

period. European investment in Serbian mines increased sharply in the 1920s, especially in the copper complex at Bor. Yet the neglect of a united Yugoslavia's difficult, early years continues to be the most striking omission chargeable generally to the country's academic community.

JOHN R. LAMPE
University of Maryland

ISTOKI RUSSKOI BELLETRISTIKI: VOZNIKNOVENIE ZHANROV
SIUZHETNOGO POVESTVOVANIIA V DREVNERUSSKOI LITERA-
TURE. Edited by Ia. S. Lur'e. Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut russkoi litera-
ture (Pushkinskii Dom). Leningrad: "Nauka," 1970. 595 pp. 2.90 rubles.

Istoki russkoi belletristiki, one of the most important books to come out of the Pushkinskii Dom to date, is a collective work with an exclusively literary focus in which eight scholars of the Sektor Drevnerusskoi Literatry participated (Ia. S. Lurie, O. V. Tvorogov, L. A. Dmitriev, A. M. Panchenko, D. S. Likhachev, V. P. Adrianova-Peretts, N. S. Demkova, and O. A. Belobrova in descending order of the size of their contributions). The word *belletristika* is used here not simply to denote imaginative prose (*khudozhestvennaia proza*) or prose fiction in its widest sense, but rather to indicate structured plot narrative (*siuzhetnoe povestvovanie*) in particular, and to stand collectively for all the genres of plot narrative (*povest'*, *rasskaz*, *novella*, *roman*). The book surveys the origins and gradual development of plot narrative in its various forms (both translated and original) from the eleventh to the end of the seventeenth century, dealing not only with works of plot narrative proper but also with numerous works (for example, lives, annals, historical tales) which cannot be considered "belles-lettres" in the fullest sense but which clearly possess certain traits characteristic of true plot narrative (such as peripatetic construction, individuated speech, and *sil'naia detal'*).

In his informative introduction, Lurie, lest there be any later misunderstanding, wisely defines the elusive and often ambiguous word *siuzhet*, linking it with the system of events, the plot, and the narrative structure as opposed to the *fabula*, which designates the mere totality of events or the temporal sequence of the story. A *fabula* is the raw material which will be worked and organized into a *siuzhet* (epic, teleological, or ambivalent) by an author, operating from his own particular idea of life and "reality."

In chapter 1 Tvorogov studies the methods (such as direct speech and artistic detail) through which mere information is changed into *description* of events in the eleventh- to thirteenth-century annals. In the first and most successful part of chapter 2 Adrianova-Peretts illustrates how translated Byzantine hagiography (lives, martyrdoms, patericons) broadened the artistic possibilities of the Old Russian writer by providing him with clear examples of the artistic devices typical of the Byzantine secular romances of love and adventure. In part 2 she deals with Slavic hagiography, and though she makes some insightful comments, she nonetheless overstates the role and artistic value of details of realia as such. In the third chapter, which treats belletristic elements in eleventh- to thirteenth-century translated historical narrative, Tvorogov, drawing on a remarkably careful reading of all the texts in their entirety, characterizes the works well but unfortunately says little about the actual influence that these works (especially the *History of the Jewish War*) had on Old Russian literature. Tvorogov discusses translated

"belles-lettres" of the eleventh to thirteenth century in chapter 4, singling out the *Tale of Akir the Wise* and the *Deeds of Digenis* as the first real works of translated "belles-lettres" and bringing out their literary qualities extremely well by clever comparison of the oldest redactions with later reworkings. In chapter 5, which closes the pre-Mongol period in the book, Likhachev discusses the *Igor Tale* and *Daniil Zatochnik*, characterizing them as embryonic hints of original plot narrative which would only be realized in a later period.

In his discussion of late thirteenth- to fifteenth-century hagiography in chapter 6, Dmitriev points out that in some fifteenth-century lives the hagiographic and rhetorical elements are clearly subordinate to *siuzhetnost'* and that these lives can therefore be considered works of original Russian "belles-lettres" (an idea which unfortunately gets glossed over in the rest of the book). In chapter 7, belletristic elements in a number of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century works of historical narrative are given detailed study, and in chapter 8 Lurie examines fourteenth- and fifteenth-century translated "belles-lettres," again profiting greatly by comparing original redactions and later reworkings. In chapter 9, entitled "Original Belles-Lettres of the Fifteenth Century," Lurie treats the first Russian original works of "secular" plot narrative, the *Tale of Dracula* (an ambivalent *siuzhet*) and the *Tale of Basarga*. In chapter 10 he examines both the steep decline of "belles-lettres," translated and original, in the sixteenth century—a decline which seems to have gone hand in hand with affirmation of unlimited autocratic power and reaction in the church—and elements of plot narrative in other areas of literature such as hagiography, historical narrative, and "publicistics."

