

**JE SUIS PLUSIEURS:
PLURAL SUBJECTIVITIES IN LIFE-WRITING BY THREE
FRANCOPHONE RUSSIAN WOMEN, 1800-1825**

Emilie Murphy, BA.

**Dissertation submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of
Master of Arts by Research in Russian**

September 2009

Abstract

This study examines textual representations of plural subjectivities in life-writing by three francophone Russian women in the early nineteenth century. It addresses a gap left by studies carried out on plural identities in Russian women's life-writing composed in the long eighteenth century by its examination of the texts from a cross-cultural perspective and close focus on linguistic and cultural identity. The application of Felicity Nussbaum's theory of gendered interdiscourses, Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin's heteroglossia, Murielle Lucie Clément's extension of Bakhtinian heteroglossia and my modifications to her approach reveal the representation of multiple discourses of self in the life-writings as well as the literary, spoken and cultural bilingualism of the life-writers and shows them to be bicultural. Bilingualism is not limited here to national languages, but is equally applicable to the expression of different subject positions within one culture and of discourses relating to different national cultures. Chapter One focuses on multiple and contradictory gendered subjectivities, the life-writers' (non)conformity to socially prescribed images of femininity, to which they ultimately represent themselves as bound, and the addressees' influence on self-representation. Chapter Two explores the life-writers' linguistic identity, whilst the third chapter examines their cultural identity. The analysis demonstrates that while multiple factors influence the life-writers' representation of their plurality, culture is key. None of the life-writers represents herself as either exclusively French or Russian by culture, but shows that each culture has a defined place in Russian life and that they coexist in an unproblematic way.

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | <i>i</i> |
| <i>Abbreviations, Dates, Language, Translation, Transliteration</i> | <i>ii</i> |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 1 Textual Representations of Multiple and Contradictory Gendered Subjectivities | 48 |
| Chapter 2 Textual Representations of Linguistic Identity | 84 |
| Chapter 3 Textual Representations of Cultural Identity | 114 |
| Conclusions | 139 |
| Bibliography | 146 |

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to various people who offered generous help and support during the preparation and writing of this dissertation. I benefited from the kind help of Professor N. D. Kochetkova and the archivists at IRLI who went out of their way to assist me. I would like to express my appreciation to Catherine Viollet and especially to Elena Grechanaia who has offered valuable advice and encouragement throughout the project and whose work provided its foundations. I would also like to thank the Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies at the University of Nottingham for granting me a fee-waiver and providing generous support to enable me to improve my Russian language skills. Lastly, and most importantly, special thanks are due to Wendy Rosslyn without whose inspirational expertise, guidance, endless patience, encouragements and generosity none of this would have been possible.

Abbreviations

- f. *fond* (collection)
 l., ll. *list, listy* (folio, folios)
 ob *oborot* (verso)
 p *rubl'* (rouble)
 IRLI Institut russkoi literatury

Dates

Dates are given according to the Julian calendar used in Russia until 1918 in Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts. Divova provides dates according to the French revolutionary calendar, but none are cited.

Language

The Russian quoted from the life-writings has been modernised in order to comply with the modern-day alphabet and spelling. The French of Miatleva's manuscript has not been modernised in order to preserve the charm of the original text and demonstrate her mastery of the language. The grammatical and spelling errors have not been corrected in either Miatleva's French or Russian. If I am unsure whether I have read a word correctly [?] will appear after the word in question.

Translation

All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

Transliteration

The Library of Congress transliteration system has been used

Introduction

Although Russian women's francophone life-writing is becoming an area of increasing academic interest amongst both Russian and French scholars, it has received no attention in its own right by anglophone researchers; but with my study I hope to contribute to remedying this paucity of research.

I have chosen to deal with Russian women's francophone life-writings composed during the reign of Alexander I (1800-1825) as this period not only saw the influence of the French language and culture reach its height in Russia but witnessed the practice of keeping a diary flourish amongst Russian women and play an important role in contemporary female scriptural activity.

For the purpose of this study, I focus on the personal diary and reminiscences of Elizaveta Petrovna Divova (1762-1813), the personal diary of Praskov'ia Ivanovna Miatleva (1772-1859) and the epistolary travel diary of Varvara Il'inichna Turkestanova (1775-1819). Studies of Russian women's life-writings to date (excluding Elena Grechanaia's and Catherine Viollet's most recent work on diary manuscripts)¹ have tended to focus on more better-known women, namely Catherine II, Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova and Varvara Nikolaevna Golovina, whose writings are of direct historical interest. The life-writings considered here, composed between 1802 and 1818, were authored by relatively obscure members of the Russian nobility, offer a relatively diverse sample of the life-writings produced by noblewomen in French at this time and

¹ Elena Grechanaia and Catherine Viollet, 'Dnevnik v Rossii v kontse XVIII-pervoi polovine XIX v. kak avtobiograficheskoe prostranstvo', *Izvestiia AN. Seriya literatury i iazyka*, 61, 3 (2002), pp. 18-36; Elena Grechanaia and Catherine Viollet, «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*» *Diaristes francophones Russes* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2008). Grechanaia's and Viollet's work will be discussed later.

have not previously been the topic of any study in their own right. What is more, Miatleva's personal diary was unknown to other researchers in the field until I uncovered it at IRLI in St Petersburg on a research visit in summer 2008.

Another reason why I have decided to concentrate my focus on Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova's texts is because they were native Russians. Many life-writers at this time were not born in Russia nor were they from Russian families, but were subjects of the Empire. Bearing in mind the fact that part of my study focuses on the life-writers' participation in Russian culture and their mastery of the Russian language, examining the texts of Russian subjects would complicate my analysis due to the fact that many of them would have had no knowledge of the Russian language or its associated culture.

French Cultural Influence in Russia in the Long Eighteenth Century

This section provides a brief outline of the cultural situation in the Russian nobility in the long eighteenth century and the reasons for which Russian nobles came to acquire knowledge of and participated in certain elements of Western, and particularly French, culture.

In the decades following Peter I's Westernising reforms, European influences permeated the Russian court and nobility. The Russian nobility's exposure to foreign contacts took numerous forms, including foreign travel, the invitation of foreigners to the Russian Empire, participation in European wars, 'regular diplomatic relations with Western courts, an expansion of commerce and

an unprecedented influx into Russia of foreign fashions in thought, letters, instructions and social intercourse.²

It was not until the reign of Elizabeth (1741-1762) that French influence came to dominate over other European influences and penetrate deeply into Russian life.³ As *lingua franca*, from the 1730s French became the European language of culture as well as of diplomacy. ‘The acquisition of French culture was a factor of social distinction welcomed at court and in society’. ‘To become French meant to become European.’⁴ Imitation of French customs, habits and thinking reached its peak in the early nineteenth century and francophile Russian nobles encountered French culture without having to leave Russia through various channels. Importations of the externals of French culture relating to appearance and social life including perfumes, wines, dancing teachers, and hairdressers, which made an ‘immediate, visible impact on society’,⁵ were more frequent than those of French books and ideas. Education was commonly dispensed by French governesses and tutors in the homes of the nobility and also at elite schools including the Smolnyi Institute, French-language books and journals were available in Russia, there was a French theatre in operation in St Petersburg and French fashion shops traded.⁶

Attitudes to France and its culture were complicated by the French revolution and its aftermath. It inspired fear and revulsion, but not the abandoning

² Hans Rogger, *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 6.

³ Rogger, p. 2.

⁴ Rogger, pp. 46-47.

⁵ Rogger, p. 47.

⁶ Émile Haumant, *La culture française en Russie, 1700-1900* (Paris: Hachette, 1913), pp. 69-118.

of French culture. The Jacobin reign of terror undermined Russia's belief in France as a force of progress and enlightenment. There was a large influx of émigrés, however, whom the Russians welcomed and French influence continued in Russia despite political measures taken by Catherine II against France and the French.⁷ The year 1812 saw Napoleon's invasion of Russia and short-lived occupation of Moscow which led to a wave of Russian patriotism and a revalorisation of all things Russian. Yet the growth of Russian patriotism during and following the Napoleonic wars was not in contradiction to the spread of French cultural influence. Despite the increased use of Russian amongst the aristocracy and nobility, women included, French was still spoken as it had become the ritualised language of communication. French products continued to be idealised and sold in Russia while French theatre made a reappearance from 1816.⁸ Those who fought corresponded in French and it was even common for the Russian language to be taught in French. It was not until the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855) that French influence in Russia gave way to an intense development of national consciousness and a revalorisation of traditional national values. French was no longer tolerated at court.⁹ The French language and associated culture remained present in Russian society until 1917 but to a much lesser degree.

Views on the merits of French culture and its benefits to Russian noble society and the Russians were not, however, unanimous and France, its culture and those who imitated it came under criticism by satirists, including Denis

⁷ Haumant, pp. 171-197; Rogger, pp. 69-70.

⁸ Haumant, pp. 336-340, 347-348.

⁹ «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*», p. 12.

Ivanovich Fonvizin, who criticised gallomania, a tendency to admire blindly anything French. They deplored 'French' laziness, vanity, emptiness and lack of piety. French influence in Russia was part of a wider debate about whether Russia should be a follower of Europe or cultivate its own culture. Those that defended Russian culture considered that the West and particularly France was a negation of Russian principles, namely the Orthodox values of religiosity, morality and modesty.¹⁰ This debate involved a conflict over language led by Aleksandr Semenovich Shishkov and Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin. Shishkov favoured the Orthodox liturgical and folk languages while Karamzin advocated writing as high society women spoke.

French culture's most obvious and pervasive influence on the Russian nobility was its language. French was not only used widely but, at times, to the neglect and total ignorance of Russian, particularly by women of the upper strata of society.

Why the Preference for French Amongst Russian Noblewomen in the Long Eighteenth Century?

From the reign of Elizabeth, it was not uncommon for French to be more frequently employed than Russian in both oral and written communication amongst the Russian nobility. The use of French became a question of *bon ton* and behaving *comme il faut* and therefore of social status. French was the language of worldly divertissements and interactions and social success required a

¹⁰ Haumant, pp. 159-170, 251-262.

perfect mastery of the language which was gained largely from francophone tutors and governesses¹¹ from an early age; children therefore received little training in their native language by hearing or imitation. Aleksandr Romanovich Vorontsov further illustrates children's lack of training in the Russian language:

On peut dire que la Russie est le seul pays où on dédaigne d'apprendre sa propre langue et tout ce qui a rapport au pays où l'on est né, la génération présente, s'entend; les gens prétendus éclairés à Pétersbourg et à Moscou ont soin de faire apprendre le François à leurs enfans, les entourent d'étrangers, leur donnent, à grands frais, des maitres à danser et de musique, et ne leur font pas apprendre la langue paternelle; de sorte que cette belle education, d'ailleurs si couteuse, mène à une parfaite ignorance de son pays, une indifférence, peut être même un dédain pour le pays du quel on tient existence, et un attachement pour tout ce qui tient aux moeurs et aux pays étrangers, et surtout pour la France.¹²

While men belonging to the Russian aristocracy and nobility in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were obliged due to their military or civil service and commercial relations to know Russian, their female counterparts had no such need. They often expressed themselves only in French. What is more, etiquette prescribed that men should address women in French, not only in conversation but in writing.¹³ So, at the turn of the nineteenth century Russian noblewomen frequently did not have a good grasp of the Russian language,¹⁴ just like

¹¹ Cf. Iurii Lotman, 'La littérature russe d'expression française XVIIIe-XIXe siècles' in *La littérature russe d'expression française*, ed. by Iurii Lotman and Viktor Rozentsveig (Vienna: Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, 1994), pp. 10-53.

¹² Aleksandr Romanovich Vorontsov, *Notice sur ma vie et les événements différents qui se sont passés tant en Russie qu'en Europe pendant ce tems-là* in *Arkhiv' Kniazia Vorontsova. Kniga piataia. Bumagi Grafa Aleksandra Romanovicha Vorontsova. Chast' pervaiia* (Moscow, 1872), p. 12.

¹³ «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*», p. 19.

¹⁴ Elena Grechanaia, 'Fonctions des citations littéraires dans les albums féminins en Russie (fin XVIIIe/début XIXe siècles)' in *Lectrices d'Ancien Régime*, ed. by Isabelle Brouard-Arends (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003), pp. 431-439 (p. 431).

Pushkin's heroine Tat'iana in *Evgenii Onegin*: 'Она по-русски плохо знала,/ Журналов наших не читала/ И выражалася с трудом/ На языке своем родном'.¹⁵

Russian women who wrote in French were products of their socio-cultural epoch. They were part of a much larger European group creating French-language literature. They favoured secular writing from the sentimental and romantic traditions including novels, letters and travel diaries that allowed them to express their selves. Another reason why Russian women chose French as their language of preference for writing was that the development of the Russian literary language was still in progress and so it was the French language that provided ready-made formulae for the easy expression of their ideas and feelings. Women borrowed from pre-existing French-language Sentimental and Romantic literary works in the form of form, content and quotation. These women could then express for themselves what they read about in French, identified with and therefore desired to reproduce in their own turn when they took up the pen.¹⁶

Dashkova developed a thorough knowledge of Russian only after her marriage in order to facilitate communication with her husband's family and may not have had reason to do so otherwise. Russian was a low priority in her education and more generally knowledge of spoken and written Russian was not considered essential in the second half of the eighteenth century:¹⁷

¹⁵ Aleksandr Pushkin, *Evgenii Onegin*, chapter 3, XXVI, <<http://www.rvb.ru/pushkin/01text/04onegin/01onegin/0836.htm?start=0&length=all>> [accessed 24 August 2009].

¹⁶ «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*», pp. 12-13.

¹⁷ Natal'ia L. Pushkareva, 'Russian Noblewomen's education in the Home as Revealed in Late 18th- and Early 19th-Century Memoirs' in *Women and Gender in 18th-Century Russia*, ed. by Wendy Rosslyn (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 111-128 (p. 116).

my uncle spared nothing to give us the best masters, and according to the ideas of the time we received the very best education; for we had perfect knowledge of four languages, particularly French; we danced well and drew a little; a state councilor taught us Italian and M. Bekheteev gave us Russian lessons whenever we felt like it¹⁸

In her memoirs, despite the Russian lessons she took as a child, Dashkova writes, ‘I spoke Russian badly and my mother-in-law spoke no other language, which added to my embarrassment. [...]. I therefore resolved to apply myself to the study of my native tongue’.¹⁹ The fact that her husband’s family did not speak French also highlights the difference in education before the 1730s and 1740s when the upper classes were not automatically educated in foreign languages, which served to create a generation gap as Dashkova demonstrates.

In her *Iz vospominanii o moem detstve*, Anna Petrovna Kern further shows what little place Russian was accorded in Russian noblewomen’s education a generation later in the early nineteenth century:²⁰ ‘We studied all subjects, of course, in French and studied Russian for only 6 weeks during the holidays during which Marchinskii, a student, came from Moscow.’²¹ As a child, Kern also engaged in reading in French: ‘We had a small children’s library with Mme Genlis, Ducray-Duminil and others and in our free time and on Sundays we would read constantly. Our favourite works were *Les veillées du château*, *Les soirées de la chaumière*.’²² Although she writes in Russian, Kern’s text is revealing insofar

¹⁸ Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova, *The Memoirs of Princess Dashkova*, ed. and trans. by Kyril Fitzlyon (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995), p. 32.

¹⁹ Dashkova, p. 38.

²⁰ Anna Petrovna Kern, *Iz vospominanii o moem detstve* in *Vospominaniia, dnevniki, perepiska* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1974).

²¹ Kern, p. 117.

²² Kern, p. 118.

as she was educated at the time when French was the everyday language of the Russian nobility.

Dashkova and Kern demonstrate that in the long eighteenth century Russian noblewomen were most often educated in the home. It was common practice for a girl to receive her early education from her mother, older sister or nanny before a Frenchman or woman or a German took over. Tuition in foreign languages and a faultless knowledge of French and German was the mark of having received a good education and were thought necessary by parents for the social success of their daughters. As most noblewomen used little Russian they were often lacking in confidence as to their ability to write the language and were reluctant to do so.²³ It was not uncommon, however, for Russian women to take up the pen and write in French.

Existing Research: Russian Women's Francophone Writing in the Long Eighteenth Century

Much research has been conducted on both male and female twentieth-century Russian francophone writers²⁴, but it is only in recent years that researchers have become interested in Russian women's francophone writing from the long eighteenth century; and yet as Catriona Kelly states 'such texts are of considerable importance in the development of women's prose writing in Russian.'²⁵ Female francophone authors include Varvara Iuliia Krüdener, author of the famous

²³ Wendy Rosslyn, *Feats of Agreeable Usefulness: Translations by Russian Women 1763-1825* (Fichtenwalde: Verlag F. K. Göpfert, 2000), pp. 17-20.

²⁴ Cf. *Écrivains franco-russes*, ed. by Murielle Lucie Clément (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008).

²⁵ Catriona Kelly, *A History of Russian Women's Writing 1820-1992* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), p. 54.

epistolary novel *Valérie* (1804) and Zinaida Aleksandrovna Volkonskaia, author of *Quatres Nouvelles* (1819).

It is only necessary to consult Grigorii Nikolaevich Gennadi's *Les écrivains Franco-Russes. Bibliographie des ouvrages français publiés par des Russes*²⁶ and Nikolai Nikolaevich Golitsyn's *Bibliograficheski slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits*²⁷ to see that Russian women publishing work in French were active on the Russian literary scene in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These diverse French-language texts have been paid very little attention by researchers to date and much research still remains to be done in this area.²⁸ More numerous than the women who wrote literary works for publication were those who penned life-writings.

²⁶ Grigorii Nikolaevich Gennadi, *Les écrivains Franco-Russes. Bibliographie des ouvrages français publiés par des Russes* (Dresden: Blochmann, 1874).

²⁷ Nikolai Nikolaevich Golitsyn, *Bibliograficheski slovar' russkikh pisatel'nits* (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1974).

²⁸ For studies on Russian women's francophone writing see Elena Grechanaia, 'Madame de Krüdener et la poésie (d'après ses archives inédites)', *Cahiers Roucher-André Chénier: Etudes sur la poésie du XVIIIe siècle*, 17 (1998), pp. 91-96; Elena Grechanaia, 'Un brouillon de Valérie de Mme de Krüdener dans les archives de Moscou', *Dix-huitième siècle*, Paris, 32 (2000), pp. 343-350; Elena Grechanaia, *Literaturnoe vzaimodeistvie Rossii i Frantsii v religioznom kontekste epokhi (1797-1825)* (Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2002); Elena Gretchanaia, Francis Ley and Michel Mercier, *Autour de Valérie. Œuvres de Mme de Krüdener* (Paris, Honoré Champion, 2007); Alessandra Tosi, 'Eighteenth-century traditions and issues of gender in Zinaida Volkonskaia's *Laure*' in *Waiting for Pushkin: Russian Fiction in the Reign of Alexander I (1800-1825)* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), pp. 131-149; Alessandra Tosi, 'Women and Literature, Women in Literature: Female Authors of Fiction in the Early Nineteenth Century' in *Women in Russian Culture and Society, 1700-1825*, ed. by Wendy Rosslyn and Alessandra Tosi (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 39-62; Alessandra Tosi, 'Zinaida Aleksandrovna Volkonskaia' in Clément, ed., pp. 15-30.

Life-Writing

This section provides an overview of life-writing as a genre, its practice by Russian women in the long eighteenth-century and existing research in the subject area.

Autobiography has become an umbrella term commonly used by western scholars to refer to the ensemble of self-representational life-writing. Autobiography as a genre is very hard to define as it covers such a rich mosaic of subgenres – letters, diaries and memoirs to name but a few – and includes such vast historical, cultural and social perspectives. There is no set definition or terminology for referring to this type of writing. What is more, Russian and Soviet scholars have a preference for the terms ‘memoir literature’ (*memuarnaia literatura*, *memuaristika*) and ‘documentary literature’ (*dokumental’naia literatura*) rather than autobiography²⁹ which serves to further complicate the designation of a universal term to talk about this kind of writing.

In his *L’Autobiographie en France*, Philippe Lejeune defines autobiography proper in the following way: ‘Nous appelons autobiographie le récit rétrospectif en prose que quelqu’un fait de sa propre existence, quand il met l’accent principal sur sa vie individuelle, en particulier sur l’histoire de sa personnalité’,³⁰ and he then defines subgenres of autobiographical writing in opposition to this definition. That is to say that the subgenres all comply with certain elements of the above definition, but not all. It soon became clear, however, that trying to provide such strict and precise definitions is problematic

²⁹ *Russia through Women's Eyes: Autobiographies from Tsarist Russia*, ed. by Toby W. Clyman and Judith Vowles (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), p. 6.

³⁰ Philippe Lejeune, *L’Autobiographie en France* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2004), p. 10.

because life-writing does not conform to any strict and exhaustive definition as it is all too easy inadvertently to cross the frontiers between different subgenres. The writing of an autobiographical text is above all the construction of one's subjectivity, of one's self-image, and defining oneself in relation to another or others.³¹ Felicity Nussbaum underlines the fact that 'ideas about the "self" are constructs rather than eternal truths'. In other words, the textual self and world of the life-writer are ideological constructs, linguistic representations of identity and reality 'derived from the many discourses available at a particular historical moment.'³² It is precisely constructions and representations of self that are central to this study.

For the purpose of this study I adopt the all-encompassing definition of autobiography proposed by Philippe Lejeune and Catherine Viollet: '«autobiographie» sera ici entendu au sens large: texte écrit avec l'intention de dire sa vie dans sa vérité, sur le moment (journal) ou après coup (récit)'³³ I employ the term life-writing to refer collectively to the diaries and reminiscences under consideration. The following sections provide a brief overview of the characteristics of these autobiographical subgenres.

³¹ Catherine Viollet, 'Petite cosmologie des écrits autobiographiques. Genèse et écriture de soi' in *Autobiographies*, ed. by Philippe Lejeune and Catherine Viollet (Paris: Place, 2001), pp. 37-55 (p. 40).

³² Felicity A. Nussbaum, 'Toward Conceptualizing Diary' in *Studies in Autobiography*, ed. by James Olney (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 128-140 (pp. 128-129).

³³ *Autobiographies*, p. 7.

Diaries

There is no consensus about the definition of the diary as a genre, as its diversity makes any generalising definition impossible. The characteristically protean diary is paradoxical in so far as it resists a precise definition but is instantly recognisable (in form, contents and function). English *diary*, French *journal (intime)* and Russian *dnevnik*, all derived from the root meaning *day*, indicate the diary's distinct narrative form, that of a daily writing practice. The diary's main recurring features include a first-person narration in separate instalments which recounts the author's personal experience. The diary, which often incorporates other genres and includes diverse materials, can have a number of uses and take different forms. The entries consist of the insignificant and anecdotal as well as the secret depths and emotional outpourings of the author.³⁴ Contrary to autobiography proper with its formal organisation, plot and themes, diaries are perceived to represent the diarist's immediate present and are also characterised by lack of premeditation and non-selectivity, as having little concern for formal or logical coherence. Diaries are thought to be without art³⁵ and their addressees can take various forms.

³⁴ Philippe Lejeune, 'How Do Diaries End?' *Biography*, 24, 1 (2001), pp. 99-112 (p. 105); Irina Paperno, 'What Can Be Done with Diaries?', *Russian Review* 63 (2004), pp. 561-573 (pp. 561-562, 564); Irina Savkina, "'Pishu sebia": avtodokumental'nye zhenskie teksty v russkoi literature pervoi poloviny XIX veka' (doctoral thesis, University of Tampere, 1999), p. 79; Françoise Simonet-Tenant, *L'écriture de la vie. Le journal intime genre littéraire et écriture ordinaire* (Paris: Téraèdre, 2004), pp. 11-13, 22.

³⁵ Steven Rendall, 'On Diaries', *Diaretics*, 16, 3 (1986), pp. 57-65 (p. 58); Simonet-Tenant, p. 22.

Diary addressees

Certain diaries, and not only epistolary ones, have an explicit addressee and are constructed as a dialogue as the addressee is invited to read the text, whereas other diaries have an implicit, symbolic or impersonalised addressee who is effectively part of the text. In certain cases there is a concrete but virtual addressee. The distinction between writing for oneself and writing for another is, in certain cases, unclear. The addressee is an influential force in diary writing as the author defines their selection of detail and means of construction of self in relation to the addressee.³⁶

Self-representation is orientated towards an addressee by way of the inclusion of their opinion in the text. To a certain extent, the addressee becomes the director of the diarist's textual performance and directly influences the textual *mise-en-scène* of self which conforms to their expectation. The presence of an addressee creates the impression of the diarist performing a textual balancing act between openness and secrecy and public and private. There is a permanent presence of 'foreign' discourse in the texts, that is to say, the discourse of the implicit or explicit addressee or environment in which the life-writer is writing as environment has also be shown to shape the detail featured in the writings.³⁷

³⁶ Catherine Viollet, 'Aux frontières de la correspondance: journaux féminins de l'aristocratie russe (début de XIXe siècle)', *Revue de l'AIRE*, 32 (2006), pp. 71-79 (pp. 73-75).

³⁷ Savkina, pp. 46, 79-80.

Reminiscences

Reminiscences are a category of life-writing which poses many difficulties in its definition as they tend to overlap several subgeneric boundaries. The classification of reminiscences is therefore largely subjective. Reminiscences take the form of personal accounts which do not fall neatly into the definitions I am adopting for either autobiography proper or diaries. Reminiscences are a complicated case as they are not simply an account of personal memories. Their composition requires an effort on the part of the author to put the reminiscences into a particular order and create a coherent account of their person but they often only focus on one episode or on a limited period in the author's life.³⁸ They are written retrospectively, often a long time after the events recounted occurred. Written from a personal point of view, the author is at the centre of the account rather than the object of the account itself.

For the purpose of this study it will be necessary to take into consideration the specificities of women's life-writing when discussing Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts.

Women's Life-Writing

Since the 1970s, there has been growing scholarly interest in women's life-writing and since the 1980s it has become a central case for feminist criticisms. Existing generic definitions excluded forms of life-writing frequently adopted by women

³⁸ Lejeune, *L'Autobiographie en France*, pp. 13-14.

such as diaries and letters.³⁹ Georges Gusdorf defined (male-authored) autobiography as focusing principally on the public side of an essential and stable author's life where the model of the account is also its object. 'Autobiography is the mirror in which the author reflects his own image'⁴⁰ as a 'complete and coherent expression of his own destiny'⁴¹ which is not shaped or imposed by outside influence, but created by the individual's own agency.⁴²

Gusdorf's individualistic concept of the autobiographical self is problematic in its application to the study of women's texts, however, as women represent their self in a very different way. Women's life-writing, termed *autogynography* by Domna Stanton⁴³, not only extends androcentric definitions of life-writing but upsets them. Feminist scholars see women's autobiographies as different to those of men and, as Stanton's term *autogynography* suggests, consider that this difference is informed largely by gender. One of the most common differentiating features of the 'autogynographic content' is the 'discontinuous, digressive, fragmented' narratives in opposition to men's 'linear, chronological, coherent' ones.⁴⁴ Women represent their self-images by various types of understatement. As a rule, they recount their experiences in a straightforward and often evasive manner. Women's autobiographies do not place

³⁹ Laura Marcus, *Auto/biographical Discourses: Theory, Criticism, Practice* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), p. 1.

