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In 1825, Alexander Pushkin groused to another writer about the on-going proliferation of “Kotsebiatina”—a pun on “otsebiatina,” the spouting of nonsense.¹ Little had changed from 1802, when Russia’s first professional writer, Nikolai Karamzin, exclaimed about the literary market: “A novel, a tale, good or bad—it is all the same, if on the title page there is the name of the famous Kotzebue.”² Quantitative analysis of Russian book history reveals that until the 1860s, over 90% of the market for novels in Russia consisted of foreign literature in translation (the percentage would be higher could we account for foreign literature in the original). In 1802, of approximately 350 total publications in Russia, August Kotzebue (1761-1819) published fifty novels and plays in Russian; in 1825, he published 32.³ Success in the nineteenth-century literary market demanded continuous quantities of novels. In both Germany and Russia, the German sentimental novelists August Lafontaine (1758-1831) and Kotzebue, mainly a prolific playwright, reigned through the 1840s in a triumvirate with Walter Scott (1771-1832). In England, Germany, and Russia, the leading French writer was Stéphanie-Félicité, Comtesse de

Genlis (1746-1830).\textsuperscript{4} Recent debates about the influence of European literature on Russian literature apply various critical approaches, from formalism and cultural semiotics, to Bakhtin and the carnivalesque, and “intense, ambivalent dialogue” about “moral integrity.”\textsuperscript{5}

Rarely is Russian literature discussed in terms of markets, sales, and readership, as if its profound value were inherent and divorced from such mundane considerations. Yet, as Pierre Bourdieu, Abram Reitblat, and others remind us, a sociological approach to literary culture considers how writers, critics, publishers, readers, and others engage in the symbolic production of the value of writers and works.\textsuperscript{6} Thus, Reitblat examines Pushkin’s reputation as a genius as constructed, rather than a given. But it is hard to evaluate the spin in Karamzin’s and Pushkin’s accounts of the book market without a better empirical understanding of those markets in Russia and Europe. A combined sociological and quantitative analysis of literature in Russia, as opposed to Russian literature, shows one way Russian writers, beginning with Pushkin, created “value” in the competition over cultural capital and readers in the literary marketplace. They continually constructed narratives that distinguished between first-, second-, and third-rate novels to create a canon that allowed them to align themselves with a few select European sentimental writers, against contemporary popular foreign sentimental novels, which Russians actually were reading. Pushkin is both an example and a crucial starting point for examining Russia’s development of a national literature in a competitive transnational literary market.


overflowing with sentimental literature. This dynamic cultural exchange in Europe’s smaller literary markets is writ large in Russia.

This fierce market struggle has been obscured by nationalist narratives of Russian literature that elide bestselling foreign sentimental literature and replace it with a few prestigious foreign “influences.” William Todd reinforces this perception of Russia as an outlier to European markets. Russian writers were influenced by outdated “romantic, confessional, melodramatic, aesthetically self-conscious, gothic” trends and the canonized writers “Sterne, Radcliffe, Byron, Scott, Dickens, Goethe, Schiller, Hoffman, Poe, Rousseau, Balzac, Sue, Sand and Hugo.” Todd argues that “European critics failed to see that the otherness of the Russian novel was in large part their own literary past.”

However, Franco Moretti graphs the transfer of novels from producing to receiving nations, and the heaviest importer is Russia: “It is a regular, monotonous pattern: all of Europe reading the same books, with the same enthusiasm, and roughly in the same years (when not months).” Russian readers were up-to-date in a European literary market integrated by French, English, and German popular sentimental novels: “The sentimental subgenre was a transnational literary form during the century of sentimentality’s prestige [1750-1850], and sentimental novels were the most translated of all literary fiction.”

Russian writers represented themselves in their novels, criticism, and letters as reading such European writers as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Samuel Richardson, Laurence Sterne, Germaine de Staël, and Scott, but denigrated or avoided naming their actual competition: such bestselling sentimental novelists as Kotzebue, Genlis, Lafontaine, and Sophie Cottin (1770-1807).

---

Nascent nationalist narratives of the Russian novel, which enshrined a few sentimental influences, were created by and around Pushkin, using *Evgenii Onegin* (written 1823-31) and his prose fiction. Pushkin’s extensive references to and omissions of French, English, and German novels and authors in his novel in verse *Evgenii Onegin* and his published and unpublished prose are usually studied as intertextual influences, but they also serve as a window into the conflicts over cultural capital between canonized and popular sentimental novels in the nineteenth-century Russian literary market. Moretti bluntly divides literature into the canon and the 99% we no longer read (for example, *Dashing Diamond Dick*), good only for his much contended “distant reading” and data mining. My quantitative approach focuses on the grey area of hundreds of international sentimental bestsellers (*La Duchesse de la Vallière*), the shared ennobling reading of generations of European readers and competition for aspiring novelists, who had a vested interest in claiming that this literature was no longer read.10 Bourdieu’s notions of conflicts over cultural capital in the literary field, where aesthetic conflicts mask market conflicts, explain the relentless backlash against popular sentimental literature by writers, critics, and scholars, which Margaret Cohen analyzes in France.11

Relying on Cohen’s typology of the sentimental novel, I conclude with a new reading of Pushkin’s last novella *The Captain’s Daughter* (1833-36), to examine where his ongoing experiments with popular sentimental literature led him. This novella is traditionally read intertextually with Scott’s *Rob Roy* (1817) and *The Heart of Midlothian* (1818), but I argue for Cottin’s bestseller *Elisabeth, ou les Exilés de Sibérie* (1806) as Pushkin’s (and most likely Scott’s) intertext. Indeed, *Elisabeth* was probably the most reprinted novel in England, France,

---

and Germany through 1850. The knowledge that everyone, including Pushkin, read Scott makes his novels plausible intertexts, while Cottin’s equal success among readers internationally with a handful of novels lies buried in book history along with that of other sentimental novelists. Pushkin borrowed widely in his poetry too, but with this elevated genre he did not risk his reputation as he might as a novelist because of the commodification of novels. Like other well-known Russian writers, in 1825 and 1829 Pushkin self-published the first chapter of *Eugene Onegin* (a job Petr Pletnev took on later) in the hopes of making more money than a publisher would give him.\(^\text{12}\) Pushkin prefaces it by a dedication to his brother, Lev Pushkin, an introduction that subtly reminds readers about his successful *Ruslan and Ludmila*, and the poem “Conversation of Bookseller with Poet,” which justifies receiving money for art—all to distance himself from the crass business of publication and maintain his artistic independence and noble reputation.

A quantitative, sociological study of novels in the Russian literary market and Pushkin enriches qualitative analysis and suggests new approaches. Mikhail Bakhtin, in his notes for a lost study on the importance and enduring power of sentimentalism (“The Problem of Sentimentalism”), proposed to begin with Fedor Dostoevsky and “trace the elements of sentimentalism to the present day (to B. Brecht).”\(^\text{13}\) He singled out sentimentalism’s core idea as “the inner connections between people,” as opposed to their social and economic connections, for “there are certain sides to life and a person that can be conceptualized and justified only in a sentimental aspect.”\(^\text{14}\) Pushkin’s attempts to write Russian sentimental novels revolve precisely


\(^{14}\) Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Estetika slovesnogo tворчества* (Moscow, 1979), 354.
around the tensions between the inner, social, and economic connections among Russia’s noble elite and presaged later experiments with sentimentalism by Nikolai Gogol, Dostoevsky, Evgeniia Tur (1815-92), Nadezhda Khvoshchinskaia (1822-89), Ivan Turgenev, Ivan Goncharov, and Lev Tolstoy. Richard Wortman underscores the strangeness of personal happiness and the emotions of sentimentalism for Karamzin and other nobles of his generation, trained to serve the state.\(^{15}\) Pushkin’s reception of Cottin’s quintessential sentimental novel reveals aspects of European sentimentalism that would transfer easily, and with difficulty, to Russia. But Bakhtin and others have overlooked Pushkin’s significant engagement with sentimentalism because they have accepted the positions Pushkin took in conflicts over popular sentimental novels in the Russian literary field.

Pushkin anchors a new Russian literature’s transitions from poetry to prose, from noble patronage to the literary marketplace, and from Classicism to pre-Romanticism, Romanticism, and Realism. Yet scholars carefully disassociate Pushkin from the devalued aesthetic of sentimentalism. For example, Leon Stil’man subtites an analysis of how Pushkin modifies the sentimental epistolary novel in *Evgenii Onegin* as “On the Question of the Transition from Romanticism to Realism.”\(^{16}\) Still, beginning with *Evgenii Onegin*, in which the narrator imagines he might write “a novel in the older vein…about a Russian family’s age-old story,” both Pushkin’s published and unpublished, unfinished prose suggests frequent unacknowledged forays into writing sentimental novels in a Russian vein (3.13.7, 12). These include *The Moor of Peter the Great* (written 1827-28), “Novel in Letters” (1829), “The guests arrived at the dacha” (1829-30), “On the corner of the small square” (1829), “My fate is decided. I am to marry”

\(^{15}\) Richard S. Wortman, *The Development of Russian Legal Consciousness* (Chicago, 1976), 122.

(1830), “The Lady Peasant” (1830), “Roslavlev” (1831), “Dubrovsky” (1832), and *The Captain’s Daughter*.

*Evgenii Onegin* contains the most references to foreign sentimental novels and writers in Pushkin’s work, and shows the international breadth of the Russian market. Written and published serially over nine years, it is Pushkin’s initial experiment in integrating the sentimental ideals of duty, virtue and love with the specificities of Russian noble life and history for women as well as men. Reading between the lines reveals Pushkin’s backlash against popular novelists.

In Chapter 3 (written 1824), Pushkin lists the heroine Tatiana’s reading, set in 1820: *Clarissa; or the History of a Young Lady* (1748) and *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (1754), by Richardson; *Julie; ou, La Nouvelle Héloïse* (1761) by Rousseau; *Delphine* (1802) by de Staël; *Die Leiden des Jungen Werthers* (1774) by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe; *Valérie ou Lettres de Gustave de Linar à Ernest de G* (1804) by Baroness Barbara Juliane de Krüdener; and *Mathilde, ou Mémoires tirés de l’histoire des croisades* (1805), also known as *Histoire de Matilde et de Malek-Adhel, épisode du temps des croisades*, by Cottin. Pushkin’s footnote hints at controversies around these novels: “Julie Wolmar, the new Héloïse. Malek-Adhel, hero of a mediocre novel by Mme Cottin. Gustave de Linar, hero of a charming tale by Baroness Krüdener” (6:193). In 1845, Vissarion Belinsky argued that Tatiana was imprisoned by the social norms of the nobility and “bad sentimental novels.” In the most sustained analysis of Tatiana’s reading, Olga Hasty argues that “In creating Tatiana, Pushkin shapes a viable artistic biography for himself and charts, moreover, the development of Russian literature within the context of the Western European tradition.”

---

Yet Tatiana’s novels are also pawns in the new conflicts of the Russian and European literary markets, in which Pushkin continually staked positions for himself as a serious rather than popular prose writer. De Staël similarly positions herself when she mentions some of the same novels in her preface to Delphine, reprinted in her Oeuvres complètes (1820), the edition Pushkin owned. In her canon-making preface, de Staël discusses the problem of writing a novel that would “rank as literature,” given the many mediocre popular novels, and provides her own rankings: “The novels we will never cease to admire, Clarissa, Clémentine, Tom Jones, The Nouvelle Héloïse, Werther, etc., seek to reveal or trace a multitude of feelings, which, in the depths of the soul, make up life’s happiness or its unhappiness.”19 De Staël sought the renewal of the French novel through the passion and moral purpose of English and German sentimental novels. She created a canonical literary lineage that perhaps appealed to the twenty-five-year-old Pushkin’s literary ambitions as he put those very novels, in costly French editions, in Tatiana’s hands, although she could hardly have had them. With parents who are not readers in a house with no library, Tatiana barters and buys books from peddlers, and not from the expensive foreign booksellers in St. Petersburg. Yet Pushkin has Tatiana refer merely to her “shelf of books,” and ironically reserves the term “study” for the dilettante Onegin’s library (8.46.8, 7.18.4). Critics prefer to connect Pushkin with the canonized novels he referenced as he rooted both himself and Russian literature in the international literary field, and to ignore the popular novels that everyone was reading, which Pushkin mentioned disapprovingly, if at all. But like de Staël and many novelists, Pushkin engaged actively, if covertly, to the end of his career with popular sentimental novels, in his effort to write Russian novels, find readers, earn money, and establish a Russian canon.

International Markets for Sentimental Novels

Though it is common knowledge that at the beginning of the nineteenth century Russia imported most of its fiction, few realize what, how much, and for how long. Studies of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Russian literary market by Gary Marker, Jeffrey Brooks, and Reitblat note the presence of foreign literature as they focus on the rise of Russian literature in (and against) a vast sea of translated literature.\(^{20}\) In “Roslavlev,” Pushkin’s female narrator digresses on the state of Russian literature in 1831: “The first two or three Russian novels appeared two or three years ago, while in France, England, and Germany, books, each more remarkable than the other, come out one after another. We do not see even translations; and if we do, well, say what you will, I still prefer the originals” (8:150). But there were already many translations and more than a few Russian novels. The sociologists Gaye Tuchman and Nina Fortin term this kind of erasure the “empty field phenomenon,” a mechanism whereby men sought to edge women out as high-culture novelists in England, to reestablish writing as a male profession once writing became more lucrative.\(^{21}\)

Moretti has roughly calculated the foreign novels available from 1750 to 1850 in various European countries and not surprisingly, the centers of novel production—France, Britain, and Germany—imported the least (less than 50%), while they supplied novels to the rest of Europe: Spain (50%), Italy (50%), Poland (70%), Denmark (80%), and Russia (80%).\(^{22}\) My rough calculation for novels in Russian translation is closer to 90%. The catalogs of Alexander Smirdin (1795-1857), in his day the most important bookseller in St. Petersburg, divide literature into two


sections, translated and original, and show that in 1828 he offered 1,139 translated eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novels and 121 original Russian titles. Russia continued to import many novels through the nineteenth century because the publication of books and journals was restricted until the 1860s. Print runs in Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century averaged 1,200 copies.

