

---

# Viktor Zhivov, “Toward a Typology of the Baroque in Russian Literature of the XVII—Early XVIII Centuries”<sup>1</sup>

Translated by Marcus C. Levitt

Marcus C. Levitt

The University of Southern California

[levitt@usc.edu](mailto:levitt@usc.edu)

---

## Abstract:

Viktor Zhivov’s 2007 article, here translated into English for the first time, attempts to describe the specific nature of the Baroque in Russia. According to Zhivov, Russian Baroque culture arose via transplantation and was not the result of organic cultural development. Because of their cardinal differences, the language of Western Baroque and that of traditional Russian culture represent polar opposites in many ways. Hence the transplantation of even the most insignificant element results in its radical transformation, highlighting the peculiarities of the process of reception. The article outlines the principles that governed this process. It argues that it was the external features of the Baroque style that were borrowed, while its deeper orientation on polysemy, which defined the Baroque worldview in the West, was not. The assimilation of Western literature was eclectic and replaced rhetorical ambivalence with the rhetoric of didacticism. It took what could be synthesized with traditional culture most easily, at the same time as the more content-oriented features and those specific to European Baroque were rejected. If in Western Europe the Baroque posed riddles for the reader, in Russia authors on the “European” trajectory assisted the reader by providing solutions. The Baroque in Russia was primarily a phenomenon of Western influence, so that its unique features took second place in the process of forming a new cultural paradigm as a whole. “Baroque” elements acquired a completely new pedagogical function, becoming carriers of the new ideology that was being introduced. The Baroque became a servitor of power, whose aim was the political reeducation of society.

## Keywords:

Baroque, stylistics, cultural transplantation, polysemy, Europeanization, semiotics

---

## 1. Posing the Question

The specific nature of the Baroque in Russia was conditioned by that fact that Baroque culture was not the result of organic cultural development but arose via transplantation, as one of the most important instances of Europeanization or of Western influence. This turn to external and non-traditional sources was itself called forth by Russia’s own inner cultural demands, and this restructuring (*perestroika*) emphasized those cultural practices and models that were more natural to borrow. However, in the given case, in speaking of borrowing or influence we must significantly clarify these notions in order to avoid random coincidences that explain nothing. In fact, the language of Western Baroque and that of traditional Russian culture represent polar opposites in many ways. This refers to their

---

<sup>1</sup> Viktor Zhivov, “K tipologii barokko v russkoi literature XVII – nachala XVIII v.,” in *Chelovek v kul’ture russkogo barokko. Sbornik statei po materialam mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii. IF RAN. Moskva: Istoriko-arkhitekturnyi muzei “Novyi Ierusalim.” Sentiabria 2006 g.* (Moscow: IF RAN, 2007), 11–31. The editors have converted the original Russian article’s in-text citations into footnotes.

hermeneutic mechanisms, to the way in which literature functions, to the construction of authorship, and to the operations of the literary process. Because of these cardinal differences, the transplantation of any, even the most insignificant element results in its radical transformation, highlighting the peculiarities of the process of reception. At the same time, the rejection of some particular cultural matter, its fundamental unacceptability, may testify to the divergence of literary and historical paths. In these circumstances, it is important to establish the basic lines of reception and to understand the principles that determine the selectivity of this process.

## 2. The Problem of Defining Western European Baroque

Crucial for Western European Baroque is its orientation on textual polysemy, the possibility of different readings, and the rhetoric of ambivalence. As René Wellek demonstrated,<sup>2</sup> stylistic elements taken alone cannot constitute something specifically Baroque; they may represent elements common to all European literatures, presented in ancient rhetorical manuals, part of the classical heritage, and constantly used by medieval Latin literature.<sup>3</sup> The novelty of the Baroque is created not by the elements themselves, or their configuration, but by the goal of their usage. As Wellek writes, "[o]ne must acknowledge that all stylistic devices may occur at almost all times. Their presence is only important if it can be considered as symptomatic of a specific state of mind, if it exposes a 'baroque soul'."<sup>4</sup> Their specific nature here is that they serve not as an embellishment or a particular rhetorical aim but are part of a system – a system of communicative means that is oriented on polysemy.

The poetry of John Donne or other English metaphysical poets may serve as a good example.<sup>5</sup> The development of a metaphor (or conceit) is constructed so that at each step the reader perceives a new view of the text, a new understanding of everything that came before, but at the same time not negating the previous meaning. Conceptism is not only the expansion of a metaphor but a play with the meaning of the whole. In the words of the Jesuit Claude-François Ménéstrier, who theorized about Baroque imagery, "[t]his is the pleasure that a metaphor gives – always representing two things together. It also pleases

<sup>2</sup> René Wellek, "The Concept of Baroque in Literary Scholarship," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 5, no. 2 (1946): 77-109.

<sup>3</sup> Ernst Robert Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Berne: Francke 1984), 138-54, 158-74, 277-305.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 92. See also the useful survey by B. L. Spahr, "Barock und Manierismus: Epoche und Stil," in *Der Literarische Barockbegriff*, ed. Wilfried Barner [Wege der Forschung, Bd. 358] (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975), 534-567.

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance, his poem "A Valediction of Weeping," in *The Complete English Poems of John Donne*, ed. C. A. Patrides (London: J. M. Dent, 1985), 84-85, with its developing metaphorical juxtaposition of tears and the globe, a craftsman creating a globe and a demiurge, a stream of tears and a flood covering the world (or globe). Many such examples could be cited, and not only from English poetry. See for example, the numerous comments on Richard Crashaw's poetry in Austin Warren, *Richard Crashaw: A Study in Baroque Sensibility* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1939). (*Author's note*)

because it makes us see objects in unfamiliar dress, if I dare say so, in a mask that surprises us.”<sup>6</sup>

In Baroque literature, plays on words, emblems, cryptograms, oxymorons, hyperboles, contrasts, etc., have the same function. Baroque stylistics is the stylistics of polysemy. The orientation on polysemy may be expressed and formulated quite explicitly, and polysemy or ambivalence itself often serves as an object of Baroque aesthetic reflection. As an example, we may cite Jean Rotrou’s well-known tragedy *Saint Genest*. It is built upon the device of a play within a play, and its main theme is the confusion between real and theatrical action, reality’s turning into fiction and vice versa. The protagonist Saint Genest is an actor who is undergoing conversion to Christianity at the same time as he is playing a Christian martyr in a spectacle staged for the Roman emperor, persecutor of Christians. All of his monologues and speeches produce ambiguity (*qui pro quo*); the spectators marvel at the power of his acting and his colleague-actors cannot understand why he is improvising, deviating from the text he has memorized. The semantic uncertainty is only resolved in the finale, where the actor himself becomes a martyr.<sup>7</sup>

