

Henrietta Mondry

The Evaluation
of Ideological Trends in Recent
Soviet Literary Scholarship

Verlag Otto Sagner München · Berlin · Washington D.C.

Digitalisiert im Rahmen der Kooperation mit dem DFG-Projekt „Digi20“
der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, München. OCR-Bearbeitung und Erstellung des eBooks durch
den Verlag Otto Sagner:

<http://verlag.kubon-sagner.de>

© bei Verlag Otto Sagner. Eine Verwertung oder Weitergabe der Texte und Abbildungen,
insbesondere durch Vervielfältigung, ist ohne vorherige schriftliche Genehmigung des Verlages
unzulässig.

«Verlag Otto Sagner» ist ein Imprint der Kubon & Sagner GmbH.

SLAVISTISCHE BEITRÄGE

BEGRÜNDET VON

ALOIS SCHMAUS

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

HEINRICH KUNSTMANN

PETER REHDER · JOSEF SCHRENK

REDAKTION

PETER REHDER

Band 255

HENRIETTA MONDRY

THE EVALUATION OF IDEOLOGICAL TRENDS
IN RECENT SOVIET LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP



VERLAG OTTO SAGNER · MÜNCHEN

1990



ISBN 3-87690-456-0

© Verlag Otto Sagner, München 1990
Abteilung der Firma Kubon & Sagner, München

Henrietta Mondry - 9783954791873
Downloaded from PubFactory at 01/10/2019 03:43:19AM
via free access

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION		2
1. METHODOLOGICAL BASIS. THE LENIN-PLEKHANOV FORMULA		11
2. HISTORICAL REVIEW		15
a) Main trends under Stalin		15
b) Main trends under Khrushchev and Brezhnev		20
3. THE GLASNOST' TIMES		32
a) Russian 19th century classics		32
b) "The forgotten names": formerly unpublished 20th century writers		47
c) Evaluation of formerly forbidden 19th century writers		76
d) Reinterpretation of the Soviet classics		98
CONCLUSION		119
BIBLIOGRAPHY		122

INTRODUCTION¹

The analysis of ideological trends taking place in the Soviet Union through the glass of Soviet Literature (Simmons, 1953) and official literary criticism (Hankin, 1958; Seduro, 1975), has proven to be a valid practice amongst Western commentators of the Soviet Union. At the centre of such methodology, which might well be of dubious validity for an analysis of a different country or nation, lies the realisation by Western scholars of the unique role of literature, literary criticism and *publicistika* in Russia and the USSR.

At the heart of the Soviet view of the role of literature and literary criticism lies the "mirror concept" of art as a reflection of reality on the one hand, and as a means for influencing reality on the other. This specific conception of literature and literary criticism has been dubbed the "anomaly of Russian literature" (Gary Saul Morson, 1987), and its sociological nature and the sociological function of Russian literature continue to constitute a subject of scholarly at-

¹ The financial assistance of the Institute for Research Development of the Human Sciences Research Council towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed in this publication and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Institute for Research Development or the Human Sciences Research Council.

tention (Mills Todd III, 1986).² The notion of literature mastering reality is a point of general agreement amongst contemporary Russian emigree and Soviet scholars. Thus, for instance, in Piatigorsky's "Philosophy or literary criticism" (1982) we find:

So, literature is not a "reflection" of life - we might recall Lenin's "Leo Tolstoy as a Mirror of the Russian Revolution"! - for it forms life, shapes it, makes life real or unreal, natural or artificial, correct or incorrect, or even moral or immoral. Literature molds our society as though, without it, society would have become "empty" and devoid of meaning. (A Piatigorsky, "Philosophy or literary criticism" in *Russian Literature and Criticism*, (Ed.) Ev. Bristol, Berkeley Slavic Specialities, 1982, p. 236).

Russian literature from the end of the 18th century in its classical anti-Establishment example of Radishchev's *Puteshestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu*, was expected to treat "the accursed questions", to address metaphysical, religious, political and sociological aspects of human existence, and to be ideologically, ethically and moralistically loaded. Not only was it characteristic for "a model of the Russian writer" (Donald Fanger, 1987) that he should be a teacher and a prophet, a martyr and an exile, but it was also expected of a literary critic that he should play a central role in Russian intellectual life of the 19th Century. The conversion of the pages of literary journals

² The "mirror" metaphor can be traced back to Lenin's article "Leo Tolstoy as a mirror of the Russian Revolution".

into ideological battlefields was a regular feature of Russian intellectual life already during the first quarter of the 19th Century. We may recall Prince Vyazemsky's witty description of the general nature of literary criticism of the times, and Belinsky's militant style of polemics in particular: "Not being able to rebel on the piazzas, they rebel in the journals."

It became a characteristic feature of Russian literary criticism to treat the analysed text as a secondary document, and to project into the text metaphysical, political, and socio-moral speculations which were characteristic of the particular trend of thought at the time. It was not only Russian writers who became the idols of the young generation, also literary critics such as "Neistovyi Vissarion" Belinsky, Dobroliubov, and Chernyshevsky, enjoyed the status of heroes and of "vlastiteli dum" among the exalted Russian youth. It was due to the influence of these literary critics that Russian writers such as Turgenev were to change "the ends" of their novels (*Rudin*, 1856), or to openly flirt with the generations of the "sons" (*In my own land*, 1864).

The ideologically tendentious nature of literary criticism³ so characteristic for Russian intellectual life of the 19th century, became a characteristic feature of official Soviet literary criticism. With the growth of totalitarianism, and as the Party ideology dominated more and more, literary criticism and publicistics, being an integral part of the Soviet media, were increasingly involved in a process of ideological struggle.

Unlike Soviet literature, whose ideological and political aspects have been broadly studied by Western scholars, the field of official literary criticism has not received adequate attention at all stages of Soviet history. The best known study of Soviet literature and literary criticism from a political and ideological angle, is the well-informed *Through the glass of Soviet literature: Views of Russian Society*, by Ernest Simmons (1953). This volume contains an essay by R. Hankin devoted entirely to Soviet literary criticism in the period up to Stalin's death ("Post war Soviet ideology and lit-

³ According to Piatigorsky, the function of literary criticism in Russian culture is equivalent to that played by philosophy in Western European cultures: "In Russian literary criticism, philosophy (now explicitly, now implicitly) was regarded as the natural method by means of which a literary text was to be analysed, ratiocinated, and 'returned to culture'. This attitude has not by any means been outmoded; even today, it is adopted by many". (A. Piatigorsky, "Philosophy or literary criticism", in *Russian literature and criticism*, ed. E. Bristol, Berkeley Slavic Specialities, Berkeley, 1982, p. 238.)

erary scholarship"). The editor of the volume gives the following verdict on the functionist nature of Soviet literary criticism:

Soviet criticism is now as much an arm of the Party as is literature itself. The function of the critic is not to maintain standards, to deepen sensibility, or to invoke a climate stimulating to creative writing, but simply to evaluate a work in terms of its ideological conformity. Thus both literature and criticism of it combine in a unity of purpose designed to promote, not the aims of art, but the aims of communism. (Simmons, 1958, p. 5).

The Khrushchev and Brezhnev eras are best reflected in the studies devoted to the history of Soviet Dostoevsky scholarship, since the rehabilitation of this writer signified a shift in the prevailing ideology towards the "thaw" of "peaceful coexistence" of the 1960's and early 1970's. This period in the history of official Soviet literary scholarship is thoroughly covered in V. Seduro's *Dostoevsky's image in Russia today* (1975) and in N. Shneidman's "Soviet theory of literature and the struggle around Dostoevsky in recent Soviet literary scholarship" (1975). The late 1970's and early 1980's are dealt with in H. Mondry's *Osobennosti vosprijatija Dostoevskogo v sovetskom literaturovedenii* (1984). Among the most recent works on ideological and political aspects of the contemporary Soviet literary scene, mention must be made of a collective volume *Literature and history* (1986), edited by Gary Saul Morson. Although this volume does not contain a special study of contemporary Soviet

literary criticism, it does include a brilliant sketch by the editor himself of the nature of the "special status" of literary criticism in Russia.

The latest reforms of Glasnost' under Perestroika, which have been taking place in the Soviet Union since 1986/87, have baffled students and commentators of the Soviet Union. Sociologists, historians and economists have been actively involved in studying the present day reforms, the essence, and the degree of authenticity of the reforms often constituting the main subject of investigation. Perestroika's biggest achievement is Glasnost', which manifests itself in the publication of formerly forbidden and unpublished literary texts. This has given rise to numerous articles, prefaces and comments by both academic and popular literary critics. Literary periodicals are flourishing under Glasnost', especially the "mouth pieces" of Perestroika, such as *Novyi mir* and "Literaturnaja gazeta", the number of whose editions increased in 1988 by 135% and 22,6% respectively. At the same time, edition numbers of more moderate journals also went up, *Neva* by 90%, *Znamia* by 80%, *Oktiabr'* by 35% (cf. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*, No. 1, 1989, pp. 93-97). At the same time, a controversial term nekrophilia was coined in order to describe the "progressive" journals' venture into publishing "archival", i.e. formerly forbidden

texts (cf. P. Proskurin's use of this term in N. Ivanova's "Otsy i deti epokhi", *Voprosy literatury*, n. 1, 1987, p. 51).

The complex and unclear aspects of Perestroika reforms could be clarified if viewed "through the glass" of Soviet literary criticism, which, as we have seen, can be regarded as a mirror of political and ideological changes in Soviet society. What proved to be a valid method in evaluating ideological trends for the previous epochs in Soviet history, could also serve to clarify the essence of Perestroika reforms through the analysis of the Glasnost' component of literary criticism. This is the aim of the present investigation, i.e. to isolate, demonstrate and examine the main ideological trends of official literary criticism under Glasnost'.

A brief overview of the prevailing ideological trends in the epochs preceding Glasnost' and Perestroika (this will include a number of examples of ideological readings of Russian and Soviet literary texts) will make it possible to present the study in contrast and comparison with preceding trends.

For the purpose of this investigation, I understand "trend" as a consensus both with regard to theme and problematics, and in interpretation. The "evaluation" of trends will proceed in five stages.

Firstly, I will isolate the dominant, i.e. most frequently occurring trends in the period under investigation. Secondly, I intend to illustrate the dominant trends through examples from the works of Soviet critics. As a third stage, I will compare and contrast recent trends with the trends in the immediately preceding period. I will then speculate on the socio-political and ideological actuality of the trend.

Since the publication of formerly forbidden and unpublished texts constitutes the main trend of Glasnost', this study has as its aim the isolation of main trends in the process of the re-evaluation of the cultural heritage of the past by Soviet literary scholarship. The analysed authors will be divided into four main groups:

1. accepted 19th century classics (e.g. Goncharov);
2. formerly forbidden 20th century writers (e.g. Zamiatin)
3. formerly forbidden 19th century writers (e.g. Rozanov and Leontiev);
4. hagiographic classics of the 20th century Soviet period (e.g. Gorkij).

The chosen order is dictated by the chronological pattern established in the process of reinterpretation which took place in the Soviet literary press during 1986 up to the present.

1. METHODOLOGICAL BASIS. THE LENIN-PLEKHANOV FORMULA

The ideological re-evaluation of the pre-revolutionary Russian cultural heritage has been an integral part of Soviet ideological life, and it has a long and diverse history.

When the new ideology of the Soviet State was in need of a Marxist-Leninist theoretical base for the working out of an official attitude towards the cultural heritage of the 19th century past and for an official line in Soviet literature, Lenin's sayings from his seven articles on L. Tolstoy were brought to life and promoted as dogma and credo for the evaluation of the cultural heritage of the past.

The main point was made by Lenin in his article of 1907, "Leo Tolstoy as a mirror of Russian revolutions", in which he wrote: "If we have before us a really great artist, he must reflect in his work at least some of the essential aspects of the revolution". The result of such an approach was that, according to Lenin, Tolstoy's work contained "the violent protest against any class oppression". And so was canonised the methodology of a "free interpretation" of the Russian classics from the social and ideological point of view.

Another important method of dealing with the cultural heritage of the past was borrowed from Plekhanov's formula "otsiuda i dosiuda", "from here up to here". Its essence is a partial acceptance of the writer's oeuvre, such as criticisms of social, political, and religious institutions of Tzarist Russia. It allows however rejection of the writer's "weak points", such as religious and metaphysical searchings, which do not harmonise with an atheistic and revolutionary vision of the world.

These two methodologies of dealing with the literature and intellectual thought of the 19th century were adopted by official Soviet literary criticism, whose history consists in the application of the official method of interpretation according to the changing ideological and political issues of the day.

Today, under Perestroika, there exists a mild attempt to polemicise with Lenin's schema. But this polemic does not mean a break away from the Marxist dogma.

An attempt to reevaluate Lenin's schema of dividing culture into two parts - progressive and conservative - as well as to reevaluate Lenin's schema from his articles on Leo Tolstoy is expressed in D. Urnov's article on "Literature in the period of Prestroika" in *Voprosy*

Literature, V. 8, 1988. Urnov, an author of various "peredovye" articles in this journal, writes:

No doubt, our understanding of our own cultural heritage is distorted. Lenin's teachings that only the *progressive* part of any culture should be taken into consideration was interpreted in an extremely vulgar way. It was thought that some books should not be touched, and that the best way of dealing with them would be to keep them locked on a special shelf under six locks.

In the same vulgar and barbarian way, Lenin's teachings on taking the progressive part out of particular author's writings was adhered to; as a consequence, those pages, which were regarded as the weakest, were almost torn out of the book ...

These practical and theoretical proceedings, which were applied to our literature for many years, terribly lowered the level of thought of our literary criticism, even of that part of it which was motivated by kindest intentions. If Lenin's teachings on "two cultures" with the help of rough hands was turned into destruction, oblivion, non-teaching and not-knowing of a significant part of our culture, then, naturally, a desire to learn about the unpublished text became characteristic for a real critic or a literary scholar. (P. 34.)

Urnov has the courage to polemicise with Lenin's "mirror" formula for his articles on Tolstoy only in a footnote, written in a somewhat ambivalent way. He does not break away from the Marxist dogma, and counter-balances his mild critique of Lenin's views by bringing in Engels' views on Balzak:

This license (to interpret the text) is also not given by Lenin's articles on Leo Tolstoy. In Tolstoy's weak points, Lenin saw an objective reflection of contradictions of the Russian revolution, its peasants' nature, its immaturity. In

the same way, those who want to analyse Balzac's writing cannot interpret Engels' views on Balzac as an attitude of Balzac's ideology. Nowhere Engels says that Balzac intended to depict one thing, but depicted another, the result of this depiction being totally different from what it was intended to be. (P. 34.)

The underlying idea which runs through the latest debate on the application of Lenin's formula to the "newly returned" (vozvrashchennaja) literature under Perestroika, consists of the reinforcement of Marxist-Leninist dogma in Soviet literary criticism. This reinforcement is achieved through the methodology of the critique not of Lenin's formula *per se*, but of misinterpretations and misreadings of this formula in the history of Soviet literary criticism.

2. HISTORICAL REVIEW

a) Main trends under Stalin

Accordingly, Dostoevsky scholarship, which was put into oblivion by Gorkij's dubbing of Dostoevsky as an "evil genius" at the 1934 1st Congress of Soviet writers, was allowed a short period of revival during World War II. The general tendency was to use Dostoevsky's chauvinistic feelings to arouse patriotism in the nation. His numerous anti-German pronouncements were quoted (see Yaroslavskiy's "Dostoevsky against Germans", 1942) and his novel *The Devils* was described as a brilliant portrayal of the precursors of modern Fascism (Yermilov, 1944; Seduro, 1975). When the war was over, the same Yermilov who authored an article of 1944 "The great Russian writer F. M. Dostoevsky", made a statement against Dostoevsky's reactionary views in "Literaturnaja Gazeta", 1947, and published in the same year a brochure with the title "Against the reactionary ideas in Dostoevsky's writing".

At the same time, Soviet literary criticism engaged in a broad polemic involving most of the periodicals against the historical-comparative school of Veselovsky. With the erection of the Iron Curtain, literary criticism was expected to respond to the politics of isolationism and

to promote the idea of the uniqueness of the Russian people in this cultural debate. It was thus only natural to start a campaign against a comparativist method in literary scholarship, which permitted a study of the influence of Western literatures and ideas on the Russian intellectual mind. A paper appeared in 1946 with the title "Sovremennye zadachi literaturovedenija" (in *Akademija Nauk*, Vol. 6), which described the concept of influence study as a belittlement of the achievements of Russian culture, since it portrays 19th century Russian writers as imitators. Instead, Russian 19th century literature should be regarded as instructive to Western writers since, due to the uniqueness of the historical experiences of Russian society under the Tzarist regime, it was full of "fearlessness, liberational pathos, and zeal for social justice" (T. Motyleva, "Ruskaja Literatura - peredovaja literatura Mira", "Literaturnaja Gazeta", Apr. 12, 1947). An extended polemic took place on the pages of almost all the literary periodicals, centering around the historical-comparative method of Veselovsky, and attacking the theory of migrating plots, with its reduced concepts of nationality and patriotism.

The Veselovsky polemics can serve as an example of how the field of literary criticism was used in order to initiate a nationwide debate; indeed, not a single sphere of intellectual life escaped the influence

of this polemical philosopher. Historic linguistics was brought into the debate on the originality and uniqueness of the Russian intellectual and artistic mind, in which Veselovsky's historical comparative theory of migrating plots was only instrumental. The latter became evident when in *Novyi Mir* (1948) an article appeared by Tarasenkov, the author of "Kosmopolity ot Literaturny" (*Novyi Mir*, No. 2, 1948). He wrote:

Contempt for Russia, its culture, its great ideas typified the Jesuit Bukharin and the bandit-cosmopolitan Trotsky. These are fearful memories. They show us with what the spirit of defence to bourgeois culture and civilisation is related under present day *political conditions* and whom it serves. (Simmons, *ibid*, p. 275).

The scope of literary scholarship under the "present-day political conditions" was to propagate the enlightening role of Russian literature for the rest of the world.

Have our literary scholars said anything resounding and convincing on this (the influence of Belinsky, Dobroliubov, Chernyshevsky, and Russian literature as a whole on the West)? Have they grasped the great world-wide significance and power of Russian and Soviet art? Have they explained it from a class, Leninist point of view? There are individual articles on this theme, but so far not a single serious piece of research. (Tarasenkov, "Cosmopolity", Simmons, *ibid*, p. 275).

The most impressive piece of "perestroika" that took place in the field of literary scholarship of the 1950's was initiated by Stalir's

ideological interference into the field of linguistics concerning the famous Marr affair. Using as a pretext for his interference the deplorable condition of Soviet linguistics, Stalin, through the media of language and literature studies, started to enforce the encouragement of hard criticism and self-criticism amongst Soviet literary scholars. Stalin's statement that "no science can develop and flourish without a conflict of opinions, without freedom of criticism" ("Stalin on Marxism in linguistics", *The Soviet linguistic controversy*, translated by Murra et al, New York, 1951, pp. 75-76), which could be interpreted as a call for pluralism, signified in fact a thaw in literary scholarship, which is usually ascribed to the Khrushchevian 1960's. After Stalin's condemnation of the "Arakcheev-like regime" which "regrettably obtains also on the editorial boards of some of our magazines" (p. 286), there appeared an immediate response in the field of literary criticism. An odious figure of Soviet literary officialdom, the academic Blagoi, was challenged by Beletskii on the grounds of distorting the truth in Pushkin's scholarship. Blagoi, who under the previous trend of anti-Westernism, claimed that Pushkin in the 1820's was totally free of Byronic influence, was now challenged with quotations from Pushkin in which Pushkin admitted that he was "mad" about Byron. This precedent serves as a fine example of one literary critic who was "more sensitive" than another to the changing orders from above.

