

DAVID SCOTT

Nikitin's Conversion in India to Islam: Wielhorski's Translation Dilemma

In 1858 Mikhail Wielhorski's *The Travels of Athanasius Nikitin* was published in London.¹

This was the first and only translation into English of the travels to India c. 1470 by the Russian merchant Nikitin. In recent years scholars outside Russia (Lenhoff and Banerjee) have dramatically and clearly shown how Nikitin's text reveals him accepting Islam.²

Nikitin's Indian milieu and the actual form of Islam that he absorbed are interesting, but are not the focus of this article.³ The central concern here is the translator Wielhorski. There has been little comment about the way in which his translation in the early 1850s (the only one available in English) systematically obscured these Islamic affirmations by Nikitin. Such a move to Islam was noteworthy in the context of Nikitin's late medieval Russia and of Europe generally.⁴ Wielhorski translated the wide-ranging details from Nikitin on Indian society and culture in the fifteenth century, yet omitted these central details revealing Nikitin's acceptance of Islam. This selective censoring of Nikitin's text, by Wielhorski in the middle of the nineteenth century, is, then, at the heart of the present article.

Three strands of enquiry seem particularly appropriate for shedding light on Wielhorski and his translation. Firstly, how was Wielhorski portrayed and treated by others? Secondly, how did Wielhorski "translate" Nikitin's text? Thirdly, why did Wielhorski choose

to filter his translation? Text and sub-text emerge amidst this dilemma for Wielhorski of what to translate and indeed what not to translate.

In considering how Wielhorski was portrayed and treated, it is useful to note that Wielhorski's translation was commissioned by the *Hakluyt Society*, an influential and prestigious body in Victorian London founded in 1846 to publish scholarly historical travel literature.⁵ It took its name from Richard Hakluyt, author of *Divers Voyages Touching the Discovery of America* (1582) and *Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589).

In introducing Nikitin's travelogue, the editor R. Major (British Museum) praised Wielhorski "who obligingly rendered his best services to our Society."⁶ Nikitin's account of India in the late fifteenth century had languished in some obscurity in Russia before the nineteenth century and was generally unknown outside Russia, but it was one of the few outside accounts of India between Marco Polo (c. 1370) and the establishment of European imperialism in the sixteenth century.⁷ Wielhorski indeed rendered a service to Western academia by bringing Nikitin to light outside Russia almost four hundred years later.

Who, though, was Wielhorski? As already noted, there has been scant study of this translator. Wielhorski enjoyed some connections in high society. As the editor, R. Major, put it in 1858, the translation of Nikitin "was undertaken by the late estimable Count Wielhorsky, Secretary of the Russian legation at the Court of St. James's, and by great good fortune was completed by him before his recall."⁸ Wielhorski's simultaneous position as an aristocrat, Secretary to the Russian embassy in London, and translator for a learned British society is interesting but not unusual. Diplomatic bureaucracies in Europe had not yet become dominated by middle-class professional career structures as became gradually the case during the latter part of the nineteenth century. In Russia, nobles were admitted to the Russian diplomatic service "in personal right." It was only in 1859, four years after

Wielhorski's death, that aspiring Russian diplomats were obliged to pass an examination in modern languages. This is somewhat ironic in light of Wielhorski's own translating activities under analysis here. Hamilton's judgement that "the regulations governing the eligibility of candidates for the Russian civil and foreign services were, however, almost oriental in their inspiration" is also ironic in the light of Wielhorski's translation of Nikitin's travels in the Orient.⁹

Two further things come to mind within all this. Why was there a "recall" of Wielhorski, and why was Wielhorski the "late" Wielhorski? Therein already lies some Victorian reticence and understatement by the editor, R. Major. Wielhorski's "recall" was delicately not explained by Major. Russia's image in the West deteriorated dramatically under the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855) who emerged as "the gendarme of Europe" suppressing dissent at home and intervening abroad, amidst growing Russophobia in Britain.¹⁰

The second quarter of the nineteenth century was thus the age par excellence of black literature about Russia. Indeed, it was then that the repertory of negative stereotypes regarding Russia first emerged.... Russia, more than any one power, became the focus of the fears...the regime of Nicholas I loomed ever more ominously.¹¹

Nicholas's crushing of the Hungarian revolt in 1848 compounded this image as "it produced a paroxysm of Russophobic rage...the spectre haunting Europe was not Marx's variety of Communism...but Nicholas and his Cossacks...morally Russia had been cast into the outer darkness of Asia."¹² Two particular areas of concern to Britain further heightened such fears. Constantinople, dominating the strategically significant Bosphorus straits, was captured for Islam in 1453 amidst the vigorous Ottoman expansionism of Nikitin's period. Such expansionism had given way to decline, and Russian opportunities, by Wielhorski's time. This was the "Eastern Question" where "on this issue Westerners could most plausibly evoke the idea of Russian megalomania...it brought the apogee of Western-Russian

estrangement in the nineteenth century.”¹³ Marx had judged in 1853 that the Bosphorus straits were “the principal means of intercourse of Europe with [Islamic] Central Asia. The principal means of re-civilizing that vast region depends upon the uninterrupted liberty of trading through the gates of the Black Sea.”¹⁴ Such wider Asian settings point to the second strategic area of concern to Britain, the “Great Game” where Britain and Russia increasingly fenced with each other across Asia during the nineteenth century amidst growing British fears about overland Russian threats to British India through Central Asia and Persia.¹⁵ As Marx noted in London, “there are always some vague and alarming rumours afloat about Russian progress in Central Asia, got up by interested...politicians or terrified visionaries.”¹⁶

In an interesting comparison between Wielhorski’s and Nikitin’s times, Marx saw a continuity of menacing Russian expansionism where “it becomes clear that the policies of Ivan III [1462-1505] and those of Russia today [1853] are not merely similar but identical...that policy of extension, under the cover of which Russia hopes, as heretofore, to carry out her projects on the East.”¹⁷ Whether Marx and Wielhorski ever met or knew of each other during their residence in London during the early 1850s is unclear, but it is an interesting possibility.

Russian threats to Turkey in 1853 triggered rising furore in Britain, followed by Nicholas’s decision to recall his ambassadorial staff from London in February 1854, including Count Wielhorski. The declaration of war on Russia by Britain and France came the following month, and with it the Crimean War of 1854-1856.¹⁸ Major’s editorial preface for the *Hakluyt Society* seems in retrospect to be summed up in “Cleese-ian” style as “above all, don’t mention the war.”¹⁹ In Britain, the Crimean War was initially popular, with Marx writing about how “when Russia began her aggression upon Turkey, the national hatred broke forth in a blaze, and never, perhaps, was a war so popular as this.”²⁰ Another

contemporary, Andrew White, noticed a similarly charged polemical atmosphere in Russia towards Britain.²¹

Amidst Crimean skirmishes, sieges, military blunders and medical mishaps, Wielhorski met his death on 22 November 1855. A revealing condolence letter in the *Journal de St. Petersburg* on 3 January 1856 was then translated in *The Times* (London) on 12 January. Such rapid textual dissemination between countries on the opposite extremes of the European continent is noticeable, even more so as they were still in a state of war. The person composing this condolence letter was no ordinary figure, being the Empress Marie of Russia, whose husband Alexander II had ascended the throne on the death of Nicholas I in September 1855, just before Wielhorski's own death. Mayer's talk of the aristocratic *Ancien Régime* spanning Europe during the nineteenth century comes to mind amidst such condolences across European national boundaries.²² Empress Marie expressed her appreciation to Wielhorski's father (Count Mikhail "the elder") of "the generous sentiment which led your son to express the desire to go to the aid of the suffering among our brave soldiers wounded in the army of the Crimea."²³ The diplomatic career of Count Wielhorski ("the younger") seems to have been at a relatively early stage, with the Empress commenting to his father how due to "the premature and unexpected death of your son...a short career," only, had ensued.²⁴

The exact circumstances of Wielhorski's death are not, though, the focus of this essay. Suffice it to say that Wielhorski had been unlucky to have died in November 1855 at the very tail end of the war, in Empress Marie's words, just after having "worthily received a testimony of the high satisfaction of His Majesty the Emperor [Alexander II], at the period of his visit to the Crimea."²⁵ Wielhorski's translation of Nikitin's travelogue was then posthumously published in London by the *Hakluyt Society*, to which we can now turn.

Wielhorski was proud of Nikitin's travels, citing Karamzin's assertion that "hitherto, geographers have ignored the fact that the honour of one of the oldest voyages to India, undertaken and described by an European, belongs to the age and country of Ivan III."²⁶ Wielhorski was right to highlight this previous neglect of Nikitin. However, Wielhorski was somewhat ambiguous in his own estimation of the general worth of the text, feeling "there is besides, throughout the memorial a want of coherence, and a most painful absence of that minuteness of description which, in placing before the reader the objects depicted, can alone be considered as a source of interest or instruction."²⁷ One could, of course, ask why Wielhorski bothered to translate it, if there was nothing of "interest or instruction" in this text for him. Nikitin's account did, in fact, have quite detailed "minuteness of description" on the powerful Bahmani (Islamic) and Vijayanagar (Hindu) realms in southern India, details that are clear, interesting and instructional.

