Part One

The Situation of Russian Cultures

A Century of Russian Culture(s) "Abroad"

The Unfolding of Literary Geography

Maria Rubins

The Archipelago of Russian Culture: Prologue

The global trends that informed much of the world's cultural production in the last hundred years—including massive migrations in the wake of major catastrophes and world wars, displacement of dissident intellectuals by oppressive political regimes, and intensified mobility after the breakup of colonial and totalitarian powers—have resulted in a proliferation of hyphenated, hybrid, translocal, and transnational identities. Russia has been no stranger to these trends, yet its unique experiences of revolution, war, the Cold War, and Soviet collapse have left their specific imprint on Russian cultural expression. Since the 1917 Revolution Russian culture has been moving progressively beyond metropolitan borders to recreate itself in diverse geographical, political, and linguistic contexts. And just as the content of cultural life in one location is distinct from that of the next, it has also taken on new forms in response to the changing meanings of emigration over time, reflecting both global and local

historical and ideological developments. The present chapter offers an account of the shifting circumstances of this century of diasporization of Russian culture.

The process of emigration from Russia has conventionally been divided into several waves. The first wave started as a reaction to the Bolshevik terror and civil war that ensued shortly after the October Revolution of 1917, and it extended until the end of the 1930s. It was the most massive of the Soviet-era emigrations and included a significant percentage of artists and intellectuals. A key moment of the initial period was the Bolshevik expulsion from Russia in 1922 of 160 leading thinkers, including Nikolai Berdyaev, Sergei Bulgakov, Nikolai Lossky, Fedor Stepun, and Semyon Frank, on what became known as the "Philosophers' Ship." This wave of emigration included many other prominent individuals as well: members of the House of Romanov; the opera singer Fedor Shaliapin; the stars of Serge Diaghilev's *Ballets Russes*; and the recipient of the first Russian Nobel prize for literature, Ivan Bunin, are but a few of the renowned figures who contributed to the international visibility of "Russia abroad" during the interwar decades. The second wave was triggered by World War II. To a large extent, it consisted of displaced persons originating in territories occupied by the German army who followed it after its retreat or were compelled to move to Germany to work, as well as liberated concentration camp inmates and prisoners of war, who were reluctant to return to the USSR and risk prompt arrest. With some notable exceptions, this wave produced relatively few outstanding cultural achievements.

The third wave of Russian emigration started in the late 1960s following the end of the Thaw, a period of relative liberalization, and continued on and off, depending on fluctuating Kremlin emigration policies, until the end of the Soviet era. Not large in number, this emigration was primarily composed of dissidents, Zionist Jews, and high-profile defectors. It counted among its ranks many celebrity figures, including the thinkers Vladimir Bukovsky and Alexander Zinoviev; the poets Joseph Brodsky and Naum Korzhavin; the writers Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Andrei Siniavsky, Viktor Nekrasov, Vasily Aksyonov, Sergei Dovlatov, Sasha Sokolov, and Vladimir Voinovich; the sculptors Ernst Neizvestny and Mikhail Shemiakin; the ballet dancers Mikhail Baryshnikov, Natalia Makarova, and Rudolf Nuriev; the cellist Mstislav Rostropovich; and the opera singer Galina Vishnevskaya. Finally, the opening up of the USSR under Mikhail Gorbachev's perestroika policy and the Soviet breakup led to a vast exodus from Russia beginning in the late 1980s. This is often referred to as the fourth wave of emigration. It was, however, radically different from preceding waves, as most people left for economic rather than political reasons. In a new era of open borders and easy global movement of people and cultural goods, many of

this contingent, especially prominent cultural figures, have preserved their Russian citizenship and do not consider themselves émigrés. This multidirectional cross-border migration, in other words, can be seen as a component of the globe-trotting cultural life that overtook the planet at the turn of the twenty-first century.

Until recently, scholars of émigré culture, regarding their subject of study as a finite phenomenon with well-defined chronological boundaries, postulated the ultimate merging of diasporic and metropolitan branches of Russian culture.[1] In recent years, however, emigration from Russia has surged yet again, bringing to the West scores of intellectuals, skilled professionals, and political activists fleeing Putin's regime. In the current political climate, this trend can be expected to intensify. It is therefore quite clear that Russian culture beyond metropolitan borders has outgrown the Soviet-era phenomenon to become a permanent and evolving formation.

Each locus of Russian life that has emerged over the last century generated its own models of extraterritorial identities, shaped by evolving relations with metropolitan space and local geography. For decades, critical constructions of Russian emigration were informed by the archetypal examples of diasporic experience, based on Jewish, Greek, and Armenian mythologies. Within this paradigm, the homeland is figured as an object of continuous longing, generating collective memories and commitment to an ultimate return (Safran 1991); displacement from the place of origin is interpreted as a trauma and the host country as a locus of exile. However, with increasing frequency over the last century, the teleology of origin and return has been displaced in Russian cultural discourse in favor of cross-cultural dialogue or circulations taking place within and across diasporic communities. Such patterns of collective identities correspond to alternative diasporic models more recently articulated by scholars along the following lines: reconfiguring "return" as "re-turn" (a rhetorical focus on the place of origin without the intention of actual repatriation, according to Tölölyan 2007, 649); postulating a spatially disseminated identity (Gilroy 1993); highlighting the important roles of a diasporic imaginary (Axel 2002) and the decentered, lateral sociocultural networks deployed across diverse territories (Clifford 1994, 308); questioning the "victim tradition"; and celebrating the "creative, enriching side of living in 'Babylon,' the radiance of difference" (Cohen 1997, 196).

The exilic "victim tradition" and the "radiance of difference" mark two opposite poles in constructions of émigré cultural life. In the following pages, each of three case studies, focusing on interwar Paris, New York of the Cold War era, and late twentieth- and twenty-first-century Israel, presents a distinct

configuration of cultural, ideological, geopolitical, and institutional parameters. Rather than embedding these case studies within the more conventional chronology of successive waves of emigration (defined primarily by Russia's fluctuating historical and political situation), I prefer to view these cultural formations as a set of *chronotopes*, shaping discourses of identity and corresponding to each specific location.[2] This shift in perspective entails further reconsideration of hierarchical approaches to metropolitan vs. diasporic geographies. Soviet-era discourse construed diasporic cultural production as located on the periphery, thereby positing its inferiority vis-à-vis the metropolitan center and stressing its alienated or even non-Russian character. Despite dramatic reversals in ideological assessments during the post-Soviet period, this centripetal pattern endured.[3] The tropes of "return" and "homecoming" inevitably prevailed in any discussion of diasporic literary figures, while response to the national agenda remained the major theme in émigré scholarship.[4] Adherence to the self-imposed "mission" of preserving the classical national canon and dedication to "writing back home" were certainly not uncommon among émigrés themselves. However, such an exclusive focus on the metropolitan center often deemphasized the transformative potential of extraterritorial Russian cultures, including their ability to generate alternative historical narratives and geographical frames. As Homi Bhabha argued in *The Location of Culture*, peripheral locations are rich in innovation and can destabilize and refashion stagnating "centers" (1994). A polycentric, nonhierarchical model of global Russian cultures may be visualized as an archipelago, a chain of islands that appear independent and isolated but in fact are interconnected in space, as well as time, often owing their origin to a series of volcanic eruptions.

