Afternoon
It is no longer within the power of the English mind - the gift may be enjoyed perhaps in Russia - to see fur grow upon smooth ears and cloven hoofs where there are ten separate toes.

Virginia Woolf

October 1924, the first English translation of *The Life of the Archpriest Avvakum*, a 17th century Russian text, was published to good reviews as the 41st imprint of The Hogarth Press. Avvakum joined an already impressive list of Russian titles at Hogarth, the press founded and managed by Leonard and Virginia Woolf. November 1926, the young publishing firm - The Nonesuch Press - issued its 35th publication, *The Book of the Bear*. Nonesuch shared neither Hogarth’s interest in Russian texts nor new authors. The *Book of the Bear* is the only translation from the Russian and one of only three children’s books among Nonesuch’s first hundred titles. *Avvakum* and *The Book of the Bear* were anomalous ventures for both these private Presses, differing though their practices and objectives were.

This essay charts the course of their translator - classical archeologist turned historical anthropologist - Jane Ellen Harrison (1850-1928), and her role in facilitating a connection between the worlds of privileged Bloomsbury and impoverished Russian refugees. The story of how these charming, diminutive books came into the world offers a glimpse into the stark divergence between the social reality of Britain - sometimes viewed as relatively unchanged after the horrors of the Great War - and that of the Russian intellectuals living in what they still believed to be a temporary exile after the cataclysmic events of revolution and civil war. Further, it brings together a number of diverse threads: the close-knit nature of the British literary community, the comparable intimacy among Russians abroad, and Bloomsbury’s fascination with an exotic notion of Russia.
English sentiment regarding Russia dates at least from the sixteenth-century English voyages of discovery and their accounts of the Muscovites published by Richard Hakluyt. The persistence into the twentieth century of the negative national and racial stereotypes fostered by Hakluyt’s narratives was accentuated by Russia’s cultural and historical isolation from the West. Virginia Woolf highlights the ambiguous human/animal boundary inherent in Hakluyt’s depictions of a barbaric Russia in the Russian episode of Orlando (1928) - a kind of tribute to the tenacity of ancient stereotypes.

Cultural alienation was paralleled by political animosity. Nineteenth-century competition for the territories of Central Asia intensified a natural antagonism between a "liberal" Great Britain and a "reactionary" Imperial Russia. With the 1907 signing of the Anglo-Russian entente, British hostility to Russia modulated into curiosity. Travel between the two countries increased, paralleled by a notable increase in literary translation.

In the first decade of the twentieth century, Constance Black Garnett (1862-1946) was the pre-eminent translator of Russian literature into English. The 1912 publication of the Garnett translation of Dostoevsky’s The Brothers Karamazov is universally acknowledged as the stimulus to the "Russia Fever" which subsequently consumed the British public. Constance was the first to translate Dostoevsky and Chekhov (the Russian authors most in vogue during the second decade of the twentieth century) into English directly from the Russian. Prior to Garnett’s work, British access to Russian literature was largely mediated through French. The literature was read either in French, as Virginia Woolf had read Crime and Punishment during her honeymoon, or translated into English from the French.

A further stimulus to British interest in Russia was their allied status during World War I. Among its rationales for the war, German propaganda had promulgated the argument that "Moscovite barbarism" must be defeated. The British periodic press devoted considerable space to the question: who are the Russians? Was Russia civilized or barbaric, part of Europe or the Orient? These were the terms of the debate. Translations of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky became primary texts for addressing the question: who are the Russians? The 1917 Russian Revolution, nearly coincident with the end of the war, created an entirely new focus for the debate. By 1921, British interest in Russia "was undergoing an upsurge […], spiced now in the post-revolutionary situation by even sharper factionalism than had been the case in the liberal/revolutionary debates before 1914" (Smith, Mirsky 87).

There had been a Russian community in Britain before the war, but
the diaspora following the events of 1917 and ensuing Russian Civil War sent into the European capitals an influx of artists and intellectuals who had lived through those seemingly apocalyptic events. The explosion of art during the Russian Silver Age (1892-1917) continued along revolutionary paths into the 1920's. This second generation of "Russia Abroad" could potentially mediate access to that mysterious, alien world of such interest, if largely inaccessible, to British youth. For literary Russians, survival itself demanded that they expand their readership beyond the narrow market of their impoverished, émigré compatriots. This meant cultivating an understanding of the literature they were producing through good literary criticism. And, of course, through translation. The story of Avvakum and The Book of the Bear touches on all these factors.

G. S. Smith notes that "[p]ostwar 'New' Bloomsbury inherited and developed an idea of Russia that had been shaped by the translation of Russian fiction and theorized before the Great War [...], an idea that Russia, lying outside the cultured world, cared more for things of the spirit" (Smith, Mirsky 98). To exemplify the "idea of Russia as apart, different, preserving primordial spiritual values that had been lost in the West", Smith cites an observation, particularly relevant to the subject of this paper, made by Virginia Woolf: "[...] it is no longer within the power of the English mind - the gift may be enjoyed perhaps in Russia - to see fur grow upon smooth ears and cloven hoofs where there are ten separate toes" (cited in Smith, Mirsky 99).

Woolf clearly recognized this power within the sixteenth-century mind of Orlando, who named his Russian princess Sasha, thinking of her as the white fox he had kept as a pet during childhood. The allure of a putative, primordial Other, still existing beyond Western European borders, is apparent as well in her 1940 biography of Roger Fry. She wrote: "And with Coué in his mind he went to the Colonial Exhibition at Marseilles and exclaimed, on seeing the Negroes, 'What we've lost by forgetting how to be animals!'" (RF 249)

Who was Jane Harrison that she should be a pivotal figure linking the worlds of Bloomsbury and Russia? While her co-translator, Hope Mirrlees, was the same generation as 'New' Bloomsbury, Harrison had known most of 'New' Bloomsbury since they were children. G. S. Smith notes that this younger generation's notion of a more spiritual Russia had been partially shaped by Harrison herself (Smith, Mirsky 98). The "Second Jane Ellen Harrison Memorial Lecture", delivered a year after her death, addresses Harrison's relevance and appeal to this younger generation:
[. . .] the historical role played by the science of anthropology and comparative religion in undermining Victorian security was at least as great as that of Russian literature, and the real salt and zest of the great age of English Anthropology seems to me to have resided precisely in the heterodox and unacademic Miss Harrison rather than in her more famous and canonized fellow-workers [. . .]. The way walked by her from the study of Greek vases through that of primitive religion to Freud and Tolstoy will be recognized as one of the most illuminating expressions of the intellectual evolution of the English mind at the turn of two historical epochs (Mirsky, "Jane Ellen Harrison and Russia" 3-4).