Wielhorski noticed how "a striking peculiarity of Nikitin's narrative, is the frequent recurrence of oriental words and sentences, spelt in Russian letters and embodied in the original text."²⁸ Such an observation is an accurate summation of the "patois" mixture of Turkish (c. 130), Persian (c. 150), Arabic (c. 280) and Indian (30) words appearing in Nikitin's Russian testimony—all of which in turn reflect significant cross-cultural and inter-faith nuances in and around the text. Wielhorski, however, then went on, concerning these "oriental words and sentences," that "some of those have been translated, while others have been necessarily left without explanation."²⁹ Why such material should or should not have "been necessarily left without explanation" by Wielhorski is the crux of this article, and of Wielhorski's "unwitting testimony."³⁰ To choose not to translate some understandable materials, whilst translating others, is not "necessarily" self-evident at all. It becomes only "necessarily" so in light of the uncomfortable message perhaps contained in such material, a message that Wielhorski as translator felt was "necessarily" not to be translated by him for

the reader's eye. Elsewhere Wielhorski admitted about Nikitin's material that "even when the meaning can be guessed at, it has sometimes, as in the present instance, been thought undesirable to supply it in English."³¹ What was so "undesirable" in Nikitin's material to cause Wielhorski to restrict his translation?

One example of filtering comes with Wielhorski not translating some details concerning the practice of prostitution in India.³² Such reserve may have reflected Victorian sensibilities in such matters.³³ However, apart from this example, there is a whole swathe of material in Nikitin that Wielhorski consistently filtered, namely that to do with Islam. Let us now turn to the question of what Wielhorski's untranslated passages on Islam concerned.³⁴

Wielhorski was ready enough to translate great detail on Islamic trading patterns across the Indian Ocean and on Islamic military power in central India, together with Hindu religious practices at Parvat. Nevertheless, he consistently ignored material concerning Nikitin's own religious responses to Islam during his stay in India. Lenhoff and Martin note "the growing ratio of Oriental prayers to Church Slavic prayers" in the text, showing that "Nikitin came to embrace Islam in more than token fashion."³⁵ In Nikitin's time such a progression was unusual, potentially dangerous for Nikitin as an individual back in Russia, and scandalous for general Christian circles. After all, religious orthodoxy was then stamping out "Judaising" strands within the Russian church.³⁶

How did Wielhorski deal with this progression? He was happy enough to translate Nikitin's preamble extolling the virtues of Christianity "by the prayer of our holy fathers, O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God have mercy on me, Thy sinful servant."³⁷ Admittedly, Lenhoff and Martin wonder if this preamble in High Church Slavic subsequently "may have been appended by an editor for the sake of decorum" at the monastery of Troitsk-Sergivsk in the late fifteenth/early sixteenth century.³⁸ Wielhorski consistently translated Christian-sounding material. However, the varied and increasingly devotional personal references

made by Nikitin to Islam were neither translated nor commented upon by Wielhorski—in particular, Nikitin’s references to *Allah* (the mandatory Islamic term for God), Mohammed (Islam’s central “Seal of the Prophets,” rejected across medieval Christianity) and Islamic ritual formulae. What examples of this pattern present themselves in Wielhorski’s translation?

The first example of Wielhorski’s re-direction of Nikitin’s testimony on Islam comes at the end of Nikitin’s trip to Parvat. Wielhorski’s translation reads:

From Pervota we returned to Beder, a fortnight before the great Mahommedan festival (Ulu Bairam). But I know not the great day of Christ’s Resurrection; however, I guess by different signs, that the great Christian day is by nine or ten days sooner than the Mahommedan *Cagrim* (Cairiam). I have nothing with me; no books whatever; those that I had taken from Russia were lost when I was robbed. And I forgot the Christian faith and the Christian festivals, and know neither Easter nor Christmas, nor can I tell Wednesday from Friday, and I am between the two faiths. *But I pray to the only God that he may preserve me from destruction. God is one, king of glory and creator of heaven and earth.*³⁹

Wielhorski’s translation suggests Nikitin as lamenting but also trying to hold onto his Christian faith. A rather different message starts to emerge with full translation of Wielhorski’s cry, “I am between the two faiths. *But I pray to the only God that he may preserve me from destruction. God is one, king of glory and creator of heaven and earth.*” Why did Wielhorski switch in mid-section (through his italics) into “*But I pray to the only God that he may preserve me from destruction. God is one, king of glory and creator of heaven and earth.*” The reason could well be that this italicised part already points towards Islam, but remains veiled by Wielhorski’s translation. The word translated as “God” by Wielhorski was not the Russian word *Bog*, which appears elsewhere in Nikitin’s text. Instead Nikitin’s word there was *Olloh*, i.e. *Allah* the central Arabic (Qur’anic) term for God. This mid-section would now read, “I am between two faiths. I pray to Allah, the Merciful, the Creator. Thou art the Lord.” A more direct “Islamic” flavour thereby becomes clearer.

In Wielhorski's presentation of Nikitin, this turning point is then immediately followed by another pattern, namely non-translation by Wielhorski. Initially this non-translation concerns the Islamic term *Allah*. We read Nikitin affirming:

I prayed to God Almighty, who made heaven and earth; and no other god of any other name did I invoke, Bog ollo, Bog kerim, Bog garym, Bog khudo, Bog Akber, God, king of glory, Ollo-Varian ollo garymello, sensen olloty.⁴⁰

This sounds still compatible enough with Christianity, except that Wielhorski's untranslated *Bog ollo, Bog kerim, Bog garym, Bog khudo, Bog Akber...Ollo-Varian ollo garymello, sensen olloty* has an immediate Islamic thrust in its start (*Bog ollo*) and completion (*Ollo-Varian ollo garymello, sensen olloty*). Nikitin's own familiar Russian term *Bog* "God" was equated and then subsumed by Nikitin within Islam's own specific term for God i.e. *Allah (Ollo)*. When translated, the whole passage then reads:

I prayed to God [*Bog*] Almighty, who made heaven and earth; and no other god of any other name did I invoke. God is *Allah [Bog ollo]*. God is munificent, God is merciful, God is Lord, God is Great, God is Great [God, King of Glory], Allah exists, Allah, Thou art the merciful, Thou! Oh, Thou, Allah.

Nikitin's repeated use of the term *Ollo*, the sacred Islamic term for God of *Allah*, is in retrospect very much pointing to a god of "another name."

Wielhorski continued to avoid translating phrases concerning *Allah*. Thus, when Nikitin was challenged by a local Muslim for not being a real Christian, Wielhorski's text had Nikitin pleading:

Do not lead me, O Lord, from the path of truth, but direct my steps to wander in righteousness; for in my trouble I did no good for Thy sake, O Lord, and have spent the whole of my days in evil. Ollo pervodiger, Ollo garym', Ollo tykarim, Ollo karim, Ollo ragymello, Akhalim dulimo. I have already passed the fourth great day [Easter] in the Mussulman country, and have not renounced Christianity. But what may come hereafter, that God alone knows.

As it stands Nikitin's own sentiments are indeterminate from Wielhorski's translation, able to be read as showing Nikitin still turning to Christianity. However, when translated we see a continuing shift and identification towards Islam in Nikitin's concluding *Ollo pervodiger, Ollo garym', Ollo tykarim, Ollo karim, Ollo ragymello, Akhalim dulimo*. This translates as "My Lord, Allah the Protector, Allah the Most High, Allah the Merciful, Allah the Beneficent. Praise be to Allah." Nikitin's phrase, "I...have not renounced Christianity. But what may come hereafter, that God alone knows," has a very different ring to it in the light of the Islamic confessional material already appearing, but left untranslated, thereby in effect redirecting the meaning of the immediately surrounding translated material.

Another pattern observable in Wielhorski's translation is its failure to translate references to Mohammed, Prophet of Islam. At the end of the description of the Bahmani sultanate, Wielhorski has Nikitin announcing, seemingly somewhat plaintively:

Mamet deni iaria arast deni khudodonot, and God knows the true faith, and the true faith bids us to know only one God and to invoke his name in every place. On the fifth great day I thought of returning to Russia, and I set out from Beder a month before the Mahommedan Bairam. *Mamet deni rossolial*. Knowing no more the great Christian day, the day of Christ's resurrection, I kept Lent time with the Mussulmans and broke fasting with them on Easter day, which I did at Kulburga.⁴¹

His translation still gives a Christian-orientated picture of Nikitin on the eve of his return to Russia, as someone valiantly maintaining general Christian sentiment, i.e. *Lent time* fasting up till Easter Sunday *the great Christian day, the day of Christ's resurrection*. Christianity as *the true faith* for Nikitin. Yet Wielhorski's non-translation there of these two short phrases within the section of otherwise translated text was crucial for his English audience. *Mamet deni iaria arast deni khudodonot* translates as "the religion of Mohammed is good," while *Mamet deni rossolial* translates as "Mohammed is the messenger of God." With those two phrases translated, the text enters a different, explicitly Islamic dimension of belief and affirmation. Moreover the phrase *Mamet deni rossolial* has the extra force of its status as the

second half of the Islamic *shahadah* “Affirmation of Faith,” the first of the “Five Pillars” of Islam. Mohammed as *Rasuliyah* was the *rasul* (“messenger”) of *Allah*, described by Cragg as a “formidable” term, which is “the central historical element in the genesis and the significance of Islam.”⁴² Not just any messenger, but the final and fullest messenger, the “Seal of the Prophets” (Qur’an 33.40).

