

**Remapping the Self and the Other:  
The Image of Russia  
through the prism of late 18th century British Intellectual history**  
by  
Svetlana Konstantinova

Submitted to  
Central European University  
History Department

In Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor László Kontler  
Second Reader: Professor Alexei Miller

Budapest, Hungary  
2008

### **Statement of Copyright**

“Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author”.

## **Abstract**

This study aims to investigate the mechanisms of formation of national consciousness, imagination of the other nations, as well as both strategies and tactics of identification and location of the Self and the Other. The thesis employs an asymmetrical example of an Image of Russia viewed by three British travellers in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. It introduces the relevant theoretical approaches of scholarship on travel and travel writing, represents the overall historical context and personal background of the authors. Furthermore, on the basis of the Cambridge school methodology, vocabularies and languages which construct both the British Self and the Russian Other are scrutinized and classification of their main elements is proposed. Finally, the thesis designs an interpretation of the British vision of the historical process in relation to the ideas of man and political order. Looking at the problem from the linguistic-philosophical perspective, the study concludes that the construction of both the Self and the Other are parts of the same process, the process of creation of the modern national consciousness.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my gratitude to a number of people who put a great deal of effort in making sense of my learning in Central European University. First of all, sincere appreciation to my supervisors, both Professor László Kontler and Professor Alexei Miller, who considerably influenced my views on history and teaching process in general and understanding of my subject-matter, the Image of “the Other”, in particular. Furthermore, a great thank you to Professor Matthias Riedl, whose scrupulous methodology of textual analysis and reasonable comments were always very useful for improvement of my overall qualification and broadened significantly my intellectual horizons.

It is a pleasure to thank our tolerant and patient Academic Writing instructor, Robin Bellers, who spent many hours going through the first drafts of a number of my papers and essays and made always wise suggestions on how to improve my style of writing and the English language skills. Finally, a special great thanks to Trinity College (The Oxford University, Great Britain) Librarian, Alison Felstead, who did the difficult task of getting her Oxford newcomer guest from Russia familiar with the Bodleian Library system and helped a lot in order to provide all the necessary materials for my, as it seemed at the time, distantly future M.A. thesis.

## Table of contents

Introduction.....	2
Chapter I. Travel, travel writing and the Other: Historiographical trends and methodological strategies .....	6
1.1 The framework of anthropology and ethnography .....	8
1.2 The framework of theoretical linguistics and literary criticism .....	13
1.3 The framework of the history of ideas and the history of science .....	14
1.4 The framework of socio-cultural history and literary history .....	20
1.5 The inter-disciplinary approach on <i>nation, nation building and empire</i> .....	25
1.6 The interdisciplinary approach on <i>cognitive mapping</i> .....	30
Chapter II. The travel narratives in context .....	35
2.1 British-Russian relations, the late 1750s-late 1780s.....	35
2.2 The 18 <sup>th</sup> century British literary world, travel writing and the authors .....	44
Chapter III. Shaping the discourse of Russia as discourse of the Other: vocabularies and languages .....	54
3.1 The concept of Progress versus the concept of Backwardness .....	56
3.2 The concept of National Character .....	60
3.3 The concept of Geography .....	68
3.4 The concept of Freedom versus the concept of Slavery .....	74
3.5 The concept of Power .....	78
Chapter IV. Self and Other through the ideas of Man and Order: Applying Practice to Philosophy .....	85
4.1 Political order, social system and public space .....	86
4.2 Human nature, national character and the individual .....	92
Conclusions.....	98
Bibliography .....	102
Appendix. ....	111

## Introduction

The present thesis investigates the mechanisms of the construction and representation of the Image of Russia as an image of the Other by three late 18<sup>th</sup> century British intellectuals.

Foreign travels and their narratives have a long history and play an important role in society since ancient times. However, the emergence of religious ideologies and their interactions in the Middle Ages highlight new agendas for travellers and travel narratives, as well as regulate their development for a long time. Nevertheless, these presumably religious-political and social facets were challenged later on by anthropologically-centered worldview and intellectual pursuits of the Renaissance. Some of its ideas were readdressed later, in the Age of Enlightenment. At that period travels and travelogues acquired, if compared with the previous epochs, almost massive dimensions. They became, as never before, tied strongly up with politics and science, and were employed to develop each other. Thus, it was mainly during the 18<sup>th</sup> century when travels and travelogues became a matter of crucial importance. The concept of the Other became newly reconstituted and legitimized according to the policy and requirements of British society exactly between the late 1760s and 1780s. To be more precise, ‘a backward Other’ as compared with an advanced Self, helped to overcome the overall political and intellectual crisis, and grounded a successful future for both the conservative domestic and challenging international politics of Britain. Finally, it is also important to mention that the Image of Russia as an Image of the Other has been a part of a

larger process of Othering which took place at that time in Europe generally and in Britain particularly<sup>1</sup>.

This study is based upon the analysis of three late 18<sup>th</sup> century British narratives, describing travels to Russia: *Anecdotes of the Russian empire in a series of letters, written a few years ago, from St. Petersburg* (1784) written by the Scottish professor of humanities William Richardson, *Travels through Holland, Flanders, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Lapland, Russia, the Ukraine, and Poland, in the years 1768, 1769 and 1770* (1772) by esquire Joseph Marshall<sup>2</sup>, and the anonymously published *General observations regarding the Present State of the Russian Empire* (1787)<sup>3</sup>. The choice of these travelogues is motivated by their difference from the whole body of contemporary British narratives of this genre due to the relatively small number of readers familiar with them; to the unusual circumstances they were created in; and to the critical and un-trivial approach to the subject-matter demonstrated by their authors<sup>4</sup>.

The present thesis consists of the four chapters. The first chapter, *Travel, travel writing and the Other: Historiographical trends and methodological strategies*, introduces scholarship on travels and travel literature in the mainstream historiographies since the postwar period, and seeks to rethink the existing methodologies and the place of the field in science. It also aims to address the problems of chronological frames of scholarship and its

---

<sup>1</sup> The factors which brought Russia to the British prospect were transition from the age of monarchies to the age of empires, emergence of colonialism in its classical sense, the danger of both American and French revolutions, the series of internal political crises in both countries, accessions of both Georg III and Catherine II, the end of the all-European Seven Years War (1756-1763), with which it became for civilians again possible to travel, the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, which highlighted necessity of an economic partnership with Russia, expansion of the Enlightenment intellectual thought, and so on. For further details see Chapter 2.

<sup>2</sup> This travel narrative caused the ongoing debate in historiography and is considered by some scholars as an imaginary, philosophical travel writing.

<sup>3</sup> The authorship was proved by M. S. Anderson who suggests that the narrative was written by Sir John Sinclair of Ulbster. See: Matthew S. Anderson, *Britain's Discovery of Russia, 1553-1815* (New-York: St. Martin's Press, 1958).

<sup>4</sup> All the materials were collected from the Bodleian Library, Oxford, UK.

structure, and to provide some historical background for its appearance and development. The chapter also touches upon the major epistemological problems and cross-disciplinary dilemmas in order to crystallize the theoretical approach, which in turn would answer the purposes of the prospective research.

The second chapter, *The travel narratives in context*, aims to contextualize the three travel narratives. Its first section, *British-Russian relations, the late 1750s-the late 1780s*, seeks to provide a political context of the relationships between the two countries, to identify the key points of importance for both players, as well as to incorporate them into a Europe-wide perspective. The second section *The 18<sup>th</sup> century British literary world, travel writing and the authors* examines the personal background and the agendas of the travel authors, the overall social and professional environment, and the particular circumstances, under which the three travel writings were written and published.

The third chapter, *Shaping the discourse of Russia as discourse of the Other: vocabularies and languages*, investigates the language of travel writings of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, and the authorial systems of expression and argumentation. It also studies vocabularies and methods which were used by three British authors in order to construct a certain image of the Other.

This chapter identifies the main elements of the discourse of the Russian Other, namely, five big groups of vocabularies: on power; on geography; on freedom and slavery; on progress and backwardness; as well as on national character<sup>5</sup>. In turn, each group of vocabularies consists of several concepts (the graphical classificatory scheme of the discourse of the Other is proposed in the *Appendix*). Every concept is separately scrutinized,

---

<sup>5</sup> The third chapter employs the approach which is based upon the Cambridge school method of contextual analysis. For further details see pp. 17-19 of the first Chapter.

the sources it and its various connotations derived from are investigated. What is more, each concept is correlated when possible with each of the others. This technique enables us to see the aims of the discourse and how certain languages of description help to embody and legitimize it in the course of time.

Finally, looking from the angle of personal background of the authors and their agendas, we uncover three approaches to writing a travelogue and three techniques of constructing the image of the Other. They could be conditionally labeled *political*, *journalistic* and *scientific*. We shall also see what they all have in common and what the main differences among them are.

The fourth chapter, *Self and Other through the ideas of Man and Order: Applying Practice to Philosophy*, addresses the philosophical worldview, the understanding of the historical process by the British authors, and the tactics of location of both Britain and Russia in the scheme. The first section *Political order, social system and public space* examines the ideas of history, political organization of societies, the problem of origin of political power and the issue of sociability as highly intertwined and inter-dependent. In addition, a particular attention is paid to the question of what, in the British view, are the factors for historical progress. The second section, *Human nature, national character and the individual*, analyzes the issues of human nature, national character and happiness. In the course of the analysis we will establish the cause-and-effect connections among these ideas applied both to the British and the Russian cases. The chapter also touches upon the question of how political order, national character and human nature affect each other.

A graphical representation of the discourse of the Other (supplement to the third chapter) could be found in the *Appendix*.

## **Chapter I. Travel, travel writing and the Other: Historiographical trends and methodological strategies**

This chapter aims to present relevant epistemological and methodological considerations on travel, travel writing and the Other in the humanities during the last five decades. They would be analyzed as tied up with, and influenced by their time, and as reflected each other. Furthermore, the chapter seeks to constitute the approach which would be applied towards the subject-matter in the current thesis.

One might suggest that scholarship on travel and travel literature was for the whole history of its existence a peripheral field of humanities. However, not every subject-matter, even being an academic discipline, is able to provoke such a curiosity and display a wide range of methods, as travels and travelogues do. Furthermore, at present times scholarship constitutes a truly interdisciplinary field.

The student who approaches the field might experience considerable difficulties. Some of them originate from a large amount of available materials and diversity of methods applied to it. The other could appear from the theoretical complexity of travels and the fact that the historical and the modern issues are intertwined there in complicated ways, thus, making the overall picture misleading.

Furthermore, it is necessary to define the chronological frames of historiography on travel and travel narration. One might say that scholarship on travel and travel literature is a very old field of science, while another indicates that it appears comparatively recently, and both of them would to some extent be right. As far as it is known, the separate critical remarks on foreign travels and travelogues, for instance, in the Russian scientific tradition,

could be traced from the German historian and member of St. Petersburg Academy of Science, G. F. Miller (1705-1783). However, the first scholar who pioneered a systematic investigation of the topic was the Honorary Member of the same scientific organization, P. F. von Adelung (1768-1843)<sup>6</sup>. It seems reasonable to accept the proposition by James Clifford, who suggests that the emergence of the field in its modern sense became possible only after the 1950s, when the dissolution of colonialism in its traditional understanding occurred. He argues that the campaign of “writing back” against the West was initiated by the famous French surrealist and ethnographer, the author of *L’Ethnologue devant le colonialisme* (1950), Michael Leiris (1901-1990)<sup>7</sup>. Though this point is debatable, what seems to be obvious is that scholarship on travels and travelogues has got a new, so to say, modern, dimension in that period as after the disintegration of colonialism the former colonies. They, which had been previously studied by and spoken for by the colonizers, reversed, and the formerly colonized found their voices to be heard.

Finally, there exists a problem of classifying and structuring of the methodologies on travels and travelogues. Looking at the issue from the angle of contents, we would assume that scholarship on travels and travel narratives splits into three types. They investigate the history of these phenomena, their formal characteristics and the problem of representation of the Self and the Other. Nevertheless, from the angle of methodological perspective the picture seems to be much more intricate. One could say that travels and travel narratives are studied by sciences such as anthropology and ethnography; theoretical linguistics; the history of ideas and the history of science; as well as socio-cultural and literary histories. Besides, there exist some interdisciplinary

---

<sup>6</sup> See: Gerard F. Miller, *Predloženie, kak ispravit pogreshnosti, nahodjashiesja v inostrannyh pisateljah, pisavshih o Rossijskom gosudarstve* (*The Proposal How to Correct the Errors Concerning the Russian State by the Foreign Authors, 1757*), in I. A. Nastenka, ed., *Antifomenkovskaja mozaika* (Moscow, 2001); Fedor P. von Adelung, *Kritiko-literaturnoe obozrenie pyteshestvennikov po Rossii do 1700 goda i ih sochinenii* (*Literary-critical account of travellers in Russia till 1700 and their writings, in two parts*), (Moscow, 1864).

<sup>7</sup> See: James Clifford, “Review on Orientalism by Edward W. Said”, *History and Theory* 19, no. 2 (Feb. 1980): 204-205.

approaches towards the subject-matter, namely, in the framework of the study of nation, nation building and empire; in the framework on mental, or cognitive, mapping.

### 1.1 The framework of anthropology and ethnography

One of the trends of the scholarship, which became classical, is *the framework of anthropology and ethnography*. It studies the social uses of language and the relationships between language and culture. Perhaps, this is the most problematical and deeply questioned methodology as a science of other peoples in another time. In other words, anthropology itself originates from a study of cultures of the Other. As Peter Hulme and Russel McDougall suggest, one might even say that the rise of the anthropological theory originates from the 18<sup>th</sup> century<sup>8</sup>.

Then, according to Johannes Fabian, anthropology passes through the second phase which could be labeled “critical” and starts with the recognition of “the scandal of domination and exploitation of one part of mankind by another”<sup>9</sup>. Finally, in the modern era, the science is preoccupied with the task of overcoming that very state of affairs, which was previously recognized as scandalous, and studies the Other with the intention to uncover cultural relativism, as well as on a smaller scale such as aesthetics, politics, and so on<sup>10</sup>.

In his turn, Peter Pels argues that anthropology is somehow marginalized among the humanities, and perceives the way to overcome this marginality by re-contextualizing the anthropological claims. He points out that it is necessary to move from a disciplinary history of great ideas, great traditions, and great names, in order to understanding anthropology as a part of

---

<sup>8</sup> Peter Hulme, Russell McDougall, “Introduction”, in *Writing, travel, and empire: in the margins of anthropology*, ed. Peter Hulme and Russell McDougall (London: I. B. Tauris, 2007), 1.

<sup>9</sup> See: Johannes Fabian, *Time and the other: how anthropology makes its object* (New-York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 35.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 35.

the broader global inequalities, which were essentialized in Orientalism, imaginary geographies, and the politics of “writing culture”<sup>11</sup>.

It seems that this branch of scholarship was considerably reshaped by Michael Foucault, who is though described as postmodernist and structuralist, but who tends to dissociate himself with “structuralism” and define himself as a postmodern anthropologist<sup>12</sup>. In his famous book, *The archaeology of knowledge*, Foucault investigates the fundamental codes of culture which govern it’s the language, the schemas of perception, the cross-cultural exchanges, as well as the hierarchy of its practices. According to him, “archaeology”, indicated in the title, examines the rules of formation of the discursive practice or knowledge, an axis of science. In addition, knowledge is a “space where the subject may take up a position and speak of the objects with which he deals in his discourse”<sup>13</sup>.

Foucault is also important for our analysis because of his understanding of the term “discourse”. He criticizes the epistemology of the history of ideas for the interpretation of the “discourse” as thematic or systematic coherency, which ideally is continuous. According to the scholar, this assumption does not allow the investigation of contradictions, internal influences, transformations and subordinations in discourses<sup>14</sup>. In the Foucauldian method, it is very important to see discontinuities, ruptures and gaps in any linguistic structure as it shows more clearly its origin, mechanism and usage. In his view, as the term “discourse” has many senses (for instance, group of verbal performances, something produced by groups of sequences of signs, group of statements that

---

<sup>11</sup> See: Peter Pels, “Afterward: Writing in the margins of a marginal discipline”, in *Writing, travel, and empire*, 222.

<sup>12</sup> See: Michel Foucault, *The archaeology of knowledge* (New York: Pantheon, 1972), 199.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 183, 182.

<sup>14</sup> See: Michel Foucault, Ibid., 149-150, 151, 155. Besides, the scholar develops methodology of discourse study in his lecture *The Discourse of Language*. See also: Michel Foucault, “*The Discourse of Language*”, in “*The archaeology of knowledge*”, 215-237.

belong to a single system of formation, etc.), and it makes its usage quite equivocal. For this reason, he prefers the term “discursive formation”<sup>15</sup>.

In his turn, James A. Boon makes a very important proposition concerning the shift in philosophical perception of the world and human variability which occurred in the late 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries. To be precise, the author suggests that the paradigm of the Enlightenment was based upon new principles, in contrast to the old ones, grounded on the idea of diminished divinity<sup>16</sup>. According to Boon, travel narratives were documented and sought to restore the total intelligibility by the interpreters.

It is Johannes Fabian who calls attention to the methodological limitations of anthropology. He investigates cultural anthropology through the prism of time based on the concepts by Foucault, Said and Bourdieu (the theory of “time and cultural practice”, 1977). The author seeks to undermine the assumption that “time may give form to relations of power and inequality under the conditions of capitalist industrial revolution”<sup>17</sup>. He stresses some methodological limitations of anthropology as applied towards Otherness, namely, that it is based upon subjectively collected ethnographical sources, which often contain the already codified image of the Other. Besides, the Other does not fit the concept of time because it is preceded by the notions of “the savage” and “the primitive”, and, hence, is quite temporal<sup>18</sup>. According to Fabian, modern travel differs from the pre-modern in two ways. First, in the times described, it was *secular* (My italics. – S.K.), civic, or was not connected with any religious practice. Second, the travel was directed not *to* the centers of learning,

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 169, 106-107, 108.

<sup>16</sup> The issue of divinity would be addressed in the details in the second chapter. See: James A. Boon, *Other tribes, other scribes: symbolic anthropology in the comparative study of cultures, histories, religions, and texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 30.

<sup>17</sup> Fabian, *Time and the other*, IX-X, XIII.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., XI, 1.

where the radiance of knowledge was coming from, but *from* them (Italics by Fabian)<sup>19</sup>. In other words, the knowledge which the pupils got home was seen as superior, and travel aimed to provide just some practical information.

James Clifford, who started in the late 1980s as a theorist of modern travel and later developed his approach in a series of works, has also strongly contributed to modern anthropology. For instance, his work *Writing culture* (1986)<sup>20</sup> is a set of essays which investigates the poetics and politics of ethnography. In this book the critique of colonialism which has become traditional theoretical standpoint in the 1980s, is expressed through theorizing the general limits of self-representation and “discursive aspect”, as well as interpretation of cultural “texts” in relation to their production. In other words, though Clifford conservatively treats ethnography as a science in the service of anthropology, he assumes that it is not only “literature” but also *writing* which could not be reduced only to a *method of writing*<sup>21</sup> (My italics. – S.K.). These methodological features are seen quite innovative for the time-being.

In *Writing culture* Clifford argues that both literary approaches to and rhetorical dimensions of anthropology are seriously misleading for the overall picture. The reasons for this are as follows. First, they can not be easily compartmentalized. Second, as literature is an unstable and “transient” category<sup>22</sup>, there often appear shifts in authorial implications which can not be studied when one uses this methodology. In addition, looking at science as both a historical and linguistic process and defining the nature of cultural accounts as constructed, Clifford seeks to investigate a “historical predicament of ethnography” as situated between

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>20</sup> James Clifford, “Introduction”, in *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography: A School of American Research advanced seminar*, ed. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

<sup>21</sup> Clifford, *Writing culture*, 26, 2.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 4, 5, 22.

“powerful systems of meaning”<sup>23</sup>. Hence, science and ethnography particularly decodes and recodes the concept of Otherness.

In *The predicament of culture* (1988), Clifford proposes new ways of understanding the forces and interactions that shape cultures<sup>24</sup>. He investigates the possibilities and limits of cosmopolitan modernities; and also ties travels with cosmopolitan subjectivity and the so-called “poetics of displacement” of the Other. Ignoring social history, gender issues and geopolitics, he defines travel writing as a cultural practice and seeks to deconstruct “travel” in its historical context. In other words, his methodological technique is de-contextualization and re-contextualization of travels and travelogues. For example, he links anthropology to the process of construction of the colonial and neo-colonial societies that took place from colonialism to post-colonialism at the turn of 1900 and neocolonialism after 1950s<sup>25</sup>.

Finally, in one of his last works, *Routes*, Clifford analyzes the three disciplinary “edges” of anthropology formed by the three types of “anthropologist”, namely, the missionary, the colonial officer and the travel writer<sup>26</sup>. This idea calls up an identification of the three styles of travel narration, which would be employed in the third chapter of the thesis.

We may conclude that the main methodological peculiarity of anthropology is that the issue of the evolutionary view on and between the Self and the Other for this science is a point of departure and not a point of arrival as it usually occurs in the case of other methodologies. In

---

<sup>23</sup> Clifford identifies three expressive modes of the “Western” science since the 17<sup>th</sup> century, namely, rhetoric, fiction and subjectivity. See: Ibid., 5.

<sup>24</sup> See: James Clifford, *The predicament of culture: twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988).

<sup>25</sup> Clifford, *The predicament of culture*, 10.

<sup>26</sup> James Clifford, *Routes: travel and translation in the late twentieth century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997).

addition, the author of the thesis shares the assumption made by both Foucault and Clifford that discourse of the Other is not always coherent and stable.

## 1.2 The framework of theoretical linguistics and literary criticism

The next historiographical trend of scholarship on travels and travel literature which is very important for our analysis is *the framework of theoretical linguistics and literary criticism*. The scholars of the trend, as a rule, are distinguished by a broader definition of “travel” which could be seen as a multiplicity of leisure travel and exploration, exile and homelessness, and immigration<sup>27</sup>.

It was a postmodern literary criticism which pioneered, in the 1960s, the study of the techniques of rhetorical analysis. The scholars of this trend are famous to apply the taxonomic approach to culture and break it down into separate elements. They examine the relationships between signs, symbols and images and the things they refer to, relationships of signs to each other in formal structures, and also the relationships of signs to their impacts on those who use them. Hence, postmodern literary criticism removes the issue of authorial intentionality from its analysis, staking the idea of “quilting”.

One of the main theoreticians on writing, discourse and the modes of power in this framework is Roland Barthes (1915-1980), who investigates the relationships among travels, colonialism and Orientalism, on both historical and contemporary materials (upon the studies on Voltaire and his own trip to Japan and Morocco)<sup>28</sup>. He proposes a complementary strategy of looking at the foreign, and argues that no knowledge is possible and even desirable. Hence,

---

<sup>27</sup> For instance, see: K. Kaplan, *Questions of travel: postmodern discourses of displacement* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), 3, 2.

<sup>28</sup> See: Roland Barthes, *Mythologies* (New-York: Hill and Wang, 1995); Roland Barthes, *Empire of Signs* (London: J. Cape, 1983). See also: See also: Diana Knight, “Barthes and Orientalism”, *New Literary History* 24, no. 3. Textual interrelations (Summer, 1993): 617-633; D. Scott, “The Smile of the Sign: Semiotics and Travel Writing in Barthes, Baudrillard, Butor and Lévi-Strauss”, *Studies in Travel Writing*, no. 7 (2003): 209-225.

everything is beyond the interpretation. Thus, the method by Barthes undermines the motivation of travellers as seen, for instance, in studies on Orientalism.

In conclusion, the *theoretical linguistics and literary criticism* methodology provides a twofold usage for our analysis. On the one hand, it is important to treat the constitution of the Other as dialectical. On the other hand, the taxonomic approach to rhetoric will be employed in the third chapter of the thesis.

### 1.3 The framework of the history of ideas and the history of science

One of the most important trends of scholarship on travels and travelogues is one which investigates them from the angle of the *history of ideas and the history of science, including the cultural geographies*. The methodology of this branch is considerably influenced and determined in many ways by the so-called Cambridge school generally, and by John G. A. Pocock and Quentin Skinner in particular. They developed the methodology of contextualism, which situates any historical event in its context, and stresses the importance of the issue of the authorial intentionality and implication. In other words, the historians propose to uncover the intention with which any author develops one or another line of argumentation, as well as the actual meaning of the text<sup>29</sup>.

Following Thomas Kuhn, Pocock, in his series of essays *Politics, language, and time*, defines the history of science as a history of paradigm, discourse and language<sup>30</sup>. The historian also shows how the language of an epoch is constituted by mental structures, how it is being controlled

---

<sup>29</sup> See also: Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas", *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3; Ibid., "Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas", in *Meaning and Context. Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. James Tully (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988): 56-57, 61.

