

FRANK MOCHA

## The Karamzin-Lelewel Controversy

The intellectual debate which was taking place in Russia during the reign of Alexander I included a polemic which, although little known today, involved the most important Russian and Polish historians of the time, Karamzin and Lelewel, as well as other historians, writers, and journalists. Among the latter, the transplanted Pole, Tadeusz Bułharyn (Faddei V. Bulgarin),<sup>1</sup> played a crucial part. The polemic developed into a controversy touching on the leading issues of the day, and it produced a sensation commanding the interest of the highest official and intellectual circles,<sup>2</sup> including, reportedly, Alexander I himself.<sup>3</sup> The polemic was largely provoked by the political views of Karamzin.

According to Marc Raeff, the political ideas of Nikolai M. Karamzin (1766–1826) are a subject by themselves—one which still needs investigation.<sup>4</sup> 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. It seems that Karamzin’s first conservative leanings were a reaction to the later, more radical, phase of the French Revolution.<sup>5</sup> They were voiced, subsequently, in his historical novels. Later, the Napoleonic Wars on the one hand and Alexander’s liberal aspirations on the other further strengthened Karamzin’s conservative feelings, which were finally provoked, under the influence of the Grand Duchess Catherine, Alexander’s ambitious sister, by current projects for the reorganization of Russia.<sup>6</sup> Karamzin was particularly irritated that some of the reforms were to be based on an alien model, the Napoleonic Code, and that the author of these projects was Speransky, the son of a common village priest. With

1. Both versions of the name are used in reference works. Although the Russian version predominates, literary historians known for accuracy use the Polish version. Bułharyn, even after he had settled in Russia permanently, used both versions. Because this article includes only the beginning of Bułharyn’s literary career in Russia, when his ties with Poland were still strong, the Polish version of the name is used throughout.

2. Marian Henryk Serejski, *Joachim Lelewel: Z dziejów postępowej myśli historycznej w Polsce* (Warsaw, 1953), p. 26.

3. Henryk Mościcki, *Pod berłem carów* (Warsaw, 1924), p. 97.

4. Marc Raeff, *Michael Speransky, Statesman of Imperial Russia, 1772–1839* (The Hague, 1957), p. 176.

5. Andrzej Walicki, *W kręgu konserwatywnej utopii: Struktura i przemiany rosyjskiego słowianofilstwa* (Warsaw, 1964), p. 30.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 30–31.

Catherine's encouragement, Karamzin wrote in 1811 the now famous tract, *On the Old and the New Russia* (*Zapiska o drevnei i novoi Rossii*), which contained a bold and comprehensive criticism of the policies of the government.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> Although the veiled threats contained in the tract at first angered Alexander, he found there much that was true and coincided with his own feelings.<sup>9</sup> The tract, one of the most important documents of Russian social thought in Alexander's era, contains also, in a condensed form, Karamzin's whole conception of Russian history. But because the tract remained for many years a secret document, 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* (*Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago*) appeared in print.<sup>10</sup>

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 because of recent victories over Napoleon. Since it was read by virtually every educated person in Russia, the *History* became a veritable school of national pride. This is understandable. The educated Russian layman, if he was taught history at all, studied universal history rather than the history of Russia.<sup>11</sup> Also, according to Marc Raeff, we do not really know what kind of a sense of history the educated layman in Russia had at that time.<sup>12</sup> History for him was still a relatively new discipline to be approached in a didactic and moralistic way, and this was precisely what Karamzin did. As a result, his position in Russia became so strong that even those who objected to the apologia of autocracy in his work did not dare attack him. At the most, his theory of the Norman origin of Russia was questioned, particularly by the liberals, who saw it as 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 Slavic "republican" institutions. (It is worth mentioning that the "Norman theory" received the official approval of Nicholas I in 1848.)<sup>13</sup>

In the same year in which Karamzin's *History* appeared (1818), the Russian historian again took it upon himself to intercede with Alexander on

7. N. M. Karamzin, *A Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia: The Russian Text*, ed. Richard Pipes (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), pp. 1 ff.

8. Walicki, *W kregu*, p. 32.

9. Raeff, *Michael Speransky*, p. 176.

10. Walicki, *W kregu*, pp. 31, 37.

11. Marc Raeff, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia* (New York, 1966), pp. 157 ff.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 236.

