



PROJECT MUSE®

French and Russian in Imperial Russia. Vol. 1: Language Use among the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Russian Elite ed. by Derek Offord etal. (review)

Anna Verschik

Ab Imperio, 4/2015, pp. 457-463 (Review)

Published by Ab Imperio

DOI: [10.1353/imp.2015.0097](https://doi.org/10.1353/imp.2015.0097)



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/611755>

or may not share physical location. His analysis of the *mahalla-to'y*, which used to be a three-day series of feasts hosted by leaders of one such community network, shows ways that this ritual reinforced kin and social relations, created mutual debt obligations, and served to redistribute food and support the poor. Like other social relationships, though, the *mahalla* is not a stable, given, and enduring form of “tradition,” but a constantly changing phenomenon, and even the three-day feasts that Abashin witnessed in his 1995 research in Oshoba seem to have given way to new forms of feasting and reciprocity in the 2000s.

In the spirit of transparency and reflexivity that pervades this massive volume, Abashin begins with a discussion of his intellectual formation as a Soviet ethnographer. He closes with a chapter about himself, subjecting his own experiences of fieldwork in the 1990s and in 2010 to examination, asking about the ways that any anthropologist-outsider becomes embedded in, but still unable to fully see, local relationships. The entire volume is a thorough education in ethnographic theory and research, and fortunately for the scholar who does not read Russian well, some chapters have been published in English as journal articles. Still, a full translation would be a true gift to the fields of ethnography, history, and Central Asian studies.

Anna VERSCHIK

Derek Offord, Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, Vladislav Rjéoutski, and Gesine Argent (Eds.), *French and Russian in Imperial Russia*. Vol. 1: *Language Use among the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Russian Elite* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015). 224 pp., ill. Index. ISBN: 978-0-7486-9551-5; Vol. 2: *Language Attitudes and Identity* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015). 288 pp., ill. Index. ISBN: 978-0-7486-9553-9.

The two volumes in question are an ambitious undertaking by a group of scholars specializing in Russian Studies. The use of French among Russian nobility starting from the middle of the eighteenth century has been covered in various studies, yet so far these have been isolated treatments. The editors of the two volumes have succeeded in integrating and presenting in a well-structured manner a solid body of research that has grown out of several conferences and projects. The volumes have a twofold aim: first, to provide detailed case studies (archives, private correspondence, periodicals) on when and where French/Russian was used, and second, to view the data within a broader disciplinary context of sociolinguistics, language policy, discourse analysis, translation theory, and, partly, code-switching studies.

All contributions present analysis of primary sources: archive documents, private correspondence, press, and literary texts of various kinds. The variety of sources is impressive and helps to convey a complex picture of language use and dynamics of language attitudes.

Each volume has an introduction and conclusion, that is, a text that summarizes the contributions to the volume. The first volume comprises twelve articles and concentrates on patterns of language use, that is, French vs. Russian or French and Russian and, sometimes, other languages. The range of topics on which the authors of the first volume focus is as follows:

1. “Division of labour” between Russian and French, including discussions on the extent of the influence of French on Russian culture and language (chapter 1, which is a general characterization of the situation of French and Russian in Catherine’s Russia by Derek Offord, Gesine Argent, and Vladislav Rjéoutski; chapter 3 by Gesine Argent on the debate concerning the essence and desirability of the influence of French on Russian language and culture between two prominent members of the Russian literati, Karamzin and Shishkov; chapter 12 by Nina Dmitrieva and Gesine Argent on diglossia vs. bilingualism);
2. Private correspondence of aristocratic families and monarchs (chapter 2 by George Dulac on the use of French by Catherine II in her letters to J. M. Grimm; chapter 6 by Rodolphe Baudin on Radishchev’s language choices in letters from exile), aristocratic families (chapter 3 on the Counts Stroganoff by Vladislav Rjéoutski and Vladimir Somov; chapter 6 by Rodolphe Baudin on Radishchev; chapter 7 by Jessica Tipton on the Vorontsov family; chapter 9 by Nina Dmitrieva on Pushkin’s French-language letters);
3. Language use in particular text types (chapter 4 on Francophone press by Vladislav Rjéoutski and Natalia Speranskaia; chapter 5 on noblewomen’s travel narratives by Emilie Murphy; chapter 8 on Karamzin’s egodocuments by Liubov Shapchenko);
4. French and its influence in particular domains (chapter 10 by Xénia Borderiou on fashion and coquetry; chapter 11 on architectural terminology by Sergei and Iuliia Klimenko).

