

Pavlova, Tur, and 'Razdel': What's in a Name?

Author(s): Diana Greene

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 108, No. 1 (January 2013), pp. 221-240

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5699/modelangrevi.108.1.0221>

Accessed: 09/01/2013 15:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

PAVLOVA, TUR, AND 'RAZDEL': WHAT'S IN A NAME?

This is the account of an authorship problem that led me through issues of canonical aesthetics to the question: what does it mean to say a work is 'good'?

In 1967–68, in the Karolina Pavlova archive of what is now RGALI (the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, f. 411), the scholar Munir Sendich discovered 'Razdel' ('The Division'), a 162-page corrected, unsigned manuscript attributed to Pavlova.¹ Sendich discussed the manuscript in his 1968 dissertation on Karolina Pavlova (1807–1893) and later, more extensively, in a 1971 article.² In both accounts he wrote that he had established the manuscript and the corrections to it as Pavlova's by comparing them with the handwriting of her letters; the original manuscript could be set between the early 1830s and late 1836, and the corrections between the early and mid-1850s.

In the wake of the prestigious 1964 *Biblioteka poeta* edition of Pavlova's poetry, Sendich's impressive dissertation and articles based on it started a Pavlova revival in what was then called the West.³ In 1978 Barbara Heldt brought Pavlova to new Western audiences with her English translation of *Dvoinaia zhizn'* (*A Double Life*), Pavlova's mixed-genre society tale. Second and third editions appeared in 1986 and 1996. By putting Pavlova's life and writing into a feminist critical perspective, Heldt also attracted feminist scholars to Pavlova's works.⁴ As the *MLA International Bibliography* attests, Pavlova scholarship steadily increased from the 1970s, eventually including dissertations, encyclopedia articles, book chapters, and scholarly articles, along with a Pavlova conference in 1995 and its subsequent essay collection. In the Soviet Union, and later the Russian Federation, works by and about Pavlova began to appear as well.⁵ Although Pavlova's literary reputation had

This article could not have been written without the generous help of Jehanne Gheith, Olga Glagoleva, David Hoover, Ekaterina Shraga, Hilde Hoogenboom, Anne Lounsbury, and Randall Spinks.

¹ 'Razdel', RGALI, f. 411, op. 2. ed. khr. 16.

² Munir Sendich, 'The Life and Works of Karolina Pavlova' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1968), pp. 110–12; id., 'Two Unknown Writings of Karolina Pavlova', *Die Welt der Slaven*, 16 (1971), 47–60 (pp. 54–60).

³ See M. Sh. Fainshtein and F. Gepfert, 'Iz istorii izdaniia literaturnogo nasledii K. K. Pavlovoi', *Russian Studies: RS*, 2.3 (1996), 303–19, for the history of the earlier (1939) *Biblioteka poeta* edition of Pavlova's poetry. For the history of Pavlova's reception and literary reputation up to 1964 see Sendich, 'Life and Works', pp. 221–51.

⁴ Barbara Heldt, 'Karolina Pavlova: The Woman Poet and the Double Life', in *A Double Life*, by Karolina Pavlova, trans. by Barbara Heldt (Oakland: Barbary Coast, 1986), pp. iv–ix; Heldt, *Terrible Perfection: Women and Russian Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), pp. 111–15.

⁵ For Soviet and Russian Pavlova criticism see *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917: bibliograficheskii slovar'*, ed. by P. A. Nikolaev, 6 vols (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 1988–), iv, 499, and the INION database. In addition, there have been at least three dissertations on Pavlova: N. A. Tabakova, 'Tvorchestvo Karoliny Pavlovoi' (unpublished thesis, Moskovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1999); Irina Sergeevna Alekseeva, 'Lingvostilisticheskii analiz perevodov Karoliny Pavlovoi' (avtoreferat, Leningrad, 1982); Elena Viacheslavovna Izusina, 'Liricheskaia geroinia v

fluctuated several times over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, by the end of the twentieth she was considered a respected, and for many a canonical, author.⁶

In the 1980s, when I first read about 'Razdel' in Sendich's dissertation and article, it seemed inevitable to me that someone would soon publish it. In 2004, however, more than thirty-five years after Sendich's discovery, as no further mention of 'Razdel' had appeared, I ordered a copy of the manuscript from RGALI, found an expert, Russian archivist Ekaterina Shraga, to transcribe it, and started translating it with Mary Zirin; our intention was to publish a previously unpublished Pavlova tale in an annotated, bilingual edition.⁷

As Sendich had remarked, it was not a clean draft. Although tightly structured in nine sections or quasi-chapters, many passages had been crossed out and rewritten. In addition, I discovered that not all the characters' names were yet established, several changing in the course of the manuscript,⁸ and that the relative ages of the heroine Polina and her brother Pavel were unclear, a point

russkoi lirike XIX veka' (unpublished thesis, kandidat nauk, Orlovskii gos. universitet, 2001). There are also two collections of Pavlova's poetry (*Stikhotvoreniia*, ed. by E. N. Lebedev (Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1985), and *Stikhotvoreniia*, ed. by S. B. Rassadin (Moscow: Tekst, 2001)), a monograph (M. Sh. Fainshtein, 'Menia Vy nazvali poetom': *Zhizn' i literaturnoe tvorchestvo K. K. Pavlovoi v retrospektive vremeni* (Fichtenwalde: Göpfert, 2002)), and in 1991 the first republication of Pavlova's tale 'Za chainym stolom' since Briusov's 1915 edition ('Za chainym stolom', in *Serdtsa chutkogo prozren'em*, ed. by N. I. Iakushin (Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1991), pp. 294–333) and its original publication in *Russkii vestnik*, 24 (1859), 797–840.

⁶ The increased Russian scholarship and republication of Pavlova's works notwithstanding, in Russia Pavlova's canonical status remains more equivocal. The only mention of her in a 2005 textbook is as a good translator of A. K. Tolstoi (V. N. Anashkina and others, *Russkaia literature XIX veka, 1840-e–1860-e gody* (Moscow: Vysshiaia shkola, 2005), p. 266). She is, however, included in *Mig, ukradennyi u schast'ia: russkie poetessy vozliublennye velikikh liudei*, ed. by Elena Oboimina and Ol'ga Tat'kova (Moscow: Eksmo, 2007), a collection of essays about Russian women poets' love affairs with famous men, followed by the poetry that the women supposedly wrote to express their amorous feelings. (It is hard to imagine a parallel collection of essays and poetry devoted to lovesick Russian men poets.) Pavlova also appears in the more useful, but still ghettoizing, *Russkaia zhenskaia poezii: antologiiia*, ed. by V. Kalugin (Moscow: Eksmo, 2010), in which all the women poets are referred to as *poetessy*. (On the use of *poetessy* see Diana Greene, 'Poet, Poetessa, Zhenshchina-Poet', in *Mapping the Feminine: Russian Women and Cultural Difference*, ed. by Hilde Hoogenboom and others (Bloomington: Slavica, 2008), pp. 265–80.) On the Russian Internet, which, I would suggest, now functions as an influential canon-builder, Pavlova is included in the Russkaia Virtual'naia Biblioteka (<http://www.rb.ru/about/program/19_list.html>) and in Biblioteka Maksima Moshkova (<<http://lib.ru/LITRA/>>) under 'Russkaia klassika'. However, she appears in the Fundamental'naia elektronnaia biblioteka (<<http://www.feb-web.ru/feb/feb/atindex/atindex.htm?cmd=show>>) only as the writer of two letters to S. A. Rachinskii (to which we shall return).

⁷ There is a typographical error in Sendich's article; the manuscript is in f. 411, op. 2, ed. khr. 16 (not 6).

⁸ Glafira Alekseevna becomes Glafira Nikolaevna; Polina's beloved, Serzh Pronskii, changes to Serge Chardin, and then to Konstantin Chardin; the governess Madame Veikher to Madame Veikhel; Sonia's fiancé Ivan Temnikov to Ivan Treskin. Here and subsequently I shall refer to characters by the last version of their names to appear in the manuscript.

to which I shall return. For me, such corrections and changes offered a fascinating glimpse of Pavlova at work. However, what did surprise and greatly disappoint me on first reading 'Razdel' was that the story was unfinished, ending abruptly just before what appeared to be the climax—something that Sendich had not indicated.

