



UDC 82-091

**Marina Koreneva**

*Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkin House), Russian Academy of Sciences*

## ON ONE SOURCE OF INFORMATION ON DUTCH, DANISH AND SWEDISH LITERATURE IN GERMANY AND RUSSIA IN THE 1830s IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FORMATION OF THE CANON OF WORLD LITERATURE

**For citation:** Koreneva M. On one source of information on Dutch, Danish and Swedish literature in Germany and Russia in the 1830s in the context of the formation of the canon of world literature. *Scandinavian Philology*, 2021, vol. 19, issue 2, pp. 360–374. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2021.209>

The article analyzes the book by the famous German literary historian O. L. B. Wolff (1799–1851), *The Fine Literature of Modern Europe* (1832), in which an attempt was made for the first time to create a canon of European literature, which at that moment was a substitute for the non-existent canon of world literature. This article provides a comparative study of Dutch, Danish, and Swedish literatures in this work, which introduced Dutch, Swedish, and Danish authors little-known at the time to the general reading public outside their own countries. The introduction of this forgotten source allows us to reconstruct the criteria for evaluating “Northern” literatures within the circle of “major” European literatures and to identify a “set” of those writers who, from the author’s perspective, deserved some attention and could therefore form a canon for the literatures described, which only partially coincides with the modern canon. Of particular interest is the comparison of the German text of the book with its Russian translation, published in 1835, which contains elements of a veiled polemic with the German scholar, manifested not only in cuts made and the stylistic treatment of Wolff’s value judgements, but also in replacing certain sections by texts of Russian origin whose authorship was established for the first time in the article. The juxtaposition of the original text and its Russian translation demonstrates a discrepancy of perceptions about the hierarchy of specific literatures within the constitutive canon of the period and the translator’s desire to place Russian literature at the forefront, which he saw eclipsing the literatures of the Netherlands, Sweden, and Denmark.

**Keywords:** Dutch, Danish, Swedish literatures, reception of “Northern” literatures in Germany and Russia in the 1830s, canon of European literature, translation as polemic.

The emergence of the term “world literature” is traditionally associated with Goethe, who, in a conversation with Eckermann on 31 January 1827, expressed the opinion that “National literature is now of little importance, the age of world literature is approaching, and everyone should contribute to its earliest possible arrival” (“National-Literatur will jetzt nicht vielsagen, die Epoche der Welt-Literatur ist an der Zeit und jedermann muß jetzt dazu wirken, diese Epoche zu beschleunigen”) [*Goethes Gespräche*, 1890, s. 46]. Although it is now known that C.M. Wieland used the term long before Goethe [Birus, 1995, s. 5; Weitz, 1987, s. 206], it is generally accepted that Goethe is the starting point for the history of the idea of world literature, even though Goethe did not have a coherent concept of world literature, and his view of this phenomenon is reconstructed from isolated, often conflicting opinions, mostly formulated in private correspondence or private conversations that do not extend beyond this private sphere [For more details see: Birus, 1995]. Meanwhile, the very idea of world literature had long been in the air and was directly linked to European debates of the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries on cosmopolitanism and the national spirit, including in relation to literature. In this regard, it suffices to recall Jens Baggesen with his “cosmopolitan excesses” and his dream of Europe as a common literary “cultivated homeland” where there would be no “slaves of nations” [for more details see: Jørgensen, 1997].

The actual emergence of world literature began with numerous anthology-type editions, which appeared in the first third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They introduced examples of folk poetry from different countries, sometimes quite exotic (Brazil, Madagascar, Mexico, etc.). At the same time, this special material became an object of description, both purely academic and aimed at the general reading public. In fact, this was all there was to it: a picture of world literature, neither in its historical perspective nor at that moment in time, remained for a long time uncharted, just as no general picture was drawn of European literature, which became a substitute for world literature on the conceptual level. Even F. Schlegel, who attached great importance to the universal-historical principle, in his famous lectures “History of ancient and new literature” (“Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur”, 1812), covering the period from the Middle Ages to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, considered only a selection of European literature — German, French, English, Italian, and Spanish, although he pointed out that a “truly universal-historical, nationally in-

