The Locus of the Fashion Shop in Russian Literature from 1764 to 1806

Victoria Ivleva

With the appearance of Vladimir Lukin's *Shchepetil'nik* [The Trinket Vendor] (1764–1765), an adaptation of Robert Dodsley's *The Toy-Shop* (1735) known to Lukin in Claude Pierre Patu's translation, *Boutique de Bíjoutier* (1756), the locus of the fashion shop entered Russian literary space. This place of cultural negotiations constituted a liminal space where Russia engaged in the process of redefining its identity through its encounters with the West. As a site of cultural reception and mobility, a fashion shop contributed to the formation of Russian identity, the figure of the other, and the social environment. It was associated with heterogeneous temporalities that comprised past and present—tradition and current trends of European culture, local and European geography. In this space, modern ideas and tendencies were presented in the form of fashionable objects, which became ideologically colored through the process of cultural re-contextualization. As the result, a fashion shop became not only a place of desire and exchange where objects acquired a symbolic value, but also a locality of complex cultural relations between different social groups, genders and ideologies.[1] This space was characterized by such oppositions as the local and national versus the European, and traditional patriarchy versus increasing social emancipation and the feminization of shopping culture. Whereas tradition was connected to concepts of order, coherence, and custom, modern culture was characterized by disruption, disobedience, and the proliferation of fashion. In eighteenth-century literary works, the fashion shop gradually changed its social and economic functions, acquired new connotations, and contributed to the formation of national identity.

Victoria Ivleva is currently working on a book about fashion, culture and identity in eighteenth-century Russia.

 Eighteenth-Century Studies, vol. 46, no. 3 (2013) Pp. 363–83.

In this article, I trace the shifting cultural significance of the fashion shop in Vladimir Lukin's *The Trinket Vendor*, Mikhail Matinskii's *St. Peterburg Gostinyi dvor* [The St. Petersburg Merchant Arcade] (1779), and Ivan Krylov's *Modnaia lavka* [The Fashion Shop] (1806), and discuss its cultural connotations in Catherine II's journal *Vsiakaia Vsiachina* [All Kinds of Things] (1769), Nikolai Novikov's *Zhivopisets* [The Painter] (1772–73), and other eighteenth-century works. I argue that by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the space of the fashion shop turned into a predominantly feminine territory that posed a threat to patriarchy, and into a locality of ardent ideological debates, oftentimes affecting members of the same family. Moreover, it was perceived as one of the last "bulwarks" of the French culture, with its emancipated heroines, love intrigues, negotiations and smuggling still in power. Anti-French sentiments were fostered by criticism of Gallomania in eighteenth-century Russian satirical literature, Catherine II's promotion of national values, and Russia's participation in the Napoleonic Wars (1804–15). I have chosen several representative texts for my analysis to map the symptomatic changes to the cultural space of the fashion shop within literary texts. While this article engages the historiography of eighteenth-century commercial culture and fashion, its main focus is literary and cultural studies.

The locus of the fashion shop and the figure of the merchant selling fashionable goods became popular in Russian drama in the second part of the eighteenth century. Empress Elizabeth's abolition of internal customs, and Catherine II's liberalization of trade led to the increase of export operations conducted by Russian merchants.[2] Catherine II intended to see Russia politically and economically autonomous, and focused, among other questions, on the development of its commerce. During her reign, the number of Russian merchants continued to grow particularly in St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Arkhangelsk.[3] Merchants gained an active voice in society and defended their interests at the assembly of the Commission for the Compilation of a New Code of Laws in 1767–8 and in petitions submitted to the government.

The number of foreign merchants also significantly increased. The earliest preserved register compiled in 1719 in St. Petersburg lists twenty nine international merchants including nine Englishmen, nine Dutchmen, five Germans and no merchants from France. (Challenging political relations between Russia and France complicated trade between the two countries). In the period between 1762 and 1777, however, as many as 65 trade companies only from Prussia and 33 trade companies from England imported goods from abroad.[4] Clothing became a profitable area of import: European garments were duty free until 1782 while textiles were subject to tax.[5] Although a significant number of French merchants were engaged in commercial operations in Russia at the time, particularly in St. Petersburg, the majority of them did not start trade companies, and therefore had a smaller turnover of goods and unstable position on the market. French products, nevertheless, were regularly imported to Russia throughout the century and sold by Danish, Dutch, German and English merchants. The interest in French products continued to increase in the eighties. In 1787 a commercial treaty with France was signed, but soon the French revolution complicated trading operations.[6]

The word *moda* [fashion] was introduced in Russia in the first half of the century. One of the first references to fashion can be found in Boris Kurakin's

"Story About the Tsar Petr Alekseevich and People Close to Him. (The Beginning of Peter's Independent Reign)" (1705–9, 1723, and 1727). The author describes debauchery in Franz Lefort's house and talks about alcoholism being fashionable: "И от того времени и по сие число и доныне (1727?) пьянство продолжается, и между великими домами в моду пришло" [And since those times hard drinking continues and has been fashionable in the great houses to this day (1727?)].[7] Yet, the word *fashion* particularly with reference to clothes, accessories and other artifacts was not a part of an active vocabulary in Russia in 1730. The Russian writer Antioch Kantemir finds it necessary to explain its meaning in the notes to his second satire: "Мода—слово французское. *Mode*—значит *обыкновение* в платье и уборах, и самых нравов человеков. Крестьяне у нас называют *поверьем*" [*Mode* is a French word. *Mode* means *customary practice* in dress and headgear, and the very morals of people. Our peasants call it *popular belief*].[8] His explanation of a French phenomenon through the word associated with sartorially conservative peasant culture is a good example of an attempt to assimilate this concept into Russian culture. (Both words *moda* [fashion] and *modnyi* [fashionable] are listed in Kantemir's *French Russian Dictionary*).[9] Such connection of fashion with customs in Kurakin's and Kantemir's texts show that fashion has not been perceived by these writers in its late eighteenth-century definition with strong implications of prompt changes.[10] From the moment fashion was inaugurated into Russian court culture, it became one of the major subjects of criticism in the works of satirical writers, Nikolai Novikov's and Catherine II's journals, and in a few of her plays.[11]

During Catherine II's reign, millinery and fashion shops became popular in St. Petersburg and Moscow. They often had French names such as "Au temple de goût" [The Temple of Taste] and "Musée de Nouveautés" [The Museum of Novelties].[12] Such association of shops with places of worship and museums reflected the cultural fluidity of this locus and the symbolic power attributed to objects of material culture sold at the stores. They were mythologized and acquired a social and aesthetic value. Like imported cultural concepts, they became redefined in a new milieu and in turn redefined the social environment.[13] The streets near the shops and trade stalls became extensions of showcase activities. Here noblemen and noblewomen demonstrated their modish equipages, apparel, and coiffures, creating social texts and spectacles with their own systems of signs.[14]

The shops also made their debut in the Russian literary space. In 1764–5, Vladimir Lukin (1737–94), a proponent of the national dramatic tradition, introduced this locus in his play *The Trinket Vendor.* The shopping stand of his protagonist Shchepetil'nik [a trinket vendor], who offers fashionable *bagatelles* to visitors of the public masquerade, can be conceptually linked with the stalls in Mikhail Matinskii's comic opera *The St. Petersburg Merchant Arcade* and with the fashion shop in Krylov's play *Modnaia lavka* [The Fashion Shop].[15] The perception of the locus as a hybrid cultural space is conveyed in Krylov's title, which combines the word *modnaia*, of French origin, with the Russian word *lavka*, which previously referred to a trading stand and later became employed in reference to a store.