Recent academic focus on the archipelago has challenged colonizing grammars that reduce islands to peripheral locations whose meanings and identities are dependent on the remote mainland. In fact, islands, often lying at the crossroads of trade and migration routes, have tended to be dynamic, shaped in equal measure by local geographies and passing flows, and, at least in the Mediterranean context, capable of producing sophisticated civilizations long before the continent. The archipelago as a trope for extraterritorial Russian culture suggests exchange, multiplicity, and fluidity. On the one hand, each individual diasporic center may appear to be an "island" in the midst of the host society, with no visible links to the metropolitan "continent" or other sites of dispersion. On the other hand, like a chain of islands, these centers emerged gradually over the last century as a result of successive "explosions": revolution, wars, periodic closure or opening of the Soviet state borders, and so on. While these common origins contributed to their shared heritage, each center of

Russian culture has also been informed by a unique combination of local and global factors. Open to cross-cultural exchanges, hybrid island identities are in flux, subject to continuous redefinition. Just as the totality of an archipelago is constituted by the articulation of each of its islands, so global Russian culture can be represented as a dynamic totality of all of its interconnected yet autonomous and evolving "centers." Indeed, the interdisciplinary study of the archipelago has challenged the binary conception of mainland versus islands, recasting the entire cultural space as an archipelago (Westphal 2007). The metropolitan Russian "continent," reconfigured so many times over the last century, is revealed under scrutiny as far less monolithic than convention would have it; in effect, it can be seen as just the largest island within the global archipelago of Russian culture. The next three sections of this chapter will engage with three particular "islands," examining the original character of each within the broader context of local and global cultural geographies.[5]

Interwar Paris and the Creation of Extraterritoria Russian Cultures

In the years following 1917, the routes of postrevolutionary dispersal of Russian emigration traversed the entire planet. From the Far East refugees fled to Harbin and Shanghai; from Crimea boatloads of civilians and soldiers of the defeated General Wrangel's White Army set sail for Istanbul, and then onward to Europe; many fled from Petrograd via Finland and the Baltics. Soon, compact Russian-speaking communities sprang up all over Europe and Asia, with some refugees reaching North Africa, Brazil, the United States, and Australia. In Europe, in addition to Paris, sizable Russian communities were established in Berlin, Prague, Sofia, Belgrade, Riga, and elsewhere. These diasporas were distinguished by their urban context, not only offering more opportunities to immigrants but also inevitably facilitating preservation of a distinct identity. Essentially, Russian cultural life in each of these locations produced a variation of the same model. During the first postrevolutionary decade, Russian émigrés harbored hopes that Bolshevik rule would soon collapse, enabling their speedy return. Consequently, they focused mostly on building diasporic networks (publishing ventures, schools, libraries, churches) that would bind together Russian-speaking communities, preserve their heritage, and support a sense of unity and common purpose. The professed teleology of return slowed assimilation and often led to the deliberate isolation of Russians within their host countries. Another factor that contributed to this isolation was the absence of an adequate legal framework. The Nansen passport, introduced by the League of

Nations in 1922, granted refugees the right to reside in a state that had signed the relevant convention, but it did not solve long-term problems of cross-border movement and employment, and it significantly reduced the likelihood of naturalization in host countries. By the 1930s, the hope of quick return was largely abandoned, and the second émigré generation began to adopt more hybrid identities. At the same time, economic crisis; the rise of xenophobic and overtly profascist sentiments in many places of Russian dispersion, from Harbin to Paris; and ultimately the outbreak of World War II dealt a heavy blow to Russian diasporic social structures.

During the interwar decades, Russian life in Europe was remarkably dynamic. The volatility of the political situation often caused individuals and whole communities who had just begun to settle into one location to pack up and move on, usually westward. For example, the establishment of diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and the USSR in 1934 led to a considerable decrease in the number of Russians fleeing to Sofia, where some 30,000 refugees had settled in the first postrevolutionary years. The rich cultural life of Russian Berlin, with its population of nearly a quarter of a million, was dramatically curtailed in the mid-1920s when relations with the Soviet Union, which had sustained cultural activity, shifted radically and many leaders of the community departed for Paris. Many of those who stayed on, including Vladimir Nabokov and his Jewish wife, Vera Slonim, were compelled to flee Hitler's regime in the following decade.[6]

Even more impressive than human mobility was the circulation of texts and ideas between pockets of the European diaspora and across the Soviet border. For example, the Change of Landmarks (*smenovekhovstvo*) movement, advocating the return of émigrés to Russia and a peaceful transformation of Bolshevism, originated in Prague with the 1921 publication of the volume *Smena vekh*, which was soon reincarnated in an eponymous Parisian periodical, and in the Berlin-based daily *Nakanune*.[7] Likewise, Eurasianism, which advocated the idea of a "Russian world" stretching across Europe and Asia and comprising other ethnicities alongside Russians, was first popularized in Sofia and developed in the works of the linguist and historian Nikolai Trubetzkoy, who taught at Vienna University. Special Eurasian seminars were organized in Paris and Prague, and the *Versty* journal, which promoted the Eurasian agenda, was edited in 1926–28 in Paris by Dmitry Sviatopolk-Mirsky, who later continued his activities in London.[8] Periodicals published in these various "islands" were read across the entire diasporic "archipelago," offering a platform for ideological debates and showcasing artistic achievement. Any Russian-language journal was potentially

open to all émigré authors, irrespective of place of residence. The Prague-based periodical *Volia Rossii*, for instance, particularly welcomed novice writers from the global diaspora. The perception of integrity of diasporic space was reinforced by the fact that cultural life in every Russian community was punctuated by the same key events, including the annual Day of Russian Culture on Alexander Pushkin's birthday (June 6); celebrations of Leo Tolstoy's centenary in 1928, and activities in the run-up to the centenary of Pushkin's death in 1937.

In the earlier 1920s, the dissemination of émigré intellectual production across European and Soviet metropolitan territory was quite easy. Due to good relations between the Weimar Republic and the USSR, Berlin became the main site of cultural exchange between Soviet Russia and Russia abroad. Many of its 188 Russian-language publishing houses had a Soviet branch office, as was the case with Petropolis, Gelikon, Epokha, and Grzhebin. The Soviet government routinely placed commissions with Berlin publishers, and some of them produced large print runs almost exclusively for the Soviet market. Russophone periodicals that came out in Berlin, too, targeted not only the émigré audience. Some, like *Novyi mir*, maintained an openly pro-Soviet stance, while *Nakanune* was practically financed from the Soviet budget and maintained a Moscow office. Formally Soviet writers and journalists (Sergei Esenin, Andrei Bely, Maksim Gorky, Ilya Erenburg, Viktor Shklovsky, and Aleksei Tolstoy, to name just a few) visited or lived in Berlin for extended periods of time, mixing with their émigré peers in the House of the Arts or the Writers' Club. This unique cooperation between metropolitan and diasporic literary cultures, replicated nowhere else until the end of the Soviet period, came to an abrupt end in 1925, when the USSR embarked on a policy of political and cultural isolation, and émigré cultural achievements became a taboo topic for many decades to come.

Having surpassed Berlin around 1925, for the next fifteen years Paris hosted the most vibrant Russian community in Europe. The Paris diaspora numbered 45,000 and equipped itself with a well-organized network of institutions: educational and theological establishments, publishing houses and libraries, and more than 60 Russophone periodicals, including *Sovremennye zapiski*, *Vozrozhdenie*, *Poslednie novosti*, and *Chisla*. Resembling Russia in miniature, the Parisian community was characterized by extreme diversity, and an attempt to map out every ideological and aesthetic position would be futile. The focus here will be on two contrasting literary trends and their respective lexicons of national and artistic identification.

