

reading she assembled a fascinating array of quotations. Unfortunately, the article has the same disadvantage as her well-known book on poetic style: examples are thrown together without sufficient regard for their disparate sources and uses; the study suffers precisely from too little attention to genre differences. One can scarcely distill a view of human nature out of this mass; and even the most striking examples seem to represent types rather than individuals.

Among the papers dealing with the seventeenth century, A. M. Panchenko's describes three phases in "pre-Simeon" literary verse but does not introduce significant new material. Somewhat more original are R. B. Tarkovsky's on fables (*pritchi*) and O. A. Belobrova's on travel literature (*khozhdeniia*), the latter containing editions of two texts of slight artistic value. A. S. Demin writes interestingly on common themes and motifs that unite the seven known dramas of the 1670s as products of "court culture." A bold but not very convincing attempt to use linguistic evidence for genre distinctions is made by S. Mathauzerová in her "Function of Tense in Old Russian Genres," which statistically compares Archpriest Avvakum's use of the aorist and imperfect versus the compound past in three kinds of writing: *povest'*, *slovo*, and *videnie*. Her emphasis on the "eternal" signification of the old tense forms and the "transitory" meaning of the new *-l* forms ignores evident stylistic reasons for Avvakum's choices of tense; and it is hard to see how such a fine point can help to define genre unless made part of a broader stylistic analysis.

The most theoretically "advanced" article in the volume is I. P. Smirnov's "From Folktale to Novel," in which he applies an archetypal approach to *The Tale of Savva Grudtsyn*. We should, no doubt, commend the appearance of a different method in Soviet criticism; and in calling attention to the *skazka* qualities of the tale Smirnov sheds light on several elements of content and structure that are otherwise puzzling. At the same time, the narrow neomythological interpretation can be overdone. For example, Smirnov would have us believe the demon's insistence on calling himself Savva's "brother" harks back to archaic totemic beliefs. The immediate and more probable explanation has something to do with the value assigned to family ties by the contemporary merchant class. The archetypal approach is less persuasive when applied (in Smirnov's last section) to a more complex work, Pushkin's *Captain's Daughter*. Does it really help us come to terms with these texts to know that they may, by several steps removed, reflect an ancient initiation rite? And is archetype an adequate basis for establishing a typology of the novel, as Smirnov wishes to do?

New subjects and some greater variety of critical methods distinguish this volume of the *Trudy*, which continues to be the principal publication for studies in Old Russian literature.

NORMAN W. INGHAM
University of Chicago

RAZVITIE RUSSKOI LITERATURY X–XVII VEKOV: EPOKHI I STILI.

By D. S. Likhachev. Leningrad: "Nauka," 1973. 254 pp. 1.41 rubles.

This is certainly not the first theoretical work dealing with the whole range of Old Russian literature written by the ranking Soviet expert in the field, but it is perhaps the one in which the purely theoretical aspects are most consistently

emphasized. As the author points out, this book was specifically designed as a set of preliminary generalizations for a future—detailed—“theoretical history” of tenth to seventeenth-century Russian literature. (Likhachev prefers to consider the tenth rather than the eleventh century the beginning of Old Russian literature, since translated works undoubtedly existed in Kievan Russia as early as the second half of that century; p. 25, n. 18.) The reader is presupposed to have a thorough familiarity with the contents and forms of early Russian literature and is taken on a sophisticated guided tour of the specific problematics of the major literary works—original as well as translated—of pre-eighteenth-century Russia, concentrating, in particular, on the various epochs and styles singled out and defined by Likhachev. The book consists of five chapters treating the “Constitution of Literature” (in the tenth to thirteenth centuries, characterized by the “style of monumental historicism”), the “Prerenaissance in Literature” (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries), the “Literature in the Period of the ‘Second Monumentalism’” (sixteenth century), the “Growth of the Personality Factor in the Literature of the Seventeenth Century,” and the “Baroque in Russian Seventeenth-Century Literature,” in addition to brief introductory and concluding sections.

