

Washington University in St. Louis

## Washington University Open Scholarship

---

Volume 13

Washington University  
Undergraduate Research Digest

---

Spring 2018

### "No Man's Land": Missing Voices in the Anglophone Canon of Russian Literature

Hilah Kohen

*Washington University in St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wuurd\\_vol13](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wuurd_vol13)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Kohen, Hilah, "'No Man's Land': Missing Voices in the Anglophone Canon of Russian Literature" (2018).  
*Volume 13*. 84.

[https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wuurd\\_vol13/84](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/wuurd_vol13/84)

This Feature Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Washington University Undergraduate Research Digest at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Volume 13 by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact [digital@wumail.wustl.edu](mailto:digital@wumail.wustl.edu).



# “NO MAN’S LAND”: MISSING VOICES IN THE ANGLOPHONE CANON OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE

## *Author:*

### Hilah Kohen

Hilah majored in Comparative Literature with a minor in Russian Language and Literature. At Washington University, she pursued an independent research project for three and a half years to explore how personal and political relationships shaped the transfer of Russian literature into English. She also worked as a literary translator. Hilah graduated *summa cum laude* and Phi Beta Kappa from the College of Arts and Sciences in May 2018 and plans to enter a graduate program in Russian or Comparative Literature.

## KEY TERMS

- Russian Literature
- Translation
- Zinaida Gippius
- Literary Canonization
- International Relations

## *Peer Editors:*

Sophie Elliott, a junior majoring in Linguistics and minoring in Math and Arabic

Syrus Jin, a junior majoring in History and Political Science

## ABSTRACT

The canon of Russian literature that is widely read in English today only began to form in the first three decades of the twentieth century. This article asks why renowned Russian writers contemporary to that period such as Zinaida Gippius (1869-1945) and Maxim Gorky (1868-1936) were excluded from that canon, which instead promoted older, exclusively male writers like Lev Tolstoy (1828-1910) and Fyodor Dostoevsky (1821-1881). I take Gippius's writing, particularly her 1916 story "No Man's Land," as a central case study. I argue that the contrast between Gippius's very loud literary work and her nearly silent reception in English indicates that she was excluded from the Anglophone canon of Russian literature not because of the nature or quality of her writing but for social and political reasons that prevented her work from being read in the first place. This article describes one such historical factor: since the Great War, English-speaking readers have largely associated Russian culture with an archaic past dating to the nineteenth century or earlier while defining twentieth-century and contemporary Russia in almost exclusively political terms. Recent Russian literature, which falls between these two Russias, tends to find favor with Anglophone audiences only if they can easily read it as a form of political opposition to the current Russian government. The same standard of interest tends not to apply to nineteenth-century works. Analyzing this somewhat arbitrary factor in literary canon formation provides a first step toward greater exposure in the English-speaking world for Gippius and other underrecognized Russophone writers of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

## FACULTY MENTOR: ANCA PARVULESCU, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH, INTERDISCIPLINARY PROJECT IN THE HUMANITIES

Professor Parvulescu's research and teaching interests include twentieth-century literature, modernity and modernism, literary and critical theory, narrative and the novel, and gender and feminist studies. She offers a range of interdisciplinary courses that bring literary, visual, and theoretical texts into critical dialogue.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Anca Parvulescu guided this research with incredible skill and generosity while expanding the horizons of my literary thinking. I am deeply grateful to her and to Nicole Svobodny, Vincent Sherry, and Ji-Eun Lee for their mentorship. I also thank the Merle Kling Fellowship and the IPH/Comparative Literature Thesis Workshop for providing invaluable guidance, logistical support, and camaraderie. A grant from the Rohatyn Center for Global Affairs at Middlebury College and a Bemis and Eisner Research Scholarship made possible the archival research for this article, as did archivists, librarians, and scholars at ten institutions in Russia and the United Kingdom.

## I. BORN IN TRANSLATION; LOST IN TRANSLATION

Scholars have increasingly called attention to the way translation takes part in the creation and not only in the transfer of literature. A work can be called “bilingual” or “born translated” when it purports to take place in a language other than the one in which it is written, when it appears in translation before it appears in its supposedly original tongue, when its author writes it with subsequent translations in mind, or when she writes and translates in tandem such that the two processes become indistinguishable.[i] The process of self-translation, Jan Hokenson and Marcella Munson have noted, is not new, but major studies of multiple forms of multilingualism, such as Rebecca Walkowitz’s *Born Translated*, have singled out Anglophone literature of the present day. Nonetheless, a story written in Russian a century ago by Zinaida Nikolaevna Gippius (1869-1945) exemplifies how translated birth can bring with it a special, and as yet understudied, kind of afterlife.