The orientation toward polysemy is ultimately based on a negation of the world’s harmony, a feeling of its illusoriness. The predominant feeling turns out to be an intense experience of the inconstancy of perceived reality and the possibility that any given thing may become its opposite. Baroque authors articulate this experience quite clearly.<sup>8</sup> Thus Marin de Gomberville, in the afterword to *Polexandre*, discussing the symmetrical perfection of women’s hairstyles, writes: “The irregularity of my spirit cannot suffer these annoying and perpetual regularities (*ces importunes & perpétuelles iustesses*). It is at home in confusion. It loves disorder. It condemns the view of those who believe that the world was made according to measure, number and weight, and it would love music less if it were not eternally irregular (*inegale*), and only forms things out of parts that are not merely different but diametrically opposed.”<sup>9</sup> The phrase about “weights and measures” is from Wisdom 11: 20, in which it says that “thou hast arranged all things by measure and number and weight.” As W. Floeck rightly notes, “Gomberville’s revolt is directed against both what is considered proper to the field of art (*innerkünstlerische*) as well as against the idea of cosmic harmony.”<sup>10</sup> Thus, the rejection of order and rules is directly linked to the negation of universal harmony, with irregularity as an ontological attribute.

<sup>6</sup> Claude-François Ménéstrier, *La Philosophie des images énigmatiques, où il est traité des énigmes, hieroglyphiques* (Lyon: Chez Hilaire Baritel, 1694), 90, quoted in J. Rousset, “La poésie baroque au temps de Malherbe: la métaphore,” *XVIIIe siècle* 31 (April 1956), 369.

<sup>7</sup> Jean de Rotrou, *Saint Genest: tragédie* (Paris: G. de Luyne, 1666); cf. Imbrie Buffum, *Studies in the Baroque from Montaigne to Rotrou* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 249 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Il’ia N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, “Barokko i ego teoretiki,” *XVII vek v mirovom literaturnom razvitii* [Red. kollegiia: Iu. B. Vipser (*et. al.*)] (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 102-153.

<sup>9</sup> Marin Le Roy de Gomberville, “Advertissement avx honnestes Gens,” *Svitte de la Quatriesme et dernière partie de Polexandre* (Paris: Augustin Covrbé, 1637), 1327-1328, cited in Wilfried Floeck, *Die Literarästhetik des französischen Barock: Entstehung, Entwicklung, Auflösung* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1979), 38. The passage from Gomberville that Floeck cites is from the 1641 edition and in a somewhat different version, one that shows that Gomberville was fully aware of the blasphemous nature of the declaration of 1637. In the 1641 version he tried to tone down the sacrilegious aspect, but without changing the idea of his statement. (*Author’s note*)

<sup>10</sup> Floeck, *Die Literarästhetik des französischen Barock*, 38.

The destruction of the borders between dream and waking is proclaimed a creative principle. Thus, one may read Donne's poem "The Dream" as a special reflection on the conditionality of this boundary; here reason acknowledges the reality of dreaming and life becomes its continuation.<sup>11</sup> By dint of this aesthetic, the Baroque becomes enigmatic; this enigmatic quality, like other aspects of Baroque culture, is emphasized and consciously cultivated. Readers (or spectators) seem to be drawn into the creative process, and this perception is purposefully stimulated. In the reader's perspective, *conceits* appear as the unravelling of meanings, and other Baroque literary devices play the same role. As Giambattista Marino writes in a sonnet attacking his literary opponent, Gaspare Murtola, "Isn't the purpose of the poet to amaze (*È del poeta il fin la meraviglia*)?"<sup>12</sup>

The orientation on polysemy defines the multiplicity of registers in which the text may be perceived and turns reading into a process of figuring out its meanings, which requires the juxtaposition of all of the possible interpretations. A well-nigh textbook example of such a multi-registered hermeneutic task is Edward Herbert's "An Ode Upon a Question Moved, Whether Love Should Continue for Ever."<sup>13</sup> In this poem, which may be seen as a response to and reenactment (*pereigrvanie*) of John Donne's "The Ecstasy,"<sup>14</sup> a sensual lyric blends with a discussion of the ideas of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite concerning corporeal mediation in spiritual ascent and an exegesis of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The presence of the various registers that mark these diverse themes creates the work's conceptual depth; each theme is doubled and both elements acquire an additional intellectual charge. These features of Baroque literature have obvious parallels in Baroque art and architecture, whose basic elements include the mixing of levels, perspectival shifts, and unpredictable viewpoints.

### 3. The Baroque in Russia and the Character of the Literary Process

Scholars of seventeenth-century Russian literature have correctly identified in works of this period (for example, by Simeon Polotskii, Sil'vestr Medvedev, and Karion Istomin) an exhaustive set of stylistic characteristics that usually characterize the Baroque.<sup>15</sup> The oeuvre of these poets also include types of poetry specific to the Baroque, like Simeon's figural poems in the shape of a heart, a cross, and stars;<sup>16</sup> emblematic and heraldic poetry, and so on. Poems appear which formally allow more than one reading, depending on the graphic presentation of the text; Simeon calls them "knots" and notes that such a knot "is read in three ways (*troiako chitaetsia*)."<sup>17</sup> It is precisely the external features of the style, external

<sup>11</sup> Donne, *The Complete English Poems of John Donne*, 83-84.

<sup>12</sup> Ettore Allodoli, *Le più belle pagine dei poeti burleschi del seicento* (Milan: Fratelli Treves, 1925), 79.

<sup>13</sup> Herbert John Clifford Grierson and Geoffrey Bullough, *The Oxford Book of Seventeenth-Century Verse* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934), 231-236.

<sup>14</sup> Ben C. Clough, "Review of *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, ed. George Saintsbury and *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century* by H. J. C. Grierson," *Modern Language Notes* 38: 1 (1923), 53.

<sup>15</sup> They are described in detail in L. I. Sazonova, *Poèziia russkogo barokko: vtoraiia polovina XVII-nachalo XVIII v.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991).

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 78-79.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 136-137.

manifestations of polysemy, that are borrowed, while the deeper orientation on polysemy that defines the specificity of the Baroque [as a movement or worldview] is not.

This limited reception is visible in the very character of the literary process. For European literatures it is characteristic that particular Baroque authors influence other ones, and interactions and borrowings are synchronous in the historical and literary respect; models are sought in works that are based on the same aesthetic principles. Thus, in England one may observe the influence of du Bartas, Marino, and Góngora,<sup>18</sup> in France – Góngora, Gracián, and Marino,<sup>19</sup> in Germany (the Silesian school) – the same Marino and Góngora.<sup>20</sup>

In Russia, the picture is quite different. Although borrowed texts were widespread in the seventeenth century, they were borrowed without any system, and it is impossible to discern any “Baroque” intent. A. M. Panchenko writes that “in European circumstances, the Russian syllabic poets would have seemed to be hopelessly retrograde, but in Russia, which had ‘skipped’ the Renaissance, their role was different: they brought to Russia the ideas of the humanists, albeit in Baroque form, and in addition colored by provincialism.”<sup>21</sup> Naturally, the question arises what Baroque form has to do with a Baroque that was the carrier of humanist ideas, and what happens to form when it is bereft of the content inherent in the donor culture?