The mainstream émigré cultural establishment was composed of an older generation of established figures who worshipped the Russian cultural legacy and practiced, to use Svetlana Boym's (2001) term, a form of "restorative" nostalgia. The utopian dream of return to a Golden Age informed their foundational "mission," which consisted in preserving the national cultural tradition in order to pass it on to future generations. Russia served as a vital center, while émigrés assessed their own exilic locations as remote outposts. Quite uninterested in the European avant-garde, senior émigré writers often limited themselves to reproducing familiar models drawn from the Silver Age. Their writing, ranging from nostalgic evocations of Russia to debates over the "national idea," reassessments of Orthodox spirituality, and explorations of the metaphysics of the revolution, demonstrated their loyalty to Russian themes. This conservative stance did not necessarily undermine artistic potential. Bunin's short story cycle *Dark Avenues* (*Temnye allei*, 1937–44), for instance, remains one of the greatest achievements of émigré writing and twentieth-century Russian literature as a whole. But these stories arguably represent an experimental development of the same aesthetic parameters that characterized Bunin's pre-emigration art. The impact of the new place and many years spent away from Russia was limited for Bunin to accentuating his tragic perception of the irreversibility of time and nostalgic longing for evanescent moments of happiness. Paris serves as a background only in one story ("In Paris"), and the conceptual and aesthetic languages of interwar Europe leave little trace on this masterpiece of the premier writer of Russia abroad.

Gradually, however, voices emerged in Russian Paris that transcended this national, retrospective cultural paradigm; increasingly, the émigrés' exilic sensibilities—with attendant feelings of loss, longing, and cultivated isolation reminiscent of "masochistic narcissism" (Said 2000, 183)—were attenuated by closer engagement with local cultural contexts. Naturally, this transition was effected more easily by the younger generation of Russian Parisian authors, who had left their country of birth as adolescents, were almost bilingual, and were intrigued by the French artistic environment. The hybrid nature of their writing reflected their fragmented, interstitial, bicultural identity. While older mentors steered them toward nostalgic re-creation of canonical Russian literary models, they sought to break away and turn to interwar European modernism.

In Modris Eksteins's view, the postwar ideological, philosophical, and aesthetic crisis produced a modernist "culture of nightmare and denial" (1990, 237). Younger Russian writers provided their own variation on this generational ethos by fusing it with their specific experience of exile and deracination.

The inevitable setting of their texts was Paris, conceived as a dehumanized urban metropolis but also as a source of creativity born out of trauma, rupture, and cultural alienation. The narrative rhythms of Gaïto Gazdanov, Boris Poplavsky, Vladimir Varshavsky, Vasily Yanovsky, Elsa Triolet, just like those of Ferdinand Céline, Henry Miller, Louis Aragon, or Philippe Soupault, are punctuated by random wanderings through defamiliarized, uncanny, nocturnal Paris. Obsessive peripatetic motion within the microcosm of the city became a trope for the itinerant identities of the uprooted "lost generation," including those Russian émigrés who preferred to refer to themselves as the "unnoticed generation." They found their *genius loci* in the Montparnasse district, with its cafés and bars, the epicenter of avant-garde art and international bohemian life. Speaking in the language of interwar European modernism, Russian Montparnassians addressed the main concerns and anxieties of their time. Although for the most part they composed in Russian, their texts departed from the "classical" literary idiom practiced by senior émigrés. Disavowing the canonical Russian view of the writer as prophet, moral guide, or social critic, they created semi-autobiographical first-person narrators who displayed intimate feelings and shameful confessions in a manner reminiscent of the human document. Their style was characterized by simplicity, physiological vocabulary, and code-switching, leading the guardians of linguistic and cultural purity in the Russian community to accuse them of "foreignness." The authors of Russian Montparnasse indeed violated many taboos that had persisted in the discourse of their elders and rearranged the canon, provocatively dismissing Pushkin in favor of Lermontov and Rozanov, whom they interpreted subjectively as precursors of twentieth-century existentialism (Rubins 2015, 165–230).

The diasporic condition of deracination, hybridity, and fusion was crystallized as well in the poetry of the Paris Note. The Paris Note emerged as a loosely bound group, mentored by the poet and critic Georgy Adamovich, and included Anatoly Shteiger, Lydia Chervinskaya, Perikl Stavrov, Irina Knorring, and Igor Chinnov. Viewing the Russian Silver Age conception of poetic craft as a theurgic activity with a great deal of skepticism, they transformed poetry into an intimate conversation about life, death, spiritual and physical malaise, and loneliness. In Adamovich's words, "The poet at first blush is talking to himself, often he talks only about himself; the era of oratory has passed" (Adamovich and Kantor 2005, 6). From the Paris Note perspective, contemporary poetry should be divorced from any philosophical, political, social, or even aesthetic agenda and rendered a "private affair." The diaristic modality of the resulting verse matched the human document style of Russian Montparnasse prose.

The Paris Note poems are distinguished by lexical poverty, confessional intonation, fragmentation, frequent pauses, and a near absence of figurative language and ornamentation:

> Words are sad and simple,
> The heart wants no highbrow words.[9]
> **Shteiger**, "Simple Landscape"
> ("Prostoi peizazh") (Kreid 2003, 118)

Such minimalism reflected the group's perception that all conventional forms of artistic expression had collapsed. As Igor Chinnov later recalled, "We believed that we should write as if there would be no more poetry after us" (Glad 1993, 33). The "exhaustion" of culture was encoded in metapoetic meditations on the inadequacy of the poetic word.

> I know the value of my poems.
> I'm sorry for them, that's all.
> **Adamovich**, "I know the value
> of my poems" ("Stikham svoim
> ia znaiu tsenu") (Kreid 2003, 51)

In the Paris Note verse, the negation of the cultural tradition and of any collective identity cemented by shared ideologies or national belonging reached a high point. In this sense, it can be defined as poetry of "counter-exile" (Hagglund 1985, 38–39) focused on the key moments of human experience per se and stripped of national, historical, or cultural specificity.

The watershed between exilic and postnational cultural identities did not strictly coincide with the generational divide. In fact, it cut across generations and even individual literary personae. In one of the most provocative texts produced by the first wave of emigration, "Disintegration of an Atom" ("Raspad atoma," 1938), Georgy Ivanov, who was closer to the older generation of émigrés, offered a hybrid discourse conflating the native tradition and the Western modernist crisis narrative, echoing T. S. Eliot's *The Wasteland* and Henry Miller's *The Tropic of Cancer*. In this work, Russian cultural collapse becomes just one case of the entropy engulfing all of European civilization. Ivanov's work challenges the Russian canon by violating major cultural taboos, evoking scatology, filth, and necrophilia, providing catalogues of rubbish alongside random allusions to high Russian culture. His narrator's misquotation of well-known poetic lines, from Pushkin to Kruchenykh, signals the extinction of cultural memory and

the irrelevance of the literary tradition in exilic reality. Grappling with arbitrary cultural references crisscrossing his failing consciousness, the narrator is impotent to decipher the fragments or reconstitute a broken whole. The metaphor of atomic explosion is employed by Ivanov to underscore the imminent physical and spiritual disintegration of his narrator. Ivanov's controversial text, which he preferred to define as a *poema* (long poem), inaugurated a new dimension of Russian literature that would be explored more systematically in the later twentieth century, in particular by Viktor Erofeev.[10]

Another elder émigré, Vladislav Khodasevich, represents an even more striking and complex case of literary development. In emigration, he gained a reputation as a resilient conservative who insisted on preserving the national cultural tradition against all odds. In his influential extended polemics with Adamovich, Khodasevich was critical of poetic "innovations" and the diaristic trend, persistently calling upon younger writers to learn from the Russian classics—and above all from Pushkin. And yet, in his last major poetic cycle, "European Night" ("Evropeiskaia noch'," 1927), Khodasevich eschews the "'grand' lexicon of poetic speech" (Bethea 1983, 276) and renders the Zeitgeist through, in Nabokov's words, "optical-pharmaceutical-chemical-anatomical" images (cited in Bethea 1983, 276). This jarring discontinuity between his professed ideal of "classical" form and a profoundly modern expression of civilizational collapse and artistic impotence is expressed in possibly even stronger terms by Khodasevich than by the Paris Note poets, his ostensible opponents. In the poem "Repository" ("Khranilishche"), for instance, the lyric persona wanders through a fine arts museum—a repository of carefully selected achievements of Western civilization. Looking at the "succession of Madonnas," he experiences disillusionment with all notions of "truth and beauty," revulsion, fatigue, and even physical malaise, ultimately relying not on the transfigurative potential of art but on "sour Pyramidon" for temporary relief. The language of high culture and creativity is meaningless for one in the grip of existential crisis, and Khodasevich's verse contributes powerfully to this pan-European *topos*. The title of the cycle, playing with the vision of darkness engulfing Europe, resonates with a range of interwar texts that use night as a figure for collapse and degradation, from Céline's *Voyage au bout de la nuit* to Gazdanov's *Night Roads*.