'Razdel' concerns women's unequal inheritance rights in Russia and the equitable division of family wealth between an older brother and his two younger sisters.⁹ Petr Fedorovich Surmilov is a kind-hearted but lazy *staro-svetskii pomeshchik* (old-world landowner), his wife, Glafira Nikolaevna a self-absorbed, withdrawn, seemingly traumatized woman who spends all her time in her study reading. As the story opens, their son Pavel has resigned his military commission to return to his parents' country estate, having lived in St Petersburg since being sent to school there as a child. As the 'young master' he immediately sets about imposing his will and harsh patriarchal views on his easygoing father, his distant mother, and his two younger sisters, Polina, in her mid- or late twenties, and Katia, a sunny seventeen-year-old. Like Pavel, Polina has lived in St Petersburg most of her life, raised by an aunt, a rich noblewoman of the city, who left Polina most of her fortune. However, other heirs have succeeded in overturning the will, forcing Polina to return, penniless, to her parents' estate in the country.

Although Polina and her suitor Konstantin wish to marry, Polina's mother Glafira Nikolaevna and Konstantin's father both violently object, the latter even threatening to disinherit his son. Neither parent will explain their opposition. The reason appears to be connected to the secret of Glafira Nikolaevna's past, which has resulted in her emotionally withdrawn state and which probably would have been revealed in the tale's ending. Another subplot concerns Sonia, a thrill-seeking friend of the younger daughter, Katia. Pavel is attracted to Sonia; she in turn is mesmerized by his domineering charm. When Glafira Nikolaevna realizes that Pavel may marry Sonia, she sees that her daughters are in danger of losing their present financial security and independence. Neither Polina nor Katia is likely to marry in the near future. Petr Fedorovich, their father, wishes to provide equally for them, but he is old and under Pavel's spell. Should Petr Fedorovich die, Pavel, his father's heir by Russian law, can hardly be depended upon to share the estate equally with his sisters, especially if he marries. Glafira Nikolaevna, too, would be completely dependent on Pavel. Now she awakes from her torpor and tells her daughters that she will

⁹ Under the 1835 *Svod zakonov* a sister inherited a fourteenth of her brother's share of immovable (real) property and an eighth of her brother's share of movable property. See Aleksei Vasil'evich Kunitsyn, *O pravakh nasledovaniia lits zhenskogo pola* (Kharkov, 1844), p. 9, and *Zhenskoe Pravo: svod zakononii i postanovlenii otnosiashchikhsia do zhenskogo pola* (St Petersburg: Tip. K. N. Plotnikova, 1873), pp. 180–81

fight for their financial security even if that means upsetting her husband and confronting her son. The story breaks off abruptly at this point.

While working on the 'Razdel' translation, I also started writing an article about our work in progress, versions of which I presented at several Slavic conferences. I discussed the similarities between 'Razdel' and Pavlova's works that Sendich had found, added some of my own, and advanced a theory, partly based on Pavlova's biography, about why she had never finished the manuscript.

I had almost completed the article when I noticed a reference in Jehanne Gheith's *Finding the Middle Ground* to a story by Evgeniia Tur (pseudonym of Elizaveta de Tournemir, 1815–1892) that interestingly was also entitled 'Razdel'.¹⁰ Following up on the note out of curiosity, I was led to a collection of archival manuscripts published in 1899, where, under Tur's name, I was appalled to see the entire text of our 'unpublished' manuscript from Pavlova's archive.¹¹ A line-by-line comparison revealed a few minor editorial changes; however, since there remained inconsistencies such as the names of Sergei Pronskii and Konstantin Chardin (*Tatevskii sbornik*, pp. 148, 85, 191; see n. 8 above), and the confusion over Polina and Pavel's relative ages (*Tatevskii sbornik*, pp. 61, 62, 173), it seemed clear to me that the RGALI manuscript was the basis of the 1899 publication.

By 1899, when *Tatevskii sbornik* was published, both Pavlova (1807–1893) and Tur (1815–1892) were dead, but the editor of the collection, S. A. Rachinskii (1836–1902), nephew of the poet Evgenii Baratynskii (1800–1844), had known them both.¹² Rachinskii recounts in an introductory footnote to 'Razdel' (p. 143) that in the late 1850s Tur read him the first part of a novel that she intended to publish in *Russkii vestnik*. They decided together, however,

¹⁰ Jehanne Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground: Krestovskii, Tur, and the Power of Ambivalence in Nineteenth-Century Russian Women's Prose* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2004), p. 147.

¹¹ 'Razdel', in *Tatevskii sbornik*, ed. by S. A. Rachinskii (St Petersburg: Tip. M. Sasiulevicha, 1899), pp. 143–249.

¹² Rachinskii first met Pavlova when he visited her salon in 1850 (Nikolaev, *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917*, v, 269). Pavlova, who considered Evgenii Baratynskii her mentor, was close to the Baratynskii family, and addresses Rachinskii as 'mon cher neveu' in several of the nine letters to him, written in French, now in RGALI, f. 427, op. 1, ed. khr. 886, 972, 973 (1858–62), one of which was published in a posthumous collection of documents from Rachinskii's personal archive (*E. A. Boratynskii: materialy k ego biografii. Iz Tatevskogo arkhiva*, ed. by Iu. Verkhovskii (Petrograd: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1916), p. 118).

Rachinskii may have become acquainted with Tur in 1856–59, when he was contributing many articles on German cultural life as well as book reviews to *Russkii vestnik* (Nikolaev, *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917*, v, 269) and Tur was editing the journal's belles-lettres section (Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 6). A botanist, Rachinskii founded and headed the Department of Plant Physiology at Moscow University, and was the first to translate Darwin's *Origin of Species* into Russian (1864). He continued to frequent literary salons, hosted one himself, opened a peasant school on his estate, and was friends with both Leo Tolstoy and K. P. Pobedonostsev (Nikolaev, *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917*, v, 269–70).

that she should abandon it, because the tragic denouement that Tur had in mind was too close to a recent scandal that people in society would recognize. Rachinskii wrote that Tur then presented him with the unfinished manuscript as a memento, which, since she was dead, he now felt free to publish.

My first reaction to Rachinskii's account and attribution of 'Razdel' was to try to disprove them. I questioned whether Tur, eighteen years older than Rachinskii, would have consulted with him about her work. By the late 1850s she would have been in her forties, and not only the literary editor of *Russkii vestnik*, but also the celebrated author of many novels and novellas.¹³ I wondered if the scandal that Rachinskii alluded to as the basis of 'Razdel' could have been the much-talked-about arrest in 1850 of Tur's brother, Aleksandr Sukhovo-Kobylin (1817–1903), for the murder of his mistress, Louise Simon-Dimanche. This case, which dragged on until 1858, when it was only ambiguously resolved, formed the basis of Sukhovo-Kobylin's bitter and well-known dramatic trilogy, and even in 1899 might have crossed the minds of those reading Rachinskii's note.¹⁴ But would Tur in the late 1850s really have been writing a novel for the very popular *Russkii vestnik* based on her brother's murder case, an ordeal which caused her family so much suffering?¹⁵ Rachinskii's account, however, threw new light on a marginal note in the manuscript next to a description of Sonia catching at water-plants from a rowing boat: 'Kakie rasteniia sprosit' u Rachinskogo?' (fol. 46^v: 'Ask Rachinskii what plants?'). I had previously assumed that the note was written by Pavlova, for whom Rachinskii was a family friend as well as a professor of botany, but now I realized that Tur, who also knew Rachinskii, could equally well have written it. But yet again, what about all the echoes in 'Razdel' of Pavlova's works that Sendich and later I had found?

Clearly, an objective means was required to establish the authorship of the

¹³ Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, pp. 6, 129.

