

Bdinski Zbornik, Ghent Slavonic Ms 408, a.d. 1360. Fascimile edition, with a presentation by Ivan Dujčev, London, Variorum Reprints, 1972.

The *Bdinski Zbornik* has been published for the first time in the Editions «Variorum Reprints» in a photo-fascimile edition of the manuscript.

It is only a few years since a contemporary literary historian of the Balkan countries wrote «Une édition complète du recueil serait bien venue» (E. Turdeanu, *La Littérature Bulgare du XIV^e siècle et sa diffusion dans les Pays Roumains*, Paris 1947—Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Études Slaves, XXII, p. 40, s. 3): he was referring to ms no. 408 of the University library of the city of Ghent, which bears the date 1360. The prologue to the photo-fascimile edition of the manuscript is by the learned Bulgarian medievalist Ivan Dujčev, who is perhaps the most qualified scholar to introduce the reader to the problems of the history of fourteenth-century Southern Slav renaissance literature (cf. pp. I-XI) and in particular to the contribution, especially between the years 1348-1360, of the city of Vidin, as a center of letters dominated by the figure of Joasaph, metropolitan of the city.

Although the first to report the existence of the manuscript was Baron Jules de Saint-Genois (*Catalogue méthodique et raisonné des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de la ville et de l'Université de Gand*, Gand 1849-1852, No. 171), the name of the Russian Jesuit Ivan Martinov (1821-1894) is indelibly associated with its first description. Since then many scholars have studied the manuscript, leading to the critical edition by J. L. Scharpé, F. Vyncke and E. Voordeckers, of the University of Ghent. While the critical and the photo-fascimile editions form an essential complement to each other, each is especially valuable to the student researching the Greek sources of the *Bdinski Zbornik* and problems of its translation, as well as the variations in the Slavonic version.

Following Dujčev's prologue is a description of the manuscript, in two unnumbered pages: then comes the photo-fascimile text, which is composed of ff. 241^r + f. 242^r (f. 21 is inverted).

Institute for Balkan Studies
Thessaloniki

CONSTANTINE PAPOULIDIS

Abbott Gleason, *European and Muscovite, Ivan Kireevsky and the Origins of Slavophilism*, Harvard University Press, 1972.

Each major and not-so-major Russian intellectual in the 19th century, it seems, is entitled to an American dissertation expanded into a scholarly book. The present work is a worthy specimen in that tradition. Its chief merit is a common-sense attention to the details of life in the career of one of the better-known philosophical and historical mythmakers in the age of Nicholas I, which gives this volume, with all its careful research, a certain pedestrian lustre.

The ideological and philosophical context set here for Kireevsky is the anti-industrialism later exemplified by Tönnies, Durkheim, Marx, and Max Weber; yet it is but briefly treated. What emerges most strongly is Kireevsky as a human being, aristocratic, indolent yet sensitive and intelligent, a family-centered homebody, a true Oblomov. When he studied in Germany, for instance, he never tried to explore or understand German society; he rather talked about Schelling than attended his lectures. As Gleason observed, during his entire

foreign sojourn Kireevsky «in a sense never left Moscow at all». Yet his first venture as a publicist was called *The European*. The regime of Nicholas I did not encourage intellectual vigor. *The European* was suppressed as a result of a senseless denunciation which appealed to the Emperor's paranoia. The blow made the timid Kireevsky shrink more into himself; yet it also aided in the formulation of his slavophile creed. The slightly more vigorous intellectual temper of the early forties, enlivened by the polemics between the westernizers and slavophiles, encouraged Kireevsky to edit another periodical, more appropriately called *The Muscovite* (it does not appear that he took any interest in any Slavs but Russians). After some awkwardness and confusion Kireevsky retired from it in 1846. Thereafter his withdrawal deepened. He was haunted by death in the family and a sense of guilt heightened rather than assuaged by frequent devotion at the Optina monastery and the reading of the Orthodox Church fathers. His life-long search for wholesomeness, so central to his creed, proved fruitless, and the cholera carried him off just in time to spare him from the post-Crimean tide of rapid westernization, which shattered his idealized vision of a revived medieval Russia.

The author's explanation of the origins of Kireevsky's creed draws heavily on Martin Malia's penetrating study of Herzen. Kireevsky was raised in a happy family and therefore cherished family tradition, which bound him to the old Muscovy and its resentment against Peter I; Herzen, the bastard, bitterly turned against it, as he did against most things Russian. Professor Gleason, elaborating this approach, points out among other things that Kireevsky, who idealized the peasant commune, offered no justification for the serf-owning landed gentry from which he derived his own identity.

With all its good qualities this book perhaps makes too little allowance for the special Russian components of the case. It would seem that in their efforts to «translate» Russian realities for the benefit of American students American historians have tended to wash out too much of the peculiarly Russian coloration, without sufficient awareness of the pitfalls of such translation. There ought to be in all studies of alien cultures a strong dose of a comparative anthropological sensibility to offset the American-flavored universalism so noticeable in Russian as in most other foreign area studies. Did not Kireevsky the slavophile merit a more Russian-flavored tribute?

Clark University

THEODORE H. VON LAUE