his wife, Sofía, were invited to an 'At Home' on Thursday 3 March 1892.⁴⁷ An 'At Home' occurred every Thursday at the Garnett's accommodation in the British Museum. Friends and people of note were invited for Afternoon Tea, which was presided over by either Olive Garnett's mother, Olivia Narney Singleton (1842–1903), or Olive Garnett herself.⁴⁸

Kropotkin was from an aristocratic family who eschewed his heritage in favour of taking a leading role in the international anarchist movement. He was arrested in 1874 after the police found copies of a revolutionary manifesto written by Kropotkin in an associate's house and imprisoned at the imposing *Petropavlovskaya Krepost* (Peter and Paul Fortress) in

⁴⁶ David Saunders, 'Volkhovsky, Felix Vadimovich (1846–1914)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62227>> (date accessed: 23/10/2015).

⁴⁷ Garnett, 'Thursday 3 March 1892', *Tea and Anarchy!* p. 63.

⁴⁸ Barry C. Johnson, 'Friends and Neighbours', in *Tea and Anarchy!* pp. 13-18 (p. 13).

St Petersburg. In 1876 Kropotkin escaped from prison and left Russia for a nomadic life in Western Europe travelling between Scotland, France, Switzerland and England.

Kropotkin's activism continued while he was abroad and he was often watched by Russian spies. He was arrested in France in 1883 owing to his involvement with the First International, a global organisation set up to unite proletariat-focused left-wing political groups and trade unions, despite the fact that the First International had been dissolved in 1876. The French government hoped to conduct a show trial in order to curb a spate of social unrest in Lyon, which they believed had been encouraged by Kropotkin. He was imprisoned for five years.⁴⁹ Upon his release Kropotkin decided to settle in England, where he became a scientific journalist. During this time, Kropotkin published some of his most well-known works such as *The Conquest of Bread* (1892), which criticised feudalism and capitalism for benefitting from poverty and the limited availability of commodities, and the essay series, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (1902), which covered sociology, anthropology, zoology and provides an alternative theory to Social Darwinism, promoting the notion of cooperation over competition. Kropotkin was one of the most prominent figures who supported a revolution in Russia, writing pamphlets, journal articles and communicating with underground revolutionaries in Russia.⁵⁰

After the 1905 revolution, Kropotkin wrote that a complete revolution in Russia would be 'the only real remedy for the redress of wrongs' in an article for the radical journal, *Mother*

⁴⁹ Peter Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, ed. Nicolas Walter (Mineola (NY): Dover Publications, 1999), pp. 606-612.

⁵⁰ Many of his pamphlets and letters can be seen in Roger N. Baldwin, *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets: A Collection of Writing by Peter Kropotkin* (Mineola (NY): Dover Publications, 1927).

Earth (1906–17), which was edited by the anarchist, Emma Goldman.⁵¹ Kropotkin returned to Russia after the February Revolution in 1917, however he soon became disenchanted with the Bolshevik regime. In an open letter to the workers of Western Europe he noted that there would always be ‘evils inherent in a party dictatorship’, and the Bolshevik Party used the Russian Civil War to justify their totalitarianism.⁵²

While Kropotkin lived in England, Olive Garnett attended many of his lectures, although they did not ‘satisfy’ her as she supposed she was ‘not sufficiently scientific’.⁵³ Olive Garnett also commented that she ‘would not call [herself] an anarchist’, feeling that Kropotkin’s belief that the government of any nation ‘wounds and then heals’ was too extreme to suit her.⁵⁴ Kropotkin became one of Olive Garnett’s chief advisors in her bid to gain a better understanding of Russia and the attitude of Russian revolutionaries, as detailed in her numerous diaries.⁵⁵

The third émigré who Olive Garnett became close friends with was Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinsky (1851–95), known as Stepniak during his residence in London and referred to as ‘Stepniak’ by Olive Garnett in her diaries.⁵⁶ Stepniak became the most significant to Olive Garnett, not only in terms of supporting her literary output but also because she fell in love

⁵¹ Peter Kropotkin, ‘The Revolution in Russia’, *Mother Earth* (July 1906), pp. 5-10, <http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/goldman/ME/mev1n5.html#5> (date accessed: 23/10/2017).

⁵² Peter Kropotkin, ‘The Russian Revolution and the Soviet Government: Letter to the Workers of Western Europe’ (28 April 1919), in *Kropotkin’s Revolutionary Pamphlets*, pp. 252-259 (p. 253).

⁵³ Garnett, Monday 29 February 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!* p. 63.

⁵⁴ Garnett, Sunday 6 March 1892, *Tea and Anarchy*, p. 67.

⁵⁵ Nicolas Walter, ‘Kropotkin, Peter (1842–1921)’, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/42326>> (date accessed: 23/10/2015).

⁵⁶ Throughout this thesis I shall refer to Stepniak-Kravchinsky using his alias, Stepniak, despite it being more informal. This is to reduce confusion when quoting from Olive Garnett’s diaries, or letters from those in Olive Garnett’s circle because he is named ‘Stepniak’ in all of these.

with him, although her love remained unrequited. Olive Garnett did not officially meet Stepniak until Thursday 20 October 1892, however she first mentions him on Wednesday 2 December 1891 after she attended a Friends of Russian Freedom meeting and saw him lecture on 'funds and practical help' for the people suffering in Russia.⁵⁷ Olive Garnett subsequently saw Stepniak at another lecture at the National Liberal Club on Tuesday 15 December, where he 'gave an hour's address about the educational, financial, social and religious and literary state of Russia'.⁵⁸ The two did not meet until Edward Garnett invited Stepniak to meet Olive Garnett at their London house in Holborn ten months later.

Stepniak, like his close associate, Kropotkin, rejected his noble birth and by the age of twenty-two was involved in the middle-class populist movement, the Narodniks. The Narodniks believed that a revolution in Russia would start with the peasant class. However, the Narodniks also claimed that the peasants were not educated or enlightened enough to be aware of their poor quality of life and so would not independently revolt against the Tsar. Additionally, the Orthodox Church was very influential among the largely illiterate peasant population and priests instructed their congregations that it was a sin against God to challenge the authority of the Tsar.⁵⁹ The act of *khozhdeniye v narod* (going to the people) began in 1873 and was the Narodniks's attempt to go to the countryside and agitate small rural communities into rebellion.⁶⁰ After escaping arrest, Stepniak spent time in Central Europe, where he met the 'father of anarchy', Mikhail Bakunin (1814–76), in Lugano.

⁵⁷ Garnett, Wednesday 2 December 1891, *Tea and Anarchy*, p 58.

⁵⁸ Garnett, Tuesday 15 December 1891, *Tea and Anarchy*, p. 59.

⁵⁹ Esther Kingston-Mann, 'Breaking the Silence: An Introduction', in *Peasant Economy, Culture, and Politics of European Russia, 1800-1921*, ed. Esther Kingston-Mann and Timothy Mixter (Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 3-20.

⁶⁰ Derek Offord, *Nineteenth Century Russia: Opposition to Autocracy* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 76.

Bakunin converted Stepniak from a political career that focussed on the spreading of left-wing literature and peaceful propaganda to a violent one.

After returning to Russia, Stepniak assassinated General Mezentsev (1827–78), the head of Tsar Alexander II's secret police, *Tretiye Otdeleniye* (Third Section) in August 1878.

Mezentsev was chosen as the target because he petitioned Tsar Alexander II for harsher sentences for the prisoners (including Volkhovsky) during the Trial of the 193. Stepniak stabbed Mezentsev in the middle of the day in St Petersburg in 1878, but did not leave Russia until 1880 when he was in danger of being arrested. Stepniak travelled to London and his wife, Fanny Kravchinskaya (1855–1945), joined him soon after and she also became a leading figure in Olive Garnett's life.

Kravchinsky Unmasked

When Olive Garnett met Stepniak he was already known in England as an author, rather than as a terrorist. Indeed, he wrote under the name of Stepniak, rather than Kravchinsky – the surname associated with his assassination of Mezenstev. Stepniak's book, *Underground Russia: Profiles and Sketches of Revolutionary Life* was published in 1882. *Underground Russia* provides case studies of figures significant to the Russian revolutionary cause, such as Kropotkin and Vera Zasulich (1851–1919) – a socialist revolutionary who arguably started the terrorist movement in Russia by shooting General Trepov (1809–89) in 1878 – and revolutionary episodes of note, including the aftermath of the assassination of Tsar Alexander II. Stepniak continued writing and publishing texts designed to inform English-speaking readers about the Russian people and Russian condition. These included *Russia*

Under the Tzars (1885), *The Russian Storm Cloud* (1886), *The Russian Peasantry: Their Agrarian Condition, Social Life and Religion* (1888) and *The Career of a Nihilist* (1889). He also delivered public lectures on the theme of social conditions in Russia and in 1888 wrote a letter to President Cleveland (1837–1908) condemning a treaty that would facilitate the extradition of Russian émigrés.⁶¹

The Garnetts were not aware of Stepniak's acts of terrorism until 28 December 1893, when they received news that an article was to be published in *The New Review* (1889–1897) attacking 'Stepniak, Volkhovsky and others – written, or at least instigated by O.K.'.⁶² This was perhaps naivety on the parts of the Garnetts – Edward, Constance and Olive – who considered Stepniak one of their dearest friends. It appears they never enquired about the particulars of Stepniak's past and Stepniak never felt inclined to tell them, so the article shocked the Garnetts to their core. The article in question was titled 'Anarchists: Their Methods and Organisation' and was written in two sections under the pseudonyms of 'Z' for section one and 'Ivanoff' for section two. Olive Garnett assumed that 'Z' was 'O.K.'⁶³ O.K. stood for Olga Novikoff (1842–1925), who was an expatriate journalist and passionate Slavophile who publicly defended Tsardom. Novikoff was intensely disliked by the Conservative ex-Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli (1804–81), but was liked by the Liberal Prime Minister, William Gladstone (1809–98).⁶⁴ 'Ivanoff' was the alias of P. I. Rachkovsky

⁶¹ Charles A. Moser, 'A Nihilist's Career: S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskij', *The American Slavic and East European Review*, vol. 20 (1961), pp. 55-71 (p. 58).

⁶² Garnett, Thursday 28 December 1893, *Tea and Anarchy*, p. 239.

⁶³ Z and Ivanoff, 'Anarchists: Their Methods and Organisation', *The New Review*, vol. 56 (January 1894), pp. 1-16.

⁶⁴ Barry C. Johnson, 'Introduction: Stepniak and General Mezentsev', in Olive Garnett, *Olive and Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett, 1893-1895*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett's Press, 1993), pp. 1-18 (p.1).

(1853–1910), who was head of the Okhrana, the Russian secret service, and keen to expose Russian political émigrés. The article is set up as a plea to the ‘fairminded [sic.] and impartial English men and women’ to ‘lift up their voices, with their eyes open’ ‘against the apology of assassination, against hideous plots, against dynamite, against the violent upsetting of all the institutions which are still held dear’.⁶⁵ Here Ivanoff is referring to the acts of terrorism seen against the Russian royal family and the potential threat the British monarchy is now under because émigrés have been granted sanctuary in Britain. Kropotkin and Volkhovsky are mentioned by name for being linked to radical plots in Western Europe and ‘the murderer of General Mezentzeff, who publishes his revolutionary lubrications under an assumed name’ is of course, Stepniak, who dropped the second half of his surname, Kravchinsky, when he settled in London.⁶⁶ Ivanoff accuses Stepniak’s pamphlet, ‘What We Want; and the Beginning of the End’ (1891), written for the Polish Political Emigrants’ Friendly Society, as ‘an appeal to the worst instincts of the human race’.⁶⁷ The quoted section of the pamphlet reads:

That the small set which governs Russia, with the support of the Russian peasantry, whose ignorance is proverbial, can only be annihilated by violence; there is no other means of doing it. In politics we are not only revolutionists, aiming straight at the insurrection of the people, but we organise also military plots, palace outrages, and the use of dynamite.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Z and Ivanoff, p. 10

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 12.

⁶⁸ Ibid., pp. 12-13. For the entire pamphlet see, E.L. Voynich, *Nihilism as It Is* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1894), pp. 13-51.

Stepniak's avocation of terrorism is evident and would have been enough to shock Olive Garnett and her family, who thought that Stepniak was simply an 'artist'.⁶⁹ Ivanoff then continues by giving a biographical account of 'the warmest partisan of terrorism', the man who assassinated General Mezentsev.⁷⁰ Olive Garnett recognised the biographical detail and was appalled and saddened by the article. She notes:

...the article "Anarchist II" was a blow to me. "Underground Russia" was once again in my mind again, and I recognised the danger that lay in this attack in that it might close up or narrow the gradually opening and broadening minds of the Russians, under English influence, a result which always follows so closely upon the heels of persecution. Selfishly, I feared that I might lose "my Stepniak" – the artist – in the Stepniak I do not know, the nihilist, terrorist and ----⁷¹

Olive Garnett was concerned that the article would result in her Russian friends becoming more fixated on their revolutionary goals. Evidently, she felt that spending time in London had had a positive effect on the mentality of the émigrés and Olive Garnett became worried that the article would encourage them, and in particular Stepniak, to regress back into the violent radicals they had been in Russia. The incomplete sentence suggests that Olive Garnett could not bring herself to write 'murderer' when she lists qualities of the Stepniak she does 'not know'. Olive Garnett continued, in an attempt to rationalise the allegation, 'the article is a clever mixture of truth unfavourably represented and falsehood in the guise of truth'.⁷²

⁶⁹ Olive Garnett, Friday 29 December 1893, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, pp. 19-21 (p. 19).

⁷⁰ Z and Ivanoff, p. 14.

⁷¹ Garnett, Friday 29 December 1893, *Tea and Anarchy*, p. 240.

⁷² Garnett, Friday 29 December 1893, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 19.

After the initial shock wore off, Olive Garnett felt miserable and was 'simply a mass of sensitiveness', particularly when she found herself next to Stepniak at a farewell party for Constance Garnett, who was leaving for a trip to Russia: 'I happened to sit next to Stepniak; I could not speak to him. What was he thinking of? Would my opinion make any difference to him? Did he think I knew, or pity my innocence?'⁷³ Olive Garnett's discomfort and agitation are clear, particularly in light of the number of questions she asked herself. Olive and Constance Garnett decided that if the accusations were true they would condemn Stepniak for them, however they vowed that they would be 'none the less the same towards him as [they] have ever been' and should regard 'the whole affair as one past, and removed from the sphere of our comprehension – except in one particular [the murder], which – whatever the motive – must forever be a source of regret.'⁷⁴ Constance and Olive Garnett believed that Stepniak was a reformed character and, while he was no longer violent, he still did his utmost to defend the Russian radical and promote anti-tsarist opinion in Britain.

Stepniak operated in largely socialist circles, was friends with George Bernard Shaw (1856–1950) and William Morris (1834–96) and in 1890 gave a lecture to the Fabian Society on Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910) and Chernyshevsky. He also lectured at the Democratic Club on Chancery Lane. The ambience of the club was described as 'revolutionary – Republicans, Irish Nationalists and Anarchists were numbered amongst its members. [...]it was a veritable Cave of Adullam for all who had turned their hands against Society as then constituted.'⁷⁵

⁷³ Ibid., p.21

⁷⁴ Garnett, Saturday 30 January 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 22.

⁷⁵ Joseph Burgess, *John Burns: The Rise and Fall of a Right Honourable* (Glasgow: The Reforms Bookstall, 1911), p. 33.

With his Russian associates, Volkhovsky and Kropotkin, Stepniak formed the 'Society of Friends of Russian Freedom' in 1890, which remained active until 1914. Its pamphlet, *Free Russia* (1890–1914), became one of the most well-known sources for anti-tsarist opinion in late Victorian and Edwardian Britain.

Stepniak became one of the most influential figures in Olive Garnett's life, serving as an editor, friend and unrequited love. Despite Olive Garnett's romantic feelings towards Stepniak, she always remained close friends with Kravchinskaya, who in turn helped Olive Garnett practise her Russian. Indeed, the Kravchinskaya-Garnett relationship became so close that Kravchinskaya came to see Olive Garnett as the daughter she never had.⁷⁶

Translations and Russophilia

Volkhovsky, Kropotkin and the Stepniaks met Olive Garnett and her family during the period of British 'Russian Fever'.⁷⁷ The British desire for 'all things Russian' began during the Crimean War and was galvanised by the influx of translations of Russian literature and the reported acts of revolutionary terrorism. Olive Garnett was among those who developed an interest in Russian culture and her exposure to her father's interest in Slavonic literature, coupled with her regular socialisation with Volkhovsky, Kropotkin and the Stepniaks, only served to heighten her intrigue. Her warm feelings towards Stepniak also contributed to Olive Garnett's desire to learn more about Russia.

⁷⁶ David Saunders, 'Kravchinsky, Sergey Mikhailovich (1851–1895)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62226>> (date accessed: 23/11/2015).

⁷⁷ Anthony Cross, 'Introduction', *Journal of European Studies*, vol. 35 (2005), pp. 251-252 (p. 252).

The dramatic increase in British Russophilia during the 1890s was greatly assisted by the translations of Russian authors such as Nikolai Gogol (1809–52), Alexander Herzen (1812–70), Ivan Goncharov (1812–91), Ivan Turgenev (1818–83), Alexander Ostrovsky (1823–86), Fyodor Dostoevsky, Anton Chekov, and Leo Tolstoy by Constance Garnett. With the help of Volkhovsky and the Stepniaks, Constance Garnett translated seventy-one volumes of literature, including seventeen volumes of Turgenev, seventeen of Chekhov, thirteen of Dostoevsky, six of Gogol, four of Tolstoy, six of Alexander Herzen, and books by Goncharov and Ostrovsky. Constance Garnett's first translated work was Goncharov's *A Common Story* in 1894. The bildungsroman follows a young man's progression from a sentimental youth living in a provincial town, to an active member of St Petersburg society, presenting a scathing critique of Romanticism.⁷⁸

The effect of Constance Garnett's overwhelming output should not be underestimated. Michaela Bronstein describes Constance Garnett's work as 'foundational', particularly in her capture of an 'entire national tradition' through a singular British voice.⁷⁹ As with her sister-in-law, Olive Garnett, Constance Garnett initially started her work on Russia as a project to draw British attention to Russia, however it became apparent that the work was more of a 'transnational project of canon formation'.⁸⁰ Rachel May celebrates the 'popularity and longevity' of Constance Garnett's efforts, noting that her volumes still appear as the

⁷⁸ Ivan Goncharov, *A Common Story*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: William Heinemann, 1894).

⁷⁹ Michaela Bronstein, 'Case Study: From Bolshevism to Bloomsbury: The Garnett Translations and Russian Politics in England' in *The Handbook to the Bloomsbury Group*, ed by Derek Ryan and Stephen Ross (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018), pp. 264-276 (p. 264).

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

translation of choice today.⁸¹ Although May does observe that Constance Garnett domesticated and tamed some of the works, she argues that this glossing over helped unify the concept of Russian literature. Admittedly this sounds homogenising now, however the glossing facilitated the British public's understanding of the texts, making them accessible, which is precisely what was needed at the time.⁸² Conversely Vladimir Nabokov condemned the translations as 'a complete disaster' due to 'woodenness', but May tempers this by praising the idiomatic and figurative language, musicality and expression, which implies they were anything but wooden.⁸³ Adrian Hunter believes that Constance Garnett's work was 'fundamental in introducing English speakers to the Russian masters and that the course of European and American modernism was altered by her rapid output.'⁸⁴ Hunter demonstrates the importance her translations, particularly in the formation of literary modernism. Constance Garnett gave the British public access to a wide and vast collection of Russian masters for the first time, contributing to the forthcoming changes in the British literary movement and the public's demand for knowledge and culture pertaining to Russia.⁸⁵ Beasley builds upon Hunter's argument in the first chapter of *Russomania*, describing Constance Garnett's translations as a key source of inspiration to a literary network that would be one of the 'crucibles of modernism'.⁸⁶

⁸¹ Rachel May, *The Translator and the Text: On Reading Russian Literature in English* (Evanston [IL]: Northwestern University Press, 1994), p. 37.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 38-40.

⁸³ David Remnick, 'The Translation Wars: How the Race to Translate Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky Continues to Spark Feuds, End Friendships and Create Small Fortunes', *The New Yorker* (7 November 2005), p. 3, 5. May, p. 39.

⁸⁴ Adrian Hunter, 'Constance Garnett's Chekhov and the Modernist Short Story', *Translation and Literature*, vol. 12 (2003), pp. 69-87 (p. 69).

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ Beasley, *Russomania*, pp. 40-134.

The Society of Friends of Russian Freedom, *Free Russia* and Nihilism⁸⁷

The effects of the Anglophone world's obsession with evoking an enigmatic and unknowable image of Russia frustrated the Russian émigrés in Garnett's circle and in the wider émigré community. In the preface to Stepniak's *Underground Russia*, the radical socialist Peter Lavrov (1823–1900) wrote

The Socialist and Revolutionary movement in Russia could not fail to attract the attention of Western Europe. It is only natural, therefore, that in every European language a somewhat extensive literature should be found upon this subject. [...] It must be confessed that, for the most part, this literature has not the slightest value. The authors know nothing of the facts related by them, [...]; they do not even know the country of which they speak, [...], they have not the least knowledge of the men who have played such prominent and important parts in that great drama, the Russian movement.⁸⁸

Here Lavrov illustrates the evident Western European interest in Russia, and in particular the revolutionary movement, while noting that most literature, whether fiction or non-fiction, served only to further the general misunderstanding of the political milieu in Russia and Russian people. Lavrov's statement that '[t]he authors know nothing of the facts related by them' echoes frustrations felt by Stepniak, Volkhovsky and Kropotkin, which were that British people had a misconceived idea of what Russian people were like and lack of

⁸⁷ I shall now revert back to referring to Olive Garnett as Garnett because other members of her family appear less frequently.

⁸⁸ Peter Lavrov, 'Introduction', in Sergei Stepniak, *Underground Russia: Revolutionary Profiles and Sketches from Life* (New York City (NY): Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), pp. v-xii (pp. v-vi).

awareness of the political situation in Russia. We can see this exasperation documented by Garnett in her diary, where in December she records that Kropotkin exclaimed, '[t]he English know nothing of Russia, they must be taught!'⁸⁹

Stepniak believed that literary works were the answer to educating the British public about the socio-political situation in Russia and he seemed to think that Garnett was capable of contributing towards this discourse. He hoped that Garnett would be able to accurately capture Russian figures in her writing and in an exchange regarding her ability to write accurately, 'Tell me,' he said 'you who have such delicate observation, can you appreciate fine shades in foreigners? Do you notice everything about us as you do English people?'⁹⁰ Garnett responded: 'I can't say whether I do notice fine shades in you. I think that the difficulty in the way of entirely understanding you lies in the language' noting the complications and miscommunications that can arise from mistranslations.⁹¹ Stepniak agreed, commenting that it was as if they had their ears 'stopped with wool'; words can be heard but not fully understood.⁹² Despite Garnett's reservations about whether she could 'appreciate the fine shades in foreigners', Stepniak clearly felt that Garnett was the writer he needed. He praised Garnett for her literary gifts of 'observation and insight'⁹³ and said that using them to write 'from an English point of view on Russia' would be of benefit to *Free Russia*.⁹⁴ Stepniak frequently reiterated the notion that Garnett should write fiction based on her observations for *Free Russia*, telling her in October 1893, 'the serious novel is

⁸⁹ Garnett, Wednesday 28 December 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 140.

⁹⁰ Garnett, Saturday 15 July 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 214.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *Ibid.* This exchange is pertinent to Chapter Six and in particular the identification of Stepniak with the pages of *In Russia's Night*.

⁹³ Garnett, Saturday 11 November 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 232.

⁹⁴ Garnett, Friday 21 October 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 126.

your work, the study of character’ and again two months later stressed that she ‘must take real people for models’.⁹⁵ In February the following year, Garnett notes again that Stepniak claimed it was her ‘fate to write upon what [she] observed.’⁹⁶ It is significant that Garnett chose to record these specific snapshots of their conversations. Quite often time spent in Stepniak’s presence would result in a diary entry that could only focus on how happy Stepniak made her feel.⁹⁷ Instead, in her careful documentation of Stepniak’s advice Garnett formed the opinion that to write from your own knowledge and experience meant that she had to get ‘everything true’ in her writing.⁹⁸

Truth, as a philosophical concept, is full of controversy and has occupied the minds of philosophers since antiquity with Aristotle (384 BC–322 BC) and Plato (exact dates unknown, but approximately 428 BC–348 BC) and features in the works of prominent theorists such as Thomas Aquinas (1225–74), Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900), William James (1842–1910) and Erich Fromm (1900–80).⁹⁹ The realms of philosophical truth theory, let alone theological, fall outside of the bounds of this thesis, however it is necessary to acknowledge that Garnett appears to equate her own personal observations to mean ‘the truth’. This is troublesome because her observations will be endowed with her own inherent prejudices, beliefs and opinions, as we shall see in Chapter Two. For the purposes of this thesis, the Correspondence theory of truth – the ‘truth’ is that which corresponds closest to

⁹⁵ Garnett, Friday 20 October 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 232., Garnett, Saturday 16 December 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 237.

⁹⁶ Garnett, Wednesday 28 February 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, pp. 44-45.

⁹⁷ For example, on Saturday 9 June 1893 she wrote, ‘He makes me so happy, and yet I feel that with him I breathe in a rarer atmosphere’ – *Tea and Anarchy*, p. 191.

⁹⁸ Garnett, Friday 22 September 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 150.

⁹⁹ For a succinct overview on the key schools of thought on truth, such as Correspondence, Coherence, Pragmatism and Deflationism see: Simon Blackburn, *On Truth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

reality – complements my methodology (see section below) owing to this project’s grounding in historical events.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, we can begin to understand why Garnett remained reasonably stylistically committed to literary realism as a ‘moral enterprise of truth telling’, rather than forging a more avant-garde path.¹⁰¹

Garnett acknowledged the role she had to play for Stepniak, fully aware that she was not writing for herself, but instead writing under instruction, commenting in her diary on 11 November 1893 that she hoped she was not withholding detail that ‘might be of use to them [the émigrés]’ in her writing.¹⁰² That is not to say that writing for others did not vex her, but it appears to make her feel aggrieved with herself, rather than Stepniak:

As a person I regret that my critics [Stepniak and Constance Garnett] are so full of their own ideas on the subject, that – for my good, of course – they won’t *let* me say a word, *me* who feel all the time something growing within me as I listen. I am in short a good little girl who does her best, has got hold – somehow – of something, and is to be helped to make the best of it [... .] I know quite well that I am only a child after all and that it is very very kind of people to pat me on the head and take an interest in me.¹⁰³

Here it is clear that Garnett was partially a victim of her age (she was twenty-one years old at the time), with Constance Garnett being ten years her senior and Stepniak twenty, and

¹⁰⁰ Arthur Prior, ‘Correspondence Theory of Truth’, in *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* (London: Macmillan, 1969), p. 223.

While I appreciate that historical events are themselves subject to bias in the re-telling, the complexities of this would fill several projects.

¹⁰¹ Levine, p. 8.

¹⁰² Garnett, Saturday 11 November 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 232.

¹⁰³ Garnett, Tuesday 18 April 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 179.

partially she lacked confidence in writing authoritatively alone. Garnett's bitterness was largely short-lived, because she was thrilled at the prospect of working with Stepniak.¹⁰⁴ Garnett relied heavily on his feedback and suggestions for her work throughout his life, but, as subsequent chapters will demonstrate, after Stepniak's death Garnett's work continued to be haunted by his ghost, alongside reflecting the literary advice and/or style of others such as her father, Richard Garnett, and one of the greatest novelists in literary history, Henry James.

Stepniak and Volkhovsky also looked further afield than their friends in their attempt to find a solution to the widespread misunderstanding of Russia in Britain. In 1890 they founded the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom with the aid of notable British liberals such as Leonard Trelawny Hobhouse (1864–1929), William Pollard Byles (1839–1917) and Robert Spence Watson (1837–1911). The organisation's pamphlet, *Free Russia*, was part pedagogic in intention and part propaganda. It contained uncensored reports on Russian social conditions, revolutionary messages and radical material in London, New York City and Zürich. Stepniak and Volkhovsky were its anonymous editors and the many of articles were credited to contributors living in Russia, with names excluded for the protection of the authors. However, Thomas Fisher Unwin (1848–1935), the publisher for whom Edward Garnett worked and who published Stepniak's pamphlets, Robert Spence Watson, who was the president of the Society of Friends of Free Russia between 1890 and 1911, and George

¹⁰⁴ Garnett, Wednesday 15 November 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 232-233.

Kennan, the American explorer who travelled in and wrote extensively on the Russian Empire, were also credited with articles.¹⁰⁵

Free Russia attracted significant attention from members of parliament, some of whom came out in support of the publication and others of whom were against it. As a member of the same network as Stepniak and Volkhovsky, and through their *Free Russia* connections, Garnett met people like George Kennan and the historian and foreign correspondent for a newspaper in St Petersburg, Angelo Soloman Rappaport (1871–1950) (28 May 1893).¹⁰⁶ Given that the pamphlet was a source of interest for members of the British government, including the Prime Minister, it had the potential to influence real and tangible change through shaping the opinions of British politicians about Russia and therefore potentially also British foreign policy and ultimately Anglo-Russian relations. Stepniak had asked Garnett to write fictional, but realist literature for *Free Russia*, and so through *Free Russia*, Garnett's sphere of influence had the potential to include the British government.

The statement by the Executive Committee printed on the cover page of the November 1898 issue of *Free Russia* declared that the objectives of the Society were to 'aid, in the extent of its powers, the Russian patriots who are trying to obtain for their country that Political Freedom and Self-government which Western nations have enjoyed for generations.'¹⁰⁷ The radical intentions of the Society are further illuminated in its appeal to

¹⁰⁵ For further information on *Free Russia* see: Carol Peaker, 'We are Not Barbarians: Literature and the Russian Émigré Press in England, 1890-1905', 19: *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, vol. 3 (2006), pp. 1-18., Donald Senese, 'Among British Liberals: Felix Volkhovsky in London, 1890-1914', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2.3 (1983), pp. 67-78.

¹⁰⁶ Garnett, Saturday 27 May 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 189.

¹⁰⁷ The Executive Committee of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom, *Free Russia*, vol. 3.11 (1892), p. 1.

‘the enlightened men and women of all countries, without distinction of nationality or political creed, who cannot witness with indifference the horrors perpetrated in the Empire of the Tsars and who wish a better future for the masses of the Russian people.’¹⁰⁸ The message of *Free Russia* was clear: the tsarist regime in Russia was inhumane and the Society was attempting to accrue a following from Europe and the United States of America. Moreover, the Society was allowed to operate openly in England, far removed from the arms of the Russian censors.

Stepniak’s and Volkhovsky’s anonymity as editors and the evident political agenda and the lack of censorship of the Society or *Free Russia* both contributed to an image of a powerful anti-tsarist hub in London, which the British government was supporting, or at the very least ignoring. The impression was undoubtedly exacerbated by the fact that several of the members of the Society were also part of the Prime Minister, William Gladstone’s, cabinet. These men included the Right Honourable Arthur Acland M.P. (1847–1926) and George Shaw Lefevre, 1st Baron Eversley (1831–1928) and their names were listed on the front cover of *Free Russia*. *The Speaker* (1890–1907) hoped that the suggestion of government support, whether true or not, would ‘open his [Tsar Alexander III] eyes to the savagery of the administration over which he reigns in stolid seclusion, and convince him that free speech is better for Russia’.¹⁰⁹ While an optimistic view, it nevertheless demonstrates that the aims and knowledge of the Society were being disseminated across the liberal readership of England. Anat Vernitski argues that Gladstone was aware of his politicians’ affiliation to the society and did not order them to disassociate themselves from it. Vernitski

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Anon., ‘Free Russia’, *The Speaker*, vol. 1.25 (28 June 1890), pp. 698-699 (p. 699).

concludes that 'British politicians were either convinced or pretended to believe notwithstanding, the terrorist past linked to the Russian founders of the Friends of Free Russia, that they had become respectable political figures with which they could associate.'¹¹⁰

Vernitski's assessment of Gladstone's sanguine attitude may not be entirely correct. Upon seeing the group of names in the credits, Novikoff, whom Benjamin Disraeli dubbed 'the M.P for Russia' and also revealed Stepniak as a murderer, accused Acland, Shaw-Lefevre, and Burt of fraternising with nihilists and murderers in a letter to Gladstone.¹¹¹ In this instance, Volkhovsky was accused of being the nihilist, and Stepniak the murderer.¹¹²

Gladstone responded by saying:

It is right to say that the gentleman who, as I understood, is the head of this little-known Society, is a man of the highest character, and one quite incapable in my opinion of connecting himself with the ideas and plans of Nihilism.¹¹³

Up to this point, Vernitski's argument stands; either Gladstone was ignorant of Stepniak's past or was choosing to ignore it. It is interesting to note Gladstone's use of the word 'Nihilism', which appears to be an automatic reference for him, however the term 'Nihilist', while applicable to some branches of the Russian revolutionary movement, was not the

¹¹⁰ Anat Vernitski, 'Russian Revolutionaries and English Sympathizers in 1890s London: The Case of Olive Garnett and Sergei Stepniak', *Journal of European Studies*, vol. 35 (2005), pp. 299-314 (p. 305).

¹¹¹ Jehanne M. Gheith, *An Improper Profession: Women, Gender and Journalism in Late Imperial Russia* (Durham (NC), Duke University Press, 2001), p. 145.

¹¹² Olga Novikoff to W.E. Gladstone (5 December 1893), in W. T. Stead, *The M.P. For Russia: Reminiscences & Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff*, vol. 2 (London: Andrew Melrose, 1909), pp. 317-318 (p. 318).

¹¹³ W.E. Gladstone to Olga Novikoff (6 December 1893), in Stead, *The M.P. For Russia*, p. 317.

umbrella term for all revolutionaries that Gladstone presented it as. 'Nihilism' was brought into popular use by Turgenev in his 1862 novel, *Fathers and Sons* (published in English in 1867) when the character Bazarov is described as

'[...] a Nihilist.'

'A what?' exclaimed Nikolai Petrovitch, while even Paul Petrovitch paused in the act of raising a knife to the edge of which there was a morsel of butter adhering.

'A Nihilist,' repeated Arkady.

'A Nihilist? queried Nikolai Petrovitch. 'I imagine that that must be a term derived from the Latin *nihil* or 'nothing.' It denotes, I presume, a man who—a man who—well, a man who declines to accept *anything*.'

'Or a man who declines to *respect* anything, hazarded Paul Petrovitch as he re-applied himself to the butter.

'No, a man who treats things solely from the critical point of view,' corrected Arkady.

'But the two things are one and the same, are they not?' queried Paul Petrovitch.

'Oh no. A Nihilist is a man who declines to bow to authority, or to accept any principle on trust, however sanctified it may be.'

'And to what can that lead?' asked Paul Petrovitch.

'It depends upon the individual. In one man's case, it may lead to good; in that of another, to evil.'¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ Ivan Turgenev, *Fathers and Sons* (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 2008), p. 25.

It is easy to see how 'Nihilist' became a catch-all phrase when Arkady defines a nihilist as a person who 'declines to bow to authority', rather than a specific branch of the revolutionary movement; one that was 'typified by its intellectual and social iconoclasm and its embrace of rational thought', meaning the rejection and attacking – verbally and physically – of traditional values, institutions and establishments.¹¹⁵ This definition is still rather loose and as Michael Newton has commented, 'A single definition of nihilism remains elusive' which makes discussion challenging.¹¹⁶ However, it is documented as being used in Britain as a solely philosophical term before the attempted assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1866 by Karakzov, and from then became associated with those who committed politically motivated terrorist acts in Russia, developing more broadly to simply label all those who were against the status quo.¹¹⁷ For example, on 17 January 1870, *The Times* ran an article detailing the activities of the Narodniks and also of Nechayev, whose political philosophy came closest to being truly nihilistic and separate to the peaceful Narodniks, however the journalist simply notes, 'If it is a general principle that the less liberal the Constitution in a country, the more extreme the radicalism it produces, the Russian 'Nihilists' is naturally tempted to surpass his more westerly fellow-agitators in extravagant ideas.'¹¹⁸ By labelling both the Narodniks and Nechayev as Nihilists, it is clear that the opinion in Britain was that any group opposed to the Tsar, be they peaceful protestors or violent terrorists, were Nihilists.

¹¹⁵ Sasha St John Murphy, 'The Debate around Nihilism in 1860s Russian Literature', *SLOVO*, vol. 28 (2016), pp. 48-68 (p. 55).

¹¹⁶ Michael Newton, 'Nihilists of Castlebar!' Exporting Russian Nihilism in the 1880s and the Case of Oscar Wilde's *Vera; or the Nihilists*', in *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism*, ed. Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Ross Bullock (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) pp. 35-52 (p. 36).

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 37, 51.

¹¹⁸ Anon., 'Socialism in Russia', *The Times* (Monday 17 January 1870), p. 4.

As a response to Gladstone, Novikoff persisted with the matter of M.P.s being affiliated with the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom and within a few days Gladstone had reached his conclusion and responded by acknowledging that

[A] Minister in our country has no title to belong to a political Society in another. Let him look to his own affairs here at any rate these give us enough, and more than enough, to do. I find both my colleagues, Mr. Lefevre and Mr. Acland, agree with me in this opinion. They have withdrawn their names from the Society, and assure me they had forgotten they belonged to it...¹¹⁹

Evidently Gladstone decided that his ministers, who were expected to show support and friendship towards Russia in defiance of revolutionary groups and in support of the Concert of Europe, could not also be part of a group that campaigned for the end of Russian autocracy. However, while Shaw-Lefevre and Acland's names disappeared from the front cover of *Free Russia* from the January 1895 edition of *Free Russia* – one month after Gladstone's letter to Novikoff – many other Liberal Party politicians such as Sir William Allan M.P. (1837–1903), Sir William Pollard Byles M.P., Thomas Lough M.P (1850–1922) and John Ellis M.P. (1841–1910) still featured, as did the founder of the Labour Party, James Keir Hardie (1856–1915).¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ W.E. Gladstone to Olga Novikoff (8 December 1893), in Stead, *The M.P. For Russia*, p. 318.

¹²⁰ January – December 1895 volumes of *Free Russia: The Organ of the English Society of Friends of Russian Freedom*, <http://www.archive.org/stream/freerussiaorgan00freegoog/freerussiaorgan00freegoog_djvu.txt> (date accessed: 06/11/2017).

While Volkhovsky and Stepniak were dedicating excessive time and effort to *Free Russia*, Garnett, not to be outdone by their commitment to demystifying and demythologising Russia, was also wondering how to bridge ‘the impassable gulf between English and Russians’.¹²¹ Her admiration and love for Stepniak, for ‘my Stepniak’, her ‘kingdom of light and warmth’, ignited her desire to go to Russia.¹²² Stepniak encouraged Garnett to ‘write from an English point of view on Russia’ and more importantly, write accurately.¹²³ Russians were not, on the whole, violent, dark or obsessive – they were oppressed by autocracy, inhibited by poverty and censorship and controlled by the sheer brute force of the State. One of Garnett’s tasks was to reveal the suffering of the Russian masses and the brutality of Tsarism, which was in line with the aims of the Society and *Free Russia*, who could use Garnett’s work as propaganda – a frequent technique of theirs.¹²⁴ However, the other task was to write openly and honestly about Russian people, places and culture from a British perspective, to impart some truths about the Russian Empire onto her readership. Plans were made for Garnett to travel to Odessa to stay with Stepniak’s friends, however these arrangements had to be cancelled when Stepniak died on the 23 December 1895, after being hit by a train while on his way to Volkhovsky’s, house.¹²⁵ Six months after Stepniak’s

¹²¹ Thomas C. Moser, ‘An English Context for Conrad’s Russian Characters: Sergey Stepniak and the Diary of Olive Garnett’, *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 11 (1984), pp. 3-44 (p. 4).

¹²² Garnett, Friday 29 December 1895, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 240., Garnett, Saturday 23 November 1895, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 23., Garnett, Friday 29 December 1895, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 239.

¹²³ Garnett, 20 October 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 126

¹²⁴ For example see Stepniak’s piece in the November 1892 edition of *Free Russia* titled ‘Foreign Office Report on Russian Agriculture and the Failure of the Harvest in 1891’, pp. 4-6 where he romanticises the Foreign Office’s report of the situation in Russia and states that the Foreign Office’s findings can only mean ‘another famine’ is imminent, possibly one every year for the next five winters, or Volkhovsky’s January 1894 piece describing his life as a political exile in Tomsk, pp. 2-3, or ‘A Cry of Despair’ in the February 1894 edition, which is a letter written by an anonymous political exile hoping to share his experience in Russia that is ‘a thousand times worth than death’ with the readers of *Free Russia*, p.15.

¹²⁵ Stepniak and Olive Garnett’s relationship, Stepniak’s past and his train accident arguably inspired the characters of Haldin, Razumov and Natalia in Joseph Conrad’s *Under Western Eyes*. For a full analysis of this

death, a distraught Garnett did travel to Russia, however she went to St Petersburg instead of Odessa and stayed with connections of Constance Garnett's. Garnett lived in St Petersburg between 5 August 1896 and 24 May 1897 and fictionalised what she witnessed, heard about or discussed there in her short story collection, *Petersburg Tales*, attempting to present a true (to her mind), knowable version of Russia to the British readership.

Methodology

The challenge in dedicating an entire project to an under-studied author naturally stems from the limited scholarship available to position myself within or against. This thesis then takes a triangulated approach, taking into consideration Garnett's life, her diaries and her fiction and focuses on a biographical and historical framework to contextualise individual arguments within the chapters and the overarching argument overall. It was important that I mobilised a variety of primary and secondary sources in order to help position Garnett correctly and to frame my argument. The first and most important of which was the three published volumes of Garnett's diaries, edited by Barry C. Johnson, *Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett 1890-1893* (1989), *Olive and Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett, 1893-1895* (1993) and *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in England 1897-1958* (2019). I was fortunate enough to meet Johnson in 2015, where he handed me a duffel bag full of pages of Garnett's scrawling, sloping diary entries, and in 2017 I assisted Johnson and Garnett's Great-Niece, Caroline White, in producing the third and final volume of Garnett's diary by proofreading

connection please see Moser's article 'An English Context for Conrad's Russian Characters: Sergey Stepniak and the Diary of Olive Garnett'.

the manuscript. The diaries themselves span nearly 70 years of Garnett's life and have been an invaluable backbone for this project, providing a focussed contextual framework, pegged to the broader social, political and historical within which Garnett lived her life.

With the diaries, we are at the mercy of Garnett's frequent and thorough purges of her writing, where she destroyed numerous entries at a time. She suffered depressive episodes throughout her life, as did her brother Edward Garnett, and the self-editing of her diaries often coincided with periods of poor mental health. This naturally calls into question the purpose behind Garnett's diary – was she writing it simply as an *aide-mémoire* and an immediate, authentic form of self-expression, or did she view her diaries as a tool of self-construction? Is the Garnett seen within the diary a persona? I do not truly know the answer, however Garnett's destruction of pages and passages from her diary suggests that she was mindful of potentially having an audience, be it her future self or something grander. If this is the case then it does throw Garnett's reliability into question. However, what can be guaranteed is that Garnett's diary entries are immediate reactions, thoughts and feelings to people, places and events of international concern. Diaries are by their nature problematic because they are entirely subjective and depend on the author accurately remembering and recording events truthfully. Whilst Stepniak believed Garnett was skilled in writing truthfully, it is much easier to write truthfully about others, than it is to write truthfully about yourself. Through also taking a historical, alongside a biographical approach, I hope to reduce bias as much as conceivably possible.¹²⁶

¹²⁶ For further information on writing the self see: Peter Heehs, *Writing the Self: Diaries, Memoirs and the History of the Self* (New York City (NY), Bloomsbury, 2014)., Liz Stanley, *The Auto/biographical I, The Theory and Practice of Feminist Auto/biography* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992).

As well as Garnett's diaries I also accessed the Garnett Family Papers found in the Charles Deering McCormick Library of Special Collections at Northwestern University, Chicago. This archive furnished me with unpublished external correspondences and manuscripts written by Garnett, enriching, confirming or refuting accounts given in her diaries. The archives allowed me to further my understanding of Garnett as a person and as an author and to bring samples of her unpublished manuscripts into conversation.

The diaries, letters and archival material provide me with a breadth and depth of knowledge about Garnett, however a biographical approach alone is insufficient in bringing Garnett into the centre of her literary and political networks. Owing to the immediacy of Garnett's fiction, which addresses and responds to contemporaneous events either on an international scale, such as the 1905 revolution in Russia, or in her personal life, such as when she helped the Russian philosopher V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky (1829–1918) write his memoir, I felt it was beneficial to take a historical approach when analysing her writing. By pegging Garnett's work to the historical context, it allows us to gain a deeper understanding of her literature and interpret her fiction in light of historical and personal events. Alongside using historians such as Derek Offord, Esther Kingston-Mann, Richard Pipes and Geoffrey Hosking I also have made extensive use of newspapers and periodicals of the time to ascertain immediate reactions to events and situations of national and international importance (social unrest in Russia, the suicide of a young woman incarcerated in Russia, shifts in Anglo-Russian relations etc.). Newspapers and periodicals have also been used to assess the critics' and publics' reaction to Garnett's published works.

The biographical and historical methods come together with scholarship relating to more well-known, influential authors such as Henry James, Katherine Mansfield and Ivan Turgenev, in order to draw Garnett from the peripheries of literary criticism. The thesis shall resituate Garnett at the centre of a conversation that looks out at her political and literary networks, considering how she engages, influences and is influenced by them and argue that her literary works demands and deserve more attention than they currently receive.

Overview

The chapters in this thesis follow a logical progression, with the first four chapters each examining a short story from the *Petersburg Tales* collection in the order they are printed: 'The Case of Vetrova', 'Roukoff', 'The Secret of the Universe' and 'Out of It'. The fifth chapter stands alone in not addressing a singular piece of Garnett's published work, but instead acts as a continuation of this thesis's arguments about the intertextual relationships between Garnett's and others' work *and* about the widening of Garnett's. Both chapters four and five demonstrate how Garnett's work is connected via Russian influence to more popular strands of literary criticism. The sixth and final chapter looks at Garnett's substantial novel, *In Russia's Night*.

Chapter One follows the first short story in *Petersburg Tales*, 'The Case of Vetrova', which is set in St Petersburg in 1897 and takes inspiration from the suicide, or murder, of a female prisoner in *Petropavlovskaya Krepost*. This incident coincided with when Garnett was living in St Petersburg. The chapter uses newspaper reports of the incident and its aftermath, as well as letters and Garnett's diary entries relating either to the death of the prisoner and the

resulting social unrest, or to Garnett's writing process. The chapter assesses how Garnett presents, in a fictionalised form, an event that demanded a significant attention in the British press. The short story stands alone in its assessment and understanding of the significance of the incident, highlighting Garnett's awareness of the nuances of the political and social tensions in Russia. I believe that it is this short story in particular that Beasley felt was at odds with Garnett's own personal allegiances, however I argue that Garnett was merely reflecting a true picture of the socio-political climate in Russia in 1897, as Stepniak encouraged her to do.

Chapter Two addresses Ford Madox Ford and Joseph Conrad's favourite short story in the *St Petersburg* collection, 'Roukoff'. The protagonist, a Miss Foster, is the same narrator we meet in 'The Case of Vetrova' and continues Garnett's literary exploration of her time spent in St Petersburg. At first the short story seems to adhere to the outdated Victorian realist style. However, I argue that 'Roukoff' is more interesting than a literary throwback because it is heavily influenced by Dostoevsky's *The Family Friend* (1859) and Gogol's *Petersburg Tales* (1842), with Garnett writing herself into the canon of Petersburg texts. Rather than focusing on a historical event, 'Roukoff' begins to explore the issue of class within Russia and, using models posited by Raymond Williams and Julia Prewitt Brown, I assess how well Garnett manages to write about people of not only different classes, but different cultures to her. As with Chapter One, I examine to what extent Garnett successfully, or not as the case may be, captures a true depiction of Russian people as she develops characters and relationships we first meet in 'The Case of Vetrova'.

Unlike the first two short stories, the third story, 'The Secret of the Universe' is not set in Russia, but in London. However, four of the five central characters are Russian and one, Alexander Barry, is based on the Russian philosopher, Flerovsky-Bervi, whose work heavily influenced the Chaikovtsy Circle. This chapter takes the minimal scholarship that exists on Garnett, primarily Thomas C. Moser's essay, 'An English Context for Conrad's Russian Characters: Sergey Stepniak and the Diary of Olive Garnett' (1984) and completes Moser's limited work on the 'The Secret of the Universe'. This chapter will provide the first sustained and in-depth analysis of 'The Secret of the Universe', exploring the five main characters and indicating where and how the story is tied to Garnett's life through the use of her diaries, letters and fragments of unpublished manuscript.

The final short story in the *Petersburg Tales* collection has received the least attention of all of Garnett's published works. On the surface the short story does not appear to have a Russian theme, the plot is ambiguous and the style cluttered with frequent punctuation and extended metaphors. This chapter offers the first sustained critical analysis of 'Out of It', making a case for its importance and highlighting a definite Russian connection through the events and personnel the story was inspired by. Furthermore, the chapter broadens the discussion and significance of Garnett and her literary work, illustrating how her texts are interconnected with dominant strands of literary scholarship that focus upon Turgenev and James.

Chapter Five continues the work of Chapter Four by widening Garnett's significance and influence in literary scholarship. As with Chapter Four, intertextuality is a prevalent theme in this chapter, which is a comparative piece considering how the short stories of Katherine

Mansfield and Olive Garnett engage with rising Russophilism and *fin de siècle* anxieties. Mansfield, in a similar way to James with Turgenev, is heavily influenced by Chekhov, and I use an unpublished short story by Garnett to demonstrate how the conversation can be taken further to include Garnett in the literary debate surrounding Mansfield's intertextuality with Chekhov. Both Garnett and Mansfield felt a close affinity to Russia, Russian people and Russian culture and both expressed this attraction in their writing, however Mansfield is an internationally studied and respected author, whereas Garnett has been largely forgotten. This chapter situates Garnett firmly alongside Mansfield, seeing Garnett as an equal to Mansfield within this discussion about the representation and utilisation of Russia in literature.¹²⁷

The final chapter looks at Garnett's long novel, *In Russia's Night*, and in particular the significance of the belatedness of its publication. The novel was published in 1918, but set in 1905, which means that it is the first of Garnett's published texts that is not produced as an immediate response to either a significant historical event or personal experience. The novel's long gestation is seen throughout the pages of *In Russia's Night* and the context of the intervening years, such as antisemitism in Russia and Britain, can be seen throughout the text. Moreover, the chapter does work on identifying key figures within Garnett's network in *In Russia's Night* and conducts the first sustained analysis of the novel, ultimately arguing that the text has been unfairly neglected by literary critics.

¹²⁷ An earlier form of this chapter was published in a book, *Katherine Mansfield and Russia*, ed. Galya Diment, Gerri Kimber, W. Todd Martin (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017).

* * *

Together, these six chapters work towards bringing Garnett from the edge of literary criticism into a discussion where she is found firmly at the centre. The thesis takes Garnett's *Petersburg Tales* and *In Russia's Night* and provides the first sustained analysis of the published texts, bringing in Garnett's diaries, unpublished manuscripts and letters in order to pin the texts to Garnett's own life. Furthermore, Garnett wrote about and for her own period and the use of historical context broadens the significance of her literature, with this project linking the short stories and the novel to the historical events that inspired them. Finally, a discussion of the intertextual nature of Garnett's work brings Garnett forward into popular areas of literary scholarship, namely that of the Russian masters, Henry James and Katherine Mansfield. Garnett's engagement with these diverse writers, as well as her own literary and political network, illustrates her work's dynamic relationship with more famous texts and figures and calls for a re-assessment of her contribution to the national conversation about Russian culture and to British literature as a whole.

Chapter One

'The Case of Vetrova': Autocracy, Apathy and Action

Olive Garnett left St Petersburg on 22 May 1897 and upon her return to London, Feliks Volkhovsky asked her to write about her experiences in Russia for *Free Russia*. Garnett declined, which is surprising given that, before Stepniak's death, Stepniak had expressed his ardent desire that Garnett write about Russia for *Free Russia*. Instead, Garnett informed Volkhovsky that she was busy writing a story about the death of the female political prisoner, Maria Fedoseevna Vetrova (1870–97), with the purpose of 'trying to show the impression it made upon public opinion'.¹²⁸ Thus, while Garnett decided not to write for Stepniak's political pamphlet at this time, she was still intent on contributing towards his legacy and on fulfilling his wish that she would help shape the British public's opinion of Russia.

This chapter will examine the short story, 'The Case of Vetrova', that emerged from Garnett's attempt to encapsulate the public mood in St Petersburg after Vetrova's death and which forms the first tale in Garnett's *Petersburg Tales* (1900) collection. I demonstrate: first, that Garnett's story successfully captures the impact that Vetrova's death had upon public opinion; second, that in doing so, Garnett follows Stepniak's instructions to 'take real people for models' for her stories; and third, why the text is worthy of significant literary

¹²⁸ Olive Garnett to Feliks Volkhovsky (15 October 1897), in Olive Garnett, *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in England, 1897-1958*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (Padstow: Tabb House, 2019), p. 96.

attention.¹²⁹ As throughout this thesis, I draw on the historical and biographical contexts from which the text emerged, including Garnett's diaries and letters, newspaper reports of the time and contemporary reviews of the story in order to pin 'The Case of Vetrova' to the historical event of Vetrova's death and the aftermath. Ultimately, I argue that both the text and Vetrova's death demand a greater level of acknowledgement than they currently both have in literary and historical scholarship respectively because of the galvanising effect Vetrova's death had upon the revolutionary movement in Russia.

The Genesis of *Petersburg Tales*

Before establishing these claims, it is important to outline Garnett's attempts to get *Petersburg Tales* published, because the struggle to see the work in print meant that there was a delay in Garnett disseminating a text that responded swiftly to significant events during her lifetime. 'The Case of Vetrova' is an immediate textual response to an actual event, but the delay in publishing the work meant that this immediacy was not fully appreciated by Garnett's first readership. Had 'The Case of Vetrova' had been published as a stand-alone text two years prior to *Petersburg Tales* being published, it might have gained a greater level of public attention than the *Petersburg Tales* as a whole.

Petersburg Tales was published three years after Garnett's return from Russia in 1900 by Heinemann. Heinemann had an interest in literature about and from Eastern European countries. Their publishing ventures included The Heinemann International Library, which

¹²⁹ Olive Garnett, Saturday 16 December 1893, *Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett* (London: Bartlett's Press, 1989), p. 237.

published translated works by European authors, including: English translations of Tolstoy's *Work While Ye Have the Light* (first pubd. and trans. in Britain, 1890; first pubd. in Russia, 1893), available in England three years before it was published in Russia; and *The Fruits of Enlightenment* (first pubd. and trans. 1891); and also Constance's Garnett's first translation, *A Common Story*, by Goncharov (first pubd. 1847; trans. 1894).¹³⁰ After *Petersburg Tales* appeared, Heinemann also went on to publish books such as the first book copy of Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (1902) and Constance Garnett's translations of Dostoevsky's *The Insulted and the Injured* (first pubd. 1861; trans. 1914), *A Raw Youth* (first pubd. 1875; trans. 1916) and *White Nights and Other Stories* (first pubd. 1848; trans. 1918).

Petersburg Tales – a quartet of short stories – came together by happy accident rather than via a deliberate and thoughtful curation process by Garnett. It is fortunate that Garnett's task to write based on her personal observations about Russia meant that a natural thematic connection flows through each of the four texts. The first story in the collection is 'The Case of Vetrova', a work that was originally intended to be published as a stand-alone piece when Garnett completed it in 1898. Unfortunately, the story was rejected by several editors. Garnett's first disappointment came when *Cosmopolis* (1896–98), the left-wing, multi-lingual and internationally printed journal, closed. 'Where is a poor devil to get published?' she fretted in her diary.¹³¹ Evidently, she had thought *Cosmopolis*, which was published by Edward Garnett's employer, T. Fisher Unwin, with its recently added Russian section and desire to transcend linguistic and political differences in an attempt to combat

¹³⁰ Kathy Rees, 'The Heinemann International Library, 1890–7', *Translation and Literature*, vol. 26.2 (2017) pp. 162-181.

¹³¹ Garnett, Sunday 20 November 1898, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 132.

nationalism, would have been the perfect candidate to publish her story.¹³² Garnett also had disappointments with Longman and *Atlantic Monthly* (1857–Present, renamed *The Atlantic*). Throughout the rejections, Garnett’s moroseness and desperation to have her work published grew, to the point where she would have been satisfied if ‘*something*’ was published, desiring to have her name in print like her brother and sister-in-law.¹³³ It was, therefore, with great delight that Garnett received news, in December 1898, that Heinemann had decided to release a collection of her short stories.¹³⁴

The eventual publication of *Petersburg Tales* was generally met with approval in the British press, with the *Manchester Guardian* hailing it as an ‘astonishing series of studies of Russian life.’¹³⁵ *The Times* was less succinct than the *Manchester Guardian*, but nonetheless appreciative:

As a nation we possess distinct ideas concerning the Russians. We have heard much about their character, their prisons, their administration of justice, etc.: but only those of us who have been into their country and lived their life can see them as appreciate them as they are. *Petersburg Tales* gives us the welcome sensation of newness – or, rather, of seeing old things in the new light. [...] Miss Garnett’s analytical ability amounts to

¹³² Liana Giorgi, ‘Between Tradition, Vision and Imagination: The Public Sphere of Literature Festivals’, in *Festivals and the Cultural Public Sphere*, ed. Gerard Delanty, Liana Giorgi and Monica Sassatelli (London: Routledge, 2011), pp. 29-45 (29-34)., Tanya Agathocleous, *Urban Realism and the Cosmopolitan Imagination in the Nineteenth Century: Visible City, Invisible World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 31.

¹³³ Olive Garnett, Saturday 4 February 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 135.

¹³⁴ Garnett, Sunday 18 December 1898, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 133., Garnett, Sunday 22 January 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p.135.

¹³⁵ Anon., ‘Our London Correspondence’, *Manchester Guardian* (16 April 1900), p. 6.

genius, and I believe that someday we shall count her among our very best writers.¹³⁶

As Barry C. Johnson points out, the fact that *Petersburg Tales* – a work by a new writer – secured at least eight reviews is significant.¹³⁷ The most positive of these reviews recognised Garnett for bringing something significant to the British public as she attempted, in memory of Stepniak, to write about Russia from a British perspective. The *Times* review recognised that Garnett had created a piece of literature that encouraged the British public to look at Russia with new eyes demonstrating Garnett’s key role in the mediation of Russian culture to a British audience.

The Death of Vetrova

In February 1897, while Garnett was living in St Petersburg, Maria Vetrova, a student at the Russian Empire’s most prominent institution for female education, Bestuzhev Courses, was arrested and accused of being a member of the Russian terrorist group *Narodnaya Volya* (The People’s Will). Vetrova was imprisoned at the formidable *Petropavlovskaya Krepost* (Peter and Paul Fortress). *Petropavlovskaya Krepost*, a bastion and symbol of tsarist power and dominance, was infamous for its brutality and inhumane treatment of political prisoners, a fact that Kropotkin – the first person to escape from the fortress in 1876 – had made widely known in France and Britain.¹³⁸ In 1877 the notorious commander of the prison, General Trepov, ordered the public flogging of the radical, Arkhip Bogolyubov (1854–

¹³⁶ Anon., ‘Books and Their Writers: The Russian at Home’, *The Times* (30 September 1900), p. 2.

¹³⁷ Garnett, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 183.

¹³⁸ Peter Kropotkin, ‘The Fortress Prison of St. Petersburg’, *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. 12.76 (June 1883), pp. 928-949.

late 1800s). Bogolyubov went insane because of the beating and several female prisoners were lashed for loudly protesting the treatment of their comrade. Vera Zasulich tried to assassinate General Trepov, partly as an act of revenge for his treatment of Bogolyubov and also as Trepov was the Governor of St Petersburg he was a significant target for the Russian revolutionaries. When Zasulich was tried for her assassination attempt the public support for her actions was so overwhelming that she was declared innocent by the jury, showing the extent of public disgust for the fortress.¹³⁹

Vetrova and several other revolutionaries were arrested after the discovery of an illegal printing plant in the St Petersburg district of Lakhta.¹⁴⁰ It was alleged by Volkhovsky in *Free Russia* that while under interrogation Vetrova was raped by her questioner and, on returning to her cell, doused herself in the kerosene contained in the cell's lamp and immolated herself as an act of protest against the treatment of political prisoners at the fortress.¹⁴¹ According to other sources, Vetrova was set alight by prison guards and died from her burns several days later.¹⁴² The news of Vetrova's death spread quickly throughout St Petersburg and student groups called for a memorial to be held. This was forbidden, however, and two proclamations were published stating that no memorial was to be held and the intelligentsia were banned from reacting any further. In order to placate the

¹³⁹ Vera Zasulich, *Vospominaniia*, in *Five Sisters-Women Against the Tsar*, ed. Barbara Alpern Engel (DeKalb (IL): Illinois University Press, 2013), pp. 59-94 (p. 78).

¹⁴⁰ Anon., 'Vetrova, Mariia', in *The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia*, trans. Jean Paradise (London: Macmillan and Collier Macmillan, 1973).

¹⁴¹ Feliks Volkhovsky, 'The Enlightened Despotism – (Middle. Vetrov's Case)', *Free Russia*, vol. 8.5 (1 May 1897) pp. 36-37.

¹⁴² Mary Hamilton-Dann, *Vladimir and Nadya: The Lenin Story* (New York City (NY): International Publishers, 1998), p. 22.

student population, several female prisoners contained in the fortress were released, albeit on condition that they were shadowed by two policemen per woman.¹⁴³

Despite the prohibition, between 5000 and 6000 people attended a service for Vetrova outside Kazan Cathedral on Nevsky Prospect on 4 March; candles were lit, wreaths were raised and the traditional Eastern Orthodox funeral hymn, 'Eternal Memory' was sung.¹⁴⁴

The memorial developed into a peaceful protest against the treatment of political prisoners, which concluded with the crowd being broken up by the Okhrana. Arrests were made and 1,200 names were taken by the police. Interestingly, the last protest that had been held previously at the Kazan Cathedral was organised by the political group, *Zemlya i Volya* in 1876 – twenty-one years before Vetrova's memorial march. It was the first political demonstration seen in Russia and was smaller in number, with about 400 people demonstrating and thirty-four of those were arrested.

The fact that the demonstration following Vetrova's murder was significantly larger suggested that revolutionary feelings were on the rise. This was confirmed by further action taken in subsequent marches organised in memory of Vetrova, which were held in the university cities of Moscow and Kiev.¹⁴⁵ Anniversary 'celebrations' in Vetrova's name also occurred annually and one such 'celebration' in 1905 was ended by the police and Cossacks.¹⁴⁶ In March 1898, a year after Vetrova's death, a group of far-left agitators met in

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Susan K. Morrissey, *Heralds of Revolution: Russian Students and the Mythologies of Radicalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 178.

¹⁴⁵ Z. P. Solovyeva, 'Kazansky Demonstrations', in *St Petersburg Encyclopaedia*, ed. Committee of Culture of St. Petersburg, < <http://www.encspb.ru/object/2855693814?lc=en> > (date accessed: 17/11/15).

