

Original article

doi: 10.17223/24099554/18/13

THE “RUSSIAN FOREIGNER” LEO TOLSTOY AND THE “RUSSIAN EUROPEAN” IVAN TURGENEV: THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE FRENCH SOCIETY

*Anastasia S. Goncharova*¹

*Yury G. Chernyshov*²

^{1, 2} *Altai State University, Barnaul, Russian Federation*

¹ *shystoryteller1996@gmail.com*

² *ashpt@ya.ru*

Abstract. The article presents a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of perception by Leo Tolstoy and Ivan Turgenev of the French and their society. The writers adopted different models of perception through factors such as personality, communication skills, and worldviews. With all the similarities, Tolstoy, a “Russian foreigner,” emphasized the differences between the two cultures, and Turgenev, a “Russian European,” strove to find a common language between them.

Keywords: national identity, intercultural interaction, image of Other, stereotypes, France, Paris, Russia, Tolstoy, Turgenev, travelogue

For citation: Goncharova, A.S. & Chernyshov, Yu.G. (2022) The “Russian foreigner” Leo Tolstoy and the “Russian European” Ivan Turgenev: Their perception of the French society. *Imagologiya i komparativistika – Imagology and Comparative Studies*. 18. pp. 269–286. doi: 10.17223/24099554/18/13

Научная статья

УДК 82.091

doi: 10.17223/24099554/18/13

«РУССКИЙ ИНОСТРАНЕЦ» Л.Н. ТОЛСТОЙ И «РУССКИЙ ЕВРОПЕЕЦ» И.С. ТУРГЕНЕВ, ВОСПРИЯТИЕ ИМИ ФРАНЦУЗСКОГО ОБЩЕСТВА

*Анастасия Сергеевна Гончарова¹,
Юрий Георгиевич Чернышев²*

^{1,2} *Алтайский государственный университет, Барнаул, Россия*

¹ *shystoryteller1996@gmail.com*

² *ashpi@ya.ru*

Аннотация. В статье представлен комплексный анализ эволюции восприятия Л.Н. Толстым и И.С. Тургеневым французов и французского общества. Различие в моделях рецепции определяется в статье с учетом таких факторов, как личность, коммуникативные навыки и мировоззрение. При всем сходстве Л.Н. Толстой, «русский иностранец», подчеркивал различия двух культур, а И.С. Тургенев, «русский европеец», стремился найти для них общий язык.

Ключевые слова: национальная идентичность, межкультурное взаимодействие, образ Другого, стереотипы, Франция, Париж, Россия, Толстой, Тургенев, травелогои

Для цитирования: Гончарова А.С., Чернышов Ю.Г. «Русский иностранец» Л.Н. Толстой и «русский европеец» И.С. Тургенев, восприятие ими французского общества // Имагология и компаративистика. 2022. № 18. С. 269–286. doi: 10.17223/24099554/18/13

The way representatives of different ethnic groups and cultures perceive each other has been a subject of interest for a very long time. Researchers try to identify objective factors concerning the issue, as well as individual characteristics of recipients. In this field we can, for example, raise this question: why did some Russian travelers, having arrived in France, admire it, while others perceived it rather critically or even negatively in the second half of the 19th century, within the context of the renewed intercultural dialogue “Russia – Europe”? A simple explanation is hardly sufficient here – for instance, that ethnic stereotypes widespread in

Russian journalism determined the perception of Russian travelers that greatly. This explanation is all the more inefficient when it concerns highly educated people with critical mindsets. In these circumstances, it is very interesting how two classics of Russian literature – Leo Tolstoy and Ivan Turgenev perceived the French and their country, and how their reception was evolving in the course of time. Both of them visited France. Initially, they spoke of it enthusiastically, but gradually their perception, assessment and behavior acquired more and more differences. Their ideas about their own roles in France differed as well – either a “stranger” or “almost one of the natives.” In order to understand the whole complex of factors that influenced these changes, it is necessary to pay special attention to the primary sources – the so-called “Paris texts.”

The study basis consists primarily of travelogues, memoirs and epistolary records from the 1850s–1880s. Travel notes from France written by Russian travelers throughout the history of French-Russian relations occupied a special place in the public life of Russia, given that for a long time they were almost the only source of information about Europeans, their morals and customs. The travelogue combines elements of documentary and fictional narration, which explains the interest of the general public, politicians, and diplomats. Travel notes become especially relevant when an active cultural dialogue takes place, and likewise when the establishment and development of interactions between countries in various fields occur. Cultural exchange between Russia and France has always been very intense; it did not cease to exist even during periods of deterioration in diplomatic relations. Russian “Paris texts” have such a rich tradition and variability of opinions due to that fact. This source type is also very valuable in comprehending public sentiments in Russia in different periods of history. This is critically relevant in examining the unique era of Alexander II’s reign when large-scale transformations in social discourse and within the structure of society itself took place.