The lecture further refers her "historic mission: the destruction of the morality on which the mentality of the 'governing people' [...] of England was based"- a destruction realized in the very lives of 'New Bloomsbury'. "Jane Harrison [...] was much younger than her physical generation and intellectually much nearer to her juniors" (16-17).

Virtually all those who left a record of their acquaintance with Harrison highlight her perpetual youthfulness. Leonard Woolf recalled: "When I knew her she was old and frail physically, but she had a mind which remained eternally young" (26). In perhaps the first published acknowledgement of Virginia’s affinity for Harrison, Jessie Stewart makes the following observation: "She was the 'Lady Themis'. She liked to be Potnia Keron, the 'Lady of the Sprites' of her letters to G[ilbert] M[urray]. Of that tradition let Virginia Woolf speak" (Stewart 187). She then cites the passage referring to Harrison in A Room of One’s Own, beginning with "The gardens of Newnham" and running through "out of the heart of spring".

The trajectory, from Greek vases to Russian literature, is seen by Harrison’s early biographer Sandra Peacock as "the circle completed". Indeed, Harrison frames her memoirs, Reminiscences of a Student’s Life (Hogarth Press, 1925), with Russia. The opening sentence reads: "In view of my present cult for Russia and things Russian, I like to think that my first childish memory is of the word 'Moscow'" (9). Nearly all writers on Harrison are captivated by her evocation of "childish memories" of things Russian in Reminiscences and cite them extensively. Peacock writes:

Jane fell in love with Russia at an early age because of her father’s extensive business dealing with Russian timber merchants, and one of her fondest memories was of a Russian sledge in which he sometimes took her for drives. Describing these outings, Jane remarked, "thank God it held only one, so I could dream undisturbed of steppes and Siberia and bears and wolves" (Peacock 11).
Can we identify the salient features of the trajectory from Greek vases to Russian literature? Harrison had abandoned "the glory that was", with its reverence for Olympian Greece, when she turned from archeology toward primitive religion. From this shift had emerged her late scholarly book, *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (1912). In *Themis*, Harrison located the origin of religion in a collectively held emotion: collective desire for the periodic renewal of life which coalesced in rituals devoted to eliciting the new growing season. Harrison's formulation of recurring return, which established her reputation, underlies the ubiquitous references to the perpetual youthfulness of her character and the force of her influence on British Modernist writers.

During the years Harrison was theorizing the emotive origins of religion, a number of Cambridge academics was questioning the narrow strictures of institutional religion. "They formed themselves into a society for 'discussion on problems of religion, philosophy and art'". Harrison read the inaugural paper on 7 December 1909. "Heresy and Humanity", addressing the effect of science on human consciousness, the social order and religion, is a fine introduction to the currents of thought roiling the transition from Victorian England into the modern world. A number of Bloomsbury figures belonged to The Heretics Society (see Robinson 232-5) and significant concepts relevant to the writing of both Woolfs are found in the Society's discussions: 'communal psychology' in Leonard's political writings and 'group consciousness' in Virginia's novels.

The shift from Greek archeology to religion, accomplished over the first decade of the century, had prepared the soil for Harrison's cult of things Russian, contemporary and past. The focus on emotions which give rise to the actions of ritual enabled Harrison to recognize ritual manifestations in contemporary life. Identifying points in common between ancient and contemporary cultural practices became central to her study of primitive religion and underlay her cultural anthropology. Russia, its language and culture, was to become, over the course of the following decade, the focal point for much of this new research. Harrison took up the study of Russian to get at the literature, to read Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov in the original. In October 1914, she wrote the oft-cited remark that Russia "still cares more than any other nation for things of the spirit" (cited in Stewart 155).

The road to Avvakum and *The Book of the Bear* led Harrison through France before returning to Bloomsbury. When she retired in 1922 from her position at Newnham College, Harrison, together with Mirrlees, moved to Paris which
was fast becoming the cultural and academic center of "Russia Abroad" (see Baranova-Shestov 182). In 1923, Harrison was invited to participate in the annual series of *entretiens* (colloquia) convened by Paul Desjardins at his manor, a former Cistercian abbey at Pontigny in Burgundy.  

As Smith remarks: "To be invited to Pontigny was to be recognized as a member of the European intellectual aristocracy" (Smith, Mirsky 101). Harrison commanded an international reputation for her work among the Cambridge Ritualists which may have prompted the invitation. With the mystique of Harrison's personal reputation in mind, her biographer, Annabel Robinson, notes the theme of the August 1923 session — 'Perpetual Youth', and suggests the possibility that Desjardins had read *Themis*, a book then taught at French universities (292).  

Special attention was devoted at the post-war *entretiens* to healing the rift with Germany and breaking down the nationalist isolation which the Great War had exposed. Harrison's turn to things Russian had evolved over the course of the war. In her most public statement, "Epilogue on the War: Peace with Patriotism" (1914), she had looked to Russia, in whose literature she identified a model of humanistic nationalism to counter the divisive nationalism which led to war. Pontigny, then, ushered Harrison into "Russia Abroad" - the Russian intelligentsia displaced by the events pursuant to 1917 — in terms conducive to facilitating their connection with Bloombury. Further, through the *entretiens*, Desjardins sought to further his ideal of a secular spirituality, bringing together diverse intellectuals who, through independent work on particular themes, might develop a body of new doctrine (Robinson 291). In this sense, Pontigny may be seen as an extension of Harrison's role in The Heretics Society.  

