Wendy Rosslyn

FEATS OF AGREEABLE USEFULNESS: TRANSLATIONS BY RUSSIAN WOMEN (1763-1825)

Chapter Two

THE TRANSLATORS

Who were the women who translated in the eighteenth century? What can we establish about their education, social status, age, their patrons and collaborators, and the places in which they worked?

About 120 women published translations in Russia between 1763 and 1825. From 1763-69 3 translators published, in the 1770s 11, in the 1780s 18, in the 1790s 33, in the 1800s 37. After this activity dropped temporarily and in the 1810s there were 16. In the first half of the 1820s there were 17.

Women translators were, like most of their male counterparts, amateurs who translated in their leisure time, usually without expectation of financial return. Because translating required a certain level of education, most were from the upper echelons of society, and they were more socially homogeneous than their male counterparts, who in Catherine's reign came from a variety of backgrounds, including the nobility but also the lower ranks of the civil service, seminaries, and the staff of educational institutions.[1] Of the women who published translations some were from the elite, amongst whom were Catherine II, Alexandra Pavlovna (sister of Alexander I), Princess Ekaterina Dashkova, Anna and Ekaterina Volkonskaia,[2] the Princesses Ekaterina, Elena and Tat'iana Golitsyna, Princess Ekaterina Menshikova, and Aleksandra Khvostova.[3] Varvara Vasil'evna Golitsyna was at court in her capacity as the niece and mistress of Catherine's favourite Potemkin.[4] Most were noblewomen, but by the end of the century, thanks to the improvement in educational provision for women of lesser status, women translators included those whose financial situation was insecure and women of humbler origins. Mar'ia Orlova had only 'a little capital'[5] and lived in the home of her benefactress; the anonymous translator of *L'Ami des femmes* commented in her preface that she lacked the means to acquire even a basic knowledge of literature. Elizaveta Del'sal' was the daughter of a proprietor of a private boarding school in Moscow,[6] and as she mentions educating 'her own and noble Russian children', she presumably worked as a teacher or governess. Nearly all seem to have been Russians, but a few were native speakers of the foreign language living in Russia, like Maria-Frantsiska-Regina Freitakh, née Pfundheller and Kleopatra Sarafova, a native speaker of Armenian,[7] or were the daughters of expatriate foreigners, like Elizaveta Del'sal', née Sos'e, or Elizaveta Dil'tei, daughter of Professor Philipp Heinrich Dilthey of Moscow University.

Translating was an activity which women evidently fitted into their leisure time, or amongst the standard activities of their daily lives. In an era of large families – Varvara Vasil'evna Golitsyna brought up nine sons[8] – these were many, though not shouldered without the help of servants. Shkalon, for example, recalled:

> Our good mother saw not only to the education of us all [six] but also to the household and later the administration of the estate. In spite of this she found time to learn German, read, copy out extracts from books, and, with the doctor's advice, treat the sick children of poor families who came from all directions.[9]

How they reconciled their various activities is sometimes revealed in their prefaces to their translations, although these must be read in the light of the fact that prefaces were usually occasions for modesty. Translation was presented as a way of making good use of their leisure time, which women were expected not to waste. In her preface Aleksandra Serbina described her work as 'the pleasant and useful occupation of leisure hours'. Translation was done on summer mornings,[10] probably when out of town with spare time and few visitors, and it can be imagined that it was also a remedy for boredom during a long winter in the country with infrequent visitors. Convalescence presented another opportunity: 'Being at present in the country, I have been unable to occupy myself with anything of any importance on account of my poor state of health; wishing to avoid idleness, I translated this comedy,' wrote Menshikova.[11] And an anonymous translator explained that her work had served as a comforting distraction in bereavement.[12] Translation could also be combined with teaching children: 'sometimes during lessons with my children I gave the teachers freedom of action under my supervision; but so as not to be idle I occupied myself with translations from the French,' wrote Menshikova.[13] Del'sal' both set her pupils translations and translated with them under the supervision of a teacher of literature.[14] Perhaps one reason why more women took up translation than original writing was that the former required fewer long stretches of uninterrupted time and could more easily be fitted into the daily round of activities.

For young members of upper-class families translation constituted a routine part of the educational process. Excellence in translation was deemed a sign of competence in the language. G. S. Vinskii, for example, boasted that his pupil, the fifteen-year-old Natal'ia Levashova of Ufa, had 'understood so much French after two years that she could translate such very difficult authors as Helvétius, Mercier, Rousseau, and Mably without using the dictionary, and write letters without making spelling mistakes; she also knew ancient and modern history, geography, and mythology quite well.'[15] Proud tutors might then arrange publication of work which they had supervised. Mar'ia Bazilevich, for example, observed in her preface to her *Novye basni i povesti* (*New Fables and Stories*) that her book arose from the need to practise her German. It seems likely that many women took up translation because they were introduced to it as part of their education.

The connection between language-learning and the practice of translation, along with the encouragement of youthful achievement, probably accounts for the young age at which translators, both male and female, could publish. Anna and Pelageia Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova were nine years old when they first published translations. The young woman who signed herself Ans-ia Kvlskia was ten, Elizaveta Titova eleven, Elizaveta Baskakova and Natal'ia Prokudina twelve; Aleksandra Pavlovna and Elizaveta Likhareva were thirteen, Anis'ia Vel'iaminova-Zernova was fourteen, and Ekaterina Svin'ina, Elizaveta Demidova, and Anna Volkova fifteen. Fifteen was the approximate age at which girls began to go out into society, accompanied by their mothers, at the end of the century.[16]

Most women translators published in Petersburg or Moscow, and probably worked

there too, since these were the main population centres and the places in which both good education and contact with journals and printers were most easily organised. However, from the 1780s some women worked in provincial towns and on country estates, as is shown by the places of publication of book titles, and by the places of writing recorded in some publications in journals. The translation habit spread with rising levels of literacy, education for women, book distribution, printing, and cultural activity in provincial towns. Mar'ia Orlova, for example, joined in the activities started in Tambov by the poet G. R. Derzhavin during his posting there as governor in 1786-88. She participated in the literary activities, sang and acted in the theatrical productions, served regularly as Derzhavin's secretary,[17] 'read and wrote much under his Horatian dictatorship',[18] and translated. Locations spread from Iaroslavl' (E. Golenishcheva-Kutuzova, 1785) to Kazinka (Anna Murav'eva-Apostol, 1791), Tobol'sk (Sof'ia Sumarokova, 1791), Nizhnii Novgorod (Natal'ia Prokudina, 1792), the village of Uteshen'e (Ekaterina Shcherbatova and Mar'ia Boske, 1798), Kazan' (K-a, 1800), the village of Zhelen' (Elizaveta and Ekaterina Neelova, 1801), Grodno (Aspazia Mak-va, 1804), Riga (Praskov'ia Neimicheva, 1807), and Khar'kov (Glafira Shumlianskaia, Aleksandra Kamenskaia, Liubov' and Liudmila Korostavtseva, and Liubov' Krichevskaia, 1816-17).

It is not surprising that several women translators came from families where writing and translation were practised and support was immediately available, since in order to translate and publish, women needed encouragement, opportunities for discussion, and contacts with the male literary world. Elizaveta Kheraskova was married to the poet M. M. Kheraskov, and Varvara Karaulova to the writer A. I. Kniazhnin. Aleksandra Kozlova and Maria Perovskaia had brothers who were writers. Dar'ia Mal'gina was the daughter of T. S. Mal'gin who worked for the Sobranie; in the Russian title of the text she translated, Mal'gin is credited with the work, and it may be that his daughter and her co-translator look up translation by completing work left unfinished at his death. Nadezhda Nikiforova's relatives Pavel and Stefan were translators.[19] And Anna Zontag grew up with her uncle the poet-translator V. A. Zhukovskii, who 'shared and inspired their literary games, theatrical performances, and readings and discussions of literary works'. He also supervised her translations for the journal *Vestnik Evropy* (*The Herald of Europe*).[20] The same held true for women writers. Ekaterina Sumarokova, for example, was the daughter of A. P. Sumarokov and the wife of the dramatist Ia. B. Kniazhnin. However, there were instances of women leading the way. Anna Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova's father and brother both translated, but began publishing after her, and Nilova began publishing in 1782, to be followed by her husband (1789) and son (1793).[21]

Many successful women translators had patrons. Patronage helped to disarm criticism of women who resisted the standard stereotype of domesticity, was a great encouragement in continuing their work, and could be of practical benefit. Exalted patrons included Catherine II, who acted as patron to Anna Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova and Mar'ia Sushkova, and also encouraged Anna and Ekaterina Volkonskaia:

> … their translation was presented through Princess Dashkova to Catherine II, who ordered the Princesses Volkonskaia to present themselves at the masquerade at Petergof, this was arranged by their patron, Princess Dashkova. The Empress deigned to speak kindly to the young translators before the entire assembly.[22]

Kheraskov was a patron of Sushkova and probably also of Aleksandra Magnitskaia.[23] But the most effective patrons of women translators were certainly tutors, who would correct errors, suggest improvements or even take a guiding hand in the work, and facilitate its appearance in print. Kozlova mentions 'works completed with the guidance of my teacher',[24] and Elizaveta Kusheleva also recorded the guidance of her tutor.[25] It is possible that the person who edited Mar'ia Bazilevich's *Novye basni i povesti* (*New Fables and Stories*) may have been her tutor; at the time he was a student at Moscow University and a translator with published work to his credit.[26]

Translators who worked without tutors could find support in the household or locality. In her preface Serbina recorded that her husband encouraged her to develop her gift for translation, and in hers Orlova acknowledged help from the son of the household in which she lived. Maria Arbuzova lived near the family of the writer and translator V. A. Levshin, and was advised by Levshin's daughter Nadezhda Kalashnikova.[27] Women translators were also able to help each other. Dashkova was patron to the Volkonskaia sisters and brought them to Catherine's notice; and their niece Ekaterina translated a play, perhaps encouraged by their example. Orlova recounts that she took up translation as a result of watching Nilova at work. Dedicating her text to Nilova, she wrote:

> ... your exercises in translation are known to many, to true Christians, and true lovers of virtue. From infancy, since my father and mother left this world and all our family was orphaned and the Lord and you took us in, I have seen you ceaselessly on the path of usefulness and honour. I have become accustomed to find you with a book, either reading or translating, once your domestic tasks are finished. Gradually I began to imitate you, and this translation of *Barford Abbey* is, although not perfect, the fruit of my imitation, which I venture to dedicate to you, aided in my work by your amiable son...'