In Lukin's play, the locus of the shop has diffuse linguistic and spatial boundaries and undergoes a process of parallel linguistic and spatial construction.[16] Lukin explains the meaning of the fashion shops' original names—*Boutiques des Bijoutiers or Boutiques des galanteries*—in the introduction to the play, by listing

commodities sold at the shops, and finds their cultural equivalents in Russian—*shchepetkii tovar* [modish *bagatelles*], and *shchepetil'nik* for a trinket vendor. The writer's linguistic choices are dictated by his ideological position towards borrowings from Europe—in Ivan Elagin's literary circle, Lukin was the main theoretician of "transposition" [*sklonenie*] of foreign works into the Russian context and argued for the creation of a national theater that would reflect Russian life and raise topical questions.[17] Following these goals, Lukin changes the title of Dodsley's satire and all characters' names to semantically loaded Russian ones.[18]

In Lukin's text, the fashion shop functions as a hybrid space of western commodities and the rituals associated with them, which are placed in the context of a self-protective Russian environment that promotes national values. Thus from its first appearance in literature, this space becomes a domain of ideological negotiations, and functions as a trading zone not only of commodities, but also of languages and cultures. The tension between competing ideologies can be clearly perceived on the linguistic level—in the employment of Russian and foreign words that describe this locus—*prilavok*, *prilavochek* [a small shop or counter], *magazin veshchei kur'eznykh* [a shop selling curiosities] analogous to a cabinet of curiosities, and *butik* [boutique]. Such attempts to name and rename the space signify the process of acculturation and may be driven by the author's anxiety about retaining cultural identity. As a result, the shop becomes a field of linguistic and cultural tensions where vocabulary employed in reference to goods, the locality and social behavior defines the seller's, customers', and observers' ideological positions.

The shift of the focus from the place to the main character, the seller of fashionable trifles in the play's title, allows Lukin to make the trinket vendor a mouthpiece for his opinions on contemporary morals, cultural borrowings, and fashion. The linguistic flexibility of the terms employed in reference to the shop and the chronotope of a public masquerade enrich functions of the shop as a theatrical space of *revelatio* that presents its own actors and observers.[19] Within this locus, the trinket vendor assumes the role of a societal judge whose comments can be contextualized within the theme of *vanitas mundi*.

As Hugh McLean points out, Lukin wanted to explore "the didactic potential of the theater" in his play, and Dodsley's piece was a good example of "what could be done to transform the theater into a school of life."[20] The ideological role assigned to the trinket vendor dictates his social status. In eighteenth-century Russia, "witty repartee with gentlefolk" is out of question for a merchant.[21] Therefore, Lukin chooses a retired officer who was forced to resign from his job for telling blunt truth to his superiors as his protagonist. While not belonging to the nobility, the trinket vendor is brought up and educated like a nobleman. His social status resembles that of Lukin who was not a nobleman by birth and had a major's rank in 1764–5.[22]

The depiction of the action in the shop is preceded by a discourse on societal morals between the observers of the main action. Such framed, tattleresque composition containing a tale within a tale creates an effect of theatrical actions performed on the figurative stage. The play's parts are united through the image of the toyshop and its goods, the figure of the seller, and the metaphor of trifles. As Hugh McLean observes, Dodsley's piece owes its tattleresque nature to Thomas Randolph's *The Conceited Pedlar* (1630), whose protagonist makes witty obser-

vations about his goods.[23] In addition, Dodsley's style may have been influenced by Joseph Addison's and Richard Steele's popular journals *Tatler* (1709–11) and *Spectator* (1711–2) which presented humorous and satirical sketches on societal foibles. According to Harry Solomon, Dodsley's "metaphor of the world as a 'great Toy-shop, and all it's [sic] Inhabitants run mad for Rattles' recalls" lines from Epistle II of Alexander Pope's *Essay on Man*, "wherein mankind is shown as . . . addicted to 'toys' of one kind or another."[24] Dodsley's dalliance with trifles and his creation of fables about the baubles is also Pope's strategy, masterfully accomplished in *The Rape of the Lock*.

While Dodsley follows a new "moralizing strain" in English literature,[25] he nevertheless emphasizes his satire's good nature and entertaining qualities in the spirit of *The Tatler* and *Spectator*. His main intention—"to please and to reform" his audience—echo the goals of Horatian satire.[26] Lukin, on the other hand, focuses on didactic and satirical tasks and follows the Juvenalian tradition. This shift in the emphasis can be explained by Lukin's negative attitude to the overflow of the Russian literary market in the fifties and sixties with translations of comedies intended for entertainment. Being the most significant theoretician of Russian serious drama that emerged in response to these tendencies, Lukin concentrated on the educational and denunciatory potential of Dodsley's piece.[27]

The action in Dodsley's *Toy-Shop* moves from the private space of a societal parlor, where the conversation between a gentleman and two ladies has a *tête-à-tête* quality, to a toyshop where his trio observes the allegorical *tableaux* unraveled by the trinket vendor.[28] Both territories, particularly the traditional space of the tea table, are largely associated with women.[29] In contrast to Dodsley's dainty store which is visited by both male and female customers, Lukin's locus is a predominantly male space associated with patriarchal values. Leaving the allegorical part of the original almost wholly intact and borrowing most of the commodities from Dodsley's toyshop, Lukin introduces patriarchal figures and workmen into his framing story. He chooses representatives of two generations—an uncle and a nephew—as observers of the trinket vendor's interactions with his customers. The writer emphasizes the patriarchal connection between the two age groups by inserting references to fathers and sons throughout his play and by supplementing the seller's revelations with the uncle's and nephew's observations about human and social follies. While Dodsley's protagonists see their trip to the shop as a form of entertainment sparked by their gossip, Lukin's uncle Chistoserdov [Pure Heart] has a well-articulated goal of educating his provincial relative and displaying the wicked ways of the world for him. He carefully prepares his nephew for the trinket vendor's revelations by illustrating unfair societal rules with examples taken from life. Thus, the seller's exposures, as he plays a traditional role of a *raisonneur*, acquire a stronger sense of a straitlaced, familial lesson. In addition, Lukin frames the trinket vendor's revelations with the workmen's comments about fashion and masks. Their dialogue introduces a theme of grotesque misrepresentations while their naive discussion of modish styles and goods in a vernacular dialect gives a flavor of caricature to the characters' ardent interest in fashion. In their parlance, French styles *à la grec* and *à la silhouette* turn into Russian cuts "a la tilogreiia" [à la body-warmer] and "a la salfetka" [à la napkin], while masks become *khari* [a word which refers to crude mugs in Russian].[30] The workmen view fashions and masks as demonic manifestations.

The trinket vendors' satirical comments constitute a core of both Dodsley's and Lukin's pieces. Both sellers, Mr. Chapman and Shchepetil'nik, moralize upon their customers' follies while offering them fashionable trinkets.[31] As a result, goods become metonymically linked with their potential owners and comment on their follies.[32] In Dodsley's piece, the second lady who observes Mr. Chapman's show calls him "a Satirical Parson" and views his shop as scripture where "every piece of Goods a different Text, from which [he] expose[s] the Vices and Follies of Mankind in a very fine allegorical Sermon."[33] Lukin, on the contrary, does not develop Dodsley's central metaphor, but preserves the analogies between customers and trinkets, goods and texts as well as the theme of changing values. Recontextualized within the space of the shop whose owner defends Russian customs, imported goods acquire vivid ideological coloring.

To underscore the revealing nature of the trinket vendor's stories, Lukin moves his toyshop to the space of a masquerade where all characters wear concealing guises. He introduces a theme of social injustice absent in Dodsley's satire and makes his seller assume a judicial position popular in literary works of the period.[34] Lukin chooses the setting of a public [*vol'nyi*] masquerade, as opposed to that of the courtiers [*pridvornyi*], to expand the trinket vendor's observations beyond the world of high society, to make this public space an arena for the exposure of a wider range of social and human follies and a place of resistance to the fads of the court culture and abuses of the state system.[35] The seller's marginal position allows him to distance himself from the represented society and to draw a picture that, unlike the description in Dodsley's parlor piece, encompasses representatives of high and middle classes.

In eighteenth-century culture, masked balls were often perceived as an entertaining setting, where people yielded to the spirit of play. Lukin, on the contrary, furnishes this feminocentric locus of mystery, adventure, and eroticism with a moralizing patriarchal voice and strong didactic and satirical goals. He goes even further, eliminating women as observers and discussants of the trinket vendor's revelations and leaving out two of the four female visitors of Dodsley's toyshop. The writer's solid investment in patriarchal figures and male protagonists can be explained by the satirical goals of his "masquerade," which are antithetical to its disguising nature. When characters see danger in masquerade activities, when this setting is employed to expose guises rather than to conceal identities, and thus a denunciatory tone prevails over a playful one, patriarchal figures often try to assume power over the masquerade's space of freedom, playfulness, and seduction which is traditionally associated with women. They try to destroy the figurative duplicity of masks, and to return characters from the realm of otherness to the world of clear-cut identities.