“No Man’s Land” was composed in Russian for publication in an English-language anthology entitled *The Soul of Russia*, a literary, political, and philanthropic project directed by the British historian Winifred Stephens whose proceeds were to benefit internally displaced Russian citizens during the First World War.[ii] The Russian version of the story not only went unpublished; its manuscript appears to have been lost.[iii] Gippius, a prominent intellectual impresario and writer of poetry, fiction, drama, memoir, biography, and philosophy, fled St. Petersburg for Paris after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. She and her husband, the fellow literary polymath Dmitry Merezhkovsky, found themselves in better material circumstances than many of their colleagues because they already owned property outside Russia, but exile nonetheless took its toll on their collections of books and papers. “No Man’s Land” therefore exists only in a translation produced by Susette M. Taylor, who, though rarely mentioned in written records since her death in 1920, was a noted translator and polyglot in her time as well as one of the first female Fellows of the Royal Geographical Society.[iv] These curious material circumstances lend “No Man’s Land” both a certain prestige and a certain precarity: written by an author considered canonical in the Russophone world but nowhere else, translated by a scholar whose barrier-breaking accomplishments were last mentioned in her own obituary, and published in its second language in an impressively well-resourced but nearly forgotten anthology, “No Man’s Land” remains unrecognized precisely because its creation and distribution were thoroughly intertwined with histories of translation and exile. It did not enter the sphere of world literature despite the international slate of literary figures that prepared it for its translated birth. Studying translation as creation primarily through the cross-linguistic ventures of writers like J.M. Coetzee or Samuel Beckett who write to meet an existing international demand thus risks papering over a less hopeful underside of the phenomenon. When authors and editors issue texts in translation to create a demand for writers who are not yet known, and the demand they imagine does not materialize, the text, left without a foothold in any language, can fall into unwarranted obscurity.

This article is about how certain circumstances of a text’s production and distribution such as birth in translation and contemporaneity itself, traits that scholars tend to find either unrelated to the literary merit of a text or a kind of literary advantage, prevented

contemporary Russian writers from gaining a readership in English in the early twentieth century even as their nineteenth-century predecessors rapidly gained popularity. That time period saw a wave of what scholars have come to call “Russian fever,” a widespread obsession throughout the English-speaking world with nineteenth-century Russian literature and the Russian arts. Thanks to a small group of translators like Constance Garnett, Louise and Aylmer Maude, and S.S. Koteliensky, British readers and writers devoured works by Lev Tolstoy, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Anton Chekhov, and Ivan Turgenev for the first time, and that group of writers solidified into an Anglophone canon of Russian literature that continues to shape reading habits and university syllabi today.[v]

It is curious that each of those four writers was dead by the time “Russian fever” reached its peak in the 1910s while writers of Gippius’s generation, those who saw a canon of nineteenth-century writers form with their own eyes, were excluded from that same canon. Gippius and her contemporaries were not kept out of the English language for a lack of connections; on the contrary, Russian-language scholarship has demonstrated that extensive networks facilitated an unprecedented level of communication between major British and Russian literary figures in the early twentieth century.[vi] The factors that did restrict the Anglophone canon of Russian literature to the nineteenth century were many; therefore, the central purpose of this article is not to explain why “No Man’s Land” never gained recognition in the English language but rather to use the literary potentials of the text itself to demonstrate the arbitrary nature of its absence from Anglophone literary canon. I close my analysis by arguing that a new conception of “Russia” among English speakers emerged in the early twentieth century that has since prevented contemporary Russian literature from gaining prominence in the Anglophone world.

I will begin by establishing a lack of correlation between the nature of Gippius’s texts and their muted Anglophone reception. In the case of “No Man’s Land” in particular, it is clear that Gippius’s writing did not get a fair hearing in English in part because its politically abrasive and literarily groundbreaking contents were met with a reception so muted as to be virtually nonexistent. The bulk of this article is an exercise in the contrast between the controversy a reading of “No Man’s Land” creates and the story’s reception, whose utter lack of controversy can only signal a lack of reading.

## II. A LOUD STORY

“No Man’s Land” delivers an engaging parable that overlaps political provocation with substantial innovations in literary technique. Gippius and Taylor, who knowingly produced the story for a British audience, could even anticipate the difficulties contemporary Russian writers faced in the English language in the mid-1910s and use them to the story’s advantage.[vii] As contemporary Russia emerged in Britain as a political ally above all else, British readers could easily overlook Russian literature that claimed to be disengaged from its country’s political role. In the opening to “No Man’s Land,” Gippius and Taylor not only undermine this expectation; they establish an unreliable narrator capable of turning the tables on a reader who expects concrete political claims from the story. That narrator complains:

To-day it is very difficult to write stories. People ask for them and ask for them, but are never satisfied. If you think out something like

fact, like something contemporary and authentic, then they say: “Why ever invent something that resembles reality, when one can have reality itself?” This is quite true. And if you write something which is fictitious, again it doesn’t do. “What sort of author is this, who, while worlds are shaking, invents imaginary happenings?”[viii]

The narrator of “No Man’s Land” ostensibly turns to his reader as a confidante; he complains not about “you” but about “people.”[ix] However, a reader of an anthology as deeply embedded in current events as *The Soul of Russia* would typically be one of those “people”—someone who has come to a text seeking both a story and earth-shaking political truths suitable for earth-shaking times. The narrator immediately places such a reader in a position of discomfort both by asking her to rethink her assumptions about the story’s purpose and by teasingly trusting that she does not actually hold them herself. The narrator proceeds not to insist upon telling a story anyway, proving the political reader wrong, but to acquiesce to that reader’s concerns, at least rhetorically:

The only thing to do is to imagine nothing, but just to sit down and lazily call to mind some old fairy tales, to tell them to oneself, without effort, and without troubling as to whether they bear upon what is real or not, or even if there be anything in them at all.