Harrison wrote from Pontigny on 29 August 1923: "I sit at present - we change every three days - between the Boche novelist Heinrich Mann, who is a dear, and my adored Russian philosopher Shestov - so I am content" (cited in Stewart 191). The émigré philosopher Lev Shestov (1866-1938) was the first "Russian to receive this accolade [an invitation to Pontigny]" (Smith, Mirsky 101). Through publication of an article on Dostoevsky in a February 1922 issue of *La Nouvelle Revue Francaise* (NRF), Shestov had come to the attention of the French public. And more significantly, to the attention of Andre Gide. Gide personally invited Shestov to his own six-lecture series on Dostoevsky, and Charles du Bos 19 began negotiations to publish Shestov's work in French (Baranova-Shestov 230-4). Also on the faculty of Paris University (the "Russian section of the Sorbonne"), Shestov offered a four-semester course, 1923/1924 and 1924/1925, on Dostoevsky, "The Philosophical Ideas of Dostoevsky and
Pascal” (Baranova-Shestov 236). It is certainly possible that Harrison may have attended some of these lectures. Through Shestov, it is most likely she met one of the two Russians who figure most prominently in her translations from the Russian: Aleksei Mikhailovich Remizov.20

Harrison and Mirrlees maintained an active social calendar, bringing together over tea English, French and Russian acquaintances. The milieu was decidedly literary. Gide, du Bos, and other writers associated with the NRF and the Pontigny entretiens were frequent visitors to Harrison’s Paris flat, together with the Russians who became part of her social-intellectual circle. Among the guests on April 9, 1924 were Logan Pearsall Smith and possibly du Bos, and Jean Schlumberger, novelist and critic, founder with Jacques Copeau and André Gide of the NRF (Smith, Letters 66nn18, 19).

Harrison’s first letter to Remizov is dated March 1, 1924. They are only recently acquainted, for she begs forgiveness at not yet knowing his patronymic. The letter, written in Russian, expresses disappointment at not seeing him the previous Sunday, invites him for the following, the 9th, and, curiously, gives as her new address: 4 rue de Chevreuse, where she had been living since November 1922. The next letter, dated April 7, invites Remizov and his wife, Seraphima to tea on Wednesday the 9th. “Ce sera un grand plaisir - de recevoir Madame aussi. Nous attendons le prince Mirsky qui vous adore!”

The second Russian to collaborate on the translations was Prince Dmitry Petrovich Sviatopolk Mirsky.22 Harrison’s friendship with Mirsky was productive for both. They furthered each other’s contacts within their respective communities - Mirsky in Bloomsbury,23 Harrison in ”Russia Abroad”. Mirsky was Harrison’s, as indeed many English speakers’, guide into Russian literature, and Harrison style-edited Mirsky’s hugely influential History of Russian Literature (1927), dedicated to Harrison.24

Smith dates Harrison’s acquaintance with Mirsky to the winter, 1923-1924. Her first letter to Mirsky, written the first week of April 1924, extends an invitation to tea on the 9th to which he had evidently responded by the 7th (Smith, Letters 65-6).25 It seems certain, then, that Remizov and Mirsky met over tea in Harrison’s and Mirrlees’ Paris flat on April 9, 1924 where the subject of Avvakum may have come up.

One senses from Harrison’s second letter to Mirsky (19 April) that the acquaintance is still quite new: “We are so glad there is a chance of seeing you again.” Harrison extends another invitation to tea, for the 26th, perhaps hoping to lure Mirsky with the prospect of Shestov’s attendance. The subject of Avvakum has certainly come up by this date, for she continues: “How kind of
you to try and get me the Avvakum text! But I fear it is difficult” (Letters 66-7). Harrison’s next letter to Mirsky is dated 14 May:

How kind of you to go on hunting for Avvakum. If you can get a copy from Russia I shall be more than glad to have it - but - for the immediate need, Mr Shestov tells me that Mr Remezov has a copy and will gladly lend it me, also that he will help me with any Old Russian difficulties - isn’t it good luck (Letters 67).

If Shestov had not been present on 26 April, he certainly was discussing the project with Harrison and Remizov, and the translation was soon underway. The first task was to obtain copies of the text. Through the probable intervention of either Shestov or Mirsky, Remizov wrote to Harrison and Mirrlees confirming the offer to assist with Avvakum and inviting them to what would be a working session. Harrison’s response to Remizov must have been written after her May 14 letter to Mirsky and before May 25.

Thank you very, very much for the letter and invitation - we will come on Sunday [the 25th] at 4:30 with great pleasure. It’s not possible to express how pleased we are that you and Serafima Pavlovna will read with us the Life of Avvakum. Despite the difficulty in obtaining the book it would be terribly difficult for us to understand such an old text without assistance (Remizov Papers).

On the 26th, Harrison reports to Mirsky on the meeting:

We spent a delightful Sunday afternoon with the Remezovs reading the Zhitie Avvakuma. We only got thro’ a page or two of the introduction - which charmed me, tho’ it is a little stiff in places - I am fairly sure that with the help of the two Remizovs (they are both so kind and delightful) I could make a satisfactory translation (Letters 68).

Smith suggests that Mirsky advanced the translation proposal. Though Mirsky had a personal interest in Avvakum (his two great-aunts had been exiled for their support of the Archpriest), the text’s status as a literary monument of medieval Russia alone would have motivated him to propose a translation. Mirsky found a vitality in Avvakum’s language which he would have preferred to see in the literature currently written in the emigration. Throughout his sojourn in the West, Mirsky actively promoted those contemporary Russian authors in the émigré community who satisfied his critical judgments. He was no less active in cultivating English appreciation of Russian literature, working
tirelessly to arrange the publication of English translations. He sent five letters alone to Charles Prentiss at Chatto & Windus promoting publication of English-language translations of Remizov (see Rogachevskii).

On points of language and style, the aesthetics of Mirsky and Remizov coincided: live, colloquial speech was the *sine qua non* for both. In his preface to the translation, Mirsky lectures both contemporary Russian authors and those foreigners who assert that there is "no difference between the spoken and the written language" of nineteenth-century Russian authors:

> The use of the language of everyday is a thing unknown to the unsophisticated stages of civilization. This is what makes Avvakum so astonishingly modern. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Russian literary craftsman of today has more to learn from Avvakum than from any writer of the nineteenth century. Turgenev and Tolstoy [...] seem as academic as Rasselas in the presence of Avvakum's daring modernity (27-8).

Mirsky's emphasis on the modernity of Avvakum's language sheds light on the Woolfs' decision to publish a seventeenth-century Russian text and warrants an extended discussion. A 1979 critique of Harrison and Mirrlees' translation notes Mirsky's criterion:

> [It] contains numerous serious errors, while its quaintly archaic, rather elevated manner transmits little of Avvakum's dyadic style and fails to illustrate an observation found in D. S. Mirsky's introduction to this very translation, that 'Avvakum's style, archaic in detail, is essentially the same as the (uneducated) spoken Russian of today' (Brostrom, "Preface" vii).

