

interviews with nearly all the local authorities on hops. Strausz's ability to read and converse in Russian helped him to gather accurate information.

A most interesting and useful aspect of the book is its delineation of the wide variation in agricultural success achieved under communism, at least in the hop industry. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, the author makes clear, have had outstanding success with widely different organizational approaches. Indeed, within Yugoslavia the differences between the Savinja region and the Bački Petrovac area are marked, and the fact that both areas are of major importance in the world hop market receives deserved emphasis. Similarly, Strausz makes it clear that Poland and the Soviet Union have failed to meet the challenges of modern technology and are unlikely to win significant shares of the world hop market.

The book is thoroughly researched, well documented, and highly accurate, so far as a nonexpert on hops can determine. Strausz's incidental information on agricultural activities in Yugoslavia is also discerning and accurate, and leads to the conclusion that he is a perceptive and informed observer. Though its immediate audience obviously is very limited, the book should be useful to a much wider readership for its penetrating insight into East European agriculture. It is to be hoped that similarly meritorious studies may soon be produced on the maize, wheat, oilseed, and livestock industries of the same countries. If the same degree of ability, scholarship, and information could be brought to bear on specific studies of these commodities, much light could be shed on the situation of Communist agriculture at the close of the 1960s.

EARL R. LENG
University of Illinois

DREVNERUSSKAIA LITERATURA: KHRESTOMATIIA. Compiled by
A. L. Zhovtis. Moscow: "Vysshiaia shkola," 1966. 346 pp.

LITERATURNYE SVIAZI DREVNIKH SLAVIAN. Volume 23 of *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury*. Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii dom), 1968. 343 pp.

A modern-language version of a medieval literary monument (or collection of monuments), even though extremely well done, is of limited usefulness. A professor of the native literature in France would never allow his students to study the *Chanson de Roland* only in the contemporary idiom, nor would an instructor in an English university limit himself to modern renderings of Chaucer. Therefore, it is difficult to understand what justification there could possibly be for Zhovtis's *Drevnerusskaia literatura: Khrestomatiia*, which is specifically intended for students in "gumanitarnie vuzy i fakul'tety" (fifteen thousand copies).

Curiously enough, this book is not the first of its kind. M. O. Skripil's *Russkaia povest' XVII-ogo veka* (1954) contained a separate section of modern Russian translations for the old texts given elsewhere in the book. Eremin's and Likhachev's *Khudozhestvennaia proza kievskei Rusi XI-XIII vv.* (1957) also contained such translations. Finally, there was the earlier version of the book under review, *Khrestomatiia po drevnei russkoi literature*, edited by Zhovtis, Posse, et al. (Alma-Ata, 1956).

The selections chosen for the present volume are disappointing. An unfortunate but familiar bias is betrayed in the omission of such works as the sermons of Kirill Turovsky and Metropolitan Ilarion, the Virgin's Descent into Hell, the Life of

Alexis, Man of God, and the Tale of the Founding of the Page's Monastery of Tver. Four pages are taken for unimportant selections from the *Izbornik* of 1076 and the *Pchela*, while nothing from either the *Aleksandriia* or *Deugenievo deianie* is included. Furthermore, the *Slovo o zhitii i prestavlenii Dimitriia Ivanovicha* is surely at least as interesting as the *Povest' o vziatii Tsar'grada* or the *Povest' o Drakule vovode*, and the excerpts from the *Inoe skazanie* could happily have been displaced by sections of the *Plach o pleneni i o konechnom razoreni Moskovskogo gosudarstva*.

The translations, which are the work of eleven different people, in general adequately convey the sense of the original but fail to reproduce the color, tone, and nuance of language.

The best way to make the ancient literature available to students, while avoiding the shortcomings noted here, would be to prepare a comprehensive anthology (perhaps even more extensive than the *Khrestomatiia* of N. K. Gudzy) with truly adequate linguistic and historicocultural notes. Such an effort would entail some new research, of course, but it could also draw on a wealth of past scholarship. Part of the remaining work has already been undertaken in the form of an outline for a dictionary of Old Russian (see *Slavic Review*, December 1968, pp. 688–89). In sum, the dream of a fully annotated and representative anthology of Old Russian literature is today a real possibility.

Volume 23 of the *Trudy* continues the recent practice of this series of grouping contributions around a central theme or topic. Since this latest volume is dedicated to the Sixth International Congress of Slavists, its focus is quite appropriate. It contains seventeen full-length articles, six descriptive comments on particular manuscripts or manuscript collections (including an account of the 1966 Archaeographic Expedition of the Old Russian Literature section of the Institute of Russian Literature, with a catalogue of manuscripts collected), and three brief notes on special problems.