The narrator’s resigned tone, it turns out, houses the setup for precisely the kind of fantastic story whose rejection he anticipated. In the end, his acquiescence is only a vehicle for a quiet insistence that, war or no war, stories persist. In these two paragraphs, Gippius and Taylor preempt a criticism that Gippius had already attempted to dismantle in Russian: war must subsume art.[x]

In the second paragraph, the narrator takes his defensive tactics one step further: he uses that criticism to establish the unreliability of the narrative he proceeds to relay. His story is not unreliable in the way critics have come to expect from works like Vladimir Nabokov’s *Pale Fire* or Henry James’s *The Turn of the Screw*, however. This narrator confesses his story to be a fairy tale; he claims no pretense to truth-telling. What his readers cannot trust is his narrative about the relationships between his tale and real life. The narrator claims that the story he will tell may be empty of the real, that he has made no effort to imbue it with significance. In the following paragraphs, he also dissuades his reader from speculating about the real-world source of the tale: it may come from “some book or other,” he says; maybe from “the old almshouse woman who sometimes came to our house on Sundays;” maybe from his young friend Boris, who died of diphtheria; maybe from all of them; maybe from none.[xi] The story’s hidden source provides the narrator with a façade of detached impartiality. Nonetheless, the story is about a war and about the no man’s land that separates the warring sides, and it is part of an anthology about the Great War, whose signature geographical feature quickly became the no man’s land between enemy trenches. It is very difficult to read “No Man’s Land” without reading for an allegory with much to say about the world outside it.

Writing such a story for translation into English provided Gippius with an opportunity to open complicated questions about the merits of war and peace with which she could not have engaged in Russian. As Ben Hellman has described, an early

wave of overwhelming support for the war in Russian public discourse led Gippius to argue publicly for the necessity of the conflict and limit her doubts about it to private spaces like the pages of *Siniaia kniga* (*The Blue Book*), the diary she kept at the time. [xii] Once she did begin publicly expressing her pacifism in poems like “Bez opravdan’ia” (“Without Justification,” 1915), those opinions also demanded an unwavering, polemical stance as the war increasingly drew ire from both revolutionary politicians and Russian citizens at large. In English, however, Gippius’s readers would be entirely unfamiliar with her previous statements on the war and unable to put pressure on her to express a particular opinion about it. Gippius seems to have taken advantage of that situation to write a story that never reveals its narrator’s political motivations, leaving its readers to search for them in vain and question both war and pacifism in the process.

The narrator tells a story about two kings. The kings rule two indistinguishable kingdoms that are perpetually at war. When the kings’ descendants finally decide to strike up a peace agreement, they decide to build two high walls stretching across their entire continent, turning the middle half of that landmass, formerly a battleground, into a no man’s land. As peace reigns in both kingdoms, the kings’ subjects find themselves unoccupied and mysteriously begin losing their mental and physical strength. Children who exhibit a higher level of intelligence begin to disappear. The two kings meet on an island off the coast of the No Man’s Land to discuss this dilemma and are shocked to see a blue light flashing from the supposedly abandoned space between the walls. Soon after, the walls collapse outward, crushing their guards, and a flock of enormous birds carrying tall blue people floods into both kingdoms. The blue people declare that their ancestors, bored by life on the other side of the wall, fled to the No Man’s Land and formed a society in which every member is a king and no king goes to war with any other. “No Man’s Land” ends as the new kings colonize the entire world and begin to rule it as they please.

The story weaves a tangle of questions. First, who wins in its moral calculus? The two young kings make peace, but apparently at the cost of the well-being of their peoples. The blue people seek permanent peace, but they colonize their peaceful neighbors. The No Man’s Land is a massive graveyard, but it gives birth to new people with new ideas. Second, is the tale’s position even didactic? The pacifism of its original kings could exist for its own sake or for the sake of permanent division. The pacifism of its blue kings could also exist for its own sake, or it could exist for the sake of unrelenting colonialism. (Only the story’s ableism seems undoubtedly sincere.) Third, what relations connect the elements of the tale to the world as Gippius and Taylor knew it? If the No Man’s Land of “No Man’s Land” is the no man’s land of the Great War, then the two kingdoms find real-world equivalents in the Allied Powers and the Central Powers, but the blue kings are much more difficult to place, as are the two walls and the two kingdoms’ degeneration. In an anthology whose moral stance is set in a pro-Russian, pro-British, pro-alliance, and pro-war direction, such a story not only aims pointed questions at the writings that surround it—it forces its reader to grapple with a piece of literature that, though only eight pages long, puts those questions through a kaleidoscope of ambiguous plot devices in a way that a political opinion piece could not. All that the story justifies concretely is its initial insistence on the ability of art to shock readers out of compliance with the political pressures of war.

“No Man’s Land” is unique not only for its ability to free Gippius to confront her qualms about both militarism and pacifism but for its departure from Russian literature of

the half century that preceded it. British readers of Gippius's time were accustomed to the short stories of Chekhov and Tolstoy, which confronted concrete moral and social issues with emotional stances ranging from empathetic creativity to unforgiving moralism but never with fantasy, unreliable narrators, and moral ambiguity. Other contemporary writers of short fiction like Gorky, Teffi, Leonid Andreev, Aleksandr Kuprin, and Ivan Bunin tended to follow a similar, traditionally realist path. Even the stories of Nikolai Gogol rarely display narrators as self-conscious or allegories as bewildering as those that appear in "No Man's Land," and even that exemplar of self-conscious narrators, Dostoevsky's man from the underground, is himself a relatively transparent polemic against the imposed rationalism of a very real nineteenth-century Petersburg life. Gippius's combination of unreal worlds, untraceable allegory, and unreliable narration represents a major narrative innovation in the field of Russian fiction, and English-speaking readers had exclusive access to it.

