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Abstract

The article examines F. M. Dostoevsky’s visit to London in the summer of 1862, in the course of his first trip abroad, which resulted in the writing of Winter Notes on Summer Impressions. A Summer-Long Feuilleton. The task to untangle the impact of numerous impressions on Dostoevsky’s creative process is initiated and the newly arisen circumstances that he encountered on his return to St. Petersburg highlighted. Winter Notes is viewed as a groundbreaking work in Dostoevsky’s canon that contains the seeds of future great works, though not primarily in accordance with the multiple ideologically based readings that have sought to define it. Instead Winter Notes is recognised for its author’s aesthetic explorations into poetics within the confines of Tsarist censorship which required that ‘Official Nationality’, the imperial ideological doctrine be upheld. Dostoevsky’s visit to the 1862 International Exhibition and its art galleries is addressed for the first time on the basis of his brother Mikhail’s letters and other evidence. The exhibition building and the works of William Hogarth, John Martin and J.M.W.Turner are singled out. Their imprint on Dostoevsky’s feuilleton is observed through the stages of impressions gained via intermedial interplay. It affirms that pre-existing notions in the ‘discourse of Englishness’ were absorbed and reinvented by Dostoevsky with the use of figurative language, clarifying the origin of metaphors used in the text, together with literary and biblical allusions. A list of Russian and British artists exhibiting in the International Exhibition of 1862 is included.
In early July 1862 Dostoevsky visited London during his first trip to Western Europe that resulted in his composition of *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions A Feuilleton for the Whole of Summer* [Zimnie zametki o letnikh vpechatleniyakh. Fel'eton na vse leto] published in two installments in February and March, 1863 in the periodical *Time (Vremia)* edited jointly with his brother.1 Here in the pivotal fifth chapter entitled “Baal”[Vaal] being the opening chapter of the second installment, Dostoevsky’s focal point is the city of London, with its Crystal Palace and the International Exhibition of 1862:

The city with its millions and its worldwide trade, the Crystal Palace, the International Exhibition... Yes, the Exhibition is striking. You feel a terrible force that has united all these people here, who come from all over the world, into a single herd; you sense an idea of gigantic proportions; you feel that here something has already been achieved, that here there is victory and triumph. [Сити с своими миллионами и всемирной торговлей, кристальный дворец, всемирная выставка ... Да, выставка поразительна. Вы чувствуете страшную силу, которая соединила тут всех этих бесчисленных людей, пришедших со всего мира, в едино стадо; вы сознаете исполинскую мысль; вы чувствуете, что тут что-то уже достигнуто, что тут победа, торжество] (5. 69).2

The two installments of Dostoevsky’s travel account depict the narrator’s impressions of aspects of life in Germany, France and England, focusing on London and Paris. The author’s reflections turn to the relationship between Russia and the West from the eighteenth century onwards. Critics have
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1 “Further New Perspectives on Dostoevsky” relates to the series begun in the previous issue of *Dostoevsky Journal*. (2022) by the same author on “New Perspectives on Dostoevsky, Notes, Queries, Translations”.

2 References to F.M. Dostoevskii. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridsatii tokh*, (Leningrad: Nauka, 1872–1993), are given in parentheses in the text citing volume and page number. Translations into English are my own, based on *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions by Fyodor Dostoevsky*. Translated by David Patterson. (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press 1997).
interpreted Dostoevsky’s travel sketches as his critique of Western Europe, often extrapolating the author’s opinions as expressed in articles in Time and in later works and letters, including The Diary of a Writer. Accordingly, Europe’s historical process from the Age of Enlightenment and Reason, followed by the French Revolution and later the Industrial Age is highlighted to have led to the ascendancy of global capitalism, as reportedly foreshadowed in Winter Notes. Moreover, this progression with its intellectual, philosophical and economic outcomes is seen to have generated the socio-economic and moral degradation of the lives of Europe’s populace. Dostoevsky is credited with seeing London as the centre of world capitalism and the Crystal Palace as a symbol of “the controlling mechanism of utilitarian rationalism”. His depiction of industrialized England and his commentary on the 1862 exhibition, is considered to be consonant with Marxist thought. “Dostoyevsky rejected the grand narrative of western progress. A fierce advocate of ‘the Russian soul’, which he located nostalgically within receding peasant lifeways, he found his era’s preeminent symbol of progress – the Crystal Palace – to be proof of the stupefaction of the human race.”

In contrast, Russia is seen implicitly as having had its own organic historical development and having been by-passed by these movements, some facets of which Russia’s upper classes tried to emulate. These are the liberal, ostensibly educated ‘Russian Europeans’, who are also the implicit addressees of Winter Notes. Critics have inferred from Dostoevsky’s discussion of “fraternity” or brotherhood (bratstvo) and the “commune” (obshchina), in chapter 6 that Dostoevsky had in view Russian Orthodoxy and the Russian common people, (who were freed from serfdom with certain conditions in the Emancipation Reform of 1861). But Dostoevsky does not refer directly to either in Winter Notes. Dostoevsky’s meeting in London with the émigré writer Alexander Herzen (pseudonym Iskander), who was one of the first to identify ‘commune’ as a beneficent social organisation, supposedly unique to Russian peasantry is usually superimposed onto Dostoevsky’s text that makes the ensuing knot of ‘fact and fiction’ difficult to untangle. Nonetheless, critics persist in citing

Dostoevsky’s apparent critique of the principle of individuality in the West that he alleges to have supplanted communality and brotherhood (5,79), as further evidence of the Russian people’s (narod) innate sense of brotherhood: “In short, the novelist saw the ideology behind the Crystal Palace as corrupting and believed that if Russia succumbed to the secular forces that had converged to create the Palace, then the Russian national character, and its inherent universalizing qualities, would be lost.”6

It is also widely acknowledged that the so-called ‘philosophical problems’ of Winter Notes associated mainly with chapter 5, “Baal” and 6, “An Essay on the Bourgeois” were further developed in ideological discussions on the pages of Dostoevsky’s novels of the 1860s and 1870s, beginning with Notes from the Underground (1864) and ending with The Brothers Karamazov (1879–1880). The reception of Winter Notes as a “brilliant prophetic” work that contained the seeds of Dostoevsky’s greatest religious insights was inaugurated by the early Russian émigré religious critics, and encapsulated in Konstantin Mochulsky’s study of 1947: “The “Crystal Palace” of the Exposition is transformed in Notes from the Underground into the “crystal palace” of socialism; the proud and powerful spirit will be called by name in the Brothers Karamazov. This is the Antichrist, the Grand Inquisitor.”7

Similar ideologically determined readings of Winter Notes that draw on the biblical, historical or philosophical allusions in its text have become universally accepted in Western academia and can be encountered also in popular secondary literature and on the World Wide Web.8 A comparable approach was endorsed by the five-volume biography of Dostoevsky by Joseph Frank begun in the 1970s that was condensed into a one-volume version in 2010, though the chapter on Winter Notes remained untouched. Here the conclusion is reached regarding the alleged inferences of Winter Notes that: “It is only the Russian people who are capable of brotherhood; all attempts to establish this principle in the West, as an alternative to the horrors of the war of all against all, are doomed to failure.”9

Dostoevsky’s vision of London as conceived in the chapter “Baal” in Winter Notes has become a popular symbol for the city and its residents,
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6 Chapman, 36.
acknowledged by many as the inspirational vision of the singular Russian 'prophet' Dostoevsky. Even on the official website of the London City Council describing London there is a quotation from this chapter: “Dostoevsky came, and found that ‘a feeling of fear somehow creeps over you... It is a Biblical sight, something to do with Babylon, some prophecy out of the Apocalypse being fulfilled before your very eyes.”\textsuperscript{10} Dostoevsky’s descriptions of London are also quoted in the majority of English books about the city, including Jeremy Paxman’s oft reprinted book \textit{The English. A Portrait of the People},\textsuperscript{11} and also in Peter Ackroyd’s bestseller \textit{London. The Biography}: “He sensed all the chaos of collective experience, in a city which was itself a curse, a quarrel and a solicitation ... He (Dostoevsky) concluded that ‘Baal reigns and does not even demand obedience, because he is certain of it’. But with the break of each day ‘the same proud and gloomy spirit once again spreads its lordly wings over the gigantic city.”\textsuperscript{12}

It is not our intention to debate with these varied and sometimes misleading interpretations reached, particularly in view of the length such a discussion would require to accommodate the complexity of \textit{Winter Notes} and its preoccupation with the issue of Russia and Europe that has its own long history in the sphere of public debate. Dostoevsky’s text rekindles this debate begun in the travelogues of D.I. Fonvizin and N.M. Karamzin (and continued in articles in the \textit{pochvennichestvo} orientated Time, whose editor Mikhail Dostoevsky, was entrusted at its inception to mediate in the Westerner-Slavophile controversy) that Dostoevsky expands and transforms.\textsuperscript{13} In addition, the text is also a polemical response to the work of Marquis de Custine \textit{La Russie en 1839} (1843), banned in Imperial Russia, as well as to earlier foreign and local critiques, including P. Ia. Chaadaev’s \textit{Philosophic Letter} (1836) written in French.\textsuperscript{14} But its most immediate implicit pre-text is presumed to be Herzen’s \textit{Letters from France and Italy, 1848–1851} (1852) in the context of a gallery of notable names alluded to in a seeming ‘tour de force’ of authorial erudition in chapters two


\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 195–197.
and three, although the semantics and the functioning character of these pre-textual instances is not always developed.\(^\text{15}\)

It is our view too that Winter Notes is a seminal work in the canon of Dostoevsky’s writing and contains the seeds of Dostoevsky’s future great works, though not in accordance with the multiple ideologically based readings that have sought to define it. Instead we recognize and appreciate Winter Notes for its author’s aesthetic explorations into poetics within the confines of Tsarist censorship that required that ‘Official Nationality’, the imperial ideological doctrine be upheld.\(^\text{16}\) It led to the evolution of Dostoevsky’s narrative style, distinguished by its reliance on numerous literary and rhetorical devices that includes the use of intermediality in combination with intertextuality, of dialogism, focus on biblical and literary allusions, metaphors, paradox, negation combined with trope subversion, enthymemes and so forth. In the context of the chapter “Baal" these were generated specifically by the ‘discourse of Englishness’ understood in its widest sense to include all literary, cultural and historical phenomena. The functioning character of Dostoevsky’s conceptualisation of intermedial impressions anticipates an essential component of his creative art as seen in future works and constitutes an underlying essence of his work, often concealed under a façade of irony and pamphleteering.

To attempt to untangle how Dostoevsky arrived at this manner of writing in Winter Notes that enabled his text to be interpreted in a multiplicity of ways it is helpful to depict, almost in a cinematographic style (if space allows it), how the author absorbed and reintegrated various intermedial and multi-modal impressions, including sensory experiences that he was exposed to on his trip to Western Europe.\(^\text{17}\) A network of complex intermedial intuitions on Dostoevsky’s mind would have conjured up a mass of cognitive signals demonstrating that “with increasing categorical complexity of stimulus information, processes are invoked that do not occur in simpler impression-formation contexts”.\(^\text{18}\) These were then translated into conscious and unconscious images and thoughts.


Dostoevsky’s insights as expressed in Winter Notes have been wrongly attributed to him exclusively, the Russian ‘prophet’, as being his own original, endemic and visionary insights centred on London and the so-called ‘Crystal Palace’ and the International Exhibition of 1862, as has his choice of metaphors and imagery. But when one looks closely on why he selected that particular kind of figurative language, one discovers that he was surrounded by its manifestations, as well as having had earlier connections with this Protestant ‘discourse of Englishness’ that was distinguished by its use of biblical allusions and belief that salvation comes by divine grace. Dostoevsky’s representation of London was a reflection of his cognitive associations with elements that already pre-existed in the English cultural tradition, and it was ironical that while being critical of those traditions, he can be seen in fact to be indebted, and even inspired by them in the writing of the chapter “Baal”. The feuilleton could not have been written without this underlying cognitive process of their assimilation, acceptance and transformation. This may explain the reasons for his prolific use, for the first time in Winter Notes of biblical allusions, both from the Old and the New Testaments. He links these with London, and they include preexisting metaphors such as that of Baal, the ancient heathen god; the identification of London with Babylon, the city of sin that prophetically was destroyed, and implicitly with its landmark the Tower of Babel; and in addition, the Apocalyptic and more general eschatological motifs combined with the ever-present underlying salvatory theme. The revelatory nature of the impressions surrounding him may have triggered in him a response to assume the role of mediator of revelation that envisages salvation in his readers-recipients, who are the ‘Russian Europeans’ he is criticising for imitating the superficialities of European culture as identified by him. This is in line with the acute and grandiose sense of one’s self that the author often experiences for a variety of reasons, which may have been of assistance to him in the vindication of a sense of guilt for the narrator’s ‘gaslighting’ to accommodate censorship. It could also partly explain the change of tone between the first installment of Winter Notes and the second focusing on London.

On his return to Russia Dostoevsky initially deferred writing Winter Notes. He then hurriedly had to complete his writing under pressure to meet deadlines, while also waiting for the appearance of the rival socially progressive periodical The Contemporary (Sovremennik) that resumed publication after it had been closed down for 8 months. Its chief critic N.G. Chernyshevsky, arrested at the time,19 was now writing in prison What Is to Be Done? (Chto
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Delat’?), to be published in installments. (See Conclusion) Dostoevsky would have wanted to make sure that his own work in Time (Vremia) persisted with its editorial line, and anticipated and polemised with what he thought the trend of Chernyshevsky’s work would be. Chernyshevsky was known to have visited Herzen in London in 1859, when he also visited the Crystal Palace in Sydenham, having written a long article about the opening of the Palace in Sydenham in 1854.20 While preparing to write Winter Notes Dostoevsky would have been aware of the increasingly repressive censorship imposed by the regime of Alexander II that endangered the continuation of his journal Time unless it conformed.21 Conversely he could not disappoint the diverse expectations of his polemically orientated addressees, including the editors and critics of adversarial liberal journals, as they continued to see him as a former victim of the regime.

Initially in the title, Dostoevsky describes his composition as a ‘feuilleton’ of summer impressions, thereby preparing his readers to expect an engaging piece of literary trivia narrated in the first person with appropriate stylistic devices. It is known that he used some of the entertaining letters he had written during his travels to his family members to amuse them, though these letters have since been lost. If the censor had reported on the content of this first installment and on its author’s views, it would have been difficult for him to formulate a final verdict, although the author assures us as early as the first chapter that these are his “sincere” and “personal” observations and appears to present a plausible account of his travels. Nevertheless, there are some evasive statements as if the narrator was equivocating and trying to conceal the truth and avoid committing himself. (See Conclusion: “Dostoevsky’s Return to Petersburg.”)

To bamboozle the censor and the reader further, the narrator teases them by alluding to some well-known names that would have sounded inflammatory at the time (such as those of Proudhon, Chaadaev, Pugachev, Cabet, Fourier etc), yet does not satisfy the expectations of his addressees by following them up in any consistent way. But in the second installment,22 the feuilleton-like tone of discourse becomes almost harsh, judgemental and denunciatory, with some apocalyptic notes. If, in the first part, one hears, as it were, the chatty, boastful,

22 Nechaeva does not cite the date for the censor’s approval for Vremia no. 3, 1863. But in Letopis’ zhizni i tvorchestva F.M. Dostoevskogo; 3 t. (St. P.: Gum. agenstvo “Akademicheskii proekt,” 1999), the date of the censor’s approval is given as March 8th, and the publication date as April 3rd, for which see. t. 1, 397, 400.
vaudeville voice of the Government Inspector in Gogol’s comedy *Revizor* (*The Government Inspector*) who, as the critic Belinsky noted, is virtually a “phantom” (*fantom*) created by the fear of the town’s Mayor (*Gorodnichii*), then part two represents Gogol’s denunciatory voice as in *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*, when, as if deliberately cladding himself in a Gogolian cloak of grandeur, the narrator continues the traditions of homilist literature.