These observations are compatible with theories regarding the functions of clothes and masquerades expressed by such scholars as Herbert Spencer, Georg Simmel, John Carl Flügel, and Terry Castle. Spencer's hypothesis about the primary function of clothes as an indicator of power and Simmel's association of male identity with the notion of depersonalization explain a detached posture of patriarchal unmaskers within a masquerade chronotope and their desire to restrict a masquerade's playful activities. On the other hand, Simmel's association of female identity with integration and personalization, his theory of flirtation

as involving an interplay of display/ consent and playful rejection/ covering, and Flügel's hypothesis about woman's sartorial emancipation ascribe a different set of functions to female disguises. Castle's feminocentric notion of a masquerade fits into the same category. [36] As a result of these contradictory tendencies, the space of the masquerade oscillates between a feminine realm of playful engagement and liberation, and a patriarchal realm of satirical exposure and control. In the comedies of Aleksandr Sumarokov, Lukin's main opponent, the servants fulfilled the role of unmaskers who accompanied their exposure of wicked protagonists with a costume change that helped advance intrigues. These go-betweens maintained an intermediate position, collaborating with the masquerades' playful and liberating tendencies. Lukin's trinket vendor, on the contrary, assumes a more straightforward role of a societal censor. He does not dally with the masquerade by donning someone's dress; instead, he tries to restrict concealing activities of its participants.

Like Dodsley, Lukin creates a positive figure in the trinket vendor, rather uncommon in eighteenth-century literature. In the Russian eighteenth-century tradition, a merchant usually pursues his financial interests by all means, advertising modish goods and thus promoting Gallomania.[37] On the contrary, Lukin's trinket vendor is more fully engaged in revealing the follies of his customers than in gaining profit from his activities. Lukin adheres to the satirical tradition of Russian popular theatre and develops a conventional trope of masquerade that allows him to present the world as a stage where everyone wears a mask. The writer underscores the trinket vendor's shrewdness of vision by having him infallibly identify his customers behind their masks.

Lukin preserves the content of Mr. Chapman's toy-shop almost unchanged. The only commodities that do not make it to the shop are stuffed dogs associated with a female domain in Dodsley's piece, and a couple of trinkets tagged with classical allusions.[38] Instead, Lukin introduces shells, stones, and a watch which Chistoserdov's nephew purchases to perform his duties in a timely manner. Both Dodsley's and Lukin's sets of goods resemble natural objects and artifacts which populated seventeenth- and eighteenth-century cabinets of curiosities. Such objects represented their owners' pecuniary power, and it is not unlikely that the cabinets' content exerted influence on the popularity of certain goods in society. In Russia, Peter I actively promoted visits to Kunstkamera, his cabinet of curiosities, among his subjects. In 1747, the museum was closed for renovation and reopened in 1766, a year after Lukin completed his play. Collecting activities of royal figures increased symbolic values of objects and made them desirable acquisitions for less privileged customers. Shells, stones, and other objects, which Lukin's trinket vendor supplies with mythologized biographies for his customer Vzdoroliubov [Fancier of Trinkets and Nonsense] to advertise them as antique rarities, demonstrate the importance of collecting activities in society.[39]

Giving his protagonists telling names and compelling them to look for commodities that represent their follies, Lukin strengthens the connection between his characters and *bagatelles* and supplies his stories with social messages. In both Dodsley's and Lukin's pieces, scales function in their traditional role as an emblem of justice and comment on the displacement of values. In Dodsley's text, a young gentleman Mr. Hale looks for scales to conduct some experiments in statics, but becomes fascinated with the seller's tests of moral values. Lukin, on the other hand,

has his seller's scales set off abuses of the Russian court system and the figure of the judge Obiralov [Swindler] who acquires scales to weigh his bribes. The ignorance of judges and *petits-maîtres* weighs equally on the trinket vendor's scales.

Lukin creates a satirical image of the *petit-maître* Verkhogliadov [Mr. Superficial] through his grotesque speech that presents a mixture of Russian and French vocabulary.[40] Both the trinket vendor and Verkhogliadov articulate their attitude to cultural changes by redefining vocabulary that describes social behavior and the trinket vendor's profession [shchepetil'nik vs. galantereishchik/ haberdasherer].[41] The trinket vendor adheres to Russian norms of behavior and vocabulary while Verkhogliadov employs borrowings from French in his language, and practices cultural behavior which was associated with French culture in Russian literary discourse. As a result, both the language and behavior become semiotically and ideologically marked. Vekhogliadov's speech, heavily loaded with French and Russified French vocabulary and modeled on the jargon of Sumarokov's *petits-maîtres*, echoes the grotesque assimilation of the foreign styles *à la grec* and *à la silhouette* in the workmen's language.[42] While Lukin's play contains satire on persons and human and social vices, Dodsley—under the influence of Steele's and Addison's journals—prefers satire on human follies.[43] The titles of both works reflect this shift in the emphasis.

Portraying his *petits-maîtres*, Lukin employs classical topoi and motifs of satirical literature about fops.[44] The motif of commodification of people and their exchange for fashionable trinkets was previously employed by Kantemir in his satire "Na zavist' i gordost' dvorian zlonravnykh" [On Envy and Pride of Depraved Noblemen]. Sacrifices of Kantemir's and Lukin's protagonists on the altar of fashion are of similar value: a village in case of Kantemir's nobleman and over a thousand peasants in case of Vzdoroliubov.[45] Lukin populates the space of the shop with gallant trifles and garments to emphasize commodification of society and the lack of profundity in the trinket vendor's customers. His protagonists' keen interest in minute details of fashionable *bagatelles* and the grotesque value they ascribe to these goods demonstrate the prominence of "pecuniary culture."[46] While characters become commoditized, artifacts acquire some features of social identity in the play. The rise of their social value leads to the bestowal of human attributes onto fashionable objects. In both Dodsley's and Lukin's pieces, the *beaux* look for snuffboxes to accentuate their wit and smuttiness. Lukin also employs the image of a mirror to comment on the follies of his characters, for instance, those of his fop Polidor: "Ежели петиметр в него посмотрится, то в одну минуту с своим нарядом все свои шалости увидит, и увидит, что он достойно от степенных людей скотиною почитается" [If a fop looks into it, he will see his dress and all his pranks the very same minute and will notice that dignified people consider him a swine, quite fittingly for him]. [47] Thus, every product that the trinket vendor offers to his customers comes supplied with its own fable or a moral lesson and functions as a figurative mirror and a magnifying glass that enlarges the consequences of follies.

In this culture, the trinket vendor performs a symbolic role of the tailor who fashions his trifles according to his own taste and his customers' life styles. After all, both words *tailor* and *detail* come from the same root "*tailler*" [to cut] and "*détailler*" [to cut up in pieces, to tell in detail, and to particularize].[48] This role is particularly evident in the trinket vendor's advertising of a watch for Chis-

toserdov's nephew and *petits-maîtres*, as he supplies his product with different functional descriptions for different consumers. He emphasizes a sense of duty and the importance of service in the nephew's life and of love affairs in the life of *petits-maîtres*. While giving his products ideologically charged descriptions, the trinket vendor does not cater to the interests of his customers. His ideological purpose explains the absence of masks among his products.

Dodsley's and Lukin's views on the goals of satire define their protagonists' roles. A visit to the toyshop becomes an entertaining pastime for the observers of Mr. Chapman's spectacle where the very nature of toys reflects the author's attitude to his piece. Dodsley's goal is "to give old Satire a new Pow'r to charm."[49] While trying to reform human nature, he does not forget to amuse his audience. Lukin, on the other hand, chooses the space of the masquerade as an educational and ideological platform to criticize social abuses and his characters' follies. He shows the impact of pecuniary culture on both customers and the poor. His trinket vendor plays the role of a mediator between different social groups and is able to see further past his commodities than Dodsley's Mr. Chapman can. The employment of the masquerade chronotope, which promotes free mingling of people and allows for a reversal of social hierarchies, permits Lukin to create a more inclusive picture of society.[50] His goal is to reform men through the exposure of follies, and through didactic lessons for the younger generation.