Granted some basic differences (both in substance and in method), the general approach is most reminiscent of that adopted by Dmitriy Tschizewskij in his several treatments of Old Russian and comparative Slavic literature. (For some polemics with Tschizewskij see pages 178 and 188, where the nature of Baroque style is discussed.) On more than one occasion Likhachev acknowledges the positive influence on his own thinking of the late Soviet historian N. I. Konrad as regards his concept of regularity in the cultural evolution of the civilized world and, in this context, especially the definition of a universally conceived notion of the Renaissance and hence also Prerenaissance, so central to Likhachev’s reasoning. Whenever possible the author attempts to view visual and verbal art as merely two facets of one and the same “style of the epoch,” quoting in particular and usually with approval the views of M. V. Alpatov, while frequently disagreeing with those of V. N. Lazarev.

In his opening remarks Likhachev suggests that a future theoretical history of Russian literature ought to approach its subject matter as a sort of “macro-object,” much as statistical physics describes its macro-objects by observing entire sets of micro-objects. Similarly, the author argues for a future “statistical science of literature” operating with a method of “approximate descriptions.” Other theoretical points raised in the introductory section concern the claimed universality of such phases in the cultural evolution of civilized nations as Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and, in particular, the Renaissance. Also stressed is the importance of defining the prevailing overall cultural style of a given period.

In chapter 1 Likhachev examines the historical conditions for the appearance in medieval Russia of a feudal culture, pointing out that Russia in its earliest history did not go through the stage of slave society and consequently did not experience the first (“antiquity”) phase of cultural development. Instead, Russia compensated for this cultural gap by turning to highly civilized Byzantium and the first Slavic country that had fully assimilated Byzantine culture—Bulgaria. Subsequently the author discusses phenomena of literary transplantation, mentioning the difference in cultural impact originating from Byzantium (religious-literary) and Scandinavia (folkloric). As a result of the importation of Byzantine-Bulgarian culture, both a rich translated and an original Old Russian literature

came into being. Likhachev then goes on to examine the Church Slavic intermediary literature and the Slavic "recension" of the multinational Byzantine culture. He analyzes the supranational features of Old Slavic literature, elaborating on the "cultural precocity" of Bulgaria. Thanks to the uniformity of the higher echelons of feudal society among the southern and eastern Slavs and the "nomadic" character of their intelligentsia, the Slavic Orthodox community remained intact. Surveying the situation of this supranational culture and the intermediary literature in various Slavic countries, the author then contrasts the functions of literature versus folklore in tenth to thirteenth-century Russia. He analyzes the broader, socially unlimited appeal of secular literary folklore in the pure vernacular. As no primary sources of it are preserved from that early period, the pertinent evidence can only be reconstructed from later recordings and from relics of folkloric themes and motifs in Old Russian literature. In the following sections on the genres and forms of Old Russian literature and on the relation between literature and visual arts, where the remarks on the collapse of traditional literary forms and the emergence of new genres (with West European parallels) are particularly insightful, Likhachev summarizes and modifies findings reported in previous publications. The last section of this chapter on literature and reality, which follows a brief discussion of the notions "style of the epoch" and "style of monumental historicism," echoes his earlier keen observations on reality and imagination as reflected in original versus translated literature, and on the basic uniformity of the monumental style in Old Russian art and literature, while indicating some tentative (Romanesque) analogies in Southern and Western Europe.