Translations competed with literature imported by foreign booksellers in St. Petersburg, from whom Pushkin bought expensive books that figured among his debts at his death. Like Tatiana, Pushkin read English and German novels in French translations. These foreign books

23 Aleksandr Smirdin, Rospis’ rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia, iz biblioteki Aleksandra Smirdina, Sistematicheskim poriadkom raspolozenia, v chehykh chastiyakh, s prilozheniem: Azbuchnoi Rospisi imen sochiniteliei i perevodchikov, i Kratkoj Rospisi knigam po azbuchnomy poriadku (St. Petersburg, 1828); Aleksandr Smirdin, Vtoroe pribavlenie k rospisi rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia iz biblioteki Aleksandra Smirdina (St. Petersburg, 1829); Aleksandr Smirdin, Tret’e pribavlenie k rospisi rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia iz biblioteki Petra Krasheninnikova, Prodolzhenie k prezhde-izdanym rospisiam A. F. Smirdina (St. Petersburg, 1852); Aleksandr Smirdin, Chetvertoe pribavlenie k rospisi rossiiskim knigam dlia chteniia iz biblioteki Petra Krasheninnikova, Prodolzhenie k prezhde-izdannoi rospisi A. F. Smirdina (St. Petersburg, 1856); Aleksandr Smirdin, Reestr russkim knigam, prodaiushchimsia v knizhnom magazine Aleksandra Smirdina (St. Petersburg, 1841); Aleksandr Smirdin, Katalog knigoprodavtsa dvora Ego Imperatorskago velichestva A. Smirdina (syna) i Ko (St. Petersburg, 1858). In the supplementary catalogs in 1829, the ratio is 58 to 7; in 1832, it is 95 to 67; while by 1852, the tide turns for the first time and there are more Russian novels, 675 to 350, but in 1856, translations again take the lead, 139 to 101. Catalogs for 1841 and 1858 do not divide literature into original and translated works.

24 A. A. Zaitseva, “Knigochezanie v Rossii na rebezhe XVIII i XIX veka,” in Kniga v Rossii (do serediny XIX veka), ed. A. A. Sidorov and S. P. Luppov (Leningrad, 1978), 191; B. Iwinski, La statistique internationale des imprimés. Resultats generaux. Rapport presenter au Congres International de Bibliographie et de Documentation (1910) au nom de l’Institut International de Bibliographie (Brussels, 1911), 18, 22, 19, http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008926739; M. Henry Meidinger, “A Statistical Account of the Book Trade of Various Countries, Part II,” Journal of the Statistical Society of London 3, no. 4 (1841): 381; Robert Michell, “Summary of Statistics of the Russian Empire,” Journal of the Statistical Society of London 35 (1872): 359–60. Around 1800 Russia published 350 books per year, while Germany produced around 3,000 books, France 2,000 books, and Britain 1,000 books; by 1850, however, although its population had nearly doubled from 35.5 million to 69 million, Russia published only 700 books per year, Germany 4,000, France 3,000, and England 3,000. Russia imported 300,000 volumes in 1835; by 1868, it published around 3,000 titles, and imported 3.5 million volumes in 4,035 titles, of which over 25% was literature.

25 Reitblat, Kak Pushkin, 191; Martyn Lyons, Le Triomphe du livre: Une histoire sociologique de la lecture dans la France du XIXe siecle, Histoire du Livre (Mayenne, 1987), 84; James Raven, “Britain, 1750-1830,” in The Novel: History, Geography and Culture, ed. Franco Moretti, vol. 1 (Princeton, NJ, 2006), 439. In France they were 1,000 copies through the 1820s, 1,500 to 2,000 in the 1830s, and 2,000 to 5,000 in the 1840s; in England, print runs of 500 were destined mainly for circulating libraries.

26 Mikhailova and Rysina, Den’gi—Pushkin, 42. Pushkin owed 138,988 rubles at his death, including 3,399 rubles to Bellizard.
dominate Pushkin’s library: 975 titles out of 1,505.\textsuperscript{27} They likewise form most of the library of the poet, translator, and royal pedagogue Vasily Zhukovsky (1,575 out of 2,163 titles, in German, French, English, Italian, Dutch, Swedish, Latin, and Greek), while Tolstoy’s family library at the end of the century is still heavily foreign (4,080 titles in 39 languages to 3,989 titles in Russian).\textsuperscript{28} Foreign works comprised 99% of the Imperial Public Library and 95% of Nikolai Rumiantsev’s library, which together formed Russia’s research collection, when they opened in 1814 and 1832 respectively.\textsuperscript{29}

This imbalance lessens by the 1850s and 1860s, when Russian writers began to produce more novels to satisfy readers’ demand. For example, Khvoshchinskaia, the highest paid novelist after Tolstoy and Turgenev, and consistently popular in library surveys in 1860 and 1896-97, wrote 13 novels, 36 tales and stories, and 54 translations of novels and tales.\textsuperscript{30} Reitblat roughly calculates that in 1830, there were around 260 productive writers, with about 300 by 1855, and 700 by 1880. In 1800, a population of 50 million had perhaps 50,000 readers (.1%), and by 1870, 10 million (8%) could read.\textsuperscript{31} The mid-century increase in Russian novels is corroborated by the list of exemplary writers cited by critics in reviews. In 1840, after Pushkin, the most cited authors are foreign, with Scott, Goethe, Shakespeare, Byron, Hugo, de Kock, and Schiller taking precedence over Russian writers. By 1860, however, Turgenev leads, and except for Byron,

\textsuperscript{27} B. Modzalevskii, “Biblioteka A. S. Pushkina,” in \textit{Pushkin i ego sovremenniki: Materialy i izsledovaniia}, vol. 9–10 (St. Petersburg, 1910). They are mostly French from Paris (643) and Brussels (82), English, Latin, Italian, Spanish, German, and Polish, mostly literature (527, of which 390, or 74% was foreign, and of 91 novels, 80 or 89% was foreign) and history (377).

\textsuperscript{28} V. V. Lobanov, ed., \textit{Biblioteka V. A. Zhukovskogo (opisanie)} (Tomsk, 1981); N. V. Kotrelev, \textit{Biblioteka L’va Tolstogo v Iasnoi Poliane: Bibliograficheskoe opisanie, Knigi na inostrannykh iazykakh}, vol. 3 (Tula, 1999).

\textsuperscript{29} V. F. Mochalov, \textit{Knizhnaia kul’ tura Rossii XIX veka: Epokha, sud’ba, nasledie N. P. Rumiantseva} (Moscow, 2006), 281.


\textsuperscript{31} Reitblat, \textit{Ot Bovy}, 17.
Goethe, and Shakespeare, the list is and will remain solidly Russian. The development of Russian novels was central to this change.

As early as 1800, in Russia as in Europe, the novel was the most widely read genre. Lending libraries in St. Petersburg were completely foreign (French and German) and “most important, every library had a sufficient quantity of the latest novels.” In 1801, in St. Petersburg and Moscow booksellers agreed to coordinate print runs and prices of translated novels to avoid oversaturating the market. At the turn of the century, 40% of books sold were belles-lettres; of 839 translated novels, 336 (40%) were republished; of 104 original Russian novels, 55 (53%) were republished. In 1802, Karamzin praises the growing literary market: “What type of book is sold most among us? I have inquired about this of many booksellers, and everyone, without hesitation, answered: ‘Novels!’… In this type of book, as is known, we have more translated than original works.” In 1822, according to a survey of St. Petersburg booksellers by Faddey Bulgarin, the sale of novels was twenty times that of historical and political works.