While Lukin places the trinket vendor's shop into a masquerade setting to create a broader picture of society and to emphasize his play's relevatory potential, Mikhail Matinskii (1750–1820) ties a knot of intrigue in his comic opera *The St. Petersburg Merchant Arcade* (1779) around a large shopping area to portray merchants as a social group. [51] As Pavel Berkov observes, while "in dramatic works written in 1750s and 1760s, the merchant or more exactly a merchant-usurer was an episodic character," in the 1770s he became one of the main protagonists.[52] In Matinskii's work, a rich merchant Skvalygin [Miser] gives his daughter Khavron'ia away in marriage to Kriuchkodei's [Hook-and-Crook], a retired registrar, who helps Skvalygin to mistreat his debtors-merchants and female customers Shchepetkova (her name derives from the word *shchepet'e* [modish bagatelles]) and Krepyshkina ([Ms. Stand Firm] whose name also resonates with the word *crêpe*/ silk fabric). At the end of the comic opera, Skvalygin's nephew Khvalimov [Mr. Praiseworthy] and the officer Priamikov [Mr. Upright] restore justice. The events in Matinskii's comic opera reflect the reality of eighteenth-century commercial culture. Losses, debts and bankruptcies were common among merchants. In order to deal with the issue of non-payment of obligations the Statute on Promissory Notes [Veksel'nyi Ustav] was founded in 1729, but the Statute did not solve the problems. As Robert J. Jones observes, neither debtors, nor creditors had adequate protection for settling debts and the absence of protection led to the abuse of power.[53]

In Matinskii's comic opera, the public space of the stalls is juxtaposed to the private family area. In comparison with a strictly regulated, patriarchal space of the house, the trade stalls offer a potentially flexible locus, with fashionable trinkets being involved in circulation and merchants and customers commenting on their origins and value. While Lukin's shop was a predominantly masculine locus, the space of Matinskii's stalls is populated with emancipated women who are engaged in window-shopping and haggling over modish goods. The heroines are

interested in light and semitransparent fabrics—chintz,[54] taffeta, gauze and satin; and luxurious accessories—silk stockings, East-Indian scarves,[55] bonnets, ribbons, silk flowers, braids, 'agréments' [trimmings] and *panniers*.[56]

These products represent a full-grown "pecuniary culture" developed under the influence of fashion, with customers constantly looking for the ways to refine their appearance. Since eighteenth-century dress was characterized by minor stylistic changes, customers were interested in trimmings and accessories. According to Aileen Ribeiro, "by the middle of the century women's dress [in Europe] was increasingly dominated by decorative trimmings such as ribbons, lace, and silk flowers."[57] Such focus on minor changes demonstrated respect for established traditions whereas customers' demand for light fabrics indicated interest in more delicate styles that gave more freedom of motion, looked seductive and made female bodies slimmer. The swinging skirts, which could be slightly raised and let one catch a glimpse of women's shoes and silk stockings, allowed women to exploit the erotic power of their attire.[58] Fashion shops became feminine treasure islands of desire, fantasy, and freedom where references to the origins of goods widened geographical boundaries of the locus, and time slowed down as measured by the acquisition of commodities. Here women undertook imaginative journeys which involved the self-fashioning of their identities and the exploration of their public and private selves, their beauty, vanity, status and sexuality. Shops served as an alternative to masquerades, allowing women to engage in aesthetic role-playing, creation of semiotized sartorial texts about themselves and vestimentary self-expression.

In Matinskii's piece, goods do not carry any figurative meaning. Losing their allegorical significance, a sense of attachment to their potential owner which they had in Lukin's play, goods become mere objects of exchange that give their owners a fashionable status in a commercialized culture. Here women become the main consumers and legislators of fashion. The culture is marked by tough competition and abuse, and involves different ways of obtaining products through import, internal production facilities, auctions, store purchases and individual orders placed abroad. The market reflects challenges that Russian culture faced in its encounter with the West: in the eyes of many, European products and concepts devalued domestic goods and cultural norms. By having female customers favor French and Italian goods over Russian ones irrespective of their quality, Matinskii addresses the popular topic of the idealization of western products. Perhaps, to further ridicule his heroines' ardent interest in fashion, the writer gives a telling name to Madame Firiuliu who makes modish bonnets for the merchant Smekalov. *Firiulit'* means "to palter" while the word *firiul'* can refer to a simpleton in dialectical Russian. The merchant's name comes from the word *smekat'* [to grasp the meaning].[59] References to tailors, shoemakers, milliners, and hairdressers in Matinskii's and other eighteenth-century writers' works show that the skills of these artisans were highly valued.

While the trade stalls become a female territory of consumption where Matinskii's emancipated heroines adopt the roles similar to those of the merchants haggling for goods, the private family space is presented as a traditional household in which old rituals prevail and women counteract their husbands' dominance with trickery.[60] Yet the practices of the mercantile world pervade a patriarchal household, as marriage becomes an object of trade here with no romantic value attached to it

and a woman can easily become a commodity. Whereas love does not have a place in Matinskii's intrigue and the wedlock is intended to increase his protagonists' abusive power, the ritual of engagement is furnished with ethnographic details (references to ransom and trousseau) which emphasize the event's trading nature.[61]

The engagement rituals provide information about sartorial and cosmetic culture. One of the maidens' songs describes the best man appareled in a caftan made of crimson cloth, a camisole [men's jacket] of golden brocade, white silk stockings, black suede shoes, sparkling buckles, a hat with a feather, and gloves with silver accents. The description contains features of traditional and contemporary dress. To prepare herself for the engagement ceremony, the bride applies an excessive amount of ceruse and rouge to her face. During the ceremony, she gives her maids of honor presents such as stockings, shoes, ribbons, ceruse, and rouge. While many of the engagement rituals which Matinskii describes were customary in the merchants' milieu, his emancipated heroines Shchepetkova and Krepyshkina perceive them as the remnants of patriarchal culture. The writer describes two types of women in his comic opera—traditional women for whom he resorts the space of patriarchal household, and emancipated heroines who move freely between the space of the stalls, patriarchal households and state institutions. While traditional wives are criticized by their husbands for their violations of dress etiquette and established domestic rules, fashionable women engage in price negotiations with merchants, are capable of exercising power over men, and counteract Skvalygin's and Kriuchkodei's abuse of power.[62]

Like Lukin, Matinskii tailors the speech of his protagonists to their social milieu and portrays underprivileged characters. The writer furnishes his description of merchants' everyday life and customs with historical and ethnographic details pertinent to this cultural group. He models his usurer Skvalygin and minor official Kriuchkodei on Sumarokov's characters, but intensifies their manipulative behavior, creating protagonists that form a union to facilitate their illegal activities. He projects his characters' abusive behavior on both private and public spheres—the miser's household and both characters' interactions with merchants and female customers. While Lukin places his shop into a broader space of masquerade and uses the masquerade trope to reveal social foibles and to emphasize values disseminated by the trinket vendor, Matinskii moves the setting of his comic opera from the expanse of the trade stalls and the expansion of merchants' activities to the closed world of traditional culture to examine the origins of abusive behavior. In both pieces, the action moves from the exterior to the interior public space where revelations take place and the motives behind the characters' actions are displayed. In comparison with the space of Lukin's shop carefully guarded by its owner, an advocate of Petrine values, the territory of the stalls is more open, allowing for more space for disagreements and defensive strategies of all parties involved in the conflict.[63]

Matinskii emphasizes familial and social questions in the main conflict of his comic opera, which were pertinent to eighteenth-century culture. He opposes his older generation that inherits the foibles of the old times to the younger one represented by Skvalygin's nephew Khvalimov and the officer Priamikov, the proponents of virtue, justice, and state service. The writer's attitude to fashion is complex. Disapproving of his heroines' keen interest in what is in vogue, he gives

them humorous names associated with fashion and their personal traits. Yet, he also portrays them as independent women who resist Skvalygin's abuse of power. In the comic opera, fashion becomes implicitly connected with women's emancipation, which the author does not necessarily approve of in his heroines. If Lukin presents both sale and purchase of fashionable products as predominantly male activities, Matinskii focuses on female consumption while leaving trade activities to male merchants.[64]

Similar examples of feminization of shopping can be found in Catherine II's *Vsiakaia Vsiachina* [All Kinds of Things] (1769–70) and Nikolai Novikov's *Zhivopisets* [The Painter] (1772–3). In these journals, female customers' inability to resist shopping temptations generates anxieties among men about women's emancipation. In *All Kinds of Things*, the merchant Foka Den'goliubov [Money-loving] complains of women's window-shopping as a disruptive activity that creates chaos in his shop.[65] He sees a potential threat to the order established by men in women's inability to resist shopping. Similar fears of female behavior are voiced in Aleksandr Ablesimov's Tale VI "Failure" published in *The Painter.* An aging coquette is gradually bereaved of her good looks, admirers, fashionable apparel supplied by her lovers, and finally her freedom; she is left with the task to please her former lovers, which culminates in her stealing a snuffbox from a French shop and leaving the shop with her cuckolded husband after her theft is discovered.[66] According to Brent Shannon, such accounts of female shoplifters revealed the fears of "the deviant desires engendered by the department store's seductive spectacle of goods" and created a stereotype of female obsession with shopping.[67] In Ablesimov's tale, men interrupt the heroine's unruly behavior and turn her into a commodity object and "a yielding and compliant feminine consumer."[68] In the end, the heroine's husband takes her away from the shop, a place of sartorial and erotic, back to the domestic world.

Shopping for luxurious products was a regular pastime for aristocracy while members of the middle class often regarded it as a threat to their income. Their negative attitude to shopping informed the association of consumption with women. Such identification had religious roots; religiously motivated didactic and satirical literature in both Europe and Russia offered a critique of fashion. These works linked luxury with desire, disobedience, sin, and women.[69] It would be a mistake, however, to claim that shopping was perceived as an exclusively female activity in the journals of 1769–1774. In *The Painter*, both male and female members of aristocracy are portrayed as potential disruptors of trade. The report from St. Petersburg Merchant Arcade presents merchants' complaint about the fad among noblemen and noblewomen of window-shopping and socializing at the stalls.[70] The writer juxtaposes two different attitudes to shops. While these loci serve as places of promenade and small talk for members of polite society, they are interpreted exclusively as places of consumption by less privileged social groups. The complaint about window-shopping opens a discussion between merchants in which some of them praise members of polite society for promoting their business. In this dialogue, noblemen and noblewomen are perceived as legislators of fashion, and the locus of the shop is viewed as a territory of both consumption and recreation. Yet, the author of the second piece saturates the merchants' refutation of criticism with satirical overtones directed both against the nobility's idle pastime and the merchants' selling practices.[71]

By the end of the century, fashion shops become more exclusively associated with the French culture in literary works. If Lukin employed this space to criticize social and human foibles and set his characters on the right path, in later works the locus became a source of questionable upbringing. Its role in the education of fops is emphasized in the journal *Sankt-Peterburgskii Merkurii* [St. Petersburg Mercury] (1793): "Когож воспитанным считаем мы у нас?/ Кто Географию Французских лавок знает" [So whom do we consider a well-bred person?/ The one who knows the Geography of French shops].[72] As commercialization of society grows, bigger western-type stores [*magaziny*] replace small ones [*lavki*], and new English concepts of plants [*fabriki*], manufacturers [*fabricanty*] and commerce [*kommertsiia*] are introduced in the texts.[73]

The locus of the fashion shop also broadens its social functions within the Russian literary space. Like in Lukin's play, in Ivan Krylov's *The Fashion Shop* (1806), this locus becomes a territory where traditional and emancipated protagonists engage in heated ideological debates and where provincial characters receive an introduction to the city life and new culture.[74] The writer underscores the cultural tension within society by introducing a conventional eighteenth-century couple—a fashionable wife, Mrs. Sumburova, who is interested in French fashions, and a patriarchal husband who hopes to advance Russian customs. As a result, cultural conflicts acquire a more personal tone, dividing members of the same family and demonstrating the expanse of cultural influences. In the play, Mrs. Sumburova comes to the city with her family to buy modish clothing for her stepdaughter Lisa and herself, in anticipation of Lisa's wedding to Mrs. Sumburova's spendthrift relative. The family arrives from the countryside where, as Krylov emphasizes, many people follow old customs. Masha, who sells fashionable clothing and gallant trifles in Madame Caret's shop, helps to baffle Mrs. Sumburova's plans and to arrange Lisa's marriage to Lestov, her owner's brother, in exchange for personal freedom and money.

According to Liubov' Kiseleva, the war with France in 1805–7 which led to the rise of patriotism in Russia may have sparked Krylov's interest in the subject of Gallomania, which acquired political significance at the time.[75] As Boris Uspenskii and Yurii Lotman observe, anti-French sentiments and discussions of the French influence on the Russian language became an important subject of debates in the journals.[76] In the play, Krylov significantly broadens the functional semantics of the locus. He makes this space a figurative island of the French culture associated with fashion, amorous encounters, squandering, and smuggling. While setting the boundaries of this locus more rigidly both in spatial and ideological terms, he also demonstrates the place's cultural hybridization. In the play, the Russian maid Masha helps Madame Caret sell fashionable goods and performs a popular task of servants from *commedia dell'arte*: she arranges Lisa's and Lestov's meetings and helps them become engaged despite the initial disapproval of Lisa's parents.[77] Masha's negotiating role conforms to the stereotypes that associated fashion shops with France, French etiquette, courtship, seduction, and trade, with marriage arrangements that involved economic considerations.[78] As a result, trade functions as a means of advancing a love intrigue rather than a goal in itself, and the shop becomes a place of female empowerment where women are involved in sale and purchase of fashionable products, and in swaying the characters' destinies.

The assortment of goods changes in Krylov's shop. While Lukin's and Matinskii's merchants were mainly involved in the sale of accessories and gallant trifles, haberdashery and millinery, Krylov's heroines advertise female clothing. The shift from smaller adjustments in dress to ideologically inspired modifications that affect the shape of garments (as in the case of a sarafan) comments on the changes in political climate. Apparel helps to shape one's social identity to a greater extent than accessories, and thus it is not surprising that in Krylov's play, clothing represents social messages pertinent to the culture of the day, ideological disagreements between the characters are more vividly accentuated, and cultural and national identities are better articulated. The borders of the locus are also better delineated in Krylov's play than in Lukin's and Matinskii's pieces. The shop is isolated from other sites of cultural activity and is kept protected from unwelcome interventions, and its shopkeeper and fashion legislator, Madame Caret, remains an absent figure for most of the play while other characters wait to meet her and appeal to her in different ways. The main portion of her remarks relate to the exchanges with her compatriot Tricher [Cheat]/ Dupré who tries to blackmail her. Masha assumes the role of Madame Caret for the majority of the time. She actively promotes fashion and responds better to the demands and psychology of her customers. Appropriating this French locus to some extent, she considers a possibility of opening her own fashion shop.

Masha advertises French goods and Mrs. Sumburova confesses to her: "Кабы не ваши мадамы, так, прости господи, хоть совсем без платья ходи!" [If it wasn't for your Madams, God forgive me, we'd all be walking around in the nude!][79] Masha easily catches Lisa's stepmother in her net, making references to the ranks of her hypothetical clients (countesses, ladies-in-waiting, and baronesses). She proudly tells Sumburova that "лучшие и знатнейшие щеголихи имеют честь у нас проматываться" [the best, most renowned ladies of fashion have the honor of going bankrupt in our [their] establishment].[80] Being a product of women's sartorial emancipation, Sumburova strives to become a member of the leisure class that lives by the laws of "pecuniary culture." Her obsession with fashion is eventually punished, as she barely escapes becoming the subject of scandal, ending in the closet for modish goods where she hides from her husband. Krylov reduces his heroine to what Laura Brown calls an object of commodity, metonymically linking Sumburova to the products of vestimentary culture.[81] Since women were occupied with adorning themselves and were subjects of various negotiations, such conversion is a grotesque, but logical development of culture on its way to commercialization. At the end of the play, Sumburov reconciles with his wife on the condition that she "will never come within a mile of a French shop" [на версту не подъезжать к французским лавкам].[82]

