This paper examines the autobiographical and biographical writing of Ariadna Vladimirova Tyrkova-Williams (1869-1962), a journalist, writer, memoirist, liberal and feminist activist in the early-twentieth century Russia. She put forward her own individual “I” in conjunction with various real and “imagined” communities, expressing a new set of identities and gender roles. Tyrkova wrote about herself, family life and political events, combining private and public sphere in hundreds of letters, her diary and memoirs. She also became a biographer, in so doing representing the self in the mirror of others.

As a rule, in works of biography the author’s own self lurks behind the life being described but is never explicitly engaged. Such displacement (“вненаходимость”) is something which is generally expected by the readership, more interested in the subject than the author him- or herself. At the same time, biographical writing inevitably contains autobiographical traces, and the life of the biographer becomes implicated in the life of the subject, regardless of the distance in time or space. So, the life of Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams who emigrated from Russia after the Bolshevik takeover, turns out to be closely intertwined with those of her subjects. These included Alexander Pushkin, Anna Filosofova (a key figure in the women’s movement in the second half of the nineteenth century) and also the British journalist from New Zealand and her second husband, Harold Williams,¹ as well as (of course) herself in her own personal memoirs.² Also available for examination is her own, partially published, correspondence with her son Arkadii Borman,³ with Harold Williams, with various Russian and English politicians, and with Russian exiles such as V. A. Maklakov, S. V. Panina, M. M. Karpovich and many others. Finally, the events of the early

³ Бorman А. АВ. Тыркова-Вильямс по ее письмам и воспоминаниям сына. Лувэн-Вашингтон, 1964.
twentieth century are reflected in her own (published) diary entries as well. Unpublished materials can be found in GARF and RGALI in Moscow, but the bulk of her personal archive is located at the Bakhmeteff Archive at Columbia University.

Using this collective body of works I will examine the connection between the biographical and autobiographical and highlight the potential for elucidating the views, values and devices of self-identification on the part of the author. At the same time I wish to demonstrate the value of writing a biography of Tyrkova-Williams which utilizes her biographical work as well as her autobiographical and epistolary texts.

Others have written of her life. V.V. Shelokhaev has written a short biography; her life in England has been mentioned by O. A. Kazina; historians of liberalism have examined her activities. Her memoirs have also been scrutinized by scholars. As for her biography of Pushkin A. Smith has discussed it in the context of the evolution of the literary canon, while at the same time emphasizing the propinquity of world views of author and subject and uncovering the political and cultural context of her Life of Pushkin. Caryl Emerson has provided a detailed analysis of the distinctive features of Tyrkova’s biographical conceptualizing to be found in that work.

We should also mention D. N. Chernigovskii’s scholarship, devoted to the study of the
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body of Pushkin biography created by the Russian émigré community. Chernigovskii considers the topic of the evolution of Pushkin’s political worldview to be (сюжетообразующей канвой) a mirror of sorts of Tyrkova’s own political evolution; at the same time he believes Tyrkova borrowed that conceptualization from Annenkov.\textsuperscript{11}

So what can Tyrkova’s \textit{The Life of Pushkin} tell us about her own life and views? This work is a pivotal one in her body of texts. To begin with, the very choice of Pushkin as a biographical subject and hero is indicative of her worldview. As A.I. Reitblat noted, “in reconstructing the life of his subject, the biographer identifies with it, and in so doing “gathers” (собирает) himself in, exposes and ranks (prioritizes) his/her own goals and values in life, gives meaning to his own life.”\textsuperscript{12} Moreover, Tyrkova’s labors on her biography of Pushkin extended over a large portion of her life, the nineteen twenties and thirties, defining what she read, what she did, and even her daily schedule. She thus labored over this biography for over a decade, immersing herself in Pushkin’s epoch and herself “living through” every stage of his life.

Her recollections of her first thoughts about writing a biography of Pushkin went back to (the fraught time of) December 1917 and January 1918. At that time, marked by the (aftermath of) the Bolshevik seizure of power, the dissolving of the Constituent Assembly (and closing of opposition newspapers), when she, a liberal journalist and leader of the Kadet Party—experienced mounting trepidation about the future of her country, she began to think about Pushkin, reading his manuscripts in the Rumiantsev Museum. On January 5, the day of the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, she made this entry in her diary: “Thinking about politics only nauseates me….I want to focus on Pushkin only.”\textsuperscript{13} In 1922 she began serious work on the biography, despite her activities also with the Committee for the Salvation of Russia, her journalistic work, her correspondence with various Russian émigré communities, and interactions with a wide variety of individuals.\textsuperscript{14}
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Living and working in emigration, Tyrkova turned to the British Museum and London Library for her materials by and on Pushkin. The period between 1923 and 1928 was one on uninterrupted work on the first volume of The Life of Pushkin. On March 15, 1923 she wrote her son Arkadii, “I’ve begun to frequent the British Museum and take great pleasure in access to original works. At home I can only read the Vengerov’s edition (of Pushkin) and doing is really frustrating. In general, it is endlessly absorbing to read about Pushkin.” In her next letter, written March 19, 1923, he again recounts visiting the British Museum and laments that she hadn’t begun work on the biography earlier, when she was thirty, in order to finish it by age 35 or 40.