The systemic and structural-functional approaches, in accordance to which we examined the Russian travelers’ perception of the French as a complex system under the influence of many factors, formed the theoretical and methodological basis of the work. The historical approach made it possible to insert the Russian travelling writers’ evolving perception of the French into the context of French-Russian relations. We also applied the concept of dialogism by Mikhail Bakhtin to our work, used structural

and semantic analysis, and likewise took into account the developments of modern ethnic psychology and communication science.

Within the framework of intercultural dialogue between countries, there is a wide range of problems studied in the science field. Among foreign research, there are studies that reflect the specifics of French-Russian relations in the second half of the 19th century. For example, the classic study of Emile Haumant [1]. While working with travel records, we used the research by James Clifford [2], which contains a critical view of the travelogue topic from the standpoint of modern ethnography: while the chronotope (in this case, Paris in the second half of the 19th century) is not always representative, it nevertheless plays a large role in understanding a certain culture. Upon studying the "Paris myth", the work of Roland Barthes [3] was quite useful and enlightening. He emphasized that we should view the city in "Paris texts" primarily through the prism of the perceiving consciousness, which is especially important when working with Russian travelogues. In order to analyze the experience Turgenev, who had lived in France for many years, but at the same time was an active participant of Russian cultural processes, it is useful to take into account the concept of the so-called "third space" explored by Homi J. Bhabha [4] and Edward Soja [5]. The "Paris myth" is a subject of study in the works of Karlheinz Stierle as well [6].

Russian studies cover the problems of French-Russian relations just as widely. The research done by Sergey Makashin [7] gives a historical overview of the literary dialogue between Russia and France. Yuri Lotman [8] carried out a large-scale study of the Russian noble culture origins and its connection to the French and their customs. While analyzing the interaction between Russia and France and identifying the perception peculiarities of the French in Russia, the works of Larisa Volpert [9], who specializes in literary contacts between Russia and France, were quite useful for our research. A number of important studies are present in the collection of articles and materials named *Russia and France. 18th–20th Centuries* [10]. Vera Milchina [11] and Pyotr Cherkasov [12] made a significant contribution to modern studies of the French-Russian discourse by examining various interaction spheres of France and Russia: from economy to culture. Nevertheless, a number of aspects of the topic under study requires further research.

Charles Montesquieu called Paris the "homeland of all foreigners" [13. P. 164], thus formulating one of the major ideas of the French cultur-

al discourse in general and the French theme in Russia in particular. Over time, Paris became some sort of a cultural cradle of the noble Russian tradition, and Russian nobles themselves viewed the French as their guides into the world of the European culture for a long time.

In the second half of the 18th century, distinctive cultural French hegemony reigned in the Russian Empire, and the French themselves obtained a role of “significant Others”, who possess valuable knowledge and therefore are valuable themselves. According to Barthes’s terminology, the French became “atopic” for the Russians, meaning that they were “unclassified” and “possessed eternal unexpected distinctiveness”, unique in a way [14. P. 18]. This milestone of the French cultural dominance reflected in various spheres of society – from diplomacy to public relations, not bypassing Russian literature. This tendency was quite evident primarily in the increased number of translations from the French language into Russian and in imitation of French stylistic techniques.

However, after the war with Napoleon Bonaparte and the ensuing events, the Russian identity began to manifest itself more clearly in Russian culture, and the orientation towards the Other in the form of the French ceased to be defining for the majority of the society. During the reign of Alexander II in Russia and Napoleon III in France, a radical change of paradigms took place, a breakdown of the special “teacher–student” hierarchy in the cultural interaction of Russia and France. These transformations brought new motifs into the field of Russian travelogues.

Above all, we should note that a certain tradition in the depiction of the French in Russian “Paris texts” already existed. Generally, they assume that the boyar Andrei Matveev laid the basis of this genre in Russia. At the beginning of the 18th century, he visited France and recorded his observations in numerous notes. For example, on the outskirts of Paris he noted the “poverty of the French people” [15. P. 46–47], but in the capital itself he pointed out the diversity and exuberance of the local people, their merriness, ways of entertainment. Bright costumes caught his eye in a positive way as well [15. P. 50]. However, this could be the exact moment when a motif of duplicity and double façades became one of the key notes in Russian “Paris texts.”

Other famous travelers, who had an impact on Russian subjects’ ideas about the French, were Denis Fonvizin and Nikolai Karamzin. Fonvizin set a distinctive “laughing context” for the notes from Paris: he mocked

everything that he observed in Paris, especially its inhabitants. The French in his records have a tendency to corruption; he depicted them as ignorant people and deemed their customs ridiculous [16. P. 288]. It is noteworthy that even then the image of the hypothetical Other, the French, was useful in identifying traitors among "their own" – mainly, of course, among Russian intellectuals. Karamzin was more tolerant in his remarks. He observed Paris during a period difficult for the French. Not a very long time ago, the French Revolution broke out. Karamzin noted a penchant for "theatrics" of the French and debunked the myth of the "marshmallow French, famous for their courtesy" [17. P. 98]. The image of a cruel French rebel replaced this image. The fascination with fashion, philosophy, and general cheerfulness of the local people were also present in the French image depicted by Karamzin [17. P. 215–217].