¹⁴⁶ G.H. Perris, *Russia in Revolution* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1905), p. 83. Perris was the founder of the popular non-fiction works that formed the Home University Library of Modern Knowledge. He is mentioned in

Minsk to form the *Rossiyskaya Sotsial-Demokraticheskaya Rabochaya Partiya (RSDRP)* (Russian Social Democratic Labour Party). Their aim was to unite revolutionary organisations that had either formed or grown in popularity since the death of Vetrova and over time they adopted notable members such as George Plekhanov (1856–1918), Zasluch, Leon Trotsky (1879–1940), Vladimir Lenin (1870–1924) and Joseph Stalin (1878–1953). While Vetrova is not currently widely credited with contributing towards the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917, the social reaction and declarations of civil dissatisfaction in response to her mysterious death certainly galvanised an upwards trend in social unrest and revolutionary activity. Trotsky even wrote in his autobiography, *My Life: The Rise and Fall of a Dictator* (1930) that he ‘started [his] work to the accompaniment of the Vetrova demonstration’, a detail with which historical scholarship has done little.¹⁴⁷ Garnett’s retelling of Vetrova’s death, alongside the event itself, warrants further attention and should be reinstated and resituated within the discourse surrounding the build up to the Russian revolutions.

Olive Garnett and ‘The Case of Vetrova’

A letter from Garnett to Constance Garnett dated 20 March 1897 indicates that Vetrova’s death had a significant impact upon the people of St Petersburg and in particular the students and other members of the Russian intelligentsia. Moreover, the letter also shows that the incident drew the attention of the British press:

all three published volumes of Garnett’s diaries and employed Garnett’s close friend, Sophie Huntsman. Perris was also a member of the Executive Committee of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom. The Cossacks had a complicated relationship with Russian autocracy, however were utilised by the imperial government to stampede public demonstrations.

¹⁴⁷ Leon Trotsky, *My Life: The Rise and Fall of a Dictator* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1930), p. 94.

I daresay you have seen in the papers what an exciting time 'la jeunesse' has been having here this week. One hears of nothing else wherever one goes [...]. [A] girl of 26 who burned herself to death in the fortress after a severe interrogation in which she appears to have been threatened with impossible penalties.¹⁴⁸

In choosing to write 'The Case of Vetrova', Garnett engages with a significant historical and political event of her time, providing a literary response to a pivotal moment in the Russian revolutionary moment. By drawing on her own personal experiences of being in Russia at this time, Garnett follows Stepniak's advice to 'take real people for models' and attempts to write truthfully about her perspective on Russia.¹⁴⁹

'The Case of Vetrova' is written in the first person from the perspective of a Miss Foster. It would be simple enough to assume that Miss Foster, the 'English *mees* boarding in the house [whose] daily occupation [was] the giving of English lessons in exchange for lessons in Russian' is a fictional alter ego of Garnett.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, Miss Foster's occupation as a tutor was also the role Garnett undertook while she was living in St Petersburg, and the pseudonym she adopted (Alice Foster) when she sent her manuscript of her short story, 'A Woman' to Macmillan for review.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁸ Olive Garnett to Constance Garnett (20 March 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 93-95 (p. 94).

¹⁴⁹ Garnett, Saturday 16 December 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 237.

¹⁵⁰ Olive Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', in *Petersburg Tales* (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1900), pp. 1-70 (p. 1).

¹⁵¹ Garnett, November, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 131. 'A Woman' remains unpublished.

Taking inspiration from the dramatic scenes that unfolded at Kazan Cathedral and the mystery of Vetrova's death in *Petropavlovskaya Krepost*, 'The Case of Vetrova' explores public reaction to the death of Vetrova, who 'died from the effects of burning, after two days' horrible suffering' after being arrested for the 'slight offence' of writing an article that 'escaped the censor by a happy chance'.¹⁵² The narrator, Miss Foster, describes Vetrova's crime as a 'slight offence', a phrase that suggests that Miss Foster finds the arrest preposterous and dislikes the strict censorship laws associated with the tsarist regime in Russia. Such sentiments are made more explicit in one of Garnett's letters from St Petersburg to Constance Garnett where she writes that Vetrova had '*merely* [italics my own] been accused of possessing some forbidden books'.¹⁵³ To Garnett, being imprisoned for possessing books was a ridiculous notion.

In the story, the reader learns that Vetrova's death was 'concealed for a fortnight',¹⁵⁴ a detail that corresponds with a reference in one of Garnett's letters to Constance Garnett, where Garnett notes that the 'authorities after concealing the death for a fortnight, at last let the cat out of the bag, at least one did, and the denials of the others only made the affair worse'.¹⁵⁵ According to 'The Case of Vetrova', Vetrova's sister grew increasingly concerned for Vetrova's welfare, particularly once a guard returned a parcel of food and money, ominously remarking that 'Vetrova had no longer need of it'.¹⁵⁶ The concealment of Vetrova's death and subsequent disappearance of her body caused outrage among the student population in Russia, many of whom believed that 'foul play [occurred] in the

¹⁵² Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 5, 4.

¹⁵³ Olive Garnett to Constance Garnett (20 March 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 93-95 (p. 94).

¹⁵⁴ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 5.

¹⁵⁵ Olive Garnett to Constance Garnett (20 March 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 95.

¹⁵⁶ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 5.

absence of any official statement whatever on the subject.’¹⁵⁷ A similar account came from Volkhovsky, who, according to Johnson, had access to Vetrova’s sister’s diary. Volkhovsky’s original account appeared in *Free Russia* (May, 1897) and a summary later appeared in quotation in G. H. Perris’s (1866–1920) book, *Russia in Revolution* (1905).¹⁵⁸ In the original version, Volkhovsky notes that he received a letter from a correspondent who claimed that ‘the executioners will certainly not say anything to commit themselves; yet their very silence, their very efforts to keep everything dark is sufficient proof that the innocent blood is on their heads.’¹⁵⁹ Volkhovsky shares the same version of events as Garnett does in ‘The Case of Vetrova’, but replaces Vetrova’s sister with a ‘comrade’.¹⁶⁰ In a note preceding Volkhovsky’s statement, Perris states that he utilised his friend’s account because ‘a fuller statement of the facts of this tragic affair [...] has yet appeared in English’.¹⁶¹ Naturally, Garnett’s ‘The Case of Vetrova’ is, technically, a work of fiction, however Perris does not mention Garnett in his short entry on Vetrova at all. This is despite the fact that Perris was in Garnett’s social network and Sophie Huntsman, one of Garnett’s closest friends, worked for him, increasing the likelihood that Perris was aware of Garnett’s work.¹⁶² Moreover, Volkhovsky would have got much of his account of Vetrova’s death from Garnett herself, along with ‘several communications from different parts of Russia’, so the lack of reference in Perris’s book is striking.¹⁶³ If Garnett’s work was not cited by those she knew, it certainly

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Volkhovsky, ‘The Enlightened Despotism – (Mdlle. Vetrov’s Case), pp. 36-37.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 37.

¹⁶⁰ Perris, *Russia in Revolution*, p. 86. Barry C. Johnson notes that Volkhovsky has Vetrova’s diaries in: Garnett, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, footnote i, p. 97.

¹⁶¹ Perris, *Russia in Revolution*, p. 83.

¹⁶² Garnett, Monday 8 January 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, pp. 25-26 (p. 26)., Garnett, Friday 7 April 1900, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 187., Garnett, Tuesday 18 April 1900, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 188., Garnett, Friday 24 April 1903, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 248.

¹⁶³ Volkhovsky, ‘The Enlightened Despotism – (Mdlle. Vetrov’s Case), p. 36.

reduces the likelihood that it would have been acknowledged by those who were not in her coterie.

Intertextuality: Suicide or Murder?

Garnett comments in her letter to Constance Garnett, that the reaction to Vetrova's death was significant enough to command the attention of the British newspapers' foreign correspondents. The reports in British papers frame 'The Case of Vetrova' and offer a range of different perspectives from the foreign correspondents who were also living in Russia when Garnett was. The reports themselves offered numerous, and generally inconclusive theories on how Vetrova died, with some assuming she was murdered and others positing that she committed suicide. Garnett's short story contributes to the British public's morbid fascination with the case by providing its readership with what they believed to be an insider's account of an incident that received notable, if at times confused and inaccurate, attention in the British press. However, as there is no reliable official confirmation of how Vetrova died, there is no definitive answer in 'The Case of Vetrova' either.¹⁶⁴ In an article on the death of Vetrova for the *The Times* on 18 March 1897 the reporter claims 'it appears that the prisoner purposely set fire to her blanket by the means of the candle or lantern in her cell and burnt herself to death'.¹⁶⁵ A subsequent article two days later notes that '[a]ll St Petersburg is talking about this extraordinary suicide and naturally, in the absence of official

¹⁶⁴ I say reliable confirmation because an official line has been displayed at the fortress, but accounts from the time contradict it. The *Petropavlovskaya Krepost* in St Petersburg ceased to be a prison in 1921 and became a museum in 1927. There is a photograph of Vetrova, and other revolutionaries who were incarcerated in the cells such as Stepniak and Kropotkin, with a caption underneath that reads: '...In prison went ill, had mental problems and hallucinations. Burned herself with a kerosene lamp in the cell 7. Died in four days in cell 6.' – Johnson, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 96.

¹⁶⁵ Anon., 'Russia', *The Times* (18 March 1897), p. 5.

and public explanation, the terrible accusations against one of the officers of the prison is widely believed'.¹⁶⁶ These reports align with Garnett's fictional presentation of events in St Petersburg and also convey the initial confusion surrounding the responsibility for Vetrova's death. A further article published a month after the preceding notes 'we are still left in the dark and are likely to remain so as to the authentic circumstances attending the terrible death of the student girl.'¹⁶⁷

The topic of Vetrova's death occurred frequently in *The Times*, featuring in the 'Sent from Our Foreign Correspondents in Russia', column highlighting the British public's fascination with the strange case.¹⁶⁸ Two years after the event, *The Times* also mentioned Vetrova in reference to the arrests of two men who had been caught smuggling pamphlets between Moscow and St Petersburg, stating that Vetrova 'had been burnt to death in the prison of the [Peter and Paul] fortress.'¹⁶⁹ By writing 'been burnt' rather than 'burnt herself' to death, the report seems to insinuate, in a more direct way than the piece published on 20 March 1897, that Vetrova was in fact murdered by guards at the fortress.

As an alternative to murder, a foreign correspondent for *The Times* wondered whether Vetrova gave away names of her comrades and then killed herself, however he sceptically wrote, 'it may be said in criticism of this explanation, that in such a case the girl's fate would hardly call forth so much sympathy among her fellow students'.¹⁷⁰ It would be highly unlikely that demonstrations of the scale witnessed in reaction to Vetrova's death across St

¹⁶⁶ Anon., 'Russia', *The Times* (20 March 1897), p. 7.

¹⁶⁷ Anon., 'Russia', *The Times* (16 April 1897), p. 6.

¹⁶⁸ These updates occurred on average at least once a week, but if a significant event had occurred they could be published as often as daily.

¹⁶⁹ Anon., 'The Russian Student Troubles', *The Times* (4 March 1899), p. 7.

¹⁷⁰ Anon., 'Russia', *The Times* (20 March 1897), p. 7.

Petersburg, Moscow and Kiev would have occurred if Vetrova had betrayed other revolutionaries. This same question is raised by Miss Foster in 'The Case of Vetrova', where she asks her host, Anna Philipovna, 'But hasn't she perhaps killed herself – in despair, or from remorse?' [...] 'Perhaps she let out secrets in the interrogation – she seemed so resolute.'¹⁷¹ These suspicions echo Garnett's letter to Constance Garnett: 'She [Vetrova] was probably afraid of betraying someone in a weak moment, and being left alone with a can of kerosene and some matches in an anti-chamber she simply set herself on fire, perishing after two days of agony'.¹⁷² However, in 'The Case of Vetrova', Sophie Ivanovna, a friend of Miss Foster and Anna Philipovna, who was deeply affected by Vetrova's death, sobbed that she believed 'that the poor, noble girl has sacrificed herself to call attention to the shocking state of things, the hideous immorality of the fortress.'¹⁷³ This then proffers three possible ways Vetrova died: homicide, suicide due to shame or suicide as a form of martyrdom.

The public fascination with suicide was a recently acknowledged phenomenon in Russia, with the subject stemming from the number of suicides tripling in St Petersburg between 1864 and 1874.¹⁷⁴ The rapidly multiplying figures were attributed by V. L. Mikhneivich, to the demographic shift seen in Russia during the nineteenth century as industrialising cities encouraged peasants to move to urban areas.¹⁷⁵ The Tsar used this belief to his advantage, by claiming that Westernisation, a symptom of industrialisation and a desire of the intelligentsia, resulted in insecurities and a nation in flux and sickness. This had a two-fold

¹⁷¹ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 7.

¹⁷² Olive Garnett to Constance Garnett (20 March 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia* Garnett, p. 94.

¹⁷³ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 7.

¹⁷⁴ Susan K. Morrissey, 'Suicide and Civilisation in Late Imperial Russia', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, Vol. 43 (1995), pp. 201-217 (p. 204).

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

effect because through condemning the Westerniser revolutionaries the Tsar was able to deter others from joining them.¹⁷⁶

The 'newness' of suicide, meant that it was still a taboo topic, and from Sophie Ivanovna's perspective, she saw Vetrova's potential suicide as an act of martyrdom and protest in defiance and contempt of the penal system. Garnett's account to Constance Garnett confirms that members of the intelligentsia 'consider her [Vetrova] as a martyr, in fact one wreath bore an inscription 'to the martyr'...'¹⁷⁷ Susan Morrissey goes as far to argue that Vetrova's suicide revived a trend for martyrdom among the radical members of the student population, which had previously been used by imprisoned populists in the 1870s as a form of political protest against the despotic state.¹⁷⁸

Bourgeois ladies of Russian society seemed outraged about the notion of suicide. In her letter to Constance Garnett, Garnett wrote that '[l]adies of society are quite indignant that she should have killed herself, a peasant girl to warrant such a fuss!'¹⁷⁹ This view is then fictionalised through Garnett's character, Zenaïde Alexandrovna, who considered the whole affair to be 'distasteful' and 'absurd'.¹⁸⁰ Alexandrovna cannot fathom why there is an interest in "the people", i.e. the proletariat or peasantry, claiming that she has a 'constitutional aversion to poor, shabbily dressed people. [...and was] afraid of peasants!'¹⁸¹ Garnett chooses to put 'the people' in scare quotes, or perhaps sneer quotes would be

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 207.

¹⁷⁷ Olive Garnett to Constance Garnett (20 March 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 95.

¹⁷⁸ Morrissey, 'Suicide and Civilisation in Late Imperial Russia', p. 179.

¹⁷⁹ Olive Garnett to Constance Garnett (20 March 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 94.

¹⁸⁰ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 58, 59.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p. 59, 61.

more appropriate, to illustrate Alexandrovna's disparaging view. This is reinforced by Alexandrovna's snobbish and ignorant description of the lower classes, which disgusts the narrator, Miss Foster who 'glanced maliciously at [Alexandrovna's face...which] gave no sign of intelligence.'¹⁸² Here Garnett, via Miss Foster, positions herself against the upper class, bourgeois view of the Russian lower classes. Through identifying a lack of intelligence in Alexandrovna, Garnett exhibits a dislike of the Russian bourgeoisie and, via placing value on intelligence, an implicit affiliation with the intelligentsia. Garnett's personal allegiances to her friends, who were members of the Russian intelligentsia and who very much believed in the importance of the people, are witnessed here.

Alexandrovna goes on to dismiss the intelligentsia's belief that Vetrova was tortured:

Of course, she wouldn't enjoy being interrogated by him [the 'procurer'] if she had anything to conceal. He is wonderfully clever; he would draw a secret from a stone, and, it is said, has caused more arrests [...] He was only doing his duty.¹⁸³

Frankly, I am not reassured by Alexandrovna's statement, which was the effect Garnett was trying to create because Garnett's own conclusion of what happened to Vetrova was at odds to Alexandrovna's. The 'him' identified by Alexandrovna was a man called Kichin, whose role involved procuring information from political prisoners for the Prosecutor's Office. Alexandrovna's words seem tacitly to suggest that torture was exactly what happened, acknowledging that Vetrova would not have enjoyed it and that the procurer managed to obtain a list of names from Vetrova. Despite Alexandrovna noting that the

¹⁸² Ibid., p. 60.

¹⁸³ Ibid., p. 59.

procurer was intelligent, perhaps meaning he was able to trick and confuse inmates into revealing the truth, the pseudo-idiom 'draw a secret from a stone' automatically makes Garnett's British readership think of 'blood from a stone'. The word 'blood' is conspicuous by its absence in Alexandrovna's defence of the procurer, drawing the reader's attention to the notion of blood and injury, with the procurer syphoning blood from Vetrova, thus furthering the belief that she was tortured.

Alexandrovna is clearly allied to the police and the governor of the fortress and Garnett uses her as a mouthpiece to deliver the tsarist version of events. In contrast, Volkhovsky presents the story adopted by the intelligentsia. There are some cross-overs, for example in Volkhovsky's statement he claims that Vetrova's cell was visited by the 'Assistant Procuror [sic.] of the St Petersburg Court of Appeal, Kichin', so there is a general consensus that Vetrova was visited by the procurer. Volkhovsky adds that the 'visit lasted four hours, no witnesses being present [...], heart-rending shrieks were heard from the cell'.¹⁸⁴ From Volkhovsky's statement it seems apparent that Vetrova was tortured. Volkhovsky and Garnett's friend, Kropotkin, certainly believed that those who worked at *Petropavlovskaya Krepost* were corrupt, drawing on his first-hand experience and informing Garnett in 1892 that those who worked there were 'depraved', which also infers either mental or physical torture of prisoners took place.¹⁸⁵ Kropotkin had previously written about horrendous episodes of torture in the fortress in *In Russian and French Prisons* (1887) and again in *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, which Garnett read in instalments between 1889 and 1899 and

¹⁸⁴ Volkhovsky, 'The Enlightened Despotism, (Middle. Vetrov's Case)', p. 37.

¹⁸⁵ Garnett, Sunday 6 March 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 66-67.

reviewed for *Free Russia*.¹⁸⁶ Garnett read *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* a year before 'The Case of Vetrova' was published, finding it 'thrilling and of profound interest' so she would have been aware that rumours of the torture of Vetrova were likely to be true.¹⁸⁷

The Director of the Police Department, General Zvoliansky eventually gave a statement where, according to Volkhovsky, he said

An unfortunate accident befell poor Vetrova; she poured (*vybila*, spilt, or poured) on herself some burning kerosene [sic.] oil from the lamp a few minutes after the gendarme who brought it left the cell... She could not stand the extreme suffering, as the wounds on the body were too deep, and further – ¹⁸⁸

Here Zvoliansky breaks off, retracts his statement and instead attests that Vetrova suffered from 'hallucinations of having been violated'.¹⁸⁹ In 'The Case of Vetrova', Alexandrovna echoes Zvoliansky, claiming Vetrova was 'off her head [...] making such a fuss [...] She said she was afraid of some man who had threatened to come in.'¹⁹⁰ The initial statement seems to infer that Vetrova was tortured owing to the use of the word 'wound' rather than the more appropriate word for injuries sustained by fire, 'burns', and then she was immolated either deliberately by herself, as suggested by Zvoliansky, or by a guard at the prison.

Volkhovsky concludes with questions, reflecting the fact the case remains unsolved: 'Was it

¹⁸⁶ Garnett, Sunday 19 March 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 137. Kropotkin's accounts of torture included removing new-born babies from their mothers, keeping prisoners permanently in the dark until they go mad, flogging and beatings. He also notes that of the 193 prisoners put on trial in the Trial of the 193 show trials, nine went mad and 11 attempted suicide. Please see Appendix 2 for further information regarding Garnett's reviews in *Free Russia*.

¹⁸⁷ Garnett 'Memoirs of the Revolutionist', p. 11

¹⁸⁸ Perris, *Russia in Revolution*, p. 86.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 59.

really suicide, or was it partly abortive [...] murder, committed to conceal a still more godless crime? [...] Whether it was a matter of physical torture and insult [...] or whether it was a matter of fiendish lust [...] makes one shiver with horror.’¹⁹¹

In summing up, when Volkhovsky suggests that Vetrova was a victim of ‘fiendish lust’ he insinuates that Vetrova may have been raped, adding further desecration and clear accusations of abuse of power to an already horrific case. Through examining newspapers, letters and second-hand accounts it is apparent that Garnett accurately presented the impression the case of Vetrova had upon the public, as per her hopes.¹⁹² The population of St Petersburg, and Britain, were united in their intrigue and horror at the case, however the general confusion as to what truly happened is clearly seen in conflicting news reports and anecdotes. Garnett offers a variety of viewpoints regarding what may, or may not, have happened to Vetrova, accurately capturing the perplexities of the situation and presenting a range of views and sympathies, while making it clear where her allegiances lie: on the side of the intelligentsia, on the side of her friends.

St Petersburg and the Revolutionary Movement Through the Eyes of Olive Garnett

Garnett manages to capture the uncertainty, mystery and bewilderment surrounding the death of Vetrova, however she also examines the general atmosphere and mood in St Petersburg as Garnett experienced it in 1897. While Garnett, through Miss Foster, positions herself on the side of the intelligentsia, that does not necessarily mean that the overall

¹⁹¹ Volkhovsky, ‘The Enlightened Despotism (Middle. Vetrov’s Case), p. 37.

¹⁹² Olive Garnett to Feliks Volkhovsky (15 October 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 96.

impression given of them is positive owing to Garnett's need to write from her observations and paint an honest picture of Russia on Stepniak's behalf. Stepniak did not ask Garnett to lie and fabricate a situation that would spark revolution; he wanted the truth and so, owing to her personal allegiance to Stepniak, that is what she attempted to deliver.

'The Case of Vetrova' opens with looking at the atmosphere in St Petersburg and we are reminded from the beginning that the narrator, Miss Foster, is an alien in St Petersburg. Garnett was asked by Stepniak to capture Russia from an English perspective so instead of trying to assimilate herself within Russian culture, Garnett makes the reader acutely aware of the idea of difference and foreignness. This feeds into what the British public want in their Russophilism and their fascination with the Otherness of Russian culture, places and people.¹⁹³ The feeling of otherness and Miss Foster's discomfort is prevalent from the opening description:

There was an uneasy feeling abroad in St. Petersburg. It had penetrated into our apartments, brought by each successive comer returning for the evening meal; and now as we sat, a party of four, at the square table in the barely-furnished, lofty, yet small dining-room, it was very present to us all, both in our increased sense of intimacy under its shadow, and in the difficulty of sustaining any conversation unconnected with it.¹⁹⁴

To a British reader, the foreignness of Russia is accentuated in the opening sentences, which are saturated with the feeling of tension, reflecting the social unrest of the time. Garnett swiftly establishes difference with the use of the word 'abroad', which can also mean

¹⁹³ Douglas G. Morren, 'Donald Mackenzie Wallace and British Russophilism, 1870–1919', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. 9.2 (1967), pp. 170-183 (p. 170).

¹⁹⁴ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 1.

‘outside’ or ‘to spread widely’ and both definitions fit within the context, however her lexical choice immediately juxtaposes the narrator against the setting via the primary definition of being somewhere foreign. The invasive feeling of unease makes its way into a dining-room that seems cold and inhospitable compared to the familiar British Victorian dining-room. The unease itself becomes tangible, as it possesses a shadow, emphasising its oppressive nature and making the reader sympathise with the English woman alone in a strange land.

As a reaction to Vetrova’s death and their subsequent outrage at the mistreatment of political prisoners in the fortress, students in St Petersburg were planning to march to Kazan Cathedral in order to ‘hear a death Mass for Vetrova’.¹⁹⁵ Anna Philipovna finds the whole notion of the protest at the Kazan Cathedral ridiculous, informing Miss Foster that ‘They [students] are, on the whole, an immoral, dirty and lazy set – men and women. [...] Our youth is cowardly, people scramble for places or commit suicide. They have no backbone, no dignity, no self-respect.’¹⁹⁶ While doing this, Philipovna also compares the students of the 1890s to recent Russian history, stating ‘we *have* had such examples’, referring to the years of populism and terrorism campaigns that culminated in the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881, when people ‘dreamed of sacrifice’, something entirely different to and more noble than suicide.¹⁹⁷

One example of the populists whom Philipovna places on a pedestal is Zasluch. When Zasluch decided to shoot General Trepov for flogging Bogolyubov at the *Petropavlovskaya*

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, p. 13.

Krepost she commented: 'I waited for some response [to the whipping], but everyone remained silent [...]. I resolved at that point, even if it cost my life, to prove that no one who abused a human being that way could get away with it. [...] I saw no other way.'¹⁹⁸ Zasluch's act was one of revenge, protest and protection. To Zasluch, Bogolyubov was a friend, her brother in arms, and she felt the need to defend him at whatever cost to herself. Zasluch emanates a sense of atheistic religious fanaticism by embroiling herself in the notion of self-sacrifice. In her autobiography she alludes to the poet Nikolai Nekrasov (1821–78), and his poem '*Mat*' (Mother) (1868) by saying 'There are times, there are entire ages, when there is nothing more beautiful and desirable than a crown of thorns.'¹⁹⁹ The 'crown of thorns' serves to symbolise the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Zasluch goes to her assassination attempt reconciled with her choice to put herself in danger as a sacrifice for the greater good, glorifying martyrdom because she would rather die than see her radical family come to any harm.

The fatalistic, yet determined, revolutionary attitude in Zasluch is but a snapshot of the passionate revolutionaries to whom Philipovna was referring. Women and men like Zasluch were not like the people Garnett encountered while she was in Russia, demonstrating that revolutionary feeling was, until the death of Vetrova, limited. Garnett was not presenting a fabricated version of events to be a propagandist tool to incite revolution, because that was not the cause she was aligned to, she was simply following Stepniak's advice to write about what she observed.

¹⁹⁸ Zasluch, *Vospominaniia*, p. 78.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 70. Nekrasov became idolised by the intelligentsia for his poems that were sympathetic to the Russian peasants. In *Free Russia* he is referred to as the 'poet of revenge and sorrow', see: Feliks Volkhovsky, 'N.A. Nekrasov', *Free Russia*, vol. 10.8 (August 1899), pp. 61-62 (p.61).

In contrast, Philipovna's son, Philip Andreitch, starts 'The Case of Vetrova' as a living example of his mother's vision of the cowardly, almost suicidal, youth. Miss Foster notes that '[w]ith[in] him I felt the purposelessness, dreariness, despair of his life, and beyond, of the life of young Russia.'²⁰⁰ This one sentence communicates to the British readership the apathetic disconnect across Russia in the younger generations of the intelligentsia. The new translations of Dostoevsky that emerged after 'The Case of Vetrova' did little to alter this impression, with suicidal characters appearing in many of Constance Garnett's translations, such as Ivan Karamazov and Smerdiakov in *The Brothers Karamazov* (first pubd. 1879; trans. 1912), Ippolit in *The Idiot* (first pubd. 1869; trans. 1913), Kirillov in *The Possessed* (first pubd. 1872; trans. 1913) and Raskolnikov in *Crime and Punishment* (first pubd. 1866; trans. 1914).²⁰¹ Additionally, while Winnie Verloc in Conrad's *The Secret Agent* (1907) was not Russian, her close ties to anarchy and the book's association with Russia do not suppress the impression Garnett has created. Philip Andreitch quotes Alexander Pushkin's (1799–1837) poem *Dar napasnyi, dar sluchainyi* ('Futile gift, accidental gift') (1828), which Garnett translates as: 'Useless gift, accidental gift!/ Life, why art thou given to me?'²⁰² Pushkin's poem gives a voice to the despair permeating Russia's youth. Philip Andreitch goes on to ask 'Oh God, why is my heart so empty, my mind so vacant? I have no convictions; there is no meaning in life for me. It's true what she says of us – suicide. I wish – yes, I wish – I could die.'²⁰³

²⁰⁰ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 19.

²⁰¹ For further discussion on suicide in Dostoevsky's novels see: Irina Paperno, *Suicide as a Cultural Institution in Dostoevsky's Russia* (Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1997).

²⁰² Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 18.

²⁰³ Ibid.

The despondence and apathy seen within Russia's youth also comes through in Garnett's letter to Alfred Powell (1865–1960). Powell was an architect and Garnett was engaged to him briefly between June and August 1897.²⁰⁴ Garnett informs Powell that while walking through St Petersburg 'one has the impression that one is moving about a city of people only half alive. [...W]here one counts suicide by the dozen.'²⁰⁵ Garnett's assessment of St Petersburg is reflected in the melancholia of Philip Andreitch, with his vacancy of mind creating the image of him wandering around aimlessly, as if he were only 'half alive'.

As well as describing the atmosphere and attitude of the youth in St Petersburg, Garnett also uses imperial architecture to juxtapose autocracy's powerful presence against the weak-mindedness of the intelligentsia. It is somewhat disturbing that despite the connotations of violence and horror associated with *Petropavlovskaya Krepost*, the pinnacle of tsarist power, the narrator acknowledges the exquisite architecture of the prison that had housed so many prominent Russian revolutionaries, including the author's close friends.

Miss Foster glances at the

[B]eautiful golden spire of the fortress church [and] looked at it, but without emotion other than pleasure that this striking elegant feature of Petersburg never fails aesthetically to convey. It seemed, as it stood there in its proud and beautiful isolation as remote and satisfying as the moon above or any other harmonious presence to which we are accustomed.²⁰⁶

²⁰⁴ The engagement between Garnett and Powell seemed to have come off the back of long correspondence while Garnett was in Russia. Once they were together in person it became clear that they got on well as good friends, but were not suited as lovers. For a more detailed account see: Garnett, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 119-127.

²⁰⁵ Olive Garnett to Alfred Powell (Wednesday 17 February 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 85-90.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

In that moment, *Petropavlovskaya Krepost* is far more powerful and impressive than the 'half-torpid' lethargy exhibited by the Russian masses' potential vanguard. *Petropavlovskaya Krepost*, in collaboration with the state, had swiftly suppressed any potential unrest, reflecting Miss Foster's view that the structure is synonymous with harmony, however sinister and despotic a form it takes. The beauty of the government's engine of torture and imprisonment is juxtaposed by the pathetic disengagement of Russia's youth.

The Russian revolutionary movement, or lack thereof, portrayed in 'The Case of Vetrova' was clearly no threat to England, as some politicians feared it was. The student groups were very much like Trotsky's fellow travellers. In 'The Case of Vetrova' the youth were born too late to be part of the great terrorist movements that culminated in the assassination of Tsar Alexander II and too early for the impending revolutions, whereas Trotsky's artists, who were writing or painting after 1917, did not grasp the Revolution as a whole and the new Communist ideal was foreign to them, resulting in a feeling of displacement and isolation.²⁰⁷ Miss Foster's reaction of disgust at the 'terrible disease of the Russians' in the face of 'the apparent superiority of [her] race' further emphasises the moral cowardice of the Russian nation.²⁰⁸ Miss Foster feels shame on their behalf and perhaps the 'tears of humility' and personal offense she seems to take at Russia's stupor could really be Garnett's reaction to the torpid state of the Empire.²⁰⁹ Given that Stepniak devoted all his time, and ultimately his life, to accumulating support and finances to liberating the Russian people from autocracy, the lethargy seen by Garnett in St Petersburg would have made Stepniak's work seem futile and his death all the more tragic. Indeed, Stepniak's death haunts the story when the

²⁰⁷ Leon Trotsky, *Literature and Revolution*, ed. William Keach (Chicago (IL): Haymarket Books, 2005).

²⁰⁸ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 22.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23

unsettling, uninspired silence in St Petersburg is interrupted by ‘the mournful screech of a tram-whistle, [...] filling [hearts] with a sad foreboding.’²¹⁰ The tram-whistle echoes the train whistle that the London train driver frantically blew when he tried to prevent Stepniak from walking out in front of the train. The screech of the whistle is mournful and the sound fills the narrator with sadness, which combine to remind the readership of the tragedy of Stepniak’s death. The harsh ‘screech’ cutting through the silence, could also mimic Stepniak’s ghost’s anguish at the lethargy of the young Russian intelligentsia.

Garnett was shocked and concerned by the ‘desperate state of things’ in Russia, informing her father a few weeks before Vetrova’s death of the ‘impossibility for a person not living in [Russia] to realise’ what the environment is like, continuing ‘one begins to doubt sometimes if the Slav population will ever be civilised’.²¹¹ Garnett’s xenophobic stance cannot be overlooked, but it should also be noted that she is also speaking in relation to the autocratic system, which was in need of reform. Additionally, Garnett observes that unless someone has spent time in Russia, they cannot truly appreciate the depressive environment and lack of urgency to act. This echoes the frustrations of Kropotkin, Volkhovsky and Stepniak, who each told Garnett at various stages of the situation in Russia and the British public’s lack of understanding. Through exploring the mentality of the St Petersburg intelligentsia, Garnett presents a realistic image of what life was like in Russia to her readership.

The death of Vetrova proved to be the spark the Russian intelligentsia required. The initial reaction and march instilled a sense of unity and collective outrage within the student

²¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 19-20.

²¹¹ Olive Garnett to Richard Garnett (22 January 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 80-83 (p. 81).

population, however it was short-lived and took several years of anniversary marches before the ripples of unrest turned into the revolution of 1905. Nevertheless, Vetrova's influence in life and death upon the Russian revolutionary movement does not receive the acknowledgement it deserves as one of the catalysing factors that rejuvenated the revolutionary movement in Imperial Russia. Garnett's short story contributes to Vetrova's narrative, with Garnett acting as the primary mediator of Vetrova's death and its effects to the British readership. She alone, in an almost prophetic way, realises the lasting significance Vetrova's death has upon the revolutionary movement in Russia. This demands that 'The Case of Vetrova' be re-situated as a tale of greater significance than literary scholarship currently allows.

Philip Andreitch, the boy who had seemed so despondent, declared the demonstration at Kazan Cathedral as 'grand' and that all his comrades had 'never heard anything like it in their lives'.²¹² This supports the notion that the students of the 1890s were caught between two periods of revolutionary upheaval – too late or too early to attach themselves to either movement. The large group sang and the 'sound rose, and swelled and filled the building until it seemed as though it would twist and tear and break through the stone and mortar and thrust the roof off'.²¹³ Garnett details a crescendo of noise that harnessed enough power to twist, tear, break and thrust, with the destructive language reflecting the aims of the movement to break Russian autocracy. Through figuratively destroying the cathedral, a symbol of tsarist support, Garnett indicates the potential power in the student groups. Garnett goes further and describes the singing as 'some great heart throbbing and

²¹² Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 50.

²¹³ Ibid.

throbbing’ – Dumb Russia was finally awakening from its stupor and the hearts of the people were beating as one.²¹⁴

Philip Andreitch assured Miss Foster and his mother, Anna Philipovna, that ‘no one who heard it will forget it to the last day of their lives’, denoting the powerful and lasting impact the demonstration had upon the intelligentsia.²¹⁵ The police, however, were efficient in breaking up the large protest, ‘neatly dividing them into four groups’ and dispersing the crowd gradually.²¹⁶ In this moment, Garnett allows her voice to come through the character of Philip Andreitch via her admiration of how the police handled the large demonstration. In her diary she defends the role of the police against Kropotkin, Stepniak and the young Rossettis, Olive and Helen, believing the young Rossettis to be silly and humourless in their belief that the British public wanted to remove the police force.²¹⁷ Moreover, in her letter to Constance Garnett about the demonstration, Garnett praises the cleverness of the Russian police in breaking up the demonstrating crowd.²¹⁸ In this moment perhaps Garnett exercises some autonomy over her personal allegiance to Stepniak and her own voice comes through. She was, after all, as seen in her diary, a royalist (‘we [the British] *like* our rulers’), someone who appreciated good sense (‘I could never do anything of which my intellect did not approve’) and disliked violence (‘[I]t is horrible to think of May Day demonstrations, bombs and platform nonsense everywhere’).²¹⁹

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Ibid., p. 51.

²¹⁷ Garnett, Sunday 6 March 1891, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 67., Garnett, Wednesday 19 October 1891, *Tea and Anarchy*, pp. 107-108., Garnett, Wednesday 5 July 1892, *Tea and Anarchy*, p. 209.

²¹⁸ Olive Garnett to Constance Garnett (20 March 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 93.

²¹⁹ Garnett, Wednesday 19 October 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 108., Garnett, Friday 25 March 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 71., Garnett, Sunday 1 May 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 73.

On the surface, it appeared that the Russian police were successful in squashing civil unrest as the students turned back to their studies to focus upon their summer exams. Indeed, Garnett's letter to her father she writes that 'St Petersburg has relapsed into its usual torpid condition.'²²⁰ However, Garnett does go on to say that she would have liked to have written more but 'the interesting subjects are taboo', implying that there was more to the situation post-protest than met the eye, but she was afraid of her letters getting intercepted.²²¹ Leading on from this, Garnett was on safer ground fictionalising what came next after she had left Russia – Miss Foster notes that 'deep in his consciousness, everyone, in every class of society, knew and rejoiced that a great sign had been given, a great event had taken place', suggesting that plans for future movements were underway.²²² As this chapter has demonstrated, Vetrova's death and subsequent protest was one of the originary events that initiated some of the most significant events in Russian history, in the form of the 1905 and 1917 revolutions. Garnett's engagement with such a pivotal moment in history deserves greater recognition and Vetrova herself needs to be clearly situated within historical scholarship surrounding the Russian revolutions.

* * *

In the concluding remarks within 'The Case of Vetrova' Miss Foster notes that

The whole world did know of the case of Vetrova, and the world has forgotten. But it meant very much to Russia, and Russia remembers. A girl's agony sent a wave of generosity and enthusiasm throughout the

²²⁰ Olive Garnett to Richard Garnett (20 March 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 98.

²²¹ *Ibid.*

²²² Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 66.

empire, the culminating sign of which is a memento for many of the turning-point in their lives.²²³

Here Garnett almost steps out of the pages of 'The Case of Vetrova' as herself, identifying the significance and importance of Vetrova's murder/suicide and admonishing those who have forgotten her. Garnett establishes that by the time of writing, public fascination with the case had dimmed in Britain, however she was determined to revive Vetrova's story and stressed Vetrova's significant position on the world stage.

Through examining 'The Case of Vetrova' alongside diary entries, written correspondences, newspaper reports and historical discourse I have demonstrated that Garnett accurately captures the atmosphere of St Petersburg and describes the intelligentsia as she saw them. Garnett did not attempt to hyperbolise the social unrest in St Petersburg, nor exaggerate the radical sentiments within the student population. Beasley may see this as Garnett writing against her own allegiances, however I view this as Garnett honouring her dead friend, writing in Stepniak's memory and presenting her readership with what she observed and real characters.

As I have demonstrated throughout this chapter, Vetrova's death was a significant moment in the revolutionary movement in Russia and, subsequently in Russian history. Moreover, the Russian revolutions had a substantial and lasting impact not only on Russia but also on Russia's geopolitical relationship with other dominant world powers. The part Garnett plays in attempting to bring Vetrova to the forefront of literary and historical thought has been

²²³ Ibid., p. 70.

neglected for long enough and I urge the narrative of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century Russian revolutionary movement to change to place Vetrova at the centre. In the cultural sphere I advocate for a centring of Garnett as a person whose literary immediacy has been overlooked and undermined by more dominant male voices, such as Volkhovsky and Periss, and call for an acknowledgement of her ability to recognise the significance of events and the impact they have on the course of history.

Chapter Two

Constructing Class: Olive Garnett's 'Roukoff'

'[M]y good little slavey'¹ – Olive Garnett, 1897

In *The Country and the City* (1973), Raymond Williams questions whether Jane Austen (1775–1817), 'for all the intricacy of her social description', could have produced a text that presents the reader with a realistic portrayal of people from a variety of British social classes.² Williams continues that Austen's understanding of social classes other than her own stemmed from 'internal and exclusive' personal observations.³ These observations would have been unavoidably and subconsciously refracted by the opinions and prejudices of Austen's own class, the lower strata of landed gentry, and thus stereotypes, rather than faithful representations of people from a diverse range of social backgrounds. In the absence of an exact depiction, the reader instead sees only further into the psyche of the class of which the writer is part, and in this situation, 'where only one class is seen, no classes are seen.'⁴

Critics such as Julia Prewitt Brown refute Williams' claim and argue that 'class' is an anachronistic term when applied to Austen's period because, at that point, society was evolving from a traditional to modern structure. Class identity was emerging at this time, rather than fully formed, and that is why identities and 'ranks' within society are either

¹ Johnson, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 23.

² Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 117.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

'ignored' or confused. Brown argues that Austen adopts a democratic approach, including multiple voices with limited rank distinctions, in order to demonstrate the collapse in hierarchical certainties and to identify the new fragmented forms of class that have just started to emerge.⁵ Unlike Austen, Olive Garnett was writing at a time when the Russian class system was fixed and upheld by the Tsar and the Church, although rebellious undercurrents were starting to be seen, as demonstrated in my previous chapter on 'The Case of Vetrova'. Prewitt Brown's response to Williams's work on Austen is pertinent to this chapter because, by extension, it suggests that clear indicators of class should be identifiable in literary works set in periods in particular nations' histories (unlike Austen's England) when the class system is principally static. In Garnett's case, her ability to write outside of her own class is a challenge for her, however 'Roukoff' nevertheless offers an interesting perspective through the lens of a young woman of a Russia Empire on the brink of irreversible change.

This chapter will examine Garnett's short story, 'Roukoff', the second featured in Garnett's *Petersburg Tales* (1900). 'Roukoff' is more insular in its outlook than 'The Case of Vetrova' and takes inspiration from Garnett's network in St Petersburg rather than an epoch-defining moment. Additionally, 'Roukoff' interacts with a small canon of Russian literary works dubbed the Petersburg Texts by members of the Russian school of semiotics.⁶ These texts, by authors including Dostoevsky, Gogol and Pushkin, contributed to the western world's perception of St Petersburg by giving the city a literary narrative. Many of the works by

⁵ Julia Prewitt Brown, *Jane Austen's Novels: Social Change and Literary Form* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1979), pp. 5, 99, 137-138.

⁶ Vladimir Toporov, *Petersburgskii Tekst Russkoi Literatury* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2003).

these authors were not yet published in Britain when Garnett wrote her own Petersburg Text in the form of *Petersburg Tales* and so her short stories, in particular 'The Case of Vetrova' and 'Roukoff', interact with the works of Dostoevsky, Gogol, Pushkin et. al. and contribute to this city-building, which might productively be thought of as a microcosmic form of nation-building. This chapter places Garnett's 'Roukoff' in broader conversation about more widely known, studied and respected authors. Alongside establishing that 'Roukoff' is a Petersburg Text, this chapter will examine how Garnett presents characters from different classes in 'Roukoff' and how they are influenced both by sudden change and also by cultural traditions such as the significance of language and funerals. By examining historical context, class structure and social unrest in Russia, alongside theorists such as György Lukács, Irving Howe and Mikhail Bakhtin, Garnett's own literary influences and the reception of 'Roukoff', I will assess Garnett's characterisation of Russian class, which overall is imbued with her own prejudices. However, Garnett does show a nuanced awareness of the revolutionary potential within the proletariat. Moreover, through looking at the intertextual links between 'Roukoff' and the Petersburg Texts I will argue that Garnett offers a view of her own class that is rarely seen in the Petersburg Texts and so Garnett fills a gap within this canon, creating a space for herself alongside the Russian masters within literary scholarship.

There is undoubtedly a focus on the Russian bourgeoisie in 'Roukoff', where even the villain is from an ennobled family. While there are some minor characters, such as a belligerent cook and a jumped-up boy in livery, who are members of the proletariat, they do not steer the plot. Instead, the behaviour of the cook and the boy foreshadows the social unrest within the Russian lower classes. Garnett's concentration on bourgeois characters confirms

Williams' argument that authors write what they know. Moreover, this notion of writing what is known to the author complements Garnett's use of literary realism, which was praised by Stepniak and is at odds with the work of her friends and contemporaries, such as Ford Madox Ford, Dorothy Richardson, Ezra Pound (1885–1972) and Joseph Conrad, who were experimenting with more avant-garde forms of literature.

It should be noted that Garnett has a more complex task than many English writers because she was writing about people from a different cultural background. Garnett had to attempt to describe a vast and demographically diverse country that was on the verge of experiencing a period of social upheaval. I propose that this restricted Garnett's ability to write a more contemporary, modernist text, since turn-of-the-century Russia was more comparable in terms of industrial and social development to mid-nineteenth century England. The modernisation of industry and technology, advances in education, comparative lack of censorship and space for liberal thoughts in England contributed somewhat to the development of modernism in British literature, whereas scientifically and culturally Russia lagged behind. Russia and Russians were the unknown, to the British readership, meaning that Garnett needed to portray a faithful and easily understood image of Russian life, particularly if she wished to adhere to Stepniak's advice to write accurately about what she observed. Garnett's style of looking back to the realism of mid-nineteenth century novelists, such as Charles Dickens (1812–70), George Eliot and William Thackeray, was more suited to addressing the social conditions and environment found in turn of the century Russia and in forming a faithful representation of Russia for the British public.

Roukoff – The Who’s Who

‘Roukoff’ follows on from ‘The Case of Vetrova’ not only sequentially in the *Petersburg Tales* collection, but also in terms of narrative, setting and characters. It is narrated by Miss Foster, who also narrated ‘The Case of Vetrova’, and, as we saw in Chapter One, is a fictionalised version of Garnett herself. ‘Roukoff’ focuses on the interaction between the bourgeoisie Philipovna family, with whom Miss Foster lives and who we met in ‘The Case of Vetrova’, and a new character, a fraud called Pavel Alexandrovitch Roukoff. Roukoff previously worked as a clerk at the Senate, is the brother of a Russian Governor and was exiled to Siberia after committing embezzlement. Roukoff attempts to extort the Philipovna family through a variety of means that Miss Foster sees through with ease. Miss Foster becomes frustrated with the gullible nature of the Philipovnas and starts to feel scornful towards her Russian hosts.

Roukoff preys upon the Philipovna family and their friends, who range from fellow members of the bourgeoisie to the Russian nobility. Roukoff is aware that the bourgeoisie and the nobility are wealthy and enjoy drama, gossip and giving the impression that they are philanthropic in order to gain admiration from their peers. These qualities mean that the bourgeoisie and nobility presented themselves as the easiest victims. Roukoff, who is blind, predominantly targets women, appealing to their maternal instincts by presenting them with his terminally ill son and playing upon his own need for assistance. Roukoff’s physical blindness does not stop him from expertly selecting gullible people for his plots, inverting the expected roles of the sighted and the blind.

The primary victims are Anna Philipovna, who is the bourgeoisie matriarch of the house Miss Foster is living in, Sophie Ivanovna, a fellow lodger with Miss Foster in the Philipovna house (who we also met in 'The Case of Vetrova') and Amélie Adrianovna Zaroubin, who is the wife of a powerful and well-connected man. We also meet a flighty socialite called Natasha, who wants to use Roukoff to help her gain celebrity status, and Princess B, Countess S and Madam C, who are all wealthy friends of Amélie Zaroubin and want to throw a party in order to raise money for Roukoff. The key male characters are Philip Andreitch, Anna Philipovna's son and who underwent a transformation from depressed student to young radical in 'The Case of Vetrova', Piotr Petrovitch, who is Zaroubin's husband, and the anglophile and prestigious lawyer, Davidoff. The only women who remain relatively unmoved by Roukoff in terms of his fraudulent activity are Miss Foster, who is unsettled by the depth and breadth of Roukoff's rapidly growing influence, an unnamed (to avoid causing any unwanted associations to real active members in St Petersburg) female member of the social democratic movement who has greater social concerns, and Lopatine, the female editor of a heavily censored, liberal monthly review, *Northern Riches*, who is more absorbed by the fact her publication is failing than in Roukoff.⁷

Historical Context

Garnett did, of course, have some experience of Russian people in the form of her close network of Russian émigrés in London, such as the Stepniaks, Kropotkins and Volkhovsky,

⁷ Olive Garnett, 'Roukoff', in *Petersburg Tales* (Boston (MA): Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1900), pp. 171-190.

and the connections she made when she stayed in Pokrovka and St Petersburg. While she was in Russia, Garnett stayed with families such as the Arsénieffs who, at the time, were living at their country estate in Pokrovka. Konstantin Arsénieff (1837–1919) was a respected lawyer whose father had been a tutor to Tsar Alexander II when he was the *Tsesarevich* (Heir Apparent). In St Petersburg, Garnett rented a room owned by a Norwegian, Mrs Sperk, whose son, Boris, was a doctor. As a tutor, Garnett was not networking with any class below her own and in her spare time she socialised with other tutors and governesses she met at the English Ladies Club in St Petersburg.⁸ Lawyers who owned country estates, doctors and English women were not going to provide Garnett with a breath or depth of knowledge about Russian people of different classes.

In 1900 Russia was still operating until the archaic ‘Table of Ranks’ system, which was introduced by Tsar Peter the Great (1672–1725) in 1722 and was not eradicated until 1917 by the Bolsheviks. The table only included the nobility, specifically the Russian military and government, and excluded other social ranks, with collegiate registrars and senior ensigns – both positions of authority and privilege in the civil service and military respectively – located at the bottom of the table. In 1900 the Union of Russian Socialists issued a flyer (Fig. 1.) critiquing the table and the Tsar’s exploitative and controlling methods of social

⁸ Olive Garnett, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 3-8.

stratification.⁹ At the base of the pyramid are the peasants and proletariat crying ‘We work for you’ and ‘We feed you’. Above the agrarian and industrial workers is the Russian Bourgeoisie responding with ‘We eat for you’, followed by the military who declare ‘We shoot you’, then the Orthodox Church who claim, ‘We pray for you’. The nobility forms the penultimate layer, stating ‘We govern you’ and at the top of the hierarchical triangle are the Tsar and Tsarina with the legend ‘We rule over you’. Despite the pamphlet being a defamatory political statement, the structural elements are accurate and the text, while sweeping in statement, was close to the truth. In 1900, the Russian tsar, Nicholas II (1868–1918), had absolute power, and while the Table of Ranks was implemented by Peter the Great in order to create a more meritocratic system, reducing the power of those with inherited titles, the domination of the nobility remained. Even after the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861, which has been hailed as ‘a prolonged crisis for the old political order’ that contributed to the collapse of the Russian empire, the nobles were still of primary importance.¹⁰ They were responsible for the defence and administration of Russia and became the symbols of Russia’s imperial power to the Western gaze.¹¹



⁹ Fig. 1.

¹⁰ Roberta Thompson Manning, *The Crisis of the Old Order in Russia: Gentry and Government* (Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 1982), p. 3.

¹¹ Richard Pipes, *Russia, People and Empire: 1552-1917* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1997), pp. 153-154.

In 1900 the majority of the Russian nobility only conversed with one another in French, which had been common practise for a century because the Russian imperial court tried to emulate Parisian social graces. The Russian language was reserved only for conversations with servants and small children, denoting that a Western language took prevalence over the mother tongue and in doing so exacerbated the divide between the upper and lower classes of Russian society. The rejection of the Russian language by the nobility also challenged the government's policy of Russification, which aimed to assimilate and unite Russia's population of 200 different nationalities, comprising of 128 million people. The dichotomy between the nobility and the masses on an economic, political and linguistic level further elevated the power of the nobility and contributed to Russia's heteroglossia. From this alone, it is clear to see that Garnett faced a significant challenge in even beginning to understand, let alone fictionalise, the nuances between language and nationalities.

The Russian Orthodox Church, combined with the power of the nobility, maintained the status quo across the empire. The Church was tasked with upholding the absolute power of the Tsar and providing the peasants with guiding moral principles, however the largely Latin-based training of the priests did not fully prepare them for pastoral duties. This resulted in schismatic and bastardised forms of Christianity, such as improvised denominations originating from an oxymoronic combination of Christianity, sorcery and folk magic, with the latter two elements still being widely practised at the turn of the century.¹²

¹² Ibid., pp. 211-213.

Peasants still provided most of Russia's food, taxes and troops and although social mobility had had an impact on peasants' geographical awareness of Russia, they were still primarily affected by the concerns of their region and had limited national feeling. Lukács attributes the absence of national feeling in both the peasant and noble to the fact that Russia had not experienced and completed a bourgeois revolution: 'In England and France, the economic, political and ideological preparation and completion of the bourgeois revolution and the setting-up of a national state are one and the same process.'¹³ After the English Civil War and the French Revolution the ideology of British and then French nationality became concrete in the minds of the respective populations. The overthrow of a monarchy, an entire governing system, comes from collective effort and the subsequent fracturing and rebuilding of society results in the need to decide what it means to be English or French. Nationhood became the property of all classes and this mass experience is what Russia was lacking in 1900. At this time the Russian Empire remained vehemently opposed to revolution, forming the Holy Alliance in 1815 with Prussia and the Austrian Empire with the aim of promoting Christian moral values and traditional monarchism as a reaction to widespread liberalism.¹⁴ This deficiency of national feeling and oppression of liberal thought explains Russia's need for the policy of Russification and also would have contributed to the significant polarisation of peasants and nobles.

The main reason Russia had not experienced a bourgeois revolution by 1900 was because the Russian bourgeoisie did not emerge as a class until the second quarter of the nineteenth

¹³ György Lukács, 'The Historical Novel', in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York City (NY): Norton, 2010), pp. 909-921 (p. 912).

¹⁴ It should be added that while Britain became part of the Concert of Europe in 1815 with the triad that formed the Holy Alliance and also opposed the French Revolution, Britain's more liberal policies meant that Britain did not join the Holy Alliance.

century, with the development of factory industry and a more solidified capitalist structure.¹⁵ Until the abolition of serfdom, the industrial labour force in Russia was mainly composed of serfs, however after 1861 the class of the proletariat became far more dominant with rapid increases in social mobility and urbanisation. A readily available and initially keen labour force increased the speed of Russia's industrialisation, which was fortuitous owing to Russia's dire need to modernise, particularly after the embarrassing defeat in the Crimean War.

In an adapting class system, old categories were no longer sufficient to contain the dynamic new groups, and people from all tiers of society began to step outside of the confines of their class. The Russian Intelligentsia formed in the wake of the diverging natures of social status and social function. University educated *hommes des lettres* were no longer able to influence socio-political thought through government channels so a select group began to attempt do so through underground means. As such, 'intelligentsia' changed from a benevolent term for the well-educated, to a loaded and largely subjective definition for westernising radicals. The Intelligentsia had caused infamous bouts of social unrest or disruption by 1900, the most notable of which was the Assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881.¹⁶

The complexities of language, nationality and a class system that did not tally to that of her own, would have made it incredibly complicated for Garnett to give a sense of the different classes within her fiction. In fact, it was unlikely she was even aware of the multitude of

¹⁵ Pipes, pp. 258-262.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 263-264.

layers and factors that came together to form the Russian class system, which at the time was also in a state of flux as industrialisation resulted in the emergence of new classes. It was easier for Garnett to write about the type of people she experienced in Russia and to maintain a realistic impression of them, rather than to present a range of classes she did not have the contextual knowledge or experience of to understand.

Russomania, Translations and Writing Back to the Petersburg Text

The class system in Russia was more complex and unstable than in England during the time Garnett was writing, however literature, be it fiction or non-fiction, often still reinforced invisible borders between classes in both Russia and England.¹⁷ The translated works of the Russian masters by Constance Garnett also exhibited similar themes of class struggle through juxtaposing the lives of the rich and the poor. 'Roukoff' engages on a thematic level with the work of the Russian masters, whom Constance Garnett was translating at the same time as Garnett published 'Roukoff'. Thus, 'Roukoff' and Constance Garnett's translations of Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Turgenev, Gogol. *et. al* all *simultaneously* contributed towards the

¹⁷ The typical trio of working-, middle- and upper-class divisions remained the principal form of categorisations the time Garnett was writing. The working class were understood as those who were stuck in a debit-credit cycle and were collectively condemned as stupid by the educated classes. As in Russia, the working class were largely perceived as a homogenous mass, although on a smaller scale. The 'us' and 'them' mentality resulted in genuine interaction and understanding being difficult between the different classes, making it challenging for artists – most of whom came from the educated classes – to construct realistic portrayals of working-class life, increasing the risk of social mimicry in literature. English society was also heteroglossic, with speech forming part of class coding and a way to identify oneself against another. Colloquialisms, dialects and tones varied across the social spheres and reinforced the invisible barriers that prevented class integration. Even the way information was disseminated to different social groups secured the isolating nature of the class system, with novels and newspapers aimed at the working class being simpler and more obviously stimulating, such as yellow journalism and the penny dreadful. For further information see: R.I. McKibbin, 'Social Class and Social Observation in Edwardian England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vol. 28 (1978), pp. 175-199.

image of Russia in the British consciousness. Therefore, to aid the contextualisation of this chapter, we shall consider Constance Garnett's translations of Russian literature in light of how the texts themselves influenced the shaping of St Petersburg in the minds of the British public. This is relevant to the thesis because owing to the belatedness of the Russian masters' texts reaching the British readership, Olive Garnett's work, published contemporaneously to Constance Garnett's translations, also influenced the British consciousness when shaping their opinions of what St Petersburg was like.

As we saw in the Introduction to the thesis, there had been a vogue for Russia in Britain since the culmination of the Crimean War, for knowing as much as possible about the Eurasian empire. Irving Howe notes that from the nineteenth century societal concerns dominated the national psyche and as a consequence the public wanted to see their struggles represented in literature and texts were expected to be less mimetic and more accurate.¹⁸ Indeed Donald Davie argues that the public's interest in the translations of Constance Garnett and others had very little to do with the literary excellence of the Russian masters, but rather 'it was for the information he [Ivan Turgenev and later Fyodor Dostoevsky and Leo Tolstoy] could give about the state of the Russian peasantry or (a little later) about the psychology and activities of Russian terrorists and nihilists.'¹⁹ Davie accuses the British public of being naïve to turn to literature to gain an understanding of Russia, despite most of the translated Russian classics being part of the realist genre, with the critic

¹⁸ Irving Howe, 'History and the Novel', in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York City (NY): Norton, 2010), pp. 1391-1402 (p. 1395).

¹⁹ Donald Davie, 'Introduction', in *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald Davie (Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 1-13 (p. 1).

George Saintsbury hailing Tolstoy's work as 'hardly works of art at all [...] they are pieces of life.'²⁰

According to Prince D. Mirsky (1890–1939), a Russian literary critic and historian who was the son of the Minister of Interior but rejected his noble birth and titles, the novels of Dostoevsky and Gogol fascinated their English readers owing to their 'representation of the baser sides of humanity in their most vulgar and grotesque aspects'.²¹ Gogol's short stories, written in the 1830s and 1840s, concern themselves with the darker and/or corrupt side of human existence in St Petersburg, which was supposedly the Russian Empire's pinnacle of western modernisation and progress. Gogol's work contains supernatural elements, taking inspiration from the fact that St Petersburg was built upon the bodies of the serfs who laboured in its construction. Ethereal qualities can also be seen in Garnett's work, as well as Dostoevsky's and Gogol's. Gogol published his collection of short stories on St Petersburg in 1842 under the title, *Petersburg Tales*, fifty-eight years before Garnett's own *Petersburg Tales*. With Constance Garnett's translations of Russian novels and short stories that concerned themselves with St Petersburg from Gogol, to Alexander Pushkin to Dostoevsky, Garnett would have seen a literary tradition emerge that later became dubbed the Petersburg Texts.

²⁰ George Saintsbury, 'Turgenev, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy', in *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald Davie (Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 23-29 (p. 27).

²¹ Prince D. Mirsky, 'Chekhov and the English', in *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald Davie (Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 203-213 (p. 217).

The Petersburg Texts are characterised by their semantic unity, with their overall image cast of St Petersburg being largely consistent.²² The repetitive nature of the city and monotony of daily working life became incorporated in the literature that discussed the city, justifying the homogenous character of the Petersburg Texts.²³ Julie Buckler, in her seminal book on the Petersburg Texts, argues that St Petersburg was the literary capital of Russia and as such the city was virtually written into existence by the likes of Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoevsky, Alexander Blok (1800–1921), Andrei Bely (1880–1934), Anna Akhmatova (1889–1966) and Osip Mandelstam (1891–1938).²⁴ The texts of these writers have replaced the physical building blocks ordered by Peter the Great with their own literary foundations and in doing so have mythologised St Petersburg by generally discussing either the very affluent areas or the very deprived.²⁵ As Gogol and his contemporaries focussed on specific areas of society, it is unsurprising that it feels like class distinctions were removed by the writers. If, for example, an author describes a ghettoised area, it is unlikely that anyone from the bourgeoisie or nobility would have been seen and so they are not mentioned, resulting in the absence of the bourgeoisie and nobility in the text. Conversely, the peasants and the proletariat would have rarely been found in an affluent area excluding those in subservient roles, but usually these characters were peripheral and of little concern. A class becomes identified by their absence and so Russian authors offered a subtle criticism of how polarised the lives of the rich and the poor were in St Petersburg.

²² Julie Buckler, *Mapping St. Petersburg: Imperial Text and City Shape* (Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 2005), p. 17.

²³ Mark D. Steinburg, *Petersburg: Fin de Siècle* (New Haven (CT): Yale University Press, 2011), p. 84.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

Moreover, as noted by Buckler, the binary of rich/poor created by the Petersburg Texts 'elide[s] the cultural middle of the imperial period'.²⁶ This, Buckler continues, is because the middle is considered 'ordinary' and often the Russian writers wished to write about the extraordinary.²⁷ Writing outside of their own class was also more challenging than writing about their own and in doing so the Russian masters could also demonstrate their skill as authors. Williams notes that '[m]iddling writers documented the milieu they knew best – their own', implying that average writers could only write about their own class.²⁸ Garnett, while not in complete ignorance of the nobility or the working class, appears to be more comfortable discussing her own class within her short story collection. In light of Williams's criticism, Garnett's primary focus on middle class Russians could be indicative of her lack of talent, however given that typically the Petersburg Texts ignore the middle class, Garnett's interest in the middle could be thought to offer a new position or literary tradition within the Petersburg Texts.

Despite difference in focus, Garnett does maintain some of the thematic elements seen within the works of Gogol and Dostoevsky in particular, which will become apparent throughout the remainder of the chapter. While the writers that fit within this tradition are Russian, Garnett's own collection contains similar elements of darkness, disease and poverty. As we have seen, Garnett's writing was influenced by the texts she read. However given the repetition of images, themes and motifs throughout the canon of Petersburg Texts and the fact that Garnett had a good awareness of at least the milieu and environment of St

²⁶ Buckler, p. 4.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

²⁸ Ibid.

Petersburg after living there for a year, it is likely that she was attempting to integrate herself into, or at least mimic, the Russian literary tradition. Garnett's intertextuality with the Russian literary tradition, and more specifically the Petersburg Text, also explains why her writing did not reflect the developing modernist text in England. If Garnett were to write accurately about Russia, adopting a modernist style would not have aided this, whereas a realist style would.

'Roukoff', Class and the Petersburg Texts

While the main plot of 'Roukoff' focuses on the duping of the bourgeoisie, the reader is also allowed brief glimpses of the proletariat, including a servant and a boy in livery. The proletariat in 'Roukoff' foreshadows the change to come within the Russian class system. At the point of publication in 1900, Russia was five years away from the revolution of 1905, but work was being done to agitate the lower and peasant classes. Stepniak, Kropotkin and Volkhovsky all left Russia (either exiled or self-exiled) owing to their involvement in revolutionary activity, of which Garnett was, or became, aware. While the proletariat remain at the periphery of 'Roukoff', Garnett's knowledge of the social unrest in Russia and her awareness of the aims of her émigré friends means that the behaviour of the proletariat in the short story subtly reflects Russia's underground social movement and foreshadows more significant historical events, such as Bloody Sunday (January 1905) and the revolutions.

An example of this foreshadowing comes in the form of, Axsenia, Anna Philipovna's cook. Incidentally, Axenia is the name of the servant Garnett herself had while she was living in St Petersburg at Mrs Sperk's house. Although the spelling is slightly different, the pronunciation is the same, which furthers the realism of 'Roukoff' because it contains autobiographical elements that allow the reader to pin fictional characters to real people.²⁹ Additionally, the fictional Axsenia is not given a patronym or a surname in the short story and similarly Garnett does not make note of her servant's patronym or surname in her diary, in fact it is perfectly possible she never enquired as to what Axenia's surname was. Unfortunately, rather than learning Axenia's full name, Garnett also distastefully refers to Axenia as 'my good little slavey'.³⁰ Garnett as herself, and via her narrator, Miss Foster, do not feel the need to give Axenia/Axsenia the level of respect as members of the Russian and English middle class, illustrating a distinction between the classes. This is very much a projection of Garnett's own social status and conditioning, where it has become natural for her to simply refer to a servant by their forename, or worse.