formed history of literature” requires the inclusion of at least “northern and eastern literatures,” which may not be as significant regarding their impact on other peoples (a factor important to Schlegel) but are instructive “in their relationship to the lives of those peoples” [Schlegel, 1841, s. 259, 260]. In explaining why these literatures were beyond his scope of study, he cited his lack of knowledge of these languages and his reluctance to rely on information from other sources [Schlegel, 1841, s. 60]. The same argument (lack of knowledge of respective languages) is used in the book *Literary History of the Last Three Centuries (Litterär-geschichte der letzten drei Jahrhunderte, 1814)* by Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752–1827), a famous German theologian and historian, professor at Göttingen University. Eichhorn considered literature to be all written texts, and in his voluminous work he mostly treated “the fruits of scholarship,” i.e. texts from various fields of knowledge (astronomy, geography, physics, philosophy, etc.), among which the literature of individual countries, including the Netherlands, Sweden, and Denmark, occupied a very modest place and was in most cases represented by a brief annotated bibliography.

The first European book to fill the gap was a work by a German professor at the University of Jena, Oskar Ludwig Bernhard Wolff (1799–1851), *The Fine Literature of Modern Europe (Die schöne Literatur Europas in der neusten Zeit)*, published in 1832 and devoted exclusively to literature. The book was a major event in European cultural life, both because it was the first to offer a comprehensive overview of current literature in various countries and because its author was a leading figure in German literary life, well known outside Germany as a popularizer of literature, a novelist, and a translator. In 1831 he provided a German translation of a collection of old French folk songs (*Altfranzösische Volkslieder, 1831*), which was reviewed in detail in the influential German newspaper *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* [*Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung, 1833, s. 255–256*]; in 1832 he published a collection of old Dutch folk songs with an appendix providing samples of old Swedish, English, Scottish, Italian, Brazilian, and German songs (*Proben alt holländischer Volkslieder, 1832*). In-depth reviews of this collection were published in the Dutch newspaper *Algemeene Konsten Letter-Bode* [*Algemeene Konsten Letter-Bode, 1833, p. 447*], as well as in the English magazine *The Foreign Quarterly Review* [*The Foreign Quarterly Review, 1835, p. 188–191*]. Later on, Wolff published other translations of poetic and

prose folklore texts from various countries: *Poetic Native Treasures from Abroad* (*Poetischer Hausschatz des Auslandes*, 1848), *The Most Beautiful Tales of All Times and Peoples* (*Die schönsten Märchenaller Zeiten und Völker*, 1850), and *Songs of Lamentation and Songs of Freedom* (*Klage-lieder und Freiheitslieder*, 1861). It is noteworthy that in all these collections, a considerable amount of space was given to Dutch, Danish, and Swedish texts, unknown to the German reader. In the preface to his first anthology in this series (a collection of old Dutch songs), Wolff wrote of the unfair, dismissive attitude of Germans towards Dutch literature in general and Dutch folklore in particular: “With all the zeal with which German scholars search for other nations’ treasures and their endeavors to unearth precious metal from long-abandoned and forgotten mines, they either neglect the poetic riches of our near north-western neighbors or regard them as rather insignificant” [*Proben*, 1832, s. V]. Noting the German public’s complete ignorance of Dutch literature, owing to the small number of translations and prejudices about the ability of the Dutch to create poetry, Wolff admitted that he, too, “shamefully” had overlooked Dutch literature for a long time, even though “ex officio he should have taken a closer look at it a long time ago” [*Proben*, 1832, s. VII–VIII]. The result of “his closer look,” which also spread to other “neighbors,” was not only a collection of old Dutch songs, but also a series of public lectures that Wolff gave in the early 1830s in Jena to a wide circle of literature lovers, whom Wolff thought it necessary to acquaint with the current state of European literature that he recognized as an entity in itself made up of separate national literatures, mutually complementing and contrasting each other when seen in juxtaposition. These lectures formed the basis of his book *The Fine Literature of Modern Europe*, which he published at the insistence of colleagues and audiences. The book was aimed not at the academic world, but at interested general readers, who for the first time were offered a portrayal of both “big” and “small” literatures existing side by side in the same cultural space, each of them described not in the logic of individual genres, as had hitherto been the custom, but in the logic of writers’ individuality.