In brief, economic relaxations and the relative material success in the early 1950's led to the refinement of the hard Zhdanov life, which had had a devastating effect on the productivity of Soviet intellectuals.

b. Soviet literary criticism under Khrushchev and Brezhnev

This relaxation, begun under Stalin, led to the so-called "thaw of the 1960's" under Khrushchev. As often in the history of Soviet literary criticism, the crucial role in the ideological changes was played by the changing political situation, in particular the changing relationship between the USSR and the West. The easing of the Iron Curtain, Khrushchev's visit to the West, an improvement in contacts between Western and Soviet scholars, an anti-Stalin campaign - this all led to changes on the pages of literary periodicals.

The launch of a new campaign for the rehabilitation of Dostoevsky's writings, which coincided with the 75th anniversary of the writer's death in 1956, illustrates a new change taking place in the external politics of the USSR. The campaign was started by the same party-official critic V. Ermilov, who had abruptly ended a short-lived Dostoevsky resurrection during World War II, when Dostoevsky's anti-German and militantly xenophobic views had been widely popularised. This time, in the mid 1950's, "Dostoevsky as a peace lover" was at the centre of the rehabilitation campaign.

While they salute Dostoevsky's memory, the advocates of peace and happiness on earth are making every effort to bring closer the day when not a teardrop will be shed by a single child in torment anywhere in the whole world! The fighters for peace

are confident that the dark forces of chaos, destruction, ruin, and animal egotism will not be victorious. (Seduro, *ibid*, p. 28).

As Seduro (1975) notes, at the centre of the campaign was the effort to win over public opinion by making compromises and concessions in the cultural sphere. This went parallel with the domestic policy. As far as the foreign policy was concerned, the parallelism between the peace-loving Dostoevsky and the policy of "peaceful co-existence" and cultural exchanges, is quite obvious.

The main methodology of dealing with the cultural heritage of the 19th century in accordance with the Plekhanov-Lenin scheme remained intact, even during the euphoric rehabilitation of Dostoevsky's heritage in the period of "peaceful co-existence". An unsigned article appeared in "Pravda" (Feb. 6, 1956, Seduro, p. 60), under the title "Velikij Russkij Pisatel', K 75-ti letiiu so dnja smerti F.M. Dostoevskogo", in which Lenin's schema for Tolstoy's writing is repeated again. It is stressed that "a great writer's artistic creation exemplifies a struggle of conflicting tendencies, but the objective evidence presented by the artist prevails over his subjective interpretations of the phenomena he is portraying" (Seduro, *ibid*, p. 32). Plekhanov's schema of dividing Tolstoy into the writer and artist versus the thinker, where the thinker's part of the Tolstoyan heritage

is rejected, is found in the *Pravda* article which divides Dostoevsky's world view into what is acceptable and unacceptable for the Soviet reader:

The example of Dostoevsky demonstrates clearly and distinctly as possible what a disastrous influence a reactionary world-view can have even on an author of genius. (Seduro, *ibid*, p. 34).

The Leninist methodology of dealing with the 19th century literary heritage remained valid as late as the mid 1970's in Soviet literary scholarship, as can be seen from the following quotation:

There is no doubt that the principle of Lenin's approach to the characterisation and evaluation of Tolstoy's world-outlook and his creative work, his methodology of the analysis of such problems as the connection of the artist with his epoch, the essence of the contradictions between the artist's views and his creative work, the determination of the strong and weak points of an artist's heritage, and the clarification of what is most important in him - could and should serve as a "guide for action" in the study of Dostoevsky *and of any other artist and thinker as important and contradictory as Dostoevsky* (Shneidman, *ibid*, p. 538; author's emphasis).

Until 1987 Dostoevsky remained the only one of those "contradictory and important" 19th century thinkers who had been published and studied in the USSR in the Brezhnev era. For this reason, the period in the history of Soviet literary scholarship between the mid 1970's

until the recent Glasnost' campaign can be studied only on the example from Dostoevskian criticism.

Official Soviet Dostoevsky scholarship supplies us with evidence of the changing of the Plekhanov-Lenin scheme towards the "holistic" adaptation and rehabilitation even of the reactionary part of the heritage. Nationalism and antisemitism, religion and revolution are amongst the themes that were formerly labelled as "contradictory". However, in the criticism of the late 1970's and early 1980's, they received an interpretation which makes them adaptable to the needs of contemporary society. Since Dostoevsky was the only classic, out of the line of forbidden reactionary 19th century writers, whose works have been published during the Soviet period, the whole process of "re-interpretation" took place mainly around his heritage. The fact that he is the most studied 19th century writer in the West has determined, as was mentioned earlier, the parameters of the "struggle". The methodology of "from here up to here", has changed into an acceptance of the formerly controversial writers; they have been made "uncontroversial" by a reinterpretation of reactionary and formerly unacceptable parts of the worldview as ideologically neutralised views. In practice, it operates in the following way. Instead of admitting that Dostoevsky was a religious thinker, literary criticism will demonstrate that religious ideals of peace, brotherhood and

equality of all people before Christ are nothing other than the ideas of Utopian socialists, and what seem to be religious ideals in Dostoevsky are in fact socialist ideals. Or, when dealing with another (for Marxist-Leninist dogma) unacceptable aspect, such as Dostoevsky's anti-revolutionary views, the critics will demonstrate that the only revolutionary movement that Dostoevsky knew was Bakunin-Nechaev anarchism, which Karl Marx himself did not accept. Had Dostoevsky known the teachings of Marx or of the First International, he would have re-evaluated his views on the revolutionary movements. Examples are often provided from *The Devils*. In a monograph of 1971 (M. Gus., *Idei i obrazy F.M. Dostoevskogo*, M, 1971), we find:

Historical Shigalevism found its expression in fascism, in the extreme open form of dictatorship of the bourgeois minority by the working majority. Dostoevsky in his genius predicted this, and it is a tremendous achievement of his historical premonition (...). But he turned things upside down, by showing the fascist scheme of Shigalev as a true revolutionary socialism.

Two years before the revolt took place in Algires (in the city of Algires), the *Possessed* was shown at the theatre. "The chosen public" applauded madly to Shigalev when he was reciting his system. Dostoevsky predicted the future, but misunderstood it (p. 405).

And, in a book of 1972 (B. Suchkov, "K 150-Letiyu so dnia rozhdenija F.M. Dostoevskogo", M, 1972):

There are plenty of near-revolutionary devils, like Petr Verkhovensky, both in the West and in the East, who have adopted an extreme leftism as their slogan. The novel *The Devils* presents in itself an anatomy and criticism of ultra-left extremism (p. 20).

The following lines from a monograph of 1971 acquire connotations of open polemics with the Western concept of freedom:

Who, in the 20th century, follows Dostoevsky's ideas that every one, even the commonest of people, has the need for spiritual freedom, and that one of the most important tasks of any society is to give a person a chance to feel himself as an individual? These ideas of Dostoevsky constitute today an integral part of the Soviet pedagogical and psychological sciences. They acquired flesh and blood in the conditions of real socialism. (p. 52).

With the changing methodology of a "holistic", neutralising approach, characteristic for the literary criticism of the decade between the mid 1970's and the mid 1980's, the image of the writer becomes blurred and amorphous. But the change itself did not bring a change in synchronicity, i.e. the reflection in literary criticism of social and political needs of the society. Examples of the evaluation of Dostoevsky's antisemitism on the pages of Soviet literary scholarship in the 1970's, at the peak of Soviet Jewish emigration from the Soviet

Union, illustrate how close to the political events official literary criticism remains during the Brezhnev era.

Dostoevsky's xenophobic feelings towards other nations were used during the Second World War for inciting anti-German feelings amongst the nation. In the 1970's, at the peak of Soviet Jewish emigration, Dostoevsky's anti-semitism was brought to light. It is well known amongst Dostoevskian scholars in the West that Dostoevsky's attitude towards Jews and Judaism falls into the category of taboo subjects in the Soviet Union. Apart from L. Grossman's work "Confession of one Jew" (1924), Soviet Dostoevskian scholarship overlooked the issue altogether. However, in the late 1970's two Soviet critics addressed the issue, this time from the political perspective, as dictated by the increase in the Third Wave Jewish emigration. In this political atmosphere of the 1970's, anti-Jewish polemics on the papers of literary monographs acquired the dimensions of anti-Zionist attacks. Dostoevsky's antisemitism was justified both from economic, racial and political angles (Kudriavtsev, 1979; Seleznev, 1980).

One way of dealing with the formerly silenced issue is illustrated by an old method of "the dividing approach", which is akin to the methodology of "from here up to here", or of the partial acceptance

of the writer's views. The following example contains elements of the class interpretation.

It is broadly accepted that Dostoevsky was an anti-Semite, although not in the literature of literary criticism, which avoids raising this question, and therefore silently confirms the stereotype that exists in the reader's psyche. The author himself stresses that he acts not against the nationality, but against a certain social idea. Zhidovstvo is separated from the nation - it means the power of money. It is not in vain that Dostoevsky never calls a Jew-worker *a zhid*. (Yu. Kudriavtsev, *Tri Kruga Dostoevskogo*, Moscow, 1979, p. 84)

Characteristic of the "holistic" approach of the 1970's is the methodology of total justification of openly unhumanistic themes and aspects of the reinterpreted classic. Dostoevsky's antisemitism becomes politicised and actualised to the needs of the 1970's. The following example serves as an illustration of the actualisation of political and economic antisemiticism, totally irrelevant to an understanding of Dostoevsky's texts:

Up till now the main typical representatives of the class of large-scale Jewish bourgeoisie were and remain the Rothschilds - millionaires, possessors of vast wealth. (Yu. Seleznev, *V mire Dostoevskogo*, Moscow, 1980, p. 304)

The Rothschilds amassed fortunes through the blood and sweat of the peoples of those countries upon which they have encroached, in order to possess them through the power of money. (Seleznev, *ibid.*, p. 303).

In Seleznev's attempt to interpret Dostoevsky's antisemiticism, a trend in the "holistic" approach is presented, characteristic of the

1970's, which presents a formerly "controversial writer" as wholly justified. One wonders what happened to the ideals of equality and brotherhood, which served as a political justification of Dostoevsky's rehabilitation in the 1950's and the 1960's.

The obvious undercurrent underlying the anti-Jewish campaign of the Brezhnev era was the Slavophilic trend. Thus, the same Seleznev's posthumous *Glazami naroda* (1986), in which he proclaims the 19th century slavophilic philosophy to be a progressive trend of thought, and which played a positive role in Russian history, received sharp criticism in *Voprosy literatury* in 1987 under Glasnost'. This year signifies the beginning of a new era in the political undercurrent of Soviet literary criticism.

The methodology typical of the "holistic" approach is applied through the method of comparison in contrast to the "really reactionary thinkers". These were the 19th Century writers unpublished through the Soviet times, but whose names and works when they appeared were quoted by the Soviet critics in such a context as to demonstrate their most "black thoughts". It is never however mentioned openly that their works are "forbidden", and quotations were supplied by references to pre-revolutionary publications, or to publications of the 1920's. Interesting in this respect is the "use" of Rozanov and

Leontiev in the holistic re-evaluation campaign of the 1970's. The most "unpublishable" 19th century thinkers and writers, due to their uncompromising non-acceptance of progress as a leading force in human history, were proponents of a philosophy of history based on the principles of aesthetics and the rejection of ethics. Leontiev's and Rozanov's names were mentioned in the literary scholarship of Brezhnev's era in connection with the rehabilitation of the question of the immortality of the soul and of resurrection in Dostoevsky's writing.

Before the 1970's, Soviet literary criticism avoided the issue of religion and faith, brushing it aside as a "perezhitok stariny", as a superstition of the dark years of prerevolutionary Russia. However, the early 1970's, which saw an alarming (for an atheist state) revival of religious sympathies in young Soviet citizens who had been born after the Revolution, marked the beginning of a re-evaluation of faith and religion in Dostoevsky's writing. As the journal *Nauka i religiya* (*Science and Religion*) in 1971 (n. 11) put it:

Up till now the topic of Dostoevsky and religion was given away to the representatives of idealistic and religious trends, who have established a real ideological monopoly in this sphere. (p. 42).

The method chosen by the Soviet literary scholars for dealing with this theme, was to reduce the degree of Dostoevsky's religiosity by proving the pragmatism of his faith in comparison with the faith of the reactionary religious thinkers Rozanov and Leontiev:

He (Rozanov) considers Dostoevsky's attempt to prove the immortality of the soul unfounded. Luckily, the idea of the existence of God does not belong to provable ideas, since it is given to a human being as a faith, like love. (Ja. Elsberg, "Nasledie Dostoevskogo i puti chelovechestva k sotsializmu" in *Dostoevsky - khudozhnik i myslitel'*, Moscow, 1972, p. 75)

or

Dostoevsky's religious views were never in full agreement not only with the Church dogma, but with mysticism as such. This is why K. Leontiev took such a sharp position against Dostoevsky's and Tolstoy's dream of the possibility of the kingdom of truth and happiness on Earth. An ideologue of reactionary thinking saw in their views a tendency, which was akin to revolutionary concepts. This is why the concept of Dostoevsky as a religious mystic, so popular in bourgeois literature and literary criticism, is unjustified. (Ja. Elsberg, p. 95).

The result of this method of interpretation based on the methodology of comparison with reactionary thinkers, is that

Dostoevsky, with all the democratic content of his thinking, is counter opposed to such of his interpreters as Leontiev, Rozanov, Merezhkovsky, Berdiaev - *those enemies of democracy and socialism*. (Ibid., p. xxx)

Thus, the "holistic" approach of the 1970's creates a neutralised political and ideological image of a writer who serves as a helping

hand to the main political and ideological developments of the 1970's. These were marked by Russophilism, sympathy towards "derevnia", anti-urbanism, anti-Westernism, and suppression of national minorities. "We have to come to an agreement with Dostoevsky since we feel he is a necessity for us now", is an open announcement made by the critic I. Volgin ("Nezavershennyi dialog", *Voprosy literatury*, 1974, p. 178). It stands as a epitaph to the tendency of the "holistic" approach which characterised ideological trends in the 1970's.

At this point, the question arises: Why was Dostoevsky, and not Rozanov, Leontiev, or Merezhkovsky, chosen for rehabilitation in the 1970's? When evaluating the most recent developments of 1988/89, we shall witness the very start of the rehabilitation of these reactionary thinkers. The answer now for the Brezhnevian period is that Dostoevsky, with his chauvinistic feelings, his theory of the soil ("pochvennichestvo"), his preference for "the voice of the heart" to scepticism, his antiintellectualism, his rejection of Western social ideals (which he called "Genevian ideas"), all appealed to the general ideological climate of the Brezhnevian era.

3. THE GLASNOST' TIMES

a) Russian 19th century classics

The general emphasis on patriotic and pro-Russian chauvinism of an anti-Western orientation went beyond the chronological confines of the Brezhnev era. It is only in 1987 that we begin to perceive a sharp change from the formerly dominant trend of anti-conservatism and anti-Westernism. From 1987, a turn towards "pan-human" values ("obshchechelovecheskie tsennosti"), towards the reduction of the significance of geographical, national and cultural borders, starts to crystallise. The ideological accent of the changing trend goes parallel with the official Gorbachev line. This line has as its main aim the re-evaluation of Soviet history according to "alternative thinking". This term, coined by a group of Soviet historians who were invited to "rewrite" the history of the USSR, marks an officially inspired trend of thought, which has as its aim the rehabilitation of socialism in theory, not in the unfortunate historical practice in which it has materialised.

The justification of the theory of socialism and of Marxist-Leninist dogma which "could have" been a success had it not ended up in the wrong hands, is achieved by two main means:

1. by discrediting Stalin and Stalinism;
2. by the rehabilitation of Stalin's opponents (Bukharin, Rykov, etc.) whom he had defeated in the early 1930's.

Formerly forbidden works of Trotsky, Bukharin, Rykov, and other members of Stalin's opposition are being quoted. Significantly, Bukharin's works are quoted in connection with economic reform, namely his statements against collectivisation of the rural population and the peasantry. Gorbachev's economic reforms of introducing private enterprise and of instituting "cooperatives" needed justification from Socialist Marxist dogma, and this justification was found in the works of one of those early ideologues of Soviet power defeated by Stalin. Significantly, it is today the historians, not the economists, who, on their own claims, are doing the rethinking of economic alternatives and planning the future economic reforms in the Soviet Union.

Since one of the main economic difficulties today is the poor state of agriculture and the consequent food shortage, the "village" theme plays a significant part in the debate over the economic misfortunes.

The Brezhnev times witnessed a rise of so-called "village prose". This acquired the status of an officially patronised critical opposition to the State's emphasis on urbanisation and industrialisation; while the Soviet Union, in its rapid growth as a world superpower, had abandoned authentic Russian national values. This trend marked the resurrection of Slavophilism, Dostoevsky's theory of the soil, the Tolstoyan trend back to physical labour, and the idealisation of native Russian values, all of which can still only be found amongst the village dwellers and the Russian peasants, not amongst the dehumanised, Westernised city population. The shortage of agricultural produce in the 1970's and early 1980's was to be explained, according to the "village writers", by the total mismanagement of the villages and collective farms. These, if given the freedom to adhere to the old way of life, would have been up to the task of feeding the whole of Russia.

The change in economic politics introduced by Gorbachev in the form of privatisation by cooperatives (arguably, on non-socialist principles), left little room for the idealisation of the patriarchal values of Russian peasants. Once it was admitted that it was necessary to work according to economically viable Western models, similar sympathies were expressed in the field of literary criticism, thus promoting Glasnost¹ in the re-evaluation of the cultural and literary

heritage of the past. The former's emphasis on what was patriotic, Russian, inherited and Slavophilic, has been turned, if not directly towards the glorification of Western forms of capitalism, then at least towards "pan-human" values. In a parallel fashion to the historians, the re-evaluators, and the representatives of "alternative thinking", a highly prolific official Soviet literary scholar, Professor A Bocharov, in the January issue of *Voprosy literatury*, 1989 suggested a similar programme for the field of Soviet literature, and spoke about the urgent need to "rewrite" the history of Soviet literature. This would involve, not only the return of the formerly unmentioned names and unpublished texts, but also, as we know, a new reading of these texts. This new reading would in turn involve a thematic adjustment to the problematics of the contemporary debates.

The most interesting illustration of readjustment in the interpretation of formerly accepted, classical literary texts towards the needs of contemporary reality is to be drawn from the period of 1986/87. This period marks a change in trends, and is characterised by the shift towards Western economic patterns and away from the glorification of Russian values which started in 1986/87. Clearly, literary scholars who wrote voluminous works in the early 1980's and submitted their manuscripts before 1985/6 could not envisage that the publication of their research in 1986/87 would coincide with the

threshold of a new era, and would thus become a target for attack from those who had adjusted their ideas to the changing ideology and political climate of 1987. (The shift from "Russian" to "pan-human" values came almost overnight and was heralded by the debates on the pages of the literary journals over a few monographs which appeared in 1986). Highly significant is an attack on the already mentioned posthumous work of the critic Yu. Seleznev, i.e. his monograph *Glazami naroda (Through the people's eyes)* of 1986. Yu. Seleznev, the author of a Dostoevsky biography (1983) in the prestigious collector's series *Zhizn' zamechatelnykh liudey* (which itself replaced a monograph by the distinguished scholar L. Grossman (ZhZL, 1961), in itself a fact of enormous political significance for the re-evaluation of literary texts of the past), was criticised for expressing tendentiously Slavophilic sympathies in his reading of Russian literature (*Voprosy literatury*, V. 7, 1987). It is not the Slavophiles, the article claimed, but the Westernisers of the 19th century that have to be chosen as a pattern for imitation and as a source for formulating productive and progressive ideas for Russia's future development.

The importance which Gorbachev ascribes to literature and literary criticism in his ideological Perestroika campaign was made clear by him in an address to representatives of the media in February 1987.

Gorbachev claimed that it was thanks to the best work of contemporary Soviet literature, literary criticism and journalism that he was able "to formulate thought and concentrate on the most 'painful points' ('bolevye tochki') of our life".

