

STAFF
RUSSIAN
STUDYSHIP

INSPIRAL
DIALET
PACIFIC
FER(1)MENTO

A HISTORY OF

RUSSIAN SYMBOLISM



A HISTORY OF RUSSIAN SYMBOLISM

LINGUISTIC & LITERARY STUDIES IN EASTERN EUROPE (LLSEE)

The emphasis of this scholarly series is on recent developments in Linguistic and Literary Research in Eastern Europe; it includes analyses, translations and syntheses of current research as well as studies in the history of linguistic and literary scholarship.

Founding Editor: John Odmark †

General Editor:

Philip A. Luelsdorff
Institut für Anglistik
Universität Regensburg
D-8400 Regensburg
Germany

Volume 29

Ronald E. Peterson

A History of Russian Symbolism

A HISTORY
OF
RUSSIAN SYMBOLISM



RONALD E. PETERSON

DEDALUS - Acervo - FFLCH-LE

891.709
P578h

A history of Russian symbolism /



21300092248

TUMBO: 101497



SBD-FFLCH-USP

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

1993

197-139
P522

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Peterson, Ronald E.

p. cm. -- (Linguistic & literary studies in Eastern Europe; ISSN 0165-7712; v. 29)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Symbolism (Literary movement)--Soviet Union. 2. Russian literature--19th century--History and criticism. 3. Russian literature--20th century--History and criticism. I. Title. II. Series.

PG3015.5.S9P4 1990

891.709'15--dc20

90-23250

ISBN 90 272 1534 0 (alk. paper)

CIP

© Copyright 1993 · John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 75577 · 1070 AN Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · 821 Bethlehem Pike · Philadelphia, PA 19118 · USA

Contents

Foreword	ix
Preface	xi
1. Introduction	1
2. The Beginnings of Symbolism in Russia, 1892-1895	
Merezhkovsky and Hippius	13
Sologub	18
Balmont	20
Bryusov and <i>The Russian Symbolists</i>	21
3. Individualism and Decadence, 1896-1898	27
The First Wave Continues	27
Decadence	33
4. Scorpio Rising: Modernism in Art and Literature, 1899-1903	35
Solovyov and Nietzsche	35
Anthologies at the Turn of the Century	37
The World of Art	38
Religious-Philosophical Meetings and <i>Novyi Put'</i>	40
Skorpion	42
<i>Severnye Tsvety</i>	43
Grif	46
Annensky	47
The Second Wave: Bely, Ivanov, Blok	49
The Symbolists in 1902-1903	54
October, 1903	58
5. Symbolism as a Unified Movement, 1904-April, 1906	63
<i>Mir Iskusstva</i> , <i>Novyi Put'</i> , and <i>Voprosy Zhizni</i>	64
<i>Vesy</i>	66
Anthologies	69
Symbolist Verse in 1904	71

Fiction in 1904-1905	78
<i>The Petty Demon</i>	79
War with Japan and Revolution in 1905	80
Intellectual Activity	82
<i>Zolotoe Runo</i>	85
Bryusov, Bely, and Nina Petrovskaya	86
Essays	88
April, 1906	90
6. Proliferation, Polemics, and Mystical Anarchism,	
May, 1906-1908	97
Polemics and Mystical Anarchism	98
<i>Pereval</i>	102
Symbolist Verse in 1906-1907	104
Prose	106
1907	107
Drama	108
Anthologies	110
Factions	113
Younger Authors	115
Prose in 1907	118
<i>The Fiery Angel</i>	120
1908	122
Anthologies	123
The Merezhkovskys Return to Russia	124
Symbolist Verse and Prose	126
7. Years of Crisis and Transition: Art vs. World View, 1909-1910	133
<i>Vesy and Apollon</i>	133
Musaget and Other Circles	137
Collections, Essays	139
Verse	142
<i>The Silver Dove</i>	145
Sologub	146
The Gogol Anniversary	148
Deaths	149
The Polemic about Symbolism	150

8. The Beginning of the Decline, 1911-1914	157
Acmeism	157
Futurism	160
Second Wave Revival	161
Summations	164
Comings and Goings	167
Prose	170
Petersburg	171
Poetry	177
Drama	180
"Dispute"	183
9. Symbolism in the Past Tense, War, and Revolution, 1915-1917	185
Formalism and Futurism	187
War	188
Prose	189
<i>Kotik Letaev</i>	189
Poetry	191
Drama	193
Revolution	194
10. Epilogue: The Symbolists' Fates and Their Influence	197
<i>Zapiski Mechtateley</i>	197
The Symbolists after the Revolution:	198
Bryusov, Blok, Bely	199
Sologub and Annensky	200
Balmont and Ivanov	201
Merezhkovsky and Hippus	202
Significant Others	204
Symbolism's Influence	205
Notes	211
A Select Bibliography	241
Index	247

Foreword

The appearance of Ronald E. Peterson's long-awaited *History of Russian Symbolism* should elicit feelings of elation and sadness, for the volume is the author's *magnum opus*, a book to which he devoted many years of research and which he succeeded in completing shortly before his tragic and untimely death in April of 1986. While friends, colleagues and scholars of Symbolism will surely lament the author's passing, they will be heartened to welcome this invaluable contribution to Russian letters.

A History of Russian Symbolism 1892-1917 represents the first comprehensive study of the multi-faceted turn-of-the-century Russian movement. Broad in its approach, the volume encompasses a thorough look at the rise and fall of Russian Symbolism. Charting its rise with figures such as Merezhkovsky, Hippius, Balmont, Bryusov and Sologub, Ronald Peterson provides a historico-philosophical and cultural background to Symbolism's heyday with the leading writers, Blok, Bely and Ivanov. These literary figures collectively forged a new way of perceiving the world, indeed "changing the face," to borrow Peterson's words, of Russian culture. Peterson illustrates the pivotal impact of journals, including *Severnye Tsvety*, *Mir Iskusstva*, *Novyi Put*, *Zolotoe Runo*, *Vesy*, *Apollon*, to name a few, without which Russia's richest period of cultural exchange would have been impossible. Indeed, the success and failure of Symbolism often coincided with the successes and failures of such journals.

Few periods have been more misunderstood than Symbolism. Its exponents were too diverse in temperament, not to mention style, to constitute a cohesive group. Russian Symbolism owes its first stirrings as a movement to Valery Bryusov, who sought methodically to head the "new school," by raising Baudelaire's "correspondences" to aesthetic heights, while members of the so-called "second wave" turned to Goethe and Nietzsche, likening their art to theurgy. And yet on one point the Symbolists all agreed, namely that the task of Symbolism was "to create a new poetic language, to work out a new the means of poetry," citing Bryusov himself.

Just as Symbolism was much more than "just literature," so this volume is much more than "just history." Ronald Peterson's breadth of knowledge spans such diverse subjects as comparative philosophy, the plastic arts and literary criticism. Although he focuses on the Symbolists' contributions in poetry, prose and drama, the author illuminates his study with side glances of what was occurring politically and socially, eschewing clichés and yet meticulous about detail. At the same time, he provides indispensable biographical material, underlining the inextricable bond between life and art. Ultimately, Ronald Peterson's *A History of Russian Symbolism* will prove to be as important a contribution as Georgette Donchin's *The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry* and ~~James West's *Russian Symbolism*~~.

Olga Muller Cooke
Texas A & M University

Preface

This book attempts to fill a long-standing need in literary and scholarly criticism, a history of Symbolism in Russia. The era of Russian Symbolism, 1892-1917, broadly defined, has been called the Silver Age of Russian culture, and even the Second Golden Age. Symbolist authors are among the greatest Russian authors of this century, and their activities helped to foster one of the most significant advances in cultural life (in poetry, prose, music, theater, and painting) that has ever been seen there.

Much has been written about Symbolism in Russia, but it is difficult to formulate universally acceptable and accurate generalizations about this literary and artistic movement that appeared on the scene in the early 1890s and flourished in the first two decades of this century. There has been a tendency in the USSR to de-emphasize scholarship on this topic because the Symbolists' views are generally antithetical to the official dogma of Socialist Realism. When works published there do address Symbolism, the discussion tends, especially in the official histories of Russian literature, to denigrate the Symbolists and favor the more "acceptable" realist authors. In the West, scholars recognize the importance of the movement, but have treated it in terms of individual authors, or from a limited perspective, or the studies are simply too superficial.

This book is designed to serve as an introduction to Symbolism in Russia, as a movement, an artistic method, and a world view. This is no simple task, because there are many differing views of Symbolism, and in fact the Symbolists themselves very often disagreed about the essence of Symbolism. Symbols, of course, have been used for centuries to unite the external sign with the thing it signifies, to "throw together" these two concepts, as the Greek etymology indicates. As generally interpreted by the practitioners, a symbol connotes a sign that needs to be deciphered and therefore invites the participation of a reader or a viewer to penetrate the mystery. Though the Symbolists' views of the correspondence between what is

below, and what is above, behind the "cover" of this world, are at times not terribly conducive to interpretation, often these "mysteries," "symbols," and "emblems" are not difficult to comprehend. Ideally, their poetry and other writings should be appreciated for the merit each work possesses, rather than for any "mysteries" that might be hinted at.

Symbolism is a rather approximate label, a misleading and yet quite convenient term. The name itself, moreover, was not always used in the movement; the terms "Decadence" and the "new art" also had currency, though they are just as imprecise, because not all the works produced were decadent, and the strong interest in ancient art among the Symbolists did not necessarily make their art "new."

It is generally acceptable, however, to refer to Symbolism in Russia as a tendency, that is, a tendency for the author to have a subjective relationship to the world, a tendency for such an author to look beyond the borders of his or her country to Western European contemporaries and forerunners, to look back to earlier Russian literature and indeed ancient history and literature, a tendency to concentrate on poetry and lyricism, though other genres were also cultivated by Russian Symbolists. Particular success was achieved in prose and drama.

Symbolism can be seen as the result of an individual perception of the world and a personal approach to life. There was, in addition, an identifiable tendency among the Symbolists to try to extend the movement to include an approach to the whole world, through Symbolism, to make it a way of life, to equate the objective world with a façade that had to be overcome in order to attain a higher reality, in agreement with Goethe that "Alles vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichnis." This tendency in literature was eventually admired and imitated by other Russian writers who normally devoted themselves to more socially oriented and realistic works, and of course by epigones who sometimes saw adopting certain aspects of the Symbolists' writings as a way of gaining quick popularity. There were many who disagreed with the Symbolists and found opportunities for criticizing this movement, and this approach is still alive today, but a recounting of the events connected with Symbolism in Russia can help to provide a greater basis for properly appreciating and understanding this phenomenon.

In this examination of Russian Symbolism, the primary emphasis is on the history of the movement itself, on what happened. Attention is devoted to what the Symbolists wrote, said, and thought, and on how they interacted. In this context, therefore, the main actors are the authors of the

poetry, prose, drama, and criticism. There are, in addition, important connections between the literary figures and artists, philosophers, and the intelligentsia in general; space is devoted to these connections as they relate to the development of the movement. Those readers interested in acquainting themselves with what these individuals wrote about Symbolism while it was an active force are encouraged to consult a companion volume, *The Russian Symbolists*, an anthology of critical and theoretical essays, printed in 1986.¹

In the chronicle of events associated with Russian Symbolism that follows, the synthesis of the material available gives the reader a comprehensive picture of this very important movement. This broad, detailed, and balanced account of this period can, I hope, serve as a standard reference work and encourage further study and research among scholars and students of literature, because the goals of the Russian Symbolist movement, most especially a commitment to aesthetic excellence and freedom of creativity, which can produce works of lasting value, will never go out of fashion.

* * *

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the American Philosophical Society, the University of Oregon Graduate School Research Office, the Ohio State University Center for Slavic and East European Studies, and Occidental College, which awarded me a MacArthur Research Professorship so that I could complete work on this history. The generous aid has made it possible for me to conduct research in libraries in the United States and Europe.

Ronald E. Peterson
Occidental College
Los Angeles

an age of cultural rebirth in that country.² In the 1880s and early 1890s, there was a widespread feeling of stagnation and lack of vitality in Russia's social and cultural life. The reigns of the last two Romanovs, Alexander III and Nicholas II, were a period of reaction, of attempts to suppress various types of activism. There is a Russian term applied to the 1880-90s: "timelessness," which refers not to a sense of "eternity" or "infinity," but more to a lack of progress, a failure to move forward with the times.³ The so-called Golden Age of Russian prose had ended in the early 1880s with the deaths of Fyodor Dostoevsky (1881) and Ivan Turgenev (1883); Leo Tolstoy by then had turned away from his great novels and was devoting his energies more to religious topics. There was an almost overpowering tendency against strictly imaginative literature in Russian at the time; critics on the left demanded (and often got) socially relevant and "progressive" literary works. Their opposite numbers on the conservative side also wanted useful literature, writings that exhibited moral good.⁴ And it was difficult to oppose this notion of utility, but the Symbolists and a few others were able to do so in large measure because most of what they published was demonstrably well written. Because the Symbolists were involved in a variety of related activities, and their interactions with counterparts in other cultural fields was fruitful, it is necessary to examine the history of Russian Symbolism against a number of different backgrounds. The main contexts that will be cited here include political and philosophical views, the fine arts, theater, and of course poetry, prose fiction, and literary criticism.

Contexts: Philosophy and Politics

In Russian philosophical thinking, the political concerns of the thinkers have tended to exercise a stronger influence than in other countries. In fact there was rather little substantial philosophy there before the latter half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. Before this time, we see a long-running polemic between the so-called Westernizers and the Slavophiles, which occupies an important role in the philosophy of the Russians.⁵ As the names suggest, the major differences of opinion were developed according to one's preference for (or aversion to) borrowing Western ideals, including democratic and liberal notions. The Slavophiles focused on the historical mission of the Russian land and its people as a superior, even Messianic nation; they strongly favored Orthodoxy and harmonious integration. They were opposed to the supposed flaws of the Roman

Catholic countries (rational thinking and concern for authority), and the Protestants were seen as even worse examples of straying from the true path. The Westernizers, however, a more diverse group, shared the belief that Russia's history should be closely bound to Western European developments. They tended to favor such Western ideas as constitutionalism and were often anti-religious or atheistic.

We find not only the beginnings of first-rate philosophical thought in Russia, toward the end of the nineteenth century, but also a major precursor to the Symbolist movement, in the mature career of Vladimir Solovyov, considered by many as Russia's leading philosopher. His connections with the Symbolists will be covered in greater detail in later chapters, but here it should be mentioned that he was concerned about religious topics, especially mysticism and the various branches of Christianity (Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Protestantism). Unlike the Slavophiles, Solovyov took a decidedly universalist position and did not necessarily believe that the Russian way was the only path to saving the world. In addition to his philosophical treatises, he wrote some rather amusing plays and mystical poetry, and the poetry bears some relation to the Symbolist movement; but Solovyov died in 1900, just as the movement was starting to be taken seriously, and so he was prevented from having greater interaction with the Symbolist authors.⁶

German philosophy toward the end of the nineteenth century had a certain influence in Russian intellectual circles. Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy ran counter to the prevailing trends in Russian thought, particularly the notion that citizens must work together for the common good. Nietzsche was much more concerned with personal destiny, with using force and power to attain goals; he was less worried about morals and was not inclined to see all people as equal. In many ways he is the opposite of Vladimir Solovyov, yet the same Symbolists admired both, though usually at different stages in their careers. And it has not been demonstrated conclusively that Nietzsche's legion of Russian admirers truly understood the totality of his message, especially in regard to Christianity, which Nietzsche saw as an overly meek and sexless doctrine that led humanity to servitude. And though intelligent Symbolist authors claimed at times to be Nietzscheans, one wonders how much of Nietzsche they actually read (his works were quite popular and widely translated in the 1890s).⁷

Vasily Rozanov and Lev Shestov, two Russian thinkers whose names will reappear in this study, were contemporaries of the Symbolists; the

1880-90
ESTAS

1880-FIM
DA ERADE
OURD

CRITICOS
ARTE
UTIL

??

??

former took some initial inspiration from Nietzsche and generally came down on the conservative side of the political debate, favoring individualism and personal freedom, by and large opposing positivistic, rational thinking.⁸ One of the early leaders of Symbolism in Russia, Dmitry Merezhkovsky, also belongs in this same group with Rozanov and Shestov, in terms of his concerns, though they were more profound thinkers than he. Merezhkovsky and other Symbolists were among the "authorities" at the meetings of the Religious-Philosophical Society in the first decade of this century, and Symbolism as a whole shows a fairly strong connection with mysticism and religion, but not within the limits of the official Orthodox Church.⁹ Though much of the early inspiration for Russian Symbolism was Western in origin, and the Symbolists maintained strong and frequent contact with Western European culture, there was as well a view among some Symbolists that Russia was indeed a special place, and these Symbolists displayed a deep appreciation for native literature and art. The Symbolists were especially active as speakers, lecturers, and leaders of opinion, including philosophical opinion, during their hour upon the stage.

Art

In the Silver Age, the ties between art and literature grew even stronger than they normally are in Russia. Prior to this time, realism was in vogue, represented particularly successfully by the group of artists known as the Wanderers (*Peredvizhniki*), who dealt primarily with the problems of Russian history and society on their canvases, often echoing the sentiments of the utilitarian thinkers. Many of the Wanderers favored critical realism and were largely inclined to paint only Russian scenes. There were a couple of reactions to the realistic style of painting: one was the so-called Slavic Revival, or neo-nationalism, a grouping of artists who favored interest in Russian themes, often derived from folklore, but who executed their pictures with less realism. The other major reaction against the Wanderers' brand of realism in art was led by an association of artists who exhibited under the name World of Art (*Mir Iskusstva*).¹⁰

Once again, more will be said about the activities of the World of Art, and its connections with Symbolism, but here it is important to note that the aesthetic function of art (painting and illustrating particularly) were emphasized. The World of Art artists helped to revive interest in Russian art of the past, including icons, and most notably in Western European

(especially French) art of an earlier era. The evolution of this group later led to the founding of truly avant-garde art in Russia and to the immensely successful Ballets Russes in Paris before World War One. Their combination of interests, both Russian and Western, is seen as well in the Symbolist movement.