In the first installment there is little that is openly denunciatory or harshly negative about Englishness and Europe, although the narration is full of pointed irony suggesting that the tone could be developed either way. In fact, almost on the first page of his travelogue the narrator, who is openly identified with the author Dostoevsky, recalls how he had longed to go abroad almost since his earliest childhood, from the time when he spent long winter evenings, before he could read, listening open-mouthed, paralysed with ecstasy and terror, as his parents read to him at bedtime the novels of Radcliffe, the English author of Gothic fiction. (5, 46) He then quotes from Khomiakov’s poem on Europe as an entire ‘land of holy wonders’ (*strana sviatykh chudes*) that will unfold before him “all at once from a bird’s eye view, like the Promised Land viewed from the perspective of a mountain top” (5, 47). In chapter two the epithet of ‘the land of holy wonders’ is developed, and Dostoevsky presents a reasonably favourable description of an Englishman, who is one of the passengers, who shares the train compartment with him. He also mentions in chapter three the mechanical curiosity of English tourists, who look more at their guidebooks, than the curiosities (5, 63). This observation confirms that Dostoevsky did visit art galleries while in Western Europe (despite comments by N.N. Strakhov that Dostoevsky was more interested in looking at local life). The narrator-author confesses that in London he did not go and see St Paul’s cathedral, though he saw it from a distance as he was travelling to Pentonville, the model prison. This comment strikes one as consequential, because it was known to informed Russians visiting London that the two main book shops selling Russian books published abroad and banned in Russia were located in Paternoster Row 60 near St Paul’s (publisher N. Trubner and Co) and in Caledonian Road, near Pentonville prison. Dostoevsky is likely to have gone to those bookshops, since it is known from the later memoirs of his wife, A. G. Snitkina that he was in the habit of visiting such bookshops while abroad. Hence Dostoevsky’s

24 Their addresses were published on the title pages of Herzen’s publications. There was one other shop listed as managed by S.Tkhorzhevsky at 39, Rupert Street, Haymarket. See also: http://sarahjyoung.com/site/2012/04/06/the-free-russian-press-in-london/.
fleeting observation could be a hint to his addressees ‘Russian Europeans’ to look beyond the surface level of Winter Notes.

What Dostoevsky does do is forewarn the reader of the visual slant of his feuilleton in context of the “world’s globe” (zemnoi shar), mentioned four times, evoking a sphere (and also Wyld’s Great Globe in Leicester Square to those who had visited London’s International Exhibition.) Once London is reached it is represented in visional terms in the form of colossal or infinite straight lines, “prospective views”, vast panoramic images, “pictures”, ‘bird’s eye’ views (s ptich’evo poleta). Such images are similar to the use today of wide angle camera lenses (5, 47; 68–69). It is akin to a perspective from above as seen on colossal canvases of religious subjects in which the Christ or God is located at the top of the picture. In “Baal” it seems the ‘Lord’ is gazing down at castaways below, as the narrator alludes to these “pariahs of society”, who for a long time yet will not be given palm leaves and white garments “and that for a long time to come they will appeal to the throne of the Most High, ‘How long, oh Lord?’” (Revelation 5:6) (5, 71).

Three Distinct Locations and Timelines for the Exhibitions, and the Dangers Awaiting Returning Russians from London

All the critics while discussing Dostoevsky’s trip of 1862 refer to Dostoevsky’s allusions to the Crystal Palace in London. However, they are vague and imprecise about which ‘Crystal Palace’ they mean, and equally imprecise about which ‘Crystal Palace’ Dostoevsky saw and visited. This could be due to in part Dostoevsky’s reference to the Crystal Palace in his work published the following year in 1864 Notes from the Underground, as some associate it with the Exhibition 1851 and others with the Crystal Place at Sydenham opened in 1854. But none of the critics have specifically discussed Dostoevsky’s visit to the International Exhibition of 1862 in London’s South Kensington and the art exhibition in its specially constructed galleries. Yet it was to view this Exhibition that was the main reasons for Dostoevsky’s visit to London, (although the ‘official’ reason for his travel was to seek medical advice in Europe, while the secret reason may have been an intended meeting with émigrés A.I. Herzen and N.P. Ogarev). In the chapter “Baal” Dostoevsky clearly and explicitly mentions both the Crystal Palace (Kristal’nyi dvorets) and the International Exhibition of 1862 (vsemirnaia vystavka) in the context of the City of London (siti): “The city with its millions and its worldwide trade, the Crystal Palace, the International Exhibition... Yes, the Exhibition is striking.” (5, 69) In this article, studied for the first time will be Dostoevsky’s acquaintance with the latter: vsemirnaia
vystavka, the International Exhibition of 1862 that was located in London in South Kensington adjoining the Gardens of the Horticultural society and one could walk to it from almost anywhere, when staying in the environs of central London. However, the Sydenham Crystal Palace (Kristal’nyi dvorets) in 1862 was located outside London towards the South in Sydenham, where it was first opened in 1854 and one had to travel to it by train. (Dostoevsky’s probable visit to the Crystal Palace in Sydenham is being discussed in detail by the author of this article elsewhere, though it will be mentioned here in passing.)

The practically complete absence of any manuscript or epistolary sources for Dostoevsky’s stay in London, like notebooks (pocket-size with a firm binding) or larger memorandum-type books with jottings for Winter Notes mean that studying the feuilleton’s creative history and the circumstances connected with Dostoevsky’s visit to London is problematic. It is possible that Dostoevsky either lost or destroyed his notebooks since he was still under police surveillance and wary of being inspected on crossing the border on his return to Russia or having his letters perlustrated. Yet according to evidence in the text of Winter Notes, the notebook (zapisnaia knizhka) accompanying the narrator is mentioned three times.

It was no secret that many Russian citizens travelling to London to visit the International Exhibition of 1862 while crossing the border on their return to Russia were invariably searched and their papers confiscated to be returned in most instances later. Neither is it a secret that many personages considered it almost as obligatory to visit A.I. Herzen, founder of the uncensored Free Russian Press in London, (later joined by N. Ogarev), and editor of The Bell (Kolokol) and Polar Star (Poliarnaia Zvezda). For instance, the dramatist Alexander Ostrovsky and comedian Piotr Gorbunov, visited London and they met with Herzen on the 22nd–25th May. Like Dostoevsky’s notebook, Ostrovsky’s


\[26\] In the text of Winter Notes the narrator mentions three times in the first chapter that he has a notebook with him. “According to my notebook I am sitting now sitting in a carriage and preparing for a visit to Eydtkuhnen tomorrow, that is, for my first impressions abroad” (5, 51). “… Apart from these general considerations, you know in particular that I have nothing special to relate, never mind record.” (5, 46) And several pages later he exclaims with apparent ambiguity: “So you need simple chatter, frivolous sketches, personal impressions plucked out of the air. I am in agreement with this and will deal instantly with my notebook. I will try to be simple-minded, to the extent that I can. I merely ask you to remember that a great deal of what I write to you now will contain mistakes. (5, 49).

diary for this period has not survived. Another guest of Herzen’s was the pianist Anton Rubinstein, who gave a concert at the Crystal Palace in South Sydenham on July 12th and was searched upon his return to Russia. The art critic of the progressive journal The Contemporary (Sovremennik), Vladimir V. Stasov also met Herzen, and quite frequently, including at the Exhibition, but upon his return to Russia he too was searched at the border, and his notes were confiscated, sent to an investigative commission, but later returned. The Exhibition was also attended by the writer Aleksei Pisemsky and he too finally obtained a meeting with Herzen. It is not known whether Herzen met A.I. Koshelëv a wealthy Slavophile orientated landowner and publicist, or Dmitry Grigorovich. The latter, a close acquaintance of Dostoevsky’s and a former class mate, who came to the World Exhibition to write a review on the art display of English artists, which was published in two issues of M. Katkov’s Russian Herald (Russkii Vestnik) for February and March, 1863. Many other well-known Russian figures attended the International Exhibition (or World Exhibition as it is now frequently called), but not necessarily visited Herzen. Among them are scientist Dmitry Mendeleev, the artist Aleksei Savrasov, Professor A. I. Iordan of the Academy of Arts, educationist V. I. Vodovozov, engineer N. F. Labzin, and many other official persons, public servants, factory owners and Siberian industrial merchants like M. K. Sidorov, V.S. Kandinsky, V. N. Latkin, F. N. Sabashnikov and so on.

Until recently there has been little information on whether Dostoevsky was subjected to a special search at the border station while returning to Russia, apart from in the Addendum to the third volume of the chronicle of his life Letopis’ (Dopolneniia k Tomam ii–iii) with a reference to archival papers that were unobtainable and held during the Soviet era in Central State Archive of the October Revolution (TsGAOR USSR). That archive became the State Archive of the Russian Federation in late April 1992, but the manuscripts remained unobtainable. These archives were released recently to some prominent

---

29 ‘Attractions’ The Times, 12 July 1862. 1: «Crystal Palace concert today at 3 pm incl Nicolas Rubinstein on piano»; See also Letopis’ zhizni i tvorchestva A.N. Gertsena. T. 3. 326, 329, 355.
31 Letopis’ zhizni i tvorchestva A.N. Gertsena. T. 3. 326–327.
33 ‘Dopolneniia k Tomam ii–iii’, Letopis’. Ibid. 573.
Dostoevsky specialists in Russia and two publications appeared simultaneously in the quarterly electronic journal Unknown Dostoevsky describing the search by customs officials of Dostoevsky at the border Verzhbolovo. According to Zakharova: “August 22 (September 3) Dostoevsky left Berlin for St. Petersburg. On August 23 (September 4), he crossed the border between Prussia and Russia, and at the Verzhbolovo border station was subjected to a thorough search, during which, in accordance with the order of the commander-in-chief of the Department of His Own Imperial Majesty’s Chancellery and the chief of gendarmes, Prince. V. A. Dolgorukov, books and letters were confiscated from him, which were sent to the St. Petersburg Committee of Foreign Censorship.”

The verdict was that the papers Dostoevsky had in his possession were deemed to be harmless from the point of view of the authorities. This is not surprising as by this stage Dostoevsky would have made sure that there would be no papers in his possession that might have been deemed to be incriminating in the slightest. (It should be noted that Dostoevsky’s friend Apollon Maikov was one of the censors of the St Petersburg Foreign Censorship Committee.) However, as a result of a similar border search carried out on P. A. Vetoshnikov, a sympathiser of A. I. Herzen, arrested on his return from London in the port of Kronstadt on 6 July/18 July, 1862, incriminating material was found and he was immediately imprisoned in the St. Peter and Paul fortress. He was carrying some letters, including one from Herzen to N. A. Serno-Solovyevich, that also served as the reason for the latter’s arrest and the arrest of N. G. Chernyshevsky the following day on 7 July/19 July 1862 and confinement in the St. Peter and Paul fortress. It marked the beginning of the “Case of persons accused of connections with the London propagandists” known also as the “trial of the 32”, handled by a special commission headed by Prince Alexander Golitsyn.

The trial lasted from July 7, 1862 to April 27, 1865 and involved more than 70 defendants.

Dostoevsky’s brother Mikhail warned him already in a letter of June 18th/30th, 1862, that there were rumours that two journals were ceasing...
publication and, if he was going to write anything for Time (Vremia), he should make it “censor-proof”. Dostoevsky probably suspected that agents from the Third Department were checking on visitors to Herzen’s home and the book shop attached to Herzen’s printing press, and therefore he would not have visited him straight away, but is likely to have spent the time getting to know London and visiting the Exhibitions.

There are many unsolved questions and puzzles with regard to Dostoevsky’s trip to London to visit the second International Exhibition, and his ensuing activities and movements, but this is partly because commentators conflate the International Exhibition (or World’s Fair as it is sometimes called) with the ‘Crystal Palace’. In the most widely distributed and read book in English about Dostoevsky’s travels to Europe, Joseph Frank’s Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation, 1860–1865 (1986), the third volume of his five-volume biography of Dostoevsky, no distinction is made between the 1862 Great Exhibition and ‘Crystal Palace’ of 1854. The latter was a huge palace rebuilt at Sydenham Hill following the earlier dismantling of the original Crystal Palace of 1851 in Hyde Park, London. Joseph Frank writes: “During his eight days in London, Dostoevsky paid an obligatory visit to the famous Crystal Palace to see the second London World’s Fair, which had opened in May 1862 and was dedicated to exhibiting the latest triumphs of science and technology.” Frank’s five-volume biography was subsequently abridged to a single volume: Dostoevsky: A Writer in His Time (2009), but the chapter devoted to Winter Notes remained unchanged. In it Frank appears to confuse two different exhibitions and two different gigantic buildings, and draws the conclusion that they were one and the same exhibition rather than two distinct displays and two distinct architectural constructions. By failing to distinguish between the Crystal Palace at Sydenham and the London International Exhibition, which opened in May 1862 and was located in the city itself rather than “on high ground just outside the city”, as he describes the Crystal Palace in Sydenham, Frank considers that it was this “Crystal Palace” that Dostoevsky visited on the outskirts of the city. Frank cites an earlier article as his source, in which the two exhibitions are also conflated.

In the commentaries to the Academy edition of the Complete Collected works of Dostoevsky in 30 volumes there is no clear distinction either between

39 Kogan, ‘Razyskania o Dostoevskom’, 586.
40 Frank, The Stir of Liberation, 239.
41 Ibid., 239.
the two exhibitions. The commentaries note: “The Crystal Palace was built according to a plan by the architect Joseph Paxton in 1851 in London, and then moved in 1853–54 to the suburb of Sydenham; it served as the main pavilion for the London exhibitions of 1851 and 1862.”\textsuperscript{43} In the edition \textit{F. M. Dostoevskii. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Kanonicheskie teksty}, t. V. (2004) there is also no distinction made between the two exhibitions: “...the Crystal Palace – a building constructed in London to the design of architect Joseph Paxton in 1851 (reconstructed 1852–1854), in which the world exhibitions of 1851 and 1862 were held.”\textsuperscript{44} In the new edition \textit{F. M. Dostoevskii. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v tridtsati pyati tomakh} the commentary explains the difference between the two palaces: “…the Crystal Palace was built to a design by architect Joseph Paxton in London in 1851 for the First World Exhibition of Industry. <...> For the World Exhibition of 1862 another palace of gigantic proportions was constructed, with two domes and twelve monumental gates. This was the exhibition at which paintings and sculptures were displayed for the first time, along with raw materials, machinery and manufactured goods. There was a rapturous response to the Crystal Palace from Stasov, who published his article on the exhibition soon after the appearance of \textit{Winter Notes\textsuperscript{\textcopyright}}. This is followed by a quotation from Stasov’s article on the Crystal Palace in Sydenham (\textit{PSS35: 5, 461}). The sequence might confuse the reader because Stasov’s description of Sydenham follows immediately after the reference to the 1862 building in London itself, and would be assumed to refer to that building.