Chapter 12 by Nina Dmitrieva and Gesine Argent discusses the situation in the eighteenth–nineteenth centuries within the framework of the well-known dichotomy of bilingualism vs. diglossia (i.e., whether bilingualism and diglossia coexisted or it was bilingualism only). I agree with the authors that the situation

cannot be described in a clear manner because diglossia presupposes a strict division of domains between two varieties, and this was not the case due to some gray areas and an absence of articulated norms. Russian was not a variety with a low status (L in the classical sense); it symbolized certain values and was used in H (high) domains, such as scholarly texts, fiction, and the press. In sum, it was not viewed as an antagonist to French. This chapter makes a nice transition to volume 2, which provides a more general sociolinguistic perspective.

The second volume comprises eleven articles and a conclusion, touches on some topics from the first volume, and introduces new topics, such as:

1. Translation culture (chapter 3 by Svetlana Skomorokhova with an application of polysystem theory to the translation activities of Aleksandr Sumarokov) and “rewriting” into Russian, adaptation, reinterpretation, problems of rendering various concepts in Russian (chapter 8 by D. Brian Kim on Krylov’s rendition of Molière; chapter 10 by Sarah Dickinson on varying translations of the French *patrie* “motherland” in the Napoleonic period, and chapter 11 by Victor Zhivov on the development of love and courtship vocabulary via translation from French);
2. Ethnolinguistic identity, attitudes toward French and purism (chapter 5 by Derek Offord on Gallophobia in Russian comedy);
3. Metalinguistic awareness and complexities of multilingual identity (chapter 4 by Carole Chapin on French-language culture in Russia viewed by the Russian and French press; chapter 11 by Derek Offord on Pushkin’s presentation of Francophonie in prose). To some extent, chapters that describe linguistic purism (namely, chapters 6 and 7 in vol. 2, authored by Gesine Argent and G. M. Hamburg, respectively) and political conservatism at the beginning of the nineteenth century deal with metalinguistic awareness as well: for instance, views on the influx of French loans, linguistic behavior and attitudes, and emphasis on the continuous development from Old Slavic to Russian (as proposed by Shishkov) are examples of metalinguistic reflections.
4. Reflections on the use of French and other languages in fiction (chapter 11 by Derek Offord on Francophonie in Pushkin’s prose, and partially chapter 8 by D. Brian Kim on Krylov’s transplanting of Molière onto Russian realities).

Based on the two volumes, one can conclude that there was no clear-cut division of labor between Russian and French and the relationship

between the languages cannot be described in an “either/or” manner. From the analysis of private correspondence we learn that Russian is the language of intimacy to be used between spouses and close friends (which does not exclude using French with the same people). At the same time, the use of Russian was expected from someone addressing a person of a higher social status (i.e., writing in French to a monarch is ambiguous because it would imply equal standing in the social hierarchy). French was not solely perceived as the language of France and French culture but rather as the *lingua franca* of the time. It was also a vehicle of knowledge and education.

