THE LITERARY BALLAD IN EARLY
NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE

by

M. R. Katz

A Thesis submitted in accordance with the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy at the University of Oxford

Linacre College

June 1972^{MT}

ABSTRACT

There is remarkably little research on the history of the Russian literary ballad or on its principal practitioner, V.A. Zhukovsky. This thesis is an attempt to rectify the situation: it follows the development of the ballad genre in Russian literature from its emergence in the 1790s to its demise in the 1840s. It has been decided to concentrate on the style of the ballads as the most original feature of the Russian genre, and in particular on the epithets in Zhukovsky's ballads as his most important contribution to the development of Russian poetic style. Consequently there will be no discussion of metrics, and only occasional remarks on syntax.

Chapter I treats the relationship of the Russian literary ballad to the traditional folk genre, to the "ballad revival" in late eighteenth-century European literature, and to late eighteenth-century "pre-romantic" developments in Russian literature. The traditional folk ballad is defined in terms of its narrative unit, method, and attitude, and in terms of its intangible "world" or "code". Attempts by Russian collectors and critics to characterize the popular genre are also considered. Two examples of Russian folk ballads are analyzed in order to demonstrate the constant features of the genre.

The literary ballad is defined in terms of these same features, and its aesthetic principles are shown to be completely antithetical to those of the traditional genre. The impetus for

the emergence of the Russian literary ballad was provided not by a desire to imitate the traditional genre, but rather by the Western European ballad revival. The English revival is traced from the change in attitudes towards the folk genre as expressed by Sidney and Addison, to Prior's early literary imitation, to Percy's collection of texts, and finally to the literary ballads of Scott and Southey. Other authors which had some influence on the Russian movement (Thompson, Young, Gray, Macpherson's *Ossian*) are considered briefly. The German revival is similarly surveyed: Bürger's *Lenore*, Herder's pronouncements on folklore, and the literary ballads of Goethe, Schiller, and Uhland.

The chapter concludes with a section on Russian "pre-romanticism", including anthologies of Russian superstitions, traditions, and *skazki*, as well as collections and imitations of folk songs and related genres - all of which influenced the development of the ballad.

Chapter II, after a brief bibliography of the Russian literary ballad, examines several ballads published anonymously during the 1790s, including two written by Anna Turchaninova, and then analyzes the literary ballads of M.N. Murav'ev, N.M. Karamzin, A.F. Merzlyakov, and I.I. Dmitriev. This analysis is followed by some general conclusions on the ballads of the 1790s. The literary ballad developed as a genre independent of folk poetry; the earliest Russian ballads were translations of English and German sources or reworkings of common European motifs. Love is the most common subject of the ballads, and the emphasis centres on the conventionally depicted characters, in particular on the psychology of the heroine. The settings are generalized, and parallels are often drawn between nature and the psychology of the

characters. Attempts at local colour are minimal and unsuccessful. The structure of the ballads is relatively simple; authors frequently intrude into the action to comment on its significance. The style of the ballads of the 1790s is characterized by emotionalism in the form of hyperbole, exclamatory and interrogative syntax, and the frequency and choice of epithets. While eighteenth-century vocabulary and syntax tend to be used for the narrative, both the setting and psychology of the characters are usually described in "pre-romantic" language. Both Karamzin's Alina (1790s) and Merzlyakov's Milon (1797) contain a striking contrast between idyll and ballad, between classical and "pre-romantic" styles.

Chapter III begins with a bibliographical sketch of biographical and critical studies on Zhukovsky, and with a note on the various editions of his work. It then examines Zhukovsky's theoretical statements about the ballad and compares them with contemporary descriptions of the genre. Both in his own opinion and in the testimony of his contemporaries, Zhukovsky was virtually identified as a balladnik. His choice of the literary ballad is attributed to the genre's popularity in Western European literature, and to the novelty of its exotic world.

Zhukovsky's views on translation as expressed in his articles and letters are summarized: the translator is a creator, inspired by what he considers to be the ideal of the source, and seeking to create an effect on the reader equivalent to that produced by the original. As an example of this theory put into practice, Zhukovsky's ballad Rybak (1818) is compared with its source, Goethe's Der Fischer (1778).

The sources of Zhukovsky's forty literary ballads are then

enumerated, after which eight representative ballads are examined with reference to their subject, characters, setting, theme, and style: Lyudmila (1808) established the pattern for Zhukovsky's ballads and introduced Bürger's theme into Russian literature; Svetlana (1808-12) was written as a parody of Lyudmila; in Adel'stan (1813) Southey's ballad was given an original conclusion and a setting which became typical for all Zhukovsky's ballads; in Ivikovy zhuravli (1813) Zhukovsky transformed Schiller's classical theme and created a mood of profound suspense; Eolova arfa (1814) combined the poet's favourite verbal motifs of youth, silence, and despondency; Gromoboi and Vadim (Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev) (1810-17) were written as a great parable of suffering and remorse, aspiration and fulfilment; finally, in Zamok Smal'gol'm (1822) Zhukovsky turned Scott's imitation of a popular ballad into a successful literary ballad.

Throughout his career Zhukovsky never altered his choice of sources, his method of transforming European themes, or his individual Russian style. While the events of the original ballad source were usually retained in outline form, the characters were metamorphized into romantic heroes and heroines, whose speech was identical with that of the narrator. The settings were generalized and details of local colour were eliminated or Russianized. Zhukovsky's real theme always remained the same: his own experience of melancholy, anxiety, despair, love, fear, or resignation. The style which expressed this theme was always "literary": its originality resided in the alternating intonations, in the negative constructions, in the syntactical parallelism, and, more significantly, in the frequency, choice, and meaning of his epithets.

In Chapter IV the epithets in Zhukovsky's ballads are studied.

It begins with a summary of previous definitions of the epithet from Quintilian to the Russian Formalists. A definition is accepted which includes all purely descriptive words under the term "epithet", and allows for a distinction in usage or function. A.V. Isachenko's grammatical classification of adjectival epithets is adopted.

After an evaluation of previous research on the epithet in Russian folk poetry, in English and German literary ballads, and in eighteenth-century Russian poetry, the following conclusions are drawn: firstly, there is little variety and no complexity in the epithets of Russian folk ballads - indeed, the range and use of the epithet is very limited; secondly, epithets in folk ballads differ fundamentally from those in literary ballads: the concrete, unambiguous epithets of the former are replaced in the latter by emotional, connotative epithets; thirdly, from its relatively insignificant role in the classical style of Lomonosov and Sumarokov, the epithet increases in importance in Russian poetry during the late eighteenth century. Murav'ev's language reflects the transition from objectivity to subjectivity, a trend which is continued by Karamzin and reaches its culmination in the poetry of Zhukovsky.

Previous studies of Zhukovsky's epithets by G.A. Gukovsky and V.P. Petushkov are evaluated, and the results of a comprehensive examination of the sources and meanings of Zhukovsky's epithets are presented. There is no evidence to indicate any substantive relationship between the epithet in folk ballads and in Zhukovsky's literary ballads. In comparison with the epithet in English and German ballads, Zhukovsky's epithets are more frequent, have their primary source in his own imagination, have fewer synonyms, and in their total subjectivity differ substantially in meaning.

Zhukovsky's poetry undoubtedly emerges from the poetic practice of the eighteenth century; moreover his style was much influenced by late eighteenth-century developments.

The originality of Zhukovsky's epithets lies firstly in their total subjectivity: they are employed not so much to describe objects and concepts, but rather to convey the poet's subjective impressions about these objects and concepts; and secondly, in the complex interrelationships between the applicability and indeterminateness of the epithets: as the applicability of an epithet increases, its meaning becomes more indeterminate; as the meaning becomes more indeterminate, so the applicability of the epithet increases. Zhukovsky's epithets created the foundation for the vocabulary of Russian romantic poetry. Therein lies his greatest contribution to the development of Russian poetic style.

Chapter V treats the polemics in Russian criticism from 1815 to 1825 which surrounded the literary ballad. It begins with the polemic in verse (Batyushkov and Voeikov) and in comedy (Shakhovskoi, Zagoskin, and a joint work by Griboedov and Katenin); it then considers the dispute over Zhukovsky's Lyudmila and Katenin's Ol'ga in 1816; next it traces the gradual shift in attitudes from praise to criticism of the ballad genre and of its creator, and analyzes the attacks made on the genre in 1818, on Zhukovsky's imitators in 1820, and on Zhukovsky's ballad Rybak in 1821. All of these polemics help to clarify the nature of Zhukovsky's innovations in the language of Russian poetry, and confirm that it is in the meaning and applicability of his epithets that his greatest originality resides. The chapter concludes with some remarks on the relationship between Pushkin and Zhukovsky, and with a consideration of Polevoi's and Belinsky's attempts to assign Zhukovsky

and the ballad genre their rightful places in the development of Russian literature.

In Chapter VI representative ballads by P.A. Katenin, A.I. Meshchevsky, and I.I. Kozlov are examined. Katenin was considered by contemporary critics as Zhukovsky's "opponent", and his ballads were said to be based on different stylistic principles. In fact, Katenin's contribution to the genre is shown to be ambiguous. While in Pevets (1814), Natasha (1814) and Pevets Uslad (1817) Zhukovsky's influence predominates, in Ubiitsa (1815), Leshii (1815), and Ol'ga (1816) Katenin was attempting to develop a new, more "popular" genre. Meshchevsky, an almost forgotten poet, has recently been discovered and labelled Zhukovsky's "double"; an analysis of his only two published ballads shows that while he imitated Zhukovsky's intonations, interrupted narrative, and epithets, his highly artificial images and complicated syntax tended to obscure his meaning. The ballads of Kozlov, Zhukovsky's most devoted disciple, are noteworthy for the originality of their narrative structure; but both their subjects and their style are derived largely from Zhukovsky's ballads.

Chapter VII treats Pushkin's literary ballads. It begins with a consideration of his early imitations of the subject, setting, characters, and style of Zhukovsky's ballads; Osgar (1814) an original poem based on an Ossianic theme, the early poslaniya, and several balladic lyrics are used to demonstrate in one way or another the influence of Zhukovsky's poetry. Next the chapter examines those works in which Pushkin parodied precisely those elements of Zhukovsky's ballads which he had previously imitated: Ten' Barkova (1814?), an unpublished pornographic parody of Gromoboi; Ruslan i Lyudmila (1817-20), the fourth canto of which

is a reworking of Vadim; and the balladic motifs in Tat'yana's dream in Onegin and in two of the Povesti Belkina. Finally Pushkin's original ballads are analyzed, and each is seen to be in some sense a "model": Rusalka (1819) is a reinterpretation of the nature-magic theme; Zhenikh (1825) synthesizes a German source and Russian folkloric motifs; Utoplennik (1828) places a popular motif and colloquial speech within the framework of sophisticated narration; Voron k voronu letit (1828) imitates the simplicity and unemotional realism of the traditional folk genre; and Besy (1830) is an exercise in the evocation of mood and the transformation of a ballad into a personal lyric. In his literary ballads Pushkin succeeded, where Zhukovsky had failed, in approaching the narrative unit, method, attitude, and "world" characteristic of the folk ballads.

Chapter VIII examines Lermontov's literary ballads. It begins with his earliest experiments based on German and English sources, including two ballads entitled Gost' written in the early 1830s. Both the choice of models for imitation and the style of his early works reflect the strong influence of Zhukovsky's ballads. These experiments were followed by a series of parodies on the ballad genre and its practitioners: Nezabudka (1830), a comic reworking of Schiller's Der Taucher; On byl v krayu svyatom (1832), a parody of Zhukovsky's Staryi rytsar' (1830); and Yugel'skii baron (1837), a parody of Zhukovsky's Zamok Smal'gol'm. Beginning with his ballad cycle of 1832 (Trostnik, Rusalka, Ballada - Kuda tak provorno), Lermontov began to use the genre in a creative and individual way. In Tri pal'my (1839) he reinterprets the theme of Pushkin's Podrazhanie Koranu IX, and introduces rich visual and aural imagery; in Dary Tereka (1839) he combines

folk elements with literary motifs; in Spor (1841) the theme of man's destruction of natural beauty is presented in a series of vivid visual images; Tamara (1841), Lermontov's most original literary ballad, is another reworking of the nature-magic theme of Zhukovsky's Rybak and Pushkin's Rusalka; finally, Morskaya tsarevna (1841) is a reworking of Lermontov's own earlier Rusalka, with an engaging narrative and meaningful theme. Lermontov's literary ballads are neither "models" in the sense that Pushkin's are, nor do they approach the characteristics of the traditional folk genre: for Lermontov the literary ballad was merely one of the available lyrical forms, not the most fashionable genre in Russian poetry.

The conclusion includes a brief survey of the Russian literary ballad from the death of Lermontov to the Soviet period and the suggestion that any future history of the European ballad revival should consider other Slavonic literatures, in particular, the ballads of Mickiewicz, Shevchenko, and Erben.

The appendixes include materials on the epithet in Russian folk ballads and in English and German literary ballads; on the epithet in Zhukovsky's ballads; on the epithet in Zhukovsky's ballad manuscripts; and on Zhukovsky's editions of Murav'ev and Kamenev.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor J.L.I. Fennell for his continued assistance and encouragement, and to the Keasbey Memorial Foundation (Philadelphia) and the International Research and Exchanges Board (New York) for their generous aid.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Am SEER</u>	<u>American Slavic and East European Review</u>
AN SSSR	Akademiya nauk SSSR
<u>IRL</u>	<u>Istoriya russkoi literatury</u> , I-X, M.-L., 1941-56
<u>IRP</u>	<u>Istoriya russkoi poezii</u> , I-II, L., 1968-69
LGPI	Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut
LGU	Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi universitet
MAO	Moskovskoe arkheologicheskoe obshchestvo
MGPIIYa	Moskovskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut inostrannykh yazykov
<u>OED</u>	<u>Oxford English Dictionary</u>
<u>Priyatnoe i poleznoe</u>	<u>Priyatnoe i poleznoe preprovozhdenie vremeni</u>
<u>SEBJ</u>	<u>Slavic and East European Journal</u>
<u>SEER</u>	<u>Slavonic and East European Review</u>
TGU	Tartuskii gosudarstvennyi universitet
<u>TODRL</u>	<u>Trudy Otdela drevnei russkoi literatury</u>
<u>TONRL</u>	<u>Trudy Otdela novoi russkoi literatury</u>
<u>ZhMNP</u>	<u>Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniya</u>

NOTE ON QUOTATIONS

After the first full reference, the sources of quotations from collected works will be abbreviated to PSS (Polnoe sobranie sochinenii) or SS (Sobranie sochinenii), followed by the volume number and page.

The sources of quotations from unpublished manuscripts will be identified by GPB (Gosudarstvennaya Publichnaya biblioteka im. M.E. Saltykova-Shchedrina, Leningrad), PD (Institut russkoi literatury, Pushkinskii dom, AN SSSR, Leningrad) or TsGALI (Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva, Moscow), followed by a "code" which indicates fond; opis'; No.; list. (In Appendix D, avt. = author's copy; popravki = scribe's copy with author's corrections.)

CONTENTS

	page
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter I THE INFLUENCE OF FOLK BALLADS AND THE BALLAD REVIVAL ON RUSSIAN LITERARY BALLADS	3
Chapter II RUSSIAN LITERARY BALLADS OF THE 1790s	30
Chapter III ZHUKOVSKY'S LITERARY BALLADS	57
Chapter IV THE EPITHET IN ZHUKOVSKY'S LITERARY BALLADS	120
Chapter V POLEMICS	164
Chapter VI ZHUKOVSKY'S IMITATORS	193
Chapter VII PUSHKIN'S LITERARY BALLADS	217
Chapter VIII LERMONTOV'S LITERARY BALLADS	253
CONCLUSION	275
APPENDIXES	
A. TEXTS OF <u>DER FISCHER</u> (GOETHE) AND <u>RYBAK</u> (ZHUKOVSKY)....	278
B. THE EPITHET IN FOLK AND LITERARY BALLADS	
The Epithet in Russian Folk Ballads	280
The Epithet in English Literary Ballads	281
The Epithet in German Literary Ballads	282
C. THE EPITHET IN ZHUKOVSKY'S LITERARY BALLADS	
Key to Charts 1b]	283
1b] Charts	286
Supplementary List of 1b] Epithets	328
Key to Charts 1a] and 2].....	330
1a] Charts	331
2] Charts	339
Frequency Chart	343
Range of Synonyms	344
D. THE EPITHET IN ZHUKOVSKY'S BALLAD MANUSCRIPTS	345
E. ZHUKOVSKY'S EDITIONS OF MURAV'EV AND KAMENEV	354
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	362

THE LITERARY BALLAD IN EARLY
NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE

by

M. R. Katz

INTRODUCTION

Читать стихотворцев, не каждого
особенно, но всех одинакового рода
вместе. Частный характер каждого
сделается ощутительнее от сравнения.
-- Жуковский¹

There is remarkably little research on the history of the Russian literary ballad or on its principal practitioner, V.A. Zhukovsky. This thesis is an attempt to remedy the situation: it follows the development of the literary ballad genre in Russian literature from its emergence in the 1790s to its demise in the 1840s. It is hoped that this genre-approach to the study of literature, recommended by Zhukovsky in one of his early notebooks, will produce the results he predicted: namely, that it will render more perceptible the individual characteristics of each ballad-writer. It has been decided to concentrate on the style of the ballads as the most original feature of the Russian genre, and in particular on the epithets in Zhukovsky's ballads as his most important contribution to the development of Russian poetic style. Consequently, there will be no consideration of metrics, and only occasional remarks on syntax.

Chapter I treats the relationship of the Russian literary ballad to the traditional folk genre, to the so-called "ballad revival" in eighteenth-century European literature, and to late eighteenth-century "pre-romantic" developments in Russian literature. In Chapter II the Russian literary ballads of the

1. Sochineniya V.A. Zhukovskogo, V (SPb., 1878), 551.

1790s are analyzed, including those by M.N. Murav'ev, N.M. Karamzin, A.F. Merzlyakov, and I.I. Dmitriev. Chapters III and IV are devoted to Zhukovsky's literary ballads, and include a discussion of his theory and practice of translation, analyses of eight representative ballads, and a comprehensive examination of the epithets in his ballads. Chapter V treats the polemics in Russian literary criticism which surrounded the ballad genre and its creator during the early decades of the nineteenth century. In Chapter VI the ballads of Zhukovsky's imitators are examined, particularly those by his "opponent" P.A. Katenin, his "double" A.I. Meshchevsky, and his "disciple" I.I. Kozlov. Chapters VII and VIII follow the poetic careers of Pushkin and Lermontov respectively, from their early imitation and subsequent parody of Zhukovsky's ballads to their individual and original use of the literary ballad genre.

The terms "classicism" and "romanticism" are used throughout in the conventionally accepted sense to refer to historical movements in European literature during the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. "Pre-romanticism" is used to identify certain literary developments which characterized the first stages of the romantic movement; no precise distinction between "pre-romanticism" and "romanticism" is intended. "Sentimentalism" is used to describe one particular aspect of "pre-romanticism", namely that tearful emotionalism associated with N.M. Karamzin and others.

The system of transliteration adopted is that used in the Oxford Slavonic Papers, which includes the transliteration of -ий and -ый in surnames as -y.

Chapter I

THE INFLUENCE OF FOLK BALLADS AND THE BALLAD REVIVAL ON RUSSIAN LITERARY BALLADS

How do you recognize a ballad?¹

The problems of recognition and definition have plagued ballad criticism since the literary world first took an interest in the folk genre. Addison's Chevy Chase papers at the beginning of the so-called "ballad revival" in the eighteenth century have been followed by numerous and varied descriptions of the genre.

The word ballad is derived from the Old French form balade - dancing song, itself derived from the Latin verb ballāre - to dance.² First used to describe medieval Provençal and Italian dancing songs, the word was borrowed to describe a specific metrical form in Old French poetry which consisted of three stanzas of eight to twelve lines each and a concluding envoy of four to six lines, all in a strict rhyme scheme. The form was popularized by Machaut, Villon, Marot, and Ronsard, and was referred to by Boileau and Voltaire as being well established. The same word was also used to describe medieval English and Scottish short narrative popular songs, belonging to the oral tradition and completely unrelated to the French form. It was these songs which were "revived" in the eighteenth century, and were collected and imitated first in England and Germany, and

1. Second Public Examination, Honour School of English (Oxford University, 1961).

2. Oxford English Dictionary, I (Oxford, 1933), 639.

soon afterwards in Russia.

An English critic, G.H. Gerould, has most accurately defined those constant features found in all traditional folk ballads:

A ballad is a folksong that tells a story with stress on the crucial situation, tells it by letting the action unfold itself in event and speech, and tells it objectively with little comment or intrusion of personal bias.¹

Gerould develops the characteristics at some length: the narrative unit, which consists of a compressed, centralized episode; the narrative method of dramatic presentation; and the narrative attitude of absolute impersonality.

No description of the ballad genre is complete which does not account for the fact that "recognition" of a ballad is easier than "definition". C.M. Ing, in a series of lectures at Oxford entitled Ballads and their Influence, chose to call this recognizable, though intangible, element the ballad "world" or "code", which consists of all those common characteristics relating to physical setting, weather, vegetation, dwellings, inhabitants, and supernature which render it almost impossible to mistake the presence of a ballad.

In the history of Russian criticism the concept of a ballad genre in folk literature has been only recently introduced. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries collectors and critics of Russian folk poetry tended to concentrate on the byliny. Kirsha Danilov, in his early collection Drevnie rossiiskie stikhotvoreniya (1804), did not strictly distinguish genres, but grouped similar works together as byliny, historical tales, humorous tales, and lyrical songs. A.I. Sobolevsky, at the end of the nineteenth century, attempted to separate ballads from byliny, calling the former

1. G.H. Gerould, The Ballad of Tradition (Oxford, 1932), 11. Cf. W.J. Entwistle, European Balladry (Oxford, 1951) and M.J.C. Hodgart, The Ballads (New York, 1962).

nizshie epicheskie pesni.¹ M.N. Speransky used the same term, but further characterized these works as narrative, rather than lyrical, songs which reflect domestic life in a realistic way.²

The genre of the folk ballad was finally established in Russian criticism by the publication of the anthology Russkaya ballada in 1936. The editors V.I. Chernyshev and N.P. Andreev presented the first definition of the Russian ballad as

songs with clearly expressed narrative content ..., distinguished from byliny, historical songs, and spiritual verse by the absence of the specific characteristics of those genres.³

Specifically, ballads lack the heroic deeds of the bogatyri in byliny, the factual accuracy of historical songs, and the ecclesiastical coloration of spiritual verse. Andreev, while admitting that theirs was a negative definition, claimed that the lack of research on the subject would permit no better at that time.

A positive definition of the Russian folk ballad was provided by D.M. Balashov in the second edition of the same anthology in 1963⁴ and was developed in a monograph dated 1966.⁵ The ballad is defined as an "epic (narrative) song of dramatic nature": "epic" because the story is related objectively by the narrator without interference; "dramatic" in that the emphasis is on action. The subject of ballads is described as the individual fate of the average, non-heroic man. The question of the origin and development of the

1. A.I. Sobolevsky, Velikorusskie narodnye pesni, I (SPb., 1895).

2. M.N. Speransky, Russkaya ustnaya slovesnost', (M., 1917), 355.

3. Russkaya ballada, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya (L., 1936), xvii.

4. Narodnye ballady, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. (M-L., 1963).

5. D.M. Balashov, Istoriya razvitiya zhanra russkoi ballady (Petrozavodsk, 1966).

Russian ballad is left unanswered.

The most recent study of Russian folk poetry includes a brief section on the ballad by V.P. Anikin.¹ Having considered Balashov's definition, Anikin concludes that it is too wide an understanding of the genre, and limits his definition to those works which render the "tragic everyday (bytovye) collisions and events" of the Russian medieval period, thus excluding Balashov's historical, social, and satirical ballads from his definition.

Gerould's definition quoted above remains the clearest statement of the ballad's constant features. Its "narrative unit" relates a compressed, centralized incident, event, or conflict in approximately thirty to eighty lines. Events preceding and following the climax are reported laconically with little comment or continuity. All the emphasis is on action, not on characters or their motivation. The drama results in part from what Balashov calls the zagadochnost' or nedoskazannost'² in that the reasons and circumstances for the events are never fully revealed.

The ballad employs a "narrative method" characterized by its concentration, compression, and dynamism. Its structure is simple: the ballad begins without an introduction, ex abrupto, and proceeds from one dramatic moment to the next; dialogue illustrates the action without any words to indicate change of speaker; there is no conclusion. Nothing superfluous retards the action or distracts attention from the central incident. Verbal and thematic repetition, parallelism, stylized diction, simple, sequential syntax, and strong reliance on verbs are all functional and contribute to the total

1. V.P. Anikin, "Balladnye pesni", in Russkoe narodnoe poeticheskoe tvorchestvo, ed. N.I. Kravtsov (M., 1971), 190-204.

2. Istoriya razvitiya, 9.

dramatic effect of the ballad.¹

The "narrative attitude" of the ballads is one of absolute impersonality. There are no lyrical digressions, no moralization, no emotionalism, no physical or psychological description - in short, no interference or interpretation of the action. The anonymous balladeers desired merely to express the experience itself and to share it with their audience.

Ballad subjects include any striking situation from everyday life. The love theme is common in its many variations: faithfulness, reconciliation, insistence on the lovers' freedom of choice, family despotism, parental interference, jealousy, revenge, incest, and so forth. The characters are ordinary men and women, often nameless, and always passively resigned to their fates. These generalized types are revealed in action and dialogue, but are rarely characterized by their speech patterns.

The ballad "world" is that of concrete reality, at best apathetic, at worst hostile to man. Supernature is conceived in real terms, as a part of the natural order, and occurs in dreams, superstitions, premonitions, and omens.

The term "illiterature" was invented by A.B. Friedman to describe the ballad genre and to serve as an antonym for Herder's concept of Kunstpoesie.² One could easily multiply the differences between the folk ballad and so-called "sophisticated poetry", but the conclusion would remain unaltered: the ballad requires its own special aesthetic.

Russian folk ballads are almost identical to their Western

1. See below, Chapter IV, pp.131-36 on the epithet in folk ballads.

2. A.B. Friedman, The Ballad Revival (Chicago, 1961), 2 ff.

European counterparts in subject, form, and style, with two important exceptions: Russian ballads are written in tonic verse and they have no refrains. In order to illustrate the narrative unit, method, and attitude of the traditional Russian folk ballads, two examples have been selected from the anthology Narodnye ballady (1963): Dmitrii i Domna and Brat'ya razboiniki i sestra.¹

The plot of Dmitrii i Domna is typical of Russian ballads. Dmitrii rides past the window where Domna sits and she mocks his appearance; Dmitrii's sister urges him to invite Domna to a feast; envoys come to Domna's mother and present their invitation three times; each time the mother refuses, but Domna declares that she will go anyway. The mother recounts her ominous dream, warns her daughter of the impending dangers, and gives some farewell advice: Domna should take three dresses with her - the first for her wedding, the second for her disgrace, and the third for her death. Domna disregards her mother's warning and goes to meet Dmitrii; he welcomes her and then beats her to death; when Domna's mother learns the news and comes to mourn her daughter, she herself is killed. Then Dmitrii turns on his sister and accuses her of having inspired both murders, and he kills her too.

This ballad consists of a narrative unit of some ninety lines relating one connected episode. Emphasis is on the action, not on the characters of Dmitrii or Domna. The narrative method is apparent in the movement from one dramatic moment to the next, in the dialogues between Domna, Dmitrii's sister, the envoys, Domna's mother, and Dmitrii himself, and also in the ternary repetition. The narrative attitude is maintained: there are no digressions, no

1. Narodnye ballady, 45-47, 124-25.

explanations, and no interpretation of the events by the author. Finally, the "world" is that of concrete reality; the supernatural intrudes only in the mother's foreboding dream.

The other example of the traditional folk ballad, Brat'ya razboiniki i sestra, relates the story of a widow who lives in a little hut together with her nine sons and one daughter; the sons leave home and become robbers; a matchmaker marries off the daughter to a rich merchant, and she goes to live with him. The daughter is so unhappy that she and her husband embark on a journey back to her home; on the way they are attacked by robbers who kill the merchant and ravish his wife. That night the youngest robber questions the wife, and, hearing her story, rouses his brothers to tell them that they have unknowingly murdered their brother-in-law and raped their own sister.

This ballad demonstrates the constant features of the genre (narrative unit, method, attitude and the ballad world). In addition, the retelling of the wife's story in lines 40-53 is an exact repetition of the opening lines of the ballad (1-14). Thus the exposition is cleverly repeated as recapitulation and brings about the realization of the full horror in the situation.

The relationship between the traditional Russian folk ballad and the imitative literary ballads of the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century will be discussed below.

* * *

In contrast to the folk ballad, the literary ballad is a form of Kunstpoesie. It has been accurately defined as

a ballad or ballad-like poem written with a deliberate and serious artistic purpose, that is, by a poet using the ballad as a form for the expression of his inspiration.¹

In other words, the literary ballad represents a conscious choice by an individual poet to employ a form and to adopt the techniques of folk poetry.

When the folk ballad was "discovered" by the literary world in the eighteenth century and "sophisticated" poets began imitating the form, they found that the aesthetic principles of the traditional ballad were not really applicable in their poetry. These poets manifested little interest in constructing an accurate copy of the genuine article, merely to display their ingenuity. The narrative unit of the folk ballad seemed to be too compressed. Poets had become interested in the causation of events, in the physical description and psychological motivation of their characters, and in the localization of the setting. The narrative method of the traditional genre seemed awkward, the language unrefined, and the metre either too irregular or too monotonous. The writers of literary ballads sought greater richness of diction, greater density of rhythms - in short, a style which, in its striking originality, would express their own individualities. Nor could sophisticated poets abide the uncompromising superficiality, impersonality, and distance from characters and events which distinguished the narrative attitude in the folk ballads. They wanted not merely to express the experience and share it with their readers, but to explain it and interpret its significance.

Thus the aesthetic principles of the folk ballad were completely

1. J.S. Bratton, "Studies in the Literary and Sub-Literary Ballad in the Nineteenth Century", Unpublished D.Phil. Thesis (Oxford University, 1969), 2.

antithetical to the canons of neo-classical, pre-romantic, and romantic taste. As one English critic has concluded:

The [folk] ballads ignored or de-emphasized precisely those elements which sophisticated poets would savour most and develop most fully.¹

Sir Walter Scott acknowledged this fact in his Essay on Imitations of the Ancient Ballad (1830); but it was scarcely recognized by the first poets who imitated the traditional form. One is left with an inevitable paradox: the literary world adopted and imitated the supreme genre of "illiterature".

Explanations for this phenomenon vary. The attraction for the ballad form in the eighteenth century can be understood as a reaction against classical genres and aesthetics. The ballad was "natural" rather than artificial; "popular" rather than aristocratic; and "national" rather than cosmopolitan.² These points are valid, but neglect the most important appeal of the form for sophisticated poets, namely, the enchantment of the exotic "world" which the ballad offered. The physical setting, meteorology, vegetation, dwellings, inhabitants, supernature - all the components of the intangible ballad "code" - were so totally different from the serene, rational world of classical poetry, that the ballad offered to both poets and readers something novel and exciting. And it is precisely this "code" which would be variously recognized and used, distorted and misused by each writer of literary ballads as he altered the form to accommodate his own talents and tastes.

The so-called "ballad revival" in Western European literature developed in three general stages: firstly, a change in the literary

1. Friedman, The Ballad Revival, 295.

2. Hodgart, The Ballads, 148.

world's perception of the folk ballad; secondly, the collection of folk ballad texts; thirdly, the creation of the genre of the imitative literary ballad. These stages were intricately inter-related, and only once were all three embodied in the literary career of one man, Sir Walter Scott.

The "revival" began in England in the early eighteenth century; by the middle of the century it had spread to Germany; and by the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century the German "revival" was exerting its influence on English literature. France was late in discovering its own ballads, but the most important English and German works were known in French translations. It was these French translations which reached Russian readers in the mid-eighteenth century and first aroused interest in the ballad form. The French versions were in turn translated into Russian, and then were imitated by Russian poets at the end of the eighteenth century.

The English "revival" developed slowly. Elizabethan England had little affection for the folk ballad; the form was considered vulgar and undignified, the preserve of the common people. Sir Philip Sidney's statement in his Defence of Poesie (1595), presumably about some version of Chevy Chase, is the exception to the pervading attitude:

... I never heard the old song of Percy and Douglas,
that I founde not my heart mooved more than with a
Trumpet; and yet it is sung but by some blinde
Crowder, with no rougher voyce, than rude stile...¹

Addison's criticism of Chevy Chase in the Spectator (1711) reflects a similar attitude towards the ballad in the early eighteenth century. He argues for a change in that attitude by showing that

1. Sir Philip Sidney, The Defence of Poesie (London , 1595), F-1.

... the Sentiments in that Ballad [Chevy Chase] are extremely Natural and Poetical, and full of the majestic Simplicity which we admire in the greatest of the ancient Poets.¹

Although Addison was taken to task by his fellow neo-classical critics, his views proved to be farsighted.

The publication of a fifteenth-century ballad, The Nut-browne Maid, in the Muses Mercury in 1707 resulted in the first literary imitation of the popular genre. Matthew Prior wrote Henry and Emma, a Poem, Upon the Model of the Nut-browne Maid, and published it together with the text of the original ballad.² The original was later included by Thomas Percy in his Reliques (1765), while Prior's imitation was translated into German by F.J. Bertuch in 1753, and from Bertuch's version into Russian prose by N. Markov in 1788.³

Among the earliest collections of ballad texts were Ambrose Phillips's Collection of Old Ballads (1723-25) and Allan Ramsay's volumes of old Scottish and English songs, including the Tea Table Miscellany (1724-32). The latter contained rewritten or "improved" versions, including some invented entirely by Ramsay and his contemporaries. While balladic motifs, characters, and melodies were incorporated by John Gay into the polished verse of his Beggar's Opera (1728) and its sequel Polly (1729), the important genre distinction between ballads and songs was first drawn by the poet William Shenstone in a letter to Thomas Hull in 1761:

1. Spectator, No.74 (1711).

2. See K. Kroeber, Romantic Narrative Art (Madison, Wisc., 1966), 13-19, for a comparison of the original with Prior's imitation.

3. N. Markov, Geinrikh i Emma (M., 1788; SPb., 1788).

[I] call that a Ballad which describes or implies some Action; on the other Hand, I term that a Song, which contains only an Expression of Sentiment.¹

The pivotal document in the eighteenth century which summarized and climaxed neo-classical interest in ballads was Thomas Percy's Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, first published in 1765. This three-volume collection contained a variety of Scottish and English songs, ballads, sonnets and romances, selected and organized haphazardly, and freely rewritten in order to make them "readable". Percy eliminated the bawdy bits, simplified the syntax, replaced archaic words and phrases, and made the plots more explicit. The Reliques had an extraordinary influence on the perception of popular poetry. Percy forced the traditional ballad into the English literary consciousness, and the excitement which was generated in England spread throughout Northern Europe. Percy's texts, though altered, became the canon; paradoxically, those most altered (for example, The Child of Elle) were among the most influential. So unacquainted with folk literature were the poets of the nineteenth century that they were rarely able to discern the meddling effects of Percy's hand.² Percy's practice of editing the texts to make them conform to contemporary standards of taste became the guide for later collectors and imitators.³ K.W.F. von Schlegel, summarizing the influence of the Reliques, wrote that through Percy the "universal passion for national ballads" had overcome all other kinds of writing and had engrossed "the whole of English literature".⁴

1. Letters of William Shenstone, ed. D. Mallam (Minneapolis, Minn., 1939), 436.

2. See Friedman, The Ballad Revival, 185-232.

3. Joseph Ritson was a notable exception: in the preface to his collection of songs and romances he attacked Percy's editorial method and advocated closer adherence to the original texts.

4. Lectures on the History of Literature, trans. J.G. Lockhart, II (Edinburgh, 1818), 218.

The influence of Percy's Reliques was felt in Russian literature only indirectly, through Bürger's imitations of English ballads and through the collections of Herder and Ursinus, both inspired by Percy. Far more important for the Russian ballad movement were other non-balladic developments in pre-romantic English literature.

James Thompson's The Seasons (1726-30) inaugurated a new era in nature poetry with its description of a purely national landscape and its insistence on the intimate connection between nature and man's soul. The poem was translated into French and German during the 1740s and 1750s, and was mentioned in Russian journals in the 1780s. Excerpts from The Seasons in Russian translation began to appear in journals from 1781. The first full translation was completed by D.I. Dmitrevsky in 1798.¹

Another poet, Edward Young, enjoyed similar popularity and exercised considerable influence throughout Western Europe. Young's Night Thoughts (1742-45) were full of new sentiment: pensive melancholy and reconciliation with death. The work was translated into German in the 1750s by J.A. Ebert, and into French prose by Le Tourneur in 1769. Excerpts in Russian prose translated by M.V. Sushkova appeared in Kheraskov's journal Vechera in 1772.² The first full prose translation was made from Ebert's German version, probably by A.M. Kutuzov, and appeared in Novikov's Masonic journal Utrennii svet between 1778-80. The first verse translation was completed by S.N. Glinka from Le Tourneur's version and published in 1806.³

Perhaps the single most influential poem of the pre-romantic period was Thomas Gray's Elegy written in a country churchyard (1750).

1. Yu.D. Levin, "Angliiskaya poeziya i literatura russkogo sentimentalizma", in Ot klassitsizma k romantizmu, ed. M.P. Alekseev (L., 1970), 229-32.

2. Ibid., 210.

3. Ibid., 211-25.

An excerpt from the poem appeared in Russian translation in the journal Pokoyashchiisya trudolyubets in 1784, and a full prose translation was printed in the same journal a year later. The first verse translation was published by V.A. Zhukovsky in Vestnik Evropy in 1802, and marked the beginning of Zhukovsky's literary career.

A phenomenon which had as much impact on Western European literature as Percy's Reliques was James Macpherson's creation of the Ossianic myth. The publication of Fragments of Ancient Poetry Collected in the Highlands (1760) was followed by Fingal (1762) and Temora (1763), both purporting to be translations from the original Gaelic poems by the third-century bard Ossian. Macpherson's liberal editing of the traditional Gaelic songs and his insertion of numerous passages of his own invention resulted in a literary imitation of popular poetry not unlike the ballads in both content and form. Full of local colour, national lore, melancholy and supernature, and written in a strikingly original style, Macpherson's hoax swept through Europe and Russia.¹

The first Russian references to Ossian occur in a translation of Goethe's Die Leiden des jungen Werthers (1774) made in 1781 and in Karamzin's Poeziya in 1787.² A.I. Dmitriev first translated Ossian into Russian verse in 1788.³ One of the poems and some of Macpherson's commentary were translated and published in Moskovskii zhurnal in 1791, and E.I. Kostrov translated Le Tourneur's French version into Russian in 1792, which he published together with a

1. See R.P. Fitzgerald, "The Style of Ossian", Studies in Romanticism, VI, No. 1, 1966, 22-33.

2. See V.I. Maslov, Ossian v Rossii (Bibliografiya) (L., 1928).

3. A.I. Dmitriev, Poemy drevnikh bardov (SPb., 1788).

long article on Ossian and his epoch.¹ Imitations of Ossianic poems were later written by Kapnist, Derzhavin, Murav'ev, Karamzin, Gnedich, and Pushkin, and exerted considerable influence on the development of Russian poetry.

No account of the influence of English pre-romanticism on the Russian ballad movement can omit the rediscovery of Shakespeare in Russia through Le Tourneur's versions. Russian translations by Karamzin (1787), Pomerantsev (1790), and A.I. Turgenev (1802) began to appear in the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century.² Some of this new interest in Shakespeare was due to the belief that he had used ballads, folk songs, and popular legends as a basis for his plays.

The two English ballad imitators who were to exert the most important influence on Russian literary ballads were Robert Southey and Sir Walter Scott. Southey was attracted to the ballad form partly as a result of his admiration for William Taylor's translation of Bürger's Lenore, one of six English versions published in 1796.³ He vacillated between the serious and comic ballad forms. His serious Gothic ballads are concise, suitably macabre, and reveal an original treatment of the supernatural. His comic ballads range from the wryly amusing to the ridiculous.

Bürger's Lenore also aroused Sir Walter Scott's interest in the ballads. After his anonymous version of Lenore in 1796, Scott translated another Bürger ballad, Der wilde Jäger. In 1801 he joined

1. E.I. Kostrov, Ossian, syn Fingalov, bard tret'ego veka (M., 1792).

2. See Shekspir i russkaya kul'tura, ed. M.P. Alekseev (M.-L., 1965).

3. See O.F. Emerson, The Earliest English Translations of Bürger's "Lenore", (Cleveland, Ohio, 1915).

with Southey and Matthew ("Monk") Lewis to publish a collection of Gothic poems called Tales of Wonder. Lewis's translation of Goethe's ballad Erkönig is followed by free renditions of Danish legends in ballad form, one of which, The Water-King, is accompanied by an explanatory note:

As I have taken great liberties with this Ballad,
and have been much questioned as to my share in
it, I shall here subjoin a literal translation.¹

Scott's rendition of Goethe's ballad was also included under the title of The Fire-King.

Scott's major contribution to the ballad revival is his collection of texts entitled Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border (1802-3), which is divided into three parts: "Historical ballads", "Romantic ballads", and "Imitations of the Ancient Ballads". His principles of editing conformed to Percy's standards of contemporary good taste. He made composite versions of the ballads, adapting "the best or most poetical readings" from all extant copies. He regularized the rhythms, eliminated any vulgarisms, and made numerous insertions and alterations, not all of which are discernible even now. His views on ballad theory were summarized in two articles which were included in the 1830 edition of the Minstrelsy, Introductory Remarks on Popular Poetry and Essay on Imitations of the Ancient Ballad.

Although they proved to be the greatest literary ballads written in English, Wordsworth and Coleridge's Lyrical Ballads (1798), including The Rime of the Ancient Mariner, and Keats's La Belle Dame Sans Merci (1819), had far less impact on the European ballad revival, and no influence of note in Russia.

1. M.G. Lewis, Tales of Wonder, I (Dublin, 1801), 60.

In Germany the influence of the English ballad revival coincided with increased German interest in folk poetry. J.W.L. Gleim, the leader of the so-called Anacreontic school, published his Lieder (1745) which dealt with military subjects in ballad form, and some romances in 1756, preceded with a note on the increasing popularity of Spanish and French romances among German readers. His poem Marianne was based on F.-A.P. Moncrif's romance Les Constantes Amours d'Alix et d'Alexis, later translated into Russian by Zhukovsky. L.C.H. Hölty indoctrinated his pupils at the University of Göttingen with a new conception of poetry, based, in part, on his knowledge of English ballads via Percy. In his own poems Hölty used themes borrowed from the Reliques, but introduced German names and elements of local colour. Two works, Adelstan und Röschen and Die Nonne, were published in Musenalmanach in 1774-75. The subject of both is that of an abandoned girl and her revenge. The eerie landscape and the presence of ghosts show the transition from romance to ballad.¹ A German translation of Ossian appeared in 1762 and kindled great enthusiasm in Klopstock and others in the English "bardic" movement.² Shakespeare was made available in pre-romantic prose translations by C.M. Wieland (1762-66), which were superseded by those of J.J. Eschenburg (1775-77).³

Bürger's Lenore, published in Musenalmanach in 1773, became the range in European literatures from Scotland to Poland and Russia, and from Scandinavia to Italy. Some critics have claimed that

1. See W. Kayser, Geschichte der deutschen Ballade (Berlin, 1936), 70-78.

2. See ibid., 80-88.

3. J.G. Herder, Von Deutscher Art und Kunst, ed. E. Purdie (Oxford, 1924), x.

Lenore is a reworking of Percy's Sweet William's Ghost.¹ Other scholars have seen its sources in German folk legends, Herder's essay on Ossian (1773), or in Goethe's drama Götz von Berlichingen (1771-73).² Whatever its source, the novelty, supernatural dread, popular speech, and sound effects of Lenore produced a literary sensation. When the ballad was enjoying its greatest popularity, Bürger wrote to his fellow poets:

With trembling knees all of you shall prostrate
yourselves before me, and acknowledge me as a
Genghis Khan, that is, the greatest Khan of the
ballad For all who shall write ballads
after me will be my unquestionable vassals and
will borrow their tone from me.³

Bürger developed his views on folk poetry in Aus Daniel Wunderlichs Buch (1776).⁴ He believed that only Volkspoesie had the necessary Herzensausguss which could redeem German poetry from its false erudition by means of real contact with nature and with the Volk. As a demonstration of his conviction, Bürger, in a series of ballads written between 1775 and 1784, virtually created the German literary ballad.

In the same year in which Bürger's Lenore was published, Herder edited what was to become the manifesto of the Sturm und Drang movement, Von deutscher Art und Kunst (1773), to which he contributed essays on Ossian and Shakespeare.⁵ He put forward his own idealized view of Ossian as a lyric poet, and defended popular poetry as the

1. See Entwhistle, European Balladry, 123-24; and Kayser, Geschichte, 89-100.

2. See J.G. Robertson, A History of German Literature (London, 1962), 259-60.

3. Brief von und an Gottfried August Bürger, ed. A. Strodtmann (Berlin, 1874), 132.

4. G.A. Bürger, Werke und Briefe (Leipzig, 1958), 575-85.

5. Bürger remarked upon completion of his ballad: "I think that to a certain extent Lenore will correspond to Herder's precepts" (Kayser, Geschichte, 91).

only genuine poetry. He challenged Germany to collect her own folk songs and to become conscious of her national traditions.

In 1777, one year before the publication of Herder's major collection of texts, A.F. Ursinus edited a slim volume of English ballads borrowed from Percy's Reliques, together with their German translations, entitled Balladen und Lieder altenglischer und alt-schottischer Dichtart.¹ Epigraphs to the collection were selected from Addison's article on Chevy Chase and from Montaigne's essay on the nature of popular poetry:

La poesie populaire et purement naturelle a des naivetés et des graces par où elle se compare à la principale beauté de la poesie parfaite selon l'art.²

An explanatory essay by the German critic J.J. Eschenburg preceded the texts and translations. This obscure work was to become the principle source of ballad translations into Russian in the late eighteenth century.

In 1778-79 Herder published his Volkslieder, an anthology of foreign texts including selections from Percy's English and Scottish ballads, Shakespeare's songs, Spanish romances, Scandinavian songs, and so forth. He argued that his collection should be regarded more as a foundation for future poetry, than as poetry itself. German poets were to recover their authentic voice by attuning themselves to the sources of inspiration of the Volkslied.

Goethe accepted Herder's challenge and wrote a series of literary ballads during his Weimar period, including Der Fischer (1778) and Erkönig (1782), and another series in 1797 which were published in Musenalmanach. He also persuaded Schiller to contribute a series of ballads to the same journal. These included

1. A.F. Ursinus, Balladen und Lieder ... (Berlin, 1777).

2. Ibid., frontispiece.

Der Taucher and Der Handschuh. The ballads of both Goethe and Schiller were to play a major role in the development of the Russian literary ballad.

Arnim and Brentano, continuing Herder's work, published a collection of German folk songs called Des Knaben Wunderhorn (1805-8), which exerted considerable influence on German lyric and ballad poetry. However, German ballad poetry was to be perfected by J.L. Uhland in his Balladen und Romanzen (1805-15), which was a major source of Russian translations in the early nineteenth century.

The ballad revival in France occurred much later than in England or Germany. The collections by Percy and Herder aroused little excitement among French readers. Only Fauriel's Chants populaires de la Grèce (1824-25) began to awaken interest in folk literature.¹ While this resulted in many translations and imitations of the folk poetry of other countries, there was no enthusiasm shown for the investigation of French sources. Later developments in the French literary ballad, particularly in the works of Hugo and Musset, had only a limited effect on the Russian ballad movement.²

Scott, in his Essay on Imitations of the Ancient Ballad (1830), summarized one of the results of the Western European ballad revival:

1. N.H. Clement, Romanticism in France (New York, 1939), 103.

2. See below, Chapter VIII, for Hugo's influence on Lermontov's ballads.

... a new species of poetry seems to have arisen, which in some cases endeavoured to pass itself as the production of genuine antiquity, and in others honestly avowed an attempt to emulate the merits and avoid the errors with which the old ballad was encumbered; and in the effort to accomplish this a species of composition was discovered which is capable of being subjected to peculiar rules of criticism and of exhibiting excellences of its own.¹

The "new species of poetry" to which Scott was referring had established itself as an original genre in English and German poetry. The aesthetic principles of the literary ballad, so unlike those of the traditional folk ballad, inevitably required that it be "subjected to peculiar rules of criticism". The ballads of Scott himself, Southey, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Keats, and those of Bürger, Goethe, Schiller, and Uhland demonstrated that the form was indeed capable of "exhibiting excellences of its own". The Russian literary ballad owes its origin and early development to the Western European ballad revival.

* * *

The influence of the ballad revival on the Russian ballad movement has been underestimated or flatly denied by Soviet critics. One of the most recent works on the subject states categorically:

The reasons for the conception [of the literary ballad genre] were of a social-historical nature, and not narrowly literary, and in any case were not rooted in the aspiration of Russian poets to imitate European models, as it has been thought previously.²

However, the interest aroused in Russia by French translations of English and German works, and the proliferation of Russian

1. Sir Walter Scott, Minstrelsy ..., ed. T. Henderson (London, 1931), 539.

2. E.A. Tudorovskaya, "Stanovlenie zhanra ballady v tvorchestve A.S. Pushkina", Russkii fol'klor, VII (M.-L., 1962), 67.

translations of these same works suggest that Western European pre-romantic literature, and particularly the ballad revival, had much greater significance for the emergence of the Russian ballad than Soviet critics would care to admit.

It must, however, be admitted that with the general development of national consciousness in Europe during the eighteenth century, the popular literary tradition was also discovered in Russia. Collections of folk literature and subsequent literary imitations, especially of the folk song, played an important role in the history of the literary ballad.

Although the aesthetic theory of French and Russian classicism rejected folklore as a valid element of style, eighteenth-century Russian poets were more interested in collecting and imitating folk poetry than were their French counterparts. Trediakovsky claimed that his tonic verse was strongly influenced by popular poetry.¹ Sumarokov wrote imitations of folk songs, including Negde v malen'kom lesu (1755), Gde ni gulyayu, ni khozhu (1765), and Ne grusti, moi svet, mne grustno i samoi (1770), all of which were later included in Chulkov's collection of popular songs. Even the Empress Catherine began collecting and reworking motifs from popular poetry. Her comic opera Novgorodskii bogatyr' Boeslavich (1786) was, in the author's own words, "composed of skazki, Russian songs and other works".²

The wave of interest in folklore which is first noticeable in the late 1750s and during the 1760s, found expression in various collections and anthologies of M.D. Chulkov and M.I. Popov.

1. G.A. Gukovsky, Russkaya literatura XVIII veka (M., 1939), 223.

2. I.I. Zamotin, Romantizm dvadtsatykh godov XIX stoletiya v russkoi literature, II (SPb.-M., 1911-13), 353.

Chulkov's Kratkii mifologicheskii slovar' (1767) included Slavonic, as well as classical, mythology. Popov's Opisanie drevnego slavyanskogo yazycheskogo basnosloviya ... (1768) pointed out parallels between Western European and Slavonic myths. Chulkov's four-volume Sobranie raznykh pesen (1770-74), frequently reprinted during the 1780s, included approximately eight-hundred songs, among them genuine folk songs and Sumarokov's imitations. Chulkov also published a Slovar' russkikh sueverii (1782); the title of the second edition (1786) enumerated its contents: An ABC of Russian superstitions, idol-worshipping sacrifices, nuptial and popular rites, sorcery, shamanism, etc., etc. V.A. Levshin issued a collection of tales in ten parts entitled Russkie skazki (1780-83), which contained "ancient narratives of renowned bogatyri and popular skazki".¹

In 1765 Popov published thirteen of his songs, the first such collection by a single poet in Russian literature. He added three more songs to the second edition in 1768, and another five to his Dosugi in 1772, including Ty, besschastnyi dobryi molodets, a variation on a folk song from Chulkov's collection; and Ne golubushka v chistom pole vorkuet, an original experiment in the style of a folk song with the rhythm, epithets, negative comparisons, and reliance on verbs - all characteristic of genuine folk songs.²

During the last decades of the eighteenth century several works were published which foreshadowed the emergence of the literary

1. See V.B. Shklovsky, Chulkov i Levshin (L., 1933) for an analysis of their work and their influence on nineteenth-century Russian literature.

2. For texts, see Poety XVIII veka, Biblioteka poeta, Malaya seriya, I (L., 1958), 510-12.

ballad genre. One of these is a narrative poem entitled Nakazannaya nevernost' (Romans) (1778) by Ya. B. Knyazhnin, who is known primarily as a classical dramatist and as a translator of French sentimental literature. The romance is a story of a mysterious love which wreaks a terrible vengeance: the beautiful heroine Liza loves the handsome Flor, but he leaves her to marry someone wealthier; Liza, overcome by grief, dies of a broken heart; her body is laid out in the church where Flor is about to be married; Flor sees her, is smitten with remorse, and dies. The lovers are buried together in one grave.

The characters in Knyazhnin's poem have no individuality: on the one hand, there is the beautiful, faithful heroine; on the other, the fortune-seeking, faithless hero. The setting is nominally Moscow, but, in fact, is completely generalized. The author intrudes into the narrative with an admonition to Flor (Ty klyalsya... trepeshchi, nevernyi...), to Liza (Ne ver' l'stetsu, o Liza nezhdna!), and a moral lesson for all: (Da budet vam primer uzhasnyi, / Goryashchim v strasti, - ne mehta). The language of the romance is highly literary and employs none of the devices of folk poetry. The intonation, which alternates between exclamatory and interrogative, and the descriptive epithets including gor'kii ston, bledna liliya, temnyi zrak, temnyi grob, and smutny vzory, foreshadow the language of the literary ballads. In fact, the subject, characters, authorial attitude, and language of Knyazhnin's romance are all closely related to the Russian ballads of the 1790s.

During the early 1790s the translation into Russian of a French history of Scandinavia resulted in an attempt to create a new genre close to the literary ballad, the so-called rytsarskaya

pesn'.¹ In 1755 one P.H. Mallet published L'Introduction à l'histoire de Dannemarc, which contained materials on the origin, beliefs, and customs of the people of Scandinavia, as well as examples of their poetry. Excerpts from Mallet's work were translated into Russian and published in a journal in 1778,² and the complete book was translated in 1785.³ Two songs were included in prose translation: Pesnya korolya Regnera Lodbroga, based on a twelfth-century original, translated into German in the 1760s, and much praised by Herder; and Pesnya Garal'da khrabrogo.

A translation of the latter song, called Pesn' norvezhskogo vityazya Garal'da khrabrogo (1793), was written by N.A. L'vov, also known as the editor of a collection of Russian folk songs (1790) and as the author of an unfinished bogatyrskaya pesnya, Dobrynya (1794). The same song was translated during the 1790s as Pesn' khrabrogo shvedskogo rytsarya Garal'da by I.F. Bogdanovich, whose long poem Dushen'ka (1778-83) also contained numerous folkloric elements.⁴ Anonymous translations of both songs from Mallet's book appeared in the journal Ippokrena in 1801.⁵ As in the versions by L'vov and Bogdanovich, the language of these translations was a stylized imitation of Russian folk poetry. The songs were preceded by a brief introduction on Scandinavian chivalry, borrowed from the

1. See R.V. Iezuitova, "Iz istorii russkoi ballady 1790-kh - pervoi poloviny 1820-kh godov", Unpublished Candidate's Thesis (Institut russkoi literatury, L., 1966), 98 ff.

2. Sankt-Peterburgskii vestnik, No.4 (1778), 312.

3. Vvedenie v istoriyu datskuyu g. Malleta, perev. s frants. F. Moiseenko (SPb., 1785). The work was translated into English by Percy and published as Northern antiquities (London, 1770).

4. When Bogdanovich's version was published in 1810 it inspired Batyushkov to retranslate the song as Pesn' Garal'da smelogo.

5. Ippokrena, VIII (1801), 355-68.

Russian translation of Mallet's text. Since the genre of the rytsarskaya pesn' lacks the narrative unit characteristic of the ballad, it can only be seen as a related form. Each stanza in these pesni relates a separate episode, rather than contributing to the dramatic development of a single ballad subject.

Another genre related to the literary ballad is the heroic poema, which arose during the late 1790s and early 1800s. These stylized imitations of folklore in the epic tradition, with their conventional settings and artificial historical colour, included Karamzin's Il'ya Muromets (1795), A.I. Radishchev's Bova (1797-1800), Kheraskov's Bakhariana (1803), and Derzhavin's Dobrynya (1804) and Tsar'-devitsa (1806).¹

* * *

The emergence of the Russian literary ballad as a genre of Kunstpoesie could not have been based on the imitation of traditional Russian folk ballads because neither the concept of a folk ballad genre, nor any collections of texts existed until recently. Anthologies of Russian traditions, superstitions, and myths, and imitations of related genres of folk literature, including the folk song, rytsarskaya pesn', and poema, indicate a growing interest in popular sources among eighteenth-century poets and their readers. The impetus for the Russian literary ballad was undoubtedly provided by the Western European ballad revival, a conclusion which has been accepted, albeit grudgingly, by at least one Soviet critic, although

1. See A.N. Sokolov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi poemy XVIII i pervoi poloviny XIX veka (M., 1955).

the emphasis remains clear:

The use of the tradition of Western European ballads in the creation of the Russian ballad in no way signifies thoughtless, blind copying of individual foreign models, but proceeded along a complicated path on the foundation of national literary development.¹

1. Iezuitova, "Iz istorii", 47.

Chapter II

RUSSIAN LITERARY BALLADS OF THE 1790s

One of the universal characteristics of the Romantic temperament, whatever its incarnation, seems to be a fascination for the ballad.¹

The bibliography of works on the history of the Russian literary ballad is remarkably short. V.I. Rezanov, in his research on Zhukovsky, discovered several anonymous ballads in Russian periodicals of the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century and published some observations on these and on the literary ballads of Merzlyakov, Dmitriev, and Karamzin.² Throughout his study Rezanov emphasizes translations into Russian and adaptations of Western European sources, rather than original Russian ballads.

The only monograph on the Russian ballad was written by a German scholar, F.W. Neumann.³ In a lengthy introduction on the theory and aesthetics of the genre, he distinguishes the epic, lyric, and dramatic components of the ballad, and proposes a classification by subject: heroic, amorous, religious, death-magic, nature-magic, and so forth. Neumann's historical survey begins with the "sentimental ballad" (Merzlyakov, Dmitriev, Karamzin), and is followed by the "sentimental-romantic ballad" (Kamenev, Zhukovsky, Kozlov, Katenin), the "realistic-romantic ballad" (Ryleev, Pushkin, Lermontov,

1. K.H. and W.U. Ober, "Zhukovskij's Early Translations of the Ballads of Robert Southey", SEEJ, IX (1965), 182.

2. Iz razyskanii o sochineniyakh V.A. Zhukovskogo, I (SPb, 1906), 194-209.

3. F.W. Neumann, Geschichte der russischen Ballade (Königsberg and Berlin, 1937).

Koltsov), the "realistic ballad" (Nekrasov, Fet, Mikhailov), and finally, the "national Russian ballad" (Polonsky, Mei, A.K. Tolstoy). Neumann's approach is highly theoretical and his range fairly extensive; as a result his monograph is of limited value.

The third and last work on the subject is R.V. Iezuitova's unpublished dissertation which treats the Russian ballad from 1790 to the mid-1820s.¹ The author criticizes both Rezanov and Neumann for their excessive attention to foreign sources, and emphasizes the "original Russian ballads" as the best and most important representatives of the genre. Iezuitova begins with the anonymous ballads in Russian periodicals and with early translations from Western European sources, but she stresses the original love themes in the works of Turchaninova, Merzlyakov, and Karamzin, and the national Russian themes in the ballads of Kamenev and Dmitriev. She then surveys Russian Ossianic poetry, including Zhukovsky's Eolova arfa and Pushkin's early experiments in the ballad genre. Finally she turns to what she calls the "Russian national ballads": Zhukovsky's Lyudmila, Svetlana, and Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev, and Pushkin's later ballads and balladic lyrics. Iezuitova's dissertation contains considerable original material and numerous valuable insights; however, its ideological bias greatly detracts from the validity of its conclusions.

* * *

The first Russian literary ballads began to appear in periodicals during the 1790s. Some were published anonymously, although specific authors or translators for certain of these have since been identified.

1. Iezuitova, "Iz istorii".

Other ballads were written or translated by well-known poets. This chapter first examines four ballads representative of those published anonymously, and then analyzes the literary ballads written by Murav'ev, Karamzin, Merzlyakov, and Dmitriev. It ends with some general conclusions on the Russian ballad at the turn of the century.

One of the earliest ballads is a prose translation from German entitled Edvin i Malli published in Priyatnoe i poleznoe preprovozhdenie vremeni in 1795.¹ It has been ascribed to one of the editors of that journal, V.S. Podshivalov.² Rezanov established the source of the translation as F. Kind's ballad Edwin und Mally, published in Lenardo's Schwarmereyen (1793), which in turn was Kind's prose version of Bürger's ballad Lenardo und Blandine.³

The ballad opens with an extensive description of the setting which closely follows its German source. This is followed by the hero's elegiac lament which employs rhetorical questions and exclamations to praise the heroine and to express the hero's grief. Then their history is related by the narrator: Edwin, an orphan, and Malli, a nobleman's daughter, were brought up together and fall in love. At a dinner given by Malli's father, she is invited to reveal her heart's favourite. When she indicates Edwin, he is banished and Malli is confined to a tower. She frustrates her father's plan to marry her off to a knight when, at the wedding feast, she hurls herself from the tower window. Edwin discovers her corpse and takes his own life so that the two lovers can be buried together.

1. Priyatnoe i poleznoe, VII (1795), 23-31, 303-11.

2. A.N. Neustrcev, Istoricheskie rozyskaniya o russkikh povremennykh izdaniyakh (SPb., 1874), 766.

3. Iz razyskanii, 205.

Throughout there is an explicit parallel between nature and the human soul. Edwin's lament concludes with invocations to the elements to respond to his own misery: Zavyvai, svirepaya burya! The narrator intervenes to silence nature in order that he can proceed with the story: Razbivaite's' tishe, varye volny! / Dui nezhnee, zavyvayushchii vetr! The ballad ends with a brief description of the natural serenity which surrounds the lovers' graves. This parallelism was to become an important characteristic of the Russian ballads.

Another interesting example of the early literary ballads is the work Alvin i Rena, published anonymously in Podshivalov's journal in 1797.¹ Neither an author nor a definite source has since been established. The story of the ballad is presented in the form of a dialogue between two characters. Alvin is setting off to war; Rena is caught between love and duty, but finally bids him farewell. After a long time only Alvin's corpse returns; the distraught Rena attempts suicide, but is restrained by her "holy faith". She dies a natural death soon afterwards, and is buried alongside Alvin.

The symbolic intertwining of laurel and myrtle on the graves of the lovers, mentioned in the first and last stanzas to frame the story, is a common folkloric device. But Alvin i Rena is by no means an impersonal folk ballad; rather, it is a literary creation designed to elicit the maximum possible emotional response. It begins and ends with a direct apostrophe to the reader: Akh! prolei slezu na grob! The motif of tears accompanies the action at every stage: Rena's farewell promise to Alvin (Slez sikh bole ne uvidish'); Alvin's immediate observation (No sleza uzhe skatilas' / Na rumyanuyu shcheku); Rena's actual farewell (I - skvoz' slezy ulybayas'); and her subsequent

1. Priyatnoe i poleznoe, XV (1797), 285-88.

loneliness and death:

Но из томных, нежных глаз
Токи слез лились, доколе -
Сердце высохло совсем.

(21:2-4)

The heavy influence of Karamzin's sentimentalism, in particular of his tearful tale Bednaya Liza (1792), is here clearly manifested.¹

The action of the ballad is not located in any particular setting until Rena attempts suicide; then comes a dynamic description of an exotic ballad seascape:

Волны ярые крутятся,
С пеной плещутся, ревут,
Вся дрожит громада страшна
Как бы рухнуть хочет вдруг.

(18)

The storm in nature is compared implicitly to the burya grusti in Rena's soul, and earlier in the ballad this parallel is stated explicitly: Luch [luny] pechal'nyi, tomnyi / Reny grust' usugublyal. The author's apostrophe to his readers, the tearful sentimentalism, as well as the parallelism between the natural setting and the psychological state of the heroine are among the distinguishing characteristics of the literary ballads of the 1790s.

In 1799-1800 two ballads by the obscure poetess Anna Turchaninova were published in Ippokrena, P.A. Sokhatsky's journal which superseded Priyatnoe i poleznoe. The first, Leonard i Blondina, subtitled pesenka, was inserted in the prose tale Nochekhodets, ili lunatik.² Neumann could locate no source, but suggested that the ballad might be a translation of a Spanish romance.³ Iezuitova observed that

1. The narrator in Bednaya Liza confesses to his readers: "Oh, how I love those things which touch my heart and force me to shed tears of tender grief".

2. Ippokrena, IV (1799), 274-79.

3. Geschichte, 36.

although the title is the same as one of Bürger's ballads, the two works are not related.¹ Thus, until a source is discovered, Leonard i Blondina can be considered an original Russian literary ballad.

The plot relates the conventional tale of two young lovers. The hero's father urges his son Leonard to take part in the bullfights in order to win admiration from the heroine Blondina. Although she is afraid, Leonard insists on obeying his father. Nor surprisingly he perishes in the ring. The ghosts of the two lovers are united after Blondina's death. The pretence of local colour - the bullfight in Granada - is soon abandoned. The language of the ballad combines conventional eighteenth-century epithets in the narration (prelestnyi, prekrasnyi, priyatnyi, nezhnyi, lyutyi) and "pre-romantic" epithets in the description of the lovers' ghosts and of the setting which frames the narration (zybkie tsvety, tonkaya ten', savan belyi, bledna ten'). Blondina's reaction to Leonard's departure lacks the sentimentality of Alvin i Rena: Bezmolvna, smyatenna, pechal'na, bledna, / Podobna fialke uvyadshei stoit. Both the choice of epithets and their inclusion in a series reflect the changes in style at the end of the eighteenth century and foreshadow future developments in Zhukovsky's style.

Turchaninova's second ballad, Vill'iam i Margarita, published in 1800, is a prose translation of David Mallet's William and Margaret (1723), which is supposed to be a literary imitation of two traditional ballads included in Percy's Reliques. In 1772 the ballad was translated into German by J.J. Eschenburg and published as Lykas und Myrta in Musen Almanach. Eschenburg's version was corrected and included together with Mallet's original in Ursinus's collection in 1777. It

1. "Iz istorii", 68.

was this text which was translated into Russian.¹ A comparison of the three versions has shown that Turchaninova, by means of a literal translation of the German, came very close to the English original.

The narrative element in this ballad is insignificant: one night Margarita's ghost appears to Vill'iam in a dream to reproach him for his infidelity. In the morning Vill'iam awakes, staggers to Margarita's grave, and, weeping, expires. The setting is vague; the time is established by the conventional phrase - Kogda vse pokryto bylo polunochnym mrakom;² and the atmosphere is created by the frequent use of "pre-romantic" epithets, such as polunochnaya grobnitsa, mrachnyi i uzhasnyi chas, strashnye mogily, rokovoe mesto.³ Margarita's elegiac monologue, describing her own previous beauty, Vill'iam's infidelity, and her death, consists of a series of parallel rhetorical questions, reproaching poor Vill'iam on each one of his broken promises:

Как ты мог говорить, что лице мое прекрасно,
а после пренебречь оное?...
Как ты мог уверять, что мои губы приятны,
а довел до того, что багрец их сделался бледен?

The heroine concludes with the words: No chu! petukh otzyvaet menya otsele - both the emotional interjection (chu!) and the motif (petukh) were to become clichés of the ballad genre. The author intervenes after the monologue to castigate the faithless hero:

Ступай, вероломец! посмотри, как лежит она униженна;
она которая скончалась от любви к тебе.

Turchaninova's two literary ballads lack the tearful sentimentality and the parallelism between external nature and the human soul

1. Ibid., 44-45.

2. Cf. the beginning of Edvin i Malli: Cheren, kak krylie vrana, krov polunochi.

3. All of these combinations are literal translations of the German and come close to the original English, except for strashnye mogily - yawning graves.

characteristic of the anonymous ballads. On the other hand, the style of both Leonard i Blondina and Vill'yan i Margarita reflects the evolution of the genre. The frequency of authorial interventions and the increase of "pre-romantic" epithets and syntactical constructions exerted a considerable influence on the literary ballads of the nineteenth century.