Dostoevsky would have been aware that there were two Crystal Palaces, the original one of 1851 and the rebuilt one of 1854, as well as a third building or palace with two domes for the 1862 World Exhibition. The first so-called ‘Crystal Palace’ was built to the design of Joseph Paxton in Hyde Park as a site for the “Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations” in 1851 (also known as the First World Exhibition). The name “Crystal Palace” was first applied to Paxton’s edifice by the journal \textit{Punch} in 1850.\textsuperscript{45} After the closure of the first Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations on October 15th 1851 Paxton and a group of entrepreneurs decided to transfer the building and reconstruct it on an even more grandiose scale on a new site in South-East London, on Sydenham Hill. The opening took place in July 1854 and was advertised and promoted by them as the “People’s Palace”, but also known as

\textsuperscript{43} Dostoevskii, F. M. \textit{Polnoe sobranie sochinenii: v 30 t.} T.5, 368–369.
the Crystal Palace. The opening was noted in the Russian press, particularly in a long unsigned article by Chernyshevsky in *Notes of the Fatherland (Otechestvennye Zapiski)*, August 1854, where he gave it a very positive review.46 There is some evidence to suggest that Dostoevsky would have read that article as he was eager to keep up with that particular journal, as he knew its editor quite well having published almost all his works there. From Dostoevsky’s letters to his brother Mikhail it is clear that he was determined to keep up his reading of leading journals, especially *Notes of the Fatherland* (28(1), 171).47 In addition, in a recent article written by a librarian in Omsk it is shown that *Notes of the Fatherland* were available in the Omsk area at the time when Dostoevsky was still living in Siberia and could have been accessed by him, including earlier editions.48 The edition for August 1854 would have been hard to miss as it had a foldout illustration of the Crystal Palace at Sydenham. It was unusual and probably unprecedented to have a foldout illustration at the time and it would have been arranged by A. A. Kraevskii, who was editor from 1839–1868. A copy of this foldout is being republished here as an illustration to this article on page 174. Dostoevsky may have read even an earlier series of articles in the same journal about the Crystal Palace of 1851 published over 1851–1852, as he was trying to catch up on the events he had missed while in prison.49


47 In a letter of 30 January/22 February, 1854 from Omsk Dostoevsky asks his brother Mikhail: “If you can send me the journals for this year, at least *Notes of the Fatherland*.”

48 Larisa G. Ponomareva, ‘Остроухник за книгой (Круг чтения F. M. Dostoevskogo v Omske,’ *Tobol’sk i vsia Sibir’*. Vyp. 7. (Omsk-Tobolsk: 2006): 219–228: “In the department of rare books OGNB there is a complete set of the journal for 1850–1854, which was issued at one time by the office of the Main Directorate of Western Siberia. Even a cursory review of the names testifies to the range of ideas and thoughts Dostoevsky had to meet when reading *Notes of the Fatherland*.” [“В отделе редких книг ОГОНБ находится полный комплект журнала за 1850–1854, который был выписан в свое время канцелярией Главного Управления Западной Сибири. Даже беглый обзор имен свидетельствует о том, с каким кругом идей и мыслей пришлось встретиться Достоевскому при чтении «Отечественных записок».”]

Sydenham palace bears no direct relation to the second International or World Exhibition of 1862, which was visited by many Russians in the summer of that year. The huge display building for the 1862 exhibition was designed by Captain Francis Fowke of the Royal Engineers and built not far from the centre of London in South Kensington, the total area allocated to it being 21 acres.50 The Legacy of the original 1851 Crystal Palace was intended to be continued by the second International Exhibition 1862. Originally the opening was planned for 1861, in order to mark the tenth anniversary of the first world exhibition organized by Prince Albert, Prince-Consort and Husband of Queen Victoria. The aim of this first exhibition, as announced by him, was to serve as a starting point for the future aspirations of nations, thereby uniting all the nations of the world, which was also the aim of the 1862 Exhibition:

Nobody, however, who has paid any attention to the peculiar features of our present era, will doubt for a moment that we are living at a period of most wonderful transition, which tends rapidly to accomplish that great end, to which, indeed, all history points – the realization of the unity of mankind. Not a unity which breaks down the limits and levels the peculiar characteristics of the different nations of the earth, but rather a unity, the result and product of those very national varieties and antagonistic qualities. The distances which separated the different nations and parts of the globe are rapidly vanishing before the achievements of modern invention, and we can traverse them with incredible ease; the languages of all nations are known, and their acquirement placed within the reach of everybody; thought is communicated with the rapidity, and even by the power, of lightning. On the other hand, the great principle of division of labour, which may be called the moving power of civilization, is being extended to all branches of science, industry, and art.51


Prince Albert chose a biblical epigraph-slogan for the exhibition, namely, David's Psalm 24 (in the Latin Vulgate this psalm is numbered 23 owing to a different numbering system): «Domini est terra et plenitudo eius orbis terrarum et universi qui habitant in eo», “The earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein”. Prince Albert’s objectives also inspired the planning of the second exhibition of 1862. But the prince died prior to the completion of his project and the planning was taken up by a commission, which tried to perpetuate his message of the union of all nations through a world exhibition in the actual construction and architecture of a second building not far from Hyde Park, where the first building of the 1851 exhibition was held. The same psalm 24(23) was displayed on the inner western transept of the 1862 exhibition building. The objectives of the original Exhibition were affirmed in the planning of the second International Exhibition that also focused on the idea of unity of mankind that encompassed national varieties and diversity. This was propagated in published sermons and tracts, such as The Royal Exchange and the Palace of Industry; or, the possible future of Europe and the World. “The Earth is the Lord’s, and all that therein is: the compass of the world, and they that dwell therein”:

The products of the different regions of the earth will recognise each other as belonging to one and the same world; the multitudes of things that will illustrate the achievements of skill and industry, though constructed or fabricated by the hands of men of many languages, will have among themselves a common dialect – a language of their own – but which all the different national workers shall alike understand. Everything will speak of oneness, brotherhood, – the same nature, the same faculties, the same Father, – the folly and wickedness of men not “living together in unity.”

Prince Albert’s vision was consolidated and modernised as it entered the public sphere in the form of the International Exhibition of 1862. In his sermon on The Universal Brotherhood of Mankind, the theologian W. G. Humphry, Vicar of the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields in Trafalgar Square, preaching on the first Sunday after the opening of the International Exhibition of 1862 reminded Londoners that all nations of the world were of one blood: “In the sight of their

53 Rev. Binney Thomas, The Royal Exchange and the Palace of Industry; or, the possible future of Europe and the World. “The Earth is the Lord’s, and all that therein is: the compass of the world, and they that dwell therein” (London. 1851) 97–98.
Creator they are one family; as such they will hereafter be assembled before Him. One of the visions in the Book of Revelation represents a multitude which no man can number, of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne, joining in a common hymn of praise, and crying, ‘Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb.’ Rev. vii. 9.54

Quoting the Acts xvii, 26: “He hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth”, Rev. Humphry also counselled them to make the most of their time of friendship with all the world, a “golden time to lay up a store of kindly recollections in the hearts of those who visit us.”55

But there were also commentators in London, who had argued against the apparent intentions of the Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations symbolised by the Crystal Palace to promote unity within diversity, including the author of the tract Belshazzar’s Feast: In its application to the Great Exhibition: “It will be said, that it is designed to encourage brotherhood among the nations, and to promote the great business of social comfort and happiness as wide as the human family. But, I ask, are these God’s objects? God has scattered the nations, and never proposes to gather them till He gathers them to Shiloh. God would have us strangers here, “content with such things as we have,” without making it our business to increase or improve them.”56

The author, J.G. Bellett made use of the same argument that Dostoevsky would use in the Grand Inquisitor chapter of The Brothers Karamazov regarding the Antichrist, in which Dostoëvsky alludes to the Three Temptations in the Wilderness. Bellett cautions that the ethos of the Exhibition “presents the kingdoms of the world, and ‘the glory of them.’ And who, I ask, was it that did this before? The Spirit led the Son of God into ‘the wilderness’, a place of strangership and pilgrimage – but the devil showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.”57

The diversity of the participants in 1862 representing many countries of the globe promoted again comparisons with the Tower of Babel, though more modernist and liberal in its interpretation. For instance, the foremost French correspondent for the Journal des deux Mondes, Henri François Alphonse

55 Ibid.
57 [Bellett John Gifford]. Belshazzar’s Feast. 8–9.
Esquiros (who also contributed to *Moscow News* (*Moskovskie vedomosti*)) described the International Exhibition in following terms: “This meeting of foreign activists, this working chaos, this mingling of idioms, all this reminded one of the Tower of Babel; however, there was one major distinction: it was from the top of the uncompleted Tower, according to the Bible, that the human races were scattered around the earth as a whole. By contrast, it was at the palace of the World Exhibition that they were destined to meet in 1862.”

Nevertheless, voices that disagreed became more vocal in 1862 cautioning against the earlier “vain delusive dreams of peace, philosophically grounded on mere worldly principles, which then filled many minds”, but were soon broken by “a terrible awakening”:

> The horrors of the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny have not been without their effect in teaching wisdom; still more recent wars, and threatening of wars, together with the demonstration given of the falsehood of those cobweb theories which assumed that the world was to be governed by mere market-price [...] Some of the more dangerous spirits are moodily mourning over the fallen idol, and their defeated expectations and predictions [...] The chastening of the Lord has been laid upon us, brethren: truly we had need of it; for never since the world began was there such a race or such ardour for the worship of Mammon.

Esquiros’s hidden allusion to Babylon, the location of the Tower of Babel, and the ancient gods or pagan idols worshipped at that time, but now fallen, including Baal associated with the worship of objects and identified with Mammon, were some of the images and symbols in circulation in the ‘discourse of Englishness’ at that time. Dostoevsky, it seems, picked up these dissonant notes in 1862, ideas which were “in the air” (to use his own expression). The idea of “living together in unity” was also undercut by some journals in Russia, including indirectly by that of the Dostoevsky brothers’. For example, the Political correspondent of *Time*, A.E. Razin alluded in the February issue for 1862 to the fact that the British government was continuing preparations for the exhibition’s opening, while part of its working population was suffering from the cessation of raw material imports from America, principally cotton, on account of the American Civil War: “And the horrors of this famine are
accompanied by the current cold winter, and in the meantime wealthy England is organizing for May 1st a magnificent industrial celebration, a colossal world exhibition, where all the latest wonders of manufacturing will be assembled, among them some amazing cotton-spinning machinery. And while spectators throng to these wonders, what will the poor workers do? Die of hunger.\[60\]

In view of the topic of ‘unity of mankind’ and ‘brotherhood’ of all nations within this ‘discourse of Englishness’ associated with the Exhibition, it is not surprising that Dostoevsky would bring up rhetorically the topic of brotherhood in Winter Notes. But due to censorship he could not have related it directly to the message embodied in the International Exhibition. Instead he had to use other means of calling attention to it, which he did by associating it with Russian reality, which became in the process an alternative reality that the ‘gaslighting’ narrator had to create. Nor could he have discussed the organisation of ‘brotherhood’ in terms of socio-political systems of government or institutions, but only with reference to morality and national religion.

Dostoevsky Makes Travel Plans

Dostoevsky began planning to apply for a foreign passport for his trip to Europe in the spring of 1862, a trip that would include the exhibition and its “wonders” (chudesa), although he was well aware of the political background against which it was proceeding. His application for a foreign passport on health grounds took over two months. The reference for permit signed by the Deputy Minister of the Interior for Dostoevsky to travel abroad was registered in the Third Department on May 4th, 1862. Attached to this document were a letter of support from the military governor-general of St. Petersburg, Alexander Suvorov, and a certificate testifying to Dostoevsky’s illness. The notification to the minister of internal affairs by Prince V. A. Dolgorukov’s adjutant-general of the most gracious granting of a foreign passport to Dostoevsky is dated May 8th.\[61\] On May 29th (June 10th) 1862 Dostoevsky was issued a foreign passport under the signature of Military Governor-General A. A. Suvorov of St. Petersburg.


An illustration of Dostoevsky’s passport is featured at the end of this article on pages 175–176.

The passport supposedly gave him some immunity from harassment at border posts, even though he would not be completely freed from searches. (But all the documents relating to his application were reported in 1973 to have perished in the May Petersburg fires of 1862 in the building of the Ministry of the Interior.) After receiving the passport Dostoevsky did not immediately go abroad, but took part in some readings at Pavlovsk on June 5/17th for victims of the May fires in St. Petersburg. He was exhausted after two and a half years of hard work as the chief critic and author of *Vremia*. He had only just completed writing *Notes from the House of the Dead* (*Zapiski iz mertvogo doma*) on June 3/15, and a colleague attested he became “much more cheerful”. His wife, Maria Isaeva was ill with tuberculosis and would die in March 1864. It is more than likely that by June 1862 Dostoevsky was already acquainted with Apollinaria Suslova his future lover (and travelling companion on his next trip to Europe), who according to the memoirs of Dostoevsky’s daughter “hung around Dostoevsky and obliged him in various ways. Dostoevsky did not notice it. Then she wrote him a letter declaring her love for him. This letter was found in my father’s papers.” Perhaps he hoped to see her at Pavlovsk, but no information has survived with regard to their early meetings.

Both in Europe and in Russia the summer of 1862 proved to be very wet, which Mikhail mentioned more than once in letters to Dostoevsky, who made several complaints to Mikhail in letters which have not been preserved about his “depression” (*khandra*) and indicated that for the first time he had abandoned himself to roulette. The wet, foggy summer is already mentioned ironically in the first chapter of *Winter Notes* (5, 47; 49) as affecting the
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62 There is a detailed description of the gaining of the passport in my earlier article: Zohrab A, “Palimpsest” Dostoevskogo: “Zimnie zametki o letnikh vpechatleniakh” i Londonskie vystavki 1862 g., Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniiia, Tom 23 (Sankt-Peterburg: RAN, IRLI, Pushkinskii Dom, Nestor-Istorii,): 29–85.


66 Dostoevskaia L. F., Dostoevskii v izobrazhenii svoei docheri (SPb.: Andreev i synov’ia, 1992), 86.

67 Saraskina L., Vozliublenaia F. M. Dostoevskogo. (M.: 1994) 22: “It is interesting neither Dostoevsky nor Apollanaria uttered a word about their first meeting and left behind no memoirs, nor oral accounts, nor even hints in… diary entries".
narrator’s judgement of his environment. During the course of his journey the narrator complains jokingly that the rocking on the “iron trundler” ie train (skakal po chugunke) is wearing him out, that he is concerned about his liver and is checking his tongue for signs of illness (5, 47–48) (like the Underground Man of his subsequent novella).

It was under these circumstances that Dostoevsky set out on June 7/19th on a journey around Europe, and for the purposes of this article we shall go straight to Paris, where he is supposed to have arrived on June 16/28th and where he stayed prior to his departure for London. According to his own words, he spent a month in Paris, minus his eight days in London (5, 68). The stamp in his passport of July 16/28th indicates that on this day (after a month in the French capital that included the trip to London and back) he was permitted to leave Paris to travel to other states. Dostoevsky’s notion of a megapolis similar to Babylon was possibly already formed in Paris under the influence of Pelletan’s newly published book The New Babylon La Nouvelle Babylone about Paris, which attracted attention in the cultural spheres of France and Russia.

The book was reviewed by Evgeniia Tur (who was living in Fontainebleau, close to Paris, at the time) in the journal Library for Reading (Biblioteka dlia chteniia, nos. 10 and 11 for 1862 (just when Dostoevsky was preparing to write Winter Notes): “Excerpts from the current literature and travel notes. Eugene Pelletan’s ‘The New Babylon’ and Bal Mabille in Paris.” While in Paris Dostoevsky probably heard about the “republicanist” writer Pelletan, who was at the time serving a prison sentence for a political offence (and had the support of Victor Hugo, who corresponded with him). Pelletan’s New Babylon was later reviewed in the April issue of the The Contemporary 1863 under the signature “Skif”, the pseudonym of Iu. G. Zhukovsky. The same issue contained the second part of the new novel written by Nikolai Chernyshevsky in the St. Peter and Paul Fortress, What is to be Done? The first part had appeared in the March issue that went through censorship on 15th February and 14th March and was issued for dissemination on 19th March. By this time the first part of Winter Notes had already come out; the second part however was passed by the censor on 8th March and appeared on 3rd April 3, which suggests that Dostoevsky might have read the first part.
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68 Brusovani M. I., Gal’perina R. G. 277.
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of *What is to be Done?* before completing the writing of his second installment of *Winter Notes.* Meanwhile the April issue of *The Contemporary* for 1863 received the censor’s approval on 20th April and appeared on 28th April. Subsequently its three issues № 3–5, containing Chernyshevsky’s new novel were withdrawn from circulation and not republished in Russia until 1905. Curiously, a notice appeared in *The Contemporary* at the end of the March issue announcing the loss of the manuscript of *What is to be Done?* and requesting that whoever found it to return it to the editorial office.