### III. A SILENT RECEPTION

However, if any of those readers took advantage of that access and read "No Man's Land," they read it so quietly that I could discover no practical way to find traces of their readings. I began my search for the reception of "No Man's Land" with familiar sources of printed scholarship: books written and compiled by the prominent Gippius scholar Temira Pachmuss, collections of research on Gippius published by the Institute for World Literature in Moscow, books on Russian or women's writings in the First World War, and Gippius's volume in the reception-centered *Pro et contra* series.[xiii] When I could find no mention of "No Man's Land," I turned to scholarly databases: Project MUSE, JSTOR, a variety of EBSCO databases, the MLA International Bibliography, CyberLeninka, and Zhurnal'nyi zal.[xiv] I searched at first for texts that contained the terms Zinaida and Gippius (or Hippus, as her name was sometimes spelled) as well as the phrase "No Man's Land." I also tried various possible Russian titles (*neitral'naia polosa*, *neitral'naia zona*, *nicheinaia polosa*, *nich'ia zemlia*) in hopes of stumbling across a record of the original Russian manuscript. These searches returned zero hits. Searches for Cyrillic and Latin spellings of Gippius's name had identical results, and searching for "Soul of Russia" or the terms Susette and Taylor instead of the title of the story were similarly discouraging. I soon decided to cast a wider net by turning to search engines and searchable databases with a much broader scope. I selected Google, Google Scholar, Google Books, Yandex, Natsional'nyi korpus russkogo iazyka (The National Corpus of the Russian Language), HathiTrust, and the Internet Archive both for the number of texts they contain and because they allow users to search the full texts of their contents rather than metadata alone. I modified my terms for these broader searches based on the scope and nature of each database. For example, because HathiTrust tends to give only the page numbers of search hits, I first searched for books in which "Gippius" or "Hippus" and "no man's land" were on nearby pages and then searched for "Gilbert" and "Gubar" to see whether the phrase "no man's land" in fact referred to Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's three-volume book series, which it nearly always did. In extremely large search engines like Google and Yandex, I often restricted my searches to the years 1915-1940 so that I could read each result. In no case did I find a record of "No Man's Land," let alone its reception, other than *The Soul of Russia* itself. Finally, I searched the British Newspaper Archive, the

Historical American Newspapers database, and the *Times* Digital Archive, where I found advertisements for and reviews of *The Soul of Russia* but no mention of Gippius's story.

I find it unlikely that no reader has happened across *The Soul of Russia* and turned to page 159 within the past century, especially given that at least 167 copies of the anthology remain in circulation in libraries alone according to WorldCat.org. I also cannot claim that no record of the reception of "No Man's Land" exists at all. However, I can think of no way of searching for it short of combing at random through the private archives of London's wealthier 1916 residents. This is an unusual finding for a short work written by a major Russian author, even a contemporary one, in the early twentieth century.[xv] When the story in question is as provocative as "No Man's Land," such a result suggests that the work did not gain a wider readership because, due to the historical circumstances surrounding the text, not enough readers accessed the story for even one of them to voice an opinion about it in a prominent public forum. "No Man's Land" would not necessarily have found favor with an early twentieth-century British audience; on the contrary, its divergence from the Russian literature to which that audience was accustomed and from the other pieces in *The Soul of Russia* would likely have drawn confusion and criticism. Silence, however, would be an unlikely response to such a text. The remainder of this article illuminates one of the many reasons for that silence.

#### IV. THE TWO RUSSIAS

What I call the 'two Russias' split targeted contemporary Russian literature as a class by its internal logic alone. Even Maxim Gorky, whose sudden rise to fame ensured that his work would be translated into English with or without the help of his own social maneuverings, fell victim to it simply by virtue of being a contemporary writer. I propose that this split took place around the year 1910: with Tolstoy's death in that year, Chekhov's in 1904, the Anglo-Russian Entente in 1907, and the beginning of the Great War in 1914, the meaning of the word "Russia" (but not *Rossiya*) began to change as the Russian state gained political significance in the predominantly Anglophone countries that fought alongside it. When that word or the phrase "the Russians" appear in texts written after the first decade of the twentieth century, they tend to refer not to a historically continuous nation-state but, after a fashion, either to an archaic nation or to a neoteric state. In the former case, "Russia" is a land of traditional folk art and soulful, occasionally primitive literature. Its temporal home is the nineteenth century and earlier. Its foremost representatives are "the Russians" as Virginia Woolf, D.H. Lawrence, and other literary figures meant the phrase: authors of realist or philosophical prose in the line of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Chekhov. [xvi] A biographical note preceding S.S. Koteliansky's translation of Lev Shestov's book *All Things Are Possible* even notes that "Shestov is one of the living Russians," as though "the Russians" are an old breed whose members have gradually been dying off.[xvii] Russian culture, then, increasingly appeared in English as a phenomenon of the past. The new, present "Russia" was a military ally and a budding revolutionary government. It was the state that appeared in newspaper headlines like "Russia's Struggle" (1915), "Russia and the War" (1917), and "The Allies and Russia" (1920).[xviii] Decades later, this political and military Russia continued to appear, albeit as an enemy, in "Russia Quits World Health Agency" (1949), "No military base in Cuba, says Russia" (1970), and "Trump aide told Australian diplomat Russia had dirt on Clinton" (2017).[xix] The essential