<sup>30</sup> See: Thomas S. Kuhn, *The structure of scientific revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), Chapter V; John G. A. Pocock, *Politics, language, and time: essays on political thought and history* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

by a determinant set of concepts that produce a paradigm of an epoch. In order to study a certain language, according to Pocock, it is necessary to take into account its cultural and social origins, contemporary linguistic and political modes of assumption and implication, as well as to keep in mind that language is always ambiguous, plural and re-shapeable<sup>31</sup>.

Pocock devotes a number of pages to the analysis of possible limitations and biases of the contextualist approach. First of all, he shows the existing danger of shift in the subject-matter from the methodological to ideological plans. In other words, he foresees the danger of starting with the examination of ideology instead of the examination of language. As the author stresses, though ideology is not ignored, however, it is not the primary subject-matter of contextualist epistemology. Besides, when one studies political thought, the equation between notions of “revolutionary thought” and “conceptual revolution” is also probable as a methodological bias<sup>32</sup>. In this case, Pocock argues, it is necessary to keep in mind the diversity of functions of paradigm and to distinguish the two different points.

This line was further developed in *The Varieties of British political thought*, co-edited by Pocock. Its contributors analyze the history of patterns of British<sup>33</sup> political discourse, its changes and principal vocabularies. In the introduction some important for our analysis methodological propositions are made. First, Pocock assumes that history takes place within a political system, or the group of systems, thus the historical events and languages can be seen as entailed by and implicit in them. Second, history is dominated by the genres of political literature produced by

---

<sup>31</sup> Pocock, *Politics, language, and time*, 13, 17-18, 26, 28, 22.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 276-277.

<sup>33</sup> Pocock defines “British” political discourse as mainly “Anglo-Scottish”. See: John G. A. Pocock, Gordon J. Schochet, Lois G. Schwoerer, eds., *The Varieties of British political thought, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 263.

culture. And last but not least, England's printed discourse is largely a dialogue with and about self<sup>34</sup>.

The epilogue to this collection by Gordon J. Schochet poses some important epistemological limitations. To be more precise, the contributor argues that any political discourse is not separable from the modes of communication that prevail in this society. Second, he stresses the danger of generalization of importance of the discourse and points out that politics is not reducible to discourse, language or vocabulary, as discourse is only about the public justification of the politics. Finally, political vocabularies are ambiguous by their nature and, thus, their meaning can only be derived from their use in specific contexts<sup>35</sup>.

Conal Condren also studies political languages from the angle of context and semantics<sup>36</sup>. Starting from the idea of rhetorical pragmatics he investigates the relationships between groups of words that form a semantic field<sup>37</sup>. His main argument is that political discourse is not always a coherent purposive practice.

This tradition of studying the linguistic-ideological aspects of discourse is continued by Robert J. Mayhew whose general subject-matter is the history of geography. The author scrutinizes the languages which were encoded in the British imperial geographical discourse, their continuity and changes as well as the politics of travel writing. Opposing the ideas of historical past and practical past, he argues against the traditional understanding of geography as a science "in essence"<sup>38</sup>. He shows that geographies that distinguished their practices textually from travel writings and natural history and travel writing have catalyzed each other to produce

---

<sup>34</sup> See: John G. A. Pocock, "Introduction", in *The Varieties of British political thought*, 1-3.

<sup>35</sup> See: Gordon J. Schochet, "Epilogue", in *The Varieties of British political thought*, 348-349, 354.

<sup>36</sup> Conan Condren, *The language of politics in seventeenth-century England* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 1-2, 4.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 17, 75, 57.

<sup>38</sup> Robert J. Mayhew, *Enlightenment Geography: The Political Languages of British Geography, 1650-1850* (New-York, St. Martin's Press, 2000), 6-8.

Eurocentrism. Hence, both geography and travel writing encode political positions and can be called as *politicized activities*. In the 17-18<sup>th</sup> centuries, in Mayhew's view, it was practically possible "to make a name as a travel writer" and then transfer it to the political position. Thus, geography *sought to compare information at a world scale* (My italics in both cases. – S.K.)<sup>39</sup>.

Furthermore, Mayhew derives some important arguments concerning the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. At the time, he argues, the happened the important changes in the structure of political discourse. First, with the loss of America, the elements of both racism and propagation of civility has grown which were supposed to ground justification of the British rule. Second, the slow detachment of the theological language from a political one appeared<sup>40</sup>. Therefore, Mayhew brings some points in favor of the idea of transition of discourse of the Other in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Charles W. J. Withers investigates the age of the Enlightenment from the geographical angle. Analyzing the narratives of the long 18<sup>th</sup> century<sup>41</sup> through the travels, sociability and national contexts, the author is seeking for the mechanisms of representations of the cosmopolitan peculiarities, national similarities, and local differences over space in terms of culture and progress. Based on the ideas of Foucault, he points out that geographical knowledge in the 18<sup>th</sup> century was implied to construct the Eurocentric vision of the world, as well as the national identities, people and their spaces. Hence, he strongly ties geography with capitalism and colonialism<sup>42</sup>.

In addition, Withers analyzes the existing classifications of travels and pays special attention to the so-called "philosophical travels". He argues that it is a very complex task to distinguish clearly

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 141, 142, 144, 246.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 254-255.

<sup>41</sup> "The long eighteenth century" (1660/1688-1815/1850-e, from the Restoration of English monarchy/Glorious Revolution up to Waterloo battle/Industrial Revolution) is a special term coined in historiography as well as the term "the short eighteenth century" (1715-1789, from the death of Louis XIV till the French Revolution). Both terms are used in order to show the unity of processes of the European states' development in these chronological frames tied in economic or political sense.

<sup>42</sup> See: Charles W. J. Withers, *Placing the Enlightenment: Thinking geographically about the Age of Reason* (Chicago and London, Chicago University Press, 2007), Introduction, as well as p. 95.

among the types of *philosophical traveler*, *sentimental traveler*, and the *scientific traveler* or explorer, as “distinction between art and science was never fixed”<sup>43</sup>.

A bit apart from the aforementioned methodological tradition lies an approach by Mary L. Pratt, who develops a very complex framework. It combines the features of post-colonial studies, comparative studies and history of science, as she investigates the mechanism of knowledge production through the prism of the European project of natural history.

Pratt has started her academic career in the late 1970s, the time, famous for Reagan-Thatcher ideological agenda for demystifying imperialism, which was, in her opinion, “an urgent and hopeless task”, as education and official culture were still dominated by “the legacy of Euroimperialism”<sup>44</sup>. Thus, in order to show the “cultural impact on the European travel and exploration by Latin America and Africa” the author uses the term “transculturation”, which she defines as “the selective borrowings by the native people from the European science”, as well as the concept of anti-conquest, or cultural resistance by the colonized<sup>45</sup>. Thus, Pratt proposes to study the responses and reverse influences of the Other.

The book by Pratt has provoked many critical reflections. As Campbell argues there is a vivid contradiction between the starting points by Pratt and the outcomes in her research. He shows that Pratt’s understanding of travel writing is too narrow, while her explanations and generalizations are too global<sup>46</sup>. In his turn, Lorimer stresses that Pratt overestimates the connections between travel writing as a genre and the European economic expansion. This overestimation makes her approach, despite the attempt to balance it by the concept of cultural

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 88, 108, 94, 110.

<sup>44</sup> Mary L. Pratt, *Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992), 10-11.

<sup>45</sup> See: Ibid., XI, 4, 6, 38, 2.

<sup>46</sup> M. Campbell, “Review on *Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation* by Mary Louise Pratt”, *American Ethnologist* 21, no. 4 (Nov. 1994): 932.

resistance, a “static treatment of Marxist capitalistic framework”<sup>47</sup>. Finally, Pratt’s strategy is considerably weakened by an emotionally dismissive tone. However, we found this work be important for our analysis, as she examines the tropes which were used by the Western travellers in order to achieve the necessary rhetoric effect.

Finally, it is necessary to mention two more works that are related to our research: the collection of papers edited by Ana Simoes and the book by Harry Liebersohn<sup>48</sup>. Simoes argues the transition from cultural to cognitive sphere happens by means of travels and travelogues, when travels recognize themselves as “travels of learning”, happened<sup>49</sup>. In his turn, Liebersohn suggests that in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century travel writing has challenged the prevailing European belief about the human nature, as before there has not been a single scientific paradigm in anthropology<sup>50</sup>. Besides, he makes the two propositions which are of particular interest for our analysis. First, he stresses that the relationship of travelers towards the world was defined by the state histories. Besides, the author argues that travelers were expected to lose control over their writings and ideas after their travel accounts published<sup>51</sup>. Thus, it was the public sphere which played with literary pictures of the world viewed by the separate individuals, and which reshaped them.

To conclude, this historiographical trend tends to generalize the importance of the context, as well as that of authorial intention. It also has some significant epistemological limitations, precisely, an overestimation of the role of discourse as a causal-consequent mechanism in history, and the shift from contextual-linguistic towards the political-ideological plan. Nevertheless, we find it helpful to enrich the methodology employed in the present thesis. First of all, we accept the issue of

---

<sup>47</sup> D. A. Lorimer, “Review on *Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation* by Mary Louise Pratt”, *The Journal of Modern History* 68, no. 2 (Jun. 1996): 430.

<sup>48</sup> See: Ana Simões, Ana Carneiro, and Maria Paula Diogo, eds., *Travels of learning: a geography of science in Europe* (Dordrecht; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003); Henry Liebersohn, *The travelers' world: Europe to the Pacific* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).

<sup>49</sup> Ana Simões, “Introduction”, in *Travels of learning*, 1-2.

<sup>50</sup> See: Liebersohn, *The travelers' world*, 2-3.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-9, 304.

intentionality and pay special attention to the context. Furthermore, we consider the discourse of the Other be addressed as a source of the British Self. As we have already indicated above, the discourse is understood as ambiguous or in a state of transition. Finally, the methodology of the present thesis takes into consideration one point, which contradicts the Pocockean distinction between the study of language and the study of ideology. To be more precise, we plan to incorporate the outcomes of the third chapter, which analyzes the languages of representation of the Other, to the fourth chapter, which examines the British paradigms of the Self, or, in other words, the British public opinion and ideology. Despite this conversion, we presume that this methodological point does not confuse the overall picture but helps to constitute two different levels of the research.

#### **1.4 The framework of socio-cultural history and literary history**

Among the relevant approaches to travels and travel literature it is also necessary to scrutinize one *in the framework of socio-cultural history and literary history*. For instance, Mary W. Helms and Jerry H. Bentley<sup>52</sup> offer an approach which recognizes the ties among travel, travel writing, and imperialism, but situates it in a broader context. According to them, foreign travels often had larger cultural and political influences on the societies of explorers, as well as they raised the social status of travellers. Hence, the authors consider travels to the distant parts of the world as a kind of search for communication and exchange. Thus, Helms and Bentley conclude that it is a strong oversimplification to reduce travels and travel writings completely to imperialism or imperialist propaganda.

---

<sup>52</sup> See: Mary W. Helms, *Ulysses' Sail: An Ethnographic Odyssey of Power, Knowledge, and Geographical Distance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988); Jerry H. Bentley, *In Old World Encounters: Cross-Cultural Contacts and Exchanges in Pre-Modern Times* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Another approach towards travel and travel literature that considers them from the social point rather than from the literary and comparative angle, was proposed by Margaret Hunt<sup>53</sup>, who studies “social history of popular racism” and “discourses of race” in travel literature. The author makes some interesting methodological points. First, she speaks about 18<sup>th</sup> century travel narratives in social terms, as having been written massively by the trading class, and represents the middle class as a contributor to the imperial project<sup>54</sup>. Hence, it comes out that *the nature of travel account is determined by the agenda of its narrator* (My italics. – S.K.). Second, Hunt identifies travel writing as an interaction between “a middling reader” and “a middling protagonist”<sup>55</sup>. Thus, it seems that they share the same agenda and *there is no difference between a writer and a reader in terms of attitude towards the subject of travelogue* (My italics. – S.K.). Finally, she argues against the proposition that “travel narrative is only... the product of professional writers and journalists”, and shows that those narratives were generally written by “the ordinary travellers”.

Hunt concludes that the concept of Otherness, as developed by the Britons, derives from the fact that England was a country of Protestants, who were a privileged social group. The other groups of people, who were non-Protestants, and could be Frenchmen, Italians, Turks, as well as Russians, were far from being seen as “independent citizens” and were heavily taxed. Hence, *Otherness in the interpretation by Hunt was originated from and supported by the religious and taxation politics* (My italics. – S.K.).

Finally, the significance of travel narratives, as Hunt sums up, is not that they provide some new information, but that they compile and collect certain ideas to be easily accessible,

---

<sup>53</sup> Mary Hunt, “Racism, Imperialism and the Traveler’s Gaze in Eighteenth-Century England”, *The Journal of British Studies* 32, no. 4. Making the English Middle Class, ca. 1700-1850 (Oct., 1993): 333-357.

<sup>54</sup> Hunt criticizes Said for underestimation of the commercial issue. See: Hunt, *Racism, Imperialism and the Traveler’s Gaze*, 337-338.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 342-343.

and bring a new mass epistemology towards the Other which can be called a “commercial gaze”<sup>56</sup>.

In her turn, Chloe Chard, whose work is based on the British travel narratives on the continent (mainly, in Western Europe), studies the features of the genre in general and also the particular concepts and strategies formed by the authors “in relation to their specific desires”<sup>57</sup>. The author identifies two types of travels, as seen in a form of personal adventure and, hence, pro-Romantic, and anti-Romantic. Thus, she draws the chronological and logical lines between the Grand Tour and its narratives, and those of modern tourism based on that “romantic” issue.

According to Chard, it is the topography of the foreign which has been transferred by the travellers into a special discourse<sup>58</sup>. In addition, she uncovers a system of the used linguistic tropes. What is considered as especially interesting in her method is that she analyzes both contradictions and semantic conflicts among these tropes<sup>59</sup>.

Catherine Turner, a student on travels and travel narratives, in her work *British Travel Writers in Europe* examines the archaeology of the genre of travel writing which is, according to her, a “fallen victim to the vagaries of canon-building”, and the role of travelogues as a public voice in shaping the emerging sense of British national identity. The author goes into details of social development with the intention to address the issue of personal motivation of the writers. In addition, in order to uncover the moral-philosophical-literary canon of the production of narratives in this genre, the author uses an interesting methodological strategy. Namely, she is

---

<sup>56</sup> In this sense, the gaze resembles the Foucauldian surveillance, which could be transferred into knowledge and then into power. See: Ibid., 353-354.

<sup>57</sup> Chloe Chard, *Pleasure and guilt on the Grand Tour. Travel writing and imaginative geography, 1600-1830* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 11.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 9, 10-11.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 8-9.

touching upon the discourses, related to travelogues, such as literary review, philosophy, polemic, fiction and poetry<sup>60</sup>.

An original methodology, that is also useful for our analysis, was developed by Casey Blanton. She treats travel writing as a literary genre and seeks to trace its evolution. Defining travel writing as “a compelling and seductive form of story-telling” and travel literature as “a large, unruly, amorphous set of discourses”, she points out that travel narratives have passed some important stages of development. They have also outlived considerable changes in literary style and practical purposes<sup>61</sup>. The author characterizes a modern travel, which starts, in her opinion, from the 1760s and originates from the Grand Tour journals by James Boswell, as a travel with an agenda of self-discovery<sup>62</sup>. Hence, the motivation of a modern traveller is based only upon the personal reasons, neither political nor commercial. Therefore, the scholar makes an interesting point concerning the periodization of the genre of travel writings, which also undermines the assumption on the modern travels and travel writings, dated to the early 18th century, which contributed to the emergence of imperialism. To be more precise, Blanton separates travel writings of the Grand Tour and that of the colonial period, stressing that they have different agendas<sup>63</sup>. Looking from this perspective, we can again assume that travelogues of the second part of the 18<sup>th</sup> century are at least the narratives in transition from the Grand Tour era towards that of imperialism.

---

<sup>60</sup> For instance, see: Catherine Turner, *British Travel Writers in Europe, 1750-1800: Authorship, gender and national identity*, Studies in European Cultural Transition, vol. 10 (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001), 1, 3.

<sup>61</sup> Casey Blanton, *Travel Writing: The Self and the World* (New-York: Routledge, 2002), 1-2.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., XII, 15-16.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., XIII. See also: Nikolas Dirks, *The scandal of empire: India and the creation of imperial Britain* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006). Dirks, bases upon the history of trial of the general-governor of British India Warren Hastings (from 1788 up to 1795), suggests that at this period it was just the beginning of legitimization of both empire and its discourse, the task which was finished to 1795 and after.

In his turn, the French literary historian Jean Vivies investigates variations on the British continental travel and the status of the genre of travel narrative in British society in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. The author argues that the genre tended to converge with the genres of fiction and autobiography. Moreover, travelogues, which transformed a reader into a traveller, played a double role in the contemporary British society. First, they organized travels into knowledge, and, second, they unified the audience by the act of reading<sup>64</sup>.

Finally, it is important to mention the collection of articles *The consumption of culture* which treats travels and travel literature as a part of modern enterprise of utilization and consumption of culture, as well as an object of consumption<sup>65</sup>. The contributors take on a task of defending *culture* against the very forms of mass use. They define *culture* as aesthetic production which varies by the political and socioeconomic contexts in which it occurs, and show that commerce and art are for a long period of time already deeply enmeshed. Moreover, the contributors argue that it is epistemologically incorrect to treat a consumer society as a homogeneous entity instead as a mobile, fragmented and inventive structure<sup>66</sup>. Finally, they propose that the Other can never be fully “known” except in the reference to the Self.

The approach of the contributors to the collection of papers *The Making of Modern Tourism* is that way addressed travels as a part of economic-cultural enterprise. They focus basically on invention and re-invention of the key tourist images, preconceptions and stereotypes mirrored in the travel narratives in order to analyze the interrelation between the national identity, tourism and the rise of modern consumer society. It was found especially

---

<sup>64</sup> Jean Vivies, *English Travel Narratives in the Eighteenth Century: Exploring genre* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002), 107, 112.

<sup>65</sup> Ann Bermingham, “Introduction”, in *The consumption of culture, 1600-1800: image, object, text*, ed. Ann Bermingham and John Brewer (London: Routledge, 1995).

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 3-5, 14-15, 218.

interesting that the authors argue that the discourse of travels consisted of two simultaneously existed versions, namely, of “official” and “practical” levels<sup>67</sup>.

To summarize, the framework of *socio-cultural history*, *literary history*, and *comparative studies* brings to our approach Hunt’s idea of “middling authors”, which would be employed in the second chapter; literary analysis of the specificity of the genre of travel writings; the necessity to give a proper weight to the requirements of such a genre imposed by the audience, as well as the investigation of the canons of writing and their contradictions.

### 1.5 The inter-disciplinary approach on *nation, nation building and empire*

Let us now move to the analysis of the relevant interdisciplinary approaches towards the field. The first of them to be analyzed is the one on the *nation, nation building and empire*. The scholars who work under this epistemological paradigm investigate the formation of national consciousness and treat travelogues as an evidence of literary nationalism. Besides, it is necessary to remark that investigation under this framework implies two different methodological strategies with two different kinds of the used materials accordingly. First, it is possible to focus on domestic travels within one country or empire and the travelogues which describe them. It means that the overall picture is to be about the natural diversity of its subjects in cultural, mental and other senses, as well as about their unity and unification as the subjects of the same government. Another option is to scrutinize foreign travels and their narratives in order to uncover the imagined differences in terms of national character, culture and to construct the hierarchical picture of the world viewed by the particular group of the foreign travellers.

---

<sup>67</sup> See: Hartmut Berghoff, Barbara Korte, “Britain and the Making of Modern Tourism: An Interdisciplinary Approach”, in *The Making of Modern Tourism: the cultural history of the British experience, 1600-2000*, ed. Hartmut Berghoff... [et al.] (New-York: Palgrave, 2002), 8, 9-10; H. Quadflieg, *Approved Civilities and the Fruits of Peregrination Elizabethan and Jacobean Travellers and the Making of Englishness*, in *The Making of Modern Tourism*, 21-45.

The most influential interpretation of the emergence of nationalism as bound up with literature was proposed in the early 1980s by Benedict Anderson, who pioneers in his book *Imagined communities* (1983) to distinguish the concept of nationalism from ideology. The author identifies nationalism as a sort of false consciousness, the “pathology of modern developmental history”<sup>68</sup>. He investigates the mechanisms of nationalism, the circumstances under which it comes into being, its changes in the course of time, as well as the reasons for its legitimation. The author argues that nationalism originates from national consciousness and is always based upon the imaginary assumption of a certain collectivity. However, this assumption is limited by its nature as it can not accommodate the voices of the Other(s) who undermine this national unity with the narratives of their own<sup>69</sup>. According to Anderson, nationalism has appeared in the end of the 18th century for two reasons. First, it was because of the shift from the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained worldview towards a hierarchic dynastic realm. Second, it happened due to the convergence of capitalism with a print technology which has defined the languages-of-power, as well as of nation with an empire<sup>70</sup>.

The concept by Anderson has been recognized as provocatively polemical. It has opened long-term debates both in a particular anti-Andersonian and in a general epistemological sense. For instance, one of the main criticisms of the first edition of *Imagined communities* was that the author has overestimated print-capitalism as a determinant force of emergence of nationalism<sup>71</sup>. In addition, Reid criticizes Anderson for overstressing the importance of Southeastern Asian region particularly and un-balanced geographical representation in genera. The critic says Australia and

---

<sup>68</sup> See: Benedict Anderson, *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1991), 5, 14-15.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 4, 6.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 7, 39, 46.

<sup>71</sup> For example, see: L. J. Sears, “Review on *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* by Benedict Anderson”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114, no. 1 (Jan.-Mar., 1994): 130.

some other important regions are excluded from Anderson's scheme, and, hence, too global generalizations could turn as incorrect. Moreover, in Reid's view, *Imagined communities* can be fairly characterized by the reduced acuteness of style in both argumentation and writing, especially in the second part where the author sought to separate racism from nationalism and attach it to class as less persuasive. Besides, as Reid stresses, Anderson neglects completely the stage of development of nationalism under the Communist regimes, as well as its decline and fall<sup>72</sup>.

As certain narrowness of the approach by Anderson became seen the author seeks to overcome them in the second version of *Imagined communities* published in 1992. The book was revised and broadened by two sections on the politics of museums and on cartography as means of formation of national consciousness.

The contributors to the collection of papers *Nation and narration* challenge the trend to investigate the post-colonial countries and their cultures as a homogeneous formation. For instance, Simon During, who examines the mechanisms of cultural nationalism in literature, suggests that *it was developed against imperialism* in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and *originated*, for example, in the British case, *from patriotism and civil imaginary* (My italics in both cases. – S. K.). In the author's view, one of the first representatives of political nationalism was Burke who sets an agenda of counter-revolution and accepts nation as the legitimizing socio-political unit<sup>73</sup>.

Another epistemological trend which is very important for our analysis was developed by Linda Colley<sup>74</sup> in the late 1980s-early 1990s. The author examines the British path to modern

---

<sup>72</sup> A. Reid, "Review on *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* by Benedict Anderson", *Pacific affairs* 58, no. 3 (Autumn, 1985): 498-499.

<sup>73</sup> During defines *cultural nationalism* as an interplay between subjectivity and representation, interprets it as a limitation of politics. See: Simon During, "Literature – Nationalism's other? The case for revision", in *Nation and narration*, ed. Homi K. Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990), 146, 152, 138-139, 142.

<sup>74</sup> For example, see: Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the nation, 1707-1837* (London: Pimlico, 1994).

statehood *in comparison with its continental counterparts* (My italics. – S. K.). Proceeding from the idea of integration and homogenization of dissimilar cultures of the Albion, the author analyzes the process of the invention of the British national identity, or Britishness, its pragmatic causes and main foundations<sup>75</sup>. This approach can be labeled as “historical revisionistic” as Colley proposes a new angle of study and challenges the traditional mainstream historiography of the Georgian England in particular and imperiology in general.

The historian argues for the creation of the British identity as opposed to the European, or, to be more precise, to the French, the Other. She points out that in the last quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the British elites faced the necessity to legitimize their dominant all-British imperial status and demonstrate a broad patriotic utility of their existence, a task, which contradicted to their essence as a social caste. Thus, Colley sees *nationalism as developed for the sake of imperialism* (My italics. – S.K.).

In her view, the task of creation of the British national identity was complicated by some circumstances. First, the British elites and their French counterparts could “neither live together peacefully, nor ignore each other and live neutrally apart”. Thus, in order to survive, the Britons should react collectively. Second, the existing cultural practices of Englishmen, Scots, Irish and Welsh who composed the fashionable class, were “ostentatiously un-British” and divergent. Finally, these relationships were highly corrosive for the political, religious order, internal security, as well as commercial and colonial power which the Britons wished carefully to preserve<sup>76</sup>. Hence, in order to shoot all the foxes, as Colley shows, the British upper class has borrowed some of the cultural practices from France and Italy hoping by that formal adoption to cover, and preserve their own<sup>77</sup>.

