

² Зозуля, М., *Каким должен быть вузовский учебник по истории литературы?* ж. *Вопросы литературы*, 1967, № 2, стр. 168—183.

³ *Історія української літератури* (кінець XIX — початок XX ст.) за ред. Н. Й. Жук, проф. Л. Д. Іванова, проф. С. М. Шаховського, Київ, 1967, 475 стр.

⁴ М. Б. Храпченко о применении этого принципа упомянул в своем докладе о направлении новых исследований и методов в советском литературо-

ведении, прочитанном 28 мая 1968 г. в Венгерской Академии наук.

⁵ Подробно об этом см. в статье Г. Сивоконь, *Второе прочтение*, опубликованной в ж. *Вопросы литературы*, 1968 г. № 1, стр. 78—90.

⁶ *Історія української літератури у восьми томах*. Том перший. Давня література (XI — перша половина XVIII ст.), відп. ред. Л. Е. Махновець, Київ, 1967, 539 стр.

Jack Lindsay: Byzantium into Europe

The Byzantium as the first Europe (326—1204 A. D.) and the further Contribution till 1453 A. D. London, The Bodley Head, (1952)

The basic idea of Lindsay's Byzantium image, drawn in huge outlines and powerful colours, is brought home by the subsidiary title. Since its foundation in 326 up till the disgraceful Latin conquest which stopped the rule of the basileus over the city for a time Byzantium had been — according to the author — part and parcel of Europe. This statement is surprising and it seems to be a daringly one-sided one. All over the 485 pages of his book Lindsay brings an unmatched knowledge and wit to bear upon his arguments to prove this thesis of his. What we get is, perhaps, not so much a complete conviction as a masterfully written work which stirs thoughts as well as contrary arguments — a work which enriches the reader in very many respects.

The beginnings of Byzantium — as is well known — are connected with two dates. In 667 B. C. some seamen of Megara had founded a small colony on the hilly peninsula protruding into the Propontis and it was at the same spot that a thousand years later Constantine founded the capital of the Roman Empire — a Christian empire by this time — and named it Néa Rhóme — later to be called Konstantinoupolis, by his own name. Ancient Byzantium had been an insignificant, small settlement compared to the metropolis taking shape at this time, but it nevertheless was the embodiment of the cultural heritage of pagan Hellas doomed to destruction. And these traces of the heritage were to interfere — as Lindsay points out — with the fate of the metropolis built upon the port of the Megara seamen as well as its culture. With the forming of the city they even helped to shape the spiritual life of the whole empire. Undoubtedly, Constantine's Byzantium became the capital of the Christian empire even though it had been born amidst the enormous crisis of an antic state (23—30). Lindsay's

presentation of Constantine's state is detailed and conscientious but the social analysis is only seemingly deep-going (33—64). If we accept that the social order of mediaeval Europe is feudalism it is — to say the least — debatable that it is identical with the Western, classical form of feudalism. Lindsay says quite categorically: "The great interest of Byzantium and its various achievements underlay the whole of mediaeval Europe will be seen in its full cogency . . ." (64) The following sentence is acceptable only in part: "the third century represented the open crisis of slave-economy and the ancient state, and the Constantinean State the first phase of a new world in which the feudalizing forces fight to take over and control the ancient inheritance." (ibid.) The sentence is disputable only inasmuch as we regard Byzantium as the exclusive starting-point of this truly involved social and cultural process. We get a very effectively written, though rather short, survey of Byzantine historic events (65—104).

In the following part we are acquainted with the life of the state (105—168). The Justinian code of rights, the fights of the parties, the life of cities and villages, the army, the life and struggle of peasants, the organization of the peasant-army of the themas are all well-known facets of Byzantine history . . . But Lindsay acquaints the reader with many original statements that are near the Marxist (Levchenko) point of view and which testify that his approach is more individual than the curt (but useful) surveys of Brehier and Diehl but which do not surpass Ostrogorsky's analyses. But then this could not have been Lindsay's aim either.