¹⁴ Harold Segel, 'Introduction', in *The Trilogy of Alexander Sukhovo-Kobylin* (New York: Dutton, 1969), pp. xiii–xlix. At the time of Simon-Dimanche's murder in 1850, Leo Tolstoy wrote in detail about the scandal to his relative Tatiana Ergolskaia (see Richard Fortune, *Alexander Sukhovo-Kobylin* (Boston: Twayne, 1982), pp. 14–15). In his 1887 memoirs the censor and editor E. M. Feoktistov vividly recreates the events, gossip, and various theories circulating in society at the time ('Glava iz vospominanii', in *Atenei: istoriko-literaturnyi vremennik*, III (Leningrad: Trudy Pushkinskogo doma akademii nauk SSSR, 1926), pp. 83–114 (pp. 85, 111–13)). In 1869 the prolific novelist and playwright P. D. Boborykin published a novel based on the murder investigation (*Na sud*, in *Vsemirnyi trud* (1869), no. 1, pp. 1–70; no. 2, pp. 1–42; no. 3, pp. 43–86; no. 4, pp. 13–32; no. 5, pp. 33–74), and republished it in 1886 in his complete works, *Sochinenii*, 12 vols (St Petersburg: M. O. Vol'f, 1886), IV, 275–527. E. K. Sokolinskii lists more than eighty publications about Sukhovo-Kobylin, his plays, and his life that appeared before 1899, when Rachinskii published 'Razdel', and which would have kept the trial in public memory (A. V. Sukhovo-Kobylin: *bibliograficheskie ukazatel'* (St Petersburg: Giperion, 2001), pp. 16–17, 39).

¹⁵ See N. A. Liubimov, *Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov i ego istoricheskaia zaslug* (St Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia Pol'za, 1889), p. 128, and E. N. Koshina, 'Pis'ma Sukhovo-Kobylina k rodnym', *Trudy Publichnoi biblioteki SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina*, 3 (1934), 187–216 (pp. 203–05).

manuscript. A colleague suggested handwriting analysis, and I was quite fortunate to receive the help of an expert in nineteenth-century Russian handwriting, Olga Glagoleva.¹⁶ Comparing the 'Razdel' manuscript with handwriting samples that I obtained from RGALI, Glagoleva convincingly demonstrated that the handwriting of the manuscript was different from Pavlova's but very similar to Tur's (email of 28 May 2011: see the Appendix).

Another colleague suggested text analysis, which can identify and trace an author's 'literary fingerprint' by mapping the occurrence of frequently used words in texts.¹⁷ Although the handwriting analysis had been conclusive, I pursued this approach as well, wanting to dispel any possible doubt. Again, I was extremely fortunate to be able to obtain an expert opinion. Professor David Hoover, a pioneer in the field of text analysis, compared 'Razdel' with works by both Tur and Pavlova.¹⁸ After running three tests (cluster analysis, delta analysis, and principal-components analysis) using the 990 most frequent words in all four texts, Hoover concluded that 'the results of all three quite different computational methods point strongly to Tur as the author of "Razdel" and give no support to Pavlova's authorship' (email of 20 July 2011).

Now completely convinced that Pavlova had not written 'Razdel'—my disappointment mitigated by relief that the 'Razdel' article and annotated translation had not yet been published—I began to find support for Tur's authorship in 'Razdel' itself.

Glafira Nikolaevna of 'Razdel', I realized, bears an uncanny resemblance to the protagonist of 'Dolg' (1850), Tur's early epistolary novella. Both characters are burnt-out, reclusive women, rescued from an unnamed trauma by older

¹⁶ Olga Glagoleva, *Working with Russian Archival Documents: A Guide to Modern Handwriting, Document Forms, Language Patterns and Other Related Topics* (Toronto: Centre for Russian and East European Studies, University of Toronto, 1998).

¹⁷ Roger D. Peng and Nicolas W. Hengartner, 'Quantitative Analysis of Literary Styles', *American Statistician*, 56 (2002), 175–85 (p. 175).

¹⁸ These works were Tur's 'Dolg' (1850), republished in *Serdtza chutkogo prozren'em': povesti i rasskazy russkikh pisatel'nits*, ed. by N. I. Iakushin (Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1991), pp. 246–93, Pavlova's 'Za chainym stolom' (1859), in *Serdtza chutkogo prozren'em'*, pp. 294–333, and the prose sections of Pavlova's *Dvoinaia zhizn'* (1848) from *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii*, ed. by Pavel Gromov (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1964), pp. 231–307.

On text analysis see David L. Hoover with Shervin Hess, 'An Exercise in Non-Ideal Authorship Attribution: The Mysterious Maria Ward', *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 24 (2009), 467–89; Hoover, 'Authorial Style', in *Language and Style: In Honour of Mick Short*, ed. by Dan McIntyre and Beatrix Busse (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2010), pp. 250–71; Hoover, 'Quantitative Analysis and Literary Studies', in *A Companion to Digital Literary Studies*, ed. by Susan Schreiban and Ray Siemens (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), pp. 517–33; Hoover, 'Testing Burrow's Delta', *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 19 (2004), 453–75. Although it is not possible here to reproduce the colour charts and graphs that show the results of Hoover's analysis of 'Razdel', an explanation of the methods that he used can be found in the appendix to his article 'Corpus Stylistics, Stylometry, and the Style of Henry James', *Style*, 41 (2007), 174–255 (pp. 198–203) (email of 20 July 2011).

husbands whose complete devotion to them has 'spoil' ('izbaloval') them and made them capricious ('kaprizna') and egotistical ('egoitska'/'egoistichnoi').¹⁹

The woman-centred family of 'Razdel' is also typical of Tur's works but not of Pavlova's. The climax of Tur's 'Oshibka' (1849) can be considered the reconciliation between Elizaveta Ivanovna and her daughter Ol'ga.²⁰ Similarly, in 'Razdel' Glafira Nikolaevna, who already has a close relationship with her daughter Katia, becomes reconciled with her other daughter Polina. We see no such focus on mother–daughter closeness or reconciliations in Pavlova's works. Another motif in 'Razdel' characteristic of Tur, but not of Pavlova, is the depiction of sexually aggressive men and their effect on women. In 'Razdel' Sonia's feelings of confusion, loss of self, and resistance in response to Pavel's repeated sexual advances are similar to those that Antonina experiences with her husband Bertini (in *Antonina*, 1851).

I also began to see references to Tur's biography in the tale. The central theme, the equitable division of a family estate between a brother and his sisters, brings to mind Tur's difficult relationship with Aleksandr Sukhovo-Kobylin, two years younger than her and heir to the Sukhovo-Kobylin estate, who refused Tur any family money after her husband left her destitute with three children.²¹ The discrepancies in the relative ages of Polina and Pavel Surmilov in 'Razdel' are also suggestive. At the beginning of the manuscript (fol. 10^r) we are told that Pavel is two years older than Polina; Polina subsequently gives her age first as twenty-nine and then as twenty-seven (fols 12^v, 14^r, 14^v). But Pavel, when he first appears (fol. 23^v), is described as 'about twenty-five', and at the end of the manuscript Glafira Nikolaevna tells her daughters that she has lived with her husband 'for twenty-five years' (fol. 79^v). One can speculate that in the early stages of writing 'Razdel' Tur thought to motivate Pavel's domineering behaviour towards his sisters by making him the oldest sibling, but later began to superimpose her own family constellation on the Surmilovs. From the descriptions of Aleksandr Sukhovo-Kobylin by his contemporaries, it would seem that in some respects, at least, he served as a model for the brutal but charming Pavel.

For example, in his posthumously published memoirs, E. M. Feoktistov (1829–1898), who tutored Tur's children and worked with Tur on *Russkii vestnik* and *Ruskaia rech'*, writes of Sukhovo-Kobylin:

There can be no doubt that this was a very clever man, and the comedy that he wrote [*Svad'ba Krechinskogo*] certainly testifies to his abilities. He graduated from Moscow University, and with a gold medal. He travelled a great deal, liked serious reading—in

¹⁹ 'Dolg', in *Serdtsa chutkogo prozren'em*, pp. 248, 255; 'Razdel', fols 18^v, 80^r. Here and elsewhere, unless otherwise stated, all citations from 'Razdel' are from the manuscript rather than the *Tatevskii sbornik* version.