⁴⁰ Georges Gusdorf, 'Conditions and Limits of Autobiography', trans. by James Olney in *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*, ed. by James Olney (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 28-48 (p. 33).

⁴¹ Gusdorf, p. 35.

⁴² Gusdorf, p. 37.

⁴³ Domna C. Stanton, 'Autogynography: Is the Subject Different?' in *Women, Autobiography, Theory: A Reader*, ed. by Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson (Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 1998), pp. 131-144.

⁴⁴ Stanton, p. 137.

great emphasis on the public aspects of their lives but rather concentrate on their personal lives, the domestic sphere, and significant others in their lives.⁴⁵ Women have their identity defined by dominant male culture, but not recognising or accepting themselves as this prescribed image of woman, they develop a dual consciousness, the self as culturally defined and the self as different from cultural prescription⁴⁶ and thus represent dual or plural identities on the pages of their life-writings.

Women's autobiography does not, therefore, present an untroubled reflection of the author's identity. The central issue of contemporary critical thought is the problematic status of the self. Contemporary feminist autobiographical critique reads women's autobiography as 'a model of non-representative, dispersed, displaced subjectivity.'⁴⁷

The following section discusses the practice of life-writing by Russian women in the long eighteenth century and provides a context in which to situate Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts.

Women's Life-Writing in Russia in the Long Eighteenth Century

It was not until the eighteenth century that women took to the public, political and literary stage in Russia. With the secularisation of Russian literature, life-writers,

⁴⁵ *Women's Autobiography: Essays in Criticism*, ed. by Estelle Jelinek (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), pp. 3-8, 15, 17.

⁴⁶ Susan Stanford Friedman, 'Women's Autobiographical Selves: Theory and Practice' in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 72-82 (p. 75).

⁴⁷ *Life/Lines: Theorizing Women's Autobiography*, ed. by Bella Brodzki and Celeste Schenck (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), pp. 1-7.

along with poets, were among the first women to take up the pen.⁴⁸ The first autobiographical accounts were written in Russian during the reign of Anna Ioannovna (1730-1740).⁴⁹ Although many Russian life-writers would have been familiar with the Western European autobiographical tradition and were familiar with such texts as Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Confessions*⁵⁰, the attention that focused on the self went against the qualities of humility and discretion prescribed by the Orthodox Church as well as the conventions of aristocratic etiquette that considered it improper to speak of oneself.⁵¹ This ideology was even more restricting for women in a culture where selflessness and self-abnegation were held to be the highest ideals of womanhood.⁵²

Influenced by sentimental and romantic literature, the notion of personal writing appeared in Russia towards the end of the eighteenth century while diary writing developed as a result of the progressive secularisation of Russian noble culture and in relation to existing autobiographical practices including correspondence and the album of citations.⁵³

The value of diaries, texts written not for publication, but for the self was that they became for women a means of self-realisation which at the same time

⁴⁸ Barbara Heldt, *Terrible Perfection: Women and Russian Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), p. 86.

⁴⁹ An early example is the notes of Anna Shestakova, *Cherty iz domashnei zhizni imperatritsy Anny Ioannovny* (1738). A later, more well-known text is Natal'ia Borisovna Dolgorukaia's *Svoeruchnie zapiski* (1767).

⁵⁰ Philippe Lejeune cites 1782 and the publication of Rousseau's *Confessions* as the birth of autobiography in France and even in Europe. *Confessions* became the model for literary autobiography in content, project, tone and theme.

⁵¹ 'Aux frontières de la correspondance', p. 72.

⁵² Clyman and Vowles, eds., pp. 1, 12-14; Savkina, pp. 53-55.

⁵³ 'Aux frontières de la correspondance', p. 72.

allowed them to remain in the domestic sphere assigned to them by men.⁵⁴ What is more, from a social point of view, keeping a diary was often encouraged or even imposed upon the diarist by the family entourage who controlled the practice. Diary forms undertaken by women included chronicles of daily life, travel diaries, diaries of religious conversion, epistolary diaries, records of balls and social events and records of the lives of the author's children. Natal'ia Mikhailovna Stroganova's travel diary, kept in French in 1780-1781, is one of the first known Russian-authored female dairies. Russian noblewomen's diaries, many of which were written in French, appeared as an important body of texts in the early nineteenth century.

Judging by Grechanaia and Viollet's survey of diaries in Russian archives it is clear that diary writing was an important scriptural act for Russian francophone women in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.⁵⁵ Aside from the events recounted, each diary is the account of a life lived and displays attempts to construct and represent a self who is at once unique and plural. The Russian female-authored francophone diaries echo each other to a certain extent and show clearly a vast social and cultural network where seemingly everyone knows everyone and the same names, events and places crop up over and over again.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Elena Grechanaia and Catherine Viollet, 'Dnevnik v Rossii v kontse XVIII – pervoi polovine XIX v. kak avtobiograficheskaia praktika', in *Avtobiograficheskaia praktika v Rossii i vo Frantsii*, ed. by Elena Grechanaia and Catherine Viollet (Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2006), pp. 6-7 (typescript).

⁵⁵ Of 80 diaries written between the late 1780s and early 1850s uncovered predominantly in Moscow archives, 52 were female-authored. Cf. Grechanaia and Viollet, 'Dnevnik v Rossii v kontse XVIII-pervoi polovine XIX v. kak avtobiograficheskoe prostranstvo', p. 19.

⁵⁶ «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*», pp. 13-17.

My analysis focuses primarily on epistolary and travel diaries. The following section aims to provide an overview of these types of diaries produced by francophone Russian women.

Epistolary Diaries

Private correspondence in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Russia played an important part in noblewomen's daily lives and writing letters was an activity that they regularly engaged in. It was both a means of communication and self-expression. The informal writing recorded personal reflections and described their own as well as other people's everyday life and the culture of their social milieu. Noblewomen wrote regularly to family and friends because at this time letters were almost the only way to communicate with those who were far away and letters created the illusion of the writers' presence.⁵⁷

Often of imposing proportions, epistolary diaries, which were inspired as a genre by the popular sentimental epistolary novel, present themselves explicitly as missives. They were conceived in the same way as correspondence proper to be sent to their recipient, by the post or by entrusting them to a private individual, once the notebook was full, or in instalments before that.⁵⁸ It is more than likely that sending letters both from abroad and from the countryside in Russia involved practical difficulties which made diary-letters both an acceptable and logical practice.⁵⁹ The diary form in a notebook may have been preferable to the

⁵⁷ Anna Belova, 'Women's Letters and Russian Noble Culture of the Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries' in Rosslyn, ed., pp. 147-161 (pp. 147-149, 154, 157-158).

⁵⁸ 'Aux frontières de la correspondance', pp. 73-76.

⁵⁹ Belova, p. 156.

traditional letter on loose sheets of paper as it allows the author to write a regular and exhaustive account of feelings and events in bulletin form.⁶⁰

Travel Diaries

More often than not women's travel writing took an epistolary or diurnal form. Russian women's French-language travel diaries were primarily destined for the private use of their author and sometimes to be shared with others on return and served several purposes. They were informative, educational and, above all, served to keep in memory the trip, which in many cases lasted months if not years.⁶¹

In Grechanaia and Viollet's survey of Russian-authored French-language life-writing, travel writing is the best represented category. Ordinarily, the travel diaries begin with the departure of the author and end with the return to this same point. Germany, France and Italy are predominantly described in the diaries, but the diarists also visit Poland, Austria, Holland, Belgium and England, among other countries and make journeys within the Russian Empire itself. Descriptions of towns and monuments visited, works of art, as well as theatre trips occupy a considerable part of the diary entries. The travellers are, as a rule interested in the cultural, political and religious character of the places they visit and their diaries include many historic and artistic details. The contents of the travel diaries are not limited to a simple itinerary of places, monuments and curiosities visited, but also

⁶⁰ 'Aux frontières de la correspondance', pp. 77-78.

⁶¹ Catherine Viollet, 'Écritures parallèles. Jounaux de voyage rédigés en français par de jeunes aristocrates russes, 1841-1847', p. 3 (typescript).

provide an insight into the means and conditions of travel, lodgings, relations with fellow travellers and meetings with acquaintances. The diaries are often anecdotal, with personal appreciations and expressions of the diarist's sentiments.⁶²

Following the situation of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's writing in an historical, social, cultural and literary context, the next section provides an overview of existing research in the field of Russian women's life-writing in the long eighteenth century and demonstrates the gaps left by scholars in their studies of plural identity with regard to French-language texts.

Existing research: Russian Women's Life-Writing in the Long Eighteenth Century

Although research has been carried out on Russian women's life-writing from the long eighteenth century, this has for the most part focused on Russian-language texts or on Russian translations of French-language texts. Equally, whereas diary writing by 'ordinary people' has been the subject of many studies in western European scholarship, which situates it as an integral part of autobiographical culture as the construction of one's own personality, there has been very little research on Russian diary culture.⁶³

Barbara Heldt was the first to address the question of Russian women's life-writing, and the split subject is an important theme in her work in the context

⁶² «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*», pp. 25-28.

⁶³ 'Dnevnik v Rossii v kontse XVIII-pervoi polovine XIX v. kak avtobiograficheskaia praktika', pp. 2-3. (typescript).

of the conflicts between the life-writers' plural public and private selves.⁶⁴ Although much of Heldt's analysis focuses on a later period, one of her pivotal texts is Dashkova's *Mon Histoire* in which she emphasises the double nature of Dashkova's life and draws our attention to her plural public and private identities of 'scholar and daughter, conspirator and bride, Russian representative abroad and mother, administrator of academies and of estates, counsellor and friend',⁶⁵ and thus reveals the complexities of the female self forever aware of her gender. Dashkova was, however, one of the very few women who had a role in public life at this time, so the public/private distinction is not productive for most other life-writers of this period.

In her doctoral thesis, Irina Savkina examines the strategies of self-description in Russian women's early nineteenth-century life-writings. She focuses on the tensions between the life-writers' secrecy and openness and between their outward conformity and inward rebellion, as well as their non-conformity with socially prescribed feminine models. She determines that these life-writers represent themselves as having a gendered self-for-self and self-for-others which is influenced by their addressee and that these women are caught between resignation to their condition and rebellion against it. Savkina concludes that self-representation is largely determined by otherness, by existing myths of femininity.

⁶⁴ Heldt, pp. 63-102.

⁶⁵ Heldt, p. 70.

The contradiction between multiple selves is emphasised in Wendy Rosslyn's article on self and place⁶⁶ in Russian noblewomen's life-writings. Rosslyn demonstrates the way in which place shapes identity. This study shows how a change of location has a direct effect on self-representation by the reflections that the life-writers make about their new way of life in contrast to their habitual lifestyle. The life-writers display multiple gendered subjectivities; they adopt different personae and different discourses of self according to their place of residence. Place, however, is only one factor that influences the multiple nature of the life-writers.

In her MA dissertation⁶⁷ on Russian women's published autobiographical writing, composed in what she refers to as the pre-romantic period, Malin Ahlbeck examines the general themes and differences in early examples of memoirs. She notes that the fact that Dashkova's *Mon histoire* and Golovina's *Souvenirs* were originally written in French is undoubtedly significant in some way, but she does not consider this aspect of the texts in her study. Ahlbeck remarks that Dashkova's and Golovina's texts are "'modern', Westernised and independent' with an emphasis on learning and instruction while Dologorukaia and Labzina's Russian-language *Svoeruchnye zapiski* (1767) and *Vospominaniia* (1810) 'concentrate primarily on their own personal misery, with a strong element of religiosity and an emphasis on traditional, patriarchal values.'⁶⁸ She does not, however, take into consideration the cross-cultural context in which the French-

⁶⁶ Wendy Rosslyn, 'Self and Place in Life-Writings by Late Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century Russian Noblewomen', forthcoming, *Slavonic and East European Review*, January 2010.

⁶⁷ Malin Ahlbeck, 'Resistance Through Martyrdom? A Study of Russian Women's Early Autobiographical Writing', (master's dissertation, Abo Akademi University, 1999).

⁶⁸ Ahlbeck, pp.105-106.

language texts were written or the fact that the francophone life-writers express multiple cultural subjectivities in their writing.

Language is an important feature of Russian francophone women's identity. Theorists have argued that human identities are formed linguistically, by and in relation to the languages we learn.⁶⁹ Jehanne M. Gheith suggests that because identities in Russia were formed by and in relation to Western Europe, to non-Russian languages and traditions this makes the very concept of a Russian (or, in this case a Russian woman) complicated.⁷⁰ Although Russian aristocratic society modelled itself on Western Europe, it was necessarily based on and infiltrated by Russian traditions. The cross-cultural context in which Russian women's francophone life-writings were written makes it difficult to define texts as belonging to a single culture. On this basis, Gheith's asserts that cross-cultural comparisons of Russian women's francophone life-writings would encourage 'asking new questions and developing new approaches to and understandings of gender, identity, nationality, and self-representation.'⁷¹ She does not carry out the proposed analysis, however, and to date, there have not been any attempts to analyse Russian women's French-language life-writings from a cross-cultural perspective.

The first attempt to examine Russian francophone autobiographical literature as such was made by Kelly Herold in 1998,⁷² but it is only in recent

⁶⁹ 'C'est dans et par le langage que l'homme se constitue comme *sujet*; parce que le langage seul fonde en réalité, dans sa réalité qui est celle de l'être, le concept d' 'ego'', Émile Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966), p. 259.

⁷⁰ Jehanne M. Gheith, 'Introduction' in Dashkova, pp. 1-26.

⁷¹ Gheith, p. 19.

⁷² Kelly Herold, 'Russian Autobiographical Literature in French: Recovering a Memoiristic Tradition (1770-1830)', (doctoral thesis, UCLA, 1998).

years that Elena Grechanaia and Catherine Viollet have begun to investigate Russian women's francophone diaries. They have published a dozen volumes and articles on both Russian and Russian francophone diary culture in the long eighteenth century.⁷³ Following their search for Russian women's life-writings, Grechanaia and Viollet have revealed that the majority of these diverse texts, composed between 1780 and 1854, including personal, epistolary and travel diaries exist in manuscript only. What is more, the rare texts that were published, often many years after their composition, are unrepresentative of the majority of the texts found in archives, their purpose being to provide historical accounts about famous people rather than recounting the personal life of the author herself. This research has shown that the first Russian women's diaries were written uniquely in French, although they did sometimes contain the occasional word or passage of Russian. The fully-fledged personal diary with a diurnal entry format only appeared at the end of the eighteenth century. Ekaterina Petrovna Kvashnina-Samarina's diary, kept between 1795 and 1799, is one of the earliest known texts of this kind.

⁷³ Elena Grechanaia, 'Frantsuzskie teksty zhenshchin aristokratskogo kruga (konets XVIII-nachalo XIX v.) i vzaimodeistvie kul'tur', *Izvestiia AN. Serii literatury i iazyka*, 58, 1 (1999), pp. 33-44; *Literaturnoe vzaimovospriatie Rossii i Frantsii v religioznom kontekste epokhi (1797-1825)*; 'Fonctions des citations littéraires dans les albums féminins en Russie (fin XVIIIe/début XIXe siècles)'; 'Les écrits autobiographiques des femmes russes du 18^e siècle rédigés en français', *Dix-huitième siècle*, 36 (2004), pp. 131-54; *Mémoires et journaux intimes féminins rédigés en français dans le premier quart du XIXe siècle: aspects religieux et linguistiques*, <<http://russie-europe.ens-lsh.fr/IMG/pdf/grechanaia.pdf>> [accessed 10 March 2008], 'Avtobiograficheskie teksty rossiiskikh zhenshchin XVIII v. na frantsuzskom iazyke' in *Avtobiograficheskaia praktika v Rossii i vo Frantsii*; Elena Grechanaia and Catherine Viollet, 'Dnevnik v Rossii v kontse XVIII-pervoi polovine XIX v. kak avtobiograficheskoe prostranstvo'; 'Journaux russes francophones du XIXe siècle: Espaces Littéraires', *La Licorne Revue de langue de de littérature française. Le journal aux frontières de l'art*, 72 (2005), pp. 89-101; «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*». Catherine Viollet, 'Motivations et réticences chez les jeunes diaristes russes (XIXe siècle)', *La Licorne*, 68 (2004), pp. 389-396; 'Aux Frontières de la correspondance'.

This large overview of existing published and unpublished texts carried out by Grechanaia and Viollet, who argue that Russian women's francophone diary-writing played an important role in the development of the diary genre in Europe, situates them in the contemporary social, historical, religious, linguistic and literary contexts, but as the majority of these texts are unpublished manuscripts, it is difficult to know how many texts were written and how many are still unidentified in family and institutional archives and so, much research remains to be done on texts waiting to be uncovered. Grechanaia and Viollet's most recent collaborative publication, «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*», provides an overview of the ways in which diarists present their self-image in their writing, but does not provide any detailed analysis or examine the issue of plural subjectivities from a cross-cultural perspective.

Bearing in mind that previous research on women's life-writing has shown that the feminine autobiographical subject is plural and unstable, I consider Felicity Nussbaum's theory about plural, inconsistent and contradictory feminine subjectivities which I will apply in my analysis in relation to Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts.

The Plural, Inconsistent and Contradictory Feminine Subject

Using postmodern theory as a theoretical base for her study of eighteenth-century diaries in England, Nussbaum asserts that constructs of the self 'are produced through social, historical, and cultural factors; and produced by them.' She

suggests that these diaries ‘hold within them competing systems of representation that construct the “self”, and that the discourse of diary is particularly open to a series of coterminous and contradictory subject positions.’⁷⁴

In her study of disparity between parts of the self in English women’s eighteenth-century autobiographical writing, Nussbaum adopts a materialist feminist theoretical position. This position requires a ‘model of ideology which acknowledges contradiction within it in order to allow subjects to misrecognize themselves in prevailing ideologies and to intervene in producing new knowledge’⁷⁵ and draws on several theorists.⁷⁶ Central in her study of gender and identity in these autobiographical writings, is a discursive subject placed in its historical specificity and the materiality of ideology which is neither ‘monolithic or exclusively aligned with a particular class as the only hegemonic force.’⁷⁷

Nussbaum concludes, therefore, that eighteenth-century autobiographical writing is a place of experimentation with *interdiscourses* (conflictual discourses) and their corresponding subject positions, where ‘gendered subjectivity is constructed, confirmed, and sabotaged’ and that accordingly ‘such texts may work simultaneously for and against the ideologies of identity which prevail.’⁷⁸

Nussbaum argues that it is possible to ‘historicize the concepts of woman, feminism, and female experience. That is, “woman” can be read as a historically and culturally produced category situated within material conditions that vary at

⁷⁴ ‘Toward Conceptualizing Diary’, p. 129.

⁷⁵ Felicity A. Nussbaum, ‘The Politics of Subjectivity and The Ideology of Genre’ in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 160-167 (p. 164).

⁷⁶ Benveniste, Lacan, Althusser, Gramsci, Pêcheux and Macdonell. Cf. ‘The Politics of Subjectivity’.

⁷⁷ ‘The Politics of Subjectivity’, p. 163.

⁷⁸ ‘The Politics of Subjectivity’, p. 165.

historical moments and in regional locations.’ She goes on to say that ‘this experience, as variously depicted in autobiographical texts, both participates in and contests existing categories of woman.’ She ‘explores the ways women’s self-writing in eighteenth-century England ventriloquates male ideologies of gender’ while it allows alternative discourses to challenge them. Women’s life-writing, especially personal diaries, is ‘one location of these contradictions that both produce and reflect historicized concepts of self and gender while sometimes threatening to disrupt or transform them.’ The ‘self’, constituted by history, language, and culture, then, is a ‘product of specific discourse and social process’ and becomes ‘a *locus* where discourses intersect’ producing an inconsistent and contradictory subject⁷⁹ who simultaneously resists hegemonic formulations of gendered subjectivity and reproduces them, which serves to express the plurality of the authors’ gendered positions.

In my investigation of the plural subjectivities in life-writing by three francophone Russian women, I take up Nussbaum’s definition of the diary as ‘a mode of perceiving reality and a signifying system within the discursive practices available in the social-cultural domain.’⁸⁰ In applying her theory of gendered interdiscourses, that is to say the multiple contradictory interpenetrating discourses of self, I aim to demonstrate the multiplicity, contradictions and inconsistencies of the self-representation of the life-writers. I apply this approach

⁷⁹ Felicity A. Nussbaum, ‘Eighteenth-century Women’s Autobiographical Commonplaces’ in *The Private Self Theory and Practice of Women’s Autobiographical Writings*, ed. by Shari Benstock (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), pp. 147-171 (pp. 148-150).

⁸⁰ ‘Toward Conceptualizing Diary’, p. 137.

as an example of heteroglossia, which is the theoretical premise of this study and is discussed in the following sections.

Bakhtinian Heteroglossia

In his essay 'Discourse in the Novel',⁸¹ Bakhtin describes heteroglossia (*raznorechie*) as a complex mixture of social languages and world views that is dialogised as each language is viewed from the perspective of others, which in turn creates a complex unity as the meaning of the text is located at a point between speaker and writer, listener or reader.

Heteroglossia denotes the multiple languages, dialects or discourses, which are at any time spoken by the speakers of any language. In 'Discourse in the Novel' it refers to a description of speech styles in language, especially characteristic of the novel, but present in languages in general. These languages are the 'languages of social groups and classes, of professional groups, of generations, the different languages for different occasions that speakers adopt even within these broader distinctions.'⁸² Bakhtin stresses the fact that social contexts are polyglot.

While linguistics and stylistics emphasise the centripetal forces that centralise and unify a national language, Bakhtin sees language pulled in opposite directions and draws attention to the centrifugal forces that serve to decentralise and disunify that same national language, which in reality is made up of various languages

⁸¹ Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, 'Discourse in the Novel' in M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. by Michael Holquist, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982), pp. 259-422.

⁸² Simon Dentith, *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 33.

creating a false unity.⁸³ These centrifugal stratifying forces of heteroglossia produce a complex mixture of languages that is also a mixture of attitudes or points of view about the world: ‘For any individual consciousness living in it, language is not an abstract system of normative forms but rather a concrete heteroglot conception of the world.’⁸⁴ So,

as a living, socio-ideological concrete thing, as heteroglot opinion, language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes “one’s own” only when the speaker populates it with his own intention.⁸⁵

The word of the speaker then ‘is an orientation toward a specific conceptual horizon, toward the specific world of the listener’ as ‘understanding and response are dialectically merged and mutually condition each other; one is impossible without the other.’⁸⁶ The other’s language, or discourse, is inserted into the novel without any formal markers and this ‘foreign’ discourse becomes an integral part of the text and is directly set up in opposition to other discourses present: ‘Two points of view are not mixed, but set against each other dialogically. [...] a dialogue composed of socio-linguistic points of view’.⁸⁷

Dialogised heteroglossia therefore occurs continually due to a process of both intentional and unintentional hybridisation. Hybridisation ‘is a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within

⁸³ Bakhtin, p. 272.

⁸⁴ Bakhtin, p. 293.

⁸⁵ Bakhtin, p. 293.

⁸⁶ Bakhtin, p. 282.

⁸⁷ Bakhtin, p. 360.

the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor.’⁸⁸ Bakhtinian hybridisation therefore involves a ‘mixing of accents and erasing of boundaries between authorial speech and the speech of others’.⁸⁹

Although heteroglossia is traditionally attributed to the novel, it is also a productive model of analysis for women’s life-writings.

Theories of Heteroglossia in Studies of Women’s Life-Writings

Particularly in the 1980s, but also since, scholars have found Bakhtin’s conceptions of dialogism and heteroglossia particularly illuminating in the discussion of the voice of female subjectivity in life-writings.⁹⁰ The concept of heteroglossia demonstrates the way in which women’s discourse is penetrated by the voices of others and is therefore dialogic. ‘Heteroglossia assumes a pervasive and fundamental heterogeneity to human subjectivity. The text is multivocal because it is a site for the contestation of meaning.’⁹¹

⁸⁸ Bakhtin, p. 358.

⁸⁹ Bakhtin, p. 320.

⁹⁰ Cf. Mae Gwendolyn Henderson, ‘Speaking in Tongues: Dialogics, Dialectics, and the Black Woman Writer’s Literary Tradition’ in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 343-351; Françoise Lionnet, *Autobiographical Voices: Race, Gender, Self-Portraiture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989); Françoise Lionnet, ‘The Politics and Aesthetics of Métissage’ in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 325-336; Nóra Séllei, ‘A Hungarian New Woman Writer and a Hybrid Autobiographical Subject: Magrit Kaffka’s ‘Lyrical Notes of a Year’ in *New Woman Hybridities: Femininity, Feminism and International Consumer Culture, 1880-1930*, ed. by Ann Heilmann and Margaret Beetham (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 35-49.

⁹¹ Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson, ‘Introduction: Situating Subjectivity in Women’s Autobiographical Practices’ in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 3-52 (pp. 30-31).

Françoise Lionnet's cross-cultural approach is particularly relevant to my study of plural subjectivities. She examines the rhetoric of self-portraiture in autobiographical fiction by authors who are bilingual, multilingual or of mixed races and cultures in a post-colonial context, arguing that is through Glissant's concept of *métissage* that francophone and anglophone women mix indigenous and colonial languages, 'privileging orality' and 'extra-(Euro)literary forms' to express their "'muted" cultural status' and reevaluate Western concepts.⁹² Lionnet's post-colonial study is relevant to my own insofar as it treats bilingual and multilingual women life-writers of mixed cultures. I am particularly interested in the presence of more than one linguistic and cultural discourse and the way in which the '(m)other tongue', linguistic and cultural, resurfaces in the apparently monolingual text, 'creating echoes of another discourse, another sensitivity'.⁹³ In Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's French-language writings there are underlying linguistic and cultural layers to be read, which reveal the life-writers' plural linguistic and cultural subjectivities and heteroglossic expression. I will examine these linguistic and cultural layers, but there will be no discussion of the '(m)other tongue', due to the fact that there is not sufficient evidence present in the texts to come to any conclusions about which language (French or Russian) the life-writers considered to be their '(m)other tongue'.

⁹² Smith and Watson in Smith and Watson, eds., p. 31.

⁹³ *Autobiographical Voices*, p. 27.

Application of Bakhtinian Heteroglossia to the Study of Life-Writing by Three Francophone Russian Women

I adopt Bakhtinian heteroglossia to examine the multiple and contradictory gendered, linguistic and cultural discourses of subjectivity in Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's life-writings. Although Bakhtin applies his conception of heteroglossia uniquely to the novel and not all the elements of his theory are applicable to the texts under consideration, other elements are productive for this study, as the texts are a site of multiple and interpenetrating socially and culturally located discourses.

