ACTA SLAVICA ESTONICA VI.
Studia Russica Helsingiensia et Tartuensia XIV.
Russian National Myth in Transition.
Tartu, 2014

HARMONISTS IN THE CAMP OF THE RUSSIAN WARRIORS: ONCE MORE ON THE HISTORICAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE NATIONAL LITERARY CANON

ROMAN LEIBOV

A literary (or another other cultural) canon can be presented not only as a *list of texts*, but also as a *system*: that is, a collection of cultural/social functions relevant to myriad historically varying series and supplying "strong" texts (meaning those that are replicated, through various means, more broadly than others[1]). This approach is most obviously applicable to national literary canons, which in new European cultures are oriented toward filling the thematic and genre lacunae of classical models ("our Aeneid", "our Shakespeare", "our Baudelaire").

In the elementary-school pedagogical canon, the greatest significance will be attached to typical narratives and descriptions tied to didactic aims: teaching the child about "proper" behavior, how to structure his/her environment, and about calendar time. In the "popular song" series, "strong texts" will serve as representations of typical lyrical emotions cultivated by the environment of the song tradition and presenting a socially acceptable model of behavior and emotional reaction. When viewing the history of the canon in this way, it is these functions that are primary (and specific to each series); the texts that serve these functions, however, are replaced depending on the historical dynamics of various series (development of a national language, educational practices, ideological stances, musical tastes and trends, etc.).

In one way or another, hierarchies of texts become explicit in many cultural and institutional spheres (in the form of standard lists of names/titles in literary-historical or critical compositions, in the practice of mass-produced reprints of old texts, in re-screening old films; for works of music, in standard repertoires and

[1] In greater detail, see [Лейбов 2011].

school music programs). Here the task lies in constantly replacing "outdated" (in the linguistic, ideological or real-historical sense) texts with "substitute texts" that fill the space of the no-longer-relevant text in the overall cultural hierarchy.

Of course, this replacement does not always imply total expulsion. The "substitute texts" fulfill a dual function in relation to the canon as a *sum of texts*: in refurbishing it, suggesting modern versions of classical texts, they simultaneously stand in for the older texts and confirm their classical status. The supplanted texts gradually depart from the school reading program, disappear from the repertoires of popular singers, but become further consolidated in literary-historical anthologies and can be heard at chamber-music concerts: in this way, the quantitative narrowing of the old text's field of replication can be accompanied by a qualitative "reinforcement", a consolidation of the work in the "cultural core" of a national tradition, its transition into the ranks of the "classics".

The combination of the stability of a structure transmitted through time and the variability of the concrete filler of this structure resembles the transmission of genetic information (this analogy is a commonplace of contemporary literary evolutionism[2]); it also recalls the transformations of folklore existing within a tradition that preserves its structural identity not despite but thanks to its plasticity and openness to transformations[3].

Of course, the mechanisms of transmission will vary quite widely in various cases. A "strong" text can, as we have seen, both co-exist with its descendents and be completely supplanted by them. Texts can take part in peculiar interferences. Thus, Tolstoy's story about Vanya tempted by a plum can be supplemented (but not supplanted) in the Soviet school program by Zoshchenko's story about little Lenin breaking his aunt's pitcher (this story is in turn a retelling of a fragment from the memoirs by V. I. Ulyanov [Lenin]'s sister Anna Ilyinichna, which were widely published during the Soviet period). Both the structural similarity of these two children's narratives (which often got mixed up in the memory of people who experienced the canon of Soviet children's reading) and their differences are striking. Vanya is compelled to admit his sin by the fear of death (hardly an unexpected plot for Tolstoy), while little Volodya is

---

[2] Among recent works in the field I would name a paper by three Americans, given at a conference in Lausanne: [Sack, Wu, Zusman].

[3] However, folklore has to do with essentially anonymous processes, while in the literary tradition at every point of development we are dealing not with anonymous shifts, but more or less conscious choices on the part of authors whose bodies of work in and of themselves have a certain internal coherence; their work with the preceding tradition is subject to more or less cognizant rules. An investigation of these literary mutations must therefore necessarily include a discussion of auto-context and authorial positions.

moved exclusively by his conscience (we can also note the absence of the father in the story about Lenin — a crucially important figure in Tolstoy's narrative).