* * *

The earliest original Russian literary ballad predates the anonymous ballads and Turchaninova's work by a decade. It was written by M.N. Murav'ev in 1781, but was not published until 1967 in the Biblioteka poeta edition of his collected poetry.¹ The ballad, entitled Nevernost' without any genre-defining subtitle, was supposed to be included in the edition of Murav'ev's work which was being prepared by Batyushkov and Zhukovsky in 1819-20. But for some reason in the manuscript of this edition, the entire poem, uncorrected, was simply crossed out by one of the editors and was never published.²

The subject of the ballad is as follows: a maiden weeps, waiting for her beloved to return from battle; at midnight, when she no longer has the strength to cry, a merciful spirit delivers her from her suffering and her ghost is received in heaven. In the meantime, her lover cannot find his way home and is hounded by natural and supernatural omens. He weeps in despair, wanders about for nine days, and finally returns only to find his beloved dead. He builds her a funeral mound and expires.

The most striking innovation in Murav'ev's Nevernost' is the introduction of the ballad "world" or "code". Knyazhnin's romance

1. M.N. Murav'ev, Stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd., (L., 1967), 210-11.

2. GPR-400/54; (called earlier GPR-8).

Nakazannaya nevernost' (1778) has been cited as a story of infidelity, grief, and the union of lovers after death.¹ To a very similar narrative Murav'ev adds a barren landscape, moonlight, midnight, hostile nature (sovy and filiny) and supernature (leshie) - all of which heighten the dramatic tension and help to create an atmosphere of strakh. Murav'ev's attempt to produce a sense of local colour is barely noticeable: the lovers swear by Polel', the Slavonic god of love and marriage; the heroine is a native of Iver'; and her lover has gone off to defend Rus' against the Moslems. The language of the ballad is composed of various elements. The use of folk epithets predominates: temna noch', chuzhu dal'nu storonku, zlye busurmany, syra zemlya, goryuchie slezy. But the corpse is described in literary language (Telo... / Bezdykhanno, pokhono / I nestrashno, khot' bledno) as are the natural omens.

A narrative attitude of impersonality and non-interference is maintained throughout; only the title Nevernost' provides the moral framework within which the reader is to interpret the events of the ballad. Where Knyazhnin's hero consciously betrays the heroine and chooses wealth, Murav'ev's is unintentionally unfaithful, and helpless in the face of natural and supernatural obstacles. One can only speculate as to why Zhukovsky and Batyushkov excluded the ballad from their edition of Murav'ev's poetry. Both of them failed to recognize a genuine literary ballad when confronted with one.

The history of Murav'ev's other ballad is equally unusual. Boleslav, Korol' pol'skii is a balladic work on a historical theme written in the 1790s, but not published until 1810 when it was included in Zhukovsky's Sobranie russkikh stikhotvorenii with the

1. See above, Chapter I, pp.25-26.

subtitle Ballada,¹ and in Vestnik Evropy without any subtitle.² The poem was also included in the 1819-20 edition of Murav'ev's works without subtitle. All of these versions had been corrected by Zhukovsky and other editors.³

Boleslav is not strictly a literary ballad since it is based on actual events and consists of a series of dramatic incidents rather than one compressed episode. The historical Boleslav III was king of Poland from 1102-1138. His bastard half-brother Zbigniev, supported by the German Emperor and the Czechs, attempted to seize power. But Zbigniev was captured and blinded, and Poland was reunited.

The poem is a romanticized version of the facts, narrated as four distinct episodes: Zbigniev's attempted coup; Boleslav's unsuccessful wooing of Zbigniev's fiancée; Zbigniev's second assault, defeat, and death; and Boleslav's remorse, renunciation of the throne, and self-imposed exile. As in Nevernost' there is a slight attempt to create local colour (Poland). Allusions to the values of service, battle, love, and friendship place the work in the traditional context of Western European chivalry.

Boleslav, the hero, is a psychologically complex character (Sokhranyal on sil'ny strasti / V voskipayushchei krovi): he manifests a generous love for the covetous Zbigniev, but conceives a passion for his betrothed; he suffers from lyubovnaya toska when his suit is rejected, and from glubokaya goREST' after Zbigniev's death; he attempts suicide, but when restrained by his courtiers, he resorts to a life of eternal wandering in search of salvation. Like

1. Sobranie russkikh stikhotvorenii, II (M., 1810-11), 277.

2. Vestnik Evropy, LI, No.9 (1810), 45-47.

3. See below, Appendix E.

Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, Boleslav's penance consists in the continual recitation of his tale.

The author intrudes freely in the ballad to comment on the action, addressing rhetorical questions to the betrothed (Akh! Zbigneeva nevesta! / Dlya chego on zrel tebya?), commenting on her great beauty, supporting her faithfulness to Zbigniev, and concluding with a sentimental moral:

Должно думать, что спокойство
Наконец сошло с небес.
Ах! ни чести, ни геройства
Не спасают нас от слез.

(18)

The folk epithets which predominate in Murav'ev's *Nevernost'* have here been replaced by an abundance of "pre-romantic" epithets: silny strasti, nezhnaya vesna, lyubovnaya toska, zlobnyi dukh. The frequency of epithets in some passages has been considerably increased, as in this description of Boleslav's renunciation and remorse:

Свой оставив трон высокий
И во рубищах простых,
Ходит в горести глубокой
По обителям святых.

(16)

The introduction of the ballad "world" or "code" in *Nevernost'* and the portrayal of a psychologically complex hero in *Boleslav* were features overlooked by Murav'ev's contemporaries, by Zhukovsky and successive editors, and by Russian critics of the literary ballad. These innovations, as well as Murav'ev's attempts at local colour, his authorial intrusions, and his "pre-romantic" epithets demonstrate his importance in the history of the ballad genre.

* * *

Since Murav'ev's *Nevernost'* long remained unpublished, Karamzin's *Raisa* (1791), subtitled drevnyaya ballada, can be considered the

earliest published literary ballad, and its subtitle - the first accurate use of the genre name.¹ Rezanov traced its source to Mallet's ballad William and Margaret, cited above as the source of Turchaninova's translation Vill'yam i Margarita.² H.M. Nebel, in a recent study of Karamzin, suggests the influence of Bürger's ballad Des Pfarrers Tochter von Taubenhain (1781) on Raisa.³ The plot of Karamzin's ballad bears a distinct resemblance to that in the ballads of Mallet and Bürger; most likely Raisa is Karamzin's independent reworking of motifs common to both sources.

The plot is as follows: on a stormy night Raisa climbs a steep cliff to bemoan her fate; she had left home to join her lover Kronid, who soon deserted her. Desperate, Raisa hurls herself into the sea; nature echoes with thunder, foretelling destruction for her faithless lover.

The ballad is set in a completely generalized time and place, with not even a conventional attempt at local colour. Characteristically, the disturbance in nature corresponds to the turmoil in the heroine's soul; however, Raisa is so blinded by her suffering, that she is unaware of her surroundings:

Она не чувствует грозы,
И бури страшный вой не может
Ее стенаний заглушить.

(3:2-4)

The heroine's monologue reveals the basic psychological contradiction in her character, namely her love/hate relationship with Kronid. He is not only Raisa's angel and bozhestvo, but also her seducer and

1. Moskovskii zhurnal, IV, No.2 (1791), 118.

2. Iz razyskanii, 199-200.

3. H.M. Nebel, N.M. Karamzin. A Russian Sentimentalist (The Hague, 1967), 106.

deserter. Both emotions constantly conflict within the heroine. The hero is presented in a more schematic, conventional way as a wicked tempter and merciless betrayer, with no psychological development.

The structure of the ballad is simple. It begins ex abrupto, with no introduction; the exposition is not provided until the heroine's extended monologue. A brief conclusion presents the author's moral interpretation - that vice is to be punished - a condemnation far more explicit than in Murav'ev's Nevernost'. Fate is depicted as the real villain, the power which destroys Raisa's happiness. Love and faithfulness are mere illusions to be swept away by the impersonal, irrevocable force of Fate. The author addresses Kronid with the words: No rok sudil, chtob ty druguyu / Raise verno predpochel.

It is in the style of the ballad that Karamzin reveals his greatest originality and makes his most important contribution to the development of the genre. Emotionalism pervades all the elements of his language. He frequently employs hyperbole in the emotive descriptions of nature, the characters, and the action itself. The syntax is distinguished by frequent emotional interruptions in the form of interjections (Uvy!) and mnogotechie. Epithets assume an overwhelming importance. The description of the setting in the first stanza contains one "pre-romantic" epithet per line:

Во тьме ночной ярилась буря;
Сверкал на небе грозный луч:
Гревели громы в черных тучах,
И сильный дождь в лесу шумел. (1)

Other details are added to the setting in subsequent stanzas:

vlazhnaya zemlya, granitnye gory, kamni ostrye, ognennye лучi. The ballad atmosphere is created in part by the use of the epithets strashnyi and uzhasnyi (strashnyi vol, uzhasnaya t'ma) which make

the "horror" explicit. The reader is repeatedly told that everything is horrible or terrible; he is not left to infer it from the details of the description.

The portrait of the heroine in the fourth stanza also contains a considerable number of epithets (ona bledna, mertvyi tsvet, tomnyi mrak); she refers to herself as bednaya (No ty neidesh' k Raise bednoi!), as does the narrator in his exclamation: Raisa, bednaya Raisa!; she describes herself as vernaya, neschastnaya, and zloschastnaya; her love for Kronid, as depicted by the narrator, is accompanied by nezhnyi vzdokh, serdechnyi trepet, and plamennaya sleza. The epithets in Raisa's apostrophe to her lover summarize the fundamental contradiction in her character: Kronid, Kronid, zhestokii, milyi!

In his emphasis on the psychology of the heroine, rather than on the situation, and in the frequency and choice of epithets, Karamzin established the pattern for the Russian literary ballad which was to be followed and developed by his contemporaries and successors, particularly by Zhukovsky.

In 1792, one year after the publication of Raisa, Karamzin published two translations in Moskovskii zhurnal, one of a historical song, the other a prose rendition of a Scottish ballad. Graf Gvarinos, subtitled Drevnyaya gishpanskaya istoricheskaya pesnya,¹ has been traced by M.P. Alekseev to an old Spanish source, Romance del Conde Guarinos Almirante de la Mar, referred to by Cervantes in Don Quixote, and included in Spanish song books from the mid-sixteenth century. This romance was translated into German and published by F.J. Bertuch in his Magazin der Spanischen und Portugiesischen Literatur (1780). Bertuch was mentioned by Karamzin in his Pis'ma russkogo puteshestvennika

1. Moskovskii zhurnal, VI, No.3 (1792), 219-26.

(1797-1801).¹ Nebel juxtaposed the Spanish original and Karamzin's version and concluded that

the German translation must have followed the Spanish version closely, for Karamzin's work, when compared with the Spanish, differs only in minor details from the original.²

The Shotlandskaya ballada³ was ascribed to Karamzin by Neustroev,⁴ and is said to originate in a French source, Etrennes sentimentales, about which no information has been discovered. The sad tale is related by the heroine Jenny: her young lover Jimmy became a sailor to earn some money before their wedding. In his absence, Jenny's father breaks his arm, her mother becomes ill, and her cow is stolen. Old Robin Gray assists the family, falls in love with Jenny and marries her. When Jimmy returns, Jenny's life becomes miserable: she dares not think about Jimmy; instead, she tries only to please her husband. The Russian prose version is little more than an unemotional recitation of the events. The only trace of emotion occurs in the lovers' bittersweet reunion:

Ах! Свидание наше было и сладко и горестно!

Ах! Как досадна мне моя молодость!

Karamzin's only other balladic work was Alina, published in Pis'ma russkogo puteshestvennika, where it was included in a letter dated Paris, June 1790. This long narrative poem combines some of the characteristic features of the ballad and the verse tale. It

1. M.P. Alekseev, "K literaturnoi istorii odnogo iz romansov v Don Kikhote", in Servantes, Stat'i i materialy (L., 1948), 113-20.

2. N.M. Karamzin, 104-105.

3. Moskovskii zhurnal, VII, No.1 (1792), 99-101.

4. Istoricheskie rozyskaniya, 707.

purports to be based on a factual episode which Karamzin heard from an acquaintance, and which he agreed to include in his Pis'ma only if he was permitted to "adorn it".¹

The plot is the conventional one: the earthly angel Alina loves and is loved by the tender youth Milon; they marry, but Milon soon grows bored and goes off with another woman. Alina languishes, and then takes her own life. Milon repents, attempts suicide, but is restrained by his friends; instead, he must live out a life of torment.

The narrative is interrupted by discursive observations by the author on sentimentality, on the wisdom of the lovers' choices, and on the nature of love, despondency, and disaffection. The setting of the work is that of the eighteenth-century idylls: svetlye vody, zelenye brega, sady, and luga. However, when the heroine wanders off into the forest, she comes upon a setting strikingly similar to that in the ballads:

Алина в мрачный лес приходит
(Несчастливым тень лесов мила!)
И видит храм уединенный,
Остаток древности священный;
Там ветер в развалинах свистит
И мрамор желтым мхом покрыт... (111-16)

This curious contrast of settings was to be further developed by Merzlyakov.

Karamzin's heroine is milaya and nezhnaya, the epitome of physical and spiritual beauty. She generously refuses to blame or condemn her faithless Milon. The hero, presented as worthy of the heroine (nezhnyi, umnyi, lyubeznyy), simply falls out of love with her, and becomes zadumchivyy and unylyy. Nor is Milon condemned by the narrator; the harshest epithets applied to him are vetrenyy and nevernyy. The

1. N.M. Karamzin. Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd., (M.-L., 1966), 381-82.

real villain is once again Fate. Both the characters and the narrator make numerous references to its power to destroy all love and happiness.

If Raisa can be considered Karamzin's "pre-romantic" ballad, then Alina is typical of his sentimental work and has close affinities with the genre of the idyll in setting, characters, and language.¹ Only the language used to describe Milon's disenchantment and Alina's excursion into the forest anticipates the changes in the psychology of characters and in the perception of the setting which were to become characteristic of the literary ballad in the nineteenth century.

* * *

The contrast between idyllic and balladic settings assumes thematic significance in a literary ballad by Merzlyakov entitled Milon (1797).² The plot is similar to that in Alvin i Rena, which appeared in the following issue of the journal in which Merzlyakov's ballad was published. The hero, Milon, has led a sheltered life, rejoicing in the beauties of nature. Once, while walking through a forest, he stumbles into a grotto where he finds a row of graves and a collection of weapons. A document addressed to him summons him to take up the armour, follow in the path of his forbears, and seek after glory. He accepts the challenge, bids farewell to the lovely Temira, and goes off to battle. Victory is achieved, but Milon is killed. Temira is plunged into grief and lies near death.

Merzlyakov's ballad is neither a love story nor a deep psychological analysis of the characters. Rather, it is a vivid contrast

1. Karamzin's prose works Bednaya Liza (1792) and Ostrov Borngol'm (1794) have affinities with his ballads, the former with Alina, and the latter with Raisa. See A.G. Cross, N.M. Karamzin (Carbondale, Ill., 1971), 102.

2. Priyatnoe i poleznoe, XIV (1797), 219-23.

between two sets of values, two ways of life. On the one hand, Milon's sheltered existence is characterized by serenity (Blazhennyi, tikhii vek), by a sensitive appreciation of nature, and by modest aspirations (Chto v svete zlato, pyshnost', slava? / Dlya dobrykh chistykh dush otrava!). The guiding principle of this life is reason, which resists the force of man's passions: Rassudka strasti ne plenyali / Blistan'em lozhnoi krasoty. On the other hand, the temptation of the grotto offers Milon happiness and fame through military exploits. An acceptance of this alternative results in a victory of passion over reason: K nemu vse strasti vdrug tolpoyu / Predstali, l'stili, krov' vozzhgli.

The uncomplicated Milon does not hesitate in choosing between the alternatives; in fact, the narrator states that after his experience in the grotto, Milon could no longer enjoy his former pursuits (S tekh por Milon ne naslazhdalsya / Spokoistvom krotkikh, mirnykh dnei). The equally uncomplicated Temira is helpless to prevent Milon's departure. She sinks into despondency to await his return, tacitly accepting his new values: S soboyu razdelit' zhelala / Priobretenny lavry im.

Only the narrator's psychology is complicated. In presenting the two alternatives, he obviously prefers the tranquil to the heroic, the rational to the passionate. It is Milon's lack of self-knowledge which is the narrator's explanation for his rejection of the "true values". Temira is warned by the narrator, and she wins his sympathy when Milon does not return: Kto mozhet, tomnaya Temira, / Tebya v to vremya opisat'? The narrator also tries to imply some ambiguity: although Milon stumbles into the grotto by chance, he finds that the document is addressed to him personally. The coincidence is, of course, only superficial; all events are predetermined and man can only submit to Fate.

This contrast in values is expressed through a corresponding contrast of styles. The hero's tranquil life and the false allure of the heroic one are described in language characteristic of the eighteenth-century idylls: blazhennyi vek, blazhennye mesta, lozhnaya krasota, svet prostrannyi. In contrast, Milon's experience in the grotto is described in "pre-romantic" language which, in its emphasis on gloom and horror, creates a typical balladic atmosphere: trepet svashchennyi, mrachnyi grot, khladnye ruki:

Через ущелины пустые
Ужасный с воем ветер шумит;
Трясутся доски гробовые,
И холодный мрамор там гремит. (11)

The modern critic is tempted to interpret Merzlyakov's Milon as an allegory: the classical hero forsakes his rationality, his serenity, and his enjoyment of nature for the romantic experience - a heroic search for happiness and fame, and a life governed entirely by passions. The theme is reflected in the language: classical diction for the former and "pre-romantic" epithets for the latter. Merzlyakov clearly prefers classicism, but chooses the "pre-romantic" genre of the literary ballad to demonstrate his preferences and to reassert his values.

Merzlyakov's only other ballad, Laura i Sel'mar, was published in Podshivalov's journal in 1798.¹ Rezanov traced its source to a work entitled Song in Ramsay's Tea-Table Miscellany (1775), which was reprinted by Ursinus with a German translation under the titles The damsel deploring / Das klagende Mädchen (1777).² This source is rejected by Iezuitova, who considers the ballad as an original

1. Priyatnoe i poleznoe, XVIII (1798), 141-42.

2. Iz razyskanii, 208-09.

reworking by Merzlyakov of a general motif, under the strong influence of Karamzin.¹ A comparison of Laura i Sel'mar with the English text, however, demonstrates unmistakable similarities.

The heroine Laura sits weeping on a cliff, scanning the waves for some sign of her beloved. She pronounces a long lament, at the end of which she glimpses a corpse washed ashore. She runs down to it, embraces her Sel'mar, and dies. The usual parallel between the natural setting (bezdna, mgla, skaly, vetr) and the heroine's emotions (gorest', grust', slezy) is implied through the juxtaposition of descriptive details; the parallel is made explicit in the beginning of Laura's monologue as she asks God to quell the storm in nature and the agitation in her soul. The lament which follows is written in the classical style, similar to that of an eighteenth-century ode; in it, Laura protests against man's avarice (strast' k bogatstvu) which results in misery for all concerned.

Epithets in the ballad are restricted to the description of the setting before and after the heroine's monologue (surova bezdna, luna unylaya, burnye vody, groznye volny, volny strashnye) and to the narrator's description of Laura's psychology (Laura blednaya, zhelan'e plamennoe i nezhnoe, gorestnaya lyubov'). The actual lament and the account of the discovery of the corpse are written in elevated diction with hardly any epithets at all.

As in Milon, so too in Laura i Sel'mar, Merzlyakov combines classical and "pre-romantic" themes and styles. Here a classical lament is put into the mouth of a balladic heroine and placed in a typical balladic setting. Merzlyakov remains a classical poet, desperately trying to employ the new, fashionable genre of the literary ballad, but still clinging to his conventional eighteenth-century values.

* * *

1. "Iz istorii", 80.

During the early 1790s Karamzin's Moskovskii zhurnal published two ballads by I.I. Dmitriev. The first, Byl',¹ shares with Merzlyakov's Milon the contrast of two ways of life, and with the anonymous ballad Alvin i Rena, its over-abundance of tears. Cheston, the hero of Dmitriev's Byl', inspired by patriotism, decides to seek after military glory. His father approves his decision, and presents him with a rifle. Suddenly, a shot is heard: Cheston's sister has been slain. The hero swears to take revenge: No prezhe, akh, sestre ustroil / Edinokrovnoi smertnyi rov.

The narrative is accompanied by tears at every stage, and the father's farewell advice explains their relevance:

Будь верный сын, будь храбрый воин,
Но будь чувствителен притом:
Сугубо лавров тот достоин,
Кто слезы льет и над врагом. (8)

The contrast of values in Byl' is between Cheston's early life of wealth, comforts, and amusements, and between a life of heroic exploits. Unlike Merzlyakov, Dmitriev approves the heroic alternative. The theme of individual heroism is combined with that of national patriotism, as expressed by the narrator in the words: Ross imenem i delom bud' and No Rossy vse userdny chada. But blind, senseless Fate interferes with Cheston's heroic and patriotic ambitions, and causes him to postpone his search for glory.

Dmitriev's second ballad can be read as an ironic sequel to Byl'. It was published in 1792 under the title Otstavnoi vakhmistr (ballada),² included with revisions in Dmitriev's I moi bezdelki (1795) under the title Karikatura, republished with large omissions in Sochineniya i

1. Moskovskii zhurnal, III, No.1 (1791), 6.

2. Ibid., V, No.3 (1792), 295.

Perevody (1803-05), and excluded altogether from the sixth edition of Dmitriev's collected works in 1823. The second title, Karikatura, is probably a pun on Carric-thura, Cathulla's palace which Ossian's Fingal delivers from siege on his way home from an expedition.

In Dmitriev's ballad a cavalry sergeant-major returns home after a long period of service and finds his house deserted except for a scraggy cat. An old servant supplies him with the sordid details: the hero's wife had been running a haven for unwholesome types, one of whom was captured and subsequently informed on her. The wife disappeared without trace. Upon hearing the news, the hero sheds a few tears; soon he remarries and now he serves as a zemskii sud'ya. M.A. Dmitriev, a Russian critic and memoirist, recorded in his reminiscences the episode on which the ballad is allegedly based, and claimed to have in his possession a drawing by the poet showing the hero's return to his native village.¹

The stanzas which were omitted from the 1803-05 edition must be read in situ in order to understand the intention of Dmitriev's original work, namely, the debunking of the sentimental literary ballad. It is as if the hero of Byl' had returned from his glorious exploits, or as if the Russian Fingal had come home from his expeditions to discover, instead of a beautiful wife and a peaceful retirement, only a deserted house.

The ballad, written in blank verse, begins with a stylized apostrophe to sedaya starina, which at once establishes an ironic tone of false historicism. Thereafter every attempt at moderately serious description or narration is immediately followed by an ironic passage which undercuts the solemnity. Almost all of these passages were

1. M.A. Dmitriev, Melochi iz zapasa moei pamyati (M., 1869), 124-25.

excluded from the 1803-05 edition.¹ For example, the hero is identified in the following manner: after the narrator poses the rhetorical question, who is this tattered figure returning home, one possible answer follows:

Не древний ли крыжати́к?
Вот сунуло куда!
Изрядный я историк.
Простите - заврался.

Then the real answer is provided: it is a former cavalry sergeant-major. As the hero draws closer to home, his emotional reaction to familiar sights is described. This is immediately undercut:

Завидя ж дым в деревне,
Растаял пуще он;
Тогдашний день субботу
И баню вспомянул.

Finally, the hero's reaction to the servant's story is ironically presented:

Несчастный муж поплакал;
Потом, вздохнув, пошел
К Терентьичу в избушку
И с горести лег спать.

Thus at every stage in the description and in the narration, Dmitriev's original intention was to deride the hero and the situation. Karikatura is indeed a "caricature" of the serious episode recorded by M.A. Dmitriev, of the drawing made by the poet himself, of the exploits of Ossian's Fingal, and, finally, of the sentimental ballad. It is the first attempt at a parody of the new genre, so ahead of its time that Dmitriev revised it and eventually omitted it from later editions of his collected works.²

1. See Karamzin-Dmitriev. Izbrannye Stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya (L., 1953), 492-93.

2. Perhaps Pushkin recognized this element of parody when in Stantsionnyi smotritel' the narrator states:

Such was the tale of my friend, the station master, a tale interrupted by tears several times, which he picturesquely wiped away with his shirt flap, as did the zealous Terent'ich in the wonderful ballad by Dmitriev.

Dmitriev's last ballad, Starinnaya lyubov', was written in 1804¹ and is a conscious stylization of a folk ballad, lacking the irony of Karikatura. Rezanov suggests a possible source in Bürger's Lenardo und Blandine.² Dmitriev's work may indeed be based on Bürger's ballad, but it also shows the influence of Karamzin, as well as a superficial attempt at Russification of setting and characters.

The plot of the ballad is conventional: a captain and his lovely daughter live in Moscow; boyars and princes woo her, but she only loves a poor young poet. Her father learns of their secret love and locks up his daughter. The poet wastes away and dies. The heroine is freed, sees her lover's corpse, and expires.

Irony has been replaced by a slightly condescending romanticized view of the Russian past (Kak milo zhili v starinu!). The setting is stylized (vyssokie teremy, belokamennaya Moskva, staraya lipa), as is the narrative itself (Zhil-byi kogda-to ...). The heroine is a chernookaya krasavitsa called Milolika, who democratically rejects all social distinctions: Chto znatnost'! serdtsu vse ravny! The hero serenades his maiden skvoz' slezy to the accompaniment of his tomnaya lira.³ And the father, a vozhd' velikii with a prejudice against indigent poets, finally relents. While Dmitriev's Karikatura was ahead of its time in being the first parody of the new genre, his Starinnaya lyubov' was behind its time, being a typical ballad of the 1790s, written when

1. Sochineniya i perevody, III (M., 1803-05), 64.

2. Iz razyskanii, 203.

3. The early version (Pel o lyubvi svoei skvoz' slezy) was altered to a less tearful one in the 1823 edition (Pel prelesti svoei tsaritsy).

the literary ballad genre was about to be totally transformed.

* * *

The Russian literary ballad of the 1790s developed as a genre independent of folk poetry. The imitative folk songs of the eighteenth century, although related in content and language to the genuine folk songs, had almost no influence on the ballad genre. The sources of the Russian literary ballad, as has been demonstrated, were basically foreign; they consisted of direct translations from English and German ballads, or reworkings of motifs which were common in Western European pre-romantic literature.

Love is the most common subject in the ballads of this period: a young, beautiful, well-born heroine loves a young, handsome, impoverished hero; their love is impeded by opposition from the girl's father or by the hero's military aspirations. The death of one lover, most often the hero's, is usually followed by the suicide or demise of the other, and the union of the lovers after death. Sometimes the hero is an unfaithful lover who deserts his heroine, and then repents afterwards. Emphasis centres on the characters, in particular on the psychology of the heroine, rather than on the situation. Tears accompany the action at every stage. A considerable role in determining the course of events is played by Fate.

The settings of these ballads are generalized: a stormy, moonlit landscape or seascape, complete with elements of hostile nature and supernatural. Parallels are often drawn between the natural setting and the psychological state of the characters. Attempts at local colour are minimal and unsuccessful.

All the ballads of the 1790s possess similar structures. Either the lovers' ghosts appear at the beginning and at the end as a frame

for the narrative, or else the action begins ex abrupto and concludes with a brief moral lesson. The authors of the ballads did not maintain an impersonal attitude towards the action; there are numerous apostrophes to the characters and comments addressed to the reader in an attempt to interpret the significance of the events.

The style of these literary ballads is characterized by emotionalism in the form of hyperbole, exclamatory and interrogative syntax, and by the frequency and choice of epithets. While eighteenth-century language tends to be used for the narrative, both the setting and the characters are usually described in "pre-romantic" language. Two ballads, Karamzin's Alina and Merzlyakov's Milon, show a striking contrast between idyll and ballad, between classical and "pre-romantic" language.

Such is the Russian literary ballad at the end of the eighteenth century and at the very beginning of the nineteenth century. Zhukovsky's Lyudmila, the first of his forty literary ballads, was published in 1808; with it the genre was transformed and the literary ballad became the most influential and controversial form in Russian poetry for almost two decades.

RUSSIAN LITERARY BALLADS OF THE 1790s

date	author	title	publication
1781	Murav'ev	<u>Nevernost'</u>	<u>Biblioteka poeta</u> (1967)
1789	Karamzin	<u>Graf Gvarinos</u>	<u>Moskovskii zhurnal</u> (1792)
1790	Dmitriev	<u>Byl'</u>	<u>Moskovskii zhurnal</u> (1791)
1791	Karamzin	<u>Raisa</u>	<u>Moskovskii zhurnal</u> (1791)
1791	Dmitriev	<u>Karikatura</u>	<u>Moskovskii zhurnal</u> (1792)
1792	Karamzin	<u>Shotlandskaya ballada</u>	<u>Moskovskii zhurnal</u> (1792)
1795	Podshivalov	<u>Edvin i Malli</u>	<u>Priyatnoe i poleznoe</u> (1795)
1797	Merzlyakov	<u>Milon</u>	<u>Priyatnoe i poleznoe</u> (1797)
1797	(anonymous)	<u>Alvin i Rena</u>	<u>Priyatnoe i poleznoe</u> (1797)
1798	Merzlyakov	<u>Laura i Sel'mar</u>	<u>Priyatnoe i poleznoe</u> (1798)
1799	Turchaninova	<u>Leonard i Blondina</u>	<u>Ippokrena</u> (1799)
1790s	Murav'ev	<u>Boleslav, Korol' pol'skii</u>	<u>Vestnik Evropy</u> (1810) <u>Sobranie russkikh stikhotvorenii</u> (1810)
1790s	Karamzin	<u>Alina</u>	<u>Pis'ma russkogo puteshestvennika</u> (1797-1801)
1800	Turchaninova	<u>Vill'iam i Margarita</u>	<u>Ippokrena</u> (1800)
1804	Dmitriev	<u>Starinnaya lyubov'</u>	<u>Sochineniya i perevody</u> (1803-05)

Chapter III

ZHUKOVSKY'S LITERARY BALLADS

Je crois qu'il [Zhukovsky] a
ajouté quelque chose à la langue
poétique en exprimant dans ses
vers un genre d'idées et de
sentiment qui étaient nouveaux.

--Zhukovsky¹

Zhukovsky's life has long attracted more critical attention than his work. Since his death in 1852, his biography has been rewritten each time new source materials have been discovered. In view of the innovations which he introduced into the content and style of Russian poetry, and in view of his influence on the development of Russian literature, it is astonishing that the last Russian monograph on Zhukovsky was written in 1904, and that it contained hardly any criticism of his work. One monograph in German, one in French, both published during the 1930s, and nothing at all in English, is the sum total of Western scholarship on Zhukovsky.

The earliest studies of Zhukovsky were written by his contemporaries one year after his death. In 1853 P.A. Pletnev published a brief sketch of his life which also included a few comments on his poetry.² He praises Zhukovsky's translations, which he considers to be "original works", arguing that these translations transformed Russian literature and "made us equal in poetry to the most educated contemporary nations". Pletnev describes Zhukovsky as the "creator

1. L.B. Modzalevsky, "Neizdannyyi konspekt [Zhukovskogo] po istorii russkoi literatury (1827)", TONRL, I (M.-L., 1948), 301.

2. P.A. Pletnev, O zhizni i sochineniyakh V.A. Zhukovskogo (SPb., 1853).

of the new Russian language", but this tribute is not explained.

An article by S.P. Shevyrev, written in the same year, pays more attention to Zhukovsky's literary career, enumerating his characteristics as a poet, dividing his work into periods, and referring to Western European influences on him. The sketch is followed by a chronological list of Zhukovsky's works, which is still useful for tracing the poet's earliest efforts.¹

The year 1883, the hundredth anniversary of Zhukovsky's birth, witnessed the publication of two full-length biographies. The first is a translation into Russian of a German work by Dr. C.J. von Seidlitz, originally published in 1870.² Seidlitz states that his biography is of the "ideally-noble, pure image of the man", and he uses both the poetry and the objective facts of the poet's life to write a study of Zhukovsky's internal spiritual development. The other biography, written by P. Zagarin (a pseudonym for L.I. Polivanov), is a survey of Zhukovsky's personality, life, and contemporaries, which emphasizes his original works, rather than his translations and imitations.³ Zagarin juxtaposes translations with their sources in support of his various arguments. He concludes with useful indexes of Zhukovsky's works and of persons mentioned in the biography.

In 1898 N.S. Tikhonravov wrote a critical review of these two biographies in which he questions in detail their interpretations

1. S.P. Shevyrev, O znachenii Zhukovskogo v russkoi zhizni i poezii (M., 1853).

2. Dr. C.J. von Seidlitz, Wassily Andrejewitsch Joukoffsky: Ein russisches Dichterleben, (Mittau, 1870); Zhizn' i poeziya V.A. Zhukovskogo (SPb., 1883).

3. P. Zagarin, V.A. Zhukovsky i ego proizvedeniya (M., 1883).

of the available sources and presents his own opinion on various issues.¹ Tikhonravov clearly prefers Seidlitz's monograph, maintaining that, although it leaves much material untouched, it is sound, concise and unbiassed. Zagarin's work is subjected to a severe attack. Tikhonravov accuses the author of lacking a critical attitude to Zhukovsky's poetry and to the sources of his biography; of accepting the faulty chronology in the seventh edition of the poet's collected works edited by P.A. Efremov; and, finally, of tendentiousness: Zagarin had written a panegyric or an apology, rather than a biography.

The last Russian monograph on Zhukovsky was published in 1904 by A.N. Veselovsky.² He criticizes the earlier works for their biographical bias and for their deficiency of literary criticism. Furthermore, he accuses previous biographers of glossing over the details of the poet's life in order to create an idealized image of the man. Veselovsky produces a different sort of biography, but biography nonetheless. He identifies the author with the author's own lyrical hero, and writes a life of the poet's persona as expressed in the poetry. The emphasis is on the theme of ideal friendship with Andrei Turgenev (and the poet's grief at his early death), and of ideal love for Masha Protasova (and the poet's grief at their forced separation). Veselovsky examines Zhukovsky's poetics and concludes that he was much closer to Karamzinian sentimentalism than to Western European romanticism.³

1. Sochineniya, III (M., 1898), i, 380-503; ii, 149-68.

2. A.N. Veselovsky, V.A. Zhukovsky. Poeziya chuvstva i serdechnogo voobrazheniya (SPb., 1904); 2-oe izd. (SPb., 1918).

3. Blok reviewed Veselovsky's book and agrees with his conclusions. See "Akademik A.N. Veselovsky. V.A. Zhukovsky (1905)", Sobranie sochinenii, V (M.-L., 1962), 568-76.

In the same year V.I. Pokrovsky edited a collection of articles on Zhukovsky's life and works, including studies by Arkhangel'sky, Tikhonravov, Veselovsky, Zagarin, and Seidlitz, among others; the articles are mostly biographical, a few thematic, and one stylistic.¹ In 1906 and again in 1916 V.I. Rezanov re-issued as separate works his series of articles published earlier in a periodical.² They contain valuable analysis of Zhukovsky's poetry in relation to its wider literary context. Rezanov devotes particular attention to foreign sources and to Western European influences on the content and style of Zhukovsky's work.

The only two Western monographs on Zhukovsky were published during the 1930s. L. Kobilinski-Ellis wrote a general study to introduce Zhukovsky to German readers.³ He considers Zhukovsky as the "father of Russian romanticism", who, in his early work, initiated the "golden age of Russian literature". The emphasis throughout is on borrowings from German sources and on Zhukovsky's religious and mystical themes. M. Ehrhard's work, published in 1938, is the last monograph on Zhukovsky in any language.⁴ It begins with a detailed account of the poet's life, stressing the moral and literary sides of his development. Ehrhard then considers each of his major themes in turn: patriotism, friendship, love, "remembrances", religious inspiration and morality, politics, art,

1. V.A. Zhukovsky. Ego zhizn' i sochineniya. Sbornik istoriko-literaturnykh statei, ed. V.I. Pokrovsky (M., 1904).

2. Iz razyskaniy (Originally published in ZhMNP, 1904-16).

3. L. Kobilinski-Ellis, Das goldene Zeitalter der russischen Poesie: W.A. Joukowski, seine Persönlichkeit, sein Leben und sein Werk (Paderborn, 1933).

4. M. Ehrhard, V.A. Joukovski et le préromantisme russe (Paris, 1938).

and the external world. A section on Zhukovsky's theory and practice of translation is followed by the first comprehensive study of the poet's style: his language, epithets, figures of speech, syntax, rhymes and rhythms. The section on Zhukovsky's metrics remains the most detailed appreciation of this aspect of his work. However, Ehrhard's work suffers from a French bias in its constant emphasis on French influences, sources, and translations. There is little appreciation of eighteenth-century Russian classicism or of Russian "pre-romantic" developments. Nevertheless, Ehrhard's monograph is still the most recent study of Zhukovsky available, and remains a valuable contribution to the subject.

Since the Revolution Soviet scholarship has relegated Zhukovsky to single chapters in general works of criticism. Eikhenbaum's chapter on Zhukovsky's syntax (intonation, rhythm-syntactic parallelism, and word order) is still the best treatment of this aspect of his work.¹ Ts. S. Vol'pe, who edited and introduced the Biblioteka poeta edition of Zhukovsky (1936), contributed a general study of the poet's life and work to the Academy of Sciences Istoriya russkoi literatury in 1941.² Vol'pe emphasizes Zhukovsky's originality and his narodnost', and includes material on his language, aesthetic views, contemporary polemics, and poetic parodies of his ballads. The article convincingly argues that the poet's own personality and internal spiritual world became the central content of his poetry.

In 1946 Zhukovsky published the first section of his projected

1. B.M. Eikhenbaum, Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha (SPb., 1922), 22-71.

2. Istoriya russkoi literatury, V (M.-L., 1941), 355-91.

history of Russian realism.¹ In it he examines Zhukovsky's role in Russian literature from 1808 to 1818, placing the major emphasis on the poet's world-view and on his style as the expression of that world-view. Gukovsky analyzes three lyrics in detail and concludes that Zhukovsky is the archetypal "romantic personality" for whom the "subjective" always remained of primary importance. In spite of the fact that his conclusions are based on the analysis of a limited number of texts, Gukovsky's book is the most important contribution to the study of Zhukovsky's achievement and of his influence on Pushkin.

Since Gukovsky's study, Zhukovsky has been the subject of short chapters in three other works. Lydia Ginzburg reviews the argument as to whether Zhukovsky is a sentimentalist or a romantic, and she supports the position of Veselovsky, rather than that of Gukovsky.² She sees Zhukovsky as a lyric poet, nourished by the Karamzinian school, and as a translator who introduced "pre-romantic" themes into Russian literature, but whose importance was on the wane when the real debate about romanticism began in Russian criticism during the 1820s.

N.V. Izmailov, who wrote the introductory article to the second Biblioteka poeta edition of Zhukovsky (1956), also contributed a chapter to the Academy of Sciences Istoriya russkoi poezii.³ In it he studies Zhukovsky's "original" ballads from 1808 to 1824 in order

1. Gukovsky, Pushkin i russkie romantiki (Saratov, 1946). The work was published in a limited edition of 500 copies and at once became a bibliographical rarity. It was not republished until 1965 (in an edition of 6500), with an introduction by one of Gukovsky's students, G.P. Makogonenko.

2. L. Ginzburg, O lirike (M.-L., 1964), 13-43.

3. Istoriya russkoi poezii, I (L., 1968), 237-65.

to discover their psychological basis and enumerate their variety of poetic devices.

Finally, I.M. Semenko, author of the introduction to the four-volume edition of Zhukovsky's collected works (1959-60), in her general study of the Pushkin period analyzes Zhukovsky's religious and moral themes, and discusses the importance of genre distinctions in his works.¹

Five editions of Zhukovsky's collected works were published during his lifetime. Volumes I-IX of the fifth edition (1849) contain the author's final corrected texts, which were not divided into genres as was Zhukovsky's usual practice, but rather were listed in chronological order, often incorrectly. Volumes X-XIII of this edition, published in 1857, are incomplete and include texts significantly altered by the editor, D.N. Bludov.²

The seventh edition (1878) was based on the texts of the fifth, but the editor, P.A. Efremov, introduced additional alterations in the poems although he had no access to original manuscripts.³ The eighth, ninth, and tenth editions repeat the errors of the seventh.

The twelfth edition (1902), edited by A.S. Arkhangel'sky and published by A.F. Marks, was based on Efremov's edition.⁴ Although it contains no variants, insufficient commentary, and no materials published after 1900, the twelfth edition remains the most comprehensive to date.

In 1939-40 Ts. S. Vol'pe edited the first Biblioteka poeta

1. I.M. Semenko, Poety pushkinskoi pory (M., 1970), 58-94.

2. Stikhotvoreniya, I-XIII (SPb., 1849; 1857).

3. Sochineniya, I-VI (SPb., 1878).

4. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, I-XII (SPb., 1902).

edition of Zhukovsky's poetry.¹ Vol'pe returned to the texts of the fifth edition which he supplemented with references to the manuscripts, notebooks, and letters; he lists variants and provides an excellent commentary. Vol'pe also reinstates Zhukovsky's practice of dividing the works according to genres.

In 1954 V.P. Petushkov edited a large format one-volume edition of Zhukovsky's works which contained a selection of his lyric poetry, ballads, skazki, epic and dramatic works, prose, and criticism.² Petushkov also edited the four-volume edition of Zhukovsky's collected works in 1959-60.³ This edition, based on the texts of the fifth (1849), includes additional works in their last redaction, together with variants from earlier authorial editions. Although comprehensive, the four-volume edition is by no means complete: it contains little prose, few letters, and no diaries or notebooks. Nevertheless, unless otherwise stated, this edition will be the source of all quotations from Zhukovsky's work in this dissertation.

* * *

The name of Zhukovsky and the genre of the literary ballad are inseparably connected. It was Zhukovsky who made the first theoretical statements about the ballad and who influenced all subsequent attempts at definition. He considered himself, and was considered by his contemporaries, primarily as a writer of ballads. Both the content and the style of his forty ballads established the

1. Stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, I-II (L., 1936).

2. Sochineniya (M., 1954).

3. Sobranie sochinenii, I-IV (M.-L., 1959-60).

model for all future Russian literary ballads.

The first description of the genre is contained in Zhukovsky's unpublished translation of J.J. Eschenburg's Entwurf einer Theorie und Literatur der schönen Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1783). In 1804 Zhukovsky completed his free rendition of this treatise, to which he added copious notes on other French and German literary theories. In the section on lyrical poetry, the "romance" and the "ballad" are defined as "light, lyrical narratives of important or unimportant, touching or uplifting, tragic or comic occurrences". The source of such works might be mythology, history, chivalry, monasticism, everyday social life, or poetic fantasy. The plot should be "simple, natural, light, pleasant, and should suit the material". For example, the narrative must be zhivopisen whenever the poet describes something chudesnoe, mrachnoe, uzhasnoe ili neobychainoe.¹

The earliest published comments on the ballad genre also belong to Zhukovsky and were included in the preface to his Sobranie russkikh stikhotvorenii (1810-11). In it he wrote that the ballad belongs simultaneously to two sorts of poetry, since it is narrative in content, but lyrical in form. Therefore in his anthology Zhukovsky includes short ballads in the section of lyrical poetry (Karamzin's Raisa, Murav'ev's Boleslav, Dmitriev's Starinnaya lyubov'), and long ballads in the section of narrative poetry (Kamenev's Gromval).

By 1816 Eschenburg's book had been translated by someone else and published anonymously.² In the appropriate section the ballad

1. GPB-286;1;83. Excerpts are also included in Rezanov, Iz razyskani, II. It is interesting that the epithets in the definition correspond to the most frequent epithets in the ballads themselves; see below, Chapter IV.

2. Pravila stikhotvorstva, pocherpnutye iz teorii Eshenburga (M., 1816).

is defined as a genre of "lyric-epic" poetry, the content of which is pechal'noe, chudesnoe, romanicheskoe, inogda zabavnoe. Zhukovsky is mentioned as the Russian poet who had demonstrated the "out-standing attractions of this genre".

One year earlier excerpts from N.F. Ostolopov's Slovar' drevnei i novoi poezii, including one on the characteristics of the ballad, had been published in Vestnik Evropy. In 1821 the entire Slovar' was published; it contains a long article on the genre which begins with the derivation of the word "ballad" and a definition of the German Ballade as a narrative about "amorous or unfortunate adventures", always based on the chudesnoe. In the section on the Russian ballada, Ostolopov need mention only one name, Zhukovsky. He quotes the entire text of Svetlana, and then lists the first stanzas of nine other ballads to demonstrate his various skills as a ballad-writer.¹

In 1822 N.I. Grech, in one of the earliest attempts at writing a history of Russian literature, referred to the ballad as a "new genre in Russian literature, created by Zhukovsky".² When in 1832 N.I. Nadezhdin surveyed the state of Russian poetry for the previous year, and wrote that "the ballads ... have replaced the ode as reigning genre", he was of course referring almost exclusively to Zhukovsky's achievement.³ During the first few decades of the nineteenth century, the ballad genre had achieved the popularity and the literary status which the ode had enjoyed during the mid-eighteenth century.

1. N.F. Ostolopov, Slovar' drevnei i novoi poezii, I (SPb., 1821), 58-78.

2. N.I. Grech, Opyt kratkoi istorii russkoi literatury (SPb., 1822), 304.

3. Teleskop, VII (1832).

Belinsky's articles of the 1840s show the most perceptive understanding of Zhukovsky's transformation of the ballad genre. In his articles on Pushkin (1843) Belinsky describes the ballad as it existed before Zhukovsky:

a short story about love, usually unhappy;
graves, crosses, ghosts, night-time, moonlight,
and sometimes domovye and witches.¹

Then he alludes to the "deeper meaning" which Zhukovsky had expressed in his ballads, but does not explain this idea. However, in an earlier article on poetic genres (1841) Belinsky's definition of the ballad clearly reflects his view of the changes which Zhukovsky had brought about:

In the ballad the poet takes some sort of fantastic and popular legend, or he himself invents an episode of this kind. But the main feature in it is not the episode, but the experience (oshchushchenie), which it awakens, the thoughts which it suggests to the reader.²

Belinsky implies that the "deeper meaning" of Zhukovsky's ballads resides in their total subjectivity: they are all ballads about Zhukovsky himself.

Zhukovsky's own words demonstrate that he considered himself primarily as a ballad-writer. As early as 1813 he wrote in a letter to A.I. Turgenev: "My chosen genre of poetry is the ballad".³ And in 1849, almost at the end of his literary career, he referred to himself in a letter to A.S. Sturdza as "the father of German romanticism in Russia and the poetic uncle (dyad'ka) of German and

1. V.G. Belinsky, "Sochineniya Aleksandra Pushkina", PSS, VII (M., 1953-59), 167.

2. "Razdelenie poezii na rody i vidy", PSS, V, 51.

3. Russkii arkhiv (M., 1895), 104.

English demons and witches".¹

The most famous portrait of Zhukovsky as a young poet, painted by O. Kiprensky in 1815 and engraved by F. Vendramina in 1817, portrays him as a balladnik.² The background of steep cliffs, wind-blown trees, medieval castle, stormy sky, and rough sea is the typical setting of his literary ballads. The poet is pictured as a youthful, melancholy visionary with tousled hair, gazing into the distance.

Zhukovsky was virtually identified with his ballads by most of his contemporaries, poets and critics alike. Batyushkov begins his Poslanie k Zhukovskomu (1812) with the lines: Prosti, balladnik moi, / Beleva mirnyi zhitel'. An anonymous review published in 1821 of an anthology of verse contains a portrait of Zhukovsky with the inscription: Germaniya! tvoya s toboyu chest': / Na beregakh Nevy - Balladnik est'³ Belinsky, in the above-mentioned article on Pushkin (1843), also states that it was Zhukovsky who created and established the genre of the ballad, and that contemporary readers thought of him almost exclusively as a balladnik.⁴ In 1855 N.G. Chernyshevsky, referring to Zhukovsky's translations from Schiller, wrote that "Zhukovsky interested his readers as a balladnik, and not

1. Sochineniya V.A. Zhukovskogo, VI (SPb., 1878), 541. In a similar vein, A.I. Turgenev, in his Khronika russkogo (1835), referring to the ballet Il nocce di benevente, wrote: "The ballet was an unbearable farce! There were more witches on stage than in Zhukovsky's ballads".

2. See Ts. S. Vol'pe, V.A. Zhukovsky v portretakh i illyustratsiyakh (L., 1935).

3. Syn otechestva, LXVIII, No.13 (1821), 282-84. The anthology reviewed is Karmannaya biblioteka Aonid (SPb., 1821).

4. "Sochineniya Aleksandra Pushkina", PSS, VII, 167.

V. A. Zhukovsky

as a translator of Schiller".¹ Finally, an unintentionally amusing tribute to Zhukovsky was penned by Ieronim Trofimovsky, a pupil at the N^o 2 Gymnasium in Kiev in 1883, Zhukovsky's jubilee year:

Ты, кроткий Светланы прекрасный певец,
Пел песни те с лирой унылой;
Для нас незабвенный баллады творец,
Давно уже скрытый могилой.²

What was it that attracted Zhukovsky to the genre of the ballad? The question, in the last analysis, is unanswerable, but several tentative explanations have been advanced. One theory postulates that the ballad offered him an escape from the subjectivity of his lyrical poetry, since it enabled him to objectify lyrical situations and lyrical characters. This explanation was implied as early as 1825 by A.I. Galich, whose definition of the ballad is based on Zhukovsky's poetic practice: "a romantic elegy in which the internal condition of the soul is expressed indirectly, namely by means of some history or adventure".³ All but the most superficial reading of the ballads eliminates this theory. Zhukovsky was not interested in objective characters or events, in time or place, or even in the psychology of his heroes. Zhukovsky's ballads are an extension of his lyrical poetry: a lyrical effusion of the poet's soul.

It has also been suggested that Zhukovsky's choice of the ballad was related to the larger trend in Russian literature towards narodnost'. According to this theory, the ballad provided the poet

1. N.G. Chernyshevsky, "Sochineniya A.S. Pushkina", PSS, II (M., 1949), 474.

2. Pamyati V.A. Zhukovskogo (Kiev, 1883).

3. A.I. Galich, Opyt nauki izyashchnogo (SPb., 1825), section 189. See also N. Kovarsky, "Poeziya Zhukovskogo", Stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Malaya seriya, 3-'e izd. (L., 1958), intro.

with a means for expressing his interest in popular legends, beliefs, customs, and so forth. This explanation, propounded by Yu. M. Lotman¹ and R.I. Iezuitova,² ignores several facts. Only three of Zhukovsky's forty ballads contain so-called "Russian motifs"; the vast majority are translations from Western European sources; and "Russification" in these translations is conventional and artificial. Lotman has also suggested that the length of the ballad could have provided Zhukovsky with the potential for more significant thematic statements than could either the lyric or the elegy.³ However, some of the ballads are shorter than some of the lyrical poems, and both the poslanie and povest' also offered the possibility of writing a larger work.

Finally, N.V. Izmailov suggested that Zhukovsky chose the ballad for thematic reasons: his sympathy for human suffering and man's compulsory submission to Fate caused him to reject the external world and create an ideal dream world of inner experience.⁴ Izmailov has erroneously made Zhukovsky into a social critic who deliberately creates the ballad genre to escape the horrors of nineteenth-century Russian reality. Zhukovsky was neither a Decembrist nor even a social critic; he spent a large part of his life at court, as tutor to the imperial family, and particularly to the future Alexander II.

The real reasons for Zhukovsky's choice of the ballad genre

1. Yu. M. Lotman, "Problema narodnosti i puti razvitiya literatury preddekabristskogo perioda", O russkom realizme XIX veka i voprosy narodnosti literatury (M.-L., 1960), 8-51.

2. Iezuitova, "Iz istorii".

3. "Problema narodnosti", 40.

4. IRP, I, 246.

lie elsewhere. Firstly, the ballad was undergoing a revival throughout Western Europe, and was, for a time, the most popular genre in English and German poetry. Secondly, the ballad was new, exciting, and exotic. It opened up a whole new world to the imagination: a world of nature and supernature; of strong passions, secret affairs, and extraordinary characters. The Russian memoirist F.F. Vigel' captures the novelty of the ballads in his reminiscences:

Nourished on the classics and on French literature, and on submissive imitations of the same, ... we saw something monstrous in his [Zhukovsky's] choices. Corpses, visions, demons, murders by moonlight; all this belongs to the skazki and even to English novels; instead of Hero awaiting his drowning Leander, he presented us a madly passionate Lenora with her galloping corpse of a lover! His [Zhukovsky's] miraculous talent was needed to force us not only to read the ballads without repugnance, but also, finally, to fall in love with them. I do not know if he spoiled our taste; but at least he created new sensations, new enjoyments for us. That was the beginning of our romanticism.¹

An important component of the "new sensations" was the Gothic element of fear and the pure emotional thrill of being frightened. Zhukovsky was not unaware of this new delight in fear; one of his inscriptions in an album has been preserved:

Во вторник ввечеру
Я буду, если не умру
Иль не поспорю с Аполлоном,
Читать вам погребальным тоном,
Как ведьму черт унес,
И напугаю вас до слез.²

1. F.F. Vigel', Zapiski, III (M., 1891-93), 137.

2. Gukovsky, Pushkin i russkie romantiki, 79.

Belinsky describes the appeal of the ballads as

some sort of sweetly-horrible pleasure, and the more they horrified us, the more passionately we read them.¹

Most likely it was the ballad's popularity in Western Europe, the novelty of its exotic world, and the delight in the emotional experience of fear which attracted Zhukovsky to the genre. The nature of his transformation of the literary ballad will emerge in the analysis of representative texts, which is to be preceded by a discussion of Zhukovsky's theory of translation, and by an example of that theory put into practice.

* * *

Zhukovsky expressed his views on translation² at the beginning of his literary career in two critical articles and in a translation of a French article, all published in Vestnik Evropy (1809-10); close to the end of his career, in 1848, he once again expressed his views on the subject. Zhukovsky's basic aesthetic principles remained the same throughout his creative life. The only difference between his earlier and later statements is the more philosophical, almost mystical, language of the 1848 pronouncements.

-
1. "Sochineniya Aleksandra Pushkina", PSS, V, 168. Compare Chapter VI in Jane Austen's Northanger Abbey: Isabella offers some new Gothic novels to Catherine, who asks excitedly: "but are they all horrid, are you sure they are all horrid?"
 2. Zhukovsky as a translator has been the subject of considerable research. M.H. Volm in W.A. Zhukowski als Übersetzer (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1945-50) presents a detailed analysis and evaluation of Zhukovsky's translations from Goethe. H. Eichstädt in Zukovskij als Übersetzer (Munich, 1970) studies his prose translations (1807-11), his Derpt cycle of lyrics (1815-17), and his translation of Fouqué's Undine (1831-36).

One of Zhukovsky's first articles (1809) was devoted to the genre of the fable, and in particular to Krylov.¹ He begins with a brief discussion of Krylov's debt to La Fontaine, and then defines Krylov's originality as his ability to adapt the original author's thoughts, feelings, and genius, and to express all this in his own style. Then Zhukovsky develops his general views on translation, introduced with a motto which could well serve as a justification for his own poetic career: "A translator of prose is a slave; a translator of verse is a rival". Zhukovsky contrasts the "poet-imitator", who is inspired by the actual model, to the "original poet", who is inspired by "an ideal located in his own imagination". Therefore the translator must share the same imagination, style, intelligence, and emotions as the creator of the original work. He must find in his own imagination the corresponding beauty to serve as a replacement for the original beauty, and which would be equal or even superior to it. Thus, according to Zhukovsky, the translator is a creator, and must possess talent equal in all respects to that of the original author.

This theory was further developed in Zhukovsky's review of S. Viskovatov's translation of P.J. de Crébillon's tragedy Rhadamiste et Zénobie.² The article begins with the bold assertion, "Only a poet can translate a poet", and then goes on to condemn Viskovatov's attempt. Zhukovsky explains that to translate poetry, in addition to understanding rhyme, caesuras, grammar, and so forth, the translator must possess "poetic talent", which is defined as

1. "O basne i basnyakh Krylova", SS, IV, 402-18.

2. "Radamist i Zenobiya", PSS, IX, 122-28.

the ability to imagine and feel vividly, combined with the ability to find in one's own language those expressions which would correspond to that which one feels and imagines.¹

Zhukovsky once again emphasizes the originality of the translator, since he is a "creator of expressions"; he can create only if he is filled with the ideal of the original work, which he then transforms into a creation of his own imagination. The final goal of the translator, then, is not a literal equivalent; rather it is

so that the translated verse produces the same total impression on the soul of the reader as does the original verse.²

In 1810 Zhukovsky published a translation of a French article on the same subject.³ The author of this article states categorically: "I consider excessive fidelity [of a translation to its source] as excessive infidelity"; then he specifies some of the cases in which alterations are necessary to achieve the same effects in the translation as in the original. An example which is relevant to Zhukovsky's own translations concerns the issue of local colour. If the original contains geographical details or references to the customs of a particular nation, this information is of interest only to that nation; such details would seem strange in a translation and must be avoided. The main responsibility of the translator is to "produce that effect which the original produces". The article concludes with some curious advice to aspiring

1. Ibid., 122.

2. Ibid., 127.

3. Vestnik Evropy, XLVIII, No.3 (1810), 190-98.

translators - in order to imbibe the sources of the original poet's inspiration, they should observe the natural landscape of that poet's native land. The skilful translator must be well-travelled!

Such were Zhukovsky's views on the theory of translation in 1810, at the start of his literary career: the translator as creator, possessing talents equal to those of the original author; the translator as inspired by the ideal of the original, located in his own imagination; and the translator trying to create the equivalent effect on the soul of the reader, rather than striving after a literal rendition.

In letters written to A.I. Turgenev in 1814 and 1816 Zhukovsky, by the same turn of phrase, as it were summarizes these views. In one letter, referring to his Ballada o starushke (1814), a translation of Southey's Old Woman of Berkeley, he wrote:

Вчера родилась у меня еще баллада-приемыш,
т.е. перевод с английского.¹

In the other letter Zhukovsky refers to his lyric poem Ovsyanyi kisel' (1816), a translation of J.P. Hebel's Das Habermuss:

Между тем написал, т.е. перевел с немецкого
пьесу под титулом Овсяный кисель...²

After a life's work of writing, i.e. translating poetry, Zhukovsky returned to his theory of translation to provide it with a philosophical foundation. In an article on Faust (1848)³ he analyzes the scene preceding the appearance of Mephistopheles, where Faust is trying to rewrite the Logos passage from the Gospel of St.

1. Russkii arkhiv (M., 1895), 128 (my underlining).

2. Ibid., 164 (my underlining).

3. "Dve stseny iz Fausta", PSS, X, 124-28.

John, substituting for Logos, the German words Sinn, Kraft, and That. Zhukovsky soundly disapproves of Faust's alternatives, asserting that no human mind could possibly conceive of anything more sublime or more encompassing than Logos. He defines the Russian Slovo as both a "spiritual embodiment of thought", conceived at the same time as the thought; and as the "material clothing of this spiritual embodiment", or the sound which expresses it. Then Zhukovsky lapses into "proto-symbolist" mysticism:

All our thoughts, unexpressed and expressed,
separate and unified, are only fragments of
something whole (otryvki chego-to tselogo) ...¹

Zhukovsky's article entitled On the Poet and his Contemporary Significance (1848)² was intended as a reply to Gogol's treatment of the "word" in his Perepiska s druz'yami (1847). Zhukovsky borrows Pushkin's aphorism, slova poeta sut' uzhe dela ego, and elaborates on it. He starts with Rousseau's statement that Il n'y a de beau que ce qui n'est pas, which Zhukovsky interprets as implying that although beauty exists, man can neither seize it nor understand it. Art is defined as the "experience and expression of the beautiful", and the artist as a creator; the means of creation are the forms of art (poetry, music, painting), while the materials of creation are words, sounds, colours, and so forth. The poet's materials are words; Pushkin's aphorism, therefore, is verified.

These two articles, although concerned with the "word" in general, really provide the foundation of Zhukovsky's theory of translation. The crucial importance of the "word" for the poet-creator, and the relationship between the "word", the thought, and

1. Ibid., 125.

2. "O poete i sovremennom ego znachenii", PSS, X, 80-88.

the "something whole" - underlie his earlier, more practical, pronouncements on the translation of verse.

Another of Zhukovsky's letters clearly summarizes the views expressed in his later articles. In February 1848 he wrote to Gogol':

I have often noticed that I have my most lucid thoughts when I have to improvise them to express or to supplement others' thoughts. My intellect is like steel which must be struck against flint in order that a spark might leap out. In general that is the nature of my authorial work; almost everything of mine is either someone else's or apropos of someone else's; but it is still all mine.¹

Additional evidence to substantiate the claim for the "originality" of Zhukovsky's translations is provided by his method of publication and by the reactions of contemporary readers to his works. In preparing his poetry for publication, Zhukovsky rarely specified whether a work was a translation from a foreign source, or whether it was original. His contemporaries received his translations as if they were original creations, and in their reviews usually emphasized Zhukovsky's independence from his source.

In an article on Zhukovsky's translation of Byron's Prisoner of Chillon, Pletnev wrote

We even dare to state emphatically that to translate as Zhukovsky translates, is the same as creating.²

Bestuzhev, in his survey of Russian literature for 1823, noted:

-
1. Otchet imperatorskoi Publichnoi biblioteki za 1887 god (SPb., 1890), 54.
 2. Sorevnovatel' prosveshcheniya i blagotvorennya, XIX, No.2 (1822), 220-21.

Many of Zhukovsky's translations are better than their originals, since euphony and versatility of language adorn the accuracy of his expression.¹

In articles written in the early 1840s, Belinsky developed this same theme:

They say that Zhukovsky has little of his own, that it is almost all translation: a mistaken opinion! Zhukovsky is a poet, and not a translator.²

As children, having no clear idea as yet of what was a translation and what an original, we learned his renditions by heart as the works of Zhukovsky.³

Pletnev had the final say in his sketch of Zhukovsky's life and works:

Zhukovsky imparted to his translations the life and inspiration of their originals. Therefore each of his translations was accorded the value and force of an original composition. This original talent afforded him the means for transforming our literature.⁴

An example of Zhukovsky's theory of translation put into practice is his ballad Rybak (1818),⁵ a translation of Goethe's Der Fischer (1778).⁶ The theme of Goethe's ballad is the irrational attraction of the natural elements and their power over rational human beings. Although Goethe disparaged any attempts to explain his work, Der

1. Polyarnaya zvezda (1834), 23.

2. "Ocherki russkoi literatury. Sochineniya N. Polevogo", PSS, III, 508.

3. "Russkaya literatura v 1841 godu", PSS, V, 548.

4. O zhizni, 5. Blok, in a diary entry for 1920, indicates that Zhukovsky was still considered as the "standard translator". Referring to M. Lozinsky's translations from Delille, he wrote: "Gumilev considers him a better translator than Zhukovsky". See Blok, SS, VII (M.-L., 1963), 371.

5. Für Wenige - Dlya nemnogikh, No.1 (1818), 50.

6. The texts of Goethe's original and Zhukovsky's translation are included in Appendix A.

Fischer is much plainer in rhythm and more complex in meaning than a simple folk ballad.¹ The fisherman can be seen as a symbol of rational self-sufficiency, of non-resistance to the fatal attraction of the elements, and perhaps of a narcissistic attraction to his own reflection. The mermaid's colloquial speech, the narrator's sophistication, the sensual imagery, and the hypnotic repetitions - all contribute to the ballad's fascination.

Zhukovsky's translation transforms Goethe's original into something quite different. In the first stanza Goethe's unemotional ruhevoll (peacefully, tranquilly) becomes zadumchiv (plunged in thought, reflection), one of Zhukovsky's most important emotional epithets. Kühl bis ans Herz hinan (implying spiritual serenity, rationality) is rendered as dusha polna / Prokhladnoi tishinoi, in which the phrase prokhladnaya tishina attempts to combine the two German epithets kühl and ruhevoll. Goethe's Und wie ... er lauscht (with its temporal conjunction and normal punctuation) is replaced by Vdrug ... pritikh ...: vdrug is Zhukovsky's favourite temporal adverb, often used to interrupt the narrative, and usually followed by dots to indicate expectation; pritikh returns to the motif of silence introduced in line four (tishina). Goethe's stanza ends with the words rauscht / Ein feuchtes Weib hervor (the verb expresses "rushing", and is repeated from line one; feuchtes Weib is a poetic expression for mermaid). Zhukovsky's rendition, I vlazhnaya vsplyla glavoi / Krasavitsa ..., employs a less forceful more poetic verb, translates Goethe's feuchtes literally as vlazhnaya, and supplies the more literary krasavitsa to represent the mermaid.

1. See R. Gray, The Poems of Goethe (Cambridge, 1966), 106.

In the second stanza Sie sang zu ihm, sie sprach zu ihm is rendered as Glyadit ona, poet ona: the "speaking" is eliminated, and Zhukovsky's mermaid must sing her fifteen lines. Her monologue is full of epithets which are introduced by Zhukovsky and have no equivalents in Goethe's original. Zhukovsky translates Todesglut as kipuchii zhar, and then combines rodnoe + dno to form its opposite, probably by analogy with rodnaya strana or zemlya. The colloquial speech of Goethe's mermaid (wie's Fischlein ist / So wohlig) is replaced by the neutral expression Kak rybkoj zhit' / Privol'no. The second stanza ends with another of Zhukovsky's unusual combinations, znoinaya vyshina, a synonym for kipuchii zhar, both of which are in contrast to the fish's abode rodnoe dno, and to the fisherman's prokhlada.

The syntax of Goethe's third stanza is varied (nicht occurs in initial, medial, and final positions) and the word order is reasonably logical. Zhukovsky's syntax is monotonous: the negative particle is fixed in the initial position; the word order, however, leads to some confusion. Goethe's epithet feuchverklärte Blau is rendered as prokhladno-goluboi: Zhukovsky avoids the idea of moisture, returns to the motif of prokhlada, and invents a compound epithet combining temperature and colour, but with vague spiritual overtones. He ignores Goethe's other, more difficult epithet wellenatmend.

The final stanza of the original begins with a vivid sensual image: Netzt' ihm den nackten Fuss; Zhukovsky's modesty is responsible for the abstract, poetic replacement: Na bereg val plesnul'. The exclamatory intonation not only of this line, but of the entire fourth stanza, and the use of mnogotochie in lines one and seven, replace Goethe's declarative intonation and normal punctuation. The

order of the clauses in line five is the reverse of that in the second stanza (Sie sprach zu ihm, sie sang zu ihm); Goethe's mermaid sings to lure the fisherman into the sea. Zhukovsky's mermaid is still singing (Ona poet, ona manit), and the second verb demonstrates his propensity to make the meaning more explicit, to explain rather than to depict. Line seven of the original is another vivid physical image (Halb zog sie ihn, halb sank er hin), which contains the complex resolution of Goethe's theme, namely, the fisherman enters the sea, partly dragged by the mermaid, and partly of his own free will. Zhukovsky's abstract version (K nemu ona, on k nei bezhit) lacks the force of the German, and resembles more a conventional meeting of two lovers.

This juxtaposition of Zhukovsky's translation with the original source indicates that his poetic practice conforms to his own theory of translation. Inspired by some ideal of the original in his own imagination, Zhukovsky creates an equivalent work, not a literal translation. But the replacement of the original is not with some objectively equivalent imagination, style, intelligence, and emotions, but rather with Zhukovsky's own individual interpretation of the original, influenced by his criteria of good taste, and expressed in his own subjective language. For example, he freely alters the epithets of the original, combining, eliminating, or inventing others as he pleases. He introduces elaborate verbal leitmotifs (tishina, prokhlada). His syntax is characterized by parallelism, exclamatory and interrogative intonation, and involved word order; it is frequently interrupted by dots, dashes, and temporal adverbs (vdrug). Concrete images of the original ballad become generalized in translation; physical, sensual ones become abstract and poetical. The colloquial tone of certain passages is

transmuted into neutral or elevated tone; themes are made more explicit in some cases, and in others the sense is sacrificed for the larger, total effect.

One can only speculate on the impact which Zhukovsky's translations made on his readers; what is clear both from this comparison of sources and translations, and from the testimony of his contemporaries, is that Zhukovsky was not a "translator" in the ordinary sense of the word. He created original works, equivalents of foreign sources, and his contemporaries were justified in receiving those works as original creations.

Throughout his long literary career, Zhukovsky's principles and practice of translation never altered. His techniques evolved as he gained more experience and better knowledge of foreign languages. His later translations and revisions of earlier ones tend to be more accurate with respect to the source, although this is not always the case. In 1831, for example, Zhukovsky retranslated Bürger's Lenore, which he had translated in 1808 as Lyudmila. The manuscript of the retranslation demonstrates how difficult it was for the poet to come any closer to the German original. Compare the following versions of the heroine's rhetorical question in the first stanza:

Lenore (1773): Bist untreu, Wilhelm, oder tot?
Wie lange willst du säumen?

Lyudmila (1808): Где ты, милый? Что с тобой?
С чужеземною красою,
Знать, в далекой стороне
Изменил, неверный, мне;
Иль безвременно могила
Светлый взор твой угасила.

Lenora-MS. (1831): О милый! Где ты? Что с тобой?
Придет ли весть о друге?¹

1. GPB- 286;1;30;61.

Lenora-pub. (1831): Где милый? Что с ним? Жив ли он?
И верен ли подруге?

Both the manuscript and the final published version of the retranslation bear a stronger resemblance to Lyudmila than to Bürger's Lenore. Any "translation" by Zhukovsky must be considered as the creation of an original poet.

* * *

Zhukovsky wrote forty literary ballads between 1808 and 1833. Of these, twenty-two were translated from German sources: two each from Bürger and Goethe, and nine each from Schiller and Uhland. Eleven ballads were translated from English sources: one each from Goldsmith, Mallet, and Campbell; two from Scott, and six from Southey. One ballad was translated from a French source: F.A. de Moncrif. Of the remaining six so-called "original" ballads: Svetlana is a reworking of Bürger's Lenore; Akhil is strongly influenced by Schiller's Trojan cycle; Eolova arfa may have originated as a translation from another of Bürger's ballads; Gromoboi and Vadim are based on a novel by the German author C.H. Speiss; and Uznik has its source in an elegy by Chénier.

In addition to the forty ballads, Zhukovsky also translated from balladic sources and employed balladic techniques in other genres. Among his lyrics, Teon i Eskhin (1814) is an original balladic elegy; Tri putnika (1820) is a translation of Uhland's balladic Die Wirtin Töchterlein; and Nochnoi smotr (1836) is a translation of J.C.F. von Zedlitz's Die nächtliche Heerschau. Among Zhukovsky's povesti, Perchatka (1831) is a translation of Schiller's ballad Der Handschuh,¹ and Dve byli i eshche odna (1831)

1. Schiller's poem was also translated by Lermontov as Perchatka (1829); see below, Chapter VIII, pp.254-55.

includes translations of two Southey ballads, Mary, the Maid of the Inn and Jaspar. Zhukovsky's early prose tale Mar'ina roshcha (1809) also employs balladic techniques and language.

Eight representative ballads have been selected from Zhukovsky's forty literary ballads and will be examined with reference to their subject, characters, setting, theme, and style. The choice has been made on the following basis: firstly, in order to demonstrate Zhukovsky's treatment of different foreign sources, ballads based on original works by Bürger, Schiller, Southey, and Scott were selected; secondly, ballads have been chosen from the most prolific and influential period of Zhukovsky's literary career (1808-1822); and thirdly, the selection is intended to display the variety of Zhukovsky's innovations in the content and style of the Russian literary ballad.

Zhukovsky's first ballad Lyudmila (1808) created something of the same excitement in Russia which Bürger's Lenore (1773) had caused in Germany and later in England.¹ Zhukovsky's version was finished in April 1808 and published in Vestnik Evropy with the genre-defining subtitle Russkaya ballada, and with the note: Podrazhanie Birgerovoi Leonore (sic).² The subtitle and the note demonstrate the twofold importance of Lyudmila: the former established the genre of the Russian literary ballad as an original form of

1. Gogol's Mertvye dushi (Chapter VIII) contains the following passage:

Many [of the townspeople] were not without education: the chairman of the chamber knew Zhukovsky's Lyudmila by heart, which was then still a great novelty, and he brilliantly recited many places, especially: Bor zasnul, dolina spit, and the word chu! so that it actually looked as if the valley was asleep; for greater verisimilitude he even shut his eyes.

2. Vestnik Evropy, No.9 (1808), 41.

poetry; and the latter indicated that the content of this first ballad was derivative, being an "imitation" of a Western European work adapted for Russian readers.

The ballad begins with a description of the heroine's anxiety at her lover's long absence in the war. When the men return, Lyudmila's milyi is not among them. She laments her fate, rejecting her mother's religious consolation. Late that night her lover returns to claim his Lyudmila and to carry her off to the bridal bed. They ride through the night and arrive in the morning at their destination: the lover turns out to be a corpse, and his home, a grave. The ballad ends with Lyudmila's death as proof of God's justice.

Although the subject of Lyudmila and Lenore is basically the same, Zhukovsky's "imitation" contains numerous deviations from the original which both illuminate his method of adapting foreign sources and reveal the most typical characteristics of his literary ballads. Bürger's Lenore begins with a reference to a particular historical setting: the hero had gone off to fight with the Prussian army against the Austrians at the Battle of Prague (1757). The armistice and the victorious homecomings of both armies are treated satirically. In contrast, Zhukovsky's Lyudmila has no definite period or location. The situation is abstract and generalized, in spite of a vague hint at Old Russian coloration (rat', druzhina).

Bürger's characters are called Lenore and Wilhelm: the heroine possesses real courage; her dramatic lament begins and ends with violent physical gestures such as tearing her hair, throwing herself to the ground, and beating her breast. The hero is presented as a real man of action whose few utterances are terse and rapid. Zhukovsky's heroine is given the Slavonic name Lyudmila, and is transformed into a sentimental, melancholy character. The narrator

describes her in the first stanza with verbs which express emotion, not action: priunyv, vzdykhala, and mechtala. Her physical gestures differ considerably from those of Bürger's heroine: K persyam ochi prekloni (1:7) and Tikho v terem svoi idet, / Tomnu golovu sklonila (3:8-9).¹ Whereas Lenore rants and raves against her cruel fate, Lyudmila accepts hers and submits to its decrees. Unlike Bürger, Zhukovsky intervenes directly in the narrative to express his emotional sympathy for the heroine:

Где ж, Людмила, твой герой?
Где твоя, Людмила, радость?
Ах! прости, надежда-сладость!
Все погибло: друга нет. (3:4-7)

The alternation of interrogative and exclamatory intonation in this passage is repeated in Lyudmila's extended lament. Zhukovsky's hero is transformed into an anonymous melancholy character, referred to only as milyi, whose speech, even to his horse, is saturated with sentimentality:

Конь, мой конь, бежит песок;
Чую ранний ветерок;
Конь, мой конь, быстрее мчися;
Звезды утренни зажглись,
Месяц в облаке потух.
Конь, мой конь, кричит петух. (17:7-12)

The lament in Bürger's ballad is based on a series of symmetrical alternations between mother and daughter, gradually increasing in length to express the more serious statements.² Zhukovsky dispenses with the symmetry and the gradual expansion,

-
1. Compare the phrases golovu tomno sklonyaet and tomno idet from Turchaninova's ballad Leonard i Blondina.
 2. Schematically, let M=mother, L=Lenore, number=lines spoken:
M-2, L-4, M-4, L-4, M-4, L-4, M-8, L-8, M-8, L-8. Totals: the mother speaks 26 lines, Lenore, 28.

and greatly reduces the number of lines spoken by the mother.¹ While she expresses herself almost entirely in aphorisms, Lyudmila echoes elegiac motifs from Zhukovsky's lyrics. The syntax of the lament also recalls that of the lyrics in its alteration of interrogative and exclamatory intonation, its use of rhetorical questions, negative constructions, repetition, and parallelism.

The lament is followed by the midnight appearance of the lover. Bürger has only three lines of transition to describe the sunset and nightfall. Zhukovsky expands the transition to nineteen lines (7:9-9:3); the passage contains no fewer than thirteen epithets: spokoynyi, mrachnyi - bis, velichavyi, tikhii, dlinnyi, dremuchii, zybkii, dalekii, svetlyi, otdalennyi, polunochnyi, pereletnyi. These epithets, characterized by their emotional overtones, flood the reader's senses with a multitude of indefinite visual and aural impressions and create a mood of mystery and uncanniness.

The midnight ride which follows in Bürger's original is famous for its dramatic sound effects: trapp trapp trapp, klingslingling, hurra hurra hop hop hop, and so on. Zhukovsky's ride, reduced from 104 to 83 lines, has no equivalent onomatopoeic expressions. Furthermore, the dynamic description in stanzas 14-15, which contains no epithets but numerous verbs, is not original, but rather a literal translation of Bürger's stanzas 19-20.

Bürger introduces his refrain in stanza 17:6, Wir und die Toten reiten schnell, which is repeated with increasing frequency to heighten the dramatic tension.² Zhukovsky introduces his refrain

1. Schematically, let M=mother, L=Lyudmila, number=lines spoken: M-3, L-9, M-4, L-14, M-6, L-8. Totals: the mother speaks 13 lines, Lyudmila, 31.

2. See lines 20:6, 24:6, 27:6, 28:7.

in stanza 15:2, Mertvyi s devitseyu mchitsya, and it is repeated only once in 17:2. Its meaning, which anticipates the climax of the ballad, lessens the tension. Neither Bürger's weird funeral procession (stanza 21) nor the haunting dirge (stanza 22) has any equivalent in Zhukovsky's version. The grotesque transformation of Wilhelm into a skeleton is graphically described in Lenore; Zhukovsky's rendition is expressed by his favourite epithets:

Видит труп оцепенелый;
Прям, недвижим, посинелый,
Длинным саваном обвит. (20:1-3)

The moral of Bürger's ballad is fairly straightforward: Mit Gott im Himmel hadre nicht! (32:6), which refers to Lenore's transgression defined earlier by her mother: Sie fuhr mit Gottes Vorsehung / Vermessen fort zu hadern (12:3-4). Bürger implies that whether God is just or unjust, one must accept His will with forbearance (Geduld! Geduld!). Lenore would not; therefore she was punished with death.

Zhukovsky's conclusion is more difficult to interpret:

Смертных ропот безрассуден;
Царь всевышний правосуден;
Твой услышал стон Творец;
Час твой бил, настал конец. (21:9-12)

The poet implies that protest is imprudent because God is unquestionably just; therefore His will must be accepted. Rather than a punishment, Lyudmila's death seems to be a release from her sufferings, granted by a merciful Creator.

Thus while Zhukovsky's Lyudmila is in fact an "imitation" of Bürger's Lenore, the differences are far more important than the superficial similarity of the subject. Zhukovsky's generalization of time and place, his sentimental heroine and her melancholy milyi,

and the modifications in the lament, the descriptive transition, the ride, the refrain, and the concluding moral lesson demonstrate the degree to which Zhukovsky deviated from the original source. The greatest contrast between the two works lies in the style of each. Bürger's colloquialisms, conversational expressions, vivid physical descriptions, and dynamic verbs are replaced by Zhukovsky's literary syntax and vocabulary, particularly by an increase in the use of emotional epithets. There are few traces of popular language in either dialogue or description.¹

An entry in one of Zhukovsky's notebooks written in approximately 1805, provides an interesting side-light on his attitude towards Bürger. First he praises the tone and the simple narrative in his ballads; then he continues with a list of Bürger's other virtues, including:

his successful use of popular expressions
both in descriptions and in the expression
of feelings; brevity and vividness; simplicity and variety in his rhythms.²

He also approves of Bürger's depiction of the uzhasnoe, which results from his successful description of mrachnye subjects and themes. Zhukovsky contrasts Bürger's style with that of Schiller; he finds Schiller's style less "picturesque" than Bürger's, less "colloquial", and far more "poetical". He concludes:

1. Examples are rare: the colloquial forms skokom, znat', and krasa occur, as do the conversational bryaknulo kol'tso and bukh v nee i s sedokom. In one copy of the ballad written in Masha Protasova's hand, the original bukh is crossed out and replaced by the more literary pryg in Zhukovsky's own hand (GPB-286;1;20;1).

2. Seidlitz, Zhizn' i poeziya, 39.

Schiller is more the philosopher, and Bürger - the simple narrator, who, occupied with his own subject, does not concern himself with anything peripheral.¹

There is a significant disparity between these theoretical views on Bürger and Zhukovsky's poetic practice. The qualities which he praises in Bürger's style are precisely those which he so radically altered or eliminated in his ballad Lyudmila. Furthermore, in spite of his professed admiration for Bürger and disdain for Schiller, during his lifetime Zhukovsky translated only one ballad from Bürger and nine from Schiller.² Whatever were his critical views, the poet in Zhukovsky recognized that the subjects and style of Schiller's ballads were more suited to his own taste. Schiller became one of Zhukovsky's most important models in the creation of the Russian ballad genre.

Bürger's Lenore also provided the impetus for Zhukovsky's Svetlana (1808-12).³ This ballad, a very free reworking of its original source, was one of Zhukovsky's most popular and most influential works. During the 1810s the poet was continually referred to as "the creator of Svetlana"; during the 1820s, as criticism of his poetry and his politics mounted, even the most ardent Decembrists approved of Svetlana, considering it Zhukovsky's most narodnyi ballad. And it was Svetlana which exerted the strongest influence on Pushkin, particularly apparent in Evgenii Onegin and Metel'.⁴

1. Ibid., 40.

2. In 1805-6 Zhukovsky translated a short excerpt from Bürger's ballad Lenardo und Blandine. See below, on Eolova arfa.

3. Vestnik Evropy, No.1-2 (1813), 67.

4. See below, Chapter VII, pp.225-29.

The ballad has been the subject of considerable research by Soviet scholars. The most detailed analysis is that of Iezuitova who considers it proof of Zhukovsky's "profound interest" in Russian folklore, namely rituals, superstitions, and legends. As evidence of this new interest she quotes Zhukovsky's letter to A.P. Zontag, written in 1816 (i.e. three years after the publication of Svetlana), in which he asked that he be sent Russian skazki and legends.¹ But when Iezuitova investigates the possible sources of Zhukovsky's folkloric material, she rejects the suggestion of I.P. Lupanova who considers the skazka as the basis of Svetlana,² since it is not clear how Zhukovsky had access to skazki until 1816. Similarly, Iezuitova rejects the influence of traditional Russian folk ballads, since Zhukovsky could not have had any models to imitate. Her theory is that the manuscript plans for Svetlana show definite borrowings of detail and vocabulary from the works of M. Chulkov; she admits, however, that it has never been established that Zhukovsky actually knew Chulkov's collections.

The earliest manuscript plan of Svetlana called Svyatki is a simple enumeration of the main scenes of the ballad.³ It deviates from Bürger's original in its inclusion of the heroine's dream; but, unlike the final version, the dream here proves to be true and the ballad was to end tragically. The happy ending was introduced in a later manuscript plan, Gadan'e, which is a detailed stanza by stanza summary of the ballad.⁴ Iezuitova, who ignores the earlier

1. "Iz istorii", 318.

2. I.P. Lupanova, Russkaya narodnaya skazka v tvorchestve pisatelei pervoi poloviny XIX veka (Petrozavodsk, 1959), 285-336.

3. GPB-286;1;78;10.

4. GPB-286;1;78;10.

plan, compares the later plan to Chulkov's chapter on fortune-telling in the Abevega russkikh sueverii (1786),¹ and finds close similarities in the description of the mirror divination; she also discovered that the podblyudnaya pesenka in Svetlana (2:9-14) was borrowed from Chulkov's Sobranie raznykh pesen (1770-74).

Other critics emphasize various aspects of the ballad. N.V. Izmailov pays particular attention to Zhukovsky's optimism as reflected in Svetlana, citing the intervention of beneficent forces which provide a happy solution to the tragic subject.² On the other hand, Gukovsky emphasizes the playfulness of the work, arguing that it has no real theme, and is nothing more than an invented fairy tale.³ Ts. S. Vol'pe suggested the most interesting interpretation.⁴ He maintains that in Svetlana Zhukovsky applied the principles of parody to the poetics of the Gothic ballad, and that by setting the frightening tale within the framework of a dream he was creating a parody of his own Lyudmila, and thus a parody of the literary ballad genre.

It must be admitted that the narodnost' of Svetlana has been overemphasized; in fact, it is limited to a few stylistic elements and folk motifs. Zhukovsky uses diminutive forms (podruzhen'ka, slovechko, legokhon'ko), colloquial expressions (vraz, krasa), and folk epithets in a conscious attempt at stylization of folklore. The epithets occur primarily in the first stanza, relating specifically to the fortune-telling (yaryi vosk, chistaya voda, zolotoi

1. See above, Chapter I, p.25.

2. IRP, I, 248.

3. Pushkin i russkie romantiki, 71.

4. Zhukovsky. Stikhotvoreniya, I (L., 1936), xvii.

persten', belyi plat), and again in the hero's speech in the seventh stanza (shirokii dvor, tesovye vorota, shelkovy povoda). Belyi is employed most frequently as a folk epithet with such substantives as plat, pelena, zapona, polotno, and golubochek, and in the compound form belosnezhnyi golubok. The popular motifs which appear in Svetlana include the fortune-telling, the song (stanza 2), the description of the church (stanza 9), the chernyi vran (stanza 10), and the dove (stanza 13).

Certainly there are more narodnyi elements in Svetlana than in Lyudmila, or, for that matter, than in any of Zhukovsky's other ballads. But the narodnost', which may conceivably be derived from Chulkov, is stylized and conventional. Folkloric language is restricted to the expression of the few folkloric motifs. Most of Svetlana is written in Zhukovsky's individual style at its most original because there was no foreign model in immediate proximity to restrain him.

Zhukovsky's heroine is characterized as molchaliva i grustna / Milaya Svetlana, the epithets of which epitomize a sentimental heroine, certainly not a folk heroine.¹ Svetlana's timidity (robost') is her most emphasized "spiritual" trait.² This characteristic is demonstrated in her acceptance of Fate and in her gentle apostrophes to her guardian angel: Mne sud'bina umeret' / V grusti

1. This line is, of course, the source of Lensky's description of Tat'yana to Onegin in III:5:

"Скажи: которая Татьяна?"
 "Да та, которая грустна,
 И молчалива, как Светлана,
 Вошла и села у окна."

2. See lines 5:3, 5:9, 6:5, 8:10, and 12:14.

odinokoi (3:3-4) and Utoli pechal' moyu, / Angel uteshitel' (3:13-14), both of which replace Lenore's Hader and Lyudmila's milder ropot against God's providence. The hero's remark to Svetlana, Tvoi uslyshan ropot (6:14), is illogical since there has not been any ropot. Zhukovsky himself was right when he admitted in the nineteenth stanza that his ballad contains ochen' malo skladu. The poet's sympathy for the heroine is obvious from the very beginning of the ballad (milaya Svetlana, 2:4), and in the various apostrophes to her: Akh! Svetlana, chto s toboi? / V ch'vu zashla obitel' (12:5-6), and Chto zhe tvoi, Svetlana, son, / Proritsatel' muki? (18:1-2).

The hero of Svetlana is characterized by the epithets blednyi and unylyi (8:14, 9:14). He is the perfect sentimental hero, whose summons to his Svetlana (Radost', svet moikh ochei / Net dlya nas razluki, 7:3-4) provides a striking contrast to Wilhelm's first words to his Lenore (Holla, holla! Tu auf, mein kind!, 14:1). Zhukovsky's thoughtful hero also describes to his bride-to-be the elaborate arrangements made for their formal church wedding (stanza 7).

The atmosphere in Svetlana is created in part by the frequent repetition of the word strakh in its various forms: strashno (5:10, 15:6), strakh (5:11, 6:9), strashnyi (11:7, 12:6-7, 13:6, 20:1), all of which usages explicitly emphasize the horror of the story, rather than implicitly demonstrate it. The dramatic tension which reaches its climax in stanza 15 is suddenly released in the final verb:

Снова бледность на устах;
В закатившихся глазах
Смерть изобразилась...
Глядь, Светлана... о Творец!
Милый друг ее - мертвец!
Ах!... и пробудилась.

With this verb the strakh, uzhas, and mrak dissipate momentarily; light and the sounds of morning flood the senses (Vse blestit). Just as one of Svetlana's friends predicted (stanza 4), her milyi returns to her. The amorous delights which await him are described in conventional eighteenth-century language: priyatny vzory, sladostnye usta, mily razgovory, and vernye obety.

Zhukovsky's epilogue places the whole subject in its proper perspective. The ballad is frightening, but it is only a bad dream, the creation of poetic fantasy, full of bol'shie chudesa (19:3). Svetlana is Bürger's Lenore and Zhukovsky's Lyudmila turned upside down, mocked, or parodied. Zhukovsky concludes with his usual moral, Vera v providen'e (19:11), but it is of little importance. The meaningful experience has been in the contrast between two moods: between the loneliness, anticipation, and terror of the dream world, and the "clarity", "pleasures", and "brightness" (stanza 20) of the real world, with the love and happiness which it promises for the characters.

Svetlana is one of Zhukovsky's most original ballads. In spite of its conventional narodnyi language and stylized motifs, the poet succeeds in producing a balladic atmosphere of fear and mystery within the dream framework. Zhukovsky demonstrated that he was the undisputed master of the Russian literary ballad, who could both create its strakh, and then write a brilliant parody of it.¹

1. In Lyubovnaya karusel' (1814), originally subtitled Tul'skaya ballada, Zhukovsky, in a poem for and about his nieces, wrote another playful parody of the ballad form not unlike Svetlana:

- О милый! милый! что с тобой?
Катюша закричала.
- Так, ничего, дружочек мой,
Мне в горло кость попала!

Lyudmila and Svetlana, both originating in Bürger's Lenore, are among Zhukovsky's most successful ballads. Less successful are two translations from other sources, both written in 1813: Adel'stan and Ivikovy zhuravli. The interest in these ballads consists in Zhukovsky's transformation of the original themes, in the character description, and in the creation of atmosphere.

Adel'stan¹ is a translation of the English literary ballad Rudiger (1796), in which Robert Southey employed a subject discovered earlier by Thomas Heywood and recorded in the latter's notes to Hierarchies of the Blessed Angels (1635); this, in its turn, probably represents a variation on the German Lohengrin theme. Zhukovsky replaced the original title with an archaic Anglo-Saxon name, possibly because a certain General Fedor Vasil'evich Rudiger was participating in campaigns in Germany and France at about the same time as the ballad was published.²

The action takes place near a castle on the Rhine. A swan tows a small boat up the river, carrying a knight called Adel'stan to the castle. The knight soon wins the love of the beautiful Lora. They marry and she gives birth to a child, but Adel'stan mysteriously postpones the baptism. He takes his wife and child onto the river, and attempts to sacrifice the child to the evil powers; but Lora appeals for divine intervention: Adel'stan is suddenly swept into the abyss and the child is saved.

In their article on Zhukovsky's early translations from Southey, K.H. and W.U. Ober argue that Zhukovsky turns Southey's abstractions into sharply defined images. As examples they cite

1. Vestnik Evropy, No. 344 (1813), 212.

2. Ober, "Zhukovskij's Early Translations", 183.

Southey's descriptions of the twilight, which becomes Zhukovsky's Den' bagryanil, his "castle walls" which become zubchaty steny, and his "damp mist" which becomes sedeet / mgla syraya.¹ They also point to the "delicious bathos" contained in Zhukovsky's version of Lora's announcement that she is with child. Southey's original is "And Margaret her Rudiger / Hail'd with a father's name" (15:3-4), which Zhukovsky translates as Ulybayas', vozveshchaet / Drugu Lora: "Ty otets!" (16:3-4).

In fact, Zhukovsky's images are no more concrete than those in Southey's original; furthermore, the Obers overlooked a much more important difference between the source and the translation. In Zhukovsky's manuscript and in the first published version in Vestnik Evropy (1813) Adel'stan succeeds in hurling his child into the waiting arms of the evil spirits:

Нет спасения! Губитель
В безду бросил уж дитя.

И дитя, вясь, стеноло,
В грозных сжатое когтях.²

This conclusion, the invention of Zhukovsky's fantasy, was later reworked to bring it into closer agreement with Southey's original:

The mother holds her precious babe;
But the black arms clasp'd him round,
And dragg'd the wretched Rudiger
Adown the dark profound.

(45)

И воскликнула: Спаситель!
Глас достигнул к небесам:
Жив младенец, а губитель
Ниспровергнут в бездну сам.

(44)

1. Ibid., 184-85.

2. GPB-286;1;14;119.

Zhukovsky's version also emphasizes the strong supernatural element: the ocharovannaya lad'ya which appears with its folkloric belyi lebed' and alyi parus to bring the knight to the castle, then reappears to carry off Adel'stan, Lora, and the child. The hero of the ballad is also described as ocharovannyi. Although he appears to be the embodiment of physical and spiritual perfection, his soul is troubled: he seems odinok i molchaliv, bezmolvno i unvylo, sumrachen dushoyu, pechal'nyi, and so on. The explanation for his spiritual discontent is provided only in the climax, when Adel'stan confesses that he had previously concluded a Faustian pact with the devil: Ya uzhasnoyu tsenoyu / Za blazhenstvo zaplatil (36:3-4).¹ The heroine Lora is hardly described at all: she is nezhnaya and robkaya - nothing more.

The description of the setting for the last journey in the "charmed boat" contains all the possible elements of balladic atmosphere: it is late (Vot uzh pozdno, 24:1; Pozdno milyi, 26:1, 28:1), dark (Cheren bereg opustelyi, 24:3; temnyi luch, 32:4); moonlit (Mesyats bleden, 28:3); cold (Kholodeet veterok, 24:4; S vod kholodnyi veter veet, 26:3); damp (Mgla syraya, 26:2; syro v pole, 28:3); and silent (oni, bezmolvny, 33:1; Tikho pleshchut, 33:3; I na berege molchanie, 34:1). The balladic mood is summarized in one stanza, which includes a series of Zhukovsky's favourite epithets to emphasize the strakh:

Страшен берег обнаженный;
Нет ни жила, ни древес;
Черен, дик, уединенный,
В стороне стоит утес. (39)

1. Zhukovsky treated this same theme in Gromoboi (1810); see below.

Zhukovsky's Adel'stan, as generalized and as abstract as Rudiger, is, nevertheless, noteworthy for the first version of the conclusion which totally altered the meaning of the original, for the style of the descriptions of the hero, and for the atmosphere of the night journey, the latter two accomplished predominantly by epithets. Adel'stan can be considered a typical representative of Zhukovsky's translations from Southey.

The other ballad written in 1813, Ivikovy zhuravli,¹ is a translation of Schiller's Die Kraniche des Ibykus (1797). It was Goethe who first discovered the subject and who then offered it to Schiller as the basis for a friendly competition in ballad composition. Unfortunately, Goethe never used the subject for a ballad. It is based on a Greek legend: Ibycus, while making his way to Athens, is attacked by robbers. He calls upon a passing flock of cranes to avenge his untimely death. Later, at an open assembly in Athens, the cranes appear overhead, and one of the murderers involuntarily cries out, "Behold the avengers of Ibycus!" thus giving away their crime. Schiller reworked the Greek myth into a philosophical statement about the influence of art over the human soul. His murderers are spectators at a performance of Aeschylus's Eumenides, and it is the catharsis engendered by the tragedy which causes them to make their confession. In the sixth and seventh stanzas Schiller paraphrases the chorus in the tragedy which precedes the entrance of Athena.² Thus the idea of revenge is relegated to a position of secondary importance; of primary importance is the power of art over the soul.

1. Vestnik Evropy, No.3 (1814).

2. C.E. Passage, "The Influence of Schiller in Russia, 1800-1840", Am SEER, V (1946), 123.

Zhukovsky's Ivikovy zhuravli is an example of his complete transformation of a classical theme. He failed to take into consideration the complex philosophical implications of Schiller's ballad, and substituted instead a simple story of revenge, accompanied by the usual moral: God sees the truth, and vice is punished. Zhukovsky neither recognized the passage modelled on Aeschylus, nor employed the classical concept of catharsis and its role in the theory of tragedy.

The hero is transformed from a classical poet into a romantic bard, from Schiller's Gottesfreund and des Gottes voll, to Zhukovsky's skromnyi drug bogov and vdokhnovennyi. Ivik possesses both a prekrasnoe litso and a krylataya mehta, neither of which has any equivalent in the original. His apostrophe to the cranes:

Сказав: прости! родной стране,
Чужого берега посетитель,
Ищу приюта, как и вы; (3:4-6)

and his dying words (I tak pogibnu v tsvete let, 5:4-8) are typical of the language of Zhukovsky's elegies. The narrator's reference to Fate (4:6), never mentioned in Schiller's original, introduces another of Zhukovsky's standard themes. The atmosphere of the ballad is created by the use of characteristic verbal motifs: strakh (13:3, 15:6) and tishina (12:7, 12:8, 18:4; 18:5, 20:4).

The climax of the ballad is achieved in stanza 22. Schiller wrote:

Das ist der Eumeniden Macht!
Der fromme Dichter wird gerochen.

Zhukovsky first translated these lines as:

... то мщенья час!
То Эвменид сокрытых глас!¹
Певцу возмездие готово!

1. GPB-286;1;14;129.

But in the published version this passage was altered to:

... "Убийца тут;
То Эвменид ужасных суд;
Отмщение за певца готово; (22:3-5)

Although the exclamatory intonation of the first version has been replaced by declarative intonation, and the motif of revenge is mentioned only once, instead of twice, Zhukovsky still insists on introducing the evaluative epithet uzhasnyi and on replacing Schiller's philosophical Macht with his own moral sud. All these changes further emphasize Zhukovsky's individual interpretation of the subject: revenge, moral judgment, and punishment for the wicked. In the manuscript version of the last stanza of the ballad, Zhukovsky translated Schiller's original conclusion fairly literally. But the rewritten version contains no fewer than seven epithets, compared to Schiller's single epithet: schreckenbleich.¹

Ivikovy zhuravli demonstrates Zhukovsky's transformation of a classical theme, received through Schiller's philosophical version, into a romantic literary ballad. The bardic concept of the poet-hero, the atmosphere established in part by leitmotifs, and the abundance of emotional epithets in the climax and in the conclusion make the ballad typical of Zhukovsky's translations from Schiller.

The most original of Zhukovsky's forty literary ballads, the one for which no specific source has yet been identified, and the one in which no particular foreign influence predominates is Bolova arfa (1814).² The subject of this ballad is as follows: the

1. Zhukovsky's epithets are: bleden, trepeten, smyatennyi, nezapnyi, smushchennyi, sklonennyi, and tshchetnyi.

2. Amfion, III (1815), 61.

high-born heroine Minvana is in love with a poor poet. Recognizing that their union would be opposed, they meet one night to say farewell. The poet places his harp on a branch of a tree to serve as a reminder of his love. When their romance is discovered by Minvana's father, the poet is exiled and dies; Minvana pines away until springtime when the poet's spirit returns to play his harp. Minvana dies soon afterwards.

Iezuitova investigated the history of Eolova arfa and suggests that its composition began in 1805-6 with Zhukovsky's unfinished translation of Bürger's Lenardo und Blandine (1776).¹ Although Zhukovsky translated only five stanzas, the theme of Bürger's ballad, the separation and demise of two lovers, is the same basic theme as in Eolova arfa. The next stage, according to Iezuitova, is Zhukovsky's unfinished ballad Nina, various drafts of which were written between 1808 and 1810.² This work begins with the lovers' farewell, and then describes the two characters in abstract, idealized terms. When their secret love is discovered and separation is enforced, one lover dies and the other soon follows suit. Iezuitova compares Nina to Plach Lyudmily, a lyric of the same period, and to Eolova arfa, and she discovers similarities in theme, description of the heroine, and in some specific expressions. She notes that Zhukovsky's translations from Goldsmith, Moncrif, and Mallet (1812-14) also concern the theme of terminated love and spiritual union, and include identical heroines in similar settings. Finally, she cites Ossianic motifs such as the bardic hero, the harp, the hunt, and the northern landscape, which can also be found

1. "Iz istorii", 170-81. Ms. GPB-286;1;12;49.

2. GPB-286;1;78;7.

in Bolova arfa.

The ballad is set at a Western European medieval castle, adorned with all the exotic trimmings of the chivalric tradition: feasts, tournaments, armour, tales of the hunt and heroic deeds. But this setting is purely external, serving only as an introductory visual background and as a source of minor details (zubchatye steny, 1:4; zubchatye mechi, 4:7). It is described once, and then ignored.

The heroine Minvana is young, beautiful, and conventionally democratic: Chto v slave i sane? / Lyubov' - moi vysokii, moi tsarskii venets (14:1-2). Her eyes, framed by temny resnitsy, contain zadumchivyi plamen'. Her head is full of sladkoe smyaten'e, while her soul is prekrasnaya and prelestnaya. The hero, Arminii, is a young, handsome, impoverished sladkoglasnyi pevets. Together they share a spiritual love which they express to each other at secret rendezvous.

Despite the possible source in Bürger's ballad, the Ossianic influence, the Western European setting, and the heroine's democratic clichés, Bolova arfa is an original work - a rich verbal collage, the components of which are Zhukovsky's favourite romantic motifs, repeated and interwoven until all meaning dissolves. The ballad represents Zhukovsky's greatest success in the creation of the purely emotional experience of spiritual love and lyrical dreams; the absence of a definite source means that no immediate model was available to hinder his imagination by restricting him to an external subject.

The three most important verbal motifs are "youth", "silence", and "despondency". The heroine is described as mladaya (5:1, 10:5), as are her various parts (S glavy molodoi / Na persi mladye, 5:6-7). The hero is called the mladoi pevets (8:1, 24:8). The word is also

used to convey the general mood of the ballad: mladoe vesel'e (12:8) and svezhaya mladost' (26:7). The epithet yunyi is similarly applied to the lovers' hearts (11:4) and to the bloom of love (20:1, 32:4). Tishina, together with its related grammatical forms, serves as a background for the whole narrative,¹ and is supported by the synonyms bezmolvnyi (12:1), and molchan'e (27:3). Iezuitova observed that the concept of tishina alters during the narrative. At the lovers' first meeting it expresses their spiritual tranquillity; then, Minvana's expectation during the brief silence before the harp makes any sound; and finally, the silence of death in the last scene.² Unynie is the most frequent emotion experienced by the two characters. The epithet unylyi is applied to dusha (12:2, 24:4), serdtse (13:1), pevets (19:1), Minvana (31:2), and strannik (32:5); it is also used impersonally (14:5, 25:3, 28:1).

In addition to these three verbal themes, Zhukovsky employs several secondary motifs. The word kholm as the location for various scenes occurs ten times in the relatively short space of the ballad. Epithets for "gold" are applied to Minvana's thick curls (struya zolotaya, 1:8) and to the waves (volny / Zlatimye tikho blestyashchei lunoi, 12:4). The heroine is associated with the epithet tsarskii (san, venets, ubor), in contrast to the hero who is described as bednyi (13:6, 15:8) and smirennnyi (14:4). The strings of the harp (arfa stroinaya, 11:1) are characterized as vernye (20:3), smyatennye (30:4), and milye (32:1).

Bolova arfa is not about Minvana or Arminii or about an Aeolian harp. Zhukovsky merely employs setting, characters, and events to

1. See lines 12:4, 17:8, 23:7, 28:3, 29:3, and 30:8.

2. "Iz istorii", 208.

express his profound emotional experience of youth, silence, and despondency. These themes, together with the secondary ones, are combined in an intricate pattern of verbal motifs. There are no stylized folk epithets and few traces of conventional eighteenth-century language. Eolova arfa is written in purely early nineteenth-century "romantic Russian", which is Zhukovsky's original and genuine contribution to Russian style.¹

During the three years which followed the writing of Eolova arfa, Zhukovsky was at work on his ballad Vadim. In 1817 he published this ballad together with an earlier work Gromoboi (written in 1810, published in Vestnik Evropy in 1811). Both were dedicated to D.N. Blyudov and were given the general title Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev.² The epigraph to Gromoboi was borrowed from Schiller's Die Jungfrau von Orleans (1801), which Zhukovsky later translated in its entirety. The epigraph to Vadim was taken from Schiller's poem Sehnsucht, previously translated by Zhukovsky as Zhelanie (1811). A quotation from Goethe's Faust, Part I, was chosen as an epigraph for the whole work: Das Wunder ist des Glaubens liebstes Kind.

The immediate source of Zhukovsky's ballad is a novel by C.H. Spiess entitled Die zwölf schlafenden Jungfrauen, eine Geister Geschichte (1797). The novel is based on medieval Catholic legends about sinners who sold their souls to the devil, and about their repentance in expiation of their guilt. The novel contains adventures of a mildly erotic nature, all of which were eliminated by

1. See below, Chapter IV.

2. Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev, starinnaya povest' (SPb., 1817).

the modest Zhukovsky.¹ Other influences on Zhukovsky's ballad include Ossian, Karamzin, Slavonic mythology, and Florian's William Tell, which Zhukovsky later translated.

A.L. Yashchenko convincingly argues that Gromoboi is nothing less than Zhukovsky's own reworking of Goethe's Faust.² He cites as evidence the epigraph and dedication to the 1817 edition, the similarity of subject between the two works, Zhukovsky's religious treatment of the main character, and finally Zhukovsky's review of Faust in 1848 in which he set forth his own interpretation.

Iezuitova makes no reference to Yashchenko's theory and abruptly dismisses the importance of the Spiess novel as a source. Instead, she analyzes the subject, treatment, and imagery of the work to discover what she calls Zhukovsky's religious-philosophic ideas, genuine Russian medieval trimmings, and narodnost'. She concludes that Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev is a totally original work and hazards the suggestion that there might be a connection between it and Vladimir, Zhukovsky's unfinished historical epic. She considers that the ballad represents the poet's unfulfilled aspirations and that it demonstrates what Vladimir would have been like had it been written. However, the evidence contained in Zhukovsky's letters and poslaniya, and the various plans for Vladimir contradict Iezuitova's theory. While the plans envisage a concrete narrative poem with particular emphasis on the Russian location, details, and motifs, the finished work Vadim is an

1. Zagarin in his biography of Zhukovsky juxtaposes Vadim and the corresponding chapter of the Spiess novel, noting the deviations from the original source.

2. A.L. Yashchenko, "Faust Gete. Rannie otkliki v Rossii", Uchenye zapiski Gor'kovskogo universiteta, LXV (1964), 189-204.

abstract literary ballad with generalized setting, characters, and themes.¹

The genre of Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev is problematical. In an early manuscript Zhukovsky subtitled the work dlinnaya ballada,² which reflects the distinction between short, lyrical ballads and long, epic ballads in his Sobranie russkikh stikhotvorenii (1810-11). In the published version the work is subtitled starinnaya povest' v dvukh balladakh: that is, a povest', which consists of two separate ballads, but which is intended to be read as a single composition.

The first ballad, Gromoboi, takes its title from the heroic tale by G.P. Kamenev.³ It concerns a Faustian hero who sells his soul to the devil in exchange for wealth and happiness. When the devil comes to collect his soul, Gromoboi offers him the souls of his innocent children in order to gain more time. He soon repents, and expresses his remorse in passages which are reminiscent of Zhukovsky's elegies. The narrator frequently evaluates the hero's words and deeds, and advises him on the best course of action. When the devil returns, the forces of good defend Gromoboi's soul. His children sink into a deep sleep where they will remain until someone pure in heart should come to rescue them.

Although the ballad's direct source is the Spiess novel, Yashchenko's theory is compelling. Zhukovsky's Gromoboi seems to

1. Of greater importance is the possible influence of Zhukovsky's plans for Vladimir on Pushkin's Ruslan i Lyudmila. See L.N. Nazarova, "K istorii sozdaniya poemy Pushkina Ruslan i Lyudmila", Pushkin. Issledovaniya i materialy, I (M.-L., 1956), 216-21.

2. GPB-286;1;14;67.

3. See Appendix E.

be a vague imitation of Goethe's Faust. The thematic differences between the works are noteworthy: Zhukovsky's hero seeks "honour and gold", not knowledge and experience; the stern moralist in Zhukovsky emphasizes the theme of repentance before an almighty deity; and, the twelve maidens represent a vague ideal of beauty, goodness, or purity, common to all of Zhukovsky's poetry.

The second ballad, Vadim, takes its name from the sixteenth-century Nikon chronicle, and relates the story of the hero's quest for ideal beauty. Vadim sets out to discover spiritual fulfilment, overcoming various obstacles and temptations along the way. He finally releases the twelve sleeping maidens of Gromoboi, thereby achieving the object of his holy pilgrimage.

Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev is Zhukovsky's great spiritual parable: the theme of the first ballad is suffering and remorse; that of the second, aspiration and fulfilment. Its length (over 150 stanzas) precludes the detailed analysis to which the other ballads have been subjected; however, the content and style of the work, in particular the frequency and usage of epithets, corroborates the conclusions reached through examination of Zhukovsky's other ballads.

The last ballad to be considered is Zhukovsky's translation of Walter Scott's The Eve of St. John (1801), included in the section called "Imitations of the Ancient Ballad" of his Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border (1802). Zhukovsky's version was written in July 1822, but not published until two years later because of problems with the censor.¹ Because the ballad combined a love

1. Sorevnovanie prosveshcheniya i blagotvoreniya, XXXV (1824), 11, as Zamok Smal'gol'm: Shotlandskaya skazka; and Novosti literatury, VII (1824), 7, as Dunkanov vecher: Shotlandskaya skazka.

story with an ecclesiastical holiday, it was thought to be "atheistic and immoral". After numerous demands were made to alter the ballad, Zhukovsky agreed to change the title from Zamok Smal'gol'm, ili Ivanov vecher to Dunkanov vecher, and to add notes of historical and moral explanation.

The ballad relates the tale of a baron who, returning to his castle, summons a page to report on his wife's activity during his absence. The page tells how on each of the three evenings she went to meet a strange knight, whom she had invited to her chamber that very evening, the Eve of St. John. The baron enters his bedchamber, reports to his wife on a fictitious battle, and sinks into a deep slumber. The knight then appears before the baron's wife and tells her that the baron is his murderer. He leaves a mysterious imprint on the table and on her hand. The next day the baron retires to a monastery, his wife to a convent.

Scott's ballad is a faithful literary imitation of a traditional folk ballad. He preserves the stanza form, the folk epithets (bold, bright, fair, gay, true), the archaic vocabulary, and the interrupted narration of the popular genre. The narrator describes the action without intervention, and the motivations of the characters are left unexplained. However, unlike the traditional ballad, the characters' speech both contributes to their characterization and is distinct from that of the narrator. Furthermore, Scott suggests a subtle contrast between the past and the present, and employs frequent internal rhymes. Neither of these devices is characteristic of popular poetry.

Zhukovsky's version is very different from Scott's original. Almost all the details of historical colour have been eliminated, either because Zhukovsky wanted to make the subject comprehensible

to Russian readers, or because he did not understand the details himself.¹ An example of the "translation" of local colour is the following passage from Scott which is to be compared with Zhukovsky's version:

His arms shone full bright, in the beacon's red light;
His plume it was scarlet and blue;
On his shield was a hound, in a silver leash bound,
And his crest was a branch of the yew. (26)

Показалось мне при блестящем огне:
Был шлем с соколиным пером,
И палаш боевой на цепи золотой,
Три звезды на щите голубом. (26)

The colours and details of Scott's description, derived from folk ballads, are replaced by vague, emotional colours and conventional details in Zhukovsky's rendition.

The characters in Zamok Smal'gol'm are transformed into typical romantic heroes and heroines. The baron is characterized by unwieldy, and later parodied, epithets: znamenityi Smal'gol'mskii baron (1:2).² While Scott's baron is "sad and sour", Zhukovsky's is otumanen i bleden litsom (4:2). On two occasions Zhukovsky resorts to a technique borrowed from Schiller, description by verbs,³ in order to "translate" Scott's refrain:

Then changed, I trow, was that bold Baron's brow,
From the dark to the blood-red high.

... поражен, раздражен,
И кипел, и горел, и сверкал. (25:1-2)

... изумлен, поражен,
И хладел, и бледнел, и дрожал. (29:1-2)

1. See B.G. Reizov, "V.A. Zhukovsky, perevodchik Val'tera Skotta: Ivanov vecher", in Russko-evropeiskie literaturnye svyazi, ed. P.N. Berkov et al. (M.-L., 1966), 439-46.

2. Cf. the equally unwieldy and as often parodied topor dvadtsatifuntovoi (3:4).

3. Cf. Kubok (stanzas 6, 12), Zhukovsky's translation of Schiller's Der Taucher.

The baron's wife is described as odinoko-unylaya (32:4) and molodaya (33:1, 34:1, 38:4); she is summed up in the lines:

Молодая жена - и тиха, и бледна,
И в мечтании грустном глядит... (33:1-2)

The page is molodoi (7:3, 8:1, 9:1); the knight is first presented as a frightening apparition (On uzhasen stoyal pri ogne, 23:2), and then as a mysterious night visitor (mrachnyi prishlets, 27:2). All the characters - the baron, his wife, the page, and the knight - speak exactly the same language, identical to that of the narrator.

Zhukovsky reworks the setting of Scott's ballad in order to emphasize his favourite motifs: night-time (the epithet nochnoi occurs eight times, the noun noch' twice, and the epithet polunochnoi twice); silence (taikom, tikhomolkom); and desolation (pustynnaya vershina, skala; pustaya vysota).

A comparison of the concluding stanzas in Scott's original and Zhukovsky's translation provides striking evidence of the gulf which separates the two works:

There is a nun in Dryburgh bower,
Ne'er looks upon the sun:
There is a monk in Melrose tower,
He speaketh word to none. (48)

That nun, who ne'er beholds the day,
That monk who speaks to none -
That nun was Smaylho'me's lady gay,
That monk the bold Baron. (49)

Scott's first stanza contains no epithets. It presents the two anonymous figures in parallel verses. In the second stanza, each line fulfils a different function: line 1 rephrases line 48:2; line 2 rephrases 48:4; both lines contain no epithets and serve to repeat the description of the characters in parallel phrases and in declarative intonation; line 3 identifies the nun, and concludes

with her "tag", the folk epithet "gay"; line 4 identifies the monk, and concludes with his "tag", the folk epithet "bold".

Scott's conclusion is laconic, enigmatic, and unemotional.

Есть монахиня в древних Драйбургских стенах:
И грустна и на свет не глядит;
Есть в Мельрозской обители мрачный монах:
И дичится людей и молчит. (48)

Сей монах молчаливый и мрачный - кто он?
Та монахиня - кто же она?
То убийца, суровый Смальгольмский барон;
То его молодая жена. (49)

In Zhukovsky's version of the first stanza, the parallel structure is flawed and two descriptive epithets are introduced: grustna for the nun,¹ and mrachnyi for the monk. As in Scott's original, each line of the second stanza fulfils a different function: line 1 converts the verb of 48:4 (molchit) into another emotional epithet (molchalivyi) and repeats the first epithet mrachnyi from 48:3; line 2 in no way rephrases 48:1-2; both lines are given an intonation foreign to popular ballads, the rhetorical question; in line 3 the words To ubiitsa provide the narrator's interpretation of the events and his moral judgment on the characters;² then Zhukovsky tries to assign a "tag" to the monk by attaching the epithet surovyi to his unwieldy title. But the epithet had been applied to the baron only once before (36:4), and has little effect in this concluding stanza. Finally, line 4 identifies the nun and gives her the "tag" molodaya, which had been associated with her earlier; however, the same epithet had also been used as the page's "tag", and thus lacks originality in identifying the heroine. Zhukovsky's conclusion is

1. Cf. grustnyi in 33:2, quoted above.

2. Cf. ubiitsa in Ivikovy zhuravli, 22:3, quoted above.

verbose (particularly in his use of epithets), interpretative (in the moral judgments), and emotional (in its interrogative intonation and connotative vocabulary).

The replacement or elimination of Scott's historical colour, the depiction of characters as romantic heroes and heroines, the emphasis on favourite motifs in the description of the setting, and the "translation" of the concluding stanzas - all clearly demonstrate Zhukovsky's transformation of Scott's imitation of a popular ballad into a romantic literary ballad. The difference between the works is not one of quality; rather it lies in two conceptions of the ballad genre. Scott and Zhukovsky were simply writing different sorts of poetry.

* * *

Zhukovsky's theoretical statements and his forty literary ballads determined the pattern for the genre and established its importance in the first decades of the nineteenth century. His conception of himself as a balladnik coincided with the views of Zhukovsky held by his contemporaries. Russian scholars have expended considerable energy in demonstrating the influence of folk literature on Zhukovsky's ballads, or at least in proving his interest in folk songs and skazki.¹ The arguments presented are contrived and are prejudiced by ideological considerations concerning narodnost'. The texts of the literary ballads show no evidence to suggest that Zhukovsky had any models of Russian folk poetry to imitate.

1. See N.N. Trubitsyn, O narodnoi poezii v obshchestvennom i literaturnom obikhode pervoi treti XIX v. (SPb., 1912); Lupanova, Russkaya narodnaya skazka; and Iezuitova, "Iz istorii".

A comparison of the narrative unit, method, and attitude of the traditional Russian folk ballad with those in Zhukovsky's literary ballads is instructive. The compressed, centralized episode of the folk genre became, in Zhukovsky's genre, a greatly expanded narrative, often of epic proportions, with more interest in the setting and characters than in the action. The dramatic, dynamic functional style of the anonymous popular ballads was replaced by Zhukovsky's individual diction and syntax. Impersonality and non-interference in the action were superseded by Zhukovsky's moralizing interpretation and frequent interruptions. Finally, the combination of natural and supernatural elements in the "world" of the traditional ballad was transformed in Zhukovsky's literary ballads to conventional coloration, where supernature was consciously employed to frighten and delight the reader. Zhukovsky's poetry takes place in a "world" far distant from that of traditional folk poetry.

The impetus for Zhukovsky's literary ballads came from Western European literature, although he was influenced by developments in Russian "pre-romantic" poetry. The characters, setting, structure, and style of the Russian ballads of the 1790s, themselves largely based on foreign sources, exerted considerable influence on Zhukovsky's ballads. But Zhukovsky went directly to the foreign sources: to Bürger's sensational Lenore, to Schiller's philosophical ballads, and to Goethe's combinations of folk and literary elements; to Southey's half-serious, half-comic verse, and to Scott's literary imitations of popular ballads. Zhukovsky discovered that each author had adapted the new genre to accommodate his own particular talents and tastes. He would do likewise.

From his first ballad in 1808 to his last in 1833 Zhukovsky

never altered his choice of sources, his method of "translating" Western European themes, or his individual Russian style. While the events of the original ballad were usually retained in outline form, the characters were metamorphized into romantic heroes and heroines, whose speech was identical to that of the narrator. The settings were generalized and details of historical colour were eliminated or "Russianized". The atmosphere of the ballads combined the elements of night-time, silence, desolation, and fear in varying proportions. Zhukovsky's real theme always remained the same: his own personal experience of melancholy, anxiety, despair, love, fear, or resignation. The style which expressed this constant theme was always "literary": its originality resided in the alternating intonations, negative constructions, parallel syntax, and more significantly, in the frequency, choice, and meaning of his epithets.¹

Zhukovsky has been called a romantic by Pushkin,² Belinsky,³ and Trotsky⁴ among others. He has also been considered a sentimentalist, a "pre-romantic", and a realist; a reactionary, and a mystic.⁵

Isaiah Berlin, in a preface to a recent study of European

1. See below, Chapter IV.

2. See Pushkin's letter to L.S. Pushkin, May 1825: "He [Zhukovsky] is holy, although he was born a romantic, and not a Greek, and a human being, but what a human being".

3. See Belinsky's articles on Zhukovsky cited above.

4. L.D. Trotsky, "Ot dvoryanina k raznochintsu: V.A. Zhukovsky", Sochineniya, XX (M.-L., 1926), 3-9; for example: "Zhukovsky adapted German and English demons to the Russian climate - and in so doing, propagated Romanticism in Russia".

5. See Gukovsky, Pushkin i russkie romantiki, 13-23.

romanticism, presents some general observations on the nature of that movement.¹ He argues that whereas classicism conceived of truth as objective, which had to be discovered, romanticism conceived of truth as subjective, invented or created by its seekers. The emphasis in romanticism is on the subjective and ideal, not on the objective and real; on the process of creation, not on the effects; on the motives, not on the consequences; and on the quality of the individual vision, not on the accurate correspondence to a stated premise.

Zhukovsky was nourished on the aesthetic theories of French and German classicism: on the laws of Boileau, the principles of Batteaux, the norms of La Harpe, and the translations of Florian; on the theories of Baumgarten and the philosophical ideas of Engel, Eschenburg, and Friedrich Bouterwek (1766-1828).

The irony is apparent: this same Zhukovsky, in his creation and establishment of the Russian literary ballad, the archetypal romantic genre in which subjective truth is created by its seeker, became the undisputed founder of the Russian romantic movement.

1. H.G. Schenk, The Mind of the European Romantics (London, 1966), xv-xvi.

Zhukovsky's Literary Ballads

<u>Date written</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author, title and date of source</u>
1808	<u>Lyudmila</u>	Bürger: <u>Lenore</u> (1773)
1809	<u>Kassandra</u>	Schiller: <u>Kassandra</u> (1802)
1808-12	<u>Svetlana</u>	(reworking of Bürger: <u>Lenore</u>)
1812	<u>Pustynnik</u>	Goldsmith: <u>The Hermit</u> (1765)
1813	<u>Adel'stan</u>	Southey: <u>Rudiger</u> (1796)
1813	<u>Ivikovy zhuravli</u>	Schiller: <u>Die Kraniche des Ibykus</u> (1797)
1814	<u>Varvik</u>	Southey: <u>Lord William</u> (1798)
1814	<u>Ballada ... (o starushke)</u>	Southey: <u>The Old Woman of Berkeley</u> (1798)
1814	<u>Alina i Al'sim</u>	Moncrif: <u>Les Constantes Amours d'Alix et d'Alexis</u> (1751)
1814	<u>El'vina i Edvin</u>	Mallet: <u>Edwin and Emma</u> (1760)
1814	<u>Akhill</u>	(strong influence of Schiller)
1814	<u>Bolova arfa</u>	(possible source in Bürger ballad)
1816	<u>Mshchenie</u>	Uhland: <u>Die Rache</u> (1810)
1816	<u>Garal'd</u>	Uhland: <u>Harald</u> (1811)
1816	<u>Tri pesni</u>	Uhland: <u>Die drei Lieder</u> (1807)
1810	<u>Gromoboi</u>	(based on Spiess novel, 1797)
1814-17	<u>Vadim</u>	" " " " " " "
1818	<u>Rybak</u>	Goethe: <u>Der Fischer</u> (1778)
1818	<u>Rytsar' Togenburg</u>	Schiller: <u>Ritter Toggenburg</u> (1797)
1818	<u>Lesnoi tsar'</u>	Goethe: <u>Erlkönig</u> (1782)
1818	<u>Graf Gapsburgskii</u>	Schiller: <u>Der Graf von Habsburg</u> (1803)
1819	<u>Uznik</u>	(based on Chénier elegy, <u>La jeune captive</u> , 1794)
1822	<u>Zamok Smal'gol'm</u>	Scott: <u>The Eve of St. John</u> (1801)
1828	<u>Torzhestvo pobeditelei</u>	Schiller: <u>Das Siegesfest</u> (1803)

Zhukovsky's Literary Ballads (contd.)

<u>Date written</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Author, title and date of source</u>
1831	<u>Kubok</u>	Schiller: <u>Der Taucher</u> (1797)
1831	<u>Polikratov persten'</u>	Schiller: <u>Der Ring des Polykrates</u> (1797)
1831	<u>Zhaloba Tserery</u>	Schiller: <u>Klage der Ceres</u> (1797)
1831	<u>Donika</u>	Southey: <u>Donica</u> (1796)
1831	<u>Sud bozhii nad episkopom</u>	Southey: <u>God's Judgement on a Wicked Bishop</u> (1799)
1831	<u>Alonzo</u>	Uhland: <u>Durand</u> (1814)
1831	<u>Lenora</u>	Bürger: <u>Lenore</u> (1773)
1831	<u>Pokayanie</u>	Scott: <u>The Gray Brother</u> (1802-3)
1831	<u>Koroleva Uraka ...</u>	Southey: <u>Queen Oracca and the Five Martyrs of Morocco</u> (1803)
1832	<u>Roland oruzhenosets</u>	Uhland: <u>Roland Schildträger</u> (1811)
1832	<u>Plavanie Karla Velikogo</u>	Uhland: <u>König Karls Meerfahrt</u> (1812)
1832	<u>Rytsar' Rollon</u>	Uhland: <u>Junker Rechberger</u> (1811)
1832	<u>Staryi rytsar'</u>	Uhland: <u>Graf Eberhards Weissdorn</u> (1810)
1832	<u>Bratoubilitsa</u>	Uhland: <u>Der Waller</u> (1829)
1833	<u>Ullin i ego doch'</u>	Campbell: <u>Lord Ullin's Daughter</u> (1804)
1833	<u>Elevzinskii prazdnik</u>	Schiller: <u>Das Eleusische Fest</u> (1799)

Chapter IV

THE EPITHET IN ZHUKOVSKY'S LITERARY BALLADS

История эпитета есть история поэтического стиля в сокращенном издании, и не только стиля, но и поэтического создания.¹

In an essay entitled O literaturnoi evolyutsii (1927) Yu. N. Tynyanov defines the concept of the dominanta in the following manner:

A system does not mean coexistence of components on the basis of equality; it presupposes the preeminence of one group of elements and the resulting deformation of other elements.²

In Zhukovsky's stylistic system the role of the dominanta is fulfilled by the epithet. The overall frequency of epithets in the ballads, the constant repetition of a limited range, the "obsession" with specific epithets demonstrated in the ballad manuscripts, and the evidence provided by the criticism, imitation, and parody of these epithets by Zhukovsky's contemporaries - all support this view of his style.

Therefore, in order to characterize the dominant element in Zhukovsky's style, it has been decided to concentrate on the epithet rather than on any other component. This chapter begins with a

1. A.N. Veselovsky, "Iz istorii epiteta (1895)", SS, I (SPb., 1913), 58.

2. Yu. N. Tynyanov, Arkhaisty i novatory (L., 1929), 41. The concept had been employed by B. Eikhenbaum in his study Anna Akhmatova (P., 1923). V. Erlich claims it was originally borrowed from the German aesthetician Christiansen; see Russian Formalism (The Hague, 1965), 199.

general section on the definition of the epithet; then it includes sections on the use of the epithet in traditional Russian folk ballads and in Western European literary ballads; there follows a survey of previous research on the epithet in eighteenth-century Russian literature and in Zhukovsky's poetry; the chapter concludes with a section setting forth the results of original research into the range, usage, and meaning of the epithet in Zhukovsky's literary ballads.

* * *

The history of the epithet¹ as a poetic device has been fraught with controversy since the Roman rhetorician Quintilian proposed one of the earliest definitions in his Institutio Oratoria. Having listed the main figures of speech, he continues:

The remaining tropes are employed solely to adorn and enhance our style [ad ornandum et augendam orationem] without any reference to the meaning. For the epithet ... is clearly an ornament. Poets employ it with special frequency and freedom.²

Thus he defines the epithet as a poetic trope of secondary importance which serves a purely ornamental function and introduces no new meaning to the substantive. The examples provided to illustrate this trope are white teeth and liquid wine. However, in oratory as opposed to poetry, Quintilian argues that the epithet is redundant unless it adds something new to the meaning of the substantive, as in the expressions abominable curse, hideous lust,

1. The word is derived from Latin epitheton, adapted from Greek ἐπίθετον - attributed; it was used by Greek grammarians as a synonym for "adjective". OED, III (1933), 248.

2. The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian, trans. H.E. Butler, III (London, 1921), 322-25.

unbridled greed, and disgraceful poverty. The passage concludes with the following caution:

But the nature of this form of embellishment is such that, while style is bare and inelegant without any epithets at all, it is overloaded when a large number are employed. For then it becomes long-winded and cumbrous.¹

The distinction between an epithet which defines the ideal or typical trait of a substantive and that which limits or individualizes the substantive has been the central issue in the debate concerning the epithet as a stylistic device. French classical literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries employed a limited number of epithets to define the typical trait of an object (for example, forêt obscure, fleuve rapide, désirs secrets). Similarly eighteenth-century English poets possessed a stock diction including poetic epithets such as flowery vale and shady grove.² The epithet in Russian classical literature was described by Lomonosov in his treatise on oratory (1744-47). He considers the epithet to be a partial aspect of pleonasm or amplification:

Умножительные распространения состоят по большей части в приличных приложениях, которые бывают: 1/имена прилагательные и причастия, как сильная рука, шумящий ветер;... 5/существительные с прилагательными, сочиненными со своими падежами, например: блаженная Россия, любезна небесам страна.³

Eighteenth-century Russian poets employed a limited range of such epithets, many of which were in fact international - borrowed from Latin and French sources.

1. Ibid., 322-25.

2. V.M. Zhirmunsky, "K voprosu ob epitete", in Pamyati P.N. Sakulina. Sbornik statei (M., 1931), 79-80.

3. M.V. Lomonosov, "Kratkoe rukovodstvo k krasnorechiyu", PSS, VII (M.-L., 1952), 131.

In the early nineteenth century Ostolopov included a definition of the epithet in his Slovar' drevnei i novoi poezii (1821). The epithet is defined as any adjective which:

... хотя бы главная мысль и достаточна была выражена, придает ей еще более силы и приятности;¹

and as any adjective taken in its abstract sense, such as blednaya smert' and mastitaya starost'. But if an adjective is necessary for the completion or clarification of the substantive, then, according to Ostolopov, it cannot be considered an epithet.²

The debate was resumed in the late nineteenth century when F.I. Buslaev attempted to distinguish between the ordinary adjective and the epithet:

Эпитет отличается от обыкновенного прилагательного тем, что служит к украшению речи и по большей части не придает нового оттенка названию предмета; потому называется украшающим эпитетом.³

This definition is derived from the use of the fixed epithet in folk poetry, and on that basis Buslaev generalizes to include all

1. Slovar', III, 451.

2. Ostolopov gives the following examples:

epithet: Во все продолжение бедственной жизни его никогда животворный луч утешительной надежды не касался его сердца.

adjective: Человек справедливый живет в мире с самим собою и с другими; человек умный свободен и в оковах.

3. F.I. Buslaev, Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo yazyka, 2-oe izd., II (M., 1863), 48. See also A. Zelenetsky, Epitety literaturnoi russkoi rechi, I (M., 1913), for a bibliography of literature on epithets (1850-1913).

poetic epithets. He also speculates on the origin of fixed epithets and on their essentially tautological nature.

A.N. Veselovsky devoted his attention to the problem, and in various essays presents a definition of the epithet, an account of its development from folk poetry, and the first attempt at classification. His definition follows what was by then the established tradition:

... одностороннее определение слова, либо под-
новляющее его нарицательное значение, либо
усиливающее, подчеркивающее какое-нибудь
характерное, выдающееся качество предмета.¹

In other words, Veselovsky still insists on the basically tautological nature of the epithet, or at best, on its ability to single out and emphasize one characteristic which is inherent in the meaning of the substantive. He divides epithets into two main groups: (1) tautological, in which the adjective and the noun express the same idea (krasnaya devitsa, belyi svet); and (2) clarifying (poyasnitel'nye), in which the quality is considered inherent in the object (belaya lebed'); or in which the quality characterizes the object with relation to some desired goal or ideal (stoly belodubovye, nozhki rezvye). This second group is further subdivided into: (a) "metaphoric" epithets (chernaya toska, mertvaya tishina); and (b) "syncretic" epithets (yasnoe solntse, yasnyi sokol).

Although Veselovsky's definition is very general, his classification attempts to accommodate the subtle distinctions in meaning which previous theoreticians denied or ignored. His brief account of the historical development of the epithet from Homer, Old French poetry, and folk literature concludes with the assertion that "the one-sided epithet is a characteristic of antiquity" and that in

1. "Iz istorii epiteta", 59.

modern literature the epithet had become "free" and "many-sided".¹ Alas, no explanation or examples are provided and Veselovsky never returned to the subject to develop this statement.

Many of Veselovsky's conclusions were repeated by A. Gornfel'd in his entry on the epithet in Brokgaus and Efron's Encyclopedic Dictionary (1904). Moreover, Gornfel'd also distinguishes between "non-epithets" and epithets on the basis of philosophic logic. The "non-epithet" corresponds to the synthetic judgment in which the predicate names the quality not inherent in the subject (eta gora vysoka). The epithet corresponds to the analytic judgment in which the predicate repeats a quality inherent in the subject (lyudi smertny, yasnaya lazur').²

A.A. Potebnya makes a distinction between "poetic (adorning)" epithets and "prosaic (necessary)" epithets, and defines the former as a type of synecdoche:

... не устранение из мысли видов, не заключающихся в себе признака, им обозначенного, а замещение определенным образом одного из многих неопределенных.³

Potebnya specifies the two ways in which a poetic epithet can relate to its object. Either the epithet introduces some new meaning which is not inherent in the meaning of the object (prokhlada sumrachnoi dubravy); or the epithet corresponds to the inherent meaning of the object (krutoi bereg), and operates as a tautology if the meaning is remembered, or as a restoration of meaning if the object

1. Veselovsky, "Iz lektsii po istorii eposa (1884)", in Istoricheskaya poetika, (L., 1940), 450-52.

2. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', XL (SPb., 1904), 926-28.

3. A.A. Potebnya, Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti (Khar'kov, 1905), 211.

has been forgotten.¹ Although Potebnya attempts a historical distinction, his definition is limited and his theory, vague.

In the late 1920s and early 1930s Formalist critics turned their attention to the epithet and defined it with greater precision, described its historical development, and explored its stylistic possibilities. B.V. Tomashevsky in his Teoriya literatury tries to restrict the meaning of the word epithet to a precise critical concept.² He distinguishes between the "logical attribute" (opredelenie), which defines a new characteristic of the object, adding further meaning, and which separates the particular phenomenon from the wider group, emphasizing its distinguishing trait (derevyannyi dom, kazennyi dom); and the "poetic epithet" (epitet), which does not separate or define a new characteristic, but repeats the qualities inherent in the substantive (shirokaya step', since more).

V.M. Zhirmunsky joined the debate and produced a major contribution to the problem of definition, as well as the most comprehensive historical survey.³ He rejects the definitions of Veselovsky, Tomashevsky, and A.G. Shalygin,⁴ arguing that there are poetic epithets which in fact introduce new meaning.⁵ Furthermore, Zhirmunsky introduces the idea of poetic function, beyond that of meaning. In the expression pryanye dorozhki, for example,

1. Ibid., 212-13.

2. B.V. Tomashevsky, Teoriya literatury: Poetika, 6-oe izd. (M.-L., 1931), 33-39.

3. "K voprosu", 75-82.

4. A.G. Shalygin, Teoriya slovesnosti (SPb., 1916), 374.

5. For example, in the expression teplyi svet, the poetic epithet introduces new meaning: the svet is described as teplyi as opposed to kholodnyi.

although the epithet is logically necessary for the limitation of the concept, it also fulfils a poetic function as a descriptive device. Thus Tomashevsky's distinction between poetic epithets and logical attributes had neither clarified the confusion surrounding the term "epithet", nor had it explained the stylistic function of epithets in context.

Zhirmunsky poses the central question: does the epithet individualize the concept or does it define the typical trait. His method of analysis is historical, and his definition emerges from a survey of the epithet from Quintilian to romanticism. The "epithet", which was defined as a specific trope by classical theoreticians, and was used in French, English, and Russian classical literature, expresses the typical, ideal trait and introduces no new meaning. The same term was also to be applied to the language of folk poetry, in which the "adorning epithets" fulfil a similar function.

However, as Zhirmunsky points out, the romantic reforms in French and English literature were directed, to a large extent, against the traditional epithets of classical literature. The narrow sense of the poetic trope disappeared and the use of the epithet declined. It was replaced by the individual attributive (opredelenie), which added new and original meaning to the substantive and which expressed the author's own personality.

Since Zhirmunsky, subsequent attempts at definition of the epithet by G.N. Pospelov,¹ L.I. Timofeev,² and B.M. Shcherbatsky³

1. G.N. Pospelov, Teoriya literatury (M., 1940).

2. L.I. Timofeev, Teoriya literatury (M., 1948).

3. B.M. Shcherbatsky, Zanyatiya po stilistike v starshikh klassakh srednei shkoly (M., 1951).

have contributed nothing new to the discussion. In a recent article V.A. Paustynskaya surveys the various definitions by Soviet scholars, the few analyses of the epithets of specific authors, and, in brief, the contributions to the debate by Western European scholars.¹ Paustynskaya outlines the main problems of the discussion clearly, makes a few tentative suggestions, and concludes that "many fundamental questions remain unsolved".

Since that article, the epithet has been the subject of entries in the Large Soviet Encyclopedia,² the Academy of Sciences 17-volume Dictionary of the Contemporary Russian Language,³ A. Kvyatkovsky's Poetic Dictionary,⁴ and O.S. Akhmanova's Dictionary of Linguistic Terms.⁵ Each of these articles merely repeats one or other of the available definitions of the epithet, without answering any of the "fundamental unsolved questions". In one of the most recent studies of poetic language, Zhirmunsky's definition is quoted as the last valuable contribution to the problem. The author adds in a footnote:

The nature of the system of epithets, and the changes in this system during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries demands specialized and detailed research.⁶

-
1. V.A. Paustynskaya, "Ob ispol'zovanii termina 'epitet'", Uchenye zapiski 1-go MGPIIYa, X (1956), 107-24.
 2. Bol'shaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya, XLIX (M., 1957), 131.
 3. Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo yazyka, XVII (M.-L., 1965), 1899.
 4. A. Kvyatkovsky, Poeticheskii slovar' (M., 1966), 359-61.
 5. O.S. Akhmanova, Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov (M., 1966), 527.
 6. A.D. Grigor'eva, "Obshchie zamechaniya o poeticheskoi frazeologii Pushkina", in Poeticheskaya frazeologiya Pushkina, ed. V.D. Levin (M., 1969), 15.

From the above it is clear that since Quintilian drew a distinction between ornamental epithets in poetry and necessary epithets in oratory, the controversy has centred on the question of whether an epithet defines the typical, ideal trait or whether it limits and individualizes a concept. The dilemma finally led Zhirmunsky to restrict the term "epithet" to the former, and to employ the term "attributive" for the latter. This is an unsatisfactory solution. Firstly, this new stylistic terminology (epithet/attributive) coincides with grammatical terminology, and could result in even greater confusion about the meaning of the epithet. Linguists distinguish between "epithet", a word or expression which qualifies a substantive without an intermediary copulative verb, and "attributive", a word or expression which qualifies a substantive and is related to it by means of a copulative verb.¹

Secondly, neither Lomonosov in his theoretical treatises on rhetoric and oratory, nor Ostolopov in his dictionary of literary terms defined the epithet as a specific trope in the narrow sense which Zhirmunsky suggests. The opposition of epithet/attributive is established by Zhirmunsky as the result of his own analysis of the role played by the epithet in the various stages of its historical development.

This dissertation will accept the following definition:

1. M.E.I. Robertson, L'Épithète dans les œuvres lyriques de Victor Hugo publiées avant l'exil (Paris, 1927), 14. The definitions originate in F. Brunot, La Pensée et la Langue (Paris, 1922). See also: E. Reiner, "La Place de l'adjectif épithète en français: théories traditionnelles et essai de solution", Wiener Romanistische Arbeiten, VII (Vienna, 1968), 12.

L'épithète est un mot, une locution, ou une proposition conjonctive attachée à un substantif ou à son équivalent, sans l'intermédiaire d'aucun verbe copule, pour donner du relief à une qualité particulière, à l'être ou à la chose représentée, soit comme individu, soit comme espèce.¹

This definition accepts the term "epithet" in the same sense as it is used by linguists as the opposite of the term "attributive" (i.e. as regards the copulative verb). It does not distinguish between "epithet" and "attributive" in the stylistic sense as suggested by Zhirmunsky. Rather it includes all purely descriptive words under the term "epithet" and allows for a distinction in usage or function: "soit comme individu, soit comme espèce", that is, whether the epithet defines some individual trait, adding new and original meaning, or whether it is used for adornment, to emphasize the typical or ideal trait. Hopefully confusion can thus be avoided.

From the grammatical point of view, the epithet can be expressed by any part of speech: adjectives (short or long form; preposed, postposed, or in apposition); nouns (usually in apposition); adverbs; verbal forms (usually participles); and phrases (prepositional phrases, complements, and appositives). Discussion of the epithet in this dissertation will be limited to the adjective for several reasons: it is the simplest form of the epithet, the most frequently employed, and the most important stylistically. Also the physical limitation of space necessitates such a decision.

In order to classify these adjectival epithets the grammatical classification of A.V. Isachenko has been adopted. He defines

1. Robertson, L'Épithète, 28.

the adjective as that part of speech which designates the quality of an object. The adjective modifies a substantive and usually agrees with it in case, number, and gender. Isachenko divides adjectives into the following groups:¹

- 1) Qualitative adjectives: the quality is indicated directly by a non-derivative adjective.
 - a) Qualitative-absolute adjectives: the quality indicated is absolute, and implies no evaluation by the speaker. This group includes colours, tastes, physical defects, etc. (belyi, sladkii, glukhoi).
 - b) Qualitative-relative adjectives: the quality indicated is relative and implies some evaluation by the speaker. This group includes expressions of spatial, temporal, and sensual perception (vysokii, kholodnyi, rannii, legkii, milyi).
- 2) Relative adjectives: the quality is defined by comparison to some other object or phenomenon; usually a derivative adjective (grobovoi, zolotoi, nebesnyi).

* * *

Most nineteenth-century definitions of the epithet emerged from the study of the language of folk poetry. The genre of the "folk ballad" was not employed in the classification of Russian folklore until Chernyshev's anthology (1936).² Although individual ballads had been included in studies of other genres, the ballad itself never before served as an object of research. Attention was directed to the language of folk literature in general, and to the language of the byliny in particular.

1. A.V. Isachenko, Grammaticheskii stroi russkogo yazyka v sopostavlenii s slovatskim, I (Bratislava, 1965), 173-242. Group 3) Possessive adjectives (mamin, Natalin) and Group 4) Relative-Possessive adjectives (sobachii, okhotnichii) have been excluded because they are employed infrequently and conventionally in Zhukovsky's poetry.

2. See above, Chapter I, p.5.

Admiral A.S. Shishkov, in one of his Razgovory o slovesnosti (1811), noted among the features of folk poetry both fixed epithets (krasnoe solnyshko, svetlyi mesyats, since more) and double epithets (temnyi dremuchii les, belaya kudryavaya bereza). He advocated the study of popular poetry, arguing that folk language could serve as a source for the enrichment of Russian literature, and as a more salutary influence on it than foreign literatures.¹

During the 1860s Buslaev defined the tautological epithet as a fixed epithet which repeats a quality inherent in its object.² He also described the process of fixation in the popular mind.³ This process was likewise studied by Veselovsky, who lists the most common tautological epithets.⁴ F. Mikloshich argued that the fixed epithet fulfils a more important function than "adornment", and therefore its selection is more conscious than had been previously thought.⁵

The first comprehensive study of the epithet in folk literature was undertaken by P.D. Pervov in 1901-2.⁶ His scope is limited to the byliny, and his choice of epithets to those "which accompany ... names of objects, particularly names of tangible objects".

1. See N.I. Mordovchenko, Russkaya kritika pervoi chetverti XIX veka (M.-L., 1959), 88-89.

2. Istoricheskaya grammatika, II, 46-49.

3. O prepodavanii otechestvennogo vazyka (1867) (L., 1941), 182.

4. "Iz lektsii", 451.

5. F. Mikloshich, "Izobrazitel'nye sredstva slavyanskogo eposa", in Drevnosti. Trudy Slavyanskoi komissii MAO, I (M., 1895), 225.

6. P.D. Pervov, "Epitety v russkikh bylinakh", Filologicheskie zapisi, I-VI (1901); I (1902).

Pervov maintains that the epithet is the most common stylistic device in all forms of popular poetry, and that it is precisely in its "changelessness" that the language of folk literature differs from that of "sophisticated" literature.

Pervov divides epithets in the byliny into the following categories: (1) ancient or organic epithets, mostly tautological (belyi svet); (2) colour (zelena trava); (3) material (bulatnaya sablya); (4) emotional relation of man to object (milyi, dorogoi); (5) size (shirokii, glubokii); and (6) "common" epithets (chastyi dozhd', sladkii napitok). He studies individual epithets within these categories by compiling lists of their various uses in the byliny, comparing the nouns modified, and deducing from the contexts the basic meanings of each epithet. By tracing the gradual development of the epithet, he hoped to determine the oldest, primary meaning. Pervov also listed several nouns with those epithets most commonly used to modify them.

Although his method was original, Pervov's conclusions are open to serious criticism. Firstly, he attempts to generalize about the language of folk literature on the basis of his study of one genre only. Secondly, his selection of epithets within that genre is limited to those which relate concepts to the external world. Evaluative epithets are hardly treated, and figurative epithets are completely neglected. Thirdly, Pervov's semantic analysis does not consider the stylistic function of the epithet in the context of its phrase, line, or in the work as a whole.

Pervov's conclusions have been criticized by A.P. Evgen'eva, who also attacks the conventional views of other nineteenth-century critics concerning the "fixedness" of fixed epithets and

the concept of "adornment".¹ She states that since Pervov's article, there had been no study of the language of specific genres of folk poetry during the different periods of oral composition. Evgen'eva considers various theories about tautological epithets, and concludes that the function of such epithets is not the "renewal" (podnovlenie) of the meaning of the substantive, but rather the "indication of the essential, typical characteristic of the object". Based on her study of laments (prichitaniya), Evgen'eva concludes that there is great variety and complexity in folk epithets, and she divides them into the following categories: (1) fixed epithets, which are constant regardless of theme (krasna devitsa, bely ruki, chisto pole); (2) "relatively fixed" epithets, which are determined by the theme (tonki bely savany, umershaya mogilushka); (3) "adorning" epithets (golovushka bednaya, or obidnaya, or bestalannaya); and (4) individual poetic attributes (suetlivaya strapnya, gor'kaya molodost').²

Finally, Evgen'eva relates the quantity and variety of epithets in folk literature to the date of transcription. Thus byliny recorded in the seventeenth century contain all the generally acknowledged "fixed epithets", as well as many others which have been overlooked. Kirsha Danilov's collection (1804) contains almost exclusively fixed epithets and "adorning" epithets, while the later collections of P.N. Rybnikov (1861-67) and A.F. Gil'ferding (1873) contain a larger number of epithets in general, a more varied selection, and some examples of new individual poetic

1. A.P. Evgen'eva, Ocherki po yazyku russkoi ustnoi poezii v zapisyakh XVII-XX vv., (M.-L., 1963), 229-43, 298-338.

2. Ibid., 314.

attributives.¹

Evgen'eva's study of tautological and fixed epithets is valuable for any future research on the language of folk poetry. However, while relating the quantity and variety of epithets in collections of folk poetry to the date of transcription, she never attempts any explanation of the variations. It is likely that the literary tradition had a strong influence on popular literature and its transcription; this would explain the increase in fixed epithets in Danilov's collection, and the appearance of individual poetic attributives in the later collections.

Furthermore, while Evgen'eva refutes other scholars' generalizations about the language of folk poetry because they were based on a study of one genre only, she is open to the same criticism. On the basis of her study of the laments, she too generalizes about the great variety and complexity of the language of folk poetry. Clearly each genre (byliny, historical songs, popular ballads, and so forth) must be studied separately, and any generalizations about the language of folk poetry should take into account the conclusions reached about each separate genre.

The results of an original analysis of the epithet in Russian folk ballads are included in Appendix B. The most frequently employed epithets in each of the three main groups of the Isachenko classification are listed with the most frequently modified substantives for each. On the basis of this analysis it is apparent that the epithet in Russian folk ballads has its source in concrete reality and is used to express man's basic sensory perception of that reality. Thus group [1a] is composed of the simplest

1. Ibid., 326-37.

colours (belyi, zelenyi, chernyi); group [1b] of the simplest concepts of physical description (vysokii, krasnyi, ostyi, temnyi, chisty, vasnyi), and of the simplest moral judgments, expressing approval (dobryi, lyubimyi, milyi) and disapproval (zloi, lyuty); and group [2] of the basic materials of existence (dubovyi, zolotoi, shelkovyi).

The meaning of the epithet in Russian folk ballads is, for the most part, unambiguous. The words are generally monosemantic and have almost no emotional overtones. They derive their effect from their clarity and from the immediacy of their impact. The usual function of each epithet with regard to its substantive is the expression of the typical, constant, or ideal trait of that substantive. No new meaning is added by the epithet, nor is the meaning of the substantive limited or individualized in any way.

The folk ballads contain none of the so-called emotional or psychological epithets, characteristic of nineteenth-century poetry, neither those which describe events (strashnyi, uzhasnyi, tainstvennyi), nor those which describe characters and settings (blednyi, zadumchivyi, mrachnyi, odinokii, pechal'nyi, pustynnyi, smutnyi, tikhii, unylyi). This analysis reveals no great variety or complexity in the epithets of Russian folk ballads. On the contrary, the range and usage of the epithet is very limited indeed. These conclusions demonstrate that the epithet in folk ballads is much closer to the epithet in the byliny than to that in the laments.

The epithet as a stylistic device in literary ballads has attracted the attention of scholars in various European literatures,¹ particularly those in English literature. Friedman, in his study of the English ballad revival, includes a brief section on the general aesthetics of folk ballads as opposed to those of literary ballads.² He maintains that while late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century poets took their initial inspiration from the traditional genre, they soon found the techniques of folk literature inapplicable in their own poetry. They adopted the verbal simplicity and economy of means of folk ballads, and even introduced certain folk idioms. But in general the language of folk ballads was thought to be too simple, allowing no room for physical and psychological description, for motivation and moralization, and most of all, allowing no room for individual style. While the anonymous authors of folk ballads tried to generalize about the nature of experience, poets since the Renaissance have sought unique, striking, original figures of speech to express their own individuality. Thus, Friedman concludes, the folk ballads tend to ignore or de-emphasize precisely those elements which sophisticated poets savour most and develop into their own stylistic systems.

An example of this opposition in aesthetic principles is provided by Kroeber's comparison between an English folk ballad and a literary imitation of it.³ In 1709 Matthew Prior published what is probably the first English literary ballad, Henry and Emma,

1. See Robertson, L'Épithète and C. Zgorzelski, Duma, poprzedniczka ballady (Toruń, 1949), 228-36.

2. The Ballad Revival, 292-326.

3. Kroeber, Romantic Narrative Art, 13-15.

a Poem, Upon the Model of The Nut-browne Maid.¹ The most significant stylistic difference between the original and the imitation is that Prior's version is full of emotional epithets (weary, tedious, happy, dejected, wounded), whereas the vocabulary of the original is simple, limited, and stylized. Prior tends to present objects and ideas in terms of the emotions which they evoke in him.

Kroeber infers two reasons for such a striking stylistic contrast between the two works: firstly, that Prior conceives of the story in terms of specific characters, and therefore employs epithets to particularize the narrative; and secondly, that since the author was in possession of a rich vocabulary, complete with metaphor, ambiguity, and complexity, it was only natural for him to relate the simple story in his own language. Kroeber does not state the most important conclusion: that it was only through such epithets that Prior could express his own, individual interpretation of the material in his own, individual style. Henry and Emma is Matthew Prior's "translation" of The Nut-browne Maid, and the poet's personality is communicated primarily through his language.

A brief historical survey of the epithet in English literary ballads is included by Josephine Miles in Eras and Modes in English Poetry.² She begins with a discussion of Percy's alterations in the language of his Reliques, which tended to make emotions more

1. See above, Chapter I, p.13.

2. J. Miles, Eras and Modes in English Poetry (Berkeley and Los Angeles, Cal., 1957), 100-23. See also her Renaissance, Eighteenth-Century, and Modern Language in English Poetry: A Tabular View (Berkeley and Los Angeles, Cal., 1960) which lists adj./n./v. frequency (per 10 lines) and major adjectives (10 times or more per 1000 lines) for: Young, Thompson, Gray, Goldsmith, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Campbell, and others.

explicit by the introduction of epithets, such as bold, doughty, gentle and proud. Both Percy's selection and his method of editing became a guide for future ballad imitators, each of whom modified the original method and materials to suit his poetic practice. Thomas Chatterton, for example, preserves the basic ballad vocabulary, but introduces epithets such as high and noble as authorial evaluation. On the other hand, Walter Scott places much greater emphasis on observed colours and objects, and much less on emotional and moral judgments. In general, the use of the traditional epithets of folk poetry declined; Wordsworth and Coleridge's Lyrical Ballads (1798) represent an entirely new development in the history of the English literary ballad.

The results of a sample of 1000 lines from English literary ballads by Scott and Southey are included in Appendix B. The most frequent epithets in each of the groups [1a], [1b], and [2] are listed along with the substantives most frequently modified by them. Miles's list of epithets which are used ten times or more per 1000 lines of traditional English folk ballads is included for comparison.¹

The survey demonstrates how little the epithets of English folk ballads and literary ballads coincide. The only folk epithets which make a significant showing in the literary ballads are fair and young. The traditional folk epithets (bonny, dear, good, handsome) have been replaced by literary epithets with their various emotional connotations (bright, cold, dark, holy, pale).

For comparison with this survey of English folk epithets, the results of a sample of 1000 lines from German literary ballads

1. A Tabular View, see chart "Major Adjectives".

by Bürger, Goethe, Schiller, and Uhland are also included in Appendix B. The most frequent epithets in each of the groups [1a], [1b], and [2] are listed along with the substantives most frequently modified by them. A list of epithets which are used four times or more in a 350 line sample of traditional German folk ballads is included for comparison.

This survey indicates a greater coincidence of epithets in German folk ballads and literary ballads. All but one of the most frequent epithets in the folk ballads are employed in the literary ballads. But the literary ballads also show frequent use of literary epithets with their emotional connotations (furchtbar, kühn, still, teuer, tief).

Friedman's general conclusion regarding the opposition of aesthetic principles in folk ballads and literary ballads has been substantiated by this brief survey of epithets in English and German ballads. Epithets in folk ballads differ fundamentally from those in literary ballads in their range, frequency, and meaning. The concrete, unambiguous epithets of the traditional ballads are replaced in the literary imitations by emotional, connotative epithets which afford sophisticated poets the possibility of interpreting the events and of expressing their individuality through their style.

* * *

The epithet in eighteenth-century Russian poetry has attracted considerable attention from Russian scholars. Although some valuable insights have emerged, their conclusions tend to be based on the analysis of a limited number of epithets, and closer

investigation reveals that many of their generalizations are unfounded.

The earliest texts studied are the Petrine love songs, analyzed by Gukovsky. Derived largely from Polish and Ukrainian sources, these songs contain a mixture of various styles and linguistic elements. Folk epithets such as belyi golubchik, yasnyi sokol, syryi bor, and burnoe more are combined with literary epithets such as zhestokaya rana, zlaya fortuna, nechayannyi ogon', ostraya strela, and prekrasnyi tsvet.¹ This mixture of styles was resolved by the middle of the eighteenth century with the establishment of Russian classicism in general, and with Lomonosov's stylistic reforms in particular.

Lomonosov's language, including his epithets, was studied by Gukovsky² and I.Z. Serman.³ Gukovsky argues that Lomonosov is the last great European Renaissance figure, and that this fact is reflected in his attitude towards the "word". According to Gukovsky, Lomonosov transforms his words into abstractions, invents strong metaphors, and employs "bold" epithets which destroy the logical connection between epithet and substantive. The organizing principle of Lomonosov's language is seen as adornment (ukrashenie), and the desired effect is defined as a feeling of grandeur and majesty. While Gukovsky tends to generalize on little evidence, Serman reaches similar conclusions through an analysis of two epithets (sladkii and zlatoi) as they develop from concrete, descriptive epithets to emotional metaphoric epithets: from sladkii sok

1. Russkaya literatura, 33-37.

2. Ibid., 107-16; and Russkaya poeziya XVIII veka (L., 1927), 14-19.

3. I.Z. Serman, Literaturnoe tvorchestvo M.V. Lomonosova (M.-L., 1962), 101-32.

to sladkii vek, and from zlataya dennitsa to zlataya vesna.¹

Serman concludes that this one aspect of Lomonosov's style became the main stylistic principle during the early nineteenth century, and that it is particularly evident in Batyushkov's poetry.²

An original analysis of a sample of 150 epithets drawn from genres representative of Lomonosov's poetry yields results which contradict the conclusions of Gukovsky and Serman.³ Both scholars tend to exaggerate the importance of Lomonosov's epithets in general, and that of his "emotional-metaphoric" epithets in particular. In accordance with Lomonosov's own theory of poetic tropes cited above, the epithet plays a secondary role in his stylistic system. Gukovsky's frequently quoted abstract epithets (velikolepnyi, velikodushnyi, nesravnennyi, radostnyi, sladkostrunnyi) are very rarely used. The majority of the 150 epithets are neither "bold" nor are they used particularly "boldly". Serman's two selected epithets (sladkii and zlatoi) were employed in their figurative sense before Lomonosov, both by Kantemir in his satires (1730s), and by Trediakovsky in his translation of P. Tallement's Voyage

1. Ibid., 125-29.

2. See Serman, "Poeziya K.N. Batyushkova", Uchenye zapiski LGU, III (1939), 229-83.

3. The following is a list of the most frequent epithets with sample substantives:

великий	светило, творец
вечный	высота, права
небесный	дверь, очи
прекрасный	лик, весна
приятный	струны, зефиры
сильный	лев, царица
сладкий	плод, слова
счастливый	жизнь, путь
чистый	голос, луч

à l'île d'Amour (1730).¹ By the late eighteenth century Lomonosov's usages had become standard literary clichés, and were canonized by quotation as examples in the Academy of Sciences Dictionary (1789-94). In general, these epithets operate on one of two levels only, either literal or figurative. There is no question of ambiguity or polysemanticism. If the desired effect is emotional, it is the result of the cumulative force of several metaphoric epithets taken together, and produces either majesty and grandeur, or clumsiness and bombast.

Sumarokov's use of the epithet has often been contrasted with Lomonosov's. During the 1750s Sumarokov conducted a lengthy polemic with Lomonosov, objecting to some of his metaphoric epithets such as plamennye zvuki or prokhladnye teni, and composed the Vzdornye ody, general parodies of Lomonosov's verse. Gukovsky maintains that for Sumarokov, the "word" represents a scientific term, possessing precise, concrete meaning, and is connected with only one specific concept.² According to Gukovsky, there is little widening or transformation of the original meaning of words; the use of tropes is kept to a minimum, and if they are used, both members of poetic comparisons are closely related.

An original analysis of a sample of 100 epithets drawn from

1. B.O. Unbegaun suggests that the abstract meaning of the epithet sladkii originates in Church Slavonic. See "Le russe littéraire est-il d'origine russe?" in Selected Papers on Russian and Slavonic Philology (Oxford, 1969), 308.

2. Russkaya poeziya, 19-32; and Russkaya literatura, 142-44, 165-69.

Sumarokov's poetry shows the contrast with Lomonosov's language.¹ The difference in range between the two authors' epithets is partly the result of Sumarokov's constant development of one theme, that of happy or unhappy love, common to all men. But both Lomonosov and Sumarokov use epithets in the same way: unambiguously and monosemantically. Gukovsky's description of Sumarokov is more accurate than his analysis of Lomonosov; however, he overlooks Sumarokov's abstract epithets, which were said to be characteristic of Lomonosov's style (blagopoluchnyi, blagoslovennyi, velikii, radostnyi). Serman, in his study of Lomonosov, also overlooks the fact that Sumarokov employs the epithets zlatoi and sladkii in precisely the same metaphoric way as does Lomonosov (zlatoi vek, zlatye dni, sladkaya zhizn', sladkaya nadezhda).

Gukovsky also studied the poetry of M.N. Murav'ev² and his conclusions have since been supported by L.I. Kulakova.³ Their interpretation is based, to a large extent, on the revaluation of Murav'ev's work by Karamzin, Batiushkov, and Zhukovsky in the early

-
1. The following is a list of the most frequent epithets with sample substantives:

драгой	дни, жизнь
злой	жизнь, печали, рок
лютый	болезнь, судьбина
нежный	любовь, глас
печальный	сердце, мысль
прекрасный	нимфы, весна
приятный	взор, жизнь
сладкий	дни, век, песни

2. "U istokov russkogo sentimentalizma", in Ocherki po istorii russkoi literatury i obshchestvennoi mysli XVIII veka (L., 1938), 252-98.
3. M.N. Murav'ev. Stikhotvoreniya, 5-49.

nineteenth century.¹ Gukovsky maintains that the new subjective world-view and new aesthetic principles of nineteenth-century poetry have their origin in Murav'ev's work. His poetic vocabulary was gradually narrowed to words of a particular emotional nature - what Gukovsky calls sladostnaya leksika. These words were employed exclusively for their emotional, evocative value, to allude to the inner, spiritual condition of the poet himself. Gukovsky places the epithet at the centre of this new style; it was no longer used to describe external objects and phenomena, but rather to characterize the relationship between the subject and these objects.

An original analysis of a sample of 100 epithets drawn from genres representative of Murav'ev's poetry demonstrates the continued importance of eighteenth-century usage in his style (nebesnyi, nezhnyi, sladkii).² Many of the most typical epithets used by Lomonosov and Sumarokov, such as vechnyi, pyshnyi, zloi, lyutyi, and lyubeznyi, are among those most frequently employed by Murav'ev. There is, however, a significant increase in the use of what were to become the most popular epithets in early nineteenth-century poetry (tainyi, temnyi, and especially tikhii), and the introduction of the epithets polunochnyi and svyashchennyi in the

1. See above, Chapter II, pp.37-38.

2. The following is a list of the most frequent epithets with sample substantives:

ВЫСОКИЙ	трон
НЕБЕСНЫЙ	свод, красота, певец
НЕЖНЫЙ	весна, мечты
ПОЛНОЧНЫЙ	час, берега
СВЯЩЕННЫЙ	волна, лес
СЛАДКИЙ	покой, глас
ТАЙНЫЙ	стезя, сени
ТЕМНЫЙ	ночь, прохлада
ТИХИЙ	трепет, пространство, светлость

description of settings. Emotional epithets such as spokoinyi and utomlennyi also begin to appear in Murav'ev's lyrics.¹

Thus while it is true that Murav'ev introduces elements of what might be called the "new subjective aesthetics", Gukovsky and Kulakova overstate their case. Murav'ev must be seen as a transitional figure, whose poetry dramatically demonstrates the contrast between the norms of conventional eighteenth-century usage, and the new aesthetic principles beginning to influence Russian literature.

Gukovsky also studied Derzhavin's language and concludes that he was "more a realist, than a romantic", since his words describe external objects and facts, rather than his own subjective experience.² More recently Derzhavin's epithets were classified by N.B. Rusanova.³ She divides the epithets into two groups: (1) those which describe man's sensory perception of the external world (visual, aural, tactile, and so on); and (2) those which describe his intellectual perception of the external world (epithets of the first group used figuratively). Rusanova draws no conclusions about the significance of Derzhavin's use of the epithet in the development of Russian style.

Finally, Karamzin's language has been compared to Derzhavin's. Gukovsky maintains that Karamzin's epithets, unlike Derzhavin's, are used to characterize the subjective relationship between the poet and external phenomena.⁴ L.V. Gerasimova classifies Karamzin's

1. See above, Chapter II, pp.37-40 on the language of Murav'ev's ballads.

2. "Vokrug Radishcheva", in Ocherki, 200-17.

3. N.B. Rusanova, "Epitety Derzhavina", in XVIII vek, VIII(L., 1969), 92-102.

4. IRL, V, 55-105.

sensory and psychological epithets, sentimental clichés, allegorical and folkloric expressions, and concludes with a comparison of the epithets in Karamzin's poetry with those in his prose.¹

From its relatively insignificant role in the classical styles of Lomonosov and Sumarokov, the epithet increased in importance in Russian poetry of the late eighteenth century. Murav'ev's language reflects the transition from objectivity and clarity to the new subjective aesthetics. Derzhavin's lingering classicism, or what Gukovsky calls his "proto-realism", represents a deviation from the mainstream of stylistic development. Progress towards total subjectivity, continued by Karamzin, reaches its culmination in the poetry of V.A. Zhukovsky.

* * *

Among the first scholarly studies of Zhukovsky's epithets was an introductory article by M.I. Sukhomlinov to the fifth edition of the poet's collected works (1849).² He lists Zhukovsky's "favourite images", and provides quotations from the lyrics as illustrations. The examples include a limited number of Zhukovsky's most frequent epithets: sladkii, sladostnyi, milyi, yunyi, unylyi, and tikhii. In 1893 V. Istomin published a "mechanical" analysis of Zhukovsky's language in which he refers to the "constant use of epithets which convey living characteristics to objects".³ He cites several examples, including boi varyi, sladkopamyatnyi zavet,

1. L.V. Gerasimova, "Epitety v proizvedeniyakh Karamzina", in XVIII vek, VIII, 290-8. See above, Chapter II, pp.40-46 on the language of Karamzin's ballads.

2. M.I. Sukhomlinov, "Yazyk i slog Zhukovskogo", Stikhotvoreniya (SPb., 1849).

3. V. Istomin, "Glavneishie osobennosti yazyka i sloga proizvedenii V.A. Zhukovskogo (1783-1852)", Russkii filologicheskii vestnik, III (1893), 1-48.

gromozvuchnoe urá, and grustnaya mrachnost'. The first volume of L.A. Bulakhovsky's study of the Russian literary language contains lists of Zhukovsky's epithets in his elegies, ballads, povesti, and other genres.¹ None of these three studies contains any discussion or stylistic analysis of the epithets.

The most important contribution to the study of Zhukovsky's epithets was made by Gukovsky in the first chapter of his projected history of Russian realism.² He argues that art, in Zhukovsky's world-view, was intended to express the internal life of consciousness, the "inexpressible spiritual emotions", and not the objective world of nature. Gukovsky analyzes the lyric Nevyrazimoe (1819) as a statement of Zhukovsky's artistic credo, and the elegy Večer (1806), as an earlier example of his poetic practice, in order to demonstrate how the "word" was losing its generally accepted terminological meaning. Gukovsky draws an analogy with music: the words must sound like music, producing emotional overtones and a haze of associations. The poet produces a musical-verbal stream with words as notes, but the melody swallows up the sense delimitations of the individual words, and they have meaning only in the unified stream. Meaning, according to Gukovsky, is located not in dictionary definitions, but in the soul of the reader; not in the words, but between the words, in the consciousness which perceives the poem and joins the words into the verbal melody. The result is that all the words are made subjective; thus, the whole objective world is made subjective.

1. L.A. Bulakhovsky, Russkii literaturnyi yazyk pervoi poloviny XIX veka (Kiev, 1941).

2. Pushkin i russkie romantiki, 13-173.

Within this general aesthetic framework, Gukovsky points to the abundance of epithets and to their predominance in Zhukovsky's poetry, and he considers the epithet as the key to the poet's subjective method. He defines the use of the epithet as "lyrical" - it adorns and evaluates, rather than describes or defines. These epithets lose their attachment to specific substantives, become independent, and introduce the element of what Gukovsky calls bespredmetnost' into the language.

Gukovsky analyzes specific epithets in several of Zhukovsky's lyrics. One of his examples will suffice: tikhoe nebo in Nevyrazimoe (1819).¹ This expression is said to be typical of Zhukovsky's epithets in as much as the "object-defining" meaning of the adjective is lost; the phrase is not a metaphor, since no comparison is implied. However, Gukovsky notes that since this epithet can also be applied to a human being (tikhii chelovek), Zhukovsky's tikhii, although apparently describing an external object (nebo), in fact refers to the subject, the poet who perceives the sky.

Several serious problems arise from Gukovsky's analysis. The main one is related to his general approach to Zhukovsky's world-view. The poet believed, according to Gukovsky, that the objective world was merely ephemeral, and that logic and reason could only produce falsehood. Thus, a critic's logical approach to that world-view would distort its meaning. And since style is defined by Gukovsky as the aesthetic aspect of the poet's world-view, one must conclude that a logical approach to the poet's style would also distort its meaning.

1. Ibid., 50.

Gukovsky's approach is not logical; rather, it is emotional and impressionistic. He provides more vague generalizations than actual analysis; he examines only three lyrics in detail, and asserts that his conclusions are valid for most of Zhukovsky's lyrical poetry and all of his ballads; his examples refer to six epithets only (zlatoi, legkii, sladkii, temnyi, tikhii, yasnyi); yet he maintains that his findings can be applied to numerous others. Furthermore, Gukovsky's method suffers from two additional biases. Firstly, he was a literary critic, not a linguist; therefore, his conclusions overlook basic semantic factors. Secondly, he seems to be influenced by the Russian symbolists' mystical concept of the "word", as for example in his analysis of Nevyrazimoe; and he seems to be prejudiced by the symbolists' revaluation of Zhukovsky's role in Russian literature.¹

In 1951 Gukovsky's theory was challenged by a linguist, V.P. Petushkov, who defended a thesis on the adjective in Zhukovsky's poetry.² He studied the lyrics from 1802-1821, and discovered that adjectives constitute 12.5% of the autonomous or "auto-semantic" (znamenitel'nye) words. Of the 981 total uses of adjectives in the sample, Petushkov found that 52% of the examples are limited to only 81 epithets; that of this same 52%, approximately half the examples are limited to only 21 epithets. In other words,

1. Blok in his Autobiography (1915) refers to Zhukovsky as the first source of his poetic inspiration, and in an Autobiographical Questionnaire lists Zhukovsky with Fet and Solov'ev as the greatest influences on his work. Zhirmunsky argues that the roots of Russian symbolism were located in Russian romantic lyrics, especially those of Zhukovsky. See Valerii Bryusov i nasledie Pushkina (P., 1922).

2. V.P. Petushkov, "Imena prilagatel'nye v poezii V.A. Zhukovskogo (Opyt stilisticheskogo analiza)", Unpublished Candidate's Thesis (LGPI, L., 1951).

approximately one quarter of the total uses of Zhukovsky's epithets is limited to 21 words.¹

Petushkov rejects Gukovsky's conclusion that it was Zhukovsky who introduced polysemanticism into Russian literature. He surveys Old Russian epithets and eighteenth-century poetic usage, and concludes that Zhukovsky's epithets are employed in the same basic manner, only more subjectively. Thus what Zhukovsky introduced in his poetry was not so much the "expansion of the significance of the word" (rasshirenie mnogoznachnosti slova or Bedeutungsweiterung), but the "hypertrophied voluminosity of the significance of the word" (gipertrofirovannaya ob'emnost' mnogoznachnosti slova) - in other words, the "slurring of the semantic definiteness" or the "deprivation of the concrete weightiness" of the word.² The result of all this, according to Petushkov, is that Zhukovsky's poetry became vague, subjective, mystical, and "symbolic".

Petushkov then analyzes specific epithets. One of them, tikhii, was used by Zhukovsky 118 times in full form and 12 times in short form in lyrics of the period 1802-21. Petushkov found that Zhukovsky uses the epithet only in its "ordinary" meanings (literal and figurative), namely those listed in the Academy of Sciences Dictionary (1789-94). Furthermore, he noted that approximately half the uses of the word are in religious contexts. For example, Petushkov interprets the same tikhoe nebo from Nevyrazimoe either

1. The following epithets were used more than 100 times each in the sample: milyi, prekrasnyi, svatoi, tikhii; the following epithets were used more than 50 times each in the sample: bozhii, vernii, veselei, groznyi, zemnoi, mladoi, nebesnyi, poslednii, svetlyi, svyashchennyi, sladkii, strashnyi, tainyi, uzhasnyi, unylui, chistyi, vasnyi.

2. "Imena prilagatel'nye", 158-59.

as a metaphor ("the sky as a quiet harbour") or as an indication of the poet's subjective emotions.¹

Petushkov also investigates those expressions in which one epithet could be replaced by another, without any change in the semantic value of the expression: tikhii blesk, mirnyi blesk, svezhii blesk, priyatnyi blesk. He concludes that such easy substitutions prove that each epithet hardly retained any specific meaning; therefore, polysemanticism, or the simultaneous existence of multiple meanings, would not be possible under these circumstances. Petushkov's thesis is that Zhukovsky employed words as conventional, approximate symbols which could represent the inexpressible, mysterious essence of external phenomena.

While Gukovsky's analysis is limited because he was too much the literary critic, Petushkov's suffers even more because he was too much the linguist. The emphasis is on the language alone, and not on the relationship between the words and the total effect of a phrase, line, or poem. In fact not even the immediate context of the epithet is considered. Petushkov's case for the existence of polysemanticism in Old Russian and in eighteenth-century poetry is insubstantial. The examples given are few, and his comments on specific epithets concern three examples only: tikhii, mirnyi, and prekrasnyi. Finally, Petushkov adopts a very narrow definition of polysemanticism as the acquisition by a word of specific new meanings; Gukovsky, on the other hand, had implied only vague emotional overtones and a haze of associations, and never really defined polysemanticism in a precise way. For the purposes of his

1. Cf. Gukovsky's conclusion about the same example, cited above.

argument, Petushkov assumed that Gukovsky was using polysemanticism in its narrow sense; he then examined the material linguistically and failed to discover any polysemanticism. Nevertheless, his conclusions are remarkably close to those reached by Gukovsky.

A comprehensive analysis of the sources and meanings of Zhukovsky's epithets is included in Appendix C.¹ In this analysis, epithets in Zhukovsky's ballads are compared with epithets in traditional Russian folk ballads, in Western European literary ballads, in eighteenth-century Russian poetry, and in pre-Zhukovsky Russian literary ballads in order to determine the originality of Zhukovsky's epithets and to define his contribution to the development of Russian poetic style.

Forty of the most frequent and characteristic epithets have been selected and divided into the three groups of the Isachenko classification: [1a] qualitative absolute (9 epithets); [1b] qualitative relative (28 epithets); and [2] relative (4 epithets). For the epithets in groups [1a] and [2] examples are selected from the ballads in order to represent the different ways in which these epithets are employed. Typically, each of these epithets crosses the boundary from [1a] qualitative absolute or [2] relative to [1b] qualitative relative epithets. The charts also provide selected examples of these epithets as used in traditional Russian folk ballads and in pre-Zhukovsky literary ballads, as well as equivalent epithets from English and German literary ballads. When required, each epithet is followed by comments on Zhukovsky's usage.

1. See also Appendixes D and E on the epithet in Zhukovsky's ballad manuscripts, and on Zhukovsky's editions of Murav'ev and Kamenev.

The epithets in the largest and most important [1b] group are presented in greater detail. Examples for each of these epithets are listed in full from all of Zhukovsky's forty literary ballads and are subdivided into their various meanings on the basis of context. The charts provide the following material for comparison: (1) the definition of each epithet from the Academy of Sciences Dictionary (1789-94); (2) selected examples of eighteenth-century Russian usage from the Academy of Sciences Dictionary of Eighteenth-Century Russian (in preparation), supplemented by further examples from an original survey; these examples are arranged by thirds of the eighteenth century; and (3) selected examples from traditional Russian folk ballads, pre-Zhukovsky Russian literary ballads, and equivalent epithets from German and English literary ballads. Each epithet is followed by comments on its frequency, source, and usage in Zhukovsky's ballads.¹

* * *

Russian scholars tend to view the literary ballad as the culmination of the movement towards narodnost' which began in Russian literature in the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century. They emphasize the influence of folklore on Zhukovsky's ballads, in particular, that of folk language on his literary language. But a comparison of the epithet in folk ballads and in Zhukovsky's ballads results in very different conclusions.

Firstly, it is true that many of the most frequent epithets in folk ballads are also the most frequent epithets in Zhukovsky's ballads. In the [1a] group, of the four most frequent epithets in folk ballads (belyi, zelenyi, rodnoi, chernyi), three occur

1. A Supplementary List of 1b] epithets is also included in Appendix C, pp.328-29.

frequently in Zhukovsky's ballads (belyi, rodnoi, chernyi). In the [1b] group, of the eight most frequent epithets in folk ballads (vysokii, dobryi, krasnyi, lyutyi, temnyi, chisty, shirokii, yasnyi), five occur frequently in Zhukovsky's ballads (vysokii, temnyi, chisty, shirokii, yasnyi). In the [2] group, of the four most frequent epithets in folk ballads (bozhii, dubovyi, zolotoi, shelkovyi), two occur frequently in Zhukovsky's ballads (bozhii, zolotoi).

However, this correspondence of epithets in folk ballads and in Zhukovsky's ballads is not a basis on which to assume the influence of folk language on Zhukovsky's literary language. Folk ballads employ the basic descriptive concepts of language: colours (1a), simple physical description and moral judgments (1b), and materials (2).¹ These concepts are an essential component in the language of any genre of folk or sophisticated literature. Therefore, a correspondence of epithets is only natural, and does not constitute evidence of influence.

Secondly, it is true that many fixed and so-called "relatively fixed" epithets in folk ballads are also used in Zhukovsky's ballads. In the [1a] group the following fixed epithets are common to folk ballads and Zhukovsky's ballads: belyi + lebed', plat, golubchik; glukhaya polnoch'; chuzhaya strana; chernyi voron. In the [1b] group the following fixed epithets are common to folk ballads and Zhukovsky's ballads: vernyi sluga; veselyi pir; goryuchie slezy; grozny + son, tuchi; dal'nyaya storona (Zhukovsky: strana); dobryi kon'; dremuchii les; krasnaya deva (Zhukovsky: devitsa); nezhnye ruki; svyaty moshchi; strashnyi son; temnyi + les,

1. See above, pp.135-36.

noch'; chistoe pole; shirokii + dvor, doroga; yaryi vosk.¹ In the [2] group the following fixed epithets are common to folk ballads and Zhukovsky's ballads: zolotoi + venets, krest, persten', uzda; nebesnyi tsar'.

But even this correspondence of fixed epithets in folk ballads and in Zhukovsky's ballads fails to support the view that folk language influenced Zhukovsky's literary language. Newly available evidence on the Russian literary language of the eighteenth century indicates that almost without exception all of the folk epithets which occur in Zhukovsky's ballads were in common use during the eighteenth century.² By the end of the century and in the early nineteenth century their use represents only a superficial attempt at folk coloration and results in conventional stylization, bearing little resemblance to the language of genuine folk poetry.³

Thus there is no evidence to suggest any substantive relationship between the epithet in folk ballads and in Zhukovsky's literary ballads. In fact, the epithets can only legitimately be compared in terms of their coincidental function: as in folk ballads, Zhukovsky's epithets tend to add no new meaning to the expression. They simply identify the typical, constant trait of the qualified substantive.

Whereas Russian criticism overemphasizes the influence of folklore, it minimizes the influence of Western European literature on the language of Zhukovsky's ballads. A comparison of the texts

1. Cf. gor'kii + uchast', dolya and zvonkie gusli in folk ballads, with gor'kii + sud'bina, zhrebi and zvonkie struny in Zhukovsky's ballads.

2. Academy of Sciences Dictionary of Eighteenth-Century Russian (in preparation).

3. See above, Chapter II, pp.54-55.

of the ballads with their original sources demonstrates that approximately 20-25% of Zhukovsky's epithets were "translated" from his foreign sources.¹ Of this percentage, approximately half the epithets were translated from English, and half from German. The remaining 75-80% of Zhukovsky's epithets were supplied by him when no epithet was present in the source.

In both the English and the German ballads which served as Zhukovsky's models, the range of synonymous epithets is much greater than that in Zhukovsky's ballads.² With fewer synonyms available, Zhukovsky found it necessary to repeat the same epithets much more frequently than did the authors of the foreign sources.³

The use of English and German epithets differs considerably from that of Zhukovsky's epithets. In English ballads epithets tend to be more concrete and are rarely applied to abstract concepts or to psychological-emotional substantives. For example, the epithet bright is applied to eyes, arms, lady, silver (cf. Zhukovsky's svetlyi + sumrak, chas, zhizn'); dark is applied to night, eyes, brow, waters (cf. Zhukovsky's temnyi + glubina, mogila, chuvstvo); and pale is applied to face, cheek, brow, light, hue (cf. Zhukovsky's blednyi + tolpa, plamen', post). The epithet in English literary ballads remains closer to that in the traditional folk ballads which served as direct models for imitation by English poets. Their use of the epithet in the literary ballad had little

1. This figure excludes Svetlana, Eolova arfa, Akhill, Gromoboi and Vadin which have no immediate sources. It includes, however, those epithets which replaced, rather than translated, epithets in the original source: e.g. wild (Ger.), weit, longue are replaced by gustoi; little, holy, halb sichtbarlich by svetlyi.

2. See Appendix C, p.344.

3. See Appendix C, p.343.

influence on Zhukovsky's lexis.

In German literary ballads of the late eighteenth century epithets became less concrete and were applied to abstract concepts and more often to psychological-emotional substantives. For example, the epithet dunkel is applied to Knäuel, Gefühl, Hain (cf. Zhukovsky's temnyi); still is applied to Hochzeitbettchen, Weiner, Antlitz, Hoffnung (cf. Zhukovsky's tikhii + zhelan'e, siyan'e, radost'); and süss is applied to Mund, Klang, Lieder, Freundin (cf. Zhukovsky's sladkii + smyaten'e, pesny, zvuki). Although German poets had actual models of traditional folk ballads for imitation, their more abstract psychological epithets differ significantly from those in the traditional ballads. However, the epithet in the German literary ballads remains "objective", that is, it continues to relate to the object or the abstract concept, and does not become "subjective", relating only to the consciousness which perceives the phenomena. The language of the German literary ballads exerted a considerable influence on Zhukovsky's lexis. The crucial difference lies in the total subjectivity of Zhukovsky's epithets. After the Russian poet's visit to Weimar in September 1827, Goethe recognized this fact in his judgment:

Auch Schukoffsky hätte weit mehr aufs
Objekt hingewiesen werden müssen.¹

In comparison with the epithet in Western European literary ballads, Zhukovsky's epithets are more frequent; they have their primary source in the poet's own imagination; they have fewer synonyms, and therefore are repeated more often; and finally, in their total subjectivity they differ substantially in meaning from

1. Neumann, Geschichte, 71.

the German and English sources.

In Russian literature of the eighteenth century epithets began to acquire figurative meanings and were more often applied to abstract substantives than ever before. The grammatical and logical connection between epithet and object was still maintained. Such figurative usage was especially developed by Lomonosov, and many examples in the Academy of Sciences Dictionary (1789-94) are borrowed from his poetry. The following are the most common figurative epithets and substantives in eighteenth-century poetry: vysokii + dukh, mysli; glubokii + vechnost'; nezhnyi + lyubov', krasota; sladkii + vostorg, vremya; temnyi + ponyatie, zavist'; tikhii + zefiry, serdtse; tyazhkii + neschast'e; chisty + serdtse, sovest'.

During the later part of the eighteenth century certain epithets, such as dikii, nezhnyi, sladkii and uzhasnyi, came to be used in poetry much more frequently. Other epithets acquired distinct emotional overtones which can be characterized: for example, blednyi + fear, death; mrachnyi + gloom; and temnyi + mystery, death. But far more epithets, particularly during the last third of the century, acquired vague emotional overtones and were applied to a wider range of substantives, including abstract and emotional concepts. The most common of these epithets were: glubokii + melankholiya; zadumchivyi + luna; milyi + taina, mechta; nezhnyi + persons; pechal'nyi + luna, lira, unynie, dusha; sladkii + volnen'e, zadumchivost'; tikhii + tuman, dolina, chuvstvo, dusha; and chisty + dusha, chuvstva.

In all these expressions the logical connection between epithet and object was beginning to dissolve. Poets were becoming

more concerned with the overall, general impression of their phrases and lines, and less interested in the meaning of their individual words. Epithets and their substantives were employed primarily to create mood or atmosphere, and to produce an emotional effect on the reader's consciousness. These late eighteenth-century developments are most clearly reflected in early Russian literary ballads, particularly those by Murav'ev and Karamzin.

Zhukovsky's poetic practice undoubtedly emerges out of the poetic practice of the eighteenth century; moreover, his language was very much influenced by the Russian classical tradition. In his ballads Zhukovsky uses certain epithets in a specifically eighteenth-century manner, such as gor'kii, prekrasnyi, prelestnyi, priyatnyi, bozhii, zemnoi, nebesnyi, plamennyi, rokovoi, and tsarskii. However, the changes in the use of epithets in the late eighteenth century also influenced Zhukovsky's poetry. In his ballads such epithets as bednyi, bezmolvnyi, bezmyatezhnyi, bezotvetnyi, nevinnyi, nevozvratnyi, neizbezhnyi, and tomnyi came to be used frequently. But in spite of Zhukovsky's heavy debt to the language of the eighteenth century, the epithets in his literary ballads in their frequency, meaning, and application represent a new development in the history of Russian poetic style.

Zhukovsky uses the epithets of the [1a] qualitative absolute and [2] relative groups in the conventional eighteenth-century manner. However, each of the epithets selected from the sample crosses the boundary from [1a] or [2] to the larger [1b] qualitative relative group. In other words, each epithet becomes a means for the poet to interpret or evaluate the phenomena he is ostensibly describing. For example, in the [1a] group belyi acquires overtones of sanctity and occurs in religious contexts

(belaya odezhda); chernyi acquires overtones of mystery and foreboding, and is used in the description of ballad settings (chernaya puchina); rodnoi comes to indicate spiritual similarity (rodnaya dusha) and emotional patriotic feeling (rodnaya strana, zemlya); and chuzhoi, as the opposite of rodnoi, betokens spiritual dissimilarity and alienation (chuzhoi breg). As for the [2] group, grobovoi acquires overtones of mystery and melancholy (grobovoi golos); zlatoi connotes beauty and spirituality (zlataya yunost'); and pustynnyi acquires overtones of vagueness and desolation (pustynnoe otdalenie).

The group of qualitative relative epithets [1b] is by far the largest and most important; it is in the application of these epithets that Zhukovsky is at his most original. The epithets in the [1b] group are employed not so much to describe or characterize objects or concepts, but rather to convey the poet's subjective impressions about these objects and concepts. In fact, Zhukovsky's epithets come to refer almost exclusively to the poet's consciousness which perceives the phenomena, and are used to evoke imaginary associations in the reader's consciousness which would enable him to share the poet's own experience. For example, the epithets veselyi, zadumchivyi, pechal'nyi, and unylyi are used to refer to their respective emotions: a) as experienced by objective characters (veselaya Lyudmila, zadumchivyi rybak, pechal'nyi Milon, unylyi pevets); b) as expressed in these characters' appearance or words (veselaya pesnya, zadumchivye ochi, pechal'noe litso, unylyi golos); and c) as evoked in the poet's consciousness by external phenomena (veselaya priroda, zadumchivyi zvon, pechal'nyi sumrak, unylyi les).

Gukovsky wrote in reference to the epithet sladkii:

... in Zhukovsky's system this epithet, in being transferred from the object to the subject, ... acquired the possibility of linkage with any object or action....¹

The implications of this statement must be explored. As the subjectivity of Zhukovsky's epithets increases, the logical, conventional connection between epithet and substantive is destroyed. Epithets can be connected with almost any object or concept. In other words, as a result of this greater applicability, the meaning of each epithet becomes more indeterminate. As the meaning becomes more indeterminate, so the applicability of the epithet continues to increase.

The applicability of strashnyi and uzhasnyi, for example, increases to include sights, sounds, persons, places, time, events, emotions, and so on; consequently the terminological meaning of each epithet becomes more indeterminate (strashnyi + sumrak, khor, utes, mg, meshchen'e; uzhasnyi + mrak, tishina, ad, den', delo).

The evidence of the ballad manuscripts demonstrates the near equivalence of these two epithets, and further reveals their ability to replace such seemingly specific epithets as grozny and diki.² In fact these four epithets are used similarly by Zhukovsky to create the emotionally charged atmosphere characteristic of a ballad. They refer less to objective phenomena than to the subjective experiences of horror, terror, anxiety and fear to be shared by the poet and reader. Similarly, the applicability of the epithet svyatoi is extended to include persons, places, time, holy

1. Pushkin i russkie romantiki, 62.

2. See Appendix D.

objects, and religious concepts, with a corresponding increase in the indeterminateness of its meaning (svyatoi + anakhoret, skala, chas, finiam, zhizn'). The ballad manuscripts demonstrate that svyatoi can even replace zlatoi as an equivalent indicating some vague emotional approval of the object described.¹

Zhukovsky's epithets acquire vague overtones, most often of fear, death, mystery, evil, emotional warmth, and sanctity. The more overtones a given epithet acquires, the more easily it can be applied to abstract substantives, and the more indeterminate its meaning becomes. Expressions such as vysokaya dal', miloe smyaten'ie, tainaya skorb', and tikhaya glubina serve as examples of Zhukovsky's original combinations.

The originality of Zhukovsky's epithets, then, resides in their total subjectivity and in the complex interrelationship between their applicability and their indeterminateness. In his study of poetic language, Tynyanov wrote:

The word does not have one fixed meaning. It is a chameleon: not only different shades (ottenki), but sometimes even different colours (kraski) appear.²

Potebnya's formulation neatly summarizes the results of this investigation: "Every new application of a word ... is the creation of a word".³ Zhukovsky's epithets created the foundation for the vocabulary of Russian romantic poetry. Therein lies his major contribution to the development of Russian poetic style.

1. See Appendix D.

2. Tynyanov, Problema stikhotvornogo yazyka (L., 1924), 48.

3. Slovo, VIII (1918), 26.

Chapter V

POLEMICS

Зачем кусать нам груди
кормилицы нашей?

-- Пушкин¹

Between 1815 and 1825 Zhukovsky was at the centre of polemics in Russian literary criticism. The genre of the literary ballad, the poets who imitated Zhukovsky, and finally Zhukovsky himself were subjected to thorough critical scrutiny. Members of the most diverse literary circles participated in the debate. On the "conservative" side, A.A. Shakhovskoi of the Beseda lyubitelei russkogo slova and Kyuchel'beker, Gnedich, Somov, Del'vig, and Griboedov of the Vol'noe obshchestvo lyubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti led a series of attacks on the new genre and its creator. To counter these attacks, Arzamas was formed by the "progressives": Batyushkov, Vyazemsky, Pushkin, A.F. Voeikov, A.I. Turgenev, the minor critics D.V. Dashkov and D.N. Blyudov, and Zhukovsky himself. The Vol'noe obshchestvo lyubitelei slovesnosti, nauk i khudozhestv, which included amongst its members Ostolopov, Kamenev, A.E. Izmailov, and S.S. Bobrov, occupied a middle position in the struggle. Merzlyakov read an attack on the literary ballad at a meeting of the Obshchestvo lyubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti at Moscow University. The polemics found expression in various forms: in poetry,

1. A.S. Pushkin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XIII (M.-L., 1935), 135 (letter to Ryleev, January 1825).

in comedy, in review articles, in exchanges of letters, and in epigrams. This chapter is an attempt to survey the polemics which began shortly after the publication of Lyudmila in 1808, which gathered strength in the late 1810s, and which reached their climax in 1825.

* * *

During the early 1810s Zhukovsky was the subject of lengthy verse poslaniya addressed to him by A.I. Turgenev, A.F. Voeikov, M.V. Milonov, and V.L. Pushkin.¹ In each of these works Zhukovsky's first efforts in writing poetry are sympathetically reviewed, and the poet is commended for his salutary influence on the development of Russian literature.

The earliest discordant note in the symphony of praise was sounded in 1810 by Zhukovsky's friend Batyushkov in his poem Prividen'e,² a free translation of Parny's elegy, Le Revenant. Batyushkov describes what sort of a loving apparition he would be after his own death, if only the dead could be resurrected. Then he continues:

... но из могилы,
Если можно воскресать,
Я не стану, друг мой милый,
Как мертвец тебя пугать.
В час полуночных явлений
Я не стану в виде тени,
То внезапно, то тихом
С воплем в твой являться дом.³

1. See Poety 1790-1810-kh godov, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. (L., 1971).

2. Vestnik Evropy, No.6 (1810), 108-10.

3. K.N. Batyushkov. Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd., (M.-L., 1964), 119.

This passage is clearly intended as a gentle polemic with Zhukovsky's description of the lover's ghost in Lyudmila.¹ The nouns mertvets and ten', the adverbs vnezapu (cf. Zhukovsky's vdrug) and tishkom (cf. Zhukovsky's tikhii), and the line V chas polunochnykh yavlenii (cf. Lyudmila: 16:2 - V chas polunochnykh videnii) are all borrowed from Zhukovsky's language in order that Batyushkov may demonstrate how he would not describe his own apparition.

In Moi penaty (1811-12) and in the poslanie, K Zhukovskomu (1812), Batyushkov characterizes Zhukovsky's poetry more sympathetically. He depicts Zhukovsky as a poet of elegies and ballads, whose favourite themes are sadness and joy, melancholy and friendship. But in another poslanie of the same period, Otvet Turgenevu (1812?),² Batyushkov once again expresses his ironic attitude towards the ballads:

Под знаменем Киприды
Сей новый Дон-Кихот
Проводит век с мечтами:
С химерами живет,
Беседует с духами,
С задумчивой луной,
И мир смешит собой.³

A similar satirical description of Zhukovsky as a balladnik is included in the earliest redaction of A.F. Voeikov's unofficial and unpublished series of stanzas called Dom sumasshedshikh (1814-17). In later redactions of the work Zhukovsky's name was changed to Balladin:

1. This example was first suggested by I.Z. Serman in an unpublished monograph on Batyushkov.

2. Opyty v stikhakh i proze, II (SPb., 1817), 153-56.

3. K.N. Batyushkov, 144.

Вот Жуковский, в саван длинный
 Скутан, лапочки крестом,
 Ноги вытянув умильно
 Черта дразнит языком.
 Видеть ведьму воображает:
 И глазком ей подмигнет,
 И кадит и отпевает,
 И трезвонит, и ревет.¹

Like Batyushkov, Voeikov gently caricatures the Gothic paraphernalia of Zhukovsky's early ballads: the shrouds, demons, and witches of Lyudmila and Svetlana. More incisive verse parodies of Zhukovsky's ballads were composed and circulated in the late 1820s and early 1830s by Pushkin and Lermontov,² and by Del'vig, Izmailov, K.A. Bakhturin, V.A. Protashinsky, and others.³ The real polemic, however, was being enacted elsewhere: on the stage.

* * *

On the evening of 23 September 1815 in the Malyi teatr in St. Petersburg, there took place the première of a new play by A.A. Shakhovskoi called Urok koketam, ili Lipetskie vody. The playwright, a member of Admiral Shishkov's Beseda, had previously expressed his views on the subject of contemporary Russian literature. His earlier comedy, Novyi Stern (1805), had been directed against sentimentalism; its hero, Count Pronsky, was intended as a caricature of Karamzin. The first canto of Shakhovskoi's poem Raskhishchennye shuby (1815) contained a

1. Poety 1790-1810-kh godov, 796.

2. See below, Chapters VII and VIII.

3. See Russkaya stikhotvornaya parodiya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya (L., 1960) and Mnimaya poeziya, ed. Yu. Tynyanov (M.-L., 1931).

mocking reference to Zhukovsky's sto zhalostnykh ballad.¹ The new comedy, Urok koketam, launched a savage attack on the ballad genre and its creator: in the pitiful figure of Fialkin the balladnik, Shakhovskoi created a brilliant caricature of Zhukovsky.

Soon after Fialkin's first appearance on stage (II:v), he boldly asserts that his own poetic genius was inspired by the fashionable genre of the literary ballad.² His speech contains numerous expressions which echo the language of Zhukovsky's lyrics and ballads: naivnost' raiskaya; fimiam; um chudesnyi; dusha nebesnaya; raiskaya vest'. In the next scene Fialkin enters, "sighing from afar", to recite a ballad for his patroness, the Countess Leleva, which is a parody of Zhukovsky's Akhill (1814), an original ballad based on a classical theme:

Пел бессмертный славу Трою,
Пел родных Приама чад;
Пел Ахилла, жадна к бою,
Пел Элены милый взгляд.
Но чувствительность слезами
Излила глаза певца.
Ах! мы любим не глазами,
Для любви у нас сердца;
И бессмертный под сетями
У бессмертного слепца.³

Although the Countess tells Fialkin that the ballad is ochen' mil, she exclaims in an aside: Chto za vzdor! Fialkin explains that his ballad might have lost something in oral recitation; he chases the Countess off stage, shouting Ballada vam and imploring her to hear out the rest of his forty-eight stanzas.

1. A.A. Shakhovskoi, Komedii, stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. (L., 1961), 91.

2. One of Fialkin's lines (Ya vybral modnyi rod / Ballad) could almost have been a paraphrase of Zhukovsky's admission in a letter to A.I. Turgenev in 1813: Ballady moi izbrannyi rod poezii. See above, Chapter III, p. 67.

3. A.A. Shakhovskoi, 164.

When Fialkin returns to the stage (V:ii), it is so that Shakhovskoi can direct his criticism against the Gothic paraphernalia of Zhukovsky's ballads. The balladnik confesses that he had learned about corpses by reading Russian literary ballads; his description contains a fair assortment of Zhukovsky's favourite motifs and expressions:

... ими [мертвецами] я свой нежный вкус питаю;
И полночь, и петух, и звон костей в гробах,
И чу!... все страшно в них; но милым все приятно,
Все восхитительно! хотя невероятно.¹

The unfortunate Zhukovsky was present at the first performance of Shakhovskoi's comedy in 1815; the event is recalled by the memoirist F.F. Vigel':

One could imagine the predicament of poor Zhukovsky, at whom several indiscreet glances were directed! One could imagine the astonishment and fury of the friends sitting around him! The glove had been thrown down; Blyudov and Dashkov, still in their tumultuous youth, hurried to pick it up.²

Blyudov responded with a satirical sketch about Shakhovskoi written in Church Slavonic called Videnie v kakoi-to ograde. Dashkov followed with two satirical attacks on the comedy: Pis'mo k noveishemu Aristofanu and Venchanie Shutovskogo. Vyazemsky joined in the attack with his satirical Pis'mo s Lipetskikh vod. In it he referred to the characters of the play as "soulless creatures" and "facetious Lilliputians"; Fialkin was called an "obvious idiot".³ Vyazemsky also composed a cycle of epigrams directed against the

1. Ibid., 238.

2. Zapiski, IV, 171-72.

3. Rossiskii muzeum, No.12 (1815), 257 ff.

playwright entitled Poeticheskii venok Shutovskogo. In 1819 Bestuzhev, in an article published in Syn otechestva, criticized the style, structure, and language of Urok koketam, and concluded that "fortunately the clouds of such comedies cannot eclipse true talent".¹

A major consequence of the polemic surrounding Shakovskoi's play was the formation of the literary society Arzamas by Zhukovsky's closest supporters. At the first meeting in 1815 each member of the group took a nickname from one of Zhukovsky's ballads, either a title, or character, or even a phrase: A.I. Turgenev was called Bolova arfa; Pushkin was nicknamed sverchok (from Svetlana); Zhukovsky was known as Svetlana, Dashkov as Chu! and V.L. Pushkin as Vot.²

Zhukovsky refrained from entering the debate, except in his satirical works directed against the members of the Beseda. For example, in Pred sudilishche Minosa (1815) he refers to his literary enemies as skoty and parodies the fables written by D.I. Khvostov, one of Shakhovskoi's supporters. In Plach o Pindare (1815) Zhukovsky's satire is directed against the entire Beseda, in particular, Khvostov and the poetess A.P. Bunina. However, Zhukovsky's real attitude is reflected in a letter dated autumn 1815, sent from St. Petersburg to his family in Belev:

1. Syn otechestva, No.6 (1819), 263 ff.

2. See Arzamas i Arzamasskie protokoly, ed. M.S. Borovkova-Maikova (L., 1933).

There is an author here ... [called] Shakhovskoi. It is known that authors are not admirers of other authors. And therefore he is not an admirer of mine. He decided to write a comedy in which he makes fun of me. My friends intervened Now there is a terrible war on Parnassus. They are fighting around me and for me, but I remain silent, and it would be better if everyone remained silent¹

M.N. Zagoskin responded to the attacks on Shakhovskoi with a comedy entitled Komediya protiv komedii, ili Urok volokitam, first performed on 3 November 1815. The hero of this play, Izborsky, sings the praises of Shakhovskoi's comedy:

Write what you will: both prose and verse; in spite of it all, the comedy [Urok koketam] is splendid: it honours our literature. I consider that it has some passages worthy of Molière.²

Then the hero turns his attention to the ballad genre; he attacks the untalented imitators of Zhukovsky who, it is claimed, write only about corpses and ghosts, and would eventually lower the level of Russian poetry.³ Zagoskin's comedy, in its turn, was followed by a series of reviews, letters, and epigrams attacking the playwright.

In 1817 Griboedov and Katenin collaborated in the writing of a satire called Student, which was never performed and which was not published until 1858.⁴ The hero, Benevol'sky, is a composite caricature of Zhukovsky, Batyushkov, and Zagoskin (whose pseudonym

1. A.A. Shakhovskoi, 774-75. Karamzin expressed similar sentiments in a letter to A.I. Turgenev dated October 1815: "Let Zhukovsky answer only with new and beautiful verse; Shakhovskoi will never catch him up".

2. M.N. Zagoskin, Polnoesobranie sochinenii, VI (P., no date), 210.

3. Ibid., 213.

4. The manuscript was discovered and published by E.N. Serchevsky in A.S. Griboedov i ego sochineniya (SPb., 1858).

in the journal Severnyi nablyudatel' was in fact Benevol'sky).

The play also contains critical references to Karamzin, A.E. Izmailov, and other supporters of Zhukovsky. Some of Benevol'sky's lines echo specific lyrics by Zhukovsky and Batiushkov; other lines parody more general features of the poets' language:

... в голове моей, в сердце такое что-то
неизъяснимое, мир незнаемый, смутная будущность.¹

... которая часто появлялась мне в сновидениях,
свешла, как Ора, легка, как Ириса, - вели-
чественный стан, сафирные глаза, русые льну
подобные, волосы...²

Benevol'sky expresses himself with a great number of epithets, most of which are borrowed from Zhukovsky's repertoire: sumrachnaya dal', mrachnye mysli, zlatoi chas, milvi tsvet, tomnyi vzor.

These comedies and the polemics which surrounded them demonstrate the importance of the position occupied by Zhukovsky in Russian literary life of the 1810s. When in 1816 critical attention was focussed on specific ballads, the issues in the debate became more clearly defined.

* * *

Zhukovsky's Lyudmila, a free translation of Bürger's Lenore, was published in Vestnik Evropy in 1808. In 1816 P.A. Katenin translated the same ballad under the title of Ol'ga and sent a copy to Zhukovsky, who forwarded it to Gnedich with the following letter:

1. A.S. Griboedov, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, I (SPb., 1911), 68.

2. Ibid., 82.

This work, in spite of its many faults, demonstrates that in time he [Katenin] will write well. If he had less self-confidence and decided to write not only for transient praises, then he would be a good author. He definitely has talent.¹

The publication of Ol'ga in Vestnik Evropy and Syn otechestva later that year provoked a storm of controversy over specific features of Katenin's style in comparison with Zhukovsky's, which foreshadowed all future criticism of the ballad genre.²

Gnedich published the first review of Katenin's Ol'ga. He begins with lavish praise for Zhukovsky's Lyudmila, which he considers to be an original Russian composition, since it borrowed only its theme from Bürger's ballad. The local colour, tone, feeling, and "popular language", he claims, are all original to Zhukovsky; in some passages Zhukovsky's Russian version is said to be preferable to the original German. Gnedich then compares Ol'ga with Bürger's Lenore, and finds Katenin's version full of sins against grammar, logic, euphony, and good taste. He singles out various unacceptable colloquial forms (svetik, vplot', sporo, svoloch') and vulgarisms,³ and finds Bürger's original "simpler, stronger, and better" than Katenin's translation. The review concludes with an ironic assault on the ballad genre:

1. SS, IV, 569.

2. Vestnik Evropy, No.9 (1816); and Syn otechestva, No.24 (1816).

3. For example, Lenore's question about the bridal bed (Hat's Raum für mich?) is rendered by Katenin as V nei ulyazhetsya l' nevesta? Gnedich points out that a nevesta who could ask such a question has no place in the original or in any translation. Zhukovsky characteristically omits Lenore's question in his version.