I cite at length Mirsky's remarks concerning Avvakum's language and the problem it poses to an English translator:

> [Avvakum's] groundwork is the spoken language of his time, that is, a language essentially the same as the spoken language of to-day (or at least of uneducated classes of twenty or thirty years ago). Wrought into this groundwork are certain elements of the literary Slavonic of the sacred Books. His use of these, however, is quite peculiar: it appears only in the form of quotations from or allusions to familiar biblical and liturgical texts. It is free from bookishness, for the plain reason that all these texts were the common possession of the people. They were familiar to every ear - in the services of the Church - not to the eye, which was unlettered in the average Muscovite. So this literary element is also after all colloquial. It is a matter of historical fact that Avvakum's enormous
influence was largely due to this familiarity of his language. The effect cannot be reproduced in English, for there are not within the English language two elements so much apart from each other as Church Slavonic and colloquial Muscovite. Nor would the colloquial English of the times of Bunyan sound colloquial to the cockney of today. Avvakum’s Russian, archaic in detail, is essentially the same as the spoken Russian of today - which knows (or at least ten years ago knew) no slang (26-7).

Mirsky’s emphasis on ear over eye must have been a determining factor in Harrison’s choice of language even as she took up the challenge to translate this Old Russian text. She writes on May 26, 1924: "I am fairly sure that [...] I could make a satisfactory translation - & Miss Mirrlees will help me to get a mixed Jeremy Taylor + Old Testament style" (Letters 68). I cite two examples:

On Pseudo-Dionysus’ Doctrine of Divine Names:
[...] God hath two kinds of names, the one kind are eternally - existent and true, the which are his essence; the other sort are accident, that is to say laudatory (Harrison-Mirrlees 33-34).
[...] the divine names which are the eternally connatural and true names for God, those which are proximate and those which are consequent, that is to say, laudatory (Brostrom 37).
[...] о Божественныхъ именехъ, что есть Богу приносущие имена истинные, еже есть близостные, и что виновные, сиръчь похвальные (Житие 1).

Avvakum’s “rationalization for assuming leadership in the Old Belief” (Brostrom 242n192):
But as to my excommunication, it came from heretics and, in Christ’s name, I trample it under foot, and the curse written against me - why, not to mince my words, I wipe my arse with that [...] (Harrison-Mirrlees 94). As for that interdict of the apostates, I trample it in Christ’s name, and that anathema - to put it crudely - I wipe my ass with it! (Brostrom 75-6).
А то запрещение то отступническое, и то я о Христе под ноги кладу, а клятвою тою, -- дурно молыть! -- гузно тру (Житие 27).

What is most apparent in these excerpts is the difference in diction. Compare: "eternally-existent" and "eternally connatural"; "the other sort are accident" and "those which are consequent"; "my excommunication, it came from heretics" and "that interdict of the apostates"; even "not to mince my words, I wipe my arse with that" and "to put it crudely - I wipe my ass with it!" Harrison and Mirrlees’ choices put the premium on comprehensibility, while Brostrom appears constrained by “bookish” precision. Even the slight tonal
difference between "arse" and "ass" is telling. While "ass" conveys the force of its contemporary American usage to Brostrom's American audience, "arse" directly embraces what Brostrom would convey with: "to put it crudely".

Read side by side, the Harrison-Mirrlees translation more closely reflects Mirsky's analysis of the Russian text: "It is free from bookishness, for the plain reason that all these texts [biblical and liturgical] were the common possession of the people. They were familiar to every ear [...]". There is no aural quality to the Brostrom translation. It is a purely "bookish" ("to the eye") text. The Harrison-Mirrlees translation flows with rhythms and figures long familiar to the British ear, educated and uneducated, cultivated by the Anglican church service. Indeed, the model of Jeremy Taylor, seventeenth-century churchman, brings to the translation a comparable quality of communal, linguistic continuity.

Errors certainly exist, and accuracy was a constant concern to Harrison. In a letter to Mirsky, franked June 23, 1924, she writes: "We badly need help from you about Avvakum as it is often difficult to be quite sure we understand the Remezovs, tho' their patience and kindness is beyond words" (Letters 69). After their final consultation with Mirsky during the décade at Pontigny (8-18 August 1924) and after the text has been sent to England, Harrison and Mirrlees write to Seraphima Remizov: "Мы кончили Аввакума. Было много ошибок!" [We completed Avvakum. There were a lot of mistakes!] (Remizov Papers). Mirsky himself wrote to Seraphima on August 12:

... доношу Вам, что Аввакум съездил благополучно в Лондон и теперь живет в Понтинъи. Прохожу по нему весь перевод Е<лены> К<арловны> и Н<адежды> В<асильевны>. Ошибок немало” [... just to let you know that Avvakum has successfully travelled to London and back, and now lives at Pontigny. I am going through E. K. and N. V.’s entire translation. There are not a few mistakes] (Remizov Papers, cited in Hughes 360n1).

Leonard and Virginia had first met Mirsky in Harrison's Paris apartment in March 1924. In Downhill All the Way, Leonard likens Mirsky to "one of those unpredictable nineteenth-century Russian aristocrats whom one meets in Aksakov, Tolstoy, and Turgenev" (23-24). He further characterizes him: "In all our relations with him he seemed an unusually courteous and even gentle man, highly intelligent, cultivated, devoted to the arts, and a good literary critic". But of his darker side, Leonard remarks: "Prince Mirsky would have found himself spiritually at home in The Possessed or The Idiot" (24). The Woolfs knew Mirsky from Paris, where he spent half his time, but especially in London,
receiving him in their home at Tavistock Square. They continued to receive him in Bloomsbury until his return to the Soviet Union in 1932. Of their last meeting, Virginia wrote presciently:

So hot yesterday - so hot, when Prince Mirsky came [...] but Mirsky was trap-mouthing: opened and bit his remark to pieces: has yellow misplaced teeth: wrinkles in his forehead: despair, suffering, very marked on his face. Has been in England, in boarding houses, for 12 years; now returns to Russia 'for ever'. I thought as I watched his eye brighten and fade - soon there'll be a bullet through your head. That's one of the results of war, this trapped cabin'd man (cited in Smith, Mirsky 209).

About her second summer at Pontigny (1924), Harrison had written to Gilbert Murray: "It has been enchanting altogether but I have lost my aged heart to a Bear Prince - why did I not meet him 50 years ago when I cld have clamoured to be his Princess [...]" (Smith, Letters 63). This Bear Prince is Mirsky, whose presence at Pontigny, only the second Russian to receive an invitation, had been facilitated by Harrison herself (Smith, Mirsky 100). And now, in November not long after the completion of Avvakum, Harrison writes to Mirsky: "Knowing my totemistic tendencies you will not be surprised that we are writing a small book for children or persons in their dotage - to be called The Book of the Bear" (Smith, Letters 74).