Women also worked in teams. On occasion these were male-female. Mar'ia and Grigorii Ivanenko were brother and sister, and Sushkova apparently translated Mercier's play *L'Habitant de la Guadeloupe* with her brother.[28] A particular case of collaboration was that of Catherine II, who was not a native speaker of Russian, with her private secretaries G. V. Kozitskii and A. V. Khrapovitskii, both of whom were writers. Khrapovitskii composed verse for her comedies and operas, and sometimes worked up individual scenes on the basis of plans provided by Catherine.[29] Female partnerships were more common, and probably easier to organise, given the different lifestyles of men and women. Several teams of sisters worked together, notably the Volkonskaia, Magnitskaia, Korostavtseva and Kusovnikova sisters, and Anon and her younger sister, who translated Boudier de Villemert's *L'Ami des femmes*. Friends also worked together. Elizaveta Baskakova and Natal'ia Kologrivova, pupils of the same tutor,[30] published their texts in journals alongside each other. Working together could also be an expression of Sentimental friendship. Shcherbatova and Boske, for example, used matching pseudonyms consisting of numbers and letters (20. 20. Shch. and 40. B.), translated the same authors, and published their texts in the same periodicals in alternation with one another. Both gave the place of translation as 'the village of Uteshen'e'. Makarov comments that they were 'inseparable friends'.[31] Shcherbatova and Boske also worked

with another team, the Magnitskaia sisters, on a large project: Dupaty's *Lettres sur I'Italie en 1785*.

Very many women published only one or two texts, although they probably translated others which did not reach the public. The average number of publications per person was just over two, but the average conceals a large number of women who translated only one text and a smaller number who were more active. One reason was probably that young women who translated in the course of their studies ceased to do so when they graduated to the rival distractions of the adult world. In other cases, as they explained in their prefaces, women identified useful translation projects, sometimes substantial ones, which they felt moved to undertake, and once they had completed them they translated no more. Sarafova's Russian-Armenian dictionary-cum-primer was used by Armenian refugees who settled in Russia after the war with the Ottoman Empire (1787-92) but had no Russian,[32] and may have been produced with them in mind. Another example is Mar'ia D.'s book of recipes for toiletries. Offended by the high prices of imported cosmetics, she saw the virtue of initiating Russian women into home production as she explained in her preface:

> ... having discovered by chance and experience that all the toilet waters, essences, aromatic vinegars for the toilette, syrups, and perfumes in these three books and similar things which we buy at such expense from the French can be made with equal quality but much more cheaply here, and not only in France, I decided to publish this book for the benefit and use of the fair sex.

The women who worked episodically could justly be described more as 'women who translated' rather than as 'translators'. Of the women who published more than one or two texts about half – Baskakova, Boske, Kamenskaia, Kologrivova, the Magnitskaia sisters, Shcherbatova, Shumlianskaia, and Svin'ina – published short pieces for journals, which perhaps suggests that editors encouraged them to continue. Substantial work was done by Arbuzova, Freitakh, Menshikova, Varvara Miklashevich, Aleksandra Podshivalova, and Ekaterina Voeikova, and the most productive translators were Anna Bunina, Demidova, Nilova, Sushkova, and Anna and Pelageia Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova.[33]

For many male writers, such as F. A. Emin and D. I. Fonvizin, translating served as a literary apprenticeship,[34] but only a few women translators similarly moved from translation into original creative writing. Titova began with translation and then wrote three original plays and a novel. Freitakh similarly went on from translating to write an original five-act drama, *Velikodushnaia zhenshchina* (*The Magnanimous Woman*); the theatre critic S. P. Zhikharev recalled: 'I had the chance to read it, and sinner that I am, I think the audience will be too condescending if it sits through the first act.'[35] Miklashevich is better known for her novel.[36] Others produced hybrid texts combining translation with original writing: Sarafova's primer was a reader with self-translated parallel text; Neimicheva's translation of a description of the fauna of the Baltic area was prefaced by a long original essay, and Natal'ia Teil's' book combined translated and original texts, the latter outnumbering the former. A few women, such as Dashkova, Catherine II, Volkova, Bunina, Puchkova, and Krichevskaia, were essentially original writers who incidentally did some translating. In general, however, translation did not lead women to original composition: most women translators did no other kind of

writing.

The most remarkable of the translators were Anna Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova and Sushkova, who were amongst the earliest women translators, and Bunina, who worked later on and was a distinguished poet, who engaged sporadically, but inventively, in translation.

Anna Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova (b. 1755) was remarkable for her precocious age, her rather modest social standing, her awareness of her readership, and above all as a pioneer. She was the second Russian woman to publish a translation and the first three book-length translations by Russian women were hers.

She was the daughter of I. A. Vel'iashev-Volyntsov, an artillery officer who taught military and mathematical sciences at the Artillery School. He was the author of the first Russian artillery manual (1767), written for use at the school, and translated Voltaire and the physicist J. A. Nollet into Russian. Nothing is known about her mother, or about her upbringing, though it can be assumed that someone attended carefully to her education. As a girl she wrote verse and thus came to the attention of Catherine II, who summoned her to court.[37] In 1764, at the age of nine, she published the first substantial translation by a Russian woman and one of only twenty-two translations of literary works in prose published in Russia that year,[38] *0 grafe Oksfortskom i o miladii Gerbii, aglinskaia povest'* (*The Count of Oxford and Milady Herby, an English Tale*), a translation of Madeleine-Angélique Poisson de Gomez' *Histoire du comte d'Oxfort et de Miledy d'Herby* (1737). It is not known how the choice of text was made, or by whom, but it seems likely that the youthful translator received advice.

The book was the entertaining story of the young Milady d'Herby who at first rejects marriage ('The beautiful Herby, finding no-one worthy of the sacrifice of her freedom, lived without passionate engagement and mentally looked on marriage vows with disdain', p. 8). But her friend Milady Suffolk, with the encouragement of Queen Elizabeth I, arouses her interest in Count Oxford, and arranges for the two to meet, unaware of each other's identity, during a walk in the London menagerie. The lady's obstinacy engages the Count and their appreciation of each other's qualities grows until marriage seems assured, at which point the Count falls victim to an aristocratic Italian adventuress in search of admirers. A friend tells Milady d'Herby how to discover the Count's true feelings by a stratagem which involves putting a sword in his bed, but as she enters his room with the sword he fears she is about to stab him. Perceiving that he has committed the infidelity which he himself condemned in the adventuress, he falls at Milady's feet, and repents, thus demonstrating strong passions and commitment to fidelity, and meriting marriage. The story shows a modern heroine who decides on her marriage partner independently of parental advice, and it is told with an attractive worldly humour which stems from the mirroring of the stories of the lovers and the postponed happy ending.

Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova's preface revealed her extreme youth:

> Kind reader, in offering to you this book, which I have translated from the French, I beg you to condescend to my years (because I am only nine years old) and because I am also writing for the first time, and to forgive those inaccuracies which may be found in this translation.

She did not lay claim to publishing the first major translation into Russian by a woman and she may indeed have been unaware of the fact.

The seventy-one page translation was printed at the press of the Land Cadet Corps on the commission of her father, who probably had some acquaintances there. The book had a print run of 1200 copies, which was well justified. Gomez was very popular in France, where one hundred of her stories had been published in seventeen volumes (1732-39) and republished in four more editions.[39] Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova was amongst the first to translate her into Russian: four translations of her stories were published in 1764, after which the Land Cadet Corps' Press went on to publish a ten-volume collection (1765-68); translations continued into the 1780s and 1790s.[40]

The young Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova evidently went straight on to her next and more ambitious project, *Tysiacha i odin chas, skazki peruanskie* (*One Thousand and One Hours, Peruvian Tales*), a translation of Gueulette's *Les Mille et Une Heures, contes péruviens* (1733, enlarged 1759), itself an imitation of Galland's *Les Mille et Une Nuits, contes arabes* (1704). Vel'iasheva Volyntsova wrote in her preface:

> Reading the Arabian tales printed in our language under the title of 1001 Nights, and having in my possession almost the same content in French, under the title of 1001 Hours, I thought of translating it into Russian and publishing it. As the book about the Comte d'Oxfort and Milady Herby which I translated was received favourably by society, I flatter myself that this one can also be read, at least to pass the time, and that the errors of translation and style can be forgiven in view of my ten years of age.

On this occasion the choice of text was evidently her own, and she gave thought to what would be popular with readers. When the first volume of her translation appeared in 1766, the first Russian translation of Galland had recently appeared: the first volume of Aleksei Filat'ev's *Tysiacha i odna noch'. Skazki arabskie* (*One Thousand and One Nights. Arabian Tales*) came out in 1763 to be followed by eleven more (1763-1774). Some of Gueulette's stories had been translated into Russian by an anonymous translator as *Tysiacha i odna chetvert' chasa, povesti tatarskie* (*One Thousand and One Quarter Hours, Tatar Stories*, 1765-66). Thus Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova was following two successful predecessors and it was reasonable to think that the book would 'be read'; indeed the vogue for oriental tales became as great in Russia as it had been in France.[41] This time the two volumes (552 pages) were printed at the Moscow University Press, although it is not known how this was arranged, or on what terms, or whether it was facilitated by Kheraskov, who headed the University, and was patron of other women writers.

Her last translation sallied out of entertaining literature and into history and law. This was an abridged version, still amounting to 372 pages, of Frederick II's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Maison de Brandenbourg,* and his *Des moeurs, des coutumes, de l'industrie et des progrès de l'esprit humain, De la superstition et de la religion,* and *Dissertation sur les raisons d'établir ou d'abroger les lois.* Again, Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova was amongst the first to translate Frederick II into Russian. She dedicated the text to Catherine II, which suggests that by this time she had been summoned to court:

> Your Imperial Majesty's maternal charity to all true subjects and your patronage of those who love learning encourages me to place this translation of the History of Brandenburg at Y. I. M's feet; to whom is it more fitting for a work by a great and wise Monarch to be dedicated than to the Great and Wise Russian Empress?