I consider the centripetal force of the writings to be the French language and social context, which creates a maximum of understanding and cohesion. As a reader of the life-writings under consideration, I understand the linguistic unity of each text to lie in the easy identification of the subject matter as self-writing by individual women in the early nineteenth century. I consider the centrifugal, stratifying forces in the texts to be to the multiple discourses of subjectivity, national languages and cultural discourses, which allow no single definition of the life-writers.

Although these life-writings are not heteroglot in style and register, they are variform in voice. The life-writers express themselves by a hybrid of languages. Following Bakhtin, I understand language 'not as a system of abstract grammatical categories, but a world view, even as a concrete opinion'.⁹⁴ Heteroglossia is in my view present in the life-writings as a complex mixture of

⁹⁴ Bakhtin, p. 284.

gendered discourses. Turkestanova, for example, simultaneously adopts two gendered subjectivities and their associated discourses, those of a worldly woman and of a devout Orthodox believer, two seemingly incompatible and contradictory subject positions.

Through their multiple discourses, these life-writers adopt multiple and contradictory subject positions, some of which conform to the dominant social code and societal expectation and some of which express an individual opinion that contradicts and/or resists these expectations. Contradictory images of self, and the opinions and points of view these images represent, are set against each other, revealing dialogism while unintentional hybridisation is present in the sense that various discourses coexist within the boundaries of the French-language life-writings.

Unlike novels, in the case of the life-writings it is not the discourses of the author, narrator and protagonists which are set up against each other and made dialogic, but the multiple and contradictory discourses of the life-writers themselves, as well as the societal discourses, and those of their implicit or explicit addressee which they adopt in their texts. The life-writers' discourses are dialogic as they both respond positively to the discourse of others by reproducing it in their writings or contest it and create a discourse of their own in response. Miatleva, for example, adopts the discourse of an obedient and submissive wife prescribed by both her husband and society and thus responds positively to them in text, by repetition of their discourse and conformity with its prescriptions, but

she also responds negatively by a second contestatory discourse by which she objects to the other discourse she adopts.

Bakhtinian heteroglossia does not, however, imply the knowledge of two or more tongues, or a cross-cultural context (the copresence and interactivity of two cultures within the world of the author and/or protagonists) and therefore fails to cater entirely for the analysis of the texts of bilingual authors living in a cross-cultural situation, which is precisely the case of the life-writers under consideration. In her doctoral thesis ‘Andreï Makine. Présence de l’absence: une poétique de l’art (photographie, cinéma, musique)’⁹⁵, which analyses the dual French and Russian cultural and linguistic identity of the protagonists presented in Makine’s novels, Murielle Lucie Clément extends Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia and introduces several new points of analysis which specifically explore the presence and use of two different national languages in a cross-cultural situation, an approach that is particularly productive for this study.

Clément’s Development of Bakhtinian Heteroglossia

Clément refers to Bakhtinian heteroglossia in her analysis of style and speech in Makine’s novels but employs the term ‘bilingualism’ in reference to her extension of Bakhtin’s theory and the use of and reference to the French and Russian languages and associated cultural discourses by Makine in his novels.

⁹⁵ Murielle Lucie Clément, ‘Andreï Makine. Présence de l’absence: une poétique de l’art (photographie, cinéma, musique)’, (doctoral thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2008), <http://www.lulu.com/items/volume_63/1398000/1398631/4/print/1398631.pdf> [accessed 31 March 2009].

Clément identifies several types of bilingualism, namely cultural bilingualism (subdivided into spatiocultural and sociocultural bilingualism), literary bilingualism (where the author employs two languages) and diegetic bilingualism (subdivided into the bilingualism of the diegetic author, scriptural bilingualism and the bilingualism of the diegetic reader).⁹⁶

By cultural bilingualism, drawing on Bakhtin's idea of hybridisation, Clément refers to the confrontation and mixing or rubbing together of two linguistic universes which translate an individual's culture. Bilingualism, in this case, does not necessarily equate to the mastery of two different tongues, but to the translation of the author's linguistic and cultural universes by discourses of the same tongue which serve to display two or more perspectives. In short, cultural bilingualism refers to the simultaneous presence of two languages or cultural discourses in one place or in one subject.⁹⁷

Clément divides cultural bilingualism into two categories, the first of which is spatiocultural bilingualism which refers to a spatial linguistic difference within one or several geographical locations (France or Russia, for example) where two visions, cultures and languages from different geographical locations are found together in the same space, superimposed, and two realities are simultaneously represented in a plurivocal way. This space can be a cultural space itself, a cinema for example.

The second sub-category of cultural bilingualism is socio-cultural bilingualism, which refers to two languages located in multiple socio-

⁹⁶ Clément, pp. 71-72.

⁹⁷ Clément, pp. 73, 86.

psychological or socio-philosophical spheres. Clément defines socio-cultural bilingualism as the representation of contrasting versions of the same socio-cultural reality and the adaptation of a translation of socio-cultural reality in a way that will be understood by the interlocutor or reader. The speaker or the writer adapts his or her discourse to the interlocutor's or reader's social level. That is to say, socio-cultural bilingualism is plurality of reality and an appropriation of another's discourse to translate images of reality and experience.

Literary bilingualism refers to the language of an author who uses two national languages in the same text. This includes an author who represents him or herself as reading and writing in several languages in the text.

Clément's third extension of Bakhtin's theory of heteroglossia is not useful for this particular study as it refers to diegetic bilingualism, that is to say the bilingualism of the characters in reading and writing depicted in the novel and so will not be examined here.⁹⁸

Application of Clément's Extension of Bakhtinian Heteroglossia to the Study of Life-Writing by Three Francophone Russian Women

Clément's approach is pertinent to my study, which also considers heteroglossia in texts from a linguistic and cross-cultural perspective, and I shall adopt some of her categories.

Contrary to Clément, I am interested in the bilingualism of the life-writers themselves rather than that of the narrative and the protagonists. I subscribe,

⁹⁸ Clément, pp. 73-77.

however, to her cross-cultural approach, but modifications to her terminology and definitions of points of analysis are necessary in order to treat the specificity of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's life-writing and the restricted presence of a second language.

I adopt Clément's definition of literary bilingualism, which is particularly productive for this study, but in order to differentiate between the life-writers' abilities in reading and writing in French and Russian, I draw on the categories she uses in her analysis of diegetic bilingualism. In so doing, I refer to the life-writers' bilingualism as readers and scriptural bilingualism. In this study, I also examine the life-writers' representation of their ability to speak two or more languages which I refer to as spoken bilingualism.

I consider that spatio-cultural bilingualism could be more productively redefined for my purpose as 'cultural transfer' and that it could be extended to incorporate the transplantation of one culture into the space of another, without requiring the simultaneous presence of two cultural discourses or two languages. A French-language play being performed in a Russian home to a Russian audience or an Orthodox church service being performed in a Protestant context are examples of cultural transfer.

Clément's definition of socio-cultural bilingualism is not very useful for this particular study. For my purposes, it can only be applied to the life-writings in a very limited way. Divova, for example, represents a double and contrasting experience of Parisian social life. She translates the same reality in different ways. The life-writers all participate in both French and Russian culture, but do not

produce double and contrasting experiences of the same culture. It is for this reason that I refer principally to the life-writer's multiple discourses of cultural participation rather than to their socio-cultural bilingualism in this dissertation. Unlike Clément's study, two languages are not simultaneously present in one place or one subject, but rather present at different points in the texts.

Having discussed the theoretical premise for this study, the following section lays out my overall approach, aims and method.

Aims

Having surveyed existing research on female autobiography, I conclude that researchers agree that the female autobiographical subject is contradictory across time and space. With this study, I aim to examine this contradiction in cross-cultural terms in francophone life-writings penned by three Russian women between 1802 and 1818.

This dissertation explores the expression of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's multiple and, at times, contradictory gendered, linguistic and cultural discourses as a form of heteroglossia.

I aim to demonstrate that bilingualism or multilingualism is not necessarily limited to two languages, but can also apply to multiple discourses within a single culture. Culture refers here to both the French and Russian national cultures and also to that of the social milieu of the Russian nobility. The life-writings translate the plural cultures of individual writers and thus

superimpose multiple discourses, opinions, languages and cultures, making the writers bicultural. The idea of biculturalism then not only refers to the possession of two national cultures, namely the French and Russian ones, but to the adoption of different cultural positions (identities) within the Russian aristocratic and noble culture.

The first chapter is primarily concerned with the demonstration of the multiplicity, contradictions and inconsistency of the gendered self-images of the life-writers. Secondly I aim to reveal the way in which an implicit or explicit addressee influences Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's self-representation. This chapter will demonstrate the way in which, as Nussbaum argues, 'their self-fashionings were bound up in cultural definitions of gender – those assumed, prescribed and embedded in their consciousness, as well as subversive thoughts and acts in contradiction to those definitions'.⁹⁹

The second chapter aims to fill a gap left by scholars in their studies of plural identity in Russian women's life-writings by taking into account the linguistic aspect of francophone texts. I examine the life-writers' demonstration of their ability to manipulate and mastery of the French and Russian languages with the aim of investigating the representation of their dual linguistic identities as one element of their plural subjectivities.

The third chapter also attempts to remedy a gap left by scholars in their studies of plural identity in Russian women's francophone life-writing by identifying the plural cultural discourses present in the life-writings. I examine Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's knowledge of and participation in

⁹⁹ 'Eighteenth-Century Women's Commonplaces', p. 154.

French and Russian culture, their dual cultural identities and cultural bilingualism. Cultural bilingualism refers here to the copresence of cultural discourses. This analysis allows me to draw some conclusions about the extent to which they consider themselves, and can be considered, bicultural.

There is some crossover between my analyses of gendered and cultural images of self, but these images will be examined from different perspectives in the first and third chapters. In the first chapter I focus on the gendered aspect of the multiple subjectivities presented, that is to say the way in which they are shaped by social environment, by which I am referring to the historical and socio-cultural context of the early nineteenth-century Russian nobility. In the third chapter I focus on the cultural aspect of some of these images of self. I will investigate the way in which the subjectivities are shaped by national influences, by aspects of French and Russian culture.

Method

In order to carry out my investigation of plural subjectivities I examine the multiple constructions of self and investigate the numerous factors that influence the plurality of these constructions and their associated discourses. Among other things, I consider in what way the life-writers' diverse and numerous experiences, including motherhood and domestic and social duties, travel, religion, reading, language and arts have a bearing on the plural textual definitions of self.

I apply Nussbaum's theory of interdiscourses in the examination of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's plural gendered subjectivities. This

approach will show that the life-writings under consideration are a site of multiple, inconsistent and contradictory subjectivities. I demonstrate the multiplicity of discourses and dialogism, revealing the life-writings as a complex mixture of gendered discourses that express the multiple subjectivities of the life-writers. Here, my vision of heteroglossia is the life-writers' multiple and sometimes conflicting gendered discourses of subjectivity which express the multiplicity of the gendered subject positions they adopt in their everyday lives.

My analysis of multiple linguistic and cultural subjectivities draws primarily on Clément's extension of Bakhtinian heteroglossia which takes into account both a bilingual author and a cross-cultural situation. I modify Clément's approach in order to better accommodate the analysis of the life-writings under consideration. I examine the presence of several national languages and cultural discourses by the analysis of the life-writers' literary (reading and scriptural), spoken and cultural (cultural transfer, socio-cultural and cultural participation) bilingualism and the copresence of multiple cultural discourses.

Having set out the social, cultural and linguistic context in which Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova wrote their texts, I have provided a brief outline of the autobiographical genre and the specific features of women life-writers' texts. To this I have added contextual detail on women's life-writing in Russia in the long eighteenth century and information from existing research on plural identities in these writings. Having concluded that the feminine autobiographical subject is

plural and contradictory, I laid out the theoretical premise for this study. Nussbaum's theory of gendered interdiscourses is a productive approach to the analysis of the multiple gendered subjectivities in the relevant texts and is one element of the heteroglossia present in them. Previous studies of women's life-writing have shown that heteroglossia is also a productive way to analyse plural subjectivities. In order to incorporate the analysis of the plural linguistic and cultural subjectivities of bilingual authors living in a cross-cultural context, I adopt and modify Clément's extension of Bakhtinian heteroglossia. Before beginning the analysis of Divova's Miatleva's and Turkestanova's plural gendered, linguistic and cultural subjectivities, I briefly introduce those life-writers and their texts in the following section.

The Life-writers and their texts

Elizaveta Petrovna Divova

Elizaveta Petrovna Divova was born on 30 June 1762. Her mother, Mariia Romanovna Vorontsova (1737-1765), was Dashkova's older sister. Her father, Count Petr Aleksandrovich Buturlin (1734-1787), a senator, was the son of Peter I's famous field marshal Aleksandr Borisovich Buturlin. Divova was a maid of honour at Catherine II's court and in 1784 married Andreian Ivanovich Divov (1747-1814), former officer of the Horse Guard, court chamberlain and director of the French troupe at the Hermitage theatre. The couple lived on Millionnaia Ulitsa in St Petersburg and had three sons, Petr (1787-1856), Nikolai (1792-1869) and

Aleksandr. Divova passed away in 1813 following a stroke which left her arms and legs paralysed.¹⁰⁰

The *Journal et souvenirs*

Divova began to keep a diary just after her arrival in Paris in 1802, quickly abandoned it, but took it up again in 1804 in the form of reminiscences. Her *souvenirs* were written back in Russia in 1812, using the notes she took while she was in Paris.¹⁰¹

Praskov'ia Ivanovna Miatleva

Daughter of Field Marshal General Count Ivan Petrovich Saltykov (1730-1805) and Countess Dar'ia Petrovna Chernysheva (1739-1802), Miatleva was the second of four children. Saltykov was Governor of the Moscow province from 1797-1804. In 1794, Miatleva married Petr Vasil'evich Miatlev (1756-1833), director of the Assignatsionnyi Bank and Privy Councillor. Together they had five children: the humorist and poet Ivan (1796-1844), Petr (1799-1827), Ekaterina (1800-1821), Sof'ia and Varvara (1811-1878). The Miatlevs owned much property. One estate alone ranged over 13,000 acres in the Kaluga Province.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Sergei Nikolaevich Kaznakov, 'Introduction' in Elizaveta Petrovna Divova, *Journal et souvenirs de Madame Divoff*, ed. by Sergei Nikolaevich Kaznakov (Paris, 1929), pp. 13-32. Hereinafter references to and quotes from the actual text of Divova's *Journal et souvenirs* will be referred to by page number only; <http://sophia.smith.edu/~aworonzovvm2/en/family_tree/pages/98.html> [accessed 28 January 2009]; <<http://baza.vgd.ru/1/6821/>> [accessed 2 August 2009].

¹⁰¹ Kaznakov, 'Avant-propos' in Divova, pp. 7-11.

¹⁰² <<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/21741/p68737.htm?>> [accessed 28 January 2009]; <<http://www.directarticle.org/miatlev.pdf>> [accessed 28 January 2009]; <<http://baza.vgd.ru/1/29315/20.htm?o=&>> [accessed 3 August 2009].

The diary

The manuscript of Miatleva's personal diary, kept between 10 December 1810 and 30 January 1813 and begun in Moscow after the birth of her daughter Varvara, is written in ink.¹⁰³ Miatleva wrote in continuous prose in a large notebook (21,5 cm x 26cm) with a patterned cover. There are no breaks between entries and Miatleva inserts the dates amongst the text. She does not always write her diary on a daily basis and there are occasionally long intervals between entries; when this occurs she seeks to explain why there is a gap and summarises what happened during the period since the previous entry. She uses few capital letters and little punctuation. The handwriting is legible for the most part and there are few crossings out. If Miatleva makes an error, she has a tendency to write over the top of what she has written previously, which often serves to make the text illegible.

Varvara III'ichna Turkestanova

The eldest of five children, Princess Varvara II'ichna Turkestanova was born into an aristocratic Georgian family in Moscow in 1775 to parents II'ia Borisovich Turkestanov (1736-1788) and Mariia Alekseevna Eropkina (1750-1795). Turkestanov had successful careers in both the military and civil service.¹⁰⁴ Turkestanova became lady-in-waiting to Dowager Empress Mariia Fedorovna in 1808 and was well-known in the literary circles of St Petersburg. She became associated with Alexander I and in 1819, gave birth to their illegitimate daughter

¹⁰³ Praskov'ia Ivanovna Miatleva, Dnevnik ee 1810g dekabr' 10 1813 ianvar' 30, IRLI, f. 196-48. Hereinafter referred to by page number only.

¹⁰⁴ <<http://baza.vgd.ru/1/40020/20.htm?o=&>> [accessed 3 August 2009].

Mariia (1819-1843).¹⁰⁵ According to sources, Turkestanova died by taking poison in 1819.¹⁰⁶ The ‘official’ version of her death was that she had died of cholera that same year.¹⁰⁷ Mariia was brought up by Prince Vladimir Sergeevich Golitsyn (1794-1861). Other sources suggest that Golitsyn was Mariia’s father.¹⁰⁸

The Journal

Turkestanova’s epistolary travel diary¹⁰⁹ recounts the journey she took across Congress Poland, the kingdoms and Grand Duchies of the German Confederation and the Kingdom of the Netherlands as lady-in-waiting to Mariia Fedorovna in 1818. The diary consists of 119 entries written between 20 August 1818 and 30 December 1818, at the start of each of which are stated the date and place of writing. There are only rare days when she does not write and sometimes there is more than one entry for the same day. Turkestanova writes to the Count and Countess Litta. Essentially she writes a personal diary in notebooks and then sends parts of it to her correspondents when she has the opportunity.

¹⁰⁵ <<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/40020/p145469.htm?>> [accessed 3 August 2009].

¹⁰⁶ Martha and Catherine Wilmot, *The Russian Journals of Martha and Catherine Wilmot*, ed. by the Marchioness of Londonderry and H. M. Hyde (London: Macmillan, 1934) p. 31; <<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/40020/p145469.htm?>> [accessed 3 August 2009].

¹⁰⁷ <<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/40020/p145469.htm?>> [accessed 3 August 2009].

¹⁰⁸ Wilmot, p. 31.

¹⁰⁹ Varvara Illin’ichna Turkestanova, *Journal tenu par la princesse Barbe Tourkestanow demoiselle d’honneur de sa Majesté l’Impératrice Maria Fedorowna 1818 (Lettres adressées au comte et à la comtesse de Litta)*, ed. by M. Katkov (Moscow: Imprimerie de l’université Impériale, 1884). Hereinafter referred to by page number only.

Chapter 1

Textual Representations of Multiple and Contradictory Gendered Subjectivities

This chapter examines Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's multiple gendered constructions of self as one element of the plural subjectivities they present in their life-writings. I also demonstrate the contradictions within and among these self-images and secondarily I reveal the way in which the *mise-en-scène* of certain images of self is orientated towards an implicit or explicit addressee who influences the life-writers' self-representation. Drawing on Nussbaum's theory of gendered interdiscourses and their corresponding subject positions I demonstrate the way in which, as Nussbaum argues, their constructions of self are closely associated with cultural definitions of gender which are taken for granted, dictated by society and ingrained in their consciousness, as well as thoughts and acts which undermine and contradict those definitions.

I suggest that Bakhtin's conception of heteroglossia can explain the life-writers' multiple discourses of self and interdiscourses. I reread Bakhtin's notion of heteroglossia from the standpoint of gender. The life-writings are made up of a variety of voices, due to the fact that language never represents a single viewpoint. The multiple constructions of self are shaped by social environment and on occasions enter into dialogue with the prevailing Russian patriarchal order. The life-writings show how the authors oscillate between various images of

femininity and the discourses of their self-images intersect, producing a heteroglossic, multiple and, at times, inconsistent and contradictory subject.

I discuss the texts in turn, although the detail varies, some texts being richer in certain areas than others, following the increasing amount of contradictions visible between and within the life-writers' multiple gendered subjectivities.

Varvara Turkestanova

Turkestanova depicts multiple gendered selves in her diary. She represents herself as lady-in-waiting, ailing victim of duty, private domestic woman, devout Orthodox believer and follower of fashion. Each self-image will be considered in turn and the questions of (non)conformity to socially prescribed models of femininity and contradiction will be assessed in relation to these images where they are relevant. Addressees and dialogism will receive particular attention as Turkestanova is the only life-writer under consideration to have correspondents.

Turkestanova's most prevalent self-image is that of lady-in-waiting to Dowager Empress Mariia Fedorovna. Turkestanova is the only one of the life-writers who had a role in public life. She writes that she travels in the same carriage as Mariia Fedorovna, which indicates her high status at court. Her textual self accompanies the Dowager Empress on official visits to courts, charitable institutions and tourist attractions and also attends official social engagements: 'Comme c'était mon jour de service, j'ai dû aller à Louisbourg. La reine-douairière avait fait préparer un déjeuner [...]' (51). She depicts herself as having

a sense of duty, of civic obligation even when she is suffering from ill health or she would rather not be present and in this way represents herself as an ailing victim of duty:

A peine étais-je dans ma chambre qu'on annonça le bal et moi, malheureuse, toute gonflée, toute souffrante, de nouveau à m'habiller et à poster. Il est une heure du matin, je reviens de ce bal enchantée que ce soit la fin des toutes les festivités. (104)

The discontent Turkestanova expresses to the Littas, addressees of her letters, about performing her official duty contradicts the outward conformity and unwavering devotion to this role she displays at court and in society. She depicts herself as not being able to determine her own use of time and expresses her annoyance at this in her diary, explicitly criticising Mariia Fedorovna:

Je m'étais arrangée avec m-me Schoulembourg pour aller ce matin dans le magasin d'un juif; mais il est venu un ordre de l'Impératrice de se rendre chez elle à 11 heures, pour l'accompagner à la bibliothèque du grand-duc. Je vous avoue que ces visites de curiosité m'ennuyent quelquefois à la mort, et quand je pense que l'Impératrice, qui a tout l'Hermitage à voir, les choses du monde les plus rares, les plus intéressantes, et les plus instructives, n'y va cependant que pour faire l'exercice, je suis... La manière dont elle examine les objets les moins signifiants me fait véritablement endêver [...]. (100-101)

In her letters she expresses frustration at the Dowager Empress's demanding nature, which again highlights her victimised self. She shows herself to find her role of lady-in-waiting burdensome:

Je commence à croire que l'Impératrice a fait voeu de visiter deux fois chaque cathédrale qui se trouve sur son passage. Vous savez de reste si je vous ai parlé de celle de Mayence? Eh bien, aujourd'hui elle a voulu la revoir, et l'évêque du concordat nous a de nouveau mené à tous les

monuments que j'ai déjà cités. Heureusement que pour cette fois elle n'a pas grimpé à la citadelle et qu'en sortant de l'église nous avons pu tout de suite continuer notre voyage.' (82)

Inconvenience and discomfort are presented as part of the working conditions of a lady-in-waiting:

Il est minuit; nous arrivons à l'instant après la journée du monde la plus cruelle [...]. Tant qu'il ne pleuvait pas beaucoup, cela allait assez bien; mais ensuite j'ai souffert comme une misérable: le vent, la pluie me venait droit à la figure, je grelottais et j'ai fini par ne pouvoir plus remuer ni bras, ni jambe; aussi j'ai pensé tomber tout à l'heure en montant l'escalier. Une odeur de poêle dans notre appartement m'avait fait craindre l'asphyxie. Dieu merci nous en sommes quitte pour la peur. (40)

Although she has an acute sense of duty, her textual self resists the role she is obliged to play. She depicts herself as losing her health in order to fulfil her duty:

Hier un souper tuant, aujourd'hui un bal; convenez, madame la comtesse, que ce voyage est une campagne à la lettre. Courir à perte d'haleine, et au moment qu'on arrive en place, au lieu de se reposer, songer à une toilette et se présenter dans un cercle ou à un bal! Je vous assure qu'il n'est au monde *qu'une seule santé* qui puisse y suffire. Quant à la mienne, elle menace ruine. Voici quatre ou cinq jours que je souffre et que je sens la bile qui m'étouffe. (28)

Turkestanova represents her office as a series of trials and characterises herself by endurance.

The theme of bad health is dominant in Turkestanova's diary and, at times, she represents herself near to death and asks Countess Litta to sing a *De profundis* for her (7). She particularly draws her addressees' attention to her infirmity if there is a forthcoming event that she would rather avoid but knows she is duty-bound to attend. The symptoms she describes appear to indicate a stress-related

reaction rather than a genuine illness, but she is nevertheless determined to do what she perceives as her duty:

Je me suis sentie toute malade pendant la journée entière; une amertume dans la bouche, un ennui intérieur, les nerfs en contradiction; en un mot, je n'étais point bien du tout, et cependant j'ai dû aller à la revue qui a commencé à dix heures et fini à deux. (21)

Her self-representation as a victim of duty is connected to the representation of herself as a devout Orthodox believer. Turkestanova represents herself as attending church services whenever possible (6, 48, 102). At home in St Petersburg, she prays in her personal oratory (116). On visiting convents in Warsaw, Turkestanova is charmed by the way the nuns care for the sick and mentally ill and take in children and bring them up. She expresses a desire to withdraw from society and live a similar life: 'Ah, si nous avions en Russie des fondations de ce genre, je vous réponds qu'on ne me reverrait plus dans les salons de Pétersbourg! Combien il est doux de servir Dieu en utilisant ainsi son existence!' (22) The cultural aspects of Turkestanova's Orthodox self will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Turkestanova also represents a private domestic self that adds weight to her Orthodox self's desire to go into a convent. Her textual self insists on how much she dislikes social events and would rather stay quietly in a calm environment at her ease: 'Mon Dieu, que je voudrais être à la fin de ce voyage; il me semble que je ne regagnerai jamais la précieuse liberté de rester en bonnet et en capote ouattée. Je n'en puis plus de cette existence festoyante.' (88) Rather

than attend to her duties, she would prefer to spend her time resting, writing letters, reading or consulting doctors (60, 72, 78-79).

Turkestanova also represents herself as a keen player of cards. Most often, she represents herself as playing *durak* and Boston whist. Organising card games is shown to be part of her court role, but she also represents herself as playing for amusement when she is not on duty (90, 95). Turkestanova's representation of her card-playing is inconsistent with her Orthodox self as cards are associated with gambling and frivolity, neither of which is approved by the Orthodox Church.