Scholars have repeatedly noted that the efforts by the Russian émigré community to foster and preserve Russian culture were an integral part of this community’s life, a way to “take the culture of the homeland with them abroad.” The difficulties of the present time, the seemingly dismal prospects for the future gave added meaning to this focus on the past as a fundamental means of preserving the national and cultural identity of the émigré world. But Tyrkova’s turn to Pushkin was not just the manifestation of nostalgia for what had been lost (the title of her memoirs, That Which No Longer Will Be, is indicative), but also an attempt to connect the present with the past; a means not only to pass on the legacy of Russian culture, but also to make sense of the events of that time, all of this within the context of the body of Pushkin’s creative output and in general of the coordinates of Russian culture and its intelligentsia.

The Pushkin cult, the promotion of a “Pushkin myth” during the Imperial, and then Soviet times, render understandable Tyrkova’s attempts to write his biography. But aside from this there were other, more personal considerations which became manifest over time as she work on this project. A. Smith notes that Tyrkova, “in contrast to many of her contemporaries (including Tynianov and Tsvetaeva) writing about Pushkin did not attempt to approach the poet from the vantage of the what in the early twentieth century came to be called the ‘Pushkin myth.’

---
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16 Ibid.
Of course one might explain her interest in Pushkin by noting her connection with the culture of the Silver Age, with took shape under the influence of Symbolism. Strange as it may seem, she did not try to make a connection between her own creative inspiration and that of Pushkin.”

In Smit’s opinion Tyrkova’s work on Pushkin is unique, when contrasted with that of Annenkov, Lerner, Veresaev and Shchegolev, and even with the novel by Yuri Tynianov (Pushkin).

After the publication of *The Life of Pushkin* in 1929, reviewers noted approvingly the modesty of the author and her attempt to “remove herself” from the work, to avoid “the temptation of drawing attention to herself.” In her volume the lives of author and subject are very subtly linked, creating the impression of a special kind of “kinship” between them. What “strands” join Pushkin and Tyrkova, and in what fashion does the biographical turn out be autobiographical?

On several occasions in her memoirs, Tyrkova recollects her fascination with the work of Pushkin, something characteristic both of gymnasium students of the time, and of her generation as a whole, knowing his work by heart and viewing the love of poetry in general as a distinctive feature of the Russian national character. But her stance towards Pushkin also bore individual traits, and the distinctive quality of her narrative stems from her recollections of an ancestor who was fellow lycee student of Pushkin’s. She learned of Alexander Tyrkov, at whose apartment was held the celebration of the anniversary of the lycee, from a letter of October 12, 1956 from Alexei Remizov, who cited the diary of Kiukhel’beker to make his point. In so doing, Remizov backs up Tyrkova’s own recollections of the tales told by the former serf on her parents’ estate, a Fedor Nekrasov, then employed by Alexander Tyrkova, himself considered to be somewhat mentally ill. Tyrkova lamented that she had not pursued further information from Nekrasov, explaining this failure by the fact that she was still a child and uncomprehending. “Could it be that Fedor Nekrasov actually poured the wine for Pushkin? Maybe he even remembered this mischievous, noisy and entertaining lord (барин)?....I already knew by heart many stanzas of Pushkin’s poetry, but it never even occurred to me that I might someday be chagrined that I had never spoken with
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this former servant about the famous lycee mates of my ancestor”\textsuperscript{23}? That childhood episode with her old servant creates an impression of a link even more immediate, vibrant and personal than could any reference to a letter or a diary.