Patronage, important to writers of both sexes, was particularly important for women, who had begun publishing so recently, and Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova was fortunate to find such a powerful patron as Catherine II. In her preface she declared:

> My intention was to be of service to those who do not know foreign languages but wish to know the history of states bordering on Russia, and I have tried as much as I can to carry it out. But as it [the book] is written in the most lofty style I hope that my indulgent readers will take account of my sex and immature age and pardon me if I have been unable to imitate the style of the original, from which my translation has been done, omitting matters of little concern to Russians, and which is offered to indulgent readers with deference.

The text was again published by the Moscow University Press. Catherine is recorded as boasting of the translation:

> 'Even Frederick has been translated here!' said Catherine to Diderot one day. 'And who do you think did it? A pretty girl!' 'Here in Russia with you on the throne,' replied the philosopher, 'you have all the wonders of the world, Your Majesty; but few people read Frederick in Paris, even men.'[42]

This was Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova's last translation, perhaps because by 1770 she had reached marriageable age. Her success must have encouraged her younger sister Pelageia, who translated two plays, and her younger brother Dmitrii, who compiled a military and mathematical dictionary and translated a large number of plays.

The second major woman translator of the early period was Mar'ia Sushkova, who worked in the 1770s, and not only produced a substantial corpus of translations which reached a wide public, but also showed greater awareness than most women of the demands and nature of the translation process. Sushkova was also one of the earliest women to publish original writing in Russia, and, to judge from her texts, had a greater grasp than most people at this time of ideas about femininity. The texts she translated were amongst the most radical chosen by women, and they took her into the theatre, where she was exceptionally successful. Sushkova is a much less shadowy figure than Anna Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova.[43] She was born Mar'ia Khrapovitskaia on 2 March 1752, the daughter of General V. I. Khrapovitskii, a military man of ancient noble stock, and of his wife, first name unknown, the daughter of M. I. Serdiukov. They had three children, possibly more. The children had literary gifts and were encouraged to develop them. Sushkova's elder brother, Aleksandr Vasil'evich, had an early love of literature and whilst still a child visited the poet Lomonosov with his father. He was educated at the Land Cadet Corps, published articles, poems, and translations, wrote a much-quoted diary, and from 1783 served as private secretary to Catherine II. Her younger brother, Mikhail Vasil'evich was educated in the home of one of the professors at the Academy

Gymnasium, and began writing at the age of 16. Unmarried, he lived in rural retreat where he wrote verse and a diary, and also translated.[44]

Like her brothers, Mar'ia was well educated, presumably at home (probably in the Ukraine), and learned not only French and German, as was usual, but also Italian and English. M. N. Makarov asserted that her knowledge of Russian was not good and that at a mature age she asked her brother Aleksandr to teach her.[45] It was not uncommon for Russian women of the upper classes to be more confident in French than in Russian, and to write Russian incorrectly, and Makarov's story may be true. However, Sushkova's younger brother asserted conversely that she was better read than he, and exercised a formative influence on him, helping him to develop his powers of reason: 'The daily reading of good books selected by my sister M. V. spared me from prejudice. Young and similar [authors] helped me to develop judgment and virtue...'.[46] When Mar'ia Vasil'evna had perfected her Russian, she began writing verse, which came to the notice of Count K. G. Razumovskii, on whose staff Aleksandr Vasil'evich served in 1772:

> Count Kirill Grigor'evich Razumovskii took the first convenient opportunity to announce to the Empress that his countrywoman Khrapovitskaia *had taken to singing in verse* and could read a Russian charter better than any court secretary. This was enough for Catherine to invite Khrapovitskaia to court, encourage her still more in her passion for writing poetry, and to make her translate and publish her work in contemporary journals...[47]

Like Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova, Mar'ia was fortunate to find a patron in Catherine II. It must have been approximately at this time that Mar'ia married V. M. Sushkov, since her married name or initials appear on all her publications.

Sushkova began publishing in 1769, when she was seventeen and continued writing for some sixteen years (1769-85). This was remarkable in itself, at a time when most women published only one or two pieces, or worked only for a short period. Her first publication was a contribution sent apparently unsolicited in 1769 to N. I. Novikov's journal *Truten'* (*The Drone*),[48] the most notable of the *Spectator*-type journals which sprang up in response to Catherine's *Vsiakaia vsiachina* (*All Sorts of This and That*, 1769-70). It provided a significant forum for debating public issues and sought to address a diverse readership, both male and female, and not only those already in sympathy with Novikov's aim of improving public morals but also those yet to be convinced, including empty-headed followers of fashion. Novikov's object was to give satirical examples of social behaviour in order to demonstrate the implications of his ideas about society and to show in action enlightened values, such as the exercise of reason, charity, and service to human kind. One of his favoured genres in the journal was therefore the portrait, and Sushkova's contribution was a response to some of Novikov's verbal cartoons of the types of people who read his journal.[49] Sushkova provided a similar set of sketches exposing the failings of various character types, on this occasion all male but for herself. Since satire was not a genre thought appropriate to women's nature and was not common in eighteenth-century women's writing, this was a bold first venture into print. She must have met with an encouraging reception, since she very soon followed this with a second set of portraits, which included a young woman of fashion, a coquette well past her prime, and a self-portrait.[50] These sketches of female behaviour were the earliest of

Sushkova's many writings on femininity. The first criticised captivity to fashion and to the values of fashionable society, contrasting it to fondness for reading (emblematic of the ability to engage in independent rational thought). The second addressed over-attention to externals and failure to cultivate the mind. In contrast to these pictures of feminine weaknesses she provided another portrait which, Novikov suggested in his accompanying editorial comment, was perhaps her own:

> A young lady of about eighteen, not unattractive, not stupid, not vain, not capricious, who can judge justly of others and herself, fond of the literary arts, likes to reason, and does not create heaviness or boredom when conversing with others. She likes it when men make just judgments of her but is angry if she notices that they are trying to flatter. NB I almost, almost forgot to inform you, Mr Editor, that this young lady has quite good taste and dresses well, in accordance with fashion and her own style.

This woman is intelligent and rational, and able to discriminate and judge, and thus equipped for creative writing. But she is not a blue-stocking – she attends to her appearance and knows the fashions, though her independent judgment ensures that she is not the captive of fashion. It was a common view amongst Enlightenment thinkers that women were creatures of emotion and lacked reason, judgment, and the capacity for learning.[51] Sushkova defended and applauded rationality in women, and also displayed her intelligence and acute observation in the wit and acerbity of her sketches. This second set of sketches was interlaced with interventions from Novikov, making it a joint piece of writing, and laying the foundations of Sushkova's collaboration with Novikov.

Her last contribution to Novikov's journals was to *Zhivopisets* (*The Painter*) in 1772. On this occasion she again presented the view of a clear-sighted observer, speaking playfully in the persona of an unsophisticated but goodhearted 'person of limited intelligence', attacking dislike of learning, ignorance, lack of critical self-awareness, idleness, and indifference to virtue, and again satirising women who were not in sympathy with Novikov's project. Emerging from behind the persona the writer applauded the common sense of the journal, associated herself with this enterprise so useful to society, and enjoined Novikov to continue it.[52] Here again Sushkova defined herself explicitly as a collaborator of Novikov and admirer of his compositions.

After her sally into print as a satirist Sushkova turned to translation. She was only the fourth Russian woman to publish a translation, her predecessors being Dashkova, Anna Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova, and Catherine II. The fact that she published her first translations in the journal *Vechera* (*Evenings*) suggests that she had found her way to, and been accepted by, a group of Petersburg writers who were well disposed towards writing by women. The journal was produced by a group of writers, based in the home of Kheraskov and his wife Elizaveta; it included I. F. Bogdanovich, V. I. Maikov, A. A. Rzhevskii (husband of the poet Aleksandra Rzhevskaia), A. V. Khrapovitskii, and Sushkova herself.[53] Such a group could provide both a forum for the discussion of writing and ideas, and a workshop in which to exercise the craft of writing in practised company.

Sushkova became one of the most consistent and productive of eighteenth-century women translators. At a time when nearly all translation was from French and texts in other languages were often translated from intermediary French translations, she was

remarkable in translating from three languages, the other two being English and Italian, which were little known in Russia at the time. Moreover she translated from English in the early 1770s, only a decade or so after women first published translations and before the upsurge of interest in English culture in the 1770s which was sparked by translations such as her version of part of Young's *Night Thoughts*. And whereas subsequent Russian translators of the text worked via French, Sushkova translated directly from English.[54] At some date unknown Sushkova is said to have made a prose translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, which remained in manuscript.[55] Since she was the only Russian woman to translate from Italian until the early nineteenth century it is unfortunate that her translations from Petrarch were also not published.

Sushkova was one of the few translators to work from Russian into a foreign language: she translated Kheraskov's *Chesmesskii boi* (1771) into French as *Le Combat de Tzesme, poème avec un discours sur la poésie russe* (n.p., 1772). This and the translation of Milton are the sole known examples of epic poetry translated by a Russian woman in the eighteenth century.

Sushkova's first published translation was a translation into prose of 'Night II' by Young. This was a solemn and edifying reflection on the great moral truths, as revealed in the solitude of night. Didactic moralising is presented with an appeal to the reader's reason and emotions, the author expressing with passion and rhetoric his own melancholic emotions, his night thoughts, about time, the transitoriness of earthly things and the vanity of human desires ('Life is War; Eternal War with Woe'), about the suffering intrinsic to this life, the need for faith, and the eternal life of the soul in the next.[56] These ideas were close to those of the freemasons, which suggests that Sushkova had encountered Young's work through Kheraskov's circle. Sushkova was the first to translate Young into Russian, introducing the vogue for the poetry of night and death which had already possessed Western Europe[57] and a poet who became a powerful catalyst for Sentimentalism. She was probably aided, although she did not work from an intermediary translation, by prose translations into German (J. A. Ebert's *Dr. Eduard Young's Klagen, oder Nachtgedanken über Leben, Tod und Unsterblichkeit*, 1760-63) and by Le Tourneur's into French (1764), and by the recognition of Young by French and German culture which they implied. Perhaps these predecessors were the reason for her decision to translate Young into prose; even so, she succeeded in preserving Young's poetic quality through consistent reproduction of his complex rhetorical syntax.