Physical appearance is very important to Turkestanova, who depicts herself as an enthusiastic follower of fashion with good taste. She is critical and judgemental of other women's sartorial appearance if it is not in the latest style or worn correctly (27-28, 111-112). In Warsaw she makes some cutting remarks about the physical appearance of the Polish women:

Eh bien, madame la comtesse, ces Polonaises, dont nous entendons parler avec tant d'emphase, ces beautés, ces tournures élégantes...eh bien cela est fort peu de choses! [...] Quant à leurs toilettes, ce n'est rien, mais ce qui s'appelle rien du tout; leur mise est de l'année dernière, et je vous prie de croire qu'elles ne connaissent du marabout que le nom! Je n'ai pas remarqué que le teint de ces dames fût aussi beau qu'il passe pour l'être, et je prévois pas que je puisse vous apporter quelque recette sur cet article. En vérité, elles sont fort au-dessous de ce que j'imaginai. (17-18)

Fashionable appearance was part of the obligations of Turkestanova's post, but she does not present it as a burden. She represents herself as being very fond of shopping and laments her lack of financial independence when she is not able to make the purchases she would like in Brussels:

J'ai vu des choses charmantes dans tous les genres, et si j'avais eu seulement la faculté de faire une certaine quantité d'emplettes, je vous réponds, madame la comtesse que j'en aurais fait de bonnes. On est fourni de tout ici: étoffes, fleurs, chiffons, bijouteries, rien n'y manque; les yeux sont fatigués et éblouis à force de les promener d'un objet à un autre. (67)

She cannot make the purchases she would like due to her lack of finances. She expresses her discontent with her lot as a woman and her lack of freedom, envying her male friend Schöpping's financial independence and thus represents herself as dependent on her post as lady-in-waiting: 'tout en l'écouter je ne pus me défendre d'un petit mouvement d'envie. Il est indépendant, il fait ce qu'il veut, il a de la fortune; en faut-il davantage pour être heureux?' (11) Turkestanova's self-representation as an enthusiastic follower of fashion and shopper is inconsistent with her self-representation as a devout Orthodox believer. She is so preoccupied with fashion that she even records what she wears to church services (77). Along with her keen interest in card-playing, these self-representations highlight a frivolous side to her nature. The shallow values that are associated with card playing and following fashion are at odds with those expected of a woman who asserts that she wishes to enter a convent.

Addressees

Turkestanova is the only life-writer under consideration whose diary has explicit and pervasive addressees. Her epistolary diary is addressed to a descendant of the noble Italian Litta Visconti Arese family, the Knight of Malta and skilled seaman Count Giulio Renato Litta (1763-1839), and his wife Ekaterina Vasil'evna Litta (1761-1829). Iulio Pompeevich, as he was known in Russia, was sent by

Hompesch, the Grand Master of the Catholic Order of Malta, on an official visit to the court of Catherine II, who was in need of naval experts, to plead the Order's cause with her. He was appointed Admiral after the Russo-Swedish war.

The accession to the throne of Paul I, a great admirer of the Knights of Malta, led to Litta obtaining finance for the order in the Russian Empire. Following the inauguration of the Grand Priory of Russia in 1797, Paul I became Grand Master of the Maltese Order in St Petersburg. Litta was appointed as Lieutenant Grand Master and after a dispensation was allowed to remain a Knight after his marriage; he continued as an official of the order. In 1798, Litta received Russian nationality and in that same year he married the niece of Prince Grigorii Aleksandrovich Potemkin and widow of the Russian Minister to Naples Count Pavel Martynovich Skavronskii, Ekaterina Vasil'evna Skavronskaia née Engel'gardt. For more than fifty years Litta held positions at the Russian court. He distinguished himself as a benefactor and made large donations during the Great Patriotic War of 1812 to help both soldiers and civilian victims.¹¹⁰

It is probable that Turkestanova became acquainted with the Littas at court, although this information is not provided in her diary. Although Turkestanova addresses the Littas with the polite *vous* form, she represents herself as on relatively intimate terms with them. She reveals that she often dines with them on her saint's day (100) and at Stuttgart Turkestanova meets Aleksandra

¹¹⁰<<http://www.lombardiabeniculturali.it/archivi/soggetti-produttori/famiglia/MIDD00010F/>>, <<http://www.batguano.com/vigeeart176.html>>, <<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/19346/p60811.htm?>>, <<http://www.russiameeting.it/articolo.php?cid=185&aid=154>>, <<http://www.mario-corti.com/press/>>, <<http://italian.ruvr.ru/main.php?lng=ita&q=68&cid=85&p=19.12.2006&pn=2>> [accessed 31 July 2009].

Vasil'evna Branitskaia (1754-1838), Countess Litta's sister, to whom she delivers letters from the Countess (45, 48). Her textual self professes sincere attachment to the Littas and implies that others back in St Petersburg, possible secondary addressees, will ask them for her news, which indicates that it is well known that Turkestanova is on close terms with the couple (39).

Before her departure, Turkestanova made a promise to Litta to write during her travels (3). She is true to her promise and anxious that he and his wife should receive her news in good time, and reply (75). She depicts writing as a duty following the promise she made, not necessarily a disagreeable duty, but one which she carries out at times when she would rather be resting. She depicts herself as an 'esclave de ma parole' 'pour écrire aujourd'hui: je tombe de fatigue' (7) which reinforces her representation of herself as loyal to her duty but also as a victim of it. She makes it clear, however, that her effort is recompensed if her letters are enjoyed by the Littas (27).

Turkestanova does not indicate that the Littas' presence as addressees would require particular self-censorship, but it is possible to assume that they influenced the images of self that she depicts by their attitudes and expectations. Although we learn practically nothing about Turkestanova's correspondents in her diary and no image of the Littas emerges, we can infer she did not fear that the self-images she depicts would affect her reputation with them in a negative way, but that the idea that her documents were not private did play a role in the way she represented herself.

Turkestanova clearly feels that she can divulge her true feelings to the Littas without fear of being judged harshly or being seen to complain. Litta was a courtier and so he would surely sympathise with Turkestanova's representation of herself as lady-in-waiting and ailing victim of duty, which perhaps explains the emphasis she places on these interconnecting self-images. It is not clear whether discontent with duty and preference for reading books was an acceptable attitude for Litta, but it seems likely that Turkestanova would not have expressed this in her letters if she thought that there could be unfavourable consequences for her if she did so. It is possible that the Littas shared this attitude. Furthermore she not infrequently addresses the Littas directly when speaking of her health:

Je n'ai pas été en état jusqu'ici de toucher la plume, m-me la comtesse; je crois en vérité avoir été à la mort; du moins me suis-je sentie si mal que j'ai prié le médecin de ne pas me faire perdre un moment pour m'y préparer. (105)

Turkestanova places particular emphasis on her depiction of herself as actively participating and showing interest in areas of life in and to which the Littas were particularly involved and predisposed. Litta was involved with charity, and Turkestanova represents visiting charitable institutions as an important part of her duties (30, 36, 70-71), although this is probably also due to the fact that Mariia Fedorovna was very interested in charities. Litta was also a religious man and so religious values would certainly have been very important to him; this could explain why Turkestanova puts so much emphasis on her representation of her devout Orthodox self in her diary. On several occasions, the

discourse of Turkestanova's self-representation as a follower of fashion is addressed directly to Countess Litta. Fashion appears to be an interest they have in common as women, and possibly Turkestanova depicts a self that feels the necessity to emphasise her good taste in order to present an image of self that Countess Litta would think highly of.

Turkestanova's text is explicitly dialogic when she addresses herself directly to her addressees. She also enters implicitly into dialogue with the Littas by shaping her multiple self-images with them in mind and orientating the discourses associated with these images of self towards their expectations and personal interests. That is to say, the Littas' pervasive presence contributes towards the selection of material Turkestanova includes in her diary.

Conclusions

It can be seen that Turkestanova represents a multiplicity of gendered subjectivities in her diary. The discourses of her multiple gendered images of self are socially and culturally located in the contemporary discourse of Russian noble society. Turkestanova does not represent herself as stepping outside the boundaries of acceptable behaviour that women were expected to respect. Certainly the depiction of herself as lady-in-waiting and ailing victim of duty is represented as being largely the product of being away from home as an unwilling traveller and attendant on Mariia Fedorovna which suggests that place influences the way she portrays herself. She must adapt herself, however unwillingly, to her environment. Turkestanova may not find her duties as lady-in-waiting so

burdensome back in St Petersburg where she may have a less intensive timetable of social engagements.

Although Turkestanova depicts multiple selves, the contradictions and inconsistencies between these subjectivities are shown to be limited. Turkestanova represents her obligations as running entirely counter to her desire for tranquillity and personal freedom and her worldly interests as being in complete opposition to her Orthodox self's religious devotion and desire to enter a convent. I suggest that the fact that Turkestanova's images of self do not display a large amount of inconsistency or contradictions, and remain conforming to accepted images of femininity, is due to the fact that her epistolary diary is addressed to the Littas and that she orientates her self-images towards their horizon of expectation. None of her discourses of self is private, but all are intended to be read by others who, due to human nature, will always be judgemental to a greater or lesser degree. The presence of an addressee requires a degree of coherency and self-surveillance in the text.

These multiple discourses of self, including the conflictual discourses, or interdiscourses, to use Nussbaum's term, are an example of heteroglossia. Each subjectivity's discourse represents a different attitude or point of view and demonstrates in what way multiple discourses coexist in an individual's language in a dialogic way. Turkestanova's discourse is unceasingly orientated towards her addressees who are the directors of her textual *mise-en-scène*.

Elizaveta Divova

In her *Journal et Souvenirs*, depicting the time she spent in Paris between 1802 and 1804, Divova presents multiple gendered images of self which will be discussed in turn and which all conform to contemporary assumptions about female roles. She portrays herself as social butterfly, social climber, hedonist, moral critic, wife, mother and hostess. Contradictions and conformity to prescribed images of femininity will be commented on where appropriate and I will discuss dialogism in relation to the way in which Divova's implicit addressees influence her textual *mise-en-scène*.

Divova's predominant self-image is that of a social butterfly, who is always socially engaged and frequently moves between different social groups. She represents herself as wanting to participate in and be noticed at all the most important social events and venues in Paris. This image of self is presented in relation to the Parisian social network, social events and entertainments:

je suis sortie tous les jours. Le matin, à midi nous courions avec mon mari les promenades, le Palais Royal, les musées, les peintres, les boutiques et tout ce qu'il y avait d'intéressant à voir à Paris. A six heures nous allions dîner où nous étions invités; tous les 15 du mois chez le Premier Consul où nous avions toujours été invités, chez les deux autres consuls et chez tous les ministres du pays puis nous allions au spectacle et de là bien souvent à des assemblées. (117-118)

She depicts herself as never experiencing a dull moment in Paris. Her diary is abounding in descriptions of shopping and theatre trips as well as other social engagements. Divova portrays her social butterfly persona as a hedonist and depicts herself as following Parisian social codes to the letter. These codes, or

authorised modes of behaviour, are represented in her text as having a good time, spending money and thinking only of oneself:

Paris est une ville où chacun ne vit que pour soi et ses plaisirs; il y en a tant que c'est à peine que des 14 ou 16 heures qu'on n'y dort pas, l'on jouit une minute de chaque plaisir. (46)

Her social climber persona is obsessed by social status and concerned with creating a social reputation. She writes that above all she wants to be seen in all the right places (47). Her main concern is experiencing Parisian social life to the full in wealthy, influential and powerful company. She socialises with Diderot's daughter, Count Ségur and Mme de Staël and thus represents herself as associating and having connections with both Parisian high and literary society. Her textual self boasts continually of her social status, she represents herself as favoured above all other foreigners, and close to power. She boasts that Paul I visited the residence she is staying in during his time in Paris (78) and that she watches official ceremonies from Joséphine Bonaparte's personal viewing gallery and is invited to her home, to her domestic theatre productions and intimate dinners (91-93). Her social climber persona also emphasises her wealth and makes a point of describing in detail her exclusive residence and how much she paid in rent as well as the expensive improvements she made to it (41-42).

Divova depicts herself as a moral critic, however, and criticises the shallowness of social acquaintanceships and the very behaviour and values that she depicts her social butterfly persona as engaging in and displaying:

Beaucoup d'argent, une bonne dose de santé, la tête froide, le coeur moins sensible que nous l'avons, pauvres mortels, un tant soit peu d'égoïsme, un peu de la légèreté française dans le caractère; avec tout cela il faudrait ne jamais quitter Paris et alors, à mon avis, le bonheur parfait existerait sur la terre et l'on passerait sa vie dans un paradis! (70)

Here, there is implied criticism of Parisian society, of the need for wealth and detachment. Divova represents herself as not completely blind to the shallowness of Parisian social life and also depicts herself as resisting the hedonistic Parisian life-style which contradicts her self-representation as both social butterfly, hedonist and social climber. She fails to recognise herself as a social climber in Parisian society and her moral critic persona is depicted like a conscience. She represents herself as being very judgemental and criticises the Parisians, French émigrés and citizens of Brussels she met in Spa for their rudeness, selfishness, nonchalance, disloyalty, ungratefulness and intrigue. As a moral critic, Divova depicts herself as cherishing values which oppose those associated with the Parisian social code:

Comme mon coeur a besoin d'un coeur qui comprenne le mien [...] le vrai sentiment d'amitié et d'attachement et qui savent aimer non pour la mode ni pour les plaisirs, mais qui ont des coeurs susceptibles d'attachement d'amitié et que rien ne fait varier quand une fois elles aiment. (46)

As a moral critic, she represents herself as ignored and unimportant in society, as essentially insecure and devastated, when after taking the waters in Spa she is 'forgotten' by Parisian society:

Ce que je trouve encore, c'est qu'étant resté quelques temps à Paris, il ne faut s'absenter et revenir...J'ai fait cette expérience-là, j'ai passé six semaines à Spa et en revenant, je ne sais quoi, mais cela n'était plus la

même chose: la société habituelle qu'on y avait s'éparpille, l'on se déshabitué l'un de l'autre, car l'on ne s'attache à personne dans les liaisons habituelles. (49)

This statement is inconsistent with her previous professions of being at the centre of the Parisian social world. She comes to the conclusion that she was popular for a reason:

si l'on change de coquetterie et si l'on ne danse plus chez vous, qu'on n'y joue plus; l'on ne remette pas les pieds et c'est comme si l'on ne vous avait jamais connue; [...] J'ai eu toujours beaucoup de monde chez moi car l'on y dansait quelquefois, l'on y jouait et y soupait. (47)

The values that she represents as close to her heart as a moral critic are clearly at odds with those she represents herself as espousing as a social butterfly, social climber and hedonist but she fails to recognise this and portrays herself as a hypocrite.

Divova appears to use her *Journal et souvenirs* as a place for recording hidden sentiments that she does not deem suitable for open expression in Parisian society. In Nussbaum's words, the text is an exposition of her hidden discourse. She does not intend her text to be read by others and therefore feels there is no danger in recording her disapproval of Parisian society's hedonistic and egotistical tendencies, a moral standpoint that is not widely respected in the French capital. This discourse of self is 'a private and personal revelation that cannot be spoken to anyone except the self. It is a confession to the self with only

the self as auditor and without public authority' which disrupts what Divova represents as 'authorized versions'¹¹¹ of Parisian experience.

Divova represents herself as a devoted and attentive wife. She states that her marriage is a happy one but simultaneously contradicts herself by creating doubt about this statement, implicitly referring in the same sentence to love affairs she is said to have had in Stockholm with the Duke of Södermanland, the future Charles XIII of Sweden and in Paris with Italian tenor Stefano Mandini:¹¹² 'A Stockholm, comme à Paris, je n'ai rien à me reprocher, aussi ma conscience est tranquille la félicité que le ciel m'a accordée dans mon ménage et dans le repos d'une conscience sans tâche [sic]' (75). Although Divova brings these affairs up in her writing in order to attribute the rumours to compatriots jealous of her social success and to defend her honour, she effectively depicts a contradictory self-image and adopts the discourse of an unfaithful and far from devoted wife. Equally, she accords little space to her husband in her writing which is inconsistent with her professions of devotion and attachment.

As an extension of her role of wife, Divova represents herself as a hostess of various social gatherings, including dinners, suppers, card games and balls. Her textual self boasts of her popularity and large numbers of guests, both French and Russian: 'Les lundis, jeudis et samedis nous avons toujours de 30 à 60 personnes chez nous; ce n'était pas du monde invité; mais comme on savait que je recevais ces jours-là, tout le monde venait' (53). Divova also represents, however, an image of a hostess dissatisfied with and resentful of her role to a certain extent

¹¹¹ 'Toward Conceptualizing Diary', pp. 135, 136.

¹¹² Kaznakov, pp. 14, 16; Wilmot, p. 339.

and depicts herself as not hesitating to go to bed before her guests leave if it is late and she has had enough: ‘je me couchais quand bon me semblait, sans me gêner du tout et les autres veillaient’ (53). Divova represents herself as acting out this role of hostess to keep up appearances in society life. Kanakov tells us that she held salons in St Petersburg in the late eighteenth century at her Millionnaia Ulitsa residence which commonly became known as *le petit Coblantz* due to the fact that she welcomed French émigrés that she had met while travelling to Western Europe in the wake of the French Revolution.¹¹³

As a further extension of her domestic role, Divova paints her self-portrait as a loving mother. She emphasises the tenderness and attachment she feels towards her eldest son Petr, to whom she affectionately refers as Pipacha and Pipinka in her writing (82). Her younger sons are only mentioned once, however, when they arrive in Paris. Divova states that she cannot describe the pleasure she felt at being reunited with them in Paris where they came to live with her until the family’s departure for Russia in April 1804. She states that ‘pour mon coeur il est resté entièrement libre et occupé sans cesse de mon mari, de mes enfants’ (126) and yet her sons are accorded little more space than her husband in her *Journal et souvenirs*. She does not depict herself as very involved in their lives or as taking direct responsibility for her two younger sons, Nikolai and Aleksandr, who were ten years old and under ten respectively in 1802. They were entrusted to the care of ‘leur abbé Barbier’ (126) who assured their safe arrival from Dresden. Even fifteen-year-old Petr did not complete the journey to Paris with his parents. When his dog was stolen at Claye, Petr was entrusted to the care of Rivière, presumably

¹¹³ Kaznakov, p. 15.

a tutor, until the dog was recovered and Petr met his parents in Paris several hours after their arrival (34).

Divova represents herself as dependent in social relations on her husband and eldest son, as well as the Russian ambassador Morkov and her influential French friend General Beuronville. She represents herself as dependent on her husband and son for invitations to certain social events. Napoleon invites Divova and Petr to dinner after they are presented to him at court and Divova joins them in the following invitations. Morkov takes her on a tour of social calls he makes to French high society on her arrival and later introduces her to Napoleon while Beuronville recommends her to his own social circle by entrusting letters to her for delivery (80). Furthermore, Divova returns to Russia when her son Petr, who works at the Russian embassy in Paris, is obliged to follow the Russian ambassador to Moscow after the assassination of the Duke of Enghien.¹¹⁴ She acts out the gendered roles that patriarchal society has prescribed for her as both dependent on and devoted to male relatives. She states that had the decision been hers she would have stayed in France: ‘Je dirai seulement que si mon bien-aimé Pipacha n’eut point quitté Paris avec l’ambassadeur, de longtemps l’idée de quitter la France ne me serait venue, car il m’était impossible de m’imaginer que de la vie je puisse le faire’ (127). Although she expresses disappointment at leaving the French capital, she never attempts to challenge her submissive position, but accepts it unquestioningly, only passively lamenting her situation.

¹¹⁴ The Russian court went into mourning following the assassination of Louis Antoine Henri de Bourbon, Duke of Enghien (1772-1804) at the Château de Vincennes near Paris in 1804. He was falsely suspected of being involved in a conspiracy to overthrow Napoleon. This event appalled the aristocracy throughout Europe.

Addressees

The following section concerns the way in which the *mise-en-scène* of Divova's social butterfly, social climber and hedonist images of self are orientated towards implicit addressees who influence her self-representation. Despite the fact that Divova's implicit addressees are not pervasive in the text, her self-portrait shows that she took into consideration other people's points of view and opinions.

Divova represents herself as a social rival and directs her discourse of social success towards other noblewomen. After describing how she watched, from Joséphine Bonaparte's personal viewing gallery, the military procession preceding the first Catholic mass sung in France at Notre Dame since the revolution, she writes:

si j'écrivais ce journal pour être lu par des femmes, je leur aurais demandé si leur ambition et leur amour-propre n'en auraient point été flattés. Les femmes des ambassadeurs, des ministres, placées en bas et me voyant dans sa famille et ses dames de palais [...]. (p. 94)

Divova represents herself as having something to prove to these women, of feeling the necessity of reassuring herself as to her social status, which clearly preoccupies her.

The presence of an addressee, however implicit and sporadic, leads to a specific selection of detail and method of self-description and serves to make Divova's discourse dialogic. She enters into dialogue with society women who are in a sense directing her social performance. As a social butterfly and climber,

Divova attempts to prove her superiority and give these women a reason to be jealous.

Conclusions

It can be seen that Divova depicts multiple gendered subjectivities all of which comply with contemporary culturally prescribed images of femininity. She moulds her self-images according to what is expected of her by both her family and society. Her self-representation as social butterfly, social climber and hedonist is presented in relation to Parisian society, which implies that she defines herself according to local social code. This suggests that place influences her self-definition. In adapting herself to her environment her self becomes more multifaceted.

Divova depicts multiple contradictions between certain subjectivities and, unlike Turkestanova, she also represents contradictions within individual subjectivities. She depicts herself as a devoted and unfaithful wife, attentive and uninvolved mother, popular and sought-after company and forgotten and anonymous nobody. The contradictions between Divova's images of self are the result of her desire to conform to expectation or adapt herself to necessity and her not quite successfully managing to do this. She knows what is expected of her as a wife and mother, for example, but does not consistently perform the roles perfectly, which serves to produce contradictory images of self. Divova acts out these socially prescribed roles seemingly willingly but never attains the ideal images of femininity prescribed by society that she aspires to, or in the case of her

selves associated with Parisian society, reflect the glittering image of someone who has arrived at the top of the social ladder. Despite the contradictions between Divova's selves, they coexist harmoniously in the text as she does not perceive them.

These multiple and contradictory discourses of subjectivity reveal the heteroglot nature of Divova's text and plural nature of her subjectivity. Her language is stratified by the multiple centrifugal discourses of self and mixture of world views which serve to make no single definition of self possible. Divova orientates her discourse towards the expectations of others and towards keeping up appearances. She responds positively to images of femininity dictated by patriarchal society, namely her role as wife, mother and hostess. She does not openly challenge her obligation to follow her family back to Russia in 1804. Dissatisfied but resigned, she makes the best of the situation within the boundaries set for her by the social prescription and only resists passively by private lament on the pages of her diary. She does not challenge these images of femininity and the roles she plays are assumed.

Praskov'ia Miatleva

Miatleva's personal diary is no exception to the texts already discussed in that it also offers multiple gendered representations of self, nearly all of which are related to the domestic sphere and her everyday life in Moscow and on her estates. Her constructions of self, which will be discussed in turn, are those of wife, moral critic, mother, estate manager, property owner, accomplished woman,

actress, worldly woman and devout Orthodox believer. Contradiction between selves as well as within individual selves and conformity to socially prescribed models of femininity will be discussed where appropriate. The examination of images of self will be followed by a discussion about the presence of addressees in Miatleva's text and dialogism.

The dominant picture of herself that Miatleva constructs is that of wife. She depicts herself as both affectionate and attentive, as always putting her husband's wishes first. Miatleva's husband occupies much space in her diary. She represents herself as an anxious and attentive carer, nursing her husband when he is ill (93-93ob), and as tender in their intimate life (65-65ob). As a submissive wife, she represents herself as fearful of her husband. She expresses concern about his fierce anger on several occasions. When her son Petr pretends to be unwell at school, Miatlev was so angry that Miatleva did not dare go and see her son (54). Her husband, whom she represents as continually sullen and rather selfish, is shown to proscribe certain social engagements, a New Year party hosted by Princess Volkonskaia, for example, as he dislikes such large gatherings (11ob). He is also shown to veto several outings as well as the purchase of luxuries, including jewellery and carriages, such as a fashionable four-place droshky (90ob). Miatleva depicts her disappointment at his decisions, but also her acceptance of them even though she considers them unreasonable. Her submissive self is represented as dependent on her husband's humour and whims as well as on his finances. Although she primarily depicts herself as rather

submissive, she also depicts a contradictory fiery self, who does not conform willingly to the ideal socially prescribed image of wife:

nous nous assimes sur le gazon, ce qui m'occasionna une brouillerie avec mon mari et dure encore ce matin il me dit de quitter le gazon à cause de mon rhume, j'avois de l'humeur je répondis que j'étois bien et il prit à son tour et je m'entêtai à rester, il se facha et s'en allat et c'est moi qui avois tort. (64ob)

She resists obeying her husband until her submissive counterpart comes to the fore and dominates. This assertive, nonconformist side to her self-representation as wife dislikes being told what to do and how to behave.

The picture that Miatleva paints of herself as a moral critic is also assertive and she represents herself as possessing her own opinion and not being afraid to voice it. She asserts authority and represents her disapproval of drinking at a party and readiness to encourage all the women present to reprimand the men sitting around them at dinner:

Pendant le soupé les Messieurs commençaiient à devenir très bryans, ce qui me fit dire qu'il seroit bien dommage qu'un si joli fête finisse mal et que cependant si cela continuait et si on buvoit encore, les femmes seroient obligées de quitter la table et la fête. cela fit qu'on se mit en devoir à qui mieux mieux d'engager ces Messieurs à ne plus en boir. il s'en suivit un silence absolu qui contrastoit parfaitement avec le brui qui avoit précédé, tout se passa bien. (88-88ob)

She asks the Pushkins to refrain from displaying their atheism: 'je pris le parti de lui dire que ma seule manière de répondre à tous ses faux et absurdes raisonnements, étoit de n'en jamais ouvrir la bouche ni chez moi, ni devant moi' (48ob). In the above examples, Miatleva represents her strong moral and religious

values, which were valued qualities in a woman, but also her contradictory non-conformity to the social expectation of a weak, submissive woman who is not expected to voice her opinion.

Miatleva represents herself as a caring and devoted mother. Her children occupy a significant part of her diary and she represents herself as playing an active part in their education (*obrazovanie*) and upbringing (*vospitanie*) and thus shows herself to be a believer in the contemporary ideology of pedagogical motherhood.¹¹⁵ She depicts herself as a patient teacher who helps Petr revise for a school exam which she attends (45ob). She writes that the children receive instruction in writing, dancing and religion at home and the older boys attend a *pension*. Miatleva represents her husband as dealing with their sons' discipline, while she takes responsibility for that of their daughters. She depicts herself so attentive as to not leave the children alone nor even leave the house when they are all at home at weekends. Her caring and devoted mother self is very much concerned for her children's welfare and due to the cold during the long Good Friday vespers service, she allows Sof'ia to stand on her feet to keep them off the cold ground so that her daughter does not catch a chill (47). She also recounts how she spends time with the children and keeps them amused. She depicts herself going out walking with and organising balls for them: 'ils espéroient un bal pour ce soir et nous avons engagé quelques personnes pour leur en donner le plaisir' (71).

¹¹⁵ Cf. Catriona Kelly, 'Educating Tat'yana: Manners, Motherhood and Moral Education (*Vospitanie*), 1760-1840' in *Gender in Russian History and Culture*, ed. by Linda Edmondson (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 1-28.