13. Walicki, *W kregu*, p. 48.

matters he considered of the greatest importance to Russia. Alexander had just made his famous speech in Warsaw in which he hinted at his desire to see in Russia a constitution like that of the Congress Kingdom of Poland.<sup>14</sup> What is more, in private conversations in Warsaw, Alexander repeatedly assured his Polish hosts (and subjects, since he was also the king of Poland) that he was soon going to incorporate into the Congress Kingdom the former Polish provinces in the East, particularly Lithuania.<sup>15</sup> Alexander's pronouncements created a wave of excitement in Poland and Lithuania, especially in Wilno, an important cultural and educational center in the East. In Russia the effect was different. While the liberals rejoiced at the prospect of changes in Russia, the conservatives feared a dangerous social upheaval. 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" 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 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.<sup>16</sup> Karamzin's intervention made a great impression on Alexander and on Russian public opinion. Among Polish circles in Russia, on the other hand, a campaign was started to undermine Karamzin's strong position. 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 *Vestnik Evropy* in 1819, he promised to make Karamzin, whom he knew personally, "more considerate toward the Poles, whom he has been attacking in a hostile manner concerning events beginning with the time of Casimir the Jagellonian."<sup>17</sup> Chodakowski's article had little effect, however, on the position of the Russian historian. It was at this point that the Polish historian Lelewel was approached by the Poles in St. Petersburg, including Chodakowski, to undertake the review of Karamzin's *History*.<sup>18</sup>

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

14. Raeff, *Michael Speransky*, p. 239.

15. Mościcki, *Pod berłem carów*, p. 94.

16. *Ibid.* Praga, a suburb of Warsaw, was the scene of a bloody battle preceding the occupation of Warsaw by the Russian army under Suvorov. The Third (and final) Partition of Poland followed.

17. Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski, "Razyskaniia kosatelnoi russkoi istorii," *Vestnik Evropy*, 1819, no. 7, pp. 277–302.

18. Nina Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," in Joachim Lelewel, *Dziela*, 8 vols. (Warsaw, 1957–64), vol. 2, pt. 2: *Pisma metodologiczne*, p. 692.

century the Polish chronicles by Marcin and Joachim Bielski, and by Strykowski, had been translated into Russian.<sup>19</sup> The most important Polish historian of the eighteenth century, Adam Naruszewicz (1733–96), was well known to both Russian historians and Russian authorities. The first volume of his chief work, the seven-volume *History of the Polish People* (*Historia narodu polskiego*), which was 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.<sup>20</sup> In his *History* Naruszewicz formulated very clearly his method and his aim, which was to study the history of the nation to its fullest extent. 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 Julian Niemcewicz, Tadeusz Czacki, and Chodakowski—some of whom he knew personally (Chodakowski) or corresponded with (Czacki).<sup>21</sup> Karamzin's acquaintance with the works of the much younger Lelewel dates only to the time of the appearance of his articles in St. Petersburg in the early 1820s.

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 in both the Duchy of Warsaw and the Congress Kingdom, he was educated in Warsaw schools and at the University of Wilno (1804–8). After graduation he became a teacher in the famous Krzemieniec Lyceum (1808–10), one of the best schools in the Wilno school district, where he worked under Czacki.<sup>22</sup> 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 other branches of learning connected with history, particularly geography, paleography, numismatics, statistics, diplomacy, heraldry, and librarianship. 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 for 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 range of methodological problems concerning the science of history.<sup>23</sup> In the book Lelewel not only perfected the historical methodology, but he was the first in Poland to

19. A. I. Sobolevsky, *Perevodnaia literatura Moskovskoi Rusi XIV–XVII vv.: Bibliograficheskie materialy* (St. Petersburg, 1903), pp. 53, 79, 81.

20. Marcelli Handelsman, *Historyka: Zasady metodologii i poznania historycznego* (Warsaw, 1928), p. 81.

21. Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," p. 692.

22. Serejski, *Joachim Lelewel*, p. 18.

23. Helena Wigockowska, "Wstęp," in Joachim Lelewel, *Wybór dzieł historycznych* (Wrocław, 1949), p. xiv.

justify and organize it.<sup>24</sup> Because of that he prepared the way for the study of history in Poland to develop into the great scholarly movement which it became.<sup>25</sup> Lelewel's total production, including political works, was to reach 1,018 items filling over fifty volumes.<sup>26</sup> 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 fill the chair of history at the University of Wilno, where he was to remain until 1824 except for two years (1819–21) at the University of Warsaw. In 1820 Lelewel was awarded the degree of doctor of philosophy by the University of Cracow.<sup>27</sup> His second departure for Wilno in 1821 brought about the ascendancy of Wilno over Warsaw as the main scholarly and didactic center of history, conceived in a modern spirit and radiating far beyond the confines of the city and the university.<sup>28</sup> 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 (the year of its appearance), before he was approached by anyone, but that he soon abandoned it.<sup>29</sup> It is possible that his imminent departure from Wilno for Warsaw prevented him from continuing the analysis. However, there is another explanation for his behavior. 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 an official historiographer, a State Councilor, and the holder of many orders, and whose salary was 60,000 rubles" (p. 694). The pressure on Lelewel by Polish circles bent on undermining Karamzin was, in view of Lelewel's continued silence, apparently of no avail. There are indications, however, that Lelewel, beginning in 1820, was in correspondence concerning Karamzin with at least one person—Tadeusz Bułharyn. In a letter dated October 15, 1821, Bułharyn reminded Lelewel that he had been "waiting for a year for the promised criticism of Karamzin's *History*" (p. 693). As will be seen, Bułharyn had his own reasons for wanting Lelewel to continue his analysis of Karamzin's work.

