



VICTORIAN
PERIODICALS
REVIEW

Unexpected Affinities: Slavic Literature in the "The Illustrated Polytechnic Review"

Author(s): Roman Koropeckyj

Source: *Victorian Periodicals Review*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), pp. 213-220

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press on behalf of the Research Society for Victorian Periodicals

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20082714>

Accessed: 06-09-2016 21:33 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



The Johns Hopkins University Press, Research Society for Victorian Periodicals are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Victorian Periodicals Review*

Unexpected Affinities: Slavic Literature in the *The Illustrated Polytechnic Review*

Roman Koropecy

In memory of Wiktor Weintraub

Although the Polish uprising of 1830 and its consequences certainly received a great deal of attention in the British press,¹ knowledge of Polish literature, either directly through translations or indirectly through critical appraisals, remained limited at best.² In contrast to the Continent, where literary tastes as much as political reflexes were sympathetic to both the thematic and formal discourse of Polish romanticism (the most prominent exponents of which had, after all, found refuge in France) the sensibilities of the British public were somewhat less receptive. This is no less true of Adam Mickiewicz (1798–1855), unquestionably the greatest Polish poet of the age, whose peculiarly Slavic idiom of romanticism, at once intensely nationalistic and infused with mysticism, found little resonance in Britain.³ By the same token, the appointment of Mickiewicz as the first professor of Slavic literature at the College de France and his increasingly controversial four-year tenure⁴ went largely unremarked by the British press. Aside from perfunctory notices in *The Athenaeum* (31 October 1840, 869) and *The Foreign Quarterly* (27 [1841], 223), the first substantial piece about the lectures — a rather dry paraphrase of the course’s first nine lectures dealing with the “prehistory” of the Slavs — appeared anonymously in the October 1844 issue of *The British and Foreign Review* (17, 437–59), while the first heretofore noted translation of any portion of the course (lectures seven through eleven of year three) was included in the second volume of Charles Frederick Henningsen’s *Eastern Europe and the Emperor Nicholas* (1846).⁵

It comes, then, as a something of a surprise to encounter in the 18 March 1843 issue of the London journal *The Illustrated Polytechnic Review and Weekly Record of Science, the Fine Arts, and Literature* (vol. 1, no. 11)⁶ an anonymous review of the 1842 Polish-

language Paris edition of Adam Mickiewicz’s “Two years’ Course of Slavonic Literature, delivered in the College de France.”⁷ Actually, aside from an introductory paragraph and a closing sentence, the lengthy (six-column, pp. 161–63) “review” is in part a paraphrase and in part a translation of an extensive fragment of lecture 28 (7 June 1842) in which the Polish poet outlines the career of his erstwhile friend, the Russian poet Alexander Pushkin, and provides an account (in part based on his own experiences) of the events leading up to the failed 1825 Decembrist uprising against Alexander I.⁸ This is in fact the first English translation of any portion of Mickiewicz’s four-year (1840–44) course at the college.⁹

The approach of the review in the *IPR* is consistent with the general practice of the period, particularly in dealing with books in a foreign language: to closely paraphrase and/or translate extensive fragments from the work (or, for that matter, from foreign reviews), often without even demarcating the words of the reviewer from those of the reviewed.¹⁰ In the present instance the reviewer was sufficiently forthright to declare that the “present purpose . . . is to extract from [the book being reviewed] a sketch of the genius and character of Puschkin. . . .” But if the anonymity of the reviewer is also in keeping with standard practice, it is the context of the review that is somewhat unexpected.

Despite the format changes that the *IPR* underwent in the course of its four-year existence (*The Illustrated Polytechnic Review* [1843–44; editor[s] not identified]; *The Polytechnic Review and Magazine* [1844–45; edited by George G. Sigmond and Thomas Stone], after merging with Sonté’s *London Polytechnic Magazine and Journal*; finally, *The Oxford and Cambridge Review* [1845–47; editor[s] not identified]), its mandate remained unchanged: to provide an accessible melange of subjects ranging from the natural and applied sciences to literature and the fine arts, literally *polytechnos*.¹¹ In the editorial statement to the introductory issue, the periodical is characterized as being

devoted to *Science, the Fine Arts and Literature*: these will be treated in our pages, not as they have been too often considered, as isolated and separated from each other, as having their peculiar interests and several spheres, but as united influences, working together for the civilization and improvement of man. (1:2)

It is, then, amidst a potpourri of articles on such topics as church architecture and the Entomological Society, galvanography and Tahiti, Ghiberti and the cosmorama, that one encounters the translation of Adam Mickiewicz's lecture on Alexander Pushkin.