What wonderful devils he [Katenin] found for his ballads! Vivent les ballades! And after this they dare to attack them? And after this they tell me that ballads have no moral purpose?¹

Griboedov came to Katenin's defence. In an article also published in Syn otechestva that year he takes exception to Gnedich's analysis of Katenin's errors in grammar, logic, and taste, and answers each of the specific accusations in turn.² He then turns his attention to Zhukovsky's Lyudmila and criticizes expressions such as Pyl' tumanit otdalen'e as incorrect usage, nadezhda-sladost' as tautology, and the excessive use of chu! and slyshish'! Furthermore, he questions the meaning of Zhukovsky's version, arguing that Lyudmila is too humble and totally undeserving of punishment; that the corpse is too milyi; that the heroine embraces the hero even after she knows that he is a corpse - and so on. Griboedov concludes with a reply to Gnedich's attack on the ballad; he defends the genre and states that there is no reason why ballad-writers should have to apologise for their choice of form.

Gnedich's initial article on Katenin also provoked a response from Batyushkov. In a letter to Gnedich in August 1816, Batyushkov thanks him for his criticism of Ol'ga, but objects to his attack on the ballad genre; he maintains that "all genres are worthy". Furthermore, Batyushkov advises Gnedich not to answer Griboedov's criticism; rather he should simply demonstrate that Zhukovsky was the greater poet: "Then all Griboedovs would disappear".³

1. Syn otechestva, XXXI, No.27 (1816), 21.

2. Ibid., XXXI, No.30 (1816), 150-60. Griboedov asks whether the nevesta should have asked: Predat'sya toshchin mechtaniyam lyubvi ideal'noi?

3. Batyushkov, Sochineniya, III (SPb., 1886), 389.

Griboedov did disappear - on a diplomatic mission to Persia in 1818 - and there this phase of the polemics almost ended. However, in 1822 Katenin, in a review of Grech's Opyt kratkoi istorii russkoi literatury, criticizes the author for overlooking his [Katenin's] ballads. Katenin declares that his prostonarodnye ballady deserved some attention as "totally original work, not borrowed from anywhere".¹ Katenin was soon answered by Bestuzhev, who states that he found no originality whatsoever in any of Katenin's works; furthermore, he points out that there are obvious borrowings from Derzhavin in at least one of his ballads (Leshii).² Katenin's faithful disciple, N.N. Bakhtin, came to his friend's defence. He replies to the objections raised by Bestuzhev, and even returns to the original accusations made by Gnedich in 1816. Bakhtin also criticizes Zhukovsky's Lyudmila, and concludes with an eloquent defence of Katenin as the better poet of the two.³

Katenin was unable to forget the dispute. In 1831, when he read Zhukovsky's second translation of Bürger's Lenore, he thought no more of it than he had of Lyudmila. He wrote to Bakhtin:

The translation is rubbish, and perhaps its only merit is that it preserves the metre of the original precisely.⁴

In another letter to Bakhtin in 1833 Katenin wrote:

1. Syn otechestva, No.13 (1822), 260.

2. Ibid., No.20 (1823), 253-69.

3. Vestnik Evropy, No.3-4 (1823), 193-214.

4. Russkaya starina, CXLVII (1911), 355. It should be noted that under the influence of Zhukovsky's retranslation, Katenin reworked his Ol'ga and made some corrections in it. See below, Chapter VI, p.202.

Both the words of Griboedov in the debate with Gnedich, and the action of Zhukovsky, who acknowledged by his second translation that his first was inadequate, justified my writing of Ol'ga, in spite of the existence of Lyudmila.¹

The Lyudmila/Ol'ga controversy and its aftermath is indicative of the next phase of the polemics. Beginning in 1816 more critics and writers were forced to take sides: Gnedich, Batyushkov, and Bestuzhev supported Zhukovsky; Griboedov, Bakhtin, and especially Katenin supported Katenin. Furthermore, criticism was no longer limited to details of grammar, logic, taste, and so on; rather, the more general issues of narodnost', originality, and the character of the ballad genre were raised; these issues were to dominate the critical debate during the next decade.

* * *

During the years immediately following the 1816 phase of the polemics it is possible to detect a change in the critical attitude towards the ballad genre and towards its creator. Anonymous reviews which appeared in various periodicals and the memoirs of Zhukovsky's contemporaries testify to the poet's early popularity. But first in private correspondence, and then in published articles, even Zhukovsky's supporters began to express their growing dissatisfaction with his limitations.

The reviews of Zhukovsky's poetry and prose published in Syn otechestva from 1816 to 1818 contain only glowing praise. An article on Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev pays tribute to the ballad's "easy, free versification", its "descriptive or pictorial poetry",

1. Ibid., 365. See also Katenin's article in Moskovskii telegraf, No.11 (1833), 450-51.

and its "vivid depictions of the majestic and the terrible".¹ The reviewer of the second edition of Zhukovsky's poetry which appeared in 1818 writes that he "belongs to the small group of our true poets".² N.I. Grech, recalling in his memoirs Zhukovsky's appearance on the literary scene, describes the uncritical enthusiasm universally shared for his early works: "Any doubt about the perfection of his [Zhukovsky's] verse was considered a crime".³ Another memoirist, F.F. Vigel', expresses similar sentiments about the poet's personality: "To know Zhukovsky and not to love him was absolutely impossible".⁴

Kyuchel'beker, who was later to criticize the language of Russian poetry for its monotony, particularly for the excess of epithets, and who was to extol Katenin's ballads, in 1817 was one of Zhukovsky's most avid supporters. In a survey of Russian literature he praises Zhukovsky for his transformation of the "external form and internal spirit" of Russian poetry, and for his introduction of "the German spirit".⁵ In an article on Batyushkov, Kyuchel'beker compares the two poets and found them equally talented, though different: while Batyushkov was influenced by Italian and French verse, Zhukovsky had become the "Russian Scott, Byron, and Goethe".⁶ As late as 1820 Kyuchel'beker was still defending Zhukovsky against an anonymous attack published in

1. Syn otechestva, XXXIX, No.32 (1817), 230-32.

2. Ibid., XLV, No.36 (1818), 225.

3. N.I. Grech, Zapiski o moei zhizni (M.-L., 1930), 493.

4. Zapiski, II, 54.

5. Vestnik Evropy, XCV, No.17-18 (1817), 157.

6. Ibid., XCVI, No.23-24, (1817), 204-8.

Nevskii zritel'.¹

A similar comparison of Batyushkov and Zhukovsky was drawn by Bestuzhev in his general review of Russian literature in 1823. Bestuzhev, who was later to berate Russian poets for their lack of originality, is full of high-flown praise for Zhukovsky:

The soul of [Zhukovsky's] reader is troubled by mournful emotions, but indescribably pleasant ones. Thus do the vague sounds of the Aeolian harp, vibrating in the sighs of the wind, reach our hearts.²

Bestuzhev commends the variety of Zhukovsky's descriptions. While admitting that there may be a little too much German coloration and mysticism, he asserts that these are but minor faults in the creator of such masterpieces as Lyudmila and Svetlana.³

Zhukovsky's friend and contemporary poet, Batyushkov, to whom he was so often compared, as early as the mid-1810s was becoming concerned about Zhukovsky's limitations. Although he published an article extolling Zhukovsky's "passionate imagination" and his ability to convey "the profound sensations of his strong and noble soul",⁴ privately, in a letter to Zhukovsky in 1814, he expresses his deep anxiety:

[A.I.] Turgenev told me that you are writing a ballad. Why not write a poema? ... What a queer fish you are! You possess everything needed to achieve lasting fame based on important work. You have the imagination of Milton, the tenderness of Petrarch ... and you write ballads. Leave the trifles to us. Take up something worthy of your talent.⁵

1. Nevskii zritel', I (February 1820), 106-28.

2. Polyarnaya zvezda (1823), 22.

3. See also an anonymous review in Vestnik Evropy, XCVI, No.23-24 (1817), 193-204: "God preserve us from this German spirit".

4. Vestnik Evropy, LXXXVII, No.10 (1816), 93-104.

5. Sochineniya, III, 306. See also Batyushkov's letters to Vyazemsky and Gnedich in 1817.

A different sort of anxiety was expressed by another of Zhukovsky's supporters, Vyazemsky, in his letters to A.I. Turgenev in 1819. He maintains that Zhukovsky's poetry was prone to a certain monotony of "patterns, forms, and phrases":¹

The poet must pour his soul into various vessels. Zhukovsky, more than others, has to guard against monotony.²

Another former supporter and ex-ballad-writer, Merzlyakov, launched a vitriolic attack on the ballad genre at a public meeting of the Obshchestvo lyubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti at Moscow University on 22 February 1818. He read out, in Zhukovsky's presence, the text of his Pis'mo iz Sibiri, excerpts of which were published in Vestnik Evropy.³ The memoirist M.A. Dmitriev recalls the plight of the unfortunate Zhukovsky:

The leading lights of Moscow society were assembled for the meeting of the Obshchestvo ... Imagine everyone's astonishment when Merzlyakov ... suddenly began to read out his "Letter from Siberia" against ... the ballads of Zhukovsky - who was sitting at the table with all the other members Zhukovsky had to endure the reading until the end; the chairman was on pins and needles: it was impossible to stop the speaker. What a most unpleasant surprise both for the members and for the public!⁴

Merzlyakov criticizes the Russian literary ballad for two reasons: firstly, it contravenes the rules of classical poetics with its improbable content, its formlessness, and its "purposelessness"; secondly, the ballad's foreign origin and alien spirit betray the great tradition of Russian classical poetry. Merzlyakov remained

1. Ostaf'evskii arkhiv, I (SPb., 1899), 227.

2. Ibid., 305.

3. Trudy obshchestva lyubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti, XI (1818), 52-70; and Vestnik Evropy, CI (1818), 276-80.

4. Melochi, 167-69.

a true classicist, both in his own efforts at writing literary ballads during the 1790s,¹ and in his classical criticism of Zhukovsky's non-classical ballads in the 1810s.

A critic who shared Merzlyakov's classical position, A.G. Glagolev, turned his attention in 1820 to Zhukovsky's imitators. His criticism was occasioned by the publication in Syn otechestva of P.A. Pletnev's ballad Mogil'shchik.² In a letter to the editor of Vestnik Evropy Glagolev points out the errors in Pletnev's grammar and logic, and criticizes the ballad's Gothic motifs and pervasive morbidity:

What is the goal of this ballad? What is its use? Where is the enjoyment? Is this the language of the gods?³

In response to an anonymous defence of Pletnev,⁴ Glagolev extends his attack to German romanticism, which, he claims, is threatening to destroy the traditions of Russian classicism. While Russian literature would always be grateful to Zhukovsky for the introduction of English and German themes, Glagolev argues that the poet's successors have "entered into the immeasurable abyss of mysticism and romanticism".⁵

The attacks by Merzlyakov and Glagolev, both launched from the position of classical aesthetics, were aimed principally at

1. See above, Chapter II, pp. 46-49.

2. Syn otechestva, LXI, No.17 (1820), 217-18.

3. Vestnik Evropy, CXI, No.11 (1820), 215. In the same article Glagolev refers to a Ruslan i Lyudmila as a parody of Kirsha Danilov by some unknown plit.

4. Syn otechestva, LXIII, No.31 (1820), 228-32.

5. Vestnik Evropy, CXII, No.16 (1820), 283-96.

the ballad genre and at Zhukovsky's imitators. In 1821, however, criticism began to be directed at Zhukovsky, namely at the language of his ballad Rybak (1820),¹ a translation of Goethe's Der Fischer.

Orest Somov initiated this phase of the polemics with a savage attack on the content and style of Zhukovsky's translation. He belittles the subject of the ballad and criticizes the author's language, in particular, his epithets:

Dusha (one must assume of the fisherman) polna prokhladnoi tishinoi. In the figurative sense this means that ecstasy, reverence fill his soul; ... but neither tishina nor shum has the capacity to fill a soul. And how can prokhladnaya be a quality of tishina? Therefore we must also have teplaya tishina, znoinyi shum, and so on.²

Somov raises similar objections to almost every epithet in Zhukovsky's version:

[Vlazhnaya glava] What? the head of the maiden is composed of vlaga? ... Rodnoe dno. What a strange rodstvo! ... Kipuchii zhar is good too Where is this znoinaya vyshina, Mister Author? ... Gorit svezheyu krasoi; that is so astonishingly complicated, isn't it? .. Prokhladno-goluboi svod neba! that is also very complicated. In time we shall compose new tones of colour and will say: vetreno-ryzhii, dozhdliivo-zheltyi, merzlo-sinii, znoino-zelenyi, etc., etc.³

Somov's objections to Zhukovsky's semantic system are invaluable in as much as they help to clarify the nature of the poet's stylistic

1. Syn otechestva, LXIV, No.36 (1820); see above, Chapter III, pp. 79-83, and Appendix A.

2. Nevskii zritel', V (January 1821), 60.

3. Ibid., 61-63. Somov includes an amusing parody using his new compound expressions:

Октябро-непогодно-бурна,
Дико-густейша темнота,
Сурово притворно-сумбурна,
Збродно-порывна глухота,
Мерцает в скорбно-желтом слухе,
Рисует в темно-алом духе,
Туманно-светлый небосклон.

innovations. Specific epithets are criticized because they do not make rational, logical sense. Somov totally rejects Zhukovsky's emotional language because it obscures the precise, objective meaning of his words.¹

The critic F.V. Bulgarin answered Somov with a defence of Zhukovsky's translation. He argues that the content of Rybak is rooted in the tradition of the Russian skazka, and that the language of the Russian version is very close to that of the German original. Thus expressions such as prokhladnaya tishina and vlazhnaya glava are in fact examples of Goethe's new and original use of language. Bulgarin concludes:

Klopstock, Schiller, Goethe, Byron, Derzhavin, and Zhukovsky abound in these bold bursts of creative imagination. New sensations and thoughts give birth to new expressions.²

Bulgarin was incredibly perceptive. These new sensations and thoughts could not be translated into the objective, logical language which Somov was demanding. A new subjective, emotional language had to be created, and Zhukovsky was its creator.

Somov answered Bulgarin. He asserts that a critic has the right to demand that poetry make sense when "translated" into objective language. He supplies a literal rendition of Goethe's Der Fischer and demands:

Where then is the prokhladnaya tishina in his soul and the vlazhnaya glava? Where is the rodnoe dno and kipuchii zhar, znoimaya vyshina and prokhladno-goluboi svod neba?³

1. See above, Chapter IV.

2. Syn otechestva, LXVIII, No.9 (1821), 71-72.

3. Nevskii zritel', V (March 1821), 283.

Somov admits that he had been an admirer of Zhukovsky's poetry until "Western, alien tumany and mraki" obscured the poet's senses; now "everything is German, except for the letters and the words".¹

With Somov's answer, this phase of the polemics almost ended. A humorous announcement for subscriptions to "The Collected Works of O.M. Somov" was published by Voeikov. Somov's works were to include a "Eulogy to the author written by himself", "Translations from languages of which the translator has no knowledge", and "Collections of misprints copied from the works of Batyushkov, Zhukovsky, Krylov, etc."² While a minor poet, Ya. I. Rostovtsov, wrote a defence of Zhukovsky in verse entitled K zoilam poeta (S pevtsa vam ne sorvat' venka),³ it was Bestuzhev who pronounced the final succinct judgment:

Балладу поместил я в число образцовых переводов,
а критику на нее между уродцами.⁴

* * *

Criticism of the new subjective language of Russian poetry, in particular of its epithets, had begun as early as 1820. An anonymous reviewer, referring to Zhukovsky's ballad Uznik, writes:

I will not comment on the expression: nebesno-tainoe because, for me, it is sovershenno-neponyatnoe.⁵

In a survey of Russian poetry in 1824 Kyuchel'beker provides the

1. Ibid., 277-79.

2. Syn otechestva, LXVIII, No.11 (1821), 195-96.

3. Ibid., LXVIII, No.12 (1821), 232-33.

4. Ibid., LXVIII, No.13 (1821), 263.

5. Ibid., LXII, No.20 (1820), 25.

best list of the most frequently repeated combinations of epithets and substantives:

Картины везде одни и те же: луна, которая, разумеется, уныла и бледна, скалы и дубравы, где их никогда не бывало; лес, за которым сто раз представляют заходящее солнце; вечерняя заря; изредка длинные тени и привидения, что-то невидимое, что-то неведомое, пошлые иносказания, бледные, безвкусные олицетворения;... в особенности же туман: туманы над водами, туманы над бором, туманы над полями, туман в голове сочинителя.¹

In 1825 Kyuchel'beker again refers to the abundance of epithets in contemporary Russian poetry, but he cites the ballads of Katenin as an exception:

So! our literature is young: but we had and still have poets (though very few) with bold imagination, laconic style - not diluted by a flood of melodious, empty epithets.²

In a similar vein, Vyazemsky writes in a review of Zhukovsky's prose tale Mar'ina roshcha (1809):

In his style, one senses youth, but a promising youth - particularly in his lack of restraint in adjectives, which is the usual fault of young writers and of young literatures in general.³

Vyazemsky continues with an interesting confession:

The truth is I am not an enemy of adjectives; I regard them as one of the means of expressing thoughts left to us; all nouns have been uttered; it remains for us to qualify [ottenivat'] them anew with adjectives.⁴

The most sophisticated criticism of the new stylistics is contained in an anonymous article entitled Mysli o Sumarokove i

1. Mnemozina, II (1824), 37-38.

2. Syn otechestva, CIII, No.17 (1825), 71.

3. Moskovskii telegraf, XII, No.23 (1826), 172.

4. Ibid., 173.

drugikh pisatelyakh published in 1828. Contemporary poetry, according to the reviewer, is based on the domination of imagination over reason. The obscurity of the emotional language is the result of the elimination of necessary verbs, the use in translations of syntactic calques from the language of the original, the striving after excessive euphonic effects, and finally, the modification of substantives by unsuitable epithets. As examples of the last feature, the critic cites expressions such as krasno-rechivaya reka, dushistaya ten', rodnaya gora, and svyatoi polden'.¹

* * *

Beginning with attacks on the ballad genre, then on Zhukovsky's imitators, and finally on Zhukovsky himself, the polemics of the late 1810s and early 1820s help to clarify the nature of the changes which were being affected by Zhukovsky in the language of Russian poetry. However, the climax in the polemics in 1825 suddenly transformed Zhukovsky from the outstanding figure in the contemporary literary scene to an important figure in Russian literary history.

As early as 1823 impassioned appeals were made for the creation of a national Russian poetry, independent of the influence of foreign literatures. Somov, in his articles on romanticism, complains of the monotonous elegiac tone of contemporary poetry, and declares:

Let there shine forth in their elevated songs,
as in a pure stream, the spirit of our people and
the qualities of our rich and majestic language²

1. Otechestvennye zapiski, XXXIV, No.96 (1828), 75-76.

2. O.M. Somov, O romanticheskoi poezii, III (SPb., 1823), 102.

Kyuchel'beker in 1824 makes a more emotional plea:

Let there be created for the glory of Russia
a truly Russian poetry; then let holy Rus'
become the greatest power in the universe,
not only in the political world, but also in
the moral sphere.¹

Early in 1825 Bestuzhev asks, almost despairingly:

When will we ever get onto the right track?
When will we begin to write in genuine
Russian? God only knows!²

Dissatisfaction with the "new poetry" was widespread; appeals for national Russian verse were becoming more strident. When in 1825 Pletnev wrote an article in praise of Zhukovsky's talent, taste, style, and originality, concluding that he was "the first poet of the golden age of our literature",³ he provoked what was to be the last phase of the literary polemics surrounding Zhukovsky.

Bulgarin, who previously defended Zhukovsky's Rybak against Somov's accusations, now violently disagrees with Pletnev:

... our age is not yet golden, and Zhukovsky
is not the first poet of our age.⁴

Bulgarin criticizes Zhukovsky for his lack of originality and for the inadequacy of his translations. In his introduction of German and English themes, Zhukovsky had performed a useful function; but now he had outlived his usefulness. Bulgarin hints that "another poet" had already appeared to replace him.

Bulgarin was answered in an article by Vyazemsky. Having

1. Mnemozina, II (1824), 42.

2. Polyarnaya zvezda (1825), 9.

3. Severnnye tsvety (1825), 34.

4. Syn otechestva, XLIX, No.2 (1825), 204.

previously expressed his anxiety in letters to A.I. Turgenev about the monotony of Zhukovsky's verse, Vyazemsky now defends Zhukovsky against Bulgarin's criticism, specifically against the charge of monotony. He concludes with a reasonable attempt to formulate the relationship between Zhukovsky and that "other poet" alluded to by Bulgarin, a theme which was to bring that poet into the polemics in 1825. Vyazemsky wrote: "Pushkin is the consequence (sledstvie) of Zhukovsky".¹

* * *

The relationship between Zhukovsky and Pushkin is extraordinarily complex; too often individual statements made by each poet have been interpreted as definitive, when in fact they represent only one aspect of the relationship. In 1820 when Zhukovsky read Ruslan i Lyudmila, he sent his portrait to Pushkin with the inscription: "To the conquering student (uchenik) from his conquered teacher".² Pushkin's letters to Vyazemsky and Gnedich in 1822 are filled with pleas for Zhukovsky to stop translating, and instead to start writing original works: "God grant that he may begin to create".³ When Pushkin received the third edition of Zhukovsky's poems in 1824, he expressed his disappointment in a letter to L.S. Pushkin:

I received the Zhukovsky. The deceased was a good fellow (Slavnyi byl pokojnik), God grant him the heavenly kingdom.⁴

1. Moskovskii telegraf, IV, No.4 (1825), 350.

2. L.P. Fevchuk, Lichnye veshchi A.S. Pushkina (L., 1970), 28.

3. PSS, XIII, 48.

4. Ibid., XIII, 98.

However, in 1831 Pushkin's letters to Pletnev convey the excitement with which he anticipated Zhukovsky's latest ballads, still hoping that he would produce original works:

I await his new ballads with impatience
But you did not say what sort of ballads they
are, translations or original works.¹

His letters to Vyazemsky written later that year recapture the pleasure he experienced when he finally received them:

But here is some good news for you: Zhukovsky
really has written twelve delightful ballads²

Zhukovsky also translated an unfinished ballad
by Walter Scott, The Pilgrim - and has added his
own ending: charming!³

Zhukovsky has poetic diarrhea, and although it
has subsided, he is still [squirting] hexameters.⁴

When Pushkin entered the debate in 1825 his primary concern was to see that justice be done: Zhukovsky should be accorded what praise was rightfully his, and the relationship between the two poets should be clarified. In a letter to Ryleev in January 1825 Pushkin reacted against the growing wave of anti-Zhukovsky criticism. He shared neither the lavish praise expressed in Pletnev's article, nor the criticism voiced by Bulgarin. He wrote:

1. PSS, XIV, 162-63.

2. Ibid., XIV, 170.

3. Ibid., XIV, 175.

4. Ibid., XIV, 208. Gogol' was equally enthusiastic about Zhukovsky's ballads and skazki of 1831; see his letter to A.S. Danilevsky of 2 November 1831.

Why should we bite the breast of our wet-nurse?...
 Whatever you say, Zhukovsky has had a decisive
 influence on the spirit of our literature; and in
 addition, the style of his translations will
 always stand as a model.¹

In a letter to Vyazemsky in mid-1825, Pushkin responded to the
 former's explanation of the relationship between himself and
 Zhukovsky. In particular, he took exception to the word "consequence":

I am not his [Zhukovsky's] consequence,
 (sledstvie), but rather his student (uchenik).²

In other words, Pushkin repeats the same term used by Zhukovsky
 in the portrait inscription of 1820. Pushkin viewed the relationship
 as an active one: his poetry was not simply the "result" of
 Zhukovsky's achievement; rather, he saw himself as the conscious
 artist who had studied Zhukovsky's style and who could recognize
 its excellence:

No one has had and no one will have a style
 which equals his in power and variety.³

Beginning his own literary career with imitations of that style,
 Pushkin went on to parody his mentor, and finally to create his
 own original style, which in its "power and variety" surpassed
 that of Zhukovsky.⁴ But never did Pushkin deny or reject the
 significance of Zhukovsky in his own poetic growth, or in the
 development of Russian literature.

* * *

1. PSS, XIII, 135. Ryleev answered Pushkin on 12 February 1825.
 He agreed that Zhukovsky's influence on Russian was beneficial,
 but considered that his "influence on the spirit of our literature"
 was harmful.

2. Ibid., XIII, 183.

3. Ibid., XIII, 183.

4. See below, Chapter VII.

After 1825 Zhukovsky and his ballads were no longer controversial. Other poets and other issues dominated the literary scene. Zhukovsky's influence had been exaggerated by some, underestimated by others, and correctly assessed only by Pushkin. As early as 1832 N. Polevoi wrote a comprehensive article entitled Ballady i povesti V.A. Zhukovskogo, published in Moskovskii telegraf, in which he tried to generalize about the poet's achievement. He criticizes Zhukovsky's verse for its monotony, for the lack of narodnost', and for the faithfulness "in essence, not in expression" of the translations. Polevoi maintains that Zhukovsky's originality is to be found principally in the "musicality of his poetry", its pevkost' or sladkozvuchie:

His sounds are a melody, the quiet murmuring
of a stream, the light breath of the zephyr
through the strings of the Aeolian harp.¹

When Polevoi's article was reprinted in his Ocherki russkoi literatury (1839), Belinsky wrote a review of it in which he made the first of several statements about Zhukovsky's role in the history of Russian literature. He takes exception to Polevoi's criticism, and by clever argument manages to transform all of Zhukovsky's alleged faults into commendable virtues. The "monotony" of his poetry is not to be interpreted in a pejorative sense, but rather in a profound one. Zhukovsky's greatness, according to Belinsky, lies precisely in his odnostoronnost'. Nor is his lack of narodnost' a defect; rather it is his "honour and glory". The so-called inaccuracy of Zhukovsky's translations is simply a

1. N.A. Polevoi, Ocherki russkoi literatury, I (SPb., 1839), 138.

result of the fact that he was a poet, not a translator; he always remained faithful to himself.¹

In various articles written during the years 1841-1843 Belinsky develops the idea of Zhukovsky as the first Russian romantic poet:

He introduced romanticism to us, without which we would not have any poetry today.²

... Zhukovsky is the literary Columbus of Rus', who discovered for her the America of romanticism in poetry.³

Zhukovsky translated into Russian not Schiller, or any other German or English poets; no, Zhukovsky translated into Russian the romanticism of the middle ages⁴

Just as Zhukovsky had been removed from the centre of the literary scene and assigned his place in history by Pushkin, Polevoi, and Belinsky, so too had the ballad genre been excluded from the arena of controversy. In 1836 Belinsky wrote in a review of K.S. Aksakov's verse parodies:

There was a time when the ballad was in the front ranks of youthful romanticism and marched into battle first, holding its victorious banner aloft; but now it has become a purely classical form; as in parliaments, the left becomes the right.⁵

In his article on Pushkin in 1843 Belinsky wrote:

1. PSS, III, 507.

2. Ibid., V, 548.

3. Ibid., VI, 460.

4. Ibid., VII, 167.

5. Ibid., II, 198-99.

In our prosaic age the reading of marvellous ballads no longer provides any pleasure, but produces apathy and boredom.¹

* * *

The outstanding characteristic of Russian literary criticism between 1815 and 1825 is the narrowing of its scope, the focussing on what was innovative, and often incomprehensible and unacceptable to the contemporary reader. The critics attacked the genre of the literary ballad, Zhukovsky's imitators, and finally Zhukovsky himself, particularly his style. The arguments presented by Somov and others demonstrate that it is indeed in the meaning and applicability of his epithets that Zhukovsky's greatest originality resides.²

The polemics raised more general problems: the theme of narodnost', as expressed in local colour and colloquial speech; the accuracy of translations; the nature of romanticism; the influence of foreign literatures; and the originality of Russian poetry. All of these issues were inherent in the debate concerning Zhukovsky and the ballad genre and they were to become some of the dominant themes in Russian literary criticism in the nineteenth century.

1. Ibid., VII, 177.

2. See above, Chapter IV.

Chapter VI

ZHUKOVSKY'S IMITATORS

И потом собачий вой их баллад...
-- Бестужев¹

The genre of the literary ballad, popularized by Zhukovsky during the early nineteenth century, attracted a multitude of imitators. P.A. Katenin, whose Ol'ga played an important role in the polemics of 1816,² wrote another five ballads from 1814 to 1817. The "epidemic" reached its peak between 1817 and 1820: N.F. Grammatin, N.F. Ostolopov, P.A. Pletnev, V.L. Pushkin, D. Glebov, M. Zagorodosky, A. Durop, M. Makarov, A.I. Meshchevsky, and others wrote innumerable ballads with titles such as Uslad i Vsemila, Edvin i Klara, Lyudmila i Uslad, Edgar i Vaina, Prividen'e, Mogil'shchik, and so on; these ballads were published in Nevskii zritel', Syn otechestva, Vestnik Evropy, in other journals, and in the poets' collected works. From 1824 to 1838 the blind poet I.I. Kozlov wrote some twenty literary ballads in imitation of Zhukovsky's.

All of these imitations became the objects of frequent criticism. Glagolev, after his attack on Pletnev's ballad in 1820, continues:

You will discover [in our journals] an enormous quantity of such horrible, mysterious monsters. Other [ballads] are perhaps less terrible, but

1. A.A. Bestuzhev, "O romane N. Polevogo", Sochineniya v dvukh tomakh, II (M., 1958), 592.

2. See above, Chapter V, pp. 172-76.

just as lavishly adorned.¹

In 1833 Bestuzhev criticized the imitators in the following terms:

And then the canine howling of their ballads,
frightful only in their absurdity....²

In this chapter an attempt will be made to examine representative ballads by P.A. Katenin, A.I. Meshchevsky, and I.I. Kozlov: Katenin, considered by contemporary critics as Zhukovsky's "opponent", whose ballads were said to be based on different stylistic principles; Meshchevsky, recently "discovered" and labelled Zhukovsky's "double", whose ballads provide an illuminating contrast with those of Zhukovsky himself; and Kozlov, Zhukovsky's most devoted "disciple", whose ballads represent the closest imitation of the genre as created by Zhukovsky.

* * *

Ever since the debate in 1816 concerning Ol'ga and Lyudmila, critics have compared Katenin's ballads with Zhukovsky's.³ Whereas Zhukovsky's ballads are often based on borrowed Ossianic and classical Greek themes, it is alleged that Katenin's ballads are based on original narodnyi motifs. Whereas Zhukovsky's ballads are full of abstract images and generalized elegiac motifs, Katenin's images are said to be concrete and to encompass a depiction of the peasants' everyday life. Finally, whereas Zhukovsky's language is "romantic" and "poetic", the language of Katenin's ballads is described as "popular", a quality manifested both in the

1. Vestnik Evropy, CXI, No.11 (1820), 215.

2. Sochineniya, II, 592.

3. See IRL, VI, 52-61 and IRP, I, 287-91.

vocabulary and syntax of his dialogues, and in the flat, prosaic intonations of his consciously "unpoetic" style.

Katenin's first literary ballad, Pevets (1814),¹ dramatically contradicts this generally accepted view of his poetry. It is not an original Russian work; rather it is a free translation of a ballad entitled Der Snger from the eleventh chapter of Goethe's Wilhelm Meister. The German original is not set in any specific period or location; it consists almost entirely of a minstrel's speech, the simplicity of which is in contrast with the magnificence of a royal hall. The king's generous offer of a reward to the minstrel is refused; instead, the minstrel expounds the doctrine of "art for art's sake":

Das Lied, das aus der Kehle dringt,
Ist Lohn, der reichlich lohnet. (5:3-4)

Katenin, in his version, creates an Old Russian setting for the subject. At one of Vladimir's feasts in Kiev boyars and bogatyri sit around a dubovyi stol, sipping sladkii med from yantarnye chashi. Katenin transforms the minstrel into an Old Russian bard, whose veshchii perst plays on zhivye struny. The images and language of Pevets are obvious borrowings from the Slovo o polku Igoreve: for example, the bard - v'etsya ptitse v nebesa, and the prince - izronil zlatoe slovo. In addition to stylized folk epithets, bookish epithets are also employed: Grusten pir, gde net pevtsa; Vdokhnovennyi... Uslad; and pesni sladkie. The poet's aesthetic views, as presented in the last two stanzas, show the strong influence of Zhukovsky, particularly of his early lyric, also called Pevets (1811). Here Katenin replaces the Old

1. Syn otechestva, No.16 (1815), 138.

Russian flavour with abstract lyricism:

Я пою, как птица в поле,
Оживленная весной;
Я пою: чего мне боле?
Песнь от сердца - дар драгой. (6:1-4)

The final stanzas, both in the first published version, and in the revised text, contain passages which closely resemble lines in Zhukovsky's Lyudmila.¹ The choice of Goethe as a source, the individual interpretation of the theme, and finally the language of his version demonstrate Katenin's heavy dependence on Zhukovsky as a model for his literary ballads.

The subject of Katenin's second ballad, Natasha (1814),² has its source in the Russian ballads of the 1790s, and also reveals the influence of motifs borrowed from Lyudmila. The ballad relates the conventional story of a tearful parting between two lovers, of the hero's death in war, of the heroine's grief, and of the spiritual union of the lovers after death. Natasha's patriotism (it is she who urges the hero to fight) is a familiar motif from the 1790s; her humility and faith (Vse v bozh'ei vole) are inherited from Zhukovsky's heroine. The language of Natasha consists of a

1. Compare the first published version of Pevets:

Счастлив дом, где дар сей скуден;
Бог к вам щедр, Он правосуден:
Благодарны ж небесам
Будьте так, как гость ваш вам. (7:5-8)

the revised version of Pevets:

Дом ваш полон всем, и сами
Вы любимы небесами:
Благодарны ж будьте им,
Сколько гость ваш вам самим. (7:5-8)

and Lyudmila:
Будь послушна небесам... (6:12)
Смертных ропот безрассуден;
Царь всевышний правосуден. (21:9-10)

2. Syn otechestva, No.13 (1815), 16 ff.

mixture of conventional folk elements (zhila-byla, bela grud', krasna devitsa, syraya zemlya) and bookish expressions, not unlike those used by Zhukovsky in his lyrics and ballads: serdechnyi / Milyi drug; dorogoe / Vremya kratkoe, zlatoe; prezhnie radosti; and skvoz' slez unyli.

Although Katenin's Ubiitsa (1815)¹ probably originates in a Grimm Brothers tale,² and although it borrows motifs from Zhukovsky's ballads, nevertheless it represents a more original work than either of his previous ballads. It relates the story of an old peasant who adopts a poor orphan child. When the ungrateful orphan later murders the peasant, he lets the blame fall on some travelling merchants. Although he inherits the peasant's land, marries, and settles down, the orphan knows no peace. Finally he confesses his crime to his wife, who reports it to the authorities. The orphan falls ill and dies, punished by a just Creator.

The events are related as a realistic narrative in prosaic language. Katenin uses both conventional folk elements such as shirokii dvor, tesovaya izba, and belyi svet, as well as literary devices, typical of the ballad genre, such as rhetorical questions and the frequent use of the epithet strashnyi. In general there are relatively few epithets and no traces of abstract elegiac melancholy. The extended dialogue between husband and wife contains unusual elements of colloquial vocabulary and syntax:

1. Syn otechestva, No.23 (1815), 143 ff.

2. See R.M. Volkov, "Russkaya ballada pervoi chetverti XIX stoletiya i ee nemetskie paralleli", Uchenie zapiski Chernovitskogo universiteta, XXXVII (1957), 3-48.

И что на месяц палишь очи... (18:3)

Молчи, жена, не бабье дело... (19:1)

Я с рук сбыл дурака... (21:4)

Проснулся, черт, и видит: худо! (24:1)

While there is little reference to the husband's emotional state, his crazed laugh both before and after his confession (stanzas 16 and 29), and his insomnia before, and deep sleep after, the confession,¹ reveal a certain psychological complexity of character absent from Zhukovsky's ballads.

Just as in Zhukovsky's Ivikovy zhuravli (1813) the cranes invoked by Ivik to avenge his foul murder drive the culprits to give themselves away, so in Katenin's Ublitsa the moon eventually forces the murderer to confess his crime to his wife. The murderer's invocation to the moon exists in two variants; the original "popular" version was published in Syn otechestva:

Да полно, ты! ты нем ведь, лысый!
Так не боюсь тебя;
Гляди сычком, скаль зубы крысой,
Да знай лишь про себя. (28)

The more bookish variant was published in the 1832 edition of Katenin's works:

Да полно, что! гляди, плешивый!
Не побоюсь тебя;
Ты, видно, сроду молчаливый:
Так знай же про себя.² (28)

The original version was attacked by Katenin's critics as being

1. Cf. Coleridge's The Rime of the Ancient Mariner, lines 240-88.

2. P.A. Katenin. Izbrannye proizvedeniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. (M.-L., 1965), 666.

too "crude" and "low" to be used in an apostrophe to the moon.¹

It is interesting to note that Pushkin, writing in praise of Ubiitsa in 1828, expresses his approval of the original version of the murderer's invocation, because it is full of "genuine tragic force"; he continues:

... few people understood the strength and originality of Ubiitsa, a ballad which one can place on a par with the best works by Bürger and Southey.²

In its realistic narrative, its psychological leitmotifs, and its colloquial language, Katenin's Ubiitsa represents a new development of the ballad genre, which was in complete contrast to the models established by Zhukovsky.

Another contrast with Zhukovsky's ballads is provided by Katenin's Leshii (1815).³ Although it was influenced by Goethe's Erlkönig, and said by Bestuzhev to contain motifs borrowed from Derzhavin,⁴ it represents another original development of the genre. Leshii relates the story of how a young boy disobeys his mother's warning, and wanders off alone at night into the forest in search of the wood-goblin. He loses his way, and asks help from an old man; the boy follows the directions given, but returns to the same place - under the spell of the old man/wood-goblin. The next morning the mother is distraught: her son has disappeared.

The greatest originality of the ballad lies in the contrast between the boy's imagined vision of the wood-goblin and his

1. Cf. Zhukovsky's lyric Podrobnyi otchet o lune (1820), in which he summarizes his own different styles for describing the moon. None of them corresponds to Katenin's.

2. "O poeticheskoi sloge", PSS, XI, 73.

3. Syn otechestva, No.47 (1815), 57 ff.

4. Ibid., No.20 (1822), 253-69.

kingdom, and the reality which he discovers in the forest. His dream is a collage of "popular" folkloric motifs: prekrasnyi, chudesnyi dom; zolotye teremy, chistye vody, krasnye devushki, sladkie piry; the lord of this realm is imagined to be a slavnyi khozain: dobryi, laskovyi, zabavnyi. However, the actual setting proves to be quite different: serye tuchi, gustoi mrak, temnyi les - and this landscape is convulsed by thunder and lightning, wind and rain. The old man/wood goblin turns out to be ugryumyi, possessing a nasmeshlivyi, zloi vid.

Although Katenin employs a number of colloquial forms such as vplot', znat', svetik, and, in the original version, gushcha,¹ the narrative is related primarily in unemotional, unambiguous language. Only the conclusion describing the mother's vain search is uncharacteristic in its use of substantivized adverbs, not unlike those in Zhukovsky's lyrics:

С каждым днем безумье то же:
Ищет сына по лесам.
Здесь не найдет; дай ей Боже
С ним увидеться хоть там. (14:9-12)

Katenin's next ballad, Ol'ga (1816),² was written as a direct challenge to Zhukovsky. Based on Bürger's Lenore, it was Katenin's attempt to demonstrate that Zhukovsky's Lyudmila was not a "popular" ballad at all, but rather a product of Karamzin's sentimentalism.³

A comparison of Ol'ga with Lyudmila and Lenore shows how much

-
1. This word was criticized by Bestuzhev in his 1820 article. Katenin, in a letter to N.I. Bakhtin, defended the word (Gushcha ves'ma russkoe i upotrebitel'noe slovo), but later changed it. See Pis'ma P.A. Katenina k N.I. Bakhtinu (SPb., 1911), 37.
 2. Vestnik Evropy, No.9 (1816), 14 ff.; Syn otechestva, No.24 (1816), 186 ff.
 3. See above, Chapter V, pp.172-76.

closer Katenin's translation is to Bürger's original than was Zhukovsky's version.¹ Whereas the setting of Lyudmila is generalized, Ol'ga, like Lenore, begins with a reference to a specific time and place: the hero had gone off to fight with the army of Peter the Great at Poltava. Whereas Zhukovsky transforms his characters into sentimental heroes and heroines, Katenin follows Bürger's characterizations more closely. For example, Ol'ga's lament is preceded and followed by violent physical gestures:

Тут, залившись слезами,
В перси бьет себя руками;
Рвет, припав к сырой земле,
Черны кудри на челе. (4:5-8)

The hero's speech is more colloquial and less poetic than in Zhukovsky's version, as for example, in the apostrophe to his horse:

Конь мой! петухи пропели;
Чур! заря чтоб не взошла;
Гор вершины забелели:
Мчись как из лука стрела. (27:1-4)

Ol'ga's lament also contains some colloquial expressions (net kak net; svetu-radosti ne stalo) and the symmetrical alternations of the mother's advice and Ol'ga's replies, both gradually increasing in length, approximate the effect which Bürger achieved.²

Whereas Zhukovsky extends Bürger's descriptive transition from three lines to nineteen (including thirteen epithets), Katenin limits himself to four lines, using folk, rather than bookish, epithets:

1. See above, Chapter III, pp. 85-90 for a detailed comparison of Zhukovsky's Lyudmila and Bürger's Lenore.

2. Schematically, let M=mother, O=Ol'ga, number=lines spoken: M-3, O-4, M-4, O-4, M-8, O-8, M-8, O-8. Totals: the mother speaks 23 lines, Ol'ga 24. Cf. above, Chapter III, pp.87-88 on Lyudmila and Lenore.

И стемнело небо ясно,
 Закатилось солнце красно,
 Все к покою улеглись,
 Звезды яркие зажглись. (11:5-8)

Although Katenin's version contains no equivalent for the sound effects of Bürger's ride, the refrain in Ol'ga is close to the German original in meaning and usage; it is introduced in 16:5-6, and repeated in 19:5-6, 23:5-6, and 26:5-6:

Месяц светит, ехать споро;
 И как мертвый еду скоро.

The hero's transformation into a corpse, glossed over in Lyudmila, is presented by Katenin in graphic detail:

Голова, взгляд, руки, тело -
 Все на милом помертвело,
 И стоит уж он с косою,
 Страшный остов костяной. (29:5-8)

Finally, the moral, significantly reinterpreted by Zhukovsky, is rendered as a close restatement of the original:

С Богом в суд нейди крамольно;
 Скорбь терпи, хоть сердцу больно. (31:5-6)

In 1831, after Zhukovsky's second translation of Lenore had appeared, Katenin decided to revise his own version. In spite of the letter to Bakhtin in which he claims that Griboedov's defence and the fact of Zhukovsky's retranslation had justified his writing of Ol'ga, Katenin nevertheless incorporated in his revised version several suggestions made by Gnedich, and he profited from the more literal rendition by Zhukovsky. For example, Gnedich argued that Zheny, deti im v dorogu / Klichut: (3:5-6) was "bad Russian"; Katenin altered the line to Vse navstrechu, na dorogu; / Klichut: .¹

1. See P.A. Katenin, 667-68 for further examples.

Katenin's last ballad, Pevets Uslad (1817),¹ comes as an unexpected conclusion to his series of literary ballads. The poem relates the story of the poet Uslad and his beloved Vsemila; the heroine's early death drives the poet to seek refuge first in battle and then in travel; he finally returns home to Rus', still grieving for his beloved. There his friends reproach him for his unseemly conduct; Uslad tearfully replies that his only happiness will be union with Vsemila after his own death.

Motifs such as the faithful hero, the untimely death of the heroine, and the union of lovers after death, were, of course, central to the love ballads of the 1790s. The language of Pevets Uslad demonstrates few of the characteristics of Ubiitsa, Leshii, and Ol'ga: neither folk epithets, nor "popular" expressions (except for znat' and avos'), nor colloquial dialogue. On the contrary, bookish epithets are frequent: rodnaya strana; zemli dalekie / I chuzhdye; krasavitsy chernookie; and Rus' svyataya. The hero's reply to his friends' reproach is reminiscent of Zhukovsky's elegies:

- Нет счастья мне под небесами,
Надежды нет. (7:3-4)

- Певец Услад лишь за могилой
Быть может рад: (8:1-2)

Thus in his last ballad, Katenin reverts to the motifs and the language of the Russian ballads of the 1790s and to the pattern of his own earlier works, Pevets and Natasha.

The purpose of this section has been to show the ambiguous

1. Vestnik Evropy, No.2 (1818), 89. Katenin's later works Sofokl (1818) and Mstislav Mstislavich (1819) are heroic poems, rather than literary ballads. The poet defined the genre of Natasha, Ubiitsa, Leshii, Sofokl, and Mstislav Mstislavich as lyrical povesti.

nature of Katenin's contribution to the literary ballad genre.

On the one hand, in Pevets, Natasha, and Pevets Uslad, the influence of the ballads of the 1790s and of Zhukovsky's models predominates,¹ on the other hand, in Ubiitsa, Leshii, and Ol'ga - although there are still motifs and expressions borrowed from Zhukovsky, Katenin is attempting to develop the genre in an original way. The realistic narrative, psychological leitmotifs, folk epithets, and colloquial vocabulary and syntax of these three ballads, are unlike any previous examples in the genre.

In 1816, after reading Ol'ga, Zhukovsky wrote to Gnedich that he thought that Katenin "definitely has talent".² Kyuchel'beker, after he turned against Zhukovsky, went out of his way to praise Katenin's ballads, arguing that

... although only experiments, [they] are ...
perhaps the only works in all of our literature
which belong to Romantic Poetry.³

Pushkin, in a review of Katenin's Sochineniya i perevody (1832), wrote that the author had been underestimated by his critics,

1. The similarity between Katenin's and Zhukovsky's language is particularly striking in the range and usage of epithets. Of the total of 132 epithets in Katenin's ballads, the most frequent are: belyi, bozhii, zlatoi, zloi, krasnyi, novyi, svyatoi (used 4 or more times each); and gor'kii, milyi, rodnoi, sladkii, strashnyi, syrui, temnyi, yasnyi (used 3 times each). The following combinations of epithet and substantive occur: vozdushnaya vyshina, lyubeznyy drug, dremuchii les, gustoi mrak, pechal'nyi zvon, yasnyi mesyats. Most of these frequent epithets and all of these combinations are commonly used in Zhukovsky's ballads. Original epithets, such as lysyi / pleshivyi mesyats, are the rare exceptions.

2. SS, IV, 569.

3. Syn otechestva, CIII, No.17 (1825), 71. Kyuchel'beker wrote several ballads in what he thought was Katenin's style. In fact Les (1818-20) and Ruchei (1819) were more influenced by Goethe and Zhukovsky; his later work, such as Rogdaevy psy (1824) and Kudeyar (1833), are heroic poemy, not ballads.

and that he had in fact achieved a considerable degree of originality and success. He praised his introduction of "popular" subjects into the elevated language of poetry, and expressed approval of the "simplicity or even crudity" of his language which had so distressed contemporary readers.¹

Zhukovsky was being generous to his "opponent"; Kyuchel'beker was exaggerating in order to make a polemic point; only Pushkin, with his usual critical acumen, was able to render a just evaluation.

* * *

A.I. Meshchevsky (1791-1820?) was a talented, although by now almost forgotten, poet and balladnik. A close friend of Zhukovsky's during their years at the boarding school affiliated to Moscow University, he was later exiled for an apparently insignificant reason. Zhukovsky defended his cause: in late 1816-early 1817 he wrote to A.I. Turgenev, reproaching the members of Arzamas for their lack of concern for Meshchevsky's fate:

And you should remember that more important to Arzamas is Meshchevsky in Siberia; but you, my friends, are leading your jolly lives in Petersburg.²

Zhukovsky and Vyazemsky prepared an edition of Meshchevsky's poetry, consisting primarily of ballads, many of which were translated from German originals; however, they failed to obtain permission to publish the edition.³

1. PSS, XI, 220-21.

2. Russkii arkhiv (1867), col.811.

3. The manuscript number is GPB-286/2/296.

Recently Yu. M. Lotman published a small selection of Meshchevsky's work, including only two ballads;¹ the texts are preceded by an introduction in which Lotman calls Meshchevsky "Zhukovsky's double", in as much as he pursued to their logical conclusion those principles of the ballad genre which had been established by Zhukovsky.² Lotman argues that whereas Zhukovsky's ballads are rich in complexity, Meshchevsky's are simpler in subject, structure, and theme. While Meshchevsky's style is similar to Zhukovsky's, he tends to exaggerate certain devices and to introduce unnecessary complications.

The first of Meshchevsky's published ballads, Edvin (1815-18), a translation of Schiller's Ritter Toggenburg, provides an interesting contrast with Zhukovsky's rendition of the same ballad, published in 1818 as Rytsar' Togenburg. Schiller's original ballad relates the story of a knight's interview with a lady: she rejects his offer of love and agrees to care for him only as a sister would her brother. The knight, unsatisfied, goes off to the wars in Palestine. He returns, still burning with desire, and learns that the lady has taken holy vows. He too forsakes the world and settles in a hut near her convent. There he lives in anticipation of catching a glimpse of his beloved; and there, his desires still unfulfilled, he dies.

Zhukovsky's version emphasizes the lady's rejection of the knight's offer of romantic love; she describes that love as one of endless meetings and partings, anguish and suffering. Similarly,

1. Uchenye zapiski TGU, CIV (1961), 277-80; and Poety 1790-1810-kh godov, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd., (L., 1971), 703-18.

2. Poety 1790-1810-kh godov, 37.

the knight's frustration is expressed by means of Zhukovsky's favourite verbal leitmotifs: Schiller's stille Hoffnung is replaced by strastnaya mûka, and the knight's unynie is apparent even in the description of his corpse:

Раз - туманно утро было -
Мертв он там сидел,
Бледен ликом, и уныло
На окно глядел. (10:5-8)

Meshchevsky, in his translation, introduces significant changes in Schiller's subject, unlike those in Zhukovsky's version. The rejection of romantic love is replaced by the motif of moonlight which illuminates the face of the lady, Lora:

Оттенил тебе долина
Тихий лик мой при луне. (1:5-6)

This motif is repeated in 8:2, and again in the final stanza, when it is Lora's death, not Edwin's, which occurs:

Вдруг свет месяца разлился...
Мертвой Лоры лик в окне... (10:5-6)

On the contrary, Edwin finds some serenity and spiritual comfort in his waiting.

Certain elements in Meshchevsky's style, such as the frequent exclamations, interruptions, and apostrophes, are similar to Zhukovsky's. However, Meshchevsky's images are expressed in highly artificial language:

Путеводный шлем Эдвина
Веял бурей роковой! (3:3-4)

Сон спешил страдальца вежды
Утомлены оковать - (9:1-2)

His syntax is complicated with numerous inversions (Sidya kel'i na kryl'tse), participles (slezyashchii vzor Edvina; Myshtsy,

veroi okrylennoi), and frequent separations of epithet and substantive: mrachnyi serdtsu prigovor; proshchal'nyi broshen vzor; gromkoi yunoshu molvoi; and tikhii strannika privet. Meshchevsky uses combinations of epithets and substantives such as rodnye brega, tikhii grom, zlataya dennitsa, temny lipy, as well as series of epithets, all characteristic of Zhukovsky's ballads:

Лик возлюбленной своей,
Тихий, ясный, умиленный -
Как заря весенних дней, - (8:6-8)

Мертвой Лоры лик в окне,
Бледный, тихий, отразился,
Как в полночном, сладком сне!... (10:6-8)

On the other hand, combinations such as Edvin osirotelyi and dushevnyaya nepogoda remain obscure in their meaning.

The second of Meshchevsky's published ballads, Lila (1815-18), is original, although its subject resembles that of Turchaninova's prose translation Vill'yam i Margarita (1800),¹ and the heroine's lament contains echoes of Zhukovsky's Lyudmila. Lila's ghost enters the bedchamber of her former lover Uslad. While he lies asleep, she relates the story of their betrothal, his betrayal, her anguish and death; she begins:

Спишь, милый, иль забыт ты сном?
Будь крест нам настороже!...
Со мной - на ложе гробовом!
С тобой - на брачном ложе!...² (2:21-4)

Because Lila still loves Uslad (Luch strasti prezhei ne potukh), she will forgive him.

The setting of the ballad consists of the most common Gothic motifs: mgla, polnoch', ten', grob, petukh. The syntax is even more complicated than in Edvin: parenthetical asides and dashes

1. See above, Chapter II, pp.35-36.

2. Cf. Lyudmila:10:1-2 - Spit il' net moy Lyudmila? / Pomnit druga il' zabyla?

frequently interrupt the action:

Ах! некогда равнял Улад
 (Лесть клятвы ненадежной!)
 С лилеей - грудь и с небом - взгляд,
 Ланиты - с розой нежной...
 И с Лилой обручен, - другой
 И сердце дал, и руку! (2:12-17)

Clauses are interposed between the subject and verb (ten' ... prokralas' - 1:4-2:3), and the accumulation of four predicates in one line results in some obscurity:

Любить, любя - прощать учись
 У презренной <ты> Лилы! (3:3-4)

The vocabulary includes the occasional archaism (ubrus - 10:1),¹ as well as epithets characteristic of Zhukovsky's style, such as plamennaya lyubov', zolotaya luna, zlataya dennitsa, and bezmolvnaya mгла.

Lotman's formulation, "Meshchevsky is Zhukovsky, put straight (vypryamlennyi) according to the laws of canonical Zhukovsky",² seems to be well-founded. The similarities and differences between the two poets further illuminate the stylistic principles employed by Zhukovsky in his ballads. The future publication of additional ballads by Meshchevsky would provide additional evidence and would permit more detailed conclusions.

* * *

The biography of I.I. Kozlov is, in some measure, the fulfillment of the emotional experiences expressed in Zhukovsky's lyrics. Chronic illness and subsequent blindness inspired Kozlov to become

1. Cf. Edvin:5:8 - Pod ubrus posvyashchena!

2. Poety 1790-1810-kh godov, 37.

a poet; his works treat the themes of melancholy, the loss of youth, the search for love and beauty, and the cruelty of Fate - all in an extremely personal way. The Poslanie k drugu V.A. Zhukovskomu (1822), which Belinsky described as Kozlov's "poetic confession",¹ shows the strong influence of Zhukovsky, as do his translations from Byron and Scott, his attempts at writing "popular" works, and his literary ballads. Between 1824 and 1838 Kozlov wrote a series of ballads, some of which are translations from Scott and Wordsworth, from the Italian poet Tommaso Grossi, and from Mérimée. With one notable exception, these ballads are "miniatures", which laconically present a dramatic situation in outline, and as such are closer to the narrative method of the traditional genre than are Zhukovsky's ballads.

An example of Kozlov's early ballads is Razboinik (1825),² based on a song contained in Scott's Rokeby (Canto 3, 16-18).³ The setting is typical of the ballad genre: forest, river, meadows, and moonlit valley. The heroine, a beautiful maiden who lives in a castle tower, is in spiritual harmony with nature. The hero, a smelyi ezdok, comes on a borzyi kon' to kidnap the maiden, so that they can lead a simple, rustic life together.

The structure of the ballad consists in the alternation of the heroine's song with the hero's monologue, and is interspersed with narrative passages. The heroine's vague desires as expressed in her song:

1. PSS, V, 72.

2. Moskovskii telegraf, No.8 (1825), 276-79.

3. The theme of Razboinik is similar to another one of Kozlov's translations from Scott's Marmion (Fifth song, 12) called Beverlei (1832).

Хочу любить я в тишине,
 Не царский сан носить; (13-14)

are transformed into actual intentions by the sudden arrival of her lover:

Хочу в привольной тишине
 Тебя, мой друг, любить; (45-46)

The language of the ballad contains a fair assortment of conventional romantic nature epithets: svetlyi tok, tumannyi dol, privetnyi shum (vod), temnyi les, dikii krai, zelenyi bereg, dushisty lug, and lesnaya glush'.

Revnost' (1832)¹ is a somewhat later example of Kozlov's original ballad miniatures. A young woman (prekrasnaya v slezakh) stands alone over a fresh grave lamenting the death of her lover, whom she has murdered in order to "fulfil her sacred duty" to her husband, Vadim. The latter suddenly emerges from his hiding place where he has overheard the lament; he condemns his wife and slays her, since he believes that even the lover's corpse must be happier than he is.

The setting is typical: midnight, moonlight, and a gloomy graveyard. The heroine expresses her tainyi strakh in language characteristic of Zhukovsky's poetry:

И мрачных дум тревоги неизбежной
 Невольно смущена,
 Склонясь на дерн, с тоскою безнадежной, ... (9-11)

The appearance of the jealous husband is melodramatic: he is described as blednee mertvetsov, but is totally real: ne prizrak.

1. Russkhi almanakh (1832-33), 221-22; entitled Revnivyi. The possibility of Pushkin's influence (Tsygany) on this ballad should not be overlooked.

The whole ballad - setting, heroine's lament, and Vadim's revenge - takes place within thirty-two lines of concise dramatic narrative. Although the characters and situation are analagous to those in Zhukovsky's ballads, the dimensions and dynamism of Kozlov's Revnost' are a successful attempt to imitate the narrative unit and method of the traditional ballad.

Another of Kozlov's later ballads, Taina (1836),¹ is an exercise in the creation of atmosphere. In a forest a shield and sword are hung on an oak tree which stands near a fresh grave; one night a young girl and a monk come to mourn the unidentified hero. The monk sings a dirge; then the girl pronounces a lament and cuts off her golden tresses with the sword.

Kozlov presents only the bare outline of the story, without any details of setting or characterization to detract from the mystery. The narrator proclaims his own ignorance:

... НИКТО, НИКТО НЕ ЗНАЕТ,
КТО ПОГРЕБЕН В ЛЕСУ ВО ТЬМЕ НОЧНОЙ? (7-8)

Nor does the monk understand: No kto on byl, chernets ne ponimal. Only the pale heroine (blednei svoei odezhdoy beloi) knows the secret, but she reveals nothing to the reader. When silence is once again established in the forest, no one is any the wiser: Torzhestvennyi odin ostalsya strakh. The language of the ballad is unexceptional; the work exists only in order to create the mood of strakh and uzhas - emotions which are central to the atmosphere of Zhukovsky's ballads.

In contrast to Kozlov's miniature ballads is the considerably longer work, Vengerskii les (1826-27).² Belinsky, whose general

1. Biblioteka dlya chteniya (1836), 169-70.

2. Nevskii almanakh (1827), 89-97; ibid (1828), 4-14.

attitude towards the genre had changed,¹ wrote in 1840:

As for the ballad [Vengerskii les] - besides some good verses, it has no significance, since it belongs to that false kind of poetry which depicts imaginary reality, which dreams up Veledas, Izveds, Ostans, Svezhans who never existed, and creates a fanciful Germanic ballad out of a Slavonic myth.²

The plot is complicated. The first part describes the escape from Kiev to the Hungarian forest of the young couple Ostan and Veleda. Their brief period of happiness together is destroyed by a mysterious vision seen by Ostan in the forest. In the second part, the frightened Ostan bids farewell to the forest, and together with Veleda he encounters a stranger wrapped in a shroud; this turns out to be the corpse of Veleda's brother, whom Ostan had recently murdered. Ostan dramatically vanishes, Veleda dies of grief, and tranquillity returns to the forest.

The setting of the ballad is conventional (dremuchii les, bezvestnaya tish', dikii krai); the heroine, a beautiful maiden with rusye kudry and golubye ochi, has given up a comfortable life to escape with the hero, a vityaz', who has sacrificed his own military career:

Он с ней, плающей душой,
К прекрасному стремится. (7:7-8)

After his vision in the forest Ostan becomes zadumchivyi and ugryumyi, oppressed by his guilt and a sense of foreboding.

The structure of Vengerskii les (alternating speeches), the themes (ideal love and cruel Fate), and the language are derived

1. See above, Chapter V, p.191-92.

2. PSS, V, 72.

principally from Zhukovsky's ballads, as are the various verbal leitmotifs, such as tainyi strakh, toska, chto-to mrachno, and so on. Zhukovsky's favourite epithets occur very frequently, as in this descriptive passage:

Когда ж повсюду тишина
И мертвое молчанье,
И полуночная луна
Льет томное сиянье,
Из тесной кельи гробовой
Тень бледная выходит...

(32:1-6)

In general the structure of Kozlov's ballads displays some genuine originality. For example, in Son nevesty (1824) the story is told within a dream; Nochnoi ezdok (1828) and Ozero mertvoi krasavitsy (1832) are lyrical monologues by the hero and heroine respectively; Vstrecha (1838) is in the form of a series of questions and answers; and in several other ballads the refrain is effectively employed as a structural device.

The subjects of Kozlov's ballads are far less original than the structure and are similar to the general pattern of the Russian ballads of the 1790s: the heroine is usually a representative of a higher social order than the hero; their mutual love is impeded by some obstacle, usually by their parents; the death of one lover is followed by the death of the other, and both tend to be united after death.

The least original aspect of Kozlov's work, however, is his style. His epithets, in particular, are derived almost exclusively

from Zhukovsky's repertoire.¹ Although epithets occur more frequently in Kozlov's descriptive passages than in Zhukovsky's, their range is the same and they are similarly employed. The difference in the effectiveness of their epithets is due to the evolution of literary style. When Zhukovsky composed his most important ballads, his use of epithets was innovative and original; when Kozlov started writing in the same style twenty years later, it was conventional and unoriginal.

Immediately after Kozlov's death in 1840, Zhukovsky published a collection of his poetry, prefaced by a brief biographical sketch of the man whom "misfortune transformed into a poet", and by an introduction to his poems, which he describes as "flowers which bloomed on the field of anguish".² Belinsky's article on Kozlov was written as a reply to Zhukovsky's preface.³ He prefers Kozlov's shorter lyrics and ballads, criticizing the longer poems such as Vengerskii les and Chernets. In general Belinsky was much less enthusiastic about Kozlov's achievement than was Zhukovsky, who clearly overestimated his originality.

* * *

1. Of a sample of 122 epithets selected from Kozlov's ballads, the most frequent are: belyi, grobovoi, milyi, nochnoi, svyatoi, tainyi, temnyi (used 8 or more times each); bednyi, groznyi, krovavyi, mladoi, mrachnyi, podzemnyi, prekrasnyi, rodnoi, svetlyi, strashnyi, tikhii, tomnyi, uzhasnyi, unylyi, chudnyi (used 4-6 times each). Epithets formed with the prefixes bez- and ne- are also characteristic: bezmolvnyi, nedvizhnyi, neotrazimyi, nepostizhimyi. All of these epithets are among those used most frequently by Zhukovsky.

2. PSS, X, 72-73.

3. PSS, V, 72.

Katenin, Meshchevsky, and Kozlov were among the most talented and interesting of Zhukovsky's many imitators. The contribution made by Katenin to the ballad genre remains ambiguous: in part he was dominated by Zhukovsky's influence, in part he attempted to develop a new, more "popular" genre. Meshchevsky's style provides an instructive contrast with Zhukovsky's: while he imitates Zhukovsky's intonation, interrupted narrative, and epithets, his highly artificial images and complicated syntax tend to obscure his meaning. Kozlov's ballads, particularly his miniatures, are noteworthy for their narrative structure, but their subjects and style are largely derived from Zhukovsky. The first literary ballads by Pushkin and Lermontov were also written in imitation of Zhukovsky's models, but each poet succeeded in transforming the genre in an individual and original way.

Chapter VII

PUSHKIN'S LITERARY BALLADS

Не понимаю, что у тебя за
охота пародировать Жуковского.
-- Пушкин¹

With the publication of Lyudmila and Svetlana, Zhukovsky became the most influential poet on the Russian literary scene. Derzhavin, late in his own literary career, bequeathed to him his poetic lyre:

Тебе в наследие, Жуковский,
Я ветху лиру отдаю;
А я над бездной гроба скользкой
Уж преклоня чело стою.²

It was only natural that aspiring young poets should imitate Zhukovsky. Pushkin, who was to become his most successful uchenik, began his literary career by choosing the genres, treating the themes, and imitating the style of Zhukovsky's poetry.

Pushkin's earliest experiment with the genre of the literary ballad took place during his years at the Lycée. Evidence for this is provided by V.P. Gaevsky in an article on the poet's Lycée works:

[Pushkin] wrote, in competition with Illichevsky, a chivalric ballad, in imitation of Zhukovsky's ballads, but this experiment has not survived.³

1. PSS, XIII, 248 (letter to Kyuchel'beker, December 1825).

2. G.R. Derzhavin. Stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. (L., 1957), 61.

3. V.P. Gaevsky, "Pushkin v litsee i litseiskie ego stikhotvoreniya", Sovremennik, XCVII, No.7 (1863), 134.

Gaevsky concludes that this first ballad was written in approximately 1812.

In 1814 Pushkin wrote a series of Ossianic poems combining heroic motifs and love themes which were strongly influenced by Zhukovsky's lyrics and ballads. The first, Kol'na, is a free rendition of an excerpt from Ossian; it closely follows Kostrov's prose translation.¹ Evlega is a free translation of the fourth song in Parny's long Ossianic poem, Isnel et Asléga. Garal' i Gal'vina, in the same series, belongs to Pushkin's dubia. The most interesting of these experiments is Osgar, Pushkin's original work based on an Ossianic theme, which reveals the extent of Zhukovsky's influence on the young poet.

In the poem an old bard stops a traveller in a graveyard so that he can relate to him tales of past heroes, particularly of Osgar, a bold warrior who was in love with the beautiful Mal'vina. But Mal'vina was unfaithful, so Osgar slew her new lover and wandered the earth in despair. Years later his ghost returned to watch over Mal'vina's grave.

The setting of the poem and the characters contain all the elements characteristic of Zhukovsky's ballads: graveyard, moonlight, midnight, a steep cliff, and a dense forest. The old bard is referred to as a zadumchivyi pevets and a starets vdokhnovennyi. Osgar is young (vo tsvete nezhnykh let) and milyi; Mal'vina is young and beautiful.

Zhukovsky-type epithets predominate in the style of the poem, particularly in the description of the setting: t'ma gustaya, dremuchii bor, groznye skaly, tusklyi luch, bezdna morskaya.

1. See above, Chapter I, p.p.16-17.

Epithets with emotional overtones are extremely frequent: bereg ugryumyi; mrachnaya iva; zimy pora unylaya; mrachnaya, bezmolvnaya toska; sladkoe ocharovanie; unylaya ten'. The atmosphere is created principally by the repetition of words relating to silence and mystery:

И тихо за порог выходит он в молчанье,
Окован мрачною, безмолвною тоской - (8:5-6)

Побегли вспять враги - и тихий мир герою!
И тихо все вокруг могильного холма! (11:1-2)

The syntax of the poem is characterized by rhetorical questions, exclamatory intonation, interruptions, and interjections - all typical of Zhukovsky's language. It should be noted that Zhukovsky's most Ossianic ballad, Eolova arfa, was written in the same year as Pushkin's Osgar; striking similarities in the phraseology of the two works have been recorded.¹ Osgar is clearly Pushkin's least original, most imitative experiment which employs the subject, characters, setting, and style of Zhukovsky's early ballads and balladic lyrics.

From 1814 to 1820 Pushkin wrote a number of works which in one way or another demonstrate the influence of Zhukovsky's poetry. In K Zhukovskomu (1816) Pushkin reviews the most recent developments in Russian poetry, including Zhukovsky's contribution; in K portretu Zhukovskogo (1818) he praises Zhukovsky's verse for its plenitel'naya sladost', bezmolvnaya pechal', and rezvaya ... radost'; in Zhukovskomu (1818) he characterizes the world of Zhukovsky's poetry as one where:

... сменяются виденья
Перед тобой в волшебной мгле. (5-6)

¹ Yezuitova "Iz istorii". 271.

In the same poslanie Pushkin reinterprets the title of Zhukovsky's periodical, Für Wenige - Dlya nemnogikh, which was originally intended to refer literally to the small audience to whom the poems were addressed, but which is applied by Pushkin to the figurative "few" who could understand and appreciate real poetry.