Tadeusz Bułharyn (1789–1859), whose biography reads like a picaresque novel, was at that time on the verge of launching the first of his many successful publishing ventures in Russia, his pseudohistorical journal, *Severnyi arkhiv* (*The Northern Archive*). That his first journalistic venture should have been

24. Handelsman, *Historyka*, p. 87.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 89.

26. Serejski, *Joachim Lelewel*, p. 14.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 21.

28. M. H. Serejski, "Wstęp," in Lelewel, *Dziela*, vol. 3: *Wykłady kursowe z historii powszechnej w Uniwersytecie Wileńskim, 1822–1824*, p. 12.

29. Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," pp. 692–94.

devoted primarily to history is not surprising. His known passion for history was fed by the consciousness of living in an important age: in his *Memoirs* Bułharyn makes much of having been born in the year of the French Revolution.<sup>30</sup> The son of a Polish patriot, who was an admirer and associate of Tadeusz Kościuszko (after whom Bułharyn was allegedly named),<sup>31</sup> young Tadeusz had the unusual experience of receiving patronage from a high-ranking Russian general, Baron Fersen, the very man whose victory over Kościuszko in 1794 had paved the way for the final dismemberment of Poland the following year. Young Bułharyn was enrolled in the Noble Land-Cadets Corps in St. Petersburg, from which he graduated in time to take part—as an officer in Grand Duke Constantine’s crack Uhlán Regiment—in the Prussian and Finnish campaigns of 1807 and 1808 respectively. In 1811, under mysterious circumstances, Bułharyn left Russian military service and joined Napoleon’s army, in which he participated in all the campaigns, including the invasion of Russia in 1812,<sup>32</sup> until he was captured by the Prussians in France in 1814. Allowed to go to Poland, he was offered a commission by the Grand Duke Constantine in the army of the newly created Congress Kingdom,<sup>33</sup> but decided against a military career and returned to Russia in 1816.

Back in St. Petersburg, Bułharyn soon became known for the military tales he told in literary clubs, occasionally in the presence of Karamzin. He realized early that there was a definite demand in Russia—in a public fed on poetry and didactic prose—for the kind of semibiographical, semihistorical stories he could tell out of his own vast experience. Some of his stories were published in the St. Petersburg literary journals. At the same time, his frequent sojourns in Wilno, on family matters, exposed him to the considerable journalistic and literary activity centering around the university. We know that he was acquainted with the professors and students there.<sup>34</sup> Bułharyn’s long acquaintance with Lelewel probably started when he attended the young historian’s lectures on universal history, which were open to the public. Some of his acquaintances in Wilno later became contributors to his journal. Through them, Bułharyn was introduced to the riches of Polish literature and history, some of which he began to translate into Russian. By 1821 he had enough material and enough contacts to launch *Severnnyi arkhiv*, the first issue of which appeared in January 1822.

30. F. V. Bulgarin, *Vospominaniia* (St. Petersburg, 1846–49), 1:3.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 313.

32. It was this fact which was always held against Bułharyn in Russia, and which was the source of many controversies surrounding him later in that country. It is not the purpose of this paper to investigate those controversies.

33. Nikolai Grech, *Zapiski o moei zhizni* (St. Petersburg, 1886), p. 444.

34. Louis Pedrotti, *Józef-Julian Słowowski: The Genesis of a Literary Alien* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965), p. 9.

The launching of the journal was undoubtedly a clever maneuver to break into publishing, and the moment could not have been better chosen. 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 Slavic past, was strongly stimulated by the Romantic Movement, and important scholars were making their appearance all over Europe. Bułharyn was not immune to these trends. He was not a trained historian, but history had always been his favorite discipline,<sup>35</sup> and he had been further exposed to it in Wilno, under Lelewel's influence. As a matter of fact, *Severnyi arkhiv* probably owed its organization, if not its existence, to the Polish historian's influence. The sections into which the journal was divided—history, geography, statistics, and so forth—correspond to the system Lelewel expounded in his work *Historyka*, from which he had lectured in Wilno.<sup>36</sup>

As the publisher of a historically oriented journal, Bułharyn might well seek contributions from Lelewel. But there were other reasons why Bułharyn particularly wanted Lelewel's criticism of Karamzin's *History*, and they had to do with the future Bułharyn saw for himself in Russia and with the role of *Severnyi arkhiv* in that future. From the beginning of the periodical's existence it was clear that it was to be Bułharyn's vehicle to launch himself as a literary writer of history. Although in the first issues he remained strictly an editor and did not contribute any piece of his own writing, 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, Bułharyn's path to prominence would have been slow, and *Severnyi arkhiv* would have been condemned to obscurity, if he had not resorted to a maneuver which at once assured him of notoriety. The quickest way to establish a reputation is to attack the biggest authority in the field. In Russia, that was Karamzin. To attack him, Bułharyn used an even greater authority, Lelewel.