Krylov's play reflects an ideological change in society in the year of Austerlitz (1805) when patriotic feelings prevailed in Russian culture.[83] French dress, which reappeared after tsar Paul I's death, still dominated on the Russian market.[84] Nevertheless, vestimentary degrees introduced by Catherine II in support of more culturally moderate attire which contained both Russian and western features, and Paul I's restrictions against certain garments which he associated with the French revolution, as well as attacks of Russian satirical writers on Gallomania made an impact on the way writers arrayed their characters at the turn of the

century. If in many eighteenth-century works, *petits-maîtres* and *petites-maîtresses* believed that Russian dress looked provincial, in *The Fashion Shop*, members of polite society wear national attire. Russian apparel coexists side by side with the French, as Masha confirms the rumors that women wear sarafans in the capital, adding that everyone is free to dress the way she wants, and thus implying certain democratization of choice and freedom of personal preferences.[85] While dress and fashion are still interpreted through the prism of ideology and national values, the characters have a choice of fashioning their identities according to their personal styles. This plurality of choice and westernization of the concept is expressed in Lestov's reference to fashions (instead of fashion in the singular form) and in his firm differentiation between ancestral customs and modern fashions.[86]

Like previous writers, Krylov emphasizes that supporters of Russian traditions view Gallomania and sartorial indulgence as demonic manifestations. The peasant Antropka associates the abundance and beauty of garments in the shop with the sinful lives of their potential owners, sharing this approach with Sumburov who perceives the shop as a demonic place.[87] There are fewer characters interested in the French language and modish goods. None of the characters except Frenchmen speak French, and Sumburov reproaches Tricher for not learning proper Russian. Only Sumburova demonstrates interest in modish garments whereas Lisa, comes to the shop to meet her future husband Lestov. And Masha, who successfully manipulates the power of sartorial products, engages in flirtations with Lestov and dreams of being independent, nevertheless supports the values of traditional life. The characters that share Sumburova's interest in fashion and foreign goods—the spendthrifts Nedoshchetov [Being Short of Something] and his sister—are only briefly mentioned in the play. Moreover, Sumburova has much less freedom than the independent heroines of Krylov's predecessors. Her main role is that of a wife who is expected to obey her husband and represent her family in a positive light. At the time when Krylov wrote *The Fashion Shop*, the epoch of female reign ceased to exist and fashion was conquered, dethroned, and stripped of its associations with freedom by eighteenth-century writers.

The mistress of the household turns into a commodity object at the same time as the space of the shop itself becomes a commodity object controlled by the state. The intervention of the police officer who comes to the shop at the end of the play to examine its possibly illegal products and activities makes this last refuge of the French culture hover on the edge of extinction. This spirit of repression towards Gallomania was presaged by the century-long ideological debates in satirical literature and by Catherine's policies promoting national values. Eighteenth-century writers presented shops as loci of ardent ideological and political debates, which sometimes engaged members of the same family, and as places where national consciousness awakened through its encounters with the West. Real and literary fashion shops played an important role in the promotion of interest towards sartorial culture that led to the appearance of virtual shops in the form of fashion journals at the end of the eighteenth century. By bringing clothing to the foreground of literary works, eighteenth-century writers helped to transform its auxiliary descriptive role into an essential part of human identity, the way clothing was interpreted by nineteenth-century realists.[88]

NOTES

I would like to thank Vera Proskurina and Boris Maslov for their valuable comments on this article at different stages.

1. On the notion of space as historical, social and ideological product, see Henry Lefebvre, *State, Space, World* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2009), 170–71, 188, 224–25.

2. See Viktor N. Zakharov, *Zapadnoevropeiskie kuptsy v rossiiskoi torgovle XVIII veka* (Moscow: Nauka, 2005), 91.

3. The number of selling places in Moscow comprised 150 rows of stalls, about 450 small shops, and 11,000 benches and tables at the beginning of the eighteenth century. See Tatiana M. Vlasova, ed., et al, *Kupechestvo Moskvy. Istoriia. Traditsii. Sud'by* (Moscow: ACT Olimp, 2008), 12. The Free Economic Society was organized in 1765 to boost economy, agriculture, and estate management in Russia. In 1766, Aleksei Polenov proposed to enlist rich peasants released from serfdom in the third estate *meshchane* [middle class] in his essay "On the Enserfed Condition of Peasants in Russia" (1765), which he submitted for a competition on the rights of property for peasants organized by the society.

4. Zakharov, *Zapadnoevropeiskie kuptsy*, 56, 572–74, 586–87, 591–92, 597–98.

5. For tax regulations on textile and clothing, see Christine Ruane, *The Empire's New Clothes. A History of the Russian Fashion Industry, 1700–1917* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 2009), 70.

6. Zakharov, *Zapadnoevropeiskie kuptsy,* 195–200.

7. See Boris Kurakin, "Gistoriia o Petre I i blizhnikh k nemu liudiakh. 1682–1695 gg.," *Russkaia starina* 68.10 (1890): 249. All translations are mine.

8. Antioch Kantemir, *Sobranie stikhotvorenii* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1956), 82–83. Some peculiarities of the old Russian orthography are preserved in the quotations.

9. See Antioch Kantemir, *Russko-frantsuzskii slovar' Antiokha Kantemira*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Azbukovnik, Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2004), 1:620.

10. On the evolution in the perception of fashion in eighteenth-century France, its association with femininity, novelty and frivolity, see Jennifer M. Jones, *Sexing La Mode. Gender, Fashion and Commercial Culture in Old Regime France* (Oxford: Berg, 2004), 3–19, 41, 48–49, 97, 186, 211.

11. See, for instance, Catherine II's play *Imeniny gospozhi Vorchalkinoi* [Mrs. Grumbler's Name Day] (1772).

12. See Mikhail Pyliaev, *Staroe zhit'e* (St. Petersburg: Zhurnal "Neva," "Letnii sad": 2000), 105.

13. On the perception of commodities as cultural products that possess biographical identities, see Igor Kopytoff, "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as a Process," in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007), 66–68, 87–90. On the transformative power of goods, see Grant McCracken, "Diderot unities, and the Diderot effect," in *Consumption: Critical Concepts in the Social Sciences*, ed. Daniel Miller (London: Routledge, 2001), 3:120–35.

14. See Pyliaev, *Staroe zhit'e*, 104–5. On the notions of a "social text" and a "spectacle of the street," see Henry Lefebvre, *Key Writings*, eds. Stuart Elden, Elizabeth Lebas and Eleonore Kofman (New York, London: Continuum, 2003), 88–92.

15. On the differences between Russian and European stores, see Ruane, *The Empire's New Clothes,* 124–27.

16. Here I examine this locus as a static and causally and spatially closed phenomenon. Later I will analyze it as a heterogeneous and mobile zone of social interactions, which is open for changes and ideological engagement. See Doreen Massey, *For Space* (London: Sage Publications, 2005) for these implications of space, particularly 13, 37, 42–62, 80, 151–52.

17. On the difference in Aleksandr Sumarokov's and Vladimir Lukin's approaches to the genre of comedy, see Aleksandr Pypin, "V. I. Lukin," in Petr A. Efremov, ed., *Sochineniia i perevody V. I.*

Lukina i B. E. El'chaninova (St. Petersburg, 1868), viii–ix, xlviii–lix; Nikolai N. Bulich, *Sumarokov i sovremennaia emu kritika* (St. Petersburg: Tip. Eduarda Pratsa, 1854), 158–66.

18. In Dodsley's piece, all characters have names in the list of *dramatis personae*, but they are identified as gentlemen, ladies, old men and a beau and assigned numbers in the text like everymen of a morality story. Most names have no semantic significance in Dodsley's play nor in Claude Pierre Patu's translation. According to Pavel Berkov, Lukin created a "poetics of 'telling names'" in Russian literature. See Berkov, *Istoriia russkoi komedii XVIII v.* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1977), 78. Kirill Pigarev observes that Ivan Elagin also used telling names in his play *Russkii—frantsuz* [Russian—Frenchman] (1765), no copies of which survive. See Kirill V. Pigarev, *Tvorchestvo Fonvizina* (Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR, 1954), 90. On purist tendencies in Russian culture and literature, see Boris Uspenskii and Yuri Lotman, "Spory o iazyke v nachale XIX v. kak fakt russkoi kul'tury ("Proisshestvie v tsarstve tenei, ili sud'bina rossiiskogo iazyka"—neizvestnoe sochinenie Semena Bobrova)," in Boris A. Uspenskii, *Izbrannye trudy* (Moscow: Gnosis, 1994), 2:360–63.