Thus although Russian book historians attribute novel-reading to women and associate men with the more prestigious history and political economy, Tatiana’s preference for novels actually reflects the taste of all readers. For Chapter 7, Pushkin initially assembled for Onegin two libraries of select foreign works that resembled his own library. In the final version, just a bust of Napoleon and a portrait of Byron remain, images that symbolize the romantic political and historical tastes of a Decembrist manqué in the first-draft library, and romantic novels of the

32 Reitblat, Kak Pushkin, 230.
35 M. N. Kufaev, Istoriia russkoi knigi v XIX veke (Moscow, 2003), 45.
37 Reitblat, Kak Pushkin, 22.
second. Some enlightenment works resurface when Onegin, suffering from unrequited love for Tatiana, reads (8.35). Once Pushkin decided that Tatiana would visit Onegin’s library, their reading converged in novels, the shared literary language of men and women: Charles Maturin’s *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820), François Chateaubriand’s *Réné* (1805) and Benjamin Constant’s *Adolphe* (1816), and in earlier versions Scott or *Corinne* (1807) plus “two or three other novels” (6:438).

Accounts of sentimentalism in Russia usually mention Sterne, Richardson, and Rousseau, but to judge by the number of editions, these were not the sentimental authors most widely read, either in Russia or Europe. In Britain, of the fifteen most prolific novelists from 1800 to 1829, most are sentimental, ten are women and two are foreign: after Scott, Mary Meeke, and Barbara Hofland, Lafontaine was fourth, while the pedagogue, sentimental novelist, journalist, and memoirist Genlis ranked sixth. In German lending libraries, Goethe was also widely read, though not as popular as Lafontaine, Scott, and Kotzebue; Lafontaine’s bibliographer wryly asserts, “There was never an age of Goethe.” More titles by Lafontaine were published in France (75), Sweden (69), Denmark (67) and Holland (64) than in Germany (63); Russia is next (43), followed by England, with 26 titles.

These international bestselling authors were also the most translated authors in Russia. In Smirdin’s catalog of 1828, the four most popular writers in Russia over the past decade were foreigners, though tellingly, none are on Tatiana’s list, which is a selection that reflects Pushkin’s interests rather than what most people were reading. Kotzebue, who served in the Russian government for much of his career, had a stunning 138 titles listed. Voltaire, whose books defined a quality library, was second with 98 works, followed by Genlis (57), and

40 Sangmeister, *Bibliographie August Lafontaine*. 
Lafontaine (52).\textsuperscript{41} Master catalogs list 237 book editions for Kotzebue, 108 for Voltaire, 71 for Genlis, and 60 for Lafontaine, an indication of the wide selection in Smirdin’s catalog.\textsuperscript{42} Russian subjects were popular: Lafontaine’s \textit{Fedor und Marie, oder Treue bis zum Tode} (1802) was reprinted four times as \textit{Prince Fedor D-ky and Princess Maria M-va, or Loyalty until Death} (1804 to 1858). In the 1820s, the preponderance of French novels in Tatiana’s reading may seem natural, but in fact, because of Kotzebue’s and Lafontaine’s prodigious output, readers everywhere were as likely to be reading the latest German novels as they were French.\textsuperscript{43}

Readers in France and Russia around 1820 would have been reading Cottin, and indeed, Tatiana has two of her novels, an aspect of her reading that remains unexamined. In an 1824 draft of Tatiana’s reading, she dreams of Malek Adhel, the hero of \textit{Mathilde} (6:292); in the final version, in addition to reading \textit{Mathilde}, she also purchases volumes of \textit{Malvina}, in one draft in Russian translation (6:394). Cottin’s five novels were continuous bestsellers in France through the 1850s, with over ten individual editions and over fifteen editions of her complete works through 1857. From 1816 to 1820, she had two bestsellers in France: \textit{Claire d’Albe} (1799), with 11 editions and 25-30,000 copies, and \textit{Elisabeth} (1806), with 10 editions and 20-25,000 copies (and 20 editions by 1848). At this time, Rousseau’s \textit{Oeuvres complètes} had 8 editions, with 13,200 to 15,000 copies, while \textit{Corinne} had 6 editions and 7,000 to 8,500 copies.\textsuperscript{44} Martyn Lyons argues that such canonical authors as Balzac, Sand, Hugo, and de Staël are not useful for social historians interested in what people read in France.\textsuperscript{45}

Pushkin understood that Cottin was competition. Indeed, during the time he was writing \textit{Evgenii Onegin}, four of Cottin’s five novels had been recently translated or reissued. The

\textsuperscript{41} Sangmeister includes only initial publications and revised editions, while Smirdin also lists reprints.
\textsuperscript{42} Kondakov, \textit{Svodnyi katalog 1725-1800}; Federov and Polonskaia, \textit{Svodnyi katalog 1801-1825}.
\textsuperscript{44} Lyons, \textit{Le Triomphe du livre}, 83.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 77.
historian, biographer, and novelist Dmitry Bantysh-Kamensky first translated Cottin into Russian: *Mathilde* (1805) went through four editions (1806-7, 1813, 1821, and 1828). A sequel had two editions (1824 and 1825), while a novel claiming to be by Cottin, but actually by another woman, had two translated editions (1812 and 1817). *Mathilde* remained popular throughout Pushkin’s career. As Mikhail Zagoskin wrote in his popular novel *Roslavlev, or Russians in 1812* (1831), “The famous novel *Mathilde, or the Crusades* drove all Russian women out of their minds. They dreamt of Malek Adhel, sought him everywhere, and finding something similar to their ideal in the face of a pensive stranger, looked at him with visible sympathy.” As the hero reads aloud from *Mathilde*, Polina, modeled on Tatiana, “envied the fate of Mathilde and shared with her this unhappy, unselfish love that was not of this earth.” As in France, Germany, and England, *Elisabeth* was Cottin’s most popular novel in Russia, with five editions (1808, 1810, 1816, 1824, and 1830), and three later editions as *Parasha, the Siberian Girl, a True Incident* (1862, 1867, and 1871). *Claire d’Albe* was not translated, perhaps because it depicts an adulterous affair, but *Malvina* (1800) was published in Russian (1816-18), while *Amélie Mansfield* (1803) had two Russian editions (1810, 1817).

Canonized sentimental writers could not compete for Russian readers with these productive novelists. Krüdener’s single bestseller *Valérie* was translated once in one edition (1807), and Rousseau’s *Julie* had two translated editions (1803-4 and 1820-21). Richardson’s three novels were translated into Russian once (*Grandison*, 1793-94; *Clarissa*, 1793-94) or twice (*Pamela*, 1787 and 1796), in addition to being read in French translation. *Werther* had four

---


translated editions but sold poorly (1781, 1794, 1796 and 1816), and translations of *Delphine* and *Corinne* were printed only once (1803-4 and 1809-10).\(^4\)

Nor did Russian canonical authors fare much better. Of the 37 titles Pushkin published in his lifetime, eight were chapters of *Evgenii Onegin*, which was printed three times in his lifetime, like his bestselling *The Fountain of Bakhchisarei*. A decade later, Belinsky defends Russian literature as popular, but the number of editions is modest in comparison to foreign bestsellers:

*Three editions of A Hero of Our Time were sold out in the course of six years.*

Lermontov’s poems will soon need a third edition… *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* by Gogol soon will have been printed four times, and there have been three editions of *The Inspector General*. The second edition (1842) of the works of Gogol sold out three thousand copies; *Dead Souls*, of which twenty-four hundred copies were printed in 1842, has long been out of print.\(^4\)

Despite Belinsky’s special pleading in italics no Russian writers published enough to be competitive with popular foreign novels.