Wielhorski’s account of Nikitin’s concluding travel back to Russia across the Black Sea was significantly selective, projecting a general air of piety from Nikitin without any particular Islamic trappings:

We lay for fifteen days at Platana, the weather continuing very bad, and then we twice attempted to sail and again met with a foul wind, that did not permit us to keep us to keep the sea: “*Ollo ak, Ollo khudo pervodiger*,” except that we know no other God. Having crossed the sea, we were carried first to Sukbalykae, and thence to Kzov (Azov), where we lay five days. At last, with God’s blessing, I reached Caffa, nine days before the fast of St. Philip. *Ollo pervodiger*, through the mercy of God I have crossed three seas.⁴³

Wielhorski’s phrases, “we know no other God,” “the fast of Saint Philip” and “the mercy of God,” give a vaguely Christian sense to the passage. The untranslated phrases *Ollo ak, Ollo khudo pervodiger* (repeated further on with *Ollo pervodiger*) were, though, uncommented upon by Wielhorski. The reader in 1858 could be excused for gliding past them without a second thought, assuming through Wielhorski that Nikitin knew no other God than that of Christianity. However, the key untranslated phrase *Ollo ak, Ollo khudo pervodiger* gives a radically different personal twist to this passage—i.e. “Allah! True God, Allah the Protector. Apart from him, we know no other God.” *Ollo ak* is the colloquial form of the classical Arabic phrase *Allahu akhbar* “God [Allah] is Great,” the cornerstone and apex of the Islamic emphasis on the unity (*tauhid*) of God, for Cragg “the ringing shout of praise that echoes through all Islamic ritual and dogma.”⁴⁴ *Ollo pervodiger*, twice affirmed by Nikitin and twice ignored by Wielhorski, translates as “Allah the Protector,” a phrase already noted as

untranslated by Wielhorski. The way Wielhorski finishes his translation with a general sense of Christian orientation surrounding Nikitin is, then, in retrospect misleading.

Furthermore, in this concluding section from Nikitin, there is a final lengthy paragraph that Wielhorski did not translate. The translation merely has:

Ollo pervodiger, through the mercy of God I have crossed three seas, dighyt khudo dono Ollo pervodiger donoamin milnarakhmam ragym Ollo-ak ber akshikhudoilello, akshi khodo karukholloalik Solom Olloakber akham dulillo spukurkhudo afatad bismilna girakmam rragym khuvomogulezi lailai sa illiaguia alimul gaibi vashagaditikhuaia rakhmanu ragymu khubomogu liazi liai laga illiakhuia Almeliku Alakudosu asalomu almuminu almugaminu aliziru alchebarualmuta kanbiru alkhaliku albariuu almusaviru alkafaru alkakharu albakhadu alriazaku alfataghu alialimu alkabizu albasutu alkafizu alrrafiu almabifu almuzilu alsemiu albasiru aliakamu aliadauliu alliatufu.⁴⁵

There the text ends. From Wielhorski's preceding translation, the reader would consequently be forgiven for thinking that Nikitin was a pious enough Russian who had maintained his Orthodox Christian faith amidst his difficult travels to far-off lands.

A very different picture emerges when Wielhorski's untranslated final section is translated. Lenoff notes how Nikitin's "closing prayer [when translated] leaves no doubt as to the state of his faith...by the end of his journey he was no longer between faiths, but had crossed over into the camp of Islam...Afanasij's last prayer is not appended for the sake of art or even symmetry: it is a final [personal] confession of [Islamic] faith."⁴⁶ Lenoff and Martin are struck by the way this final sequence "is imbued with an alien [Islamic] theology. It is so utterly unprecedented that there can be no doubt of its authenticity: no other medieval Russian text, to our knowledge, closes with a Muslim prayer."⁴⁷ What was there in this final piece that Wielhorski resolutely left untranslated? It translates as:

The Lord knows the rest! Allah, the Protector, the all-knowing. Amen. In the name of Allah, the Merciful and Beneficent. God is great! God is good! Jesus is the spirit of Allah. Peace be upon him. God is great. There is no God but Allah, the Creator. He is God and there is no other God before him. Allah is King, the Light, the World, the Saviour, the Guardian, the Glorious, the Mighty, the Great, the Creator, the Founder, the Maker. He permits sins and punishes them; giving, feeding, ending all difficulties;

knowing, accepting our souls; he, who spreads out the heavens and the earth, All-Preserving, All-mighty; who lifts up and casts down; All-Hearing, All-Seeing. Allah is the true judge, the good.

What stands out? One prominent feature is the constant invocation of *Allah (Ollo)*. That in itself is cumulatively significant and points to Islamic frames of reference. Jesus is mentioned here by Nikitin, but subtly and decisively within an Islamic setting as “the spirit of God (*Allah*)” rather than in a Christian setting as “Son of God.”⁴⁸

Moreover, structurally the whole paragraph follows Islamic norms. The recent analysis by Banerjee demonstrates what is lacking from Wielhorski’s version. She notes:

Afanasy Nikitin begins his closing passage with *Bismillah e-Rahman ur-Rahim*, “In the name of Allah, the Greatest and the All-merciful.” This is followed by the very emotional *topos* of praise known as *Takbir*, with the phrase *Allahu Akbar*, “God is Great,” repeated several times throughout the closing passage. Significantly, Nikitin uses an amalgamated Persian and Turkish translation of this *topos* three times, *Akshi khodo, illelo akshi khodo*, plus a Persian variant, *Ollo Pervardygar*, once, as opposed to the Arabic standard formula, *Allahu Akbar*, only twice. Immediately following the *Takbir* is the merchant’s phonetic but instantly recognisable *Shahada*, the *topos* of confession: *La ilaha illa’l allah*, “There is no God but Allah.” Nikitin’s rendition of the penultimate *topos* of thanksgiving, the *Tahmid*, is similarly set apart by an addition of its Persian variant, *Shukur khoda afatad*, following the standard Arabic *Al-ham dl’l-allah*, “Thanks be to God.” He ends his account with a series of epithets, *Asma-al-husna* (The Beautiful Names), which are also commonplaces in medieval Islamic discourse.⁴⁹

The combination of *Bismillah e-Rahman ur-Rahim* opening, *Takbir* praises, *Shahada* confession, *Tahmid* thanksgiving, and *Asma-al-husna* “Beautiful Names” gives Nikitin’s closure a very deliberate and organised Islamic air. Nikitin geographically and then religiously entered into the world of Islam (*Dar al-Islam*) before moving geographically (but not religiously) back into his old Christian world. As Banerjee puts it, “[Nikitin] may have been carrying his document back to Russia in a gesture similar to a Christian bearing witness to the faith...[which] rings out in his unequivocal [Islamic] declaration *La ilaha illa’l Allah*, ‘There is no God but Allah,’ even as he stands in Kaffa on the border of his homeland.”⁵⁰

Wielhorski responded to this concluding Islamic clarion call by Nikitin with a definite and deafening silence, save for a relatively bland comment tucked away elsewhere in his introduction that Nikitin “terminates his narrative by a long sentence in corrupt Turkish, expressive of his gratitude to heaven for his preservation and safe return to his native country.”⁵¹ This indicates that Wielhorski understood its meaning, but chose not to translate it for the reader. In effect Nikitin was not able to bear witness for posterity, since posterity had no inkling of his Islamic proclamation, given Wielhorski’s non-translation of that crucial finale. Wielhorski was not the only Russian scholar to redirect Nikitin’s declaration of faith at the end of the travel account away from its original clearly Islamic thrust.⁵² As can be seen from this final passage, with its key Islamic phrases and sustained structure actually translated, for Wielhorski to have called it just “expressive of gratitude to heaven” appears, in retrospect, somewhat misleadingly “economical with the truth.”

What is clear, then, is Wielhorski’s consistent failure to translate passages pointing to Nikitin’s increasing identification with Islam. Since he did not attempt to translate such passages, it is not a question of the finer points of Wielhorski’s translation “skills” there. The Islamic-pointing content of such passages in Nikitin’s text has now been reasonably established by figures like Lenhoff and Banerjee. Instead we have a far starker situation concerning “intent.” Wielhorski “entered” Nikitin’s text, translated most of it for the benefit of posterity, whilst not translating some passages that he acknowledged as understood by him. Why was there such sustained and deliberate filtering by Wielhorski? Why was his “translation” at certain times a “non-translation”?

