baroque style in literature as prevailing up to and including the 1760s, with Kantemir, Trediakovskii and Lomonosov as its leading exponents. Sumarokov and Kheraskov are the true classicists while Derzhavin is represented as a “destroyer” of classicism to an extent that may be thought somewhat exaggerated. The author does not support the views of the Soviet school which traces the roots of Russian realism to the works of eighteenth-century writers such as Novikov and Radishchev. The most original and probably the most valuable element of the author’s analysis of the literary movements is to be found in his contention, reiterated throughout the book, that it is the “minor” writers, in their little-known works, rather than the leading lights who provide us with important and unmistakable signals indicating changes in literary fashions. This also serves as a justification for what to some must appear an inordinate amount of space devoted to such writers and works.

There are occasional slips and inaccuracies, mainly in the realm of historical data. Peter II was not seventeen but eleven years old at his accession (p. 10), and Aleksis Orlov, as far as is known, was never Catherine’s lover (p. 11). Elizabeth ascended the throne in 1741 (not 1742 as on p. 96), Sumarokov could not have praised Catherine for the building of St. Isaac’s (p. 138) which did not begin until some twenty-two years after her death, and Ia. A. Bruis (Bruce), the military governor of Moscow who stopped the performances of Nikolev’s play, can hardly be described as “Catherine’s chief censor” (p. 328). There are some inconsistencies and errors in the spelling of Russian words and proper names, and the incidence of misprints seems rather high. But the significance of such minor shortcomings is small in relation to the impressive whole. All students of eighteenth-century literature, not only those of its Russian component, will be indebted to Professor Brown for his penetrating, enlightening and wide-ranging survey of a period whose significance, in the Russian context, has not always been fully appreciated.

K. A. Papmehl

University of Western Ontario


Roman Jakobson’s study is an analysis of the ictuses in Pushkin’s verses written during a night of insomnia. He perceives the stress patterns of the lines of this poem as falling
into two categories: “the light ictuses of the first and fifth syllable” and the “heavy ictuses of the third and seventh syllables.” These patterns are demonstrated in detail and without interpretation. In his study of the poem first published in the fifth chapter of Journey to Arzerum and treating the destruction of the janissaries in 1826, Walter Vickery examines both extrinsic and intrinsic evidence, including variants, to show that this seemingly unfinished piece is in fact a complete poem whose theme—in the end “all roads lead to destruction”—is fully developed. Dean Worth’s strictly linguistic paper is based on Jakobson’s observation that Russian rhyme develops from a grammatical to an anti-grammatical orientation, and he applies Jakobson’s taxonomy of grammatical rhymes to Evgenii Onegin, demonstrating how three main types of grammatically-classified rhymes are distributed through the approximately 2,600 rhyme pairs of Pushkin’s novel in verse. Like Worth, Lawrence G. Jones attempts to open a new area of literary investigation and stresses that his work is tentative. He uses J. Thomas Shaw’s work on Pushkin’s rhymes to show that they are worked into a total structure or closed system. He demonstrates by schema the symmetrical, asymmetrical, and other structures of Pushkin’s rhymes, using selected poems in their entire text.

Scholars have begun to take an interest in a curious aspect of Pushkin’s creativity: he acted out personal situations, or attempted to persuade others that he had so acted, in ways that correspond to the structural pattern of an artistic work or works. In a study of Pushkin’s utopian myth, Andrej Kodjak examines three works—“Mistress into Maid,” “Tsar Saltan,” and The Captain’s Daughter—and finds that these similar “utopian narratives” possess eleven common features. Using especially the eleventh feature—“evil attempts to harm or kill the protagonist turn to his advantage”—Kodjak shows that the pattern of these features corresponds perfectly to Pushkin’s quarrel with his father in 1824 and his attempt to persuade V. A. Zhukovskii that his father had tried to ruin him personally and politically. Similar in terms of myth, if not in relation to Pushkin’s curious practice, is Senderovich’s study of the shade-myth in Pushkin’s works. He uses Jakobson’s work on the statue in Pushkin’s poetic mythology (“The Stone Guest,” “The Bronze Horseman,” “The Tale of the Golden Cockerel”) and M. O. Gershenzon’s survey of shades and spectres in Pushkin’s oeuvre to show that the shade is a phenomenon of Pushkin’s art, not of his life. The shade- and statue-myths are related, and Senderovich employs Jakobson’s verbal sign system, but they differ in that a meeting with a statue in Pushkin’s works is fatal, a meeting with a shade brings salvation.

In his study of Pushkin and Romanticism, Victor Terras applies M. H. Abrams’ model of Romanticism (Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature) to Pushkin and concludes that the poet’s “relation to Romanticism is consistent with the view . . . that Russia, like France, was reached by the romantic wave with a delay of a generation, or more.” Terras cites my Russian Romanticism: Two Essays (Mouton, 1975) here. However, I believe with the late G. A. Gukovskii and his successors (Iurii Lotman, Lidia Ginzburg, Il’ia Serman, Iriina Semenko, among others) that Romanticism reached Russia at the turn of the century and may be traced, both organically and stylistically, to its roots in the pre-Romantic trends of the eighteenth century, most particularly to the Sentimentalist interlude of the 1790s. As Terras shows, Pushkin does not fit the Abrams model. But I suspect that the Russian Romantic movement as a whole fits the model very well, despite the fact that the Russian Romantics still had to play the game of “catch up with the West” and differed radically from their Western counterparts in that they faced the huge problem of creating a modern national literature on the weakly assimilated Western traditions of the eighteenth century in Russia. Equally imaginative as a new contribution to Pushkin studies is Paul Debreczeny’s attempt to deal with the disunity of the various modes of presentation in The Captain’s Daughter, particularly the jarring effect of the juxtaposition between the tragic note of the execution of Captain Mironov and the otherwise generally comic tone of the novel.