Mostly, like readers everywhere, Russians consumed the latest works in various languages. Priscilla Meyer showed the hitherto unexamined reception of French popular literature by Pushkin, Lermontov, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy through *Revue étrangère de la littérature, des sciences et des arts* (1832-64), a joint venture between Pushkin’s French bookseller, Ferdinand Bellizard, in St. Petersburg and S. Dufour in Paris, who sent materials by courier, including articles yet to be published by *Revue de Paris* and *Revue des deux mondes*, to


which Russians also subscribed. In the 1830s and 1840s, the publication of George Sand’s novels in the latter was often followed by their immediate translation into Russian.

Given the robust market everywhere for sentimental novels from 1750 to 1850, why does Pushkin represent his heroines in Evgenii Onegin, “Count Nulin,” “The Blizzard,” “The Lady Peasant,” “Novel in Letters,” and “Dubrovsky” as reading “ancient” eighteenth-century French novels, in provincial estate libraries? A quantitative approach belies the longstanding critical cliché that Russia’s distance from Europe condemns readers to haphazard encounters with foreign literature and ideas. Select older sentimental novels were still widely read in the nineteenth century. Through the 1850s, Jacques-Henri Bernardin de Saint-Pierre’s Paul et Virginie (1787) was a continuous bestseller in France; in Russia, Turgenev mentions the novel in Rudin (1856), and a new translation appeared in 1892. Criticism of sentimental novels as outmoded reflected both the thirst for the new that a flourishing market created, and Pushkin’s wishful thinking.

Backlash against Popular Sentimental Novels

Pushkin mentions bestselling sentimental literature in Evgenii Onegin and elsewhere, but scholars neglect these references, in part because Pushkin used the same strategy with his literary competitors as Balzac and Stendhal: “erasure and denigration.” In an overlooked passage that shows Pushkin knows the motley Russian book market, Tatiana buys volumes of Cottin’s Malvina from a passing peddler, for which she pays three and a half rubles and exchanges “a collection of coarse fables,/ a grammar, two Petriads,/ and Marmontel, third tome” (5.23.8-10).

50 Meyer, How the Russians Read the French, 15–16.
52 Cohen, Sentimental Education, 78. Balzac does this too.
54 Cohen, Sentimental Education, 78.
The drafts show that Pushkin had added Russian works to an initial assortment of expensive French books that included a volume by Charles François Lhomond (probably *Éléments de grammaire française*, 1780) and Pierre-Charles Levesque’s *Histoire de Russie* (1783), which Pushkin owned (6:395). Pushkin tried out several adjectives before settling on “razroznennoi” ‘unlike’ volumes of *Malvina*, beginning with 1) “russkoiu” ‘Russian,’ 2) no adjective, 3) “izvestnoiu” ‘famous,’ 4) “izodrannoiu” ‘tattered,’ and 5) “izorvannoiu” ‘torn,’ (6:394, 606). *Malvina* rhymes with “poltina” ‘half a ruble,’ as Pushkin slyly equates popular sentimental novels with market commodities.

Pushkin buries Cottin at the height of her fame in a heap of peddler’s books and in a footnote as the author of a mediocre novel. For the full publication of *Evgenii Onegin* (1833), Pushkin tweaked his footnotes, crossing out an indecipherable adjective for Cottin’s novel (6:533). In an 1836 address to fellow members of the Russian Academy, Pushkin says that Cottin reflects the “affectation and pomposity” of bygone sentimental novels, although “the public, i.e. most readers, for want of habit, sees in today’s novelists the most profound experts in human nature” (12:70). Moreover, he is aware that the mere mention of her and such writers as Jules Janin and Eugène Sue in the proceedings of Imperial Russian Academy is unusual: “until now, only the names of those among the living, who have erected themselves eternal monuments by their talents, merits, and works have been pronounced. (Academies remain silent about others.)” (12:68). In his commentary to the novel, Iuri Lotman, following the annotations of the Pushkin Jubilee edition, writes “Marie Cottin,” her birth name being Marie Sophie Ristreau, instead of “Sophie Cottin”, as she was known—an indication of how Pushkin’s disdain has marginalized her in some of the institutions of Russian literary history.\(^{55}\)

Aside from Cottin, Evgenii Onegin contains another clue to the Russian market for sentimental novels. As Lensky anticipates happiness with Olga at Tatiana’s name day party, the narrator drily comments:

While we, enemies of Hymen,
In home life see only
A series of tedious pictures
A novel in the style of Lafontaine (4.50.9-12)

Pushkin footnotes him as “Author of a multitude of family novels,” as if he needed introduction and was less well-known than he was (6:193). Respecting Pushkin’s authority, Lotman underestimates Lafontaine’s popularity over a half century, despite his record 69 novels in 146 volumes from 1789 until 1822, with five novels in ten volumes in 1810 alone: “a third-tier German novelist, who enjoyed success at the end of the eighteenth century and was propagated by Karamzinists.”\(^5^6\) In 1828, in drafts for published notes, Pushkin disdains women’s preference for Lafontaine over classic authors, using the same adjective (posredstvennyi) as for Cottin’s novel: “Born with the most irritable sensibility, they read the eloquent tragedy of Racine coldly and cry over the mediocre novels of August Lafontaine” (11:324).

Critics echo Pushkin’s strategic critical moves against popular sentimental novels. In his commentary, Vladimir Nabokov writes that on reading Mathilde by the “sensitive but talentless Sophie Cottin…, I skipped dozens of pages, I confess, but this is nothing compared to the boredom induced by Mme de Staël’s Delphine” (2:342-43). Like Pushkin, as a “consecrated writer” who “consecrates an author or a work,” Nabokov updates the qualitative distinctions by

\(^5^6\) Ibid., 256.
which high art distances itself from commodified art, only now de Staël’s position has been lowered.\textsuperscript{57}

If the moribund Werther and Julie are still readable today—in a detached mood of study, at least—Mme de Staël is not endurable under any circumstances—and I am not sure Pushkin would have inflicted her epistolary novel Delphine (1802), a thing of 250,000 gray words, upon his Tatiana, had he remembered that it did not even possess the pseudo-exotic book-of-the-month glamour of Cottin’s preposterous Mathilde, let alone the emotional drive of Goethe’s and Rousseau’s novels.\textsuperscript{58}

Hasty defends Richardson, Rousseau, and de Staël for their “wild popularity” and claims Pushkin respected them. Like Nabokov, she notes the “unequal quality” of Tatiana’s novels and twice congratulates Tatiana on her “commendable” taste in preferring Clarissa, Julie, and Delphine to her other, presumably lesser novels.\textsuperscript{59}

However, a thorough examination of Pushkin’s writing reveals negative comments on Mathilde and (especially) Clarissa in his unpublished writing, and silence about the rest of Tatiana’s novels, with the exception of unusual marginalia in Valérie. In a letter (1824), Pushkin complains about having to work up Clarissa: “I’m not writing poems, continue my Notes and am reading Clarissa, it’s unbearable what a tiresome fool she is” (mochi net kakaia skuchnaia dura) (13:123)! In 1829, while working on Onegin’s library, he also wrote the unfinished “Novel in Letters,” in which Liza similarly complains:

Crossing myself, I began with the translator’s introduction and, seeing his assurance that although the first six parts are somewhat boring, nevertheless, the last six completely reward the reader’s patience, I bravely set to work. I read one volume, another, a third,

\textsuperscript{57} Bourdieu, The Field of Cultural Production, 42.
\textsuperscript{59} Hasty, Pushkin’s Tatiana, 49, 46, 50, 86.
and finally reached the sixth, so boring it’s unbearable. Well, I thought, now I will be rewarded for my effort. Well? Read the death of Clarissa, the death of Lovelace, and the end. Every volume contained two parts and I did not notice the transition from six boring to six interesting ones. (8:47)

Sasha responds that “With my impatience, I do not plan to read him; I even find excess pages in Walter Scott” (8:49). Ten years later, in the unpublished “Journey from Moscow to Petersburg” (1833-35), the narrator seems resigned to Clarissa: “A boring book can be very good; I am not speaking about learned books, but about books written with simply a literary goal. Many readers will agree with me that Clarissa is very tedious and boring, but for all that, Richardson’s novel has unusual worth” (11:244). Pushkin makes only two references, both unflattering, to Pamela, which had been an even bigger success than Clarissa: in “The Lady Peasant,” the English governess Miss Jackson reads it twice a year as her antidote to “this barbarous Russia,” and in drafts of Evgenii Onegin, Olga’s face has “Pamela’s cloying look” (8:111, 6:575). In “Roslavlev,” set in 1812, the heroine worships de Staël, who had recently visited Russia while in exile, and a suitor exclaims: “‘You are too demanding, Princess… You require that everyone see Madame de Staël in you and speak with tirades from Corinne’” (8:154). Without comment, he put Corinne in a draft version of Onegin’s library, and mentioned it with Delphine in his defense of de Staël’s memoirs of Russia (1825, 11:27-29). Thus Pushkin publicly aligned himself with certain canonized sentimental novels that he mentions, which in private, he tolerated but did not particularly like.

What remains of Pushkin’s library reveals a professional interest in sentimental novels, but there are also uncut and perhaps unread volumes.60 He owned Richardson’s Pamela, Clarissa, and Grandison in English and all the pages are cut. While all the pages of Corinne are

60 Modzalevskii, “Biblioteka.”
cut, the third volumes of *Delphine, Julie*, and *Confessions* are uncut. There remain no works by Goethe. *Valérie* contains a mystery, with underlined phrases and marginalia that form a love letter he may have sent to Anna Kern.  

Aside from *Valérie*, Pushkin does not appear to have given Tatiana the novels that he read with interest, such as *Réné* or *Adolphe*.

Pushkin’s list for Tatiana rejects another popular author, by her absence: Genlis. Beginning with children’s plays and her pedagogical treatise, *Adèle et Théodore, ou Lettres sur l’éducation contenant tous les principes relatifs aux trois plans d’éducation des princes, des jeunes personnes et des hommes* (1782), which had three Russian editions (1792, 1794, 1796), Genlis published constantly and remained a fixture of libraries throughout Europe well after her death in 1830. In a poem (1814) to his older sister Olga, a possible prototype for Tatiana, Pushkin teases her about what he imagines she reads: poetry and prose, by Russian and foreign writers, including Rousseau and Genlis (1:41, 29-30). As the reading of a fictional character, Genlis appears only once in his work: Masha, the dreamy, literary, provincial Tatiana-like heroine in “Novel in Letters” is brought up on the novels of Genlis in one draft, and Cottin in another (8:565). Pushkin read her himself. In an 1825 letter to his brother from exile at his family’s estate at Mikhailovskoe, he writes: “If possible, send me the latest *Genlis*—and Child-Harold by Lamartine (it should be some kind of nonsense!), and generally something newish, and *[Russian] Antiquity.*” (13:174). In 1834, Pushkin outlined an unfinished literary historical survey, “On the Insignificance of Russian Literature”: “Voltaire and the giants have not had one follower in Russia; but the third-rate pygmies, the mushrooms growing at the foot of oaks, Dorat, Florian, Marmontel, Guichard, Mme de Genlis enthral Russian literature, Sterne is foreign to us, with the exception of Karamzin… General insignificance. Meanwhile shallow French literature

---

“envahit tout” (11:495-96). His criticism notwithstanding, Pushkin continued to read Genlis, evidently to stay abreast of the market.

The backlash against this avid market for foreign novels that Genlis represented animates critiques of women readers as mere consumers. In “Stroll around Moscow” (1811-12), the poet Konstantin Batiushkov walks up Kuznetsky Most Street with romantic disdain for the book market:

Now we see in front of us foreign bookstores. There are many, and not one can be called rich by comparison with those in Petersburg. Books are expensive, good ones are few, ancient writers hardly at all, but on the other hand there are Madame Genlis and Madame Sévigné—two catechisms of young girls—whole heaps of French novels—the worthy reading of stupid ignorance, senselessness and debauchery…. They constantly sell out in Moscow, for our faddish women are not inferior to Parisians in piety and hungrily read stupid and boring sermons, as long as they are written in the language of the *mellifluous* Fénélon, sweet friend of the honorable maiden Guyon….And there is a whole row of Russian bookstores, some are completely poor. Whoever has not been in Moscow does not know that it is possible to trade in books just as in fish, furs, vegetables and the like, without any knowledge of literature; that person does not know that here is a factory for translations, a factory for journals, and a factory for novels, and that booksellers buy learned wares, that is translations and works, by weight, repeating to the authors: not quality, but quantity! Not style, but pages! I am afraid to look into a store, for, to our shame, I think that not one nation ever had such a disgraceful literature. Fortunately, many books are born here in Moscow and die here, or at least at nearby markets.62

---

In 1802, Karamzin blamed society women for the lack of Russian novels because of their preference for French, an accusation repeated by Zagoskin. In “Roslavlev,” Pushkin’s female narrator rebuts this prejudice:

N.B. It is a sin for the author of Iury Miloslavsky [Zagoskin] to repeat vulgar accusations. We have all read him, and it seems that he is indebted to one of us for the translation of his novel into French. The fact is we would be delighted to read in Russian; but it seems that our literature is no older than Lomonosov and still extremely limited…. In prose we have only the History of Karamzin.... The endless complaints of our writers about our disdain for Russian books resemble the complaints of Russian merchants, indignant that we buy our hats at Sikhler’s rather than content ourselves with the works of Kostroma milliners. (8:150)

Like Batiushkov, Pushkin gendered the commodification of novels as feminine, but as he began his forays into novel writing, he courted noblewomen as readers and translators, adding the second sentence and the beginning of the next one between the rough and final drafts (8:743). In deriding women’s taste for Genlis and French novels, Batiushkov ignores her male translators and readers at the highest levels. Over his entire career, Karamzin translated more works by Genlis than by any other writer. When he launched Russia’s first serious literary political journal, The Messenger of Europe, most issues began with Genlis, whose broad appeal ensured commercial success. His sometimes free translations of Genlis, which could sugarcoat her sharp conclusions, were republished four times. Yet Lotman and others have ignored Karamzin’s continuous engagement with Genlis. Not only Pushkin, but also Zhukovsky, the

---

63 Nikolai Karamzin, “Why Is There so Little Writing Talent in Russia?,” in Selected Prose of N. M. Karamzin (Evanston, IL, 1969), 193.
Bakunin sisters, Anna Kern, Mikhail Dmitriev, Aleksandr Labzin, and Goncharov read Genlis; Chichikov, Oblomov, General Kutuzov in *War and Peace*, and an aspiring clerk in Dostoevsky’s *Notes from the House of the Dead* all read her novels—evidence that she represents two generations of shared popular sentimental reading by nobles.  

