INSTITUTUM
HISTORICUM POLONICUM
ROMAE

XVII

ANTEMURALE

NON EXSTINGUETUR

ROMAE
1974

INSTITUTUM HISTORICUM POLONICUM ROMAE
VIA DEGLI SCIPIONI 284 - ROMA

IAM PRIDEM ROMAE PRODIERUNT HAEC VOLUMINA
(continuatio *Studia Teologiczne* — Wilno, vol. I-X):

XI — MEYSZTOWICZ, V., *Repertorium bibliographicum pro rebus Polonicis Archivi Secreti Vaticani.* Vaticani, 1943.

XII — MEYSZTOWICZ, V., *De archivo Nuntiaturae Varsaviensis quod nunc in Archivo Secreto Vaticano servatur.* Vaticani, 1944.

XIII — SAVIO P., *De Actis Nuntiaturae Poloniae quae partem Archivi Secretariatus Status constituunt.* Romae, 1947.

XIV — MEYSZTOWICZ, V., *Prospectica descriptio Archivi Secreti Vaticani* (Ed. chirotypica, exhausta).

ANTEMURALE, I-XVII ROMAE, 1954-1973

ELEMENTA AD FONTIUM EDITIONES

Vol. I — *Polonica ex Libris Obligationum et Solutionum Camerae Apostolicae.* Collegit J. LISOWSKI, pp. XV+292, 704 doc. (A.D. 1373-1565) ind. nom. propr. 1960. (Archivum Secretum Vaticanum).

Vol. II — *"Liber Disparata Antiqua Continens"* Praes. E. WINKLER, pp. XVIII+190, 281 doc. (ante a. 1424) 19 facs. Ind. nom. propr. 1960. (Archivum Capituli Trident.).

Vol. III — *Repertorium Rerum Polonicarum ex Archivo Orsini in Archivo Capitolino,* I pars Coll. W. WYHOWSKA - DE ANDREIS, XVIII+162, 1144 doc. (A.D. 1565-1787) 29 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1961.

Vol. IV — *Res Polonicae Elisabetha I Angliae Regnante Conscriptae ex Archivis Publicis Londoniarum.* Ed. C. H. TALBOT, pp. XVI+311, 166 doc. (A.D. 1578-1603) 9 tab., Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron., glossarium verb. ang. ant., 1961.

Vol. V — *Repertorium Rerum Polonicarum ex Archivo Dragonetti de Torres in Civitate Aquilana.* Ed. P. COLLURA, pp. XI+86, 483 doc. (A.D. 1568-1682) 4 tab. 1962.

INSTITUTUM
HISTORICUM POLONICUM
ROMAE

XVII

ANTEMURALE

NON EXSTINGUETUR

ROMAE
1974

SUMPTIBUS
FUNDATIONIS
LANCKOROŃSKI

EDIDIT:
INSTITUTUM HISTORICUM POLONICUM ROMAE
VIA DEGLI SCIPIONI, 284 — ROMA

INDEX RERUM

I. FONTES

II. STUDIA

III. NECROLOGIA

FONTES

JERZY OSSOLIŃSKI, Grand Chancelier de la Couronne. Plaquette en argent de la 2-ème moitié de XVII-ème siècle; collections du Château Royal de Wawel à Cracovie

HEDWIGE CHOYKO-BOUTIÈRE
(AVIGNON, FRANCE)

CORRESPONDANCE DU CARDINAL MAZARIN ET DU CHANCELIER DE POLOGNE OSSOLINSKI

Lettres de 1643 et 1650

En cherchant les polonica, inédits ou publiés, à la Bibliothèque Calvet à Avignon, j'ai trouvé parmi les manuscrits une lettre du Cardinal Mazarin au Chancelier de Pologne Jerzy Ossolinski du 20 septembre 1650, ainsi que deux autres de la même date, écrites au sujet du voyage que l'homme d'Etat polonais se proposait de faire à Rome: une au père du Cardinal, l'autre, à peu près identique mais sous une forme différente, au même et destinée à être envoyée à Ossolinski. Toutes les trois sont écrites en italien et non pas de la main propre du Cardinal, ce qui, d'ailleurs, ne peut pas surprendre: de nombreuses lettres étaient dictées aux secrétaires et confiées aux copistes.

Les vérifications qui s'imposaient ont été faites: ce sont des i n é d i t s. Les recherches effectuées ont permis de constater qu'elles n'entrent pas dans le recueil de la correspondance de Mazarin publié par Cheruel et son aide et successeur Avenal[1] *(dans la série "Documents de France," éditée par le Ministère de l'Instruction publique). D'autre part, les renseignements recueillis affirment que les lettres de la Bibliothèque Calvet*[2] *ou d'autres copies de la même correspondance à Ossolinski n'ont fait sujet d'aucune publication séparée, en France ou en Pologne.*

L'énorme correspondance de Mazarin, manuscrite mais rarement originale, confiée souvent à ses secrétaires, se trouve dans les archives et bibliothèques françaises et italiennes; des documents isolés sont dispersés dans d'autres pays. Plus nombreuses sont des "copies d'époques", en possession de plusieurs bibliothèques de France. On sait que c'est surtout le secrétariat de Colbert qui a pris le soin de sauvegarder ces documents historiques. Ils furent rangés tout d'abord dans l'ordre chronologique, ce qui s'est avéré peu commode pour les historiens—exceptés les biographes de Cardinal—et on a adopté par la suite le classement par sujet, en rassemblant les lettres surtout dans les archives du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères à Paris. Il n'y a pas

---

[1] Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin pendant son ministère recueillies et publiées par M. A. Chéruel. T.I-décembre 1642-juin 1644; t.III- 1648-1650. V. *Bibliographie.*

[2] Ms. 1399-1401.

de section polonaise, malgré tout l'intérêt qu'attachait Mazarin pour les affaires de Pologne et à sa politique vis-à-vis de la France, de l'Autriche et de la Suède. La correspondance à ce sujet est incorporée dans le "Fonds France" et le "Fonds Suède." Cette dernière affectation est significative: Mazarin menait sa propre politique—compliquée et, conformément à son caractère, rusée—vis-à-vis des affaires polono-suédoises, escomptant tirer quelque profit de ces relations embrouillées pour son jeu contre la prépondérance de la Maison austro-espagnole de Habsbourg.

Ne pouvant pas m'occuper moi-même de ces documents, je les signale pour ceux qui désireraient et pourraient, à Paris, les examiner: on y trouve des lettres de Mazarin à Ossolinski de 1648, une de 1649,[3] *ainsi qu'une correspondance du Cardinal avec la Cour de Pologne, adressée au roi Jean-Casimir et à la reine Marie-Louise.*

L'étude des lettres au Chancelier de Pologne trouvées à Avignon m'a incitée à en chercher d'autres, dans d'autres archives et bibliothèques. Ces recherches n'ont pas donné le résultat escompté: les lettres Mazarin-Ossolinski sont peu nombreuses. La Bibliothèque Mazarine à Paris possède deux lettres du Cardinal adressées au Chancelier: une est datée du 27 août 1643,[4] *l'autre du 9 décembre de la même année. Ce sont des manuscrits faits par les secrétaires du Ministre, ou des "copies d'époque", écrites en français, sans indication du lieu d'où elles ont été expédiées et sans signature. Le nom du destinataire se trouve sur la marge le la feuille, contrairement aux lettres "avignonaises" qui, bien que dépourvues de la signature originale de Mazarin, possèdent un en-tête ainsi que la mention finale indiquant le lieu d'expédition: "Di Bourg", lisons-nous sous le texte de la lettre, et la date complète.*

---

[3] Collection reliée de copies de lettres en italien du Cardinal Mazarin. Mémoires et documents France, vol. 262, fol. 31 v° à 32 v°; vol. 262, fol. 268 v° à 269 r°; vol. 265 fol. 143 v° à 145 r°. Il existe un inventaire analytique de ces lettres à la Bibliothèque Mazarine à Paris, avec les notes suivantes: Lettre du 25 janvier 1648. Paris. "Au duc Ossolinski, chancelier de Pologne. Compliments et recommandations pour un parent de Mazarin." Lettre du 3 Avril 1648. Paris. "Au duc Ossolinsky (sic). Protestations d'estime et d'affection. Mazarin tiendra compte de la recommandation qui lui est adressée en faveur des seigneurs Magni." Lettre du 24 Avril 1649. Saint-Germain-en-Laye. "Au duc d'Ossolin, au Osselin, grand chancelier de Pologne. Remercîments (sic) à l'occasion du zèle qu'il a montré pour la France. Promesse d'accueil favorable pour son neveu. Les troubles de la France sont terminés. Les Espagnols ont prouvé par leurs demandes extravagantes qu'ils ne voulaient pas la paix." — Parmi ces lettres, celle du 3 avril 1648 paraît particulièrement interessante pour la politique d'Ossolinski. Je signale ces renseignements pour des chercheurs qui voudraient s'occuper des lettres non encore examinées par moi. Ayant quitté Paris pour le Midi, pour les travaux exigeant les sources provençales, je ne pourrai pas continuer cette analyse que je me suis promis de faire dans la deuxième partie de mon étude: je dois me limiter aux résultats obtenus précédemment à la Bibliothèque Calvet, à la Bibliothèque Mazarine et à la Bibliothèque Nationale — lettre d'Ossolinski "à un inconnu" qui complète la correspondance trouvée précédemment.

[4] V. les notes aux lettres.

Désirant grouper cette correspondance par sujets qui liaient les lettres, j'ai laissé les manuscrits du Ministre des Affaires Etrangères pour une analyse ultérieure et poursuivi mes recherches dans des archives et bibliothèques. Elles furent décevantes—sauf la découverte finale.

A la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris, le déception paraissait complète: aussi bien dans les catalogues de manuscrits français du XVII s. que dans les dossiers intitulés "Fonds polonais", il n'y avait pas de correspondance de Mazarin avec le Chancelier de Pologne. Un heureux hasard m'a permis enfin de trouver un document inattendu: un autographe de Jerzy Ossolinski.

Si l'attribution de cette lettre au Chancelier de Pologne ne présente pas de difficultés, le fait que le destinataire en était Mazarin n'était pas du tout évident. Dans les dossiers de la Collection Baluze, parmi la correspondance manuscrite, se trouve une lettre classée comme autographe du XVII s., d'un "duca d'Ossoli[n]", écrite en italien à un destinataire inconnu. Une analyse approfondie m'a permis de constater que l'auteur en était le Chancelier Jerzy Ossolinski et qu'elle était adressée au Cardinal Mazarin.

Il y a plusieurs indices—changés par suite en preuves irréfutatables—qui permettent de soutenir cette thèse.

Le fait que la lettre, datée du 10 août 1643, envoyée en France, est écrite en italien[5] *et qu'à la signature du nom est ajouté le titre de "duca" déféré à Ossolinski par le pape*,[6] *fait supposer qu'elle est adressée au Cardinal Mazarin, Italien, mais Ministre de France (dont le français, soit dit entre paranthèses, était franchement mauvais) et dignitaire de l'Eglise. Ajoutons que dans les lettres de Mazarin à Ossolinski conservées à la Bibliothèque Calvet, seul le titre duca ou dux est employé: on ne trouve jamais, dans cette correspondance, celui de princeps, dont l'empereur d'Autriche,*[7] *ennemi de Mazarin, a honoré l'homme d'Etat polonais lors de son séjour à Vienne, en route de retour de son ambassade à Rome. Mais c'est le texte de la lettre qui constitue l'argument décisif pour désigner Mazarin comme destinataire de l'autographe d'Ossolinski conservé dans le Fonds Baluze.*

L'écriture d'Ossolinski est peu lisible et la lecture de certains mots peut être douteuse, mais ceux-ci ne peuvent pas altérer le context. Aussi bien sont sujet que la date qui figure sur le manuscrit indiquent que c'est la lettre à laquelle le Cardinal répond par son message de décembre 1643, dont l'authenticité ne laisse aucun doute: c'est la copie dont nous avons parlé, conservée à la Bibliothèque Mazarine à Paris, parfaitement lisible et qui, sur la marge de la feuille, indique le destinataire: "Mr. le Duc d'Ossolin Grand Chan[celier] de Pologne, 9 déc[embre] 1643." Il faut reconnaître que sur le nombre très limité de cet échange épistolaire entre les deux hommes d'Etat, retrouvé en France, une chance rare nous a permis de faire ce rapprochement.

---

[5] V. Notes à la lettre 1, de la collection Baluze.

[6] Le pape Urbain VIII.

[7] L'empereur Ferdinand II.

Ossolinski est arrivé à Rome pour son ambassade, célèbre à l'époque, en automne 1633, et les "préparatifs" durèrent toute une semaine avant que l'entrée solennelle soit fixée pour le 27 novembre.[8] *Pendant ce séjour préliminaire, Ossolinski a rencontré plusieurs dignitaires écclésiastiques, à commencer par le tout puissant Cardinal Barberini, et en finissant par des prélats plus modestes et des secrétaires de légations—qu'il a éblouis par l'excellente connaissance des langues italienne, française, espagnole, allemande—sans parler de son parfait latin: il l'employait surtout à la Cour d'Urbain VIII, dans les discours officiels pour présenter et négocier sa mission. Et cette mission était de poids et comprenait plusieurs points. Il fallait obtenir l'approbation du pape pour la politique tolérente vis-à-vis des dissidents, du roi Ladislas IV; le problème, de l'acceptation par la Cour papale des projets de guerre contre les Turcs fut d'envergure européenne; il y avait aussi la question épineuse du procès de l'Académie de Cracovie avec l'ordre des Jésuites.*

Parmi les jeunes "dignitaires" de l'Eglise, ceux de moindre importance, il y avait Giulio Mazzarino—c'était son nom à cette époque—qui devait toute son étonnante et rapide carrière à la bienveillance de la famille de Barberini. Le Pape Urbain VIII, à qui le futur ministre de France devait sa nomination à Rome, puis le titre de vice-légat à Avignon (ce titre lui apporta le privilège de précéder son nom par le biensonnant M o n s i g n o r e et, un jour, de porter le chapeau cardinalice), s'appelait avant le conclave, ne l'oublions pas, Maffeo Barberini. Pendant son séjour à Rome, les honneurs pleuvaient sur Mazzarino: il fut nommé chanoine non consacré du chapitre de Latran, puis d'autres chapitres, puis c a m e r i e r e de pape. Ce qui nous intéresse dans ce tracé de la carrière romaine de Mazarin, c'est le fait que depuis octobre 1632 jusqu'à la fin 1634 il n' pas quitté la Ville Eternelle. Il était donc à la cour de pape pendant l'ambassade d'Ossolinski, cette fameuse ambassade où les chevaux de dignitaires polonais, ferrés spécialement à cette occasion, "perdaient" dans les rues de Rome leurs fers en or. Ce fait choque moins dans la conjoncture des moeurs de l'époque: rappelons que quelques années plus tôt (1625), le célèbre Buckingham "perdait" les perles de ses magnifiques vêtements à la Cour de France, lors du festin donné à l'occasion du mariage de la princesse Henriette avec Charles I, roi d'Angleterre.

Après le temps passé à Rome, commence pour Mazarin la période française, d'abord plus modeste, puis, après la mort de Louis XIII brillante. La régente Anne qui l'a nommé premier ministre (contre l'avis du Parlement, ne l'oublions pas) lui donna toute sa confiance et lui accorda tout le pouvoir. On sait ce qu'on disait de leurs relations personnelles.

Je n'ai pas trouvé de lettre du Cardinal au Chancelier de Pologne antérieure au 27 août 1643. Il est intéressant de noter qu'à la même date

---

[8] Il y a beaucoup de compte rendus de cette "ambassade". Une des premières descriptions—peut-être la première—est de Parisi, *Vera relatione della entrata (a Roma) dell' Illustrissimo Signore G. Ossolinschi* (1634).

[9] Chéruel, op. cit. T.I., p. 325.

Mazarin écrit au Comte d'Avougard, "résident de sa Majesté" Roi de France à Gdańsk (Dantzig), en le priant d'expédier sa lettre à Ossolinski: "Je vous envoie la réponse à la lettre de M. le Grand Chancelier de Pologne que je vous supplie me faire la faveur de lui vouloir faire tenir. C'est véritablement un personnage de grand mérite, et qui est très digne de grade où il vient d'être élevé dans le royaume de Pologne. Vous m'obligerez de l'assurer particulièrement de l'estime que j'en fais et du désir que j'ai de vivre avec lui en une très parfaite correspondance de volonté".

On connaît suffisamment le caractère et la façon d'agir de Mazarin pour être persuadé que ces mots flatteurs sont destinés à être lus tels quels, par l'intéressé, c'est-à-dire par Ossolinski.

Pourquoi Mazarin tenait tant à d'excellents rapports avec Ossolinski?

On peut réduire toute l'histoire des relations franco-polonaises de cette époque au problème essentiel: antagonisme entre les influences françaises et autrichiennes. Les anciennes alliances de la cour de Pologne avec la Maison de Habsbourg étaient le sujet de constante inquiétude du Ministre français. Il ne pouvait pas minimiser le rôle de la Pologne: cet état, très vaste à cette époque, situé aux confins de l'Autriche, pas encore ébranlé par de multiples guerres qui devaient le secouer avant longtemps, ni par les luttes intestines, contribuait à l'accroissement de la puissance des Habsbourg; par contre, le rapprochement entre la France et la Pologne pouvait causer l'affaiblissement de leur puissance. A ces fins, Mazarin aura même, plus tard, recours aux fameux et tant décriés accords avec les pays protestants, les états scandinaves et l'Electeur de Brandenbourg en tête.

Pour le moment, il emploie une autre politique: de "Tu felix, Austria, nube", il veut faire "tu felix, Francia, nube". Il s'efforce de rapprocher la France et la Pologne par la voie du mariage. Après la mort de Cécilia Renata, archiduchesse de Habsbourg, la première femme de Ladislas IV (de la dynastie polono-suédoise de Vaza), la Cour française revient à l'ancien projet de la candidature de Marie de Gonzague-Nevers, princesse de Mantoue, pupille de la reine Anne d'Autriche.

Pour mener à bien ces démarches, Mazarin envoie à Varsovie un agent spécial, le comte de Grégy.[10] *Ossolinski, dont l'influence sur le roi de Pologne était considérable, très apprécié à la Cour surtout après l'heureuse ambassade à Rome de 1633 et à Ratisbone en 1636, pouvait peser beaucoup dans les desseins de Mazarin. Celui-ci n'oublie pas que, excellent diplomate, le Chancelier a réussi d'obtenir pour le premier mariage de son roi la main de l'Archiduchesse et cela dans des conditions difficiles, créées par l'attitude de l'Empereur mal disposé à ce moment vis-à-vis de la Pologne. Ce qui plus est, il a obtenu également la promesse de l'appui de Habsbourg pour légaliser les prétentions du roi Ladislas—un Vaza—au trône de Suède. Cet homme*

---

[10] V. R. Przeździecki, op. cit. dans la *Bibliographie*, t. I, chap. IV; notamment p. 136.

[11] V. L. Kubala, op. cit. dans la *Bibliographie*. Bibliothèque Calvet: lettres de Roncalli ms. 1399, t. II.

d'Etat polonais controversé par une fraction politique de son pays, critiqué et détesté par les masses nobiliaires, était auréolé de la renommée d'un des premiers diplomates européens.

Ossolinski avait de la véritable estime pour les idées du Cardinal qui inspirait confiance à ce catholique convaincu. La première phrase de sa lettre exprime l'espoir inavoué mais sousentendu que, "après tant de tempêtes"— Mazarin changera la ligne politique de Richelieu, appuyé sur le soutient secret des protestants afin d'écraser la puissance des Habsbourg. Les évènements immédiats ont donné raison au Chancelier; il se trompait quant à la suite de la politique du Cardinal.

Mazarin tenait donc à l'appui d'Ossolinski pour le "mariage français" du roi de Pologne avec une de ses candidates—car la brillante mais pas bien jeune Marie de Gonzague n'était pas la prétendante unique. L'instrument de ce jeu de Mazarin devait être Domenico Roncalli (on rencontre ce nom orthographié "Roncagli", "Roncali" et, dans les documents polonais, aussi "Ronkali"), Italien d'origine, secrétaire du roi Ladislas IV, un des membres de la légation d'Ossolinski à Rome en 1633. Il fut nommé agent polonais à Paris et, avant longtemps, est devenu bientôt confident équivoque—soudoyé selon Kubala et d'autres historiens—de Mazarin.

Roncallii était pressenti d'abord comme négociateur du mariage du roi-veuf avec la reine Christine de Suède, conformément aux instructions de la Cour polonaise. Il avait peu de chances de réussir. La reine de Suède témoignait peu d'inclinaisons pour le matrimonium, même si, au lointain, se dessinait une alliance des deux trônes par le mariage des époux Vaza. Le lucide et puissant Ossolinski est devenu bientôt le plus chaleureux partisant de la candidate française. Il a gagné, par la suite, la gratitude de Marie-Louise, très désireuse de cette union—qui, pour la Pologne, ne s'est pas avérée bien avantageuse.

Dans la correspondance de la nouvelle reine avec Mazarin se lit sa joie, sa reconnaissance aussi, pour l'habile ministre qui l'a élevée jusqu'au trône, sur lequel elle monta en 1645. Les deux grands hommes d'Etat, le Cardinal français et le Grand Chancelier polonais, s'appuieront de nouveau lors des pourparlers au sujet du mariage du successeur du roi Ladislas, son frère Jean-Casimir: cette fois, la question matrimoniale deviendra celle de l'abandon ou de la continuation de la politique franco-polonaise, assez récemment établie au détriment de la Maison d'Autriche.

Le Cardinal chargea Marie de Gonzague, avant son voyage pour Varsovie, de multiples recommandations et conseils, dont celle-ci s'acquitta scrupuleusement. Il s'agissait surtout d'obtenir une forte influence sur le royal époux pour veiller aux intérêts de la France.[12] *Mazarin ne néglige pas pour autant ses affaires personnelles: il recommande instamment à la reine des démarches en vue d'obtention du chapeau cardinalice pour son frère,*

---

[12] Dans sa lettre à la Reine du 3 février 1647, Mazarin recommande de ne "rien négliger pour prendre l'ascendant sur son esprit". (Af. Etr. Fonds Suède t. VII, fol. 54-55).

Michel, archevêque d'Aix-en-Provence: en effet, le roi de Pologne avait le privilège de la "promotion" dans la nomination d'un nouveau cardinal, et Ossolinski, très bien vu à la Cour de Rome, pouvait appuyer cette affaire. Michel est devenu cardinal, mais plus tard (1648), et non par l'intermédiaire du roi de Pologne.

Marie Louise savait, toutefois, défendre son indépendance, elle avait une bonne intelligence, son jugement personnel—et son "petit caractère" qui, à la fin de son second régne, la faisait s'immiscer trop, au gré de Polonais, dans les affaires politiques et l'a rendue impopulaire malgré ses mérites antérieurs. On peut se parmettre d'abandonner ici l'ordre chronologique pour souligner que Marie Louise, totalement soumise au début à la direction de Mazarin, a su progressivement se libérer de son influence et adopter l'attitude de l'indépendance complète vis-à-vis de la politique française, toujours inquiète au sujet des relations tendues entre la Pologne et la Suède. A la fin son activité deviendra totalement opposée aux plans du Cardinal: elle appuiera une nouvelle alliance avec l'Autriche, un projet conçu en partie par elle-même. A cette époque, Mazarin commencera à compter la Pologne parmi les états hostiles à la politique française. Ossolinski, mort en 1650, manquera. Personne ne saura le remplacer pour maintenir, avec un pareil talent diplomatique, l'équilibre entre les gouvernements intéressés dans ces affaires compliquées. Mais les relations franco-polonaises vont s'améliorer quand l'archi-habile Mazarin promettra les démarches en vue de l'union entre une nièce de la reine, Anne de Gonzague-Nevers, avec le duc d'Enghien, fils du Grand Condé, successeur présumé—et déçu—au trône électif de Pologne après la mort de Jean-Casimir.

Ces remarques qui dépassent le cadre chronologique des lettres ici présentées, donnent une idée des relations entre l'adroit ministre français et la reine Marie-Louise qui voulait mener sa propre politique.

En 1643, sans nommer dans leurs lettres Marie de Gonzague, sans la moindre allusion aux projets de mariage de Ladislas, les deux fins politiciens savent parfaitement pourquoi l'un d'eux envoie et l'autre reçoit, les bras ouverts, le rusé Roncalli. Le Chancelier, avec la pensée secrète d'allier Mazarin à l'idée du mariage suédois et, en cas d'échec, de traiter l'union française, recommande l'agent de Pologne aux bonnes grâces du Cardinal; le Cardinal, dans sa réponse, s'empresse d'assurer son correspondant que l'envoyé, recommandé personnellement par Ossolinski ne peut que trouver le meilleur accueil.

Le mot "s'empresse" paraît ne pas correspondre aux circonstances. La première lettre de Mazarin après celle du Chancelier du 10 août 1643, est datée du 27 du même mois, mais elle ne constitue pas la réponse au sujet de Roncalli—ce n'est qu'un "compliment" après la nomination d'Ossolinski â la haute dignité du "Grand Chancelier".[13]

---

[13] Ossolinski fut nommé en 1643 vice-chancelier; c'est en 1645 qu'il est devenu Grand Chancelier. Mazarin, comme beaucoup d'autres politiciens européens, a prévu cette nomination.

La véritable réponse de Mazarin à la lettre d'Ossolinski est du 9 décembre de la même année; elle parait tardive. Mais il faut prendre en considération les modalités de la correspondance à cette époque: les lettres étaient acheminées par des "courriers" spéciaux, ou bien, ce qui parait avoir lieu dans le cas qui nous intéresse, portées par les envoyés eux-mêmes. Mazarin parle dans sa réponse de Roncalli a r r i v é déjà à la Cour française; d'autre part, étant donné que celui-ci devait "témoigner" des sentiments du Cardinal vis-à-vis d'Ossolinski, il parait probable, sinon évident, que l'agent polonais se mettait en route de retour pour Varsovie. Il partait donc ou bien avec des instructions de Mazarin, ou bien afin d'obtenir celles de son maître le roi de Pologne: à cette occasion il devait porter la lettre du ministre français du 9 décembre 1643.

La matière des lettres de Mazarin de 1650 est tout à fait diflérente.

Le pape Urbain VIII meurt en 1644. On commence à prononcer les noms de "papabile". Mazarin recommende à son légat à Rome de soutenir la candidature d'un des cardinaux favorables à la Cour de France: Bentivoglio ou Sachetti; il recommande surtout de combattre celle du cardinal Panfili, partisant des Habsbourg, et c'est Panfili qui sort pape du Conclave. Il prend le nom d'Innocent X. L'attitude de Mazarin qui précédait cette élection ne lui a empeché d'assurer le nouveau pape de sa "joie indiscriptible", mais cette "joie" ne l'empêche pas non plus de révoquer, dans un accès de colère, son légat, dont la situation serait devenue d'ailleurs extrêmement embarrassante et indésirable à la Cour de Rome. Dans la correspondance de Mazarin de cette époque se lit souvent son mécontentement, son agacement. Dans ces circonstances, sa lettre à Pietro Mazzarino où le souci des bonnes relations avec le puissant et très estimé à la Cour du pape Chancelier Ossolinski, est si évident, ne prend que plus de poids. Le Cardinal recommande en même temps que cette lettre—expression de son zèle"—arrive à la connaissance du dignitaire polonais. Tout au long de son pontificat, et dès son début, Innocent X n'était enclin à favoriser ni la politique ni les intérêts personnels de Mazarin, et Ossolinski, bien vu par le nouveau pape comme il l'était par son prédécesseur, pouvait être très utile.

Nous savons que, aussi bien dans la politique du Cardinal-Ministre que dans ses problèmes personnels, son ennemi principal était le coadjuteur Gondi, instigateur de la Fronde, jaloux de la prépondérence de Mazarin dans les affaires françaises et de son influence sur la régente. Les années 1650-1651, c'est la période la plus aiguë de leur rivalité, la lutte de ces deux hommes, combien différents, mais pareils dans le trait dominant de leur caractère: une ambition démesurée. Gondi s'efforce de gagner la confiance du pape Innocent X—et il deviendra, rapppelons-le, cardinal en 1652, le célèbre Cardinal de Retz. Mais avant cette victoire de Gondi, Mazarin essaie de contrecarrer ses plans et, sachant qu'il n'est pas bien vu à Rome, il doit recourir aux influences des personnalités en faveur à la Cour papale. Cette conjoncture parait pouvoir expliquer l'insistance de Mazarin: il désire donner l'hospitalité de son palais à Ossolinski, il décide de faire tout pour que cette invitation

soit acceptée et pour que l'accueil de cet hôte de marque souligne l'importance que Mazarin y attache.

La date des lettres du Cardinal à ce sujet attire l'attention: 1650, année la plus difficile de son existence, année cruciale,[14] *l'époque de Bordeaux soumis difficilement et travaillé encore par la Fronde, moment où il doit affronter les hostilités de Paris. Rien de ces soucis graves, de ces affaires primordiales ne perce dans ses lettres à son père—et pourtant, le 20 décembre 1650 Mazarin n'est pas encore sorti des pires difficultés, pour trouver, après un bref repis et avant la victoire définitive, la disgrâce et l'exil.*

Si peu sympathique, souvent retors, toujours adroit, Mazarin a une qualité napoléonienne: il sait s'occuper à fond de l'affaire du moment, lui donner apparemment toute son attention, sans pour autant perdre de vue les autres. Il ne manque jamais ni de sang froid ni d'énergie: la réception du Grand Chancelier à Rome doit être magnifique, il le dit dans les directives données à ce sujet — les affaires aussi bien politiques que "privées" le demandent.

Sachant que la question turque constituait l'objet des préoccupations de la Pologne en ce moment et qu'elle était le but véritable du voyage qu'Ossolinski préparait, on peut supposer avec certaine vraisemblance que c'est à ce problème que fait allusion Mazarin en parlant à son père des "affaires politiques". Le ministre français pour lequel le Turquie était une alliée naturelle contre la puissance de Habsbourg, ne pouvait pas se permettre de rompre avec elle. Par contre, attiser l'élan guerrier de la Pologne contre la Grande Porte pourrait arranger la politique de Mazarin vis-à-vis de la Suéde. Sans compromettre aucun de ses intérêts, il désirait sans doute s'assurer, par l'intermédiaire d'Ossolinski, les relations amicales avec l'Etat polonais, assez tendues à cette époque.

La raison de l'arrêt que le Chancelier se proposait de faire à Venise demande une explication. Dès 1633, Ossolinski entretient le pape Urbain VIII de la nécessité de concentrer les forces de toute la chrétienté contre la Turquie. En rentrant de Rome, sa mission brillamment accomplie, il s'arrête à Venise et essaie d'intervenir auprès du doge et son conseil, mais Venise, liée alors avec la Grande Porte, ne peut pas accepter ces plans. Pourtant, les incursions turques se faisant de plus en plus fréquentes, la Signoria menacée sur toutes ses possessions maritimes, change peu à peu son attitude. En 1645, arrive à Varsovie son légat, J. B. Tiepolo et l'envoyé de Rome, J. de Torres, le suit: [15] *les deux confèrent et agissent en pleine intelligence avec Ossolinski, souvent en conférences secrètes.*

Le Chancelier considère l'affaire mûre en 1650 et, non sans opposition d'une partie de l'opinion politique polonaise, lui, le "pacifiste" (notamment

---

[14] Ces affaires sont bien connues des historiens. Cabrini (*Mazarin*, Paris 1962) écrit (p. 178): "Il n'y a rien de plus tragique dans la vie de Mazarin que cette sombre fin d'année 1650. C'est l'heure pour lui de la grande solitude".

[15] V. R. Przeździecki, op. cit., T.I, *La Nontiature apostolique en Pologne*, chap. III, notamment p. 6.

dans les affaires polono-ukrainiennes) décide d'agir pour coordonner les préparatifs de la guerre contre les Turques.

Depuis le début de l'insurrection cosaque (1648) Ossolinski considérait une guerre extérieure comme le seul moyen de sauvegarde devant le pire fléau—les luttes intestines. La Turquie était affaiblie par les abus des riches, par l'opression inouïe qu'exerçaient les tout puissants "fonctionnaires" sur la population vivant dans la misère indescriptible, tenait sous sa domination les pays voisins qui l'abhorraient: elle avait à ce moment des ennemis partout, à l'intérieur et à ses confins.

Ossolinski suggera, en 1650, le projet d'une ligue contre l'Etat Ottoman. La menace d'une guerre avec Moscou—qui élargissait de plus en plus ses possessions—pouvait entraver ses plans, mais momentanément, ce danger parait écarter; la guerre, inévitable, éclatera en effet quelques années plus tard. L'envoyé de Venise à Vienne commence une activité visant le même but: d'une part il s'efforce de canaliser l'énergie militaire de Chmielnicki contre la Turquie et recherche l'accord du H o s p o d a r valaque et du Khan tartare, d'autre part, il obtient l'assentiment de l'empereur Ferdinand III à l'entrée de l'Autriche dans la Ligue projeté. Mais celui-ci pose une condition: il donnera son appui, si non seulement Venise mais aussi le Vatican y adhèrent. C'est pourquoi Ossolinski entreprend le voyage à Rome "pour participer aux dévotions de l'Année Sainte",[16] *mais sans doute—et même surtout—pour entamer les pourparlers à la Cour papale. Malgré sa santé chancelante, il décide de s'arrêter à Venise, bien que ses projets devaient y être présentés antérieurement par un envoyé spéciel.*

Mazarin était au courant, par ses agents, des plans et tractations du Grand Chancelier. Supposant, avec sa perspicacité coutumière, que les premières résidences de Rome ouvriront leurs portes à Ossolinski, il veut les devancer et s'empresse de lui offrir l'hospitalité de son propre palais. Non content de tout prévoir pour le séjour du dignitaire polonais à Rome, il exige l'envoi de "Laurent" à la rencontre d'Ossolinski, Laurent Mancini, père des très chères nièces du Cardinal, les célèbres "mazarinettes". Pour organiser l'accueil digne de l'invité ainsi que l'apparat de son séjour dans le P a l a z z o M a z z a r i n o, somme toute pas très sompteuse, et pour rendre cette résidence plus comfortable, le Cardinal désigne Benedetti, l' "abbato Elpido" son intendant et son premier biographe-panégyriste.[17]

Le palais de Mazarin, en comparaison avec la richesse architectonique de Rome, n'est pas particulièrement intéressant. Il le devient pour nous en tant que demeure offerte à Ossolinski, offerte avec l'empressement accom-

---

[16] L'Eglise célèbre l'Année Sainte tous les 25 ans; elle est consacrée aux prières particulières et aux débats.

[17] On l'appelait l'*alter ego* du Cardinal, qui lui confiait souvent les affaires particulièrement délicates, notamment celles qui concernaient les personnages étrangers. La Biographie qui a paru sous le titre *Raccoltadi diverse memorie per scrivere la vita del Cardinale Mazarini* s'arrête à l'année 1652. Elle fut publiée tout de suite après la mort du Cardinal, en 1661.

pagné de directives qui voulaient souligner l'honneur et la faveur que le Chancelier aurait fait au Cardinal en l'acceptant.

Ossolinski n'a jamais occupé le Palazzo Mazzarino. Il n'est pas allé à Rome. La mort l'a frappé la veille de son départ, par un après-midi de terrible orage qui s'ést abattu sur Varsovie, pareil à celui qui grondait déjà à toutes les frontières de la République polonaise. Cette tempête n'a pas couvert le bruit de voix qui se sont soulevées contre ce dignitaire impopulaire, brillant mais trop orgueilleux, fin politicien, mais homme d'Etat qui se fiait trop à ses propres jugements—diplomate pourtant irremplaçable, et en effet médiocrement remplacé par son successeur. Sa mort a privé l'Europe d'un des diplomates les plus éminents—et à réjoui de nombreux adversaires, de sa politique, ses compatriotes surtout. Peut-être aucun dignitaire polonais n'a eu tant d'honneurs de son vivant—et tant d'ironiques et haineuses "épitaphes" après sa mort.

Qu'est devenu l'original de la lettre de Mazarin au Grand Chancelier du 20 septembre 1650? Nous l'ignorons. On ne sait même pas si elle est arrivée en Pologne.

1

Transcription de la lettre d'Ossolinski à Mazarin du 10 août 1643.

. . . sig. mio. Ossolinski.[18]

Tiene ogni giorno maggior campo il valor di Vostra Eccelenza di segnalarsi e rendersi glorioso nelle Christianità ch'aspetta dalla suo mano la tranquillità e pace dopo tante tempeste. Io che mi professo partialissimo di vostra Eccellenza godo del occasione che se le presenta e prego il Signor Dio

---

[18] Les mots au-dessus de la lettre et en dessous: debut—illisible, puis—lecture incertaine, surtout audessus de la signature d'Ossolinski. Il faudrait les comparer avec d'autres lettres du Grand Chancelier, ce qui est irréalisable en France. "Sigillo mio" qu'on peut lire, abrégé, au debut, fait supposer que la lettre portrait, comme d'habitude, le sceau de son auteur.

[19] Allusion probable à la politique de Mazarin: Ossolinski, catholique fervant, espérait le changement de tentatives de Richelieu, soutenant, par l'alliance avec Gustave-Adolphe, les protestants pour affaiblir la prépondérance de la Maison autrichienne.

[20] Domenico Roncalli (ortographe variée: Roncagli, Roncali, en polonais-parfois Ronkali), d'origine italienne; il est devenu secrétaire de Ladislas IV, chanoine de Varmie, un des membres de l'ambassade d'Ossolinski à Rome en 1633. Envoyé à Paris comme "agent" de Pologne, il deviendra un confident de Mazarin, totalement dévoué aux projets secrets du Cardinal et soudoyé par lui, selon Kubala (v. Bibliographie). Conformément aux instructions reçues en Pologne, il devait soutenir le projet du mariage du roi avec Christine de Suède: bientôt il entrera dans le jeu de Mazarin et appuyera les démarches visant le mariage du roi avec Marie de Gonzague, princesse de Mantou, parente de la reine Anne d'Autriche, élevée à la Cour de France. Marie-Louise deviendra, comme on sait, épouse de Ladislas, puis, à sa mort, de son frère, le roi Jean-Casimir.

che secondi i suoi sforzi e le pie intenzioni.[19] Rappresenterà più oltre della mia devozione il Segretario Roncalli[20] destinato da suo Serenissimo Rè a cotesta corte a cui degnisi Vostra Eccelenza dar piena credenza mentre io per fine le bacio affetuosamente le mani Di V. E.

Di Varsovio li 19 agosto 1643

affmo . . .

Il Duca d'Ossolin

Ms. de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris, col. Baluze, 172, fol. 86. Cachet: Bibliothèque Royale.

Papier d'assez bonne qualité, en bon état; XVII-e siècle; 29 cm. 7 sur 19 cm., 2. Filigrane inconnu en France, probablement polonais.

2

Transcription de la lettre de Mazarin à Ossolinski du 27 août 1643.

Mr. d'Ossolin grand Chancellier de Poloigne[21]

Mons

Il ne pouvoit rien arriver de plus agreable, que les marques que j'ai reçües dans la lettre de vtre Excellence du souvenir qu'elle a de moy. Cette faveur m'est d'autant plus chere, que na l'ayant pas meritée par mes services, Je ne la puis devoir qu'à vtre seule courtoisie, et ie vous avoüe que ce ne m'est pas une petite satisfaction, d'estre aux bonnes graces d'un homme, qui se trouve en un degré d'honneur, où il n'y a que la vertu qui puisse eslever. Les grandes qualitez que ie remarquay en la personne de vtre Excellence, lorsque i'eus le bien de la voir à Rome[22] me furent un presage, que cet honneur ne luy manqueroit point, ou que la Poloigne viendroit à manquer de Justice. Je m'estimerois heureux si dans celuy que le Roy m'a fait, et que la Royne a eü la bonté de me continüer, i'y rencontrois quelque occasion de faire paroitre à vtre Exc. l'estime particulière que ie fais de son merite et la veritable et parfaite passion avec laquelle ie desire estre toute ma vie.[23]

Ms. de la Bibliothèque Mazarine à Paris, 2214, fol. 97. Papier de qualité médiocre, jauni, légères traces de rouille; XVII s; 35 cm.2 sur 23 cm.4.

[21] Poloigne: ortographe variable, aussi Poulogne, Pouloigne, Poligne. Rappelons qu'il s'agit des lettres copiées par les secrétaires du Cardinal. Dans les lettres en italien, lues par nous: Polonia. Ossolin: parfois, chez les copistes Ossolim.

[22] Allusion à l'ambassade d'Ossolinski à Rome en 1633. Ossolinski fut envoyé par le roi Ladislas IV pour présenter la fidélité du nouveau roi au Siège Apostolique. En même temps il devait obtenir d'Urbain VII son accord pour la politique de Pologne conciliante vis-à-vis des "hérétiques" et "schismatiques" — et belliqueuse vis-à-vis de l'Etat ottoman. V. Introduction.

[23] Cette lettre *copie* d'époque ne porte ni date ni nom de lieu. La date que nous donnons est enregistrée dans les archives françaises. Chéruel donne une lettre de Mazarin à M. le Comte d'Avougour, "Résident pour sa Majesté a Dantzic", où il prie le destinataire de faire parvenir sa lettre au Grand Chancelier Ossolinski et l'assure de son estime qu'il a pour cette personnalité de valeur exceptionnelle et de son désir de fidèle entente avec lui (Chéruel, op. cit., t. I, p. 325).

3

Transcription de la lettre de Mazarin à Ossolinski du 9 décembre 1643.

Mons le Duc [24] Ossolin Grand Chancellier de Poligne

J'ay receu celle que V.E. m'a fait le faveur de m'esrire, si pleine d'estime pour moy, que ie me souhaterois estre tel qu'elle me figure pour estre plus digne de ses bonnes graces. Mais ie me prometz que les bonnes qualitez qui me manquent pour cela, seront supplées par l'abondance de la passion que i'ay pour son service et par la considération en laquelle i'ay une personne qui a merité tant de part de l'amitié d'un des plus grands Rois de ce Siecle. Le Sr. Roncalli pourra rendre tesmoignage à V.E. que ce sont des sentiments que ie pour elle, et que ie n'ay rien plus à coeur, que de rencontrer les occasions de luy en donner des preuves/ Quand il ne seroit pas venu en cette Cour de la part du Roy son Maistre, et qu'il ne seroit pas si honeste homme qu'il est, l'honneur qu'il a d'estre estimé et aymé de V. E. me faira toujours beaucoup considerer sa personne, et en prendre beaucoup de soin, puisque ie desire que V.E. connoisse en toute sorte de rencontre que ie suis parfaitement.

Ms. de la Bibliothèque Mazarine à Paris, 2214, fol. 143. Papier de qualité médiocre jauni, taches de rouille; XVII s.; 35 cm., 2 sur 23 cm., 4.

4

Transcription de la lettre de Mazarin à Ossolinski du 20 septembre 1650

Al Signor Duca d'Ossolim(sic) Gran Cancelliere de Polonia.

Havendo inteso, che Vostra Eccellenza se ne passa a Roma per la devotione dell' anno santo mi parebbe di mancar troppo a quello, che io le devo se non potendo servirla di persona nella mia Patria non procurasse almeno di farlo per quei mezzi, che mi sono possibili nella mia lontananza; Offerisco dunque a Vostra Eccellenza la commodità della mia casa,[25] che se

---

[24] Cf. notes 5 et 6 à l'Introduction. Il est notable que Mazarin, ennemi de l'Autriche n'emploie en s'adressant à lui ou en parlant de lui (v. lettres du 20 septembre 1650) que le titre donné au Grand Chancellier de Pologne par le pape.

[25] "La casa" de Mazarin à Rome a été construite par le Cardinal Borghese (Scipione) sur le terrain d'anciens Thermes de Constantin, en 1603, d'après les plans des architectes Ponzio et Vasanzio. Le palais est passé dans les mains du duc d'Altemps, puis fut acquit par le Cardinal Bentivoglio (celui que Ossolinski a rencontré à Rome en 1633), et c'est lui qui l'a cédé à Mazarin. Le Cardinal l'a agrandi et transformé d'après les projets des architectes Maderno et Venturi. Actuellement le palais est la propriété des familles Rospigliosi et Pallavicini. Dans le "Casino" avoisinant se trouve depuis l'époque de Mazarin, la célèbre fresque de Guido Reni *Aurora*. Il est difficile de trouver des renseignements sur cette demeure, même les archives très documentés dans la matière, celles de la Bibliothèque Mazarine à Paris n'ont su m'indiquer aucun document. Ces détails m'ont eté fournis par le Department d'architecture à Rome, par l'aimable intermédiaire de Mlle Jola Di Nicolo.

non per altro, almeno per la situatione d'essa, e par la Pardonanza assoluta, che potrà essercitarvi, non le potrà esser discara.[26] Io non faccio questa offerta per compimento, ma con certezza indubitabile, che elle deba accettarla, altrimenti crederei di ricevere un gran torto da Vostra Eccellenza, e che volesse defraudarmi di quelle guista ambitione, che io ho che la Corte di Roma conosca la stretta amicitia e confidenza che passa frà di noi.

Vostra Eccellenza potrà conoscere qual siano li miei sentimenti dalla lettera qui inclusa, che io scrivo a mio Padre, il quale dovrà servirla in mio luogo, mentre io resto baciandole (etc)

Di Bourg [27] li 20 settembre 1650

Ms. de la Bibliothèque Calvet à Avignon, 1401, fol. 131 v. Papier de très bonne qualité, blanc, légèrement poreux; quelques taches d'humidité; XVII s.; 35 cm. sur. 22 cm.

5

Transcription de la lettre de Mazarin à son père du 20 septembre 1650.

Al Signore Pietro Mazzarino.[28]

Il Signore Duca di Ossolim Gran Cancelliere di Polonia se ne va per la devotione dell'anno santo à Roma, ove benchè gli venghino offerti diversi Palazzi per suo allogiamento, io non dimeno come suo intrinseco e partialissimo pretendo essere da lui preferito ad ogni altro. Et havendo pregato Sua Eccellenza à servirsi delle mia casa, credo non sia per negarmi questo favore. Mi è parso per tanto di darne avviso à Vostra Signoria anticipatamente acciò ella si contenti di mettere all'ordine il Palazzo nel migliore, e più honorevole modo, che potrà di passarne un complimento con sua Eccellenza per mezzo d'una lettera, che lo troverà facilmente à Venetia,[29] ove deve capitare, e di andare, o mandare il Signor Lorenzo mio Cognato ad incontrarlo e finalmente di riceverlo con ogni dimostratione d'affecto, e di cortesia, e dandoli tutte le commodità, che sarà possibile, assicurando Vostra Signoria, che mi farà grandissimo piacere, e che è cosa che per diversi rispetti, e publici, e privati mi preme assaissimo di che potrà, anche Vostra Signoria avvertire il Benedetti acciò egli medesimamente dal canto suo

---

[26] Le palais se trouve en proximité du Quirinal qui, à cette époque, était un des bâtiments appartenant au pape.

[27] Probablement Bourg-sur-Gironde, à 23 klm. de Bordeaux.

[28] Pietro Mazzarino (1576-1664) est né à Palerme qu'il a quitté très jeune, pour entrer dans le service de la famille Colonna. Intendant de la Maison, estimé, il a obtenu en mariage une parente éloignée de Colonna; certains historien prétendent qu'elle êtait seulement filleule du chef de la famille. Le Cardinal était l'ainé des six enfants. Pietro Mazzarino était, contrairement aux allégations des premiers biographes du Cardinal, d'origine modeste.

[29] Venise: cf. l'Introduction.

concorra con tutto quello potrà in questi miei sentimenti, ne la prego dunque con tutto l'affetto, e qui cordialissimamente La saluto.

Di Bourg li 20 settembre 1650.[30]

Ms. de la Bibliothèque Calvet à Avignon, 1401, fol. 130 r. et v. même papier, même écriture.

6

Transcription de la lettre de Mazarin à son père, pour la transmettre à Ossolinski.

Il signore duca d'Ossolim Gran Cancelliere del Re di Polonia sene và per devotione dell'anno santo à Roma: ove benché non siano per mancarli diversi Palazzi per suo allogiamento, io nondimeno come suo intrinseco e partialissimo servitore pretendo, che cotesta mia casa deve essere do lui preferita od ogni altra, che perciò havendo pregata Sua Eccelenza à servirsene in questa occasione, credo indubitamente non sia per negarmi questo favore.

Mi é parso di darne avviso à Vostra Signoria acciò elle si contenti di ricevere non solo questo Signore in mio nome, mà di farlo Padrone assoluto delle casa, et almancamento di quelle cose, delle quali elle si ritrova hoggidì spogliata, e che si richiederebbero per la commodità, et honorevolezza d'un Personaggio di questa conditione Vostra Signora supplisca con una servitù affettuosa, e cordiale, quale appunto è quella ch'io professo.

Vostra Signoria medesima ha tal cognotione della qualità, e merito di detto Signor Duca, che be, può persuadersi la premura, che io ho in questo negotio, onde rimettendelo alla sua prudenza resto con pregarli da Dio ogni maggior contento.

Di Bourg li 20 settembre 1650

Ms. de la Bibliothèque Calvet à Avignon, 1401, fol. 130 v. et 131 r. La lettre est précédée de la mention suivante: *La sudota lettera med-o fu mandata in mano dil sud-o Gran Can-re mutando 1 modo seguense.* Les trois lettres du 20 sept. 1650 sont gardées dans le même dossier relié; papier du XVII s., beau, légèrement jauni, légèrement poreux; 35 cm. sur 22. Copies d'époque.

Bibliographie (sources principales)

La bibliographie d'ouvrages sur Mazarin, innombrables et bien connus, n'est pas indiquée dans ce tableau sommaire, sauf:

E. A. Chéruel et G. d'Avenel, *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin pendant son Ministère,* recueillies et publiées par . . . (Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France publiée par les soins du Ministère de l'Instruction publique. I-e série: Histoire politique, Paris, 1872-1906.

Czermak W. Plany wojny tureckiej Władysława IV. Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności, Seria II, t. IV, Kraków 1895;

---

[30] La mention de la lettre de Mazarin à son père, envoyée avec quelques changements—bien volontaires et arrangés à dessein—à Ossolinski est très caractéristique pour le Cardinal qui aimait avoir des "témoins" de ses sentiments à l'égard des personalités éminentes.

Gasztowt A.M. *Une mission diplomatique en Pologne au XVII siècle: Pierre de Bonzi à Varsovie,* Paris 1916;
Kubala J. *Jerzy Ossoliński,* Warszawa 1924;
Lorris P. G. *la Fronde,* Paris 1961;
Noyers (de) P. *Lettres de Pierre de Noyers, secrétaire de la Reine de Pologne Marie Louise de Gonzague (...) pour servir à l'histoire de Pologne et de Suède de 1655 à 1659,* Berlin, 1859;
Przezdziecki R. (Comte.) *Diplomatie et protocole à la Cour de Pologne.* T.I: Paris 1934; T. II: Paris 1937;
Plebański J. K. *Jan Kazimierz Waza; Maria Ludwika Gonzaga.* Warszawa 1862;
Pułaski F. *La mission de Claude de Mesme Comte d'Avaud,* ambassadeur extraordinaire en Pologne 1634-1636, Paris 1937;
Waliszewski K; *Polsko-francuskie stosunki w XVII wieku, 1644-1667.* Kraków 1889.

JEAN CASIMIR. Estampe espagnole de l'époque qui prouve la popularité du prince dans la péninsule ibérique même après son avènement au trône de Pologne

STUDIA

LUIS FERRAND DE ALMEIDA
(COIMBRE, PORTUGAL)

LE PRINCE JEAN CASIMIR DE POLOGNE ET LES ANTECEDENTS DE LA RESTAURATION DU PORTUGAL (1638-1640)

En dépit des obscurités et des incertitudes qui entourent encore cette question, il n'existe aujourd'hui aucun doute que Richelieu s'intéressa à la situation du Portugal avant la révolution de 1640 et chercha par ses agents secrets a sonder l'état d'esprit des Portugais et à les inciter à un soulèvement contre le roi d'Espagne.

Or, parmi les faits qui démontrent cet intérêt les historiens ont d'habitude signalé le cas de l'emprisonnement dans un port français du prince Jean Casimir, frère du roi de Pologne Ladislas IV, qui en mai 1638 se dirigeait vers l'Espagne pour prendre possession, disait-on, du gouvernement du Portugal avec le titre de vice-roi. Cet épisode fut raconté au siècle passé par Bazin et Saint-Aymour qui en avaient déjà saisi le rapport avec les antécédents de la révolution portugaise; ici, au Portugal, ce même cas avait été divulgué dans plusieurs publications de A. Rodrigues Cavalheiro qui avait perçu "des liaisons étroites avec ce qui se tramait dans notre pays".[1]

Dans les pages qui suivent nous reprenons ce sujet, en espérant pouvoir éclaircir, au moins en partie, certains points obscurs, à la lumière de documents inédits et d'autres peu connus ou négligés jusqu'à présent.

1. Le voyage et l'emprisonnement du prince Jean Casimir en France.

Le 20 mars 1638, les *Nouvelles Ordinaires*, publiées à Paris, annonçaient ce qui suit comme nouvelle du 13 février parvenue de Dantzig: "Le Prince Casimir, frère du Roy de Pologne, est parti de Warsau pour passer par Vienne et l'Italie dans l'Espagne, où il espère estre nommé Vice-Roy de Portugal".[2] Le 25 février le prince polonais se trouvait déjà à Vienne, en

---

1) A. Rodrigues Cavalheiro, „A aventura de Casimiro da Polónia", in *Temas de História*, Porto, s. d. p. 102. Voir du même auteur: „Os antecedentes da Restauração e a posição do Duque de Bragança", in *Congresso do Mundo Português*, vol. VII, Lisbonne, 1940, p. 36; „A França e a revolução de 1640", in *Revista dos Centenários*, an II, N° 24, Décembre 1940, p. 12; *1640, Richelieu e o Duque de Bragança*, Lisbonne, 1942, pp. 44-47; en collaboration avec L. Vieira de Castro: „A Europa e o domínio filipino em Portugal. Das tentativas do Prior do Crato às manobras secretas de Richelieu", in *Anais* de l'Académie Portugaise de l'Histoire, vol. VIII, Lisbonne, 1944, pp. 215-216.

2) *Nouvelles Ordinaires du vingtiesme Mars 1638*, in *Recveil des Gazettes Nouvelles Relations Extraordinaires et autres recits des choses avenues tovte l'annee 1638*, Paris, 1639, N° 35, p. 137.

Autriche.[3] Il voulait voyager incognito, mais il était accompagné d'une suite nombreuse, ce qui allait contribuer à le faire reconnaître; d'autre part les Français se chargèrent immédiatement de répandre la nouvelle aux quatre vents.

Passant en Italie, il se dirigea à Milan et de là à Gênes, où il fut magnifiquement reçu. A Milan on lui avait offert huit galères pour le transporter en Espagne, mais Jean Casimir refusa, préférant se servir d'une galère génoise, avec le dessein, comme fut prouvé par les évènements, de visiter les ports de Provence, à l'abri de la liberté de commerce concédée aux Génois par la France.

Il partit probablement le 5 mai,[4] passa près de l'Ile Sainte Marguerite, non loin de Cannes, et débarqua à Saint-Tropez, où il passa quelque temps à visiter la ville et le port, toujours déguisé, traitant ses compagnons d'égal à égal et faisant croire que l'un d'eux, Konopacki, était le chef du groupe.[5]

De Saint-Tropez il se dirigea à Marseille par terre, mais en cours de route il s'arrêta à Toulon, où il examina tout avec soin, navires inclus. Il s'arrêta ensuite à Marseille, comme il semble, pour quatre jours, afin de mieux connaître la ville, et, craignant que sa suite ne vienne à être remarquée, il la répartit entre plusieurs auberges. Entre temps la galère du prince qui était restée un jour entier à La Ciotat (port entre Toulon et Marseille) arriva au Château d'If, où Jean Casimir et ses compagnons, afin de ne pas se faire remarquer rembarquèrent séparément, le matin du 9 mai.

Arrivés à Port-de-Bouc qui est "le dernier de la Provence du costé d'Espagne", ils débarquèrent comme toujours et examinèrent l'emplacement de cette place-forte et des fortifications de Martigues. Mais la galère génoise sur laquelle voyageait le frère du roi de Pologne ne parvint plus à lever l'ancre à Port-de-Bouc en direction d'Espagne; ayant eu connaissance de

---

3) „... Le Prince Casimir de Pologne est arrivé en cette ville..." *(N. O. du vingtseptiesme Mars 1638,* in *Recveil* cit., N° 38, p. 150. De Vienne, 25 Février 1638).

4) Il s'agit d'une date qu'on peut déduire d'une nouvelle provenant de Gênes et datée le 6 Mai 1638, publiée par la *Gazette* in *Recveil* cit., N° 60, p. 239: „.... Hier, dix galéres de Naples passèrent à la veuë de ce port pour aller descharger quelques fantassins à quinze milles de cette ville; d'où le Prince Casimir, frère du Roy de Pologne, est parti le mesme jour pour l'Espagne, sur une galère de cette Republique".

5) Les documents que nous publions en appendice l'appellent „Kanopolski" (Docs. I et III) et „comte de Konopasquy, abbé de Vokos" (Doc. VII). Il s'agit de Jan Karol Konopacki (c. 1581-1643), abbé commendataire de Wąchock (1635), homme cultivé qui avait étudié dans les universités de France et d'Italie et qui avait voyagé à travers une grande partie de l'Europe. Pour plus de détails biographiques voir: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny,* ed. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, vol. XIII, Wrocław, 1967-68, pp. 545-6. Nous devons l'identification de ce personnage et un résumé de l'article précité à notre ami le dr. Adam Zieliński. Il y a aussi des références à Konopacki et à son voyage avec Jean Casimir dans le *Memoriale rerum gestarum in Polonia 1632-1656* d'Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł, ed. dirigée par A. Przyboś et R. Żelewski, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, vol. II (1634 - 1639), Varsovie, 1970, pp. 92 et 292, et vol. III (1640-1647), Varsovie, 1972, p. 24.

l'espionnage pratiqué par le prince polonais, le comte d'Alais, gouverneur de Provence, donna l'ordre à Nargonne, commandant de la forteresse en question, de s'emparer du navire et de ceux qu'il transportait. Toutefois, il n'était pas facile d'exécuter cet ordre, car la galère pouvait fuir un danger pressenti; l'officier français décida donc d'user de prudence et d'avoir recours à un stratagème qui réussit. Il commença par disposer six canons en batterie, dissimulés entre de grandes fascines pour ne pas éveiller la méfiance; il se dirigea ensuite seul jusqu'à la pointe d'un petit môle et fit dire au capitaine de venir à terre, car M. de Nargonne avait à lui communiquer des choses ayant trait à la sécurité de son voyage.

Le commandant du bateau souleva quelques difficultés, mais finit par céder et fut immédiatement arrêté. En employant le même procédé Nargonne s'empara de Konopacki et, à la fin, de Jean Casimir, lui-même, ainsi que de tous ceux qui l'accompagnaient, au total de 24 personnes.

Se voyant incarcéré le prince protesta, mais son ravisseur, en réponse, "usa de remonstrances accompagnées de respect", en lui faisant voir qu'une personne de sa qualité ne pouvait entrer dans un pays, comme il l'avait fait, sans un passeport du roi, de plus à une époque peu sûre et encore en circulant déguisé, pour visiter les villes et les ports du royaume, ce qui rendait infondée toute excuse de sa part. Après six jours de prison à Port-de-Bouc, Jean Casimir et ses compagnons furent livrés au capitaine des gardes du comte d'Alais qui les emmena à Salon, où ils restèrent en détention pendant un certain temps.[6]

---

6) Docs. I, II, III, IV, VII et XXVI. La similitude entre certains de ces documents est trop grande pour qu'on puisse admettre qu'ils soient entièrement indépendants. Il faut comparer, particulièrement, les documents I, III et les premiers alinéas du doc. VII. Les informations sont essentiellement les mêmes dans tous ces trois documents etdevaient être inspirées par Richelieu puisqu'il est notoire que le *Mercure* et la *Gazette* dépendaient de lui. Nous ignorons les connexions qui pourraient exister entre ces trois documents et le doc. XXVI, plus réduit sur certains points mais plus developpé sur d'autres. Toutefois la date de la capture du prince indiquée dans ce dernier document — Août 1639 — est absurde.

A propos de ce problème il faut noter que les éléments que nous avons à notre disposition ne permettent pas d'établir le jour exact de l'emprisonnement de Jean Casimir. Les documents I et III nous font incliner pour le 9 Mai, mais si le prince quitta Gênes le 5 de ce mois *(vide supra)* et demeura 2 jours à Saint-Tropez, 4 à Marseille et peut-être même 5 à Toulon (docs. I, III, VII et XXVI) il est évident qu'il ne pouvait pas être le 9 à Port-de-Bouc. En conséquence ou bien Jean Casimir ne quitta pas l'Italie le 5 mais plus tôt: ou il ne demeura pas aussi longtemps dans les ports provençaux comme l'indiquent les documents que nous connaissons; ou il ne fut pas emprisonné de 9 Mai. Ce qui est indiscutable c'est, uniquement, que l'incident s'est produit en Mai 1638, probablement dans la première moitié du mois. Saint-Aymour *(Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France*, t. III, Paris, 1886, p. XXIII) et Rodrigues Cavalheiro *(Temas de História*, p. 104; *1640, Richelieu e o Duque de Bragança*, p. 46) acceptent la date du 10 Mai, mais nous ignorons les sources sur lesquelles ils se basaient. Nous trouvons, toutefois, la même date dans le *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, t. XIII, p. 546. Dans le *Memoriale* de A. S. Radziwiłł, t. II, p. 271, note 7, la date de l'emprisonnement est le 9 Mai.

2. *Le voyage de Jean Casimir et les relations hispano-polonaises.*

Le voyage de Jean Casimir en Espagne, interrompu dans les circonstances que nous venons d'exposer, a été souvent considéré comme une "aventure", "un événement bizarre", "une odyssée étrange", et son protagoniste fut appelé "un type étrange d'aventurier et de demi-fou", "*condottiere* disposé à tout", "prince barbare et demi-fou".[7]

Or, à ce qu'il nous semble, il y a quelque exagération dans ces affirmations. Tandis qu'il est certain que Jean Casimir était un esprit versatile, inquiet et ayant le goût de l'aventure, nous ne voyons pas pour autant de raison pour le considérer comme *barbare et demi-fou* et son voyage est moins étrange et absurde qu'il ne peut paraître à première vue, si nous l'étudions à la lumière des relations hispano-polonaises de l'époque et si nous tenons compte de ses antécédents.

Il serait hors de propos de rappeler, même dans les grandes lignes, les relations entre l'Espagne et la Pologne depuis les temps les plus reculés; [8] aussi, nous limiterons-nous au XVII siècle en éclairant les aspects qui peuvent contribuer, directement ou indirectement, à expliquer le voyage du frère de Ladislas IV en 1638.

En 1612 arrivait à la cour de Sigismond III le baron de Dohna, ambassadeur extraordinaire du roi d'Espagne, dont la mission fut mentionnée dans une *Relación* publiée par M. Gómez del Campillo. Une référence y était faite, en termes très élogieux, au fils ainé du roi, le prince Ladislas Sigismond que l'on disait être "dotado de todas las virtudes y dones naturales y de muy grandes esperanzas" ("doté de toutes les vertus et dons naturels et faisant naître de très grandes espoirs"). Son frère, Jean Casimir, était encore un enfant; "El hijo segundo se llama Juan Casimiro; es de edad de cuatro años, lindisimo muchacho" ("le deuxième fils s'appelle Jean Casimir; il a quatre ans, ravissant petit garçon"). Et l'auteur de la relation ajoutait ces paroles un peu mystérieuses: "Los Príncipes de Polonia desean mucho el efecto del negocio que se le encargó al Barón en secreto, del cual

---

7) Saint-Aymour, *op. cit.*, pp. XXII-XXIII; Rodrigues Cavalheiro, *Temas de História*, p. 102; *1640, Richelieu e o Duque de Bragança*, p. 44; *A Europe e o dominio filipino em Portugal*, pp. 216, 222.