The translation is, as was noted earlier, prefaced by a short introduction:

[The volume] is a collection of Polish lectures, delivered by the author, extempore, at Paris, and printed from short-hand notes taken at the time. It is in every respect a remarkable book, though printed in a very hasty manner, and has excited great interest among the Slavonic literary world: at some future time we hope to lay before our reader a review of its contents. Our present purpose, however, is to extract from it a sketch of the genius and character of Pushkin, the great Russian poet, and at the same time to give a short account of the conspiracy against the Emperor Alexander, in which Pushkin was implicated, and which he may almost be said to have called forth by his writing. (1:161)

Clearly the reviewer's interests here are focused not so much on the significance of Mickiewicz's appointment to the chair at the College de France or on the appearance of the volume of lectures as they are on the figure of Pushkin and the anti-tsarist conspirators of 1825. No less telling in this regard are the reviewer's concluding remarks to the translation: "So far Mickiewicz. His view of Puschkin's genius and calling is striking and novel; but it may be questioned whether his passionate admiration for his friend, and above all his anti-Imperial tendencies, have not induced him to take too low a view of the modern Russian school; at some other time we may return to this subject, for the sake of giving another view of the state of Russian literature." (1:163) This "other view" (like the "review of the volume's contents") never appeared. It would seem, nonetheless, that the *IPR*'s

reviewer was sufficiently knowledgeable about the state of Russian Literature at the time to assess critically Mickiewicz's idiosyncratic presentation of Pushkin's career as well as of the Russian literary process.¹² The reviewer even takes the liberty to interrupt his translation of the lecture in order to intimate that a point taken by Mickiewicz is not altogether accurate: "The first poem published by [Pushkin] (so says Mickiewicz) breathed a gloomy Jacobinism, a bitter hatred against all existing things, against all Russia." (1:61)¹³ Taken together — but particularly the less than sympathetic remark about Mickiewicz's "anti-Imperial tendencies" — the tone and the thematic interests of the *IPR* review all but exclude the possibility that its anonymous author was a Polish sympathizer, much less a Pole.

It is important to note here that in the early 1840s the British public's acquaintance with Russian literature and its most prominent representative was as tenuous as its acquaintance with Polish. At the time of his death in 1837 Pushkin had merited a handful of translations and reviews, a mention or two in travelogues, and a couple of obituaries.¹⁴ And when writing of Pushkin, English authors almost always used either the then current English spelling — Pushkin or Poushkin — or the French — Pouchkine. The appearance, then, of the German form of the poet's name — Puschkin — in the *IPR* review could conceivably signal a German connection, that is, a cultural sphere in which the reputation of both Pushkin and Mickiewicz was already well established by the 1830s.¹⁵

And indeed, in the preceding issue (4 March 1843) of the *IPR*, in the section entitled "*Varieties*," the editors included the following note:

The first number of Jordan's *Jahrbücher für Slavische Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft* (Annals of Slavonian Literature, Art, and Science) has been published. The work professes to be an organ of mediation between the Germans and the Slavonians. The number contains interesting communications concerning the leader of Illyrian literature, the Croat Ljudewit Gaj, on the Polish historian Lukaszewicz and an article of Mickiewicz on Puschkin (of which we hope to

give an account, from another work, next week).
(1, 46)

But rather than delivering on this hope, the editors of the *IPR* chose to adhere to the standard practice of the period: it turns out that the reviewer's paraphrase of the first part of Mickiewicz's lecture on Pushkin¹⁶ is a word for word translation of a German paraphrase and translation of the same portions of Mickiewicz's lecture that appeared (anonymously) in the inaugural issue of *Jahrbücher* (I. Jahrgang, 1. Heft [1843]).¹⁷ Moreover, the German translation also concludes with a few words from the translator; although in certain particulars somewhat different from the conclusion in the *IPR*, the latter is in fact a paraphrase (and in part even a translation) of the former.¹⁸ Finally, even the above-mentioned critically sceptical aside on the part of the *IPR*'s translator has its direct equivalent in the *Jahrbücher*'s translation.¹⁹ In view of the differences in the two conclusions as well as the appearance in the *IPR* of an introduction apparently independent of *Jahrbücher*, it is useful to examine at least briefly the immediate context of the German translation, particularly with regard to the clues it provides for identifying the authorship and provenance of the *IPR* review.

Although the *IPR* never made good on its hope "of giving another view of the state of Russian literature," the German periodical did provide a corrective to Mickiewicz's views on the subject by directly juxtaposing them with the article "*Gegenwärtige Richtung der russischen Literatur*" (1, 52–61), an abstract (strictly speaking, a paraphrase) of an 1842 survey by S. P. Shevyrev in which the conservative Russian critic, in contrast to the Polish professor at the Collège de France, stresses the achievements of Pushkin's contemporaries and successors.²⁰ The same issue also contains an enthusiastic but measured review of Mickiewicz's *Two Years' Course*, which, together with Shevyrev's article, may have inspired the introductory paragraph to the translation in the *IPR*. Commenting on the improvisatory nature of Mickiewicz's lectures, the difficulties of publishing stenographs of such lectures, and the resulting haste and sloppiness of the publication, the review in *Jahrbücher* nonetheless remarks that the work "will circulate throughout the entire Slavic world" and that it is "of immense importance for the present and carries great weight for the future of the Slavic world." (1, 71)²¹