In presenting this picture, Wolff significantly expanded literary geography, taking his subject beyond the core of the already established literary canon (literatures of France, England, Spain, Italy, and Germany) to the literatures of the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, as well as Portugal, Poland, Russia, and Hungary, which, although individually

described in more or less detail in European specialist scientific works, nevertheless remained little known to the general reader. While striving to maintain the principle of “equality,” the author still had to deal with the issue of internal hierarchy, reflected in the sequence of the material described: the section on Dutch literature follows immediately after the first sections on the literatures of France and England, while the section on Russian literature comes after those of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, and towards the end there are essays on the literatures of Denmark and Sweden. The book concludes with an overview of German literature, giving it a “strong position” in the composition of the book. Another special feature of the book was that not only did it contain biographical information about the authors and detailed descriptions of the literature of a particular country from a historical perspective, but also included samples of texts by selected authors, translated into German, which gave the reader a very informative and well-commented anthology.

For Wolff, the first and essential criterion for evaluating a particular literature was the people’s poetic potential, embedded in the language and directly linked to the “spirit” of the people. This idea of a direct correlation between the quality of literature and the characteristics of the national language and national mentality was not new. Even Friedrich Schlegel, who believed that no language, especially an unknown one, should be denied the right to perfection, nevertheless admitted that some languages “are in a certain sense averse to poetry or less favorable to it than others” [Schlegel, 1841, s. 260]. According to Wolff, an example of this “disinclination” towards poetry is the Dutch language, which gives the same impression as “a respectable man in a colorful schlafrock, slippers, and nightcap, who takes it upon himself to speculate on important subjects of global interest” [Wolff, 1832, s. 387]. Noting the “positive qualities” of the Dutch people (“susceptibility to truth and goodness,” “persistence and diligence in all undertakings,” “favorable attitude to spiritual aspirations,” “industriousness”), he believes that all these qualities are “sufficient to make a quiet respectable citizen, but not sufficient to make a good poet” who could show “imagination and depth” and rise “above the mundane everyday life,” so dear, as Wolff wrote, to the heart of every Dutchman who was prepared to be satisfied with the very mediocre “poetic products” that filled the book market in great numbers [Wolff, 1832, s. 388]. It was precisely by this pragmatic down-to-earth attitude of the people in general, and the undemanding reading tastes in the ab-

sence of impartial criticism, that Wolff explained the lack of major poetic “geniuses” in Dutch literature, whose main achievements he attributed to “successes in didactic poetry,” owing above all to the pragmatic spirit so characteristic of the Dutch people [Wolff, 1832, s. 388]. Having listed a number of contemporary Dutch poets (A. C. W. Staring van den Wildenborch, H. A. Spandaw, W. Messchert, P. Strick van Linschoten), whose work Wolff described as “home-grown” [Wolff, 1832, s. 431], and, of all novelists, having singled out only Betje Wolff and Aagje Deken, whose novels Wolff considered “useful reading” because they gave “a picture of Dutch mores” [Wolff, 1832, s. 432], Wolff chose for a more detailed analysis those authors, old and new, who had gained fame in other countries: P. C. Hooft (1581–1647), J. Cats (1577–1660), J. van den Vondel (1587–1679), H. C. Tollens (1780–1856), R. Feith (1753–1824), W. Bilderdyk (1756–1831), J. Kinker (1764–1845). Biographical information about each poet was given, followed by a detailed description of their work and extensive examples translated into German, in some cases with a parallel original. Some of the translations Wolff borrowed from the book *Collection of Flowers — Selected Readings from Dutch Poets with an Essay on Dutch Poetry in German (Deutsche Blumenlese aus niederländischen Dichtern nebst einer Abhandlung über die Niederländische Poesie, 1826)* by Peter Ludwig von Eichstorff (1799–1848), German-born Dutchman, lieutenant in the Royal Dutch Army and the first populariser of Dutch poetry in Germany, and some of the poems Wolff translated himself. While in his preface Eichstorff started that his task was “justifying” the Dutch literature and showing through translation that even behind the “ugly language” there is true poetry [Eichstorff, 1826, s. II], Wolff, in his own words, deliberately “eradicated” some “Dutch blemishes” which resembled the original too much [Wolff, 1832, s. 420] in order to bring the poetic language closer to a kind of conventional common European language and thus “raise” Dutch poetry to the level of world/European literature. The presence of the texts, even in translation, allowed the reader to make an independent judgement on the distinctive features of Dutch poetry, without prompting from the author, who, noting the glimmers of a true “poetic feeling” in some poets, reproached the Dutch for the inexorable imitation of the Germans in their lyrical poetry, and the French in epic and dramatic poetry, and drew a disappointing conclusion about the backwardness of modern Dutch poetry compared to the other enlightened countries [Wolff, 1832, s. 412].