Theater

Russian drama in the 1880s and early 1890s displayed little inclination to part from the accepted realistic approach, as represented in the plays of Aleksandr Ostrovsky, the leading playwright just before Chekhov.¹¹ But by the end of the nineteenth century there was increasing interest in Western European drama, in the plays of Maurice Maeterlinck, Henrik Ibsen, Gerhart Hauptmann, Knut Hamsun, and Oscar Wilde. Some of these works had definite Symbolist pedigrees, and to the Russian audiences seemed very modern, compared with the comfortable familiarity of Ostrovsky's plays, which largely dealt with the merchant class milieu of Moscow. Chekhov's four major plays also helped to inject needed vitality and creative innovation into Russian theater, though it has often been pointed out that the success of Chekhov's plays depended to a certain extent on the superior achievements of the Moscow Art Theater in staging these works. And the founding of this theater in 1898 by Konstantin Stanislavsky and others, plus the brief span of Vera Komissarzhevskaya's theater in Petersburg (1904-10), did much to improve the quality of theater in early twentieth-century Russia.

The Symbolists too were active in this field, as we shall see in subsequent chapters; all the major Symbolists wrote plays, though some were certainly more adept in this genre than others. Their first recognition as dramatists came with Vera Komissarzhevskaya's interest in modern drama, starting around the end of 1905; she staged several plays by Symbolists that were hotly debated but by any measure significant for Russian theater in the Silver Age. And by the time of World War One and the revolutions in 1917, Symbolist plays were produced at a number of other theaters and were rightly considered a part of the normal Russian repertoire. There was as well a marked tendency among Symbolist authors for introducing Western European drama from the contemporary period and ancient Greek drama to Russian theatergoers through translations and in a number of important essays that the Symbolists wrote about drama.

Literature

In literary criticism in the latter half of the nineteenth century, we also see a bias toward "civic" writing and tendentious literature. Realism had been pre-eminent for several decades, though the "realism" is a definitely Russian type that stresses a point of view, and this approach still lives today. But the Symbolists were able to effectively counter this trend. By and large they did favor individualism, and this is in fact one of the reasons why Symbolism has to be seen as a fairly loose grouping of individuals. They brought higher standards to literature, especially to poetry, which had reached a low point in the 1880s and 1890s. The Symbolists did borrow the name, and some of the ideas, from French and Belgian Symbolists, including the notions of correspondences between mundane images and metaphysical concepts and the importance of music in literature. But where the French were somewhat limited in their view of Symbolism, seeing it mostly as one approach to writing, some Russian Symbolists wanted to make their Symbolist concepts into a whole philosophical system, a world view that could encompass all thought.¹²

Like their Western European counterparts, the Russian Symbolists put a strong emphasis on the sound value of words, and indeed even individual letters. And it is clear that the first Symbolists in Russia imitated, to a certain extent, the French authors grouped around this "school" particularly in the 1890s and the early part of this century. But as the movement developed in Russia, there was increasing appreciation for Russian authors, for example, Gogol and Dostovsky for Russian, lyrical poets, such as Aleksandr Pushkin and Fyodor Tyutchev, who were recognized for their achievements and reinterpreted (in the case of Gogol and Tyutchev) in a way that revealed more profound understanding of their writings. And though Symbolism reached its high point in France around 1885-95, and in Russia approximately ten to fifteen years later, in many respects Russian Symbolism surpassed the accomplishments of this Western European source.¹³

Normally, when the term "Symbolist" is applied to a group of writers, the first genre associated with it is poetry. Indeed the forerunners of the Russian Symbolists, both those from Western Europe and the sizeable number from Russia, were poets. Several Symbolists excelled in this genre; there was a tremendous broadening of scope, of selecting themes from world history as well as the author's own intimate thoughts and feelings, and an expansion in the formal types of verse (longer poems and cycles

RELIG
FRANCA

SISTEMA
FILOSOFIC

LINGUAGEM!

ULTRAPASSOU
O SIMBOL?
FRANCA

became popular). Though it is somewhat difficult to convey, in translation, precisely how and why the verse of the Symbolists was better than that of many others (several examples of their poetry are given in this study), one must recognize the number of positive evaluations expressed by Russian and Western scholars in this matter. To this judgment one can add, moreover, that there were almost no serious rivals for poetic excellence outside the Symbolist movement from 1900 to 1910.

Some of these authors were also accorded due respect for their prose fiction, and this is an important area where the Russian Symbolists can be distinguished from other Symbolist groups in Western Europe. A number of significant and influential novels by Symbolists were published in 1905-17, works that had a lasting effect on the later development of Soviet Russian literature. As has been noted, it is rather paradoxical to speak of a "Symbolist novel," and in fact it is not always possible to determine any percentage of "Symbolist" elements in these works by Russian authors affiliated with the movement.¹⁴ There are elements of traditional realism, Romanticism, fantasy, religion, political and social thought, and even lyric poetry in the prose fiction produced by these authors, which includes a fairly large body of short stories in addition to the novels. Nevertheless, one can refer to their works as Symbolist novels, because they did help to promote the goals of the movement in many ways, though, in contrast to the poets, the Symbolists working in prose had to contend with the more established, and more widely circulated, realist writers, led by Maksim Gorky and Leonid Andreev.

Symbolist critics were also able to gain attention and recognition for their views, and here we see a tendency to oppose the "requirement" that literature reflect social, political, and historical attitudes. At the same time, however, the Symbolists disagreed among themselves about how literature, drama, and art in general should be analyzed and commented upon. Despite attempts to define one, there is no single Symbolist theory of art or one Symbolist aesthetics; in fact several of them were put forth by Symbolists.¹⁵ Generally, they focused their attention on the relation of Symbolist art to reality, and not surprisingly, there was a favorable view toward Symbolism as a kind of higher reality, a view that it was somehow more real than the world we perceive with our senses. And though it sometimes has been, Symbolist criticism should not be seen as simply intuitive, as solely based on such slogans as Baudelaire's "forest of symbols" or the "language of hints." It is true that reference was often made to Goethe's lines

Alles vergängliche
Ist nur ein Gleichnis,

but attention was paid to the transitory phenomena as well.¹⁶ Symbolist theoreticians generally did not advocate art for art's sake, and in fact the more serious theoreticians saw creation as a mythic, ritualistic act, which connects the artist with the past and the future. There was intuitive and impressionistic literary criticism, but it was overshadowed by more earnest attempts to arrive at a Symbolist aesthetics, which will be examined in greater detail in this study.¹⁷

Characteristics

It is now time to introduce the main characters of this "drama" and round out their images to a certain extent, especially in terms of the topics that were important to the Symbolists. One of the most common approaches to Russian Symbolism is to categorize the main practitioners, to place them in various groups. This tendency among scholars is an enticing one and is based on the authors' own proclivities for allying themselves into short-lived camps according to different ideas and issues. It is not possible to attach a label that can remain useful indefinitely because the groupings were fluid for the most part, and writers who might have been in agreement on one topic found themselves on opposite sides a year or two later, when some new wrinkle turned up. Another aspect of trying to generalize according to groups is that distortions inevitably result because the authors have a way of contravening logically defined and symmetrical approaches. A sort of series of adaptable descriptions of these loose connections, whether those that existed at the time or those that have been invented later by others, is needed instead.

The most traditional grouping of Russian Symbolists is by generations or "waves."¹⁸ This by now standard terminology will be used in this study, though it should be understood that relying too heavily on the delineation by "waves" is subject to serious qualification. The first Symbolists who began to publish before the end of the nineteenth century are generally known as the "older generation" or "first wave," that is, Dmitry Merezhkovsky, Zinaida Hippus, Valery Bryusov, Konstantin Balmont, Fyodor Sologub, and others. The chief representatives of the "second wave," including Aleksandr Blok, Andrey Bely, and Vyacheslav Ivanov, embarked on their careers in a substantial way after the turn of the century.

To these two groups the name of Innokenty Annensky should be added: Annensky began to publish Symbolist works after the beginning of this century, but thematically he is linked more closely to the first wave. There are, of course, more actors who will be introduced later, the minor figures who were often fervent and extremely active participants in the movement.

The characteristics that are often ascribed to these two waves of Symbolism are indicative, if occasionally overstated. The first wave is seen, for instance, as more decadent and more under the influence of French and Belgian Symbolism, they are sometimes described as more egocentric than the later wave of Symbolists.¹⁹ The younger generation, has, moreover, been depicted as more idealistic and religious, they are supposed to have taken more of their ideas from German philosophers than the earlier group, which has allegedly led to the difference in world view that does sometimes crop up between the two waves. But Sologub, who was called the Russian Schopenhauer, and the religious idealism of Merzhkovsky and Hippus are somehow left out of this generalization.

The topics that are chosen for the contrasts are, nevertheless, valid ones and do give an idea of what was important for the Symbolists in the Silver Age. It is true that Blok, Bely, and Ivanov all saw mysticism as an important aspect of a world view, at least at some points in their careers. And certain authors expressed decadent views in their poetry, including Bryusov, Sologub, Balmont, Bely, Blok, and even Hippus, though she claimed at one point to be totally free of that taint.²⁰ There were Symbolists who advanced a personal approach to life and others who tried to emphasize the collective nature of humanity. Some saw Symbolism as an artistic method, especially Bryusov in 1910, while others felt it was much more than "just art." This last position was argued most forcefully by Ivanov, Blok, and Bely. And there was a perhaps inevitable difference at times in the views of Symbolists who resided in Moscow, as opposed to the Petersburg natives. Despite these divisions, however, and even though these figures all had rather strong personalities and were not afraid of trying to convince others of the correctness of their views, the Symbolists did work together in a significant way and indeed formed a fairly coherent movement that had a definite sense of unity, at least until the major polemic in 1910.

As a movement, Symbolism did help to raise the aesthetic level of literature and indeed even culture in Russia. At the time of its inception, around 1892-94, the literary scene was permeated by a sense that something new was needed in Russian culture. There was a strong feeling of tense

1.0
X
2.0
GERMAN

UNIDE
-DE

A Note on References, Transliteration and Translation

References in the text to the months and years of publication for these works by Symbolist authors are taken from the Chronicles of Literary Events in *Russkaia literatura kontsa XIX — nachala XX veka*, gen. ed. B. A. Bialik, 3 vols. (Moscow, 1968-72). These detailed chronicles are based on extensive surveys made in the USSR and on official government records of publications (issued weekly) during the period before the Revolution. When these works are listed in the Notes, they are accompanied by the year of publication shown on the cover.

The transliteration system employed in the text is quite close to J. Thomas Shaw's System I, used "when the audience sought is not comprised solely of specialists in Russian studies," and in the Notes, System II, the Library of Congress system, with the diacritical marks omitted; see J. Thomas Shaw, *The Transliteration of Modern Russian for English-Language Publications* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 3-4, 8.

All translations are mine, unless specified otherwise.

1. Introduction

Russian symbolism is part of the general cultural upheaval that changed the face of Russian civilization between 1890 and 1910. It was at once an aesthetic and mystical movement; it raised the level of poetic craftsmanship, and it was united by a mystical attitude towards the world, which is expressed in the very name of symbolism.

Mirsky

The Russian Symbolist movement was indeed a major factor in the "cultural upheaval" at the turn of the century that Prince Mirsky mentions in his comments about this important era in literature, art, and philosophy known as the Silver Age.¹ From its beginnings in 1892-94, through the phase of its greatest flowering and influence in 1904-10, to its conclusion in a period of world war and revolution, Russian Symbolism accomplished much in its efforts to improve the standards of literary technique and of thinking in Russia. The degree to which all the Symbolists accepted a mystical attitude toward life can be (and, in fact, was) disputed, but the Symbolist movement itself was much more than "just literature" for many Russians in the first decades of this century. It can certainly be said that Symbolism changed the face of Russian culture, and scholars generally agree that some of this century's best Russian poets are numbered among the Symbolists. This chapter is devoted to the contexts of this multi-faceted movement, to tracing its roots, and to a brief characterization of its major tendencies, with the ultimate goal of indicating why it was such a significant cultural phenomenon.

The Silver Age, which lasted about two decades, from the end of the 1890s to 1917, not only demonstrated the outstanding capabilities of artists, writers, performers, and others active in Russia at the time, it also marked

expectation among the Symbolists, a palpable sense of the approach of the end of the century, and a concomitant emphasis on *fin de siècle* philosophy, similar to what had existed in Western Europe. There was, in addition, the expectation that a new era was about to begin; this feeling was reinforced, as was supposed then, by natural phenomena, such as the sunset, the color of which seemed to change (for Bely at least) around the year 1900. And so, Symbolism was accompanied by Apocalyptic forebodings, an attraction toward eschatology, and the hope for fundamental transformation.

At the height of its influence, approximately 1904-10, Symbolism had several publishing houses and journals where their activities could be focused. Various miscellanies were published yearly: the Symbolists' efforts to broaden and deepen the traditions of poetry and appreciation for it were noted, as was the frequent stress on spiritual wholeness, manifested by some, in a politically fragmented world, particularly after the abortive revolution in 1905. Though they had been attacked earlier, and lumped together for that purpose, for idealistic philosophy and a preference for lyricism and music in their poetry, as opposed to the formerly preferable civic poetry, their views came to be influential and even popular among the members of the Russian intelligentsia in general, including the realist authors.²¹ The leaders of the movement, Bryusov especially, moved from the position of outcast in the mid-1890s to that of cultural arbiter, and the stigma of decadence, which had been a point of contention in earlier years, was removed or at least overlooked.

Because of the serious disagreement about the true nature of Symbolism in 1910, Ivanov, Blok, and Bely joined forces in an effort to prove to Bryusov that Symbolism was more than simply an artistic method. It was clear soon after this polemic (carried out on the pages of a new journal, as the main Symbolist journal, *Vesy (Libra)*, had ceased publication in 1909) that Symbolism could not be restored as a vital force, despite the attempts to revive it in the years just prior to the First World War. Symbolism had by then been nudged from its position as the leading movement, replaced by two of its offshoots, Acmeism and Futurism. In contrast to Symbolism, where the main spokesmen and propagators were the major writers of the movement, Acmeism was less important as a movement than its individual representatives, most especially Anna Akhmatova, Nikolay Gumilyov and Osip Mandelstam; and Futurism, though it included such poets as Vladimir Mayakovsky, Velimir Khlebnikov, and Boris Pasternak, still received a good deal of its crucial support and promotion from minor figures in vari-

DUGG
INTIGRZA
ESPIRITUAL
X
MUNDO
POLITICA
FRAGMENTADO
(1905)
ASCENSÃO
DE
BRUSSIV
POLEMICA
1910
FUTURISMO
COMO
"OFFSHOOT" (BRASO)
DO SIMBOL.

ous fields. To a certain extent, though of course not exclusively, Acmeism was a continuation of the best recent trends in Symbolism; Annensky was considered a spiritual father of the movement, and though Nikolay Gumilyov and Mandelstam tried to create a "gulf" that supposedly separated Symbolism from Acmeism, there was still much in common, particularly the notion of the poet's special role and an individual approach to life, plus the emphasis on maintaining a high level of craftsmanship.²² Futurism can likewise be viewed as a continuation of some aspects of Symbolism, e.g., the efforts to shock complacent readers and the emphasis on renewing poetry and poetic language.²³ But it would be too much to say that these two movements can be easily and solely defined as post-Symbolist movements, as mere continuations of Symbolism, because they also contributed in their own ways to the richness of the Silver Age.

From a later vantage point, it is perhaps easier to see flaws in Symbolists' writings and thinking than it may have been when there was, according to various witnesses, "Symbolism in the air." The positive accomplishments, of course, significantly outweigh the shortcomings; and the influence the Symbolists had on Russian literature is undeniable. Even the Soviet critics, who are forced (or may prefer) to see Symbolism as a symptom of "bourgeois decline," take pains to admit that it was a stimulating intellectual movement. Because of the reactions by various individual Symbolists to the Socialist Revolution in 1917, it has been difficult at times for Symbolists to gain proper recognition and appraisal in their native country, but there has been a good deal of attention devoted to Symbolists in the West, which has compensated for some of the gaps that have existed in Soviet scholarship and publishing decisions. And once again, Prince Mirsky accurately renders the proper judgment about this movement and its importance for Russian culture:

the Symbolists combined great talent with conscious craftsmanship, and this makes their place so big in Russian literary history. One may dislike their style, but one cannot fail to recognize that they revived Russian poetry from a hopeless state of prostration and that their age was a second Golden Age of verse.²⁴

AN??
GRAD
PRATA
(COESTIC)
É O
CENTRO??