Harrison's biographers all address at length her practice of using animal nicknames both for herself and when addressing or referring to friends. The use of intimate nicknames was widespread during the nineteenth century. A cursory reading of period memoirs makes clear how widespread was the habit which, today, is more or less confined to relations between adult and young child. The use of pet names among the Stephen children has attracted a fair amount of scholarly attention. Sir Leslie himself may well have set the tone, calling his children "ragamices", illustrating his experiences (even the margins of his reading) with drawings of animals and sketching himself as a bear (Lowe 29). In his biography of Virginia, Quention Bell calls on this family practice of illustrating personal qualities by reference to animals. After mentioning that Virginia called Katherine Cox "Bruin," Bell expatiates on the bear metaphor. What is notable about Harrison's habit is the scope of her familiarity with the practice: her combination of seriousness and playfulness when naming and her consciousness of its religious significance.

For Harrison, a nickname is never gratuitous. To assign a nickname involves delving beneath the superficial in search of an underlying unity and
meaning adequate to the person’s identity and relationship with Harrison. Animal names were her preference, but not exclusively. In an undated letter to Frances Darwin, Harrison refers to her difficulty in determining the animal name for her.

> About names - how strange & wonderful they are. I think one will always - in the New Jerusalem - have official names for public use & one’s secret names for those who are near to one [...] One cannot always find a real name - it either comes or doesn’t come & it is useless to hunt. I think very often [...] the real names are sudden flashes of sudden intimacy & contact caught in a moment & then kept for always. (cited in Robinson 212-13)

In referring to all Russians as Bears, and to Mirsky as Bear Prince, Harrison consciously employed the conventional association of nations with animals (Russia=Bear, Spain=Bull). It fit well with her associative habit of totemic thought. The totem is ultimately bound up with kinship. The notion of totem developed in *Themis*, crossing the human-animal boundary, facilitated her self-placement in a larger world of relatedness. Adopting the bear as personal totem, Harrison projected her own values onto the animal. And in addressing Mirsky as Bear Prince, she drew him into a complex intimacy.

Writing to Mirsky in December 1924, Harrison announces: "The Bear book is growing slowly". Searching for a story she remembers as "vy charming, [...] about a Bear-Prince (a sad story for the Bear turned into Prince instead of vice-versa)", she requests a copy of Tolstoy’s *Novaia Azbuka*, a primer still in publication (Smith, *Letters* 76). Harrison writes from London in January 1925: "At last I have found the Azbuka with the sad & touching story of a bear who was turned into a prince [...]" (Smith, *Letters* 79). This must be the Russian version of the French "Beauty and the Beast" tale featuring a Bear Prince which appears in *The Book of the Bear*.

While Harrison struggles with issues of verse translation for Krylov’s fables, Mirrlees has taken on the translation of Remizov: "Hope has translated two bear-stories by Remizov - they are the purest Remizov & lovely beyond words" (Smith, *Letters* 79). Not well known outside the Russian-speaking world, Remizov composed an idiosyncratic modernism, incorporating "medieval literary, historical, biblical, apocryphal, and folklore sources". Mirsky’s appreciation for Remizov, and the connection with Avvakum, is apparent in Maria Pavlovsk’y’s summary:

> The essence of [Remizov’s] art is the mingling of modernism with the native literary and non-literary heritage of the past, using a montage technique. [...]
Most of Remizov’s works are derived from native sources, especially Old Russian Literature [...]. His Russian language style seeks to restore pre-Petrine usage by exterminating foreign influences. [...] He attempted to save words from 'oblivion' by revitalizing them, assigning them new meanings. His richly ornate style rests upon simple Slavonic syntax and spoken intonation (696-7).

Remizov’s stories in The Book of the Bear so freely mix dream and waking realities, civilized and natural orders that one begins to suspect Harrison and Mirrlees abandoned their original intention, to collect "stories from all countries", and confined themselves to Russian when they discovered what a treasure they had found in Remizov. Harrison’s "lovely beyond words" is a fitting assessment.

Out of the book’s 24 stories, four are by Remizov: "Her Star-Bear," "The Bear’s Lullaby," and "Hare Ivanich" from his 1907 book ПОСОЛОНЬ (Sunwise), and "The Hare as Nurse to the Bear-Cubs" from a 1921 collection titled, É: ЗАЯШНЫЕ СКАЗКИ ТИБЕТСКИЕ (Io: Tibetan Hare Tales) (Rogachevskii 354). ПОСОЛОНЬ is composed of Remizov’s reworking of material drawn from Slavic and non-Slavic rituals, games, riddles, charms and apocrypha. Remizov valued these folk genres for their reflection of pre-logical human thought (Rosenthal 195-6).

The main actors in these pieces are children, pagan Slavs, supernatural creatures, folk-tale characters, and animate nature. Supernatural figures are the presumed sources of toys that come to life. They are frequently the players in a game which may revert to the presumed original ritual (Rosenthal 98).

There is an obvious sympathy between Remizov’s and Harrison’s apprehension of the world as there is an affinity between the toys populating Remizov’s apartment in Paris and the stuffed animals inhabiting Harrison’s rooms at Newnham. Rosenthal cites, as example of the analogy Remizov draws between a child’s game and ritual, the game Kostroma. Remizov saw in the game vestiges of a cult of the dying and reborn god, depicting the figure of Kostroma as an animal harbinger of spring (99-100).

As the "Year-Spirit," the dying and reborn god was central to Harrison’s earlier writing on Greek religion and the vestiges of ancient ritual she now sought in contemporary cultural practice. Remizov’s syncretic approach to his sources: pagan and Christian, ritual and dramatic, would have appealed greatly to Harrison, who had recently solicited Russian vertep plays from Oxford scholar, Paul Vinogradoff to extend her insights into the parallels
between ancient Greek ritual and theater into the still live practice of the Russian peasantry. Remizov as creative artist and Harrison as scholar of the religious impulse both looked to manifestations of earlier human experience in contemporary life. The one recreating; the other, explicating.

In July 1925, Remizov received a notice from Harrison’s and Mirrlees’ literary agent that the book had been placed with Nonesuch. He annotated the notice with the name, David Garnett (1892-1981), and title, *Lady into Fox* (Remizov Papers). A few days later, Harrison invited Mirsky to tea with Garnett, adding:

> I am asking the Remezovs as I know he will like to meet them but they have no common tongue so it wd be very kind if you would come & help as interpreter.