Khodasevich, Ivanov, and the authors of the Paris Note and Russian Montparnasse produced the most innovative writing of Russian Paris. Their challenge of major cultural proscriptions was facilitated by their position outside the metropolitan realm—not only geographically but in many respects conceptually. While Russian Paris ceased to exist as a viable sociocultural network with the

outbreak of World War II, it created a generative paradigm of Russian culture beyond metropolitan borders and produced a broad spectrum of extraterritorial identities: from the nearly total exclusion of the non-Russian context (such persistent focus on the affairs of the homeland would be practiced later by Solzhenitsyn in his Vermont exile, for instance) to the gradual evolution away from a strictly national focus toward hybridization and cross-cultural dialogue (as occurred with Joseph Brodsky, Andrei Makine, and a number of Russian Israeli authors, including Boris Zaidman and Nekod Singer) and the exploration of universal themes (as demonstrated by the Third Hour experience, to be discussed in the following case study).

The Third Hour: Universality in the Cold War Era

The cataclysmic events of World War II brought the transformation or disappearance of older centers of Russian cultural activity abroad and the rise of new ones. By 1952, many of the 450,000 ex-Soviet displaced persons in Europe found themselves in Germany. Gradually, the center of gravity began to shift to other continents, most importantly North America. The Russian community in the United States had already been reinforced by first-wave émigrés fleeing the war and Holocaust, and immigration became a truly massive phenomenon later in the 1940s (with 548,000 arriving by 1950). While the United States remained the chief host country for post–World War II Soviet immigrants, other important destinations eventually emerged, including Israel and France (although Russian life in Paris was never again as vibrant as during the interwar decades).

Transcending the traditional division into second and third waves, the Cold War era presents a coherent historical and political background for tracing unifying tendencies that underpinned extraterritorial Russian culture between the late 1940s and early 1980s. Polarization of the world, the Iron Curtain, and reckless competition between the two superpowers resulted in a minimum of communication between metropolitan and diasporic branches. Those leaving the USSR during the second half of the twentieth century assumed that they would be unable ever to return. Indeed, unlike postrevolutionary refugees, they had no desire to do so, having often experienced repressions, the Gulag, or forced confinement in psychiatric wards. While they had no affinity for the Soviet system, their cultural production displayed the marks of the Soviet idiom, which sometimes resulted in the older émigrés' reluctance to embrace this generation. The dissident movement, frequently taking the form of exported texts even before the emigration of their authors through the phenomenon of

tamizdat (publication of unauthorized works smuggled abroad) defined the politicized reception of Soviet intellectuals once they arrived in the West. Politicians, publishers, media, critics, and the general public were mostly interested in their eyewitness accounts of Soviet atrocities and construed ex-Soviet writers as, in the first instance, an opposition to the Communist regime. Reflecting on the situation of the 1970s–80s, Olga Matich concluded: "More often than not Russian literature today is read for its political content, both in the Soviet Union and abroad. As a result, the apolitical Russian writer is all but trapped in the stranglehold of politics, even in the West. Following the Russian lead, Western critics tend to apply political criteria to Russian literature and judge it for the most part according to its testimonial and propagandistic value" (1984, 182).

A number of émigré intellectuals and ideologically committed journals, such as *Kontinent*, perpetuated this politicized reception by sustaining their focus on Russia and its current condition. Others, who subscribed to a more universal artistic identity, and wished to liberate themselves from the dissident label, published in such periodicals as *Sintaksis*, *Ekho*, *Kovcheg*, *Chast' rechi*, *Novyi amerikanets*, and *Gnozis*. It was harder for the apolitical cohort to obtain publishing contracts and to build a reputation with Western readers, as Russian cultural activities were sometimes financed by Western politicized institutions and states, often covertly. Despite attempts to interpret Joseph Brodsky's persona according to the same dissident model, he became an exceptional case of an ex-Soviet poet who had been arrested, condemned, and expelled from his homeland, yet managed to transcend the émigré frame to become accepted as part of the American intellectual establishment.

The postwar years, unlike the interwar decades, were distinguished by the increased role academic structures assumed in promoting Russian émigré cultural production—as, for instance, in the case of academic publishers such as Ardis, Slavica, and Hermitage, along with periodicals such as *Zapiski russkoi akademicheskoi gruppy v SShA*. There were other important publishing ventures with a Russia focus across Europe and the United States, including YMCA Press and Rifma, the almanac *Mosty*, the journals *Grani*, *Opyty*, and the New York–based *The New Review*, which since its founding in 1942 has been the chief periodical for literary production of the entire global diaspora. The Viktor Kamkin bookstore in Rockville, MD, became the main distribution center for Russian and Soviet books in the United States, as well as a diasporic cultural center. Many literary personalities achieved a high level of integration in their host countries, becoming university professors, editors, publishers, and radio presenters with the Russian Service of Radio Liberty. Alongside the first-wave celebrities Nabokov and Berberova, the likes of Vladimir Markov, Boris Filippov, Igor

Chinnov, Yury Ivask, Lev Loseff, Tomas Venclova, and many others actively shaped the Slavic academic discipline.

Against this background of ideological fault lines and the pull of assimilation, the intellectual community formed in New York around the *Third Hour* journal was remarkable for its inclusive spirit and transcendence of any specifically Russian agenda. Founded by Russian émigrés, it soon outgrew the confines of a diasporic association and obtained a distinctly transnational identity. The society was initiated by the writer, journalist, and translator Elena Izwolsky. The daughter of Alexander Izwolsky, the Czar's Foreign Minister and later ambassador to France, she spent her childhood in Saint Petersburg, Japan, and Europe, and after the Revolution settled in Paris, subsequently moving to New York in 1941. She wrote articles for Anglophone Christian periodicals; authored a biography of Mikhail Bakunin, sketches about Marina Tsvetaeva, and books on Russian spirituality; compiled memoirs; and translated with enviable ease between Russian, English, and French. Izwolsky aspired to create zones of intellectual and spiritual contact between thinkers, irrespective of national origins or political convictions. Herself a convert to Catholicism with a preference for its Eastern branch, she promoted a nondenominational vision of Christianity. Open-mindedness prevented this refined aristocrat from squarely rejecting the Bolshevik regime, and she even visited the USSR after Stalin's death (a rare occurrence among "white Russian" émigrés).