2. The Beginnings of Symbolism in Russia 1892-1895

It has been customary and indeed logical to name the year 1892 as the beginning point for Symbolism in Russia. During that year Dmitry Merezhkovsky published a volume of poetry called *Symbols* and delivered lectures in Petersburg and Moscow on the subject of "The Reasons for the Decline and the New Currents in Contemporary Russian Literature." In September of 1892, a major article on Symbolist poets in France appeared in *Vestnik Evropy* (*The European Herald*), and later that year a series of articles about Nietzsche began to appear in a journal devoted to philosophy and psychology.¹ At this time Valery Bryusov was still a student and was not publishing any of his works, but he was translating pieces by Maurice Maeterlinck and Paul Verlaine into Russian. The publication of three slim volumes of poetry, edited and partially written by Bryusov, entitled *The Russian Symbolists* (1894-95), is also considered another "inception" of Symbolism in Russia. The two beginnings made by Merezhkovsky and Bryusov are in fact very different. Their Symbolist-oriented works (and the critical articles about them, printed in periodicals of the 1890s) did not appear in isolation, nor did they immediately alter the trends then current in Russian literature. The focus of this chapter will be on these somewhat modest beginnings and on the context that surrounds the appearance of Symbolism on Russian soil.

Merezhkovsky and Hippius

Merezhkovsky already began his literary career as early as 1878; he met Dostoevsky in 1881, shortly before the great writer's death, and published his first poem in an anthology that same year. He printed poems in various journals until 1888, when his first volume of verse, called *Poetry, 1883-1887*, was published in Petersburg.² During these years he wrote what is now called populist poetry on social themes which were then in vogue. He

became acquainted with other poets, writers, and critics, some of whom were influential, including one writer who was later associated with Symbolism. N. M. Minsky. Minsky, who has been described as a "camp follower at the outset and a straggler at the end of his career," published works that were widely read at the time, though now they are largely forgotten; his name crops up occasionally in the course of this study because his ideas had a certain currency with the Symbolists.³

During this early, "civic" phase of his literary career, Merezhkovsky also developed an interest in French poets. He translated, for example, some poems by Baudelaire in 1884-85 and was attracted to various aspects of French Decadence, especially the emphasis on individualism. This latter interest was buttressed by an acquaintance with Nietzsche's philosophical writings. Minsky had been one of the first to popularize the German philosopher's works and ideas in Russia; Minsky's philosophical tract, *By the Light of Conscience*, first printed in Petersburg in 1890, shows his indebtedness to Nietzsche.⁴ At this point Merezhkovsky too agreed with Nietzsche's view that the old had to be destroyed before a new life could be created. Also during this period, from the publication of his first book in 1888 to the lectures in 1892, he began to cultivate certain traits associated with Decadence (which he later renounced), and he emphasized paganism, immorality, sin, and sacrilegious subjects in his verse, published later in *New Poetry, 1891-1895* (Petersburg, 1896).⁵ In retrospect, it seems clear that any "decadence" which could have been ascribed to Merezhkovsky was rather transitory and certainly shallow.

The title of his *Symbols* book of 1892 was chosen with the Western European Symbolists in mind and was rightly perceived as an important stage in his development as a writer, and to a certain extent it was a somewhat significant event in the history of early Russian Symbolism.⁶ Merezhkovsky was decidedly not a first-rate poet, and he cannot stand comparison with other major poets of the Symbolist era, such as Blok, for example. In the late 1880s and early 1890s, however, Merezhkovsky's poems did gain some recognition. The poems in *Symbols* were inspired by his travels to Western Europe, particularly Italy in 1891. The book also contained a translation of Edgar Allan Poe's "The Raven" (Poe was a favorite of the first wave Symbolists) and poems devoted to the *fin de siècle*. In this latter cycle of poems, Merezhkovsky reveals how impressed he was by the vitality of life in Paris, and he contrasts the French "visionaries" to the boring society life in Petersburg. The most significant work in *Symbols* is a

long poem entitled "Vera," a tragic recounting of an unhappy love affair. Bryusov wrote in his diary that he read *Symbols* in the autumn of 1892; he was quite taken with "Vera" and even claimed to have learned it by heart.⁷ And Bryusov's favorable reaction was not unique; other readers in Russia were enthusiastic about "Vera" and rated Merezhkovsky rather highly as a poet.

One of Merezhkovsky's most important contributions to Russian Symbolism was his collection of essays, *On the Decline and the New Currents in Contemporary Russian Literature*, published in book form in Petersburg in 1893.⁸ In October of 1892, after making contacts with French writers during a trip to France earlier that year, Merezhkovsky first delivered the lecture that was later used as the title for the book; he repeated this lecture in Moscow. Opinions about it were generally mixed. The book itself contains fifteen chapters; the first six are about contemporary Russian literature, and the remaining nine are devoted to realism, Dostoevsky, and the nineteenth-century Russian poet Apollon Maykov. As the title of the lecture and the book imply, Merezhkovsky believed that Russian literature was at a low point in the early 1890s. He felt that Russia had produced good poets but that it had not developed an outstanding national literature. He pointed to the lack of true aesthetic judgment among the reading public and to the despoliation of the Russian language by journalistic jargon. He attacked editors and publishers for their narrow interests and was specifically opposed to the idea of paying authors honoraria; though Merezhkovsky suggested that authors contribute their works for free, it should be noted that he had an independent source of income from his family and did not have to rely solely on honoraria. Merezhkovsky's invective had another subjective side: it was frequently difficult from him to place his works in journals, for a variety of reasons. The condition of contemporary Russian literature also upset him; he felt that most of it was bad, and he leveled his attacks on various critics and points of view. Here Merezhkovsky's judgment has some merit.

The most important portion of the book is the fourth chapter, on "The Beginnings of the New Idealism in the Works of Turgenev, Goncharov, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy." The first seven pages of this chapter are devoted to Symbolism in France; here Merezhkovsky explains that the nineteenth century witnessed a struggle between science and faith, between empiricism and mysticism. He feels that people living in the last decade of the nineteenth century were occupied with extreme materialism and yet longed

for more spiritual idealism. He associated realism in literature with materialism and points to the liberating possibilities offered by Symbolism, as demonstrated in France. Included as a quotation from Émile Zola, in which the French advocate of Naturalism condemns Symbolism as a "label that stands for shoddy verse" and compares Symbolist poets to "nut shells dancing on Niagara Falls."⁹ Merezhkovsky counters this statement by pointing to the spiritual superiority of Paul Verlaine. He then calls on Goethe for support in his challenge of Zola's criticisms and states, "the same Goethe said that a poetic word should be symbolic."¹⁰ Merezhkovsky also draws support from the sculpture and drama of ancient Greece, and from the "deeper currents" in Ibsen's *A Doll's House* and Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*. He includes as well a most frequently quoted slogan, which was dear to every Russian Symbolist, Tyutchev's line "A thought uttered is a lie."¹¹ He rejects the notion of "photographic exactitude" and advocates instead greater sensitivity to hints, elusive nuances, the dark subconscious, and beauty. This portion of his essay concludes with the naming of the three main elements of the new art: mystical content, symbols, and a broadening of artistic sensitivity. These are all important elements of Symbolist aesthetics, and here Merezhkovsky's place in the evolution of Symbolist meditation about art is fully justified: he did anticipate the major tenets of Russian Symbolism at this time, though he was later overtaken by more serious theoreticians, including Bryusov, Bely, and Ivanov.

In January, 1889, Merezhkovsky married a young poet, Zinaida Nikolaevna Hippus. They had met in Tiflis, and though they quarreled and were not ecstatically in love, they were soon married. There has been a good deal of argument about the nature of their marriage, about the partners' unity (or lack of unity) in their philosophical views. But what is important here, however, is Hippus' status as a poet, her part in the development of Russian Symbolism, and the fact that they worked together as a team for more than fifty years.

Hippus is regarded (quite correctly) as a better poet than her husband. She began publishing her first poems in *Severnyi Vestnik* (*The Northern Herald*) in 1888, but her first "new" poetry started to appear there only later, in 1892, in particular the poem "Song," which concludes with the oft-quoted line: "I need what's not on this earth."¹² Because of her husband's connections in the literary world, she met many of the important figures in the Petersburg intelligentsia in the early 1890s; one of her important acquaintances at that time was Akim Volynsky. He was influential in his

various posts at *Severnyi Vestnik* (from 1889 to 1898), and he opened the journal up, especially from 1893, to systematic publication of the Symbolists' poetry. Volynsky published her first major book in December, 1895 (the cover has 1896 as the publication date), a collection of stories and poems called *New People*.¹³ In her reminiscences about Merezhkovsky and herself, she treats Volynsky rather negatively but admits that *Severnyi Vestnik* gave space to the young forces "and sometimes hit the mark, as is the case, for example, with a writer and poet like Sologub, who wouldn't have broken through as soon without *Severnyi Vestnik*."¹⁴ In her own poetry, she admits to a certain decadent influence from French Symbolism and says, "I began to write verse, but of a completely different nature, with an uncustomary rhythm and free meter."¹⁵ Some of her poems and stories were printed in *Severnyi Vestnik*, but she began to find fault with Volynsky in 1895, partly because of a divergent view of art and because Volynsky made changes and cuts in Merezhkovsky's first novel, *Julian the Apostate* (the first part of his trilogy, *Christ and Antichrist*), which appeared in *Severnyi Vestnik* in 1895.¹⁶

Hippus' poetry also deals with religious themes in poems like "Ballad" (1890) and "Impotence" (1893), and with death in "Consolation" (1889) and "Snowflakes" (1894); religious faith and death were in fact pervasive themes in her poetry and prose in her literary career. Despite the fact that Hippus later poked fun at this "decadent" period in her life and poetry, these poems just mentioned are among the most frequently anthologized of her works, and it is almost always the case that the most "Symbolist" poems (from the first collection of verse, written from 1889 to 1903) are the ones chosen to represent her, especially the poem "Song," which has appeared at least fourteen times, according to a bibliography compiled in 1975.¹⁷

Song

My window is high above the earth,
 High above the earth.
 I see only the sky with the sunset,
 With the sunset.
 And the sky seems empty and pale,
 So empty and pale . . .
 That it has no pity for my poor heart,
 For my poor heart.
 I'm dying in insane sadness,
 Alas, I'm dying.
 I'm striving for something I know not,
 I don't know what.

And I don't know where this wish.
 This wish came from.
 But my heart wants and begs for a miracle,
 A miracle!

Oh, let something happen that's never happened,
 That's never happened.
 The pale sky promises me miracles,
 It promises.

But I cry, without tears, about the false promises,
 About the false promises.
 I need what's not on this earth,
 What's not on the earth.¹⁸

1893

Sologub

The Merezhkovskys met Fyodor Sologub soon after his arrival in Petersburg in 1892. Sologub had begun to write poetry as early as 1875; he had become a school teacher in 1882, at the age of 19, and taught in provincial schools for ten years. Although he had already published a poem, "The Fox and the Hedgehog," in a Petersburg journal called *Vesna (Spring)* in 1884, and began to translate Verlaine, in 1889, he was still a "young debutant" when he met Minsky in 1891 and the other contributors to *Severnyi Vestnik* shortly after that. Sologub was quite impressed by Minsky and his *By the Light of Conscience*, and he often wrote on the sense of human existence, a theme borrowed in part from Minsky and in part from Schopenhauer. Sologub found much to like in the German philosopher's *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, and Volynsky dubbed Sologub "the Russian Schopenhauer."

Sologub indeed had a fruitful association with *Severnyi Vestnik*, though the editors did not always agree with his views. His first poem published in this journal, "Evening," appeared in 1892; after that he published mostly in *Severnyi Vestnik*, particularly poems, reviews, and stories. His first story to appear, for example, "Shadows" (later called "Light and Shadows"), which was included in the last issue for 1894, was recognized at that time as the first example of Russian Symbolist prose.¹⁹ The story is quite indicative of Sologub's more mature prose and treats common themes such as mental instability and escape. The hero of the story is a twelve-year-old boy (children are frequently the main characters in Sologub's prose); the boy

becomes so interested in casting shadows on a wall to form various shapes that this activity eventually takes over his life. The dullness and oppressiveness of his everyday existence, especially at school, is contrasted to the freedom of his fantasies during the shadow game. His widowed mother, who at first scolds him for indulging in this all-consuming activity, ultimately joins him at the end of the story; night descends on them as their eyes shine with madness.

Many of the children in Sologub's stories are depicted as students who suffer at the high school (*gimnaziya* in Russian) because of their insensitive and brutal teachers. Sologub's realistic details are combined with fantasy to give a strongly pessimistic view of life, not only for the children, but for the adults too. He is one of the most consistently "decadent" of the Russian Symbolist writers, and his evolution never really led him away from his Symbolist orientation. He is most successful when his settings seem realistic and fairly objective, as in his first published story. His original intentions were not to shock the reader with absurd statements or strikingly new forms, but to express his psychological and philosophical notions. Unlike some of the other authors, Sologub had no particularly strong interest in Symbolism as a programmatic entity at its inception. He found the Symbolist writers, both Russian and Western European, congenial; it was only later that he wrote about the principles of Symbolism.

The next year, 1895, saw the publication of Sologub's first two books: *Bad Dreams*, his first novel, which appeared in serial form in *Severnyi Vestnik*, and his first book of verse, *Poems, First Book*, which came out in December, 1895.²⁰ *Bad Dreams* (separate edition in 1896) is an account of a provincial school teacher who dreams of a better world and of transforming people into gods. The novel was heavily edited and was the subject of a good deal of negative criticism. Sologub was accused of advocating crime and debauchery and of hating humanity. Tolstoy considered the novel "impossible, slovenly nonsense." Obviously a number of Sologub's critics identified him too closely with the fictional characters and events he depicts, but Sologub was interested in presenting a view of life that he had seen first hand and wanted to relate to his readers.

Poems, First Book features longing for the grave, sadness, poverty, "black thoughts," life as a "mute, gray prison," shadows, a fantasy goddess, and a "queen of joyful evil." Hippus found the book a "true pleasure" and praised several of the poems in it, calling them beautiful and almost perfect. Sologub was often criticized for the "decadent character" of his verse, but

his talent was generally acknowledged. This was in fact a common kind of reaction to Russian Symbolist poetry in these early years; the talent of these poets could not be ignored.

Balmont

Another poet who gained a reputation as a "decadent" during this phase of Symbolism was Konstantin Balmont. Like Sologub, Balmont also published some poetry before his first serious debut in 1894. He came from the provinces (a village near Vladimir) to study at Moscow University in 1886; he was expelled for political activities and he tried again, unsuccessfully, to study there in 1888. Shortly after marrying (for the first time) in 1889, he became dissatisfied with his marriage and tried to commit suicide by throwing himself out of a window in 1890; he injured himself rather badly and had to remain in bed for a year after this "accident." In 1894, he was divorced from this wife.

Balmont was essentially a self-taught person, a voracious reader, and a tireless translator. He apparently knew sixteen languages well enough to translate from them, though Marina Tsvetaeva, one of Russia's important post-Revolutionary poets, accused him of speaking and writing only one: Balmontian. In the early 1890s he supported himself by translating, especially the works of Edgar Allan Poe and Percy Shelley. His first published pieces of his own writing were three poems that appeared in a Petersburg journal, *Zhivopisnoe Obozrenie (Pictorial Review)*. His first collection of poems, printed privately in Yaroslavl in 1890, attracted little attention.²¹ Balmont had to pay to have this book, *A Collection of Poems*, published and later was so ashamed of it that he tried to destroy all the copies he could find, but its existence was sometimes mentioned in articles critical of his poetry. The only poem in it that he later reprinted is "The Stream," in which he counsels readers to search for the beautiful in surroundings that seem dark, prison-like, and moldy. The book also contains translations of poems from German and French, in addition to the twenty-one original poems.

Balmont's first representative book of poetry, *Under the Northern Sky*, was published in Petersburg in February, 1894.²² It contains fifty-eight poems and was so well received that it went through five editions. It was praised by some for its refinement, its "poetic honey," and attacked by others for the decadent mood and his vagueness. Balmont's fondness for

alliteration is sometimes carried to extremes in this volume, and he was often taken to task for it. The range of interests he displays in *Under the Northern Sky* is typically quite broad and includes: transitory dreams and images, spells, alienation, and sadness; he devotes poems to figures from Greek mythology, the beauty of Christ's crucifixion, musing by a fjord, thoughts on the death of Ivan Turgenev, and the plague. He began to make his reputation with this book, though better ones were to come later.

A few months later, in September 1894, Balmont met Valery Bryusov; at first both men were quite impressed with each other, and they became friends. Bryusov later wrote, "Many things became clear for me, more opened up for me, only through Balmont . . . I was one person before I met Balmont and became another person after my acquaintance with him."²³ In his diary, Bryusov wrote about the times he and Balmont spent drinking, reciting poetry, and wandering the streets of Moscow, often until dawn. These poets got along best during that fall (and in 1895); Bryusov soon began to notice shortcomings in Balmont as a poet and as a person, but at this early point in their careers, there was a good deal of mutual admiration.

Balmont's next major book of verse, *In Boundlessness*, appeared in December 1895, the same month as Hippius' *New People* and Sologub's *Poems, First Book*.²⁴ At this time Balmont was fairly popular and had his work published in different journals. Reviewers at several periodicals recognized his poetic talents and regretted that he was "wasting" them on "decadent" verse. This book was also quite successful and went through six editions by 1917. In the more than one hundred poems it contains, Balmont concentrates on shadows, sadness, flowers in swamps, a dying swan, restless dreams, the blessed peace of death, and love. He contrasts the sunny south to the cold, gloomy, prison-like north; and he explains why he threw himself out the window in 1890: he was trying to be free and forget the sadness of his married life, but he lived because death told him to live out his life and serve another destiny. Balmont felt that his life had been spared for a reason, and he took it as a sign that he had a greater future ahead of him.