Following travelers (Pyotr Vyazemsky, Ivan Golovin, Mikhail Pogodin), who visited France during Nicholas I's reign in Russia, were similar in their assessment of the French, noting additionally the passion for politics and the tendency of hollow speeches without deep meaning. In the texts of this era, a more explicit *Francophobia* prevailed than in previous periods. Most Russians – especially those in power – were afraid of possible revolution ignition in their empire, and these sentiments are present in the notes of the Russian travelers of the time. They portrayed the French as fanatics, or "blasphemers" who did not know how to handle their own freedom [18. P. 136]. Together, these texts form a cornerstone of the French discourse in Russia and present a collection of existing Russian stereotypes about the French that were relevant in the described period.

During the reign of Alexander II, the first travel agency came into being in Russia in 1885 [19. P. 159]. The liberalization of the departure procedure was a catalyst for a sharp increase in the number of travelers. Nikolai Wrangel, for instance, wrote that citizens of the Russian Empire "literally flooded Europe" [20. P. 80] at that time. The goals of temporary departures from Russia varied greatly. Some tourists went on personal trips to visit relatives and friends who lived in other countries, others sought out European medical treatment and rest.

By this time, important changes had taken place in Paris itself. Firstly, a so-called "private individual" appeared who had inclination towards practicality over spirituality and sentimentality. Then a duality of French

culture occurred: the aristocracy coexisted with the bourgeoisie. Anne Martin-Fugier described this situation as the irrevocable disappearance of the former society and the “aristocratic art of living” [21. P. 102].

Secondly, the intellectual conquest of France by Russian travelers also took place. The French were actively getting acquainted with Russian literature, mostly due to Turgenev’s influence. He translated a number of literary works by eminent Russian authors into French. As a result, a situation arose that was opposite to the period of Francophilia in Russia (a certain milestone of the French-Russian interaction that took place in the middle of the 18th century – the first third of the 19th century, during which French culture was holding a dominant place in Russian public thought). France was going through a crisis – quite recently, in 1848, a new revolution took place – and was actively searching for the identity. Russia, on the other hand, reserved a role of an indifferent observer after the Crimean War.

Assessments of the French realm during the described period vary greatly, according to the well-established tradition of the Russian travelogue: there were both enthusiastic and critical notions. The latter included, for example, articles from the periodical *Russkiy Vestnik*. In its several issues of only the year 1858, the periodical published “Letters from Paris” by J. Felden, “Paris Letters” by E. Tour, “The Letter from Paris” by E. Feoktistov, “Reminiscence of P.N. Kudryavtsev (Letter from Paris)” by M. Kapustin, and many others. The most illustrative example in this range was the notion written by Evgenia Tour, which describes the renewed French capital and the “new French” in a negative way. The Parisians, according to her, have no center, while the French people as a whole “are divided, scattered, torn apart”, they had lost their sciences and art [22. P. 6]. The writer emphasized that the death of Paris was approaching, that the atmosphere of a general celebration, theatricality gave her an impression that she observed “some kind of a universal orgy before death” [22. P. 16]. It is easy to see that Tour made an emphasis on the death of civilization, its impoverishment, primarily spiritual in nature.

The new Paris of Napoleon III’s reign, however, continued to interest Russian readers, despite such dejected assessments and predictions. The painting of the new Paris of the time aroused great interest among Russian readers, in connection with which in 1858 Nikolai Nekrasov in a letter to Mikhail Mikhailov asked the latter to continue publishing his travel

notes in *Sovremennik*, since the French with their theater, gossips, and "administrative abominations" had invariably interested Russian readers [23. P. 279]. Nekrasov's words also indicated a change in the preferences of the Russian reading part of the society – from political news bulletins to notes on cultural changes and personal impressions of Paris.

In this context, the comparison of Turgenev's and Tolstoy's "Paris texts" are of interest for us according to several reasons:

- during a certain period of time, writers were residing in Paris at the same time and met occasionally;
- their impression of the capital depicted in their letters and journals turned out to be exact opposites of each other;
- the texts' ideological bent varied, correspondingly, thereby allowing us to take a look at the French society during Napoleon III's reign from two different points of view;
- both writers had a great amount of influence on French literature, though the acknowledgment of Turgenev took place during his stay in Paris, while the recognition of Tolstoy occurred decades later.