One cannot, of course, be absolutely sure of Wielhorski’s reasons for such selectivity. Nevertheless various wider frameworks are of relevance in considering why Wielhorski filtered Nikitin’s travel account. Spiegel’s analysis of the “social logic” of medieval texts may be matched with a social logic surrounding Wielhorski’s text in the

nineteenth century.⁵³ Said's *Orientalism* sparked vigorous debate over the hegemonic mythification of cultures,⁵⁴ giving rise to applications of the term "imagining" to European conceptions of, for instance, India (Inden) and of the Middle East (Hentsch), and may be invoked here in relation to Wielhorski.⁵⁵ Victorian historiography involves its own projections about Britain as imagined national community through "uses of a past, imagining the national past";⁵⁶ Wielhorski engaged in his own filtering of Nikitin's text to imagine, for an English readership, a particular national Russian past. Nagarjuna's earlier Buddhist critique (c. 100 ACE) on language as a contextual *vikalpyate* ("construct") has echoes in postmodernists such as Foucault and Derrida and, in turn, with Wielhorski's own construction of Nikitin's testimony.⁵⁷ Translation presents further ambiguities and challenges in relation to historical record and representation. In his discussion of censorship and cultural change in the *Oxford Translation Debates* of 1401-1407, Watson distinguishes between translators operating there "as [open] communicators or, alternatively, [closed] guardians of knowledge."⁵⁸ Which role was Wielhorski to play in the 1850s? Martin Luther's *Open Letter on Translating* (1530) acknowledged implications for political-religious authority and legitimacy in such translating activities, implications also present in Wielhorski's setting. Cheyfitz notes the wider "poetics of imperialism" in nineteenth-century translations.⁵⁹ He does not refer to Wielhorski's nineteenth-century translation of Nikitin, but an analogous poetics of Russian imperialism is evident in Wielhorski.

Spitzer's general talk of "milieu and ambience" at play in translations is particularly applicable to Wielhorski's own family background and the wider settings of society and politics in mid-nineteenth-century Russia.⁶⁰ Wielhorski's family was well known in court circles of the Russian Empire, especially through his father, Count Mikhail Wielhorski "the elder," and his uncle, Count Matvei Wielhorski.⁶¹ His father (1788-1859) was a well-known patron of the arts in the Russian capital, promoting concerts of contemporary Western music,

maintaining a private orchestra on his estate, with the oboist Luft dedicating his *Second Concertino* to him. His uncle (1794-1866) was an accomplished cellist, composer of *Theme and Variations for a Cello with an Orchestra*, with Schumann dedicating his *Sonata Op. 58* to him.⁶² Berlioz described his own reception in 1847 at the Wielhorskis' (father and uncle) cultural soirée in St. Petersburg where:

Leur maison est à Saint-Pétersbourg un petit ministère des beaux-arts, grâce à l'autorité que donne aux comtes Wielhorski leur goût si justement célèbre, à l'influence qu'ils exercent par leur grande fortune et leurs nombreuses relations, grâce enfin à la position officielle qu'ils occupent à la cour auprès de l'Empereur et de l'Impératrice. Leur accueil fut d'une charmante cordialité; je fus en quelques heures présenté par eux aux principaux personnages, aux virtuoses, aux gens de lettres qui se trouvaient dans leur salon.⁶³

Ambiguities were undeniably present in this musical-cultural setting with some of the aristocracy taking a more Slavophile nationalistic stance, whilst others like Wielhorski's family took a more "modernising" West European stance.⁶⁴ Such an Islamic perspective as that represented by Nikitin would, however, have been culturally alien to both camps.

Further problematic crosscurrents were present in and around the family of the translator, Count Wielhorski "the younger." His grandfather was the Polish nationalist Michel Wielhorski, author of *On the Restoration of the Ancient Government [of Poland] in Accordance with Fundamental Laws of the Republic* (1775), who had denounced Poland's partition between Prussia, Austria and above all Russia.⁶⁵ Michel's son, Count Wielhorski "the elder," may have felt uncomfortable cultural ambiguities. Though born in Volhynia in eastern Poland, he moved to St. Petersburg the imperial court capital, taking the Russified name form of *Mikhail* (as did his son in turn) rather than keeping the Polish form *Michel*. Such an adjustment mirrored that of his Polish contemporary, Count Rzewuski (1791-1866). Born in Volhynia, he also subsequently moved to Saint Petersburg, arguing for an incorporation of Polish feeling within a wider "all-Slavonic culture developing under the sceptre of the Russian Emperor."⁶⁶ The "coterie of Sankt-Petersburgh" first met on his estate

in 1841, Polish conservatives “whose aim was to propagate among the Polish nobility [like the Wielhorskis?] the idea of necessary reconciliation with the Russian Empire.”⁶⁷ However Polish nationalist sentiment remained volatile and thus suspect in imperial Russia, with Nicholas I’s army crushing Polish reform in 1831, which Walicki terms “the national catastrophe.”⁶⁸ Consequently the 1840s were “the period of the greatest flowering of Polish Romantic Messianism.”⁶⁹ Polish nationalism had been further stifled by the Russian army in 1848, but was still keenly felt inside and outside Russia.⁷⁰ In 1856, Marx called Poland an “outside thermometer” reflecting wider revolutionary sentiments.⁷¹ Such a milieu presented the Wielhorski family with uncomfortable demands of potential and actual loyalties within the Russian imperial system. As a junior diplomat, Count Wielhorski “the younger” may have had consciously or subconsciously to prove a greater loyalty to the cause of the Russian Empire.

Such aspects point to the domestic political context in which Wielhorski was shaping his translation of Nikitin. The year 1855 saw not just the death of Wielhorski but also the death of Nicholas I who had kept Russian policy on firmly autocratic reactionary lines since his accession in 1825, immediately signalled by his creation in 1826 of the “Third Section” that conducted surveillance on dissidence.⁷² The Marquis De Custine, whose account of his travel to St. Petersburg and Moscow in 1839 was itself subject to further interpretation and censorship down the decades, encountered this environment.⁷³ In his account he lambasted the weakness of the aristocracy as “the silence of the great... What is the Russian nobility doing? It adores the Czar and makes itself an accomplice.”⁷⁴ Similar comments were made by Donald Mackenzie Wallace, following his stay in Russia between 1870-1875, that “in Russia the nobles were servants of the State.”⁷⁵ The Czar was, for Custine, a veritable “Imperial Whirlwind... there does not exist on the earth today another man who enjoys and exercises such power.”⁷⁶ Suppression was a feature of Russian society where autocratic

“divine right applied to the mechanism of social life...from it springs such grave results that one’s fear stifles the desire to laugh.”⁷⁷ Surveillance was noticeable with “the Russian police, so quick to torment the people...thanks to the terror which hovers over all heads, submission serves everyone.”⁷⁸ Custine felt worried about his own correspondence coming under such police scrutiny, with him “busy hiding my papers because any of my letters, even one which would appear most innocent to you, would suffice to send me to Siberia.”⁷⁹

Such autocratic repression became still stronger in the wake of the 1848 revolutions across Europe, whereupon Nicholas I exerted even tighter control on his Russian subjects in “the era of censorship terror” under which it became “virtually impossible to publish opinions about religion, philosophy or politics.”⁸⁰ The creation of the Buturlin Committee in 1848 “marked the capping of the edifice of a censorship that was obscurantist in outlook and all-pervasive in nature.”⁸¹ By 1850 there were twelve different agencies dealing with censorship. History was itself suspect and Nikitenko at the time called it “a Holy War against scholarship and knowledge.”⁸² Meanwhile, Russians abroad were subject to surveillance by members of the Russian diplomatic corps, including the Russian legation in London of which Wielhorski was a member. Wielhorski’s own freedom of translation was then particularly circumscribed in the early 1850s.

Within such self-censorship and wider state censorship, comes Wielhorski’s selective non-translation concerning Nikitin’s increasing acceptance of Islam. This particular area of sensitivity for Wielhorski is striking but perhaps not unexpected on reflection. The Empress Marie in her condolence letter had mentioned the “Christian sentiment” of Wielhorski.⁸³ Exclusivism was the dominant theological stance of Christianity towards other religions in the nineteenth century. In this climate, Wielhorski wrote of Nikitin as having been “a staunch and zealous devotee [of Christianity], he never failed to keep the great festivals of the Greek-Russian Church, although he had no books of devotion to guide him.”⁸⁴ This

Christian interpretation of Nikitin has been a recurring feature of Russian historiography, as with Wielhorski's contemporaries (Karamzin, Srevnevsky) and afterwards.⁸⁵ However, as we have seen, Nikitin in fact was far from "a staunch and zealous devotee" who "never failed to keep the great festivals of the Greek-Russian Church." Nikitin's testimony, when fully translated, shows him instead moving from Christianity over to Islam—a process unusual in areas outside Islamic political control, and virtually unknown amongst European Russians in the nineteenth century.