The "ancestor text" can be reflected more or less completely in the "successor texts". Sometimes the former's features appear in diluted form in a whole group of texts (the "strength" of the text is dispersed), but sometimes a new "strong" text appears that supplants its "ancestor". In the 20th century, this supplanting is often connected to extraliterary series: the social-historical and the political-ideological[4]. Often the success of the "successor text" will be determined less by the degree of its resemblance to the "ancestor" and more by the felicity of the "mutations" that impart new features to the text, which are unexpected from the point of view of the old literary system.

Meanwhile, the signals of texts' structural non-resemblance can nearly completely overshadow their resemblance; understanding the new text need not in any way depend on the reader's recognition of its "ancestor" — even quite the opposite. As Yuri Lotman pointed out repeatedly, new meanings in culture emerge explosively at the borders of heterogeneous semiotic systems, at places where adequate translation is unequivocally impossible. In our view, the evolution of a cultural canon — i. e. a series that is by definition conservative and oriented toward transmitting existing hierarchies rather than innovations — can be directly linked to the mechanisms of cross-genre contacts, of peculiar cultural "interbreeding".

The question naturally arises: when the author gives no explicit indications as to the link between the "successor text" and the "ancestor text", to what extent are these weak signals relevant to a description of literary evolution? Are they not an exaggeration on the researcher's part? One would think that accentuating the description of the structure of canonical series and its transformations would allow researchers of intertextuality to do away with the eternal question of intentionality: if two texts demonstrate intersections at various structural levels and simultaneously can be described as isomorphic with regard to the functions they serve within extraliterary series, they should attract the attention of the history of transformations of the cultural canon, and can be examined within that canon as realizations of a single invariant.

It would seem that precisely these ties (often hidden, overshadowed by new generic aims of "successor texts") to the "rather distant" ancestor could explain the success of many canonical texts of the Soviet era, which were discreetly replicating 19th-century standard reading materials.

---

[4] For a discussion of one example of this kind of substitution see [Лейбов 2013].

An example of such a "strong" classic text with close ties to the extraliterary series is Zhukovsky's "The Bard in the Camp of the Russian Warriors" (1812, henceforth: BCRW). As is well known, Zhukovsky's paean gave rise to numerous synchronous and more remote imitations, parodies and rehashings[5], which is typical for certain types of "strong" texts. The popularity of these replications lies to a large degree in the melodic-syntactical originality of the text and the presence of a more or less distinctly expressed epic component. In this sense, by all means, this is one of the strongest corpuses (in Zhukovsky's case, the role of the absent epic narrative is, of course, provided by historical context). As a model poetic text of the Patriotic War, the BCRW was consolidated in the school canon as well, successfully maintaining its place there all the way until the Soviet period[6].

Let us note the antinomy embedded in Zhukovsky's text between the metaphorical "singing" deployed in the old-time conventional poetic world of the paean (with its "arrows" and "armor" and "swords") and the text's real intonational orientation on melodiousness. The conventional song-activity at the conventional feast before the battle, which unites the lyric element with the text's entirely epic monumentality, did not assume that the BCRW would be transposed into amateur vocal genres; but naturally neither did it prevent the creation of various musical compositions using Zhukovsky's poem by Bortniansky (1813), Verstovsky (1827) and A. Varlamov (1832) (on the latter two see [Глумов: 83, 85]). This musicality (which is connected to the general aims of the "school of harmonious precision") is wonderfully described by Tynianov in his novel *Pushkin*. In the novel, the evaluation of BCRW's melodic form is given by a poet of an older poetic school — Derzhavin. Characteristically, he describes the effect of the paean on the public as "musical contagion", while drawing a parallel between Zhukovsky's text and popular, frivolous songs and

---

[5] O. A. Proskurin demonstrated how Zhukovsky's intonational and melodic pattern becomes the dominant in texts by authors whose goals are far from both parody and pure imitation: "The very fact of the travesty of Zhukovsky's 'Singer' *consolidates* the text's canonical status, confirms its right to universal renown <…>" [Проскурин 2000: 174].

[6] It can be found in anthologies of 19th-century poetry for the duration of the entire century. The poem first appeared in 1815 in a German anthology (*Severin, J.* Russisches Lesebuch mit einem Russisch-Deutschen und Deutsch-Russischen Wörterbuche und einer Abhandlung über die Vorzüge der Russischen Sprache von Dr. Johann Severin Vater. Leipzig; Petersburg, 1815), then was publishing in the anthologies of Peninsky, Galakhov and Filonov. According to a database compiled by A. V. Vdovin [Вдовин], Zhukovsky's text or excerpts from it have appeared sixteen times throughout the 19th century (compare Pushkin's "The Commander" at three times, Lermontov's "Borodino" at twenty-one times). On ties between Zhukovsky's text and the context of 1812 see [Лотман 1963].

dances: "His song on 1812 is suspicious: everything uses the motif of a romance and forces the protagonists to waltz" [Тынянов: 427].