Indeed, it was in the seventeenth century when the *Gesta Romanorum* (Rus. *Rimskie deianiia*), a collection of novellas created in England in the thirteenth century, was disseminated in Russia. Similarly, the *Speculum magnum exemplorum* (Rus. *Velikoe zertsalo*), a collection put together in the fifteenth century on the basis of earlier material, was translated and copied. A collection of *Facetiae*, whose sources were various, including works by Poggio Bracciolini and certain novellas from Boccaccio, circulated in manuscript.<sup>22</sup> All this is very far from Baroque literature. One may say that from the very beginning, the assimilation of Western literature was eclectic. It seems to me that this eclecticism was natural and also characteristic of the later period. Its driving force was to replace rhetorical ambivalence with the rhetoric of didacticism.

#### 4. The Assimilation of External Features

In borrowing external features there is still significant selectivity. What is taken, first of all, is that which may be synthesized with traditional culture most easily, at the same time as the more content-oriented features and those specific to European Baroque are rejected. Thus, the motif “the world is a dream” is assimilated, and is easily perceived as a usual expression of the idea of the fragility of earthly being; the more specifically Baroque motif

<sup>18</sup> See Mario Praz, *Secentismo e marinismo in Inghilterra: John Donne-Richard Crashaw* (Florence: La Voce, 1925).

<sup>19</sup> Helmut Hatzfeld, “Der Barockstil der religiösen klassischen Lyrik in Frankreich,” *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* 4 (1929): 30-60.

<sup>20</sup> Gerald Gillespie, *German Baroque Poetry* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971).

<sup>21</sup> A. M. Panchenko, *Ruskaia stikhotvornaia kul'tura XVII veka* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1973), 168.

<sup>22</sup> See the survey in E. V. Petukhov, *Ruskaia literatura: istoricheskii obzor glavneishikh literaturnykh iavlenii drevniago i novago perioda*, 3rd rev. ed. (Petrograd: Tip. A. Suvorina, 1916), 306-327.

that "a dream is the world" (as in John Donne's poems cited earlier, for example) does not occur in Russian letters. In precisely the same way the motif "the world is a theater" – that is, a spectacle of passions that is easily combined with the idea of the vanity of earthly glory – is easily assimilated. However, the additional motif that "the theater is the world" is alien to the Russian repertoire. Thus, it is easy to find in Karion Istomin the theme of the imperfection of earthly existence, but here it is transformed into a perfectly traditional lesson about sin and virtue:<sup>23</sup>

*Время летяще и часов кончину  
зрите, люди, в том смерть всякому чину,  
Иже в мире сем имут мудры главы,  
сподобятся вси небесны в век славы.  
Не забывай лет и в часах что было,  
Богу молися, трудись не уныло.  
Суетна тем жизнь, яже в грех бывает,  
добродетель же с Христом единяет.*

(Look, people, at time flying by and the end of our hours; in this death comes to every rank. Those who in this world have wise heads are vouchsafed eternal glory in heaven. Do not forget the years and hours that have passed, pray to God, labor with gladness. Life is vain which dwells in sin, virtue unites us with Christ).

In an analogous way, theatricality is only assimilated as the aggregate of external devices, and we have ample testimony about theatricality in eighteenth-century court sermons, about the theatricalization of celebrations and of the public life of the cultured elite as a whole.<sup>24</sup> Yet at the same time, the illusoriness and the blurring of boundaries between life and its depiction – that is, the conceptual function of these theatricalizing devices – find no resonance in the Russian setting. As Sazonova remarks, "such a specific feature [of the Baroque] as the hedonistic relationship to existential problems connected to Renaissance traditions remained alien to Russian meditative poetry.

If, for example, the Polish Baroque poet Jan Morsztyn's meditations on life's transitory and fickle nature are accompanied by praise of earthly pleasures, in seventeenth-century Russian poets there is merely the preaching of piety. In the meditations of seventeenth and early eighteenth-century poetry, didactic and moralizing tendencies rather than tragic ones predominate. In comparison with the lyrics of Polish and Czech poets of Dubrovnik, with their vivid 'individualistic' character, the special nature of Russian meditative

<sup>23</sup> Sazonova, *Poëziia russkogo barokko*, 112.

<sup>24</sup> Iu. M. Lotman, *Izbrannye stat'i v trekh tomakh* (Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992-1993), I: 269-286.

poetry consists in its propensity for an abstract and generalized type of statement.<sup>25</sup>

One might argue about the degree to which Baroque hedonism derives from the Renaissance, but it is obvious that, in Baroque literature itself, it serves as an important means of creating contrast; it is this very contrast that is lacking in Russian “didactic” Baroque.

Cultural texts were interpreted primarily on the basis of the old language in which illusoriness, having become a subject of interest, is understood rather straightforwardly as demonic possession. One may recall how Archpriest Avvakum perceived theatrical spectacles. Recounting a performance at the court of [Tsar] Aleksei Mikhailovich (a performance on biblical themes using Italian theatrical machinery, with whose aid actors were lowered onto the stage from the ceiling), he writes:

A man dressed as Archangel Michael descending in front of him [the tsar] into the chamber was asked: “Who are you and where are you from?” He says: “I am the Archistratigus [“Supreme Commander of the Heavenly Hosts” (*Translator’s note*)] of the Lord’s power, sent to you, the great Sovereign.” Thus God’s power blighted him, this archangel of darkness – he has been lost, body and soul. And he doesn’t even realize it; he is doing what he must. But woe unto him!<sup>26</sup>

The tsar’s theatrical interests are seen as a sign that his faith has weakened and are likened to the ecclesiastical innovations he introduced. Notably, in this context, interpretations of Avvakum’s writings as Baroque (in view of their broad use of contrast) appear very doubtful. Traditional Russian culture strove to distinguish the genuine from the apparent, and this endeavor was based on religious ideas and thus ruled out the full acceptance of ambivalence that was the hallmark of Western European Baroque.

In this context there was no real demand to stimulate the perception of the viewer, listener, or reader. Therefore, such stimulation was reduced to entertainment, evoking the traditional rhetorical prescription to delight (*delectare*). This was only partially new for Russia and, in any case, had no direct connection to the Baroque. *Concetti* could be assimilated and create the effect of the unexpected, but the sense of depth and semantic duality was absent. As an example, I will cite Stefan Iavorskii’s sermon on the week of

<sup>25</sup> Sazonova, *Poëziia russkogo barokko*, 25.