Bryusov and *The Russian Symbolists*

If Merezhkovsky's lectures on the decline of Russian literature in 1892 were the first examples of interest in Symbolism in Russia, then the three collections of verse published under the title *The Russian Symbolists* are the first

ALTERA (WIDE P. 33)

20
LVRD
1895

10 LVRD
IMPORT
1894

important steps toward what would later become the literary movement. The driving force behind these collections of verse, as with so many Symbolist undertakings, was Valery Bryusov. Bryusov, in contrast to Balmont, was a very well educated person; he finished the Polivanov Gymnasium (a leading preparatory school in Russia) in 1893 and went on to Moscow University, where he received a degree from the History and Philosophy Faculty in 1899. Bryusov read an enormous amount and very often impressed others with his erudition. He felt like an outsider with his schoolmates, though, and decided early that he wanted to become famous. He felt that Decadence was the most promising area in which to realize his aims and took up that banner in order to achieve his goal.

He became interested in Symbolist writings in 1892-93. He was attracted to Baudelaire, Verlaine, and Maeterlinck and began to translate French and Belgian Symbolists. He was also introduced to Symbolism by Merezhkovsky's poems and lectures, and by Z. Vengerova's article about the Symbolist poets in France, which had appeared in *Severnyi Vestnik* in September 1892. Another important stimulus, though from a different direction, was the publication of Max Nordau's *Entartung (Degeneration)* in a Russian translation in November, 1893.²⁵ Nordau saw decline, decay, and degeneration in nearly everything around him, particularly in works by Zola, Ibsen, Tolstoy, the Symbolists, the Pre-Raphaelites, and other groups; Nordau's book was much discussed in Russia and other countries. Bryusov began to translate Maeterlinck in 1892, including the play *L'Intruse (The Intruder)*, and in February 1893 he wrote a lecture about Symbolism that was apparently never delivered. By March of 1893 he had "chosen" Decadence as a literary mode and affirmed that "Symbolism is necessary."²⁶ Also in March 1893 he purchased Verlaine's famous book about Symbolist poets, *Les Poètes maudits* (literally, *The Accursed Poets*). Despite Bryusov's seriousness about Decadence and Symbolism, he also wrote a play in 1893 that made fun of his newly chosen literary direction. The play, *Summer Passions*, was not passed by the censors, and it was certainly not one of Bryusov's more important works, although the name of the hero is of some interest — Findesiecle.²⁷

The first installment of *The Russian Symbolists* appeared about a year later, in March 1894.²⁸ The reaction to it was perhaps greater than the contents themselves merited. The book consists of poems by Bryusov and his friend from his high school years, A.L. Miropolsky, plus translations from Verlaine and Maeterlinck, in all forty-four pages. The poems by Bryusov

were not of high quality, but their shock value was great. In his preface, Bryusov (writing under the pseudonym of V.A. Maslov) maintains that Symbolism is not necessarily "the poetry of the future," but that it can express delicate moods. He distinguishes between Symbolism and Decadence, declaring that Symbolism aspires to "hypnotize" the reader. In his conclusion to this brief introduction, he asks other poets who agree with his views to send in their poetry for future publications. The book was quickly attacked in a newspaper, but Bryusov was singled out for a little praise. Because of this review, Bryusov was elated and felt like a "true poet."²⁹ Vladimir Solovyov wrote a witty review of the book for the August issue of *Vestnik Evropy*, and each of the reviews Solovyov wrote about the installments of *Russian Symbolists* generally helped Bryusov to gain the reputation he was seeking.³⁰

The second installment appeared in October, 1894.³¹ Bryusov prefaced this volume with a letter to an imaginary charming female reader and gave a more serious explanation of what Symbolism meant to him. He called it the "poetry of hints" and felt that it would occupy a leading place in Russian literature (a prediction that indeed came true a little over ten years later). He reported that there were even different groups of Russian Symbolists in 1894, and criticized the extreme forms of Symbolism, especially mysticism; once again, Bryusov's early sentiments, that is, his dislike for the mystical aspect of Symbolism, are highly indicative of his later positions. There are more authors represented in this volume, some of which were simply made up by Bryusov, though others were his acquaintances. The book is divided into four sections: Notes, Gammas, Chords, and Suites; the readers were supposed to divine the connections between the poems and music, but anyone already familiar with Western European Symbolism and the frequently quoted first line of Verlaine's poem "Art poétique" — "De la musique avant toute chose" — would have found the names Bryusov chose for the subdivisions rather obvious.

The reaction to Bryusov's antics this time was stronger and more widespread. VI. Solovyov remarked that one of the most noticeable characteristics of the Russian Symbolists was their rapid propagation, from two to ten in a few months.³² In fact, as N. Gudzy has pointed out, Bryusov and Miropolsky were again the main contributors to this volume, though they were joined by a couple of other minor writers.³³ Bryusov was again singled out for modest approval, and the translations included were generally considered acceptable.

27
SYMBOLIST
RUSSIAN
1894

BRIVIA
AND
1894

The third and final installment came out in August of 1895; a fourth volume of *Russian Symbolists* was planned, but it never materialized.³⁴ Bryusov attacked his critics in the foreword to this volume, which is an unfinished essay ("To the Zoiluses and Aristarchuses"). He felt that Russian society was intellectually and philosophically underdeveloped and therefore was not ready to accept these experiments in verse. The most memorable piece in this fifty-two page collection is Bryusov's single-line poem:

O cover thy pale legs,

which was subjected to ridicule. In VI. Solovyov's review, he again poked fun at "Mr. Bryusov and Company," the "young sportsmen who call themselves Symbolists," and he included three parodies of supposedly Symbolist poems that became as famous as the books themselves.³⁵ ~~Despite his mocking tone, however, the philosopher certainly treated Bryusov's efforts seriously enough to help begin the young poet's literary career with these reviews. Bryusov later collected his poems from these volumes and published them under the title *Juvenilia*, which was passed by the censor in 1896 but which appeared in print only in 1913.~~³⁶ He did not feel that his poems from this period had any independent significance, but he saw them as an important initial step in his evolution as a poet.

Bryusov's first separately published book of poetry carried the rather audacious title *Chefs d'oeuvre*.³⁷ In his introduction, which was considered impertinent by many reviewers, Bryusov explained that the title was chosen to denote the "last book of my youth . . . In the future I'll write much more significant things (at twenty-one it's permissible to offer such a promise!)." Bryusov asserted that the book would not receive a fair evaluation from the critics or the public and concluded his introduction by saying that the book was not addressed to his contemporaries or even to humanity, but to "eternity and art." He was, not surprisingly, correct in his guess that the book would not be well received. When it appeared in August of 1895, almost simultaneously with the third installment of *The Russian Symbolists*, it was indeed attacked, mostly for its pretensions. It also occasioned a polite, but very disappointing silence among Bryusov's friends. He did admit that the poems were weak, but he also felt that they were still worth some attention. In general, one can say that Bryusov's greatest contributions to Russian Symbolism lie in areas other than poetry, specifically in such endeavors as organizing, editing, promoting, and setting standards, though he did improve on his early and immature verse.

A wide variety of interests is evident in *Chefs d'oeuvre*. Bryusov's poems are usually well constructed, though there is an abundance of exclamation points, long lines (sometimes up to twenty-five syllables), and direct repetition of words in a line. There also seem to be a fair number of corpses in these poems, perhaps a legacy from Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du mal*, in particular one "flower" entitled "Une charogne."

An early Symbolist who gained quite a reputation as a "decadent," not so much for his poetry but because of his lifestyle, was Aleksandr Dobrolyubov, whom Bryusov met in June of 1894. Dobrolyubov lived in Petersburg and preached the benefits of suicide to young students there in the early 1890s. Apparently his "teachings" caused some deaths and he was expelled from the university because of this. Dobrolyubov is often cited as the extreme example of decadence, and Hippius thought of him as the only true decadent.³⁸ Bryusov was very impressed by Dobrolyubov, whom he felt was an "arch-Symbolist," although he was not as interested in Dobrolyubov's verse. Dobrolyubov published his first book of poetry in 1895; it carried the Latin title *Natura Naturans. Natura Naturata*, which refers to creative nature and created nature.³⁹

These authors, and the works they published in these four years from 1892 through 1895, were without a doubt important for the development of Symbolism in Russia, but it should be pointed out that they did not as yet play a major role in Russian literature. During this formative period of Russian Symbolism's inception, Tolstoy, Chekhov, and other realist prose writers were considered the leading lights, and their works were the most widely sold. The Symbolists often had to pay to have their first books published, and these books had print runs often from 200 to 600 copies. Maeterlinck was a popular author during this time, however, and other foreign authors were read and discussed, so the environment for developing a Symbolist movement on Russian soil was to a certain degree favorable.

Though Bryusov and his friends tried to give the impression (in interviews given to newspapers in 1894 and 1895) that there were many adherents to the Symbolist "school," it is clear that they were exaggerating the importance of their literary efforts somewhat. Their numbers were still small and the individual talents were not yet well developed, but there was, nevertheless, an increasing interest in Symbolism, and some of these authors were included in a broadly based anthology of younger poets, *Young*

TALGNTOS
SINDA
N DEGEN/VOR

Poets, published in Petersburg in February 1895.⁴⁰ One of the editors of this anthology, P. Pertsov, noted that same year that a division within Symbolism was already identifiable, especially between Symbolists in Petersburg and Moscow. Bryusov also admitted that there was no unity in the movement. In spite of the absence of a single school, however, Bryusov felt that the appearance of Symbolism in Russia was not accidental, that it had to happen, and that it had to be considered as valid. The somewhat scattered, individual efforts seemed like a shallow reflection of a restless mood to many, who often criticized without making any attempt to understand the philosophical and theoretical notions behind the writings. We now know that the Symbolists were headed for something greater.

DIVISAO

3. Individualism and Decadence 1896-1898

The three years that followed the initial phase of Symbolist activity were comparatively quieter and less fruitful from the point of view of advancing the movement. During this period, the Symbolists of the first wave, mentioned in the last chapter, continued to write and publish, especially poetry, but there was no central focus or unifying point for their efforts. The geographical separation of the two capitals remained an obstacle to greater consolidation of the Symbolist movement. These years were a time of preparation, with a certain emphasis on decadence, not only in literature, and individuals acting more or less in isolation. Merezhkovsky, Hippius, Sologub, and Balmont all gained more recognition as talented writers who could appeal to a somewhat wider circle of readers. The influence of Western European trends was strongly felt at this time; Maeterlinck's plays were produced quite frequently on Russian stages; Hauptmann and especially Ibsen began to attract more and more theatergoers and readers. Among Russian authors, Chekhov and Tolstoy were the leading figures. And in 1898, after serious problems with censorship and prolonged financial difficulties, *Severnyi Vestnik* was forced to cease publication. It was the end of one period for the Symbolists, a time of expectations that began to be fulfilled around the end of 1898 and the start of 1899.

The First Wave Continues

In Merezhkovsky's next book of verse, *New Poems, 1891-1895*, there were noticeable tendencies toward decadence and Nietzsche's philosophical tenets, and away from a more traditional Christian point of view. During the last half of the 1890s, Merezhkovsky found much to admire in the ancient cultures of Greece and Rome, including paganism. He saw the eras of cultural flowering there as calmer and more harmonious times, and these

aspects of ancient religions and philosophies attracted him. He felt there was a sense of measure and of enjoyment of life, coupled with a noble self-love and a love of beauty and nature that he did not find in his own age and immediate surroundings. It should be noted, of course, that Merezhkovsky's appreciation of classical societies cannot be considered unique; it was characteristic of other Symbolist authors as well.

The works he had printed in 1896-98 show a strong interest in the eternal themes of love and death: e.g., "The Science of Love" (1896), "Love is Stronger than Death" (1896), and "Love" (1898).¹ During these years he traveled rather frequently, spending a good deal of time in Italy, preparing for the second part of his *Christ and Antichrist* trilogy, devoted to Leonardo da Vinci, which was first published in the journal *Nachalo (The Beginning)* in 1899.² His essay, "The Village of Vinci," printed in 1897, shows how he immersed himself in the surroundings of Leonardo, where he lived and worked, in order to provide a detailed background for the novel.³ The choice of figures like Julian, Leonardo, and later Peter the Great for this trilogy was also partly dictated by Merezhkovsky's admiration for Nietzsche's ideas about strong personalities, supermen. The essays of Merezhkovsky's *Eternal Companions*, published in 1896 (the cover has 1897), shows his preference for illustrious people, as seen in the book's subtitle: *Portraits from World History*.⁴

Hippius was quite active in this period, printing numerous short stories and poems, including her second collection of short prose and poetry, *Mirrors*, which came out in 1897, though the title page has 1898.⁵ The book was met by mostly negative criticism, once again for the decadent aspect that her contemporary critics found not to their liking; especially common are the intertwined themes of love and death and the verb "to decay" in her poems in this collection. Her novel, *Without a Talisman*, was printed in the journal *Nablyudatel (The Observer)* during May through September 1896.⁶ The title refers to living without a religious faith, a topic of great importance to Hippius, because she felt that one could not really live without a faith. Also in 1896, Hippius printed a "Petersburg novella" called "Golden Blossom" in *Severnyi Vestnik*; the hero of the work, a decadent critic named Zvyagin, kills a woman who has scorned him.⁷ A story published a year later in the same journal, "Among the Dead," has clear traces of the mysticism that would later become a major part of the Merezhkovskys' philosophy.⁸ In 1898 her novel *The Victors* was published as a book; once again the hero is a negative person absorbed by self-love, and here Hippius

shows her fear that bourgeois people, who believe in common sense, will ultimately triumph over more philosophically oriented individuals.⁹

A major break in relations took place in 1898 between the Merezhkovskys and their patron at *Severnyi Vestnik*, Akim Volynsky. Apparently Hippius felt she could no longer maintain contact, whether personal or professional, with Volynsky, and she broke with him.¹⁰ This move was prompted by personal motives, however, and it did not seriously affect the Merezhkovskys' careers. Volynsky, meanwhile, had published an important article about Nietzsche in *Severnyi Vestnik*.¹¹ The article, "Apollo and Dionysus," was an interpretation of Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy*; the duality of these two complementary divinities from Greek mythology, each representing opposite notions, was later taken up by other Symbolists and expanded upon, particularly by V. Ivanov.

Another of the attending figures of this era, Minsky, was also active as a publicist, trying to set the tone of discussion in certain circles. His earlier success, *By the Light of Conscience*, first published in 1890, appeared in a second edition in 1897.¹² Minsky's ideas in the book were strongly influenced by Nietzsche's, but as is often the case with Russian writers at this time, it is difficult to say how profound Minsky's understanding of the German philosopher's writing truly was. In any case, Minsky's views were widely respected at the time among the new authors, and he also had the good fortune to publish one of the first books about Henrik Ibsen in Russia (1896).¹³

Ibsen and Maurice Maeterlinck became widely admired playwrights in Russia in the 1890s; editions of their works were printed, and a number of their plays were staged in major cities and even some of the smaller provincial towns.¹⁴ Both of these Western European authors appealed to the Symbolists, though Ibsen has to be considered the more influential. The Norwegian author was proclaimed a new Shakespeare, a prophet, a modern Viking who represented the old Saga tradition, and his works seemed strikingly new in a period noted for many unoriginal plays by Russians. From 1891 to 1912, seven editions of his collected works were published in Russia, and nineteen of his twenty-five plays were performed there. Ibsen's popularity coincided with the introduction of the first private theaters in Russia (1882 and after); his plays that dealt with current topics and problems represented a major shift away from the standard fare that had reigned at the state theaters, and he helped to touch off a wave of "Scandomania" in the early years of this century, when interest, particularly among the Symbolists, in

Ibsen, Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, Knut Hamsun, Edvard Grieg, and August Strindberg was at its peak in Russia.¹⁵

Sologub published a collection of stories and poems called *Shadows* in 1896.¹⁶ As often happened with many of his writings, the reviewers found much to like in *Shadows* because of his talent but just as much to dislike because of his subject matter and unusual point of view. He was, in addition, working during these years on his masterpiece, *The Petty Demon*, which appeared several years later.¹⁷ In the poems in *Shadows*, he focuses on philosophical questions about the nature of human existence. Everywhere he looks, he can see the hopelessness and banality of life, people not knowing why they live, suffering because they live in an anti-human environment on earth. ~~Many of the views Sologub expresses echo the pessimistic judgments of Arthur Schopenhauer;~~ at this time it seemed to Sologub that Schopenhauer had solved the problems that tormented him, especially the idea expressed in the phrase *homo homini lupus* (man is wolf to man), and Sologub was also fascinated by the heroes of Dostoevsky's novels and the tragic side of life portrayed in these works.

Balmont spent a good deal of time from 1896 through 1898 traveling in Western Europe. He married a second time in 1896, and one of the high points of his travels was the first of his several visits to Oxford University in England, where he was invited by the faculty to give a series of lectures at the Taylor Institute. After this extended period of travel in 1896 and 1897, he went back to Russia at the end of 1897 to oversee the publication of his next volume of poetry, *Quiet*, which eventually appeared in May 1898.¹⁸ This book also got mixed reviews and is indeed not one of his best works. Not surprisingly, there are poems devoted to Oxford, El Greco, and Don Juan, which show his varied, and continuing interests. In Volynsky's view, Balmont now had to be considered a more accomplished poet than either Merezhkovsky or Minsky, an opinion that now seems perfectly acceptable, but at the time it was somewhat novel.¹⁹ The year Balmont spent in Western Europe were mostly devoted to studying different languages and literatures, and he was particularly attracted to Spanish art, drama, and literature. His list of topics for reading at this time also included demonism, natural science, and world history.