In 'Roukoff', Axsenia is often late with bringing tea, which Miss Foster notes 'was one of her ways of asserting herself'.³¹ Axsenia's deliberate dilatoriness illustrates the bourgeoisie's dependency on servants for their food, as seen in the Union of Russian Socialist's flyer where the label for the servants reads, 'We work for you'/'we feed you'. Axsenia is aware of her small degree of power within the Philipovna household and exploits it wherever possible. Miss Foster realises that Axsenia is 'the only person whose temper Anna Philipovna

²⁹ Garnett, 25 April 1897, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 102-103.

³⁰ Johnson, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 23.

³¹ Garnett, 'Roukoff', p. 80.

really feared', further destabilising the traditional roles expected of master and servant.³²

This subversion of master-servant alludes to an undercurrent of fear within the bourgeoisie and nobility relating to the fact that the proletariat had the potential and numbers to conduct a revolution from below. Additionally, through Axsenia's temper and deliberate tardiness Garnett demonstrates in microcosm how the working class were becoming aware of their own position within society, their poor social conditions and also the inherent power they could have.

A similar incident of a servant subverting their enforced role occurs when a boy in livery attempts to gain access to Philipovna's house 'through the great gates and across the courtyard' by pretending he could not find the servant's entrance.³³ The livery denotes that the boy is in the service of a nobleman and therefore would have had suitable training and been made perfectly aware of the proper way to conduct himself when delivering a letter. The fact that he remains unnamed indicates his lack of social status and also the extent to which the nobility does not care about their servants as individuals. The boy's confidence and daring in using the entrance reserved only for the owner, family and friends of the household, defies his servant's training and illustrates his rejection of societal expectations. Despite the fact he is unnamed, he makes his presence known. His attempts to fool the bourgeoisie by lying to them about not being able to find the servant's entrance, contribute to the theme of deceit that runs throughout 'Roukoff'. The boy's actions expose the bourgeoisie to the class from which they were attempting to distance themselves. The proximity of proletariat to bourgeoisie is symbolic of the rising threat of the working class.

³² Ibid., p. 93.

³³ Ibid., p. 145.

Axsenia and the boy in livery are either only partially named or not given a name at all and so do not have a complete identity bestowed upon them by Garnett. Naming would have served as a class marker between master and servant in Britain, alongside dialect, however language was also an important defining factor between master and servant in Russia. The Francophilia of the Russian court existed, as it did in Prussia, because the French language was associated with sophistication, culture and, most importantly, Europeanness. French began to take precedence in the Russian court during the rule of Empress Elizabeth I (1741–62), when a Franco-Russian alliance formed against Prussia and Great Britain, leading to the Seven Years War (1756–63). The westernisation policies of Peter the Great exacerbated Russian admiration of French culture and Russia's multilingualism grew as the empire became more accessible. Learning French became a status symbol and even institutions like Moscow University and St. Petersburg's Smol'nyi Institute for Noble Maidens taught some of their classes exclusively in French.³⁴ While the nobility spoke French and the bourgeoisie attempted to mimic them, the lower classes still spoke predominantly Russian or regionalised languages.

In Britain, social dialect stereotypically indicates class, however in Russia the language was literally different between classes thereby accentuating the polarisation. The heteroglossia of Russia's many languages creates a carnivalesque space. In *Rabelais and His World* (1965) Bakhtin argues that in literature the freedom and radicalism of carnival highlights 'artistic

³⁴ Derek Offord and Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, *French and Russian in Imperial Russia* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015).

awareness and *purposefulness*' (italics my own).³⁵ In the momentary subversion of power from Anna Philipovna to Axsenia and the seizure of power from the boy in livery, the two members of the proletariat traverse a class and linguistic divide. The carnival allows Axsenia and the boy to exercise their unexpected powers despite their traditional roles. The repetition of Axsenia's subversion in the boy draws the reader's attention to the behaviour of the servants who otherwise remain at the peripheries of the short story, emphasising the significance of their actions and Garnett's awareness of the conduct of classes other than her own. However, awareness does not necessarily equate to understanding and if you place Garnett's fictional portrayal of the servants alongside how she writes about them in her diary, particularly how she writes about Axsenia/Axenia, it is clear that she is writing from the perspective of her own class, rather than attempting to form an alternative viewpoint. Garnett writes from a position of privilege where she is able to dismiss those of a lower class to her and confirms Williams' assertion that most writers are only truly able to write about their own class.

The theme of the belligerent servant is also seen in other Petersburg Texts such as Dostoevsky's 'The Friend of the Family' (1853) and in Gogol's short gothic horror story, 'A Terrible Vengeance' (1832). In 'A Terrible Vengeance', the narrator observes that the servants of Poles 'strut about as if they were something special.'³⁶ The arrogance emanating from these servants suggests that they possessed an elevated sense of self-importance, which is replicated in Garnett's Axsenia and the boy in livery. In this instance the servants do

³⁵ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Cambridge (MA): M.I.T. Press, 1968), p. 87.

³⁶ Nikolai Gogol, 'The Terrible Vengeance' in *The Collected Tales of Nikolai Gogol*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volkonsky (London: First Vintage Classics Edition, 1999), pp. 36-59 (p. 58).

not belong to Russians, but rather to an ethnic group who were the source of much distrust, unrest and suspicion for the Russian Empire. Gogol's scathing remark shows that he does not think the Poles' servants are special and he positions himself in opposition to them.

In Dostoevsky's short story, which is set nearly thirty years later, it is the Russian servants that are acting out of place. This demonstrates that the threat of a rebellious workforce had moved closer, from the Polish to the Russian servants and so to the centre of the empire. An elderly servant called Grishka has a public argument with his master – an unusual occurrence in itself – and uses his own logic to best his master. The narrator notes 'The servant, proud of his skill in argument and his influence over his master displayed before witnesses, turned to the workmen with redoubled dignity'.³⁷ Grishka's triumph subverts the Master/servant binary and, like Axsenia and the boy in livery, disrupts the status quo. Grishka's outspoken behaviour comes two years before the Emancipation of the Serfs (1861), where domestic workers began to become conscious as a class. Grishka and his master's argument occurred in a public place and in front of witnesses, demonstrating that the servants had also moved their grievances from the private realm to the public. Grishka's confrontation was a microcosm of the actual events, demonstrations and strikes that sprang up in Moscow and St Petersburg in the build up to the 1905 revolution.³⁸

³⁷ Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Friend of the Family and The Gambler*, trans. Frederick Whishaw (London: Vizetelly and Co., 1887), p. 21.

³⁸ Rebecca Spagnolo, 'Serving the Household, Asserting the Self: Urban Domestic Servant Activism, 1900-1917', in *The Human Condition in Imperial Russia*, ed. Christine D. Worobec (Lanham (MD): Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2009), pp. 141-154 (p. 146).

By the time Garnett was writing, forty years later, ‘the extent to which domestics were able to assert themselves as organised members of a rapidly growing urban workforce [...] was unparalleled in the modern world’.³⁹ This was particularly impressive, given that the socialist movement in Russia had limited concern for the welfare of domestic workers.⁴⁰ The Marxist philosophy adopted by the Russian intelligentsia included the belief that domestic servants were ‘flunkeys, lickspittles, etc. living from the surplus of product [...] which lives not from capital but from revenue.’⁴¹ Domestic servants were serving the Russian bourgeoisie and nobility and so, unlike those working in industry, their labours were of little concern to radical groups, because they did not see the labour as productive or valuable. The Russian servants had to mobilise themselves, with limited resources and support, in order to serve their own interests.⁴² This demonstrates how Russian people were beginning to step outside of their class confines and arguably shows Garnett’s artistic awareness of social unrest within class groups. Additionally, as David Lodge establishes, ‘the transgression of traditional power relations between the classes [is] inherent in Revolution’ and given that Garnett was aware of and established these transgressions in her work her *purpose* could have been, in a Dostoevskian fashion, to predict and foreshadow the revolution to come.⁴³ Garnett’s unpublished diaries reveal that while she was writing ‘Roukoff’ she was reading Dostoevsky’s short story, ‘The Friend of the Family’ (translated into English by Frederick Whishaw in 1887).⁴⁴ Given the timing of Garnett’s reading of ‘The Friend of the Friend’, it is unlikely that Garnett’s level of political foreshadowing was remotely similar to Dostoevsky’s

³⁹ Ibid., p. 144.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 146.

⁴¹ Karl Marx, *Grundrisse*, trans. Martin Nicolaus (London: Penguin, 1973), p. 401.

⁴² Rex A. Wade, *The Russian Revolution, 1917* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 123.

⁴³ David Lodge, *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 110.

⁴⁴ Olive Garnett, 22 January 1899, Unpublished Diaries, reprinted with permission from Caroline White.

masterful navigation through Russia's political upheaval and subsequent foreshadowing. What Garnett would have noticed was a trajectory of events, from non-conforming Polish servants at the peripheries of the Russian empire to combative Russian servants at the centre of the Russian empire. Garnett's inclusion of Axsenia and the boy's subversions seeks to add to the narrative already initiated by Gogol and Dostoevsky and allows readers to trace the unrest of domestic servants from the peripheries of empire to the centre in narrative form.

Garnett continues to adopt tropes seen in Gogol's work in 'Roukoff' when Philipovna goes to visit the place where Roukoff is staying and exclaims to the narrator '[I]t was the most disgusting, filthy place you could imagine'⁴⁵, 'oh! If you [Miss Foster] had seen that lodging! Should you like to see it; you would then know what Russian vice and poverty look like in town – on the principle of seeing *everything*, you know.'⁴⁶ Garnett's description is comparable to Gogol's destitute St Petersburg in 'The Portrait', where poverty-stricken bodies lie slumped in dark rooms.⁴⁷ Philipovna is evidently not usually exposed to such poor standards of living and was deeply appalled and shocked by what she saw. Through the voice of Philipovna, Garnett communicates to the reader that destitution was either deliberately overlooked by the bourgeoisie or that they simply had no awareness of the extent of other people's poverty. As Miss Foster was staying with Philipovna it would be unlikely that Miss Foster regularly visited poor areas, experiencing only the bourgeois style of living in St Petersburg. As we know that Miss Foster is a fictionalised representation of

⁴⁵ Garnett, 'Roukoff', p. 74.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Nikolai Gogol, 'The Portrait', in *The Collected Tales of Nikolai Gogol*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (London: Granta, 2003), p. 116.

Garnett perhaps this brings into question Garnett's suitability and reliability as an author describing Russia's different classes. However, it is interesting that Garnett's bourgeois characters cross the invisible boundary into the ghetto where an allegedly impoverished Roukoff lives, bringing together a bourgeois class, who was often absent from other texts in the Petersburg canon, and those who lived in poverty.

Garnett's description of the 'vilest hole' Roukoff inhabited is added to by Philipovna when she calls it a 'dung heap' full of 'evil' people and claims that Roukoff is the sole 'pearl' to be found there.⁴⁸ This acts as a critique of the bourgeoisie, rather than the proletariat, because with Philipovna's sweeping insult she condemns an entire class, reducing the individuals to a homogenous mass. There is an idiomatic 'do not judge a book by its cover' element to the narrative, which later becomes corrupted by Roukoff's criminal behaviour, who ironically is the one individual the bourgeoisie do not judge in the 'dung heap'. Miss Foster notes that Philipovna only warms to Roukoff because, despite him being 'so *Russian*' and having no idea who or what he is, he can speak perfect French, which indicates that he is a member of either the bourgeoisie or the nobility.⁴⁹ It is also a forewarning that Roukoff is educated and clever. Similarly, the identity and origin of Foma Fomich Opiskin in Dostoevsky's 'The Friend of the Family' is also unknown. Like Roukoff, it is believed that Opiskin was 'to have been sometime and somewhere in the government service'.⁵⁰ While Roukoff was found in squalor and Opiskin was not, their past is very similar, further exemplifying the intertextuality between 'Roukoff' and 'The Friend of the Family'.

⁴⁸ Garnett, 'Roukoff', pp. 81, 74, 76.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Dostoevsky, *The Friend of the Family and The Gambler*, p.4.

Similarities between the texts can be seen while looking at the themes of unmasking and concealment. In a similar way to Roukoff, Opiskin also takes advantage of the Russian nobility and extorts money from them. Moreover, the narrator, Sergey Alexandrovich, is one of the few characters who sees through Opiskin's mask, just as Garnett's narrator, Miss Foster does with Roukoff. Unmasking and concealment become regular themes in the Petersburg Texts, such as in Gogol's play *The Government Inspector* (1836), and his short story 'The Nevsky Prospekt' (1835), while Dostoevsky's 'The Underground Man' (1864) and 'The Friend of the Family' all consider 'impersonation, imposture, illusion and falsification'.⁵¹ This theme is also seen in 'Roukoff' through Roukoff's duping of the bourgeoisie and nobility, where they believe Roukoff was in desperate need of financial aid. Dostoevsky's 'The Friend of the Family' was hailed in Britain as a valuable picture 'of a society and a people with whom we are imperfectly acquainted, but who deserve the closest scrutiny.'⁵² This confirms Davie's notion that the British public were turning to Russian fiction for information about Russia and taking the imagined literary work to be the truth. While manipulation of the wealthy is not a new motif in literature, it is nevertheless interesting that Garnett incorporated the same themes into her short story shortly after reading Dostoevsky's work.⁵³

⁵¹ Steinburg, p. 84.

⁵² Anon., 'Review of Friend of the Family', quoted in Fyodor Dostoevsky, *Uncle's Dream and the Permanent Husband*, trans. Frederick Whishshaw (London: Vizetelly and Co., 1888), p. 1.

⁵³ Garnett also incorporates images taken from Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (1865) in 'Roukoff', such as when Miss Foster, the narrator, comments 'I felt like Alice in Wonderland between the mock turtle and the gryphon' (Garnett, 'Roukoff', p. 125) after being bested intellectually. Garnett mentions *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in the same diary entry as Dostoevsky's 'The Friend of the Family'. This further contributes to the notion that Garnett was strongly influenced by other authors, which is not unusual, however Garnett perhaps does not pull it off with the finesse of her peers; the *Alice in Wonderland* simile appears particularly incongruous.

The relationship between 'The Friend of the Family' and 'Roukoff' continues with regards to the respective villains' abilities to manipulate other characters and elements of George Eliot's *Middlemarch, A Study of Provincial Life* (1871) can also be seen in Garnett's work. In 'Roukoff', a significant part of the narrative comes back to Garnett's critique of the Russian bourgeoisie. Miss Foster is somewhat alarmed by the effect Roukoff's plots are having upon her friends and her opinion of them becomes more negative. Miss Foster describes Roukoff as a spider, who has ensnared her circle of bourgeoisie friends 'into his vast web' causing frictions and divisions within her social network.⁵⁴ Garnett's metaphor subverts George Eliot's conceit of the web used to describe her interdependent community of Middlemarch to illustrate the reach and influence Roukoff had upon the Russian community. Moreover, by using *Middlemarch*, a text renowned for its literary realism, Garnett not only anchors herself to the realist genre, but also to British culture in an effort to distance Miss Foster from the gullible Russian bourgeoisie. Garnett also borrows from 'The Friend of the Family' again, with regards to Roukoff's ability to manipulate her circle of friends. In 'The Friend of the Family' it is stated that Opiskin has 'cast a spell on them [the Alexandrovich family] all; he is a regular alchemist' whose 'inhumanly despotic domination' manipulated the family into continually carrying out his bidding.⁵⁵ Opiskin and Roukoff are both portrayed as masterful and unnatural men, one like a spider and the other as some sort of dictatorial magician, which establishes a feeling of unease in both texts and contributes to the power of Roukoff and Opiskin as their behaviour, actions and descriptions unsettle the reader.

⁵⁴ 'Roukoff', p. 101.

⁵⁵ Dostoevsky, 'The Friend of the Family', pp. 24, 7.

Rejecting the Bourgeoisie

Roukoff continues to entrap Miss Foster's friends and associates through playing on their emotions. For example, he persuades Philipovna to sympathise with him by explaining that her deceased husband, Andrei Grigorovitch, had assisted him several years ago. Grigorovitch was an ophthalmologist and given that Roukoff is blind it is assumed by the reader that this is how Grigorovitch helped him. Roukoff's unreported discussion with Philipovna results in Philipovna becoming emotional because 'it brought [her] darling [husband] so vividly before [her]' suggesting that Roukoff brought Philipovna into his confidence by warmly referring to her husband, Grigorovitch.⁵⁶ Philipovna's memories of her husband remind Philipovna of her own solitude. 'Alone, I am dry, barren [...], do you not see how *empty* my life has become?' she asks Miss Foster.⁵⁷ The images of a sexless life, coupled with the fact her son is an adult and no longer dependent upon her, demonstrate that mothering instincts are playing a part in Philipovna's desire to take care of Roukoff and his sick son. Philipovna describes herself as 'barren', suggesting that if her husband had not died she would have wanted to have had more children.

Philipovna's maudlin nature juxtaposes the British modernists' reaction against the sentimentality seen in Victorian fiction, meaning that Garnett's audience may not have been as sympathetic and receptive to Philipovna's emotions as their predecessors.⁵⁸ Garnett's life

⁵⁶ Garnett, 'Roukoff', p. 75.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ For example, Oscar Wilde's infamous remark that it would take a heart of stone to read of the death of Charles Dickens' Little Nell in *The Old Curiosity Shop* (1840) without laughing.

For further discussion on this see: Michael Bell, *Sentimentalism, Ethics and the Culture of Feeling* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000), pp. 118-149.

was spent in literary circles and so she would have been aware of the rejection of sentimental themes, which implies that Garnett did not want her British writers to sympathise with Philipovna. Once Philipovna returns home from her discussion with Roukoff, she comments proudly that, '[h]is [Grigorovitch's] patients were from all classes', demonstrating that Roukoff's attempts to prey upon Philipovna's emotions had been successful.⁵⁹ Moreover, it implies to the reader that Philipovna was sympathetic towards people from classes below her, but as we saw from her assessment of the 'evil' people Roukoff shared his house with, she was not. Philipovna's attitude here is typical of those who carry out philanthropic acts purely for their own gain and satisfaction and this made her a primary target for Roukoff. Indeed, his alleged personal connections to Grigorovitch inspired Philipovna to gift 50 roubles to Roukoff, which was 'more than [she] could afford.'⁶⁰

Philipovna's son, Philip, asks Miss Foster, 'Have you heard about this wonderful protégé of *maman*, mademoiselle?' to which Miss Foster responds, 'I, for my part, don't think much of your protégé. I think he's an imbecile or worse'.⁶¹ From the beginning of the short story, Miss Foster asserts that she mistrusts Roukoff and finds the female hysteria surrounding him illogical. In a moment of irony, Miss Foster stares down at her British newspapers 'as if they recalled [her] from Bedlam'.⁶² By immersing herself in a newspaper from England, Garnett shows that Miss Foster found the behaviour of the Russian bourgeoisie to be unfamiliar to her and that the familiar Latin text, opposed to the confusing Cyrillic alphabet, and news of home brought her comfort. By remapping the infamous British psychiatric

⁵⁹ Garnett, 'Roukoff', p. 76.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 77.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 82-83.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 80.

hospital 'Bedlam' (or Bethlem Royal Hospital) on to St Petersburg, Miss Foster ironically finds sanity within the displacement, which in turn demonstrates how chaotic and ridiculous she found the impact Roukoff had upon her hosts and friends to be. Moreover, Philip's original question ('Have you heard about this wonderful protégé of *maman*, mademoiselle?') is asked in English, with in a Russian accent and contains French vocabulary. This mongrelisation of language demonstrates the heteroglossia of the wealthier classes in Russia. The polyphonic elements of Philip's discourse, combined with the figurative relocation of Bedlam, creates a site of carnival, where a multitude of voices and stereotypical images of deranged lunatics fill the space, forming a hysterical scene where the only point of calmness is the English Miss Foster. The juxtaposition of Foster and the Russian bourgeoisie is indicative of the differences between British and Russian cultures and the dialogical disunity in the space of Russian collective consciousness. Additionally, Phillip's hybridisation of French and English shows how desperate the Philipovna family were to be associated with the francophones of the Russian court because they are desperate to incorporate the language of the Russian nobility whenever they can. This is a further criticism of the Russian bourgeoisie, who are presented here as social climbers and so are just as unappealing to readers as Austen's Mr Collins, Eliot's Gwendolen Harleth and Thackeray's Becky Sharpe.

Miss Foster's interaction with Sophie Ivanovna – another houseguest of Anna Philipovna's – does little to improve the impression Garnett gives her readers of the Russian bourgeoisie. Miss Foster observes that Ivanovna and Philipovna 'worked one another up, speaking in heart-rendering accents of suffering, poverty despair, social evils generally, and impending

retribution.⁶³ Miss Foster's only reaction to their theatrics was to comment that she found it all 'very dull' which adds to the notion that the vogue for sentimentality in British literature is over.⁶⁴ Miss Foster's British stoicism and disinterest elevates her character above the cacophony of Ivanovna and Philipovna, allowing Garnett to position herself in opposition to the two hysterical women and further discredit the attitude of the Russian bourgeoisie.

Garnett also uses Ivanovna to contribute to the narrative of St Petersburg seen throughout the Petersburg Texts. Ivanovna believes that St Petersburg's citizens were full of 'stonyheartedness and cynicism', which 'could never have happened in Moscow'.⁶⁵ By setting Russia's new capital, St Petersburg, alongside the deposed Moscow, Ivanovna paints an unsettling picture of the city and its people in comparison to the old capital. With Peter the Great naming St Petersburg his capital and using it as his point of contact with the West, Ivanovna's comment implies that Russia has been corrupted by Western influence, which is damaging St Petersburg. By portraying Ivanovna as a scatty, over-emotional woman, Garnett can dismiss Ivanovna's slavophilic beliefs, indicating Garnett's preference for the Russian westernisers and more radical members of society.

Garnett's only character belonging to the Russian intelligentsia is the 'plucky editress', Lopatine. Lopatine was the editor of a monthly review, *Northern Riches*, which Miss Foster describes as an 'enlightened' journal suggesting it lends itself to the more liberal forms of

⁶³ Garnett, 'Roukoff', pp. 93-94

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

culture Garnett was used to in England.⁶⁶ It is possible that Lopatine was named after German Lopatin (1845–1918), the Russian revolutionary, journalist and close friend of Volkhovsky. Miss Foster's admires Lopatine despite Lopatine's 'hopeless and arduous struggle' against Russian censorship and her calmness and practicality is sharply opposed to the excitability of Ivanovna and Philipovna.⁶⁷ Miss Foster's admiration of a member of the Russian intelligentsia accentuates her criticism of the bourgeoisie and aligns Garnett ideologically with the Russian radical intelligentsia.

Funerals and Furthering the Class Divide

Roukoff's scheming comes to light at the funeral of Roukoff's son, who is the final victim of Roukoff's plots against the wealthy Russians. In the scene, the hysterical qualities of Philipovna and Ivanovna are transferred to Roukoff. Similarly, in 'The Friend of the Family', Opiskin reaches a peak of hysterical madness at the funeral of Sergey Alexandrovich's Grandma, who had been kind to Opiskin. While members of the Orthodox Church begin to throw earth on top of the grave, Opiskin 'leapt in to it, shouting that he would be buried in it too'.⁶⁸ The signs of genuine despair and grief in the wake of the death of a mother-figure help to humanise Opiskin to the reader and removes his more unnatural, alchemistic traits.

The funeral scene in 'Roukoff' allows Garnett's readers to view a more traditional Russian Orthodox funeral, compared to the political protest that stemmed from Vetrova's burial in

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Dostoevsky, 'The Friend of the Family', p. 200.

'The Case of Vetrova'. In the British tradition, the funeral offered a clear indication of social hierarchy. The working class could not experience 'pure grief' because death and funerals were often associated with financial problems, such as struggling to pay for a service or coffin.⁶⁹ The private graves, ceremony and mourning paraphernalia expected at the funeral of a wealthy Edwardian, were carried out in stark contrast to the pauper burial, demonstrating 'binary opposites on the cultural landscape' of England.⁷⁰ Similarly in Russia, the social class of a person directly affected what sort of funeral their family could afford. For the Russian Tsars, the pomp and ceremony of a Romanov funeral had an additional purpose, which was to reinforce and preserve autocratic power and rule; it was one of the ultimate symbols of wealth and prosperity juxtaposed against the funerals of millions of Russian working class families who could not afford a coffin.⁷¹ The Romanovs paraded the ornate biers of their dead through the city streets, gathering large crowds of mourners and using this demonstration of their strength and fortune to refine or rebuild their influence over the Russian people. By doing this, the Tsars simultaneously united the Russian people in collective mourning for the old Tsar and also reinforced the authority of the new Tsar. This act was particularly important after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 in order to demonstrate to society that Tsar Alexander III was still strong in the face of radical violence.⁷² A Romanov funeral was orchestrated in an exact way in order to restore balance and stability after the loss of a monarch. Roukoff attempts to utilise his son's funeral as a way to restore financial stability in his own life. At this point in the short story, Roukoff has

⁶⁹ Julie-Marie Strange, 'She Cried a Very Little: Death, Grief and Mourning in Working-Class Culture, c. 1880-1914', *Social History*, vol. 27 (2002), pp. 143-161 (p. 143).

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Tom Trice, 'Rites of Passage: Populist Funerals in Imperial St Petersburg, 1876-1878', *Slavic Review*, vol. 60 (2001), pp. 50-74 (p. 52.).

⁷² Ibid.

been exposed and is poverty-stricken so he cannot afford to pay for the funeral, however he does not care about this and instead sees it as an opportunity to try and extort more money. Roukoff telegrams sixty Russian officials to ask for monetary donations towards the funeral.⁷³

The distinction between classes based upon the type of burial a family could afford in Russia was similar to Britain and exemplified in 'Roukoff' at the Smolensk cemetery. Miss Foster witnesses a row of thirty coffins being prepared for burial and the caskets are varied with 'some, by their gorgeous palls and numerous wreaths, apparently belonging to wealthy families, others, of plain white wood and without a single ornament, to the very poor.'⁷⁴ In death, there is no distinction between Russian and English tradition; the upper classes use the ceremony to declare their wealth, while the poor struggle to bury their dead with dignity. The division between the rich and the poor is seen in Gogol's 'Nevsky Prospekt', one of the short stories in his *Petersburg Tales* collection. The narrator states:

My heart is always vexed at the sight of a rich catafalque and a velvet coffin; but my vexation is mixed with sadness when I see a drayman pulling the bare pine coffin of a poor man, and only some beggar woman met at an intersection plods after it, having nothing else to do.⁷⁵

Both Gogol and Garnett present the dichotomy between rich and poor in their short stories and a funeral is where those difference are publicly seen.

⁷³ Garnett, 'Roukoff', p. 154.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 164.

⁷⁵ Nikolai Gogol, 'The Nevsky Prospekt', in *The Collected Tales of Nikolai Gogol*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (London: Granta, 2003) pp. 134-155 (p. 148).

In 'Roukoff' the burning incense at the ceremony for Roukoff's son creates a fantastical atmosphere in the Church. The oppressive environment causes Miss Foster discomfort, to the point where her mind starts to wander and dislocates from reality. This incorporates supernatural elements used by Dostoevsky in his literary feuilleton 'Petersburg Visions in Verse and Prose' (1861).⁷⁶ Dostoevsky, while looking at the Neva River on a January evening and seeing St Petersburg through the mist writes:

Some strange thought suddenly stirred inside me. I shuddered, and at that moment my heart seemed to fill with a hot spurt of blood, suddenly boiling up from a surge of a powerful, but previously unknown sensation. I seemed to understand something at that moment which up until that point had only stirred within me, but had not been consciously realised. It seemed that my eyes had been opened to something new, to a completely new world that was unfamiliar to me and known only by some murky rumours or secret signs. I suppose that my existence began at that precise moment.⁷⁷

In 'Roukoff', the mists created by the Neva are swapped for clouds of incense. Miss Foster becomes overly aware of her own body and her intense focus upon herself creates a dream-like image similar to Dostoevsky's. The heightened sensations and feelings of Dostoevsky and Miss Foster give both passages a gothic element, particularly with the incorporation of the masking mist and incense. While Dostoevsky seems in his moment to become conscious

⁷⁶ 'Petersburg Visions in Verse and Prose' was originally published as a literary feuilleton in 1861 in Dostoevsky's own magazine, *Vremya* (1861–63). The text was not re-printed in Dostoevsky's lifetime but was discovered and published in a 1918 collection of his printed works, therefore Garnett would not have read this before she wrote 'Roukoff' unless Constance Garnett or one of her émigré friends had it in translation.

⁷⁷ Fyodor Dostoevsky, 'Petersburg Visions in Verse and Prose' (1861), quoted in Julie A. Buckler, *Mapping St. Petersburg: Imperial Text and Cityshape* (Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 2007), p. 22.

of his own existence, Miss Foster comes to realise her own isolation and alien status within St Petersburg:

The very air, perhaps from the incense burned over-night, was oppressive, and I soon had the peculiar sensation one sometimes experiences while awake – of moving in a dream. My limbs became heavy, and my head became light; everything seemed strangely unreal and yet vivid, and the strain of keeping my attention fixed contracted my forehead precisely as if I had a painful headache or was straining my eyes through glasses too strong for my sight, and I suddenly felt strange somehow – isolated.⁷⁸

The length of the second sentence acts as a micro-stream of consciousness, causing the reader to get lost within Miss Foster's hazy thoughts, replicating her own delirium. Other characters are also affected by the incense, including Roukoff who becomes manic and flings himself into his son's grave, much like Dostoevsky's Opiskin when he claims he wishes to be buried alive with the grandmother. Roukoff's dramatic action disrupts the hypnotic spell the incense had upon the congregation and he disturbs the scene still further by going on to claim that the people who had charitably assisted him had buried 'his son like a pig'.⁷⁹ In the liminal space created by the incense and Miss Foster's phantasmagorical experience, the hysterical roles adopted by the Russian bourgeoisie dissolve and are reassigned to Roukoff. In the same way that a Romanov funeral was created and performed in order to restore balance and peace, the funeral scene in 'Roukoff' introduces harmony to Miss Foster's life because it facilitates the eradication of Roukoff via his unmasking. Roukoff's

⁷⁸ Garnett, 'Roukoff', p. 159.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

depravity and madness is finally recognised and, as one of Miss Foster's Russian friend's comments, 'There is an English saying, 'All's well that ends well''.⁸⁰

Reviews

While Garnett is not remembered alongside those in her network such as D.H. Lawrence, Henry James, Ford Madox Ford and Joseph Conrad, her work was nevertheless celebrated by the British and U.S. press when it was published. On 31 March 1900 the U.S. company who published *Petersburg Tales* in the U.S., Houghton and Mifflin, sent Garnett a copy of the U.S. edition ('which looks very nice') and an envelope full of press cuttings that were 'mostly favourable'.⁸¹ By this point, 300 of the 500 copies ordered by Houghton and Mifflin had been sold. The reviews were kept by Olive Garnett and form part of the 'Garnett Family Papers' in the archives at Northwestern University. *The Cambridge Tribune* (MA) establishes that *Petersburg Tales* was published in the U.S. because it had 'received so much attention at home [in England]'.⁸² The rapid printing of *Petersburg Tales* in the U.S. implies that the collection of short stories was well-received in Britain at the time. Garnett's initial popularity contrasts with the fact that Garnett is not well known today, indeed *Petersburg Tales* is now only in print in the U.S., and *In Russia's Night* (1918) is out of print, suggesting that it may be the fact that she only had two significant works published that affected her status. The *Manchester Guardian* hailed Garnett as a true 'artist [who] obtain[ed] the pregnant

⁸⁰ Garnett, 'Roukoff', p. 172.

⁸¹ Garnett, Monday 31 March 1900, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 189.

⁸² Anon., 'Book Notes', *Cambridge Tribune*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F49 'Miscellaneous', Box 22.

simplicity of Turgenev and the fineness of Mr Henry James.’⁸³ Evidently Garnett’s undercutting of the Russian bourgeoisie in ‘Roukoff’ was identified by the reviewer who notes that while the ‘philanthropists’ were ‘fashionable’ and ‘lavish’, they were ultimately ‘cowardly’.⁸⁴ The same conclusion is reached by *The Outlook* who calls Philipovna, Ivanovna, Zaroubin and their friends a group of ‘chicken-hearted sentimentalists’.⁸⁵ This contributes to the argument that Garnett was aware that her Western audience would have been disparaging of sentimental behaviour as seen through their rejection of the sentimental novel. By presenting the Russians as sentimental, Garnett is able to highlight the difference in attitude between the British middle class and the Russian bourgeoisie, particularly when faced with a difficult situation.

Whether the reviewers found the texts to be accurate representations of Russian life and social class or not may not be the most appropriate assessment of Garnett’s ability to produce realistic fiction. I am establishing this because the reviewers are not given by-lines and therefore it is difficult to assess which, if any, of Garnett’s reviewers had actually travelled to Russia themselves. Without expert knowledge of the country, a reviewer’s assessment of Garnett’s realism, or lack thereof, cannot be considered overly valuable in terms of confirming or denying Garnett’s skills as a writer. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the majority of newspapers firmly believed Garnett’s representation to be wholly accurate. In an almost contradictory report by *The Boston Transcript* the reviewer states

⁸³ Anon., ‘Reviews’, *Manchester Guardian*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F49 ‘Miscellaneous’, Box 22.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Anon., ‘A New Writer’, *The Outlook*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F49 ‘Miscellaneous’, Box 22.

that the West know little about Russia 'because the efforts which have been made to reveal something of it by native story-tellers are circumscribed by the fact that the native point of view is itself remote'.⁸⁶ The reviewer states that accounts of Russia written by Russians may be subject to elements of bias. Moreover, it implies that Russian people are immeasurably different to the Western population, proposing that the dichotomy between the two cultures is too great for the West to fully understand the Russian perspective. While establishing that the West know nothing of Russia, the reviewer still asserts that Garnett 'understands her Russia, its natives, its habits, its atmosphere'.⁸⁷ It seems unusual that the reviewer is so confident in Garnett's representation in light of Russia's apparent 'remoteness', however it does serve to demonstrate that Garnett's portrayal excited and intrigued Western readers.

The Brooklyn Daily Eagle and *The Commercial Advertiser* all conform to *The Boston Transcript's* view. *The Commercial Advertiser* goes as far as to claim Garnett's 'attitude is characteristic of young Russia – of revolutionary, young Russia – and it makes her stories, therefore, all the more realistic.'⁸⁸ The journalist has noticed the chaotic undertones in 'Roukoff' and Garnett's obvious affiliation and liking of radical women such as Loptaine. Garnett's *Petersburg Tales* was published in 1900, five years before the attempted revolution of 1905, however the prophetic nature of Garnett's work, including the subversion of classes or the belligerence of the working class, has clearly convinced the reviewer of the revolutionary milieu in Russia at the turn of the century. *The Brooklyn Eagle*

⁸⁶ Anon., 'Petersburg Tales', *The Boston Transcript*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F49 'Miscellaneous', Box 22.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Anon., 'Petersburg Stories', *The Commercial Advertiser*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F49 'Miscellaneous', Box 22.

has looked to 'Roukoff' for a history lesson on Russia, just as Western readerships have looked to Dostoevsky, Turgenev and Tolstoy for information about Russia. The writer comments that 'as studies of Russian character they [the four short stories] are peculiarly graphic and as affording a vivid yet unaffected insight into various phases and ranks of Russian life they are of no small value'.⁸⁹ This shows that to the reporter, *Petersburg Tales* has a pedagogical purpose and treats the collection as work of non-fiction, even going so far as commenting on the stories' being 'unaffected' or unbiased. By placing Garnett's text alongside Dostoevsky, Turgenev and Tolstoy's *oeuvres* in terms of their value in learning about and understanding Russia, the *Brooklyn Eagle* could not have afforded Garnett any higher praise.

* * *

Garnett's adaptation of realism to suit the British public's demands for information on Russia results in the creation of a nuanced and generally well-constructed text. The reception of Garnett's text suggests that she did present a faithful, or at the very least a *convincing*, image of the epoch she was describing, even going so far as to include elements that foreshadow the impending 1905 Russian Revolution, which becomes the subject of her next and final book, *In Russia's Night*. Yet Garnett's reviewers were also, on the whole, members of the middle class and therefore, we might assume, primarily interested in their class equivalents in Russia. This means that they would be less likely to notice if other

⁸⁹ Anon., *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F49 'Miscellaneous', Box 22.

classes were absent from 'Roukoff', which bar a few non-essential characters, they are. On the whole Garnett does fall into the trap theorised by Williams of only being able to describe her own class, given that Garnett's description of the Russian working class's home is used as a tool to illustrate the judgmental nature of the Russian bourgeoisie; even her villain is a fallen member of the bourgeoisie. Characters such as Axsenia and the boy in livery do not play pivotal roles in the short story, nor, in Axsenia/Axenia's case, in Garnett's life, and the people Roukoff lived with are ignored altogether. However, what Garnett does do well is note her dislike of the Russian bourgeoisie, their personalities and their desire to climb the social ladder. The bourgeoisie are presented as similar but different to the British middle class, with Philipovna and Ivanovna coming close to some of the least liked characters in British Victorian Literature. Garnett uses Miss Foster's narration to separate herself from her hosts in order to highlight her opposition to them. By admiring members of the intelligentsia, like Lopatine, Garnett is able to position herself subtle in sympathy with her Russian émigrés and through including the scenes with Axsenia and the boy in livery, Garnett identifies spheres of significance without taking an overtly radical stance herself, which she leaves for *In Russia's Night*. Ultimately, throughout the short story Garnett still adheres to her own personal allegiance to Stepniak, by attempting to portray a faithful image of Russia from *her* point of view, so while she does not overly offer an informative or sensitive assessment of classes outside of her own, she does keep her promise to the secret love of her life.

On 'Roukoff's wider significance and appeal, the text has so far been neglected owing to its apparent outmoded tradition of literary realism. However, this chapter's showcasing of the intertextuality between 'Roukoff', Dostoevsky's 'The Family Friend', Gogol's *Petersburg*

Tales and other Petersburg Texts demands that 'Roukoff' is re-examined as a text of critical value. Garnett, like the Russian masters before her, includes a darkness and a madness in St Petersburg by providing sites of carnival where expected societal norms collapse and a corrupt form of society pervades the streets of the Russian capital. The Russian bourgeoisie, so desperate to emulate the nobility they aspire to be, take on the role of the lunatic, while the cruel exploiter gains ever-growing reaches of power. Through a dialogic relationship with the Petersburg Texts, Garnett writes herself retrospectively, but paradoxically simultaneously, into the canon of the Petersburg Texts but from a British point of view, with the work of Dostoevsky and Gogol being translated and read at the same time as Garnett's. In this way, 'Roukoff' becomes a narrative that contributes to the British perception of St Petersburg, with Garnett acting as mediator between St Petersburg, the Petersburg Texts and the British public

Chapter Three

'The Secret of the Universe' and the London Life of Vasily Vasilyevich Bervi-Flerovsky

'Observation is your strongest, fancy intervention your weakest point'¹ – Sergei Stepniak

Olive Garnett's 'The Secret of the Universe' is the third story in the *Petersburg Tales* (1900). While 'The Case of Vetrova' and 'Roukoff' are both set in St Petersburg, 'The Secret of the Universe' removes the reader from Russia and deposits them in London, much to the annoyance of literary reviewers, who felt that only the first two short stories justified the collection's title.² Geographical location notwithstanding, 'The Secret of the Universe' still offers Garnett's readers an insight into Russian life. However, rather than the narrator being an outsider looking in (as Miss Foster was in St Petersburg in 'The Case of Vetrova' and 'Roukoff'), the story subverts this trope and provides an account of the daily activities of a handful of Russian émigrés living and working in London. Like 'The Case of Vetrova', events in 'The Secret of the Universe' are closely related to Garnett's own life (or at least the life she presents to us in her diaries). In this sense, Garnett continues to pursue her interpretation of Sergei Stepniak's request for the truth, dutifully obeying his continual insistence that she must 'write upon what [she] observed' in order to further readers' understanding of Russia and the Russian context.³

¹ Sergei Stepniak to Olive Garnett (24 October 1895), in Olive Garnett, *Olive and Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett* ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett's Press, 1993), pp. 212-211 (p. 212).

² Anon., 'Petersburg Tales', *The Mail and Express*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F36 'Olive Garnett Review', Box 23.

³ Garnett, Wednesday 28 February 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 212., Sergei Stepniak to Olive Garnett (24 October 1895), in *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 212.

An anonymous reviewer in the *Academy* (1869–1902) declared that ‘The Secret of the Universe’ ‘shows Miss Garnett in her most personal vein’, a phrase that is used to praise Garnett’s convincing rendering of the story, but that fails to specify *why* ‘The Secret of the Universe’ appears to be her ‘most personal’.⁴ In 1984, Thomas C. Moser presented a rationale for this claim that was unavailable to the earlier reviewer when he notes that ‘The Secret of the Universe’ is, on the whole, exclusively taken from Garnett’s religiously kept diaries.⁵ Moser goes as far as identifying Garnett, Sergei Stepniak, Fanny Stepniak, and ‘the Bervis’ as the central characters and offers a sentence on the plot, which is significant because ‘The Secret of the Universe’ is otherwise overlooked in literary criticism.⁶ This chapter will provide the first rigorous and detailed analysis of ‘The Secret of the Universe’, exploring its five main characters and indicating where and how the story is tied to Garnett’s life via connections to her diaries, letters and fragments of unpublished manuscript. Stepniak believed that observation was Garnett’s strongest point as writer, with fancy being her weakest. ‘The Secret of the Universe’ completely supports Stepniak’s theory; the parts in ‘The Secret of the Universe’ that close related to Garnett’s own experiences and are documented in her diary are lucid and well-written, whereas the ending, which Garnett imagined, is reminiscent of a poor Greek tragedy.⁷ Despite the weakness of its ending, ‘The Secret of the Universe’ is of significance to literary and historiographical spheres because it revolves around the life of the Russian philosopher, Vasily Vasilyevich Bervi-Flerovsky,

⁴ Anon, ‘Petersburg Tales’, *The Academy: A Weekly Review of Literature and Life*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F36 ‘Olive Garnett Review’, Box 23.

⁵ Thomas C. Moser, ‘An English Context for Conrad’s Russian Characters: Sergei Stepniak and the Diary of Olive Garnett’, *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 1 (1984), pp. 3-44.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁷ Stepniak to Garnett (24 October 1895), in *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p 212.

whose literary and philosophical works strongly influenced household names like Karl Marx (1818–83) and Maxim Gorky (1868–1936) and also figures well-known to Russian history, Kropotkin, Stepniak, Volkhovsky and Vera Figner (1852–1942).⁸ The people Bervi-Flerovsky influenced hold a more substantial position in history than Bervi-Flerovsky does, however his work was central to the development of Marx, Stepniak and Kropotkin’s own personal philosophies that contributed to social revolution across Europe and one of the most prominent forms of socio-economic analysis, Marxism. The fact that Garnett is perhaps the only person who has written Bervi-Flerovsky into British literature, alongside Bervi-Flerovsky’s wide sphere of influence, makes ‘The Secret of the Universe’ an important and compelling short story.

‘The Secret of the Universe’: Who’s Who

‘The Secret of the Universe’ is narrated by a young woman called Emmie, who at the start implies that the story she is about to tell will end in tragedy. As with both ‘The Case of Vetrova’ and ‘Roukoff’, the opening of ‘The Secret of the Universe’ fills the reader with unease. After Emmie starts recounting the narrative, it transpires that she had been roped in to helping her close friends, two Russian émigrés, Constantine ‘Koko’ Sylvester and his wife, Blanche, to translate and publish the ‘philosophical and scientific writings’ of one Alexander Barry, a Russo-Scottish philosopher and sociologist whose work had been banned in Russia.⁹ Barry and his wife, Wilhelmina, had spent many years in exile in the Russian

⁸ For Gorky’s description and praise of Bervi-Flerovsky see: Donald Fanger, *Gorky’s Tolstoy and Other Reminiscences* (New Haven (CT): Yale University Press, 2010), pp. 69-71. Bervi-Flerovsky’s influence on Marx, Kropotkin, Stepniak, Volkhovsky and Figner will be seen further on in this chapter.

⁹ Olive Garnett, ‘The Secret of the Universe’, in *Petersburg Tales* (Boston (MA): Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1900), pp. 191-274 (p. 196).

Empire owing to Barry playing, according to Sylvester's vague account, a 'prominent part in an important movement'.¹⁰ While Barry works on his manuscript titled 'The Secret of the Universe', Wilhelmina offers to tutor Emmie in Russian.¹¹ Wilhelmina and Blanche are fiercely protective of their husbands and so when Sylvester struggles to shape Barry's book into something publishable, Emmie is caught in the middle between the two wives as both become increasingly antagonistic and spiteful towards the other. Wilhelmina is desperate to see her husband published after their many years of struggle and Blanche fears that Sylvester is too consumed by Barry's manuscript and is neglecting his own work. Sylvester tries to see if Barry's manuscript could be published in a periodical, rather than as a book in its own right, and Emmie asks a contact at the Royal Society whether he would consider reading and publishing it.¹² Both lines of enquiry prove to be futile. Barry and Wilhelmina become more and more depressed and agitated by their situation and Barry's failure to succeed. It is suggested by both Emmie and Sylvester that a change in direction from the socio-philosophical to the autobiographical may be of benefit to Barry and more in line with public interest.¹³ Wilhelmina is also encouraged to write her account of her many years in exile with her husband and children. While writing their autobiographies serves to distract Barry and Wilhelmina for a time, it soon becomes apparent that the works are difficult to read and translate and are near unpublishable. After the Barrys receive a letter from Blanche, informing them that they have been unsuccessful again and perhaps they should stop writing, Barry commits suicide by hanging himself in his writing room and Wilhelmina also ends her life.¹⁴ Here then, the reader understands why Emmie states that this would

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 226

¹¹ Ibid., p. 211.

¹² Ibid., p. 230.

¹³ Ibid., p. 225.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 272.

not be a happy tale, but one of suffering, at the beginning of 'The Secret of the Universe'. The short story closes with Emmie informing the reader that these sad events happened some time ago and now Barry, Sylvester, Blanche and Wilhelmina are all dead and she is the only person who can tell Barry and Wilhelmina's story.¹⁵

Most of the plot of 'The Secret of the Universe' is drawn from actual events and interactions, which can be found in the pages of Garnett's diary between October 1893 and December 1895. While Garnett uses the names Emmie, Constantine 'Koko' Sylvester, Blanche Sylvester, Alexander Barry and Wilhelmina Barry in 'The Secret of the Universe' it is reasonably straightforward to pair up the characters with people who feature prominently in Garnett's life. Emmie is a proxy for Garnett herself and there is nothing to suggest that Emmie is not Miss Foster, who we meet in 'The Case of Vetrova' and 'Roukoff'. Miss Foster's forename is never used in 'The Case of Vetrova' or 'Roukoff' and Emmie's surname is not used in 'The Secret of the Universe'. Miss Foster is a governess in St Petersburg so convention would have demanded the use of her surname as opposed to her forename, whereas Emmie is in an informal environment among close friends in 'The Secret of the Universe'. Additionally, given how closely 'The Secret of the Universe' ties up with Garnett's life and, as I have argued in earlier chapters, the fact that Miss Foster is a fictionalised Garnett, suggests that Emmie is Miss Foster and ergo, Garnett.

As Moser noted, Stepniak appears in the short story as the figure of Constantine 'Koko' Sylvester. Stepniak's official surname was Stepniak-Kravchinsky and these initials (SK) are

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 274.

reversed (KS) to give Koko Sylvester. Blanche Sylvester is a fictionalised version of Stepniak's wife, Fanny. Garnett could have chosen to give Fanny a name of French origin because in English, Fanny is a diminutive of Frances, which derives from Latin and means, 'French woman'. Additionally, 'blanche' means 'white' in French and throughout the period described in 'The Secret of the Universe', Garnett often comments in her diary that Fanny looks 'very pale' and 'wretchedly ill' so perhaps the moniker Blanche alludes to Fanny's worrying visage owing to her illness.¹⁶

Moser identified the Bervis as the couple whom the Barrys represent in 'The Secret of the Universe' and describes Mr Bervi as 'a distinguished, elderly Russian philosopher of Scottish descent' and an 'old friend of Stepniak'.¹⁷ Mr Bervi is the Russian sociologist and philosopher, Bervi-Flerovsky, who published under various pseudonyms including Vasily Vasilyevich Flerovsky-Bervi (by which he was commonly known), Vladimir Vasiliev, Nikolay Flerovsky and S. Navalikhin. Moser calls him 'Nikolay Bervi', which gives an indication of the difficulties one can face when researching a man of many names.¹⁸ Garnett often struggles with the spelling, interchangeably using 'Bervie', 'Fleurovsky',¹⁹ 'Bervey', 'Bervi'²⁰ and at one point is misidentified as 'Berry',²¹ which is, of course, exceedingly close in spelling and pronunciation to Barry. Garnett does note that Bervi-Flerovsky's surname is taken from Bervie (now Inverbervie) in Kincardineshire, Scotland, the birthplace of Bervi-Flerovsky's

¹⁶ Garnett, Tuesday 13 March 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 55., Garnett, Thursday 24 May 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 79.

¹⁷ Moser, p. 22.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Olive Garnett, Saturday 21 October 1893, *Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett 1890-1893*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett's Press, 1989), p. 231.

²⁰ Garnett, Monday 1 July 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 191., Garnett, Sunday 14 January 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 30.

²¹ Garnett, Saturday 21 October 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 231.

grandfather.²² It is evident that Garnett used this biographical fact to create Bervi-Flerovsky's alias in 'The Secret of the Universe'. In the short story the narrator says, 'His [Barry's] grandfather, [was] pure Scotch, of Barry, in Kincardineshire, from which he took his name', further solidifying the fact that Bervi-Flerovsky is Barry.²³ Bervi-Flerovsky's wife, Hermione Bervi Ivanovna (dates unknown) is Wilhelmina Barry in 'The Secret of the Universe'. This is apt, given Blanche's assertion in 'The Secret of the Universe' that Barry never mentions his wife and that she is a mere extension of her husband.²⁴

Bervi-Flerovsky's role in the Russian populist movement is underplayed in much modern scholarship, garnering minimal attention from the likes of Derek Offord, Franco Venturi and William Leatherbarrow.²⁵ However Stepniak and Garnett's other close friends, Kropotkin and Volkhovsky, were all members of the Chaikovtsy Circle – a revolutionary group that focussed on the importance of literature and education – that was greatly influenced by the work of Bervi-Flerovsky.²⁶ Moreover, his seminal works, *Polozheniye rabochego klassa v Rossi* (*The Situation of the Working Class in Russia*), published in 1869 and modelled upon Friedrich Engels's (1820–95) *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1845), and volumes one and two of *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk* (*The ABC of Social Sciences*) (1871) contributed towards the revolutionary movement in Russia in the 1870s.²⁷

²² Ibid.

²³ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', p. 195.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 209.

²⁵ Derek Offord, 'The Contribution of V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky to Russian Populism', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 66 (1988), pp. 236-251., William Leatherbarrow and Derek Offord, eds, *A History of Russian Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 272.

²⁶ Franco Venturi, *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia*, trans. Francis Haskell (New York City (NY): Alfred Knopf, 1960), p. 482.

²⁷ Offord, 'The Contribution of V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky to Russian Populism', p. 237.

Bervi-Flerovskiy: A Brief Biography

Bervi-Flerovskiy was born in 1829 in Kazan and after reading Law at university became an official in the Ministry of Justice in 1849. Despite Bervi-Flerovskiy's prominent position, he attracted the attention of the *Tretiye Otdeleniye* (Third Section), particularly the Executive Head, Vasily Andreyevich Dulgorukov (dates unknown), when he protested against a wave of student arrests in 1861.²⁸ Bervi-Flerovskiy drew further notice and suspicion when, after the emancipation of the serfs (1861), he intervened in government business regarding the activities of the nobility. Lenin stated, 'The most solidified and best educated class, and the one most accustomed to political power – the nobility – displayed a very definite desire to restrict the powers of the autocracy by means of representative institutions.'²⁹ The autonomy and power of the Russian nobles was damaged when the serfs were emancipated and so, many grievances were held across the Russian Empire, along with the desire to reclaim authority. In an act that influenced Lenin's assessment of the nobility's behaviour post-Emancipation, thirteen nobles from the province of Tver sent a petition to Tsar Alexander II to request a free constitution in Russia.³⁰ This collective action was illegal because it was perceived to be a seditious demonstration against the autocratic power of the tsar. Nobles were expected to communicate their grievances individually to the government of their ruler.³¹ The government, determined to make an example of the nobles following a series of social uprisings after the Emancipation Reform Act, interned the thirteen nobles at

²⁸ Venturi, p. 487.

²⁹ Vladimir Lenin, 'The Persecutors of the Zemstvo and the Hannibals of Liberalism' in *Lenin: Collected Works*, vol. 5 (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961), pp. 31-80 (p. 36).

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Sergei Stepniak, 'A Russian Philosopher in London', *Free Russia* vol. 4.10 (October 1893), pp. 116-117 p. (116).

the *Petropavlovskaya Krepost* (Peter and Paul Fortress) in St Petersburg to await the Tsar's justice. While it appeared that the Tverian nobles had not committed such a great crime, Count Panin – the Minister of Justice (1841–62) – found a loophole in the law that would allow the government to sentence the nobles to five to ten years' penal servitude. Stepniak describes the 'trick' in *Free Russia* as follows:

There is in the Code of Law a paragraph concerning the willful miscarriage of or disobedience to an order given by the Tzar in person. It referred to the oral orders that may be given by the Tzar to his officials [...]. Now, since in all Russia all laws are the emanation of the Tzar's will, and can be viewed as his personal orders, Count Panin conceived the brilliant idea of punishing the 13 Liberals of Tver on the strength of this paragraph. It was not only absurd, but simply a flat joke like a witticism borrowed from a primer. Yet the servility of the Russian court is such that nobody dare to protest against the absurd interpretation of the law, and the 13 noblemen were on the point of being condemned on the strength of a judicial joke.³²

Bervi-Flerovsky, after becoming aware of this grave injustice, wrote individual letters of protest to lawyers, senators, representatives of the nobility and the British Ambassador in St Petersburg, Lord Francis Napier (1819–98).³³ Once the 'flat and stupid joke' became public knowledge the 'ridiculous indictment' was withdrawn.³⁴

Notwithstanding Bervi's moral victory, the thirteen nobles of Tver were exiled to Siberia without any law to justify their banishment. When Dulgorukov heard about Bervi-

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., Venturi, p. 487.

³⁴ Stepniak, 'A Russian Philosopher in London', p. 117.

Flerovsky's intervention he forced Bervi-Flerovsky to 'undergo six months psychiatric examination in a lunatic asylum',³⁵ an incident that Stepniak describes as 'Oriental'³⁶ in nature. Dulgorukov eventually drove Bervi-Flerovsky out of the Ministry of Justice and banished him to Astrakhan.³⁷ From this moment, Bervi-Flerovsky was a marked man.

The years following Bervi-Flerovsky's initial exile contain a series of arrests, interrogations and expulsions, firstly being forced to move from Siberia to Tomsk and then on to Vologda in 1866.³⁸ Bervi-Flerovsky married Hermione Ivanovna in 1861 and his wife was forced to accompany him into exile. The journey between Vologda and Tomsk was made on foot and the distance, via rudimentary roads and paths, was some 3,000 miles.³⁹ To make matters worse, Hermione had given birth to their son nine months before the journey began. The couple became acutely aware of the failing health of their small son, who became 'one large sore' after spending sixth months travelling from Vologda to Tomsk and sleeping in 'dung-hills swarming with vermin, which covered the walls, floor, ceiling and every inch of space. Sleep was rendered impossible by the incessant torture caused by the parasites penetrating under the clothes, filling the ears and hair and covering the face'.⁴⁰ The family were eventually moved to European Russia in 1868 (Tver) and Bervi-Flerovsky began on his more significant literary contributions, the first of which was a tirade about Tolstoy's *War and Peace* which had been serialised in *Russkiy Vistnik (Russian Messenger)* (1808–1906) prior to its publication as a complete novel in 1869. Writing under the pseudonym, S. Navalikhin,

³⁵ Venturi, p. 488.

³⁶ Stepniak, 'A Russian Philosopher in London', p. 117.

³⁷ Venturi, p. 488.

³⁸ Stepniak, 'A Russian Philosopher in London', p. 117.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid

Bervi-Flerovsky claimed that *War and Peace* was unremarkable, elitist and lacked elegance.⁴¹ Indeed Count Bezukhov's half a million a year and 160,000 slaves must have seemed insulting to a man who had experienced extreme poverty and watched his wife and children nearly die while in exile.⁴²

In 1869, Bervi-Flerovsky published *Polozheniye rabochego klassa v Rossi* under the pseudonym, N. Flerovsky, to protect himself and his family from further persecution. Offord describes the work as 'an exhaustive survey of the nation's misery', detailing the living conditions of peasant and proletarian workers across Russia, including national minorities such as the Finns, Kalmyks, Armenians and Letts.⁴³ Rather than being a systematic study, the text is a quasi-travelogue, which tackles economic, social and ethical issues, with anecdotal evidence, absorbed by Bervi-Flerovsky during his years spent marching across the Russian Empire in exile, reinforced by statistics. The impression given is compatible with Stepniak's description of the Bervi-Flerovskys' ordeal, with 'unalleviated destitution, suffering and squalor' emerging as a common textual theme and living condition seen throughout Russia.⁴⁴ Bervi-Flerovsky accentuates the plight of the Russian working people by dismissing Engels's opinion that English workers are victims of 'social murder'⁴⁵ and states that the fate of the English workers seems like a 'heavenly blessing and an unattainable [state of] well-

⁴¹ S. Navalikhin, 'An Elegant Novelist and his Elegant Critics', *The Affair*, vol. 6 (1868), in V. A. Knowles, *Leo Tolstoy: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge, 1978).

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Offord, 'The Contribution of V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky to Russian Populism', p. 237.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ The concept of 'social murder' was Engels's belief that the British government was systematically and mercilessly killing their workers owing to their economic and social policies. Engels believed the English workers were the most unfortunate in Europe. See: Freidrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (London: Panther Books, 1969) p. 42.

being⁴⁶ compared to their Russian counterparts. Indeed, in later life, Bervi-Flerovsky would accuse the Russian government of using Engels's depiction of social suffering in England as a propaganda tool in Russia.⁴⁷ The work was eye-opening for Karl Marx, who wrote in a letter to Engels, 'This is the first work to tell the truth about Russian economic conditions.'⁴⁸ Marx found *Polozheniye rabochego klassa v Rossi* enormously influential and based his subsequent studies of Russia's economy on the text. It also encouraged Marx to learn Russian so that he could become better acquainted with the material.⁴⁹

The root of Russia's ills, Bervi-Flerovsky argues, does not stem from geographical or climatic factors, but rather from moral ones. After the emancipation of the Serfs, Russia was in a state of primitive accumulation. The freed serfs were forced to pay very high taxes to take ownership of their land, which resulted in peasants having insufficient funds to survive. The produce the peasants were selling also had no price protection, which meant they often undersold their goods to merchants.⁵⁰ Additionally, instead of holding on to the grain supply the peasants so desperately needed, they were forced to trade grain for cotton, which was nearly useless to them.⁵¹ The astronomical taxes and poor payments resulted in the destruction of the family unit as breadwinners went in search of seasonal or long term employment or were conscripted into military service away from the *obshchina* (commune).⁵² In industrial areas, the proletariat struggled to find work as machines

⁴⁶ Bervi-Flerovsky, *Polozheniye rabochego klassa v Rossi*(St Petersburg: N.P Polyakova, 1869), pp. 250-251.

⁴⁷ Offord, 'The Contribution of V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky to Russian Populism', p. 243.

⁴⁸ Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels (10 February 1870), in *The Marxists Internet Archive*, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/letters/70_02_10.htm> (date accessed 13/02/2017).

⁴⁹ James White, *Karl Marx and the Intellectual Origins of Dialectical Materialism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996) pp. 247-249.

⁵⁰ Venturi, p. 490.

⁵¹ Offord, 'The Contribution of V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky to Russian Populism', p. 239.

⁵² *Ibid.*

replaced people and resulted in profits going directly to capitalist factory owners.⁵³ While Bervi-Flerovsky acknowledged that Russia was significantly behind Western Europe in terms of modernisation and development, he did not believe the solution lay in following European models of capitalism because then Russia would inevitably always remain backward. Bervi-Flerovsky advocated that the removal of private landownership and tax and social harmony would result in an economic transformation. By following a separate historical destiny to that of Western Europe, Russia had the potential to go from being an inferior nation to a superior nation.⁵⁴

It was Bervi-Flerovsky's optimistic concluding sentiment of Russia's potential that made *Polozheniye rabocheho klassa v Rossi* such a success with the populist movement, for at the heart of Russian populism was the belief that Russia had a unique path of historical development to follow, if only her people were receptive to it.⁵⁵ The Chaikovtsy Circle were particularly open to Bervi-Flerovsky's ideas and *Polozheniye rabocheho klassa v Rossi* became one of their central texts. The Chaikovtsy Circle believed that by educating the masses through literature they would be able to bring about reform in Russia. Their form of propaganda was called *knizhnoe del* (the cause of the book) and so they accumulated and circulated valuable texts including *Polozheniye rabocheho klassa v Rossi*, Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, volumes of Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–64) and Pyotr Lavrov's (1823–1900) *Historical Letters* (1870).⁵⁶ The *Tretiye Otdeleniye* became suspicious over whom 'N. Flerovsky', the author of the damning and provocative text, could be. Once they established it was Bervi-

⁵³ Venturi, p. 493.

⁵⁴ Bervi-Flerovsky, *Polozheniye rabocheho klassa v Rossi*, pp. 451-453.

⁵⁵ Offord, 'The Contribution of V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky to Russian Populism', p. 236.

⁵⁶ Venturi, p. 482.

Flerovsky, he became closely monitored, particularly when it became apparent that he was the author of *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk*, which was published and distributed by the Chaikovtsy Circle in 1871.⁵⁷ While Venturi asserts that *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk* serves only to show 'the encyclopaedic thirst of the younger generation in Russia' and believes that Bervi-Flerovsky's thoughts are only 'half expressed',⁵⁸ Stepniak places far more significance on the text, commenting that at one time it was 'in the hands of every earnest Russian student'.⁵⁹ *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk* is of particular interest to this chapter because 'The Secret of the Universe' dwells upon the progress of the third volume of the text, the first two volumes, which track a trajectory of successful and unsuccessful civilisations and societies, having been published but subsequently banned in Russia in 1871.

In 1873, Bervi-Flerovsky wrote a pamphlet for the revolutionary Dolgushin Group titled, 'How to live according to the law of nature and justice'.⁶⁰ The group took their knowledge of Russia's social situation from Bervi-Flerovsky's books and also the teachings of the notoriously violent radical, Nechayev, who promoted acts of self-sacrifice and terrorism in his pamphlet, 'Catechisms of a Revolutionary' (1869).⁶¹ The pamphlet followed the *Narodnik* movement's sentiments of 'going to the people', but also contained a violent streak, no doubt stemming from the Nechayev influence, urging readers to

Go to the people and tell it the whole truth to the very last word. Tell it
that man must live according to the law of nature. According to this law all

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 494.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Stepniak, 'A Russian Philosopher in London', p. 117.

⁶⁰ The Dolgushin Group was named after its founder, Alexander Dolgushin (1848–85), who led groups of students that advocated for Siberian independence.