Just such “kinship ties” with Pushkin are also manifest in her description of her own brother Sergei. She finds in him the very same spirit, unfettered boldness, joy of life which (she saw as) characteristic of Pushkin’s friends and generation as a whole. In her memoirs, describing her brother and his friends, she sees in them Pushkin’s own lycee friends and in so doing mingles the biographical with the autobiographical: “Many years after his [Sergei’s] death, as I was studying Pushkin and his friends, I found it easier to understand them simply because Pushkin’s generation brimmed over with the same unfettered Russian spirit (широкая русская удаль) that made my own Seryezha so wonderful.”\textsuperscript{24} Writing of her own brother, Tyrkova tells of his exuberance, his mischievous tendencies, his bold, adventurous spirit. Just so she imagines Pushkin’s generation to be, for it “was able to be merry, even prankish. They met life head on, and took from it everything it offered them.” To this, she adds a commentary stemming from the recent revolutionary events in Russia; she juxtaposes the intelligentsia of Pushkin’s generation with that of the nihilists, the Tolstoyans, and then the Bolsheviks. In contrast to Pushkin’s generation’s capacity to enjoy the fullness of life, we see later the ugly face of nihilism and the vicious cruelty of Bolshevism.\textsuperscript{25}

Everywhere we see the images crafted by Tyrkova in her memoirs replicated in her biography of Pushkin. Arina Rodionovna, Pushkin’s legendary nanny known to any Russian schoolchild as an essential component of the “Pushkin myth” appears also in Tyrkova’s biography as the embodiment of all that is authentically folk and Russian, as well as of domestic warmth and comfort, and of the estate life and habits of the Russian nobility and of ties with the historic past. Yet Tyrkova is not trying to fashion an ideal image and cites a letter from Arina Rodionovna to Pushkin which calls our attention to her touching concern for him, but at the same time does so in ungrammatical Russian. In so doing she is pointing out that Pushkin’s peerless command of the language came from somewhere else, although he undoubtedly marveled at the richness of her oral speech and her storytelling, and read her out loud his own stories. The nanny in Tyrkova’s own
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family brought up more than one generation of children, and the description of her in Tyrkova’s memoirs immediately brings to mind Ariana Rodionovna: “Oh how many devoted, loving, wise Russian nannies there were…”26

Descriptions of the Russian nobility occupy a prominent place both in her biography of Pushkin and in her own memoirs. Its social identity, closely linked with a cultural identity and the awareness of belonging to a societal estate which had played a distinctive role in Russian history—all this is yet one more thread joining Pushkin and Tyrkova. Her reflections upon the Russian nobility carried out in the circumstances of emigration bear a strongly nostalgic element are tied up with thoughts about a Russia that “is gone forever”. That being said, the strong emphasis upon the identity of the nobility emerges only in Tyrkova’s memoirs, when the nobility become one of the “places of memory” embodying representations of the service rendered by her ancestors to Russia as a Great Power, to the state and to culture.

Tyrkova admits that at the turn of the twentieth century, a time of reform and revolution, and up to the collapse of the Russian Empire, her belonging to the nobility was not such a significant element, giving way to the seemingly more relevant gender, professional, and political forms of self-identification. Describing the membership of the Kadet Party, she observes that even if many of its members were from the nobility, “it would have never occurred to anybody to make mention of that fact. That would have been considered ridiculous…But there were those among the enlightened nobility who did take pride in that fact, in the service their class had rendered (their country). They, like Pushkin, recalled the role their ancestors had played in the evolution of Russia as a Great Power and Empire.

Just so, her own familial nest of the nobility becomes a symbol of the lost culture of the nobility, of a lost Russia, and the depiction of Mikhailovskoe in her biography of Pushkin blends with her description of the Tyrkova family estate, Vergezha—she says as much when she mentions reading Pushkin’s letters from Mikhailovskoe.27

Tyrkova’s religious quests also find reflection in her Pushkin biography. In her memoirs she describes her tortuous path to Orthodoxy, how much this was obstructed by how religion was taught in her secondary school and by the atmosphere of the post-reform era in general, including the stance of the intelligentsia towards the Orthodox Church. Despite the profound religious

convictions of her father (as she writes: “Orthodoxy was not something external, obligatory, but something at his core, something for which church attendance, observance of Lent and confession were essential to his life.”) 28 Tyrkova admits that her youthful years were spent distant from the church and without any special religious inclinations, though she was also not an unbeliever. She tells of her encounter with Father John of Kronstadt, who served as her father’s spiritual pastor, and regrets that in her youth she could not comprehend or appreciate his significance or that of Orthodoxy as a whole.