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 8, 1.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 2-3, 4-5, 164-165.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 166.

Besides, the author traces British nationalism from patriotism, which can be also conventional, and states that the foreign travels as well as travel narratives is significant as the main means for that task.

Following Anderson, Colley treats the Britons as “an invented nation”, the construct developed as “a culture which was largely defined itself through fighting and is used to fighting”<sup>78</sup>. However, she concludes that the British common identity happened to fail in some sense to come into being.

Colley’s approach has caused many critical responses. As Hampton shows, the author links Englishmen, Scots, Welsh and especially Irish rather than bringing them proportionally into her analysis of Britishness, which seems necessary when looking at the subject-matter of her book. Besides, the reviewer also mentions among the omissions by Colley the fact that she does not address the “traditional nationalist paradigm”. Finally, though it is claimed in the book that this story is not about “the high culture”, the author eliminates the analysis of the role of the masses and their culture<sup>79</sup>. It is necessary to say that Colley sought to recapitalize some of these points in her later work, *Captives*<sup>80</sup>, which combines efficiently large-scale and small-scale dimensions of the Empire.

Cubitt, who studies the mechanisms of imagining nations, argues that travel literature is a sort of geographic and ethnographic discourses, which help to achieve effect of national self-discovery and to create national identity, as well as nationalist mythologies<sup>81</sup>. He proposes that to imagine a nation means to always differentiate its main project from the rival

---

<sup>78</sup> See: Ibid., 9.

<sup>79</sup> See: Ibid., 8; J. Hampton, “Review on *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1937*. Yale University Press, 1992 by Linda Colley”, Gateway. An Academic History Journal on the Web. Winter, 2002 (See: [http://grad.usask.ca/gateway/reviewhampton\\_colley\\_britons.html](http://grad.usask.ca/gateway/reviewhampton_colley_britons.html)), accessed 08.05.2008.

<sup>80</sup> See: Linda Coley, *Captives* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2002).

<sup>81</sup> Geoffrey Cubitt, “Introduction”, in *Imagining nations*, ed. Geoffrey Cubitt (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 12.

versions. The author identifies three main techniques of differentiation of the Other<sup>82</sup> which would be addressed further.

The last approach which is important to be shortly summarized here, is that proposed by Iver Neumann<sup>83</sup>. The political scientist seeks to uncover “archeology”, uses and limitations of the dichotomy self/other. Like Colley, he examines the formation of the European collective identity in relation to the external, in his case, Turkish and Russian, “Other”. What is new and interesting in his approach is that Neumann treats the idea of the Other from the point of its political practicability, and distinguishes among several Otherness, namely, all-European, regional and national. In addition, the author argues against the epistemological tendency, which originates from Marx, “to study collective identity formation as dialectical”. He points out that it is only dialogism which can make political practices clearer, and criticizes the absence of the Other in philosophizing about the Self<sup>84</sup>.

In retrospect, the adherents of the framework on the *nation, nation building and empire* develop more or less cohesive methodology which could be characterized mainly by the presence in the analysis of the broad international context, the Other as opposed to the Self, as well as by the critique of the idea of homogeneity of any national identity.

### 1.6 The interdisciplinary approach on *cognitive mapping*

An authoritative concept concerning Otherness is proposed by Larry Wolff who investigates the mechanisms of *cognitive mapping*, imaginative, or philosophic, geographies and boundaries. The author argues that the West reciprocally invented the East as its own complementary concept at the Age

---

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 7.

<sup>83</sup> See: Iver Neumann, *Uses of the other: “The East” in European identity formation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

<sup>84</sup> See: Ibid., 3, 13-14, 36, 228.

of the Enlightenment, the time when the general shift of the philosophic-geographical paradigm happened<sup>85</sup>. In his view, Eastern Europe was invented in order to represent the “full scale” from civilization to barbarism, and took its place among the paired analytical antitheses, like in the tables by Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778). However, Wolff points out, contrary to the way in which it is often considered, Eastern Europe had never been the antipode of the West<sup>86</sup>. What was imaginative in this concept is that it is more a kind of synthetic, geographically unnatural<sup>87</sup>, association of the lands which compose this region<sup>88</sup>.

This “invention” happens, according to Wolff, not only and fully because of the economic factors which constitute the axis East-West. A certain convention among diplomacy, cartography and philosophy, which “operated in triangular relations of mutual endorsement, reinforcement, and justification”, as well as travels and travel writing which contributed to this work of orientation, also matter<sup>89</sup>. Finally, the author concludes, this theoretical construction of Eastern Europe has been somehow “underdeveloped” and unstable<sup>90</sup> as the actual borders of the region were shifting during more than the last two centuries.

The approach by Wolff has provoked a critical discussion. First of all, it is not fully clear, if Eastern Europe as a theoretical construct of the Enlightenment includes Russia or not. Wolff proposes contradictory arguments on the point. On the one hand, he stresses that Russia in the imagination of the 18<sup>th</sup> century authors was a part of the Eastern European region (for example, he titles the first part of the fifth chapter “Addressing Eastern Europe: Voltaire’s Russia”). On the other hand, later on he indicates that this is not evident, as Russia was seen as “the alternative to

---

<sup>85</sup> Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford University Press, 1994), 4-5, 360.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 13, 357-358, 15.

<sup>87</sup> On the contrary to the previously existed geographic-philosophical axis “South-North”.

<sup>88</sup> By the way, Wolff classifies the images of the Other as that of entering, possessing, imagining, mapping, addressing and peopling.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., 356, 8, 362, 6.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 358, 361.

Europe” and, in travellers’ view, contained two parts, “European” and “Asiatic”<sup>91</sup>. Further, Wirtschafter argues that Wolff uses the images of the Other not as the analytical categories but as simple pictures to illustrate his concept, and is not going into details in order to find the roots of this “Western” desire of self-promotion<sup>92</sup>. In addition, Poe and Anderson note on the general style of argumentation by Wolff which often combines essential as well as marginal for the overall picture elements<sup>93</sup>.

Another approach which is focused on the mechanisms of cognitive mapping, intellectual history and a case study of formation of collective identity, is accomplished by Brian Dolan<sup>94</sup>. The author points out, that travel literature of late 18<sup>th</sup> century took part in the creation of the European identity. It was used by the Britons as a means to explore the so-called “limits of modernity”, or the boundaries of the modern world as it was known and perceived by them.

Besides, Dolan argues that the Britons constructed certain “northern”, “eastern” and “southern” frontiers. Moreover, the travel authors approaches the territories of Russia as “located” somewhere between “the North” and “the East”. However, in his view, the British travelers, when defining the place of Russia in the scheme, had experienced some difficulties. They originated from the question if Russia developed the project of “alternative Enlightenment”<sup>95</sup>.

---

<sup>91</sup> See also: Ibid., 15, 22-23.

<sup>92</sup> See: E. K. Wirtschafter, “Review on *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* by Larry Wolff”, *The Slavic and East European Journal* 39, no. 4 (Winter, 1995): 643, 644.

<sup>93</sup> Marshall Poe, “Review on *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* by Larry Wolff”, *Russian Review* 55, no. 4 (Oct., 1996): 713; Matthew S. Anderson, “Review on *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment* by Larry Wolff”, *The English Historical Review* 112, no. 446 (April, 1997): 491.

<sup>94</sup> Brian Dolan, *Exploring European Frontiers: British Travellers in the Age of Enlightenment* (New-York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000).

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 68-72, 180.

Now let us move on to the constitution of the approach which can be applied towards travels, travel narratives and the image of the Other in the present thesis. First, we assume that the British travel authors were intentionally reflecting on the Other, with a certain goal, or several goals. For that reason, the travel narratives will be analyzed in the second chapter in their context and correlated with the backgrounds and personal agendas of their authors.

Further, in the third chapter entitled *Shaping the discourse of Russia as discourse of the Other: vocabularies and languages* we apply towards our materials the approach by Pocock and Skinner, namely, their proposition to study vocabularies and linguistic modes of the narratives in their context. But also, quite consciously, contrary to the method (see pp. 17-19 of the current chapter), we move from this point on the issue of public intellectual discourse and ideology in order to uncover the functions of the image of the Other in the British society. However, these two points, in our opinion, will not be submerged, mixed or replaced one by another, but will constitute the two different complementary levels, as the vocabularies would be incorporated in the fourth chapter dedicated to the Self and the Other seen through the ideas of Man and Order.

Then, the concept of the Russian Other, which in our case is not a domestic Other, will be analyzed with a strong reference to the British Self. Thus, the paper focuses on the cross-cultural aspect of travels, but not in the dialogical manner. In other words, it is not intended to study any response from the side of the Other, namely, from the Russian side.

Finally, going from the arguments driven by Anderson, Blanton, Mayhew and some others, we approach the British discourse of the Other as that in a state of transition and, for these reasons, not monolithic. Besides, the narratives would be approached in three different ways.

Looking from the angle of an authorial style of narration, we will uncover *scientific*, *journalistic* and *political* ones.

## Chapter II. The travel narratives in context

The second chapter aims to provide both the overall context and some particular information which seems to be relevant for the further understanding and interpretation of the three British travel narratives. In other words, this part of the thesis seeks to indicate the features of political, social and cultural environment of the travelogues, as well as to identify the imposing factors and the intellectual horizons of the epoch in general and, looking from the angle of personality of the authors, in particular.

### 2.1 British-Russian relations, the late 1750s-late 1780s

It is a very challenging task to characterize the 18<sup>th</sup> century British-Russian relations, first of all, because of their complexity and instability, as well as the fact that there is no consensus on this issue in the literature. One can say that since the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century till the midst 1770s there was a kind of partnership between Britain and Russia rather than the confrontation. At the same time, there are some arguments that the relations during the whole 18<sup>th</sup> century could not be generally labeled as allied, mainly because they have radically changed for several times<sup>96</sup>.

Furthermore, a scholar who approaches the field, experiences difficulties in terms of scale of analysis. In our view, it is impossible to understand the nuances of the relations between the two if to treat them as isolated not only from the neighboring and regional

---

<sup>96</sup> See both in: Anderson, *Britain's discovery of Russia*, 135, 141-143, 233-235; Entoni Kross, *U temzskikh beregov: rossiane v Britanii v XVIII veke* (By the Banks of the Thames: Russians in Eighteenth-Century Britain) (Sankt-Peterburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1996), 6.

environment, but also from the rival (in our case, the continental European) and their own geopolitical ambitions. Hence, it would be relevant to interchange micro- and macro- scale in the course of the investigation.

Finally, it seems reasonable to identify some periods which are marked by distinct tendencies. Moreover, it would be relevant to expand the time scale till the frames of the “long eighteenth century”<sup>97</sup>, because it helps to see what was indeed special in the period since the early 1760s till the late 1780 in comparison with the previous and the subsequent ones.

Thus, we identify conditionally six more or less large spans, indeed important for the overall British-Russian relations, namely, 1698-1710s, 1710s-1725, 1725 - the late 1750s, 1767- the late 1770, 1780- the late 1790s, as well as the late 1790s- the late 1810s. Let us characterize each of them in a few words.

The first period could be labeled, in Anderson’s expression, “the British discovery of Russia”<sup>98</sup> and “a political honeymoon” of the two countries<sup>99</sup>. However, already from the early 1710s, the relations were considerably worsened thanks at least two factors. First, in 1714 the House of Stuarts was succeeded by the Royal dynasty of Hanoverians, and the Kings of that dynasty were still quite sensitive to the interests of this Germanic kingdom, often to the prejudice of the British interests<sup>100</sup>. This situation kept till the time of

---

<sup>97</sup> The term was explained in the first Chapter, p. 20, 41n.

<sup>98</sup> It is important to remark that the author of these lines shares the view that this “discovery” was in many ways prepared in the previous decades, under the Peter the Great’s father, who was quite hastily labeled in the Russian tradition as “the Quietest”, tsar Alexei Mikhailovich’ rule (1629-1676, the tsar since 1645). However, since 1698 this “discovery” became indeed evident and the nature of it was considerably reshaped by the personality of Peter itself.

<sup>99</sup> It means that in this period there were no crucial disagreements, or the launched political, commercial and cultural contacts over-heightened them.

<sup>100</sup> This statement, which is usually attributed in historiography to the Georgian opposition, could be, however, well exemplified by the affair of Mecklenburg. It was in 1716, when Peter the Great, who gave one of his nieces in marriage to the Duke of Mecklenburg, planned in the course of the Northern war to invade some

George III (b. 1738, succeeded the throne in 1760), who was the first “British born and bred”, and spoke in English as his first language. Second, Britain, as a protestant country, sought to keep the alliance with the other protestant players in Europe, while both the Germanic kingdoms and Sweden, a protestant partner of Britain, were included at the time in the Russian sphere of geopolitical interests.

During the second period, the British-Russian relations were considerably weakened, as the subsequent decades after the death of Peter the Great were marked by political instability. Hence, the overall political situation in Russia was perceived by the Britons as a sort of decline. In other words, Britain did not see a point to enter into a military alliance with that country and to keep a partnership, with the exception of a commercial one<sup>101</sup>.

At the same time, at the beginning of the 1750s all political unions which kept the balance of powers in Europe came into crisis. However, Britain, which found Prussia as an influential partner against France and reckoned to maintain commercial relationships with Russia, occupied one of the best positions. In addition, the Treaty of Paris (1763) provided Britons with many territorial acquisitions, such as Canada, Cap-Breton; the islands of St. Vincent, Dominica, Grenada and Tobago; Senegal in Africa, as well as with admission of

---

neighboring Germanic territories previously taken by Swedes, in order to expand this County. Britain, the Russian ally at the time, which was theoretically going to benefit from this action, and planned a mutual landing operation in Sweden, refused this idea, being too sensitive to the interests of Hanover.

<sup>101</sup> For further details of commercial interests of Britain in Russia, see: *Anderson M. S. Britain's discovery of Russia*. P. 132; H. H. Kaplan, “*Russian Commerce and British Industry: A Case Study in Resource Scarcity in the Eighteenth-Century*”, in *Russia and the West in the eighteenth century*, ed. Anthony G. Cross (Newtonville, Mass.: Oriental Research Partners, 1983), 326-332.

her recent achievements in India<sup>102</sup>. The situation boded well both in political and material terms.

However, the British union with Prussia unexpectedly came to the end, and the country was in danger by being isolated among the European powers. That is why the Cabinets of both Lord Bute (1762-1763) and George Grenville (1763-1765) inclined to enter into the alliance with Russia, which was less than the other players interested in posing limitations on the maritime and colonial politics of Britain. In her turn, at the moment when Catherine II came to power (1762)<sup>103</sup>, Russia sought to restore its international prestige, shaken by the previous sharp change of orientation from union with France and Austria to that with Prussia. Moreover, Russian diplomacy came to conclusion that France was still an influential rival in Poland, Sweden and in the Middle East. Thus, a sort of agreement with Britain was highly welcomed. Thus, there is no wonder that political plans like the famous *Northern Accord* were projected<sup>104</sup>.

Nevertheless, the relations between Britain and Russia remained ambiguous. Thus, Lord Buckinghamshire, the British Ambassador in Petersburg (1762-1765) tried to renovate both the treaty of Alliance (expired in 1759) and commercial treaty of 1734 (expired in 1749)

---

<sup>102</sup> See: Matthew S. Anderson, *Europe in the eighteenth century, 1713-1783* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), 246-253; A. B. Sokolov, *To meet a halfway: Russia and Anglia in the 16-18<sup>th</sup> centuries (Navstrechu drug drugu: Rossia i Anglia v XVI-XVIII vekah)* (Yaroslavl, 1992), 255.

<sup>103</sup> As Sokolov argues, Catherine II was an Anglomane in her intellectual taste that was also beneficial for the whole course of British-Russian relations. However, it seems that her tender attachment to Britain was caused by many reasons. For instance, being yet the Grand Duchess of Russia (1745-1762), Catherine II went in correspondence with the current British Ambassador in Russia, Charles H. Williams (1708-1759), in order to find support against the intrigues of the Court, and lend some money perhaps for organization of a coup d'etat against the Empress Elizabeth Petrovna (b. 1709, 1741-1762). For further details, see: Sokolov, *To meet a halfway*, 258; The Correspondence of Grand Duchess Catherine Alexeyevna and the English Ambassador Charles Hanbury Williams, in the years of 1756 and 1757 (Perepiska Velikoj Knjagini Ekateriny Alekseevny i angliiskogo posla Ch. G. Yiliamsa, 1756 i 1757 godov), ed. Sergey Gorjainov (Moscow, 1909). On the whole affair, see: S. S. Konstantinova, *The Pages of History of the Anglo-Russian Relations: Charles Hanbury Williams and Russia (Stranicy istorii russko-britanskikh svjazej: Charles Ganbury Yilliams i Rossia), Voprosy istorii i politiki. Nauchnye trudy instituta biznesa i politiki. Vypusk 2* (Moscow, 2006), 6-24.

<sup>104</sup> The "Northern Accord" was conceived as an alliance which aimed to unite Britain, Prussia, Denmark and Russia against the Bourbon-Habsburg League. However, it was never realized in practice.

for three years. This mission was accomplished only in 1765, by the next Ambassador, Sir George Macartney (1737-1806)<sup>105</sup>. However, the question of entering into a political alliance has not been resolved, as the Polish question, political struggle in Sweden and the Russo-Turkish War of 1768-1774, the problems, in relation to which the positions of Britain and Russia had a tendency to disperse, became indeed confusing factors.

It was in 1768 when the Russo-Turkish War started, as Sokolov argues, catalyzed by France and Austria, which were alarmed by the Russian politics in Poland<sup>106</sup>. Though Britain officially claimed that the War was unnecessary and proposed itself as a peace mediator, it allowed Russia to use the British maritime bases in Gibraltar and Port Mahon. One can argue that the British interest in weakening of the Ottomans was that it could help to strengthen the British Levant trade<sup>107</sup>. Thus, the war, though put the partners in doubts on geopolitical scale, was currently profitable for both of them.

In June of 1772 the new British Ambassador in Russia, Sir Robert Gunning (b. 1731, 1772-1776) received instructions to enter if possible into a political alliance with Russia. The Cabinet was ready to accept even the Russian fleet in the Black Sea and, as a theoretical possibility, the autonomy of Crimea (which was factually annexed by Russian later on, in 1783)<sup>108</sup>. However, Catherine II found it necessary to seek for free entry into the Mediterranean, to get any island there and make Moldavia and

---

<sup>105</sup> See: W. F. Reddaway, "Macartney in Russia, 1765-1767", *Cambridge Historical Journal* 3, no. 3 (1931): 260-261; Sokolov, *To meet a halfway*, 260.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 266-268.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., 266-268.

<sup>108</sup> See: Matthew S. Anderson, "The Great Powers and the Russian Annexation of the Crimea, 1783-4", *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 37, no. 88 (1958): 17-41.

Wallachia autonomous. Though this broader program gave the rise of unfavorable criticism from London, the official protest was not made<sup>109</sup>.

The August of 1772 was marked by the first partition of Poland. Britain kept officially neutral, though the Polish King requested George III for support<sup>110</sup>. Some critical opinions from the British side were heard, they were mostly discussed in the private correspondence. Therefore, this action did not confuse the general line of the British politics towards Russia, mainly because any aversion to Russia meant to be united with France. While in the forthcoming conflict with the American colonies Britain was expecting the main danger from the French side<sup>111</sup>.

Furthermore, Britain and Russia kept in touch in Sweden, where they were partners in order to weaken the French influence. Thus, the allies supported the party of the so-called “Nightcaps” against the party of “Hats”. The former, amongst the other things, aimed to limit the Royal power and introduce a constitution. However, the allied politics on this issue failed. The coup d'etat of 1772, which was supported by Swedish King Gustav III and aimed to restore his absolute power, was seen by the allies as a great success of the French diplomacy<sup>112</sup>.

The reasons of such a tolerant British attitude towards the Russian geopolitical ambitions during the late 1760s- the early 1770s could be explained by a sharp political struggle, which took place in Britain itself. The current politics of George III known as “the politics of the Royal Siblings” caused a hard criticism. Then, one of the oppositionists, the radical journalist John Wilkes (1725-1797), who accused the king and his ministers of lying,

---

<sup>109</sup> See: Sokolov, *To meet a halfway*, 268-269.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 264-265.

<sup>111</sup> Anderson, *Europe in the eighteenth century*, 349-350; Sokolov, *To meet a halfway*, 265-266.

<sup>112</sup> See: Sokolov, *To meet a halfway*, 276.

was elected in the Parliament<sup>113</sup>, and, hence, could finally destabilize the already fragile political balance. Finally, in the early 1770s the Falkland crisis, which was hardly caused an Anglo-Spanish War, diverted the British view from the European theater<sup>114</sup>. After that Britain was destabilized by one of the strongest political disorders, the Constitutional Crisis of 1782-1784<sup>115</sup>. However, as Matthew Anderson remarked, “every step of Russia in Poland or towards the Black Sea approaches the day when Britain had to ask itself about the politics in the Eastern Europe. If in 1760s-1770s this day was postponed, in the late 1780s it was already impossible”<sup>116</sup>.

These latent disagreements between Britain and Russia were revealed in the midst of the 1770s, when the North American colonies rebelled, and the British requests for the Russian help against both the colonies and France collapsed. Hence, the relations between the two countries came into a difficult period. Having requested Russia for help via his new Ambassador Sir James Harris (b. 1746, 1777-1783), Lord North’ Cabinet found it quite unexpectedly that Russia took the neutral position. The diplomat even proposed to “grant” Russia Menorca Island in the Mediterranean, as Catherine II seemed to appreciate this territorial acquisition, but this proposition did not shake the Russian line concerning the American colonies<sup>117</sup>.

On the contrary, Catherine II had issued the *Declaration of Armed Neutrality* (1780) which was factually beneficial for the American colonies, and was interpreted by Britain in this way. After more than five years of residence in Russia Harris failed his mission and was recalled

---

<sup>113</sup> See: D. G. Peter, *John Wilkes, a friend of liberty* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1996), 125-141; Sokolov, *To meet a halfway*, 270.

<sup>114</sup> Sokolov, *To meet a halfway*, 271.

<sup>115</sup> For further details, see: L. G. Mitchell, *Charles James Fox* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 46-71.

<sup>116</sup> Anderson, *Britain's discovery of Russia*, 129.

<sup>117</sup> See: P. Whiteley, *Lord North: the Prime Minister who lost America* (London: Hambledon Press, 1996), 156-170; Sokolov, *To meet a halfway*, 276.

because of the “health reasons”<sup>118</sup>. However, this recession trend of the relations between Britain and Russia was not unique as it mirrored in many ways the changes which occurred in the international balance of powers.

At the same time, Britain remained interested in commercial partnership with Russia, especially as Britain and France were still rivals in these terms. In 1786 France, in contrast to Britain, managed to renovate the French-Russian trade treaty<sup>119</sup>. That is why, when the Russo-Turkish War (1787-1792) started, the British Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger (1759-1806) was against leading any military action in the region, including the reason that this time the French seemed to benefit from the Russian success.

Nevertheless, Britain lost all its patience in 1791 during the Ochakov crisis. Pitt sent an ultimatum in which he demanded from Catherine II to give to Turkey back Ochakov, which was taken by Russians, and to start peace talks. However, the Prime Minister underestimated the opposition in the Parliament and was soon enforced to refuse these claims and the ultimatum itself. The whole affair, nevertheless, could make the relations between Britain and Russia neither better nor worse, as the considerable disagreements both in the recent past and current future existed. As Anthony Cross argues, with the third partition of Poland (1795) Catherine lost the last of her friends in Britain<sup>120</sup>.

Furthermore, the pamphlet war between Britain and Russia, which continued since the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, increased again its turnover in the late 1780s. It was in 1789 when the best-known piece of anti-Russian propaganda, the pamphlet *Concerning the danger of political balance in Europe* was released. Though it is considered in the literature

---

<sup>118</sup> D. M. Griffiths, “Nikita Panin, Russian Diplomacy, and the American Revolution”, *Slavic Review* 28, no. 1 (Mar., 1969): 1-24. See also: Isabel de Madariaga, *Britain, Russia and the Armed Neutrality of 1780: Sir James Harris's mission to St. Petersburg during the American Revolution* (London, 1962).