One cannot classify Tolstoy as a so-called "Westernizer" because he, despite his love towards French culture and literature, was a Russian "to the bones" [24. P. 187–188]. At the same time, he is not inherently a "Slavophil", due to the fact that he never made the originality of Russian culture and "official Orthodoxy" a cornerstone in his writing, he never glorified it. Moreover, in one of his journals, he openly defined the Russian Empire as a part of the so-called "pseudo-Christian civilization" [25. P. 200].

Educated through French culture, Tolstoy did not harbor hatred against it and he did not deny its influence on his development as a writer. For instance, he stated, without denial of Rousseau's ideas impact on his personal views that he owed a lot to Russo, loved his art, but at the same time, emphasized the difference between their ideologies, "Rousseau rejects every civilization, I, on the other hand, reject the pseudo-Christian one" [25. P. 199].

Tolstoy saw the problem not in the choice of the development path, where the main options were either European values or absolute cultural distinctiveness and independence. Being a peculiar religious reformer, he discerned the root of the problem primarily in the false interpretation of the Christian doctrine, deviation from the "true faith." This thesis is essential when it comes to analyzing his "Paris texts."

Tolstoy began his journey through Europe in 1857. Upon arriving in Paris, he visited the yearly masked ball in the halls of the Grand Opera along with Nekrasov and Turgenev. Tolstoy was ecstatic about everything, especially about the vivacity and merriness of the citizens. He wrote to his sister that the “Frenchy” were terribly amusing and sweet in their mirth of the “enormous size” [26. P. 465]. Soon after the arrival in Paris, he notified Vasily Botkin in a letter that he “was pleased and happy” about his life in Paris [26. P. 471].

Tolstoy met a number of famous French writers, among whom were Xavier Marmier, Pierre Dupont, Louis de Loménie, Louis Ulbach, Augustine Brohan, and others. Additionally, he found out that he had a lot of relatives in Paris, such as the Trubetskoys. Tolstoy got acquainted with famous people mostly through Turgenev and Nekrasov, who were already part of the French elite. However, Tolstoy was not as sociable and not as famous among the French as his compatriots, which is evident in his letters, “I got around not much in the society and in the literary world, I seldom visited cafes and public balls...” [26. P. 476]. And when the stars aligned and the writer attended galas, mostly due to Turgenev’s persistence, he characterized these events as “minor, lewd and stupid” [27. P. 119].

Tolstoy pursued different goals in Paris. He felt like he was an “absolute fool” [26. P. 471], according to his letter to Sergey Botkin, but he pinned his hope for a change of this fact on Paris. The trip was self-development and aesthetic pleasure in nature. The Russian writer visited theaters, attended lectures at the Collège de France and searched for inspiration in French art and architecture. Although lonely, the journey seemed successful.

However, the sarcophagus of Napoleon I made a rather frightening impression on the writer. He got a confirmation of the thought that the “deification of a villain is terrible” [27. P. 117]. Though it was not the only thing that ruined the positive image of Paris for Tolstoy. He found the French guillotine even more gruesome and inhumane. In the morning of 6 April 1857, Tolstoy “had stupidity and cruelty” [27. P. 438] to see a public execution by hanging, which took place in front of a French jail. The memory of this horrific event had a lasting painful effect on the Russian writer, even after his departure from Paris.

Comparing the war in the Caucasus with the events in Paris, which he witnessed himself, Tolstoy made a conclusion that the latter is worse than

the former, due to the guillotine being "tranquility and comfort in murder, elaborated down to the finer details, and there is nothing dignified about it" [27. P. 438]. In Tolstoy's opinion, "no theories of existence and progress can justify this act" [27. P. 438]. There is a high probability that this experience of witnessing the execution instilled in the writer terror and repulsion towards violence in every form, which became one of the main themes in his writing and evolved in the basis of his religious doctrine. Under the influence of such an event, he formed a deeply pessimistic perception of the whole stay in Paris and then, as a consequence, a rather negative image of the whole European civilization.

In the unsent letter to Turgenev, he made a confession of being glad to "have left this Sodom" [26. P. 474]. Botkin received the letter where Tolstoy had described his life in France and the French themselves as to his liking. However, according to this letter, he had not met a "single sensible person, neither among the elite nor among the folk" [26. P. 473]. The first impression of the vibrant French disappeared, turning into dismal feelings: he wrote that at the time the French awoke in him such associations as "and guillotine, and idleness, and vulgarity" [26. P. 474]. On 8 April 1857, Tolstoy left the French capital and went to Geneva.

In conclusion, the Russian writer started to pay closer attention to the downsides of the French society. It did not lead him, however, to hatred against the French. It is evident in his further records where he spoke fondly of France and its citizens. This experience of traveling around Europe led him to the complete rejection of evil in general, no matter what sort of humanity people used in attempts to justify these measures.