Taken together, the translation of Mickiewicz's lecture on Pushkin, the accompanying abstract of Shevyrev's article on Russian literature, and the review of the *Two Years' Course* reflect as much the climate and direction of Slavistics in the German cultural sphere of the period²² as they do the temperament of the founder and initial editor of *Jahrbücher*, Jan Petr Jordan.²³ A leading figure of the Serbian national revival, Jordan was also a rather typical Panslavist of the day (the motto of his journal was "Understanding! Reconciliation! Accord!" [*Verständigung! Versöhnung! Vereinigung!*]) whose numerous contacts with leading Slavic intellectuals helped make *Jahrbücher* one of the more influential periodicals of the nineteenth-century Slavic revival.

The translation of Mickiewicz's lecture as well as the review of the *Two Years' Course* appeared in *Jahrbücher* anonymously, although both may have come from the pen of the journal's editor.²⁴ More to the point, however, is the abstract of Shevyrev's article, signed with the initials "J.P." and thus almost certainly the work of the renowned Czech physiologist Jan Evangelista Purkyne, in 1843 a professor at the University of Breslau (Wrocław).²⁵ Recognized internationally for his achievements in physiology, biology, and microscopics, Purkyne was at the same time a prominent figure in the Panslavist movement and a regular contributor to various Slavic periodicals in the 1830s and 1840s.²⁶ And it was to Purkyne that Jordan turned for advice on the projected contents of the first issue of *Jahrbücher*, particularly with regards to things Polish.²⁷ Considering Purkyne's articles, correspondence, and interests from this period, one would deem it more than likely, then, that the Czech scientist was also instrumental in the appearance of the translation of Mickiewicz's lecture on Pushkin in *Jahrbücher*: either as the translator or as someone who may have suggested to Jordan such a relevant — and potentially controversial — piece for the first issue of a new periodical. By the same token, it is the figure of Purkyne that, by all appearances, constitutes the link between the German translation of Mickiewicz's lecture and its retransmission in the *IPR*.

Who was the founder and editor of the short-lived *IPR*? The publisher, we know, was Henry Renshaw, active primarily in the medical publishing business, but also the publisher, for example, of *Hood's Maga-*

zine.²⁸ Unfortunately, none of the issues of *IPR* indicates the identity of the editor(s). However, from information provided in the inaugural editorial of the *IPR*'s successor, *The Polytechnic Review and Magazine*, there can be little doubt that the anonymous editor of the *IPR* was Sigmond.²⁹ And although information on Sigmond is sparse, what there is of it is sufficient to establish with a high degree of probability not only his connection with the *IPR*, but also his role in publishing the review and translation of Mickiewicz's lecture on Pushkin in the ephemeral London periodical.

Information on Sigmond's life and literary activity may be gleaned from material scattered on the title pages of his works as well as from some of the works themselves.³⁰ Born in 1794, Sigmond studied at the medical faculty of Edinburgh University, completing his studies there in 1814 with the publication of his *dissertatio inauguralis, De aquis thermalibus apud Bathonias complectens*. In 1825 he traveled for research purposes to Scandinavia and delivered a lecture in Latin on the medical theories of Servetus before the Medical Society of Stockholm.³¹ Forced to return prematurely to Britain by "the untimely death of a parent,"³² Sigmond set off again for the Continent sometime before 1839, this time visiting Germany, Bohemia, and Russia (not necessarily in this order);³³ the last, it should be noted, made a positive impression on him.³⁴ At various times he held positions as lecturer at Jesus College, Cambridge, and Sydenham College; was the president of the Royal Physical Society of Edinburgh; was professor of *Materia Medica* to the Royal Medico-Botanical Society in London and the curator of its herbarium. Judging by his publications, Sigmond seems to have had a wide range of interests, although focused primarily on herbal medicine. Much of his writing in this area was of a popular nature, replete with curious or exotic facts and entertaining anecdotes, but always accessible and practical. As the (probable) editor of the *IPR*, Sigmond published one of the weekly's very few signed articles — "*Observations of Monomania*" (1, 189) — as well as a number of anonymous articles which clearly reflected his interests — the Ceylon moss, the Medico-Botanical Society, digestion, medicinal plants, etc. It appears that after 1844 Sigmond published little, and in 1845 he ceased work on *The Polytechnic Review and Magazine*, the *IPR*'s third incarnation, transferring editorial

duties to the anonymous editors of *The Oxford and Cambridge Review*.³⁵ Unfortunately, I have been unable to verify the date of Sigmond's death.³⁶

Sigmond's mention of his travels to Germany, Bohemia, and Russia does not, of course, provide any basis for assuming that it was through him that the translation of Mickiewicz's lecture on Pushkin found its way from *Jahrbücher* to the pages of the *IPR*. Nonetheless, there exists additional evidence for such an assumption.