²⁰ Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, pp. 141, 143.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

a word everything seemed to work out to his advantage, but at the same time scarcely anyone has ever inspired so much hostility. The cause of this was his nature—crude, insolent, in no way moderated by his education; this aristocrat, who spoke French superlatively, who had learnt gentlemanly manners, who strove to appear like a real Parisian, was essentially by instinct a brutal savage [*zhestokim dikarem*], who didn't shrink from the worst excesses of serfdom; his servants lived in fear of him.²²

Tur in her diary and letters describes several incidents demonstrating her brother's capacity for violence. Rudnitskii cites a diary entry of February 1836 in which she reports that her brother volunteered to kill the Moscow University professor N. I. Nadezhdin, who was Tur's tutor—this during the time when Tur and Nadezhdin wished to marry against her family's strong objections to Nadezhdin's non-aristocratic origins. Rudnitskii also quotes a letter from Tur to Nadezhdin in February 1836 urging him to leave Moscow because her brother has ordered his serfs to beat and kill him; she further describes how she herself was beaten by her father and brother.²³ Koshina cites a letter from 1849 that Tur wrote to her sister Evdokiia Petrovo-Solovovo describing dinners with her brother and Louise Simon-Dimanche, who was living with him. Sukhovo-Kobylin, she writes, acts like a 'despot', screaming at Simon-Dimanche, 'slapping faces and breaking plates' ('il casse la figure et les assiettes'). However, like Pavel in 'Razdel', Sukhovo-Kobylin could also, it seems, be charming; in 1885 Tur wrote to her sister that her brother could make her laugh when he wished to.²⁴

Another theme in 'Razdel' with biographical resonance is the effect on young children of being sent away, either to boarding schools or to be raised by relatives—a common practice among the nineteenth-century nobility. In 'Razdel', Pavel lives at school in St Petersburg from the time he is seven, and Polina is raised from infancy by Glafira Nikolaevna's well-to-do sister. We are shown that as a result Pavel does not have a close relationship with his family, and at one point Polina openly contrasts her own feelings of alienation with the closeness that Katia, raised at home, feels to their parents (fols 13^v–15^r). This phenomenon may have been familiar to Tur, who could not afford to support her three children and sent her youngest, Ol'ga, to be

²² Feoktistov, 'Glava iz vospominani', p. 110. All translations are mine unless otherwise stated. Feoktistov, who graduated from Moscow University in 1851, was a student of the liberal Timofei Granovskii and a friend of Turgenev, but became more conservative as he grew older, working as a censor from 1863 and heading the censorship bureau from 1883 to 1896. See *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. by I. E. Andreevskii, 86 vols (St Petersburg: Brokgauz i Efron, 1890–1907), LXXXII, 924, and B. L. Modzalevskii, 'Predislovie, iz vospominanii E. M. Feoktistova', in *Turgenevskii sbornik*, ed. by A. F. Koni (St Petersburg: Kooperativenoe izdatel'stvo literaturov i uchenykh, 1924), pp. 155–60.

²³ Konstantin Rudnitskii, *A. V. Sukhovo-Kobylin: ocherk zhizni i tvorchestva* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1957), pp. 26–27.

²⁴ Koshina, 'Pis'ma Sukhovo-Kobylina k rodnym', pp. 198–99, 211.

raised by her cousin, with whom, however, she remained close.²⁵ In ‘Razdel’ we see Polina caring for her cousin’s children who are visiting for the holiday. For Pavlova, on the other hand, who became an only child after the early death of her younger sister, and was raised at home, none of these issues would have had any personal relevance.²⁶ Finally, as Olga Glagoleva pointed out,²⁷ it is suggestive that Sonia’s last name, Iakshina, is almost identical to that of Tur’s paternal aunt, Varvara Iashkina. While I had no desire to reduce ‘Razdel’ to autobiography or to practise ‘biographical criticism’, these parallels additionally confirmed Tur’s authorship.

I found, however, that the correct attribution of ‘Razdel’ to Tur only raised new, wider issues for me concerning canonical authors, canonical aesthetics, and what it means to say that a work is ‘good’. I became curious about the contrast between the literary reputations of these two authors: on the one hand, the now canonical Pavlova, known for the craft and sophistication of her works, praised by such canon-makers as Belinskii and Mirsky, and championed by Valerii Briusov, who edited her collected works in two volumes; and on the other hand, the virtually forgotten Tur.²⁸ I discovered that like other binary hierarchical oppositions, this one broke down under scrutiny, Pavlova and Tur’s lives and works showing many similarities.²⁹

Both authors came from aristocratic backgrounds and lived in Moscow, where they each received an excellent education at home. Both knew French

²⁵ Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 221, n. 120.

²⁶ Pavlova, ‘Moi vospominaniia’, *Russkii arkhiv*, 10 (1875), 222–40; also in *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by Valerii Briusov, 2 vols (Moscow: Izd. K. F. Nekrasova, 1915), II, 269–312 (p. 293).

²⁷ Email of 3 May 2011.

²⁸ On Pavlova see V. G. Belinskii, ‘Russkie zhurnaly’ (1839), in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 13 vols (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1953–59), III, 168–92 (p. 191); D. S. Mirsky, *A History of Russian Literature: From its Beginnings to 1900* (New York: Vintage, 1958), p. 128. On Tur see Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 129. To my knowledge, the only works of Tur’s to be republished since the nineteenth century are her tale ‘Dolg’, her 1883 translation of Edward Bulwer-Lytton’s *The Last Days of Pompei* (1834), republished in 1991 under Tur’s name with no mention of Bulwer-Lytton (*Poslednie dni Pompei* (Moscow: Kul’t inform press, 1991)), and her 1866 translation of Nicholas Wiseman’s *Fabiola*; or, *The Church of the Catacombs* (1854) (*Katakomy: Povest’ iz pervykh vremen khristianstva* (Moscow: Sestrchestvo vo imia Velikoi Kniagini Elizavety, 1999)). The only works about Tur, besides Gheith’s foundational study, are Wanda Laszczak, *Zarys życia i twórczości Eugenii Tur* (Opale: Wyzsza szkoła pedagogiczna im. Powstanców Slaskich w Opolu, 1987), and Jane Costlow, ‘Speaking the Sorrow of Women: Turgenev’s “Neschastnaia” and Evgeniia Tur’s “Antonina”’, *Slavic Review*, 50 (1991), 328–35. In addition, the INION and the MLA Bibliographies list one conference paper abstract about Tur (L. V. Kalashnikova, ‘Salias-de-Turnemir Elizaveta Vasil’evna v Kaluzhskoi gubernii’, in *Voprosy arkhologii, istorii, kul’tury i prirody Verkhnego Pooch’ia* (Kaluga: Kaluzhskii oblastnoi kraevedcheskii muzei, 2008), pp. 343–45), one article (I. P. Olekhova, ‘Avtor i kritik v stat’iakh Evgenii Tur: gendernye aspekty reprezentatsii’, in *O zhenshchine i zhenshinakh i prochem*, ed. by M. V. Stroganov (Tver’: Marina, 2007), pp. 80–97), and the republication of nine of Tur’s letters (V. F. Luginin, E. A. Zaitseva, and G. I. Liubina, ‘Ia zhiyu zdes’ uedinenno, rabotaiu mnogo’, *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, 6 (2007) 193–208).

²⁹ See Helen Cixous, ‘Sorties Out and Out: Attacks/Ways Out/Forays’, in *The Feminist Reader: Essays in Gender and the Politics of Literary Criticism*, ed. by Catherine Belsey and Jane Moore, 2nd edn (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997), pp. 91–103.

and German. Both studied with brilliant but socially disadvantaged tutors (Pavlova with the exiled Adam Mickiewicz, Tur with the *raznochinets*, Moscow University professor, and publisher Nikolai Nadezhdin), with whom they fell in love but whom they were prevented from marrying by family opposition. Both subsequently experienced unhappy marriages with men who impoverished them. Both spent many years in Europe. Tur made her literary debut with 'Oshibka' in 1849. Pavlova's first prose story, *Dvoinaia zhizn'*, appeared in 1848. While both were highly praised by the critical establishment at the beginning of their careers, by the end of the 1850s and early 1860s they were attacked by radical critics as being irrelevant to the social mission of Russian literature.³⁰

As for the similarities in their writing, the most convincing evidence is, of course, Sendich's list of 'traits suggesting Pavlova's authorship' of 'Razdel', which include the plot, characters, nature descriptions, digressions, and the use of aphorisms and proverbs.³¹ Several other motifs common to Tur's and Pavlova's works could be added: panoptic mothers who mistakenly think that they can understand and control their daughters (Marfa Ivanovna in 'Razdel', Vera Vladimirovna in *Dvoinaia zhizn'*); the 'chess match' between two such mothers 'with their children as pawns' in Tur's 'Oshibka' and Pavlova's *Dvoinaia zhizn'*;³² drawing-room conversations troped as duels—those between Pavel and Treskin in 'Razdel' (fol. 32^r) and between Princess Aline and Wismer in Pavlova's 'Za chainym stolom';³³ the direct address to female readers in Tur's 'Razdel' ('moia chitatel'nitsa', fols. 1^r, 24^r), and in Pavlova's dedication of *Dvoinaia zhizn'* ('The offering of this thought is for you, | All of you [. . .] | The mute sisters of my soul!');³⁴ a relationship between an immature, flirtatious, irresponsible young woman and a stern, reproaching, disapproving, but 'loving' male (Sonia and Treskin in 'Razdel', Countess Polina and Vadim in Pavlova's *Kadril'*); a scene in which a man accuses a woman of having played with him for her own amusement, and the woman, while accepting some but not all of the blame, emphatically rejects the motives imputed to her (Tur's 'Dolg' and Pavlova's 'Za chainym stolom').