Her return to the faith occurred only later, while in emigration, when the church came to signify Russian culture as a whole for her, providing a connecting link to the Russia that had been and a spiritual crutch in this period of her life. In 1955 she wrote to her granddaughter Natasha, “I am Orthodox not only by heart, but also by conviction.” 29 In her Pushkin biography she seeks to uncover his own path to religion, suggesting that his religious awareness was achieved only over time, that he was too long under the spell of the philosophes of the eighteenth century: “his religious searchings either were late maturing, or he was tardy in uncovering them…” 30 She posits that Pushkin proceeded with extreme caution, even timidly, when it came to religion, even avoiding such conversations. But about his religiosity she found evidence in his poetic stanzas and in the testimony of Viazemskii and Pletnev, both of him gave witness to his strong religious feelings in the last years of his life. Tyrkova was convinced that Pushkin simply couldn’t have remained indifferent to the beauty of the Gospels and that it was no accident that he superimposed on his own verse those of Ephrem (Ephraim) of Syria 31. Just as she lamented she had never accompanied her father in his journeys to meet with Father John of Kronstadt, thereby missing out on this source of the “holy waters”( прошла мимо этого “источника воды живой”), she regretted that Pushkin had never met up with Serafim of Sarov and was convinced that had he done so, he would not have been possible that he “would not have responded to the elevated, radiant spirituality emanating from [that saintly figure].” 32
The biographical and the autobiographical merge also when Tyrkova reflects upon writing as a profession, and specifically upon journalism. For her, just as for other members of this new profession, taking shape only at the turn of the century, the theme of literary creativeness (in the form of journalism) was linked to that of the establishment of a professional identity in general, something comparatively new to the hierarchy of identities in Russian society and reflecting the history of the intelligentsia and the overall changes underway in the country at that time.\footnote{О «поле журналистики» и журналистах в России см. Родигина Н.Н., Сабурова Т.А. Время, пространство, память в мемуарах русских журналистов конца XIX – начала XX вв. А.В. Амфитеатрова и В.М. Дорошевича // Автобиография. 2014. №3. The Space of Memory. Russian Auto-Biographical Genres and European Context. Part II. http://www.avtobiografija.com/article/view/90 Дата обращения 20.02.2015} Tyrkova, a former contributor and staff member of “Северный Край”, “Русь”, “Речь” and other periodicals, and later of the émigré newspapers “Сегодня” and “Возрождение”, for long intervals in her life depended upon writing to sustain herself financially, having no other options. This was typical of many educated women search for independence, but with limited access to higher education as well as to many professions, and running into many stereotypes and obstacles along the way. Perhaps for this reason on several occasions in her biography of Pushkin we read that that he was one of the first Russian writers living off of his earnings from his written work: “The honoraria which Pushkin received from 600 “minor poems” opened up a new era in the history of Russian literature. This was a triumph for all writers, for the emergent intelligentsia, who were still in the process of creating what Viazemskii called an “industry of the mind.”\footnote{Тыркова-Вильямс А.В. Жизнь Пушкина. В 2 т. М.: Молодая гвардия, 2010. Т. 1. С. 387} Such commentaries by Tyrkova correspond to her own life experience; the phrases in her Pushkin biography about written as a profession, a cottage industry “upon which it is possible to live”\footnote{Тыркова-Вильямс А.В. Жизнь Пушкина. В 2 т. М.: Молодая гвардия, 2010. Т. 2. С. 395} could also apply to that period of her life after a divorce, when she was forced to support herself and two children by her own efforts and began to write for newspapers, in so doing “making writing my own craft.”\footnote{Тыркова-Вильямс А.В. Воспоминания. То, чего больше не будет. М.: Слово/Slovo, 1998. С. 213.}

But Tyrkova’s autobiography emerges even more prominently in \textit{Life of Pushkin} when the focus is upon issues of freedom, politics and change in Russia. The only woman to serve on the Central Committee of the Kadet Party, an active participant in the vast societal movement of the early twentieth century—a person for whom freedom mattered above all else—saw its very embodiment in the works of Pushkin, a summons to freedom: “In his “missives to Chaadaev”, in
his “Liberty (Вольность), in his “Village/Countryside” (Деревня), and in his epigrams he put forth the political ideology of the progressive intelligentsia.”

In exile Tyrkova reexamined her own political experiences, the Russian intelligentsia’s struggle for freedom in the context of the subsequent revolution and coming to power of the Bolsheviks: “Pushkin’s ever-active mind earlier than other understand the dangers posed by extremism and possibly of revolution itself.” In Andre Chenier” Tyrkova found a condemnation of “the fury of revolution, barbaric, blind cruelty brought on by бунт [mob violence].” She sought to persuade us that Pushkin was far from enraptured with revolution, that for him the most important thing was the balance of legality with freedom; that which permitted Viazemskii, on the basis of this work, to call Pushkin a liberal conservative. In the opinion of scholars, by following Viazemskii in apply this appellation to Pushkin, Tyrkova accentuated the conservative and statist side of his political mindset, something closer to her own personal views. It also reflected the struggle ongoing at the time over who could rightfully claim Pushkin to themselves—the Soviet literary establishment or the Russian émigré community.