In the acknowledgements included in the foreword to the English edition of his Stockholm lecture, Sigmond singles out the Russian ambassador to Sweden, "Count Suchtelen." "In his magnificent library," Sigmond writes of Count Petr Kornilovich Suchtelen,

my mornings flew with a rapidity too great for the shortness of life. The treasures he has collected are well known to every lover of books: all that is curious, all that is splendid or useful, adorn this celebrated collection; whilst the mild, the gentle, the excellent possessor enjoys no greater treat than that of welcoming the lover of literature, and pointing out to him with the greatest accuracy, erudition, and taste, all that is worthy attention. From his long experience to gather instruction and knowledge, is a delight which, to have enjoyed, forms an era in existence.³⁷

A man who, according to the words of one of his contemporaries, was knowledgeable about "all the mathematical sciences, all areas of literature, philosophy, theology"³⁸ would most likely not have passed up an opportunity to inform his British guest about recent developments in Russian literature and particularly about its most outstanding representative, Pushkin. In any case Sigmond's subsequent trip to Russia testifies to his curiosity about "that highly interesting country"³⁹ and certainly deepened his awareness of Russian culture.

It is unclear exactly when Sigmond may have been in Central Europe (but before 1839), and he provides few details about his travels. Like his trip to Scandinavia, the purpose of his visit(s) to Central Europe was no doubt primarily scholarly — whether, as we know

from his publications, to gather specimens and observe their use or to pay visits to specialists in his discipline. Was, then, Jan Evangelista Purkyně, from 1823 a professor of physiology at the University of Breslau and already an internationally renowned scientist, one of the scholars whom the British medico-botanist may have visited during his travels in Germany and Bohemia? Unfortunately, neither Sigmund's own works nor studies devoted to Purkyně have documented any direct traces of contact between the two.⁴⁰ Nonetheless, there is enough circumstantial evidence to make such contact at least possible and, consequently, Purkyně's role in providing the editors of the *IPR* with the first issue of *Jahrbücher* probable.

Purkyně's achievements in physiology were of sufficient significance to have him inducted in 1829 into the prestigious Royal Society of London, for whose journal he would occasionally contribute.⁴¹ Indeed, throughout his life Purkyně maintained extensive contacts with British (particularly Scots) scientists and doctors, who would often turn to him for letters of recommendation.⁴² In 1851, for example, he translated into German a study on the microscopic structure of muscles by one Martin Barry — a colleague of his for a time at the University of Breslau — as a way of strengthening this Edinburgh doctor's applications for positions in Germany and Bohemia.⁴³ In 1841 Purkyně became an honorary member of the British Microscopic Society, about which, interestingly enough, so much is written in the *IPR* (1:157, 186, 257; 2:14, 237). Considering, then, these rather extensive contacts between the Czech physiologist and the British medico-scientific community, a visit to Purkyně in the late 1820s or 1830s from a graduate of the Edinburgh medical faculty and himself a professor of medicine and practitioner of physics traveling in Central Europe is quite probable. Moreover, the two had a mutual acquaintance in the person of the famous Swedish anatomist Anders Adolf Retzius, whom Sigmund includes among the scholars he contacted in Sweden⁴⁴ and who at least from the early 1830s was quite close to Purkyně and his wife.⁴⁵

If, indeed, such were the unexpected personal affinities that resulted in the *IPR*'s publication of an English translation of Mickiewicz's lecture on Pushkin, what needs to be examined, however briefly, is the political and cultural climate that could have induced the editor

of the polytechnic journal to share that translation with his readers.

One of the consequences of the periodic international crises that erupted in the decades after the Congress of Vienna was the British public's surge of interest in things Russian⁴⁶ and, after 1830–31, also of things Polish. In this connection, then, it remains to be asked, why, in view of the variety and scope of material on Russia and Poland that appeared in the first issue of *Jahrbücher*, it was Mickiewicz's lecture on Pushkin that the editor of the *IPR* chose to print in his weekly. As was noted earlier, Mickiewicz's name was not a household word in the British press, but then neither was it completely unfamiliar, at least for the readers of such journals as *The Foreign Quarterly*, *The British and Foreign Review*, and *The Athenaeum*, which precisely in the late 1830s and early 1840s published several articles about the Polish poet and patriot.⁴⁷ However, in contributing to this minifad, the editor of the *IPR* chose for his journal a piece not so much about Mickiewicz himself nor even about the newly published *Two Years' Course*, but rather, as the reviewer himself makes clear, one in which the figure of the Polish poet functions primarily as a pretext — a topical one, to be sure — for providing British readers with information on Russia's greatest poet and, more pointedly, about Russia's internal affairs: "This . . . collection of Polish lectures . . . is in every respect a remarkable book . . . and has excited great interest among the Slavonic literary world. . . . Our present purpose, however, is to extract from it a sketch of the genius and character of Puschkin, the great Russian poet, and at the same time to give a short account of the conspiracy against the Emperor Alexander." And no less significant in this respect is the objection in the review's closing sentence to Mickiewicz's "too low a view of the modern Russian School," ostensibly a consequence — and this independently of the German original — of "his anti-imperial tendencies." While what we may be seeing here is, in fact, an uninformed — and thus slightly exaggerated — reflection of the Pan Slavist ideology of *Jahrbücher*,⁴⁸ the reviewer's attempt to highlight the figure of Pushkin at Mickiewicz's expense could at the same time be viewed as an articulation — justified, to a certain degree, by the Russian-British compromise of 1840 — of a new, more sympathetic attitude towards Russia after years of anti-Russian sentiment,⁴⁹ a sentiment that