One more feature of BCRW important for our further considerations is its dialogic structure, in which the nameless Singer (for historical readers, of course, the protagonist of Zhukovsky, who was in the active army) leads a solo, caught up by the "chorus" of Warriors[7].

We believe we can examine a classic poem by M. Isakovsky as a "secret descendent" of Zhukovsky's paean. Below is the text as it was printed in Isakovsky's collections:

В прифронтовом лесу

Лиде

С берез, неслышен, невесом,
Слетает желтый лист.
Старинный вальс "Осенний сон"
Играет гармонист.
Вздыхают, жалуясь, басы,
И, словно в забытьи,
Сидят и слушают бойцы —
Товарищи мои.

Под этот вальс весенним днем
Ходили мы на круг,
Под этот вальс в краю родном
Любили мы подруг,

Под этот вальс ловили мы
Очей любимых свет,
Под этот вальс грустили мы,
Когда подруги нет.

И вот он снова прозвучал
В лесу прифронтовом,
И каждый слушал и молчал
О чем-то дорогом;

И каждый думал о своей,
Припомнив ту весну,

[7] Denis Davydov appears as a double for the Singer in the poem; Zhukovsky dedicates a separate quatrain to Davydov that connects the two aspects of the hero (and lyric subject) through rhyme: "Давыдов, пламенный боец, / Он вихрем в бой кровавый; / Он в мире счастливый певец / Вина, любви и славы".

И каждый знал — дорога к ней
Ведет через войну...

Так что ж, друзья, коль наш черед, —
Да будет сталь крепка!
Пусть наше сердце не замрет,
Не задрожит рука;

Пусть свет и радость прежних встреч
Нам светят в трудный час,
А коль придется в землю лечь,
Так это ж только раз.

Но пусть и смерть — в огне, в дыму —
Бойца не устрашит,
И что положено кому —
Пусть каждый совершит.

Настал черед, пришла пора, —
Идем, друзья, идем!
За все, чем жили мы вчера,
За все что завтра ждем;

За тех, что вянут, словно лист,
За весь родимый край…
Сыграй другую, гаромонист,
Походную сыграй [Исаковский: 229–230].

First published in "Pravda" on 21 September 1942, at the height of the German army's advance on Stalingrad, the poem "In the Battlefront Wood" (henceforth: IBW) was written during the evacuation in Chistopol in early September [Исаковский 1982: 257]. During the war, two songs appeared based on Isakovsky's poem: one canonical one by Matvei Blanter, and a second by Leonid Bakalov. Both versions were published in 1944; we do not have a precise date for the creation of the music or the chronology of its performances. According to the notes to the Biblioteka Poeta edition published during Isakovsky's lifetime, the song with Blanter's music alone was published 42 times before 1965 [Исаковский: 471].

The title of the text (in reproductions, line 18 is often substituted as "In the woods on the battlefront") describes a lyric situation that immediately recalls Zhukovsky's BCRW. This comparison might seem like a stretch: war-era Soviet songs often refer to a standard situation of "resting in the gap between battles", and the music/song theme also appears frequently and can be explained without

reference to Zhukovsky (the song genre generally assumes the introduction of the singing theme, underscoring the performative aspect of the lyric utterance)[8].

The canonization of the "accordionist at rest" lyric plot also dates from 1942 — we have in mind Part Two of Alexander Tvardovsky's "Vasily Terkin", "The Accordion", which was published in "Krasnoarmeyskaya Pravda" 10 September 1942, but written in 1940 and published in "Krasnaya Zvezda" (№ 261, 6 November) in a shorter version [Твардовский: 491, 438]. Let us note that the accordion in Tvardovsky's poem turns out to be metonymically connected to its dead owner, the tank man, and develops the theme of the song (and military) relay-race (subsequently the accordion appears in the poem as a significant attribute of the protagonist).