Tyrkova finds in Pushkin’s writings support for the idea of a strong state; “Pushkin’s generation was brought up in a climate of pride in empire…..At the time of the Polish revolt he was already a convinced supporter of the idea, valuing the integrity and indivisibility of the Russian state/empire.” Its collapse led Tyrkova, as it did many others of the liberal intelligentsia, to a recognition of the vital need to have a strong state in order to preserve the country, to ward off anarchy. She lamented that the Russian intelligentsia had “lost its taste for empire (великодержавность).” [She means empire, a strong state and Russia as a great power] In Pushkin Tyrkova found confirmation of her own views, fears, hopes, and his biography is profoundly entwined with the history of the empire itself.
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41 По мнению Н.В. Гришиной, эмигранты использовали имя Пушкина в политических целях, пытаясь найти в творчестве поэта все, понимаемое под либерализмом, «наследя образ поэта несуществующими чертами борца и свободолюбца» (Гришина Н.В. Образ А.С. Пушкина в эмигрантском творчестве П.Н. Миллюкова и А.А. Кизеветтера // Интеллигенция России и Запада в 20-21 вв.: поиск, выбор и реализация путей общественного развития. Екатеринбург, 2004. С. 65-66.)
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As we see, Tyrkova’s own life experience is interlaced with her telling of the biography of Pushkin and her own personality show through clearly on its pages. Of course this is always the case in biographical writing; Tyrkova herself noted just that in Pushkin’s *Eugene Onegin*, a work that is heavily autobiographical though the author cannot be found in any specific individual in that work. Also the usually hidden authorial personality of the biographer can be uncovered in Tyrkova’s *Life of Pushkin*. Both as an experiment in life writing and as a way of integrating the story of one’s own life in the context of the history of the country as a whole, *The Life of Pushkin* shaped the subsequent writing of her own memoirs. So, the autobiographical component in *The Life of Pushkin* is not only present; it provides us clues to understanding Tyrkova’s rendition of her own life, the evolution of her views. As V.A. Maklakov confessed to her in a letter, “I could never have written ‘your’ Pushkin.”

Indeed we find in her biography of Pushkin shades of her own life, her intellectual and moral strivings, and her reflections upon recent historical events when “the difference between good and evil became so murky”. By delving into Pushkin’s era Tyrkova was not seeking salvation from the present in the past; instead she was trying to reconnect the torn fabric of history using the “threads” of kinship. For Tyrkova, Pushkin is not “my own” as for example Marina Tsvetaeva or Valerii Briusov would claim, as much as he was “ours”, a “person of our own generation, not separated from us by the passage of time.”

Tyrkova’s participation in the women’s movement also found indirection reflection in her biography of Pushkin. Her sketches of Golitsyna, Vorontsova, Viazemskiaia, Raevskiaia, Volkonskaia reveal highly educated, refined women who strongly influenced the evolution of Russian culture, of public life and, of course, of Pushkin’s own life. As Caryl Emerson observed: “As a biographer, Tyrkova-Williams is a product of the nineteenth century, and she enjoys certain benefits by being no poet herself. Chernyshevskian traces of an *intelligentka*’s view of women's rights and appetites - where women too are agents, able to calculate their own best interests - suffuse her image of Pushkin in his successive roles of Don Juan, bridegroom, and husband”. Emerson sees in Tyrkova a radical woman of the 1860s, although we might note that Tyrkova’s
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mother might better fit into that era, even if only in terms of her views on bringing up children. It might be useful to compare Tyrkova’s description in her memoirs of her mother’s views on that topic (reflecting her own-Tyrkova’s—beliefs about upbringing) with her portrayal in The Life of Pushkin of Pushkin’s mother and her influence on her son’s character. Most likely, it was Tyrkova’s activities as a feminist in the first decade of the twentieth century that gave Emerson reason to describe her as a woman of the sixties by conviction and bearing traces of the influence of Chernyshevsky, but a close reading of Tyrkova’s memoirs belies this interpretation. In the eighties decade, to which Tyrkova belongs in terms of her worldviews, the influence of Chernyshevsky had faded, and his What is to be Done was no longer on the list of “obligatory reading” for the budding Russian intelligentsia. In fact, even among those in the generation of the 1870s who were considered nihilists and who took part in the Populist movement, confessed in their own memoirs that Chernyshevsky’s novel had not played a big role in shaping in their beliefs—one might even say that to a large measure this was mainly a novel for men.