Miatleva demonstrates inconsistency in her role as mother, however. She is inconsistent in the patience and disciplining techniques she applies when dealing with her sons and daughters. She adopts a far harsher approach with her daughters. She depicts herself as a strict and unfair disciplinarian during the children's dancing class when she makes her daughter Ekaterina participate against her will:

Je voulus les faire danser devant moi. voilà Catchka qui se butte et il n'y a eu plus moyen de lui rien faire faire. je la menai derrière le paravent et là je la menaçai et je me montai moi même au point de lui donner des tappes et de la tirer par les cheveux et par les oreilles enfin je l'effrayais si bien qu'elle revins et dansa le reste de sa leçon; je lui avois dit entre autre que je ne l'aimai et ne l'aimerois plus dutout que les autres seroient comme mes enfans et elle comme une petite souillon. (9ob)

The brutal behaviour is inconsistent with the warm and caring nature she displays as a devoted mother. She is far more gentle when she undertakes the moral education of her son Petr, who is often in trouble. She simply talks to him calmly to make him understand he did wrong when he ordered wine to be bought in secret or was found in a compromising situation with a girl, for example (78ob-79, 92).

Miatleva represents herself as a capable and responsible estate manager. Her textual self takes responsibility for her serfs, and organises and oversees the work done on the estate, as well as housekeeping. Miatleva depicts herself as organising and managing what is grown and produced on her estate, taking charge of employing staff and deciding on their conditions of employment and wages (73, 76ob). This image of self contradicts the downtrodden, passive and

submissive self she depicts whose husband dictates what carriages, jewellery and homeware she can and cannot purchase when out shopping. She depicts a self that controls the family budget and makes her own decisions about expenditure (8). She also portrays herself as the decision-maker about home improvements and makes no mention of consulting her husband. She arranges the installation of a new stove, for example (51).

Further to her estate management responsibilities, Miatleva represents herself as a property owner, an independent, self-sufficient woman who buys and sells land, making informed decisions about benefits, disadvantages and probable profit gain:

J'ai terminé mon achat de la terre de [illegible] en ajoutant sottement cinq mille roubles aux 400 que je donnois [...] enfin j'ai été bête comme à mon ordinaire le plan de la maison qui est superbe m'a tourné la tête. le marché est donc arrêté pr 405,000 p. et c'est eux qui payeront les frais de купчей. il ne s'agit plus que de trouver de l'argent où les moyens d'en avoir car il leur faudra de l'argent comptant au moment de la signature de contrat de rente. pour moi je suis enchantée de cette acquisition et si cela se termine comme je l'espère j'irai m'établir là depuis le commencement du printemps jusqu'en automne. C'est à 320 V: d'ici [illegible] 4 jours de route tout au plus, est un établissement superbe, je me fais une fête de passer là tous les étés et vais chercher à vendre ou à engager mes terres de Calouga qui ne me donnent que 20,000 p, tandis que celle-là m'en donnera au moins 40. (30ob-31ob)

Although she represents herself as managing her own money and property and being more than aware of potential for profit, she also shows herself ready to let her head be turned by an exciting purchase. She depicts herself as much swayed by desire as practicality.

As a property owner, Miatleva also portrays herself as engaging in other commercial activities. She depicts herself as pawning and selling jewellery: ‘il nous faut quelqu’argent comptant et comme ceux qui ont le notre ne payent pas je suis obligée d’engager mes perles au lombard pour en avoir’ (30ob). She carries out deals on behalf of others and shows herself borrowing and lending money, well aware of interest rates. She borrows 15,000 roubles at 6% in order to purchase a sugar factory (51). Miatleva’s textual self does not, however, step outside the roles that were considered acceptable for Russian women at this point in time. Although few women took advantage of the right to engage in property sales she is entitled to do so by law. Property ownership was an extension of her domestic role. The cultural element of Russian women’s property rights will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Miatleva represents herself as an accomplished woman possessing many talents and hobbies, none of which distract her attention from her domestic duties and thus shows herself to personify the ideal image of woman prescribed by patriarchal society. She engages in reading, diary-writing, painting, flower-arranging, singing, dancing, fishing, interior design, sewing, acting and theatre-going. She also displays a keen interest in fashion. She is intent on displaying these accomplishments but she represents herself as enjoying them and not as finding them burdensome. This gendered image of an outwardly accomplished woman appears to be embedded in her consciousness and she passes it on to her daughters by ensuring they receive training in the areas, including dancing, that will lead to their future social success.

The picture of herself that Miatleva constructs as an actress contradicts the ideal image of a modest woman attached to the domestic sphere who neither displays herself nor her graces. She depicts herself acting in French plays she produces at home with her friends. Russian society was suspicious of women acting on stage as they were considered to be displaying vanity and allowing men to view and admire their bodies. More commonly, actresses were women from the lower classes. Noblewomen did act in their own domestic theatres, but not usually for money, due to the fact that in the eyes of society, the selling of the self for gain equated to prostitution.¹¹⁶ Miatleva depicts herself as organising tickets for entry to a theatrical production, which suggests that she was not just performing to a small family audience (13ob). She does not state whether the tickets would be sold, but selling her skill for money would certainly have been considered disreputable. Miatleva recounts that she is called to order by Titov, a male family friend, who warns her she must stop acting, as her reputation has already been damaged. Even though she states that she ‘always’ acted and ‘everywhere’ (9), has not done this against her husband’s wishes and ‘n’y voyais aucun tort pour moi ni pour ma réputation’ (9), she depicts herself as being compelled to avoid ‘me donner en spectacle et vouloir étaler mes grâces en public’ (9). Although Miatleva depicts herself as being angry because she believes ‘ce spectacle rompu a la veille de jouer, fait beaucoup plus clabauder que si j’avois joué devant 500 personnes’ (15-15ob), she is obliged to postpone the production until it could be performed in front of a very small audience (15). With her acting Miatleva

¹¹⁶ Wendy Rosslyn, ‘St Petersburg Actresses on and off Stage (1755-1825)’ in *St Petersburg, 1703-1825*, ed. by Anthony Cross (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 119-148 (p. 120).

challenges societal norms and then, under pressure, conforms to an acceptable image of femininity dictated by patriarchal society.

Miatleva portrays herself as a worldly woman. She presents herself as a glamorous woman who created a sensation at a ball she attended thanks to her superior skills at dancing, her elegance and her magnificent dress (18ob). She also depicts herself as fashion-conscious and getting carried away when she goes shopping, on one occasion overspending on ‘charming cotton stockings’ she sees in an English shop (82ob), which further serves to contradict the image she depicts of herself as being a capable money-manager.

Despite the fact that Miatleva represents herself as more than prepared to go on stage and gives great attention to external appearances, she also represents herself as a devout Orthodox believer whose life revolves around the Orthodox calendar. She shows herself to attend church on a regular basis and provides a detailed description of her religious commitments in Easter week (45ob-48). Her Orthodox self entirely contradicts her self-representation as an actress and worldly woman which are far from associated with modesty. The cultural aspect of Orthodoxy will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Addressees

Miatleva’s textual *mise-en-scène* of her multiple selves is not explicitly orientated towards an addressee, but that is not to say that there is not an implicit presence influencing her self-representation. Miatleva’s conscience is active on the pages of her diary. She uses writing as an act of self-criticism of a moral kind. She

employs her diary as a safe place to confide her flaws in character and errors of conduct. She reproaches herself for her pride, quick temper and jealousy (6). After brutally disciplining her daughter Ekaterina during her dance lesson Miatleva confides that ‘j’étais toute mécontente de moi de m’être laissé aller à l’emportement contre cet enfant et je ne me pardonne par encore [illegible] c’est une leçon pour l’avenir’ (9ob). When continual whisperings during the rehearsal of her domestic theatre production irritate her, ‘je me suis laissée aller à une humeur que j’ai laissé éclater et j’ai dit bien des choses que je voudrais après n’avoir pas dis’ (11).

Miatleva’s discourse is dialogic. She is perfectly aware of the way that she is expected to behave and of the societal mould that she must train her self-image to fit, but her non-conformist selves respond negatively to social prescription and fail to comply. She records her deviance from accepted behaviour and then forces her nonconformist selves to conform to prescription by obeying her husband and other patriarchal figures. She reconciles herself to what she perceives as necessity and thus responds positively to social prescription, orientating her discourse towards that of society with the aim of gaining approbation from her husband, entourage and her own conscience.

I suggest that Miatleva’s honesty about her flaws in character and the frustration she records about her husband is an indication that she never imagined he or anyone else would read what she had written. The fact that she does not have an addressee other than herself allows her to write more freely and therefore

enter into dialogue with her husband and social prescription on paper. She writes without fear of a judgemental reader.

Conclusions

The above analysis has shown that multiple discourses of self intersect in Miatleva's diary and create multiple, inconsistent and contradictory gendered subjectivities that are located in the contemporary socio-cultural context. Some of the individual images of self have their own interdiscourses, including Miatleva's wife and mother selves. She is respectively resistant and submissive and gentle and brutal. Miatleva represents herself, however, as conforming unquestioningly to domestic household duties, which derive from contemporary ideologies about a woman's role. As wife, she shows a marked initial resistance, however, to submitting to her husband's authoritarian behaviour as well as that of other male patriarchal figures as she perceives them to be impinging on her freedom and amusement. Her acting activities take her outside the norm of accepted feminine behaviour but she represents herself as being quickly obliged to retreat back into that norm.

Miatleva's oscillation between the discourses of multiple, inconsistent and contradictory subject positions produces a heteroglossic text. Each discourse represents a different point of view, or reality. Miatleva's interdiscourses, to use Nussbaum's term, are ultimately concerned with cultivating gendered images of self that conform to social prescriptions of femininity, whether these images are represented as being embedded in her consciousness or she obliges herself to

conform to them. Miatleva represents herself as inconsistent in her submissiveness and assertiveness throughout her diary and thus enters into dialogue with patriarchal discourse. She responds to patriarchy positively by accepting a number of her domestic roles unquestioningly and negatively, when she fails to conform to the image of a submissive woman. She resists her imposed position of submissive woman by outbursts of temper in arguments and initial challenge to her lot. She also enters into a dialogue of reconciliation with herself about conforming to social prescription. She is self-critical in a moral sense about her behaviour, flaws in character and any outward resistance she displays to social prescription and the images of self her husband or other male figures encourage her to adopt.

General Conclusions

This chapter has revealed the textual representation of multiple, inconsistent and contradictory gendered subjectivities which coexist in Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's life-writings and has thus demonstrated one aspect of their plural subjectivities.

Multiplicity of gendered subjectivities in these texts is represented as being a result of a mixture of an understanding of gender roles, social pressures, circumstances and human nature. Although the life-writers represent a plurality of similar images of self, which are closely associated with cultural definitions of gender, they do not represent themselves in the same way. They mould their constructions of self and place different emphasis on different aspects of their self

according to circumstances and necessity and gaining approbation by both explicit and implicit addressees.

A number of these subjectivities are complementary. Divova's and Miatleva's subjectivities, including those of wife, mother, hostess and estate manager, for example, are all connected to the domestic sphere and create an impression of unity between their different selves. This impression of unity is, however, only superficial and is largely undermined by numerous inconsistencies both between and within subjectivities.

The application of Nussbaum's theory of gendered interdiscourses to the life-writings has revealed contradictions which are represented as a result of social pressure, resistance to these pressures and human nature. The majority of the contradictions emerge between the life-writers' worldly and moral critic and Orthodox representations of self. Social pressure demanded that the women follow fashion and participate in social events but also that they maintain their moral and religious values and do not display vanity. None of the life-writers perceives these contradictions because these images of self are prescribed by society and have been accepted as the norm, and so they coexist harmoniously in the texts. Miatleva represents the largest amount of contradictions between her various subjectivities, and she is the only life-writer to perceive some of them, namely those within her wife and mother subjectivities. Awareness of these contradictions leads her to self-criticism of a moral kind.

All the life-writers represent themselves as discontented with one or more of their individual subjectivities' roles. Those relating to socially prescribed duty

are shown to cause most discontent: for Turkestanova that of lady-in-waiting, for Divova that of dependent female relative and for Miatleva that of wife. The life-writers are ‘nonconformist’ and resist these roles passively, physically or actively. Divova laments her situation, Turkestanova wishes to withdraw from society and complains of illness inflicted by duty while Miatleva expresses her discontent by verbal anger. Despite the fact that they fail to act out these roles perfectly, none of the life-writers represents herself as finding a way to escape these unwanted roles and all depict themselves as bound to a large extent by expectation, either that of society, of someone close to them, or of their addressee.

This chapter has also shown that Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova all make different uses of the diary as a genre. We have seen that they all, to some extent, employ the pages of their diaries and reminiscences as an outlet for discontent and complaints about their lot; but for Divova, writing is primarily represented to be an act of memory about Parisian high society and social life. Miatleva writes as both an act of conscience and to record daily life while Turkestanova’s diary is intended to inform the Littas about her travels.

My analysis has demonstrated the heteroglot nature of these life-writings. All three life-writers oscillate between different discourses of femininity by way of their adoption of multiple subjectivities which represent different cultural positions, attitudes and points of view within the contemporary Russian noble culture. Their discourse is dialogic. It incorporates the discourse of social prescription and is orientated towards others. Turkestanova is the only life-writer with explicit addressees, but we have seen that the discourse of all three women is

orientated towards others who fundamentally influence their self-representation, as do contemporary prescriptions of femininity. The life-writers respond to an addressee's expectations positively, by reproducing his or her discourse, or negatively, by contesting it and producing a competing discourse of their own which indicates that the gendered self is not always constructed according to personal creation or chosen methods for speaking about the self. Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova express their multiple, inconsistent and contradictory gendered subjectivities by the heteroglossia of gendered cultural difference within their socio-cultural environment.

This chapter has demonstrated that 'bi/multilingualism' is not limited to two different languages but can also refer to the multiple, inconsistent and contradictory discourses of gendered subjectivity within a socio-cultural group, in this case early nineteenth-century Russian francophone noblewomen. Plural gendered subjectivities are not the only manifestation of plural subjectivities in Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's life-writings, however, and their plural linguistic and cultural subjectivities will be discussed in the following chapters.

Chapter 2

Textual Representations of Linguistic Identity

The previous chapter demonstrated that one subject can be composed of multiple subjectivities which express themselves through multiple discourses within the same national language. It revealed Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's bi/multilingualism by their adoption of multiple gendered discourses within their socio-cultural milieu. This chapter investigates a further aspect of the life-writers' plurality and the diversity of their language by the investigation of their representation of their plural linguistic subjectivities and of their bilingualism in the context of national languages.

Drawing on Clément's extension of Bakhtinian heteroglossia, I examine the representation of the life-writers' literary (reading and scriptural) and spoken bilingualism and their resulting dual or multiple linguistic identities. Bilingualism in this case does not equate to the perfect mastery of two tongues, but to the presence of two national languages in the texts and the life-writers' representation of their ability to manipulate more than one language. I demonstrate the life-writers' ability to manipulate and mastery of French, Russian and, to a much lesser extent, other European languages and also discuss the use of these languages in everyday life according to the description provided. This approach provides evidence of their participation in French and Russian culture and shows how the mastery of various languages contributes towards their cultural bilingualism.

I discuss the texts collectively and divide the analysis of the evidence provided by the life-writers about their linguistic capacities into three sections: reading, writing and speaking. In the first section, I examine the life-writers' reading material and their representation of their ability to read in different languages, in the second section, their written expression and in the third, their demonstration of their oral abilities. It is necessary to take into account the fact that although the texts are written in French, the life-writers may represent themselves as having different or plural linguistic identities as readers or speakers. The contexts in which these particular languages are employed will be examined where relevant.

The three life-writers, who do not tell us how they learned their foreign languages, will not be accorded equal attention in each section as the amount of evidence in each text is different. Miatleva and Turkestanova represent themselves as having at least some knowledge of more than one language (French, Russian and English, while Turkestanova also displays knowledge of Italian), but Divova represents herself as monolingual in French. Of course it is necessary to take into consideration the fact that I examine the evidence provided in the life-writings themselves rather than biographical information about the life-writers. In reality, Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova can be seen to be bilingual by virtue of being Russian native speakers writing in French. An investigation of the texts alone, however, requires the presence of another national language to conclude that the life-writers are indeed bilingual.

Reading

In this section, I provide a brief outline of the availability of books in Russia and in what way reading constituted an important part of everyday life for Russian noblewomen in the early nineteenth century. I examine the representation of the material Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova engaged in reading. This examination will allow me to consider their demonstration of their abilities to read in various languages. I come to some conclusions about whether or not, according to the evidence provided in the life-writings, they can be considered to be bilingual by their capacity to read in several languages.

Books and Reading in the Lives of Russian Noblewomen in the Early Nineteenth Century

Very little is known in general about what reading Russian noblewomen engaged in during the early nineteenth century, but their choice of reading material would have been largely dictated by the availability of texts as well as the fact that social expectations and pressures demanded a perfect mastery of the French language and saw the ability to read non-Russian-language literature as an accomplishment.

In Russia in 1800 the active reading public only amounted to around 12,000. Furthermore, the literacy rate amongst women was only about 4% (while at 6% it was not much higher for men). The book trade was not born in Russia until the early 1760s, and the level of publishing activity was very low. Between 1801 and 1805 only 718 books were published, of which only 131 were in Russian. By the early nineteenth century, books and reading were becoming

increasingly fashionable and were accessible in the provinces as well as in towns partly due to travelling salesmen. In St Petersburg in 1807 there were only 10 state and 8 private presses, and about 15 private Russian bookshops. ‘The book market in Russia was much less developed than in Western Europe. In the first two decades of the nineteenth century on average some 250 books were published each year in Russia, compared to 4500 in France, and only a quarter of these were belles lettres.’¹¹⁷

The question of how much foreign-language literature was available and accessible in the Russian Empire in the early nineteenth century is difficult to answer. While the Academy and the Cadet Corps, as well as some private printers, published foreign-language books in Russia, a number of merchants imported them, ordering largely from France and Switzerland. Transportation and currency problems were responsible for the high prices of the imported books. Foreign book dealers served mainly the French and German communities in Moscow and St Petersburg, but also attracted an increasing number of customers from the Russian nobility. In Moscow the sale of foreign books showed vitality and there was a network of French-owned bookshops, although there was only one German-owned bookshop of importance.¹¹⁸ Miatleva considers the acquisition of new books to be an event worthy of recording in her diary. She purchases books in a bookshop in Moscow during the time she is writing her diary, but does not provide details of her purchases (77).

¹¹⁷ Wendy Rosslyn, *Anna Bunina (1774-1829) and the Origins of Women's Poetry in Russia* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1997), pp. 91-92.

¹¹⁸ Gary Marker, *Publishing, Printing, and the Origins of Intellectual Life in Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985) pp. 172-175.

There was also a market for foreign-language primers and grammars. During Catherine II's reign, 33 different French grammars, glossaries, alphabet books, lexicons and conversation books came into print. 'In addition, in the second half of the eighteenth century, Russian publishers printed six French dictionaries and a number of four-language lexicons that included sections in French. The print runs of Academy foreign-language grammars were usually between 1,000 and 1,800 copies per edition', but only two of the grammars went into second printings before 1780. 'The total number of French primers and grammars in print was only a small fraction of the total number of Russian ones. Consequently, there is no question that reading in French remained less widespread among the Russian public than reading in Russian was.'¹¹⁹

Reading as an activity manifested a woman's position as viewed by society. Books were seen as both educational tools and entertainment. Women did not ordinarily read the same books as men, who encouraged reading for women for improvement rather than entertainment. From the mid-eighteenth century reading became an important part of noblewomen's everyday life, a popular leisure activity and by the beginning of the nineteenth century the image of young women was inseparable from romantic reading.¹²⁰ The fact that the life-writers record in their diaries what they read as well as new literary acquisitions indicates that books and reading were an important part of their daily lives and worthy of recording. The Miatlevs had a huge library consisting of 6,524 volumes. Miatleva does not, however, provide any details as to which volumes these were (37ob).

¹¹⁹ Marker, p. 196.

¹²⁰ Olga E. Glagoleva, 'Imaginary World: Reading in the Lives of Russian Provincial Noblewomen (1750-1825)' in Rosslyn, ed., pp. 129-146 (pp. 130, 132, 142).

The Reading of Three Francophone Russian Women

During the time Divova, Miatlvea and Turkestanova were writing, they record reading a variety of material, from novels and newspapers, to travel literature and plays and much of this in French, although not to the exclusion of Russian.

The life-writers do not indicate how they acquired their reading material or in which language they read the texts. While they are unlikely to make a note of everything they read, we can infer that the texts they do mention are indicative of what francophone Russian women read in general, as there are many similarities among the reading materials they record.

The foreign, and particularly French, novel appealed to the sensibilities of the Russian female reader by the typical themes it dealt with, including love, social status and propriety. Although our life-writers do not cite specific titles they have read, in many cases they do provide authors' names. Mme de Staël is not unanimously approved of by the life-writers and yet they are familiar with her novels. Turkestanova writes that Mariia Fedorovna read Mme de Staël in the carriage (109). Divova describes de Staël's epistolary novel *Delphine*¹²¹ as being 'sans principes et contre la religion' (120). Although Divova depicts herself as disapproving of de Staël's novel, she states that she attended tea on several occasions at the author's home before she was exiled from Paris (120). As a social climber, Divova connects herself socially to de Staël and emphasises the fact that she was moving in prominent social circles and in this way participated in the Parisian literary scene. She also connects herself socially to another famous

¹²¹ Germaine de Staël, *Delphine* (Geneva, 1802).

French woman novelist, Madame de Souza, who, according to Divova, ‘a écrit pendant son émigration de si jolis romans, est une femme de beaucoup d’esprit et très aimable; je l’ai beaucoup vue!’ (124) Divova indicates that she is familiar with de Souza’s epistolary and memoir novels set in the reigns of Louis XV and Louis XVI and whose recurring themes include family, education and virtue. Turkestanova reveals that she also reads novels and records reading a ‘silly novel’ in the carriage on her travels, but provides no supplementary details (27).

Miatleva records reading *Les Cousins*, an unpublished allegorical novel, written by her cousin Tat’iana Vasil’evna Golitsyna’s father Vasilii Alekseevich Vasil’chikov (1754-1830), Brigadier and Governor of Novgorod from 1789-1795:

ma cousine galitzin femme de Dimitry [...] après le diné pendant que les enfans jouaient Meilhan [?] me commença la lecture d’un roman de son père, les cousins que Boris m’a prêté. C’est parfaitement écrit et rempli d’esprit comme tout ce qui est sorti de sa plume. C’est un roman allegorique et critique sur le siècle et la Cour où il vivoit et qui pourroit servir à toutes les cours. (48ob)

It was not unusual for texts to circulate in manuscript in the early nineteenth century in Russia and to be duplicated by copying by hand. Miatleva shows that she has read other works written by the same author and is, therefore, in a position to judge the quality of this text. She represents her experience as a reader by her ability to identify the genre of Vasil’chikov’s work and indicates that she has sufficient knowledge of the subject matter to support the author’s views.

Correspondence from Western Europe was widely read in Russia in the long eighteenth century and provided models for Russians who wished to try their hand at the autobiographical genre, as there was a scarcity of published work of

this kind by Russian authors. Mme de Sévigné was famous for her abundant correspondence and Divova clearly has a high opinion of her talents as a writer. We can infer that she has read the correspondence, as when she is reunited with her children after their arrival in Paris from Dresden, she states that not even de Sévigné could express in writing the joy she is feeling (126), which indicates that she does not estimate any other author more highly. We can also surmise that Miatleva is familiar with de Sévigné, as she comments approvingly on her hairstyle in portraits (2). Turkestanova writes in her diary that ‘j’ai passé la journée à lire les lettres de l’abbé Galiani,¹²² que je ne recommande à personne, car c’est une lecture parfaitement ennuyeuse’ (111). She later changes her mind, however, and writes ‘je me suis raccommodée avec ce Napolitain; le second volume de ses lettres est joli tout-à-fait; il y en a quelquesunes qui pétillent d’esprit’ (112).

Turkestanova demonstrates an interest in biographical writing. She records reading *Zapiski o zhizni i sluzhbe Aleksandra Il’icha Bibikova*:¹²³ ‘Si le style en était moins lourd, l’ouvrage en serait plus agréable à lire; mais il faut convenir que le cousin n’a pas la plume brillante. Au reste, c’est toujours une lecture assez intéressante’ (12). Like Miatleva, Turkestanova makes critical observations about what she reads. She also represents herself as a reader with experience and a point of view. Her clear opinions suggest that she is able to analyse the information she reads and make reasoned judgements. Her observations on the quality of

¹²² Ferdinando Galiani, *Correspondance inédite de l’abbé Galiani conseiller du Roi pendant les années 1765 à 1783*, ed. by Barthélemy Mercier de Saint-Léger, 2 vols (Paris, 1818).

¹²³ Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bibikov, *Zapiski o zhizni i sluzhbe Aleksandra Il’icha Bibikova synom ego senatorom Bibikovym* (Saint Petersburg, 1817).

Bibikov's biography also indicate that she has a high level of comprehension of Russian.

The life-writers also represent themselves as having an interest in travel writing. On several occasions Turkestanova mentions a text by Reichardt and Schreiber, which she uses to instruct herself and her fellow travellers about various sites they come across during their travels: 'au reste avec Reichardt et Schreiber à la main et que je consultais alternativement, je m'instruisais parfaitement sur tous les objets qui excitaient mon intérêt' (60). It is unclear exactly which text she is referring to, especially as she does not indicate in which language the text was written. When we take into consideration the regions in which she was travelling, however, it is most likely that she was reading Aloys Wilhelm Schreiber's *Guide pour ceux qui font le voyage du Rhin et de la Moselle et qui vont visiter les bains du Mont Taunus, les vallées du Necker et de la Murg, et le canton dit Odenwald*.¹²⁴ It seems unlikely that she was reading Johann Friedrich Reichardt's and Schreiber's *Vertraute Briefe, geschrieben auf einer Reise nach Wien und den Oesterreichischen Staaten zu Ende des Jahres 1808 und zu Anfang 1809*¹²⁵ due to the fact that she does not mention travelling to Austria in her diary and she requires a translation from German when speaking to the sculptor Dannecker's daughter in Stuttgart, which indicates that she did not have knowledge of German (50).

¹²⁴ Aloys Wilhelm Schreiber, *Guide pour ceux qui font le voyage du Rhin et de la Moselle, et qui vont visiter les bains du Mont Taunus, les vallées du Necker et de la Murg, et le canton dit Odenwald* (1813).

¹²⁵ Johann Friedrich Reichardt and Aloys Wilhelm Schreiber, *Vertraute Briefe, geschrieben auf einer Reise nach Wien und den Oesterreichischen Staaten zu Ende des Jahres 1808 und zu Anfang 1809* (Amsterdam, 1810).