David Garnett’s mother is the translator of Dostoevsky, Chehov etc. (*Letters* 84).

Garnett’s deep roots in Bloomsbury and books are well known; his familiarity with Russia, perhaps less so. Writing his memoirs, Garnett dates the introduction of “things Russian” into their family life from the months before his birth when his father “got to know some Russian political exiles in London” (*Golden Echo* 1:10). The introduction of Herzen, Kropotkin, Volkhover and, most significantly, Stepniak into life at the Cearne - the Garnett family home near Edenbridge, Kent - was decisive for Constance. “[I]n the enforced idleness of pregnancy she began to learn Russian from Volkhover” (11). On the eve of the New Year, of 1894, Constance left her husband and young son and went to Russia, largely on Stepniak’s errands (14).

In the letter cited above, Harrison identifies Constance Garnett as the translator of Dostoevsky and Chekhov, the Russian authors whom Mirsky was then interpreting for British readers as Shestov was interpreting Dostoevsky for the French. David recalls that, when she herself had been a student at Newnham, Constance had passionately admired Harrison “whose short curls and freedom from the trammels of her sex aroused as much awe as envy” (*Golden Echo* 1:6). In 1915, David spent two weeks in the Paris hotel where Harrison and Mirrlees were residing. Their mutual friend, Lytton Strachey, wrote to Harrison requesting that she “be kind” to Garnett:

As a result of Lytton’s letter, Jane Harrison came up, talked to me about my mother, whom she remembered at Newnham, and about her Russian translations, which were very much in her mind just then. For Hope Mirrlees and she were learning Russian and Jane suggested that I should accompany them to one of M. Boyer’s lectures on the Russian language at the school of
Oriental languages. At one of these lectures M. Boyer made his students read aloud a sentence or two of Russian. When my turn came, he complimented me upon my Russian accent, picked up from the peasant boys in Tambov, and I was held up as an example to the class (Golden Echo 2: 98).

The peasant boys in Tambov refers to the 1904 trip to Russia with his mother. David’s account is strongly redolent of Turgenev’s story, ”Bezhin Meadow.” Constance had honed her translation skills on Turgenev, the first Russian author to capture the English imagination, and Turgenev remained Edward Garnett’s favorite Russian author. David’s famously unconventional upbringing - not socialized, close to nature - no doubt facilitated the ease with which he had entered into life among adolescent peasant boys herding horses on the steppe.

In an echo of Harrison’s memoirs, Garnett wrote: ”These stories of my mother’s visit to Russia were among the earliest of my childhood memories” (15). Of particular note is the following story: ”In the neighborhood of Nijhni [Novgorod] [...] Constance also visited a gipsy encampment where she saw a tame bear sitting outside one of the huts with one of the gipsy babies in its arms. The baby was fast asleep and the bear swaying rhythmically” (14-15). This childhood memory must have been especially evoked when reading an emotionally charged story included in The Book of the Bear, relating a government-ordered destruction by the gypsies of their bears.

Now, in 1925, as a founding director of Nonesuch, he may have played a deciding role in the acquisition of The Book of the Bear, about which it is curious that Garnett says nothing. He writes: ”She took me with her several times to visit various leading intellectuals associated with the summer school at Pontigny. Thus I met M. Charles Dubos and, I think, M. Gide. She also took me to visit the Russian author Remizov, a curious little dried up old man” (2: 98).

The Book of the Bear is illustrated with color, woodcut prints by Ray Garnett, David’s wife. Their son, Richard, speculates that Harrison, ”who had known Constance at Cambridge and was a friend of Ray’s family,” may have suggested her for the work. ”[Ray] was the obvious choice as illustrator [...] for she was an experienced and trained illustrator and had travelled in Russia before the War.” A frequent illustrator for Chatto & Windus, Ray’s only work for Nonesuch was The Book of the Bear. In ”Ray Garnett as Illustrator”, J. Lawrence Mitchell states: ”[t]here could hardly have been a more appropriate
illustrator than Ray Garnett” (23). Mitchell’s assertion that Ray’s illustrations for David’s *Lady into Fox* (1922) had been the deciding factor in Chatto & Windus’ decision to publish it (15) suggests that her illustrations may also have played a role in the Nonesuch decision to publish *The Book of the Bear*. Of these illustrations, Mitchell writes:

Comparison of Ray’s ’Russian file’ at Hilton Hall with the eight coloured drawings in *The Book of the Bear* shows how much she drew upon these sketches in preparing the material for The Nonesuch Press. The peasant costumes, we can be sure, are authentic. And her style in these illustrations is somehow different, as though transformed as she remembered ‘days and weeks peopled by Georgian princes, a dancing bear, riders galloping over the mountains on elaborate saddles’ (Frances Partridge, Memories, p. 21). (Mitchell 24)

Ray too, then, had a youthful connection with Russia. David recalls his first encounter with Ray. At a costume ball given by James and Margery Strachey, attended as well by Adrian and Virginia Stephen, the two had spent an hour discussing Russia. It was another ten years before they met again and married (*Golden Echo* 1:208). Another testament to Ray’s abiding interest in Russia is found in a letter from T. H. White:

If it [the Arthurian tetralogy] turns out to be a good book, as I suspect it may, it will be due to Ray. Some things she said at Sheskin made me think in an improved way, and particularly to settle down to read the Russians. It will be through them, but particularly through Ray, that Guenevere has turned out to be a living being. (cited in Mitchell 19)

The classically “naïve” style of Garnett’s early and most spectacular success, *Lady into Fox* (1922) in this work may well have appealed strongly to Remizov (recall his annotation). A sophisticated work, *Lady into Fox* yet maintains an objective distance and non-sentimental tone which place it squarely within the tradition of folkloric story-telling. The straightforward translation of young wife (based on Ray herself36) into vixen and her return to the wild parallels the metamorphic transition from bear to star in Remizov’s ”Her Star-Bear,” included in *The Book of the Bear*. The transgression of animal/human boundary or, rather, the total disregard for such a boundary bound together illustrator (Ray Garnett), publisher (David Garnett), author (Remizov) and translator (Harrison).