<sup>119</sup> Kross, *U temzskikh beregov*, 27.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

be written by the French journalist Du Pen and sponsored by the Swedish King, it influenced also considerably the British attitudes towards Russia. As Poland was seen in Europe as an “eastern barrier” to the Russian geopolitical ambitions projected on the West, now the comprehensive, the all-European, campaign on the issue of the Russian danger was launched<sup>121</sup>. As a top, it was in 1797 when the pamphlet, which is today known as *The Will of Peter the Great* (the original title is *Le Testament de Pierre le Grand*) was composed, as in the Russian historiography is considered, the Polish immigrant in France M. Sokolnizky, with the assistance of Napoleon I<sup>122</sup>. According to this document, Peter “prescribed” to his successors to establish the rule of Russia over Europe and to acquire universal dominion. *The Will* also set the step-by-step “program” of actions (including partition of Poland and conquest of India), which was, as a contemporary, experienced in political terms, could figure out, already partly realized.

Finally, the late 1790s - the late 1810s were marked for Europe by the fear of a “revolutionary pandemic”, and then, of the “Napoleonic alarm”. Thus, Russia, with its huge in number army and tough mobilizing potential, though considerably discredited in the European eyes as a country, which is conservatively despotic and not so advanced in industrial terms, was, however, a quite welcome and reliable partner in this situation. A decade later and afterwards, when the 18<sup>th</sup> century Russia stepped into the past and left a space for a new one, which was introducing the liberal projects of abolition of the Russian

---

<sup>121</sup> Anderson, *Britain's discovery of Russia*, 132-134, 154.

<sup>122</sup> However, one can also find the other arguments concerning the dating of this document. Namely, there is an opinion that the excerpt of it was released in 1812, and, first time fully published in 1836. For further details, see: S. A. Mezin, “*The Stereotypes of Russia in the 18<sup>th</sup> century European social thought*” (*Stereotipy Rossii v evropeiskoj obshestvennoj mysli XVIII veka*), *Voprosy istorii*, no. 10 (2002): 154-155.

slavery (*krepostnoe pravo*), and being in the chair of *the Sacred Alliance*<sup>123</sup>, the political partnership between Britain and Russia gave gradually a place to a high-tensioned rivalry.

To draw a preliminary conclusion, we could say that the relations between Britain and Russia in the early 1760s – the late 1780s were quite ambiguous and determined by some important parameters, such as a global geopolitical ambition, current political or commercial interest, religious solidarity. At the same time, they were marked by many particular factors, for instance, by the unresolved question about military and political alliance, the project, which was never realized on the full scale.

In the period between the 1760-s – the late 1780s Britain experiences several serious political crises one by one, caused by both domestic and international factors. Let us see now how this political instability influenced the cultural scene and society.

## 2.2 The 18<sup>th</sup> century British literary world, travel writing and the authors

It was in the 18<sup>th</sup> century then the public sphere appeared as an area of social life where the main problems of a society could be identified and discussed. Since public was seen as an enlightened collectivity and all knowledge “belonged” to the enlightened public, all forms of scholarship and even *belles’ letters* came under its scrutiny<sup>124</sup>. Hence, as E. C. Spary argues, participation in the literary world was increasingly linked to participation in polite society<sup>125</sup>. In other words, if you write, you belong to a certain circle, and vice versa.

---

<sup>123</sup> The Sacred Alliance (Svjaschennyi Sojuz) is known as a conservative alliance in which Russia, Prussia and Austria entered with a goal to keep the conditions posed by the Viennese Congress (1815), namely, to preserve the monarchies, which were seen as a legitimate political order, in Europe.

<sup>124</sup> See: T. Broman, “*Periodical literature*”, in *Books and the Science in History*, ed. M. Frasca-Spada and N. Jardine (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 232.

<sup>125</sup> E. C. Spary, “*The ‘Nature’ of Enlightenment*”, in *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, ed. William Clark, Jan Giolinski and Simon Schaffer (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999), 288.

It is not by coincidence that the period of professional activity of famous writer Samuel Johnson (1709-1784) gave his name to the whole period of British literature and public life<sup>126</sup>. It was a new type of man, who stepped forward to reshape in many ways public consciousness, born in the family of non-noble origin, who got a polite education, had been intellectually working all his life and found support in the political circles. It was also Johnson who raised considerably the social prestige of writing and became a kind of “culture hero”<sup>127</sup>. Besides, his name is associated with canon-making in 18<sup>th</sup> century British literature.

Style of writing, which was considered in a comprehensible way and could be seen as “a true meaning and content in itself, the signature of imaginative genius, and even the language of unconscious or transcendental knowledge”<sup>128</sup>, become a crucial element of any proper literary work. Murray Cohen points out, the language was seen as reflecting the structures of the mind, was tied up with knowledge and logic of human reason<sup>129</sup>. A well-written book could appear as a public authority, or, in other words, to set the standards of understanding and interpretation of the reality. As Glenn J. Broadhead argues, the British authors of the 18<sup>th</sup> century were collectively performing such a function as describing an actual practice, prescribing the rules and formulating the theoretical explanation<sup>130</sup>, which could be later standardized. However, it was possible only if the morality of the author was publicly acknowledged<sup>131</sup>.

---

<sup>126</sup> See: The Cambridge History of English and American Literature, in 18 vols., ed. A. W. Ward, A. R. Waller, and the others (New-York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; Cambridge, England: University Press, 1907–21), vol. X, s.v. “The Age of Johnson” (The Bartleby Great Books online: [www.bartleby.com/cambridge](http://www.bartleby.com/cambridge), accessed 08.05.2008).

<sup>127</sup> A. Kernan, *Printing technology, letters and Samuel Johnson* (Princeton: New-Jersey, 1987), 6.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.

<sup>129</sup> Murray Cohen, *Sensible Words: Linguistic Practice in England, 1640-1785* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1977), XXIV, 7, 30.

<sup>130</sup> G. J. Broadhead, “Samuel Johnson and the rhetoric of conversation”, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 20, no. 3. Restoration and Eighteenth Century (Summer, 1980): 463.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, 195.

Travel narrative was among the fashionable forms of literary activity at the time. This genre possessed a unique characteristic, because, if to remember its origin, it combined the features of both scientific voyages, and, a consequence, had to operate with fact, with a literary form. Thus, a travel narrative was something between science and literature. However, in the course of time, the former features were gradually substituted by the latter.

The genre experienced the peak of its popularity for many reasons. First, there was the Grand Tour, the educational travel on the continent, which used to crown the learning of the upper class youth in the British society. Thus, both a young gentleman and his tutor, who was usually a person of a “middling” origin, could observe in the course of travel the areas which were considered as belonging to “common knowledge” (like foreign manners, customs and the spirit of nation)<sup>132</sup>, and, with some references to intellectual authorities, reflect in a travel account on his own experience.

Second, travel literature used both to provide a sample for the future generations and to make the corrections in the British youth’s upbringing, if the results did not fit the required standards. As Brian Dolan argues, it was the deep crisis of the Grand Tour as an educational program (1784-1803), which promoted the formation of literary, or philosophic, traveller<sup>133</sup>, and, as a consequence, increased the bias of travel account towards literature.

Third, a travel narrative allows one to moralize about human history, to draw the line between the prosperous British Isles, and, with more or less strong deviations, the rest of the world, as well as to justify the overall political course. In other words, in order to overcome the political and intellectual crises, to make sense of the shakes of the past, to reconcile the people with the uneasy present, and to highlight an optimistic future scenario, it was relevant

---

<sup>132</sup> Justin Stagl, *A history of curiosity: the theory of travel, 1550-1800* (Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995), 224.

<sup>133</sup> Dolan, *Exploring European frontiers*, 12, as well as Chapter 1.

for the Britons to bring into a public view an example of the backward Other, or the Other in troubles. For this reason the authors of travel literature were either present or future politicians, or people one way or another close the political circles.

Finally, as travel narrative was much in public demand, formation of literary market and a commercial reason came into operation, and the publishers were fighting for the box-office success of a certain account. Therefore, the reason to produce a travel narrative could belong to any area of human existence – economics, politics, social environment, and so on.

Let us move now on to the personality of Esquire Joseph Marshall and a narrative entitled *Travels through Holland, Flanders, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Lapland, Russia, the Ukraine, and Poland, in the years 1768, 1769 and 1770* (1772). Marshall describes himself as an agronomist and a landowner, who travelled with the educational goals. Nevertheless, this information does not resolve the enigma of his story.

The suspicion, that Marshall never made the trip he described, was raised immediately after the publication of his travel account. However, such a kind of allegation was quite usual for the time, and often unsupported, as with Lady Elizabeth Craven (1750-1828)<sup>134</sup>. However, the case of Marshall was indeed a special, because some outside actors were involved. In 1772, the editor of one of the literary magazines, after the publication of the review on this travel account, was somehow informed that “there is no such a traveler” as Marshall. Nevertheless, the famous London bookseller and publisher of *Travels*, John Almon (1737-1805), who was often found involved in a risky business and was supposed to be in direct touch with the author, hurried to reassure Marshall’s personality. He provided some facts of his biography, though not very detailed and impossible to verify at the moment. The

---

<sup>134</sup> Anthony G. Cross, “The Armchair Traveler “in” Catherine’s Russia”, in *Rossiiia, Zapad, Vostok: vstrechnye techeniia*, ed. V. Bagno (St. Petersburg, 1996), 320.

following April, when the second edition of Marshall's travels was prepared to outcome, *Gentleman's Magazine* announced the death of the author<sup>135</sup>. It is exactly the bond between these two points which enables Cross to conclude that the whole story was nothing else but a commercial trick, because the income of the publisher strongly depended on the fact that this travel account was real<sup>136</sup>. Therefore, the value of information provided by any travel account was still associated in the British society in general and among the publishers in particular with its authenticity. In other words, a travel account had commercial success mostly when it pretended to be a real one, which means that the reader expected to get first-hand information.

Nevertheless, this story caused an ongoing debate among scholars on the personality of Marshall, namely, around the question whether he was a true or philosophic traveller. On the one hand, there is a strong tradition to classify him among the former. Thus, Matthew S. Anderson in his famous book *Britain's Discovery of Russia* approaches Marshall's travelogue as authentic<sup>137</sup>. Furthermore, Peter Putnam argues that Esquire was "an unknown author" who made his travels at the time when Sir George McCartney (1737-1806) was appointed Ambassador to the Russian Court (1764-1767) and wrote and published his travel account later on<sup>138</sup>. In contrast to Putnam's dating, Larry Wolff points out, that Marshall stayed in Russia between 1768 and 1772<sup>139</sup>. Finally, Brian Dolan argues that the identification of Marshall as a fictitious traveller was a mere "suspicion"<sup>140</sup>. Furthermore, it is possible that Marshall visited some of the countries which the title of his travel

---

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., 317-318.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 318.

<sup>137</sup> Anderson, *Britain's Discovery of Russia*, 100-101.

<sup>138</sup> Peter Putnam, ed., *Seven Britons in Imperial Russia 1698-1812* (Princeton: New-Jersey, 1952), XXIV.

<sup>139</sup> Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe*, 81.

<sup>140</sup> Dolan, *Exploring European frontiers*, 81, 196n.

account indicated. For instance, Niles Jacobsen and Ruth Jensen argue that Marshall travelled through the Netherlands in 1768<sup>141</sup>.

On the other hand, Marshall is also identified as a philosophic traveller. Both the Soviet literary critic M. P. Alexeyev (1896-1981) and the British historian Anthony G. Cross brought the most forcible arguments on the issue. Alexeyev's position is mostly based upon the evidence by another British traveller, John Parkinson<sup>142</sup>. At the same time, the linguist, following German scholar Helmyt Anton (1936), argues that Joseph Marshall was a pseudonym of a fruitful British author and journalist John (in another version, George) Hill, who passed away in 1775<sup>143</sup>. This version looks highly convincing, especially when compared with personal data of John Hill (c. 1716-1775), a pharmacist, who travelled over Britain in search of herbs, then became a writer and was permanently attacked in the British periodicals by many authors, including Henry Fielding, for plagiarism<sup>144</sup>.

In addition, Anthony G. Cross, the best known student of eighteenth-century relationships between Britain and Russia, went through a gradual evolution of views on the point. Thus, in the article published in 1975 in Russian, the historian treats Marshall among the other British travellers without distinction of any kind<sup>145</sup>. However, in the English version

---

<sup>141</sup> See: Antiqbook: De Europese site voor antiquarische en tweedehands boeken / Translated from Dutch by Sara Zorandy. Accessed May 6, 2008 (<http://www.antiqbook.nl/boox/steu/15577.shtml>). See also: Niles Jacobsen and Ruth Helkiaer Jensen, eds., *Denmark. Some contributions to the geography of Denmark and other topics discussed by Copenhagen geographers*. 22nd International Geographical Congress, Canada, 1972. Collected papers 4 (N.p., Det Kongelige Danske Geografiske Selskab, 1972), 153.

<sup>142</sup> Parkinson argues that when being in Stockholm he had heard some "remarkable stories" about Marshall, who had never visited the continent, but published his travel account. See: M. P. Alexeyev, *Russko-angliiskie literaturnye svjazi (XVIII – pervaja polovina XIX veka)*. Literaturnoe nasledstvo 91 (Moskva, 1982), 175; See also: John Parkinson, *A Tour of Russia, Siberia, and the Crimea, 1792-1794*, ed. by William Collier (London: Frank Cass, 1971), II.

<sup>143</sup> Anderson, *Britain's discovery of Russia*, 175n; Cross, *The Armchair Traveler*, 318.

<sup>144</sup> See: Hill John // Encyclopedia Britannica online, accessed 08.05.2008 ([http://jcsn.org/StudyCenter/Encyclopedia\\_Britannica/HIG\\_HOR/HILL\\_JOHN\\_c\\_1716\\_1775\\_.html](http://jcsn.org/StudyCenter/Encyclopedia_Britannica/HIG_HOR/HILL_JOHN_c_1716_1775_.html)).

<sup>145</sup> Anthony G. Cross, "Zamechanija" sira Johna Sinklera o Rossii", in *XVIII vek*, sbornik 10 (Leningrad, 1975), 161.

of this article released in 1993 Marshall's name was left out<sup>146</sup>. Furthermore, in the latest works, such as *Anglophilia at the throne* (1992), a special article on the issue (1996) and *By the Banks of the Neva* (1997), Cross, on the basis of the evidence provided by the *Monthly Review* and the *Annual Register* (both for 1772), already labels Marshall as an "armchair traveller" and the whole story "a mystification on a grand scale"<sup>147</sup>.

What is also remarkable the circumstances under which the travel narrative by Marshall appeared once more. It was in 1792 when an excerpt of it was released augmented with the first French edition of another travel account, by a young Scot Andrew Swinton<sup>148</sup>. Swinton during his lifetime also happened more than once to be accused of plagiarism<sup>149</sup>. In addition, Swinton sometimes appears in the literature in the context similar to that of Marshall: as a certain Esquire, a little known traveller, who was also "highly suspect"<sup>150</sup>.

No less interesting, but much more traditional figure for the 18<sup>th</sup> century British social landscape was William Richardson (1743-1814), a literary scholar, humanist and moralist. Being born son of parish minister of Scottish origin, he saw his identity as an important parameter and subsequently reflected on it in his travel account<sup>151</sup>. Richardson was a

<sup>146</sup> See: Anthony G. Cross, *Anglo-Russica: aspects of cultural relations between Great Britain and Russia in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries* (Oxford: Berg, 1993), 51-61.

<sup>147</sup> Anthony G. Cross, ed., *Anglophilia u trona. Britanzy i russkie v vek Ekateriny II*, katalog vystavky (London, 1992), 103; Anthony G. Cross, "By the banks of the Neva": chapters from the lives and careers of the British in eighteenth-century Russia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 385-386.

<sup>148</sup> Andrew Swinton, *Travels into Norway, Denmark and Russia in the years 1788, 1789, 1790, and 1791* (London, 1792). The first edition in French was released in 1798.

<sup>149</sup> See: web-site of International League of Antiquarian Booksellers (ILAB): [http://www.ilab.org/db/book1293\\_B315966.html](http://www.ilab.org/db/book1293_B315966.html); accessed 08.05.2008; Alexeyev, *Russko-angliiskie literatymye svyazi*, 129; Cross, *By the banks of the Neva*, 386.

<sup>150</sup> Anthony G. Cross, ed., *Russia under western eyes, 1517-1825* (London, 1971), 388; Ibid., "By the Banks of the Neva", 384; Ibid., "British Awareness of Russian culture", in *Anglo-Russica*, 47; Cross, *U temzskikh beregov*, 180-181.

<sup>151</sup> For instance, it is not by coincidence that Richardson travelled to Russia by the ship, called *Tweed* in honor of the river in Scotland. See: William Richardson, *Anecdotes of the Russian empire in a series of letters, written a few years ago, from St. Petersburg* (London, 1784), 11.

graduate of Glasgow University (1757-1763), where he was prepared to become a theologian, and was considered as a person with a strong academic background.

It was in 1766 when he was employed as a tutor of the sons of Lord Charles S. Cathcart (1721-1776). Later on, when the Lord was appointed Ambassador to the Russian Court (1768-1772), Richardson was so efficient in combining these functions with the duty of personal secretary, what he had enjoyed the patronage of his master after the Cathcart family' return to Britain. Though the patronage system in 18<sup>th</sup> century England evolved into a unique and enough vague mixture of many enterprises, such as a commercial venture, private beneficence, and public or audience support<sup>152</sup>, Richardson had profited at least in two senses. On the one hand, he occupied both a professor of humanities' position and a chair in Glasgow University (1773-1814), where he became famous as a student of Shakespeare's literary heritage<sup>153</sup>. On the other hand, Richardson published a travel narrative entitled *Anecdotes of the Russian empire in a series of letters, written a few years ago, from St. Petersburg* (1784), with a polite dedication to his patron. It became very popular and was soon translated into Dutch, French and German<sup>154</sup>.

Finally, the last travel account we focus on in the current thesis, was produced by Sir John Sinclair of Ulbster, Bart (1754-1835), a politician and an agricultural "improver". Sinclair was the third but the only surviving son of an ancient family of Scottish origin. He was educated at the universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, where he was guided by Adam Smith, and Oxford, where he got a legal studies degree, a traditional education of the British gentry. Nevertheless, he preferred to start a parliamentary career rather than to practice as a

---

<sup>152</sup> See: P. J. Korshin, "Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage", *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 7, no. 4 (Summer, 1974), 473.

<sup>153</sup> Despite this fact, his name was almost forgotten twenty years after his death. See: H. J. Pitcher, "William Richardson's *Anecdotes of the Russian Empire* (1784)", *Forum for modern languages studies* III, no. 1 (January 1967), 236.

<sup>154</sup> See: Putnam, *Seven Britons in Imperial Russia*, XXIV; Cross, *Russia under western eyes*, 208.

lawyer, and became a M.P. for three times (in 1780, 1802 and 1807). In addition, in 1810, in a crucial moment for the British monarchy, when George III was secluded for the health reasons and replaced by a regent, Sinclair was appointed a Privy Councilor, or, a member of the committee of royal advisors<sup>155</sup>. Therefore, he appears as a highly experienced politician.

Furthermore, in his later years, after he found himself pursuing the art of agriculture, Sinclair happened to be an influential social activist. To be more precise, he became a fellow of the most continental societies for agricultural improvement<sup>156</sup>. Moreover, he supervised the first successful encyclopedic project among the others of that kind, *Statistical Account of Scotland* in 21 volumes (1791-1799). The last enterprise is remembered as a quite innovative one, as the team employed for the first time in English the word *statistics* and a comprehensive geographical survey of the country.

It is necessary to mention that Sinclair's travel to the continent, or, as Brian Dolan labels it, “a whirl-wind tour”<sup>157</sup>, happened under remarkable circumstances, during a seven-month parliament recess (1786-1787). In this short term the politician managed to visit France, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Russia (where he stayed for one month), Poland, Austria and Prussia. In some of these countries, equipped with more than a hundred letters of recommendation, he had personal interviews with the crowned heads, including Catherine the Great. Thus, the travel resulted in a privately printed pamphlet *General Observations regarding the Present State of the Russian Empire* (1787)<sup>158</sup>, which was addressed to the selected audience of Sinclair's colleagues, and, for

---

<sup>155</sup> Obituary: Rt. Hon. Sir John Sinclair, *The Gentleman's Magazine*, ed. Silvanus Urban, Gent. Vol. V. New series. (London, 1836, January to June): 431-432. Accessed May 6, 2008 ([http://books.google.com/books?id=26Lsr2E-i\\_sC&pg=RA1-PA431&dq=Correspondence+of+the+Right+Hon.+Sir+%22John+Sinclair%22,+Bart&ei=r6X2R\\_3AOoKWzASC38SWCg](http://books.google.com/books?id=26Lsr2E-i_sC&pg=RA1-PA431&dq=Correspondence+of+the+Right+Hon.+Sir+%22John+Sinclair%22,+Bart&ei=r6X2R_3AOoKWzASC38SWCg)).

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Dolan, *Exploring the European frontiers*, 81.

<sup>158</sup> The authorship was proved by M. S. Anderson in 1958. See: Anderson, *Britain's discovery of Russia*, 151.

this reason, was passed over by the British press. In addition, the author managed to hide the text, which could be acknowledged as scandalous, but not the map of his travel, which was widely distributed, from his Russian acquaintances (for instance, from Princess E. R. Dashkoff, Prince G. A. Potemkin, etc.)<sup>159</sup>. However, in 1835, shortly before his death, Sinclair published his two-volume correspondence, which also contained the considerably revised materials of *General Observations*<sup>160</sup>.

In retrospect, the overall environment, as well as the particular circumstances under which the three travel narratives appear, was indeed ambiguous. It seems that the image of Russia as such could be considerably influenced by many factors, including the political context of the relations between Britain and Russia, the challenging agendas behind the British society at the time and the personal background of the travel writers. The authors, among whom at least two had a close bond with political circles, seemed to be able to accomplish this hard labor, to construct the proper image of the Russian Other in order to highlight the advantages of the British Self and to reconcile the existing problems with the public which had to believe in positive future scenarios.

---

<sup>159</sup> See: Cross, “Zamechanija” Sira Johna Sinklera, 160.

<sup>160</sup> See: John Sinclair, *The Correspondence of the Right Honorable Sir John Sinclair, Bart. With Reminiscences of the Most Distinguished Characters Who Have Appeared in Great Britain, and in Foreign Countries, During the Last Fifty Years*, in 2 vols. (London: H. Colburn & R. Bentley, 1831); Cross, “Zamechanija”, 165.

### Chapter III. Shaping the discourse of Russia as discourse of the Other: vocabularies and languages

*Language is an engine to be used as the poet pleases.*

William Richardson.

*To know language is to know the things which may be done with it.*

J. G. A. Pocock

The third chapter examines vocabularies, languages, as well as rhetorical and stylistic modes of expression and argumentation which were used by three British authors in order to construct a certain image of Russia as the Other.

Let us say a couple of words in order to designate both a theoretical framework and a methodological strategy which would answer the purposes. First of all, it is necessary to introduce the working definition of the term “discourse” as it is a very debatable and complex notion. We will adopt the term coined by Geoffrey Leech and Michael Short (1997) who understand it as a “linguistic communication, the codified message for the audience, as written as well spoken” (1992)<sup>161</sup>. Furthermore, the approach is based upon a new theory of language, which investigates the relationship between language, as a tool for the social construction of meaning, and the overall context it operates in.

One may conditionally identify two levels of the chapter. One of them, which employs the Cambridge school method of contextual reading and analysis<sup>162</sup>, examines the content of the vocabularies. We will assume that the discourse of the Other consists of some interconnected segments, and each of them combines a group of concepts. In the course of analysis every concept would be separately scrutinized and connoted if possible

---

<sup>161</sup> Quoted in: Sara Mills, *Discourse* (New-York: Routledge, 1997), 3.

<sup>162</sup> For further details, see: Pocock, *Politics, language, and time*.

with the others. As one concept could belong to several segments, it would be reflected on for a few times.

Another level of the chapter examines the rhetoric structures of travel narratives, the tropes and the techniques of Othering which were used in. We will seek to uncover three approaches to the construction of the Image of Russia which are conditionally identified as *scientific* (by Joseph Marshall), *journalistic* (by William Richardson) and *political* (by John Sinclair) styles of writing.

It is necessary to remark that the language of self-representation, which was developed and more or less commonly acknowledged in England before the civil wars (1642-1651) and Glorious Revolution of 1688<sup>163</sup>, did not withstand the test of time. Its values seemed to be considerably worn in the destructive public discord. Thus, to the last decades of the 17<sup>th</sup> century the importance of relationships between rhetoric and political representation was fully recognized by the most influential British thinkers, Hobbes, Sprat and Locke. Each of them dismissed the use of figurative language as, they claim, it could distort reality, move the passions and thereby mislead the overall judgment<sup>164</sup>. Nevertheless, to the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century rhetoric, as a means of public communication and institutionalization of politics, was reassessed and effectively re-employed in order to play a new role in the British society. The deep and crucial changes which reshaped beyond recognition the face of the

---

<sup>163</sup> It's most important elements were the divine right of Kings, natural law, patriachalism, as well as non-resistance against the power. Some of them were incorporated in the Whig ideology of order of 1680s, and later on in the conservative Hanoverian, labeled by in history as "Whig". See: J. P. Sommerville, *Royalists and patriots: politics and ideology in England, 1603-1640*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1999), X, 27, 38-39; H. T. Dickinson, *Liberty and property: political ideology in eighteenth-century Britain* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977), 13, 26, 33, 57-58, 67-68.