Literature was preparing our society for the changes, it was moving social conscience. Some publicists and critics bravely stood for those ideas which today are confirmed as party and state decisions in the fields of economics, culture and education. ("Pravda", 14 Feb, No 45, 1987).

Starting from 1986, "bolevye tochki", "gumanisticheskie idealy" and "obshchchelovecheskie tsennosti" have become key terminology in the official literary criticism. If "Narodnost'" was the key concept of the preceding epochs - a concept borrowed from 19th century revolutionary democratic literary criticism of the Belinsky and Dobroliubov brand - then from 1986 the shift towards "gumanism" and "obshcheloviecheskie tsennosti" has led to a change in choice for the quotations from the 19th century ideologue of "narodnost'", Belinsky.

Since the pattern of finding justification for ideological changes in literary criticism has always consisted in searching for a confirmation from an ideologically canonised figure, the change from "narodnost'" to "pan-humanism" and "vseobshchnost'" (universality) had to be confirmed from the views of the figure, hagiographic for

official Soviet literary criticism, of Belinsky, the founder of the concept "narodnost".

At the nation-wide conference which took place at "The Pushkin House", hosted by the Institute of Russian Literature of the Academy of Science in 1986, such a justification was found and officially sanctioned. It has been described in the following way by one of the official *literaty* in connection with the re-evaluation of the classics:

It is not elitism, but, on the contrary, universality, ("vseobshchnost") which distinguishes the classics, whose artistic vision of the world derives from those ideas which, during the centuries, were developed, shaped and polished in the nation's mind (consciousness). The stronger these ideas are present in literature, the more they characterise the qualities of the classics.

In this regard it is difficult to imagine any other idea which would be so characteristic of the people's consciousness and for literature at the same time, as the idea of humanism. Without this idea, clearly speaking, the whole value of *narodnost* is lost. As once V. Belinsky uttered unwillingly (vyrvalos' v serdtsach u V. Belinskogo): 'let any narodnost' be cursed, if it excludes humanitarianism (chelovechnost'). (V Buznik. "Mera klassiki - gumanism. (O chuvstve novogo v sovremennoi literature i kritike)." *Russkaja literatura*, No. 3, 1987, p. 4).

By the end of 1987, terms like humanism and "obshchechelovecheskoe" had become key words in the field of literary criticism.

Thus, in *Moskva*, No. 12, 1987, the critic V. Bondarenko in "Ocherki literaturnykh nraov" introduced the term "obshchechelovecheskoe" "pan-human" as a criterion for discovering a true artist and true art. This article initiated a broad polemical debate, whose results were reflected by the same author in "Razgovor s chitatelem" in *Moskva*, No. 9, 1988, where the final crystallisation of antithetical positions between "narod" and "cosmos" took place. It is interesting to note that again the name of Seleznev was used as a proponent of the now so much criticised school of nationalistic thought. On the pages of *Voprosy literatury* V. 3, 1989, in the midst of a polemical article, praising the history of the humanistic tradition in Western European literature (N. Anastasiev, *Napravliayushchaya ideya iskusstva (Zametki zarubezhnika)*", Seleznev's thoughts, expressed in 1981 in *Inostrannaja literatura* in connection with the centenary of Dostoevsky's death, are quoted. There is criticism of his views on the necessity of the existence of a sharp boundary between nationality and the humanistic ideal, which, he claimed, was essential to Russian literature of the 19th Century (p. 73). (It is necessary to mention that although Seleznev's generally nationalistic views are being discredited, his ardent antisemitism, expressed in his monograph on Dostoevsky of 1980, are left untouched by his colleagues.)

However, the debate around the re-evaluation of the cultural heritage on the basis of "obshchechelovecheskie" values had opponents in the crucial year of 1987. Thus, for instance, it was suggested that poets such as P. Kogan and Vs. Bagritsky, should be considered invalid for rehabilitation because of the amorphous internationalism in their ideals and their lack of Russian patriotism (as in S. Kuniaev "Radizhizni na zemlie", *Molodaya gvardiya*, No. 8, 1987). It is significant that certain aspects of today's debates on Russian literature are reminiscent of the debates on Veselovsky's school of historical comparativism in the 1950's. If then Veselovsky's method was attacked on patriotic grounds, and discredited as unscientific in its methodology, then today the whole group of literary critics who are known as the "Ogon'kovtsy" (because of their affiliation with *Ogoniok*, the mouthpiece of Gorbachev's Perestroika campaign), has adopted a position of cultural comparativism. According to N. Ivanova, one of the leading literary polemicists (an "ogon'kovka"),

If you separate certain qualities of your culture, in a manner of cast hierarchy as unique qualities, then it would not be a bad idea to look at your own culture through the eyes of the neighbouring culture. (*Voprosy literatury*, No. 3, 1989, p. 74).

The "Veselovsky debate" line is present in her opponent's, V. Bondarenko's, ironic answer:

In order to understand a Russian novel, it is necessary to look at it from the Chinese point of view.

The polemically anti-patriotic nature of "obshchechelovecheskoe" and its proponents can be best illustrated by the following overview of the problem:

The fact that the Russian novel was formed in close connection with the Western European novel and, therefore, can be understood only through their common aesthetical context, is a truism. Is it really possible to understand the true measure of Tolstoy's findings without drawing comparisons between *War and Peace* and Stendal's novel? Obviously not, at least Tolstoy himself openly speaks about the lessons he drew from Stendal. Or, on the other hand, is it possible to truly appreciate Hemmingway's books without applying to them Tolstoyan parameters? Obviously not, because Hemmingway himself confessed openly that he constantly kept in mind the Russian classic's epochal vision. (Anastas'yev, *Voprosy literatury*, V. 3, 1989, p.75).

Polemics around "pan-Russian" patriotism versus "obshchechelovecheskoe" ("pan-human"), with the pronounced shift towards Westernism (the latter being in harmony with the Gorbachovian *Perestroika* affiliation with the West) can be illustrated by another example. This time the polemics is centered around a 19th century novel, always recognised and continuously published in the Soviet Union, Goncharov's masterpiece, *Oblomov*.

There has always been an agreement amongst literary critics of diverse opinions, from the revolutionary democrat Dobroliubov to the

symbolist Merezhkovsky, that the hero of the novel, Oblomov, is created as a Russian type. Oblomov stands as an archetype of the Russian character created in the history of Russian literature, and his affinity with the idle East is symbolised by his eastern "khalat" and the geographical location of his estate on the Eastern borders of Russia. Predictably, the treatment Oblomov received in a monograph published in 1986 (which we here consider to be a year which falls ideologically into the Brezhnevian era) is that of the glorification of this Russian type in a "derevniafilic" fashion. According to the author of this monograph, Yu. Loshchits, Oblomov is a productive type, as are his peasants, who were able to feed the whole of Russia under the supervision and loving care of masters like Oblomov. Even more interesting than the glorification of Russophilism and Oblomovism is the treatment given to Oblomov's antagonist and opponent in the novel, Shtoltz. This Germano-Russian businessman of an English type (of whom Goncharov made a topos theme in his *Frigate Pallas*) was meant by Goncharov to represent the Westernised, capitalist path along which he wanted the Russian economy of the second half of the 19th century to develop. However, at the hands of the Russophilic author of the new monograph, Shtoltz is proclaimed to be anathema to Russian society, since as a foreigner, he can bring only destruction to the Russian soil. Certain parallels drawn by this literary critic between Shtoltz's constant travellings on business and ... "a wandering Jew"

can be read as a broad hint on the "cosmopolitan" nature of Shtoltz. The latter can mean that Shtoltz stands as a metaphor for the Jewish idea of capitalism (compare Seleznev's monograph of 1980 "*V mire Dostoevskogo*" where the "underground man" becomes "a Jewish type", brought to life by "the Old Testament mentality").

In Loshchits's monograph (1986) we find the following "seminary Slavophilic" accusation of Shtoltz:

While the 'Kingdom of Sleep' exists, Shtoltz does not somehow feel well, even in Paris he cannot find peace and sleep. He is tormented by the thought that Oblomovka's muzhiks from the beginning of the world work on their little land and crop from it rich crops, and that is without reading agronomic pamphlets of any kind. And he is also tormented by the fact that an excess of bread is left with the muzhiks, instead of being sent along the railway lines into that very same Paris. 'The kingdom of sleep' is being destroyed not because Iliya Iliyich is lazy and idle, but because strikingly active is his friend. According to Shtoltz's will "the kingdom of sleep" has to become ... a railway station, and Oblomovka's muzhiks should seek employment in it. (p. 190).

Needless to say, such a polemical context with a heavily pronounced pro-village and slavophilic line, could not remain unnoticed at the time of the new ideological trend of the Perestroika period, when a new "Russian type" was being coined precisely on the pattern of Shtoltz. And indeed, in the January 1989 issue of *Voprosy literatury* there appeared a lengthy paper on Goncharov's novel, "An old sleeping habit. Thoughts on I.A. Goncharov's novel *Oblomov*" ("Dolgi navyk

ko snu"). The author of this paper, V. Kantor, openly declares the ideological context of his work, and makes the actualisation of Oblomov's text the main purpose of his research. Predictably, the new interpretation of Goncharov's novel presents the Shtoltz-character as Goncharov's answer to the economic and political problems faced by Russia at the time. Oblomov is being ridiculed in the same fashion as he was ridiculed by Lenin, who saw in Oblomov the incarnation of inborn Russian idleness and inertia. As a proponent of the "Russian capitalist" line, V. Kantor rehabilitates Shtoltz in the following terms:

Why is Shtoltz so much disliked? It appears that his sin is of the most unacceptable kind for our vulgar-sociological science: he, as well as Tushin from *The Ravine*, is a *Russian capitalist*, shown from an idealised perspective. But the word "capitalist" remains for us a swear word. (pp. 171-72).

Of interest to us here are two motifs - that of the justification of "Russian capitalism", and a seeming attack on the vulgar sociological nature of Soviet literary criticism. The first motif, however, puts the author of the article himself into line with the vulgar sociological readers of literary texts, since he all too well follows the economic reforms of Perestroika. The difference between Kantor's and Loshchit's interpretations of Goncharov's text is only in the shift from the Slavophilic village type nationalism of the Brezhnev era to the pro-Western economic pragmatism of the Gorbachev reforms.

Katerina Clark has demonstrated a sudden Resurrection of the Zhdanovist novel of the nationalist treatment of rural life in the years 1978/79. She draws political and social parallels between the "village prose" of the Brezhnev era and the Zhdanov prose of the Stalin era. In her "Zhdanovist fiction and village prose" we find:

One reason why 'village prose' might have some features in common with Zhdanovist fiction is that there are aspects of the social and cultural climate of the Soviet Union today which are similar to those which were obtained in the Zhdanov period. These include: firstly, World War II's cultural role in official culture as a major symbol; secondly, an increasing chauvinism and xenophobia; thirdly, an ageing administration which resists major innovation; fourthly, problems in feeding the populace which have made the question of what to do in the rural sector more urgent; and finally, a low birth rate. (pp. 39 - 40.)

The ideological struggle around the Shtoltz-Oblomov antithesis is conducted in a way typical for the methodology of Soviet literary scholarship in its treatment of negative-positive heroes of Russian literature. In this case, Russia and the West are at the centre of the ideological antithesis - Oblomov-Shtoltz as positive and negative elements. It is noteworthy that in the midst of Slavophilic-Western debates in the late 1960's on the pages of *Voprosy literatury* a similar methodology of deducing elements of "political culture" was used in its application to the positive (Slavophilic) and negative (Western) heroes of Russian literature. In Janov's "A Riddle of Slavophilic criticism" ("Zagadka Slavianofil'skoj Kritiki") we find:

The problem of the negative hero in literature is one of the most exact indicators of the level of *political culture* of a people, of that amorphous material, which, according to its viewpoint organises all ideological constructions of an epoch and here, by the way, just like then, when the problem of a positive hero arises, a real connection between literature and social consciousness is manifested. That same connection, which gives us the possibility to *explore social consciousness by means of literary criticism, turns the literary analysis into an analysis* of those or other ideological trends. (A. Janov, "A riddle of Slavophilic criticism" ("Zagadka slavianofil'skoi kritiki" in *Voprosy literatury*, V. 5, 1969, p. 92).

The essence of Soviet literary criticism as a reflection of the ideological trends of Soviet society remains unchanged. The "pro-Schtoltsian" critic does not hide his ideological bias; some ten pages after his attack on vulgar-sociologism he makes the following statement:

Oblomov was a severe warning to the culture, but its contemporaries refused to see it, as they saw the main problematics of the novel the description of the passing away of the Russian past. More than a hundred years had to pass, the Revolution had to take place, and the civil war, and Stalin's terror, and decades of *stagnation* and inertia, so that the culturological essence of the great novel would become all apparent. (p. 184).

b) "The forgotten names" : formerly unpublished 20th century writers

The struggle around the Brezhnevite model of literary thought, based on the glorification of Russian values, and the new Gorbachevian model with its affinity with the West, can be illustrated also on the level of theoretical work in literary criticism. Yu. Andreev's book *Glavnoe zveno, ideologicheskie voprosy literatury i literaturovedeniya*, M, *Sovremennik*, 1986, belongs to those books which were submitted to the publisher in 1985, and therefore would not reflect the Perestroika atmosphere of the 27th Party Congress. This book is built on the antithetical thinking that characterised the Soviet ideological dogma based on the Marxist-Leninist class struggle paradigm. The latter is employed in the sphere of literary criticism, which is divided by Yu. Andreev into the adherents of formalism in literature, and those for whom the context of a literary work is of main interest, "soderzhanisty" in literature. Yu. Andreev makes, amongst other statements, the following, which interests us here in its relation to the ideological treatment of the cultural heritage of the past. In Andreev's monograph of 1986 we read:

The October revolution and the civil war were depicted not only by the adherents of the New World - no, there also were a lot

of writers who were 'on the other shore', and amongst them there were not such ordinary figures. It is enough to mention that amongst those were such big figures, like Bunin, Kuprin, and A. Tolstoy, in order to understand the scale of their resources (vozmozhnosti). But, in spite of it, out of hundreds and hundreds of novels, essays, tales, short stories, and poems written on the Great October by the enemies of Soviet Power, generally speaking none of them are part of *the history* of Soviet literature. (p. 29).

The unfortunate author of this monograph could not foresee that the discipline of Soviet history was going to undergo a major change after the publication of his book, and that the trend of a return into the history of Soviet literature of formerly "forgotten names" would become a crucial part of Gorbachev's official campaign of Glasnost'.

In March 1988 a conference on Perestroika and literature took place in Copenhagen, which was attended by figures like Yuriy Afanasjev, a father of "new thinking" (novoe myshlenie) in Soviet historiography (also of "alternative thinking"). At the conference Western, Soviet and ex-Soviet literary scholars met. *Voprosy Literaturny* (V. 5, 1989) published extracts from speeches of Afanasjev, Siniavski, Etkind, etc.

Afanasjev's speech is quite remarkable as it contains a reproach of some of the emigre opinions on Soviet literature. Afanasjev divided existing opinions on Soviet literature into "tam" and "u nas", and scholars into "vy" and "my". Afanasjev was prepared to reconcile

scholars on the grounds of patriotism and the desire to help the motherland which they all, he maintained, still have in common.

Of course we hear the echoes of those discussions going on among people who had left the Soviet Union, and we heard the opinion that the real literature is the one which does not have thematic, ideological and other restraints and limitations, that the true literature does not have censors and that such literature, it is said, is only possible in emigration. As regards literature published in the Soviet Union, they say it is some sort of specific phenomenon which has nothing to do with literature. Real literature, they say, takes place in immigration. This point of view we have heard already for a long time. This point of view is unjust in relation to what is happening in literature in the Soviet Union ... Before Perestroika our literature was squeezed by censorship. But *there* - I have in mind not *here*, at present - *there* you can say things you want to say, but only from a distance. But I think that these "you" and "us" are not the truth in relation to those who have gathered here. I think that everybody wants the best for our motherland, and this means a new kind of "new thinking", and let our two ways of thinking meet at a common point. (p. 41.)

When Yu. Afanasjev called for a "rewriting" of the history of the Soviet Union, when the trend of "alternative thinking" with its return into history of the names of Trotsky and Bukharin was initiated, Professor A Bocharov addressed similar issues in the field of the history of Soviet literature. Not only is Soviet history to be rewritten, he mentioned, but also the history of Soviet literature (see *Voprosy literatury*, V. 1, 1989). The main essence of the trend of "alternative thinking" in history is the officially inspired re-

evaluation of the Soviet past, which is intended to go parallel with the process of Perestroika.

As formerly forbidden names of the early Soviet ideologues, such as Bukharin, Rykov and Trotsky, all defeated by Stalin, are returning into Soviet history in connection with the search for economic alternatives to the Soviet past and present, debates around "who is to blame?" and "what is to be done?", which have become semiotic signs in the debate lead by Soviet historians on contemporary economic policy, have acquired two main directions: the determinists (I. Kliamkin, *Novyi Mir*, 1986; A. Tsytko, *Nauka i zhizn'*, 1988/89) versus the alternativists (N. Shmelev, *Studencheskij meridian*, 1, 2, 1989) of utopian thinking. According to the latter, the USSR could have been on an economic level with West Germany and the USA if it had persevered with the new economic policy.

It is important to stress at this point in our investigation that although the proclaimed aim of Glasnost' with its alternative thinking and re-evaluation of formerly forbidden or semi-forbidden names in the history of Soviet and Russian thought and literature is Pluralism, we have so far been able to identify the same antithetical pattern of thinking which was characteristic for the previous epoch.

When dealing with the intermediate period between the Brezhnev era (1985/86) and the proclamation of Glasnost' and Perestroika (1986/87), and when discussing the outline of alternative thinking in history and economics, we encounter only a bi-polar antithetical grouping. This does not allow us to admit the existence of the so-sought after Pluralism in the intellectual climate of contemporary Soviet society.

So far we have been able to distinguish two groups of antithetical thinking that are characteristic of the Gorbachev era: Russian patriots versus "obshchechelovecheskoe" in literary criticism and publicistics, and "determinists" versus "alternativists" in the sphere of economic debates lead by Soviet historians. Both groups fall into the broader categories of Russophiles and "conservatives" versus Westernists and "pan-humanists". The latter pole on the antithesis represents the officially inspired line, the so-called "proraby perestroiki'", while the first category may be considered to be what was the officially patronised line in the previous epochs. What remains however an unchanged dogma is the tendency to view literature and literary criticism as the sphere of influence of Officialdom, as the medium for creating and transgressing ideological influence. Since economic problems remain the biggest obstacle of Perestroika, and since the Soviet practice has proved itself slow in

producing any positive results, the sphere of ideological change, of literary criticism and publicistics, become increasingly loaded with officially inspired ideological responsibilities. The "nadstroika" is being changed before the "basis", which still remains immobile.

One should thus not be surprised to encounter an essentially non-Marxian statement by a literary critic: "a path to a healthy economy lies through the breaking of our *soznanie* (consciousness) and not in a different way" (L. Bakhov and G. Lisichkin, "O polze detskikh voprosov", *Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, V. 9, 1988, p. 4.)

The putting of the Marxian formula "s golovy na nogi" is obviously connected with the trend towards "Russian capitalism", towards admitting the necessity of economic changes of a viable and productive nature. The latter necessitates tolerance towards the West. The trend towards "obshchechelovecheskoe" and "pan-human" values in literature is dictated by economic necessities and the need for economic reforms on the Western pattern.

The following passage illustrates the points made above:

For decades we, historians, literary scholars, theorists, critics, only on words separated ourselves from the heritage of vulgar sociologists, but, in real fact, we were motivated by the schema of the 'stolbovaja doroga', the central path of

Soviet literature. In order to get into this path one had to operate with the two following patterns: with the actualisation of thematics, and with the sectarianly understood realistic style.

Not in vain our press today reminds us of the Stalinist formula, which for many years served as a dogma: "It would be best of all to operate in literature with the concepts of class significance, or even with such concepts as 'Soviet', 'anti-Soviet', 'revolutionary', 'anti-revolutionary', etc."