In this way, several authors explain that the use of French did not always signal self-identification with Francophone culture. For instance, chapter 2 in volume 1 presents the case of the Counts Stroganoff, a family with substantial proficiency in French and other languages, yet patriots of Russia who value Russian. High fluency in French in the Russian upper classes did not, in fact, create a distinction between Russia and the rest of Europe (Introduction to volume 1). The authors of the introduction make a critical reassessment of a presumed rift between the elite, affected by their use of French, and the common people (Pp. 17–18). The same topic is addressed

in chapters 5, 6, and 7 in volume 2. Derek Offord’s conclusion concerning French in Pushkin’s prose (Vol. 2, chapter 12) is that after almost a century of using French a “certain refined sensibility and moral consciousness” was introduced and that the acquisition of foreign cultural models was a necessary step for the emergence of a culture that would be labeled as Russian (Vol. 2. P. 210).

To take a broader view, the Russian context was not extraordinary because a good command of French was the norm for European aristocracy all over Europe. This observation is significant because we often tend to view sociolinguistic and cultural processes in the framework of area studies (Russian Studies, German Studies, Baltic Studies, etc.), but stepping outside the mental borders of a certain field is productive for insiders and outsiders alike. The sociolinguistic “normality” of elite multilingualism is elaborated on in chapters 1 and 2 of volume 2. Michelle Lamarche Marrese (Vol. 2. Pp. 42–43) argues against the commonly held view (including among some scholars) that the Russian elite had a poor command of Russian and were linguistically alienated from common people. Archival documents show this not to have been the case: business communication and communication with bailiffs, nannies, and servants was conducted in Russian.

The reader comes to realize the complexity of attitudes toward French and Russian in both Russia and France. As Carol Chapin in chapter 4 (Vol. 2) has it, the French press dedicated some space to proficiency in and the use of French, and the French public felt flattered that their language and culture occupied such an important position in the education and life of the Russian aristocracy.

At the same time, French–Russian bilingualism created mixed feelings in some Russian intellectuals and men of letters in the second half of the eighteenth century. An analysis of their texts show, however, that the criticism was not directed at the knowledge of French and other foreign languages as such but at what was understood as the indiscriminate introduction of French lexical items and “mixing,” coupled with a superficial knowledge of French and French customs and disdain for all things Russian. In such a discourse, the use of French words and the mindless copying of French fashions and manners becomes synonymous with shallowness, pompousness, and flippancy. In this light one may ask whether it was indeed linguistic Gallophobia (Vol. 2, chapter 5, by Derek Offord) because critical attitudes toward superficially acquired French notwithstanding, the authors of satire as well as their audiences were proficient in French and never denied the

importance of French as a vehicle of education, new knowledge, and international communication.

Chapters 6 and 7 (authored by Gesine Argent and G. M. Hamburg, respectively) tackle linguistic purism and purists, of which Shishkov was a textbook example. Both authors discuss the impact of Herderian ideas of romantic nationalism. Curiously, the links between purism and political conservatism have led to a tradition (introduced by Iurii Tynianov) where Shishkov and like-minded people are termed archaists as opposed to innovators. As Gesine Argent argues (Vol. 2, chapter 6, P. 105), chronologically speaking, Shishkov was a representative of innovation, that is, a supporter of the new ideas of national romanticism and exclusiveness of a language as a mirror of a people’s soul. Indeed, the Herderian view on peoples and languages was a certain reaction to the Enlightenment with its Universalist and rationalist ideals.

In this connection, it would be desirable to take the next step and to place the purist ideologies in question within a general typology of linguistic purism. A rather standard treatment of the topic is that of George Thomas, who proposes various approaches: archaizing, ethnographic (i.e., glorification of folk, dialects, countryside), elitist, reformist (breaking with the past), and patriotic (elimination of foreign

elements and models).¹ It appears that the Russian purism of the time was archaizing and patriotic. In future, more analysis of the topic would be most welcome.

The articles that provide a more general theoretical context are, to my mind, more informative, at least for a reader who has no connection or only a passing one with the field of Russian Studies. For instance, chapter 3 in volume 2 presents the main principles of polysystem theory (developed by Itamar Even-Zohar starting in the late 1970s) and argues that Sumarokov's activity as a translator and his opinions fit well with the main postulates of the theory. Svetlana Skomorokhova (Vol. 2. P. 51) emphasizes that Even-Zohar acknowledges his methodological connections with Russian formalism and is well aware of the Russian literary context.