<sup>164</sup> See: Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651), ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 35; Thomas Sprat, *The History of the Royal Society of London for the Improving of Natural Knowledge* (1667), in M. Pera, *The Discourses of Science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 130; John Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1689), vol. II. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), 146.

Anglophone community during the long eighteenth century<sup>165</sup> had to be publicly introduced, strengthened and justified.

In order to analyze the British discourse of the Other it is necessary to fix vocabularies and identify the groups of concepts in relation to the issues of progress and modernization, national character, geography, freedom and slavery, as well as of power<sup>166</sup>.

### 3.1 The concept of Progress versus the concept of Backwardness

One of the most important ideas in the Age of the Enlightenment was the idea of *progress and modernization*, which appears in the travelogues as *versus* the idea of *backwardness*. It is obvious that nations, when seen in a hierarchic system, occupy a place which is better or worse in comparison with the others. From the first lines of travel narratives we know that the Russian people are allocated on a lower stage than “the other nations of Europe”, including Britons, or, in other words, less advanced *in terms of progress*<sup>167</sup>.

*Progress* as seen by the British authors indicates the level of *improvement*, or *advancement*, of a nation. In addition, *improvement* has its antithesis, which is *corruption*. *Improvement* contains ideally some essential characteristics. First of all, it is exactly the “*pretension to improvement*” which distinguishes “the nations in the west of Europe”<sup>168</sup>, and, thus, is an essential characteristic of the European Self. This *propensity* for advance is a quality which is, in opinion of the Britons, desirable for, but, as they argue, possessed and performed not by every people. Hence, not all the nations, the authors stress, are in the same *state* of advancement. Therefore, in this context improvement is a state, a condition. As we saw, the notion of *improvement* is a relevant rhetoric tool for

<sup>165</sup> The term was explained in the first chapter, p. 20, 41n.

<sup>166</sup> For detailed graphical representation of the British discourse of the Other see *Appendix B*.

<sup>167</sup> For example, see: John Sinclair, *General Observation*, 4.

<sup>168</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 374-375.

demarcation the Self and the Other. Besides, it is an effective starting point for the creation of hierarchy of the peoples.

Moreover, *improvement*, which is sometimes understood as a *process*, interplays with *time*. For instance, Richardson points out that in early times Russia was “in a more improved state than its [neighbors]”; at present, the authors show, its improvement, as put side by side with the British, is “in an infant state”<sup>169</sup>. Though the argumentation is based upon the hardly comparable, in terms of time and geography, objects, but what outcomes for a reader from this metaphor is that progress is principally *reversible* and even, in the Russian case, it could be reduced to *regress*, which has an obviously negative connotation. For instance, Richardson mentions that “only Catherine and Peter made effort to resemble [Russia] to other European states, but it could again return to its former oriental condition”<sup>170</sup>. However, according to his idea, as well as to that by some of his influential contemporaries, a proper improvement is non-reversible, immense, and *permanent*<sup>171</sup>.

The authors argue that not all the improvements cause the same *effect*. Thus, looking from the perspective of their general outcomes for England and France, the civil wars are interpreted by the authors as *an improvement*, because they produced the result “much better than that on the frontiers of Russia”. As for the former wars “re-established the public affairs and super-eminent abilities”, while for the latter they are just turned into a “dreadful warfare”<sup>172</sup>.

Nevertheless, Richardson does not explain that are the reasons of such a difference. In order to establish connections between *an improvement*, as well as its

---

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., 378, 260.

<sup>170</sup> Here the idea of the Orient is correlated with the notion of backwardness. See: Ibid., 372.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 372, 324. For example, see also a work by radical philosopher William Godwin (1756-1836): William Godwin, *Enquiry concerning political justice, 1793*, in William Godwin, *Enquiry concerning political justice: with selections from Goldwin's other writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 19, 132.

<sup>172</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 73-74.

inhibitors and transformers, let us address now Godwin, who identifies two *barriers* to improvement of humanity, namely, *climate* and *luxury* <sup>173</sup>. Both notions are present on a permanent basis in the three travelogues. However, the idea of luxury is applied as relating not only to everyday life culture of the Russian nobles, but also to the institution of the Orthodox Church<sup>174</sup>. Therefore, the Church, which was ideally seen as an enlightener and improver for both individuals and the nation as a whole, rolls into luxury and, hence, prevents Russia from improvement and progress on both levels. Consequently, the Orthodox Church was seen as a barrier of improvement.

Furthermore, *an improvement* is seen by the British authors as being strongly tied up with a notion of *culture*. Marshall, who uses the term *improvement* mainly in the context of his inquiry of the state of agriculture, correlates *improvement* with the *cultivation* of land and agriculture<sup>175</sup>, which are opposed to the state of *nature*.

The notion of *culture* is quite poly-semantic and comprehensive. First, belonging to culture means to possess certain *knowledge*, either theoretical or practical. It is remarkable that the authors consider religion as a type of knowledge, which is, if religion is acknowledged as *true*, tied up with the issue of *superiority*. Thus, according to Richardson, it is just “in some states of Europe” where men “enjoy the means of superior [religious] knowledge”<sup>176</sup>. Besides, as he argues, in order to be true, knowledge has to be of certain quality, namely, of *an essence*, and not that of a *form*<sup>177</sup>.

Finally, knowledge is connected with *education* and relationships between a *master* and an *apprentice*<sup>178</sup>. Thus, the British authors develop the whole spectrum of rhetoric about the Russian apprenticeship, from a seemingly neutral word choice like “*borrowing*

---

<sup>173</sup> See: Godwin, *Enquiry*, 60.

<sup>174</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 16-17, 59, 63-64; Sinclair, *General Observations*, 4, 49.

<sup>175</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, Vol. 3; 117, 126.

<sup>176</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 225.

<sup>177</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 62, 110.

<sup>178</sup> As Iver Neumann points out, the Eastern Europe was seen by the European travellers as “a permanent apprentice” of the West. See: Neumann, *Uses of the other*, 77-79.

of knowledge, assistance”, “*adoption* of principles and institutions” up to high-tense lexicon as “the [Russian] *lust* of acquisition”. This propensity for knowledge was, with a slight anxiety, compared by Sinclair with famous tactics of the Roman Empire to borrow from their neighbors “every useful institution”, and then turn this knowledge against them.

Besides, in order to represent his subject in a more distinct way, Sinclair employs to it metaphors like “an ape on the back of a tiger”<sup>179</sup>. It relieves such a quality of a “Russian” ape as imitativeness and weakness in contrast to the courage and strength of a “British” tiger. Again, such a parameter, as *essence* and *measure* here matter, as the Russian people are often criticized in the travelogues for their immoderate and unscrupulous acceptance of the European fashion. Richardson also tells his reader two allegoric fables. One of them is about a horse, which asked God to improve its look but was horrified by a perspective to be improved to such a degree as to become another species, a camel. Hence, the horse refused the idea of becoming more beautiful. Another fable, which is also quite symbolic, is about a female goat which wanted to have horns, but, being too stubborn, God granted her by both horns and a beard which she did not initially want<sup>180</sup>. There was no need for a reader to be so acute to recognize in these stories both the curious Other and the superior, even divine, Self<sup>181</sup>.

In addition, if we look closer at the reflections of the British authors concerning who are the manager of an improvement and its agent, it is obvious that *an improvement* is somehow attached to the ideas of *political power* and *national character*.

Therefore, the segment of vocabularies which combines the notions relating to *progress* and *backwardness* is mainly based upon the notion of *improvement*, which is

---

<sup>179</sup> Sinclair, *General Observations*, 15, 5; Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 36, 70.

<sup>180</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 98-100.

<sup>181</sup> For the other examples of the Britons as chosen and divinely predetermined nation, see: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 9.

analyzed by the authors through the ideas of time, limitation and result. It is used as one of the main coordinates which helps to allocate the peoples on the time and progress scale, as well as to give some general grounds to address why a certain status is given to a certain nation. Besides, as we could see, the British authors identify two types of progress, for individuals particularly and for society in general, where one determines the other.

### 3.2 The concept of National Character

Now let us move on the segment of vocabularies on the Other representing the idea of *national character*. It is generally described in the narratives in terms of *civility* versus *barbarism*. As Robert J. Mayhew argues, rhetoric of civility was a very important and innovative part of the British discourse of the Other in the 1770s, because it was employed for justification of the politics of the British Empire after the loss of the American colonies<sup>182</sup>.

It was a common sense in the British literature that in the 18<sup>th</sup> century “the Russian people are just emerging from barbarity” and has yet “no proper civility”<sup>183</sup>. In order to understand the connotations of the idea of *barbarity*, let us start from this notion employed in relation to the Fins.

In the first lines of his work, Richardson describes an accident which took place in the Finnish Gulf with the ship which he travelled by. The ship called for assistance. However, these lands, as the voyager expected, were barbarous, or peopled by certain, not *clearly known*, barbarous Fins, who “were hardly subject to either power” and “might prove no less *formidable* than the Gulf itself” with its dangerous *underwater* rocks (My italics). The rocks among which an experienced British captain could not manage to

<sup>182</sup> See: Mayhew, *Enlightenment geography*, 254.

<sup>183</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3, 140, 149.

navigate<sup>184</sup>. When a few Fins, finally, appear, they were for a long time “seemed afraid to approaching us”, and, then, “were very happy in being allowed to pick up the casks floating upon the water”, which the ship thrown down before. While the chief person of these Fins was very glad to get from a seaman “an old laced hat”<sup>185</sup>. The author employs here, so to say, the classical image of a barbarian from an unknown island, ascending to the tradition of famous novel, *Robinson Crusoe* (first published in 1719), who is afraid of differently looking strangers, skillful in an indigenous craft, unfamiliar with western comfort, can not recognize a proper value of things, and perhaps lives in a tribe without any allusion of well-developed social or political organization.

Nevertheless, *barbarity* of the ordinary Russian people, as seen by the British authors, was quite different. To be more precise, the Russians as seen by the authors are “obedient and very patient”, like slaves, but sometimes “active and loosened”. The last quality, in Marshall’s opinion, needs “to be tamed”<sup>186</sup>, or in other words, *barbarians* need to be ruled in a special, *corrective* way, than a civilized nation. Therefore, national character is tied up with the idea of *power*.

On the contrary, being *civilized* means to possess knowledge of arts such as commerce or husbandry which are *useful* for both community and government<sup>187</sup>. Furthermore, a civilized person certainly has a good *sense of taste*, which means that the things which you deal with should be properly apprehended or displayed<sup>188</sup> in a way which is not basically disputable. The standard of taste as seen by the Britons is correlated

---

<sup>184</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 8.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-12.

<sup>186</sup> See: Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 140.

<sup>187</sup> See: Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 169; Sinclair, *General Observations*, 42-43.

<sup>188</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 15, 33; Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 245.

with such a parameter as *measure, proportion* and *elegance*<sup>189</sup>, the qualities, which can be found in nature<sup>190</sup>.

In the late 1760s, it was a time when many British philosophers elaborated on the rhetoric of aesthetics, which had indeed a comprehensive character<sup>191</sup>. For instance, in his *Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* Burke develops a discursive intersection between philosophy, politics and economic. The author, starting from the ideas of *pain* and *pleasure*, ties them up with human capability to cognize them in a proper way, and to evaluate them in terms of *taste*. Then, Burke proceeds to the factors, which, in his opinion, defines and develops taste. To be more precise, in order to develop taste people exploit their organs of perception, imagination and natural sensibility. However, these qualities belong mainly to free people and are blocked if the people are oppressed, because pain and fear danger the aesthetics<sup>192</sup>. Therefore, as the aesthetic perception of an individual is influenced by his social status, *taste* as an aesthetic category is attached to the ideas of liberty and slavery.

In addition, a very important mark of *civility* is the *morality* of the individuals, their *sentiments*. The latter is considered by the authors as an indicator of “difference between a slave and a free native” and the compass of human *happiness*<sup>193</sup>. Thus, Richardson argues that the Russian people are deprived in terms of sentiment. He stresses that

---

<sup>189</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 218; Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 110.

<sup>190</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 69. The connection between taste and nature was established by Hume who argued that “nature is a standard of out judgment”. See: David Hume, *An Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (1751), in *Hume's ethical writings: selections from David Hume*, ed. Alasdair MacIntyre (Notre Dame, [Ind.]: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965), 24-25, 275.

<sup>191</sup> For example, see: Edmund Burke, *A philosophical enquiry into the origin of our ideas of the sublime and beautiful* (1757), in *Edmund Burke*, ed. Adam Phillips (Oxford [England]: Oxford University Press, 1990 (1992 printing); David Hume, *On the Standard of Taste* (1757), in *David Hume, A treatise of human nature*, ed. David F. Norton, Mary J. Norton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), Essay XXIII. See also: Tom Furniss, *Edmund Burke's aesthetic ideology: language, gender, and political economy in revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

<sup>192</sup> See: Burke, *A Philosophical enquiry*, 17, 26, 33-37, 77, 233-234, 26.

<sup>193</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 197; See: David Hume, *An Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, in *Hume's ethical writings: selections from David Hume*, ed. Alasdair MacIntyre (Notre Dame, [Ind.]: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965), 276; Godwin, *Enquiry*, 143.

they are “a little better than *savages*”, as they *survived* from their nonage neither being “*humanized* by tender [paternal or filial] affection”. Moreover, as the common people have no *right of choice* of wife/husband and obeyed to that of their master, they do not usually have mutual affection, no *virtue* of fidelity, as well as much *care* about children. As we can see here, the authors develop the idea that the social status of an individual determines his/her morality.

The Britons indicate some reasons to ground their considerations related to sentiment. First, they argue that the Russian people are not civilized, because they are psychologically prepared for life neither by human *experience*, nor “opinions favorable to mankind”, transmitted usually either with a proper *education*, or with true religion<sup>194</sup>. Second, they stress the relevance of social status. As Richardson points out, “slave [as well as a people overwhelmed by oppression] has not in his breast one sentiment of humanity, but hatred and deep revenge”<sup>195</sup>. Hence, it seems that in terms of sentiments both a *barbarian* and a *savage* have similar characteristics and relate closely to the moral state of a *slave*. Consequently, he has no idea of happiness and could not be happy.

One of the most frequent notions is the notion of *superstition*. Superstition has basically two connotations; namely, a blind believe in dogma, or an unreasoning fear of something which is unknown<sup>196</sup>. *Superstition* is seen as a mark of irrational, un-thoughtful behavior, which was attributed by the Britons to a *beast*, and, therefore, to *nature*. In addition, *superstition* is represented in travelogues versus *reason*, rationality, strength<sup>197</sup>, which belongs to the advanced development of mind of the “enlightened” nations, namely, to the Europeans. What is wrong with superstition in social terms is that the

<sup>194</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 337-338.

<sup>195</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 199, 215, 240-241.

<sup>196</sup> See: Ibid., 15-16, 65. As the Russians do not usually possess a proper knowledge (see the current chapter, pp. 62-63), their sense of fear appears to a reader as something regular.

<sup>197</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 244. Dickinson argues that the rhetoric of reason was arguments developed by Whigs against Filmerian divine pre-ordain See: Dickinson, *Liberty and property*, 61.

sense of fear, as the Britons argue, could not regulate society and establish proper rules of conduct. Basically, the British authors point out that superstition *corrupts* human nature in general and certain societies in particular.

Furthermore, an important word in relation to *reason* is the notion of *interest*. This idea is basically means that a person, in order to improve either his/her own condition or general condition of society, has to be interested in, to see the reason for improvement<sup>198</sup>.

David Johnston points out that the rhetorical tradition of location of reason versus superstition is a very old part of British public discourse and was developed by Hobbes in *Leviathan* (1651)<sup>199</sup>. In addition, this issue was also developed by the British poet Alexander Pope (1688-1744), who in his influential work *An Essay on Man* (circa 1733) delineated the idea that some societies are based on the sense of fear<sup>200</sup>. The innovation here relied on the fact that this rhetoric was employed in the travelogues in another context, in relation to the discourse of the Other.

The British authors used also the concept of *honor* for demarcating the Self and the Other. When analyzing the absence of duels from the 18<sup>th</sup> century Russian tradition, Richardson suggests that the institution of duel, which aims to vindicate honor, is missing not because Russians do not have conflicts, but because they do not strive for the defense of honor. Therefore, the Russians have no sense of honor in the British sense or at all. However, he remarks, duels were absent not only from the Russian tradition, but also from that of “the Roman, Greeks, Jews, Persians and any people of antiquity; or even among the moderns, if we except the Europeans”<sup>201</sup>. Hence, the sense of honor is an

---

<sup>198</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 252-253.

<sup>199</sup> David Johnston, *The rhetoric of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes and the politics of cultural transformation* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989), 92, 101.

<sup>200</sup> Compare with Pope: “Great Nature spoke; observant Men obeyed; / Cities were built, Societies were made: / Here rose one little state: another near / Grew by like means, and joined, through love or fear. / ...Converse and Love mankind might strongly draw, / When Love was Liberty, and Nature Law”. See: Alexander Pope, *An Essay on Man*, ed. Frank Brady (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965), 36.

<sup>201</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 380-381.

element used by the authors not only in the Russian discourse, but also in the discourse of the Other in general.

The idea of honor generates the analysis of another quality of the Russian national character in the travel narratives, namely, of the issue of *inconsistency*, or irrational behavior, without any “fixed principles” of life. This inconsistency, which has in the travelogues clearly negative connotation, is caused, as Richardson shows, by the fact that the Russians behave in the same situation in different ways, as, for instance, in the case with vindication of honor where they could pay or not to pay attention towards its defense<sup>202</sup>.

Therefore, the idea of national character is employed by the Britons in order to uncover, in contrast to that of the Russians, the notion of Europeanness in general and the sense of Britishness in particular. As we could see, the Europeans, as civilized persons, are distinguished by rationality, steadiness, firmness of mind and fixed principles to live and act by.

One of the most interesting issues addressed in the travel narratives is the problem of *patriotism*, which was very important for the Britons. As Griffin suggested, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century the public debate about patriotism, which was caused by domestic and international reasons, including the Union with Scotland of 1707 and the Jacobite rebellion of 1745, was more or less continuous. Thus, it was in 1749 when the sermon concerning the idea of true patriotism was preached before the House of Commons, and during the ceremonial of accession of George III (1760) when he proclaimed that he was born and bred a Briton, and “a patriot King”<sup>203</sup>.

It is necessary to stress that the idea of patriotism went through a radical evolution. The majority of the students of patriotism share the view that its rhetoric

<sup>202</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 217, as well as 59-61, 245-247, 249.

<sup>203</sup> See: Dustin Griffin, *Patriotism and poetry in eighteenth-century Britain* (Cambridge, U.K.; New-York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 9, 292, 22, 20. See also: Colley, *Britons*.

originates from the Tory political resistance against Walpolean corruption in the 1730s, and was headed by Viscount Henry Bolingbroke (1678-1751), the author of *The Idea of a Patriot King* (1738, published 1749)<sup>204</sup>. Though Bolingbroke was far from being alone in his patriotic reflections, he touches upon an issue, which is very important for our analysis of the discourse of the Other. He argues that as patriotism should be founded on the great principles and supported by great virtues, patriotic people have to wish to be free<sup>205</sup>.

However, the problem of patriotism got a new dimension in the 1740s, when a debate which aimed to distinguish among “modern”, “false” and “real” types of patriotism was launched. In the 1770s, when the American War for Independence started, the opponents shared two different views. There were those who understood the idea of patriotism in the “narrow” sense, and were against the independence of America arguing that this land is the British heritage and should be kept in this quality. Others, in turn, pointed out that the colonialism undermines the core principle of the British spirit, liberty. Hence, to keep America further as a colony means to destroy the British constitution. Finally, there were some people, who, like Oliver Goldsmith, hesitated to join any group, because he doubted if the idealized Britain ever existed<sup>206</sup>.

Moreover, through the 1740s-1780-s the content of the idea of patriotism was also changed. It was bishop of Gloucester William Warburton (1698-1779) who defined in the late 1740s the modern patriotism in a traditional way as “Love of Our country”<sup>207</sup>. In the 1770s, when hated by many others British radical journalist John Wilkes (1725-1797) raised a patriot banner, another influential journalist and publisher, Samuel Johnson

<sup>204</sup> See: During, *Literature – Nationalism’s other*, 140-141; Griffin, *Patriotism and poetry*, 120.

<sup>205</sup> Henry St. J. Bolingbroke, *Political writings*, ed. I. Kramnick (New-York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), 234.

<sup>206</sup> See: Griffin, *Patriotism and poetry*, 205, 218.

<sup>207</sup> William Warburton, *A letter to the editor of the letters on the spirit of patriotism, &c. (1749)*, (Jr. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1978), 21.

(1709-1784) gave in his 1773 edition of dictionary the definition of a patriot as “a factious disturber of the government”. Finally, the British politician Vicesimus Knox (1752-1821) in his treatise *The Idea of Patriot* (1784) deplored the “prostitution” of the name of patriot by selfish men, proclaiming in a conciliating manner that “every good man is a patriot”<sup>208</sup>.

Let us now to see how the idea of patriotism was employed in the travel narratives. The authors elaborate on the whole scale of rhetoric of patriotism, from simple negation of this quality among the officials of the Russian empire (for instance, Richardson remarks that S. A. Ponyatowsky (1732-1798) had no sense of patriotism being either Prince at the Russian Court or the King of Poland), till separate propositions that some outstanding persons, like Count N. I. Panin (1718-1783), have *a real patriotism*. As for the Russian nobility in general, it was figured out by the Britons, they indicate some signs of patriotism from time to time<sup>209</sup>.

Let us now consider what it means for the authors to be patriotic. First, in order to be a patriot it seems necessary to be *constantly* indulged in the public affairs, or, in other words, to be interested in and take care of the being of your community, to have a personal civic position. However, the *expression* with which this is done also matters. Thus, it is not a proper way to be a patriot if your expressions are “*severe*” or “*indignant*”. Therefore, in order to be proper, the reflections have to fit some standards, which are *moderateness, slowness in making outcomes*, and so on.

Then, if we look closer at the cause of the “real” patriotic concern, it is supposed that a real patriot will care about *an essence*, and not too much about *a form*. However, this issue does not contradict two other ideas. First, a real patriot has to unmask the detractive points concerning his/her country, or to vindicate its honor. Second, he/she has

<sup>208</sup> Griffin, *Patriotism and poetry*, 21, 31.

<sup>209</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 46, 244-245; Sinclair, *General Observations*, 26.

to develop, protect and promote his/her own national achievements, either liberal spirit or national dress.

Finally, it seems that a real patriot does not welcome the radical changes, even in order to improve his country, because they turn destructive<sup>210</sup>. Generally speaking, to be a real patriot you have to *be indignant* in a special *virtuous way*. Therefore, *patriotism* is a *virtue* of a national character.

It is obvious, that all these points do not fit, in the British authors' opinion, the Russian reality. Basically, it is because they were exactly *constructed in contrast* to the observation of the Russian nation, as well as of many others. The Russian people were not proper patriots as they behaved vis-à-vis the British standards.

To draw a conclusion about the idea of patriotism, let us mark its features. First of all, it is exactly that the languages of patriotism drew both upon classical (ideal) and indigenous (a certain national) material<sup>211</sup>. Second, this notion was employed by the British authors against both the outsiders and commoners. Finally, the issue of patriotism, in our opinion, is one of the oldest and high-tensioned in the British discourse of the Self.

### 3.3 The concept of Geography

Another big group of issues which is significant for the analysis of the Other could be combined in relation to *geography*. As Robert Mayhew argues, cosmographical, and, later on, geographical descriptions of the earth were related to the issue of *divinity* since the times of the English cartographer Peter Heylyn (1559-1662) and employed in the travel writings in order to indicate presence or absence of political health of a country<sup>212</sup>.

---

<sup>210</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 244-245, 364, 395.

<sup>211</sup> Colin Kidd, *Constitutions and character in the eighteenth-century British World*, in *From republican polity to national community: reconsiderations of Enlightenment political thought*, ed. Paschalis M. Kitromilides (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2003), 59.

<sup>212</sup> The issue of divinity would be addressed below. See: Mayhew, *Enlightenment geography*, 32, 62-65, 142.