Tolstoy's example confirms a thesis by Lotman, who pointed out that Europe was "nothing but a perfect point of view, not a cultural and geographical reality for many Russian nobles. But this reconstructing 'point of view' possessed to some extent higher reality in relation to the actual life, which is observed from its position" [28. P. 17–18]. Russia mythologized France and French society. The main myth falls within the discourse of the lost Paradise; it is some sort of Arcadia for a typical Russian noble raised in French culture. The discrepancy of a mythologized image of the French with reality is often a challenge: Russian nobles faced a choice between merging with the Other and rejecting them. This is one of the main themes in the genre of the Russian travelogue. Tolstoy managed

to become a true foreigner and a “stranger” in Paris only through rejection and construction of new ethnic stereotypes.

In comparison with Tolstoy, Turgenev’s experience of living in France was rather contrasting. Turgenev classified himself as a Westernizer, which he mentioned on several occasions in his writings. However, his idea was not to imitate the West but to accumulate the experience of the Western culture and then to transform it into “blood and juice” for Russian culture. Due to that, “a fresh, folk and very Russian gift occurs spontaneously, among useless imitation activity” [29. P. 237].

Initially, Turgenev’s stay in France affected him in the same way as in Tolstoy’s case. According to Turgenev’s biographer Pavel Annenkov, European countries were a “regeneration land” for the writer. In its soil, all Turgenev’s thoughts and aspirations laid roots [30. P. 316]. However, his reception of the French was susceptible to change just like Tolstoy’s.

During his stay in the 1850s, he quickly got disappointed in the French capital and the citizens, despite the fact that he was already famous in Paris and had an access to the local elite circles. For instance, in the letter to Alexander Herzen he wrote, “So far, I have not met a single young, likable creature; everything is terribly shallow and hollow” [31. P. 173]. In his letter to Tolstoy of 3 January 1857, he stated that the French could be excellent soldiers and administrators but they were too close-minded, “Everything that is not theirs, seems barbaric to them – and that is stupid” [31. P. 181]. It is evident that Turgenev reproduced established stereotypes about the French as a shallow, stupid nation focused only on their own inner world. Because of this reaction to the mismatch of the witnessed reality and fantasies about the European city, we could classify Turgenev as a typical Russian Westernizer, who praises all achievements of Europe but then quickly expresses dismay due to real European problems [32. P. 7]. However, Turgenev’s real perception was more complex.

Starting from 1863, the writer went back to his homeland incrementally seldom. One of the main reasons took the form of Pauline Viardot, with whom Turgenev had grown closer during his stay. “I have never thought that he is capable of such strong love,” wrote Tolstoy upon returning home [26. P. 476]. Despite aversion to the French society demonstrated earlier, Turgenev hardly left Paris because of his infatuation. Eventually, his attitude towards the French elite started to change. Prolonged residence in Paris, friendly relationships with such famous French

artists as, for example, Edmond de Goncourt, Alphonse Daudet, Émile Zola, Prosper Mérimée, Guy de Maupassant, and Gustave Flaubert, could be potential reasons for a change of heart. His connection with the singer Viardot also played a major role in this gradual transformation of perception. Due to that, his comments about the French became not so sharp and offensive in the 1870s.

Turgenev's criticism of the Russian tyranny and serfdom, his comprehension and conceptualization of the "new man" image combined with an elegant narration style seemed quite familiar and close in spirit to French culture, and that caused a special treatment of Turgenev himself. For instance, Hippolyte Taine stated in a private conversation with Eugène-Melchior de Vogüé that Turgenev was the first always and everywhere, that Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, in comparison with this writer, seemed to be "geniuses ignoramus", who wrote masterpieces but "did not know their craft" [33. P. 171]. Vogüé himself expressed such an opinion, "Re-reading yet again the pages written by Turgenev, I repeatedly recalled that whisper soft sound of silver on crystal ... The ungentle Russian land took him away from us. Him, whom we considered almost our own" [33. P. 147]. The fact that the French writers paid closer attention first and foremost to the writing technique of Turgenev and not to the content of his works seems quite illustrative in itself.

Turgenev's remark of 5 March 1876 deserves special attention due to its essence – comprehension of differences in Russian and French national spirits. The play *Madame Caverlet* by Emile Ogier seen by Turgenev recently served as a reason for the evaluation. He stated, "You, people of the Latin race, the spirit of the Romans with their worship of the sacred right is yet alive in you; in short, you are people of the Law... And we are not like that <...> More human! Yes, that is right! We are less restricted by social niceties. We are more human people!" [34. P. 225–226]. Although Turgenev's attitude to the French became more tolerant over the course of time spent in France, this passage demonstrates that Russian culture is dominant in the consciousness of the writer when he makes a comparison of Russian and French cultures. The peculiar tendency to theatrics of the French was abhorrent to Turgenev.