Today, we proclaim a totally different understanding of the literary process, more forcefully we operate with the concepts "humanism", "pan-human values". (p. 10). (Vl. Piskunov in dialogue with John Malmstad "Po tu u etu storony okeana", *Literaturnoe obozrenie*, No. 9, 1988).

As we have noted earlier, not everything is of an "anti-vulgar sociology" nature in today's pro-Glasnost' literary criticism campaign. It is true that it is not Stalin's dogma which is used as a criterium for the analysis of works of literature. But the fact that literature and art are expected to be actual, and to respond to the needs of the contemporary political and economic situation remains intact. We have the phenomenon of one set of terminologies replacing another, but the final goal remains unchanged. The terminology of the new dogma - "pan-human and humanistic" - has as its aim, in Piskunov, "a coinage of a new way of thinking":

The overcoming of the old stereotypes is reflected in the process of the evaluation of the events of the past. To put it differently, to the reader for the first time is returned native literature in its full, uncut form, which helps to ac-

quire some freedom of spirit, and also helps to form "a new way of thinking" ("novoe myshlenie"). (p. 10.)

As we shall illustrate below, innovative qualities of Gorbachev's treatment of the sphere of literature and art are limited to the polemics against his political predecessors, and not to a view of literature as free of ideological loading. According to Gorbachev:

Ideology and the psychology of stagnation were reflected on the state of things in the spheres of culture, literature and art. Criteria for evaluation of the work of art were lowered. This led to the state of things when, together with the existence of works in which serious socio-moral problems were raised, real life collisions were reflected, a great number of colourless works were published, which did not offer anything either to the mind or to the heart. (Gorbachev's speech in Jan. 1987, Plenum of TSKKPSS, quoted from *Literaturnoe obozrenie*, No. 10, 1988, p. 10).

It is important to note that Gorbachev is not offering a model which would be different either in form or in content from the models offered by his predecessor. Literature and art are judged according to the criteria of their socio-moral "soderzhanie", and are supposed to reflect real life in all its diversity. And indeed, if we compare Gorbachev's statement, quoted above, with the one made by Brezhnev at the 24th Party Congress, we shall encounter the same criteria in the evaluation of art and literature. The ideologue of "stagnation" addressed the functionalist value of literature in the same ideologically loaded way:

With the advancement of our society along the path of communism the role of literature and art is increasing in the creation of the worldview of a Soviet man, his moral convictions, and his spiritual culture. (V. Liukjanov. "Metodologia no rasputie", *Literaturnoe obozrenie*, No. 10, 1988, p. 30.)

The socio-moral aspect remains an invariant in both Brezhnev's and Gorbachev's statements on the ideological role and function of Soviet literature and art. Since the debates on the necessity of pluralism as a basis for the democratisation of Soviet society have been central to literary polemics over the last four years of Glasnost', they unavoidably had to lead to the realisation of the necessity for a new terminology and a new theoretical base. The generally intolerant nature of the dogma of socialist realism could not offer such theoretical keys for the reading of texts open to interpretation in more than "one correct way". And although in reality literary debates and polemics betray the existence of antithetical rather than pluralistic paradigms, the theoretical base for the multiplicity of opinions in literary criticism lies in the process of terminological coinage.

The Journal of the Union of the Soviet writers, *Literaturnoe obozrenie* has in the past few years been offering itself as a tribune for polemics on "bolevye tochki". As a democratic forum which invites two, seldom more participants to express their views in a particular discussion, it has on numerous occasions discussed the problem formu-

lated as "metodologija na rasputje" (methodology at the crossroads). (See V. Lykjanov, *Literaturnoe obzrenie*, No. 10, 1988, p. 30).

On one important occasion, this tribune for the creation and coinage of the new theoretical base which would allow pluralistic thinking in the evaluation of literary texts, was given to a group of prominent academics, namely psychologists. (*Literaturnoe obozrenie*, No. 10, 1988, pp. 83 - 87).

These scholars appealed to Vygotsky's theory of the interdependence of thought, language and society, according to which society influences thought and language, and language is defined as a social phenomenon. They once more accorded first place to the sociological function of literature. Vygotsky's linguistic-philosophical theories sociologise the metaphysical and idealistic in literature, and help to define sociological functionalism as the major aspect of literary writing. If Vygotsky's theory of language as a social phenomenon reconfirms once more the notions of actualisation, environmentalism and sociologism as major aspects of literary writing then Bakhtin's and Lotman's structuralist concepts of "polyphonism" and "cultural multifocusism" are being offered as methodological support for "alternative" (pluralist) thinking.

Let us look at some concrete examples of the methodological search conducted by this group of academics. In connection with the sociological functionalism of literature and Vygotsky's theories of language, we find the following tendentious Marxist elaboration:

In the new circuit of the development of our society, literature, having regained its authentic function of social forecasting reality and social constructionism, proved to be a leader of all the social sciences...

Vygotsky says: "thought is not expressed in a word, but is being realised in a word, as well *as does the soul*. It is born in society, and is materialised in the deeds and behaviour of separate individuals". (A. Asmanev, *ibid*, No. 10, 1988. "O kazhdom i obo vsekh", p. 83 - 84).

There is a strong need for professional methodology of dealing with such material which functions in culture, which would be based on Vygotsky's ideas. (V. Sobkyn, *ibid*, No. 10, 1988, p. 85).

The theoretical base for pluralistic concepts in literature is also loaded with the same strong sociological connotations, where the cultural multiplicity of the text is replaced by its social multiplicity, with the orientation on various classes in society:

Existence in culture of various layers (*plastov*) of artistic texts, meant for different strata (*sloyov*), created *polyphony* in social consciousness. Yu. M. Lotman wrote, that one chapter of *Evgenii Onegin* was meant for one reader, another chapter - for a different reader, i.e. for a true understanding of this work it is necessary to achieve an understanding of a different point of view. For a long time we had to deal with the texts which were meant to be single-focused, and which presupposed an interpretation from a single point of view. Today into our

cultural reality are being introduced such texts, which suggest multifocused approaches. Literature presents an opportunity to teach the art of dialogue. This is very important nowadays. (V. Sobkin, *ibid*, p. 84).

It is clear, that by "multifocused texts", which are now being "introduced" into literature, V. Sobkin means "formerly unpublished texts", as distinct from the "single focused" texts, which are to be understood as the literature of social realism. The seeming tolerance of pluralistic "poliphonism" and "dialogism" of the suggested methodology in actual fact presupposes an ideological preference for the "dialogue". If the main function of literature in today's Soviet society is sociologism, and if theoretical definitions of polyphonism, language, thought and cultural multiplicity are limited to the borrowings from the works of Marxist scientists and theorists, then the disposition of forces in a dialogue are determined from the beginning. And if we remember that the trend of alternative thinking proclaims itself to be an opponent of determinism, then the authenticity of the alternative pluralistic trend needs to be put in question for the second time in the present investigation. If the analysis of Soviet literary criticism dealing with the concrete literary texts, demonstrated the existence of only two conflicting opinions in the early stages of the Glasnost' and Perestroika campaign (1986 - 1987) (patriotism versus pan-humanism, Russophilism versus "obshchechoveskoe"), then the theoretical and terminological

debates in the field of literary criticism in the later stage of Perestroika (1988) also prove to be antithetical rather than multi-fold (i.e. social realism versus the *rest*).

The introduction into literary debates of formerly unpublished works of Russian and Soviet literature, the works which fall into the category of "the rest" in the antithesis mentioned above, has been a landmark in the intellectual territory of Gorbachev's reforms. Intended to build Gorbachev's popularity amongst Soviet and Western intellectuals, the publication of formerly unpublished texts has also brought a subscription boom for a number of literary journals and magazines (thus resulting in a marked improvement in the financial aspects of literary journalism).

We have been able in our investigation to identify the main ideological trends of official literary criticism between 1986 until the present. These are based on the antithesis between a Slavophilic, nationalistic and anti-Western orientation (which characterised the preceding epochs), and, on the other hand, the promotion of "Russian capitalism", i.e. a pro-Western orientation.

The latter, we demonstrated, runs parallel with the economic policy under *Perestroika*. The harmonious coexistence of literary scholar-

ship with contemporary Soviet historiography, which has as its aim the re-evaluation of socialist economics, to be achieved through "alternative thinking", makes the aims and tasks of the publication of one set of formerly forbidden texts clear.

The economic inspirations of Bukharin, which included his views against collectivisation, which lie at the centre of the present rehabilitation campaign, are also substantiated by his "pan-humanistic" and generally enlightened cosmopolitan views on literature. His speech at the First Soviet Writers Congress is being quoted as a manifestation of today's "obshchechelovecheskij" mood. Thus, in an article "Razmyshlenija o Pervom siezde Sovetskikh pisatelej" (*Voprosy literature* 10, 1988), we find the following account of Bukharin's speech on poetry (in which he proclaimed Pasternak to be "the first poet" who succeeded Majakovskij), in which the pan-human and humanitarian connotations of Glasnost' ideology are particularly apparent.

Meanwhile Bukharin gave a lecture on poetry. He said that our people were coming into the political arena more passionately and more wisely and demanded on all fronts a higher and more complex approach to literary production, including the poetical creation. Now the period when it had been possible to pass under the semi-ironical slogan "Even if they are covered by snots, they are ours" ("Khot' sopliven'kie da svoi") was already over. We now needed the courage and boldness to put forward true, universal criteria for our art and poetic cre-

ation. We have to catch up with and overtake Europe and America in mastery. We have to lay claim to this.

Bukharin referred to St. Augustine, who taught that evil exists only in order to emphasise good. Bukharin quoted from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in English, turning the attention of the Congress to the poetics of the Indian scholar Anandavarkhani; he talked about the ancient Chinese poem of Sykun Tu - "Categories of verse", and explained the inspiration of the Great Dao and the magical interpretation of some Arab philosopher. And finally he went over to the poetry of Nicolai Gumilev.

The name Gumilev put the audience somewhat on the alert, inasmuch as he had been shot by the Cheka as a White conspirator and counter-revolutionary. But then Bukharin went over to Bal'mont, to Bely, about whose poetical form Mayakovsky had said shortly before that it was white, with epaulettes. (P. 98.)

If re-evaluation of the economic history of the Soviet Union is achieved through the rehabilitation of the names and works of Bukharin, Rykov, Zinoviev and even Trotsky, and through the final discreditation of Stalin and Stalinism, then the publication of literary texts from the period of the interparty struggle of the 1920's and the 1930's becomes a logical continuation of the anti-Stalin campaign. But how "new" is the trend? After all, during the 1960's and 1970's a number of writers made a career out of introducing an "official dose" (cf. with Marietta Chudakova's term "dozirovshchiki") of anti-Stalinist criticism. And isn't it true that the whole group of "derevenshchiki" were constantly preoccupied with economic problems and sharply criticised in their writings the collectivisation of peasants in the 1930's? Thus the publication of the works of

Stalin's victims, such as Mandelshtam and Akhmatova, or of the grotesque satires on socialism, such as *Master and Margarita* and *My*, which are now being interpreted as anti-Stalinist, can be seen as the ideological part of Gorbachev's anti-Stalin campaign.

Politically transparent motives for the publication of some of the formerly unpublished Soviet texts explains the unpopularity of Gorbachev amongst a number of prominent literary critics and publicists. Gorbachev's open polemics with the Brezhnev era (dubbed as the "period of stagnation"), which negates all the intellectual achievements of the 1960's and the 1970's, has been challenged by some less conformist literary critics. In the famous "Kolokol'nyi zvon-ne molitva" (*Novyi Mir*, No. 8, 1988, pp. 232-245), Alla Latynina, a highly reputable critic, goes as far as proclaiming that the publication of the Encyclopedia dictionary *Miphy narodov mira* (Myths of the world's nations) during the Brezhnev era is no less an important intellectual achievement than the publication of formerly forbidden texts. She defends "the period of stagnation" also on the following grounds: "During the Brezhnev times the fear, described in B. Yampol'ski's novel *Moskovskaja Ulitsa* was unknown" (p. 236).

A "conservative" voice can also be heard when it comes to the opinion that the village writers who, it is often said today, paved the way

to Perestroika by pointing out "bolevye tochki" of the Russian rural existence, have been neglected. A strong call for the return into literature of "derevenshchiki" is expressed in the recent article "Knigi F. Abramova perechitannye segodnia" ("The books by F. Abramov reread today") (*Voprosy literatury*, 8, 1989):

Much of what is written at the moment about the so-called "returned literature", to the full extent (as in a particular case) relates also to the literature that was published, but had for a long time in one way or the other been subjected to official attack, persecution or adapted falsifications.

A totalitarian regime is totalitarian, for the very reason that everything in it is shaped and determined, but a certain quota is left to free thinking. Nobody can say what exactly it is and who, among the authors proclaiming the main ailments in the life of society, will draw the lucky ticket, but it does exist. It is needed in order to enable people to always on occasion exclaim: "But we are democrats! ... Look ...". A blind eye is on rare occasions turned on this strange quota of the talented and brave and they are squeezed through the narrow mesh of the censor's net. One of them was Feodor Abramov.

Besides, the "admitted" literature of critical social problematics had for a long time been a "Zolushka" of well-meaning pseudo-civic public literature. Today it has become the course for reward and triumph for the former "persecuted", as well as "returned" literature. This must be seen in conjunction with the fact that the former shadow of the political opal here too frequently conjures up some aberration of the critical viewpoint.

To use the expression which Yuri Trifonov loved to repeat: literature is not "a workshop of carpenters". The value of each talent is to be found in its originality. And the meaning of spiritual reform which outlives the country lies, among other things, there in that the artistic events of the recent past are to receive a fair evaluation even without concession and with the same social acuteness and topicality that it was evaluated with yesterday, and on the same progressive, improved

role that they used to play. Now it is necessary to evaluate not only that that *was*, but also that that it has *become*.

What purpose would it serve if, under the banner of perestroika, one figure for likely praise were to be replaced by another? As a literary phenomenon Abramov is surely of great significance, and without embellishment. (P. 113.)

At the same time, a prominent and highly active literary scholar, A. Bocharov, who as we noted serves as an ardent advocate of *Perestroika* in literary criticism, sees in the publication of formerly unpublished literary works a manifestation of democratisation. Bocharov openly admits the ideological function of the new trend, and predicts a decline in the popular interest in the historical and ideological values of these publications:

As regards publications from the archives, it seems that in the second half of the next year (cf. 1989), this wave will slow down. The fact of the matter is that these materials are a fact of our contemporary social life, one of the most valuable manifestations of *Glasnost*'. The moment they will become a part of our "literary heritage", and not an act of the rehabilitation of historical injustices and of evaluation of our past, their stream will dry out naturally. And really, who else besides a narrow circle of experts can be concerned about a new publication of editorial verses of N. Gumiliov, V. Khodasevich or a story by A. Bek, A. Platonov, Ye. Zamiatin? ("Zhurnaly v fokuse mnenij", *Literaturnoe Ohozrenie*, No. 1, 1988, p. 99.)

Remarkable here is the acknowledgement by a literary scholar of the degree of manipulation present in the interpretations of formerly forbidden texts. It is worth stressing that Bocharov uses the names of the 20th century writers who were invariably associated with the

Soviet period, and some of whom in the earlier stages of Glasnost' were marked as doomed for their ideological irrelevance to the new era. Thus, for instance, the highly controversial name of Zamiatin is mentioned in an article of early 1987, where his novel *My* is dubbed "beznadjezhno ustarevshey" ("hopelessly archaic") since it is full of "distrust in the humanistic nature of revolution and of unsolvable misanthropic views on the world" (V.V. Buznik, "Mera Klassiki - Gumanism" (O chuvstve Novogo v sovremennici literature i kritike), *Russkaja literatura*, No. 3, 1989, p. 7.). When finally *My* was published it was predictably interpreted in the spirit of alternative thinking, as a pamphlet on the historical phenomenon of Stalinism, and not on socialism per se.

The "conservators" opinions vis a vis "proraby perestroiki" in interpretation of "belye piatna" of Russian literature of the Soviet period are particularly interesting as reflected in the material devoted to *Doctor Zhivago*.

In the process of evaluation and interpretation of "returned names", the name of Boris Pasternak is the most sensational. The history of the publication of *Doctor Zhivago* alone can constitute a case for a full length monograph. Used as a first manifestation of Glasnost', this novel has encountered not only an euphoric reception, but also

a certain resentment and even opposition at the hands of literary critics of various political sympathies. The reasons for resentment seem significant. It lies in the attempt to make a martyr, a true "narodnyi poet", out of an elitarian writer, who came from the intelligentsia and was an "intelligentsia" himself, by today's intelligentsia of an elitarian brand, such as Andrej Voznesenskij. Voznesenskij set up a *Commission of the Legacy of B.L. Pasternak*. At its first meeting, held on February 12 1987, i.e. two days after Pasternak's birthday, "his portrait as a young man, done by his father, was decked with fresh Georgian roses. Everybody spoke profoundly and from his own deeply felt experience". The commission passed as a first unanimous resolution that the 1958 resolution of the Union of Soviet Writers expelling Pasternak should be rescinded. On February 19, 1987, the Secretariat of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union rescinded the 1958 resolution of the Presidium of the same Board expelling Pasternak from membership of the USSR Writers' Union. Interviewed by Irina Rishina of *Literaturnaya gazeta*, Voznesensky made the following telling points about the commission's first resolution and the Secretariat's reinstatement of Pasternak as a member of the Writers' Union:

The Secretariat's decision is both a joyful and a sorrowful event. It has become possible only in recent times, and it is a victory of new thinking. Behind these few lines one sees the world of Boris Pasternak, that boundless continent of culture

- there is almost no intellectual sphere that was not touched by the great artist: poetry, prose, essays, letters of philosophic depth, the elements of music, translations from the Georgian, a Russian-language "Faust" and an almost complete translation of Shakespeare. His legacy is encyclopaedic.

The Commission on the Legacy of B.L. Pasternak includes such unique figures in our country's culture as academician D.S. Likhachyov, who many times helped his works to succeed, M.L. Leonov and Mikhail Ulyanov. There is Svyatoslav Rikhter, under whose masterly fingers Chopin sobbed from the keyboard of Neigauz's piano during the poet's funeral in Peredelkino. "Chopin's mournful melody floats like a stricken eagle" - it floated above the thousands-strong crowd of those who had come to say farewell, among whom there were so pitifully few writers. Alas, this was an example of the duplicity that was current then, of a "double standard", when some people whispered enthusiastically about the poet at home but stigmatized him from the speaker's rostrum and could not even bring themselves to say good-bye.

From the fourteen points raised at the commission's first meeting, Vožnesensky mentioned that the Secretariat of the Writers' Union would be requested to publish *Dr. Zhivago* in the Soviet Union as well as a complete collection of Pasternak's works; that a museum be created in Pasternak's old dacha at Peredelkino; that Pasternak readings be held in the dacha two or three times a year. (In its issue of June 3, 1987, *Literaturnaya gazeta* reported that the first Pasternak readings were held in the auditoriums of the Gorky Institute on the 30th and 31st of May, 1987); that an exhibition of "Pasternak's world" be organised; that UNESCO be requested to declare 1990 as Pasternak year, and that a street or square be named after Pasternak.

The comments made by Voznesensky about Pasternak, the man and his work, are worthy of being quoted in full:

I think that the story of the novel *Doctor Zhivago*, which served as a pretext for his expulsion, is an example of an era when openness was forgotten, when people had to stigmatise a work without having read it. However, our people, most of whom were born after the Revolution and stood firm during the war, have the right to read everything and make their own judgements about everything. We who have breathed the air of openness find it difficult to believe that most of the responses amounted to this: "I haven't read Pasternak's novel, but I think ...". I think that the publication of the novel will perplex many people: what was he expelled for? It's a poetic novel, a psychological autobiography. As a young man, I heard every page of it from the author's lips, as he read it in installments to his friends - Vs. Ivanov, A. Akhmatova, S. Rikhter, G. Neigauz, V. Asmus - the pages are permeated with the subtle music of feeling. In 1948 Pasternak wrote in a letter: "This hero is meant to represent a kind of mixture of me, Blok, Yesenin and Majakovskij, and when I write poems now, I always write them in the notebook of this man, Yury Zhivago".

