

eventually published in 1784 it also included an extensive ‘glossary’ cum index (pp. 144–80) (compiled by whom is unclear), in which the largest entry by far concerns Castle himself (pp. 145–9).

Castle described himself on the title page of his work ‘an Englishman and artist’ and there are 13 full-page black and white plates, mainly, it seems, drawn by Castle himself and indeed in four, possibly five, instances portraying the author of whom there is no other known likeness.

The German text, including the glossary, was translated into English by Sarah Tolley, who describes the language of the original as ‘colloquial and pedestrian’, and the enterprise has been the initiative of the editor Beatrice Teissier, whose previous book, *Russian Frontiers: Eighteenth-Century British Travellers in the Caspian, Caucasus and Central Asia* (2011) was reviewed in this journal (*JES*, 42: 313–14), and who is responsible for the introduction, meticulous notes, bibliography and index. Castle’s diary is an interesting addition to accounts of the Russian empire available in English for a period that is not rich in such sources and will take its place as an addendum in my *In the Lands of the Romanovs: A Bibliography of English-Language First-Hand Accounts of Russia, 1613–1917* (2014).

Anthony Cross

French and Russian in Imperial Russia. Edited by Derek Offord, Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, Vladislav Rjéoutschi and Gesine Argent. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015. Vol. I: *Language Use Among the Russian Elite*. Pp. xvii + 270. Vol. II: *Language Attitudes and Identity*. Pp. xvi + 266.

These two volumes are derived from a research project at the University of Bristol on ‘The History of the French Language in Russia’. As was the case throughout Europe, for the Russian elite in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century French was an essential language of communication and mark of status. Along with German to a lesser extent, it was the major conduit of Petrine Westernization and was particularly significant given the relatively underdeveloped nature of native Russian-language culture. French was also necessary in the active projection of a new image of a transformed Europeanized Russia in the West. Although all this has been broadly acknowledged by scholars and many aspects of the interplay between French and the vernacular have been explored, no general study until now has concentrated to this extent on the particular issue of the role of French in Russia using the perceptions developed by historians of cultural influence and sociolinguists in the fields of bilingualism and multilingualism.

Although having a common overall title, the two complementary volumes have different emphases indicated by their respective sub-titles. The first deals with the use of French by Russians in practice and the second with attitudes to the usage of French and its role in the development of the Russian language and of a Russian national identity. In both cases, chapters outlining general issues are co-authored by the joint editors and collaborators in the research project, whereas specific topics are addressed by individual authors.

Thus Offord, Argent and Rjéoutschi have an initial chapter on the Catherinian period that marked the ascendancy of French, identifying the salient issues that emerge,

particularly the paradox that their appreciation and use of French made the Russian elite conscious of the importance of their native language in cultural nation-building. From the general one moves to the particular in the second chapter by Georges Dulac on the use by Catherine II of French in her letters to Friedrich Melchior Grimm. This intimate correspondence is valuable in reflecting in its playfulness and relaxed syntax the orality of the French that was probably used in court circles. Three more chapters examine an individual's use of French and the range of motivations for the choice of language. Rodolphe Baudin in a perceptive study shows that, contrary to Catherine who used French as a mark of intimacy, Alexander Radishchev, writing to his patron Vorontsov from his Siberian exile, employs French to maintain a proper sense of social distance and respect. The dictates of social etiquette may also on occasions account for Karamzin's choice of French, as Liubov Sapchenko indicates in her close analysis of Karamzin's switching between the two languages in letters and albums. However, French may also have been preferred for the expression of inner thoughts and feelings, whereas Russian was his natural medium for recounting events and action. In Pushkin's carefully crafted letters too, as Nina Dimtrevna argues, etiquette as well as his reliance on French literary models determined the choice of French. But Russian was preferred for personal, confidential correspondence. Paradoxically, Russian was also the designated language for official correspondence but it is intriguing that in communicating with Benckendorff, the Chief of Gendarmes, Pushkin turned to French in moments of embarrassment and awkwardness to excuse errant behaviour.