After the "scandals" surrounding Bryusov's first publications in 1894 and 1895, he naïvely decided to publish a second edition of *Chefs d'œuvre*, which was met with negative comment by his detractors and an embarrassing silence by his friends.²⁰ He resolved in his next book of poetry, *Me Eum*

Esse (It is I, 1897), to adopt a mocking tone.²¹ He vowed that it would not contain one sensible word, but still it would find admirers, and that it would offer him the last laugh. But it failed to create the sensation he wanted, and he felt very disenchanting about his literary career, which at this time was very short on the success he was so earnestly seeking.²²

Because of this disillusionment, he decided to break off all literary activity in 1897 for a period of two years. He failed to keep this vow, of course, but the new tack did allow him a chance to examine what he had been doing. In 1897, moreover, he married Ioanna M. Runt, and this marriage was certainly a positive factor in his life. Ioanna turned out to be a faithful supporter (though Bryusov often was not faithful to her); and she always stood by him, even actively promoting him as an important author after his death. Especially important was her assistance in the publication of various resource books about Bryusov's life that have proved valuable to later scholars.

Another positive element in Bryusov's life was his involvement, beginning in 1898, with a respected journal, *Russkii Arkhiv (Russian Archive)*, where he was able to publish a review article about an edition of Tyutchev's poetry.²³ Tyutchev was recognized as one of the main precursors of Russian Symbolism, and the Symbolists themselves did a lot to ensure Tyutchev's good reputation among Russian readers, who had become accustomed to hearing mainly negative comments about him because he did not deal with major social themes in his poems. This shift to Bryusov's activities, which took him away from the largely futile attempts to gain some notoriety and toward working more seriously in literature helped to improve his own creative skills; he also realized that he was now totally occupied with literature and would be for the rest of his life.

During the period from 1896 through 1898, Bryusov traveled often in Russian and was moved to meditate on Pushkin's and Lermontov's poetry during a trip to the Caucasus. As has been pointed out, Bryusov continued the nineteenth century tradition of writing about the Caucasus in *Me Eum Esse*.²⁴ Most of the book was written during his visit there in 1896; in it, Bryusov displays interests in love, wandering, and searching for ideal beauty. He also shows how early he became interested in the image of a *volkhv* (magician, sorcerer), which later assumed greater importance for him. He also went to Germany in 1897 and was most impressed by the magnificent cathedrals in Cologne and Aachen; the inspiration he felt there was later transferred to his novel about medieval Germany, *The Fiery Angel*, first published in 1907-08.²⁵

Bryusov was quite enthusiastic about Leo Tolstoy's booklet *What is Art?*, which appeared in January 1898.²⁶ Bryusov saw some similarities between Tolstoy's rather unusual views of art (including major rejections of much of world literature and figures such as Shakespeare and Ibsen in favor of writing simple stories) and surprisingly, his own. He was so astounded that he even wrote a letter to Russia's venerable moralist, in which he almost accused Tolstoy of plagiarism because some of Tolstoy's statements are supposedly similar to those in Bryusov's introduction to *Chefs d'Oeuvre*. No one else noticed these imagined similarities, and Tolstoy never answered the letter. But Bryusov in fact wrote a response to Tolstoy's book: it was called *On Art* and it appeared in December 1898 (the cover has 1899).²⁷ Like Sologub, Bryusov shows his indebtedness to Schopenhauer as the source of some of his ideas, especially the view that the goal of poetry is to disclose all sides of the inner life, that the strength of a poet's soul is in his unique way of perceiving the world, that the artist has to be original, liberate his personality, and deal with a multitude of truths. The book is of some interest, largely because these views became fundamental aesthetic positions for some of Symbolism's followers in Russia; but over the course of about a decade after the appearance of *On Art*, Bryusov's own views changed radically, and he did not retain his reverence for Schopenhauer.

After the publication of the book, Bryusov journeyed to Petersburg in December 1898, where he was very active in literary circles for ten days. He visited with the Merezhkovskys and traded barbs with Hippius; Bryusov told her she was imitating the decadence of Dobrolyubov, and Merezhkovsky responded by stating that Bryusov's recent book about art was essentially empty.²⁸ The charges from both sides contain an element of truth, and one cannot maintain that Bryusov's book was his definitive statement on the subject of art. On this quick trip to the capital, Bryusov also met other leading figures, most notably Minsky (who seemed like a spider to Bryusov), Sologub, Ivan Bunin (later Nobel Prize laureate), Vladimir Hippius (a poet and scholar related to Zinaida; he later taught at the Tenishev School in Petersburg), and other figures, mostly from the older generation. The one person who made the deepest impression was the young poet Ivan O. Konevskoy (real last name Oreus). Bryusov took a strong interest in Konevskoy's career and felt he was an excellent poet.²⁹

Apparently Konevskoy seemed more talented in his context; though Bryusov considered him one of the most remarkable poets at the end of the century, no one would be willing to advocate this evaluation of Konevskoy

now. The writings that he left behind, in the collections *Musings and Thoughts* (1899) and *Verse and Prose* (1904) could accurately be called juvenilia.³⁰ There is a strong emphasis on expectation, self-interest, on free will (as interpreted once again by Schopenhauer), an interest in the sun and wind shared by Balmont, and a view of death as fainting. Konevskoy hoped there were possibilities for other existences. Because of his premature death in 1901 at the age of twenty-three, it is not really possible to speculate on whether he would have become a major poet, or on whether his unconventional language and difficult syntax would have developed into a more conventional style.

Decadence

There was a good deal of disagreement among the people now considered the representatives of Symbolism, even at this rather early point. But at this stage one thing served to unite all of them: the frequent mention of decline and decay in their poetry (though this was not universal); there were certainly morbid and occasionally macabre aspects of their verse, but not, however, as all-pervasive as some critics seemed to think. Another aspect of literary decadence, the tendency toward a highly refined (or even overly refined) style that can overshadow the content of a work is well represented in Balmont's poems of this time, especially in his overwhelming use of alliteration, as seen in the following passage (and it was possible to retain most of the alliteration, even in this English translation):

1896-8
I am the willful wind, wafting always,
Worrying waves, caressing willows,
Sighing in branches, I sigh and fall silent,
Swaying grasses, swaying willows,
etc.³¹

ALITERAÇÃO (VIDE P.21)
PRÓX. MOI MARIA (BLOR)!

Early in his career, Balmont had celebrated the smell of decay and the joys of death, as experienced by plague spirits. These topics complement the views expressed by Sologub that speak of finding pleasure in vice and insane wandering. Merezhkovsky at this time offered some poems in which he advised the reader to be his own God, his own Creator, and spoke about the ill effects of bright light on a sick man's soul. Hippius was writing about dust and death; the narrator of her poem "Sonnet" in *Mirrors* is imprisoned in a dark cell but does not want to see the bright light of day.³²

Though it is not difficult to locate and identify decadent verses in these

authors' collections, others that are not decadent can also be found, even in the works of Sologub, who is usually the most consistently decadent of the major Symbolists. There is, for example, an early poem by him that could have been written by just about any Russian school teacher:

Five times eight is forty,
Forest is spelled with an "e,"
An owl is sharp-eyed at night,
It's Prípyat, not Prip'yát!

I've been repeating this
For three years now,
Now the third summer
Is approaching soon.

Although I'm sick and tired,
They never ask us,
That's how it is,
So step lively into class.³³

One poet of the second rank who did not balance his decadent tendencies in literature is Aleksandr Dobrolyubov, who dropped out of literature at this time and by 1898 had begun to wander over Russia as a religious zealot. He "preached" silence and even had his own followers, called Dobrolyubovians. Despite the radical change in his life style, he nevertheless continued to visit Bryusov occasionally and maintained his interest in Symbolist poetry for a while; more of his books were also published — *Collected Verse* (1900) and *From the Invisible Book* (1905).³⁴

Blok's retrospective title for his poetry of this period, *Ante Lucem*, is appropriate as well for the years 1896-98 in the Symbolist movement. In these three years the movement still did not come fully into the light, as it would in the next period, up through 1903. This pre-dawn era is one of scattered lights and individual interests. These interests are often decadent, as no Symbolist aesthetic had yet been formulated. The Symbolist authors were certainly influenced by the approaching end of the century, by the poetry from Western Europe they were reading, and to a great extent by the views of Nietzsche, which were actively being spread in Russia.³⁵ Several Symbolists were known to a somewhat broad group of readers, and others, as yet unpublished, were beginning to compose their first works. Despite this lack of true cohesion, some critics saw a "school," and the main leaders in 1896-98 were Balmont, Bryusov, Hippius, Merezhkovsky, and Sologub. In the next chapter, we shall see this listing of Symbolism's leaders expand considerably.

4. Scorpio Rising: Modernism in Art and Literature 1899-1903

In this next period, the Symbolist movement becomes more unified and certainly better known. Where before the Symbolist authors often had to rely on their own resources in order to bring out books and had a somewhat limited access to the journals, by 1903 there were established publishing houses where their works were not only accepted, but in fact predominated. In the early part of this five-year span, Zinaida Hippius allegedly claimed (with some justification) that there was still no Symbolism, because Blok had not yet published any works.¹ But by the end of 1903, works by all the major Symbolists had appeared, there was a strong current of appreciation for some of the Symbolist poets, especially Balmont and Bryusov, and the movement was nearing the period of its greatest recognition and influence. At this time, it was permissible to treat the Symbolist movement without the former mockery of many critics. There were in fact several developments which will be chronicled here, such as the formation of new journals and publishing houses and the debuts of other Symbolist authors (including Annensky and the representatives of the Second Wave), that will show how Symbolism came to be a more vital force in Russian literature and cultural activities around the turn of the century.

Solovyov and Nietzsche

The approaching end of the nineteenth century evoked certain premonitions, not only among Symbolists but outside of Russia as well. Several Symbolist authors were seeking signs of a change, however, and this search seemed to have some basis in reality when it turned out that two idols of the Symbolist movement died in 1900. Bely was able to claim, later of course, that the deaths of Vl. Solovyov and F. Nietzsche, both in August (new style), heralded the end of the positivistic scientific age and the beginning

of a new, enlightened era. And the leaders of this new century were to be the Symbolists.

Following the flurry of Nietzsche's writings, published in Russian translation in 1898, and his death in 1900, one of the first major articles devoted to him appeared. Lev Shestov, a conservative religious philosopher, published a long piece about Nietzsche and Dostoevsky under the general title *The Philosophy of Tragedy*, beginning in 1901.² In that study, Shestov maintains that both Dostoevsky and Nietzsche avoid commonplaces and focus instead on the ugliest people and their problems. He praises both for seeking refuge in chaos and darkness; he feels that philosophy is the philosophy of tragedy, as portrayed by Dostoevsky's *Underground Man* and Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*. Just before that, Shestov had published a book, *The Good in the Teachings of Count Tolstoy and F. Nietzsche* (1900), in which he shows a preference for Nietzsche's "cruel" approach to life, which he says is more realistic than Tolstoy's moralizing.³ Though Shestov should not be considered a card-carrying Symbolist, his ideas did have some popularity in Symbolist circles, and his preference for Dostoevsky and Nietzsche over Tolstoy reflects the general attitude among Symbolists.

Another unifying feature of the Symbolist movement in the 1890s, though it appears thus largely in retrospect, was the interest in the poetry and philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov and the involvement with members of his family that future Symbolists shared. The philosopher's brother Mikhail, an historian, and his wife Olga, an artist and translator, opened their home to young men who would later gain fame as poets, and their nurturing efforts also helped to prompt their son Sergey to become a poet, critic, and later a priest. Two Symbolists who became acquainted with Solovyov's ideas in this way were Aleksandr Blok, considered by many to be Russia's finest poet in the twentieth century, and Andrey Bely, one of the most prolific, original, and brilliant of the "Frenzied Poets."⁴ Blok was related to the Solovyov family, and Bely's family lived in the same Moscow apartment house, so there was a good deal of interaction, though Blok and Bely did not actually meet each other until 1904.

The ideas of the philosopher that appealed most to Blok, Bely, and Sergey Solovyov center on the belief that the Antichrist would soon come, as predicted in the Book of Revelation, and bring about the Apocalypse, after which Sophia, also called the Divine Wisdom and representing the Eternal Feminine, would appear to herald the end of history and the begin-

ДОУТРИНА
ДО
СОЛЮВ

ning of the Kingdom of God on earth. VI. Solovyov's poetry was also of great interest to these "knights of St. Sophia," especially the poem, "Three Meetings," where Solovyov describes the vision he had of Sophia in Russia, England, and Egypt.⁵ The mystical views expressed by Solovyov appealed particularly to Bely and the philosopher's nephew Sergey. Blok confessed to having attempted to read the philosophical works, but he was apparently attracted more to the philosopher's laugh, and Blok's early enthusiasm for Solovyov's ideas about the Eternal Feminine waned after a while. Bely's appreciation, though based on a more solid acquaintance with the philosophical writings, also favored the physical presence rather than the ideas, as seen in the story Bely composed about the venerated philosopher, "We Await His Return," and in his long poem, *The First Encounter*, where Solovyov also has a leading role.⁶ Sergey remained the most devoted of the three and later wrote a biography of his uncle.⁷

Shortly before his death, Solovyov published one of his most popular and rewarding books, *Three Conversations* (May 1900), which includes a story about the Antichrist that became better known than the philosophical sections and still proves interesting today.⁸ The picture of the Antichrist that emerges is a rather positive one, very much in line with the Biblical prophecy. He is an enlightened person, a benefactor, and he brings about miraculous reforms. His purposes are quite noble, but his flaw is that he rules in his name only, not in God's. When wise church leaders realize who he is, his negative traits are then revealed. The Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox churches unite to fight him, and at the end, the Woman Clothed in the Sun arrives to signal the beginning of a new epoch. This work by Solovyov made a lasting impression and helped to keep alive the feeling that something final was approaching during the early years of this century.

Anthologies at the Turn of the Century

For many of the people involved in striving for greater freedom in art, and specifically for those actively promoting the cause of modernism, the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth naturally provided an occasion for reflecting and for dreaming about the future. The titles of some publications at this time often mirror the perception of the *fin de siècle*.

An anthology of poetry by four authors, for example, called *A Book of Meditations*, appeared in Petersburg in late 1899.⁹ The four contributors

were Balmont, Bryusov, Konevskoy and Modest Durnov, a minor poet and artist who was active in the early phase of Symbolism. The book did not attract much attention among readers, and Bryusov makes it clear in his diary that the publication was Balmont's idea, that it did not interest him very much, and that Hippius and Sologub had been invited to participate but declined.¹⁰ Konevskoy's first book, and the only one published during his lifetime, *Musings and Thoughts*, published the same month (November 1899), echoes the title of this anthology and shows the same tendency for reflecting about life and musing about the future.¹¹

Another miscellany published in late 1899, however, points in the other direction with its title: *Morning Star* (or *Dawn*).¹² Though this collection includes pieces by Balmont, Hippius, Sologub, and others, it is not a specifically Symbolist anthology and shows rather that these poets had been accepted more on the basis of their artistic accomplishments than for the novelty of their ideas or style. And though the collection itself is not terribly important, the point that newer authors who stood for more artistic freedom and for stylistic sophistication were accepted as equals is significant.

The World of Art

One of the major developments that served to give Symbolism a more prominent position in Russian cultural life occurred shortly before the new year of 1899: the founding of the World of Art group in Petersburg and the publication of the first issue of its eponymous journal, *Mir Iskusstva* (*World of Art*), in November 1898. The role of this group and its periodical in the evolution of Russian modernism was a considerable one, despite the fact that the interests of many World of Art artists were rather far removed from topics associated with the avant-garde or with Decadence. It was important for the Symbolists that this quintessentially Parnassian journal opened its pages to their writing after the demise of *Severnyi Vestnik*, which printed its last issues in early 1899 (Nos. 8-9 in January 1899 and Nos. 10-12 in April 1899).

The leader of the World of Art group, the founder of the exhibitions it sponsored, and the editor of the elegant journal that helped to revive Russian culture was Sergey Diaghilev, an art critic, arbiter of taste, and above all an excellent organizer. Diaghilev gathered together a number of important Petersburg artists, many of whom had studied together. They met regularly at his home, discussed trends then current in Russian art, and worked

out the program for their new journal. The main idea of the journal is often given in the form of a slogan: Art is free, life is fettered.¹³ They sought freedom from the influence of the accepted realistic painters, avoided social and political commentary in their art works, and often focused most of their attention on the "how" of art, rather than the "what." Their tastes were eclectic and revealed equal support for Russian national art as well as foreign, especially French, artistic styles. The publication of their illustrated, well produced and expensive journal was initially subsidized by wealthy patrons, Savva Mamontov and Princess M.K. Tenisheva, but after a short while this sponsorship was withdrawn and Tsar Nicholas II authorized a subsidy from his personal funds in 1900 to keep the journal going. At the beginning, Diaghilev was the general editor, Alexandre Benois was the art editor, and Dmitry Filosofov, an important figure behind the scenes of the Symbolist movement, was in charge of the literary section.

In 1899 various Symbolist authors were invited to participate in the journal's activities, even though the periodical's primary emphasis was on art. Important articles by Symbolists and other authors who favored modernistic trends were published. Merezhkovsky, Hippius, and Minsky were quick to join forces with Diaghilev and his colleagues, and Sologub and Balmont contributed poetry in 1901.¹⁴ Works by Bryusov appeared there in 1901, and Bely began to contribute in 1902, though Blok, who started attending meetings in 1902, felt alienated from the artist and never published in *Mir Iskusstva*.¹⁵ The Symbolists who published there were happy, for the most part, to have this outlet for their writings, and in the first years of this century, several of the World of Art artists illustrated books by Symbolists. But it was difficult for some authors, particularly the Merezhkovskys, to work with Diaghilev, who was apparently rather authoritarian in his dealings with colleagues.