Chapters 11 and 12 treat the strong reappearance of plot narrative and realistic detail in the seventeenth century. Panchenko discusses the general role played by folklore and the relation to European culture, pointing out also that Russian literature was influenced by only the second-rate works of Western "belles-lettres" and was in fact very "provincial" in this respect. Among the genres discussed in these last chapters are the chivalric romance, the didactic miscellany, the tale (Likhachev's subchapter on the *Tale of Savva Grudtsyn* is perhaps the high point in the book), and the novella.

Lurie concludes that this survey refutes the opinion of scholars (unspecified) who feel that "free narrative" had no place in the Old Russian cultural and literary tradition and shows that although the widespread diffusion of the secular tale in the seventeenth century was in many ways a novel phenomenon, it did not signify the fall of the Old Russian "cultural ideal," because no such single unified ideal ever existed for Old Rus': "It was not the single aesthetic ideal of Old Rus' that hindered the development of Russian plot narrative, but ideological phenomena of a wider nature" (p. 564). I would have been happier with a conclusion that interpreted the varying history of plot narrative in Old Rus' as successive swings toward and away from a single, albeit "official," church-fostered, literary ideal (which, like all ideals, was merely an official desired norm), the required degree of conformity to which varied according to "ideological phenomena of a wider nature." Lurie is undoubtedly right, however, in his conclusion—the most important one, I believe—that the appearance of secular narrative in the seventeenth century, far from being unexpected or fortuitous, was based on deep traditions going back not only to the fifteenth century, when the first original Russian works of "belles-lettres" appeared, but right to the translated and original literature of the eleventh century. As a sort of afterthought Lurie raises the question (p. 565) of the differ-

ence between Old Russian plot narrative and contemporary Russian prose (a topic for a new book?), thereby raising more questions than he answers. He judiciously concludes the book, however, simply by saying that the study of Old Russian "belles-lettres" provides the key to many important problems in the study of imaginative prose in general.

The book suffers a little from overly detailed retelling of narratives and, apart from Lurie's introduction, shows a remarkable neglect of non-Russian studies of the material in question. On the positive side, it has few misprints and factual errors, has decent indexes, and has been extremely well edited by Lurie, no mean feat for a book of this size and collective nature.

In a way the book is a milestone in the study of Old Russian literature and a testimony to D. S. Likhachev's teachings and aims. Without the many critical editions of various works that have come out of the Pushkinskii Dom, such a book could not have been written. Although not everything in this book will be new to students of these critical editions, much *is* new. Besides, it is good to see everything brought together and drawn on to illustrate a new general goal. The book is a must for all students of Old Russian literature.

RICHARD W. F. POPE
Indiana University

THE DEMETRIUS LEGEND AND ITS LITERARY TREATMENT IN THE AGE OF THE BAROQUE. By *Ervin C. Brody*. Rutherford, Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1972. 323 pp. \$15.00.

This is a careful study of the treatment of the Demetrius theme by European dramatists from Lope de Vega to several minor German playwrights of the early twentieth century. Following a satisfactory chapter on the historiography of the Demetrius legend, Professor Brody presents detailed studies of Lope's *Gran Duque de Moscovia y emperador perseguido* (ca. 1613) and John Fletcher's *Loyal Subject* (1618). He then analyzes works by German and Russian playwrights, concentrating on Schiller, Hebbel, Pushkin, Khomiakov, Ostrovsky, A. Tolstoy, and A. Suvorin.

Brody goes far toward establishing the sources of and influences on the various plays he has studied. He identifies the historical original of many characters and perceptively illustrates how some of his authors (especially Lope and Fletcher) were influenced by their *Zeitgeist* in organization of plot and depiction of character. Lope's drama, for instance, is permeated with typically Spanish concepts of honor, Catholicism, and monarchy. If Lope's sources were Jesuits, Fletcher's included his uncle Giles (*Of the Russe Commonwealth*), Jerome Horsey, Thomas Heywood, and Lope's *Gran Duque*. Fletcher was inhibited by political conditions under James I, and could not develop the Demetrius theme as he may have wished to do. Yet, as Brody demonstrates in a tour de force of literary-historical detection, the Demetrius theme is present in *The Loyal Subject* in the person of the younger son of Archas (the loyal subject), who appears at the court of the duke disguised as a maiden. Brody shows that Schiller, Hebbel, and Pushkin surmounted the limitations of earlier writers and, in depicting the events of the Time of Troubles, created universal types and posed eternal questions. Brody's generally positive assessment of the works of Khomiakov, Ostrovsky, and A. Tolstoy are also of interest.

There are some minor annoying errors in the book. The names of Duma