The Third Hour ecumenical society and the eponymous journal occupied a central place in Izwolsky's diverse pursuits. The idea of the journal was discussed in 1944 in the New York home of Irma de Manziarly, who had previously financed cultural projects in Russian Paris, in particular the journal *Chisla*. De Manziarly's past was no less eventful than Izwolsky's. Born in Saint Petersburg to German Protestants, she went on to live in France as well as India, where she studied esoteric teachings and met Mahatma Gandhi. Both women were spiritual seekers who sought an exit from the postwar crisis and wished to contribute to healing and uniting humanity. The wealthy patroness volunteered to fund this ecumenical initiative, and Izwolsky assumed the daunting role of organizer and journal editor. The title of the society and journal was taken from the Acts of the Apostles (2:4–17), in which the apostles prophesy in various tongues to make their message intelligible to all. The editorial policy of universality was clearly stated in the first and subsequent issues: "Against the background of conflicting intellectual trends and tragic world-events, we continue to seek testimonies and expressions of authentic religious and human experiences. We believe that such testimonies in the field of religious life, as well as in literature, poetry and art, exemplify the working of spiritual forces without which the

challenge of our time cannot be met. This is the great adventure of dedication and brotherhood to which our generation more than ever seems to be called: a personal call addressed to each, but in the name of all" ("To Our Readers" 1951, 1). The organizers originally intended to publish the journal in English, Russian, and French, but after the first trilingual issue, only English was retained. Between 1946 and 1975, ten issues of the *Third Hour* came out, with the final one a memorial volume dedicated to Izwolsky.

An important aspect of Third Hour activities were regular lectures followed by discussion with a glass of red wine. The society's core members were a colorful collection of personalities, including the composer Arthur Lourié (see Bullock, this volume), the former leader of the *mladorossy* movement Alexander Kazem-Bek, the head of the short-lived Russian Provisional government Alexander Kerensky, the writer Vasily Yanovsky (who became Izwolsky's main editorial associate), and many other authors, thinkers, and public figures who had migrated to New York from all over the world in the post–World War II years, including the poet W. H. Auden, the philosopher Denis de Rougemont, and the art critic and essayist Anne Freemantle. The founders of the Third Hour attracted such an impressive international following because of their cosmopolitan views, their historical experience reflecting the major European catastrophes of the twentieth century, and their considerate rebranding of the classic Russian message of universality (often conceived as "messianic" spiritualization of the rest of the world on Russian terms) into a more equal intellectual exchange and dialogue with global religious and philosophical currents.

Despite the editorial team's Christian orientation, the range and diversity of the journal's publications is impressive: they comprise articles on theology, philosophy, music and the arts, reports on the global ecumenical movement, memoirs, poetry, and fiction. *Third Hour* systematically featured works by Nikolai Berdyaev, Simone Weil, Edith Stein, Alexander Schmemann, and Teilhard de Chardin. De Manziarly shared her impressions of Gandhi, and Wladimir Ryabushinsky contributed an article on Old Believers' icon-painting. Izwolsky wrote about Vladimir Solovyov, Yanovsky about Nikolai Fedorov, and Lourié about the composer Modest Musorgsky. Taken together, these materials reflect the integrity of the group's fundamental beliefs. Several key themes recurred from issue to issue and meeting to meeting: the world is in crisis; the resulting spiritual vacuum may be filled with destructive ideologies; Christianity in its conventional form cannot provide a viable platform for reunification and needs to be reformed; artistic activity requires a commitment to spiritual kinship.

The Third Hour members' perception of a global crisis developed the interwar discourse of the entropic condition of Western civilization. In particular,

the journal featured Berdyaev's reflections about "the end of . . . the kingdom of reason" and the advent of a new Middle Ages, when "subconscious and irrational forces have entered history" (Berdyaev 1951, 2). This loss of "forms which were worked out through a long cultural process" (Berdyaev 1976, 81) and reversion to barbarism could result, according to the philosopher, in the rise of totalitarian regimes that seek to solve the social question by destroying freedom of the spirit. Citing Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor, Berdyaev claimed that at present the masses were attracted to slavery and ideologies imposed from above. He advocated the creation of "laboratories of spiritual culture" that would work to transform world consciousness, and the Third Hour community heeded this call.

Marrying Berdyaev's belief that "the supreme value is neither the State, nor society, nor civilization, nor culture, but concrete man" (1951, 6) with Emmanuel Mounier's philosophy of Personalism, Izwolsky developed ideas on personal responsibility to humanity and went on to draw parallels with the works of Vladimir Solovyov, whom she considered the precursor of Mounier. She argued that Solovyov's teachings fit the twentieth century better than his own times, as he was "one of the first thinkers who denounced in advance the great sins of the twentieth century: totalitarian ideology, race-hatred, the excesses of nationalism" (Iswolsky 1976b, 75). For Yanovsky, the goal of uniting humanity articulated by the Third Hour was consonant with Fedorov's philosophy of a "common cause"—"the fight against poverty, disease, death" and the resurrection of our forefathers. Yanovsky elaborated on Fedorov's legacy of reconciliation between Church, science, and technology by bringing Henri Bergson into the equation: "Bergson's formula, God created man and man created the machine, is fully acceptable to Fedorov" (1976, 90). Furthermore, defining Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* as "an attempt at resurrection" à la Fedorov, Yanovsky urged writers "to cultivate our memory, become fully perceptive of our past, securely fix all the traits of our loved ones, external as well as internal. This is the task that belongs to art" (89). From this perspective, any creative activity is intimately linked to transcendent global spiritual needs. In a certain way, the Third Hour updated the formula of *art engagé*, drawing in part on W. H. Auden's dictum "Art is not enough," which concluded a lecture he gave at the Third Hour soon after joining the group in the 1940s.[11] Izwolsky, in particular, cited Auden's formula to postulate "oblation, a giving up of oneself entirely, instead of a mere intellectual pledge" (Iswolsky 1976a, 127). These examples demonstrate the Third Hour intellectual practice of establishing unexpected resonances between ideas and personalities usually discussed in separate contexts, drawing attention to unifying concerns and the evolution of world intellectual systems and sensibilities.

When considered against the historical context of the Cold War, the arms race, wars of national liberation, the 1960s social movements, rapid technological innovation, and the impact of mass media on radicalization of public discourses, the Third Hour's efforts to promote universal consciousness and reconciliation across deep-running divides stands out as a powerful yet minor countertrend. The main legacy of the group consists in facilitating dialogue across the divides separating Russian and Western philosophical traditions; Russian, European, and American intellectuals; Eastern and Western brands of Christianity; and even Communist ideology and humanist ideals. The ethical, spiritual, and ideological positions of the Third Hour were largely defined by postrevolutionary émigrés, yet they offered a new model of integrating Russian specificity into open-ended global conversations, effectively eliminating the dualistic opposition of Russia and the West that is characteristic of the Russian nationalist narrative. Instead, they mediated the traditional Russian pathos of engagement in the spiritual affairs of the world through Western philosophical and artistic creeds, emphasizing continuity, parallels, and exchanges rather than uniqueness and exclusivity. The Third Hour community transcended their local geography, as well as the Cold War ethos, and cultivated their intrinsic connection to other cultural "islands" across time and space. In doing so, they developed a new approach to constructing Russianness—not in nationalist, spatial, linguistic, or exilic versus metropolitan terms but as a dynamic intellectual identity shaped by diverse global flows and circuits of contact.

The Drifting "Island" of Russian Israel

Along with the United States, Israel received a massive influx of late Soviet-era immigrants. Yet the 160,000 who arrived in the 1970s were later dwarfed by the million-strong *aliyah* (the ingathering of Jews in the Holy Land—literally, the "ascent") of the 1990s, bringing the number of Russian speakers in Israel to its present total of one-fifth of the Israeli population. The nearly fifty-year history of Russian Israeli cultural life in many respects illustrates the transition from the Cold War situation to the contemporary condition of Russian cultural multiplicity, with trends toward intense localization and hybridization of cultural identities competing with global circuits of cultural production. At the same time, formulations of this community's collective identity are based on a dynamic combination of Jewish, Russian, Soviet, and Israeli elements, revealing its fundamental uniqueness among other Russian diasporic formations.