But stylistic and thematic similarities to Pavlova's writings notwithstanding, the question remains: is 'Razdel', a draft of an unfinished novel, 'good'?

³⁰ Sendich, 'Life and Works', pp. 239–43; Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, pp. 40–41. Such biographical similarities were not unique to Tur and Pavlova, but rather were part of 'the cultural narrative of the [nineteenth-century Russian] woman writer' (Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 29). Similarly, other writers, such as Rostopchina, who had been praised in the 1840s and early 1850s, were ridiculed and dismissed as irrelevant by the radical critics in the 1860s.

³¹ Sendich, 'Two Unknown Writings of Karolina Pavlova', p. 55.

³² Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 143.

³³ 'Za chainym stolom', in *Serdtsa chutkogo prozren'em* (pp. 303–06).

³⁴ 'Vam etoi mysli prinoshen'e, | [. . .] Vas vsekh [. . .] | Nemykh sester moei dushi!' (*Dvoinaia zhizn'*, in *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenií*, p. 231).

During the years when I believed Pavlova to have written it, I considered ‘Razdel’ to be a work of some literary significance: a tightly structured, highly original tale that creates a richly detailed world; I thought the characters complex, engaging, and nuanced, with readers being shown the protagonists’ flaws, the antagonists’ positive traits, and the similarities that protagonists and antagonists share.

So, for example, although the power-hungry, despotic Pavel comes closest to being the villain, we are made to understand that his scorn for women and his need to dominate them are rooted in his mother’s rejection of him as a child and his aunt’s rejection of him as a young man. In addition, many of Pavel’s objectionable characteristics and speeches echo those of more sympathetic family members, albeit in exaggerated form. At the beginning of the tale, when Katia’s singing teacher warns her that catching cold will affect her voice, Katia rebelliously replies ‘Eto mne ochen’ nuzhno’ (fol. 5^r: ‘Who cares?’). Later when Pavel expresses disdain for Sonia in front of Treskin and is told that Sonia and Treskin are practically engaged, he echoes this sentence (fol. 30^r: ‘Ochen’ mne nuzhno’). Similarly, when Marfa Ivanovna, Sonia’s mother, ignorantly asks ‘What are fallow fields?’, Pavel’s father, Petr Fedorovich, who fancies himself an agronomist, dismissively says to her ‘Slepym krasok ne kazhut’ (fol. 5^v: ‘Don’t show a blind person colours’—that is, ‘You couldn’t possibly understand’). Later Pavel contemptuously says to his mother of his father’s eating habits, ‘Mezhdu fransuzskim slovom “gourmet” i russkim “ob’edalom” ogromnaia raznitsa [. . .] No chto mne govorit’ obo vsem etom s vami—eto znachit pokazyvat’ kraski slepomu’ (fol. 76^r: ‘There’s a tremendous difference between the French word “gourmet” and the Russian word “gorger”. [. . .] But why am I talking about all this with you? It’s the same as showing colours to a blind person’). These and other echoes among the Surmilovs keep us from being able to dismiss Pavel as an enemy Other. The entire family is implicated in Pavel’s words, attitudes, and behaviour.

Additionally, while believing that Pavlova was the author, I had admired the repetition of key words, which, like leitmotifs, gather increasing significance and meaning in the course of the narrative. For example, the word ‘kapriznyi’ (‘capricious’), which appears on the first page, reappears when Sonia wishes Treskin would be more capricious (fol. 6^v), when Marfa Ivanovna compares Sonia to the heroine of Alfred de Musset’s play *Les Caprices de Marianne* (fol. 52^v), when Treskin reproaches Sonia with having a capricious nature (fol. 58^r), when Glafira Nikolaevna tells Pavel that unlike Marfa Ivanovna she will not submit to her children’s whims and caprices (fol. 77^v), and finally, when Glafira Nikolaevna admits to her daughters that she herself has become capricious and perhaps selfish (fol. 80^r). This is similar to Pavlova’s intensi-

fyng repetition of 'detskii' ('childish') throughout her verse tale 'Kadril'.³⁵ In both cases the device emphasizes that if women wish to gain social and psychological freedom, they must overcome the conditioning that encourages them to remain capricious children.

The increasingly sexualized motif of Sonia's arm and the connection between that sexualization and violence function similarly. When Pavel first meets Sonia he is immediately attracted by her shapely arm. During their first extended conversation, he tells her about a Dumas play in which a man coerces his wife by squeezing and hurting her arm. Pavel himself then presses Sonia's arm. Later, on a walk through some dense undergrowth, Pavel accidentally lets go of a branch, which lashes Sonia's arm so sharply that it bleeds. He then passionately kisses the wound. The escalating mixture of eroticism and violence in Sonia's dangerous flirtation with Pavel underscores Glafira Nikolaevna's admonition to her daughter Katia (and perhaps to the reader) that the most important qualities to look for in a husband are 'dobrota serdtsa, i miagkost' kharaktera' (fol. 79^r: 'a kind heart and a gentle character').

Most of all I had appreciated 'Razdel' as part of a nineteenth-century literary tradition that contested the social and cultural subordination of women,³⁶ and did so by presenting gynocentric alternatives to standard Russian male plots. In 'Razdel' instead of only 'fathers and sons', we see mothers and daughters, mothers and sons, fathers and daughters, sisters and brothers, aunts and nieces and nephews. Instead of the 'marginal', tyrannized poor ward, of Pushkin's *Pikovaia dama* (*The Queen of Spades*) and her successors,³⁷ we are shown a loving relationship between Polina and the aunt who adopted her. Instead of the unnecessary and tragic duel in *Evgenii Onegin* after Onegin dances all night with Lenskii's fiancée, we have the controlled and non-violent response of Treskin, who, when Pavel dances all night with Sonia, simply goes home. And instead of the power-based sexual relationships found in such writers as Stendhal, Musset, Dumas, and Balzac, who are referenced through-

³⁵ Diana Greene, *Reinventing Romantic Poetry: Russian Women Poets of the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), pp. 162–63.

³⁶ On the literary and political contestation of women's subordination throughout nineteenth-century Europe see *Women, the Family and Freedom: The Debate in Documents*, ed. by Susan Bell and Carol Offen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983), pp. 25, 77–83, and *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: A European Perspective*, ed. by Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 309–15. For Russia, see Catriona Kelly, *A History of Russian Women's Writing, 1820–1992* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 60–69; Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, pp. 129–52; Linda Edmondson, 'Feminism and Equality in an Authoritarian State: The Politics of Women's Liberation in Late Imperial Russia', in *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: A European Perspective*, ed. by Paletschek and Pietrow-Ennker, pp. 221–42; and Diana Greene, *The Menagerie or the Visitor's Pass? Aleksandra Zrazhevskaiia and Praskoviia Bakunina on Russian Women Writers*, Carl Beck Papers, no. 1803 (Pittsburgh: Center for Russian and East European Studies, 2007).

³⁷ Svetlana Slavskaya Grenier, *Representing the Marginal Woman in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature: Personalism, Feminism, and Polyphony* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001).

out the manuscript,³⁸ we are shown the possibility of relationships that while not perfect, are based on mutual respect—for example, that between Glafira Nikolaevna and Petr Fedorovich, and the one Treskin offers to Sonia.