characteristic of this split is not the separation of the political from the cultural. Studies at the intersection of semiotics and international marketing have described that kind of multiplication in national images for a few decades, and their findings are hardly limited to Russia.[xx] What is remarkable about the English-language usage of “Russia” in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is the temporal split between the political Russia and the cultural one.[xxi] In a literary context, scholars continue to use “the Russians” to refer to Tolstoy and Dostoevsky but not to the political leaders who censored and imprisoned them (and almost never to more recent writers).[xxii] Meanwhile, present-day artistic figures appear in political commentary as the opponents of “*Putin’s Russia*” and not as Russia’s representatives.[xxiii] As this bifurcation in Anglophone representations of Russia began to emerge in the early twentieth century, its formation coincided with and deeply affected the development of the English-language canon of Russian literature.

The history of Zinaida Gippius’s reception in English illustrates how the separation of the two Russias, by denying the very possibility of contemporary Russian literature, first began to limit most English-language readership of Russian literature to the nineteenth century. Specifically, as translators, editors, and readers deemed Gippius and her writings irrelevant to the workings of the post-revolutionary Soviet state, they slowed the circulation of her work rather than finding other sources of interest in it. Even before the Revolution, Winifred Stephens, the editor of *The Soul of Russia*, placed “No Man’s Land” in a section of the anthology entitled “War in General” even though its title pointed clearly to another section, “The Present War.” Stephens appears to reserve the latter section for pieces whose stance on the political issues of the day was immediately clear; a piece called “Face to Face with War” by Olga Metchnikoff, for instance, portrays the citizens of (immediately pre-Revolutionary) Russia as united and ready for sacrifice in the face of a brutal German enemy.[xxiv] *The Soul of Russia* itself soon fell prey to a similar bias: a single year after its publication, its descriptions of a durable Russian-British alliance became obsolete as the new Bolshevik government condemned both the alliance and the imperialism of its predecessor’s ally. Although the Bolshevik Revolution did not actually reduce the value of the anthology’s artistic and literary pieces, the fact that readership of *The Soul of Russia* has since largely been limited to a scholarly audience hints that British readers felt the entire book to be a kind of outdated historical artifact. [xxv]

This theory of a ‘two Russias’ split both explains contemporary Russian literature’s exclusion from Anglophone canon and responds to an emerging question in the study of Russian-British relations about the source of Anglophone interest in Russian cultural products. Rebecca Beasley and Philip Ross Bullock, two leading scholars in that field, observe that “[British] interest in more recent developments in the Russian arts seems to have been almost entirely restricted to dance.”[xxvi] Even post-revolutionary futurist art from Russia, they note, seemed not to attract attention in London. Stephens’s introduction to *The Soul of Russia* carries a hint as to the cause of this disparity: the anthology, she wrote, “describes a circle, so to speak, in the tendency to revive the archaic exhibited by [Dmitry Semyonovich] Stelletsy’s pictures.”[xxvii] Stelletsy’s paintings joined art by Lev Bakst and Natalia Goncharova in the anthology; all three artists were best known outside Russia for producing the sets of the Ballets Russes. The Ballets Russes, I suggest, were by far the most successful form of contemporary Russian art in early twentieth-century Britain not because they centered on dance—after all, their musical

scores and sets also struck a chord with British viewers—but because they could be read as a primitivist expression of the Russian soul. Even the Ballets Russes succeeded only because they fit into the mold of one of the two Russias.

I have turned to the writings of Zinaida Gippius and to “No Man’s Land” in particular because they seem to insist that they need not fit that mold. Gippius’s writings are unabashedly contemporary, not in the sense that they fit what scholars now call contemporary literature but in the sense that they are written in and about their present moment even when, as in “No Man’s Land,” they do not explicitly describe a present world. They are also unabashedly artistic, introducing their viewers to worlds and characters who, like the blue kings of the land between the walls, are often difficult to conceive. Gippius’s narrators tend to be very stubborn about handling contemporary political and social issues through a cryptic narrative medium, and even if that medium occasionally makes Gippius’s works difficult to translate, it also makes them stand out from the writings of her predecessors. Beginning in the 1960s, Gippius’s life, philosophy, and writing finally began to achieve recognition among English-speaking scholars of her generation of Russian writers thanks to the research and translations of Temira Pachmuss. More recently, Olga Matich and Jenifer Presto have brought her works to the attention of Russianists more broadly. This article aims to expand that attention beyond the realm of Russian Studies: the works of Zinaida Gippius merit the attention of a broad audience both within and outside the academy.

---

## NOTES

[i] Rebecca L. Walkowitz, *Born Translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature, Literature Now* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015).

Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson, *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation* (New York: Routledge, 2014).