Divova indicates that she was familiar with Marie-Gabriel-Florent-Auguste de Choiseul-Gouffier's *Voyage Pittoresque en Grèce*.¹²⁶ Once again, she emphasises the fact that she knew the author, but offers no opinion on the text itself. She writes that she met him in St Petersburg at the court of Catherine II and that he called on her in Paris. She accuses him of ingratitude to Russia as an émigré and intrigue. She suggests that he did not illustrate the text himself (97-98).

Miatleva and Turkestanova represent themselves as familiar with French theatre in its written form. Miatleva records reading French playwrights, including Racine, Molière and Beauharnais, whose respective plays *Athalie*, *Le Misanthrope* and *Le Barbier de Séville ou la Précaution inutile* she writes about acting in (2ob, 5). She also writes of reading books about theatre costume (2ob-3). Turkestanova is familiar with Racine's comedy *Les Plaideurs* (18) and to pass the time in the carriage while travelling, she reads *Bélisaire* (109), a tragedy in five acts in verse by French dramatist Victor-Joseph Étienne de Jouy,¹²⁷ whose performance was forbidden at the Comédie-Française due to the supposed similarities between *Bélisaire*, a Roman general, and Napoleon. Turkestanova represents herself as well informed about new books, and able to acquire them.

Miatleva writes that she read newspapers which are shared between family members, as most likely other reading material was: 'mon frère [...] part pour

¹²⁶ Marie-Gabriel-Florent-Auguste de Choiseul-Gouffier, *Voyage Pittoresque en Grèce* (Paris, 1782).

¹²⁷ Victor-Joseph Étienne de Jouy, *Bélisaire* (Paris, 1818).

Макаръев¹²⁸ après demain et m'a promis de me laisser les gazettes qu'il reçoit pendant son absence' (76). Miatleva shows that she was interested to read material chosen by her brother. It was not unusual for men to pay attention to and supervise women's reading and select suitable material for the consumption of female relatives.¹²⁹ Miatleva also indicates that she reads *L'Abeille du Nord*.¹³⁰ Turkestanova also reads newspapers: 'j'ai reçu un fatras de gazettes qui m'ont occupé assez longtems' (113). She indicates that her addressees will read about Mariia Fedorovna's travels in the *Severnaia pochta*¹³¹ and believes that their uneventful reception at Narva will be exaggerated by this publication in the 'style emphatique, qui lui est propre' (4) and so determines to put the record straight and tell the Littas that nothing exceptional occurred. She states, however, that if it should 'parle de nos triomphes de Dorpat, elle ne dira que la vérité' (5) which indicates that the Imperial travelling party were very well received there. The fact that she is familiar with the newspaper's style and knows what kind of events are covered is a strong indication that she read the Russian-language *Severnaia pochta* herself.

Turkestanova shows herself to be familiar with the Bible and compares her attendant Rhull's sister, in whose house she stays at Valmiera in modern-day Latvia when she is too unwell to continue the journey, to the widow of Zarephath

¹²⁸ Miatleva is probably referring to the famous Russian fair that was held annually on the banks of the Volga in the vicinity of the Makar'ev Monastery.

¹²⁹ Cf. Glagoleva.

¹³⁰ Most likely a review that appeared from 1804-1810 at Altona, an area of Hamburg in Germany. Although she is writing in 1811, she may have only just received this particular edition. It is not possible that Miatleva read the *Severnaia pchela* as this Russian daily did not appear until 1825.

¹³¹ The *Severnaia pochta* was a newspaper published twice a week in St Petersburg between 1809 and 1819 by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and included materials about Russia's economic life and foreign news.

(114). Furthermore, she records regularly reading the Bible, but not of her own volition, it seems, as a form of instruction for both heart and mind: ‘L’Impératrice, qui nous fait voyager, je crois, pour nous former l’esprit et le coeur, s’est mise en devoir de nous faire lire chaque matin un chapitre de la Bible et un autre du Nouveau Testament’ (5).

Conclusions

Evidence suggests that a considerable amount of the reading recorded by these women was by French authors or written in French and while none of the women tells us what she prefers to read, the majority of the reading material recorded is novels, life-writings, plays and newspapers.

Divova does not mention explicitly any reading she has done, but solely names French female novelists and life-writers. This may be due to the fact that she was in Paris at the time of writing and was writing about Paris when she wrote her reminiscences. She is more concerned with recording her literary acquaintances than her literary habits. She represents herself as a monolingual French-language reader who knows famous French authors personally.

Miatleva records reading a variety of genres. She must have read the plays in French as she acted in them in French. It seems likely that the newspapers she read were in both French and Russian. She demonstrates that French-language reading material was accessible in Russia. Although she remained in Russia during the time she kept this diary it is possible that she subscribed to *L’Abeille du nord*, but no proof of this is provided. Miatleva thus represents herself

principally as a French-language reader who participates in French, Russian and Russian francophone literary culture. Miatleva represents herself as a bilingual reader.

Turkestanova records the largest amount of reading. She demonstrates that even while travelling she still had access to both French and Russian reading material and, what is more, recently published material. To all appearances, she reads Russian but engages predominantly in French-language reading. She represents herself as participating in French, Russian and, whether or not she reads Reichardt and/or Schreiber in the original or in French translation, germanophone literary culture. Like Miatleva, Turkestanova represents herself as a bilingual reader.

Although the evidence suggests that the life-writers engaged predominantly in reading in French, Miatleva and Turkestanova represent themselves as experienced and critical readers who participate in literary cultures in addition to the French one. There is evidence of Miatleva and Turkestanova being able to read French and Russian with equal ease. Judging by the works that the life-writers read, we can infer that they had a very high level of French comprehension and that Turkestanova, if not Miatleva, had a high level of Russian comprehension. A reasonable assumption to make from the evidence provided is that all three life-writers were fluent readers of French, if not equal to natives, while Miatleva and Turkestanova were fluent readers of Russian. While Divova represents herself as a monolingual reader in French, Miatleva and

Turkestanova represent themselves as bilingual readers with dual linguistic identities.

Writing

Further drawing on Clément's extension of Bakhtinian heteroglossia, this section focuses on the life-writers' scriptural bilingualism. Bilingualism here does not necessarily refer to the mastery of several national languages, but the life-writers' ability to manipulate them in writing and also the visible presence of several languages in the texts. In a first instance, I examine the demonstration of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's written abilities in French, and then I turn my attention to the demonstration of their written expression in Russian and the presence of other national languages in the texts. Dialogism will be discussed where relevant.

Divova's text is written entirely in French and it is for this reason that she will receive limited attention in this section. The absence of languages other than French in her text could be due to the fact that she was in Paris when she was writing her *Journal* and writing about her time in Paris in her *Souvenirs*, and had no reason to use Russian or any other language. Divova makes absolutely no reference to her ability to write in any language other than French, so there is no evidence for scriptural bilingualism.

The quality of the written French in Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts is very good. It is, however, a reasonable conjecture that the versions of Divova's and Turkestanova's texts under consideration have been

edited for publication. Having read several manuscripts written in the early nineteenth century, I have seen that the level of mastery of written French varies from life-writer to life-writer, is phonetic in places and usually complies with contemporary spelling rules. Divova's and Turkestanova's written French, on the other hand, is both more modern and flawless, which indicates editorial modification. Miatleva's unedited manuscript, however, demonstrates that although she generally has an excellent command of the French language and writes fluently, spelling is phonetic in places. It was not uncommon for Russian francophone women life-writers to write phonetically.¹³² Accents and grammatical agreements are not always as a modern-day reader would expect. Miatleva writes *e* or *é* at the end of infinitives instead of *er*, *diné* being just one example. She merges words in writing as she hears them pronounced in speech, *dutout*, *apeupres* and *pardessuslemarché*, for example. Miatleva employs spelling common in the early nineteenth century, substituting *a* for *o* in imperfect tense conjugations such as *avoit*, *vouloit*, *rendoient* and *étoit* and in words such as *affoiblis*, while omitting the *t* in words such as *désagremens*, *bruyans* and *établissemens*. Her writing shows signs of hypercorrection in the form of the doubling of consonants, *reppetitions*, *toutte*, *vollonté*, *sallon* and she employs abbreviations, such as *pr./* for *pour* and also when referring to titles of friends and acquaintances, *psse/* instead of *princesse* and *csse/* instead of *comtesse*, for example. Overall, Miatleva displays a good level of grammatical accuracy.

¹³² Cf. «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*», pp. 40-41.

Although I cannot comment on the quality of Divova's and Turkestanova's written French, these published texts are remarkably similar to Miatleva's in style and expression. The texts all flow easily and none of the life-writers writes in an elevated or literary style, but rather their language appears to mimic speech and in this way gives an insight into their everyday vernacular. The syntax and wide vocabulary they employ is fairly simple and the texts contain a variety of colloquialisms such as *asticoter* and *baragouiner* and locutions including *le jeu n'en vaut pas la chandelle*, for example, which demonstrate a good mastery of, if not native ability in, written expression. One indication of the life-writers' high level of ease in French written expression is that they write in a conversational style: 'les enfans ont teind des oeufs ce matin la bonne est un peu mieux à ce que l'on dira, mais sa convalescence sera longue et lente, bien heureuse encore si elle en revient, elle même a l'air inquiète' (46ob). This example, taken from Miatleva's diary, is just one instance of a run-on sentence. Miatleva uses fewer coordinating conjunctions than is usual in written French and, together with the informality and spontaneity of her language, demonstrates her informal, conversational style of writing.

Evidence suggests a high level of ease in the life-writers' French written expression. None of them emphasises the fact that she is writing in French, nor does she give any reason for writing in this language, which seems on the face of it an unusual choice for Russian nationals. The absence of any reference to their use of French is an indication that writing in this language was completely natural and did not require any explanation. It is necessary, of course, to take into

consideration the fact that Turkestanova's text is an epistolary diary and epistolary etiquette required the use of French.¹³³ Her use of the French language in writing is therefore dialogic. It is orientated towards both social expectation and that of the Littas. Social code requires sufficient proficiency in written French to enable Turkestanova to correspond in that language.

Although their texts are written predominantly in French, Miatleva and Turkestanova insert Russian words in Cyrillic into the French text. Both life-writers employ orthography common in early nineteenth-century Russia. The Russian language is frequently employed to inscribe names such as *Krasovski* and *Vaniusha*, especially when the life-writers provide the Russian patronymic as well, *Nikolai Ivanovich Saltykov* and *Mariia Semenovna*, for example. Cyrillic script is also used by Turkestanova to inscribe insults. She refers to Princess Czartoryska as the *Kievskaiia ved'ma*. She finds a Monsieur Borgne's name so amusing that she provides the Russian translation, *krivoi*, so her addressees can fully appreciate the joke. Toponyms including *Tula* and *Bogorodskoi* often appear in Cyrillic script. Miatleva writes that she goes fishing in the *Moskva reka* and that she shops on *Ulitsa Prechistenka* in Moscow. Cyrillic script is also often employed to render specifically Russian reality, particularly where religious terminology is concerned. Referring to property and estate concerns, Miatleva mentions her husband's *zaemnoe pismo* and the *torgovka* who is interested in purchasing her jewellery. She attends a *panafida* and the *vecherniaia* when the *Plashchanitsa* is carried through the church on Good Friday. Turkestanova refers to the Russian newspaper *Severnaia pochta* and Russian comic opera *Mel'nik* in

¹³³ «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*», p. 19; Lotman, pp. 34, 36.

Cyrillic and enjoys playing *durak*. She writes of there only being two *psalomshchik* at a church service she attended in Stuttgart and of the *pod''ezd* to the building where she lives in St Petersburg. Miatleva's and Turkestanova's use of Russian demonstrates that they were able to manipulate the language in writing at least to some degree. Here, we see the way in which language reveals a Russian cultural layer in the life-writings. The French-language text is inhabited by Russian cultural discourse, as will be explored in Chapter Three.

Although Miatleva demonstrates a certain capacity to write Russian by her use of Cyrillic script in her diary, it is possible to see that this small sample of her written Russian is also phonetic in places. As in French, she recreates the sounds in writing, *Varinka* instead of *Varen'ka* and *otpuskn'ia* instead of *otpusknaia*, for example. Due to the fact that Turkestanova's text has been edited, I cannot comment on the quality of her Russian expression, but it is clear that Miatleva wrote Russian much in the same way as she did French and so there is no reason to suppose that she mastered this language to a lesser degree in writing than she did French.

Contrary to her use of French, Turkestanova draws attention to her use of Russian in writing, which indicates that it was unusual. She resorts to writing Russian when she is abroad as a subtle act of resistance to her duty. She objects to the continuous obligation of official visits and her use of the Russian language has the effect of concealing her identity to non-Russian readers:

M-r Faber, qui était avec nous, pria très-humblement Sa Majesté d'inscrire son nom dans un livre où il fait écrire tous les voyageurs. L'impératrice y

consentit; je signai après elle et j'écrivis en russe mon nom tout au long.
Ne le lira pas qui voudra! (61)

It is not, however, only Russian words that appear in Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts. They also insert words in other European languages. Miatleva inscribes some English words when she is referring to employing a *housekeeper* to make *pickles* for consumption during the winter (73ob). Turkestanova writes on several occasions that the *God save the King* melody was performed in Mariia Fedorovna's honour. She also inscribes Italian words in mid-sentence, *altri tempi* (14) and *tutti quanti* (45), for example. Her use of Italian is most likely directed towards her Italian addressee Litta and is therefore dialogic. She adapts her language to relate to Litta as an Italian in his native tongue. Although their limited use of English and Italian does not provide evidence to suggest that the life-writers mastered these languages, it is another case of what Clément refers to as scriptural bilingualism, the visible presence of several languages in the same text.

Conclusions

This section has revealed that Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova write French to a high standard, if not to the same level as natives. The life-writers' lack of reliance on Russian, or any other language indicates the high level of their comfort and ease writing in French.

Divova represents herself as monolingual in French as far as writing is concerned, which indicates that she considers French to be her first language or at least language of choice in the written medium. Miatleva and Turkestanova, on

the other hand, demonstrate an ability to manipulate the Russian language in writing, albeit to a restricted degree, when referring to specifically Russian reality. There is no evidence to suggest that Miatleva mastered Russian any less than she did French. Miatleva and Turkestanova represent their use of Russian to be limited to specific situations where French will not do, which shows that Russian was indispensable in their everyday lives. The Cyrillic script, employed to refer to Russian cultural concepts, reveals a Russian cultural discourse in their texts and therefore their participation in Russian culture.

It can be seen that Miatleva and Turkestanova demonstrate scriptural bilingualism. They demonstrate the ability to write English, Italian and Russian. Their insertion of words in those languages into their texts is an aspect of heteroglossia in their writings. Furthermore, Turkestanova's use of both written French and Italian is dialogic. Miatleva and Turkestanova reveal a further aspect of their plural linguistic subjectivities by their ability to write in several languages.

Speaking

This section focuses on Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's demonstration of their oral mastery of French, Russian and, to a much lesser extent, other European languages as it can be perceived through their writing. Modifying Clément's extension of Bakhtinian heteroglossia to incorporate the spoken bilingualism of the life-writers, I consider the way in which the report of their spoken linguistic proficiency constitutes another form of heteroglossia present in

the texts. Bilingualism here does not necessarily mean the perfect mastery of the languages in question, but the demonstration of the ability to communicate in these languages. Due to the fact that it is impossible to analyse directly their oral capacities and because the women do not state how well they spoke French or Russian, I extract details from their writings which provide circumstantial evidence as to their spoken proficiency and reach conclusions about whether or not, according to the evidence provided, they can be considered to be bilingual. Once again, Divova will receive restricted attention in this section due to the fact that she does not make any reference to speaking or being able to speak any language other than French. This is probably due to the fact that in Paris she would have had no need to employ any other language.

In a first instance, I examine the circumstantial evidence for the life-writers' proficiency in spoken French. I then investigate that of their proficiency in spoken Russian and in Miatleva's case in English. I discuss dialogism where relevant.

Circumstantial evidence suggests that Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova possessed a high level of proficiency in spoken French. Although they do not explicitly write about their use of the language in social and domestic contexts, the absence of reflections on this subject suggests that it is the norm for these women to function in French rather than in Russian or any other language. Their demonstration of an ability to read and write to a high standard in French suggests that they also spoke French to the same standard, if not to the same level as a native.

The life-writers would have required a good mastery of spoken French and also enhanced their oral skills on their travels due to their obligation to use it in both official and social situations. In Paris, Divova would have had consistent and regular exposure to the French language. She would have found it necessary to speak French to her French servants, French social acquaintances and at court. In this way, she would probably have furthered her knowledge and command of the French language. Travelling in an official role as lady-in-waiting when French was the *lingua franca* in Europe, Turkestanova, it is realistic to conjecture, would have spoken French to the diplomats she encountered and at the foreign courts she visited. As a representative of the Russian Empire she would have been expected to possess a high level of competence in the language. In this way, the French language is dialogic insofar as the life-writers represent it in their texts as such. Their use of French acts as a social dialect which is orientated towards specific interlocutors, towards their social level and, therefore, responds positively to their discourse.

Although the life-writers do not comment directly on their own proficiency in and use of spoken French in social interactions, they do comment critically on that of others. Divova, who saw Napoleon's mother, Maria Letizia Ramolino, Her Imperial Highness Mother of the Emperor (1750-1836), occasionally in the mornings, harshly criticises her French: 'la mere du Premier Consul à l'air d'une femme d'esprit; elle parle très mal le français' (104). Unless her own spoken French was excellent, Divova would not know if another's was faulty. Ramolino was not formally educated. Born in Ajaccio when Corsica was

still part of the Republic of Genoa,¹³⁴ she would in all likelihood have spoken Corsu as her native language and therefore have spoken French only as a subsidiary language. Turkestanova comments on a nun's lack of knowledge of French at St Casimir's convent in Warsaw:

La mère provinciale de S-t Casimir ne parle pas le français; mais une autre religieuse qui le baragouine un peu m'a fait entendre qu'elles aimeraient bien que l'Impératrice les prît sous sa protection et qu'elles eussent des relations avec Pétersbourg. (22)

The fact that she comments pejoratively that the nun could only say a few words in French, and badly at that, indicates that while the nun shows herself capable of using French as a communication tool, Turkestanova represents herself as manipulating it at a higher level.

Miatleva's ability to act in French plays demonstrates a certain mastery of the French language. It not only shows that she is able to learn and reproduce the lines in what is presumably not her mother tongue, but that she is confident enough in the language to stand up and perform in front of an audience. In order to successfully portray her characters both in speech and physically, Miatleva would need to understand nuances in the French-language script. Accordingly, if it can be assumed that she produced high-quality performances on the stage, her spoken French was very likely of a high standard.

French was not, however, spoken to the exclusion of Russian by noblewomen at the turn of the nineteenth century. Miatleva demonstrates at least

¹³⁴ <<http://europeanhistory.about.com/od/bonapartenapoleon/a/bioletbonaparte.htm>>; <<http://napoleonbonaparte.wordpress.com/2008/01/18/la-famille-de-napoleon-laetitia-bonaparte-1750-1836-madame-mere/>> [accessed 21 August 2009].

a small knowledge of Russian vocabulary, which she displays in her diary, a fact which was discussed in the section on writing. It is entirely likely, therefore, that if she could write these words down, she could employ them in speech. Miatleva shows that certain contexts in her domestic life required the use of spoken Russian. She describes interactions with her servants, who as part of the lower classes would not have spoken French; so, in all likelihood, Russian would have been the language in which she would have disciplined them: 'j'ai été voir la laverie et déclarer à toutes les blanchisseuses, que je ne forçois personne, mais que je ne payerois que celles qui travailleroient' (67). Miatleva also refers in Russian to her husband's promissory note (75ob), which indicates that she was familiar with Russian financial terminology and that Russian financial transactions that were settled verbally would have been carried out in Russian. As estate manager responsible for the household budget (8), she was likely to have made financial transactions with merchants and to have carried out her own property purchases in Russian whether directly or through an intermediary (31, 57ob). To negotiate transactions and understand the mechanics of the Russian financial system would have required a reasonably good command of the spoken language. Miatleva's discourse can be seen to be dialogic as she adapts it and orientates it towards the social level of her interlocutors, whether they are serfs, merchants or in the property market. She responds to them in a way they will understand, using their own language. This shows that national languages function as social discourses for early nineteenth-century Russian noblewomen. I

cannot, however, comment on the specific quality of Miatleva's spoken Russian as her diary contains no evidence in this regard.

The fact that regular churchgoers Miatleva and Turkestanova refer to religious terminology in Russian indicates that only Russian would do in the religious domain. Orthodox church services would have taken place in Church Slavonic, the Russian liturgical language, and dealings with religious officials in Russian. The life-writers would very likely have participated in these services by learning prayers in Church Slavonic by heart. Although Church Slavonic is relatively similar to the Russian language, it would nevertheless have been foreign to them. They would have had a certain level of spoken comprehension, but not have had any facility in the liturgical language. The Russian priesthood was excluded from high society as it was not part of the nobility. Priests received a relatively elementary education and therefore did not, as a rule, know French.¹³⁵ Miatleva's and Turkestanova's ability to manipulate the Russian and, possibly to some extent, the Russian liturgical language emphasises their spoken bilingualism, plural linguistic subjectivities and therefore heteroglot nature. Their language is dialogic; they orientate it towards Orthodox Church officials, other Orthodox believers and God.

Miatleva's demonstration of her ability to speak a third language, namely English, further reveals the plurality of her linguistic subjectivities and emphasises her heteroglot nature. She demonstrates her spoken bilingualism by her ability to converse in English when Admiral Grey calls on her (5ob). She does

¹³⁵ *Literaturnoe vzaimovospriatie Rossii i Frantsii v religioznom kontekste epokhi (1797-1825)*, pp. 9-10.

not directly mention the presence of English servants in her home, but she appears to have a *housekeeper* (73ob) and also mentions in passing that there is an English woman in her house: ‘l’angloise a eu la jaunisse et n’en est pas encore débarassée’ (56). It is a reasonable assumption that Miatleva speaks English with these members of her staff as she is capable of engaging in English conversation with her guests. Again, Miatleva adapts her language to the social situation.

Conclusions

This section has revealed that Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova demonstrate a high level of proficiency in spoken French in their texts. Divova represents herself as monolingual in French while Miatleva and Turkestanova demonstrate knowledge of spoken French and Russian. Miatleva also shows herself to speak English. None of the life-writers reveals which language she prefers to speak, but the weight of circumstantial evidence suggests that French was the language of everyday transactions while Russian was reserved for specifically Russian situations for which French would not do. The use of English in Miatleva’s case also has limited and specific use. The fact that the presence of a second and third language stands out in the texts and yet none of the life-writers comments on her French suggests that French is the dominant spoken language, while Russian along with English are secondary languages. There is, however, no concrete evidence provided of this or indeed of whether the life-writers spoke French and Russian to the same standard.

My analysis has shown that Miatleva and Turkestanova display spoken bilingualism in their life-writing which is one element of their heteroglot nature and dual/plural linguistic subjectivities. My modification to Clément's conception of heteroglossia to include spoken bilingualism has shown that the life-writers' demonstration of their spoken bilingualism, in the context of speaking several national languages rather than social and cultural dialects, also constitutes a form of heteroglossia in the life-writings. Furthermore, Miatleva and Turkestanova represent themselves as adapting their spoken language to different social and cultural situations and in this way, national languages act in the same way as social dialects of the same language. They represent themselves as employing different national languages in different contexts and thus adapting and orientating their discourse towards their interlocutor which serves to render their discourse dialogic. They show themselves to respond to their interlocutor's discourse at his or her social level.

General Conclusions

This chapter has revealed that linguistic identity counts for an important part of the plural subjectivities represented in text by Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova. It has also shown that linguistic identity is a contributing factor to these francophone Russian women's cultural identities and demonstrated not only the life-writers' all round mastery of the French language to native standard but their literary and spoken bilingualism.

My analysis has revealed the textual Miatleva's and Turkestanova's multiple linguistic subjectivities by the examination of their literary (reading and scriptural) and spoken bilingualism. That is to say, the analysis has demonstrated their bilingualism as readers, writers and speakers of both French, Russian and, to a lesser extent, Italian and English. Bearing in mind that I examine the evidence provided in the life-writings themselves rather than biographical information about the life-writers, my analysis has revealed the textual Divova to be monolingual in French. Divova's representation of her French linguistic identity is interesting insofar as it demonstrates the extent to which French language influence had penetrated Russian noble society in the early nineteenth century and in some cases had become dominant, eclipsing Russian altogether.

Following Clément's extension of Bakhtinian heteroglossia to incorporate the analysis of texts by a bilingual author composed in a cross-cultural context, this chapter has shown that the concept of literary (reading and scriptural) bilingualism can also be applied to certain francophone Russian women's life-writings. Miatleva and Turkestanova demonstrate their ability to manipulate several national languages in reading and writing. National languages, namely French and Russian in this case, function in the same way as social dialects do in Bakhtin's analysis of heteroglossia in the novel. They equate to the multiple social discourses possessed by an individual at any one time. Different national languages are employed in different social and cultural contexts and adapted to and orientated towards a certain target audience. In the case of the demonstration of spoken bilingualism, these linguistic discourses are dialogic, they are

represented as being orientated towards particular interlocutors and the associated social context. Turkestanova's use of French in her epistolary diary is also dialogic, as she has specific addressees and is responding both to their letters and epistolary etiquette, as is her insertion of Italian words into her diary for the benefit of her Italian addressee. Further extending Clément's points of analysis, I have also demonstrated the way in which Miatleva's and Turkestanova's spoken bilingualism can be perceived through their writing and further draw our attention to the presence of heteroglossia in their texts.

Their ability to manipulate different languages allows Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova to participate in different cultures; and they represent themselves as accessing and participating in French, Russian and other European culture by the literature they read and their domestic and social interactions with both Russians and foreigners. The use of French and Russian allows them to communicate with different social circles. It can be seen therefore that the ability to read, write and communicate in several languages contributes to Miatleva's and Turkestanova's cultural bilingualism, that is to say their manipulation of French, Russian and other cultural discourses, which is examined in more detail in Chapter Three.

On a superficial, external level, that is to say when displaying accomplishments, to conform with epistolary etiquette and in social and public life, French is represented by the life-writers as their dominant tongue. Russian is represented as being employed when referring to more personal, domestic aspects of life, religious life and life on the estate, for example, areas where the language

was obligatory for cultural reasons. The weight of evidence indicates, however, that French was Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's dominant tongue. Their overall lack of reliance on Russian or any other language and lack of comment on their writing in French and use of French more generally suggests that it is an entirely normal practice and does not require comment.

This chapter brings into question the idea that at the turn of the nineteenth century Russian noblewomen were not capable of using Russian, the tongue of their native country. The fact that Miatleva and Turkestanova represent themselves as having at least some knowledge of Russian is interesting, as women of this time and social class are usually thought to represent a more extreme case of deficiency in Russian than they demonstrate in their life-writings.