Two lyric songs featuring this same musical instrument seem to be the closest to Isakovsky[9]. The first song's text was written by A. Surkov ("The fire beating in the narrow little stove…", a song entitled "In the earthen hut" or "The earthen hut", 1941, dedicated "to Sofya Krevs"[10] and put to music by K. Listov in early 1942). The second was written in 1942 by A. Fatyanov ("On the sunny field…", composed by V. Solovev-Sedoi). The invariant in the plots of these three songs can be described as: *the accordion at rest reminds the warrior of his distant love, giving him strength*. For our purposes, however, this invariant (which is universal for the military lyric song of the modern era) is not as essential as

---

8 On the Soviet song as a single field of meaning see the monograph by [Чередниченко].

9 According to data from the Russian language National Corpus, the accordion or harmonium [гармонь] was "assimilated" by poetry in several stages. The word *garmonika* is attested sporadically in the late 18th century, when this musical instrument had still not been assimilated by democratic culture (Nikolev, the poem "Sensations while listening to the *garmonika*" [Чувствование при слушании гармоники] (1795) — it is not clear from the text which instrument exactly he is talking about, but probably it was Franklin's glass concertina, which was in fashion during the second half of the century in Europe). But by the 1860s the *garmonika* (in today's sense of the word) in poetry became an attribute of folk culture — first of lower-class urban folk culture (or more broadly — tavern culture), and only later — village folk culture. Cf.: *До тошноты мне гадок был народ: / Фабричные с гармониками, пьяный / Их смех, яйцом пасхальным полный рот* <…> (Merezhkovsky, "Old-fashioned octaves" [Старинные октавы], late 1890s), *В деревне, чуть заря вечерняя займется, / Играет молодежь, сплетаясь в хоровод, / Звучит гармоника, и песня раздается / Такая грустная, что за сердце берет* (Drozhzhin, "Summer evening in the village" [Летний вечер в деревне], 1906). The lexemes *garmon'* and *garmoshka* appear in Russian poetry simultaneously in the early 20th century (the first example of *garmon'* is in N. Kluev, 1908, and *garmoshka* in Bely, 1907). The first is evidently an antidote to the "bourgeois" aura around *garmonika*, and the second is its intensification. The "harmonization of the *garmon'*" can be seen in the introduction of the word *talianka* (in Kluev, Esenin, 1914), though the diminutive form *talianochka* appears in Esenin even earlier — in 1912. Slightly later we find the word "accordionist" [*garmonist*] (1915, also simultaneously in Esenin and Kluev).

10 This text was published 25 March 1942 in "Komsomol Pravda", but in Chistopol it became known by late 1941 (at least, to Surkov's wife).

the variations that give form to the three different song worlds. Let us now attempt to describe through contrast the different parameters of these texts, focusing attention on IBW and accentuating those features of Isakovsky's song that are, in our view, inherited from Zhukovsky.

Meter and stanzaic form, without a doubt, act as an extremely significant constructive factor in the song texts. In this regard we can immediately note the three authors' orientation on different branches of the literary song tradition. Surkov is oriented toward the romance. The anapestic trimeter with alternating rhyme and all masculine endings was canonized by Fet ("Do not wake her at the dawn…" [На заре ты ее не буди...], 1844), and is encountered regularly in the modern era in Blok and Gumilev (cf: *О тебе, о тебе, о тебе, / Ничего, ничего обо мне!*). The romance intonations are easily recognizable in Surkov. Fatyanov chooses a more democratic and less marked model of meter and stanzaic form — a stylized *folksong*: iambic trimeter with alternating rhyme, with alternating dactylic and masculine endings. First tried out in the early 19th century and immediately giving birth to a strong tradition (Merzlyakov's "Among the even valley…" [Среди долины ровныя…], 1810), in Fatyanov this form preserves a lively and recognizable orientation on the song tradition. The circumstance of place in the beginning is worth noting for its nearly emblematic reference to the similar stanzaic form of the quasifolkloric song "Along the Murom road…" [По Муромский дороге…], which could be found in professional repertoires in the years leading up to the war[11]). The stanzaic form of IBW almost directly replicates the "waltzing" meter of BCRW (Zhukovsky's paean has iambic trimeter and tetrameter with alternating masculine and feminine endings; Isakovsky has the same but with all masculine clausula). In any event, the meter of IBW — a ballad meter — refers to Zhukovsky[12]. It is noteworthy that Zhukovsky had tried out this meter in one of his translations of Uhland ("Harald", 1816) — the combination of the motifs of war, of tempting and magical love, death and enchanted *sleep* (though in the ballad this sleep turns out to be fatal[13]): *Но только жажду утолил: / Вдруг обессилел он; / На камень сел, поник главой / И погрузился в сон.* The same motifs can be found in other ballad-tinted texts of the first half of the 19th century. Cf. no love motif, but the song motif: *Хотя певец земли родной / Не раз уж пел об нем, / Но песнь — все*

[11] Cf. the same stanzaic form in the exotic genre (Lermontov's "Tryst" [Свидание]) and the "urban romance" (Myatlev's "Lanterns" [Фонарики], 1841; Polonsky's "The Hermitess" [Затворница], 1846).