Geography starts from the idea of *distance*, which is interpreted in the travel writings both in terms of *space* and *culture*. When describing transfer to the unknown lands, in order to get a certain response from a reader authors should employ the technique of *alienation*. It is necessary to show symbolically *the distance from home*. For instance, it was in the works by Richardson and Marshall accordingly, who describe the symbolic loss of connections with home, namely, “the anchor [of the ship one of them traveled by] having broken twice”, and “distance between [the Russian] dominions and the European theater”<sup>213</sup>. In addition, Richardson represents the Finnish Gulf where his ship had an accident, as a barbarous land, which is, as he un-equivocally says, is “just fifty-five leagues from Saint Petersburg”<sup>214</sup>. Therefore, St. Petersburg initially, before the authorial arrival, gets for a reader the colors of a “barbarous” kind of place or a place which is nearby.

In addition, the notion of distance is also used by Richardson, as employed towards “domestic” Russian landscape, in order to show that the Russian lands are so vast that they do not have any cooperation among its parts. Hence, the author says, “the half of Russia may be destroyed, and the other half know nothing about the matter”<sup>215</sup>. Again, it comes out that advanced countries have to have a well-developed system of communication, while Russia as judged by this criterion did not belong to this circle.

Furthermore, the Other, as a journey itself, is associated in the British discourse with a *sense of danger*. The issues which are attributed to lands peopled by the Others are a stormy weather, underwater (read as “unknown” and “dangerous”) flows and rocks, which cause such a reaction as the sense of *readiness* to and *awareness* of troubles and

---

<sup>213</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 9; Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 106.

<sup>214</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 8, 12.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

even death<sup>216</sup>. Therefore, the European Self when encountering the Other seems to be a very brave and, when overcomes the difficulties, skillful person.

The next component of geographical Otherness is the notion of *landscape*. As Patricia Seed argues, landscape was traditionally a very important category in the British discourse, as it was used since the Age of Geographical discoveries in order to describe the boundaries of the New World' British colonies<sup>217</sup>.

Thus, the first letter by Richardson (pp. 1-14) is dedicated to *the landscapes of transition* from home to alien lands. The author adopts "the beautiful gradation" by Virgil, who gives a logical progression composed by "an unanimated nature", "an exhibition of living [but irrational] objects" and "the manners of intelligent and rational beings"<sup>218</sup>. The author tells that the travellers passed a place close to Kronstadt called "in the language of those parts *Highland*" (My italics), but "rocky, mountainous, and covered with heath"<sup>219</sup>. It is obvious, that these features are opposed to landscape familiar to a British reader, which is mainly covered with woods and hills, and has visible signs of *cultivation*<sup>220</sup>, and represented as a positive. Consequently, the lands in the travelogues get their image from the people who populated them.

The suggestion concerning the bond between "*good*" and "*cultivation*" could also be proved by his description of "magnificent appearance [among these lands] of palaces of Peterhoff and Oranienbaum" which "diversified the landscape [beyond recognition]"<sup>221</sup>. The palaces were both connected with the name of Peter the Great, who

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., 1, 7, 9-11 and 225.

<sup>217</sup> Patricia Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995), 140.

<sup>218</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 57-58.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>220</sup> See: John Thomson, *The Seasons*, Spring, Lines 952-956, in: Dustin Griffin, *Patriotism and poetry in eighteenth-century Britain* (Cambridge, U.K.; New-York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 80, 84.

<sup>221</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 13.

was acknowledged in the British tradition as a great Cultivator<sup>222</sup>. Therefore, the description of landscape is a means of alienating of the Other. Though it has, indeed, some references to the idea of divine providence, the current travel writings do not prove the suggestion made by Mayhew that the notion of landscape was used as an indicator of political health.

The next element, which is very important for this segment of concepts, is the notion of *climate*. In the Russian case, the country appears as a kingdom of “uninterrupted frost”, “boundless white desert”, strong winds, which affect a traveller causing “a monotonous melancholy” and “a low-spirit mood”. That is why weather is called by the author “hazy”, “misty”, “tiresome”, “disgusting” and “dreary”. Besides *severity*, the climate of Russia is *inconsistent* in terms of temperature, as strong cold may turn quickly into a strong heat. This severity of climate, the author argues, could both symbolically and practically kill all the beautiful and familiar to a British reader elements, as the story with a nightingale who sang like a British one does and dies “with a severe winter being caged”<sup>223</sup>. Finally, Richardson following Charles Montesquieu (1689-1755), tie up climate of Russia with the national character of Russians<sup>224</sup>.

The vocabularies, which relate to geography, also encompass the issue of *the four ends of the world*, which used to be represented in pairs, in binary combinations such as North-South, West-East, as well as North-East. Each of these four parts of the world has its own features, which are especially distinctive in comparison with, and opposed to the rest. Thus, *the South* seems to be the place, which is more livable, delightful and “capable of the highest improvement”<sup>225</sup>. *The North*, in contrast, is usually less civilized (primarily,

---

<sup>222</sup> See: Anthony G. Cross, *Peter the Great through British Eyes. Perceptions and Representations of the Tsar since 1698* (Cambridge, 2000).

<sup>223</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 51-53, 47, 255; Sinclair, *General Observations*, 5.

<sup>224</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 54, 66-67, 51-53, 197. See also: Charles Montesquieu, *The spirit of the laws* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 1989), Books XVI-XVII; 265, 283-284.

<sup>225</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 68, 387-379.

in terms of agriculture, but, as we could see before, agriculture is tied up with cultivation, culture, advancement and progress, see p. 4), has “less quantity of bright stars”. A “star” has here not only literal, but also politically and culturally symbolic meaning, as it is a star which could “illuminate those who would otherwise have sat in darkness”<sup>226</sup>.

The geography of travel narratives and its meanings is one of the most debatable issues in the scholarship on travels and travel writings. For instance, Wolff argues that towards the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century an imaginative South-North axis which was previously used for marking “a backward Other” was basically replaced by West-East one, and Eastern Europe took its place in both schemes. In his turn, Neumann shows that during the 18<sup>th</sup> century Russia was predominantly represented as “a Northern power”. Finally, Dolan points out that geography was mainly seen in the travel narratives in terms of North-South axis<sup>227</sup>.

What we could figure out from our material is that the geographical representations made in the three travel writings are quite ambiguous. On the one hand, Russia for the Britons both historically, since the Kievan times, and in the present is an eastern land, comparable in its present state with the ancient “eastern monarchies and particularly Persia, Assyria, and Babylon”<sup>228</sup>. For instance, it was Richardson who drew the imaginative partition along Poland, Wallachia and Bessarabia which were considered as “the eastern *frontier*”<sup>229</sup>. However, for the authors this ambiguous frontier seems to be fluctuating.

---

<sup>226</sup> Ibid., 320.

<sup>227</sup> See: Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe*, 4-5, 360; Neumann, *The Uses of the Other*, 86; Dolan, *Exploring European frontiers*, 33-34.

<sup>228</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 364, 367, 368.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid., 74.

On the other hand, the Britons, and Sinclair especially, widely employ the rhetoric which represents Russia as a northern empire<sup>230</sup>. The North was described by the British travellers as a “border of civilization”, in contrast between civilized and barbaric. Finally, the combination of both, namely, of the North and the East, gives Siberia, the place, which has the strongest negative connotations in the British folklore since the medieval times<sup>231</sup>. Therefore, when placing Russia, the authors addressed mixed geographical coordinates. However, the travel narratives do not allow concluding, that the North-South representations were fully replaced by the West-East. It seems that both axes neighbor and supplement each other.

At the same time, when the Britons elaborate on geography, some curious exceptions are possible. Thus, Russia could be seen from time to time among “the other nations of Europe”, as it was identified in the context of its war with the Ottomans (1768-1772) in which Britain found to be involved<sup>232</sup>. Probably, in that case Russia got such an unusual status in comparison with the third player, which was also an ideological tactics. Undoubtedly, it is necessary to strengthen your rival in order to increase the effects of your own after-war achievements.

Nevertheless, what is obvious from the vocabularies on geography is that Europe as a whole is separated from “the west of Europe”, the notion, which, as viewed by the Britons, has much more positive connotation than the “whole Europe”<sup>233</sup>. Therefore, despite the general trends of representation of the Other, the context could dictate the Britons to make some deviances from traditional rhetoric.

---

<sup>230</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 180; Sinclair, *General Observations*, 15. Dolan points out that the tradition originates from both Defoe’s *A System of Magick* and Thomson’s *Winter* (both issued in 1726). See: Dolan, *Exploring European frontiers*, 57-58, 74, 76.

<sup>231</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 327, 51-53. See also: N. P. Mikhalskaja, *Obraz Rossii v angliiskoj hudozestvennoj literature IX-XIX vekov (The image of Russia in English literature of 11-19<sup>th</sup> centuries)* (Moscow, 1995).

<sup>232</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, Letter VII (January, 1769), 45.

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*, 372, 374-375.

### 3.4 The concept of Freedom versus the concept of Slavery

A very important means which was employed in order to construct the Self and the Other was a vocabulary on *freedom* or *liberty* represented *versus slavery*. What is unambiguous is that *slavery* in the British travel narratives has a strictly negative connotation, because it is “more severe than [a violent] death”, inconsistent with principles of liberty, abhorred by free men and makes society deplorable<sup>234</sup>. Therefore, *slavery* is opposed to the idea of *liberty*.

The notion of *liberty* is multivalent. Thus, freedom in the understanding of both Richardson and Marshall could mean “liberty to be *privileged*” in terms of choice of profession, as well as in possessing unlimited quantity of land which you could cultivate by your own efforts<sup>235</sup>. If liberty caused improvement, no improvement is possible without liberty<sup>236</sup>. Therefore, to be a slave in this sense means to have no choice of business or to be considerably limited in your choice.

In addition, liberty could be interpreted as religious liberty, or *liberty of conscious*<sup>237</sup>. Finally, there is a fundamental connotation of liberty, namely, *general liberty*, which is, however, ambiguous. Richardson uses the notion in the context of the story of Anna Ioannovna’ succession on the Russian throne and a list of *Conditions* (1730)<sup>238</sup>. He points out that Anna who broke the agreement “had little respect to the

---

<sup>234</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 355, 346, 363, 360.

<sup>235</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 254; Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 125, 147, 217, 228-229.

<sup>236</sup> This idea is very much present in the British political writings, for example, by Priestley and Godwin. See: Joseph Priestley, *Essay on the First Principles*, in Joseph Priestley, *Political writings*, ed. Peter N. Miller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 36; Godwin, *Enquiry*, 291.

<sup>237</sup> See: Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 250, 252. This tradition is enough old. For instance, Henry St. John Bolingbroke (1658-1751) in his treatise *A Dissertation upon parties* (circa 1733) is also tied up liberty with religion. See also: Bolingbroke, *Political writings*, Letter I from 27.10.1733; 5, 8-9; Letter III from 10.11.1733; 28-29.

<sup>238</sup> After the death of Peter II in January of 1730, the Privy Council decided to offer the Russian throne to the Princess of Courland Anna Ioannovna (b. 1673), with strict limitations on her power prescribed in the list of “Conditions” which she was supposed to sign. According to the “Conditions”, she was not allowed to declare war, make peace, set taxes, spend government money, get married, choose successor for the throne, sign death sentences and distribute or confiscate estates and honors without a

general freedom of the people, or even of the nobility”<sup>239</sup>. Therefore, “general freedom of the nobility” could mean the ancient *privilege* of the nobles to share the political duties with a ruler. Finally, liberty, as in the British case, could be tied up with the ideas of *tradition* and *national pride*<sup>240</sup>.

In addition, if we look at the liberty from the perspective of an individual, we will assume that it is, as seen by the Britons, is not a temporary condition, but a more or less permanent position, *a state*. This idea was very popular among the Britons<sup>241</sup>.

Freedom could be political, the notion, which is close to the idea of public freedom, or, in a more strict sense, *freedom of speech*. Thus, Richardson, when describing the famous Catherinian Legislative Committee (1764), analyzes an interesting incident. He tells that at the beginning it was allowed to speak freely about the most vital problem of the Russian Empire, namely, which social strata could buy lands and slaves. But, as it caused “too much disorder”, it was discontinued and censored on a preliminary stage by Marshal<sup>242</sup>. Looking at the incident, the author makes two conclusions. First, Russia has no freedom of debate, and second, that every achievement demands *to know how to use* and *preserve* it properly.

In addition, freedom is tied up with the idea of *security*. But it is supposed to work properly when regulated *just* by principles, neither by violence nor by restrictions<sup>243</sup>.

---

special permission by the eight members of the Privy Council. In order to get the throne she signed and then, supported by the Guards, destroyed the paper.

<sup>239</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 369.

<sup>240</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 340-341. The idea of liberty in contemporary British discourse was considerably varied. For example, Priestley identifies civil, intellectual and political liberty. Besides, there is a strong rhetoric of natural liberty, which existed before any government, in the writings by Hervey and Hutcheson. See also: Priestley, *Essay*, 3, 12-13, 44, 58, 16, 28; Lord John Hervey, *Ancient and modern liberty stated and compared* (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989), 3; Francis Hutcheson, *A system of moral philosophy, in three books (1755)*, in Francis Hutcheson, *Collected Works* (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1990), 283.

<sup>241</sup> In Locke’s understanding, slavery is “the State of War continued”. See: Locke, *Essay*, 284; Hutcheson, *A system of moral philosophy*, 280.

<sup>242</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 30-31, 254.

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid.*, 103-104.

Let us now consider who is an agent of slavery and liberty. The British authors argue that every man has *rights*, which could be identified as *natural* (for example, to live, to be free, to choose wife/husband) and *created* by society (for example, to have property)<sup>244</sup>. In addition, it is ideally seen, that the rights of man are stable and, once granted or established, have to be *invariable* and *permanent*<sup>245</sup>. Therefore, one can conclude that those who have rights are intelligent and *rational*, while those who do not are slaves.

Applying these notions to the Russian reality, it is obvious, that the idea of slavery concerns primarily common people, or, to be more precise, peasants. They are living in a state of *domestic slavery*, and close to the condition of beasts<sup>246</sup>.

In contrast to the common people, the aristocracy seems to be enjoying “a very extensive political liberty”<sup>247</sup>, and not only in domestic Russian terms. Thus, both Marshall and Sinclair argue that the Russian nobles who are living near Moscow are not obliged to attend the court, which is seen as “a greater appearance of liberty than in most other countries”<sup>248</sup>. Consequently, slavery could also be connoted with limitations posed by vassalage and etiquette.

However, as Richardson shows, looking at the problem of slavery closer and comparatively with the European people, it is possible to identify some categories of slaves, as everybody in Russia is “an immediate slave of the Crown”. Hence, the Emperor of Russia has authority over the nobility, while the nobility does over their slaves. To

---

<sup>244</sup> See: Sinclair, *General Observations*, 4, 11; Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 239, 199.

<sup>245</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 343-344, 346, 353.

<sup>246</sup> *Ibid.*, 92-93.

<sup>247</sup> *Ibid.*, 193, 361-362.

<sup>248</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 159-160; Sinclair, *General Observations*, 38-39.

accomplish the demarcation of the Self from the Other in terms of liberty and slavery, the author adopts the famous idiom by Virgil<sup>249</sup>.

In order to uncover the other important concepts, let us to see how the Russians, as seen by the Britons, became slaves. Thus, Richardson argues that Russia, which, in comparison with Britain, has “no natural shield, [was] seeking for protection of its subjects of every denomination from the incursions of foreign enemies”. It was so strong that the Russians “became *careless* of their own defense” and became slaves<sup>250</sup>. Thus, slavery is nothing else than *corrupted, or over-exercised, protection*.

In Marshall’s opinion, the *degree of oppression* also matters. Thus, peasants in Poland are oppressed, but with a sense of *proportion*, and, if compared with the Russian peasants, are “in an absolute freedom”<sup>251</sup>.

Another important notion which is connected with *liberty* is *surveillance*. However, its understanding by Richardson, who employs it, is quite ambiguous. He mentions once that “surveillance is inconsistent with liberty”. But later on, when he elaborates on the problem of the proper use and preservation of liberty, he points out that “the places should be observed where freedom arose spontaneously and without any previous purpose”<sup>252</sup>. Therefore, to be *free* in a proper way, you have to know your *goal*. Furthermore, it is clear that when you scrutinize the idea of liberty, the issue of *corruption* matters, because, as the Britons argue, slavery corrupts human nature. A slave, they show, has nothing to think or care about either in present, or in the future<sup>253</sup>.

Finally, vocabularies on liberty versus slavery in order to demarcate a “free Self” from an “abject Other” employ the issue of *education*. Thus, as it is theoretically

---

<sup>249</sup> “O fortunatos nimium, sua sis bona norint, Britannos!” which means “Oh! blessed beyond all bliss are the Britons, if they but knew their happiness!” See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 200, 239, 370-371. In original: “O fortunatos nimium, sua sis bona norint, Agricolas!”. Adopted from: Virgil. *Georgiche*. II, 458.

<sup>250</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 363, 365-366.

<sup>251</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 242-243, 244.

<sup>252</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 346, 243-254.

<sup>253</sup> *Ibid.*, 196, 215.

considered, before being emancipated, slaves must be gradually taught how to use freedom. Therefore, good education is a necessary part of being a free person. However, slavery *prevents* the development of knowledge<sup>254</sup>. Therefore, education is a very important factor, because it promotes spirit, either of slavery, or that of freedom. It influences, or, in stronger words, *affects* liberty<sup>255</sup>.

Besides, it is very well seen from the travel narratives that slavery is considered by the authors as something which never touches upon Britain. Perhaps the best expression of this idea could be found in James Thompson's (1700-1748) patriotic verses made in co-authorship with David Mallet (1705-1765), which were enormously popular among all classes of the British society, *Rule, Britannia!* (first time appeared in 1730s)<sup>256</sup>.

To draw a conclusion concerning the vocabularies on *liberty* and *slavery*, it is necessary to run through all the other segments of the discourse of the Other. Furthermore, this part of representation of Russia is one of the most conservative and is strongly tied up with the general philosophical reflections of the problem.

### 3.5 The concept of Power

The last segment which is very important for the overall construction of the image of the Other consists of the vocabularies on *power*. The Britons argue that proper power is *stable* and *secure*<sup>257</sup>. However, stability and security are supposed to be achieved not by means of violence and limitations, posed on the subjects, but by means of justice, and

---

<sup>254</sup> Ibid., 70.

<sup>255</sup> See: Priestley, *Enquiry*, 39.

<sup>256</sup> The refrain of the verses is: "Rule, Britannia, rule the waves; / Britons never will be slaves". See: John Thomson, Davis Mallet, *Rule Britannia (1740)*, in *Empire and identity: an eighteenth-century sourcebook*, ed. Stephen H. Gregg (New-York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 87-88.

<sup>257</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 75-76.

stable law. In other words, there should be certain principles which compose the foundations of power, which is, in the British case, a *constitution*<sup>258</sup>.

Let us now consider the values upon which a proper power should be orientated. First, a proper power is based upon and works for the sake of *humanity*<sup>259</sup>, namely, the principle which supposes a ruler to care about the well-being of his subjects<sup>260</sup>.

In addition, the Britons show that it is impossible to imagine a proper power without *justice*, which is regulated by *law* and *punishment*, which, in turn, justifies the standards of right and wrong. It is obvious, that, in order to be good, they have to *prevent* crime and save the established order<sup>261</sup>. Moreover, *law* is ideally seen as *ultimate* and *final*, and should be known by the people who are ruled by it<sup>262</sup>.

Furthermore, law is supplemented by *punishment*. To work properly, *punishment* has to be *non-violent* and *adequate* to both crime and the principles of a free government, and, perhaps, equally *spectacular* for everybody<sup>263</sup>. However, the capital punishments, like perpetual imprisonment, banishment, sentence to death, and slavery are considered as inadequate, because they treat people like *irrational beasts*<sup>264</sup>. The issue of corporal punishment is much more ambiguous. First, corporal punishment (associated sometimes with *knout*), as *torture of the body*, is theoretically acknowledged as *barbarous*. However, corporal punishment as applied to the peasants is generally appropriate to the case and does not provoke any special emotion, as peasants are morally corrupted<sup>265</sup>. In contrast, when applied to people of higher rank, corporal punishment transforms its initiator to be seen in the worst light.

---

<sup>258</sup> Ibid., 347, 343.

<sup>259</sup> Ibid., 25-27, 41.

<sup>260</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 336.

<sup>261</sup> Ibid., 340, 355.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid., 232, 234.

<sup>263</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 142; Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 362, 355-356, 359.

<sup>264</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 197, 351, 353-358, 195, 235, 350.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid., 230-231, 235, 59-60.

In order to be proper, power has *to be able* to function. For instance, in opinion of the Britons, Russia is rich in terms of acute politicians and officials, who could manage any problem, either a plague pandemic or a military campaign, and, hence, are sometimes acknowledged as *geniuses*. Thus, both Peter the Great in a higher degree and Catherine II in a lesser one, were considered by the authors as the men who are able to govern and geniuses simultaneously. This meant that they possessed courage, generosity, ambition, love, and the ability to manage current political problems, to foresee the future, to be equally great in practice and speculation (in other words, to be *universal*), and, for Catherine, to have manliness of spirit<sup>266</sup>. In addition, in perception of the people they became immortal. Even Prince G.A. Potemkin (1739-1791) is an able-man as he, in Sinclair's opinion, could "*impress all ranks of people*" (My italics)<sup>267</sup>.

It seems that rhetoric of political ability appears as a new feature of the discourse of the Other, and, in higher degree, as a kind of the reflection on the domestic British troubles considered in relation to the time of Georg III (b. 1738, 1760-1820). The king has been suffering from recurrent and permanent mental illness which was inconsistent with the functions of his office. The first attack occurred in 1765, and it was exactly in the 1780s when the disease irreversibly progressed, and in the 1788 when the strongest attack of illness was first time announced in public.

The British rhetoric of power was also based upon a comparative analysis of different forms of government, namely, the idea of a free state as opposed to the triad of absolutism, despotism, and tyranny. The issue of *absolutism* or *absolute power* was applied to Russia both in domestic terms and in the newly colonized lands, namely, in Poland<sup>268</sup>. Though the notion of *absolute monarchy* was a comparatively neutral word

---

<sup>266</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 119; Sinclair, *General Observations*, 22, 27.

<sup>267</sup> Sinclair, *General Observations*, 30, 41.

<sup>268</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 142; Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 46-49.

choice, it was considered at the time as “something repugnant to law” and “inconsistent with civil society”<sup>269</sup>.

The idea of *despotism* employed a language which was much stronger<sup>270</sup>. Thus, despotism means that nobody, including the despot, the members of his family and society in general<sup>271</sup>, has any *guarantee*, either in natural, or in social rights. In contrast, everybody is living in a state of *fear* and expecting *violence*<sup>272</sup>.

However, it is not only the ruler who behaves in a despotic way, usurping the rights of man. Under despotic power, the Britons argue, the nobles are allowed to exercise power in relation to their peasants. Finally, despotism is tied up with the ancient times and the idea of the *Orient*, or *the East*, which is unequivocally backward<sup>273</sup>.

In its turn, *despotism* is very close to *tyranny*<sup>274</sup>, which is considered as a peak of the British rhetoric of power, applied to the image of the Other. *Tyranny* was generally seen by the Britons as “the exercise of power and force beyond Right”<sup>275</sup>. Finally, people under such a kind of government are completely unhappy<sup>276</sup>.

As we could see, the vocabulary on power combines many diverse elements. It is based upon both theoretical (including historical) and practical reflections, employs the legal issues and a broad comparative perspective. Finally, it settles all the doubts of a reader concerning the political achievements of the Self, either fundamental, or current.

In retrospect, the British discourse of the Other appropriated several groups of vocabularies, each of them having its peculiarities. What all of them have in common is

---

<sup>269</sup> David Hume, *Political essays*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 63; Locke, *Essay*, 326.

<sup>270</sup> See: Sinclair, *General Observations*, 5; Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 76, 78, 81.

<sup>271</sup> Sinclair, *General Observations*, 24-25, 28; Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 142.

<sup>272</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 347, 370.

<sup>273</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, vol. 3; 184; Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 368.

<sup>274</sup> Sinclair, *General Observations*, 4, 11; Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 219-220, 222.

<sup>275</sup> Locke, *Essay*, 398, 419.

<sup>276</sup> Priestley, *Enquiry*, 46.

that the Other is strongly seen through the prism of the Self, and addressed to the intellectual authorities through the analysis made on the comparative basis. Information the authors operates with, as well as analytical techniques could be conditionally identified as having both national and cosmopolitan dimensions.

The language developed in the travel narratives and its patterns of argumentation were in many ways constructed in contrast to the image of the Other. Thus, the latter got an automatic disadvantage in comparison with the British Self.

Nevertheless, though the British authors sought to represent Russia as a part of the so-called the West-and-the-Rest-discourse, the language employed for this purpose is quite heterogeneous and ambiguous, because it incorporates components which existed before and were used in different contexts, for instance, the ideas of reason and superstition. Therefore, the discourse of the Other, and the masked Self, looks in many ways traditional. At the same time, some quite innovative features, like the rhetoric of political ability, could be found in it. In addition, separate aspects of the Other, as in the case with the geographical positioning of Russia, were represented as mixed.