<sup>26</sup> Avvakum, “Kniga tolkovaniia i npravouchenii,” *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka* (Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo Nauk SSSR, 1927), 39: 466. For similar statements, see Avvakum’s “Advice to the Saintly Holy Fathers” (*Sovet sviatym ottsam prepodobnym*), in *Zhitie protopopa Avvakuma, im samim napisannoe i drugie ego sochineniia* (Moscow: Khud. lit. 1960), 255. An analogous view of theatrical performances is expressed by an anonymous follower of Avvakum, who wrote a letter (*poslanie*) to him in Pustozersk after the death of Aleksei Mikhailovich, in 1676 [quotation omitted by translator]. Cited in N. Iu. Bubnov and N. S. Demkova, “Vnov’ naidennoe poslanie iz Moskvyy v Pustozersk “Vozveshchenie ot syna dukhovnago ko ottsu dukhovnomu” i otvet protopopa Avvakuma (1676 g.),” *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* 36 (1981), 143.

Pentecost concerning the text "Receive ye the Holy Spirit" (John 20: 22 [20: 7]).<sup>27</sup> The seven weeks from Easter to Trinity are juxtaposed to seven images of the descent of the Holy Spirit. These seven images correspond to seven "ranks" of people, and to each of these is attributed its own image of the descent. Thus, for the tsar (about whom Iavorskii, basing himself on etymology, declares that "every Orthodox tsar is Christ, God's anointed"<sup>28</sup>), the Holy Spirit descends in the image of a dove, "and rests upon him as on the Christ, and becomes for him Noah's dove, bringing an olive branch, betokening peace"<sup>29</sup> (the dual allusions are to John the Baptist's baptism of Christ and to Noah after the flood). "To the great tsarinas and tsarevnas [wives and daughters of the tsar]" are ascribed the "image of overshadowing (*osenenie*), that overshadows the Heavenly Tsaritsa."<sup>30</sup> This "overshadowing" (cf. Luke 1: 35) is elegantly juxtaposed to a parasol, which it seems was mentioned by name for the first time in Russian letters.<sup>31</sup> Princes, boyars, and other courtiers are assigned the image of wine:

And when [the Apostles] were filled with wine on the day of Pentecost, and as soon as they perceived the Holy Spirit, they became bold and audacious, unafraid of any threat or antagonism. Those who formerly were rabbits now became lions, former sticks now became pillars. And where was this boldness, audacity, and grandness from? [The Apostles] were filled with wine, the Holy Spirit. Wine produces audacity. [...] And in my zeal, I desire that we perceive in our princes, boyars, and the whole assembly [of senior government officials (*Translator's note*)] this image of the wine, the Holy Spirit. Drink, Christ lovers, and delight in this divine wine. And because wine gives a person eloquence and understanding, for it gladdens a person's heart, and makes one dare to achieve brave and every kind of good deed; we wish for you as well in your labors and good offices [to find] in this divine drinking this kind of action, this kind of grace and spiritual power.<sup>32</sup>

One must keep in mind that in the holiday ritual, after the triumphant church service that climaxed with the sermon, a feast followed at which everyone got completely intoxicated. This pragmatic feature is what created the acumen [witty twist—*Translator's note*] of Iavorskii's sermon. Thus, a contrast is created between the spiritual (allegorical) and

<sup>27</sup> Stefan Iavorskii, *Propovedi blazhennyya pamiati Stefana Iavorskogo* (Moscow: Sinodal'naia tip., 1804-1805), I: 163-179; cf. Iu. F. Samarin, "Stefan Iavorskii i Feofan Prokopovich," *Sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow, 1880), 5: 357-358.

<sup>28</sup> Iavorskii, *Propovedi blazhennyya*, 164-5. On the connection between Christ and tsar as God's "anointed," see Viktor Zhivov and Boris Uspenskii, "Tsar' i Bog: Semioticheskie aspekty sakralizatsii monarkha v Rossii," *Iazyki kul'tury i problema perevodimosti*, (Moscow: Nauka), 79-83. Also see, B. A. Uspenskii and V. M. Zhivov, *Tsar and God and Other Essays*, trans. Marcus C. Levitt, David Budgen, and Liv Bliss, ed. Marcus C. Levitt (Boston: Academic Studies Press 2012), especially 24-5, 158, and via the index. See also section 9 below (*Translator's note*).

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 178.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 179.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 168.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 171-172.



material (pragmatic) interpretation. However, no new meaning is produced as a result of this contrast. Of course, this might also be the case in Western European Baroque literature; but there, this was a peripheral phenomenon, whereas in Russian circumstances this became fundamental.

## 5. Hermeneutic Mechanisms in the Russian Baroque

The Baroque orientation on polysemy presumes particular hermeneutic principles. However, in Russia, these principles were not assimilated. Baroque authors like Simeon present the traditional scholastic theory of the four basic kinds of interpretation as something new,<sup>33</sup> which was well known to Ukrainian bookmen, who may well have been the model for Simeon.<sup>34</sup> Thus, the poem “Writing” (*Pisanie*) speaks of the “conceptual” (*myslennyi*) reading of the Bible and that

*Из мысленного паки разум исплывает  
четверогубый, иже души оживляет.  
Первый разум писменный, им же деяния  
исторически миру дают писания.  
Второй аллегоричный, иже под покровом  
иноглаголяния дает дела словом.  
Третий нравом учащий, иже вся приводит  
к благих дел творению, да ся благодать родит.  
Есть онагогический в четвертом лежащий  
месте, вся ко небесным духовно родящий.<sup>35</sup>*

(From the conceptual realm flow four-pronged reason [or meaning] that enlivens the soul. The first is the written [literal] meaning, the historical acts that writing gives to the world. The second is allegorical, that gives meaning to things through the veiled word. The third teaches a moral that leads to good deeds and produces grace. In the fourth, place is the anagogical meaning that spiritually gives birth to heavenly things).

This scheme obviously has no direct relationship to Baroque hermeneutics. Here we see the very same eclecticism in assimilating Western European elements as in the choice of literary borrowings about which we spoke earlier.

Similarly, the juxtaposition of knowledge and inspiration was not assimilated. For Russian writers of the second half of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, a poet was first of all a scholar, and by no means the carrier of special revelatory knowledge that

<sup>33</sup> On the theory and its sources, see Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'écriture*, 4 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1959-1963).

<sup>34</sup> Ioanikii Galiatovskii, *Kliuch razumeniia sviashchennikom, zakonnikom i laikom nalezhchii* (L'vov: Tip. Mikhaila Slezki, 1665), 167-168.