[12] On the BCRW poem in broad context see [Шапир].

[13] Zhukovsky would use the same stanzaic form later in his "Fisherman". For more detail see [Немзер: 98–100].

песнь; а жизнь — все жизнь! / Он спит последним сном (Lermontov, "The fighter's grave [Могила бойца]", 1830). Particularly indicative of the interaction with the themes and lexicon of BCRW: *Кругом весь лагерь в тишине, / Объят глубоким сном; / А на сердце так тяжко мне, / Так много грусти в нем. / Я на груди у ней мечтал / Когда-то в тихом сне, / Очаг радушно так пылал, / И было сладко мне. / А здесь, где пламень роковой / Сверкает на мечах, / Я грустен, одинок душой / И слезы на глазах. / Но есть еще надежда мне — / Мне скоро в бой идти, / И я забудусь в вечном сне, / Мой милый друг, прости* (Ogaryov, "Presentiment of War" [Предчувствие войны], 1842). We should note that Soviet poetry had already attempted to unite the intonations and motifs of BCRW that we find in Isakovsky: cf. Ya. Smelyakov's "Death of the brigadeer" [Смерть бригадира] (1932) and particularly Tvardovsky's "In the downed tank" [В подбитом танке] (1940) with its opening: *Застиг и нас тяжелый час, / Пришел и* ***наш черед****. / В подбитом танке трое нас, — / Все ясно наперед.*

The joining of the motifs of death, love, song and heroic fatalism, which are at the forefront in Isakovsky, doubtless hark back to BCRW rather than to "Harald". We cannot fail to notice the direct quotation of a key fragment of Blanter's song and the ninth rejoinder of Zhukovsky's Singer (on the place of this fragment in the composition of BCRW see [Немзер: 58–60]):

Пусть свет и радость прежних встреч
Нам светит в трудный час.
А коль придется в землю лечь,
Так это только раз!
Но пусть и смерть в огне, в дыму
Бойца не устрашит,
И что положено кому,
Пусть каждый совершит.

Так что ж, друзья, коль наш черед,
Да будет сталь крепка!
Пусть наше сердце не замрет,
Не задрожит рука.
Настал черед, пришла пора,
Идем, друзья, вперед!
За все, чем жили мы вчера,
За все, что завтра ждет!

Друзья! блаженнейшая часть:
Любезных быть спасеньем.
Когда ж предел наш в битве пасть —
Погибнем с наслажденьем;
Святое имя призовем
В минуты смертной муки;
Кем мы дышали в мире сем,
С той нет и там разлуки:
Туда душа перенесет
Любовь и образ милой…
О други, смерть не все возьмет;
Есть жизнь и за могилой.
[Жуковский: 239]

The text of the song quoted above departs from Isakovsky's poem. Without stopping for a detailed discussion of the transformations undergone by Isakovsky's poem in Blanter and Bakalov's songs (and afterwards — in actual perfor-

mance), we will describe them summarily. In Bakalov's version lines 9–17 (third and fourth stanzas) are dropped, evidently because they seemed too elegiac and far from the heroic theme. The transformations that the text underwent in Blanter's version are more radical, and also have to do with composition. We can point in particular to the rejected final stanza of Isakovsky's text; this stanza gives the circular repetition of the elegiac topos of "leaves falling" in its metaphoric variation[14]. The lost simile (perhaps the composer found it to be an excessively outdated poeticism), along with the final change-over from the "waltz" to the "military march", appear to be an obvious and significant piece of "evidence" tying Isakovsky's text to Zhukovsky's BCRW. However, the emotional, intonational and motif interchanges between these texts from two different Patriotic Wars are quite substantial (particularly when contrasted with Surkov's and Fatyanov's songs using the poem). Let us now turn to the other layers of the texts.