Nikitin's itinerary had taken him down the Volga to the Caspian ports of Derbent and Baku nestling by the Caucasus, into Central Asia to Bukhara and then through Persia to the Bahmani sultanate in central India. In his day they were all under Islamic control. However, the nineteenth century saw a dramatic Russian drive into Islamic Asia—at first around the Caspian Sea, occupying Derbent and Baku in 1805, then the north-eastern shores of the Ust Urt plateau between the Caspian and Aral Seas in the mid-1830s, and the Kirgiz steppes during the 1840s. The mouth of the Syr Darya was fortified in 1847, whilst downstream Perovsk was occupied in 1853.⁸⁶ Defeat in the Crimean War, whilst blocking Russia in the Balkans, merely heightened her expansion in Central Asia at the expense of Islam. Russian imperialists like Prince Bariatinskii expressed this clearly with regard to expansionism in the Caucasus around 1860.⁸⁷ Public declarations of Russian supremacist sentiments came in Gorchakov's Memorandum of 1864, replete with its talk of the "half-savage" Central Asian tribes who needed to be subordinated by a "civilised state" like Russia.⁸⁸ Khodarkivsky quite appropriately sums up general Russian stereotypes of Muslims in Central Asia as being "ignoble savages and unfaithful subjects."⁸⁹ Tashkent was soon occupied in 1865, followed by Samarkand in 1868. Persia continued to be the scene for ongoing Russian attentions throughout the nineteenth century, culminating in a formal Russian sphere of influence in 1907 across northern Persia.

At a wider level, Said has noted in *Orientalism* that “for Europe, Islam was a lasting trauma.”⁹⁰ Such feelings of “resentment” and “trauma” were perhaps consciously or subconsciously also at play in Wielhorski’s systematic “non-representation” of Nikitin’s moves towards Islam. Wheeler contrasts British attitudes in India to Islam with those of Russia “in Turkestan and the Steppe region, where an additional reason for hostility and tension between conquerors [the Russian Empire] and conquered [local Islamic khanates] lay in the fact that the Russians themselves had lived for 250 years under Muslim domination and harboured a hereditary, though partly subconscious, feeling of resentment against Islam.”⁹¹ The “Mongol Yoke” had indeed lain heavy on Russia from 1238 to 1480. This had entered deeply into Russian literature, as with *Sofonija’s Tale* concerning the epic Battle of Kulikovo that had taken place in 1380.⁹² This yoke had been not just nomadic but also Islamic, following the Berke’s ascension to power in 1255. Ivan III renounced the vassalage to the Golden Horde in 1480, but continuing threats were posed to Russia, with Moscow still being sacked by Crimean Tatars as late as 1571.

The Romanov dynasty may indeed have removed the Mongol yoke from Russian shoulders, but one legacy was what in Wielhorski’s period had been labelled by the Marquis de Custine as “the political enslavement of the Orthodox Church,” with the Church legitimating and supporting the Romanov dynasty.⁹³ This Czarist welding of Church and State was reflected in Moscow as the “Third Rome,” in a Christian and imperial sense, a doctrine that had crystallised in Russia during Nikitin’s time.⁹⁴ To question the Church was also to question state autocracy. Consequently, Custine saw religious matters as potentially explosive. He considered that “the unity of the Orthodox Church is only apparent: the sects, reduced to mutism by the skilfully calculated silence of the dominant Church, dig their way under ground...it is through religious dissension that a social revolution will some day occur in Russia.”⁹⁵ His talk of sects was aimed at varied Christian non-Orthodox strands. In such

circumstances, conversion to Islam would have been even more disturbing. After all in 1854, as the Crimean War broke and Wielhorski was recalled from London, another observer noted:

Russia has claimed for its war of might against right a religious sanction as a war of the vice regent of god against the infidel Turks...the crusading proclamations of the Russian generals show how much stress is there laid upon the religious phase of the struggle for inflaming the zeal of the Russian people and army. Even the St. Petersburg journals do not omit to cast in the teeth of France and England the reproach that they are fighting on behalf of the abhorred Crescent against the religion of the Cross.⁹⁶

Translation by Wielhorski of Nikitin's earlier conversion to Islam would have been very unwelcome information in such a domestic climate.

In that setting, White describes the funeral arrangements for Czar Nicholas I that he witnessed in 1855, with "in the midst of them, the crowns and scepters of all the countries he had ruled, among them those of Siberia, Astrakhan, Kazan, Poland, the Crimea, and, above all, the great crown and scepter of the empire. At his feet two monks were repeating prayers."⁹⁷ This mention of Kazan points back to Nikitin's own era, a time of early Russian expansionism under Ivan III, who in 1480 formally renounced the previous vassalage imposed by the Islamic Golden Horde from their Volga strongholds.⁹⁸ Meanwhile Kazan was the first Islamic khanate encountered by Nikitin as he travelled down the Volga in 1466, the focus of military campaigns by Ivan III in 1468-69 and annexation by Ivan the Terrible in 1556 (along with Astrakhan), reflecting early Russian "conquest and imperial ideology" there.⁹⁹ The Islamic khanate of the Crimea fell to Catherine the Great in 1783.¹⁰⁰ Such actions reversed the preceding period of dependency on Islam. Nevertheless, such earlier dependency was still a sensitive matter in the nineteenth century, where Islamophobia was marked in Russian circles. As the Marquis de Custine noted in 1839:

The Emperor of All the Russias, with all his thrones, with all his pride, is, nevertheless, only the successor of these same Grand Dukes we see so

humiliated...under the conditions imposed on the Grand Dukes of Muscovy in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries by their masters the Tatars. But in Russia, like everything else, glory is of recent date.¹⁰¹

Wielhorski could have translated, and thus helped publicise, that Nikitin had earlier not just travelled through these particular Islamic areas but had also converted to Islam during Russia's "first" emerging waves of expansionism in the late fifteenth century. However, that would have also jarred against the "second" wave of Russian imperialism mounting against Islam in Wielhorski's nineteenth century.

Moreover the very concept of religious freedom of movement was alien in Russia, where race and religion had become fused. As Mackenzie Wallace witnessed in his 1870s travels, "in their minds religion and nationality are so closely allied as to be almost identical. The Russian is, as it were, by nature a Christian, and the Tartar a Mahometan; and it never occurs to any one in these villages to disturb the appointed order of nature."¹⁰² Imperial politics were at play in this area since "Islam opposes a strong barrier to Russification."¹⁰³ Religious conversion from Christianity was treated as a criminal act in Russia, where "they cannot openly profess Mahometanism, because men who have once been formally admitted into the National Church cannot leave it without exposing themselves to the severe pains and penalties of the criminal code."¹⁰⁴ Cross-religious missionary activity was frowned upon as:

It seems to a Russian in the nature of things that Tatars should be Mahometans, that Poles should be Roman Catholics, and that Germans should be Protestants...these nationalities are therefore allowed the most perfect freedom in the exercise of their respective religions, so long as they refrain from disturbing by propagandism the divinely-established order of things...with regard to the Russians themselves the theory has a very different effect. If in the nature of things the Tatar is a Mahometan...it is equally in the nature of things that the Russian should be a member of the orthodox Church. On this point the written law and public opinion are in perfect accord...change of religion is not justifiable; on the contrary, he is amenable to the criminal law, and is at the same time condemned by public opinion as an apostate – almost as a traitor.¹⁰⁵

Here the comment by Lenhoff comes to mind in her original 1979 study of Nikitin's concluding section, that "Afanasij's closing prayer leaves no doubt as to the state of his [Islamic] faith. The Christian clergy would never have tolerated...the ultimate violation of medieval Russian social and literary etiquette."¹⁰⁶ In 1857 religious, political, social and literary barriers were still very much against acknowledging such a conversion. Wielhorski went along with such sensibilities, thereby solving his own dilemma through selective non-translation of Nikitin's testimony.

Nikitin's testimony has been the subject of ongoing historical reinterpretation and filtration down the centuries. Russian Christian concerns are one such area, seen in the monastic editing of the text in the early sixteenth century and still influencing Wielhorski's selections in the 1850s, by which time Russian imperialism had vigorously reawakened. Soviet-era projections of Nikitin, in turn, emphasised his supposed class-consciousness.¹⁰⁷ Postmodernist cultural studies, exemplified recently by Ovtchinnikova, have dealt with Nikitin's travels in a deliberately symbolic way.¹⁰⁸

However, a far more direct and explosive story emerges from Nikitin's travels, which Wielhorski (like others) was reluctant to acknowledge. Constantinople fell to Islam in 1453, which at the time was a dramatic announcement of Oriental victory. European military technological advances had reversed this military picture by the nineteenth century. East had also conquered West, however, through Nikitin's unprecedented conversion in about 1470 to Islam. Orientalism at play in the nineteenth century was being in a sense inverted or undercut by the re-presentation of Nikitin's fifteenth-century narrative, however incomplete its translation. In retrospect, there would have been obvious pressures on Wielhorski not to tell the complete story of Nikitin's travels with regard to Islam. As the Marquis de Custine put it, looking back on his visit to Russia in 1839:

In Russia history forms part of the domain of the crown; it is the moral property of the prince...it is kept in the storeroom along with the imperial treasures and only that part

of it which the ruler wishes to make known is displayed. The memory of what happened yesterday is the property of the Czar; he alters the annals of the country according to his own good pleasure and dispenses, each day, to his people the historic truths which accord with the fiction of the moment.¹⁰⁹

Wielhorski's Czarist Russia seems, then, to illustrate Jenkins' comment elsewhere that "what can be known and how we can know interact with power," or Trouillot's notion of "silencing the past" through the interaction of "power and the production of history."¹¹⁰

Leopold Ranke (1795-1886) forms a fitting conclusion to this story. He studied and taught in philology before turning to history. As "the father as well as the master of modern historical scholarship" he was the leading historian of Wielhorski's period.¹¹¹ Ranke's famous axiom was that "the strict presentation of the facts, contingent and unattractive though they may be, is undoubtedly the supreme law" for the historian.¹¹² History should be written from the "purest, most immediate documents."¹¹³ Wielhorski clearly found certain details of Nikitin's document too "unattractive" to translate, especially Nikitin's adoption of Islam, which seems to have been "the truth that dared not be told." Should Ranke's standards for a historian be applied to Wielhorski, who after all was a translator not a historian? Watson's discussion of the *Oxford Translation Debate* of 1401-1407 particularly distinguishes between translators operating there "as communicators or, *alternatively*, guardians of knowledge."¹¹⁴ In the 1850s Wielhorski's choice not to translate certain passages, especially those showing Nikitin's conversion to Islam, reveals him as a selective "guardian of knowledge" against, as much as for, the reader. Text and sub-text, sensibilities and censorship emerge, then, from Wielhorski's translation. Untying the text (to use Young's phrase) of Wielhorski's translation shows the textual power exerted by Wielhorski through his particular selectivity of translation.¹¹⁵ Wielhorski's translation emerges, finally, as a construct revealing Wielhorski the translator and the specifics of his nineteenth-century context and perceptions of Islam, as much as Nikitin the fifteenth-century traveller.

Notes

- ¹ M. Wielhorski, tr., "The travels of Athanasius Nikitin," in R. Major, ed., *India in the Fifteenth Century. Being a Collection of Narratives of Voyages to India in the Century Preceding the Portuguese Discovery of the Cape of Good Hope* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1858), 32 pages. Nikitin's Russian text reproduced *Khozhenie za Tri Moria Afanasya Nikitina*, S. Lur'e and L. S. Semenov, eds. (Leningrad: Nauka, 1986), 5-17 for Lvov (*Ermolins Chronicle*), 18-31 for fuller Troitsk-Sergivsk monastery document (the version translated by Wielhorski). Discussion of general relationship between these late medieval Russian chronicles in J. Fennell, *The Emergence of Moscow 1304-1359* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1968), "Appendix A: Sources," 315-322.
- ² G. Lenhoff, "Beyond Three Seas: Afanasij Nikitin's journey from Orthodoxy to Apostasy," *East European Quarterly* 13.4, 1979, 431-447; G. Lenhoff and J. Martin, "The Commercial and Cultural Context of Afanasij Nikitin's Journey Beyond Three Seas," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 37.3, 1989, 321-344; A. Banerjee, "Iusuf Khorasani or Afanasy Nikitin? Mentality, Narrative Voice, and Subjectivity in The Journey Beyond Three Seas," forthcoming 2001-2002 in *Die Welt der Slaven*. My thanks to Banerjee for sending me her paper ahead of publication.
- ³ Suffice to note that Banerjee has recently shown the outsider-elite side of Islam (the "Khorassanians" from Iran) that Nikitin gravitated to in India rather than the native Indian converts. We can also note how the Bahmanid realm, where Nikitin mostly stayed, attracted varied Sufi mystics who may well have been the *tariqa* pole to which Nikitin gravitated, rather than the *ulama* clerics. See R. Eaton, *Sufis of Bijapur, 1300-1700: Social Roles of Sufis in Medieval India* (Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press, 1978). Sufism had been a frequent means for Islam to project itself effectively across cultures. Such nuances on Nikitin are not the focus of attention for this study, which is centred on Wielhorski the translator.
- ⁴ The exceptions here were in the Balkans where Ottoman political expansion was to bring attendant conversions to Islam amongst Albanians and Bosnians, conversions very much of significance at the start of this present century.
- ⁵ R. Bridges and P. Hair, eds., *Compassing the Vaste Globe of the Earth: Studies in the History of the Hakluyt Society* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1996).
- ⁶ R. Major, "Editor's Preface," in Wielhorski, iv.
- ⁷ Apart from Nikitin, Major's *India in the Fifteenth century* contained other narratives by Abd-er-Razzak, Nicolo Conti and Hieronimo di Santo Stefano, a cross-cultural range of perspectives on India.
- ⁸ Wielhorski, i.
- ⁹ K. Hamilton, *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration* (London: Routledge, 1995), 101. A comparative angle can be seen in P. Lauren, *Diplomats and Bureaucrats* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1976), 23-33 for "the milieu of nineteenth century European diplomacy," based on French and German trends. Andrew White's description of his own role as a junior American attaché between 1854-55 in Russia is useful comparative testimony. See *Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White* at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/Whi1Aut.html>, ch.2. "Under the system...at that time young men of sufficient means, generally from the leading universities, were secured to aid the minister, without any cost to the government, their only remuneration being an opportunity to see the life and study the institutions of the country to which the minister was accredited...It was the period of the Crimean War, and at our legation there were excellent opportunities for observing not only society at large, but the struggle then going on between Russia on one side, and Great Britain, France, Italy, and Turkey on the other."
- ¹⁰ J. Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain: A Study of the Interaction of Policy and Opinion*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950).
- ¹¹ M. Malia, *Russia Under Western Eyes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000), 92, 98.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 147, 150.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 152.
- ¹⁴ K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Russian Menace to Europe: a Collection of Articles, Speeches, Letters and News Dispatches*, P. Blackstock and B. Hoselitz, eds. (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1952), 131. Trade had taken Nikitin out of Russia into Asia, ironically to return through the Black Sea to the Crimea. See J. Martin, "Travelling merchants: the trade with the Muslim east (15th and 16th centuries)," *Central Asian Studies* 4.3, 1985, 21-38.
- ¹⁵ D. Gillard, *The Struggle for Asia 1828-1914: a Study in British and Russian Imperialism* (London: Methuen, 1977), 65. For "Russia's manifest destiny in Asia" see also E. Ingram, *The Beginning of the Great Game in Asia, 1828-1834* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).
- ¹⁶ Marx and Engels, 187-188.
- ¹⁷ Marx and Engels, 12, 154 (1853, "Bluff and Counter-bluff").
- ¹⁸ N. Rich, *Why the Crimean War? A Cautionary Tale* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1985); W. Baumgart, *The Crimean War* (London: Arnold, 1999).

¹⁹ A line later immortalised in the 1980s *Fawlty Towers* classic comedy series with John Cleese's admonition to his staff concerning hotel guests from Germany.

²⁰ Marx and Engels, 188. On the conduct and challenges of the war see O. Anderson, *A Liberal State at War: English Politics and Economics During the Crimean War* (London: Macmillan, 1967); J. Connacher, *Britain and the Crimea, 1855-56* (London: Macmillan, 1987).

²¹ *Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White*, ch.2 where "some other Russian efforts at keeping up public spirit were less legitimate. Popular pictures of a rude sort were circulated in vast numbers among the peasants, representing British and French soldiers desecrating churches, plundering monasteries, and murdering priests."

²² A. Mayer, *The Persistence of the Old Regime* (Beckenham: Croom Helm, 1981).

²³ Letter reproduced by Major in "Editor's Preface," Wielhorski, iii-iv, iii.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Notes by Wielhorski, xiv-lxxx (part of Major's own "Introduction" preface there, v-xc), lxxv.

²⁷ Ibid., lxxvi.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ A. Marwick, *The New Nature of History. Knowledge, Evidence, Language* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), 172-179.

³¹ Wielhorski, 18, fn. 1.

³² Ibid. "[I]n India *pachektur a uchu zeder sikish ilarsen ikishitel akechany ilia atyrsen a tle jetelber bularadastor akul kara-vash uchuz charfuna khubbem funa khubesia kap karaam chuk-kichi khosh.*" This translates as "in India women are obtained by contract and they are cheap; you can have intercourse for two *sitel*. For four fun you can get a pretty one; for five [fun]—a pretty negress, all black with small and pretty nipples." Elsewhere Wielhorski translated other comments from Nikitin like "in the land of India, it is the custom for foreign traders to stop at inns; there the food is cooked for the guest, by the landlady, who also makes the beds and sleeps with strangers. Women that know you willingly concede their favours, for they like white men" (ibid., 21). A harsh view was generally taken of women at Beder with "the women all harlots or witches" (ibid., 12).