Furthermore, the three authors employ different techniques of constructing the Self and the Other in particular, and travel narrative in general. Thus, Joseph Marshall, who pretends to be a scientist, pays attention mainly to his subject, agriculture and everything which relates to geographical and physical parameters, the legal status of various lands, social and economic questions which are connected with land relationship, and so on. In addition, from time to time he makes historical reflections, some moderate generalizations and a few references to the British intellectual authorities. Finally, this travel narrative is distinguished by almost abstract and broad addressing to the audience.

The travel narrative by William Richardson is written with a goal to catch and keep attention of the audience, to strike the imagination, and perhaps to amuse his

reader<sup>277</sup>. The latter belongs, undoubtedly, to a certain, quite narrow, and even chosen, circle. It is the fashionable form of *belles' letters*, quite sophisticated and would-be for an intellectual language, which work in a favor of this proposition. Besides, he creates the effect of inclusiveness of the readers, who have already seen or could see the object in the future times. All these peculiarities make the work by Richardson closer to light-readings.

Nevertheless, this narrative, *The Anecdotes of the Russian Empire*, is highly connected with politics. The author makes frequent and strong references to the intellectual authorities and history. At the same time, he employs highly metaphorical and symbolic languages, makes broad comparisons, and too philosophical generalizations in order to involve the reader's emotions, and to recognize familiar and alien. Undoubtedly, it is the most detailed and the best argued travel account among all the three.

The last but not least, *General observations* by John Sinclair is issued from the pen of a politician. As it was written for a narrow circle of people and published anonymously<sup>278</sup>, the author feels in some sense free in his reflections. First, he touches upon the different set of topics, which provide the latest information, more useful for politics, and organized in thematic sections. In the course of the narrative, the author gives the reader practical explanations and reasons for one or another conclusion. Further, Sinclair pays attention to the rival versions of any event, in order to make the more exact and flexible prognosis for the future.

Basically, *General Observations* gives no references to the intellectual authorities or general polite discourse, except some figurative mentioning of a tribe of the writers who establish sets of standards and promote them to the public, while he only refers to the fruits of their labour.

---

<sup>277</sup> For further biographical details of the author, see Chapter 2.

<sup>278</sup> For more details see Chapter 2.

Finally, in comparison with Marshall and Richardson's writings, it has no shine or sense of correctness, gives straightforward definitions and strong generalizations. The overall style not very sophisticated as the favorite techniques of argumentation by Sinclair are negation, debasement and exaggeration.

## Chapter IV. Self and Other through the ideas of Man and Order: Applying Practice to Philosophy

The forth chapter addresses the philosophical worldview and understanding of the order of things by the British authors, as well as their tactics of location both of Britain and Russia in the scheme. If the previous chapter aimed to uncover the practical language through which both the Self and the Other could be identified and recognized, the current one seeks to bring some of these vocabularies into a broader picture in order to explain the general design of history as seen by the British authors. In other words, we will present how this language was employed to justify the location of the British Self and the Russian Other, and the way in which British society could benefit from it. Though is based mainly upon the analysis of Richardson, because it is the most philosophical text among the three, we would, where possible, bring the examples from the other travel narratives.

The chapter consists of two sections which investigate how the Britons perceived political system, social order and public space; as well as the issues which relate to human nature, national character, and individuals accordingly. The first section *Political order, social system and public space* aims to scrutinize the general design of history as it was considered by the travel authors, emphasizing the issue of universal unity of the historical process and the idea of its gradual progress. It touches particularly upon the factors which, in the travellers' view, determine and advance nations, including divine predestination and personality of the ruler. The second section *Human nature, national character and the individual*, analyzes authorial understanding of human nature, national peculiarities, as well as the systems of moral principles, as they were interpreted by the Britons in the Age of Enlightenment. It also

scrutinizes the questions of what happiness means for a certain nation, and how political system, human nature and national character mutually affect each other.

#### 4.1 Political order, social system and public space

In order to see how the Self and the Other were distinguished by the Britons and relocated in relation to one another, let us scrutinize the British vision of history and its peculiarities. First of all, history was seen as a kind of process, a linear development, a vector, which targets progress<sup>279</sup>. In other words, it is a permanent growth from a less advanced state to a more advanced one<sup>280</sup>. The historical process, as perceived by the authors, is universal, thus, all peoples have a single destination in terms of progress. In addition, the progress is not momentary, it is gradual, and it usually takes time and effort for a nation to head toward it, make it stable and non-reversible.

Furthermore, history, in the opinion of the travel authors, is based upon comparison. On the one hand, as the progress is gradual, it is natural that not all the peoples are at the same stage at the same time. Thus, it is possible to make comparisons among them and indicate a place for everyone in relation to the others. On the other hand, it is also a natural way to understand something, to make it familiar to you, to draw parallels with that which you might already know. It leads, again, to the comparative vision of nations. Therefore, progress is used as a ground for comparisons among nations.

Moreover, the British vision of the Self and the Other was considerably influenced by several factors. First, there were contemporary ideals, the Enlightenment paradigm with its ideals of rational man, well-regulated society, a positive perception of British history and quite conservative positioning of the other nations. Second, it is important to mention here national consciousness, which started to be publicly assessed at the time. However, this issue is very

---

<sup>279</sup> The idea of progress was examined in the third Chapter, pp. 60-62.

<sup>280</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, 158.

complex. For the late 18<sup>th</sup> century we could not talk about senses of Scottishness, Irishness, and so forth, because they were not yet so easily crystallized. Of course, we could find some separate signs of it, like in the case of Richardson, who perhaps tried to stress his Scottish origin through a story with the name of the ship he traveled to the foreign lands by<sup>281</sup>. Perhaps, it would be more relevant in the case to talk about a more or less common sense of Britishness, the sense of interest in their own, British, experience in comparison with others (France, Russia, etc.), as well as the broad public promotion of this interpretation.

Finally, for the British vision of history, the time a certain people became “visible” in international terms and started to make sense of the overall international (could be read as European) environment, matters. Those nations, which went into that space and became distinguished by the neighbors a long time before, saw those who joined the group later on as newcomers, and not of advanced nature. For example, Britons when they compare the peoples in legal terms and terms of liberty, stressed that it is just the British nation which made the first step in this direction in the early 13<sup>th</sup> century. It was Richardson, who brings there the examples of the *Magna Carta Libertatum* (Great Charter of Freedoms), the famous paper, issued in 1215, and so-called *Habeas Corpus Act*<sup>282</sup>, in order to identify the British Self and the Russian Other. Therefore, when compared on this basis, Russia was identified as a relative newcomer.

And, last but not least, the current politics could also influence the overall vision of the Other. It seems reasonable that William Richardson, who wrote about Russia at the time when Catherine II was perceived in Britain with great interest and even benevolence<sup>283</sup>, was more

---

<sup>281</sup> For further details, see: Chapter 2, p. 55, 151n.

<sup>282</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 237. Habeas Corpus Act is both a document issued in 1679 and a legal procedure, an ancient standard, which aims to provide freedom of an individual against the state in the case of unlawful imprisonment or persecution. It includes a proof of the right of authority to judge a person, the right of petition to appeal against court decision, etc.

<sup>283</sup> See: Anthony G. Cross, *Royal Blue-Stocking: Catherine the Great's early reputation in England as an authoress*, in Вијенац Горски, *A Garland of Essays offered to Professor Elizabeth Mary Hill*, ed. R. Auty, L. R. Lewitter and A. P. Vlasto (Cambridge, 1970), 87-92.

tolerant towards his subject-matter than John Sinclair, who did it in the late 1780s, in a period of high political tension.

As we saw from the previous analysis, history in British eyes gradually progresses. Nevertheless, it could never be advanced by itself; there should be some causes and catalysts. Among the factors, which, according to the authors, determine history and advance nations, the two principal factors are divine predestination and personality of a ruler. The issue of divine predestination was almost latent and, perhaps, one of the oldest in the British discourse of the Self<sup>284</sup>. It attracted the British authors as it could help to ground the idea of Britons as “a chosen nation”, the best, or better than the others, which is supported by God, and, could then overcome any problem. In addition, the religious issue was a very important mark of the British Self (especially in contrast to France), because it was not eliminated from the Enlightenment thought and was widely employed as a foundation of society. In France, it was Voltaire and some other philosophers who sneered at religion and religious superstition. Thus, the Catholic religion, which was seen as a justifier and supporter of the Bourbon throne and the absolutist monarchy, was publicly condemned later on, in the course of the French revolution.

The idea of divine predestination sees the Britons as an active nation which is worthy of this benevolence, because the British people had struggled for their own rights since the 13<sup>th</sup> century<sup>285</sup>, and here the example of the *Magna Carta*, which established some foundations of political and social order, seems to be relevant again. Therefore, the political order of Britain, in this interpretation, was established thanks both to the activeness of the people and divine support.

Nevertheless, this is not enough, in order to persuade the audience and to make the case really distinguishing, it was necessary to indicate the origin of political order. It would be more

---

<sup>284</sup> For further details, see the third Chapter, pp. 72-75. See also: G. Miede, *The Present State of Great Britain: An Eighteenth-Century Self-Portrait*, in *Aristocratic Government and society in Eighteenth-Century England*, ed. D. A. Baugh (New-York, 1975), 33.

<sup>285</sup> It seems relevant to draw here a parallel with Max Weber's assumption about a cornerstone of the Protestant ethic and, therefore, an important mark of the British Self, namely, with idea that the divine benevolence could be merited by the proper behavior of a true believer. See: *Max Weber, The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*, (London: Routledge, HarperCollins, 1992).

convincing to set the standards of right and wrong in relation to this issue. For instance, Marshall identifies the different types of political system, namely, a free state, an absolutist regime, a despotic government and a tyranny, their general principles and both ideal and practical outcomes<sup>286</sup>.

Furthermore, the British authors establish the coordinates of the right political order. The measure of rightness, as seen by the Britons, is to what extent any political system greets and supports improvements, makes a country strong, advanced and compatible with others, and its nation happy. A right political order was seen as a model, machine, clock, which works mechanically, because it has a well-debugged mechanism. It needs just a clock-master to observe its work and a careful look of its owner to check if the clock-master works properly.

In contrast to the right political order, a wrong political order could not work like a machine because it basically has no mechanism. Its work depends strongly on its manager. Thus, the political order in Russia, which is undoubtedly wrong, is determined by the will of the sovereign<sup>287</sup>. Thus, the Russian “machine” is less predictable and manageable than the European in general and British in particular. In addition, it has some overriding factors like unpredictable climate; huge territory; barbaric, irrational people; the political habit to make revolutions; despotic political traditions, and so on. Therefore, the right political order is the main locomotive of history in the British case, while the personality of the manager is the Russian.

It is necessary scrutinize the latter issue and its significance for Russian history. As we saw from the previous analysis, it is exactly a skillful ruler who advances Russia. If he/she could manage in the short term but also to lay the foundations of the clock-mechanism for the future, this kind of ruler, as the authors show, possesses “the true art of governing”<sup>288</sup>.

It is necessary to remark that, according to the Britons, 18<sup>th</sup> century Russia had some remarkable rulers who made the country visible on the European scale; Peter (b. 1672, 1698-

---

<sup>286</sup> For example, see: Marshall, *Travels*, 153, 156.

<sup>287</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, 142.

<sup>288</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 46.

1725) and Catherine (b. 1729, 1762-1796), both of whom were labeled “the Great”<sup>289</sup>. As the travel authors indicate, skillful rulers possess both “a truly philosophic disposition”<sup>290</sup> and practical talents; they know exactly the necessities of the government; target several comprehensive goals simultaneously; care about the perspectives and ideals, and are able to foresee dangers<sup>291</sup>. Moreover, in the Russian case, it is not only the ruler who has the duties of governing. The Britons stress that the favorites, for instance, Prince G. A. Potemkin, play an important role at the Russian court and usually share power with the monarch<sup>292</sup>. Therefore, the issue of personality turns a core issue for the Russian political order.

Moreover, this issue of personality is strongly tied up with the mechanisms of changing power in Russia. Thus, Sinclair suggested that “everything depends on the sovereign so that many people hope to gain from the change of sovereign”<sup>293</sup>. As seen by the authors, this problem has two outcomes. First, usurpation of power is a sign of despotic political order<sup>294</sup>. Second, these revolutions are so fatal and, in the course of the whole 18<sup>th</sup> century, multiple in number that “they would be perpetuated for ever”<sup>295</sup>.

The Britons point out that, as a result of despotism and unpredictability, the illegal mechanism of changing power, the public sphere and sociability in Russia were also affected. Nevertheless, talking about the 18<sup>th</sup> century British perception of social space, it is important to make some reservations. First, there was no common social space, as both British and Russian societies were radically stratified. Second, in Britain polite society consisted of a broader circle of people, the people of so-called *middling sort*. Finally, there was a basis which could appear as a common ground for social communication,

---

<sup>289</sup> The issue of greatness in the British perception was examined in the third Chapter, pp. 83-84.

<sup>290</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, 147.

<sup>291</sup> Sinclair, *General Observations*, 22; Marshall, *Travels*, 117-119, 143, 162, 210-211.

<sup>292</sup> See: Sinclair, *General Observations*, 29, 31-32.

<sup>293</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.

<sup>294</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, 142.

<sup>295</sup> For instance, see: Sinclair, *General Observations*, 24-26.

namely, a space determined by religion and religious ritual. That is why the church was sometimes seen by travel authors as a sort of public space<sup>296</sup>.

However, they were more interested in another one, which was a matter of primary importance, a civic public space. Though Richardson argues that “the amusements of the Russians are indeed extremely social”, because they used to entertain in crowds<sup>297</sup>, it is not that kind of social space which he had in mind. In general, the Briton found the issue of public space in Russia quite problematical. Ideally, it looks like a certain network in the frames of which political, social, cultural and high society information freely circulated. As it seems to the author, Britain has such a kind of social network. In other words, people who belong to a certain circle, have a free access to certain information, such as the news in the periodicals, parliament debate’ reports, the last rumors of the court and polite society, and so forth<sup>298</sup>. However, the Britons argue, the issue of sociality and public space, when applied to Russia, brought the different perspective of that society.

First of all, Richardson concludes that there was “no intelligence of political nature [in Russia], but such as the court chooses to communicate; no views of men and manners, and no anecdotes of incidents in domestic life, can be collected from the newspapers. How unlike England! ...The half of Russia could be destroyed, and the other half knows nothing about the matter”<sup>299</sup>. Therefore, a public space is connoted here as a

---

<sup>296</sup> For example, see: Sinclair, *General Observations*, 24; Marshall, *Travels*, 112; Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 61.

<sup>297</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 212.

<sup>298</sup> It is necessary also to keep in mind that the British system of sociability was at the time considered as the most advanced and exemplary on the European scale. Of course, the government had some pressure levers on the press, but they were not for everyday use and, then, were kept for a proper case. In addition, it was not so easy to pacify the freedom-loving British press. For instance, it was already during the Great Northern War (1700-1721), when the British Parliament, under the pressure of the Russian Ambassador in London Prince B. I. Kurakin (1676-1727), unsuccessfully tried to stop the pamphlet war in the British periodicals which could considerably harm the fragile political balance between the two countries.

<sup>299</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 38.

space in which there is communication, a free circulation of information and a certain knowledge. Thus, a public space is in many ways formed by the periodicals.

Then, the travel author specifies that the Russian people “have no occasion to give themselves any further trouble about public affairs... [because the Empress] actually forbids them to speak, write, or think politics”<sup>300</sup>. This limitation, the Briton stresses, posed administratively on the public sphere, was caused by the nature of the Russian political order, which is despotic. While all the despotic political systems, in order to ensure “the Prince’s person” and the order itself, established police and spy networks<sup>301</sup>. Therefore, the public space in Russia seems to be considerably narrowed to the polite circle. That is why, according to the Britons, public space in Russia consists of “favorites and courtiers”, and in many ways is around power and sovereign. Therefore, it comes out that political order in Russia crucially affects and even determines social space.

#### **4.2 Human nature, national character and the individual**

Let us now see how, according to the Britons, an individual feels in this space, which is produced and framed by a political order, power and sociability, both ideally and practically. What is important to mention here is that the general philosophical reflections on human nature considerably influenced this vision.

It is obvious that it is a social organization and a state which played a role of critical importance in the process of formation of men. That is why those who lived in tribes were perceived by the travel authors as barbarians<sup>302</sup>. It is exactly a state which brings the rules of social conduct, establishes systems of punishment, social ideology and the aim of upbringing of the subjects, the general line of their treatment, and so forth. In addition, the system of punishment

---

<sup>300</sup> Ibid., 104.

<sup>301</sup> See: Ibid., 250, 346-347.

<sup>302</sup> See the third Chapter 3, pp. 64-65.

especially matters, – how do you treat people; who is an agent of correction; which effect do you want to produce; which methods do you employ, and so on. Let us now see how the Britons saw the overall picture.

First of all, Richardson says, it is necessary for government and rulers to identify “a valuable purpose” or some purposes. They are, as the Briton argues, to breed people as good subjects, correct the defects of their social behavior; prevent future crimes and corruption of other subjects<sup>303</sup>. Therefore, there are some values and principles which should be protected, such as life, freedom, free will, moral sentiments, honor, tradition, etc. Moreover, there are some general principles how to approach the whole matter of social regulation: namely, there should be no extreme options, cruelty, as well as inhumanity.

Then, the author identifies some types of offences and punishments, which have to be correlated one with another. In other words, small offences and big offences should be punished in a different way. It is interesting that crimes are measured by Richardson in comparison among them (for example, small, bigger, etc.) and, in a lesser degree, by their outcomes for society. However, he theoretically states, there are some crimes which are so intolerable that they could justify severity in punishments<sup>304</sup>.

Punishments, in their turn, are judged by Richardson by the ideal standards and by their form and the level of severity. The last point is an indicator of the nature of government itself. Thus, he identifies ideally tolerable, intolerable and ignominious types of punishment<sup>305</sup>. A proper punishment, the author says, is supposed not only to correct the accused person, but also produce a general effect on the rest. Hence, a proper punishment is not continuously exhibited, is shameful, spectacular for *everybody*, exemplary<sup>306</sup>, and so forth. As we could see, some of the

---

<sup>303</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, Letter XXXII. The Administration of Justice in Russia; 232-237.

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*, 350, 356.

<sup>305</sup> For instance, tolerable punishment is imprisonment for a limited time, and, in separate cases, public infamy. Intolerable are banishment, sentence to death (in most cases), slavery (deprivation of liberty), corporal punishment (especially then applied to the nobility), hard labor. See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 350-352.

<sup>306</sup> See the third Chapter, p. 83.

punishments are not proper because they are inconsistent with the principles of liberty and human rights, could harm the ideas of social privilege and dignity (as in the case of corporal punishment of the nobility). These issues, the author hints, should not be touched because they are *foundations* the society rests upon.

Furthermore, it is not enough, the Briton stresses, to punish, because society is supposed to be protected from being disturbed in the future by the punished person. It is impossible, the Briton argues, if a criminal is allowed “to survive an ignominious punishment, and to continue in the fame of the society to which he formerly belonged”. Surviving criminals should not be permitted to live in society together, they should be separated, because their corruption would be prolonged and they could form “the school of vice”<sup>307</sup>. Therefore, punishment transforms human nature.

As we can see, the issue of justice and system of punishment is a very important point for distinguishing right and wrong. In addition, these philosophical-legal problems were very popular both in Britain and Russia at the time. It was exactly in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century that Britain planned to accomplish a reform of prisons. At the same time, Catherine II sought to prepare a balanced project of penitentiary reform, the famous *Ukaze o turmah* (*A Decree about the prisons*). Furthermore, two distinguished British contemporaries, the philosopher, philanthropist and social reformer John Howard (1726-1790)<sup>308</sup>, and, later on, the famous Grand Tour tutor, the reverend William Coxe (1747-

---

<sup>307</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 353-354.

<sup>308</sup> Esquire John Howard two times refused to meet with Catherine II and died in Kherson trying to prevent a pandemic of typhus. For further details, see: A. E. Pisarenko, *Bastille, Petersburg, Novo Russia in the destiny of John Howard (in Russian)*, *New and the Newest history*, no. 5 (1989): 161-173; The New Encyclopedia Britannica in 30 vols. Vol. 6 (Chicago, 1994): 88-89 s.v. “Howard”; [William Mayor] *The British Nepos: consisting of the lives of illustrious Britons, who have distinguished themselves by their virtues, talents, or remarkable advancement in life; with incidental practical reflections, with 24 portraits* (London, 1823), 377-378.

1828), made their inquiries concerning penitentiary systems in the course of their visits to Russia<sup>309</sup>.

As for the Russian case, it does not bear standards. First, the moral principles of Russians are corrupted because of slavery and despotic power. Hence, Richardson hints, there is no common consideration of values. The rulers of Russia are so despotic that they often neglect the value of life, freedom, and ignore the sentiments of their subjects. Therefore, even the foundations of society are not proper to protect them. Second, if to keep in mind the practical part of this philosophical-legal system, again, it seems to be not exemplary. Russia in the 18<sup>th</sup> century still practices some customs, which are improper from the British angle, like barbaric, ancient corporal punishments (i.e., cutting out of tongues) or corporal punishment by *knout*<sup>310</sup>. Then, as the author argues, punishment should “reconcile imagination” in order to show that a person “has a choice to be free and happy or to be in chains and bondage”<sup>311</sup>. While the Russian people have no idea of freedom, are already in chains, so, they basically have no choice and no imagination. Therefore, the overall penitentiary and legal system, as well as the ideology of the upbringing of the subjects, are highly questionable.

Finally, let us see how the individual feels in this space framed by political order and its system of government, if he is satisfied and comfortably lives. In order to analyze this issue, it is necessary to scrutinize what it means to be happy, both for a certain nation and for an individual. First, the British authors argue, there is domestic happiness, which is more or less common for every nation, which means to have a family, mutual love

---

<sup>309</sup> See: William Coxe, *Account of Prisons and Hospitals in Russia, Sweden and Denmark* (London, 1781); John Howard, *An Account of the principal lazarettos in Europe; with various papers relative to the plague: together with further observations on some foreign prisons and hospitals; and additional remarks on the present state of those in Great Britain and Ireland*. Warrington; printed by William Eyres; and sold by T. Cadell, J. Johnson, C. Dilly, and J. Taylor (London, 1789).

<sup>310</sup> For further details about the image of knout in perception of the Western travellers, see: Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe*, Chapter 2. Possessing Eastern Europe: sexuality, slavery and corporal punishment.

<sup>311</sup> See: Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 235.

between husband and wife, children, care and tender affection. However, Richardson dismissed the possibility for Russians to have domestic happiness, because the common people have no right to choose a partner and they follow the choice of their masters<sup>312</sup>. Second, there is social happiness of the higher strata, which is to be in favor of a ruler or a current favorite of the ruler<sup>313</sup>. Then, there is happiness in temporary terms, to have fun and to display an infantile levity, which is, in Richardson's view, common for the Russian national character<sup>314</sup>, still, it is not a proper type of happiness. Whereas, being happy, Richardson argues, is a question of spirit, personal balance, and, to some extent, that you share these with your natives. Happiness for Marshall means being entirely free from any oppression<sup>315</sup>, not being neglected by the government as a population of certain region or area<sup>316</sup>.

Finally, if we look at Richardson carefully, we can see that there is a quite strange category of happiness, which is half-latent, namely, being semi-happy. Thus, writing about Poland and Ukraine, Richardson hints at two points. One of them is that the people of the Ukraine are happier in comparison to the Russians, but, at the same time, they are happy "in proportion to the neglect under which the country lies"<sup>317</sup>. Thus, they could be happier if they had more care, and they practically are less happy in comparison to Western people. In addition, a quite unusual remark was made in relation to Poland. Marshall suggested that the Polish people are happier at war-time, because, in contrast to that, "in time of peace the Polish nobles treat all the peasants in the utmost extent of the word"<sup>318</sup>. It seems that the Polish people are semi-happy in comparison with the west:

---

<sup>312</sup> Ibid., 199, 215.

<sup>313</sup> See: Ibid., 80.

<sup>314</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 249.

<sup>315</sup> Marshall, *Travels*, 155.

<sup>316</sup> See: Ibid., 166-167.

<sup>317</sup> See: Ibid., 166-167.

<sup>318</sup> Ibid., 188-189.

though they are not oppressed like in Russia, they are sometimes oppressed, it reduces their spirit<sup>319</sup>.

Finally, one of the authors makes a very important remark. He argues that “people prevent their own happiness yet wishing for something still finer and more perfect, their enjoyments are incomplete”<sup>320</sup>. So, the author is trying to propose, after such an exemplary treatment of the other nations in relation to happiness, that the Britons are in the best position; hence, basically they have nothing to wish. Therefore, the British order, though not theoretically ideal, but practically the best one, needs no more changes.