8) Au sujet des relations diplomatiques voir: R. Przeździecki, *Diplomatie et protocole à la Cour de Pologne*, t. II, Paris, 1937, pp. 215-261. Quelques chapîtres de cet ouvrage ont été publiés en traduction espagnole dans le *Boletin de la Real Academia de la História*, de Madrid, avec des précieuses notes de M. Gómez del Campillo. Au sujet des relations économiques: J. Rutkowski, *Histoire économique de la Pologne avant les partages*, Paris, 1927, pp. 62, 64, 195. Au sujet des relations culturelles: J. Morawski, „Espagne et Pologne. Coup d'oeil sur les relations des deux pays dans le passé et le présent" in *Revue de Littérature comparée*, vol. XVI, 1936, pp. 225-246; J. Goldman, „La philologie romane en Pologne", in *Archivum Neophilologicum*, vol. II, 1937, pp. 71-318; C. Koranyi, „Jurisconsultos y jurisprudencia españoles en Polonia desde el siglo XV hasta el siglo XVIII" in *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español*, t. V, 1928, p. 227-245; E. C. Brody, „Spain and Poland in the Age of the Renaissance and the Baroque: A Comparative Study", in *The Polish Review*, vol. XV, 1970, N° 4, pp. 86-105, et vol. XVI, 1971, N° 1, pp. 53-107.

trató con mucho tiento y destreza sin dar más que buenas esperanzas para cuando llegase la ocasión..." [9] ("Les princes polonais désirent beaucoup la réussite de l'affaire dont on a secrètement chargé le Baron, et qu'il a traitée avec beaucoup de tact et d'adresse, sans donner rien de plus que de bons espoirs pour le moment où l'occasion se présenterait").

La Guerre de Trente Ans devait provoquer quelques tentatives de rapprochement entre l'Espagne et la Pologne, car tant ce pays que la Maison d'Autriche avaient intérêt à voir la puissance de la Suède abattue. C'est ainsi qu'en 1626 le roi d'Espagne envoya à Varsovie comme ambassadeur Jean de Croy, comte de Solre, accompagné du baron d'Auchy. Ils proposèrent, à ce qu'il parait, la création d'une ligue contre la Suède, ce à quoi le roi de Pologne ne consentit point, parce qu'ils ne lui garantissaient pas que le trône suédois lui serait restitué et aussi parce qu'il voyait que l'opinion publique était hostile à la guerre.[10]

Le comte de Solre revint en Espagne et fut remplacé en 1627 auprès de la cour de Varsovie par le baron d'Auchy. Celui-ci resta trois ans en Pologne, où il chercha à mettre sur pied l'important plan de formation d'une escadre hispano-polonaise pour combattre les Suédois dans la Mer Baltique, sous le commandement du prince Ladislas de Pologne. A cause de différentes circonstances ce projet ne se réalisa pas et, à la fin, une trève signée à Altmark (1629) entre la Pologne et la Suède finit par la rendre inopportune. Appelé peu après en Espagne (1630), d'Auchy n'en écarta pas pour autant, parait-il, l'idée d'une alliance hispano-polonaise d'autant plus que Sigismond III mourut en 1632 et son fils ainé, Ladislas IV, lui succéda par voie d'élection sur le trône polonais. Or, Ladislas IV, alors qu'il n'était encore que prince, s'était déjà'montré favorable aux plans d'Auchy.[11]

Après l'ambassade du comte de Siruela [12] (1633) — de pure courtoisie d'Auchy fut désigné à nouveau pour une mission à Varsovie, mais ne réussit pas à dépasser les Flandres, où il s'attarda longtemps, pendant qu'il envoyait des demandes successives au Conseil d'Etat. Et c'est précisement un de ces écrits qui jette quelque lumière sur certaines paroles énigmatiques que l'on trouve dans la relation de l'ambassade du baron de Dohna et que nous avons transcrites plus haut. En vérité, d'Auchy rappelait que vu le retard de la remise du cadeau de 12000 écus qui avait été offert au roi de Pologne alors qu'il était prince, il serait bon *sazonarle el animo* (de lui remonter le moral) avec quelques présents d'ambre et de nacre; le roi d'Espagne consentit, mais

---

9) **M. Gómez del Campillo, „Notas"** à la traduction de Przeździecki, in *Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia*, t. CXXII, fasc. II, 1948, pp. 536-538. Cf. **Przeździecki**, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 231.

10) **Przeździecki**, *op. cit.*, t. II, pp. 231-232.

11) **Przeździecki**, *op. cit.*, t. II, pp. 232-233; Gómez del Campillo, *op. cit.*, p. 540.

12) **Przeździecki**, *op. cit.*, t. II p. 233; Gómez del Campillo, *op. cit.*, pp. 542-543.

nous ignorons si ce présent arriva jamais à destination.[13] Ce qu'on voit, sans aucun doute, c'est qu'il existaient entre la cour d'Espagne et Ladislas IV des relations antérieures à l'avénement de celui-ci au trône de Pologne. Et nous constaterons bientôt que les rapports avec Jean Casimir ne furent pas moins étroites au cours des années précédant de peu son voyage de 1638.

Ce fut probablement le séjour prolongé du baron d'Auchy dans les Flandres qui amena le roi d'Espagne à nommer pour l'ambassade à Varsovie le comte de Solre, qui avait déjà occupé ce poste en 1626. Ses instructions du 16 juin 1635 sont importantes pour la bonne compréhension des relations hispano-polonaises de l'époque et de la situation de Jean Casimir. Le préambule justifiait l'ambassade et le choix de l'ambassadeur par l'état de la situation internationale ainsi que par la conspiration des ennemis de la Maison d'Autriche, désireuse de veiller à conserver ses amis. Et quoique le roi de Pologne eût toujours montré de l'affection envers la Maison d'Autriche, l'ambassadeur venait pour lui exprimer l'appréciation du roi d'Espagne et son désir de resserrer leurs liens encore davantage, son devoir étant de le satisfaire en tout ce qui pourrait contribuer à la plus grande amitié entre les deux royaumes. Il devait s'informer avec soin à quel point en était l'affaire du mariage du roi, étant donné que le désir du souverain espagnol était que Ladislas IV épousât la fille de l'empereur. Les buts principaux de l'ambassade étaient de double nature, à savoir chercher à obtenir une solide union avec la Maison d'Autriche, spécialement avec l'Espagne, et donner satisfaction au roi de Pologne concernant les demandes qu'il avait faites par l'intermédiaire de ses ministres. Quant'au premier point, l'ambassadeur devrait tenter d'obtenir l'établissement du commerce; il conviendrait que l'union qui se réaliserait fût dirigée contre la France, l'Espagne offrant de son côté une aide contre la Suède. En tout cela le comte devait procéder avec toute son habileté et tout son zèle; il devait négocier une autre incursion de Cosaques, et ce serait une grande chose si, avant l'hiver, quelque 10 ou 12,000 Cosaques et Croates eûssent déjà envahi la France. Quant'au second point, le roi de Pologne avait demandé au roi d'Espagne qu'il lui prêtât aide pour récupérer le royaume de Suède et qu'il veillât sur ses deux frères (Jean Casimir et Charles). On donnerait à l'ambassadeur d'Espagne un crédit de 250,000 écus pour remettre au roi de Pologne à titre d'aide contre le Suède. D'un autre côté, une somme de 1,000 écus par mois était attribuée à chacun des princes, frères de Ladislas IV; à cette fin le comte de Solre emporterait un crédit de 48,000 écus, étant chargé de rendre compte de l'âge et des qualités des deux frères, ainsi que de leurs inclinations et de ce que le roi désirait pour eux. Il pourait offrir la "Toison d'Or" pour Jean Casimir, si Ladislas IV en montrait satisfaction. Il lui était recommandé de prêter attention aux négociations de la France, parce que l'expérience avait montré sa "impiedad y perfidia nunca vista" ("dureté et perfidie jamais vues"). Et l'instruction insiste, en terminant: "Gobernaréis la negociación como os pareciere, procurando negociar con el Rey de Polonia las más tropas que pudiéredes de cosacos que entren en

---

13) Przeździecki, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 234; Gómez del Campillo, *op. cit.*, p. 539.

Francia, pues toda la mira de esta negociación ha de enderezarse a afligir la Francia" [14] ("Vous menerez la négociation comme il vous semblera bon, cherchant à négocier avec le Roi de Pologne le maximum que vous pourrez de troupes cosaques pour envahir la France, car toute l'intention de cette négociation est de s'engager dans une voie qui conduise à affliger la France").

Le roi Philippe IV décida de donner au comte de Solre comme compagnon de sa mission à Varsovie le capucin Fr. Alonso Vasquez, abbé de Santa Anastácia, avec une instruction datée du 20 juin 1635. Les mêmes sujets y étaient traités et des indications identiques aux instructions pour le comte de Solre y étaient données. Surtout quant'au point concernant la situation des princes Jean Casimir et Charles, on disait que Fr. Alonso pourrait communiquer à Ladislas IV que le roi d'Espagne avait résolu de leur accorder quelque assistance, sinon telle qu'il désirait, au moins celle que ses charges lui permettaient, et que Solre emportait l'ordre de le lui déclarer.[15]

Il faut croire que ces missions diplomatiques avaient porté quelque fruit, car les relations entre la Pologne et les pays de la Maison d'Autriche devenaient de plus en plus étroites. Nous avons déjà vu qu'un des objectifs du comte de Solre était de parvenir à lancer une expédition de Cosaques contre les Français, et, en réalité, la même année, en 1635, Ladislas IV céda à l'Empereur une force armée de 5,000 Cosaques qui combattirent au Luxembourg contre la France et qui causèrent de grandes dévastations.[16] Toutefois, la politique de Ladislas IV était encore hésitante, parce que, à la même époque, il concédait à l'ambassadeur de France quelques troupes qui se joignirent à l'armée suédoise.[17] Ainsi, la Pologne ne prenait-elle pas une part directe aux combats, mais elle demeurait transformée en un "grand marché d'hommes",[18] dont la domination était disputée à Varsovie par les diplomates des puissances rivales.

En 1637, pourtant, Ladislas IV pencha décidément vers une alliance avec la Maison d'Autriche," en oubliant — dit O. Halecki — les expériences malheureuses de son père".[19] En cettte année le roi de Pologne signa avec l'Empereur un pacte secret contre la Suède et résolut finalement le problème si débattu de son mariage, en épousant l'archiduchesse Cécile-Renée, soeur

---

14) Gómez del Campillo, *op. cit.*, pp. 543-546.

15) Gómez del Campillo, *op. cit.*, pp. 546-548. Cf. Przeździecki, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 234.

16) Cf. *Recveil de toutes les Gazettes... contenant le recit des choses remarquables... dont les nouvelles nous sont venuës toute l'annee 1635*, Paris, 1636, pp. 673, 687; *Recueil de toutes les nouvelles* (année 1636), Paris, 1637, pp. 8, 27-28; Y. de Saint-Prest, *Histoire des Traités de Paix, et autres negotiations du dix-septieme Siécle depuis la Paix de Vervins jusqu'à la Paix de Nimegue*, t. II, Amsterdam, 1725, p. 531.

17) *Recueil de toutes les Gazettes* (année 1635), p. 687.

18) G. Fagniez, *Le père Joseph et Richelieu (1577-1638)*, t. II, Paris, 1894, p. 342. Cf. Przeździecki, *op. cit.*, t. I, Paris, 1934, pp. 128-129.

19) O. Halecki, *A History of Poland*, 2ème ed., New York, 1943, p. 151.

de Ferdinand III.[20] Le mariage se réalisa à Vienne, par procuration, Ladislas ayant été représenté par son frère, Jean Casimir.[21]

Le prince avait fait la guerre au service de l'Empereur, combattant contre les Suédois et leurs alliés (1635), et il est intéressant de rappeler qu'il fut dans ces combats le compagnon d'armes et l'ami de l'infant Duarte, frère du duc Jean de Bragance, futur roi Jean IV de Portugal.[22] En cette même année 1637 Jean Casimir manifesta le désir d'entrer au service du roi d'Espagne, devant lever à cette fin 4 ou 5,000 lances polonaises.[23] Encore en 1637 la "Toison d'Or" lui fut conférée, mais la pension de 12,000 ducats promise par le comte de Solre demeurait en retard, à en croire le rapport du marquis de Castañeda à qui le prince s'était plaint à Vienne.[24]

En Pologne on avait fait des remarques au sujet de cette pension, car on considérait que "sus Principes no hauian acostumbrado reçiuir sueldo de otros Reyes" ("ses Princes n'avaient pas la coutume de recevoir des dons d'argent d'autres rois"), mais Jean Casimir qui désirait déjà "viuir y morir" ("vivre et mourir") au service du roi d'Espagne accepta et apprécia cette faveur. A son passage à Milan, le prince polonais fit des démarches pour qu'on lui payât des arriérés de deux ans, mais le marquis de Leganés s'excusa, disant qu'on le paierait plus tard à Madrid. Ayant été emprisonné dans les circonstances que nous avons déjà rapportées, Jean Casimir envoya en Espagne un de ses compagnons, un certain Antonio Manara, pour qu'il manifestât à Philippe IV son regret de n'avoir pu continuer son voyage "y offreçer se a su seruiçio" ("et lui offrir ses services") et pour qu'il lui demandât le paiement de la pension promise par le comte de Solre et confirmée par l'abbé de Santa Anastácia, d'autant plus qu'elle lui manquait beaucoup à cause de son emprisonnement. Le Conseil d'Etat espagnol fut d'avis qu'on pourrait donner 1,000 ducats à Antonio Manara comme à compte sur ce qu'on avait promis au prince.[25]

Notons pour terminer ce sujet que Jean Casimir avait déjà fait en 1636 une tentative de venir en Espagne, en partant de Gdańsk (Dantzig), mais il

---

20) Halecki, *op cit.*, p. 151; Fagniez, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 344; Przeździecki, *op. cit., t.* II, pp. 128-130, 235; A. Waddington, *Le Grand Electeur Frédéric Guillaume de Brandebourg. Sa politique extérieure, 1640-1688*, t. I, Paris, 1905, p. 29; J. Tazbir et E. Rostworowski, „La République nobiliaire", in *Histoire de Pologne*, sous la direction de S. Kieniewicz, Varsovie, 1971, p. 257.

21) A. S. Radziwiłł, *Memoriale*, t. II, pp. 224, 226-237; Przeździecki, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 128; W. Tomkiewicz, *Więzień Kardynała — Niewola francuska Jana Kazimierza*, Varsovie, 1957, p. 18. (Toutes les informations extraites de ce livre que nous avons utilisé dans cette étude nous ont été fournies par le dr A. Zieliński).

22) Cf. J. Ramos Coelho, *Historia do Infante D. Duarte*, t. I, Lisbonne, 1889, p. 219; au sujet du service impérial de Jean Casimir et de son retour en Pologne voir aussi: A. S. Radziwiłł, *Memoriale*, t. II, pp. 105 (et n. 3), 137 (et n. 3) et 159.

23) Doc. VIII.

24) Doc. VIII. Cf. Gómez del Campillo, *op. cit.*, p. 546.

25) Doc. XIV. Cf. Doc. X.

n'avait pas réussi à dépasser la Hollande.[26] De même, à un moment la rumeur avait couru du mariage d'un infant d'Espagne avec la soeur de Ladislas IV et de l'offre de l'archevêché de Tolède à un des frères du roi de Pologne, nous ne savons pas si c'était pour Jean Casimir ou pour Charles.[27]

De cette manière, à la lumière des relations hispano-polonaises de l'époque et des rapports de Jean Casimir avec la cour de Madrid, le voyage du prince polonais en 1638 apparaît comme parfaitement compréhensible. S'il y a quelque chose d'étrange et d'aventureux dans cette histoire c'est la façon dont elle se passa. Mais, même pour cet aspect il parait possible, comme nous le verrons, de trouver une explication.

3. *Jean Casimir et la vice-royauté du Portugal.*

Il y a différentes versions sur les objectifs du voyage. Un biographe contemporain de Jean Casimir, Ewerhard Wassenberg, affirme que le prince avait tout juste l'intention de visiter, pendant trois ans, divers pays de l'Europe Occidentale et de retourner dans sa patrie après avoir prêté "obédience" au Pape à Rome.

Pour W. Tomkiewicz cette version officielle ne correspond pas à la réalité, parce que les finances polonaises ne se trouvaient pas en état de permettre une pareille dépense et parce que le frère de Ladislas IV n'avait pas avisé l'ambassadeur de France de la visite qu'il entendait faire dans ce pays et n'avait pas cherché non plus à obtenir le passeport nécessaire. Wassenberg ignorait, ou ne voulut pas, révéler le vrai motif du voyage, comme pense l'historien en question, qui croit que le secret est gardé dans les archives espagnoles. Il est certain que celles de Simancas n'ont pas jusqu'à présent révélé grand chose et que les archives polonaises ne paraissent pas être plus riches quant à ce sujet; la documentation de caractère secret aurait été détruite par ordre de Ladislas IV. Quand Jean Casimir partit on parlait à la cour polonaise d'un voyage en Italie, la destination ibérique ne fut mentionnée que plus tard.[28]

On a dit que Jean Casimir était allé en Espagne pour signer une alliance avec Philippe IV et pour prendre commandement d'une escadre contre les

---

25) Doc. IX; W. Tomkiewicz, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

27) Przeździecki, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 234. Dans une letre du 9 Juin 1641, dirigée au duc de Medina de las Torres, vice-roi de Naples, l'envoyé polonais Tytlewski faisait mention de *„las gratas ofertas de su Magestad Catolica del Arçobispado de Toledo para el Principe Carlo"*. Mais le viceroi, dans sa reponse du 12 Juin fait allusion à *„las promesas que los ministros del Rey, mi señor, huvieren hecho al señor Rey de Polonia del Arçobispado de Toledo para el señor Principe Casimiro ..."* Il est probable que la première de ces informations soit plus correcte et que la seconde soit due uniquement à une erreur. Les deux textes apparaissent en *Elementa ad Fontium Editiones*, vol. XXI *(Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas*, VII pars), ed. W. Meysztowicz, Institutum Historicum Polonicum, Roma, 1970, docs. 55 et 56, pp. 62 et 65.

28) W. Tomkiewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.

Français.[29] Nous ne savons pas si les auteurs qui l'affirment se fondent sur des sources polonaises ou d'autres inconnues de nous. On ne peut pas tirer de pareilles conclusions des documents que nous publions et ils ne contiennent pas non plus de références à ces prétendus objectifs. L'on dit soit que le prince allait être vice-roi de Portugal, soit, simplement, qu'il désirait entrer au service du roi d'Espagne.

Il ne peut y avoir de doute que pour beaucoup de gens de l'époque l'idée de cette vice-royauté constituait l'explication du voyage de Jean Casimir et qu'il ne devait pas s'agir à peine d'un bruit journalistique, car nous savons qu'il est parvenu jusqu'au Conseil d'Etat d'Espagne même. Le comte-duc de Olivares, en examinant ce sujet, fut de l'opinion que "si la persona fuese tal y tubiese buenos lados, no era malo lo de Lisboa, por las ventajas con que se podrian adelantar las materias del comerçio con Dansic y las otras çiudades del Mar Waltico" [30] ("si la personne était comme-ça et avait de bons côtés, [le projet] de Lisbonne ne serait pas mauvais à cause des avantages quiferaient progresser les affaires commerciales avec Dantzig et les autres villes de la Baltique"). L'hypothèse fut donc envisagée par le *favori* de Philippe IV, qui orientait alors la politique de son pays.

D'autres problèmes encore se sont posés. Ainsi, par exemple, qui aurait pris l'initiative de ce voyage? D'après Bazin, ce fut le roi d'Espagne qui appela Jean Casimir pour lui conférer la vice-royauté du Portugal, le prince acceptant "avec empressement l'honneur qu'on lui offrait si loin de son pays".[31] Saint-Aymour demande si l'initiative sera partie de Philippe IV ou si tout ne fut plutôt un songe qui surgit spontanément dans le cerveau mal équilibré du prince polonais, et il répond: "C'est ce que nous ignorons encore".[32] Rodrigues Cavalheiro fait une allusion à ces deux hypothèses, sans se décider pour l'une ou l'autre,[33] et I. Révah, en se référant à Jean Casimir, dit qu'on ne saura sans doute jamais si l'idée de la vice-royauté portugaise avait surgi spontanément dans son esprit ou s'il se mit en route appelé par

---

29) *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne*, t. VII, Paris, 1813, p. 276; W. Czapliński, „The Reign of Władysław IV, 1632-48", in *The Cambridge History of Poland*, t. I, Cambridge, 1950, p. 495; O. Halecki, *Borderlands of Western Civilization. A History of East Central Europe*, New York, 1952, p. 201.

30) Doc. IX. Au sujet du commerce entre le Portugal et la Pologne au XVII siècle voir: J. Rutkowski, *op. cit.*, p. 195; Virginia Rau, *A exploraçâo e o comércio do sal de Setúbal*, vol. I, Lisbonne, 1951, pp. 156, 161 (note 71), 164, 165, 176, et *Subsidios para o estudo do movimento dos portos de Faro e Lisboa durante o século XVII*, Lisbonne, 1954, pp. 227-228, 241-242, 247-248, 250.

31) A. Bazin, *Histoire de France sous Louis XIII et sous le ministère du Cardinal Mazarin*, 2ème ed., t. II, Paris, 1846, pp. 473-474, *cit.* par L. Vieira de Castro et R. Cavalheiro, *op. cit.*, in *Anais* de l'Académie Portugaise de l'Histoire, vol. VIII, p. 222.

32) Saint-Aymour, *op. cit.*, p. XXIII.

33) R. Cavalheiro, *1640, Richelieu e o Duque de Bragança*, p. 45.

le roi d'Espagne, désireux de confier le royaume lusitanien à un "homme à poigne".[34]

Or, quelques documents que nous publions aujourd'hui permettent sinon de résoudre définitivement la question, au moins d'indiquer un commencement de solution. Nous voyons en effet que déjà avant 1638 Jean Casimir avait manifesté le désir de servir le roi d'Espagne et de "viuir y morir" ("vivre et mourir") dans ce service.[35] Mais le document le plus intéressant et significatif est l'avis du Conseil d'Etat espagnol du 7 juin 1638. Le comte-duc d'Olivares, lorsque lui fut communiquée la nouvelle de l'arrivée en Espagne, par l'Italie, du frère du roi de Pologne, opina qu'il fallait demander au comte de Solre ce qu'il en pensait, car, cela étant matière dépendante de ses négociations, il pourrait donner les éclaircissements nécessaires, après quoi on prendrait la décision appropriée. Il était d'avis que "caros son estos huespedes reales" ("ces hôtes royaux reviennent cher"), mais si le prince avait des qualités il ne ferait pas mal à la tête du gouvernement de Lisbonne. Une fois déjà, on l'avait empêché de venir en Espagne, mais à présent et d'après ce que dirait le comte de Solre, on allait voir ce qu'il y avait à faire. Par la suite, le Conseil opina que, vu le décès du comte de Solre, on consulterait ses rapports ainsi que ceux de l'abbé de Santa Anastácia pour juger de ce qu'on pourait offrir au prince "y si hizieron algun empeño con el para esta jornada" [36] ("et si l'on avait pris quelque engagement envers lui au sujet de ce voyage").

Il est difficile de concilier ces discours et ces démarches avec l'idée que Jean Casimir avait été officiellement appelé par Philippe IV. Olivares — le tout-puissant *valido* (favori) — et le Conseil d'Etat ignoraient totalement qu'il existât une invitation de ce genre et témoignaient même d'un certain embarras et de quelque incertitude par rapport à ce qu'il serait le plus convenable de faire. Le comte-duc en arriva même à remarquer, avec amertume, que ces hôtes royaux revenaient cher.... Donc, selon toute apparence, l'initiative du voyage aurait appartenu au prince polonais. Mais nous ne devons pas écarter totalement la possibilité de quelque suggestion ou promesse provenant du monarque espagnol, par l'intermédiaire d'un de ses agents diplomatiques. En réalité une source polonaise en date du 9 juin 1641 dit que Sa Majesté Catholique aurait offert "un gobierno de Virrey para el Principe Casimiro" [37] ("le rang de Vice-Roy au Prince Casimir").

Un autre problème à résoudre est de savoir si Jean Casimir arriva jamais à être effectivement nommé vice-roi du Portugal. Si nous faisions crédit à

---

34) I. Révah, *Le Cardinal de Richelieu et la Restauration du Portugal*,, Lisbonne, 1950, p. 27.

35) Docs. VIII et XIV.

36) Doc. IX.

37) *Elementa ad Fontium Editiones*, vol. XXI, ed. W. Meysztowicz, doc. 56, p. 65. L'envoyé extraordinaire de Pologne Stanisław Makowski, écrivant de Madrid à Ladislas IV en date de 28 Août 1638,affirmait que Jean Casimir avait été attendu dans la capitale espagnole où la dignité de vice-roi de Portugal lui aurait été concédée (W. Tomkiewicz, *op. cit.*, p. 23).

certains documents, nous pourrions finir par accepter cette conclusion,[38] mais, à notre avis, ce serait là une conclusion précipitée. L'avis déjà cité du Conseil d'Etat espagnol du 7 juin 1638 prouve clairement que la nomination n'avait pas été éffectuée jusqu'à ce jour, et il n'est pas probable qu'elle ait eu lieu postérieurement, car on apprenait peu de jours après l'emprisonnement du prince.[39] Ce point de vue est confirmé par différents documents. Déjà la première nouvelle se rapportant au voyage de Jean Casimir disait qu'il se dirigeait vers l'Espagne, "où il espere estre nommé Vice-Roy de Portugal".[40] Ensuite, se référant à l'arrestation du frère de Ladislas IV, la *Gazette* informait qu'il avait quitté Gênes "pour aller en Espagne, où il devoit estre, à ce qu'on dit, Vice-Roy de Portugal"...[41] Enfin, les *Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu* disent simplement: "Ce prince étoit parti de Pologne pour aller en Espagne, où on lui promettoit de lui donner un grand emploi..."[42] Il semble donc que la vice-royauté du Portugal ne dépassa jamais les désirs de Jean Casimir, les nouvelles des journaux et, tout au plus, les plans de Philippe IV ou d'Olivares.

4. Mise en liberté de Jean Casimir et son retour en Pologne.

Nous avons déjà vu quelles furent les circonstances de l'arrestation du frère de Ladislas IV de Pologne. Le prince effectua un véritable et minutieux travail d'espionnage[43] qui ne pouvait leisser indifférentes les autorités françaises, d'autant plus que Jean Casimir se mettait au service du roi d'Espagne, alors en guerre avec la France. Encore l'année d'avant les Espagnols avaient attaqué la Provence.

Ce furent précisément ces raisons qu'invoqua Richelieu pour justifier l'emprisonnement du prince aux yeux du roi de Pologne et devant l'opinion publique. Un *Extraordinaire* du 23 juillet 1638, après avoir raconté l'épisode avec beaucoup de détails, commentait: "Ceux qui sçavent le plus des secrets d'Espagne ne se sont pû empescher d'escrire que cette prise a arresté de grands desseins de l'Espagnol sur la Provence: où les ennemis estoient résolus de retourner, nonobstant les incroyables pertes d'hommes et d'argent qu'ils ont souffertes l'année passée (...): mais ayans pris leurs mesures sur les

---

38) Docs. I, III, IV.

39) Doc. X.

40) *Recveil des Gazettes* (année 1638), p. 137.

41) Doc. II.

42) Doc. VII. Cf. H. Lacape, *La France et la Restauration de Portugal*, Paris, 1939, p. 14.

43) Docs. I, III, IV, V, VII et XXVI; R. Cavalheiro, *1640, Richelieu e o Duque de Bragança*, p. 46. On peut admettre que le prince voulait rendre à l'Espagne un important service pour obtenir ainsi plus facilement la vice-royauté de Portugal: „il se proposa d'y entrer par quelque signalé service à l'Espagne" (Doc. III. Cf. Fagniez, *op. cit.*, t. II, p. 344).

44) Doc. III.

projets de ce Prince, sa detention les a obligez a differer leur mauvaise volonté à un autre temps".[44]

Ecrivant à Ladislas IV, Richelieu affirmait être certain de ce que, lorsque le roi connaîtrait bien les circonstances de l'arrestation de son frère, il n'y verrait rien de singulier, vu que le prince "s'en alloit pour s'attacher en Espagne", avec laquelle la France était ouvertement en guerre et qu'au lieu de traverser le mer, comme il pouvait le faire en toute sécurité, "il visitoit les places et les ports de la coste de Provence sur lesquels l'Espagne a desjà fait plusieurs fois divers desseins"; vu ces circonstances, la prudence interdisait qu'il fût mis en liberté "sans des précautions si asseurées qu'il n'agira point contre la France..." [45] Dans toutes ces justifications silence absolu sur l'affaire du Portugal. Cela n'a rien d'étonnant; Richelieu n'aurait certainement pas voulu par quelque allusion intempestive éveiller des soupçons dangereux. Il lui suffiçait de présenter, comme motifs de l'arrestation, l'espionnage pratiqué par le prince et son intention de servir le roi d'Espagne.

On a déjà voulu voir dans la date de la mise en liberté de Jean Casimir une preuve du rapport existant entre le voyage du prince polonais et les projets du ministre français au sujet du Portugal. D'après Saint-Aymour, le frère du roi de Pologne "ne fut relâché qu'au printemps de l'année 1641, c'est-à-dire quand la nouvelle de l'heureuse issue de la révolution portugaise fut parvenue à Paris".[46] De son côté, Rodrigues Cavalheiro écrivit que "Richelieu ne mit Casimir en liberté que lorsque son action ne pouvait d'aucune façon porter préjudice aux plans qu'il avait par rapport au Portugal. Pour cela même ce ne fut qu'au printemps de 1641, alors que la première ambassade de Jean IV auprès du roi de France se trouvait à Paris, que le prince polonais sortit de prison par ordre du Cardinal".[47] Or, les documents que nous connaissons relatent autre chose et nous donnent la certitude que Jean Casimir fur mis en liberté bien des mois avant la révolution portugaise de 1640.

Nous avons déjà vu que le prince fut détenu à Port-de-Bouc, probablement pendant la première quinzaine de mai 1638, qu'il passa six jours dans ce port et fut transféré de là au château de Salon, d'où il écrivit au roi de France, le 28 mai, protestant contre la violence qui lui avait été faite. Fin juillet il se trouvait encore à Salon, puisqu'en date du 20 de ce mois il écri-

---

45) Doc. V. Que Richelieu craignait, à cette époque, une attaque des Espagnols, prouve sa lettre du 7 Juin 1638 au comte d'Alais, gouverneur de la Provence. Par cette lettre il recommanda, malgré que la flotte espagnole soit faible, des mesures destinées à éviter un débarquement par surprise (Avenel, *Lettres, instructions diplomatiques et papiers d'Etat du Cardinal de Richelieu*, t. VII, Paris, 1874, p. 1032).

46) Saint-Aymour, *op. cit.*, p. XXIII.

47) *1640, Richelieu e o Duque de Bragança*, pp. 46-47. Cf. *Temas de Historia*, pp. 104-105; *A Europa e o domínio filipino em Portugal*, p. 216. D'autre auteurs ont répété cette erreur: H. C. Ferreira Lima, *Catálogo da Exposiçâo Bibliográfica e Iconográfica Luso-Polaca*, Lisbonne, 1938, p. 6; António A. Dória, „Notas" au Comte da Ericeira, *História de Portugal Restaurado*, nouvelle ed., vol. I,Porto, 1945, p. 495.

vait de nouveau à Louis XIII, se plaignant de n'avoir reçu aucune réponse.[48] A une date inconnue il dut être transféré à Lyon.[49] Le 6 Août 1639 le roi de France ordonna "au capitaine Moulinet, lieutenant au gouvernement de mon chasteau de Vincennes, de recevoir le prince Casimir comme prisonnier de guerre, de le traitter comme il convient pour un personnage de cette importance et de le garder de mesme".[50] Et le 15 septembre de la même année le prince fut transféré de Lyon au Château de Vincennes, d'où il sortit libéré les derniers jours de février 1640.[51]

Comme il était naturel, le roi de Pologne, en apprenant les événements de Port-de-Bouc, ne resta pas inactif et commença une véritable campagne diplomatique en vue de la libération de son frère. Après avoir écrit à Louis XIII et à Richelieu.[52] Ladislas IV envoya à cour de Paris son secrétaire Guillaume Forbes qui passa par Dantzig au cours de la première quinzaine de juillet 1638 et qui en août se trouvait déjà en France.[53]

Richelieu écrivait à Chavigny le 30 août qu'un envoyé polonais était arrivé pour parler au roi de la question du prince Casimir, que Chavigny devait l'entendre, lui adresser ensuite *bona verba* et se tenir *in deliberatis* quant'à la détention du prince.[54] Forbes apportait une lettre du roi de Pologne au roi de France, dont les plaintes furent considérées impertinentes, "comme si on eût en cela commis une action contre le droit de gens". Le souverain polonais disait ne pouvoir croire que l'arrestation eût été faite par ordre du roi de France. Celui-ci, toutefois, répondit en termes très aimables, mais fermes. Il n'avait pas donné l'ordre d'arrêter Jean Casimir, mais y avait acquiescé en prenant connaissance des circonstances dans lesquelles elle s'était réalisée. Il ne voulait pas discuter la question de la liberté du prince tant qu'il n'aurait en son pouvoir "une assurance authentique par écrit dudit Roi et de la république de Pologne" avec la promesse formelle que Jean Casimir ne combattrait jamais contre la France.[55]

---

48) Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VII, p. 189, note 1. On peut déduire le même du doc. III, du 23 Juillet 1638, qui affirme que le prince et ses compagnous ont été conduits à Salon „où ils reçoivent traitement favorable".

49) Doc. XXVI.

50) Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VIII, Paris, 1877, p. 203.

51) Docs. XXIV et XXV. Au sujet des prisons de Jean Casimir en France existe une étude de D. Gluksman-Rodański: „Les prisons en France d'un futur roi de Pologne: Jean Casimir", in *Le Salut Public*, Lyon, 9 et 16 Juin 1931. Malheureusement nous n'avons pas pu consulter cet article (Cf. J. Lorentowicz, *La Pologne en France. Essai d'une bibliographie raisonnée*, vol. II, Paris, 1938, p. 104, N° 1511). Voir aussi A. S. Radziwiłł, *Memoriale*, t. II, pp. 271-272, 284, 292-293, 297.

52) Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VII, p. 189, note 1.

53) Docs. X et XVI; *Recveil des Gazettes* (année 1638), Paris, 1639, N° 109, p. 445; Du Mont et Rousset, *Le ceremonial diplomatique des Cours de l'Europe*, t. I. Amsterdam, 1739, p. 132.

54) Doc. XVI.

55) Docs. VII et XIX. Cf. A. S. Radziwiłł, *Memoriale*, t. II, pp. 292-293.

Entre temps, Ladislas IV intensifiait ses démarches en faveur de son frère. En octobre 1638 un autre envoyé polonais, Piotr Dębski, se trouvait déjà à Paris.[56] On sollicita l'intervention des républiques de Venise et de Gênes et il est certain que la première du moins se manifesta par une lettre adressée à Louis XIII et qui fut remise par l'ambassadeur vénitien à la cour de France.[57] Les Français trouvèrent plus importune une sollicitation du roi d'Angleterre, dont les relations avec le roi de France étaient à ce moment peu amicales, et qui proposait un échange entre Jean Casimir et le prince palatin Robert, prisonnier de l'Empire.[58]

Ce désagréable incident provoqua en Pologne, comme il était naturel, des ressentiments. L'envoyé français dans ce pays, le baron d'Avaugour, rendait compte à Richelieu des protestations et plaintes qu'il recevait; sur lui pesait "l'envie publique de tout un royaume", où il était auparavant très respecté.[59] D'un autre côté, l'entretien en octobre 1638 du roi de Pologne avec l'Empereur ne laissait pas de causer de l'inquiétude en France, car les ennemis de ce pays cherchaient à tirer parti des circonstances favorables.[60] Ainsi, Philippe IV d'Espagne, en accord avec son Conseil d'Etat, entendait-il que le plus convenable "seriaençender al Polaco para se vengue" [61] ("serait inciter le Polonais à se venger") et Olivares fut d'avis que, en obtenant une action concrète de la Pologne dans ce sens, "seria grandissima negoçiaçion y muy importante" [62] ("serait une très grande et très importante négociation"). La diplomatie espagnole déploya dans ce sens une grande activité,[63] mais sans résultats payants.

Ladislas IV était rentré d'Autriche mécontent.[64] Il recommença à écrire à Louis XIII et à Richelieu (mars 1639) et, peu après, la Diète polonaise promit par un écrit signé et cacheté par 52 députés que le prince Jean Casimir ne commettrait aucun acte d'hostilité envers le roi de France ou son royaume. Ce document, accompagné d'une déclaration identique du monarque lui-même, doit avoir été emporté à Paris par l'ambassadeur extraordinaire Krzysztof Gosiewski qui arriva à la capitale française le 2 février 1640.[65] Cependant Richelieu se reconnut satisfait seulement après que Jean

---

56) Doc. XVII. Cf. A. S. Radziwiłł, *Memoriale*, t. II, p. 272, n. 2, et p. 293, n. 6; *Recveil des Gazettes* (année 1638), N° 142, p. 592.

57) Docs. VII, XIX et XX. Cf. Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VIII, p. 203.

58) Doc. VII.

59) Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VII, p. 789, note.

60) *Ibid.*, pp. 789-790, note.

61) Doc. XI.

62) Doc. XII.

63) Docs. XII. XIII et XV. Voir à suivre note 67.

64) Doc. XVIII.

65) Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VIII, p. 202; Docs. XXII et XXIII. Cf. A. S. Radziwiłł, *Memoriale*, t. II, pp. 293-294, 323 et t. III, pp. 7, 24.

Casimir et l'ambassadeur ont signé des engagements du même ordre le 25 et le 26 février. A cette dernière date le premier ministre français considérait la question comme terminée, mais le veille déjà lep rince polonais avait été mis en liberté.[66] Comblé d'attentions par la famille royale française et par le célèbre cardinal, Jean Casimir partit finalement pour son pays les derniers jours de mars.[67]

Dans notre investigation nous n'avons pas rencontré les preuves de l'existence d'un rapport direct entre l'aventure de Jean Casimir de Pologne et les projets de Richelieu à l'égard du Portugal. Il se peut qu'elles surgissent encore, bien que nous le croyions peu probable. Le plus naturel est que le fameux ministre de Louis XIII avait tout simplement voulu empêcher qu'un chef audacieux et vaillant se mette au service de l'Espagne quels que fûssent ses objectifs immédiats. Mais, si en vérité le prince se déstinait au gouvernement de Lisbonne, l'action de Richelieu en l'arrêtant en France put indirectement avoir contribué à faciliter le triomphe de la révolution portugaise de 1640.

DOCUMENTS

I

Au Mois de May de cette année le Prince Casimir, frere d'Vladislas Roy de Pologne, fut arresté en la coste de Provence, par le Comte d'Alais Gouverneur de la Province, en cette sorte. Ce Prince avoit autresfois levé des troupes de Cosaques pour le service du Roy d'Espagne, & les avoit menées bien avant dans l'Alemagne, pour les faire entrer en la Franche-Comté, tesmoignant en cela ses inclinations pour la maison d'Austriche. Ayant esté fait Vice-Roy de Portugal au commancement de cette année, pour prendre possession de cette dignité avec esclat il se fit accompagner de soixante

---

66) Avenel, *op cit.* t. VII, p. 789, note; Docs. XXIV et XXV. Cf. A. S. Radziwiłł,*Memoriale*, t. III, p. 24.

67) Docs. XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX et XXX. Au début de 1640 — peut-être même en 1639 — fut negocié à Naples un traité entre l'Espagne et la Pologne qui prevoyait, avec l'aide financière de l'Espagne, une intervention militaire polonaise dans la guerre contre la France. Bientôt, toutefois, apparurent des difficultés dans l'exécution de cet accord et Ladislas IV annonça le 23 Juin 1640 que „la liberacion del Principe Cassimiro y las promesas hechas por el en Francia han en alguna parte hecho mudar de rostro al negocio...". On arriva à Varsovie à la conclusion que cet événement avait alteré la raison de l'accord „en lo esencial" et que le roi n'avait plus la liberté de declarer la guerre. On craigna aussi que Richelieu puisse inciter les Turcs à attaquer la Pologne occupée par une guerre contre la France. En 1641 une nouvelle tentative d'entente hispano-polonaise a été fortement contrariée par la diplomatie française et Ladislas IV dut démentir les bruits que son frère Jean Casimir prendrait de nouveau part dans la guerre au service de la Maison d'Autriche. Voir à ce sujet: *Elementa ad Fontium Editiones*, vol. XXI, docs. 23-25, 27-35, 37, 38, 40-61, 63-65; A. S. Radziwiłł, *Memoriale*, t. III, p. 68.

hommes capables d'vne entreprise, où estoient plusieurs personnes de condition, & entr'autres Kanopolski, qui ayant esté long temps en France, en avoit apris la langue. Il ariva en Italie sans s'estre fait cognoistre, & fut bien receu dans Milan. On luy offrit huit galeres pour le conduire en Espagne, mais il les refusa, desirant se servir d'vne galere de Genes, & sous pretexte de la liberté du commerce que les Genois ont en France, avoir moyen de visiter plus commodément la coste & les ports de Provence. Au partir de Genes il passa pres de l'Isle Sainte Marguerite, fut deux iours à Saint Tropés, dont il considera l'assiéte & le port, ne se donnant non plus à cognoistre qu'auparavant. De là il fut à Marseille par terre, & passa par Toulon, fort peu accompagné, visita la ville, le port, & les vaisseaux du Roy. Pour mieux recognoistre Marseille il y sejourna quatre jours, & sa galere s'estant arrestée vn iour entier à la Cioutat, il vint descendre sous le chasteau d'If. Ses gens, afin de se rendre moins considerables, se logerent en diverses hotelleries de Marseille, & de là feignans d'estre des passagers inconnus les vns aux autres, se rembarquerent tous le lendemain 9 de May. Ils arivérent sur le midy au port du Bouc, qui est le dernier de la Provence du costé d'Espagne; & s'estoient desja logez aux Martigues: lors qu'vn Courrier du Comte d'Alais vint porter l'ordre au Gouverneur de la place, de se saisir de la galere de Genes, & des personnes qui estoient dedans, notamment du Prince Casimir, nonobstant tout son déguisement. Le Gouverneur, homme d'age & d'experience, mit six bastardes en baterie contre le port, tenant les embraseures bouchées entre les gabions: Et apres avoir disposé la garnison, & mis ordre que la galere ne se pût retirer sans courir risque, parut seul sur la pointe d'vn petit mole, au bas de la contrescarpe du rivage, d'où il obligea, par toutes les courtoisies dont il se pût aviser, le Capitaine de la galere de Genes d'entrer dans vn petit bateau, & de mettre pied à terre, pour entrer en suite dans la forteresse, avec Kanopolski, & en suite le Prince Casimir, tous ses Gentilhommes & principaux officiers, en nombre de vingt-quatre personnes. Et sur les plaintes que ce Prince fit, lors qu'il se cognut aresté, le Gouverneur vsa de remonstrances accompagnées de respect. Et luy ayant fait entendre, qu'il n'avoit pû entrer dans le Royaume sans passe-port du Roy, en temps suspect, ayant visité les villes & ports en personne incogneuë, & dissimulant sa qualité, il le retint six iours, au bout desquels il le remit avec sa suite entre les mains du Capitaine des Gardes du Comte d'Alais, qui le conduisit à Selon, ville de Provence, à quatre lieuës d'Aix.

(*Vingt-devxiesme tome dv Mercvre François, ov Svite de l'Histoire de nostre Temps, sous le Regne du Tres-Chrestien & Tres-Auguste Roy de France & de Navarre Lovis XIII. En l'Année 1638,* Paris, 1641, pp. 250-252).

II

Le Prince Casimir, frere du Roy de Pologne, s'estant embarqué sur vne galére de Génes avec quelques Espagnols & grand nombre d'autres personnes de sa suïte, pour aller en Espagne, où il devoit estre, à ce qu'on dit, Vice-Roy

de Portugal; s'avança jusques vers la Tour de Bouc, sur les costes de cette province, où il a esté arresté & conduit dans la ville de Salon: les Consuls de laquelle ont ordre du Comte d'Aletz nostre Gouverneur de le traiter selon sa qualité. L'on a renvoyé la galére Génoise avec toute sa chiourme & équipage: mais on a retenu les Espagnols.

(Gazette, in *Recveil des Gazettes Novvelles Relations Extraordinaires et avtres recits des choses avenves tovte l'année 1638,* Paris, 1639, n.º 62, p. 247 [Nouvelle de Aix-en-Provence, 18-Mai-1638]).

III

Extraordinaire dv XXIIIe ivillet M.DC.XXXVIII. contenant Le siége de Fontarabie en Espagne, par le Prince de Condé: Et Ce qui s'est passé à l'arrest de la personne du Prince Cazimir Frere du Roy de Pologne.

Plusieurs parlans diversement de l'arrest de la personne du Prince Cazimir frere du Roy de Pologne; l'importance de l'affaire m'oblige à vous en faire le recit. Ce Prince ayant tousjours tesmoigné vne grande passion au service de la maison d'Austriche jusques à avoir levé pour le service du Roy d'Espagne, & conduit bien avant dans l'Alemagne pour faire entrer dans la Franche Comté ces Cozaques fameux par leurs frequentes revoltes, fut au commancement de cette année pourveu du Gouvernement de Portugal. Il n'eut pas plustost fait ses preparatifs pour s'y rendre en qualité de Vice Roy qu'il se proposa d'y entrer par quelque signalé service à Espagne. Pour ce faire il prend soixante personnes, & entre elles Kanopolsky homme d'intrigue qui avoit apris la langue Françoise en ce Royaume où il avoit long temps demeuré, & quelques autres personnes de condition: le reste de ce nombre estoit composé de gens entreprenans & de son train: avec lequel estant arrivé *incognito* dans l'Italie, il fut tres-bien receu à Milan; refuse huit galeres qui luy furent offertes pour le conduire en Espagne, & s'embarque en vne galére de la Seigneurie de Genes qui luy facilitoit son dessein de visiter comme il fit soigneusement la coste de Provence & ses ports. De fait, au partir de Genes, il passe à la veuë de l'Isle Sainte Marguerite: fait arrester sa galere bien equippée à Saint Tropez: y passe deux jours à visiter soigneusement la place & port de la ville estant deguisé, & ayant distribué ses gens en diverses hostelleries pour oster tout soupçon qu'il y eust là aucun de sa qualité, vivoient comme compagnons, ce Prince deferant vne fois le mesme honneur de la table & du passage que ses gens luy avoient rendu l'autre fois. Le travail de la mer ou quelque autre sujet l'ayant au partir de Saint Tropéz obligé d'aller par terre à Marseille, il passe lui cinquiesme à Toulon, y visite la ville, le port & les vaisseaux du Roy, se rend à Marseille avec ce petit train, & employe 4 jours à la visiter au dedans & au dehors. Cependant sa galére s'estant arrestée vn jour à la Cioutat, vint descendre souz le chasteau d'If: d'où son train se partageant par petites troupes dans les hosteleries de Marseille, & ne paroissans point plus de trois ensemble: ils se rembarquérent tous le lendemain matin, qui estoit le 9e de May dernier, comme passagers

inconnus les vns aux autres. Ils arrivent sur le midy au port du Bouc, qui est le dernier de la Provence du costé d'Espagne, & se logent aux Martigues avec leurs feintes accoustumées: Lesquelles ayans esté descouvertes aux lieux d'où ils venoient: vn Courier du Comte d'Alez Gouverneur de la province porteur d'vne lettre de creance du sieur de Champigny, arrive au sieur de Nargonne Gouverneur de cette place: qui lui porte l'ordre de se saisir, s'il peut, de la galére de Génes & des personnes de qualité qui estoient dedans, entr'autres de ce Prince Cazimir, nonobstant tout ce déguizement reconnu pour tel par ceux qui avoient voyagé en Pologne. Ce Gouverneur, que son grand aage a rendu pra...[1] telles affaires, met six bastardes en batterie contre le port, tenant les embrazeures bouchées entre les gabions, & dispose sa garnison en sorte qu'il ne parust sur le port que la garde ordinaire, pour oster à la galére tout soupçon, qui luy eust fait lever l'anchre: & se tenant seul sur la pointe d'vn petit mole au bas de la contrescarpe du rivage, envoye dire au Capitaine de la galére Genoise qu'il avoit receu advis des Galéres de Bizerte & d'Alger qui importoit à son salut. Le Capitaine envoye s'excuser, le Gouverneur renvoye le presser: en fin le Capitaine cedant à la peur qu'on luy fait entre dans vn petit batteau, & ayant mis pied à terre est insensiblement introduit dans la forteresse, puis Kanopolski lequel prenoit la qualité d'Ambassadeur, & en fin par leur induction le Prince Cazimir avec le reste de ses Gentilshommes & principaux Officiers au nombre de 24 personnes. Lors ce Gouverneur assaisonnant ses courtoisies & civilitez de remonstrances pour respondre à leurs plaintes fit entendre à ce Prince qu'vne personne de sa qualité ne pouvoit entrer en ce Royaume, comme il avoit fait sans passeport du Roy, mesme en vn temps suspect comme cettuy-cy (*sic*): qui est la pratique des autres Estats, mesme de l'Italie d'où il venoit & de l'Espagne ou il alloit: Mais qu'au lieu d'avoir envoyé vn Gentilhomme vers le Gouverneur de la Province lors qu'il a pris terre à Saint Tropez d'y avoir visité les villes & ports du Royaume estant deguizé, lui ostoit toute excuse. A quoi n'ayant pû rien repartir: apres avoir demeuré là six jours ce Gouverneur remit ledit Prince & sa suïte entre les mains du Capitaine des Gardes du Comte d'Alez, que les a conduit à Selon, comme vous avez sceu, où il reçoivent traitement favorable, & la galere a esté renvoyée à Genes.

Ceux qui sçavent le plus des secrets d'Espagne ne se sont pû empescher d'escrire que cette prise a arresté de grands desseins de l'Espagnol sur la Provence: où les ennemis estoient résolus de retourner, nonobstant les incroyables pertes d'hommes & d'argent qu'ils ont souffertes l'année passée, & telles qu'on fait monter à plus de vingt-mille, les hommes qui leur sont morts de maladies, & qui leur ont esté tüez en cette provïnce là, & à plus de vingt millions leurs despences à fortifier les places qu'on a reconquises sur eux, où qu'ils nous y ont laissées: mais ayans pris leurs mesures sur les projets de ce

---

1) Le papier de l'exemplaire que nous avons consulté est endommagé, rendant ce passage illisible.

Prince, sa detention les a obligez a differer leur mauvaise volonté à vn autre temps. [...].

(Ibid., n.º 90, pp. 369-371).

IV

Durant cet été [*1638*], le prince Casimir, frère du roi de Pologne, après avoir servi l'Empereur dans ses armées, fut déclaré par le roi d'Espagne vice-roi de Portugal. Pour prendre possession de cette charge il vint à Milan, et de là il s'embarqua à Final pour aller en Espagne; mais en passant sur la côte de Provence il mit pied à terre à Saint-Tropès, et entra déguisé dans la ville, d'où il alla par terre à Toulon et à Marseille, où il observoit avec grand soin la situation des lieux, et la force des villes et des ports. De là étant allé aux Martigues, toujours travesti, il y fut reconnu; et Nargonne, qui y commandoit comme gouverneur de la tour de Bouc, le fit arrêter par ordre du Comte d'Alais, gouverneur de Provence, qui le fit conduire à Salon; et quelque temps après il fut mené au château de Vincennes.

(Mémoires de François de Paule de Clermont, Marquis de Monglat, in Petitot, *Collection des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France. . . .*, tome XLIX, Paris, 1825, pp. 219-220).

V

Lettre de Richelieu au roi Ladislas IV de Pologne. 1638 (Juillet ou Août?)

Je m'asseure que lorsque Votre Majesté sçaura particulièrement les circonstances sur lesquelles le prince Casimir a esté arresté en France, elle ne le trouvera pas estrange, puisqu'il s'en alloit pour s'attacher en Espagne, entre laquelle et la France la guerre est depuis quelques années ouverte, comme sçait Votre Majesté, et qu'au lieu de passer par mer, comme il le pouvoit faire seurement, il visitoit les places et les ports de la coste de Provence sur lesquels l'Espagne a desjà fait plusieurs fois divers desseins.

La seureté des Estats ne permettant pas qu'en telles occasions ou ait esgard à la qualité des personnes, il a esté impossible à ceux qui estoient dans la province de faire autre chose que ce qu'ils ont fait, sans en avoir ordre particulier.

Maintenant la prudence ne veut pas qu'il soit deslivré sans des précautions si asseurées qu'il n'agira point contre la France, ny directement, ny qu'il n'y puisse contrevenir. Il est et sera traitté avec le respect qui est deub à une personne de sa qualité, et non à celuy qui est en l'estat auquel il est, et je tiendray à grand honneur de le voir en un autre estat pour pouvoir faire voir à Votre Majesté, en sa personne, le révérence, que je rendray tousjours à son nom comme estant. . . .

(Avenel, *Lettres, instructions diplomatiques et papiers d'Etat du Cardinal de Richelieu*, tome VII, Paris, 1874, doc. CCXXII, pp. 788-790).

VI

Lettre de Richelieu à Chavigny. Chaunes, 25-Août-1638

[...]. Je ne croy pas qu'il y ait rien à faire en l'affaire du prince Casimir qu'à représenter à son secrétaire, quand il vous parlera, le tort qu'il a eu de venir passer en France, et en recognoistre la coste, allant servir en Espagne; et cependant le bien garder. [...].

(Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VI, Paris, 1867, doc. LXXI, p. 114).

VII

... Le roi d'Angleterre, pour le délivrer [1] sans mettre la main à la bourse, fit faire de grandes instances au Roi pour donner le prince Casimir, frère du roi de Pologne, en échange de lui.

Ce prince étoit parti de Pologne pour aller en Espagne, où on lui promettoit de lui donner un grand emploi; il passa par Milan et de là à Gênes, où il fut reçu superbement; de là il s'embarqua sur une galère pour faire son voyage, et vint descendre à Saint-Tropez au commencement de mai, cachant sa qualité et feignant que le comte de Konopasquy, abbé de Vokos, qui étoit avec lui, étoit le maître de la troupe, et prenoit le nom d'ambassadeur; de Saint-Tropez il alla par terre à Marsielle, passe à Toulon, y visite la place, le port et les vaisseaux du Roi très-exactement, fait le même à Marseille, où il employa quatre jours entiers à cet exercice; et, après avoir vu ces places, il passa au château d'If, et de là au port de Bouc, qui est le dernier port de la Provence, et vit exactement avec quelques-uns des siens la situation de cette place, et les villes de Martigues et leurs fortifications; ce dont le comte d'Alais, gouverneur de Provence, ayant avis, et considérant qu'il s'est fait connoître à Milan et à Gênes, où il a été reçu magnifiquement, passe en France, déguisé et ayant peur d'être connu, en dessein d'aller en Espagne, qu'il y doit être employé, qu'il a déjà porté les armes pour la maison d'Autriche en Allemagne contre les alliés du Roi, après toutes ces choses visité nos places exactement, et particulièrement nos ports de Provence, sur lesquels nous avons avis que les Espagnols ont des desseins formés, crut être obligé de se saisir de sa personne, et en donner avis au Roi; il en envoie donner l'ordre au sieur de Nargonne, gouverneur de ladite tour de Bouc. Ce commandement étoit assez difficile à exécuter, car le prince et les siens étoient embarqués sur la galère et la galère au port, à laquelle il étoit aisé de se retirer; mais il en vint à bout par adresse, car, après avoir mis six canons en batterie contre la galère, tenant néanmoins les embrasures bouchées afin qu'elle ne prît pas l'épouvante, il alla seul au bas de la contrescarpe du rivage, et manda au capitaine de la galère qu'il avoit un avis des galères de Biserte, et qu'il le

---

1) Il est question de Robert, prince palatin, qui a été fait prisonnier par les Impériaux il y a quelque temps avant.

prioit de le venir trouver, parce qu'il avoit choses à lui dire qui étoient importantes à la sûreté de son voyage. Le capitaine, après un peu de difficulté, vint, que Nargonne retint, et demanda à parler à Konopasquy et au prince Casimir même; et ainsi il se saisit de lui et de tous les siens, qu'il mit entre les mains du capitaine des gardes du comte d'Alais, qui le conduisit dans le château de Salon, qui appartient à l'archevêque d'Arles. Sa Majesté, en ayant avis, avoua sa détention, manda au comte d'Alais qu'il le fît traiter le plus courtoisement et honorablement qu'il pourroit, et le défrayât et lui et son train, mais qu'il n'omit rien de ce qui étoit nécessaire pour le tenir en la sûreté convenable; quant au capitaine de la galère et tous ceux qui étoient auprès de lui, qu'ils les renvoyât et leur fît connoître qu'il n'auroit donné aucune interruption à leur voyage s'il n'eût eu fondement d'en user ainsi; les avertissant néanmoins que Sa Majesté attendoit de leur république qu'elle ne conduiroit ni favoriseroit à l'avenir les personnes qui pourroient, par leur qualité ou par leurs actions, être soupçonnées d'avoir des entreprises contre la France.

Dès que le roi de Pologne a avis de l'arrêt de son frère, il dépêche un secrétaire vers le Roi avec une lettre pleine de plaintes peu raisonnables, comme si on eût en cela commis une action contre le droit des gens, et que son frère n'eût point donné juste sujet de recevoir le traitement qu'on lui faisoit, disant qu'il ne croyoit pas qu'il lui eût été fait par ordre de Sa Majesté.

Sa Majesté, ayant reçu la copie de cette dépêche avant l'arrivée dudit secrétaire, ne le reçut pas si bien qu'il eût été sans cela; elle le redépêcha néanmoins à quelque temps de là, et manda au roi de Pologne que, bien que son frère eût été arrêté sans son commandement, il avoit néanmoins approuvé l'action quand on lui eût donné avis de ce qui s'étoit passé, et que, hors la juste occasion que lui et ceux de sa suite avoient donnée de douter de leurs desseins, non seulement Sa Majesté n'auroit-elle pas voulu qu'il eût été empêché en son voyage, mais elle l'auroit fait honorer, recevoir et assister par tous les endroits de son passage, et lui auroit témoigné qu'il n'y auroit pas de lieu au monde où il pût être mieux reçu, et où il eût été plus libre qu'en tous ses Estats; mais qu'en l'état où il se trouvoit, on ne pouvoit parler de sa liberté qu'avant toutes choses Sa Majesté n'eût une assurance authentique par écrit dudit Roi et de la république de Pologne, par laquelle ils assurassent que ledit prince Casimir ne porteroit jamais les armes contre le service de Sa Majesté. En même temps la république de Venise est sollicitée de s'entremettre envers le Roi pour sa délivrance; leur ambassadeur présente à Sa Majesté une lettre de sa République sur ce sujet, et montre que ladite République étoit prête d'envoyer un ambassadeur extraordinaire pour en faire une plus grande instance. Mais Sa Majesté leur fit savoir que, bien qu'elle ne trouvât rien à redire à l'office que leur ambassadeur avoit passé pour la liberté dudit prince, et que tout ce qui venoit de leur part ne lui pouvoit déplaire, pource qu'elle savoit que ses intentions leur seroient toujours en plus particulière recommandation que celles de ses ennemis, elle ne pouvoit approuver que cet office fût suivi de l'envoi d'un ambassadeur

extraordinaire; que le roi de Pologne lui en avoit écrit, qu'il avoit demandé de lui quelque sorte d'assurance, et que, l'affaire étant en cet état, leur ambassadeur ne leur pourroit remporter la satisfaction qu'ils auroient pu espérer, outre que Sa Majesté auroit lieu de trouver à redire à une déclaration si précise pour la maison d'Autriche et ses adhérens contre son Etat, et même qu'un tel procédé en faveur des rois de Pologne et de Hongrie, donneroit un juste sujet aux Suédois de soupçonner ladite République de partialité, et ainsi rétracter l'acceptation qu'ils avoient faite de sa médiation; ce qui lui ôteroit le moyen de contribuer à la paix de la chrétienté, que est la chose du monde qui lui étoit le plus à coeur; Sa Majesté ne pouvant en ce cas alléguer aucune raison qui pût démouvoir les Suédois d'une telle résolution, puisqu'elle-même s'y trouveroit intéressée.

Mais, entre toutes les sollicitations qui furent faites pour ce prince, la plus importune fut celle du roi d'Angleterre, prétendant que Sa Majesté lui devoit accorder la liberté de ce prince pour l'échange de son neveu, ne considérant pas qu'excepté la guerre ouverte, tous les mauvais offices qu'on peut recevoir d'un prince voisin, on les recevoit de lui, et en la cause publique et en choses particulières de ce royaume. Néanmoins il faisoit faire une grande instance vers Sa Majesté sur cela. Elle eut peine à s'en défaire et à lui faire connoître qu'ayant renvoyé le secrétaire de Pologne vers le Roi son maître, pour savoir qu'elle sûreté il voudroit donner que ledit prince ne servît point contre la France ni ses alliés, Sa Majesté craignoit qu'on prétendît que cette diligence fût une espèce d'engagement à délivrer le prince Casimir par cette voie, en cas que Sa Majesté y trouvât ses sûretés, quoiqu'en effet elle n'eût donné aucune parole déterminée; mais qu'en considération de la bonne amitié qui étoit entre Leurs Majestés, si Sa Majesté ne se trouvoit point engagée à délivrer ledit prince Casimir sur les simples assurances du roi de Pologne, comme en effet elle ne croyoit pas l'être, elle ne délivreroit point ledit prince sans faire de fortes et efficaces instances pour la liberté dudit prince Robert.

(Mémoires du Cardinal de Richelieu, in Petitot, *Collection* cit., tome XXX, Paris, 1823, pp. 456-460).

VIII

Avis du Conseil d'Etat au sujet des lettres du Marquis de Castañeda du 30 Novembre — 12 Décembre de l'année précédente.
Madrid, 30 Mars 1638

[...]. Refiere [...] que el Prinçipe Casimiro dessea seruir a V. Mag.d y leuantar de quatro a çino mill hombres, lanzas Polacas, y que lo hauia comunicado a su A., y refiere sus partes, lo bien que ha seruido alli y que quando estubo con el le dijo que el conde de Solrre le hauia declarado doze mill ducados de Pension anual en aquella embaxada.

Al Consejo pareçe [...] que lo que con orden de V. M.d se huuiere

offrezido al Prinçipe Casimiro es conueniente que se cumpla y se de orden para ello [...].
(Archivo General de Simancas: *Estado*, leg. 2339).

IX

Avis du Conseil d'Etat. Madrid, 7 Juin 1638

[...] En otra de la mesma fecha [*24 Février 1638*] da quenta [*le Marquis de Castañeda*] de la Venida a Spaña del Prinçipe Casimiro, por la parte de Italia.

El Conde Duque: que se avise del reciuo y preguntar al conde de Solre lo que juzga desto, pues, siendo dependiente de negoçiaçion suya, podra dar la luz neçesaria y despues tomarse la resoluçion que conuiniere. Caros son estos huespedes reales, pero si la persona fuese tal y tubiese buenos lados no era malo lo de Lisboa, por las ventajas con que se podrian adelantar las materias del comerçio con Dansic y las otras çiudades del Mar Waltico. La otra vez se le ataxo la jornada a Spaña; aora, conforme lo que disere el conde de Solre, se vera lo que se huuiere de hazer.

El Conssejo: que supuesto que ha muerto el conde de Solre se vean luego sus relaciones y las del Abbad de santa Anastasia, para ver lo que esta offreçido y si hizieron algun empeño con el para esta jornada [....].
(A. G. de Simancas: *Ibid.*).

X

Avis du Conseil d'Etat. Madrid, 16 Juin 1638

Señor

El Embajador de Alemania, imbio al Conde Duque vna carta de Don Antonio Manara (persona que venia con el Principe Casimiro), escrita desde Bayona a 9 deste mes, en que apunta el succeso de hauer lleuado a Paris al Principe y que estaua para ir a aquella Corte el Baron de Formes. El Embajador dize que este Formes ha estado en Paris por el Rey de Polonia, aun que no saue su Capacidad, y pone en consideracion si sera bien procurar que pase por aca, adonde tambien ha residido algun tiempo, para entender algo de lo que ha penetrado en aquella Corte [...].

El Conde Duque de S.^{t} Lucar auisa que V. M.^{d} manda se vea en el Conssejo la Carta y papel dichos, juzgando el Conde que en quanto a lo que propone el Embajador de hazer venir aca al Baron de Formes le parece seria empenarnos de ante mano sin sauer que vtil podria resultar dello.