I would also like to mention St. Lesnevsky's speech. He said that the people must be told about everything that B.L. Pasternak did for our literature: about his depiction of V.I. Lenin, about the fact that he created an epic of the Revolution and how Gorky assessed this and how Majakovskij loved him. About the fact that Pasternak was one of the founders of the Writers' Union and a participant in the International Writers' Congress in Defence of Peace and how his devotion to the homeland was displayed during the Great Patriotic War. He always sought out the new and burned with desire to participate in the people's life in the forms that were characteristic of him. In the extremely difficult situation that developed around him, he conducted himself with striking dignity. I could add my own evidence and arguments to what St. Lesnevsky said so fervently and convincingly, because I knew B.L. Pasternak well, thought a great deal about his fate, and even tried to help him in the troubles that befell him.

I always looked up to him, always saw him as a poet of genius. It's very difficult to talk about B.L. Pastenak - it's like

talking about music. My meetings with him were a special page in my life, without which it would have been much poorer. I made his acquaintance in 1926. From his house ... you can see the Peredelkino cemetery where he is buried, and from his grave you can see the house. I often visit Boris Leonidovich's grave. There are always flowers there. The people bring them. He is a people's writer, and he had a people's funeral.

The building of a "narodnyi poet" out of a refined representative of the Russian intelligentsia goes together with the re-evaluation of figures such as Bukharin and Trotskij under Glasnost'. In the article "Razmyshlenija o pervom sjezde sovetskikh pisatelej" (*Voprosy literatury*, 10, 1988), Bukharin is remembered for calling Pasternak "pervyi poet", thus passing Majakovskij's official title on to this refined and learned poet, rather than to Demjan Bednyi. Bukharin's cosmopolitan spirit and knowledge of foreign languages and culture are being praised, parallel with his appreciation of real poetry, such as Pasternak's and Gumilev's.

In *Voprosy literatury* (1989), in the memoirs on the First Congress of Soviet Writers, we find:

So who then is the leading poet after Majakovskij?

The number one poet appeared to be Boris Pasternak.

It was an insult, as Boris Pasternak did not know life. He could not know it on account of his haughty aloofness. When a delegation of the subway construction crew appeared on the stage to greet the congress (a splendid delegation consisting

of beautiful young men and women with hammers over the shoulder), Pasternak walked out of the presidium he was a member of and took this heavy, long tool away from a blond, graceful young girl, in order to lighten her heavy burden. The girl did not give it to him. The hall burst out in uproarious laughter, because Pasternak did not know life. The hall thundered with laughter, all voices fell simultaneously and Pasternak started to laugh with them at the same time. He did not know and could not know that the victorious revolution had elevated the Soviet woman and girl above the prejudices of the past, and no hardship was too difficult for them when it was a matter of participating in the building of a new life in any field the Party had determined. Pasternak did not know the place of the poet in the working order.

But in order not to offend other poets too much, Nicolai Ivanovich said that against the background of the capitalist ("marazm") and unhealthy eroticism, and a pessimistic lack of restraint and cynicism, we create a vigorous, optimistic poetry full of the joy of life, which is fundamentally united with the victorious march of millions and which reflects huge creative outbursts, the struggle and the building of a new world.

The lecture did not please those poets who united them with the victorious march of millions. They were offended because Gumilev and Pasternak were praised. They were indignant at Bukharin's frivolity at a time when the class struggle was intensifying. (P. 100.)

The "konjunktura" qualities of the Pasternak campaign brought to life the not very enthusiastic interpretation of *Doctor Zhivago*. The "cool" treatment which *Doctor Zhivago* received at the hands of such critics as Pavel Gorelov (*Voprosy literatury*, V. 9, 1988) can be given two main reasons. Either, like Alla Latynina, Gorelov resents the "sensationism" attached to "Pasternak's case", or, more interestingly, as in the case of the occasional defence of Fedor

Abramov and "derevenshchiki", the critic resents the "pan-intelligentsia" mood of Pasternak's campaign.

Gorelov, in his criticism of *Doctor Zhivago*, reverses a method characteristic of Soviet literary criticism: using the antithesis "soderzhanie-forma" he chooses to criticise the novel on the grounds of its weak "forma", but praises "muzhestvo" and "chestnost'" of this book. The result of this inversion is manifested in a diminished significance of *Doctor Zhivago*. Gorelov structures his article as polemics with the main points of Likhachov's interpretation of the novel. If Likhachov's main idea is to "neutralise" the ideological aspects of the novel by stressing the "tolerant", "observant" nature of Zhivago who, by the nature of his profession ("vojenvrach") has to remain neutral to the conflicting sides, Gorelov argues for a more "definite", militant position, and rejects the very concept of "tolerance". Through this debate one can easily perceive signs of a struggle between "pluralism" and "pan-humanism" of Perestroika, brought out of Pasternak's text by D. Likhachov. The old, militant, antithetical thinking characteristic of Soviet literary criticism of the pre-Glasnost' times has made its return in the interpretation of *Doctor Zhivago*.

The anti-intelligentsia undercurrent of Gorelov's interpretation of *Doctor Zhivago*, successfully interwoven with its aim to diminish the significance of the novel, can be illustrated by the following extract from his article:

Zhivago in all of his changes and evolutions is a typical intelligent. Like Pierre Bezukhov, Dmitriy Nekhliudov And of course he is not "national" ("ne narodnyi"), but (I do not like this word, but cannot choose a better one), an individual, so to speak, an intelligent singleton ("intelligent-odinochka"). This is not meant as a reproach, but we have to be honest till the end. D.S. Likhachov writes about "high intelligentnost'". This intelligentnost' is solid, but rather typical and average at the same time. (P. 65.)

Knowing that the canonised definition of the classics in Russian literature is "bezvremennost'", Gorelov diminishes the novel's significance on the grounds of its "nesvoevremennoe pojavlenije":

Unlike the works of A. Platonov and M. Bulgakov, this novel had to appear "in time", in its time ("v svojo vremia"). Pasternak himself understood it, and awaited, awaited, a timely publication. Today this novel - sadly - is an act of personal courage of Boris Leonidovich, a fact in the history of our literature, an event amongst journalistic publications, but - as obviously is the case - it is not a fact of artistic truth ... This truth as is known does not age and does not die." (P. 67.)

To what extent the resentment evoked by *Doctor Zhivago* is motivated by feelings of opposition towards "konjunkturshchiki" of Perestroika is manifested in the following "liricheskoe otstuplenie" in Gorelov's article:

Nowadays emerged, as if they grow from the ground, experts on the questions: "how one should write in the Glasnost' times". Everybody is being taught anew. One thing is strange: it is they, the very same ones, who taught and advised, and knew too well "how to write in the times of stagnation". And they taught and advised. In the very same newspapers, as now, and with the very same equal success "restructured themselves". They will always exist, whatever happens, and they will always be restructuring themselves. Till such time this restructuring will continue, until we will not start structuring a new simple and stable structure. (P. 69.)

Gorelov's article is published in the volume of *Voprosy literatury* together with another two articles by V. Vozdvizhenskij and G. Gibian (the latter in Russian translation). Vozdvizhensky takes a pro-Perestroika stand, with definite cosmopolitan moods in evaluating the symbolism of Russia in the novel. Gibian's article is devoted to the "Jewish question" as reflected in the complex projection of Leonid Pasternak's views on the uniqueness of the Jewish nation by Boris Pasternak onto the Russian intelligentsia.

In a "posleslovije" to the three articles the editorial board, under the signature "Otdel Sovetskoj literatury" rather tendentiously brings out the dimensions of the question of "nationalities" as reflected in the three articles under discussion.

In the discussion on Boris Pasternak's novel *Doctor Zhivago*, three points of view are expressed: two opposing ones and one unexpected.

Knowing the novel's content, the history of its creation and the history of its publication, knowing its author's fate, one could presume that the socio-moral questions will be raised, but in real fact the discussion evolved around the "question of nationality". Simply speaking, at the centre of attention appeared an argument on how *Russian* is Pasternak's novel. In Gorelov's view, the book is non-Russian, brought to life by the "fear of the loss of national identity". V. Vozdvizhenskij argues: the "Russian national artist" had nothing in common with this sort of fear; his novel grew on a totally different soil. But according to the views of the American literary scholar, G. Gibian, the book is "superrussian", Pasternak's views "slavophilic", and the book has overtones of "Russian messiansim".

One has to admit that these debates are dictated not so much by the book itself, as by the contemporary situation and the time of the discussion. National problems today are particularly important ("ostry"), even painful, but it seems they were of far lesser importance to the author of the novel than for its commentators today." (P. 128.)

Under the seeming "objectivity" of this anonymous commentator to the debates around *Doctor Zhivago*, the undercurrent of exaggeration of the "nationality" question is obvious. After all, the choice for placing articles in the volume of *Voprosy literatury* was made by the very same editorial board who authors the commentary. An attempt to demonstrate "pluralism" in bringing diverse opinions on one controversial subject, like *Doctor Zhivago*, is in agreement with the main ideological trends of Glasnost' - as inserted "from above". The antithetical disposition of "konservatory" and "proraby Perestroiki" falls into the categories of "Russian", "patriotic" versus

"panhuman", and "pluralistic" in evaluation of this most sensational, formerly forbidden Soviet text.

c) Evaluation of formerly forbidden 19th century writers

The re-evaluation of formerly unpublished texts is not limited to 20th century literature. We addressed earlier the issue of changes in the interpretation of Goncharov's novel. Far from being one of "the forbidden works", this novel, sanctified by Lenin's reading of it, which suggested "Oblomovism" to be a disease which was shared both by upper and lower classes of Russian society, has been now used for promoting Gorbachev's economic reforms a la "Russian capitalism".

At this point it is important to stress that what concerns us here is not the mere fact of the reinterpretation of the literary texts. After all, it has been part of "the anomaly" of Russian literature and literary criticism from at least the end of the 18th century to turn the pages of literary periodicals into an arena for economic and socioeconomic debates. Already at the time of its publication, the same *Oblomov*, we may recall, received the most diverse interpretations, from the revolutionary democratism of Dobroliubov on the one hand, to the aesthetical purism of Druzhinin on the other. What concerns us here is rather an attempt to isolate a particular ideological trend, characteristic and peculiar for a given period in time, namely the period of *Glasnost'* and *Perestroika*. And indeed, on the

basis of the analysis conducted so far - which has included examples of the formerly unpublished texts of the Soviet period, and accepted texts of the 19th century classics - it appears possible to isolate a leading dichotomy between the patriotism of "the conservatives" and the adherents of the times of "stagnation" on the one hand, and the pan-humanism and "obshchechelovecheskie tsennosti", with an accent on economic "Russian capitalism", of the supporters of Gorbachev's politics on the other.

The final part of the investigation will be conducted on a second set of examples: formerly forbidden 19th century classics and canonised figures of the Soviet literature. We might recall that while analysing the rehabilitation of Dostoevsky's religious and metaphysical views of the Brezhnev era we demonstrated that Soviet literary scholarship was using the names of "the most unpublished" 19th century conservative thinkers and writers, K. Leontiev (1831-1891) and Rozanov (1856-1919).

Since their full work was never republished after the revolution, K. Leontiev and Rozanov may be taken as symptomatic of the degree of rehabilitation which such work has received under the latest *Glasnost'* and *Perestroika* reforms. For this reason they have been chosen to illustrate the treatment of formerly unpublished 19th cen-

ture writers. As an example of re-evaluation which the canonised Soviet classics have received under Glasnost', the work of Maxim Gorkij is chosen. Gorkij's place in the hagiographic line of Soviet classics as the father of socialist realism makes him a perfect and obvious choice for the study of the re-evaluation of this group of writers.

The names of K. Leontiev and V. Rozanov occupy a unique place in the history of Russian literature and intellectual thought. Mentioned and quoted almost always as a pair, neither belonged to a school or left disciples either in Russian or in European intellectual thought. Their atypicality in the field of Russian 19th century intellectual life lies in their advocacy of aesthetic principles in the evaluation of the philosophy of history and the philosophy of religion. In the all prevailing moral and ethical attitudes towards the problems of human existence in the era of Russian realism, when "accursed questions of the Russian boys" were judged only from the angle of ethical relevance, Leontiev was working on the principle of "aesthetic immoralism" as a driving force in human history. When the eschatological visions of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy were breaking away from natural sciences towards the ethical and moral problematics of the immortality of the soul and resurrection, Leontiev was building his theory of determinism by evaluating human history on the pattern

of the life of an organism in the biological sciences. As fatalism and determinism is a leading force in the life of organic matter, which is destined to flourish, deteriorate and finally die, so human societies also go through three stages of development, with destruction and death at the end. Thus, European history went through three stages of development. The societies of Periclean Greece and the absolutism of Louis the XIV, with their poeticised social diversity and poeticised social injustice, were followed by the era of "unified simplification" of bourgeois Europe. The era of "srednij evropeets" (a middle European) is the era of the final death of European civilisation, which can be counteracted although only for a short period, by monarchic Russia which should be "frozen" in order to delay the unavoidable process of decay and death.

It is our luck that we are presently at the stage "in Werden", and are not standing *at* the top of a hill, like England, *next* to the top of a hill, like the Germans, and, even more so, have not started to descent from the hill, like the French. (Vol. 7, p. 23).

The way towards the achievement of the isolation of Russia from the uniformity of European capitalism and bourgeois justice lies in the preservation of social contrasts through the strengthening of the monarchy and an asceticised Russian Orthodox faith, where the Church receives the status it used to have in Byzantium.

The genres in which Leontiev expressed his views are diverse; they include novels, historical tracts, and literary criticism. In his highly acclaimed literary criticism, his aesthetical principles for the evaluation of the work of art have acquired dimensions of ideological polemics against "obnosky naturalnoi shkoly Gogolia", with its accent on moralisation, on "tasteless and crude" detailed imitation of "reality". Leontiev's literary criticism (he is best known in the West for his work on Tolstoy and Dostoevsky) stands for the analysis of what he calls not only "what is written", but "how it is written", and therefore is in a unique opposition to the Belinsky inspired socio-economic literary criticism.

Rozanov, Leontiev's sole open admirer and an acknowledged advocate of his views on the philosophy of history, is often dubbed as an incarnation of the Dostoevskian type of the "man from the underground". As author of numerous controversial statements, which were meant to shock and offend his contemporaries, he stood aside from both the utilitarian camps of revolutionary democrats and populists on the one hand, and esoteric decadents and symbolists on the other. If the main object of criticism and hatred of Russian literature from Gogol' to Chekhov in its realist stream and Fet to Gippius in the sublime one, was "meshchanstvo" in all its variance, then it took Rozanov to poeticise everything ordinary, banal, like "a cucumber on a June day

with a shot of dill on it", to become a "genius of obyvatelshchina". Rozanov, as a literary critic, is known, as well as Leontiev, for his anti-Gogolian concepts, for his opposition to the Gogol school of Russian literature, where the Gogol school equals socio-economic criticism of reality. According to Rozanov, starting already from Radishchev, Russian writers were involved in a task in comparison with which "Akakij Akakievich's '*chistopisanie*' exercises were more useful for the society". Rozanov's final judgement of Russian literature (made in *The Apokalipsis nashego vremeni*) consisted of a verdict that it was due to the destructive role of Russian writers and literary journalists that the Russian revolution took place. Russian writers from Radishchev and Novikov, as well as literary critics and publicists, all "these Hertzens and Belinskys", paved the way to the demoralisation of the public spirit, and made impossible creative work for the Russian tsars.

Thus, both Leontiev and Rozanov stand as epitaphs to the conservative stream of Russian intellectual thought. As writers and literary critics they made statements on the role of literature and literary criticism in Russian society which were unacceptable both to the "self-censored" writers amongst their contemporaries and later to the official Soviet literary criticism. Their work was never republished

in the Soviet Union, although their names had come up occasionally in a negative context, as was demonstrated earlier.

However, interest in the literary judgements made by both Leontiev and Rozanov have always been present amongst "formalistically" inclined Soviet literary figures, such as B. Eichenbaum and V. Shklovsky, and it is debated that Mandelshtam, who devoted an essay to Leontiev "*V ne po chinu barstvennoi shube*", was influenced by his "*naturalist-biological*" views. And indeed, it is Leontiev's and Rozanov's literary criticism which inspired a few works of Soviet literary scholars in the late 1960's and 1970's. There appeared only one work devoted to Rozanov during the Brezhnev era: "V.V. Rozanov i ego mesto v literaturnoi bor'be epokhi" (*Voprosy literatury*, No. 2, 1975), by A. Latynina, the controversial author of "*Kolokol'nyi zvon-ne molitva*" (1988, *Novyi Mir*), and two works devoted to K. Leontiev as a literary critic in the 1970's (P. Gaidenko "*Naperekor istoricheskomu processu, Konstantin Leoniev - literaturnyi kritik*", in *Voprosy literatury*, No. 5, 1974, and S. Bocharov "*K. Leontiev o russkoj literature*", in *Kontekst 1977*, M. 1978).

If we compare the situation of the Brezhnev era research on Leontiev and Rozanov to the situation under Glasnost', then we discover that interest in these two writers still centres around their literary

criticism. But there is a shift from the theme of Leontiev's and Rozanov's affinity with the Slavophiles, and from Leontiev's hatred of the European bourgeois uniformity, towards Leontiev's differences from the Slavophiles and his general Westernism.

Let us look now into the concrete examples of the interpretation of the two main themes (role of literature and literary criticism and the Russia-West dichotomy) in the works quoted above. Under Glasnost' there has appeared only one work on Rozanov (V. Erofeev, "Rozanov protiv Gogolia", *Voprosy literatury*, No. 2, 1987), and none of his work has so far been published. One work by K. Leontiev, his *Analiz, stil' i vejanie*, was published with a preface by Bocharov in *Voprosy literatury*, V. 12, 1988 and V. 1, 1989, and in an article in "Literaturnaja Gazeta", 14 April, 1989.

The work on Leontiev and Rozanov of the 1960's and 1970's is marked by the critics openly admitting the two thinkers' ultra conservatism. The explanation for the necessity to conduct any research on Leontiev and Rozanov was based on the fact of their popularity in Western literary scholarship. The reason for the popularity, in turn, was explained by a general rise of interest in anti-humanist and misanthropic theories in the Western world. Both articles of the

1970's on Leontiev and Rozanov use the thinkers' popularity in the West as a reason for addressing the issues of their writing.

In the article on Leontiev we find the following attack, typical for pre-Glasnost' times, on bourgeois culture:

Among those who attract the close attention of the representatives of bourgeois culture, one can encounter the name of the Russian reactionary philosopher and publicist K.N. Leontiev - a founder of an original aesthetical, if one can say that, apology of violence. An analysis of the ideological trends of the past, which in a certain way anticipated today's ways of thought, allows us today to understand better the *social* roots and philosophical sources of important trends of bourgeois culture, bourgeois aesthetics and cultural sciences, *against which we are leading an irreconcilable ideological struggle today*. This is why a critical analysis of "spiritual heritage", which was left to contemporary bourgeois ideologues by such colourful personages of the "bourgeois drama" as Marquis de Sade and Konstantin Leontiev, are becoming today an actual task. (Gaidenko, *ibid*, p. 161.)

A. Latynina's article on Rozanov is devoted to a discussion of the writer's attitude towards the role of Russian literature and literary criticism in the socio-political developments in 19th century Russian society. The article abounds with Rozanov's unflattering statements against Russian writers and publicists, and the writer's general anti-intelligentsia mood of the "Vekhovian" brand is evident. A prevailing theme of the article is to prove that Rozanov, although he made attacks on the socio-political preoccupation of the writers

of the "otritsatel'nogo napkavlenija", himself used literature as a means to change and influence "the reality".⁴

A. Latynina concludes her article with the following statement of actualisation:

We can say today that it (rozanovshchina) does not fit into the confines of one epoch which brought Rozanov to life, and that its (rozanovshchina's) social nature is permanent. (p. 106.)