Kazak (1814), subtitled Podrazhanie malorossiiskomu, is probably based on the Ukrainian folksong Ekhav kazak za Dunai. It shows evidence of Zhukovsky's influence on its heroine, setting, and dialogue. Only the ironic reversal in the final stanza destroys the romance of the lovers' elopement:

Поскакали, полетели.
Дружку друг любил;
Был ей верен две недели,
В третью изменил. (15)

Pushkin's lyric Srazhennyi rytsar' (1815) has no real subject, but it manages to capture the mysterious atmosphere of Zhukovsky's ballads by its language, rich in enigmatic hints and suggestions. Tam u leska (1819) is a balladic lyric which relates a love story in typical Zhukovsky style,¹ except that the narrator is distinct from the author. Finally in the balladic Chernaya shal' (1820), subtitled Moldavskaya pesnya, although no source has yet been discovered, Pushkin's narrator emerges as a genuine character, and the device of the refrain, repeated in the last stanza, acquires tragic significance:

Гляжу, как безумный, на черную шаль,
И хладную душу терзает печаль. (16)

It has been argued that this work is a parody of Zhukovsky's ballads² - an interpretation which seems unjustified inasmuch as

1. Cf. Zhukovsky's ballad El'vina i Edvin (1814).

2. See B.P. Gorodetsky, Lirika Pushkina (M.-L., 1962), 265; and G.F. Bogach, Pushkin i moldavskii fol'klor (Kishinev, 1963), 42-45.

no evidence of parody is provided by either the manuscript copy or the variant redactions of the work.¹

* * *

In a letter to Kyuchel'beker written in December 1825 Pushkin stated:

I don't understand what makes you parody Zhukovsky.²

In spite of this claimed incomprehension, after his series of Ossianic poems in 1814, and both during and after the various poems written from 1814 to 1820 which clearly reflect Zhukovsky's influence, Pushkin began to parody precisely those elements of Zhukovsky's style which he had so faithfully imitated. In an article written later in his career, Pushkin observed of parody in general:

This sort of joke requires rare versatility of style: the good parodist is master of all styles.³

Pushkin^k was to demonstrate in his parodies of Zhukovsky's ballads that he possessed that "rare versatility" and that he was the undisputed "master of all styles".

Evidence of Pushkin's first experiment in parody is provided by Gaevsky's article on his Lycée works:

1. See PSS, II, 631-34.

2. PSS, XIII, 248.

3. "Angliya est' otechestvo karikatury (1830)", PSS, XI, 118.

Attracted by the success of the talented and witty poem written by his uncle, V.L. Pushkin, called Opasnyi sosed,¹ which was circulating in manuscript and being avidly read and reread, the nephew [Pushkin] adopted the same genre and ... wrote Ten' Barkova, a ballad, known in several copies. At first he passed it off as a work by Prince Vyazemsky, but seeing that it was enjoying great success, he [Pushkin] acknowledged that he wrote it.²

Composed while Pushkin was working on his unfinished poema, Monakh, said by Gaevsky to be an imitation of Barkov's pornographic works, Ten' Barkova is a witty pornographic parody of Zhukovsky's ballad Gromoboi (1810). Although the complete text has never been published, small excerpts have appeared in various editions of Pushkin's collected works. In 1929 N.O. Lerner published the largest extract to date (70 lines) in Ogonek. In his introduction to Ten' Barkova Lerner dispels any doubts concerning Pushkin's authorship and argues that the work was written no later than 1814.³ M.A. Tsyavlovsky prepared the text for a special supplement to Volume I of the Academy of Sciences edition of Pushkin's complete collected works (1937-59); in a commentary on the poem he compared the texts of Ten' Barkova and Gromoboi in order to demonstrate how closely Pushkin parodied Zhukovsky's religious passages. Tsyavlovsky's supplement and commentary have never been published.⁴ All attempts to publish the text since then have failed, and neither the complete text nor the commentary is available for scholarly consultation.

1. V.L. Pushkin's poem describes the diverse clientele at the local brothel; see Poëty 1790-1810-kh godov, 668-72.

2. "Pushkin v litsee", 155-57.

3. N.O. Lerner, Rasskazy o Pushkine (L., 1929), 47-56.

4. See M.A. Tsyavlovsky, Stat'i o Pushkine (M., 1962), 418.

If the various published excerpts are assembled, a general idea of Ten' Barkova emerges. On a certain winter evening a defrocked priest, a poet, and various other unsavoury characters gather in a Petersburg brothel. The priest is by far the most high-spirited, and earns himself the title of "Zealous priest of Priapus"; the poet seems to be impotent, but the ghost of Barkov comes to his rescue. If the poet will agree to sing Barkov's praises, then his potency will be restored:

Возьми задорный мой гудок,
Играй как не попало!
Вот звонки струны, вот смычок, -
Ума в тебе немало.

The young poet eagerly accepts the offer:

- Барков! доволен будешь мной! -
Провозгласил детина.
И вмиг исчез призрак ночной,
И мягкая перина
Под милой ...
Не раз потом измялась.....

A general similarity between Zhukovsky's Gromoboi and Pushkin's Ten' Barkova is undeniable. Zhukovsky's disenchanted hero enters into a bargain with the evil Asmodei: if he signs over his soul to the devil, he will be rewarded with honours and riches. Pushkin's impotent poet enters into an agreement with the talented, though underrated Barkov: if he praises Barkov's poems, he regains his potency. However, without access to the full text of Pushkin's parody or to Tsyavlovsky's commentary, no detailed analysis is possible here.

While Pushkin's first experiment in parody was based on Zhukovsky's Gromoboi, his next was based on Zhukovsky's Vadim.¹

1. There exists a short poem Ballada (Chto, ty devitsa, grustna) (1819), a joint effort at comic verse on the subject of writing ballads. The first five words were written by Zhukovsky, the remainder, by Pushkin.

In September 1815 the two poets met in Tsarskoe Selo and became life-long friends. From 1814 to 1817 Zhukovsky worked on the sequel to his ballad Gromoboi which he completed in 1817; both parts (Gromoboi and Vadim) were published that year under the general title Dvenadtsat' spyashchikh dev. From 1817 to 1820 Pushkin worked on his long poem Ruslan i Lyudmila, published in 1820. Zhukovsky read the poem and sent his portrait to Pushkin with the famous inscription acknowledging his defeat.¹ Since its publication, critics have tended to read Ruslan, particularly the fourth canto, as a parody of Zhukovsky's Vadim. Pushkin later replied to the critics:

They accused my poem [Ruslan] of immorality ...
and [said it was] a parody of Dvenadtsat'
spyashchikh dev; for this second charge, I should
have been soundly rebuked for a lack of aesthetic
feeling. It was unforgivable (especially at my
age) to parody a virginal, poetic creation in order
to delight the crowd.²

The fourth canto of Ruslan begins with an invocation to Zhukovsky which first characterizes and praises his poetry, and then begs forgiveness in advance for what is to follow (17-27). Next Pushkin succinctly summarizes the contents of Gromoboi (28-37), and continues with a general description of Zhukovsky's ballads, written in Zhukovsky's own style:

И нас пленили, ужаснули
Картины тайных сих ночей,
Сии чудесные виденья,
Сей мрачный бес, сей божий гнев,
Живые грешника мученья
И прелесть непорочных дев.³ (38-43)

1. See above, Chapter V, p.187.

2. "Oproverzhenie na kritiki (1830)", PSS, XI, 144-45.

3. (My underlining.) Pushkin's description of the castle and the maiden's song (68-95) parody Zhukovsky's epithets in the conclusion to Gromoboi (68-74).

Then follows the parody. Pushkin's Ratmir, in pursuit of Lyudmila, succumbs to temptation and accepts the physical pleasures which Zhukovsky's Vadim had rejected. On the other hand, Ruslan proves to be the faithful lover and hero, who does not succumb to temptation, but rather overcomes numerous obstacles to achieve his goal. However, this goal is not the abstract, mystical illumination towards which Vadim had aspired; on the contrary, it is the very beautiful and very physical Lyudmila. Pushkin has turned Zhukovsky's theme on its head. All the hero's sacrifices and torments are not directed towards achieving some sort of spiritual fulfilment, but rather towards discovering personal contentment in earthly love.

In his recent study of Pushkin, J.O. Bayley, discussing Stantsionnyi smotritel', wrote:

Like all Pushkin's parodies it does not deride or belittle the source, but gives it a further dimension of humanity.¹

Such is the essence of Pushkin's parody of Zhukovsky in Ruslan i Lyudmila. The spiritual Vadim has been reincarnated as the physical Ruslan, and the former's abstract ideal has been replaced by the latter's human emotion. This is parody in its most creative sense.²

Another, perhaps less obvious, example of Pushkin's parody of Zhukovsky's ballads is contained within chapter V of Evgenii Onegin. By now Tat'yana's dream has acquired a respectable bibliography;³

1. J.O. Bayley, Pushkin. A Comparative Commentary (Cambridge, 1971), 311.

2. The same sort of parody is employed by Dostoevsky in Bednye lyudi. Akakii Akakievich's lifeless shinel' is replaced by Devushkin's human Varvara as the basis of the hero's life.

3. See R.A. Gregg, "Tat'yana's Two Dreams", SEER, XLVIII, No.113 (1970), 492-505, for a bibliography.

two items in it have particular relevance for this discussion. M.P. Samarin, in a little-known article entitled "Iz marginalii k Evgeniyu Oneginu",¹ studies the relationship of the dream to Pushkin's ballad Zhenikh. Based on manuscript evidence, Samarin notes: firstly, that Pushkin was working on chapters IV and V of Onegin and on Zhenikh simultaneously; and secondly, that in a rough draft of Zhenikh the heroine is called Tat'yana, and the heroine of Onegin is originally called Natasha. In his analysis of the texts, Samarin demonstrates some intriguing similarities between the two: the settings of the dream and the ballad are almost identical (forest, night, hut); details in the narration are common to both works (shaika, door, long knife); some of the phraseology coincides (cf. EO:V:17 Lyudskaya molv' i konskii top, and Zhenikh:18:1 - Vdrug slyshu krik i konskii top); and finally, Natasha's story in Zhenikh is related as if it too were a dream. Thus it is possible to identify balladic motifs and expressions in Tat'yana's dream.

R.E. Matlaw, in an article entitled "The dream in Yevgeniy Onegin",² considers the relationship of Tat'yana's dream to Zhukovsky's ballad Svetlana. He argues that one of the sources of Pushkin's material on Russian folklore is Svetlana, and demonstrates some similarities in phraseology between the two (particularly in descriptions of the snowy setting, the chase, and the heroine's fear). Matlaw concludes that the romantic diction of the dream

1. M.P. Samarin, "Iz marginalii k Evgeniyu Oneginu", Naukovi zapiski naukovo-doslidchoi katedri istorii ukrains'koi kul'turi, No.6 (1927), 307-14.

2. R.E. Matlaw, "The dream in Yevgeniy Onegin, with a note on Gore ot uma", SEER, XXXVII, No.89 (1959), 487-504.

constitutes either a parody of Zhukovsky's language, or an example of Tat'yana's own exaggeration, or evidence of Pushkin's ironic attitude towards romantic heroines.

The epigraph to chapter V and references to Zhukovsky's Svetlana in earlier chapters leave little doubt as to the presence of parody. In chapter III:5 Lensky compares Tat'yana to Svetlana, using Zhukovsky's epithets molchaliiva i grustna. In chapter V:10 the narrator intervenes to recall the fortune-telling scene in Svetlana and to express his fears on behalf of Tat'yana. The epigraph to chapter V is borrowed from Zhukovsky's epilogue to the ballad:

О, не знай сих страшных снов
Ты, моя Светлана... (20:1-2)

The point is made by Matlaw that this epigraph is ironic: Svetlana's dream turns out to be false, and its melodramatic horrors are replaced by the joys of marriage. While Tat'yana's dream also proves to be false in that she does not marry Onegin, in a much deeper sense her dream comes true: Lensky is killed and she is married off to someone else. Tat'yana's dream is a subtle parody of Zhukovsky's Svetlana in which Pushkin ironically reverses the whole role of the dream itself. Svetlana's dream is unreal and forgotten; Tat'yana's dream is real and fulfilled.

Not all of Pushkin's parodies of Zhukovsky's ballads were written in verse. In 1830 Pushkin turned once again to Svetlana for an epigraph to one of his Povesti Belkina, Metel'. He borrowed twelve lines from the ninth and tenth stanzas of the ballad, which depict the snowy setting of Svetlana's ride, the little church by the roadside, and the black raven, an omen of sadness.

Bayley interprets Metel' as an attack on "the contemporary vogue for tales of romantic elopements and demon bridegrooms" and he notes "parallels with Bürger's Lenore that are hinted at in the nightmare of the heroine Masha".¹ Bayley's observations can be extended: it is possible to interpret Metel' as a parody of the subject and setting of a typical literary ballad. The poor hero and pale heroine represent different social classes; the obstacle to their love is provided by the heroine's parents; an elopement is planned in an atmosphere of mystery and is followed by a midnight ride through a snowy landscape. Two motifs occur in Mar'ya's dream: her father hurls her into a bottomless pit (cf. Lyudmila's demise in a grave), and her lover appears as a corpse (cf. the transformation of the milyi into a skeleton). But unlike Tat'yana's dream, Mar'ya's dream is not completely fulfilled. Her lover fails to appear at the church; he departs in disgrace and is killed in battle. The heroine is married to a passing stranger who soon disappears.² Only by an unlikely coincidence are the heroine and the stranger-husband romantically reunited years later, in a parody of the disguise/recognition motif which is characteristic of Zhukovsky's ballads. Metel' ends with the words:

Бурмин побледнел... и бросился к ее ногам.

Zhukovsky's ballad Pustynnik (1812) contains a tearful reunion

1. Pushkin, 311-12.

2. Gregg, in "Tat'yana's Two Dreams", argues that Tat'yana must have known perfectly well the fate of eligible maidens who do not marry the man they love - they marry someone else. Thus Tat'yana marries the general. Similarly in Metel', Mar'ya marries the stranger.

between former lovers, described in almost the same words:

--Мальвина! - старец восклицает,
И пал к ее ногам. (36:1-2)

Metel' ends happily. The heroine fails to get back her original lover; instead she is given an acceptable substitute. Once again Pushkin has ironically reversed the ballad situation.

Another of the Povesti Belkina contains elements of ballad parody. In Grobovshchik all the various miraculous and mysterious motifs of the literary ballads are present, once again in the form of a dream. The hero's "invitation" extended to his former clients to attend a house-warming party is vividly enacted in his imagination. While the hero is terrified, the comic tone of the narrator's description of the skulls, skeletons, and corpses transforms the Gothic paraphernalia of a literary ballad into the prosaic details of the old grave-digger's dream.

Pushkin resorted to verse parody once more in his cycle entitled Pesni zapadnykh slavyan (1834). Vurdalak, one of the songs translated from Mérimée's literary hoax, La Guzla (1827), is an amusing parody of the terror which ballads were supposed to arouse. The hero Vanya, wandering through a graveyard late one night, is frightened by a horrible noise which he takes to be a vampire; it turns out to be a dog chewing an old bone. Vanya's irrational fear is the object of amusement: he is described as ot strakha blednyi, and the tension is sustained in balladic language:

Бедный Ваня еле дышит,
Спотыкаясь, чуть бредет
По могилам; вдруг он слышит,-
Кто-то кость, ворча, грызет.¹ (2)

1. (My underlining.) Cf. Svetlana:6:2 - Chut' Svetlana dyshit,
and Zhenikh:1:8 - Drozhit i ele dyshit.

Although Pushkin's parodies date from 1814 (Ten' Barkova) to 1834 (Vurdalak), the works in which Zhukovsky's motifs and style were subjected to the most significant reinterpretation were written between 1817 and 1825. By 1825 Pushkin had freed himself from the narrow conventions of the Russian ballad. He started using the genre not for imitations or for parodies, but rather to create original literary ballads.

* * *

Pushkin's first creative experiment in the ballad genre was Rusalka, written in 1819, but not published until 1826 because of censorship problems. The ballad has since attracted little attention from the critics. Tomashevsky dismisses it as Pushkin's "Western European ballad",¹ while Iezuitova merely emphasizes its "anti-clerical theme".² No one has yet demonstrated the relationship between Pushkin's Rusalka and Zhukovsky's ballad Rybak (1818).

Rusalka relates the story of a monk whose evening prayers are interrupted when a mermaid suddenly appears and beckons to him. Her reappearance on the following night torments the monk and keeps him from his devotions. On the third night he disappears mysteriously; his corpse is discovered the next day by some children.

The similarities to Zhukovsky's Rybak are numerous: the ballad setting and atmosphere; the mermaid's summons; the hero's submission; and the demonstration of the power of nature-magic over human beings. But all of these motifs, adapted from Goethe's original, were substantially reworked by Pushkin in Rusalka.

1. Tomashevsky, Pushkin, II (M.-L., 1961), 375.

2. "Iz istorii", 425.

While Zhukovsky's setting for Rybak is abstract and merely implied, Pushkin emphasizes the realistic connection between nature and supernature. Each appearance of the mermaid is preceded by a mysterious transformation of the landscape, brought about by shadows, darkness, and moonlight (stanzas 2, 5, 7). The solution to the mystery is contained in the final stanza in the phrase ocharovannye brega: the landscape may appear to be "natural", but it is really under the control of the supernatural.

Whereas Zhukovsky's mermaid is a pure and idealized krasavitsa, Pushkin's legendary rusalka¹ represents a physical temptation in human form. She appears naked and alluring, flirtatious and playful. Some of the epithets which are used to describe her are borrowed from Zhukovsky:

... легка, как тень ночная,
Бела, как ранний снег холмов. (3:5-6)

vlazhnye vlosy (cf. Rybak: vlazhnaya glava); and chudnaya deva, /
... prelestna ... bledna. However, the description of the mermaid in stanza 6 is strikingly original in its almost exclusive use of verbs:

Глядит, кивает головою,
Целует издали шутя,
Играет, плещется волною,
Хохочет, плачет, как дитя,
Зовет монаха, нежно стонет...

Zhukovsky's fisherman is a passive and uninvolved hero. Pushkin's monk is chosen not for "anti-clerical" reasons, but because the poet wants to demonstrate the power of nature-magic over someone who is leading a severely disciplined, ascetic life. Pushkin's real

1. Fasmer in Etymologicheskii slovar' russkogo yazyka, III (M., 1971), 520, traces the origin of rusalka to OR rusaliya - the pagan holiday of springtime, later the resurrection of the holy fathers before Trinity; the OR is borrowed from Middle Greek ῥοσάλια - Trinity, or Latin rosalia - the holiday of roses.

interest lies in the gradual development of the hero's obsession. The monk is first described as staryi and svyatoi; by the second night the vision of the mermaid has made him ugryumyi; and on the third night the otshel'nik strastnyi is near distraction.

Pushkin's final image of the monk's corpse is understated and unemotional. The manuscript version reads:

И только бороду седую
Русалки дергали в воде.¹

The published text was altered to:

И только бороду седую
Мальчишки видели в воде. (7:7-8)

The realistic physical image of the beard visible in the water is very striking. Bayley considers the bathos of this climax an example of Pushkin's complete non-involvement:² the mermaid does not appear on the third night, thus frustrating the reader's expectations and deviating from the pattern of Zhukovsky's Rybak. The vision or possible hallucination of the monk is replaced by the factual observations of outsiders. The elimination of the rusalki from the manuscript and their replacement by the mal'chishki supports Bayley's view. Pushkin is clearly trying to achieve the distance between narrator and subject which is characteristic of the narrative method in traditional folk ballads.

The manuscript versions of Rusalka contain additional evidence of Zhukovsky's influence, much of which was eliminated in the final copy.³ The original description of the setting uses the favourite

1. PSS, II, 573.

2. Pushkin, 56.

3. PSS, II, 569-73.

Zhukovsky epithet tikhii (Sidit u tikhikh beregov); the mermaid is referred to as krasavitsa nagaya (cf. Rybak:1:8) which is altered to zhenshchina nagaya; and the intonations and interruptions characteristic of Zhukovsky's syntax are much more apparent in the early versions.

Rusalka is Pushkin's own version of Zhukovsky's Rybak, written not as a parody of it, but as a creative reinterpretation. While some of the description still shows the influence of Zhukovsky's style, the dominant supernatural element, the sensuous mermaid, the obsessed monk, the objective narrator, and the astonishing realism foreshadow Pushkin's original development of the ballad genre. Pushkin remained silent during the polemics which enveloped Rybak in 1820.¹ Rusalka was his own poetic contribution to the debate.

In 1822 Pushkin wrote the Pesn' o veshchem Olege, which has sometimes been included in discussions of his literary ballads,² although it belongs to the tradition of Russian historical poemy, such as Katenin's Mstislav (1819), Ryleev's Dumy (1821-23), Kyuchel'beker's Svyatopolk (1824), and Yazykov's Oleg (1827). Pushkin borrowed the subject of the Pesn' from two sources: Karamzin's Istoriya Gosudarstva Rossijskogo, which contained the Primary Chronicle's concise account of Oleg's career; and the so-called L'vov Chronicle,³ an edition of which was in Pushkin's library, and which included some dialogues which were adapted by

1. See above, Chapter V, pp.181-83.

2. See Gukovsky, Pushkin i russkie romantiki, 331 ff.; and Tudorovskaya, "Stanovlenie zhanra narodnoi ballady", 67-83.

3. Letopisets russkoi ot prishestviya Rurika do konchiny tsarya Ioanna Vasil'evicha (SPb., 1792).

the poet.¹

In his Pesn' Pushkin attempted to create an accurate historical picture of life in ninth- and tenth-century Rus' by including numerous details relating to the heroic byt (military campaigns, funeral feasts, and so on). The language of the poem is not stylized; it is rather a conscious mixture of elements borrowed from folklore (temnyi les, vernyi kon'), the chronicle sources (veshchii Oleg), and the contemporary literary language (vdokhnovennyi kudesnik, pokornyi Perunu).² Pushkin's theme, the inevitability of Fate, is similar to that found in literary ballads.

Zhenikh, written in 1824-25, is one of Pushkin's most original literary ballads, although both its genre and its source have been the subject of controversy. When it was first published in Moskovskii vestnik in 1827, its genre was defined as prosto-narodnaya skazka. The fact that this subtitle was removed when the work was included in the 1829 edition of Pushkin's poetry shows the poet's own vacillation concerning its true genre. Zhenikh is neither a skazka in the traditional sense, nor is it a conventional literary ballad. Instead, Pushkin combines the subject and narrative method of a skazka with the form and narrative attitude of a ballad to produce something novel.

Belinsky, in his articles on Pushkin, considers Zhenikh a genuine, narodnyi Russian work:

1. See K.A. Nemirovskaya, "Pesn' o veshchem Olege i letopisnoe skazanie", Ucheniye zapiski LGPI im. A.I. Gertsena, LXXVI (1949), 13-56.

2. See O.V. Tvorogov, "Leksika Pesni o veshchem Olege", Uchenye zapiski LGPI im. Gertsena, CLXIX (1959), 229-53.

This ballad, in terms both of its form and content, is saturated with Russian spirit; one can say about it a thousand times more than about Ruslan i Lyudmila: Zdes' russkii dukh, zdes' Rus'yu pakhnnet.¹

Pushkin's letter to his brother, written from Mikhailovskoe in November 1824, is often cited as authoritative evidence of the narodnyi sources of Zhenikh:

... in the evenings I listen to skazki - and compensate for the deficiency in my damned upbringing. How lovely these skazki are! Each one is a poema!²

N.F. Sumtsov undertook a detailed comparison of Zhenikh with twenty variants of the Russian skazka based on the same subject.³ He concludes that Pushkin's work, although it contains motifs similar to those in the skazki (e.g. the matchmaker's offer and the father's acceptance; the youth in the troika; the girl at the gate), differs from each one in some particular way; thus he eliminates the variants as definite sources for Zhenikh. N.M. Dolgova studied the songs recorded by Pushkin which were later included in Kireevsky's collection (1868), and discovered that some of the wedding songs have elements in common with Zhenikh.⁴

In addition to these Russian sources, foreign sources have also been suggested for the ballad. M.K. Azadovsky mentioned the possibility of influence on Zhenikh by the Grimm Brothers.⁵ The

1. "Sochineniya Aleksandra Pushkina", PSS, VII, 433-34.

2. PSS, XIII, 121.

3. N.F. Sumtsov, "Issledovaniya o poezii A.S. Pushkina", in Khar'kovskii universitetskii sbornik v pamyat' A.S. Pushkina (Khar'kov, 1900), 276-86.

4. N.M. Dolgova, "K voprosu ob istochnikakh ballady A.S. Pushkina Zhenikh", Uchenye zapiski Gor'kovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, XLVIII (1958), 27-36.

5. M.K. Azadovsky, "Istochniki skazok Pushkina", Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii, I (1936), 134-63.

most convincing argument was presented by A.M. Kukulevich and L.M. Lotman, based on an analysis of Der Räuberbräutigam from the Grimm Brothers' Kinder- und Hausmärchen (1812-13). They compared the content of the German tale with Zhenikh and came to the conclusion that the former contains all the major motifs of Pushkin's poem, including the wedding feast, dream interpretation, and so on, some of which are lacking in the Russian skazki. They also compared the language of the two works, and found several interesting parallels in phraseology.¹

The problem is to explain how Pushkin could have known the German tale, since it was not included in the available French translation of the Grimm Brothers. It is supposed that Pushkin either read it in German, or that Zhukovsky served as the intermediary. Tomashevsky in his study of Pushkin accepts the conclusions reached by Kukulevich and Lotman.² It is probable that Pushkin began with the Grimm Brothers's tale, and then used motifs borrowed from Russian skazki and songs in order to create a truly Russian narodnyi ballad.

Pushkin was certainly influenced by other literary ballads, particularly by Bürger's Lenore, from which the stanza and metre of Zhenikh are borrowed, and by the versions of Lenore written by Zhukovsky and Katenin. The rough draft of Zhenikh, which is twice as long as the final version, shows how strong these influences were. The following passages in the manuscript, which were either eliminated or greatly reduced, demonstrate the similarities between

1. A.M. Kukulevich and L.M. Lotman, "Iz tvorcheskoi istorii ballady Pushkina Zhenikh", Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii, VI (1941), 72-91.

2. Pushkin, II, 103.

the original version of Zhenikh and Zhukovsky's ballads:¹

И кинулась рыдая мать
В слезах Наташу обнимать²
Стоит бледна как полотно
Открыв недвижно очи
И все глядит она в окно
В печальный сумрак ночи.³

Наташа снова задрожит
И взоры снова устремит⁴
То в окны то к порогу
Молясь тихонько Богу.

The scene between mother and daughter, the heroine's temperamental nature, and her religious devotion are motifs familiar from Zhukovsky's Lyudmila and Svetlana. The final version of Zhenikh still shows traces of Zhukovsky's influence in its general atmosphere of strakh and mystery, and in the use of the adverbs vdrug and vot. The last stanza of Pushkin's ballad is similar in language and theme to the final stanza of Zhukovsky's Ivikovy zhuravli.

In a letter written to Bakhtin in November 1827 Katenin complained:

Pushkin's Natasha [i.e. Zhenikh] is sewn together out of scraps, Svetlana and Ubiitsa have been shamelessly pillaged.⁵

And indeed, Zhenikh shows some influence of Katenin's own ballad

1. PSS, II, 957-64.

2. Cf. Lyudmila:4 (the scene between mother and daughter).

3. Cf. Lyudmila:8:9 - V svetlyi sumrak oblechenny.

4. The variants of this line include two Zhukovsky epithets:
I vzor nedvizhnyi / ushasnyi <?> ustremit.

5. Pis'ma P.A. Katenina k K.N. Bakhtinu (SPb., 1911), 100-101.
Katenin mistakenly used the heroine's name as the title.

Natasha.¹ There are also striking similarities in names, motifs, and phraseology between Zhenikh and chapter V of Evgenii Onegin, which were being written simultaneously.² Yet in spite of this variety of foreign and Russian influences and similarities, Pushkin's Zhenikh is one of his most original works.

The ballad begins in medias res: Natasha, a merchant's daughter, returns home after three days away, and resumes her normal life without explaining her absence to her parents. One day when a troika goes by, she recognizes the driver, but keeps silent. The driver, attracted by Natasha, sends a matchmaker to her father to arrange a wedding. At the wedding feast Natasha recounts her mysterious "dream", and thus exposes her bridegroom as a robber and a murderer.

The brevity of Zhenikh and the maintenance of the enigma until the understated conclusion contribute to the heightened dramatic tension. Horror is inherent in the situation itself, and does not need to be made explicit by frequent use of Zhukovsky-type epithets such as uzhasnyi and strashnyi. Natasha's practical heroism, demonstrated in the invention and execution of a plan to expose the villain, is in marked contrast with the humble submission to Fate of Zhukovsky's heroines and heroes.

The language of the ballad consists of a combination of popular and literary elements. Repetition of individual words and motifs, sometimes ternary or augmented, is functional, rather than ornamental, and therefore is similar to the repetition in traditional

1. Cf. Zhenikh:13:7 - Ne p'et, ne est, ne sluzhit;
Natasha:12:5 - Ne pila tri dnya, ne ela.

2. See above, p. 226.

folk ballads.¹ In a recent article R.M. Volkov traced the numerous parallels between Pushkin's language in Zhenikh and popular songs, sayings, riddles, and chastushki, many of which are recorded in Dal''s dictionary.²

Pushkin uses the folk devices of diminutives, affectionate suffixes, and noun-epithets (dusha-devitsa, devitsa-krasa), as well as literary devices, such as rich synonym groups to describe Natasha and the bridegroom, and the noun catalogue:

Крик, хохот, песни, шум и звон,
Разгульное похмелье...³ (20:1-2)

Epithets are comparatively rare in Zhenikh. Pushkin uses some folk epithets (tesovye vorota, likhaya troika, perstni zolotye, ditya rodnoe) and describes Natasha in folkloric terms (rumyana and vesela). The matchmaker also employs a series of folk epithets to characterize the suitor:

И статный, и проворный,
Не вздорный, не зазорный. (6:7-8)

Literary epithets are used side by side with the folk expressions: bednaya nevesta, the conventional expression of the narrator's sympathy for his heroine, and svyataya volya - both are borrowed from Zhukovsky's repertoire.

The originality of Pushkin's style lies principally in his use of verbs. The frequency and importance of the predicate in the language of traditional folk ballads has been discussed

1. See above, Chapter I, p.9 on Brat'ya razboiniki i sestra.

2. R.M. Volkov, "Narodnye istoki tvorchestva A.S. Pushkina", Uchenye zapiski Chernovitskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, XLIV, No.13 (1960), 3-46.

3. Cf. Evgenii Onegin: V:17:7 - Lai, khokhot, pen'e, svist i khlop;
V:25:12 - Shum, khokhot, davka u poroga.

earlier.¹ Pushkin employs verbs in Zhenikh in a variety of ways: repetition for retardation (tuzhit' in 2:1 and poglyadet' in 4:1), or to establish a leitmotif (tuzhit' in 2:1, 13:8, 22:3); antonyms (pristupat' in 1:6, 2:2 and otstupat'sya in 2:3); tautologies (vek ... vekovat' in 9:5 and divu divovat'sya in 17:8); and homonyms (slezy tocht in 21:2 and nozh ... tocht in 21:4). Pushkin tends to load the final couplets of his stanzas with as many as four verbs (stanzas 1, 3, 12, 13); verbs establish a parallel between the victim in the robber's hut (Ne p'et, ne est, ne sluzhit in 13:7) and Natasha at the wedding feast (Sidit, molchit, ni est, ni p'et in 21:1); and ellipsis of the verb in dialogue is used for acceleration (Otets ei in 5:3, 14:6). Natasha's dream contains a representative selection of folk and literary devices, of verbs and epithets:

И вдруг, как будто наяву,
 Изба передо мною.
 Я к ней, стучу - молчат. Зову -
 Ответа нет; с мольбою
 Дверь отворила я. Вхожу -
 В избе свеча горит; гляжу -
 Везде серебро да золото,
 Все светло и богато. (16)

The Grimm Brothers's tale, Russian skazki and songs, Bürger's Lenore, Zhukovsky's Lyudmila and Svetlana, and Katenin's Natasha - these are the components which form the background of Zhenikh. Pushkin synthesized his sources and adapted his models to produce what is certainly one of the best known Russian literary ballads, one which has been included along with Goethe's Erkönig and Keats's La Belle Dame Sans Merci among the greatest examples of the ballad

1. See above, Chapter I, pp.6-7.

genre in European literature.¹

In an article on the subject of narodnost' Pushkin wrote:

Climate, the system of government, and faith give to each people its particular physiognomy which is more or less reflected in the mirror of their poetry. There is a pattern of thought and feeling, a multitude of customs, beliefs, and habits which belong to each people exclusively.²

In other words, local colour could not be imposed on a text by the artificial introduction of an occasional Slavonic name or Old Russian word; rather, poetry should naturally reflect the uniqueness of that culture which produced it. In Zhenikh Pushkin included various motifs and expressions drawn from Russian popular sources. In his remaining ballads he continued to characterize in poetry the "customs, beliefs and habits" of his narod.

One popular belief, which was eliminated from the final version of Zhenikh, namely the domovoi,³ was used as the basis of Pushkin's unfinished ballad Vsem krasny boyarski konyushni (1827). The work is in two parts: in the first, an old groom complains of the disturbances caused by the presence of the domovoi in the boyar's stables; every morning he finds one horse hot and foaming from having been ridden all night. In the second part the narrator explains the reason for the occurrence in folkloric style; it is not a domovoi, but only the young groom who rides out each night to visit his beloved. The domovoi motif and the folkloric style (e.g. krasna devka, borzyi kon'; potikhon'ko, polegon'ko; and terminal verbs) were to reappear in Pushkin's later ballads.

1. Bayley, Pushkin, 57.

2. "O narodnosti v literature (1825-26)", PSS, XI, 40.

3. See PSS, II, 960 - Il' shutit shutki domovoi.

Utoplennik (1828), Pushkin's next ballad, is based on another popular belief, namely that the soul of a murderer knows no peace. When the work was first published in Moskovskii zhurnal in 1829, it was subtitled prostonarodnaya pesnya; later that year, when it was included in an edition of Pushkin's poetry, it was called a prostonarodnaya skazka, which subtitle had been removed from Zhenikh in the same edition. Neither a pesnya, nor a skazka, Utoplennik is certainly the most prostonarodnyi of Pushkin's literary ballads.

In an article on poetic style in 1828 Pushkin wrote:

There comes a time in mature literatures when intellects, bored with monotonous works of art and with the limited range of conventional language, turn to novel popular conceptions and to unfamiliar popular speech, which had previously been despised.¹

Utoplennik is the poetic realization of this theoretical statement.

In it the "popular conception" is carried over without authorial comment into a literary form and it is expressed in "the real language of men".² The children who first discover the corpse use colloquial words and popular speech rhythms. The father's crude words addressed to his children and to the corpse express both his non-reflective spontaneity and his superstitious terror. On the other hand, the narrator in his description of the corpse and in his digression concerning its possible identity (2:6 - 3:8) employs rhetorical questions and bookish epithets: trup uzhasnyi is a typical Zhukovsky phrase (cf. slukh uzhasnyi in 10:1); neschastnyi goremyka combines a literary epithet with a colloquial

1. "O poeticheskome sloge (1828)", PSS, XI, 73.

2. In the same article Pushkin refers to Wordsworth and Coleridge, whose "deep feelings and poetic thoughts" were expressed in the language of the common man.

substantive (cf. muzhik neschastnyi in 10:3); khmel'nyi molodets is a folkloric expression; and nedogadlivyi kupets (3:8) and lenivaya ruka (7:7) are good examples of Pushkin's original, individualizing epithets.

The corpse's reappearance is described in vivid physical images: dripping beard, immobile gaze, and naked body.¹ The effective repetition of the refrain (9:7-8):

И до утра все стучались
Под окном и у ворот.

in slightly altered form (10:7-8):

И утопленник стучится
Под окном и у ворот.

contains the only use of the title-word in the ballad, insists on the connection between nature and supernature (the storm always precedes the appearance of the corpse), and enforces the actuality of the occurrence by its repetition of the time and place.

It is Pushkin's placing of the "popular conception" and the popular speech within the framework of sophisticated narration without any interference or interpretation on the part of the author that constitutes the originality of Utoplennik.

In 1828 Pushkin wrote a short ballad which begins Voron k voronu letit; in manuscript copies it is called either Dva vorona or simply Shotlandskaya pesnya.² The ballad is based on The Two Corbies, included in the section of "Romantic Ballads" in Scott's

1. Cf. Rusalka:7:7-8 - I tol'ko borodu seduyu / Mal'chishki videli v vode.

2. PSS, III, 674.

Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border.¹ A French translation of the Minstrelsy by N.L. Artaud, including a prose version of Les deux corbeaux, is known to have been in Pushkin's library.²

Pushkin translated only the first three stanzas of the ballad, which he enlarged to four, omitting the last two stanzas.³ The story is reduced to its basic components: two ravens discuss the source of their next meal; one knows of a bogatyr' who lies slain in the field. Only his falcon, his mare, and his wife know why and by whom the bogatyr' was slain: but his falcon has flown away, an enemy has taken the mare, and his wife has found a new lover.

Folk elements are inextricably woven into the language of the ballad: the dominant verbs in the simple syntactic units; the haunting repetition of the folk motif voron; and the carefully selected folk epithets (chistoe pole, kobylka voronaya, khozaika molodaya). However, the most original changes introduced by Pushkin into his version are firstly, the intensification of what Balashov calls the zagadochnost' or nedoskazannost' of a ballad;⁴ and secondly, the emphasis on the theme of infidelity.

In the English original and in the French translation one raven states laconically:

-
1. Scott notes the parallel between The Twa Corbies and an ancient English dirge, The Three Ravens, included in Joseph Ritson's Ancient Songs (1792). Scott presents the texts of both "in order to enable the curious reader to contrast these two singular poems, and to form a judgment which may be original".
 2. N.L. Artaud, Chants populaires des Frontières Méridionales de l'Écosse (Paris, 1826). See P. Struve, "Walter Scott in Russia", SEER, XI, No.32 (1933), 397-410.
 3. The manuscript contains some evidence that Pushkin attempted to translate the last two stanzas; see PSS, III, 674.
 4. See above, Chapter I, p.6.

And nae body kens that he lies there,
But his hawk, his hound, and lady fair.

... et personne ne sait qu'il gît en ce lieu,
excepté son épervier, son chien et sa dame.

Pushkin's third stanza probes the mystery:

Кем убит и отчего,
Знает сокол лишь его,
Да кобылка вороная,
Да хозяйка молодая.

The enigma implicit in the folk ballad is made more explicit in the literary ballad: the reader is teased into thinking that there may be an explanation (kem and otchego). But although the question is posed, no answer is provided: the mystery is intensified.

In the English original and in the French translation, the lady's infidelity is simply one of the consequences of the knight's death:

His hound is to the hunting gane,
His hawk to fetch the wild-fowl hame,
His lady's ta'en another mate,
So we may make our dinner sweet.

Son chien est allé à la chase; son épervier
lie pour autre maître les oiseaux sauvages;
sa dame a pris un autre serviteur; ainsi,
nous pourrons faire un bon dîner.

This stanza is followed by a gruesome description of the ravens' imminent feast and a forecast of the knight's skeleton, soon to be exposed to the winds.

Pushkin alters this stanza substantially, and his version ends ironically:

Сокол в рощу улетел,
На кобылку недруг сел,
А хозяйка ждет милого,
Не убитого, живого.

The emphasis is clearly on the wife's infidelity, on her betrayal of the slain bogatyr'. She knows "by whom" and "how" he was killed, but has chosen a new milói. Unlike the sentimental heroines of the love-ballads of the 1790s who faithfully embrace the corpses of their slain lovers and then expire, expecting to be united with them in death, Pushkin's heroine would seem to be a descendant of Dmitriev's hero in Karikatura (1791).¹ Upon hearing that his wife had vanished, the husband reacts "heroically":

Несчастный муж поплакал,
Женился на другой. (25:3-4)

While Dmitriev's ballad was intended as a parody, Pushkin's is a successful imitation of the unemotional realism inherent in the traditional folk ballads.

One year after Voron Pushkin wrote an enigmatic ballad which begins Zhil na svete rytsar' bednyi (1829); it was later included in somewhat abbreviated form in his dramatic work Stseny iz rytsarskykh vremen. The ballad relates the tale of a knight who has been granted a mysterious vision which he cannot fathom. Since that experience, he shuns all women, prays exclusively to the Virgin Mary, and fights infidels on her behalf. At his death the devil claims the knight's soul, arguing that he prayed only to Mary and not to God, and that he failed to observe the obligatory religious fasts; but Mary intercedes on the knight's behalf and allows him to enter paradise.

It has been suggested that in Pushkin's ballad the knight, a stock figure of the pseudo-medieval ballad, is related to his true medieval context, that of mystical devotion to Our Lady; thus the

1. See above, Chapter II, pp.50-52.

work is seen as a vulgarization of the chivalric cult of the Virgin.¹ This explanation is plausible, but it overlooks the fact that the vulgarization is achieved by presenting the knight as a romantic lover and by demonstrating that his religious devotion to the Virgin is a perversion of normal affection.

The epithets of the first stanza (bednyi, molchalivyi, prostoi, sumrachnyi, blednyi, smelyi, pryamo) are the conventional epithets used to describe the hero in a romantic literary ballad. The knight's mystical experience is presented as an emotional one, not an intellectual one (stanza 2), and his vision results in his being unable to look at or speak to any earthly woman. Consequently his chaste nights are spent before the Virgin's image: ... skorbny ochi / Tikho slezy l'ya reko (7:3-4). To the end of his life the knight remains faithful to his jealous mistress: Vse vlyublennyi, vse pechal'nyi (11:3). The ironic observation, Strannyi byl on chelovek (6:4), is the narrator's understated conclusion concerning the knight's character. Zhukovsky had described a knight's spiritual love for his idealized lady in Rytsar' Togenburg (1818);² in Zhil na svete Pushkin presents that love of the most ideal Lady ironically.

Pushkin's last original ballad, Besy (1830), is more concerned with the creation of atmosphere than with relating a narrative. The visual imagery of white on white (clouds, snow, moonlight), the repetitions of verbs (mchatsya, v'yutsya; edu), nouns (tuchi; v'yuga), and epithets (mutno nebo, noch' mutna; strashno, strashno

1. Bayley, Pushkin, 62.

2. See above, Chapter VI, pp.206-207.

ponevole),¹ the parallelism within stanzas, the refrain, the breathless speed of the verse, and the intricate sound patterns - all combine to produce the hypnotic effect of an incantation.

The driver's speech combines colloquial diction and syntax with literary expressions (3:5-8). He explains away the eeriness of the situation by introducing the motif of the demon (bes - singular), and describes its activities as pranks (shalost'), which in an early manuscript was either the title or subtitle of the ballad.² After the driver's simple explanation, the refrain re-establishes the opening mood. This is followed by an ominous silence: even the horses sense the presence of the supernatural. The narrator then tries to explain away the occurrence, employing folkloric motifs:

Закружились бесы разны,..
Домового ли хоронят,
Ведьму ль замуж выдают? (6:3, 7-8)

In the manuscript version additional folkloric motifs were included:

Что за звуки!... аль бесенок
В люльке охает, больной;
Аль мяукает котенок
К ведьме ластится лихой -
Али мертвых черти гонят -
Не русалки ль там поют?
Домового ли хоронят
Ведьму ль замуж отдают -³

Once again, the opening mood is re-established by the refrain; this is followed by the conclusion:

1. The manuscript variant for this latter phrase echoes Zhukovsky: Chto-to strashno ponevole - the vague что-то is Zhukovsky's; the ponevole, expressing unintentional fear, is Pushkin's.

2. PSS, III, 834.

3. Ibid., 837.

Мчатся бесы рой за роем
В беспредельной вышине,
Визгом жалобным и воём
Надрывая сердце мне...

(7:4-8)

The repetition of the verb mchatsya with besy (plural) instead of with tuchi, the climax of sound effects reached in the phrase roi za roem / ... voem, the vague, Zhukovsky-like bespredel'naya vyshina - all characterize the external demons. Suddenly, in the last line, these demons are dramatically related to the poet's internal emotional state. The parallel between nature and psychology, which had been employed in Russian literary ballads since the 1790s, is here completely reinterpreted by Pushkin. The ballad Besy has been transformed into a profound personal lyric.

Pushkin's last contributions to the ballad genre are translations of the two Polish ballads by Adam Mickiewicz and were written during the poet's Boldino autumn of 1833.¹ The first is a free translation of Czaty, Ballada ukrainska (1827), which Pushkin calls Voevoda, Podrazhanie Mitskevichu or Pol'skaya ballada. Pushkin alters the metre of the original and changes some details of the plot. In a recent study of Pushkin's manuscript version of this ballad, Ya. L. Levkovich demonstrated the poet's conscious elimination of Russian details and his introduction of Polish local colour.² For example, he alters svetlitsa to spal'nya, pukhovik to krovat' (Pol. koze), kazachka to khlopets (Pol. kozak), and introduces the Polish titles pan and panna³ instead of muzh

1. In the same year Pushkin wrote Gusar, a short narrative poem in colloquial style, which has a few characteristics of the ballad genre. See V. Danilov, "Istochnik stikhov Pushkina Gusar", Russkii filologicheskii vestnik, LXIV, No.3-4 (1910), 243-52.

2. Ya. L. Levkovich, "Perevody iz Mitskevicha", unpublished article (Institut russkoi literatury, L., 1970).

and moloditsa or zhena. Levkovich also noted the correspondence in vocabulary and intonation between the boy's reply to his master:

Ветер, что ли, плачут очи,
Дрожь берет; в руках нет мочи. (9:4-5)

and the driver's reply to the narrator in Besy:

...- Нет мочи:
Коням, барин, тяжело;
Вьюга мне слипает очи; (2:1-3)

Pushkin's second ballad translated from Mickiewicz is called Budrys i ego synov'ya; it is a fairly literal rendition of Trzech Budrysów, Ballada litewska (1827). Some minor alterations are introduced by Pushkin in the details of local colour for each of the three countries to which one of Budrys's sons is dispatched. For example, Mickiewicz describes the faces of Polish girls as Lice bielsze od mleka, which Pushkin changes to bela, chto smetana.¹ But in general, the simplicity of the narrative, the ternary structure, and the effective use of repetition in the Polish original are accurately conveyed by Pushkin in his translation.

* * *

Bayley's study of Pushkin includes the following observation:

All the ballads give the impression of being models, demonstrations without further comment of how the thing should be done.²

While Pushkin's Ossianic poems and early balladic lyrics closely imitate the subject, setting, characters, and style of Zhukovsky's

1. M. Gorlin in "Les ballades d'Adam Mickiewicz et Puškin", Revue des Études slaves, XIX (1939), 235 ff., accounts for the minor differences between Mickiewicz's and Pushkin's description of Russia by arguing that the details in Pushkin's version correspond to those in one of Mickiewicz's manuscripts, which Pushkin must have read or heard recited.

2. Pushkin, 62.

ballads,¹ and his parodies treat in an ironic manner those same elements which he earlier imitated, each of his original ballads stands in some sense as a "model": Rusalka is an individual reinterpretation of the nature-magic theme; Zhenikh, an original narodnyi ballad, synthesizes a German source and Russian folk motifs; Utoplennik places a popular motif and colloquial speech within the framework of sophisticated narration; Voron imitates the simplicity and unemotional realism of the traditional genre; and Besy is an exercise in the evocation of atmosphere and a transformation of a ballad into a personal lyric.

Bayley compares Pushkin's ballads to those written by Goethe and Keats for the following reasons:

All [three authors] avoid the romantic ballad's tendency to show off its ancient lore, to put wild and passionate sentiments in stilted eighteenth-century dialogue, or to revel in the picturesque, the horrid or pathetic.²

There is another reason: Pushkin succeeded, where Zhukovsky had failed, in consciously employing the form of the literary ballad to its best possible advantage. Writing without any specific models of traditional Russian ballads, Pushkin, in his literary ballads, approached the compressed narrative unit, the dramatic narrative

1. The results of a survey of 175 epithets from ten of Pushkin's ballads (768 lines) are as follows: of the total number, 147 epithets are used only once each; 18 epithets are used twice each; 5 epithets are used three times each (veselyi, krutoi, mutnyi, pustoi, svetlyi); and 6 epithets are used from 4-6 times each (belyi, vernyi, molodoi, svyatoi, staryi, chernyi). In contrast to Zhukovsky's frequent repetition of a limited range of epithets, Pushkin tends not to repeat himself in his ballads. The epithet came to play a far less important role in Pushkin's poetry as his style matured; it was gradually replaced by the verb as the most original means of description.

2. Pushkin, 57.

method, and the impersonal narrative attitude characteristic of the folk genre; furthermore, he succeeded in creating the intangible sense of the ballad "world" - all within the realm of Kunstpoesie.

Chapter VIII

LERMONTOV'S LITERARY BALLADS

Прошу вас, также, милая бабушка,
купите мне полное собрание сочи-
нений Жуковского последнего издания
и пришлите также сюда тотчас.
-- Лермонтов¹

In 1838 Lermontov became acquainted with Zhukovsky in St. Petersburg and the two poets continued meeting until Lermontov's departure for the Caucasus in April 1841. Zhukovsky's influence on his poetry is evident from the very beginning of Lermontov's poetic career, both in his experiments in the ballad genre and in his application of balladic techniques in his lyric poetry. As Pushkin had progressed from imitation to parody of Zhukovsky's ballads, so too did Lermontov. Beginning in 1830 Lermontov began to parody those elements of Zhukovsky's style which he had previously imitated. But in his ballad cycle of 1832 and particularly in his works written between 1837 and 1841, Lermontov transformed the ballad genre into a form capable of expressing his own deeply personal inspiration.

Lermontov's earliest experiments with the literary ballad are based on German and English sources. Both his choice of models for imitation and the style of these experiments reflect the strong influence of Zhukovsky's ballads. The first of these works,

1. M. Yu. Lermontov, Sochineniya v shesti tomakh, VI (1957), 462 (letter to E.A. Arsen'eva, June 1841).

Ballada (Nad morem krasavitsa-deva sidit) (1829), is Lermontov's reworking of Schiller's ballad Der Taucher, which Zhukovsky also began translating in 1825, and which he published under the title Kubok in 1831. In Lermontov's version a mermaid sends a young man down into the depths of the sea to retrieve her necklace and, by so doing, to demonstrate his love for her. The youth succeeds in this task, but when she sends him down again to fetch some coral, he does not return.

Lermontov's characters and setting are described in the typical language of Zhukovsky's ballads: the heroine is a krasavitsa-deva; the hero is referred to as drug, yunosha, and mladoi udalets; and the sea is variously depicted as puchina, pennaya bezdna, grot, and chernoe dno; the manuscript variants for the last phrase include mrachnoe dno and uzhasnoe dno.¹ The numerous exclamations (O schast'e! on zhiv) and the interruptions in the narrative are characteristic of Zhukovsky's syntax; however, it is in the frequency and range of its epithets that Lermontov's style reveals the most notable influence of Zhukovsky's language, in expressions such as: no mrachen kak byl (early variant: on vykhodit pechalen i mrachen kak byl);² vlazhnye kudri; pechal'nyi vzor; and dusha beznadezhnaya.

In the same year Lermontov translated Schiller's Der Handschuh: Eine Erzählung as Perchatka (1829), which Zhukovsky translated under the same title in 1831. The subject is similar to that of Ballada, although its resolution is different: an aristocratic lady lets her glove fall among the wild beasts in an arena in order

1. Ibid., I, 327.

2. Ibid., I, 327.

to test her knight's affections. He retrieves the glove, but tosses it in her face in protest at her caprice.

The language of Lermontov's version and its emphasis on the theme of Fate paradoxically render it more Zhukovsky-like than Zhukovsky's own, relatively literal, translation:

Schiller: Da fällt von des Altans Rand
Ein Handschuh von schöner Hand
Zwischen den Tiger und den Leun
Mitten hinein. (44-47)

Lermontov: Сверху тогда упали
Перчатка с прекрасной руки
Судьбы случайной игрою
Между враждебной четю. (30-33)

Zhukovsky: Вдруг женская с балкона сорвалась
Перчатка... все глядят за ней...
Она упала меж зверей. (38-40)

Lermontov's short fragment V starinny gody zhili-byli (1830) is possibly a translation from an unidentified German source.¹ The single stanza which describes two knights who had returned from the crusades in Palestine echoes the theme and style of Zhukovsky's translation of Schiller's Ritter Toggenburg in 1818,² and also resembles his later translations of Uhland's ballads.³

The ballad Gost' (Klarisu yunosha lyubil), subtitled Byl' and written in the early 1830s, represents the culmination of the German influence on Lermontov's literary ballads. It describes the love affair between Klarisa and Kalmar, whose marriage plans are disrupted when war breaks out; Kalmar, after hearing Klarisa's pledge of eternal faithfulness, goes off to fight. However, when

1. See A.M. Garkavi, "Zametki o M. Yu. Lermontove: Lermontov i Zhukovsky (Iz istorii russkoi ballady)", Uchenye zapiski Kaliningradskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta, VI (1959), 274-85.

2. See above, Chapter VI, pp.206-207.

3. See, for example, Staryi rytsar' (1832), a translation of Uhland's

springtime arrives, Klarisa is about to marry someone else. At the wedding feast, a silent guest in military dress at last reveals himself to be the corpse of Kalmar, and there he reclaims his Klarisa.

Basically a reworking of Bürger's Lenore, Lermontov's Gost' also combines motifs inherited from the Russian ballads of the 1790s (war as the obstacle to love; death of the hero; and subsequent union with the heroine), and from Zhukovsky's ballads. Kalmar, tomim toskoi, expresses a favourite Zhukovsky theme in unmistakably Zhukovsky language:

Пускай холодный смерти сон,
О, дева красоты,
Нас осеняет под землей,
Коль не венцы любви святой! (3:3-6)

Even Kalmar's corpse resembles the corpses of Zhukovsky's heroes (pryam i nedvizhim), while the atmosphere of strakh, created in part by kakoi-to strannyi zvuk, is typical of Zhukovsky's ballads.

While Schiller and Bürger, both in the original German and in Zhukovsky's free renditions, served as one source of Lermontov's early ballads, English literary ballads provided the poet with another source of inspiration. In 1829 Lermontov wrote Dva sokola, a reworking of Scott's ballad The Two Corbies, based either on Pushkin's version in 1828,¹ or on the English original.²

Lermontov's version is not an imitation of the traditional genre; rather it is in the form of an extended lyrical dialogue between two misanthropic falcons, each expounding on why he has come to hate the world and its inhabitants: the first is

1. See above, Chapter VII, pp.243-46.

2. See D.P. Yakubovich, "Lermontov i Val'ter Skott", Izvestiya AN-SSSR, Otd. obshchestvennykh nauk, No.3, (1935), 243-72.

disenchanted with rampant hard-heartedness; the second, with common deceitfulness, particularly as shown by women:

Но измена девы страстной
Нож для сердца вековой!... (31-32)

Even more than Pushkin, Lermontov clearly emphasizes the theme of infidelity, which is here made explicit in Zhukovsky-type language.

In 1830 Lermontov wrote two works based on Byronic subjects. Chelnok presents a balladic situation: a small boat, manned by two oarsmen, is being buffeted about by a storm at sea; a mysterious chto-to, wrapped up in white canvas, lies wounded in the bottom of the boat. This victim of some unexplained crime is described in epithets borrowed from Zhukovsky's repertoire:

И бледный, как жертва гробов;
Взор мрачен и дик,... (2:4-5)

The enigma is left unresolved; instead, there follows a lyrical reflection on the poet's expectation of happiness in life and the comforting proximity of peace in death.

The second work, Ballada (Beregis'! Beregis'! ...) is an unfinished and inaccurate translation of the ballad inserted between stanzas 40 and 41 of the sixteenth canto of Byron's Don Juan. It describes an extraordinary "black friar", who refused to be driven from the house of a local nobleman when the Moors overran Spain. Once again, Lermontov's style, particularly his choice of epithets, reflects the influence of Zhukovsky's ballads: chernyi monakh, mrak nochnoi, rodimyi dol, and blednaya luna.

Another ballad entitled Gost' (Kak proshlets inoplemennyi), written in 1830, represents the culmination of the English influence on Lermontov's ballads. It is a reworking of the theme used by Zhukovsky in his ballad Pustynnik (1812), which in turn is a

translation of Goldsmith's The Hermit. Lermontov's guest, a bednyi monakh, arrives at an unfamiliar house late one night and is granted shelter. He recognizes the lady of the house as his former beloved, and throws himself at her feet. Then the guest retires to his chamber to weep all night; in the morning his hosts discover his corpse.

The scene of the lovers' recognition in Gost' is almost identical in situation and language to that in Zhukovsky's ballad:

Он хозяйку вдруг узнал,
Он дрожит - и вот забылся
И к ногам ее упал.¹ (3:6-8)

Furthermore, one of Zhukovsky's favourite epithets, pechal'nyi, is applied both to the features of the monk:

Свечки луч печально льется
На печальные черты. (3:3-4)

and to the cloak which covers those same features, now lifeless:

И бесчувственное тело
Плащ печальный покрывал!... (5:7-8)

Scott, Ossian, Byron and Goldsmith - both in the original and in Zhukovsky's versions - provided Lermontov with models of English literary ballads. During these same years (1830-32) Lermontov also tried to employ the stylistic devices of the ballad genre in traditional lyric forms, for example in Pesn' barda, Mogila boltsa (subtitled Duma), and Russkaya pesnya (Klokami belyi sneg valitsya).

The most interesting of these balladic experiments, Ballada (V izbushke pozdneyu poroyu), is in the form of a mother's song to her infant. She recounts her husband's heroism in leading the

1. Cf. Pustynnik:36:2 - I pal k ee nogam; see above, Chapter VII, p.228 on Pushkin's parody of this motif.

Russians against the Tartars. Suddenly the husband returns, mortally wounded, to announce his defeat and to expire. The mother urges her child to avenge his father's death in a speech which concludes with a fair measure of bathos:

И он упал - и умирает
Кровавой смертью бойца.
Жена ребенка поднимает
Над бледной головой отца:
"Смотри, как умирают люди,
И мстить учись у женской груди!..." (6)

* * *

Lermontov's experiments with German and English sources and his imitation of Zhukovsky's ballads were followed by a series of parodies on the ballad genre and its practitioners. The first of these, Nezabudka (1830), subtitled Skazka, is a witty parody of Schiller's Der Taucher, which had previously served as the source of Lermontov's own Ballada (Nad morem), a serious work, written under the influence of Zhukovsky's ballads. Nezabudka begins with a comparison of human affections, past and present, and concludes that in the old days love and fidelity were stronger than they are now. An example follows: two lovers are conversing near a brook; the heroine asks the unsuspecting hero to pick her a pretty blue flower to prove his love. He manages to pick one, but on his way back to her the ground gives way under him. As he bids farewell to his beloved, he tosses the flower to her and begs her not to forget him: hence, the name of the flower - nezabudka.

Schiller's tragic subject, the test of affection occasioned by the lady's caprice which results in the lover's death, is here cast in a comic vein. The description of the hero (rytsar'

blagorodnyi; moi milyi), the heroine (lyubeznaya; deva) and the idyllic setting (Pod ten'yu lipovykh vetvei; Svod nad nami yasnyi) echo phrases from Zhukovsky's ballads. In the climax Lermontov combines elevated abstract substantives with the most frequent epithets of Zhukovsky's language in delicious bathos:

Уж близко цель его стремленья,
Как вдруг под ним (ужасный вид)
Земля неверная дрожит,
Он вязнет, нет ему спасенья! (38-41)

Other epithets in Nezabudka would seem to parody Lermontov's own language in his earlier Ballada (Nad morem): for example, pechal'nyi vzor and dusha beznadezhnaya of the serious work are superseded by tsvetok pechal'nyi and ruka beznadezhnaya in the parody.

Ballada (Iz vorot vyezhayut), written in 1832, turns the first two lines of a German folk song, Die drei Ritter, into a parody of Zhukovsky's chivalric ballads. Three knights ride off to battle, leaving their three loves behind; the knights are slain and the women grieve; then three new knights come to court them, and the ladies forget their sadness:¹

Уж три витязя новых в ворота спешат,
увы!
И красотки печали своей говорят:
прости! (3)

Each line of the ballad is followed by an ironic uvy! or prosti! used to parody the chivalric ideal of true love.

Lermontov's ballad On byl v krayu svyatom (1832) is a parody of Zhukovsky's Staryi rytsar' (1832), which in turn is a translation of Uhland's Graf Eberhards Weissdorn. Zhukovsky's knight,

1. See above, Chapter II, pp.50-52 on Dmitriev's Karikatura.

having heroically defended the Faith in Palestine, spends his old age tranquilly dozing under an olive tree, a branch of which he had brought back and planted from a tree in the Holy Land. Lermontov's knight returns from Palestine bald and battered, having spent his time there pillaging and raping; he finds his wife pregnant, and his children unruly. Each stanza of the parody begins seriously, and is followed by an ironic twist which deflates its meaning:

Понес он в край святой
Цветущие ланиты;
Вернулся он домой
Плешивый и избитый.¹ (2)

The final parody, Yugel'skii baron (1837), is a combined effort by Lermontov and V.N. Annenkova, a poetess and close friend of Lermontov's grandmother, to caricature Zhukovsky's translation from Scott, Zamok Smal'gol'm (1822).² Lermontov's baron summons his page to deliver a letter to the baroness; the page refuses, and finally reveals that she has been unfaithful in the baron's absence. The baron laughs and explains to the page that "northern women" are always faithful to their husbands. The page listens carefully, admits his mistake, and agrees to deliver the baron's message.

Zhukovsky's style is subjected to merciless parody - in Lermontov's excessive use of verbs (i kusal on, i rval, i pisal, i strochil),³ in the interrogative intonation (Ne devitsa li ona? .. i odna li verna?), and particularly in the selection and use of

1. Cf. Lermontov's Vetka Palestiny (1837) - lyrical reflections on a similar theme - which shows Zhukovsky's influence on its lexis and syntax.

2. See above, Chapter III, pp.109-14.

3. Cf. Zamok Smal'gol'm:25:2 - i kipel, i gorel, i sverkal.

epithets. On the one hand Lermontov uses precisely those epithets which Zhukovsky used to characterize the heroes: the baron is described as znamenityi and vysokii, his wife as odinoka, bledna, milaya, vernaya; and the page as molodoi and moi malyutka. On the other hand, Lermontov takes Zhukovsky's unwieldy topor .../ Ukreplen dvadtsatifuntovoi, and replaces it with the splendid dolgovyazyi lakei / Tritsatipyatiletnyi durak.

In much the same way as Pushkin, Lermontov proceeded along the path from imitation to parody. From Nezabudka (1830) to Yugel'skii baron (1837) he attempted to overcome Zhukovsky's influence by parodying the themes and style of those ballads which he had previously imitated. With his ballad cycle of 1832 Lermontov began to use the form in a creative and individual way.

* * *

In 1832 Lermontov wrote three literary ballads: Trostnik, Rusalka, and Ballada (Kuda tak provorno). Similarities in the treatment of emotional experience in these works and their pervading lyricism enable the critic to consider them as a ballad cycle.

The first, Trostnik, is a nature-magic ballad which is said to have been influenced by Victor Hugo's poetry.¹ A fisherman plucks a reed and blows through it: the reed sings the sad tale of a young girl who was held prisoner in her stepmother's house. When she spurned the amorous advances of the woman's evil son, the girl was mercilessly killed. The reeds which grew above her grave contain her sadness.

Sadness (pechal') is the theme of the ballad; Lermontov

1. B.M. Bikhenbaum, Stat'i o Lermontove (L., 1961), 344.

emphasizes the intimate connection between human suffering and nature, between the girl's soul and the "animate" reeds (budto ozhivlennyyi):

И над моей могилой
Взошел тростник большой,
И в нем живут печали
Души моей молодой; (6:1-4)

In contrast to this sadness, the fisherman, whose presence is used to frame the ballad, is described as veselyi; he is incapable of helping the girl or even sharing her experience (A plakat' ne privyk).

The girl's monologue is related simply and its language is rich in repetitions (ostav'; rybak), internal rhymes (devitsa, krasavitsa, temnitsa), and folk elements (slezy goryuchie; na bereg krutoi; na sini volny), as well as literary elegiac themes (ya nekogda tsvela; i rannyuyu mogilu). As in Zhukovsky's Rybak, Lermontov's fisherman is not in spiritual sympathy with nature. But instead of being seduced by the force of nature-magic, in Trostnik the fisherman is merely involuntarily employed to express the girl's pechal'.

The second work in the cycle, Rusalka, is another nature-magic ballad which probably has as one of its sources an early ballad by Heine, Die Nixen.¹ The narrative element in it is far less important than in Trostnik. Rusalka consists of a mermaid's lament: she begins with a description of her luxurious kingdom beneath the sea, and then of the lifeless corpse of a handsome vityaz', who will not respond to her amorous advances. As in Trostnik, nature is animate: for example, the waves are described as revnivy. Motifs from the earlier ballads (such as trostniki

1. Eikhenbaum, Lermontov. Opyt istoriko-literaturnoi otsenki (L., 1924), 105.

and krutoi bereg) are repeated in Rusalka; the theme of pechal' has become the vaguer neponyatnaya toska, although the word pechal' was used in the original manuscript version. The manuscript also contains more extensive description of the mermaid herself (vlazhnaya; khladnaya; belaya grud'; belaya ruka)² - all of which epithets were rejected in the final text.

The subject and characters of Rusalka are simply unimportant compared to the richness of the visual imagery in the description of the mermaid's underwater realm, where a profusion of colours and materials dazzle the senses: serebristaya pena, zlatye stada (rybok), khrustal'nye goroda, yarkie peski, shelkovye kudri, sinyaya reka, and so on. Lermontov returned to this motif in a later ballad, Morskaya tsarevna (1841), where the treatment is more narrative than lyrical.

The last work in the 1832 cycle, Ballada (Kuda tak provorno), unlike the first two, is not a nature-magic ballad, although it too is said to have been influenced by Hugo.³ All the emphasis is placed on the action and on the creation of atmosphere. A young Jewess hurries through the streets to warn her Russian lover that their affair has been discovered and that her father threatens to take revenge on them both. She urges her lover to flee and swears that she will never reveal his identity. He replies to her plan by stabbing her and then killing himself. Their corpses are discovered in the morning.

The heroine, an exotic "alien", is described in the manuscript

1. Sochineniya, II, 270.

2. Ibid., II, 269.

3. Eikhenbaum, Stat'i, 344.

version as having I vlazhnye ochi, volshebnye ochi;¹ in the final text the only epithet which remains is bledna (Kak mramornyi idol bledna); the hero, referred to by the Jewess as her angel prekrasnyi, remains still and silent in contrast to her movement and agitation: I mrachen glukhoi byl otvet. The balladic motifs are numerous: the midnight setting; the father's revenge; the knife (noz' rokovoï); and the enigmatic chto-to, referring first to the knife (9:3), and then to the heroine's corpse (10:1). Whereas in Trostnik the theme is pechal' and in Rusalka - toska, in Ballada it is the emotion of strakh and the heroine's tainaya nadezhda:

И страхом и тайной надеждой пылая,
Еврейка глаза подняла,
Конечно, ужасней минута такая
Столетий печали была; (4)

The brevity of each of the three ballads in the 1832 cycle, the lyricism and the imagery of the nature-magic ballads emphasized at the expense of characters and narrative, and the emotionally charged atmosphere of Ballada are an indication of Lermontov's future contributions to the ballad genre.

In 1837-38 Lermontov experimented with certain balladic narrative techniques in his historical poems. The most popular of these, Borodino (1837), was preceded by an earlier lyrical work, Pole Borodina (1831), in which the account of the battle is presented in fairly conventional language by a participant at the event.² In the later, better-known reworking of this theme, Lermontov introduced the figure of the young listener, and further

1. Sochineniya, II, 270.

2. See I.N. Rozanov - Lermontov - master stikha (M., 1942), 43-52, for a comparison of Pole Borodina with Zhukovsky's Pevets vo stane russkikh voinov (1812) and Pushkin's Poltava.

characterized the narrator as a simple "everyman" by means of the alternating prostorechie and pathos of his language, and his ironic sense of humour.

Lermontov's next literary ballad, Tri pal'my (1839), influenced by Hugo's Les Orientales,¹ is a reworking of the theme used in Pushkin's Podrazhanie Koranu IX (1824). Pushkin's poem, a close rendition of a passage in the Koran,² is narrated in the poet's "Eastern style", with its humorous details of realistic local colour.³ In Lermontov's version, three proud palm trees in a desert oasis complain to God that they are serving no useful purpose in the world. Suddenly a caravan appears, and the palm trees welcome their unexpected guests. That night the travellers chop down the trees and burn them to keep warm; in the morning they depart, leaving behind only a pile of ashes.