Her next contributions to *Vechera* (*Evenings*) were verse translations of the idylls 'Les Moutons' and 'Le Ruisseau' by Antoinette Deshoulières (1637-1694), whose work had became known in Russia in the 1750s.[58] Deshoulières was one of the French women writers who could furnish Russian women with eminent predecessors to quote in justification of their desire to write and publish. She was a *précieuse*, hostess of a well-known salon, friend of Corneille and other writers, author of plays and poems, won the Académie Française prize for an ode, and had a poem read at the Académie. She was one of the best-known women of her time in France. 'Les Moutons' is about true and false values – both poems are mentioned by Mme de Renneville in her *Galerie des femmes vertueuses, ou Leçons de morale à 1'usage des demoiselles* (1809). The theme of the poem is the blessed lot of the sheep, who have no cares, hopes or desires, and are therefore happy. Without tranquillity, there is little value in riches, birth, beauty, and wit, and human kind's celebrated reason is a doubtful advantage, since it is no defence against

the pain caused by the passions. The poem harmonises retrospectively with Young: there is nothing sure in the universe, everything in this life is subject to fortune and woe. Still more in the spirit of Young is 'Le Ruisseau', which speaks bleakly of the transitoriness of existence and the degrading effects of time on human beings, who are born to suffer the pain inflicted by the passions. We are made from dust and after our pitiful existence we return to it. 'Le Ruisseau' had already been translated by Bogdanovich,[59] a member of the Kheraskov circle, so publishing a new version was potentially an act of rivalry.

Sushkova's last translation in *Vechera* was of Act V, scene I of Addison's *Cato* (1713), in which Cato, contemplating suicide, reflects tranquilly on the process of death and asserts the eternal life of the soul. This is also thematically close to Young and Deshoulières.

When Novikov published his survey of Russian literature in 1772, Sushkova was one of the nine women to appear, even though at this point she was still relatively new to publishing. Novikov characterized her appreciatively as 'a young woman with the gifts of a sharp and enlightened mind and great diligence'.[60]

After her translations of 1772 Sushkova published nothing for the next six years. She had a son Mikhail in 1775, and possibly other children too, and was presumably occupied with bringing up the child and running the household. Even so, her next project was much more ambitious than before. This was a translation of Marmontel's *Les Incas, ou La Destruction de 1'empire de Pérou* (1777), an indictment of superstition and of violence committed in the name of religion.[61] Unfortunately no evidence has come to light to show whether the choice of text was hers, or hers alone, or how she acquired the newly-published text. However, she translated it with some speed. Marmontel was very popular in Russia from the 1760s onwards,[62] and we know from a letter of 1777 that Sushkova was translating *Les Incas* at the same time as another translator, N. A. L'vov, who had already finished half the text.[63] Sushkova succeeded, however, in getting her version published, to the exclusion of L'vov's.

The text was not read in its time as having gender implications. However, the text can also be read in part as a discussion of women's behaviour and the rationality of parental and societal authority over women. In Marmontel's narrative the Inca woman, Cora, is forced by her father to become a priestess. She takes her vows to the deity and carries out her duties faithfully until she meets the Castilian Alonzo, who falls in love with her. Cora flees from the temple when the eruption of a volcano threatens to destroy it, and is found by Alonzo. They declare their love and Alonzo begs Cora to seek 'freedom, the first good after love' and run away with him but Cora is aware that the penalty for breaking vows is the death of the offender and her entire family, and she returns, unaware that Alonzo has taken advantage of her innocence. Alonzo confesses but argues that depriving young women of the chance of motherhood is contrary to Inca worship of the sun, the god of fecundity. The Inca is convinced, and both are released. However, Alonzo is soon killed in battle and on finding his grave Cora goes into labour and dies of grief, her infant dying as soon as he is born. Cora is the victim of her society and its religious customs, and also of the abuse of parental authority. Through her Marmontel justifies freedom of action for virtuous women and tyranny, ambition, cruelty, and fanaticism are condemned. This was not a common theme in translations by Russian women, which makes Sushkova's translation particularly interesting.

The text was published by the Moscow University Press (Kheraskov still headed the

University) and the second edition was published by Novikov, at his own expense, which suggests the importance he attached to it as a vehicle for enlightened values. Two more editions followed and in all 5000 copies were printed; the large number may partly be due to its later status as a book used by parents with children who were learning to read.[64]

Sushkova now diversified her activities again, and began translating for the theatre, which provided a different mode of participation in public life. She undertook translations of a number of plays for Michael Maddox, and his company at the Petrovskii Theatre between 1782 and 1785. Maddox provided a mixed repertoire of serious plays, comedies, and comic operas which drew in large audiences, including Novikov's circle. Sushkova's translated plays were published by Novikov, and it was probably her association with Novikov which led her to Maddox's theatrical circle, although a contemporary records that Maddox accepted unsolicited scripts.[65]

Although it was the custom for the author or translator to meet the costs of publication, Novikov financed publication of Sushkova's four translated plays, which constituted all that she translated between 1778 and 1784, and all her work which required finance, since her other work was for periodicals, or remained unpublished. Her work thus circulated not only to the theatre-going public but also more widely.

Writing for the theatre requires experience of the production side and few eighteenth-century Russian women translated for the theatre, perhaps because they lacked this experience, perhaps deterred by the fact that women's essential nature was thought to be conducive to personal and private writing, but not to writing connected with the public sphere. Moreover, most actors were noblewomen's social inferiors. Sushkova was fortunate to work with the Maddox company, where she probably acquired this experience, and she had considerable success, translating five plays in three years, four of which were performed.

The first play which Sushkova translated was Marmontel's musical comedy *Zémire et Azor*. This was first performed at the Petrovskii Theatre in 1781,[66] and in her preface Sushkova referred to the play's success with the public. An oriental version of the Beauty and the Beast story set in Persia, the play had relevance in Russia as a discussion of arranged marriages and the requirement for the wife to accommodate herself to the authority and needs of the husband.

Sushkova's second translated play was *Beglets*, a translation of Louis-Sébastien Mercier's *Le Déserteur*, which she completed in 1782. The hero of the play becomes a deserter because he has committed insubordination as a result of protracted bullying by an officer. His virtue is appreciated by his fiancée and her family. But when officers are billeted on the family, he is arrested, and the death sentence passed in his absence must be carried out. Although he is offered an opportunity to escape, he refuses and goes to his death with equanimity. Only at the last moment is it revealed that a pardon has been arranged and the man is saved. Though other plays by Mercier had been translated into Russian,[67] this was the first to be performed, and it opened at the Petrovskii Theatre in March 1782. Mercier had rewritten the original ending of the play, engineering the salvation of the hero, and Sushkova's published text uses this later version, which was first performed in Paris in June 1782. The fact that she knew of, acquired, and published the recent version so promptly suggests that she had contacts with theatrical circles not only in Russia but also in France.[68]

Sushkova's next translation, *Erisia, ili Vestalka*, was of a play by Jean Gaspard

Dubois-Fontanelle, *Ericie ou la Vestale*. Novikov again published the text at his own expense, although this time the play did not go into production at the Petrovskii. The play has much in common with *Les Incas* as an indictment of fanaticism and superstition. And because the argument is illustrated through the fate of a woman, it can be read as an attack on the abuse of parental authority and a defence of rebellion against it. The heroine is in many ways reminiscent of Cora. Forced by her father to become a vestal virgin, she submits, though she longs for freedom and happiness with her lover. She rebels against the regime in the temple, encouraging novices to return home while they can, and rejects the idea of self-sacrifice, perceiving that many women are victims of their fathers' ambition. Erisia rebels against social conventions but cannot overcome her respect for religious obligations and ultimately punishes herself for putting love before duty. Before this, however, she (and her lover) criticise the selfish exercise of parental authority and make a spirited defence of the woman's right to control her own fate. One character voices a denunciation of marriage as submission to power, indulgence of caprice, and enforced respect for a man who does not deserve it. But though marriage as the exercise of male authority is condemned, the play does not advocate sexual freedom for women. Erisia is destroyed not only by her father, but also by her liaison with her lover, which induces her to put her own needs before her religious duty. She is torn between the demands of the gods and the demands of nature. As in the case of Cora, the play defends the latter, but against the consequences of fanaticism and superstition, not against the conventions of modern Western societies. However, the audience is challenged either to condone the illicit views and actions of the rebellious woman, or to criticise her natural emotions, courage, loyalty, and good faith. Even though she sins, she is still attractive in her tragedy and reveals what might be gained from breaking with convention, to which she is bound by superstition. She is not merely an immoral woman who can easily be condemned.

At the same time as working on her translated plays Sushkova also published two poems. In 1783, in a journal overseen by Catherine II through Dashkova, she published 'Pis'mo kitaitsa k tatarskomu Murze, zhivushchemu po delam svoim v Peterburge'[69] ('Letter from a Chinaman to a Tatar Murza Living in Petersburg on Business'), an ode to Catherine inspired by Derzhavin's 'Felitsa' (1782), also a panegyric to Catherine. 1783 was the year in which Khrapovitskii became private secretary to Catherine, and this poem may have been connected with his appointment, celebrating her magnanimity, wisdom, and gentleness, her good laws and deeds, and her self-sacrificing care for her subjects. The second poem, 'Stansy na uchrezhdenie Rossiiskoi Akademii' ('Stanzas on the Foundation of the Russian Academy'),[70] celebrated an important moment for Russian women, Catherine's appointment of Dashkova as Director of the Academy. Sushkova refers to the worthiness of the appointment and to the prejudice which might have prevented it, but for Catherine. Sushkova invoked Catherine's protection for her boldness in writing, and described Dashkova as the glory of her sex and a wondrous new phenomenon.

