

it, above all because of my continued inability to identify its author.

Anonymity as such should not however be the 'ultimate deterrent' from study of the diary. (a) Publishing authors sought to conceal their identity for various reasons, often hiding under pseudonyms or cryptonyms (hardly ever as ill-sustained and transparent as mine!): some soon revealed it or were quickly exposed, others kept the secret to their grave, leaving it to posterity (if it had the inclination) to do the detective work. Anonymity was, indeed, a literary convention. There are several published precedents from virtually the same period and in the same genre as the diary and relevant to England. Princess Ekaterina Dashkova's authorship of the *Puteshestvie odnoi Rossiiskoi znatnoi Gospozhi, po nekotorym Aglinskim provintsiiam* (1775) was probably known the day it was published, at least to the small number of subscribers to the journal in which it appeared. (b) The identity, however, of Vasiliï Malinovskii, the *Rossiianin v Anglii*, who published his fascinating travels through Britain in another

*Peter I to the Era of Pushkin* (Amsterdam; New York, 2006).

(a) An interesting recent contribution to the question with relation to English literature is John Mullan, *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature* (London, 2007).

(b) *Opyt trudov Vol'nogo rossiiskogo sobraniia*, II (1775), 105-44. In the same journal Mikhail Pleshcheev, a former counsellor in the Russian embassy in London, used the eloquent pseudonym of 'Angloman' to sign several pieces he had written (ibid., II, 257-61; III, 72-4).