For these reasons, I now believe that regardless of its author, ‘Razdel’ must be considered a work of literary significance. But, I wonder, would I have evaluated it so positively if I had I known from the start that it was written not by the (currently) canonical Pavlova, but by the largely forgotten Tur?

Tur’s fiction has been described as ‘exemplary women’s writing’, not ‘complex, ironic, and probing’ or “‘good” in the same terms that works by Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and company are’.³⁹ The above aesthetic values, along with Paul Lauter’s ‘formalist virtues’—economy, complexity, irony, well-articulated structure, originality, detachment, and verbal sophistication—are the ones that I had found and admired in Pavlova’s works.⁴⁰ Knowing that Pavlova was not the author now made me wonder about my appreciation of ‘Razdel’ and canonical aesthetics. Could it be that because I believed Pavlova to have written ‘Razdel’, I remained oblivious to the fact that it was ‘women’s writing’, lacking the necessary canonical aesthetic qualities? Or did my belief that Pavlova was the author of ‘Razdel’ allow me to ignore my prejudices and appreciate a very different, non-canonical aesthetic? And what is ‘women’s writing’?

If, indeed, women write differently from men, there is no reason why the term ‘women’s writing’—‘zhenskoe pisatel’stvo’ or ‘literaturnaia deiatel’nost’ russkikh zhenshchin’—should not simply denote the way they write, presumably as opposed to ‘men’s writing’, or the way men write, an idea to which I shall return.⁴¹ However, in Russia, women’s writing (‘zhenskaia literature’, ‘damskaia proza’) has long had a pejorative connotation, which persists to the present.⁴²

³⁸ Sonia says: ‘I would like to love and fear, and unconditionally obey the one I love with confusion and terror. Have you read [the novel *Le Rouge et le Noir* by Stendhal crossed out] in novels the descriptions of such a love? If they describe it, it must exist’ (fol. 7^r). As mentioned above, Marfa Ivanovna refers to Musset’s *Les Caprices de Marianne*, with its tyrannized and self-destructive heroine, and Pavel tells Sonia about a husband’s abuse of his wife in a Dumas play, adding that this is the way Sonia should be treated (fol. 45^r). Sonia replies to Pavel: ‘Terror and love—there is an alluring, indescribable charm in this. That union of rapture and trepidation. Balzac said this, and he is the great expert in women’s hearts’ (fol. 46^r).

³⁹ Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, pp. 8, 17.

⁴⁰ Paul Lauter, *Canons and Contexts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 104.

⁴¹ V. G. Belinskii, ‘Sochineniia Zeneidy R-voi’, VII, 648–78 (pp. 650, 651).

⁴² See Adele Barker, ‘Are Women Writing Women’s Writing in the Soviet Union Today? Tolstaya and Grekova’, *Studies in Comparative Communism*, 21 (1988), 357–64, and Svetlana Boym, ‘The Poetics of Banality: Tat’iana Tolstaia, Lana Gogoberidze, and Larisa Zvezdochetova’, in *The Fruits of her Plume: Essays in Contemporary Russian Women’s Culture*, ed. by Helena Goscilo (New York: Sharpe, 1993), pp. 59–84. Beth Holmgren, *Women’s Works in Stalin’s Time: On Lidiia Chukovskaia and Nadezhda Mandelstam* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), discusses Akhmatova’s difficulties in fashioning herself as an important Russian (woman) writer (pp. 76, 82, 195, n. 22,

Such scholars as Catriona Kelly, Irina Savkina, Svetlana Boym, Jehanne Gheith, and Hilde Hoogenboom have shown that in Russia the negative stereotypes associated with women's writing—what Savkina calls 'diskurs zhenskoi literatury'—had their origins in men's literary criticism of the 1830s, and can be understood as extensions of negative stereotypes about women authors, and of women in general.⁴³ As women, women writers were considered to exhibit a natural weakness and defectiveness, and to lack the power of abstraction, as well as being generally identified with sexuality and their bodies.⁴⁴ Starting with some of Belinskii's reviews ('Zhertva', 1835; 'Povesti Mar'i Zhukovoi', 1840), the infamous story 'Zhenshchina-Pisatel'nitsa' (1837) by Rakhmanyi [N. N. Verevkin], and Belinskii's very influential essay 'Sochineniia Zeneida R-voi' (1843), women writers were characterized as dilettantes,⁴⁵ unable to partake in social progress, incapable of genius, and 'ambiguous creatures' ('dvusmyslennoe sushchestvo') or prostitutes if they left their 'feminine sphere' of the family to publish.⁴⁶ The doubled feminine of the term 'zhenshchina pisatel'nitsa' (woman authoress) used from Belinskii ('Zeneidy R-voi') on, as several scholars have pointed out,⁴⁷ sexualized and reduced women writers to being women first and (second-rate) authors second.

This social construction of the woman writer, then, established the terms

196, n. 34), and mentions as an enduring negative stereotype the 'second-rate value culturally ascribed to Russian women' (p. 172).

Such negative stereotypes of women writers were not, of course, unique to Russia, but existed in nineteenth-century France (Honoré Daumier, *Liberated Women: Bluestockings and Socialist Women* (New York: Vilo, 1982), and Michael D. Garval, *A Dream of Stone: Fame, Vision and Monumentality in Nineteenth-Century French Literary Culture* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004), pp. 112–57), England (Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Aurora Leigh*, ed. by Margaret Reynolds (New York: Norton, 1996), II. 141–40), and the United States (Hawthorne's often-cited 'damned mob of scribbling women'), and persist today, for example in the term 'chick lit', which has been applied to the works of Jane Austen (see MLA International Bibliography and google scholar (<http://scholar.google.com/>) under 'chick lit' Austen).

⁴³ Irina Savkina, "Poeziia opasnyi dar dlia devy": Kriticheskaiia retsentsiia zhenskoi literatury i zhenshchiny-pisatel'nitsy v Rossii pervoi poloviny IX veka', in *Perom i prelest'iu: zhenshchiny v panteone russkoi literatury*, ed. by Wanda Laszczak and Daria Ambroziak (Opole: University of Opole Press, 1999), pp. 29–57 (p. 52). Savkina here uses 'discourse' in the Foucauldian sense, which Joan Scott, in 'Deconstructing Equality vs. Difference; or, The Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism', *Feminist Studies*, 14 (1988), 35–50, has glossed as 'a historically, socially, and institutionally specific structure of statements, terms, categories and beliefs' which 'because they are assigned the status of objective knowledge, seem to be beyond dispute' (pp. 35–36). For the specifically Russian historical factors of the 1830s and 1840s that structured the discourse of women's literature see Savkina (start of this note); Svetlana Boym, 'Poetics of Banality'; Kelly, *History of Russian Women's Writing*; Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*; and Hilde Hoogenboom, 'A Two-Part Invention: The Russian Woman Writer and her Heroines from 1860–1917' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1996).

⁴⁴ Savkina, "Poeziia opasnyi dar", pp. 30, 39; Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 23.

⁴⁵ Savkina, "Poeziia opasnyi dar dlia devy", p. 52.

⁴⁶ V. G. Belinskii, 'Zhertva', in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* I, 221–28 (pp. 225, 226), and 'Povesti Mar'i Zhukovoi', *ibid.*, IV, 110–18 (p. 115).

⁴⁷ Savkina, "Poeziia opasnyi dar dlia devy", p. 34; Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 22.

for the reception of 'women's writing'. Since women authors were incapable of genius, 'objective' abstract thinking, or depicting ideas, it followed that their writing, characterized by 'an excess of affect and a lack of structure',⁴⁸ could only be 'subjective', autobiographical, and lacking in originality; its subject-matter limited to love, family relations, and the position of women, as opposed to issues of 'real' social significance, i.e. those that more immediately affected men.⁴⁹ Such stereotyped women's writing seems to have been what at least some of the men critics preferred; Belinskii, in advising Evdokiia Rostopchina to write about the world of the 'feminine soul', complacently observes: 'then they [her writings] would also be more interesting to the other half of the human race, which, God knows why, has appropriated the right of judgement and reward'.⁵⁰ Russian women writers variously resisted, modified, internalized, or accommodated themselves to these stereotypes, sometimes doing all at once.⁵¹ But did those Russian women, disparaged for writing 'women's prose', actually write differently from men? And if so, was their writing inferior or perhaps just different?