Y hauiendose visto en Consejo [...], se conforma con el parecer del Conde Duque. V. M.^{d} mandara lo que mas fuere seruido.

En Madrid, a *16* de Junio de *1638*.
(A. G. de Simancas: *Ibid.*).

XI

Lettre du secrétaire Pedro de Arze à André de Rozas. Madrid, 23 Août 1638

Con ocasion de lo que el señor Duque de Medina de las Torres ha escrito sobre la detençion del Prinçipe Casimiro en Françia, ha resuelto Su M.d, en conssulta del consejo de estado de *14* deste, que lo que conuendria seria ençender al Polaco para que se vengue. Abiso dello a V. m., a quien guarde Dios como desseo. En Madrid, a *23* de Agosto *1638*.

Pedro de Arze

S.or Andres de Rozas
(A.G. de Simancas: *Ibid.*).

XII

Avis du Conseil d'Etat au sujet des rapports de l'Allemagne du Marquis de Castañeda. Madrid, 4 Septembre 1638

[...]. En otra de 4 [*Juillet*] auisa lo que se ha extrañado alli el arresto hecho en Françia del Principe Casimiro.

El Conde Duque: el Reçiuo, y lo misterioso pareçe poco fundado hasta agora, y que se queje mucho al Emperador y si pudiese encaminar que el Rey de Polonia hiziese algun resentimiento con effecto seria grandissima negoçiaçion y muy importante.

El conssejo: assi encaminando la negoçiaçion de Polonia por mano de los ministros del Emperador. [...].
(A. G. de Simancas: *Estado,* leg. 2339).

XIII

Lettre de Pedro de Arze à André de Rozas. Madrid, 4 Octobre 1638

El Conde de Siruela, en carta para Su Mag.d de *4* de Agosto, escriue el capitulo de qui va aqui copia sobre la detençion en Françia del Prinçipe Casimiro, y Su M.d, en consulta del consejo destado de *19* deste, ha resuelto que se refuerzen todos los ofiçios en Alemania y en todas partes para que en Polonia se resientan desta detençion y hagan algo contra Françia, como lo dize el Conde de Siruela, de que abiso a V. m., que guarde Dios muchos años como desseo. En Madrid, a *4* de Ottubre *1638*.

Pedro de Arze

S.or Andres de Rozas
(A. G. de Simancas: *Ibid.*).

XIV

Avis du Conseil d'Etat. Madrid, 31 Octobre 1638

Señor

V. Mag.d fue seruido de mandar por su real decreto de *29* de Settiembre que se viese en el consejo el memorial que dio a V.M.d Don Antonio Manara, embiado a esta corte por el Prinçipe Casimiro, en que refiere el acçidente de la detençion del Prinçipe en Françia y el sentimiento con que quedaua de no haver podido seguir su Viaje para vesar la real mano de V. M.d y offreçerse a su seruiçio. Dize que trae orden de su amo de representar a V. M.d como el Conde de Solre offreçio en Polonia al Principe doze mill zequies al año de pension, pagados en Milan, y que despues se lo confirmo el Abbad de Santa Anastasia, y que avnque el Reyno de Polonia reparo en que sus Prinçipes no hauian acostumbrado reçiuir sueldo de otros Reyes, todavia el Principe Casimiro, que estaua ya con deseos y resoluçion de viuir y morir en seruiçio de V. M.d, açepto y estimo como deuia la merced, y despues de hauer pasado por Milan, se hizo en su nombre instançias al Marques de Leganes para que se le pagasen dos años decorridos, y se escuso con los grandes gastos de la guerra, diziendo que V. M.d se los mandaria pagar luego en esta corte; y porque al presente le falta la comodidad neçesaria y conveniente a su qualidad, por estar detenido de la manera que se saue, supplica a V. M.d se sirua de mandar que se le pague esta cantidad prontamente, o la mayor parte della [...].

Presenta la carta que trae del Prinçipe Casimiro en su creençia [...].

Hauiendose visto en el Conssejo los memoriales referidos de Don Antonio Manara. ha pareçido [...] que se le podrian dar mill Ducados a quenta de lo que se señalo por orden de V. M.d al Prinçipe Casimiro [...].

V. Mag.d mandara lo que mas fuere servido.

Madrid, a *31* de Ottubre *1638.*

(A. G. de Simancas: *Ibid.*).

XV

Avis du Conseil d'Etat au sujet des rapports du Marquis de Castañeda Madrid, 20 Novembre 1638

[...]. En otra auisa como los señores Reyes de Polonia, con occasion de tomar los baños en Poden, venian a Viena, y lo que alli se discurria sobre esta Venida. [...].

En otra de la misma fecha [*30 Septembre*] da quenta de la Venida de los señores Reyes de Polonia a los baños de Poden y el agasajo que hizieron a su sobrino Don Fernando de Monrroy, que de su parte fue a visitarlos. [...].

El Marques, en otra de *3* del mismo para el Conde Duque, trata de la

venganza que el Rey de Polonia dessea tomar de la prision hecha en Françia del Principe su hermano.

El Conde Duque: el Reçiuo y aprobaçion y verdaderamente que si pegase esta mina juzga que seria el medio mas efficaz y ajustado para hazer venir en la paz al Rey de Françia, tanto mas si logo viniesen en este rompimiento, y no tiene ninguna duda en que el Rey de Francia, si viese venir el nublado, resueltamente se atreuiese de ninguna manera en poner manos en Casimiro, antes bien le guardarian como a reliquia que les seruiria de dar la paz; el Marques se ha portado bien, y assi se le debe agradezer y dezirle que un gran seruicio seria de V. M.d que encaminase esto, hauiendose en ello passiuamente, con que cree se ayudara mas a la resoluçion [...]. Tambien se debe ordenar al Marques que encarezca mucho al de Polonia el sentimiento de V. M.d en esta sin razon y agrauio y falta de fee publica, y de quanto procurara por todos caminos el remedio delo, y enquanto a los officios con la Republica, se podran hazer sin poner ninguna difficultad, si bien se puede esperar poco del fauor que se alcanza alli que hayan de tener buen effecto los que alli se hizieren.
(A. G. de Simancas: *Ibid.*).

XVI

Lettre de Richelieu à Chavigny. Péronne, 30 Août 1638

[...]. Il y a icy un envoyé de Pouloigne qui s'en va trouver le roy sur le sujet de la détention du prince Casimir, lequel ne vous deplaira pas, estant assez gaillard de sa nature. Vous l'escouterés; ensuite il luy faut donner *bona verba,* et demeurer *in deliberatis* quant à la détention du prince Casimir. [...]. (Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VI, doc. LXXIX, p. 127).

XVII

Au même mois d'Octobre 1638, le Sieur *Demsky,* soi disant Gentilhomme, Envoyé de Pologne, pour s'avancer quelques jours de voir le Roi, disant être pressé, étant venu au sujet du Prince *Casimir* frere du dit Roi [*de Pologne*], prisonnier à *Salon,* en Provence, demanda à voir leurs Majestés, sans Cérémonie; ce qui fut fait s'étant rendu à St. *Germain* le dit Sieur de *Berlise* le leur presenta: Et comme il demanda Congé, se mettant en pretention d'être traité comme les Gentilshommes Envoyés, on lui demanda son passeport, où ayant trouvé qu'on ne lui donnoit aucune qualité, on lui refusa de le traiter comme les Gentilshommes, & on l'obligea de se rendre encore à St. Germain seul où le même de *Berlise* le présenta encore à leurs Majestés pour en prendre Congé sans aucune Cérémonie & même partit sans avoir de presens.

(Du Monte et Rousset, *Le ceremonial diplomatique des Cours de l'Europe,* t. I, Amsterdam, 1739, p. 133).

XVIII

Les Polonnois se plaignent icy fort haut du mauvais traittement qu'ils ont receu à Vienne, & de ce que le Roy de Hongrie n'a pas rendu assez d'honneur à leur Roy ni à ses Officiers qui menacent de s'en vanger quelque jour. [...]. Le 7e de ce moïs ledit Roy de Pologne partit de Warsau pour Grotno en Lituanie: On croid qu'il s'abouchera par le chemin avec l'Electeur de Brandebourg. Les Estats de Pologne n'ont point voulu se mesler de solliciter la liberté du Prince Casimir, d'autant qu'il a entrepris ce voyage sans leur avis, & qu'il a esté arresté pendant qu'il estoit au service des estrangers & non pas de cette couronne.

(N. O. du douziesme Février 1639, in *Recveil des Gazettes* [...] *des choses avenves* [...] *pendant l'année mil six cent trente-neuf.,* Paris, 1640, n.o 17, p. 85 [De Dantzig, 10 Janvier 1639]).

XIX

"Mémoire au Sieur du Houssay, Conseiller du Roy en son Conseil d'Estat et son Ambassadeur à Venise.

Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 27 décembre 1638.

Le sr Corave, ambassadeur de la République de Venise en cette cour, a présenté une lettre de ses seigneurs au roy, par laquelle ilz font instance auprès de S. M. pour la liberté du prince Cazimir de Poulogne, et ledit sieur ambassadeur a ajousté que ladite République estoit preste d'envoyer un ambassadeur extraordinaire sur ce sujet".

En présentant la lettre du roy à la République, M. du Houssay dira que ce qui vient d'elle ne peut déplaire au roy... Un des secrétaires de S. M. polonaise est venu solliciter la liberté de ce prince; il est reparti avec cette réponse, que "S. M. s'excuse d'accorder ce que demande le roy de Pologne, désirant avant toutes choses une asseurance par escrit de luy authentique et de la République de Poulongne, par laquelle ils asseurent que ledit prince Cazimir ne portera jamais les armes contre le service de S.M.". M. du Houssay fera en sorte que la République n'envoie pas un ambassadeur qui n'obtiendrait rien.

"Ledit sr ambassadeur Corave a fait de fortes instances auprès du roy, du cardinal et vers le sr de Chavigni... il n'a peu y faire prendre une autre résolution que celle ci-dessus..."
(Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VIII, Paris, 1877, p. 350).

XX

[...]. Le Baron Biboni Ambassadeur de Roy de Pologne, arrivé depuis peu en cette ville, pour prier cette Republique de la part de ce Roy, qu'elle vueille s'interposer envers Sa Majesté Tres-Chrestienne, pour la délivrance du Prince Casimir de Pologne, a fait de si grandes instances à ce Senat, qu'apres

avoir remontré à ce Baron Polonnois le droit qu'on avoit de retenir ce Prince prisonnier en France, ayant esté pris comme il alloit en habit déguisé reconnoistre les endroits pour l'attaquer: Il s'est enfin laissé emporter à ses poursuites, & a declaré pour cet effet le Sr Bartolomeo de Passano Ambassadeur extraordinaire en France. [...].

(Gazette, in *Recveil des Gazettes* [...] *des choses avenves* [...] *pendant l'année mil six cent trente-neuf.,* Paris, 1640, n.º 24, p. 114 [de Gênes, 3 Février 1639]).

XXI

Le Roy de Pologne est arrivé en Litavie. Le Sr Denhof, qu'il avoit envoyé en ambassade à Vienne, y a fait 3 propositions. I. Que son Maistre ayant avis certain que le Grand Seigneur vouloit faire la guerre en la Chrestienté, il exhortait le Roy de Hongrie de faire la paix dans l'Empire. II. [...]. III. De consentir que le Prince Robert soit échangé pour le Prince Casimir.

(N. O. du cinquiesme Mars 1639., ibid., n.º 27, p. 125 [De Dantzig, 5 Février 1639]).

XXII

[...]. On escrit de Pologne qu'on y prépare vne magnifique ambassade pour la France: & que le Sr Gasiesosky *(sic)* Referendaire de Litüanie, ou le Sr Sapieha Mareschal de la mesme province, en sera le chef. On croit que son principal dessein est de solliciter la liberté du Pr. Casimir. [...].

(N. O. du trentiesme Avril 1639., ibid., n.º 51, p. 229 [De Dantzig, 31 Mars 1639]).

XXIII

[...]. Le 2e de ce mois, le Sr Christophle Corvinus Gosiewsky Palatin de Smolensko Ambassadeur extraordinaire de Pologne, fit son entrée en cette ville par la porte de S. Denys, accompagné de plusieurs Seigneurs Polonnois, de seize Gentils-hommes suivans, huit Pages & seize estafiers vestus de livrées de velours rouge cramoisi avec passemens d'or & d'argent: ayant esté receu hors la ville par le Mareschal de la Mesleraye, assisté du Comte de Brulon Introducteur des Ambassadeurs, & de plusieurs autres Seigneurs de marque, & suivi d'vn grand cortege; à la veuë d'vne multitude incroyable de personnes de cette ville, accourüe à ce spectacle. [...].

(*Gazette,* in *Recveil des Gazettes,* année 1640, n.º19, p. 84 [De Paris, 4 Février 1640]).

XXIV

Décret du roi Louis XIII de France. Sans date (Février 1640?)

Nous, etc... ne doutant point que le prince Casimir n'observe religieusement la parole qu'il nous a donnée de ne porter point les armes contre nous,

ny contre nos confédérez, en faveur des princes avec lesquels nous et eux sommes présentement en guerre, que l'Ambassadeur du roy et de la république de Pologne s'y est obligé de la part du roy, de la république et de la diette, nous avons bien voulu, pour le désir que nous avons de donner pleine et entière satisfaction au roy, à la république et à la diette, mettre en liberté le prince Casimir...
(Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VII, p. 789, note).

XXV

Lettre de Richelieu à Chavigny. Ruel, 26 Février 1640

Je suis bien aise que l'affaire du prince Cazimir soit terminée. On ne sçauroit, à mon avis, s'exempter de le traitter; soit qu'il demeure à l'hostel des ambassadeurs, soit qu'on le loge à l'hostel de Schomberg, il faut faire les choses honorablement: s'il demeure à l'hostel des ambassadeurs, il est besoin du luy faire promptement bien meubler un appartement et le traitter par présens, ses officiers et ceux de l'ambassadeur estant suffisants pour le servir; s'il va à l'hostel de Schomberg, il faudra le traitter par les officiers du roy, ce qui sera un peu plus incommode.

Quand il partira d'icy, j'estime à propos que S. M. luy donne une espée de 3 ou 4 mille escus. Pour cet effect Loppez en a une. Il y en a d'autres dans Paris; vous mettrez Mondain en queste comme si c'estoit pour l'envoyer en Savoye.

Quant à l'affaire du prince Palatin, le temps nous fera voir ce qui en réussira. [...].
(Avenel, *op. cit.*, t. VII, doc. CCXXXI, pp. 812-813).

XXVI

Traitement fait au Prince Iean Cazimir apres son êlargissement du Château de Vincennes en 1640.

Le Prince Iean Cazimir estoit fils de Sigismond III, qui possedoit la Pologne par droict d'Election, et qui estoit Roy hereditaire de la Suede dont il auoit esté depoüillé par son oncle Charles. [...].

Voicy la cause de sa detention.

Ce Prince montroit beaucoup de passion pour la Maison d'Autriche, et coe[t]. Il cherchoit les moiens d'en donner des preuves. Il eut dessein de la seruir contre la France; pour reussir dans ses projets, il prit auec luy 60 hommes habiles et gens de main. Le Prince avec toute sa suite alla jncognito en Italie. Cependant il fut receu avec honneur à Milan; on luy offrit huit Galeres pour son transport en Espagne, d'ou il deuoit partir pour aller en Portugal en qualité de Vice-Roy. Il les refusa, et en prit vne de la Republique de Genes coe.[t] *(sic)*, estant plus commode dans le dessein qu'il auoit d'obseruer plus aisement et sans soupçon les ports qu'il vouloit visiter. En sortant de Genes au commencement du mois d'aoust *1639*, il alla à l'Isle de Sainte

Marguerite, et de la à S.t Turpin *(sic)*, ou trouvant vn endroit propre à cacher sa Galere, il y passa deux jours à visiter tout seul le Ville, le port, et tous les autres lieux qui meritoient d'estre veus, faisant loger separement sa suite en plusieurs hosteleries avec ordre qu'on ne luy rendit aucun honneur, n'y chez luy, n'y ailleurs, de peur d'estre connu. De Saint Turpin il partit à Cheual auec peu de suite pour Marseille. En chemin faisant, il s'arresta à Toulon, ou il demeura cinq jours. Il y vit exactement la scituation du lieu, le port, les magazins, les munitions, et les vaisseaux de guerre. Estant arrivé à Marseille, il y passa quatre jours à visiter les dehors et les dedans de la Ville; pendant ce temps la sa Galere demeura au port de la Ciuta; de la Elle alla au Château d'If; la les gens du Prince, par petites bandes, vinrent à Marseille, et s'y logerent separement; l'on en voioit jamais que deux ou trois ensemble. Le Prince et tout son monde, apres le sejour qu'ils y firent, s'embarquerent vn à vn sur la Galere le plus secretement qu'ils purent, et arriverent à la Tour de Bouc, frontiere de la Provence. Ils allerent à terre à la maniere accoustuméé; de la ils se rendirent à Martigues, ou le Prince, estant reconnu, fut arresté avec toute sa suite par l'ordre du Comte d'Alais, Gouverneur de la Province. Le 15 Septembre il fut conduit à Lion, d'ou on le transfera au Château de Vincennes. Il en sortit en *1640,* à la sollicitation du Roy son frere, qui envoia vn Gentil-homme expres pour faire la demande de son êlargissement au Roy. On me pardonnera ce trait d'histoire; je reuiens à ce qui regarde le Ceremonial. [. . .].

Ce Prince eut le 20 Mars son audience de congé à S.t Germain. Il y fut conduit avec les mêmes Ceremonies qu'à sa 1.ere audience, et fut receu de même du Roy, qui luy donna vne bague de grand prix qu'il tira de son doigt en signe d'amitié perpetuelle, et luy envoia vne Enseigne de pierreries digne de sa magnificence.

Pendant tout le sejour que le Prince Cazimir fit à Paris, il avoit tous les jours les Carosses du Roy, et de la Reyne; quatre Pages du Roy, et six de ses valets de pied.

Le Comte de Brulon l'accompagnoit partout ou il alloit.

(Memoires de Monsr. de Sainctot Introducteur des Ambassadeurs, t. IV —Bibliothèque de Ajuda, Lisbonne: *Ms. 47-XIII-4,* pp. 61-68).

XXVII

Le 8e, le Prince Cazimir frere du Roy de Pologne, alla salüer à Saint Germain Leurs Majestez: où il disna à la table du Roy. Le soir du mesme jour, il vint aussi en cette ville visiter Son Eminence dans l'Hostel de Richelieu: & fut magnifiquement receu par tout. Le lendemain S. E. lui rendit sa visite.

(Gazette, in *Recveil des Gazettes,* année 1640, n.o 33, p. 144 [De Paris, 10 Mars 1640]).

XXVIII

[. . .]. Le 20, le Prince Cazimir fut conduit à Saint Germain par le Comte de Brulon, Introducteur des Ambassadeurs & Princes estrangers: où ce Prince

ayant pris congé de Leurs Majestez, le Roy tira de son doigt vne bague de tres-grand prix, qu'il lui donna en signe d'amitié perpétüelle. Il fut le mesme jour à Rüel visiter Son Eminence, qui lui fit voir les raretez de son parc. Le mesme jour le Comte de Brulon porta de la part de Sa Majesté à l'Ambassadeur extraordinaire de Pologne, vne enseigne de pierreries de grand prix. [. . .].
(*Gazette,* ibid, n.º 41, p. 176 [De Paris, 24 Mars 1640]).

XXIX

Lettre de M. de Roissy à son fils, le Comte d'Avaux. Paris, 30 Mars 1640

. . . Vostre dit frère, ny moy, n'avons ouy parlé dudit ambassadeur [*Gosiewski*] qui partit hier, comme je croy, et le Prince Cazimir aussy très satisfaict du Roy et de S. E., mais très mal de Monsieur qui n'a pas voullu luy donner la main droite chez soy. Il a visité cinq fois la Princesse Marie et croy qu'il remporte son portrait, qu'on dit qu'elle luy a donné. [. . .].

(Correspondance inédite du Comte d'Avaux (Claude de Mesmes) avec son père Jean-Jacques de Mesmes, Sr de Roissy (1627-1642), publ. par A. Boppe, Paris, 1887, p. 211).

XXX

On nous escrit de Dantzic [. . .] que le Prince Casimir est dans la dite ville de Warsau avec le Roy son frere [. . .].

(N. O. du treziéme Avril 1641., in *Recveil des Gazettes* [. . .] *des choses avenves tovte l'année mil six cens quarante-vn.,* Paris, 1642, n.º 43, p. 206 [De Hambourg, 17 Mars 1641]).

XXXI

La Diéte de Pologne qui s'est tenuë à Warsau, est finie. On y a résolu, entr'autres choses, qu'il ne seroit desormais permis au Roy de Pologne ni à aucun Prince de sortir du Royaume, sans le consentement des Estats.

(N. O. du neufiesme Novembre 1641., ibid., n.º 140, p. 821 [De Dantzig, 11 Octobre 1641]).

FRANK MOCHA
(NEW YORK)

TADEUSZ BUŁHARYN (FADDEJ V. BULGARIN) 1789-1859: A STUDY IN LITERARY MANEUVER

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia University
1970

INTRODUCTION

Tadeusz Bułharyn (1789-1859) or, in the Russian version of the name, Faddej Venediktovich Bulgarin, was an extremely controversial figure on the Russian literary scene. A descendant of a patriotic Polish family, he had been, in succession, a Russian and then a French officer, before ultimately embarking on a literary career in Russia. Unlike Pushkin and Mickiewicz, his contemporaries, he was not a great writer, but he nevertheless became that rare and formidable phenomenon in the Russia of his day: a successful man of letters. At a time when most writers found it difficult to write freely or profitably, Bulgarin enjoyed, from the early 1820's until the 1850's, success as an important journalist, a popular novelist, and an influential critic. His literary activity paralleled several important developments, such as the rise of Russian journalism and literary criticism, the decline of poetry and the simultaneous rise of prose fiction, as well as the onset of a conservative tendency in Russian literature; Bulgarin took an active, often leading part in all these developments. For these reasons, and because there is no really definitive work on him, he deserves study.

The present work does not intend to be a definitive literary biography of Bulgarin, but will focus on only one period of his career, the period leading up to his successes. The decision to limit the range of this work to the early period is a logical one: Bulgarin was a very prolific writer, and it would be difficult to deal with him *in toto* within the space of one essay. Furthermore, it is not the purpose of the author to get bogged down in the gossip, intrigue and accusations, which surrounded Bulgarin's later career to such an extent that it is doubtful now whether an accurate picture of the man can ever be derived.

In the early stage of his career Bulgarin maintained close ties with the Russian liberals, particularly the future Decembrists, who had welcomed him in Russia and with some of whom he remained close to the end. A literary operator *par excellence*, in order to promote his growing publishing ventures, he also kept on good terms with the increasingly reactionary Russian authorities. In the later stage of his career, after the rout of the liberals in 1825, Bulgarin's dependence on the authorities—for reasons of security—became stronger, culminating in his being ac-

cused of betraying the liberal cause and even of collaborating with the secret police. In view of Bulgarin's continued success, professional jealousy was no doubt at the root of at least some of these accusations. They are mentioned here because they were chiefly responsible for the distorted and incomplete picture of Bulgarin which survived to this day. Beginning with Pushkin's epigrams, Bulgarin was invariably represented as a traitor (on account of his service with Napoleon), as a police informer (an accusation which has never been proved conclusively), as an ultra-conservative editor of *The Northern Bee*,[1] and as an arch-reactionary who was opposed, hated and feared by every decent and liberal voice in Russia. This picture of Bulgarin, painted by his contemporaries, was repeated by their followers. No effort was made to separate the writer from the ruthless opportunist Bulgarin was declared to be. As a result, until fairly recently, there was no attempt to evaluate Bulgarin's literary significance.

The only book-length work devoted exclusively to Bulgarin are his own *Memoirs*,[2] a huge, six-volume account of his activities from birth until 1811, with frequent digressions on everything and everybody Bulgarin came into contact with later on. The book is too subjective to be used for anything except the bare facts of Bulgarin's early years. Bulgarin's life was also the subject of a large part of an autobiography of Nikolaj Grech,[3] his partner in the journalistic field. It is a valuable source, but has to be approached cautiously, because Grech was primarily writing about himself, and would readily sacrifice Bulgarin's reputation to show himself in a better light. Grech's account of Bulgarin is to be found in some of his other works, but the pattern, with small changes, is essentially the same. Another writer who wrote extensively on Bulgarin was Mikhail Lemke (1872-1923),[4] an expert on the Russian police and censorship during the reign of Nicholas I, but his account concentrates on Bulgarin's alleged co-operation with the police. Consequently, Lemke perpetuates the one-sided image created by Bulgarin's contemporaries. Because of Lemke's bias (he was, incidentally, a member of the Russian Communist Party), the more reliable parts of his account are those in which he speaks well of Bulgarin, or those which are confirmed by other sources, just as the more credible parts of Bulgarin's own biography are those in which he does not exaggerate his own rôle.

The last years of Bulgarin's life were described by P. S. Usov who,

---

[1] ***Severnaja Pchela*, Gazeta politicheskaja i literaturnaja**, S. Peterburg, 1825-1859.

[2] **F. V. Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*,** S. Peterburg, M .D. Ol'khin, 1846-1849.

[3] Nikolaj I. Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, S. Peterburg, A. S. Suvorin, 1886.

[4] **Mikhail Lemke, *Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1825-1855 gg.*,** S. Peterburg, S. V. Bunin, 1909. Also: "Faddej Bulgarin," *Ocherki po istorii russkoj cenzury i zhurnalistiki XIX stoletija*, S. Peterburg, "Trud," 1904.

as a young man, had been assistant to both Grech and Bulgarin on *The Northern Bee.*[5] It is a valuable source, not just because it is one of the few articles sympathetic to Bulgarin, but because it is extremely objective in depicting Bulgarin's growing isolation. Usov could afford to be objective because Bulgarin needed him more than he needed Bulgarin.

Nothing written on Bulgarin during his lifetime can be regarded as reliable. It was written either by Bulgarin's allies or enemies, thus not objectively. For example, Grech's short biography of Bulgarin, written in 1828,[6] is full of praise of Bulgarin; Belinski's meticulous summary of Bulgarin's literary career, written in 1847,[7] was designed to demolish him.

According to Grech, who outlived Bulgarin, the general hostility towards his erstwhile partner followed him even after his death.[8] Accordingly, in most histories of nineteenth century Russian literature, his importance is minimized, with possibly the sole exception of Engelhardt's history,[9] in which he is accorded a modest place in the mainstream of Russian literature. However, it is possible to learn more about Bulgarin by researching numerous scattered sources from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.[10] Of particular interest are articles on Bulgarin by A. L. Pogodin,[11] the only Russian critic who understood Bulgarin's peculiar predicament in Russia.

Of some significance for the study of Bulgarin are references to his works in the Russian Formalists' writings on Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. While no direct borrowing is implied, there are similarities between some of Bulgarin's works and the works of the two great Russian writers. The explanation is that both Dostoevsky and Tolstoy had read Bulgarin's picaresque and historical novels, and were influenced by them.

Among Soviet critics, V. F. Pereverzev wrote about Bulgarin in connection with Pushkin and the picaresque novel,[12] and V. Kaverin, in

---

[5] P. S. Usov, "K biografii Bulgarina," *Istoricheskij Vestnik*, 1883, VIII, pp. 284-331.

[6] Nikolaj I. Grech, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina," *Russkaja Starina*, 1871, Vol. IV, pp. 514-520.

[7] V. G. Belinskij, "Vospominanija Faddeja Bulgarina'" *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij*, Moskva, Akad. Nauk, 1953, Vol. IX, pp. 613-670.

[8] Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, pp. 436-437.

[9] N. Engel'gardt, *Istorija russkoj literatury XIX stoletija*, Tom pervyj, 1800-1850, S. Peterburg, A. S. Suvorin, 1902.

[10] For example, the journals: *Russkaja Starina* (Petersburg), and *Russkij Arkhiv* (Moscow) contain much valuable material on Bulgarin.

[11] A. L. Pogodin, "Russkie pisateli-Poljaki," *Prace Polskiego Towarzystwa dla Badań Europy Wschodniej i Bliskiego Wschodu*, Kraków, Nr. IV, 1933/34. Also: "Ivan Vyzhigin, roman Faddeja Bulgarina," *Zapiski Russakago Nauchnago Instituta v Belgrade*, Vypusk 9, 1933.

[12] V. F. Pereverzev, "Pushkin v bor'be s russkim plutovskim romanom," *U istokov russkago realisticheskogo romana*, Moskva 1965 (1933).

connection with journalism.[13] Bulgarin's literary career is outlined in the official Soviet *History of the Russian Novel*,[14] and in the *History of Russian Literature*.[15]

In the West, until very recently, Bulgarin has been treated only peripherally in books and articles on other nineteenth century Russian writers and journalists, since it is virtually impossible to discuss Pushkin, Gogol', or any of Bulgarin's contemporaries, without mentioning Bulgarin. The treatment that he received in these works was invariably negative. The situation is, however, beginning to change, and Bulgarin is receiving more attention. Jurij Striedter, for example, gives Bulgarin's novel, *Ivan Vyzhigin*,[16] an extensive treatment in his book, *The Picaresque Novel in Russia*.[17] Two American doctoral dissertations have come out recently, one discussing Bulgarin's contribution to the nineteenth century Russian prose,[18] the other, his historical novels.[19] Both were followed by their authors' articles in *The Slavic and East European Journal*. The present dissertation will be a further contribution to our knowledge and understanding of Bulgarin.

This dissertation will stress, as the proper approach to Bulgarin, an examination of the circumstances under which he worked. The fact that he was a Pole in Russia in times of crises: the Napoleonic Wars, the Decembrist Revolt of 1825, the Polish Insurrection of 1830-31, and the European Revolutions of 1848 (the dissertation will limit itself to the first two crises) and a former French officer who had actually fought against Russia in 1812, helped to shape his destiny in that country. He was extremely vulnerable and under constant suspicion; he had to prove his loyalty again and again. He was, therefore, careful in his choice of themes and genres; he frequently changed his emphasis, and even abandoned some in favour of others. These constant changes provide a study of the ways a Polish writer could, or perhaps had to, maneuver in Russia in order to be succesful.

Bulgarin's reputation in Russia rests on his activities in the late 1820's, the 1830's, and the 1840's during which, as an already established writer and journalist, he jealously (and notoriously) guarded his position.

---

[13] V. Kaverin, "Legenda o zhurnal'nom Triumvirate," *Zvezda*, No. 1, pp. 160-192.

[14] Akademija Nauk SSSR, *Istorija russkogo romana*, Moscow, 1962.

[15] ———, *Istorija russkoj literatury*. Moscow, 1963.

[16] F. V. Bulgarin, *Ivan Vyzhigin, nravstvenno-satiricheskij roman*, Sanktpeterburg, v tipografii vdovy Pljushar, 1829.

[17] Jurij Striedter, *Der Schelmenroman in Russland*, Berlin, Osteuropa Institut, 1961.

[18] Nicholas P. Vaslef, *Faddej V. Bulgarin: His Contribution to Nineteenth Century Russian Prose*, Unpublished dissertation, Harvard, 1966.

[19] Gilman H. Alkire, *The Historical Novels of Faddej Bulgarin*, Unpublished dissertation, Berkeley, 1966.

Little attention has been paid to his early period (1816-1825) which, by virtue of falling between two crises: the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the Decembrist Revolt, had an identity of its own. In this period of Bulgarin's literary apprenticeship, he explored the genres and themes he was ever going to explore, and ended with his most immediate success, the novel *Ivan Vyzhigin.* The present work will limit itself to a discussion of this period, a period characterized further by Bulgarin's relentless and successful drive to establish himself as a writer.

With these self-imposed limitations, the dissertation will concern itself with the following:

(1) Because Bulgarin is still a relatively unknown writer, a chapter (I) will be devoted to his early biography. The biography will provide insight into his personality and the beginning of his career, and account for certain of his later actions and writings.

(2) Another chapter (II) will describe, chronologically, Bulgarin's methods in becoming a literary figure between 1820 and 1825, and will give special attention to his journalistic activity.

(3) A short chapter (III) will be devoted to Bulgarin's first writings.

(4) Three chapters (IV-VI) will discuss the various themes and genres in Bulgarin's writings between 1820 and 1825. The discussion will concentrate on the shifts of emphasis, and Bulgarin's cleverness in promoting his own writings.

(5) One chapter (VII) will be devoted to Bulgarin's first and most successful novel, *Ivan Vyzhigin,* and to the maneuvers that went into it before its ultimate publication in 1829, after having been almost finished in 1825.

(6) A special chapter (VIII) will be devoted to Bulgarin's literary criticism, an important factor in his overall success.

Because of its particular approach to Bulgarin, the dissertation will be an assessment of Bulgarin's works from a point of view to be maintained throughout, namely, that Bulgarin's literary career responded to conditions in Russia; one of these responses was that his literary treatment of Poland—becoming more and more a part of Russia—shifted with every change in political climate; his literary treatment of Russia also shifted. The result of these, and other, maneuvers was that Bulgarin succeeded in staying in the centre of things and in "making it."

---

[20] The biographical details contained in this chapter are drawn mainly from the following sources: F. V. Bulgarin, *Vospominanija,* S. Peterburg, M. D. Ol'khin, 1846-1849; Nikolaj Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni,* S. Peterburg, A. S. Suvorin, 1886; Mikhail Lemke, *Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1825-1855 gg.,* S. Peterburg, S. V. Bunin, 1909. Of these three works, Bulgarin's is understandably subjective. Grech's account seems to be the most reliable, if only by virtue of the fact that Grech, long-time patron and friend of Bulgarin in Russia, wrote it long after their friendship had come to an end in the 1850's. Lemke's analysis has the aura of a hatchet job, consequently, it is preoccupied with the more sordid details of Bulgarin's life. All three works contain omissions and discrepancies in biographical data but, among the three of them and with the help of other sources, it is possible to outline a reasonably accurate account of Bulgarin's colorful career.

PART I

BACKGROUND

Chapter I: BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND [20]

Historical events had a great impact on Bulgarin's life. He lived in a time of great upheavals and was deeply affected by them. In his works, he betrays a keen concern with history, and an awareness of its influence on human lives. He writes:

> The year of my birth (1789) is marked by the beginning of the upheaval which overthrew the ancient French monarchy and, like an earthquake and a volcanic eruption, changed the outlook and the internal order not only of Europe, but also of America. The sparks of the French Revolution reached Poland, which was then like a store of gunpowder. . . .[21]

Thus, he not only expresses a historical judgment, but also conveys a feeling of certain pride, a sense of involvement in an important age. This sense of personal involvement, of participation, is present in much of his writing, both in his *Memoirs:* "My early years were spent amidst unusual events, which form a part of history . . ." [22] and in the use of many biographical details included in his other works. To be sure, Bulgarin glamorizes the period, when he writes about it in terms such as: "Our age—an age of marvels and military glory!" [23] He romanticizes it by speaking about the "heroic spirit of the times." [24] But this is only natural in descriptions dealing with the Napoleonic era, particularly by one of its participants. The sense of participation is strengthened further by Bulgarin's countless and often boastful reports of his encounters with important people, Polish, Russian, French, etc., including Napoleon himself. As a result, a picture of Bulgarin emerges in which in the words of a reliable nineteenth-century historian of Russian literature, "He was an undoubted adventurer, a man who had seen much in his time." [25] But this picture of Bulgarin is not a complete one.

---

[21] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, I, p. 3.

[22] *Ibid.*, I, p. 2.

[23] *Ibid.*, V, p. 242.

[24] *Ibid.*, IV, p. IX.

[25] N. Engel'gardt, *Istorija russkoj literatury XIX stoletija*, Tom pervyj, 1800-1850, S. Peterburg, A. S. Suvorin, 1902, p. 292.

Alongside the picture of a man wanting to be admired as a soldier and, later, as a writer, emerges a picture of another Bulgarin, a man who presents himself as merely the victim of circumstances. In the same sentence in which he speaks of his involvement with history, Bulgarin says: ". . . and it was my fate to be tossed about, like a small drop of water together with huge waves, in the stormy sea, until I was thrown on the shore." [26] In this self-dramatizing assessment of his rôle, Bulgarin deliberately plays down the degree of his involvement and participation in the events of the time. These events were the upheavals preceding and accompanying the third and final partition of Poland, and the wars following Napoleon's successful penetration of Central and Eastern Europe, directly and indirectly involving Poland and culminating in the campaign of 1812. In his *Memoirs,* Bulgarin seeks to play down this part of his career because it is closely connected with his Polish heritage—an accident of history, one which became a definite handicap to him once he settled in Russia permanently after 1812. But mainly he plays it down because during the period in question, he managed to change sides three times and actually participated in Napoleon's invasion of Russia, something which the Russians have never forgiven him. He is trying to tell his Russian readers that before he was "thrown on the shore," i.e., into Russia after 1812, he was merely a "small drop" in a "huge wave" of history. This may be true as far as his childhood experiences are concerned, but was by no means certain afterwards, once he was capable of making independent decisions. Because the pattern of his early decisions has a direct bearing on his evolution, it is necessary to examine his background in some detail.

1. *Family Background*

Despite the un-Polish sound of his name, Bulgarin's Polish background is beyond dispute. The family was rooted in Polish history and social order: for centuries, its members held various military, administrative and honorary positions in the Polish Commonwealth. According to the pre-Revolutionary *Russian Biographical Dictionary,* "The Bulgarins were fanatically devoted to everything Polish." [27]

The un-Polish name is explained by Bulgarin himself in a lengthy and well documented footnote to his *Memoirs.*[28] The footnote says that the family came from Bulgaria, where it belonged to an ancient aristocratic clan called Skanderbek (or Szkanderbek, in Polish spelling). The name of the legendary clan itself is of Albanian origin; Bulgarin shows his awareness of the fact by refering to himself as of "Albanian

---

[26] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 2.

[27] A. A. Polovcov, *Russkij biograficheskij slovar'*, S. Peterburg, 1908, Vol. 3, pp. 476-479.

[28] Bulgarin, "Pojasnenija," *Vospominanija,* I, p. 307 ff.

blood." [29] The Skanderbeks had left Bulgaria "probably as a result of internal confusion of the country," and had settled "in White Russia, that is *free* Russia" [30]—not under the rule of the Mongols—long before the union of Lithuania with Poland." [31] Although in official documents they continued to be called Szkanderbek, a new name, Bułharyn (later changed to Bulgarin in Russia), which at first served primarily to denote their place of origin, gradually became the accepted name. During the reign of King Zygmunt III Vasa (1587-1632), the so-called "King of the Jesuits," [32] the Bułharyns embraced Roman Catholicism,[33] and from then on they played prominent rôles in the social and political affairs of Poland and Lithuania.

The Bułharyns took great pride in their history and family connections. The writer's father, Benedykt, claimed the powerful Prince Karol Radziwiłł ("Panie Kochanku") as his uncle. A great-uncle was supposedly mentioned by the Polish poet and historian, Niemcewicz, as inspiringly patriotic at the time of the First Partition of Poland.[34] Aniela Buczyńska Bułharyn, the writer's mother, traced her descent directly to Jan Buczyński, "the well-known Chancellor and friend of False Dimitrij (he believed that Dimitrij was genuine)";[35] one of her brothers, also named Jan Buczyński, was Adjutant-General to Stanisław August Poniatowski, the last King of Poland. Bulgarin himself hints at "old family connections" with Tadeusz Kościuszko,[36] the hero of Poland and America. He indicates that he himself was christened Tadeusz (Faddej in Russian version) after Kościuszko.

2. *Last Years under Polish Rule*

Bulgarin was born at Pieryszew, his mother's estate in the Mińsk Województwo [37] (later Gubernia), 1789, seventeen years after the First

---

[29] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, III, p. 263.

[30] As a matter of fact, at that time White Russia (Byelorussia) already belonged to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but Lithuanian domination was preferable to that of the Mongols; hence, it is possible to speak of "free" Russia.

[31] Bulgarin, "Pojasnenija," *op. cit.*, I, p. 308.

[32] W. F. Reddaway, ed., *The Cambridge History of Poland*, Vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, 1941, p. XV.

[33] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, I, p. 72.

[34] N. I. Grech, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina,'" *Russkaja Starina*, 1871, Vol. IV, p. 515. Also, Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 24 ff.

[35] Bulgarin, "Pojasnenija," *op. cit.*, I, p. 312. Jan Buczyński figures prominently in Bulgarin's historical novel, *Dimitrij the Impostor*, 1830, I, 17 ff., III, 84, 86 ff.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 313.

[37] An administrative unit and a military district into which the Polish Commonwealth was divided.

Partition of Poland and six years before the final dissolution of the Commonwealth. Pieryszew, like the other family estates further west, was then still a part of Poland, and there did not seem to be any fear of the imminent catastrophe. On the contrary, this was the time of the Four Years' Diet, which produced the memorable Constitution of the Third of May (1791), and patriotic feelings ran high. The liberal Constitution provoked an intervention by Poland's neighbours and, after a brief war during which some of the conservative elements among the Polish nobility joined Catherine the Great, the Second Partition followed (1793). Some of the Bułharyn estates were now located within the confines of the Russian share of the Polish Commonwealth, and the family chose to move west. Meanwhile, Bulgarin's mother, a resourceful woman, had sold her Pieryszew estate and settled with the children in Makowiszcze (or Makowiszki), at the same time clearing from debts another estate belonging to her husband, Benedykt, who was away at that time, and who was taking part in the so-called Kościuszko Insurrection (1794), Poland's reaction to the Second Partition.

Benedykt Bułharyn was a great admirer of the Insurrection leader Kościuszko. He was a violent man, known in his circles under the name "szalony (furious) Bułharyn," [38] and is reputed to have killed a Russian General, Voronov, in 1794, during the Insurrection,[39] but, according to one source, "not in battle." [40] Both Grech and Lemke agree that for this deed Benedykt was exiled to Siberia. Bulgarin cautiously omits any reference to the event in his *Memoirs*. He shares others' opinion of his father as "furious,"[41] but assigns to him a less violent role in the Insurrection. According to Bulgarin:

> My father, too, was with Kościuszko's army, with a detachment that he had gathered himself. But Kościuszko, on account of old family connections, and as a result of my mother's letters, did not want to subject him to dangers, because he was convinced of his ardour. Kościuszko persuaded my father to accept the position of Civilian War Commissar.[42]

In his position, Benedykt was responsible for arming men and keeping order in the Nowogródek Województwo, which included Makowiszcze. Thus, the family, although separated, was not far apart. In October, 1794, Kościuszko was defeated and taken prisoner by General Fersen, and a month later Suvorov, having slaughtered the defenders and the population of Praga, a suburb of Warsaw, occupied the capital, and the stage was set for the Third (and final) Partition of Poland.[43] Benedykt's service

---

[38] N. I. Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, p. 437.

[39] Mikhail Lemke, *Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1825-1855 gg.*, p. 232.

[40] Grech, *loc. cit.*

[41] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, I, p. 79.

[42] Bulgarin, "Pojasnenija," *op. cit.*, I, p. 313.

should have ended here, according to Grech and Lemke, who state that he had killed the Russian general, but not according to his son's *Memoirs.* Bulgarin has his father continue in the service because

> Polish institutions were then dissolving; the country was ruled by Russian generals and officers designated by them. The new rulers were glad whenever they could use any of the natives, and my father, in his position of Civil Military Commissar (représentant du people, en mission) was obliged, whether he wanted to or not, to carry out the duties of Marshal of Nobility, judge, and of all political institutions.[44]

The family's transition from Polish to Russian authority is symbolized by the figures of Kościuszko and Fersen, the latter replacing the former as the family's protector and Benedykt's superior.

When in the spring of 1795, amidst general confusion in Poland after Kościuszko's downfall, the family had to seek safety again, this time from marauders on both sides, aroused peasants and ordinary bandits, Aniela Bułharyn sent word to Benedykt, asking him to come and "bring with him a troop of soldiers and a *sauf conduit* from the Russian general stationed at nearby Nieśwież." [45] The general, who had established his headquarters in the seat of the Radziwiłł family, was Fersen himself, now a count and a recipient of numerous other rewards from the Russian Empress and her allies on account of his victory over Kościuszko.[46] He had become famous, and his victory was even compared to certain of Napoleon's victories.[47] The Bułharyns were rescued by one of Fersen's officers who arrived with a detachment of Russian soldiers. "Fear of meeting the Russians for the first time" [48] changed to relief when the officer turned out to be a sympathetic russified Pole, while his men were very orderly and friendly, especially toward the six-year-old Tadeusz (Faddej), whose first impressions of the Russians date from that period. When Benedykt arrived, he took his whole family to Nieśwież, "where Fersen requested his presence in order to form a temporary Requisition Commission." [49] In Nieśwież, the Bułharyns were treated with great courtesy by the Russians. Benedykt spent his time in conferences with Fersen and his staff officers; Aniela and her daughters were entertained. As for young Tadeusz, he sincerely admired Fersen as a grand old man who gave him presents, but he continued to worship Kościuszko as an

---

[43] Reddaway, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 172.

[44] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, I, p. 41.

[45] *Ibid.*, I, p. 6.

[46] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 43-44.

[47] *Ibid.*, I, p. 45.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

almost legendary figure whose name he constantly heard at home, even after the Russian take-over. At home, Tadeusz was surrounded by Polish culture and tradition. Due mainly to the efforts of his mother, and despite the prolonged absences of the father, the Bułharyns had managed to preserve a semblance of a family life which was extremely Polish in character. This Polishness, acquired in childhood, was maintained and constantly reinforced by later contacts with other Poles. It was a quality which, according to A. L. Pogodin, who made a study of Polish expatriate writers in Russia, Bulgarin never lost, unlike many Poles living and serving in Russia.[50]

3. *Under Russian Rule*

The first years under Russian rule were not easy for the Bułharyns. They experienced a series of misfortunes, the first of which had to do with the youngest member of the family, Tadeusz (Faddej).

The household in which the boy had been growing up was dominated by women. Both parents had been married previously, and Tadeusz had step-brothers and step-sisters, but only two of them, Elżbieta and Antonina, still remained at home.[51] "I was the last, the favourite and the spoiled child of my parents.' [52] Pampered by the women, he was not equipped to withstand the hardships of moving from place to place and hiding in the woods to avoid the enemy. As a result, he grew up as a weak and delicate child, full of anxieties and fears.[53] The nurses who constantly looked after him filled his head with stories of witches, demons, vampires, etc., which were a part of the rich folklore of the area, thus increasing his fears. His overwhelming sense of fear became so acute, that it led to a traumatic experience when the sight of a night funeral procession left him in a coma for nine days.[54] A severe illness followed, which was a beginning of several illnesses later, mostly connected with nervous disorders. Bulgarin's description of his childhood, an almost standard formula for this period, is to be found, in altered versions, in his other works (picaresque novels and stories), beside the *Memoirs.* His colourful life was to provide him, from the beginning, with

---

[50] A. L. Pogodin, "Russkie pisateli — Poljaki," *Prace Polskiego Towarzystwa dla Badań Europy Wschodniej i Bliskiego Wschodu,* Nr. IV, Kraków, 1933/34, p. 107.

[51] Grech maintains *(op. cit.* p. 438) that Antonina was her mother's daughter from a third marriage, after Benedykt's death, to Mendżyński. Bulgarin, on the other hand ("Pojasnenija," *op. cit.*, I, pp. 314-315) claims that Mendżyński was his mother's first husband. Because Antonina was older than Tadeusz, Bulgarin must be right.

[52] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 8.

[53] *Ibid.*, I, p. 103.

[54] *Ibid.*, I, p. 63.

much material for his future writings.

Following the conclusion of his official duties, the elder Bułharyn spent more time with his family. His son's delicacy tried his patience, and he embarked on a crash program to harden him. Tadeusz preferred the educational part of his training to the physical. His education began at home:

> I had a teacher who taught me reading and writing in Polish, French, German and Latin, and the first four rules of arithmetic. The younger of my sisters, Antonina, taught me to play the piano, the guitar, and to sing.[55]

The fact that in 1796 Tadeusz was not being taught Russian is not surprising. His education followed an established pattern of which Russian was not yet a part.

Soon afterwards, the family experienced its second misfortune, much more serious than the first. In September of 1796, Benedykt went to Wilno on business; two weeks later, his wife received the news that he had been arrested. His arrest, according to Bulgarin, had nothing to do with the reasons later advanced by Grech and Lemke.[56] Bulgarin's explanation has all the earmarks of his technique: to minimize his and his family's anti-Russian sins. It must, therefore, be taken with a grain of salt. According to him, Benedykt had received a letter and money in payment of an old debt from an old school friend, Gersdorf, a Polonized Liflandian who, after participating in the Kościuszko Insurrection, made his way to Turkey and became a Pasha in Constantinople. (It is true that Kościuszko's emissaries and other Polish patriots were at that time active in Turkey.[57]) In view of Turkey's sympathy for Poland and hostility to Russia, Benedykt was interrogated and put in prison, but Bulgarin says nothing about the length and destination of the sentence. Fortunately, for Benedykt, Catherine the Great died and Paul I succeeded her on the throne of Russia. One of his first acts was to free Kościuszko, and this is probably how Benedykt also regained freedom. He returned to Makowiszcze in February of 1797 a changed man: considerably aged, melancholy and subdued.[58] He lived to witness the family's third, and most painful, misfortune.

1797 was the last year in which the Bułharyns lived together in Makowiszcze. It started well with Benedykt's return and Elżbieta's successful marriage to Stefan Pogorzelski, a secretary to two poet-Ministers of Justice, Derzhavin and Dmitriev.[59] Later that year the Bułharyns

---

[55] *Ibid.*, I, p. 105.

[56] See p. 68.

[57] Maryan Kukiel, *Dzieje wojska polskiego w dobie Napoleońskiej 1795-1815*, Warszawa, E. Wende i spółka, 1918, Tom I, pp. 38-39.

[58] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

[59] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 121; "Pojasnenija," *op. cit.*, I, p. 327.

suddenly became homeless. Due to various causes, they had reduced their holding to one estate, Makowiszcze, which they did not own outright, but on which Aniela held the mortgage. The owner, a certain Daszkiewicz, could redeem the estate only for cash. He succeeded, however, in acquiring several of Benedykt's promissory notes in exchange for his own and, making up the difference in ready cash, obtained permission of the courts to regain possession of the estate. The decision was apparently unjust, and showed that the Bułharyns did not enjoy the favour of the new authorities. This became even more apparent when a protest by the Bułharyns did not prevent Daszkiewicz from evicting them, by applying an ancient Polish custom of *zajazd* [60] (a forcible eviction), even though the custom was considered illegal by the Russians. The Bułharyns immediately started a lawsuit against Daszkiewicz, by appealing to the Governor at Minsk and to the courts, basing their appeal on an important point of Polish law: *expulsio et violentia.*[61] Thus began a long line of lawsuits in which the family, and later Tadeusz, was involved.

It seems that the cause of most of the family's troubles was the father. As a former convict, he could not expect sympathetic treatment at the hands of the Russian authorities. Also, his pride and violence had earned him many enemies among the lesser nobility and the Jewish population of the area, many of whom were now government officials. "All this now turned against him and because of him, against the mother." [62] She realized this and decided to seek justice and protection somewhere else. She went to Wysokie, the estate of her close relative, Wincenty Kukiewicz, Marshal of Orsza nobility and guardian of the young Princes of the powerful Lubomirski family. For their education, Kukiewicz employed the formidable teaching skills of the philologist Cychra and his two sons. Here Tadeusz had an opportunity to resume his own education.

> The old man Cychra, an extremely kind and pleasant person, loved me as if I were his own child, and was able to awaken in me not just a willingness, no, but a passion for learning.[63]

Tadeusz showed progress in languages (Russian is, again, not mentioned) and music, but his real passion, which always remained with him, was history and geography.

The lawsuit was decided, temporarily, in favor of the Bułharyns, pending a new trial. Benedykt returned to Makowiszcze, and Aniela with the children set out for Petersburg, to seek support for their case.

---

[60] *Ibid.*, I, p. 133. This ancient custom is sentimentally treated by Mickiewicz in his epic poem, *Pan Tadeusz*. The poem's *zajazd*, "the last in Lithuania," takes place only a few years later than the above, in 1811. This shows that the custom was still practiced in Bulgarin's time.

[61] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 140-141.

[62] *Ibid.*, I, p. 184.

[63] *Ibid.*, I, p. 181.

4. *In Petersburg*

The reduced, and so less vulnerable, family reached Petersburg toward the end of 1797 or at the beginning of 1798. The trip, ostensibly in search of patronage, turned into a long and successful stay. It was, at the same time, an important stage in the family's efforts to build a new life after the termination of Polish independence and the troubles which followed. So far, the Bułharyns had dealt almost exclusively with fellow Poles, in a province which was, and remained for a long time, Polish in character. Even some of the Polish laws and institutions remained in force.[64] Leaving their native surroundings behind was a drastic step, undertaken out of necessity and not without certain misgivings about the Russian capital. As it turned out, the presence in Petersburg of a large number of Poles, some already firmly established, and of many wise Russians who were able to attract the new subjects to serve Russia, made the transition easy.

It must be remembered that since the First Partition of Poland, a quarter of a century earlier, Petersburg became the capital for those Poles who were new Russian subjects: some of them resided there. After the final dismemberment of Poland, their number grew larger: the last Polish king resided there with the remnants of his court. Several Polish dignitaries became senators. Polish officials who wished to serve were compensated with equivalent ranks in the Russian service.[65] Former Polish officers received commissions in the Russian army (one rank lower). Furthermore, several aristocratic Polish families were required to send hostages to Petersburg, both as a guarantee of their families' loyalty and as a security for their estates. One such hostage was the young Prince Adam Czartoryski, who was soon to become a close friend and confidant of the future Emperor Alexander I.[66]

The Bułharyns stayed with a family friend named Józef Kozłowski, conductor of the court orchestra,[67] whose home was frequented by many of his Polish and Russian friends. The most important of them was his landlord and neighbour, Lev Aleksandrovich Naryshkin, a magnate from

---

[64] J. Tretiak, wyd., *Mikołaja Malinowskiego Księga wspomnień*, Kraków, Akademia Umiejętności, 1907, p. 20.

[65] *Ibid.*, pp. 20-23.

[66] M. Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski*, Warszawa, Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1948, Tom I, p. 29 ff.

[67] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 189. Bulgarin does not identify Kozłowski's position except "direktor teatral'noj muzyki." Bulgarin's restraint, in view of his penchant for name dropping, can only be explained by his ignorance of Kozłowski's real position in Russia. Besides being the court conductor, Kozłowski was also director general of theatres and a composer. His career in Russia lasted forty years, until his retirement in 1820. L. T. Błaszczyk, *Dyrygenci polscy i obcy w Polsce działający w XIX i XX wieku*, Kraków, Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, pp. 140-141.

Catherine's era, patron of the arts and literature, and a great enthusiast for a Polish-Russian *rapprochement.* Naryshkin practiced what he preached, and his three daughters were married to three Polish aristocrats: the Princes Lubomirski and Poniński, and Count Sollogub, the father of the future writer. One of Naryshkin's two sons, Dimitrij, was married to the famous Polish beauty, Princess Maria Czetwertyński, who was later involved in a long liaison with Alexander I. The Bułharyns allegedly became members of this select circle. "All of them received and looked after my mother and sister." [68] As for Tadeusz himself, Naryshkin asked to have him dressed in Polish nobleman's attire and sing Polish songs to amuse the guests. The boy enjoyed it: "This was my happy time in Petersburg!" [69]

It was also a time when his future was being decided. Looking back at this period, Bulgarin says:

> The move to Petersburg was the most important event in my life, an event which had an influence on my entire subsequent fate! [70]

By a coincidence, Count Fersen was then Director of the Noble Land-Cadet Corps (Sukhoputnyj shlakhetnyj kadetskij korpus). There is disagreement on Tadeusz's entrance into the Corps. Lemke says that Aniela went to no little trouble to have the boy accepted; [71] Grech, that she "succeeded" in placing him in the Corps.[72] Bulgarin, in his *Memoirs,* offers the following version:

> Count Fersen . . . saw my mother in society and, talking with her once about me, advised her to enroll me in the Corps, promising his patronage and fatherly care. When this offer became known, everybody urged my mother to follow the advice of Count Fersen. She was particularly influenced by the advice of Count Seweryn Potocki, which my mother repeated to me much later, when I could understand its importance.[73]

Potocki's advice was that of a successful careerist and fortune seeker in Russia. He pointed out the advantages of a military education in Russia for a lardless Polish nobleman, and the opportunity to prove one's devotion to a new fatherland. He convinced her that she must accept Fersen's offer.

Tadeusz was placed in the care of Count Fersen, and the latter assigned to him an officer who had once served in Poland, with the task

---

[68] Bulgarin, *op. cit.,* I, p. 238.

[69] *Ibid.,* I, p. 239.

[70] *Ibid.,* I, p. 143.

[71] Lemke, *op. cit.,* p. 232.

[72] Grech, *op. cit.,* pp. 437-438.

[73] Bulgarin, *op. cit.,* I, p. 239.

of preparing him for the future life of a cadet. A proof of nobility was sent for to the provinces and received. Meanwhile, Count Fersen left the Corps, but the Bułharyns stuck to their decision. In a few months, a directive came from the Emperor, with the result that Faddej Venediktovich Bulgarin, as he was now called, was enrolled in the junior division of the Corps on November 18, 1798.[74]

The junior division of the Corps, unlike the three senior ones, lacked the true appearance of a military school. It was no more than a boarding school, supervised by women (mostly French and German); only the teachers were men. In his own account of the entrance into the Corps, Bulgarin dramatizes the experience. Having been excessively spoiled by everybody in the past, he could not now become accustomed to the routine of cadet life, and could not get along with the other cadets, who teased him for his bad Russian pronunciation. Gradually, he developed a strong tendency toward self-pity. He began to resent everybody, even his family who, he thought, had abandoned him. His latent hypochondria asserted itself; he became ill and had to be moved to a hospital.

His illness frightened Aniela. She did her best to assure him of the family's unchanged love for him, but he was not convinced. Not understanding his mother's concern with his future, all he remembered was that she had handed him over to strangers. With ample opportunity for reflection in the hospital, he developed a new attitude toward the Corps, his family, and his future life.

> Misfortune develops the mind. In the hospital, I had time to think, and reflecting on my situation I decided to submit to fate, to overcome all difficulties, make myself independent, and live in future without anybody's help.[75]

Accordingly, after leaving the hospital, he studied day and night to catch up with his schoolmates. With his "unusual memory," and knowledge acquired previously, he soon surpassed them. In time he mastered the Russian language, his main difficulty, though Grech, who confirms that Bulgarin was a very good student, has reservations about his grammar.[76] For his excellent work, Faddej was assigned to a more advanced class. When his mother had to return to the estate, the parting was difficult, but without trauma. He had already decided that he had to make his own way in life, and that this was what his parents wanted him to do. It was only much later that he found out that the decision to enroll him in the Corps had been made without the knowledge of his father and, as it turned out, even against his will. Benedykt was very upset when Aniela told him she had left Faddej in Petersburg, and he wanted him back home. His bad health deteriorated even more after the news, and

---

[74] *Ibid.*, I, p. 242.

[75] *Ibid.*, I, p. 254.

[76] Grech, *op. cit.*, pp. 452-453.

he had to postpone his trip to Petersburg to see his son. He died some time afterwards. His death, which represented the removal of the most important link with the recent Polish past, coincided with Faddej's promotion, after passing the required examinations, to the grenadier company of the senior division of the Corps.[77] This, in turn, represented his entry into the Russian military service.

5. *In the Russian Army: Cadet Corps*

By entering the senior division of the Corps in 1799, Faddej established a record of a kind.

> I was the only Pole in the Corps. It seems that I was also the first cadet from the nobility of the newly acquired Polish provinces.[78]

The distinction of being the first and only Pole, and a namesake of a famous compatriot, made Faddej a target of his colleagues' gibes: they began calling him "Kościuszko." Their favorite prank was "to baptize Kościuszko into the Russian Faith," [79] and consisted of tossing him from the roof of the bathhouse into a pile of snow. The result was another stay in a hospital. This time, however, he recovered much faster and, upon return to the grenadier company, went through the initiation ceremony voluntarily, winning in this way the respect of his colleagues.

He had other problems to overcome. He was in the habit of reading books instead of paying attention to classes, and of answering questions in his own words rather than repeating lessons by heart. His teachers soon accused him of commiting the three cardinal cadet sins: laziness, slovenliness and mischieviousness, for which he was frequently whipped by the company commander, Colonel Purpur. The latter became Faddej's nightmare and would have no doubt caused his failure at the year-end examinations, had it not been for the timely intervention of the Corps' Inspector, Colonel Klinger, an émigré German writer.[80] Klinger himself undertook to examine the boy, and found him superior to the other cadets.[81] Realizing that Faddej had been victimized by his superiors, Klinger promised to have him transferred to another company.

---

[77] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 256.

[78] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 256-257.

[79] *Ibid.*, I, p. 257.

[80] Frederick Maximilian von Klinger (1752 Frankfurt am Main — 1831 Dorpat), German poet and playwright. The title of one of his plays, *Sturm und Drang* (1776) provided the name for the late XVIII century German literary movement. In 1778, Klinger joined the Austrian army, and in 1780 he went to Petersburg where he served as Inspector and later as Director of the Corps of Cadets. Still later, he became Curator of the University of Dorpat (Derpt). *Der Grosse Brockhaus*, F. A. Brockhaus/Leipzig, 1931, p. 233.

[81] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 277.

The incident marks the beginning of an important pattern in Bulgarin's life. Because he was always vulnerable in Russia, and it was impossible to win everyone's acceptance, he very carefully cultivated good relations with people in high positions, whose approval mattered most. It was easier to win their approval and protection (or form alliances with them) if they were foreigners, like Klinger and members of the Polish colony in Petersburg, or Russians of foreign background, like Fersen and a host of others later, mostly of German and French background. With the reliance on foreigners and high-ranked Russians, there began to develop in him a low regard for the ordinary Russians, as people quite different from everybody else and of no account. This, too, was the result of Klinger's influence. Klinger never grew to like the Russians and always kept them apart from the rest of humanity: "die Menschen und die Russen." [82] In Bulgarin, this attitude towards the Russians took a different turn later, after 1812, but for the moment all he wanted was not to be victimized by them.

Faddej's triumph at the examinations was marred by a brutal beating administered to him immediately afterwards by the enraged Colonel Purpur. The shock was so great that it necessitated another removal to a hospital because of a nervous disorder. It was, however, his last serious unpleasantness in the Corps. When he returned from the hospital, he discovered that he had been transferred to one of the upper classes by skipping a grade; that the commander of his new company (musketeers) was a kind man who expected his junior officers to treat the cadets well. The teachers, mostly foreigners in the upper classes, were more experienced, and the eight hours daily in class were no longer a bore. Faddej soon recovered and became body and soul a part of the Corps.

There is much controversy surrounding the degree of his Russification at that time. In his *Memoirs,* Bulgarin gives the impression that it was considerable.

> I must admit that in the Corps I became Russified to such an extent that I attended with my companions services in a Russian Orthodox church. I even studied the Orthodox catechism with Father Kolosov and was one of his best pupils.[83]

This is confirmed in an official biography.[84] One gets the impression that Faddej was divesting himself of his Roman Catholicism and that he eventually became Orthodox. This is probably the impression Bulgarin wants his readers to have. Yet, a few pages further he describes how shocked his mother was, seeing him on her visit to the Corps singing solo in an Orthodox church, and how he had to promise her, against his will

---

[82] *Ibid., I,* p. 274.

[83] *Ibid.,* II, p. 51.

[84] Polovcov, *op. cit.,* p. 476.

to remain a Catholic.[85] Numerous other passages in the *Memoirs* show him attending a Roman Catholic church in Petersburg, celebrating Christmas on the twenty-fifth of December in Prussia, and going to confession in Hamburg, indicating that he did remain a Catholic.[86] There is no evidence that his Catholicism posed any problems in his later career. There was no need for him to change his religion. The Corps at that time had several Catholic and Protestant cadets, and was providing religious instruction for them. They were, however, greatly outnumbered, and Faddej must have found it expedient to conform to his Russian surroundings by joining the majority.

In a different passage pertaining to his school days Bulgarin tells about another aspect of his Russification.

