

The chapters on nineteenth-century writers are the best: some are very good; all are at least adequate for a popular history. They contain few surprises (most of the standard things are repeated here), and what is new is frequently debatable. Biographical data are kept at an adequate minimum. Style is not emphasized. The plot summaries are useful and of reasonable length, though they contain some minor inaccuracies. Quotations are used generously; while of value in themselves, they are something of a luxury in a book which demands economy of treatment.

The discussion of Old Russian literature is well done, considering its brevity. There are errors, such as the statement that the *Igor Tale* is "pervaded by a Christian spirit," but a rather complete picture of the period emerges.

The survey of Soviet literature, except for the sections on Blok, Esenin, and Mayakovsky, tends to become a mere catalogue of authors and titles, with brief descriptions of the works. Works are arranged chronologically and, within a given period, by general theme. Individual authors are consequently split between various sections, but the approach washes here, because no detailed analysis is attempted. Too little effort is made at relative evaluation, and the documentary value of the works is stressed at the expense of their literary value.

Although there is certainly no need for literary histories to be written in solemn and dignified tones, the attempt here at a popular style is not always successful. We are told, for example, that Stalin's death "eased the mind of many a writer," and that Solzhenitsyn "certainly knows how to make history come alive."

This survey is for neither the scholar nor the advanced student. For the general reader and, with reservations, for the beginning student, however, it fulfills a need which Mirsky (the only one-volume history which is of comparable scope) is too erudite and outrageous to meet.

DORIS V. JOHNSON
Wayne State University

ISTORIJA ZHANROV V RUSSKOI LITERATURE X–XVII VV. *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury*, vol. 27. Leningrad: "Nauka," 1972. 467 pp. 2.96 rubles.

Despite its title, this volume of the *Trudy* is not unified by a central theme; only a few of the papers bear more than marginal relevance to the history of Old Russian genres. One of the best studies in that respect is M. V. Rozhdestvenskaia's on the genre of the apocryphal *Slovo o Lazarevom voskresenii*. Proceeding from observations made by Eremin, she shows in detail what features connect it with oratorical writing (*slova*), and she succeeds in placing it in the context of other examples and genres. She seems mistaken, however, in claiming that the *Slovo* raises heretical questions about the fate of man and the mercy of God; as she herself points out, the complaints of the righteous men in hell serve further to glorify Christ when he comes to save them.

Ia. S. Lurie also attacks a question of genre directly in his stimulating article on annalistic writing. More plausible than D. S. Likhachev's comparisons of chronicles to architectural "ensembles" is Lurie's conclusion that "the 'compilatory,' composite character . . . of chronicle-writing renders very doubtful any characterizations of chronicles overall as single literary monuments." Instead, the chronicle is "more a conglomeration of several genres that have different origins

and unequal artistic significance" (p. 85). O. V. Tvorogov's paper on Russian chronographs, by contrast, presents the current scholarly view of their history and says little about the literary genre, except to give the standard characterization of chronographs as a "genre of historical narrative," or "'scientific,' historical works," as that was understood in the Middle Ages (p. 217). Important ongoing research into the sources and filiation of chronograph compilations is further represented in the technical articles by Tvorogov and B. M. Kloss, which are of immediate interest mostly to specialists. Lurie also contributes a communication on the origin and make-up of the putative chronicle compilation of 1489–90.

Very welcome as a sign that Soviet scholars may at last give attention to the rich and largely unstudied literature of church poetry is G. M. Prokhorov's groundbreaking paper, "On the History of Liturgical Poetry: The Hymns and Prayers of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos." Before discussing the Old Russian translations of this fourteenth-century patriarch's works (of which he appends a valuable bibliography), he emphasizes that the Orthodox cultural renaissance of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was fundamentally religious and took place in a "churchly framework," expressing itself in icon, hymn, and prayer. As Prokhorov intends, studies like this will open up a new field and eventually lead to a better understanding of the "second South Slavic influence."

Because Likhachev is in a position to offer major new insights, his article is particularly disappointing. It contributes almost nothing new about the genre of the *Slovo o polku Igoreve*. Likhachev asserts that the *Slovo* is closest to the French *chansons de geste*, and he repeats the well-known circular argument that the *Slovo* is possible as a twelfth-century work because it belongs to a mixed genre of that time, existence of which is best proved by the *Slovo* itself. Another paper that reaches no significant new conclusions is T. N. Kopreeva's on the genre of Vladimir Monomakh's *Pouchenie*. She would like to argue for it as autobiography but is aware that the mere presence of autobiographical material is not decisive for the genre. Her discussion takes no account of the literary type of the admonition to one's children, which was practiced in both Byzantium and the medieval West. R. P. Dmitrieva's description of *chet'i sborniki* of the fifteenth century is interesting in itself, even though she does not make a case for a genre of "encyclopedic" *sborniki*. L. A. Dmitriev's title is "The Genre of North Russian Lives," but his article has little to do with genre as such. He contends that sixteenth-century *zhitiia* of monks in northeastern Russia display a new interest in folk legends about the fates of simple people, sometimes vividly described. Yet his examples are not radically different from the anecdotal manner of earlier monks' lives and *paterika*. (Incidentally, the theme of a saint saving men at sea is not new but has a long history, as in the miracles of Saint Nicholas.)

The honor of first place in the book was appropriately given to the late distinguished scholar V. P. Adrianova-Peretts, whose posthumous study of the image of man in Old Russian didactic writings was apparently intended as an addendum to Likhachev's *Chelovek v literature drevnei Rusi*. She set out to show that didactic literature (in which she includes proverbs, translated books of aphorisms, parables found in sermons, and so forth) presented not an idealized view of mankind but glimpses of people as they really were, neither wholly good nor wholly bad—and thereby anticipated and helped prepare for the better-rounded image of man that emerged in seventeenth-century literature. Out of her vast

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