19. The term 'chronotope' coined by Mikhail Bakhtin refers to the organization and representation of spatial and temporal relationships in the text. See Mikhail Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes Towards a Historical Poetics," in *Narrative Dynamics: Essays on Time, Plot, Closure, and Frames*, ed. Brian Richardson (Columbus: Ohio State Univ. Press, 2002), 15.

20. Hugh McLean, "The Adventures of an English Comedy in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Dodsley's *Toy-Shop* and Lukin's *Ščepetil'nik*," in *American Contributions to the Fifth International Congress of Slavists,* 2 vols. (The Hague: Moulton, 1963), 2:209.

21. Ibid., 2:210.

22. See Pypin, "V. I. Lukin," iii, xxiii.

23. McLean, "The Adventures of an English Comedy," 207.

24. Harry M. Solomon, Introduction, in Robert Dodsley, *The Toy-Shop (1735). The King and the Miller of Mansfield (1737)* (Los Angeles: Clark Memorial Library, UCLA, 1983), iv.

25. See McLean, "The Adventures of an English Comedy," 204.

26. Dodsley, *The Toy-Shop,* 46. Patu follows Horatian and Dodsley's goals: to please and to instruct. See Patu, trans., *La Boutique du Bijoutier, Satire Dramatique,* 50, in *Choix de Petites Pieces du Théatre Anglois, Traduites des Originaux,* vol. 1. (London & Paris: Prault Fils, 1756), 50.

27. Berkov, "Russkaia komediia i komicheskaia opera XVIII veka," in *Russkaia komediia i komicheskaia opera XVIII veka*, ed. Berkov (Moscow & Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1950), 13–14.

28. Patu removes Dodsley's reference to the parlor and tea drinking from the introduction, but keeps other details intact.

29. For the association of the space of tea table with women in eighteenth-century English literature, see Laura Brown, *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1993), 44.

30. Berkov, *Russkaia komediia,* 98. For features of the northern dialect in the workmen's speech, see Pypin, "V. I. Lukin," lix.

31. Ilya Serman defines Lukin's main dramatic strategy as "self-narration, a character's account of himself, his self-analysis, his conclusions about himself, which were supposed to serve both as an authorial evaluation and also let the viewer know quite definitely . . . what attitude he should adopt toward a particular character in the play." Ilya Z. Serman, "The Eighteenth Century: Neoclassicism and the Enlightenment, 1730–1790," in *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, ed. Charles A. Moser (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989), 68.

32. On the perception of objects that we own as parts of our extended self, see Russell W. Belk, "Possessions and the extended self," in *Consumption*, 1: 180–238.

33. Dodsley, *The Toy-Shop,* 17. Patu calls his *bijoutier* "a new type of a satirist or rather a preacher." Patu, *Choix de Petites Pieces*, 14.

34. On the comparison of literary criticism with a court hearing, see Grigorii A. Gukovskii, "Russkaia literaturno-kriticheskaia mysl' v 1730–1750-e gody," in *XVIII vek*, ed. Pavel N. Berkov, vol. 5 (Moscow & Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1962), 126–27.

35. The first public masquerades were organized in Russia in 1758.

36. See Herbert Spencer, *A System of Synthetic Philosophy,* Vol. 7, *The Principles of Sociology* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1890), 2:205–10; Georg Simmel, *Georg Simmel: on Women, Sexuality, and Love*, trans. Guy Oakes (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1984), 72–73, 86–87, 100–101, 134–43; John Carl Flügel, *The Psychology of Clothes* (London: The Hogarth Press Ltd, 1950), 105–13; Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986), 6, 33, 51, 101, 105, 125.

37. Compare merchants in Matinskii's *St. Petersburg Merchant Arcade*, Catherine II's and Nikolai Novikov's journals, and Ivan Krylov's Masha from *The Fashion Shop*.

38. Patu preserves all goods from Mr. Chapman's shop, rarely changing any details related to their description.

39. On passage of things through regimes of value, see Kopytoff, "The Cultural Biography of Things," 66–68, 87–90.

40. Berkov acknowledges Lukin's input in creation of individualized languages. See Berkov, *Istoriia russkoi komedii XVIII v.* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1977), 79–81.

41. *Shchepetil'nik* is an old Russian word and *galantereishchik* is a French borrowing.

42. References to both styles reemerge in the trinket vendor's conversation with Ver'khogliadov about snuffboxes.

43. Dodsley, *The Toy-Shop,* 22.

44. As Iurii Shcheglov has demonstrated, unfavorable representations of "slaves of fashion" go back to the satires of Horace, Juvenal, Plautus, and other writers who created the main topoi associated with the figure of a foppish, narcissistic person. See Iurii Shcheglov, *Antioch Kantemir i stikhotvornaia satira* (St. Petersburg: Giperion, 2004), 62–63, 127–42, 204–206, 288.

45. See an example from Kantemir's satire: "You will put on an entire village on yourself." Kantemir, *Sobranie stikhotvorenii* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1956), 72. This motif reemerges in Aleksandr Shakhovskoi's play *Pustodomy* [The Spendthrifts] in which the countess Nedoshchetova [Mrs. Being Short of Something] makes her husband mortgage all their villages to pay for her modish attire and knickknacks. The sphere of fashion, which was perceived negatively in Russian traditional society, became predominantly associated with women towards the end of the century.

46. I employ Thorstein Veblen's term here. See Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, 4th ed. (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1959).

47. Berkov, *Russkaia komediia,* 104. Note a similar comparison of a *petit-maître* with a brute [skotina] in Sumarokov's satire "O frantsuzskom iazyke" [About the French Language].

48. William Alan Neilson, et al., eds., *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language,* 2nd ed., unabridged (Springfield, MA: G & C Merriam Co., 1961), 710, 2568.

49. Dodsley, *The Toy-Shop,* 46. On the connection of shopping and window shopping with entertainment in French culture, see Jones, *Sexing la Mode,* 153

50. See Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2009), 10–12, 18–23; *Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo,* 2nd ed., (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963), 166–68.

51. According to Simon Karlinsky, eighteenth-century Russian comic opera was "a literary rather than a musical-dramatic genre. It was a brief (one- or two-act) play that included songs, vocal ensembles, and occasionally choruses." Simon Karlinsky, *Russian Drama from Its Beginning to the Age of Pushkin* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1985), 116. The first European works of this kind called *paysannerie* (1740–60) explored rustic plots with traditional love intrigues. In the 1770s and 1780s, bourgeois subjects became popular. Mark Darlow, *Nicolas-Etienne Framery and Lyric Theatre in Eighteenth-Century France* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2003), 48–49, 51–52. On the musical qualities and staging of Matinskii's comic opera, see Vsevolod A. Prokof'ev, "Mikhail Matinskii i

ego opera 'Sanktpeterburgskii Gostinyi Dvor," in *Muzyka i muzykal'nyi byt staroi Rossii. Materialy i issledovaniia,* vol. 1. (Leningrad: Academia, 1927), 65–67.

52. Berkov, *Istoriia russkoi komedii,* 276. For a discussion of the topic of money in Russian literature in the fifties and sixties, see Berkov, *Vladimir Ignat'evich Lukin. 1737–1794* (Moscow & Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1950), 66.

53. Robert E. Jones, "Merchant Bankruptcy and the Courts, 1649–1800," in *Eighteenth-Century Russia: Society, Culture, Economy*, eds. Roger Bartlett and Gabriela Lehmann-Carli (Wittenberg: Lit Verlag, 2004), 524–25.

54. British colonial merchants introduced chintz and calico in the second half of the seventeenth century. See Ruane, *The Empire's New Clothes,* 23.

55. Expensive shawls later replaced Oriental scarves. According to Raisa Kirsanova, shawls became fashionable no earlier than 1792. See Raisa M. Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium i byt XVIII–XIX vekov* (Moscow: Slovo, 2002), 137–38. They may have come into fashion even earlier since they are mentioned in Ivan Dmitriev's "Modnaia zhena" [The Fashionable Wife] (1792).