[ii] Winifred Stephens, ed., *The Soul of Russia* (London Macmillan, 1916).

[iii] I searched for a Russian version of “No Man’s Land” in the 15-volume edition of Zinaida Gippius’s collected works (*Ruskaia kniga*, 2001-2012) and on the Internet as well as in the Russian State Archive of Literature and the Arts (Moscow), in the archives of the Institute of Russian Literature (St. Petersburg), and in the catalog of the Gippius papers at the University of Illinois. I found no mentions of or excerpts from the story. I also searched for the archives of the four individuals through whom “No Man’s Land” entered the English language: Maria Tsetlina, Daniel Gorodetsky, Susette M. Taylor, and Winifred Stephens. While both Tsetlina and Taylor left books and artworks to institutions they valued, none left an accessible archive of documents.

“Temira Pachmuss and Vladimir Zlobin Collection, 1901-1996” (University of Illinois), Record Series Number 15/20/21, University of Illinois Archives, accessed December 29, 2017, <https://archives.library.illinois.edu/uasfa/1520021.pdf>.

[iv] “Ms. Susette M. Taylor,” *The Geographical Journal* 57, no. 3 (1921): 238.

Karen Attar, *Directory of Rare Book and Special Collections in the UK and Republic of Ireland* (Facet Publishing, 2016), 338.

“Education,” in Janet Horowitz Murray and Myra Stark, *The Englishwoman’s Review of Social and Industrial Questions: 1886* (Routledge, 2016).

- [v] Rebecca Beasley and Philip Ross Bullock, eds., *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism* (Oxford University Press, 2013).
- [vi] Olga Kaznina, *Russkie v Anglii. Russkaia emigratsiia v kontekste rusko-angliiskikh literaturnykh svyazei v pervoi polovine XX veka* (Moscow: Nasledie, 1997).
- [vii] Because Gippius's Russian manuscript is unavailable to me, I prefer to think of "No Man's Land" as a collaborative effort. The text that survives was not Gippius's creation alone, and excluding Susette Taylor's role in its composition would misrepresent the source of my analysis.
- [viii] Stephens, *The Soul of Russia*, 159.
- [ix] My choice to describe the narrator of the story using masculine pronouns is based primarily on Gippius's tendency to write both fiction and poetry from a male character's point of view, but my guess could nonetheless be entirely incorrect. In Taylor's rendition of Gippius's story, the narrator uses a single verb that would, in Russian, reveal its speaker's gender ("may have heard"), but it is possible that such a verb did not appear in Gippius's manuscript. It is also possible that the verb reveals a female narrator.
- [x] See, for example, "Togda i opiat'" in Zinaida N. Gippius, *Poslednie stikhi (The Last Verses)*, reprint of *Poslednie stikhi, 1914-1918*. St. Petersburg: 1918. (Letchworth, Herts.: Prideaux Press, 1974). Gippius engages in an internal argument about the merits of wartime art in "Tishe" in the same collection.
- [xi] Stephens, *The Soul of Russia*, 159.
- [xii] Ben Hellman, *Poets of Hope and Despair: The Russian Symbolists in War and Revolution (1914-1918)* (Helsinki: Institute for Russian and East European Studies, 1995), 139-217.
- [xiii] Zinaida N. Gippius, *Intellect and Ideas in Action: Selected Correspondence of Zinaida Hippus*, ed. Temira Pachmuss (München: W. Fink, 1972).
- Zinaida N. Gippius, *Stranitsy iz proshlogo: Iz perepiski Zinaidy Gippius*, ed. Temira Pachmuss (Frankfurt am Main ; New York: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2003).
- Z. N. Gippius, N. V. Koroleva, and Institut mirovoi literatury imeni A.M. Gor'kogo, eds., *Zinaida Nikolaevna Gippius: Novye Materialy, Issledovaniia* (Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2002).
- Hellman, *Poets of Hope and Despair*.
- Margaret R. Higonnet, ed., *Lines of Fire: Women Writers of World War I* (New York: Plume, 1999).
- Temira Pachmuss, *Zinaida Hippus: An Intellectual Profile*, 1st edition (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971).
- Temira Pachmuss, *Zinaida Hippus: Hypatia dvadtsatogo veka* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2002).
- Aleksander N. Nikoliukin, ed., *Z.N. Gippius: pro et contra: lichnost' i tvorchestvo Zinaidy Gippius v otsenke sovremennikov i issledovatelei: antologiya* (Russkii khristianskii humanitarnyi institut, 2008).
- [xiv] All searches described in this paragraph were conducted between January 2015 and December 2017.
- [xv] A similar set of searches for *The Green Ring*, one of the other works by Gippius published in English, quickly yields results in both secondary and primary sources. The same goes for randomly selected short stories by Chekhov that were translated in the same period by Constance Garnett. I also searched for Alexander Kuprin's "Captain Ribnikov," published as part of a collection in 1916 in a translation by S.S. Koteliansky and John Middleton Murry, because it

is lesser-known work written by a lesser-known author than Chekhov. That story earned specific reviews and commentary in British newspapers that appear in the British Newspaper Archive although it did not appear as the title story of its collection.

For Chekhov, see e.g. Anton Pavlovich Chekhov, *The Darling, and Other Stories*, trans. Constance Black Garnett (New York, Macmillan, 1921).