After this Sushkova ceased publishing, for unknown reasons, though she continued to translate and to work with the Maddox company. The next play which she translated was another comic opera, Sedaine's *Rose et Colas*, which was performed in 1784.[71] The 1787 theatrical dictionary noted that *Roza i Kolas* was one of the best plays and that it was produced in Moscow in the public pleasure gardens,[72] which were also a

Maddox enterprise.

The last play which Sushkova translated was Mercier's comedy *L'Habitant de la Guadeloupe. Gvadelupskii zhitel'* was intended for the Petrovskii Theatre, but although it was apparently nearly finished in 1785,[73] it was neither performed nor published. Mercier's play is much more conventional than those previously translated by Sushkova, and the fact that she apparently translated it in conjunction with one of her brothers may explain the difference. Based on Frances Sheridan's novel *Miss Sidney Biddulph*, it discusses moral and immoral attitudes by contrasting the response of two families to an unfortunate man who asks their help. The rich hard-hearted couple refuse, whilst the impoverished widowed mother displays much generosity and is rewarded by a proposal of marriage from the petitioner who, it turns out, was all the time a rich man in disguise. Greed and pride are opposed to charity, modesty, and love.

Although more is known about Sushkova's life than about the lives of most eighteenth-century women writers, nothing has come to light about her activities after 1785, though it has been plausibly suggested that some of the tasks given by Catherine II to her private secretary Khrapovitskii, such as copying extracts of plays or completing an opera libretto, may have been done by his sister, Sushkova.[74]

What is known for certain is that she gave birth to two more sons, Petr in 1783 and Nikolai in 1796 when she was forty-four.[75] Sushkova's eldest son Mikhail was also a writer, and author of the story *Rossiiskii Verter*.[76] He left home at the age of seventeen to prepare for entry into a guards regiment and was staying in Moscow when, depressed by his failure to find purpose in love, by his poor financial position, which his father was unable to better, and by the prejudice which this attracted in society, particularly perhaps in Natal'ia Khitrovo, once the object of his affections, he hanged himself.[77] His suicide note asserted his firm belief in the non-existence of the soul, and declared that it was better to commit suicide like Cato than to live in torment, and that since the burden of life must sooner or later be set down, there was no reason not to free oneself from it sooner. He presented his suicide as a rational decision. Ironically, in *Rossiiskii Verter* the suicidal hero leaves behind a copy of Addison's tragedy *Cato*, open at Act V, scene 1, the passage translated by Sushkova. Mikhail adapted her translation to quote in the story: whereas Sushkova made the argument for the immortality of the soul stronger than in the original,[78] Mikhail removed all reference to it.

Like all suicides, he was denied burial in consecrated ground. He was accused of arrogance, vanity, and irreligion; his parents were blamed for failing to bring him up in true Christian faith. All this was a heavy burden for Sushkova to bear. Her daughter Praskov'ia told Nikolai:

> Whatever happened to her in life that was sad or joyful, she did not like to speak either of sadness or of joy; she kept everything in her heart, so to speak, and revealed her inner feelings and thoughts only to heaven. Even the heavy cross of the suicide of her first-born, from whom she had hoped for comfort and support in her old age was something that she was able to bear… [79]

Even of the suicide she spoke to no-one, 'as if it had never happened':

> Private prayers, devout reflection and concealed tears gave her the strength to carry

> her cross. Self-control and reconciliation to her fate were, in short, her entire inner life.[80]

In Paul's reign (1796-1801) Sushkova's husband became governor of Simbirsk; whether they moved to the provinces is uncertain. Sushkova died at the age of 51 in Moscow on 23 December 1803, without knowing that 23 December 1811 was to see the birth of her granddaughter, Evdokia Petrovna Rostopchina, a worthy successor to her as a woman writer.

Sushkova was in many ways unusual amongst Russian women translators. As we have seen, most translators published only one or two short pieces over a short period and many were young unmarried women who did their translation as part of their language learning with their tutors. It was rare for women to work over a long period and on large projects as Sushkova did, and she probably also worked without close supervision; it is not known whether she consulted with other translators, but quite possible that she discussed her work with family members and other writers, perhaps even with the actors of the theatre for which she was working. Sushkova was also unusual in that she translated from languages which few translators, male or female, could attempt, and she chose to translate a little more freely than other women working at the time, which suggests confidence in her ability as a translator, though she appreciated the requirement for modesty and did not present herself as particularly confident in her prefaces. We do not know how and by whom her source texts were chosen, but some are markedly more radical challenges to contemporary formulations of femininity than most texts translated by Russian women at the time, which tend to reinforce them. Where most women translated short pieces of moralising prose, Sushkova worked principally in the theatre. No other woman translator translated so many plays, or had so many of them performed; Sushkova thus contributed to public debate not only through print but also through theatre, reaching a considerably wider audience. Another exceptional aspect of her work is her ability to attract patronage. Her patrons Catherine II, Novikov, and Kheraskov, were powerful luminaries and no other woman translator had such a long-standing partnership with a publisher, or such firm ties with a theatre company. Indeed, it was probably her ability to find helpful patrons which gave her access to newly-appeared foreign texts and encouraged her to continue her translation work. Sushkova also achieved greater publishing success than the other women translating at this time. Not only was she the most able to find finance for her translations; she was also one of the few women whose texts were enthusiastically received by critics and the market over a long period.

Sushkova was certainly an unusual woman for her time. Without the advantages of aristocratic birth or education which enabled Catherine and Dashkova to play leading roles in public life, she established collaboration with Novikov in his campaign for improving public morals and engaged in public debate, she made her voice heard in Russian literature, theatre, and translation, and set before the public the ways in which women were affected by lack of rationality in themselves, the family, and society.

The third translator of note is Anna Bunina (1774-1829), whose translations are interesting because, unlike most women translators of the time, she often reworked source texts to make new texts of her own.

Bunina did not have the advantage of solicitous parents or a considered education.[81]

Her father P. M. Bunin was a noble of low rank; little is known of her mother, A. I. Lodygina. The family was reasonably affluent and Bunin gave his older children a good education, but when his wife died in giving birth to Anna, the younger children were sent away to be brought up by relatives. Anna went to live with several families in turn, all of whom were prosperous but neglected to give her more than very elementary education. She was therefore unusual amongst upper-class women in not learning languages in childhood. Her opportunities for informal education improved when at the age of thirteen she went to live with her brother Vasilii, 'one of the most educated people of his time', with 'an excellent knowledge' of foreign languages.[82] She also spent winters in Moscow, which probably introduced her to circles with literary and intellectual interests, and to high culture, and gave her access to more varied reading matter than could be found in the provinces. She had began writing verse without tuition or encouragement, and it is likely that when she went to Moscow she acquired her first mentors, her nephew by marriage B. K. Blank, a prolific second-rate writer, and Prince P. I. Shalikov, a derivative writer mocked for his lack of talent and his sentimentality, but a patron of women's literary talents. In her late twenties Bunina had to leave this house when her brother's marriage failed, but she managed to spend some time in St Petersburg with distant relatives, and when her father died in 1802 she used her small legacy to establish a home there independently of her family – she never married – and to attend to her education. Her principal tutor, P. I. Sokolov, taught the Russian language at the Academy Gymnasium, and Russian grammar, logic and rhetoric at the Academy of Naval Architecture. He was also editor of *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* (*The St Petersburg Gazette*), translator from French and Greek, and sub-librarian at the Russian Academy before becoming its secretary. With Sokolov Bunina embarked on an ambitious course of study covering Russian literature, French, Gerrnan, English, music, physics, and mathematics, but not Latin or Greek. After only six months she had spent all her capital and needed to earn income. As she lacked the connections to ensure an appointment at court, and as there was no great demand for Russian governesses, the possibilities included a post in an educational institution, or becoming a companion. However, Bunina contrived to earn a modest living from writing.

One of her first publications was a substantial translation project, *Pravila poezii, Sokrashchennyi perevod Abbata Bate, s prisovokupleniem Rossiiskago stoposlozheniia v pol'zu devits* (*The Rules of Poetry, Translated in Abridged Form from Abbot Batteux, with a Supplement of Russian Versification for the Use of Young Ladies*, 1808). Her purpose was, she declared, to provide a practical manual which would enable beginners, particularly young women, to write verse. As Bunina knew from experience, if women were to write poetry, they must have a sound literary education and clear working explanations. Bunina's was the first manual of poetics produced by a Russian woman, and probably the first produced specifically for women. This was the kind of work which could attract patronage and Bunina presented the book to Dowager Empress Maria Fedorovna, who had it published.

Of the thirty poems in Bunina's first collection, *Neopytnaia muza* (*The Inexperienced Muse*, 1809) over one quarter were described as translations, and four consecutive translations opened the book. Two of these translations were attributed. 'Tsiklop' ('Cyclops') was a version of Theocritus' idyll xi 'The Cyclops', which she probably read in a French intermediary translation, and 'Nauka o stikhotvorstve iz g. Boalo. Pesn' I' ('The

Art of Verse, from M. Boileau. Canto I') was a close translation of part of *L'Art poétique*, which had been translated by Trediakovskii in 1752, and more recently by D. I. Khvostov. Khvostov was routinely pilloried for his vanity, bad taste, lack of talent, preposterous verse, and prodigious output and, like his other work, his translation of Boileau met with a hostile reception. Bunina must have been aware that in offering rivalry, even to one so little admired, she was inviting retribution, and she furnished her translation with a self-deprecating footnote:

> This feeble extract, full of errors and shortcomings, was done when the complete translation by his Excellency Count Dmitrii Ivanovich Khvostov of all four parts of the *Art poétique* was not yet known. Lacking the strength to compete with [male] poets, 1 conclude after the first part only.

Her translation received an admiring review in the journal *Tsvetnik* (*The Flower Garden*) but about three weeks later one Kh. K. sent a lengthy letter to the editors, defending Khvostov's translation on the grounds that it was closer to the original than Bunina's and quoting no less than twelve extracts from Khvostov's version, which suggests that it was probably from Khvostov himself. In spite of her declaration to the contrary, and perhaps encouraged by the review, Bunina went on to complete the translation.