The two persons in the Symbolist camp who were initially most active in the World of Art journal were the Merezhkovskys, however. Hippius, for example, contributed reviews of plays by Minsky (his play *Alma*, published in 1900) and Aleksey K. Tolstoy.¹⁶ She also sent travel notes from Taormina in Sicily, in addition to poetry.¹⁷ But she published a novel, *The Twilight of the Spirit*, in another journal, *Zhizn* (*Life*), in 1900, that was later printed as a separate book in 1902.¹⁸ This novel shows her interest in religious topics and the importance of love.

Merezhkovsky was also inclined to print his fiction in different journals. His *Romance of Leonardo da Vinci*, which had begun to appear in *Nachalo* in 1899, was printed in its entirety in *Mir Bozhii* (*God's World*) in 1900.¹⁹ His most important contribution to *Mir Iskusstva* was undoubtedly his lengthy study of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, which began appearing in 1900.²⁰ In this work, he praises Dostoevsky, whom he labels a "seer of the spirit," and shows his disdain for Tolstoy's religious views. After a visit to Yasnaya Polyana, where Merezhkovsky had an opportunity to meet the person he described as the "seer of the flesh," he softened his previously critical stance toward Tolstoy somewhat. Similar to his earlier statements about the decline of Russian literature, this study caused others in the intelligentsia to question their own assumptions about these two authors and the general direction of Russian literature at the end of the century. Merezhkovsky's invitations to re-examine the writings of important nineteenth century authors and the critical opinions about them that had become fixed with time in fact constitute his greatest contribution to Russian cultural advancement and have helped to maintain his reputation as a "thinker."

The Religious-Philosophical Meetings and *Novyi Put'*

In late 1898-early 1899, both Merezhkovsky and Hippius committed themselves to a strong faith in Christian tenets; they formed a "movement" that has at times been called the "God-seekers" (*Bogoiskateli* in Russian) or simply "the cause" (*delo*), this latter name is used in Hippius' diaries. As a first step, a rather unusual "triple" marriage ceremony was performed in 1901, linking Merezhkovsky, Hippius, and Dmitry Filosofov, who had left his lover Diaghilev to join the Merezhkovskys.²¹

One of the significant corollaries to the Merezhkovskys' interest in religion and its relation to literature was the founding of the Religious-Philosophical Meetings in St. Petersburg in November 1901. This forum for intellectuals and members of the clergy was the first of its kind in Russia and generated a good deal of interest (and suspicion among the leadership of the Holy Synod) because there was no guaranteed freedom of speech in Russia at that time. Thus it was quite a novelty for persons interested in freedom of expression, including a number of Symbolists, to attend meetings where all manner of opinions could be expressed publicly. Early leaders of these Meetings were the Bishop Sergey, rector of the St. Petersburg

Academy, who presided, Merezhkovsky, Filosofov, V.A. Ternavtsev, an employe of the Holy Synod (the council that oversaw all the functions of the Russian Orthodox Church), and V.S. Mirolyubov, a writer, editor, and philosopher.

By the end of 1902, the Merezhkovskys were estranged from the editorship of *Mir Iskusstva*, and they felt a strong need to have their own journal. So they founded one, called *Novyi Put'* (*The New Path* 1903-04), whose main purpose was to serve as an outlet for the reports of the Religious-Philosophical Meetings, though it also proved to be an important periodical for the Symbolist writings, if only for a brief time. Merezhkovsky and Hippius called on an experienced and sympathetic editor, P. Pertsov, to edit the new journal and obtained financial assistance from an influential conservative newspaper publisher, Aleksey Suvorin. They also asked Bryusov to be the secretary of the journal, and initially he did collaborate, though by the autumn of 1902 he was not on good terms with the Merezhkovskys, who were in fact the ones mainly responsible for the journal's editorial content. Balmont and other younger poets contributed to *Novyi put'*, and according to Hippius, Diaghilev was disturbed that some of his subscribers, and literary contributors, would desert *Mir Iskusstva* for the new journal. Thus, he offered in vain to merge them shortly after the beginning of 1903.²²

Much of *Novyi Put'* was devoted to religious topics and contained material by young and unknown writers, in addition to the Merezhkovskys and other established figures on the literary scene. At its high point it had over two thousand five hundred subscribers, and in its programmatic statement in the first issue (January 1903) Pertsov wrote that the journal's goal was to avoid the tone of the thick, political journals that predominated then and to focus instead on spiritual unity in Russia, on new art and thought, and on contemporary trends abroad.²³

ABR 1903
ENC. -
RUB-FILE
PR 018105

The journal was dealt a fairly serious blow in April 1903, however, when further Religious-Philosophical Meetings were banned by the Holy Synod.²⁴ And the journal created to report on these meetings lasted only until the end of 1904. One of the reasons for continuing so long was that the reports were printed in the journal until February 1904. By that time, Merezhkovsky had lost much of his initial interest, and he was not happy there were no honoraria for his writings published there (a marked shift from his point of view in 1892!). More information about this journal will be offered in the next chapter.

Skorpion

The summer of 1899 saw the formation of the first nucleus of Moscow Symbolists, a grouping that would soon prove very significant for the Symbolist movement. At this time, Balmont, Bryusov, Jurgis K. Baltrushaitis, Sergey A. Polyakov, and M.N. Semyonov met often to share their similar views on literature and to discuss the need for founding a publishing house primarily devoted to Symbolist writings and other works of the "new art." By the end of that year, the publishing house they wanted had been formed: it was named Skorpion (Scorpio, after the zodiacal sign) and was mainly financed by Sergey Polyakov, the son of a wealthy Moscow businessman. Polyakov, however, was also a poet, editor, and accomplished translator of Ibsen, Hamsun, and others. Semyonov was a minor writer and translator (especially from Polish and German), who helped out with some of the editorial duties, though his role in the Skorpion venture was not as significant as the others'. By March of 1900, they had brought out their first book, Aleksandr Dobrolyubov's *Collected Verse*, which had been compiled with Konevskoy's assistance.²⁵ In the next decade and a half, the books printed by Skorpion were among the most important of the Symbolist movement, and of Russian culture from 1900 to 1916.

One of the chief merits of Skorpion was the impetus its founding gave to unifying the two main centers of the movement, in Petersburg and Moscow, by providing an outlet for Symbolists' books, by issuing anthologies annually, and later by publishing a journal, *Vesy*. Though the geographical and ideological differences remained, and at times flared up rather hotly, this avowed Symbolist house opened the way for greater recognition of the movement and the individuals associated with it. It was the first, and most important, of the Symbolist publishing houses, and though Polyakov was nominally the person in charge, the main organizing and administrative skills were provided by Valery Bryusov. The effort was rather modest in the beginning, and through the course of its existence, the venture was never a highly profitable one. Because of Skorpion, which printed translations of works by European authors admired by the Symbolists, Russian readers were able to become better acquainted with Hamsun (a collection of essays published in 1900, *Pan*, printed in 1901, *Drama of Life*, 1902), Ibsen (*When We Dead Awaken*, 1901), Gabriele D'Annunzio (*Tragedies*, 1900), and Arthur Schnitzler (*The Green Cockatoo*, 1900).²⁶ By 1904, Skorpion had brought out works by almost all the major Symbolists and several minor

ones (major: Balmont, Bryusov, Bely, Ivanov, Sologub, Hippius, Merezhkovsky; minor: Dobrolyubov, Konevskoy, A. Miropolsky, L. Zinovyeva-Annibal), in addition to a collection of poetry by Bunin.²⁷

One of this house's first publications in 1900 was, not surprisingly, Bryusov's own *Tertia vigilia*, which appeared in October of that year.²⁸ The title refers to the third watch of the Roman guards, especially the three hours after midnight. Despite the less than optimistic connotation of the title, the poems in *Tertia vigilia* were met with praise by Bunin, Maksim Gorky, and Blok, among others; Bryusov felt it was one of his best efforts in verse. In his preface, he takes a moderate stance, trying to encompass all types of poetry in his credo — "the ultimate goal of art is to express the totality of the artist's soul" — and yet he still favored the "new art" because of its greater freedom in all areas.²⁹

The poems in this collection, written from 1897 through 1900, include a section called "Favorites of the Centuries," which centers on figures from ancient Rome, Greece, Egypt, the Bible, and early history, plus the Middle Ages and Russian history. Other poems are devoted to seashores, enclosed spaces (such as the poet's room), loves, his friends, and even to himself. There is as well a cycle titled "A Book for Children," which contains a poem on Little Red Riding Hood (one wonders, though, how many children actually read the verse in Bryusov's collections). The longer poems of the final section about a hermit, impressions of Revel, in Estonia, and others particularly attracted the attention of Blok and Gorky; winning Gorky's praise was in fact a reasonable measure of how Bryusov's talent had developed, since Gorky was the main leader of the opposing realist camp.

Severnye Tsvety

Another of Skorpion's early projects indeed united the various authors and groups in April 1901 in one publication: the first of its annual miscellanies, *Severnye Tsvety (Northern Flowers)*.³⁰ The title chosen for the collections shows how the editors tried to draw a direct connection between their publication and the earlier miscellanies of the same name, published by Baron Anton Delvig, an associate of Pushkin:

We wish to resume publication of this miscellany after a seventy-year hiatus (the last time it was published, for the Delvig family, was in 1832); we hope to preserve its traditions as well. We would like to stand apart

from the literary parties that now exist and accept for our collection everything that contains poetry, no matter what school the author belongs to. Following the *spirit* of the former *Northern Flowers*, which were enlightened by the close participation of Pushkin, we have not found it necessary to imitate its small format, tiny print (petite), etc., which were common in the miscellanies of Pushkin's time, and which we felt would be a completely unnecessary hindrance for contemporary readers. We are glad, nevertheless, that the artist K. Somov has kindly taken it upon himself to design the cover of our publication; Somov marvelously conveys the spirit of our own 1820s and 1830s. All the vignettes are reproduced from editions of that same time.³¹

As this preface states, the editors opened their pages to writers who did not necessarily support their views, particularly such established writers as Anton Chekhov and Bunin, who contributed a story each, but by far the most space was given over to Symbolist prose and poetry. One other significant aspect of the preface is the emphasis on the book's outward appearance; fully half of the editorial statement is concerned with the size of the print, the cover, and the vignettes used to illustrate the edition.

The first collection of *Severnye Tsvety* featured prose by Hippius and Baltrusaitis, in addition to the more famous authors mentioned above, plus poetry, letters, memoirs, and critical prose. The Symbolists who offered their verse included Dobrolyubov, Balmont, Sologub, Miropolsky, Konevskoy, Baltrushaitis, and Bryusov. In the last section, the letters of Pushkin, Tyutchev, Fet, and Vl. Solovyov appeared, along with a highly critical view of Balmont, Bryusov, and Dobrolyubov by Prince Urusov, notes by Vasily Rozanov on the Old Testament, which he calls an "unread book," probably with justification, and Konevskoy's reply to Hippius' review of Minsky's *Alma*, which was printed in *Mir Iskusstva*.

The second *Severnye Tsvety* miscellany, which appeared in March 1902, retains the same format of prose, poetry, and articles that the first issue featured.³² The second miscellany's preface has a fairly defensive tone, however; the editors defend their decision to publish letters, notes, and articles by Pushkin, Fet, Turgenev, and Nikolay Nekrasov in the anthology. They feel that Afanasy Fet's article on "The Sources of Nihilism" is worthy of placement next to previously unpublished letters by Turgenev; generally, the Symbolists helped much to restore the reputation of Fet, one of the finer poets of the mid- to late- nineteenth century, whom the Soviets still consider a little too conservative and "narrow."

The editors of this second collection again take a "non-party" stand

and even include a caustic article by Volynsky that attacks many of the Skorpion and *Severnye Tsvety* participants (these groups are largely synonymous). Though the editorial statement tries to avoid polemics, it is clear from the last two sentences that the original hope of reviving the Golden Age of Pushkin's time had not been fulfilled: "The authors are responsible for themselves — that's the view of the *Northern Flowers*' editors. An honestly expressed opinion, a novel and conscientious one, has a right to be heard."³³

The prose section begins with a story by Rozanov, an enigmatic author who sometimes found himself allied with Symbolists, though his views are in many areas antithetical to theirs. Hippius' "Heavenly Words" is a memoir of a man from his earliest recollections to around age ninety. Bryusov's "Now That I Have Awakened" deals very effectively with dreams and their attractiveness. In Sologub's "The Hoop," an old man plays with a hoop shortly before he dies and is content at death because of this game. Many of the so-called first wave of Symbolist poets are represented by poems: Minsky, Konevskoy, Bryusov, Balmont (some of whose poems also appear under pseudonyms), and Merezhkovsky. One of the most noteworthy poems is by Sologub:

I am the god of the mysterious world,
The whole world exists only in my dreams.
I'll build no idol for myself.
Neither on earth nor in the heavens,

I'll not reveal my
Divine nature to anyone.
I'll work like a slave, and for freedom
I call on the night, peace, and darkness.³⁴

In addition to the archival material and Volynsky's piece, the third section of this miscellany includes an article by Konevskoy and a chronology of Fet's poetry.

There is a shift in emphasis in the third issue of *Severnye Tsvety* (March 1903), as indicated in the preface:

Our third miscellany is different from the two previous ones. Its contents are more "single-voiced," more consistent. There are a number of new names in it, and some of our previous companions are missing. We are happy about the new authors. There is new youth, vigor, and power in them! And we're too busy to feel sorry for the ones left behind. There was a time when we would have waited for them, given them a chance to catch up, but now it's time to move on again. Our heads are again facing forward, toward the future, and we no longer see who is behind us.³⁵

The tone is less defensive, but there is still some sign of insecurity. The third anthology is no longer divided into sections, but there is still some archival material (by the fabulist Ivan Krylov and by Tyutchev).

The contents of this collection are rather varied. Bely published his fragment from a mystery play, "The Arrival," about people waiting for Christ's Second Coming; he later said that it was part of a play with the general title *The Antichrist*, written in response to Solovyov's poetry, but the theme is closer to other works about a False Messiah, which Bely was writing at the time. Balmont contributed poems on Spanish and British topics. Hippus offered "Mass," a story about an Italian girl who wants to have a mass said for a foreigner she has made love with on a train, and to pay for it she wants to use the ten lire he gave her. There is an article by Rozanov on Revelation, and a story by Mark Krinitsky, who was at that time attracted to Symbolism, later wrote in a more realistic way, and ended up supporting the Revolution rather vociferously. An early version of Merezhkovsky's *Peter and Alexis* (the third part of his trilogy) appeared on these pages, as did poems by Dobrolyubov, Miropolsky, Hippus, Blok, V. Ivanov, Sologub, and Bryusov.

Grif

Another Symbolist publishing house, which competed with Skorpion but never matched it in quality or depth, was Grif (Gryphon, named after the mythological beast), founded in 1903 by Sergey Sokolov an attorney who wrote poetry under the pseudonym of Kuchetov and who was particularly attracted to the decadent facet of the new art. At this time he was married to the poetess Nina Petrovskaya, who played a fairly important role in amorous intrigues related to the Symbolist movement. Blok, Bryusov, and Bely all had dealings with Sokolov in 1903 and all found him alien to their way of thinking. Blok felt Grif was an "indubitable fake," though he had his first book printed by Grif. Bryusov issued a decree to Skorpion writers not to place works with Grif (but he was generally not heeded), and Bely, who was somewhat less negative about Sokolov (until 1907), described him in dark colors in his memoirs and compared him to various birds.³⁶

That year Grif published its first collection, edited by Sokolov, simply called *Grif Miscellany*.³⁷ It contained only ninety-three pages, almost all of which were devoted to poetry. Balmont contributed five poems under his own name and another five under his frequent pseudonym Lionel. Despite

the rivalry between Grif and Skorpion, Bryusov printed three poems. Bely published eight poems, plus excerpts from a larger work, his "Fourth Symphony." Sokolov and his wife included two poems each, and other writers associated with Symbolism, such as Viktor Hofmann and Maksimilian Voloshin, who had previously published poetry in the second *Severnye Tsvety*, also contributed poems.

After this anthology, three more followed in the course of the next ten years. At first Grif printed only a few books; between the appearances of the first and second anthologies (the second came out in February, 1904), it published Balmont's *Only Love* (October, 1903) and a translation of Oscar Wilde's *Salomé* (1904). In the first years of its existence Grif concentrated mainly on the leading Symbolists (Balmont, Bely, Blok, Sologub) and Wilde, who was quite popular in Russia at the time.

Annensky

Another Symbolist author who was later associated with Grif is Innokenty Annensky. Though his poetry and dramas have come to be respected and his critical articles are still frequently cited in regard to Symbolist and post-Symbolist poets, he did not become well known until after his belles-lettres were printed, beginning in 1901. He had begun to publish book reviews and scholarly and pedagogical pieces in the decade before, the 1890s (like Sologub, Annensky was a school teacher for much of his life). His early translations of Euripides' plays in the late 1890s and through 1900, which were sometimes performed, led to his own four tragedies, published in the first decade of this century, which correspond quite closely to the general interest among the Symbolists in ancient literature, especially myths and legends.

Annensky's literary interests are close to those of the first wave of Russian Symbolism, particularly of Bryusov, Sologub, and Balmont; and like these authors, Annensky also translated many French modernist poets, such as Baudelaire, Verlaine, and Mallarmé. By 1896 he had become the director of the lyceum at Tsarskoe Selo, where Pushkin had studied as a young man; it was undoubtedly an important post, but Annensky did not feel comfortable with it. He was torn by the divergences between his duties at the lyceum and his personal interests, that is, his poetry, which can be seen as rather decadent: it features escaping from everyday life, chewing on lotus leaves, the attractiveness of drugs like hashish and of deep ponds,

EDITOR DA DIV. DE ÁGUAS!
(NOV 1906 - OUT 1907)

Ann

accompanied by ennui and liberal doses of poison.