The ***lyric plot*** in Surkov's song is developed as a transition from the theme of music, which expresses the feelings of the lyric subject on display (the addressee of the lyric monologue in the accordion's "song" is presented through symbolic details: *про улыбку твою и глаза*), to introspection, which replaces music (as the symbolic language of love) with the language of nature (*про тебя мне шептали кусты*). The unchanging/*unquenchable* love plot[15] edges out the musical motifs, which return only in the finale. In Fatyanov, the plot is given as a narrative. The protagonist *plays* [sings] *of love*, and this same theme is developed in the narration (cf. the verb "to tell [рассказывать]" in the refrain") of

[14] Isakovsky himself never accepted the loss of the final stanza; when printing IBW, he always kept to the first version. Recalling this in a 22 August 1962 letter to L. F. Ilyichev, Isakovsky wrote: "Although I understand that the composer could not act otherwise, I am still sorry that he abbreviated the poem <...>. Furthermore, he moved several stanzas. I repeat, I understand why it was done this way, but nevertheless <...> the poem is to a significant extent crippled [Исаковский 1982: 257]. Indeed, the text of the song may be seen as a free-standing work, authorized against its will. The circular construction of the poetic "original" is compensated for in Blanter's song by a direct repetition of the first two stanzas in the finale and a rearrangement of Isakovsky's stanzas. In the song, the stanzas are doubled into eight-line couplets and arranged in the following order (the number of the stanza in the original text is given): I (1–2), II (3–4), III (5–6), IV (8–9), V (7–10), VI (1–2). Couplets III and V (the intrusion of the elegiac reminiscence into the marching present and the call to march, which compensate for the final lines of the text) are rendered in a major key, the rest are in minor. In many performances, including early renderings by Efrem Flaks, we find truncated versions of the song, which was too long for a work in this genre — we would like to see in this too generic reflections of the ancestor-text.

[15] In Surkov's text this is the love of the lyric subject. The original text, where the final line reads "from my unquenchable love", is reproduced precisely in most of the songbooks [*Our songs, Favorite songs, Russian Soviet songs*], but also presented in a transformed mode consolidated by tradition [*Soviet songs*]: "from your unquenchable love".

the feat that allows the male protagonist to affirm his place in the heart of the female protagonist.

The ***lexical/stylistic and lexical/semantic*** levels of the three texts also demand attention. Surkov uses the prefabricated language of the "high-style" Soviet love lyric, as evident in, for instance, the work of K. Simonov. The lexicon here is devoid of social or temporal markers; it includes the frequently encountered lexemes of 19th – 20th century poetic language in quite trivial combinations (though this does not make them any less effective in the song). The metaphors of "singing" and "burning" that organize the text are hard to see as original, as are the similes with tar and tears (cf. Benediktov in 1857: *И смола слезой, слезой / Каплет с бедной елки*). Fatyanov's song, on the contrary, features a lexicon obtrusively marked with features of the "folksong"; the text is equipped with diminutives (for which the author was reproached by stern Soviet critics[16]) and designations of realia. The latter are also shifted toward the conventional "songlike" quality of the bourgeois romance (*ночи жаркие, полушалки*[17]) and a moderate *elevated-folk* tendency to the picturesque (*ворог*).

In light of this lexical and semantic "purity" of the parallel texts, Isakovsky's poem seems like a remarkable attempt to graft the classical rose of the "school of harmonious precision" onto the wilding of the "folksy" Soviet song. The number of poeticisms here is small but notable ("*очей любимых свет,*" cf. Surkov's "про улыбку твою и *глаза*"). One more example: the metonym "that the *steel* be strong [да будет *сталь* крепка]" (note the parallel here with Zhukovsky's conventionally poetic battle metonyms). We should mention that for the Isakovsky-Blanter text, the *syntactic* poeticisms are much more important than the lexical ones. Such are the anaphoric repetitions in lines 9–16 and 21–24, as well as the above-cited "motivational" fragment of the song.

Marked as social-historical, the realia are reduced to a minimum and linked to the theme of music. The only expression that can really be examined as a socially marked detail is "we'd go out reveling" [*ходили мы на круг*], referring to the phraseology of the Russian village. A significant bit of cultural and musical realia introduced in the opening is the Archibald Joyce waltz, "Songe d'Automne" or "Autumn Dream", written in 1908. In the poem, the waltz is

---

16 Cf: "Alongside the beautiful, vivid folk expressions <…> we are distressed to find invented, emaciated images and a love for diminutive suffixes that come in many cases from songs of bourgeois rather than folk origin, and which lend a certain false and lisping "intimacy" rather than a hint of love and closeness" [Бочаров: 145].