In retrospect, the British authors elaborate on some theoretical points on what is history, how it is developing, what the difference is among nations in historical terms, and so on. In this historical space the ideas of political order, public space, national character and human nature matter. All of them, as we could see from the previous analysis, are strongly connected. Then, the authors bring in this theoretical field the concrete examples chosen to contrast them, mark and justify this difference, create their gradation, and, therefore, set the standards. It seems that political order and the individual are intertwined if looking from the British perspective. In other words, political order aims to breed the individual, while the individual aims to rule political order.

This model, which is in many ways based on the historical experience of the British society, when applied to the examples of the British Self and the Russian Other, automatically gives an advantage to the former and a disadvantage to the latter. The Britain state of affairs, though it does not seem as a perfectly accomplished in general, is still much closer to the ideal than the Russian in particular. Therefore, the British society, even having some non-essential, in comparison with that of the others, defects, has nothing to worry about either in present or in future.

---

<sup>319</sup> See: Ibid., 188-189.

<sup>320</sup> Richardson, *Anecdotes*, 137.

## Conclusions

Travel, travel writing and the image of the Other are indeed challenging issues for the student who approaches this subject-matter. Despite the fact that the field has a relatively short history, it is highly problematic and strikes the imagination due to the diversity of relevant methodological strategies, which are sometimes in direct conflict.

Thinking of the image of the Other which we have to keep in mind is the problem of the origin of travel literature. On the one hand, the early scientific explorations, which the 18<sup>th</sup> century travel narratives originate from, appeared as descriptions which targeted in perspective the making of territorial acquisitions and establishment of colonial dependence. On the other hand, the Grand Tour, i.e., an educational trip by the young British gentry on the continent, which was very popular in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and, as a rule, resulted in the publication of a travel account, aimed to show the difference between home and the alien lands. Hence, the politics of writing culture in the 18<sup>th</sup> century were considerably influenced by these two factors.

Furthermore, there exists the problem of context. Some strategies on travel and travel literature, like structuralism, simply negate it, some others, like the Cambridge school methodology, are based upon it. Therefore, it is impossible to understand the nuances of the image of the Other without paying attention to both the overall historical agenda of the time in general and the interests of the peoples involved in the process of cross-cultural contacts in particular. Hence, secularization of the civic scene from the religious, the process of transformation from monarchy to empire, particular commercial, political, geopolitical, as well as military interests, the formation of the professions, and other aspects have to be taken into consideration when someone addresses this topic.

Taking these aspects into consideration, it was helpful to see which interests of the Britons could influence their vision of the Russian Other at the time.

The scale of contextualization was also changed in the course of the analysis, to approach the picture from an all-European, both from British domestic and international angles, as well as from the personal authorial views. In other words, in order to get impressions of the battlefield, telescope and magnifying glass are equally useful. Moreover, as seen, the strategy which answers our purpose is to analyze the Russian Other in a strong connection with the British Self, because, as Linda Colley argues, the continental counterparts, in the case of Britain, considerably influenced the process of making the British nation. Thus, we assume that the British Self and its agenda is a very important and even determinant factor for the understanding of the whole enterprise.

The present thesis focused on two aspects of the formation of the image of the Other, namely, on both the practical linguistic and theoretical philosophical dimensions. Thus, the third chapter investigated the language, vocabularies and the overall rhetoric which were employed by the three British travel authors, William Richardson, Joseph Marshall and John Sinclair. It argued that the discourse of the Russian Other is dialectical, non-coherent and includes old-fashioned elements, traditional for the age of the Enlightenment, as well as some novel ones. This statement could be exemplified by three issues, namely, by the idea of divine predestination, the problem of climate and its ties with the national character of certain people, as well as the rhetoric of civility accordingly. Some elements of the discourse of the Other and the masked Self, like the concept of patriotism, could be associated with all three categories, because it went through several evolutions and gradually got some new connotations, often radically different from the previous.

In the course of the analysis five big groups of vocabularies which relate to the concepts of geography, power, freedom versus slavery, progress versus backwardness, as well as that of national character, were identified. The main characteristics of these vocabularies are their comparativeness, because every concept is correlated with its British “analogue” or antipode by the current author, flexibility and inter-penetration, because most concepts simultaneously belong to several vocabularies and could change their meaning. For instance, the idea of climate was scrutinized twice, in the vocabularies on both geography and progress. Therefore, the overall rhetoric on the Other is very ambiguous.

The question which still remains open here is to what extent this British discourse of the Russian Other is universal. In other words, though it is obvious that many issues employed in relation to the Other were general for the “enlightened” European public, is it possible to fill the scheme of the discourse of the Other by another material? How far could we move on in order to make generalizations? As it seems this problem is a matter of future investigations.

Finally, the third chapter uncovered three different styles of constructing the Self and the Other in particular, and travel narrative in general. Looking at the narratives one by one, it is obvious that Richardson, Marshall and Sinclair employed dissimilar techniques of writing, which could be conditionally labeled as journalistic, scientific and political respectively. Though in this case there is a danger of overgeneralization, because in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, professions, standards of specialized language and literary genres had just started to crystallize, which it seems is indeed the case. It is impossible to be confused with the flamboyant, light-read, associative and cognitive hand of Richardson, in contrast to the thoughtful, measured and seemingly well-grounded style of Marshall, as well as with the unscrupulous, practical and straightforward pen of Sinclair.

Last, but not least, it is necessary to remember that though the common intellectual luggage which could be used by contemporaries in relation to any outside object became a very important mark of national community, it is not completely reducible to language and vocabularies. Hence, the fourth chapter of the thesis examines the overall design of history as seen by the British travel authors, their tactics of location of both the Self and the Other in this picture, as well as strategies of justification of this positioning. To be more precise, it analyzes the British vision of political order, human nature, national character and the place of the individual in this environment. The chapter argues that, in British eyes, political order, human nature and national character mutually affect and determine each other. Finally, the chapter concludes, this theoretical model, when illustrated by both the British and the Russian examples, gives a positive for the British eye perspective. It was ready to be practically employed in order to stabilize the present and to promote the positive vision of the future.

## Bibliography

### Primary sources, collected from the Bodleian library, Oxford, UK

Marshall, Joseph, *Travels through Holland, Flanders, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Lapland, Russia, the Ukraine, and Poland, in the years 1768, 1769 and 1770*. London, 1772.

Richardson, William, *Anecdotes of the Russian empire in a series of letters, written a few years ago, from St. Petersburg*. London, 1784.

Sinclair, John, *General observations regarding the Present State of the Russian Empire*. London, 1787.

### Secondary sources

Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, *Political writings*, ed. I. Kramnick. New-York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Burke, Edmund, "A philosophical enquiry into the origin of our ideas of the sublime and beautiful (1757)". In *Edmund Burke*, ed. Adam Phillips. Oxford [England]: Oxford University Press, 1990 (1992 printing).

Coxe, William, *Account of Prisons and Hospitals in Russia, Sweden and Denmark*. London, 1781.

Godwin, William, *Enquiry concerning political justice: with selections from Goldwin's other writings*. Oxford: OUP, 1971.

Gregg, Stephen H., *Empire and identity: an eighteenth-century sourcebook*. New-York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Hervey, John, Lord, *Ancient and modern liberty stated and compared*. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1989.

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan (1651)*, ed. Richard Tuck. Cambridge: CUP, 1991.

Howard, John, *An Account of the principal lazarettos in Europe; with various papers relative to the plague: together with further observations on some foreign prisons and hospitals; and additional remarks on the present state of those in Great Britain and*

*Ireland. Warrington; printed by William Eyres; and sold by T. Cadell, J. Johnson, C. Dilly, and J. Taylor. London, 1789.*

Hume, David, *A treatise of human nature*, ed. David F. Norton, Mary J. Norton. Oxford: OUP, 2000.

Hume, David, “*An Inquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals (1751)*”, In *Hume's ethical writings: selections from David Hume*, ed. Alasdair MacIntyre. Notre Dame, [Ind.]: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965.

Hume, David, *Political essays*, ed. Knud Haakonssen. Cambridge: CUP, 1994.

Hutcheson, Francis, *Collected Works*. Vol. V. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1990.

Locke, John, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1689)*. Vol. II. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.

Montesquieu, Charles, *The spirit of the laws*, ed. Anne M. Cohler, Basia C. Miller, Harold S. Stone. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 1989.

Parkinson, John, *A Tour of Russia, Siberia, and the Crimea, 1792-1794*, ed. by William Collier. London: Frank Cass, 1971.

Pope, Alexander, *An Essay on Man*, ed. Frank Brady. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.

Priestley, Joseph, *Political writings*, ed. by Peter N. Miller. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.

Sinclair, John, *The Correspondence of the Right Honorable Sir John Sinclair, Bart. With Reminiscences of the Most Distinguished Characters Who Have Appeared in Great Britain, and in Foreign Countries, During the Last Fifty Years, in 2 vols.* London: H. Holburn & R. Bentley, 1831.

Sprat, Thomas, “*The History of the Royal Society of London for the Improving of Natural Knowledge (1667)*”. In Pera M., *The Discourses of Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Swinton, Andrew, *Travels into Norway, Denmark and Russia in the years 1788, 1789, 1790, and 1791*. London, 1792.

*The Correspondence of Grand Duchess Catherine Alexeyevna and the English Ambassador Charles Hanbury Williams, in the years of 1756 and 1757 (Perepiska Velikoj Knjagini Ekateriny Alekseevny i angliiskogo posla Ch. G. Yiliamsa, 1756 i 1757 godov)*, ed. Sergey Gorjainov. Moscow, 1909.

Warburton, William, *A letter to the editor of the letters on the spirit of patriotism, &c. (1749)*. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1978.

### Internet sources

Antiqbook: De Europese site voor antiquarische en tweedehands boeken / Translated from Dutch by Sara Zorandy. Accessed May 8, 2008 (<http://www.antiqbook.nl/boox/steu/15577.shtml>).

Encyclopedia Britannica online, s.v. "John Hill", accessed 16.05.2008 ([http://jcsn.org/StudyCenter/Encyclopedia\\_Britannica/HIG\\_HOR/HILL\\_JOHN\\_c\\_1716\\_1775\\_.html](http://jcsn.org/StudyCenter/Encyclopedia_Britannica/HIG_HOR/HILL_JOHN_c_1716_1775_.html)).

Hampton J. "Review on Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1937 by Linda Colley. Yale University Press, 1992". In *Gateway. An Academic History Journal on the Web*. Winter, 2002 (See: [http://grad.usask.ca/gateway/reviewhampton\\_colley\\_britons.html](http://grad.usask.ca/gateway/reviewhampton_colley_britons.html), accessed 08.05.2008).

Obituary: Rt. Hon. Sir John Sinclair. In *The Gentleman's Magazine*, ed. Silvanus Urban, Gent. Vol. V. New series (London, 1836, January to June): 431-432 Accessed May 6, 2008 ([http://books.google.com/books?id=26Lsr2E-i\\_sC&pg=RA1-PA431&dq=Correspondence+of+the+Right+Hon.+Sir+%22John+Sinclair%22,+Bart&ei=r6X2R\\_3AOoKWzASC38SWCg](http://books.google.com/books?id=26Lsr2E-i_sC&pg=RA1-PA431&dq=Correspondence+of+the+Right+Hon.+Sir+%22John+Sinclair%22,+Bart&ei=r6X2R_3AOoKWzASC38SWCg)).

The Cambridge History of English and American Literature, in 18 vols., ed. A. W. Ward, A. R. Waller, and the others. New-York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; Cambridge, England: University Press, 1907–21. Vol. X. s.v, "The Age of Johnson" (The Bartleby Great Books online: [www.bartleby.com/cambridge](http://www.bartleby.com/cambridge), accessed 05.05.2008).

The web-site of International League of Antiquarian Booksellers (ILAB): [http://www.ilab.org/db/book1293\\_B315966.html](http://www.ilab.org/db/book1293_B315966.html), accessed 08.05.2008.

### Articles and books

Adelung Fedor P., von. *Kritiko-literatyrnoe obozrenie pyteshestvennikov po Rossii do 1700 goda i ih sochinenii (Literary-critical account of travellers in Russia till 1700 and their writings), in two parts*. Moscow, 1864.

Alexeyev, Mikhail P., *Russko-angliiskie literatyrnye svjazi (XVIII – pervaja polovina XIX veka) (The Russian-English literary contacts, the 18 – the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century)*. Literatyrnoe nasledstvo (Series: Literary heritage). Vol. 91. Moscow, 1982.

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. 2nd ed., revised. London: Verso, 1991.

Anderson, Matthew S., *Britain's Discovery of Russia, 1553-1815*. New-York: St. Martin's Press, 1958.

Anderson, Matthew, S., "The Great Powers and the Russian Annexation of the Crimea, 1783-4". *The Slavonic and East European Review* 37, no. 88 (1958): 17-41.

Anderson, Matthew S., *Europe in the eighteenth century, 1713-1783*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Anderson, Matthew S., "Review on Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment by Larry Wolff". *The English Historical Review* 112, no. 446 (April, 1997): 490-491.

Barthes, Roland, *Mythologies*. New-York: Hill and Wang, 1995.

Barthes, Roland, *Empire of Signs*. London: J. Cape, 1983.

Baugh D. A., ed. *Aristocratic Government and society in Eighteenth-Century England*. New-York, 1975.

Bentley, J. H., *In Old World Encounters: Cross-Cultural Contacts and Exchanges in Pre-Modern Times*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Berghoff, Helmut [et. al.], eds., *The Making of Modern Tourism: the cultural history of the British experience, 1600-2000*. New-York: Palgrave, 2002.

Bermingham, Ann, Brewer, John, eds., *The consumption of culture, 1600-1800: image, object, text*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Bhabha, Homi K., ed., *Nation and narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Blanton, Casey. *Travel Writing: The Self and the World*. N.-Y.: Routledge, 2002.

Boon, James A., *Other tribes, other scribes: symbolic anthropology in the comparative study of cultures, histories, religions, and texts*. Cambridge: CUP, 1982.

Broadhead, G. J., "Samuel Johnson and the rhetoric of conversation". *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 20, no. 3. Restoration and Eighteenth Century (Summer, 1980): 461-474.

Campbell, M., "Review on Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation by Mary Louise Pratt". *American Ethnologist* 21, no. 4 (Nov. 1994): 931-932.

Chard, Chloe, *Pleasure and guilt on the Grand Tour. Travel writing and imaginative geography, 1600-1830*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

Clark, William, Giolinski, Jan, Schaffer, Simon, eds., *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Clifford, James, "Review on Orientalism by Edward W. Said". *History and Theory*, 19, no. 2. (Feb. 1980): 204-223.

Clifford, James, Marcus George E., eds., *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography: A School of American Research advanced seminar*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Clifford, James. *The predicament of culture: twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Clifford, James. *Routes: travel and translation in the late twentieth century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the nation, 1707-1837*. London: Pimlico, 1994.

Colley, Linda, *Captives*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2002.

Condren, Conan, *The language of politics in seventeenth-century England*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Cross, Anthony G., "A Royal Blue-Stoking: Catherine the Great's early reputation in England as an authoress". In Горски, Вијенац, *A Garland of Essays offered to Professor Elizabeth Mary Hill*, ed. by R. Auty, L. R. Lewitter and A. P. Vlasto. Cambridge, 1970.

Cross, Anthony G., ed., *Russia under western eyes, 1517-1825*. London, 1971.

Cross, Anthony G. "Zamechanija" sira Johna Sinklera o Rossii (Observations about Russia by Sir John Sinclair). In *XVIII vek* (The 18<sup>th</sup> century), sbornik 10. Leningrad, 1975.

Cross, Anthony G., ed., *Anglophilia u trona. Britanzy i russkie v vek Ekateriny II*. (*Anglophilia at the throne. The Britons and the Russians at the Age of Catherine II*), catalogue of the exhibition. London, 1992.

Cross, Anthony G., *Anglo-Russica: aspects of cultural relations between Great Britain and Russia in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries*. Selected essays. Oxford: Berg, 1993.

Cross, Anthony G., "The Armchair Traveler "in" Catherine's Russia". In *Rossia, Zapad, Vostok: vstrechnye techeniia*, ed. by V. Bagno. St. Petersburg, 1996, 313-320.

Cross, Anthony G., *"By the banks of the Neva": chapters from the lives and careers of the British in eighteenth-century Russia*. Cambridge: CUP, 1997.

Cross, Anthony G., *Peter the Great through British Eyes. Perceptions and Representations of the Tsar since 1698*. Cambridge, 2000.

Cubitt, Geoffrey, ed., *Imagining nations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.

Dickinson, H. T., *Liberty and property: political ideology in eighteenth-century Britain*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.

Dirks, Nicholas, *The scandal of empire: India and the creation of imperial Britain*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.

Dolan, Brian, *Exploring European Frontiers: British Travellers in the Age of Enlightenment*. New-York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Fabian, Johannes, *Time and the other: how anthropology makes its object*. New-York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

Foucault, Michael, *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Pantheon, 1972.

Frasca-Spada M., Jardine N., eds., *Books and the Science in History*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.

Furniss, Tom, *Edmund Burke's aesthetic ideology: language, gender, and political economy in revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Gibson, William, *Church, State and Society, 1760-1850*. N.-Y.: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Griffin, Dustin, *Patriotism and poetry in eighteenth-century Britain*. Cambridge, U.K.; New-York: CUP, 2002.

Griffiths, D. M., "Nikita Panin, Russian Diplomacy, and the American Revolution". *Slavic Review*, 28, no. 1 (Mar., 1969): 1-24.

Helms, M. W., *Ulysses' Sail: An Ethnographic Odyssey of Power, Knowledge, and Geographical Distance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Hulme, Peter, McDougall, Russel, eds., *Writing, travel, and empire: in the margins of anthropology*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2007.

Hunt, Mary, Racism, "Imperialism and the Traveler's Gaze in Eighteenth-Century England". *The Journal of British Studies* 32, no. 4. Making the English Middle Class, ca. 1700-1850 (Oct., 1993): 333-357.

Jacobsen Niles K., Jensen Ruth H., eds., *Denmark. Some contributions to the geography of Denmark and other topics discussed by Copenhagen geographers. 22nd International Geographical Congress, Canada, 1972*. Collected papers. Vol. 4. N.p, Det Kongelige Danske Geografiske Selskab, 1972.

Johnston, David, *The rhetoric of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes and the politics of cultural transformation*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Kaplan, H. H., "Russian Commerce and British Industry: A Case Study in Resource Scarcity in the Eighteenth-Century". In *Russia and the West in the eighteenth century*, ed. A. G. Cross. Newtonville, Mass.: Oriental Research Partners, 1983.

Kaplan, K., *Questions of travel: postmodern discourses of displacement*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.

Kernan, A., *Printing technology, letters and Samuel Johnson*. Princeton: New-Jersey, 1987.

Kitromilides, Paschalis M., ed., *From republican polity to national community: reconsiderations of Enlightenment political thought*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2003.

Knight, Diana. "Barthes and Orientalism". *New Literary History* 24, no. 3. Textual interrelations (Summer, 1993): 617-633.

Konstantinova, Svetlana S. "The Pages of History of the Anglo-Russian Relations: Charles Hanbury Williams and Russia" ("Stranizy istorii russko-britanskikh svjazej: Charles Ganbury Yilliams I Rossia"). In *Voprosy istorii I politiki. Nauchnye trudy instituta biznesa i politiki*. Vupysk 2. Moscow, 2006: 6-24.

Korshin, P. J., "Types of Eighteenth-Century Literary Patronage". *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 7, no. 4 (Summer, 1974): 453-473.

Kross, Entoni, *U temzskikh beregov: rossiiane v Britanii v XVIII veke*. Sankt-Peterburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1996.

Kuhn, Thomas S., *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Liebersohn, Henry, *The travelers' world: Europe to the Pacific*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Lorimer, D.A., "Review on Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation by Mary Louise Pratt". *The Journal of Modern History* 68, no. 2 (Jun. 1996): 429-431.

Madariaga, Isabel, de. *Britain, Russia and the Armed Neutrality of 1780: Sir James Harris's mission to St. Petersburg during the American Revolution*. London, 1962.

Mayhew, Robert J., *Enlightenment Geography: The Political Languages of British Geography, 1650-1850*. New-York, St. Martin's Press, 2000.

[Mayor W.] *The British Nepos: consisting of the lives of illustrious Britons, who have distinguished themselves by their virtues, talents, or remarkable advancement in life; with incidental practical reflections, with 24 portraits*. London, 1823.

Mezin, Sergey A., "The Stereotypes of Russia in the 18<sup>th</sup> century European social thought" ("Stereotipy Rossii v evropeiskoj obshestvennoj mysli XVIII veka"). In *Voprosy istorii*, no. 10 (2002): 154-155.

Mikhalskaja, N. P., *Obraz Rossii v angliiskoj hudozestvennoj literature IX-XIX vekov (The image of Russia in English literature of 11-19<sup>th</sup> centuries)*. Moscow, 1995.

Miller, Gerard F. “*Predlozenie, kak ispravit pogreshnosti, nahodjashiesja v inostrannyh pisateljah, pisavshih o Rossiiskom gosudarstve*” (“*The Proposal How to Correct the Errors Concerning the Russian State by the Foreign Authors, 1757*”). In *Antifomenkovskaja mozaika*, ed. by I. A. Nastenka. Moscow, 2001.

Mills, Sara, *Discourse*. New-York: Routledge, 1997.

Mitchell, L. G., *Charles James Fox*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Murray, Cohen, *Sensible Words: Linguistic Practice in England, 1640-1785*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1977.

Neumann, Iver, *Uses of the other: “The East” in European identity formation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Peter, David G., *John Wilkes, a friend of liberty*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Pisarenko, A. E., “Bastille, Petersburg, Novo Russia in the destiny of John Howard” (in Russian). *New and the Newest history*, no. 5 (1989): 161-173.

Pitcher, H. J., “William Richardson's Anecdotes of the Russian Empire (1784)”, *Forum for modern languages studies III*, no. 1 (January 1967): 236-251.

Pocock, John G. A., *Politics, language, and time: essays on political thought and history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Pocock, John G. A., ed., *The Varieties of British political thought, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.

Poe, Marshall, “Review on Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment by Larry Wolff”. *Russian Review* 55, no. 4 (Oct., 1996): 713-713.

Pratt, Mary L., *Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Putnam, Peter, ed., *Seven Britons in Imperial Russia 1698-1812*. Princeton: New-Jersey, 1952.

Reddaway, W. F., “Macartney in Russia, 1765-1767”. *Cambridge Historical Journal* 3, no. 3 (1931). P. 260-294.

Reid, A., “Review on Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism by Benedict Anderson”. *Pacific affairs* 58, no. 3 (Autumn, 1985): 497-499.

Scott, D., “The Smile of the Sign: Semiotics and Travel Writing in Barthes, Baudrillard, Butor and Lévi-Strauss”. *Studies in Travel Writing*, no. 7 (2003): 209-225.

Sears, L. J., "Review on Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism by Benedict Anderson". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114, no. 1 (Jan.-Mar., 1994): 129-130.

Seed, Patricia, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Simões Ann, Carneiro Ana, Diogo Maria P., eds., *Travels of learning: a geography of science in Europe*. Dordrecht; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.

Skinner, Quentin, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas". *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3-53.

Sokolov, Alezander B. *To meet a halfway: Russia and Anglia in the 16-18<sup>th</sup> centuries* (*Navstrechu drug drugu: Rossia i Anglia v XVI-XVIII vekah*). Yaroslavl, 1992.

Sommerville, J. P., *Royalists and patriots: politics and ideology in England, 1603-1640*. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 1999.

Stagl, Justin, *A history of curiosity: the theory of travel, 1550-1800*. Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995.

Tully, James, ed., *Meaning and Context. Quentin Skinner and His Critics*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.

Turner, Catherine, *British Travel Writers in Europe, 1750-1800: Authorship, gender and national identity*. Studies in European Cultural Transition. Vol. 10. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001.

Vivies, Jean, *English Travel Narratives in the Eighteenth Century: Exploring genre*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002.

Weber, Max, *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. London: Routledge, HarperCollins, 1992.

Whiteley, Peter, *Lord North: the Prime Minister who lost America*. London: Hambledon Press, 1996.

Wirtschafter, Elise K., "Review on Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment by Larry Wolff". *The Slavic and East European Journal* 39, no. 4 (Winter, 1995): 643-644.

Withers, Charles W. J., *Placing the Enlightenment: Thinking geographically about the Age of Reason*. Chicago and London, Chicago University Press, 2007.

Wolff, Larry, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford University Press, 1994.

**Appendix.**  
**The Discourse of Russia as Discourse of the Other: a graphical representation**