In Paris Dostoevsky would have read his favourite French journal *Revue des deux Mondes* and the articles by Alphonse Esquiros, who was its English correspondent (and who, as mentioned earlier had also contributed articles in Russian translation to M. Katkov’s *Moscow News*). All of Esquiros’s articles about England (39 in total) were later collated in a volume and published in a collection which ran through several editions under the title *L’Angleterre et la vie anglaise.* One of his articles on the International Exhibition 1862 was devoted to its art displays: ‘The fine arts at the London exhibition; painting and painters in the UK’ [*Les-beaux arts à l’exposition de Londres; la peinture et les peintres dans le Royaume-Uni*]. Here he noted: “Although the entire Palace of Industry excites curiosity, it is still the Picture Gallery which is the main center of attraction. It also offers us the opportunity to complete our study of the 1862 exhibition [5], and after having travelled through foreign schools, represented by a few selected works, we will research the characteristics of art in England. More than elsewhere, painting has given form and expression in Great Britain to national feeling, to ways of life, to popular habits.”

In Dostoevsky’s passport there are no stamps confirming his arrival in England and departure therefrom. This is one of the reasons why commentators differ in their opinions as to his arrival date in London and his departure, and even as to the length of his stay. The captains of ships arriving in Britain were supposed to list the foreigners on board in conformity with the 1836 law demanding lists of foreigners arriving in British ports. The names were entered in a list known as the “Returns of alien passengers from July 1836 to December 1869.” However, there is a gap in the returns between January 1861 and December
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Although Dostoevsky mentions in Winter Notes that he spent only eight days in London, nevertheless the fact that he was secretive in his sole surviving letter, written to Strakhov on June 26th (July 8th) in Paris, and did not mention his imminent departure for London suggests that he wished to keep his plans concealed or was concerned about his mail being opened. According to Joseph Frank it was “mid-June” when Dostoevsky reached Paris “and he remained there for two weeks”. Frank writes that “Dostoevsky summed up his impressions in a letter to Strakhov a day before leaving for London.” Since the letter to Strakhov is dated July 8th (New style), so according to Frank Dostoevsky left for London on July 9th N.S. But according to M. I Brusovani and R. G. Galperina in their article “F. M. Dostoevsky’s foreign travels, 1862 and 1863”, “Dostoevsky sets out for London no later than June 30th/July 12th.” This is repeated in his biography Letopis’: “Around June 30th (July 12th). D. sets out for London.” According to the recollections of Dostoevsky’s daughter (which are admittedly sometimes imprecise) Dostoevsky remained in London “for a long time”: “London struck Dostoevsky as much more interesting than Paris. He remained there for a long time, got to know it thoroughly and raved about the beauty of young English women.” In the best-known Russian biographies of Dostoevsky, by Leonid Grossman, Yuri Seleznëv and Liudmila Saraskina the question of Dostoevsky’s departure from Paris and the dates of his arrival in London are not discussed.

Dostoevsky’s Arrival in London and His “Marvelling at the Wonders of the International Exhibition” of 1862 in South Kensington

Dostoevsky’s would have arrived in England by steamship, having crossed via the shortest and quickest route: Boulogne-Folkstone or Calais-Dover.
The south-eastern railway line ran from Folkstone and Dover to London. A description of entering London via the south-eastern railway line and the panorama which the passenger sees on entering the megapolis is given in an 1862 book for travellers.\(^{86}\) It is similar to the way Dostoevsky describes his experiences: “In a word, I was overcome by an unquenchable thirst for novelty, for a change of place, for general, synthetic, panoramic, perspective impressions. Well, what do you expect from me after such avowals? What am I to tell you? What am I to describe? A panorama, a perspective? Something from a bird’s eye view?” (5, 47.) His first view of London’s environs and the “city” was indeed from a bird’s eye view, from the train that hurtles between the roofs of houses in the environs of the megapolis and the people below on the ground seem “diminutive”, reminding one of the pictures of crowds in *Winter Notes.* While the train is speeding the traveller sees “diminutive-looking people, and cabs, and carts”, “hurrying along deep down in the roadway under the train!” Around the end of the first week in July (8–13 July N.S.), when Dostoevsky most probably arrived in London, the weather was warm and sunny, but had taken a turn for the worst by the middle of the week, particularly on the Wednesday 4/16 July, when he visited Herzen.\(^{87}\)

It seems certain that Dostoevsky first saw the Crystal Palace in South Sydenham on a bright, sunny day from a train speeding past:

No sooner does the train near London than the huge glass temple of the Crystal Palace appears glittering in the light, like so much ice-work. Then stations rush rapidly by …. In a minute or two the train turns the angle of the line, and then through what a bricken wilderness of roofs it seems to be ploughing its way, and how odd the people look, as they slide swiftly by, in their wretched garrets!

Dostoevsky leaves the train most likely at Victoria Station. It is possible that he then takes a carriage or an omnibus (horse-drawn) and departs for the centre of London, near Leicester Square, where, according researchers in Russian, he is said to have lodged at the Prince of Wales Hotel, situated “not far from Regent Street” on the basis of the fact that many Russian tourists stayed in this hotel according to the unpublished diary of P. I Miller.\(^{88}\) There really was a


\(^{87}\) *The Times*, July 17: 12; *The Times*, July 18: 6.

\(^{88}\) Brusovani, M. I., Gal’perina R. G., 279: «in the city centre, not far from Regent Street». 
Prince of Wales Hotel in London but, according to our research, it was situated in Leicester Place, not far from Leicester Square. The notice in *Bell's Weekly Messenger* for 1861 advertises the “Prince of Wales Hotel” and describes it as “extensive and magnificent.” The tariff, including breakfast, was three shillings and sixpence, but on the third floor there were rooms for single gentlemen available for one shilling.89 The hotels and boarding houses around Leicester Place and Leicester Square were popular with foreign visitors, including those from France and Germany.90 They were advertised as being in the immediate vicinity of the Haymarket. A guidebook from those years states that Haymarket, the area “between Coventry-street and Regent-street “at night is a resort of the worst company in London, male and female. See Dickens’s *Household Words*.” The western side of the Haymarket is chiefly occupied by “restaurants, taverns, public houses and shell-fish shops.”91

Joseph Frank writes that on arrival in London Dostoevsky visited Herzen, probably “several times during the eight or so days of his English sojourn,” but “Unfortunately, we have no account of what they said to each other on those two occasions (probably the 11th and certainly the 16th of July.”92 With regard to Herzen’s letter of July 5/17th to Nikolai Ogarëv, mentioning that “Dostoevsky called yesterday,” Frank writes that Dostoevsky probably met with Ogarëv “a day or so earlier.”93 But according to information in hand Ogarëv left London for the Isle of Wight on Sunday, July 1/13th.94 At the present time it can be surmised that Dostoevsky met with Herzen probably four times between July 4/16th and July 8/20th, though not every time at Herzen’s home, but could have had a rendezvous with him at the International Exhibition (as Herzen met some other visitors there). In addition to Herzen’s letter there is also evidence that Herzen gave Dostoevsky a signed photograph of himself dated July 19th.96 Dostoevsky in turn gave Herzen a signed photograph dated Sunday, July 20th. But an agent of the Third Department reported that Dostoevsky met

91 Ibid. 286.
92 Frank, 189.
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95 Ibid. 340. Some commentators have provided misleading dates in correlation to days of the week that year, when Sunday fell on the 13th and 20th July, which was one of the days when Herzen saw visitors, the other day being Wednesday.
Herzen and Bakunin in June 1862, although in the Chronicle of Dostoevsky’s Life (Letopis’) it is suggested this could have been on Thursday, July 5/17th. The following Monday Herzen left London for Coves, on the Isle of Wight, just off the English coast. On the same Monday Dostoevsky was back in Paris and in a letter to his brother (which has not survived) he asks him to inform Strakhov that he will remain in Paris till July 15/27th. According to the stamps in his passport he leaves the city on July 16/28th. Dostoevsky writes of his impressions of Herzen in his Diary of A Writer of 1873 (21, 8–10).

Thanks to a number of pieces of evidence it is known, indeed, it is practically indisputable, that Dostoevsky visited the International Exhibition of 1862. His brother Mikhail knew that Dostoevsky was planning to visit the International Exhibition. This is confirmed by a letter dated June 9/21, 1862, from Mikhail Dostoevsky, who assumed on this day that Dostoevsky was already in London: “Having not received a reply from you to my last letter (with Bazunov’s money), I assume you are in London and marvelling there at the wonders of the world exhibition [и дивишься там на чудеса всемирной выставки]. I am expecting a lengthy letter from you.”

Dmitry Grigorovich, a former classmate of Dostoevsky’s at the engineering academy and subsequently a flat-mate, also went to London to visit the World Exhibition in order to write a review of the art display, and was hoping to meet up with Dostoevsky. Grigorovich probably knew that three pictures had been selected from Tret’iakov’s collection, one of which was painted by K.A. Trutovsky, a former junior schoolmate of himself and Dostoevsky at the Main Engineering Academy. The painting was called Khorovod (Khorovod in the Kursk province). On returning from his travels, Grigorovich told Mikhail he did not meet with Fyodor abroad, of which fact Mikhail informed his brother in a letter of July 9/21, 1862: “Grigorovich called on his way through. He talked a heap of nonsense and left. I was very sorry he didn’t catch you abroad.”

---

97 Rossiia pod nadzorom, 586.
98 Letopis’ zhizni i tvorchestva F.M. Dostoevskogo, T.I. 370; as a source cited is Literaturnoe nasledstvo, 86: 7, 596.
99 Letopis’ zhizni i tvorchestva A. N. Gertsena. T. 3. 344.
100 Brusovani M. I., Gal’perina R. G., 282.
102 His painting was called Khorovod (Khorovod in the Kursk province). See also: Andreeva Galina, ‘Pavel Mikhailovich pobyyval kak obychno v Anglii ...’, Tret’iakovskaiia Galereia №1 (2004): 21–35.
103 Dolinin, 537.
As he made his way through London Dostoevsky would have had easy access to public transport. If he had been to all the places which he mentions in *Winter Notes*, he would have visited not only the Haymarket, but also Whitechapel in the East, Pentonville in the North, the World Exhibition in South Kensington in the West and – further away – the Crystal Palace, known as the People's Palace rebuilt in Sydenham, to the south-east of the city, which was easily reached by train. The trains for Sydenham left from the London Bridge station every quarter of an hour, as well as from Victoria Terminus, Belgravia.104 Judging by his mentioning of “the city”: “The city with its millions and world-wide trade,” Dostoevsky also investigated the city centre and, in that case, could have seen the Bank of England, the City Hall, the Inns of Court (the professional association for lawyers), the Old Bailey, being the central criminal court, and even possibly the Tower of London. The London Stock Exchange was an outstanding new brick building in the city, completed by March 1854 in the architectural style of the 1851 Great Exhibition. Dostoevsky could well have viewed the newest of London's bridges: Westminster Bridge, opened on May 24th, 1862, which joined Westminster, where the Houses of Parliament were located, with Lambeth in the East. Perhaps he had heard of William Wordsworth's celebrated sonnet “Composed on Westminster Bridge” (1802), in which the poet captures a morning scene slightly reminiscent of Dostoevsky’s own description of a vision on the Neva, that recurs in a number of his works.

Dostoevsky is most likely to have viewed the exhibitions for the first time in the first couple of days following his arrival in London (most likely on Monday 2/14 or Tuesday 3/15 July), when the weather was still sunny, although it deteriorated, and by the time he visited Herzen on the Wednesday of 4/16 July there was a huge storm.105 Dostoevsky may have used public transport to get to Herzen's house, which on today's London map is located at 1 Orsett Tce in the Westbourne district of the City of Westminster.106 Since Dostoevsky is


105 *The Times*, July 17th:12; *The Times*, July 18th: 6: “Another Irruption of the Fleet Sewer. – On Wednesday afternoon another outbreak of the Fleet sewer and inundation of the works of the Metropolitan Railway took place, consequent on the heavy storms with which the metropolis was visited. Between 4 and 5 o'clock, as the workmen employed at the new station being erected at King’s- cross and the uncompleted portion of the tunnel at the corner of Acton Street, Bagnigge-Well’s-road were busy at their labours, they were alarmed by a sudden rush of water into their works. A warning cry was instantly raised, and the men made their escape in all directions... In less than ten minutes the water rose to a height of 15 feet...”.

106 It runs roughly east-west between Porchester Tce in the west and the junction of Westminster Bridge and Westbourne Tce in the east and is crossed midway by Gloucester Tce.
presumed to have stayed not far from Leicester Square, he would have walked past Wyld’s Great Globe (demolished in October, 1862). He would have been close also to Trafalgar Square, and would have had to walk past the National Gallery and the Royal Academy of Arts. At that time the National Gallery stood out for its collection of works by Paul Claude (Lorraine) and J. M. W. Turner, who regarded Claude as his teacher, and their paintings were displayed side by side in a prominent place. All the leading London tourist guides of that period noted that Turner had donated the majority of his paintings to the National Gallery “on condition that they will be hung alongside Claude in the National Gallery.” 107 (Today they are exhibited in the Tate Gallery.) At the International Exhibition there were nine oils and 49 water colours of Turner’s on display, while his illustrations were displayed in the engravings section. 108

The Art Displays at the International Exhibition 1862 in South Kensington: Hogarth, Martin, Turner

Like most visitors to London in the summer of 1862 Dostoevsky could not have missed seeing the International Exhibition with its galleries in South Kensington. This colossal structure was designed by combining the baroque and pseudo-classical styles and had two gigantic twelve-facet glass domes in the East and West of the building, the biggest in existence at that time. 109 The domes were constructed to rise up from rotundas adjacent to Exhibition Road in the East and Prince Albert Road in the West. The two domes were connected by a nave similar to a nave in a church built in the Gothic style and illuminated by the window apertures customary for such churches. At either end the nave

107 Murray’s Modern London. 70.
109 McDermott, The Popular Guide to the International Exhibition of 1862, 14: “They consist of the following parts: Two duodecagonal domes, which are 160 feet in diameter and 250 feet high, and are the largest of ancient and modern times. The dome of the Pantheon is 142 feet in diameter and 70 feet high; the dome in the Baths of Caracalla was 111 feet; Bruneleschi’s at Florence, is 139 feet in diameter and 133 feet high; the dome of St. Peter’s is 158 feet in diameter, and 263 feet high from the external plinth; the dome of St. Paul’s Cathedral is 112 feet in diameter and 215 feet high. The domes are of glass, with an outer and inner gallery.”
was transected by two transepts running from north to south. According to the Commissioners “The buildings provide on a large scale for four objects: I. Picture Galleries, which require to be solid structures, secure from all accidents of weather, extremely well ventilated, and lighted at the top; II. Ample spaces of different forms, and lighted in different ways, for the Exhibition of Works of Industry, arranged in courts and galleries; III. Platforms and wide Passages, for Ceremonials and Processions; and, IV. Accommodation for Refreshments.”

Various other facilities were provided such as “Retiring Rooms, Lavatories, & c.” a post office, a telegraph office, a railway information office etc.