> I almost forgot how to speak Polish, and though I understood a light conversation, I could no longer converse myself, and others also forgot that I was not a native Russian. If it happened that I was asked what nationality I was (because our officers and teachers assumed from my name that I came from Bulgaria), I always answered that I was a Russian.[87]

This must be viewed both as a deception on Faddej's part to gain acceptance and as a typical Bulgarin exaggeration aimed at his Russian readers. To be sure, he was surrounded by Russians and foreigners, but not at all times: he was allowed to go out occasionally, at which times he visited the various Poles to whom his mother had introduced him, as well as his step-brother, Józef Mendżyński, a captain in a Polish Cavalry Regiment (presumably incorporated into the Russian army after 1795) and Adjutant to the Governor-General of Petersburg, Count Pahlen.[88]

Of great importance in the process of Faddej's Russification was that he lived in the capital, in which history was being made. He claims to have seen the last Polish King in church once, before the King's death,[89] symbolizing the passing of Poland. The King's funeral was followed by that of the "great" Suvorov, the conqueror of Warsaw and hero of the Italian campaign, from which he had returned in 1800.[90] The whole Corps participated in the funeral. The same year Czar Paul, during a visit to the Corps, changed its name to "First Cadet Corps" and chose

---

[85] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 52-57.

[86] *Ibid.*, I, p. 292; III, p. 31; VI, p. 304.

[87] *Ibid.*, II, pp. 51-52.

[88] Count Peter Pahlen, who later engineered the conspiracy of March 11, 1801, against Paul I. M. T. Florinsky, *Russia, A History and Interpretation*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1965, Vol. I, p. 627.

[89] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 292. [Stanisław August Poniatowski, a virtual prisoner in Petersburg after 1795, died in February of 1798, so Bulgarin could conceivably have seen him but not during his stay in the Corps, which began in November of that year.]

[90] *Ibid.*, pp. 297-300.

its Director, Count Lamsdorf, to be the tutor of his two younger sons, Grand Dukes Nicholas and Michael. In Lamsdorf's place, the Czar appointed Count Platon Zubov,[91] and the following year, shortly before his death, he promoted Zubov to Chief of the Corps (a new, military function) and Klinger became Director in charge of curriculum. In March of the same year (1801) the Corps swore allegiance to a new Czar, Alexander I, and participated in the funeral of his father, Paul I. The darker implications of these events were unknown to young Faddej. Their significance to him was above all a sense of direct participation in the history of Russia. In his *Memoirs,* he writes of this period as the beginning of a "new epoch" for Russia and for himself,[92] thus identifying himself with his new country and its new ruler.

History, which was contributing to Faddej's gradual Russification, was also slowing down and even reversing the process. Soon after Alexander's coronation, Zubov was dismissed, and his functions were taken over by the Grand Duke Constantine. Here Bulgarin begins a long acquaintanceship with the Grand Duke, but the latter, a strict Prussian-type disciplinarian, bent on enlarging and whipping the Corps into shape, could hardly inspire a sensitive cadet. Far more inspiring and exciting to Faddej was the news of Napoleon's victories in Europe. He was aware that some of the victories were achieved with the participation of the Polish Legions under General Dąbrowski,[93] which were at that time active in Italy against Austria.[94] Faddej was not alone in admiring Napoleon. A *rapprochement* between France and Russia was begun already under Paul I,[95] and was continued, though cautiously, by his successor; it resulted in the Franco-Russian treaty of October, 1801,[96] which added to the prestige Napoleon already enjoyed in Russia. How great the prestige was can be judged from the friendliness and courtesy displayed by Alexander towards General Duroc, Napoleon's favourite and his new envoy to Petersburg,[97] and the adulation showered on him by its inhabitants—including the cadets whom he visited on several occasions —because of his closeness to the "genius." [98] Faddej's admiration for the "genius Napoleon" was boundless; it was going to stay with him all his

---

[91] **The same Platon Zubov who had been the last favourite of Catherine** II, and a participant in the murder of Paul I. Florinsky, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 507, 627.

[92] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 305; II, p. 9.

[93] *Ibid.*, II, p. 157.

[94] Kukiel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 62 ff.

[95] Florinsky, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 621.

[96] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 654.

[97] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 652.

[98] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 171-173.

life, as seen in his writings. This was something which he shared with most Poles, for whom Napoleon was an almost miraculous figure—a great and an only man at this stage of history who was doing something for Poland.[99] It is doubtful whether Faddej thought at that time in exactly the same terms about Napoleon, but his feelings for him indicate, nevertheless, an early clash in his allegiances. This, however, did not prevent him from continuing to study diligently, passing examinations, skipping a grade once more at some stage, and reaching the upper third class from which it was already possible to be promoted to officer rank in army regiments.[100] His successes were due mainly to extensive reading in history, geography and literature.

Faddej's reading may equally be said to have slowed down and reversed the process of his Russification. At first, he read what was assigned to him and whatever he could lay his hands on, mostly histories and geographies. As his Russian improved, he could appreciate contemporary Russian literature. He shed tears over Karamzin's sentimental *Poor Liza* (Bednaja Liza) and knew by heart parts of *Letters of a Russian Traveller* (Pis'ma russkago puteshestvennika). He also became a regular reader of Karamzin's journal, *The Messenger of Europe* (Vestnik Evropy), and Makarov's *Moscow Mercury* (Moskovskij Merkurij). Gradually, he began to read foreign books and turned to the then fashionable novels of Marmontel,[101] the sentimental stories of Mme de Genlis[102] and Ducray-Duminil,[103] and the mysteries of Mrs. Radcliffe.[104] He read all the books that the reading public of the day considered worthy of reading.[105] It was not until his promotion to the upper third class, when he met his new teacher of literature, the Livonian German, Lieutenant Lanting, that his reading became more selective. He dis-

---

[99] Szymon Askenazy, *Napoleon a Polska*, Warszawa, Kraków, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze, 1919, Tom I, p. 11 ff.

[100] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 9.

[101] Jean-François Marmontel (1723-1799), a French writer and a protegé of Voltaire. He was a dramatist, a satirist, a novelist and a historian of literature. Widely translated. Best known for his moral-satirical stories. *Grand Larousse Encyclopédique*, Vol. 7, Paris, 1963, p. 103.

[102] Stephanie F. de Genlis (1746-1830), French woman writer of moral-satirical stories and sentimental novels. Many of her works were concerned with education. *Grand Larousse Encyclopédique*, Vol. V, Paris, 1963, p. 43.

[103] François G. Ducray-Duminil (1761-1819), a French writer. He began as a singer, later became a dramatist and an editor. He was most successful as an author of popular stories and novels. *Grand Larousse Encyclopédique*, Vol. IV, Paris, 1963, p. 257.

[104] Ann Radcliffe (1764-1823) was the chief exponent in England of the Gothic novel, extremely popular in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 18, University of Chicago, 1967, p. 1022.

[105] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 27.

covered Lessing and Schiller, began to study German, and became a Germanophile in his literary tastes.[106]

The Cadet Corps had a literary tradition. Russian drama had its beginning with former cadet Sumarokov. Ozerov, another star pupil, had continued the tradition. Several Russian actors had also been cadets. Knjazhnin had taught there at one time and several of his pupils afterwards.[107] During Faddej's stay in the Corps, this literary tradition was represented by Klinger and Lanting; they had around them a group of aspiring writers, mostly young Russian aristocrats, as well as the sons of French aristocratic exiles. Lanting, who had become Faddej's latest protector and for Faddej a father surrogate, invited him often to his quarters where the young select group gathered. It included Klinger's son, Aleksander, the poet Krjukovskij, two Princes de Broglio, and several young and talented officers of the Guards, among them Baron Dibich.[108] Confronted with and prompted by these brilliant young men, and subjected to the Corps' literary tradition, Faddej soon developed a passion for authorship.

> In between serious historical works, exercises in translations, and book reports, in order to train my mind, I wrote fables, satires, poems, fragments of plays, and all these pieces spread throughout the Corps. I won the reputation of an *author*.[109]

The claim to an early authorship is Bulgarin's own. He supports it by citing names of important people, former cadets, who kept copies of his early writings all their lives. One of these copies—of a fable—had supposedly been edited by the "great" Derzhavin himself. There is no way to disprove this, although Grech, Bulgarin's biographer, says that as late as 1820 Bulgarin still had difficulties in writing literary Russian [110] but that he had a great talent for exaggeration. Playing on the double meaning in Russian of the word "sochinitel' " ("author" and "story teller"), Grech says of Bulgarin on another occasion that "he was a great sochinitel'." [111]

Following another series of examinations, Faddej was admitted to the upper second, penultimate class, from which a cadet could be promoted to an officer of artillery or of the General Staff of the Grand Duke Constantine.[112] Completion of the ultimate, upper first, class presumably

---

[106] *Ibid.*, II, p. 42.

[107] *Ibid.*, II, pp. 14-16.

[108] Baron Ivan Ivanovich Dibich, later Field-Marshal and Commander-in-Chief of Russian forces in the Polish-Russian War of 1830-31. He died before the conclusion of that war.

[109] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 38.

[110] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

[111] *Ibid.*, p. 442.

[112] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 57-58.

entitled a graduate to even higher distinctions. Bulgarin does not mention anywhere going beyond the upper second class. As it turned out, it did not make any difference in his military career. "Because of the Grand Duke's special kindness toward the Poles," [113] Faddej, after becoming an officer on October 11, 1806, was transferred to the Grand Duke's Uhlan Regiment, which later became a Guard's Regiment.[114] While this was undoubtedly a great distinction, it was made possible chiefly because of a changed international situation, and the demands of war.

The uneasy *rapprochement* between Russia and France had been replaced in 1805 by the disastrous Third Coalition [115] of Russia, England and the Continental Powers against Napoleon. War began immediately and its first round resulted in a shattering defeat of the Austrians and Russians under Kutuzov at Austerlitz. The effects of this defeat reached even the Cadet Corps which was asked to commission qualified cadets in order to fill vacant positions in the Russian army. The Grand Duke Constantine, as Inspector of Cavalry, personally selected the cavalry officers, particularly for his own Uhlan Regiment which had suffered heavy casualties and had to be re-organized and re-trained.[116] The seventeen-year-old Cornet Bulgarin was one of the new officers.

His early graduation from the Corps meant separation from his proctector, Klinger, and his mentor, Lanting. His new protector in a sense, the Grand Duke Constantine, liked him, but only because he was fond of Polish cavalrymen generally, not for any other reason. Consequently, Bulgarin was for the first time in his life really on his own. As an officer in the prestigious Uhlans, he was received everywhere and enjoyed the same social acceptability as his more noble Russian friends. According to Grech, this early entry into society at large was responsible for most of Bulgarin's future troubles.[117] He was introduced to drinking and cards, and even resorted to various subterfuges to obtain leaves and passes more often than he was entitled to. His opportunism and lack of moderation began to show for the first time. What saved him from getting into trouble at this time was his genuine love for the theatre, where he spent most of his free evenings. Among the performances he attended was the opening of Ozerov's *Dmitrij Donskoj* on January 17, 1807.[118] The occasion was extremely patriotic, because at that time Russia was already again at war with Napoleon.

Whatever chances there had been for another *rapprochement* be-

---

[113] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

[114] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 125.

[115] Florinsky, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 653-661.

[116] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 209.

[117] Grech, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina," *op. cit.*, p. 516.

[118] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 285.

tween Russia and France, they were dimmed by the resignation of Prince Adam Czartoryski, a close friend of Alexander, as Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the conclusion of a secret military alliance between Russia and Prussia in July of 1806.[119] Two months later Frederick William, frightened by rumors of an impending partition of Prussia, precipitated the second round of the Third Coalition's conflict with Napoleon. History repeated itself and Prussia, like Austria before, was swiftly defeated. Alexander again honoured his obligation, and a Russian army under Bennigsen confronted the French in Poland in November of 1806. An additional force, the Guards Corps, including the Grand Duke Constantine's Uhlans, left Petersburg in February of 1807.[120]

6. *In the Russian Army: War Service*

There are considerable discrepancies in the various accounts of Bulgarin's war service. Some of them place its beginning as early as in 1805; [121] others, in 1806.[122] There are other discrepancies, and Bulgarin's own account does not always help to clear them. It is helpful only when it coincides with our own conclusions. This seems to be the case with the beginning of his war service. Had it really begun earlier than in Bulgarin's account, he would no doubt have told us about it.

It is possible to gauge Bulgarin's feelings as he set out on his first campaign. He was a Russian officer, in a regiment in which there were many Poles, going to fight Napoleon, but these contradictions did not seem to bother him at the time. Rather, he was overwhelmed by the enthusiastic reception given to the Uhlans on their march through the Baltic provinces, and considered the whole episode a marvellous adventure, entirely in keeping with the exciting times in which he was living. The romantic mood can be seen in his recollection of a ball given in honor of the Uhlans by the German gentry in Dorpat.

> We danced until we were literally *ready to drop.* The charming German girls were delightful! After a sumptuous supper, accompanied by numerous toasts to the ancient divinities, Bacchus and

---

119 Florinsky, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 658-659.

120 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, II, p. 325.

121 Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni, op. cit.*, p. 438; *Grech*, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. B.," *op. cit.*, p. 516; Grech, "F. V. Bulgarin. 1789-1859. Biograficheskij ocherk," *Russkaja Starina*, 1871, vol. IV, p. 485; A. N., "Voennaja sluzhba Bulgarina. 1805-1811," *Russkaja Starina*, 1874, vol. IX, p. 774; Pogodin, "Russkie pisateli-Poljaki," *op. cit.*, p. 108; I. E. Andreevskij, ed. *Enciklopedicheskij slovar'*, 1891, vol. IV, F. A. Brokgauz, Leipzig, I. A. Efron, S. Peterburg, p. 895.

122 Lemke, *Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1826-1855 gg., op. cit.*, p. 232; K. K. Arsenev, ed., *Novyj enciklopedicheskij slovar*, vol. 8, F. A. Brokgauz, Leipzig, I. A. Efron, S. Peterburg, p. 489; Polska Akademia Umiejętności, *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, Tom III, Kraków, 1937, str. 131.

> Aphrodite, a mazurka began which lasted until seven in the morning. At eight o'clock we heard the sound of a trumpet under the windows calling us: *Mount your horses!* [123]

Dorpat made a lasting impression on Bulgarin. It was a university town and a cultural centre for the nobility of Livonia. In view of his experiences in the Cadet Corps, Bulgarin felt at home among the Germans. He became acquainted with the family of Karl Kründer, a local patron of the arts, whose estate, Karlovo, was the scene of frequent musical evenings. The acquaintance proved lasting. Some twenty years later Bulgarin purchased Karlovo from Kründer's son and became a Livonian landowner himself, residing there for varying periods afterwards.[124]

After Livonia, the Guards Corps entered Courland, a province that had previously belonged to the Polish Commonwealth. The gentry was German for the most part, but in appearance, customs and way of life they resembled Polish nobility. It is probably due to this mixture of Polish and German culture that Bulgarin always considered Courland, next to Livonia, his favourite province. Its only drawback was—according to his *Memoirs*—that like the former Polish-Lithuanian provinces further south, it had a large Jewish population.[125] Bulgarin's attitude towards the Jews will be discussed elsewhere (Chapter VII).

Upon entering Lithuania, Bulgarin secured a short leave to visit his uncle, a prior in a Dominican monastery nearby. During his visit he heard much that was new to him: that Bennigsen's campaign was not victorious as the Russians were led to believe; that his army had been pushed out of Prussian Poland, and was now in East Prussia; that in Warsaw there already existed an interim Polish rule and a Polish army of 30,000; [126] that Lithuania was flooded with Napoleon's proclamations, and that 12,000 Polish youth of good families had crossed over to Warsaw to join the Polish military service. He had an opportunity to observe a growing patriotic spirit which was especially strong among the Polish women.

> I spent three days in Rossieny, and only once did I make a social call—at the home of a wealthy landowner P. The ladies looked questioningly at my uniform and openly expressed their patriotic feelings. There I heard for the first time the famous Polish song about the return of the Polish legions from Italy.[127] It was ex-

---

123 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 82-83.

124 *Ibid.*, III, pp. 78 and 84.

125 *Ibid.*, III, pp. 100-102.

126 Napoleon's decree of January 14, 1807, constituted a Governing Commission of five "directors" (ministers) in Warsaw, . . . The total Polish military effort during the 1806/7 war surpassed 50,000. Reddaway, ed., *The Cambridge History of Poland, op. cit.*, II, pp. 227-8.

127 "Jeszcze Polska nie zginęła. . .," which later became the Polish National Anthem.

quisitely sung by a beautiful Polish maiden . . . and many among those present had tears in their eyes.[128]

These strong impressions were counteracted by Bulgarin's uncle who, like many older and more conservative Poles in that area who did not trust Napoleon, put all his faith in Alexander's declared good will towards the Poles. The uncle warned his nephew not to fall prey to "female recruiting" and gave him a letter of introduction to Bennigsen, whom he claimed to know through the latter's Polish wife. Somewhat reassured, particularly by the prospect of meeting Bennigsen, Bulgarin rejoined his regiment and crossed the border into East Prussia in March of 1807.[129]

The Guards Corps arrived on the scene during a temporary suspension in the fighting. The pause afforded Bulgarin an opportunity to continue very much in the same way as in Livonia: in the spirit of romantic adventure. During frequent foraging expeditions he met some of the local German gentry among whom was a certain Frau Dargitz, a widow whose two young daughters captivated him completely. He visited the family as often as he could, and played before the women the rôle of a knight-protector.[130] By his own admission, the episode provided him later with the material for a romantic story, *First Love* (Pervaja ljubov').[131]

The romantic interlude came to an end in May when, after the Bartenstein convention,[132] the Third Coalition's last gasp, fighting was resumed. At this precise moment Bulgarin decided to visit Bennigsen's headquarters with the intention of being transferred to it. His request was turned down but he was invited to dine with Bennigsen.

> With this dinner, my hopes for the patronage of the Commander-in-Chief came to an end. If I were not in His Highness' Uhlan Regiment, I would undoubtedly have been transferred to the Headquarters, as I was later assured by A. B. Fok. . . . My whole service and possibly my whole life would have taken a different turn . . .[133]

Bulgarin was willing to exchange the patronage of the Grand Duke for that of the German-born Bennigsen. Was he trying to escape the rigours of Constantine's discipline, or the realities of combat duty? Probably both.

According to his companions from those days, including General

---

[128] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 121-122.

[129] *Ibid.*, III, p. 124.

[130] *Ibid.*, III, pp. 129-144.

[131] *Sochinenija Faddeja Bulgarina*, Tom I, No. 2, "Pervaja ljubov'," S. Peterburg, 1843, pp. 24-80.

[132] Florinsky, *op. cit.*, II, p. 660.

[133] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 167-168.

> Joselian, bravery was not one of his virtues; often, when a battle approached, he would try to be designated officer of the day in charge of the stables.[134]

In view of the above, Bulgarin's account of his subsequent heroics must be viewed with a certain amount of skepticism. An air of suspicion clings particularly to the details of his participation in the Battle of Friedland on June 14th.[135] Although Grech corroborates these details in his earliest (1828), and most favourable, biography of Bulgarin,[136] in his two later biographies he says only that Bulgarin was seriously wounded in the stomach and spent several weeks in a hospital in Königsberg.[137] Lemke and Pogodin say the same thing.[138] Bulgarin himself does not mention anything about being wounded. The reason for this is probably the following. All other accounts, except Grech's earliest biography, mention that in Königsberg Bulgarin met several Poles from Napoleon's army who tried to talk him into defecting. Bulgarin refused, but only on the grounds that it would not be honourable, particularly before the conclusion of peace. Apparently, for one or many reasons, such as his admiration for Napoleon, his growing opportunism, his disappointment at not being transferred, or his latent Polish patriotism, he was considering defection and did not want to write about it later in his *Memoirs.* Furthermore, if he did write about Königsberg, he would not have been able to claim that he had also been an eye-witness to the famous meeting between Napoleon and Alexander on the Niemen raft on June 25,[139] eleven days after his wound.

All Bulgarin's biographers agree that for the Prussian campaign he received the Order of St. Anna 3rd class, rarely given to a cornet.[140] This new distinction, a clear sign of favour from the Grand Duke, was probably the main reason why Bulgarin remained in Russia after the Treaty of Tilsit of July 7, 1807.

While the Uhlans were making their way back to Petersburg, Bulgarin was given permission to visit his mother in Makowiszcze, the scene of his childhood. Everywhere on his way east through Kowno, Wilno, Nowogródek, Nieśwież, he saw satisfaction at the defeat of Russia and

---

134 Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, p. 438.

135 Bulgarin, *ibid.*, III, p. 216 ff.

136 Grech, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina," *op. cit.*, pp. 516-517.

137 Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, p. 438, and "F. V. Bulgarin. Biograficheskij ocherk," *op. cit.*, p. 485.

138 Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 232, and Pogodin, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

139 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, III, p. 256 ff.

140 *Ibid.*, IV, p. 3 ff.

excitement over the recent creation of the Duchy of Warsaw.[141] Poland was not forgotten here, and the young Russian officer found himself an object of scorn. During a visit to Prince Dominik Radziwiłł, he almost got into a duel over the respective merits of the French and Russian armies.[142] On his return trip, possibly to avoid any similar confrontations, which must have been very unsettling for him, he took a different, roundabout route and caught up with his regiment just before Petersburg. Immediately upon arrival in the capital, he threw himself into its pleasures, thus removing from his mind any other considerations.

The dissolute interval which followed Bulgarin's return to Petersburg may have been, for him, a reaction to the strong impressions of the war and of his visit to Lithuania. He describes in his *Memoirs* a lengthy escapade with a French female spy,[143] which may or may not be true, but gives an idea of his preoccupations or fantasies, leading to a habitual neglect of his garrison duties. Another escapade is substantiated by Grech,[144] and concerns Bulgarin's presence at a masquerade ball given by Princess Czetwertyński, and attended also by the Grand Duke, who remembered that Bulgarin was supposed to be on duty that evening. This was a serious breach of discipline, and it had its consequences. According to Bulgarin, the intervention of the Polish ladies, to whom the Grand Duke was very partial, saved him.[145] According to other sources,[146] the incident ended with Bulgarin's arrest and transfer to a different, less prestigious, regiment. The discrepancy is caused by a confusion in the chronology of Bulgarin's military service and the growing number of his offenses. The incident ended most likely with Constantine formally forgiving Bulgarin but remembering his fault and, as was his habit, making life miserable for the culprit from then on, particularly after the latter wrote a malicious satire:

All of Strel'na [147] trembles, terror everywhere, fear.
Is it an earthquake?
No! No! It's the Grand Duke taking us for a drill. . . .

(Trepeshchet Strel'na vsja, povsjudu uzhas, strakh.
Neuzheli zemletrjasenie?
Net! Net! Velikij knjaz' vedet nas na uchenie . . .) [148]

---

[141] The Duchy of Warsaw, established at the Treaty of Tilsit, consisted of former Polish territories held by Prussia. This, to the majority of Poles, meant the beginning of the restoration of Poland.

[142] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, III, p. 314 ff.

[143] *Ibid.*, III, p. 350 ff.

[144] Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, p. 439.

[145] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 386-388.

[146] Pogodin, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-109; Grech, *loc. cit.*

[147] The Uhlan regiment was quartered in Strel'na and Peterhof.

[148] Quoted by Grech, *loc. cit.*

That Bulgarin was allowed to remain in a crack regiment after this was due, no doubt, to new international developments, namely war with England's ally, Sweden. The war was a direct result of the Tilsit agreement with France.[149] No doubt its sudden outbreak saved Bulgarin from some such fate as transfer to an infantry regiment, or worse.

In February of 1808 Russian troops suddenly crossed the Swedish border, ostensibly to push it further west from Petersburg, and occupied Finland. The Finnish population, however, refused to submit, and reinforcements were needed. It was at this stage of the war that the Uhlan Regiment's Second Battalion, under Colonel Count Gudovich, and including Bulgarin's squadron, was sent to Finland.[150] The Grand Duke himself could not have thought of a better punishment for Bulgarin. Due to the constant splitting up of the battalion, Bulgarin could not count on the protection of Gudovich, who seems to have liked him.[151] As a result, or perhaps due to Constantine's instructions, he was receiving the toughest assignments.

> He fought in the Corps of Count Kamenskij, in the advance-guard, right up to Torneo, participating in all battles. He almost lost his eyesight in the winter campaign, when it was necessary to spend nights in the snow in 25 degrees cold. His weak eyes are to this day a reminder of this campaign for him.[152]

Although obviously his heart was not in this campaign, or perhaps because it was not, his literary apprenticeship flourished in Finland. His poems and satires were very popular,[153] and he claims even to have been visited by the poet Batjushkov.[154] On another occasion, in Kuopio, Barclay-de-Tolly invited him to dine with him after hearing a laudatory poem about himself.[155] It is of some significance and in keeping with the trend of Bulgarin's evolution, that a poem of this kind should have been about a general of foreign, Scottish-Livonian, background.

It was also this campaign that provided Bulgarin with his first measure of international fame, which was won without any maneuvering or ulterior motives. Because he clearly sympathized with the Protestant Finns and Swedes he frequently protected them, even to the extent of committing insubordination. On one of these occasions, he was sent to capture a certain pastor, the leader of a dangerous partisan band. Moved

---

149 Florinsky, *op. cit.*, II, p. 665.

150 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, IV, pp. 68-69.

151 *Ibid.*, IV, p. 75.

153 Grech, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina," *op. cit.*, p. 517.

153 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 82.

154 *Ibid.*, IV, p. 102.

155 Quoted in Bulgarin, *Vosp.*, IV p. 162.

by the pleas of the pastor's young wife, he pretended he hadn't seen the man, and left. He reported to Kamenskij that the pastor had escaped.[156] Bulgarin was put under arrest, but the incident became famous in Finland and Sweden. When the war ended, an engraving was printed in Stockholm, with the inscription: "The Generosity of a Russian Officer." During his visit to Stockholm in 1838, Bulgarin was shown the engraving and was honoured by his hosts.[157]

In March of 1809, after a year's fighting, the Guards battalions, including the Uhlans, returned to Petersburg in triumph—the first one in many years.[158] There is no way of establishing with any degree of exactness what happened to Bulgarin immediately afterwards, because his narrative is interrupted at this point by several long digressions, and resumes again in Kronstadt. Presumably he had been transferred, but he does not say when and in what circumstances. Lemke says only that after the Finnish campaign, Bulgarin was transferred to the Kronstadt Garrison Regiment for writing a satire on his regimental commander.[159] Grech's account is of no help because he places the transfer immediately after Bulgarin's escapades in Petersburg, particularly after his satire on Constantine. The anonymous A. N., who tries to bring some order into the chaos of Bulgarin's war service in Russia by tracking down and checking regimental records, is the most reliable source.[160] He read Grech's "Biographical Sketch" of Bulgarin,[161] and disagrees with it.

> This is not true. Documentary evidence shows that during the war in Finland in 1808-1809, Bulgarin was still in the same Uhlan Regiment from which (after his sentence and confinement in the fortress) he was transferred to the Kronstadt Garrison Regiment (of course, for the satire mentioned above) after the Finnish campaign.[162]

Despite these discrepancies, there is agreement on one point: that Bulgarin was punished for his satirical writings. But which satires? The one on Constantine, or the later ones in Finland? He admits writing satires in Finland.

---

156 Bulgarin, "Soldatskoje serdce, epizod," *Vosp.*, IV, pp. 364-392.

157 Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, pp. 440-441; Pogodin, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

158 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, V, p. 210.

159 Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

160 A. N. "Voennaja sluzhba F. V. Bulgarina, 1805-1811". *Russkaja Starina*, 1874, Vol. IX, pp. 774-777.

161 Grech, "F. V. Bulgarin. 1789-1859. Biograficheskij ocherk." *Russkaja Starina*, 1871, Vol. IV, pp. 484-514.

162 A. N., *op. cit.*, p. 775.

Friends made me write satirical verses about themselves and others, and nobody was offended, on the contrary, they all laughed and were pleased.[163]

There was one satire in Finland which was not a laughing matter. Bulgarin denies writing it, but in all probability it was his, too. It was called "Ves'-gom." [164]

We came to Friedland town
And, unfortunately and shamefully,
We threw our guns in the river,
And turned back. . . .

(Prishli k Fridlandu my mestechku
Tut, k neschast'ju i s stydom,
Pobrosali pushki v reku,
Sami sdelali ves'-gom. . . .) [165]

The satires, together with Bulgarin's insubordinations in Finland and his earlier escapades in Petersburg, were enough to earn him a term in the fortress and a transfer to an inferior regiment.

As for the fortress, although Bulgarin does not talk about it, there are enough indications to conclude that he spent at least some time in it. He alludes constantly to a "great misfortune" (gore) and a "cruel fate," and refers to himself as having "fallen from a higher sphere of society into a different world." [166] In a long digression, he describes with great detail the Kronstadt prison system itself as if he had experienced it.[167] For a long time afterwards he retained a fear of prisons in Russia and he would hesitate to open an official letter because it "smelled of the fortress." [168]

Characteristically, Bulgarin found a protector in Kronstadt in the person of the German-born Commandant of the Garrison Regiment, General von Klugen. This is confirmed by Grech who says that von Klugen reduced Bulgarin's sentence and allowed him to live in town.[169] Bulgarin claims that the General was an old friend of his great-uncle, Michał Bułharyn, former deputy to the Polish Sejm and a great patriot.[170]

---

163 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 82.

164 An abbreviated form of the military command "Ves' krugom" ("About face!") which had just then been introduced in the Russian army. The speeding-up of the tempo of the maneuver from three to two beats provided a clever satirist with a comment on the movements of the Russians *vis-à-vis* the French.

165 Quoted in Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, V, pp. 185-186.

166 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 2, 3, 14, 70.

167 *Ibid.*, VI, p. 133 ff.

168 Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, p. 462.

169 *Ibid.*, p. 440.

170 See p. 67.

The coincidence seems a little far-fetched; von Klugen's partiality to his prisoner was probably just another example of Bulgarin's ability to win the sympathy of a German superior.

Even with von Klugen's sympathy, Bulgarin's existence, until he was restored to official duties, was precarious. His status was so inferior that he had to vacate his lodgings when two squadrons of Uhlans arrived in Kronstadt.[171] It was under these circumstances—more out of necessity than by choice—he got to know the heterogenous inhabitants of the town: Polish customs officials, Italian innkeepers, Russian merchants, and the incredible French cannibal Cabri, whom Admiral Kruzenstern had brought to Russia from the Pacific Islands.[172] During his stay in Kronstadt Bulgarin claims to have spent time in "literary pursuits." [173] At first it was mostly reading, until the visiting Uhlans spread his reputation as an "author." He was immediately in demand, and some of his poems became popular songs at Kronstadt parties.[174]

Even with the change of status, the long stay in a small town which was virtually isolated during the long winter was boring to an officer accustomed to life in Petersburg. There were also fresh disciplinary problems which even the "good" von Klugen could not always overlook: Bulgarin mentions an adventurous trip by land and sea to Petersburg [175] made without permission; he also refers to his partiality for strong beverages.[176] There is evidence that he wanted to leave Kronstadt.

> In 1810, General of Cavalry A. P. Tormasov, was appointed Commander-in-Chief in Georgia, in place of Field Marshal Count I. V. Gudovich. This changed my fate because I was planning to apply for a transfer to Georgia in order to serve under the father of Colonel Count A. I. Gudovich, who liked me.[177]

He must have been desperate if, with his preference for Petersburg and the Baltic provinces, he was willing to transfer to Georgia. When a transfer finally came, to the Jamburg Dragoon Regiment in August of 1810,[178] it was apparently an unpopular one, because Bulgarin speaks

---

171 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 47.

172 Admiral I. F. Kruzenstern made a trip around the world in 1803-1806. His book, *Travel Around the World* (Puteshestvije vokrug sveta) came out in 1809. Bulgarin (*Vosp.*, VI, p. 15) claims to have read it the same year, and been able to compare Cabri's stories with Kruzenstern's description of the "savage Frenchman."

173 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 29.

174 Bulgarin quotes one of them in a footnote to page 111 of *Vosp.*, VI.

175 *Ibid.*, VI, p. 68 ff.

176 *Ibid.*, VI, p. 55.

177 *Ibid.*, V, pp. 294-295.

178 A.N., *op. cit.*, p. 775.

with despair about leaving von Klugen, his last "guide," and about "slipping into an abyss." [179] The loss of von Klugen's protection, and the failure to secure Count Gudovich's patronage mark the beginning of Bulgarin's withdrawal from the Russian army. The fact that his new regiment was stationed in Revel, in Livonia, facilitated this step.

7. *From the Russian Army to Napoleon*

Bulgarin left Russian military service and went to Warsaw (in the independent Grand Duchy) in May of 1811. The circumstances surrounding his separation from the Russian army were always a source of great vulnerability for him in Russia. The evidence indicated that he had left on the eve of Russia's great war against her enemy, Napoleon, and had joined the army of that enemy. The fact that Russia and France were at peace between 1807-1811 was largely forgotten.[180] For his step Bulgarin has been called at various times, a traitor, a turncoat, and a deserter. Even his long-time friend, Grech, implies as much:

> In Revel Bulgarin carried out his earlier intention. Having retired from service (or perhaps while still in the service), he left Revel in the company of a certain Frenchman, Count de-Kensonna (Quinsonnat), . . .[181]

A. N., the anonymous compiler of facts on Bulgarin, corrects Grech again, while at the same time speaking of the need to know the facts.

> It seems that it would not be entirely without advantage to present the exact information about a fact—sufficiently clarified by now—which had served as the basis for numerous and cruel attacks on Bulgarin, although his attackers hardly knew its exact circumstances. . . . In the *History of Jamburg Dragoon Regiment* . . . there is an undisputable item of information about the termination of Bulgarin's military service in Russia: 'In the rank of podporuchik (second lieutenant) he was dismissed from service for bad conduct on May 10, 1811.' This information was unknown until now, and it proves that Bulgarin left Russia not while still in the service, but after having been separated from it.[182]

This is also what Bulgarin says in his *Memoirs,* that he was not a deserter, and hence, not a traitor.[183]

---

[179] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 148.

[180] Florinsky, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 661-671, and other historians refer to the period as "Franco-Russian Alliance."

[181] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 441.

[182] A. N., *op. cit.*, pp. 774-775.

[183] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 159.

An interesting item in A. N.'s information above is Bulgarin's rank, second lieutenant, indicating that he was promoted in the Dragoons. In view of this, we can reject as a piece of slander the information, contained in another source, that Bulgarin was reduced to private, became a regular drunkard, begged for handouts on the streets of Revel (always accompanying his requests with witty epigrams), and finally stole an officer's overcoat.[184] Although this information is repeated almost word for word by Lemke (its source figures prominently in his bibliography),[185] it is ignored by Pogodin and in all three of Grech's biographies of Bulgarin.

As far as Bulgarin's "dismissal" is concerned, there is evidence indicating that he wanted to be dismissed and that this was cleverly arranged to coincide with something else. The "certain Frenchman" whom Grech mentions was, according to a short but well-documented biography by A.N., the commander of the Jamburg Dragoons himself, Colonel Victor Osipovich de-Kensonna (Count de Quinsonnat), a Frenchman in Russian military service who was retiring and returning to France by way of Warsaw at about the time of Bulgarin's dismissal.[186] In what by then had become a pattern, Bulgarin again won the sympathy of a non-Russian superior, for whom it was easy to arrange the dismissal, and who then took him along to Warsaw. The "bad conduct" clause, however, in view of Bulgarin's over-all record, was unavoidable.

In his *Memoirs* Bulgarin does not mention Quinsonnat at all. Presumably, he does not want his readers to think that he had a preconceived plan to go to Warsaw. He mentions another travelling companion, Captain O. from the Duchy of Warsaw, who involved him in a tragi-comedy kidnapping of a Jewish girl,[187] but with whom he parted company in Kovno, on the border of the Duchy of Warsaw. After that, Bulgarin turned back in order to visit his mother,[188] and it was not until his visit with Michał Bułharyn, the former Deputy to the Polish Sejm, that the question of going to Warsaw supposedly came up.

> Then came the decisive change in my life. The elders of our family decided that I must not remain idle, and I was told to go to the Duchy of Warsaw and enter military service, in which some of our relatives were already serving. Here I must explain something, which in present times seems puzzling. Russia was at that time in close alliance with France. . . . There was freedom of movement between Russia and the Duchy of Warsaw. . . .[189]

---

[184] Pavel Nashchokin, "O Bulgarine. Pis'mo P.V. Nashchokina k S.D. Poltorackomu." *Russkij Arkhiv*, 1884, Book 3, pp. 352-353.

[185] Lemke, *op. cit.*, pp. 232-233.

[186] A.N., *op. cit.*, pp. 775-777.

[187] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 165 **ff.**

[188] *Ibid.*, VI, p. 161.

[189] *Ibid.*, VI., pp. 222-223.

Supplied with money by his great-uncle Michał and uncle Stanisław Bułharyn, and with letters of introduction from Count Tyszkiewicz, a close friend of the family, Bulgarin went to Warsaw.

In Warsaw, Bulgarin claims to have secured an interview with Prince Józef Poniatowski, the Minister of War,[190] in order to apply for a commission in one of the cavalry regiments. He was unsuccessful;[191] he was told that the Duchy had too many good men waiting for commissions. All they could offer him was a second lieutenant's rank in an infantry regiment which was only just being formed. Bulgarin says that he turned this down and decided to go to Paris.[192]

There is some controversy surrounding the last statement. Grech maintains that Bulgarin's brother told him that Bulgarin had enlisted as a private in a cavalry regiment that was being formed by the French in Warsaw, and was sent with it to Spain.[193] Lemke says the same thing, except that the regiment was supposedly already in Spain, and Bulgarin joined it there.[194] Other sources also confirm Bulgarin's enlisting in Warsaw.[195] Thus there is strong evidence that when Bulgarin left Warsaw, he was already an enlisted man. In view of this, his picaresque narrative of the crossing of Germany as a civilian must be rejected, although it is possible that he was only embellishing a journey that he had made as a soldier. The journey led from Warsaw through Wrocław, Dresden, Hamburg to Paris.[196]

8. *With Napoleon*

Bulgarin's *Memoirs* end with the moment of his arrival in Paris, and thus we do not have his version of what happened to him afterwards. We do have, however, statements from those who knew him intimately (particularly Grech) to whom he told various details of his service under Napoleon; we also find numerous references and allusions to this period of his service in his writings.[197] With these and other isolated fragments, and with the help of books on the history of the period, it is possible to continue outlining Bulgarin's colourful career with some degree of accuracy.

---

190 *Ibid.*, VI, p. 244 ff.

191 S. Piekarek, "Bułharyn," *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, Kraków, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1937, Tom III, p. 131.

192 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 257.

193 Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 441.

194 Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

195 Polovcov, *op. cit.*, p. 476.

196 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 258-324.

197 Bulgarin, "Znakomstvo s Napoleonom na avanpostakh pod Baucenom v 1813 g." *Sochinenija*, Part 1, No. 6, S. Peterburg, Smirdin, 1830.

The best clue is provided by a reliable Polish work, Marian Kukiel's *History of the Polish Army during the Napoleonic Era.*[198] Kukiel says that the "Vistula" Lancers, a crack Polish cavalry unit fighting in Spain, became in 1811 a nucleus of the newly formed French regiments of Light-Horsemen Lancers; the new regiments were complemented with Polish cavalrymen recruited in the Duchy of Warsaw.[199] It is reasonable to assume that Bulgarin would not object to joining the new regiments in Spain, especially since a friend of his was already serving there in Napoleon's Light-Horsemen Guards.[200] Grech confirms the assumption in his earliest biography by saying that Bulgarin served in "chevau-légers" in Spain.[201]

There is absolute agreement among Bulgarin's biographers and critics that, after Spain, Bulgarin participated in Napoleon's invasion of Russia in 1812, a fact which he always tried to disguise (this is probably the reason why his *Memoirs* end in 1811 in Paris, with Bulgarin as a civilian), and frequently denied later, even in official communications with the Russian authorities.[202] He was not successful because the available evidence points in the direction of his participation in the campaign. The Light-Horsemen Lancers, in which Bulgarin served, were withdrawn from Spain some time in 1812 and became a part of Napoleon's army against Russia.[203] There are other arguments.

Bulgarin is said to have fought in Marshal Oudinot's Corps against the Russian forces of Prince Wittgenstein in Lithuania and Byelorussia. In Bulgarin's novel which deals with the campaign of 1812, he gives an unusual amount of attention to this area of the campaign, which was by no means the most important, and to Wittgenstein, one of its lesser commanders.[204] (Wittgenstein is also mentioned generously in the *Memoirs.*[205]) On the other hand, he describes the more important areas of the campaign in a standard manner typical of a non-participant.

Bulgarin was not always able to remain silent about his participation. According to Grech, he would occasionally tell his friends that during the retreat, at the crossing of Berezina he was one of the Polish Uhlans who guided Napoleon across the crumbling ice.[206] This may

---

198 M. Kukiel, *op. cit.*, II, p. 29.

199 *Loc. cit.*

200 Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, V, p. 80.

201 Grech, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina," *op. cit.*, p. 517.

202 Lemke, *op. cit.*, pp. 232-237.

203 M. Kukiel, *op. cit.*, II, p. 29 ff.

204 F. V. Bulgarin, *Pëtr Ivanovich Vyzhigin*, S. Peterburg, Pljushar, 1831, Vol. II, pp. 78, 80, Vol. III, p. 192.

205 Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, IV, pp. 256, 266, V, pp. 40, 216, 282, 297.

206 Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, p. 442.

sound like one of his stories, but as it happened Wittgenstein was executing a maneuver to prevent Napoleon from crossing the Berezina,[207] which means that Oudinot's corps was also present at the crossing.

After the crossing of the Berezina, Bulgarin followed the remnants of the Grande Armée west.

9. *From Napoleon Back to Russia: The Polish Congress Kingdom*

There are certain indications that Bulgarin realized at some point during the disastrous campaign that he had made a mistake by joining Napoleon. Grech tells of the following incident.

> He told us that finally he succeeded on one occasion in being present at an exchange of prisoners. He went to the Russian advance-guard, and saw some of his old companions but was not recognized by them. He sent greetings to some of his former friends with the Russian sergeant who was escorting the French truce envoys.[208]

Was Bulgarin contemplating defection? His faith in Napoleon had probably been shaken by the sight of many Polish landowners in Lithuania and Byelorussia who, instead of greeting the French Emperor, were co-operating with the Russians.[209]

Once the Russians entered the Duchy of Warsaw, there were open attempts, initiated by Alexander, to bring the Polish units over to the Russian side.[210] But there was no peace yet, the war was still going on, and Bulgarin remained loyal to Napoleon to the end. According to Grech, he participated in all the battles of the 1813 and 1814 campaigns, earned a captain's rank, and was captured in France by the Prussians.[211] Because one of the articles of the Treaty of Paris in 1814, at Napoleon's insistence, guaranteed to Polish soldiers a return to their country,[212] Bulgarin was allowed to return to Poland.

It is difficult to determine precisely when Bulgarin reached Warsaw, but it seems that it was not before 1815. Both Grech and Lemke say that he spent some time in a Prussian prison camp before he was handed over to the Russians.[213] Meanwhile events in Poland had taken a new turn. The Duchy of Warsaw was abolished by the Congress of Vienna, and replaced, after some territorial adjustments in favour of its neigh-

---

[207] Florinsky, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 677-678.

[208] Grech, *op. cit.*, pp. 441-442.

[209] H. Mościcki, *Pod berłem carów*, Warszawa, Instytut Wydawniczy "Biblioteka Polska," 1924, p. 70 ff.

[210] Kukiel, *op. cit.*, II, p. 167.

[211] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 442.

[212] Kukiel, *op. cit.*, II, p. 246.

[213] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 444; Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

bours, by a so-called Polish Congress Kingdom with Alexander as its first king.[214] The Commander-in-Chief of the new kingdom's army, composed mostly of veterans from Napoleonic wars, was the Grand Duke Constantine. It was he who, according to Grech, greeted his former cornet.

> Konstantin Pavlovich received him kindly and, pointing to Bulgarin's former colleagues, . . . in stars and ribbons, said:
> 'You, too, could have been a general, if you had remained with me.'
> 'Your Highness!' answered Bulgarin, 'I served my country.'
> 'Good, good!' retorted the Grand Duke. 'Now serve me for a while!'
> The Grand Duke offered the returned patriot any military command post of his choice but Bulgarin declined, declaring that he must go to his mother and put her estate in order.[215]

The incident is probably not entirely true, but the fact remains that Bulgarin left the military service for good. By leaving the service and going to his mother's estate, which was situated in the Russian part of Poland, Bulgarin was also leaving the Congress Kingdom.

The question arises, why Bulgarin chose not to remain in the Congress Kingdom? That he did not wish to serve under the Grand Duke is understandable in view of his past experience, but there were other advantages of remaining in Poland. The new Kingdom had a liberal Constitution, granted by Alexander in 1815, that was the envy of Russia.[216] A contemporary Polish historian, Joachim Lelewel, claimed later that in many respects the new Constitution was more liberal than either the famous Constitution of May 3rd, 1791, or the Constitution of the Duchy of Warsaw of 1807.[217] Even the rigid and ruthless disciplinarian, Grand Duke Constantine, was surrounded by an aura of liberalism, which in fact he hardly deserved but which he acquired simply by being a Viceroy of Poland.[218] The new Kingdom was making rapid strides in education, commerce and industry; its population was increasing quickly, a sign of vitality.[219] There were many opportunities for a young man who wanted to make a career. The nobility particularly was much better off than in the provinces incorporated into Russia, where severe restrictions were

---

[214] S. Askenazi, *Carstvo pol'skoe 1815-1830 g.*, Vladimir Vysockij, transl. from Polish, Moskva, Knigoizdatel'stvo pisatelej, 1915, p. 17 ff.

[215] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 444.

[216] Marc Raeff, *Michael Speransky, Statesman of Imperial Russia, 1772-1839*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1957, p. 239.

[217] Joachim Lelewel, "Trzy konstytucje polskie 1791, 1807, 1815," *Dzieła*, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961, VIII, pp. 467-539.

[218] Marc Raeff, *The Decembrist Movement*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 4-5.

[219] Askenazi, *op. cit.*, p. 40 ff.

commonplace and whose inhabitants dreamed of being incorporated into the Congress Kingdom.[220]

It is possible, in view of his early thirst for authorship and his undoubtedly rich store of military experiences, that Bulgarin was already then contemplating a literary career, and if he was, then the better place for it would be Russia, if only on account of her enormous successes in the recent wars and the anticipated readiness of the Russians to read about them. For Poland, on the other hand, the Napoleonic Wars ended with a disappointment. The fact that Bulgarin began to write almost immediately after returning to Russia supports this explanation. However, a more likely explanation of Bulgarin's return to Russia is one based on his known distaste of being left to his own devices. In Poland, he would have been alone. All his relatives were in Russia, both in the countryside and in Petersburg, and he could reasonably count on their help. A third explanation is the one supplied by Bulgarin himself, namely that he returned home rather than remained in the Congress Kingdom to stay with his mother and put the family estate in order. His subsequent trip to Petersburg can then be viewed as, among other things, an attempt to save the estate.

Upon return home Bulgarin found that there was practically no estate left. His mother had won it back in court, but in the process she had ruined herself financially. An uncle, Paweł Bułharyn, came to the aid of his favourite nephew. He was at that time engaged in a three-way litigation involving himself, Count Tyszkiewicz and a certain Parczewski.[221] The case, which was to be heard by the Senate in Petersburg, concerned the legal title to eight thousand serfs. Taking advantage of his nephew's old contacts in the capital, Paweł Bułharyn promised him five percent of the total if he would go to Petersburg and handle the case. Bulgarin readily accepted, no doubt pleased at this opportunity. He arrived in Petersburg sometime in 1816,[222] and moved in with the family of his sister, Antonina, and her husband Istrickij, an official in the capital. According to Grech, Bulgarin had no trouble re-entering Petersburg's life in his changed circumstances, and during the next few years was largely occupied with his uncle's legal affairs.[223]

Lemke says that Bulgarin was unsuccessful in his temporary legal profession.[224] Grech, on the contrary, says that Bulgarin was very clever in court and indicates that his tactics seem to have included all the malpractices prevalent in his day.[225] His duties afforded him an opportunity

---

220 Mościcki, *op. cit.*, p. 77 ff.

221 Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

222 Stefan Piekarek, "Bułharyn," *op. cit.*, p. 131.

223 Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 447.

224 Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

225 Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 447 ff.

to observe types of people he had never met before: greedy, corrupt, incompetent. The experience provided him with material for his future stories, anecdotes and novels.

It seems that the entire period of Bulgarin's legal profession was also, at the same time, a period of literary apprenticeship. According to a Polish source, he started writing as early as 1816,[226] mostly short pieces based on his military experiences and later, his legal experiences. Grech reports with an undisguised degree of awe:

> Somehow, I don't know how, Bulgarin stumbled into a French circle at the home of Generals Bazen, Seinover and others. He read to them his compositions, which someone translated for him into French.[227]

In this French circle he occasionally met literary notables, whose names and faces he was always very careful to remember and who invariably remembered him, thus creating for him the beginning of a literary reputation.

10. *The Wilno Experience* [228]

There is evidence that Bulgarin, at the time of his legal and literary activities in Petersburg, was also spending considerable time in Wilno. His name crops up in Russian and Polish sources dealing with the intellectual and ideological trends in Wilno in the years 1816-1822. Another Polish source is more specific:

> After the Napoleonic wars Bulgarin lived in Wilno where he came to the attention of readers of periodicals as a poet and satirist; after 1819 he moved to Petersburg where his literary production belongs already to Russian literature, but he continued his ties with Wilno and was a patron of Poles arriving to Petersburg and promoter of their achievements.[229]

What we are dealing with here is evidence of almost a double life, of an activity so intense as to confuse Bulgarin's biographers, both Russian and Polish. It is reasonable to assume that Bulgarin's legal duties would require him to travel from Petersburg to Wilno, but it seems that he was practically dividing his time between the two cities. These extended sojourns in Wilno (almost a year in 1819), in view of that city's impor-

---

[226] Stefan Piekarek, "Bułharyn," *op. cit.*, p. 131.

[227] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

[228] N. D. "N. I. Grech, F. V. Bulgarin i A. Mickevich. Materialy dlja ikh biografii". *Russkaja Starina*, 1903, Vol. CXVI, pp. 333-351. Also: Zdzisław Skwarczyński, *Kazimierz Kontrym. Towarzystwo Szubrawców. Dwa studia*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1961.

[229] Zdzisław Skwarczyński, *Wiadomości Brukowe*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1962, pp. XLI-XLII.

tance as a centre of learning and culture and as a link between Russia and Poland,[230] were of great significance in Bulgarin's development.

Wilno, once the capital of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania, became, in the period under consideration, one of the most important cities in the Russian Empire. Its new importance was the result of the reorganization of Russia in 1802, chiefly along the recommendations prepared by Prince Adam Czartoryski,[231] when eight ministries were formed. Czartoryski, besides heading the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, became also member of the council for schools in the Ministry of Education (whose first head was the Polish-educated Zawadowski).[232] The new ministry's model, in the absence of any Russian tradition, was the former Polish Commission for National Education,[233] founded in 1773, the first modern Ministry of Education in Europe.[234] In his *Memoirs*, Bulgarin shows awareness of the fact by stressing it repeatedly in his long digression on the Russian reforms.[235] Russia was divided into six school districts of which Wilno, with the densest network of educational institutions in all of Russia, was one.[236] The Wilno district, very characteristically conceived under Czartoryski's influence, included not only all the provinces taken by Russia in the partitions, but also provinces which had belonged to Poland in the more distant past.[237] Thus Wilno became a cultural centre for an area much larger than before the partitions. The curator of the huge district became Czartoryski himself who held that position from 1803 until 1824, throughout almost the entire reign of Alexander I.[238] The headquarters of Czartoryski's educational activities was the University of Wilno.

Wilno's most important educational institution has also acquired a new importance. The former Jesuit Academy, founded in 1579, became, through a charter of 1803, the Imperial University of Wilno.[239] With Czartoryski's guidance, and under the leadership of carefully selected

---

230 Skwarczyński, *Towarzystwo Szubrawców*, p. 80.

231 Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski*, I, p. 57.

232 Józef Bieliński, *Żywot ks. Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego*, Warszawa, Gebethner i Wolff, 1905, Tom II, p. 5 ff.

233 Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski*, I, p. 58.

234 Manfred Kridl, *A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture*, New York: Columbia University Press, The Hague: Mouton & Company, 1956, p. 139.

235 Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, V, p. 246 ff.

236 Skwarczyński, *Towarzystwo Szubrawców*, p. 84.

237 Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski*, I, p. 58.

238 Józef Bieliński, *op. cit.*, II, p. 8.

239 Józef Bieliński, *Uniwersytet Wileński (1579-1831)*, Kraków, W. L. Anczyc i Spółka, 1899-1900, Tom I, p. 5.

chancellors, the University reached great heights, attaining the highest level in the Russian Empire and ranking with the best institutions in Western Europe. Its professors were permitted considerable freedom in their work; their activities often extended beyond the academic subjects they taught. The University was also taking full advantage of the liberal winds blowing at that time in Russia. In a few years this would change, but meanwhile the University was like a magnet attracting the best minds in Poland and Lithuania.

The University's excellence became Czartoryski's special concern once his other official duties in Russia came to an end, and particularly when he began to realize that Poland was not going to be restored in its entirety in a union with Russia under Alexander which he advocated, nor would even the Lithuanian provinces be united with the Congress Kingdom. Meanwhile the University, and other higher schools in the Wilno district, was producing intelligentsia far in excess of the local needs, and beginning to export the surplus into Russia proper. The long-range purpose of this policy was to make up through education what was lost at conference tables. The ultimate aim of this plan was to assure Polish intellectual and cultural primacy within the Russian Empire.[240] This was precisely the accusation levelled against Czartoryski later by his Russian enemy, Senator Novosilcev, who went as far as to declare that the whole purpose of the huge enterprise which was the Wilno centre of learning was nothing less than a Machiavellian-Wallenrodian scheme (with reference to a poem by Mickiewicz with a Machiavellian theme) designed by Czartoryski to capture Russia from within.[241] The accusation was not entirely without foundations.

The implications surrounding Wilno and the University were not lost on Bulgarin. They are present in his *Memoirs*, in some of his other works, and in the rôle he assigned to himself after his return to Petersburg from Wilno for good. But while in Wilno he took advantage of the opportunities the University offered. Although Bulgarin never studied at the University of Wilno officially, he was acquainted with the professors and students there.[242] His long acquaintance with Lelewel, for example, probably started with Bulgarin attending the young historian's lectures on universal history: there are echoes of Lelewel in Bulgarin's writings which support the assumption. Lelewel's course, which was offered during the historian's first appointment in Wilno in 1815-1818 (he later went to Warsaw to return again to Wilno in 1821) [243] and which enjoyed great popularity among the students (one of whom, Mickiewicz, dedi-

---

[240] Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski*, I, p. 129.

[241] Skwarczyński, *Kazimierz Kontrym*, p. 24.

[242] Louis Pedrotti, *Józef-Julian Sękowski: The Genesis of a Literary Alien*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1965, p. 9.

[243] Bieliński, *Uniwersytet Wileński*, II, pp. 37-43.

cated a glowing poem "To Joachim Lelewel"), was open to the public. Bulgarin probably also attended lectures on Polish literature which were offered during his stay in Wilno. His knowledge of Polish literature, which he was to display shortly, was too sound to be acquired by independent study alone, especially if one recalls that this was probably the first time in his life that he was reading extensively in Polish. It was probably while attending lectures or other gatherings at the University that Bulgarin concluded some of his other acquaintanceships in Wilno. If one recalls that several of Bulgarin's future protégés,[244] as well as some of his partners in literary and journalistic ventures, came from Wilno, it is reasonable to assume that he had met them during his extended stay there. His friendship with Sękowski, the future orientalist, writer and journalist, had its beginning during this period.[245] It is possible that he also met Mickiewicz at the same time. Both Mickiewicz and Sękowski graduated from the University in 1819. Sękowski, incidentally, was one of the University's first "exports" to Russia. However, after being sponsored by the University for two years of study and travel in the Orient which enabled him to secure an appointment to the chair of Oriental languages at the University of Petersburg, Sękowski chose to make an official break with his Polish heritage.[246]

Of greatest importance for Bulgarin during his stay in Wilno was his exposure to the considerable journalistic and literary activity centering around the University. The literary activity was to grow even bigger with Mickiewicz's rise as a great Romantic poet, but until then it was concentrated in several cultural-literary periodicals. Wilno had a journalistic tradition going back to the eighteenth century; the tradition continued. During Bulgarin's stay there, Wilno had several periodicals, mostly edited by members of the University faculty (Lelewel was editor of *Wilno Weekly* (Tygodnik Wileński) between 1815-1818),[247] but none of them had the success of the satirical *Pavement News* (Wiadomości Brukowe), which was published between 1816-1822.[248] To satisfy the demand for it, which reached 3,000 copies, and to ensure continuous high quality of the periodical, a society of collaborators was organized around it in 1817, known as the *Society of Scamps* (Towarzystwo Szubrawców).[249] Its members had pseudonyms, which indicated the general direction of their satire. Neither the pseudonyms, nor the name of the *Society* itself, were meant to be frivolous, nor were they designed to deceive the

---

244 See p. 98.

245 Pedrotti, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

246 *Ibid.*, p. V.

247 Zdzisław Skwarczyński, *Wiadomości Brukowe*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1962, p. III.

248 Skwarczyński, *Towarzystwo Szubrawców*, p. 78.

249 Skwarczyński, *Wiadomości Brukowe*, p. VII.

gubernial authorities, as some critics believed.[250] The name, *Society of Scamps,* was a programmatic *nom de guerre,* a provocative name assumed voluntarily by people who were going to challenge the supposed high values of those who considered these values their own prerogative, mainly the landowners and the clergy who, despite the enlightening influence of the University, were still feudal and backward. The *Society* directed itself against their obscurantism and conservatism, trying to break their hegemony; it dedicated itself to the defence of the peasant, to the fight for a progressive worldview and the recognition of work and knowledge as standards of social value.[251] Because the Society was primarily engaged in social criticism of local nature, its members—including several respected professors of the University—did not create any large or lasting works. But their erudition, and the knowledge of all the great satirists and moralists from antiquity to the present which they displayed in their periodical, made *The Pavement News* a cultural phenomenon of Wilno literature.[252] The fact that Bulgarin, along with Sękowski, became a member of the *Society*—under a pseudonym "Derfintos," [253] a mythical god trying to reconcile people—points to another, the most important, aspect of his involvement in Wilno's literary and cultural life.

The Wilno experience had a crucial influence on Bulgarin. Its long-range effects remained with him all his life: he was forever justifying his position *vis-à-vis* Poland and Russia. This can be seen in all his longer work, particularly his *Memoirs.* He was, for a long time, a self-styled spokesman for Polish literature and culture in Russia. In addition, the lessons he learned in Wilno helped him become a successful journalist, a writer of stories on morals and manners, even a historian in a sense, and later a novelist—succeeding where his mentors had failed but borrowing many of their devices.

The Wilno experience had an immediate effect on Bulgarin. His exposure to Polish literature resulted, immediately upon his return to Petersburg, in a long article "written at the urging of my literary friends":[254] *A Short Survey of Polish Literature.*[255] His literary career in Russia was launched.

---

[250] *Ibid.*, p. X.

[251] Skwarczyński, *Towarzystwo Szubrawców*, p. 217.

[252] Pedrotti, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[253] Skwarczyński, *Wiadomości Brukowe*, p. XLI.

[254] N. D., *op. cit.*, p. 347.

[255] Bulgarin, "Kratkoe obozrenie pol'skoj slovesnosti," *Syn Otechestva*, Nos. 31 and 32, S. Peterburg, 1820.

11. *Back in Petersburg: Conclusion*

When Bulgarin returned from Wilno to Petersburg in 1820, it was for good. Until then, it had been mainly his uncle's affairs which kept him in the capital; from then on, it was literature. Grech claims that it was after meeting him that Bulgarin decided to settle permanently in Petersburg.

> Having returned to Petersburg again, he . . . met me and from the beginning of 1820 began to publish articles in my journal, *Son of the Fatherland* (Syn Otechestva). . . . In this way his wandering life ended and Bulgarin, after marching arms in hand from Torneo to Guadalquivir, at last exchanged his sword for a pen and, as he said, established his headquarters in Petersburg.[256]

Grech's explanation sounds plausible: their first meeting most probably did take place at the beginning of 1820, if only for editorial purposes (Bulgarin's first important article was printed in Grech's *Son of the Fatherland*).[257] Although Lemke states that Bulgarin and Grech met in 1823,[258] Grech himself confirms the earlier date, including the month, February of 1820, in another passage.[259] But the decision to remain in Petersburg was Bulgarin's own.

Bulgarin's decision may have had something to do with Czartoryski's ideology but, more likely, it was influenced by a sober evaluation of the respective merits of Wilno and Petersburg as locations for a literary career. If Bulgarin was still hesitating between the two cities, the ultimate choice was obvious. In Wilno, as in the Congress Kingdom earlier, it would have been impossible for him to make a career as a writer and journalist: most writers, including Mickiewicz at that time, needed a profession to support themselves; Bulgarin did not have one. Furthermore, it was also partly a question of the amount of potential competition. The literature in vogue in Wilno at the time was too sophisticated for Bulgarin to make a success of it at the early stage of his career. His production in Wilno was limited to a few short satirical poems. It is no accident that the experience gained in Wilno did not show itself in his writings in Russia until some time later. Instead, his first serious efforts consisted of crude textbook-type works and military stories, which would have been of no commercial value in Wilno. In Petersburg, on the other hand, he soon realized that there was a definite demand in Russia—in a public fed on poetry—for the kind of stories that he could tell out of his own vast experience. In addition, the Wilno

---

[256] Grech, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina," *op. cit.*, pp. 517-518.

[257] See above.

[258] Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

[259] Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni*, pp. 445-446.

experience introduced him to the riches of Polish literature and history. After the seemingly satisfactory solution of the Polish question—as the Russians saw it—Russians took an interest in the Polish past and present, and Bulgarin was going to exploit it. The last factor needs elaborating.

Poland, and particularly the Congress Kingdom, was of special interest to the Russian liberals, especially after the famous speech in Warsaw in 1818 in which Alexander I hinted at his desire to see in Russia a Constitution like that in Poland.[260] Because of this interest in Poland, Bulgarin, a recent arrival from that country, was favourably received in Petersburg liberal circles.[261] Some of the liberals were writers and journalists, capable of helping Bulgarin; their friendship became a factor in Bulgarin's decision.

As a result of all these factors, Bulgarin had enough material and enough contacts to enter the field of literature as a career.

Chapter II: LITERARY BACKGROUND

Bulgarin's entry into literature is usually credited to the influence of Grech. Undoubtedly, Grech had much to do with the success of the move, but not with the move itself. Grech admits this himself, contradicting somewhat an earlier statement.

> Having lost the possibility to continue with success his military service, he became a solicitor; seeing that it was possible to gain literary reputation, and with it a fortune, he finally took up literature. . . .[262]

In this new undertaking, Grech proved to be of considerable help, but not until he had convinced himself that Bulgarin would succeed anyway. Grech had noticed Bulgarin's determination and his methods.

> In order to achieve his goal, he would use any means at his disposal: from morning to night he would go from one senator to another, from one public prosecutor to another; he would call on secretaries and solicitors, he would feed and bribe them, he would bring toys and sweets for their children, and presents for their wives and mistresses. . . . These exploits, justified by the nature of his occupation, produced in his mind a mixed theory of the principle of war, litigation and literature. . . . This theory did not prevent him from being not an evil man but kind, compassionate, charitable and, in a fit of passion, ready for sacrifice.[263]

---

[260] Raeff, *Michael Speransky, . . . , op. cit.*, p. 239.

[261] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 446.

[262] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 447.

[263] *Ibid.*

These characteristics convinced Grech and somehow met with his approval, because a close relationship soon developed between the two men. The relationship turned into a partnership in 1822, when Grech invited Bulgarin to join him as co-editor of his journal, *Son of the Fatherland.* The partnership, which lasted some thirty years, and which forms a chapter in Russian literary history, was convenient for both of them. By helping Bulgarin, Grech was also helping himself. In this connection, a few words must be said about him.