By comparison, the picture of Swedish literature, as presented by Wolff, was much more favorable. He attributed the Swedes' successes to the harmonious language, refined during the Reformation process, and to the people's propensity for poetry in general, as reflected in the richness of the folklore [Wolff, 1832, s. 618, 619]. However, in Swedish literature Wolff did not find "geniuses" of the first magnitude either, because, in his opinion, the dependence on France, which lasted until the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, was too great, and most of the names the Swedes themselves were proud of (G. Stiernhielm, G. Rosenhane, H. Spegel, S. Triewald, O. Dalin) were of interest, as Wolff believed, only in a historical and literary sense, but not in the poetic sense proper, although their poetic works were indeed different from most of their contemporary "imitators and rhymers" [Wolff, 1832, s. 619]. Among those who even in the era of "francoomania" managed to escape from "French captivity," Wolff included the poetess Hedvig Charlotta Nordenslycht (1718–1763) with "her light poems," Bengt Lidner (1757–1793), "a lyric poet full of feeling, animation, enthusiasm and not without originality," as well as Gustav Philipp Creuz (1726–1770), "a master of the poetic story," Johan Henrik Kellgren (1751–1795), "a national poet in all his manifestations," and Carl Michael Bellman (1740–1795), "a true son of his country" [Wolff, 1832, s. 619, 620]. Speaking of current Swedish literature, Wolff outlined the conflict between supporters of Romantic poetry, grouped around the journal *Phosphorus*, and the "Hustavists" — a confrontation useful for the development of literature, as Wolff believed [Wolff, 1832, s. 620]. Listing the leading poets of his time, Wolff named Esaias Tegnér (1782–1846), Per Daniel Amadeus Atterbom (1790–1855), Karl August Nicander (1799–1839), Erik Johan Stagnelius (1793–1823), and Frans Michael Franzén (1772–1847). Citing the fact that most of them were involved in the formation of the new Romantic school and were themselves still in development [Wolff, 1832, s. 620], Wolff confined himself to a more detailed description of only two poets, E. Tegnér and E. J. Stagnelius, choosing the former as an example of an established poet who achieved national fame, and the latter as a young talent with rich poetic potential, who did not have time to fully develop because of his early death. Among the qualities that distinguish Tegnér's poetry, Wolff identified "brilliant imagination," "light jocular-ity," "rich figurative language" and "harmonious euphony." Yet, Wolff did not fail to note that the poet lacks "rich, warm feelings and <...>

rapture of heart,” which is why his poetry “dazzles and delights rather than moves and touches” [Wolff, 1832, s. 621]. After rebuking Tegnér for his lack of heartfelt feeling and some superficiality, Wolff contrasted him with E. J. Stagnelius, whose poetry, especially his dramatic poetry, as Wolff wrote, is marked by passionate feeling and deep thought, as well as by euphony of language and the beauty of the verse, so perfectly embodied in his philosophical and religious poetry collection *Lilies in Sharon* (*Liljori Saron*, 1821–1822) [Wolff, 1832, s. 635]. While praising E. J. Stagnelius as a lyric poet, Wolff thought that his experiments in epic poetry, in particular the poem *Vladimir the Great* (*Wladimir den Store*, 1817), devoted to the Baptism of Rus, were much weaker and did not reach the heights which any epic work should aspire to [Wolff, 1832, p. 635]. This contrasted with the rave response to the German translation of the poem (*Wladimir der Große*, 1827) by Olof Berg (1790–1854), whose unmatched mastery, as the newspaper *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* reported, enabled German readers to get acquainted with a poem that was “in no way inferior to the works of the best German authors” [*Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 1828, No. 17, s. 136; see also: *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 1828, № 226, s. 120]. Other works by E. J. Stagnelius had not yet been translated into German at the time Wolff’s book was published, so he was not able to present this important poet properly. As a matter of fact, the other contemporary Swedish poets he mentioned were also left without any textual “illustrations,” although some of their works had been translated into German and were available to the author, who could have consulted an anthology of Swedish poetry compiled by Ludolf Schley (1798–1859) (*Schwedische Dichtungen*, 1825). As a result, while “backward” Dutch literature turned out to be represented by numerous poetic examples, the much more “promising” and rising Swedish literature, according to Wolff [Wolff, 1832, s. 636], was illustrated only by a large fragment from the epic poem *Frithiof’s Saga* (1825) by E. Tegnér, first published in German in 1826 in what became a “classic” translation by Amalie von Helvig (1776–1831), a close friend of Goethe and Schiller and the Heidelberg Romantics. She enthusiastically translated Swedish poets including Attenbom and Nicander mentioned by Wolff and whose poems she mostly published in literary newspapers.