Chapter 3

Textual Representations of Cultural Identity

This chapter reveals a third aspect of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's plural subjectivities. Further to their multiple gendered and linguistic representations of self, I discuss the multiple French and Russian cultural discourses, or cultural bilingualism, of the life-writers and consider their multiple associated cultural subjectivities. By culture, I refer to French and Russian national influences, way of life and the arts. I develop the idea presented in the last chapter that mastery of different languages permits access to and participation in the associated cultures.

My analysis focuses on Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's representation of their participation in and knowledge of French and Russian culture. I consider their representation of their cultural awareness and whether they participate more fully in French or Russian culture. In my investigation of the life-writers' plural cultural subjectivities, I draw on both Clément's extension of Bakhtinian heteroglossia to incorporate cultural bilingualism and my modifications to her points of analysis. I consider cultural transfer (the transplantation of one culture into the geographical space associated with another culture), socio-cultural bilingualism (a double and contrasting experience of the same cultural reality) and cultural participation (taking part in a way of life or activities associated with a particular culture). The multiple cultural discourses are another form of heteroglossia present in the life-writings.

Due to the texts' diversity in respect of the cultural context in which the women were writing, which has a direct effect on cultural participation, they will not be accorded equal attention in each section of the analysis. In their travel writings, Divova and Turkestanova describe events, meetings and customs that are out of the ordinary for them, which serves to highlight their participation in foreign culture. Divova's case is particularly interesting as she writes about the time she spent in Paris and she comments directly on what she depicts as Parisian difference. It is for this reason that her Parisian sojourn will receive particular attention. By contrast, Miatleva did not leave Russia in the years she kept her diary and so my analysis will focus on the expression of her participation in Russian culture in Moscow and on her estates.

I examine the life-writers' participation in French culture before looking closely at Divova's representation of her participation in Parisian life. I then investigate all three women's representation of their participation in Russian culture.

Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's Participation in French Culture

This section focuses on Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's participation in French culture whether from a distance or in France itself. The French language is the vehicle for the self-images that the life-writers represent and its associated culture influences this representation. In the second chapter, we saw that the life-writers participate in French literary culture, but this section shows in what way they participate in French culture in a wider sense. I will discuss all three life-

writers' knowledge of and participation in the French arts and then Divova's experience of Parisian life. The analysis reveals the life-writers' adoption of French cultural discourses and discusses cultural transfer and socio-cultural bilingualism where relevant.

Theatre

Divova and Turkestanova represent themselves as enthusiastic theatregoers who participate in French theatrical culture both in Russia and abroad. 'In the half century ending in 1825 theatre was one of the chief forms of public entertainment in Russia, particularly in St Petersburg'.¹³⁶ There was a French theatre in operation in St Petersburg but the life-writers do not reveal if they went. Divova's husband was director of the French troupe at the Hermitage Theatre and so it is very likely that she attended French theatrical performances in the imperial capital and perhaps even knew the French actors personally, but she makes no mention of this. During her stay in Paris, theatre was one of Divova's main amusements. She writes of seeing plays, operas and ballets and declares herself to be 'folle du théâtre de Paris' (41). She provides a list of new operas that she has seen during her Parisian stay, some of them several times, these including Jean-Baptiste Lully's *Proserpine* and *Psyché* (62-63). Turkestanova records her numerous visits to French theatrical productions on her travels across Congress Poland, the kingdoms and Grand Duchies of the German Confederation and the Kingdom of the Netherlands and recounts productions she saw including Nicolò's comic opera

¹³⁶ 'St Petersburg Actresses on and off Stage', p. 119.

Joconde, Eugène Scribe's vaudeville *Les deux précepteurs*, Molière's *Le Misanthrope* and Ballière de Laisement's opera *Le Rossignol* in Brussels (68, 69).

Turkestanova also shows that she appreciates French opera. She writes that she knows the music of French composer André Campra's *Tancrède*, which she saw several times on her travels, off by heart (87).

Unlike Divova and Turkestanova, Miatleva represents herself as acting in domestic theatrical productions. This is an instance of cultural transfer. French culture is played out in a Russian context, that is to say, French theatre is transplanted into Russia. It is performed by Russians, in a Russian home and to a Russian audience. Miatleva appropriates the French play by learning and perfecting her French theatrical role. She assimilates verbally and gestually the French characters she plays. This example of cultural transfer demonstrates the way in which Miatleva adopts a French cultural discourse and participates in French theatrical culture.

All three women represent themselves as experienced theatregoers and knowledgeable about the quality of the performances. They do not hesitate in their criticism, as the following example taken from Divova's text illustrates:

L'on se plaint que l'on crie beaucoup à l'Opéra français; moi-même, dont les oreilles n'étaient jamais habituées qu'à la musique italienne, la française, surtout chantée par Mlle Maillard me faisait mal et je me bouchais quelque fois les oreilles; mais en réfléchissant après, j'ai vu que les acteurs et les actrices de l'Opéra français ne pouvaient faire autrement que de crier, car les Italiens ne jouent pas l'opéra italien; ils sont sur la scène comme des bûches de bois et ne s'occupent que de leur chant. Mais les Français à l'Opéra jouent comme s'ils jouaient la tragédie, il vous arrachent des larmes par leur jeu. (61)

Like Divova, Turkestanova has a critical eye: ‘le soir spectacle; on a d’abord donné un prologue en musique pour exprimer la joie de voir l’Impératrice à Weymar, ensuite la tragédie de Mahomet.¹³⁷ J’ai trouvé que l’un ne cadrerait pas avec l’autre’ (91). Miatleva writes of having seen Henri Montan Berton’s opera *Françoise de Foix* in Russia: ‘opera nouveau assez intéressant musique de Berton insignifiante assez bien joué horriblement chantée’ (53). The life-writers depict themselves as familiar with and well-versed in French theatrical culture.

Art

Another element of French culture in which our life-writers participate is art. Miatleva and Turkestanova show themselves to be knowledgeable of French art and artists. Not only do they represent themselves as familiar with the artists and their works, but also as being able to offer a critique. Miatleva writes of her admiration for works by artists including Claude Vignon and Antoine-Jean Gros in Iusupov’s collection (54ob): ‘avec beaucoup de charlatanisme, les peintres françois produisent de l’effet surtout dans les portraits’ (55). Turkestanova goes to see an art exhibition in the town hall in Weimar and writes that amongst the best paintings was a Holy Family by French painter Nicolas Poussin (96). Miatleva and Turkestanova’s representation of their knowledge of and familiarity with French painting suggests that it was a subject in which they had acquired a degree of expertise.

¹³⁷ Voltaire, *Le fanatisme, ou Mahomet le prophete* (1741).

History

Turkestanova represents herself as taking an active interest in contemporary French and Russian history. She followed the events as they happened and remembers them well. She visits famous sites and landmarks from the Napoleonic wars, including the bridge near Kovno, in modern-day Lithuania, where Napoleon crossed the Neiman (14), the site of Field Marshal Mikhail Fedotovitch Kamenskii's flight at the Battle of Pultusk (17), the house in Tilsit where the peace treaty was signed in 1807 between Imperial Russia and the French Empire (112) and the site of the battle of Waterloo (74). Turkestanova, who visits the auberge in Warsaw where Napoleon stayed on his return from the Battle of Berezina, is even able to quote him: 'Du sublime au ridicule il n'y a qu'un pas' (20). Although some of these visits were the result of travelling with Mariia Fedorovna, Turkestanova depicts herself as genuinely interested in the Napoleonic wars and enthusiastically determines to make the visits even when she is unwell: 'Vous pensez bien que je n'aurais pas voulu manquer cette partie, aussi pour en être ai-je laissé toutes mes médecines de côté' (74).

Divova's Representation of her Participation in Parisian Life

This section is concerned with Divova's representation of the ways in which she participated in Parisian life and culture during her stay in the French capital between 1802 and 1804. It examines her views and definitions of French culture and the extent of her integration into Parisian life as well as the socio-cultural bilingualism present in her text.

Divova came to Paris in order to enjoy herself, spend money and socialise with hospitable, cheerful and agreeable Parisians (76). She represents herself as participating in Parisian life with a view to creating a social reputation for herself. Divova's view of full participation in Parisian life involves cramming as many pleasurable activities into the day as possible:

Paris est une ville où chacun ne vit que pour soi et ses plaisirs [...] on voudrait les avoir tous et comment en trouver le moyen? Si la journée était de quatre-vingt-seize heures elle serait encore trop courte pour ceux qui courent après tous les plaisirs: boutiques, promenades, Champs-Élysées, Bois de Boulogne, Tuileries, Palais-Royal, Boulevard, partout où l'on doit se montrer, il faut voir tout cela, dîner à six heures, courir les spectacles, comment trouver le temps à tout? (46)

She writes that she lives as the French do. For Divova, participation in Parisian culture signifies circulating in literary circles, visiting museums, going to the theatre, going shopping, eating good food and being seen in all the right places:

Voulez-vous voir des gens de lettres? C'est à Paris. Voir toutes les anciennes choses de l'Italie? Au muséum de Paris. Des spectacles? Seize théâtres chaque jour! [...] Ajoutant à cela les Tuileries, les Champs-Élysées, les boulevards, le Palais-Royal. Tout cela plein de monde à pied, en cabriolets, en buggys; des déjeuners à la fourchette au Bois de Boulogne, des dîners chez tous les traiteurs. (48)

Divova's prime depiction of her participation in Parisian culture is her hedonistic behaviour as a social butterfly in social life. She describes her busy social calendar, her attendance at and hosting of many events and shows herself to delight in the hedonism of Parisian society. The pleasures she enjoys most require ample wealth and leisure time. She represents these pleasures as essential to

participating in Parisian life to a maximum and thus projects a self-indulgent image.

A further way Divova participates in Parisian life is by spending time at the French court and with Parisians in their own homes (44-45). She represents herself as fully integrated into its high-society inhabitants' everyday life and not as an outsider, a visiting foreigner, who would simply see the superficial surface of Parisian life. According to Divova, her landlady Madame de la Reynière loved her like a daughter and they both had keys to access each other's communicating rooms (78-79). She depicts herself as participating in life at the French court and as knowing the First Consul and his wife not only personally but well enough to be invited to their home (91-92). Divova thus represents herself at the core of Napoleon's realm and knowing the workings of French court life like a native. She feels at home in Paris: 'Je ne sais comment cela s'est fait, mais au bout de 3 mois de séjour à Paris, je me suis crue dans ma patrie' (125). What is more, she depicts herself as treated differently from other foreigners by attending social events to which foreigners were not ordinarily invited (51, 84, 92). Divova represents herself as an active participant at the heart of the Parisian social world who has knowledge of high society from the inside.

Divova depicts a double experience of Parisian life, however, one positive and one negative. She represents the same cultural reality in contrasting ways. Although Divova shows her enthusiastic participation in and integration into the enchanting, hedonistic Parisian social world, she also paints quite a contradictory and dreary picture of her experience of Parisian social life in which she feels used

and lonely. She laments Parisian selfishness and detachment: ‘je suis forcée de convenir que mon coeur et mon âme y [in Paris] ont souffert bien des fois. Je ne puis me faire à l’idée qu’on ne vienne chez vous que pour s’amuser, qu’on ne pense pas à vous quand on croit que vous êtes seule’ (47). She experiences two versions of the same reality. Divova’s double and contrasting experience of Parisian life is an example of socio-cultural bilingualism as Clément defines it.

Although Divova places much emphasis on her integration into Parisian life and living like a native, she also emphasises Parisian difference and her participation in Parisian life as an outsider. She shows herself to be culturally aware in that she draws attention to what she considers to be out of the norm: ‘l’on déjeune à Paris à midi à la fourchette (ce n’est que la soupe qui manque pour faire un dîner de ces déjeuners-là); car l’on n’y dine qu’à six heures’ (82). She further comments that Parisians, and particularly the women, dance differently at balls (118) and represents her surprise at the way the Parisians heat their houses stating that the Russian system is superior (58). Divova shows by these observations that she is not well-versed in Parisian daily life and suggests that it is not natural to her but that she has adopted these habits because she is in Paris.

Enthusiasm for French life, it seems, did not bring Divova to serious sympathy for Catholicism. She views Roman Catholic religious services as a visitor to Paris. She takes a very light-hearted approach to the first mass sung at Notre Dame since the Revolution:

Ce qui m’a bien amusée encore, c’est de voir tous les généraux républicains en grande tenue obligés d’écouter bien attentivement toute la messe sans y mettre le moindre intérêt; presque tous ceux que je

connaissais n'avaient pas l'air ni la manière bien chrétien de s'exprimer sur la religion. (95-96)

The main interest of this event for Divova is not the historic public revival of Catholicism but the cachet of closeness to power as she watches the celebration from Joséphine Bonaparte's viewing gallery (94). Divova does not, therefore, represent herself as participating in Parisian life and culture at its profoundest level.

Conclusions

This section has revealed the numerous aspects of French culture of which Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova display knowledge and in which they participate. It has shown that Miatleva and Turkestanova, who are well-versed in French theatre and art, are able to gain knowledge of and participate in the French arts from a distance. In Miatleva's case, cultural transfer occurs as she represents herself performing French plays in a Russian context. While the life-writers demonstrate a good grasp of French cultural discourse in the domain of the arts, these are only external and superficial aspects of French culture.

It is perhaps surprising, therefore, that Divova, who recounts her time spent in the French capital, also principally depicts herself as participating in superficial aspects of the culture, that is to say Parisian social life and theatrical culture. For Divova's textual self, Paris is not about French culture *per se* but the pleasures of social events and high society. Although she did socialise with Parisians in their homes and experienced French everyday life at first hand, she

only emphasises the fact that she was on close terms with those concerned rather than details of their everyday typically French activities that she may have participated in or known about. Divova's motto appears to be 'when in Rome do as the Romans do'. As a pleasure seeker and social climber, she participates in Parisian culture when she will be able to derive some benefit from it. She uses Parisian cultural discourse as a means to an end, and secondarily, she represents herself as not entirely integrated. Even with all the knowledge she has of the inner workings of Parisian society, she does not participate in Parisian life at its most profound level or adopt the cultural discourse as a way of life. Divova only submerges herself in French life as far as it suits her purposes. She goes through the external motions, but incongruously does not ultimately share the hedonistic cultural values, which is revealed by the presence of socio-cultural bilingualism in her text.

It can be seen, therefore, that although the life-writers represent themselves as having a thorough knowledge of certain external manifestations of French culture, they do not involve themselves at any profound level. Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova confine their engagement in French culture to material aspects related to social life. Although their mastery of the French language allows them access to many elements of French culture, they demonstrate no spiritual affinity with it. They do not represent themselves as entirely French by culture. Even Divova, who depicts herself as living like a native, ultimately approaches French culture as an outsider, adapting herself to Parisian life

according to desire and perceived necessity. Nevertheless, all three life-writers are fluent in aspects of French cultural discourse.

Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's Participation in Russian Culture

This section is concerned with Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's representation of their knowledge of and participation in Russian culture, whether from a distance or in Russia itself. Following evidence in the texts, it examines their religious devotion, superstition, property rights, use of the Julian calendar, interaction with serfs and views on serfdom, participation in Russian theatrical culture and special attention will be accorded to Turkestanova's sense of cultural awareness. Where appropriate, I consider cultural transfer. This section demonstrates in what ways these women represent themselves as being Russian by culture. Divova will receive restricted attention in this section due to the fact that she makes very little mention of her knowledge of or participation in Russian culture in her *Journal et souvenirs*, which again is likely to be attributable to the fact that she writes about her Parisian sojourn and had no reason to refer to Russian culture.

Despite the fact that Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova write in French, a Russian cultural layer is visible in their life-writings. The life-writers' Russian cultural roots are evident in the French-language texts. In the expression of their Russian cultural identities, their francophone linguistic identity is of secondary importance.

Religion

Both Turkestanova and Miatleva represent their participation in Russian culture by their depiction of their religious identity as devout Orthodox believers. External manifestations of religious belief, such as crossing oneself, are characteristic of the Orthodox faith.¹³⁸ Miatleva exclaims in her diary that when she attended the Vespers service she did not see a single person present cross themselves (88ob). The fact that she records this indicates that she sees the sign of the cross as an appropriate and obligatory expression of devotion and that it was surprising and out of the norm that it was not performed by everyone present. Turkestanova demonstrates her personal devotion by private prayer in her personal oratory in St Petersburg: ‘pleine d’un sentiment de joie et de reconnaissance envers la Providence, pour m’avoir ramenée dans mes foyers, la première chose que je fis fut d’aller à mon oratoire pour Lui rendre mes actions de grâces’ (116). Icon corners were common in the main room in noble houses as well as in bedrooms.¹³⁹

Turkestanova represents her Orthodox identity when she regrets not being able to celebrate her saint’s day in the way that she is accustomed to do with the Littas (100). In Orthodoxy, saint day celebrations are more important than birthday celebrations. Furthermore, she is very enthusiastic in her wishes to Countess Litta and other Catherines of their mutual acquaintance when it is her saint’s day:

¹³⁸ Janet M. Hartley, *A Social History of the Russian Empire, 1650-1825* (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 236, 242.

¹³⁹ Hartley, p. 237.

C'est aujourd'hui votre fête, m-me la comtesse; j'ai bu à votre santé, je vous ai souhaité tout le bonheur qu'on peut avoir-ici bas [sic], et pour moi la continuation de votre amitié. Vous aurez la bonté de dire à Catherine Ribeaupierre que je ne l'ai pas oublié et à m-me Samoïlow que sa fille et moi avons fait chorus pour son compte. (93)

Miatleva and Turkestanova further highlight their participation in Russian religious culture by their depiction of Easter and Christmas celebrations. Miatleva records her intensive timetable of religious activities in the week leading up to Easter, the most important celebration in the Russian Church, beginning with her prayers and devotions and ending with a service in a chapel created for that purpose in her house on the Saturday evening and the visits the family received on Easter day itself. According to ancient tradition painted eggs are given and received at Easter in Russia and Miatleva depicts herself spending time painting eggs with her children (46-48). The Christmas celebration is also a major part of Russian culture. Turkestanova depicts herself as pursuing her religious observance in a foreign context which demonstrates great devotion to her faith. She celebrates Orthodox Christmas on 25 December 1818 in Frombrok in Northern Poland: 'c'est le jour de Noël, point de messe nulle part. Pour nous dédommager, le marquis Paulucci a fait chercher un prêtre de regiment qui a chanté un *Te-Deum*; tous les orthodoxes se sont rassemblés pour l'écouter'(114). This is an example of cultural transfer. An Orthodox church service is performed in a foreign context, in Poland in the latter case and in Prussia in the following. Special arrangements are made for Mariia Fedorovna to enable her to worship and Turkestanova participates as a member of the travelling party: 'messe à Potsdam dans une chapelle que le roi avait fait arranger tout exprès à cette intention; le

prêtre de la mission russe la desservit avec les chantres d'un de nos régiments qui se trouvait en marche' (105-106).

Turkestanova indirectly represents her Orthodox identity when she comments on visiting Catholic and Protestant religious buildings as a tourist (9). She describes the convent of the Order of the Sisters of Saint Elizabeth at Prague as living up perfectly to the romantic ideas that she has always cultivated about Catholic convents (36). Turkestanova depicts these places as exotic and not as places of worship. Both women represent their participation in Russian culture to be of a profound religious nature.

Julian Calendar

Turkestanova and Divova demonstrate their participation in Russian culture by their observance of the Julian calendar. In 1818, Orthodox Christmas Eve fell 13 days later than Catholic and Protestant Christmas Eve and accordingly on 13 December 1818, Turkestanova informs her addressees in St Petersburg that it is Christmas Eve in Berlin (106). Divova also shows herself to observe the Julian calendar when she represents herself as celebrating Russian New Year in Paris by holding a ball (54). The life-writers' representation of their observance of this calendar in a foreign context shows the extent to which it played a significant role in their lives.

Superstition

Miatleva depicts herself as being of a superstitious nature. The Russians were reputed for their superstitiousness and calendrical predictions and divination were particularly common at the time of important religious feasts. New-Year fortune telling was part of the culture of celebration¹⁴⁰ and in her diary entry on New Year's Eve in 1810, Miatleva represents herself as participating in Russian culture by her belief in omens and prognostics based on what she depicts as a bad omen:

après le dîner nous avons encore eu réppettition du Barbier et j'ai très mal imaginé de la faire dans la chambre rouge, car j'y ai gagné un torticoli affreux, en rentrant dans le salon je ne pouvais plus remuer et j'en ai beaucoup souffert; c'est mal commencer mon année et cela promet tout plein de désagremens. Dieu veuille me les épargner! (13)

She interprets the stiff neck as a sign of impending misfortune for the year to come. Miatleva does not represent herself as perceiving the contradiction between her superstitious tendencies and her observance of the rituals of the Orthodox Church, two seemingly incompatible cultural discourses within Russian culture. She simultaneously embraces these ethic and moral and irrational belief systems.

Property Ownership

One of the principal images of self that Miatleva depicts in her diary is that of female property owner, a specifically Russian identity. Following an act of legislation in 1753, 'women could own and dispose of property separately from

¹⁴⁰ W. F. Ryan, *The Bathhouse at Midnight: An Historical Survey of Magic and Divination in Russia* (Stroud: Sutton, 1999), p. 131.

their husbands'¹⁴¹ and without their husband's consent. 'They became 'active participants in the market for land and serfs and controlled as much as a third of the estates in private hands on the eve of Emancipation.'¹⁴² This legal privilege enjoyed by Russian noblewomen was an advantage virtually unknown to their counterparts in Western Europe.¹⁴³ Miatleva represents property as a prime topic of conversation with her female friend:

hier j'ai trouvé la psse/ Boris [illegible] et nous avons beaucoup parlé de Богородской, elle a encore augmenté le désir que j'ai de l'acheter [...] j'ai d'autant plus envie d'avoir cette terre que tout y est prêt, il n'y a que s'y transporter (14ob-15)

She frequently writes of her intentions to buy and sell property:

nous venons de recevoir une réponse de notre homme de Kypck, il paraît que la terre est en mauvais état. j'en suis moins fâchée aprésent ayant en tête d'acheter une terre que Mr/ Démidoff vend à Volodimir de 2000. paysans et qui sera beaucoup plus à notre portée que l'autre puisqu'elle n'est qu'à 200. verstes au plus (72ob)

She represents herself as having female competition in negotiations for property purchase, but she does not always depict herself as visiting the places and carrying out the negotiations herself. She writes that she sends agents on her behalf: 'Ce matin Бабров [?] est revenu d'une campagne où je l'avais envoyé pour la voir. je la trouve trop chere et Mde de Broglie la marchande ainsi nous en sommes revenues tout à fait.' (57ob). She depicts herself as looking on her estates

¹⁴¹ Michelle Lamarche Marrese, *A Woman's Kingdom: Noblewomen and the Control of Property in Russia, 1700-1861* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 1, 52.

¹⁴² Michelle Lamarche Marrese, 'The Enigma of Married Women's Control of Property in Eighteenth-Century Russia' in *Russian Review*, 58, 3 (1999), pp. 380-395 (p. 381).

¹⁴³ *A Woman's Kingdom*, p. 1. For an overview of the situation in France see Adrienne Rogers, 'Women and the Law' in *French Women and the Age of the Enlightenment*, ed. by Samia I. Spencer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), pp. 33-48.

as a source of revenue which are to be readily sold (30ob-31ob). Miatleva depicts her participation in Russian culture as having a practical dimension.

Serfdom

By their interaction with serfs and defence of serfdom, Miatleva and Turkestanova respectively represent themselves as participating in and showing knowledge of Russian culture. Serfdom was a specifically Russian cultural feature. Miatleva represents herself as responsible for signing a large number of release papers for the serfs that her husband does not wish to appear on the next census (88ob). She also recounts her serfs bringing the family a large quantity of bread (45). Miatleva depicts herself as attentive to her baby daughter Varvara's nanny, Mariia Semenovna. She is concerned both about her health and her being able to participate in the Easter service from a different room despite her childcare responsibilities (47ob). Once again she shows her participation in Russian culture to be of a practical nature. In Brussels, Turkestanova endeavours to defend Russian serfdom to a critical aide-de-camp who fought in Russia during the Napoleonic wars:

dans les principes du monde les plus liberaux; il [the aide-de-camp] m'amusa infiniment. Je tâchai de lui prouver que nos paysans (serfs comme il les appelle) sont bien plus heureux que d'autres, et je le démontrai si bien que le gouverneur [Vander Burch] et sa femme se rangèrent de mon côté. (70)

As lady-in-waiting to Mariia Fedorovna, Turkestanova is representing the Russian Empire in an official role and so it is her duty to defend and promote Russian

culture. She depicts herself as fully believing what she says, however, and as having a reasoned knowledge of the subject matter.

Theatre

Turkestanova is the only one of the life-writers to depict herself as participating in Russian theatrical culture. She represents herself as going to see Russian theatrical productions in St Petersburg and writes that the rendition of Campra's *Tancredi* she saw in Weimar reminded her of the Russian opera *Mel'nik* from the time of the 1777 St Petersburg floods (92). She is undoubtedly referring to Aleksandr Onisimovich Ablesimov's comic opera *Mel'nik – koldun, obmanshchik i svat*.

Turkestanova's Representation of her Cultural Awareness

Confronted with foreign alterity, Turkestanova represents her sense of Russian cultural awareness and identity as being heightened. At court in Weimar, for example, she depicts her participation in Russian court life by drawing attention to what she considers to be out of the norm by her representation of her surprise at the customs there:

Ici on fait comme à Dresde: dès que le grand-duc et son épouse sont à leurs tables de jeu, tous les assistants vont l'un après l'autre faire leur révérence à ces augustes personnages; lorsque je vis qu'on s'en allait la faire gravement à l'Impératrice, je pensais en tomber de rire. Néanmoins, pour ne pas me singulariser, j'ai été saluer la vieille grande-duchesse, mais je n'ai jamais eu le courage de répéter ma révérence à l'Impératrice; je sens que je n'eusse pu l'envisager sans lui rire au nez [...]. (90)

She shows herself to be objective about foreign landscape, buildings and towns (96), but her comments about them more often than not lead to her evocation of the Russian equivalent:

L'entrée de Stuttgart a été triomphe, s'il en fut jamais; une illumination qui ne cédait en rien à celle de Peterhoff; une magnificence au château qui, je vous l'avoue, m'a fait tomber les bras; c'est bien plus beau que notre cher palais d'Hiver (j'en accepte l'Hermitage). Il n'y a pas de salle comme S-t George, mais il y en a de très-belles [...]. (42)

She represents being abroad, and especially as an unwilling traveller, as unceasingly leading her mind back to Russia and particularly to Moscow and to St Petersburg (36, 49, 96) for which, she states, she will always have a marked preference despite the weather (78). She shows herself to experience great pleasure on occasions when she meets compatriots on her travels (62) and represents herself as having a profound sense of attachment to her homeland and as being overcome with joy on her return:

Je n'en croyais pas mes yeux en traversant les rues; quoiqu'il fit pas trop clair, j'avais baissé la glace pour ne rien perdre des objets qui s'offraient à ma vue, et lorsque j'aperçus le palais d'hiver, je pensai m'élancer hors de la portière.' (115-116)

By using Russian reality as a benchmark for comparison, Turkestanova represents a thorough knowledge of Russian culture whilst through her presentation of her attachment to Russian life and her homeland, she depicts a strong sense of cultural awareness and national belonging.