⁶¹ Sergei Nechayev, 'Catechism of a Revolutionary' (1869) from *The Marxists Internet Archive*, <<https://www.marxists.org/subject/anarchism/nechayev/catechism.htm>> (date accessed: 08/12/2016).

men are equal; all men are born naked; all men are born equally small and weak. [...] Before you lie the villages and the cottages scattered throughout Russia. Around them is land, and this land is now held in common. There are no longer any land lords – those builders of evil who have enslaved our land, our Mother. [...] A curse on the cowardly, on the weakling who will not fight for his brother.⁶²

In this quotation Bervi-Flerovsky states that all men are equal, so while Stepniak claims that ‘not a line in the pamphlet could be considered as an incitement to crime’, the notion that Tsar Alexander II was worth no more or no less than a Russian peasant, would certainly have been seen as inflammatory material.⁶³ Bervi-Flerovsky also promotes hatred towards ex-landowners, which would have threatened the nobility and the Tsar’s rule. Moreover, he chastises those who will not fight and although he could have meant this in a non-violent way; the fact that Nechayev was involved with the Dolgushin Group and was Tsar Alexander II’s most feared and most vicious political prisoner makes it seem more likely that Bervi-Flerovsky was promoting physical violence. Indeed, Figner, a leading member of the group who assassinated Tsar Alexander II in 1882, *Narodnaya Volya*, cited Bervi-Flerovsky’s work as inspiration for her own radical activities.⁶⁴ After the pamphlet was published, Bervi-Flerovsky found himself under arrest and he and his family were exiled for 14 more years.

⁶² Vasily Vasilyevich Bervi-Flerovsky, ‘How one must live according to the laws of Nature and Truth’, quoted in Franco Venturi, *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia*, trans. Francis Haskell (New York (NY): Alfred Knopf, 1960), p. 498.

⁶³ Stepniak, ‘A Russian Philosopher in London’, p. 117.

⁶⁴ Venturi, p. 526.

In 1893, Bervi-Flerovsky and his long-suffering wife left their children behind and moved to England, upon the recommendation of Feliks Volkhovsky,⁶⁵ so that Bervi-Flerovsky could continue working on his literature unmolested.⁶⁶ Bervi-Flerovsky was already 65 when he ‘voluntarily expatriated himself’ and his wife to England and by this point he had already seen the inside of 82 different prisons.⁶⁷ It is at this point that Bervi-Flerovsky and Hermione are reunited with Stepniak, Kropotkin and Volkhovsky and meet Olive Garnett for the first time. It is evident from the information given above that Bervi-Flerovsky had a significant impact on the philosophy and actions of notable figures in socio-political history, with Karl Marx being the most prominent. Bervi-Flerovsky’s contribution to the shaping of the mindset of the Russian intelligentsia in the 1870s and 1880s, including figures such as Stepniak, Kropotkin, Volkhovsky, Figner and Dolgushin is significant, but largely overlooked in favour of the political acts and/or literary output of Stepniak et.al. Garnett’s contribution towards Bervi-Flerovsky’s legacy should not be dismissed, although admittedly it contains the less exciting elements of his life, because it is one of the very few pieces of literature, perhaps the only piece, that acknowledges Bervi-Flerovsky’s place in political history. As with Vetrova, Garnett’s literature elevates the standing of those who deserve more historiographical attention, although she was more aware, almost to a prophetic degree, of the importance of Vetrova than she was of Bervi-Flerovsky.

Olive Garnett and the Bervi-Flerovskys

⁶⁵ Garnett, Tuesday 2 July 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 192.

⁶⁶ Sergei Stepniak, ‘A Philosophy of Solidarity’, *Free Russia*, vol. 5.6 (1 June 1894), pp. 51-52 (p. 51).

⁶⁷ Stepniak, ‘A Russian Philosopher in London’, p. 116.

The first mention of the Bervi-Flerovskys in Garnett's diary is when she attends the theatre with them and Stepniak on 21 October 1893. Garnett describes Bervi-Flerovsky as having 'a very Scotch appearance but Russian eyes slanting upwards'.⁶⁸ This description correlates closely with a portrayal of Barry in 'The Secret of the Universe' where the narrator, Emmie, notes Barry's 'two slanting slits of eyes [...] that were distinctly Russian' despite his 'Scotch physiognomy'.⁶⁹ References are also made to Bervi-Flerovsky's literary works. Sylvester summarises the effect one of Barry's publications had on the Russian populist movement, stating that 'it expressed the right sentiments at the right time' by commenting upon 'the case of the Russian working-man. It was quoted as a work of science'.⁷⁰ This makes a clear reference to *Polozheniye rabochego klassa v Rossi* by identifying the working-class motif and its subsequent use by thinkers such as Marx. Sylvester's belief that it carried the 'right sentiment' is related to the Populist movement's belief that Russia had her own unique destiny to fulfil. Sylvester also informs Emmie about Barry's work, 'The Way', which 'was in every thinking young persons' hands in its day'.⁷¹ Sylvester's admiration of 'The Way' resembles Stepniak's praise of the first two volumes of Bervi-Flerovsky's, *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk* (that we know Stepniak believed was 'in the hands of every earnest Russian student').⁷² This implies that 'The Way' is *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk*, the third volume of which Bervi-Flerovsky wrote while in London. Despite Barry's text being called 'The Secret of the Universe' in the short story, it is noted that the most important part of the book is the section called the 'ABC of Natural Science', mimicking the title of Flerovsky-

⁶⁸ Garnett, Saturday 21 October 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 231.

⁶⁹ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', p. 197, p. 195.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

⁷² Stepniak, 'A Russian Philosopher in London', p. 117.

Bervi's *ABC of Social Sciences*.⁷³ The final text discussed in 'The Secret of the Universe' is Barry's autobiography, which remains untitled in the short story. However, one of the extracts from the work demonstrates Barry's struggle against autocracy: 'Nicholas I., I abominate you! Alexander II., I defy you! Alexander III, I despise you!'⁷⁴ This tirade imitates the working-titles of Bervi-Flerovsky's autobiography, *Three Russian Emperors – A System Explained/Under Three Tzars: An Autobiography* seen in Garnett's diary.⁷⁵ Tsar Nicolas I, Tsar Alexander II and Tsar Alexander III ruled sequentially during Bervi-Flerovsky's chastened life in Russia. Tsar Nicholas II is left off Barry's list and Bervi-Flerovsky's titles because he only assumed the throne in 1894, a year after Bervi-Flerovsky had left Russia and was no longer subject to autocratic power. Given that Barry's heritage, physical appearance, imperfect English and literary works of Barry so closely resemble Bervi-Flerovsky's it would be an oversight to not realise that Barry is a fictionalised Bervi-Flerovsky.⁷⁶

On Saturday 14 July 1894, Fanny Stepniak, who had been suffering from one of her long periods of illness, asked Garnett to 'revise the English of the philosopher's [Bervi-Flerovsky's] autobiography' that she had been translating from the original Russian manuscript.⁷⁷ Stepniak was too busy revising Bervi-Flerovsky's other work to help and Garnett was delighted to be given the opportunity to be involved. In 'The Secret of the Universe', Emmie and Blanche strike the same accord with the proposal of 'starting afresh

⁷³ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', p. 220.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

⁷⁵ Garnett, Friday 5 April 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 166.

⁷⁶ Barry's 'imperfect English' is mentioned in Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', p. 194 and Bervi-Flerovsky's need to have some parts of conversations translated into Russian in order for him to fully understand them ('Fleurovsky [sic] and [Angelo] Rapaport [sic.] talked incessantly to me, the latter helping out the former's English') can be seen in Garnett, Saturday 21 October 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 231.

⁷⁷ Garnett, Saturday 14 July 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 99.

with the work, [Blanche] translating aloud and [Emmie] taking down [the English].⁷⁸ A small fragment of this initial collaborative work remains in the Garnett Family Archives at Northwestern University and will be attached as Appendix Three.⁷⁹ Emmie fondly acknowledges the fun Blanche and she had in the early days of the work, remembering an incident when ‘we laughed until we cried’.⁸⁰ It is probable that this incident is based upon a happy memory shared in Garnett’s diary where one evening Garnett ‘compiled a ‘receipt for making a Russian Revolution’ from the autobiography, which went as follows:

Take a few quiet Russians, well beat them with *tchinovniks* [government officials], stir with Poles, warm gradually with enthusiasm for the masses, bring them to boiling point and be careful not to let them cool down.

When boiling, turn out and serve hot.⁸¹

Garnett recalls that the receipt made her and Fanny laugh a lot. The reference to beatings by the *tchinovniks* would have stemmed from Bervi-Flerovsky’s personal experience as well as the Russian populist movement’s desire to mobilise the masses. In 1863, Polish people rebelled against Tsar Alexander II’s rule and Bervi-Flerovsky also details the struggles of ethnic minorities, including Poles in *Polozheniye rabochego klassa v Rossi*. Evidently the Polish minorities left a particularly marked impression upon Bervi-Flerovsky because in ‘The Secret of the Universe’, Emmie recollects that ‘the chapters on the Polish exiles whom Barry [Bervi-Flerovsky] met in Siberia – the best chapters – were also the most painful, and

⁷⁸ Garnett, ‘The Secret of the Universe’, p. 244.

⁷⁹ Olive Garnett, ‘A Man of Principle (A True Story from Russian Life) by N. Flerovsky’, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F12 ‘Miscellaneous Notes’, Box 26.

⁸⁰ Garnett, ‘The Secret of the Universe’, p. 245.

⁸¹ Garnett, Monday 11 March 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 160

strange to record.⁸² Emmie also notes that the atmosphere in Russia was ‘vibrating with indignation and revolt’, linking to Garnett’s imagery of bringing revolutionaries to the boil.⁸³

Garnett/Emmie clearly had a good relationship with Fanny/Blanche and enjoyed spending time with Hermione/Wilhelmina. Garnett often comments on the courteous manner of ‘Madame Bervie’, dubbing her ‘cordiality itself’,⁸⁴ and in ‘The Secret of the Universe’, Emmie says that ‘Madame Barry, without a suggestion of manner, was quite the most polite person [...] I had yet come across.’⁸⁵ Garnett and Hermione arranged to help one another linguistically, with Hermione tutoring Garnett in French and Garnett aiding Hermione with her English. Garnett considered French to be the ‘gateway’ language between English and Russian, given that French was still considered to be an international language in Europe and the majority of the Russian nobility used French as their everyday language.⁸⁶ Additionally, although Fanny and Felix Volkhovsky were in the process of teaching Garnett Russian, French was more accessible to Garnett compared to Slavonic-based Russian.

In ‘The Secret of the Universe’, Garnett merges her tutors together and Emmie receives Russian lessons from Wilhelmina.⁸⁷ The narrator notes that sometimes Wilhelmina would come to her house and it is clear that Garnett used her own home for the fictional location because when it was time to leave (six o’clock in the evening), Wilhelmina ‘got up precipitately to go to the reading-room of the British Museum to find her husband and take

⁸² Garnett, ‘The Secret of the Universe’, p. 246.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 245.

⁸⁴ Garnett, Sunday 14 January 1894, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett* p. 31.

⁸⁵ Garnett, ‘The Secret of the Universe’, p. 212.

⁸⁶ Garnett, Monday 4 March 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 155.

⁸⁷ Garnett, ‘The Secret of the Universe’, p. 211.

him home.⁸⁸ Garnett lived in the grounds of the British Museum owing to her father, Richard Garnett's role as the Keeper of Printed Books, which granted the Garnett family residency at the museum. Wilhelmina's willingness to leave Emmie's at six o'clock and hurriedly set off to the reading rooms alone, sometimes in the dark and with only a slim grasp upon the English language, suggests that the distance between Emmie's and Barry's reading room was insignificant.

Wilhelmina's desire to leave and collect her husband has a maternalistic element. In both Garnett's diary and 'The Secret of the Universe' it is mentioned that Hermione/Wilhelmina infantilises her husband. Garnett observes that Hermione speaks to Bervi-Flerovsky 'as to a very dear baby, whose mistakes are delights in themselves'⁸⁹ and in the short story Wilhelmina 'treat[s] her philosopher like a baby'.⁹⁰ In both her diary and her story, Garnett assumes this behaviour stems from the Bervi-Flerovskys/Barrys many years in exile.

Hermione's/Wilhelmina's children were also left behind in Russia when the couple moved to London and so Hermione's/Wilhelmina's maternal separation anxiety could have resulted in her projecting her need to mother a child onto her husband, who was particularly vulnerable and miserable owing to his lack of literary success in England.

When Garnett/Emmie went to the Bervi-Flerovskys'/Barrys' house for lessons it was very rare that the two women spent their time alone as Bervi-Flerovsky/Barry clamoured to be the centre of attention in behaviour befitting his child-like status. On 22 March 1895 Garnett went to the Bervi-Flerovskys' to have 'a good long French lesson' from Hermione,

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 219.

⁸⁹ Garnett, Friday 15 March 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 161.

⁹⁰ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', p. 236.

but was also subjected to ‘a Russian history lesson’ on Tsar Boris Godunov (who ruled as regent and then as tsar between 1585–1605 and was one of the first Russian leaders to encourage Westernisation in Russia)⁹¹ and ‘the Question of the East and the Question of the West’ from Bervi-Flerovsky.⁹² Garnett reprimands herself for being ‘ungrateful enough to feel a little tired of the philosopher’s loud voice.’⁹³ A similar scene is unveiled in ‘The Secret of the Universe’ where Emmie describes the Barrys’ house, observing ‘linoleum on the floor, a table, six bent-wood chairs, stove, and a lamp [...] how peaceful the atmosphere, impressive as evening bells ringing over quiet fields’.⁹⁴ This modest living space matches Garnett’s description of the Bervi-Flerovskys’ house and also mentions identical items: ‘The room was very bare containing merely a stove, a table and some cane [bent-wood] chairs and books’.⁹⁵ Even though the room is sparsely furnished, Garnett acknowledges an air of ‘simple nobility’ within the room, coinciding with the underlying impressive ambience in the Barrys’ house that Emmie detects.⁹⁶ Emmie recalls having a Russian lesson with Wilhelmina, but is interrupted by Barry who ‘talked on of things that had happened long ago in Russia and in Siberia, [...] of the need for us all to unite, always to draw closer’.⁹⁷ Like Garnett, Emmie found the philosopher’s lecture a little irksome and his voice irritating, complaining that Barry ‘seemed to me to talk of everything in heaven and earth in his shrill voice.’⁹⁸ Presumably the ‘things that happened long ago’ equate to Bervi-Flerovsky’s speech on Tsar Boris Godunov and the need for unification could stem from Barry’s desire for the

⁹¹ Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire 1552-1917* (London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1997)

⁹² Garnett, Friday 22 March 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 163.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Garnett, ‘The Secret of the Universe’, p. 215.

⁹⁵ Garnett, Friday 15 March 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 161.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Garnett, ‘The Secret of the Universe’, p. 216.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

constructs of East and West to be eradicated in order for Russia and the rest of Europe to 'draw closer'.

Despite Bervi-Flerovsky's/Barry's lengthy monologues Garnett/Emmie hold a high level of respect for the philosopher, particularly as Stepniak/Sylvester is so impressed by him. Two people/characters who have lukewarm feelings towards one another are Fanny/Blanche and Hermione/Wilhelmina. Their animosity towards one another comes, in most part, from their protectiveness of their husbands. Hermione/Wilhelmina felt that Stepniak/Sylvester was not doing enough to help Bervi-Flerovsky/Barry publish his literary works, while Fanny/Blanche believe that Bervi-Flerovsky/Barry was taking up too much of Stepniak/Sylvester's time, energy and emotions. In 'The Secret of the Universe' Blanche believes that Barry possesses some form of mania that makes him unable to focus upon anyone except himself, resulting in permanent maudlin state of being.⁹⁹ This is certainly how the critics viewed the situation. A reviewer of *St Petersburg Tales* for *The Academy* called Barry a 'megalomaniac' and saw Blanche as Sylvester's defender 'from the obsession of [those] innocent horse-leechers.'¹⁰⁰ Garnett writes that Fanny says she has to suffer the 'indignant man [Barry]' however it is mainly Garnett's documentation of Hermione's attitude towards Fanny that illustrates the bad blood between the two women.¹⁰¹ In an angry outburst, Hermione shouts 'She wants three things, money, her husband's renown, a position in society. [...] She holds him [Stepniak] in her hands [...] She has no heart.'¹⁰²

Within Hermione's frustration, a couple of elements are realised; firstly, that the Stepniaks

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 223.

¹⁰⁰ Anon., 'Petersburg Tales', *The Academy*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F36 'Olive Garnett Reviews', Box 23.

¹⁰¹ Garnett, Sunday 10 March 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 158.

¹⁰² Garnett, Thursday 26 September 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 204.

are struggling for money and secondly, the possibility that Stepniak's reputation is waning. Without either of these things, Fanny's position in society is unsecure. Although this assessment makes Fanny seem superficial, the Stepniaks invested a substantial portion of their finances into the Bervi-Flerovskys' comfort and their literary ventures. While Stepniak was occupied with Bervi-Flerovsky's work, he was not producing any of his own. Hermione's sentiments are found within 'The Secret of the Universe' when she confides in Emmie that she views Blanche as 'a woman without a soul', echoing Hermione's statement regarding the lack of Fanny's heart.¹⁰³

Fanny's distress with Hermione and Bervi-Flerovsky manifest themselves within the character of Blanche in 'The Secret of the Universe' more acutely than within the pages of Garnett's diary. While having dinner at the Barrys, Blanche and Emmie are surprised by the 'astonishing' spread of food.¹⁰⁴ Blanche scathingly remarks that 'While the exiles discussed endlessly, their wives must have been getting up rival tea-parties.'¹⁰⁵ Here Blanche unsympathetically mocks Barry's love of theoretical discourse, implying that while the Barrys were in exile all he did was indulge himself in conversation with other men and left their wives to out-do one another on a domestic level. As we have seen, the experience the Bervi-Flerovskys had in exile did not allow for such frivolous activities. Blanche also mocks Wilhelmina's admiration of her husband's writing, particularly the 'atrocious, fantastic, impossible and utterly unintelligible book', *The Secret of the Universe*, which is Bervi-Flerovsky's *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk*.¹⁰⁶ This is the text that causes Sylvester so much

¹⁰³ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', p. 255.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 217.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 218.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 205.

trouble. Blanche repeats a conversation in the kitchen she had with Wilhelmina about the text to Emmie:

[...T]he most important part – it is called the A B C of Natural Science – explains why it is that if this spoon didn't wish to stir the rice, it wouldn't; and why the rice wouldn't boil if it didn't want to! My dear Emmie, you can imagine my face.' 'Do you mean to say that this wooden spoon has any will in the matter?' I said sharply. 'Certainly,' Wilhelmina answered, stirring slowly; 'and I often think to myself how fortunate it is that the spoons and plates are so accommodating; for I don't know how I should manage for Alexander [Barry] if they were not.'¹⁰⁷

The name of the section, 'A B C of Natural Science' is clearly taken from the title of the complete manuscript, volume three of *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk*. Blanche is obviously sceptical of Barry's theory and is exasperated with Wilhelmina's insistence of taking the work at face value when she considers the potential spoons, plates and rice have for animation and independent thought. This parody of Aristotelean theory of the soul is more plainly seen when Emmie comes across a section in Barry's manuscript headed, 'Part IV – The Metaphysics of Pure Being', which borrows its title directly from Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.¹⁰⁸ The quotation reads, 'The inanimate is vitalised by the animate in virtue of its own potential animations: the animate is devitalised by the inanimate in virtue of its own potential inanimity.'¹⁰⁹ The continual reference to *anima* and *potential* evidently links to Aristotle's theory. Moreover, the 'A B C of Natural Sciences' appropriates Aristotle's own naming system for his treatise, where he utilised the Greek alphabet to subdivide his

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 220.

¹⁰⁸ Aristotle, *The Metaphysics* (London: Penguin Classics, 1998).

¹⁰⁹ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', p. 208.

theory.¹¹⁰ The fact that Barry is borrowing theory from elsewhere is not lost upon Sylvester and Blanche, however when Barry starts combining Aristotelian theory with his own branch of populism 'one gets hopelessly fogged'.¹¹¹ Sylvester attempts to understand the text 'metaphysically, mathematically, scientifically, by the rules of common sense [...] and philosophically' but struggles.¹¹² Indeed Bervi-Flerovsky's *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk* is infamous for its difficulty to read, let alone understand. Offord notes its 'stylistic deficiencies'¹¹³ and Venturi states that the 'sociological treatise acquires significance only when read through the eyes of those who published it and who guessed at those thoughts and aspirations which remained half expressed.'¹¹⁴ This responsibility fell squarely on Stepniak's shoulders, causing both Garnett and Fanny extreme anxiety as Stepniak struggled to find meaning in the 'superfluous and cumbersome' manuscript.¹¹⁵

In a bid to help Stepniak/Sylvester and Fanny/Blanche gain an understanding of the text and to assist in finding a likely publisher, Garnett/Emmie uses her contacts to open a dialogue with the Royal Society. In the extracts from the diary and 'The Secret of the Universe' the reader can see the dialogic nature of the two texts, which helps to strengthen the reliability of Emmie's narration and the keen observational skills that Garnett used when constructing her short stories. On 22 September 1895, Garnett records that she re-wrote a letter Bervi-Flerovsky had written to accompany his manuscript that Garnett was posting to a Mr Jackson who was a friend of Lord Kelvin (1824–1907), the famous thermodynamicist and

¹¹⁰ Aristotle, *The Metaphysics*.

¹¹¹ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', p. 208.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 206.

¹¹³ Offord, 'The Contribution of V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky to Russian Populism', p. 239

¹¹⁴ Venturi, p. 495.

¹¹⁵ Sergei Stepniak to Olive Garnett (8 October 1895), in *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 210.

president of the Royal Society.¹¹⁶ In 'The Secret of the Universe' we see a possible response from Mr Jackson. In a letter to Emmie from 'an old friend of our family [...who is] a Fellow of the Royal Society' we see the critique that, 'the synopsis has given me bad dreams. It doesn't proceed on orderly, scientific lines. I suddenly come upon, 'The next stage in *evolution* is the *creation* of the organic matter and the all. 'The *evolution* of consciousness out of thought begins by *creating* chemical compounds. Such passages make my brain reel.'¹¹⁷ It transpires that the Royal Society struggled to make sense of the text as much as Stepniak/Sylvester and Fanny/Blanche did, illustrating the chaotic nature of Bervi-Flerovsky's work.

Stepniak attempts to explain Bervi-Flerovsky's theory in *Free Russia*, however he glosses over the metaphysical aspects, reporting only that, 'Thought is the inspiring principle and propelling force determining the progress of the organic world as much as that of human societies. By a subtle reasoning process Mr Bervy intends to prove that progress in nature is the simple manifestation of logic.'¹¹⁸ When summarising Bervi-Flerovsky's social doctrine, Stepniak is on more comfortable ground:

It is only through speech that an organically solid human society can be reformed and its progress secured. This progress, according to our author, is summed up in three words – development of solidarity. In the origin of human societies this solidarity was obtained at the expense of freedom. It was based upon the development in the masses of the instinct of obedience and upon the subjugation of the weak to the strong. But side by

¹¹⁶ Garnett, Sunday 22 September, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 202.

¹¹⁷ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', pp. 229-230.

¹¹⁸ Stepniak, 'A Philosophy of Solidarity', p. 52.

side with this form of solidarity based upon exploitation, [...] evolved the family, in which solidarity is based upon the opposite principle – the work of the strong for the weak, and the easy and voluntary sacrifice of egotistic interests for the good of the whole. The struggle between these two principles is the corner-stone of the evolution of human societies.¹¹⁹

Here, Bervi-Flerovsky's message is easier to understand because it falls more comfortably within populist doctrine by focusing on the masses. It adopts an anti-Social Darwinist tone by calling for the strong to help the weak – the strong being the intelligentsia and the weak the Russian masses - and in doing so facilitates Bervi-Flerovsky's rejection of Chernyshevsky's promotion of revolution via rational egoism in *Chto delat?* (What is to be Done?) (1863).

Stepniak struggled on with Bervi-Flerovsky's manuscripts until the day he died (23 December 1895). It was generally agreed that Stepniak was killed as a result of a terrible accident and lapse of judgement. George Lazareff, a close friend of Stepniak's, testified that 'Stepniak was overly occupied with important literary work and often lost in thought – wandered onto the tracks.'¹²⁰ Since the end of 1893, Stepniak had been working on Bervi-Flerovsky's manuscripts intensely, as seen in Garnett's diary, so it is assumed that some of the 'important literary work' Lazareff refers to is Bervi-Flerovsky's *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk*. The progression of the narrative in 'The Secret of the Universe' follows the entries in Garnett's diary almost religiously up until the point where Stepniak dies. This is partly because after Stepniak's death, Garnett was so grief-stricken she did not keep a proper diary

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Moser, p. 23.

again for several years and also because she travelled to Russia and the Bervi-Flerovskys left England, so there is limited material to which the narrative can be connected to. In a letter Stepniak sent Garnett two months before he died, he wrote 'You must work at living models. Observation is your strongest, fancy your weakest point. You may create something but only on condition of walking on solid ground.'¹²¹ Until the concluding section of the narrative, Garnett's short story is interesting, believable and the character development is nuanced, in fact it is one of Garnett's most lucid creative pieces. The ending however is bizarre, abrupt and tinged with a note of hysteria. In January 1899, while writing 'The Secret of the Universe' Garnett notes: 'I am going to make it [the ending] tragic to support the weight of the story as it develops.'¹²² It is at this point that Garnett deviates from Stepniak's 'condition' that she walks on 'solid ground', whereas previous to this she had been focusing on 'facts and details [...] old letters and papers', and invents her ending, illustrating that 'fancy' or imagination is one of her weaker points.¹²³

The short story ends with Barry, upon accepting that his work will not be a success, hanging himself and, when Wilhelmina discovers his body, she also kills herself 'in a dreadful manner.'¹²⁴ These shocking incidents would fulfil the requirements of a Greek or Shakespearean tragedy and the wailing lamentations of Emmie as the short story reaches its climax make the text almost tragi-comic. Emmie cries 'Alas! Alas! All are gone now – Wilhelmina, and Barry – poor Barry! – Blanche and oh, Sylvester! Sylvester!'¹²⁵ It seems that

¹²¹ Sergei Stepniak to Olive Garnett (24 October 1895), in *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 212.

¹²² Olive Garnett, Sunday 20 November 1899, *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in English 1897-1958* (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019), p. 132.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Garnett, 'The Secret of the Universe', pp. 272-273.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 273.

Emmie is most distressed about Sylvester, who is the only character out of the four Emmie lists whose living counterpart is dead – the Bervi-Flerovskys moved back to Russia after Stepniak's death and Fanny remained in London. Garnett's deep love and affection for Stepniak and terrible grief she experienced when he died effects the ending of 'The Secret of the Universe'. Stepniak was right when he told Garnett that fancy was her weakness. Garnett seems to acknowledge this fact at the end of 'The Secret of the Universe', noting 'I remember saying then [when she agreed to write the story] that I should never be able to contrive a good ending, and Sylvester's laughing rejoinder, 'You must leave it for me; I'll make the end.'¹²⁶ The death of Stepniak meant that Sylvester did make the end in a way because it steered the narrative off centre so dramatically. Garnett's self-awareness that she could not conceive a proper ending to the short story is seen here and one assumes that she could not write a satisfactory or true-to-life ending because she did not have one with Stepniak and as his death was so sudden there was no closure of the real narrative of the Bervi-Flerovskys.

* * *

Garnett's narrative offers its readers an insight into the life of Bervi-Flerovsky and his self-inflicted exile in London. While he may not be the most famous name to spring from the Russian populist and terrorist movements, he is certainly one of the most influential. Bervi-Flerovsky's instrumental part in the populist movement in Russia resulted in a gateway being formed for ideologies that resulted in the assassination of Tsar Alexander II, Marxism

¹²⁶ Ibid.

and the Russian Revolutions require further examination, but it is significant that Garnett felt the need to write about him. In a similar way to Vetrova, Garnett was able to – consciously or otherwise – identify historically significant, but otherwise neglected, figures to write about. In examining Bervi-Flerovsky, Garnett broadens the reach of her influence to encompass relevant socio-political historiography, and had her work been more widely read it would have helped to keep the life and work of Bervi-Flerovsky more permanently fixed in the British consciousness.

The chapter identifies how closely ‘The Secret of the Universe’ is tied to Garnett’s own experiences, as documented in her diary, noting the close, and sometime fraught, relationships that occurred within her small circle of friends who were Russian émigrés. Additionally, this piece also notes where Garnett has taken artistic liberties, sometimes as a tool to condense information, such as when Wilhelmina tutors Emmie in Russian rather than Hermione’s lessons in French, and sometimes as a way to communicate her grief over the loss of one of her closest companions. The effect of these diversions from the truth is often harmless, except when it comes to the ending of the text, which is just as abrupt, sad and unexpected as Stepniak’s own death. Finally, it highlights the struggle Stepniak had when trying to publish Bervi-Flerovsky’s almost nonsensical *Azbuka sotsial’nykh nauk* and autobiography, which insinuates that in the 1890s the British public were not interested in the 1870s populist movement in Russia. As Emmie states, the Barrys ‘had outlived their generation and their activity’,¹²⁷ suggesting that the public’s attention in the 1890s was

¹²⁷ Ibid., p. 255.

perhaps more preoccupied with the state of Anglo-Russian relations as the Great Game drew to a close, rather than the outdated work of a Russo-Scottish philosopher.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ The Great Game refers to Anglo-Russian competition for Afghanistan and spheres of influence in the Middle East

Chapter Four

Olive Garnett's 'Out of It' (1900) and Henry James's *The Princess Casamassima* (1885– 1886)

'Last night [Halloween] at the witching hour of twelve I peeled an apple before the looking glass and threw the peel over my shoulder. The form it took was S which I take it might be a S or J, neither of which letters having power at present to stir my heart' – Olive Garnett,

1 November 1892¹

In the 120 years since Olive Garnett published *Petersburg Tales* (1900), there has been limited criticism undertaken on the work as a whole and even less that focuses on the last short story in the collection, 'Out of It'. This chapter offers the first sustained critical analysis of this enigmatic, dreamlike short story. It makes the case for the importance of 'Out of It' by: challenging the grounds for the story's neglect; resituating the text in terms of Garnett's life and career; and identifying the key events and personnel the story was inspired by and the intertexts it engages and reworks.

Thomas Moser, the scholar who has carried out the most analytical work on Olive Garnett until now, dismisses 'Out of It', the final short story in the *Petersburg Tales*, on the grounds that it was the 'least Russian and least successful' in the collection.² He goes on to give a

¹ Garnett, 'Tuesday 1 November 1892', *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 132-133 (p. 132).

² Thomas C. Moser, 'An English Context for Conrad's Russian Characters: Sergey Stepniak and the Diary of Olive Garnett', *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 11.1 (1984), pp. 3-44 (p. 30).

summary of its plot, but overall, it is quite clear from Moser's tone that he found the concluding short story both inane and immature, labelling it 'embarrassingly bad'.³ He sees the work as a daydream within which Garnett indulges herself by fantasising about being in a relationship with, and marrying, Stepniak.⁴ Such an autobiographical reading is something of a leap on Moser's part, even if, as we will see, Stepniak's influence is nonetheless palpable. The story only names two characters (Mr and Mrs Leader) and throughout the text the narrator, the character to whom the narrator is speaking and the character of whom the narrator is talking remain anonymous. We do know, however, thanks to a dateline at the head of the story, that 'Out of It' is set in London in 1899, which contributes to Moser's lack of interest in the story because it is not set in Russia like 'The Case of Vetrova' and 'Roukoff'.⁵ Given the ambiguity of, and anonymous characterisation within, 'Out of It', a thorough analysis would be required to prove Moser's assertion correct. Moser does not elaborate on his criticism and does not attempt to prove why or how Stepniak is depicted within the pages of 'Out of It', most probably because he had little time for the story and the proceeding three have a far more obvious Russian connection through their setting and/or characters.

In the discussion that follows, I revisit Stepniak's presence within the pages of 'Out of It' via analysis of the story contextualised by biographical evidence from Garnett's diaries. While acknowledging these biographical resonances, this chapter contends that this multi-layered text draws on a much wider frame of cultural and literary reference. The significance of 'Out

³ The summary can be found in Moser, 'An English Context', pp. 28-29.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Olive Garnett, 'Out of It', in *Petersburg Tales* (Boston [MA]: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1900), pp. 275-316 (p. 275). All subsequent references are to this edition.

of It' extends beyond the matter of (dis)proving a character's identity. Garnett's 'least successful' story is far more interesting and valuable than Moser can allow. This is not to say that it is an especially good or particularly well-written text, but that once a straightforwardly autobiographical reading is set aside, other aspects of Garnett's literary debts and ambition come into focus. Moser, for example, fails to acknowledge the important connection between 'Out of It' and the work of Henry James,⁶ which, as I return to below, Edward Garnett, several newspapers of the day, Barry C. Johnson, Anne Lee Michell (Olive Garnett's niece) and Rebecca Beasley acknowledge.⁷ Yet, none of these sources offer sustained analysis of this source of influence, characterising Garnett's short story, in passing, as 'Jamesian' in its style (indirect, repetitive, ambiguous, prolixious), or reading the text as a kind of daydream about James. Here I offer a more rigorous account of both Stepniak's and James's influence on Garnett's story.

Firstly, I demonstrate that the titular 'It' from 'Out of It' is, in fact, a reference to 'a revolutionary cause' and that the short story explores whether it is possible for a person to escape the cause once they have committed themselves to it or not. Secondly, I show how the influence of Stepniak *and* James can be seen in 'Out of It' and contend that the influence of both men can be identified in the style that Garnett adopts, as well as in her portrayal of the unknown character and their relationship to the narrator. I will demonstrate that the

⁶ Moser does identify Henry James's presence *In Russia's Night* via the character Arabagine, but more will be said on this in the sixth chapter.

⁷ Rebecca Beasley, *Russomania: Russian Culture and the Creation of British Modernism, 1881-1922* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), p. 77.

Edward instructed Garnett to remove the 'expression [in 'Out of It'] that would remind people of Henry James's, which, if attempted at all, was not done sufficiently because contemporary newspaper and periodical reviews identified the Jamesian connection. Beasley too identifies 'Out of It' as the 'most Jamesian' of the short stories and argues that the entire *Petersburg Tales* collection is an experiment 'using the Jamesian method'. Anne Lee-Michell forms a more personal and less critical view, but nevertheless identifies a connection to James, claiming that 'Out of It' is Garnett's fantasy of being in a relationship with James.

story was written by Garnett in part to come to terms Stepniak's untimely death and also as an attempt to rationalise his assassination of General Mezentsev. Furthermore, I will show how the plot of 'Out of It' revisits key themes seen from James's *The Princess Casamassima* (1895–96),⁸ a novel which in turn has been proved by critics and biographers like Leon Edel,⁹ to borrow heavily from Ivan Turgenev's *Virgin Soil* (1877, translated into English by Constance Garnett in 1896).¹⁰ It is the Russian influence upon James that makes his influence upon Garnett even more interesting and valuable for this project. Moreover, the clear connections between 'Out of It' and *The Princess Casamassima*, both in style and in plot, makes 'Out of It' a short story worth analysing because the intertextuality connects Garnett to James, which in turn makes Garnett a person of interest to those who study James thus widening her sphere of influence and bringing her work closer to popular strands of literary criticism. James's influence is important to this project firstly because of James's position within literary history and the wealth of literary criticism and popular interest in his work, and secondly because of *The Princess Casamassima's* intertextual relationship with *Virgin Soil*, which brings the Russian connection to the heart of 'Out of It' via the fact that *The Princess Casamassima* is a reworking of Turgenev's observations of Russian revolutionaries in *Virgin Soil*. Stepniak's haunting of the short story, alongside Garnett's inadvertent writing back to Turgenev makes 'Out of It' just as 'Russian' – to use Moser's descriptor – as 'The Case of Vetrova', 'Roukoff' and 'The Secret of the Universe'.

⁸ Henry James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Volumes 1-3 (London: Macmillan, 1886). All subsequent references will be to this edition. Volumes shall be differentiated thus: *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 1 or *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 2 or *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 3.

⁹ Leon Edel, *Henry James: A Life* (New York City (NY): Harper Collins, 1985) – this is a condensed version of Edel's biography of Henry James, which consists of five volumes and span James's infancy to death. Further discussion of James's and Turgenev's relationship can be seen in Glyn Turton, *Turgenev and the Context of English Literature, 1850–1900* (London: Routledge, 1992).

¹⁰ Other critics have also identified Émile Zola, Honoré de Balzac (1799–1850) and Charles Dickens (1812–70) as influencing *The Princess Casamassima*. For further details see: Adeline Tintner, *The Cosmopolitan World of Henry James: An Intertextual Study* (Baton Rouge (L): Louisiana University Press, 1991).

I frame my argument with necessary contextual background, particularly contemporary accounts of Stepniak's funeral, which provides a sombre but useful demonstration of Stepniak's power and influence across a broad range of hard-Left European radical individuals, parties and movements, as well as sets up points of comparison to the unknown character seen in 'Out of It'. I will then move on to detail James's impact on Garnett and texts that are relevant and contemporaneous to *The Princess Casamassima*. While there are few secondary resources on Garnett to work with, there is of course a wealth of material on James. For the purposes of this piece of research, alongside Garnett's admiration and correspondences with James, I will concentrate on the influence of Turgenev on James, his inspiration behind the writing of *The Princess Casamassima* (including the value he puts on impressions and also the philosophical work of his brother, William James) and James's interaction with radical politics, people and literature. This will allow the argument concerning the intertextuality between *The Princess Casamassima* and 'Out of It' to remain focussed, but not limiting. After I have contextualised the environment within which 'Out of It' was written, I shall then consider themes seen within both 'Out of It' and *The Princess Casamassima*, such as the importance of feeling, the revolutionary cause and underground activity and the transformative power of art and death. Together this will establish why 'Out of It' needs to stand alongside 'The Case of Vetrova', 'Roukoff' and 'The Secret of the Universe' as an equal when considering how useful the contribution of *St Petersburg Tales* is to literary history, especially considering the diverse influences on which Garnett drew in 'Out of It' and indeed the whole *Petersburg Tales* collection.

The Funeral of Sergei Stepniak – Being ‘In It’

We know that Garnett was unsettled by the news that Stepniak killed General Mezentsev, and that his actions did not fit her view of ‘my Stepniak’, the figure she loved and admired, as explored in Chapter 1.¹¹ ‘Out of It’ and *The Princess Casamassima* both contain themes of doubt, desire to escape and, assuming Stepniak is at least in part behind the creation of the unnamed central character, revolution. These factors set up a theory that Garnett used the writing of ‘Out of It’ to explore and justify Stepniak’s assassination of Mezentsev, making Stepniak out to be an individual who simply got caught up in the Russian populist movement, which increased in momentum and violence before he had a chance to escape it (or want ‘Out of It’), resulting in him carrying out crimes he never intended to commit.¹² Whilst this does not condone, or detract from Stepniak’s clear act of revolutionary terrorism, it would have allowed Garnett to keep Stepniak on a pedestal as her source of inspiration, motivation and unrequited love.

Through identifying the attendees at Stepniak’s funeral and their political affiliations we can go a considerable way in assessing Stepniak’s involvement with the revolutionary cause and the size of his political circle. Donald Senese describes Stepniak’s approach towards left-wing groups as ‘irenic’, which resulted in him being admired by a diverse range of people and the list of attendees and speakers at his funeral illustrate that.¹³

¹¹ Olive Garnett, Friday 29 December, *Tea and Anarchy: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett’s Press, 1989), p. 240.

¹² Given what we know about Stepniak’s membership of clandestine groups, such as the Circle of Chaikovsky, and the promotion of acts of terrorism in his published literature, it seems unlikely this was the case.

¹³ Donald Senese, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii: The London Years* (Newtonville [MA]: Oriental Research Partners (1897), p. 60.

Stepniak's final journey started at Woodstock Road in London, from which the hearse travelled to Waterloo Station. The coffin was then taken to Brookwood Cemetery for cremation and finally his remains were then interred at Kensal Green Cemetery.¹⁴ While at Waterloo an array of prominent hard-Left politicians and radicals gave eulogies for their dead comrade. A reporter for *The Times* observed: 'It was a significant and striking spectacle, this assemblage of Socialists, Nihilists, Anarchists and outlaws of every European country, gathered together in the heart of London to pay respect to the memory of their dead leader'.¹⁵ There are two important points to raise here: firstly, the list of different political groups and secondly the fact that Stepniak is identified as their leader.¹⁶ The variety of political groups, all far-left in their beliefs but still different, that were represented at the funeral suggests that Stepniak had some sort of involvement with all of them, that he was 'In It' in a multitude of ways. Senese confirms this notion by stating that Stepniak seemed to be 'intimate with every major socialist figure'.¹⁷ Moreover, the journalist referred to Stepniak as the funeral crowd's 'leader', identifying him as one of the key orchestrators in the far-left political movement in Europe. Indeed Eduard Bernstein (1850–1932), former editor of *Der Sozialdemokrat (Social Democrat)* (first published in Zurich in 1879 and then printed in London from 1887 until 1890),¹⁸ who attended the funeral as a representative of

¹⁴ There is no evidence currently available that proves Olive, Constance or Edward Garnett attended any stage of the funeral of their dear friend.

¹⁵ Anon., 'Funeral of Stepniak', *The Times* (30 December 1895), p. 9.

¹⁶ The socialists called for public ownership of property and natural resources and for people to live in cooperation with one another. The term 'Nihilists' was often misused to mean 'Russian terrorists' when Russian nihilism revolved around the removal of existing ideals and values and replacing them with rational egoism and determinism. Anarchism advocates the elimination of the state and rejects any form of control over the people.

¹⁷ Senese, *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii*, p. 39.

¹⁸ *Der Sozialdemokrat* was illegally distributed in Germany from Zurich and then London because the Anti-Socialist Laws banned periodicals and newspapers that disseminated social-democratic principles. The laws were implanted in March 1881, partially in response to assassination attempts on Kaiser Wilhelm I of Germany

the Social Democrat Party of Germany (SPD), claimed Stepniak's role to be 'the true mediator of the revolutionary forces in his own country, [...] and the movement all over the world.'¹⁹ This certainly does not help support Garnett's hope that Stepniak was simply swept along in the revolutionary tide.

Kropotkin's eulogy dispels any notion that Stepniak remained at the periphery of revolutionary activity, stating that what

Stepniak had done for Russia, for the Russian revolutionary movement, was proved by the hundreds of letters and telegrams which had reached them, every one of them saying how the senders felt the grief of the loss of that fearless fighter for liberty. After many years of effort, he had succeeded in making his words heard in Russia, and in a few days, he would have found an important review which would have called upon Russia to rise. [...] The wave of revolution would reach Russia, and then every one [sic] would remember that beautiful image of Stepniak [...]²⁰

Kropotkin spoke overtly about instigating a revolution in Russia. He suggested that significant damage had been done to the revolutionary cause when Stepniak was killed. This might have been close to the truth because two days before he died Stepniak was offered the editorship of a new journal, *Zemsky Sobor*, which aimed to unite all of the revolutionary factions.²¹ The dispersed and disparate nature of the existing groups meant it was difficult

and widespread civil unrest. The organ was used to aid the formation of proletariat class consciousness, with Engels as a regular contributor.

¹⁹ Anon., 'Funeral of Stepniak', p. 9.

²⁰ Anon. 'The Funeral of Stepniak', p. 9.

²¹ The name, *Zemsky Sobor* (Assembly of the Land), comes from a form of Russian parliament convened in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but also encapsulates the periodical's purpose to unite (or assemble) Russian people. Further details of *Zemsky Sobor* and its originary publication, *Letucie Listki* can be found in Senese's text.

for them to merge and thus made them less of a threat.²² Through unifying the different parties, there may have been enough strength in numbers to instigate a revolution in Russia.²³ The new editorship suggests that Stepniak had no plans to be 'Out of It'. In fact, William Morris (1834–96), the textile designer and social activist (among other pursuits), who was 'there to represent the feelings of the English Socialists on the death of their lost comrade', felt that all English Socialists sympathised with the 'end and aim that Stepniak had before him'²⁴ – the aim of total revolution in Russia.

Powerful and emotive speeches were also given by Spence Watson, Avetis Nazarbekian (1866–1939), one of the founding members of the Social Democrat Hunchakian Party (SDHP),²⁵ Keir Hardie (1856–1915), one of the founders of the Labour Party, Herbert Burrows (1845–1922) of the Social Democratic Federation, John Burns MP (1858–1943) and Eleanor Marx (1855–98), the youngest daughter of Karl Marx who applauded Stepniak's dedication to women's rights in her eulogy. Additionally, the Italian anarchist Errico Malatesta (1853–1932), whom Stepniak followed into an anarchist uprising in Benevento, Italy (1877), commended Stepniak's 'greatness of soul and the sympathy he extended to all oppressed and downtrodden peoples'.²⁶

The Times reporter noted that 'for a full hour they [the mourners] stood in the drizzling rain, as speaker after speaker mounted the parapet and delivered his funeral oration with an

²² While they were all left-wing groups, they all had different approaches and central values (for example where the revolution should start – below with the proletariat, or above with the intelligentsia – or whether to take a violent or peaceful approach, and even that was not as binary as it appears (mass terrorism vs individual acts of terror or strikes vs marches or protests etc.).

²³ Moser, p. 31.

²⁴ Ibid

²⁵ The first socialist party in the Ottoman Empire and Iran (then Persia)

²⁶ Anon., 'The Funeral of Stepniak', p. 9.

earnestness which there could be no mistaking.²⁷ They all stood in the rain in December, in the time between Christmas and New Year, to celebrate their comrade rather than partake in festive or religious activities. The revolutionary fervor and dedication seen by an array of European nationalities provoked powerful speeches that all alluded to ways Stepniak could have initiated a Russian revolution. Stepniak emphatically lived his life 'In It', and not 'Out of It', as Garnett hoped for.

For the purpose of this chapter, it is useful to consider Stepniak's European influence, and how that manifested at his funeral, because it demonstrates that he was 'In It' as a key figure throughout his adult life. Moreover, the reportage of the funeral included Kropotkin's speech, which identified the crucial role Stepniak would have had in uniting a range of radical parties. This unmistakably confirms the identity of the unnamed character in 'Out of It' as Stepniak, which shall be further demonstrated in the chapter. Finally, the numerous eulogies given by Stepniak's comrades illustrate the oratory skills of radical figures, which is a common characteristic of the revolutionaries seen within *Virgin Soil*, *The Princess Casamassima* and 'Out of It'. Speeches form pivotal moments within the three texts, where characters get swept up in the fervour generated by the orations or where protagonists are inspired to deliver speeches themselves, pledging their lives to radical revolutionary causes. These three factors combined make Stepniak's funeral a valuable point of comparison to *The Princess Casamassima* and 'Out of It'.

²⁷ Ibid.

Henry James and Ivan Turgenev

As with Stepniak's funeral, it is useful to spend a moment outlining the similar plotlines in *The Princess Casamassima* and *Virgin Soil* in order to contextualise the chapter before turning to the relationship between *The Princess Casamassima* and 'Out of It'. As noted in the introduction, research has already been done exploring the intertextuality between the two novels so there is no need to analyse the connection in detail, however it is useful to highlight the key comparable characters and plotlines so that they are fresh in the mind of the reader and it makes the argument in this chapter easier to follow.

Edward Garnett's *Turgenev: A Study* (1917) discusses *Virgin Soil* and notes that Kropotkin and Stepniak bore 'witness to the truth of Turgenev's portraiture' of the nihilists from the early radical movement in Russia.²⁸ This is in opposition to Edward Garnett's contemporary, Maurice Baring (1874–1945), who, in his work *Landmarks of Russian Literature* (1910), asserted that Turgenev's 'vision was weak and narrow compared with that of Tolstoy, and that his understanding was cold and shallow compared with that of Dostoevsky'.²⁹

Incidentally, both Dostoevsky and Tolstoy themselves seemed to dislike Turgenev's work, with Dostoevsky claiming that he became disenchanted with Turgenev's novels as he got older.³⁰ James, on the other hand, much preferred Turgenev, writing reviews of and enjoying his work before having the privilege of befriending him in France and thereafter exchanging letters until Turgenev's death.³¹

²⁸ Edward Garnett, *Turgenev: A Study* (London: W. Collins Sons, 1917), p. 10.

²⁹ Maurice Baring, *Landmarks in Russian Literature* (New York City (NY) Macmillan, 1912), p. 99.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Henry James, 'Ivan Turgenev', in *Partial Portraits* (London: Macmillan, 1899), pp. 291-323.

James noted Turgenev admired and strove for realism in literature, whereas Turgenev found James's own work to be good but too '*tarabiscoté*' (fussy or complicated) to use Turgenev's own descriptor.³² It was Turgenev's realism that, according to James, provided British, French and Germans with their only notions of the Russian people.³³ The reality, or at least perceived reality, that James saw in *Virgin Soil*, was to inspire the writing of *The Princess Casamassima*. In 1877 James reviewed *Virgin Soil* for *The Nation* (1865–Present), observing that

The author's wisdom is shown in his deep perception of the fact that the clandestine movement of which he gives a sketch is particularly fertile in revelations of character Turgenev's central figure is usually a person in a false position, generally not of his own making which according to the peculiar perversity of fate, is only aggravated by his effort to right himself. Such eminently is the case with young Neshdanoff [sic], who is the natural son of a nobleman, not recognised by his father's family, and who, drifting through irritation and smothered rage and vague aspiration into the stream of occult radicalism, finds himself fatally fastidious and skeptical and 'aesthetic' – or essentially an aristocrat in a word, than any of the aristocrats he has agreed to conspire against. He has not the gift of faith, and he is most uncomfortably at odds with his companions, who have it in a high degree.³⁴

³² Ibid., pp. 317, 299.

³³ Ibid., p. 292.

³⁴ Henry James, 'Review of *Virgin Soil*', *The Nation*, vol. 24 (April 1877), pp. 252-254.

As others, such as Daniel Lerner, Edel and Christine Richards have noted, there is a remarkable closeness between James's summary of Turgenev's plot and that of his own in *The Princess Casamassima*.³⁵ Both Turgenev and James's main characters, Nezhdanov and Hyacinth Robinson, are illegitimate sons of noblemen. Nezhdanov is already involved in revolutionary politics when we meet him at the beginning of Turgenev's novel while Hyacinth is not, but Hyacinth shortly becomes heavily involved in radical circles. They both fall in love with unobtainable women in the form of Madame Sipyangina and Princess Casamassima and have additional love interests in the form of Marianna and Millicent. Nezhdanov and Hyacinth pledge their dedication to the revolutionary cause and are encouraged by their associates, Solomin and Muniment respectively. In critical scenes for *Virgin Soil* and *The Princess Casamassima*, Nezhdanov and Hyacinth become disillusioned in the face of examples of civilisation they have vowed to destroy (including art, literature, architecture). They lose any hope of people with the women they love and cannot find a way to escape the radical parties they have found themselves intertwined in and so commit suicide.

The similarities are quite staggering, and well documented and analysed by a variety of critics, so there is no need to dwell on them. For the purposes of my argument, here, I want to underline the intertextual chain that leads from Turgenev to James to Garnett. At two

³⁵ For further discussion see: Daniel Lerner, 'The Influence of Turgenev on Henry James', *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 20 (1941) pp. 28–54., Leon Edel, *Henry James: The Middle Years 1882-1895* (New York City (NY): Lippincott, 1962)., Eunice C. Hamilton, 'Henry James's *The Princess Casamassima* and Ivan Turgenev's *Virgin Soil*', *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 61 (1962), pp. 354–364., Anthony D. Briggs, 'Someone Else's Sledge: Further Notes on Turgenev's *Virgin Soil* and Henry James's *The Princess Casamassima*', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. 5 (1972), pp. 52–60., Christine Richards, 'Occasional Criticism: Henry James on Ivan Turgenev', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 78.3 (2000), pp. 463–486., Millicent Bell, 'Turgenev and James', *The Sewanee Review*, vol. 110.2 (2002), pp. 231–241.

removes from Turgenev and one from James, Garnett's 'Out of It' is far more Russian than Moser could see.

Henry James: Garnett, Politics and *The Princess Casamassima*

Preceding chapters have demonstrated Stepniak's influence upon both Garnett and her writing. James's influence upon Garnett includes, but also extends beyond advice and commentary of her work. *The Princess Casamassima* is the most important intertext for 'Out of It'. As I demonstrate below, in claiming as much, my intention is not to present James's as an originary text upon which Garnett plagiaristically drew – an explicit or implicit contention of many traditional studies of male-to-female literary influence.³⁶ Garnett's 'Out of It' is no copy or imitation but a study of, and creative writing back to, James's novel. Indeed, in crafting her short story, Garnett followed James's advice to use the work of great writers, among whom she counted James to be the best, to assist the development of her own work, much as she had followed Stepniak's instructions to write about what she knew. The strategy was risky, however. A scathing review of the *Petersburg Tales* in the *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* noted that: 'it is perhaps due to the American [Jamesian] influence that so many authors think that to make a book one only needs to write of uninteresting people in elusive language.'³⁷ Interestingly, and unfairly, the same newspaper had previously congratulated James on *The Princess Casamassima*, describing it as 'wonderfully done' and acknowledging, but not criticising, James's 'resemblance' to

³⁶ Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York City (NY): Oxford University Press, 1973) and then refuted by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (New Haven (CT), Yale University Press, 1979).

³⁷ Anon., 'Petersburg Tales', *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature Science and Art*, vol. 91 (2 March 1901), p. 277.

Virgin Soil.³⁸ Foreshadowing the Bloomian homocentric mode of literary influence, James is not criticised for his borrowing of Turgenev's plot, Zola's style, or his Dickensian London and Balzacian Paris settings. The *Saturday Review* enjoined James to continue writing in the same vein as *The Princess Casamassima* but with less ambiguity. Garnett, on the other hand, was identified as a monotonous and unimaginative writer because her work was clearly influenced by James.³⁹ Unfavourable reviews consigned her work to the annals of history, whereas the leniency shown to James, who more obviously borrows from Turgenev than Garnett does from James, has a literary legacy. If, as Barthes claims, 'any text is the transformation of another', Garnett's use of James's in her writing should be just as valued as Turgenev's in James's.⁴⁰

In the second volume of Garnett's diary, Barry C. Johnson identifies 1894 as a turning point for Garnett, when she starts to turn away from Stepniak as a source of advice or stylistic influence.⁴¹ I am not convinced this is entirely true because it is still evident that Garnett was sending manuscripts to Stepniak for his feedback, however Stepniak's criticisms were becoming quite severe. In October 1895 Stepniak wrote to Garnett about her most recent manuscript and said 'the whole thing is heavy, too slow, explanatory very often instead of being graphic and self-painting (ugly world but you guess what I mean). Very little movement and the plot is quite threadbare. It is useless to try to improve this story. Make

³⁸ Anon., 'Review of *The Princess Casamassima*', *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, vol. 62 (27 November 1886), p. 728. The same reviewer moves on to Alice Price's *A Wilful Woman*, describing it as 'ambitiously bad' and accuses her of 'trading on a bigger capital than she possesses' fully unappreciative of Price's 'resemblance' to other writers.

³⁹ Jennie Batchelor, 'Influence, Intertextuality and Agency: Eighteenth-Century Women Writers And The Politics Of Remembering', *Women's Writing*, vol. 20.1, pp. 1-12 (2013), <<https://doi.org/10.1080/09699082.2013.754253>> (date accessed: 06/11/21).

⁴⁰ Roland Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', trans. Stephen Heath (New York City (NY): Hill, 1981) pp. 142-148.

⁴¹ Johnson, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 118.

something else and let yourself *go*.⁴² Harsh as Stepniak's words were, Garnett still valued his comments, even though the negative criticism deeply upset her. If Garnett was thinking of turning away from Stepniak for advice, she never did and it was only Stepniak's death two months later that prematurely terminated their working relationship.

After losing Stepniak, Garnett sent her stories to her father for comment, but still had to look for an alternative source of literary inspiration and influence. While the teachings of Stepniak pervaded Garnett's writing, she also found a deep admiration for the literary works of James. Garnett noted her delight at 'The Death of a Lion' (1894) and 'The Coxon Fund' (1894), which were both published in periodical form in *The Yellow Book* (1894–1897). Upon reading *The Tragic Muse* (1889-1890), in March 1895 Garnett commented in her diary that she 'enjoyed it immensely'⁴³ and after finishing a volume of *The Bostonians* (1885–1886), first published in *The Century Magazine* (1881–1930), she wrote, 'Olive [Chancellor, one of the central characters] is really awful like me and Verena like Lucy [her sister]. The latter fortunate and the former the unfortunate, and yet I wouldn't change.'⁴⁴ While both Olive Garnett and James's Olive Chancellor are serious, enjoy music and are morally astute, Chancellor despises men and is an active participant in the Women's Rights movement, whereas Garnett seemed to enjoy the company of men more and although Garnett was interested in the women's movement, she was not an active participant until later on in her life.⁴⁵ Garnett also read *The Awkward Age* in May 1899, which Heinemann published the month before, and in her diary, she notes that she opted to read it because she was 'getting

⁴² Sergei Stepniak to Olive Garnett (13 October 1895), in *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, pp. 210-211 (p. 211).

⁴³ Garnett, Wednesday 20 March 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*., p. 162.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

⁴⁵ This will be discussed in Chapter Six.

straight and beginning to think of [her] writing again. Helped thereto by reading *The Awkward Age*.⁴⁶ The use of James's literary style to assist Garnett in writing her own short stories and novels continued throughout the rest of Garnett's writing career and Garnett's personal interest in James himself bloomed in a similar way to her love for Stepniak. Much to Garnett's frustration however, James did not become a confidante in the same way that Stepniak did, but she became a rapacious reader of his novels and short stories. For example, while holidaying in Rye for most of November 1901 (which also happened to be where James was living), Garnett read *A Little Tour in France* (1884), 'Covering End' (1898), *The American* (1877) and *Partial Portraits* (1888).⁴⁷ It was on this holiday too, that Garnett developed an almost obsessive interest in the whereabouts of James, becoming nervous whenever she walked past Lamb House (his residence) noting that she travelled down to Rye with James's new cook, that she heard James's voice as he walked past the draper's shop she was in, that she did *not* see James on her next outing in to town but that she finally did bump into him in the chemist's.⁴⁸ None of these actions are quite as odd as when she began to keep a photograph of James on her bedside table, nor when she started celebrating James's birthday on her own and well into her old age.⁴⁹

The novel that galvanised Garnett's life-long obsession with James was *The Princess Casamassima*. When *The Princess Casamassima* began to be serialised in *The Atlantic*

⁴⁶ Olive Garnett, Sunday 14 May 1899, *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in England 1897-1958*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019), p. 143.

⁴⁷ Garnett, Tuesday 12 November 1901, Wednesday 20 November 1901, Saturday 23 November 1901 and Saturday 7 December 1901, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 211–215.

⁴⁸ Garnett, Monday 11 November 1901, 12 Tuesday November 1901, 13 Wednesday November 1901, Monday 18 November 1901, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 211–213.

⁴⁹ In April 1901 Garnett celebrated Henry James's birthday by buying and planting three pansy roots. (Garnett, Sunday 14 April 1901, *An English Girl in Old Russia* p. 197). 53 years later in 1954 Garnett wrote a letter to Richard Garnett, her great-nephew and within it stated that Henry James's birthday was her 'happiest anniversary, celebrated for many a long year with a bowl of forget-me-nots from my garden'.

Monthly in 1895 Garnett read the first volume twice within the same week in the November. Unfortunately, we have not been left with Garnett's comments on the novel after the rapid re-reading – it may have fallen victim to one of her regular purges – but it is safe to assume that because she read it twice in quick succession it made a significant impression. In September 1900 Garnett records that her friend Sophie Huntsman gifted her a new copy of *The Princess Casamassima*, which she had lent to Mrs Wood (who was a governess with Garnett in St Petersburg) who had subsequently lost it.⁵⁰ The fact that Garnett was desirous of a new copy again surely underlines her interest in the novel. The only lasting record of Garnett's opinion on *The Princess Casamassima*, exists within the pages of 'Out of It'. Indeed, the title 'Out of It' seems to originate in James's protagonist, Hyacinth Robinson, and other characters like Princess Casamassima, who refer to being 'out of it' in relation to no longer being involved in the revolutionary cause, i.e., 'it'. When, for example, Eustache Poupin, supporter, friend and revolutionary, accuses Hyacinth of 'cooling off', Hyacinth responds with, 'Do you think I want to get out of it?'⁵¹ Similarly, the Princess herself tells Hyacinth that she cannot share information with him because he is too 'much out of it', to which Hyacinth replies, 'Yes, no doubt I'm out of it'.⁵² The abstract phrase encapsulates the secrecy of the revolutionary movement, whilst also pandering to the Jamesian style of ambiguity so fits well within Garnett's intent to write a short story about revolutionary circles.

After Garnett read *The Princess Casamassima* for the first time in 1895 she felt encouraged finally to write to Henry James. Regrettably a copy of the letter no longer survives, however

⁵⁰ Garnett, 22 October 1901, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 183.

⁵¹ James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 2, p. 241.

⁵² James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 3, p. 217.

from reading James's reply, which Garnett did painstakingly note down at least in part in her diary, we can infer that she wrote to James asking for professional advice. Garnett copied very few letters into her diary and any that she did were from immediate family members or Stepniak, so the fact that she transcribed James's letter illustrates the esteem with which Garnett held James the author and his words. In his response James gently rebuffs Garnett's request for advice, writing: 'We can't help each other much in these ways'. This would have been a disappointment to Garnett, however the rest of his response does furnish her with recommendations that appear to stick to her literary work for the rest of her life. James states that rather than reviewing each other's work, the most helpful thing he and Garnett could do for one another was 'by doing, each, and stubbornly, even selfishly, [their] little best, we can only *get* help by the grateful perception, in others, of that best, and the study of it in the cases in which it seems worth studying'.⁵³ Here, James lessens the blow of declining to advise Garnett through encouraging her to try her hardest and to study the work of others that she believes to be good. Despite having an impressive body of published work, James does not patronise Garnett; his language is inclusive, saying that they both need to try their best and they both need to get help by studying authors who produce better work than theirs. James goes on to say

Be a patient woman and a ferocious artist. / try to combine that mindless and that firmness. You must work out your manner and you must *live into it*. It's a great honour to be allowed to dream, even, that we may find a chance to produce a little life that is exempt from the law of destruction – not at the mercy of accident. Read a great deal, and *use* above all, what

⁵³ Henry James to Olive Garnett (20 December 1895), in *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, pp. 272-273 (p. 272).

you do read. Admire, generously, all the great energies and efforts. They all have something for us – they are all of the loveable fraternity. Don't shut up yourself in little formulas and attitudes... Nothing has ever helped one, really, but *Time*, and the impulse given to one's spirit, one's course, by all friendly responses and charming signs... Take plenty of the former, and you may have the latter.⁵⁴

James furthers his opening recommendation of studying good literature, by encouraging Garnett to 'read a great deal, and *use* above all, what you do read. [...] They all have something for us'. This seems odd because James is advocating the use of borrowing from other writers, or at least using their work as a sort of springboard. It is evident, after becoming aware of this fact, why *The Princess Casamassima* so closely resembles Turgenev's *Virgin Soil*, which Garnett reads in August 1899.⁵⁵ Assuming James was following his own advice, he would have read *Virgin Soil* and *used* what he read. In a similar vein, Garnett presumably thought James was a good writer, given the number of his novels she read and noted down, and hence we have an explanation as to why Garnett chose to read her copy of *An Awkward Age* before starting her own writing process again.

After encouraging Garnett to use other writers to help her become a better author, James goes on to advise Garnett not to pursue subjects which is at odds with Stepniak's earlier encouragements to write specifically about real people and from her observations. James theorises:

⁵⁴ James to Garnett, pp. 272-273. Garnett adds her own note at the bottom of the transcription of the letter that says '[t]he first time I met H.J. he said 'you are a person' and when he parted 'you may write to me'.