<sup>35</sup> A. M. Panchenko, *Russkaia stikhotvornaia kul'tura XVII veka* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1973), 183-184.

was received from above and set against usual, historical learning. This opposition (connected with that between the real and the possible in Aristotle), which was of such importance for Western European Baroque and which defined the status of literature, was absent in Russia, where no trace of these notions were seen, and where poetry fully ascribed to the paradigm of scholarly enlightenment.

For Russia of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the opposition between various kinds of knowledge turns out to be unimportant, insofar as a much more general and culturologically significant opposition was between knowledge (as belonging to the new culture) and ignorance (as adhering to traditional culture). The principle of opposing the educated to the ignorant is established and begins to act as a weapon in cultural, political, and religious struggle (in the polemic between Nikonians and Old Believers, in the clash between Grecophiles and Latinophiles in the late seventeenth century, and between advocates and enemies of the Petrine reforms).<sup>36</sup> Once set into motion, this mechanism of cultural differentiation, directly connected to the question of power and the question of the right to that power, is activated again and again, in the case of any cultural, political or religious conflict.

In principle, the separation of elite culture from that of the ignorant crowd is characteristic of the Baroque.<sup>37</sup> In Russia, however, this separation assumes special importance. If in the West social and cultural differentiation are constant attributes of literature and culture (i.e., various texts are meant for various audiences), in Russia all of traditional learned culture has one addressee: the pious person in need of Christian edification. Literature is oriented on Holy Writ, and just as Holy Writ is addressed to all Christians, so all of the texts that are oriented on it preserve this single undifferentiated addressee. The discourse of unity embraces literary culture as a whole as well as its implied reader.<sup>38</sup>

In the Russian Baroque this situation changes. Instead of one unified audience, it is separated into the educated and the ignorant, and texts appear that are directed toward the cultural elite (which is constituted by these very texts). Simeon openly declares this in the poem "Voice of the People" (*Glas naroda*) that was part of his [anthology] *The Many-Flowered Garden*:

Что найпаче от правды далеко бывает,  
гласу народа мудрый муж то причитает.  
Яко что-либо народ обыче хвалити,

<sup>36</sup> V. M. Zhivov, *Iz tserkovnoi istorii Petra Velikogo: issledovaniia i materialy* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2004), 11-16.

<sup>37</sup> In the "Argument" preceding his comedy "Les Visionnaires," Jean Desmarests de Saint-Sorlin [*Oeuvres poetiques* (Paris: Le Gras, 1641), unpaginated, fol. ā iij 2v] mocks the bad taste of uneducated society and declares:

Ce n'est pas pour toy que l'escriis,  
Indocte & stupide vulgaire:  
l'escriis pour les nobles esprits.  
Je serois marry de te plaire. (*Author's note*)

<sup>38</sup> V. M. Zhivov, *Razyskaniia v oblasti istorii i predystorii russkoi kul'tury* (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2002), 100-105.

то конечно достойно есть хулимо быти,  
 И что мыслит, суетно; а что поведает,  
 то никоея правды в себе заключает.  
 Еже гаждает дело, то весма благое,  
 а еже ублажает, то бохма есть злое.  
 Вкраце, - что-либо хвалит, то неправо в чести,  
 мир сей непостоянный весь лежит в прелести.  
 Не веруй убо гласу общему народа,  
 ищи в деле правды человека рода.  
 Слово ветр развеает, а кто тому верит  
 безрасудно, срамоты мзду себе возмерит.<sup>39</sup>

(The wise man considers the voice of the people something most often far from the truth. For that which the people praises is usually, of course, worthy of condemnation, and what it thinks is vain; and what it thinks it knows, has no truth at all. It perverts things that are very good and applauds what is evil in God's eyes. In short, it praises whatever is dishonorable. This inconstant world abounds in evil attractions. So do not trust the voice of the common people but seek the truth of mankind in action. The wind scatters words, and those who trust them are foolish and prepare themselves for ignominy).

This separation of audiences could also take place within a single text, in which one part was constructed according to the principles of Baroque rhetoric and another part lacked any Baroque embellishments. Several times St. Dimitri of Rostov ends his sermons with words to his unlettered auditors, addressing them with a special additional statement laying out the given moral lesson. Thus, in one sermon he says: "I think that not everyone will remember what I have said except the lettered ones; the simple and unlettered folk will leave without benefit. So, I will say it in a way that is easy (*dostoino*) to be remembered."<sup>40</sup> In an analogous way, in the sermon of August 19, 1701: "It is already . . . time to finish with an 'amen' . . . but . . . I think that all I have said to sinners will not be understood by the unlettered, and I fear they will go away without benefit, and I will appear a pompous rhetorician and not a useful teacher, so I will say a little something to benefit the simplest ones."<sup>41</sup> After these statements follow texts in correct Church Slavonic but minus Baroque rhetorical devices. Indeed, in the previous part we find Baroque *concetti*, a rhetorical strategy of enticing the listener, and rather complex Church Slavonic, while in these additions for the "simple folk" there are no *concetti* and the language is easier.

## 6. The Baroque as Enlightenment

<sup>39</sup> Panchenko, *Russkaia stikhotvornaia kul'tura XVII veka*, 188.

<sup>40</sup> Sv. Dimitrii Rostovskii, *Sobranie raznykh pouchitel'nykh slov i drugikh sochinenii* (Moscow: Sinodal'naia tip., 1786), 1: 51v.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 5: 56v.

In Russian conditions, elements of Baroque stylistics serve as markers of European culture, so that these elements become an object of explanation and learning. If in Western Europe the Baroque posed riddles for the reader, in Russia authors on the "European" trajectory succor the reader by providing solutions.

In 1704, Peter I returned to Moscow after his victories in Livonia. The triumphal gates and celebratory commemoration were composed by Iosif Turoboiskii, prefect of the Moscow Academy, and his explanatory guide was published right then. The celebration was planned according to European Baroque models, but this tradition was unknown and incomprehensible to Muscovites. That which they saw, they perceived within the framework of familiar cultural paradigms. Therefore, these public Baroque festivities led them to think that Peter was the Antichrist. In particular, that is how they understood Peter's depiction in the role of Mars, i.e., as a pagan idol.<sup>42</sup> Turoboiskii specifically warns against such a perception:

Because you, pious reader, will not be surprised by what we have written, nor emulate the ignorant, who know nothing and have seen nothing, but who like a turtle in its shell never ventures out, and as soon as it sees something new is shocked and belches out various unholy claptrap.<sup>43</sup>

It is evident that the substance of this "unholy claptrap" (*bliadoslovie*) were suggestions of the anti-Christian or demonic nature of the corresponding festivities. Turoboiskii explains how one should apprehend such depictions "correctly." At the same time, he defends the very method of allegorical interpretation, arguing that it is not "some kind of arrogance" or "the folly of frenzied reason" (*nekim buistvom*) but standard for Holy Writ itself:

You should also know this, dear reader, that it is usual for a seeker of wisdom to imagine a thing in an unfamiliar image. Thus, lovers of wisdom depict the truth as a measure, wisdom as a clear-sighted eye, courage as a pillar, abstinence as a bridle, and numberless others. Do not think that this is some kind arrogance or the folly of frenzied reason, because we also see this in divine writ. Is not an olive branch and a rainbow shining in the sky an image of our escape from the devil's work? Is not the crossing of the sea an image of baptism? Is not a snake hanging from a tree an image of the crucified Jesus? Have you not read how Jacob called his sons Reuven – water, Judah – a lion cub, Dan – a serpent by the roadside, Benjamin – a ravenous wolf? [...] Because such is the nature of things, and because divine writ presents various things in various images, we who receive instruction from divine writ must present a worldly thing in worldly images, and we strive to acclaim the glory of our celebrants in the image of ancient celebrants, due to the poverty of our skill.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Zhivov, *Razyskaniia v oblasti istorii i predystorii russkoï kul'tury*, 472-482.

<sup>43</sup> *Panegiricheskaia literatura petrovskogo vremeni*, ed. V. P. Grebeniuk (Moscow: Nauka, 1979), 156.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 155-6.

Further, concrete images are explained: Mars is a metaphor for Peter; a lion – the Swedes, and so on. Notably, fully traditional hermeneutic schemes, familiar from patristic literature, are analyzed as innovations. This testifies once again that these innovations were poorly assimilated by Russian cultural consciousness and could produce misapprehension and cultural conflict.

## 7. The Conflict between Hermeneutic Systems

When the *perestroika* of culture took place in the seventeenth century, together with the rhetorical organization of literature appear methods of rhetorical interpretation of tropes and figures. Metaphor and allegory become objects of reflection. Elite (“Baroque”) culture demonstratively demands the correct elucidation of metaphors and allegories as conventional signs. In these circumstances, traditional culture cannot help but react; in traditional culture, tropes may also become objects of reflection, and the result of this reflection may be the rejection of such conventionality. Verbal tropes are equated to sacred symbolic entities (the form of the cross, arrangement of the fingers in making the cross, and so on) for which the connection between signified and signifier is conceptualized as unconditional.

Thus, the apologist for Old Belief, Nikita Dobrynin (Pustosviat), and Simeon Polotskii debated the phrase “the stars converse with You” (*Тебѣ собесѣдуютъ звѣзды*) in addressing God in one of the prayers in the baptismal service according to the Nikonite edition of the Prayer Book (*Trebnik*); in the pre-Nikonite version, the corresponding phrase was read differently: “the stars pray to You” (*Тебѣ молятся звѣзды*). According to Nikita Dobrynin, such texts must be read in an unconditional sense. In his opinion, the stars are angels, but angels can only pray to God and cannot converse with Him due to their subordinate position: “Angels do not share God’s throne (*soprestol’ny*), only the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost share a throne [...] And concerning the stars, in [holy] writing one cannot find them described as interlocutors with God.”<sup>45</sup> In answering such objections, Simeon wrote:

The phrase here is not about conversing aloud or with the mind, because stars do not have lips or minds, but are inanimate things [...] As it says in the same prayer, “The sun sings to You, the moon glorifies You” [...] because here “sings” and “glorifies” are similarly metaphorical [to this word – *метафорически* – Simeon adds a gloss – *преноснѣ*, meaning “figuratively” (*Author’s note*)] and the same goes for conversing. All such phrases are not inappropriate; to those who think beautifully, the fruits are beautiful and good; but for mindless Nikita and the like-minded they are a trap and stumbling block.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>45</sup> I. Rumiantsev, *Nikita Konstantinov Dobrynin (“Pustosviat”): Istoriko-kriticheskii ocherk* (Sergiev Posad, 1916), 258, 330.

<sup>46</sup> Simeon Polotskii, *Zhezl pravleniia* (Moscow: Pechatnyi dvor, 1667), 1: 55-55v.

Thus, Simeon directly indicates the possibility of two interpretations of the same text (one may find an analogous defense of the corrected text of the given prayer in Paisios Ligarides).<sup>47</sup> At the same time, he directly connected the hermeneutic conception he was laying out with the existence of metaphorical usage, remarking upon it as a special means of reference. It is worth mentioning the fact that Simeon knew very well that his opponents rejected this type of exegesis and he explicitly connected this rejection with ignorance, framing the polemic in terms of the opposition between knowledge and ignorance discussed above.<sup>48</sup>

Stefan Iavorskii later grounded the necessity of understanding words in their figurative meaning in precisely the same way. Moreover, he found it possible to approach the text of Holy Writ in this way, considering biblical exegesis the basis for any hermeneutic method. In a treatise of 1721 on praising the names of the Eastern patriarchs during liturgy, he reasoned that "universal" (*vselenskii*) in the title of the Constantinopolitan patriarch does not mean "ruling over the universe." He wrote:

Furthermore, it is known that the word "universal" does not always exclusively mean the entire world, but sometimes refers to many places, or a significant part of the world, in a metaphorical sense (*tropicheskim razumom*). Thus, in the Gospel of Luke where it says that "a decree went out from Caesar Augustus that the whole universe should be registered" (Luke 2: 1) – was the whole universe with all of its inhabitants, lands, cities, and kingdoms really in Augustus Caesar's power? Not at all, for Caesar's dominion had no inkling of the recently discovered new world, the Kingdom of China, great Tartary, and much, much more. Thus, one may speak about any Fourth Monarchy [Babylon, i.e., a great power (*Translator's note*)] as controlling the entire universe. This is how a phrase [about the universe] from the Psalms is interpreted in the Apostles: "Their message has gone out to all the earth, and their words to the ends of the universe" (Rom. 10: 18). Again: "preach the gospel to the whole of creation" (Mark 16: 15). And again: "the people of Jerusalem and all Judea were going out to him {John the Baptist}, and all the country of Jordan, and he baptized them in the river Jordan" (Mathew 3: 5-6). There are also other often-used words—but precisely words, and not the truth itself—whose well-known meaning is taken as a trope [*tropitsa*, i.e. Lat. *tropice* (*Author's note*)], as in the phrase

<sup>47</sup> *Materiialy dlia istorii raskola za pervoe vremia ego sushchestvovaniia*, ed. N. I. Subbotin (Moscow, 1875-1890) 9: 123-128. For a history of the question, see Rumiantsev, *Nikita Konstantinov Dobrynin*, 380-381.