Margaret Cohen, in her study of early nineteenth-century French women's novels, describes them as 'shaped by a coherent, if now lost aesthetic [. . .], fragments of lost solutions or answers to questions we no longer hear'.⁵² These novels, she writes, have become unreadable or 'illegible' to later audiences, and are therefore dismissed as 'uninteresting or inferior in terms of the aesthetics that have won out'.⁵³ Naomi Schor discusses the novels of George Sand in similar terms. Although canonical and quite 'legible' throughout the nineteenth century, they are no longer so, Schor convincingly argues, because of the triumph of the representational mode of realism and its masculinizing aesthetic, over Sand's representational mode of idealism.⁵⁴

I would suggest that much of what is called Russian 'women's writing' can also be understood as illegible answers to questions we no longer hear. A key for deciphering this writing may be found in Philip Fisher's discussion of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, in which Fisher historicizes and contextualizes the now denigrated aesthetic that he calls sentimentality, which he describes as a tactic of 'politically radical representation' popular from 1740 to 1860 throughout

⁴⁸ Svetlana Boym, *Death in Quotation Marks: Cultural Myths of the Modern Poet* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 197.

⁴⁹ On the social—and political—significance of the patriarchal family, and the Russian government's awareness of it, see Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, pp. 26, 142.

⁵⁰ V. G. Belinskii, 'Stikhotvorenniia grafini E. Rostopchinoi', in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, v, 456–61 (pp. 457–58).

⁵¹ Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 24.

⁵² Margaret Cohen, *The Sentimental Education of the Novel* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), pp. 21, 25.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 32, 21.

⁵⁴ Naomi Schor, 'Idealism and the Novel: Recanonizing Sand', in Schor, *George Sand and Idealism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), pp. 23–54.

Western culture, which experimented with extending 'full and complete humanity to classes from whom it has been socially withheld': the poor, the insane, prisoners, children, women, slaves, as seen in the works of Dickens, Hugo, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy.⁵⁵ Now, Fisher writes in 1985, 'with the political and historical work of these images accomplished [. . .] we no longer even remember the images that they were designed to correct'.⁵⁶ I would suggest that Cohen's discussion of the 'sentimental social novel' of the 1830s and 1840s, Schor's discussion of Sand's representational mode of idealism, and Fisher's discussion of sentimentality all concern the same phenomenon—one that is related to the shift from Romanticism to Realism, and in Russia, to 'women's writing'.

Throughout her career, as both writer and critic, Tur showed an affinity for the aesthetics of idealism or sentimentality. In her fiction ('Oshibka', *Plemiannitsa*, *Antonina*, *Dve sestry*, *Zakoldovannyi krug*) she grants full humanity to invisible, often non-aristocratic and not particularly beautiful heroines by having them win moral, if not socially recognized, victories over the parents, guardians, husbands, and patriarchal customs and laws that oppress them. As a critic, Tur debuted in *Russkii vestnik* with a three-part review of George Sand's *Histoire de ma vie* (May, June, and August 1856). And in her article on Charlotte Brontë she writes of the importance of touching people's hearts in order to bring about beneficial change, an echo of Stowe's goal in writing *Uncle Tom's Cabin*—to bring about a 'change in heart' in her readers in order to 'change the world'.⁵⁷

Hoogenboom has convincingly argued that by the 1860s, Russian women writers, responding to radical critics' attacks on Romanticism, began to adapt the realist aesthetic and write like men realist writers.⁵⁸ For me, 'Razdel', written in the late 1850s, is a fascinating, transitional work that innovatively combines several representational modes. It reflects realism in its detailed descriptions of characters, settings, and life on a country estate, a third-person, reliable narrator,⁵⁹ an amoral manipulative villain, the use of suspense, and its focus on money and inheritance issues. It expresses eighteenth-century sentimentalism in the 'education of the heart'⁶⁰ that Sonia and Katia receive, and by creating a sympathetic community of (female) readers through repeated

⁵⁵ Philip Fisher, 'Making a Thing into a Man: The Sentimental Novel and Slavery', in Fisher, *Hard Facts: Setting and Form in the American Novel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 87–127 (pp. 92, 99).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

⁵⁷ Evgeniia Tur, 'Miss Bronte: eia zhizn' i sochineniia', *Russkii vestnik*, 18 (November–December 1858), 501–75 (p. 575); Jane Tompkins, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 132, 130.

⁵⁸ Hoogenboom, 'A Two-Part Invention', pp. 2, 32.

⁵⁹ This narrator is very different from the 'first-person', judging narrator that Laszczak finds typical of Tur's other works (*Zarys zycia i twórczości Eugenii Tur*, p. 50).

⁶⁰ Maria Edgeworth and R. L. Edgeworth, *Practical Education* (London: Johnson, 1801), p. viii.

appeals to 'moia chitatel'nitsa'.⁶¹ It also partakes of George Sand's idealism in its protest against the injustice of sisters and brothers inheriting unequally.

Other scholars have recently begun to draw attention to Tur's formal experiments and innovations: *Plemniannitsa*, her four-volume novel—one volume of which is an interpolated narrative—written at a time when short forms were the norm in Russian literature; *Zakoldovannyi krug*, an epistolary novel with 'diverse subjective standpoints' that 'anticipates twentieth-century literary experiments';⁶² *Dve sestry*, a 'spill-over' novel, in which the characters from *Antonina* are reassembled from another point of view.⁶³ Tur has also been credited with developing the 'sociopsychological novel'.⁶⁴ Perhaps Tur is due for a reassessment.

In the late 1850s, because of attacks by radical critics, Tur left literature and turned to writing children's stories, a more 'acceptable' occupation for women.⁶⁵ If, as Rachinskii states, Tur started 'Razdel' in the late 1850s, it may have been one of her last works, or perhaps her last work, of adult fiction. The unusual amalgam of representational modes, the use of a more omniscient narrator, and the sometimes surrealistically echoing motifs mark it as the beginning of a new and extremely interesting stage in Tur's development as a writer.⁶⁶ We can only regret that, like 'Razdel', this development was cut short.

A subjective, autobiographical narrative has seemed to me the best way to present this material. Will it, I wonder, be considered *damskaia kritika*? Similarly, rather than a general conclusion, I can only provide my own conclusions, along with some questions and speculations. The incorrect attribution of 'Razdel' to Pavlova has shown me that in cases of uncertain authorship it is unwise to rely on internal literary evidence—that is, close reading—without objective tests, especially when one has a vested interest in a particular outcome. But the correct attribution of 'Razdel' to Tur still leaves several questions unanswered and others perhaps unanswerable.

Most obvious are the physical questions. How did Tur's unfinished manuscript end up in Pavlova's archive? Research on the relationship between Tur and Pavlova might help answer this question. Although Tur is not mentioned

⁶¹ On 'the imagined community' of sentiment see Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Dever, 'Introduction', in *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel*, ed. by Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Dever (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), pp. 1–34 (p. 17).

⁶² Christine D. Tomei, 'Evgeniia Tur (Elizaveta Sailhas de Tournemir)', in *Russian Novelists in the Age of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky*, ed. by J. Alexander Ogden and Judith E. Kalb (Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2001), pp. 339–44 (p. 343).

⁶³ Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 140.

⁶⁴ Lasczak, *Zarys życia i twórczości Eugenii Tur*, p. 70.

⁶⁵ Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, pp. 41–42.

⁶⁶ I am thinking of the scene in which Polina dreamily arranges vine-leaves and peaches in a latticed basket. In a simultaneously occurring scene between Katia and Sonia, the vine-leaves and peaches reappear, as if conjured up by Polina, or as if the three women shared a poetic connection.

in any Pavlova scholarship that I have come across, they must have known each other: both knew Rachinskii, and ran salons in Moscow in the 1840s with many of the same attendees—Ogarev, Granovskii, Ostrovskii, Herzen.⁶⁷ In 1859 Pavlova's tale 'Za chainym stolom' was published in *Russkii vestnik*, while Tur was its literary editor.