If one is looking for a fuller examination of the “woman question” in Tyrkova’s body of work, it can be found in her biography of A. P. Filosofova, published in 1915. Her views on the topic are also manifest in her descriptions of (Pushkin’s wife) Natalia Goncharova, whose personality and behavior continue to be a heated topic of debate after all these years. Tyrkova emphasizes Pushkin’s love for Goncharova, his search for a wife and a heart (а не очередную музу) and despite her slightly ironic tone when it comes to Goncharova (Московщина), she is far from taking a critical stance towards her. She makes no demands on her for intellectuality or for sharing her husband’s interests. For Tyrkova it is more than enough simply that Pushkin loved Goncharova, basked in her beauty, so Goncharova was a wife living up to the expectations of her time.

Tyrkova’s tone changes abruptly when it comes to Natalia Goncharova’s relationship with D'Anthès; she even goes so far as to refer to the “incorrigible denseness of this woman with such a limited worldview.” Here again, Emerson sees a manifestation of character traits more typical of the intelligentka of the 1860s: "‘This frivolous, empty woman filled her life not with love, but with a play with others' feelings.’ At this point it crosses the reader's mind that Tyrkova is reacting
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to Pushkin's wife as would a radical intelligentry of Chernyshevsky's generation, for whom seriousness of purpose and the ability to carry through on a feeling were virtues more to be prized than spousal fidelity.”50 I would respectfully disagree with Emerson here, since Tyrkova repeatedly insisted that Pushkin trusted his wife (and this stance, this feeling is what is most important to Tyrkova). Most important, while condemning Goncharova’s flirtatiousness and her inability to recognize Pushkin’s genius, Tyrkova refuses to apply the criteria of the second half of the nineteenth century to Goncharova; instead, she sees in her a typical society lady of the time, mainly concerned with shining at the society balls and gatherings, winning over the hearts of males.

But we might also examine Tyrkova’s understanding of authenticity in the realm of feelings through the prism of her own life experiences. In her notes towards an autobiography, written in 1959, she noted: “What really matters for all of humanity and for each and every one of us is to have, and to take, and to give love.”51 In this phrase we see evidence also of her religious feelings, of her acceptance of Orthodoxy during her years in exile.

As we pointed out earlier, Tyrkova’s labors over her Pushkin biography lasted, with interruptions, over a decade. Between the first and second volumes she wrote the biography of her husband, Harold Williams. In a diary entry of 1943 she listing all the things that had been meaningful to her in life, she mentions that period of work: “Over the course of many years I was living with both Willy and Pushkin.”52 She also had written her son Arkadii Borman: “The most important thing (for me) was to write these two books; the second volume of Pushkin and my book about (Harold Williams)…..Between the two of them, life was full indeed for me.”53 In 1928, shortly after completing her first volume on Pushkin, Harold Williams died unexpectedly, an event leading to her decision to write about him as well. In so doing she hoped both to preserve the memory of his life, and to dull the pain of bereavement. After reading his biography, E. H. Carr wrote: “Harold Williams was a saint and a scholar, whom fate plunged somewhat incongruously into international affairs. … It was fitting that this memorial should come from the hand of one

who enjoyed his complete devotion and shared his ideals. This biography has a style and distinction which raise it out of the ordinary ruck of commemorative volumes.”\textsuperscript{54}

Compatibility in views and convictions was essential to Tyrkova in matters of marriage. In her memoirs she mentioned the absence of either as the reason for her divorce from her first husband, the maritime engineer Alfred Borman. Their son, Arkadii confirmed this fact: “I don’t know why specifically my parents divorced, but in my mind a better question would be how they managed to stay together seven years. They were so different, but even more important was that Papa was unable to bring out in Mama that which needed to be brought out. He wasn’t even aware of the necessity. Later she always was restrained in her comments to me: ‘It didn’t work out; we didn’t fit together’.”\textsuperscript{55}