in the 1830s and 1840s was fueled in large part by Polish émigrés and their liberal and radical British sympathizers for whose propaganda the writings of “the head and prince . . . of patriotic bards”⁵⁰ had become an important component.⁵¹

Aside from the distinction of being the first to introduce Mickiewicz’s Parisian lectures to British readers, the *IPR*’s review of the *Two Years’ Course*, with its translation of the lecture on Pushkin, is indicative of the British public’s ambivalence towards Russia in the early 1840s, prior to Nicholas I’s visit to England in June 1844, but at the same time on the doorstep of the decade that would culminate in the tragic events of 1853–56. The *IPR*’s equivocal projection of Poland’s and Russia’s most renowned poets comes to serve, then, as an incidental emblem of the tug between liberal sentiment and great-power realpolitik marking Victorian Britain’s relationship towards the two Slavic nations.

— Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute—UCLA

Notes

¹On British reactions to the events, see J. H. Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain. A Study of the Interaction of Policy and Opinion* (Cambridge, MA, 1950), 107ff.; C. Webster, *The Foreign Policy of Palmerston, 1830–1841. Britain, the Liberal Movement and the Eastern Question*, vol. 1 (London, 1951), esp. pp. 181–99; as well as M. Handelsman, *Anglia-Polska 1814–1864* (Warsaw and Lviv, 1917); and L. Zielinske, *Emigracja polska w Anglii w latach 1831–1846* (Gdansk, 1964).

²On the reception of Polish Literature in Britain after the 1830 uprising, see E. M. Curran, “The Foreign Quarterly Review on Russian and Polish Literature,” *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 40 (1961–62): 217–19; M. M. Coleman, *Polish Literature in English Translation* (Cheshire, CT, 1963); H. Geber, “Angielsko-polskie związki literackie,” in *Literatura polska. Przewodnik encyklopedyczny*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1984), 19–20; and W. Krajeska, “Angielsko-polskie związki literackie,” in *Słownik literatury polskiej XIX wieku*, ed. J. Bachorz and A. Kowalczykowska (Wrocław, Warsaw, and Cracow, 1991), 25–26.

³On the British reception of Mickiewicz in the first half of the nineteenth century, see M. M. Coleman, *Adam Mickiewicz in English* (Cambridge Springs, PA, 1954), 1–18; and W. J. Ros, “Mickiewicz and Britain,” in *Adam Mickiewicz in World Literature. A Symposium*, ed. W. Lednicki (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956), 295–305.

⁴On Mickiewicz’s lectures, see W. Weintraub, *Literature as Prophecy. Scholarship and Martinist Poetics in Mickiewicz’s Parisian Lectures* (S-Gravenhage, 1959). In a preliminary list of those who attended the

poet’s lectures at various times during their duration the names of only two Britons appear: D. Urquhart, who was notorious for his anti-Russian sentiments and, consequently, pro-Polish sympathies; and E. G. Wakefield, colonial statesman and author of *The Art of Colonization* (1833). See Z. Makowiecka, *Kronika życia i twórczości Mickiewicza październik 1840–maj 1844* (Warsaw, 1968), 618–19.

⁵C. F. Henningsen, *Eastern Europe and the Emperor Nicholas* (London, 1846), 2, 71–113. Henningsen provides an overview of Mickiewicz’s life and works, including translations of some of his poetry, as well as information on Russian literature that in places obviously draws on Mickiewicz’s lectures (see, for instance, 2, 127).

⁶Henceforth *IPR*, with volume and page number given in the text.

⁷Kurs drugoletni (1841–1842) literatury sławianskiej wykładanej w Kollegium Francuzkiem przez Adama Mickiewicza (Paris, 1842). All subsequent references to the Polish translation of the lectures (originally delivered in French) are to this edition. Cf. A. Mickiewicz, *Les Slaves. Cours professé au Collège de France...et publié d’après les notes stenographées*, vols. 1–3 (Paris, 1849).

⁸Mickiewicz, *Kurs drugoletni*, 213–25; cf. id., *Les Slaves*, 3:277–96. On the Pushkin-Mickiewicz relationship, see J. Krzyżanowski, “Mickiewicz and Pushkin,” *The Slavonic Review*, 6 (1927–28): 635–45; and W. Lednicki, “Mickiewicz’s Stay in Russia and His Friendship with Pushkin,” in *Adam Mickiewicz in World Literature*, 13–104.