<sup>48</sup> See in more detail B. A. Uspenskii and V. M. Zhivov, "Zur Spezifik des Barock in Rußland. Das Verfahren der Äquivokation in der Russischen Poesie des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Slavische Barockliteratur II: Gedenkschrift für Dmitrij Tschizewskij (1894-1977)*, ed. R. Lachmann (Munich: W. Fink, 1983), 25-30. See also Simeon's commentary on the words of the Creed on Christ being "seated" at the right hand of God in heaven [...] (*omitted by translator*). Simeon Polotskii, *Obed dushevnyi* (Moscow: Verkhniaia tipofrafiia, 1681), fol. 81-82v.

of the Apostles: one ought to “pray without ceasing” (1 Thessalonians 15: 17), where “without ceasing” means “often.”<sup>49</sup>

Thus, the person educated in the Baroque separates a word from its content, which is what allows the possibility of using a word in a figurative sense. Hence, for Iavorskii, the text of the Gospels is not in and of itself the truth; the truth appears only as the result of applying the correct hermeneutic procedure, so that the “genuine” content of the text is revealed. This is why it is so important to study grammar, rhetoric, and so on. The Old Believers approach this matter differently. For them Holy Writ as a text revealed by God is the truth in and of itself, which in principle does not depend on the perceiving subject or interpretive method. The sacred form and sacred content by their very essence cannot be separated insofar as they are bound by an unconditional bond. From this point of view, the truth is not connected with correct interpretation but with the correct reproduction of a text. For this reason—according to Old Believers—the Nikonians’ correction of church books resulted in their perdition, and the hermeneutic justification for these corrections represented impious tricks by those who were indifferent to the truth.

Thus, elite culture not only introduced rhetorical organization into literature, it also insisted on the necessity of knowing rhetoric for the correct understanding of Holy Writ, and, consequently, for the salvation of the soul. Hermeneutic devices become instruments for cultural differentiation.<sup>50</sup> It should be kept in mind, at the same time, that these devices, like the rhetorical principles concerning tropes and figures that appear in Russia within the framework of Baroque culture, are not directly connected with the Baroque per se. They belong to the rhetorical organization of literature in general, and their importance for Russian Baroque once again testifies to its eclecticism – borrowing not what is specific to Baroque, but what could also be taken from Quintilian. The Baroque in Russia is primarily a phenomenon of Western influence, so that its unique elements take second place in the process of forming the new cultural paradigm as a whole.

## 8. Eclecticism as a Principle of the Russian Baroque

Insofar as the reception of the Baroque boiled down to the assimilation of external devices that were disconnected from their semiotic context, the recipient culture did not develop criteria for the selection of cultural material and the means to classify cultural texts. Therefore, the principle of assimilating the new culture became eclecticism. This is characteristic for all writers and theoreticians of the Russian Baroque without exception, although, of course, to different degrees.

Fedor Kvetnitskii’s *Clavis Poetica*—composed in the 1730’s as a course in poetics to be presented in the Moscow Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy—may serve as an example of such

---

<sup>49</sup> Zhivov, *Iz tserkovnoi istorii Petra Velikogo*, 246-247.

<sup>50</sup> B. A. Uspenskii, “Otnoshenie k grammatike i ritorike v Drevnei Rusi (XVI-XVII vv.),” *Izbrannye trudy*, [izd. 2., ispr. i dop.], 3 vols. (Moscow: Shkola “Iazyki russkoi kul’tury,” 1996-1997), 2: 5-28.

eclecticism in literary theory.<sup>51</sup> Lomonosov, by the way, studied under Kvetnitskii. In European poetic manuals, two trends are clearly evident. One, based on the notion of poetic inspiration (*furor poeticus*), approaches poetry as a special means of cognition. The difference between the historical and the poetic are related to the Aristotelian opposition between the real and the possible (as in Aelius Donatus) and poetry is the understanding of the possible – that is, the universal and timeless, transcending particular historical knowledge (as in Giovanni Antonio Viperano). The second trend, represented first of all by Jesuit poetic manuals, puts the emphasis on the doctrine of ingenuity or wit (*acumen, argutio*). In the pedagogical context, this doctrine quickly took on the character of a set of rules for producing the unexpected and ambiguous (as in Pontan and Masenius); the freedom of poetic genius, so important for the first trend, is completely ignored here.

In Kvetnitskii's poetics, a textbook for students who have studied grammar but not yet rhetoric, these two tendencies are intermingled. The very definition of poetry given at the beginning of the textbook testifies to the compromise character of its theoretical basis ("*ars quamcumque materiam vero simili fictione ad delacatationem et utilitatem audientium metricae tractandi*"). The oppositions between art and nature, poetic vision and metrical organization, so significant for European literary development, are eliminated or downplayed in the few lines dedicated to these questions. *Furor poeticus, fictio, and acuta apprehensio* are merged into one, and the material of poetry (*materia*) is not set apart as something special and ideal, but treated the same way as the material of rhetoric – the difference between poetry and prose texts boils down to metrical organization – and the problem of correlating genres and styles remains untouched.

In the section concerning description (*descriptio*), Kvetnitskii follows Feofan Prokopovich and declares clarity (*claritas*) and brevity (*brevitas*) as virtues. This directly contradicts the principle of *acumen* as presented in other parts of the manual. This contradiction is revealed very clearly in the discussion of genres, the section "*De carmina in specie*." A short description of six classical genres – epic, bucolic (*georgic*), satire, drama, elegy, and lyric – is accompanied by fourteen short chapters dedicated to *acumen*, epigram, Baroque word play, etc. Indeed, here Kvetnitskii's enthusiasm for the playful genres of Baroque poetics, for various operations with the verbal sign leading to unexpected combinations of ideas, is clearly evident. Together with operations of a semantic type, formal transformations are given great importance: anagrams and structures according to patterns – program / anagram / epigram, acrostics, various figural poems, and so on. Bernd Uhlenbruch, who published Kvetnitskii's poetic manual, justly remarks that it is hardly possible to speak of a direct development of the poetics of *acumen* leading from Sarbiewski to Muscovite rhetorical and poetic manuals of the eighteenth century. While some continuity exists, the basic ideas undergo significant reworking. In particular, if Sarbiewski understands *acumen* as a creative principle that considers anagrammatical transformations as "childish nonsense," his followers introduce this kind of formal game as one of the

---

<sup>51</sup> For its publication and commentary see B. Uhlenbruch, "Fedor Kvetnickij," *Clavis poetica: Eine Handschrift der Leninbibliothek Moskau aus dem Jahre 1732*, ed. B. Uhlenbruch (Cologne: Böhlau, 1985); see also V. M. Zhivov, "Aktual'nye problemy istorii russkoi ritoricheskoi traditsii (Po povodu izdaniia poetiki F. Kvetnitskogo)," *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie* 2 (1988): 94-99.



sources of acumen. Furthermore, Kvetnitskii's enthusiasm for verbal games, figural poetry, and *carmina curiosa* to some extent indicates a connection to Kievan traditions, but Feofan's *Poetica* was not part of this development. The latter's acceptance of the ideals of clarity and simplicity in no way coincide with this trend, so that there is a basic contradiction at the very heart of this type of cultural assimilation.