The 1970s *aliyah* included former *refuseniks*, many of whom experienced a Zionist awakening after the Six-Day War of 1967. Their biographical trajectories systematically renegotiated the concepts of "exile," "return," "home," and

"abroad," in many respects responding to the fundamental Jewish metanarrative that designates Zion/Israel as the true homeland, life elsewhere as exile, and immigration to Israel as repatriation and redemption (see also Moshkin, this volume). Among those who arrived in Israel during that decade were many writers (David Markish, Leonid Girshovich, Yury Miloslavsky, Ruf Zernova, Eli Luxemburg), poets (Anri Volokhonsky, Mikhail Gendelev, Mikhail Grobman), and literary scholars and critics (Mikhail Weiskopf, Maya Kaganskaya, Ilya Serman). They built a cultural network, created Russian-language journals (*Sion*, *22*, *Zemlia i liudi*, *Vozrozhdenie*, *Menora*, *Ami*, *Vremia i my*), and established the Union of Russian-Israeli Writers. The Russophone community of this initial period had a strong sense of internal coherence and shared cultural values, and given this generation's political circumstances, it is unsurprising that the Zionist theme came to dominate its literary production (as is signaled in the titles of some of the journals just referenced).

Poetry from this period saw a revival of *zionide* (*sionida*), a genre that addresses Eretz-Israel as a sacred locus and projects contemporary situations onto biblical myths, with departure from the USSR often figured as exodus from Egypt.

> Just as at the dawn of time,
> Pharaoh does not let my people go.
> **Markish**, "Recitative"
> ("Rechitativ") (1971, unpublished)

Some poems, such as the "Blue Scream" ("Sinii krik," 1973), by Markish, or Miloslavsky's "Song of the False Dmitrii" ("Pesenka Lzhedmitriia," 1966), highlight motifs of vengeance against the wicked "step-motherland." Prose narratives such as Yulia Shmukler's "We Are Leaving Russia" ("Ukhodim iz Rossii," 1975) and Ruf Zernova's "Our Roads Homeward" ("Nashi dorogi domoi," 1990) are characterized by similar double-coding of exodus from Russia in terms of biblical mythology, and representations of the journey to Israel draw on tropes characteristic of the centuries-long tradition of Jewish writing about pilgrimage to the Holy Land (Ezrahi 2000). Russophone works of this period present thematic and stylistic continuities with Soviet unofficial literature of the 1960s–70s, as a number of writers had been involved in tamizdat or samizdat activities and their first publications in Israel were often works created while still in the Soviet Union.[12] Replacing the "negative communist totality" with "another effective utopian construct," exodus narratives thus serve as a "mirror-image . . . to the canon-forming literature of social [*sic*] realism" (Smola 2015, 98). Mikhail Weiskopf reads the common "plot" of Russophone

writing from this period as initiation, with a tripartite structure: symbolic death, liminal stage, and rebirth and acquisition of a new identity. A common sequel to this scenario of initiation is representation of the post-euphoric shock caused by the clash between dreams and reality. Occasionally, texts reflect this negative stage by reversing the previous pattern (picturing Russia as paradise lost, and Israel as a new exile) but more frequently by establishing equivalency between the USSR and Israel. With both homelands exposed as false and unwelcoming, the protagonist is now doomed to eternal migration (Vaiskopf 2001, 246).

David Markish's novel *Dog* (*Pes*, 1984) engages many of these contradictions. It relates the odyssey of an exiled samizdat writer named Vadim Soloviev through Western capitals and Israel. After a series of failed attempts to shake the world with grand spiritual revelations, he becomes deeply disappointed by the "mercantile" West and returns to the USSR, only to be shot by a border guard. On a metaliterary level, the novel revisits fundamental cultural idioms, including the clichéd definition of the Russian national writer as prophet, treating them with extreme ambivalence. Despite the ironic adoption of the Wandering Jew identity, Soloviev is not transformed by his migrations into a hybrid diasporic individual nourished by cross-cultural encounters. His destiny as an author, he believes, is to be a moral authority. In Alice Nakhimovsky's view, this canon needs an oppressive political regime as its prerequisite: "The myth of the Russian writer as 'beggar and prophet,' the moral teacher of an audience who values and needs him, does not work in the West. It is a tradition that is meaningful only in non-freedom. . . . Non-freedom permits certain knowledge of right and wrong. . . . In the comfortable certitude of the totalitarian state, he [Vadim] had a clear identity as a nonconformist writer. . . . In the West all these categories become confused" (1992, 200, 206, 214). The unrealized aspiration of the novel's protagonist to prophetic status, however, also contains a covert comment on the devalued status of high culture in Western/Israeli society. As we have seen in the case of the Third Hour, the paradigm of universal and moral art "exported" by Russian immigrants can find resonance within a broad circle of Western intellectuals but is contingent on specific geocultural conditions, including the writers' ability to convert specifically Russian cultural capital into a more global commodity.

The cultural dynamics of Russian Israel changed dramatically with the end of the Cold War. Perestroika, the sudden opening of Soviet borders and the reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Israel, resulted in massive emigration of Soviet Jews at the end of the 1980s and the start of the 1990s. Many of them were economic migrants who considered Israel a less desirable destination than Germany or the United States yet wound up there as a result of the

complexities of the immigration process. One-third of those who did end up in Israel had non-Jewish or part-Jewish origins, and some 90 percent were secular. This "great Aliya" produced new, heterogeneous identities within Israel's Russophone population. It displaced existing cultural networks and created new ones, such as the publisher Gesharim–Mosty kul'tury, the theater Gesher, and the Jerusalem Club, which became a platform for vibrant cultural debates. Compared to the ideologically charged names of older journals, the titles of newly founded periodicals—*Solnechnoe spletenie*, *Ierusalimskii zhurnal*, *Zerkalo*, *Znak vremeni*, *Nota bene*, *I.O.*, *Kedr*, *Chernaia kuritsa*, *Obitaemyi ostrov*, *Dvoetochie*, and so on—suggest the decreased prominence of Zionism. This ideological shift paralleled processes in Israeli society as a whole in these years, such as a partial deconstruction of Zionist ideology, revision of national myths and narratives, and the rise of post-Zionist discourses (Silberstein 1999). Toward the turn of the century, the cynical treatment of national "father figures" became the stuff of popular culture (e.g., the popular TV show *Hartzoufim*) and also left a mark on Hebrew literary production (Bar-Iosef and Kopelman 1999, 31–32).

While still exploring the plot of initiation, 1990s narratives of Russian immigrants transitioned more quickly to a negative representation of Israel (Vaiskopf 2001, 251). In her analysis of works by Efraim Sevela, Iakov Tsigelman, Grigory Kanovich, and Mikhail Baranovsky, Klavdia Smola points to their common motif of disillusionment with the exodus myth. Their protagonists' inability to find spiritual unity with Israel and Judaism renders their geographic relocation senseless and produces a perception of Jewishness as an accident of fate and a burden (Smola 2011). Similar forms of "Zionist dystopia" can be found in the 1990s stories of "failed Aliya" written in Hebrew by Soviet immigrants, including Boris Zaidman. Dominated by nostalgia, these stories project a condescending view of Israeli society fueled by a residual Soviet Orientalist discourse (Tsirkin-Sadan 2014). In concert with the fading of political commitment, since the late twentieth century Russian Israeli literature has participated in the postmodernist trends characteristic of post-Soviet culture in general, deconstructing fundamental myths and engaging in metaliterary experimentation and linguistic play.

An important factor for the development of Russophone cultural activities in Israel in the last decades has been the intensification of physical mobility and economic and virtual interconnection with former Soviet states. This situation mirrored patterns of circulation across the entire diaspora, which was reenergized by free exchange with the metropolitan space after many decades of isolation. Most importantly, for extraterritorial Russian writers, readmission to metropolitan literary life has meant access to larger publishing markets and

audiences. Toward the end of the twentieth century, the archipelago of Russian culture began to shift, displaying its multidirectional lateral linkages.