It is likely that the nave and glass window apertures may have reminded Dostoevsky of station-platforms he was familiar with in Russia (Tsarskoselsky, Pavlovsk) and the Moscow Nikolaev railway that was in the process of being built when Dostoevsky met Belinsky there, whose haunting presence can be discerned in Winter Notes. The exhibition building also reminded other visitors of a railway station, including Esquiros: “South Kensington could be taken for a railway station, a barrack, or a model prison... The interior of the building is vastly preferable to the exterior in terms of architectural beauty... the naves which stretch from one dome to the other, supported by slender iron columns, undoubtedly possess a titanic grandeur, power and boldness which accord well with the national genius of the English.” Like Esquiros, Dostoevsky is likely to have found it difficult not to be ‘overcome by a sense of profundity and solemnity upon entering. The motivation behind the erection of this colossal building is truly religious.” At the corners of the principal and lateral facades rose avant-corps with towers. The principal façade of the building stretched along Cromwell Road in the South, while at the opposite end, along the back façade in the North, lay the park-like gardens of the Royal Horticultural Society with their squares for strolling around and areas for recreation, and musical entertainment. If Dostoevsky had spent any time there listening to music and observing the crowd, he might have recalled similar scenes in the gardens of Pavlovsk station (founded in 1838). Some crucial scenes in his novel The Idiot (1868–1869) take place on park benches in the Pavlovsk Park and also the Summer Park (Letnii sad) at St Petersburg (such as Part II, chapter 5), and seem to hark back to the time Dostoevsky spent in parks at the International Exhibition, where he is likely to have felt detached and alienated from the well-dressed crowds around him.

---


The commissioners responsible for the International World Exhibition tried to express the philosophy guiding it with numerous quotations from the Bible, which they positioned along the most outstanding walls of the exhibition building. Dostoevsky, who knew Latin very well, is likely to have had his consciousness invaded by these massive and profuse inscriptions. Above the internal circular wall of the western rotunda, adjacent to Prince Albert Road and supporting one of the glass domes, verses in Latin from David’s Prayer, I Chronicles 29:11 were inscribed. On the internal wall of the eastern dome were further verses in Latin from the same Prayer of David, I Chronicles 29:12. At the western end of the nave was an inscription in Latin based on Luke 2:14. At the eastern end of the nave was an inscription based on Ecclesiastes 9:1. At each end of the transepts there were also the inscriptions by which the creators of the exhibition hall were guided. The western transept bore an inscription in Latin from the Latin Vulgate Old Testament Bible, Book of Sirach 16:30, which is regarded in the Russian Orthodox Church as uncanonical and not included in the Synodal Translation of the Bible. In the King James translation of the Bible this verse reads: “With all manner of living things hath He covered the face thereof (the earth – I.Z.); and they shall return into it again.” At the opposite end of the transept was an inscription in Latin from Psalm 24 (in the Latin Vulgate this psalm is listed as Psalm 23 owing to a slightly different numbering system): “Domini est terra et plenitude eius”. A psalm of David. (On the first day of the week): The earth is the Lord’s, and everything in it, the world, and all who live in it.”

On the eastern transept of the exhibition hall were some lines from William Cowper (1731–1800), the well-known 18th century English poet and hymn writer: “Alternately the nations earn and teach” and opposite to it, from the same poet – “Each climate needs what other climes produce.”

Cowper was famous for comparing London with ancient Babylon from the Book of Revelations in the long poem “The Task. A Poem in Six Books” (1785): London is “So rich, so throng’d, so drain’d, and so supplied/As London, opulent, enlarged, and still/ Increasing London? Babylon of old/ Not more the glory of the earth, than she/ A more accomplish’d world’s chief glory now.”

Comparisons between London and Babylon were quite widespread in English culture. From early times, but particularly in the 18th century, London came to be associated with Babylon and this was expressed in a saying about London: “cette Babilone (sic), le seul refuge des infortunes [This Babylon – sole refuge

112 Allusions to the Psalms are often encountered in Dostoevsky’s works.
for the unfortunate, i.e., refugees]. Comparisons between London and Babylon became still more widespread in the 19th century. Peter Ackroyd cites several examples, but others could be added. Commentators from the nineteenth century onwards frequently resorted to the image of the ancient city of Babylon in order to recreate the nobility, magnificence and refinement of the modern megapolis of London. The comparison with Babylon was made because both cities were the centre of global commerce that subjugated the rest of the world; it was seen as the throne of Imperial power that defined history. Often quoted in confirmation of this is an article from the popular London magazine of that time, *Temple Bar*, published in 1862 “London as it strikes a stranger”: “We compare London with Imperial Rome and when we would express in one word the idea of her greatness we call her “The Modern Babylon”. It is natural, then, that in trying to form the idea of London we should think of that great Assyrian capital with her lofty walls, her hundred brazen gates, her magnificent palaces, and wonderful hanging gardens.” In the popular Guide *Murray’s Modern London 1860* the hanging gardens of old were linked to London’s parks and open spaces: “The ventilation of the Great Babylon is in some degrees provided for by its numerous squares.”

There can be no doubt that the London exhibition, both the building and the displays and art works, left a deep impression on visitors. Commentators have noted that the motivating force that drove the creation of the colossal building was profoundly religious. According to the latest research on “Decoding the emotions of architectural experience” the configuration of spaces and outline of architecture really influences the cognitive functions of subjects and their emotions. Dostoevsky, who was always seeking inspiration for his writing from contemporary reality and was exceptionally attuned to impressions could not have escaped being impacted by the exhibition.

---


The theme of Babylon was continued and reflected in the subject matter of some pictures in the exhibition. It was particularly dominant in those of John Martin, which also made an impression on Grigorovich, who wanted to share this with his Russian readers: “You are more familiar with the name of Martin (1789–1854); engraving and aquatint have long distributed his compositions throughout Europe: “Belshazzar’s Feast”, “The Fall of Ninevah”, “The Fall of Babylon”, “The Deluge”, “Joshua Commanding the Sun to Stand Still” and so forth.”

He was stunned by another outstanding painting by John Martin, “The Fall of Man” based on Genesis 3:6–7. Dostoevsky must have seen at least some of the English art exhibits because the planning of the picture galleries was arranged in such a way that, in order to get to the Russian exhibits, he would have had to go through the main entrance to the galleries in the South, then proceeded along it around two corners until he reached the Russian exhibits. The entrance from the gardens to the North was open only to visitors with expensive season: “The Picture Galleries occupy three sides of a quadrangle. The largest gallery is in Cromwell Road ... being about as long as the gallery at the Louvre at Paris. The passage from end to end of this great Picture Gallery is uninterrupted, although the entrance is in the centre of it.”

Significantly, the International Exhibition was noted for the high importance it attached to the display of English portrait painters of the 18th century. Many of them hung in the principal gallery intended “to receive the largest-sized oil-paintings and cartoons.” These included Sir Joshua Reynolds and T. Gainsborough. The selection of Russian 18th century portrait painters drew admiration as well, and some compared them with the English school. The art critic Stasov noted: “Here we walked at the same pace as England, and all the acclaim she deserves belong to us as well. Portraits of Levitsky, Borovikovsky, Kiprensky, Bryullov will be next to the best portraits of Reynolds, Gainsborough, Romney and Lawrence, contain the same amount of grace, truth, brilliant luxurious tones (especially in fabrics, satins and velvets), high society grace, noble dignity, magnificent splendor.”


120 Ibid. 14.

121 Ibid., The Popular Guide to the International Exhibition of 1862, 12.
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155
заключают столько же изящества, правды, блестящих роскошных тонов (особенно в материях, атласах и бархатах), великосветской грации, вельможеского достоинства, пышной парадности.]122 The age of Catherine the Great was also represented in the section of statuary that included a bronze model of the magnificent statue of the Empress by M.O. Mikeshin. Dostoevsky also bore the impact of cartoons of 18th century life in several series of engravings and pictures by the English artist William Hogarth (1697–1764), who was regarded as the founder of an independent school of art in England. Hogarth's exhibits were on show in the main gallery and included the series of engravings “The Rake's Progress”, “The Harlot's Progress”, “Humours of an Election”, “Gin Lane”, “A Scene from the Beggar’s Opera”, “Strolling Actresses Dressing in a Barn” etc. as well as several portraits. The columnist for *Revue des deux Mondes*, Esquiros (whom Dostoevsky is likely to have read), regarded him as the creator of “the human comedy of his time; true a number of times the comedy turns into tragedy, but the grotesque becomes horrifying.”123

Dostoevsky's Subliminal Impressions?

The narrator's dialogical 'stream of consciousnes' chatter in the first installment of *Winter Notes* can be traced directly to what the author actually saw and experienced at the Exhibitions in London. For example, the narrator specifically recalls the parodies of Kuzma Prutkov and Fonvizin, especially the latter’s satirical comedy *The Brigadier* (1769) (5, 55), and cites from it to expose the Russian gentry’s Gallomania. The narrator recreates visually striking vignettes from the era of Catherine the Great caricaturing uncouth Russian landowners imitating European manners, customs and behaviour “as they put on silk stockings and wigs, hung little swords – and behold, here's a European” (5, 57). Dostoevsky would have seen authentic, prototypical versions of such vignettes at the Exhibition. As Stasov observed: “From Catherine's time, we have only portraits of noblemen in expensive caftans and with golden snuffboxes, only maids of honor and princesses, stretching out their plump genteel hands that have never seen a day's work towards a harp ... From the first 30s or 40s of our century, only portraits of generals with thick epaulettes and a scowling countenance remain; princes in a boyar caftan or uniform; noble ladies with

---


fans of odalisques in their hands or a hidden eagernes in their eyes to resemble a French duchess.”

Dostoevsky’s depictions in Winter Notes of night-life in the Haymarket, also recall the tales presented in Hogarth’s series of pictures embracing horrifying aspects of life, but at the same time indirectly preaching a morally based image of Christian behaviour. Stasov, who attended the Exhibitions from approximately the first week of July (as Dostoevsky) and until the second week of August, wrote that Hogarth revealed to his contemporaries “scenes from the street, from the market, from the drinking hole and the house of shame, secrets from behind the curtains of genteel life, the boldly displayed underside of splendour and grandiosity.” Dostoevsky, too, is likely to have noted Hogarth’s mastery at depicting the depths of degradation and cruelty, yet nevertheless lightening the darkness and preserving a sense of moral beauty, while often portraying children for the sake of this contrast.

In the chapter “Baal” many scenes are described in the style of Hogarth: “Anyone who had been to London has probably paid at least one visit to the Haymarket. This is an area where certain streets at night are thronged by thousands of street walkers... In the Haymarket I saw mothers bringing their under-age daughters to ply the trade. Young girls around twelve years old reach out to grab your hand and beg you to go with them.” (5, 71) In the Haymarket Dostoevsky saw one girl “no more than six” and gave her half a shilling, and she dashed off in flight as if afraid that he would take her money away. The image of the small girl who “opened her small hands in gesticulation, and then suddenly clapped them together and pressed them to her bare breast” (5, 72) was first exploited in Winter Notes and would be repeated in subsequent works by Dostoevsky. The depiction echoes Hogarth’s illustrations as described by Esquiros: “In ‘The Harlot’s Progress’ Hogarth depicted the life of a prostitute in various episodes; he takes her from the cottage where she was born to a hotel, from a hotel to a palace, from a palace to a den of iniquity, from a den of iniquity to a prison, from a prison to a hospital, and then from there to a grave. These tableaus were worthy of a sermon; charitable organizations established in London to combat what the English call social evil and protect unfortunate girls were familiar with them.” Hogarth was criticised for the choice of
subjects in his pictures like the “Four Stages of Cruelty” and “Gin Lane”, the latter of which was shown at the exhibition and reinforces the picture drawn by Dostoevsky: “Gin Lane’ for example, where a drunken woman allows a new-
born child to slip from her hands and dangle from her open breast... but the 
crude details in Hogarth's pictures reveal moral notions and intentions.”127 “Gin 
Lane” also made an impression on Dostoevsky's friend Grigorovich: “On some 
steps sits a drunken woman; wishing through an instinct for self-preservation 
to keep her balance after lurching to one side, she has let go of her suckling 
child, who is falling head first onto the pavement below; she is so drunk that 
she is barely aware of what she is doing.”128

Also in the Haymarket one night Dostoevsky was stopped by a woman who 
spoke to him in broken French and thrust into his hand a small piece of paper 
on which was printed “in French 'I am the resurrection and the life...' etc.” – 
several well-known phrases (5, 72–73). It is notable that the doctrine “I am the 
resurrection and the life”, which forms the basis of Lazarus's resurrection, is 
the quintessence of the theme of St. John, which inspired the Victorian poets 
and preachers. It would appear in the novel Crime and Punishment, which was 
serialised in Katkov's journal Russkii Vestnik in 1866. The novel also contains 
allusions to Babylon and the Crystal Palace, and many other hidden allusions 
to the environment and expanses of London, from the taverns and problems 
of drunkenness to prostitution and urban life with its throngs of people, horse-
drawn carriages, drivers, etc.129 Here the picture of Petersburg is almost in line 
with the metaphor of “Babylon” employed by Herzen to describe the Russian 
Imperial city in his tract “Moscow and Petersburg” published in 1857 in his 
underground journal The Bell (Kolokol). Dostoevsky recalls once entering a 
“casino” in the Haymarket, where he saw a girl of perfect beauty. This scene 
also inspired the writing of Crime and Punishment. With regard to the “casino” 
it should be noted that in London it was forbidden to play games of chance, 
that it was a punishable crime.130

127 Esquiros, Alphonse, “Les-Beaux arts à l'exposition de Londres la peinture et les peintres 
dans le Royaume-Uni”, Revue des deux mondes. 2e période. № 41 (1862).
128 Grigorovich D. V., 'Kartiny anglijskikh zhivopiscev na vystavakh 1862 goda v Londone', 
Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 12-ti tomakh T.11-12 (Sankt- Peterburg, 1896), 264.
129 A propos “Raskolnikov’s dream” about the horse (hack), England operated under the 
Martin’s law of 1822, which prohibited cruel treatment of horses or the overloading of 
carriages (omnibuses, as they were called): The “Act to Prevent the Cruel and Improper 
Treatment of cattle”, and the consequent establishment in 1824 of the Society for 
the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. In the course of Dostoevsky’s eight-day stay in 
London a coachman was fined for overloading an omnibus (The Times).
130 Murray's Modern London, xxviii: Avoid gambling institutions or "hell holes". Games of 
chance are banned in England, they are the profession of swindlers and rascals, and 
(xxix) the police have been given instructions to arrest those caught gaming.
The description at the beginning of the chapter “Baal” where the narrator compares Paris with London, he concludes with a metaphor for a feral society encapsulated in ‘anthropophage’, usually translated into English as ‘cannibalism’ (though the word exists in Shakespeare’s Othello): “if only they could somehow live together, somehow form a community and organize themselves in a single ant-hill; turn into an ant-hill, and just organize themselves without devouring one another – instead of turning into anthropophage!” (5, 69) It has been suggested that the allusion to anthropophage illustrates the aphorism of Thomas Hobbes about the “war of all against all”. Citing Hobbes’s expression, Joseph Frank remarks that Western society was thus dominated by the “war of all against all”, as Dostoevsky described it in his Winter Notes.\(^{131}\)

The English political philosopher Hobbes, one of the founders of the modern theory of the social contract, gives this description to bestial human existence in its natural state. But could Dostoevsky really have had Hobbes in mind when Leviathan (1651) had not been translated into Russian or French (and when the first Russian translation appeared in 1868, it was instantly banned by the censorship) and he is unlikely to have had access to the Latin version. The expression “cannibalism” was generally used at that time with respect to colonized native populations when described from an imperialist viewpoint. Could Dostoevsky have characterised the English population from the viewpoint of unrelenting Russian imperialism? But it is noteworthy that the population of some parts of London really is described from a superior imperial standpoint: “Whitechapel, with its half-naked, wild and hungry (polugolym, dikim i golodnym) population” etc (5,69). On the other hand he may have also meant the Androphagi, who were an ancient Scythian tribe whose existence was recorded by ancient Graeco-Roman authors, including the historian Herodotus, whose works Dostoevsky had read.