17 It would seem nearly indisputable that the lines "Про то, как ночи жаркие / С подружкой проводил, / Какие полушалки ей / Красивые дарил", with their symbolism of erotic exchange, point to two canonical source texts: Nekrasov's "Peddlers" and Blok's "The Twelve".

called "old-fashioned" (it would seem that by 1941 this collocation was already rather stable), which seems to discreetly correspond to the profoundly archaic quality of the genre and plot of IBW. Isakovsky also introduces a reminiscence into the opening of his text, taken from the beginning of the Russian text of "Autumn Dream" (the Lebedev-Kumach version, which was performed by L. Ruslanova: *Ветер осенний листья срывает, / Вся природа грусти полна. Только надежда не унывает, / Сердце знает — придет весна*). Early recordings of Blanter's performance of the song open with a musical citation from Joyce's waltz.

The ***pronominal, nominal*** and ***communicative*** schema of these songs are built contrastively, as are their ***temporal*** and ***spatial*** models. We can contrast the explicit first-person quality of Surkov's text to the third-person narration of Fatyanov; in his song the protagonists are distinguished by special denominations ("little guy" [парнишка], "girlfriend" [подружка], "girl" [дивчина], "black-eyed" [черноглазая]). The "first-person" pole of the text is represented by the chorus, with its rhetorical address to the "*talianochka*" (cf. Surkov's "sing, accordion" [пой, гармошка]). In our estimation, the fundamental fact is that Isakovsky's text features the significant (and, we presume, tracing directly back to Zhukovsky's classic text) situation of the "singer in the camp" of warriors. The lyric "I" is expressed weakly but significantly, it is dissolved into the "we" ("the warriors are my comrades"). The accordion player, who is depicted by Fatyanov but entirely absent in Surkov (it is clear that someone is playing the accordion, but this is not expressed in the text at all), in Isakovsky's text is the protagonist appearing in the opening and finale, the equivalent to Zhukovsky's Singer.

There is another key element: in Isakovsky the theme of music and/or singing is supplemented by the theme of dance, and the music played is given a concrete title — this is the *old-fashioned waltz, "Autumn Dream"*. This mention incorporates the musical reminiscence into the song, which in turn becomes an emotional emblem of the otherwise abandoned elegiac world of love[18], and leads us once again to Zhukovsky, where the "song" was put into quotations and identified through the Singer's remarks in direct speech (caught up by the chorus of warriors).

The *Singer* and his *song* are the true protagonists of BCRW. They are transformed by a mid-20th century poet into a nameless accordion-player and a waltz — wordless, yet heard by all — which symbolically intrudes into ordi-

[18] Cf. the introduction of the theme of parting in the description of the world of the past: *Под этот вальс грустили мы, / Когда подруги нет.* The music of the waltz is directly connected with the elegiac theme of parting.

nary military life and reminds everyone of those simultaneously intimate and lofty values for whose sake warriors go to war.

Zhukovsky's seemingly hopelessly outdated poem becomes a "waltz" in the non-metaphorical sense (cf. the old man's grumbling of Tynianov's Derzhavin) and transmits the basic emotional impulse of BCRW through the text of a poet of a new era and in a new genre. The weak reflections of the classical text that can be found in the Soviet song are not mere accident, nor are they an homage to the author's early poetic education "featuring Muses, Phoebuses, etc." [Исаковский 1963: 9]. The transmission of the formal features of Zhukovsky's paean is necessary for the fulfillment of a generic task: creating a new kind of song that would model the emotions of people in 1942, just as Zhukovsky's paean had modeled the emotions of Russian society during the "Tarutino period" of the War of 1812[19]. In this connection, a seemingly external feature of Isakovsky's poem is worth noting, as well as its volume. Too long to be a lyric song, the poem was shortened by both composers, and in actual performances was often reduced to three eight-line fragments (the opening, the major chorus and a repetition of the opening).

This is a rather interesting feature of IBW, particularly noticeable against the background of Surkov's poem. "In the earthen hut" is a short lyric monologue (cf. the metonym "my living voice"), organized around a classic topos of overcoming distance. Hence the extreme popularity of Listov's song among professional and — still more importantly — amateur performers.

The amateur musical genre of the masses in which IBW dissolves is brought out by Isakovsky's text itself — it is a dance. Just as Isakovsky's poem "renews" BCRW, so Blanter's melody "supplants" Joyce's "old-fashioned waltz". "In the battlefront woods" does not turn into a drinking song[20]; Blanter's composition is a song for listeners rather than performers.