Annensky, however, was not especially drawn to the Russian Symbolist movement itself at this point in his life, and when he became better known, and sought after, some time later, he still was not an active participant in the various groups associated with Symbolism. He in fact disliked the views expounded by the Merezhkovskys and considered them rather cynical. In addition, he was quite disappointed with Merezhkovsky's translations of Euripides and attacked him for his lack of scholarly erudition.³⁸

Annensky's real literary debut occurred in 1901: his tragedy *Melanippe the Philosopher* came out in November of that year.³⁹ This play focuses on a critical point in the life of Melanippe (also known as Arne), daughter of Thea and Aelous, King of Magnesia in Thessaly. Melanippe had given birth to two sons by Poseidon, and for this she was blinded and imprisoned. Annensky's drama is directed at Melanippe's unsuccessful attempts to defend herself and her children.

He developed this tragedy along the lines of the classical unities, but he allowed himself some liberties with the mythical aspects of the legend. In his preface to the drama, he explains why he did not write a totally classical play; he speaks of the gulf between ancient and contemporary souls, and because he favors the modern milieu, he believes he would feel uncomfortable conversing with characters in ancient Greek plays. And though some of his translations of Euripides' plays were done for performances, his style in *Melanippe* reveals that his intended audience was composed of readers, rather than members of an audience in a theater. He describes Melanippe's eyes in great detail, for instance, and calls for quite delicate shadings in the colors used for clothes and natural phenomena. The poetic style of the play also shows the same mixture of classical motifs with very modern language, all of which help to demonstrate that the views, emotions, and action alluded to in regard to Melanippe's fate are still contemporary.

Annensky's next work, a tragedy called *King Ixion*, appeared in February 1902.⁴⁰ Like his previous play, this "dramatic fairy tale" is based on a Greek myth, though once again the style is not entirely classical. The main action here centers on the actions of Ixion, king of Lapithae, after the murder of his father-in-law, Eioneus (also called Dieoneus, which is the version Annensky uses). Despite this crime, Zeus decides to spare Ixion, but Ixion wants to be a god, to exert his will. In Annensky's rendering, he drinks the gods' nectar of immortality but fails to shed his human feelings. He falls in love with Hera and is tricked into thinking that he spends a night with her,

but it turns out that the goddess of deceit has fooled him. When the gods learn of his desire for Hera, Ixion is punished. The conclusion shows that humans are not allowed to defy fate, that mortals cannot place themselves above good and evil. And the general mixture of the contemporary with the classical is typical in plays by French authors in the twentieth century as well, most notably Jean Anouilh.

The Second Wave: Bely, Ivanov, Blok

Bryusov was now clearly emerging as the leader of the movement's first wave. He had spent the fall of 1901 collecting material for the second issue of *Severnye Tsvety*. He was rather disappointed when Chekhov failed to contribute again, but he was able to cement personal relations with the Merezhkovskys during their visit to Moscow in December 1901. He was not in agreement with their views on Christianity but found Hippius rather intriguing. During their discussions, he also met the student Boris Bugaev (the real name of Andrei Bely), who had not yet published anything, either under his pseudonym or his real name. Bryusov described him as a "student-decadent" at this time, but by October 1902 he reported in his diary that Bely was the most interesting person in Russia.⁴¹

From May through early July 1902, Bryusov had been traveling (mostly in Italy), and after his return he was elected to the Literary-Artistic Circle in Moscow (another indication of his more solid status as an author); here he met some of the leading realist authors and was able to keep up with the general flow of literary activities. One of his responsibilities as a new member of the literary establishment was reading the verse of young poets. One poet he mentions at the time (October 1902) is Aleksandr Blok, whom he called "minor," and another is Andrei Bely, who was by then a "major figure."⁴² And in fact two of the most significant debuts in 1902 were Bely's and Vyacheslav Ivanov's. By March 1903, when Blok's first poetry was printed, one could truly say that Symbolism had arrived.

Bely

Bely had begun to write poetry, drama, and lyrical fragments in prose while still at Moscow University. His first literary contacts in 1901 were with people like himself; these friends in Moscow would later provide the nucleus for the Argonauts, a Symbolist circle where discussion was gener-

BRUSSOV
NA TACADE
MIA

ARCE
NAUTAS

ally devoted to mysticism, art, politics, V. Solovyov, poetry, and decadence. Bely's first published work, his *Second Symphony, Dramatic*, originated in these discussions and satirized some of the same notions that Bely and his friends had put forth.⁴³ Bely published four *Symphonies* in all (1902-08), and in them he tried to combine music and literature in a lyrical, rhythmical, and repetitive style that was certainly innovative, if not always successful.

When his *Second Symphony* was ready, he showed it to various members of the Solovyov family, who felt it should be published, that it was a real contribution to contemporary literature. Bely wanted to avoid embarrassing his father, a professor of mathematics at Moscow University; thus he chose the pseudonym Andrey Bely. In a short time, however, the true name behind the *nom de plume* was known to everyone. Although Bely's father died around the time he completed his studies at the University (June 1903), the pseudonym was maintained as his professional name. Friends, nonetheless, continued to call Bely "Borja."

In his preface to the *Second Symphony*, Bely explained his purpose: "This work has three levels of meaning: musical, satirical, and moreover, ideological-symbolic," and in addition to the repetition of "musical" phrases, he wished particularly to make use of the extremes of mysticism.⁴⁴ The work has no discernible plot, and, in fact, the emphasis is on juxtaposition rather than connected narrative. Bely's main thrust here, as in other works at the early stage in his career, is that time is not linear, that existence moves along a spiral, and that everything returns, that is, until the Apocalypse. He also parodied the spiritual climate in Russia at the beginning of the Silver Age and poked fun at Merezhkovsky (as Drozhzhikovskiy and Merezhkovich), Rozanov (as Shipovnikov), and others. The main character, Sergey Musatov, represents Bely to a certain degree, and Musatov's mystical views are ridiculed in a typically Belyian way: a vision of the Beast from Revelation turns out to be a little girl with blue eyes. Musatov meets a woman called Fairy Tale (*Skazka*), who represents the Woman Clothed in the Sun, another image from Revelation, but nothing comes of their acquaintance.

The *Symphony* appeared in April 1902 under the imprint of Skorpiion. While Bryusov protested that the publishing house was unable to fund the enterprise, Mikhail Solovyov, the brother of the late philosopher, covered the expenses. The initial critical reaction, not surprisingly, was one of abuse from certain quarters and general puzzlement. There were favorable com-

ments, however, from Blok, who was greatly impressed, and Emil Medtner, an authority on music and later friend of the Symbolists. Blok in fact devoted his first printed article to Bely's *Symphony*; that article appeared a year later in *Novyi Put'*.⁴⁵

After this debut in print, Bely was recognized as a talented, promising young man by the "elders" of the Symbolist movement, especially Merezhkovsky and Hippus. Bely had met them in Moscow in February 1902, when Merezhkovsky gave a lecture, and a "mystical correspondence" began between Bely and Hippus. The young debutant also met the main leaders of the World of Art group during a well publicized exhibition in Moscow, which opened in March 1902.⁴⁶ Diaghilev made a strong impression on Bely, who later in his memoirs depicted him as coquettish, immaculately dressed and coiffed. Through his acquaintance with the editors of *Mir Iskusstva*, and on their invitation to collaborate, Bely was able to bring out his first article, "The Forms of Art," in the December 1902 issue of that journal.⁴⁷

This article, the first of many on literature and related topics, offered a theoretical explanation of the connection between art, in the broad sense, and music, which he tried to depict in a literary form in his *Second Symphony*. Bely valued music as the highest achievement of art, partly because it embodies motion. In his later comments on how he wrote, he often pointed out that he composed both prose and poetry while walking in fields. Another important element in music is the mood that it can create, which Bely tried to capture and transfer to his writings. In this article, Bely also stated that Symbolism is the highest form of artistic development in literature, a view that he never really abandoned.

The article, which was signed with Bely's real name, B. Bugaev, was well received among the devotees of the "new art." Blok was moved to write to Bely for the first time on January 3, 1903, after reading it. In his letter, Blok said: "The article is brilliant, candid. . . . All hope lies with you. . . . Your words enlighten us brilliantly because we need them all."⁴⁸

Ivanov

Another debutant of sorts in 1902, Vyacheslav Ivanov, was not a young man (he was thirty-six when his first book, *Guiding Stars*, appeared).⁴⁹ Ivanov had completed his degree at Moscow University and gone to Berlin to work for a doctorate in the late 1880s. He was particularly interested in

SINFONIA

3 NIVEIS DE
SIGNIFICADO:
- MUSICAL
- SATIRICO
- IDEOLOGICO-SIMBOLICORIR DO
MISTICISMO10 ARTI
64MUSICA
↓
MOOD

the Roman republic and the Apollo/Dionysus dichotomy, and while working on his dissertation, he met his second wife, Lydia Zinovyeva-Annibal (and divorced his first wife Darya because of her); they were married finally in 1899. A few of Ivanov's poems had appeared in the journals *Kosmopolis* (1898) and *Severnyi Vestnik* (1898-99), through the assistance of VI. Solovyov and of his first wife. At this time Ivanov was almost totally unknown in his home country, largely because he spent so many years in Western Europe, and he remained relatively anonymous until 1902-03, when he began to meet other Symbolists and published his first books.

The poems that appeared in *Guiding Stars*, most of which had been written after he met Lydia (also a writer associated with the Symbolist group), reveal Ivanov's rather impressive, often imposing erudition and center in large part on his interests in legends and myths, his travels, and his relationship with Lydia. Ivanov's favorite form, the sonnet, is well represented here as it was to be in later collections. The poetic cycles in *Guiding Stars* also display his interests in religion and philosophy: "The Worlds of the Possible," "Heavenly Mother," as well as his Symbolist leanings: "Gates," "Flowers of Twilight." The last cycle of the book, "Suspria," is about death and was occasioned by a bout with typhus in Athens just after the turn of the century, but in fact Ivanov lived for another forty-six years after the publication of this book, making him the longest-lived Symbolist from Russia.

The most important image in the book, however, and in his other writings, is that of Dionysus. One cycle in *Guiding Stars* is devoted to his favorite Greek god. Ivanov saw Dionysus as a force, as the inner expressions of ecstasy, the principle of new life, a belief in the power of the Word. Though some readers thought Ivanov's style was rather heavy, that it resembled the poetics of eighteenth century Russian verse, and that his philosophical inclinations were rather remote from the present day, Blok praised the book, and others could not help noticing the richness of poetic erudition.⁵⁰

The following spring, Ivanov gave a series of lectures on the Hellenic religion of Dionysus at the Russian School in Paris. The lectures were well attended; Bryusov, who was there in April, felt Ivanov was a "genuine" person, but that he was overly attracted to Dionysus. The Merezhkovskys had heard about Ivanov before attending his lectures, and they were so impressed when they actually met him that they invited him to publish these lectures in their journal.

Blok

In January of 1903, Bryusov met Aleksandr Blok for the first time. Like Bely, who was the same age, Blok was also a student; he finished his studies at the University of St. Petersburg in 1906, partly because of the chaotic conditions there in 1904 and 1905. But Blok had been writing poetry seriously for about five years before that; these first efforts were later published under the title *Ante Lucem* (*Before the Dawn*, in this case). Shortly before the two most "acceptable" Symbolist writers (from the Soviet point of view) were introduced, Bryusov felt that Blok was only the most significant of the minor poets. In the years that followed, Bryusov and Blok usually found themselves on opposite sides of just about every issue and they never became close friends.

Blok's acquaintance with Bely, however, which began with an exchange of letters in 1903, developed into an emotional, long-lived friendship that at times also included outbursts of hatred and challenges to duels. These two authors' backgrounds were somewhat similar in that both of their fathers were professors and both were brought up in highly literate and cultured households. Their correspondence began with Blok's letter, mentioned above, of January 3, about Bely's article in *Mir Iskusstva*. Bely, meanwhile, had decided independently on January 4 to write a letter of introduction to Blok, and their letters crossed in the mail. Later they took this as a mystical sign of the preordination of their friendship. And in addition to their common interests, they found themselves quite close to the family of Mikhail and Olga Solovyov (and son Sergey); both Bely and Blok were profoundly disturbed by the death of Mikhail in January 1903 (and the resulting immediate suicide of his wife), and they were quite concerned about Sergey.

The correspondence continued for one year before they actually met in Moscow in January 1904, when Blok and his wife were visiting there. These letters reveal their early views on mysticism, literature, and the other representatives of Symbolism, and they represent a valuable source of information about the Symbolist movement as well. There is, moreover, evidence of a deep attachment between them that had its origin precisely in these letters.⁵¹

Blok made his literary debut in March 1903, when he published a cycle of ten poems addressed to "The Beautiful Lady."⁵² This figure is related to images from Plato and Solovyov, i.e., the World Soul, and The Eternal

СЕРГЕЙ
БЕЛЫЙ -
- БЛОК

А БЕЛА
ДАМА
1903

Feminine, plus Revelation's Woman Clothed in the Sun, but in Blok's poetry the female figure is much less abstract and was sometimes even confused with his real wife, Lyubov Blok (née Mendeleeva). And though Blok's feelings about this poetic personage changed a few years later, he is still best remembered for his poems about The Beautiful Lady, especially the poem "I already sense You":

I already sense You. Years pass by —
I imagine You always looking the same.

The whole horizon is fiery and intolerably bright,
I wait silently, *longing and loving*.

The whole horizon is fiery and Your appearance is near,
But I'm afraid You'll change Your form.

Having finally changed Your familiar features,
You'll arouse insolent suspicions.

Oh, how sadly, how low I'll fall,
A victim of my fatal dreams!

How bright the horizon is! Radiance is near.
But I'm afraid You'll change Your form.⁵³

Another ten poems on this same theme appeared in the third collection of *Severnye Tsvety* in March 1903, and with these publications Blok emerged as an important Symbolist poet.

The Symbolists in 1902-1903

1902 was the fiftieth anniversary of Nikolay Gogol's death in 1852, and in February of that year Merezhkovsky gave a significant lecture, "Gogol's Fate," for the occasion. The lecture, which was later printed in the first three issues of *Novyi Put'* for 1903, was the beginning of a critical reassessment of the nineteenth century classic that was sparked by the Symbolists, particularly between 1902 and 1909, the latter date being the centenary of Gogol's birth.⁵⁴ The prevailing view of Gogol in the second half of the nineteenth century centered almost exclusively on the social stance that Gogol supposedly took in regard to the "little people," especially minor civil servants in St. Petersburg. Merezhkovsky, and then later Bely and Bryusov, directed their attention instead to Gogol's style, his craft, and his eccentric view of his fellow human beings. The Symbolist reinterpretation of this important writer was indeed a valid one, and the views they advanced then are still respected today.

HIPPUS
MISTICA
MAJATAKA
DECADENC
IA??

EXILIO
BALMONT

BLOK
EMERGE

ENFOQUE
SIMBOLTA
ESTILO
(X CONTEU-
RISMO DO
SÉCULO XIX)

The next month Hippius' subsequent collection of prose, her *Third Book of Stories*, appeared in St. Petersburg in two parts, one of which contained her *Twilight of the Spirit*, mentioned above.⁵⁵ The four stories show a preference for mysticism and a rejection of the science and technology so emphasized in Europe at the time. Also included in the collection are a critical attack on decadence and current literary criticism, plus her first play, *Sacred Blood*.

Balmont spent all of 1902 in exile, much of which took place in Paris, Oxford, and other Western European cities: He had been exiled from the Russian capital in 1901 for reading his poem "The Little Sultan" (which is critical of the "Turkish" government and caused a riot), and he returned to Moscow only in January 1903. Before this incident, he had printed one of his best books of verse, *Burning Buildings*, which came out in May 1900, and carried a typically Balmontian subtitle: *Lyrics of a Contemporary Soul*.⁵⁶ Though Balmont had to pay for the initial printing of this volume, it turned out to be one of his most popular books and went through five editions by 1912.

After Balmont's return, he became an active spokesman for Symbolism, and February 1903, was a busy month for the proponents of this movement. Bryusov, for example, noted in his diary that the public lectures he and Balmont gave on literature in February and early March were like "battles," which "went on a whole month. It was a battle for the new art. The allies were the Scorpions and Gryphons (the new publishing house). Balmont and I were in the lead, being the 'venerables' . . . and after us came a whole herd of youths, thirsting for fame, young Decadents: . . . Voloshin and Bugaev."⁵⁷

Balmont had begun the "battle" with a lecture on "The Sense of Personality in Poetry" on February 3, and on February 28 he spoke about the nineteenth century Russian poet Nikolay Nekrasov. On March 4 there was an Evening of the New Art, accompanied by controversy because the younger members of the audience tried to outdo each other in praising Decadence, which helped to fill the newspapers with lively stories, though the "venerable" spokesmen by this time had some measure of respect from the critics. Balmont recited his verse and gave a talk on the "Don Juan Type in World Literature" in early March, and Bryusov concluded this round of public appearances with his April lecture in Paris, "The Keys of the Mysteries."