In addition to the obvious and explicitly mentioned topics such as language policy/language politics, historical sociolinguistics, purism, norms, influence of French on terminology, French as a vehicle of cultural innovation, some topics are touched on but not labelled (this is

merely a remark and not a criticism, insofar as scholars whose background is Russian Studies cannot be equally well-informed about all new directions in sociolinguistics). Such topics include, for instance, multilingualism and emotions.² We learn that Russian noblewomen sometimes switch to Russian in their travel narratives because, being away from home, they look for an opportunity to use the language and the very usage is motivated emotionally and not functionally (Vol. 1. P. 116). In addition, occasional violations of the established etiquette by Pushkin in his otherwise French-language letters to his future wife (Vol. 1. P. 182), appear where he wants to show affection. Another field to be mentioned is linguistic biographies and autobiographies: chapters concentrating on language use in aristocratic families deal with personal reflections on individual multilingualism, linguistic preferences, and language learning.³

A possible topic for further research would be elite multilingualism as a special case. The core of sociolinguistics and multilingualism literature explores the multilingual-

¹ George Thomas. *Linguistic Purism*. London, 1991.

² See Jean-Marc Dewaele. *Emotions in Multiple Languages*. Basingstoke, 2010; Aneta Pavlenko. *Emotions and Multilingualism*. Cambridge, 2005.

³ On linguistic autobiographical narratives, see: Jiří Nekvapil. *Language Biographies and Analysis of Language Situations: On the Life of the German Community in the Czech Republic // International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 2003. Vol. 162. Pp. 63-83; Aneta Pavlenko. *Autobiographic Narratives as Data in Applied Linguistics // Applied Linguistics*. 2007. Vol. 28. No. 2. Pp. 163-188.

ism of indigenous minorities or immigrants (and mostly synchronically for the reasons that sociolinguistics studies naturalistic language use and that the turn to the historical viewpoint has emerged only recently). Thus, approaching elite multilingualism in Russia, and in Europe in general, in combination with a historic sociolinguistic approach would be an innovation.

A contact linguistic approach, that is, a more structure-centered treatment of cross-linguistic influence and language change, is not represented in the volumes. Code-switching is treated in terms of language choice and societal norms and, to some extent, lexical innovation is discussed in several chapters, but not within any contact linguistic model or framework. I believe that an analysis of contact-induced language innovation and change in written text (the press, egodocuments, etc.) would be useful and offer a diachronic perspective.

On the whole, the articles are well-integrated into the collection and it appears that the contributors are well-versed in each other's work and the field of Russian Studies. The collection can be recommended also to those who do not specialize in Russian Studies, but have more general interests such as translation culture, historical sociolinguistics, and multilingualism in Europe in the eighteenth–nineteenth centuries.

Нина КАЗАРОВА

А. Ю. Баженова. Историки Императорского Варшавского университета 1869–1915: просвещение, наука, политика. Люблин: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2014. 408 с. ISBN: 978-83-60695-80-7.

Варшавский императорский университет имеет трудную историю. Основанный императором Александром I в ноябре 1816 года, он был закрыт указом Николая I после польского восстания 1830–1831 гг. Только через 30 лет, в 1862 г., Александр II восстановил университет под названием “Главная школа”. Но и она просуществовала недолго. После восстания 1863–1864 гг. школа была закрыта, и на ее базе в 1869 г. был создан русскоязычный Императорский Варшавский университет, просуществовавший в Варшаве до июня 1915 года, а затем эвакуированный в Ростов, где существует по сей день под названием “Южный федеральный университет”. В нынешнем году отмечается 100-летие университета на Донской земле.

В последние годы возрос исследовательский интерес к истории высшего образования вообще и к истории российских университетов в частности. Ежегодно выходят статьи и монографии, по-