Could Dostoevsky have been wishing to be seen by Imperial censors to be demolishing and discrediting this whole edifice of the International Exhibition recognised as a symbol of “the realization of the unity of mankind” by diminishing and destroying it with his artistic weapon of linguistic metaphors and the use of paradox? The Exhibition celebrated “the universal brotherhood of mankind” as expressed in the following terms: “Everything will speak of oneness, brotherhood, – the same nature, the same faculties, the same Father, – the folly and wickedness of men not ‘living together in unity’”.\(^{132}\) But instead,


\(^{132}\) Rev. Binney Thomas, The Royal Exchange and the Palace of Industry; or, the possible future of Europe and the World. “The Earth is the Lord’s, and all that therein is: the compass of the world, and they that dwell therein” (London. 1851) 97.
in *Winter Notes* this Imperial British enterprise was implicitly negated and figuratively subverted through the use of paradox. The call to universal unity and reconciliation that was the intention of the Exhibition was nullified by the metaphor of ‘anthrophage’ and ‘ant heaps’, that distinguished (according to Dostoevsky’s use of the sacred power of the ‘Word’ and image), all Western humanity, with its belief in individual will and freedom. He described it in “Baal” as “a struggle to the death between the general individualistic basis of the West” [“Борьба на смерть всеобщезападного личного начала”] (5, 69). Dostoevsky even invents a word for it *всеобшчезападногло* (vseobshchezapadnogo), by combining three words: all (*vse*), general (*obshche*) and West (*zapad*). Yet the notion of individual will and freedom would be the prime focus of his next work *Notes from the Underground* (1864), where it is paradoxically almost celebrated. Yet in *Winter Notes* he resorts to a monologue in Part II on disunity, alienation, and mutual estrangement identified with Europeans’ desire for individuality, using metaphors such as Baal (five times) and Babylon from the public sphere that he borrowed from and reused to his own ends, while metaphorically destroying his sources in the process. Could Dostoevsky’s own feelings of alienation and unease, perhaps, that he seems to have experienced at the Exhibition amongst the well-dressed crowds that surrounded him, coupled with his ill health described as *khandra* (хандра), could these have accentuated his wounded sense of self?133

Dostoevsky could scarcely have missed a picture by John Martin, which drew great attention at the exhibition, namely, “Belshazzar’s Feast”, which is related to the fall of Babylon. Visible in the background of the picture is the Tower of Babel. Belshazzar is depicted as the emperor of Babylon and the son of Nebuchadnezzar. While he is feasting with the Babylonians, a mysterious hand suddenly appears, as according to biblical tradition, and scrawls on a wall a prediction of downfall and destruction. The same night the Chaldean (Babylonian) Belshazzar was killed: Daniel 5: 30–31. Chapters 2–7 of the Book of Daniel relate how all earthly kingdoms meet their end. This can be understood as one of the layers of meaning on which the chapter “Baal” in *Winter Notes* is based. Dostoevsky’s interest in the theme of Babylon is confirmed by the fact that his notebook of 1864–65 mentions plans for an unrealised literary-critical article on the topic of Babylon’s foundation (20, 186).134

---

133 Dostoevsky’s letters have not survived, but they are cited by Mikhail in his own letters.
sheets of newspaper clippings from the *St. Petersburg Gazette (St Petersburgskie Vedomosti)* of 1865 that he made of their regular column entitled ‘News in Archeology and the Arts’ (*Arkheologicheskie i khudozhhestvennye novosti*). These clippings have bibliographical pencil marks on them and “the probability that these marks were made by Dostoevsky is very believable” (вероятность того, что эти пометки сделаны именно им, весьма правдоподобна).135

Grigorovich considered that Martin was a direct heir of J. M. W. Turner (1775–1851) in the genre of fantasy: “Turner’s picture in the exhibition titled ‘The Seventh Egyptian Plague’ appeared to define Martin’s vocation.” Grigorovich emphasized that reproductions of Martin’s engravings were very popular and his paintings often featured apocalyptic and prophetic subjects. John Martin gave several interpretations of the biblical scene involving the destruction of Babylon, based on the biblical verse from Jeremiah (51: 58): “Babylon’s thick wall will be levelled and her high gates set on fire; the peoples exhaust themselves for nothing...” Some of his other pictures linked to Babylon and the themes of destruction and prophecy may have been seen by Dostoevsky as mezzotints with etching that Grigorovich referred to, including “The Angel prophesising the destruction of Babylon” and “By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept.” (The latter Psalm is cited in *The Brothers Karamazov*). Dostoevsky may also have seen Martin’s mezzotint illustrations to the Bible and to Milton’s *Paradise Lost* representative of the artist’s artistic imagination and desire for monumental effects.

One canvas that stood out at the exhibition was Martin’s “Joshua Commanding the Sun to Stand Still” from the story in Joshua 10: 12–13: “The sun stopped in the middle of the sky and delayed going down about a full day”: [13] “So the sun stood still, and the moon stopped, till the nation avenged itself on its enemies, as it is written in in the Book of Jashar.” This biblical verse underscores one of the important motifs in *The Idiot* (8, 189). Martin’s compositions are characterized by the depiction of lofty scenes that convey images of huge spaces filled with classical architecture and numerous minute figures. In this epic scene from the story in Joshua that attracted crowds of viewers at the Exhibition, he depicts the biblical battle of Gibeon, part of the conquest of Canaan. The canvas is solidly packed with countless figures, which look like the endless trails of ants overwhelmed by the complex classical

---

architecture and the landscape of geometrical rocks around them. This picture was reproduced in a lithograph and two mezzotints. For Grigorovich Martin's pictures generally represent "endless views of eccentric buildings, colonnades, arches, stairways, passages and terraces. Amidst all this, under flashes of lightning and supernatural light rays breaking through dark clouds, are tens of thousands of people moving like ants (my emphasis – I.Z.).” Martin's paintings in conjunction with Grigorovich's interpretations of them may have precipitated Dostoevsky's visions of an ant-heap in tandem with his critique of the socialists' contention that man, unlike an ant in an ant-heap, does not appreciate what is to his own advantage, according to the theory of rational egoism. (5, 81) Grigorovich notes that in Martin's exhibited painting “The Deluge” “the artist's fantasy finally takes the viewer beyond the bounds of the possible”; he refers to “the sea of huge waves in which entire nations are drowning” and “sweeping over unto eternity”. Dostoevsky too repeatedly associates the populace of London with a “sea” and with an endless “mass”.

In Winter Notes as in Martin's pictures, the viewer looks “at these hundreds of thousands, at these millions of people meekly flooding here from the whole world – people who have arrived with a single idea, quietly, stubbornly and silently thronging in this colossal palace.” (5, 79) As in ancient times, the ruling “mighty spirit which created this colossal scene” is proudly convinced of his own majesty. In the ancient world the crowds of people huddling at the foot of the fourteen-storey Tower of Babel were also compared with ants, if one looked down at them from above.136 Many well-known verses from the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments, were the subject of pictures not just of Martin and Turner, but also of numerous English artists at the Exhibition, which highlighted the importance of the holy scriptures in Protestant England. It corresponded to the prominence given to Biblical allusions in English literature in the Victorian era examples of which had appeared in translation in Russian journals. There cannot be any doubt that this tendency would have left an imprint on Dostoevsky's own writer's craft and poetics.137

136 This comparison is found in the book about The Antiquities of the Jews by Josephus Flavius. In a letter of March 27th, 1854, Dostoevsky asked his brother Mikhail to send him the works of Flavius and several other historians. (28(1), 179). Our concern here is not with the image of the anthill as a concept in Dostoevsky's works, which has been covered in a number of studies, though not from an intermedial perspective.

The resemblance between themes depicted in the pictures of English artists and analogous themes pursued by writers was pointed out by the Russian art critics Grigorovich and Stasov reviewing the Exhibition of 1862: “These Friths, Websters, Faeds and other contemporary painters with their “Epsom Derby Day”, “Railway station”, their fashionable “Ramsgate Sands”, their microscopic dramas, novels and comedies from English life are perfect complements to the Dickenses and Thackerays.” Moreover, Stasov compared “Hogarth” to Henry Fielding, and considered that genre painter William Collins “repeats Goldsmith’s gentility.”

In addition to these there were a large number of pictures illustrating themes in classical British literature that would have been familiar to Dostoevsky. Thus, there were 25 pictures based on Shakespeare’s tragedies, comedies and historical chronicles. Five pictures were based on the works of Walter Scott, all of whose works available in Russian translation that Dostoevsky attests to have read by the age of twelve (30(1) 211–212). The reciprocal relationship between art and literature in British culture may have been a feature specially noted by Dostoevsky, as in his own later works ekphrasis, as well as the visual level acquire added significance. One such example in *The Adolescent* is the story narrated by Makar (the adopted father of the adolescent hero Arkady Dolgoruky) about the merchant Skotoboinikov and the nameless little boy, who breaks the merchant’s porcelain lamp and terrified at retribution throws himself into the river, only to be dragged out “dead” (*mertven’kii*) (13,317–318). This motif or pattern of breakage is repeated, as on a large canvas, in the breakage or splitting of the icon by Versilov, the biological father of the adolescent. Significantly, the repentant merchant wants the scene with the little boy immortalised in a painting and offers to employ the foremost painter “from London” itself (13, 319).

But let us return to the Prince of Wales Hotel in Leicester Place, where it is believed Dostoevsky stayed, located close to Trafalgar Square, the National Gallery and the Royal Academy of Arts. As mentioned earlier, the National Gallery was known for its outstanding collections of works by Paul Claude (Lorraine) and J. M. W. Turner, who regarded Claude as his teacher. Their paintings were displayed side by side. At the International Exhibition Turner’s nine oils on mythological themes predominated followed by landscapes. A number of them depicted idyllic pastoral scenes such as “Tivoli” and “Mercury and Herse”. Apart from that his illustrations were displayed in the engravings section.139 By way of a digression, there is a high degree of probability that

---


Turner could have made an impression on Dostoevsky. It is possible to come to this conclusion on the basis of a note by Dostoevsky which repeats almost word for word what Grigorovich repeated about Turner, citing the English art critic John Ruskin, that he “was a prophet sent by God to reveal the secrets of the universe” [был пророком, посланным от Бога, чтобы открыть тайны вселенной ....]. Dostoevsky uses in his notebooks to The Possessed (Besy) almost the same words with reference to Shakespeare, another English genius: “Shakespeare is the chosen one whom God anointed as a prophet to reveal to the world the mystery of mankind” [Шекспир – это избранник, которого творец помазал пророком, чтоб разоблачить перед миром тайну о человеке] (11, 157). Turner and Shakespeare were repeatedly compared by the critic John Ruskin and the author of the Art Catalogue to the Exhibition, John Palgrave: “Turner appears as a man of sympathy absolutely infinite ... I know nothing but that of Shakespeare comparable with it.” “To speak of him is like speaking of Shakespeare; the poet's supremacy within his art is not more supreme than the painter's. And as in Shakespeare what we most feel is what Coleridge felicitously called his 'myriad-mindedness,' so it is with Turner. Each has created, whilst he described, a world of infinite variety.” Not long before his death, according to Ruskin, Turner uttered the aphorism “The sun is God.” It is considered that this conviction explains his numerous paintings of sunrises and sunsets, as well as his depictions of the sun god Apollo in such pictures as “The Angel Standing in the Sun” and “Chryses”. Turner's idea of the sun chimes in with the multiple images of the sun in The Idiot, where the depiction of the landscape and the world of nature plays such an important role. Dostoevsky’s motifs in Winter Notes relating to the apocalyptic and the prophetic are reminiscent of Turner’s compositions on similar themes. Turner's composition at the Exhibition of the “Reichenbach Falls” in Switzerland is consonant with descriptions of the waterfall by Myshkin in The Idiot. Grigorovich maintains that in the second half of his career “Turner began to seek special effects in nature and revealed an aspiration for the supernatural, the fantastic.” It was as if he was distracted towards the end of his life by a sort of dizziness. Not content with the beauty and poetry of nature, but striving to depict eternity,
he was as it were blinded by the rays of its light and became lost in it..."143 Describing his outlook and manner of execution in the painting “Italy” (its correct title is the story of “Thomson's Aeolian Harp”), Grigorovich notes a landscape like this “could only come from an imagination aroused by hashish, or arise in a dream, in a steppe mirage, or exist in a kingdom of airy spirits and sorceresses.”144 Dostoevsky’s choice of the painting “Acis and Galatea” by Claude Lorraine, to depict the vision of the Golden Age in The Adolescent (13, 375) brings to mind very similar paintings by Turner. The paintings of Turner and Martin elucidate the concept of the ‘sublime’, proposed by Edmund Burke in his treatise A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful (1757). Burke argues that everything that acts in a similar way to terror is a source of the sublime. This conception is an important element of romantic art and is reflected in Dostoevsky’s treatment of London scenes in “Baal” with their inherent visuality.

A special feature of the Exhibition were paintings depicting children, though not solely in portraits as they had been in earlier times, but more individualistically in appropriate clothes and settings, and following childish pursuits, such as play with pets, toys and other children. This was mirrored in the frequent depiction of children in British Victorian literature, particularly the novels of Dickens. Several pictures were illustrations to verses from Matthew 19: 13, where Christ blesses little children, and Matthew 18:6, both employed by Dostoevsky (13, 318). Esquiros singles out one painting by M.Webster of children in a family setting listening to their grandfather reading the Bible on a Sunday night. He comments that “two sentiments sweeten the depiction of poor interiors in England, the love of children and God’s presence in the house.” [Dans ce tableau ... se dégagent les deux sentiments qui parfument en Angleterre les intérieurs pauvres, l’amour des bambins et Dieu présent dans la maison.]145

The focus on children, in the London chapter of Winter Notes, especially on the little girl of six in Haymarket at night echoes this Victorian preoccupation with children, except it is done in a way that subverts it, which fits in with Dostoevsky’s overall style and employment of literary and rhetorical devices.

It is impossible to cover here the numerous paintings on religious topics, (even though a critical article condemned the Exhibition for showing too

143 Grigorovich, 82, 83.
144 Grigorovich, 82.
few\textsuperscript{146}) many on prophetic or apocalyptic themes. But one cannot fail to mention David Roberts’s picture of the ruins of the Temple of Baalbek, erected to celebrate the pagan divinity Baal that reminds one of the prominence given by Dostoevsky to the metaphor of Baal. In the course of his career as an artist Roberts painted several pictures of Baalbek, mainly the surviving ruins of the temple, the gates to the Great Temple of Baalbek (1841), the ruins of the lesser temple of Baalbek, a view of Baalbek from a fountain (1847) and so forth. At the time of the International Exhibition ‘Baal’ was well known as the title of an anonymous satirical poem published in 1861 by a high-ranking author describing the iniquities of English life. Its full title was \textit{Baal: or, Sketches of Social Evils. A Poem in Ten Flights}.\textsuperscript{147} Social evils were described under the following headings: Moral Reflections; Drink; Physic; Mammon; Cant; Matrimony; The Church; Justice; Politics; Elocution. Some critics considered that the work bordered on the indecent.