Aleksandr Ivanovich Kuprin, *The River of Life, and Other Stories*, trans. Samuel Solomonovich Koteliansky and John Middleton Murry (Boston: J.W. Luce, 1916).

[xvi] See, for example:

D.H. Lawrence, "Forward," in *All Things Are Possible*, by Leo Shestov (New York: R.M. McBride & Co., 1920), 7–12.

Virginia Woolf, "Modern Fiction," in *The Common Reader: First Series* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1925), 146–54.

Virginia Woolf, "The Russian Point of View," in *The Common Reader: First Series* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1925), 173–82.

[xvii] Leo Shestov, *All Things Are Possible*, trans. S.S. Koteliansky (New York: R.M. McBride & Co., 1920), 5.

[xviii] "Russia's Struggle," *Wells Journal*, October 15, 1915, British Newspaper Archive.

"Russia and the War," *Evening Despatch*, May 5, 1917, British Newspaper Archive.

"The Allies and Russia," *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, February 25, 1920, British Newspaper Archive.

[xix] "Russia Quits World Health Agency," *The Nottingham Journal*, February 17, 1949, British Newspaper Archive.

"No Military Base in Cuba, Says Russia," *Birmingham Daily Post*, October 14, 1970, British Newspaper Archive.

Sabrina Siddiqui, "Trump Aide Told Australian Diplomat Russia Had Dirt on Clinton – Report," *The Guardian*, December 31, 2017, sec. US news, <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/dec/30/donald-trump-russia-inquiry-george-papadopoulos-australian-diplomat>.

[xx] Nicolas G. Papadopoulos and Louise Heslop, *Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing* (Psychology Press, 1993).

[xxi] I most frequently use the words "politics" and "political" in this article in the second sense given by the *Oxford English Dictionary*: I refer to the state and to the people officially charged with running it. Those words effectively convey the conglomerate of government and military actors that many Anglophone commentators labeled as representatives of Russia after the nineteenth century. When I use "politics" in a broader sense, I say so explicitly or use a compound term such as "politics of gender."

"Politics, n.," *OED Online* (Oxford University Press, n.d.), <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/237575>.

[xxii] Studies in the field of British Russophilia exemplify this trend:

Neil Cornwell, *James Joyce and the Russians* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992).

Roberta Rubenstein, *Virginia Woolf and the Russian Point of View* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Joanna Woods, Katerina: *The Russian World of Katherine Mansfield* (Auckland: Penguin, 2001).

George J. Zytaruk, *D. H. Lawrence's Response to Russian Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971).

[xxiii] Emphasis added. Perhaps the best example in recent months can be found in commentary published in English-language news sources on the criminal allegations leveled against the theater director Kirill Serebrennikov. Unlike coverage of the same events in independent Russian-language sources like *Meduza* and *Novaya gazeta*, pieces selected for publication in American and British sources often explicitly identify Putin but not his opponents with ownership or representation of Russia. Compare the following:

Oleg Kashin, "Opinion: Portrait of the Artist in Putin's Russia," *The New York Times*, September 14, 2017, sec. Opinion, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/14/opinion/artist-putin-russia-serebrennikov.html>.

Pavel Merzlikin, "Advokat Ekateriny Voronovoi otvechaet na voprosy, vznikshie posle pis'ma eyo podsashchitnoi o dele 'Sed'moi studii. 'Suda nad Katei prosto ne dolzhno byt,'" *Meduza*, December 1, 2017, <https://meduza.io/feature/2017/12/01/advokat-ekateriny-voronovoy-otvechaet-na-voprosy-voznikshie-posle-pisma-ee-podzaschitnoy-o-dele-sedmoy-studii>.

Sasha Sulim, "'Posmotrite na menia, na moyom litse net sledov prestupleniia.' Figuranty dela 'Sed'moi studii' ostalis' pod arestom," *Meduza*, December 14, 2017, <https://meduza.io/feature/2017/12/04/posmotrite-na-menya-na-moem-litse-net-sledov-prestupleniya>.

[xxiv] Stephens, *The Soul of Russia*, 174-176.

[xxv] The anthology is discussed briefly in 1954 in Dorothy Brewster's early and highly valuable contribution to the study of British Russophilia, but I could find very few references to it in earlier documents, including those dating to the era of "Russian fever" itself, beyond newspaper advertisements. Dorothy Brewster, *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1954), 170-172.

[xxvi] Rebecca Beasley and Philip Ross Bullock, "Introduction: The Illusion of Transparency," *Translation and Literature* 20, no. 3 (November 2011): 283-300, 295.

[xxvii] Stephens, *The Soul of Russia*, vi.

---

## WORKS CITED

Attar, Karen. *Directory of Rare Book and Special Collections in the UK and Republic of Ireland*. Facet Publishing, 2016.

Beasley, Rebecca, and Philip Ross Bullock. "Introduction: The Illusion of Transparency." *Translation and Literature* 20, no. 3 (November 2011): 283-300.

———, eds. *Russia in Britain, 1880-1940: From Melodrama to Modernism*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Brewster, Dorothy. *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1954.

Chekhov, Anton Pavlovich. *The Darling, and Other Stories*. Translated by Constance Black Garnett. New York, Macmillan, 1921.

Cornwell, Neil. *James Joyce and the Russians*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992.