The explanation of how Bułharyn succeeded in persuading Lelewel to continue his analysis of Karamzin's *History* is a complicated one, and lies in the inherent differences between Karamzin's and Lelewel's political views. Karamzin's position was that of a conservative defending the status quo and warning the emperor not to undertake any hasty changes.<sup>37</sup> Lelewel, on the other hand, was known for his progressive views, his love of freedom, and his hatred of despotism.<sup>38</sup> Lelewel's views were undoubtedly communicated by Bułharyn to the liberals in St. Petersburg. We know that Bułharyn was a

35. Bulgarin, *Vospominaniia*, 3:70.

36. Józef Bieliński, *Uniwersytet Wileński, 1579–1831* (Cracow, 1899–1900), 2:440.

37. Walicki, *W kręgu*, p. 205.

38. M. H. Serejski, ed., "Wstęp," in Joachim Lelewel, *Wybór pism politycznych* (Warsaw, 1954), p. vi.

member of liberal circles during his first years there.<sup>39</sup> 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,<sup>40</sup> shocked the future Decembrists as much as it shocked Lelewel, though for different reasons. An attack on a man voicing such views was in the interests of the liberals—we know that they did applaud Lelewel's articles when they came out.<sup>41</sup> For Lelewel, potential support in St. Petersburg was very important, and this is what Buřharyn undoubtedly assured him of. In the end, all parties were satisfied: the Polish circles in Russia and the Russian liberals found someone to attack Karamzin, Lelewel regained his confidence, and Buřharyn, besides playing an important part, was to become the translator, editor, and publisher of a brilliant historian.

The attack on Karamzin was carefully prepared. As early as 1821 Buřharyn began to introduce Lelewel's works to the Russian literary circles by reading—at the March 21 meeting of the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature, of which he was a member—his own translation of the Polish historian's work *On the Earliest Historians of the Poles and on Schlözer's Refutation of Kadłubek in Particular*.<sup>42</sup> 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 the following year,<sup>43</sup> thus becoming even better known in Russian literary circles. That same year (1822) Buřharyn introduced Lelewel to the general public by placing an announcement about him in the "Miscellaneous" section of *Severnnyi arkhiv*: "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 at 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."<sup>44</sup> The announcement was followed by a further build-up of Lelewel in a later issue of *Severnnyi arkhiv* (October 1822): Buřharyn called him "the chief historical writer in Poland in our time,"<sup>45</sup> and included him among the journal's contributors. Then, in the November 1822 issue, in the "Criticism" section, Buřharyn printed Lelewel's

39. V. G. Bazanov, *Uchenaia respublika* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1964), p. 444.

40. N. M. Karamzin, "Predislovie," *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago*, 3 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1842–45), vol. 1 (bks. 1–4), pp. ix ff.

41. A. Bestuzhev, "Vzgliad na russkuiu slovesnost' v techenie 1823 goda," *Poliarnaia zvezda*, 1824, p. 270.

42. Bazanov, *Uchenaia respublika*, p. 395.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 447.

44. Bulgarin, "Raznyia izvestiia," *Severnnyi arkhiv*, 1822, no. 4, pp. 373–74.

45. *Severnnyi arkhiv*, 1822, no. 19, p. 81.



article, "A Critical Examination of Mr. Karamzin's *History of the Russian State*."<sup>46</sup> This was the first and the most devastating criticism by Lelewel of Karamzin's *History*. In it Lelewel questioned Karamzin's qualifications as a historian.

Lelewel's criticism was masked by the strictly scholarly form of the article, 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;<sup>47</sup> there are records of his students' assignments in which they used Karamzin, instead of Polish works, as a source for the history of Lithuania, with Lelewel's approval.<sup>48</sup> 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 Russian society.

Before making any 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 to Russia but to the whole of Europe, particularly Poland and Lithuania, whose own history was entangled with Russian history to such an extent that a critical examination 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*.<sup>49</sup> 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.

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," thus implying that Karamzin should have remained a writer rather than trying to be a historian. On this point Lelewel 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. He then enumerated several controversial points in Karamzin's "Preface" with which he disagreed, letting the public make up their own minds about Karamzin.<sup>50</sup>

The first point was the declared purpose of Karamzin's *History*, as a

46. Joachim Lelewel, "Razmotrenie *Istorii gosudarstva rossijskago* g. Karamzina," *Severnii arkhiv*, 1822, no. 23, pp. 402–34.

47. Lelewel, *Dziela*, 3:80–81.

48. *Ibid.*, 2, pt. 2:899.