⁵⁵ Garnett, Saturday 26 August 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 148.

I don't in the least believe in going in *pursuit* of subjects. The real subjects are the subjects that come, that are already here – that are as close to us as our skins as our pen is to our paper...we must work out our salvation...I *do* believe in going in pursuit of *form*; but one does that by sitting in one's chair.⁵⁶

This section of the letter is a summary of James's theory on writing, which is explained in full in 'The Art of Fiction' (1884), where he lays out his thesis on writing from experience and says:

It is excellent and inconclusive to say that one must write from experience [...] What kind of experience is intended, and where does it begin and end? Experience is never limited and it is never complete; it is an immense sensibility, a kind of huge spider-web, of the finest silken threads, suspended in the chamber of consciousness and catching every air-borne particle in its tissue. It is the very atmosphere of the mind; and when the mind is imaginative...it takes to itself the faintest hints of life, it converts the very pulses of the air into revelations...⁵⁷

'The Art of Fiction' was published in 1884 in *Longman's Magazine* (1882–1905), but it was also reprinted in *Partial Portraits* in 1888. We know that Garnett read *Partial Portraits* in 1901 and so James's words here may have influenced, consciously or unconsciously, her writing of *In Russia's Night*, however in James's letter to Garnett he proffers the same advice. In his essay James rejects the view held by Stepniak and others that one should

⁵⁶ Henry James to Olive Garnett, p. 272

⁵⁷ Henry James, 'The Art of Fiction', in *Partial Portraits* (London: Macmillan, 1899) pp. 375–408 (pp. 387–388)

‘write what you know’ and instead advises that a writer should take their own experiences and allow their imagination to turn them into ‘revelations’.

Allowing the mind to form ‘the faintest hints of life’ is presumably what James’s himself did when writing *The Princess Casamassima* because the novel stands alone in James’s canon as being concerned with radical revolutionary politics and, while James was not naïve to radical politics and loci of civil unrest, it also was not a particular area of intrigue for him either. Even when writing to Frances Kemble (1809–93) on the 24 March 1881, eleven days after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II, James only dedicated one sentence to the news that shocked the globe right at the end of his letter: ‘You must have felt *spattered*, like all the world, with the blood of the poor Russian Czar!’⁵⁸ The fact that James did not feel the need to discuss the epoch-making event further, goes some way to indicating a lack of interest. The sentence itself is very theatrical, perhaps in an attempt to reflect Kemble’s vocation as an actress, but also serves to illustrate that the world has been tainted by the assassination. James asking Kemble whether she felts ‘*spattered*’ by blood spilled thousands of miles away, alongside the deliberate italicisation of ‘*spattered*’, makes the assassination seem almost comical; a slapstick comedy spray of fake blood. Alexander II was killed by a bomb that was thrown by hand and he suffered horrific injuries that took a while to claim his life; his legs were destroyed below the knees, his left eye forced from its socket and his abdomen mutilated.⁵⁹ James’s tasteless comment, written to force a reaction rather than express sympathy, and his lack of interest in discussing the matter further, despite the political

⁵⁸ Henry James to Mrs Frances Kemble (24 March 1881), in Percy Lubbock, *The Letters of Henry James* (New York City (NY): Scribner, 1920), p. 78.

⁵⁹ Anon., ‘Assassination of the Emperor of Russia’, *The Times* (14 March 1881), p. 9.

upheaval the assassination could across Europe, helps to highlight James's disengagement in radical politics.⁶⁰

Howe believed that James 'was relying far too comfortably on his celebrated lack of knowledge and justifying far too easily his acceptance of second-hand impressions.'⁶¹ This furthers my previous point – James was largely disengaged with the nuances of radical politics and did not mind that he had gaps of knowledge about such a complex topic. James acknowledges that the inspiration for *The Princess Casamassima* stemmed from him walking the streets of London, rather than ardently researching radical public figures. On his walks around the British capital James would 'receive many impressions, so the impressions worked and sought an issue, so the book after a time was born.'⁶² Here James follows his theory seen in 'The Art of Fiction' where he advocated allowing the mind to act like a spiderweb, catching impressions of people, places, and things and gradually which he would then turn into literature. James also endows Hyacinth with his belief in the importance of impressions:

[I]t may be said of [Hyacinth] that what was most important in life for him was simply his impressions. They came from everything he touched, they kept him thrilling and throbbing during a considerable part of his waking consciousness, and they constituted, as yet, the principal events and stages of his career. Fortunately, they were sometimes very delightful.

⁶⁰ Until Edel's substantial biography on James, it was argued (particularly by Howe) that James was ignorant about politics however Edel notes that James's friendship with Turgenev and his own father, Henry James Senior's (1811–82), interest in Charles Fourier's (1772–1837) branch of socialism meant that it was unlikely – see Leon Edel, *The Life of Henry James: Volume 1 (1843-1889)* (Harmondsworth: London, 1997), pp. 770-781

⁶¹ Irving Howe, *Politics and the Novel* (New York City (NY): Meridian Press, 1957), p. 146.

⁶² Henry James, 'Preface', *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 1 (London: Macmillan, 1921) pp. v-xxix (p. v)

Everything in the field of observation suggested this or that; everything struck him, penetrated, stirred; he had, in a word, more impressions than he knew what to do with.⁶³

It seems that James is speaking through Hyacinth here, by placing his own values on his protagonist. James relives the writing process of walking through London, gathering his collection of impressions and making his career out of them, and has Hyacinth re-tracing the same routes through the city. Hyacinth makes connections when all things that come into his field of vision suggest 'this or that' and lead him on a cumulative path of thoughts and ideas.

Alongside his heavy reliance on impressions to aid in his storytelling, critics point to newspapers as James's other primary source of material. Indeed, James was an avid reader of the British papers, once telling Grace Norton that he could not bear to leave England because he could not 'give up the morning papers!'⁶⁴ Taylor Stoehr establishes that '[t]here is little doubt that James believed most of what he read about the anarchists in the newspapers, and that his broad conception of them in *The Princess Casamassima* reflects his reading.'⁶⁵ W.H. Tilley's work supports Howe and Stoehr's claims and cites *The Times* as a key source of inspiration for James in his composition of the novel.⁶⁶ There is a steady stream of content from *The Times* during the 1880s and 1890s relating to the Russian 'nihilists' or 'anarchists' (terms that are used interchangeably by the press), their whereabouts (Paris, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Odessa, St Petersburg to name a few)

⁶³ James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 1, p. 149.

⁶⁴ Henry James to Grace Norton (7 August 1877), in *The Letters of Henry James*, p. 78.

⁶⁵ Taylor Stoeher, 'Words and Deeds in *The Princess Casamassima*', *ELH*, vol 37.1 (1970), pp. 95-135

⁶⁶ See W.H. Tilley, *The Background of The Princess Casamassima* (Gainesville (FL): University of Florida, 1961), pp. 40-42, 45-49

and their activities (printing pamphlets, collecting weapons, digging tunnels, plotting assassinations, orating, meeting, being on trial etc).⁶⁷

In addition to taking inspiration from the press, James wrote *The Princess Casamassima* in the atmosphere of the *fin de siècle* as the nineteenth century started to reach its end.⁶⁸

Well known texts such as *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886), *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891) and *Dracula* (1897) contributed to a revival of gothic literature as a popular genre. Alongside the supernatural classics, the radical activities of not just the Russians, but the dynamite campaign of the Irish Fenians, the Trafalgar Square riots of 1886, the violence of London's Bloody Sunday (1887) and public discontent seen in strikes such as the Matchgirl Strike of 1888⁶⁹ and the Dock Strike 1889 all also had an impact upon literature. The Fenians, a group of Irish republicans against the British Empire, targeted military buildings, key infrastructure (London Bridge, Paddington and Westminster Bridge for example), police headquarters and the Houses of Parliament. The actions of the Fenians caused a great deal of anxiety among the British public partly because there was uncertainty regarding who was responsible for the bombings – aside from the Fenians, the Germans, Russians and French were all under suspicion. The climate of distrust and doubt, combined with the British readership's interest in the nature of criminality inspired the creation of texts dedicated to the activities of radical groups, such as Robert Louis and Fanny Stevenson's *The Dynamiter* (1885), Tom Greer's *A Modern Daedalus* (1885), Donald

⁶⁷ For example, see: Anon., 'The Russian Nihilists', *The Times* (16 April 1881), p. 11., Anon., 'The Arrest of Russian Nihilists', *The Times* (4 June 1890)., Anon., 'The Arrest of Anarchists in Paris', *The Times* (31 March 1890)., Anon., 'Russian Political Arrests', *The Times* (25 May 1894), p. 5.

⁶⁸ Detailed work shall be carried out on the *fin de siècle* in Chapter 5.

⁶⁹ This would have been particularly unsettling because it was an act of defiance carried out by woman and young girls.

Mackay's *The Dynamite Ship* (1888), John Henry Mackay's *The Anarchist: A Portrait of Civilisation at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (1891), George Griffith's *The Angel of the Revolution* (1893) and culminating in the two most famous texts of the genre, Conrad's *The Secret Agent* (1907) and *Under Western Eyes* (1911). The public mood, a recent history of revolutionary activity, the popularity of the gothic and revolutionary-themed novels and James's own condemnation of the 'abysmal vulgarity of the British public' all culminated to create ideal writing conditions for *The Princess Casamassima*.⁷⁰ The novel itself sits among these texts focusing on revolutionary activity, sharing themes and sensationalist notions about the operation of a revolutionary organisation, all the while feeding the public's morbid fascination with the influence revolutionaries and radicals were having across Europe.

'Out of It' – Garnett's Jamesian Attempt

Johnson, as the editor of the three published volumes of Garnett's diaries and the person most familiar with Garnett's life, works and relationships, identifies no Russian connection whatsoever within the pages of 'Out of It' and instead attributes James as the inspiration and primary stylistic influence. Johnson is misleading here on two counts: first the Russian connection in 'Out of It' is clear because Stepniak haunts the short story as a character and it is only because of him that Garnett is interested in depicting revolutionary groups in her writing; and second, that the Jamesian influence does not preclude a Russian connection because James himself plagiarised his plot for *The Princess Casamassima* from Turgenev's

⁷⁰ Garnett, Monday 18 November 1901, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 213

Russian novel, *Virgin Soil*. Johnson observes that 'Out of It' bears 'an uncanny resemblance to *The Sacred Fount*'⁷¹ (1901), published a year later and Garnett recorded her impressions of the novel in her diary on the 19 February 1901:

Sat up with *The Sacred Fount*. In case I lose my impressions, I got bored and irritated tracking it down but at the word 'crazy' especially, during the last scene with Mrs Briss. Generally and after the last page, late at night in bed the whole bloomed for me as a rare and delicate flower of *art*, of art, not of life. The sinfulness of Mrs Briss., so much worse than that of Long: and how Henry James *hates* the Mrs Bs.' And the Ls. Almost with a personal hatred: he feels that they have so much of the field, are always triumphing there and sacrificing the Mays and the Guys, also how sin may be just as ugly, uglier in ultra civilisation than it its crude state, that we don't get rid of it with art and the rest, we seem only to perceive it as more and more hideous and more and more cruel and brazen.

[...] H.J. is – in spite of himself – obsessed with the idea of sin: perhaps a legacy from a puritan ancestry. Anyhow he has completely unmasked Mrs Briss. and if she is as clever as he represents (which I don't believe) even she must wince – or don't they ever?⁷²

This is one of the longest pieces of commentary Garnett has dedicated to any subject in her diary. She speaks as if she knows James well, pointing out that he hates characters like Mrs Brissenden and is obsessed with the idea of sin. The following day, Garnett remains preoccupied with *The Sacred Fount* and says that the text is 'very good for [her] to hold up

⁷¹ Johnson, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 118

⁷² Garnett, Tuesday 19 February 1901, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 194-195

[her] work to. I was stimulated to new light on L.B. [her manuscript called *Lorrimer's Bargain*, which was never published] and wrote happily.⁷³ Here, as we saw earlier with *The Awkward Age*, Garnett is following James's advice and following his recommendation to study 'good' literature, in order to improve her own work. Garnett's methodology backfired somewhat in May 1901 when Edward, after having read *Lorrimer's Bargain*, criticised it as being too like James's work.⁷⁴

While Garnett was undoubtedly influenced by *The Sacred Fount*, it is difficult to accept Johnson's point that it was the best text to use as an example to prove how Garnett's work was like James's given the publication date of 1901, which was a year later than *Petersburg Tales* (and therefore, 'Out of It') was published. Nevertheless, Johnson was right to pick up on James's influence and this is confirmed by Beasley who argues that the entire collection of short stories is Jamesian, but that 'Out of It' is the '*most Jamesian*' (italics my own).⁷⁵

When *Petersburg Tales* was published the reviewer for *The Academy*, commented

[L]ike all clever writers of the rising generation, she [Garnett] shows tendencies that we propose for the future to call Jacobean [Jamesian]. "Out of It" for instance, is a mere essay in the manner; and as such it is clever. The substance of the tale, however, is too slender to sustain accidents so elaborate, and our admiration is quite unimpressed.⁷⁶

It was evident straight away, therefore, that the influence of James could be seen in Garnett's writing by those who knew James's style well. The reviewer believes the attempt

⁷³ Garnett, Wednesday 20 February 1901, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 195

⁷⁴ Garnett, Wednesday 1 – Thursday 2 May 1901, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 197

⁷⁵ Beasley, *Russomania*, p. 77

⁷⁶ Anon., 'Petersburg Tales', *The Academy*, Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F36 'Olive Garnett Reviews', Box 23.

to be insubstantial and, after all, it is perhaps difficult to be overly verbose in a short story, but the content is certainly abstract and indirect. The opening few lines read

Yes, I was prepared for your question. I knew, friend, that you wanted to understand what it is exactly that puzzles you about me – what the something is that keeps us at every approach still apart. The enclosed sheets will explain. I wrote them for myself. I have the habit of writing. But they won't be too vague for you, with your habit was reading between the lines. You realise, of course, that it is only for you I would do this - that I wouldn't give him away to anyone else; and, of course, I know that you won't give me away.⁷⁷

Within the first line Garnett confuses the reader because it seems to open when the narrator and a companion are mid conversation. The reader wonders what the question was that the narrator had prepared themselves for and it also adds an element of uncertainty because it gives off the impression that the beginning of the story is missing. The narrator goes on to imply that there is something unsettling in their nature that confuses other people and to solve this issue they have written down an explanation. However, the explanation was originally intended for the narrator, rather than the public, suggesting the 'enclosed sheets' were more like diary entries. The element of documenting the self immediately links the narrator to Garnett herself and her diaries. Readers who are aware of Garnett's diaries then feel compelled to place a version of Garnett at the centre of the narrative because the text is so ambiguous, providing no identifying factors with which the reader would usually create an image of the narrator. The abstract nature of the opening of

⁷⁷ Garnett, 'Out of It', p. 275.

'Out of It' is secured in the last sentence where four commas, one em dash and one semi-colon create a fragmented effect. The repetition of 'of course' is jarring and is a hallmark of James's work.

In the opening of *The Sacred Fount* James's text is also disjointed and broken by a variety of punctuation marks, including an em dash, semi-colons and numerous commas:

One was glowered at, in the compartment, by people who on the morrow, after breakfast, were to prove charming; one was spoken to first by people whose sociability was subsequently to show as bleak; and one built with confidence on others who were never to reappear at all—who were only going to Birmingham.⁷⁸

The narrator in *The Sacred Fount* remains unnamed throughout, like the narrator in 'Out of It', which is ironic given that the narrator desires to delve into the personal lives of fellow guests at a weekend party in the country.

Those who were not well versed in the Jamesian method Garnett had adopted were considerably confused by 'Out of It'. The discordant style baffled Garnett's friend, suffragette and literary contemporary, Beatrice Harraden (1864–1936). Garnett gave Harraden the manuscript of 'Out of It' to read and reported in her diary that Harraden said 'Out of It' 'wasn't human' and after reading it six times she thought it was 'insane' and assumed 'that it was translated from a foreign language'.⁷⁹ The idea that Harraden thought it was translated poorly from another language is quite comical. Harraden's response

⁷⁸ Henry James, *The Sacred Fount* (New York (NY): Charles Scribener's Sons, 1901), p.1.

⁷⁹ Garnett, Wednesday 14 November 1900, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 149.

highlights the issue that the reviewer for *The Academy* would later comment on; 'Out of It' was not substantial nor accurate enough in its mimicry of James's style and, at times, the text was difficult to decipher.

The Princess Casamassima also follows a dislocated style, with Vesna Kuiken, writing for *The Henry James Review*, indicating that the novel contains 'misunderstood motivations, confused thinking, decentred experiences, and a general state of doubt becomes emblematic of the novelistic method James organises.'⁸⁰ The content and the style of 'Out of It' and *The Princess Casamassima* will be the main focus going forward. *The Princess Casamassima* is a better fit than *The Sacred Fount* purely based on the publication date alone, but so too could numerous other pre-1900 texts written by James. It is the clear intertextuality between *Virgin Soil*, *The Princess Casamassima* and 'Out of It' that results in strong points of comparison with which *The Sacred Fount* cannot compete.

'Out of It', *The Princess Casamassima* and Stepniak

Both 'Out of It' and *The Princess Casamassima* are set in London (bar a quick jaunt to France and Italy for Hyacinth Robinson) and both concern themselves with revolutionaries and their activities. Both the main character and the unnamed 'he' in 'Out of It' become swept up in the revolutionary fervour, as does Hyacinth and, ultimately, the unnamed 'he' in 'Out of It' and Hyacinth in *The Princess Casamassima* meet their deaths. While *The Princess Casamassima* is clearly about a revolutionary group, there is a need to prove that 'Out of It'

⁸⁰ Vesna Kuiken, '1884: *The Princess Casamassima*, Anarchy and Henry James's Materialist Poetics', *The Henry James Review*, vol. 38.2 (2017), pp. 113-133 (p. 114).

is. The overall secrecy and concealment seen throughout the text creates an air of suspicion and an assumption that the story is about something illicit. Garnett's readers at the time would have imbibed the national interest in the activities of anarchist and nihilist groups and they would presumably have had a particular interest Russia and/or Russians to select a book called *Petersburg Tales* to read. The connection between the secrecy and a revolutionary group would not have been a complex one for those with a vested interest. Furthermore, the person of whom the narrator speaks has two different portraits of them plastered 'in the shop-windows'⁸¹ that suggests the person was on a Wanted poster for some sort of criminal activity. This proposal is taken further when the narrator says:

He paid the penalty of this reputation of his always to the last farthing. He was never let off. And so naturally my very first notion of all, derived from the newspapers, was that he was immersed, head over ears in it, fighting, struggling, panting, in the full enjoyment of all it contained, all it meant.⁸²

Here we have a character who has portraits of them in shop windows and newspaper reports, implying some sort of infamy. His reputation is described as his 'penalty' and therefore shows that it is not a good one as he drowns in all 'it' contained and meant. He is later dubbed the 'chief transgressor' and is also commended for 'successfully leading forlorn hopes [and] losing causes' which cements his role as a leader in a group that operated illegally.⁸³

The character is a composite. While Moser is certainly partly right that he is a representation of Stepniak, Lee-Michell's view is that 'Out of It' is a dream of what it would

⁸¹ Garnett, 'Out of It', p. 275

⁸² Ibid., p. 277-278.

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 283, 278.

be like to love and be loved by Henry James.⁸⁴ The case for the man being James rests partly on the novel's Jamesian style, on Garnett's obsession with the writer at the time and also on the description of the man as someone who 'walked very badly',⁸⁵ a possible allusion to the unknown but 'horrid' and 'obscure' injury James suffered as a teenager.⁸⁶ The injury was serious enough to exempt him from military service in the American Civil War (1861–65) and could have affected his gait to create the 'shuffling' walk seen in 'Out of It'.⁸⁷ Stepniak, on the other hand, was known for his desire to rush around with his head bent low, a fact acknowledged at the inquest into his death.⁸⁸

A walk does not count for much in the overall picture when trying to identify the mysterious character in 'Out of It'. The titles of 'chief transgressor' and 'leader of forlorn hopes' do not fit the profile of James who was not enamoured by reform. According to Jonah Raskin, James only opted for legislative change in England because he was concerned that without reform, England was in danger of a 'dreaded revolution in the streets of London' and feared that revolutionaries would suddenly erupt from the ground in the same way that James's inspiration for Hyacinth Robinson 'sprang up' for him 'out of the London pavement'.⁸⁹ It appears that James was swept up in the British people's interest in radicalism and potential underground activity reflected in the literature of the time.

⁸⁴ Johnson, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 387.

⁸⁵ Garnett, 'Out of It', p. 276.

⁸⁶ Elizabeth Lowry, 'Open Wounds', *The Guardian* (4 October 2008), <
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2008/oct/04/henryjames>> (date accessed: 25/10/21).

⁸⁷ Garnett, 'Out of It', p. 276.

⁸⁸ Johnson, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 235-236.

⁸⁹ Jonah Raskin, 'Henry James and the French Revolution', *American Quarterly*, vol. 3., pp. 724-733 (p.726)., James, 'Preface', p. vii.

Additionally, when James was in Paris in 1872, a year after the Paris Commune was destroyed, he wrote a letter to his brother, William, stating that he could ‘smell the Commune suppressed but seething.’⁹⁰ This image suggests that while the physical Commune had been removed, radical activity still operated beneath the surface and had the potential to erupt without warning. A similar concept is seen in *The Princess Casamassima* when Hyacinth describes London as a city where ‘unmeasured misery lurked beneath the dirty night, ominously, monstrosly, still, only howling, in its pain’.⁹¹ The Dickensian descriptions of London seen throughout *The Princess Casamassima* are encapsulated here where London is anthropomorphised into some sort of beast that feels misery, lies still and howls. The animalistic qualities make London seem wild, untamable and unpredictable, with the potential to attack at any moment.

Conversely, Stepniak was not afraid of radical activity given his own involvement in acts of political terrorism and coordination of revolutionary groups. While the labels of ‘chief transgressor’ and ‘leader of forlorn’ hopes cannot be applied to James, they can to Stepniak. The language seen here resonates with the words spoken about Stepniak at his funeral that we saw earlier in the chapter, such as when Malatesta praised Stepniak’s sympathy for the ‘oppressed and downtrodden’. Additionally, the character in ‘Out of It’ is ‘connected with a cause or causes’ in a similar way to Stepniak’s involvement with the array of different factions represented at his funeral.⁹² Burns described Stepniak having ‘the nature of a child’⁹³ in his eulogy and in ‘Out of It’ the character is said to be ‘boyish’⁹⁴. Furthermore,

⁹⁰ Raskin, ‘Henry James and the French Revolution’, p. 725.

⁹¹ James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 2, p. 86.

⁹² Garnett, ‘Out of It’, p. 282.

⁹³ Anon., ‘The Funeral of Stepniak’, p. 9.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

during Kropotkin's eulogy at Stepniak's funeral, he mentioned the editorship Stepniak had been offered just before he died and it was thought that the preoccupation with the possibility of uniting Russian radicals that caused Stepniak to be so distracted he did not notice the train coming. At the end of 'Out of It', when the character dies, a 'partly filled-in telegraph form found among the papers in his pocket' that reads 'In it again. Come. Will explain.'⁹⁵ It is not known to whom the telegram was going to be addressed, however the narrator notes that the same morning a letter had arrived for the character that 'contained a proposition – now, I believe, before the public – which, if worked out, will no doubt have far-reaching and beneficial effects. In the letter it was suggested, as usual, that he should be the standard bearer.'⁹⁶ Here, surely, Garnett lifts this plotline almost directly from Kropotkin's speech, with the 'far-reaching and beneficial effects' being a total revolution in Russia and the proposition being the offering of the editorship. Garnett does not go as far as to kill off her character on the train tracks, he dies of 'some shock – some great excitement'⁹⁷ that his heart could not take.

Further evidence that proves the unnamed character is Stepniak can be linked to Moser's argument that that 'Out of It' is just Garnett's fantasy of a life with Stepniak. In the short story the narrator and the unnamed character get married after resolving to 'behave better'.⁹⁸ Could 'behaving better' mean stepping away from the revolutionary cause and being 'out of it' so they were no longer involved in insinuated acts of violence? Garnett's reaction to Stepniak's assassination was, as we know, one of shock and disbelief. As a

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 315.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 314.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 293.

person with strong moral values, it pained Garnett to think of the violent side of Stepniak; she was happy to assist the cause to liberate Russian people, as seen in her coterie and her contributions to *Free Russia*, but murder was not something she, nor indeed most people, could rationalise.⁹⁹ Garnett does also hint in her diary in May 1895 that she would like to marry Stepniak: 'Connie talked in evening about Stepniak being urged by Fanny to shut himself up to produce; how he wanted new life, to elope with someone, not to be set down to work. [...] I got quite excited.'¹⁰⁰ Garnett's exhilaration at being told Stepniak may want to elope with someone, alongside her frequent mentioning of Stepniak being 'so handsome' certainly imply that she had fantasies about being in a relationship with him.¹⁰¹ Additionally, she admits that although she does love Stepniak's wife she 'find[s] it hard to make any demonstration of affection. Something seals [her] lips', which could be a sign of jealousy.¹⁰² Garnett never declared her love for Stepniak to him, nor did anything untoward – her feelings on 'free love' were made clear in Chapter One – so she may have used 'Out of It' as a creative outlet for her true feelings. After all, Henry James did tell her that one of the benefits of being a writer is that '[i]t's a great honour to be allowed to dream'.¹⁰³

If 'Out of It' is an outlet for Garnett to express her love for Stepniak, she could have utilised the text to aid her understanding of or to rationalise Stepniak's murder of General Mezentsev. By examining the feelings of central characters, and in particular moments of overwhelming emotion, Garnett could justify to her conscious how Stepniak became

⁹⁹ As well as writing reviews of Kropotkin's autobiography Garnett also wrote a literary piece, 'The Wandering Romanoff' – Garnett, Sunday 19 March 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 137.

¹⁰⁰ Garnett, Thursday 23 May 1895, *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 186.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 129.

¹⁰³ James to Garnett (20 December 1895), in *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, pp. 272-273.

involved in the radical movement and why he agreed to assassinate the Chief of Police. As established earlier in the chapter, the oratory power of radical revolutionaries was significant in both 'Out of It' and *The Princess Casamassima*. The transformative effect of oration provokes powerful feelings of unity and passion within the central characters and results in them dedicating themselves to the revolutionary cause.

William James, one of the most revered thinkers in the history of the United States, dedicated much of his study to thoughts, feelings, and emotions and in two consecutive articles for *Mind* (1876–Present) he argued that our bodies feel before our minds emote.¹⁰⁴ This 'feltness', a bodily reaction, is then followed by a mental acknowledgment. Henry James read his brother's work, praising it throughout the years and in 1905 claiming that he could 'conceive no sense in any philosophy that's not yours! As an artist and a 'creator' I can catch on, hold on, to pragmatism and can work in the light of it and apply it!'¹⁰⁵ I demonstrated earlier that Henry James had no qualms about using the work of 'good' authors to aid his own writing and I believe that William James's theory on feltness can be seen in *The Princess Casamassima* and consequently also in 'Out of It' when Garnett borrows Henry James's styles. Moreover, William James submitted his articles for *Mind* a year before James published the first volume of *The Princess Casamassima*, implying that James had time to read William James's articles and capture their essence in his novel.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ William James, 'On Some Omissions of Introspective Philosophy', *Mind*, vol. 9.33. (1884), pp. 1-26., William James, 'What Is An Emotion?', *Mind*, vol. 9.34 (1884), pp. 188-205.

¹⁰⁵ Quoted in Ralph Barton Perry, *Thoughts and Character of William James* (Boston (MA): Little, Brown, 1935), p. 429

¹⁰⁶ For further information on the influence William James had upon Henry James see: Jill Kress Karn, 'William James, Henry James and the Turn Toward Modernism', in *Understanding James, Understanding Modernism*, ed. David H. Evans (London: Bloomsbury Collections, 2015), pp. 121-140.

'Feltness' is often exhibited by Hyacinth when he is in the 'Sun and Moon' – an establishment where the radical group meet secretly – and forms directly in response to the orations of ardent revolutionaries. Within the 'Sun and Moon' Hyacinth can feel the 'contagion of excited purpose', causing 'a breath of popular passion [to pass] over him, and he seem[s] to see, immensely magnified, the monstrosity of the great ulcers and sores of London.'¹⁰⁷ Sickness, here, serves to highlight the infectious effect the revolutionary cause had upon Hyacinth and also exposes the ugly, impoverished parts of the civilised western capital the radicals wanted to liberate. Mr Delancey stands and accuses all present of being afraid, which 'affected Hyacinth like a quick blow in the face: it seemed to leap at him personally as if a three-legged stool or some hideous hob-nailed boot, had been shied at him' and 'the next moment Hyacinth found that he had sprung up on a chair opposite [Mr Delancey], and that at the sight of so rare a phenomenon the commotion had suddenly checked itself.'¹⁰⁸ The speed of Hyacinth's response and the physical impact felt within his body at Mr Delancey's accusation illustrates the point that Hyacinth's body experienced the reaction before his brain was able to rationalise what was said. He was not entirely sure how he ended up standing on a table and commanding the room at large because his body acted in spite of himself.

Garnett's narrator similarly has almost out of body experiences when attending meetings at Mr and Mrs Leader's house. One particular evening the narrator describes herself as 'blazing away' and possessing a 'clear, burning impulse'¹⁰⁹ to be involved in the cause. The words 'blazing' and 'burning' evoke images of fire, suggesting a burning passion for the movement

¹⁰⁷ James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 2, p. 84.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

¹⁰⁹ Garnett, 'Out of It', pp. 284, 287.

but also as something that could either burn out, as it does in the narrator's case, or become uncontrollable, as it does in her husband's. The scene develops and, reading between the lines, it appears the narrator involves herself in plans to commit a criminal act. The character who becomes the narrator's husband says: 'You see a clear way before you. [...] The execution is nothing – merely mechanical; leave it to me, I can do that; the clear burning impulse alone is valuable.'¹¹⁰ It is unclear whether 'execution' is relating to an actual assassination or the meaning of 'carrying out a plan', but either the direct meaning or implied one shows that a pivotal event had been suggested by the group in the fits of their passions.

A socio-psychological reading of 'Out of It' presents the collective passion and group mentality as the reason behind the narrator's dedication to the revolutionary cause and the recommendations of a violent act.¹¹¹ The anonymity of the characters homogenises the group and furthers the image of group or herd mentality. In a similar way, while the 'sublime' leader, Hoffendahl, of the radical group in *The Princess Casamassima* is named, he is never seen and so becomes mythologised through the rhapsodies of Eustache Poupin.¹¹² Hoffendahl does not attend the sessions at the Sun and Moon, however decisions to commit violence acts are made in his name. The agreement to perpetuate violence occurs owing to the oratory power of those present at the Leaders' house in 'Out of It', as at the Sun and Moon in *The Princess Casamassima*, and stems from the groups feeding off each other's passions, heightening emotions and overemphasising them. The criminal act is never

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 286.

¹¹¹ Socio-psychology and the concept of herd mentality was an emerging field during the 1890s, led by Gustave Le Bon (1841–1931) and his text *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (1895).

¹¹² James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 2, p. 79.

explicitly named or identified in 'Out of It', and forms from the mass of overflowing emotion. The lack of authoritative voice or leader in the moments of passion, ironic given the surname of their hosts, the Leaders, decentralises the decision-making and diffuses responsibility, so no individual can be held solely accountable. From a biographical perspective, Garnett's inclusion of powerful emotions, group mentality and decision making offers a rationale behind Stepniak deciding to kill General Mezentsev. Stepniak too, in Garnett's mind, could have been caught up in the emotions and fervour of the clandestine revolutionary group *Zemlya i Volya*, resulting in the decision to assassinate Mezentsev. While this theory would not exonerate Stepniak, Garnett provides herself with an explanation as to why he killed Mezentsev – becoming swept up, perhaps involuntarily, in the emotion of the revolutionary cause – and lessens the amount of blame that can be apportioned to him.¹¹³

Alongside involuntary demonstrations of passion or emotion, James and then Garnett both use conceits of water to illustrate their protagonists' feelings about the revolutionary movement. As Hyacinth considers turning away from the revolutionary cause he weighs up the benefits of revolution versus the status quo, observing how

[T]he flood of democracy was rising over the world; [...] there was a joy, exultation, in the thought of surrendering one's self to the wave of revolt, floating in the tremendous tide, of feeling one's self lifted and tossed,

¹¹³ This of course would be nothing but a fantasy on Garnett's part; Stepniak had already exhibited a propensity for violence in the Herzegovina Uprisings in the Balkans (1875-77) and in Italy with Errico Malatesta (1877).

carried higher on the sun-touched crests of billows than one could ever be
by a dry, lonely effort of one's own.¹¹⁴

James's language evokes a sublime image of being swept away by powerful floodwaters, the bodily relief of finally submitting to the current, while simultaneously marvelling at the beauty of the sunlight reflected and refracted on and through the waves. The allusion to the biblical Great Flood 'rising over the world' encapsulates the destructive and renewing properties of water and serves to highlight the potential impact of the revolution. Hyacinth being 'lifted and tossed' conveys an image of being unable to escape or catch your breath and the repetition of 'one' creates a cyclical effect mirroring Hyacinth being pitched up and dragged back down repeatedly by the water. Finally, Hyacinth identifies the joy found in a common cause and shared experience, compared to barren isolation of rejecting the ideals of the group; he is re-born as a radical, with James's use of water baptising Hyacinth into his new faith – the revolution.

Garnett evokes a similar image through her narrator's thoughts on changing between being in and out of the revolutionary cause: 'If I didn't always enjoy the shivering on the brink, the plunge in, at least I delighted in the swim in deep waters; nothing but exhaustion brought me back to the shore. [...] I was swept along – I swam; it was swimming in a current.'¹¹⁵

Garnett starts as James finished, noting how unpleasant it is being outside of the group, 'on the brink' rather than in the 'deep waters' of the organization. Garnett's description is not as dynamic as James's; her narrator is not thrown up by the waves, but the deep waters suggest a vastness and an element of danger, also evoking elements of the sublime. Like

¹¹⁴ James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 3, pp. 84-85.

¹¹⁵ Garnett, 'Out of It', pp. 291-292

Hyacinth though, Garnett's narrator 'delighted' in the dangerous elements and was happy to be swept along in the revolutionary tide for a time. However, the use of 'swim', 'swam' and 'swimming', following James's style of including repetition, breaks the flow of the sentence, perhaps symbolising the disruption of the narrator's enjoyment in the water. The staccato effect caused by the repetition and liberal punctuation mimics the gasp for breath of a tired swimmer as the exhausted narrator fights her way back to the shore. The fatigue from the narrator suggests that being involved in the cause was unsustainable and too draining.

Water is not the only extended metaphor shared in James's and Garnett's work. Both authors use extended metaphors of revolution or war to describe central female characters. Hyacinth has a vision of Millicent Henning, his childhood friend and love interest as an anglicised Marianne¹¹⁶, the personification of the French Republic:

Having the history of the French Revolution at his fingers' ends, Hyacinth could easily see her [Millicent] (if there every should be barricades in the streets of London) with a red cap of liberty on her head and her white throat bared so that she should be able to shout the louder the Marseillaise of that hour, whatever it might be. [...W]ho was better designated than Miss Henning to figure in a grand statuesque manner as the heroine of the occasion?¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ Note here that Marianne is very similar to Turgenev's naming of Marianna, bringing an even closer connection together between Turgenev and James's characters.

¹¹⁷ James, *The Princess Casamassima*: Vol. I, pp. 153-154.

The empowered version of Millicent that Hyacinth conjures up, portraying her as the very essence of revolution, is juxtaposed by Hyacinth labelling Millicent as ‘plebeian’¹¹⁸ in the sentence before. Millicent is seen wearing the Phrygian-style *bonnet rouge* that is emblematic of the French Revolution and adorns Marianne in Eugène Delacroix famous painting, ‘*La Liberté Guidant le Peuple*’ (Liberty Leading the People).¹¹⁹ Millicent is not bare-breasted like the Marianne of the painting but her ‘white throat’ is on display to make her voice all the louder. There is also an oedipal connection to Hyacinth’s mother because, through Millicent’s morphing into Marianne, she becomes sexualised when she is described as ‘statuesque’ and bare-necked and is also placed on a pedestal via through being made a symbol of national allegiance and international fame. The figure of Marianne encapsulates the emancipated woman, heroinism, wife and mother and is representative of the people of France who include Hyacinth’s dead mother and maternal grandfather. The Princess even comments that it is a shame Hyacinth’s mother is dead because ‘French mothers are usually so much to their sons’ suggesting a deeper connection than the usual mother-son dynamic.¹²⁰

In a review for *The Graphic* Millicent is celebrated as ‘entirely successful [...] the most original creation that has ever come from his [James’s] pen.’¹²¹ Millicent’s success comes through her transformation throughout the novel from the ‘very bad little girl; [who]’ll come to no good,’ covered in ‘smutches and streaks’¹²² to an independent, well-dressed woman earning her own living at a department store. Millicent destabilises the natural order of

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 153.

¹¹⁹ Eugène Delacroix, *La Liberté Guidant le Peuple*, c. 1830, oil on canvas, 260cm x 325cm, Louvre-Lens, Lens.

¹²⁰ James, *The Princess Casamassima*: Vol. 1, p. 210.

¹²¹ Anon., ‘Review of *The Princess Casamassima*’, *The Graphic*, vol. 35 (18 December 1886), p. 646.

¹²² James, *The Princess Casamassima*: Vol. 1, p. 16.

things by refusing to remain impoverished and seeks to make something of herself. She disrupted the male-dominated city by working at a central department store, carving a path for herself and becoming part of the modernising world. Whilst Hyacinth is busy daydreaming of Millicent becoming Marianne through social revolution, Millicent manages to become her very own Marianne through social *evolution* and does so quietly and without violence – quite the opposite method to Hoffendahl’s and his band of radicals.¹²³

In ‘Out of It’ the narrator is at Mrs Leader’s house and attempts to join in a conversation with those who were ‘In It’ (i.e. radicals):

I was [...] right in the thick of the fight, a jewel on some helmet. [...] My spurs were on, but I hadn’t mounted. The horses neighed, the trumpets sounded; I lingered. How did I know if I could keep my seat? I had cantered in the riding school; but how about the mêlée? [...W]e would ride in the press together, banners waving above the crowd.¹²⁴

The conceit of being part of the cavalry, the most intimidating section of an army owing to speed and elevated height, creates an image of the radical group being extremely powerful, which often in the grand scheme of things they were not. The development of the metaphor, focusing first on the mounting and then the riding, followed by the addition of the trappings of war in the trumpets and banners creates a vivid image of a dynamic army. The short sentences and excessive punctuation results in quick, snappy sentences allowing

¹²³ For a detailed discussion of the destabilising role Millicent Henning plays in the novel see: Katherine Mullin, ‘The Shop-Girl Revolutionary in Henry James’s *The Princess Casamassima*’, *Nineteenth Century Literature*, Vol. 63.2 (2008), pp. 197–222.

¹²⁴ Garnett, ‘Out of It’, pp. 284–286.

the reader to imagine a cavalry charge pick up speed and hear the horses' hooves thundering along the ground.

The narrator is hailed as a key figure in the movement and is told 'my dear child, without you it would all be over'.¹²⁵ The infantilisation of the narrator through 'my dear child' while simultaneously juxtaposing this in identifying the narrator as the driving force behind the cause being results in the transformation of the narrator into a powerful symbol. In a similar evolution of Millicent into Marianne, the narrator takes on an image like that of Joan of Arc (1412–31), another French symbol of victory and heroism. Sadly, the narrator's transformation is not permanent and she does not enjoy the personal success and self-evolution that Millicent does. Instead, the narrator finds herself isolated and alone, much like Hyacinth before his suicide where he wanders aimlessly around an 'indifferent' London.¹²⁶ The narrator is suddenly widowed at the end of the short story and is no longer involved in the cause, living 'a very retired life, and it is allowed to be natural that [her] grief should absorb [her] to the exclusion of every outside interest for a time.'¹²⁷ The deep sadness felt by the narrator reflects Garnett's own grief at the sudden death of Stepniak. After he died Garnett did not write in her diary again until the summer of 1896 when she travelled to Russia, so we do not have a record of her thoughts and feelings, bar a letter expressing her 'unspeakable anguish'¹²⁸ to Egor Lazarev (1855–1937) after he informed her of Stepniak's death; her grief seems to have gone beyond words.

¹²⁵ Ibid., p. 308.

¹²⁶ James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 2, p. 231.

¹²⁷ Garnett, 'Out of It', p. 315.

¹²⁸ Olive Garnett to Egor Lazarev (24 December 1895), in *The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, p. 242

After being swept up into the revolutionary fervour and both reaching their peaks as key figures within the movement both Hyacinth in *The Princess Casamassima* and the narrator in 'Out of It' go through a period of inner turmoil where they realise they no longer wish to be 'in it'. Hyacinth is commanded to assassinate a duke, a bastardised symbol of his noble father, but his morality overcomes any desire he had to be part of the cause.¹²⁹ The narrator in 'Out of It' lost their passion and acknowledged: 'I *was* dangerous [...] I wasn't serious, wasn't really in it – was in short coquetting with the tremendous principles involved, for frivolous ends, possibly from personal motives.'¹³⁰ I think in a way Garnett acknowledges her daydream here and why the reality of it would be dangerous. She loved Stepniak, she believed in the emancipation of the people but she did not believe in violence. There was a risk that she could pretend she valued the cause in order to make Stepniak admire her further, which could result in either severely compromising the cause, her morals or both.

The key turning points for both characters revolve around art, which anchors both Hyacinth and the narrator to their heritage. While in Paris, Hyacinth 'recognised, he greeted with a thousand palpitations, the seat of his maternal ancestors – was proud to be associated with so much of the superb.'¹³¹ The beauty of Paris transfixes Hyacinth and it unmasks part of his heritage and identity on his mother's side. Hyacinth is revolted by the fact it is also the most bloodstained city in the world following the French Revolution. Hyacinth's discomfort at the thought of violence in the beautiful city reveals his underlying uncertainty in the value of the revolutionary cause. Hyacinth's discomfort is compounded further when he is in Venice and witnesses 'the monuments and treasures of art, the great palaces and properties, the

¹²⁹ James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 3, pp. 195-196.

¹³⁰ Garnett, 'Out of It'. p, 293.

¹³¹ James, *The Princess Casamassima*, Vol. 2, p. 207.

conquests of learning and taste, the general fabric of civilisation as we know it', but he acknowledges that 'all the despotisms, the cruelties, the exclusions, the monopolies and the rapacities of the past' are the reasons why art, architecture and learning exists.¹³² He considers the fact that the planned revolution could pave the way for modernisation and new cultures, but fears that Hoffendahl does not value art and culture and so his revolution would destroy it rather than renew it.¹³³ Ultimately Hyacinth chooses art and morals rather than revolution and murder and he pays for that decision with his life.

Garnett's character too looks back to her ancestors while she questions her position 'in it'. She imagines herself:

[...] surrounded only by the dead ashes of former achievements, treading at every step on the shriveled laurels, hearing in every murmur the falling echoes of bygone applause, the long-silent read on hollow boards; seeing everywhere the dust settled, the properties crumbled, the motionless, extinguished lamps; hearing seeing, feeling...¹³⁴

This deserted, barren, cultureless vision fills the narrator with a deep feeling of loneliness. For Hyacinth it was paintings and architecture that resonated with him and his heritage and for the narrator it is the art of acting that ran through the generations. The dried-up laurels, dust, darkness and silence creating an image in total opposition with what the theatre should be like. Like for Hyacinth, the narrator is concerned that in bringing about revolutionary change only dust and ashes would remain.

¹³² Ibid., pp. 229-230.

¹³³ Ibid., p. 230.

¹³⁴ Garnett, 'Out of It'. p. 289.

* * *

In conclusion, the intertextual links between 'Out of It' and *The Princess Casamassima* are clear, as is the consistent presence of Stepniak within Garnett's writing. Until this point, critics identified where either James *or* Stepniak played a central role in the inspiration for or the writing of 'Out of It', however this chapter has proved that the influence of both James *and* Stepniak can be seen throughout the short story. The very title 'Out of It' is an allusion to *The Princess Casamassima* in which it is frequently used by James as a phrase for turning away from revolutionary politics. The style and plot of 'Out of It' is also, insolubly connected to *The Princess Casamassima*, just as *The Princess Casamassima* is, in turn, connected to Turgenev's *Virgin Soil*. All three texts depict characters who are swept up in a revolutionary movement and who subsequently come to question their involvement in it. The protagonists in each of the stories decide to try and leave the revolutionary movement after having a pivotal interaction with a medium of Art. Turgenev's and James's characters both see suicide as the only option to permanently evade the revolutionary group, whereas Garnett's protagonist survives but loses her husband to the cause. Garnett utilised the same literary devices as James such as ambiguity, extended metaphors like water, fire and war, and the excessive use of repetition and abundant punctuation overwhelms the forty-one pages of the short story.

Additionally, I recognise Moser's passing comment that the unnamed male character is Stepniak to be true and have taken the time to provide ample evidence to make this point beyond refute, which no work of literary criticism has done before. Garnett drew upon the profile of Stepniak as a revolutionary figure and combined him with the Jamesian manner in

order to create some sort of hybridisation of the two men she had an almost unhealthy obsession with her entire life. 'Out of It' may be considered a homage to two diametrically opposed figures who guided and influenced much of Garnett's adult life. 'Out of It' cannot be dismissed as the girlish fantasy Moser outlines and I have shown that it was worth performing a sustained historical and contextual analysis of the short story. While I agree that when one holds it up to the rich, descriptive volumes that make up *The Princess Casamassima* 'Out of It' is a poor cousin, it nevertheless provides an interesting, valuable source of criticism. The intertextual links between the works of Turgenev, James and Garnett, alongside the presence of Stepniak within 'Out of It', makes the short story relevant to this thesis because of its strong Russian influence and consideration of the mentality of radical groups. Moreover, the influence of James and Turgenev brings Garnett into central conversations within literary criticism, rather than leaving her on the periphery to illustrate a point or simply provide supporting evidence. 'Out of It' may have been considered the 'least successful' of Garnett's texts by Moser, however it is the short story that can elevate Garnett's importance and significance and gives her the attention her literary efforts deserve.

Chapter Five

At Home Among the Russians: The Short Stories of Olive Garnett and Katherine Mansfield

This chapter is the first that does not focus on a single short story from Olive Garnett's *Petersburg Tales* (1900) collection. Instead, it draws upon the lines of argument in Chapters One to Four and applies them in relation to one of the most notable authors and prolific short story writers of the modernist movement, Katherine Mansfield. In particular, this chapter develops my claims about the rich intertextual relationships between Garnett's work and that of a wide range of international writers or revolutionaries, including James, Chekhov and Chernyshevsky. Ultimately this chapter contends that the work of Garnett stands up against literary giants like Mansfield and Chekhov, as well as socio-politically influential texts by the likes of Chernyshevsky and holds its own. As such, and as I have argued throughout this thesis, Garnett's peripheral position in literary study warrants re-evaluation.

Analysis of Garnett's immediate literary networks suggests that, apart from both women being friends with Lawrence, there was no direct link between Garnett and Mansfield.

Mansfield did write to Constance Garnett, to thank her for translating a substantial amount of Russian literature at a rapid pace¹ and Edward Garnett wrote to John Middleton Murry (1889–1957) to offer his condolences on the passing of Mansfield,² but as far as we know

¹ Katherine Mansfield to Constance Garnett (8 February 1921), in *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume IV: 1910-1921*, eds. Vincent O'Sullivan and Margaret Scott (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004) pp. 176-177.

² Helen Smith, *The Uncommon Reader: A Life of Edward Garnett* (London: Jonathon Cape, 2017), p. 285.

there were no direct communications between them. A more obvious distance between these women writers is marked by their scholarly reception. While Garnett has remained an understudied, indeed barely known author, Mansfield's career and name are celebrated internationally, with studies of her personality and life commanding as much interest as the analysis of her work. Despite this polarity in success, both women shared, to an almost obsessive degree, a mutual interest in Russia and both wrote short stories about Russia and Russians. Joanna Woods has conducted significant work on Mansfield's exploration of Russia. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce Garnett into the discussion surrounding Mansfield in relation to Russian themes.³ It will consider the influence that Russia, and Russian people, had on the style and work of Mansfield and Garnett, and in turn, how Mansfield and Garnett present Russia in their literary texts. This approach is important to this thesis because it draws Garnett from the periphery of scholarly conversations about the Russian influence of British literature and repositions her alongside Mansfield, therefore moving Garnett to a more central position within these discussions.

This chapter is, in large part, devoted to the question of where the interest in Russia comes from in Garnett's and Mansfield's short stories. Both were influenced by various Russian radicals and philosophers such as Chernyshevsky, and also notable Russian writers, particularly Chekhov, both of whom, I will argue, served to inspire the writing of both women. The chapter will analyse Mansfield's short stories, 'Tales of a Courtyard' (1912), 'A Dill Pickle' (1917) and '*Marriage à la Mode*' (1912) and Garnett's 'The Case of Vetrova' (1900), 'Roukoff' (1900), 'A Russian Girl' (1905) and the unpublished short story 'Influenza –

³ Joanna Woods, *Katerina: The Russian World of Katherine Mansfield* (Auckland: Penguin Books, 2001).

A Reply to 'Typhoid Fever' by Anton Tchekhov' (1909) as well as letters and diary entries in order to demonstrate the influence Russia and Russians had on the lives and work of these two women.

Mansfield has long been celebrated for her ability to transfer the literary lessons of Chekhov into her own short stories and her prolific literary output and reputation is not to be questioned. Garnett's reputation overall cannot equal that of Mansfield's, especially in relation to Mansfield's numerous volumes of critically acclaimed published work compared with Garnett's much smaller offering. However, Garnett's body of unpublished work is substantial; manuscript and print do not necessarily need to be oppositional, especially as publication is only one form of authorship. Through the lens of the representation or influence of Russia in literature read by the British public, Garnett can be brought closer to Mansfield in literary criticism. If we return to the introduction to the thesis, Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's concept of the *metastory* was raised as a useful way to consider the importance of marginalised writers. The *metastory* sees value in all texts because together they form a complete literary narrative. There is a risk that the development of the *metastory* will be neglected for, as Jane Garrity states, trends in intersectional studies have rendered the recovery of women as *passé*. According to Garrity, Mansfield, as well as Virginia Woolf, have become even more dominant within the study of women's writing owing to their transnational frame, which complements trends in interdisciplinary studies and transnationalism. Garrity acknowledges the importance of these newer strands of criticism, however refutes the notion that studying women writers is old-fashioned. She urges for a revival in the act of recovery because without it there is a risk women writer who

warrant recognition could be lost.⁴ One of the aims of the thesis is to recover Garnett's work and to also introduce some of her unpublished work. The use of an unpublished text allows for a richer metastory and illustrates the potential interest and value the text could have in terms of criticism of intertextuality and the influence of Russian writers upon anglophone ones.

The Significance of the Short Story

First, it is instructive to consider the rise of the short story as a popular genre in the nineteenth century because it sets the scene within which both Garnett and Mansfield were writing. While short stories were nothing new, dating back to the oral traditions and also encompassing parables, fables and fairy tales, Florence Goyet argued that the emergence of the short story as a popular genre in the modernising world of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was 'part of the democratisation of literature'.⁵ Short stories made literature more accessible to a diverse range of classes, with literacy rates in England improving exponentially in the nineteenth century, growing from fifty-three percent in 1820 to eighty-two percent by 1900.⁶ This was in part owing to Protestant Sunday Schools teaching children how to read and also to an increased demand for education stemming from the Industrial Revolution. Thomas Laqueur argues that literacy rates improved in correlation to the increasing demand for skilled jobs that required literate employees. The Education Act of 1870 introduced a curriculum for children aged five to twelve and a

⁴ Jane Garrity, 'Modernist Women's Writing: Beyond the Threshold of Obsolescence?', *Literature Compass*, vol. 10.1 (2013), pp. 15-29.

⁵ Florence Goyet, *The Classic Short Story, 1870-1925: Theory of a Genre* (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2014), p. 7.

⁶ Max Roser and Esteban Ortiz-Ospina, *Literacy* (Our World in Data, 2018), <<https://ourworldindata.org/literacy#note-3>> (date accessed: 19/03/18).

subsequent law passed in 1880 enforced compulsory school attendance for children aged between five and ten.⁷ The short story grew in popularity at this time because, much like the serialised novel, it could be read quickly by a large number of people, many of whom had limited leisure time owing to work commitments. As well as satisfying this broad readership, short stories also provided ‘quick, swift pleasure to readers accustomed to more demanding writing’, meaning that short stories were also enjoyed by the educated upper classes too.⁸ The short story offered the literate public a different reading experience compared to the serialised novel. Andrew Maunder describes the short story as a work ‘of single effect’,⁹ as opposed to the serialised novel, which dealt ‘not only with familiar characters, but also always with the *same* characters.’¹⁰ Short stories provided their readers with tiny windows on the world, presenting snapshots of a variety of people from different classes, races and backgrounds as well as a range of places and histories. Moreover, the short story was often used to inform the reader as well as entertain them. This was certainly the case for Chekhov, whom both Garnett and Mansfield sought to emulate at various stages in their literary careers. Edward Crankshaw identified the central features of the Chekhovian text as ‘faultless, matter-of-fact rendering of the complex states of mind and being of ordinary people’.¹¹ However, this does not necessarily mean that the short story, Chekhovian or otherwise, followed the traditional beginning – middle – end structure of the novel, which certainly rings true for Mansfield’s work and for some of Garnett’s, such as ‘Out of It’ (1900), where implied meaning helps to assist the framing of the short story. This

⁷ Devon Lemire, ‘A Historiographical Survey of Literary in Britain between 1780 and 1830’, *Constellations*, vol. 4 (2012), pp. 248-261.

⁸ Rosa and Ortiz-Opsina.

⁹ Andrew Maunder, *The Facts on File Companion to the British Short Story* (New York City (NY): Infobase Publishing, 2007), p. vii.

¹⁰ Goyet, p. 77.

¹¹ Edward Crankshaw, ‘Work of Constance Garnett’, *The Listener* (1947), pp. 195-196 (p. 196).

notion follows James's argument of what he believed made a good short story, which was 'to do the complicated thing with a strong brevity and lucidity'.¹² To James's mind then, a good short story was concise, but clear. Mansfield, as we will see, was more successful in achieving these objectives than Garnett, a fact that may partly account for Mansfield's greater fame.

Context: Translations and Russomania

Both Garnett's and Mansfield's writing emerged partly against the backdrop of the 'Russomania' that took hold in Britain from the 1880s. 'Russomania' reverted to Russophobia in the subsequent *fin de siècle* and post-Great War paranoia within the British national consciousness, which expressed itself in the form of prejudice towards the foreign Other. The trajectory from post-Crimean War 'Russomania' to post-Great War prejudice and a rise in Russophobia maps a clear link between the start of Garnett's writing period and the end of Mansfield's and oscillation in feelings towards Russia during this period can be seen within their short stories.

As we have seen in the Introduction, the Crimean War (1853–56) contributed to the increased demand for all things Russian in Britain.¹³ The British public's curiosity about Russia began in 1854 just after the beginning of the Crimean War, with interest gathering momentum in the 1880s when the translation of Russian literary works into English began in

¹² Henry James, *The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces*, ed. R. P. Blackmur (New York (NY): Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), p. 231.

¹³ Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Bullock, 'Introduction: The Illusion of Transparency', *Translation and Literature*, vol. 20 (2011), pp. 283-300 (p. 283).

earnest.¹⁴ Before the Crimean War, only twenty-one Russian books had been translated into English.¹⁵ However, by 1860 a further seventeen literary works were available in translation, including publications by Ivan Turgenev and Mikhail Lermontov. Colonial ties ensured that Britain's new-found interest in Russia was transmitted to New Zealand. By 1897, the General Assembly Library in Wellington had a modest collection of Russian fiction, including works by Gogol, Pushkin and Dostoevsky, nineteen texts by Tolstoy and sixteen by Turgenev. Mansfield did not have borrowing privileges until 1907. She was, however, exposed to Dostoevsky, and possibly Turgenev, in the preceding three years at the liberal women's educational establishment, Queen's College in London, where Garnett had also been educated between 1882 and 1889.¹⁶ 1907 was also the year that Mansfield decided to dedicate time to becoming a writer. In a similar way to Garnett's expeditious reading of the work of Henry James, Joanna Woods argues that while reading Russian novels, Mansfield was 'searching for a style' and found it within the pages of Turgenev and Chekhov.¹⁷

The translation work of Constance Garnett, had a profound effect and influence on both her sister-in-law and Mansfield. Between 1884 and 1928, Constance Garnett translated seventy-one volumes of Russian literature into English.¹⁸ While there were other Russian-to-English translators at the time, the sheer number of texts made accessible to the British public by

¹⁴ Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Bullock, 'Introduction: Against Influence: On Writing About Russian Culture in Britain', in *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* eds. Rebecca Beasley and Philip Ross Bullock (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 1-20 (p. 5).

¹⁵ Beasley and Bullock, 'Introduction: The Illusion of Transparency', p. 283.

¹⁶ Barry C. Johnson, 'The Museum Garnetts', in Olive Garnett, *Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett 1890-1893*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett's Press, 1989), pp. 1-12 (p. 7). Antony Alpers, *The Life of Katherine Mansfield* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1953), p. 57. Woods, pp. 24, 34, 52.

¹⁷ Woods, pp. 52, 53.

¹⁸ See Appendix 1.

Constance Garnett's work made her the most significant translator of the era.¹⁹ Adrian Hunter believes her work was 'fundamental in introducing English speakers to the Russian masters and that the course of European and American modernism was altered by her rapid output'.²⁰ Here, the work of Hunter supports Rebecca Beasley's argument, as elaborated in the introduction to this thesis, that Russian literature had just as significant a role in the shaping of British modernism as French texts. Moreover, Hunter's and Beasley's claims are complemented by the work of Claire Davison and George Steiner, who state that Constance Garnett's translations form part of a literary triumvirate, alongside the Greeks and Elizabethans, who are responsible for the most momentous developments in the history of Western literature. The Greeks provided philosophy, epics, tragedies and drama, the Elizabethans prose, poetry and theatre and Constance Garnett's works of translation inspired the dramatic break from literary tradition and the emergence of modernism.²¹ However, the irony is not lost upon Davison that the Russian masters were inspired by Victorian novelists, from whom the modernists were so desperate to distance themselves.²²

Ample evidence of the influence of Constance Garnett's translations on Garnett and Mansfield can be seen in their respective diary entries and letters. On reading Constance Garnett's translation of Turgenev's *A House of Gentlefolk* (originally published in *Sovremennik*²³ in 1859 and translated in 1894), Garnett wrote in her diary: 'My heart leapt

¹⁹ Other notable names include Aylmer Maude (1858–1938), S.S. Koteliansky (1880–1955) and Frederick Whishaw (1854–1934).

²⁰ Adrian Hunter, 'Constance Garnett's Chekhov and the Modernist Short Story', *Translation and Literation*, vol. 12 (2003), pp. 69-87 (p. 69).

²¹ Claire Davison, *Translation as Collaboration: Virginia Woolf, Katherine Mansfield and S. S. Koteliansky* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014), p. 3.

George Steiner, *Tolstoy or Dostoevsky: An Essay in Contrast* (London: Faber and Faber, 1959), p. 15.

²² Davison, p. 1.

²³ *Sovremennik* (*The Contemporary*) was a quarterly periodical, founded by Pushkin and published in St Petersburg between 1836 and 1866.

within me, and I experienced pure joy. I have been too long dead to these gentle influences [...] my thoughts turned at once to that offspring of mine – my story...'.²⁴ Garnett was also enraptured by Stepniak's introduction to the translation where he praises Turgenev's ability to create a 'living picture' of rural Russia, illustrating the 'the youth of the Russian democracy.'²⁵ Here Garnett, as when she read James, is inspired to turn to her own writing after reading the work of Turgenev and Stepniak, perhaps using Turgenev's 'living picture' to assist in the formation of her truthful representation of Russia. Garnett was fortunate to discuss the translations in person with Constance Garnett, with whom she spent ample time; however, Mansfield – who saw Constance Garnett as a rival since they were both working on translations of Chekhov's diaries and letters– did not have this luxury.²⁶ Instead she wrote Constance Garnett a letter:

[I can] no longer refrain from thanking you for the whole other world that you have revealed to us through those marvelous translations from the Russian. Your beautiful industry will end in making us most ungrateful. We are almost inclined to take for granted the fact that a new book is translated by Mrs Constance Garnett. [...] These books have changed our lives, no less! [...] I am only one voice among so many who appreciate the greatness of your task, the marvel of your achievement.²⁷

²⁴ Olive Garnett, Sunday 14 October 1894, *Olive and Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett, 1893-1895*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartletts Press, 1993), pp. 124-125 (p.125).

²⁵ Sergei Stepniak 'Introduction', in Ivan Turgenev, *A House of Gentlefolk*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Heinemann, 1906), pp. v-xvii (p. vi, p. xvii).

²⁶ Woods, p. 173. S.S. Koteliensky translated the work from Russian to English and then Mansfield reviewed and polished it.

²⁷ Katherine Mansfield to Constance Garnett (8 February 1921), in *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume IV: 1910-1921*, eds. Vincent O'Sullivan and Margaret Scott (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004) pp. 176-177.

Mansfield's and Garnett's semantics are very similar. Mansfield believed that Constance Garnett had introduced her to a new world, which stimulated her own writing and lifestyle. Mansfield went as far as Russifying her name and signing documents (including the 1911 UK census) using either 'Katharina', 'Katerina', 'Katoushka' or 'Kissienka'.²⁸ However, despite both authors citing Constance Garnett as a source of inspiration, she was not the main influence on either Garnett or Mansfield. Stepniak, as discussed in previous chapters, helped form and edit the content of Garnett's work, while Chekhov famously influenced Mansfield's prose and style.²⁹

The Russian Influence: Stepniak and Chekhov

Before Stepniak's death, Garnett was dependent on his detailed reviews and feedback on her manuscripts in order to improve her writing and process. She even considered his likes and dislikes when thinking of ideas for stories, noting on Monday 10 April 1893, 'My 'Anarchist' idea grows in my mind [...] I shall lay it before Stepniak; it takes the place of the romance because it is a subject that he would like better.'³⁰ This suggests that by this point, Garnett still lacked confidence in her art and was no longer writing for herself or for pleasure, but to impress Stepniak. Diary entries from the period between 1893 and 1895 offer up the most evidence of the importance of Stepniak's guidance and the calming, reassuring influence he had upon a young Garnett, who was only in her early twenties at the

²⁸ Woods, pp. 82, 83, 84, 99, 117.

²⁹ A caveat needs to be added that without the aid of Volkhovsky and Stepniak, Garnett would not have been able to speak, understand or read Russian and without Kropotkin, she would not have been so well informed on the condition of Russia after the untimely death of Stepniak in 1895. The pieces of advice that Stepniak gave Garnett form a significant part of her diary and it is apparent that she considers his comments while writing *Petersburg Tales* and *In Russia's Night*.