Translated by Ainsley Morse

---

[19] Isakovsky would turn again to the same stanzaic and intonational schema in a way directly connected to the genre of paean — a 1943 congratulatory toast is in significant dialogue with IBW: *И не в обиде будет он, / Коль встретим так, как есть, / Как нам велит войны закон / И наша с вами честь. // Мы встретим в грохоте боев, / Взметающих снега, / И чашу смерти до краев / Наполним для врага* [Исаковский: 251]. With regard to the genesis of IBW we can also suggest a hypothesis on the influence of another text (written using nearly the same pattern of mixed iambs). This is the popular song "The Boer and his sons" (1899), based on a song by G. Galina. Cf. the opening, which replicated the beginning of IBW: *Под деревом развесистым / Задумчив бур сидел,* and also: *Но он нахмурясь отвечал: / "Отец, пойду и я! / Пускай, я слаб, пускай, я мал, / **Крепка рука** моя!" // Да, **час настал, тяжелый час** / Для родины моей. / Молитесь, женщины, за нас, / За наших сыновей.* In his memoirs, Isakovsky recalls having particularly loved this song in his childhood [Исаковский 1978: 55–56].

[20] On the reduction of popular songs in everyday practices of Russian parties cf. [Николаев].

Works Cited

Бочаров: *Бочаров А.* Массовая советская песня. М., 1956.

Вдовин: *Вдовин А. В.* База данных по русским хрестоматиям и книгам для чтения / Сост. А. Вдовин (http://ruthenia.ru/canon/hrestomatii_version_29_11_2013_s_filtrami.xls).

Глумов: *Глумов А. Н.* Музыка в русском драматическом театре. М., 1955.

Жуковский: *Жуковский В. А.* Полное собрание сочинений. М., 1999. Т. 1: Стихотворения 1797–1814 гг.

Исаковский 1963: *Исаковский М.* Стихотворения. Л., 1963.

Исаковский 1978: *Исаковский М.* На ельнинской земле: Автобиографические страницы. М., 1978.

Исаковский 1082: *Исаковский М.* Собрание сочинений. М., 1982. Т. 5: Письма.

Лейбов 2011: *Лейбов Р.* Художественный текст как механизм репликации и "Золотой век" русской литературы // Пушкинские чтения в Тарту. 5: Пушкинская эпоха и русский литературный канон. Тарту, 2011. Т. 1.

Лейбов 2013: *Лейбов Р.* "Кто он?": эпизод из истории трансформаций русского школьного канона // Хрестоматийные тексты: русская педагогическая практика XIX века и поэтический канон. Тарту, 2013. (Acta Slavica Estonica. IV).

Лотман: *Лотман Ю. М.* Тарутинский период Отечественной войны 1812 года и развитие русской общественной мысли // Учен. зап. Тарт. гос. ун-та. 1963. Вып. 139. С. 281–297 (Труды по русской и славянской филологии. [Т.] 6).

Любимые песни: Любимые песни. Пермь, 1959.

Наши песни: Наши песни. М., 1952.

Николаев: *Николаев О. Р.* Почему мы не поем "русские народные" песни до конца? (О некоторых механизмах трансляции русской песенной традиции) // Русский текст. 1997. № 5.

Немзер: *Немзер А. С.* При свете Жуковского: Очерки истории русской литературы. М., 2013.

Проскурин: *Проскурин О. А.* Литературные скандалы пушкинской эпохи. М., 2000.

Русские советские песни: Русские советские песни. М., 1952.

Песенник: Песенник. Симферополь, 1952.

Песни советские: Песни советские [на обложке: Советские песни]. Молотов, 1951.

Советские песни: Советские песни. Брянск, 1952.

Твардовский: *Твардовский А.* Василий Теркин: Книга про бойца. М., 1976.

Тынянов: *Тынянов Ю. Н.* Пушкин / Подгот. текста В. А. Каверина и Е. А. Тоддеса. Л., 1974.

Чередниченко: *Чередниченко Т.* Типология советской массовой культуры: Между "Брежневым" и "Пугачевой". М., 1994.

Шапир: *Шапир М. И.* К семантике “пародического балладного стиха” (“Тень Баркова” в контексте полемики о старом и новом слоге) // Шапир М. И. Universum versus: Язык — стих — смысл в русской поэзии XVIII–XX веков. М., 2000. Кн. 1. (Philologica russica et speculativa; Т. I).

Sack, Wu, Zusman: *Sack, Graham Alexander; Wu, Daniel; Zusman, Benji*. Simulating the Cultural Evolution of Literary Genres // Digital Humanities, Lausanne — Switzerland’ 14 (Long Paper, http://dharchive.org/paper/DH2014/Paper-785.xml).