⁹To this day only fragments of Mickiewicz’s lectures have been translated into English. See the dated but in this respect largely still relevant list of translations in Coleman, *Adam Mickiewicz in English*, 60. There is no evidence that Mickiewicz was aware of the review and translation in *IPR*.

¹⁰See E. M. Curran, “Reviews of Foreign Literature: Some Special Problems,” *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, 20 (1973), 1–7.

¹¹For a discussion of similar periodicals, see S. Sheets-Pyensen, “Popular Science Periodicals in Paris and London: the Emergence of a Low Scientific Culture, 1820–1875,” *Annals of Science*, 42 (1985), 549–72. Although the author quotes *The London Polytechnic Magazine* (p.553), the *IPR* does not appear in her list of London popular science periodicals (pp. 565–69).

¹²About Mickiewicz’s treatment of the two, see Lednicki, “Mickiewicz’s Stay in Russia,” 82–88; and Weintraub, *Literature and Prophecy*, 52–60.

¹³Cf. Mickiewicz, *Kurs drugoletni*, 217. Cf. A different reading of this passage in *Les Slaves*, 3:284: “La première strophe que lança Pouchkine, strophe empreinte d’un sombre jacobinisme et d’une haine profonde contre tout ce qui existait, parcourut toute la Russie.”

¹⁴On the British reception of Russian literature and Pushkin in the first half of the nineteenth century, see S. H. Cross, “Pouchkine et Angleterre,” *Revue de littérature comparée*, 17 (1937), 161–71; *Pushkin in English. A List of Works by and about Pushkin*, ed. A. Yarmolinsky (New York, 1937); G. Phelps, “The Early Phases of British Interest in Russian Literature,” *Slavonic and East European Review*, 36 (1957–58),

418–30; and Curran, "The Foreign Quarterly Review," 206–17; cf. P. Ie. Shchegolev, *Duel' i smert' Pushkina*, 3d ed. (Leningrad, 1928), 410–17.

¹⁵In this connection, see A. Luther, "Puskin in Deutschland," *Revue de littérature comparée*, 17 (1937), 182–90; H. Raab, *Die Lyrik Puskins in Deutschland (1820–1870)* (Berlin, 1964), 17–92; H. Schroeder, "Mickiewicz in Germany," in *Mickiewicz in World Literature*, 159–93; M. Szyrocki, "Zur Mickiewicz-Rezeption in Deutschland (1828–1855)," in *Wissenschaftliche Konferenz zum Thema Polonische Motive in der deutschsprachigen Literatur (1750–1850)*, ed. G. Koziellek, Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 431 (Warsaw and Wrocław, 1978), 113–23; and P. Roguski, *Tulacz polski nad Renem. Literatura polska w Niemczech w latach 1831–45* (Warsaw, 1981), 89–133. Cf. Curran, "The Foreign Quarterly Review," 219.

¹⁶The war against Napoleon, which brought whole masses of the Russian armies into the farthest west of Europe, and threw the most intelligent and excitable part of the Russian nation into the closest connection with the Germans, French, and English, left behind it in the minds of those resolute defenders of their fatherland, a crowd of ideas of freedom, but half digested, and often ill understood, which could not fail, when the soldiery returned home, to exert a destructive influence on all social relations. The Emperor himself seemed inclined to aid the progress of freer ideas; [a more or less accurate translation of the lecture begins at this point] for he dismissed the religious enthusiasts who had surrounded him at Vienna, gave an extended amnesty to Lithuania," etc. (1, 61)

¹⁷"Der Krieg gegen Napoleon, welcher ganze Massen russischer Heere bis in den fernsten Westen Europa's führte und den intelligentesten und bewegtesten Theil der russischen Nation mit de Deutschen, Franzosen und Engländern in die genaueste Berührung brachte, hinterleiss in den Gemüthern der entschlossenen Vaterlandsvertheidiger eine Masse von halbverdauten und oft übelverstandenen Freiheitsideen, welche nach ihrer Rückkehr auch in der Heimath ihren zersetzenden Einfluss auf alle gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse nicht verläugnen konnten," etc. "Puschkin von Mickiewicz," *Jahrbücher für slawische Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft* 1 (1843), 45. All references to *Jahrbücher* are from the reprint edition (Leipzig, 1974) and are noted in the text.