Gippius, Zinaida N. *Intellect and Ideas in Action: Selected Correspondence of Zinaida Hippus*. Edited by Temira Pachmuss. München: W. Fink, 1972.

———. *Poslednie stikhi (The Last Verses)*. Reprint of *Poslednie stikhi, 1914-1918*. St. Petersburg: 1918. Letchworth, Herts.: Prideaux Press, 1974.

- . *Stranitsy iz proshlogo: Iz perepiski Zinaidy Gippius*. Edited by Temira Pachmuss. Frankfurt am Main, New York: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2003.
- Hellman, Ben. *Poets of Hope and Despair: The Russian Symbolists in War and Revolution (1914-1918)*. Helsinki: Institute for Russian and East European Studies, 1995.
- Higonnet, Margaret R., ed. *Lines of Fire: Women Writers of World War I*. New York: Plume, 1999.
- Hokenson, Jan Walsh, and Marcella Munson. *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Kashin, Oleg. "Opinion: Portrait of the Artist in Putin's Russia." *The New York Times*, September 14, 2017, sec. Opinion. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/14/opinion/artist-putin-russia-serebrennikov.html>.
- Kaznina, Olga. *Russkie v Anglii. Russkaia emigratsiia v kontekste rusko-angliiskikh literaturnykh sviazei v pervoi polovine XX veka*. Moscow: Nasledie, 1997.
- Kuprin, Aleksandr Ivanovich. *The River of Life, and Other Stories*. Translated by Samuel Solomonovich Koteliansky and John Middleton Murry. Boston: J.W. Luce, 1916.
- Merzlikin, Pavel. "Advokat Ekateriny Voronovoi otvechaet na voprosy, vznikshie posle pis'ma eyo podsashchitnoi o dele 'Sed'moi studii.' 'Suda nad Katei prosto ne dolzhno byt'"" *Meduza*, December 1, 2017. <https://meduza.io/feature/2017/12/01/advokat-ekateriny-voronovoy-otvechaet-na-voprosy-vznikshie-posle-pisma-ee-podzaschitnoy-o-dele-sedmoy-studii>.
- "Ms. Susette M. Taylor." *The Geographical Journal* 57, no. 3 (1921): 238.
- Murray, Janet Horowitz, and Myra Stark. *The Englishwoman's Review of Social and Industrial Questions: 1886*. Routledge, 2016.
- Nikoliukin, Aleksander N., ed. *Z.N. Gippius: pro et contra: lichnost' i tvorchestvo Zinaidy Gippius v otsenke sovremennikov i issledovatelei: antologiya*. Russkii khristianskii gumanitarnyi institut, 2008.
- "No Military Base in Cuba, Says Russia." *Birmingham Daily Post*. October 14, 1970. British Newspaper Archive.
- Pachmuss, Temira. *Zinaida Hippus: An Intellectual Profile*. 1st edition. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971.
- . *Zinaida Hippus: Hypatia dvadtsatogo veka*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2002.
- Papadopoulos, Nicolas G., and Louise Heslop. *Product-Country Images: Impact and Role in International Marketing*. Psychology Press, 1993.
- "Politics, N." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, n.d. <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/237575>.
- Rubenstein, Roberta. *Virginia Woolf and the Russian Point of View*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- "Russia and the War." *Evening Despatch*. May 5, 1917. British Newspaper Archive.
- "Russia Quits World Health Agency." *The Nottingham Journal*. February 17, 1949. British Newspaper Archive.
- "Russia's Struggle." *Wells Journal*. October 15, 1915. British Newspaper Archive.
- Shestov, Leo. *All Things Are Possible*. Translated by S.S. Koteliansky. New York: R.M. McBride & Co., 1920.
- Siddiqi, Sabrina. "Trump Aide Told Australian Diplomat Russia Had Dirt on Clinton – Report." *The Guardian*, December 31, 2017, sec. US news. <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/dec/30/donald-trump-russia-inquiry-george-papadopoulos-australian-diplomat>.

Stephens, Winifred, ed. *The Soul of Russia*. London: Macmillan, 1916.

Sulim, Sasha. "Posmotrite na menia, na moyom litse net sledov prestupleniia." *Figuranty dela 'Sedmoi studii' ostalis' pod arestom.* *Meduza*, December 14, 2017. <https://meduza.io/feature/2017/12/04/posmotrite-na-menya-na-moem-litse-net-sledov-prestupleniya>.

"Temira Pachmuss and Vladimir Zlobin Collection, 1901-1996." University of Illinois. Record Series Number 15/20/21. University of Illinois Archives. Accessed December 29, 2017. <https://archives.library.illinois.edu/uasfa/1520021.pdf>.

"The Allies and Russia." *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*. February 25, 1920. British Newspaper Archive.

Walkowitz, Rebecca L. *Born Translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature*. Literature Now. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

Woods, Joanna. *Katerina: The Russian World of Katherine Mansfield*. Auckland: Penguin, 2001.

Woolf, Virginia. "Modern Fiction." In *The Common Reader: First Series*, 146–54. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1925.

———. "The Russian Point of View." In *The Common Reader: First Series*, 173–82. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1925.

Zytaruk, George J. *D. H. Lawrence's Response to Russian Literature*. The Hauge: Mouton, 1971.