³³ In Wielhorski's untranslated piece, the explicit commercial pricing ("intercourse for two *sitel*") and physical descriptions ("small and pretty nipples") of Nikitin's text seems maybe to have crossed the threshold for our translator's sensitivities. Montgomery's phrase "wholesome literature" concerning male definitions of what was considered "suitable" in the Victorian decades comes to mind. See F. Montgomery, "Women who did, and all that kind of thing ...": male perceptions of 'wholesome' literature," in C. Parker, ed., *Gender Roles and Sexuality in Victorian Literature* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1995), 172-187. In turn, this fits into wider recurring mid 19th century reticence over explicit acknowledgement of sexual practices, when euphemism or better still non-acknowledgement through non-translation could be employed instead. Another ploy used was to translate or keep the text in Latin, as in the translation of Nicolo Conti's comments on Southeast Asia in the late fifteenth century. The translator and custodian of public sensibilities there was the Keeper of Printed Books at the British Museum, J. Winter Jones. Like Wielhorski, Jones appeared in the same 1858 volume of travels edited by R. Major for the *Hakluyt Society*. Jones deliberately chose not to translate certain sexually related material, leaving an extended paragraph of untranslated Latin in the middle of the other wide-ranging material translated there from Conti. J. Jones, tr., *The Travels of Nicolo Conti*, in R. Major, ed., *India in the Fifteenth Century...*, 11, where the "offending" passage was left as "*hac sola in civitate plurimas tabernas rei, quam joci gratia scripsi, ridiculae lascivaeque esse affirmat; vendi in his a solis feminis ea que nos sonalia, a sono, ut puto, dicta appellamus, aurea, argentea aereaque, in modum parvulae avellanae; ad has virum, antequam uxorem capiat, proficisci (aliter enim rejicitur a conjugio:) exacta atque elevata paulumi membri virilis cute, trudi inter pellem et carnem ex his sonaliis usque ad duodecimum, et amplius, prout libuit variis circum circa locis; inde consuta cute intra paucos sanari dies; hoc ad explendum mulierum libidinem fieri; his enim tanquam internodiis, membrique tumore, feminas summa voluptate affici. Multorum dum ambulant membra tibiis re percussa resonant, ita ut audiantur. Ad hoc Nicolaus saepius a mulieribus, quae eum a parvitate Priapi deridebant, invitatus, noluit dolorem suum aliis voluptati esse.*"

³⁴ Translations of Wielhorski's untranslated passages taken from Lenhoff, Carter and Banerjee. Amidst their illuminating, ground-breaking comments, they do not, though, discuss Wielhorski's earlier non-translations of such passages, hence this present study.

³⁵ Lenhoff and Martin, 338.

³⁶ G. Vernadsky, "The Heresy of the Judaizers and the Policies of Ivan III of Moscow," *Speculum* 8.4, 1933, 436-454; J. Wiczynski, "Hermetism and Cabalism in the Heresy of the Judaizers," *Renaissance Quarterly* 28.1, 1975, 17-28.

³⁷ Wielhorski, 3.

³⁸ Lenhoff and Martin, 335.

³⁹ Wielhorski, 18.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 19.

⁴¹ Ibid., 28-29.

⁴² K. Cragg, *The House of Islam* (Belmont: Dickenson Publishing Company, 1969), 19.

⁴³ Wielhorski, 32.

⁴⁴ Cragg, 5-18, 7.

⁴⁵ Wielhorski, 32.

⁴⁶ Lenhoff, 445.

⁴⁷ Lenhoff and Martin, 338-339.

⁴⁸ "Son of God" would have reflected Christian trinitarian terms, particular prevalent in Russian Orthodox circles of Nikitin's background. On the one hand such a Russian Orthodox trinitarian emphasis was in part against Islam's stark monotheism (where Jesus appeared as the "secondary" subsequent "spirit of God"). On the other hand such a Russian Orthodox emphasis was also against Roman Catholic nuances which for them seemed conversely to over-emphasise Jesus within the Trinity—a battle conducted in the general "Filoque" clause controversies of Nikitin's fifteenth century.

⁴⁹ Banerjee, 8-9.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 11-12.

⁵¹ Wielhorski, lxxiv.

⁵² Trubetskoi (1926) saw this concluding paragraph (together with the other non-Russian passages, not translated by Wielhorski), as reflecting Nikitin's "spiritual isolation" on account of his Christian faith. Lur'e (1958) considered this final declaration as "interrupted and unfinished. Uспенky (1994) concluded that it was an "inverted Christian prayer to the Trinity." These writers as cited and referenced in Banerjee, 8. See Lenhoff's earlier criticisms of Trubetskoy's non-acknowledgement (like Wielhorski) of Nikitin's Islamic conversion in "Trubetskoy 's Afanasy Nikitin, Reconsidered," in *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 18.4, 1984, 377-392. However, whilst Nikitin showed signs of spiritual isolation in the middle of his travel account (e.g. his cry "I am between the two faiths") by the end of it he was no longer isolated, he had joined the camp of Islam, his prayer was complete, an Islamic prayer. Nikitin started out as a patriotic enough Russian Christian but he returned to Russia as a Muslim rather than as a Christian. Nikitin's inside world had become an Islamic one.

⁵³ G. Spiegel, "History, historicism and the social logic of the text in the Middle Ages," *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 65, 1990, 59-86. In it he partly accepted and partly criticised wider discourse theory approaches. Debate on Spiegel's approach may be seen in *Past and Present*, 133 (1991) and 135 (1992), by Lawrence Stone and others. On discourse theory, see H. White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987); idem., "Postmodernism, Textualism, and History", in E. Goebel and W. Klein, eds., *Literatur - Forschung Heute* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999), 173-184. Also F. Ankersmit and H. Kellner, eds., *A New Philosophy of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); R. Berkhofer, *Beyond the Great Story: History as Text and Discourse* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1995). Marwick and some other historians continue to remain unconvinced by Hayden White's type of "history." See also later 111n.

⁵⁴ E. Said, *Orientalism* (1978, London: Penguin, 1995, 329-354). See esp. 59-72 for negative images of a threatening Islam from the late Middle Ages. For some responses to Said see L. Binder, *Islamic Liberalism: A Critique of Development Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1988), 85-127; R. Young, *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West* (London: Routledge, 1990), 119-140; A. Ahmad, *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures* (London: Verso, 1992), 159-219; J. Lela, *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), 45-75; B. Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 99-118. See also R. Kabbani, *Europe's Myth of the Orient* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986).

⁵⁵ R. Inden, *Imagining India* (1989, rep. with new author's preface, London: Hurst, 2000); T. Hentsch, *Imagining the Middle East* (New York: Black Rose Books, 1992).

⁵⁶ G. Day ed., *Varieties of Victorianism: the Uses of a Past* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998); N. McCaw, *George Eliot and Victorian Historiography: Imagining the National Past* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000). Also A. Culler, *The Victorian Mirror of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

⁵⁷ D. Santana, "The Madhyamika and Modern Western philosophy," *Philosophy East and West* 36.1, 1986, 41-54; I. Mabbett, "Nagarjuna and Deconstructionism," *Philosophy East and West* 45.2, 1995, 203-225; P. Hiatt, "Post-modernism - a cross-cultural perspective," *Asian Philosophy* 5.2, 1995, 197-208. See also later 111n. As Jenkins puts it, "history remains inevitably a personal construct, a manifestation of the historian's perspective as a narrator," K. Jenkins, *Re-Thinking History* (London: Routledge, 1991), 12. See also, A. Munslow,

Deconstructing History (London: Routledge, 1997), and the forthcoming study on "A Buddhist 'construction' of History" by the present author.

⁵⁸ N. Watson, "Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409," *Speculum* 70.4, 1995, 822-864, 846.

⁵⁹ E. Cheyfitz, *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from the Tempest to Tarzan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

⁶⁰ L. Spitzer, "Milieu and Ambience: An Essay in Historical Semantics," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 3.1, 1942, 1-42.

⁶¹ My thanks to Clare Scott for tracking down these tangled nineteenth-century aristocratic genealogies.

⁶² W. Wasielewski, "The Violoncello and its history (Cello Playing in the 19th Century Slav States and Hungary)," www.celloheaven.com/wasiel/19ssah.htm Matvei's younger brother Jozef (1817-92) also played the cello and piano.

⁶³ Berlioz, *Memoires*, at <http://hector.ucdavis.edu/Berlioz2003/Memoires/Mem55.htm>

⁶⁴ R. Ridenov, *Nationalism, Modernism and Personal Rivalry in Nineteenth Century Russian Music* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981), 30-32, for Matvei Wielhorski's connections in high circles. Also A. Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), esp. 394-455 for "Slavophiles and Westernizers."