1. *Nikolaj Ivanovich Grech*

Nikolaj Ivanovich Grech (1787-1867) was an extremely prolific writer who, like Bulgarin, succeeded in making literature a very profitable enterprise. His success was due largely to good education, hard work, and a series of important patrons, including Uvarov, who helped him start his own journal, *Son of the Fatherland,* in 1812.[264] The next ten years were the most brilliant in Grech's career as well as in the life of his journal whose contributors included practically all of the most important Russian writers of the day. It was during this period that Grech's sympathies shifted from the conservative literary circle "Beseda" to the progressive "Arzamas." Following a trip to France in 1817, he considered himself a thorough liberal.[265] As such, he became friendly with the liberal circles in Petersburg, which later became the revolutionary circles of the future Decembrists. But the Semenovsky Regiment mutiny frightened him and he began to gravitate back towards conservatism. From then on Grech could be said to represent a barometer of official Russian political climate. His political evolution parallelled closely the gradual abandonment of liberal principles by Alexander. Although he retained the friendship of some of his former liberal friends, his journal lost many of its contributors and subscribers, and Grech found himself suddenly in need of help. It was at this point that he asked Bulgarin to become his partner.

The exact nature of the partnership, in view of Grech's admitted dislike for the Poles,[266] has always been a matter of considerable speculation. It has been taken for granted that the erudite Grech somehow tolerated the crude newcomer Bulgarin by using him on the journal for tasks which he considered beneath his dignity, such as attacks against

---

[264] Ivanov-Razumnik, "N. I. Grech i ego 'Zapiski'," N. I. Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni,* Tekst po rukopisi pod redakciej i s kommentarijami Ivanova-Razumnika i D. M. Pinesa, Moskva-Leningrad, "Academia" 1930, p. 12. This edition of Grech's *Notes* is very similar to the Suvorin editon of 1886, except for the "Comments" by Ivanov-Razumnik and the organization of the material. The later edition is also more extensive including, as it does, several chapters and passages omitted in the earlier edition.

[265] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[266] Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni* (1886), pp. 443-444.

their journalistic competitors. Lemke perpetuates this version of the Grech-Bulgarin relationship by saying that

> Grech was somehow always able to conduct himself in such a way that he was not involved in the base actions of Bulgarin, who laboured not only for himself but also for his colleague.[267]

The same conclusions could be derived from the two partners' references to each other. Bulgarin always refers to Grech as a "friend and colleague," [268] and only rarely to his greed for money by calling him "Darzhan, Darzhan!" (d'argent, d'argent!),[269] while Grech talks about the partnership as one in which willy-nilly he was Bulgarin's partner,[270] and on that partnership depended the well-being of his family.[271] After collating the available evidence in his "Comments" to the 1930 edition of Grech's *Notes About My Life,* Ivanov-Razumnik concludes that Bulgarin was the dominant partner and that Grech followed him into reaction.[272] In an obvious effort to upgrade Grech and downgrade Bulgarin, Ivanov-Razumnik treats Bulgarin's commercial moves as if their motives were primarily political. Ivanov-Razumnik does not mention it, but in 1822, the same year in which Bulgarin became co-editor of *Son of the Fatherland,* he also started his first independent venture, the journal *The Northern Archive* (Severnyj Arkhiv) which had virtually no political orientation. As a publisher, he needed and received the advice and editorial help of the more experienced Grech, and this was how the partnership stood until 1825, when Grech, in turn, became co-editor of Bulgarin's publications. Afterwards, the partnership became even closer.

2. *The Northern Archive*

Bulgarin's new venture would suggest that his legal preoccupation must have come to an end in 1822. In his *Memoirs,* he claims to have made the acquaintance of M. M. Speranskij.

> He was very kind to me, and it is to his sense of justice and his personal intervention that I am obligated, because my relatives won the dragged out and complicated lawsuit in which I was involved both emotionally and materially.[273]

Since Speranskij was recalled to Petersburg in 1822,[274] Bulgarin's claim

---

[267] Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

[268] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija,* V, p. 274.

[269] Ivanov-Razumnik, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[270] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 437.

[271] *Ibid.*, p. 448.

[272] Ivanov-Razumnik, *op. cit.*, p. 22 ff.

[273] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, V, pp. 125-126.

[274] Raeff, *Michael Speransky, . . .*, p. 259.

is chronologically possible. But elsewhere he says that he was introduced to Speranskij as late as 1823, when already publishing *The Northern Archive.*[275] (Speranskij was supposedly much interested in the publication, particularly in its sections dealing with Russian history and, according to Bulgarin, offered many valuable suggestions). According to Bulgarin's *Memoirs,* he approached Speranskij in 1825 with a request to intercede on his behalf in the "family lawsuit," which Speranskij supposedly did with success.[276] We are dealing here either with Bulgarin's notoriously faulty chronology or with a second lawsuit. Whatever the case, it would seem that in 1822 Bulgarin was still a solicitor, in addition to being co-editor and a publisher. It would also seem that even if what he says about Speranskij is only partially true, Bulgarin was able, in this second stay in Petersburg, to secure the patronage of important Russians. This he demonstrated again in connection with the opening of *The Northern Archive,* the first issue of which he dedicated "to the Generous Patron of Learning and Enlightenment in the Fatherland," Chancellor Count Rumjancev.[277] The dedication was a result of correspondence between Bulgarin and Rumjancev, in which the Count eagerly accepted an invitation to subscribe to the journal, stressing its importance, and promising to help upon his return to Petersburg.[278] That the journal had official backing can be seen from the instruction of the Minister of Education, Prince Golicyn, to the guardians of school districts that they should propose that the educational institutions under their jurisdiction subscribe to *The Northern Archive,* "in which there is a good selection of various heretofore unpublished materials concerning Russian history, as well as most interesting geographical and statistical information about Russia and other countries." [279]

Despite the Ministry's high opinion of it, or perhaps because of it, *The Northern Archive* did not receive the critical acclaim it deserved. Grech, for instance, for reasons of his own which possibly had something to do with the fact that he was not at first officially associated with the journal, speaks of it as of nothing more than an opportunistic venture.

> With the intention of increasing his income from literary activities, Bulgarin turned to Russian and Slavonic history. Having collected some historical materials, he began to publish *The Northern*

---

[275] Bulgarin, *op. cit.,* V, pp. 339-340.

[276] *Ibid.,* V, pp. 342-343.

[277] *Severnyj Arkhiv,* zhurnal istorii, statistiki i puteshestvij, izdavajemyj F. Bulgarinym, chast' pervaja, Sanktpeterburg, v tipografii N. Grecha, 1822.

[278] "Iz arkhiva F. V. Bulgarina. Pis'ma grafa N. Rumjanceva-F. V. Bulgarinu," *Russkaja Starina,* 1901, Vol. CV, pp. 383-384.

[279] Archives of the Third section, I expedition 1826, No. 82. Quoted by Lemke, *op. cit.,* p. 233.

> *Archive,* printed in it interesting articles, but committted frightful blunders due particularly to insufficient knowledge of foreign languages. He misprinted names and confused events; if he published it today, he would not avoid attacks and ridicule, but in the blissful days when 'each printed page seemed holy to us,' even worse things were accepted.[280]

Lemke, who habitually repeats Grech's, statements about Bulgarin whenever they are derogatory, does so too with regard to *The Northern Archive.*

> Lacking the appearance of a regular journal, *The Northern Archive* had as its aim history, statistics, travel, and of course, in view of the general poverty of journalism, it did have some readers.[281]

One critic, however, who has read the journal carefully, praises it, and attacks Lemke for his criticism, accusing him, in view of his unfairness to the journal, of not reading it at all.[282]

There is an element of truth in all of these statements. The launching of the journal was undoubtedly a clever maneuver to break into publishing, and the moment could not have been chosen better. Russia stood at the zenith of its power, and interest in its history was high; each successive volume of Karamzin's *History of the Russian State* was greeted with enthusiasm. Outside Russia, interest in the past, including the Slavonic past, was strongly stimulated by the Romantics, and important scholars were making their appearance all over Europe. Bulgarin was not immune to these trends. He was not a trained historian or linguist, but history had always been his favorite discipline;[283] he had been exposed to it further in Wilno under Lelewel. As a matter of fact, *The Northern Archive* probably owed its organization into sections to the Polish historian's influence. The sections: history, geography, statistics, etc., corresponded with Lelewel's system expounded in his work, *Historyka,* from which he had lectured in Wilno.[284] Bulgarin knew several foreign languages sufficiently well to be able to make the selections he needed from other foreign sources as well. In the process of translation and adaptation mistakes were inevitable but, at this stage of the journal's existence, this was all he could do, and cared to do. For several issues the journal had nothing original in it, while Bulgarin experimented with its content. There is evidence that he sought the advice of Count Rumjancev. The reason for this is obvious: in the past, Bulgarin had been too free with

---

[280] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

[281] Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

[282] A. L. Pogodin, "Ivan Vyzhigin, roman Faddeja Bulgarina," *Zapiski Russkago Nauchnago Instituta v Belgrade,* Vypusk IX, Belgrad, 1933, p. 145.

[283] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, III, p. 70.

[284] Bieliński, *Uniwersytet Wileński (1579-1831)*, II, p. 440.

his pen and had been punished for it. He had learned a lesson about the risks of pursuing literary activity in Russia. His letter to Rumjancev is not available but the Count's reply of January 22, 1822, tells us that Bulgarin was worried about censorship, as well as suggesting how well Bulgarin has mastered the technique of obtaining influential supporters.

My dear Sir, Faddej Venediktovich:

> Having received the letter with which you were kind to honour me, and having read the journal, *The Northern Archive,* which had been delivered to me, I was surprised to find that you have kindly dedicated it to me; but surprise does not prevent me from being grateful.
>
> All the articles of the first issue promise success of the task which you began; they are very interesting.
>
> It is not difficult for me to agree with you, dear Sir, concerning the number of obstacles that you will receive from our present censorship, since your purpose is, above all, to occupy yourself and your readers with articles concerning Russia; but please don't be afraid of it: modesty in your utterings, and good selection of articles will overcome much.
>
> To make your journal a meeting place, as you yourself suggest, of learned Europe and Russia, would completely change its substance, since one part would dislodge the other, and no great and important goal would be achieved. Within two months I hope to be in Petersburg, at which time I will unfailingly endeavour to have the honour of making your acquaintance. I will be ready then to hear out your opinions about my ideas. . . .[285]

Rumjancev's objections to European materials were, presumably, caused by the fact that five revolutions broke out in Europe in 1820-1821 alone.[286] Possibly as a result of his advice, the journal concerned itself henceforth mainly with materials on Russia. Its many articles on Poland, originating mainly from Wilno, were apparently no exception, since Wilno was a part of the Russian Empire.

3. *Literary Pages*

The question whether *The Northern Archive* was a success or not can be decided by the fact that it kept growing. Alongside the sections on history, geography, travel, etc., it included a strictly literary section, under the heading "Criticism." This section became gradually so important that in 1823, to accommodate it, Bulgarin opened a separate journal, *Literary Pages* (Literaturnye Listki). It was divided into two parts: Poetry and Prose. The poetry contributions came from many of

---

[285] "Iz arkhiva F. V. Bulgarina. . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 383-384.

[286] Florinsky, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 687-688.

the important poets of the day. The prose section had fewer contributors because almost everything in it was written by Bulgarin himself. It included the genres at which Bulgarin was most proficient: military tales and stories on morals and manners. The stories were popular, and Bulgarin's literary reputation grew. Aleksandr Bestuzhev (Marlinskij), a co-editor with Kondratyj Ryleev of the *Polar Star* (Poljarnaja Zvezda), to which Bulgarin was also a regular contributor, was the first to define the nature of this reputation.

> *Bulgarin,* a Polish writer, writes in our own language in a particularly interesting way; he looks at things from a completely different point of view, expresses his ideas with a sort of military sincerity and truth, without diversity and play of words. Possessing a discriminating and original taste, which is not even carried away by feelings of youth and ardour, he amazes one with his unborrowed stylistic forms. He will certainly become one of our best writers.[287]

The *Literary Pages* retained the section "Criticism" from *The Northern Archive.* But more often than not the section became a means of attacking competitors or, under the heading, "Anti-criticism," of replying to their attacks. Thus, it was the *Literary Pages,* and not *The Northern Archive,* which became Bulgarin's literary forum. With this new venture, and his contributions to other journals in Petersburg, his entry into the mainstream of Russian literature was completed.

4. *Ingredients of Success*

Of great importance in Bulgarin's success was a fact which his enemies have always found difficult to ignore, his ability to gather around himself a group of devoted friends who were also outstanding writers as well as known liberals. Three of them: Griboedov, Bestuzhev and Ryleev, remained his friends until their death. Grech, as usual, claims credit for introducing Bulgarin to his friends.

> In my house he met the Bestuzhev brothers, Ryleev, Griboedov, Batenkov, the Turgenevs, and others—the flower of educated youth! I have to mention here that Bulgarin was at that time entirely different from what he became later: he was a clever fellow, likeable, gay, hospitable, capable of friendship and seeking the friendship of honest people.[288]

But it was not only Bulgarin's qualities that helped him make friends. Ryleev and Bestuzhev, for example, had been stationed in Poland, and were genuinely interested in Polish literature. Ryleev was a great admirer

---

[287] A. Bestuzhev, "Vzgljad na staruju i novuju slovesnost' v Rossii," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* izdannaja A. Bestuzhevym i K. Ryleevym (Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moskva-Leningrad, 1960) 1823, p. 27.

[288] Grech, *op. cit.,* p. 446.

of the Polish poet Niemcewicz, and a successful imitator of his *Historical Songs* (dumy). Both Ryleev and Bestuzhev knew the Polish language quite well, and Bulgarin represented for them a link with Poland. The friendship must have begun very early after Bulgarin's return to Petersburg, because there are letters from both Bestuzhev [289] and Ryleev [290] to Bulgarin, dating from the beginning of 1821. The letters are very intimate, like letters between old friends. They are written partly in Polish, and contain references to many mutual friends, fellow-members of the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature (Vol'noje Obshchestvo Ljubitelej Rossijskoj Slovesnosti) [291] which Bulgarin joined on March 28, 1821.[292] In his *Memoirs*, Bulgarin often refers to friendships begun before his true literary activity, and to "our literary circle of the twenties." [293] It could be argued that some members of the circle helped Bulgarin by writing favorable criticisms of his works (Bestuzhev) but, on the whole, the evidence indicates that it was Bulgarin who really helped his friends by publishing their works and, as in the case of Griboedov, by looking after their financial affairs.[294]

Bulgarin's popularity became even greater after his marriage sometime in the early 1820's. His wife, who was of German origin, was a good hostess, and their house on Voznesensky Street became a popular meeting place. The fact that their guests were mainly liberals or, as in the case of Ryleev and Bestuzhev, future Decembrists, is of great importance here, because it helps to underline the changes that occurred in Bulgarin's life during the next few years.

One of Bulgarin's chief cultural contacts, the University of Wilno, had been since 1821 under official suspicion because of its liberal character. The chief investigator was Senator Novosilcev, a high official at the side of the Grand Duke Constantine in Warsaw, and a personal enemy of Prince Adam Czartoryski, the Curator of the Wilno school district. A relatively minute incident, in connection with the anniversary of the Constitution of the 3rd of May, provoked a full-scale investigation, during which the existence of certain student societies was discovered.[295]

---

[289] "Iz arkhiva F. V. Bulgarina. Pis'ma A. Bestuzheva-F. V. Bulgarinu," *op. cit.*, pp. 392-404.

[290] "Ryleev. I. Pis'ma Ryleeva k Bulgarinu," *Russkaja Starina*, 1871, Vol. III, pp. 65-71.

[291] Bazanov, V., *Uchenaja respublika*, Moskva, Leningrad, Akademija Nauk SSSR. 1964, p. 247.

[292] *Ibid.*, p. 444.

[293] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 7 ff. and p. 27.

[294] Piksanov, "Iz arkhivnykh melochej." *Russkaja Starina*, 1905, vol. CXXIV, pp. 706-718.

[295] Kridl, *A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture*, New York, Columbia University Press, The Hague, Mouton & Co., 1956, p. 226.

Many students and ex-students, including Mickiewicz, were arrested and, after a long investigation, deported to Russia in October of 1824 "for spreading nonsensical Polish nationalism." [296] Mickiewicz and a few others who received mild sentences were sent to Petersburg and "placed at the disposal of the Ministry of Education." During the investigation Novosilcev came across the *Society of Scamps* of which Bulgarin had been a member during his stay in Wilno and possibly later as well. The *Society* was declared subversive by Novosilcev. The investigation supposedly revealed that the *Society* had important collaborators in Petersburg, among them Bulgarin, Grech and Sękowski, by then a professor of Oriental languages. Convinced of the importance of his findings, Novosilcev reported them to Count Arakcheev in a letter from Wilmo dated December 28, 1824.[297] In view of this, it is difficult to understand how Bulgarin succeeded at about the same time in obtaining official permission to start another publishing venture, the newspaper *The Northern Bee* (Severnaja Pchela), his most important undertaking.

The evidence is very scant. Lemke insinuatingly declares that Bulgarin became publisher of *The Northern Bee* thanks to his approaches to Arakcheev and Shishkov, the Minister of Education.[298] Grech, as usual, relates the affairs to his own circumstances but provides an important clue.

> In 1824 the Gosner catastrophy broke out over me. Kankir wanted earlier to take me into the Ministry of Finance, but finding out that I was being brought to trial, he postponed it until my acquittal. It was then that Bulgarin and I undertook the publication of *The Northern Bee,* without, however, discontinuing either the *Son of the Fatherland* or the *Northern Archive.* We received permission to do this from the Ministry of Education without trouble. Bulgarin knew Lobarzhevskaja (the future wife of Shishkov), and through her wormed his way to the old man. He even called and considered himself her relative as long as Shishkov was Minister.[299]

Grech's statement is a testimony to Bulgarin's resourcefulness. It also defends him from accusation of some unsavoury governmental favours but, on the contrary, hints at a certain collaboration among the Poles in Petersburg, thus confirming to some extent Novosilcev's denunciation. In his report, Novosilcev mentions several Polish officials in Petersburg who, according to him, by having access to all ministries, "serve the Wilno population as the main weapon of all its intrigues." But the most dangerous, in his view, was "Madame Labarzhevskaja, an old plotter,

---

[296] *Ibid.*, p. 226.

[297] N.D. "N. I. Grech, F. V. Bulgarin i A. Mickevich," *op. cit.*, pp. 334-337.

[298] Lemke, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

[299] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 450.

on whom, more than on anybody else, the greatest hopes are placed." [300] Whether it was due to the alleged Polish influences in Petersburg or to some patronage Bulgarin had secured for his newspaper, Novosilcev's report was ignored and not revived again until 1827, under a different ruler, different circumstances, but similar accusations.

Beginning with the first issue of *The Northern Bee* on January 1, 1825, the Bulgarin-Grech partnership was consolidated. Their publications now became joint undertakings. Bulgarin remained co-editor of *Son of Fatherland,* and Grech became co-editor of the *Northern Archive* and *The Northern Bee.* The *Literary Pages* were discontinued and merged with *The Northern Bee.*

There was one new publication which Bulgarin, probably because of his love for the theatre if not for other reasons, kept for himself. The almanac, *Russian Thalia* (Russkaja Talija), printed excerpts from dramatic literature, as well as articles on the history of Russian theatre and biographical sketches of the leading singers, actors, and dancers of the day. It merits consideration here if only for the fact that it was the first to print Griboedov's masterpiece, *Woe from Wit* (Gore ot uma) in 1825.[301] At the end of the year, the *Russian Thalia* was also discontinued and merged with *The Northern Bee.*

5. *The Northern Bee*

The Northern Bee was a daily newspaper only during certain periods of its existence; ordinarily, it came out three times a week (Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday). But it was the only private newspaper in Russia.

> In the eyes of the highest circles, *The Northern Bee* was considered the sole representative of public opinion. At court, it alone was read; abroad, it was said to be the organ of the court.[302]

The Northern Bee had a virtual monopoly on both foreign and domestic news. The monopoly meant also that the newspaper's nearly 10,000 subscribers constituted the largest single group of readers in Russia. The absence of any real competition left the views of *The Northern Bee* almost unchallenged and made its position in Russian life extremely strong.

The unique position occupied by the newspaper enabled its publishers to communicate their views to every corner of the Empire. On occasion they abused it by promoting their own views, or praising their own publications or books. This was, at the beginning, the only bone of contention between them and their friends. Otherwise, the newspaper

---

[300] N. D., *op. cit.*, pp. 334-335.

[301] A. L. Pogodin, "Russkie pisateli-Poljaki," *op .cit.*, p. 111; Bazanov, *op. cit.*, p. 337; *Literaturnye listki*, 1824, No. 19 and 20, p. 45.

[302] Lemke, *Ocherki po istorii russkoj cenzury i zhurnalistiki XIX stoletija*, S. Peterburg, 1904, p. 410.

was not without its good points. It consisted, outside its domestic and foreign news sections, of numerous other sections including literature, history, science, fashions, agriculture, medicine, theatre, etc., in other words it was suited to each taste. This particular quality of the newspaper often drew praise from Bulgarin's friends such as Bestuzhev, in his "Critical Examination of the Russian Literature during the year 1824 and the beginning of 1825," published in *Polar Star* for 1825.[303]

Gradually, the newspaper had to give more and more space to official announcements, and its image suffered. In connection with the Decembrist Revolt a whole issue was devoted to a "report of Investigating Committee" signed by General Adjutant Benkendorf.[304] This official version of the revolt, printed in a private newspaper, was more than anything else responsible for the damnation of the paper by every liberal voice in Russia, and for the branding of its publishers as arch-reactionaries.

6. *Bulgarin's Politics Before 1825*

While it may be correct to say that Bulgarin's chief publishing venture, *The Northern Bee*, became a reactionary newspaper towards the end of 1825, the same cannot be said about his other publications, or about Bulgarin as a writer in general. *The Northern Bee* was under an obligation to print official announcements and, following the death of Alexander I on November 19, 1825, the "Domestic News" section of the newspaper was devoted entirely to government affairs. From November 27, when the news of Alexander's death in Taganrog was received in the capital,[305] until the end of the year, *The Northern Bee* appeared with a black border on its title page, and with its contents focussed on the problem of succession.[306] The policy of the newspaper seemed to coincide with that of the government against the liberal opposition. In fact, the newspaper was trying to steer a cautious course.

It must be stressed again that Bulgarin's reactionary reputation rests on his activities after 1825. Prior to that, there is not enough evidence to identify him decisively with one camp or the other. His only reactionary episode, closely connected with important historical changes taking place in Russia and Poland,[307] was that of *The Northern Bee* mentioned above,

---

[303] A. Bestuzhev, "Vzgljad na russkuju slovesnost' v techenije 1824 i nachale 1825 godov," *Poljarnaja Zvezda*, 1825, pp. 488-499.

[304] *Severnaja Pchela*, No. 156, December 31, 1825.

[305] Florinsky, *op. cit.*, II, p. 746.

[306] *Severnaja Pchela*, November 28-December 31, 1825, Nos. 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156.

[307] Constantine, the legal successor to the Russian throne, was in Warsaw.

but even there Bulgarin was careful to limit himself to printing ready-made announcements. His only liberal episode occurred in 1821, during a meeting of the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature, when Bulgarin, as a newly elected member eager for approval and recognition, participated in the increasingly liberal Society's discussion of Russia and revolutionary Spain.

> In the mid-year 1821 meeting . . . F. V. Bulgarin read his *Reminiscences of Spain* (Vospominanija ob Ispanii). If Glinka had been carried away by the desire 'to point out the amazing resemblance in the history and fate of the two noble nations, then Bulgarin went even still further. He found that the Spaniards provided an example of the love of liberty.' 'An example both great and laudable.' [308]

The *Reminiscences of Spain* appeared almost immediately after the meeting in the Society's journal, *The Emulator* (Sorevnovatel'); "they were undoubtedly instrumental in awakening an interest in Spanish affairs." [309] Bulgarin capitalized on this interest by publishing that very same year in the "Foreign Literature" section of the *Son of the Fatherland* a long article entitled, *A Look at the History of Spanish Literature.*[310] Unlike the *Reminiscences . . .* , the article was completely void of any liberal sentiment. Bulgarin's estimate of Spanish literature was not a high one, and the article ended on a note of advice to the Spanish people:

> It is to be desired that the present enthusiasm of the Spanish nation for the common good should awaken their minds from the lethargy which has contributed to their decline in every respect and, together with their love of their country, should kindle the holy fire as a sacrifice to the Muses and the Graces.[311]

Both the gratuitous advice and the ability to capitalize on current events and issues later became important features in Bulgarin's writing.

The two episodes demonstrate the futility of attempting to assign Bulgarin to one or the other of the two political camps. It would be equally wrong to make use of their chronology in order to trace Bulgarin's literary progress before December 1825 along a straight line leading from liberalism to reaction. Perhaps the best assessment of Bulgarin during the period in question is provided by a Polish source:

> [Bulgarin] formed many friendships, both among the Poles and the

---

[308] Bazanov, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

[309] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

[310] Bulgarin, "Vzgljad na istoriju ispanskoj literatury," *Syn Otechestva*, 1821, XL, pp. 289-305, XLI, pp. 3-21.

[311] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

> Russians, and tried to earn the name of an ardent patriot in the eyes of both.[312]

The quotation provides a key to Bulgarin. While admittedly a shift away from the liberal camp can be observed in him, this is not the best way to look at Bulgarin the writer and journalist. If any definite statement can be made about Bulgarin in the period before the Decembrist Revolt, it must be one concerning his literary activity, his main concern, namely that Bulgarin moved from Poland-oriented writings to Russia-oriented writings. For this, there is sufficient evidence.

7. *Bulgarin and Poland (Up to 1825)*

Bulgarin's interest in Poland was more a result of his Wilno experience than of his Polish background. Lacking a formal Polish education, it was only in Wilno that he immersed himself in Polish history and literature. Upon his return to Petersburg, he asserted himself as a self-appointed spokesman on Poland, and a self-styled expert on Polish history and literature. Thus began a long preoccupation with Poland which is present in Bulgarin's writings throughout his entire literary career and which undergoes constant changes and adjustments corresponding to the historical changes in the relations between the Congress Kingdom of Poland and Russia. In the period under consideration Russo-Polish relations were only beginning to deteriorate, and there was still faith among the Poles in Alexander's good will toward their country: "They regarded Alexander as their own King and sincerely gave him their fullest confidence." [313] Bulgarin took full advantage of the situation in his *Short Survey of Polish Literature.* He echoes the Polish sentiments when he says:

> The noble zeal for Learning and Literature did not vanish with the unfortunate political disappearance of Poland in 1796. The Polish Muses found refuge at the throne of the Magnanimous Alexander, . . .[314]

Like the Poles in Warsaw, Bulgarin calls Alexander "Restorer of Poland" [315] and refers to the former Polish provinces under Russian rule as "Lithuania" [316] and not by their new Russian names. He goes on to include Lithuania in the sphere of Polish culture, thus implying the indivisibility of the two. This is an important point because it was primarily

---

[312] S. Piekarek, "Bułharyn," *op. cit.*, p. 131.

[313] Reddaway, *op. cit.*, II, p. 281.

[314] Bulgarin, "Kratkoe obozrenie pol'skoj slovesnosti," *op. cit.*, pp. 212-213.

[315] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

[316] *Ibid.*, p. 248.

on this issue that the relations between the Congress Kingdom and Russia eventually deteriorated.[317]

Although the main purpose of Bulgarin's *Survey* was to display his knowledge of Poland, the degree to which he identified himself in it with Poland's interests is worth noting. He even uses the personal pronoun "we" when referring to the Poles. His estimate of Polish literature and culture was very high, "on a par with all enlightened countries." [318] Linde's Polish dictionary,[319] "known to all Russian and Slavonic scholars" was, according to Bulgarin, superior to similar West European dictionaries.[320] In an extensive footnote Bulgarin heatedly rejects Germany's claim to Copernicus, and documents the great astronomer's "undoubted" Polish origin.[321] The *Survey* is full of such items, but it is in the description of Polish universities that Bulgarin's praises reach their climax, especially when he speaks of the University of Wilno and its professors.[322] Not until his historical novel, *Dimitrij the Impostor,* published in 1830, would Bulgarin again speak so enthusiastically of the Poles and their achievements.

As a journalist, Bulgarin was equally generous with news and reports from Poland and Lithuania, as well as with articles by Poles and on Poland. The first number of *The Northern Archive* included an article by Józef Sękowski,[323] but it was the second number which set the trend of the periodical for some time to come. In a discussion of new books in the "Miscellaneous" section, Russian books occupied only one page, while Polish books occupied two.[324] Unlike the Russian books, which were simply listed by title and author, including Volume IX of Karamzin's *History . . .* , referring the reader for additional information to various issues of the *Son of the Fatherland,* each of the Polish books was provided with a description, invariably a favourable one, and with comments such as: "It would be desirable to see a similar book in Russian" or "For a Russian student of history, this work is a necessity." [325]

Beginning with the Wilno inquiry, which assumed an importance well out of proportion with the minor incident that had provoked it,[326]

---

317 Reddaway, *op. cit.*, II, p. 287 ff; Askenazi, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

318 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

319 Samuel Bogumił Linde, 1771-1847, *Słownik języka polskiego.*

320 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

321 *Ibid.*, p. 198.

322 *Ibid.*

323 Osip Senkovskij, "Vozvratnyj put' iz Egipta. . . ," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 1, pp. 45-62.

324 *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 2, pp. 201-203.

325 *Ibid.*, p. 202.

326 See p. 112.

and had all the earmarks of a vicious anti-Polish campaign, Bulgarin's Poland-oriented writings (or those sponsored by him) declined. There were two reasons for this. In the first place, many of Wilno's cultural societies and literary periodicals, including *The Society of Scamps* and *The Pavement News,* were closed down, thus depriving Bulgarin of important contacts. In the second place, as we know, in view of his past and present ties with Wilno, Bulgarin's name came up in the course of the inquiry, causing him to exercise caution. In any event, the Wilno inquiry influenced Bulgarin deeply.

Yet another circumstance, namely his attitude to Mickiewicz, shows that the Wilno events had a profound influence on Bulgarin. Adam Mickiewicz (1798-1855), one of the chief victims of the Wilno inqury, was already widely recognized after the publication of his first works in 1822 and 1823 as the foremost Polish poet.[327] His fame spread even to Russia, and he had admirers and disciples among those of the Russian poets who knew Polish. Ryleev, among others, translated two of Mickiewicz's ballads, "The Nixie" (Świtezianka) and "The Lilies" (Lilie), as early as 1822, the year of their appearance.[328] Bulgarin, who in *The Northern Archive* scrupulously reported all noteworthy Polish publications, completely ignored Mickiewicz's works. Later, when Mickiewicz arrived in Petersburg as an exile in November, 1824,[329] Bulgarin seems also to have ignored him, although Mickiewicz is known to have entered Petersburg's Polish society, which Bulgarin frequented.

The explanation of Bulgarin's coolness to Mickiewicz in this period, however, lies deeper than the fear of getting involved with a Polish political exile. We know that Bulgarin, probably through access to Shishkov, succeeded not only in neutralizing Novosilcev's accusations, but even obtained permission to publish *The Northern Bee.*[330] The explanation lies also in Bulgarin's gradual drawing away from liberal circles. If it was profitable to be a liberal in 1821, it was no longer so in 1825. In 1822, his first full year of membership of the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature, Bulgarin participated in twelve meetings of the Society; [331] in 1824, when the Society became dominated by Ryleev and Bestuzhev, the future Decembrists, Bulgarin participated in one meeting only.[332] But these liberals, from whom Bulgarin was drawing away, were precisely those with whom Mickiewicz was forming close friendships. According to Lednicki:

---

[327] Kridl, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

[328] Kondratij Ryleev, "Svitezjanka," "Lilii," *Stikhotvorenija...*, Moskva, Gosizdat. Khudozh. Lit., 1956, pp. 329-331.

[329] Kridl, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

[330] See p. 113 ff.

[331] Bazanov, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

[332] *Ibid.*, p. 334.

> It is an episode which thus far has been obscure but is nevertheless significant—the rapid establishment by Mickiewicz of intimate relations with those who one year later became the Decembrists, . . .[333]

In view of Bulgarin's choice to steer a middle course between the opposing political groups in Russia, it might have been compromising for him to become acquainted with Mickiewicz.

The Mickiewicz episode is extremely important in evaluating Bulgarin's exact position in his handling of Poland. As a journalist, Bulgarin had a duty to acknowledge Mickiewicz's presence in Russia, if not to review his works. But Mickiewicz personified all the dangers threatening Bulgarin in the 1820's: those connected with events in Poland and with liberalism in Russia. When Bulgarin failed to acknowledge Mickiewicz's presence, he compromised his rôle as a spokesman on Poland in Russia, even though he continued to include news and reports from Poland and Lithuania in *The Northern Archive* and *The Northern Bee.* But the news now was selective news.

Bulgarin's non-journalistic writing on Poland also underwent a change: the Polish theme became merely an ingredient in his military stories and historical works. In them, Poland continued to be presented as a hospitable land; the Poles, as proud and noble people; the Polish women, always beautiful and virtuous. But somehow the total image of Poland emerging from these writings was one of vulnerability, and implied the need for Russian protection. A typical example of the new direction in Bulgarin's writings in the years 1824 and 1825 was *Military Life.*[334] This story, written in the form of a letter to Grech, was set in Poland during the Prussian campaign of 1806-1807. A Polish landowner tells a Russian officer, his guest, who asked his host how to repay the hospitality extended to him:

> That will be easy for you!
> You are going to fight my countrymen. Be magnanimous to them after battle, and help them in their misfortune.[335]

The story was written in the first person and we know it was autobiographical. Thus the officer represents Bulgarin, and the landowner's words are an expression of Bulgarin's new attitude.

Chronologically speaking, Bulgarin wrote more about Russia than about Poland after the Wilno inquiry. When Alexander's "magnanimity" ceased to be a reality after he had abandoned his friend, Prince Czartoryski, in the latter's struggle with Senator Novosilcev for control

---

[333] Wacław Lednicki, "Mickiewicz's Stay in Russia," *Adam Mickiewicz in World Literature*, Symposium ed. by W. Lednicki, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California University Press, 1956, p. 33.

[334] "Voennaja zhizn'. Pis'mo k N. I. Grechu," *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 1, pp. 14-22, No. 2, pp. 33-50.

[335] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

of the University of Wilno,[336] Bulgarin developed a pattern: while continuing to praise certain of Poland's cultural achievements, he began to praise Russia's achievements more.

The shift in prominence could best be seen in the treatment of contemporary matters. In the "Magic Lantern" section of the February 1824 issue of *Literary Pages,* Bulgarin made a long appeal in favour of publishing learned articles in separate books rather than in journals.

> The publications of the Moscow Society of Lovers of Russian Letters are superior to all the literary journals. . . . The publications of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, of the Warsaw Society of Friends of the Sciences, and the publications of the Cracow University enjoy European fame. In a word, it is our opinion that private individuals should publish periodicals, but learned Societies should publish books, and then there would ensue a useful balance in literature for the common good and the glory of the country.[337]

The passage is significant because, though giving them praise, it placed the far older and more venerable Polish institutions behind the Russian. It is also suitably patriotic.

Appeals to patriotism became regular ingredients of Bulgarin's increasingly Russia-oriented writings of 1824 and 1825. In 1822 he had called a Polish book a "necessity" for Russian students; [338] in 1824, when reviewing a Russian book, he said:

> We hope that every collector of Russian books, that every Russian patriot will buy Mr. Ertov's book, as a monument to the outstanding talents of the Russian people which need the active approval of their compatriots in order to attain perfection.[339]

He used the same technique when promoting a book on Kutuzov, *A Historical Panegyric to the Illustrious Prince Golinishchev-Kutuzov of Smolensk:*

> The book has great merit and is particularly pleasing by its ardent patriotism which increases the beauty of the author's work.[340]

The patriotic note reached its height in the article, *Visit to Kronstadt,*[341] written in a form of a letter to Grech. Bulgarin had been invited by Ryleev, the director of the Russo-American company, to participate in a christening of a new ship. He was glad to accept the invitation

---

336 Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski,* I, p. 130 ff.

337 Bulgarin, "Volshebnyj fonar'," *Literaturnye listki,* 1824, No. 3, p. 103.

338 See p. 118.

339 Bulgarin, "Bibliograficheskie izvestija," *op. cit.,* 1824, No. 9 and 10, p. 389.

340 *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 11 and 12, pp. 436-437.

341 Bulgarin, "Poezdka v Kronshtat," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 15, pp. 83-88.

because "it would provide material for an article." [342] The article turned out to be not just a celebration of a patriotic occasion, but a self-serving literary maneuver in the guise of patriotism. Describing the ship, Bulgarin proudly reported finding copies of Grech's books in its library, as well as copies of both the *Son of the Fatherland* and his *Northern Archive.* Toasts were reportedly drunk to these two periodicals by the officers of the fleet. Bulgarin reciprocated by praise of his actual and potential subscribers in a highly patriotic ending to his article:

> You know that I have had the occasion to see almost all European armies, but I openly admit that I had never met such unanimity, friendship, and fraternal agreement as among officers of the Russian fleet. . . . and I conclude my article by expressing the hope that the example of such concord will spread to all the social classes, for the common good and welfare of Russia.[343]

Bulgarin has learned to combine patriotic with commercial considerations.

The patriotic fervour increased with the launching of *The Northern Bee.* From the first number on January 1, 1825, each issue had under its masthead a section entitled, *Memoirs of the Fatherland,* in which anniversaries of important events in Russian history were recorded. Thus, the first item to catch the reader's eye was the evidence of Russia's achievements.

---

[342] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[343] *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

PART II

WORKS

Chapter III: FIRST WRITINGS (1816-1820)

Bulgarin's first literary steps were characterized by a determined drive to establish himself as a writer. These earliest attempts consisted mostly of short pieces based on the author's own experiences. Most of them did not see print, but were only read at literary gatherings. Some of them were later published, or incorporated in longer pieces.

After his school and army years Bulgarin decided to abandon poetry. As he explains in his *Memoirs*, this was an age of poetry, and it was against his compulsive drive for participation not to be involved in it. On the other hand, he could see his limitations as a poet, and he must have realized the rising demand for prose. Nevertheless, his journals later contained a number of poems either anonymous, or signed with unidentifiable initials. Some of these poems could conceivably be Bulgarin's, but even so, they were most probably written earlier. Similarly, Bulgarin's Polish satire, "The Road to Happiness" (Droga do szczęścia), which Ryleev translated into Russian and read at an April, 1821, meeting of the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature,[1] also belongs to an earlier period; it was possibly written during Bulgarin's stay in Wilno in 1819, where he is known to have done some writing in Polish.

Among Bulgarin's early writings is his first publication in book form, *Selected Odes of Horace* (Izbrannye ody Goracija).[2] There is disagreement among Bulgarin's biographers on the exact date of publication but, though Bulgarin makes some token acknowledgment, there is general agreement that the work verged on unscrupulous plagiarism, for the scholarly comments and most of the translations were the work of Jeżewski, a member of one of the literary societies at the University of Wilno.[3] According to Grech, Bulgarin's Latin was not good enough for such an undertaking.[4] For Bulgarin, the book offered the possibility of a large commercial gain, but his attempt to have it accepted as a textbook for Russian schools failed.

---

[1] "Put'k shchast'ju„" Bazanov, *op.cit.* p. 266.

[2] Polovcov, *Ruskij biograficheskij slovar'*, p. 477.

[3] Polska Akademia Umiejętności, *op. cit.*, p. 131; *Grech, op. cit.*, p. 449.

[4] Grech, *ibid.*

The failure of this effort did not discourage Bulgarin. His next publication, *A Short Survey of Polish Literature*,[5] resembles the previous work. In scope, it goes beyond a mere literary survey, being rather a history of Polish culture. The wealth of information contained in it leads one to suspect, however, that it too was not an entirely original work but something that Bulgarin brought with him from Wilno, and which he translated into Russian and expanded in Petersburg.

Besides being of questionable authorship, the *Survey* marks the beginning of other of Bulgarin's habits: he let it be known that it was being published not on his initiative, but "at the request of Russian men of letters." [6] The technique of preceding a publication by an announcement that it is appearing in answer to the demands of the reading public, as a duty, or for some other such reason, was to become one of Bulgarin's favourite maneuvers. In the case of the *Survey*, which was published in Grech's *Son of the Fatherland*,[7] the maneuver helped to vindicate Bulgarin's dubious reputation as an original writer. In other instances, it served as insurance against potential critics.[8]

The *Short Survey of Polish Literature* was a pivotal work for several reasons. The fact that it was printed by Grech in 1820, when the *Son of the Fatherland* was still an organ of the liberals, as well as the unofficial journal of the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature,[9] meant Bulgarin's acceptance in the ranks of Russian writers. Because of its wealth of material on Poland, the *Survey* served as a source and reference for a number of Bulgarin's later works. Thus, it was an important link in his handling of Poland in his writings, and was already discussed in this connection.

Chronologically, the *Survey* was Bulgarin's last publication before Russia's gradual turn towards reaction. Until then, Bulgarin's writings reflected his concern to establish himself as a writer. After 1820, they would reflect, in addition, his ability to adapt himself to the changes in the political climate of Russia and Poland in the period between the Semenowsky Regiment mutiny (October 18, 1820) [10] and the Decembrist Revolt (December 14, 1825). There is consequently, a one-year gap in his writing after 1820. Alexander's growing distrust of liberalism and of the

---

[5] **See pp. 103 ff, 117 ff.**

[6] N. D., "N. I. Grech, F. V. Bulgarin i A. Mickevich. . ." *op. cit.*, p. 347.

[7] *Syn Otechestva*, 1820, No. XXXI, pp. 193-218, No. XXXII, pp. 241-264.

[8] The announcement, for example, for the forthcoming publication of *The Russian Thalia*, in the *Literary Pages* of October, 1824, No. XIX and XX, pp. 45-46: "Several lovers of the Russian theatre have suggested that I should publish the first theatre almanac in Russia."

[9] Bazanov, *op. cit.*, p. 44 ff.

[10] Florinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 716.

Poles,[11] which was exploited by Senator Novosilcev,[12] was not lost on Bulgarin. He adapted himself quickly to the new situation and, for the time being, refrained from writing specifically on Poland. He curtailed his writing on other subjects as well. His two articles on Spain,[13] of which only the first was distinctly liberal, were his only noteworthy publications in 1821.

It must be added here that Bulgarin was at that time busy gathering material and soliciting subscribers for his first journal, *The Northern Archive.* It is reasonable to assume that prospects of financial gain, together with the prestige that goes with being a publisher, were also sufficient reasons for curtailing all activities not connected with the journal. Grech confirms the assumption by saying that considerations of profit weighed strongly with Bulgarin; the need to satisfy his vanity weighed even more than his desire to amass a fortune.[14] This holds true throughout most of Bulgarin's literary career: it is hard to know which of his writings were motivated by profit, and which by convictions or merely by vanity. Accordingly, his writings after 1821 are in a profusion of categories, typical of a man in search of a suitable theme. For the purposes of the present study, it is possible to distinguish the following: the military story, history, the story of morals and manners, etc., eventually culminating in a full-length novel, all increasingly interspersed with literary criticism.

Chapter IV: THE MILITARY STORY

While the Polish and Russian themes in Bulgarin's writings called for constant adjustment and an adaptation to the current political situation, the military story was at first relatively free of such considerations. All Bulgarin had to do was to delve into his own military experiences and produce entertaining anecdotes and stories. There was a demand for such tales, especially from the period of the Napoleonic Wars.

Bulgarin at first read these tales at literary gatherings, and later published them either in his own journals or in those of his friends, notably in Ryleev's and Bestuzhev's almanac, *The Polar Star.* Both Ryleev and Bestuzhev were, like Bulgarin, former officers. It is no wonder, therefore, that Bulgarin's military stories appeared in all three issues of the almanac, and that Bulgarin was singled out for praise in the

---

[11] **Reddaway *op. cit.*, p. 285.**

[12] **See p. 112 ff.**

[13] **See p. 116.**

[14] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 448.

almanac's review of Russian literature for 1823.[15] Bulgarin seems to have found a suitable genre, for he even claimed later, in his *Memoirs,* that it was he who had introduced this genre into Russian literature.[16]

Bulgarin's military tales were almost always written in the first person, and he made no secret of the fact that they were autobiographical. On the contrary, he wanted it known, and usually succeeded in this by various unmistakable allusions to himself. He was so fond of writing about his military adventures that, even when composing an obituary for a former comrade-in-arms, he would be carried away to such an extent as to compose what read as a picaresque mlitary story in which the central figure would inevitably be Bulgarin himself.[17]

Bulgarin's military tales abounded in humor and the typical cavalryman's devil-may-care fanfaronade. They were "tall" stories in the fullest meaning of the word, and often improbable. A typical such story was one entitled, *A Military Joke,*[18] describing Bulgarin's adventures in Napoleon's army.

The story is noteworthy not only because it was one of the earliest examples of the military tale, but also because some later examples of the genre bear resemblance to it, notably Pushkin's *Snowstorm,*[19] where the resemblance is, however, in plot only, since both stories accidentally bring together two young lovers. In style, although the language is excellent and the descriptions of the manners of the times are rendered in an entertaining way, Bulgarin's tale is verbose and calculated to impress its readers with his knowledge and worldliness as well as with his miltary adventures. Moreover, unlike Pushkin, whose story was just a parody of such tales, Bulgarin insisted on the veracity of his story, subtitling it "An Uninvented Anecdote." [20] It was this insistence on truth that eventually led critics to accuse Bulgarin of using invented experiences in his tales, particularly in one entitled *Military Life,* written in 1824.

In *Military Life,* in keeping with his changing attitudes at the time, Bulgarin switched to his service in the Russian army. As mentioned

---

[15] A. Bestuzhev, "Vzgljad na russkuju slovesnost' v techenije 1823 goda," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1824, pp. 265-271.

[16] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija,* I, p. XXIII.

[17] Bulgarin, "Nekrologija," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 5, pp. 176-182.

[18] Bulgarin, "Voennaja shutka," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1823, pp. 157-162.

[19] Bulgarin's tale antedates by seven years *The Tales of Belkin,* of which "The Snowstorm" is a part. This does not mean that Pushkin imitated Bulgarin—the differences between the two stories are too great—but it is possible that Pushkin borrowed the idea for his story from Bulgarin. Pushkin frequently borrowed ideas for his works from other people's (cf. *Poltava* and Ryleev's *Vojnarovskij*: the execution scene); thus the resemblance of his story to Bulgarin's cannot be rejected outright as purely coincidental, particularly since this was not the only instance in which Pushkin followed Bulgarin in the choice of a topic or an idea.

[20] Bulgarin, *op. cit.,* p. 157.

earlier,[21] the story was written in the form of a letter to Grech. The letter was "a supplement to an oral narrative," [22] thus presumably strengthening the story's veracity, in view of Grech's known skepticism toward Bulgarin's tales.[23] The story was set in Poland in the Prussian campaign of 1806/1807. As an Uhlan in Grand Duke Constantine's Regiment, Bulgarin could not possibly have been in Poland at that time, since the Uhlans joined Bennigsen's Russian army directly in East Prussia, without entering Poland, as Bulgarin himself stated later in his *Memoirs.*[24] Bulgarin needed the Polish setting for other reasons,[25] but the fact remains that in his story he was inventing, sacrificing veracity for a literary maneuver. He was attacked for it, and defended himself in an editorial in the next issue of the *Literary Pages.* The defense was a maneuver in itself:

> An outstanding literary figure has put a question to me: did all the adventures described in the article *Military Life* actually happen to me? Since similar questions may be repeated, I have deemed it good to give an answer in my periodical and to repeat what I said in the Preface, namely that in this article are gathered various happenings *seen* and experienced, in order to compose, so to speak, a panorama of military life. Various happenings refer to one person, solely in the interest of my aim to keep to the plan of the work as written in the form of 'a letter to a friend' and in order not to break the narrative by digressions. In a word: *Military Life* is a *work* depicting that which an officer experiences at the front during a battle and what can happen to him in the campaign. But the main incidents are founded on fact.[26]

The explanation was evasive and inconclusive. The attack had found its mark.

As a result of the criticism, Bulgarin stopped writing autobiographical tales based on his experiences in the Russian army. Without inventing, he would not be able to hold the reader's interest, and if he invented, he would be found out by those who knew both the course of the Russian campaigns and the Russian military lore. In his next military tale, *Yet Another Military Joke,* published in 1825,[27] Bulgarin switched

---

[21] See page 120.

[22] Bulgarin, "Voennaja zhizn'," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 1, p. 14.

[23] Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni,* p. 442.

[24] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija,* III, p. 124.

[25] See page 120.

[26] Bulgarin, "Ob'javlenie izdatelja," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 2, p. 72.

[27] Bulgarin, "Eshche voennaja shutka," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1825, pp. 660-669.

back to his experiences in the French army, but the switch did not help him. The story, which was but a variation of the earlier *Military Joke,* was set in Germany in 1813. Unable, or unwilling, to dwell on his service against Russia, Bulgarin removed his story from the military theatre and obscured it to such an extent that it was difficult to tell in which army he really was serving. These maneuvers robbed the story of all its potential interest, and signified a temporary decline in this genre for Bulgarin.

On the whole, 1825 was too soon for Bulgarin to write about his military service. His autobiographical military stories had to wait until 1846, to be incorporated in his *Memoirs.* By then his military service was so distant that it did not make much difference what was truth in them and what was fiction.

Chapter V: BULGARIN AND HISTORY

Bulgarin's temporary abandonment of the military tale did not affect the volume of his literary production. He more than made up for it in other literary categories, particularly in his own historical writings—and by the promotion of other people's writings on history in his journals.

Since his school days, history was Bulgarin's favorite study. In his *Memoirs* he tells of his extensive reading in the subject, and of his first attempts at writing on history in which he was encouraged by the senior members of the literary circle in the Cadet Corps, particularly by Baron Dibich.[28]

The passion for history was fed by the consciousness of living in an important age, and by the sense of a direct participation in history which Bulgarin possessed to a high degree. His *Memoirs* contain numerous passages to that effect. Some such passages, pertaining to the era in which Bulgarin lived, have already been quoted at the beginning of Chapter I. In other passages he speaks of his own participation.

> For almost ten years I literally did not get off my horse, participating in battles and riding, sword in hand, across Europe from Torneo to Lisbon, spending days and nights, winter or summer, in the open, and resting in the palaces of magnates, in the homes of ordinary citizens, and in the huts of poor peasants. I lived in a marvellous age, I mixed with great heroes, I knew many unusual people, I looked at great passions . . .[29]

It is not surprising, therefore, that Bulgarin continued to study history when the opportunity presented itself, in Wilno, and when he chose literature as his profession, history remained his primary preoccupation:

---

[28] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija,* II, p. 43.

[29] *Ibid.,* I, p. VIII.

most of his writings were in one way or another connected with history. His first journalistic venture, *The Northern Archive,* was rationally devoted primarily to history.

From the beginning of the periodical's existence, it became obvious that this was to be Bulgarin's vehicle to launch himself as a literary writer of history. Although in the first issues Bulgarin did not contribute anything written specifically by himself but remained strictly in the role of editor, his remarks on the works of his contributors showed a readiness and presumption to become an authority on history. Since his first contributors were relatively unknown, Bulgarin's path to prominence would have been slow, and *The Northern Archive* would have been condemned to obscurity, had he not resorted to a maneuver which at once assured him of a reputation and notoriety. The quickest way to establish a reputation is to attack the biggest authority in the field. In Russia, this was Karamzin. To attack him, Bulgarin used an even greater authority, the historian Joachim Lelewel. The polemic which followed developed into a controversy touching on the leading issues of the day; it produced a sensation commanding the interest of the highest official and intellectual circles,[30] including, reportedly, Alexander I himself.[31] The polemic was largely provoked by the political views of Karamzin.

1. *The Karamzin-Lelewel Controversy*

According to Marc Raeff, the political ideas of Nikolaj M. Karamzin (1766-1826) are a subject by themselves, one which still needs investigation.[32] A writer of immensely popular sentimental stories, an innovator in the area of the Russian language, and a member of the progressive literary circle "Arzamas," Karamzin nevertheless had become the spokesman of the old-fashioned, conservative, serf-owning nobility.[33] It seems that Karamzin's first conservative leanings were a reaction to the latter, more radical, phase of the French Revolution.[34] They were voiced, subsequently, in his historical novels. Later, the Napoleonic wars on the one hand and Alexander's liberal aspirations on the other contributed to the further strengthening of Karamzin's conservative feelings,[35] which were finally provoked, under the influence of the Grand Duchess Catherine, Alexander's ambitious sister, by current projects for the

[30] Marian Henryk Serejski, *Joachim Lelewel. Z dziejów postępowej myśli historycznej w Polsce,* Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1953, p. 26.

[31] Henryk Mościcki, *Pod berłem carów,* Warszawa, Instytut Wydawniczy "Biblioteka Polska," 1924, p. 97.

[32] Raeff, *Michael Speransky,* . . . , p. 176.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] Andrzej Walicki, *W kręgu konserwatywnej utopii. Struktura i przemiany rosyjskiego słowianofilstwa,* Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964, p. 30.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

reorganization of Russia.[36] Karamzin was particularly irritated by the fact that some of the reforms were to be based on an alien model, the Napoleonic Code, and that the author of these projects was Speranskij, the son of a common village priest. With Catherine's encouragement, Karamzin wrote in 1811 the now famous tract, *On the Old and the New Russia,* which contained a bold and comprehensive criticism of the policies of the government.[37] According to Karamzin, only a close alliance between the autocracy and the nobility was good for Russia; any breach of the alliance could have disastrous results for both parties.[38] Although the veiled threats contained in the tract at first angered Alexander, he found much that was true and coincided with his own feelings.[39] The tract, one of the most important documents of Russian social thought in Alexander's era, contained also, in a condensed form, Karamzin's whole conception of Russian history.[40] But because the tract remained for many years a secret document,[41] Karamzin's readers were not to learn about his views until 1818, when the first eight volumes of his twelve-volume *History of the Russian State* appeared in print.[42]

Karamzin's *History* acquired an immediate and immense popularity. Written in a pleasant style, it had the additional advantage of appearing at a most appropriate time, when interest in Russia's history was particularly strong on account of recent victories over Napoleon. Because it was read by virtually every educated person in Russia, the *History* became a veritable school of national pride.[43] This is understandable. The Russian educated layman, if he was taught history at all, studied universal history rather than the history of Russia.[44] Also, according to Marc Raeff, we do not really know what the sense of history was that the educated layman had in Russia at that time.[45] For him, history was still a relatively new discipline to be approached in a didactic and moralistic way, and this was precisely what Karamzin presented him with. As a result, Karamzin's position in Russia became so strong that even those who objected to the apologia of autocracy in his work, did

---

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] N. M. Karamzin, *A Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia,* The Russian Text, edited by Richard Pipes, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 1 ff.

[38] Walicki, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[39] Raeff, *loc. cit.*

[40] Walicki, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[41] *Ibid,* p. 37.

[42] *Ibid.*

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] Marc Raeff, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia,* New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966, p. 157 ff.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

not dare to attack him. At the most, his theory of the Norman origin of Russia was questioned, particularly by the liberals, who saw in it an attempt by Karamzin to justify a strong, indivisible rule, supposedly chosen by the Russians themselves in their distant past at the expense of old Slavonic "republican" institutions.[46] (It is worth mentioning that the "Norman theory" received official approval of Nicholas I in 1848.) [47]

In that same year 1818 in which Karamzin's *History* appeared, the Russian historian took it again upon himself to intercede with Alexander on matters which he considered of the greatest importance for Russia. Alexander had just made his famous speech in Warsaw in which, as already mentioned earlier, he hinted at his desire to see in Russia a Constitution like that in Poland.[48] What is more, in private conversations in Warsaw, Alexander was repeatedly assuring his Polish hosts that he was shortly going to incorporate into the Congress Kingdom the former Polish provinces in the East, particularly Lithuania.[49] Alexander's pronouncements created a wave of excitement in Poland and Lithuania, especially in Wilno. In Russia, the effect was different. While the liberals rejoiced at the prospect of changes in Russia, the conservatives feared a dangerous social upheaval.[50] There was, however, unanimous opposition to the plans concerning Lithuania, and Karamzin undertook to express it. Immediately upon Alexander's return from Warsaw, Karamzin read to him a sharp "Protest of a Russian Citizen" [51] against the unification of Lithuania with the Congress Kingdom. He argued that Alexander had no right to do it, that Lithuania belonged not to him but to Russia, and that if he should give up Lithuania he would achieve one of two things: he would either ruin Russia or force her sons to shed their blood once more on the walls of Praga.[52] Karamzin's intervention made a great impression on Alexander and on Russian public opinion. Among Polish circles, on the other hand, a campaign was started to undermine Karamzin's strong position in Russia.[53] The only way to do it was to attack his reputation as a historian.

The first Pole to polemicize with Karamzin was the ethnographer Zorian D. Chodakowski. In an article in *The Messenger of Europe* in 1819, he promised to make Karamzin, whom he knew personally, "more considerate toward the Poles, whom he has been attacking in a hostile

---

[46] Walicki, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] Raeff, *Michael Speransky, . . .*, p. 239.

[49] Mościcki, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[50] Raeff, *op. cit.*

[51] Mościcki, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[52] *Ibid.*

[53] *Ibid.*

manner concerning events from the time of Casimir the Jagiellonian." [54] Chodakowski's article was not sufficient, however, to undermine the position of the Russian historian. It was at this point that Lelewel was approached by the Poles in Petersburg, including Chodakowski, to undertake the review of Karamzin's *History*.[55]

Joachim Lelewel (1786-1861) was the most prominent in the long line of Polish chroniclers and historians who were, or were about to become, known to the Russian intellectual and scholarly circles. As early as the seventeenth century, the Polish chronicles by Marcin and Joachim Bielski, and by Stryjkowski, were translated into Russian.[56] The most important Polish historian of the eighteenth century, Adam Naruszewicz (1733-1796), was well known both to Russian historians and Russian authorities. The first volume of his chief work, the seven-volume *History of the Polish People* (Historia narodu polskiego), comprising a sound and—for its time—exceptional study of the origins of Poland, was not allowed to be published in 1786 because of the protest of the Russian envoy in Poland, and was published only in 1824, in the Congress Kingdom.[57] In his *History*, Naruszewicz formulated very clearly the method of his approach and its principle: the goal of his narrative was to be the history of the nation in the fullest coverage.[58] His work, as well as the works of his predecessors, became important sources for Karamzin who was, in addition, well acquainted with the works of such contemporary Polish historians as Niemcewicz, Czacki, Chodakowski, some of whom he knew personally (Chodakowski) or corresponded with (Czacki).[59] Karamzin's acquaintance with the works of the much younger Lelewel dates only to the time of appearance of the latter's articles in Petersburg in the early 1820's.

At the time of the Karamzin "Protest" in 1818, Lelewel was already a historian of considerable repute. The son of a government official in departments of education in former Poland and, later, both in the Duchy of Warsaw and the Congress Kingdom, he was educated in Warsaw schools and in the University of Wilno (1804-1808). Upon graduation he became a teacher in the famous Krzemieniec Liceum (1808-1810), one of the best schools in the Wilno school district, where he worked under

---

[54] Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski, "Razyskanija kosatelnoj russkoj istorii," *Vestnik Evropy*, Moskva, 1819, Vol. VII, pp. 277-302.

[55] Nina Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," Joachim Lelewel, *Dzieła*, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964, Tom II (2), p. 692.

[56] A. I. Sobolevskij, *Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi 14-17 vekov, Bibliograficheskie materialy*, S. Peterburg, Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 1903, pp. 53, 79, 81.

[57] Marceli Handelsman, *Historyka, Zasady metodologii i poznania historycznego*, Warszawa, Gebethner i Wolff, 1928, p. 81.

[58] *Ibid.*

[59] Assorodobraj, *loc. cit.*

the historian, Tadeusz Czacki.[60] Recalled by his father to Warsaw, Lelewel devoted himself to scholarly research and writing. His interests included not only history: ancient, medieval and modern, but also branches of learning connected with history, particularly geography, paleography, numismatics, statistics, diplomacy, heraldry, librarianship, etc. Perhaps the most important part of his work at that time was the study of the methodology of history, both as a theory and as a practical guide to the teaching of history. His book on the subject, *Historyka* (1815), was the first and, until fairly recently, the only attempt in Poland to grasp the whole of the methodological problems of the science of history.[61] In the book, Lelewel not only perfected historical methodology, but he was the first in Poland who justified and organized it.[62] Because of that, he prepared the ground for further development of history in Poland into the great scholarly movement which it became.[63] Lelewel's total production, including political works, was to reach 1,018 items comprising over fifty volumes.[64] His early works alone attracted sufficient attention to earn him membership in the Warsaw Society of Friends of Learning and an invitation in 1815 to the chair of history at the University of Wilno, where he was to remain until 1824, except for two years (1819-1821) at the University of Warsaw. In 1820 Lelewel was awarded a degree of Doctor of Philosophy by the University of Cracow.[65] His second departure for Wilno in 1821 brought about the ascendancy of Wilno over Warsaw as the main scholarly and didactic centre of history, conceived in a modern spirit and radiating far beyond the confines of the city and the University.[66] In this context, Lelewel's subsequent handling of Karamzin's *History* assumes a special significance.

There is evidence that Lelewel began the analysis of Karamzin's *History* as early as 1818, before he was approached by anyone, but that he soon abandoned it.[67] It is possible that his imminent departure from Wilno to Warsaw prevented him from continuing the analysis. However, there is another explanation of his behaviour. Some of Karamzin's ideas on the blessings of autocracy must have shocked Lelewel and made him realize that his analysis would inevitably lead to a polemic, and he was reportedly afraid of a polemic with "an eminent Russian, who was also

---

[60] Serejski, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

[61] Helena Więckowska, "Wstęp," Joachim Lelewel, *Wybór pism historycznych*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1949, p. XIV.

[62] Handelsman, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

[64] Serejski, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[66] Serejski, "Wstęp," J. Lelewel, *Dzieła*, III, p. 12.

[67] Assorodobraj, *op. cit.*, pp. 692-694.

an official historiographer, a State Councilor and the holder of many orders, and whose salary was 60,000 rubles." [68] The pressure on Lelewel by the Polish circles bent on undermining Karamzin was, in view of Lelewel's continued silence, apparently of no avail. There are indications, however, that Lelewel was, since 1820, in correspondence with Bulgarin. In a letter dated October 15, 1821 (on the eve of the launching of *The Northern Archive*), Bulgarin reminds Lelewel that he has been "waiting for a year for the promised criticism of Karamzin's *History*." [69]

The explanation of how Bulgarin succeeded in persuading Lelewel to continue his analysis of Karamzin is a complicated one, and lies in the inherent differences between Karamzin's and Lelewel's political views. Karamzin's position was a position of a conservative defending the *status quo* and warning the Emperor not to undertake any hasty changes.[70] Lelewel, on the other hand, was known for his progressive views, his love of freedom and hatred of despotism.[71] Lelewel's views were undoubtedly communicated by Bulgarin to the liberals in Petersburg—we know that Bulgarin was a member of the liberal circles during his first years in Petersburg. Karamzin's assumption, expressed in the "Preface" to his *History*, that his work was to serve as a lesson for politicians and lawgivers by showing them how Russian rulers in the past were able to control their subjects and thus prevent disasters stemming from revolts and anarchy,[72] shocked the future Decembrists as much as it shocked Lelewel, even if for different reasons. An attack on a man voicing such views was in the interest of the liberals—we know that they did applaud Lelewel's articles when they came out.[73] For Lelewel, potential support in Petersburg was very important, and this is what Bulgarin undoubtedly assured him of. In the end, all involved parties were satisfied: the Poles and the Russian liberals found someone to attack Karamzin, Lelewel regained his confidence, and Bulgarin, besides playing an important part, was about to become the translator, editor and publisher of a brilliant historian.

The attack on Karamzin was carefully prepared. As early as 1821 Bulgarin introduced Lelewel's works to the Russian literary circles by reading—at the March 21 meeting of the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature—his own translation of the Polish historian's, *On the Earliest Historians of the Poles and on Schlözer's Refutation of Kadłubek*

---

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 694.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 693.

[70] Walicki, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

[71] Serejski, ed., "Wstęp," Joachim Lelewel, *Wybór pism politycznych*, Warszawa, Książka i Wiedza, 1954, p. VI.

[72] N. M. Karamzin, "Predislovie," *Istorija gosudarstva rossijskago*, Kniga I (tomy I, II, III, IV), p. IX ff.