³⁰ Garnett, Monday 10 April 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 177.

time. For example, even though Stepniak may have preferred a manuscript on anarchists he read the romance novel and offered Garnett supportive and valuable feedback. Garnett noted on the 18 April 1893, 'I may as well remark that it will be entirely owing to Stepniak that the strong points [in a manuscript] will be placed in strong lights, and the trivial points get in their right places in the background. [... He] taught me a great deal'.³¹ Stepniak helped Garnett with the structure of her writing – something she had struggled with. Garnett's self-confidence was also driven by Stepniak's opinion of her work. After expressing her fear of being a bad writer to him, Garnett took solace in his words of encouragement, commenting that: 'He believes in me so much that I almost begin to believe in myself'.³²

In contrast to Garnett's self-doubt, Mansfield appears – on the surface at least – confident in her own ability. In 1917, on the flyleaf of her copy of Chekhov's *The Lady with the Dog* (pubd. 1899 in *Russkaya Mysl* (Russian Thought)³³ and trans. Constance Garnett 1917), Mansfield wrote, 'By all the laws of M. and P. | This book is bound to belong to me. | Besides I am sure that you agree. | I am the English Anton T'.³⁴ By comparing herself to a celebrated writer of cultural significance, Mansfield playfully suggests she possesses substantial literary skills, foreshadowing her own international acclaim. Additionally, like Garnett, Mansfield also acknowledges the impact a Russian had upon her own writing. Further, 'I am the English Anton T.' is uncomfortably accurate, and not only because they

³¹ Olive Garnett, Tuesday 18 April 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 178-179 (p. 179)

³² Garnett, Wednesday 15 November 1893, *Tea and Anarchy*, pp. 232-233 (p. 233).

³³ *Russkaya Mysl* was a monthly periodical founded by Vukol Lavrov. It originally ran from 1880–1927 and then was re-established as a newspaper in 1947.

³⁴ Katherine Mansfield, *The Scrapbook of Katherine Mansfield*, ed. John Middleton Murray (London: Constable, 1939), p. 162.

The 'T' in 'Anton T' comes from the non-standardised spelling of 'Chekhov', so either 'Tchekhov' or 'Tchehov', which Mansfield used interchangeably.

were both victims of tuberculosis.³⁵ In 1951, E. M. Almedingen rightly accused Mansfield of plagiarism in *The Times Literary Supplement*. Upon reading Mansfield's 'The-Child-Who-Was-Tired', originally published in *The New Age* (1894–1938) in 1910, Almedingen claimed she 'got a curious sense of walking through a once well familiar room'.³⁶ This was because 'The-Child-Who-Was-Tired' is simply a borrowing of Chekhov's story *Spat' khochestsia* (*Sleepyhead*) (1888), which was published in *Petersburgskaya Gazeta* (St Petersburg Gazette) (1867–1917), and first translated into English by Robert Edward Crozier Long (1872–1938) in 1903.³⁷ Mansfield's 'borrowing' of Chekhov's story was not an isolated case. Claire Tomalin, Woods and W. H. New all cite examples of the 'unconscious memory of Chekhov' in Mansfield's work.³⁸ 'The-Child-Who-Was-Tired' is perhaps the most infamous example and was used to illustrate the effect Chekhov's work had upon Mansfield.³⁹ Mansfield's uses of and debts to Chekhov are well documented. Much less so is her representation of Russia and Russians in her fiction. It is naturally of particular interest to this thesis that this work is carried out because it serves to relocate Garnett's work alongside that of her more noted contemporary, Mansfield. Mansfield studies too are

³⁵ Chekhov was diagnosed with tuberculosis in 1897 and died from the disease in 1904, aged forty-four. Mansfield was diagnosed in 1917 and died in 1923, aged thirty-three.

³⁶ E. M. Almedingen, 'Chekhov and Katherine Mansfield', *The Times Literary Supplement*, 19 October 1951, p. 661.

³⁷ Robert Edward Crozier Long was a journalist whose literary network consisted of figures such as Jerome K. Jerome (1859–1927) and W.T. Stead. Long eventually became a special correspondent in Russia for *New York American* (1882–1967), reporting on the revolutions, Balkan wars and the Great War. His translation of *The Black Monk and Other Stories* (1903), which included 'Sleepyhead', was the first work of Chekhov to be published in English. Constance Garnett did not publish any Chekhov until 1916 and 'Sleepy' was not published by her until 1922 in the short story collection, *The Cook's Wedding and Other Stories*.

³⁸ W. H. New, *Reading Mansfield and Metaphors of Form* (Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999), p. 15., Claire Tomalin, *Katherine Mansfield: A Secret Life* (London: Penguin, 2003), p. 259., Woods, pp. 195-212.

³⁹ For recent and further discussion, see Sarah Ailwood and Melinda Harvey, *Katherine Mansfield and Literary Influence* (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 2015).

productively enriched by consideration of Garnett, not least by extending accounts of her works' intertextual relationships beyond a predominant focus upon Chekhov.⁴⁰

Mansfield was not alone in her interest in writing back to Chekhov. Garnett also, as this research highlights for the first time, wrote a short story titled 'Influenza – A Reply to 'Typhoid Fever' by Anton Tchekhov', that draws upon the Chekhovian style and reworks Chekhov's short story, 'Typhus'. As with Mansfield's 'The-Child-Who-Was-Tired', Garnett's title clearly denotes its connection to one of Chekhov's texts. It should be noted at this point that typhus and typhoid fever, while similarly named and associated with similar symptoms, are two different diseases. It is not surprising that Garnett muddled up typhus and typhoid fever in her title, however we can be sure that Constance Garnett translated the title of Chekhov's text correctly with Chekhov naming his short story, 'Тиф' (or *tif*), which is a direct translation of 'typhus' in Russian. Presumably, Garnett was preoccupied with typhoid fever because Edward Garnett suffered from the disease in 1896.⁴¹ This work on 'Influenza' aids the recovery of Garnett and her work through highlighting a manuscript that lends itself to a critical discussion of intertextuality and the use of Chekhovian style. Garnett's unpublished work does not need to operate in isolation or in opposition to Mansfield's published *oeuvre* but instead both can contribute towards a fragment of the metastory that centres upon women writers who were influenced by Russia and Russian literature.

⁴⁰ For further information on this topic see: Galya Diment, Gerri Kimber and W. Todd Martin, *Katherine Mansfield and Russia* (Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press, 2017).

⁴¹ Smith, pp. 74-75.

'Influenza' was written by Garnett after a period of illness in March 1909 and formed part of a larger collection with the working title, *Tales of Women*.⁴² Garnett considered sending a version of *Tales of Women* to be published in 1911 and was writing short stories such as 'A Woman', 'A Woman's Last Hours', 'The Goal' and 'Bertha', which she would ultimately group together as the *Tales of Women*, as early as 1898.⁴³ Garnett wrote 40 short stories between 1900 and 1918, the vast majority of which remain unpublished, with her output dwindling after completing *In Russia's Night* (1918). We have already seen in Chapter One that Garnett did not purposefully curate the stories that would form *Petersburg Tales* and did not write the four stories with the intention that they would be published together, so it is perfectly logical to state that 'Influenza' was a late edition to the unpublished *Tales of Women* collection.

Chekhov wrote 'Typhus' in 1887 and, as with 'Sleepyhead', published it in the *Petersburgskaya Gazeta*, where he published thirty-three of his short stories. While working as a doctor, a profession he maintained for as long as he was able to alongside his literary career, Chekhov witnessed the effects of typhus, scarlet fever, diphtheria and cholera and saw the impact the epidemics had upon the Russian people.⁴⁴ Russia suffered from epidemics of typhus between 1870 and 1922. A surge in the disease was often associated

⁴² The original manuscript for 'Influenza' can be seen within the *Tales of Women* manuscript in the Charles Deering McCormick Library of Special Collections at Northwestern University., Olive Garnett, Monday 6 November 1911, *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in England 1897-1958* (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019), p. 360.

⁴³ Garnett, November B.M. 1898, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 131., Garnett, Saturday 22 October 1904, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 279., Garnett, Sunday 23 February 1902, *An English Girl in Old Russia* p. 220', Garnett, Sunday 31 January 1904, *An English Girl in Old Russia* p. 264.

⁴⁴ Alexander Chudakov, 'Dr Chekhov: A Biographical Essay (29 January 1860-15 July 1904)', in *The Cambridge Companion to Chekhov*, eds. Vera Gottlieb and Paul Allain (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 3-16.

with famine or war, particularly when large groups of people moved away from famine-struck or war-torn areas, carrying the pathogenic lice with them to uninfected populations. Symptoms of typhus include rashes, high fever, the overwhelming need to lie down and mental confusion.⁴⁵ At the beginning of March 1897, Chekhov's brother, Alexander, asked Chekhov to travel to St Petersburg to treat his wife for typhus. While in St Petersburg, Chekhov was appalled by the evidence of poverty, sickness and death, calling it the 'city of death' on 17 March 1887 in a letter to his friend, Maria Kiseleva.⁴⁶ 'Typhus' was written by the 23 March 1887, further emphasising the strong impression the condition of St Petersburg left upon Chekhov, and the short story was published two days later.

'Typhus' opens with a young lieutenant called Klimov travelling on a train between St Petersburg and Moscow. Klimov does not feel well and as such finds the other passengers in his compartment challenging. Klimov become irritated, 'Detestable people these Finns and...Greeks' he thought, 'Absolutely superfluous, useless, detestable people. They simply fill up space on the earthly globe. What are they for?'⁴⁷ Klimov's xenophobia and aggressive language illustrates his vehement feelings towards his fellow travellers and demonstrates that Klimov feels superior to them. Garnett's 'Influenza' similarly opens with her protagonist, Virginia, on the cusp of falling ill with influenza, noting that she feels 'superior' to another woman at a fish and chip shop.⁴⁸ Virginia mocks the unknown woman because

⁴⁵ K. David Patterson, 'Typhus and its Control in Russia, 1870-1940', *Modern History*, vol. 37 (1993), pp. 361-381 (p. 361).

⁴⁶ Anton Chekhov to Maria Kiseleva (17 March 1887), quoted in Robert Blaisdell 'Dr Anton Chekhov and the Typhus Epidemic (23 April 2020), <<https://russianlife.com/stories/online/dr-anton-chekhov-and-the-typhus-epidemic/>> (date accessed: 01/12/21).

⁴⁷ Anton Chekhov, 'Typhus' in *The Tales of Tchekhov: Volume 4 - The Party and Other Stories*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Chatto and Windus, 1917), pp. 259-269 (pp. 259-260).

⁴⁸ Olive Garnett, 'Influenza – A Reply to 'Typhoid Fever' by Anton Tchekhov', Garnett Family Papers, MS164, F3 'Tales of Women', Box 26, pp. 1-16 (p. 1).

firstly, the woman asks for a 'filleted fish for an invalid', which Virginia believes to be an unnecessary thing to do, and secondly, the woman's glasses fall off when she was trying to get a closer look at the fish available. Virginia's spiteful and childish behaviour is not as derogatory as Klimov's, however her attitude is still unpleasant. Towards the end of the short stories, when Klimov and Virginia are feeling better, their moods lift and they regret their dour moods and objectionable behaviour.⁴⁹

Klimov and Virginia progressively feel more unwell, longing for their servants, Pavel and Phoebe respectively, to arrive and take care of them. Pavel is not travelling on the train with Klimov and Phoebe has been excused for the weekend in order to attend her mother's funeral, a fact that annoys Virginia.⁵⁰ Notably neither of them have a spouse or child(ren) that they yearn for, with Klimov living with his aunt and younger sister, Katya, and Virginia only having Phoebe for company. As their illnesses worsen, Klimov and Virginia desperately long for their beds, feeling unbearably uncomfortable either sitting/lying across their seat on the train (Klimov) or trying to rest on their sofa (Virginia). Both texts have a third person-limited narrator, who in 'Typhus' notes that 'a heavy nightmarish lethargy gradually gained possession of [Klimov] and fettered his limbs',⁵¹ while in 'Influenza', the narrator informs the reader that Virginia feels her 'comfortable bed upstairs was the best and safest place', but she worries that if she goes to bed she will be 'completely cut off from the outside world'.⁵² Again, Garnett's story offers a less extreme version of Chekhov's; Klimov is clearly suffering

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 5., Chekhov, 'Typhus', p. 267.

⁵⁰ Chekhov, 'Typhus', p. 262., Garnett, 'Influenza', p. 2.

⁵¹ Chekhov, 'Typhus', p. 263.

⁵² Garnett, 'Influenza', p. 3

from prostration, one of the symptoms of typhus, whereas Virginia's influenza causes a less paralysing effect.

As the stories progress, Garnett's plot sometimes gets lost and confused among Virginia's musings on family portraits, the 'brevity' that James recommends in 'Lessons of a Master' is conspicuous only in its absence. In fact, Chekhov's short story was about half the length of Garnett's. The similarities between the texts reunite once again on the subject of mental confusion (another symptom of typhus), or the experiencing of hallucinations. Klimov and Virginia both make note of the fact that time seemed to speed up during their illness. Klimov noted that 'the daylight was continually being replaced by dusk'⁵³ and Virginia commented 'a whole afternoon [...] is gone in a flash. I have lost count of time.'⁵⁴ This creates a distorted image of day swiftly turning to night and back again, with the cyclical motion creating a jarring effect for the reader. Within these rapidly ending days, both Klimov and Virginia experience hallucinations. Klimov, upon finally reaching his bed, sees familiar figures such as Pavel, the Finn from the train, the Captain and Lance-Corporal in his regiment and a lady he noted at the station, all crisscrossing his bedroom, crowding him in and making him feel claustrophobic.⁵⁵ This scene is reflected in Virginia's internal monologue about her family portraits, which for some reason Garnett decided to considerably lengthen in her response.⁵⁶ Upon reviving from his hallucination, Klimov is struck by the beauty of a 'quivering sunbeam, bright and keen as the sword's edge'.⁵⁷

Chekhov's slowing of the pace through the brief, but rich, description of a sunbeam reflects

⁵³ Chekhov, 'Typhus', p. 265.

⁵⁴ Garnett, 'Influenza', p. 5.

⁵⁵ Chekhov, 'Typhus', p. 265.

⁵⁶ Garnett, 'Influenza', pp. 6-11.

⁵⁷ Chekhov, 'Typhus', p. 266.

the slowing of time in the short story, symbolising Klimov's slow return to health. Garnett uses light too, however in juxtaposition to Chekhov, Garnett's use of light goes hand in hand with Virginia's hallucination where she

[S]tood as it seemed on a beach, [...] The sun had set: on the sea were long dissolving hints of amethyst, of emerald, of blue and over all a glory and infinite depths in the fender hued sky. And suddenly, while still drinking in this vision of light and air and colours, the marvel happened, - her being came easily and naturally apart into two'.⁵⁸

Virginia has an out-of-body experience, where she feels herself divide while gazing at a sunset at the beach. Garnett creates an evocative image through her use of colour and whilst not as briefly phrased as Chekhov, her composition is never the less beautiful, albeit with quite a surprising ending. Virginia sees her vision as a sign to move forward from her illness as a bolder, kinder and more independent person. Garnett also utilised her own personal experience to inspire Virginia's hallucination. In 1909, the same year she wrote 'Influenza', Garnett suffered from a period of illness where she experienced a 'psychological discovery' where her 'everyday self 'O' separated itself off from [her] other self 'G''.⁵⁹ Here, despite Virginia's hallucination being ethereal, they are, ironically, still based on a form of reality an on one of Garnett's own personal observations.

Garnett's short story finishes quite triumphantly with the return of Phoebe and Virginia's new-found fortitude, however Klimov recovers and wakes up to the news that his sister has died from typhus as a result of caring for him. It is fitting that Chekhov's story ends

⁵⁸ Garnett, 'Influenza', p. 12.

⁵⁹ Garnett, March 1909, *An English Girl in Old Russia 1896-1897*, p. 346.

tragically, reflecting the significant loss of life suffered by the Russians during typhus outbreaks.⁶⁰ Garnett's text is a milder version of Chekhov's short story throughout, a fact that no doubt reflects Garnett's more privileged upbringing and lack of exposure to extreme illness and poverty, bar Edward Garnett's case of typhoid fever. In performing a sustained comparison of Chekhov's 'Typhus' and Garnett's 'Influenza' I have demonstrated that it is valuable to draw Garnett into a conversation where Mansfield has been the key focus, and place Garnett alongside her when considering the influence of with Chekhov's short stories. This also builds on the argument presented in Chapter Four, where Garnett was placed alongside Henry James and Ivan Turgenev as a forgotten figure in the narrative surrounding the intertextual connections between *The Princess Casamassima* and *Virgin Soil*. Garnett's work similarly evidences a significant connection and intertextual relationship between Garnett and more famous writers like Mansfield, James, Chekhov and Turgenev.

The Russian Influence: Nikolai Chernyshevsky

Alongside Stepniak and Chekhov, it is also possible to discern the influence of other Russian writers and/or political activists upon Mansfield and Garnett. For example, through looking at the language and descriptions used by Mansfield in 'A Dill Pickle' (*New Age*) (1894–1938) and 'Tales of a Courtyard' (*Rhythm*)⁶¹ and Garnett's 'The Case of Vetrova' and 'A Russian Girl' (*The Speaker*), as well as in their personal writings, it is possible to discern the likely influence of the Russian revolutionary, Chernyshevsky. One of Chernyshevsky's qualities that would have been particularly appealing to Mansfield and Garnett was his strong

⁶⁰ For further information on typhus outbreaks in Russia between 1870 and 1940 see Patterson.

⁶¹ *Rhythm* ran between 1911 and 1913. It was edited by John Middleton Murray, who was Katherine Mansfield's partner. Mansfield also was an associate editor from June 1912.

support of women's rights. As with Mansfield's and Garnett's fiction, women take a leading role in Chernyshevsky's literary work, and all three authors explore the (in)equality of the sexes in their texts.⁶² His seminal text, *Chto delat'?* (*What is to be Done?*), was written in 1862 and translated into English by Benjamin Ricketson Tucker in 1886.⁶³ Lenin found Chernyshevsky's work to be of particular importance and went on to name his better-known pamphlet 'What is to be Done?' (1902) in recognition of the novel that would later go on to 'suppl[y] the emotional dynamic that went to make the Russian Revolution.'⁶⁴ *What is to be Done?* fictionalises Chernyshevsky's desire for and prediction of a Russian revolution.⁶⁵ Owing to censorship Chernyshevsky had to adopt an allegorical approach to communicate his message to the Russian people. For example, at the beginning of the novel, the female protagonist Vera Pavlovna sings a 'bold and daring French song' – an allusion to *La Marseillaise* – but she changes the words to apply to the situation in Russia, as if she is foreshadowing the revolution: 'We are uneducated but we are working people; we have strong hands. We are uneducated but not stupid, and we long for light.'⁶⁶ This sentiment is reflected in Chernyshevsky's preface to the novel, where he angrily addresses the Russian people:

The author is in no mood [...] because he keeps thinking about the confusion in your head, and about the useless, unnecessary suffering of

⁶² For a discussion of the role of women in Mansfield's short stories see Aihong Ren, 'Women Characters in Katherine Mansfield's Short Stories', *Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 5 (2012), pp. 101-107. Garnett often debated the issue with Stepniak, Kropotkin and Volkhovsky, but still held traditional views on marriage. For an example of a debate on this see: Garnett, Wednesday 28 December 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 140-141.

⁶³ Nikolai G. Tchernuishevsky, *A Vital Question; or, What is to be Done?*, trans. Nathan Haskell Dole and S.S. Skidelsky (New York City (NY): Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1886).

⁶⁴ J. Frank, 'N. G. Chernyshevsky: A Russian Utopia', *Southern Review*, vol. 3 (1967), p. 68.

⁶⁵ Michael Katz and William Wagner, 'Chernyshevsky, *What Is to Be Done?* and the Russian Intelligentsia', in Nikolai Chernyshevsky, *What is to Be Done?* ed. Michael Katz and William Wagner (Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 1-36 (p. 2.).

⁶⁶ Chernyshevsky, *What is to Be Done?*, p. 42.

each and every one of us that results from the absurd muddle in your thoughts. [...] You are so impotent and spiteful, all because of the extraordinary quantity of nonsense between your two ears. [...] You're nasty out of intellectual impotence.⁶⁷

Chernyshevsky was frustrated by the apathetic nature of the Russian people, furious because 'their mental feebleness means they do not rise' up in revolution.⁶⁸ In a similar tirade against New Zealanders, Mansfield wrote to her mother: 'I am ashamed of young New Zealand, but *what is to be done* [italics my own]. All the firm fat framework of their brains must be demolished before they can begin to learn. [...] These people have not learned their alphabet yet.'⁶⁹ The similarities between Chernyshevsky's and Mansfield's words are striking. Mansfield even adopts the title of Chernyshevsky's work, which out of context is hardly noteworthy, but when put with the content it adds an extra dimension.

Both Mansfield and Chernyshevsky condemn a nation's ignorance and call their people unhealthy, lazy, 'fat' brains; brains full of substance but simultaneously are also substance-less. Each extract indicates a desire for urgent change and the language is alarmingly vicious in both, condemning whole populations for being stupid. While there is currently no further supporting evidence, considering Mansfield's predilection for borrowing from other writers, coupled with the fact that her words echo those of Chernyshevsky, it leaves open the possibility that Mansfield may have been aware of the text or might have either heard somebody talking about it, or that she had read it herself. Perhaps while Mansfield stayed at

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 48.

⁶⁸ Chernyshevsky, *What is to be Done?*, p. 10.

⁶⁹ Katherine Mansfield to Vera Beauchamp (April/May 1908), in *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield: 1903-1917*, vol. 1, ed. Vincent O'Sullivan and Margaret Scott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), pp. 44-45 (p. 44).

the German spa, Bad Wörishofen (1909), Floryan Sobieniowski (dates unknown) (whose family lived under Russian rule in Poland) discussed *What is to be Done?* with her.

Sobieniowski, after all, introduced Mansfield to writers 'who were at the forefront of literary developments in Russia.'⁷⁰ The effects of Chernyshevsky's work were already being felt across Europe with Lenin's pamphlet having already been published in Stuttgart. News of the text was also smuggled into Russia via *Iskra* (1900–05), the political underground emigrant newspaper.⁷¹ This suggests that members of the European Intelligentsia staying at Bad Wörishofen, including Sobieniowski, would have been aware of it.

Both Stepniak and Kropotkin read *What is to be Done?* and, given their shared passion and desire for a Russian revolution, they would have undoubtedly discussed the text with Garnett, even if she had not read it herself. Moreover, the text was available in the British Library from 1867, meaning Garnett had very easy access to the text owing to her father's position as Keeper of Printed Books. In Garnett's 'The Case of Vetrova', Evgenia Pavlovna, a journalist and ex-Narodnik,⁷² who has the same patronymic as Chernyshevsky's protagonist, Vera, shares views similar to Chernyshevsky; she says, 'I saw young Russia, with whom is the future, now lying bruised, humiliated, half torpid; vanquished, yet breathing; moving now and again, ominously moaning like some creature in painful sleep.'⁷³ Garnett mimics the language she uses in her letters, within which she also describes St Petersburg's condition as

⁷⁰ Woods, p. 70.

⁷¹ Vladimir Lenin, 'Preface to *What is to be Done?*', in *Lenin's Collected Works, vol. 5., trans. Joe Fineberg and George Hanna* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961), pp. 347-530, <<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1901/witbd/index.htm>> (date accessed: 1/08/2015).

⁷² Evgenia says 'I wore a red blouse and actually did 'go among the people'' - Olive Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova' in *Petersburg Tales* (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1900), pp. 1-70 (p. 27).

⁷³ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 28.

‘torpid’.⁷⁴ In her short story, as in her letters, the Russia Garnett sees in St Petersburg, or ‘Dumb Russia’, is an uninspiring mass, with occasional glimmers of life and potential.⁷⁵ There is no individual drive towards revolution and in describing the populace as a ‘creature’, Garnett simultaneously homogenises the Russian people and animalises them. This automatically positions Garnett, and her narrator Miss Foster, above the inactive Russian people. Furthermore, in a letter to Powell, Garnett describes the Russian people as ‘jellies’, informing him that ‘there is a typical character here [in Russia] which the Russians call ‘*kisse*’ = jelly and the English ‘rag’, meaning ‘a good natured sort of person [...] but who never does anything’.⁷⁶ Garnett goes on to assert that ‘nine out of ten Russians are jellies’, reinforcing the idea that the Russian population were one gelatinous mass rather than individuals. The concept of jelly also is echoed by Mansfield declaring that New Zealanders possess ‘firm fat framework’ for brains, with the juxtaposition of firm and fat mimicking the state of matter of a jelly as somewhere between a liquid and a solid. The liminal state of jelly further exhibits the stasis of the Russian people who were, as we saw in Chapter One, caught between two revolutionary periods.

The notion of stupidity as seen in Mansfield’s letter and Chernyshevsky’s preface is repeated in ‘The Case of Vetrova’ and Garnett’s letters, alongside frustration with the stagnant and static Russian people. Evgenia Pavlovna’s bleak portrayal of Russia’s young generation is in keeping with general impressions of laziness and selfishness seen in ‘Young Russia’ throughout ‘The Case of Vetrova’.⁷⁷ Garnett’s characters are looking for signs of

⁷⁴ Olive Garnett to Richard Garnett (22 January 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia, 1896 – 1897*, pp. 80-83 (p. 81).

⁷⁵ Garnett, ‘The Case of Vetrova’, p. 29.

⁷⁶ Olive Garnett to Alfred Powell (17 February 1897), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 85-90 (p. 85).

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

revolutionary potential but instead are met with apathetic, lethargic attitudes, reflecting Chernyshevsky and Mansfield's frustrations with Russia and New Zealand respectively. Garnett's narrator, Miss Foster, admires and sympathises with Evgenia, suggesting that Garnett utilises her to present her opinion on the Russian population she witnessed between 1896 and 1897. Upon reading 'The Case of Vetrova', Kropotkin informed Garnett that he thought it was 'excellent: true to reality, and a correct rendering of the Russian atmosphere.'⁷⁸ This shows that Garnett's presentation of 'Dumb Russia', the uninspiring mass, is an accurate representation of the Russian population, at least through the eyes of the radicals and intelligentsia, with whom Garnett sympathised.⁷⁹ The notion of stupidity as seen in Mansfield's letter and Chernyshevsky's preface is repeated, along with a frustration with the stagnant and static Russian people. Pavlovna's grievances sympathise with Kropotkin's and Stepniak's views, as documented in Garnett's diary.⁸⁰

Further references can be seen to *What is to be Done?* in Mansfield's short story on the subject of advances in psychology in Russia. 'A Dill Pickle' was first published in October 1917, twenty years after the death of Vetrova, and the reader can see a shift in Russia's national psyche. On the same day 'A Dill Pickle' was published *The Times* declared 'The [Russian] Revolution is one of the most impressive things in the world.'⁸¹ The short story, featured in *New Age*, Alfred Orage's (1873–1934) socialist periodical, and the date of publication is significant because the piece is released one month before the Bolshevik Revolution (using the Gregorian calendar), and seven months after the abdication of Tsar

⁷⁸ Garnett, Saturday 4 February 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 135.

⁷⁹ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 29.

⁸⁰ Garnett, Monday 29 February 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 63-64., Garnett, Thursday 3 March 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 64-65., Garnett, Sunday 23 October 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 126-129.

⁸¹ Anon., 'Russian Army's Share in Allied Efforts', *The Times* (4 October 1917), p. 7.

Nicholas II (15 March 1917). The Petrograd Soviet and Provisional Government were ruling with Dual Authority in Russia and while there were many uprisings, such as the July Days (16–20 July 1917) and the Kornilov affair (27–30 August 1917), there was widespread hope that Russia was heading towards democracy.⁸² It should also be noted that the Eastern Front in the Great War was being forced ever closer towards Petrograd at this time.⁸³ The events of the intervening twenty years, such as the Russian revolutions of 1905 and March 1917 and the subsequent abdication of Tsar Nicholas II, indicate that Garnett's 'half torpid' Russia had changed.⁸⁴

In 'A Dill Pickle', an unnamed man and his ex-lover, Vera meet to exchange travel stories and memories. The unnamed man has been to Russia and describes it as being 'so informal, so impulsive, so free without question' implying that the Revolution had been successful and reflecting the optimistic view in *The Times* that the collapse of autocracy had been immensely beneficial to the Russian people.⁸⁵ The 'Dumb Russia' we see in Garnett's 'The Case of Vetrova' and Chernyshevsky's *What is to be Done?* is transformed in Mansfield's 'A Dill Pickle' and is now portrayed as a liberated and inviting country.

The unnamed protagonist in 'A Dill Pickle' attempts to talk to Vera about why their past relationship was unsuccessful. He states that he studied 'Mind Systems' while he was in Russia and concluded that both he and Vera 'were such egoists, so self-engrossed' and 'not

⁸² Robert Service, *A History of Modern Russia from Nicholas II to Vladimir Putin* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 2005), pp. 32-54. The Imperial Government changed the city's name from St Petersburg to Petrograd in 1914, and it then became Leningrad in 1924. It was not renamed St Petersburg until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

⁸³ Anon., 'M. Kerensky on Anarchy', *The Times* (1 October 1917), p. 7.

⁸⁴ Garnett, 'The Case of Vetrova', p. 28.

⁸⁵ Katherine Mansfield, 'A Dill Pickle', in *Bliss, and Other Stories* (New York City (NY): Alfred Knopf, 1920), pp. 228-238 (p. 234).

peculiar at all'.⁸⁶ Significantly, Chernyshevsky was an advocate of rational egoism which, he believed, could ignite revolutionary fever in the masses. Rational egoism is based on the belief that all humans are motivated by their own self-interest and never knowingly act against their own wishes; however, so long as humanity is aware of this fact, it will be possible for society to progress.

If Mansfield did read or discuss *What is to be Done?*, then Chernyshevsky's development of rational egoism would have become apparent to her through the conceit of two medical students, Lopukhov and Kirsanov. Both students do not want to become practising doctors after they graduate owing to the 'underdeveloped, [...] pitiful state' of medicine in Russia.⁸⁷ Lopukhov and Kirsanov decide to reject their expected path of employment in order to 'prepare for the future' by becoming researchers.⁸⁸ The students make the decision based on self-interest, because they find Russia's lack of medical knowledge embarrassing. In the short term, this means that two new private medical practices will not be established when Lopukhov and Kirsanov graduate, and so fewer people can seek treatment in a given area. Long term, the students' actions will aid the progression of Russian society because their research will benefit Russia as a whole, rather than the comparatively small number of people who would visit a private practice. Chernyshevsky argues that if individuals devote themselves to their own growth and pursue their own paths, like Lopukhov and Kirsanov, life for all Russians would improve.⁸⁹ Thus, the 'Mind System' mentioned in 'A Dill Pickle' could be rational egoism. Lopukhov and Kirsanov's decision not to practise medicine had an

⁸⁶ Mansfield, 'A Dill Pickle', p. 238.

⁸⁷ Chernyshevsky, p. 92.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 313.

immediate negative impact upon potential clients, so it is possible that the couple in 'A Dill Pickle' experienced negative side-effects of practising rational egoism, such as appearing selfish to one another. This would have caused a strain on the relationship and resulted in it ending. If the couple had remained together and fulfilled their own ambitions, the relationship could have been more fruitful, just as Lopukhov and Kirsanov's research will benefit all of Russia.

It is conceivable then, that rational egoism contributed to the Russian revolution. The Russian people began to consider their own futures, and by looking from 'The Case of Vetrova' to 'A Dill Pickle', we can see a shift in the collective attitude from dejected and defeated to impulsive and 'free without question'.⁹⁰ Further, in 'A Dill Pickle' the reader sees Russia's advances in areas of contemporary intrigue, such as psychology.⁹¹ At the turn of the century in Russia, psychology and philosophy remained interdependent disciplines, whereas Western Europe and the United States of America had separated the two and generally considered a more medicalised approach to psychology.⁹² Medical students, like the fictional Lopukhov and Kirsanov, began to focus on developing Russia's medical knowledge. By 1912, Russia started to follow suit, with the Psychoneurological Institute in St Petersburg opening in 1907 and the Moscow Institute of Psychology in 1912.⁹³ Russia's developing interest in psychology is representative of the modernisation of Russia as a whole, moving away from the nation accused of being backward at the end of the Crimean War. The

⁹⁰ Mansfield, 'A Dill Pickle', p. 234.

⁹¹ In 1913 a section on Freud's psychology had been added to the British Association's symposium, the 'Origin of Life' – Anon., 'British Association: Discussion on the Origin of Life', *The Times* (17 September 1913), p. 10.

⁹² Robert Lawson, Jean Graham, Kristin Baker, *A History of Psychology: Globalization, Ideas, and Applications* (New York (NY): Routledge, 2016), p. 399.

⁹³ Psychological Institution Russian Academy of Education, *About* (Moscow, Psychological Institution Russian Academy of Education, 2016) <<http://www.pirao.ru/en/>> (Date accessed: 09/11/2016).

unnamed protagonist in 'A Dill Pickle' benefitted from Russia's psychological advances, which apparently offers an explanation as to why his relationship with Vera ended. This illustrates in microcosm Russia's contribution to western thought via their own modernisation.

The final influence of Chernyshevsky detectable in Garnett's work is in her short story, 'A Russian Girl', which was published in *The Speaker* in January 1905. As a prominent forum for liberal politics it seems apt that *The Speaker* published Garnett's story immediately after the Bloody Sunday (22 January 1905) massacre in front of Tsar Nicholas II's Winter Palace in St Petersburg. Undoubtedly Garnett would have written the piece before Bloody Sunday, given the deadlines and schedules required for the printing of periodical; however, the presentation of 'civilised' and charitable women in 'A Russian Girl' would have greatly increased the sympathies of the reader, particularly given the liberal leaning of the publication towards the Russian people, rather than the Tsar.

The protagonist in Garnett's short story is called Vera Pavlovna, which is the same as the protagonist in *What is to be Done?*. Garnett's Pavlovna is part of the Russian bourgeoisie and uses her privileged position to help the peasants living in her village. Pavlovna and the narrator go into a Foundling house and find that

[F]rom the end of a long pole, hung a wicker basket. Filthy rags suspended from a string protected the face of the sleeping infant within from flies.

'Here's a baby, Vera!' My companion came and looked at it.

‘H’m, well, I’ll bring a piece of muslin. Those rags must be thrown away’,
she pronounced with decision.⁹⁴

The passage illuminates Pavlovna’s character as someone who is altruistic and philanthropic by helping those who are of a lower class. The unsanitary environment and rudimentary insect net do not seem to upset Pavlovna, which suggests she has become desensitised to the poverty around her. Pavlovna donates and distributes excess food, materials and clothes that she no longer needs. Chernyshevky’s Vera Pavlovna is also charitable, giving the profits of her dressmaking business to her workers:

‘You see,’ she [Vera] continued, ‘I have this amount of money left over.
Now, what shall we do with it? I established the workshop so that profits
would go into the hands of the seamstresses themselves for the work
they’ve done. Therefore I’m distributing the money among you.’⁹⁵

The distribution of wealth is a microcosm of an idealistic and egalitarian society, something for which Garnett’s Pavlovna also strives, which can be seen when she requests that each child be allowed to have his or her share in the apples she gives out to the village.⁹⁶ Reading Garnett’s ‘A Russian Girl’ and Chapter 3 of Chernyshevsky’s *What is to be Done?*, which focusses on Vera’s charitable nature, together it is easy to see what E.M. Almedingen meant by feeling like one is ‘walking through once well familiar rooms’. Through reading Garnett and Mansfield’s work via the lens of Chernyshevsky’s *What is to be Done?* the thesis offers a new perspective on some of Mansfield’s familiar work, but also helps to tether Garnett’s work firmly to that of Mansfield’s, via their shared intertextuality with Chernyshevsky.

⁹⁴ Olive Garnett, ‘A Russian Girl’, *The Speaker: A Liberal Review* (28 January 1905), pp. 116-118 (p. 117).

⁹⁵ Chernyshevsky, p. 190.

⁹⁶ Garnett, ‘A Russian Girl’, p. 417

Fin de siècle Fears and Russophobia

While the actions of Garnett's Pavlovna were commendable, Garnett does not always describe Russian characters or cultures favourably, as we have seen throughout Chapters One to Four. A similar tendency is found in some of Mansfield's work too and is reflective of the section of the British public that did not revel in the vogue for Russian culture. Britain accumulated supremacy and wealth through industrialisation and imperialism in the nineteenth century, however these gains were also responsible for the development of confusion and fear in the national consciousness. In 'De Juventute' (1860), William Thackeray commented that 'We are of the time of chivalry [...] we are of the age of steam'⁹⁷ elucidating a specific anxiety in the British psyche, illustrating how Britain was torn between medieval traditions and the desire to progress. This confusion stretched to Russian culture in Britain, which some enjoyed immeasurably, whereas others saw it as a threat to British culture and values. Industrialisation brought with it an influx of crime, disease and poverty while scientists propagated theories of Natural Selection, eugenics and degeneration, all of which contributed to the 'sense of caution, even alarm', running through nineteenth-century Britain.⁹⁸ Further, industrialisation led to improvements in infrastructure, facilitating the movement of people across Europe, heightening the threat of the Other. In 1905, the Aliens Act was passed as the first modern law passed to inhibit immigration into Britain. The Act was amended in 1914 and 1919 to take into consideration the enemies of Britain during the Great War. By labelling immigrants as 'Aliens', the Act dehumanised and othered people

⁹⁷ William Makepeace Thackeray, 'De Juventute', in *Roundabout Papers and Little Travels and Road-Side Sketches* (London: Smith and Elder, 1887), pp. 68-72 (p. 72).

⁹⁸ Colin Matthew, 'Introduction: The United Kingdom and the Victorian Century, 1815-1901', in *The Nineteenth Century of the British Isles 1815-1901*, ed. Colin Matthew (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 1-38 (p. 2).

seeking a new life in Britain.⁹⁹ This, compounded by Russia's pan-Slav expansionist policies, which was an ideology that gained impetus in the mid-nineteenth century and aimed to unify the global Slavic population, an imperial interest in central Asia and an influx of Russian immigrants into Britain from 1880 made Russian people and culture a prime target for British paranoia and prejudice.¹⁰⁰

Themes surrounding these fears in the national psyche can be seen in the work of Mansfield and Garnett. For example, Garnett's portrayal of peasants in 'A Russian Girl' is unpleasant and in keeping with *fin de siècle* themes of fear of immigration, degeneration and threat towards nationhood. In 'Roukoff', Garnett utilises physical signs of illness to demonstrate the corruption of Roukoff, who, as we saw in Chapter Two, extorted the Russian bourgeoisie in St Petersburg and used his son's terminal illness to prey on the sympathies of the public. Likewise, images of diseased bodies, vices or the encroachment of Russia into Britain can be seen throughout Mansfield's work as well in 'Tales of a Courtyard'. Despite the dehumanising language the reader sees in these three texts, the style and tone of Mansfield and Garnett indicate to their audiences that their attitudes towards Russian peasants or immigrants do not sympathise with the prejudiced opinions of some of the British public, which has turned from Russophilic to Russophobic.

Sickness and degeneration are explored in Garnett's 'Roukoff' where they are used as devices to illuminate her dislike of the Russian autocratic regime. By positioning herself as anti-tsarist, Garnett indicates her sympathy towards those fleeing to England from

⁹⁹ David Glover, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora in Fin-de-siècle England: A Cultural History of the 1905 Aliens Act* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2012), p. 4.

¹⁰⁰ Davison, p. 2.

persecution in Russia. Roukoff used to work in the Russian Senate, the highest judicial body in nineteenth-century Russia, and so his deceit throughout the novel becomes an implied critique of the Russian regime. Roukoff is malnourished, unnaturally pale and his lips are the same colour as a corpse. The images of sickness and death pervade the story, serving as a metaphorical device to highlight the depraved nature of Roukoff (or the Russian regime) and the gullibility of the Russian bourgeoisie.

Roukoff is a picture of ill-health; his

[T]hin brown hair was quite gray; he was above the average height, and emaciated; blue veins streaked his wrist and temples. [...] He was frightfully pale. His eyes – blue, and wide open – were covered with film; but his mouth [...] was absolutely hideous [...] the lips were bluish and sometimes turned white.¹⁰¹

He is blind, an ironic metaphorical comment on the 'blindness' of his bourgeoisie victims.

The description of Roukoff is reminiscent of a corpse, with his 'frightfully pale' skin and blue lips; he sounds unnatural and diseased. Roukoff's previous position as a Senator symbolically connects his extortion to the oppressive autocratic regime in pre-revolutionary Russia, and, through the lens of a *fin-de-siècle* reading, his degeneracy serves as a metaphor for the corruption and decadence of Russian rule.

In 'A Russian Girl' Garnett's narrator, Miss Foster, the narrator of 'The Case of Vetrova' and 'Roukoff', describes the peasants as they are seen through the eyes of her bourgeoisie hosts

¹⁰¹ Olive Garnett, 'Roukoff', in *Petersburg Tales* (New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1900), pp. 71-190 (p. 136.).

using atavistic terminology, such as: 'primitive', 'disgusting', 'savages', and 'animals'.¹⁰² The Russian peasants remain unnamed, given that the Russian bourgeoisie would not have endeavoured to learn the peasants' names. This, combined with the derogatory terminology, homogenises and dehumanises the peasants. Furthermore, it is noted that the charitable Vera Pavlovna is 'Parisian clad from head to toe', and her westernised style of dress implies that she is 'civilised' while the peasants, in traditional Russian clothing, are not.¹⁰³ The wealthy bourgeoisie family Miss Foster is staying with spends its time 'chatting in French' and using 'long-handled glasses' to eye the peasants.¹⁰⁴ By presenting the Russian bourgeoisie's Francophilia alongside their eagerness to marvel at the peasants, Garnett mocks the bourgeoisie, except for Vera Pavlovna, owing to her philanthropic nature. The majority of the bourgeoisie have to maintain a 'safe' distance from the peasants, resorting to comical long-handled glasses to view them. The glasses serve to highlight the vulgar curiosity of the bourgeoisie, as if the peasants were an exhibit at a zoo or museum, which further accentuates the ridiculousness of the spectacle. The long handle suggests they are either opera glasses, which contributes to the notion that the peasants are a viewing spectacle, or lorgnettes, the name of which derives from the French *lorgner* meaning 'to take a sidelong look at', giving the impression that the bourgeoisie are sly. The effect this has is two-fold: firstly, it positions Garnett against the bourgeoisie, and therefore on the side of Russian revolutionaries, and secondly it implies that Garnett is disparaging of Britain's attitude towards the Russian common people.

¹⁰² Garnett, 'A Russian Girl', pp. 416-418.

¹⁰³ Garnett, 'A Russian Girl', p. 416.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 417

Mansfield's story, 'Tales of a Courtyard', divided into three sections, contains similar sentiments when addressing Russian immigrants in an undisclosed Eastern European country. While the story is not set in Britain, the attitudes seen are symptomatic of British prejudice against Russian immigrants, meaning that it could be seen as an allegorical representation of British attitudes towards Russians in their midst. In the first section of the triptych, native people call a group of Russians (two men and one woman) 'swine' and note that 'they'd [the Russians] take some killing.'¹⁰⁵ The connection between killing and pigs creates a sinister image of an abattoir. The brutality of Mansfield's words shocks the reader and highlights the attitude of some among the British public. The trio cause particular offense to the native onlookers because they all live together. One woman refers to the situation as 'filthiness', and it is widely assumed the three Russians are practising Free Love.¹⁰⁶ The Russian woman is pregnant and her 'swollen distorted belly' associates her pregnancy with disease and abnormality rather than the celebration of new life and womanhood.¹⁰⁷ 'Tales of a Courtyard' comes off the back of Mansfield's *New Age* period (1910-12), where her writing style became more satirical and sardonic.¹⁰⁸ This, considered alongside Mansfield's intense fascination with Russia and her liberal attitude to sexuality, draws the conclusion that Mansfield's alarming dehumanisation of the Russian immigrants is intentionally shocking in order to draw attention to the unreasonable British attitude towards Russian immigrants.

¹⁰⁵ Katherine Mansfield, 'Tales of a Courtyard', *Rhythm* (August 1912), pp. 99-105 (p. 100).

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ Mansfield, 'Tales of a Courtyard', p. 100.

¹⁰⁸ Carey Snyder, 'Katherine Mansfield and the *New Age* School of Satire', *The Journal of Modern Periodical Studies*, vol. 1.2 (2010), pp. 125-158 (p. 125).

The theme continues in Mansfield's short story, '*Marriage à la Mode*', which was first published in *The Sphere* (1900–64) in 1912. *The Sphere* contained news stories that focussed on Britain and her colonies and after the Great War the fragmentary atmosphere in England and across the British Empire was prevalent.¹⁰⁹ Underneath the surface '*Marriage à la Mode*' encapsulates the fears associated with a disjointed British consciousness, such as concerns relating to national identity. In Chekhovian fashion the tale appears to start in the middle of a scene with a father, William, fretting about what presents to buy his children. William contemplates the toys his boys already have and thinks, 'nowadays they had Russian toys, [...] Serbian toys – toys from God knows where.'¹¹⁰ 'Nowadays' indicates there has been change in the toys his children played with, and indeed toys from across Europe had been making their way into his sons' nursery. The effect of the new toys and his wife Isabel's delight in them results in William feeling 'like a stranger' in his own house.¹¹¹ William's insecurities and displacement are symbolic of the cultural and social fragmentation experienced during and in the aftermath of the Great War. The cataclysmic loss of life dramatically affected British society and while European migrants (or toys) were still coming in to England, the fragments of British society would never be repaired, at least in the same way. The post-war world still threatened to damage British nationality, via the migration of people from Eastern Europe.

* * *

¹⁰⁹ Pamela Dunbar, *Radical Mansfield: Double Discourse in Katherine Mansfield's Short Stories* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), p. xiv.

¹¹⁰ Katherine Mansfield, '*Marriage à la Mode*', *The Garden Party, And Other Stories* (New York City (NY): Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), pp. 151-167 (p. 151).

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

In conclusion, both Olive Garnett and Katherine Mansfield clearly felt a close affinity to Russia, Russian people and Russian culture and this is expressed in their creative and personal writing. Garnett, for example, wrote in her diary: 'I feel more at home with Stepniak and in harmony with him than with anyone I have known',¹¹² while Mansfield stated 'I have found my people at last' when she moved in with a community of mainly Russian émigrés near Fontainebleau in 1922.¹¹³ Through examining external forces such as fluctuating British attitudes towards Russia, from 'Russomania' to Russophobia, the influence of notable Russian figures like Chekhov, Stepniak, Kropotkin and Chernyshevsky and the plentiful translations of Constance Garnett, we have seen in part how Mansfield and Garnett's passion for Russia and subsequent desire to write about Russia evolved. Mansfield and Garnett's short stories allow the reader to gain a greater understanding of British attitudes towards Russia in the early twentieth century. The stories include snapshots from inside Russia and also Russians in Britain. With regards to Chernyshevsky's possible influence on Mansfield, there remains limited evidence, however there is scope for further scholarly work to investigate the links that this chapter highlights. While Garnett did not enjoy the commercial success of Mansfield, either in her lifetime or posthumously, offering Garnett as a comparison to Mansfield serves to bring her forth into the scholarly conversation surrounding Mansfield and in turn allows for a new reading and understanding of Mansfield's interest in Russia.

¹¹² Garnett, Monday 10 July 1893, *Tea and Anarchy!*, pp. 212-215 (p. 215).

¹¹³ Quoted in Woods, p. 13.

Chapter Six

In Russia's Night

This final chapter will examine Olive Garnett's only published novel, *In Russia's Night*, which was accepted by Collins in November 1917 and published on 25 March 1918. *In Russia's Night* is a substantial text at 347 pages and roughly 75,000 words, so regrettably the confines of this thesis mean more substantive critical work on it cannot be undertaken at present, although this leaves open the possibility of future endeavours regarding Garnett's final piece of published work. The five preceding chapters mainly consider Garnett's life between 1892 and 1900, following her progression from a nineteen-year-old young woman to a published author with a significant network of literary and political connections. The period between *Petersburg Tales* (1900) and *In Russia's Night* lasts eighteen years and, from a biographical standpoint, it was a very different but nevertheless rich and interesting time in Garnett's life that is owed the same detailed attention. Garnett's attempts to be accepted for publication again, the death of her father, re-location to Kew, her securing of a salaried job, an increased interest in Women's Suffrage and the Great War all influenced – and inhibited – the writing process of *In Russia's Night*.

The impact of Garnett's belatedness in writing and releasing *In Russia's Night* certainly had a direct impact on the novel's potential. The text is no longer in circulation today so, unless a reader has a specific interest in seeking out a copy of the novel in a private archive or institutional collection, the text remains largely unread. Yet this novel deserves recognition

for the insights it offers into the revolutionary activity that culminated in Bloody Sunday (January 1905), an event that ultimately resulted in the 1905 Russian Revolution and foreshadowed the 1917 Revolutions. Moreover, the temporality of *In Russia's Night* is of interest because, owing to the text's long gestation (with the basic idea for the novel forming in 1897 after Garnett's stay in Russia), the cultural, social and political changes that occurred during its writing period permeate the novel. In particular, this chapter will consider the growth in antisemitism towards Eastern European Jews that spread from Russia and into Britain in the early twentieth century. This chapter establishes the significant moments that occurred in the build-up to Bloody Sunday, moments that Garnett weaves throughout *In Russia's Night*, pegging the text firmly to its historical context. There are few novels, particularly in the English language, about this turbulent and critical moment in Russia's history, a fact that makes the critical neglect of *In Russia's Night's* all the more striking.

As in her previous works, Garnett's *In Russia's Night* draws on people, places and events that were familiar to the author. Accordingly, this chapter highlights key biographical referents in the novel, including Garnett herself, Volkhovsky, Madame Arsénieff and of course Sergei Stepniak, who continues to haunt the pages of Garnett's writing. Some of these referents have been previously identified. Barry C. Johnson has established connections to some of these figures. Moreover, Adeline Tintner, in her essay 'Fiction is the Best Revenge: Portraits of Henry James by Four Women Writers', argues that Garnett presents a version of Henry James in the character of Pavel Vladimirovitch Arabagine. Tintner contends that Garnett uses Arabagine to create a vengeful portrait of James who had not been as forthcoming with literary assistance as Stepniak. Building on Chapter Four's

demonstration of the deep admiration Garnett had for James until her death, I counter Tintner's claim.¹ Instead, I demonstrate that Arabagine reflects growing waves of antisemitism in Russia and Britain and position him in relation to other prominent characters of Jewish descent in the works of Garnett's well-known contemporaries. In so doing, I draw Garnett into a larger conversation concerning the representation of Jewish people in British and Russian literature, identifying *In Russia's Night* as a text that can be considered alongside famous works such as *Oliver Twist* (1837-39) and *The Brothers Karamazov* (1879). Overall then, this chapter centres *In Russia's Night* as a text worthy of reconsideration by literary scholars owing to its encapsulation of the Russia Empire on the brink of total, irreversible change and its engagement with societal concerns and prejudices at the dawn of the twentieth century.

Bloody Sunday: A Historical Overview

In order to set the scene that Garnett uses as the backdrop for her historical novel, it is important to give a brief overview of the events that led to Bloody Sunday and indeed to make note of what Bloody Sunday was in itself. This will contextualise Garnett's novel and provide the reader of this thesis with a general awareness of the environment Garnett was trying to encapsulate. *In Russia's Night* concludes with the dramatic events of Bloody Sunday where hundreds of innocent people were killed during a peaceful march. There were four key areas that provided sources of civil unrest in Russia at the turn of the century, which were: agriculture, labour, the Intelligentsia and nationality.

¹ Adeline Tintner, 'Fiction is the Best Revenge: Portraits of Henry James by Four Women Writers', *Turn-of-the-century Women*, vol. 2 (1985), pp. 42-49.

Since the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861 the question of land ownership had been a difficult one to answer for the imperial government. Once the peasants were freed, they needed their own land to live and farm on. The government attempted to provide this land, known as 'allotment land', through selling land belonging to the nobility to the peasants. The peasants were able to repay the nobility in small instalments, however the peasants were not allowed to sell their land, meaning they were tied into the payments for most of their lives. The more pressing issue was that owing to overpopulation the land itself was too small – the peasants could not grow enough produce to feed themselves and sell, meaning that they could not afford to pay back their loan, let alone buy food and goods required for their families. This resulted in a population of starving, angry peasants who were driven to committing acts of rebellion such as robbing or destroying houses that belonged to the nobility.²

Destitution and famine drove peasants from their homes, often resulting in large groups of them seeking work in Russia's developing towns and cities. Industrialisation was necessary to Russia's advancement and successful government programmes implemented by Finance Minister, Sergei Witte (1849–1915), such as building new railways and exporting more Russian produce, was very successful. However, to pay for the increasing the level of industry in Russia, Witte raised the taxes upon the already over-stretched peasants, resulting in large numbers of peasants moving to large cities looking for work. Cities were becoming overpopulated and appropriate living space in the cities could not be provided

² Richard Pipes, *A Concise History of the Russian Revolution* (New York City (NY): Vintage, 1996), p. 8.

fast enough for the rapidly increasing numbers. The quality of living was abysmal and conditions inside the factories were challenging, with people working long hours while operating dangerous machinery. The concentrated numbers of discontented proletariat resulted in the group becoming more receptive to revolutionary ideas, which they subsequently took back to the countryside when visiting their families. The radicalised proletariat organised illegal strikes and protests relating to the harsh conditions within the factories.

The dissatisfied proletariat were a prime target for the university-educated members of the intelligentsia. We have seen in this thesis how the intelligentsia reacted to the death of Vetrova and the subsequent march in her honour. Less than a decade later the intelligentsia's marches had evolved into the organisation of riots, strikes and the circulation of anti-government petitions and pamphlets. The growing proletariat class in the cities provided the intelligentsia with a larger target audience on their doorstep, meaning they no longer had to travel between remote villages in the countryside hoping to radicalise peasants like the Narodniks did. As mentioned above, the proletariat also already happened to be dissatisfied with their quality of life and so were easier to radicalise.

Threading through the changing dynamics between the intelligentsia, proletariat and peasant classes is the issue of nationality. We have seen how the half-European and half-Asiatic Russian empire struggled partially owing to the diverse range of ethnicities. European Russians were prioritised over Asian and Orthodox Christianity was the dominant religion. To make matters more complex, the nobility spoke French, rather than Russian, furthering the class divide and providing no unity of language. The policies of Russification

and Russianisation, which had been present since the sixteenth century, became more apparent after the Crimean War and civil unrest in the 1860s. People who were ethnically Russian were placed in positions of power and the Russian language and cultural expectations were forced upon communities who did not identify as Russian, such as the Poles, Ukrainians, Lithuanians and Latvians. For example, in 1885 Tsar Alexander III made it illegal for Baltic government officials to use any language except Russian and bilingual schools were introduced across the Baltic region to enforce the learning of Russian over native languages. The oppression of heritage, culture and language resulted in social discontent and radicalisation, causing a reaction along the Russian Empire's border countries, making the Russian Empire more vulnerable.³

The tensions created by the oppression of non-Russian nationalities, starving peasants, radicalised proletariat and active members of the intelligentsia formed the basis for revolution. The social unrest within Russia held enough potential to launch a revolutionary campaign, however the disparate groups needed to be unified in order for a revolution to be coordinated and no catalysing moment caused enough collective outrage among the peasants, proletariat and intelligentsia to do so. In December 1904 six workers from the Putilov Ironworks in St Petersburg were fired for being members of the Assembly of the Russian Factory and Mill Workers of the City of St Petersburg. The Assembly was set up to protect workers' rights and was approved by the Okhrana as a legitimate organisation. There was general outrage at the Ironworks that people could be made redundant for being members of a government-approved group, which resulted in most workers going on strike.

³ Theodore R. Weeks, 'Defining Us and Them: Poles and Russians in the "Western Provinces," 1863-1914', *Slavic Review*, vol. 53.1 (1994), pp. 26-40.

Word spread throughout St Petersburg and multiple strikes in solidarity took place across the city. By the middle of January 1905 there was no electricity in the city.⁴

Members of The Assembly, coordinated by its leader, Father Georgy Gapon (1870–1906), planned to peacefully march to the Winter Palace and present a petition to Tsar Nicholas II asking for improved working conditions. On Sunday 22 January 1905 large groups of workers, including men, women and children, began to process from all quarters of St Petersburg towards the Winter Palace. The Imperial Guard and mounted Cossacks attacked the groups all over the city, killing participants and bystanders. In a move reminiscent of a father turning on his son, the Russian people felt that the Tsar had betrayed them; while Tsar Nicholas II was not to lose his crown for another twelve years, he lost his people when he ordered his troops to shoot and trample them. The reaction across Russia to the events of 22 January were immediate; strikes broke out across major industrial cities and they went hand in hand with naval and military mutinies protesting Russia's poor performance in the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05). Bloody Sunday lit the torch of the revolutionary flame and Russia was plunged into revolution until June 1907.⁵

Nationality: The Jewish Question and *In Russia's Night*

A particular ethnic group who was viciously targeted as part of the policies relating to Russification and Russianisation was the Jewish community. It is worth pausing and offering more detail on Russia's antisemitism because it had a direct impact upon the treatment of

⁴ Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution: 1899-1919* (London: Harvill Press, 1990), pp. 146-142.

⁵ Dominic Lieven, *Nicholas II: Emperor of All The Russians* (London: John Murrar, 1993), pp. 139-140.

Jewish people in Britain. Furthermore, Arabagine, one of the principal characters in *In Russia's Night*, is Jewish and it is possible to see where British antisemitism against Russian Jews in particular has unfortunately influenced Garnett's descriptions of Arabagine. During the Russian annexation of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century, the Russian empire acquired 500,000 Jewish citizens. According to Benjamin Nathans, the Romanovs were unsure how to bring these new subjects within the orbit of state control and to prevent the Jewish people from inflicting their 'allegedly harmful features' on the Russian inhabitants.⁶ The government commissioned studies of Jewish policies abroad and so groups travelled to Western Europe to observe how nations such as France and Austria 'dealt' with their Jewish population. The data collected from these trips, coupled with the adoption of Luigi A. Chiarini's (1789–1832) book *Theorie du Judaïsme* (1830), which advocated converting the Jewish people to Christianity, were utilised by the government to attempt 'to define the Jews' position within the Russian state'⁷ It was concluded by Tsar Nicholas I (1796–1855) and his Minister of State Domains, Pavel Kiselev (1788–1872) that Russia 'should follow the example set by its western neighbours and dismantle Jewish communal autonomy'.⁸ The subsequent persecution of the Jewish people through pogroms and nationalistic policies resulted in vicious oppression of the Jewish people and the rise of antisemitism in Russia. The antisemitism reached new heights in 1881 after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II, despite only one Jew, Hesya Helfman (1855–1882), being part of the *Narodnaya Volya's* executive committee.

⁶ Benjamin Nathans, *Beyond the Pale: The Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia* (Berkeley (CA): University of California Press, 2002), p. 368.

⁷ Jacob Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction: Antisemitism, 1700-1933* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1980), p. 139.

⁸ Nathans, *Beyond the Pale*, p. 368.

The May Laws (1881) were introduced as a reactionary policy by Tsar Alexander III only two months after his father was assassinated. The May Laws forbade Jewish people from living in many areas of Russia and consequently forced them into ghettos, or 'Pale Settlements', in western Russian cities.⁹ Garnett mentions the banishment of the Jewish population in passing in *In Russia's Night*, referring to a Jewish family who 'had suddenly been ordered to leave Petersburg or change their faith.'¹⁰ Despite this ostracisation, 'the territory between the Black and Baltic seas [...] remained home to the largest Jewish population in the world.'¹¹ Further economic, social and legal sanctions were placed upon the five million Jews in Russia, resulting in, according to *The Times*, the Jews being degraded 'below the level of human creatures.'¹² Abraham Ascher, posited that 'at bottom, the hostility toward the Jews derived from the belief that they were marked by innate vices that made their full assimilation into Russian society impossible.'¹³ Newspaper reports from 1903 corroborate and explain Ascher's argument, for example a special correspondent for *The Times* stated that

[W]hich cannot be made Russian is anti-Russian. In the midst of this vast imperial organism, there subsists one race of which neither the assimilation nor the elimination seems possible. [...] the Jew can never really be at home. His race, his religion, his customs are alike unique and indestructible.¹⁴

⁹ Anon., 'The New Tsar and the Jews' *The Times* (6 June 1895), p. 14

¹⁰ Olive Garnett, *In Russia's Night* (London: Collins, 1918), p. 306.

¹¹ Nathaniel Deutsch, *The Jewish Dark Continent: Life and Death in the Pale Settlements* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 2011), p1.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Abraham Ascher, *The Revolution of 1905: Russia in Disarray* (Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press, 1988), pp. 42-43.

¹⁴ Anon., 'The painful accounts we have published', *The Times* (25 September 1903), p. 7.

In the wake of the imperialistic and autocratic policy of Russification, Russia's population of 5.2 million Jews (compared to a total of 3.5 million Jews in Western Europe) were viewed as a threat to the creation of a homogenous and unified Russia.¹⁵ By default this incompatibility with empire automatically results in the Jewish people being perceived as dangerous, purely owing to their otherness. The othering of the Jewish population resulted in an 'Us versus Them' mentality, which was seen throughout many European countries and became labelled the 'Jewish question'. The 'Jewish question' became a central discussion in the Russian *fin de siècle* landscape, in particular with regards to the discourse surrounding societal change.¹⁶ European liberalism was closely associated with the rise of Jewish political consciousness through Zionism and widespread support for the policy stemming from Leo Pinkser's famous pamphlet; the 'Auto-emancipation' of the Jews.¹⁷ In late October 1905, before the signing of the October Manifesto, Tsar Nicholas II asserted 'nine-tenths of the revolutionaries are Jews',¹⁸ with Vyacheslav Plehve (1846 – 1904), Nicholas II's hated Minister of the Interior, placing the number at a slightly lower, but still significant, 40%.¹⁹ Interestingly, the leader of the proletariat who marched peacefully to the Winter Palace to deliver a petition to Nicholas II, Father Gapon, did not admit Jews to join the march on religious grounds.²⁰ However, this fact was ignored and Nicholas II went on to accept the insignia, and therefore the legitimising in the eyes of the Crown, of The Union of Russian

¹⁵ Inna Shtakser, *The Making of Jewish Revolutionaries in the Pale of the Settlement: Community and Identity in the Russian Revolution and its Immediate Aftermath, 1905-1907* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), pp. 3-4.

¹⁶ Nathans, *Beyond the Pale*, p. 3., Elena M. Katz, *Neither With Them Nor Without Them: The Russian Writer and the Jew in the Age of Realism* (Syracuse (NY): Syracuse University Press, 2008), p. 197.

¹⁷ Jonathan Frankel, *Crisis, Revolution, and Russian Jews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 58.

¹⁸ Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution, 1899-1919* (London: Harvill Press, 1995), p. 46.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

People (*Soiuz Russkogo Naroda*) in December 1905, which was a monarchist organisation that promoted the restoration of autocracy and also the persecution of the Jews.²¹

The Russian Jews were often viewed unfavourably in the British press too with one special correspondent noting that officials in St Petersburg reported the revolution was 'dominated by Jews.'²² These Jews were, in the opinion of the journalist, 'horrid creatures doing horrid deeds [...]; those maimed, crushed and vengeful souls.'²³ Despite the clear antisemitism in the report, the writer does concede that the Jewish people have certain *desiderata*, including 'intellectual enlightenment, moral impulse, spiritual impulse and a high aim', which the 'men of Terror' were able to exploit and harness, owing to the persecution of the Jews driving the Jewish people into the open arms of the seemingly more humanitarian revolutionaries.²⁴ Eric Haberer disagrees with the view that the Jewish people were exploited by the revolutionaries, but rather that younger Jewish people flocked to groups such as *Narodnaya Volya* because it allowed them to be more active in an urban environment, albeit an underground one.²⁵

Antisemitism was a common feature of Russian literature at the beginning of the twentieth century. Several of the novels and short stories that Constance Garnett translated feature Anti-Semitic language and descriptions. One of Constance Garnett's earliest translations was Turgenev's short story, 'The Jew' (pubd. 1846; trans. 1899).²⁶ Girshel, Turgenev's Gogolian,

²¹ Ibid., p. 46.

²² Anon., 'Russia Revisited', *The Times* (8 November 1905), p. 5.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Eric Haberer, *Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-century Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 173.