Harrison and Mirrlees’s collaboration with Mirsky and Remizov ends after the publication of *The Book of the Bear*, but their close friendship does not
end. They continue to introduce each other into their respective communities, to visit, correspond, and share books. Harrison and Mirrlees continue to offer financial advice and assistance to their Russian friends. Harrison sends to Mirsky a check for £50, wishing she were wealthy enough to send the whole £200 he thought necessary to underwrite the immensely ambitious journal, Вёрсты (Mileposts). Harrison makes a number of practical recommendations, suggesting that he “take counsel with Leonard Woolf. Not that they cld give money they are poor as rats but he is so experienced in journalism & has such a good business head [...].” She further recommends that he ask Leonard for an introduction to Maynard Keynes who, together with his wife Lopokova, had just met the Remizovs at her apartment where Lydia “fell instantly in love” with Seraphima Pavlova, Remizov’s wife (Smith, Letters 86-7). Mirsky duly wrote Leonard, following Harrison’s suggestions.37 And “Keynes did in fact donate £20” (Smith, Mirsky 149).

Three issues of Вёрсты appeared, 1926, 1927 and 1928. Edited by Mirsky, musicologist Peter Suvchinsky and Sergei Efron, with Remizov, Shestov and the poet Marina Tsvetaeva serving as the advisory board, the journal is unique among the “thick journals” of “Russia Abroad”.38 Its principal goal was to publish the best Russian-language works regardless of country of origin. But Mirsky intended this journal, generously subsidized by Bloomsbury-ites, to reach beyond Russian literature and culture. On March 3, 1926, Mirsky had written the following to Leonard Woolf:

We want to have articles on foreign literature in our Review, and want to start with England. [...] [I.A. Richards] suggests E.M. Forster, whom I do not know as a critic at all. Can you give me some advice? What we want is a concise and historical view of the present state of English literature (Rogachevskii 365-6).

The second issue contained an essay by E.M. Forster (1879-1970), "Contemporary English Literature”. Smith characterizes the essay as a concise version of Forster’s Aspects of the Novel, a book which Mirsky reviewed for the London Mercury. The issue also contained a substantial review by Mirsky of Eliot’s Poems, 1905-1925. Noting that the review "was the end result of a rather different plan”, Smith cites a March 11, 1926 letter from Mirsky: “I’ve had the idea of doing a verse translation (vers libre, like the original) of T.S. Eliot’s long poem The Hollow Men (4 pages, about 100 lines), a work of genius in terms of the concentration of its feeling for the death and impotence of post-war Europe, and it really is a very important piece in artistic terms” (Mirsky 158).
In that same letter of 3 March, Mirsky inquired whether "The Nation and the Athenaeum" might publish notice of poet Marina Tsvetaeva's poetry reading, to be held at the School of Slavonic Studies on March 12 (Rogachevsky 366, 367n5). On February 27, Mirsky had "published the first substantial article ever to appear about Tsvetaeva in English, in the New Statesman, which was edited at the time by Leonard Woolf" (Mirsky 146). Mirsky invited Harrison and Mirrlees to the London reading as honored guests, though only Hope was able to attend. They were at the time "hard at work on preface to the Bear's Book" (Letters 89). They had returned to London, eventually setting up house (May 1926) at 11 Mecklenburgh Square. "We chose this neighborhood because it is close to the Nonesuch Press at which we are publishing a work of capital importance - The Book of the Bear" (Harrison, cited in Stewart 198).

The two women had met Tsvetaeva in Paris. February 2, 1926 Mirsky wrote to Remizov proposing the meeting: "It would be good to arrange the meeting of our Englishwomen with Marina Tsvetaeva at your place. It was Miss Harrison who gave the first money for the journal". Echoing Harrison's comment on the financial situation of the Woolfs ("they are poor as rats"), Mirsky continued: "Though I don’t know how she came up with it. She herself has none" (cited in Hughes 375). Mirsky sent Harrison the first issue of ∫ёрсты when it appeared in July, to which she responded in an appreciative letter ("it is a great triumph") on July 15, detailing her reading of the issue which included a Russian text of Avvakum prepared by Remizov (Letters 93). Harrison regularly exchanged books with the Remizovs, receiving his works and sending to them Hope's novels. Mirsky reviewed Hope's novels in the third and final issue of Вёрсты (Hughes 389).

The Remizovs' poverty remained a continuing worry for Harrison. She frequently remarked on her concern for them. When The Book of the Bear was published, she forwarded a personal check to Remizov to cover his royalties, knowing that he could not afford to wait until payments from the publisher arrived. At one point, she sent a check for £10 so they could take a vacation at the sea. Her last letter to Seraphima, written shortly before her death, expressed profound grief that her medical expenses had so impoverished her that she cannot send the money Seraphima had evidently requested. As late as 1933, Mirrlees sent along a small royalty check for the use of his bear stories in an Anthology for Schools (Remizov Papers).

Harrison's journey into "Russia Abroad" thus produced two remarkable, small books, Avvakum and The Book of the Bear. It produced as well the less tangible, though significant, human benefit of alleviating
the desperate financial situation of the Remizovs by facilitating access to British publishers and through personal acts of charity. The inclusion of Bloomsbury figures in Вёрсты, a fascinating episode in British-Russian literary relations, may largely be laid on her doorstep. She helped underwrite journal and through her introduction of Mirsky to the Woolfs she helped secure additional funding as well as access to their critical judgements and network of writers. If Harrison and Mirrlees were responsible for Mirsky’s acquaintance with T.S. Eliot, we might add the remarkable inclusion of Eliot’s predilection for the English Metaphysical poets into Mirsky’s analysis of Russian literature in his History - that guide to the subject for generations of English speakers. It seems certain that a mutual, Modernist interest in the style and diction of early (17th century) authors in their respective literary traditions guided the relations between Bloomsbury and Harrison’s Russian friends. This story remains to be told.
NOTES


2. Avvakum was the ninth Russian book translated into English for and published by Hogarth, of which Leonard co-translated four and Virginia co-translated three together with their Russian collaborator, S.S. Koteliansky. The Virginia Woolf Society of Great Britain has collected all of Woolf’s translations into a single volume, titled Translations From the Russian by Virginia Woolf and S.S. Koteliansky.


4. Nonesuch’s first imprint (1923) was the Love Poems of John Donne, as their primary objective was to publish fine, yet inexpensive editions of classics. In contrast, the Hogarth Press sought out new authors and published the “first translations into English of now acknowledged masterpieces from contemporary foreign literatures” (Gaither 4).