49. Lelewel, "Razmotrenie *Istorii*," pp. 411–12.

50. *Ibid.*, pp. 409, 410, 413 ff.

lesson for politicians and lawmakers on how to rule Russia.<sup>51</sup> The next point concerned Karamzin's statement that unlike historians of antiquity he would not include speeches in his *History*, but that the art of writing would nevertheless make his work absorbing reading. The exaggerated importance attached by Karamzin to narrative skills in writing history was objectionable to Lelewel, for whom such matters were secondary. 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. Lelewel criticized Karamzin at every step, questioned his sources, and rejected his methods. According to Lelewel, Karamzin understood history as a history of kings, princes, and the state, without taking into consideration other factors, such as people and 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' labor by an honorable man."<sup>52</sup>

Lelewel's article was preceded by Bułharyn's tongue-in-cheek introduction, "To Readers, from the Publisher of *Severnnyi arkhiv*," in which Bułharyn 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 *Severnnyi arkhiv* 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.<sup>53</sup>

Bułharyn 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 Bułharyn too, in whose journal Lelewel published his articles. Also, anticipating a reaction to Lelewel's article, Bułharyn reiterated his old argument for the need in

51. Karamzin, "Predislovie," pp. ix ff.

52. Lelewel, "Razsmotrenie Istorii," p. 434.

53. F. V. Bulgarin, "K chitateliam, ot Izdatelia *Severnago arkhiva*," *Severnnyi arkhiv*, 1822, no. 23, pp. 402–3.

Russia to get acquainted with Polish literature, and stressed his “duty” to introduce to his Russian readers its brilliant representative.

Buřharyn’s anticipation was correct. Lelewel’s article, which was but an “Introduction” to his detailed “Critical Examination,”<sup>54</sup> and which concentrated on Karamzin’s famous “Preface” to his *History*, created a sensation in St. Petersburg and Moscow. Buřharyn at first took the reaction lightly, as can be seen from his enthusiastic letter of December 12, 1822, to Lelewel: “Your name is on everyone’s lips—the most important people, like Golitsyn, Speransky, Olenin, and so forth, 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.”<sup>55</sup> This was in fact not quite true; Karamzin did not reply in print, but he vented his feelings in a letter to a friend, the poet Ivan I. Dmitriev, in December 1822: “A new enemy has appeared on the pages of *Severnnyi arkhiv*: a Pole who began his profound criticism with a statement that he does not agree with me on anything, and that all my views on the historical art are false. Most amusing of all is that even Fadei Bulgarin, the publisher of *Severnnyi arkhiv*, considers it his duty to abuse me, and has stopped calling on me. In any case, I am a liberal in my actions; let them say and write what they want.”<sup>56</sup> Unfortunately for Karamzin, his friends were men like the poets Dmitriev and Zhukovsky, who were not competent to take up his defense. The job was left to a young historian, Mikhail P. Pogodin, who in an article in *Vestnik Evropy* attempted to defend Karamzin but ended up apologizing to Lelewel and suggesting that Lelewel examine Karamzin’s *History* in connection with Polish history.<sup>57</sup> A long correspondence developed subsequently between Pogodin and Lelewel, in which the former showed great interest in the works of the latter.

It would seem that the attack on Karamzin was a success. However, Buřharyn’s subsequent maneuvers indicate that it was not entirely so. In the following issue of *Severnnyi arkhiv* (December 1822) there appeared an article entitled “An Expression of Opinion on the *History of the Russian State* of Mr. Karamzin.”<sup>58</sup> This was not Lelewel’s expected next installment but a translation of a review taken from Göttingen’s *Learned News* (*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeiger*). The German review was favorable to Karamzin, and considered his work an important contribution. Buřharyn added this footnote: “Just when

54. Joachim Lelewel, “Vvedenie: Zamechanie na predislovie iz *Istorii*: Tsel’ kritiki na vse sochinenie,” *Severnnyi arkhiv*, 1822, no. 23, pp. 408–34.

55. Lelewel, *Dziela*, vol. 1: *Materiały autobiograficzne*, p. 143.

56. *Pis’ma N. M. Karamzina k I. I. Dmitrievu* (St. Petersburg, 1886), pp. 342–43.