The two articles abound with Leontiev's and Rozanov's anti-European statements, and with expressions of sympathy with their dislike of the "srednij evropeets".

Putting Leontiev's and Rozanov's alliance to the school of Russian Slavophiles under a considerable degree of doubt occupies a prominent place in both articles in question. Slavophilism is viewed as much too liberal a concept for Leontiev's and Rozanov's separatist tend-

⁴ It is important to note that Rozanov was not opposed to treating literature as reality, and he is not entirely out of the Belinsky trend of social literary criticism. See, for instance, Piatigorsky's "Philosophy or literary criticism", where he states: "Neither Belinsky nor Rozanov was an external observer of literature, of course. Nor was Rozanov's mightiest adept, Andrej Siniavsky ... it was under the impact of Belinsky's pronouncement that Gogol's destiny unfolded outside of literature itself, and Siniavsky's scrutinising symbolico-mythological analysis in *V teni Gogolia* stands not far from Rozanov's initial statements." (Ibid, pp. 236 - 237.)

encies for isolating Russia from "evropeiskaya zaraza". A defence of Slavophilism as a less conservative form of thinking in comparison with Leontievan views is reinforced by quoting the most conservative out of all Leontiev's statements. "We have to freeze Russia at least for a short while, so that it does not decay". In Gaidenko we find:

It is not surprising that Leontiev could not find a common language with the Slavophiles. He himself wrote about it: It (Slavophilism) seemed to me already then too egalitarian and liberal in order to be able to separate us, the Russians, from the newest West. This is one thing. Another side of this teaching, which I did not trust, and which is closely connected to the first one, was a one-sided morality. This teaching I did not find appealing, both in its stated wisdom and in aesthetics. (p. 176).

If Leontiev's and Rozanov's conservatism, we might recall, served as a means of decreasing the degree of Dostoevsky's religiousity, then the comparison with the Slavophiles serves here as a means to liberalise Slavophilic teaching, so popular during the 1970's with the Officialdom. The work of Leontiev and Rozanov, not published during Soviet times, is cited in scattered quotations from the pre-revolutionary editions. A prominent place in "scattered" Leontievan criticism is occupied by the open polemics with the West, which in at least one instance acquired a form of personal attack on Western scholars. Thus, in the midst of Slavophilic polemics in the late

1960's on the pages of *Voprosy literatury* and *Voprosy filosofii*, directed against a notorious Chalmaev, the author of "Inevitability" (*Molodaja Gvardija*, 9, 1969), we find the following example of Leontievian criticism:

In Chalmaev's article praise is given to the Patriarch Nikon, and the writings of the double-dyed reactionary Konstantin Leontiev are cited, that very same Leontiev whose views even I. Aksakov dubbed as "an impassionate cult of the stick", that very same Leontiev who thought that one must "freeze" Russia, and that one must "ask the czar to hold us a bit more threateningly". Isn't it better to leave this occupation to the Zenkovskys and Losskys, who for some time have been uttering the religious hysterics of the Slavophiles, their propagation of humility and submission for the true development of the "Russian soul", and the "revelations" of Konstantin Leontiev for the expression of national wisdom. (S. Pokrovsky, "Imaginary riddle" ("Mnimaya zagadka"). *Voprosy literatury*, V. 5, 1969, p. 127).

With the publication of formerly unpublished authors as a part of Gorbachev's Glasnost' campaign, the names of Leontiev and Rozanov started to be mentioned as outsiders to the Russian cultural heritage, abandoned and forgotten during the Soviet times.

In the cultural heritage context the names of Leontiev and Rozanov came up in an interview given by V. Rasputin in *Knizhnoe obozrenie* (No. 14, 1 Aug. 1988). Rasputin, a writer of a nationalist and slavophilic affiliation, who criticised anti-Stalinist *Deti Arbata*

for "poshlost' na konchike pera", offered the following list of "forgotten thinkers":

At present a number of unjustly forgotten names are being returned to our literature. It would also be desirable to do the same with our national philosophy and to recall the work (let it be "vyborochno" (selectively) to begin with) of Vasiliij Rozanov, Konstantin Leontiev, Vladimir Solovjev, Lev Shestov, Nikolai Berdiaev, etc. This would raise our intellectual consciousness. (p. 8.)

In Rasputin's offer of "selective" publication of thinkers of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century, one immediately recognises the Plekhanovian formula "otsiuda i dosiuda", "from here up to here", which has been a leading method in the treatment of the cultural heritage of the past. Even the work of canonised (for the methodology of socialist realism) writers, such as Gorkij's, has not been published in full, and we shall address the issue of the "opening of the lid" on the necessary thematics of Gorkij's writing as a final stage of our investigation.

As far as "otsiuda i dosiuda" in the interpretation of Leontiev and Rozanov during Glasnost' is concerned, there appeared one publication of Leontiev's work, his literary criticism of L. Tolstoy, *Analiz stil' i vejanie o romanakh Gr. L.N. Tolstogo*,; none of Rozanov's works have been published.

The theme of the role of literature and literary criticism in Russian society, which was a much-discussed aspect of Leontiev's and Rozanov's work in Soviet literary scholarship in the 1970's, has remained intact, but it has received a new interpretation. The Slavophilic affiliations of the two writers have also received a new interpretation, characteristic for the prevailing tendency towards "pan-human values" ("obshchechelovecheskie tsennosti"), understood during the last two or three years in terms of cultural and economic affinity with the West.

If the main idea of the article on Rozanov in the 1970's was to demonstrate his views on Russian literature and literary figures as a destructive force which paved the way to the Revolution, and to demonstrate Rozanov's general anti-intelligentsia moods, then in the article of 1987 ("Rozanov against Gogol'", in *Voprosy Literaturny*), Rozanov's disappointment with the Russian peasants and the simple folk is being emphasised.

In the period of "alternative thinking", when the cruelty and terror of the years of the Revolution and of military communism are being interpreted as undesirable, when the image of Perestroika as a "bloodless revolution" is being promoted in the press, when the shift from populism to sympathising with the intelligentsia has occurred

as a manifestation of Glasnost', in this context the shift of emphasis from Rozanov's dislike of the Russian intelligentsia towards his apocalyptic vision of the destructive role that the Russian populace will play in Russia's history, acquires the usual and typical (for Soviet literary criticism) critical ideological dimensions. In V. Erofeev's 1987 article we find the following shift from the Slavophilism and anti-intelligentsia attitude of A. Latynina's paper of 1975 towards Russia's disappointment with its people:

He (Rozanov) - as a witness to the Revolution - discovered that the people whom we find acting in the Revolution as an active force, do not correspond to that fairytaleish and God-fearing *narod*, which was idealised by Rozanov in his four points (see above). The Slavophilic image of *narod* has turned out to be a myth. *Narod* was not what it was supposed to be. (p. 169.)

A similar shift towards the actualisation of the cultural heritage has occurred in the evaluation of K. Leontiev's writing. His views as a literary critic, which have always been highly esteemed by Tolstoy and Dostoevsky scholars, have been praised in a short preface to his *Analiz, stil' i vezhanie* by S. Bocharov. This preface stresses the affinity of Leontiev's formal analysis to the literary theorists of the 20th century, and a need for an influential study of Leontiev's work is expressed (*Voprosy Literaturny*, No. 12, 1988). Thus, from the point of view of the choice of theme and genre in Leontiev's and Rozanov's writing, not much has changed from the 1970's - when their

views on literature and literary criticism received evaluation in a few articles. The shift occurred in the "rehabilitation process", which is marked by the actualisation and emphasising of one aspect of his thought, and the down-playing of an undesirable aspect of the thinker's heritage.

In Leontiev's case this is best demonstrated by the most quoted example of his conservatism, the citation on the necessity to "freeze" Russia in order to save it from "the decaying influence" of the "newest Europe". This phrase, we might recall, was extensively cited in the debates around Slavophilism in the 1960's and the mid seventies.

In 1988, as one of a series of articles on the history of Russian philosophical thought which appeared in "Literaturnaya Gazeta" (here, a number of short informative articles on the life and work of such Russian thinkers as V. Soloviev and P. Florensky appeared in succession in October and November of 1988 and January and February of 1989), there appeared an article on Leontiev in which the author addressed, in a conspicuously colloquial style, the following question to the reader:

How should we understand Leontiev? When he was dying in November 1891 in the rooms of the monastery's hotel, he really

hardly thought about Bizantinism and a "triunite process". Should we today think about them? What can he offer us? And we are in search, we are in a great need. We are poor, do not understand the situation we are in, and everyone asks a question "What has been happening to us?" Let the thinker of the past explain to us. (p. 5.)

An openly utilitarian actualisation of the Leontievian cultural heritage as a means for his rehabilitation in this popular non-academic article acquires a rather unattractive connotation.

A popular rehabilitation of Leontiev goes as far as to reinterpret his statements on the necessity of "freezing Russia":

Leontiev spoke about conservation, defence, but he was heard as a lackey of the throne, and his tongue would go numb. He wanted to say, but did not know *how*, that the problem is not caused by the enemies of the monarchy, but that the planned project takes over in life. (p. 5.)

The "holistic" rehabilitation which was characteristic of the Brezhnev era (which we demonstrated in the example of official Dostoevsky scholarship in the 1970's and early 1980's) is applied to K. Leontiev's writing in a blunt and somewhat crude fashion. Leontiev's most reactionary views, which the reader has not yet been able to consult in the original writing, are being now presented as subject to misinterpretation, and therefore mistakenly taken for reactionary. The methodology of explaining the ideological meaning of

thoughts and utterances as something that, had it been expressed differently, would have had a different meaning, has been applied by the official Soviet literary criticism through the decades. Lifted from Lenin's articles on Tolstoy, it is still used in Glasnost' times for the interpretation of undesirable motifs and problematics.

The same old interpretative device of reducing a person's conservatism though comparison with "a real conservative" is to be encountered in the further rehabilitation of Leontiev:

It would be possible to understand an eccentric (chudak) willing to extend the process of florescence. For such an embalment Leontiev was too sober-headed. *It was Konstantin Pobedonostsev*, an old maiden, that hoped to freeze Russia, but in vain. (Ibid, p. 5.)

As Leontiev's ascetic monastic Christianity served as a means to rehabilitate Dostoevsky's "pragmatic religiousity", now the figure of Pobedonostsev is brought to life in order to rehabilitate Leontiev's separatism and historic determinism. Since the process continues *ad infinitum*, one wonders whose figure will be brought to life when and if the time comes to rehabilitate Pobedonostsev's (or Arakcheev's) views on the state and politics. If Rozanov's rehabilitation, which took place in the article of a journal with an intellectual readership, attached anti-populist meaning to Rozanov's apocalyptic views of socialism and revolution, then Leontiev's attitude towards

socialism, meant for a broad readership without special training, received the "holistic" rehabilitation by means of a complete distortion of the original sources.

Leontiev's deterministic views on the unavailability of the final death of any social, political and cultural entity (where death equals socialism), are being used to prove that Leontiev understood "neizbezhnost' socializma" in a Marxist fashion:

Looking thoroughly into the changes in the society, which less and less preserved its foundations, Konstantin Leontiev in the XIX century saw that socialism is inevitable and that it will turn out to be an unprecedented trial (nebyvaloye ispytanie), but that a human being does not have any other worthy solution, but to cope with yet another ordeal (nadryv).

It seems that only now we are beginning to hear Leontiev's word in all its extent (razmakh), fearless and tranquil in its trust (doverie) in Russia, which will catch on to (naletu podkhvatit), will understand everything and everything will pull through (vytianet). (p. 5.)

Not only the content of such a "holistic" interpretation is offensively incorrect, but so is the abundance of colloquialisms which were chosen to convey the content. The evaluation of the views of one of the most refined stylists of Russian literature, and an ardent opponent of "zlovonnye obnoski gogolevskoi shkoly", in colloquialisms and imitations of peasant speech in the Russian real-

ist novel, is as offensive and tasteless as the popular rehabilitation itself.

At this point we may conclude that the re-evaluation of formerly forbidden 19th century Russian thinkers and writers in the figures of Leontiev and Rozanov under *Glasnost*' is pursued with the methodology of Plekhanov's formula "*otsiuda i dosiuda*". This makes possible the interpretation of the work of art in extracts, and allows one to form opinions without consulting the original text in its full form. This leads to a free interpretation of a text by official literary criticism.

In relation to the main trend of interpretation of the group of formerly unpublished 20th century Soviet writers and the group of 19th century ideologically neutralised and accepted classics, the process of interpretation of the third group is at present in a less developed stage. However, the third group bears a "family resemblance" with the two groups discussed at an earlier stage of our investigation.

This third group bears the influence of "alternative thinking" in the case of the evaluation of Rozanov's apocalyptic views on the destructive nature of the Russian revolution and the violent nature of the Russian peasant. This aspect they have in common with the pre-

vailing trend of interpretation with the first group of writers. And as far as the resemblance in the interpretation of the second group of writers is concerned, they have in common a shift from Slavophilism and Western phobia. Since the work of the third group has not been published yet in any form (besides Leontiev's essay on Tolstoy), they are easily subjected to "holistic interpretation" (which, we might recall, Dostoevsky's writing underwent in the 1970's and early 1980's).

This holistic approach towards Dostoevsky remains unchanged under Glasnost'. Thus, for instance, an article on Dostoevsky's politics, authored by an American scholar and ambassador to the USSR, Jack Matlock, a Russian translation of which was published in *Voprosy literatury*, 7, 1989, is accompanied by an article by a Soviet Dostoevsky scholar, L. Saraskina. If Matlock traces links between Dostoevsky's downfalls, such as chauvinism, antisemitism, and territorial messianism ("Konstantinopol' dolzhen byt' nash") and the external politics of the USSR under Brezhnev, then Saraskina counterposes these views, labelling Dostoevsky as "velikij gumanist", whose spiritual heritage will help to serve mankind, which is in a great need of his writing (p. 65).

If in the 1970's and early 1980's, Dostoevsky's Shigalevs and Verkhovensks were treated as his prophecies of German fascism and white African colonialism, then today they are interpreted as a Stalinist phenomenon:

Russia's future was predicted by Dostoevsky with a frightening power of premonition. Russia became that very same country for the experiment, of which Shigalev and Verkhovensky dreamt. This "dream" was realised on a scale, in the XX Century, which could be predicted only by Dostoevsky: on a scale of "a hundred million heads". (P. 67.)

Just as the "holistic interpretation" of Dostoevsky resulted in a blurred image of the writer, the constructed images of Rozanov and Leontiev under Glasnost' are undergoing a process of rehabilitation which results in the distortion of their views, which are in crucial opposition to dialectic and historical materialism. In this respect the process of interpretation is identical to the methodology of the "holistic approach" of official Soviet literary scholarship in the Brezhnev era.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

d) Reinterpretation of the Soviet classics

The fourth group of writers to be isolated - the classics of Soviet literature - are also being re-evaluated under Glasnost'. In spite of his status of the founder of Socialist Realism, and of a classic of Soviet literature, which he has enjoyed in the history of Soviet literature, Maxim Gorkij's writing has been subjected to a process of re-evaluation in accordance with the new demands of contemporary ideology.

In an interview given by a Soviet academic, Vl. Piskunov, to John Malstam, it was stated that in the process of Perestroika and Glasnost', changes taking place in the field of literature also include the re-evaluation of the classics of Russian literature of the Soviet period:

Apart from the rehabilitation of forgotten names, I see a new source for the revitalisation of our artistic vision: that of the *new way of reading of old books*, those books, which long ago entered the *arsenal* of Soviet literature, but up till now were apprehended superficially, and were cut in their true meaning. Gorkij and Mayakovsky suffered especially in this respect. (*Literaturnoe obozrenie*, No. 9, 1988.)

As a major event, Piskunov quotes a planned publication of Gorkij's article "Dve dushi" ("Two souls"), in which Gorkij makes his assessment of the "Sushchnost' russkogo naroda", the nature of the Russian

nation. At the same time in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth issues of *Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, Gorkij's "Nesvoevremennye mysli", ("Untimely thoughts"), is published, which first appeared in "Novaja Zhizn'" in 1917/18. Both from a thematic and chronological point of view, the choice of publications from Gorkij's archive has a certain interest, since this choice signifies a process of adaptation of Gorkij's writing to the latest ideological and socio-economic developments under Glasnost' and Perestroika.

Gorkij's journalistic polemics with the anti-humanitarian and violent forms which the 1917 revolution had taken, conducted by him on the pages of "Novaja Zhizn'" in 1917 and 1918, are being quoted now in support of "alternative thinking". His statements of a general humanitarian nature are being quoted in support of Perestroika as a means of democratising society, and passages employing the "term" "Glasnost'" have been broadly publicised.

Here are some examples of the ideological actualisation of Gorkij's statements of 1917/1918, based on the parallelism between the times of the October Revolution and the contemporary revolutionary reforms of Perestroika. The shift of accent is from violence to "peaceful revolution" by means of reforms:

Gorkij thinks that Revolution has acquired such forms which contradict its inherent humanitarian ideals. He is convinced that both forms in which it develops, and methods in which it is conducted, do not correspond to the democratic principles of socialism, of morality, of humanitarian ethics. (I. Veinberg, "Vo imia revoliutsii i kul'tury", *Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, No. 10, 1988, p. 92).

The parallelism with the main essence of "alternative thinking" expresses itself in the advocacy of a dividing line between "ideal socialism" and the "real form of socialism", i.e. the Soviet reality. Ideal socialism could have taken place, if it was not for the circumstances (i.e. the interparty struggle in which the evil people - Stalin, Kaganovich, etc. - took over).

Openly actualised are the following statements on "Glasnost'", in which the term is used as part of Gorkij's political terminology:

A free press is a precious achievement of *Glasnost'* and it has to be based on the foundation of truth (pravda), and the truth, insists Gorkij, always has healing qualities (ibid, p. 26);

and later

Gorkij, who considered *Glasnost'* to be a powerful means of democratisation in a society, in the Post-October period impassionately and determinedly stands for freedom of speech, even if it stands in contradiction to the ruling ideology. (Ibid, p. 96).

The latter serves as an advocacy of "pluralistic" thinking, the concept which is being introduced to the contemporary society under

Perestroika. Earlier analyses based on the examples of the re-evaluation of the former three groups of writers showed that pluralism in real interpretation acquires a form of antithetical opinions on the pages of official literary criticism. The content of the antithesis is based on contemporary Slavophilic, nationalistic and patriotic sentiments on the one hand, and "pan-human" and "obshchechelovecheskie" values on the other, with the stress on the necessity of economic changes according to the Western pattern.

The split between the adherents to "narod" values on the one hand and the proponents of "intelligentsia" values on the other, can be identified as a significant undercurrent of the present day debates around all four groups of writers isolated by us. Thus, Rozanov's statements against "dark narod" are being reinforced, Bukharin's cosmopolitanism and educated erudition of a true "intelligent" are being promoted, while, at the same time, "conservatory" have issued a call for the return of "the village prose" values (i.e. rereading Fedor Abramov) and, in a parallel fashion, the plays of A. Ostrovskij are being returned into the repertoire of Moscow theatres for their "koloritnost'" and "samobytnost", for their addressing a problem of "svojo" and "chuzhoe", "natsional'noe" and "ino-natsional'noe" in Russian culture.

In T. Moskvina's article "V sporakh o Rossii. A.N. Ostrovskij. Sud'by klassiki" ("In debates around Russia. A.N. Ostrovskij. Fate of classics") in *Teatr*, 10, 1989, we find the following actualisation of Ostrovskij's plays based on the antithetical disposition "narod" - "prosveshchenie":

About Ostrovskij? - today? Yes, and obligatory. We need the whole complex of thoughts on Russia without any fragmentations ..." (p. 39).

But a few passages later this "holistic" stanza is changed into the "dividing" approach:

Such themes, as "foreign inside the native" and "alien within the national" ("chuzhoe v svojom" and "inonatsional'noe v natsional'nom") are developed [in Ostrovskij's plays] steadily and comically ...

Love to the foreign ("chuzhoe") is explained by attraction to education, culture, enlightenment. (P. 41.)

The author of the article concludes that it is the portrayal of the "glavnye protivorechija", the main contradictions, of the Russian national character which paved the way to the immortality of the nineteenth century's dramatist in today's Russia.

The same antithetical disposition is present in the return into the repertoire of *Taganka* theatre of B. Mozhaev's play *Zhivoj*. Mozhaev's

doubtful martyrdom (Liubimov's staging of *Zhivoj* was banned by Furtseva twenty one years ago) is being promoted in order to reinforce the trend of thought, promoted by "conservatory", that the "village prose" writers deserve the status of "vozvrashchennaja" literature under Glasnost'. *Zhivoj* is being staged with the decoration consisting of the Orthodox Church with its golden onion domes and with leafless birch trees on stage, and a balalaika and a volume of *Novyi mir* placed on the stage, at the same time, as a symbol of "intelligentsia" appreciating the values of the Russian peasant and his 'malaja rodina'. (See interviews with B. Mozhaev, "Chem shchi hlebat'?", Vl. Zolotukhin's diary extracts "Den' shestogo nikogda" and V. Gulchenko's "Znaki prehinanija" in *Teatr*, 7, 1989.)

The same "intelligentsia" - "narod" dichotomy is vividly expressed both in the choice of extracts of publications from L. Trotsky's book *Literatura i revoliutsia* (simultaneously published in *Teatr* (in July 1989) and *Voprosy literatury* (in August 1989)) and in the comments to these extracts. V. Rogovin in his "poslesloviye" to Trotsky's articles published in *Teatr*, 7, 1989, points out the problem of intelligentsia in Trotsky's work, which he calls the problem of "higher echelons" of the Russian culture. Echoes of the present day polemics with "derevenshchiki" are vivid:

Trotsky stresses the falsehood of juxtaposition: land-machinery, village-city, since the old archaic peasants' work can be juxtaposed only to a big wheat factory. This is why the trend to aestheticise the old village looks archaic, and an approach which juxtaposes an organic, wholesome, "national" village to the "extravagantly spending city" is historically reactionary. (P. 83.)

In the preface to the publication of Trotsky's article "Intelligentsia" from his book *Literatura i revoliutsia in Voprosy literatury*, 8, 1989, by N. Trifonov, we encounter the same "intelligentsia" versus "narod" theme:

In the second part of Trotsky's book, where some of Trotsky's pre-revolutionary articles are published, a special article is devoted to the theme of "intelligentsia". The open anti-intelligentsia mood of this article is apparent. The author of this article states that "intelligentsia did not transform its words into deeds" and that the Russian intelligentsia's place in the history of the world ideas was only one of an absorber; it lived as a hanger on, and did not make any original contribution to the kingdom of the world culture". (P. 187.)

Thus, in the light of the "intelligentsia" and "narod" debates, it does not come as a surprise that the evaluation of Gorkij's "Nesvoevremennye mysli", published for the first time in 1988, is used as a platform by the followers of the "intelligentsia" values to reinforce the anti-"narod" moods of Gorkij's work.

Gorkij's mistrust in the Russian peasant, his views on his cruel and barbaric nature - all that which members of today's *Pamyat'* platform

and thinkers like Igor Shafarevich call "Russophobia" - the supporters of the pro-intelligentsia trend (which often equals pro-Perestroika) are brought out in the interpretation of "Nesvoevremennye mysli".

In the *Novyi mir* article devoted to the publication of "Nesvoevremennye mysli" (in Volumes 10, 11 and 12 of 1988 *Literaturnoe obozrenie*), "K. Gor'komy - edinomy i tselomu" (Towards a whole and unified Gorkij) we find:

"Nesvoevremennye mysli" by Gorkij is an example of national self-criticism, a very "Russian" phenomenon in its essence. The most powerful places in this pamphlet are not the ones in which he attacks "anarchist-communists and phantasiers from the Smolnyj" ... but the most powerful places are the ones which are full of national self-rejection. (P. 252.)

The author of this article shifts Gorkij's accent from the cruelty of the revolution combined with the cruelty of the Russian peasant, who makes this revolution to the accent on "Russophobia" and Chaadaevesque self-hatred. The latter allows him to make statements, rehabilitating Gorkij's attitude towards the revolution. The result of this interpretation is a "edinyj Gor'kij" who accepted the revolution:

Of course, the writer believed in revolution. But he understood it not simply as a political revolt, but as a cultural event. (P. 252.)

A usual anti-Stalin stanza has also penetrated into this interpretation of formerly unpublished texts, this time, however, against the principle of historicity and without taking chronological accuracy into account:

The famous pamphlet by Gorkij takes us to the very foundations of Stalinism, opening a new perspective on the image of the cult of personality which has become somewhat casual by now.

What did Stalin mean against the background of such people as Lenin, Trotskij, Zinoviev, when he only started showing his teeth as a national commissar on nationalities? No wonder Gorkij does not mention his name in his pamphlet. But one is left to admire the writer's gift for historical vision, when he in June of 1918 gave a psychological portrait of the image of the future tyrant. (P. 249.)

Needless to say, this portrait had nothing to do with Stalin *per se*, and could be applied to any dictator at any time in history and in any nation.

If interpretation of "Nesvoevremennye mysli" is characterised by the "holistic" attempt to unify Gorkij's views on the revolution on the one hand, and by a "dividing" approach when it comes to the problem of "narod" and "intelligentsia" on the other, the latter being one of the important undercurrents of *Perestrojka* debates, then the pub-

lication of Gorkij's "Dve dushi" is interesting as a manifestation of the same "dividing" approach.

The planned publication of Gorkij's "Dve Dushi" ("Two Souls") also fits perfectly into the established prevailing dichotomy of two conflicting opinions on the path for the reforms in Soviet society. "Dve dushi" is one of the most controversial of Gorkij's attempts to give a psychological and historical description of the nature of the Russian psyche. At the time of its publication (1917), it evoked criticism from both the right and left and even resulted in a parody (*Nerazberikha* ("Confusion"), Je. Chirikov (1917), in "Russkij narod pod sudom Maksima Gor'kogo" ("Russian people under Maksim Gorkij's judgement"). Gorkij's main thesis is that the Russian soul consists of two conflicting elements: of an Eastern, or negative part, and of a Western, or civilised and positive part. This thesis was found to be weak and schematic by critics from the camp of the intelligentsia (Plekhanov, Burtsev) and obscure and philosophical by the proletarian readers (see "Pri svete zdravogo smysla", Ye. Chirikov (1917), "Under common sense's light").

In "Dve Dushi" we find:

We have two souls: one comes from a nomad-mongol, dreamer, mystic and a lazy bone, and next to this powerless weak soul

lives the soul of a Slav, which can catch fire quickly and brightly, but can't burn for long, and turns down quickly, and which is not capable of defending itself from poison, cultivated within it, and which continues to paralyse her (soul's) powers. (Ibid, p. 12).

Further, Gorkij turns to the archetypal inherent image of Russian inertia in the image of Oblomov and the type of superfluous men, created by Russian realist literature, and claims that "oblomovshchina" is a characteristic feature of all the classes of the Russian nation. To the Eastern part of the dichotomy, Gorkij ascribes both the phenomenon of Eugenij Onegin and Oblomov, Russian sectarianism of "Bogoiskatel'stvo" and "strannichestvo", "skopchestvo" and "khlystovstvo" and the problem of alcoholism. All these "Eastern features" hinder the development of the "Western soul", which equals enlightenment, education, material well-being, and general cultural pursuits.

Furthermore, in "Dve dushi", Gorkij makes an attack on Russian patriotism, which he qualifies as a manifestation of the "lackey nature" of Smerdiakov or of "krepostnoj rab Firs", and makes statements on the reactionary nature of "natsional'noe samoopredelenie".

The choice for the publication of "Dve Dushi" from Gorkij's archives, signifies more than a mere manifestation of Glasnost'. "Dve dushi" presents a fierce attack on Russian nationalism, on "kvasnyi" patri-

otism, and speaks on the necessity of going along the cultural and economic path of Western civilisation as the only way for the future development of Russia - all of which has been the essence of Perestroika reform. The publication of formerly unpublished material is meant to be a sign of the democratisation of society, a manifestation of tolerance towards diverse ideological thought and opinion, and more importantly, to signify the presence of Pluralism in the society under reform.

The choice for the publication of Gorkij's archival material not only shows that it is made to suit the needs of contemporary ideology, but also confirms our earlier schema of antithetical dichotomy, and not of pluralism, as the prevailing trend in official literary criticism.

At the time of the ideological shift from the Russian, patriotic and "spiritual" values towards the recognition of the necessity of economic reform, along "material" Western lines, Gorkij's most "Chaadaevesque" work has been pulled out of oblivion. This allows us to establish an unexpected line of similarity in interpretation between the formerly unpublished 19th century reactionary classics (Leontiev, Rozanov, Chaadaev) and the canonised classics of the Soviet period.

But there is a constant figure in the history of Russian literature and literary criticism, whose image has remained unshaken during the whole history of Soviet literary criticism, including the times of Glasnost' - the figure of N. Chernyshevsky. Not only at the time of the all-prevailing dominance of Party dogma, but also at the times of "thaw", Chernyshevsky, a founder-figure of the socio-economic tradition of Russian non-academic literary criticism, has been an emblem of the fundamental principle of Soviet literary criticism, and has remained a leading ideological advocate of socio-economic, political and ethico-moral trends of contemporary reality. Thus during the thaw of the 1960's, even in Tvardovsky's *Novyi Mir*, his hagiographic status was unaffected. A. Lebedev's paper "Sud'ba velikogo nasledia" ("Destiny of the Great Heritage") in *Novyi Mir* 1967, dealt with the ideologically canonised cultural heritage at a time of relative journalistic freedom (for instance, Bulgakov's novel *Master and Margarita* was first published in the Soviet Union).⁵

⁵ On the misinterpretation of Bulgakov as an enemy of the New Economic Policy of the 1960's and 1970's, and his later rehabilitation as a critic of military communism under Glasnost', see M. Chudakova "Mikhail Bulgakov i Moskva" in "Sovetskaja Kul'tura", 9 September 1989.

Chernyshevsky's image served as a reminder of the duties of Russian literary criticism, whose long-established tradition was to serve the nation, to help solve social and ethical problems of human existence, and not to limit its interests to the sphere of pure art and aesthetics.

The struggle around Chernyshevsky's heritage is aimed at resurrecting the pure, idealistic, revolutionary-democratic principles. His name is being connected with the name of Lenin in the debates around the actualisation of *Chto delat'*? for Perestroika. In the recent article with the characteristic title of "Rereading Chernyshevsky" (*Voprosy literatury*, V. 8, 1988), the author V. Serdiuchenko laments that

An unbiased view on things forces us to admit that Chernyshevsky's novelistic heritage is not experiencing its best times today. This heritage is put into the confines of school and university text books, and those few research papers which are devoted to his works remain outside the broad reading interests of the audience. Is not this honourable silence a proof of unchanging actuality of the great revolutionary democrats' writing? (P. 120.)

In Serduchenko's antithetical disposition between the theoretical and practical forms of socialism, as reflected in the works of Chernyshevsky, one perceives echoes of today's discussion of "alternative thinking" in evaluating the historical process:

Lenin knew that the socialist idea is not a *theorema* born in the heads of separate philosophers-humanists, but that it is to be found in the very midst of the organism of peoples' existence; that this idea can be deduced only with the help of peoples' lives, since, if imposed "from above", it will immediately cease to exist.

With Lenin's departure one of the poles of this process stopped operating. Accumulated social qualities began to be spent on aims which were out of harmony with the needs and the hopes of the majority. The heroic quest for the socialist ideal was gradually formalised in the mass consciousness, and subsequently Chernyshevsky started to lose "his own reader".

Thus, the problem of artistic qualities of Chernyshevsky's texts - is first of all the problem of historical times and the problem of his readers. Those readers who are used to draw aesthetical inspirations out of artistic mastery of the Turgenevian-Goncharovian word, will not even under the recommendation of literary criticism be able to find "the beautiful" in the novelistic engineering of Chernyshevsky. The poetics of his novels consists of socialist logics. (P. 133.)

It thus comes as no surprise that at the peak of Glasnost' in 1988, as a response to the promised publication of Nabokov's *Dar* (*The Gift*), the novel, which contains a parody of Chernyshevsky's personality and his utilitarian aesthetics, according to which reality is superior in form to its pale imitation in the work of art, there appeared an article in defence of Chernyshevsky. A Soviet academic, V. Tunimanov, in his Jubilee article, devoted to the celebration of the 160 anniversary of Chernyshevsky's birth, takes a position of an ideological defender of Chernyshevsky's heritage. According to Tunimanov, Chernyshevsky's image has suffered from misinterpretations, was mythologised, and the distorted image served as material

for Nabokov's grotesque and unjust parody on the writer. The real Chernyshevsky stands as an emblem of moral and spiritual purity, and can continue to serve as a pattern for imitation for the young generation. His martyrdom and years of exile are given as an unexpected parallelism to the sufferings of Soviet poets (i.e. Mandelshtam) in the 1930's, and Alexander the II is dubbed as a lesser tyrant than Stalin. This is an example of how "alternative thinking" can be applied to historically irrelevant material. More importantly, it demonstrates that the process of re-evaluation and rehabilitation of the cultural heritage of the past, which constitutes an essential part of the *Glasnost*' campaign, has rather clear boundaries, the ones described by Plekhanov as *otsiuda i dosiuda* ("from here up to here"). The content of the boundaries fluctuates, and stands in a dependent relation to the prevailing ideological trends, dictated "from above". And although Gorbachev made a point of separating himself from the policy of giving ideological directions, as practised by his predecessors, messages "from above" continue to be received and advocated by official literary criticism.

To what extent official literary criticism responds in an expected way to the directives "from above" can also be illustrated by the example of the behaviour of the weekly "*Literaturnaja gazeta*", which in March 1987 held a conference under the self-explanatory title

"Kritika v uslovijakh Perestroiki" (Criticism under the conditions of Perestroika), which found the following description in *Literaturnoe Obozrenie*:

Within the walls of *Literaturnaja Gazeta* (in March 1987), a conference on 'The criticism under the conditions of Perestroika' took place. The actuality of this event is obvious, it can also be followed through in the papers made by the participants, who arrived for the meeting from various cities and regions of our country (L. L'vov, *ibid*, p. 37.)

The content of the questionnaire of the *Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, published in the journal's section "Sociological services", combines the prevailing "mirror" methodology of Soviet literary criticism even under Glasnost':

By a tradition coming from the native past, a magazine is first and foremost *a mirror* of a leading literary idea, of a specific social position. Which of our contemporary magazines, in your opinion, express an 'unusual expression of face'? Which magazines have wasted their originality, which have acquired it? (*Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, No. 2, 1988, p. 90).

To what extent both the "mirror" concepts of "reflections" of the "ulcers" of the society and the "influence" concepts of changing society by means of the power of ideological criticism remain intact under Glasnost' can be confirmed by the following two statements of official literary critics. On the "mirror" reflection function we

find in L. Lavlinsky: "The rhythms of renewal - about literary criticism of our days" (*Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, No. 6, 1988, p. 3):

When the press reveals ulcers of society until recently hidden from the people, it is clear that *strictly literary criticism and the problem that has eternally worried it about artistic merit*, is shifted to the background ("second plan") as it were. It is understandable that under these conditions literary criticism, if it wants to emerge from beyond the boundaries of *a narrow circle of specialists*, if it wants to be *necessary to the people*, cannot but be publicistic, i.e. explore through its own means the real processes occurring in reality, and place their meaning together with their *reflection* in literature ...

and the "influence" function is confirmed in the following statement in the article with a self-explanatory title: "Criticism and perestroika" (Al. Mikhailov in *Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, No. 3, 1987):

At present opportunities have opened up in front of criticism not only *to influence* the atmosphere of literary life, but also *to create this atmosphere*. The critic will have to restore and strengthen the shaken faith in it. These are the tasks of the present day.

Taking for a credo the "anomalous" role of literature in Russian society, according to which "in Russia the role of literature has always been different, unique from the literature in the West" (V. Kaverin, *Voprosy literatury* V. 11, 1987, p. 51), official literary criticism openly admits that at the time of slow economic changes, which put Perestroika under threat, literary scholarship became loaded with responsibilities before the changing society:

One can say already with certainty, that changes taking place in our society have mostly been reflected in the sphere of the printed word. The economic reforms have not yet given the desired results. Literary journalism, although with difficulties, is overcoming old fears and the usual self censorship ... Step by step it is becoming an active instrument of Perestroika. (G. Gudkov, B. Dubin, "Journal and its time", *Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, No. 1, 1989, p. 93.)

As an "active instrument of Perestroika", literary criticism continues to serve the same function under Glasnost' as it did in the previous epochs of Soviet history and its main ideological trends remain within the confines of the long established cultural antithetical paradigm, at the base of which lies the eternal struggle of ideologies.

CONCLUSION

Ju. Lotman describes as the main model of Russian culture a dual structure built on the antithesis "new ways" → "old ways". Within this structure there are such categories as

Russia → The West

"true faith" → "false faith"

"knowledge" → "ignorance", etc

This most persistent opposition of the dual dynamics of Russian culture has two deep structures underlying the concept of "new culture". In Lotman we find two models for the construction of the "new culture".

1. The deep structure which evolved in the foregoing period is preserved. But it is subject to drastic renaming, while still maintaining all the basic features of the old structure. In this case, new texts are created while the archaic cultural framework is preserved.
2. The deep structure of the culture is itself changed. But in this process it reveals its dependence on the previous cultural model

since it is constructed by turning the old culture "inside out", by rearranging what has previously existed but with a change of signs. (p. 7.)

This investigation demonstrated that although attempts have been made to introduce pluralism into contemporary Soviet society, the dual antithetical model continues to operate. Not only the structure of the antithesis "old ways" → "new ways" is preserved, but also its semantics is intact; "Russia" → "The West". What marks a distinguishing feature of the Glasnost' times is an inversion in the placing of the positive sign in the value structure of the antithesis. If in the models of literary criticism under Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev, the distribution of "the positive-negative values" within the antithesis was:⁶

⁶ We must keep in mind that during Stalin's, Khrushchev's and Brezhnev's time there were officially inspired turns from the main path towards associating the West with "the new ways", like admitting the technological advancement of the West, but it never went into the sphere of "dukhovnye" values.

+		-
"Russia"	→	"The West"
"new ways"	→	"old ways"

then under Glasnost' the scheme looks as follows:

+		-
"Russia"	→	
"The West"	→	"old ways"
"new ways"	→	

The distributors of the sign values in this investigation are contemporary literary scholars and critics, who are divided into two main camps under Glasnost': "conservatory" and "proraby Perestroiki".

In Glasnost' times, literary criticism remains under the dictate "from above", as it has been in the previous epochs, and in this functional role it has provided a media for promoting a concept of pluralism imposed "from above". This concept however, as was demonstrated in numerous examples, in real fact turned out to be nothing more than an antithetical model with opposing polarities. Pluralism, which has a long tradition in Western cultures, proved to be an alien concept to Soviet culture in general, and literary criticism in particular. Soviet literary criticism of the 19th century, with its "otritsatel'noe napravlenie" (negative tendency), had at its basic structure the antithetical polemical disposition "old ways" → "new

ways", where "Russia" acquires the meaning of "old ways" through the debates of Slavophiles and Westernisers.

The pragmatics of the "old-new" dichotomy, which became archetypal in 19th century Russian literature, was abruptly interrupted and inverted in Soviet literature and its "mirror", Soviet literary criticism, by orders "from above", during Soviet history. The forced meaning of the antithesis where "Russia" equals "new ways", continues to operate in the cultural structure of Perestroika and Glasnost', as it was in the previous epochs in Soviet history. However, for the first time "Russia" was forced into the opposite pole where it equals "The West". If (according to Lotman) culture can be understood as a system of historical and collective memories of the people, then any sign, alien to this culture but enforced upon it, should be rejected by the system. And indeed Glasnost', in spite of its tendentially open Westernism imposed "from above", paradoxically gave birth to a new trend in contemporary literary criticism (through which history and literature meet), the trend of going back to the "most persistent opposition" of Russian culture "old ways" → "new ways", where Russia and the West are situated at the opposite poles of the antithesis, and where "Russia" equals "old ways". In this way the old Brezhnevite "stagnation" model of "village prose" meets with the "conservatory" of Perestroika times on the basis of the first model, where old equals

new. And "proraby Perestroiki" and "ogon'kovtsy" represent the inverted old model whereby through turning the old model "inside out", they rearranged what has previously existed, attaching to it a changed sign value.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ANASTASJEV, N. 1989. Na pravliajushchaja ideja iskusstva (Zametki Zarubezhnika). *Voprosy literatury*. 3.
2. ANDREEV, Yu. 1986. *Glavnoe zveno, ideologicheskie voprosy literatury i literaturovedeniya* Moscow: Sovremeniik.
3. ALIAKRIUSKIJ, O. 1989. Zarubezhnaja literatura XX veka i zadachi kritiki. *Voprosy Literatury*. 2.
4. BAKHOV, L., LISICHKIN, G. 1988. O pol'ze detskikh voprosov. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 4.
5. BASINSKY, P. 1989. "K. Gor'komy - edinomy i tselomy (Politika i nauka)". *Novyi mir*. 3.
6. BIBIKHIN, V. 1989. Konstantin Nikolaevich Leontiev. Iz istoricheskoy russkoj filosofskoj mysli. "Literaturnaya gazeta". 14. April.

7. BOCHAROV, S. 1988. "Esteticheskii traktat Konstantina Leont'eva". Preface to K. Leontiev, "Analiz, stil' i vejanie, o romanakh grafa L.N. Tolstogo". *Voprosy Literatury*. 12.
8. BOCHAROV, A. 1988. Nam nuzhno mnogo istorij. *Voprosy Literatury*. 1.
9. BONDARENKO, V. 1987. Ocherki literaturnykh nraov. Polemicheskie zametki. *Moskva*. 12.
10. BONDARENKO, V. 1988. Razgovor s chitatelem. *Moskva*. 9.
11. BUZHIK, V. 1987. Mera klassiki-gumanizm (O chuvstve novogo v sovremennoj literature i kritike). *Russkaja Literatura*. 3.
12. CHIRIKOV, L. 1917. *Russkij narod pod sudom Maksima Gor'kogo*. *Moskovskoje khigoizdatel'stvo*.
13. CHUDAKOVA, M. 1987. Aktual'nye problemy izuchenija istorii russkoj literatury. *Voprosy literatury*. 9.
14. CHUPRIN, M. 1989. *Kritika eto kritiki*. Moscow: Sovetskij pisatel'.

15. CLARK, K. 1982. Zdanovist fiction and village prose. In BRISTOL, EV. (ed) *Russian Literature and Criticism*. Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialities.
16. CONDEE, N., PADUNOV, V.L. 1988. The frontiers of Soviet culture. Reaching the limits? *Harriman Institute Forum*. May.
17. EGOROV, B. 1969. Problema, kotoruju neobkhodimo reshit. *Voprosy literatury*. 5.
18. ELSBERG, Ya. 1972. Nasledie Dostoevskogo i puti chelovechestva k sotsializmu. *Dostoevsky - khudozhnik i myslitel'*. Moscow.
19. EROFEEV, V. 1987. Rozanov protiv Gogolia. *Voprosy literatury*. 2.
20. *Esli po sovesti* (collective volume). 1988. Moscow Khudozhestvennaja literatura.
21. FINK, L. 1988. Na vernom puti. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 10.
22. FRIEDLANDER, G. 1971. *F.M. Dostoevsky i mirovaja literatura*. Leningrad.

23. GAIDENKO, P. 1974. Naperekor istoricheskomu protsessu. Konstantin Leontiev - literaturnyj kritik. *Voprosy literatury*. 5.
24. GALAKTIONOV, A., NIKANDROV, P. 1966. Slavianofil'stvo, ego natsional'nye istoki i ikh mesto v istorii russskoj mysli. *Voprosy filosofii*. 6.
25. GIBIAN, G. 1988. Leonid Pasternak i Boris Pasternak otets i syn. *Voprosy literatury*. 9.
26. GIBIAN, G. 1982. One drop of politics: art and ideology in the Soviet novels of social inquiry. In BRISTOL, Ev. (ed) *Russian literature and criticism*. Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialities.
27. GLUSHKOVA, T. 1988. Kuda vediot Ariadnina nit'? "Literaturnaja gazeta". 12.
28. GORELOV, P. 1988. Razmyshlenija nad romanom *Doktor Zhivago*. *Voprosy literatury*. 9.

29. GUDKOV, L., DUBIN, B. 1989. Zhurnal i vremia. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 1.
30. GUL'CHENKO, V. 1989. "Znaki prepinanija." *Teatr*. 7.
31. GUS, M. 1971. *Idei i obrazy F.M. Dostoevskogo*. Moscow.
32. HANKIN, R. 1961. Postwar Soviet ideology and literary scholarship. In SIMMONS, E. (ed) *Through the glass of Soviet literature. Views on Russian society*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.
33. HINGLEY, R. 1981. *Russian writers and the Soviet society*. U.K.: Methuen.
34. *Inogo ne dano* (collective volume). 1988. Moscow Progress.
35. IVANOVA, N. 1987. Otsy i deti epokhi. *Voprosy Literatury*. 1.
36. IVASK, Yu. 1974. *K. Leontiev zhizn' i tvorchestvo*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

37. JANKOVSKY, Yu. 1981. *Patriarkhal'no-dvorianskaya utopija*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaja literatura.
38. JANOV, A. 1969. Zagadka slavianofil'skoj kritiki. *Voprosy literatury*. 5.
39. KANTOR, V. 1989. Dolgij navyk ko snu. Razmyshlenija o romane I.A. Goncharova *Oblomov*. *Voprosy literatury*. 1.
40. KAPUSTIN, M. 1988. Dialektika po direktive. *Literaturnoe obozrenije*. 8.
41. KARIAKIN, Yu. 1989. Dostoevskij v kanun XXI veka. *Sovetskaja kul'tura*. 6 April.
42. KAVERIN, V. 1987. Bol'shoj den'. *Voprosy literatury*. 11.
43. KIRILOV, S. 1989. Sojuzy i sojuzniki o chom i kak sporiat liternye kritiki. *Voprosy literatury*. 2.
44. "Kopengagenskaja vstrecha dejatelej iskusstv." 1989. *Voprosy literatury*. 5.

45. KUDRIAVTSEV, Yu. 1979. *Tri kruga Dostoevskogo*. Moscow: MGU.
46. KUNIAEV, S. 1987. Radi zhizni na zemle. *Molodaya gvardiya*. 8.
47. LATYNINA, A. 1988. Kolokol'nyi zvon - ne molitva. *Novyj mir*. 8.
48. LATYNINA, A. 1975. Vo mne proiskhodit razlozhenie literatury. V. Rozanov i ego mesto v literaturnoj Bor'be epokhi. *Voprosy literatury*. 2.
49. LAVLINSKIJ, L. 1988. "Ritmy obnovlenija: o literaturnoj kritike nashikh dnei. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 6.
50. LEBEDEV, A. 1967. Sud'ba velikogo nasledija. *Novyj mir*.
51. LIKHODEEV, L. 1989. "Metafory razmyshlenija o Pervom sjezde sovetskikh pisatelej." *Voprosy literatury*. 10.
52. LJVOV, V. Utverdit' poshatnuvshejesya doverie. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 2.

53. LUKASHEVICH, S. 1967. *K. Leontiev (1831 - 1891): A study in Russian "heroic vitalism"*. New Jersey: Pageant Press.
54. LOTMAN, Yu. 1984. *The semiotics of Russian culture*. U.S.A.: Michigan Slavic Series.
55. LUKJANIN, V. 1988. Metodologija na Rasputie. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 10.
56. MAKASHIN, S. 1989. "Zhizn' v literaturovedenii (iz vospominanij)." *Voprosy literatury*. 5.
57. MALMSTAD, J., PISKUNOV, VI. 1988. Po tu i etu storonu okeana. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 9.
58. MATLOCK, J. 1989. "Literatura i politika: Fedor Dostoevskij." *Voprosy literatury*. 7.
59. MIKHAILOV, A. 1987. Kritika i perestroika. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 3.
60. MONDRY, H. 1989. Anti-semitic trends in Soviet Dostoevsky scholarship of the Brezhnev era. In MONDRY, H. (ed) *The waking*

sphinx. South African essays on Russian culture. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

61. MORSON, G. (ed) 1986. *Literature and history.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
62. MOSKVINA, T. 1989. "Sud'by klassiki. V sporakh o Rossii. A.N. Ostrovskij." *Teatr.* 10.
63. MOZHAEV, B. 1989. "Chem shchi khlebat'?" *Teatr.* 7.
64. NINOV, A. 1987. Tri usloviya kritiki. *Voprosy literatury.* 7.
65. OKLIANSKIJ, Yu. 1989. "Knigi Fedora Abramova perechitannye segodnia." *Voprosy literatury.* 8.
66. OKLIANSKIJ, Yu. 1989. "Perechityvaja Fedora Abramova (k segodniashnim sporam)". *Znamia.* 10.
67. OSIPOVA, E., PUSTARNAKOV, V. 1968. Issledovanije russkogo slavianofil'stva. *Voprosy filosofii.* 7.

68. OVCHARENKO, A. 1987. Rasskazy i povesti Vasilija Shukshina. *Russkaja literatura*. 3.
69. PIATIGORSKY, A. 1982. Philosophy or literary criticism. In BRISTOL, Ev. (ed) *Russian literature and criticism* Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialities.
70. *Pis'ma iz derevni*. 1987. Moskva: Sovremennik.
71. POKROVSKIJ, S. 1969. Mnimaja zagadka. *Voprosy literatury*. 5.
72. RASPUTIN, V. 1988. Bez sovesti, liubvi k zemle ... *Knizhnoje obozrenije*. 14. 1 April.
73. ROGOVIN, V. 1989. "Lev Trotskij. Stat'i o kul'ture." *Teatr*. 8.
74. ROZANOV, V. 1982. *K.N. Leontiev. Pis'ma k Vasiliju Rozanovu*. Nina Karski Press.
75. RZHEVSKY, N. 1973. Leontiev's Prickly Rose. *Slavic Review*. 2. June.

76. SARASKINA, L. 1989. "V koordinatakh ponimanija." *Voprosy literatury*. 7.
77. SELEZNEV, Yu. 1980. *V mire Dostoevskogo*. Moscow.
78. SELEZNEV, Yu. 1986. *Glazami naroda*. Moscow.
79. SERDIUCHENKO, V. 1988. "Perechityvaja Chernyshevskogo. Chernyshevskij chitatel', vremia." *Voprosy literatury* 3.
80. SHAFAREVICH, I. 1989. "Svoistvo khoroshej knigi - budit' mysl'" "Knizhnoe obozrenie". N. 34. 25 August.
81. SHNEIDMAN, N. 1975. Soviet theory of literature and the struggle around Dostoevsky in recent Soviet scholarship. *Slavic Review*. 34(3).
82. SIMMONS, E. (ed). 1961. *Through the glass of Soviet literature. Views on Russian society*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.
83. SIVOKON', G. 1987. Obretenie spetsifiki (literatura v uslovijakh real'nosti). *Voprosy literatury*. 7.

84. SOBKIN, V., ASMAKHOV, A. 1988. O kazhdom i obo vsekh. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 10.
85. STAROSEL'SKAJA, N. 1989. Razmyshlenija o teatral'nom sezone 1987/88 goda. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 1.
86. STRELIANYI, A. 1988. Bolshe vsego ja bojus'. *Moskovskije novosti*. 18.
87. SUCHKOV, B. 1972. K 150-letiju so dnja rozhdenija F.M. Dostoevskogo. Moscow.
88. TODD, M. III. 1987. Sociology and literature. In FLEISHMAN et al. (eds) *Stanford Slavic Studies*. Stanford.
89. TRIFONOV, N. 1989. "Vozvrashchennye knigi. *Literatura i revoliutsija* L. Trotskogo." *Voprosy literatury*. 7.
90. TUNIMANOV, V. 1988. Nejubilejnye razmyshlenija k 160-letiju so dnja rozhdenija N.G. Chernyshevskogo. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 8.

91. URNOV, D. 1988. "Peremeny i mnenija o literature v period perestroiki." *Voprosy literatury*. 6.
92. VEINBERG, I. 1988. Vo imya revoliutsii i kul'tury. *Literaturnoe obozrenie*. 9.
93. VELEKHOVA, N. 1989. "Nad kem smejalsja Erhdman?" *Teatr*. 6.
94. VOLKOV, I. 1987. Sotsialisticheskij realizm - osnovncj metod sovetskoj literatury. *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta Series 9. Philologija*. 6.
95. VOZDVIZHENSKIJ, V. 1988. Proza dukhovnogo opyta (obsuzhdaem roman Borisa Pasternaka *Doktor Zhivago*). *Voprosy literatury*. 9.
96. ZOLOTUKHIN, V.L. 1989. "Den' shestogo nikogda." *Teatr*. 7.

SLAVISTISCHE BEITRÄGE

(1988-1990)

218. Besters-Dilger, Juliane: Zur Negation im Russischen und Polnischen. 1988. VI, 400 S.
219. Menke, Elisabeth: Die Kultur der Weiblichkeit in der Prosa Irina Grekovas. 1988. VI, 309 S.
220. Hong, Gabriel: Palatalisation im Russischen und Chinesischen. 1988. X, 193 S.
221. Kannenberg, Gudrun: Die Vokalwechsel des Polnischen in Abhängigkeit von Flexion und Derivation. Eine generative Beschreibung. 1988. 353 S.
222. Fuchs, Ina: "Homo apostata". Die Entfremdung des Menschen. Philosophische Analysen zur Geistmetaphysik F.M. Dostojevskijs. 1988. 802 S.
223. Thomas, George: The Impact of the Illyrian Movement on the Croatian Lexicon. 1988. 291 S.
224. Filonov Gove, Antonina: The Slavic Akathistos Hymn. Poetic Elements of the Byzantine Text and Its Old Church Slavonic Translation. 1988. XIII, 290 S.
225. Eggers, Eckhard: Die Phonologie der deutschen Lehnwörter im Altpolnischen bis 1500. 1988. IX, 221 S.
226. Srebot-Rejec, Tatjana: Word Accent and Vowel Duration in Standard Slovene. An Acoustic and Linguistic Investigation. 1988. XXII, 286 S.
227. Hoelscher-Obermaier, Hans-Peter: Andrzej Kuśniewicz' synkretistische Romanpoetik. 1988. 248 S.
228. Ammer, Vera: Gottmenschentum und Menschgottum. Zur Auseinandersetzung von Christentum und Atheismus im russischen Denken. 1988. X, 243 S.
229. Poyntner, Erich : Die Zyklisierung lyrischer Texte bei Aleksandr A. Blok. 1988. XII, 275 S.
230. Slavistische Linguistik 1987. Referate des XIII. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens Tübingen 22.-25. 9. 1987. Herausgegeben von Jochen Raecke. 1988. 444 S.
231. Fleischer, Michael: Frequenzlisten zur Lyrik von Mikołaj Sep Szarzyński, Jan Jurkowski und Szymon Szymonowic und das Problem der statistischen Autorschaftsanalyse. 1988. 336 S.
232. Dunn, John F.: "Ein Tag" vom Standpunkt eines Lebens. Ideelle Konsequenz als Gestaltungsfaktor im erzählerischen Werk von Aleksandr Isaevič Solženicyn. 1988. X, 216 S.
233. Kakridis, Ioannis: Codex 88 des Klosters Dečani und seine griechischen Vorlagen. Ein Kapitel der serbisch-byzantinischen Literaturbeziehungen im 14. Jahrhundert. 1988. X, 362 S.
234. Sedmidubský, Miloš: Die Struktur der tschechischen Lyrik zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts. Untersuchungen zum lyrischen Frühwerk von K. Toman, F. Šrámek und F. Gellner. 1988. 291 S.
235. Standard Language in the Slavic World. Papers on Sociolinguistics by Hamburg Slavists. Edited by Peter Hill and Volkmar Lehmann. 1988. 161 S.
- ***
236. Ulf-Møller, Nina K.: Transcription of the Stichera Idiomela for the Month of April from Russian Manuscripts from the 12th Century. 1989. VIII, 245 S.
237. Cienki, Alan J.: Spatial Cognition and the Semantics of Prepositions in English, Polish, and Russian. 1989. X, 172 S.
238. Leithold, Franz-Josef: Studien zu A. P. Čechovs Drama "Die Möwe". 1989. 193 S.
239. Bock, Hildegard: Die Lerntheorie P. Ja. Gal'perins und ihre Anwendbarkeit im Fremdsprachenunterricht. 1989. X, 365 S.
240. Pogačnik, Jože: Differenzen und Interferenzen. Studien zur literarhistorischen Komparativistik bei den Südslaven. 1989. 254 S.
241. Kretschmer, Anna: Zur Methodik der Untersuchung älterer slavischer schriftsprachlicher Texte (am Beispiel des slavenoserbischen Schrifttums). 1989. 255 S.
242. Slavistische Linguistik 1988. Referate des XIV. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens Mainz 27.-30. 9. 1988. Herausgegeben von Wolfgang Girke. 1989. 350 S.
243. Псалтырь 1683 года в переводе Авраамия Фирсова. Подготовка текста.

244. Simeonova, Ruska: Die Segmentssysteme des Deutschen und des Bulgarischen. Eine kontrastive phonetisch-phonologische Studie. 1989. 220 S.
245. Федор Сологуб: Неизданное и несобранное. Herausgegeben von Gabriele Pauer. 1989. XLVI, 282, 4 S.
246. Tomei, Christine D.: The Structure of Verse Language: Theoretical and Experimental Research in Russian and Serbo-Croatian Syllabo-Tonic Versification. 1989. XVIII, 192 S.
247. Fleischer Michael: Strömungen der polnischen Gegenwartsliteratur (1945-1989). Ein Überblick. 1989. 130 S.
248. Heil, Jerry T.: No List of Political Assets: The Collaboration of Iurii Olesha and Abram Room on "Strogii Iunosha" [A Strict Youth (1936)]. 1989. X, 128 S.
249. Davis, Margaret G.: Aspects of Adverbical Placement in English and Slovene. 1989. XIV, 342 S.
250. Götz, Diether: Analyse und Bewertung des I. Allunions-Kongresses der Sowjetschriftsteller in Literaturwissenschaft und Publizistik sozialistischer und westlicher Länder (von 1934 bis zum Ende der 60er Jahre). 1989. X, 244 S.
251. Koschmal, Walter: Der russische Volksbilderbogen. (Von der Religion zum Theater.) 1989. VIII, 132 S., 2 Farbabbildungen.
252. Kim, Hee-Sok: Verfahren und Intention des Kombinatorischen in B. A. Pil'njaks Erzählung "Ivan da Mar'ja". 1989. XVI, 244 S.
- ***
253. Ucen, Kim Karen: Die Chodentrilogie Jindřich Šimon Baars. Eine Untersuchung zur Literarisierung der Folklore am Beispiel des Chronikromans von Baar. 1990. X, 277 S., 6 Farbabbildungen.
254. Zybatow, Lew: Was die Partikeln bedeuten. Eine kontrastive Analyse Russisch-Deutsch. 1990. 192 S.
255. Mondry, Henrietta: The Evaluation of Ideological Trends in Recent Soviet Literary Scholarship. 1990. IV, 134 S.