5. *Avvakum* and *The Book of the Bear* were co-translated together with Harrison’s student, poet and novelist, Helen Hope Mirrlees (1887-1978). Mirrlees read Classics with Harrison at Newnham, matriculating as a member of the College in 1910. Her first publication, *Paris, Spring 1919: A Prose Poem*, the 5th issue of Hogarth Press (London 1919), was solicited by the Woolfs (D-II 22n8).

6. G. Lowes Dickinson is quoted as saying: “Cambridge has resumed precisely as before the war, only more so; just tradition re-asserting itself” (cited in Stewart 153).


8. See also Smith, M.S. “Woolf’s Russia: Out of Bounds.”


10. See Heilbrun for an account by Frank Swinnerton (of Chatto & Windus) of “the way things happen in the publishing world,” detailing a chance encounter which led to both Constance undertaking the translation of Chekhov in 1916 and the consequent Chekhov “craze” (191-2).

11. See esp. “Russians in London” (83-88) and “The Williamses and Others” (88-90), and accompanying notes in Smith, *Mirsky*.

12. For a history of this second-wave of the Russian diaspora, see Raeff, *Russia Abroad*. 
13. See also Smith, Mirsky 104-5.

14. Jessie Crum Stewart had preceded Hope Mirrlees as Harrison’s favored student and continued to collaborate with Harrison after her marriage to Stewart.

15. The preface to the second (1927) edition of Themis summarizes its contents as follows: “It is in a word a study of herd-suggestion, or, as we now put it, communal psychology. [. . .] That the gods and rituals examined are Greek is incidental to my own specialization” (vii).


17. The fullest treatment of Harrison’s influence on Woolf remains the essays collected in Jane Marcus’ collection, Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy. See also Carpentier, Ritual, Myth and the Modernist Text and M.S. Smith, “‘Could it be J—H—herself.”

18. Working among the mutually supportive group of scholars now collectively known as the Cambridge Ritualists, Harrison made extensive use of recent sociological theory (Durkheim), philosophy (Bergson) and materials newly collected by anthropologists (most notably by J.G. Frazer).

19. Charles du Bos secured Shestov’s invitation to Pontigny. Perhaps by way of inducement, du Bos mentions in his letter of invitation that Lytton Strachey will be present.


21. Aleksei Remizov and Serafima Remizova-Dovgello Papers, Amherst Center for Russian Culture, Amherst College. Citations from this collection are identified as “Remizov Papers”. The author expresses her gratitude to the director of the Amherst Center for Russian Culture, Professor Stanley Rabinowitz, for his assistance and the permission to cite from these unpublished “albums”.

22. D.P. Sviatopolk-Mirski (1890-1939). Literary critic and publisher. Adopted the literary name, Mirsky after immigrating to England where he became Lecturer in Russian for the School of Slavonic Studies, King’s College, London University in 1922 and frequent contributor to its journal, “The Slavonic Review”. Joining the Communist Party of Great Britain in 1931, Mirsky returned to the Soviet Union in 1932, was arrested in 1937 and died in a prison camp.

23 "During his time in London, Mirsky consortet not with the snobs of Mayfair, but with the snobs of Bloomsbury” (Smith, Mirsky 92). According to Smith, all Mirsky’s known addresses were in Bloomsbury, “he remained an insular Bloomsburyite from the beginning to the end of his time in London” (105). Among his Bloomsbury acquaintances were: E.M. Forster, T.S. Eliot, Roger Fry, the Keynes and the Woolfs (99-103).
24. "The History put Mirsky incontestably in the position he has never subsequently lost, as the principal intermediary between Russian literature and the English-speaking world" (Smith, Mirsky 114). For an overview of the History, see 109-114.

25. Harrison’s letters to Mirsky are preserved among the Jane Ellen Harrison Papers in the library of Newnham College.


27. "[l]it is thus that I imagine her — not in the fiercer or gruffer aspects of bearishness — but comfortably furry, slow-moving, warm-hugging, honey-loving, a little clumsy, a little insensitive, but not so insensitive as to be unhuntable — rather, a shade imperceptive, but, unless touched by passion, helpful and dependable" (Bell 173).


29. See Heilbrun’s The Garnett Family for a history of the family’s life with books. Garnett’s own three volume memoir, collectively titled, Golden Echo, chronicles his association with Bloomsbury.

30. Garnett’s account of his visit to Boyer’s lecture causes one to wonder whether Harrison deliberately misconstrued Garnett’s facility with the language to entice Mirsky to join them.

31. See Golden Echo 1: 74-93.

32. The Bears (Медведи 1883), by Vsevolod Mikhailovich Garshin (1855-1888). First English translation, the collection The Signal and Other Stories, (London: Duckworth, 1912).

33. Appraising the success of Nonesuch, A.J.A. Symons writes that Francis Meynell, founding director of the Press, relied "upon the literary judgment of his colleagues, Vera Mendel and David Garnett, to assist his own in the selection of suitable subjects" (10-11). See also, David Garnett, The Golden Echo 3: 16-20.

34. Personal correspondence with author (26 July 1995). Ray’s sister, Frances Partridge, recalls, in Memories, Harrison’s presence in their childhood home and being entertained in Harrison’s rooms when she herself attended Newnham (Partridge 24, 60-1).

35. On the other hand, Mirrlees wrote to Remizov (October 19, 1926): "THE BOOK OF THE BEAR will appear at the beginning of November. David Garnett’s wife did the illustrations for it — she does not understand bears. You, on the other hand, understand bears well — nonetheless, why did you draw the bear to resemble a devil?" (my translation, Remizov Papers). Annabel Robinson notes that Harrison wished Jessie Stewart had done the illustrations (Life 298).
36. Garnett gives the following description of his wife: "Ray was a woodland creature. She wanted the protection and shelter that woods gave" (2: 234). David's fullest description of Ray appears in *Golden Echo* 2. 229-235.

37. Mirsky's letter to Woolf (1.2.1926) is cited in full by Rogachevskii (364).

38. Responding to Remizov's role with the journal, Harrison added the following to her list of recommendations, no doubt having in mind his playful and fanciful approach to the world and certainly the precarious state of his personal finances: "I hope Remezov is not chief business manager - you might as well elect a squirrel - tho' I suppose he has a long line of splendid old Moscow merchants behind him" (Smith, *Letters* 87).

39. On February 25, Mirsky wrote to his fellow Вёрсты editor, Peter Suvchinsky, naming Harrison "his first investor [вкладчица]" (cited in Hughes 377n5).
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