By contrast, her relationship with Harold Williams was built upon feeling combined with common political views, professional interests as journalists, and joint literary endeavors. Williams translated Tyrkova’s work about the 1917 Revolution; she prepared for publication his work on the same subject; they were co-authors of a work entitled “Hosts of Darkness” on Soviet Russia. Tyrkova introduced Williams to the circle of leaders of the Kadet Party, accompanied him on his work travels (to Turkey for example), and they were together with the White Army in the south of Russia. In 1919 she wrote Williams from England: “I so want to find my way to you as soon as possible. We must be together. For us that is a cardinal law, one that must not be violated.”\textsuperscript{56} This need to be together is a constant refrain in her letters, and she even goes so far as to write: “Without you I turn incredibly stupid. We are so used to thinking matters out together, so that without you I am missing half of my brain.”\textsuperscript{57} Two years later, having left briefly for a conference in Paris, she wrote him every day, related every turn of politics and event at the conference, but confessing she missed him and thought constantly about home: “You know Willy, when all is said and done, we really have to live out our lives together, don’t you agree? After all, we have learned how to complement one another…something like right and left hands.”\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{55} Борман А. А.В. Тыркова-Вильямс по ее письмам и воспоминаниям сына. Лувэн-Вашингтон, 1964. С. 35.
\textsuperscript{56} Наследие Ариадны Владимировны Тырковой: Дневники. Письма. М.: РОССПЭН, 2012. С. 336.
\textsuperscript{58} Наследие Ариадны Владимировны Тырковой: Дневники. Письма. М.: РОССПЭН, 2012. С. 352.
In Tyrkova’s biography of her husband, much space is devoted to the revolutionary events in Russia, to the life of politics in which they were both immersed; he as a British correspondent and she as a member of the Central Committee of the Kadet Party. Not coincidentally Tyrkova often employs the pronoun “we” to underscore their commonality of positions and views: “Our life was closely interwoven with politics, on which we spent a great deal of our time and energy. We were emphatically politically minded. Storms and whirlwinds raged around us, and we felt we were sailors busy trimming sails and tightening ropes. … We had much to do but we were not afraid of work.”

Their apartment in St. Petersburg/Petrograd was a place of congregation bringing together writers, politicians, and scholars. Through her biography of Williams we can resurrect Tyrkova’s “social network,” for various reasons something not so easily visible in her memoirs. Even about her own family she gives us a different slant in that biography. We could add to that list.

Tyrkova’s biography of Williams substantially overlaps with the text of her own memoirs; entire chapters are virtually identical [for example one about the activities of the Duma entitled, “The Tauride Palace”]. It is evident then that she not only drew from her biography to construct her memoirs, but utilized both to tell the history of her country. Her biography of Williams was a testimony to the memory of her husband no doubt, a means of coping with her loss; but at the same time it served as a tool to describe Russia’s societal movement and revolution. As was the case with many participants in the liberal as well as revolutionary movement, she was profoundly disillusioned with the outcome of 1917 and by what she always called the Bolsheviks’ seizure of power (revisionist historians talk of the Bolsheviks “coming to the power” to emphasize the genuine support they had among soldiers and the working classes) and believed they were the bane of Russia, having brought upon the country untold misery. Yet she held out hope for its resurrection, and believed it her obligation to leave behind her testimony about the past as well as to elucidate the reasons for what had happened.

In exile, liberals continue their polemic about what path Russia should have taken and the reasons for the Bolshevik triumph. Historians often rely heavily upon the memoirs of P.N. Miliukov and V. A. Maklakov as reflecting the two major currents in Russian liberalism.

---
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Anthony Kroner has demonstrated just how influence have been the memoirs of these two political activists upon our conception of the relationship between «власть и общественность.»

Undoubtedly, in the historic argument between Miliukov and Maklakov Tyrkova (like Karpovich) leaned to the side of Maklakov. One can clearly discern in all of her writings in emigration—even her biography of Pushkin—adherence to a philosophy of conservative liberalism, regret over the missed opportunities for a “dialogue” with the authorities and over what she saw as an infatuation with the revolutionary mood of the moment.

William Rosenberg argues that even at that earlier date Tyrkova had represented the ‘right wing’ of the Kadet party and lumps her together with Maklakov, Novgorodtsev, Struve and Izgoev. However, to support this argument (namely that from the start she had believed that the most serious threat to Russia’s future had been not the powers that be, but rather the demagogy of those promising the world to the simple and ignorant workers and peasants).

In the same vein, Karpovich, recalling the criticism leveled at Maklakov for his “conservative liberalism,” which had purportedly emerged only after the revolution, repeatedly insisted that in fact he had always, in his own, stood in opposition within the party to its maximalism. In describing Maklakov’s position, Karpovich recognizes that his beliefs were put to pen only retrospectively but nevertheless had typified his views far earlier. It was this fact that had allowed Maklakov to reconstruct so forcefully his positions on key issues confronting the party in the early twentieth century.

In fact, in the early twentieth century Tyrkova even more than Williams had herself been caught up in the mood of the time, and acted even more militantly than had Miliukov; she had been blind to looming catastrophe which ended up destroying the liberal movement along with the political order she had sought to bring down. Tyrkova underscores the fact that the memoirs of political activists in emigration are replete with reflections which came to the surface only as they sought to gain some historical perspective on events: “….that which became clear in the light of all that had happened in the previous 35-40 years leading up to the Bolshevik Revolution, would have been difficult to predict or understand earlier. Even Maklakov, as I remember him in the State Duma as well in the central committee of the Kadet Party, had no objection to either’s