Wolff presented Danish literature in an even more favorable light by prefacing his description of contemporary writers with a thorough literary-historical survey, starting with Saxo Grammaticus (c. 1150 —



c. 1220), followed by Anders Christensen Arrebo (1587–1637), “the father of Danish poetry,” and moving on to the “original and genial” Ludvig Holberg (1684–1754) [Wolff, 1832, s. 610], through whom, as Wolff wrote, Danish literature for the first time obtained its true independence [Wolff, 1832, s. 636]. Wolff noted that the satirist Christian Falster (1690–1752) used a language that, while easy of style, was also somewhat crude and clumsy [Wolff, 1832, s. 612], and the lyrical poet Christian Braunmann Tullin (1728–1765), a Norwegian by birth, was “of versatile talent” [Wolff, 1832, s. 612]. Wolff commented on the next generation: Johannes Ewald (1743–1781), “the unrivalled dramatist”; Johannes Hermann Wessel (1742–1783), a Norwegian “patriot” and author of scathing comedies and epigrams; Edvard Storm (1749–1794), a Norwegian literary man who spent a large part of his life in Denmark, and whom Wolff characterized as “a talented author of ballads and fables, of deserved fame” [Wolff, 1832, s. 613]; and Johann Clemens Tode (1736–1806), who made a significant contribution to Danish culture, as reported by Wolff, with his numerous writings (mainly on medical subjects) and who gained attention with his lyrical songs [Wolff, 1832, s. 613]<sup>1</sup>. Among the writers of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and the first third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Wolff singled out Knud Layne Rahbek (1760–1830), who, according to Wolff, had a significant influence on the formation of the Danish literary taste with his national dramas, “excellent lyrical poetry,” “exemplary” prose and “sharp literary criticism” [Wolff, 1832, s. 613], Thomas Thaarup (1749–1821), “an excellent lyric poet, <...> translator and librettist” [Wolff, 1832, s. 613], the Norwegian poet Johan Nordahl Brun (1745–1816), the satirist Thomas Christopher Bruun (1750–1834), Frederik Høegh-Guldberg (1771–1852), author of “successful elegies and satires” [Wolff, 1832, s. 613], and the Norwegian Claus Frimann (1746–1829), famous for his “outstanding” ballads and “folk” songs [Wolff, 1832, s. 613]. Among the most important literary phenomena of his time, Wolff listed three authors — Jens Baggesen (1764–1826), Adam Oehlenschläger (1779–1850), and Bernhard Severin Ingemann (1789–1862). He gave a detailed characterization to each of them, pointing out that, for all their undoubted merits, only Oehlenschläger could be considered “a European star of the first magnitude” [Wolff, 1832, s. 614]. Justly assuming that these three writers were well

---

<sup>1</sup> Wolff neglected to discuss Tode’s prose and dramatic writings.

known to the German reader by numerous translations, and in the case of Baggesen and Oehlenschläger also by their texts originally written in German, Wolff dispensed with examples of their work.