In a series of external markers, Kvetnitskii's poetic manual may be defined as Baroque (just as those of Feofan or Lavrentii Gorki), although a Baroque value system (*ustanovka*) is lacking. Because of this, the author does not differentiate between various currents in European literary thought. In place of the Baroque emphasis on polysemy comes a general orientation on didacticism. Obviously, the conflict between philosophical and literary movements that were so central to Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were perceived as a phenomenon of secondary interest in Russia during the period we are concerned with; Russia was adopting not one of the various European movements but European culture as a whole. This led to eclecticism, to a certain kind of synthesis of the theories being assimilated, and compromise or contradiction appear as external signs of this synthesis.

## 9. The Ideological Purpose of Baroque Devices

And so, in the West, Baroque's arsenal reflected the mentality of the era and organically developed out of its orientation on polysemy. In Russia, external elements were borrowed, but not this deeper context. For this reason, there was no correlation between the era's mentality and elements of poetics or stylistics. As a result, these elements were set free and acquired a completely new pedagogical function. They became carriers of the new ideology that was being introduced. Above we spoke about how and for what reason Iosif Turoboiskii explained the substance of emblematic depictions for Muscovite society, training it in the new political discourse. The Baroque became a servitor of power, whose aim was the political reeducation of society.<sup>52</sup>

We will limit ourselves to one very simple example. For Baroque poetics, the *figura etymologica* was a characteristic device of verbal play. We find its wide use in Feofan Prokopovich. Thus, in his "Speech on the Tsar's Power and Honor" of 1718, he defends the practice of calling the tsar "Christ," referring to the etymological meaning of the word as

<sup>52</sup> Cf. L. I. Sazonova's very indicative formulation: "At the same time, Baroque poetry in Russia is characterized by a substantial change in its historical markers of a special type of world-apprehension. In conditions of strengthening absolutism, the pessimism and reflectivity, tragic feeling and mystic exaltation that were features of European Baroque, had to lose their authoritative position. A different ideological orientation took on primary importance, one which was connected to state building and the tasks of enlightening society. In Russian literature, the Baroque fulfilled two most important functions: panegyric and educational." See Sazonova, *Poëziia russkogo barokko*, 223. It is unnecessary to say that such functions had nothing in common with the sources of Baroque poetics and were peripheral to the literary space of West European Baroque; they destroyed the wholeness and rendered the entire phenomenon of Russian Baroque problematic. These functions were characteristic of later literary development, such as the classicism described by L.V. Pumpianskii, "K istorii russkogo klassitsizma (poetika Lomonosova)," *Kontekst: Literaturno-teoreticheskie issledovaniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1983), 303-331. Furthermore, one may say that the belated Russian Baroque was superimposed onto new principles of literary construction. (*Author's note*)

"the anointed one" (*pomazannik*).<sup>53</sup> However, the connection is not limited to etymology (externally, this could be expressed in the semiotically significant writing of the word with a superscript [*titul*]), and the verbal play threatens to transform into reality. If the tsar is Christ, those who betray him are Judases. This is the case with Mazepa in the "Service of Thanksgiving...on the Great God-Given Victory...near Poltava," which was written by Feofilakt Lopatinskii in 1709 and edited by the tsar himself.<sup>54</sup> The naming process goes beyond the framework of a game of meanings. Right after Mazepa's betrayal, Peter himself called him "the second Judas"<sup>55</sup> and ordered that he be anathematized.<sup>56</sup> The *figura ethymologica*, thus, is transformed into an excommunication from the church for a political crime, something without precedent in Russia. Of course, the anathematization of Mazepa also had important educational significance.

This transformation presents a general model that is significant for all of the Baroque elements assimilated into Russia. Thus, say, Feofan's *Rhetoric* reveals its sources as moderate Baroque (Nicholas Caussin, Junius Melchior).<sup>57</sup> However, Feofan's framework differs from those of his sources. His enlightenment thrust, the goal of his treatise, is to introduce a new order, the systematization of a new lifestyle. If in Western Europe rhetoric governed the existing order, in Russia its task was to create a new one. Here we encounter what Renate Lachmann calls "*Dekorum-Rhetorik*."<sup>58</sup> The modality has changed. If in European rhetoric we find prescriptions of the sort: "When you deliver a speech to greet a monarch, it is recommended that you employ such and such an arrangement of the following figures [...]," on Russian soil it takes a different form: "When meeting a monarch, you must make a speech of greeting. This is the way it is done: you make such and such an arrangement and use the following figures [...]," and so on. Instead of regulating existing verbal practices, the entire sphere of public behavior is constituted anew and subjected to regulation.

Clearly, this new function does not depend on a Baroque or Classicist mentality, and this defines the significance of Feofan's *Rhetoric* (and other analogous tracts) for the following generations. Insofar as elements of Baroque stylistics are assimilated by themselves, apart from a Baroque foundation, they acquire a special durability, which is not characteristic of

<sup>53</sup> Feofan Prokopovich, *Feofana Prokopovicha ... Slova i rechi pouchitel'nyya sobrannyya i nekotoryya vtorym tisneniyem, a drugiya vnov' napechatannyya*, I (St. Petersburg: 1760-1774), 252; cf. Zhivov and Uspenskii, "Tsar' i Bog," 79-83.

<sup>54</sup> Feofilakt (Lopatinskii), *Sluzhba blagodarstvennaia, Bogu v Troitse sviatoi slavivomu o velikoi Bogom darovannoi pobede, nad sveiskim korolem Karlom 12 i voinstvom ego. Sodeiannoi pod Poltavoii v leto 1709* (Moscow: Pechatnyi dvor, 1709), fol. 16v-17, 19v.

<sup>55</sup> See Peter's letter to Stefan Iavorskii (Oct. 31, 1708), in *Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo*, 12 vols. (St. Petersburg, Moscow, 1887-1977), 8: 261.

<sup>56</sup> *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1830), IV, № 2213. On the history of the anathematization and the symbolic actions and objects connected with it, see Ernest A. Zitser, *The Transfigured Kingdom: Sacred Parody and Charismatic Authority at the Court of Peter the Great* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 93-107.

<sup>57</sup> Renate Lachmann, "Feofan Prokopovič," *De arte rhetorica libri X, Kijoviae 1706*, ed. R. Lachmann (Cologne: Böhlau, 1982), 468, and S. A. Kibal'nik, "O 'Ritorike' Feofana Prokopovicha," *XVIII vek 14* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1983), 197.

<sup>58</sup> Lachmann, "Feofan Prokopovič," 61.

their European counterparts. Because of this, the tradition of Russian Baroque literature continues to assert its influence throughout the entire eighteenth century.