---

politics. Those critical commentaries which fill his memoirs came to him only after the fact.” 63 Maklakov himself, in a letter to Tyrkova, acknowledged that “earlier, of course I didn’t recognize as clearly as I do now the error of our tactics.” 64 In his own memoirs, writing of Stolypin he also admitted that the value of the latter’s agrarian reforms “became clear to us only later, under the Bolshevik regime.” 65

Tyrkova’s own memoirs reflect that evolution of political view characteristic of Russian liberals and reflecting the powerful impact of the October Revolution. She wrote: “Only now, after all that Europe had undergone, after witnessing Russia’s ills, can I look differently upon much of what happened earlier…..I can see more clearly our weaknesses, our mistakes, the errors of our ways. But I won’t renounce my post, my fundamental beliefs in freedom, humanism, respect for the person.” 66

While not joining Miliukov in his blaming the government for its failure to implement political reforms—and in general providing a critical evaluation of him in her memoirs—at the same time Tykrovs disagrees with Maklakov in his assessment of the relationship between the opposition and the authorities. As she put it, she had no desire “to be a political Magdalina (Mary Magdalene)” laying all the blame for the outcome of events upon the emancipation movement alone. On September 29, 1950, after having read Maklakov’s Власть и общественность, she made the following entry in her diary: “Lots of interesting details about grouping and programs. But as is always the case with Maklakov, you never find a categorical judgement about events and people. There are accusations leveled against figures in the liberation movement, but no comparable treatment of the government’s actions.” 67 Even earlier, in 1944, after reading his account of the State Duma, she had written him: “I am befuddled why you are so persistent in listing the myopia, missteps, stubbornness and, to put it bluntly, stupidity of the opposition, but….nowhere do you provide an account of how the government led us into a revolution.” 68

Tyrkova’s basic thesis was that at the root of the problem was a long-lasting mutual misunderstanding, mistrust between the intelligentsia and власть which prevented the two sides for working together to reform Russia. Acknowledging the opposition’s mistakes, especially its
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excessive militancy, Tyrkova repeatedly drew Maklakov’s attention to the government’s actions in opposing all change. On February 23, 1944 she wrote him: “Why is it that the best and most talented of us so adamantly kept the government at arm’s length at all times, why had we lost all faith in it. (...) Just so, the government placed no trust in us, over the course of decades rejected us, turned us away (Tyrkova is referring to the gubernatorial tendency to reject candidacies for positions in the zemstvo and elsewhere), and in general hampered us in living and acting constructively.” 69

In the next letter (March 6) she again insisted: “After all, if you are going examine the behavior of those in society (общественность), you musn’t do this without at the same time consider what the authorities were doing, which partially explains our own errors. (...) Notice, please, that I myself, when I write about this epoch, am pained at the recognition of our mistakes, prejudices, idiotic bookishness (...) But even now I can and wish to recognize the emancipatory fury (ярость) of that time.” 70

This very mix of ideas could be found in Tyrkova’s biography of her husband Williams, as could her assessment of leading figures in the liberal movement, of Stolypin, and of the relationship between власть и обществоность. Over and over again she underscores the mutual incomprehension between the two: “The wall of misunderstanding and ill-will rose higher and higher. Russians were in both camps, and most of them desired the good for Russia. But neither the Government nor the people seemed to wish for an understanding.” 71

In this biography she made use of her own diary entries from the early twentieth century, as well as of Williams’ own articles and telegrams published in the Manchester Guardian and Morning Post. Her own memoir entries and biographical text are interwoven with William’s own book written about Russia in 1915, based partly upon his own earlier experience, like Tyrkova, as a journalist writing about the workings of the first and second State Dumas. As he wrote: “This period was one of open and declared hostility between the Government and the Representative Assembly. There was no moderating element on either side.” 72 At the same time Williams placed that share of the blame that rested upon the legislature for the absence of a dialogue exclusively upon its left wing—not the liberals: “In the Parliament the Cadets, who in
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themselves represented liberal and democratic constructive tendencies, were continually overridden, and if not out-voted, were outvoiced by the more demonstrative violent and aggressive left wing of the Duma, the Labour and Socialist groups.”

*********

And so, an examination together of *The Life of Pushkin*, *Cheerful Giver: The Life of Harold Williams*, and her own memoirs reveal to us the multiple sides of the life and worldview of Adriadna Tyrkova. More importantly we see the blurring of boundaries between biography and autobiography, between journalism, correspondence, diary entries and memoir. We see also the merging of texts written at different points in one’s life—but also by different (if joined at the hip) authors, with different temperaments, different cultures, and with different relationships to their audience. Hence, what some might label the intertextuality of these writings, we instead, somewhat less academically have chosen to speak of “mix and stir.”

---

23 Ibid.