⁶⁵ Walicki, *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism: The Case of Poland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 25-26.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 230

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*. In 1841 he allowed his estate to be the meeting place for varied conservative figures, such as J. Przeclawski, editor of the Polish weekly *Tygodnik Petersburski*, Bishop Ignacy Holowinski and the literary critic Michal Grabowski who then formed "the coterie of Sankt-Petersburgh." In Rzewuski's book *Miscellanea of Jarosz Bejla* (1841-1843) he argued that Poland had ceased to be a nation, so that Polish efforts should thereby be subsumed within a greater (imperial) Russian setting.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 242.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 239. He saw this Polish Messianism as "the mission of defending the West against Turks and Russians," *ibid.* This is an interesting double-barrelled rejection with suggestions of ongoing Polish antipathy to Islam. Ottoman expansion in the Balkans had indeed led to their annexation of Poland's eastern provinces of Jedisan in 1526 and Podolia in 1676, which had been countered in a crusading spirit by Poland taking wider offensives against the Ottoman; notably with John Sobieski's relieving of the siege of Vienna in 1683, and Poland regaining Podolia in 1699. Crimean Tatar raids on Poland had been a feature over many decades, although in the sixteenth century some Tatar groups were eventually given some supportive "sanctuary" within the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth amidst its ongoing disputes with rising Russian power. See L. Bohdanowicz, "The Polish Tatars," *Man*, 44, 1944, 116-121. Amidst such Polish avenues, Wielhorski's adopted Russian context remains paramount, though, for his perceptions of Islam.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 247-276, for profile of Mickiewicz and reactions to him inside and outside Russia. He was a well-known Polish contemporary of Wielhorski in exile in Paris, who died the same year as Wielhorski. It would be interesting to know what Wielhorski thought of him.

⁷¹ Marx, Letter to Engels, 2 December 1856, cited in Walicki, *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism*, 366.

⁷² S. Monas, *The Third Section: Police and Society in Russia under Nicholas I* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961); C. Ruud, *Fighting Word: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982).

⁷³ De Custine's book was eventually published. A best seller in Western Europe, it was immediately banned in Russia. Meanwhile Xavier Labenski, a Russian diplomat of Polish origin published a stern attack in his pamphlet *Un Mot sur l'ouvrage de M. le marquis de Custine intitulé "La Russie en 1839,"* which was quickly translated into English in 1844 (London: T.C. Newby). See George Kennan, *The Marquis de Custine and his Russia in 1839* (London: Hutchinson, 1972) for discussions of its subsequent limited appearances and suppressions in 1891, 1910 and beyond.

⁷⁴ Marquis de Custine, *Journey for our Time: The Journals of the Marquis de Custine*, ed. and tr., P. Kohler (London: Arthur Barker, 1953), 71.

⁷⁵ D. Mackenzie Wallace, *Russia* (London: Cassell, 1877), 421

⁷⁶ Custine, *Journey for our Time*, 72, 106.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 119, 121.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 169.

⁸⁰ W. B. Lincoln, *Nicholas I: Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias* (London: Penguin, 1978), 316-324, 301.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 321.

⁸² Ibid., 320. Classical works by Tacitus and Plato were suppressed, the censor Mekhelin spent time and effort to remove all references to the words “republican” and “republicanism” from earlier studies on Ancient Greece and Rome, and an article on “The Condition of Russia in the reign of Vasily Ivanovich Shuiski” was deemed unsuitable for publication in *Contemporary*, since the author had noted that Dmitry the Pretender had told the Russian peasants they should be free.

⁸³ Wielhorski, iii.

⁸⁴ Wielhorski, lxxviii.

⁸⁵ Karamzin (1829) held that Nikitin “pines for Russian Orthodoxy everywhere,” Sreznevsky (1857) considered Nikitin “by his writings to be a remarkable fifteenth-century Russian man...an Orthodox Christian, a patriot,” whilst Uspensky (1979) maintained, “I would like to stress that Afanasii Nikitin remains a zealous and, evidently, entirely orthodox Christian.” Extracts cited and referenced in Banerjee, 1; Carter, 433; Carter and Lenhoff, 329.

⁸⁶ There is a profile of the Islamic character of these new Russian areas in Schuyler’s travels of 1873. See E. Schuyler, *Turkistan: Notes of a Journey in Russian Turkestan, Kokand, Bukhara and Kuldja* (1876, rep. London: RKP, 1966). Cf. N. Khalfin, *Russia’s Policy in Central Asia 1857-1868* (London: Central Asian Research Centre, 1964).

⁸⁷ “We should therefore take immediate steps to the end that, as they lose their religious faith, the Moslems may have before them another ready made creed, purer and more reassuring to the dictates of reason and conscience...I propose that we initiate a restoration of Orthodox Christianity in the Caucasus.” See G. Vernadsky, *A Source Book for Russian History From Early Times to 1917* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1972, 3 vols., vol. II, extract 15.21, 608. Later in 1862 he would write “their civil organization rests upon the foundation of Mohammedanism, and all their rules are therefore at odds with the civil principles of Christian government...it is necessary in this area to find also some means derived and formed within their midst, which, gradually undermining the importance of the mullahs, would in time destroy the authority of the Mullahs,” *ibid.*, 609. Bariatinskii was the Czar’s vice-regent and military commander in the Caucasus.

⁸⁸ See *ibid.*, extract 15.22, 610. Gorchakov was vice-chancellor in the government. This memorandum was sent to the other major powers in Europe.

⁸⁹ M. Khodarkovsky “Ignoble savages and unfaithful subjects: Constructing non-Christian identities in early modern Russia,” in D. Brower and E. Lazzerini, eds., *Russia’s Orient: Imperial Borderlands and People, 1700-1917* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), ch.1, 9-26. See whole book for papers and sources from both sides.

⁹⁰ Said, 59. He says that these earlier centuries of successful Islamic expansionism meant that across Europe “not for nothing did Islam come to symbolize terror, destruction, devastation, the demonic, hordes of hated barbarians.”

⁹¹ G. Wheeler, *A Modern History of Soviet Central Asia* (London: RKP, 1965), ch. 9.

⁹² Tr. R. Jakobson and D. Worth. *Sofonija’s Tale of the Russian-Tatar Battle on the Kulikovo Field* (The Hague: Mouton, 1963).

⁹³ Custine, 238. See generally, R. Nichols and T. Stavrou, eds., *Russian Orthodoxy Under the Old Regime* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978).

⁹⁴ D. Stremokhoff, “Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine,” *Speculum* 28.1, 1953, 84-101.

⁹⁵ Custine, 154.

⁹⁶ Marx and Engels, 152-153, 24 October 1854.

⁹⁷ *Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White* at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/Whi1Aut.html>, ch.2. In 1839 the Marquis de Custine, *Journey for our Time*, 205, also described these crowns of Kazan, and elsewhere, in a setting where “everything in Russia is symbolic.”

⁹⁸ Elsewhere, Ivan III annexed the mercantile northern republic of Novgorod in 1478. Nikitin’s own principality of Tver, an earlier rival to Moscow, was annexed in 1486—ironically (given Wielhorski’s Polish connections) because of Ivan’s concerns about the influence at Tver of Poland-Lithuania and, with it, of Roman Catholicism.

⁹⁹ J. Pelenski, *Russia and Kazan: Conquest and Imperial Ideology, 1438-1560s* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974). Also G. Lantzeff and R. Pierce, *Eastwards to Empire: Explorations and Conquest on the Russian Open Frontier to 1750* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1973) for wider early Russian expansionism into Islamic Asia and Siberia.

¹⁰⁰ A. Fisher, *The Russian Annexation of the Crimea 1772-1783* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), inc. 19-23 for humiliating tributes imposed on Russian Czars by the Crimean khanate, under the ascendancy of the Ottoman Empire after 1475.

¹⁰¹ Custine, 206.

¹⁰² Mackenzie Wallace, 239-240.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 247.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 243.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 463-464.

¹⁰⁶ Lenhoff, "Beyond Three Seas....," 445.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 446, fn. 6 for references to varied Soviet writers, like Osipov, Aleksandrov and Goldberg (1951), Vodovozov (1955), Adrianova-Perete (1958), Lur'e (1958), Prokofiev (1970), Lixacev (1975).

¹⁰⁸ O. Ovtchinnikova, "Journey to the Other World: Afanasij Nikitin, the Hero of Tradition," AATSEEL National Meeting, Chicago, 1999, at <http://clover.slavic.pitt.edu/~djb/aatseel/1999/abstract-53.html>.

¹⁰⁹ Custine, 237.

¹¹⁰ Jenkins, 11; M-R. Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1995). This comes back to some of the linguistic, philosophical and historical explorations by Michel Foucault, e.g. *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. D. Bouchard (Oxford: Blackwell, 1977); *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, ed. C. Gordon (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1980). See also M. Barrett, *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault* (Cambridge: Polity, 1991); B. Hindess, *Discourses of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996).

¹¹¹ F. Stern, ed., *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present* (London: MacMillan, 1970), 54-62.

Ranke was dubbed in his time the "Nestor of Historians." For discussions on Ranke see G. Iggers and J. Powell, eds., *Leopold Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1990).

¹¹² L. Ranke, "Preface" to *Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations from 1494-1514* (1824), rep. in Stern, *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present* (London: MacMillan, 1970), 55-58, 57.

¹¹³ Ibid., 54.

¹¹⁴ Watson.

¹¹⁵ Cf. R. Young, *Untying the Text* (London: RKP, 1981); R. Scholes, *Textual Power* (London: Yale University Press, 1985).