²⁶ Garnett mentions reading Turgenev throughout her diary and her closest note relating to reading Turgenev after Constance Garnett's translation is published is 5 September 1900, *The Diaries and Letters of Olive*

stereotypical Jewish male, is described as ‘a thinnish, red-haired, little man, marked with smallpox, he blinked incessantly with his diminutive little eyes, which were reddish too; he had a long crooked nose.’²⁷ Girshel is at a Russian military encampment near Danzig – the story is set in 1813, during the War of the Sixth Coalition at the Siege of Danzig – to spy on the Russians. This illustrates, in microcosm, the perceived threat the Jewish community posed to the Russian empire as a corrupt and untrustworthy Russian traitor. Turgenev’s description of Girshel is archetypal; he is portrayed as degenerative, unhealthy and displays clichéd physical Jewish traits. In an era where interest in criminal anthropology and eugenics was increasing owing to Darwinism and the work of criminologists like Cesare Lombroso (1835–1909), fears of a cultural crisis and the rapid deterioration of empire, Turgenev’s presentation of Girshel would have been viewed through this lens.²⁸ In Garnett’s circle, George Bernard Shaw was openly pro-eugenics so undoubtedly, she would have been aware of the growing momentum of the social philosophy.²⁹

Constance Garnett’s first Dostoevsky translation, *The Brothers Karamazov* (pubd. 1880; trans. 1912), also contains Anti-Semitic discourse. For example, in an exchange between the mentally ill Lise Khokhlakov and her partner, the almost angelic Aloysha Karamazov, the following occurs:

‘Aloysha, is it true that at Easter the Jews steal a child and kill it?’

Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in England 1897-1958, ed. Barry C. Johnson (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019), p. 181. Of course, this does not mean that she did not read Turgenev sooner than the diary entry suggests!

²⁷ Ivan Turgenev, *The Jew and Other Stories*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Heinemann, 1899), p. 3.

²⁸ For further scholarship see: Paul Knepper, ‘British Jews and the Racialisation of Crime in the Age of Empire’, *The British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 41.1 (2007), pp. 61-79., H.P. Söder, ‘Disease and Health As Contexts of Modernity: Max Nordau As Critic of *Fin de Siècle* Modernism’, *German Studies Review*, vol. 14.3 (1991), pp. 473-487.

²⁹ Richard Barnett, ‘Eugenics’, *The Lancet*, vol. 363 (2004), p. 1742.

‘I don’t know.’

“There is a book here in which I read about the trial of a Jew, who took a child of four years old and cut off the fingers from both hands, and then crucified him on the wall. [...] he said that the child died soon, within four hours. That was ‘soon’! He said the child moaned, kept on moaning and he stood admiring it.’³⁰

Lise’s account of the sadistic murder relates to a presumed case of blood libel. Indeed, Dostoevsky may have been inspired by the only Russian Orthodox child-saint, Gavriil Belostoksky (1684–1690), or Gabriel of Belostock, who was allegedly kidnapped, tortured and killed by Jews when he was six years old. The news of his death galvanised a cult-like response from the Russian Orthodox population and Gavriil was canonised in 1820.³¹

Matthew Goldish notes that ‘In the period from the twelfth to the twentieth centuries, Jews were regularly charged with blood libel or ritual murder— that Jews kidnapped and murdered the children of Christians as part of a Jewish religious ritual.’³² The supposed crimes usually coincided with Christian religious festivals, such as Easter, and were used as impetus and justification for many Jewish pogroms in Russia. For example, the 1903 Kishinev pogrom was instigated by such a case.

In Lise’s retelling, the murder is a gross perversion of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ in which the nameless Jew as a monster: subhuman, evil and mentally unstable. The innocence of the

³⁰ Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, trans. Constance Garnett (New York City (NY), The Lowell Press, 1912), pp. 755-756.

³¹ Anon., ‘Childmartyr Gabriel of Bialystock’, *Archives of the Orthodox Church of America*, <<http://oca.org/saints/lives/2015/04/20/101158-childmartyr-gabriel-of-bialystok>> (date accessed: 30/02/2015)., Senate (US) Committee of Foreign Relations, *Annual Report of International Religious Freedoms, 2004* (Washington (DC), 2004), p. 289

³² Mathew Goldish, *Jewish Questions: Responsa on Sephardic Life in the Early Modern Period* (Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 2008), p. 8.

child, symbolic of Jesus's own purity, exposed by contrast to the monstrous Jew, not only serves to further exacerbate the depravity of the Jews in the eyes of Anti-Semitic Russians, but also reminds the reader of the notion of Jewish deicide, according to which the people of Judea took responsibility for Jesus' death, and said their descendants would also carry the blame. Matthew 27: 24-25 reads, 'When Pilate saw that he was getting nowhere, but that instead an uproar was starting, he took water and washed his hands in front of the crowd. 'I am innocent of this man's blood,' he said. 'It is your responsibility!' All the people answered, 'His blood is on us and on our children!'³³ Here, Dostoevsky, like Turgenev, uses the Jews as a foil to promote the Christian Orthodox agenda and ideals. Arguably, he also illustrates the potential threat the Jews hold, if one were to substitute Jesus for the Russian empire.

Within the newly translated works of Turgenev and Dostoevsky the British reading public would have seen echoes of archetypal antisemitism familiar in literary works from Shakespeare's Shylock and Dickens' Fagin. However, antisemitism in British literature began to become more sinister in correlation with an increasing number of Russian Jews in Britain, alongside more aggressive Anti-Semitic domestic policies. In 1905 the Aliens Act was implemented as the first modern law in Britain to inhibit immigration into Britain. Although the Aliens Act was not directed at a specific ethnic group, by the 1880s the term 'alien' had become synonymous with 'Jew' as the ethnically disgraced pariah who had been forced out of Eastern Europe.³⁴ The change in British attitude towards Jewish people filtered into literature. For example in 'Imaginary Letters IX' by Wyndham Lewis (1882–1957) Jewish

³³ Mathew 27: 24-25, New International Version

³⁴ David Glover, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora in Fin-de-siècle England: A Cultural History of the 1905 Aliens Act* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p.4.

people are portrayed as dangerous radicals in a scene that reflects Tsar Nicholas II's paranoia that the Jews were responsible for the revolutionary movement in Russia: 'The Revolution is here [... .] All the Jews are mobilised. They march about in huge tribes with banners.'³⁵ By hyperbolising the involvement of the Jewish community in the 1917 Russian Revolution, Lewis contributes to the misconception of the number of Jewish people present in the revolutionary movement. Lewis' use of 'tribe' also creates an image of a barbaric, pre-historic, threatening mob, further adding to the image of Jews being atavistic, as seen in Gogol's Yankel, Turgenev's Girshel and Dickens' Fagin. The juxtaposition of successful, prolific Jews in Britain, versus the poverty-stricken, uneducated, immigrant Russian Jews results in a heteroglossic effect with regards to discourse surrounding 'the Jew' in Britain. Bryan Cheyette posits that within English literary discourse there is a doubling of Jewish characters owing to what Cheyette dubs the conflict between 'race' and 'culture', where Jewish people are presented as characters who are incredibly civilised, but concurrently 'an unchanging Semitic 'other''.³⁶

The prominent Jewish character *In Russia's Night* is Arabagine, and Garnett's portrayal of him adheres to Cheyette's doubling model. Physiologically Arabagine fits the Jewish stereotype as he is described as 'a man of medium size, and spare figure, with a dark wig, twisted face, and a humorous expression.'³⁷ Here Arabagine has the slender frame of Girshel and the 'distorted' face of Fagin.³⁸ Although it is never revealed, it is possible that Arabagine's wears a dark wig in order to hide distinctive red hair, in a similar way that

³⁵ Wyndham Lewis, 'Imaginary Letters IX', *The Little Review*, vol. 4 (1918), p. 51.

³⁶ Bryan Cheyette, *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society Racial Representations, 1875–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 9-13.

³⁷ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 96.

³⁸ Charles Dickens, *Oliver Twist* (Ware: Wordsworth Classics: 2000), p. 308

Yankel, Gogol's Jewish archetype in *Taras Bulba* (1835), hides his hair colour by blackening his moustache and eyebrows and places a cap upon his head.³⁹ Indeed, in *In Russia's Night*, Arabagine gives the protagonist, Katia a copy of *Taras Bulba*, which strongly suggests that Garnett would have been aware of the text, potentially having read the 1915 translation by Isabel F. Hapgood (Constance Garnett's did not appear until the 1920s).⁴⁰ Arabagine's primary profession is an art dealer, so he may have attempted to disguise his Jewish roots. In 1881 a special correspondent noted that to the Russians, a Jew 'offends their sensibilities; and what is worse, he competes with them in trade in such a manner as to have them at his mercy.'⁴¹ While the heavy sarcasm in the text is partly a snide dig at the Russians, it also highlights how merchants dislike and are suspicious of their Jewish peers, supporting the theory that Arabagine wore a dark wig because he was aware of the Anti-Semitic tendencies of his fellow merchants and did not wish to dissuade them from trading with him. Arabagine's profession meant that he was extremely knowledgeable about art, often taking Katia around galleries and talking in detail about 'the barbarian element' in classic 'Muscovite' pieces.⁴² By labelling works by Russian masters such as Ivan Kramskoy, Ilya Repin and Vasily Surikov as 'barbaric', Garnett firstly others Arabagine by disassociating him with notable Russian figures, but also ensures that he is not labelled as 'barbaric' or uncivilised himself. Therefore, Arabagine's doubleness is seen on the one hand in his stereotypical racial characteristics and on the other with within the cultural discourse surrounding his profession and pastimes.

³⁹ Nikolai Gogol, *Taras Bulba: A Tale of the Cossacks*, trans. Isabel F. Hapgood (New York City (NY): Alfred Knopf, 1915), p. 256.

⁴⁰ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 107.

⁴¹ Anon., 'The treatment to which the Jews in Russia have been subjected to', *The Times* (30 June 1881), p. 9.

⁴² Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 141.

Despite the fact that Arabagine does not seem to offend Katia and her friends, he is certainly viewed unfavourably by Katia's mother-in-law, Madame Annenkov, who refers to Arabagine as 'an Armenian Jew [...] not even reputable.'⁴³ Arabagine is viewed as an especially distasteful character to Madame Annenkov because not only is he Jewish, he is also not Russian, which to her makes him immediately inferior. When Katia and her husband Dmitri, Madame Annenkov's precious only child, are invited to live with Arabagine, Madame Annenkov is horrified and goes on to investigate Arabagine – illustrating her determination to discredit him – and confides in Katia that Arabagine has 'queer morals.'⁴⁴ Katia herself was aware of Arabagine's 'rather oriental ideas about women.'⁴⁵ While Arabagine's behavior is never explicitly explained in the novel, it is widely assumed that he is promiscuous, with his penchant for treating women in an 'oriental' fashion making him 'uncivilised' for not conforming to monogamous relationships. In this instance, Madame Annenkov's superficial nature and determination to keep up appearances are the primary reasons for her distaste, rather than her suspicions of genuine revolutionary activity. However, Madame Annenkov's attitude is representative of the wider opinion of the nobility that Jews are not to be trusted.

In a letter Katia receives from Arabagine, while she and Dmitri are spending the summer in Florence, Arabagine writes, 'Russia is to the future what the British Isles and Gaul were to the world when Caesar invaded them - a tremendous part of the globe to be civilised.'⁴⁶

Here it is clear that Arabagine finds the Russian empire backward. The Romans gave Britain

⁴³ Ibid., p. 104.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 127.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 217.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 166.

basic infrastructure such as roads and aqueducts, aiding the unification of the country through making communication easier. In Arabagine's letter he is lamenting the lack of cohesion – the absence of symbolic connecting roads – within the empire, both geographically and on a human level as well. If 'the future' can be inferred to mean 'the revolutionaries' then Arabagine's letter would have raised the suspicions of Russia's secret police, although Arabagine never actively became involved in the revolutionary movement and died before the events of Bloody Sunday 1905.

In light of this, Arabagine does not represent a Jewish threat to autocracy in *In Russia's Night*, and although this does not disprove Nicholas II's assertion that nine-tenths of the revolutionaries were Jews, it does show that Garnett intentionally excluded Arabagine from the revolutionary activity surrounding him, when she could have portrayed him as a radicalised Jew. Interestingly this exclusion may have been inspired by Garnett's personal life; Fanny Stepniak, who was Jewish, committed no acts of political terrorism, while her husband did.⁴⁷ Arabagine's character exists to enable and enrich Katia's and to encapsulate Russia's innate antisemitism and Garnett's awareness of it.

Garnett's Belatedness: Writing, Women and War

Alongside historical events taking part on the world stage, events closer to home also informed and shaped the writing and publishing of *In Russia's Night*. When *In Russia's Night* was published was advertised throughout 1918 in *The Times*, the *Times Literary Supplement*,

⁴⁷ Garnett, Friday 21 October 1893, *Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett's Press, 1989), p. 126

the *Illustrated London News*, *The Manchester Guardian* and *Punch*. The consistent featuring of *In Russia's Night* in both national and local newspapers suggests that the book was received with great interest and promise in a Great Britain that was still reeling in the aftermath of the February and October revolutions in Russia the previous year. However, contemporary developments in the Great War meant that the novel was out of alignment with the British public's mood. The 'Russomania' that reigned when *Petersburg Tales* was published eighteen years previously had now soured, particularly after the new Russian Bolshevik government's signing of a peace treaty (Brest-Litovsk) with Germany on 3 March 1918, twenty-two days before the publication of *In Russia's Night*. Additionally, three days before publication on 21 March 1918, the Germans began their Spring Offensive, with their army boosted by thousands of German divisions freed by Russia's withdrawal. Approximately 7,500 British soldiers died on the first day of the offensive and news of the various battles occupied much available print space and been of primary concern for the British public.

The *Times Literary Supplement's* claimed 'at the moment the story seems as far off as if it were dated in the reign of Peter the Great'.⁴⁸ In light of the 1917 revolutions and the Great War it is easy to side-line a novel centred on alternative, dated events. Considering the immediacy of earlier Garnett's writing, particularly 'The Case of Vetrova' and 'The Secret of the Universe', it is odd that Garnett decided to focus on 1905 rather than the epoch-defining, Empire-breaking revolutions of 1917 in *In Russia's Night*. It is not definitively known why Garnett chose to write about 1905, rather than 1917. Yet, as we will see, her

⁴⁸ Ibid.

diaries suggest that this decision may have resulted from a range of factors, including: her tendency to self-criticism and repeated re-editing of her work; the devotion of time to writing other things; and other distractions such as the Great War, her new job at Kew Gardens and her burgeoning interest in the Women's Suffrage movement, and/or a simple, but frustrating case of writer's block with her 'Russian novel'.⁴⁹ With regards to Garnett's extensive and rigorous self-editing, certainly in the original manuscripts of her early diaries (1890-1895) there are revisions, signs of pages being torn out and, in several cases, evidence of the destruction of several volumes.⁵⁰ This continued into the new century with Garnett spending the 26 and 27 of June 1910 reading, 'destroying' and 'tearing up' her diaries.⁵¹ Barry C. Johnson commented that the original manuscript 'brings out so starkly and so touchingly [...] the dilemma of the young writer striving to write well what she wants to write'.⁵² Garnett's insecurities involving her diary, writing that she knew no one see (presuming she had no intention of ever publishing her diaries), suggests she should have been even more critical about her fictional work, resulting in a delay in her creative response to the Russian revolution of 1905.

Garnett may have also struggled to write about Russia during the revolutionary period of flux and uncertainty. The collapse of Empire and rapidly evolving events would have been difficult to follow and accurately reflect artistically. According to N.A. Berdyaev (1874–1948), a Russian philosopher who fell out with the Bolsheviks owing to their totalitarianism, the 1917 revolutions negated 'the state, culture, native land, normative morals, science and

⁴⁹ Olive Garnett, Friday 12 August 1910, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 352.

⁵⁰ Olive Garnett, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 21.

⁵¹ Garnett, Sunday 26 and Monday 27 June 1910, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 352.

⁵² Garnett, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 19.

art' in Russia, arguing that the Russian revolution had caused a cultural drought and an unstable identity.⁵³ As seen in her diaries and this thesis, Garnett's principal focus as a writer was character and culture, and it was of paramount importance to her to propagate an accurate account of places and events. Therefore, Garnett may have found 1917 difficult to write about while the environment was still so unbalanced for fear of writing a text that was not factually sound. Garnett's early work supports this idea, with short stories like 'The Case of Vetrova' being an immediate response, but still written once the status quo had resumed. Moreover, Garnett was profoundly aware of Stepniak's and Kropotkin's historic exasperation with the British press for disseminating incorrect information and their complaints 'that very few English papers inserted the particulars', such as details of the famines, disease and abhorrent living conditions that blighted the lives of ordinary Russian people.⁵⁴ In fact Garnett shared the same view of the British press and their reportage of the March revolution in 1917, commenting, 'English Press unsatisfactory about Russian matters' in her diary.⁵⁵ Garnett would have wanted to create a novel of which both Stepniak and Kropotkin approved and one that was accurate. We know from Garnett's diaries that she started writing creatively again in April 1905, three months after the events of Bloody Sunday and three days after she had a discussion with her friend, the Polish philosopher Wincenty Lutoslawski (1863–1954) about the situation in Russia.⁵⁶ Reflecting on the meeting Garnett wrote, 'Nicholas I of Russia was a powerful autocrat *because* he believed in his power and its right; Nicholas II is losing his crown because he no longer

⁵³ N.A. Berdyaev, 'The Spirit of the Russian Revolution' (1918), <http://www.berdyaev.com/berdiaev/berd_lib/1918_299.html> (date accessed: 15/03/2015)

⁵⁴ Garnett, Thursday 3 March 1892, *Tea and Anarchy!*, p. 65

⁵⁵ Garnett, Saturday 17 March 1917, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 373.

⁵⁶ Garnett, Monday 10 April 1905, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 292., Garnett, Friday 7 April 1905, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 292.

believes in the divinity of kings – the autocratic idea.⁵⁷ This clearly demonstrates that the situation in Russia was occupying Garnett's mind and so the literary work she began three days later could have been the origins of *In Russia's Night*.

Despite these promising signs that Garnett may have been about to produce an immediate literary response to Bloody Sunday, the following January no such manuscript had appeared and Garnett, in setting up some resolutions for the new year, wrote the following:

[I]t will be good to be alone with my books and my thoughts; and deaf to the 'noise of life' [...] How good, alone with paper and ink to express *one's self*; [...] How good to be detached when one is weary of the effort to lose consciousness in others [...] to make the dream of that novel a reality, the reality and every other sign and sound a dream, how very good. [...] I should like to put more interest into this (for a time) than into the affairs of other people. I have intoxicated myself long enough at other's springs; now I want to explore my own...⁵⁸

Garnett vows to herself to spend more time writing for pleasure and specifically to 'express *one's self*' (italics Garnett's own), rather than being intoxicated 'at other's springs', which is presumably referring to taking guidance, instruction and/or inspiration from Stepniak, James and also her brother, Edward Garnett. She seems determined to write '*that novel*' (italics my own), which was to become *In Russia's Night*. Disappointingly however, this was not to be the case, although there was certainly some work in progress; in May 1906 Garnett claimed she had 'inspiration for sequel to Russian novel!', which would later be

⁵⁷ Garnett, Friday 7 April 1905, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 292.

⁵⁸ Garnett, Tuesday 9 January 1906, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 311.

titled *A Piece of Our Crazy Work*.⁵⁹ The sequel was not finished until 24 November 1918 and was rejected by Collins because, rather than continuing to depict the revolutionary events in Russia, it followed Katia – the protagonist of *In Russia's Night* – to London.⁶⁰ The emergence of an idea for a sequel strongly suggests that the original text had been completed, or at least that Garnett had a very clear idea of the plot. However, no new novel was offered to publishers during 1906, although Garnett's promise to herself to write more did result in an increase in the number of short stories she was writing. Garnett wrote around 40 short stories between 1900 and 1918, which somewhat distracted her from 'that novel', allowing her to procrastinate or focus on other work during periods of writer's block.⁶¹ Garnett did try to get some short stories published beyond her *Petersburg Tales* collection and had some success as we have seen with *The Speaker* taking 'A Russian Girl' in 1905, but also with *Ford's English Review* (1908–37) publishing 'A Certainty' in April 1909, for which Garnett was paid five pounds, and *Country Life* (1897–Present) printed 'A New Regime' in June 1909, which paid her a comparatively meagre two pounds, 18 shillings and six pence.⁶² However, Garnett did have to increase her resilience to rejection because in May 1906, *The Tribune* (1906–08) rejected 'Midsummer Eve' for being 'too juvenile',⁶³ in November 1907 *The Cornhill Magazine* (1860–1975) sent back 'Glass',⁶⁴ in 1908 Curtis Brown (the literary agency) declined 'Bertha' in February⁶⁵ and *The Fortnightly* (1865–1954) returned 'The Goal'

⁵⁹ Garnett, Monday 28 May 1906, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 323.

⁶⁰ At the end of *In Russia's Night*, Katia says 'I am thinking of returning to England' and *Our Crazy Work* picks up Katia's story once she has returned to London.

⁶¹ Garnett never explicitly says she has writer's block or complains that she is struggling to write the novel, however the fact it took her 12 years to write suggests she ran into difficulty at times!

⁶² Garnett, Wednesday 21 April 1909, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 346., Garnett, Saturday 12 June 1909, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 346., Garnett, Sunday 13 June 1909, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 346.

⁶³ Garnett, Saturday 26 May 1906, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 311

⁶⁴ Garnett, Wednesday 6 November 1907, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 338.

⁶⁵ Garnett, Wednesday 5 February 1908, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 340

in November,⁶⁶ while *The Englishwoman* (1909–21) rejected 'Jumbo' in November 1912⁶⁷ and a group of literary sketches were disregarded by *Everyman* (1912–16, 1929–1935) in March 1918.⁶⁸ Garnett's prodigious literary output at this time, boosted by a few successes, distracted her from crafting her Russian novel.

As well as concentrating on her short stories, the death of Garnett's dearly loved 'Papa', Richard Garnett, on Good Friday 1906, significantly disrupted Garnett's life. Grief at her father's death was compounded by the need to organise his funeral and estate. This event also left the author homeless.⁶⁹ At the age of 35, Garnett was the only remaining child left living at her parental home and she still received an allowance from her father until he died. After Richard Garnett died, Garnett needed to find somewhere to live and a way to earn money. This resulted in her moving to Kew with her younger brother, Arthur Garnett, with whom she lived amicably for nine years. Garnett's pace of life at Kew was certainly different to life at Tanza Road, where she had lived with her father; she no longer had servants to cook and clean for her and this greatly reduced Garnett's leisure time. Garnett also had to get a job and in 1907 she secured a role in the Herbarium at The Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew, writing up index slips for the *Index Kewensis*, an index of all seeded plants.⁷⁰ Garnett only worked for three hours a day, however this on top of newly acquired domestic duties would have certainly been a substantial change of circumstances. Not only did her house- and employed work distract her from her writing, but it also made Garnett seriously

⁶⁶ Garnett, Sunday 26 May 1918, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 342.

⁶⁷ Garnett, Saturday 2 November 1912, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 360

⁶⁸ Garnett, Monday 26 March 1917, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p.376.

⁶⁹ Garnett, Friday 13 April 1906, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 318., Garnett, Tuesday 17 April 1906, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 319.

⁷⁰ Garnett, February 1907, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 331.

consider Women's Suffrage. She began to attend meetings, marches, to distribute pamphlets and to regularly socialise at various events organised by the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, which included meeting Millicent Fawcett (1847–1929), notable suffragist, politician and writer, in March 1912.⁷¹

In August 1910, Garnett again committed to making a 'fresh start on Russian novel', and trips abroad to Rome in March 1913 and Bruges exactly a year later both remind her of her stay in Russia. Rome's 'great open cobbled spaces' were reminiscent of St Petersburg's and a chateau owned by a friend's aunt outside of Bruges brought back memories of Pokrovka (the Arsénieffs's summer residence), which would end up being replicated in *In Russia's Night's* opening scene. However, by October 1915 she still had not finished the novel and wrote 'talking about Russia bad for me [sic]' in her diary, with the shadow of the unfinished text weighing on her mind.⁷² By this point of course, the Great War had started, providing an understandable distraction from creative leisure time. Garnett's diary contains brief entries about the progress of the war and the atmosphere in London, which she describes as 'gloomy, rumours of spies and soldiers' on 7 August 1914.⁷³ In February 1915 Garnett expresses her own opinion of wars, commenting, 'War may be an evil but I feel it often to be *necessary*', although whether she still felt the same three months later after the 'first zeppelin raid over London districts' marked the beginning of the first 'total war', where civilians were in danger as well as soldiers.⁷⁴ Anxieties about the war and factual details

⁷¹ Garnett, Wednesday 6 March 1912, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 359.

⁷² Garnett, Friday 12 August 1910, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 352., Garnett, Tuesday 26 October 1915, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 373.

⁷³ Garnett, Friday 7 August 1914, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 368.

⁷⁴ Garnett, Monday 1 Feb 1915, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 368., Garnett, Monday 31 May 1915, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 370.

continued in the diary, distracting Garnett from setting down to write. The crucial turning point in Garnett's productivity in relation to completing *In Russia's Night* was at the end of 1916 when she 'dreamt of S. Stepniak', which she describes as 'lovely'.⁷⁵ While Garnett does not explicitly state in her diaries that this was the catalyst for completing the novel, two and a half months later, *In Russia's Night* was finished, strongly suggesting the apparition of Stepniak had, as per normal, an influence upon Garnett's writing.

In Russia's Night was accepted for publication by Collins eight months after completion and published four months later, thirteen years after the Bloody Sunday massacre. Garnett's reviewers were quick to notice the odd temporality of the novel, with the reviewer for *Punch* commenting, 'It is not Olive Garnett's fault that these events reviewed in the light of to-day seem very mild and insignificant.'⁷⁶ While 1905 was undoubtedly politically significant, the reviewer's claim of Garnett's belated news rings true. Perhaps the *Illustrated London News* offers the most nuanced opinion, with the reviewer showing an awareness that the events of 1905 were a precursor to the Russian Revolutions of February and October 1917. Moreover, the new Bolshevik government in Russia signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk the same month *In Russia's Night* was published thus ending Russia's alliance with Britain and France in the Great War. The reviewer states, 'more than ever now we seek an answer to the Russian riddle. Miss Garnett's novel is not a book to be left unread at the present time, for she shows herself to be a careful and unprejudiced observer, equipped with the powers of the lucid writer.'⁷⁷ The review first points to the mysterious and

⁷⁵ Garnett, Saturday 30 December 1916, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 373.

⁷⁶ Mr. Punch's Staff of Learned Clerks, 'Our Booking Office', *Punch* (22 May 1918), p. 335.

⁷⁷ Anon., 'In Russia's Night', *Illustrated London News* (20 April 1918), quoted in Anon, 'W. COLLINS SONS & CO LTD.' *The Times Literary Supplement* (30 May 1918), p. 249.

intriguing aspects of 'the Russian riddle', i.e. the enigmatic empire to which many of the British public seemed to be attracted, in order to attempt to establish why the 1917 revolutions occurred. Second, the review clearly connects the events of 1905 to 1917, suggesting that the novel's focus on 1905 can assist the reader in understanding the events of 1917, particularly in light of Garnett's apparently balanced views and keen observational skills. By reading *In Russia's Night*, the journalist believed, the British public would gain a greater understanding of Russia during a time when dramatic and alarming change was taking place.

Olive Garnett as Writer and Narrator

The protagonist of *In Russia's Night* is named Katia and through the novel the reader charts her evolution from a young, single British woman to a widowed Russian citizen. Katia marries Dmitri Annenkov, a bohemian artist and the son of her host, Madam Annekov. Katia and Dmitri are not the most compatible couple and Katia knew that Dmitri was having affairs, while she remained ill-informed and felt awkward about sex, conjugal or otherwise.⁷⁸ When holidaying in Florence, where Garnett herself travelled to in 1900, Katia met the revolutionary Piotr Muromsky and fell in love with him. Despite Dmitri's affairs and Muromsky's attempts to draw Katia away from her husband, Katia remained committed to her wedding vows. Muromsky and his friend, Nikitin, stir up revolutionary thoughts in Katia, Dmitri and their travelling companions.⁷⁹ At the end of the novel both Dmitri and Muromsky die at the gates of the Winter Palace, leaving Katia mourning both of them. While Katia's

⁷⁸ Olive Garnett *In Russia's Night* (London: W. Collins and Sons, 1918), pp. 47-52.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 159-235.

character arc does not match Garnett's, who certainly did not search through dead bodies outside the Winter Palace on Sunday 22 January 1905 looking for survivors, the replication of scenes described in Garnett's diary and letters in *In Russia's Night* at least point to Garnett basing the character of Katia upon herself⁸⁰. Within the introductory chapter to Garnett's Russian diary, Barry C. Johnson outlines how Garnett, almost word for word, copies the notes of her journey from Plussa station to Pokrovka (the country house where the Arsénieff's spent their summers) to describe Katia's commute from the station to the fictionalised version of Pokrovka, Glinskoë. From the moment the coachman deposits Garnett/Katia at the steps of Pokrovka/Glinskoë Johnson claims Garnett's 'essentially factual recollection [...] gives way to fiction', however it is evident that this is not the case.⁸¹

In the novel, Katia describes the grounds and countryside around Glinskoë as 'wooded and traversed by many paths, and in places indescribably melancholy; this was partly due, I fancy, to the neglected state of the trees, which beyond the garden, appeared to grow as they liked in dense plantations without fear of the axe, struggling up anyhow to reach the light.'⁸² This picture is similar to the one painted of Pokrovka by Garnett in a letter to her mother, Narney Garnett, of 'the birch and aspen groves, the mountain ashes; the light quivering foliage; and the tender sad sighing everywhere, the half desolation, the suggestion that in a very short time everything would be absorbed in the vast, become wild again.'⁸³ This is, in essence, the same scene, with the unusual personification of the morose woodland and the general unkempt wildness, with both descriptions reminiscent of Ivan

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 331-336.

⁸¹ For Johnson's discussion of this see: Barry C. Johnson, 'Pokrovka', in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 9-11 (p. 11).

⁸² Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 16.

⁸³ Olive Garnett to Narney Garnett (18 August 1896), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 14-17 (p. 16)

Turgenev's excessively 'quivering' aspens in one of his sketches, 'The Tryst'.⁸⁴ The depressing atmosphere continues the theme of the disengaged, torpid Russia we saw in 'The Case of Vetrova', which no doubt would have disappointed Garnett's readers when they first opened the book and were looking for images of the highly volatile Russia of 1918.

The similarities between Pokrovka and the fictional Glinskoë even include the neighbours, most of whom Mrs Arsénieff and her fictional counterpart, Madam Annenkov will not socialise with because they are 'new people'⁸⁵ who host 'rowdy parties of impossible people'.⁸⁶ Garnett explains to her aunt that, 'the old race of landed proprietors is fast dying out; ruined by the emancipation, the merchants and civil servants are taking their place in the country.'⁸⁷ Here Garnett demonstrates her awareness of tensions within Russian society, making reference to the 'allotment land' sold off by the nobility to the emancipated serfs. However what Garnett neglects to mention is that previously the nobility used to have to frequently mortgage their land because they were running out of money. Emancipation simply made it obvious that the nobility could no longer afford to keep hold of their inherited land.⁸⁸ In both Garnett's letters home and *In Russia's Night* she identifies only one neighbour who could be considered a friend to Mrs Arsénieff/Madam Annenkov, which is a man called 'Count N.' whose property neighbours Pokrovka/ Glinskoë. He is described by Madam Arsénieff as a man of 'irregular habits'⁸⁹ and by the fictional Madam Annenkov as a 'mauvias sujet' (bad subject), however because he is a Count and therefore 'old money' he

⁸⁴ Ivan Turgenev, 'The Tryst', in *A Sportsman's Sketches, Volume Two*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Faber Finds, 2008), pp. 45-52 (p. 46). Constance Garnett originally translated *A Sportsman's Sketches* in 1895.

⁸⁵ Olive Garnett to Ellen Garnett (16 September 1896), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 18-21 (p. 21).

⁸⁶ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 18.

⁸⁷ Garnett to Ellen Garnett, in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 21.

⁸⁸ Sidney Harcave, *The Russian Revolution* (London: Collier Books, 1970), p. 19.

⁸⁹ Garnett to Ellen Garnett, in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 20.

is acceptable company in their eyes.⁹⁰ This illustrates the snobbery of Mrs Arsénieff/Madam Annenkov and shows that they place value on titles rather than personality.

Garnett's descriptions continue to be the same throughout much of the novel, drawing upon sights she witnessed during her stay in Pokrovka and St Petersburg. Katia notices the 'rich black mud'⁹¹ on the road going towards the village, which matches the streets that were nothing more than 'sloughs of black mud', Garnett complained of in a letter to 'Cuckoo', her paternal aunt.⁹² In both novel and diary, the path to where the peasants live is associated with dirt and uncleanness and the peasants themselves are described as 'loutish' and 'dead drunk'⁹³ in the novel and 'stupid and lazy' in Garnett's letters.⁹⁴ Here, Garnett's snobbery is almost worse than Mrs Arsénieff's because she is belittling those of a lower class than her. A further connection that can be seen in Pokrovka and Glinskoë is the frequent amount of croquet played. Croquet is often mentioned in *In Russia's Night* because the fictional residents at Glinskoë played it 'endless[ly]',⁹⁵ which certainly seemed to be the reality in Pokrovka with Garnett noting that she played croquet at least three times in her first six days while being hosted by the Arsénieffs.⁹⁶ The French-speaking Russians delighting in the Anglo-French game creates an image of false and confused identity within the Russian bourgeoisie, which Katia/Garnett agrees with, dubbing them 'artificial'.⁹⁷

⁹⁰ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 18.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁹² Garnett to Ellen Garnett, in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 19.

⁹³ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 37, p. 39.

⁹⁴ Garnett to Ellen Garnett, in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 20

⁹⁵ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 103.

⁹⁶ Garnett, Sunday 9 August 1896, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 13., Garnett, Monday 10 August 1896, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 13., Garnett, Wednesday 12 August 1896, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 13.

⁹⁷ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 103.

Mud and croquet are all very well, however Garnett's recollections of *Petropavlovskaya Krepost* can also clearly be seen in the character of Katia. Admittedly, when viewing the fortress from the outside Katia's attitude towards *Petropavlovskaya Krepost* is that of a revolutionary, longing to 'see the place fall', which is in contrast to the admiration Garnett's other fictional self, Miss Foster, felt in in 'The Case of Vetrova'. However, on the interiors of the fortress, Garnett projected her own opinions onto Katia. In a letter to 'The Cardinals',⁹⁸ Garnett writes:

I have been in the church of the fortress of Peter and Paul on the Neva, where the Tsars are buried. It is a gaudy place as unlike Westminster Abbey as possible. The tombs are all alike, of white marble with a gold cross on top and the name of the Tsar in gilt letters at the side. [...] Upon all the pillars draped with cloth of silver are hung the many wreaths and crowns in gold and silver [...] On the walls are enormous trophies, gold laurels upon velvet sent by foreign nations. The glitter is dazzling with all this gold, silver, marble, lighted candles and gilt decorations. [...] The glitter of the gold is quite tawdry...⁹⁹

Similarly, Katia comments 'there seems to be something sinister in the very tawdriness of it all, of the pillars draped with cloth of silver, the gold and silver wreaths and gold laurels upon velvet, mounts lit up by many candles' where the bodies of the Russian Tsars and their families lay, next to the cells of prisoners incarcerated for allegedly conspiring against the

⁹⁸ The Cardinals were the architects Detmar Blow (1867–1939), William Cowlshaw (1869–1957) who was also engaged to Garnett's sister Lucy, William Lethaby (1857–1931) and Alfred Powell (1865–1960) Garnett's soon-to-be fleeting fiancé. It is unknown why they were collectively referred to as 'The Cardinals' by some of the Garnett siblings.

⁹⁹ Olive Garnett to 'The Cardinals' (24 September 1896), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 27-31 (p. 30).

rule of the descendants of the entombed.¹⁰⁰ Garnett uses almost exactly the same phrases to describe the inside of the church at the *Petropavlovskaya Krepost*, emphasising the excessive use of gold and silver, which contrasts against the black mud that swamps peasant villages in Pokrovka and Glinskoë, and the stark cold walls of the prisoners' cells. In bestowing her feelings about the tombs of the Tsars upon Katia, Garnett re-affirms her belief that the tombs were tawdry in the letter she wrote of containing her initial impressions over a decade before *In Russia's Night* was published. The opulence of the final resting place of Tsar Nicholas II's ancestors is juxtaposed against the collapse of the Russian Empire, which was an event in progress during the year of *In Russia's Night's* publication, reflecting the excessiveness that led to the destruction of the Roman Empire and the *fin de siècle* anxiety in the British psyche that the British Empire would fall too.

Garnett is able to build a believable image of Russia for the reader, contextualising her story with anecdotes and examples from real life. Through using her own personal recollections of Russia within her fictional work, Garnett positions herself within the text, lending her voice to Katia's. While Garnett is writing about an event she did not witness, she is able to accurately describe the Russian atmosphere by pinning her story to her own truth. Her contemporaneous readership would not have been aware of this of course and it is only through the publication of her diaries and letters that we can see the extent to which Garnett tried to include a true-to-life rendering of Russia within her novel.

¹⁰⁰ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, pp. 279-280.

Sergei Stepniak as Piotr Muromsky

As in *Petersburg Tales*, and more specifically 'The Secret of the Universe' and 'Out of It', the character of Stepniak haunts *In Russia's Night*. Muromsky, the object of Katia's affections in *In Russia's Night*, is quite clearly a literary representation of Stepniak. While holidaying in Florence, Katia is introduced to the radicals Piort Muromsky and A. A. Nikitin. Katia is staying on the historic Via Romana, which is where Garnett herself stayed in 1900 with Olivia Rossetti Agresti (1875–1960).¹⁰¹ In their introductions, Muromsky is presented as 'a stalwart of the steppes', which automatically makes the connection to Stepniak, whose nickname meant 'man of the steppes'.¹⁰² Nikitin is identified as a widowed Ukranian, which matches the profile of Volkhovsky, who was born in Poltava, a Ukranian city, and was widowed twice, once in 1877 and again in 1887.¹⁰³

In a subversion of reality, rather than Muromsky being married and unavailable (as Stepniak was), Katia was married to Dmitri and Muromsky was in love with Katia. Katia enjoys the attentions of Dmitri and Muromsky, much to the frustration of Edward Garnett who found that element wholly unbelievably,¹⁰⁴ but ultimately Katia found the concept of free love 'morbid and perverted' so remained faithful to Dmitri.¹⁰⁵ In the novel, as in life, Garnett

¹⁰¹ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 145., Olive Garnett to Richard Garnett (19 April 1900), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 163-169 (p. 163).

¹⁰² Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 149.

¹⁰³ Volkhovsky's first wife was Mariya Antonova (1848–77), his second was the revolutionary Aleksandra Korzhevskaya, who shot herself in 1887. Their daughter Katia died aged three in 1889 and Vera, who appears frequently in the diary, was Volkhovsky's surviving family member when he came to London.

¹⁰⁴ Edward felt there was no justifiable reason for Muromsky and Dmitri to both be in love with Katia because the protagonist lacked charm and was too morally 'stiff'. Edward Garnett, unlike his sister, had a more relaxed attitude towards the sanctity of marriage, having had a mistress (Nellie Heath 1872–1962) since 1899. Edward Garnett to Olive Garnett (19 March 1918), in *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 375-376 (p. 375).

¹⁰⁵ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, 203.

denied Katia from having romantic liaisons with the man she truly loved. Even within the fictional world she could not bring herself to write about the potential of a physical relationship with Stepniak; in 'Out of It' she completely anonymises the characters and the text is not sexually charged, and in *In Russia's Night* her moral commitment to wedding vows takes precedence over following her heart.

Muromsky's similarities to Stepniak can also be seen within Muromsky's political agenda. Katia identifies Muromsky's 'sacred aim of freeing [his] country', noting that he understood 'the power and scope of creative art, wishing to turn it to the service of his cause'.¹⁰⁶ This sympathises with Stepniak's aim of removing the oppressive tsarist regime in Russia and Muromsky's belief in the power of art also aligns with Stepniak's notion that he could use the British press and literature to educate the English readership about the situation in Russia. Similarly, Nikitin shares the views of Muromsky/Stepniak and also his real-life counterpart, Volkhovsky, noting that 'holding the ear of that vast freedom-loving [British] public and to refute our enemies' lies, is one of our chief aims and dreams in these stagnating times'.¹⁰⁷ Volkhovsky of course edited *Free Russia* with Stepniak and continued to do so after Stepniak's death until 1914. Volkhovsky hoped that by publishing statistics, first-hand accounts and short stories about the effects of the oppressive tsarist regime he would be able to re-forging the British public's perception of Russian culture. Part of Stepniak's vision was to use Garnett to write about Russia from the British point of view because he believed she could write accurately about Russian people, places and culture. Garnett notes this discussion in her diary in 1893, as we saw in the Introduction, and

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 214, 189.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

twenty-four years later, while writing *In Russia's Night* in 1917 Garnett takes her diary entry and plants it within her novel:

'[W]ith regard to foreigners – can you appreciate fine shades in them,' he went on; 'do you, for example, notice everything about us as you do about English people, and have you ever know foreigners before you came to Russia?'

'I did not know any before, and I don't know how much I notice,' I replied;

'I think language creates a difficulty. How can you or I know that we convey to one another just what we want to express.'

'You are right,' he said. "I feel as if we had our ears stopped with wool. We hear but not clearly.'¹⁰⁸

Garnett records exactly the same conversation, illustrating the profound impression the exchange with Stepniak had upon her. Given Garnett's preoccupation with Stepniak's words, as seen by her replication of them, it is clear that attempting to observe the 'fine shades' in 'foreigners' has been a focus of her literary work. In including familiar figures to her, such as Stepniak, Volkhovsky and Madam Arsénieff, Garnett has been able to anchor her writing within the familiar; by intertwining the characteristics, opinions and even conversations of significant people in her life within her fiction she has kept her representation of Russian people as accurate as possible to the best of her knowledge.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 213

Historical Events

While Garnett's original readership might have seen glimpses of Stepniak in Muromsky, they would not have been able to identify the palpable similarities between principal characters in *In Russia's Night* and the author's circle of acquaintance, of course. Much more apparent to this readership would have been Garnett's engagement with significant historic events in the build up to Bloody Sunday and the beginning of the Russian revolution in 1905.

Tethering her novel to this factual, historical information, convinces the reader of the narrator's and subsequently the author's reliability.

For example, Katia notes that on the 17 June 1904 she hears that 'the Governor-general of Finland was shot dead'.¹⁰⁹ This assassination was in reference to Nikolai Bobrikov (1839–1904), who was killed by the Finnish activist, Eugen Schauman (1875–1904) on 16 June 1904. Bobrikov epitomised the Russian government's nationalistic policy and enforced the Russianisation and Russification of Finland and his assassination was a radicalised reaction to the oppressive autocratic regime. Interestingly, Bobrikov's assassination also appears in one of the seminal texts of modernism, James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922), which happens to be set on the day of Bobrikov's assassination. In the 'Aeolus' episode the journalists at *Freeman's Journal* are discussing the top news stories of the day while exchanging pithy remarks. J.J. O'Molloy asks the others, 'was it you shot the lord lieutenant of Finland between you? You look as though you had done the deed. General Bobrikoff.'¹¹⁰ Garnett is more accurate than Joyce when Katia learns of Bobrikov's death a day after it took place

¹⁰⁹ Garnett, *In Russia's Night*, p. 261.

¹¹⁰ James Joyce, *Ulysses* (London: Egoist Press, 1922), p. 129.

because Bobrikov died in the evening of 16 June and newspapers did not report on his death until 17 June.¹¹¹ Similarly, Garnett also includes the assassination of Plehve, ‘the all powerful Russian Minister of the Interior who had so long held the reins of reactionary power in his hands’. As with Bobrikov, Katia became aware of his death on 28 July 1904, a day after Yegor Soznonov (1879–1910), a member of the Socialist-Revolutionist Combat Organisation had thrown a bomb into Plehve’s carriage.

In an accurate summary of the volatile social situation in Russia, Katia notes that

The Russo-Japanese War fiasco was producing deep and swift currents, setting towards progress in the national life. Plehve had fallen in attempting to dam these back. The two main organisations of social Revolutionists and Social Democrats had greatly increased their propaganda and influence. Thanks to their exertions the workmen were at length showing real solidarity and the country was roused and shaken. Hatred and distrust of the government was being openly shown in all classes; it was impossible to doubt that the revolutionary tide had immensely gathered volume, and must soon, beyond all power to restrain it, break loose.¹¹²

Here Garnett summarises the key social tensions that were mentioned in the historical overview, including the Russo-Japanese war, the increasing influence of the Intelligentsia and the unification of the proletariat. Garnett does not make note of the agrarian problem, however we know she was aware of this owing to her letter to her aunt where she discusses

¹¹¹ Anon., ‘Dictator Shot: Finnish Vengeance on the Czar’s Viceroy’, *Daily Mail* (17 June 1904), p. 5.

¹¹² Garnett, *In Russia’s Night*, p. 277.

the issues of emancipation. In demonstrating her awareness of the key social dynamics that contributed towards the Russian revolution of 1905, Garnett anchors *In Russia's Night* within the history of the 1905 revolution, writing her characters into the historical narrative. Through demonstrating her knowledge, Garnett convinces the reader that her work is informed and therefore more likely to be an accurate portrayal of the situation in Russia.

As the novel progresses, the pages become littered with events that form the precursor to Bloody Sunday. Garnett mentions the striking of the 'iron workers' in reference to the strike at the Putilov factory in December 1904, the closing of shops and the printing presses so no newspapers were available.¹¹³ Within the space of two pages Garnett reaches Saturday 21 January where they see a copy of Father Gapon's 'boldly expressed' petition.¹¹⁴ Garnett draws the reader's attention to the end of the petition quoting: 'if you do not answer our prayer, we will die in this square before your palace. Should our lives serve as the holocaust of suffering Russia, we shall not regret this sacrifice, but will bear it willingly.'¹¹⁵ Excerpts of the petition were published in the London newspapers on the 23 January 1905¹¹⁶ and as early as the evening of 22 January Garnett was wondering in her diary, 'What is going on in Petersburg to-day?'¹¹⁷ Despite her worry, we get very little else from her diaries about the events of Bloody Sunday, bar her noting on the 24 January, 'Petersburg Quiet'.¹¹⁸ *In Russia's Night* on the other hand does capture Garnett's awareness of the tragedy. On the day of the march Dmitri tells Katia that 'it looks like an arranged massacre' highlighting the pre-

¹¹³ Ibid., pp. 324, 326.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 327.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ For example, Anon., 'Yesterday was a Terrible Day in St Petersburg', *The Times* (22 January 1905), p. 9.

¹¹⁷ Garnett, 22 January 1905, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 285

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 24 January 1905, p. 266.

meditated nature of the attacks on the peaceful protestors.¹¹⁹ The novel describes people being ‘shot down indiscriminately at the Putilov ironworks, at the canal, trying to cross the Neva by the bridges, and in the Palace Square’, highlighting areas all over St Petersburg, provoking visions of attacks on every street corner.¹²⁰ In fact, this is far closer to the truth than visions of the tragedy in the public imagination that see thousands of men, women and children slaughtered outside the Winter Palace. This was perpetuated by popular artwork at the time, such as in Wojciech Kossak’s (1856– 1942) piece ‘Bloody Sunday in Petersburg on January 9, 1905’.¹²¹ In this painting mounted Cossacks trample and cut down men, women and children. Kossack finished the piece just five months after Bloody Sunday and it was displayed in galleries across Europe and the States between 1905 and 1907. In fact, most of the deaths occurred on streets leading towards the palace, the Nevsky Prospect and the Narva Gate, which is over an hour’s walk from the Winter Palace.¹²² *In Russia’s Night* ends with the death of Dmitri and Muromsky. Garnett describes Katia’s horror of ‘feeling for corpses’ as she searches for survivors and at one point overturns the body of Muromsky and realises he is dead.¹²³ Dmitri was not killed during the march but in the aftermath when he directed his anger and upset at an Imperial Guard, who fatally injured him.¹²⁴ This is the second published work of Garnett’s where the character who represents Stepniak dies at the end, reminding the readers of her own personal tragedy in losing the man she loved.

¹¹⁹ Garnett, *In Russia’s Night*, p. 329.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 331

¹²¹ Wojciech Kossack, *Bloody Sunday in Petersburg on January 9, 1905*, 4 x 8 metres, Kirovograd Fine Art Gallery, Ukraine.

¹²² Pipes, p. 25.

¹²³ Garnett, *In Russia’s Night*, p. 334.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

* * *

In Russia's Night is an ambitious novel, especially in comparison to Garnett's short stories. Writing it clearly challenged her, with the main body of the work taking twelve years to compose, when in the same amount of time she managed to write tens of short stories with little trouble. As this chapter has demonstrated, however, Garnett took great care and time in researching this novel, particularly in relation to the build-up to Bloody Sunday and contextualising details such as the assassination of Bobrilkov and the strike at the Putilov Ironworks. We saw a similar impulse to rich contextualisation in 'The Case of Vetrova', but this was easier to achieve for the short story, Garnett could rely on her lived experience, whereas she had to read about the Bloody Sunday massacre in the newspapers in order to formulate ideas for her novel. Moreover, at this point in her life, she was spending less time with her network of Russian émigrés so could not draw from their second-hand re-telling either. Nevertheless, the presence of Garnett's Russian network can still be seen within *In Russia's Night*, where Garnett embeds conversations and biographical information into her fiction in order to ground her work in reality.

Perhaps the most interesting thing in *In Russia's Night* is its strange temporality and long gestation. Garnett's re-telling of Bloody Sunday was published in the wake both of the epoch-defining Russian Revolutions and of Russia's severance of their alliance with Britain and France in the Great War. The novel was published at a time when readers were undoubtedly interested in Russia, however the particular, belated context of *In Russia's Night* is at odds with what would be expected from a novel about an empire that had just deposed its emperor. For Garnett's contemporary readership, the spectre of 1917 looms

over *In Russia's Night* and is conspicuous by its absence. However, to a present-day readership, the elephant in the room of the 1917 revolutions is less visible, a fact that allows readers to focus on the work itself.

If *In Russia's Night* were currently in print, it would no doubt be more greatly appreciated and its temporality less jarring for a writer whose previous success rested on her fiction's immediacy. Here, we might draw a parallel with another writer whose belated novel was, until recent scholarly reclamation, deemed anomalous. Frances Burney's (1752–1840) final novel, *The Wanderer* (1814) published eighteen years after her initial tranche of popular novels (1778–96), is valued far more now by eighteenth-century critics and the reading public than it was by Burney's contemporary readership who found it tiresome and vulgar.¹²⁵ *The Wanderer*, like *In Russia's Night*, also has a peculiar temporality: it is set during the French Revolution (1789–99), but was published towards the end of the Napoleonic Wars (1803–15). Moreover, Burney, like Garnett, took over a decade to finish her novel. *In Russia's Night*, like *The Wanderer*, wears its long gestation in its plot. It may be set in the run-up to Bloody Sunday, but, as we have seen, it reflects the later rise of antisemitism in Britain.

In Russia's Night has suffered both because it was written too slowly to provide an immediate literary response to Bloody Sunday and because it was published while more dramatic, overshadowing, events were unfolding on the world stage. Had *In Russia's Night*

¹²⁵ See: Debra Silverman, 'Reading Frances Burney's *The Wanderer; or Female Difficulties*: The Politics of Women's Independence', *Pacific Coast Philology*, vol. 26.1 (1991), pp. 68-77., Kate Chisholm, 'Return of the Wanderer', *The Guardian* (19 April 2000), <<https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2000/apr/19/artsfeatures.biography>> (date accessed: 16/12/21).

been published more contemporaneously with the events it describes, Garnett's reputation as a writer/position in literary history might be as secure as it deserves to be.

Conclusion

On 16 August 1897 Olive Garnett's beloved father, Richard Garnett, wrote to his daughter

I have the feeling that you have a destiny, which will lead you to something enviable, or at least important and remarkable, and when this comes we shall probably see that all your undeserved troubles and sorrows have played a part in shaping it.¹

The letter, written shortly after Garnett called off her engagement to Alfred Powell, illustrates the affection Richard Garnett had for his daughter, and also the concerns he had for her welfare and future. As a private document, written without the expectation it would be subjected to public scrutiny, we might assume that Richard Garnett exaggerates his belief in Garnett's potential here in order to instil some cheer in his daughter after her short-lived engagement. However, Richard Garnett's prophetic belief in the significance of his middle daughter's future is likely genuine. He was not a man to pay lip service to endeavours, nor to over-indulge his offspring in flights of fancy; he ensured they were educated, skilled, practically minded and well-connected.

Barry C. Johnson, in closing the third and final volume of Garnett's diaries, refers back to Richard Garnett's letter and concludes, 'a century after Dr Garnett was pondering his daughter's 'destiny', it has become clear: as a writer, to be a diarist.'² Many diarists, of course, hold a noted place in literary history, yet Johnson's complete disregard of Garnett's

¹ Richard Garnett to Olive Garnett (16 August 1897), in Olive Garnett, *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in England 1897-1958*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019), p. 400.

² Barry C. Johnson, 'Conclusions', *An English Girl in Old Russia*, pp. 397-402 (p. 402).

fiction in his assessment of Garnett's importance and remarkableness is unjust. It is impossible to say whether Garnett's diary was the 'important and remarkable' work that Richard Garnett believed his daughter's pen would achieve. It seems unlikely Richard Garnett anticipated that the achievement of Garnett's life, work and efforts would be to support the work of biographers or critics studying men such as Sergei Stepniak, Peter Kropotkin, Ford Madox Ford or Henry James and yet, this is how she has commonly been viewed. Reviews of the diaries have noted its appeal for 'Russianists' given Garnett's interactions with the Russian émigré network.³ Max Saunders and Thomas C. Moser have used Garnett's diaries in their articles, chapters or biographies of Ford⁴ and Leon Edel used her diary to poke fun at her 'curious fixation' with Henry James.⁵ Garnett's diaries have taken centre stage once, as the inspiration for Martyn Wade's BBC Radio 4 drama, 'Stepniak', which is described as 'The bitter-sweet real-life love story of Olive Garnett (sister of the famous Russian translator, Constance) who meets and falls for a Russian expatriate whose charms hide a secret and rather sinister past...'.⁶ Garnett is not given the dignity of having her name in the title, even though the inspiration and content of the drama is taken from her diaries. Moreover, describing the Garnett-Stepniak relationship as a 'love story' is far-fetched and places Garnett in the position of the love-sick victim, rather than bringing forth her writing. Traditionally, then, Garnett's diaries have been used to serve accounts of the lives and works of others rather than their author. This is a view of the diaries that I have sought to counter by using the diaries to illuminate Garnett's life, professional networks and

³ A.G. Cross, 'Reviewed Work: *Olive and Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett 1893-1895* by Barry C. Johnson, Olive Garnett', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 72.3 (1983), pp. 513-514.

⁴ Max Saunders, *Ford Madox Ford: A Dual Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)., Thomas C. Moser, 'From Olive Garnett's Diary: Impressions of Ford Madox Ford and His Friends, 1890-1906', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 16.3 (1947), pp. 511-533.

⁵ Leon Edel, *Henry James: A Life* (London: Collins, 1987), p. 525.

⁶ Martyn Wade, 'Stepniak', BBC Radio 4, 30 June 2001.

literary achievements. In bringing Garnett's writing and life to the middle of the debate, I have subverted the supporting role Garnett's work usually plays alongside the political or literary activities of Sergei Stepniak and Henry James in particular, but also seen how her texts stand up against or interact with work by Katherine Mansfield, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Ivan Turgenev and Anton Chekhov.

In the introduction to the thesis, I noted Rebecca Beasley's assumption that Garnett's allegiances were pro-revolutionary or at least socialist in nature and it was this assumption that resulted in Beasley's assessment that Garnett wrote against her own loyalties and interests. I then went on to redefine Garnett's allegiances, stating that it was to *individuals* that Garnett was faithful or about whom she was passionate, rather than the causes and aims of those individuals. In the chapters that followed I developed this claim by taking a triangulated approach which considers Garnett's biography and the political and historical context of her life in which she lived to offer a sustained analysis of Garnett's published works, *Petersburg Tales* (1900) and *In Russia's Night* (1918) along with her unpublished diaries, previously unacknowledged articles and unpublished short stories. Throughout, I have been attentive to the intertextual relationships between Garnett's fiction and that of Russian masters, such as Dostoevsky, Chekhov and Turgenev, as well as that of James and Katherine Mansfield. This is the first project of its kind to undertake this work and it has done so in order to move Garnett from the periphery to the centre of literary criticism on writers who informed and shaped the British impression of Russia and, more broadly, to reassess Garnett's position in early twentieth-century literature.

The most influential figure in Garnett's life was Stepniak. His belief that Garnett's strength as a writer lay in her powers of observation has been a signature note of this thesis. We have felt Stepniak's constant presence either through Garnett's approach to her work, reflecting the atmosphere in St Petersburg after the death of Vetrova in 'The Case of Vetrova' (1900) and capturing the personalities and dynamics of notable Russian figures in 'The Secret of the Universe', or as a fictional representation in characters such as the unnamed man in 'Out of It' (1900) and Muromsky in *In Russia's Night* (1918). We can see that while Garnett's life changed significantly between 1900 and 1918, going from a young lady with an allowance and servants to a working woman cooking her own meals, she remained steadfast in her commitment to write based on her observations about Russian people, places and culture. *In Russia's Night* remained as true to life as Garnett could manage, pegging her story to real events she was aware of and places she had travelled in order to enhance the verisimilitude of the novel. In doing so, *In Russia's Night* presents itself as a nuanced and well-researched novel that has been unfairly neglected and deserves a recognised place in literary criticism on historical novels.

This work in itself establishes Garnett as an author worthy of more rigorous study and popular interest, making the case for Garnett to be taken seriously as an author and contributor to the British public interest in Russia. The biographical and historical context woven throughout most of the *Petersburg Tales* collection, her short story 'A Russian Girl' and *In Russia's Night* all contribute towards the British public's perception of Russia at the first quarter of the twentieth century. The immediacy with which Garnett writes allows her to encapsulate pivotal moments (the death of Vetrova in 1897 and Bloody Sunday in 1905) that contribute towards the collapse of the Russian empire. Indeed, an article conducting a

direct comparison of the short stories in *Petersburg Tales* and *In Russia's Night*, analysing the upward trajectory of the revolutionary groups compared to the fall of the tsars would certainly bear interesting fruit.

Stepniak remained in Garnett's thoughts and dreams throughout her life, with their three short years of being close friends (1892-1895) having a profound impression on Garnett for the next sixty-three. Five years before she died, Garnett recorded an upsetting dream in her diary:

Going upstairs, turned and looked back into the desperate face of S.S. following me. He said 'we must part now, *forever*. No hope.' I was stupefied, 'Oh no.' 'It is so, we must,' he looked miserable, something to do with the change in Russia [possibly the death of Stalin on 5 March 1953], 'and here we part', I felt he meant it. Here I awoke: now, what does this mean? Some subconscious intuition I suppose.⁷

Garnett's distress in the dream about having to separate from Stepniak is palpable; his death still pained and haunted her over half a century after he was killed. I have no doubt that without the presence of Stepniak in her life Garnett would have written numerous short stories and novels for pleasure, however the focus and direction that Stepniak instilled in her as a young writer imbued her with a purpose and lifelong interest in Russia.

As with Stepniak, Garnett's dedication to the life and works of Henry James remained until she died. In 1955 she was still celebrating Henry James's birthday (with 1955 marking 112

⁷ Garnett, Wednesday 15 July 1953, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 394.

years since James was born and 39 years since he died), with Garnett referring to the day as 'The Birthday' as though it were a momentous occasion.⁸ Interestingly, Garnett did not make note of Stepniak's birthday. The prolific literary output of James engaged, inspired and entertained Garnett throughout her adult life, resulting in the creation of her more experimental and abstract short stories, such as 'Out of It' (1900). 'Out of It', the least loved and understood short story by Garnett's reviewers, deviates somewhat from Garnett's overarching commitment to Stepniak's literary advice. Nevertheless, the intertextuality between 'Out of It', James's *The Princess Casamassima* (1886) and, inadvertently in Garnett's case, Turgenev's *Virgin Soil* (1877), draws Garnett into a substantial debate within literary criticism that previously had only concerned itself with the work of James and Turgenev however now must also take into consideration Garnett's 'Out of It' too. This thesis has shown that 'Out of It' provokes a rich and interesting discussion and it is down to the neglect of the short story, and *Petersburg Tales* as a whole that we have not been made aware of Garnett's dynamic literary relationship with James and Turgenev before.

The dominance of James in Garnett's life can be seen regularly in her diaries, from her obsessive behavior in Rye to her rapid consumption of his literary and theoretical work. It remained constant when Garnett's world shifted significantly after her father's death and, as a result, Garnett moved to Kew and gradually became involved in the suffragette movement. As we have seen in Chapter Six, Garnett became heavily involved with the movement – attending meetings, marches and handing out leaflets. In a particularly amusing collision of worlds and interests, Garnett recounts an incident on 4 May 1914 when

⁸ Ibid., p. 395.

she went to view the new portrait of Henry James by John Singer Sargent (1856 – 1925) at the Royal Academy and upon leaving the room for a few minutes, returned to find the portrait missing. She learns, from an excitable group of women, that a suffragette, Mary Aldham (1858–1940) had attacked James' portrait with an 'axe' according to Garnett, but the real weapon was a meat cleaver. Garnett finished her re-telling of events by commenting that she 'had clearly missed a great chance of protecting the picture', although what she could have done against a militant suffragette wielding a meat cleaver is anyone's guess!⁹ It seems that in that moment she would have chosen Henry James, one of her sources of deep fascination, over a violent act to draw attention to the 'Votes for Women' campaign.¹⁰

In Garnett and Mansfield we find kindred spirits in the form of two women with a deep and intense interest in Russian people, places and culture. Moreover, both were devoted to a Russian émigré; Garnett with Stepniak and Mansfield with Koteliansky. Sadly, Garnett does not appear to mention Mansfield in her diary, but further investigations into the archive material at Northwestern University may offer additional information. Garnett read so widely and with such rapacity that it would be surprising to find that she never read a single page of Mansfield's work. Yet even in the absence of hard evidence, analysing Garnett's work alongside a female writer who shared her fixation with Russia and who also enjoyed writing short stories provides a useful point of comparison. Mansfield's borrowing and intertextuality with Chekhov has received significant attention in literary criticism, however

⁹ Garnett, Monday 4 May 1914, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 365.

¹⁰ For further discussion of Mary Aldham's attack on Henry James and why it was not a display of anger against James himself see: Thomas J. Otten, 'Slashing Henry James (On Painting and Political Economy, Circa 1900)', *The Yale Journal of Criticism*, vol. 13.2 (2000), pp. 293-320.

Garnett's writing back to Chekhov's 'Typhus' (1887) in her short story 'Influenza' (1900) had been a neglected point on comparison until revived in this thesis. As with James, bringing Garnett's work into intertextual conversation with Mansfield's has allowed for new perspectives on Mansfield herself, but more importantly places Garnett alongside more famous figures and draws her work into dominant strands of literary criticism.

In bringing Garnett into the debates surrounding Chekhov, Dostoevsky, James, Mansfield and Turgenev, her literature forms part of a central conversation within literary criticism. This thesis has illustrated Garnett's interconnectedness between some of the most notable Russian masters, as well as substantial figures of James and Mansfield and called for an increased interest in Garnett's literature. *In Russia's Night* should be considered as a text worthy of print once more and *Petersburg Tales* should be more readily available in Britain and these would certainly be projects I would look to work towards.