[73] A. Bestuzhev, "Vzgljad na russkuju slovesnost' v techenije 1823 goda," *Poljarnaja Zvezda*, 1824, p. 270.

in Particular.[74] Possibly as a result of this reading, as well as of his growing scholarly reputation, Lelewel was elected an honorary member of the Free Society in the following year,[75] thus becoming even better known in Russia. That same year (1822) Bulgarin introduced Lelewel to the general public by placing an announcement about him in the "Miscellaneous" section of *The Northern Archive*:

> Mr. Lelewel, who by his writings and historical utterances has gained the fullest respect in the learned world, was appointed in competition against other historians to the chair of history in the University of Wilno. Now he has begun his lectures. It is reported from Wilno that not a single auditorium in the University can hold the enormous number of people drawn there by Mr. Lelewel's talent and fame. In view of such enthusiasm one can expect a brilliant success.[76]

The announcement was followed by a further build-up of Lelewel in a later issue of *The Northern Archive* (October, 1822): Bulgarin called him "the chief historical writer in Poland in our time," [77] and included him among the journal's contributors. Then, in the November 1822 issue, in the "Criticism" section of *The Northern Archive*, Bulgarin printed Lelewel's article, *A Critical Examination of Mr. Karamzin's History of the Russian State*.[78] This was the first and the most devastating criticism by Lelewel of Karamzin's *History*. In it, he questioned Karamzin's qualifications as a historian.

The main thrust of Lelewel's criticism was concealed under a strictly scholarly form of the article, which was written as a review by one historian of another historian's work. Lelewel was, after all, at that time using Karamzin's *History* as a recommended source for those parts of his course which dealt with Russia; [79] there are records of his students' assignments in which they use Karamzin, instead of Polish works, as a source for the history of Lithuania, with Lelewel's approval.[80] Accordingly, in his article Lelewel chose to treat Karamzin as a fellow historian, without the slightest reference to his political views and his eminent position in the Russian society. This approach allowed Lelewel to apply to the *History* all the critical skill at his disposal.

---

[74] Bazanov, *op. cit.*, p. 395.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 447.

[76] Bulgarin, "Raznye izvestija," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1822, No. 4, pp. 373-374.

[77] *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1822, No. 19, p. 81.

[78] Joachim Lelewel, "Razsmotrenie *Istorii gosudarstva rossijskago* g. Karamzina," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1822, No. 23, pp. 402-434.

[79] Joachim Lelewel, *Dzieła*, Tom III, *Wykłady kursowe z historii powszechnej w Uniwersytecie Wileńskim 1822-1824*, pp. 80-81.

[80] *Ibid.*, Tom II(2), *Pisma metodyczne*, p. 899.

Before entering into specific points of criticism, Lelewel justified his own position as a critic. As a non-Russian—he argued—he probably had no right to pass judgment on a work held in such high esteem in Russia. On the other hand, Russian history was of interest not only for Russia, but for the whole of Europe, particularly for Poland and Lithuania whose own history was entangled with Russian history to such an extent that a critical investigation of one should throw light on the other. This was "one of the main reasons" compelling Lelewel to undertake the analysis of Karamzin's *History*.[81] But because—Lelewel continued—he had in mind an analysis of the whole work, and was unwilling to pass up "thoughtlessly" even the smallest part of it, and since there was at the beginning of the work a "Preface," it was to this part that his first article was devoted.[82]

Lelewel began his article by stressing the importance of histories in general, but he also bemoaned the fact that "many writers keep trying to earn the name of historian, but hardly any of them achieve it,[83] thus presumably implying that Karamzin should have remained a writer rather than trying to be a historian. On this point, Lelewel again deliberated cautiously whether it was up to him to deny Karamzin the name of historian or whether the decision was up to Karamzin's readers.[84] He then enumerated several controversial points in the "Preface" with which he disagreed,[85] no doubt letting the public make up its own mind about Karamzin.

The first point was the declared purpose of Karamzin's *History*, which was to be, as already mentioned, a lesson for politicians and lawgivers on how to rule Russia.[86] The next point concerned Karamzin's statement that, unlike the histories of antiquity, he would not include speeches in his *History*, but that the art of writing would nevertheless make his work an absorbing reading. The exaggerated importance attached by Karamzin to narrative skills in writing history was objectionable to Lelewel for whom such matters were of secondary importance. Another point of disagreement was Karamzin's arbitrary plan, based on the evolution of central power in Russia, of dividing his *History* into three parts: old, middle, and new, and his rejection of Schlözer's division of Russian history into periods. On the whole, Lelewel criticised Karamzin at every step, questioned his sources, and rejected his methods. According to Lelewel, Karamzin understood history as a history of kings,

---

[81] Lelewel, "Razsmotrenie *Istorii*...," *op. cit.*, pp. 411-412.

[82] *Ibid.*, p. 412.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 409.

[84] *Ibid.*, p. 410.

[85] *Ibid.*, p. 413 ff.

[86] Karamzin, "Predislovie," *op. cit.*, p. IX ff.

princes, and the state, without taking into consideration other factors, such as people or geography.

Lelewel ended his article with a promise to enter into detailed analysis of all the volumes, and with a hope that "the public will receive kindly these efforts to evaluate the excellent fruit of many years labour of an honourable man." [87]

Lelewel's article was preceded by Bulgarin's tongue-in-cheek introduction, "To Readers, from the Publisher of *The Northern Archive*," [88] in which Bulgarin declared:

> A famous writer should be pleased to have a famous learned man as a critic. . . . It was long expected that real scholars and expert historians would turn to the examination of Mr. Karamzin's works. Now Mr. Lelewel has attempted this feat and, being well disposed to our journal, he has chosen to publish in it his critical analysis of all the volumes of Karamzin's *History* which have appeared to date. We will publish this critical examination in *The Northern Archive* of 1823. Polish literature and its first-rate writers are still very little known to the Russian public. For this reason we have made it our duty to acquaint our readers with Mr. Lelewel and with his scholarly works. Mr. Lelewel is incontrovertibly one of the outstanding historians in Europe.[89]

Bulgarin then gave a brief but laudatory biography of the Polish historian, and concluded his introduction with an impressive list of Lelewel's publications.

The introduction was a clever maneuver: it accomplished many things. It was the final build-up of Lelewel. By praising Lelewel, it praised Bulgarin too, in whose journal Lelewel published his articles. Also, in anticipation of a reaction to Lelewel's article, Bulgarin reiterated his old argument of the need in Russia to get acquainted with Polish literature, and stressed his "duty" to introduce to his Russian readers its brilliant representative.

Bulgarin's anticipation was correct. Lelewel's article, which was but an "Introduction' to his detailed *Critical Examination*,[90] and which concentrated on Karamzin's famous "Preface" to his *History*,[91] created a sensation in Petersburg and Moscow. Bulgarin at first took the reaction lightly, as can be seen from his enthusiastic letter of December 12, 1822, to Lelewel:

---

[87] Lelewel, "Razsmotrenie *Istorii*. . . ," *op. cit.*, p. 434.

[88] Bulgarin, "K chitateljam, ot Izdatelja *Severnago Arkhiva*," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1822, No. 23, pp. 402-407.

[89] *Ibid.*, pp. 402-403.

[90] Lelewel, "Vvedenie. Zamechanie na predislovie iz *Istorii*. Cel' kritiki na vse sochinenie," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1822, No. 23, pp. 408-434.

[91] Karamzin, "Predislovie," *Istorija gosudarstva rossijskago*.

> Your name is on everyone's lips—the most important people, like Golicyn, Speranskij, Olenin, etc., are paying homage to your learning and ability. . . . A few rabid Karamzinists are frowning, but even they give you justice. Karamzin is silent, because he has nothing to say.[92]

This was in fact not quite true; Karamzin did not reply in print, but he vented his feelings in a letter to a friend:

> A new enemy has appeared on the pages of *The Northern Archive*: a Pole who began his criticism with a statement that he does not agree with me on anything, and that all my views on the subject of the craft (art) of history are false.[93]

Unfortunately for Karamzin, his friends were men like the poet Zhukowskij, who would not be competent to take up his defense. It was left to a young historian, Pogodin, who in an article in *The Messenger of Europe* (Vestnik Evropy) attempted to defend Karamzin, but ended up by apologizing to Lelewel and by suggesting that Lelewel examine Karamzin's *History* in connection with Polish history.[94] A long correspondence developed subsequently between Pogodin and Lelewel.

It would seem then that the attack on Karamzin was a success. However, Bulgarin's subsequent maneuvers indicate that it was not entirely so. In the following issue of *The Northern Archive* (December, 1822), there appeared an article entitled: *An Expression of Opinion on the History of the Russian State of Mr. Karamzin.*[95] This was not Lelewel's expected next instalment but a translation of a review taken from Göttingen's *Learned News* (Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeiger). The German review was favourable to Karamzin, and considered his work an important contribution. Bulgarin added this footnote:

> Just when we had begun printing Mr. Lelewel's article on the *History of the Russian State* (see book 23, *N.A.*, p. 402), an honoured literary figure has sent us a translation of the present article with his comments. As a proof of our complete objectivity, we are publishing this review immediately after Mr. Lelewel's introduction to his *Critical Examination.* (Note by the Publisher of the *NA.*) [96]

Since, as a publisher, he subscribed to numerous foreign journals, the "honoured literary figure" who sent in the translation could have been Bulgarin himself. The stress on "objectivity" suggests that he was trying

---

[92] Joachim Lelewel, *Dzieła*, Tom I, *Materiały autobiograficzne*, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1957, p. 143.

[93] *Ibid.*

[94] *Ibid.*

[95] "Vzgljad na *Istoriju rossijskago gosudarstva* g. Karamzina," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1822, No. 24, pp. 486-504.

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 486.

to appease the reaction provoked by Lelewel's article and his own introduction to it. The next (January, 1823) issue of *The Northern Archive,* however, brought a fresh reversal. There still was no follow-up by Lelewel, but instead, a curious long-titled article took its place:

> The remarks of one of the collaborators of *The Northern Archive* on the article published in No. 24 of the journal in 1822, entitled "An Expression of Opinion on the History of the Russian State of Mr. Karamzin from Göttingen's *Learned News* of August 22, 1822)" [97]

The article was signed: "A Moscow native, A.M." Although this is not one of Bulgarin's easily identifiable pseudonyms, there are other indications (style and Polish data) that this article too was written by him. It was a demolition of the Göttingen review, which had been praised earlier and now was being called nothing more than an "announcement." The "native" concluded that the only "real" Karamzin critic was Lelewel.

The reason for this reversal was the appearance of an unexpected ally in the person of M. T. Kachenovskij, the editor of *The Messenger of Europe* which, ironically, had once been edited by Karamzin.[98] Kachenovskij had himself criticised Karamzin's famous "Preface" as early as 1819, and it was his journal in which Chodakowski had printed his criticism of Karamzin,[99] for which Kachenovskij was rebuked by Zhukovskij and constantly attacked by the "partisans of the historian." [100] Upon reading Lelewel's article, he wrote to Bulgarin from Moscow,[101] congratulated him on the quality of the translation, and strongly encouraged him to continue the articles, although at the same time warning Bulgarin about Karamzin's "partisans."

Bulgarin was probably also strongly encouraged to continue Lelewel's articles by the Russian liberals, particularly the future Decembrists who, as already pointed out, had their own reasons for wishing to see Karamzin attacked. A. Bestuzhev, editor of the *Polar Star,* firmly refused to acknowledge any merits in Karamzin's *History,* with the exception of purely literary or, rather, linguistic and stylistic qualities. Karamzin was reportedly offended by Bestuzhev's remarks,[102] particularly by his concluding statement that only "time will pass judg-

---

[97] *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1823, No. 1, pp. 91-100.

[98] N. M. Lisovskij, *Bibliografija russkoj pechati 1708-1900 gg.*, Petrograd, 1915, p. 37.

[99] See p. 132.

[100] N. Piksanov, "Iz arkhiva F. V. Bulgarina" (Pis'ma M. T. Kachenovskago k F. V. Bulgarinu 1823-1824), *Russkaja Starina,* 1903, Vol. CXVI, p. 603.

[101] January 2, 1823. *Ibid.*, p. 602.

[102] "Literaturno-esteticheskie pozicii 'Poljarnoj Zvezdy'," *Poljarnaja Zvezda, . . . , op. cit.,* p. 821.

ment on Karamzin as a historian." [103] Bestuzhev wrote his remarks in an editorial in 1822, the year of Lelewel's first article. The similarities between Bestuzhev's and Lelewel's views on Karamzin are striking. They show not only Lelewel's influence on the Russian liberals, but the extent of the controversy provoked by Karamzin's *History*.

How important the Karamzin episode was in Bulgarin's career can be judged from the following passage in his *Memoirs*:

> Look through the pages of *The Northern Archive* of 1822. There you will find the beginning of the strife and its consequences—the beginning of literary hostility which continues to this day and will continue even after my death.[104]

Bulgarin concluded the passage by placing the blame for the hostility on Karamzin's adherents, who were sensitive to the slightest criticism of the respected historian.

It was no doubt due to the hostility of the Karamzinists that Lelewel's promised articles began to appear in *The Northern Archive* only in October, 1823.[105] By then, interest in Lelewel was widespread among the Russian liberals, who were openly applauding the appearance of his articles. The future Decembrist, A. O. Kornilovich, wrote to the historian P. M. Stroev in Moscow on November 9, 1823:

> In yesterday's issue of the periodical [*The Northern Archive*] you will see the continuation of the criticism of Karamzin. How are your *literati* receiving this criticism? Here everybody more or less agrees with it. With the first issues of next year, the analysis of all nine volumes will be published, one by one. Then a real battle will begin.[106]

Kornilovich's concluding statement was based more on anticipation than on fact. It is doubtful whether Lelewel was interested in intensifying the ideological battle raging around Karamzin's *History*. His primary interest was to diminish Karamzin's reputation as a historian by showing conclusively that the *History* was an overrated work; once the *History* was compromised, all Karamzin's views, including his political views and his anti-Polish statements, would lose some of their weight in Russia. It was probably for these reasons that Lelewel's new articles—those which appeared in the remaining months of 1823—assumed a new form. Following a brief introduction (it was this introduction which raised Kornilovich's expectations), Lelewel's articles no longer constituted a direct criticism of Karamzin, nor were they yet the promised volume-by-volume analysis of his *History*, but a "Comparison of Karamzin with

---

[103] *Ibid.*, pp. 864-865.

[104] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija*, p. x.

[105] *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1823, No. 19, pp. 52-80.

[106] Lelewel, *Dzieła*, Tom II(2), pp. 694-695; also, *Poljarnaja Zvezda*, p. 951.

Naruszewicz" or, rather, a comparison of Karamzin's *History of the Russian State* with Naruszewicz's *History of the Polish People.*[107] As will be seen this approach, while removing Lelewel from the centre of a Russian ideological polemic, was nevertheless as effective as the earlier approach in undermining Karamzin's reputation as a historian. It would have been even more effective except for Bulgarin who, frightened by the stress on Polish history in the new articles, took liberties with Lelewel's manuscript.

The extent of Bulgarin's tampering with the manuscript is of importance, because it not only points to his own position in the Karamzin-Lelewel controversy but also shows that the gravitation from Poland to Russia-oriented writing affected his position as editor as well as writer. There is evidence that he overstepped his duties as translator-editor considerably, and that he not only altered the portions of Lelewel's text dealing with Polish history—which, in view of the anti-Polish character of the Wilno inquiry taking place at that time, it is possible to understand—but that his heavy editorial hand affected the entire manuscript.[108] This was partly Lelewel's own fault. We know that he did not attach much importance to matters of language and style, for which the *Society of Scamps* had already mocked him painfully in *The Pavement News.*[109] His writings were rendered readable only after numerous reworkings. In the case of his criticism of Karamzin, Lelewel did not have time to rewrite and would frequently send Bulgarin what amounted to a very rough copy, often sending corrections afterwards, perhaps too late to be included in the printed Russian version. Under such circumstances, Bulgarin had ample opportunity to translate and edit the manuscript according to his own inclinations: he wanted to be popular and politically cautious at the same time.[110] His cautiousness was already noticeable at the time of the very first article when, on October 22, 1822, he wrote to Lelewel: "I took the liberty of making some corrections demanded by the spirit of the Russian language, which is poor in philosophical discourses." [111] But it was in the following year that his cautiousness became more pronounced. He was condensing or leaving out altogether passages devoted to Naruszewicz or to Polish affairs generally, afraid, as he told Lelewel in a letter dated April 11, 1823, "of being accused of excessive Polonophilism, which would inevitably lead to the loss of sub-

---

[107] Lelewel, "Obshchaja kritika celago sochinenija. Sravnenie Karamzina s pervym Pol'skim Istorikom Narushevichem," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1823, No. 19, pp. 52-80, No. 20, pp. 147-160, No. 22, pp. 287-297.

[108] Nina Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," Joachim Lelewel, *Dzieła*, Tom II(2), *Pisma Metodologiczne*, p. 696.

[109] Zdzisław Skwarczyński, *Towarzystwo Szubrawców*, p. 196.

[110] Nina Assorodobraj, *op. cit.*, p. 696.

[111] *Ibid.*

scribers." [112] The letter, which preceded the appearance of Lelewel's *Comparison* by half a year, indicates that Bulgarin's editorial excesses had as much to do with the delay in printing Lelewel's articles as did the hostility of the Karamzinists. Lelewel obviously opposed some of Bulgarin's alterations. In a letter of November 25, 1823, already after the appearance in print of the *Comparison,* he complained to Bulgarin about the arbitrary subtitles, "entirely not in keeping with the spirit of the work," which Bulgarin had inserted in his articles.[113] Fortunately, Bulgarin always scrupulously returned Lelewel's manuscript, which was eventually published in its Polish version and became a part of Lelewel's collected works,[114] thus enabling us to determine the extent of Bulgarin's alterations.

Even with Bulgarin's "corrections," the *Comparison of Karamzin with Naruszewicz* was a devastating work. The idea itself of comparing Karamzin with a historian from a previous century was offensive to the Russian historiographer, placing him, by implication, in the eighteenth century. Lelewel was, of course, aware of these implications, and explained in a lengthy paragraph why Russian readers should not be surprised or offended at the comparison but, on the contrary, flattered, because of the high esteem Naruszewicz enjoyeyd in Poland.[115] It is surprising that Bulgarin left this passage in, unless he felt that it was made palatable by Lelewel's further explanations, in which the Polish author considered the interest of both the historians in the common Slavonic past of Russia and Poland, a subject which Bulgarin himself was increasingly stressing in Russia. The comparison itself—Lelewel maintained—was not being made for its own sake, but for the sake of studying Karamzin. As for the question—which Lelewel claimed to have been asked—which of the two historians was the better one, the answer was not provided, although the impression the reader is left with is that it would be Naruszewicz, if only by virtue of the fact that he had fewer sources to work with than Karamzin, a contemporary writer who, however, did not exploit all these sources.[116] Concerning specific issues, Lelewel was surprised that Karamzin, who as a rule ignored foreign affairs, paid so much attention in his *History* to Lithuania, as if Lithuania had always been a part of Russia.[117] There were more such issues but they—Lelewel

---

[112] *Ibid.*

[113] *Ibid.*

[114] Joachim Lelewel, "Porównanie Karamzina z Naruszewiczem," *Dzieła,* Tom II(2), pp. 588-628.

[115] *Ibid.*, p. 605.

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 606 ff.

[117] *Ibid.*, p. 612.

promised—would be discussed in the course of the detailed analysis of the *History* which was to follow the *Comparison.*[118]

The Comparison, despite its avoidance of Russian ideological issues, was well received by the Russian liberals. The editors of *The Polar Star,* for example, selected the *Comparison* for praise in the almanac's appraisal of Russian literature of 1823:

> Lelewel's articles on Karamzin were received in literary circles as a pleasant and rare phenomenon. Their merit consists of objectivity, common sense and deep learning.[119]

By gaining respect and admiration for himself in Russia, chiefly at the expense of Karamzin, Lelewel was surely achieving his goal of undermining Karamzin's reputation as a historian. He could now enter directly and with authority into the long-promised *Critical Examination* proper, with a reasonable expectation that it would have a wide circle of readers in Russia. The fact that Bulgarin was willing to print it, in view of his known fears, confirms the assumption. Accordingly, a new series of articles began to appear in the first issues of *The Northern Archive* for 1824.[120] The only difference was that the articles were now relegated—for reasons which will become clear later—from the "Criticism" to the "Miscellaneous" section of the journal.

Judging by the great attention to detail displayed in the first articles, Lelewel's *Critical Examination of Karamzin's History of the Russian State* was to be an extensive work: after the first three articles, Lelewel was still dealing with Volume I of Karamzin's *History.* Because the Russian version of the articles is the only one in existence, we have no way of determining to what extent Bulgarin altered Lelewel's text this time; it seems that, emboldened by the success of the *Comparison* and the fact that Lelewel was not at that stage writing about Poland but examining Karamzin's version of the origin of Russia, Bulgarin did not feel the need to change anything. This assumption seems the more reasonable when one considers that in his examination Lelewel firmly disputed Karamzin's theory of the Norman origin of Russia, a very important point in the ideological polemic surrounding Karamzin's *History,* and his arguments here appear not to have been tampered with. It was most probably because of the controversial nature of the polemic, and Lelewel's obvious determination not to shy away from it any more, that the *Critical Examination* was interrupted in February of 1824, although we know that Bulgarin was in possession of at least some continuation.

---

[118] *Ibid.,* pp. 627-628.

[119] A. Bestuzhev, "Vzgljad na russkuju slovesnost' v techenije 1823 goda,' *Poljarnaja Zvezda...,* p. 270.

[120] Lelewel, "Razsmotrenie *Istorii gosudarstwa rossijskago* soch. Karamzina, g. Lelewelem," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1824, No. 1, pp. 42-57, No. 2, pp. 91-103, No. 3, pp. 165-172.

There are reasons to believe that Bulgarin was prevented perhaps by censorship or some other intervention, from continuing to publish the *Critical Examination* in the same form in which Lelewel was writing it. Following the first three articles, the next issue, No. 4, of *The Northern Archive,* contained only a short announcement: "Criticism of *History of the Russian State* will continue in the next issue." [121] However, neither the next issue, nor several later ones, featured Lelewel's articles; there were also no announcements to that effect. Instead, Bulgarin was again busy altering Lelewel's manuscript, as his letter dated June 15, 1824, indicates: "I ask your permission to transform occasionally into a different form things pertaining to Russia and her affairs." [122] In the meantime, other events made the continuation of the *Critical Examination* even less likely.

The interruption of the *Critical Examination* coincided with the height of the Wilno investigation. Because of his influence on the students, Lelewel became one of the victims of the drama. By a special Imperial decree of August 14, 1824, justifying the investigation and prepared by Senator Novosilcev, Lelewel was suspended from the University, together with three other professors.[123] While several students and ex-students, among them Mickiewicz, were sent into exile in Russia, the professors were allowed to return to "their homelands" which, in Lelewel's case, was the Congress Kingdom. It is not known how much his criticism of Karamzin contributed to his loss of the Wilno chair of history, but it is a fact that he did not continue the *Critical Examination,* and the only sections of it which were still to appear in *The Northern Archive* were those already in Bulgarin's possession.

The reasons why Bulgarin decided to print the remaining articles, in view of Lelewel's changed circumstances and Bulgarin's known cautiousness, are difficult to gauge. Perhaps he was trying to show that his journal was not affected by the Wilno events. As if in demonstration of this, two of the remaining three articles appeared in August, 1824,[124] immediately after the Imperial decree. Bulgarin's own explanation, contained in a lengthy footnote accompanying the first article, was his by now favourite maneuver, namely that he was printing the articles "at the request of the public." In the same footnote he also vaguely hinted at the reasons for the long delay:

> Several circumstances beyond my control prevented me from printing the continuation of this learned criticism, which had won the approval of enlightened lovers of history, who expressed to me,

---

[121] *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1824, No. 4, p. 236.

[122] Nina Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," *op. cit.*, p. 696.

[123] Lelewel, *Dzieła*, Tom I, p. 67; also, "Nowosilcow w Wilnie," *op. cit.*, Tom VIII, pp. 545-605.

[124] *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1824, No. 15, pp. 132-143, No. 16, pp. 187-195.

orally and in writing, their thoughts on the subject. Undoubtedly readers are not obligated to concern themselves with the problems of a publisher of a journal, and have a right to demand the fulfilment of a promise. I know this, and I ask my kind readers' forgiveness. But I also ask them to remember that there are many things which are not up to the publisher. F.B.[125]

Another reason why Bulgarin printed the remaining articles had probably something to do with their content. The articles concerned the respective levels of knowledge and learning of the Normans and the early Slavs,[126] and were very flattering, if not to Karamzin, at least to Russia. To be sure Lelewel disputed Karamzin's contention that the Normans were the teachers of the Slavs, but as a proof he cited the high cultural level of ancient Kiev. Thus there was not much controversy in these articles, and even if there had been more in the manuscript, Bulgarin painstakingly smoothed it out in lengthy footnotes—a new device—or probably edited it out. The last contention seems very likely: all three articles were much shorter than the average length of an article by Lelewel, thus indicating a considerable amount of deletions.

Despite these precautions, there was another delay before the third, the last of the remaining articles appeared in print in October of 1824.[127] The article was a continuation of the previous two, and ended with an announcement that "there will be a continuation." [128] The announcement was followed by an explanatory footnote:

> I have no more manuscript of Lelewel's *Critical Opinion;* but he has promised to provide me with a continuation, and the first article which will be sent will be entitled: 'The Characteristics of the State Founded by the Normans or Rus.' *Publisher.*[129]

However, there was no continuation. A Polish source maintains that Bulgarin was actually in possession of the article but did not print it because "he lost interest." [130] Bulgarin's "loss of interest" was probably due to the potentially highly controversial content of the article. Also, just at that time, Bulgarin too found himself under investigation on account of his earlier activities and later contacts in Wilno,[131] and was busy trying to extricate himself. Under these circumstances, caution dictated to Bulgarin an earlier termination in his journal of the work of Lelewel

---

125 *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1824, No. 15, p. 132.

126 Lelewel, "Ob obrazovannosti Varjagov i Slavjan," *op. cit.*, 1824, No. 15, p. 132 ff.

127 *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1824, No. 19, pp. 47-53.

128 *Ibid.*, p. 52.

129 *Ibid.*

130 Nina Assorodobraj, *op. cit.*, p. 694.

131 See p. 113.

who was, after all, an old Wilno acquaintance. But there were other considerations.

The process of parting company with Lelewel as a contributor to *The Northern Archive* which began when his articles were relegated to the less prestigious sections of the journal, was connected with another process, that of Bulgarin taking the place of Lelewel as the journal's most important contributor, and culminating, as will be seen, in his own criticism of Karamzin, made the following year. For Bulgarin, the process was one of trying to get out of an increasingly difficult situation but also of trying to make the best of it. His duties as Lelewel's translator and editor deepened his grasp of history immensely. He demonstrated this by his lengthy and apt footnotes in the last articles. His last, the explanatory footnote, left the readers waiting, a good publishing policy, for Lelewel's article, while in reality they were waiting for Bulgarin's.

Thus, after ten instalments, Lelewel's *Critical Examination of Karamzin's History of the Russian State* ended without going beyond Volume I of the *History*. Nonetheless, its total effect, particularly that of the "Introduction" and the *Comparison*, was considerable. Karamzin's reputation undoubtedly suffered: fresh instalments of his *History*, Volumes X and XI, were virtually ignored by the liberal press, or simply not discussed as works of history. Lelewel, whose views frequently matched those of the Decembrists, gave the liberals a scholarly basis for some of the most important points of their opposition to autocracy.

For the remainder of 1824 there was no comment on Karamzin's *History* in Bulgarin's journals, except for a brief announcement of the appearance of Volumes X and XI.[132] In view of the nature of Bulgarin's temporary difficulties, any criticism of the official historiographer by a Polish journalist was out of the question. In the meantime, however, Bulgarin—having gained experience and reputation as a translator and editor of Lelewel—attempted to build for himself a reputation as a historical writer as well. The attempt, besides following strict patterns, was also, to some extent, connected with Karamzin.

2. *Poland and Russia*

Bulgarin's historical writings, like his journalism, show, from the beginning, a trend from a Polish to a Russian orientation. The trend was established early, at the beginning of Bulgarin's journalistic activity, when he still played the rôle of a self-appointed spokesman on Poland. He was, however, careful from the beginning not to be taken for too ardent a Polonophile to the extent that his Russian loyalty could be questioned; he never neglected, when praising contemporary Polish

---

[132] *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 5, p. 193.

achievements, to add that they were made possible by the magnanimity of the Russian Emperor.[133]

The trend became a pattern when Bulgarin began to praise, simultaneously, Russian achievements in other fields. In the same issue of *The Northern Archive* in which there was an article on Jan Śniadecki [134] and Joachim Lelewel,[135] both distinguished professors of the University of Wilno, there was also an article by Captain-Commodore Kruzenstern on his attempts to find the Northwest passage,[136] with Bulgarin's editorial comments, as well as Bulgarin's review of a book, *A Chronological History of All Travels into the Northern Regions,* by V. N. Berkh,[137] who had participated in Kruzenstern's expedition around the world.

This pattern continued until Bulgarin shifted to history in his treatment of Poland, when a new pattern developed. Bulgarin now showed great interest in works on the Cossack rebellion under Chmielnicki.[138] From these works Bulgarin would print excerpts, with his own editorial comment, in *The Northern Archive.* This particular period of Polish history abounds in both humiliating Polish defeats and great Polish victories. Bulgarin matched the Polish exploits with descriptions from works depicting Russian victories in the reign of Peter the Great and Catherine.

This pattern was followed by concentration on historical events in which both countries were involved, particularly the "Time of Troubles" (Marina Mniszech), the Russo-Polish war which followed Chmielnicki's rebellion, and the Northern War. By then, the Russian theme had become more prominent than the Polish.

In Bulgarin's own works dealing with history—apart from the editorial comments above and introductory remarks to other people's works to which he was mostly restricted until 1823—the same patterns can be observed. Stories with contemporary or fairly recent setting showed a determined moving away from Polish subjects which was due, no doubt, to the Wilno investigation. Only one of the military stories, for example, based on recent history, had anything to do with Poland (*Military Life*) and even then, the Polish setting was adapted only in

---

[133] Bulgarin, "Kratkoe obozrenie pol'skoj slovesnosti," *op. cit.,* pp. 212-213.

[134] *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 4, pp. 287-299.

[135] *Ibid.,* pp. 372-374.

[136] "O Grenlandii, ili novye opyty dlja otkrytija severozapadnago puti," *op. cit.,* pp. 341-366.

[137] V. N. Berkh, "Khronologicheskaja istorija vsekh puteshestvij v severnye poljarnye strany," *op. cit.,* pp. 367-371.

[138] Bohdan Chmielnicki was also at that time one of the heroes of Ryleev's *Dumy* (Historical Ballads) where he was presented as a fighter for freedom. The coincidence is worth mentioning but it is too involved to be discussed here.

order to make a point.[139] A three-instalment article from the same period, *A Stroll Along the Sidewalk of the Nevskij Prospect*,[140] was probably the best expression of the now dominant Russian theme, in which the Polish items were merely incidental. The article was in the form of a first person narrative, in which the narrator (Bulgarin) was showing his friends the famous street. ("Why this place?" "Petersburg is considered one of the best towns in the world, and Nevskij Prospect is the best street in Petersburg.") [141] Rambling, as was his habit, Bulgarin nevertheless demonstrated a remarkable grasp of the historical and cultural background of the street, including such items as the rôle of the last Polish King, Stanisław August Poniatowski, in the founding of a Catholic church on the Nevskij Prospect,[142] and the temporary location of the famous Załuski library, taken by the Russians from Warsaw in 1795.[143] These items, however, were greatly outnumbered by a multitude of facts and anecdotes concerning Russian economics, Russian history, and Russia in general.

On the whole, in his belletristic works dealing wholly or partly with history, Bulgarin noticeably refrained from writing on contemporary Poland or on subjects from the recent Polish past. Instead, as in his editorial writings, he shifted to a more distant past. Here, using his Polish knowledge, he could find subjects to write about that would interest his Russian readers. A telling example of this new direction was *The Liberation of Trembowla*, a story printed in Bestuzhev's and Ryleev's journal, *The Polar Star* in 1823.[144] This story, based on an event in a Polish-Turkish war in the reign of Jan Sobieski, was an adaptation of an opera by Józef Wybicki, *Polish Woman or the Siege of the Fortress Trembowla*, which was listed in Bulgarin's *A Short Survey of Polish Literature*.[145]

Unlike the *Survey*, *The Liberation of Trembowla* was not in praise of Poland's achievements—on the contrary, Poland was presented in one of her more vulnerable moments—but in praise of a Polish woman and of a Polish King who, as a sworn enemy of the Turks was, not surprisingly, popular in Russia. By concentrating on such a King, Bulgarin made his story more acceptable to official Russian sensibilities.

---

[139] See p. 120. ff.

[140] Bulgarin, "Progulka po trotuaru Nevskago Prospekta," *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 4, pp. 118-133, No. 5, pp. 159-172, No. 6, pp. 213-230.

[141] *Ibid.*, No. 4, pp. 117-118.

[142] *Ibid.*, No. 5, pp. 163-164.

[143] *Ibid.*, No. 6, pp. 213-215.

[144] Bulgarin, "Osvobozhdenie Trembovli, istoricheskoe proisshestvie XVII stoletija," *Poljarnaja Zvezda*, izdannaja A. Bestuzhevym i K. Ryleevym (Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moskva-Leningrad, 1960), 1823, pp. 210-215.

[145] Bulgarin, "Kratkoe obozrenie pol'skoj slovesnosti," *op. cit.*, p. 257.

There is another detail, connected with the story, which tells us that Bulgarin was concerned about the reception of his Poland-centered writings. The story was preceded by a short introduction, dedicated to Russian women, and ended with these words:

> Charming Russian ladies! Your history abounds in valiant exploits of your women-compatriots. I shall not repeat them here: now you should become acquainted with the heroic deeds of Slavonic women belonging to the same race as yourselves and inhabiting a country watered by the noble Vistula. Nowadays you form one family, you have the same father, your children and brothers are forever united by ties of mutual happiness. You should know and respect one another: history will serve as a guide to this.[146]

This was the first time that Bulgarin spoke so openly of Russian-Polish unity. At that moment the Polish and Russian themes became one in his writings. The immediate outcome was that his next important work on a Polish theme revolved around both Poland and Russia, namely the story of Marina Mniszech.

The female protagonist of *The Liberation of Trembowla,* the heroic Eleonora Chrzanowska, was the first in a long line of Polish women about whom Bulgarin wrote at various stages of his literary career. Marina Mniszech was the second. *Marina Mniszech, the Wife of Dimitrij the Pretender* rightly belongs to Bulgarin's writings on history, and, accordingly, all four instalments appeared in the "History" section of *The Northern Archive.*[147] But the story is also an important link in the evolution of Bulgarin's Polish and Russian attitudes, and it will be discussed in this connection. Above all, the story of Marina Mniszech was Bulgarin's most important attempt to establish himself as a historical writer, and in this respect it was connected both with Karamzin and Lelewel.

The attempt began as early as the first gap in the publication of Lelewel's *Critical Examination.* In the "Miscellaneous" section of *The Northern Archive* of June, 1823, there was a report of the "Public reading on May 22, 1823, in the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature—a Society supported in the highest quarters."[148] On that occasion,

> F. Bulgarin read excerpts from the biography composed by him of Marina Mniszech, the wife of Dimitrij the Pretender. Those excerpts contained a depiction of the condition of Russia and Poland of that time, the appearance of the Pretender, the seizure of the Russian throne, the Pretender's marriage to Marina in Cracow, with his envoy Afanasij Vlas'ev standing proxy, Marina's arrival

---

[146] Bulgarin, "Osvobozhdenie Trembovli, . . ," *op. cit.*, p. 210.

[147] Bulgarin, "Marina Mnishekh, supruga Dimitrija Samozvanca," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1824, No. 1, pp. 1-13, No. 2, pp. 59-73, No. 20, pp. 55-77, No. 21 i 22, pp. 111-137.

[148] *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1823, No. 11, p. 373 ff.

> in Moscow, the assasination of the Pretender and Marina's dethronement.[149]

The reading was not a success. It was reported in the Society's records without comment.[150] The one comment made by Bulgarin's friend, Alexandr Bestuzhev, was hardly a compliment:

> Bulgarin's article was of great interest. However, in our country, we still do not know how to value the study of history.[151]

Grech, who was also present, gave this version of Bulgarin's performance:

> The article was weak and badly written. He did not read it, but mumbled it, and his failure was complete. This annoyed Bulgarin and turned him away for several years from Russian history, which at one time he had considered merely a pastime.[152]

Grech's low opinion of Bulgarin's performance is understandable. He considered Bulgarin's literary accomplishments at best as those of a good storyteller.[153] His historical writings he ignored. Thus for him the Marina Mniszech biography was but of slight consequence. But Bulgarin's interest in her was to continue.

The "Miscellaneous" section of the last issue of *The Northern Archive* for 1823 contained two announcements: in one Bulgarin notified his readers of the receipt of Lelewel's analysis of Volume I of Karamzin's *History*;[154] the other announcement also concerned Karamzin's *History*:

> Volumes X and XI of N. Karamzin's *History of the Russian State* are being printed and will soon appear. . . . Those two volumes cover the reign of Fedor Ivanovich [Godunov], conditions in Russia at the end of the XVI century, and the reigns of his son Fedor and that of the Pretender.[155]

As we know, Karamzin's announced volumes did not appear until later in 1824.[156] Why did Bulgarin find it necessary to announce them so far in advance? The answer was provided in the next two issues of *The Northern Archive* (January, 1824), where there appeared the first instalments of his own article, *Marina Mniszech, the Wife of Dimitrij the*

---

[149] *Ibid.*, p. 374.

[150] Bazanov, *op. cit.*, p. 427.

[151] *Ibid.*, p. 293.

[152] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 451.

[153] See p. 81.

[154] *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1823, No. 24, p. 402.

[155] *Ibid.*, p. 404.

[156] See p. 146.

Pretender.[157] These instalments dealt with exactly the same material as the announced volume's of Karamzin's *History.* Thus, Karamzin had been cleverly forestalled by Bulgarin.

In the same issues of *The Northern Archive,* the Lelewel articles were relegated to the "Miscellaneous" section at the end of the periodical, whereas Bulgarin's biography of Marina Mniszech occupied the first section of the periodical, under "History." Not only was Bulgarin editor and publisher of the journal, but now he had also maneuvered himself into the rôle of the most important contributor of a journal which, in the words of Bestuzhev's review of Russian literature for 1823, "had rendered a great service to Russian history." [158]

The first two instalments of the story appeared in January of 1824, but the two remaining ones did not appear until October and November of that year. This gap, in view of Bulgarin's known speed in writing, needs to be explained.

While Bulgarin was writing *Marina Mniszech,* the inquiry into the University of Wilno was reaching its climax. It was still continuing when the next instalments of *Marina Mniszech* were due. It is not surprising then that Bulgarin interrupted the writing of a Polish-oriented story in which Russia was dominated by Polish, or Polish-directed adventurers. At the same time, Lelewel's articles also ceased to appear. Instead, *The Northern Archive* began to feature Russian historians such as A. O. Kornilovich, K. F. Kalajdovich, I. D. Ertov, P. G. Butkov, and others, thus placing greater stress on the Russians than on the Poles. We see the same emphasis on Russia when the remaining instalments of Bulgarin's *Marina Mniszech* appeared in October and November of 1824.[159] By then the inquiry was finished, sentences passed, and the story itself showed a decidedly pro-Russian angle. By extending the biography beyond the outline given at the Free Society's reading, Bulgarin achieved the desired impression of favouring Russia. It was at this point that the Russian theme became more prominent than the Polish in Bulgarin's writings.

The source for the remaining instalments of *Marina Mniszech* was a reliable and objective Collection of *Memoirs about former Poland,* compiled by the Polish poet and historian, Julian Niemcewicz. Bulgarin quoted Niemcewicz extensively without, however, revealing the title of the collection. It was only after *Marina Mniszech* was completed that he began to print entire excerpts from Niemcewicz's *Collection* under the title *The Diary of Samuel Mackiewicz, who was in Russia during the*

---

[157] Bulgarin, "Marina Mnishekh, supruga Dimitrija Samozvanca," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* No. 1, pp. 1-13; No. 2, pp. 59-73.

[158] A. Bestuzhev, *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* p. 270.

[159] *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1824, No. 20, pp. 55-77, No. 21 and 22, pp. 111-137.

time of the Second Pretender.[160] *Marina Mniszech* bears a strong resemblance to *The Diary.*

This maneuver of reversing the order of publication in order to preserve the appearance of originality in his own work was one of Bulgarin's strategems. It was a matter of skilful timing. If it was important for Bulgarin to begin *Marina Mniszech* before the appearance in print of Vol. X and XI of Karamzin's *History,* it was even more important to finish the biography before printing its source, the excerpts from Niemcewicz's *Collection,* although Niemcewicz's work itself had been published as early as 1822,[161] and Bulgarin surely was aware of this.

Niemcewicz's *Collection* served another purpose. It provided Bulgarin with valid and valuable information on Poland and Russia. With this, Bulgarin was in a position to undertake his own critical examination of Karamzin's latest volumes, dealing with the period with which Niemcewicz's work was chiefly concerned.[162]

3. *Bulgarin and Karamzin: Sequel*

The climate for resuming the criticism of Karamzin's *History* had changed drastically during the last remaining months of 1824. There were no longer any political obstacles, since it was not Lelewel who was to be the critic but Bulgarin himself, and he was now in a strong position, having just become the publisher and editor of *The Northern Bee.* Thus, the first issues of *The Northern Archive* in 1825 contained not only *The Diary of Samuel Mackiewicz,* but also, under "Criticism," Bulgarin's *Critical Opinion on Vol. X and XI of N. M. Karamzin's History of the Russian State.*[163]

Bulgarin's approach to Karamzin in the *Critical Opinion* was typical of his technique:

> A year has passed since the appearance of those impatiently awaited two volumes of a work which occupies a foremost place in Russian literature; yet no one from among the Russian scholars and men of letters has expressed his opinion on the work of the distinguished Historiographer. . . . but, since not a single one of our learned researchers in history has revealed so far his thoughts on this work, then I, having waited in vain for a whole year, and despite any shortcomings I may have, have decided that it was my

---

[160] "Dnevnik Samuila Mackevicha, byvshago v Rossii vo vremja vtorago Samozvanca," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 1, pp. 3-20, etc.

[161] *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 1, p. 3.

[162] On several occasions in his criticism of Karamzin Bulgarin quotes Niemcewicz and Mackiewicz (*Sev. Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 2, p. 200) but, again, without disclosing his source.

[163] Bulgarin, "Kriticheskij vzgljad na X i XI tomy *Istorii gosudarstva rossijskago,* sochinenoj N. M. Karamzinym," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 1, pp. 60-84, etc.

duty as a journalist to expound briefly the thoughts and feelings which were aroused in me by this subject.[164]

After this modest introduction Bulgarin, armed with all the necessary material, plunged into a detailed analysis of Karamzin's volumes. His *Critical Opinion* differed from Lelewel's *Critical Examination.* Unlike Lelewel, Bulgarin did not question Karamzin's qualifications, but offered a commentary on the historian's arguments, disagreeing with him only on some distinctly controversial issues on which Karamzin had made hasty judgments, as for example, the overall evaluation of Boris Godunov, and the mystery surrounding the death of the Carevich Dimitrij. According to Miljukov,[165] Bulgarin's defense of Boris was later adopted almost verbatim by Pogodin, and his refutation of the first Pretender's identity with Otrep'ev was repeated by later historians, who used Bulgarin's arguments.[166]

But it was not only as a historian that Bulgarin disagreed with Karamzin. His criticism, although respectful, concerned other aspects too, particularly Karamzin's style. Bulgarin summarized his remarks later in his *Memoirs*:

> While Karamzin was an independent man of letters, drawn by a natural inclination to this field as a bee to a meadow, he was simple, pleasant, and natural in style. But once in the official rôle of historiographer, he wanted to appear important, serious, eloquent, according to the *prevailing opinion* in which apparently the style had to correspond to the subject and, according to the *theory at the time,* as though in literature there should be *different styles*: a low, a middle, and a high style. Karamzin, up to the seventh volume of his *History* is pompous, grandiloquent, and unnatural. I proved in my *Northern Archive* and in the *Literary Pages,* the supplement to it, that in these volumes all Karamzin's rivers are *deep,* all valleys *broad,* all the youth *beautiful,* and all the old men *charitable*! In these volumes Karamzin even speaks of *young youth!* All the *adjectives* are accumulated so that his *periods* [long sentences with many subordinate clauses, F.M.] might be rounded off and melodious, and pedants believed and still believe that only that style is *exemplary* which is composed of *periods*!!! However, from the eighth volume of his *History,* Karamzin has returned to his natural self, and with the exception of a few passages his style in that volume and subsequent volumes is natural and simple as his soul, honest and noble.[167]

For some reason, Bulgarin's *Critical Opinion* was also left un-

---

[164] *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

[165] P. Miljukov, *Glavnye techenija russkoj istoricheskoj mysli,* Tom I, Vtoroe izdanie redakcji zhurnala "Russkaja Mysl," Moskva, 1898, p. 251.

[166] *Ibid.*, p. 251.

[167] Bulgarin, *Vospominanija,* II, pp. 30-31.

finished. The last article (April, 1825) ended with the words "to be continued" [168] and a promise to examine "all the famous men mentioned in Vol. X and XI of Karamzin's *History*; for surely Godunov had honest men round the throne, true executives of the law in the courts, and strict discipline in the army." [169] Whether through Karamzin's influence, or whether for other reasons, Bulgarin's promised continuation did not materialize. Instead, a few issues later, Bulgarin found it necessary to print in *The Northern Archive* a defense of historical criticism in general:

> For some time now writers in Russia have ceased completely to occupy themselves with historical criticism, whereas, on the contrary, this subject has become a foremost occupation of scholars in other enlightened countries in Europe.[170]

Bulgarin was suggesting that he was a pioneer of a neglected subject in Russia for which there was a need. In support, he published a long article by Count Jan Potocki on *Historical Criticism: General Rules of the Art of Research.*[171] This article was followed by others in the same vein, testifying to Bulgarin's persistent interest in history and historical criticism. This interest, together with his successes in the writing of fiction, was to continue and result in his becoming one of the first historical novelists in Russia.

Chapter VI: MORALS AND MANNERS

Bulgarin's confidence, which he demonstrated in his treatment of Karamzin, particularly in his criticism of Karamzin's style, was due primarily to the fact that, as a writer, he was becoming increasingly successful. His success was greatest as the author of the so-called stories on morals and manners, a genre which Bulgarin, as well as his critics, refer to generally as *Nravy.*[172] These stories were light in content and, until Bulgarin began to attach a special significance to them, could be called sketches of contemporary manners. As such, they filled a demand for light reading which was then growing in Russia.

Unlike Bulgarin's efforts in other literary categories, the *Nravy,* by their nature, did not encounter any difficulties, nor did they arouse any controversy. On the contrary, they seem to have quickly gathered "their

---

[168] *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 8, pp. 362-372.

[169] *Ibid.,* pp. 371-372.

[170] *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 14, p. 152.

[171] I. P. Potockij, "Istoricheskaja kritika. Obshchie pravila iskustva delat' razyskanija," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 18, pp. 91-105.

[172] This term, as used by Bulgarin, covers a wide variety of writings, testifying to the evolution of this genre, as will be seen.

own readers and admirers," [173] and received wholehearted support from Bulgarin's literary friends, even those who, like Grech, had criticized his historical writings. The story which won Grech's particular approval, and which was printed in *The Polar Star* for 1824, was the *Fashion Shop*: [174]

> Bulgarin's first humorous article revealed his real talent and created a stir in our literature. *The Fashion Shop* was followed by many others which were excellently received by the public.[175]

The Fashion Shop was a witty satire on Russian gallomania—one of the targets of Bulgarin's *Nravy*. Other targets were the everyday habits of the Russians. Grech, who had certainly not been the most generous of Bulgarin's critics, continued praising him for depicting those habits:

> Bulgarin's articles on Russian morals and manners are those which please the public most of all: the characters, the failings, the comic aspects of society men and women, and of our officials, have been caught by Bulgarin and depicted vividly and naturally.[176]

In his favourable opinion of Bulgarin's stories, Grech was wrong in one detail: *The Fashion Shop* was not Bulgarin's first "humorous article" (jumoristicheskaja stat'ja). As with all the other literary categories, this new genre too was the result of careful speculation. With no guarantee of success in the genres in which he was writing, Bulgarin had to experiment with new ones. The experiment began with an announcement by Bulgarin of the launching of the *Literary Pages* in October of 1823:

> In this journal there will be printed observations and remarks on the morals and manners of several social classes but without, however, mentioning any personalities. . . . Most of all there will be printed in the *Literary Pages* amusing and instructive articles on manners and customs similar to those in Addison's *Spectator*, Johnson's *Rambler, The Adventurer, Seeker of Adventures*, and *The Hermit* of the famous Jouy.[177]

The *Literary Pages* were to become, primarily, a vehicle for these stories.

The announcement was unusual in one respect. As already mentioned in connection with his historical writings, Bulgarin never disclosed his sources beforehand, always trying to preserve the appearance of

---

[173] A. L. Pogodin, "Ivan Vyzhigin, roman Faddeja Bulgarina," *Zapiski Russkago Nauchnago Instituta v Belgrade*, Vypusk 9, 1933, p. 145.

[174] Bulgarin, "Modnaja lavka, ili shto znachit fason," *Poljarnaja Zvezda*, 1824, pp. 310-317.

[175] Grech, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina," *op. cit.*, p. 518.

[176] *Ibid.*, p. 519.

[177] Bulgarin, *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1823, No. 19, p. 83.

originality and innovation. This time, he openly named several Western publications as his models. His frankness was, however, only a prudent maneuver. Since the articles would inevitably contain elements of satire of Russia, they would not be received well by the Russian reader if they were conceived entirely by Bulgarin, a Polish journalist. But as imitations of similar articles and stories from famous Western journals and novels, they would be welcome and would sell very well. As a further precaution against potential critics, Bulgarin resorted to his customary stratagem and, in an "Announcement" accompanying the first issue of the *Literary Pages,* declared that it was only "at the request of the readers of *The Northern Archive*" [178] that the *Literary Pages,* its supplement, were being published.

Having thus insured himself against the accusation of presuming to criticise Russia, Bulgarin also took steps to avoid accusations of excessive borrowing from foreign sources. He announced that "with the exception of poetry, there would be no translations of any kind in the *Literary Pages.*" [179] However, he broke his promise on several occasions, and almost every time in order to print a translation from Jouy's *l'Hermite de la Chaussée d'Antin.*[180] In view of the absence of any translations from the other sources mentioned in Bulgarin's announcement, mainly because both Addison and Johnson belonged to an earlier age, it must be concluded that in the articles and stories on morals and customs Jouy was Bulgarin's most important influence. Moreover, Bulgarin's evolution as a writer of *Nravy* was exactly like that of Jouy and others (Dickens, Eugène Sue) who also started their literary careers by writing sketches of contemporary manners. Thus Bulgarin's development was not a personal one, but a part of something that was going on in literature at that time. Jouy's particular attraction for Bulgarin stemmed probably from the fact that the two men had led somewhat similar lives.[181]

Bulgarin's reliance on Jouy did not seem to provoke any adverse criticism. Despite Grech's claim that there were some attacks on Bulgarin for borrowing from Jouy, there is no evidence to support this claim, and Grech himself is vague about it.[182] The editors of *The Polar Star,* on the other hand, took Bulgarin's dependence on Jouy as a matter of course:

---

[178] Bulgarin, "Ob'javlenie," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No. 1.

[179] Bulgarin, *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1823, No. 19, p. 83.

[180] "Nravy," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 20, pp. 373-384.

[181] Victor-Joseph Etienne Jouy (1764-1846) was a French writer and journalist who, like Bulgarin, had spent many years in various armies before choosing a literary career. He wrote in many genres, but is best known for his series of collections of the "Paris Hermit," sketches of contemporary manners, of which *l'Hermite de la Chaussée d'Antin* is the best known.

[182] Grech, *op. cit.,* p. 519.

> Mr. Bulgarin's 'Supplements' to *The Northern Archive* are bringing the Paris Hermit to life on the shores of the Neva. The lively and amusing style and the novelty of the ideas are preparing the public for absorbing reading—and the eccentric inhabitants of our capital as well as the manners of our society are inexhaustible sources for his satirical pen.[183]

The Polar Star's generous opinion of Bulgarin's new genre was based more on anticipation than on reality. It was not until much later that Bulgarin exploited the satirical possibilities of the genre. In 1823, due to the political situation in Wilno, Bulgarin was in no position to satirize Russian eccentricities. It is no wonder that a year later, *The Polar Star's* praise was less generous, and the editors complained of "something left unsaid" in Bulgarin's sketches.[184] A later critic, A. L. Pogodin, was more correct in assessing Bulgarin's first steps as the author of *Nravy*:

> In the section devoted to morals and manners in Bulgarin's journal, Bulgarin fairly frequently publishes his little scenes from Russian life. Here at first he revealed his two characteristics: a partiality for history, and a good-natured humour of a man endowed with a keen observation.[185]

Bulgarin's first stories in the new genre were as Pogodin had described them: keen observations by a man with a partiality for history. His next stories, as Pogodin also hinted in his criticism, underwent a change. The evolution of the genre, as practised by Bulgarin, continued, and it represents one of the most skilful of his literary maneuvers.

The evolution of Bulgarin's *Nravy* can be divided into several stages, according to the growth of Bulgarin's confidence. The first stage was represented by a three-instalment article (in the *Literary Pages*, November-December, 1823) entitled, in the manner of Jouy, *A Stroll out of Town*.[186] But to remove any semblance of satire, the article, printed in the "Prose" section of the journal, was subtitled simply "Letters about Petersburg" and not "Nravy." It was unsigned, but the narrator, as in the first-person military tales, was easily identifiable as Bulgarin. The stress on history served a double purpose: it was in keeping with Bulgarin's growing emphasis on Russian history in his writings, and also it freed him from writing about contemporary Russian customs, for which he was not yet ready. Instead, he displayed his knowledge of facts about Russia and the Russians of a century ago. In this, and in

---

[183] A. Bestuzhev, "Vzgljad na russkuju slovesnost' v techenije 1823 goda," *Poljarnaja Zvezda*, 1824, p. 270.

[184] A. Bestuzhev, "Vzgljad na russkuju slovesnost' v techenije 1824 i nachale 1825 goda," *Poljarnaja Zvezda*, 1825, p. 498.

[185] **A. L. Pogodin, "Russkie pisateli-Poljaki,"** ***op. cit.*****, p. 111.**

[186] **Bulgarin, "Progulka za gorod,"** ***Literaturnye Listki*****, 1823, No. 1, pp. 1-8, No. 2, pp. 17-20, No. 3, pp. 29-32.**

other articles of this period, Bulgarin played the part of an educated commentator on the Russian past. Grech probably understood best this stage in Bulgarin's writings:

> I would like to advise the reader to regard Bulgarin's little pictures of Russia not as satires but as historical sketches, as the observations of a traveller about a foreign nation.[187]

In the next stage Bulgarin shifted to contemporary Russia. *The Fashion Shop*, mentioned earlier, belongs to this period. Although *The Fashion Shop* impresses us now as a witty satire of Russian gallomania, Bulgarin's contemporaries, who expected something stronger, referred to it simply as a "humorous article." [188] It had wit, but lacked other necessary ingredients of a satire. It concentrated on one aspect of the Russian gallomania only, namely the slavish imitation in Russia of French fashions, and particularly the willingness of the Russians to pay any price for any garment that was supposed to be of French manufacture and, therefore, fashionable. Bulgarin did not laugh at the ignorance of the Russians but, with the aid of pertinent figures of prices, exposed the fraud to which they were victim. By bringing into play his superior knowledge, he was sharing it with the Russians and thereby teaching them. Thus, from a passive but educated observer, Bulgarin transformed himself into an active teacher.

Probably because of the change of emphasis the *Nravy* were undergoing, *The Fashion Shop* was printed not in the *Literary Pages* but in *The Polar Star*. The success of the article, however, was immediately followed by similar articles in Bulgarin's own journal, which was now sub-titled "Journal of Morals and Manners and of Literature." The most characteristic of the articles was another three-instalment "stroll" (February-March 1824), namely, *A Stroll Along the Sidewalk of the Nevskij Prospect*,[189] already mentioned in connection with Bulgarin's Russian theme.[190] It was this article which particularly struck critics by its similarity to Jouy's sketches: the parallelism of the titles (Chaussée d'Antin—Nevskij Prospect) was unmistakable.[191] Outwardly, the article was a continuation of the earlier learned historical narrative, except that the narrator showed greater self-assurance: the article was this time signed with Bulgarin's initials, and contained several references to his earlier articles in the *Literary Pages*.[192] Also, the narrative moved from

---

[187] Grech, *op. cit.*, p. 519.

[188] **See page 155.**

[189] Bulgarin, "Progulka po trotuaru Nevskago Prospekta," *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 4, pp. 118-133, No. 5, pp. 159-172, No. 6, pp. 213-230.

[190] **See page 148.**

[191] **"Kommentari," *Poljarnaja Zvezda*, p. 898.**

[192] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 118 ff.

the outskirts of Petersburg to the city itself. Once in the city, the narrative centered on its most famous street, and once on Nevskij Prospect, it concentrated on its main stores, particularly its fashion shops, and the article became a continuation of *The Fashion Shop,* taking up where the latter left off. The narrator's listeners have, of course, read *The Fashion Shop,* and have admittedly learned the lesson contained in it:

> [We] promised ourselves to improve and, at the first opportunity, to refuse to buy all those things which can be made at home, and give away all the money intended for the foreign fashions to the needy.[193]

Having benefited from the narrator's wisdom, the listeners thanked him for being their *cicerone,* and pressed him to continue. After all, he has so far limited himself only to the correcting of the shopping habits of the Russian women; surely—his listeners maintained—he must have a cure for other bad habits, too. He had indeed:

> Be patient, you will soon see some of them in my journal, provided other journalists will not take advantage of my hint and will not print their articles before mine.[194]

Bulgarin the teacher and the journalist projecting his ideas now merged into one. This stage corresponds to a similar stage in Bulgarin's literary criticism where, as will be seen, he often took it upon himself to be a spokesman for high standards in the Russian language.

The next stage of the *Nravy,* as Bulgarin hinted, was slow in coming. The April 1824 issue of the *Literary Pages* contained yet another "stroll," [195] with the customary emphasis on history. Otherwise the sketches concerned specific topics (*On Charm*) [196] but they were treated in such a general manner that they could hardly be called *Nravy.* Then, in June of 1824, an article appeared in the *Literary Pages* which marked the beginning of another stage in the evolution of Bulgarin's *Nravy.* The article, *New Meanings of Old Words or a Conversation with a Man of the Previous Century,*[197] was the boldest satire Bulgarin had written so far. In it, he deplored the deterioration of morals and manners in Russia over the last century. To prove his point, he selected several expressions and, in a humorous manner, supplied their present meaning. Thus, "well-bred people" (vospitannye ljudi) became synonymous with "those who know French better than Russian," and "rogue" (plut) became a "clever

---

[193] *Ibid.,* 1824, No. 5, p. 166 ff.

[194] *Ibid.,* 1824, No. 6, p. 221 ff.

[195] Bulgarin, "Progulka v Ekateringof," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 8, pp. 291-312.

[196] Bulgarin, "O prelesti," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 7, pp. 247-254.

[197] Bulgarin, "Novoe znachenie starykh slov ili beseda u cheloveka proshedshago stoletija," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 11 and 12, pp. 397-407.

and resourceful person," and so on.[198] It was not the satire itself, however, that made the article significant, but the fact that in it, Bulgarin introduced for the first time Arkhip Faddeevich, his wordly and wise alter ego, and the most important among his many pseudonyms.[199] In the article, Arkhip Faddeevich was but one of four participants in the conversation, but it was he who voiced the strongest indignation over the decline of standards in Russia. It was also he who, at the end of the conversation, exhorted the first-person narrator, Bulgarin, that "the duty of an honourable man was to tell the truth." [200]

Arkhip Faddeevich was somebody behind whom Bulgarin could hide. Bulgarin provided him with all the necessary statistics: he was born in 1744, which meant that in 1824 he was 80 years old; his knowledge was universal. Although Arkhip was old enough to be Bulgarin's grandfather, the latter left no doubt in his readers' mind whose creation Arkhip Faddeevich really was by providing him with his own patronymic. As Bulgarin's alter ego, Arkhip Faddeevich became the narrator in the utopian stories, the next stage in the evolution of Bulgarin's *Nravy.*

Bulgarin's utopian stories, which belong among his most important contributions to Russian literature, have been generally ignored by critics. They received a comprehensive treatment only recently, in one of the two American dissertations on Bulgarin (Nicholas P. Vaslef), which contains an excellent chapter, "Bulgarin and the Russian Utopian Genre," written under the direction of Professor Roman Jakobson.

The utopian stories, of which Bulgarin wrote two before December 1825, began to appear in September 1824 in the *Literary Pages* and continued, after the termination of this journal, in *The Northern Archive* until June, 1825. They marked the lessening of his dependence on Jouy, and the appearance of other influences on his fiction. In a lengthy footnote to the first utopian story, *Credible Fiction or World Travel in the Twenty-Ninth Century,*[201] he acknowledged some of the influences and explained the purpose of the story:

> I don't want to appropriate for myself somebody else's ideas, and admit to my readers that many people before me have set out to travel into future centuries on the wings of their imagination. The

---

[198] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 397 ff.

[199] I. F. Masanov, *Slovar' psevdonimov russkih pisatelej, uchenykh i obshchestvennykh dejatelej*, Tom IV, Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Vsesojuznoj *Knizhnoj Palaty*, 1956-1960, p. 86.

[200] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 407.

[201] Bulgarin, "Pravdopodobnye nebylicy ili stranstvovanie po svetu v dvadcat' devjatom veke," *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 17, pp. 133-150, No. 18, pp. 173-192, Nos. 19 and 20, pp. 12-27, Nos. 23 and 24, pp. 129-145. *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1825, No. 2, pp. 202-211, No. 3, pp. 294-302.

> famous French writer Mercier [202] and the German Julius von Voss have particularly distinguished themselves in this genre. . . . I have decided also to cross over 1,000 years ahead, and to have a look at what our descendants are doing. . . . Unlike Mercier and Voss, basing myself on our early discoveries in science, I shall be offering only that which can actually be, although in our time it is unrealizable. The moral purpose of this article my readers will see for themselves. . . . *The Publisher*.[203]

Bulgarin's explanation was not complete. For some reason not explained by him he did not mention eighteenth-century Russian and Polish Utopias, but went directly to French and German sources. The reason was most probably the same as in the case of Jouy's sketches: foreign-inspired stories would be more welcome and would sell better in Russia.

Bulgarin's explanation was incomplete in another respect. As a self-appointed guardian of Russian morals and manners, he wanted—as he had promised his readers—to show the benefits of living in a society free from vice. But it was impossible for him to show a nineteenth-century utopian Russia—an ideal place with an ideal government and institutions—without being critical of the Russia of his day. The solution was to choose a distant future and a place outside of Russia proper for the setting of his story.

The story takes place in the year 2824, in an Arctic kingdom in Siberia. It was presented as "credible fiction," and Bulgarin provided plausible scientific and pseudo-scientific innovations to establish an aura of credibility in the reader's mind. Properly categorized as to its genre, the story would have to be called didactic science-fiction, since it relied on technical inventions to supply the utopian conditions of the Arctic society; the didactic element was provided by the story's purpose: to show what wonders can be achieved by the proper application of education, science and morality.

Bulgarin left no doubt as to the identity of the utopian society. Its inhabitants spoke fluent Russian, and its capital city had a Russian name, Nadezhdin (Hopeful).[204] The name of the city and the time of the story indicate what presumably seemed to Bulgarin a reasonable but hardly flattering time span in which Russian society might attain to perfection.

While describing in great detail the future society, Bulgarin did not neglect his immediate concerns. *The Library for Reading* [205] in

---

[202] Louis Sébastien Mercier (1740-1814) wrote several novels, of which the most curious, *An 2440 ou Rêve s'il en fut jamais* (1770), is an anticipation which seems to foresee real events.