¹⁸"So weit Mickiewicz; seine Auffassung Puschkin's ist eigentümlich und neu; und wenn die Höhe, auf welche er ihn stellt, ihn verleitete, mit seinem Tode der Tod der russischen Literatur unzertrennlich zu verknüpfen: so zeigt das, wie hoch er seinen Freund zu schätzen weiss, wird aber schwerlich den Beifall der russischen Literaten und Literar-Historiker finden. Man vergleiche damit den folgenden Artikel." (1:51)

¹⁹"Das erste von diesem Dichter herausgegebene Gedicht (so heisst es im zweiten Bande von Mickiewicz's *Vorlesungen über slaw. Literatur...*) athemte finsternen Jacobinismus," etc. (1:46)

²⁰See S. P. Shevryev, "Vzgliad na sovremennuiu russkuiu literaturu," *Moskovitianin*, 1842, pt. 2, no. 3, 153–91. In its description of the inaugural issue of *Jahrbücher* the IPR notes: "A paper of Professor Schewirjew, of Moscow, known by a history of poetry, treats of the present bias of Russian literature. The chief object of the article is to show that, without adhering to strict nationality, Russian literature can never attain to excellence. To achieve this, he recommends the gradual formation of a national idiom, to be composed of the language of the high classes of society, the conversation language of

the people, the language of the ancient writing, and the dialect common to Slavonians. The critical notices of Russian writers are ably done: those on Karamzin, whom he places at the head of the old school, and of Gogol, the chief of the new school, are admirable." (1:146)

²¹In this connection it is worth noting that, according to the editors of *Jahrbücher*, as a result of the Mickiewicziana published in the inaugural issue of the periodical, "die Jahrbücher in Russland verboten wurden." (3 [1845], 119)

²²On the development of Slavic studies in German speaking areas, see S. Hafner, "Geschichte der österreichischen Slawistik"; H. Schaller, "Geschichte der Slawistik in Deutschland und in der Bundesrepublik einschließlich Berlin (West)"; and E. Eichler *et al.*, "Die Entwicklung der Slawistik in Deutschland bis 1945 und in der deutschen Demokratischen Republik," all in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Slawistik in nichtslawischen Ländern*, ed. J. Hamm and G. Wytrzens, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophische-Historische Klasse, Schriften der Balkankommission Linguistische, 30 (Vienna, 1985), 11–244. In fact the first book edition of the two years course subsequent to the Polish was published in German: *Vorlesungen über slawische Literatur und Zustände. Gehalten im Collège de France in den Jahren von 1840–1842 von Adam Mickiewicz*, 2 vols, (Leipzig, 1843).

²³About Jordan, see H. Šleca, "Dr. Jan Pětr Jordan, jeho žiwjenje a skutkowanje. Přinošk k stawiznam serbskeho narodneho wozrodženja tez wozrodzenja Slowjanstwa a slowjanskeje wzajmnosce," *Časopis Mačicy Serbskeje*, 77 (1924), 3–91; 78 (1925), 3–63; M. Schmidt, *Dr. Jan Pětr Jordan. Jeho žiwjenje a skutkowanje wot lěta 1848* (Bautzen, 1962); and H. Rösel, "Johann Peter Jordan und siene Tätigkeit als Slavist in Leipzig," *die Welt der Slaven*, 5 (1960), 90–105.

²⁴The translation is tentatively ascribed to Jordan by M. Alekseev, "Belinskii i slavianskii literator Ia.-P. Jordan," in V.G. Belinskii, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 56, 2 (Moscow, 1950), 467; and Makowiecka, *Kronika žycia i twórczości Mickiewicza*, 393. At one point in the review of Mickiewicz's lectures the anonymous reviewer in fact refers his/her readers to the translation of the Pushkin lecture: "Vrgl. den von uns aus dem Kursus mitgetheilten Abschnitt" (1, 70).

²⁵About Purkyně in English, see H. J. John, *Jan Evangelista Purkyně* (Philadelphia, 1959). Among the many studies in Czech, the most comprehensive is V. Žaček, *Jan Evangelista Purkyně* (Prague, 1987).

²⁶See M. Kudelka, "Slavistické práce Jana Ev. Purkyně," in J. E. Purkyně, *Opera omnia*, 10 (Prague, 1968), 11–66.

²⁷For the correspondence of Jordan with Purkyně on this topic, see J. Páta, *Jan ev. Purkyně a Lužičti Srbové* (Prague, 1937), esp. pp. 25–26; as well as Šleca, "Dr. Jan Petr Jorda," 78 (1925): 15–16; and Žaček, *Purkyně*, 158.

²⁸See "Renshaw, Henry," *Modern English Biography*, 3, 115.

²⁹"Having with our last number completed a volume, we have determined to commence a New Series. . . . In order to render our Journal more perfect the *Polytechnic Review* has availed itself of the power of uniting with a Periodical which had acquired considerable

reputation, and extensive circulation, under the name of *London Polytechnic Magazine*." Thomas Stone, the editor of the latter and, until 1845, coeditor of *The Polytechnic Review and Magazine*, was a member of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh and the author of works on phrenology and mesmerism. See "Stone, Thomas," *Allibone's* (1870), s.v.