Despite the programmed selectivity and a certain subjectivity of the author's assessments, Wolff's book, which sketched the broad outlines of individual national literatures from diachronic and synchronic perspectives, without going into the details of literary struggles, but with an exclusive focus on the quality of the texts, could serve as a reliable "guide" to European literature as a common cultural space. The very fact of being included in that space meant a kind of "canonisation" of both the particular literature as a whole and of the authors mentioned, regardless of the private opinion expressed by Wolff about this or that writer. Immediately after this work came out, there were many favourable reviews published, including some from outside Germany. Some excerpts from it concerning German literature were soon translated into Dutch and published intermittently in fourteen issues of the newspaper *Bredasche Courant* in 1833, 1835, and 1836. It was also translated into Russian, in its entirety and relatively quickly: the translation came out in 1835. It was printed in the print shop of Moscow University and was included in the list of "books of remarkable importance and usefulness" in the 1835 annual report of the university [*Report*, 1836, p. 44]. It was also available in the university library [*List*, 1838, p. 189]. The interest in Wolff's work in the university circles was not coincidental: there was no comprehensive course of foreign literature at the university, and students received information about "major" Western literatures (French, German, and English) in the corresponding lectures, linked to the study of a particular language. According to students' memoirs from that time, the study of Western literature often consisted of a joint translation of individual, often random, samples of texts, the choice of which was dictated by the logic of rhetoric and poetics, when the focus was on knowledge of forms and genres in their correlation with the appropriate style, rather than on the authors and their style of writing [Dmitriev, 1998, p. 122–123]. In this context, Wolff's book seemed an absolute novelty, both because it focused on the authors, and because it provided an integrated picture of world/European literature, introducing also literatures little known in Russia, which included those of the Netherlands, Sweden, and Denmark.

Wolff's work was translated by N. G. Lavdovsky, a third-year student who took part in a joint student translation of August Schlegel's work

*On Dramatic Art and Literature (Überdramatische Kunst und Literatur*, 1809–1811), under the supervision of well-known professor I. I. Davydov (1794–1863), who later included this text in his *Readings on Literature* (fourth year), published in 1838. It was probably Davydov who brought Wolff's work to Lavdovsky's attention. As early as 1833 an enthusiastic review of the German edition of Wolff's book appeared in the *Notes of the Imperial Moscow University*, of which I. I. Davydov was the editor: "This is a truly remarkable work on literature! It is a collection of lectures given not to students but to lovers of literature; it is not intended for scholars but for people who are interested in poetry and want to become acquainted with the finest and most curious works of European literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Judgements made by the esteemed author about writers are supported by characteristic passages from the analysed works or translations from them, moreover, in most cases with the presentation of the original itself" [*Scientific Notes of the Imperial Moscow University*, 1833, p. 157]. At the same time, extracts from Wolff's book, although only concerning German literature, appeared in the magazine *Telescope* [Wolff, 1833], published by the literary critic and professor of Moscow University, N. I. Nadezhdin (1813–1890). Lavdovsky studied under Nadezhdin and left deeply felt recollections about his teacher. The first Russian readers of Wolff's book, among whom was Alexander Pushkin<sup>2</sup>, saw it as a solid, accurate guide to contemporary literatures. In the words of V. G. Belinsky, it might also prove a reliable aid for translators in their search for new texts of importance for formation of literary taste in Russia [Belinsky, 1953, p. 131]. It is not known whether any translators heeded Belinsky's advice and whether Wolff's book attracted attention of those who were particularly interested in "Northern" literatures. Yet, the way this work was translated into Russian gives us an idea of how its ideas were received by its first "active" reader, N. G. Lavdovsky.

On the whole, Lavdovsky's translation is remarkably accurate in the part included in the Russian edition which, however, does not match the volume of the original. The translator made some cuts, consistently "deleting" political concepts (revolution, constitution, etc.) from the book, as well as individual passages relating to the political context, removing

---

<sup>2</sup> Wolff's book was in Alexander Pushkin's personal library. [Modzalevsky, 1910, p. 60–61].

all samples of the texts Wolff quoted (probably for want of translations), and significantly increasing the stylistically negative characteristics, particularly those relating to Dutch and Swedish literatures. However, the most radical revision of the text was the rejection of Wolff's proposed "canon" and its internal hierarchy: indeed, the "canon," while declaring the "equality" of all literatures, was nevertheless based on a division into "major" literatures and those "lagging behind." Among those "lagging behind" in the European panorama were not only literatures of the Netherlands, Sweden, and Denmark, with all the merits of the latter two, but also Russia, about which Wolff noted the richness of folk poetry and described the work of Lomonosov, Derzhavin, Kapnist, Neledinsky-Meletsky, Bogdanovich, Karamzin, Zhukovsky, Batiushkov, Pushkin, and Ozerov, with examples from Karl Friedrich von der Borg's (1794–1848) anthology *Poetical Works of Russians (Poetische Erzeugnisse der Russen, 1823)*. The conclusion of Wolff's discussion of Russian literature was that it never rose above the imitation of Western models, which at the time included, as Wolff wrote, romantic poetry, mainly German and English [Wolff, 1832, s. 540]. The whole section on Russian literature was completely omitted by the translator and replaced by the article "On the constituent origins and direction of national literature in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries" by N. I. Sazonov (1815–1862), a student of I. I. Davydov, who was awarded a gold medal by Moscow University for this essay. The article was originally published in *Notes of the Imperial Moscow University* [Sazonov, 1835] and was a panegyric glorification of the consistent and uninterrupted successes of Russian literature from antiquity to modern times under the banner of nationalism. The author considerably expanded the "set" of names to include Simeon Polotsky, Dmitry Rostovsky, Feofan Prokopovich, Stefan Yavorsky, Sumarokov, Fonvizin, Khemnitser, Krylov, and Merzliakov; he did not mention Pushkin. He provided an ideological basis for the imitativeness, characteristic of Russian literature, which he did not deny, but interpreted this as a result of the particular receptivity of the Russian people, who were organically involved in a special Russian-European development [Wolff, 1835, p. 471] and therefore capable of fulfilling an important historical and cultural mission: "Russia stands between the two worlds, a partner of both in its development; — perhaps it is destined to merge these worlds in itself, combining the education of Europe and Asia, to begin a new era in the intellectual life of all humankind. Russia has already