The sources of the remaining six translations have not been identified, and it is possible that they are pseudotranslations – original poems in disguise. Bunina usually identified her source texts but in this case she simply subtitled the poems 'Translation', and when she reprinted them in her collected works, she no longer designated them as such. Pseudotranslations can be used to introduce innovation:

> From the point of view of literary evolution, the use of fictitious translations is often a convenient way, sometimes one of the only ways open to writers, to introduce innovations into a literary system, especially when this system is resistant to deviations from canonical models and norms of original literary writing in the target culture […], and if the difference is in the direction of greater tolerance for deviations from sanctioned models, as is often the case, then the translational norms can also be adopted, at least in part, for the composition of original texts, which are introduced into the system in the guise of genuine translations and, as a result, have a lower resistance threshold to pass.[83]

Here it was a case of bringing new norms not to Russian literature but to Russian women's writing. The poems were not entirely innovatory, inasmuch as their themes of ambition and the pursuit of fame were acceptable for Russian male authors, but they were controversial as the product of a woman's pen, and it may be that Bunina intended to screen herself by suggesting that they were the work of a putative foreign author, who would be thought to be male.

Bunina's next major work was *Padenie Faetona* (*The Fall of Phaethon*), her rewriting of the story which opens book II of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* about Phaethon, who is allowed to drive the chariot of the sun and in his inexperience goes too near the earth and scorches it, so that Zeus has to destroy him to prevent disaster. In the dedication of the poem Bunina referred to herself not as the translator but as the composer of the

work. Like Ovid, she used myth for purposes of her own, justifying, as it were, her rewriting of the myth by choosing a source text which in turn reinterpreted another, in this case Euripides' *Phaethon*. In her discussion of the poem in her preface Bunina pointed out the cultural difference between Ovid's readers and hers, and in the poem she invoked Ovid's support, so that as she climbed the heights of Parnassus she should not anger the Graces but earn the approval of her fellow Russians. Her means of engaging her readers was to domesticate the text, and the purpose of the story was no longer to tell the Greek myth, or to explain why Libya is a desert and Ethiopians have black skin, but to explore the situation of the inexperienced youth who aspires to join the company of the great. Unlike Euripides, Ovid presented the story as a search for identity: his Phaethon is motivated by uncertainty as to his lineage and the need to prove himself worthy of his divine father. Unlike Ovid, Bunina presented the story as a search for status: her Phaethon is compelled by the desire to acquire fame and the recognition of mortals and gods. Unlike Ovid, who removes the tragic dimension from Phaethon's death, and invites laughter, Bunina's narrator has an ambivalent attitude to Phaethon. On the one hand she questions whether his courage in fulfilling his ambition is mere ill-advised temerity. On the other hand she views Phaethon as responsible and guilty, not as a mere agent in a larger plan, and because he threatens the downfall of the existing order, he has more dignity and consequence than Ovid's hero. He is a tragic character whose punishment arouses pity and whose courageous struggle for self-definition is thwarted by authority. Phaethon was symbolic not only of the aspiring male writer but also of the woman writer, the person narrating the story. [84] He represents the woman who enters a sphere to which her right of entry is disputed, but insists on engaging in an activity perilous to herself and to society at large, and aspiring audaciously to the same status as her male counterparts, until she meets with retribution for her challenge to hierarchy. Phaethon is descended from god and mortal; she has the divine gift of inspiration but the physical weakness and social limitations of a woman. In the poem Phaethon behaves like a woman, 'lowers his eyes, just like the female sex, submits, and blushes red from shame and anger' and he is described as 'inexperienced', an allusion to the title of Bunina's collection of poems. She thus used translation as a screen for the expression of her own views, and, as before, for innovatory content.

When the poem was submitted to the literary society Beseda liubitelei russkogo slova (Colloquium of Admirers of Russian Writing) for publication in its journal, it met with considerable hostility. Bunina reported the view of one critic:

> Ovid did not jest. Every person in his story acts and speaks as befits his condition: in the father we see the father, in the son the son. He proceeds to his goal simply and quickly, without burdening the story with excessive fecundity and not deviating from the path with unnecessary witticisms.[85]

This was a correct analysis of Bunina's introduction of a modern narrator and her expansion of the source text, and it revealed the assumption that Bunina's task was to translate Ovid, not to rewrite. Evidently Bunina's poem evoked the disapproval of others too, since between her submitting it to the society and its reading at one of the meetings, radical changes were made, involving cuts, new passages, and changes in the order of lines, the effect of which was to reduce the poem to its plot and decimate the lively

digressions, thus reducing the presence of the author-narrator. Much of the imagery relating to Phaethon's mixed status was also removed. Remodelled by members of the society without Bunina's consent, the poem was well received at the reading and published in the society's journal. Speculation can produce a number of reasons for the reaction of the Colloquium: possibly the lightness of the narrator's tone was thought incongruous with the authority of the classical source; possibly satire, whilst appropriate in a classical author, was thought unfitting in a woman; possibly the problem was the freedom with which Bunina rewrote an authoritative text. The story of Phaethon's punishment by the king of the gods for attempting a feat thought impossible for mortals was in any event precisely the story of Bunina's own treatment by the Colloquium. However, unlike Phaethon, Bunina was not destroyed by her punishment. Shortly after the reading she re-published the poem, restoring her original text and adding an eighteen-page preface disparaging the emendations.[86] This was in contravention of the convention that writers, however much offended, abstain from disputes, and the counter-attack was mounted carefully, with the most assertive statements tactically blunted by blander ones. Bunina began the preface with the usual modest declaration of her inadequacy, but undermined this by remarking on the conventionality of such declarations. The amendments were tactfully but firmly rejected on the grounds that to accept them would be 'to seize another's property on the pretext that it is beautiful and profitable'. And towards the end of the preface she quoted both versions, arguing line by line for the superiority of her own. This assertiveness was again tactically softened by claims that she held these views uncertainly, and that faults remained, so that she was in need of the public's condescension, and the preface concluded with her declared willingness to accept advice, but the last blow was a spirited footnote, in which she further justified her text. Rebuttal of criticism, especially in print, by women writers was a rarity, and this is one of the few occasions of which we have evidence. It is hard to imagine that any woman might have retaliated with more spirit.

Bunina's defence of her poem evoked a reaction from her patron A. S. Shishkov, who made acrimonious entries in her album, presumably at this time, including:

If you want to be respected,
If you want to be happy,

Do not be arrogant,
Do not be vain.

Write, soar, be extolled,
But always learn to reason.

To make everyone pleased with you,
Know how to control yourself.

Be wary of criticising; criticism is a difficult art; it demands knowledge and impartiality in equal measure. Attacking a fool is neither useful nor glorious; in attacking an intelligent man you easily deceive yourself, and instead of showing his ignorance you show your own.

> The most praiseworthy thing in a woman is meekness, and in a man justice.

To these Bunina added her own comments:

> Meekness in a woman is of two kinds: one is her most precious adornment, the other is her ignominy. By abasing herself she loses the chief and only advantage of her sex.
>
> This two-sided meekness in women is not distasteful to men. Making use of it, they encroach on everything and make themselves into absolute rulers. The landowner is not averse to having many servants. The more there are the more profitable it is for him; but let us ask these servants whether they would wish to make an agreement with their landowner. [...] This two-sided meekness is still more useful to men when it is found in women who are in the same walk of life as they are.
>
> Madrigals please frivolous women. The woman who has become accustomed to reason desires only that people should treat her worthily. Do not praise her, but do not sacrifice your pride, then she will love you more than when you begin arbitrarily at one moment to shower her with irrelevant praise and at the next to humiliate her with irrelevant domination.[87]

She argued that women should not denigrate their own achievements, but assert their proper worth, because to abase themselves was to sanction men's domination. Men preferred women to think of themselves as inferior, and not to compete, and while women complied, men acted condescendingly towards them. What was required was a relationship based on rights and equality. One of the signs of equality in the literary process was the participation of the woman writer in literary criticism as the critic and not merely the object of criticism, hence her spirited preface.

Reaction to the preface was mixed. Khvostov noted that any person curious enough to compare the two versions of the poem could 'appreciate the humbleness of the Inexperienced Muse',[88] implying that Bunina was vanquished. Shishkov's entries in her album suggest that she had caused offence. Bunina's reply to her critics immediately evoked an anonymous satire, the style of which suggests that it emanated from a rival literary circle:

> The fall of Phaethon is known to all,
> Bards in all lands have thundered it aloud
> In good and faulty verse,
> Following in the footsteps of the exiled Naso.
> However no-one grasps
> The fact
> That a great grief o'ertook Apollo
> When after these disasters, Zeus,
> Commanding him to be a shepherd, chased him from the heavens.
> 'Tis a shame to lose a son, twice so to lose one's place.
> To be retired as god is truly great misfortune.

But finally the curly-locked Apollo,
Nursing his grief and groaning in his breast,
Out of his mind, turned to Parnassus.
To please the Muses in a skirt he dressed.
He first began to warble songs at twilight,
And then set to and sang quite freely
(Vexation turned his head),
With every passing hour he sang yet more.
Although the world considered that Apollo in his skirt looked old,
Although his heavenly ardour was extinguished,
He kindly sang at every hour
Exceeding unharmoniously.
Wishing in vain to check his zeal,
The Muses, seeing this, said all together:
'Sorrow in thy, 0, Phoebus, head is nesting,
If you have donned a skirt, embroider now a canvas.
We tell you courteously, politely,
That for a god to wear a skirt is neither sweet nor nice,
And that a god must make us marvel if he sings at all.
The god of light, the sire of verse,
Is the example for all singers,
But in your verse there often are no feet.
How shameful for an earthly singer not to know the metre.'
To this they added
That to indulge him
They had removed some errors, though lacked the time for all.
No sooner had the Muses sung,
Than lo! the god of verse was kind enough to answer
With showers of abuse,
Which often happens amidst bards on earth.
Beskirted Phoebus lost his temper
And bellowed loud and strong;
His threat: to bridle Pegasus.
Mounting his steed, he stumbled on his skirt
And thus he fell right off his horse.[89]

The poem was not intended for publication, circulated in manuscript, and has only been preserved because Khvostov, who felt himself to be an unjustly defeated rival of Bunina's, took a copy. As retribution for failing to be diffident, humble, and submissive, she/Apollo was caricatured as ridiculously self-confident, over-ambitious, and vulgar; as retribution for her success as a poet, she was shown as incompetent, in the wrong occupation, and in poetic decline. Personal gibes were added as Bunina, who was thirty-seven, was described as old and sexually unattractive (lacking heavenly ardour). The advice to abandon poetry and take up embroidery was advice to return to women's traditional occupations. Parody of her style centred on convoluted word order, cumbersome compounds, and the mixture of short and long lines, high and low style, all

of which, in their right place, were approved by the Colloquium. The message was blunt: a woman who writes is out of her rightful sphere, unladylike, an unfortunate incompetent, and makes herself ridiculous. The response to Bunina's poem clearly identified the issue of status. Bunina's perceived presumptuous claim to the high status enjoyed by male writers was caricatured by demoting Apollo from god to mortal and from sire of song to incompetent performer. He was also demoted from male to quasi-female, and humiliated by having his errors callously corrected.