As it stands, it is an injustice to dismiss Garnett's writing, particularly when one considers the immediacy with which she writes where she constructs fiction for and of her time. She engages intelligently with the politics of her day and operates within a wide network of literary and political figures, most of whom still continue to provoke interest in the public consciousness today. It is evident that Garnett was influenced by notable figures and historical events, however Garnett was also a key mediator in the presentation of pivotal historical events to the British public via her short stories and novels. Garnett does not belong at the peripheries any longer, misunderstood by critics or simply seen as a victim of unrequited love. Garnett needs to be situated within the key conversations that focus on the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth century and more specifically within the debates

surrounding the representation of Russia in British literature. Her work charts the collapse of an empire, reproducing it with a keen eye through works of historical fiction. Garnett captures an epochal moment and her work deserves a place of note within British literature. She is not a footnote or an illustrative point or even only a diarist. Olivia Rayne Garnett is a writer.

Appendix One

Constance Garnett's Translations in Chronological Order

1894 – Goncharov, *A Common Story*; Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God is Within You*; Turgenev, *The House of Gentlefolk*, *Rudin*

1895 – Turgenev, *Fathers and Sons*, *On the Eve*, *Smoke*, *A Sportsman's Sketches*

1896 – Turgenev, *Virgin Soil*

1897 – Turgenev, *Dream Tales and Prose Poems*, *The Torrents of Spring*

1898 – Turgenev, *A Lear of the Steppes and Other Stories*

1899 – Turgenev, *A Desperate Character and Other Stories*, *The Diary of a Superfluous Man and Other Stories*; Ostrovsky *The Storm*

1900 – Turgenev, *The Jew and Other Stories*

1901 – Tolstoy, *Anna Karenina*

1902 – Tolstoy, *The Death of Ivan Ilyitch and Other Stories*

1904 – Tolstoy, *War and Peace*

1908 – Constantine, *The Revolt of the "Potemkin"*

1912 – Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*,

1913- - Dostoevsky, *The Idiot*, *The Possessed*

1914 – Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*

1915 – Dostoevsky *The House of the Dead*, *The Insulted and the Injured*

1916 – Dostoevsky, *A Raw Youth*, Chekhov *The Darling and Other Stories*, *The Duel and Other Stories*

1917 – Dostoevsky, *The Eternal Husband and Other Stories, The Gambler and Other Stories;*

Chekhov, *The Lady with the Dog and Other Stories, The Party and Other Stories*

1918 – Dostoevsky, *White Nights and Other Stories;* Chekhov, *The Wife and Other Stories,*

The Witch and Other Stories

1919 – Dostoevsky, *The Honest Thief and Other Stories;* Chekov, *The Bishop and Other*

Stories

1920 – Dostoevsky, *The Friend of the Family and Other Stories;* Chekov *The Chorus Girl and*

Other Stories, Letters to His Family and Friends, The Schoolmistress and Other Stories

1921 – Chekhov, *The Horse Stealers and Other Stories, The Schoolmaster and Other Stories*

1922 – Gogol, *Dead Souls;* Chekhov, *The Cook's Wedding and Other Stories, Love and Other*

Stories; Tolstoy, *Christianity and Patriotism;* Turgenev, *Knock, Knock and Other Stories, The*

Two Friends and Other Stories

1923 – Gogol, *The Overcoat and Other Stories;* Chekov *The Cherry Orchard and Other Plays,*

Three Sisters and Other Plays

1924-1927 – Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts* (6 volumes)

1926 – Gogol, *Evening on a Farm Near Dikanka, The Government Inspector and Other Plays;*

Chekhov, *The Letters of Anton Chekhov to Olga Knipper*

1928 – Gogol, *Mirigorod*

1934 – Turgenev, *Three Plays*

Appendix 2:

Olive Garnett as A.B.D.

We know that Garnett wrote reviews of Kropotkin's memoir for *Free Russia* because she documents writing the proofs in her diary, however the reviews that appear in *Free Russia* are signed by A.B.D. There is no direct evidence where Garnett acknowledges that she is A.B.D. however I argue that there is sufficient evidence in her diaries, combined with the publication date of volumes of *Free Russia* to confirm that A.B.D. is Garnett. This is relevant to this thesis because it illustrates the belief of Volkhovsky (who was the editor of *Free Russia*) that Garnett could write well enough to feature in his journal, it proves that Garnett read Kropotkin's memoir in detail and also that she gained a good understanding of it in order to be able to write a suitable review. The content seen in *Memoirs of the Revolutionary* presents tsarist Russia as cruel and oppressive and no doubt would have shaped Garnett's views on the Russian Empire. Moreover A.B.D., or Garnett, gives Kropotkin favourable reviews, implying that she was in sympathy with his cause.

On Sunday 19 March 1899 Garnett noted that she 'Wrote reviews of Kropotkin's autobiography [...] for *Free Russia*.'¹ A review of Kropotkin's autobiography then appears a few weeks later in the April 1899 edition of *Free Russia* signed by A.B.D.² Furthermore, Garnett is asked by Volkhovsky to review the completed version of *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* on 29 November 1899 and she records in her diary that she attempts to work

¹ Garnett, Sunday 19 March 1899, *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in England 1897-1953*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019), p. 137.

² A.B.D., 'The Autobiography of a Revolutionist, I – IV., by P. Kropotkin. (The "Atlantic Monthly," September, 1898 – March 1899', *Free Russia*, vol. 10.4 (April 1899), p. 36.

on the review on 5 December 1899.³ Subsequently, a review of the full *Memoir* can be found in *Free Russia* on 1 January 1900 signed off by A.B.D.⁴

The timing of Volkhovsky asking Garnett to write the reviews, followed by the swift publication of A.B.D. reviews strongly suggests that A.B.D. is Garnett. Moreover there is no record in Garnett's diary of her complaining that Volkhovsky has twice chosen to use another writer's review of Kropotkin's work over her own.

Below I include the extracts of Garnett's reviews as items of further interest.

In full A.B.D., '*The Autobiography of a Revolutionist, I – IV.*, by P. Kropotkin. (The "Atlantic Monthly," September, 1898 – March 1899', *Free Russia: Organ of Society of Friends and Russian Freedom*, vol. 10.4 (April 1899), p. 36.

These six deeply interesting instalments of Prince Kropotkin's memoirs bring us to the year 1871, when he returned to St Petersburg after his tour in Finland for the Russian Geographical Society. It was one of the decisive times in his life; he had just refused the Society's offer of the secretaryship, an appointment which he had coveted for the opportunities it gave of freedom and leisure for scientific research. The fascinated reader will discover *why* this enthusiastic scientist refused it; *why* at an earlier

³ Garnett, Wednesday 29 November 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 153.

Garnett, Tuesday 5 December 1899, *An English Girl in Old Russia*, p. 154.

⁴ A.B.D., '*Memoirs of a revolutionist: By P. Kropotkin; with a Preface by George Brandes*, (Smith, Elder and Co., 2 vols; 218)', *Free Russia*, vol. 11.1 (1 Jan 1900), p. 11.

period in 1862 he decided, instead of entering a regiment of the Guards, to join that of the Armour Cossacks in a remote part of the Empire; *why* he could not have done otherwise. The author himself gives characteristic replies to these questions, and in them will be found the key to this important work, which no student of Russian thought and of the best life of our time can afford to neglect. Besides the serious questions touched upon which we have indicated and the atmosphere of noble and strenuous endeavour in the face of reactionary opposition, the reader will also find page after page of charming and picturesque descriptions, beginning with an account of the author's home and childhood in a now vanished part of Moscow. Very interesting are the character sketches of Alexander II., taken from personal observation. This hitherto somewhat enigmatic personage seems to step for a moment into full light from out of the dark cloud of fate, which as we read, looms larger and larger, to eventually completely envelop him. Prince Kropotkin dates Alexander II.'s final surrender to the reactionaries from the great Apraxin Court fire in May, 1862, which it was rumoured was the work of those reactionaries themselves. They hoped by thus intimidating the Tzar to induce him to postpone the final abolition of serfdom. The author says, *apropos* of this: "I saw Alexander II. once more before leaving St. Petersburg. He asked: "So you go to Siberia? ... Are you not afraid to go so far?" I hotly replied, "No, I want to work. There must be so much to do in Siberia to apply the great reforms that are going to be made." He looked straight at me: he became pensive; at least he said, "Well, go: one can be useful everywhere;" and his face took on such an

expression of fatigue, such a character of complete surrender that I thought at once “he is a used up man: he is going to give it all up.” But unfortunately we have no space here for the quotations we should like to make from among so much that are instructive, quaint and entertaining – pictures of serf life, military life, court life, student life in St. Petersburg, and life far away in Siberia; we can only say that all is living, all is convincing with that charm of simple straightforwardness which is part of the sympathetic personality of the author.

It is particularly interesting to note that the quotations Garnett chose to include paint a very sympathetic image of Tsar Alexander II, presenting him as a defeated, sad man. Garnett could have selected any number of quotations resulting to poor living conditions of the working class or the peasants, which would be more in sympathy with her friends’ cause, however she did not, she chose autocracy.

An extract from A.B.D., *‘Memoirs of a revolutionist: By P. Kropotkin; with a Preface by George Brandes, (Smith, Elder and Co., 2 vols; 218)’*, *Free Russia: The Organ of the English Society of Friends of Russian Freedom*, vol. 11 (1 Jan 1900), p. 11.

The high expectations raised by the first chapters of this work as they appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, have not been disappointed now that the whole is before us in book form. It is from the first page to the last, not merely of thrilling but of profound interest – a veritable treasure mine to the student of life: for, like all the best memoirs it is life, and in this case it

is the life of a many-sided man, of a great country, of a grand movement,
and one scarcely knows under which aspect it appears most. Pre-
eminently it is a book written about the soul.

Appendix 3

The work below was found at in the Garnett Family Papers archive at Northwestern University. The original manuscript consisted of two pieces of paper and was handwritten. The transcription is verbatim.

In full, Olive Garnett, 'A Man of Principle (A True Story from Russian Life) by N. Flerovsky', Garnett Family Papers, Northwestern University, MS164, F12 'Miscellaneous Notes', Box 26, pp. 1-2.

Olive Garnett, 'A Man of Principle (a true story from Russian Life) by N. Flerovsky (Bervy)'

At the beginning of the year 1862, I was arrested on a political charge and imprisoned in St Petersburg. Owing to special circumstances I was treated very leniently. The governor of the prison, not liking to see me under lock and key, allowed me perfect freedom within the precincts of the gaol. I naturally took full advantage of this privilege and it happened that once while walking in the corridor I found that the door of one of the rooms was open.

There was a young man within; he had an intelligent look and his appearance was altogether so pleasing, that wondering what might be the charge against him, I enquired if he also was a political offender. "Oh no," answered the warden, "he is not a criminal at all, but he is a most unlucky man; speak to him, he will tell you his story." I spoke to him and made his acquaintance.

He produced upon me a mixed but on the whole favourable impression. His chief characteristic was an excessive moral sensitiveness, which may be described as positively morbid. He could not stand or put up with the slightest injustice, just as some people with

sensitive nerves cannot stand the slightest smell of tobacco. To compare and measure and chose the lesser of two evils was beyond his capacity. He could not compromise, acting always under an irresistible impulse like a monomaniac. From the point of view of worldly wisdom and even common sense his actions were often absurd, but one could never deny him one's sympathy, for the purity of his intentions and unselfishness of his motives.

We became fast friends and one day, this young man, whom I will call Fomin, told me the following sad history. He said that he had been made an officer when only eighteen years old, and that being of a warlike disposition, he had sought a post at Sebastopol. He had obtained this and had served, but had fled with the army before the victorious French. This had been a great shock to him, he could not get over it, but he determined to rehabilitate his honour at the first opportunity, and the war with the French ended, he went to the Caucasus impelled by this idea. He had not served there very long, when it happened that one day he had to go with a party of about two hundred and fifty men under command of the captain of the division through a wood in the mountains. The way was barred and it was only with the greatest difficulty that they could make the ascent at all. Suddenly, in the worst part of the road, they were attacked on both sides at once. The firing was so incessant that it seemed to the men that the wood must conceal some thousand of the enemy at least, and they fled in panic.

Appendix 4

The extract below was found at in the Garnett Family Papers archive at Northwestern University. The manuscript consists of sixteen pieces of paper. Pages 1-2 are typed, but with handwritten additions or deletions. In the transcription below I have not included the text Garnett struck through but have included the additions she wrote between the typed lines. Pages 3-16 are handwritten and this text is copied verbatim. Parentheses have been used when a word is illegible.

In full, Olive Garnett, 'Influenza – A Reply to 'Typhoid Fever' by Anton Tchekhov', Garnett Family Papers, MS164, F3 'Tales of Women', Box 26, pp. 1-16.

Olive Garnett, 'Influenza – A Reply to 'Typhoid Fever' by Anton Tchekhov'

Two ladies were being served at the fish-shop: one, middle-aged, careworn, blonde, said: - "I want something filleted, fresh as a daisy, for an invalid...": she was peering about, and, as she stopped, her glasses fell off. The other, stuffing change into her purse, thought 'How often one hears that now...influenza...it is very much about,' and she went out of the shop, which, blue-washed within, picturesquely protected from the dwelling house behind, feeling superior, exempt, even quite exuberant. In the street there was a bitter wind, a driving screen to the opaque and threatening sky: and she felt pleased with the thickness and warmth of her new coat whose rich black was quickly grey with sleet. This coat was double-breasted, and she turned up the collar of astrakhan to the level of her eyes, and again felt pleasantly superior to the passers-by who had not such comfortable clothing. 'But I think I'll

get some eucalyptus jujubes, my throat feels off,' she reflected, 'and then I shall have done everything, and need not turn out again.'

Yes, it was good to get home, take off one's things, draw the curtains, poke up the fire and rest by it for awhile. She took a jujube, then another, her left temple ached horribly [...], but her throat continued to be sore. After the tea which she personally made for herself, she felt tired, strange and dozed a little. 'I am glad I am out of that wind, it is still sleeting heavily...my coat really is splendid...the anxious lady....'filleted for an invalid' and how near-sighted she was!' Such thoughts surged up. She rose and peeped out, returned to the fire, became too hot and drew back a little, dozed, stirred up the coals repeatedly, and all the time felt disinclined to put away the tea-things and especially to read or to take up any occupation though there were several matters requiring attention. 'Why doesn't Phoebe come?' occurred to her more than once, but each time she remembered Phoebe had gone into the country to her mother's funeral. Night came on, the tea-things were still untouched, our friend still dozed at intervals, and she decided not to trouble to prepare supper. 'I am not quite myself' she finally declared in a loud voice as if to an invisible auditor, and became unconscious in her chair.

During the next day she continued to feel very poorly, and did not dream of leaving the house. She ordered supplies through the milk-boy, and was certain that she had influenza. 'And at such time one ought to take great care of oneself, she reasoned, she felt annoyed with Phoebe for being away, though she had sent her: with Phoebe's mother for dying, though the death had been expected and inevitable: with the milk-boy for forgetting one of the items she had ordered, and in general with a scheme of things that allowed her to fall ill

at such an awkward time, in such bitter weather, and just as she was feeling so particularly well. 'Yes, fate...' she philosophised... 'the important events of life always befall this suddenly and inevitably, for example, an illness with might end in death...as this' she realised wonderingly. Her having felt so exuberant and superior to less fortunate persons on the very eve of failing ill herself worried her: and yet she felt that much sympathy for the worn looking lady at the fish-shop would have been at the time out of place. It is as if when one is well and one's strong individuality bears one triumphing along a certain amount of disdain were permissible, and as if when ill oneself and feeble, then another order of things might be necessary. It was however impossible to think consecutively to any purpose. She gave up on the attempt. She really felt ill.

The day passed thus in discomfort and querulousness broken by periods of dozing. Again and again she approached the window only to be driven back to the fire by the murky, and, as it seemed sinister, form without, the terrible wind against which a few passers-by struggled along, bent, buttoned up and cold. As by this time she has used up all her pocket-handkerchiefs she was obliged to go into an un-warmed room to wash them out, then to watch over their drying in the fenders. 'But if I sit too close to the fire I may fall forward with dozing and be burned,' she thought, 'and yet of all things in such an illness it is necessary to keep warm?' And, in her state, it seemed a sheer impossibility to keep warm enough without running the risk of being burned. Finally she decided not to sit too close to the fire and to keep on her new jacket. But this, though physically comforting, proved a mental torment, because it was in this new jacket that she had felt, as she had expressed it, 'unlawfully' superior to others who were thinly clad. Doubtless her comfortable bed upstairs was the best and safest place, but in bed one would be completely cut off from the outer

world, and out of hearing of Phoebe's ear should Phoebe return. Besides, to go to bed would be giving up on oneself, and once the ground were so cut from under one's feet one might never rise again... 'Now is this a sick fancy or a good instinct?' tormented her, but she could not decide, and pursuing the fancy to its limit, 'shall I recover, as it is?' That it seemed impossible to forecast, and indeed the matter looked of less and less importance. The only matter of moment seemed to be (with the maximum of courage of which she was capable) to preserve for herself a certain vital susceptibility of soul for whatever might occur.

During the night the wind dropped, snow fell thickly, and when next morning in sunshine she drew aside the curtains some had drifted in at the windows, which save for the rise of the moon, gave it the look of a glassed in verandah, dark in corners only. In this corner was her couch and now not so cold, she lay upon it all day under a rug listening to the muffled footsteps of the passers-by, the jingling of the bells on tradesmen's' carts and all the many noises of the alivened street. The postman on his rounds brought several communications which fell through the letter box onto the passage floors unheeded. For, appearing, as to her they did to come from an immense distance – another world, they demanded no attention in her actual one. And so her position in space had been thus overset by her influenza all the more purely [...] seemed to her divisions of time. For one of these days, she realised to herself 'seems like a week, and yet a whole afternoon on which one dozes is gone like a flash. I have lost count of time. Time, in fact is only in one's thoughts.' She made the momentous observation idly. It did not seem to concern her very much.

The more violent and unpleasant symptoms had passed: it was possible to take up a book and to pay attention to the printed paper. Her throat was better and its soreness was

proceeded by a dry and painful cough. She opened her letters. Phoebe had written to say that her home was snowed up and that she would return as soon as she could get to the station. The daily papers contained sensational weather reports and interviews with medical men as to the best treatment for the prevailing epidemic. The milk-boy, proving amenable, was now dispatched for 'a little fish' something filleted, fresh as a daisy for an invalid': and by this time our patient was quite sure that her disdain and [...] lack of compassion for the tired lady really had been objectionable – she felt as if, should she meet her, she would like to apologise and that, in certain cruciferous, such as the weakness of ill health another order of things, then triumph in personal ascendancy is imperative. Lying on the couch drawn up in an angle by the hearth which, she reflected with satisfaction, she had managed to keep clean and tidy even at her worst, she took an interest in analysing some of the feelings to which she had been subject – the fear of malaise haunting her these dreary days of which this struggle between disdain and compassion and been so predominant a symptom. 'Truly, I was not myself, there was something objectionable in me but not of me,' she reasoned, 'since a portion of me is now sitting here in judgement upon it?' And it occurred to her to make responsible for the for the unpleasantness she had suffered those ancestors whose portraits had with their fixed smiles, grave expressions, blue eyes, watched her so unwaveringly, suspended on the light papered walls, made brighter by the [...] without.

She had for instance felt especially ill-used in having, at such as time, to wait upon herself, to light her own fire, and to open her door shivering the while and dreading a complete and enforced cessation of activity, and she attributed her infuriation and spite against this land uneasily to a great-grandmother whose lovely face to which the painter had caught a look

girlish a little mischievous, hung above the hearth. This doubtless 'fine' lady, named like herself Virginia had however been very much more and proudly the mother of five boys and of three girls: but successive portraits (for she had been remarkably endowed with beauty) seemed to exhibit a gradual deterioration in temper and nerve. Her spouse, represented on his marriage in a light blue coat adorned with steel buttons, and with unpowdered hair, looked at that date amiable, but later had been reported something of a martinet, narrow in his religious views. Money cares had been absent and sufficient staff of servants kept the domestic hearths bright; but it is not improbably that the eight had been a difficult team to drive straight beneath the paternal eye. Maybe the problem of reconciling so many varying wills to his and of maintaining her own individuality and judgement had been tough, at any rate her miniaturist had markedly showed that in old age firmness had declined into ill-temper, fun into misery, and there was distortion in the bent brows and tightly compressed lips. She had become a rather terrible old lady. The price, as this depicted had been high, but (so her descendant seemed to figure it out), preservation of the material will, and consequent ineffaceable slump in the family purchased. And the dormant, resurgent injunctive of her soul, brought with her very life blood, established she probably died, as one says 'happy'.

Naturally, in such a struggle one or more had been sacrificed. The son of this Virginia – represented as the beau ideal of a dandy, with looks of the lightest polish, and carrying a tasseled cane – had all the airs of having merely to lounge smilingly along the way made so smooth by his [...] proprietors. The smile was undoubtedly a trifle weak, and it is possible that the traditional excellent family 'taste' had been in his case expended on objects no more important than the fine cameo in his ring. A cameo at its best is honourable, a perfect

thing, and it could never have been required of [him] that he should, for instance, sweep up a hearth. What had been his irreducible motivation of performance? His immaculate 'forever'? One might never know. His great nieces then? Ah hers these past days, like that of some vestal of old had been to perform her ablutions and to replenish the coal box from a [...] cellar in that shell of a house, the stock laid in upstairs by the departing Phoebe having been exhausted since. So our friend mused, gazing at her great uncle's presentment with the accompanying undercurrent 'it is not fitting that I either, who from time immemorial must have had people to do things for me...' From time immemorial!' astonished she paused at her glib phrasing and suddenly knew that it was so, and that this and this had and be in very truth existed back, back forever, into the 'back of the beyond'. Well, she could remember having seen that great-uncle of the cameo ring in the flesh, in her fancy – a little frail of gentlemen, dependent on other's services with little to do but to turn that same ring on his finger and look from the windows – with no hearth in the wider sense at all. Was that a preferred mode of existence and as certainly as the words had come to her? Such a thing has not occurred to one of my blood for generations, so as certainly, she suddenly knew the joy of the unknown. That she herself might differ from her proprietor, and that this difference might constitute a new joy, with fresh powers; that she might be treading a borderland on which they had never stood, as some expanses; that much succeeding moment might be unique and she an initiator – this thought suddenly seized her with a powerful rapture sweeping every discontent into the waste of the background.

From the walls her own mother, with an expression of such coquetry as a girl, and of mournfulness as a woman, regarded her and her grandmother in the special shades of grey and sea-lavender she always wore, with wise steadfast eyes, seemed to be looking both

backwards and forwards along the centuries as if she at last had nothing to learn either of hope or of fear. Then our friend resourcefully thought 'I have been making them responsible for my weakness, but what strength, what strength they all give, all those of my blood who have lived, suffered with views like to move. My God, what strength! And for the first time she surveyed life not with the irreflective enjoyment with which a child or a peasant delights in a familiar landscape, but with memory and foresight, reading into the deeper meaning which these bestow. 'Yes, our aims, conscious or unconscious, are the same' she addressed her silent audience, 'and, as in each successive generation our suffering are identified, as we become more finely strung, gaining in intention, we gain in force to make them fruitful. Clenching her hands in asseveration, the white tears of physical weakness trickled down her cheeks, 'and what awaits me, one stage further than any of you on the long journey?' she demanded. It was a silent question, it produced in due sequence a silent response.

She had come in from her first little walk: it was just a fortnight since influenza had swooped down upon her – a fortnight of such moral and physical struggle that to be free of it was to be as an [...] everything into day. Again she was thinking how good it was to have seen in the public gardens the tracery of trees silhouetted black against a [...] sky, wintry with a suggestion of spring. She had masked, clinging to the fir trunks, [...] which would soon be peaceful ladders of delicate green and in autumn of burning crimson. She had watched alone the old brick, ivy-wreathed, water towers, slowly changing cumulous clouds letting show between them blue patches of sky, and, in the west, the ochre and orange of the early sunset. And, inevitably, from her mind's eye this actual and lately present scene faded away, and there swam before it a vision of the sea on a calm evening.

It was high tide in a bay along whose shores stretched off like couchant lions, here in shade and there vivid in bright patches in the changing lights. There were a few boats out in the bay, and one white sail. She stood as it seemed on a beach, inhaling a smell of brine and listening to the rhythmic beat and long withdrawals of the tide on the shingle. The sun had set: on the sea were long dissolving hints of amethyst, of emerald, of blue and over all a glory and infinite depths in the fender hued sky. And suddenly, while still drinking in this vision of light and air and colours, the marvel happened, - her being came easily and naturally apart into two, as easily and naturally as a skin of a banana is peeled.

With the lesser, insignificant past, as she afterwards described it, were her natural faculties, her normal judgement – that feeble transmitted self against which so lately she had been peevishly protesting. Feeble indeed she deemed that self, and wondering if it were worth what she noted in retrospect as having been somewhat half-hearted efforts towards its preservation. At all events she felt she would not over much regret if its maintenance as a separate entity should prove that impossible of achievement. She had for it but a kindly tolerance. So much for this lesser, tentative self! Beneath it, the mind it contained, perceived a substance or state, vast, indeed limitless; stable, indeed immortal, without mind or need of it, and infinite for help. And for this underlying substance from which it spring, the superficial mind connected as by a slender filament conceived respect, nay awe. For the absolute confidence it empowered was, indeed, what it appeared that this same poor little mind had been eternally seeking, and how to its infinite satisfaction, and for its assured remembrance, had found.

Two selves! The line of demarcation as distinct as the thread of association! So that this same little mind so put strenuously while the revelation lasted, an image with which ineffaceably to stamp the whole and language to render it a possession. Then, possibly because of that immediately preceding far scene of light and colours, of sea and sky at evening, the image in language came.

The state, unmoved, unmovable, timeless, without attributes. Thrown up into the ocean above was the superficial self waving feebly about with vague purpose as might wave a tentacle of some marine creature to find [...] and establish itself, or to period in that ocean as fate should decide. And if it were to perish? Its own mind assured of the existence of universal being of the substance with itself from which it sprang knew itself content. Infinite content therefore, infinite repose, be assured as the state of our friend for a succeeding time to be counted in hours of our worked reckoning.

Phoebe the maid let herself into the house after all on her return from her mother's funeral, for she had taken her key. She came panting upstairs into a sitting-room flooded with the strong western sunlight of lengthening spring evenings. Her broad figure and cheerful face brought a welcome element of bustle and everyday life. She was in new black, and on one arm she carried a laden basket which she clapped down on a chair, the while she glanced with good-humoured and jealous criticism about the room. Evidently the same good Phoebe who had gone away tearfully a fortnight before; she whose mind had certainly pretty well sounded the exiguous possibilities of existence for herself but whose heart contained no overflows; who would always enthusiastically part even with the very buttons off her jacket if that would do a suffering fellow creature any good.

Her mistress stood at the end of the long and light room with a foot on the fender and a hand on the draped mantelshelf; and coming forward swiftly, 'so your mother has gone, Phoebe', she said in a gentle voice. There was radiance as of remote joy in her thin face, and Phoebe looking about, making up her mind to start on the room soon and give it a good turn out and thinking how pulled down and lonely her mistress seemed, yet noting the radiance, was arrested in her own vigorous satisfaction at returning, and puzzled.

Bibliography

Manuscripts and Unpublished Sources

Northwestern University

Garnett Family Papers. MS164

Private Collection

Unpublished diaries of Olive Garnett (in possession of Caroline White)

Primary Sources

A. B. D. [Olive Garnett], Review of *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, *Free Russia*, vol. 11.1 (1 Jan 1900), p. 11

— [Olive Garnett], Review of *The Autobiography of a Revolutionist*, *Free Russia*, vol. 10.4 (April 1899), p. 36

Anon., 'A Cry of Despair', *Free Russia*, vol. 5.2 (February 1894), p. 15

Anon., 'Assassination of the Emperor of Russia', *The Times* (14 March 1881), p. 9.

Anon., 'British Association: Discussion on the Origin of Life', *The Times* (17 September 1913), p. 10

Anon., 'Dictator Shot: Finnish Vengeance on the Czar's Viceroy', *Daily Mail* (17 June 1904), p. 5

Anon., 'Free Russia', *The Speaker*, vol. 1.25 (28 June 1890), pp. 698-699

- Anon., 'Funeral of Stepniak', *The Times* (30 December 1895), p. 9
- Anon., 'M. Kerensky on Anarchy', *The Times* (1 October 1917), p. 7
- Anon., 'Our London Correspondence', *Manchester Guardian* (16 April 1906), p. 6
- Anon., 'Petersburg Tales', *Manchester Guardian* (16 April 1900), p. 6
- Anon., 'Petersburg Tales', *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature Science and Art*, vol. 91 (2 March 1901), p. 277
- Anon., 'Review of Friend of the Family', in Fyodor Dostoevsky, *Uncle's Dream and the Permanent Husband*, trans., Frederick Whishshaw (London: Vizetelly's Russian Novels, 1888)
- Anon., 'Review of *The Princess Casamassima*', *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, vol. 62 (27 November 1886), p. 728.
- Anon., 'Review of *The Princess Casamassima*', *The Graphic*, vol. 35 (18 December 1886), p. 646
- Anon., 'Russia', *The Times* (16 April 1897), p. 6
- Anon., 'Russia', *The Times* (18 March 1897), p. 5
- Anon., 'Russia', *The Times* (20 March 1897), p. 7
- Anon., 'Russia Revisited', *The Times* (8 November 1905), p. 5
- Anon., 'Russia Revisited', *The Times* (November 8 1905), p. 5
- Anon., 'Russian Army's Share in Allied Efforts', *The Times* (4 October 1917), p. 7
- Anon., 'Russian Political Arrests', *The Times* (25 May 1894), p. 5
- Anon., 'Socialism in Russia', *The Times* (Monday 17 January 1870), p. 4
- Anon., 'The Arrest of Anarchists in Paris', *The Times* (31 May 1890), p. 7
- Anon., 'The Arrest of Russian Nihilists', *The Times* (4 June 1890), p. 5

- Anon., 'The New Tsar and the Jews' *The Times* (6 June 1895), p. 14
- Anon., 'The painful accounts we have published', *The Times* (25 September 1903), p. 7
- Anon., 'The Russian Nihilists', *The Times* (16 April 1881), p. 11
- Anon., 'The Russian Student Troubles', *The Times* (4 March 1899), p. 7
- Anon., 'The treatment to which the Jews in Russia have', *The Times* (30 June 1881), p. 9
- Anon., 'Vetrova, Mariia' in *The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia*, trans. Jean Paradise (London: Macmillan and Collier Macmillan, 1973)
- Anon., 'W. COLLINS SONS & CO LTD.', *The Times Literary Supplement* (30 May 1918), p. 249
- Anon., 'Yesterday was a Terrible Day in St Petersburg', *The Times* (22 January 1905), p. 9
- Aristotle, *The Metaphysics* (London: Penguin Classics, 1998)
- Baldwin, Roger N., *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets: A Collection of Writing by Peter Kropotkin* (Mineola (NY): Dover Publications, 1927)
- Bervi-Flerovsky, Vasily Vasilyevich, *Azbuka sotsial'nykh nauk*, 2 vols. (N.P. Polyakova: St Petersburg, 1871)
- , *Polozheniye rabochego klassa v Rossi* (N.P. Polyakova: St Petersburg, 1869)
- Chekhov, Anton, *The Tales of Tchekhov: Volume 4 - The Party and Other Stories*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Chatto and Windus, 1917)
- Chernyshevsky, Nikolai, *What is to be Done?* (New York City (NY): Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1886)
- , *What is to Be Done?* ed. Michael Katz and William Wagner (Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1989)
- Dickens, Charles, *Oliver Twist* (Ware: Wordsworth Classics, 2000)

- Dostoevsky, Fyodor, *The Brothers Karamazov*, trans. Constance Garnett (New York City (NY): The Lowell Press, 1912)
- , *The Friend of the Family and The Gambler*, trans. Frederick Whishaw (London: Vizetelly and Co., 1887)
- Engels, Friedrich, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (London: Panther Books, 1969)
- , *Turgenev: A Study* (London: W. Collins Sons, 1917)
- Garnett, Olive, 'A Russian Girl', *The Speaker* (28 January 1905), pp. 116-118
- , *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia: 1896-1897 & in England 1897-1958*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019)
- , *In Russia's Night* (London: W. Collins and Sons, 1918)
- , *Olive and Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett, 1893-1895*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartletts Press, 1993)
- , *Petersburg Tales* (Boston (MA): Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1900)
- , *Petersburg Tales* (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1900)
- *Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett 1890-1893*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartletts Press, 1989)
- Gogol, Nikolai, *Taras Bulbas: A Tale of the Cossacks*, trans. Isabel F. Hapgood (New York City (NY): Alfred Knopf, 1915)
- , *The Collected Tales of Nikolai Gogol*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (London: Granta, 2003)
- Goncharov, Ivan, *A Common Story*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Heinemann, 1894)
- James, Henry, *Partial Portraits* (London: Macmillan, 1899)

- , 'Review of Virgin Soil', *The Nation*, vol. 24 (April 1877), pp. 252-254
- , *The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces*, ed. R. P. Blackmur (New York (NY): Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934)
- , *The Princess Casamassima*, Volumes I and II (London: Macmillan, 1921)
- , *The Princess Casamassima*, Volumes I, II and III (London: Macmillan, 1886)
- , *The Sacred Fount* (New York (NY): Charles Scribener's Sons, 1901)
- James, William, 'On Some Omissions of Introspective Philosophy', *Mind*, vol. 9.33. (1884), pp. 1-26
- , 'What Is An Emotion?', *Mind*, vol. 9.34 (1884), pp. 188-205
- Joyce, James, *Ulysses* (London: Egoist Press, 1922)
- Kovalskaia, Elizaveta, 'Elizaveta Kovalskaia', in *Five Sisters-Women Against the Tsar*, ed. Barbara Alpern Engel (DeKalb (IL): Illinois University Press, 2013), pp. 202-249
- Kropotkin, Peter, *In Russian and French Prisons* (London: Ward and Downey, 1887)
- , *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, ed. Nicolas Walter (Mineola (NY) Dover Publications, 1999)
- , 'The Fortress Prison of St. Petersburg', *The Nineteenth Century*, vol. 13.6 (June 1883), pp. 928-949
- , 'The Revolution in Russia', *Mother Earth* (July 1906), pp. 5-10
- Lavrov, Peter, 'Introduction' to Sergei Stepniak, *Underground Russia: Revolutionary Profiles and Sketches from Life* (New York City (NY): Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), pp. v-xii
- Lenin, Vladimir, 'The Persecutors of the Zemstvo and the Hannibals of Liberalism', in *Lenin: Collected Works*, vol. 5 (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961), pp. 31-80

- , 'What is to be Done?', *Lenin's Collected Works, vol. 5., trans. Joe Fineberg and George Hanna* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961), pp. 347-530
- Lewis, Wyndam, 'Imaginary Letters IX', *The Little Review*, vol. 4 (1918), p. 51
- Mansfield, Katherine, *Bliss, and Other Stories* (New York City (NY): Alfred Knopf, 1920)
- , 'Tales of a Courtyard', *Rhythm* (August 1912), pp. 99-105
- , *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield: 1903-1917 Volume 1*, ed. Vincent O'Sullivan and Margaret Scott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984)
- , *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield 1920-1921 Volume IV*, ed. Vincent O'Sullivan and Margaret Scott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)
- , *The Garden Party, And Other Stories* (New York City (NY): Alfred A. Knopf, 1992)
- , *The Scrapbook of Katherine Mansfield*, ed. John Middleton Murry (London: Constable, 1939)
- Marx, Karl, *Grundrisse*, trans. Martin Nicolaus (London: Penguin, 1973)
- The Marxists Internet Archive*
- <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/letters/70_02_10.htm> (date accessed: 13/02/2017)
- Mr. Punch's Staff of Learned Clerks, 'Our Booking Office', *Punch* (22 May 1918), p. 335
- Navalikhin, S., 'An Elegant Novelist and his Elegant Critics', *The Affair*, in V. A. Knowles, *Leo Tolstoy: The Critical Heritage*, vol. 6 (London: Routledge, 1978)
- Stead, W.T., *The M.P. For Russia: Reminiscences & Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff*, vol. 2 (Andrew Melrose: London, 1909)
- Stepniak, Sergei, 'A Philosophy of Solidarity', *Free Russia*, vol. 5.6 (June 1894), pp. 51-52.
- , 'A Russian Philosopher in London', *Free Russia*, vol. 4.10 (October 1893), pp. 116-117

—, 'Foreign Office Report on Russian Agriculture', *Free Russia* vol. 13.11 (November 1892), pp. 4-6

—, 'Introduction', in Ivan Turgenev, *A House of Gentlefolk*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Heinemann, 1906), pp. v-xvii

—, *Underground Russia: Revolutionary Profiles and Sketches from Life* (New York City (NY): Charles Scribner's Sons: 1883)

Thackeray, William Makepeace, *Roundabout Papers and Little Travels and Road-Side Sketches* (London: Smith and Elder, 1887)

The Executive Committee of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom, *Free Russia*, vol 3.11 (1 November 1898), p.1

Trotsky, Leon, *Literature and Revolution*, ed. William Keach (Chicago (IL): Haymarket Books, 2005)

—, *My Life: The Rise and Fall of a Dictator* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1930)

Turgenev, Ivan, *A Sportsman's Sketches, Volume Two*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Faber Finds, 2008)

—, *Fathers and Sons* (Oxford: Oxford World Classics, 2008)

—, *The Jew and Other Stories*, trans. Constance Garnett (London: Heinemann, 1899)
<<http://www.eldritchpress.org/ist/jew.htm>> (date accessed: 10/03/2015)

—, *Virgin Soil* (London: Heinemann, 1906)

Volkhovsky, Feliks, 'N.A. Nekrasov', *Free Russia*, vol. 10.8 (August 1899), pp. 61-62

—, 'The Enlightened Despotism – (Middle. Vetrov's Case)', *Free Russia*, vol. 8.5 (1 May 1897) pp. 36-37

—, 'Tomsk', *Free Russia*, vol. 5.1 (January 1894), pp. 2-3

Voynich, E.L., *Nihilism as It Is* (T. Fisher Unwin: London, 1894)

Wade, Martyn, 'Stepniak', BBC Radio 4, 30 June 2001

Woolf, Virginia, 'Mr Bennett and Mrs Brown', in *Collected Essays: Volume 1* (London: Hogarth Press, 1966)

Z and Ivanoff, 'Anarchists: Their Methods and Organisation', *The New Review*, vol. 56 (January 1894), pp. 1-16

Zasulich, Vera, *Vospominaniia*, in *Five Sisters-Women Against the Tsar*, ed. Barbara Alpern (DeKalb (IL): Illinois University Press, 2013), pp. 59-94

Secondary Sources

Agathocleous, Tanya, *Urban Realism and the Cosmopolitan Imagination in the Nineteenth Century: Visible City, Invisible World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Ailwood, Sarah, and Melinda Harvey, eds, *Katherine Mansfield and Literary Influence* (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 2015)

Almedingen, E.M., 'Chekhov and Katherine Mansfield', *The Times Literary Supplement* (19 October 1951), p. 661

Alpers, Antony, *Katherine Mansfield: A Biography* (New York City (NY): Alfred Knopf, 1953)

Anderson, M.S., *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1966)

- Anon., 'Childmartyr Gabriel of Bialystok', *Archives of the Orthodox Church of America* <
<http://oca.org/saints/lives/2015/04/20/101158-childmartyr-gabriel-of-bialystok>> (date
accessed: 30/02/2015)
- Anon., 'Vetrova, Mariia', in *The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia*, trans. Jean Paradise (London:
Macmillan and Collier Macmillan, 1973)
- Ascher, Abraham, *The Revolution of 1905: Russia in Disarray* (Stanford (CA): Stanford University
Press, 1988)
- Auerbach, Erich, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R.
Trask (Princeton [NJ], Princeton University Press, 1953)
- Ayers, David, *Modernism, Internationalism and the Russian Revolution* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh
University Press, 2018)
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Cambridge (MA): M.I.T. Press,
1968)
- Baring, Maurice, *Landmarks in Russian Literature* (New York City (NY) Macmillan, 1912)
- Barnett, Richard, 'Eugenics', *The Lancet*, vol. 363 (2004), p. 1742
- Barthes, Roland, 'The Death of the Author,' trans. Stephen Heath (New York City (NY): Hill,
1981)
- Batchelor, Jennie, 'Influence, Intertextuality and Agency: Eighteenth-Century Women Writers
And The Politics Of Remembering', *Women's Writing*, vol. 20.1, pp. 1-12 (2013)
<<https://doi.org/10.1080/09699082.2013.754253>> (date accessed: 06/11/21).

Beasley, Rebecca 'Russia and the Invention of the Modern Intelligentsia', in *Geographies of Modernism: Literatures, Cultures and Spaces*, ed. Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker (Oxford: Routledge, 2005) pp. 19-30

—, *Russomania: Russian Culture and the Creation of British Modernism, 1881-1922* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020)

Beasley, Rebecca and Phillip Bullock, 'Introduction: Against Influence: On Writing About Russian Culture in Britain', in *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism*, ed. Rebecca Beasley and Philip Ross Bullock (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 1-20

—, 'Introduction: The Illusion of Transparency', *Translation and Literature*, 20 (2011), pp. 283-300

Bell, Alan, 'Garnett, Richard (1835–1906)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33334>> (date accessed: 13/10/2015)

Bell, Michael, *Sentimentalism, Ethics and the Culture of Feeling* (Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke: 2000)

Bell, Millicent, 'Turgenev and James', *The Sewanee Review*, vol. 110.2 (2002), pp. 231–41

Berdyaev, N.A., 'The Spirit of the Russian Revolution' (1918), <http://www.berdyaev.com/berdiaev/berd_lib/1918_299.html> (date accessed: 15/03/2015)

- Blaisdell, Robert, 'Dr Anton Chekhov and the Typhus Epidemic (23 April 2020)
<<https://russianlife.com/stories/online/dr-anton-chekhov-and-the-typhus-epidemic/>>
(date accessed: 01/12/21)
- Bloom, Harold, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York City (NY): Oxford University Press, 1973)
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 'The Market of Symbolic Goods' in *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (New York City [NY]: Columbia University Press, 1994), pp. 1-34
- Briggs, Anthony D., 'Someone Else's Sledge: Further Notes on Turgenev's *Virgin Soil* and Henry James's *The Princess Casamassima*', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. 5 (1972), pp. 52–60
- Bronstein, Michaela, 'Case Study: From Bolshevism to Bloomsbury: The Garnett Translations and Russian Politics in England' in *The Handbook to the Bloomsbury Group*, ed by Derek Ryan and Stephen Ross (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018), pp. 264-276 (p. 264).
- Brooks, Peter, *Realist Vision* (New Haven [CT], Yale University Press, 2005)
- Brown, Julia Prewitt, *Jane Austen's Novels: Social Change and Literary Form* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1979)
- Buckler, Julie, *Mapping St. Petersburg: Imperial Text and City Shape* (Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 2005)
- Burgess, Joseph, *John Burns: The Rise and Fall of a Right Honourable* (Glasgow: The Reforms Bookstall, 1911)
- Casanova, Pascale, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. M.B DeBevoise (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 2004)
- Cheyette, Bryan, *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society Racial Representations, 1875–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Chisholm, Kate, 'Return of the Wanderer', *The Guardian* (19 April 2000), <

<https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2000/apr/19/artsfeatures.biography>> (date accessed: 16/12/21).

Chudakov, Alexander, 'Dr Chekhov: A Biographical Essay (29 January 1860 – 15 Jules 1904)', in *The Cambridge Companion to Chekhov* eds. Vera Gottlieb and Paul Allain (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 3-16

Cixous, Hélène, 'The Laugh of the Medusa', trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen, *Signs*, vol. 1.4 (1976), pp. 875-93

Clark, Suzanne, *Sentimental Modernism: Women Writers and the Revolution of the World* (Bloomington (IN): Indiana University Press, 1991

Crankshaw, Edward, 'Work of Constance Garnett', *The Listener* (1947), pp. 195-196

Cross, A.G., 'Reviewed Work: *Olive and Stepniak: The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett 1893-1895* by Barry C. Johnson, Olive Garnett', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 72.3 (1983), pp. 513-514

Cross, Anthony 'Introduction', *Journal of European Studies*, vol. 35 (2005), pp. 251-252

Davie, Donald, 'Introduction', in *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald Davie (Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 1-13

Davison, Claire, "'Liaisons Continentales': Katherine Mansfield, S.S. Koteliansky and the Art of Modernism Translation', in *Katherine Mansfield and Continental Europe: Connections and Influences*, eds. Janka Kascakova and Gerri Kimber (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 117-141

- , *Translation as Collaboration: Virginia Woolf, Katherine Mansfield and S.S. Koteliansky* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014)
- DeKoven, Marianne, *Rich and Strange: Gender, History and Modernism* (Princeton [NJ]: Princeton University Press, 1992)
- Dentith, Simon, 'Realist Synthesis in the Nineteenth-Century Novel: "That unity which lies in the selection of our keenest consciousness"', in *A Concise Companion to Realism* ed. Matthew Beaumont (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2010), pp. 33-49
- Deutsch, Nathaniel, *The Jewish Dark Continent: Life and Death in the Pale Settlements* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Diment, Galya, Gerri Kimber and W. Todd Martin, *Katherine Mansfield and Russia* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017)
- Dunbar, Pamela, *Radical Mansfield: Double Discourse in Katherine Mansfield's Short Stories* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997)
- Edel, Leon, *Henry James: A Life* (New York City (NY): Harper Collins, 1985)
- , *Henry James: The Middle Years 1882-1895* (Philadelphia (PA): Lippincott, 1962)
- , *The Life of Henry James: Volume 1 (1843-1889)* (Harmondsworth: London, 1997)
- Fanger, Donald, *Gorky's Tolstoy and Other Reminiscences* (New Haven (CT): Yale University Press, 2010)
- Frank, J., 'N. G. Chernyshevsky: A Russian Utopia', *Southern Review*, vol. 3 (1967)
- Frankel, Jonathan, *Crisis, Revolution, and Russian Jews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

- Garrity, Jane 'Modernist Women's Writing: Beyond the Threshold of Obsolescence?', *Literature Compass*, vol. 10.1 (2013), pp. 15-29
- Gheith, Jehanne M., *An Improper Profession: Women, Gender and Journalism in Late Imperial Russia* (Durham (NC) Duke University Press, 2001)
- Gilbert Sandra M., and Susan Gubar, *No Man's Land: The Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century Vols. 1-3* (New Haven [CT]: Yale University Press, 1988-1994)
- , *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (New Haven (CT) Yale University Press, 1979)
- Giorgi, Liana, 'Between Tradition, Vision and Imagination: The Public Sphere of Literature Festivals', in *Festivals and the Cultural Public Sphere*, ed. Gerard Delanty, Liana Giorgi and Monica Sassatelli (London: Routledge 2011), pp. 29-34
- Glover, David, *Literature, Immigration, and Diaspora in Fin-de-siècle England: A Cultural History of the 1905 Aliens Act* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2012)
- Goldish, Mathew, *Jewish Questions: Responsa on Sephardic Life in the Early Modern Period* (Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 2008)
- Goyet, Florence, *The Classic Short Story, 1870-1925: Theory of a Genre* (Cambridge, Open Book Publishers, 2014)
- Guillory, John, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago [IL]: University of Chicago Press, 1994)
- Haberer, Erich, *Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth-century Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

- Hamilton, Eunice C., 'Henry James's *The Princess Casamassima* and Ivan Turgenev's *Virgin Soil*', *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 61 (1962), pp. 354-364
- Hamilton-Dann, Mary, *Vladimir and Nadya: The Lenin Story* (New York City (NY): International Publishers, 1998)
- Harcave, Sidney, *The Russian Revolution* (London: Collier Books, 1970)
- Heehs, Peter, *Writing the Self: Diaries, Memoirs and the History of the Self* (New York City (NY), Bloomsbury, 2014)
- Hopkirk, Peter, *The Great Game: The Struggle for Empire in Central Asia* (New York City (NY): Kodansha International, 1994)
- Hosking, Geoffrey, *Russia: People and Empire 1552-1917* (London: Harper Collins, 1997)
- Howe, Irving, 'History and the Novel', in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York City (NY): Norton, 2010), pp. 1391-1402
- , *Politics and the Novel* (New York City (NY): Meridian Press, 1957)
- Hunter, Adrian, 'Constance Garnett's Chekhov and the Modernist Short Story', *Translation and Literature*, vol. 12 (2003), pp. 69-87
- Johnson, Barry C., 'Conclusions', in Olive Garnett, *The Diaries and Letters of Olive Garnett, An English Girl in Old Russia 1896-1897 and in England 1897-1958* (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019) pp. 397-402
- 'Friends and Neighbours', in *The Diary of Olive Garnett, 1890-93: Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartletts Press, 1989), pp. 13-18
- , 'Introduction: Stepniak and General Mezentsev', in Olive Garnett, *Olive and Stepniak: The*

- Bloomsbury Diary of Olive Garnett, 1893-1895*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett's Press, 1993), pp. 1 – 18
- , 'Pokrovka', in Olive Garnett, *The Letters and Diaries of Olive Garnett: An English Girl in Old Russia 1896-1897 and in England 1897-1958*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (Padstow: Tabb House Books, 2019), pp. 9-11
- , 'The Museum Garnetts', in Olive Garnett, *Tea and Anarchy! The Bloomsbury Diaries of Olive Garnett 1890–1893*, ed. Barry C. Johnson (London: Bartlett's Press, 1989), pp. 1-12
- Kaplan, Carola, and Anne B. Simpson, eds., *Seeing Double: Revisioning Edwardian and Modernist Literature*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996)
- Karn, Jill Kress, 'William James, Henry James and the Turn Toward Modernism', in *Understanding James, Understanding Modernism*, ed. David H. Evans (London: Bloomsbury Collections, 2015), pp. 121-140
- Katz, Elena M., *Neither With Them Nor Without Them: The Russian Writer and the Jew in the Age of Realism* (Syracuse (NY): Syracuse University Press, 2008)
- Katz, Jacob, *From Prejudice to Destruction: Anti-Semitism, 1700-1933* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1980)
- Katz, Michael, and William Wagner, 'Chernyshevsky, *What Is to Be Done?* and the Russian Intelligentsia', in Nikolai Chernyshevsky, *What is to Be Done?*, ed. Michael Katz and William Wagner (Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 1-36
- Kemp, Sandra, Charlotte Mitchell, and David Trotter, 'Garnett, Olive: Olivia Rayne Garnett', in *The Oxford Companion to Edwardian Literature*, ed. Sandra Kemp, Charlotte Mitchell, and David Trotter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

- <<http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198117605.001.0001/acref-9780198117605-e-439?rskey=1dUf1d&result=440>> (date accessed: 1/11/2014)
- Kingston-Mann, Esther, 'Breaking the Silence: An Introduction', in *Peasant Economy, Culture, and Politics of European Russia, 1800-1921*, ed. Esther Kingston-Mann and Timothy Mixer (Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 3-20
- Knapp, Shoshana Milgram, 'Revolutionary Androgyny in the Fiction of "Victoria Cross"', in *Seeing Double: Revisioning Edwardian and Modernist Literature*, eds. Carola M. Kaplan and Anne B. Simpson (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 3-19
- Knepper, Paul, 'British Jews and the Racialisation of Crime in the Age of Empire', *The British Journal of Criminology*, vol. 41.1 (2007), pp. 61-79
- Kuiken, Vesna, '1884: *The Princess Casamassima*, Anarchy and Henry James's Materialist Poetics', *The Henry James Review*, vol. 38.2 (2017), pp. 113-133
- Lawson, Robert, Jean Graham, Kristin Baker, *A History of Psychology: Globalization, Ideas, and Applications* (New York (NY): Routledge, 2016)
- Leatherbarrow, William, and Derek Offord eds., *A History of Russian Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
- Ledger, Sally, 'Naturalism: "Dirt and horror pure and simple"', in *A Concise Companion to Realism*, ed. Matthew Beaumont (London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2010)
- Lemire, Devon, 'A Historiographical Survey of Literacy in Britain between 1780 and 1830', *Constellations*, vol. 4 (2012), pp. 248-261
- Lerner, Daniel, 'The Influence of Turgenev on Henry James', *The Slavonic Year-Book: American Series*, vol. 1 (1941), pp. 28-54

Levine, George, *The Realist Imagination: English Fiction from Frankenstein to Lady Chatterley*

(Chicago [IL]: The University of Chicago Press, 1981)

Lieven, Dominic, *Nicholas II: Emperor of All The Russians* (London: John Murrar, 1993)

Lodge, David, *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London: Routledge, 1990)

Lowry, Elizabeth, 'Open Wounds', *The Guardian* (4 October 2008)

<<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2008/oct/04/henryjames>> (date accessed:
25/10/21)

Lubbock, Percy, *The Letters of Henry James* (New York City (NY): Scribner, 1920)

Lukács, György, 'The Historical Novel', in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* ed.

Stephen Greenblatt (New York City (NY): Norton, 2010), pp. 909-921

Manning, Roberta Thompson, *The Crisis of the Old Order in Russia: Gentry and Government*

(Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 1982)

Marcus, Jane, *New Feminist Essays on Virginia Woolf* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1981)

Marshik Celia, and Allison Pease, *Modernism, Sex and Gender* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019)

Matthew, Colin, 'Introduction: The United Kingdom and the Victorian Century, 1815-1901', in

The Nineteenth Century of the British Isles 1815-1901, ed. Colin Matthew (Oxford:
Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 1-38

Maunder, Andrew, *The Facts on File Companion to the British Short Story* (New York City (NY):

Infobase Publishing, 2007)

May, Rachel, *The Translator and the Text: On Reading Russian Literature in English* (Evanston

[IL]: Northwestern University Press, 1994)

- McKibbin, R.I., 'Social Class and Social Observation in Edwardian England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vol. 28 (1978), pp. 175-199
- Mirsky, Prince D., *A History of Russian Literature: From the Earliest Times to the Death of Dostoevsky (1881)* (London: Routledge, 1927)
- , 'Chekhov and the English', in *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald Davie (Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press, 1965)
- Morren, Douglas G., 'Donald Mackenzie Wallace and British Russophilism, 1870 -1919', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. 9.2 (1967), pp. 170-183
- Morrissey, Susan K., *Heralds of Revolution: Russian Students and the Mythologies of Radicalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)
- , 'Suicide and Civilisation in Late Imperial Russia', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, vol. 43 (1995), pp. 201-217
- Moser, Charles A., 'A Nihilist's Career: S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskij', *The American Slavic and East European Review*, vol. 20 (1961), pp. 55-71
- Moser, Thomas C., 'An English Context for Conrad's Russian Characters: Sergey Stepniak and the Diary of Olive Garnett', *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 11 (1984), pp. 3-44
- , 'From Olive Garnett's Diary: Impressions of Ford Madox Ford and His Friends, 1890-1906', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 16.3 (1947), pp. 511-533
- Mullin, Katherine, 'The Shop-Girl Revolutionary in Henry James's *The Princess Casamassima*', *Nineteenth Century Literature*, Vol. 63.2 (2008), pp. 197-222
- Nathans, Benjamin, *Beyond the Pale: The Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia* (Berkeley (CA): University of California Press, 2002)

- New, W.H., *Reading Mansfield and Metaphors of Form* (Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999)
- Newton, Michael, 'Nihilists of Castlebar!' Exporting Russian Nihilism in the 1880s and the Case of Oscar Wilde's *Vera; or the Nihilists in Russia*', in *Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism*, ed. Rebecca Beasley and Phillip Ross Bullock (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) pp. 35-52
- O'Gorman, Francis, *The Victorian Novel* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002)
- Offord Derek, and Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, *French and Russian in Imperial Russia* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015)
- , *Nineteenth Century Russia: Opposition to Autocracy* (London: Routledge, 2013)
- , 'The Contribution of V. V. Bervi-Flerovsky to Russian Populism', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 66 (1988), pp. 236-251
- Otten, Thomas, 'Slashing Henry James (On Painting and Political Economy, Circa 1900)', *The Yale Journal of Criticism*, vol. 13.2 (2000), pp. 293-320
- Paperno, Irina, *Suicide as a Cultural Institution in Dostoevsky's Russia* (Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 1997)
- Patterson, David K., 'Typhus and its Control in Russia, 1870-1940', *Modern History*, vol. 37 (1993), pp. 361-381
- Peaker, Carol, 'We are not Barbarians: Literature and the Russian Émigré Press in England, 1890–1905', *19: Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, vol. 3 (2006), pp. 1-18
- Perris, G.H., *Russia in Revolution* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1905)

- Perry, Ralph Barton, *Thoughts and Character of William James* (Boston (MA): Little, Brown, 1935)
- Pipes, Richard, *A Concise History of the Russian Revolution* (New York City (NY): Vintage, 1996)
- , *Russia, People and Empire: 1552-1917* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1997)
- , *The Russian Revolution, 1899-1919* (Harvill Press: London, 1995)
- Pratt, Alan, 'Nihilism', *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, Embry-Riddle University (2001)
<<http://www.iep.utm.edu/nihilism/>> (date accessed: 06/11/2017)
- Prior, Arthur, *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* (London: Macmillan, 1969)
- Psychological Institution Russian Academy of Education, *About* (Moscow, Psychological Institution Russian Academy of Education, 2016) <<http://www.pirao.ru/en/>> (date accessed: 9/11/2016)
- Raskin, Jonah, 'Henry James and the French Revolution', *American Quarterly*, vol. 3, pp. 724-733
- Rees, Kathy, 'The Heinemann International Library, 1890–7', *Translation and Literature*, vol. 26.2 (2017), pp. 162-181
- Remnick, David, 'The Translation Wars: How the Race to Translate Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky Continues to Spark Feuds, End Friendships and Create Small Fortunes', *The New Yorker* (7 November 2005)
- Ren, Aihong, 'Women Characters in Katherine Mansfield's Short Stories', *Studies in Literature and Language*, 5 (2012), pp. 101-107
- Richards, Christine, 'Occasional Criticism: Henry James on Ivan Turgenev', *The Slavonic and East European Review* 78, no. 3 (2000), pp. 463-486

- Rogatchevskaia, Ekaterina, 'The Russian Collections at the British Museum Library and the British Museum Staff: Materials of the British Library Corporate Archives, 1840s-1920s', *Solanus*, vol. 23 (2013), pp. 64-102
- Rose, Jonathan, *The Edwardian Temperament 1895-1919* (Athens [OH]: Ohio University Press, 1986)
- Roser, Max and Esteban Ortiz-Ospina, *Literacy* (Our World in Data, 2018)
<<https://ourworldindata.org/literacy#note-3>> (date accessed: 19 March 2018)
- Saintsbury, George 'Turgenev, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy', in *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald Davie (Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 23-29
- Saunders, David, 'Kravchinsky, Sergey Mikhailovich (1851–1895)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62226>> (date accessed: 23/11/2015)
- , 'Volkhovsky, Felix Vadimovich (1846–1914)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2007)
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62227>> (date accessed: 23/11/2015)
- Saunders, Max, *Ford Madox Ford: A Dual Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)
- Senate (US) Committee of Foreign Relations, *Annual Report of International Religious Freedoms, 2004* (Washington (DC), 2004)
- Senese, Donald, 'Among British Liberals: Felix Volkhovsky in London, 1890-1914', *Immigrants and Minorities*, vol. 2.3 (1983), pp. 67-78

- , *S.M. Stepniak-Kravchinskii: The London Years* (Newtonville [MA]: Oriental Research Partners (1897)
- Service, Robert, *A History of Modern Russia from Nicholas II to Vladimir Putin* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 2005)
- Showalter, Elaine, *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Bronte to Lessing* (Princeton [NJ]: Princeton University Press, 1977)
- Shtakser, Inna, *The Making of Jewish Revolutionaries in the Pale of the Settlement: Community and Identity in the Russian Revolution and its Immediate Aftermath, 1905-1907* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014)
- Silverman, Debra, 'Reading Frances Burney's *The Wanderer; or Female Difficulties*: The Politics of Women's Independence', *Pacific Coast Philology*, vol. 26.1 (1991), pp. 68-77
- Smith, Barbara Herrnstein *Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Literary Theory* (Cambridge [MA]: Harvard University Press, 1988)
- Smith, Helen, *The Uncommon Reader: A Life of Edward Garnett (1868-1917)* (London: Jonathon Cape, 2017)
- Snyder, Carey, 'Katherine Mansfield and the *New Age* School of Satire', *The Journal of Modern Periodical Studies*, vol. 1.2 (2010), pp. 125-158
- Söder, H.P., 'Disease and Health As Contexts of Modernity: Max Nordau As Critic of *Fin de Siècle Modernism*', *German Studies Review*, vol. 14.3 (1991), pp. 473-487
- Solovyeva, Z.P. 'Kazansky Demonstrations' in *St Petersburg Encyclopedia*, ed. Committee of Culture of St. Petersburg < <http://www.encspb.ru/object/2855693814?lc=en> > (date accessed: 17/11/15)

- Spagnolo, Rebecca, 'Serving the Household, Asserting the Self: Urban Domestic Servant Activism, 1900-1917', in *The Human Condition in Imperial Russia*, ed. Christine D. Worobec (Lanham (MD): Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2009), pp. 141-154
- St John Murphy, Sasha, 'The Debate around Nihilism in 1860s Russian Literature', *SLOVO*, vol. 28 (2016), pp. 48-68
- Stanley, Liz, *The Auto/biographical I, The Theory and Practice of Feminist Auto/biography* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992)
- Steinburg, Mark D., *Petersburg: Fin de Siècle* (New Haven (CT): Yale University Press, 2011)
- Steiner, G., *Tolstoy or Dostoevsky: An Essay in Contrast* (London: Faber and Faber, 1959)
- Stoehr, Taylor, 'Words and Deeds in *The Princess Casamassima*', *ELH*, vol 37.1 (1970), pp. 95-135
- Strange, Julie-Marie, 'She Cried a Very Little: Death, Grief and Mourning in Working-Class Culture, c. 1880-1914', *Social History*, vol. 27 (2002), pp. 143-161
- Tilley, W.H., *The Background of The Princess Casamassima* (Gainesville (FL): University of Florida, 1961)
- Tintner, Adeline, 'Fiction is the Best Revenge: Portraits of Henry James by Four Women Writers', *Turn-of-the-century Women*, vol. 2 (1985), pp. 42-49
- , *The Cosmopolitan World of Henry James: An Intertextual Study* (Baton Rouge (L): Louisiana University Press, 1991)
- Tomalin, Claire, *Katherine Mansfield: A Secret Life* (London: Penguin, 2003)
- Toporov, Vladimir, *Petersburgskii Tekst Russkoi Literatury* (St Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2003)

Trice, Tom, 'Rites of Passage: Populist Funerals in Imperial St Petersburg, 1876-1878', *Slavic Review*, vol. 60 (2001), pp. 50-74

Venturi, Franco, *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia*, trans. Francis Haskell (New York City (NY): Alfred Knopf, 1960)

Vernitski, Anat, 'Russian Revolutionaries and English Sympathizers in 1890s London: The Case of Olive Garnett and Sergei Stepniak', *Journal of European Studies*, vol. 35 (2005), pp. 299-314

Wade, Rex A., *The Russian Revolution, 1917* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Walter, Nicholas, 'Kropotkin, Peter (1842–1921)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2004)

<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/42326>> (date accessed: 23/10/2015)

Waters, Catherine, *Special Correspondence and the Newspaper Press in Victorian Print Culture, 1850-1886* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019)

Weeks, Theodore R., 'Defining Us and Them: Poles and Russians in the "Western Provinces," 1863-1914', *Slavic Review*, vol. 53.1 (1994), pp. 26-40

White, James, *Karl Marx and the Intellectual Origins of Dialectical Materialism* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 1996)

Wild, Jonathan, *Literature of the 1900s: The Great Edwardian Emporium* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017)

Williams, Raymond, *Country and the City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973)

Woods, Joanna, *Katerina: The Russian World of Katherine Mansfield* (Auckland: Penguin Books, 2001).