In the 1830s and 1840s, Belinsky heaped criticism on Cottin and Genlis together as outdated, *because* they were still widely read as respectable literature. In 1834, he blames Karamzin for importing the sentimental tale, “brought in powdered and rouged like a Russian merchant’s wife, whining and tearful like a spoiled, touchy child, bombastic and inflated like a classical tragedy, boringly instructive and cloyingly moral like a hypocritical devout woman, the ward of Madame de Genlis” (1:272). In 1835, Genlis and Cottin are “the literary scum of the good old days” (1:206). Again, in 1835, Belinsky writes: “What is Miss Edgeworth? The chambermaid of Mesdames Genlis and Cottin, who, having heard enough of their wisdom, having become accustomed to their manner, decided to preach in the nineteenth century those morals and relate the same instructive, boring nonsense that people laughed at in the eighteenth century” (10:317). In 1847, he returned to them: “the ladies Genlis and Cottin were famed for sentimental moral novels, but the latter put morals and their inevitable companion, boredom, in the foreground” (10:104). In Belinsky’s first collected works (1900), Semyon Vengerov provided bibliographies for writers Belinsky reviewed, and on Genlis noted: “The works of Genlis were translated in Russia to such an unheard of extent that in a way they turned into a domestic hazard to good taste.”  

---

erasing the last traces of Genlis’s omnipresence for Pushkin and Russian readers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

**Pushkin and Cottin**

Like de Staël, Pushkin not only positioned himself apart from the market for popular novels, but also engaged critically with sentimental novels. As he was finishing *Evgenii Onegin* and had begun to write prose fiction, Pushkin sought to combine his interests in Russian history and the nobility with the drama of duty, virtue and love in sentimental novels. In Tatiana and Onegin, Pushkin confronted challenges that later Russian novelists also addressed, namely to integrate the sentimental Bildung of the individual with Russian noble culture, especially the tensions between the self and noble duty to family, society, Russia and God, for heroines as well as heroes. In different ways, Bakhtin and Cohen argue that these tensions are central to sentimentalism. Yet, the sentimental, moral education of children by their parents in a bourgeois nuclear family, as depicted in Cottin’s and many sentimental novels, differed substantially from the upbringing of Russian noble children, brought up by serf nannies, educated by (often) foreign governesses and tutors, and lightly supervised by parents, who stepped in during adolescence to arrange a service education and career, and marriage. Tatiana’s serf nanny, education at home, and arranged marriage are typical.

By the end of *Evgenii Onegin*, Pushkin embedded Tatiana and her marriage in a Bakhtinian chronotope of Russian noble life, with Russian history, family lineages, and service requirements. Like Onegin, Tatiana in Chapter 8 (1830-31), set in 1825, had changed and no longer saw her life through the timeless, placeless sentimental novels of her youth, set in 1819-20. Now a princess and the wife of a general (rank two) in St. Petersburg high society, Tatiana

---

famously tells Onegin, a noble nobody without a service career and its concomitant rank, that although she loves him, she is married and will be faithful. A year later, Pushkin devised a similar ending for the unpublished “Dubrovsky,” in which a general’s daughter is married against her will to Prince Vereisky, with two chivalric orders and three thousand serfs, because her noble lover Dubrovsky, an officer in the elite Guards turned outlaw, fails to rescue her; like Tatiana, Maria Kirillovna vows to be faithful. In the prose fiction he began writing in 1827, Pushkin intertwined sentimental love affairs with displays of noble duty and virtue against the background of his own family history, the Time of Troubles around 1600, the Pugachev revolt in 1773, and the War of 1812 (in which Tatiana’s husband participated).

Like Pushkin and Tatiana, most Russian writers, their characters, and their readers were nobles and in this they differed significantly from their European counterparts as represented for example in Cottin’s novels. In Russia noblemen and women belonged to the system of military, civil, and court state service that Peter the Great instituted with the Table of Ranks (1722), which was their raison d’être until 1917. Irina Reyfman argues that Pushkin’s well-known anxiety about his “insignificant” rank (nine, titular councilor), “unimpressive” civil-service career (rather than the more prestigious military one), and unimportant noble family permeates his prose: “The issue of rank and status is present in virtually every piece and … it frequently constitutes the core of the narrative.” Focusing on Pushkin and his heroes, Reyfman overlooks his noble heroines, who also have rank and status through their fathers, mothers, and husbands. Tatiana was not only Pushkin’s “creative double,” but also his aspirational noble alter ego, with virtually the
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70 Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii, 1649 goda, vol. 6, 1 (St. Petersburg, 1830), 490–91. According to paragraph seven of the Table of Ranks, “All married wives enter the rank according to that of their husbands;” paragraph nine deals with the ranks of daughters; and ten with women at court.
highest status and military rank. By contrast, Cottin’s well-born characters are generalized minor aristocrats without the specificities of status and rank that are central to Russian noble identity.

As Pushkin embedded heroines in Russian history and noble culture, he continued to reference sentimental novels, still an elevated sub-genre of the novel, even as he moved away from the heroine poignantly suffering in love, which he describes in a letter in 1825: “women have no character, they have passions in their youth, and that’s why it is so easy to portray them” (13:197). In the unfinished “Novel in Letters” (1829), Pushkin wonders how to update the sentimental heroine. Liza writes:

What is there in common between Lovelace and Adolphe? And the role of women does not change. With the exception of ceremonial curtsies, Clarissa still resembles the heroines of the newest novels. Is it because in a man the ways to please depend on fashion, the opinion of the moment, while in women, they are based on feeling and nature, which are eternal? (8:48)

While the ladies in “Novel in Letters” discuss love, novels and noble status, the gentlemen write about “the rapid decline of our nobility,” “ancient families,” “our historic lineage,” and conclude that “service aristocracy cannot replace a hereditary aristocracy” in Russia’s “historical heritage” (8:53). Liza, in exile from St. Petersburg high society because of an awkward situation about her noble status, and not Masha, a provincial novel-reading heroine based on Tatiana, becomes the new prototype for Pushkin’s later noble heroines. Maria in “The Blizzard,” Liza in “The Lady Peasant,” Polina in “Roslavlev,” Maria in “Dubrovsky,” and Maria in The Captain’s Daughter are capable noblewomen, principled in love and duty. In Evgenii Onegin, Pushkin elides Tatiana’s transformation from provincial sentimental heroine to elite noblewoman, yet the roots
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71 Hasty, Pushkin’s Tatiana, 217.
of her new persona as a society woman are in his other works at this time, especially “Novel in Letters,” which he wrote shortly before he returned to Tatiana.