Is there a copy of 'Razdel' with the editorial changes that Rachinskii made in preparing it for publication in *Tatevskii sbornik*? Although according to the archivists at RGALI, there is no copy of 'Razdel' in Rachinskii's archive there (f. 427), it might exist among his papers in other archives.⁶⁸ And might another, cleaner copy of the manuscript exist somewhere else?

Finally, although the 'Razdel' manuscript has been shown to be Tur's, should we believe the rest of Rachinskii's account of it—that Tur was planning a tragic denouement for the story, but realized, in talking to Rachinskii, that it 'brought to mind a true occurrence which at that time was still well remembered by Moscow society' ('napominaet proisshestvie istinnoe, togda eshche pamiatnoe moskovskomu obshchestvu')? And what does it mean that one of Rachinskii's few substantive editorial changes was to tone down Pavel's rudeness, pomposity, and cold-blooded ruthlessness?⁶⁹

⁶⁷ Gheith, *Finding the Middle Ground*, p. 35; Munir Sendich, 'Moscow Literary Salons: Thursdays at Karolina Pavlova's', *Die Welt der Slaven*, 17 (1972), 341–57 (p. 344)

⁶⁸ Nikolaev, *Russkie pisateli, 1800–1917*, v, 271.

⁶⁹ 'Razdel', in *Tatevskii sbornik*, p. 143. Pavel on having trained his sisters to obey him (all italics are mine):

Manuscript, fol. 64^v: 'oni khodiat u menia *po palochke*' ('They toe the line with me' [or else I'll take a stick to them' is implied]).

Rachinskii, p. 225: 'oni khodiat u menia *po strunke*' ('They toe the line with me').

The description of the reaction of a provincial young woman whom Pavel has insulted:

Manuscript, fol. 66^r: 'devushka, kotoroi negodovanie pridalo smelosti *i sili*' ('The young woman, whose indignation gave her courage *and strength*').

Rachinskii, p. 227: 'devushka, kotoroi negodovanie pridalo smelosti' ('The young woman, whose indignation gave her courage').

Manuscript, fol. 26^r: 'Vprochim ia ochen' rad, zametil Pavel *vazhno* chto Polia khoziainichaet' ('"But I'm very glad", Pavel remarked *pompously*, "that Polia runs the household"').

Rachinskii, p. 178: 'Vprochim ia ochen' rad, zametil Pavel, chto Polia khoziainichaet' ('"But I'm very glad", Pavel remarked, "that Polia runs the household"').

Manuscript, fol. 45^r: 'Neuzheli vy ne ponimaete, govoril ei Pavel, chto chem bole mushchina liubit zhenshchinu, tem bole on vykazyvaet *despotizma* v otnoshenii k nei' ("Do you really not understand", Pavel said to her, "that the more a man loves a woman, the more *despotically* he acts toward her?").

Rachinskii, p. 199: 'Neuzheli vy ne ponimaete, govoril ei Pavel, chto chem bole mushchina liubit zhenshchinu, tem bole on vykazyvaet *egotism* v otnoshenii k nei' ("Do you really not understand", Pavel said to her, "that the more a man loves a woman, the more *egotistically* he acts toward her?").

Manuscript, fol. 50^r: 'smotria priamo v glaza eia svoimi *bledno* golubymi no blestiaschimi glazami' ('looking straight into her eyes with his *pale blue* glittering eyes').

Rachinskii, p. 206: 'smotria priamo v glaza s svoimi *zhadno*-golodnymi, no blestiaschimi glazami' ('looking straight into her eyes with his *insatiably hungry* but glittering eyes').

For me, however, more significant than determining the author of 'Razdel' is the opportunity to rethink the opposition between canonical and non-canonical nineteenth-century Russian women writers. On the one hand we have writers such as Pavlova, Khvoshchinskaia, and Durova, some of whom refused to identify themselves as women writers, or to 'write as a woman', and were praised by men critics as 'extraordinary women' or honorary men.⁷⁰ On the other hand, we have those who have been labelled as representatives of 'women's writing', such as Tur, Rostopchina, and Zhadovskaia, who may have adhered more closely to the sentimental aesthetic. But to whatever degree these nineteenth-century women writers internalized the categories and dualities imposed on them, each deserves to be evaluated on her own, unique terms.

This is not to suggest that there can be no aesthetic standards, only that all non-realist writing is not necessarily bad. Cohen, it seems to me, provides a useful standard for evaluating all literature, canonical and non-canonical alike. She writes:

A good work, a work that deserves to be studied for literary reasons provides a forceful response to the contemporary problematic, whether the work takes shape within a position, honoring its codes with maximum clarity (the Aristotelian view of literary excellence), or whether the work breaks with the dominant practices in significant ways (the preferred modernist text).⁷¹

Much now forgotten nineteenth-century Russian women's writing provided 'a forceful response' to the contemporary problematic (for women) of women's position in society. That 'Razdel' does so, and also breaks with the dominant (realist) practices in significant ways, suggests that it is worth reconsidering.

BOBST LIBRARY, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

DIANA GREENE

⁷⁰ Nancy K. Miller, 'The Text's Heroine', in Miller, *Subject to Change: Reading Feminist Writing* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 67–78. Pavlova, it should be noted, did write 'as a woman'—that is, using a woman's voice and signature. On 'the extraordinary woman' see Germaine de Staël, 'On Women Writers', in *Major Writings of Germaine de Staël*, ed. by Vivien Folkenflik (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), pp. 201–08; Virginia Woolf, 'Women and Fiction', *Forum*, March 1929, pp. 179–83 (pp. 179–80); Belinskii, 'Sochineniia Zeneidy R-voi', p. 678. Examples of women writers praised as honorary men—(1) Viazemskii on Madame de Staël: 'G-zha de Stal' pervaiia iz zhenshchin pisala muzhestvennym perom' ('Mme de Staël was the first woman to write with a manly pen': S. Durylin, *G-zha de Stal' i ee russkie otnosheniia: literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vols xxxiii–xxxiv (Moscow: AN SSSR: Moscow, 1939), p. 317); (2) Belinskii's above-cited appreciation of Pavlova's 'masculine energy' ('Russkie zhurnaly', p. 191); and (3) his tribute to Durova: 'kazhetsia sam Pushkin otdal ei svoe prozaicheskoe pero, i emu-to ona obiazana etoi muzhestvennoi tverdost'iu i siloiu' ('It seems that Pushkin himself lent her his pen for writing prose, and that it is to him that she is indebted for this manly firmness and strength': 'Zapiski Aleksandrova (Durovoi)' (1839), in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, III, 148–57 (p. 149)).

⁷¹ Cohen, *Sentimental Education*, p. 25.

APPENDIX

Handwriting Analysis Report by Olga Glagoleva

I have looked carefully at all samples you sent me and my impression that the Razdel hand is similar to that in the Tur samples but different from the Pavlova hand is confirmed.

The peculiarities of the Razdel penmanship are stable throughout all of the samples and very similar to those of the Tur hand. The handwriting in both sets is highly developed, free flowing with rapid speed and high connectedness. The formation of letters and their combinations are somewhat simplified and peculiar, which is particularly obvious in the execution of the letters 'т', 'ж', 'л', 'д', and 'ячь'. The shape of most letters is и-like with rounded strokes. The letters 'т' and 'ячь' are particularly deformed and often simplified to a single vertical stroke ('т') or a cross ('ячь'). The letter 'д' in contrast is often flourished. The same characteristics and peculiarities are stable in the Razdel manuscript and the Tur samples in both languages, Russian and French. Some words bear a striking resemblance—'что', 'это', 'мне'.

On the other hand, the Pavlova handwriting is simple and less freely going with low connectedness between the letters. The letters are rather narrow with wedge-shape strokes and missing or incomplete loops. The letters 'т', 'л', and 'ж' are fully executed (which is never the case in the Razdel) and completely different from those in the Razdel hand; the 'д' letters are always rather simple, and even if a bit flourished, as in the sample on the page with the printed Russian poem (Играли молодые грезы . . .), still simple and much less flourished than in the Razdel handwriting. Again, the characteristics of the Pavlova hand are stable in all the samples, but much differ from the Razdel penmanship.

I'm sending you back some pages where I have marked up some peculiar letters in all three (or rather two) hands, to illustrate for you what I wrote above. The two hands—Pavlova's and in the Razdel—are a great deal different.

Dr Olga Glagoleva
email of 28 May 2011