

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,

Milton, Voltaire, Byron, Goethe, Walter Scott), or "John Bunyan, Pushkin i Lev Tolstoi" (1969), which examines Pushkin's poem "Strannik" and, less persuasively, Tolstoy's "Zapiski sumasshedshego."

It will always remain a problem for Soviet criticism that metaphysics and the philosophy of religion cannot be pressed into the frame of social history. The bulk of the second section is taken up by "Dostoevskii i Pushkin" (1971). Besides well-known and obvious references (such as, for example, in "Bednye liudi," p. 430, and "Mr. Prokharchin" or *Podrostok*, p. 444), there are new suggestions of parallels between "Slaboe serdtse" and "Mednyi vsadnik" (p. 439), *Besy* and "Domik v Kolonne" (the fire, p. 460), the hero of "Krotkaia" and Germann (p. 485), *Podrostok* and "Geroi" (p. 483), and many others. Even if some of these suggestions seem farfetched or too general, enough of them are valid to make this article an exciting experience to read. Less persuasive because too political is the essay "Mickiewicz i Pushkin" (1956). Pushkin hardly wanted to replace wars among peoples with wars of the peoples against the *khishchniki-monarkhi*, especially not in connection with the Polish uprising of 1830–31; his attitude toward the people was always, to say the least, cautious. But several of Blagoy's *literary* remarks are interesting even if one knows Waclaw Lednicki's studies about the relations between the two poets. In the essay "Ot 'Evgeniia Onegina' k 'Geroiu nashego vremeni'" (1967) one might single out as particularly stimulating the remarks about Griboedov as one of the prototypes for Pechorin. The article "Pushkin dlia Gor'kogo" (1949) can remain unread without much loss, but—no Pushkin for a change—the early treatises "Tiutchev i Viazemskii" (somewhat enigmatically dated 1916–28) and "Aleksandr Blok i Apollon Grigor'ev" (1927) are still valid.

The second volume has three sections. The first, "Literatura kak iskusstvo," deals nearly exclusively with Pushkin, but neither "Printsipy pushkinskogo masterstva" nor "Pushkin—zodchii" (both 1955) provides features of much value. Parallels between "Skupoi rytsar'" and the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" or Karl Marx (pp. 130 ff.), for instance, do little for our understanding of literature or even socialism in this special interpretation. The method of mixing art and politics works much better, of course, in "Gertsen—master nevydumnoi literatury" (1963), but it gets completely out of hand in "'Petr Pervyi' Alekseia Tolstogo" (1946) or "'Sud'ba cheloveka' M. Sholokhova" (1958). Because "art" here is played up with *epitheta ornantia* identical to those used for Pushkin, the reader might wonder about the scale of values being applied.

The second section, "Iz istorii russkoi poezii," includes a speech on the occasion of the anniversary of Aleksei Koltsov's 150th birthday ("Slovo o Koltsove," 1959), in the usual style, praising Koltsov at the expense of a "reactionary" tsarist administration and talent-killing censorship, and disregarding Soviet "reactions" of a very similar kind. There is a rather irrelevant article about the contemporary fable writer and poet Sergei Mikhalkov (1972), and there are two important essays: "Podlinnyi Venevitinov" (1932–71), which offers some new material about Venevitinov's Decembrist sympathies, unfortunately exaggerating them and underplaying his metaphysical interests (the parallel between Venevitinov and Lensky still deserves special attention); and "Grammatika poezii" (1970), which analyzes Fet's famous poem "Shopot, robkoe dykhan'e," and is obviously trying to keep pace with the fashionable current of contemporary literary scholarship and its endeavors to investigate the borderline between literary research and linguistics, the so-called *lingvostilistika*.

The third section contains three items. In the first, "Gogol'—kritik" (1958), we learn at last why Pushkin deemed it necessary to take issue in print with Gogol's article "O dvizhenii zhurnal'noi literatury v 1834 i 1835 godu," which he himself had published in *Sovremennik*. Gogol's article had appeared without his signature, unknown to Pushkin, who was out of town at his mother's funeral. Some critics took the essay to be Pushkin's own work and a kind of program for his periodical. This went too far for Pushkin's tastes, so he responded with his "Letter to the Editor" signed with the letters A and B.

The speech marking the anniversary of Belinsky's 150th birthday ("Slovo o Belinskom," 1961) is full of the usual clichés about Belinsky as the father of realism. The third item, "Khudozhnik v nauke" (1967), is a speech also, given on Konstantin Fedin's 75th birthday. Though he mainly discusses Fedin's autobiographical book, *Gor'kii sredi nas*, Blagoy also offers a survey of Fedin's literary criticism which culminates in a somewhat unexpected comparison of Fedin and Marina Tsvetaeva, not to the advantage of the latter, even if Blagoy is far from detracting from her talent. Fedin emerges as an impressive literary critic, knowing where and how to put his artistic highlights in a scholarly treatise.

Although the tendentiousness that characterizes Soviet criticism is always present, Blagoy's two volumes contain so many remarkable *details* and show such genuine erudition that they are certainly worth reading, even though there are many repetitions because the books consist of essays not specially edited for a collection. Also, an index would have been immensely helpful in this flood of names and titles.

VSEVOLOD SETCHKAREV  
Harvard University

TEORIIA DRAMY V ROSSII OT PUSHKINA DO CHEKHOVA. By A. Anikst. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 643 pp. 2.65 rubles.

RANNIAIA RUSSKAIA DRAMATURGIIA (XVII—PERVAIA POLOVINA XVIII V.), 2 vols. Compiled by O. A. Derzhavina et al. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. Vol. 1: PERVYE P'ESY RUSSKOGO TEATRA. 511 pp. 1.97 rubles. Vol. 2: RUSSKAIA DRAMATURGIIA POSLEDNEI CHETVERTI XVII I NACHALA XVIII V. 368 pp. 1.37 rubles.

Alexander Anikst is not only one of the Soviet Union's greatest authorities on Shakespeare and English literature in general but also its foremost chronicler of theories on drama of all periods and all Western countries. His 1967 volume, *Teoriia dramy ot Aristotelia do Lessinga*, is an enormously useful compilation of Western ideas on the uses of drama up to the end of the eighteenth century. As Anikst tells us in the foreword to his more recent book, he had intended to follow the first volume with a similar survey of drama theories of the nineteenth century, but was led in the course of his work to restrict his purview to Russian material only. Nevertheless, the new book was published in the same format as the old one and with a similar cover, and the intended unity of the two volumes is further proclaimed by the identical heading printed facing the title page of both volumes: A. Anikst, *Istoriia uchenii o drame*. The juxtaposition that unavoidably results is perhaps farfetched and certainly unfair, but it is also highly instructive.

The first volume ranged through some twenty centuries and described the drama theories of Ancient Greece and Rome, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance,