



Title	Philologism and Conservatism in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature
Author(s)	Baer, Joachim T.
Citation	スラヴ研究, 16, 125-144
Issue Date	1972
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/5019
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	KJ00000112946.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

PHILOLOGISM AND CONSERVATISM IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE

Joachim T. BAER

解 説

この論文は1970年9月北海道大学文学部における講演で、著者によってその中心的な部分の要旨が紹介されたものである。

エイヘンバウムが指摘した「芸術的フィロロギズム (художественный филологизм)」の系譜にあらためて照明をあて、その歴史的な展望を試みることによって、著者は19世紀ロシア文学史のいわば主流の陰にあったもうひとつの注目すべき流れを見事に取り出して見せた。すべてが「発見」ではないとしても、著者が言うように、ここで問題にされている作家たちを「ひとつのグループとして」明確にとらえて、その言語的、思想的な相貌を論ずるということはこれまで誰もしなかったのである。

講演ではこの流れの上にさらにレーミゾフ、プリシュヴィン等が位置することについても触れられ、著者の構想のパースペクティヴとその有効性を伺わせた。しかし主流との関係、あるいは相互作用においてこの系譜の持つ意味がさらに明らかにされることも必要であろう。今後の研究に期待したい。

(福岡星児)

Breve, however, was a conservative, and furthermore, like all Germans serving in Russia he was especially devoted to orthodoxy, ...¹⁾

In Èjxenbaum's introduction to the *Selected Works of Leskov* (Izbrannye sočinenija) in 1931, we read the following observation:

Leskov appeared on the foundation of an enormous philological labor carried out before him, which had started with Šiškov and Vostokov and included Dal', Vel'tman, Snegirev, Saxarov, Afanas'ev, Bessonov, Katkov, Petr Kireevskij, Konstantin Aksakov and others. All these were not academic scholars but ideologists-dilettantes imbued with the pathos of Slavophilism...

The old philologism served as a basis, on the one hand, for the formation of a new academic discipline, on the other, for the construction of new literary forms with the emphasis on speech, on "skaz." The roots of Leskov's linguistic

1) L. N. Tolstoj, *Sobranie sočinenij*, 1959, Vol. XI, p. 29.

“excessiveness” and “eccentricity” lie precisely in this ground cultivated by the labor and enthusiasm of the Slavophile ideologists.²⁾

Èjxenbaum’s remarks point to a number of factors: the existence of a philological tradition in Russia as an amateurish yet ideologically motivated avocation since the first decade of the nineteenth century; furthermore, the development on this basis (the study and editing of medieval Russian texts, s. the publication of *The Igor Tale* in 1800; early efforts at the collection and publication of folklore material, etc.) of a branch of learning in the field of philology located at the universities; and finally, the rise of a type of belles-lettres which derived its artistic effects from a play with philological elements: words of dialectal origin, of local color, of professional association, play with unusual semantic constructions characteristic of speakers from certain social groups, the insertion of fairy tale elements and similar devices. This off-shoot from the original amateurish philologism Èjxenbaum has aptly called “artistic philologism” with a stress on the word “artistic.” What Èjxenbaum did not mention in the study from which we quoted and what he assumes we know is the great impetus which the development of philology as an intellectual pursuit in the widest sense—its area of scholarly concern was conceived very broadly till the early decades of our own century—had received from the writings of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) in the eighteenth century and from the Romantics in early nineteenth-century Germany, particularly from such representatives as the brothers Wilhelm (1786–1859) and Jakob (1785–1863) Grimm, the brothers Schlegel (August Wilhelm, 1767–1845; Friedrich, 1772–1829) and others.

The recognition of the importance of one’s country as a nation—the rise of nationalism is precisely associated with Romanticism—the importance of cultivating one’s native speech and of penetrating into the history of one’s country in order to discover its origin and early cultural manifestations, all these were prominent features in the intellectual currents of the early nineteenth century. It is not surprising, therefore, to discover them also both in the academic and artistic branches of Russian philologism, and to find them in association with Slavophilism in the middle of the nineteenth century.

Since intellectual history in nineteenth-century Russia was dominated by the confrontation between the so-called “progressive” and “conservative” forces, the writers with a bent towards philologism could not remain neutral in this contest. Indeed, their forced involvement in the ideological battles of the time could be of central significance in their creative careers (see Leskov). Our purpose will be to show the links between their artistic aspiration and its conservative ideological basis. The aim of this paper is to present the author’s world view against the background of his writing, and its newness as a scholarly contribution rests on the fact that no-one has yet discussed these writers as a group and from the particular aspect of their shared

2) Boris M. Èjxenbaum, “Črezmernyj pisatel’ (K 100-letiju rozdenija N. Leskova),” *O proze* (Sbornik statej), 1969, p. 332.

ideological basis.

The term "artistic" philologism will be elucidated when we discuss its aspects in connection with Russian conservatism in the central part of this paper using illustrations from Vel'tman, Dal' and Leskov. We cannot omit, however, to discuss briefly the forerunners of this movement which reaches back as far as the seventeenth century to the writings of the archpriest Avvakum (1620–1682).

The church schism and the great spiritual upheaval which resulted from it are a familiar chapter from Russian intellectual history in the seventeenth century. Yet, intimately connected with the matter of a revision of the church books, reform of the ritual and renewal of antiquated church practices was the question of the Russian literary language and its development. It must be underlined that the person most gifted in expressing himself in the Russian language and in giving its written forms new vitality was precisely the spiritual leader of the Old Believers, a religious fanatic unbending in his opposition to the religious reforms and willing to die for his convictions the death of a martyr. He in fact died a martyr's death on the stake in 1682. This fanaticism with regard to old traditions must be remembered when we come to Dal', Vel'tman and in a certain sense also Leskov. At the same time all these writers were gifted in finding new forms of literary expression, and in experimenting with a great variety of genres. Lack of formal culture never worked to the detriment of the "artistic" philologists, on the contrary, to their advantage. Avvakum is our first illustration of this fact. His *Life Written by Himself* is recognized as the most important literary document of the seventeenth century. Literary critics have above all praised his use of language: "Avvakum is a great artist of words, and his example is still full of instruction to every writer of Russian."³⁾

In the seventeenth century Avvakum found himself in a similar situation with regard to his native language as did Šiškov, Vel'tman and Dal' two centuries later. Political circumstances in Russia in the early seventeenth century were responsible for the cultural penetration of the country by the Polish language and literature. This process had its parallel in the decrease of the influence of the Church-Slavonic language and the rise of the influence of Latin in the chancelleries of the Russian empire.⁴⁾ In the circles of the Russian aristocracy Polish and Latin came to be accepted means of communication: "Towards the end of the seventeenth century a knowledge of Polish was the appurtenance of an educated nobleman."⁵⁾ For various reasons this trend encountered the active opposition of the Old Believers in whose writings foreignisms from the West were not admitted. Instead, the archaic forms of Church Slavonic were fused with the spoken word of the broad masses:

Side by side with the preservation of the traditions of the "Slavonic" language, the living spoken language deeply penetrated the written word while coexisting

3) D. S. Mirsky, *A History of Russian Literature*, 1955, pp. 28–29.

4) V. V. Vinogradov, *Očerki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XVII-XIX vv.*, Leiden, 1950, pp. 30–31.

5) *Ibid.*, p. 32.

with these traditions in the same styles. Here a battle was fought for the literary rights of the popular language, i. e., the written and spoken word of the broad masses of the people. The clearest expression of these democratic tendencies in the system of the church-literary language are certain works of the Old Believers, e. g., the works of the ideologists and leaders of the Schism (the deacon Fedor, Epifanij and Avvakum).⁶⁾

It is important to note that conservatism in ideological matters has usually had special nationalist overtones, and nationalism again was linked with an interest in folk speech and folk traditions. Here we encounter Avvakum, hardly a man of whom one could speak as an "artistic" philologist in the sense of Dal' and Leskov; yet as the spiritual leader of the Schism and a propagator of the spoken Russian word in his writings ("I love my Russian native language"⁷⁾) his outlook on the world, colored by mysticism, fanaticism and simple conservative Russianism, resembles undeniably that of Šiškov, Dal' and Vel'tman. Again it should be said that all these men were naturally gifted rather than well-educated, a boon from the point of view of their closeness to their native environment, yet also a factor indicating their intellectual limitations.

Let us add here also that the writers of the "artistic" philological tradition were the first to be interested in the life and heritage of the Old Believers.⁸⁾ While we should not try to discover any kinship between Dal', Mel'nikov-Pečerskij, Leskov, and Avvakum on this basis, it is important to recognize and to underline the interest of these nineteenth-century Russian writers in a Russian heretical sect which had been officially persecuted or at best ignored, yet had preserved the Russian heritage and old Russian ways in the most undiluted form.

So far we have not yet said what "artistic" philologism and its connection with conservative nationalism actually meant. We must withhold our answer to this question until we come to the nineteenth century where this tradition has left its most important traces. During the intervening period between Avvakum in the seventeenth and Alexander Šiškov (1754-1841) in the nineteenth century, the contributions of Vasilij Tredijakovskij (1703-1769) and Mixail Lomonosov (1711-1765) to the history of Russian literature in the eighteenth century may not be overlooked.

To the elements mentioned so far, "artistic" philologism and national conservatism, a third one must here be added—archaism. At a time of transition when the spoken word was trying to assert itself in the literary language, this meant a conscious decision on the part of the writer in favor of the Old Church Slavonic lexical stock. As we shall see later, all the "artistic" philologists were in one way or another archaists, and Tredijakovskij in the eighteenth century, especially in the later part of his writings, displayed features of archaism which he had tried to eliminate earlier:

6) *Ibid.*, p. 34.

7) Leonid P. Grossman, *N. S. Leskov*, M., 1945, p. 279.

8) A. Mel'nikov-Pečerskij, *V lesax*, 1874; *Na gorax*, 1881; Dal', *Ural'skij kazak*; Leskov, *Zapečatlenyj angel*, etc.

“Therefore, new social movements decidedly threw Tredjakovskij, who was sensitive to the shifts of the time, into the other direction and made him turn again to the sources of ‘Slavonicism’. In the seventeen-forties and fifties a determined restoration of the literary rights of the Church-Slavonic language was under way.”⁹⁾

Lomonosov, on the other hand, by his genius transcends these labels of philologist, archaist, or nationalist. A man with great gifts in many areas in the same sense as Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519) he recognized the need for a national literary language which held a place for the Old Church Slavonic element (“But the Church Slavonic language is proclaimed also as the preserver of the national unity of the Russian language”).¹⁰⁾ This fact needs to be stressed since the role of the Church Slavonic element as an aesthetic factor is a central aspect, e. g., of Leskov’s “artistic” philologism: “Direct Biblical expressions or bookish Slavonicisms are in general characteristic features of this ‘divine’ style, which is natural to certain of Leskov’s topics.”¹¹⁾

The process of polarization in the history of the Russian literary language along ideological lines received a definite outline in the polemic between admiral A. S. Šiškov (1754–1841) and Nikolaj Karamzin (1766–1826). Beyond the crystallization with regard to the question of the literary language in each group of adherents, we have here the seeds of Slavophilism and Westernism of the mid-nineteenth century. The later Westernizers took their lead from the school of Karamzin whereas the Slavophiles and such writers sympathetic to them as Vel’tman’, Dal’ and Leskov, followed the tradition of Šiškov: “The Slavophiles defended the Church Slavonic language as the national historic basis of the Russian literary speech, the source of its unity and of its rhetorical charms. A. S. Šiškov was the leader of the conservative group of Slavophiles setting up the church-bookish ideology against those bourgeois revolutionary movements and ideas which the influence of the French language had brought with it.”¹²⁾

In the history of conservative forces with regard to the development of the Russian literary language Šiškov represents an important link between Lomonosov in the eighteenth, Dal’ and Leskov in the nineteenth century. His polemic with Karamzin revived the discussion that had been conducted between Lomonosov and Sumarokov fifty years earlier: “Šiškov was a follower of Lomonosov who introduced into the linguistic peculiarities of the literary dialects a fresh current.”¹³⁾ He did not banish the Russian “native” language from literature. On the contrary. While taking his model on the division of styles from Lomonosov, he stated: “The second type of our literature is written in *native speech*, which is not as elevated as the *holy* language (*svjaščennyj jazyk*), yet very pleasant, and which in its simplicity conceals an eloquence most sweet to the heart and the emotions.”¹⁴⁾

9) Vinogradov, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

10) Vinogradov, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

11) A. S. Orlov, *Iazyk russkix pisatelej*, M., 1948, p. 161.

12) Vinogradov, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

13) J. I. Tynjanov, *Arxaisty i novatory* (Reprint), Munich, 1967, pp. 93–94.

14) *Ibid.*, p. 94.

As to Šiškov's ideological disposition it has already been said that he was a conservative. Vasilij L'vovič Puškin (1770–1830), the great poet's uncle and a member of "Arzamas," while intending to abuse Šiškov allegedly was the first to use the word "slavjanofil" in reference to him.¹⁵⁾ It was an aptly coined definition which should be read now without the abusive overtones the term was meant to convey at the time. Furthermore, it was a narrow definition of a specific attitude with regard to the Russian language. Slavophilism as a world outlook developed considerably later.

In the history of the development of the Russian literary language Šiškov and his group have been called archaists. It is a term which describes in Russian literary scholarship what Slavophilism does in the history of Russian intellectual thought. Both terms complement each other. Archaism was a complex phenomenon in the history of Russian literature as well as in the history of the literary language. Russian writers in the first two decades of the nineteenth century were split into the "Arzamas" (1815–1818) and the "Beseda ljubitelej russkogo slova" (1811–1816), the first was forward-looking, the second tradition-minded. Žukovskij presided over the sessions of "Arzamas," Šiškov over those of the "Beseda." Archaism in the specific context of the polemic around the course of development of the Russian literary language and the question of genres connected with it ceased to be a live issue around 1820. It has not ceased, however, to play a role in another context, in the work of art itself, and here again we meet references to the artistic philologists of the nineteenth century as well as to other writers :

Archaic elements are present in any work of art, but they are not always the same ones ; their function is unequal and they are not always decisive in the given system. Sometimes their role is secondary and passive ; and sometimes emphasis is put precisely on them. Pisemskij, e. g., puts emphasis on the archaism of certain elements of style ("coarseness") transferring this principle from the area of verse (Katenin) to prose. He is followed by Leskov who works already according to the principle of archaic stylization making his speech ornate and playing with stylistic levels. Tolstoj archaizes other elements of prose while following in the footsteps of verse (Tjutčev) and absorbing its devices : elements of the construction itself, of the genre and the *sjužet*. He decomposes an object into its parts, builds a mosaic of "details," unites them by "generalizations," which are sometimes oratorical, sometimes lyrical and sometimes philosophical, thereby bursting the limits that separate "belletristics" from other genres, etc.¹⁶⁾

What Ėjxenbaum here said of Leskov ("who works already according to the principle of archaic stylization making his speech ornate and playing with stylistic levels") is equally true of Vel'tman and Dal', which will be shown below.

Before turning to the central part of this paper and a discussion of artistic philologism in connection with conservatism we must once more stress the link between the

15) I. V. Jagič, *Istorija slavjanskoj filologii*, Spb., 1910, p. 160.

16) Boris M. Ėjxenbaum, *Lev Tolstoj*, Vol. I. 1928, p. 290.

major figures of this tradition (Dal', Vel'tman and Leskov) and their forerunners (Šiškov, Vostokov, Snegirev, Saxarov, Bessonov, Katkov, Petr Kireevskij and Konstantin Aksakov). We are deliberately limiting ourselves to the names given by Ėjxenbaum in the introductory quotation to this paper. What we wish to underline here is the confluence of philological interest with a conservative world outlook.

Aleksandr Šiškov as head of the "Beseda ljubitelej ruskoj slovesnosti" and the first "Slavophile" has already been mentioned. We should add here that he was an important theoretician on the Russian language, albeit without any scholarly foundation, which made his scholarly publications of doubtful value. However, in spite of his dilettantism in philological matters his writings were very timely and remained not without influence on his contemporaries. The young Sergej Timofeevič Aksakov (1791-1859) recalls his reaction to these writings in his "Recollections on Aleksandr Semenovič Šiškov." In connection with Šiškov's "Discourse on the Old and New Speech" (*Rassuždenie o starom i novom sloge*) and the "Addenda" (*Pribavlenija*) to the same work he observes:

These books drove me completely out of my mind. ... Of course, I considered him an irrefutable authority, the wisest and most learned of all people! I believed in every word of his as in a sacred object. My Russian disposition and hostility to everything foreign were decisively strengthened and the dim feeling of nationalism grew to the point of exclusiveness. I did not dare to display it entirely because I encountered firm opposition from all my friends and I had to keep my convictions in the depth of my heart where in silence and retreat they gained enormous and incorrect dimensions.¹⁷⁾

In this statement we have in summary all the elements of the ideological position of the philological tradition, its scholarly and artistic branch: Russianism, nationalism and hostility to foreign influences. All these features must be remembered when we come to Dal' whose ideological and theoretical affinity with Šiškov was already pointed out forty years ago by Boris Tomaševskij:

There is something in common between the ideas of Dal' and Šiškov although this expressed itself in different ways. They shared a common hatred for the language of educated society, which opposes the principle of "nativism" (*narodnost*). Šiškov, who, incidentally, did not absolutely shy away from colloquial speech or peasant lingo (permitting it for certain genres) on the whole leaned towards slavonicisms. Dal' in another epoch no longer thought of slavonicisms. He wanted to rebuild the Russian literary language on the basis of the peasant language turning his back on the cultural heritage.¹⁸⁾

Let us not forget to mention that Šiškov tried to give an underpinning to his theories by compiling a Dictionary just Dal' would sixty years later. The modest

17) S. T. Aksakov, *Sobranie sočinenij*, 1955, Vol. II, p. 268.

18) B. V. Tomaševskij, *Stilistika i stixosloženie*, L., 1959, pp. 163-164.

results of these efforts were published in 1816 in the periodical, *Izvestija*.¹⁹⁾

The following quotation from Šiškov's "Discourse" (1803) anticipates what Dal' would say in his theoretical articles forty years later:

What sort of knowledge can we have of our native language if the children of our best-known princes and nobility from their most tender years are put into the care of Frenchmen, become attached to their manners and are taught to despise their own customs, uncritically to adopt their tutors' whole manner of thinking and reasoning, to speak more freely in their language than in their own and to become infected by them to such a degree that they not only never practice their own language, not only are not ashamed of not knowing it, but that many of them even brag and boast of this most shameful ignorance as if it were a kind of ornament and virtue.²⁰⁾

Konstantin Aksakov (1817–1860) together with his younger brother Ivan Aksakov (1823–1886) a leading Slavophile and both the sons of Sergej Aksakov, who had been a friend of Šiškov's, started his career as a philologist with a dissertation on Lomonosov (1841). In the philological field he is also the author of the *Attempt at a Russian Grammar* (*Opyt russkoj grammatiki*, 1846), which scholars later have called a "complete failure."²¹⁾ He had wanted to create an original theory of the Russian language independent of the existing grammars but failed just as all the theorists in the philological school would fail: "In the area of language, too, the Slavophiles lost the game completely. The Russian language did not return to the Slavic roots but opened itself to the influence of the west."²²⁾

Another leading Slavophile mentioned in Èjxenbaum's introduction was Petr V. Kireevskij (1808–1856), brother of the better known Slavophile, Ivan Kireevskij (1806–1856), who is famous mainly as a collector of Russian folksongs which, however, he was not allowed to publish during his lifetime. Vladimir Dal' turned over his own collection of folksongs to Kireevskij, an indication that they respected each other and shared similar interests and aspirations. His philosophical outlook is best expressed in the following quotation from a note found among his papers: "The native language cannot blossom without the fullness of national life. But what is national life? As everything else that's alive it cannot be pressed into any formula. Tradition is necessary. A contrived nationality, national dress, customs when once discarded change their meaning and become obscure (*stanovjatsja kitajstvom*). The fullness of national life can be found only where tradition is respected and where space is left for tradition, consequently also for life."²³⁾

P. A. Bessonov (1828–1898) is known as a scholar and professor in Xar'kov and as the editor of Petr Kireevskij's *Songs* (1860–1874) as well as Aksakov's *Attempt at*

19) Jagič, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

20) "A. S. Šiškov," *Brokgauz-Èfron ènciklopedičeskij slovar'*, Spb., 1903, Vol. XXXI, p. 612.

21) Jagič, *op. cit.*, p. 460.

22) V. M. Setschkareff, *N. S. Leskov*, Wiesbaden, 1959, p. 163.

23) M. Geršenzon, *Istoričeskije zapiski*, Berlin: Gelikon, 1923, p. 98.

a Russian Grammar (1886). There is no doubt then that he was intimately acquainted with the work of these two important figures of Russian literary and intellectual life in the nineteenth century. Later scholarship, however, has taken a negative view of Bessonov's uncritical and adulatory attitude towards his masters, an attitude that also served his own self-glorification: "But what can be said about the mediocre and coarse escapades of Bessonov who considered himself the younger colleague and collaborator of Konstantin Aksakov!"²⁴⁾ Elsewhere it has been said that Bessonov called Aksakov in all questions regarding the Russian language "an Il'ja Muromec."²⁵⁾

M. N. Katkov (1818–1887) is now remembered principally as the editor of *Russkij vestnik* (1856–1887), one of the most prominent *conservative* journals of the second half of the nineteenth century. Little is known about his philological activities which nevertheless were of some significance: "We cannot pass over in silence his successful dissertation directly concerned with Slavic philology. This was his study 'On the Elements and Forms of the Slavonic-Russian Language' (Moscow, 1845, 253 pp.) in which even now the reader can find many bright ideas and can enjoy the critical wit of the author. Even now one may still regret that circumstances forced him to abandon this specialty just when he had made a start with it."²⁶⁾

A. N. Afanas'ev (1826–1871) is Russia's greatest collector of fairy tales and legends (approximately 600). His scholarly competence has been rated higher than that of Dal', and together with F. I. Buslaev (1818–1897) he is considered the greatest representative of the Russian "mythological school:" "No other Russian scholarly work up to that time had expressed real scientific Slavophilism (slavjanoljubie) so graphically as Afanas'ev's *The Russian Fairytales* and *The Poetic Views of The Slavs on Nature*."²⁷⁾ The great Soviet folklorist M. K. Azadovskij (1888–1954) has echoed these remarks: "The collection of Afanas'ev belongs not only to the largest but also to the most important Russian folklore editions."²⁸⁾

Of Ivan Mixailovič Snegirev (1793–1868) it is said that he looked upon the heritage of Russian early times from the point of view of an antiquarian.²⁹⁾ and I. P. Saxarov (1807–1863) focused his attention on the collective spiritual life of the Russian people in the past and in the present. In his work, *Legends of the Russian People about the Family Life of its Ancestors* (1836–1837), "he expressed regret at the loss of many features of this spiritual life and wished to resurrect it at least in scholarship."³⁰⁾

The last in the group of forerunners of the artistic philologists mentioned by Èjxenbaum is the important Slavacist Aleksandr Xristoforovič Vostokov (1781–1864) who established his fame with his "Discourse on the Slavonic Language" published in 1820 as part of the Works of the Society of Friends of Russian Literature. He has

24) Jagič, *op. cit.*, p. 460.

25) *Ibid.*, p. 510.

26) *Ibid.*, p. 915.

27) Jagič, *op. cit.*, p. 514.

28) M. K. Azadovskij, *Istorija ruskoj fol'kloristiki*, M., 1963, Vol. II, p. 74.

29) Jagič, p. 486.

30) *Ibid.*, p. 502.

been described as “a convinced archaist although of a special kind and a member of Šiškov’s ‘Beseda’.”³¹⁾ Let us not forget to mention that he was of German descent with the family name “Osteneck” which he later changed by means of a free translation to “Vostokov.”³²⁾ German or Scandinavian (Dal’, Vel’tman) descent as we indicated in the epigraph to this paper from Tolstoj’s *Resurrection* (Voskresen’e) by and large meant conservatism in Russia.

* * *

“Artistic” philologism as a tradition of writing found its major development in the work of three nineteenth-century writers: Vel’tman, Dal’ and Leskov. Èjxenbaum tried to define the term which he had coined in one of his essays on Leskov:

I spoke of the artistic philologism of Leskov. It is essential to explain the meaning of this phrase. ... The fact of the matter is that Leskov’s linguistic “eccentricity” (čezmernost’), which set him apart from the “classics” (even such as Ščedrin and Dostoevskij), is historically related to Dal’ and Vel’tman, not viewed separately, but in relation to the age of incipient Russian philologism, of Russian “Slavic studies.” This philologism which had started with Šiškov and the struggle between his followers and those of Karamzin has a long and very complex history which runs through the entire nineteenth century and on into the twentieth.³³⁾

Aleksandr Fomič Vel’tman and Vladimir Ivanovic Dal’ were contemporaries. Their dates almost coincide, Vel’tman living from 1800–1870, Dal’ from 1801–1872. Both made their debut in literature almost at the same time, Vel’tman in 1831–1832 with *Wanderer* (Strannik) and Dal’ in 1832 with his *Russian Fairy Tales, First Group of Five* (Russkie skazki, Pjatok pervyj). Both experimented with a prose style which had not yet become stabilized. Vel’tman’s earliest work of fiction belongs to the genre of the tale of travel which in Western Europe had existed since the second half of the eighteenth century but gained popularity in Russia only with Karamzin’s *Letters of a Russian Traveller* (Pis’ma russkogo putešestvennika, 1791–1792). Dal’ entitled his work in this genre, which has almost the length of a short novel (106 pages), *Bedovik*. The tradition in which Karamzin, Vel’tman and Dal’ wrote these works goes back to Lawrence Sterne (1713–1768) although different stylistic elements were stressed in different literary epochs. Karamzin tried to express an individual and emotional attitude and phrased it in the cultivated language of upper society whereas Vel’tman was influenced by the interaction of various levels of style, the mixing of the real with the phantastic, disregard for chronological sequence and for the construction of a coherent whole: “Thus, the basis of the ‘sjužet’ of *Wanderer*—the playing with several contrasting levels—is a play based on the collision of contrasts, on the conflict of levels, on their displacement, substitution and annihilation by each other. This is the

31) Ju. N. Tynjanov, *Arxaisty i novatory*, op. cit., p. 104.

32) Jagič, p. 215.

33) B. M. Èjxenbaum, “Čezmernyj pisatel’,” op. cit., p. 330.

“Sternian” principle of construction.”³⁴⁾

More important still from the viewpoint of artistic philologism is the following observation by the same critic: “Vel’tman’s attention is directed towards the ‘*individual word*’ (na otdel’noe slovo), its structure and connection with the neighboring words. The semantic effects are derived from a struggle of the elements within the word, from the collision and displacement of neighboring words and word compounds. Thus, on the principle of conflict and displacement of semantic elements, Vel’tman over a period of twenty years develops a peculiar linguistic system which subsequently becomes the foundation of Leskov’s language.”³⁵⁾ The devices Vel’tman uses are many: Zeugma (“While you are walking through the town and through a certain part of the past”); homonyms for the purpose of creating calembours (“the pie was filled with truffles, anchovies, oysters! Filled as a century is filled with events!”); inappropriate quotations and others.³⁶⁾ The styles of various literary genres are mixed in *Wanderer* giving it the aspect of a parody.

While the majority of critics received this work enthusiastically, N. E. Nadeždin (1804–1856), editor of *Teleskop*, criticized the author for lack of a “strict unity, order, structure and harmony,” for lack of “an idea, of one basic idea,” the same type of criticism which fifty years later would be raised against the linguistic “eccentricities” of Leskov.

Vel’tman’s second novel, *The Immortal Koščej* (*Koščej bessmertnyj*, 1833), enjoyed even greater success than *Wanderer*. While it belonged to the genre of the historical novel (the action is laid in the XIIth to XIVth centuries), it is very different from the historical novel in vogue during the period. Vel’tman here as in his previous work does not create a plot but constructs his novel as a sequence of individual scenes which are loosely connected with each other. His wide ranging studies in history, archeology and language coupled with his phantasy enable him to recreate a vivid picture of the life of the past. The most important stylistic device in this reconstruction of the past is his language where his path runs parallel to that of Dal’. Vel’tman uses archaic expressions, dialectisms and on the basis of these creates his own neologisms. He avoids foreignisms of Western European origin but tries to enrich the Russian literary language by introducing archaic expressions which had been preserved in the dialects, had been eliminated from the literary language, or had never entered it. Furthermore, he not only introduces new linguistic material into his language but on the basis of this material reconstructs new words, a method which was also favored by Dal’: “From all this it becomes clear how close to each other ran the paths of Vel’tman and Dal’; and it is no surprise to find that Dal’ fairly often took words from early Russian writings. In ‘*Koščej*’ we find spots completely analogous in style to the tales of Dal’, or descriptions in which Vel’tman like Dal’ chooses regional expressions from the North East, from Siberia or Kostroma, etc.”³⁷⁾

34) B. Buxštáb, “Pervye romany Vel’tmana” in B. Èjxenbaum, ed., *Russkaja proza*, 1926, p. 198.

35) *Ibid.*, p. 199.

36) Buxštáb, p. 200.

37) Buxštáb, p. 214.

Another device that unites both writers is the use of rhythmic prose, which we find in Vel'tman's *Svetoslavič, Foster Child of the Enemy* (Svetoslavič, Vražij pitomec, 1835)—the novel which Odoevskij considered Vel'tman's best—or the use of folkspeech in its vulgar variety in *The Somnambulist* (Lunatik, 1834). Philologism as a literary device is most evident in Vel'tman's *Svetoslavič* and in his *Aleksandr Filippovič Makedonskij* (1836): "*Svetoslavič* even more than 'Koščej' is a philological novel. True, there is no emphasis in it on archeology, nor on any enumeration of objects; instead, fragments of a scholarly character are simply inserted, the curious escapades so common with Vel'tman where history and philology are interlaced with Scandinavian, Greek and Indian mythology and whose main argument is provided more by etymological analogies than by original ones."³⁸⁾

Vel'tman in the fifties and sixties continued to write but tried to adapt to the literary climate of the day which was now determined largely by the radical critics. His novel *Salomea* (1846), first part of his *Adventures Drawn from the Sea of Life* (Priključenija, počerpnutye iz morja žitejskogo), belongs to the tradition of the novel of manners (*social'no-bytovoj roman*) and was reviewed still quite favorably by Belinskij in his "Survey of Russian Literature in 1847": "Despite all the oddities and, we might say, absurdities of Mr. Vel'tman's novel, it is a highly outstanding work."³⁹⁾ The decline of his fame began in the fifties, a trend which was signalled by the journal *Sovremennik* which wrote in 1851: "... the beginning and the most brilliant period of the literary activity of Mr. Vel'tman are very distant from our present time. Therefore, without wishing to do offense to his merits, we find it impossible to believe that a great number of readers has preserved a clear recollection of his first works which had earned him his fame."⁴⁰⁾ Almost twenty years before his death he was considered an anachronism.

Vel'tman's artistic philologism was linked with his love for Russia's past and her old institutions. He found here a world of inspiration which interested him far more than the description of contemporary manners. Yet, this preference for the past was precisely the reason for the loss of recognition with the radical critics of the fifties and sixties, one (Černyševskij) of whom wrote: "What is this? Is this really a gifted writer? Is this really creative phantasy? No, this is simply an unsuccessful stratagem pretending to the lightness and playfulness of a story."⁴¹⁾

Vel'tman's method of trying to support his conservative Slavophile—in later life Panslavic—convictions by means of bold philological hypotheses is ridiculed in the review of his *Attila and Russia in the IVth and Vth Centuries* (Compilation of Historical and National Legends, Moscow, 1858) by N. A. Dobroljubov:

As you see, the philological system is very simple and Mr. Vel'tman makes

38) *Ibid.*, p. 225.

39) Ralph E. Matlaw, ed., *Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobroljubov, Selected Criticism*, 1962, p. 72.

40) Buxštab, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

41) N. G. Černyševskij, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij*, 1948, Vol. IV, p. 511.

indefatigable use of it. He makes discoveries which indeed are brilliant. Take, e. g., the Huns (gunny)—who do you think they would be in your opinion? In Latin one writes ‘Guni’ and ‘Huni.’ Can you guess now? No? Therefore, Mr. Vel’tman brings them even a little closer to the Russian: ‘Xuni.’ You still can’t figure out what he means? Well, the author of *Attila* gives them an even more Russian appearance: ‘Xueni’ (p. 89). Even now you still don’t know who they are? This word, it seems, is already so clearly of Russian origin that one can’t even make it any more explicit. Just start writing it in Russian letters, and what do you get? Mr. Vel’tman assures us that you will get ‘Kyiane,’ which means ‘Kievliane,’ residents of the city of Kiev. Here you have the solution to your riddle⁴²⁾.

Before we turn to Dal’, it should once more be stressed that Vel’tman was one of the most fertile and popular writers of the eighteen-thirties. During his long life he held a variety of official positions and ended his career as director of the Kremlin Armoury (Oružejnaja palata) with the rank of Confidential State Councillor. The reminiscences of Vel’tman by his contemporaries stress his “eccentricity” (čudakovatyj dobrjak) and his fondness for archeological investigations.⁴³⁾ All these features must be kept in mind for they apply equally to Dal’ and Leskov.

Vladimir Ivanovič Dal’ is the second important artistic philologist of the nineteenth century. He is important as a writer in the evolution of Russian literature and not through the immanent literary quality of his work. As in the case of Vel’tman his literary fame declined after 1850, and at present he is primarily remembered as the author of the most comprehensive collection of proverbs in the Russian language (Posloviцы russkogo naroda) and his four-volume Dictionary (Tolkovyj slovar’ russkogo jazyka). For fifty years Dal’ was an indefatigable collector of native Russian words, idiomatic sayings, proverbs and dialectal expressions. He wanted to be a reformer of the Russian literary language as did Šiškov several decades earlier. We referred to the similarity of these two writers in their theoretical approach to the Russian language earlier in this paper.

Dal’ was uncompromising in his defense of native speech as the only admissible model for literary Russian. He set forth his ideas in a number of articles appearing over two decades between 1842 (Poltora slova o nyněšnem russkom jazyke) and 1868 (Iskaženie russkogo jazyka). He also stated them emphatically in the introductions to his *Dictionary* and the *Proverbs of the Russian People*. Both times he characteristically calls the introduction “Naputnoe slovo” to avoid the calque “Vvedenie” based on the Latin. The following remarks taken from his article, “A Word and a Half about the Russian Language” illustrate his didactic attitude:

“But where after all are we to learn Russian? You cannot learn it from books because they are not written in Russian; in your drawing rooms and salons it’s

42) N. A. Dobroljubov, *Sobranie sočinenij*, 1962, Vol. II, p. 337.

43) S. A. Vengerov, *Kritiko-biografičeskij slovar’ russkix pisatelej i učenyx*, Spb., 1897–1904, Vol. V, p. 225.

also been impossible to do so for years ; where should we learn it ? If we don't find in books or higher society what we are looking for, then there is only one reserve (*klad'*) or hidden treasure (*klad*), one spring (*rodnik*) or mine (*rudnik*), but at least this one is not exhausted. It is the living Russian language as it lives up to the present moment with the people. One source, the speech of simple folk (*jazyk prostonarodnyj*), and as important aids, old manuscripts and all living and dead Slavic dialects."⁴⁴⁾

Particularly the last sentence reminds us of the artistic practice of Aleksandr Vel'tman, but of Leskov as well. Vel'tman pored over old manuscripts, a fact we find attested not only in his own artistic writings but in his philological articles as well (s. the enumeration of these articles in A. S. Vengerov, *Kritiko-biografičeskij slovar' russkix pisatelej i učenyx*, Vol. 5, pp. 225-227).

Dal' was a theorist on language as well as an artist. He wrote fairy tales, tales and sketches, largely in the tradition of writing of his time with links to Gogol' and Pisemskij and of varying literary merit. Most successful and from the point of view of artistic philologism most representative is his collection of five fairy tales, *Russkie skazki, Pjatok pervyj*, published in 1832. These are fairy tales from the oral tradition which the author recreated in his own manner. The plot here is always subordinated to his own artistic purpose which he states in the line: "bend the ready tale like the shaftbow of birch-cherry wood" (*gni skazku gotovuju, čto dugu čeremxovuju*). What he means is—"bend" your style, be playful with it. His tales start with a *priskazka*, a device not often found in fairy tales and serving the same function as the epigraph at the beginning of a story or novel: to arouse interest and to hint at the course of the action. Next, he often presents a narrator whose name is Dem'jan: "I have a narrator in bast-shoes, he has not walked on parquet floors and knows ornamented writings and marvelous speeches only from fairy tales."⁴⁵⁾

The narrator appears and disappears at the author's whim. Here Dal' lays bare his device of presenting his material. He does it in the style of a showbooth man. Dal's *skaz* has been well defined as "the half-poetic *skaz* of the showbooth man (*polustixovoj raešnyj skaz*)."⁴⁶⁾ This device is also used for humorous intent permitting the author to address his narrator, trading casual remarks with him and making humorous asides at other persons in the tale, sometimes a woman figure called "kuma Solomonida." The language is saturated with untranslatable proverbs and everyday idioms. It makes use of popular etymologies where the word for "telescope" appears as "podozritel'naja truba" instead of "podzornaja truba," with the meaning of "suspect spy glass." Rhythmicized speech is occasionally used as a device of artistic philologism:

Nyne prišla pora, prišla i služba tvoja, i dolžno tebe služit' ee samomu; ne v moix silax vysvobodit' tebja niže podat' tebe bedstvujščemu ruku pomošči.⁴⁷⁾

44) V. I. Dal', *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij*, Spb. 1898, Vol. X, pp. 545-546.

45) Dal', *op. cit.*, Vol. IX, p. 3.

46) V. Gofman, "Folklornyj skaz Dalja" in *Russkaja proza*, Èixenbaum, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 239.

47) Dal', *op. cit.*, Vol. IX, p. 13.

There is a marked beat in these lines, not of any definite rhythmic pattern but noticeable nevertheless due to the brief syntactic units. The first line, of course, is easiest to recognize as a rhythmic unit through its parallel construction, caesura, repetition of the word *prišla* and the two stresses in each half of the line on the vowel "a." Dal's *Fairy Tales* may justifiably be called a brilliant firework of folk speech, dialect, proverbs, and calembours in a literary genre where they can be used to the fullest effect.

As an artistic philologist Dal' did not surpass in his later work anything he had produced in these five fairy tales although his later fairy tales and other prose writings display some of the devices used here. The critical reception of his work was excellent during the thirties and forties (Belinskij and Turgenev praised him highly) until he was completely rejected by the radical critics: "Dal' does not have nor ever did have any clear idea in his conception of the people, or, to put it better, not in his conception (for what kind of a conception can there be without any idea), but in the pile of trifles which he has remembered from the life of the people."⁴⁸⁾

In his philosophical views Dal' tended towards Slavophilism. He published widely in *Moskvitjanin*, a conservative journal edited by M. P. Pogodin, and collaborated with Petr Kireevskij, to whom he gave a large part of the Russian songs that later went into the Kireevskij collection, as well as with Afanas'ev whose collection of fairy tales was enriched by contributions from Dal'. Although of Danish origin Dal' recognized only Russia as his home country. In later life he found it incongruous with his great love of Russia to continue to be a Lutheran and he asked to be received into the Orthodox Church through baptism. This was the climax of a period of growing mysticism which had seen him participate together with Vladimir Solov'ev (1853–1900), at that time a young student in Moscow, in the spiritualistic meetings of the Lapšin Circle in Moscow and at the seances of the Russian Swedenborgians:

Like Solov'ev he [Lapšin] attributed great significance to philosophical and religious questions, valued highly the mystical literature in its most perfect models and had a penchant for Slavophilism. His study of folklore (notebooks containing lists of proverbs, sayings, etc., have been preserved) led, incidentally, to his collaboration with Dal'. ... Spiritism held an important place in the life of this circle [the Lapšin Circle where both Solov'ev and Dal' met].⁴⁹⁾

Nikolaj Semenovič Leskov (1831–1895) represents the highest point in the flowering of artistic philologism in Russian literature, and with him its development came to a close. First, it should be stated that Leskov was not interested in the theoretical aspects of this tradition. He did not try to transform the Russian literary language as Šiškov or Dal' had done earlier, nor did he want to be a preserver of Russian folk speech in the context of Slavophilism. He approached the folk idiom from the point of view of the artist who sees in it a device to make his art interesting

48) Černyševskij in *Sovremennik*, 1861, Vol. LXXXVI, No. 4, n.p.

49) S. M. Luk'janov, "O Vladimire Solov'eve v ego molodye gody (Materialy k biografii)" in *Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosvěščenija*, 1916, No. 1 (January), p. 57.

and lively. He is highly conscious of problems of form in literature, the importance of exciting subjects, the creation of tension in a narrative through its structure, the arousing of interest with the reader by means of enigmatic titles and epigraphs. These devices plus the artistic handling of the spoken word, at which he is an unsurpassed master, have established Leskov's fame. In his attitude towards foreignisms he shared the view of Dal': "In general I do not consider foreign words good or suitable if they can be substituted by strictly Russian words or words that have become Russianized. We must preserve our rich and beautiful language from deterioration in which all of you are particularly guilty, particularly, because it would be so easy for you to speak well in it. A beau monde weakness was adopted without taste, and such words as *èvakucija*, *okkupacija*, *intelligencija* and others (*tutti frutti*) began to make the rounds. This is sinful and not even sweet."⁵⁰⁾

Both Dal' and Leskov were writers connected with the provinces. Dal' underlined his provincialism by using the pseudonym 'Kazak Luganskij' until the mid-forties; Leskov who came from the milieu of the small landed gentry repeatedly referred to his village (Gostomlja) in his writings (see his tale, "Life of a Peasant Woman"—From my Gostomlja Recollections). Gostomlja in the Province of Orel identifies the area of his origin. Quite different from this was the milieu of the writer in which Tolstoj and Dostoevskij produced their works. Here it was a literature of the large manor (*usadbnaja literatura*), on the one hand, and of the large city (*stoličnaja literatura*), on the other.

Like Dal' Leskov was a collector of idiomatic words and expressions typical of certain professions and of a certain milieu. Yet, the collecting of material in his notebooks never served to underpin or to disseminate certain theories on language, but always found its way into his artistic writing. He was aware of the finest nuances in words as between the two words for "simpleton": *prostec* and *prostak*. Grossman quotes a revealing passage from Faresov, the biographer of Leskov, illustrating Leskov's sensitive ear for the spoken language ;

"Man lives by words and one must know at which moments of one's psychological life which words are used. To study the speech of every representative of the numerous social and personal situations is rather difficult. But this popular, vulgar and bizarre language in which many pages of my works are written was created not by me but caught by ear from the peasant, the semi-educated person, the gas-bags (*krasnobai*), the saintly fools (*jurodivye*) and the hypocrites. After all, I collected it over many years word by word, proverb by proverb and individual expressions caught in the air among a crowd, on wooden barges, in the induction centers and in monasteries. I carefully and over many years listened to the intonation and pronunciation of Russian people on various levels of their social station. With me they all speak in their own fashion and not in a literary manner. For a writer to absorb the language of the ordinary citizen and his live speech is more difficult than to absorb bookish speech.

50) *Russkie pisateli o jazyke*, L., 1954, p. 605.

Therefore, we have so few artists of the word, i. e., those in command of live and not of literary speech."⁵¹⁾

Leskov was under the influence of both Vel'tman and Dal' with regard to his language, the construction of his tales, and his entire poetics: "A. F. Vel'tman influenced him through his 'playful' language, full of parodistic elements, calembours, words out of the chronicles."⁵²⁾

Underlining the long history of literary philologism and Leskov's debt to it, it has been noted that "some works of Leskov display a thick ornamentation with Slavonicisms, e. g., in the compound epithets ("fireburning"—*ognepaljaščij*) in deliberately archaic but strong expressions such as "philosophising"—*suemudrie*, "verbosity"—*velerečie*. Here Leskov in a way echoes Lomonosov who already in 1757 had pointed out the esthetic significance of the Slavonic language for the development of Russian artistic literature."⁵³⁾

Leskov's acquaintance with Mel'nikov-Pečerskij in St. Petersburg in the 1860's increased his interest in the Old Believers and brought to his attention new riches of the Russian speech: "In 1863 he starts to become acquainted with Old Believer literature and listens to theological discussions: 'precisely in the milieu of the Old Believers the old Russian word of pre-Petrine times had been preserved uncontaminated and its purity and characteristic had been guarded from later influences from southwestern Russia.'⁵⁴⁾

Leskov was introduced to Dal' by Mel'nikov-Pečerskij and subsequently began to deepen his interest in Dal's ornamental prose style, his playful use of popular sayings and rhythmicized prose: "All this appealed to the inclinations and tastes of Leskov and undoubtedly formed his style. Dal' particularly was a master in the area of the so-called popular etymology (i. e. the comic distortion of intelligent speech, of foreign expressions in nouns) for which Leskov became famous later."⁵⁵⁾

Of the various possibilities (phonetic, morphological, syntactic, and lexical) of *skaz* Leskov developed the lexical most highly.⁵⁶⁾ Those who know "The Left-Handed Craftsman," "Leo, Son of the Palace Marshall," and "The Sealed Angel" in the original are aware of Leskov's brilliant display of folk etymologies and calembours. He would use, e. g., *melkoskop* instead of *mikroskop* relating the meaning of *melko* to the sound of the Russian word. The same is true of *barometr* which by some speakers would be reproduced as *buremetr*, again drawing a logical connection between folk etymology and meaning. Such specimens as *kleveton* instead of *feleton* ("čtoby zavtra že na vseobščee izvestie kleveton vyšel"),⁵⁷⁾ *propuganda* instead of *propaganda* (an etymology with *pugat'*—to frighten) or *plakon* instead of *flakon* betray Leskov's

51) Leonid Grossman, *Bor'ba za stil'*, M. 1927, pp. 203-226.

52) L. Grossman, N. S. Leskov, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

53) L. Grossman, N. S. Leskov, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

54) *Ibid.*, p. 279.

55) *Ibid.*; p. 280.

56) Hugh McLean, *Studies in the Life and Art of Leskov* (dissertation, Harvard University, 1957).

57) N. S. Leskov, *Sobranie sočinenij v odinnadcati tomach*, 1958, Vol. VII, p. 48.

excellent sense for the esthetic effect of words which at times are used for irony and humor (*Levša*—"the showbooth jester"—Grossman), at other times to express the sad course of human destiny (see *Tupejnyj xudožnik*). However, the good taste of some neologisms and word deformations such as the substitution of "Babeljar" for "Abaelard" to draw a connection with *baba* and *babnik* (philanderer), "Quasimorda" instead of "Quasimodo" (*morda*-snout), a hint at the outward appearance of the hero of Hugo's novel, may justifiably be questioned.⁵⁸⁾

In summarizing the artistic philological tradition in nineteenth-century literature, we can make several observations. With regard to the formal aspect of writing in this tradition we notice that the aim of the writer (Vel'tman, Dal' and Leskov) was not the creation of a plot that would hold the reader's attention but the play with linguistic elements ("*ustanovka na jazyk*"—Tynjanov). This is, to say it once more, what is meant by *artistic philologism*. Vel'tman went to early Russian literature (the chronicles) for the source of his linguistic material, Dal' created his fairy tales on the basis of the oral folk tradition, Leskov used both methods plus the faithful recording of the speech of representatives from various social strata (see, e. g., Domna Platonovna in *Voitel'nica* and Maria Martynovna in *Polunoščniki*). Leskov and Dal' often used the anecdote as the basic structural unit. Both liked to use the device of the chronicle in presenting their material (see Leskov's *Soborjane, Zaxudalyj rod*; Dal's *Savelij Grab, Vaxx Sidorov Čajkin* etc.). All three of them built on the tradition of Avvakum, Lomonosov, Šiškov and contemporary philologists, dilettantes and scholars.

Their artistic method is, of course, directly related to their talent as writers. Leskov observed in his "Warsaw Diary" (No. 226, 15/XII, 1884): "I invent with difficulty (*tjaželo i trudno*) and therefore I always needed living human beings who could interest me by their spiritual content (*duxovnym soderžaniem*).⁵⁹⁾ Dal' modestly disclaimed to be an artist. It is illustrative to quote him in his own language and style: *Èto ne moix ruk delo. Inoe delo vykopat' zoloto iz skrytyx rudnikov narodnogo jazyka i byta, i vystavit' ego miru na pokaz; inoe delo peredelat' vykopannuju rudu v izjaščnye izdelija. Vsjakomu svoe.*⁶⁰⁾ Vel'tman was different. He combined his philological interest with great inventiveness and phantasy (see his *Strannik* and *Koščeĭ bessmertnyj*).

From the sociological aspect all three writers tended towards conservatism. All three occupied government positions for varying lengths of time: Vel'tman served for twenty-eight years (1842-1870) as assistant and later as director of the Kremlin Armoury (*Oružejnaja palata*); Dal' for three decades was attached to the Ministry of the Interior in Orenburg, St. Petersburg and Nižnij-Novgorod; Leskov occupied various governmental positions, the last at the Ministry for the Administration of State Property.⁶¹⁾

None of the three came from the landed aristocracy. Dal's father, an immigrant

58) Vsevolod Setschkareff, *N. S. Leskov*, 1959, pp. 165-166.

59) *Russkie pisateli o literature*, S. Baluxatyj, ed., Vol. 2, 1939, p. 300.

60) V. I. Dal', *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, op. cit.*, Vol. I, XXXII.

61) Setchkarev, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

from Denmark during the reign of Catherine II, served first as army physician with the troops stationed in Gatčina near St. Petersburg; later he was a physician at the state foundry in Lugan'. Vel'tman's father, of Swedish descent since the seventeenth century, served in Moscow as director of the debtors' prison. Leskov's ancestors were village priests, only his father, although trained as a priest, had refused to put on the cassock.⁶²⁾ None had enjoyed an exceptionally good education. Dal' and Vel'tman had received a military education; Leskov did not finish high school. The necessity to earn a living forced all three as young men into the service of the state. In each case their natural inclinations and interests were served by the opportunity to travel across Russia. Vel'tman lived and worked in Bessarabia (see his *Načertanie drevnej istorii Bessarabii*, 1838); Dal' worked in Orenburg and Nižnij-Novgorod, and Leskov travelled widely especially during his years of service with the British commercial enterprise of Scott and Wilkins. The observations gathered during these travels plus extensive reading in world literature were the actual school of these writers. Observations of native Russian life form in large part the basis of their writings.

All three had deep roots in their own country regardless of whether Russia was the country of their ancestors or not. Their artistic philologism is directly related to this rootedness in Russia. In spirit they belonged either to the provinces ("Kazak Luganskij," or "Iz Gostomel'skix vospominanij"), or to patriarchal Muscovy (Vel'tman); and it is in this context that we must recognize their archaism and Slavophilism.

Of these three writers Leskov was, of course, the most important one. He was a writer whose artistry did not lose power with the passage of time but continuously increased in scope and depth. As to his philosophical views, these also underwent changes in the course of his life. Whereas Vel'tman's and Dal's conservatism was very clear-cut, Leskov's position versus the timely issues of his day was often ambiguous. This did not save him, however, since the radical critics of the eighteen-sixties would not tolerate ambiguity. The violent attacks against Leskov in the radical press, which were a response to his articles analyzing the cause of the Petersburg fires in 1861, drove him, albeit against his will, into the conservative camp. Grossman characterizes Leskov's position as "vague" (neotčetlivo) with a definite leaning toward "the right" (s javnym krenom vpravo).⁶³⁾ When Leskov in 1865 came under the influence of M. N. Katkov in whose journal (*Russkij vestnik*) he contributed actively until his break with its editor in 1874, he seemed to have definitely joined the conservative elements of Russian intellectual life.

If we read Leskov's work carefully, we recognize in it one persistent theme—love of Russia. He was fond of his country's historical institutions and old ways. Above all he loved the simple Russian man. He was emotionally closely connected with Kiev and this old Russian city's history. Especially in later life he displayed a pronounced interest in the Slavophiles, corresponded actively with its major living representative, Ivan Aksakov (1832–1886), and studied the writings of Aleksej Xomjakov (1804–1860)

62) *Ibid.*, p. 31.

63) Grossman, *N. S. Leskov, op. cit.*, n.p.

and Jurij Samarin (1819–1876). He, too, showed an interest in spiritism which swept through Russian intellectual circles in the 1870's.

As a final thought we should say that the pure Russianism which characterizes the artistry and the philosophical convictions of these three artistic philologists bore the traits of a certain mysticism. Vel'tman's research in Slavic and early Russian archeology, Dal's conversion to Russian orthodoxy (recall the epigraph to the present paper from Tolstoj) as well as the decidedly religious bent of his late writings (*New Scenes from Russian Life*, 1867–1868), and Leskov's search for the "meaning of life" in his late years making a Tolstoian of him illustrate this feature.

Yet, we do not even need to go to the late works of these writers to discover this deep bond between their art and their profound love of their home land. The essence of Leskov's attitude towards Russia as well as towards his sources of inspiration was beautifully stated as early as 1867 when the first chapters of his *Cathedral Folk* (Soborjane), originally entitled "Those Expecting the Waters to Move" (Čajušćie dviženie vody), appeared in Kraevskij's *Notes of the Fatherland* (Otečestvennye zapiski). At a certain point of the fable the archpriest Tuberozov replies to the deacon Axilla who had raised the question about the value of the practices and customs of the past. Tuberozov, who is Leskov's favorite character in this work, here without any doubt expresses the author's convictions. These words are intended to summarize what has been said above with regard to philologism and conservatism and should be read as a statement which unites the various elements into one world view whose basis is mystical and applies to all the writers discussed in this paper. To preserve the connotative associations of Leskov's words, we shall first give it in Russian with an English translation following:

Živite, gosudari moi, ljudi russkie, v ladu so svoeju staruju skazkoj. Čudnaja vešč' staraja skazka! Gore tomu, u kogo ee ne budet pod starost'! Dlja vas vot eti prutiki starušek udarjajut monotonno; no dlja menja s nix kaplet sladkix skazanij istočnik! ... O, kak by ja želal umeret' v mire s moeju staruju skazkoj.⁶⁴⁾
 (Live, my dear sirs, my Russian people, in concert with your old Russian fable. It is a marvelous thing—this old fable! Woe to him who does not have it when he grows old! For you these small switches of old women strike monotonously, but for me they are the spout of sweet legends!... Oh, how I wished to die in concert with my old fable.)

Joachim T. BAER
 Assistant Professor of
 Slavic Languages and Literatures
 Princeton University
 028 East Pyne Hall
 Princeton, New Jersey 08540
 February 26, 1971

64) N. S. Leskov, *Sobranie sočinenij*, Vol. IV, M. 1957, p. 152.