57. Mikhail P. Pogodin, “Nechto protiv oproverzheniia g. Lelewela,” *Vestnik Evropy*, 1824, no. 5, pp. 19–29.

58. “Vzgliad na *Istoriu rossiskago gosudarstva* g. Karamzina,” *Severnnyi arkhiv*, 1822, no. 24, pp. 486–504.

we had begun printing Mr. Lelewel's article on the *History of the Russian State* . . . , an honored 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" (p. 486). Since as a publisher he subscribed to numerous foreign journals, Bułharyn himself could have been the "honored literary figure" who sent in the translation. The stress on "objectivity" suggests that he was trying to appease those who had been provoked by Lelewel's article and his own introduction to it. The next (January 1823) issue, 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 *Severnyi arkhiv* 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)." <sup>59</sup> The article was signed: "A Moscow Native, A.M." Although this is not one of Bułharyn's easily identifiable pseudonyms, <sup>60</sup> there are other indications (style and Polish data) that this article 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. Kachenovsky, the editor of *Vestnik Evropy*, which ironically had once been edited by Karamzin. <sup>61</sup> Kachenovsky had himself criticized Karamzin's famous "Preface" as early as 1819, and it was his journal in which Chodakowski had printed his criticism of Karamzin (mentioned earlier), for which Kachenovsky was rebuked by Zhukovsky and constantly attacked by the "partisans of the historian." <sup>62</sup> After reading Lelewel's article Kachenovsky wrote to Bułharyn from Moscow, congratulating him on the quality of the translation and strongly encouraging him to continue the articles, although at the same time he warned Bułharyn about Karamzin's "partisans." <sup>63</sup>

Bułharyn was probably also strongly encouraged by the Russian liberals to continue Lelewel's articles, particularly by the future Decembrists, who had their own reasons for wishing to see Karamzin attacked. A. Bestuzhev, editor

59. *Severnyi arkhiv*, 1823, no. 1, pp. 91–100.

60. I. F. Masanov, *Slovar' pseudonimov russkikh pisatelei, uchenykh i obshchestvennykh deiatelei*, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1956–60), 4:86.

61. N. M. Lisovsky, *Bibliografiia russkoi periodicheskoi pečati, 1703–1900 gg.* (Petrograd, 1915), p. 37.

62. N. Piksanov, "Iz arkhiva F. V. Bulgarina" (Pis'ma M. T. Kachenovskago k F. V. Bulgarinu, 1823–1824), *Russkaia starina*, 116 (1903): 603.

63. Letter of January 2, 1823. *Ibid.*, p. 602.

of *Poliarnaia zvezda* (*Polar Star*), firmly refused to acknowledge any merits in Karamzin's *History*, with the exception of the purely literary, or rather linguistic and stylistic, qualities. Karamzin was reportedly offended by Bestuzhev's remarks, particularly by his concluding statement that only "time will pass judgment on Karamzin as a historian."<sup>64</sup> 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 also the extent of the controversy provoked by Karamzin's *History*.

How important the Karamzin episode was in Buřharyn's career can be judged from the following passage in his *Memoirs*: "Look through the pages of *Severnnyi arkhiv* 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."<sup>65</sup> Buřharyn 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 owing to the hostility of the Karamzinists that Lelewel's promised articles began to appear in *Severnnyi arkhiv* only in October 1823.<sup>66</sup> 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 [*Severnnyi arkhiv*] you will see the continuation of the criticism of Karamzin. How are your *literati* receiving this criticism? Here everyone more or less agrees with it. With the first issue of next year, the analysis of all nine volumes will be published, one by one. Then a real battle will begin."<sup>67</sup> Despite Kornilovich's concluding statement, it is doubtful that Lelewel was interested in intensifying the ideological battle raging around Karamzin's *History*. His main 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

64. "Literaturno-esteticheskie pozitsii 'Poliarnoi zvezdy,'" in V. G. Bazanov, ed., *Poliarnaia zvezda izdannaiia A. Bestuzhevym i K. Rylcevim* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1960), pp. 821, 864–65.

65. Bulgarin, *Vospominaniia*, p. x.

66. *Severnnyi arkhiv*, 1823, no. 19, pp. 52–80.

67. Quoted in Lelewel, *Dziela*, 2, pt. 2:694–95, and in Bazanov, ed., *Poliarnaia zvezda*, p. 951.

a direct criticism of Karamzin, nor were they yet the promised volume-by-volume analysis of his *History*, but a "Comparison of Karamzin with Naruszewicz," or rather a comparison of Karamzin's *History of the Russian State* with Naruszewicz's *History of the Polish People*.<sup>68</sup> As will be seen, this approach, although it removed Lelewel from the center of a Russian ideological polemic, was nevertheless as effective as the earlier device in undermining Karamzin's reputation as a historian. It would have been even more effective except that Bułharyn, frightened by the stress on Polish history in the new articles, took liberties with Lelewel's manuscript.