Dostoevsky’s introduction to Baal in English literature and culture would have come from the novels of Walter Scott, most of which Dostoevsky had read by the age of twelve,\textsuperscript{148} especially the Waverley novels. References to Baal appear in several of Scott’s Waverley novels: \textit{The Abbot} (1820), \textit{The Fortunes of Nigel} (1822), \textit{Peveril of the Peak} (1823) and others.\textsuperscript{149} Baal is usually presented in the novels from a Puritan Protestant viewpoint and sometimes associated with Catholicism and “the corruptions of the Church of Rome”.\textsuperscript{150} Baal is one

\begin{footnotes}
\item[146] The Pictures in the late Exhibition’, \textit{London Quarterly Review} No. xxxvii, October (1862): 285–352; 345: “Considering that at one time religious art meant nearly all art, it seems strange how little of it there was in these galleries”.
\item[150] Scott Walter, \textit{Peveril of the Peak} (Paris:1823) Chapter 13: “Men are called to make their choice betwixt God and Baal”; Chapter 24: 538: “The lecturer was not naturally eloquent; but a strong, deep, and sincere conviction of the truth of what he said supplied him with language of energy and fire, as he drew parallel between the abominations of the worship of Baal, and the corruptions of the Church of Rome – so favourite a topic with the Puritans of that period; and denounced against the Catholics, and those who favoured them, that hissing and desolation which the prophet directed against the city of Jerusalem”; Chapter 29: Thou must not think to serve both the good cause and Baal. Obey, if thou wilt, thine own carnal affections, summon this Julian.” There was an early translation of \textit{Peveril of the Peak} into Russian: Skott V., \textit{Peveril Pik} V 5 t. Per. A.I. Pisarev i S. Aksakov (M.: Tip. N. Stepanova, pri Imp. Teatre, 1839).
\end{footnotes}
of the most frequently encountered ancient pagan divinities in the Bible. Baal is also known as one of the fallen angels from Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, as one of the idols of those “bestial gods.”\(^{151}\) He is mentioned as Baalim (plural) along with his female companion Astarte.

Dostoevsky’s Return to Russia; Increase in Tsarist Repression and Censorship; Dostoevsky’s Use of ‘Aesopian’/Biblical Language to Couch his Impressions

Upon his return to St. Petersburg (after undergoing a search at the border crossing at Verzhbolovo, as mentioned earlier, see footnotes 34 to 35), Dostoevsky did not immediately embark on the writing of *Winter Notes*. He was concerned with other urgent matters for *Time*, writing an outline that indicated to subscribers for the coming year the trend that *Time* would pursue, some unsigned polemical articles that were critical of aspects of both conservative and liberal rival journals, the story *A Nasty Tale* (*Skvernyi anekdot*), a satire on the faux (or fake) liberalism of a high-ranking civil servant. It is possible that he intended with these reasonably progressive-sounding publications to tone down the criticism of the more radical journals with regard to the forthcoming *Winter Notes* that he knew could not be positive in relation to Britain and France, who had been supporting Poland, and the Poles’ eventual uprising against Russian rule. It is believed that it was a deliberate strategy on his part to put some time and space between the impact of the impressions in the summer abroad and their subsequent recording in winter in Russia.\(^{152}\) He was aware that Grigorovich and Stasov would be publishing their articles on the art displays in London at the beginning of the new year in rival journals and may not have wished to precede them. Being an experienced gambler that he was even then, he would not risk putting all his cards on the table.

We will not delve in too much detail into the political changes which occurred in the intervening months following Dostoevsky’s departure for Europe in early June 1862, soon after the Petersburg May fires, his visit to Chernyshevsky on 17 (29) May, 1862, the latter’s arrest on 7 July/19 July 1862, and Dostoevsky’s return to Petersburg on August 24th/September 6th. These
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changes continued to evolve and put pressure on censors and editors, and undoubtedly left their mark on the literary process of the writer's work. Suffice is to recall Strakhov's remarks that, owing to the temporary banning of *The Contemporary* and *Russian Word*, the lower standing of Herzen's publications in London, and the growing influence of Katkov's conservative *Moscow News* "1863 saw a profound shift in the public mood, the most profound and important of all the similar changes which occurred during the previous Tsar's reign."\(^{153}\) Strakhov wrote these remarks at the beginning of the 1880s, and remembered well the outbreak of the Polish uprising on the night of January 10 (22nd)/11 (23rd) in the winter of 1862–1863, which led to even greater internal repression.\(^{154}\) These events led as a consequence to the closing down "by the highest authority"\(^{155}\) of Dostoevsky's journal *Time* after the 4th issue for 1863, when the censor banned Strakhov's article "A Fateful Issue (on the Polish Question)" despite the support and protection of the head of the Petersburg Censors Committee, V. A. Tsee, who was subsequently relieved of his duties.\(^{156}\) A satirical view of the literary publishing milieu is depicted in a caricature of August 1863 published in the periodical *Splinter* (*Zanoza*) is reproduced in this article on page 177.

As the official editor of *Time*, Mikhail Dostoevsky was already concerned about this possibility of closure or suspension of his journal the previous summer.\(^{157}\) Moreover, just prior to Dostoevsky's departure for Europe, two articles about the May fires intended for *Time* No. 5, 1862 were banned and, in the course of the latter's absence, Mikhail was twice called up by the Third Department for explanations with regard to his brother. The combined issue no. 1/2 for 1863 (published 09/02/1863) of *The Contemporary*, which its editor Nekrasov was permitted to issue following suspension of the journal carried an

\(^{153}\) Abakumov O. Iu., ‘... Chtob nravstvennaia zaraza ne pronikala v nashi predely: iz istorii bor'by III Otdeleniia s evropeiskim vlianiem v Rossii (1830-e -nachalo 1860-h gg.),’ *Saratov: Nauch. kn. 2008*.

\(^{154}\) Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva F. M. Dostoevskogo. T. 1. 389.

\(^{155}\) Ibid. 407.

\(^{156}\) Rudakov V. E., *Poslednie dni tsenzury v Ministerstve narodnogo prosveshheniia. Predsedatel' S.-Peterburgskogo tsenzurnogo komiteta V. A. Tsee* (SPb., 1911); Bel'chikov N. F., ‘Zhurnaly 1860-kh godov xix v. v otsenke III otdeleniia,’ *Istoricheski arhiv.* № 4 (1957): 164: “A note from the III Department on May 8th, 1964, mentioned that Tsee was retired because of the ‘epidemic of liberalism’ which had affected him’. See also the note by V.A. Tsee dated May 27th 1862 “On the history of censorship”: “...instead of banning our literature it is much more useful to direct it (…) To achieve this moral influence…” (Arkhiiv Rossisskoi Akademii nauk. F. 647. D. 94. L. 2 ob.)

advertisement on the title page indicating that a new novel by Chernyshevsky would commence publication in the March issue. Its article “A Brief Survey of Journals for the Past Eight Months” discussed the nature of other journals, including Time, while its “Internal Review” criticized journals for clinging to a policy of ‘gradualism’ – “trying not to draw attention to themselves, remaining silent on topical issues and agreeing with official doctrine.”\textsuperscript{158} Time was one of the journals targeted. The third issue of The Contemporary (censor’s permit 15/02/1863, publication 19/03/1863) featured the first part of Chernyshevsky’s novel \textit{What is to be Done?} There is no doubt that Dostoevsky reacted to the criticism of the articles in The Contemporary, and he would have heard in the Petersburg’s close publishing community that included printers and typesetters of the trend of future installments of Chernyshevsky’s novel bringing about his return to the public sphere. On the one hand, Dostoevsky, as the ideological mouthpiece of Time had no wish to appear an adherent of the policy of “gradualism” and retrograde. On the other hand, he and his brother were fearful of censorship and keen to avoid the risk of their periodical being closed down. This situation was reflected also in the final version of the second part of \textit{Winter Notes} in Time no. 3, published on April 3rd.

It is difficult not to assume that Dostoevsky did not include in his text some equivocal means of communication suggestive of reflections which were apparently intended to ensure that the reader guessed that the author had had to resort to Aesopian language like the radicals, and thus suggest to the reader that the text ran deeper than its apparent surface meaning. For instance, his addressees would have been struck by the suggestive use of the forbidden notion of “forming a system” (\textit{ustroit’sia}), which at that time was usually associated with the structures of socio-political and socio-economic institutions, which were taboo topics for discussion (unless in contexts condemning socialism and nihilism). At the beginning of the chapter “Baal” the narrator talks of the necessity of somehow getting along with each other, of somehow putting together a community and settling (\textit{ustroit’sia}) into a single anthill, but if only we settle (\textit{ustroit’sia}) into it without devouring each other (5, 69). In the following chapter he again mentions attempts to somehow establish (\textit{ustroit’}) fraternity (5, 81). But because of censorship, Dostoevsky could not have discussed forms of government as such: “Discussions about the advantages of representative, monarchical rule over autocratic, and republican

rule over monarchical, were acknowledged to be completely unacceptable."159 He could only have conducted discussions of socio-political organisations from the standpoint of the moral values of Christian teaching and philosophical anthropology.

This brings us to a realization, which has not been clearly articulated in Dostoevsky scholarship so far, namely, that the major reason why Dostoevsky’s texts are permeated with imagery and metaphors, and employ a scriptural type of language, including direct biblical allusions, but also ancient, pre-Christian motifs, is to construct a layer of meaning by means of a non-political discourse which might obscure the implied subtext of political discourse inspired by the impressions he received in London and elsewhere abroad. Since these Christian and anthropological metaphors embody meaning that is fathomless, capable of being interpreted in intertextually almost infinite ways, Dostoevsky’s texts might have been left untouched by censors due to their multifacetedness and ambiguity, which would have presented difficulties for censors wishing to request changes or make specific cuts. This proposition applies equally or even more to his major novels. This tendency of Dostoevsky’s arose due to his predisposition to be affected by intermedial impressions, concurrently to being attuned to the passage of current reality (tekushchaia deistvitel’nost’), and compelled to have recourse to it (toska po tekushchemu) in order to produce his artistic works.

Right from the start of the feuilleton emphasis is placed on the narrator’s awareness that he is being observed and spied on. This espionage is conducted by French foreign agents, and even landlords, but to Russian readers adept at ‘Aesopian’ language and reading between the lines it could have been indirectly linked with the Russia state and its surveillance mechanisms conducted by the Third Section, which intensified domestically and abroad during the period of the International Exhibition of 1862, with its corrosive tentacles spreading into

159 At the end of the 1860s the rules of censorship were revised. Among the articles considered harmful were those which had as their topic the basic principles behind the Russian state constitution: «темой которых были основные начала российского государственного устройства. Эти статьи пропагандировали конституционный строй других государств, пропагандировали республиканские, демократические, коммунистические или анархические идеи … Совершенно недопустимыми признавались рассуждения о преимуществах представительного монархического правления перед самодержавным и республиканского перед монархическим <…>. Цензор не должен был разрешать суждения о том, что народ имеет право сменять своих правителей или менять форму правления в своей стране, рассуждений о политических правах и свободах». See Patrusheva N.G., Tsenzurnoe vedomstvo v gosudarstvennoi sisteme rossiiskoi imperii vo vtoroi polovine xix – nachale xx veka (SPb.: 2013) 91; 99.
the populace. The Chief of Gendarmes of the Third Section of the Imperial Chancellery, adjutant general V.A. Dolgorukov wrote in his report for 1862: ‘Therefore, caution required the closest secret surveillance to be established in London, both for political exiles and for their visitors. The measures taken on this subject were a complete success.” [Посему осторожность требовала учредить в Лондоне самое близкое секретное наблюдение, как за политическими выходцами, так и за их посетителями. Предпринятые по сему предмету меры имели полный успех.]

Herzen warned Stasov in a letter of July 28/ 9 August, who was still in London at the Exhibition: “Spying has intensified to insolence” [Шпионство усилилось до наглости.]

Hence, right from the opening page Dostoevsky will not commit himself, but repeatedly suggests in a variety of contexts that his reactions cannot be trusted, have no bearing on the matter in hand and are superfluous. He even titles the third chapter ‘And a Completely Superfluous One’: “You no doubt know that I have nothing in particular to relate and even less to properly write, because I saw nothing properly myself, and what I did see I had no time to examine” [вы специально знаете, что мне-то особенно нечего рассказывать, а уж тем более в порядке записывать, потому что я сам ничего не видал в порядке, а если что и видел, так не успел разглядеть] (5, 46). “Besides, I consider myself a conscientious man, and I would not lie by any means, not even as a traveler. Yet if I begin to depict and describe even a single panorama, then I am bound to lie, not because I am traveler but simply because in my circumstances it is impossible not to lie” [Кроме того, я считаю себя человеком совестливым, и мне вовсе не хотелось бы лгать, даже и в качестве путешественника. А ведь если я вам начну изображать и описывать хотя бы только одну панораму, то ведь непременно солгу и даже вовсе не потому, что я путешественник, а так просто потому, что в моих обстоятельствах невозможно не лгать.] (5, 47)

The narrator notes that in the carriage “there was one Russian who had lived ten years in London occupied with commercial affairs in an office, and was only now coming Petersburg for two weeks on business” (5, 52). This sounds almost like a hint regarding the situation of P.A. Vetoshnikov, who worked for several years in London in a shipping company and was arrested on his return to Russia, resulting in “Case of the Persons Accused of Maintaining Relations with the London Propagandists.”
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The description of the London crowds at the Haymarket and Whitechapel on a Saturday evening is reminiscent of the account of nightlife in N. P. Ogarëv’s poem “Night”, originally entitled “Night in London”. Some readers were familiar with the poem because it was first published in *Polar Star* in London 1859 that circulated ‘underground’. (This possibly suggests that Dostoevsky did meet Ogarëv in London, which might indicate that he arrived there earlier than generally thought.)¹⁶³ The way in which the narrator emphasizes the haste he was in to get to Pentonville was probably a veiled hint at Herzen's printing press and book shop of banned books at 136–138 Caledonia Road, close to and on the same street as Pentonville prison (as mentioned earlier). If, as usually occurred, agents of the Third Department passed on the information that Dostoevsky was patronizing this shop, (as they had reported on his visit to Herzen),¹⁶⁴ Dostoevsky would have been able to explain that he was merely viewing the model prison at Pentonville.

There are lots of hints in the text that arouse question marks. For instance, the narrator seems to hint at something even when he suddenly mentions the Rubens picture “Three Graces”. There was a scandal that erupted in the English public sphere and beyond, prior to the opening of the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, that was due to the display of naked statues which had to be covered up in the appropriate places at the last minute, when hundreds of fig leaves had to be produced for this purpose. The statue of the “Three Graces” by Germain Pilon (1560) in the Garden Gallery of the Renaissance section in the Crystal Palace at Sydenham (the Graces were slightly covered, unlike the Rubens “Three Graces”) was also available for sale in the form of three-dimensional replicas in the shops at the Crystal Palace.¹⁶⁵ A plaster cast of the “Three Graces” by Antonio Canova was one of the statues on display at the Crystal Palace in Sydenham. Dostoevsky may have also seen one of the several versions of the “Three Graces” by Bertel Thorvaldsen. At the National Gallery the painting of Sir Joshua Reynolds’s “The Three Graces” was on view, although Grigorovich described it as “three good-looking adult Englishwomen, clothed in puritanical chastity, and even with refined scarves around their necks” [ничего больше, как три красивые, рослые англичанки, закутанные с

163 Ogarev N. P., ‘Noch’ (Posviashheno G<ertsen>u i N<atali>i)’, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia v dvух tomakh. Tom vtoroi. Poëmy. Prosa. Literaturtno-kriticheskie stat’i* (M.: GIKhL, 1956), 21–36. I wish to acknowledge my appreciation to Dr. Hilary Chapman for pointing out this poem to me and its relevance to *Winter Notes*, as well as thank her for her research assistance.
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To digress, the three Graces are sisters and the youngest and most beautiful is called Aglaya, like a heroine in The Idiot. If Dostoevsky had really visited the National Gallery, he could not have missed a picture titled “Allegory. Vision of a Knight” (1504) by Raphael, who was a favorite painter of Dostoevsky’s. The depiction of a sleeping knight was one of a pair of pictures of the same dimension and in the same style, the other being “The Three Graces” (held in the museum Chateau de Chantilly). The knight sleeps and sees a vision, and on both sides of him are female figures: one represents love and holds a flower, while the other holds a book and a sword. A sketch for Raphael’s “The Knight’s Vision” is in the British Museum. The picture recalls the plot of The Idiot, a fact hitherto overlooked.