This increased mobility between Israel and the former USSR has even given rise to a new literary genre, mock odyssey, featuring the journey of a Russian Israeli back to the country of origin. Examples include Mikhail Gendelev's *Great (Un)Russian Journey* (*Velikoe [ne]russkoe puteshestvie*, 1993, 2014) and Elena Tolstaya's *West-Eastern Pull-Out-Divan* (*Zapadno-vostochnyi divan-krovat'*, 2003).[13] These travelogues, representing late- and post-Soviet reality with a great deal of irony and estrangement, effectively travesty the tradition of an immigrant's sentimental return to the country of birth. Another strategy of texts addressing Russian reality is the creation of a clash between different codes of memory. Russian Israeli writing routinely challenges the standard discourses of history, offering an alternative perspective, highlighting marginal, silenced, or taboo experiences. This is particularly evident in narratives about World War II or the siege of Leningrad, which explode not only the official epic code of heroism and sacrifice but also the normative Russian lexicon used to articulate memories about the Great Patriotic War, as in Gendelev's *Great (Un)Russian Journey* and Svetlana Shenbrunn's *Happiness Pills* (*Piliuli schast'ia*, 2010).

Among the outcomes of the great mobility of Russian intellectuals since the 1990s has been the phenomenon of the globe-trotting writer who may reside in different locations outside or inside the metropolitan space (see Wanner, this volume). In recent years, the rise of conservative discourses and oppressive measures against nonconformist artistic expression has led a number of prominent intellectuals to leave the Russian Federation. Many leading authors, including Boris Akunin, Ludmila Ulitskaya, and Vladimir Sorokin, now reside primarily abroad yet continue to rely on publishing and media networks in Russia.

Mirroring the cross-border circulation of authors and texts in the contemporary globalized world, this situation has further eroded the "metropolitan" versus "diasporic" dichotomy. Yet in local contexts, such as that of Israel, this new cultural reality has contributed to an even greater plurality in models of Russophone cultural life. The metaphorical title of a short story collection edited by Markish, *On This Bank of the Jordan* (*Po etu storonu Iordana*, 2008), evoking the Jews' passage over the river Jordan into Israel at the conclusion of the Exodus, highlights the distinct status of those Russophone writers whose prose reflects a Jewish frame of reference and continues to gravitate toward the Israeli cultural context. Others, however, like Dina Rubina, articulate a more complex relationship to cultural location. Already a professional writer in the USSR before emigrating in 1990, she wrote prose during the first decade after her arrival in Israel that was saturated with references to the carnivalesque mixture of cultures,

languages, and mentalities characteristic of Israeli life. In these works, such as *Here Comes the Messiah* (*Vot idet Messiia*, 1996) and *At Your Gates* (*Vo vratakh tvoikh*, 1992), Russian *olim*, *haredi* Jews, and disguised Arab suicide bombers were depicted as actors in a theater of the absurd. These works were also published by Russian presses and, with their exotic subject matter, appealed to the metropolitan Russian reader. In more recent years, however, Rubina has steadily moved away from an Israeli thematic repertoire and Middle Eastern settings to engage with more "global" plots and themes. A best-selling author in Russia, she is practically unknown in Israel beyond the Russophone community. The protagonists of her latest novels, such as *Leonardo's Handwriting* (*Pocherk Leonardo*, 2008) and the *Russian Canary* (*Russkaia kanareika*, 2014), are defined primarily by their multidirectional migrations across space, time, and memory in narratives featuring rapid shifts between plot lines that mirror the hybrid identity of these deracinated protagonists. These works confront momentous questions of human destiny, the inevitability of fate, and the heavy price exacted upon those endowed with special gifts. While Rubina's vision resonates with aspects of Jewish mysticism, this connection is never quite spelled out. Pulling away from her local setting and cultural institutional frameworks, her authorial position reiterates the aspirations to universal transcendence associated with the Third Hour in another time and place.

Yet in contrast to such broadly cosmopolitan conceptions of identity, Russophone Israeli culture of the past decades has also produced literary voices that explore the local geopoetic modalities of the Middle East. The poet Alexander Barash, in collaboration with prose writer Alexander Goldshtein, articulated the concept of the community of writers living in the region as the "Mediterranean Note," a phrase he used as the title for one of his poetry collections (*Sredizemnomorskaia nota*, 2002). The specificity of this Mediterranean writing, according to Barash, proceeds from a combination of hedonism and apocalyptic vision that recalls late antiquity (Barash 2009). Despite the obvious allusion to the Paris Note, the poet's verse is a far cry from the minimalism of Parisian poets, and numerous toponyms imbue Barash's poems with an intentionally exotic quality. But there is a deeper analogy between the two poetic trends: in both cases, Russian diasporic poetry is informed by the creative potential of a specific place, mediating its character and aesthetics, as in his 1999 poem "Abandoned Syrian military camp . . ." ("Broshennyi siriiskii voennyi lager' . . ."):

> Abandoned Syrian military camp [. . .]
> the Golan is a quiet, empty plateau
> covered with high grass [. . .]

This place knows two conditions:
war and interim truce
And as before sleep or death
in the yellow evening glow
a deer glides by, with an adolescent's grace
disappearing where the gardens used to be
behind the crumbled basalt walls
of a Byzantine village.

(**Barash** 2002)

Despite the strategy of localization of Russian culture that links Barash and Goldshtein to their predecessors in Paris, a significant readership of the Israeli authors' works consists of elite metropolitan audiences who value them precisely for their innovative, peripheral poetics.

Certain distinctive features of Russophone Israeli literature predicated on geographical specificity are evident in the poem cited above. Compared to cultural production in other significant centers of Russian dispersion (Berlin, Prague, Paris, London, or New York), it often engages with the landscapes of the whole country rather than the urban contexts alone. From the start, spurred by the providential mission of recovering a specific territory in myths of exodus and return, Russian narratives have reflected on the direct link between land, physical survival, and geopolitics. One of the most productive topics in Russian Israeli literature has been war (as reflected in Gendelev's Lebanese poetic cycle), along with motifs of Arab terrorism and the dangers of everyday existence in the settlements (e.g., Luxemburg's "Settlers" ["Poselentsy," 2008], Yuliya Vudka's *Candle of Memory* [*Svecha pamiati*, 2008], and works by Rubina). In contrast to the conventional construction of Russian territory in the dominant metropolitan tradition as an infinite space with a well-defined "center" and an amorphous periphery (see Kukulin, this volume), Israel is commonly represented through rapid changes of scenery, reflecting the density and diversity of the land.[14]

For some Russophone Israeli authors, a focus on the local landscape serves as a distinguishing trait. For others, a primary marker of difference is the idiosyncratic use of the Russian language. *Simvol "My"*—an anthology of Russophone Jewish literature from Israel, Europe, and America—was conceived to illustrate the decentered condition of Russian culture and to promote translocal conversations, bypassing the metropolitan space. The preface-manifesto states that in the twenty-first century, Russian literature has become international and free from "the hierarchy of 'dominance and subordination,' determined by

the geographical location of the text and the author" (Vrubel'-Golubkina 2003, 5–8). It urges diaspora writers to cultivate their "foreignness" in particular by means of linguistic "distancing" from their country of origin.