[203] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, 1824, No. 17, pp. 133-134.

[204] *Ibid.*, 1824, No. 17, p. 140.

[205] The name *Biblioteka dlja chtenija*, italicized by Bulgarin in the text, is of some significance. It became later, in the 1830's, the name of a successful journal on which Bulgarin co-operated with Grech and Sękowski.

Nadezhdin was called *The Northern Archive!* The description of the library in the story was strikingly similar to what Bulgarin wanted his own journal to be:

> A place where it is as convenient to gather *news* as antiquities; a place where one can find all the latest travels, historical works, description of our manners, our wisdom and folly, and news of all branches of learning.[206]

The instalment in which this passage appeared was printed in the last issue to be published of the *Literary Pages.* The next instalments were to appear in *The Northern Archive,* in a separate section subtitled "Nravy." Thus, Bulgarin manipulated his story in such a way as to insert in it, at the appropriate moment, an advertisement of his other journal.

The next utopian story, published in *The Northern Archive* of May and June of 1825, was entitled *Improbable Fiction or Travel to the Centre of the Earth.*[207] As the title indicates, the story was a counterpart to the *Credible Fiction.* While it maintained a certain aura of reality, *Improbable Fiction,* set under the surface of the earth, was not presented as something plausible, but as an allegorical journey whose purpose was the satirization of the weaknesses of society. Another important difference between the two stories was that *Improbable Fiction,* unlike its predecessor in the utopian genre, was set in the present, and not in the future.

It was because of the setting, which enabled Bulgarin to emphasize the weaknesses of people living in his own day, that he resorted to allegory. Protected by the allegorical masks of the underground inhabitants, Bulgarin was considerably more critical of people's vices than he would have otherwise dared to be. In this, he was helped by the way he had structured his story in which—unlike the first story where technology was the main subject—technology was relegated to the background, enabling him to concentrate on people's morals and manners.

The allegorical journey consisted of three parts, or visits, to three different underground societies, each one of them on a different level of development. The first society, closest to the surface of the earth, was made up of spider-like creatures living in perpetual darkness and afraid of light. They were called *Ignorants* (Ignoranty) and their country *Ignorance* (Ignorancija). The Ignorants considered themselves very wise, "because they placed their happiness in food and drink."[208]

The second society, closer to the centre of the earth, was made up of

---

[206] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, 1824, No. 23 and 24, p. 145.

[207] Bulgarin, "Neverojatnye nebylicy ili puteshestvie k sredotochiju zemli," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 10, pp. 174-185, No. 11, pp. 360-377, No. 12, pp. 437-451.

[208] *Ibid.*, 1825, No. 10, p. 182.

creatures resembling orangutangs, living in half-light and half-darkness, and considering themselves perfect in every respect. They were called *Cattle People* (Skotinioty) and their country *Cattle Country* (Skotinija). The men in Skotinija divided their time between eating, sleeping, and endless self-praise,[209] while the women cared about nothing except their appearance and amusement.

The third society, located in the very centre of the earth, was made up of inhabitants looking like earth people but living in eternal light. Their country was called, appropriately, *The World of Light* (Svetonija), and their capital city, Utopia, "a place for which we looked in vain on the surface of the earth." [210] Svetonija was an ideal country where people lived in perfect harmony and contentment; where the word "fashions" was not even known; where the courts were empty, and the meaning of the word "slander" (jabeda) was not even very clear to the inhabitants; where bribery was unknown; where everybody had a trade, and young people, busy with learning one, were well behaved; and so on.[211]

The satirical purpose of Bulgarin's story was unmistakable. It was obvious that everything that was positive in Svetonija was negative in Russia. Furthermore, Bulgarin has now added to the customary targets of his satire the legal system, which had been satirized by practically every Russian writer of importance since the eighteenth century. The overall satirical effect of Bulgarin's allegory was strengthened by the respective "levels" of its three societies: the closer to the centre of the earth, the more enlightened the inhabitants were. The implication was that the inhabitants of the surface of the earth were the most ignorant of all.

Because of the harshness of the satire, Bulgarin, beside resorting to allegory, took other precautions calculated to protect him from attacks as a daring critic of Russian society. Thus, he never mentioned Russia by name in his story, except indirectly with reference to the starting point of the journey (Novaja Zemlja), and to the language of the inhabitants of Svetonija which was a mixture including Russian words. Furthermore, the story was signed with Bulgarin's initials only, and the narrator was Arkhip Faddeevich; even so he was restricted to the beginning and the end of the story only, since the bulk of it came from a supposedly "found manuscript," [212] a device to which Bulgarin resorted in order to remove himself further from the story's content. The story was also conspicuous by the absence in it of any self-praise by Bulgarin, except perhaps the author's boastful ability to communicate with the inhabitants of the underground societies in their various languages.

Despite these precautions, or because of them, Bulgarin wanted to

---

[209] *Ibid.*, 1825, No. 11, p. 366.

[210] *Ibid.*, 1825, No. 12, p. 439.

[211] *Ibid.*, p. 443 ff.

[212] *Ibid.*, 1825, No. 10, p. 177.

make certain that his story had been understood by everyone. For this reason, when the manuscript in the story ended, he had Arkhip Faddeevich make this explanation:

> I do not known what you will conclude from this *Travel to the Centre of the Earth* but it seems to me that: *the first region,* or *Ignorancija,* stands for complete ignorance; *the second region* or *Skotinija,* stands for half-education and half-learning, which is much worse than ignorance; and that *the third region,* or *Svetonija,* stands for true enlightenment, which makes people kind, loyal, quiet, modest and honest.[213]

In view of the obvious transparency of the allegorical disguise of the satire, and Bulgarin's explicit naming of virtues and vices, it is difficult to understand the need for this explanation. However, the explanation may have been necessary for the large, uneducated public which Bulgarin expected would also read his story.

The story ended with a false disclaimer, a device which was to become another of Bulgarin's favourite literary maneuvers:

> I do not dare to teach the public, and that is why I am leaving it to the public itself to decide whether Arkhip Faddeevich's conclusion is a correct one.[214]

A teacher of the Russian public was precisely what Bulgarin aspired to be.

The next and final stage in the evolution of Bulgarin's *Nravy,* and in his evolution as a writer, was to be a full-length novel. A. L. Pogodin, perhaps the most objective of Bulgarin's crittics, described the transition from the *Nravy* to the novel:

> Gradually his observations of Russia's customs and the memories of his own experiences, rich in all sorts of adventures, have prompted the author of the *Nravy* to write a large novel.[215]

As will be seen in the next chapter, Bulgarin indeed began—and perhaps even finished in 1825—a novel on morals and manners, but its intended publication was delayed by his cautious approach to the novel and, later, by the worsening political situation in Russia and Bulgarin's involvement in it. This novel was *Ivan Vyzhigin,*[216] the most successful of all his literary ventures, a pulling together of everything he has written so far, and a masterpiece in literary maneuver.

---

213 *Ibid.*, 1825, No. 12, p. 451.

214 *Ibid.*

215 A. L. Pogodin, "Russkie pisateli-Poljaki," *op. cit.*, p. 111.

216 Faddej V. Bulgarin, *Ivan Vyzhigin, nravstvenno-satiricheskij roman,* Sanktpeterburg, v tipografii vdovy Pljushar, 1829.

Chapter VII: THE NOVEL: *IVAN VYZHIGIN*

By the middle of 1825, Bulgarin has tried his hand successfully at all the literary genres he was to use, including the autobiographical sketches which later became part of his *Memoirs.* In this long literary apprenticeship, lasting about ten years, all his endeavours seemed to point to the novel. The military stories, the historical writings, the themes of Poland and Russia, and even some of the earlier *Nravy*—the "strolls" with their comments on the Russian past—all became important materials for his future historical novels.

Bulgarin was constantly thinking in terms of a longer literary form; his writings were becoming consistently more extensive, running frequently into several instalments. The most voluminous was the biographical story, *Marina Mniszech* which, together with its most important source, the even more voluminous *Diary of Samuel Mackiewicz,* and Bulgarin's extensive *Critical Opinion on Vol. X and XI of N. M. Karamzin's History of the Russian State,* contained all the necessary materials for a historical novel. The novel, *Dimitrij the Impostor,*[217] did not appear until 1830; like Bulgarin's other historical novels, all dealing with the history of both Poland and Russia, *Dimitrij the Impostor* had to wait for the proper political climate.

While the historical novels had to wait for the right moment, Bulgarin's preoccupation with the novel in general did not cease. In the October, 1824, issue of the *Literary Pages,* Bulgarin published a long review of Vasilij Narezhnyj's (1780-1825) new story, *The Seminarist* (Bursak).[218] After praising Narezhnyj, who was then the chief Russian writer of the picaresque novel, Bulgarin offered his own ideas on what the Russian novel should be:

> Russian Literature is not rich in original novels. Mr. Narezhnyj is now almost the only one who devotes himself to this type of composition. In general, one can see in his works much intellect, much imagination, but one has to admit that there are no tender feelings in them, no taste for elegance, and no knowledge of social life and of the higher class of society which, in the novels of Walter Scott and numerous other writers or our time, constitute their real charm and their chief merit. A skilful depiction of the picture of society

---

[217] Faddej V. Bulgarin, *Dimitrij Samozvanec, istoricheskij roman,* Sanktpeterburg, v tipografii Aleksandra Smirdina, 1830.

[218] Bulgarin, "Izvestija o novykh knigakh. *Bursak,* Malorossijskaja povest', sochinenije Vasilija Narezhnago," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, Nos. 19 and 20, pp. 49-50.

> depends on a succesful portrayal of its various classes. Each class should have its language, its customs, and its own way of life.[219]

The qualities lacking in Narezhnyj's novels were precisely those which Bulgarin was so keenly developing in his *Nravy*. A novel, according to him, must concentrate on the morals and manners of the whole society and not just one segment of it, as in the Ukraine-Cossack-centered novels of Narezhnyj. It seems that in his review Bulgarin tried to disassociate himself from Narezhnyj, partly because of the latter's troubles with the censorship—in connection with his principal work, *A Russian Gil Blas* (1814)—but also because in his own novel, about which Bulgarin must have already been thinking, he would prefer to claim the more prestigious foreign influences. This preference was confirmed in a series of articles, *On the Novel*,[220] which appeared in *The Northern Bee* shortly after its launching in January of 1825.

The timing of Bulgarin's articles with the launching of *The Northern Bee* was of some significance. The unique position occupied by the newspaper enabled Bulgarin as its publisher to speak on a variety of subjects with an even greater authority than before. Unlike his earlier journalistic ventures, which were somewhat restricted in their subjects (history, the theatre, morals and manners, and so on), *The Northern Bee* became, to a much greater extent than the *Literary Pages* which had merged with it, Bulgarin's forum. From this forum Bulgarin was influencing public opinion on what the Russian novel should be and, indirectly, preparing the public for his own novel.

The three-instalment article began with a long-winded introduction on the nature of the novel and the divided opinions on it, and continued with a promise to arrive at some conclusions:

> We will try, as much as it is possible, to hold a middle ground, and to glance impartially over the vast field of romantic literature. Three nations are competing now in this field: the English, the French, and the Germans.[221]

Bulgarin actually refrained from discussing Romanticism altogether,[222] and restricted himself to evaluations based on the novel's treatment of morals and manners. Thus he maintained that the German novels depicted neither society at large nor individual people, but only a constant struggle of passions. The French novels depicted society, but it was a society conceived artificially, in which the component parts behaved

---

[219] *Ibid.*

[220] Bulgarin, "O romanakh," *Severnaja Pchela*, 1825, Nos. 5, 7, 9.

[221] *Ibid.*, No. 5.

[222] Bulgarin's restraint with regard to Romanticism, and all new literary trends in general, will become more obvious in the next chapter, "Criticism."

according to a pattern. The English novels stood out with their unique depiction of the protagonists, especially their *moral* qualities. Among the English novelists, the most prominent was Walter Scott. The end of the article was devoted to him and to his imitators.

> Talking about the contemporary English novelists, it is self-evident that first place, by right, must be given to the favourite of all, Walter Scott. He alone—due to the richness of his imagination, the variety of his protagonists and characters, images and descriptions—can produce a whole catalogue of names. The favourite locale for his novels is his Fatherland, Scotland, and his favourite subjects, the manners and morals of his countrymen.[223]

Bulgarin thus established a link between himself—at that time a busy author of the *Nravy*—and a prominent contemporary novelist whose favourite subjects were supposedly also the morals and manners of society.

In the May 4, 1825, issue of *The Northern Bee* Bulgarin returned to the topic of the novel. Discussing a new French book and speculating on its genre he argued strongly for Scott's novel on morals and manners:

> Walter Scott wanted to write and embellish the history not of *one* man: he brings to the stage whole nations, he describes whole epochs. Let us take as an example *Quentin Durward:* this novel is a picture of the court of Louis XI and France of that time. If the lives of famous men belong exclusively to history, then the depiction of morals and manners belongs to the novel: and who described them as well as the famous author of *Gil Blas*? Walter Scott did not wish to depict one man or one event: he wanted to describe morals and manners and, in this respect, one must say, his depictions are accurate. . . .[224]

Despite Bulgarin's elaborate efforts to pass himself off as a literary descendant of Walter Scott, it was nevertheless Lesage, the "famous author" of *Gil Blas,* who chiefly inspired his first novel. Like Jouy, Lesage held for Bulgarin a particular attraction, which probably also stemmed from certain biographical similarities.[225] But, as with Jouy, Bulgarin did not mention Lesage until he had discussed several other writers, mostly English, in order to protect himself from accusations of imitating an obvious source. Also, Scott was simply a more serious and

---

[223] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, No. 7.

[224] Bulgarin, "Novye knigi," *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 54.

[225] Alain René Lesage (1668-1747). The French novelist and dramatist was an orphan who supported himself by translations and adaptations from Spanish. Later he published several important novels of which the second, in four volumes, was *Gil Blas de Santillane* (1715-1735). All his novels are set in Spain, but they depict Paris society. *Grand Larousse Encyclopédique,* VI, pp. 699-700.

respected writer. Hence, the elaborate discussion of the novel in general, and Walter Scott in particular.

The necessity for the intricate maneuvers became obvious when, following Bulgarin's article in the May 4th issue of *The Northern Bee* (above), there appeared, in the *Nravy* section of *The Northern Archive* of the same month, Bulgarin's *Ivan Vyzhigin, or the Russian Gil Blas* (An excerpt from a New Novel).[226] Despite the placing of the excerpt in the "Morals and Manners" section, its subtitle was taken verbatim from the picaresque novel of Narezhnyj who, in turn, had borrowed it from Lesage. By entitling his novel "Gil Blas," Bulgarin risked being included among the numerous imitators of Lesage's picaresque novel. According to Pereverzev, a Soviet critic who made a study of the picaresque genre (*Pushkin in a Struggle with the Russian "Picaresque Novel"*), the picaresque novel was very popular in Russia:

> Beginning with Narezhnyj's *Russian Gil Blas,* half-baked Gil Blases of Russian manufacture captured little by little an increasingly noticeable place in literature.[227]

This was still true in 1825, and later. For example, at about the same time when Bulgarin's excerpt appeared, the *Son of the Fatherland* was printing two picaresque novels: *A Persian Gil Blas,*[228] and *Gil Blas of the French Revolution.*[229] Both of these publications were announced in *The Northern Bee,*[230] probably to stimulate even more the interest in the genre. By promoting the picaresque novel, Bulgarin was exploiting its popularity and promoting his own novel, while at the same time doing everything to make *Ivan Vyzhigin* appear as something different, something new. In this light, his preoccupation with Walter Scott was understandable.

That *Ivan Vyzhigin* was to be a "new" novel was indicated by Bulgarin himself in the title of the excerpt: "An excerpt from a New Novel." He never introduced novels in this manner unless it was a new novel by someone well-known who had already written other novels; this was Bulgarin's first novel. Moreover, the "New" in Bulgarin's title was capitalized, which was grammatically incorrect, unless Bulgarin wanted to attract attention to the adjective.

Additional information concerning Bulgarin's aspirations for his novel was provided in the introduction, "To My Readers," which accompanied the excerpt. The introduction started almost exactly as Bul-

---

226 Bulgarin, "Ivan Vyzhigin, ili Russkij Zhilblaz (Otryvok iz Novago Romana)," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. IX, pp. 67-87.

227 V. F. Pereverzev, "Pushkin v bor'be s russkim plutovskim romanom," *U istokov russkago realisticheskogo romana,* Moskva, 1965, p. 78.

228 "Persidskij Zhilblaz," *Syn Otechestva,* 1825, No. 10.

229 "Zhilblaz francuzskoj revoljucii," *op. cit.,* No. 11.

230 *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 59 and No. 66.

garin's review of Narezhnyj's *The Seminarist,* on a note of despair over the state of the Russian novel:

> Many people complain that we have very few, or almost no original Russian novels, while foreign literatures abound in this type of composition. The main reason for the success of this branch of literature in foreign countries is that no social class there takes an offense if one of its members is brought on the stage. . . . In Russia, on the contrary, even with an imaginary picture of morals and manners, the authors have to explain that there are no personalities involved, as if personalities could exist without names.[231]

Continuing the introduction, Bulgarin implied a readiness to correct the situation, and announced that, like the foreign writers, he was going to concentrate on showing his readers all the harmful consequences of evil liaisons and of contempt for strict principles of morality, and all the delights of virtue and honour. He ended the introduction with a concrete promise:

> I intend to present several chapters [of *Ivan Vyzhigin*] in *The Northern Archive.* I ask my readers not to hurry with a verdict until the appearance of the whole novel, which I intend to complete before the end of the year.[232]

The chapter which was included in the first excerpt dealt with the evils of gambling, as described by Bulgarin's hero and narrator, Ivan Vyzhigin. Ivan was to be employed in a fashionable gambling establishment in Petersburg, and received a thorough initiation into the trade. Consequently, the chapter constituted the most damning exposure of gambling to be encountered in Russian literature. Bulgarin's admitted source for the chapter was Polish:

> All the details of this dishonourable trade were taken from No. 122, 1818, of the satirical newspaper published in Wilno under the name *Pavement News* (Brukowe Wiadomości). The article was entitled: "The exposure of the secrets of card players"; in Polish: "Wyjawienie Sekretów Króla Faraona" (The Exposure of King Pharaoh's Secrets). The card game *bank* is called in Polish *Faraon* (Pharaoh), and that is why it is impossible to translate the title in Russian and preserve the same meaning.[233]

By quoting the Polish source, Bulgarin was not only displaying his wide reading, but he was following his growing custom of documenting any piece of evidence for which he could have been taken to task; also, he was accounting for his intimate knowledge of gambling.

There is no record of any reaction to the chapter, nor of any hasty

---

231 Bulgarin, "K chitateljam," *op. cit.,* pp. 67-68.

232 *Ibid.,* pp. 69-70.

233 *Ibid.,* p. 86.

"verdicts," as Bulgarin feared in the introduction. Nevertheless, there was a lapse of two months before another chapter appeared. When it finally did appear, it signified several adjustments for the future novel.

The second excerpt did not come out until July, 1825. It, too, appeared in the *Nravy* section of *The Northern Archive,* but was entitled, simply, *An excerpt from A Russian Gil Blas.*[234] Both the reference to a "new" novel and the "Ivan Vyzhigin" in the title were absent. It may be that Narezhnyj's death the previous month [235] persuaded Bulgarin to assume the former's place as the chief Russian writer of the picaresque genre, rather than insist on a "new" novel. The content of the second excerpt seems to support this view. The chapter included in the excerpt did not deal with a social evil, like gambling, but with a rather humourous side of the Russian social life, namely matchmaking, of which Ivan Vyzhigin was the object.

It may also be that the deteriorating political climate on the eve of the Decembrist Revolt made Bulgarin tone down the exposure of some of Russia's evils. Whatever the reasons, there is evidence showing that Bulgarin's novel underwent, almost from the beginning, considerable revisions. The extensive chapter on gambling was almost entirely eliminated, and only portions of it found their way into the finished novel in the form of Ivan's schoolboy brushes with gambling.[236] The same thing presumably happened to numerous other chapters but, because they were not printed in *The Northern Archive,* we can only speculate on the extent of the revisions. The chapter on the matchmaking, on the other hand, was almost entirely preserved, with the exception of a few lines of introduction which had to be rewritten in order to provide a suitable transition for a new location of the chapter in the finished novel.[237]

As it evolved, *Ivan Vyzhigin* was going to turn into a story of a man depicted, in a piscaresque pattern, by the kind of incidents in which he participated. The novel, in fact, was to reveal many of the devices of the picaresque genre. The central figure, an orphan in search of his origin, serves as the narrator of the story, and as a commentator on the life and customs of the people he meets on his travels. His travels take him from one extreme of the Empire, the formerly Polish province of Belorussia with its large Polish and Jewish populations, to the other, the Kirghiz steppes. His adventures include encounters with Poles, Jews, Russians, Tartars, gamblers, thieves, bandits, and so on, and are crowned with honourable service in the Russian army against the Turks. The bulk of the story, however, takes place in Moscow and Petersburg. The people

---

[234] Bulgarin, "Otryvok iz Russkago Zhilblaza," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 13, pp. 56-79.

[235] *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 75 (July 23).

[236] Bulgarin, *Ivan Vyzhigin. . . . , op. cit.,* Part I, Chapter X.

[237] Bulgarin, *op. cit.,* Part IV, Chapter III.

who cross Ivan's path are frequently representative members of various social classes and professions. His comments on them are didactic in nature because Ivan, like the central figure in *Gil Blas* of Lesage, and unlike the typical Spanish picaro, is not a rogue, but a man who achieves wisdom and position in society through the experiences to which he is subjected. As the novel evolved, these separate experiences would undergo—for reasons both political and literary—frequent revisions.

It was in the re-location of the material already written that the extent of the revisions, both in the content and organization of the novel, could best be seen. The two excerpts, printed in *The Northern Archive,* were designated: chapter 10 and 13, respectively, of Part I of the planned novel. In the finished novel, parts of chapter 10 remained in chapter 10 of Part I, but chapter 13 became chapter 3 of Part IV. Between the gambling episode and Vyzhigin's marriage plans, which were so close in time in the first version of the novel, in the finished novel Bulgarin placed a series of picaresque adventures ending with the hero's marriage and settling down to an exemplary life.

In view of Bulgarin's known speed in writing,[238] it is fair to assume that the process of revising of the novel was completed, as Bulgarin had promised, by the end of 1825, and that its publication was delayed by the events of the December Revolt of that year. In these events Bulgarin found himself in serious jeopardy, and was saved only by the honesty of his doomed friends, Ryleev and Bestuzhev.[239] Nevertheless, he was thoroughly investigated, and his whole past examined, particularly his military service. His repeated declarations of loyalty, and the fact that his military service could hardly be considered treasonable, resulted in his being cleared in the middle of 1826.[240] One effect of this investigation was that he carefully edited all references to Napoleon out of the final version of *Ivan Vyzhigin.* Another effect was that, while awaiting a suitable moment for publication, Bulgarin was constantly polishing his novel, and introducing slight changes, including the title. As a result, *Ivan Vyzhigin* became a better book than it would have been had it been published in 1825. Thus the delay, rather than working against Bulgarin, proved to be an advantage.

---

238 Bulgarin's second novel, *Dimitrij the Impostor,* more than twice as extensive as *Ivan Vyzhigin,* was written in less than a year.

239 Lemke, *op. cit.,* p. 236, says that Bulgarin had gone to Ryleev's house on the evening after the revolt (December 14), but that Ryleev sent him home, thus saving him from arrest and perhaps even worse consequences. This is confirmed by Grech (*op. cit.,* p. 377), who adds that Ryleev entrusted to Bulgarin the care of his wife and daughter ("Your place is not here. You'll live, go home. I am lost! Farewell! Don't abandon my wife and child!") Later, at the investigation, Nicholas I, pointing out the continuous good relations of the Decembrists with the journalists, asked Bestuzhev about their part in the plot. Bestuzhev replied: "We did not confide in Bulgarin. He is a Pole, and Russian affairs are foreign to him." Bestuzhev stuck to his explanation, and Bulgarin was cleared.

240 *Lemke, op. cit.,* p. 238.

In 1826, after the investigation, Bulgarin decided again to print a few excerpts from his novel. The first excerpt, consisting of two instalments, appeared in Nos. XVII, XVIII (joint issue), and XIX, XX (also a joint issue) of *The Northern Archive.*[241] The joint issues, a rarity before December 1825, were commonplace afterwards, and resulted from a shortage of publishable material after the rout of the liberals. It was probably for this reason—to fill the pages of his journal—that Bulgarin printed the excerpts. Another reason was strictly commercial: to keep the public interested in the delayed novel.

The new excerpt, like the earlier ones, appeared in the *Nravy* section of *The Northern Archive,* although its subject marked a considerable departure from the customary subjects of Bulgarin's *Nravy.* The excerpt was entitled: *A Wealthy Jew, The Sources of His Wealth,* and subtitled: (An Excerpt from A Manuscript: *A Russian Gil Blas, or the Adventures of Ivan Vyzhigin*).[242] The subtitle, which represented a new title of Bulgarin's novel, indicated its even closer identification with Narezhnyj's picaresque novel, whose full title war: *A Russian Gil Blas, or the ad-Adventures of Prince Gavril Simonovich Chistjakov.* But it was the subject matter of the excerpt which calls for a special comment.

The period following the Decembrist Revolt of 1825 was one of literary caution. Nicholas I was interested in the extent of the Decembrist plot and in the possible involvement of writers and journalists. All writings were subjected to careful scrutiny for signs of liberal sympathies. Under such conditions, a novel like *Ivan Vyzhigin* was risky: almost any part of it could be read as a criticism of Russia and an implied call for reforms. For Bulgarin, to print excerpts from it so soon after December, 1825, was a delicate problem. He solved it by selecting from his manuscript Ivan Vyzhigin's adventures in the formerly Polish province of Belorussia among its large Jewish population. Dealing with non-Russians, he could be harsh and critical. With an authority of an eye-witness—because he was writing about an area he knew intimately—Bulgarin viewed the Jews as a highly organized society-within-a-society, and credited them with many of the ills that had contributed to the fall of Poland. By making such assumptions, he was presumably performing an important service for Russia, by warning his adopted country about the Jews, who were now Russian subjects.

The next, and last, excerpt from the novel to appear before its publication in a book form was one set too in the formerly Polish Belorussia, and largely for the same reasons. The excerpt appeared in the *Nravy* section of the first number of *The Northern Archive* for 1827, and was

---

[241] *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1826, Nos. XVII and XVIII, and XIX and XX.

[242] Bulgarin, "Bogatyj Zhid. Istochniki ego bogatstva. (Otryvok iz rukopisi: *Russkij Zhilblaz, ili pokhozhdenija Ivana Vyzhigina*). *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1826, Nos. XVII, XVIII, pp. 144-155, and Nos. XIX, XX, pp. 302-313.

entitled: *The Little Orphan, or Picture of Humanity in the Manner of the Flemish School*;[243] the subtitle remained unchanged. The excerpt described Ivan Vyzhigin at the age of ten, as an orphan in a family of a Polish landowner. In the novel, the excerpt became chapter 1 of Part I. The fact that Bulgarin's novel was to begin with a chapter set in formerly Polish Belorussia, at a time when that province was still largely Polish in character, was—as will be seen—of considerable importance in the evolution of the novel.

The last two excerpts, unlike the earlier ones, passed into the finished novel in an almost unchanged form. The only changes, very minor ones, pertained to punctuation, spelling and, occasionally, vocabulary. For example, the *Wealthy Jew* excerpt contained a reference to Napoleon[244]—an additional proof that it had been written before the Decembrist Revolt. In chapter 7 of Part I of the finished novel, which included the excerpt almost word for word, the reference to Napoleon was replaced by the word "trade" (torgovlja):

> Every word could be heard; while they talked about Napoleon, about the war and about the Governor, then I did not pay attention to the conversation, . . . [*The Northern Archive*].
>
> Every word could be heard; while they talked about trade, economy, about the war and about the Governor, I did not pay attention to the conversation; . . . [*Ivan Vyzhigin*].[245]

Because the revisions were so minute, frequently amounting to substitutions of optional adjectivial or case endings, or punctuation, it would again seem that the more serious revisions had been done considerably earlier and that, in effect, the novel had been ready for publication at least as early as December 1825. In addition, there is no record of any adverse reaction, or censorship problems in connection with the two last excerpts, if this was what Bulgarin wanted to test by publishing them. Thus, after the publication of the last excerpt in January of 1827, there was apparently nothing preventing him from finally publishing the whole novel. But just at that time, circumstances arose which again put Bulgarin's future in jeopardy, and were undoubtedly responsible for another delay in the publication of the novel.

Due to the police activities of the Third Section, established in

---

[243] Bulgarin, "Sirotka, ili kartina chelovechestva, vo vkuse Flamandskoj shkoly," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1827, No. 1, pp. 87-99.

[244] Bulgarin, "Bogatyj Zhid . . ." *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1826, No. XIX, XX, p. 305.

[245] Bulgarin, *Ivan Vyzhigin. . .*, Part I, p. 117.

1826,[246] Bulgarin's contacts in Wilno in 1819 and later—which had already been investigated by Senator Novosilcev in 1824 [247]—came under renewed investigation in 1827.[248] The new investigation may have been triggered by Bulgarin's lengthy reference, in one of the excerpts, to the *Pavement News*,[249] a publication of the highly suspect (to Novosilcev) *Society of Scamps* in Wilno, but it seems that the investigation was really re-opened on account of the Polish poet Mickiewicz, who had shortly before been allowed to return from his exile in the South of Russia and to live in Moscow.[250] Mickiewicz soon became the favourite of literary salons in Moscow; he also established close relations with distinguished Russians and Poles in Petersburg during his frequent stays there. Among others, Mickiewicz now became friendly with Bulgarin. As a political deportee, Mickiewicz was under observation by the Third Section, which now took an interest in Bulgarin as well, especially in his activities in Wilno in 1819, where he had possibly met Mickiewicz for the first time.

Bulgarin was obviously unaware of being under observation. On the contrary, he felt very secure; in 1824 he had ignored Mickiewicz for reasons of personal security; now he became a great admirer of the poet, and helped him publish his works. Mickiewicz was at that time finishing an ambitious poem, *Konrad Wallenrod,* whose hero somewhat resembled the author: a Lithuanian living among the enemies of his country (the Teutonic Knights). The poem was passed by the censorship, and Bulgarin enthusiastically announced its forthcoming publication in the "Miscellaneous" section of *The Northern Bee* of February 21, 1828:

> In Petersburg they are printing a new poem by the best contemporary Polish Poet, Adam Mickiewicz: *Konrad Wallenrod,* an historical novel in verse, based on the history of Lithuania and Prussia. We have long intended to speak about the works of this Poet: we will acquaint our readers with them after the publication of the present work, which will occupy one of the first places in the Literature of the Slavonic peoples.[251]

Bulgarin's announcement placed him in grave danger because the poem, which advocated treason as a means of salvation, was considered highly subversive by the literary detectives of the Third Section; Bulgarin's high praise of the poem was also considered subversive.

---

[246] S. F. Platonov, *History of Russia,* New York, Macmillan Company, 1925, p .343. The Third Section of "His Majesty's Own Chancellery" had charge of the highest police powers of the Empire. In the course of time, its surveillance of general law and order grew into a surveillance of political ideas.

[247] See page 113.

[248] A. L. Pogodin, *op. cit.,* p. 154.

[249] See page 169.

[250] Kridl, *op. cit.,* p. 229.

[251] *Severnaja Pchela,* 1828, No. 22.

Bulgarin's praise of *Konrad Wallenrod* was followed by the Third Section's inquiry at Senator Novosilcev's office in April 1828,[252] whether there was not any new evidence on Bulgarin's activities in Wilno, particularly on his contacts with the *Society of Scamps.* Novosilcev's reply, a copy of which went to the Grand Duke Constantine in Warsaw, arrived in May 1828.[253] Novosilcev was unable to produce any new evidence, but he insisted on the subversive nature of Bulgarin's activities, including his writings, and accused him of continuously supporting the spreading and strengthening of Polish patriotic designs. The last example of this activity was, according to Novosilcev, Bulgarin's high praise of *Konrad Wallenrod,* a dangerous book written by Mickiewicz, a former member of a secret Polish patriotic society.

By then Bulgarin must have become aware of the danger threatening him. His letters from this period were full of bitterness and pessimism. In at least three letters dating from early 1828, including a letter to a competitor,[254] he talked about leaving literature altogether after publishing his "Gil Blas" [255] because "a satirical writer and critic, and a *Pole* on top of that, has many enemies." [256] Among the enemies he included censorship:

> We are awaiting a new Censorship Law as the Jews await Messiah. They say that the law will be truly European, worthy of the century and of the name of our Monarch.[257]

Unfortunately, the new Censorship Law placed literature under the supervision of the Third Section, and it was then that Bulgarin, in order to protect himself, resorted to one of his most successful maneuvers.

In one of the letters Bulgarin mentioned that he was preparing three volumes of his *Collected Works.*[258] The volumes came out shortly afterwards,[259] with Bulgarin taking great care not to include anything that could conceivably be taken as pro-Polish or subversive. So the volumes, which consisted of short works, included many panegyrics to Russia and the Emperor. Immediately upon publication, Bulgarin presented a special copy to Nicholas I, from whom, in the presence of Count A. Kh.

---

[252] N.D. "N. I. Grech, F. V. Bulgarin i A. Mickevich," *op. cit.*, p. 337.

[253] *Ibid.*, pp. 337-344.

[254] F. A. Bjuler, "Nikolaj Alekseevich Polevoj," *Russkaja Starina,* 1871, vol. IV, pp. 678-679.

[255] N. Lerner, "Pis'ma F. V. Bulgarina," *Russkaja Starina,* 1909, vol. CXL, pp. 348, 351.

[256] *Ibid.*, p. 351.

[257] *Ibid.*

[258] *Ibid.*

[259] S. A. Vengerov, *Russkie knigi, s biograficheskimi dannymi ob avtorakh i perevodchikakh,* S. Peterburg, A. E. Vineke, 1899, pp. 269 ff.

Benkendorf, the head of the Third Section, he received words of gratitude and a diamond ring.[260]

As a result of Imperial favour, the investigation of Bulgarin came to an end. Novosilcev's accusations were answered by a long letter from the Third Section, dated July 14, 1828,[261] in which Bulgarin was not only cleared of all accusations, but praised as a loyal writer, the only Pole capable of praising Peter I, Suvorov, and other Russian heroes and enemies of Poland. Bulgarin, the letter continued, rarely wrote anything in praise of Poland, unless it was at the insistence of his Russian literary friends.[262] As for Mickiewicz, it was said in the letter that his *Konrad Wallenrod* was a work of pure poetry, without any political overtones; furthermore, far from being a Polish revolutionary leader, Mickiewicz was abused by the Poles themselves in Warsaw and Wilno who envied him his talent.[263]

There is no doubt that Mickiewicz owed his freedom to leave Russia a few months later to this letter, and thus he owed it to Bulgarin, for the letter bore unmistakable signs of Bulgarin's influence and even style. Mickiewicz's own letters from this period include one to Bulgarin, full of gratitude for the latter's deeds on his behalf. An editorial footnote to the letter explains that the permission to leave Russia was granted to Mickiewicz chiefly as a result of Bulgarin's intervention.[264] Bulgarin's maneuver on behalf of Mickiewicz and himself had brought him into co-operation with the Third Section; this marked the beginning of his tarnished reputation, a direct result of the maneuver.

The effect of the investigation on *Ivan Vyzhigin* was that all references to the *Society of Scamps* and all quotations from their periodical, *The Pavement News,* were edited by Bulgarin out of the final version of the novel. Another effect was that for the beginning of the novel Bulgarin used a chapter set in the formerly Polish province of Belorussia. The chapter, although written most probably in 1825, contained enough satire of Polish history, and of the customs of the Polish nobility, to enable Bulgarin to establish from the beginning that this was not going to be a pro-Polish novel.

Once all the offensive or risky passages were removed from the novel, and Bulgarin's position was again secure, the obstacles delaying the novel's publication disappeared. Accordingly, the novel was published at the beginning of 1829. Its published version contained one more change, one in its title. The new title (*Ivan Vyzhigin, A Moral-Satirical Novel*), which marked the final stage in the evolution of the novel, was

---

260 K. K. Arsenev, ed., *Novyj enciklopedicheskij slovar'*, V. 8, p. 489.

261 N.D., *op. cit.*, pp. 344-351.

262 *Ibid.*, p. 347.

263 *Ibid.*, p. 351.

264 Mickiewicz, "Listy," *Dziela*, Vol. XIV, pp. 493-495.

conspicuous by the absence in it of any reference to Gil Blas, though Bulgarin had been making such references only a few months earlier in some of his letters.

By dropping the reference to Gil Blas, Bulgarin wanted, in the first place, to disassociate himself from either Narezhnyj or Lesage: he was returning to the idea of a "new" novel. In the second place, he wanted to stress a moral-satirical theme, rather than a picaresque adventure: this, too, was a return—to the *Nravy*. For while satire is an ingredient of both of these genres, Bulgarin's primary aim was didactic—as in his *Nravy*—and not merely a satirical depiction of society. The picaresque element was of secondary importance, adopted probably only because of Bulgarin's love of adventure.

Although Bulgarin himself decided to call *Ivan Vyzhigin* a moral-satirical novel, by subtitling it so, he by no means settled the question of the novel's genre. While some critics, notably A. L. Pogodin, follow Bulgarin's designation,[265] Professor Jurij Striedter still considers the novel an example of the *Schelmenroman* (picaresque).[266] Most Soviet critics, on the other hand, call it a novel on morals and manners, thus confirming the opinion expressed in the present work that *Ivan Vyzhigin* was a novel-length final evolution of Bulgarin's *Nravy*.

The question of genre arises chiefly because *Ivan Vyzhigin* was, to some extent, a mixture of all the genres and themes which were part of Bulgarin's literary production prior to the writing of the novel. The novel included passages on the history of Poland and Russia, military scenes from a Russo-Turkish war, countless pictures of Jewish, Polish, and Russian morals and manners, and even a utopian interlude in the Kirghiz steppes. In keeping with the evolution of Bulgarin's themes of Poland and Russia, the former was used by Bulgarin as an object of satire and, at best, a historical curiosity; [267] the latter, on the other hand, was presented as a country with a great future, and the novel ended with a patriotic panegyric to Russia.[268]

Because of *Ivan Vyzhigin's* variety and sweep, covering—as Bulgarin had promised—the whole of Russia, the novel had something for every taste, and this was the secret of its success, which was unprecedented. It had readers in all classes of Russian society, which was what Bulgarin was aiming at. Within a short time it sold 6,000 copies (not counting translations into all major European languages, including Polish), surpassing any Russian book at the time, except Karamzin's *History*, the purchase of which was considered a civic duty.[269]

---

[265] A. L. Pogodin, "*Ivan Vyzhigin*, roman Faddeja Bulgarina," *Zapiski Russkago Nauchnago Instituta v Belgrade*, Vypusk 9, 1933, p. 150 ff.

[266] Jurij Striedter, *Der Schelmenroman in Russland*, Berlin, Osteuropa Institut, 1961.

[267] Bulgarin, *Ivan Vyzhigin*, . . . , Part I, chapters I-V.

[268] *Ibid.*, Part IV, pp. 306-310.

[269] A. L. Pogodin, "Russkie pisateli-Poljaki," *op. cit.*, pp. 113-114.

Bulgarin's success with *Ivan Vyzhigin* did not go unrewarded. He was honoured both in Poland and Russia. The Warsaw Society of Friends of Learning (Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk) elected him member early in 1829.[270] The following year, he was described by a Russian literary society as one of the two most important writers in Russia. The other writer was Pushkin.

Following his success with *Ivan Vyzhigin,* Bulgarin had many other, though lesser successes, but they were mostly connected with his journals: he was never able to repeat the success of his first novel. This was partially the result of a growing hostility towards Bulgarin among writers, journalists, and critics, on account of his tarnished reputation. He was gradually replaced as a popular writer by other novelists, who had capitalized on the interest in the prose genre which Bulgarin had awakened, and eclipsed him as a novelist. Eventually, *Ivan Vyzhigin* was attacked by prejudiced critics, and declared an inferior novel.

There is no need to defend *Ivan Vyzhigin*: its popularity was its best defence. Neither is there a need, in the present work, to enter into a lengthy analysis of the novel to point out its merits. This has been done recently in an unpublished American dissertation,[271] and there is very little that can be added to it. Earlier, A. L. Pogodin ably summarized the case for *Ivan Vyzhigin*:

> Faddej' Bulgarin's novel, *Ivan Vyzhigin,* was in its time one of the most remarkable works of Russian literature, but as a result of the bad reputation that Bulgarin earned through his unsympathetic personality and, particularly, as a result of the hostile and contemptuous evaluation of the novel by Belinskij, it was forgotten and no one now remembers it.[272]

The present work does not intend to enter into these controversies: they lie outside the scope of this chapter. Its declared aim was to show that *Ivan Vyzhigin* was a crowning achievement of Bulgarin's literary apprenticeship, and that it was largely written in the last year of that apprenticeship, in 1825.

Chapter VIII: CRITICISM

Criticism occupied a special place in Bulgarin's writings: it was a device for self-promotion. Because of its special nature, it lay outside of

---

[270] *Severnaja Pchela,* **1829, No. 6.**

[271] Nicholas P. Vaslef, *Faddej V. Bulgarin: His Contribution to Nineteenth Century Russian Prose,* Harvard University Thesis, 1966.

[272] **A. L. Pogodin, "*Ivan Vyzhigin,* roman Faddeja Bulgarina,"** ***op. cit.,*** **p. 141.**

Bulgarin's main literary genres and themes, but it unified them through a common concern with success.

Of the three fields of literature in which Bulgarin was engaged: journalism, belletristic writings, and criticism, the last was the weakest in quality and the smallest in volume, but no less important than the other two in Bulgarin's over-all literary strategy.

Bulgarin's activity as a literary critic may be said to have been influenced by the spirit of the times; his reading had some bearing on it; but primarily it was motivated by his own interests. He engaged in criticism for three main reasons:

(1) to maintain the reputation of a literary man;

(2) to promote his own works by shaping public opinion in favour of his writings;

(3) to fight competition.

Because of such an approach to criticism, Bulgarin was often involved in feuds with other writers, journalists, and critics.

Bulgarin's literary feuds form a large part of what is generally referred to as his literary criticism. As in the other fields, he was successful in this one too, but not in the conventional sense; he wrote very few purely literary and objective critical articles. Most of his "criticism" was biased in one way or another, or was not criticism at all but "anti-criticism"—replies to criticism. His success was based mainly on a clever ability to silence his foes by concentrating on their weaknesses. The intricacies of his technique in this field constitute a consistently engrossing chapter in his literary career.

Bulgarin's first steps as a literary critic go back to the early 1820's, to his long articles on the literatures of Poland and Spain. But because they were probably not entirely original works,[273] and their significance lies elsewhere, they can be disregarded here. On the same grounds we can largely disregard Bulgarin's criticism of Karamzin's *History.* It was a continuation of Lelewel's criticism and, hence, with the possible exception of Bulgarin's remarks on Karamzin's style, not entirely original.

Bulgarin's first fully original work of criticism was a long article, printed in the March, 1823, issue of *The Northern Archive,* and entitled *A Short Survey of Russian Literature in 1822.*[274] Like his earlier articles on literature, it dealt more with history and literary history than with literary criticism; it appeared, characteristically, in the "History" section of the journal. However, a new aspect has been added to Bulgarin's approach to literature. The *Short Survey* was preceded by a lengthy introduction, which showed that Bulgarin's views on literature were influenced not only by his interest in history but also by his growing interest in writing depicting morals and manners. Around these two

---

[273] See p. 124 ff.

[274] Bulgarin, "Kratkoe obozrenie russkoj literatury 1822 goda," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1823, No. 5, pp. 377-422.

interests—the main interests in his literary career—Bulgarin constructed his own theory of literature:

> Literature is the depiction, or a copy, of the moral condition of a nation: in it we observe the customs, the passions, and the mutual attitudes of the people who constitute a society. In that sense literature can, without a doubt, be called an important part of the history of a nation; for the degree of education and, so to speak, the moral existence of mankind will always be one of the most interesting subjects in the depiction of its morals and manners.[275]

Unfortunately—Bulgarin argued—this literary principle, indisputable in England, France and Germany, did not work in Russia. The reason for it was, according to Bulgarin, the small number of good writers in Russia, and the even smaller number of good works of literature. This deficiency was caused, in turn, by the habit of educated Russians to think, speak and read in a foreign language. If, on the other hand, educated people of the upper classes read in their native tongue or, at least, bought Russian books, then the number of good writers would undoubtedly increase, in accordance with the attention paid to them by their countrymen.[276] Bulgarin ended his argument with a prescription:

> And so, I repeat that the only way to bring Russian literature to a flowering state is through reading and buying of Russian books and journals by the educated and the well-to-do.[277]

This prescription, exhorting people to read Russian writers was, at the same time, an exhortation to read Bulgarin, one of the most prolific among them (in the genres stressed by him), and a self-appointed spokesman for Russian literature.

The survey itself, which followed the introduction, is important to us because it contained the beginnings of the patterns along which Bulgarin's criticism was to operate, and his favourable treatment of friends and potential allies. It was divided into several sections (like *The Northern Archive* in which it was printed) [278] of which "History" was by far the largest: it included, characteristically, several works on literature under the sub-heading "Original Russian Compositions." Among those, Grech's *Short History of Russian Literature* [279] received the most extensive treatment, although it had already been reviewed, following its publication in 1822, in *The Northern Archive.*

---

[275] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 377.

[276] *Ibid.*, p. 378.

[277] *Ibid.*, p. 380.

[278] **See p. 109.**

[279] Bulgarin, "Istorija," a) "Oryginal'nye russkie sochinenija," 1. "Opyt kratkoj istorii russkoj literatury," soch. N. Grecha, *op. cit.*, pp. 381 ff.

The "Literature" section showed the same pattern: the discussion of Grech's *Textbook of Russian Literature* (Uchebnaja kniga rossijskoj slovesnosti), and the announcement of Bestuzhev's and Ryleev's *Polar Star* were extremely favourable, although the former was only an anthology, and the latter an almanac which should properly have been mentioned among the journals. Bulgarin also singled out for praise *The Collected Works of Count D. I. Khvostov,* a minor poet but an influential man, and—for patriotic reasons—*The Theory of Partisan Action* (Opyt teorii partizanskago dejstvija) by Denis Davydov, a popular hero of 1812. Works, which were for other reasons mentioned favourably in the "Literature" section included Pushkin's *The Prisoner of the Caucasus* and Zhukovskij's translation of Byron's *The Prisoner of Chillon.*

Zhukovskij was a friend of Karamzin and, because of that, any close contact with Bulgarin was out of the question. Yet, probably because of Zhukovskij's immense popularity and good connections at the court, Bulgarin always referred to him in his pronouncements with utmost respect, and always included him among the few "good" Russian writers. As for Pushkin, it seems that Bulgarin at that time genuinely admired the young poet, sensing in him his future greatness. In the survey, Bulgarin reviewed Zhukovskij's and Pushkin's poems jointly, thus placing the poets on the same level, undoubtedly aware that it would be agreeable and flattering to both of them:

> Two gems of Russian Literature which the best of our Romantic poets bestowed on our native public. Light versification and purity of the language are the virtues of both these poems. But it seems to us that whereas Pushkin is inferior to Lord Byron in imagination (la conception), the English poet, at least this time, is inferior to the Russian in the variety and greatness of images.[280]

The review was augmented in the "Conclusion" of the survey, in which Bulgarin stated that the two poems "somewhat refreshed the fading Russian literature (poetry)." [281] This passage, the first in the long line of Bulgarin's criticisms of Pushkin, gave no hint of the hostility that was to develop between the two men a few years hence.

It was the "Journals" section of the survey which was the most indicative of Bulgarin's future development as a critic. Some journals, such as Grech's *Son of the Fatherland* received, as was to be expected, extremely favourable treatment. Others, notably *Notes of the Fatherland* (Otechestvennye zapiski), edited by Pavel Svin'in,[282] were attacked and ridiculed on the ground that they were badly organized and in need of more suitable content.[283] In the case of *Notes of the Fatherland,* a competitor of *The Northern Archive,* Bulgarin announced a more detailed

---

[280] Bulgarin, *op. cit.,* pp. 402-403.

[281] Bulgarin, "Obshchee zakljuchenie," *op. cit.,* p. 421.

[282] N. M. Lisovskij, *Bibliografija russkoj pechati,* Petrograd, 1915, p. 61.

review, thus clearly inviting a "journalistic war." Still other journals were courted by Bulgarin as, for example, *The Messenger of Europe* (Vestnik Evropy), whose editor, M. T. Kachenovskij, received the most flattering praise for his contributions to history and archeology.[284] Kachenovskij, as mentioned earlier,[285] was a known critic of Karamzin and, therefore, a leading candidate for Bulgarin's ally. He promptly acknowledged the praise in a letter of March 26, 1823,[286] in which he again encouraged Bulgarin to continue printing Lelewel's articles on Karamzin's *History.* The two men became close friends and allies.

Although the *Short Survey* was devoted to Russian literature Bulgarin, as was his custom, did not neglect to mention its Polish influences and contributions, such as Linde's *Dictionary*,[287] Niemcewicz's *Dumy,* and Sękowski's Oriental studies as opposed to the "silly translations of terrible German novels" [288] which he claimed were so popular in Russia.

Possibly in order not to offend the authorities by his outspoken criticism of Russia, Bulgarin's *Short Survey* ended on a patriotic note:

> In some German cities there are more books printed yearly than in the whole vast Russia. I explained the reasons for it at the beginning of my survey: I am ending it with a sincere wish that the Russians, out of love for the glory of their Fatherland, will pay more attention to native literature, and will try to spread true enlightenment as the only basis of a nation's greatness! [289]

Bulgarin's bold arguments and his accusations directed toward the Russian reading public, which in 1823 was almost synonymous with Russian aristocracy, were not left unanswered. The chief reply came from Prince P. A. Vjazemskij, a prominent aristocrat and a respected literary figure. In a lengthy article, *Remarks on the Short Survey of Russian Literature in 1822,* published in *Literary News,*[290] Vjazemskij disagreed with Bulgarin on everything, and even accused him of being partial, particularly on Count Khvostov and to the *Messenger of Europe.*

It seems that this was what Bulgarin was waiting for: to be attacked by someone from the "literary aristocracy," someone, furthermore, whom it would be safe to demolish, for Vjazemskij, though a close friend of

---

283 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

284 *Ibid.*, pp. 416-417.

285 See page 139.

286 N. Piksanov, "Iz arkhiva F. V. Bulgarina," *op. cit., pp. 605-606.*

287 See p. 118.

288 Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 379.

289 *Ibid.*, p. 422.

290 P. A. Vjazemskij, "Zamechaniia na kratkoe obozrenie russkoj literatury," *Novosti Literatury,* 1823, No XIX, as quoted in *Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No. 1.

both Zhukovskij and Pushkin, had neither Zhukovskij's connections (he was, in fact, in temporary disfavour at court) nor Pushkin's talent. Bulgarin's counterattack was published not in *The Northern Archive* but in its newly launched supplement, the *Literary Pages* which, it appears, had been launched in mid-1823, not only to provide a vehicle for Bulgarin's *Nravy*,[291] but also to provide a forum for his growing literary feuds. The long-winded counterattack, which appeared under a sub-heading "Anti-criticism," was the first in a series of attacks and counterattacks and was entitled: "Reply to the article, printed in the nineteenth number of *Literary News*, published by *The Russian Invalid*, entitled: *Remarks on the Short Survey of Russian Literature in 1822*, printed in the fifth number of *The Northern Archive* of 1823."[292]

Bulgarin's "Reply" to Vjazemskij was carefully prepared. Like the *Short Survey*, it is important to us because it contained most of the critical devices which Bulgarin was to use, with variations, in such articles: a precise statement of the issues; a well documented refutation supported by facts and statistics; a concentration on the opponent's weaknesses and exposure of his naïveté and ignorance of facts; irony, ridicule and, finally, a lesson in literary theory, history, and even in the proper usage of the language. In view of Vjazemskij's social rank, the "Reply" began in a respectful manner:

> It is impossible for me to reply in detail to all the retorts and remarks made by Prince Vjazemskij on the subject of my article. . . . The Hon. Critic wrote about *how things should be*, whereas I presented *things as they are in actual fact*. . . . I said that our public, and the upper classes in particular, read very little in Russian, and still less buy Russian books. . . . The Hon. Critic tries to completely refute my statement.[293]

To Vjazemskij's contention that, contrary to Bulgarin's statement, Russian books were read and purchased by the Russians, as evidenced by the success of Karamzin's *History*, Bulgarin replied that in a nation of forty-five million, among whom there were readers numbering *one* million, the five thousand copies of Karamzin's *History* which were sold in two editions amounted only to one copy for each two hundred readers! As for other Russian writers, even the first edition of Batiushkov's works had not been sold out; Zhukovskij's works came out in a second edition, but so far they had only been taking space in the bookstores, and not on the shelves of the readers; it was the same with the works of Dmitriev, and others. On the other hand—and here Bulgarin cleverly turned the

---

291 See p. 155-156.

292 Bulgarin, "Antikritika. Otvet na stat'ju, pomeshchennuju v No. XIX *Novostej literatury*, izdavaemykh pri *R. I.* pod zaglaviem: *Zamechanija na kratkoe obozrenie russkoj literatury 1822 goda*, napechatannoe v No. 5 *Severnago Arkhiva* 1823 goda," *Literaturnye Listki*, 1823, No. 1, pp. 9-16.

293 *Ibid.*, p. 9.

tables on Vjazemskij—the "favoured" Count Khvostov's works came out in a fifth edition!

To Vjazemskij's naïve belief that Russian readers were buying and reading foreign books of high quality only, Bulgarin replied—with information obtained from Petersburg's booksellers—that the ratio of "good" foreign books (history, political economy, and so on) to foreign novels and romantic stories was one to twenty! Further, to Vjazemskij's contention that Russian youth did not read Russian journals because it devoured foreign ones, Bulgarin replied ironically:

> The Hon. Critic must have dreamt that he was in Eldorado when he wrote his remarks; but *I* checked with the St. Petersburg Post Office and found out that in the number of 6,000 subscribers for *all* newspapers and journals, there are 600 for foreign publications. When one considers the number of educational institutions using foreign publications, and the number of foreigners who read nothing in Russian, it does not leave much for the youth.[294]

Vjazemskij's remarks on literature received the same treatment. His statement that there could not be a national Russian idyll, because Russia was a northern country, was ridiculed by Bulgarin's advice not to confuse literature with climate, and a reminder that the Swedes and the Poles, also northern nations, had their national eclogues and idylls. Continuing his lesson in literary theory in a footnote, Bulgarin displayed his knowledge of Polish literature while further embarrassing Vjazemskij:

> The Hon. Critic (who knows the Polish language, from which he had translated many fables) ought to be familiar with the interesting Idylls and Eclogues of Zimorowicz, Niemcewicz, Naruszewicz, and others. In Polish, they even have their own, special name (*Sielanki*).[295]

Bulgarin ended the "Reply" with an authoritative and arrogant: "Dixi!" This was followed by a quotation from Molière: "Souvent on entend mal ce qu'on croit bien entendre," [296] calculated, presumably, both to display his erudition and to justify the harshness of the counter-attack.

Following Bulgarin's "Reply," almost every issue of the *Literary Pages*, and frequently of *The Northern Archive*, contained an item of criticism or anti-criticism. These items, comprising articles of varying length on a variety of issues were, for the most part, Bulgarin's maneuvers aimed at self-promotion and self-aggrandizement; they contained his favourite strategems. The articles appeared under various subheadings and titles, and were usually signed with one of Bulgarin's many pseudonyms. The detailed review of the *Notes of the Fatherland*, for

---

[294] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[295] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[296] *Ibid.*, p. 15

example, which had been announced by Bulgarin,[297] appeared under the sub-heading "Criticism"; it was entitled "A Letter from a Reader of the *Notes of the Fatherland* to the Editor of *The Northern Archive,*" [298] and was signed "Arkhip Faddeev," a variation of the Arkhip Faddeevich mentioned earlier.[299] In the "letter," Arkhip Faddeev, the supposed "reader" of the *Notes of the Fatherland,* complained to the editor of *The Northern Archive,* Bulgarin, about the unreliability of the *Notes of the Fatherland's* content, and questioned the journal's very purpose and right to continue. The issue was trivial: the dimensions and gas lighting of a new public building in Petersburg, but not too trivial for Bulgarin, who would seize at anything to prove that his journal was more reliable than a competitor's. For this purpose, subsequent issues of the *Literary Pages* occasionally featured a column, signed by "Arkhip Faddeev," and entitled: "The Correction of Mistakes in No. [. . .] of the *Notes of the Fatherland.*" [300]

Another "Letter to the Editor of *The Northern Archive,*" also under the sub-heading "Criticism," [301] concerned a doubtful article on geography in *The Russian Invalid* of June 14, 1823. The editor, Bulgarin, was asked to settle the doubt, which he did in a devastatingly ironic "Answer," signed: "The Publisher of *The Northern Archive.*" [302] This was a new technique, enabling Bulgarin to attack anybody. In the case of *The Russian Invalid,* it enabled him to settle an old account with its editor, Voejkov.[303]

Aleksandr Fedorovich Voejkov (1779-1839), a relative by marriage of Zhukovskij and, because of that, his protégé,[304] was a particularly troublesome person, and a feared journalist and critic.[305] In 1821, he had been, on Zhukovskij's recommendation, co-editor with Grech of *Son of the Fatherland* and, according to Grech, tried to take over the journal. Since 1822 he was editor of *The Russian Invalid or Military News,* an

---

297 See p. 181.

298 Bulgarin, "Kritika. Pis'mo ot izdatelja *Otechestvennykh zapisok* k izdatelju *Severnago Arkhiva,*" *Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No. II, p. 25.

299 Masanov, *Slovar' psevdonimov russkikh pisatelej . . . , loc. cit.*

300 Bulgarin (Arkhip Faddeev), "Popravka oshibok v No. 42-m *Otechestvennykh zapisok,*" *Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No V, p. 60.

301 Bulgarin, "Kritika. Pis'mo k izdatelju *Severnago Arkhiva* o Kjakhte," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No. II, p. 26.

302 Bulgarin, "Otvet," *op. cit.,* p. 27.

303 Lisovskij, *op. cit.,* p. 53.

304 Voejkov was married to Zhukovskij's niece, Aleksandra Andreevna (Zh. dedicated his poem "Svetlana" to her). Her mother was a daughter of A. I. Bunin, whose illegitimate son was Zhukovskij.

305 "Dom sumasshedshikh, satira A. F. Voejkova," *Russkaja Starina,* 1874, Vol. IX., p. 582.

official newspaper of the Ministry of War. One of the first acts in his new job was a public boast that *The Russian Invalid* was superior to the *Son of the Fatherland* because it had more subscribers (1,700 to 750).[306] Bulgarin, Grech's partner, intervened and applied to the Ministry for permission to take over *The Russian Invalid,* promising to pay double the amount Voejkov was paying for the lease. Bulgarin's maneuver, incidentally, almost cost him the friendship of Ryleev, who considered it dishonest. In view of the Ministry's willingness to increase its income from the newspaper, Voejkov was in danger of losing his job. According to Grech, it was only at the personal intervention of Zhukovskij that Bulgarin was talked into withdrawing of his application.[307] The quarrel was patched up, but it flared up at any provocation, such as the publication by Voejkov of Vjazemskij's anti-Bulgarin *Remarks* in the *Literary News,* a supplement of *The Russian Invalid.*[308]

Voejkov is important to us because, by virtue of being both a journalist and a protégé of the "literary aristocracy," he throws light on what may be referred to as the "commercial" and the "literary" patterns of Bulgarin's criticism. The commercial pattern, as shown in the examples above, consisted of concentrating on, exaggerating, and attacking the weakest aspects—not necessarily literary nor the most important —of the opponent's journal or article, and of hitting back ruthlessly when attacked (anti-criticism). The purpose of this type of criticism and anti-criticism was primarily to attract the attention of the readers, in order to win them over to one's own publications, by offering them supposedly higher standards as part of the "journalist's duty to the reader." The commercial pattern of criticism, which was a running battle throughout most of Bulgarin's literary career was, for the most part, apolitical.

The literary pattern, on the other hand, was subject, to a large extent, to political and literary trends in Russia and abroad. Because these two trends ran counter to each other in Russia, the pattern was extremely complicated. Although it consisted of devices similar to the commercial pattern, it was less spontaneous and more carefully prepared. Bulgarin had to take into consideration many factors: the prestige of the writer, the prevailing political landscape and the writer's place in it, new developments in literature, and so on. His criticism would, invariably, be influenced by these factors. Thus, for example, he was very careful never to offend Zhukovskij and, at least on one occasion, apologized to him in print for accidentally leaving his name off the list of important poets mentioned in his article, *On Charm.*[309] Bulgarin took this opportunity to

---

306 Grech, *op. cit.,* pp. 492-493.

307 *Ibid.,* p. 493.

308 See pp. 182-183.

309 Bulgarin, "O prelesti," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 7, pp. 247-254.

pay Zhukovskij a high tribute, while at the same time stressing the independence of his own opinions on literature:

> This happened unintentionally. From the very beginning of my entry into literature I have always tried to be, as much as possible, impartial, without paying attention to other considerations. And if I should ever be carried away by any private passions or enmities, it would certainly not be with regard to V. Zhukovskij, whom I respect as a man and love as a poet, even though I have my own opinions regarding Russian literature.[310]

With regard to Pushkin, Bulgarin was wise to join in the acclaim of the young poet, but he was also ready to exploit the latter's precarious political situation (banishment from Petersburg), by advising him to write patriotic poems (which, incidentally, Pushkin did a few years later):

> In Moscow there will soon appear a new poem by A. Pushkin, entitled: *The Fountain of Bakhchisaraj.* We have read a few excerpts from this poem, and can say boldly that we have not read *for a long time* anything more excellent. The genius of Pushkin promises much for Russia; we would like to see him glorify with his harmonious verses some heroic patriotic deed.[311]

But it was with the young innovators, whose literary future was as yet unknown, that Bulgarin was particularly careful before forming an opinion about them. The most progressive of the young Russian writers at the time were V. K. Kjukhel'beker and Prince V. F. Odoevskij. Bulgarin's feud with them, which lasted throughout most of 1824, was the height of the literary pattern of his criticism. It concerned the two young writers' literary almanac, *Mnemozina.*

As if to prepare himself for a more lively journalistic and critical activity in 1824, Bulgarin thoroughly reorganized the *Literary Pages* after their five hasty issues of 1823. The journal's name was changed to *Literary Pages, Journal of Morals and Manners and Literature,* and its contents expanded to include a section entitled "Various News" which was changed, in the second issue of 1824, to "Magic Lantern or Various News." [312] The "Magic Lantern" was written exclusively by Bulgarin. It consisted of literary news, criticism, and literary announcements which very frequently included critical evaluations. It was in the "Magic Lantern" in January of 1824 that *Mnemozina* was first, somewhat cautiously, announced:

---

[310] Bulgarin, "Raznye izvestija," *op. cit.*, 1824, No. 8, pp. 321-322.

[311] Bulgarin, "Literatura," *op. cit.*, 1824, No. 1, p. 25.

[312] **Bulgarin, "Volshebnyj fonar' (*) ili raznye izvestija,"** *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 2, pp. 59-72. In a footnote accompanying the first appearance of the new section, Bulgarin gave credit for its name to Grech: (*) N. I. Grech was pleased, in the first issue of *Son of the Fatherland,* to call the various news, printed in the *Literary Pages,* the *Magic Lantern.*— Let is stay the way it was named. Dixi et factum est. *The Publisher.*

> They are promising us in Moscow to publish an Almanac in four parts, under the title *Mnemozina.* The publishers, Messrs. Kjukhel'beker and Prince Odoevskij, maintain that this publication is being issued in imitation of German Almanacs. We have never heard about an Almanac in four parts, but if the book is good—which we do not doubt—then the bigger it is, the better.[313]

The critical review of the first part of *Mnemozina* appeared in the "Magic Lantern" of the March 1824 issue of the *Literary Pages.*[314] Bulgarin apparently had made up his mind about the literary future of the two young writers because his review was almost totally negative. Significantly, the only articles singled out for praise were those written by Major General Denis Davydov and Prince Shakhovskoj. This showed Bulgarin's preference for military material and for older, more conservative and patriotic writers. One of Kjukhel'beker's two stories, *Ado,* an "Esthonian story," was saved from rejection only because it was "filled with noble feelings of love for the Fatherland." [315] Otherwise, both Odoevskij and Kjukhel'beker were criticized to the point of being ridiculed. As if this were not enough, Bulgarin concluded his review with a spiteful lecture:

> Having acquainted our readers with *Mnemozina,* we must point out to its esteemed Messrs. Publishers that in our times it is necessary, when publishing books, to think as much about *grammar* as about filling pages. For example . . .[316]

Bulgarin's critical review of the second part of *Mnemozina* appeared in the "Magic Lantern" of the August 1824 issue of the *Literary Pages.*[317] Unlike the first review, which was in the "Literature" section of the "Magic Lantern," the second appeared under the sub-heading "Criticism," which meant an attack on the contents.