Contributing to the establishment of cross-cultural dialogue, Turgenev participated in the criticism of French literary works. For example, sharing an opinion about Taine, he used a rather harsh wording. He compared

the French writer with the hound dog that had been in Turgenev's possession in the past. It could "pick up a trail, stand up straight, it performed all maneuvers of the hound dog magnificently, but there was one thing it lacked – a gut feeling" [34. P. 193]. Predominantly, Turgenev's comments revolved around his conviction that there was no such thing as real criticism in France, the ideal of which, in Turgenev's opinion, could be probably embodied in Russia by Vissarion Belinsky. The latter seemed a perfect combination of a critical mind and artistic creativity.

We can, therefore, make an assumption that Turgenev's attitude towards the French could transform due to the good treatment of the Russian writer from the French artistic society, as well as to the personal connections with a Frenchwoman, among other things. Noteworthy is the fact that France itself had an inspiring effect on Turgenev. During his stay there, he wrote his most heartfelt and patriotic works. His biographer stated, "He was scolded in his homeland. And, in France, people viewed him as an ambassador of Russian culture. He failed to become a European, but, at the same time, he did not manage to stay a Russian" [35. P. 2003]. Indeed, Turgenev played a role of a peculiar mediator between the two cultures. He introduced the masterpieces of Russian literature to France. Sometimes, he introduced Russian writers to the French, like in Tolstoy's case, for example. He had a direct access to French literary circles. Nevertheless, he did not lose his connections with Russian culture either, posing a truly interesting case of a personal identity.

A new country of residence in the form of France and a forsaken homeland represented by the Russian Empire created the so-called "third space" – a special space where interaction of the cultures took place. Turgenev did not overlook cultural differences between Russia and France. Due to that fact, he transcended the binary opposition "friend-or-foe." Paris did not manage to become a new home for the writer. At the same time, it did not remain foreign to him. In the course of initiation and slow integration, there emerged a new identity – a "Russian European" [36].

In conclusion, we must say that the period of Alexander II's reign in the Russian Empire and Napoleon III's rule in France was a unique time in the context of French-Russian cultural contacts. Travelers from Russia, due to the general liberalization of the departure procedure literally flooded Europe, especially France. They attempted to see and evaluate the reality, which had been accessible only in books, magazines, newspapers, and

stories of other people in the previous years. There were numerous cases of newly established personal contacts between the Russians and the French, as well as a fruitful cultural exchange. Russian periodicals maintained in some sense traditions of Nikolay I's era, incriminating the French and portraying them as hollow people with forsaken cultural traditions and with morals that were too loose.

Motivations behind these actions could be political: for instance, the rejection of the revolution in France in 1848, the criticism of the role the French had played in the humiliating Crimean War, as well as the fact that there was a national identity crisis in France during the described times, which could not go unnoticed by Russian travelers. During this period, Francophilia became irrelevant to the Russian Empire, and French culture was not any longer a defining factor for the Russian society. Instead of idolization, we can see that the critical view of the French society became very common. In this case, the observations of Tolstoy and Turgenev present a special kind of scholarly interest.

The opinions of the Russian writers in the end turned out to be almost diametrically opposite. Tolstoy became disillusioned with the values of the European civilization, unlike Turgenev, who managed to integrate into the French society and to fall in love with the culture and the people. Evidently, we can conclude that there were many factors at play in the process of integration into the French society in both cases, ranging from personal characteristics, communication skills, and circumstances of personal life to the ideological ideas, which defined their behavior for the most part. Consequently, one of the writers tried to draw the line between the cultures, emphasize the differences, and "build bridges", while the other one sought to find common ground for them.

Ever since Edward T. Hall pointed out the evident connection between a culture and communication, researchers have been noting some common patterns, manifested in the course of intercultural engagement [37]. For example, a person, who ends up in another cultural environment, often goes through a few stages of perception of the host culture. Frequently, the reactions of surprise or even excitement are quite typical for the first stage, but then the so-called "cultural shock" occurs (when a person feels rejected, like they do not fit in, as if they are alone and there is no one to understand them). After this "shock" stage, two general variants can emerge: (1) a person finds a solution in "separation" (attempts to iso-

late themselves from the dominant culture or even a departure from a foreign country altogether); (2) a person finds opportunities of enculturation and integration (learns a language for better comprehension of the foreign reality and customs of local people, and then, as a result, a person manages to fulfill themselves in this society).

Turgenev, unlike Tolstoy, was open for interaction with the French literary elite, where there was already a special treatment of him as “almost one of their own.” His personal connection with Pauline Viardot, whose good impression of the writer could have influenced the reception of the French, was another undeniably important factor. It is a well-known fact that Tolstoy “had an eye on <...> a noblewoman named A.V. Lvova and others in hope to find a bride” [38], but his attempts were not successful. Meanwhile, it is crucial for a person who ends up in another cultural environment and experiences the “cultural shock” to find a “kindred spirit” that can potentially help adapt to the unknown setting, lower psychological stress, etc. For both Tolstoy and Turgenev, it was important to find at least one “likable creature” or “sensible person” that could prevent them from feeling rejected and perceiving themselves as strangers on the French “celebration of life.”