done much; there is more to be done,” Sazonov wrote at the end of his article, concluding with a quote from Derzhavin’s ode *On the Taking of Izmail* (1791): “Where is there a people in the lands of the universe, / That would have as much strength in them?” [Wolf, 1835, p. 474]. This rhetorical question concluded not only Sazonov’s essay, but Wolff’s entire book in Russian translation, as the translator moved the section on Russia to the very end of the book, placing it in a compositional “strong position” and thereby engaging in an implicit polemic with the book’s author. Wolff proposed a literary canon that proved unacceptable in its internal hierarchy to the Russian translator, who could see competitiveness in the proposed scheme and found it necessary to introduce his own amendments: in the Russian version, Russian literature, which Sazonov characterized by its nationalism and religious spirit, emerged victorious from the cultural competition with Europe and definitely outshone the literatures of the Netherlands, Sweden, and Denmark.

## REFERENCES

- Allgemeene Konsten Letter-Bode*. 1833. N 28, 21, Juni. S. 447.
- Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*. 1828. N 17, Januar. S. 136.
- Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*. 1828. N 226, September. S. 120
- Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*. 1833. N 32, Februar. S. 255–256.
- Belinsky V. G. *Exile. A novel by Bohemus. Transl. from German*. Complete Works: in 13 vols. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences Publ., 1953. Vol. 1: Articles and reviews. Works of fiction. 1829–1835. P. 129–131. (In Russian)
- Birus H. Goethes Idee der Weltliteratur. Eine historische Vergegenwärtigung. *Weltliteratur heute. Konzepte und Perspektiven*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1995. S. 5–28.
- Dmitriev M. A. *Chapters from Reminiscences of My Life*. Text preparation, commentary by K. G. Bolenko, E. E. Liamina, T. F. Neshumova, introductory article by K. G. Bolenko, E. E. Liamina. Moscow: New Literary Review Publ., 1998. 752 p. (In Russian)
- Eichstorff P. L. *Deutsche Blumenlese aus niederländischen Dichtern, nebst einer Abhandlung über die Niederländische Poesie*. Namur: D. Gerard, 1826. 192 s.
- Goethes Gespräche*. Hrsg. von W. von Biedermann. Bd. 5. Leipzig, 1890. 507 s.
- Jørgensen S.-A. Baggelsen zwischen Holger Danske und Hermann dem Cherusker. “Germanismus und Cosmopolitische Ausschweifungen”. *Meddelelser fra Thorvaldsens Museum*. Copenhagen, 1997. S. 18–28.
- List of books from the Library of publicstudents of the Imperial Moscow University*. Moscow: University printing house, 1838. 40 p. (In Russian)
- Modzalevsky B. L. A. S. *Pushkin’s Library (bibliographical description)*. S.-Peterburg: Printing house of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1910. 488 p. (In Russian)