The extent of Bułharyn's tampering with the manuscript is important, 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 an editor as well as a writer. There is evidence that he overstepped his duties as translator-editor considerably, and that not only did he alter the portions of Lelewel's text dealing with Polish history (which, in view of the anti-Polish character of the Wilno investigation taking place at that time, is understandable), but his heavy editorial hand affected the entire manuscript.<sup>69</sup> 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 satirical Society of Scamps (*Towarzystwo Szubrawców*) in Wilno had already mocked him painfully in its periodical, *Wiadomości Brukowe* (*The Pavement News*).<sup>70</sup> His writings were rendered readable only after numerous reworkings. When it came to his criticism of Karamzin, Lelewel did not have time to re-write and would frequently send Bułharyn what amounted to a very rough draft. He often sent corrections later—perhaps too late to be included in the printed Russian version. Under these circumstances Bułharyn had ample opportunity to translate and edit the manuscript according to his own inclinations: he was eager to be important, but he wanted to be politically cautious at the same time. His cautiousness was already noticeable at the time the very first article was published. On October 22, 1822, he wrote to Lelewel: "I took the

68. Lelewel, "Obshchaia kritika tselago sochineniia: Sravnenie Karamzina s pervym Pol'skim Istorikom Narushevichem," *Severnyi arkhiv*, 1823, no. 19, pp. 52–80; no. 20, pp. 147–60; no. 22, pp. 287–97.

69. Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," p. 696. (A relatively minor incident in Wilno, in connection with the anniversary of the May Third Constitution, provoked a full-scale investigation, during which the existence of certain student societies was discovered. The discovery was blown out of proportion and served as an excuse for a vicious anti-Polish campaign, conducted by Senator Novosiltsev. Many students and ex-students, including Adam Mickiewicz, were arrested and, after a long interrogation, deported to Russia in 1824 "for spreading nonsensical Polish nationalism." Both Lelewel and Bułharyn were involved in the investigation.)

70. Zdzisław Skwarczyński, *Kazimierz Kontrym: Towarzystwo Szubrawców: Dwa studia* (Wrocław, 1961), p. 196.

liberty of making some corrections demanded by the spirit of the Russian language, which is poor in philosophical discourses."<sup>71</sup> But it was in the following year that his cautiousness became more pronounced. He condensed or left out altogether the 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 Polonophilisms, which would inevitably lead to the loss of subscribers.”<sup>72</sup> The letter, which preceded the appearance of Lelewel’s “Comparison” by half a year, indicates that Bułharyn’s editorial excesses were as much to blame as the hostility of the Karamzinists for the delay in printing Lelewel’s articles. Lelewel obviously opposed some of Bułharyn’s alterations. In a letter of November 25, 1823, shortly after the publication of the “Comparison,” he complained to Bułharyn about the arbitrary subtitles, “entirely not in keeping with the spirit of the work,” which Bułharyn had inserted in the articles.<sup>73</sup> Fortunately, Bułharyn always scrupulously returned Lelewel’s manuscript of the “Comparison,” which was eventually published in its Polish version and became part of Lelewel’s collected works,<sup>74</sup> thus enabling us to determine the extent of Bułharyn’s alterations.

Even with Bułharyn’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, as it did 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, should be flattered, because of the high esteem Naruszewicz enjoyed in Poland (p. 605). It is surprising that Bułharyn 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 shown by both of the historians in the common Slavic past of Russia and Poland, a subject which Bułharyn himself was increasingly stressing in Russia. The comparison—Lelewel maintained—was not being made for its own sake, but for the sake of studying Karamzin. To the question which Lelewel claimed to have been asked—Which of the two historians was the better one?—the answer was not provided. The impression is that it would be Naruszewicz, if only because he had fewer sources to work with than Karamzin, a contemporary writer who had all the sources at hand but did not exploit them (pp. 606 ff.). 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

71. Bułharyn to Lelewel, Oct. 22, 1822. Quoted in Assorodobraj, “Komentarze,” p. 696.

72. Bułharyn to Lelewel, Apr. 11, 1823. Ibid.

73. Lelewel to Bułharyn, Nov. 25, 1823. Ibid.

74. Lelewel, “Porównanie Karamzina z Naruszewiczem,” in *Dziela*, 2, pt. 2:588–628.

Lithuania had always been a part of Russia (p. 612). There were more such issues, but they—Lelewel promised—would be discussed in the course of the detailed analysis of the *History* which was to follow the “Comparison” (pp. 627–28).

The “Comparison,” despite its avoidance of Russian ideological issues, was well received by the Russian liberals. The editors of *Poliarnaia zvezda*, for example, selected it for praise in the almanac’s appraisal of the 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.”<sup>75</sup> 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 be widely read in Russia. The fact that Buřharyn 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 *Severnnyi arkhiv* for 1824.<sup>76</sup> The only difference was that the articles were now moved—for reasons which will become clear later—from the “Criticism” to the less prestigious “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 1 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 Buřharyn 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 origins of Russia, Buřharyn 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 1824, although we know that Buřharyn was in possession of at least some continuation.

There is reason to believe that Buřharyn was prevented, perhaps by censorship or some other intervention, from continuing to publish the “Critical

75. Bestuzhev, “Vzgliad na russkuiu slovesnost’,” p. 270.

76. Joachim Lelewel, “Razsmotrenie Istorii gosudarstva rossiiskago soch. Karamzina, g. Lelewelem,” *Severnnyi arkhiv*, 1824, no. 1, pp. 42–57; no. 2, pp. 91–103; no. 3, pp. 165–72.