Linguistic practice across generations in eminent aristocratic families is examined in the cases of the Stroganovs and Vorontsovs. What is apparent in both families is that while their extensive use of French was felt to identify them with the broader European enlightenment, it did not preclude them from the expression of patriotic feelings and a high regard for their native tongue.

Two chapters turn from personal usage to the predominant employment of French as a technical, working language in the fields of fashion and architecture. One sphere in which French was exclusively used was the Francophone press intended mainly for French expatriates, and French too was overwhelmingly the medium for women's travel narratives.

Many of the themes touched upon in the discussions of bilingual practice recur in the companion volume which elaborates the effects of this bilingualism on developing cultural attitudes and sense of national identity in the period through to the age of Pushkin. It is significant that the time when French was so widely used was also the period that witnessed the conscious refinement of a standard Russian literary language. As Stephen Bruce acknowledges in an initial chapter, French, in Russia as throughout Europe, was exploited as a universal lingua franca, a necessary tool. It did not entail an exclusive attachment to all things French. Indeed, it was often a suitable medium for carrying the arguments in favour of the national language and concomitant culture to a wider enlightened readership in Europe. It was certainly the view of Princess Dashkova, as Michelle Lamarche Marrese makes plain in the following chapter. That eighteenth-century writing contextualized itself within the broader European culture is certainly evident in Aleksandr Sumarokov's adaptations and reworking of dramatic models, as Svetlana Skomorokhava shows, and the point is reinforced by Offord in his discussion of Gallomania in Russian

satires, rightly stressing how dramatic Gallophobia was a common European literary trope. According to Carole Chaplin, even French reviewers of Russian comedy accepted that mockery of extravagant Frenchified ways was not an attack on French culture but a satire on the mores of unenlightened Russians.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century the instinctual feeling that the native language was worthy of respect and defence eventually led to a conscious analysis of the ways by which it should be developed and an escape from the assumption that French was the sole medium of enlightened European culture. The key conflicting views formed the basis of the linguistic debate between Karamzin and Aleksandr Shishkov examined by Argent. Both were in agreement on the richness of Russian, the lack of due respect for it and the negative effects of the education through the medium of French. They differed, however, in their strategies for further developing a standard literary language. Whereas Karamzin was content to assimilate the existing French input into Russian lexis and syntax, Shishkov advocated tempering French borrowing by actively exploiting elements from sacred Slavonic texts.

Language became identified with burgeoning early nineteenth-century Slavophilism, and Shishkov, Fedor Rostopchin and Sergei Glinka are examples chosen by G. M. Hamburg to demonstrate this sense of language as a definer of nationhood. Again the irony is that all three utilized French in their promotion of linguistic nationalism. The effect of this new political sense is underlined by Sara Dickinson's examination of the changing Russian versions of 'la patrie' as 'otchestvo' and 'otchizna' gave way to 'rodina', Russian lexis being deeply affected by the Napoleonic War.

Pushkin, as Offord argues, embodied the pressure of the changing attitudes of his age. Entirely at ease with *francophonie*, he nevertheless was the genius who would ensure that Russians would progress naturally to express themselves principally in their vernacular. Yet even so, in certain spheres, French lexis proved to be irreplaceable.

The late Victor Zhivov, with his usual wit, shows how the Russian vocabulary of love remained incomplete and fragmentary compared to that of French gallantry, as did that of the world of fashion where, as Olga Vassileva-Codognet argues, French only slowly ebbed in favour of Russian to leave a tidemark of transliterated lexis.

This is a fascinating study revealing the complexities and paradoxes of the interaction between an accepted universal lingua franca and a fast developing national language.

W. Gareth Jones

Letters from Vladivostok, 1894–1930. By Eleanor Lord Pray. Edited with introduction and notes by Brigitta Ingemanson. Biographical sketch by Patricia D. Silver. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2013. Pp. xxxi + 276. \$60.00.

Eleanor 'Roxy' Lord (1868–1954), soon after her marriage to Frederick Pray (1867–1923), left America and, travelling via Japan, arrived in Vladivostok in late June 1894. Frederick was to work for Charles Smith, who with his wife Sarah, Frederick's sister, were owners of the American Store. What was initially envisaged as a five-year stay became one of nearly four decades and Mrs Pray became the unofficial and unheralded