Conclusions

This section has demonstrated a layer of Russian cultural discourse within Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's French-language texts. Miatleva, Turkestanova and, to a lesser extent, Divova all represent themselves as possessing knowledge of and participating actively in elements of Russian culture. Miatleva's and Turkestanova's knowledge of and participation in Russian culture is principally shown to lie in religious, practical and domestic spheres of life and Turkestanova's also in court life. They represent themselves as being involved in Russian culture at a profound level. Their Orthodox faith is represented as being very important to them as well as other beliefs, namely superstitions and the justice of serfdom. Miatleva's day-to-day practical life involving non-nobles and financial transactions also occupies much space in her representation of her participation in Russian culture.

We can infer that their mastery of the Russian language allows Miatleva and Turkestanova full access to Russian religious life, while it allows Miatleva to interact with her serfs and carry out negotiations for property purchase. A command of the Russian language would also enable Turkestanova to understand Russian theatre productions.

This section has shown that Miatleva and Turkestanova's texts are heteroglot by their representation of themselves as adopting several cultural discourses within Russian culture. The fact that Divova recounts the years she spent in Paris and her circulating largely in French society explains the absence of references to her participation in Russian culture. As an unwilling traveller and

representative of the Russian Empire, Turkestanova, on the other hand, shows her mind as never far from her homeland. She represents herself as highly culturally aware. This section has also demonstrated cultural transfer and the contradiction that exists between Miatleva's religious beliefs and superstition but which she does not depict herself as perceiving. Miatleva and Turkestanova represent themselves as Russian by culture in religious, practical and domestic spheres of life.

General Conclusions

This chapter has revealed the representation of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's French and Russian cultural multiplicity as a third element of the plural subjectivities that they depict in their life-writings. It has demonstrated the life-writers' knowledge of and participation in various elements of French and Russian culture, that is to say the arts and everyday life, and has shown all three women's cultural bilingualism.

French and Russian cultural discourses in the life-writings under consideration behave in the same way as social discourses in Bakhtinian heteroglossia. Clément's extension of Bakhtin's conception of heteroglossia to incorporate a cross-cultural situation is, therefore, applicable to Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts and the application of her method of analysis and my own modifications to that method which cater for the specificity of the texts under consideration, have revealed the life-writers' cultural bilingualism and

shown instances of cultural transfer and socio-cultural bilingualism as well as contradictory cultural discourses within Russian culture.

The life-writers do not, however, show the same degree of cultural bilingualism and cultural multiplicity. Bearing in mind I examine textual representations and not biographical information, Divova represents the least cultural multiplicity. All the cultural subjectivities she depicts are related to externals, such as social occasions. She does, however, show herself to be culturally aware insofar as she perceives differences between the Parisian and her habitual way of life and tries her best to live Parisian life like a native. She represents her cultural bilingualism as limited by her depiction of her participating for the most part in French culture although this is perhaps not surprising as she writes about her time in the French capital. Miatleva and Turkestanova, who depicts herself as the most culturally aware of the three women, represent a greater degree of cultural multiplicity and bilingualism and show that it was possible to access French culture without actually being on French soil. They demonstrate the interaction of two different cultures within their texts which is represented as being the result of the infiltration of French culture into Russian noble culture in matters of social life and the arts.

It is clear, however, that Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova do not adopt the same discourses in both French and Russian culture. Turkestanova's depiction of her knowledge of and participation in both French and Russian theatrical culture excepted, the life-writers display their knowledge of and participation in differing spheres of the two cultures. The life-writers' representation of their

knowledge of and participation in French culture is connected to the social sphere and the arts while that of Russian culture is represented as based on religious, practical and everyday foundations. Different social contexts are depicted as imposing different cultural discourses. The life-writers do not, therefore, represent themselves as either exclusively French or Russian by culture, but rather as bicultural. Although they demonstrate knowledge of and participation in the French culture, ultimately, none of them represents herself as being entirely uprooted from her native soil despite using the language of another culture.

Paradoxically the life-writers write about their knowledge of and participation in Russian culture in French and Turkestanova writes in French about something Polish, German or Dutch and compares it to something Russian. It could be argued that language is one of the most significant external signs of cultural participation which renders the life-writers' expression of their Russian cultural subjectivities problematic. Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova do not, however, depict themselves as perceiving this contradiction or as suffering from it. This indicates that all three women are indeed bicultural. This chapter has shown, therefore, that the use of the French language, far from suppressing the presence of Russian cultural discourse in the texts, bears witness to the life-writers' cultural bilingualism. Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova represent their relationship with the French language and culture as unproblematic, that is to say they represent no conflict between their French and Russian cultural selves. Their cultural bilingualism allows them to generate polysemic meanings from a

deceptively monolingual (French-language) narrative and produces a depiction of cross-cultural identities.

Conclusions

This study has examined the plural subjectivities of Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova as represented in their life-writings. It remedies a paucity of research concerning plural identities in Russian women's francophone life-writing by considering texts written in a cross-cultural context. In this respect, Nussbaum's theory of gendered interdiscourses, Bakhtinian heteroglossia, Clément's extension of heteroglossia and my modifications to that extension proved productive in their application to the texts under consideration and revealed the multiple discourses adopted by the life-writers and their associated subjectivities. In Chapter One, the focus was on gendered subjectivities and the addressees' influence on self-representation. Chapter Two explored the life-writers' linguistic identity, whilst the third chapter examined their cultural identity. The analysis revealed all three life-writers' representation of their cultural bilingualism as well as Miatleva's and Turkestanova's representation of their literary and spoken bilingualism. In this study, bilingualism is not limited to national languages, but is equally applicable to the expression of different subject positions within one culture and of discourses relating to different national cultures.

What makes this study innovative is its examination of both the textual representation of plural subjectivities in Russian women's francophone life-writing from the early nineteenth century and the cross-cultural angle from which it approaches the texts. While previous studies have been made of plural identity in Russian women's life-writing, they neither focus specifically on French-

language texts nor take into consideration their specific linguistic and cultural dimension. This dissertation adds to the current pool of knowledge through its focus on contradictory and inconsistent gendered subjectivities and offers a new approach to, and understanding of, francophone Russian women's self-representation in life-writings by analysing them from linguistic and cultural perspectives. It has further shown that Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova represent themselves as bicultural, a concept which refers not only to their self-representation of being both French and Russian by culture, but also to the adoption of different gendered subjectivities within Russian noble culture.

The analysis has demonstrated the importance of the role played by culture in the representation of the life-writers' plural subjectivities, whether that be the culture of the contemporary Russian noble society, or French and Russian culture. The content of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts makes it clear that biculturalism can take many different forms. Their biculturalism is complex and multidimensional and the life-writers adopt more than one cultural profile in various ways. The texts depict individual versions of biculturalism, that is to say Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova represent themselves as shifting their cultural identities according to the social or cultural situation in which they find themselves.

It is striking that Divova represents herself as culturally but not linguistically bilingual, as language is an important part of culture. She places much emphasis on self-promotion in general and yet does not comment on her linguistic accomplishments, which contrasts not only with the other texts under

consideration, but also with Russian women's francophone texts in general where language figures prominently. This could be attributed, of course, to her depiction of herself trying to live like a native Parisian and Parisian subject matter, and so it is possible that she considered descriptions and representations of the use of anything other than French language and culture unnecessary. On a superficial level, Divova's text gives few clues to her cultural bilingualism, but the representation of Parisian difference in everyday, domestic matters, and therefore of her cultural awareness, is revealing in the context of the harmonious coexistence of two cultures in her writing, the French culture concerning arts and the social sphere and the Russian culture concerning everyday, domestic life.

Miatleva's representation of the coexistence of two national cultures in her life is particularly interesting, as she is the only life-writer under consideration who remained in Russia while she kept her diary. This confirms that the French language and its associated culture had indeed penetrated deeply into Russian everyday life and that the adoption of the French language and popularity of French arts and social custom was not simply a result of being abroad at a time when French was the *lingua franca*.

Turkestanova represents not only the most linguistic bilingualism, but also the most cultural bilingualism. She also shows herself to be the most culturally aware of the three women. Even though she places more emphasis on her preference for, and attachment to, Russia and everything Russian than the other life-writers, she does not reject French culture. On the contrary, she engages herself in the same way as Divova and Miatleva in French social custom and the

arts. Turkestanova's case is interesting insofar as it shows that one can express an intense sense of belonging to one's homeland and still represent the prevalence of a foreign culture in particular aspects of life, which once again serves to emphasise the curiously unproblematic coexistence of French and Russian culture in Russian life.

The analysis has revealed French to be Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's dominant tongue overall, but French and Russian are represented as having different uses in different contexts. French is depicted as the life-writers' dominant language when displaying accomplishments, conforming with epistolary etiquette and in social and official public life, while Russian is shown to be employed in religious and domestic contexts, that is to say in situations where it is obligatory for cultural reasons. The investigation of the life-writers' participation in the French and Russian cultures has shown that while French cultural and linguistic influences had infiltrated Russia and its culture to a large extent, the Russian language and culture are nevertheless represented as occupying an important place in the lives of Miatleva and Turkestanova, whose knowledge of and participation in Russian culture lies, like the use of the language, in the religious and domestic spheres of life. None of the three life-writers represents herself as either exclusively French or Russian by culture. Miatleva and Turkestanova display literary and spoken bilingualism while all three life-writers display cultural bilingualism. The findings indicate that there were clear social, linguistic and cultural codes within the Russian nobility to which the life-writers subscribed.

One of the most interesting features of Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's texts is the way in which the French and Russian cultures are represented as coexisting in their lives in an unproblematic way. In fact, the life-writers do not comment on this apparently unusual and striking element of their writing, which indicates that it was the norm. Each culture is depicted as having a very defined place in their lives. The life-writers represent a clear divide between the French and Russian cultural spheres of influence, and while there is no contradiction within these spheres (excepting Miatleva's representation of herself as both a devout Orthodox believer and superstitious), there is an apparent contradiction between them which the life-writers do not depict themselves as perceiving. French cultural influence is represented as having a worldly dimension, lying within the social sphere and the arts, while Russian cultural influence is represented as having a religious and domestic dimension. Despite the fact that French was the language of culture, the extent to which French culture was accorded a privileged place in the Russian nobility seems unnecessary due to the fact that Russia had its own culture, and rather than concentrate on developing this culture to put it on a par with other Western European cultures, this situation was officially sanctioned and encouraged by several successive monarchs.

The life-writers represent themselves as being no less Russian by culture because they write in French. Divova's, Miatleva's and Turkestanova's cultural bilingualism is represented as a product of their social position. Writing in French as a Russian woman is therefore represented as a result of culture.

It is not possible to make a clear statement about whether or not Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova can be considered to be representative of Russian francophone women in general. As far as language is concerned, they represent two differing models. Divova represents herself as monolingual in French, while Miatleva and Turkestanova portray themselves as bilingual in French and Russian and capable of manipulating English and Italian. Despite the diverse nature of the life-writings and the situations in which they were composed, there is commonality. All three women represent themselves to a lesser or greater degree as culturally bilingual and they depict their knowledge of and participation in the same spheres of French and Russian culture. This suggests that they can be taken as representative of Russian francophone women from this period, especially in view of the fact that other life-writers not considered in this study represent similar models of cultural participation in their texts. It is necessary, of course, to bear in mind that this study has focused on textual representations of self rather than on biographical information, and so generalisations should not be based on this material as there is no guarantee of its veracity. The same analysis applied to biographical information would undoubtedly have yielded different results and shown a greater degree of bilingualism, particularly in the case of Divova. However, the dearth of biographical material available means that such a study would in all probability have been generally much less fruitful.

This dissertation has demonstrated the plural nature of the subjectivities of Divova, Miatleva and Turkestanova. Far from having one static subjectivity and a unitary, essential sense of identity, the life-writers, within the specific historical

context of the early nineteenth-century Russian nobility, represent themselves as having multiple subjectivities on the basis of the different gendered, linguistic and cultural positions they occupy. Although the life-writers' depiction of their plural subjectivities is influenced by a complex array of factors, those subjectivities are largely represented as lying within pre-coded cultural discourses. Culture is shown to be key. It shapes the life-writers' self-representation and gives it meaning.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Dashkova, Ekaterina Romanovna, *The Memoirs of Princess Dashkova*, ed. and trans. by Kyril Fitzlyon (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995)

Divova, Elizaveta Petrovna, *Journal et souvenirs de Madame Divoff*, ed. by Sergei Nikolaevich Kaznakov (Paris, 1929)

Kern, Anna Petrovna, *Iz vospominanii o moem detstve in Vospominaniia, dnevniki, perepiska* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1974).

Miatleva, Praskov'ia Ivanovna, *Dnevnik ee 1810g dekabr' 10 1813 ianvar' 30*, IRLI, f. 196 – 48

Turkestanova, Varvara Illin'ichna, *Journal tenu par la princesse Barbe Tourkestanow demoiselle d'honneur de sa Majesté l'Impératrice Maria Fedorowna 1818 (Lettres adressées au comte et à la comtesse de Litta)*, ed. by M. Katkov (Moscow: Imprimerie de l'université Impériale, 1884)

Vorontsov, Aleksandr Romanovich, *Kniaz'*, *Notice sur ma vie et les événements différents qui se sont passés tant en Russie qu'en Europe pendant ce tems-là* in *Arkhiv Kniazia Vorontsova. Kniga piatia. Bumagi Grafa Aleksandra Romanovicha Vorontsova. Chast' pervaiia* (Moscow, 1872)

Wilmot, Martha and Catherine, *The Russian Journals of Martha and Catherine Wilmot*, ed. by the Marchioness of Londonderry and H. M. Hyde (London: Macmillan, 1934)

Secondary Sources

General Reference

Benveniste, Émile, *Problèmes de linguistique générale* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966)

Glagoleva, Olga E., 'Imaginary World: Reading in the Lives of Russian Provincial Noblewomen (1750-1825)' in *Women and Gender in 18th-Century Russia*, ed. by Wendy Rosslyn (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 129-146

Hartley, Janet M., *A Social History of the Russian Empire, 1650-1825* (London: Longman, 1999)

- Haumant, Émile, *La culture française en Russie, 1700-1900* (Paris: Hachette, 1913)
- Kelly, Catriona, 'Educating Tat'yana: Manners, Motherhood and Moral Education (*Vospitanie*), 1760-1840' in *Gender in Russian History and Culture*, ed. by Linda Edmondson (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 1-28
- Lamarche Marrese, Michelle, 'The Enigma of Married Women's Control of Property in Eighteenth-Century Russia' in *Russian Review*, 58, 3 (1999), pp. 380-395
- . *A Woman's Kingdom: Noblewomen and the Control of Property in Russia, 1700-1861* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002)
- Marker, Gary, *Publishing, Printing, and the Origins of Intellectual Life in Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985)
- Pushkareva, Natal'ia L., 'Russian Noblewomen's education in the Home as Revealed in Late 18th- and Early 19th-Century Memoirs' in Rosslyn, ed., pp. 111-128
- Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeevich, *Evgenii Onegin*,
<<http://www.rvb.ru/pushkin/01text/04onegin/01onegin/0836.htm?start=0&length=all>> [accessed 24 August 2009]
- Rogers, Adrienne, 'Women and the Law' in *French Women and the Age of the Enlightenment*, ed. by Samia I. Spencer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), pp. 33-48
- Rogger, Hans *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960)
- Rosslyn, Wendy, 'St Petersburg Actresses on and off Stage (1755-1825)' in *St Petersburg, 1703-1825*, ed. by Anthony Cross (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 119-148
- Ryan, W. F., *The Bathhouse at Midnight: An Historical Survey of Magic and Divination in Russia* (Stroud: Sutton, 1999)
- Tosi, Alessandra, *Waiting for Pushkin: Russian Fiction in the Reign of Alexander I (1800-1825)* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006)

Heteroglossia

- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich, 'Discourse in the Novel' in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. by Michael Holquist and trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982), pp. 259-422
- Clément, Murielle Lucie, 'Andreï Makine. Présence de l'absence: une poétique de l'art (photographie, cinéma, musique)', (doctoral thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2008),
<http://www.lulu.com/items/volume_63/1398000/1398631/4/print/1398631.pdf> [accessed 31 March 2009]
- Dentith, Simon, *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader* (London: Routledge, 1995)
- Henderson, Mae Gwendolyn, 'Speaking in Tongues: Dialogics, Dialectics, and the Black Woman Writer's Literary Tradition' in *Women, Autobiography, Theory: A Reader*, ed. by Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson (Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 1998), pp. 343-351
- Lionnet, Françoise, *Autobiographical Voices: Race, Gender, Self-Portraiture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989)
- . 'The Politics and Aesthetics of Métissage' in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 325-336
- Séllei, Nóra, 'A Hungarian New Woman Writer and a Hybrid Autobiographical Subject: Magrit Kaffka's 'Lyrical Notes of a Year'' in *New Woman Hybridities: Femininity, Feminism and International Consumer Culture, 1880-1930*, ed. by Ann Heilmann and Margaret Beetham (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 35-49

Life-Writing

- Benstock, Shari, ed., *The Private Self: Theory and Practice of Women's Autobiographical Writings* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988)
- Brodzki Bella and Celeste Schenck, eds., *Life/Lines: Theorizing Women's Autobiography* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988)
- Gusdorf, Georges, 'Conditions and Limits of Autobiography', trans. by James Olney in *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*, ed. by James Olney (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 28-48

- Jelinek Estelle, ed., *Women's Autobiography: Essays in Criticism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980)
- Lejeune, Philippe, *L'Autobiographie en France* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2004)
- . 'How Do Diaries End?' *Biography*, 24, 1 (2001), pp. 99-112
- Lejeune, Philippe and Catherine Viollet, eds., *Autobiographies* (Paris: Place, 2001)
- Marcus, Laura, *Auto/biographical Discourses: Theory, Criticism, Practice* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994)
- Nussbaum, Felicity A., 'Eighteenth-century Women's Autobiographical Commonplaces' in Benstock, ed., pp. 147-171
- . 'The Politics of Subjectivity and The Ideology of Genre' in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 160-167
- . 'Toward Conceptualizing Diary' in *Studies in Autobiography*, ed. by James Olney (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 128-140
- Paperno, Irina, 'What Can Be Done with Diaries?', *Russian Review* 63 (2004), pp. 561-573
- Rendall, Steven, 'On Diaries', *Diaretics*, 16, 3 (1986), pp. 57-65
- Simonet-Tenant, Françoise, *L'écriture de la vie. Le journal intime genre littéraire et écriture ordinaire* (Paris: Téraèdre, 2004)
- Smith, Sidonie and Julia Watson, 'Introduction: Situating Subjectivity in Women's Autobiographical Practices' in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 3-52
- Stanford Friedman, Susan, 'Women's Autobiographical Selves: Theory and Practice' in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 72-82
- Stanton, Domna C., 'Autogynography: Is the Subject Different?' in Smith and Watson, eds., pp. 131-144
- Viollet, Catherine, 'Petite cosmologie des écrits autobiographiques. Genèse et écriture de soi' in *Autobiographies*, pp. 37-55

Russian Women's Life-Writing

- Ahlbeck, Malin, 'Resistance Through Martyrdom? A Study of Russian Women's Early Autobiographical Writing' (master's dissertation, Abo Akademi University, 1999)
- Belova, Anna, 'Women's Letters and Russian Noble Culture of the Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries' in Rosslyn, ed., pp. 147-161
- Clyman, Toby W. and Judith Vowles, eds., *Russia through Women's Eyes: Autobiographies from Tsarist Russia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996)
- Heldt, Barbara, *Terrible Perfection: Women and Russian Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987)
- Rosslyn, Wendy, 'Self and Place in Life-writings by Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth-century Russian Noblewomen', forthcoming, *Slavonic and East European Review*, January 2010
- Savkina, Irina, "'Pishu sebja...": avtodokumental'nye zhenskies teksty v russkoi literature pervoi poloviny XIX veka' (doctoral thesis, University of Tampere, 1999)

Russian Women's Francophone Life-Writing

- Grechanaia, Elena, 'Avtobiograficheskie teksty rossiiskikh zhenshchin XVIII v. na frantsuzskom iazyke' in *Avtobiograficheskaia praktika v Rossii i vo Frantsii: sbornik statei*, ed. by Elena Grechanaia and Catherine Viollet, (Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2006) (typescript)
- . 'Les écrits autobiographiques des femmes russes du 18^e siècle rédigés en français', *Dix-huitième siècle*, 36 (2004), pp. 131-54
- . 'Fonctions des citations littéraires dans les albums féminins en Russie (fin XVIIIe/début XIXe siècles)' in *Lectrices d'Ancien Régime*, ed. by Isabelle Brouard-Arends (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003), pp. 431-439
- . 'Frantsuzskie teksty zhenshchin aristokraticeskogo kruga (konets XVIII-nachalo XIX v.) i vzaimodeistvie kul'tur', *Izvestiia AN. Seriiia literatury i iazyka*, 58, 1 (1999), pp. 33-44
- . *Literaturnoe vzaimovospriiatie Rossii i Frantsii v religioznom kontekste epokhi (1797-1825)* (Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2002)

- . ‘Mémoires et journaux intimes féminins rédigés en français dans le premier quart du XIXe siècle: aspects religieux et linguistiques’ in *Les Rencontres de l’Institut européen Est-Ouest. Premières rencontres*, <www.russie-europe.ens-Ish.fr/IMG/pdf/gretchanaia.pdf> [accessed 10 March 2008]
- Grechanaia, Elena and Catherine Viollet, ‘Dnevnik v Rossii v kontse XVIII – pervoi polovine XIX v. kak avtobiograficheskaia praktika’ in Grechanaia and Viollet, eds. (typescript)
- . ‘Dnevnik v Rossii v kontse XVIII-pervoi polovine XIX v. kak avtobiograficheskoe prostranstvo’, *Izvestiia AN. Serii literatury i iazyka*, 61, 3 (2002), pp. 18-36
- . ‘Journaux russes francophones du XIXe siècle: Espaces Littéraires’, *La Licorne Revue de langue de de littérature française. Le journal aux frontières de l’art*, 72 (2005), pp. 89-101
- . «*Si tu lis jamais ce journal...*» *Diaristes francophones Russes* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2008)
- Viollet, Catherine, ‘Aux frontières de la correspondance: journaux féminins de l’aristocratie russe (début de XIXe siècle)’, *Revue de l’AIRE*, 32 (2006), pp. 71-79
- . ‘Écritures parallèles. Journaux de voyage rédigés en français par de jeunes aristocrates russes, 1841-1847’ (typescript)
- . ‘Motivations et réticences chez les jeunes diaristes russes (XIXe siècle)’, *La Licorne*, 68 (2004), pp. 389-396

Russian Women’s Writing

- Golitsyn, Nikolai Nikolaevich, *Bibliograficheskii slovar’ russkikh pisatel’nit* (Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1974)
- Kelly, Catriona, *A History of Russian Women’s Writing 1820-1992* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Rosslyn, Wendy, *Anna Bunina (1774-1829) and the Origins of Women’s Poetry in Russia* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1997)
- . *Feats of Agreeable Usefulness: Translations by Russian Women 1763-1825* (Fichtenwalde: Verlag F. K. Göpfert, 2000)

Russian Francophone Writing

- Clément, Murielle Lucie, ed., *Écrivains franco-russes* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008)
- Gennadi, Grigorii Nikolaevich, *Les écrivains Franco-Russes. Bibliographie des ouvrages français publiés par des Russes* (Dresden: Blochmann, 1874)
- Grechanaia, Elena, 'Un brouillon de Valérie de Mme de Krüdener dans les archives de Moscou', *Dix-huitième siècle*, 32 (2000), pp. 343-350
- . 'Madame de Krüdener et la poésie (d'après ses archives inédites)', *Cahiers Roucher-André Chénier: Etudes sur la poésie du XVIIIe siècle*, 17 (1998), pp. 91-96
- Grechanaia, Elena, Francis Ley and Michel Mercier, *Autour de Valérie. Œuvres de Mme de Krüdener* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2007)
- Herold, Kelly, 'Russian Autobiographical Literature in French: Recovering a Memoiristic Tradition (1770-1830)', (doctoral thesis, UCLA, 1998)
- Lotman, Iurii, 'La littérature russe d'expression française XVIIIe-XIXe siècles' in *La littérature russe d'expression française*, ed. by Iurii Lotman and Viktor Rozentsveig (Vienna: Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, 1994), pp. 10-53
- Tosi, Alessandra, 'Women and Literature, Women in Literature: Female Authors of Fiction in the Early Nineteenth Century' in *Women in Russian Culture and Society, 1700-1825*, ed. by Wendy Rosslyn and Alessandra Tosi (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 39-62
- . 'Zinaïda Aleksandrovna Volkonskaïa' in Clément, ed., pp. 15–30

Biographical Information

Divova

<http://sophia.smith.edu/~aworonzovvm2/en/family_tree/pages/98.html>
[accessed 28 January 2009]

<<http://baza.vgd.ru/1/6821/>> [accessed 2 August 2009]

Miatleva

<<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/21741/p68737.htm?>> [accessed 28 January 2009]

<<http://www.directarticle.org/miatlev.pdf>> [accessed 28 January 2009]

<<http://baza.vgd.ru/1/29315/20.htm?o=&>> [accessed 3 August 2009]

Litta

<<http://www.lombardiabeniculturali.it/archivi/soggetti-produttori/famiglia/MIDD00010F/>> [accessed 31 July 2009]

<<http://www.batguano.com/vigeeart176.html>> [accessed 31 July 2009]

<<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/19346/p60811.htm?>> [accessed 31 July 2009]

<<http://www.russiameeting.it/articolo.php?cid=185&aid=154>> [accessed 31 July 2009]

<<http://www.mario-corti.com/press/>> [accessed 31 July 2009]

<<http://italian.ruvr.ru/main.php?lng=ita&q=68&cid=85&p=19.12.2006&pn=2>> [accessed 31 July 2009]

Ramolino

<<http://napoleonbonaparte.wordpress.com/2008/01/18/la-famille-de-napoleon-laetitia-bonaparte-1750-1836-madame-mere/>> [accessed 21 August 2009]

<<http://europeanhistory.about.com/od/bonapartenapoleon/a/bioletbonaparte.htm>> [accessed 21 August 2009]

Turkestanova

<<http://baza.vgd.ru/1/40020/20.htm?o=&>> [accessed 3 August 2009]

<<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/40020/p145469.htm?>> [accessed 3 August 2009]

<<http://baza.vgd.ru/post/1/40020/p145469.htm?>> [accessed 3 August 2009].