> The second part of *Mnemozina* will undoubtedly antagonize many critics, because it includes several polemical articles, in which one finds extremely harsh opinions about the works of contemporary writers, and strange ideas about some ancient and modern poets, who had gained the respect of educated Europe. . . . *In my duty as a journalist,* I am obliged to report to my readers about this book. . . .[318]

---

313 *Ibid.,* p. 67.

314 Bulgarin, "Literatura. *Mnemozina,* sobranie sochinenij v stikhakh i proze. Izdavaemaja Kn. V. Odoevskim i V. Kjukhel'bekerom. Chast' I." *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 5, pp. 182-193.

315 *Ibid.,* p. 185.

316 *Ibid.,* p. 192.

317 Bulgarin, "Kritika. *Mnemozina.*... Chast' II." *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 15, pp. 73-83.

318 *Ibid.,* p. 73.

Bulgarin found particularly objectionable Kjukhel'beker's article, "On the Direction of Our Poetry, Particularly Lyrical, in the Last Ten Years," in which the author voiced free opinions about lyric poetry in general and its supposed decline in Russia in particular. In his article, Kjukhel'beker had named Zhukovskij as the last representative of the declining lyric poetry in Russia, but because he had also generously praised Baron Del'vig, Bulgarin—in an obvious attempt to embarrass Kjukhel'beker, a close friend of Pushkin, and to play the part of a defender of established Russian poets—declared that the former had put Baron Del'vig above Zhukovskij, Pushkin, Batjushkov.[319]

Bulgarin's attack on Odoevskij concerned the latter's article, "Aphorisms from Various Writers, According to Contemporary German Lovers of Wisdom":

> From these excerpts one can gather that the esteemed Author had dedicated himself to the study of higher Philosophy; but we would not advise him to write about this subject yet, until his study produces something tangible. . . . We are certain that the esteemed Author will not take our advice badly: he is promising Russia so much, that it would be wrong not to be frank with him.[320]

The belletristic articles in the almanac received half-hearted praise, but the ironic conclusion of Bulgarin's review left no doubt that the feud was going to continue:

> Concluding my short opinion on *Mnemozina*, I can foresee a place for myself in its third part, among "special" articles [answers to criticism]. Messrs. Publishers, due to their unwarranted irritability, are quite unwilling to accept even the best-intentioned remarks, and if they turned into a joke that which I had told them in my review of the first part of *Mnemozina* about the noble feelings and thoughts filling the work of Mr. Kjukhel'beker, then they are bound to find now many more reasons to be displeased, in the expectation of which I have the honour to remain their obedient servant. F.B.[321]

The anticipated attack on Bulgarin came not from *Mnemozina*, but from several journals unfriendly to Bulgarin, in which their publishers, as well as the publishers of *Mnemozina* itself, voiced their indignation. Bulgarin, obviously enjoying himself immensely, because suddenly, without risking anything, he found himself in a centre of a huge controversy, reacted by resorting to some of his favourite stratagems. In the same issue (November, 1824) of the *Literary Pages* in which he announced the forthcoming termination of this journal and the launching of *The Northern Bee*,[322] he

---

[319] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

[320] *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79.

[321] *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.

[322] Bulgarin, "Ob'javlenie," *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 21 and 22, pp. 63-64.

also printed his reply to his attackers, thus indicating that this was to be his final word on the issue of *Mnemozina*, and that it would be he who would have the last word. Preceding his reply, presumably in order to justify its harshness and to bring his readers up to date, was a "Letter to the Editor," addressed to Bulgarin, and written by him, but signed with meaningless name endings: -ij -ov,[323] in which he berated himself for praising *Mnemozina* in his last review, when it was *his duty as a journalist* to give a report about this book. Then he proceeded in the "letter" to cancel the few positive statements he had made in his review and, in effect, to write a new one which was full of wit, irony and ridicule.

Bulgarin's "letter" was followed in the "Magic Lantern" by his long-titled reply to his attackers: "Brief Objections to the Accusations of P. P. Svin'in, to the Irony of the Publisher of *Ladies Journal*, to the Pretensions to me of V. K. Kjukhel'beker, and to the Lover-of-Wisdom aphorisms of V. F. Odoevskij." [324] The reply was a masterpiece of Bulgarin's brand of criticism. The one to Svin'in, the editor of *Notes of the Fatherland* and Bulgarin's old enemy and competitor, was the most skillful. Reproaching Svin'in for attacking his person more than his journal, Bulgarin generously refrained from doing the same and, turning the tables on Svin'in, concentrated on the *Notes of the Fatherland* instead, painstakingly listing all of its shortcomings. He followed the same pattern with the *Ladies Journal*. The reply to Kjukhel'beker was more personal in nature. Bulgarin reviewed Kjukhel'beker's attacks on him and destroyed them one by one. He then demolished him finally by an insulting rejection of Kjukhel'beker's alleged offer to work for Bulgarin:

> For your promise to analyze for my journal, at my convenience, the Odes of Horace and prove that he was a prose writer, I thank you, but I am not accepting the offer, considering it beyond your ability and, besides, why should you venture so far? You should better try not to germanize your sentences needlessly, as Voejkov had pointed out to you. This is much more useful. Farewell! [325]

The reply to Odoevskij was the longest and best prepared. It started, as with Kjukhel'beker, with a direct attack on Odoevskij's grudge against Bulgarin, and ended with a long, well documented, essay on the Lovers of Wisdom. After rejecting their German philosophy, Bulgarin demonstrated his familiarity with it.

The extent of Bulgarin's polemic with Kjukhel'beker and Odoevskij

---

[323] **"Volshebnyj fonar'. Kritika. Korespondencija."** *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 21 and 22, pp. 90-100.

[324] Bulgarin, "Kratkie vozrazhenija na obvinenija P. P. Svin'ina, na **ironiju izdatelja** *Damskago Zhurnala*, **na pritjazanija ko mne V. K. Kjukhel'bekera, i na aforizmy ljubomudrija knjazja V. F. Odoevskago,"** *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 21, 22, pp. 100-121.

[325] *Ibid.*, pp. 110-113.

showed his growing hostility to any new philosophical or literary trends in Russia. This hostility, however, did not include Romanticism. Probably in order not to place himself against Zhukovskij and Pushkin, whom he considered the best Russian Romantics, Bulgarin never took part in the polemics on Romanticism. His most notable statement on the subject was a footnote to someone else's criticism of Pushkin's *The Fountain of Bakhchisaraj* in the *Literary Pages* of April, 1824: [326]

> I will take this occasion to explain my position in relation to Romantic poetry, about which many quarrel today, trying to disprove it. In the first place, I do not recognize any divisions of poetry into either classical or Romantic, and I literally follow the idea contained in this famous poem: Tous les genres sont bons, hors les genres ennuyeux.[327]

The following year Bulgarin was again able to evade the issue of Romanticism. A new journal was founded, *The Moscow Telegraph*,[328] which, according to Belinskij, "was launched as if made to order for Romanticism." [329] Its editor, Nikolaj A. Polevoj, who had worked for a short time for *The Northern Archive* and later for *Mnemozina*,[330] became Bulgarin's chief antagonist in 1825. The antagonism, however, stemmed from different reasons. Nikolaj Polevoj (1796-1846), who shared *The Moscow Telegraph* with his younger brother Ksenofont, his future biographer, was a follower of French Romanticism, but it was not chiefly as a Romantic that Polevoj made his mark in Russian literature and journalism. It was rather as a self-professed journalistic pedagogue—something that Bulgarin also aspired to—that Polevoj preferred to be known. The initial number of his journal announced an editorial policy of being a review of reviews, drawing on the best foreign learned journals, in addition to which *The Moscow Telegraph* would "transmit to its readers not merely Russian works but everything excellent, pleasant, and useful that was to be found in the national and in all the ancient and modern literatures." [331] This pedagogical ideal contained a paradox. Polevoj, who had never had any systematic education (he came from a merchant family), was interested in everything. Moreover, he was interested in teaching everything and believed that the foreign reviews should stimulate every branch of learning, and if some subjects remained

---

[326] Olin, "Kriticheskij vzgljad na *Bakhchisarajskij fontan*," *Literaturnye Listki*, 1824, No. 7, pp. 265-277.

[327] Bulgarin, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

[328] Lisovskij, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

[329] N. I. Mordovchenko, *Russkaja gritoka pervoj poloviny XIX veka*, Moskva-Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk, 1959, p. 184.

[330] Charles Passage, *The Russian Hoffmanists*, The Hague, Mouton & Co., 1963, p. 68.

[331] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

untreated, he would himself write articles to fill up the deficiency. It was the last statement that left him open to criticism.

The general public accepted the new journal and its policy very well, thus assuring its success. The journalists, however, felt threatened and offended because Polevoj, in proclaiming his fitness for the task, did not hesitate to express his contempt for existing journals and their editors. One of the first targets of his scorn was Bulgarin, and a feud began which was the highlight of Russian journalism of 1825.

Bulgarin and Polevoj had many traits in common. Both were energetic, self-made men, not very gifted writers, but extremely good organizers and capable publishers. Both were also pretentious men, trying to impress their readers with their knowledge. The difference between them was that while Bulgarin tried to build his reputation by first securing important contributors and then waiting for the proper moment to print his own works, Polevoj had no such sense of timing. From the beginning, he became his journal's most important contributor. In this, he could not be other than superficial when he wrote now on Oriental art and religion, now on economics, now on history. This superficiality made him an easy target of his enemies and competitors. In the early stages he had the support of Prince Vjazemskij and, with it, of the "literary aristocracy," but he soon antagonized them, too. Bulgarin's chief allies were his partner Grech and Kachenovskij whom he was able to bind to himself more permanently.

Bulgarin's feud with Polevoj followed the pattern of his other feuds except that it was more intensive. At the beginning he simply concentrated on Polevoj's more jarring mistakes, listing them in a small section of *The Northern Bee* sub-headed "The Correction of Mistakes." Most of them concerned history, Bulgarin's strong point, as for example his rebuttal in *The Northern Bee* of Polevoj's article on Lelewel in one of the first numbers of *The Moscow Telegraph*.[332] Bulgarin's criticism would inevitably provoke Polevoj to include Bulgarin among the journalists whom he had selected for special criticism in such articles as "A Special Supplement to *The Moscow Telegraph*,[333] printed in No. 13 of the journal. This, in turn, would call for a massive "Anti-criticism" article by Bulgarin, in which he would try systematically to demolish Polevoj. Such an article, in two parts, one by Bulgarin and one jointly by Grech and Bulgarin, appeared in *The Northern Archive* in August, 1825.[334] In it, Bulgarin accused Polevoj of presumption, unfairness to statements on books and writers, insufficient learning, harsh tone, and ignorance of Russian language and grammar. Each accusation was carefully docu-

---

[332] Bulgarin, "Popravka oshibki," *Severnaja Pchela*, 1825, No. 47.

[333] Quoted in *The Northern Archive*, 1825, No. 16.

[334] "Antikritika. Zamechanija na stat'ju napechatannuju v 13 numere *Moskovskogo Telegrafa*, pod zaglaviem: Osobennoe pribavlenie i proch.," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1825, No. 16, pp. 348-380.

mented with examples from Polevoj's own articles in *The Moscow Telegraph.* The feud had its moments of humour when Bulgarin, ridiculing Polevoj's faulty translations from the French, would list a lengthy mock-vocabulary, organized in three columns: French, Russian, and *Moscow Telegraph* language.[335]

On the whole, Polevoj proved no match for Bulgarin, and soon found himself defending the content of his journal, his use of foreign languages, his knowledge of history, and so on, the usual targets of Bulgarin's criticism.

Bulgarin's victory over Polevoj, whose journal was the centre of Moscow's literary circles (and who ultimately came back to work for Bulgarin), made him even more confident in expressing his literary judgments than before. Consequently, when the next issue of *Mnemozina* appeared, Bulgarin did not even bother to enter into a long polemic, but dismissed it automatically as a pretentious and juvenile publication.[336] This was a complete putdown for Odoevskij and Kjukhel'beker.

Bulgarin's growing confidence extended to his treatment of established writers: he was no longer the cautiously flattering critic he had been earlier. When the first excerpts from Pushkin's *Evgenij Onegin* appeared in print, Bulgarin did not accord them an automatic praise, but suspended judgment while awaiting the appearance of the remainder of the poem.[337] This was a sign of maturity and a claim to equality.

Bulgarin's views on literature were at that point better expressed in his *Nravy,* and particularly in his utopian stories, than in his critical articles, which were mostly a means of hitting back at something or somebody. These stories provide a valuable insight into his understanding of Russian literature in general, and of the rôle of journalism and criticism in particular. Bulgarin's views had an increasingly conservative tendency, and a disdain of the new, the young, and the fresh in Russian literature. This could be seen in the narrator's statement in *Credible Fiction* after he had examined the holdings of the Arctic Kingdom's library:

> I sought in vain for our new Romantics, our tender Parnys and Lamartines (presumably imitations), and all the sweet-sounding poets who in our day charmed the receptive ears of their friends and their ladies. . . . There was only lofty thought, strong feelings, deep knowledge of the human heart, enlightened love of the Fatherland, and the great truths of nature, but the sweet-sounding poetry composed of words and pictures alone had been smashed like the old gusli.[338]

---

[335] *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 132.

[336] *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 127.

[337] *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 23.

[338] Bulgarin, "Pravdopodobnye nebylicy ili stranstvovanie po svetu v dvadcat'devjatom veke," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 18, pp. 190-191.

Similar views, but more explicit, could be found in *Improbable Fiction* the following year (1825), in the guide's description to the narrator of the condition of literature in Svetonija:

> Our literature is in perfect condition: our poets praise the Almighty and the virtues of their countrymen; the prose writers develop and disseminate useful moral truths through history, novels, stories, tragedies, comedies, satires, and so on. Scientists invent and perfect things; artists and actors work for the glory of the Fatherland; and all writers, scientists and artists enjoy respect in their society, and live in peace and harmony with each other.[339]

As for journalism, the narrator was told that there were many journals in Svetonija and that they were devoted to interesting articles and constructive criticism, and that there was no hostility among journalists and critics. The narrator was amazed at all these revelations, and described, in turn, the conditions of literature in his own country:

> All this is excellent, but I will admit that it rarely happens in our own country, and chiefly because we often introduce our own private enmities into literature, and because for some time now commercial gains and calculations have occupied our men of letters more than the good of literature and the pleasure of the readers.[340]

This statement can be read as Bulgarin's assessment of Russian literature in 1825, including his own part in it, because by then he had already succeeded—probably better than any other Russian writer at that time —in making literature a profitable profession.

CONCLUSION

Bulgarin's turbulent life provides an extreme example of how a foreigner—a Pole—could adapt himself to new conditions after the fall of his country, and start a new life in Russia. What we know of Bulgarin's early life comes mostly from his own *Memoirs* which—although they often read like an exercise in personal panegyric—enable us to determine that he came from a Polish patriotic background. As a child, Bulgarin witnessed the last two partitions of Poland, and his world collapsed around him. In Russia, the country adopted for him by his mother, he was well treated and had powerful protectors. His Polish heritage made him leave Russia and join Napoleon, who was showing promise of restoring Poland. After the defeat of Napoleon, Bulgarin's

---

[339] Bulgarin, "Neverojatnye nebylicy ili puteshestvie k sredotochiju zemli," *Severnyj Arkhiv*, 1825, No. 12, p. 447.

[340] *Ibid.*, p. 448.

world collapsed once more, and once more he adopted Russia, this time for good.

Unlike thousands of his compatriots with similar backgrounds who returned to their former occupations after the Russian amnesty, Bulgarin returned to Petersburg and selected a new career, perhaps the one in which his background and preparation made him least likely to succeed. All he was bringing with him into his new profession was a Polish background, a secondary education, a passion for work, and a store of military experiences. Incredibly, this proved to be enough. In Petersburg, Bulgarin mastered the art of making useful contacts in a capital full of people who had also been to France and Poland, and with whom he had much in common. He found listeners for his stories and, later, readers for his writings. He was lucky to start his writing career at the proper moment, when there was a growing demand for prose. He was successful.

If we looked for the kind of over-all success Bulgarin had, we could probably rank his accomplishments in order of importance.

1. Bulgarin's most important and most durable success was in the field of journalism—*The Northern Bee* (1825-1859).[341] It was the first private Russian newspaper which, at the height of its popularity, had over 10,000 subscribers.

2. Bulgarin's most immediate success was in the field of the novel. His first novel, *Ivan Vyzhigin,* enjoyed an unprecedented success both in Russia and abroad. The brevity of its popularity was compensated by its long-range effect on Russian literature. It stimulated in Russia a widespread demand for novel-length fiction, and thus was instrumental in giving other writers an opportunity to follow Bulgarin's example.

3. Bulgarin's literary criticism, although mostly not of the conventional type, was very important to his over-all literary success. He used criticism as a weapon with which to fight competitors, especially younger ones, succesfully. With the means of publication at his disposal, Bulgarin was able with his critical writings to influence public opinion in favour of his own literary ventures and thus pave the way for their success. All his journalistic and novelistic successes depended, to a large extent, on his success in the field of criticism.

4. The success with *The Northern Bee* was preceded and prepared by successes with four other journals within a short space of time.

(a) *The Northern Archive* (1822-1828),[342] represented Bulgarin's independent entry into journalism. The journal featured articles on history, geography, statistics, travel, and so on, reflecting the interests of the readers. The articles were written by authors little-known today, but also by some well-known ones, including the Polish historian Joachim Lelewel. The journal's non-fictional content was balanced by Bulgarin's

---

[341] N. M. Lisovskij, *Bibliografija russkoj pechati 1703-1900 gg.,* Petrograd, p. 69.

[342] *Ibid.,* pp. 65-66.

Nravy, through which he stimulated the demand for light reading in Russia.

(b) *The Literary Pages* (1823-1824), at first only a literary supplement to *The Northern Archive,* became a very successful forum for Bulgarin's own writings. Next to the *Nravy,* it included some of Bulgarin's semi-autobiographical military stories, and his observations, often very critical, on Russian literature and journalism.

(c) Although Bulgarin was only co-editor with Grech of the *Son of the Fatherland* (1822-1840),[343] it was in this journal that he successfully began his literary career with his articles on the literature of Spain, Poland, and Russia. Although some of these articles may not have been entirely original, they facilitated his entry into Russian literature.

(d) Less known, but only slightly less important was Bulgarin's theatre almanac, *The Russian Thalia* (1825). In it, he published excerpts from Russian plays and foreign dramas; articles on the Russian theatre, and biographical sketches of the leading actors of the day; several other pieces, including the first publication of Griboedov's *Woe from Wit.*

(e) Beside extensive writings in his own journals, Bulgarin was also a regular contributor to several of Petersburg's journals and almanacs, notably *The Polar Star.* His contributions consisted of well-received and popular military stories and historical tales.

(f) Bulgarin's new journals after *The Northern Bee* were less successful. *The Children's Interlocutor* (1826-1827) and *The Economist* (1841-1845) had little or no literary value. But Bulgarin enjoyed continuous success with *The Northern Bee,* and in a joint journalistic venture—*The Library for Reading*—with Grech and a new partner, Sękowski.[344]

5. Bulgarin's later novels, after *Ivan Vyzhigin,* were labeled, perhaps undeservedly, failures.

(a) *Dimitrij the Impostor* (1830), if published earlier, would have probably repeated the success of *Ivan Vyzhigin,* but it suffered by comparison with Pushkin's *Boris Godunov* and Zagoskin's *Jurij Miloslavskij.*

(b) *Pëtr Ivanovich Vyzhigin* (1831),[345] a sequel to *Ivan Vyzhigin* and an obvious attempt to repeat its success, was written during the Polish-Russian war of 1830-1831 when Bulgarin's future in Russia was temporarily in jeopardy again. This may have contributed to the cool reception of the novel.

(c) *Mazepa* (1834),[346] like *Dimitrij the Impostor,* suffered by com-

---

[343] *Ibid.,* pp. 50-52.

[344] V. Kaverin, "Legenda o zhurnal'nom Triumvirate," *Zvezda,* No. 1, pp. 160-192.

[345] Bulgarin, *Petr Ivanowich Vyzhigin, nravoopisatel'nyj istoricheskij roman XIX veka,* Sanktpeterburg, A. Pljushar, 1831.

[346] Bulgarin, *Mazepa,* Sanktpeterburg, A. Smirdin, 1833-34.

parison with Pushkin's poem on the same subject, *Poltava.* By then, Bulgarin had also been eclipsed in popularity by other novelists, and his last novel, *The Memoirs of Chukhin* (1835) is hardly mentioned; only his position as a journalist remained strong.

Bulgarin's whole career showed a pattern of responses to conditions, both literary or historical. When it was safe to write about Poland, he capitalized on his Polish background and became a self-styled spokesman on Polish literature and history. When it became politically dangerous, he turned to Russian literature and history, became a journalist and spokesman on morals and manners. In line with historical developments in Russia, he became increasingly conservative. On his entry into the literary world, he gravitated, perhaps by youthful inclination, to the circles of young liberals who received him well because of his Polish liberal and constitutional background. But in the long run a conservative orientation was to prove more profitable, especially after the Decembrist Revolt, and Bulgarin spoke for a complete union of Poland and Russia after the Polish-Russian war of 1830-1831. His ability to adapt himself to changing conditions paid off. Almost everything he attempted turned to gold: successful journals, popular stories, a newspaper with a wide circulation, and widely read stories and novels. His claim, expressed in his *Memoirs,* that every educated person in Russia had read him was probably correct.

Bulgarin's literary career lasted some forty years. The present essay has concentrated on the early period of the career (1816-1825). This period contained all the ingredients of Bulgarin's success, and also had an identity of its own; the rest of Bulgarin's career was equally interesting and important, but different in character. While the early period showed his reaction and responses to his position in Russia when establishing his literary career, the latter period, especially the 1830's and 1840's, showed his responses to a younger generation on the make, exemplifying the same qualities of craft and energy he had displayed earlier. To the later period belonged also the epilogue of Bulgarin's relationship with Mickiewicz on the one hand, and his battle with Pushkin on the other, both immensely interesting and complicated topics which, together with other details of Bulgarin's later career, such as the monopoly he exercised with Grech and Sękowski over Russian journalism. could very well become subjects of another essay. On the whole in the later period, while a new generation was now "making it," Bulgarin's efforts were directed towards "holding it."

All of the qualities of Bulgarin's mind and character emerged in the early period of his career: an aggressive personality, a brashness of behaviour, and clever maneuvers which he resorted to in order to promote himself and to accumulate perhaps more power and money than any Russian literary figure had accumulated before.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Akademija Nauk SSSR, *Istorija russkogo romana,* Vol. I, Moskva, 1962.

————, *Istorija russkoj kritiki,* Vol. I, Moskva-Leningrad, 1958.

————, *Istorija russkoj literatury,* Vols. V-VII, Moskva, 1941-1956.

————, *Istorija russkoj literatury,* Vol. II, Moskva, 1963.

Alekseev, M. P., ed., *Adam Mickevich v russkoj pechati 1825-1955,* Moskva-Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1957.

Alkire, Gilman H., *The Historical Novels of Faddej Bulgarin,* Unpublished dissertation, Berkeley, 1966.

Andreevskij, I. E., ed., *Enciklopedicheskij slovar',* Vol. IV, Leipzig, F. A. Brokgauz and S. Peterburg, I. A. Efron, 1891.

Arsenev, K. K., ed., *Novyj enciklopedicheskij slovar',* Vol. VIII, Leipzig, F. A. Brokgauz and S. Peterburg, I. A. Efron.

Askenazi, Shimon, *Carstvo pol'skoe 1815-1830 g.,* Vladimir Vysockij, transl. from Polish, Moskva, Knigoizdatel'stvo pisatelej, 1915.

Askenazy, Szymon, *Napoleon a Polska,* Warszawa, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze, 1919.

Assorodobraj, N., *Założenie teoretyczne historiografii Lelewela* (na prawach rękopisu), Warszawa, Materiały dyskusyjne Komisji Naukowej Obchodu Roku Mickiewicza PAN, 1955.

Bazanov, V. G., ed., *Poljarnaja Zvezda izdannaja A. Bestuzhevym i K. Ryleevym,* Moskva-Leningrad, Akademija Nauk SSSR, 1960.

————, Uchenaja respublika, Moskva-Leningrad, Akademija Nauk SSSR, 1964.

Belinskij, V. G., Polnoe sobranie sochinenij, Vols. IX and XII, Moskva, Akademija Nauk SSSR, 1955.

Bieliński, Józef, *Uniwersytet Wileński (1579-1831),* Kraków, W. L. Anczyc i Spółka, 1899-1900.

————, *Żywot Ks. Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego,* Warszawa, Gebethner i Wolff, 1905.

Błaszczyk, Leon T., *Dyrygenci polscy i obcy w Polsce działający w XIX i XX wieku,* Kraków, Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1965.

Brodskij, N. L., ed., *Literaturnye salony i kruzhki,* Perveja polovina XIX veka, Moskva-Leningrad, Academia, 1930.

Bulgarin, Faddej V., *Dimitrij Samozvanec, istoricheskij roman,* Sanktpeterburg, V tipografii Aleksandra Smirdina, 1830.

————, *Ivan Vyzhigin, nravstvenno-satiricheskij roman,* Sanktpeterburg, V tipografii vdovy Pljushar, 1829.

————, *Mazepa,* Sanktpeterburg, Izdanie A. Smirdina v tipografii vdovy Pljushar, 1833-34.

————, *Neverojatnye nebylicy ili puteshestvie k sredotochiju zemli, Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 10, pp. 174-185, No. 11, pp. 360-377, No. 12, pp. 437-451, and in *Sochinenija,* Vol. III. Sanktpeterburg, Tipografija N. Grecha, 1827-1828.

————, *Petr Ivanovich Vyzhigin, nravoopisatel'nyj-istoricheskij roman XIX* veka, Sanktpeterburg, V tipografii A. Pljushara, 1831.

————, *Pravdopodobnye nebylicy ili stranstvovanie po svetu v dvadcat'-devjatom veke, Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 17, pp. 133-150, No. 18, pp. 173-192, Nos. 19 and 20, pp. 12-27, Nos. 23 and 24, pp. 129-145, *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 2, pp. 202-211, No. 3, pp. 294-302, and in *Sochinenija,* Vol. V, Sanktpeterburg, Tipografija N. Grecha, 1827-1828.

————, *Scena iz chastnoj zhizni v 2028 godu ot Rozhdestva Khristova, Sochinenija,* Vol. IV, Sanktpeterburg, Tipografija N. Grecha, 1827-1828.

————, *Sochinenija,* Sanktpeterburg, Tipografija N. Grecha, 1827-1828.

————, *Vospominanija,* Sanktpeterburg, Vols. I-III, Izdanie M. A. Ol'khina, Vols. IV-VI, V tipografii Karla Kraja, 1846-1849.

Bulgarin, Thaddeus, *Ivan Vejeeghen,* Philadelphia, Carey and Lea, 1832.

Byron, George G. N. B., Lord, "Mazeppa," *The Works of Lord Byron,* New York, Octagon Books, Inc., 1966, II, pp. 199-233.

Chizhevskij, Dmitrij, *Russische Literaturgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts,* München, Eidos Verlag, 1964.

Davydov, Denis, *Sochinenija,* Moskva, Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoj Literatury, 1962.

Debreczeny, Paul, *Nikolay Gogol and His Contemporary Critics,* Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society, 1966.

Dement'ev, A. G., *Ocherki po istorii russkoj zhurnalistiki 1840-1850 gg.,* Moskva-Leningrad, Gosudarstvennoje Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoj Literatury, 1951.

————, ed., *Russkaja periodicheskaja pechat'* (1702-1894), Moskva, *Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Politicheskoj Llteratury,* 1959.

Der Grosse Brockhaus, Leipzig, F. A. Brokhaus, 1931.

Engel'gardt, Nikolaj, *Istorija russkoj literatury XIX stoletija,* Tom pervyj 1800-1850, S.-Peterburg, Izdanie A. S. Suvorina, 1902.

Florinsky, Michael T., *Russia, a History and an Interpretation,* In two volumes, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1965.

Forster, E. M., *Aspects of the Novel,* New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1954.

Friche, V. M., ed., *Literaturnaja enciklopedija,* Vol. I, Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Kommunisticheskoj Akademii, 1930.

Gillon, Etienne, chief ed., *Grand Larousse Encyclopédique,* Paris, Librarie Larousse, 1960-1964.

Gomolicki, Leon, *Dziennik pobytu Adama Mickiewicza w Rosji 1824-1829,* Warszawa, Instytut Badań Literackich, 1949.

Grech, N. I., *Zapiski o moej zhizni,* S.-Peterburg, Izdanie A. S. Suvorina, 1886.

————, *Zapiski o moej zhizni,* Commentary by Ivanov-Razumnik and D. M. Pines, Moskva-Leningrad, "Academia" 1930.

Haley, Sir William, chief ed., *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* The University of Chicago, 1969.

Handelsman, Marceli, *Adam Czartoryski,* Warszawa, Towarzystwo Naukowe, Rozprawy Historyczne, 1948.

————, *Historyka. Zasady metodologii i teorii poznania historycznego,* Warszawa, Gebethner i Wolff, 1928.

Ikonnikov, V. S., *Opyt russkoj istoriografii,* Kiev, 1891.

Janowski, Ludwik, *W promieniach Wilna i Krzemieńca,* Wilno, Księgarnia Józefa Zawadzkiego, 1923.

Karamzin, N. M., *A Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia,* The Russian Text, edited by Richard Pipes, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1959.

————, *Istorija gosudarstva rossijskago,* Izdanie pjatoe v trekh knigakh, Kniga I (tomy I, II, III i IV), kniga III (tomy IX, X, XI i XII), Sankt-peterburg, v tipografii Eduarda Praca, 1842-1845.

Kaverin, V., *Baron Brambeus,* Moskva, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1966.

Krasicki, Ignacy, *Pan Podstoli,* Kraków, Biblioteka Narodowa, 1927.

————, *Przypadki Mikołaja Doświadczyńskiego,* Sanok, Nakład i druk Karola Pollaka, 1855.

Kridl, Manfred, *A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture,* S-Gravenhage, Mouton and Co., 1956.

Krzyżanowski, Julian, *W świecie romantycznym,* Kraków, Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1961.

Kukiel, M., *Dzieje wojska polskiego w dobie Napoleońskiej 1795-1815,* Warszawa, E. Wende i spółka, 1918.

Lednicki, Wacław, *Pushkin's "Bronze Horseman" The Story of a Masterpiece,* Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1955.

————, ed., *Adam Mickiewicz in World Literature,* A Symposium, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1956.

————, ed., *Russia, Poland and the West,* Essays in Literary and Cultural History, London, Hutchinson, 1954.

Lelewel, Joachim, *Dzieła,* Tom I, II(1), II(2), III, VI, VII, VIII, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1957-1964.

————, *Wybór pism historycznych,* Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1949.

————, *Wybór pism politycznych,* Warszawa, Książka i Wiedza, 1954.

Lemke, Mikhail, *Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1826-1855 gg.,* S.-Peterburg, Izdanie S. V. Bunina, 1909.

————, *Ocherki po istorii russkoj cenzury i zhurnalistiki XIX stoletija,* S.-Peterburg, "Trud," 1904.

Lesage, Alain René, *The Adventures of Gil Blas of Santillane,* London, J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 1909.

Linde, Samuel Bogumił, *Słownik języka polskiego,* Wyd. 3 fotooffsetowe, Warszawa, Panstwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1951.

Lisovskij, N. M., *Bibliografija russkoj pechati 1703-1900 gg.* (Materijaly dlja istorii russkoj zhurnalistiki), Petrograd, 1915.

Manteuffel, Tadeusz, ed., *Historia Polski,* Tom II, 1764-1864, Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958.

Masanov, I. F., *Slovar' psevdonimov russkikh pisatelej, uchenykh i obshchestvennykh dejatelej,* Tom IV, Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Vsesojuznoj Knizhnoj Palaty, 1956-1960.

Meshcherjakov, N. L., chief ed., *Malaja sovetskaja enciklopedija,* Vol. II, Moskva, Gosudarstvennyj Institut "Sovetskaja Enciklopedija," 1937.

Mickiewicz, Adam, *Dzieła,* Warszawa, Czytelnik, 1955.

————, "Konrad Wallenrod," *Dzieła,* Warszawa, Czytelnik, 1955, II, pp. 67, 150.

————, "Listy," *Dzieła,* Vol. XIV, Warszawa, Czytelnik, 1955.

————, "Wiersze," *Dzieła,* Vol. I, Warszawa, Czytelnik, 1955.

Miljukov, Pavel, N., *Glavnye techenija russkoj istoricheskoj mysli,* Tom I, Vtoroe izdanie redakcii zhurnala "Russkaja Mysl", Moskva, 1898.

————, *Outlines of Russian Culture,* Michael Karpovich, ed., Valentine Ughet and Eleanor Davis, trans., Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943, Part. II.

Mirsky, D. S., *A History of Russian Literature,* Francis J. Whitfield, ed., New York, Vintage Books, Inc., 1958.

Monas, Sidney, *The Third Section,* Harvard University Press, 1961.

Mordovchenko, N. I., *Russkaja kritika pervoj chetverti XIX veka,* Moskva-Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1959.

Mościcki, Henryk, *Pod berłem carów,* Warszawa, Instytut Wydawniczy "Biblioteka Polska," 1924.

Muratova, K. D., ed., *Istorija russkoj literatury XIX veka; bibliograficheskij ukazatel',* Leningrad, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1962.

Myshkovkaja, L., *Literaturnye problemy Pushkinskoj pory,* Moskva, Sovetskaja Literatura, 1934.

Narezhnyj, V. T., *Izbrannye sochinenija,* Vol. I, Moskva, Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoj Literatury, 1956.

Nechkina, M. V., *A. S. Griboedov i Dekabristy,* Moskva, Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoj Literatury, 1957.

Niemcewicz, Julian Ursyn, *Pamiętniki czasów moich,* Warszawa, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1957.

Pares, Bernard, *A History of Russia,* New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1953.

Passage, Charles E., *The Russian Hoffmannists,* The Hague, Mouton and Co., 1963.

Pauls, John P., *Pushkin's "Poltava,"* New York, Winnipeg, Paris, Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1962.

Pedrotti, Louis, *Józef-Julian Sękowski,* Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1965.

Pereverzev, V. F., *U istokov russkogo realisticheskogo romana,* Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoj Literatury, 1965 (1933).

Platonov, S. F., *History of Russia,* E. Aronsberg, transl., New York, The Macmillan Co., 1925.

Polovcov, A. A., *Russkij biograficheskij slovar',* Vol. III, St. Peterburg, 1908.

Polska Akademia Umiejętności, *Polski Słownik Biograficzny,* Kraków, 1931.

Pushkin, A. S., *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij,* Izdanie Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1937.

Raeff, Marc, *Michael Speransky, Statesman of Imperial Russia, 1772-1839,* The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1957.

———, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia,* New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966.

———, *Russian Intellectual History, An Anthology,* New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.

———, *The Decembrist Movement,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Reddaway, W. F., ed., *The Cambridge History of Poland,* Vol. II, Cambridge University Press, 1941.

Ryleev, Kondratij, F., *Stikhotvorenija...,* Moskva, Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Khudozhestvennoj Literatury, 1956.

Sakulin, P. N., *Iz istorii russkago idealizma, Knjaz' V. F. Odoevskij, Myslitel'-pisatel',* Vol. I, Moskva, Izdanie M. i S. Sabatnikovykh, 1913.

Schweizer Lexicon, Zürich, Encyclios-Verlag Ag., 1945-1948.

Scott, Sir Walter, bart., *Quentin Durward,* Boston, Estes and Lauriat, 1894.

Serejski, Marian Henryk, *Joachim Lelewel. Z dziejów postępowej myśli historycznej w Polsce,* Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1953.

Setchkarev, Vsevolod, *Gogol, His Life and Works,* Robert Kramer, transl., New York University Press, 1965.

Shmidt, O. Ju., chief ed., *Bol'shaja sovetskaja enciklopedija,* Vol. VI, Moskva, Akcionernoe Obshchestvo "Sovetskaja enciklopedija," 1927.

Skabichevskij, A. M., *Ocherki po istorii russkoj cenzury (1700-1863 g.),* S. Peterburg, Izdanie F. Pavlenkova, 1892.

Skwarczyński, Zdzisław, *Kazimierz Kontrym.-Towarzystwo Szubrawców. Dwa studia,* Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1961.

————, *Wiadomości Brukowe,* Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1962.

Słowikowski, Tadeusz, *Poglądy na nauczanie historii w Polsce w wieku XVIII oraz dydaktyczna koncepcja Joachima Lelewela,* Kraków, Polska Akademia Nauk, 1960.

Sobolevskij, A. I., *Perevodnaja literatura Moskovskoj Rusi 14-17 vekov. Bibliograficheskie materialy,* S. Peterburg, Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk, 1903.

Striedter, Jurij, *Der Schelmenroman in Russland,* Berlin, Osteuropa-Institut an der Freien Universität, 1961.

Suchodolski, Bogdan, chief ed., *Wielka Encyclopedia Powszechna PWN,* Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962, II, 225.

Svjatlovskij, Vladimir, *Russkij utopicheskij roman,* Peterburg, Gosudarstvennoje Izdatel'stvo, 1922.

Tretiak, J., wyd., *Mikołaja Malinowskiego Księga wspomnień,* Kraków, Akademia Umiejętności, 1907.

Vaslef, Nicholas, P., *Faddej V. Bulgarin: Reevaluation of His Contribution to the Nineteenth-Century Russian Prose,* Unpublished dissertation, Harvard, 1966.

Vavilov, S. I., chief ed., *Bol'shaja sovetskaja enciklopedija,* Second edition, Moskva, Gosudarstvennoe Nauchnoe Izdatel'stvo, 1947-1958.

Vengerov, S. A., *Russkie knigi, s biograficheskimi dannymi ob avtorakh i* perevodchikakh, S. Peterburg, A. E. Vineke, 1899.

Vernadsky, George, *A History of Russia,* New Haven, Yale, University Press, 1962.

Walicki, Andrzej, *Osobowość a historia,* Warszawa, Polski Instytut Wydawniczy, 1959.

————, *W kręgu konserwatywnej utopii. Struktura i przemiany rosyjskiego słowianofilstwa,* Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964.

Wellek, René, and Warren, Austin, *Theory of Literature,* New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956.

Welsh, David, *Adam Mickiewicz,* New York, Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1966.

Załęski, Stanisław, *Jezuici w Polsce,* Kraków, Drukiem i nakładem drukarni W. L. Anczyca i Sp., 1908.

Zapadov, A. V., ed., *Istorija russkoj zhurnalistiki XVIII-XIX vekov,* Moskva, Izdatel'stvo "Vysshaja Shkola," 1966.

————, ed., *Khrestomatija po istorii russkoj zhurnalistiki XIX veka,* Moskva, Izdatel'stvo "Vysshaja Shkola," 1965.

ARTICLES

A. N., "Voennaja sluzhba F. V. Bulgarina, 1805-1811," *Russkaja Starina,* 1874, Vol. IX, pp. 774-777.

Belinskij, V. G., "Vospominanija Faddeja Bulgarina," *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij,* Moskva, Akademija Nauk, 1953, pp. 613-670.

Berkh, V. N., "Khronologicheskaja istorija vsekh puteshestvij v severnye poljarnye strany," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 4, pp. 361-371.

Bestuzhev, A., "Vzgljad na russkuju slovesnost' v techenije 1823 goda," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1824, pp. 265-271.

Bestuzhev, A., "Vzgljad na russkuju slovesnost' v techenije 1824 i nachale 1825 goda," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1825, pp. 488-499.

Bjuler, F. A., "Nikolaj Alekseevich Polevoj," *Russkaja Starina,* 1874, Vol. IV, pp. 674-681.

Bludov, D. N., "N. I. Grech, F. V. Bulgarin i A. Mickevich. Materialy dlja ikh biografij, *Russkaja Starina,* 1903, Vol. CXVI, pp. 333-351.

Bulgarin, F. V., "Antikritika. Otvet na stat'ju, pomeshchennuju v No. XIX *Novostej Literatury,* izdavaemykh pri *R. I.* pod zaglaviem: Zamechanija na 'Kratkoe obozrenie russkoj literatury 1822 goda', napechatannoje v No. 5 *Severnago Arkhiva* 1823 goda," Literaturnye Listki, 1823, No. 1, pp. 9-16.

———, "Bibliograficheskie izvestija," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 9 and 10, pp. 387-390.

———, "Bogatyj Zhid. Istochniki ego bogatstva. (Otryvok iz rukopisi: *Russkij Zhilblaz, ili pokhozhdenija Ivana Vyzhigina). Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1826, No. 17 and 18, pp. 144-155, No. 19 and 20, pp. 302-313.

———, *"Dumy.* Stikhotvorenija K. Ryleeva," *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 37.

———, "Eshche voennaja shutka," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1825, pp. 660-669.

———, *"Evgenij Onegin,* roman v stikhakh. Sochinenije Aleksandra Pushkina," *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 23.

———, (Arkhip Faddeev), "Kritika. Pis'mo ot chitatelja *Otechestvennykh zapisok* k izdatelju *Severnago Arkhiva," Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No. 2, p. 25.

———, (Arkhip Faddeev), "Otvet na pis'mo k izdatelju *Moskovskago Telegrafa,* pomeshchennoe v 3 knizhke cego zhurnala na str. 1-13," *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 25.

———, (Arkhip Faddeev), "Popravka oshibok v No. 42-m *Otechestvennykh Zapisok," Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No. 5, p. 60.

———, "Ivan Vyzhigin, ili Russkij Zhilblaz (Otryvok iz Novago Romana)," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 9, pp. 67-87.

———, "Izvestija o novykh knigakh. *Bursak,* Malorossijskaja povest', sochinenije Vasilija Narezhnago," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 19 and 20, pp. 49-50.

———, "K chitateljam," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 9, pp. 67-70.

———, "Kratkie vozrazhenija na obvinenija P. P. Svin'ina, na ironiju izdatelja *Damskago Zhurnala,* na pritjazanija ko mne V. K. Kjukhel'-bekera, i na aforizmy ljubomudrija knjazja V. F. Odoevskago," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 21 and 22, pp. 100-121.

———, "Kratkoe obozrenie pol'skoj slovesnosti," *Syn Otechestva,* 1820, No. XXXI pp. 193-218, No. XXXII, pp. 241-264.

———, "Kratkoe obozrenie russkoj literatury 1822 goda," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1823, No. 5, pp. 377-422.

———, "Kriticheskij vzgljad na X i XI tomy *Istorii gosudarstva rossijskago,* sochinenoj N. M. Karamzinym," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 1, pp. 60-84, No. 2, pp. 182-201, No. 3, pp. 271-278, No. 6, pp. 176-197, No. 8, pp. 362-372.

———, "Kritika. *Mnemozina,* sobranie sochinenij v stikhakh i proze, izdavaemaja kn. V. Odoevskim i V. Kjukhel'bekerom. Chast' II," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 15, pp. 73-83.

———, "Kritika. Pis'mo k izdatelju *Severnago Arkhiva* o Kjakhte," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No. 2, p. 26.

———, "Literatura," *Literaturnye Listki,*" 1824, No. 1, pp. 25-29.

———, "Literatura. *Mnemozina,* sobranie sochinenij v stikhakh i proze, izdavaemaja kn. V. Odoevskim i V. Kjukhel'bekerom. Chast' I," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 5, pp. 182-193.

———, "Marina Mnishekh, supruga Dimitrija Samozvanca," *Severnyj Arkhiv, 1824,* No. 1, pp. 1-13, No. 2, pp. 59-73, No. 20, pp. 55-77, No. 21 and 22, pp. 111-137.

———, "Modnaja lavka, ili shto znachit fason," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1824, pp. 310-317.

———, "Nekrologija," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 5, pp. 176-182.

———, "Nekrologija (Graf Adam S. Rzewuski)," *Severnaja Pchela,* No. 36.

———, "Neverojatnye nebylicy ili puteshestvie k sredotochiju zemli," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 10, pp. 174-185, No. 11, pp. 360-377, No. 12, pp. 437-451.

———, "Novoe znachenie starykh slov ili beseda u cheloveka proshedshago stoletija," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 11 and 12, pp. 397-407.

———, "Novye knigi," *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 54.

———, "O prelesti," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 7, pp. 247-254.

———, "O romanakh," *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 5, 7, 9.

———, "Ob'javlenie," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 21 and 22, pp. 63-64.

———, "Ob'javlenie," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1823, No. 19, pp. 81-85.

———, "Ob'javlenie izdatelja," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 2, p. 72.

———, "Osvobozhdenie Trembovli, istoricheskoe proisshestvie XVII stoletija," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1823, pp. 210-215.

———, "Otryvok iz Russkago Zhilblaza," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 13, pp. 56-79.

———, "Poezdka v Kronshtat," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 15, pp. 83-88.

———, "Popravka oshibki," *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 47.

———, "Pravdopodobnye nebylicy ili stranstvovanie po svetu v dvadcat' devjatom veke," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 17, pp. 133-150, No. 18, pp. 173-192, No. 19 and 20, pp. 12-27, No. 23 and 24, pp. 129-145, *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 2, pp. 202-211, No. 3, pp. 294-302.

———, "Progulka po trotuaru Nevskago Prospekta," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 4, pp. 118-133, No. 5, pp. 159-172, No. 6, pp. 213-230.

———, "Progulka v Ekateringof," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 8, pp. 291-312.

———, "Progulka za gorod," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1823, No. 1, pp. 1-8, No 2, pp. 17-20, No. 3, pp. 29-32.

———, "Raznye izvestija," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 4, pp. 373-374.

———, "Sirotka, ili kartina chelovechestva vo vkuse Flamandskoj shkoly," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1827, No. 1, pp. 87-99.

———, "Voennaja shutka," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* 1823, pp. 157-162.

———, "Voennaja zhizn'. Pis'mo k N. I. Grechu," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 1, pp. 14-22, No. 2, pp. 33-50.

———, "Vojnarovskij. Poema. Sochinenie K. Ryleeva," *Severnaja Pchela,* 1825, No. 32.

———, "Vol'shebnyj fonar' ili raznye izvestija," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 2, pp. 59-72.

———, "Vol'shebnyj fonar' ili raznye izvestija," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 8, pp. 314-322.

———, "Vol'shebnyj fonar'. Kritika. Korrespondencija," *Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 21 and 22, pp. 90-100.

———, "Vzgljad na istoriju ispanskoj literatury," *Syn Otechestva,* 1821, No. XL, pp. 289-305, No. LXI, pp. 3-21.

———, "Zamechanija na stat'ju, pomeshchennuju v No. 11, *Vestnika Evropy,* pod zaglaviem: *Istoricheskie spravki," Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 14, pp. 151-172.

"Dnevnik Samuila Mackevicha, byvshago v Rossii vo vremja vtorago Samozvanca." *Severnyyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 1, pp. 3-20, etc.

Friche, V. M., ed., "Bulgarin," *Literaturnaja enciklopedija,* Moskva, 1930, I, pp. 611-613.

Grech, N. I., "A. F. Voejkov, 1779-1839. Biograficheskij ocherk," *Russkaja Starina,* 1874, Vol. IX, pp. 621-643.

———, "Faddej Venediktovich Bulgarin. 1789-1859. Biograficheskij ocherk, . . ." *Russkaja Starina,* 1871, Vol. IV, pp. 483-514.

———, "Izvestie N. I. Grecha o zhizni i sochinenijakh F. V. Bulgarina," *Russkaja Starina,* 1871, Vol. IV, pp. 514-520.

"I. N. Skobelev i F. V. Bulgarin. Dva pis'ma I. Skobeleva F. Bulgarinu," *Russkaja Starina,* 1895, Vol. LXXXIV, pp. 44-46.

Ivanov-Razumnik, "N. I. Grech i ego 'Zapiski'," N. I. Grech, *Zapiski o moej zhizni,* Moskva-Leningrad, "Academia," 1930, pp. 9-32.

"Iz arkhiva F. V. Bulgarina. Pis'ma k nemu raznykh lic," *Russkaja Starina,* 1901, Vol. CV, pp. 383-408.

Izmajlov, A. E., "Prilozhenija k pis'mam. Stikhi na Bulgarina," *Russkij Arkhiv,* 1871, pp. 1007-1011.

Kaverin, V., "Legenda o zhurnal'nom Triumvirate," *Zvezda,* No. 1, pp. 160-192.

"Kommentarii," *Poljarnaja Zvezda,* pp. 885-888.

Kruzenshtern, kapitan-komandor, "O Grenlandii, ili novye opyty dlja otkrytija severo-zapadnago puti," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, pp. 341-366.

Lednicki, Wacław, "Mickiewicz's Stay in Russia," *Adam Mickiewicz in World Literature,* Symposium ed. by Wacław Lednicki, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California University Press, 1956, pp. 13-104.

Lelewel, Joachim, "Razsmotrenie *Istorii gosudarstva rossijskago* g. Karamzina," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 23, pp. 402-434, etc.

————, "Vvedenie. Zamechanie na predislovie iz *Istorii.* Cel' kritiki na vse sochinenie," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 23, pp. 408-434.

Lemke, Mikhail, "Faddej Bulgarin," *Ocherki po istorii russkoj cenzury i zhurnalistiki XIX stoletija,* S. Peterburg, "Trud," 1904, pp. 371-427.

————, "Faddej Bulgarin i *Severnaja Pchela," Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1826-1855 gg.,* S. Peterburg, S. V. Bunin, 1909, pp. 229-358.

Lerner, N., "Pis'ma F. V. Bulgarina," *Russkaja Starina,* 1909, Vol. CXL, pp. 347-357.

————, "Zametki o Pushkine. III. Epigrammy Vjazemskogo na Bulgarina," *Russkaja Starina,* 1908, Vol. CXXXIII, pp. 113-119.

Moskovskij urozhenec A. M., "Zamechanija odnogo iz sotrudnikov *Severnago Arkhiva,* na stat'ju, pomeshchennuju v No. 24 sego Zhurnala na 1822 god, pod zaglaviem: "Vzgljad na istoriju rossijskago gosudarstva G. Karamzina. (iz uchenykh gettingenskikh vedomostej, 22 avugusta 1822 goda.)" *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1823, No. 1, pp. 91-100.

N. D., "N. I. Grech, F. V. Bulgarin i A. Mickevich. Materialy dlja ikh biografi," *Russkaja Starina,* 1903, Vol. CXVI, pp. 333-351.

Nashchokin, Pavel, "O Bulgarine. Pis'mo P. V. Nashchokina k S. D. Poltorackomu," *Russkij Arkhiv,* 1884, Book 3, pp. 352-353.

Olin, "Kriticheskij vzgljad na *Bakhchisarajskij fontan, Literaturnye Listki,* 1824, No. 7, pp. 265-277.

"Perepiska Velikogo Knjazja Konstantina Pavlovicha c Grafom D. Kh. Benkendorfom," *Russkij Arkhiv,* 1884, Book 3, pp. 245-328.

Pereverzev, V. F., "Pushkin v bor'be s russkim plutovskim romanom," *U istokov russkogo realisticheskogo romana,* Moskva, 1965 (1933), pp. 63-113.

Piksanov, N., "Iz arkhiva F. V. Bulgarina," *Russkaja Starina,* 1903, Vol. CXVI, pp. 601-609.

————, "Iz arkhivnykh melochej. Stolknovenie Bulgarina s mater'ju Griboedova," *Russkaja starina,* 1905, Vol. CXXIV, pp. 706-718.

Pogodin, A. L., "Ivan Vyzhigin, roman Faddeja Bulgarina," *Zapiski Russkago Nauchnago Instituta v Belgrade,* 1933, Vypusk 9, pp. 141-181.

————, "Russkie pisateli-Poljaki," *Prace Polskiego Towarzystwa dla Badań Europy Wschodniej i Bliskiego Wschodu,* Kraków, 1933/34, Nr. IV, pp. 107-121.

Polovcov, A. A., "Bulgarin," *Russkij biograficheskij slovar',* S. Peterburg, 1908, III, 476-479.

Potockij, I. P., "Istoricheskaja kritika. Obshchie pravila iskustva delat' razyskanija," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1825, No. 18, pp. 91-105.

"Ryleev, I. Pis'ma Ryleeva k Bulgarinu," *Russkaja Starina,* 1871, Vol. III, pp. 65-71.

Senkovskij, Osip, "Vozvratnyj put' iz Egipta...," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 1, pp. 45-62.

Shmidt, O. Jr., chief ed., "Bulgarin," *Bol'shaja sovetskaja enciklopedija,* Moskva, 1927, VI, pp. 28-30.

Usov, P. S., "K biografii Bulgarina," *Istoricheskij Vestnik,* 1883, VIII, pp. 284-331.

Vjazemskij, P. A., "Zamechanija na 'Kratkoe obozrenie russkoj literatury'," *Novosti Literatury,* 1823, No. 19, as quoted in *Literturnye Listki,* 1823, No. 1, pp. 9-16.

Voejkov, A. F., "Dom sumasshedshikh," *Russkaja Starina,* 1874, Vol. IX, pp. 580-611.

"Vzgljad na *Istoriju rossijskago gosudarstva* g. Karamzina," *Severnyj Arkhiv,* 1822, No. 24, pp. 486-504.

NECROLOGIA

OSCAR HALECKI

Obiit Oscar Halecki. In senatu virorum, qui rebus gestis mundi cognoscendis et exponendis dant operam, inter primos merito censebatur.

Ex stirpe, quae ex Magno Ducatu Lithuaniae nobilem ducit originem, Oscar (vel potius Ansgarius) Halecki natus est Viennae in Austria a.1891, lauream doctoralem in Universitate Jagellonica Cracoviensi vix vigesimum vitae annum agens obtinuit. Mox in eadem Universitate, annis 1916-1918, ipse historiam docuit. Deinde ad Universitatem Varsaviensem translatus, per duo decennia, historiae Europae Orientalis professor fuit. Ab a.1939 exul, in Universitatibus Fordhamiensi Novi Eboraci (in Statibus Americae Foederatis), Montis Regalis in Canada, Columbiae (item in Statibus Foederatis Americae) aliisque docuit, gradum Professoris Emeriti obtinuit. In oppido White Plains (in Statu Massachussets), a patria longe remotus obiit die 17. Septembris a.1973. Ibidem cum amatissima uxore, quae paucis annis ipsum praecessit, in uno sepulchro requiescit.

Inter tot tantasque defuncti viri dotes primo loco nominandum puto eius in operando maximum ardorem. A prima iuventute linguis ediscendis sedulam operam navabat, non modo linguae latinae et polonicae, sed etiam gallicae, italicae, germanicae, anglicae optimam consecutus est cognitionem, et iis omnibus linguis non modo libere, sed etiam eleganter loquebatur, scribebat, docebat.

Opera et fontes, ad historiam Poloniae et totius fere Europae pertinentes, omnes perlustravit — et ferrea, ut aiunt, insignitus memoria — omnia in mente firmiter retinebat. Hoc vero prodigio infallibilis memoriae praeditus, textus propriorum operum in mente componebat, et res ita compositas quasi ex dictamine conscribebat, nil fere addendo vel corrigendo; manuscripta eius mirae sunt claritatis, a correctionibus fere ex toto sunt libera. Ecclesiam Catholicam et patriam suam Poloniam supra omnia diligebat, et hic amor in omnibus operibus suis clare perspici potest. Ecclesia et Polonia sunt scriptorum Oscaris Halecki praecipui vel quasi unici heroes. Facta et gesta earum omnia accuratissime notabat.

Econtra hominibus illis, per quos illa gesta et facta ad effectum deducta sunt, auctor minorem tribuit attentionem. Personae descriptae sunt quidem debita cum plenitudine, nil, quod de eis scitur, omissum est, attamen videntur nullos vitae motus habere et fere inanimatae, ut ita dicamus, apparent. Et ita est etiam de illis, qui ei maxime cari sunt, ut regina Hedvigis et rex Vladislaus III.

Omnia opera Oscaris Halecki — quacunque sint lingua composita — maxime curato stylo scripta sunt et optimo, clarissimo ordine mentem auctoris in mentem lectoris directe reponunt in eaque claram, nunquam confusam memoriam eorum, quae auctor dicere volebat, relinquunt.

Sed iam inde ab a.1966 Oscar Halecki, ad omnium vivum dolorem, lectiones et orationes coram publico facere noluit. In oppido remoto et prorsus alieno, ad sepulchrum uxoris piissimae, frequenter ad Sacramenta accedens, ad ultimam expectatam vitae pervenit horam.

V.M.

ALIQUA OPERA MAIORA OSCARI HALECKI

H.O. — Zgoda Sandomierska . . . 1570 r., (422 p.), Warszawa 1915.

H.O. — Przyłączenie Podlasia, Wołynia i Kijowszczyzny . . . 1569 r., (2 + 245 p.), Kraków 1915.

H.O. — Ostatnie lata Świdrygiełły . . . (6 + 315 p.), Kraków 1915.

H.O. — Dzieje Unii Jagiellońskiej (2 vol.), Kraków, 1919-20.

H.O. — Polska, jej dzieje i kultura, Warszawa 1927.

H.O. — Un empereur de Byzance à Rome . . . 1355-1375, (416 p.), Warszawa, 1930.

H.O. — The crusade of Varna, (96 p.), New York 1930.

H.O. — The limits and divisions of European History (XIII + 422 p), New York 1950.

H.O. (et socii) — Cambridge History of Poland (2 vol.), Cambridge, 1950.

H.O. — . . . Eugeniusz Pacelli . . . (5 + 271 p.), London 1951

H.O. — Borderlands of Western Civilization . . .(16 + 503 p.), New York, 1952.

H.O. — Pius XII . . . (8 + 394 p.), London 1954.

H.O. — A History of Poland, (14 + 359 p.), London 1955.

H.O. — From Florence to Brest, (445 p.), Roma, 1958.

H.O. — Historia Polski, (316 p.), London 1958.

H.O. — The Millennium of Europe, (27 + 442), Notre Dame (Ind., USA), 1963.

H.O. — Tysiąclecie Polski katolickiej (614 p.), Rzym 1966.

H.O. — Storia della Polonia (trad.) (410 p.), Roma 1966.

ELEMENTA AD FONTIUM EDITIONES (cont.)

Vol. VI — *Res Polonicae Iacobo I Angliae Regnante Conscriptae ex Archivis Publicis Londoniarum.* Ed. C. H. TALBOT, pp. XI+396, 281 doc. (A.D. 1603- 1629) 8 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron., glossarium verb. ang. ant. 1962.

Vol. VII — *Repertorium Rerum Polonicarum ex Archivo Orsini in Archivo Capitolino,* II pars. Coll. W. WYHOWSKA - DE ANDREIS, pp. XIV+250, 1205 doc. (A.D. 1641-1676) 11 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1962.

Vol. VIII — *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas,* I pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ, pp. X+214, 157 doc. (A.D. 1514-1576, 1720-1791) 7 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1963.

Vol. IX — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Regni Daniae,* I pars. Coll. L. KOCZY, pp. XII+184, 98 doc. (A.D. 1526-1572) 8 tab. Ind. nom. propr. 1964.

Vol. X — *Repertorium Rerum Polonicarum ex Archivo Orsini in Archivo Capitolino,* III pars. Coll. W. WYHOWSKA - DE ANDREIS, pp. XVI+343, 1399 doc. (A.D. 1568-1676) 12 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1964.

Vol. XI — *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas,* II pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ, pp. VIII+ 287, 214 doc. (A.D. 1567-1578) 7 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1964.

Vol. XII — *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas,* III pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ, pp. V+291, 163 doc. (A.D. 1571-1576), 5 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron., 1964.

Vol. XIII — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Musei Britannici,* I pars. Ed. C. H. TALBOT, pp. XVI+175 (A.D. 1598), 2 tab. Ind. nom. propr. 1965.

Vol. XIV — *Collectanea ex rebus Polonicis Archivi Orsini in Archivo Capitolino Romae,* I pars. Ed. W. WYHOWSKA - DE ANDREIS, pp. VI+234, 177 doc. (A.D. 1575-1668), 4 tab. Ind. nom. propr. 1965.

Vol. XV — *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas, IV* pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ, pp. VI+340, 211 doc. (A.D. 1576-1586), 5 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1966.

Vol. XVI — *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas,* V pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ, pp. VII+336, 227 doc. (A.D. 1587-1589), 5 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1966.

Vol. XVII — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Musei Britannici,* II pars. Ed. C. H. TALBOT, pp. VII+311, 169 doc. (A.D. 1411-1616), 2 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1967.

Vol. XVIII — *Collectanea ex rebus Polonicis Archivi Orsini in Archivo Capitolino,* II pars. Ed. W. WYHOWSKA DE ANDREIS, pp. VIII+256, 140 doc. (A.D. 1669-1676), 4 tab. Ind. nom. propr. 1968.

Vol. XIX — *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas,* VI pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ, pp. VIII+429, 121 doc. (A.D. 1556-1620), 4 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1968.

Vol. XX — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Regni Daniae,* II pars. Ed. C. LANCKOROŃSKA et G. STEEN JENSEN, 266 doc. (A.D. 1577-1696) 4 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. 1969.

Vol. XXI — *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Generali Hispaniae in Simancas,* VII pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ, 187 doc. (A.D 1491-1696) 2 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. pp. VIII+262, 1970.

Vol. XXII — *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Parmensi,* I pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ et W. WYHOWSKA DE ANDREIS, doc. 183 (A.D. 1535-1588) pp. VIII+210, 2 tab. 1970.

Vol. XXIII — A. *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Parmensi* II pars. Doc. NN. 184-319 (A.D. 1598-1772) Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. B. *Documenta Polonica ex Archivo Capitulari in Brisighella.* 63 doc. (A.D. 1578-1588) Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ et W. WYHOWSKA DE ANDREIS p. 297, 2 tab. 1970.

Vol. XXIV — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Regni Daniae* III pars. Ed. C. LANCKOROŃSKA et G. STEEN JENSEN, 152 doc. (A.D. 1419-1564) pp. VIII+301, 4 tab. 1971.

Vol. XXV — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Regni Daniae* IV pars. Ed. C. LANCKOROŃSKA et G. STEEN JENSEN 78 doc. (A.D. 1563-1572) 6 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. pp. VIII+248, 1971.

Vol. XXVI — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Mediceo Florentino* I pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ et WANDA WYHOWSKA DE ANDREIS, 145 doc. (A.D. 1559-1589) 4 tab., pp. VIII+320, 1972.

Vol. XXVII — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Mediceo Florentino* II pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ et WANDA WYHOWSKA DE ANDREIS, 262 doc. (A.D. 1589-1612), pp. VIII+377, 1972.

Vol. XXVIII — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Mediceo Florentino* III pars. Ed. V. MEYSZTOWICZ et WANDA WYHOWSKA DE ANDREIS, 205 doc. (A.D. 1613-1626), 4 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron., pp. VIII+376, 1972.

Vol. XXIX — *Res Polonicae ex Archivo Regni Daniae* V pars. Ed. C. LANCKOROŃSKA et G. STEEN JENSEN, 139 doc. (A.D. 1578-1630), 5 tab. Ind. nom. propr., ind. chron. pp. VIII+376, 1972.

Vol. XXX — *Documenta ex Archivo Regiomontano ad Poloniam spectantia,* I pars. Ed. C. LANCKOROŃSKA, 447 doc. (A.D. 1525-1548), 9 tab. Elench. epistolarum, elench. sigillorum, ind. nom. propr., pp. XII+259, 1973.

Printed and made in Great Britain by Caldra House Ltd.,
23 Coleridge Street, Hove, Sussex, BN3 5AB, England.