In conclusion, let us consider some thoughts voiced by the English reverend Thomas Binney summing up the importance of the Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations. There had been numerous articles in the Russian press about that Exhibition, its aims and intentions, at least some of which Dostoevsky is likely to have read in numerous issues of Notes of the Fatherland in 1851–1852 and in other journals (see footnote 49). Binney notes that some had predicted with almost prophetic perspicacity that there would be those opposed to the exhibition: “There are some prophets, of these our times, whose ‘scrolls’ in relation to the great event, are filled with ‘lamentation, mourning, and woe’” [Ezekiel 2: 10]. They can see nothing, in the thing itself, but a gigantic display of pride and vainglory – and they apprehend nothing, from the meeting of the nations, but mutual corruption, prolonged riot, and perhaps blood. Their favourite analogies are the Tower of Babel, Nebuchadnezzar’s golden image, or the Devil tempting Christ by revealing on the mount ‘all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them’, or some such human or diabolical atrocities!” And here the Reverend Binney quotes the same extracts from the Bible which were adapted by Dostoevsky with reference to his polemical discussion begun in Winter Notes and later developed as the culminating point of his arguments in The Brothers Karamazov, namely, Babylon as a city of sin with its Tower of Babel (Genesis 11:12), the pagan idol (Baal), which is worshipped in Babylon (Daniel 3: 1), and the temptation of
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Christ by the Devil (Matthew 4: 8–10), (14, 231–236). And at this point Binney warns that:

It is a pity to give way to these dark imaginings; – to see nothing in our fellow man, nothing but what is bad, and to expect nothing from the hand of God but the thunderbolt of vengeance or the ‘vials of wrath’! It is far better, far more becoming, especially in those that believe that “the earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof: the world and they that dwell therein,” to take healthy, cheerful, and hopeful views, of the great event.

The Reverend Binney was unable to foresee that it would have been impossible for someone like Dostoevsky to depart from the path that he was destined to take. Like the phantom Government Inspector created by the fear of Gogol’s Gorodnichy (mayor), so Dostoevsky’s phantom flaneur, the narrator of Winter Notes was created by the expectations of censors and readers. But Dostoevsky could not fail but to respond in his own way to the underlying idea which ran through the London’s International World Exhibitions: of the necessity of world unity and empathy.

---
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FIGURE 2  Dostoevsky’s foreign passport of 1862. The original is held at the RGB, the Russian State Library in Moscow, while a copy is available on its website.
FIGURE 3  Dostoevsky's foreign passport of 1862 in German for border checks crossing into Prussia. The original is held at the RGB, the Russian State Library in Moscow, while a copy is available on its website.
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Appendix British Artists Exhibiting at the International Exhibition of 1862 (Combined Oils and Water Colours)

Absolon, John; Alexander, William; Allan, Sir William; Ansdell, Richard; Anthony, Henry Mark; Archer, James; Armitage Edward; Austen, Samuel; Backhouse, Margaret (née Holden); Barnes, Edward Charles; Barret, George; Barry, James; Bartholomew, Valentine; Barwell, Frederick Bacon; Baxter, Charles; Bayliss, Wyke; Baynes, James; Beechey, Sir William; Bennett, William; Bird, Edward; Blake, William; Bond, William Joseph Julius Caesar; Bone, Henry Pierce; Bonington, Richard Parkes; Bostock, John; Bouvier, Augustus; Bowler, Henry Alexander; Boxall, William; Boys, Thomas Shotter; Branwhite, Charles; Brett, John; Bridell, Frederick Lee; Bridell Fox, Eliza Florance (née Fox); Brierly, Oswald Walters; Briggs, Henry Perronet; Brodie, John Lamont; Bromley, William; Brooks, Thomas; Brown, Ford Madox; Buckner, Richard; Burton, Frederic William; Byrne, William; Calderon, Philip Hermogenes; Callcott, Sir Augustus Wall; Callow, William; Campion, George Bryant; Carpenter, Margaret Sarah (née Geddes); Carrick, Robert; Carrick, Thomas; Cattermole, George; Chalon, Alfred Edward; Chalon, John James; Chamberlayne, Mason; Chambers, George; Chester, George; Clark, Joseph; Claxton, Marshall; Clennell, Luke; Cleveley, John; Clint, Alfred; Cobbett, Edward John; Cole, George; Cole, George Vicat; Collingwood, William; Collins, William; Collinson, James; Collinson, Robert; Constable, John; Cook, Richard; Cook, Samuel; Cooke, Edward William; Cooper, Abraham; Cooper, Thomas Sidney; Cope, Charles West; Copley, John Singleton; Corbaux, Marie Françoise Catherine Doetter (“Fanny”); Corbould, Edward Henry; Cotman, John Sell; Cox, David Senior; Cox, David, Junior; Cozens, John; Creswick, Thomas; Criddle, Mary Ann (née Alabaster); Cristall,
Joshua; Crome, John; Cross, John; Crowe, Eyre; D'Egville, James Hervé; Dadd, Richard; Danby, Francis; Danby, Thomas; Daniell, William; Davidson, Charles; Davis, Henry William Banks; Davis, William; Dawson, Henry; Dayes, Edward; De Loutherbourg, Philip James; De Wint, Peter; Delamotte, William Senior; Desanges, Louis William; Dighton, Denis; Dillon, Frank; Dobbin, John; Dobson, William Charles Thomas; Dodgson, George; Douglas, William Fettes; Drummond, James; Duffield, Mary Ann (née Rosenberg); Duffield, William; Duncan, Edward; Duncan, Thomas; Dyce William; Eastlake, Sir Charles Lock; Eddis, Eden Upton; Edridge, Henry; Egg, Augustus L.; Elmore, Alfred; Essex, William; Etty, William; Evans, Samuel; Evans, William; Faed, John; Faed, Thomas; Fahey, James; Farmer, Emily; Fielding, Copley; Fogg, James & George; Ford, William Bishop; Foster, Birkett; Fripp, Alfred Downing; Fripp, George Arthur; Frith, William Powell; Frost, William Edward; Fuseli, Henry; Gainsborough, Thomas; Gale, William; Gambardella, Spiridione; Gastineau, Henry; Gibson, David Cooke; Gilbert, Arthur; Gilbert, John Graham; Gill, Edmund; Gillies, Margaret; Girtin, Thomas; Glover, John; Glover, William; Good, Thomas Sword; Goodall, Edward Angelo; Goodall, Frederick; Goodall, Walter; Gordon, Sir John Watson; Gosling, William W.; Gow, James; Grant, Francis; Graves, Hon. Henry Richard; Haag, Carl; Haghe, Louis; Hall, George Lothian; Halliday, Michael Frederick; Halswelle, Keeley; Hamilton, William; Harding, James Duffield; Hardy, Frederick Daniel; Hargitt, Edward; Harlow, George Henry; Harrison, Mary (née Rossiter); Hart, Solomon Alexander; Harvey, George; Haslem, John; Havell, William; Haydon, Benjamin Robert; Hayes, Edwin; Hayes, Michael Angelo; Hayter, Sir George; Heaphy, Thomas; Heaphy, Thomas (Senior); Hearne, Thomas; Hemsley, William; Herbert, John Rogers; Herdman, William Gawin; Hering, George Edwards; Herrick, William Salter; Hill, David Octavius; Hills, Robert; Hilton, William; Hofland, Thomas Christopher; Hogarth, William; Holiday, Henry; Holland, James; Hook, James Clarke; Hopkins, William Henry; Hoppner, John; Horsley, John Calcott; Howard, Henry; Howitt, Samuel; Hughes, Arthur; Hughes, Edward; Huime, Frederick William; Hunt, Alfred William; Hunt, William Henry; Hunt, William Holman; Hurlstone, Frederick Yeates; Ibbetson, Julius Caesar; Jackson, John; Jackson, Samuel Phillips; Jenkins, Joseph John; Johnston, Alexander; Jopling, Joseph Middleton; Jutsum, Henry; Kaufmann, Angelica; Keyl, Friedrich Wilhelm; Knight, John Prescott; Knight, William Henry; Lance, George; Landseer, Charles; Landseer, Sir Edwin Henry; Lauder, Robert Scott; Laurence, Samuel; Lawless, Matthew James; Lawrence, Sir Thomas; Le Jeune, Henry; Lear, Edward; Lee, Frederick Richard; Lee, William; Leighton, Frederick; Leitch, William Leighton; Leslie, Charles Robert; Leslie, John; Lewis, John Frederick; Lidderdale, Charles Sillem; Linnell, James Thomas; Linnell, John; Linnell, William; Linton,
William; Liverseege, Henry; Lizars, William Home; Lucy, Charles; Macbeth, Norman; Mackenzie, Frederick; Maclise, Daniel; Macnee, Daniel; Maguire, Thomas Herbert; Mann, Joshua Hargrave Sams; Margetts, Mary (Mrs); Marks, Henry Stacy; Marshall, Charles; Martin, Charles; Martin, John; Martineau, Robert Braithwaite; Mason, George; MacCallum, Andrew; McCulloch, Horatio; McInnes, Robert; McKewan, David Hall; Meadows, James (Senior); Meadows, Kenny; Millais, John Everett; Moira, Eduardo de; Mole, John Henry; Moore, Henry; Morland, George; Morris, Philip Richard; Müller, William James; Mulready, William; Mutrie, Annie Feray; Mutrie, Martha Darley; Naftel, Paul Jacob; Naish, John George; Nash, Joseph; Nasmyth, Alexander; Nasmyth, Patrick; Nesfield, William Andrews; Newton, Alfred Pizzey; Newton, Gilbert Stuart; Nicholson, Francis; Niemann, Edmund John; Norbury, Richard; Northcote, James; O’Neil, Henry Nelson; O’Neill, George Bernard; O’Neill, Henry; Oakes, John Wright; Oakley, Octavius; Opie, John; Osborn, Emily Mary (Miss); Owen, Samuel; Owen, William; Palmer, Samuel; Partridge, John; Paton, Joseph Noel; Patten, Alfred Fowler; Peel, James; Pettit, Joseph Paul; Phillip, John; Phillips, Henry Wyndham; Phillips, Thomas; Philp, James George; Pickersgill, Frederick Richard; Pickersgill, Henry William; Pidgeon, Henry Clark; Poole, Paul Falconer; Prentice, J. K.; Prout, Samuel; Prout, Skinner; Pyne, James Baker; Raeburn, Sir Henry; Ramsay, Allan; Rankley, Alfred; Rayner, Samuel; Read, Samuel; Redgrave, Richard; Reinagle, Ramsay Richard; Reynolds, Sir Joshua; Richardson, Edward; Richardson, Thomas Miles; Richmond, George; Rivière, Henry Parsons; Roberts, David; Roberts, T.; Robins, Thomas Sewell; Robson, G. F. & Hills, Robert; Robson, George Fennel; Romney, George; Rooker, Michael Angelo; Ross, Sir William Charles; Rossiter, Charles; Rothwell, Richard; Rowbotham, Thomas Leeson; Rowlandson, Thomas; Runciman, Alexander; Sandby, Paul; Sant, James; Schetky, John Christian; Scott, David; Setchel, Sarah; Severn, Joseph; Sharpe, Eliza; Shee, Sir Martin Archer; Simson William; Singleton Henry; Smallfield, Frederick; Smirke, Robert; Smith, Collingwood; Smith, George; Solomon, Abraham; Solomon, Rebecca; Stanfield, Clarkson; Stanfield, George Clarkson; Stevens, F.; Stone, Frank; Stone, Marcus; Stothard, Thomas; Stubbs, George; Swinton, James Rannie; Tait, Robert Scott; Tayler, Edward; Tayler, Frederick; Tennant, John; Thomas, George Housman; Thomas, William Cave; Thompson, Jacob; Thomson, Henry; Thomson, John (of Duddington); Thorburn, Robert; Tidey, Alfred; Tidey, Henry; Topham, Frank William; Townsend, Henry James; Turner, Joseph Mallord William; Turner, William; Upton, Edward; Uwins, Thomas; Vacher, Charles; Varley, John; Vickers, Alfred; Vincent, George; Vinter, John Alfred; Wallis, George; Wallis, J.; Walter, H.; Ward, Edward Matthew; Ward, James; Warren, Edmund George; Warren, Henry; Watts, George Frederic; Webbe, William James; Webber, John; Webster,
Russian Artists Exhibiting at the International Exhibition of 1862 (in Oil, Water Colours and Drawings. Spelling in English as in the Exhibition 1862 Official Catalogue. Names in Russian Added for Current Article)

Aivazovsky, John; Alexeief, Theodore; Axenfeldt; Bogolubof, Alexis; Boodkofski, Gustav; Borovikofsky, Woldemar; Bruolof, Charles; Bruni, Theodore; Duker, Eugene; Fedotof, Paul; Ivanof, Alexander; Jacoby, Valerian; Jegorof, Alexis; Kapkof, James; Khoodiakof, Basil; Kiprensky, Orest; Kloit, Baron Michael; Korzookhin, Alexis; Lagorio, Leo; Lebedef, Michael; Levitsky, Demetrius; Losenko, Anthony; Meschersky; Moller, Theodore; Morozof, Alexander; Neff, Timothy; Orlofsky, Alexander; Popof, Andrew; Raooolof, John; Reimers; Scherwood, Voldemar; Skirmunt, Simon; Sorokin, Eugraphe; Strashinsky, Leonard; Swertchkoff, Nicholas; Tchedrin, Sylvester; Tchernishof, Alexis; Tchiistiakov, Paul; Trootofsky, Constantine; Tropinin, Basil; Tutrumof, Nicanor; Tym, Basil; Varneck, Basil; Venezianofof, Alexis

Айвазовский Иван Константинович; Алексеев Фёдор Яковлевич; Боголюбов Алексей Петрович; Боровиковский Владимир Лукич; Бруни Фёдор Антонович; Брюллов Карл Павлович; Будковский Густав Яковлевич; Варнек Александр Григорьевич; Венецианов Алексей Гаврилович; Галактионов Степан Филиппович; Дюкер Евгений Эдуардович; Егоров Алексей Егорович; Иванов Александр Андреевич; Капков Яков Фёдорович; Кипренский Орест Адамович; Клодт Михаил Константинович; Корзухин Алексей Иванович; Лагорию Лев Феликсович; Лебедев Михаил Иванович; Левицкий Дмитрий Григорьевич; Лосенко Антон Павлович; Мещерский Аксений Иванович; Моллер Фёдор Антонович; Нейф Тимофей Андреевич; Орловский Александр Осипович; Попов Андрей Андреевич; Равилов Иван Петрович; Реймерс Иван Иванович; Сверчков Николай Егорович; Скирмунт Семен Александрович; Сорокин Евграф Семёнович; Страшинский Леонид Вильгельмович;
Russian Artists – Etchings and Engravings

Afanassief, Constantine; Bersenief, John; Galactionof, Stephen; Jordan, Theodore; Konstantinof, Peter; Ootkin, Nicholas; Pishchalkin, Andrew; Skotnikof, George; Tchemezof, John; Tchessky, John

Афанасьев Константин Яковлевич; Берсенев Игорь Николаевич; Галактионов Степан Филиппович; Иордан Фёдор Иванович; Константинов Пётр Константинович; Пищалкин Андрей Андреевич; Скотников Егор Осипович; Уткин Николай Иванович; Чемезов Евграф Петрович; Ческий Иван Васильевич