³⁰Like Stone, Sigmond has merited a biobibliographical article only in *Allibone's* (s.v.) wherein he is credited as the author of the following books: *De aquis thermalibus apud Bathonias complectens* (1814); *The Unnoticed Theories of Servetus* (1826) (the latter two republished in corrected and slightly revised form as *Medical Dissertations* [1828]); *Tea; Its Effect, Medicinal and Moral* (1839); *Mercury, Blue Pill, and Calomel* (1840); *The Ceylon Moss* (1840). The latter two were published by Renshaw, the publisher of the *IPR*.

³¹For information on this trip, see the published version of this lecture, *The Unnoticed Theories of Servetus. A Dissertation Addressed to the Medical Society of Stockholm* (London, 1826), 1–2.

³²*Ibid.*, 2.

³³G.G. Sigmond, *Tea; Its effects, Medicinal and Moral* (London, 1839), 46–47.

³⁴Recounting an unintended visit to the home of a "Cossack driver" in Moscow, Sigmond writes with a not altogether unfamiliar naïvité: "When he understood . . . that I was English, his joy seemed great: He gave me as a reason . . . that the Emperor Nicholas (of whom he spoke as deity amongst men) loved the English. If the blessings of the poor inhabitants of his empire are dear to a monarch, none can more experience delightful sensations than the Emperor of Russia. Whatever may be the feeling existing against the absolute monarch, it must be softened towards the individual, when we find him recognized by his people as beneficent father. (*Tea*, 48–49)

³⁵See the editorial "To Our Reader," *The Polytechnic Review and Magazine*, 2 (1845).

³⁶Both the *NUC* (545:692) and the *BLC* (302:229) (but not *Allibone's*) identify Sigmond ("G.G.S.") as the editor of *The Dramatic Works of . . . R. B. Sheridan* (London, 1848) and the author of the volume's prefatory "Memoir of [Sheridan's] Life." I have been unable to find any information confirming this attribution; but, considering the *NUC's* misattribution of *A Practical and Domestic Treatise on the Diseases and Irregularities of the Teeth and Gums* (Bath, 1825) to Sigmond and not, as it should be, to his father, one remains sceptical, particularly in view of Sigmond's interests, about his role in the Sheridan volume. According to Eileen M. Curran (to whom I am grateful for this information as well as for her helpful critique of the present article), in the early 1860s Sigmond applied to the Royal Literary Fund for aid (file 1545).

³⁷Sigmond, *Unnoticed Theories* (as republished in *Medical Dissertations*), 8. On Sukhtelen, see *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'*, s.v.

³⁸*Ibid.*

³⁹Sigmond, *Tea*, 47. In this respect, it is significant that the *IPR* also published reviews of *Russia and the Russians* (1842), the English edition of Johann Georg Kohl's travelogue of the Russian Empire, as well as of *The Bible in Spain* (1843) by George Borrow, the well-known translator of both Polish and Russian literature (1:29–31, 42–43, 77–79). Both reviews evince a personal knowledge on the part of the anonymous reviewer of at least St. Petersburg and Moscow.

⁴⁰The process of cataloguing Purkyně's archives has, however, yet to be completed.

⁴¹See Žaček, *Purkyně*, 75; and F.X. Halas, *Soupis korespondence Jana Evangelisty Purkyně* (Prague, 1987), 210.

⁴²Cf. Halas, *Soupis*, 45–46, 49, 168, 258.

⁴³See *ibid.*, 207; as well as John, *Purkyně*, 88.

⁴⁴Sigmond, *Unnoticed Theories*, 6.

⁴⁵Cf. Halas, *Soupis*, 207; as well as V. Kruta, "Anders Retzius und Johannes Ev. Purkyně. Briefwechsel zweier Biologes des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts," *Lychnos*, 1956, 101–31; and *id.*, "Anders Retzius und Johannes Ev. Purkyne. Ein Nachtrag zu dem Briefwechsel zweier Biologes des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts," *Lychnos*, 1959, 222–27.

⁴⁶See Gleason, *Russophobia in Great Britain*; and also [M.P. Alekseev], "Pushkin i angliiskie puteshestvenniki v Rossii," in *Russko-angliiskie literaturnye svyazi (XVIII vek-pervaia polovina XIX veka)*, Literaturnoe nasledstvo, 91 (Moscow, 1982), 574–656.

⁴⁷See above, p. [1] n.3. Several other periodicals (e.g., *The New Quarterly Review*, *The New Monthly*, *Illuminated Magazine*, *The Polish Monthly Magazine*) also published articles on Mickiewicz or translations of his works.

⁴⁸On the pro-Russian sympathies of early, particularly Czech, Panslavism, see for instance, H. Kohn, *Pan-Slavism. Its History and Ideology*, 2d ed. (n.p., 1960), 3–26.

⁴⁹Cf. Gleason, *Russophobia in Great Britain*; and H.N. Ingle, *Nesselrode and the Russian Rapprochement with Britain, 1836–1844* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1976).

⁵⁰"Polish Literature," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 7th ed. (1830–42), s.v.

⁵¹Cf. Coleman, *Mickiewicz in English*, 4–11.