Lermontov preserves Pushkin's Eastern landscape of the desert, oasis, and palm trees, but he substitutes for his one palm, kladex, and putnik - three palm trees, ruhei, and karavan. He also borrows some of Pushkin's language with slight modifications. For example, Pushkin rhymes kholodnyi with bezvodnyi (4:3-4); Lermontov rhymes besplodnyi with kholodnyi (1:4), which he repeats in 9:4 with an ironic twist: instead of referring to the spring-water, kholodnyi modifies the lifeless ash left from the charred palms. Pushkin's first line, I putnik ustalyi na Boga roptal, supplies Lermontov with two lines: No strannik ustalyi iz chuzhdoi zemli

1. Eikhenbaum, Stat'i, 344.

2. See Tomashevsky, Pushkin, II, 23.

3. See Gukovsky, "Pushkin i poetika russkogo romantizma", Izvestiya AN SSSR, Otd. literatury i yazyka, No.2 (1940), 90-91 for a comparison of Pushkin's Podrazhanie with Zhukovsky's Pesni araba nad mogiloyu konya (1810).

(2:2), and I stali tri pal'my na Boga roptat' (3:1). Pushkin's transition, I mnogie gody nad nim protekli, becomes Lermontov's I mnogie gody neslyshno proshli.

In spite of the similarity of Eastern coloration and of various expressions, Lermontov significantly altered the meaning of Pushkin's poem. Pushkin's subject is the punishment of a tired traveller for his ropot against God; when he awakes from his long sleep, the traveller realizes that his youth has disappeared. He is restored to his former condition only by means of a miracle, and he continues on his way with true faith in God. Lermontov places the palm trees in the centre of the ballad: it is their ropot against God which results in the arrival of the caravan and in the final destruction of the trees. The palms are punished for their sin of pride (Tri gordye pal'my - 1:2; I, gordo kivaya makhrovoy glavoyu - 7:4); and man is depicted both as the ungrateful despoiler of natural beauty and as the involuntary instrument of God's revenge.

Tri pal'my is rich in visual and aural imagery. The oasis setting is described as zelenyi, goluboi, and zolotoi; the caravan - with the epithets uzornyi, chernyi, and belyi; the ash left behind is sedoi. The peaceful silence of the desert, broken only by the zvuchnyi ruchei, is shattered with the arrival of the caravan; after its departure, the silence which returns is the silence of death: without the shade of the palm tree, the little stream has dried up. There remains only the sled pechal'nyi - a totally subjective expression to convey the poet's own emotional reaction to the events. Having borrowed Pushkin's Eastern coloration and some of his language, Lermontov's reinterpretation of the theme and his introduction of rich imagery transform the narrative of Tri pal'my

into an immensely personal statement about the poet's favourite themes of pride and inhumanity.

Lermontov's next ballad, Dary Tereka (1839), is said to have been influenced both by the spirit of popular Cossack songs and tales,¹ and by the style of Hugo's Oriental ballads.² The river Terek in the Caucasus flows down to the turbulent Caspian Sea, bearing gifts to placate it. First the river offers the body of a Kabardian warrior, but the Caspian is not appeased; then the Terek offers the body of a young Cossack woman: the sea accepts it greedily, s ropotom lyubvi.

Both the river and the sea are personified: the Terek is depicted as lukavyi, laskayas', and buinyi; the Caspian is an indifferent starik, until the kazachka appears:

И старик во блеске власти
Встал, могучий, как гроза,
И оделись влагой страсти
Темно-синие глаза. (70-74)

The language of Dary Tereka combines folk elements - such as the river's ternary address to the sea, various repetitions, and folkloric expressions - with literary passages, such as the image of the warrior's armour with its inscription from the Koran, and the description of the kazachka's corpse:

С темно-бледными плечами,
С светло-русою косой.
Грустен лик ее туманный,
Взор так тихо, сладко спит
А на грудь из малой раны
Струйка алая бежит. (51-56)

1. See N.M. Mendel'son, "Narodnye motivy v poezii Lermontova", in Venok M. Yu Lermontovu. Yubileinyi sbornik, (M.-P., 1914), 193-95.

2. Bikhnenbaum, Stat'i, 353-54.

The kazachka's wound corresponds to the Cossack's bloodied moustache:

И усов его края
Обагрила знойной крови
Благородная струя; (34-36)

Both wounds are unexplained; the resulting enigma and the poet's non-interference in the ballad are in complete contrast to the more personal themes expressed in Tri pal'my.

During the year 1840, while under arrest for his duel with the son of the French ambassador, Lermontov once again experimented with balladic techniques in his narrative verse. Vozdushnyi korabl' is a historical poem based on J.C.F. von Zedlitz's ballad Das Geisterschiff.¹ In it Lermontov returns to the Napoleonic theme which first attracted him in his lyrics of 1820-30. Vozdushnyi korabl' emphasizes the lyrical themes of Napoleon's personal loneliness and of his deep love for France. Sosedka is in the form of lyrical reflections of a prisoner who would waste away, were it not for the fact that his sosedka, the jail-keeper's daughter, suffers the same confinement as he does.² In Plennyi rytsar', a knight compares his own glorious past with the squalor of his present imprisonment. The lyrical poem, Lyubov' mertvetsa (1841), is based on motifs borrowed from Bürger's Lenore.³ It was not until 1841 that Lermontov returned to the literary ballad to make his most original contributions to the genre.

1. In 1836 Zhukovsky translated another of Zedlitz's works on the Napoleonic theme, Die nächtliche Heerschau, as Nochnoi smotr.

2. Cf. Zhukovsky's Uznik (1819).

3. This work is also called Novyi mertvets, Zhivoi mertvets, and Vlyublennyi mertvets in manuscript versions; see Sochineniya, II, 294-95.

The first of these ballads, Spor, is a debate between two mountains in the Caucasus: the wise Shat and the impetuous Kazbek. Shat warns Kazbek that he too, like his predecessors, would be conquered and exploited by the peoples of the East. Kazbek replies that he has no fear that the dryakhlyi Vostok would ever awake. Suddenly the two mountains notice the advance of Russian regiments towards the East; Kazbek tries to count them, but fails and sinks into silence.

This ballad has been interpreted as an expression of Lermontov's sympathy for the Caucasian peoples, and of his recognition that Russian annexation of the Caucasus would lead to economic and cultural betterment of the area.¹ In fact this ideological theme is as unimportant as the narrative element. Spor consists of three distinct groups of visual and aural images. The first, presented by Shat, describes man's destructive power and its effects on the Caucasus (dymnye kelii, zheleznaya lopata, strashnyi put'). The second, presented by Kazbek, is a colourful characterization of the slumbering peoples of the East (pena sladkikh vin; uzornye shal'vary, tsvetnoi divan, zadumchivyi fontan, raskalennye stupeni). The third group of images, provided by the narrator, describes the colours and sounds of the advancing army (strannoe dvizhen'e), followed by the emotional reaction of Kazbek (tomim zlovshchei dumoi; polnyi chernykh snov; grustnyi vzor).² As in Tri pal'my Lermontov's theme in Spor is man's destruction of natural beauty; the poet's method is the creation of vivid imagery.

1. See Sochineniya, II, 359-60.

2. The manuscript version contains the following variants for the epithets in the description of Kazbek: tomim tyazheloi / nadmennoi dumoi; polnyi gordykh snov; and mrachnyi vzor; see Sochineniya, II, 298-300.

Lermontov's most original literary ballad, Tamara (1841), is probably based on an old Georgian legend, although no exact source has yet been identified.¹ It tells the story of the beautiful princess Tamara, whose seductive voice attracts travellers to her castle; there they are treated to a night of amorous delights, while strange sounds echo through the forest. The only sounds in the morning are those of the roaring Terek carrying away the hapless travellers' corpses, and the sweet farewells from Tamara.

The ballad is related in pure romantic Russian, with few traces of folkloric expressions. Particularly in the manuscript version, Tamara shows the continuing influence of Zhukovsky's style on Lermontov's ballads. The setting of Tamara is mysterious and foreboding: the tower is described as starinnaya, vysokaya, and tesnaya (in the manuscript, as ugryumaya and zubchataya);² it stands on a black cliff (cherneya na chernoï skale) overlooking a deep ravine. The visual details and the language of the landscape description closely resemble the settings in Zhukovsky's ballads.

The heroine of Lermontov's ballad, however, is unlike Zhukovsky's idealized Svetlanas and Minvanas (Bolova Arfa). Tamara combines the principles of good and evil within her:

Прекрасна, как ангел небесный,
Как демон, коварна и зла. (2:3-4)

Her supernatural charms are described as vsesil'nye (in the manuscript as moguchie and volshhebnye);³ her power is

1. Bikhnenbaum, Stat'i, 356. Bikhnenbaum refers to A. Veselovsky's articles in Kavkaz, No.6-7, No.66 (1898), in which he cites two French books about the Caucasus containing mention of a similar legend.

2. Sochineniya, II, 303.

3. Ibid., II, 303.

neponyatnaya.¹ The nights of passionate love are accompanied by strannye, dikiye zvuki, the explanation for which again emphasizes the heroine's dual nature:

Как будто в ту башню пустую
Сто юношей пылких и жён
Сошлись на свадьбу ночную
На тризну больших похорон. (8)

The mrak i molchanie which follow the next morning was expressed in the manuscript as glukhoe smerti molchan'e,² which is typical of Zhukovsky's style in its explicitness and in its epithet. Similarly the bezglasnoe telo was originally ch'e-to bezglasnoe telo,³ the vague ch'e-to being another favourite Zhukovsky device. Lermontov eliminated the most imitative elements from his final text, and the result is an original literary ballad, haunting and enigmatic. Tamara is, in a sense, Lermontov's own interpretation of the nature-magic theme treated in Zhukovsky's Rybak and in Pushkin's Rusalka: the attraction of the supernatural and the subordination of human will to higher powers.⁴ But in Lermontov's version the implicit ambiguity is made explicit in the nature of the heroine (good and evil), and in the consequences for the travellers (love and death).

Lermontov's last literary ballad, Morskaya tsarevna (1841), concerns the same nature-magic theme as Tamara, and is, in fact, a reworking of his own Rusalka (1832). Whereas in the earlier ballad both the narrative element and the theme are relatively

1. Cf. Lermontov's Rusalka: 7:2 - neponyatnaya toska.

2. Sochineniya, II, 304.

3. Ibid., II, 304.

4. See above, Chapter III, pp. 79-83, and Chapter VII, pp. 230-33.

unimportant when compared with the imagery, Morskaya tsarevna has both an engaging narrative and a meaningful theme. A young tsarevich, while bathing his horse in the sea, is invited by a mermaid to spend one night with her. The impetuous youth seizes the poor mermaid, and pulls her ashore despite her angry protests. When his comrades rally to inspect his catch, instead of a beautiful creature, they discover only a scaly sea-monster muttering incomprehensible reproaches.

Lermontov's theme is the mysterious attraction of supernatural beauty; however, instead of submitting to its power, man attempts to grasp that beauty and to carry it back into his own world in order to exert his will over it and to preserve it. The attempt to master the supernatural is doomed to failure; the tsarevich is left zadumchivyi, with only an image of the beautiful mermaid in his memory.

The language of the ballad is simple and dramatic; verbs tend to replace epithets as the principal means of description:

Фыркает конь и ушами прядет,
Брызжет и плещет и дале плывет. (2)

Держит, рука боевая сильна:
Плачет и молит и бьется она. (8)

Tamara and Morskaya tsarevna, both written between May and July 1841, demonstrate Lermontov's success in overcoming the limitations of Zhukovsky's style.¹

* * *

1. The results of a survey of 208 epithets from 18 of Lermontov's ballads (940 lines) are as follows: of the total number, 140 epithets are used only once each; 40 epithets are used twice each; 9 epithets are used 3 times each; and 19 epithets are used 4 or more times each: belyi, blednyi, boevoi, bol'shoi, vysokii, dikii, zolotoi, krovavyi, milyi, mladoi, moguchii, mrachnyi, nochnoi, pechal'nyi, prekrasnyi, rodnoi, sinii, kholodnyi, chernyi. Lermontov's epithets are closer in frequency, range, and meaning to Zhukovsky's epithets than to Pushkin's. Repetition of a limited number of epithets and formations with the prefixes bez- and ne- is characteristic of Lermontov's style.

While Lermontov's most original ballads are like Pushkin's inasmuch as they avoid the tendency to "show off" their "ancient lore", to "put wild ... sentiments in stilted eighteenth-century dialogue", and to "revel in the ... pathetic"¹ - they are neither "models" in the sense that Pushkin's ballads are, nor do they approach the characteristics of the traditional folk genre. For Lermontov, the literary ballad was merely one of the available lyrical forms, not the most fashionable genre in Russian poetry. When Belinsky wrote in 1843 that "the reading of marvellous ballads no longer provides any pleasure, but produces apathy and boredom",² his description of the demise of the genre was all too accurate.

1. Bayley, Pushkin, 57.

2. See above, Chapter V, pp. 191-92.

CONCLUSION

Ideas can be, and are, cosmopolitan,
but not style, which has a soil, a
sky, and sun all its own.

-- Chateaubriand¹

Widespread fascination for the ballad in late eighteenth-century European literature inspired Russian poets to experiment with the new genre during the 1790s. After the publication of Lyudmila in 1808 the literary ballad became the most influential and controversial genre in Russian literature for almost two decades, and Zhukovsky was considered its most talented practitioner. While the ideas in his forty literary ballads are "cosmopolitan" in that they were frequently borrowed from English and German sources, the style of his ballads, particularly the frequency, range, and meaning of his epithets, is remarkably original. These epithets created the foundation for the vocabulary of Russian romantic poetry. The polemics in Russian criticism from 1815 to 1825 help to clarify the nature of Zhukovsky's stylistic innovations and the ballads of his imitators provide valuable material for comparison. Pushkin and Lermontov also began their literary careers by writing imitations of Zhukovsky's ballads; both progressed through parody to original use of the genre.

By the beginning of the 1840s the literary ballad had lost its magic. The particular characteristics of the genre, its narrative unit, method, and attitude, and its intangible "world"

1. Schenk, The Mind of the European Romantics, xxiii.

had disappeared. The ballad was relegated to a position of equality with other lyrical genres; the term "ballad" became a synonym for a "lyrical story in verse".

In the late thirties and early forties Nekrasov made use of the genre in some of his early apprentice works (Voron, Rytsar', Vodyanoi). During the 1850s the ballad once again became the object of parody, particularly in the comic verse of "Koz'ma Prutkov"¹ (Nemetskaya ballada; Putnik) and I.P. Myatlev (Artamonych). In the sixties A.K. Tolstoy revived the genre in his stylized historical and folkloric narrative poems. Later, during the symbolist period, Vladimir Solov'ev parodied the form in Osenneyaya progulka rytsarya Ral'fa (1886), while Valerii Bryusov used the ballad to express his most personal lyrical themes (Putnik; U morya; Ballada o lyubvi i smerti; Ballada vospominanii). Among Soviet poets, the genre has been successfully employed by Nikolai Tikhonov, Sergei Esenin, and Aleksandr Tvardovsky, among others.²

A comprehensive account of the ballad revival in nineteenth-century European literature still remains to be written. In addition to the English, German, French, and Russian ballads, this future literary history must include related developments in other Slavonic literatures, including Polish,³ Ukrainian,⁴ and

1. A pseudonym for a "collective" consisting of A.K. Tolstoy, Vladimir and Aleksandr Zhemchuzhnikov, and the Alekseev brothers.

2. See V. Lartsev, "Ballada v sovremennoi poezii", Zvezda vostoka (Tashkent), 9 September 1963, 123-33.

3. E.g. Mickiewicz's Ballady i romanse (1822); see W. Weintraub, The Poetry of Adam Mickiewicz (The Hague, 1954), 31-45.

4. E.g. Shevchenko's literary ballads (1840s); see W. Smyrniw, "The Treatment of the Ballad by Shevchenko and his Contemporaries in Relation to Western Balladry", Canadian Slavonic Papers, XII, No.2 (1970), 142-74.

Czech.¹

The Russian literary ballad is only one manifestation of that fascination for the ballad genre, which is "one of the universal characteristics of the Romantic temperament, whatever its incarnation".²

1. E.g. Erben's Kytice (1853); see M. Součková, The Czech Romantics (The Hague, 1958), 87-127.

2. Ober, "Žukovskij's Early Translations", 182.

A P P E N D I X E S

APPENDIX A

DER FISCHER - GOETHE

Das Wasser rauscht', das Wasser schwoll,
Ein Fischer sass daran,
Sah nach dem Angel ruhevoll,
Kühl bis ans Herz hinan.
Und wie er sitzt und wie er lauscht,
Teilt sich die Flut empor;
Aus dem bewegten Wasser rauscht
Ein feuchtes Weib hervor.

Sie sang zu ihm, sie sprach zu ihm:
Was lockst du meine Brut
Mit Menschenwitz und Menschenlist
Hinauf in Todesglut?
Ach wüsstest du, wie's Fischlein ist
So wohlig auf dem Grund,
Du stiegst herunter, wie du bist,
Und würdest erst gesund.

Labt sich die liebe Sonne nicht,
Der Mond sie nicht im Meer?
Kehrt wellenatmend ihr Gesicht
Nicht doppelt schöner her?
Lockt dich der tiefe Himmel nicht,
Das feuchverklärte Blau?
Lockt dich dein eigen Angesicht
Nicht her in ewgen Tau?

Das Wasser rauscht', das Wasser schwoll,
Netzt' ihm den nackten Fuss;
Sein Herz wuchs ihm so sehnsuchtsvoll,
Wei bei der Liebsten Gruss.
Sie sprach zu ihm, sie sang zu ihm;
Da wars um ihn geschehn:
Halb zog sie ihn, halb sank er hin,
Und ward nicht mehr gesehn.

APPENDIX A

РЫБАК - ЖУКОВСКИЙ

Бежит волна, шумит волна!
 Задумчив, над рекой
 Сидит рыбак; душа полна
 Прохладной тишиной.
 Сидит он час, сидит другой;
 Вдруг шум в волнах притих...
 И влажною всплыла главой
 Красавица из них.

Глядит она, поет она:
 "Зачем ты мой народ
 Манишь, влечешь с родного дна
 В кипучий жар из вод?
 Ах! если б знал, как рыбкой жить
 Привольно в глубине,
 Не стал бы ты себя томить
 На знойной вышине.

Не часто ль солнце образ свой
 Купает в лоне вод?
 Не свежей ли горит красой
 Его из них исход?
 Не с ними ли свод неба слит
 Прохладно-голубой?
 Не в лоно ль их тебя манит
 И лик твой молодой?"

Бежит волна, шумит волна...
 На берег вал плеснул!
 В нем вся душа тоски полна,
 Как будто друг шепнул!
 Она поет, она манит -
 Знать, час его настал!
 К нему она, он к ней бежит...
 И след навек пропал.

APPENDIX B

THE EPITHET IN RUSSIAN FOLK BALLADS¹

	epithet	substantives
1a7	белый	руки, груди, тело, снег
	зеленый	сад, луга, вино
	родной	матушка, сестрица
	сладкий	меды, водочки
	черный	кудри, брови, вороны
1b7	высокий	терем
	грозный	тучи, сон
	добрый	конь, молодец
	злой	жена, мачеха, змея
	красный	девица, золото, солнце
	любимый	дочь, зять
	лютый	зелье, змея
	милый	друг
	младой/ молодой	княгиня, сестрица
	новый	горница, гробница
	острый	сабля
	темный	лес, ночь
	чистый	поле, серебро
	широкий	двор, ворота, улица
	ясный	очи, сокол
27	божий	церковь, масло, звон
	булатный	нож, меч
	дубовый	стола, гроб
	золотой	перстень, казна, цепочка, венец
	шелковый	пояс, платок, платье

1. Texts selected from *Narodnye ballady*, 45-174; see above, Chapter IV, p. 135.

APPENDIX B

THE EPITHET IN ENGLISH LITERARY BALLADS¹

epithet	uses	substantives
1a] black	5	horse, eyes, arms
red	5	light, brow
white	8	face, countenance, cheeks, waves
1b] bright	8	eyes, lady
cold	9	hands, corpse, dew
dark	9	night, water, eyes, brow
deep	6	sounds, water, river
fair	18	strand, stream, chamber, lady, sky
gay	4	heart, lady
holy	10	water, hymns, eve, sacrament
little	10	boat, foot-page
pale	10	face, cheek, brow, light, hue
wild	4	alarm, winds, water
young	7	Edmund, Eberhard
2] silver	3	chain, pound

English folk ballads: used
10x or more per 1000 lines²

English literary ballads:
uses in sample of 1000 lines

bonny	-
dear	-
fair	18
golden	-
good	-
green	-
handsome	-
old	1
red	5
silver	3
young	7

1. Sample of 1000 lines from English literary ballads by Scott and Southey; see above, Chapter IV, p.139.

2. Miles, A Tabular View, see chart "Major Adjectives".

APPENDIX B

THE EPITHET IN GERMAN LITERARY BALLADS¹

	epithet	uses	substantives
1a]	schwarz	3	Tat, Mantel, Mund
	tot	3	Kind, Fräulein
1b]	alt	6	Sitte, Zeit, Held
	dunkel	3	Gefühle, Hain
	fromm	3	Schauder, Dichter
	furchtbar	4	Stimme, Macht
	gross	3	Leid, Trauer, Tat
	hoh	4	Balkon, Schloss
	kühn	5	Auge, Held
	schwer	3	Traum, Tat
	schön	3	Spiele, Gestalt
	still	6	Weiner, Hoffnung, Antlitz
	süss	4	Mund, Lieder, Freundin
	teuer	5	Lohn, Bild
	tief	6	Gruft, Traum, Himmel
	wild	4	Wald, Gewalt
2]	golden	3	Stern, Becher
	irdisch	3	Leid, Gut

German folk ballads: used 4x
or more in 350 line sample²

breit
edel
gross
grün
hoh
rot
schön
weiss
zart

German literary ballads:
uses in sample of 1000 lines

1
2
3
2
4
-
3
1
2

1. Sample of 1000 lines from German literary ballads by Bürger, Goethe, Schiller, and Uhland; see above, Chapter IV, p.140.
2. Texts selected from The Penguin Book of German Verse, ed. L. Forster (London, 1959), 44-64.

APPENDIX C

KEY TO CHARTS¹

1b]

Definition - Slovar' Akademii Rossiskoi (SPb., 1789-94). Asterisks denote figurative meanings as indicated in the Dictionary. Parentheses contain examples cited in the definition.

I, II, III - Examples are selected from the Academy of Sciences Dictionary of Eighteenth-Century Russian (in preparation), supplemented with examples from an original survey. Examples are arranged by thirds of the eighteenth century (I, II, III). The following is a list of abbreviations used to designate the source of each example:²

I -	Гист.	<u>Гистория о российском матросе</u> <u>Василии Кориотском</u>
	Кант.	Кантемир
	Тред.	Тредиаковский
II -	Елаг.	Елагин
	Княж.	Княжнин
	Лом.	Ломоносов
	Лук.	Лукин
	Май.	Майков
	Пет.	Петров
	Поп.	Попов
	Сум.	Сумароков
	Тред.	Тредиаковский
III -	Фон.	Фонвизин
	Чулк.	Чулков
	Бог.	Богданович
	Дер.	Державин
	Дмит.	Дмитриев
	Кап.	Капнист
	Кар.	Карамзин
	Кост.	Костров
	Мж.	<u>Московский журнал</u>
	ММерк.	<u>Московский Меркурий</u>
	Мур.	Муравьев
	Нел.	Нелединский-Мелецкий
	Пант.	<u>Пантеон иностранной словесности</u>
	Рад.	Радищев
	СПбМерк.	<u>Санкт-Петербургский Меркурий</u>
	Хем.	Хемницер

1. See above, Chapter IV, p.153.

2. Examples listed without any specific source were in general usage in eighteenth-century Russian.

- Folk - Examples are selected from Narodnye ballady, 45-174.
- W. Eur. - Examples are selected from English literary ballads by Scott and Southey, and from German literary ballads by Bürger, Goethe, Schiller, and Uhland - all of which were "translated" by Zhukovsky.
- Lit. - Examples are selected from Russian literary ballads of the 1790s and early 1800s. Each substantive is followed by a "code" which identifies ballad/stanza (if in verse)/line. The following is a list of abbreviations used to designate ballad titles:

ЭМ	<u>Эдвин и Малли</u>
АР	<u>Алвин и Рена</u>
ЛБ	<u>Леонард и Блондина</u>
ВМ	<u>Вилльям и Маргарита</u>
М	<u>Милон</u>
ЛС	<u>Лаура и Сельмар</u>
Б	<u>Быль</u>
К	<u>Карикатура</u>
СЛ	<u>Старинная любовь</u>
ГГ	<u>Граф Гваринос</u>
Р	<u>Раиса</u>
А	<u>Алина</u> ¹

- Zhukovsky - Full examples from the forty literary ballads are recorded, and are arranged chronologically within each subdivision of the definition. Literal meanings are listed first; figurative meanings follow. Numbers 1), 2), 3), etc., refer to more or less distinct meanings; letters a), b), c), etc., refer to groups of substantives to which each given meaning is applied. There is no correspondence intended between the subdivisions of one chart and those of another. Each substantive is followed by a "code" which identifies ballad/stanza/line. If an epithet has been translated from, or has any equivalent in, the foreign source, then the original word is included in parentheses after the "code". An oblique stroke indicates that although the ballad itself has a specific source, the given epithet was supplied by Zhukovsky where none was present in the original. No mark indicates that the ballad has no specific source. The following is a list of abbreviations used to designate ballad titles:

Л	<u>Людмила</u>
Ка	<u>Кассандра</u>
Св	<u>Светлана</u>
П	<u>Пустынник</u>
Ад	<u>Адельстан</u>

1. The code for Alina consists of the page number (84-89) in N.M. Karamzin, Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii (M.-L., 1966) and the line.

ИЖ	<u>Ивиковы журавли</u>
Ва	<u>Варвик</u>
АА	<u>Алина и Альсим</u>
ЭЭ	<u>Эльвина и Эдвин</u>
Ах	<u>Ахилл</u>
Э	<u>Эолова арфа</u>
М	<u>Мщение</u>
Га	<u>Гаральд</u>
ТН	<u>Три песни</u>
Г	<u>Громобой</u>
В	<u>Вадим</u>
Ры	<u>Рыбак</u>
РТ	<u>Рыцарь Тогенбург</u>
ЛЦ	<u>Лесной царь</u>
Гг	<u>Граф гапсбургский</u>
У	<u>Узник</u>
Э	<u>Замок Смальгольм</u>
Т	<u>Торжество победителей</u>
К	<u>Кубок</u>
ПН	<u>Поликратов перстень</u>
ЖЦ	<u>Жалоба Цереры</u>
Д	<u>Доника</u>
С	<u>Суд божий над епископом</u>
А	<u>Алонзо</u>
Л	<u>Ленора</u>
По	<u>Покаяние</u>
КУ	<u>Королева Урака и пять мучеников</u>
РО	<u>Роланд оруженосец</u>
ПКВ	<u>Плавание Карла великого</u>
РР	<u>Рыцарь Роллон</u>
СР	<u>Старый рыцарь</u>
Бр	<u>Братоубийца</u>
Ул	<u>Уллин и его дочь</u>
ЭП	<u>Элевзинский праздник</u>
НС	<u>Ночной смотр¹</u>

Comments - The examples from Zhukovsky's ballads are followed by brief comments concerning: Frequency - the total number of times each epithet is used, and the number of ballads in which it occurs; Source - the number of times an epithet was translated from a foreign source and what English, German, or French epithets the Russian replaced; and Usage - comments on Zhukovsky's individual use of each epithet, including comparison with eighteenth-century Russian usage if relevant.

1. Although not strictly a literary ballad, Nochnoi smotr has been included in the survey because its epithets provide examples similar to those in the literary ballads.

Definition			Zhukovsky	1) Of persons, their complexion, etc., pale, pallid, wan; in context reflects: a) emaciation b) death c) fear d) general emotional distress
I	II	III		
он (Кант.) она (Тред.)	луна (Пет.) свет (Лом.) лицо (Тред.) труп (Лом.) цвет (Елаг.) зависть (Тред.)	смерть (Дер.) вид (Бог.) тени (Кар.) молнии (Кар.) ужас (Кар.) осень (Кар.)	гости пост толпа он друг лик она лик некто он труп он	
Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	он лик Громобой жена убийца посланный	
/	pale: face cheek hue splendour bleich: Fenster	Рена АР:19:2 щеки ЭМ:20 привидения ЭМ:176 тень ЛБ:3:3 Лаура ЛС:1:3 она Р:4:1	ИМ:23:1 (schreckenbleich) Б:22:1 Г:43:2 З:33:1 По:15:3 РР:5:1 (bleich) ВА:10:4 ВА:19:3 (pale) ВА:35:4 (pale) АА:14:3 З:4:2 По:10:4; РО:23:2	

1) Of persons, their complexion, etc., pale, pallid, wan; in context reflects:

a) emaciation

гости
пост

С:6:2
Бр:5:3

b) death

толпа
он
друг
лик
она
лик
некто
он
труп
он

Ка:14:1 (bleich)
Св:8:14
Св:9:14
ЭЭ:19:4
ЭЭ:25:2
Ах:21:7
В:56:7
РТ:10:7 (bleich)
Д:27:2 (livid)
Бр:11:4 (bleich)

c) fear

он
лик
Громобой
жена
убийца
посланный

ИМ:23:1 (schreckenbleich)
Б:22:1
Г:43:2
З:33:1
По:15:3
РР:5:1 (bleich)

d) general emotional distress

лик
лик
лик
он
барон
он
Тюрпин

ВА:10:4
ВА:19:3 (pale)
ВА:35:4 (pale)
АА:14:3
З:4:2
По:10:4;
РО:23:2

(sad and sour)
13:4
/

Zhukovsky	
2) Dim, reflecting, or producing weak light;	СВ:8:14 АД:28:3 / АА:14:7 (pâleur) Г:71:4 Г:72:7 В:6:8 В:55:4 В:57:6
Compound:	бледноликая Изолина А:9:1 /
Comments	
Frequency: Used 34 times; occurs in 20 ballads.	
Source: Translated from foreign source 9 times; once replaces <u>sad</u> and <u>sour</u> .	
Usage: Zhukovsky further develops late eighteenth century usage of the epithet and expands its applicability. Depending on its context, <u>blednyi</u> can reflect emaciation (including the transferred usage <u>blednyi post</u>), death, fear, or general emotional distress.	

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Надежный, неложный, истинный; 2) Относительно к вере: исповедующий Христианскую веру.			1) faithful, loyal, true, reliable; referring to: a) friends друг Ах:8:1 друг Э:21:4 товарищ РР:13:3 /
I слуга (Кант.) друг (Гист.)	II сердце (Лом.) жена (Фон.) друг (Сум.) раб слуга служба человек	III дружба (Кар.) чувство (Иж) знак признак источник	b) spouse жена АА:26:3 / c) servants, companions, etc. провокатий Иж:3:2 (befreundet) пес В:1:10 слуга РР:11:3 (treuest) d) abstractions обеты Св:18:11 струны Э:20:3 сон В:64:3 обет Д:24:2 (sacred)
Folk нянька слуга	W. Eur. faithful: Eberhard treu: Schwesterliebe	Lit. сын Б:8:1 кров Р:2:2 Раиса Р:16:2 он А:89:4	Comments Frequency: Used 11 times; occurs in 8 ballads. Source: Translated from foreign source once; also replaces <u>befreundet</u> and <u>sacred</u> . The folk epithet <u>vernvi sluga</u> is common in 18th c. poetry. Usage: <u>Vernvi</u> is related to the poet's theme of <u>ideal</u> friendship; it is also one of a series of equivalent epithets applied to <u>struny</u> as a metaphor for poetry (Cf. <u>milyi</u> , <u>slackii</u>).

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Радостный, у кого сердце приятными чувствованиями наполнено; 2) Вливающий приятные чувствования в других, забавный чувствам.			1) experiencing joy, joyous; referring to: a) people or mythological figures	
I	II	III	Людмила Л:10:3 / девы Ка:2:4 / посетитель Ва:12:3 / пахарь Г:15:7 Вадим В:46:2 толпа Ку:16:4 / Ком СП:16:2 / Камени СП:22:5 /	
лицо (Кант.) нрав (Кант.) дух (Тред.) место (Тред.)	природа (Елаг.) жизнь (Лук.) глас (Лом.) вид (Чулк.) нрав пир	взоры (Рад.) улыбка (Кар.) дни (СПБ Мерк.) мечты (Дер.) песни (Кар.)	b) places вместе ад З:15:2 Г:7:7	
			c) events пир пир М:1:1 (froh) Г:28:4	
			2) expressing joy; Очи З:5:3 (mild) песня ТП:1:1 (schönste) взор Т:7:1 / разговор РО:1:6 /	
Folk пир	W. Eur. gay: heart froh: Braut Ziel	Lit. вид АР:6:2 девица ЗМ:67 гости ЗМ:177 пир ЗМ:196	блеск Б:25:1 / утро З:16:2 природа З:16:2 луч В:4:4 бер В:69:8	

ВЕЧЕРНИЙ

Comments

Frequency: Used 21 times; occurs in 13 ballads.

Source: Translated from foreign source once; also replaces mild, schönste. The folk epithet veselyi pir occurs in 18th century poetry and in pre-Zhukovsky literary ballads.

Usage: Zhukovsky expands the applicability of the epithet particularly in descriptions of locations such as vmeste (minutnaya slado-
st' / Veselovogo vmeste) and ad; he also uses veselyi to express his own subjective reaction to phenomena (blesk, beg, priroda). The epithet implies the poet's emotional sympathy.

Definition			Zhukovsky	
<p>1) Возвышенный, в верх поднявшийся, или поднятый,несенный; 2) Выспренный, далеко в верх отстоящий; 6) В смысле* и нравственном означает: важный, превосходный, могущественный, крепкий, гордый, величавый....</p>			<p>1) high; of considerable upward extent or magnitude;</p> <p>стан В:4:5 брег В:25:8 окно У:2:1 скала К:2:1 (von der H8h) замок Д:1:3 (high) окно А:4:1 /</p>	
<p>I /</p>			<p>2) elevated, lofty;</p> <p>душа П:29:3 / венец Е:14:2 / даль Д:14:3 /</p>	
<p>Folk</p> <p>терем крылец</p>	<p>II</p> <p>дух (Лом.) мысли (Лом.) чело Трут.) гора (Лом.) (Лом.)</p>		<p>III</p> <p>тайнства (МТ.) добродетель (МТ.) творец (Кар.) песнь (Дер.) ум (Дер.)</p>	
<p>W. Eur.</p> <p>high: walls tower Mass</p> <p>hoh: Schloss Bergesrücken Luft</p>	<p>Lit.</p> <p>теремы СЛ:1:2 цель ГГ:17:2 холм Р:19:1</p>		<p>Comments</p> <p>Frequency: Used 9 times; occurs in 7 ballads.</p> <p>Source: Translated from foreign source twice.</p> <p>Usage: Zhukovsky further develops the figurative meanings which the epithet acquired in the 18th century, and expands its applicability to include other abstract concepts: thus <u>vysokaya dusha</u> replaces the classical <u>dukh</u> and <u>mysli</u>; <u>vysokaya dal'</u> indicates an infinite, spiritual location.</p>	

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Имеющий дно далеко в низ от поверхности лежащее; 2) *Трудный к познанию, к постижению умом; 3) *Презмерный, великий, крайний (молчанье, печаль, знание); 4) Проницательный, остроумный (мысль) - ночь - поздние часы ночи - сон - крепкий сон			1) deep; having great extension downward; extending far inward; снег Св:9:2 (tief) река М:4 пучина К:11:5 свод По:32:3 голос Д:14:1 рев ЭП:18:6
мысли (Тред.) труд (Кант.) темнота (Кант.)	I	II	2) intense, profound; a) referring to sleep, etc. сон Св:13:5 сон Г:17:11 сон З:38:3 (heavy) сон РО:6:8 сон РО:17:2 тишина ИЖ:12:7 ночь Г:28:10
	III	III	
чувствитель- ность (Кар.) меланхолия (МЖ.) размышление (МЖ.) уныние (М. Мерк.)			b) concerning the emotions нежность Д:22:2 (deep) размышление По:40:2 уныние ЭП:4:7
Folk	W. Eur.		Comments
погреб ямы снежочки	deep: water sounds tief: Gruft Himmel Traum		Frequency: Used 16 times; occurs in 10 ballads. Source: Translated from foreign source three times. Usage: Zhukovsky further develops the figurative meaning of the epithet which originated in the 18th century, and extends its applicability to include emotional substantives, following late 18th century developments.

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Строгий, свирепый, суровый; 2) Наполненный угроз; 3) Иногда значит: страшный, ужасный, наводящий страх (туча, буря).			1) dreadful, awful; inspiring fear, horror; referring to: a) sight	
I	II	III	ОЧИ СВ:15:8 СОН СВ:16:9 КОГТИ АД:45:2 ПРИЗРАК ВА:17:1 ЛУЧ АХ:21:4 ЛИЦА ТП:4:2 СОНМ Г:25:1 ТУЧИ Г:29:6 б) sound ГЛАС АХ:7:6 ВОЙ Г:28:9 РЕЧЬ В:23:1 с) people РАТЬ Л:1:12 СТАРЕЦ Г:59:7 ЗВЕРЮЛОВ ЭП:2:6 d) time ВРЕМЕНА ГГ:2:6 (schrecklich) e) place МОРЕ К:3:3 (wild) 2) stern, cruel, severe; ЗАКОН Г:33:11 СЫН (небес) Г:55:1	
ГОЛОС (КАНТ.)	ВЗОР (ЛОМ.) ЗВУК (ЛОМ.) СУДЬБИНА (ЛОМ.) СЛОВА (ЕЛАГ.) ТУЧИ ОБЛАКА	ГОЛОС (КАР.) НОЧЬ (МЖ.)		
Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.		
СОН ТУЧИ КОРОЛЬ	/	ВОЛНЫ ЛС:4:3 ГОЛОС ГГ:10:2 ЛУЧ Р:1:2		

ГРОЗНЫЙ

	Comments
	<p>Frequency: Used 18 times; occurs in 10 ballads.</p>
	<p>Source: Translated from foreign source twice: <u>schrecklich</u>, wild (Ger.) > <u>grozny</u>.</p>
	<p>Usage: Zhukovsky expands the applicability of the epithet, applying it to a wide range of phenomena. <u>Groznyi</u> is used as a synonym for the more frequent epithets <u>strashnyi</u>, <u>uzhasnyi</u> (e.g., Akh! <u>uzhasnyi</u>, <u>grozny</u> <u>son!</u> - CB: 16:9).</p>

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Говоря о прозябаемых: частый, непроходимый, изобильный (лес, роща); 2) Говоря о деревьях: ветвистый, многолиственный; 3) В отношении к волосам: волосистый, много волосов имеющий; 6) В отношении к воздуху и к облакам: мрачный, непроницаемый от скопившихся паров.			1) thick, dense; filled with objects or individuals; лес Га:1:4 {wild} лес Га:8:4 {weit} лес Га:12:2 / лес В:25:7 лес РО:18:1 / толпа Т:2:1 /
I мгла (Тред.) воздух (Тред.)	II тень (Лом.) мрак (Тред.) лес (Тред.) ночь (Сум.) ночь (Сум.)	III печаль (Рад.) туман (Рад.) власы (Рад.)	2) thick, bushy (of hair); борода АА:14:3 (longue) борода ЛЦ:2:3 / кудри Э:5:5 кудри В:36:5 3) dense, impenetrable; тьма П:2:1 / мгла ИЖ:19:4 / дым Б:34:2 / пыль В:43:6
Folk /	W. Eur. /	Lit. /	Comments Frequency: Used 14 times; occurs in 10 ballads. Source: Never translated from foreign source; replaces <u>wild</u> (Ger.), <u>weit</u> , <u>longue</u> . Usage: Zhukovsky uses <u>gustoi</u> as a synonym for <u>mrachnyi</u> in the description of ballad settings; however, the epithet did not acquire the emotional overtones which were characteristic of <u>mrachnyi</u> .

Definition			Zhukovsky	
I мысли (Тред.)	II печаль (Тред.) голос (Чулк.) нрав (Тред.) места камень звери народ	III природа (Им.) взор (Им.) радость (Им.) уныние (Дер.) берега (Кар.)	1) wild, in a state of nature; бор В:51:7 поляна По:24:3 вепрь Ку:25:1 (wild) берег Бр:1:2	/
			2) unusual, abnormal, terrible; referring to: a) sight взор Г:43:6 свет ЗП:3:4	/
			b) sound рев Ил:8:5 хор Ил:15:2 глас В:21:5 песня Т:2:5	/
			c) people or mythological figures сторож Г:79:1 Троглодит ЗП:2:1	/
			d) emotions исступление С:19:2	/
Folk степь	W. Eur. wild (Eng.): look Margaret waters wild (Ger.): Meer Wald Gewalt	Lit. брег ЛБ:17:4	3) strange, uncivilized, savage; ОН Г:26:11 ОН По:34:1	/

ДИКИЙ

Comments

Frequency: Used 15 times; occurs in 9 ballads.

Source: Translated from foreign source once.

Usage: Zhukovsky expands the figurative meaning acquired during the 18th century; he applies the epithet to a wide range of natural and supernatural phenomena. Dikiy also acquires overtones of mystery and uncanniness.

ЗАДУМЧИВЫЙ

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Тот, который задумывается; подверженный задумчивости; 2) Печальный, в печали находящийся.			1) pensive; plunged in meditation or reflection; ОН ЗЗ:14:1 / ОНА Г:75:10 РЫБАК РЫ:1:2 (ruhevoll) ОН У:20:3 / ОН ПО:23:3 // Оливер РО:25:2 //	
I ОН (Кант.)			2) expressing pensiveness; ПЛАМЕНЬ З:6:2 (ВО ВЗОРАХ) ОЧИ В:23:2	
II щеголь (Чулк.) управление (Елаг.) тиран (Сум.) я вы он			3) evoking pensiveness; ЗВОН З:29:2 лира Г: Введ. 3:8	
III супруг (Бог.) девы (Дер.) луна (Дмит.) краса (Дер.)				
Folk			Comments	
/			Frequency: Used 10 times; occurs in 6 ballads. Source: Translated from foreign source once: <u>ruhevoll</u> > <u>zadumchivyi</u> . Usage: Zhukovsky further develops late 18th century usage in which <u>zadumchivyi</u> is used not only to describe the emotional state of objective characters, but also to express the poet's subjective reaction to phenomena (<u>zvон</u> , <u>лира</u>).	

Comments

Frequency: Used 27 times; occurs in 16 ballads.

Source: Translated from foreign source four times; twice replaces silver.

Usage: Zhukovsky, strongly influenced by German sources, develops the meaning legkii = airy, ethereal; the epithet acquires overtones of mystery and uncanniness, and is usually applied to supernatural phenomena.

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Приятный, любезный, пленительный, привлекательный; (взор, дитя).			1) kind, sympathetic, pleasant, attractive;
I дружки (Тред.)	II зрак (Сум.) вид (Пет.) невинность (Княж.) утехи (Май.) она он я вы ты	III улыбка (Нел., Кар.) друг (Мур.) мечта (Нел.) тайна (Мл.) душа (Кар.) тени (Кар.) скорбь (Кар.)	<p>вид Л:20:4 / взор Ка:13:3 (schön) разговоры Св:18:8 живость АА:14:5 / взгляд Г:30:3 встреча Г:33:2 смятение В:36:10 мечта В:39:1</p> <p>2) dear, favourite, close to the heart;</p> <p>друг Л:4:4 / Светлана Св:2:4 друг Св:3:2 друг Св:15:13 тень П:35:3 / жизнь П:39:3 / струны Э:32:1 цветок Е:32:7 творенья Г:31:6 рыцарь РГ:1:2 край РГ:4:7 (teuer) родина Т:4:12</p>
Folk сестрица чадо	W. Eur. dear: children kind: he she lieb: Sonne Kind traut: Reiter Kind	Lit. тень ЛБ:17:3 супруг М:23:4 Кронид Р:9:1 чувствитель- ность А:84:4 подруга А:85:8 тень А:86:30 слезы А:87:17	<p>Comments</p> <p>Frequency: Used 20 times; occurs in 10 ballads.</p> <p>Source: Translated from foreign models once; also replaces schön.</p> <p>Usage: Zhukovsky further develops late 18th century usage of the epithet, especially that of Karamzin. As <u>kind</u>, <u>milyi</u> is applied to</p>

abstract substantives (zhivost', smyaten'e); as dear it is used to describe persons (even ten'), natural phenomena, homeland, etc. Milyi conveys the poet's warmest emotional approval; it comes to replace its 18th century synonyms prekhasnyi and priyatnyi.

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Темный, лишенный света (солнце, день, места); 2) *Невеселый, печальный, угрюмый (взор, лица).			1) dark, poorly illuminated; Дол и лес Эльдон Пустыня	Л:7:12 З:30:2 По:26:4 /
I печаль (Кант.)	II мысли (Сум.) глаза (Елаг.) глубина (Лом.) древность (Лом.)	III осень (Кар.) тишина (Дер.) тень (Кар., Рад.) природа (Мур.) ад (Княж.) задумчивость (Мж.) уединение (Мж.)	2) gloomy, sombre; конь пришлец монах монах лица лоб	Ах:16:6 З:27:2 З:48:3 З:49:1 Бр:5:3 Бр:6:4 /
			3) evil, mysterious; ад он бес	Ка:14:3 Б:41:2 Д:27:3 /
Folk /	W. Eur. dreary: place days and nights	Lit. час ВМ:29 грот М:8:4 лес А:86:29	Comments Frequency: Used 12 times; occurs in 8 ballads. Source: Never translated from foreign source. Usage: Zhukovsky follows the figurative usage of the epithet which developed in the 18th century. Even as <u>dark</u> , <u>mrachnyi</u> implies <u>gloomy</u> . The figurative meaning is expanded to include <u>kon'</u> , and it acquires overtones of mystery when referring to the devil (cf. <u>chernyi</u>).	

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Мягкий, не имеющий грубости; 2) Слабый (дитя); 3) Разборчивый, отменно чувствительный; 5) *Чувствительный к дружбе, к состраданию, к любви, и проч. (друг, сердце); 6) *Трогательный, привлекательный (голос, взгляд).			1) tender, loving, affectionate; / Лора АД:15:1 матери Г:14:1 любовь Д:22:1 друг Л:3:5
I постель (Кант.)	II взгляд (Сум.) любовь (Сум., Лом., Елаг.) весна (Лом.) душа (Сум.) взоры (Трут.)	III чувства (Кар.) томность (Кар.) горечь (Ма.) дух (Нел.) мечты (Мур.)	2) pleasant, delightful; / взор АХ:19:5 звуки Г:30:6 глас В:21:3 клик ЖЦ:7:10
			3) gentle, soft; / рука Л:14:3 (Lilienhände) рука Га:4:2
			4) weak, delicate; / чада ЖЦ:8:2 (Frühlings Kinder) пол П:21:2
Folk руки тело	W. Eur. zart: Saite Erbarmen	Lit. сердце АР:11:1 девица БМ:118 красы ЛБ:11:1 желание ЛС:2:1 вздох Р:12:2 пламень А:85:24	Comments Frequency: Used 12 times; occurs in 10 ballads. Source: Never translated from foreign source; twice the epithet replaces substantives of related meaning. Usage: Zhukovsky follows the usage which developed in early literary ballads, especially those by Karamzin. He uses <u>nezhnyi</u> to describe persons, countenance, and sounds, and less frequently, abstract substantives (<u>Lyubov'</u>).

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Таковий же, схожий, похожий; 2) Холостий или безсемеийний.			1) solitary, lonely, alone; referring to: a) persons девица Св:11:5 рыцарь Ад:14:4 Вадим В:46:4 / b) places, things, etc. грусть Св:3:4 храм Св:9:4 путь В:60:9 огонь З:13:3 путь З:18:3 путь РР:4:2 /(lonely) /(alone) / Compound: ОДИНОКО-УНЫЛАЯ ЖЕНА 3:32:4 (fair)
I	II	III	
	/	/	
Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Comments
ДОЧЬ	lone: hour lonely: night lonesome: hill solitary: way	/	Frequency: Used 10 times; occurs in 6 ballads. Source: Translated from foreign source twice; also replaces <u>fair</u> . Usage: Since there are no examples recorded in Dictionary of 18th Century Russian or in pre-Zhukovsky ballads, the use of <u>odinokii</u> as a descriptive epithet seems to have originated with Zhukovsky.

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) В печали находящийся; 2) Причиняющий печаль.			1) sad, experiencing sorrow; она ЭО:12:4 / мать В:10:5 / я Ц:4:1 / Милон РО:27:2 (traurig)
I песни (Тред.) жизнь (Тред.) сердце (Тред.) лицо (Кант.) разговор (Кант.)	II слова (Сем.) уста (Елаг.) воплъ (Елаг.) мысль (Сум.)	III уединение (Мж.) уныние (Мж.) душа (Мж.) луна (Кап.) лира (Дер.)	2) expressing sorrow; глас Ах:4:2 / лицо А:5:2 / вой Л:21:8 / око ОП:4:5 / 3) evoking sorrow; денница Ах:5:1 / сумрак Б:22:2 / жребий Г:2:3 / вестия КУ:41:2 / торжественно-печальный гимн КУ:37:2 /
Folk печь	W. Eur. sad: looks traurig Ode	Lit. луч АР:12:3 Блондина ЛЕ:10:1	Comments Frequency: Used 12 times; occurs in 11 ballads. Source: Translated from foreign source once. Usage: Zhukovsky expands the meaning of <u>pechal'nyi</u> to include not only the emotional state of objective characters as experienced by them or as expressed in their countenance, but also to express the poet's own subjective reaction to phenomena (<u>dennitsa</u> , <u>sumrak</u>).

СВЕТЛЫЙ

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Сияющий, блистающий, выпускающий свет; 2) Чистый, ясный; 3) *Говоря о цвете: подходящий к яркому, белому; - голос - яркий, звонкий, приятный.			1) bright, shining; emitting, reflecting, or pervaded by, much light; взор сумрак хоровод глаза огонек рог краса дом день юг венец крест день	Л:1:6 / Л:8:9 / Л:16:6 (halb sichtbar-lich) СВ:13:11 П:12:3 (little) АХ:2:2 Г:16:7 Г:28:1 Г:48:1; 65:4 В:7:1 В:44:11 В:68:11 Ц:7:8 /
I день (Кант.) вода (Кант.) ум (Кант.)	II взор (Лок.) дом (Лом.) месяц (Княк.) ночь (Чулк.)		III воздух (Кар.) блеск (Лер.) вечер (Лер.) голос (Лер.) спокойствие (Пант.) лицо (Нел.)	
Folk светлица	W. Eur. bright: bloom eyes silver bunt: Blume		СВ:20:12 СН:15:2 / Г:36:2 В:72:1 З:16:2 (holy) Бр:3:2 /	
Compound: светлоглавый Аполлон	СН:15:2 /		/	

Comments

Frequency: Used 22 times; occurs in 10 ballads.

Source: Never translated from foreign source; replaces little, holy, halb sichtbarlich.

Usage: The literal meaning of svetlyi = bright, shining acquires overtones of mystery (sumrak, khorovod). Zhukovsky also develops the figurative meanings of the epithet (zhizn', rai, chas, etc.).

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Всесовершенно чистый, праведный; 2) Живущий по правилам верою предписанным; 3) Богу посвященный.			1) holy; belonging to, dedicated to, devoted to God; referring to: a) religious concepts, events, etc.	
I муж (Кант.)	II правда (Лом.) добродетель (Сум.) слово (Сум.) страх (Тред.)	III язык (Кар.) поэзия (Кар.) восторг (Кар.) чувство (Пант.)	провиденье союз милость любовь награда жизнь обычай благодать треба союз слово усыпление воля процессия власть	Л:4:10 / СЗ:6:1 / Г:44:7 В:12:4 В:64:4 В:71:10 ГГ:3:9 / ГГ:8:8; 11:2 / ГГ:9:7 / Д:9:4 / Л:8:2 / По:35:3 / КУ:5:2 (divine) КУ:20:2 / ПКВ:13:4 /
Folk тела монах мощи	W. Eur. holy: water hymns men heilig: Macht pflicht	Lit. Мать ГГ:19:3	b) religious objects икона налой дары риза рука налой облачение фимиам кости раки мощи глава Олива	
			Л:5:8 (hochgelobt) СВ:2:14 Б:10:4; 12:1; 18:4; 20:1 Г:57:10 (holy) В:11:4 В:67:3 По:1:2 По:3:2 КУ:15:3 КУ:27:2 КУ:32:3 КУ:36:4 СР:2:1	

	c) people	анахорет чернец угольник боги чудотворцы угольники пришельцы	П:1:2 (gentle) Б:3:1 / Г:37:4 ЖЦ:7:11 (ewig Hohen) По:43:1 КУ:22:4; 29:1; 39:1 (holy) КУ:38:2 (blessed)
	d) places	стены обитель приют монастырь Илион храм монастырь земля места скала храм	Г:12:5 Г:36:4; 36:5 В:16:11 РТ:7:4 / Т:2:8 / По:5:1 / По:17:1; 21:1 ПКВ:1:3; 14:3 (heil'gen) ПКВ:6:1 (Heiland) Бр:4:8 (schroff) Бр:5:7 /
	e) time	час	По:10:1 /
	Comments		
Frequency: Used 61 times; occurs in 18 ballads.			
Source: Translated from foreign sources eight times; also replaces <u>gentle</u> , <u>ewig</u> , <u>schroff</u> .			
Usage: The epithet <u>svyatoi</u> occurs in almost exclusively religious contexts, and is not used to sanctify or elevate secular themes as in Karamzin's lyrics.			

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Церковный, до веры касающийся; 2) Заслуживающий особенное почтение, благоговение наше.			1) revered, honoured, mysterious; referring to: a) religious concepts страх Иж:13:3 / узды Г:11:12 прах В:69:3 ноша ГГ:7:10 / б) people провозвестница Ка:3:7 / Гелиос Иж:9:7 пришлец В:8:6 в) places лес Ка:16:2 / брег Ах:23:1 вид В:68:5 град Т:1:1 / д) time час Г:13:9	
I	II	III		
/	огонь (Тред.) места (Пет.) ужас (Лом.)	красота (Мж.) песнь (Мж.) холм (Мур.) лес (Мур.)		
Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Comments	
/	sacred: rite day hochgelobt: Sakrament	трепет М:8:1 радость М:23:1 остаток (древности) А:86:32	Frequency: Used 12 times; occurs in 7 ballads. Source: Never translated from foreign source. Usage: Unlike <u>svyatoi</u> , Zhukovsky applies <u>svyashchennyi</u> , an 18th century elevated equivalent for <u>svyatoi</u> , to secular words (<u>les</u> , <u>vid</u>).	

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Тоже что смущенный (взор); 2) *Мятежный, беспокойный (время).			1) agitated, restless; indicative of emotional disturbance; ДУХ Св:16:8 ДУМЫ Ад:34:4 (sullen) ОКЕАН Ил:11:4 / ОН В:47:3 ДЕНЬ Бр:8:5 /
I дружок (Кант.) лицо	II взоры (Княж.) глаза (Елаг.)	III дни (Рад.) надежда (Нел.) души (Мур.) эфир (Дер.)	2) indistinct, indefinite; крик Ва:32:2 / желанье У:11:5 ОГОНЬ У:21:5 Всё К:19:1 /
Folk /	W. Eur. restless: conscience sullen: thought	Lit. /	Comments Frequency: Used 9 times; occurs in 8 ballads. Source: Translated from foreign source once. Usage: The epithet acquires overtones of mystery, particularly in combinations such as <u>smutnyi</u> + <u>zhelan'ie</u> , <u>vse</u> .

e) time	МИГ час день и ночь час	Л:12:10 Г:20:10 Г:28:7 Г:50:11	/
f) place	места берег стремнина одр утес	Св:11:7 Ад:39:1 (desolate) Г:1:2 Г:43:1 В:57:10	
g) event and misc.	путь призвание бой отрада мир что-то дело жизнь пир	Ка:15:6 Б:44:2 Г:19:9 Г:26:4 Г:5:12 Д:20:4 (strange) С:4:2 Бр:8:8 ЭП:8:8	 / / / / / / / / /
Comments			
Frequency: Used 47 times; occurs in 21 ballads.			
Source: Never translated from foreign source; replaces <u>desolate</u> , <u>strange</u> .			
Usage: <u>Strashnyi</u> , Zhukovsky's second most frequent epithet, is applied to a wide range of phenomena in order to explain, rather than to demonstrate, how "terrible" something is. (Cf. <u>uzhasnyi</u>).			

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Сокровенный, никому неизвестный, кроме одного или весьма немногих; (намерение, разговоры).			1) secret; a) known by few	
I	II	III	Иж:9:6 (verborgner) С:10:4 В:26:10 В:52:2 У:23:3 Ш:7:4 Щ:7:5 Щ:8:10 По:49:1 враг часы рука сила звезда погибель узды дар свидетель	
			b) concealed, not openly avowed	
			Св:5:3 В:2:3 В:56:1 Д:22:3 По:37:4 По:45:3 робость чувство страх скорбь дума грех	
			2) unknown to anyone; mysterious; Compound: небесно-тайный удел У:14:6	
			Св:16:12 Ах:16:2 Б:3:3 В:73:1 мрак рок дары чудеса	

ТАЙНИ

Comments

Frequency: Used 19 times; occurs in 12 ballads.

Source: Translated from foreign source once.

Usage: Zhukovsky further develops late 18th century usage of the epithet, expanding its applicability (chuvstvo, strakh, etc.). Tainyi also acquires overtones of mystery and uncanniness (mrak, rok, etc.).

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Мрачный, чуждый света (место, ночь); 2) В цветах называется цвет противоположный светлomu; 3)*Неудобопонятный, невразумительный, (выражение).			1) dark; devoid of or deficient in light; referring to: a) place or object	
I	II	III		
лес (Гист.)	зависть (Лом.)	аллея (Мж.)	кельи	Л:11:6 /
ночь (Тред.)	печаль (Тред.)	чувства (Мж.)	даль	СВ:10:7
язык (Тред.)	век (Княж.)	прохлада (Мур.)	луч	АД:32:4 (dim)
	гроб (Княж.)	могила (Кар.)	свет	ИД:14:3 (dusterrot)
	ночь лес	бездна (Дер.)	своды	Б:9:1
	мысль понятие	небеса (Дер.)	лес	Г:1:11
			глубина	Г:3:3
			вершины	Г:27:4
			сень	Г:41:3
			ночь	В:16:11
			лес	В:19:9; 28:7
			бор	В:53:10; 63:1
			липы	РГ:7:3 (duster)
			ветви	ЛЦ:6:2 (duster)
			небо	У:22:3
			ночь	З:19:3
			громада	Б:1:3
			дорога	С:13:2
			свод	Л:12:7
			приют	Л:18:4
			ограда	По:21:2
			свод	По:32:3
			лес	РО:2:7
Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.		
лес	dark:	/		
ночь	night			
темница	water			
	eyes			
	dim:			
	eyes			
	light			
	dunkel:			
	Knduel			
	Gefühle			
	duster			
	Ort			
	finden			
	b) death			
			могила	Л:20:10
			гроб	Б:14:5
			гробы	НС:1:5
			могилы	НС:2:5

ТЕМНЫЙ

	<p>2) of dark colour; <div> <div>ресницы</div> <div>Е:6:3</div> </div> <div> <div>корона</div> <div>ЛЦ:2:3</div> </div> <div> <div>очи</div> <div>Д:12:2</div> </div> <div>/</div> <div>(dark)</div> </p> <p>3) vague, indefinite; <div> <div>чувство</div> <div>ГГ:5:9</div> </div> <div>(dunkel)</div> </p>
	<p>Comments</p> <p>Frequency: Used 33 times; occurs in 19 ballads.</p> <p>Source: Translated from foreign source 5 times; also replaces <u>düsterrot</u>.</p> <p>Usage: Zhukovsky further develops late 18th century usage of the epithet. <u>Temnyi</u> acquires overtones of mystery and vagueness, particularly when applied to abstract locations (<u>dal'</u>, <u>glubina</u>, <u>vershiny</u>) and to emotions (<u>chuvstva</u>).</p>

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Смирный, кроткий (человек, нрав); 2) Медленный, небыстрый (походка); 3) Противопологается слову громкий (голос); 4) Относительно к ветру: слабый; 5) Спокойный, благонадежный.			1) quiet, barely audible, making little noise; шепот Л:9:9 (vernehmlich) шорох Л:16:1 / глас Л:18:11 / хор Л:21:8 / шепот СВ:6:11 глас Ах:4:2 пенье Г:21:6 хор Г:43:11 глас Г:44:11 глас В:36:9 шаги В:47:2 шум В:57:2 говор В:70:11 стон Т:2:6 / голос Д:14:2 / пенье КУ:33:3 /
			2) peaceful, secluded, still, calm; referring to: a) place
			дубрава Л:8:2 / дом Л:13:9 (still) могила П:35:1 / склон Ва:5:1 / (брегов) гроб Б:22:3 / лес В:49:9 сень В:50:6 замок В:58:5 дол РТ:8:7; 10:3 (ruhig) равнина Д:13:4 / приют Л:18:4 (still) земля По:35:3 /

b) time	утро	П:22:3	/
	сон	Г:54:7	
	ночь	З:19:3	(sweet)
	вечер	По:32:1	/
c) people	ангел	Г:66:3	
	дитя	В:35:3	
	он	У:20:6	
	жена	З:33:1	/
d) landscape, weather, etc.			
	Ксант и Симоис	Ах:23:6	
	ветерок	Б:17:8	
	сиянье	Г:38:8	
	трепетанье	В:34:8	
e) emotions	ветер	Д:10:1	/
3) slow, measured;	радость	Б:11:4	
	желанье	Г:32:6	
3) slow, measured;	стопа	Иж:18:5 (langsam)	
	стопа	Б:23:7	
Compound:	тихострунный:	волны	Ад:22:3
	сумрачно-тихий:	доника	Д:15:3
Comments			
Frequency: Used 46 times; occurs in 18 ballads.			
Source: Translated from foreign source 5 times; also replaces <u>sweet</u> .			
Usage: Zhukovsky expands the applicability of the epithet, applying it to a wide range of sounds, and to both locations and persons to indicate physical and/or spiritual tranquility.			

Definition			Zhukovsky	
(see <u>tyazhkii</u>)			1) heavy, ponderous, of great weight;	
I	II	III	труп	Ва:37:4 (heavier)
/	работа (Сум.)	вздох (СПб Мерк.)	панцырь	М:12 (schwer)
	оковы (Елаг.)	власть (Рад.)	винты	В:54:4
	урон (Елаг.)	язык (Мур.)	седок	З:4:4 /
	рука (Трут.)		шуйца	З:46:1 /
			мечи	Р0:3:6; 9:2 /
			шит	Р0:11:3 /
			плот	ЭП:20:4 (schwer)
			2) oppressive, grievous, hard to bear;	
			крест	Г:2:5
			3) massive, dark;	
			облака	В:30:7
Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Comments	
/	heavy: weight	разлука AP:3:4	Frequency: Used 11 times; occurs in 7 ballads.	
	schwen: Traum Tat panzer	вздох AP:7:3 палаш К:4:3	Source: Translated from foreign source 3 times.	
			Usage: Zhukovsky employs the epithet in the literal sense, except when combined with <u>krest</u> to indicate a spiritual burden. (Cf. <u>tyazhkii</u>).	

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Имеющий тяжесть, силу стремящую тело к падению; 2) Имеющий великую, нарочитую пред другими тяжесть (бремя, ноша); 3) *Весьма трудный, неудобносимый (работа).			1) heavy, ponderous, of great weight; ВИНТЫ Б:19:2 (strong) ВРАТ Б:24:3 / ЦЕПЬ Г:59:5 ГРОБ :21:6 / ДРОТИК ЭП:10:2 //
I МЫСЛИ (Кант.) несчастье (Кант.) раны болезнь работа	II узы (Лом.) стон (Сум.) оковы (Сум.) горесть (Сум.) размышление (Елаг.)	III скорбь (Кан.) милость (Хем.) слеза (Рал.) тьма (Дер.)	2) oppressive, grievous, hard to bear; ДОЛГ АА:26:5 / МУКА Э:30:1 МУКА Г:73:10 СЛЕЗЫ Бр:5:2 /
			3) loud, deep; СТОН Ва:27:4; 29:4 / СТОН Б:44:1; 47:3 / ЗВОН ЭЕ:24:2 / ТОПОТ В:53:8 ХРАП Ул:5:3 (hard)
			4) serious; БОЛЕЗНЬ КУ:18:4 /
Folk грехи	W. Eur. (see <u>tyazhelyi</u>)	Lit. цепи ГГ:12:1	Comments Frequency: Used 17 times; occurs in 12 ballads. Source: Never translated from foreign source; replaces <u>strong</u> , <u>hard</u> . Usage: Zhukovsky employs the epithet <u>tyazhki</u> as an elevated variant of <u>tyazhelyi</u> : <u>tyazhki</u> + <u>vrat</u> , <u>tsep</u> ; in the figurative sense the epithet is applied to psychological substantives (<u>muka</u>).

У ЛАНДАНШУИ

Definition			Zhukovsky	
1) Весьма страшный, великий страх, ужас причиняющий (взор, шум, буря).			1) horrible, dreadful, exciting horror; referring to:	
			a) sight	
			сон СВ:16:9 создания ИЖ:16:8 (furchtbar) вид Б:24:1 / мрак Г:42:9 млат Г:67:9 сон З:42:2 вихорь К:17:4 /	
			b) sound	
			песни ИЖ:18:1 рой Б:25:3 шум Б:25:3 песня ТП:3:1 тишина Г:19:1 шепот Д:4:4 слово По:11:2 /	
			c) people	
			он АХ:21:1 он Г:7:8 он В:1:7 он З:23:2 / ездок РР:18:3 (schwarz)	
			d) place	
			лес ИЖ:5:3 ад Г:20:6 гроб Г:33:7	
			e) time	
			день Ва:15:1 /	

1) Весыма страшний, великий страх, ужас причиняющий (взор, шум, буря).				
I стремнины (Кант.) час (Кант.) грозы (Тред.)	II сила (Лом.) звуки (Лом.) сон (Сум.) слово (Сум.) страх (Чулк.)	III величина (ИЖ.) ад (Рад.) муки (Нел.)		
Folk / /	W. Eur. (see <u>strashnyi</u>)	Lit. явление ЭМ:215 час ВМ:29 ветр М:11:2 день и ночь Б:15:3 тьма Р:9:4 минуты Р:20:1		

	<p>f) event, misc.</p> <p>ИСТИНА ЖИЗНЬ ЦЕНА СУД СТРАШИЛИЩЕ МОЛВА КАЗНЬ ДЕЛО ЧТО</p> <p>Ка:8:7 Ка:11:7 Ал:36:3 Ил:22:4 Ва:11:3 Рт:5:3 Т:12:3 По:27:1; По:38:2</p> <p>(schrecklich) / / / / / / (schwer) 47:4 /</p>
<p>Comments</p> <p>Frequency: Used 33 times; occurs in 17 ballads.</p> <p>Source: Translated from foreign source twice; also replaces <u>schwarz</u>, <u>schwer</u>.</p> <p>Usage: Zhukovsky applies the epithet to a wide range of phenomena in order to explain, rather than demonstrate, how "horrible" something is. (Cf. <u>strashnyi</u>).</p>	

Definition			Zhukovsky
1) Лишившийся бодрости духа, предавшийся печальному возчувствованию (вид).			1) experiencing despondency, dejection; ОН Св:8:14; 9:14 ГОСТЬ П:12:2 (pensive) ОН АА:15:5 (Tant de chagrins) ДУША Э:12:2 СЕРДЦЕ Э:13:1 ПЕВЕЦ Э:19:1 СТРАННИК Э:32:5 ПРИЗРАК Г:40:8 ДУША РТ:8:1 ОН По:39:1
I	II	III	2) expressing despondency; ВЗОР Ва:19:3 ОЧИ В:55:8 ГАРМОНИЯ Д:6:3 (strange) ГОЛОС Д:14:1 ЛИЦО По:13:3
ГОЛОС (Кант.)	ЛИЦО (Тред.) ВЗОР (Благ.) ДУХ (Благ.) сердце (Пет.)	ДУША (Нел.) ВОПЛЬ (Кап.) песни (Кар.) поэт (Кар.) леса (Кар.) мысли (Дмит.)	3) evoking despondency; ЗЕМЛЯ Ах:8:3 ДНИ Г:26:5 ЛЕС Г:73:4
Folk / 	W. Eur. distressful: cry voice mournful: mood duster: Ort Linden traurig: Ode	Lit. луна ЛС:3:1 ВОПЛЬ СЛ:6:6 ВИД А:85:9 ТОМНОСТЬ А:85:22	Compound: сумрачно-унылый Гаральд Га:8:1 /

Comments

Frequency: Used 19 times; occurs in 11 ballads.