- Proben alt holländischer Volkslieder. Mit einem Anhang altschwedischer, englischer, schottischer, italienischer, madecassischer, brasilianischer und altdeutscher Lieder.* Gesammelt und übersetzt von O. L. B. Wolff. Creiz: Verlag von E. H. Henning, 1832. 218 s.
- Report of the Imperial Moscow University, January 1, 1835 to January 1, 1836.* Moscow: University printing house, 1836. 76 p. (In Russian)
- Sazonov N. I. On the constituent origins and direction of national literature in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. *Scientific Notes of the Imperial Moscow University*, pt. 9, N 1, July, 1835. P. 81–129. (In Russian)
- Schlegel F. *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur.* Berlin: Athenaem, 1841. 482 s.
- The Foreign Quarterly Review.* 1835. N 29, March. P. 188–191.
- Scientific Notes of the Imperial Moscow University.* 1833, pt. 1, N 1, July. P. 157. (In Russian)
- Weitz H.-J. „Weltliteratur“ zuerst bei Wieland. *Arcadia*, 22, 1987. S. 206–208.
- Wolf O. L. B. German literature in the 19<sup>th</sup> century; extracts from a new work. *Teleskop.* 1833, pt. XV, N 9. P. 83–103; pt. XV, N 10. P. 214–238; pt. XV, N 11. P. 494–514. (In Russian)
- Wolf O. L. B. *Readings on contemporary fine literature.* Moscow: University printing house, 1835. 478 p. (In Russian)
- Wolff O. L. B. *Die schöne Litteratur Europa's in der neuesten Zeit: dargestellt nach ihren bedeutendsten Erscheinungen. Vorlesungen, gehalten vor einer gebildeten Versammlung.* Leipzig: Verlag von Breitkopf und Härtel, 1832. 694 s.

### **Марина Коренева**

*Институт русской литературы (Пушкинский Дом) РАН*

#### **ОБ ОДНОМ ИСТОЧНИКЕ СВЕДЕНИЙ О НИДЕРЛАНДСКОЙ, ДАТСКОЙ И ШВЕДСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРАХ В ГЕРМАНИИ И РОССИИ 1830-х гг. В КОНТЕКСТЕ СТАНОВЛЕНИЯ КАНОНА МИРОВОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ**

**Для цитирования:** *Koreneva M.* On one source of information on Dutch, Danish and Swedish literature in Germany and Russia in the 1830s in the context of the formation of the canon of world literature // *Скандинавская филология.* 2021. Т. 19. Вып. 2. С. 360–374. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2021.209>

Статья посвящена анализу книги известного немецкого историка литературы О. Л. Б. Вольфа (1799–1851) «Изящная литература Европы новейшего времени» (1832), в которой впервые была предпринята попытка сложения канона европейской литературы, замещающего собой отсутствовавший канон литературы мировой. В центре рассмотрения — сравнительная характеристика нидерландской, датской и шведской литератур в этом труде, который знакомил широкую читающую публику с творчеством малоизвестных тогда за пределами своих стран писателей Нидерландов, Швеции и Дании. Введение в научный оборот этого забытого источника позволяет реконструировать критерии оценки «северных» литератур в кругу «главных» европейских литератур и вычлнить «набор»

тех писателей, которые, с точки зрения автора, заслуживали некоторого внимания и потому могли составить канон описываемых литератур, лишь частично совпадающий с современным канонам. Особый интерес представляет сопоставление немецкого текста книги с ее русским переводом, опубликованным в 1835 г. и содержащим элементы скрытой полемики с немецким исследователем, которая нашла свое выражение не только в произведенных сокращениях и стилистической обработке оценочных суждений Вольфа, но и в замене отдельных фрагментов текстами русского происхождения, авторство которых впервые установлено в статье. Сравнение оригинала и его русского перевода демонстрирует несоответствие представлений о иерархии отдельных литератур внутри конституируемого канона данного периода и о стремлении переводчика вывести на первый план русскую литературу, которая по его представлениям затмевала собой литературы Нидерландов, Швеции и Дании.

**Ключевые слова:** нидерландская, датская, шведская литературы, восприятие «северных» литератур в Германии и России 1830-х гг., канон европейской литературы, перевод как полемика.

### **Marina Koreneva**

PhD in Philology, Senior Researcher,  
Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkin House), Russian Academy of Sciences,  
4, nab. Makarova, St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation  
E-mail: marinakoreneva7@gmail.com

### **Коренева Марина Юрьевна**

кандидат филологических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник,  
Институт русской литературы (Пушкинский Дом) РАН,  
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, наб. Макарова 4  
E-mail: marinakoreneva7@gmail.com

Received: June 22, 2021  
Accepted: September 14, 2021