The “Paris texts” presented here allow us to construct a comprehensive image of the French in the Russian Empire during the described era: the Russian travel writers portrayed them as materialistic people who had lost their spirituality and had been in a transitional position between holding on to the aristocratic traditions of the past and accepting the bourgeois practices of the modern time. The French did not seem very close in spirit to the Russian writers, but due to different personal reasons. Tolstoy, viewing the French society impersonally-aesthetically, relied on Christian moral ideas in his observations. During that time, pragmatism reigned in France, allowing a public execution. This fact went against Tolstoy’s worldview. Turgenev’s situation differed: he was promoting Russian culture in France and, in the end, managed to accommodate the “third place” of a mediator between the two cultures. Due to his close relationships with Pauline Viardot, he incrementally became a voluntary exile and lived in Paris for a very long time. Nevertheless, he did not merge with the foreign culture in its entirety, which, on one hand, annihilated the opposition “friend-or-foe” and, on the other hand, did not allow him to become a solid part of the foreign society. Turgenev acquired the identity of a “Russian European”, in which Western-

ism and "Russianness", or Russian originality, merged. It made his perception of the French introspective, and, at the same time, made it lose some characteristics of the outsider's view.

Paris gave birth to a "Russian foreigner" in the form of Tolstoy and a "Russian European" represented by Turgenev. At the same time, both writers sometimes aligned their views in the description of France, where they reproduced themes of theatrics, hollow merriness, double façades, emptiness, cruelty, and a deep sense of spiritual loss. In this sentiment, they echoed the mood of typical letters from Paris from the periodical *Russkiy Vestnik*. This may be due not only to the influence of stereotypes rooted in Russian journalism, but also to the fact that the writers felt and saw the real crisis of identity that France was experiencing at that time, and they tried to depict this process in their observations.

References

1. Haumant, É. (1913) *La culture française en Russie (1700–1900)*. Paris: Paris Hachette.
2. Clifford, J. (1992) Travelling Cultures. In: *Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge. pp. 96–116.
3. Barthes, R. (1985) *L'aventure sémiologique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
4. Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
5. Soja, E. (1996) *Thirdspace: Journey to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Blackwell.
6. Stierle, K. (2001) *La capitale des signes. Paris et son discours*. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.
7. Makashin, S.A. (1937) Literaturnye vzaimootnosheniya Rossii i Frantsii XVIII–XIX vv. [Literary Relations of Russia and France in the 18th and 19th Centuries]. In: *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* [The Literary Legacy]. Vol. XXIX/XXX. Moscow: Zhur.-gaz. ob"edinenie. pp. 5–82.
8. Lotman, Yu.M. (2017) *Besedy o russkoy kul'ture: Byt i traditsii russkogo dvoryanstva (XVIII – nachalo XIX veka)* [Conversations about Russian Culture: Life and Traditions of the Russian Nobility (18th – Early 19th Centuries)]. Saint Petersburg: Azbuka.
9. Volpert, L.I. (2010) *Pushkinskaya Frantsiya* [Pushkin France]. Tartu: [s.n.].
10. Speranskaya, N.M. (ed.) (2013) *Rossiya i Frantsiya: XVIII–XX vv.: Lotmanovskie chteniya* [Russia and France: 18th and 19th Centuries: Lotman Readings]. Moscow: RSUH.
11. Milchina, V.A. (2017) "Frantsuzy poleznye i vrednye": nadzor za inostrantsami v Rossii pri Nikolae I ["The French, Useful and Harmful": Supervision of Foreigners under Nicholas I]. Moscow: NLO.