This is what we can say about his presentation of the religious fights. The fights of the orthodoxia and the heresis in Byzantium rather than in the West went on in a very refined spirit but also with an un-

matched cruelty (169—259). H. G. Beck (*Byzantinisches Handbuch* 2/1. *Theologische Literatur und Kirche in Byzanz. Hb. der Altertumswiss.*) probably tells more news about the subject in his nice system but Lindsay again surprizes us with many original ideas. His favourite one is the following up of the 'pagan' antic infiltration into Christianity. The idea has already been tackled by Harnack and Norden but for the student of the history of religion Lindsay has brought many interesting thoughts and results. The destructive opposition of the orthodoxia and the nationalistic heresies, the inner problems of the iconoclasmos (221—235) is discussed in a way that is full of novelties. Talking about the bogumils Lindsay stresses the extreme rapidity with which the heresies spread among the peasant masses of the Northern Balkan (244—254).

After such a minutely detailed analysis of the complicated history of Byzantium and its shaping forces the sketch of Byzantine culture, under several headings, cannot possibly lack substantial basis. Byzantine culture came about from a long co-existence of late-Roman and Greek culture to which significant Oriental influences were added. Lindsay unearthes splendidly the ingredients of a compilative and yet original culture. "Hellenistic art in the form taken in the countless Alexandrian workshops flowed in with its graceful rhythm and fresh impressionist nuances of colour and atmospheres; Syriac art brought its harsh dramatic impact and Mesopotamian art, its hieratic contours . . . Allegory and realistic narrative, pagan motives and apocalyptic passion." (251). All these changing and shaping forces and forms come from the people. Man, tormented by the great changes of the late antic tried to express its pagan, Jewish and Christian notions about the world in Dura-Europos's images (266—267). The marked and three-dimensional world of the polis — we could say — gave way to the two-dimensional new state burdened with an Assyrian splendour and obscure notions and the Oriental over-heatedness of Antiocheia (*βασιλεία των Ῥωμαίων*). And this is how culture changes. A new art-form appears, the mosaic, and a new kind of church-architecture comes about in the Haga Sophia as its prototype (276) whereas the finest examples of mosaic art are preserved in the Ravennan San Vitale, the seat of Byzantine Italy's exarcha. The Byzantine masters, getting in touch with the art of the Scythians, bring the email-technique to perfection to mediate it to the West (277—278). The penetration

of Byzantine art into Europe can be demonstrated in many other examples (Aachen, St. Denis, Germigny, Quimperlé). The author is quite willing to discuss the rôle of the iconoclasts in the history of Byzantine art in a positive light. There were popular, humanistic features coming to the foreground with the too hieratic Syrian traditions receding backwards. (281—286). During the reactionary and disturbed reign of the Macedonian dynasty (867—1057) some other tendencies also gained ground. It is probably enough to refer to the newly consecrated Hagia Sophia in Paulos Silentiarios which recalled the fresh colours of early spring — the light penetrates the huge edifice showing, as it were, the meaning of its architecture (Sophia). The heavy architecture of Byzantine churches arose under the two-century-long Macedonian reign, with the art of the icons also showing a new, more rigid and ascetic tendency on the hands of monk-painters and perpetuated by them — as Lindsay maintains. Yet, we must propose that the sentimental simplicity of the Slavian world annexed to Byzantium must have given warmth to this canonistic work of art. One must look at the icons at length . . .

The Byzantine emanation reached the extreme parts of Western Europe, the British Isles (cf. with the York *Hodegetria* p. 293, Winchester Psalter 1160, p. 294), the Norman countries (Normandy and Siculo-Normandy) and even Chartres. The influence of Byzantium is, of course, even more powerful on the territories of its own cultural supremacy: on the lands of the Slavs belonging to the Eastern Church and in Southern Italy. In Russia, however, Byzantium was forced to share its influence with the Caucasian (Armenian-Syrian) and Iranic impacts. As to Southern Italy, Lindsay — deplorably, perhaps — talks about indirect impacts only, the influences through Monte Cassino. Even if he dwells on two classic Siculo-Byzantine relics (the capella palatina of Palermo and the Monreale cathedral) he fails to mention the Greek cloisters of Calabria and Sicily, which originally used to be Greek cathedrals. He, of course, touches on the contacts between Dugento and Byzantium (301—302).