The poet Mikhail Gendelev decouples language from identity and canon even more forcefully: "I am an Israeli Russophone poet. And a Jewish person. . . . I don't consider . . . a language (Russian in our case) the principle and formational element . . . in a poet's identification" (2003, 519). His poem "To the Arabic Language" ("K arabskoi rechi") thematizes provocatively the rejection of Russian as unfit for an Israeli poet, so long as it remains a proxy for the Russian cultural tradition: "I'd so much like to leave our speech / to leave it painfully and inhumanely." Rewriting his famous intertext, Mandelshtam's "To the German Language" ("K nemetskoi rechi"), Gendelev insists that local challenges, in particular Arab terrorism, require a response in kind; the Russian humanist ethos is, ultimately, inadequate and needs to be recoded. A Middle Eastern poet must "learn" from Arabic an alternative, dehumanized "tongue" of violence: "with your teeth / to spit out into the atmosphere / War desire! [*zhelanie Voina!*]."

Finally, Gali-Dana and Nekod Singer, writers, poets, and editors of bilingual Hebrew-Russian journals, have made even more radical steps toward estranging Russian from its original territory by giving up the commitment to a single language altogether in favor of a linguistic polyphony, effected in complex practices of translation and self-translation. Comparing the nonidentical Russian and Hebrew versions of Singer's prose, Roman Katsman views "the totality of his work" as a "kind of virtual conceptual performance of a multiplicity of languages that play with each other, replace each other, translate, and do not translate each other" (2016, 69).

At the same time as these Russian Israeli intellectuals contribute to a more deeply "diasporic" redaction of the Russian language with regard to the metropolitan circuits, in Israel they represent a resistance to the nation-building strategy of hebraization. Expressing a disappointment with Israeli cultural policies common in Russophone circles, the essayist Anna Isakova laments that two thousand years of diasporic Jewish experience is systematically suppressed in Israel for the sake of a synthetic Hebrew culture based on a reversal of the anti-Semitic stereotype: this "new Jew, the Aryan, is not fond of his past" (2007, 469). In a reflection of this stance, Russophone Israelis often assess their commitment to the Russian language as a sign of cultural superiority in the Israeli context—a link to European culture and an expression of cosmopolitanism. As sociological research demonstrates, Hebrew enjoys low prestige in the eyes of some immigrants inclined to practice "cultural separatism" (Remennick 2002).

The title of Mikhail Baranovsky's story "Izrailovka" reproduces the pejorative Russian nickname for Israel, while the poet Elena Akselrod laments the remoteness of Europe:

> . . . I didn't come full circle. And I ended up—where?
> Europe is not nearby, near me is a Bedouin tent.
>
> (Shklovskaia 2001, 15)

While ambivalence toward Europe, perceived as a cradle of anti-Semitism, has been an important component of the Israeli Zionist ethos, Russian Jews preserve their diasporic habit of assimilating European values as an antidote to what some term the "Asiatic" stream in Russian culture (Marom and Miller 2011, 94).[15] The routes open before the next Russian Israeli literary generation range from writing in a more or less estranged diasporic Russian, integrating a "Russian intonation" in Hebrew, or creolizing both languages and thereby contributing to the further diversification, hybridity, and diasporization of Israeli cultural geography.

Local Global Cultures

In some sense, the history of global Russian cultures offered above unfolds as a spiral, from a moment of open borders linking sites of extraterritorial production with the metropole in the 1920s, through the era of Cold War fragmentation of the Russian world, and back to the present era of even more robust interconnection of sites of cultural life. Yet these sites are themselves more diverse and distinctive than ever before. Shall we speak, then, of "a" Russian language and "a" Russian culture, or should we embrace the notion of Russian languages and Russian cultures as distinct constructs within a polycentric Russian-speaking archipelago? Is there an extraterritorial "world literature in Russian"? The above case studies—Russian Paris, the New York–based Third Hour group, and Russian Israel—problematize any reductive mapping of global cultural dispersion and interconnection. As the Third Hour demonstrates, the aspiration to a truly universal idea of Russian culture may be articulated at a moment of the greatest de facto division of the Russian cultural world. And the case of Russian Israel indicates that the drive toward local hybrid cultural formations may bring success in Moscow.

In our age of massive migrations of intellectuals, virtual connectivity, and proliferation of interstitial identities, nation-states, national canons, languages, and master narratives are insufficient criteria for a taxonomy of global literary

outputs. Yet while no one formula may encapsulate global culture, the global may still encapsulate a unity of diversity. Diasporic narratives are nourished by borders and migrations across them, encounters on each side, and interaction between different loci. Remaining in dialogue with metropolitan culture and the national tradition, local cultures simultaneously transcend them, engage in transnational conversations, and create constellations out of diverse aesthetic and ideological vocabularies. Such narratives tend to present specific extraterritorial locations not as peripheral with regard to the metropolitan center but as autonomous and unique. Diasporic authors and communities contest their alleged marginality and assert their hybrid character. Yet diasporic consciousness and patterns of writing inevitably spill over into the metropolitan world, eroding monolithic identities and discourses even as they participate in transnational literary systems.

In the contemporary context, diasporization and hybridity have become conditions for novel ways of "translating" the world. Perhaps they have even become prerequisites for much of today's artistic practices. Contributing alternative possibilities, the open-ended, global diaspora revitalizes a culture obsessed with its own uniqueness, greatness, uniformity, and boundaries. Ultimately, then, geographical fragmentation and unification are revealed as interrelated processes of cultural development that attest to the fecundity of global dispersion as an engine for cultural innovation and collective self-fashioning. The question of whether we should talk about one global Russian culture or many finds an answer only provisionally and, paradoxically, locally.

Notes

1. Marc Raeff's conclusion reflects the optimistic expectations of the late 1980s: "The creation of culture in Russia Abroad is now a closed chapter, for Russia Abroad is no more. Will its culture be reintegrated into the mainstream in the homeland? We believe that the signs of recent years suggest an affirmative answer" (1990, 198).

2. Mikhail Bakhtin defined *chronotope* as "intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature" (1984, 84).

3. If during most of the Soviet era diasporic production was silenced within Russia, since glasnost it has been celebrated—but not so much for its difference as for its status as a branch of Russian culture now welcomed back to the "fold."

4. On émigré projects of cultural continuity and development of the national agenda, as well as on the reception of émigré literature in turn-of-the-century Russia, see Slobin 2013.

5. On Russian émigré culture, see Struve 1959, 1996; Karlinsky 1973; Raeff 1990; Patterson 1995; Rubins 2005.

6. On Russian émigré life in Berlin, see Volkmann 1966; Williams 1972; Fleishman, Hughes, and Raevskaya-Hughes 1983; Schlögel 1994b, 2007.

7. See Hardeman 1994.

8. See Shlapentokh 2007; Bassin, Glebov, and Laruelle 2015.

9. In the original, the word used for "highbrow," *zaumnyi*, may also be a reference to "trans-sense" words, in the formulations of Russian Futurists.

10. From his anthology *Russian Flowers of Evil* (*Russkie tsvety zla*, 2001) to his more recent works and media appearances, Viktor Erofeev has described a number of metropolitan and émigré writers' shift in recent decades away from the Russian humanist tradition to examine the limits of humanity. This new writing often uses shock therapy to bring the reader face to face with the evil inherent in human beings. The claim to originality of these works, however, can be properly assessed only in the context of earlier precedents, Ivanov's *Disintegration of an Atom* in the first instance.

11. Auden eventually published this lecture in the form of an essay in Auden 1949.

12. As opposed to tamizdat (publishing abroad), samizdat (self-publishing) designates unauthorized printing of texts in the Soviet Union for dissemination within underground circles.

13. Cf. a similar tendency in cinema (e.g., Mikhail Kalik's autobiographical film *And the Wind Returns*, treated in Moshkin, this volume).

14. Even Jerusalem, featured as a sacred center in the earlier Zionist narratives, usually stands for all of Zion (Ezrahi 2000, 237).

15. Furthermore, Russian remains an internal code for a community largely opposed to the leftist intellectual establishment; it thereby provides a zone free of political correctness.