12. Cherkasov, P.P. (2015) *Shpionskie i inye istorii iz arkhivov Rossii i Frantsii* [Spy and Other Stories from the Russian-French Archives]. Moscow: Lomonosov.
13. Montesquieu, C.S. (1972) *Lettres persanes*. Paris: Le Livre de poche.
14. Barthes, R. (2015) *Fragmenty ljubovnoj rechi* [A Lover's Discourse: Fragments]. Moscow: Ad Marginem.
15. Matveev, A.A. (1972) *Russkiy diplomat vo Frantsii (Zapiski Andrey Matveeva)* [A Russian Diplomat in France (Andrey Matveev's Notes)]. Leningrad: Nauka.
16. Fonvizin, D.I. (1866) Pis'ma iz Frantsii i Rossii k grafu I. Paninu v Moskvu [Letters to Count Panin from France and Russia to Moscow]. In: *Sochineniya Fonvizina* [Fonvizin's Writings]. Saint Petersburg: P.I. Glazunov.
17. Karamzin, N.M. (1984) *Pis'ma russkogo puteshestvennika* [Letters of a Russian Traveler]. Leningrad: Nauka.
18. Vyazemskiy, P.A. (1984) *Estetika i literaturnaya kritika* [Aesthetics and Literary Criticism]. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
19. Razvozjaeva, E. (2007) L'Histoire du tourisme russe en France 1885–1914. *Bulletin de l'Institut Pierre Renouvin*. 25. pp. 159–175.
20. Wrangel, N.E. (2003) Vospominaniya ot krepostnogo prava do bol'shevikov [Memories from the Serfdom to the Bolsheviks]. Moscow: NLO.
21. Martin-Fugier, A. (1998) *Elegantnaya zhizn', ili Kak vznik "ves' Parizh", 1815–1848* [Elegant Life, or How "All Paris" Came into Being, 1815–1848]. Moscow: Izd-vo im. Sabashnikovyh.
22. Tour, E. (1858) Parizhskie pis'ma [Letters from Paris]. *Russkiy vestnik*. 9. pp. 5–75.
23. Nekrasov, N.A. (1987) *Perepiska N.A. Nekrasova v 2 t.* [Nekrasov's Correspondence in 2 Vols]. Vol. I. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
24. Turgenev, I.S. (1968) Korrespondentsii [The Correspondence]. In: *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem: V 28 tomakh* [Complete Collection of Writings and Letters: In 28 Volumes]. Vol. XV. Leningrad: USSR AS.
25. Tolstoy, L.N. (1985) Izbrannye dnevniki [Selected Diaries]. In: *Sobranie sochineniy v 22 tomakh* [Collected Works]. Vol. 22. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
26. Tolstoy, L.N. (1984) Izbrannye pis'ma [Selected Letters]. In: *Sobranie sochineniy v 22 tomakh* [Collected Works]. Vol. 18. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
27. Tolstoy, L.N. (1937) Dnevnik i zapisnye knizhki, 1854–1857 [Diaries and Notebooks, 1854–1857]. In: *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy v 90 tomakh* [Complete Works in 90 Volumes]. Vol. 47. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
28. Lotman, Yu.M. (1992) Simvolika Peterburga i problemy semiotiki goroda [Symbolism of St. Petersburg and Problems of City Semiotics]. In: *Izbrannye stat'i: V 3 tomakh* [Selected Articles: In 3 Volumes]. Vol. 2. Tallin: Aleksandra.
29. Turgenev, I.S. (1978) Smert' Lyapunova [Lyapunov's Death]. In: *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem: v 30 tomakh* [Complete Writings and Letters: In 30 Volumes]. Vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka. pp. 236–250.

30. Annenkov, P.V. (1989) *Literaturnye vospominaniya* [Literary Memoirs]. Moscow: Pravda.
31. Turgenev I.S. (1983) Pis'ma [Letters]. In: *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem: v 30 tomakh* [Complete Writings and Letters: In 30 Volumes]. Vol. 3. Moscow: Nauka.
32. Kantor, V.K. (2001) *Russkiy evropeets kak yavlenie kul'tury (filosofsko-istoricheskijy analiz)* [The Russian European as a Cultural Phenomenon (Philosophical and Historical Analysis)]. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
33. Vogüé, E. de. (1912) *Le roman russe*. Paris: Plon-Nourrit.
34. Goncourt, E. & Goncourt, Z. (1964) *Dnevnik. Zapiski o literaturnoy zhizni. Izbrannyye stranitsy: v 2 t.* [The Diary. Notes on Literary Life. Selected Pages: in 2 Vols]. Vol. 2. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
35. Troyat, A. (2003) *Ivan Turgenev*. Moscow: EKSMO.
36. Domanskiy, V.A. & Kafanova, O.B. (2019) I.S. Turgenev – russkiy yevropeets: vzglyad iz Rossii i Frantsii [Turgenev Is a Russian European: A View from Russia and France]. *Vestnik TGPU – TSPU Bulletin*. 6 (203). pp. 7–19.
37. Hall, E.T. (1959) *The Silent Language*. New York: Doubleday.
38. Polosina, A.N. (2009) L.N. Tolstoy v Parizhe [L.N. Tolstoy in Paris]. *Neva*. 7. pp. 199–206.

Information about the authors:

A.S. Goncharova, student, Altai State University (Barnaul, Russian Federation). E-mail: shystoryteller1996@gmail.com

Yu.G. Chernyshov, Dr. Sci. (History), head of the Department of General History and International Relations, Altai State University (Barnaul, Russian Federation). E-mail: ashpi@ya.ru

The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Информация об авторах:

Гончарова А.С. – студентка Алтайского государственного университета (Барнаул, Россия). E-mail: shystoryteller1996@gmail.com

Чернышов Ю.Г. – д-р ист. наук, заведующий кафедрой всеобщей истории и международных отношений Алтайского государственного университета (Барнаул, Россия). E-mail: ashpi@ya.ru

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

The article was accepted for publication 23.09.2021.

Статья принята к публикации 23.09.2021.