In russifying his sentimental heroines, Pushkin engaged in the conflicts of the literary market through Liza, who attacks the outdated, fusty nature of “ancient” foreign sentimental novels:

You cannot imagine how strange it is in 1829 to read a novel written in 1775. It seems as if from our living room we suddenly enter an ancient room upholstered in brocade, and sit in stuffed satin armchairs, and near us see strange dresses, but familiar faces, and recognize in them our grandfathers and grandmothers, but younger. For the most part these novels have no other merit. An absorbing event, a situation nicely complicated, but Belcour speaks obliquely and Charlotte answers affectedly. A clever person could take a ready plan, ready characters, correct the language and stupidities, embellish the innuendoes, and out would come a wonderful, original novel. (8:50)

Always misidentified as Werther, with its heroine Charlotte, the novel referred to here is Charlotte, a Tale of Truth (1791), re-titled Charlotte Temple, by Susanna Rowson (1762-1824), an English and later American writer. The first bestselling novel in the United States, where it is set in 1774-75, it had over 200 editions; it was not translated into French until recently, although there was a German translation in 1835. News of the posthumous American publication of Rowson’s sequel Charlotte’s Daughter (1828) may have reached Pushkin. It is a slight volume where the moral sermons are longer than the plot: Charlotte is seduced first by Montraville, who persuades her to leave school, her beloved parents, and England for America, then by his friend Belcour; after the birth of a daughter, Charlotte dies and Lucy is raised by her

---

parents. Knowing that Pushkin’s critique is aimed at not the canonical Werther, but at an actual bestseller finally makes sense of Liza’s recipe for a better popular sentimental novel. At the same time, Pushkin borrowed from these novels: originally Liza’s correspondent Sasha was named Marianna, perhaps a reference to Pierre de Marivaux’s La vie de Mariane (1731-42), which was translated into Russian (1762) and reprinted in France in 1829.

Scholarly narratives of Russian literature draw stature from intertextual connections with other national canons (Goethe), while quantitative approaches yield unexpected synergies (Rowson) that reveal literary market conflicts over popular sentimental novels. Cottin’s Elisabeth provided Pushkin with a historical springboard for the heroine of his last, longest novella, The Captain’s Daughter, a synthesis of Russian history, noble family life, and the sentimental novel. In this first-person memoir, Petr Andreevich Grinev receives his officer’s education under Captain Mironov, falls in love with his daughter, but cannot get his father’s consent to marry her. The Pugachev rebellion erupts in 1773, the captain and his wife are killed, and a rival officer switches sides and claims Maria Ivanovna, who sends Grinev a letter requesting help. The stranger he befriended en route to his regiment now turns out to be Pugachev, who allows him to leave with Maria Ivanovna. Grinev is arrested for consorting with Pugachev, and Maria Ivanovna travels to St. Petersburg to obtain his pardon from Catherine the Great.

Scholars usually ignore the title to focus on Grinev and prototypes for his father, but the heroine is cut from the same historical, noble cloth. Pushkin could have read in a footnote in the 1820 edition of Cottin’s collected works that in Elisabeth, Cottin based her heroine’s quest for Emperor Alexander’s pardon of her father, a Polish noble arrested in 1789 for protesting the
Polish partitions, on a similar journey in 1804 by Praskovia Lupolova, a non-noble.\textsuperscript{73} Scholars argue that Pushkin’s source is *The Heart of Midlothian* by Scott, who based the journey of his lower class Scottish heroine Jeanie Deans to London to plead for her sister on an actual journey by a Scottish farmer’s daughter, Helen Walker, in 1788.\textsuperscript{74} In addition to its Russian setting, Cottin’s novel seems a likelier source because of the importance of the heroine’s noble status.

In their meetings with Alexander I and Catherine II, Elisabeth and Maria Ivanovna both exhibit their virtue as noble daughters, though in different ways prefigured by the titles and their names. As she travels on foot across Siberia, Elisabeth displays her daughterly virtue and retells her story at every stop. During the theater of Alexander’s coronation in Moscow in 1801, her beloved, Smoloff, a Guards officer and son of the Governor of Tobolsk, who oversees her father’s exile, retells her story, while in a tableau, “Elizabeth raised her clasped hands towards Heaven, repeating the last words, ‘Forgiveness for my father!’ A clamor of admiration arose from the crowd! The Emperor himself joined in! He could not hesitate to believe that the father of a daughter so virtuous must be innocent of the crimes alleged against him.”\textsuperscript{75}

In contrast, Pushkin eschews the first-name titles of sentimental novels and instead underscores the heroine’s and her father’s military rank—nine, Pushkin’s own rank—and the noble status it confers on father and daughter. The title is still sentimental though, with a diminutive (“dochka,” dear daughter) that is used just three times, lastly by Grinev’s mother, as she imagines their wedding (8:369). More often (fifteen times), she is the “daughter of Captain Mironov,” emphasized in the constant use of her patronymic. Yet, scholars invariably call her


Masha. Grinev’s father, obsessed with rank, may have initially refused permission because Mironov’s rank was lower than his, but now that she is the “daughter of an honored warrior,” Grinev hopes he may agree (8:358). The importance of fathers to one’s identity is underscored by the epigraph to the first chapter, “And who is his father?” The novel’s epigraph, a proverb, “Preserve your honor from a young age,” applies to Maria Ivanovna doubly, as a woman and noble. Dmitry Iakubovich argues that like Scott’s novels, it is both a historical novel and a family chronicle about noble duty and honor. Yet he argues that the epigraph is more important than the title, as if it did not apply to the heroine too. Like Elisabeth, who refuses to let Smoloff’s love interfere with her duty to her father, Maria Ivanovna negotiates the conflict between duty to society and to self, and she virtuously breaks off the courtship when Grinev’s father objects. Just as her parents defended Russia, she, “as the daughter of a man who had suffered for his loyalty,” dutifully defends the Grinev family’s noble reputation (8:370). Alone with an incognito Catherine II, who asks, “Who are you?” she responds, “I am the daughter of Captain Mironov” and Catherine “recognizes” her (8:372). Later at court, Maria Ivanovna recognizes Catherine, and others see that the sovereign recognizes her virtue not just as a woman, as with Cottin’s Elisabeth, but as a noblewoman. Her identity, like that of Grinev, derives from her father’s noble military service. Catherine’s letter of commendation and two interviews demonstrate personal access to the ruler, the highest recognition for noble service. Pushkin argues for the same personal, sentimental relationship of duty between nobles and their ruler that Karamzin had promoted in his letter to Alexander I in 1811, a conservative political position sanctioned by the virtuous sentiment of duty.77
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76 Iakubovich, ““Kapitanskaia dochka’,” 170, 191, 192.
A quantitative and sociological analysis of Russia’s European literary market reveals that as Pushkin aligned himself with select foreign sentimental novels, he distanced himself from internationally popular sentimental fiction through disparagement and silence. But in search of readers and an income as a professional writer, Pushkin learned from bestselling foreign sentimental novels as he fashioned a specifically Russian chronotope for novels of noble life and, especially, as he created his heroines. When Tatiana goes to bed with her book about dreams, Pushkin teases readers as he notes what she does not read, in a list that breezily descends from foreign classics to the bathos of popular Russian reading:

But neither Virgil, nor Racine,
Nor Scott, nor Byron [originally Fielding], nor Seneca
Nor even the Ladies’ Fashion Magazine
So occupied anyone. (5.22.8-12)

In a cascade of negation, he nevertheless remains silent about the popular sentimental novels that Tatiana would have been reading, and with which he and other Russian writers had to compete in the literary marketplace. Shielded by a list of canonized writers that shows that he and his elite readers know what they should be reading, in the following stanza Pushkin allows Tatiana to buy Cottin, Marmontel, and whatever else the country peddler brings, briefly acknowledging the endless stream of engrossing bestselling foreign sentimental novels that everyone in Russia and Europe was reading.