"Byzantium, true, never created a great written drama; but its whole history was essentially dramatic." (303) The drama of Byzantium is liturgy — and the circus with the mimes whose antic predecessors had already made fun of Christian rites. They could not stay in Christian Byzantium for long (304—305). The musical and per-

forming festivals, however, were very popular: the akroaiseis and the ekphraseis. The accepted times of these were the Kalenda New Year, the Maioumas (every third year) and the Brumalia in the autumns (305). On other occasions popular dances were performed most often by the guilds. The songs accompanying them were generally folkloristic in character. Written drama was really started by the play of a Jew, Ezechiel, under the title of Exodus, written in the most classic Hellen in an iambic meter. A school of drama was, however, started by somebody else called Methodios. This play was called "The Feast of the Ten Virgins" (*Ludus de decem virginibus*). The true form of the Byzantine liturgic play differs from its Western counterparts. It presented sermons and homilies.

The greatest dramatic creation of Byzantium is the liturgy that is connected with Basileios and Ióannés Chrysostomos (307—308). The influence of antic elements is unmistakable in this great dramatic work. Compared to it the Protestant, but even the Catholic liturgies of Western Europe are poor imitations. — Right to the sixth century the classical tradition of music had survived. But from this time onwards some basically new, Oriental forms appeared. The common source of Byzantine and pre-Gregorian music were the Antiochean and Jerusalem churches with the synagogue in the background (309). Antic music was built upon the quantitative forms of the verse, popular psalms arose under quite different circumstances. A more perfect hymnody is the way the people of the bios thetoretikos, the monks used to sing (311). It was from the psalms that the heretics created their lighter types of songs. The theme of liturgic drama returns later on as a truly homiletic presentation of a biblical scene in contrast to the theoretical *ludus* of the West which was also biblical in its inspiration but which was far less theological (316—323). Nevertheless, in the late-Byzantine age the Western-type liturgic *ludus*, regarded profane by the Greek hierarchs, re-appears. It is impossible to enumerate Lindsay's interesting remarks on the musical ornamentation of the liturgic play (320—321). The ornaments are full of splendour, almost too refined compared to the Western *cantus planus* (except the *jubili*) and they had undoubtedly entered Byzantium through Syrian (and Jewish) music. The oldest Byzantine musical form, the *kontakion*, goes back to Romanos who had been a Syrian Jew before he became the greatest church-composer of Byzantium.

After a short discussion of the *heirmos* and *troparion* Lindsay goes back to the subject of the *kontakion* (as the most favoured of all forms) which was sung much outside the church as well. Christmas *kontakions*, for example, were performed in the emperor's palace by some fifty *psaltes*, the hymn-singers of the *Apostoleion* and the *Sophia*. Solemn acclamations, the *akta* featured both in the emperor's and the church's liturgy. The same can be said of the musical, and even dancing, ornaments of the above-mentioned dramatizations of *logoi panegyrikoí*. The people of the Greek villages had a patronal festival which they called *panegyris* and on these occasions the choir leaders and the people gave a common singing and dancing performance of the *enkomiions* (322). The colourful, rich musical culture unites and resounds in an angelic tone, the echo, the 'ep' ouranious'. May we suggest that it is above all in this kind of music that the Oriental (Syrian-Hebrew) religious notions express themselves best together with the teaching of the earthly reflection of the 'ideas'. A beautiful hymn of the Caroling culture can, at its best, place the saints among the cherubim: "inter ardentés cherubim cetervas . . ." A *kontakion cherubikon*, deriving from the same period, represents the flaming inhabitants of heaven with mortals: "Hoi, ta chérubim mystikós eikozontes..."

As to literature Lindsay makes the following general statement: "Literature is not as great as Byzantine Art; it lacks the universal quality, the mass-element, except in religious terms." (340). Literary works, he explains, had to suffer from the double controlling power of the *orthodoxeia* and the *basileia*. Lindsay's remark is exact: "The basic dilemma appeared in the fact that when the writer moved fully into the mass-area he became a religious polemist or expounder, and when he tried to draw on the humanist positions of the pagan past he tended to fall into the élite attitudes of that past." The representative genre is historiography. But the Byzantine *rhétor* does not only draw on the Thukydeian heritage. The greatest of them all was Jóannés Malalas, a Syrian of Antiochy (Malalas meaning *rhétor* in Syrian). Agathias, another historiographer, was a jurist as well as a poet, a true representative of the Priscinean and even Ciceronian type of writers (342). The true overture in poetry, by the way, was heralded with the appearance of the Egyptian school in the 4th and 5th centuries. (Egypt at that time belonged to the *Pars Orientalis* and thus to the Eastern-Roman Empire.) (544) The 7th-century Jóannés lived also