56. *Panniers* were called *fizhmy* in Russian after the German word *Fischbein*, which referred to fish bones from which *panniers* were made. See Kirsanova, *Russkii kostium i byt XVIII–XIX vekov,* 39. The farthingales with *panniers* were worn in Europe until the French Revolution. James Laver, *English Costume of the Eighteenth Century* (London: A & C Black Ltd., 1931), 28. On the history of the hoop petticoat and its association with female autonomy, see Kimberly Chrisman, "*Unhoop* the Fair Sex: The Campaign Against the Hoop Petticoat in Eighteenth-Century England," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 30, no. 1 (1996): 7–22.

57. Aileen Ribeiro, *Dress in Eighteenth-Century Europe. 1715–1789* (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc., 1985), 18, 50. On popular trimmings in the 1770s and early 1780s, see Norah Waugh, *The Cut of Women's Clothes, 1600–1930* (New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1968).

58. Ribeiro, *Dress in Eighteenth-Century Europe,* 39.

59. Since Matinskii gives telling names to his characters and carefully stylizes their social dialects, his familiarity with this word is credible. In *Imeniny gospozhi Vorchalkinoi* [Mrs. Grumbler's Name Day] (1772), Catherine II portrays a *petit-maître* who has a similarly sounding name—Firliufiushkov.

60. On the conservatism of Russian merchant culture, see David L. Ransel, "Russian Merchants: Citizenship and Identity," in *Eighteenth-Century Russia: Society, Culture, Economy*, eds. Roger Bartlett and Gabriela Lehmann-Carli (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2007), 417–18, 420, 426–28. Ransel claims that although merchants adopted certain elements of western culture, they adhered to Russian religious and folk tradition to distinguish themselves from the nobility as a group.

61. In addition to providing details about bridal ransom and trousseau, Matinskii emphasizes the commercial implications of the union on several other levels. First, Skvalygin's and his son-in-law's future financial profit becomes an incentive for the minor official's marriage to the merchant's daughter. Second, Skvalygin tries to profit during the engagement ceremony by collecting money for the drinks and gifts from invited merchants. Third, Matinskii draws parallels between engagement customs and Kriuchkodei's office practices, compelling his character to explain his unwillingness to share a drink with his bride by referencing his habit of not sharing his bribes.

62. While Shchepetkova's family status is not mentioned, Krepyshkina is a widow. She tells Shchepetkova that she used to control her husband when he was alive. See Berkov, *Russkaia komediia,* 290.

63. The open setting with more characters involved in the conflict is also dictated by the musical needs of the comic opera.

64. On the feminization of shopping and masculinization of trade, see Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace, *Consuming Subjects: Women, Shopping, and Business in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1997), 12, 84–95.

65. *Vsiakaia Vsiachina* 65 (1769): 173. Although *Vsiakaia Vsiachina* [All Kinds of Things] reworks a letter from *The Spectator* (IV, 2), the author makes his own selection of themes and characters. For the comparison between *The Spectator*'s and *All Kinds of Things*'s articles, see V. Solntsev, *'Vsiakaia Vsiachina' i 'Spektator.' (K istorii russkoi satiricheskoi zhurnalistiki XVIII veka)* (St. Petersburg: Tip.

V. S. Balasheva, 1892), 13. Here the locus of the shop can be perceived as a "heterotopia of crisis" characterized by the break with the traditional culture and disruptive female behavior that threatens patriarchal culture. On the description of the "heterotopia of crisis," see Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," *Diacritics* 16 (1986), 22–27.

66. Berkov, ed., *Satiricheskie zhurnaly N. I. Novikova* (Moscow & Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1951), 208. Similar theft is depicted in the news "From the Merchant Arcade" in Novikov's *Truten'* [The Drone] (1769–70). A boyar's wife steals goods from the stalls and beats the merchant for his attempt to return his products. Berkov, ed., *Satiricheskie zhurnaly N. I. Novikova,* 57.

67. Brent Shannon, *The Cut of His Coat* (Athens: Ohio Univ. Press, 2006), 57.

68. Here I employ Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace's description of female customers. Kowaleski-Wallace, *Consuming Subjects,* 87.

69. See Joyce Appleby, "Consumption in Early Modern Social Thought," in *Consumption,* 1:47; Jones, *Sexing La Mode,* 15–17, 37.

70. Berkov, *Satiricheskie zhurnaly N. I. Novikova,* 298–99.

71. Ibid., 352–54.

72. *S.-Peterburgskii Merkurii* 1 (1793): 248–50, in Vasilii I. Pokrovskii, Supplements to *Shchegoli v satiricheskoi literature XVIII veka* (Moscow: Universitetskaia tip., 1903), 75.

73. Nikolai I. Strakhov, *Perepiska Mody* (Moscow: Univ. tip., u V. Okorokova, 1791), 2, 228.

74. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, French madams visited the countryside to offer goods that had gone out of fashion in the capitals. See A. L. Grishunin, et al., eds., *Rasskazy babushki. Iz vospominanii piati pokolenii, zapisannye i sobrannye ee vnukom D. Blagovo* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1989), 77.

75. Liubov' N. Kiseleva, "Zagadki dramaturgii Krylova," in Ivan A. Krylov, *Polnoe sobranie dramaticheskikh sochinenii* (St. Petersburg: Giperion, 2001), xxvi. Krylov's *Fashion Shop* was quite popular at the beginning of the century. Aleksandr Shakhovskoi employed Krylov's heroine—Masha, Madame Caret's saleswoman—in his play *Pustodomy* [The Spendthrifts] and developed the characters of Mr. Nedoshchetov, Lisa's would-be bridegroom, and his sister who are briefly mentioned in Krylov's play. The first one arranges matters in a western manner at his estate, while the second one squanders her husband's property on garments. Shakhovskoi makes Count and Countess Nedoshchetovs his main protagonists.

76. See Uspenskii and Lotman, "Spory o iazyke v nachale XIX v.," 2:351–52.

77. For the description of eighteenth-century fashion shops as places of amorous encounters, see Pokrovskii, *Shchegoli v satiricheskoi literature XVIII veka* (Moscow: Universitetskaia tip., 1903), 9. For a description of tasks that female sellers of fashionable goods performed, see Krylov, *Pochta dukhov* [The Spirits' Mail], in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii,* 3 vols. (Moscow: Gos. izd. khudozh. literatury, 1945–1946), 1:47.

78. On the ideological and spatial association of shops with courtship and entertainments in French culture, see Jones, *Sexing La Mode,* 153, 162–63.

79. Krylov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii,* 2:433; Laurence Senelick, ed. & trans., *Russian Satiric Comedy* (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1983), 35.

80. Krylov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 2:424; Senelick, ed. & trans., *Russian Satiric Comedy,* 30.

81. See Brown, *Ends of Empire,* 18–20, 44–45. The young women who worked in fashion boutiques in Paris were often viewed as commodity objects. As Jennifer Jones points out, the name '*grisettes*' that denoted their profession and categorized them as a social group came from the cloth worn by them in the seventeenth century. See Jones, *Sexing La Mode,* 156.

82. Krylov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii,* 2: 488; Senelick, ed. & trans., *Russian Satiric Comedy,* 65.

83. See Vsevolod N. Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, "Krylov i teatr," in *I. A. Krylov: Issledovaniia i materialy*, eds. Dmitrii D. Blagoi and Nikolai L. Brodskii (Moscow: OGIZ, 1947) 234; Nikolai Stepanov, *I. A. Krylov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo* (Moscow: Khudozh. lit., 1958), 42.

84. Tsar Paul associated certain French garments with the French revolution and banned them at the beginning of his reign. Nikolai A. Sablukov, "Zapiski," in *Tsareubiistvo 11 marta 1801 goda. Zapiski uchastnikov i sovremennikov,* 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg: Izd. A. S. Suvorina, 1908), 22; Filipp F. Wiegel, *Zapiski* (Moscow: Artel' pisatelei "Krug," 1928), 1:93.

85. On the role of fashion in promoting individualism, see Gilles Lipovetsky, *The Empire of Fashion. Dressing Modern Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1994), 27–37.

86. Note Kantemir's description of fashion through references to customs and habits at the beginning of the article.

87. Resorting to the device of his earlier plays, Krylov shows the life of society through the eyes of naïve low class characters. Kiseleva, "Zagadki dramaturgii Krylova," xxvii.

88. On the role of clothing in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature, see Daniel Roche, *The Culture of Clothing: Dress and Fashion in the Ancien Régime*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), 408.