In 1961, in her foreword to the Droblenkova bibliography on Soviet work in the field of Old Russian literature, V. P. Adrianova-Peretts discussed more than a century of relevant Russian scholarship. Her remarks, which constituted a fairly conventional Marxist treatment, conceded the value of the work of certain past scholars but stressed that only in the post-1917 period, via Marxist-Leninist methodology, had a fully valid understanding of the old literature been achieved. The "bourgeois schools" of comparativism and formalism, active in the 1920s, were said to have retarded the elaboration of the new methodology. In 1968 *Sovetskoe literaturovedenie za 50 let*, edited by V. G. Bazanov, appeared. The overall tone of this book is quite exciting, especially in reference to the comparativists and the formalists. The formalists are defended for their contribution to the study of form, style, and language. The dogmatism of the forties and fifties is strongly censured, and scholars are exhorted to give more attention to just such studies as had earlier been condemned as bourgeois and cosmopolitan. (In his chapter "Drevnerusskaia literatura," Ia. S. Lure stresses that not until recent years "has the question of the literary workmanship of Old Russian writers . . . been seriously researched.")

This change of attitude is reflected in volume 23 of the *Trudy*. The caliber of the work included is generally superior to that of previous volumes. The omnipresent ideological element has been muted or eliminated. Where possible foreign influences on (or sources of) native works are discussed, a new spirit of objectivity and openness is displayed. The inclusion of five articles by non-Soviet authors, though not without precedent, is also noteworthy. Most important of all, several

pieces show the influence of the best literary scholarship of the first quarter of the century.

Most of the articles (twelve of the seventeen) are essentially literary history. Of special interest are N. N. Rozov's study of possible West Slavic sources for the work of Metropolitan Ilarion, A. I. Ivanov's estimate of the influence, both topical and stylistic, of Savanarola on Maxim the Greek, and the joint effort of N. S. Demkova and N. F. Droblenkova on Slavic acrostic verse. A second category would include studies of artifacts of the fine arts (frescoes, hagiographic icons, and glazed tiles) which bear some relationship to literary questions, similar to contributions in volume 22.

Scholars of medieval Russian literature will find much interesting material here. At the same time they will find reason to hope that the quality of Soviet scholarship in this field will continue to improve.

RICHARD H. MARSHALL, JR.
University of Toronto

THE TRILOGY OF ALEXANDER SUKHOVO-KOBYLIN. By *Alexander Sukhovo-Kobylin*. Translated and with an Introduction by *Harold B. Segel*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1969. xlix, 264 pp. \$6.95.

Harold B. Segel's translation of the *Trilogy of Alexander Sukhovo-Kobylin* makes available in English for the first time a fascinating work of Russian drama from the mid-nineteenth century. Add the thorough and interesting introductory essay, and we have indeed reason to be grateful for Professor Segel's work. Anyone familiar with the trilogy must have lamented that heretofore only *Krechinsky's Wedding*, the first of the plays, has been in print in English.

Segel's introduction testifies to his years of interest in Sukhovo-Kobylin. In it he covers the relevant scholarship, Russian and English, analyzes the dramatic and philosophical structure of the trilogy, and writes in an attractive, nonpedantic style. Soviet works on the playwright (including the recent sketch *Sud'ba Sukhovo-Kobylina* by Isidor Kleiner, Moscow, 1969) slight Sukhovo-Kobylin's connections with the contemporary French theater. Segel's essay remedies this neglect and points up as well the anticipation of the theater of the absurd in the third play of the trilogy.

The translation itself reads well. One is grateful for the decision to leave "speaking" names in Russian, with explanatory notes, rather than to try for English approximations. A similar decision is no doubt responsible for the toning down of numerous colorful, spicy idioms. In a text of this kind the translator must usually take this course or risk affronting the reader with outrageous "equivalents." The reader of Russian will inevitably question some of these choices. He will question more seriously the correctness of certain translations. For example, in *The Death of Tarelkin* (act 2, scene 4) the disguised archvillain Varravin, mistakenly believing that Tarelkin has died, exclaims: "Zarezal. Bez nozha, a kinzhalom udaril." In Segel's translation Varravin announces: "He cut his throat. With a dagger yet, no ordinary knife." The sense of the idiom is actually that Tarelkin has put Varravin in a terrible situation by dying at this moment. Further on (act 2, scene 6), Varravin claims that the deceased Tarelkin has made off with his watch, translated as "Brigette." Any reader of *Eugene Onegin* will recognize this as the striking watch by the famous French watchmaker Bréguet, a *breget* in Russian.