The problem of an alleged Prerenaisance in Russian fourteenth and fifteenth-century literature (and art), dealt with in chapter 2, has also been previously treated by the author. Likhachev discusses the characteristics of the Prerenaisance, communication with Byzantium, the new literary movement (the so-called Second South Slavic Influence operating as a two-way street), the reflection of Prerenaisance features in Hesychasm and their presence in art (where the Byzantine influence was both direct and indirect, the latter channeled through Serbia rather than Bulgaria), the unity of the Prerenaisance trend in Orthodox Southeastern Europe, the turning to an "antiquity of its own" (pre-Mongol Russia), general European analogies of the East Slavic Prerenaisance, and the close of the Russian Prerenaisance. His chief argument is that it was the continued *religious* motivation for various interrelated phenomena in literature, art, and ideology that prevented these beginnings from maturing in Russia into a full-fledged Renaissance. Likhachev examines with great perceptiveness elements of emotionalism, irrationalism, and mysticism as well as a trend toward expressionism, dynamism, and "abstract psychologism" as they are found in the literature, art, and ideology of late medieval Russia. Nonetheless, the reader is left with some doubt about the appropriateness of labeling this complex trend in Old Russian intellectual and aesthetic life "Prerenaisance" and not some other designation (in art, say, Late Gothic). In this context, the reviewer cannot help recalling the approach of the Dutch cultural historian Jan Huizinga, who described life and art in fourteenth and fifteenth-century France, Burgundy, and the Netherlands as the "Waning of the Middle Ages" rather than calling it pre-Renaissance. While the proper designation for the style of, say, Pakhomii Logofet or Feofan Grek, Epifanii Premudry or Andrei Rublev, may remain a minor terminological issue as long as the substance of this new style can be accurately captured, it is nonetheless clear

why Likhachev for his part prefers the term Prerenaissance: it fits his overall concept of the sequence of cultural phases in the subsequent evolution of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Russia.

The sixteenth century, briefly discussed in chapter 3, is conceived as the period of the style of a second—now sterile and artificial—monumentalism resulting from the ideologically conditioned inability of the Russia of Ivan IV to attain the spirit and the level of art of a true Renaissance. And it was only in the seventeenth century, analyzed in the two following chapters, that a “delayed” Renaissance style came to coexist with that of the subsequent period in the evolution of European civilization—the Baroque. But this Baroque, Likhachev argues—against Tschizewskij, Angyal, and others—cannot be claimed to have been the prevailing “style of the epoch” during the seventeenth century. The details of his reasoning cannot be repeated here, much less assessed. Suffice it to say that although not all of the arguments will fully convince the reader familiar with the texts and phenomena quoted, by and large the analysis is indeed cogent. This new outline of a “theoretical history” of early Russian literature opens some new avenues and reiterates some old—Marxist—approaches toward a body of writing which, in the West at any rate, continues to be underrated in its overall significance.

HENRIK BIRNBAUM

University of California, Los Angeles

OT KANTEMIRA DO NASHIKH DNEI. 2 vols. By *D. Blagoy*. Moscow: “Khudozhestvennaia literatura.” Vol. 1: 1972. 559 pp. 1.57 rubles. Vol. 2: 1973. 463 pp. 1.32 rubles.

These two volumes contain a selection of essays by an old veteran of Soviet Russian literary scholarship, Dmitrii Blagoy (born 1893), who is particularly well known for his *Istoriia russkoi literatury XVIII veka* and *Tvorcheskii put' Pushkina*. Of his papers published between 1916 and 1972, and covering a period of over two hundred years of Russian literature, well over half of those collected here deal with Pushkin or his influence on other writers and poets—a fact which perhaps should have been mentioned in the title.

Volume 1 is divided into two sections. The first, “Tri stoletia novoi russkoi literatury” (1958–68), presents a survey based on the idea that literary development takes the form of a spiral, repeating the same typical phenomena, but each time at a higher level; there is always progress, never a return to the old. “Progress” in Soviet humanities means moving toward the culmination point—socialist (communist) society, of course, camouflaged in this case by the notion of *narodnost'*. As a result, the spiral does not work for movements such as Symbolism, which did not approve of “realism”—a kind of sacred fetish for Soviet literary scholarship.

The second section, “Dialektika literaturnoi preemstvennosti,” deals basically with the same problem, but in a much less politically tinged way. *Preemstvennost'* is not only the adoption but also a re-evaluation of the heritage of the “fathers” by the “sons,” which sometimes assumes a rather sharp form, behind which stands the natural law of sociohistorical development and the corresponding literary spiral (1:245). Some of the essays contain new observations—for example, “Smekh Pushkina” and in close connection with it “Faust v adu” (both 1968), which discuss Pushkin’s parodic tendencies (for example, of Homer, Dante, Shakespeare,