Bunina continued to writer, and her next collection of poems (1812) contained a translation of Sappho, and poems whose starting point was Thomson's *The Seasons*, for which she probably used French intermediary translations. At about this time she fell ill with breast cancer, and in 1815 she travelled to England in search of a cure. When she returned to Russia in 1817 she was in worse health and as her illness progressed she did less creative writing, and turned again to translation instead. She made a close translation of a play by Genlis, *Agar dans le désert* (1817), a defence of the existence of divine providence, which her illness must have given her reason to doubt. In the play Ishmael asks why, if God loves those who do his will, he and Hagar are left helpless in the desert. Hagar replies that God wants to try their patience, but sees their sufferings and will not abandon them; they must bear everything without complaint, and their virtue will be rewarded with immortality, fame, and eternal bliss. Hagar has to watch her son die. But she continues to believe in a good and almighty God, to submit to his commands, and to hope for mercy. She does not complain, and is finally rewarded by the appearance of an angel, who transforms the desert into a place of beauty and brings Ishmael back to life. Although Bunina had voiced scepticism in some poems, others had affirmed the existence of God, the benevolence of the divine order, and the rightness of submission to divine authority, expressing concern at the human tendency to murmur rebelliously against God. If Bunina suffered and complained with Ishmael, she needed to hear the assurance of the angel that God never failed to reward patience, submission, courage, and virtue. Perhaps she read herself into the text and translation in this case was a form of self-expression at second hand.

Aware that her life was drawing to an end, Bunina published three volumes of her collected works (1819-21), which included, as well as poems already mentioned, a verse rendering of a French romance and in 1823 she published a translation of Lamartine's 'Le Vallon'. The poem describes the poet's response to the valley landscape, which he perceives as a descent into forgetfulness and death, followed by an ascent back to life and the perception of divine goodness in nature. Bunina's translation follows the sense, syntax, images, metre, and rhyme scheme of the source text closely until the section on the ascent, which she omitted. Her radical remodelling of the text must be seen in the context of her illness, and her rewriting of Lamartine as a deeply personal lyric.

By 1824 she was so ill that she could no longer live independently, but she made her own arrangements for the nursing she needed, and continued to support herself in spite of her illness. Financial independence remained a constant concern which not even the advanced stages of cancer could remove from her mind, and her position became increasingly insecure. Leaving Petersburg had removed her from personal contact with the court, and when Alexander I died in 1825, followed within months by his wife Elizaveta Alekseevna, she lost her chief patrons. She had no firm connections with the new monarch, Nicholas I, and her needs grew as her illness worsened. She therefore had

to depend for income on the pensions she had been awarded for her poems and on sales of her writing. She published a free translation of Psalm 52 in 1827, but her main occupation was the commission given her by Elizaveta Alekseevna before her death. Elizaveta Alekseevna had wanted a Russian translation of the *Sermons* of Hugh Blair, which were regarded as models of elegant style, and were very popular.[90] She had approached various potential translators, all of whom were otherwise engaged. The task, which held some possibility of reward from Elizaveta Alekseevna, came at a time when Bunina was thinking more about religion than earlier in her life. Of the five volumes of Blair's sermons, Bunina translated one, and perhaps the choice was her own, since several of the subjects were ones which she had contemplated herself. They included: 'On Sensibility', 'On the Duties Belonging to Middle Age', 'On Death', 'On Fortitude', and 'On the Joy and the Bitterness of the Heart'. She dedicated the translation to the young people of Russia, with the aim, as she wrote in her introduction, of planting the seed of Christian virtues. But the work was not easy. Bunina's English was probably adequate as she had lived in England, but she lacked confidence in her ability and it is possible that she made use of one of the French translations of the sermons. She was, moreover, only able to work in a kneeling position, because of the pain in her breast and arm.[91] The dedication of the book read: 'To Russian youth from her who laboured in the translation', and it was indeed a labour. In spite of the pain she had to see the translation through a protracted publication process until it finally appeared in 1829. Her patron Shishkov proposed to the Russian Academy that she be awarded a medium gold medal and five hundred roubles for her translation or, alternatively, one thousand roubles and no medal. This was evidently a strategy for maximising Bunina's income when it was desperately needed for medical expenses. In the event she was awarded both a medal and the thousand roubles, for her poems and her translation.[92] This must have been a very welcome award, and of more practical use than the other which she received for the translation, a splendid diamond brooch from the Empress,[93] which she could neither sell nor wear. The translation of Blair was her last work before she died in 1829.

Like Anna Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova and Sushkova, but for different reasons, Bunina was unusual amongst women translators. She did not have the advantage of a solid education in languages in her youth, and had to provide this herself in later life. She was both the most distinguished woman poet of her time, and an adventurous translator. Perhaps because she was an accomplished writer, she was exceptionally prepared to liberate herself from the idea of formal equivalence, and to imitate or rewrite her source texts. Her translations acted as a screen from behind which to voice controversial sentiments of her own. Indeed, her rewritings then functioned almost as original works on themes which concerned her, particularly the situation of the female writer in search of recognition. She used prefaces to her translations to present herself as a confident translator who was not in need of readers' indulgence. Indeed, she was prepared to use the occasion to argue vigorously for the virtues of her work and to dispute with its detractors. She looked to her translation work to bring financial reward, and received it in the form of sales and awards. And she used translation pragmatically as a form of writing which she could still practise when circumstances made original work impossible and income vital.

Notes

1 Levin, i, 148.
2 A. Tolycheva, 'Istoricheskie anekdoty i melochi', *Russkii arkhiv*, 1877, book 2, 98-103 (p. 100).
3 F. F. Vigel', *Zapiski*, 2 vols (Moscow, 1928), ii, 255.
4 Anon., Kniaz' Grigorii Aleksandrovich Potemkin-Tavricheskii 1739-91 gg. Biograficheskii ocherk po ne izdannym materialam', *Russkaia starina*, 12 (1875), 481-522 (510-22). Vigel' describes Golitsyna's character and family life: i, 119-25.
5 *Sochineniia Derzhavina*, edited by Ia. Grot, second edition, 6 vols (St Petersburg, 1876), v, 467.
6 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 31, No. 51-52, 119.
7 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 29, No. 13, 195.
8 Vigel', i, 125.
9 *Zapiski i vospominaniia russkikh zhenshchin*, pp. 281-388 (p. 296).
10 Anon., preface to *Faniia* (Moscow, 1794).
11 Preface to *Razvratnoe semeistvo* (Moscow, 1778).
12 Preface to *Drug zhenshchin* (St Petersburg, 1806).
13 Quoted in Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 29, No. 10, 148.
14 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 31, No. 51-52, 119.
15 Quoted in Natal'ia Pushkareva, 'Russian Noblewomen's Education in the Home as Seen in Late 18th- and Early 19th-Century Memoirs' (forthcoming).
16 Pushkareva, 'Russian Noblewomen's Education in the Home'.
17 *Sochineniia Derzhavina*, v, 876. Derzhavin was also a patron of the translator Anna Turchaninova (Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 31, No. 30, 49).
18 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 29, No. 13, 194.
19 *Svodnyi katalog*, i, 54 and 208, ii, 485, iii, 327; i, 95 and 350, iii, 24.
20 0. B. Lebedeva, in *Russkie pisateli 1800-1917*, ii, 352. There is also an article on Zontag by A. S. Nikolaev in *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'*, vii, 451-63.
21 See entries in *Svodnyi katalog*, ii, 400; iii, 288.
22 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 30, No. 21, 120.
23 This is suggested by her poem of gratitude for encouragement 'K bessmertnomu tvortsu, "Rossiady"', *Pppv*, 1797, part 13, p. 176.
24 Preface to *Estella* (St Petersburg, 1789).
25 The title of *Istoricheskaia i khronologicheskaia rospis'* mentions the guidance of Fedor Gablitsel'.
26 V. D. Rak, in *Slovar' russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka*, i, 47-48.
27 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 31, No. 30, 52.
28 N. Arapov, *Dramaticheskii al'bom* (Moscow, 1850), p. xxxi.
29 *Shekspir i russkaia kul'tura*, ed. by M. P. Alekseev (Moscow-Leningrad, 1965), p. 35.
30 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, No. 21, 119-20.
31 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 30, No. 18, 66.
32 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 29, No. 13, 195.
33 Entries on Kamenskaia and Miklashevich appear in *Russkie pisateli 1800-1917*and

on Demidova, A. and N. Magnitskaia, Nilova, Podshivalova, Pelageia Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova, and Voeikova in *Slovar' russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka*.

34 Levin, i, 149.

35 S. P. Zhikharev, *Zapiski sovremennika*, 2 vols (Leningrad, 1989), i, 217.

36 V. E. Vatsuro, 'Griboedov v romane V. S. Miklashevich "Selo Mikhailovskoe"', in his *Pushkinskaia pora* (St Petersburg, 2000), 308-332. Vatsuro includes an account of her life.