on the peripheries of the Byzantine world, in Damascus, which was under Arabic rule in addition — he even surpassed the great poet of the Emperor City, Theodoros, the héguménos of the Stoudios cloister (545). The history of Barlaam and Josephat arrived in Byzantium from Georgia and on to the Latin West including Hungary, although Lindsay makes no mention of that. Instead of going into details let us conclude that Byzantium assimilates much rather than makes others to assimilate in contrast to the daring and risky venture of the Palaia Rhómé which gave the new people the hard lesson of having to acquire the antique erudition together with the acquisition of Christianity. It seems that the hard rationalism of the Italón sophia was missing here and this is why this colourful, rich culture could not achieve anything quite as dynamic and creative as its Latin counterpart. Lindsay arrives basically at the same conclusion: "There are no great works in the sense the writings of Homer and Aischylos, Plato and Aristotle, Sappho and Theokritos are great . . . or those of Dante and Chaucer, Rabelais and Villon, Cervantes and Shakespeare." (351) Lindsay supplements the picture with some more concrete features through a discussion of the poet Nonnos, a Byzantine legend, Photios and Psellos (representatives of Byzantine humanism) and the Digenes Akritas, an epos (353—368). As to the latter: the style of the popular epics (agyrtes) had an effect on the style of the official

inscriptions which, in their turn, became an integral part of Byzantine historiography. This is how elements in the history of style connect the popular epic with the historiography of the court (368—376). And finally, we must not forget about the last service Byzantium, on the brink of its destruction, made to European culture: the inspiration it gave to Latin humanism (Michaél Chrysoloras — Coluccio Salutati, pp. 377—383). Lindsay resumes the subject somewhat later (447—452).

After discussing some better-known subjects (Byzantium and the West, Byzantium and the Arabs) Lindsay deals with the achievements of Eastern Rome in the field of the natural sciences (alchemy and technology) — in a highly interesting chapter on the history of sciences.

In the final chapter (Conclusions) Lindsay gives a clever survey of the history of Byzantine studies from the end of the 17th century (Du Cange) to Gibbon and Toynbee. It is a great pity he does not mention Montfaucon or the Bonn byzantinists. His blames concerning the prejudices of Gibbon and Toynbee are fully justified. We cannot know Europe without knowing Byzantium. And if we — in conclusion — apply Lindsay's results on Hungary we are bound to say the same. The age of the Árpáds with its literary and general culture can never be fully discovered without a complete confrontation of the Hungary of those times with Byzantium.

LÁSZLÓ MEZEY

Robert Goffin: *Fil d'Ariane pour la Poésie*

Précédé de la lettre de Jean Cocteau. A. G. Nizet, Paris, 1964, pp 280

Robert Goffin est l'une des personnalités représentatives de la poésie contemporaine de langue française et le recueil de ses morceaux choisis, publié en 1966 dans la collection «Poètes d'aujourd'hui» de Seghers, avec une excellente présentation d'Alain Bosquet, a pu convaincre les sceptiques, si tant est qu'il y en eut, de ses qualités. Goffin est un poète disposant d'une expérience quasi unique en son genre: il a publié son premier recueil il y a un demi-siècle, en 1918, ses œuvres sont le miroir des mouvements poétiques les plus marquants du siècle. Malgré cela, son intonation est tout à fait personnelle, on ne saurait s'y tromper. Sa carrière a débuté sous le signe du symboliste Albert Samain; puis c'est l'animisme Jules Romains qui l'a influencé;

plus tard, ce sera le cubisme d'Apollinaire, ensuite Cendrars, les surréalistes — Breton et Éluard surtout; à ce dernier, il a emprunté le titre de l'un de ses récents volumes: *Sources du Ciel* —, enfin le néo-classicisme de Paul Valéry. Mais il n'est pas resté insensible à la rhétorique cosmique de Paul Claudel non plus. Avant tout, c'est cependant au jazz qu'il s'est nourri, il lui a consacré peut-être le premier article analytique au monde et, en 1930, dans *Aux Frontières du Jazz*, il l'a taxé de «première forme du surréalisme».

Fil d'Ariane pour la Poésie est une confession sur cette carrière de cinquante ans dans le domaine de la poésie et de la critique, une somme au sens le plus large du terme: autobiographie poétique, livre de