Examination" in the same form in which Lelewel was writing it. Following the first three articles, the next issue (no. 4) of *Severnyi arkhiv* contained only a short announcement: "Criticism of the *History of the Russian State* will continue in the next issue."<sup>77</sup> However, neither the next issue nor several later ones featured Lelewel's articles; there were also no announcements. Instead, Bułharyn 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."<sup>78</sup> 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 known influence on 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 Novosiltsev, Lelewel was suspended from the university, together with three other professors.<sup>79</sup> Although several students and ex-students (among them Adam 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 *Severnyi arkhiv* were those already in Bułharyn's possession.

The reasons Bułharyn decided to print the remaining articles, in view of Lelewel's changed circumstances and Bułharyn'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,<sup>80</sup> immediately after the imperial decree. Bułharyn's own explanation, contained in a lengthy footnote accompanying the first article, was his by now favorite maneuver: 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, orally and in writing, their thoughts on the subject. Undoubtedly readers are not obligated to concern themselves with the problems of the publisher of a journal, and have a right to demand the fulfillment of a promise. I know this,

77. *Severnyi arkhiv*, 1824, no. 4, p. 236.

78. Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," p. 696.

79. Lelewel, *Dziela*, 1:67; also "Nowosilcow w Wilnie," *Dziela*, vol. 8: *Historia Polski nowożytnej*, pp. 545–605.

80. *Severnyi arkhiv*, 1824, no. 15, pp. 132–43; no. 16, pp. 187–95.

and I ask my kind readers' forgiveness. But I also ask them to remember that there are many things that are not up to the publisher. *F.B.*" (p. 132). Another reason Bułharyn printed the remaining articles probably had something to do with their content. The articles concerned the respective levels of knowledge and learning of the Normans and the early Slavs, and were very flattering, if not to Karamzin, at least to Russia.<sup>81</sup> 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, Bułharyn painstakingly smoothed it out in lengthy footnotes—a new device—or probably edited it out. Since all three articles were much shorter than the average length of an article by Lelewel, numerous deletions had probably been made by Bułharyn.

Despite these precautions, there was another delay before the third and last of the remaining articles appeared in print in October 1824.<sup>82</sup> The article was a continuation of the previous two, and ended with an announcement that "there will be a continuation." 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*" (p. 52). But there was no continuation. A Polish source maintains Bułharyn was actually in possession of the article but did not print it because "he lost interest."<sup>83</sup> Bułharyn's "loss of interest" was probably due to the highly controversial content of the article. Also, just at that time Bułharyn found himself under investigation for his earlier activities and later contacts in Wilno, and was busy trying to extricate himself.<sup>84</sup> Under these circumstances, caution dictated to Bułharyn an early termination in his journal of the work of Lelewel, who was, after all, an old Wilno acquaintance. But there were other considerations.

The process of parting company with Lelewel as a contributor to *Severnyi arkhiv*, which began when his articles were relegated to the less prestigious sections of the journal, was connected with another process—Bułharyn's taking the place of Lelewel as the journal's most important contributor (the process culminated in Bułharyn's own criticism of Karamzin the following year). For Bułharyn, this was one way 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

81. Lelewel, "Ob obrazovannosti Variagov i Slavian," *Severnyi arkhiv*, 1824, no. 15, pp. 132 ff.

82. *Severnyi arkhiv*, 1824, no. 19, pp. 47–53.

83. Assorodobraj, "Komentarze," p. 694.

84. N.D., "N. I. Grech, F. V. Bulgarin i A. Mitskevich: Materialy dlia ikh biografii," *Russkaia starina*, 116 (1903): 334–37.

editor deepened his grasp of history immensely. He demonstrated this in his own historical studies (*Marina Mniszech*, for example, in 1823-24) and in his lengthy and apt footnotes for Lelewel's last articles. His last, explanatory footnote left the readers waiting—a good publishing policy—for Lelewel's article. In reality they were waiting for Bułharyn's.

Thus, after ten installments, Lelewel's "Critical Examination of Karamzin's *History of the Russian State*" ended without going beyond volume 1 of the *History*. Nonetheless, the total effect, particularly of the "Introduction" and "Comparison," was considerable. In those two parts Lelewel accomplished what he had set out to accomplish and what was expected of him: he undermined Karamzin's reputation as a historian. In the last part, the "Critical Examination" proper, consisting of six installments, he gave the Russian reader a sample of a detailed critical approach to Karamzin's *History*. Karamzin's reputation undoubtedly suffered: fresh installments of his *History* (volumes 10 and 11) were virtually ignored by the liberal press, or simply not discussed as works of history. This was chiefly the result of Lelewel's criticism. Lelewel, whose views frequently matched those of the Decembrists, gave the Russian liberals a scholarly basis for some of the most important points of their opposition to autocracy.