Source: Translated from foreign source twice; also replaces strange.

Usage: Zhukovsky further develops late 18th century usage, especially that of Karamzin, and applies the epithet unlyi not only to describe the emotional state of objective characters, but also to express the poet's own subjective reactions to phenomena (zemlya, dni, les).

Definition			Zhukovsky
<p>1) Незамаранный, незагаженный; 2) Не имеющий в себе никакой примеси; 3) *Относительно к голосу: светлый, ясный; 6) *В нравственном смысле: непорочный, нелицемерный, непротивный (вера, сердце, совесть, любовь, душа).</p>			<p>1) clean, pure, spotless; ВОДА СВ:1:9 СТЕКЛО СВ:4:7 ПОТОК З:10:1 СВОД ПО:32:3 /</p>
<p>I совесть (Кант.) девицы (Кант.) воздух (Тред.)</p>	<p>II голос (Лом.) сердце (Сум.) луга (Сум.) день (Княж.)</p>	<p>III душа (МЖ., Дер.) чувства (МЖ.) роса (Мур.) стихи (Кар.)</p>	<p>2) pure, unspoiled, free from corruption; кто ИЖ:16:2 (rein) все В:7:2 перси В:36:3 жертва ЗП:13:1 / душа П:30:3 / душа ЗЗ:3:1 / душа Г:45:1; 63:6; 76:6</p>
			<p>3) open, spacious; поле В:17:2</p>
<p>Folk поле серебро</p>	<p>W. Eur. rein: Seele</p>	<p>Lit. души М:5:3 поле К:2:1 дева ГГ:19:4</p>	<p>Comments Frequency: Used 14 times; occurs in 8 ballads. Source: Translated from foreign source once. Usage: Zhukovsky further develops late 18th century usage. The epithet acquires overtones of mystery and vagueness when applied to substantivized pronouns (<u>kto</u>, <u>vse</u>), and is almost synonymous with <u>svyatoi</u> when used to modify <u>dusha</u>.</p>

APPENDIX C

THE EPITHET IN ZHUKOVSKY'S BALLADS

SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF 1b7 EPITHETS

epithet	definition	selected examples	
бедный	deserving pity	девица певец	Л:10:9 / З:13:6; 15:8
безмолвный	silent	певец берега полночь бор	З:12:1 Ва:1:3; 38:3 / Ва:10:1 (silent) В:51:7 /
безмятежный	serene, tranquil	незнание сердце ночь	Ка:7:3 / Г:30:12 З:19:1 *
безответный	without response	блаженство житель	А:15:4 (Hde) Св:12:8
горький	a) causing anguish	судьбина жребий	Св:16:11 Г:2:3
	b) produced by anguish	слезы слезы	Г:15:3 Л:14:6 /
грустный	melancholy	мечтание дума	З:33:2 (mournful) Щ:5:7 /
душистый	aromatic	ветер долина вечер	З:22:7 Г:27:2 По:32:1 /
звонкий	sonorous	топот колокольчик	Л:18:9 / Св:17:8
		струны	А:2:2
зыбкий	shimmering	воды туман	Л:8:7 / Б:22:4 /
		чада уста	Г:24:5 Г:12:8
невинный	a) not guilty	Минвана сердце	З:8:8 З:8:8
	b) naive, ingenuous	слезы дни	АА:16:7 / Г:39:3
невозвратный	irretrievable	судьбина рок суд	К:21:1 / Г:20:7 Т:6:7 /
неизбежный	inevitable	храм сарай великан щит	Б:41:3 С:6:3 (great) В:22:5 Р0:2:8; 26:2

* Zhukovsky's bezmyatezhnaya noch' (3:19:1) may be a superb mistranslation of Scott's faint-hearted knight (Eve:19:1).

epithet	definition	selected examples	
прекрасный	a) beautiful (physical)	лицо юноша явление свет	ИЖ:7:3 (teuer) К:4:6 / В:8:4 У:10:6 /
	b) beautiful (spiritual)	душа дни свобода	Э:6:8 Э:19:4 У:1:4 /
прелестный	a) charming (physical)	вид образ	Г:30:1 В:9:6
приятный	b) charming (spiritual)	душа	Э:6:8
	pleasant	взоры блеск жизнь	Св:18:6 Ад:12:2 / Г:7:9
прохладный	a) cool (physical)	приют	Л:18:4 (kthl)
	b) cool (spiritual)	тишина	Ры:1:4 (kthl)
пустой	empty, deserted	хижина	Св:12:7
		степь даль небо	П:2:5 / Ах:12:2 В:55:11
сладостный	pleasant, delightful	покой	Ва:12:3
		тень любовь пенье	Г:32:11 В:10:11 По:33:4
сумрачный	gloomy	рыцарь	Ад:23:3
		вечер сиянье	Г:49:9 В:59:3
таинственный	mysterious	час	З:38:1 /
		мгла гости	К:16:5 / КУ:33:4 (saintly)
томный	languid	голова	Л:3:9 /
		взор взор	У:2:4 / ЭЭ:20:2 /
угрюмый	sullen, morose	пришлец	П:15:1 /
		лес бран взор	Г:70:12 Г:71:8 По:37:2 /
уединенный	lonely, isolated	одр	Ва:18:3 (lonely)
		холм тень	Ах:23:3 В:60:2
яркий	bright	свет	Св:9:7
		сиянье глаза	Э:27:1 Св:6:8
ясный	a) clear (physical)	день озеро	Св:20:7 По:11:4 /
	b) untroubled (spiritual)	взор лицо	У:13:1 / В:65:6

APPENDIX C

KEY TO CHARTS

1a] and 2]

Folk - as for 1b]

W. Eur. - as for 1b]

Lit. - as for 1b]

Zhukovsky - Examples are selected from Zhukovsky's ballads and are arranged within each subdivision chronologically. Each of these epithets crosses the boundary from 1a] qualitative absolute or 2] relative epithets to the 1b] qualitative relative epithets. The 1a] or 2] meaning of each epithet is listed first with examples; then the 1b] meaning follows, also with examples. The "code" which identifies ballad/stanza/line, and the abbreviations of ballad titles are the same as for 1b]. If an epithet has been translated from, or has any equivalent in, the foreign source, then the original word is included in parentheses after the "code". An oblique stroke indicates that although the ballad itself has a specific source, the given epithet was supplied by Zhukovsky where none was present in the original. No mark indicates that the ballad has no specific source. The examples are followed by brief comments on Zhukovsky's usage, including comparison to eighteenth-century Russian usage if relevant.

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
ручки тело грудь снет платъе голубушка лебедушка	white: countenance cheek billows robes weiss: Schaum	одежда ЭМ:2:11 саван БЛ:2:2 грудь Р:5:1	1a] white; плат полотно голубочек лебедь СВ:1:12 СВ:14:3 СВ:14:14 АД:4:2; 6:1 / 1b] holy, pure; одежда одежда В:6:8 КУ:10:4 (white)
Comments			
1a] <u>Belyi</u> is used in a conscious attempt to imitate the language of folklore. Its use is restricted to primarily <u>narodnyi</u> contexts.			
1b] The epithets also acquires overtones of sanctity and mystery, and occurs in religious contexts.			

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
ВОДА	lively: hue lebende: Seele	жена К:19:4; 20:3 ОН А:89:3	1a] alive; спутник В:11:11 душа К:10:6 (lebende) ОН Л:1:3 / 1b] vivid, bright; цветы У:12:5 белизна К:13:2 (schwanenweiss) звук К:21:5 /
Comments			
1a] <u>Zhivoi</u> is used in the conventional sense.			
1b] The epithet is used as a synonym for <u>svetlyi</u> , parallel to the English lively (although not directly translated from it), and to the French <u>vif</u> .			

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
/	mute: he she	отчаяние ЭМ:165	ГОЛОВА БЕЗДНА PO:22:2 / K:10:5 (heulende)
	stumm: Harm		1a] mute 1b] deep; inexpressible ПЕЧАЛЬ ГРУСТЬ PT:2:1 (stumm) Y:20:3
Comments			
1a] Nemoi is used figuratively (+ bezdna) to replace heulende Tiefe; cf. <u>glukhaya bezdna</u> - K:19:3.			
1b] The epithet is used to imply profound spiritual condition.			

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
матушка сестрица бабушка	dear: children native: field land lieblich: Tochter teuer: Land	/	<p>1a] blood-related; отец семья Г:14:9 У:20:1</p> <p>1b] spiritually related; душа душа Д:6:2 / А:19:4</p> <p>1b] dear, beloved; страна страна страна берега дно хотел глас Л:10:12 / И:3:4 / Ка:15:7 / Ва:11:1 / Ры:2:3 / Т:2:9 (geliebt) Щ:10:8 /</p>
Comments			<p>1a] <u>Rodnoi</u> is used in the conventional sense, and does not occur in folkloric contexts.</p> <p>1b] The meaning of the epithet is extended from blood-relatedness to spiritual similarity (<u>rodnaya dusha</u>); it is also used to express the poet's warm emotional relationship with his homeland, and with specific features in its landscape.</p>

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
/	white: foam billows weiss: Schaum grau: Weiden Bart	старина К:1:2	1a] gray-white; пена К:7:2 (weiss) глубина К:13:1 / брега Г:69:9 мох В:52:7 призраки В:58:10 ветлы Л:6:4 (grau) бездна УЛ:6:4 (white) 1b] possessing gray-white hair; therefore, old, brave, strong, etc.; бoцц Га:1:2 (kühn) бoцц Га:8:2 (stolz) бoцц Га:12:4 (alt) Риоль ПКВ:9:1 (grau) старик СР:5:1 (getreu) гусары НС:2:7 (weiss) Comments
			1a] <u>Sedoi</u> is used in descriptions of the sea (cf. Lomonosov - <u>sedaya pena</u>). 1b] The epithet replaces a variety of German epithets, which indicates that it has acquired overtones of strength, maturity, courage, etc.

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
меды водочки	sweet: eve stream paths süss: Mund Lieder Freundin	разговоры ЭМ:153	<p>1a] sweet (to the taste); вино {ПКВ:11:3 (rot) грозы {ЭП:4:1 (süss)</p> <p>1b] pleasant, delightful; час Л:3:1 / покой П:5:4 / глас Ах:19:4 смятенье О:6:4 вспоминанье Г:1:8 песни А:4:3 / лира ЭП:25:2 /</p>
Comments			
<p>1a] <u>Sladkii</u> is used in the conventional sense.</p> <p>1b] Zhukovsky develops late eighteenth century usage of the epithet (cf. <u>sladkii</u> + <u>vostorg</u>, <u>volnen'e</u>, <u>zadumchivost'</u>), by applying <u>sladkii</u> to abstract psychological substantives, such as <u>smyaten'e</u> and <u>vospominan'e</u>. The epithet is used to express the poet's emotional approval of objects and concepts.</p>			

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
кудри брови соболь вороны	black: horse arms eyes schwarz: Täter Mantel Mund schwärzlich: Gewimmel	кров (ночи) ЭМ:1 птица (ночи) ЭМ:175 покрывало ВМ:8 Верх АИР:17:4 тучи Р:1:3	1a] black; ворон / гроб / ночь / рясы / конь (schwarz) 1b] dark, mysterious; тень Г:46:3 мгла Г:57:7; 74:11 лес Г:49:8; 69:8 щель К:7:3 (schwarz) пучина К:20:1 (schwarz)
Comments			
1a] <u>Chernyi</u> is used in the conventional sense.			
1b] The epithet acquires overtones of mystery and foreboding, and is regularly employed in ballad settings where it is applied to all the physical locations of the action. (Cf. eighteenth century usage: <u>chernyi</u> + <u>serdste</u> , <u>sovest'</u> to mean evil).			

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
сторона	fremd: Boden	/	<p>1a] foreign; <div> <div>край</div> <div>Л:13:8 /</div> </div> <div> <div>город</div> <div>Г:37:2</div> </div> <div> <div>страна</div> <div>Л:1:5 /</div> </div> </p> <p>1b] alien, strange; <div> <div>брег</div> <div>ИЖ:3:5 /</div> </div> <div> <div>страна</div> <div>В:10:7; 29:3</div> </div> </p>
Comments			
<p>1a] <u>Chuzhoi</u> is used in the conventional sense; cf. eighteenth century usage: <u>chuzhoi</u> + <u>strana</u>, <u>storona</u>, <u>storonka</u>.</p> <p>1b] The epithet is used as the antonym of <u>rodnoi</u> and implies spiritual dissimilarity, as well as the poet's hostility towards the object.</p>			

ГРОБОВОЙ

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
доска	sepulchral: sound	доска M:3:11	<p>2] sepulchral;</p> <p>келья Л:15:3; 17:3 / прах Л:16:4 / покров Б:10:3 / саван Б:18:1 (winding) одежда А:10:3 /</p> <p>1b] deathly, gloomy;</p> <p>голос Ва:19:4 / цвет Б:29:3 (dead) тень Г:28:8</p>
Comments			
<p>2] Grobovoi is used frequently, and occurs primarily in "gothic" descriptions of ballad settings.</p> <p>1b] The epithet acquires overtones of mystery and melancholy, and is employed as a synonym for <u>mrachnyi</u>.</p>			

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
цепочка крест перстень венеч узы	golden (ger.) Stern Becher Pokal gülden Gewand Sporen	бокал ЭМ:50	<p>2] containing, made of, covered in, gold;</p> <p>перстень СВ:1:10 венеч СВ:2:10 крест В:12:1 струны Гр:4:5 (in der Saiten Gold) цепь З:26:3 (silver) - кубок К:2:4; 25:1 /</p> <p>1a] golden (of colour), yellow;</p> <p>струя Э:5:8 волны ЭП:11:3 (golden)</p> <p>1b] happy, blessed;</p> <p>юность Г:13:2 весна Г:15:9 снovidенья Ка:12:6 /</p>
Comments			<p>2] and 1a] <u>Zlatoi/zolotoi</u> is used frequently, supplied when no epithet is present in the foreign source, or used to replace the original epithet.</p> <p>1b] Zhukovsky develops eighteenth century figurative usage (<u>zlatoi + vek</u>, <u>vesna</u>, <u>dni</u>); this development is restricted to the form <u>zlatoi</u> only. The epithet acquires overtones of spirituality (<u>zlatoi + yunost'</u>, <u>snoviden'ya</u>).</p>

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky
царь	heavenly: light vision himmlisch: Licht	Господь Гг:8:3	<p>2] heavenly;</p> <p>царь Л:4:7 / царь Г:4:9; 14:5 свол В:1:12 облако В:2:10</p> <p>1b] spiritually exalted;</p> <p>награда Л:7:2 (Seligkeit) жизнь К:26:1 (Himmelsgewalt) рай Л:11:1; 11:3 (Seligkeit)</p>
Comments			
<p>2] <u>Nebesnyi</u> is used in the conventional sense.</p> <p>1b] The epithet is used to modify sacred concepts in religious contexts only (cf. Lomonosov - <u>nebesnyi</u> + <u>dver'</u>, <u>sineva</u>, <u>tsvet</u>); it is not applied to secular concepts as in Murav'ev: <u>nebesnyi</u> + <u>dolina</u>, <u>pevets</u>, <u>krasota</u>.</p>			

ПУСТЫННЫЙ

Folk	W. Eur.	Lit.	Zhukovsky								
/	bleak: mountain desolate: place dreary: place	/	<div>2] desert; 1b] empty, deserted;</div> <div> <div>сова ветер</div> <div>Л:11:9 Г:70:7</div> <div> <div>отдаление вершина скала берег место часовня</div> <div>В:63:4 З:11:4 (eiry) З:24:4; Т:13:2 По:27:2 РР:3:2</div> <div>/</div> <div>/</div> <div>/</div> <div>/</div> </div> </div> <tr> <td colspan="4">Comments</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="4"> <div>2] <u>Pustynnyi</u> is used in the conventional sense.</div> <div>1b] The epithet acquires overtones of vagueness and mystery, and is frequently employed in the description of ballad settings.</div> </td></tr>	Comments				<div>2] <u>Pustynnyi</u> is used in the conventional sense.</div> <div>1b] The epithet acquires overtones of vagueness and mystery, and is frequently employed in the description of ballad settings.</div>			
Comments											
<div>2] <u>Pustynnyi</u> is used in the conventional sense.</div> <div>1b] The epithet acquires overtones of vagueness and mystery, and is frequently employed in the description of ballad settings.</div>											

APPENDIX C

THE EPITHET IN ZHUKOVSKY'S LITERARY BALLADS

FREQUENCY CHART

	epithet	total uses
1a7	сладкий	21
	черный	28
1b7	святой	61
	страшный	47
	тихий	46
	бледный	34
	темный	33
	ужасный	33
	легкий	27
	светлый	22
	веселый	21
	милый	20
	тайный	19
27	унылый	19
	златой/ золотой	30

APPENDIX C

THE EPITHET IN ZHUKOVSKY'S LITERARY BALLADS

RANGE OF SYNONYMS

Zhukovsky's literary ballads	страшный ужасный	святой священный	тихий	одинокий уединенный	пустой пустынный
English literary ballads	awful	holy	calm	alone	bleak
	distressful	blessed	silent	lone	desolate
	fearful	divine	still	lonely	dreary
	frightful	sacred		lonesome	
	ghastly			solitary	
	hideous				
German literary ballads	furchtbar	heilig	ruhig	-	-
	grasslich	hochgelobt	still		
	grausig	selig			
	schrecklich				

APPENDIX D

THE EPITHET IN ZHUKOVSKY'S BALLAD MANUSCRIPTS

A study of the epithets in Zhukovsky's ballad manuscripts and a comparison of these manuscripts with published texts results in a greater understanding of Zhukovsky's "creative method".

One of the most important features of this method is the concept of "equivalence", that is, the substitution of one epithet for another without any real change in the literal meaning of the expression.¹ For example, the epithet uzhasnyi in manuscript versions is frequently replaced by strashnyi in published texts. Strashnyi is replaced by lyutyi, groznyi, and ostryi; nezhnyi is replaced by tikhii and milyi; zlatoi by svyatoi and zolotoi. On the other hand, the epithets tainyi, grustnyi, yasnyi, and milyi are all replaced by tikhii; and the epithets belosnezhnyi and konskoi are replaced by legkii.

The frequency and reversability of substitutions indicate how little the poet was concerned with the precise terminological meaning of each epithet. Zhukovsky's main interest was in the general emotional effect of the whole expression, which could be produced by one epithet as easily as by its equivalents.

On the other hand, the manuscripts also demonstrate Zhukovsky's "obsession" with certain specific epithets, and his persistent attempts to introduce these epithets into a particular line or

1. Full examples are listed below.

stanza.¹ The most striking evidence is provided by an early draft of the original ballad Akhill, where the "obsession" centres on the epithets tikhii and pechal'nyi, and in Donika, a translation from Southey, where the "obsession" centres on the epithets unylyi and mladoi.

Related to this feature is the "constancy" of particular epithets in all manuscript versions of a given line. For example, in Ivikovy zhuravli Zhukovsky had considerable difficulty in the composition of the last two stanzas, and the process of rewriting is easily traced. However, the epithets in line 23:1 (I bleden, trepeten, smyatennyi) and in line 23:2-6 (Smushchennyi vid, sklonennyi vzor / I tshchetnyi plach ...) remained constant in all variants.² Similarly in Uznik, the eleventh stanza centres around the epithets lyubima and tomima in all versions.³ In these examples the emotive value of the specific epithets seems to have been too important to be sacrificed in the process of rewriting.

The ballad manuscripts also demonstrate Zhukovsky's own dissatisfaction with the range and repetitiveness of epithets. In the eighth stanza of Akhill the poet seems to be searching for a metaphor which does not contain any epithets: Ya pogibnu odinokii; V rannei mladosti moei; V sile ... yunikh dnei; the published text reads: Ya padu v vesne moei - without epithets.⁴

In the manuscript of Roland oruzhenosets Zhukovsky consciously searches for synonyms with which to modify the nouns shchit and

1. Full examples are listed below.

2. GPB-286/1/14/129/avt.

3. GPB-286/1/29/33/avt.

4. GPB-286/1/25/33/avt.

mech in order to avoid unnecessary repetition. His range is limited to five epithets: tyazhelyi, ogromnyi, shirokii, krepkii, and bol'shoi; the manuscript shows frequent replacement of one epithet by another.¹

In two ballads Zhukovsky attempted to eliminate epithets entirely from certain lines, and to write a line with a predominance of verbs. An early draft of Kubok shows the poet struggling to eliminate glubokii and dalekii from line 5:5-6; he finally succeeds in producing a line closer to Schiller's original: I volny spiralis' i pena kipela: / Kak budto groza, nastupaya, revela.² In a rough draft of Zamok Smal'gol'm, lines 25:2 and 29:2 reveal Zhukovsky's considerable labour before he was able to eliminate the epithet bagrovaya and come closer to Scott's original.³

Finally, one collection of Zhukovsky's manuscripts copied by a scribe in 1831 and corrected by the author, demonstrates an unusual phenomenon. In two separate ballads the scribe has copied the lines, omitting the epithets; they were later supplied by Zhukovsky in his own hand.⁴

1. GPB-286/1/37/2,6/avt.

2. PD-27.779/CXCVIII/b. 50/avt.

3. GPB-286/1/30/8/avt.

4. GPB-286/1/36/5/popravki. Full examples are listed below.

EQUIVALENCE

epithet	manuscript	published	source ¹
ужасный	ужасная отрада	страшная	Г:26:4 ГПБ-286/1/14/67/авт.
	ужасное мщение	страшное	По:30:4 ГПБ-286/1/30/56/авт.
	ужасный гость	страшный	РР:7:1 ГПБ-286/1/37/14/авт.
	ужасная сила	со страхом	ИЖ:19:3 ГПБ-286/1/25/33/авт.
	ужасный глас	грозный	Ах:7:6 ГПБ-286/1/25/33/авт.
страшный	страшный жребий	лютый	Г:31:7 ГПБ-286/1/14/67/авт.
	страшный закон	грозный	Г:33:11 ГПБ-286/1/14/67/авт.
	страшный луч	острый	Д:20:2 ГПБ-286/1/30/50/авт.
нежный	нежный шопот	тихий	Св:6:11 ГПБ-286/1/14/82/авт.
	нежные разговоры	милые	Св:18:8 ГПБ-286/1/14/82/авт.
златой	златое облачение	святое	По:1:2 ГПБ-286/1/30/56/авт.
	златой кубок	золотой	К:15:3; 23:2 ГПБ-286/1/30/42/авт.
тихий	тайное желанье	тихое	Г:32:6 ГПБ-286/1/14/67/авт.
	грустная жена	тихая	З:33:1 ГПБ-286/1/30/8/авт.

1. The "code" identifies ballad title:stanza:line; each manuscript is identified by: Archive/fond/opis'/No/list/avt. (author's copy) or popravki (scribe's copy with author's corrections).

epithet	manuscript	published	source
тихий	ясная земля	тихая	По:35:3 ГПБ-286/1/30/58/авт.
	милая земля	тихая	По:35:3 ГПБ-286/1/36/13/поправки
легкий	белоснежны крылы	легкие	Св:15:2 ГПБ-286/1/14/82/авт.
	конской скот	легкий	Л:13:1 ГПБ-286/1/30/61/авт.
<u>Misc.</u>	ветер хладный	буйный	Л:12:5 ГПБ:286/1/14/47/авт.
	белый саван	длинный	Л:20:3 ГПБ-286/1/20/1/авт.
	приятный ручейка	веселый	Св:20:11 ГПБ-286/1/14/82/авт.
	волшебный блеск	приятный	Ад:12:2 ГПБ-286/1/14/119/авт.
	юное бытие	весеннее	У:4:1 ГПБ-286/1/29/33/авт. ЦГАЛИ-198/1/29/авт.
	ясный взор	милый	У:13:1 ЦГАЛИ-198/1/29/авт.
	ночной свидетель	тайный	По:49:1 ГПБ-286/1/36/13/поправки

EQUIVALENCE¹

manuscript	published	source
горьких горестей обитель	безотрадная обитель	Л:7:5 ГПБ-286/1/14/47/авт.
темной девицы тоскою	бедной девицы тоскою	Л:10:9 ГПБ-286/1/14/47/авт.
вдали смятенный стон	шумит священный лес	Ка:16:2 ГПБ:286/1/14/52/авт.
и над водой гармонией далекой	гармония в дали небес высокой	Д:14:3 ГПБ-286/1/30/50/авт. ГПБ-286/1/36/7/поправки
в чужую в далекую страну	в чужую он страну	Л:1:4 ГПБ-286/1/30/61/авт.
сырый, глубокий / <u>приют</u> /	прохладный, тихий / <u>приют</u> /	Л:18:4 ГПБ-286/1/36/11/поправки

1. In these examples the substitution of equivalent epithets involves rewriting the entire line.

OBSESSION

epithet	manuscript	published
тихий	Над тихо... Тихий катится луна... Тихо смотрит... ...тихою пучиной Тихо в поле опустелом.	Над Эгейских вод равниной Светел всходит рог луны; Здезды спящею пучиной И брега отражены.
	ГПБ-286/1/25/25/авт. ¹	Ах:2:1-4
печальный	Печальный <....> Печальный дар... И печален твой возврат.	Лиру взял; ударил в струны; Тих его печальный глас: "Старец, пал твой Гектор юный; Свет души твоей угас; И Гекуба, Андромаха Ждут тебя у градских врат С ношей милого им праха... Жизнь и смерть им твой возврат.
	ГПБ-286/1/25/25/авт.	Ах:4:1-8
унылый	Унылый <....>	И каждый раз - в то время, как могилой Кто в замке угрожаем был, - Пророчески, гармонией унылой Из бездны голос исходил.
	ГПБ-286/1/30/50/авт.	Д:6:1-4
	Пророчески-унылой... ГПБ-286/1/36/7/ поправки	Пророчески, гармонией унылой Д:6:3
	Глубина унылой и глубокий... Бездна их таинственный... ...жалобно-унылой ...унылой и глубокой	Вдруг безда их унылый и глубокий
	ГПБ-286/1/36/7/ поправки	Д:14:1
младой	Младая жизнь в душе... В ее младой груди...	Любовь в груди невесты пламенела
	ГПБ-286/1/36/7 поправки	Д:12:1

1. See photocopy of manuscript, n. 392.

Отученик на Влада:

Kajalambh Bhattacharya

Combs Longyear & Co.

Organism variations
 Counted to report constant Anguina?

ka pafnatioe suron cont.

Михо Ве... изред сагуналь

Планеты языков родств

и прилично опасается

Sparym wyprawa Sankt walyz!

Major... ..

[illegible][illegible]

~~Mr. [unclear]~~ Shogun ~~man~~ [unclear] my [unclear]

Udgera vinyasika

~~to Bureau of...~~ city conference

Bugrovskiy ~~in the same city~~ ^{the same city} ~~the same place~~ ^{the same place} ~~the same place~~ ^{the same place}

26 Kohen nuyot ~~26 Kohen nuyot~~ ~~26 Kohen nuyot~~

~~Page 24 - August 20, 1968 - [illegible] [illegible]~~

Akhill

SCRIBAL OMISSIONS

И в пристань, царь морей КРЫЛАТЫЙ,
Дарами дальних стран БОГАТЫЙ,
Флот торжествующий влетел.

ПП:6:4-6
ГПБ-286/1/36/5/поправки.

С светлым днем ПОДЗЕМНУ ночь?..
Так, не все следы пропали!
К ней дойдет мой НЕЖНЫЙ клик:

ЖЦ:7:8-10
ГПБ-286/1/36/5/поправки.

APPENDIX E

ZHUKOVSKY'S EDITIONS OF MURAV'EV AND KAMENEV

The anthology of Russian poetry which Zhukovsky edited provides valuable insights into his concept of the ballad genre, as well as additional understanding of his stylistic system. In September 1809 Zhukovsky wrote to A.I. Turgenev:

Now a word about my Sobranie. I shall publish not examples, but a full collection of the best Russian poems - a book which, for people with taste and with moderate means, can replace separate collections of all the works of Russian poets. I shall take the best from each one, and having combined it all, will offer our public a fragrant pot-pourri ...¹

This anthology, entitled Sobranie russkikh stikhotvorenii, was published in 1810-11. In his preface Zhukovsky states that the anthology was the first attempt in Russian literature at a "general collection", containing "all kinds of poetry". He explains that he chose the best works of classical Russian poets and included other works of interest, which, though less well known, were also deserving of attention. Since the precise chronological order of the poems was too difficult to establish, Zhukovsky arranged them in "technical order", that is, by "kinds of poetry". Thus Volumes I and II contain lyrical poetry (odes, romances, and ballads); Volume III - verse povesti, skazki, and fables; Volume IV - satires, epistles, elegies, idylls, didactic and descriptive poems; and Volume V - epigrams, madrigals, excerpts,

1. SS, IV, 463.

and so forth. Among the works subtitled ballada in Volume II, Zhukovsky includes Karamzin's Raisa, Dmitriev's Starinnaya lyubov', and Murav'ev's Boleslav, Korol' pol'skii. Among the verse povesti in Volume III, he includes Kamenev's bohatyrsкая povest', Gromval.

When Murav'ev died in 1807, many of his works remained unpublished. Zhukovsky decided to include one of these works, Boleslav, in his Sobranie, and to give it the subtitle ballada.¹ He freely altered the text and it is difficult to determine which are Zhukovsky's editorial corrections, and which are those of the author or of other hands. A comparison of Murav'ev's original copy of the manuscript² with Zhukovsky's altered text shows the nature of the changes which the editor required before publishing the work and before labelling it a ballad. Zhukovsky's corrections correspond to those which he made in the manuscripts of his own ballads,³ and to his general stylistic principles concerning diction, particularly epithets, and syntax.⁴

1. The same work was published by Zhukovsky in Vestnik Evropy, LI, No.9 (1810), 45-47, with no subtitle, and was included in the Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Murav'eva (SPb., 1819) edited by Zhukovsky and Batyushkov, also without subtitle.

2. Otdel pis'mennykh istochnikov Gosudarstvennogo Istoricheskogo muzeya. This manuscript, which contains thirty-four poems composed during the 1770s, was recopied with the author's own corrections in approximately 1802.

3. See above, Appendix D.

4. The following list is not exhaustive.

	Murav'ev	Zhukovsky
7:3	К бою звали гласы трубы.	Коней ржанье, гласы трубы.
7:4	Побежден, Збигней бежит.	Рати в бой! Збигней бежит.
8:1-2	Так, как ангел-покровитель, Входит в город Болеслав.	В град, как ангел-покровитель, Входит мощный Болеслав.
13:1	Пленна витязя сретает...	Что же? Пленника сретает...
13:3	Меч во грудь его вонзает.	Он в злодея меч вонзает.
14:1-4	Где возьму я выраженья, Чтобы горесть описать, Коею лишась движенья Царь не знает, что начать.	Где возьму я выраженья Скорбь убийцы описать, Он безгласен, без движенья Он не знает, что начать.
17:3	Просит он, чтоб помолились,	Слезно просит, чтоб помолились,

Comments

- 7:3 Cf. Zhukovsky's Lyudmila 9:5 - Borzyi kon' i rzhet i pyshet.
- 7:4 Note Zhukovsky's exclamatory syntax.
- 8:1-2 The lines are altered in order to insert the epithet moshchnyi.
- 13:1 Note Zhukovsky's interrogative syntax.
- 13:3 The meaning is made more explicit by the insertion of the word zlodei, indicating Zhukovsky's own moral judgment.
- 14:2 Murav'ev's gorest' is replaced by Zhukovsky's skorb'; ubiitsa repeats the editor's moral judgment.
- 14:3 Zhukovsky inserts the epithet bezglasen (one of his series of epithets prefixed by bez-) as a parallel to the following bez dvizheniya.
- 14:3-4 Note Zhukovsky's repetition: On bez ..., bez .../ On ...
- 17:3 Note the insertion of the adverb slezno.

Kamenev's Gromval (1802), subtitled bogatyrskaya povest', is included in Volume III of Zhukovsky's Sobranie along with Karamzin's Il'ya Muromets, Vostokov's Svetlana i Mstislav, and P.I. Sumarokov's Amur, lishennyi zreniya. Gromval was reprinted in the second edition of the same anthology (1815-17) under the subtitle ballada. Since then, Kamenev's poem has been considered one of the first, if not the first, original Russian literary ballads.¹ In 1906 E.A. Bobrov noted the alterations made by Zhukovsky in the original text.² However, he ignored the possibility of editions between the initial publication of Gromval in 1804, and Zhukovsky's anthology in 1815. In 1934 P.N. Berkov made a thorough study of the various versions of the work, and analyzed the changes introduced by each editor.³

The plot of the poem is as follows: the hero, Gromval, sets off to rescue the beautiful maiden Rogneda. He comes upon a castle, and there tries to find the wicked villain Zlomar. Gromval witnesses a Gothic horror show in which all the spirits return to harass the villain who had cast his spells over them. Dobrada, the good fairy, tells Gromval where he can find the maiden. Once again he sets off in search of her; after overcoming terrible obstacles, Gromval finally rescues Rogneda.

1. See E.A. Bobrov, "Iz istorii russkoi literatury XVIII i XIX stoletii", Izvestiya Otd. russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti, XI, No.4 (1906), 320-29; N.K. Piksarov, Oblastnye kul'turnye gnezda (M.-L., 1928), 89; Neumann, Geschichte, 50; and Yu. M. Lotman, "Russkaya poeziya nachala XIX veka", in Poety nachala XIX veka, Biblioteka poeta, Malaya seriya, 3-e izd. (L., 1961), 60.

2. Bobrov, "Iz istorii", 320-29.

3. P.N. Berkov, "K istorii teksta Gromvala G.P. Kameneva", Izvestiya AN SSSR, Otd. obshchestvennykh nauk, No.1 (1934), 100-04.

Kamenev's Gromval is a heroic tale, not a literary ballad; both its initial subtitle (bogatyrskaya povest') and its inclusion in the Sobranie with povesti by Karamzin, Vostokov, and Sumarokov, support this view. The title of the work is taken from one of Kheraskov's late poems, and several motifs are borrowed from Levshin's Russkie skazki (1780-83), including the winged serpent Zilant, the fairy Dobrada, and the myth of Zimtserl.¹

Gromval begins with a line of conscious, stylized historicism which emphasizes the fact that it is a skazka: Podnimayu zavesu sedoi stariny.² The hero is called a bogatyr' (3:3), a vytyaz' (8:1), and a rytsar' (33:2). Although his stated goal is the rescue of the maiden in distress, he muses candidly:

Если не можешь Рогнеду спасти,
Замок разрушить, Зилантов сразить,
Богатырскую кровь ты пролей за нее,
И геройской смертью любовь увенчай. (41)

The heroine is described as milaya (12:4), lyubeznaya (13:4), and prekrasnaya (65:4). Dobrada is the embodiment of Virtue, who provides the hero with a piece of advice (pokorstvui sud'be - 33:2) and with a secret weapon. The villain Zlomar is a khishchnoi volshebnik (12:2), and a zlobnoi, likhoi charodei (15:2), who possess a chernoe serdtse (15:4).

Kamenev's style combines various elements: folk epithets (bodryi kon', chistoe pole, moguchaya ruka, syraya zemlya); pseudo-classical references (borei, tartar, akvilony); sentimental epithets (ugryumaya noch', pechal'nyi rytsar', nezhnye tony,

1. Poety-radishchevtsy, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya (L., 1935), 812-18.

2. Cf. Dmitriev's Karikatura (1791): Snimi s sebya zavesu, / Sedaya starina! (1:1-2); see above, Chapter II, p. 51.

tomnaya dusha); a Gothic pot-pourri, including belye savany, teni, skelety, dukhi, groby, and tyazhkie stony; and finally, innumerable archaic phonetic spellings, inconsistencies in orthography and morphology, and various dialectal forms.

Kamenev's epithets are noteworthy: there are 116 different epithets in Gromval, used a total of 160 times; that is, almost one epithet for every two lines of verse. The most frequent epithets are: sinii, chernyi, volshebnyi, krepkii, mrachnyi, strashnyi, and uzhasnyi.

The history of the text of Gromval is interesting for the alterations introduced by each subsequent editor, particularly those added by Zhukovsky.¹ Kamenev first read out the poem in August 1802 at a meeting of the Obshchestvo lyubitelei izyashnogo,² and was thereupon accepted as a member of the society. The original text of that reading has not been preserved.

Gromval was first published in the society's journal in 1804, without any genre-defining subtitle, by V.V. Popugaev, who probably introduced some changes into the text.³ In 1806 the work was published by N.F. Ostolopov with the subtitle rytsarskaya povest', and with numerous stylistic alterations which attempted to eliminate archaic and vulgar expressions, and to make it more poetic.⁴ Zhukovsky included Gromval in his Sobranie (1810-11) under the subtitle bogatyrskaya povest', and again in the second

1. See Berkov, "K istorii", 63-84.

2. Later known as Sankt-Peterburgskoe vol'noe obshchestvo lyubitelei slovesnosti, nauk, i khudozhestv.

3. Periodicheskoe izdanie vol'nogo obshchestva ..., I (SPb., 1804), 110-27.

4. Lyubitel' slovesnosti, X (1806), 1-14.

edition (1815), with the subtitle ballada. He accepted almost all of Ostolopov's corrections, and made additional alterations of his own. Zhukovsky strengthened the visual imagery, replaced incorrect grammatical forms, logical inconsistencies and vulgarisms, and eliminated Kamenev's pseudo-classical references (for example, borei is replaced by vikhr' and akvilony by burny vikhri). Zhukovsky introduced some of his favourite epithets and motifs, most of which correspond to his corrections of Murav'ev's manuscript cited above, and to the alterations in his own manuscripts.¹

1. The following list is not exhaustive; see also, Appendix D.

	Kamenev	Zhukovsky
22:4	Освещается зала вмиг синим огнем.	Освещается зала ужасным огнем.
24:3	И волшебник Зломар, синевато-багров...	И волшебник Зломар, ужасающий вид...
25:1	Пол расступился, зеленый огонь...	Пол расступился, адский огонь...
33:3-4	... смерть острой косой ... судьба навсегда В тартар душу низвергла злодея сего.	В тартар душу низвергла злодея сего.

Comments

- 22:4 and 24:3 Note Zhukovsky's introduction of his favourite epithet uzhasnyi - uzhasayushchii.
- 25:1 Cf. the frequent use of the epithet adskii in Zhukovsky's Gromoboi.
- 33:3 Zhukovsky's theme of Fate replaces Kamenev's conventional image of death.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrams, M.H., The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition. New York, 1958.
- Addison, Steele and others, The Spectator in Four Volumes. Edited by G. Smith. London, 1958.
- Alekseev, M.P., "K literaturnoi istorii odnogo iz romansov v Don Kikhote", in Servantes. Stat'i i materialy. L., 1948, 96-123.
- Arzamas i Arzamasskie protokoly. Edited by M.S. Borovkova-Maikova. L., 1933.
- Azadovsky, M.K., "Istochniki skazok Pushkina", in Pushkin. Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii, I. M.-L., 1936, 134-63.
- Balashov, D.M., Istoriya razvitiya zhanra russkoi ballady. Petrozavodsk, 1966.
- "Knyaz' Dmitrii i ego nevesta Domna", in Russkii fol'klor, IV. M.-L., 1959, 80-99.
- Batyushkov, K.N., Opyty v stikhakh i proze. SPb., 1817.
- Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii. Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. M.-L., 1964.
- Sochineniya. SPb., 1885-87.
- Bauer, H.F., Les Ballades de Victor Hugo: Leurs origines françaises et étrangères. Paris, 1936.
- Bayley, J.O., Pushkin: A Comparative Commentary. Cambridge, 1971.
- Belinsky, V.G., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v XIII tomakh. M., 1953-59.
- Berkov, P.N., "Iz istorii russkoi parodii XVIII-XX vv.", Voprosy sovetskoi literatury, V. M.-L., 1957, 220-66.
- "K istorii teksta Gromvala G.P. Kameneva", Izvestiya AN SSSR, Otd. obshchestvennykh nauk, No.1 (1934), 63-84.
- Bestuzhev, A.A., Sochineniya v dvukh tomakh. M., 1958.
- Blok, A.A., Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh. M.-L., 1960-63.
- Bobrov, E.A., "Iz istorii russkoi literatury XVIII i XIX stoleyii", Izvestiya Otd. russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti, XI, No.4 (1906), 320-39.
- Bogach, G.F., Pushkin i moldavskii fol'klor. Kishinev, 1963.

Bratton, J.S., "Studies in the Literary and Sub-Literary Ballad in the Nineteenth Century". Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1969.

Briefe von und an Gottfried August Bürger. Edited by A. Strodtmann. Berlin, 1874.

Brunot, F., La Pensée et la langue. Paris, 1922.

Bürger, G.A., Werke und Briefe. Leipzig, 1958.

----- See also Briefe von und an Gottfried August Bürger.

Bulakhovsky, L.A., Russkii literaturnyi yazyk pervoi poloviny XIX veka, II. Kiev, 1957.

Buslaev, F.I., Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo yazyka. M., 1863.

----- O prepodavanii otechestvennogo yazyka. L., 1941.

Bychkov, I., Bumagi V.A. Zhukovskogo, postupivshie v imperatorskuyu Publichnuyu biblioteku v 1884 g. SPb., 1887.

Chernyshevsky, N.G., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v pyatnadtsati tomakh. M., 1939-53.

Clement, N.H., Romanticism in France. New York, 1939.

Cross, A.G., N.M. Karamzin. Carbondale, Ill., 1971.

Danilov, Kirsha, Drevnie rossiiskie stikhotvoreniya sobrannye Kirshevu Danilovym. Edited by A.P. Evgen'eva and B.N. Putilov. M.-L., 1958.

Danilov, V., "Istochnik stikhotvoreniya Pushkina Gusar", Russkii filologicheskii vestnik, LXIV, No.3-4 (1910), 243-52.

Davie, Donald, Articulate Energy: An Inquiry into the Syntax of English Poetry. London, 1955.

Derzhavin, G.R., Stikhotvoreniya. Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. L., 1957.

Dmitriev, A.I., Poemy drevnykh bardov. SPb., 1788.

Dmitriev, I.I., Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. L., 1967.

----- See also Karamzin-Dmitriev.

Dmitriev, M.A., Melochi iz zapasa moei pamyati. M., 1869.

Dolgoval, N.M., "K voprosu ob istochnikakh ballady A.S. Pushkina Zhenikh", Uchenye zapiski Gor'kovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, XLVIII (1958), 27-36.

Ehrhard, Marcelle, V.A. Joukovski et le préromantisme russe. Paris, 1938.

- Eichstädt, Hildegard, Žukovskij als Übersetzer. Munich, 1970.
- Eikhenbaum, B.M., Lermontov. Opyt istoriko-literaturnoi otsenki. L., 1924.
- Melodika russkogo liricheskogo stikha. SPb., 1922.
- Skvoz' literaturu. L., 1924.
- Stat'i o Lermontove. M.-L., 1961.
- Emerson, O.F., The Earliest English Translations of Bürger's "Lenore". Cleveland, Ohio, 1915.
- Entwhistle, W.J., European Balladry. Oxford, 1951.
- Erlich, V., Russian Formalism. The Hague, 1965.
- Etkind, E.G., "Materiya stikha". Unpublished manuscript. L., 1969.
- Poeziya i perevod. M.-L., 1963.
- Razgovor o stikhakh. M., 1970.
- "Stikhotvornyi perevod kak problema sopostavlenii stilistiki". Unpublished thesis. LGPI im. Gertsena, L., 1965.
- Evgen'eva, A.P., Ocherki po yazyku russkoi ustnoi poezii v zapisyakh XVII-XX vv. M.-L., 1963.
- Fedorov, A.V., "Slovoupotreblenie i ego osobennosti v stile elegii i ballad V.A. Zhukovskogo", Uchenye zapiski LGPI im. Gertsena, CCLVII (1965), 141-52.
- Fevchuk, L.P., Lichnye veshchi A.S. Pushkina. L., 1970.
- Fitzgerald, R.P., "The Style of Ossian", Studies in Romanticism, VI, No.1 (1966), 22-33.
- Friedman, A.B., The Ballad Revival. Chicago, Ill., 1961.
- Furst, L.R., Romanticism in Perspective: A Comparative Study of the Romantic Movements in England, France and Germany. London, 1969.
- Gaevsky, V.P., "Pushkin v litsee i litseiskie ego stikhotvoreniya", Sovremennik, XCVII, No.7 (1863).
- Galich, A.I., Opyt nauki izyashchnogo. SPb., 1825.
- Garkavi, A.M., "Zametki o M. Yu. Lermontove. Lermontov i Zhukovsky. (Iz istorii russkoi ballady)", Uchenye zapiski Kalininskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta, VI (1959), 274-85.
- Gerasimova, L.V., "Epitety v proizvedeniyakh Karamzina", in XVIII vek, VIII. L., 1969, 290-98.

- Gerould, G.H., The Ballad of Tradition. Oxford, 1932.
- Gershenzon, M.O., "Sny Pushkina", in Pushkin. Sbornik I. Edited by N.K. Piksanov. M.-L., 1924, 77-96.
- Gillies, A., Herder. Oxford, 1945.
- Ginzburg, L. Ya., O lirike. M.-L., 1964.
- Goethe. Selected Verse. Edited by D. Luke. London, 1964.
- Gorlin, M., "Les ballades d'Adam Mickiewicz et Puškin", Revue des Études slaves, XIX (1939), 227-41.
- Gorodetsky, B.P., Lirika Pushkina. M.-L., 1962.
- Gray, R., The Poems of Goethe. Cambridge, 1966.
- Grech, N.I., Opyt kratkoi istorii russkoi literatury. SPb., 1822.
- Zapiski o moei zhizni. M.-L., 1930.
- Gregg, R.A., "Tatyana's Two Dreams: The Unwanted Spouse and the Demon Lover", SEER, XLVIII, No.113 (1970), 492-505.
- Griboedov, A.S., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. SPb., 1911.
- Gronicka, André von. The Russian Image of Goethe: Goethe in Russian Literature of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century. Philadelphia, Pa., 1968.
- Gukovsky, G.A., Ocherki po istorii russkoi literatury i obshchestvennoi mysli XVIII veka. L., 1938.
- "Pushkin i poetika russkogo romantizma (Problema natsional'no-istoricheskogo kolorita v romanticheskoi poezii)", Izvestiya AN SSSR, Otd. literatury i yazyka, No.2 (1940), 56-92.
- Pushkin i russkie romantiki. M., 1965.
- Russkaya literatura XVIII veka. M., 1939.
- Russkaya poeziya XVIII veka. L., 1927.
- Herder, J.G., Von Deutscher Art und Kunst. Edited by E. Purdie. Oxford, 1924.
- Hodgart, M.J.C., The Ballads. New York, 1962.
- Iezuitova, R.V., "Iz istorii russkoi ballady 1790-kh - pervoi poloviny 1820-kh godov". Unpublished Candidate's Thesis, Institut russkoi literatury, L., 1966.
- Ippokrena. M., 1799-1801.

Isachenko, A.V., Grammaticheskoi stroi russkogo yazyka v sopostavlenii s slovatskim, I. Bratislava, 1965.

Istomin, V., "Glavneishie osobennosti yazyka i sloga proizvedenii V.A. Zhukovskogo (1783-1852)", Russkii filologicheskii vestnik, No.3 (1893), 1-48.

Istoriya russkoi literatury, I-X. M.-L., 1941-56.

Istoriya russkoi poezii, I-II. L., 1968-69.

Karamzin, N.M., Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. M.-L., 1966.

Karamzin-Dmitriev, Izbrannye stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya. L., 1953.

Katenin, P.A., Izbrannye stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. M.-L., 1965.

----- See also Pis'ma P.A. Katenina.

Kayser, W., Geschichte der deutschen Ballade. Berlin, 1936.

Kind, F., Lenardo's Schwärmeren. Leipzig, 1797.

Kobilinski-Ellis, L., Das goldene Zeitalter der russischen Poesie: W.A. Joukowski, seine Persönlichkeit, sein Leben und sein Werk. Paderborn, 1933.

Kostka, E., Schiller in Russian Literature. Philadelphia, Pa., 1965.

Kostrov, E.I., Ossian, syn fingalov, bard tret'ego veka: gall'skie stikhotvoreniya. M., 1792.

Kozlov, I.I., Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya. L., 1960.

Kroeber, K., Romantic Narrative Art. Madison, Wisc., 1966.

Kukulevich, A.M. and Lotman, L.M., "Iz tvorcheskoi istorii ballady Pushkina Zhenikh", in Pushkin. Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii, VI. M.-L., 1941, 72-91.

Kyukhel'beker, V.K., Izbrannye proizvedeniya v dvukh tomakh, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. M.-L., 1967.

Lartsev, V., "Ballada v sovremennoi poezii", Zvezda vostoka (Tashkent), 9 September 1963, 123-33.

Lermontov, M. Yu., Sochineniya v shesti tomakh. M.-L., 1954-57.

Letters of William Shenstone. Edited by D. Mallam. Minneapolis, Minn., 1939.

Lerner, N.O., Rasskazy o Pushkine. L., 1929.

- Levin, Yu. D., "Angliiskaya poeziya i literatura russkogo sentimentalizma" in Ot klassitsizma k romantizmu. Edited by M.P. Alekseev. L., 1970, 195-297.
- "Karamzin, Batyushkov, Zhukovsky - redaktory sochinenii M.N. Murav'eva" in Problemy sovremennoi filologii. Sbornik statei k 70-letiyu akademika V.V. Vinogradova. M., 1965, 182-91.
- "O romanticheskom perevode v Rossii". Unpublished article, Institut russkoi literatury, L., 1971.
- "Ob istoricheskoi evolyutsii printsipov perevoda" in Mezhdunarodnye svyazi russkoi literatury. Sbornik statei. Edited by M.P. Alekseev. M.-L., 1963, 5-63.
- Ocherk stilistiki russkogo literaturnogo yazyka kontsa XVIII - nachala XIX v. Leksika. M., 1964.
- Levkovich, Ya. L., "Perevody iz Mitskevicha". Unpublished article, Institut russkoi literatury, L., 1970.
- Lewis, Matthew G., Tales of Wonder. Dublin, 1801.
- Lomonosov, M.V., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. M.-L., 1950-59.
- Lotman, Yu. M., "Neizvestnye stikhotvoreniya A. Meshchevskogo", Uchenye zapiski TGU, CIV (1961), 277-80.
- "Problema narodnosti i puti razvitiya literatury preddekabristskogo perioda" in O russkom realizme XIX veka i voprosy narodnosti literatury. M.-L., 1960, 8-51.
- Lupanova, I.P., Russkaya narodnaya skazka v tvorchestve pisatelei pervoi poloviny XIX veka. Petrozavodsk, 1959.
- Lyubitel' slovesnosti, SPb., 1806.
- Makogonenko, G.P., Ot Fonvizina do Pushkina. Iz istorii russkogo realizma. M., 1969.
- Maksimov, D.E., Poeziya Lermontova. M.-L., 1964.
- Maslov, V.I., Ossian v Rossii (Bibliografiya). L., 1928.
- Mastera russkogo stikhotvornogo perevoda, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. L., 1968.
- Matlaw, R.E., "The dream in Yevgeniy Onegin, with a note on Gore ot uma", SEER, XXXVII, No.89 (1959), 487-504.
- Mendel'son, N.M., "Narodnye motivy v poezii Lermontova" in Venok M. Yu. Lermontovu. Yubileinyi sbornik. M.-P., 1914, 163-95.
- Merzlyakov, A.F., Stikhotvoreniya. Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya. L., 1958.
- Mikloshich, F., "Izobrazitel'nye sredstva slavyanskogo eposa", Drevnosti. Trudy Slavyanskoi kommissii MAO, I., M., 1895.

Mikushevich, V.B., "K voprosu o romanticheskom perevode" in Aktual'nye problemy teorii khudozhestvennogo perevoda. Materialy vsecyuznogo simpoziuma, I. M., 1967, 69-79.

Miles, Josephine, Bras and Modes in English Poetry. Berkeley and Los Angeles, Cal., 1957.

----- Renaissance, Eighteenth-Century, and Modern Language in English Poetry: A Tabular View. Berkeley and Los Angeles, Cal., 1960.

Mnemozina. M., 1824-25.

Mnimaya poeziya. Materialy po istorii poeticheskoi parodii XVIII i XIX vv. Edited by Yu. Tynyanov. M.-L., 1931.

Mordovchenko, N.I., Russkaya kritika pervoi chetverti XIX v. M.-L., 1959.

Morozov, A.A., "Parodiya kak literaturnyi zhanr (k teorii parodii), Russkaya literatura, No.1 (1960), 48-77.

Moskovskii telegraf. M., 1825-34.

Moskovskii zhurnal. M., 1791-92.

Murav'ev, M.N., Stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. L., 1967.

Narodnye ballady. Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. Edited by D.M. Balashov. M.-L., 1963.

Nazarova, L.N., "K istorii sozdaniya poemy Pushkina Ruslan i Lyudmila", in Pushkin. Issledovaniya i materialy, I. M.-L., 1956, 216-21.

Nebel, H.M., N.M. Karamzin. A Russian Sentimentalist. The Hague, 1967.

Neiman, B.V., "Pushkin i Lermontov. Iz nablyudeni nad stile", in Pushkin. Sbornik statei. Edited by A. Egolin. M., 1941, 315-48.

Nemirovskaya, K.A., "Pesn' o veshchem Olege i letopisnoe skazanie", Uchenye zapiski LGPI im. Gerstena, LXXXVI (1949), 13-56.

Neumann, F.W., Geschichte der russischen Ballade. Königsberg and Berlin, 1937.

Neustroev, A.N., Istoricheskie rozyskaniya o russkikh povremennykh izdaniyakh. SPb., 1874.

Nevskii zritel'. SPb., 1820-21.

Nowottny, W., The Language Poets Use. London, 1962.

Ober, K.H. and W.U., "Žukovskij's Early Translations of the Ballads of Robert Southey", SERJ, IX, No.2 (1965), 181-90.

- Ostaf'evskii arkhiv knyazei Vyazemskikh. SPb., 1899.
- Ostolopov, N.F., Slovar' drevnei i novoi poezii. SPb., 1821.
- Otechestvennye zapiski. SPb., 1839-84.
- Otchet imperatorskoi Publichnoi biblioteki za 1887 god. SPb., 1890.
- Pamyati V.A. Zhukovskogo. Kiev, 1883.
- Passage, C.E., "The Influence of Schiller in Russia, 1800-1840",
Am SEER, V, No.12-13 (1946), 111-37.
- Pautynskaya, V.A., "Ob ispol'zovanii termina 'epitet'", Uchenye zapiski 1-go MGPIIYa, X (1956), 107-24.
- Percy, Thomas, Reliques of Ancient English Poetry. London, 1765.
- Pervov, P.D., "Epitety v russkikh bylinakh", Filologicheskie zapiski, I-VI (1901); I (1902).
- Petushkov, V.P., "Imena prilagatel'nye v poezii V.A. Zhukovskogo: Opyt stilisticheskogo analiza". Unpublished thesis, LGPI im. Gerstena, L., 1951.
- Piksanov, N.K., Oblastnye kul'turnye gnezda. M.-L., 1928.
- Pis'ma P.A. Katenina k N.I. Bakhtinu. SPb., 1911.
- Pletnev, P.A., O zhizni i sochineniyakh V.A. Zhukovskogo. SPb., 1853.
- Poeticheskaya frazeologiya Pushkina. Edited by V.D. Levin. M., 1969.
- Poety nachala XIX veka, Biblioteka poeta, Malaya seriya, 3-e izd. L., 1961.
- Poety-Radishchevtsy, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya. L., 1935.
- Poety 1790-1810-kh godov, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. L., 1971.
- Poety XVIII veka, Biblioteka poeta, Malaya seriya, 3-e izd. L., 1958.
- Polevoi, N.A., Ocherki russkoi literatury. SPb., 1839.
- Polyarnaya zvezda. SPb., 1823-25.
- Pospelov, G.N., Teoriya literatury. M., 1940.
- Potebnya, A.A., Iz zapisok po teorii slovesnosti. Khar'kov, 1905.
- Privatnoe i poleznoe preprvozhdenie vremeni. M., 1794-98.
- Problemy romantizma: Sbornik statei. Edited by U.R. Fokht. M., 1967.
- Pukhov, V., "V.A. Zhukovsky - sostavitel' i izdatel' sbornikov stikhotvorenii russkikh poetov", Russkaya literatura, No.3 (1959), 186-88.

Pushkin, A.S., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. M.-L., 1937-59.

Pushkin, rodonachal'nik novoi russkoi literatury. Sbornik nauchno-issledovatel'skikh rabot. Edited by D.D. Blagoi and V. Ya. Kirpotin. M.-L., 1941.

Putilov, B.N., Slavyanskaya istoricheskaya ballada. M.-L., 1965.

Quintilian, The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian. Translated by H.E. Butler. London, 1921.

Reiner, E., "La Place de l'adjectif épithète en français: théories traditionnelles et essai de solution", Wiener romanistische Arbeiten, VII. Vienna, 1968.

Reizov, B.G., "V.A. Zhukovsky, perevodchik Val'tera Skotta: Ivanov vecher", in Russko-evropeiskie literaturnye svyazi: Sbornik statei k 70-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya akademika M.P. Alekseeva. Edited by P.N. Berkov et al. M.-L., 1966, 439-46.

Rezanov, V.I., Iz razyskaniy o sochineniyakh V.A. Zhukovskogo, I. SPb., 1906.

Robertson, J.G., A History of German Literature. London, 1962.

Robertson, M.E.I., L'Épithète dans les oeuvres lyriques de Victor Hugo publiées avant l'exil. Paris, 1927.

Rothe, Hans, N.M. Karamzin's europäische Reise: Der Beginn des russischen Romans. Philologische Untersuchungen. Berlin and Zürich, 1968.

Rossiiskii muzeum. M., 1815.

Rozanov, I.N., Lermontov - master stikha. M., 1942.

Rusanova, N.B., "Epitety Derzhavina", in XVIII veka, VIII, L., 1969, 92-102.

Russian Folk Literature. Edited by D.P. Costello and I.P. Foote. Oxford, 1967.

Russkaya ballada, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya. Edited by V.I. Chernyshev. L., 1936.

Russkaya literaturnaya parodiya. Edited by B. Begak, N. Kravtsov, and A. Morozov. M.-L., 1930.

Russkaya poeziya. Edited by S.A. Vengerov. SPb., 1893-97.

Russkaya starina. SPb., 1870-1917.

Russkaya stikhotvornaya parodiya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya. L., 1960.

Russkie pisateli o perevode XVIII-XX vv. Edited by Yu. D. Levin and A.V. Fedorov. L., 1960.

Russkii al'manakh. SPb., 1832-33.

Russkii arkhiv. M., 1863-1917.

Russkii romantizm: Sbornik statei. Edited by A.I. Beletsky.
L., 1927.

Russkoe narodnoe poeticheskoe tvorchestvo. Edited by N.I. Kravtsov.
M., 1971.

Ryleev, K.F., Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii, Biblioteka poeta,
Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. L., 1971.

Samarin, M.P., "Iz marginalii k Evgeniyu Oneginu", Naukovi zapiski
naukovo-doslidchoi katedri istorii ukrains'koi kul'turi,
No.6 (1927), 307-14.

Sankt-Peterburgskii vestnik. SPb., 1778-81.

Schenk, H.G., The Mind of the European Romantics. London, 1966.

Schiller, Friedrich, Sämtliche Gedichte. Munich, 1965.

Schlegel, K.W.F., Lectures on the History of Literature. Translated
by J.G. Lockhart. Edinburgh, 1818.

Scott, Sir Walter, Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border. Edited by
T. Henderson. New York, 1931.

Seidlitz, C.J. von, Wassily Andrejewitsch Joukoffsky. Ein russisches
Dichterleben. Mittau, 1870. (See also Zeidlits)

Semenko, I.M., Poety pushkinskoi pory. M., 1970.

Serchevsky, E.N., A.S. Griboedov i ego sochineniya. SPb., 1858.

Serman, I.Z. "Konstantin Batyushkov, Poet ideal'noi formy".
Unpublished manuscript, Institut russkoi literatury,
L., 1970.

----- "O poetike Lomonosova (Epitet i metafora)" in Literaturnoe
tvorchestvo M.V. Lomonosova. Issledovaniya i materialy.
M.-L., 1962, 101-32.

----- "Poeziya K.N. Batyushkova", Uchenye zapiski LGU, III
(1939), 229-83.

Severnye tsvety. SPb., 1825-32.

Shakhovskoi, A.A. Komedii, stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta,
Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. L., 1961.

Shekspir i russkaya kul'tura. Edited by M.P. Alekseev. M.-L., 1965.

Shalygin, A.G., Teoriya slovesnosti. SPb., 1916.

Shcherbatsky, V.M., Zanyatiya po stilistike v starshikh klassakh
srednei shkoly. M., 1951.

Shenstone, W. See Letters of William Shenstone.

- Shevyrev, S.P., O znachenii Zhukovskogo v russkoi zhizni i poezii. M., 1853.
- Shklovsky, V.B., Chulkov i Levshin. L., 1933.
- Sidney, Sir Philip, The Defence of Poesie. London, 1595.
- Slovo, VIII. M., 1918.
- Smyrniw, W., "The Treatment of the Ballad by Shevchenko and his Contemporaries in Relation to Western Balladry", Canadian Slavonic Papers, XII, No.2 (1970), 142-74.
- Sokolov, A.N., Ocherki po istorii russkoi poemy XVIII i pervoi poloviny XIX veka. M., 1955.
- Somov, Orest, O romanticheskoi poezii: Opyt v 3 stat'yakh. SPb., 1823.
- Součková, Milada, The Czech Romantics. The Hague, 1958.
- Southey, Robert, Poems of Robert Southey. Edited by M.H. Fitzgerald. London, 1909.
- Speransky, M.N., Russkaya ustnaya slovesnost'. M., 1917.
- Stepanov, N.L., Lirika Pushkina: Ocherki i etyudy. M., 1959.
- Struve, Peter, "Walter Scott and Russia", SEER, XI, No.32 (1933), 397-410.
- Sumarokov, A.P., Izbrannye proizvedeniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya, 2-oe izd. L., 1957.
- Stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya. L., 1935.
- Sumtsov, N.F., "Issledovanie o poezii A.S. Pushkina", in Khar'kovskii universitetskii sbornik v pamyat' A.S. Pushkina. Khar'kov, 1900.
- Syn otechestva. SPb., 1812-52.
- Teleskop. M., 1831-36.
- Tikhonravov, N.S., Sochineniya. M., 1898.
- Timofeev, L.I., Teoriya literatury. M., 1948.
- Tomashevsky, B.V., Pushkin. M.-L., 1956; 1961.
- Stikh i vazyk. Filologicheskie ocherki. M.-L., 1959.
- Teoriya literatury: Poetika. M.-L., 1931.
- Trotsky, L.D., "Ot dvoryanina k raznochintsu: V.A. Zhukovsky", Sochineniya, XX, M.-L., 1926, 3-9.
- Trubitsyn, N.N., O narodnoi poezii v obshchestvennom i literaturnom obikhode pervoi treti XIX v. SPb., 1912.

Trudy Obshchestva lyubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti. M., 1812-26.

Tsyavlovsky, M.A., Stat'i o Pushkine. M., 1962.

Tudorovskaya, E.A., "Stanovlenie zhanra narodnoi ballady v tvorchestve A.S. Pushkina", in Russkii fol'klor, VII, M.-L., 1962, 67-83.

Turgenev, A.I., Khronika russkogo. Dnevnik (1825-1826 gg.). M.-L., 1964.

Tvorogov, O.V., "Leksika Pesni o veshchem Olege A.S. Pushkina", Uchenye zapiski LGPI im. Gertsena, CLXIX (1959), 229-53.

Tynyanov, Yu., Arkhaisty i novatory. L., 1929.

----- Problema stikhotvornogo yazyka. L., 1924.

Uhland, Ludwig, Gesammelte Werke. Leipzig, n.d.

Ullman, Stephen, Language and Style. Oxford, 1964.

----- Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. Oxford, 1962.

Ursinus, A.F., Balladen und Lieder altenglischer und altschottischer Dichtart. Berlin, 1777.

Van Tiegham, Paul, Le Romantisme dans la littérature européenne. Paris, 1948.

Velikorusskie narodnye pesni. Edited by A.I. Sobolevsky. SPb., 1895-1902.

Veselovsky, A.N., V.A. Zhukovsky. Poeziya chuvstva i serdechnogo vobrazheniya. SPb., 1904; 2-oe izd. 1918.

----- Istoricheskaya poetika. L., 1940.

Vestnik Evropy. M., 1802-30.

Vigel', F.F., Zapiski. M., 1891-93.

Vinogradov, V.V., Stil' Pushkina. M., 1941.

----- Yazyk Pushkina. M.-L., 1935.

Volkov, R.M., Narodnye istoki tvorchestva A.S. Pushkina (ballady i skazki). Chernovitsy, 1960.

----- "Russkaya ballada pervoi chetverti XIX stoletiya i ee nemetskie paralleli (Ballady P.A. Katenina)", Uchenye zapiski Chernovitskogo universiteta, XXXVII (1957), 3-48.

Volm, Matthew, W.A. Zhukowski als Übersetzer. Ann Arbor, Mich., 1945-50.

Vol'pe, Ts. S., V.A. Zhukovsky v portretakh i illyustratsiyakh. L., 1935.

Weintraub, Wiktor, The Poetry of Adam Mickiewicz. The Hague, 1954.

Wordsworth and Coleridge, Lyrical Ballads. Edited by R.L. Brett and A.R. Jones. London, 1963.

Yakubovich, D.P., "Lermontov i Val'ter Skott", Izvestiya AN SSSR, Otd. obshchestvennykh nauk, No.3 (1935), 243-72.

Yashchenko, A.L., "Faust Gete. Rannie otkliki v Rossii (V.A. Zhukovsky i A.S. Pushkin)", Uchenye zapiski Gor'kovskogo universiteta, LXV (1964), 189-204.

Zagarin, P., V.A. Zhukovsky i ego proizvedeniya. M., 1883.

Zagoskin, M.N., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. P., n.d.

Zamotin, I.I., Romantizm dvadtsatykh godov XIX stoletiya v russkoi literature. SPb.-M., 1911-13.

Zelenetsky, A., Epitety literaturnoi russkoi rechi. M., 1913.

Zgorzelski, Czesław, Duma, poprzedniczka ballady. Toruń, 1949.

Zeidlits, K.K. (sic), Zhizn' i poeziya V.A. Zhukovskogo, 1783-1852. SPb., 1883. (See also Seidlitz)

Zhirmunsky, V.M., "K voprosu ob epitete", in Pamyati P.N. Sakulina. Sbornik statei. M., 1931.

----- Valerii Bryusov i nasledie Pushkina: Opyt sravnitel'no-stilisticheskogo issledovaniya. P., 1922.

Zhukovsky, V.A., "Neizdannyyi konspekt po istorii russkoi literatury". Edited by L.B. Modzalevsky in TONRL, I, M.-L., 1948, 283-315.

----- Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. 12-oe izd. SPb., 1902.

----- Sobranie sochinenii. M.-L., 1959-60.

----- Sochineniya. 7-oe izd. SPb., 1878.

----- Sochineniya. M., 1954.

----- Stikhotvoreniya. 5-oe izd. SPb., 1849; 1857.

----- Stikhotvoreniya, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaya seriya. L., 1936.

----- Stikhotvoreniya i poemmy, Biblioteka poeta, Malaya seriya. L., 1958.

----- (ed.) Sobranie russkikh stikhotvoreniy. M., 1810-11.

(V.A.) Zhukovsky. Ego zhizn' i sochineniya. Sbornik istoriko-literaturnykh statei. Edited by V.I. Pokrovsky. M., 1912.

MANUSCRIPTS

Gosudarstvennaya biblioteka im. V.I. Lenina, Moscow. Fond 104.

Gosudarstvennaya Publichnaya biblioteka im. M.E. Saltykova-Shchedrina, Leningrad. Fond 286.

Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii dom), AN SSSR Leningrad.
Fond 244, 475, and others.

Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva, Moscow.
Fond 198.