37 M. M., 'Vel'iasheva-Volyntsova', in *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. by I. E. Andreevskii, 41 vols (St Petersburg, 1890-1907), v, 869. See also *Russkaia poeziia*, ed. by S. A. Vengerov, 7 vols (St Petersburg, 1893-1901), i, 68.

38 Levin, i, 143.

39 Levin, i, 183. An account of the short stories and historical tales is given in Shirley Jones-Day, 'A Woman Writer's Dilemma: Madame de Gomez and the Early Eighteenth-Century Novel', in *Femmes Savantes et Femmes d'Esprit: Women Intellectuals of the French Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Roland Bonnel and Catherine Rubinger (New York, 1994), pp. 77-98.

40 *Svodnyi katalog*, i, 245-47.

41 V. N. Kubacheva, '"Vostochnaia" povest' v russkoi literature XVIII-nachala XIX veka', *XVIII vek, 5* (1962), 295-315.

42 V. Kallash, in *Russkii arkhiv*, 39 (1901), part 2, 241, quoting Osterman's recollection of the conversation as recorded in *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 29, No. 3, 34-35.

43 Research on Sushkova includes Iu. D. Levin, *Vospriiatie*, pp. 147-48; S. V. Evtushenko, '0 portrete odnoi iz pervykh russkikh poetess M. V. Sushkovoi', *Pamiatniki kul'tury. Novye otkrytiia. Ezhegodnik za 1991 god* (Moscow, 1993), pp. 163-66. The best biographical accounts, though short, are in *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'* (St Petersburg, 1896-1918) and *Dictionary of Russian Women Writers*, pp. 628-29. There is also interesting material in Frank Göpfert, 'Catherine II et les femmes-écrivains de son temps', in *Catherine II et 1'Europe*, pp. 237-48.

44 The chief biographical source is *Russkii biograficheskii slovar' s. v.* Khrapovitskii.

45 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 29, No. 7, p. 98.

46 Letter of 16 November 1805, quoted in N. V. Sushkov, 'M. V. Khrapovitskii i M. I. Serdiukov', *Raut na 1852 god. Istoricheskii i literaturnyi sbornik* (Moscow, 1852), p. 206.

47 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 29, No. 7, p. 99. Italics original.

48 'Portrety', *Truten'*, 18 August 1769, reprinted in *Satiricheskie zhurnaly*, pp. 108-09. On the journal see Jones, chapters 2-3.

49 'Kakovy moi chitateli'.

50 'Portrety', *Truten'*, 19 January 1770, reprinted in *Satiricheskie zhurnaly*, pp. 188-91.

51 For a summary of Enlightenment thinking about women see Michèle Crampe-Casnabet, 'A Sampling of Eighteenth-Century Philosophy', in *A History of Women in the West*, ed. by Natalie Zemon Davis and Arlette Farge (Cambridge-London, 1993), pp. 315-347, and for a challenge to the opposition of woman to man as nature to culture see Sylvana Tomaselli, 'The Enlightenment Debate on Women',

History Workshop, 1985, No. 20, 101-24.

52 Part I, No. 11, reprinted in *Satiricheskie zhurnaly*, pp. 320-21.

53 A. V. Zapadov, introductory article to M. M. Kheraskov, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Leningrad, 1961), p. 9.

54 P. R. Zaborov, '"Nochnye razmyshleniia" Iunga v rannikh russkikh perevodakh', in *XVIII vek*, 6 (1964), 269-79. *Les Nuits d'Young, traduites de 1'anglais par Le Tourneur* (Paris, 1769) was a free translation. Le Tourneur announced in his preface that he had relegated to the notes those parts of the text which related to theology rather than to 'more universal morals'. Sushkova, whose version is full and accurate, must have used the original English text.

55 It is not known whether the translation has survived. Publication of translations of *Paradise Lost* may have met with opposition from the Synod (Levin, ii, 192). On the translations of Milton and Petrarch see N. V. Sushkov, 'A. V. Khrapovitskii', *Raut* (Moscow, 1854), iii, 129.

56 On Young, his translators, and imitators see Paul von Tieghem, 'La Poésie de la nuit et des tombeaux', in his *Le Préromantisme* (Paris, 1948), pp. 3-206. There is a fuller discussion of Russian translations of Young in Zaborov, '"Nochnye razmyshleniia"' and Levin, ii, 145-48.

57 van Tieghem, 'La Poésie', 47. Between 1751 and 1805 there were nineteen translations of the complete text into twelve languages.

58 Levin, ii, 132. Both poems are in *Predstatel'nitsy muz*, pp. 109-13.

59 Levin, ii, 132-33. Bogdanovich's version is in *Poleznoe uveselenie*, 1761, December, 246-48; for a detailed commentary on his text see Joachim Klein, *Die Schäferdichtung des russischen Klassizismus* (Wiesbaden-Berlin, 1988), pp. 45-53.

60 Novikov, p. 360.

61 This was a major project which ran to 475 pages. Another text ascribed to Sushkova is *Schastlivoe pokhishchenie, povest' gishpanskaia* (St Petersburg, 1777), a translation of *L'Heureux Enlèvement, nouvelle espagnole, traduite de 1'anglais d'après mademoiselle Eliza Haywood;* her son Nikolai was not convinced that this was her work.

62 See Levin, i, 168-70 and 272-73.

63 Ivan Murav'ev, letter of 17 August 1777, in *Pis'ma russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka*, ed. by G. P. Makogonenko (Leningrad, 1980), p. 277.

64 Makarov, 'Materialy', *Damskii zhurnal*, 1830, part 29, No. 10, 146.

65 S. N. Glinka, quoted in B. N. Aseev, *Russkii dramaticheskii teatr XVII-XVIII vekov* (Moscow, 1958), p. 192.

66 R. A. Mooser, *L'Opéra-comique français en Russie au XVIIIe siècle* (Geneva-Monaco, 1954),118.

67 Levin, ii, 60.

68 P. R. Zaborov, 'Teatr L.-S. Mers'e v Rossii', in *Russkaia kul'tura XVIII veka i zapadnoevropeiskie literatury*, ed. by M. P. Alekseev (Leningrad, 1980), pp. 63-82, especially pp. 71-72.

69 *Sobesednik liubitelei rossiiskogo slova*, 1783, part 5, 5-8. Reprinted in *Predstatel'nitsy muz*, pp. 113-14.

70 *Sobesednik liubitelei rossiiskogo slova*, 1783, part 9, 19-22. Reprinted in

Predstatel'nitsy muz, pp. 115-16,

71 Mooser, p. 120.

72 *Dramaticheskii slovar'* (Moscow, 1787), p. 118.

73 Zaborov, 'Teatr L.-S. Mers'e', p. 81.

74 Göpfert, 'Catherine II', 243. Göpfert also suggests that Sushkova may be the anonymous woman poet who translated *Pis'mo Ioanna Kalasa k zhene ego i detiam. Perevedeno s frantsuzskogo iazyka nekotoroiu ukrainskoiu stikhotvorkoiu* (Moscow, 1787). However, this seems unlikely, since Sushkova always signed her work with her name or initials.

75 There were also at least two daughters: Praskov'ia, date of birth unknown, is mentioned in the extracts from memoirs of N. V. Sushkov (1796-1871), RO RNB, f. 297, k. 4, ed. khr. 6. One of Mikhail's suicide notes mentions his 'sisters' and, in the context of his siblings, 'nine people'.

76 *Rossiiskii Verter, poluspravedlivaia povest', original'noe sochinenie M. S., molodogo, chuvstvitel'nogo cheloveka, neschastnym obrazom samoizvol'no prekrativshego svoiu zhizn'* (St Petersburg, 1801).

77 On the suicide see M. G. Fraan'e, 'Proshchal'nye pis'ma M. V. Sushkova (O probleme samoubiistva v russkoi kul'ture kontsa XVIII veka'), in *XVIII vek*, 19 (1995), 147-67.

78 Fraan'e, p. 160.

79 Fraan'e, p. 158.

80 Sushkov, memoirs.

81 On her biography see Wendy Rosslyn, *Anna Bunina (1774-1829) and the Origins of Women's Poetry in Russia* (Lewiston-Queenston-Lampeter, 1997), and 'Anna Bunina's "Unchaste Relationship with the Muses": Patronage, the Market and the Woman Writer in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 74 (1996), 223-42.

82 P. P. Semenov-Tian-Shanskii, *Memuary* (Petrograd, 1917), i, 7.

83 Gideon Toury, 'Translation, Literary Translation and Pseudotranslation', *Comparative Criticism*, 6 (1984), 73-85 (p. 83). See also his 'Pseudotranslations and their Significance' in his *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 1995), pp. 40-52.

84 The Phaethon myth was also used by Anne Bradstreet, the first woman poet of colonial New England. In her 'Elegy upon that Honourable and Renowned Knight, Sir Philip Sidney' (1638) she figures herself as Phaethon to represent her daring pursuit of literary fame.

85 Preface to *Padenie Faetona* in Anna Bunina, *Neopytnaia muza*, part 2, p. 92.

86 Anna Bunina, *Neopytnaia muza*, part 2, pp. 81-98.

87 Quoted in K. Ia. Grot, 'Al'bom A. P. Buninoi', *Russkii arkhiv*, 1902, part 1, pp. 500-06 (pp. 502-03).

88 A. V. Zapadov, 'Iz arkhiva Khvostova', in *Literaturnyi arkhiv*, ed. by S. D. Balukhaty, 1 (1938), 383.

89 Zapadov, 'Iz arkhiva Khvostova', p. 383.

90 The sermons were published between 1777 and 1801, and by 1794 the first volume was in its nineteenth edition and the second in its fifteenth. The sermons

were translated into several languages.

91 M. D. Khmyrov, 'Russkie pisatel'nitsy proshlogo vremeni', *Rassvet*, 12 (1861), 213-28 (p. 226).

92 *Trudy Imperatorskoi Rossiiskoi Akademii* (St Petersburg, 1840), i, 76.

93 *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 1829, No. 34, p. 1589.

Reference: Rosslyn, Wendy. *Feats of Agreeable Usefulness: Translations by Russian Women 1763-1825*, Fichtenwalde, F. K. Göpfert, 2000, p. 33-66.