Review
Reviewed Work(s): The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb: A Socio-Cultural Study of the Cult and the Texts. by Gail Lenhoff
Review by: Paul Bushkovitch
Source: *Slavic Review*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Summer, 1991), pp. 434-435
Published by: Cambridge University Press
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2500218
Accessed: 25-12-2023 15:01 +00:00

durately reticent on motivation and purpose. The analysis is, moreover, often driven by implicit functionalist assumptions; it is precarious, however, to treat social behavior and culture simply as dependent variables of a social and economic system. Another alarm is tripped by the very uniformity of social behavior and norms presented here; within the space of a few paragraphs on a given topos, the analysis ranges across the entire east European plain, eight centuries, and a myriad of different ethnic and social groups to produce a surprisingly homogeneous pattern. So monolithic a sexual culture—virtually undifferentiated by time, status, or geography—effaces the particularism that was so characteristic of premodern society and that proved so resistant to homogenization by modern states and cultures. Even if one eschews the kind of pessimistic conclusions that V. O. Kliuchevskii drew in his study of *zhitiia sviatykh,* the penitentials are clearly more appropriate as a source for theological and ecclesiastical history than they are for the history of sexual norms and behavior.

These reservations aside, this volume is nonetheless an impressive piece of research that makes a significant contribution to our understanding of Orthodoxy and Slavic societies in the medieval period.

GREGORY L. FREEZE
Brandeis University

THE MARTYRED PRINCES BORIS AND GLEB: A SOCIO-CULTURAL STUDY OF THE CULT AND THE TEXTS. By *Gail Lenhoff.* UCLA Slavic Series. Vol. 19. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1989. 168 pp. Cloth.

Gail Lenhoff's study of the texts and cult of princes Boris and Gleb represents a new departure in a seemingly well-studied area. Her work has two parts: a theoretical discussion about the proper mode of understanding the literature of medieval Rus′ and a specific study of Boris and Gleb. Lenhoff believes that scholars of old Rus′ literature have been mistaken to approach the texts primarily as works of art. These works need to be examined not as art in the modern sense but as part of the life of the times. Their primary function was religious, to serve as part of a cult or some other devotional purpose, and not aesthetic. The primary bonds of a text were vertical, to the institutions that needed it, not horizontal, to other texts. In this she reflects the influence of the Berlin Slavists K.-D. Seemann and W.-H. Schmidt, who pioneered applying earlier German work on the New Testament to Slavic literature.

Lenhoff's conclusions about the texts and cult of the two saints reveal the virtues of her approach. Her account of the evolution of the cult is the most detailed in the literature, going well beyond the intermittent debate over the time of "canonization" of the two saints. Many cherished ideas about them will have to be revised: Starting as a local Vyshgorod martyr cult, the veneration of Boris and Gleb only gradually became a more "Kievan" and dynastic cult in the twelfth century. Not until the fifteenth century were Boris and Gleb associated with the Moscow dynasty and "national" Rus′-Russian ideas. Lenhoff's conclusions are, in large part, based on a careful study of the liturgy of the saints' festival, which has previously attracted little attention.

The strength of a philological approach to the texts comes out most effectively in Lenhoff's discussion of the two principal narratives of the martyrdom, the *Skazanie* and the *Chtenie,* both, in her view, composed in the late eleventh century. A close reading of the two texts reveals two different orientations: the more dynastic approach of the *Skazanie,* which combines Christian notions of martyrdom with pre-Christian conceptions of the importance of kinship loyalty and, second, the more purely Christian attitude of the *Chtenie,* which Lenhoff sees as aimed at a monastic audience and which neglects the kinship element of the *Skazanie.*

Lenhoff's study of the literature of the veneration of Boris and Gleb is exemplary, but she goes beyond her specific theme. She identifies purely Christian culture in this early era with monastic culture and describes nonmonastic culture as including pagan as well as Christian elements. On this last point I have a word of criticism: Lenhoff's attempt to find specific pre-

Christian elements in the earliest cult of the princes in itself seems to be on the right track, but her overall view of Slavic paganism is too dependent on B. A. Rybakov and the older literature. Rybakov's studies of paganism are not his most convincing, and the more skeptical approach of Henryk Łowmiański might lead to more interesting conclusions in this area.

PAUL BUSHKOVITCH
Yale University

THE NIKONIAN CHRONICLE: FROM THE YEAR 1425 TO THE YEAR 1520. Ed. *Serge A. Zenkovsky.* Trans. Serge A. Zenkovsky and Betty Jean Zenkovsky Vol. 5. Princeton, N.J.: Darwin, 1989. xxxix, 325 pp. Figures. $35.00, cloth.

With this fifth volume, the late Serge Zenkovsky's translation of the Nikon Chronicle is complete. Zenkovsky's career was distinguished and his contributions to scholarship great, but this project's broad scope (the Russian publication is over 1,500 pages) seems to have overwhelmed his laudable but diffuse goal: to publish "the last major Russian chronicle" because it reflects "the mentalities, political situation and cultural environment" of its time (1:xiv). This publication is very problematic. The text is not precisely the "Nikon Chronicle" (an encyclopedic source extending from pre-Rus′ history to 1520, compiled in Metropolitan Daniil's scriptorium in the late 1520s). Rather, the editor used as his basis primarily one manuscript (the Obolenskii as published in *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* [*PSRL*], vols. 9–13), which both Boris M. Kloss (author of the definitive study of this complex chronicle) and Zenkovsky justifiably consider the "original" text of the source. Zenkovsky, however, added "important supplementary information or expanded textual material" (p. vii). In this volume about ten pages constitute interpolations from the Ioasaf Chronicle (which the Obolenskii's compilers used) or from the Illuminated Chronicle (which incorporated the Obolenskii text when it was compiled in the 1560s–1570s). The result is a new twentieth century compilation, not just the Nikon Chronicle.

Several spot-checks show that the translation itself is wanting, particularly toward the end. Inaccuracies abound: A church was painted with frescoes (*podpisana*) not consecrated (p. 36); *Mordva* is not *militia* (p. 69); Ivan Andreevich, not Andrei Ivanovich (p. 72); September, not March (p. 283); November, not Novgorod (p. 287); Patrikeev, not Obolenskii (p. 300). Sentences, words, and clauses are left out. Brackets are not used consistently: Zenkovsky's explanatory glosses are frequently not bracketed, while other bracketed items should not be. Certain names are garbled: "Ivan Mikulin syn Iarov" should either be "Ivan, son of Mikula Iaryi" (not "Ivan Mikulin, son of Iaryi") or be retained as is and certainly never transformed into the patronymic (*-vich*). Relevant personal and geographical names should be given in Polish, Lithuanian, or Belorussian, not the Russified transliteration seen here. One might question some translations, but the most serious is the unfortunate use of "Russia" for *"Rus′,"* beginning in the tenth century, which contaminates the English text with a Great Russian bias also found in the annotations and historical introduction. As for the supporting apparatus, the genealogical charts omit individuals and offer dates that could have been tracked down more exactly, the footnotes are repetitive compared to the glossary and to one another, maps and indexes are to follow in a supplementary volume. In sum, this project already demands re-editing.

To obtain Zenkovsky's stated goal, moreover, a simple translation is insufficient; one wants to learn what is unique about this text as a sixteenth century document and, at the same time, to enable the uninitiated to see beyond the medieval chronicle's paratactic rhetorical mode that abjures causation in favor of neutral connectives (Nancy Partners has written eloquently on this aspect). These tasks might have been accomplished by an introductory essay on the genre or by full annotations to the text's sources (a gargantuan task) showing how the sixteenth century compiler selected and shaped history to create a "usable past." But demonstrating the Nikon's "ideology" is not easy: Kloss sees several motives for the Nikon's compilation—concerns over the church's right to own land, the interdependence of church and state, the struggle with heresy,