This talk was printed the next January as the lead article of the first

BATALHA
PELA
NOVA
ARTE

ABR
1903

issue of *Vesy* and is now considered a manifesto of Russian Symbolism.⁵⁸ But in this statement, Bryusov concentrates mostly on the past art, condemning the view that art must have a purpose or utility, and is somewhat vague about the new art and precisely how the "keys of the mysteries" will be used. He favors intuition and inspired guessing, art as revelation, and freedom from purpose. He feels that Symbolism is the final stage in the history of art: "Now art is finally free."⁵⁹ While in Paris, Bryusov experienced some disappointment with the city, noting that "Moscow is a more decadent city than Paris," and finding that the Russians he met there were generally not to his liking, with the important exception of V. Ivanov.⁶⁰

The pace of Symbolist activity continued to be fairly energetic the next few months, particularly in terms of publications. In May 1903, for example, Balmont's most important volume of poetry, *Let's Be Like the Sun*, appeared.⁶¹ This book of 198 poems was one of the most popular publications by a Symbolist author; it had a printing of 1800 copies in the first six months, a figure that was nearly unheard of at that time for poetry, and it went through five editions by 1917. The poems were written, for the most part, during the early part of his exile, before leaving for Western Europe in March 1902. With this book, Balmont moved unquestionably to the front ranks of Russian poets and became the uncrowned king of Symbolist poetry; Blok, for example, wrote that this book was Balmont's greatest poetic achievement, and Annensky called it one of the definitive examples of the "new poetic word," referring to Balmont as one of the "best representatives of the new poetry." In his review, Bryusov wrote: "Here Balmont's poetry has spread out to its full expanse. . . . Among contemporary poets Balmont is indisputably the most significant, both in the power of his elemental gift and his influence on literature."⁶²

One of the reasons for the widespread acceptance of this book, apart from the fact that Balmont was then at the height of his creative powers, was his shift away from Decadent colors and "songs of twilight" to bright, bold colors and an unabashed worship of the sun, sparkling light, and optimism. Again a strong emphasis on his own personality and his place in the world is noticeable, this time in a positive context: "I can speak with everyone in his own language," as "the son of sun," "the brother of the wind." His verse displays energy and innovation as well as adoration of the elements and a certain pantheism. The poems are well written from the technical point of view, as Bryusov almost gushed: "there have been no equals to Balmont in the art of verse in our Russian literature."⁶³ Balmont's

CHAVES
P/O S
MISTERIO

BALMONT

SEJAMBS

COME L
JOL

BLOK E
MENDE
LEEVA

TECNICA

ALTERACAO
CARACT. DE BALMONT

poems are not really the most innovative among the Symbolists', but they are very recognizable, especially because of the sometimes excessive use of alliteration, mentioned in the previous chapter. His style and images found many imitators among young poets, even among Symbolist colleagues like Bely. Perhaps the best known poem from the collection is the following piece:

I am the refinement of the leisurely Russian tongue
Other poets before me are precursors,
I first discovered inclinations in this speech,
With reprises, angry and tender-ringing.
I am a sudden break,
I am thunder playing.
I am for all and for no one.
A splash very foamy, torn-together,
Semi-precious stones of the original earth,
Forest roll call of a green May,
All this I'll grasp, I'll take, bereaving others.
Eternally young as a dream,
Strong because I'm in love
With myself and with others,
I am refined verse.⁶⁴

Summer was traditionally a slow time in terms of cultural events in Russia, but a social event of some significance took place the following August: the marriage of Aleksandr Blok to Lyubov D. Mendeleeva, the daughter of Prof. Dmitry Mendeleev, chemist and creator of the Periodic Table of Elements. This marriage was quite literally surrounded by mystical perceptions of Lyubov as The Beautiful Lady, not only by her husband, who worshipped her at the time, but also by Bely and Sergey Solovyov. Though Bely still had not met Blok, he was invited to participate in the wedding, but he was forced to decline because of his father's death in June.

After the wedding, Blok and his wife continued to be treated like children, partly because they were still students and because they lived with his mother in Petersburg. Their marriage was apparently not consummated until the autumn of 1904 because Blok was determined to retain an aura of reverence for his bride, so that he would not defile the image he had created for her (and to prevent her from contracting venereal disease, from which he had already suffered).⁶⁵ Lyubov Blok records in her memoirs that though she was painfully ignorant in this area, she took the initiative, but she was disappointed with the result and generally with this aspect of their marriage.⁶⁶ At first glance, it might seem somewhat out of place to dwell on

the details of the Bloks' married life in this study, but in fact their relations, or lack of them, had a significant effect on various members of the Symbolist movement and a notable influence on several publications in the early 1900s.

October 1903

The month of October 1903 was marked by the appearance of several books that were significant in making the Symbolist movement a more established feature of Russian literary life. These publications, by five of the major publishing houses, were also instrumental in promoting the fortunes of the Symbolist publishing houses, Skorpion and Grif. Balmont's next collection of verse, for example, *Only Love*, was one of Grif's first efforts.⁶⁷ *Only Love* is a good example of his talents, but it is not as dazzling as *Let's Be Like the Sun*; its poems, written mostly in 1903, are devoted not only to love, but also to historical figures, writers (especially Poe and Baudelaire, two for the outstanding favorites of Russian Symbolists), and mythical images such as the Fire Bird.

That same month, the collected poetry of Hippius and Merezhkovsky was published by Skorpion. Hippius' volume contains poems from 1889 to 1903, usually considered among her best work.⁶⁸ These poems show how highly personal she was and how often philosophical and religious themes are the subjects of her verse. In her preface to the *Collected Verse, 1889-1903*, entitled "What is Necessary about Verse," she notes that poetry is "only one of the forms which prayer can take in our soul," and she is quite modest about the value others can find in her poetry.⁶⁹ Merezhkovsky's collection covers his poetry from 1883 to 1903.⁷⁰ On the whole, his poetry did not exert a great influence on the Russian Symbolist movement. After this book appeared, he wrote comparatively less verse and concentrated instead on prose.

Skorpion also published the *Collected Verse* of Sologub in October.⁷¹ It contains his third and fourth books of poetry, essentially from 1898 through 1903. The poems often echo his prose works, particularly *Bad Dreams* and the later trilogy, *A Legend in Creation*; the influence of Schopenhauer is strong, many poems feature children and dreams, especially dreams about love.⁷² The style is simple, the lines mostly short, and there are few tropes; by and large Sologub's style did not change or evolve as much as others' did. In 1903 he had some loyal readers, but he was not as actively involved

in advancing the cause of the "new art" as Balmont or Bryusov, for instance. He was still a school master in Petersburg, still unmarried and very devoted to his sister Olga, with whom he was living at the time.

One of the most significant events in October, however, was the publication of a volume of verse that is often recognized as Bryusov's best, *Urbi et Orbi*, in which he addresses not only the rather small "city" of his readers, but also the whole world.⁷³ Blok and Bely were quite impressed with Bryusov's achievements in this book, which is innovative in style, eclectic in the choice of themes, and strong on personal, lyrical ballads. The reviewers found much to like in it, even those who had been previously disposed to denigrating Symbolist verse. But Blok was probably the most positive: "What will you do after *this*? . . . such [verse as you have written] I would never have thought possible. . . . I can never hope to stand next to you."⁷⁴ Later publications, proved, however, that although Bryusov was correctly recognized as one of the two leading poets in the Symbolist camp (along with Balmont) in 1903, Blok in fact surpassed both of them not long afterwards.

Bely's *Northern Symphony, First, Heroic*, was printed by Skorpion also in October, and at this time he began his regular Sunday meetings at his apartment, where his friends could gather.⁷⁵ Though this symphony was not published until after the second one, it was completed before it, around the end of 1900. The main genre of the piece, aside from its pretensions to musical form, is essentially a fairy tale. It draws heavily on the historical dramas of Ibsen, songs by Grieg, and German ballads about medieval figures. The symphony, which carries a printed dedication to Edvard Grieg, features a young knight in love with a princess; he wants to take her away with him, but her father prevents this. In the end, however, after their deaths, they meet in heaven and live happily there for eternity.

Bely's Sundays, which lasted until he departed for Western Europe in 1906, were the occasions for young Muscovites, followers of the Symbolist movement for the most part, to discuss, improvise, and generally make merry. They called themselves Argonauts, after the legend about Jason and the Golden Fleece, but more specifically because of images in Bely's poetry at the time (1903) and a longish "lyrical fragment in prose" called "Argonauts," which he published in 1904. The participants included poets, artists, and philosophers, most especially Ellis (pseudonym of Lev L. Kobylynsky, about whom there will be more in later chapters), Sergey Solovyov, Bely's close friend Aleksey Petrovsky, and Nina Petrovskaya. The

BRYUSOV

HIPPIUS

ARGO -
NAV -
TAS

Argonauts were inspired by the poetry of Vi. Solovyov and the personality of Nietzsche. They had apocalyptic expectations and shared the view that mystical cataclysms were coming. Blok was rather sympathetic to their ideals, but Bryusov was frequently ironic and negative about the group.⁷⁶

In September and October 1903, Bely started work on his second university degree, in philosophy at Moscow University, but he never completed it. He was actively involved in salons, literary gatherings at the Bryusovs', the Balmonts', at Skorpion, Grif, writing poetry and an article for *Novyi Put'* called "On Theurgy"⁷⁷ He quite often maintained a frantic pace of activity, and because of his close involvement with nearly every aspect of the Russian Symbolist movement, it is not surprising that he emerged as one of the leading Symbolists, and that an examination of Bely's "works and days," along with Bryusov's, gives a very detailed account of Symbolism in Russia.

One event in Bely's life that autumn also turned out to have some significance for Symbolism: his relationship with Nina Petrovskaya, whom he had first met in March or April 1903. Bely recalls in his memoirs that his friendship with her began to develop suddenly that fall. She considered him a Second Christ, and he saw their relationship as an example of mystical, spiritual closeness, even love. Both wore black crosses, and Bely felt they were linked for eternity. he even composed a short story that was based rather directly on their relationship, entitled "A Luminous Fairy Tale."⁷⁸ Further developments in this important and soon troubled relationship, which provided material for other literary works, will be examined in later chapters.

Indeed, by the end of 1903, one could say that Symbolism existed, and there were many obvious examples of the movement's presence in Russian literary and cultural life. The name "Symbolism," for instance, was used often, without need for qualification or identification, especially in articles by Bryusov, Balmont, and Bely.⁷⁹ In comparison with the situation only ten years earlier, Symbolism was now a vital force. Where before the printing of *The Russian Symbolists* in 1894-95 had been 200 to 400 copies, the number of Grif anthologies printed was 1,200 each year. Several of the movement's initiators had already published volumes of collected verse, and new adherents to the movement were sending in material to the newly established houses of Skorpion and Grif, both of which boasted annual miscellanies and would later publish journals. "Mystical" relationships described in Symbolist lyric poetry had been formed: Blok and his wife,

Ivanov and his wife, and Bely and Nina Petrovskaya. And not only had the Symbolists' emphasis on form in poetry found support, persons associated with the movement had helped to obtain some measure of intellectual freedom in Russia, under the auspices of the Religious-Philosophical Meetings and *Novyi Put'*. These political and social gains were rather short-lived, however, and the later developments, including the flowering of Symbolism, which will be described in the next two chapters, demonstrate that the Symbolist movement found its greatest strength in artistic achievements, and in unity. At this point, the movement was fairly unified, and it stood on the threshold of its most brilliant phase.

ENFASE
NA
FORMA

BELY
"SOBRE
TEUR-
GIA"
1903

UNIDADE DA
MOVIMENTO

FM
1903 =
SIMBOLISMO
ESTABELECIDO

"RELACIONA-
MISTICA"

VERA KOMISSARZHEVSKAYA E NO TEATRO ALEXANDRINO DE
J. MEYERHOLD DE 1896, MONTA SEU TEATRO 1904, Q' E DIRIGIDO POR
MEYERHOLD EM 1906

MEYERHOLD MONTA 1906 A 'PUPPET SHOW' DE BLOK
1907 VERA K. ROMPE / MEYERHOLD (MKHAT)

STANISLAWSKI ~~HA~~ FUNDA O TEATRO DO ARTE DE MOSCOU EM
1898 DE MONTA RHEKOV (AS SAIVOTAS).

5. Symbolism as a Unified Movement 1904 - April 1906

"ERA DE
OURO DO
SIMBOLISMO"
(PETERSON P.95)

The next phase of Symbolism has a well defined starting point in early 1904, with the first issue of the Symbolist journal *Vesy*, the publication of several important collections of poetry, and an historical event that at first may not have seemed to have any strong connection with the movement, but which ultimately provided an impetus for change within it — the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War. The end of this brief phase, some twenty-eight months in duration, is also rather distinct and can be perceived in various indicators: the publication of a miscellany in Petersburg called *Fakely* (*Torches*), which offered the first significant opposing viewpoint to that of *Skorpion* and *Vesy*; the end of one period in a very tumultuous and important relationship between Andrey Bely and Lyubov Blok; the publication of Blok's first drama, *The Puppet Show*; and the composition of Blok's best known lyrical poem, "The Stranger," all of which took place in April 1906.

Between these main points, a number of developments helped to propel Symbolism to the forefront of Russian intellectual life. 1904 witnessed the demise of two early journals that had given some encouragement to modernism, *Mir Iskusstva* and *Novyi Put'* (though the latter reappeared in 1905 in a somewhat different form and under a new title). Also in this period from 1904 through April 1906 several outstanding works of prose fiction and criticism appeared; it was a time when "manifestos" were promulgated rather frequently. And a second Symbolist journal, *Zolotoe Runo* (*Golden Fleece*), began publication in January 1906; it soon became a rival for *Vesy*. The miscellanies of *Skorpion* and *Grif* continued the traditions of Symbolism in its earlier phase, but by April 1906 challenges to their hegemony were already noticeable. These twenty-eight months were a period of intellectual ferment, some of which was directed to defining Symbolism; now that it had become an accepted phenomenon, its supporters took some care in describing their views of it and in trying to apply it as a

world view. During this period there was a sense of commonality of purpose, though of course not a total unanimity of opinion.

Mir Iskusstva, Novyi Put', and Voprosy Zhizni

Mir Iskusstva experienced a change in editorial direction in early 1904, but this change was not sufficient to keep the journal running smoothly, and it ceased publication with its last issue for 1904. Starting with the second issue for 1904, Alexandre Benois had taken over the editorial responsibilities from Sergei Diaghilev, and though his name alternated with Diaghilev's on issues printed in 1904, Benois was the general editor, more or less by himself.¹ Dmitry Filosofov was active as the literary editor, and a number of his works were published that year, but very little by the Symbolists was included in 1904. Bely contributed an article appropriate for this period of Symbolism's flourishing, "Symbolism as a World View," in which he put forth the notion that was later taken up by others in the Symbolist movement, i.e., Symbolism was more than a literary trend, it was instead a belief system, an approach to life.² In this article, Bely advances his characteristic belief that Nietzsche had prepared the way for Symbolism with his aphorisms and that Symbolist art — the only true path to genius — would ultimately lead to theurgy, that is, instructing people in the various religious mysteries perceived by some Symbolists and other mystics.

The only other contribution by a Symbolist to *Mir Iskusstva* in 1904 was a cycle of poems by Balmont that appeared in the journal's final issue. His poems "Hymn to the Sun," from *Let's Be Like the Sun*, and "Water" and "Fire," from *Liturgy of Beauty*, were illustrated by Evgny Lancéray, and in fact the poems served to accompany the illustrations, rather than vice versa.³ This lack of solid participation by the Symbolists in *Mir Iskusstva*'s last year is of course partly motivated by the inception of *Vesy* and the annual publication of miscellanies, but another reason is the shift in location of modernism's center from Petersburg to Moscow that was taking place around this time. A major factor in the journal's cessation was, quite understandably, Diaghilev's growing disinterest in it, but its demise was also partly hastened by the emergence of its "younger brother" to the south.

For the second year of its run, *Novyi Put'* projected the same program and the same staff as in 1903, but this turned out not to be the case. The main contributors, for most of the year, continued to be the Merezhkovs-

kys, Minsky, and Rozanov. During 1904, excerpts from Dostoevsky's notebooks were printed, and the reports on the Religious-Philosophical Meetings were discontinued, with the brief announcement: "Due to circumstances beyond the editors' control, the printing of reports on the Religious-Philosophical Meetings is now being halted." These reports were never resumed, however, and in the latter half of 1904, there was a major shift in editorial leadership at *Novyi Put'*; D. Filosofov became the editor (July), and the main guidance in the journal's program was provided by two former Marxists, Sergey Bulgakov and Nikolay Berdyaev, philosophers who were invited (in October) to give fresh political input. With these changes in the editorial make-up, readers noticed a greater preference for current events and less emphasis on religious topics.

Despite these changes, however, more Symbolists contributed to *Novyi Put'* in 1904 than in the previous year. Merezhkovsky and Hippus naturally continued to offer their works for publication, and Merezhkovsky's novel, *Antichrist: Peter and Alexis*, the concluding part of his trilogy, was a major piece printed that year.⁴ In this novel, Merezhkovsky describes the relationship between Russian Emperor Peter the Great and his son, and once again he deals with the conflict between Christianity and paganism, in this case represented by Alexis and Peter, respectively. This third tome was not well integrated into the trilogy, all of which suffers from an overemphasis on stark duality, but the view of Peter the Great as the Antichrist was a fairly common one in Russian history, beginning in the 17th century.⁵ Hippus contributed a kind of diary in two parts, "Bright Lake," which describes a visit to monks in the country and talks with them about the Apocalypse. And her "Suor Maria," "intermezzo" devoted to the problems of unfulfilled love and sacrifices to make others happy, appeared late in the year. In addition, she published poetry in most of the issues for 1904.⁶

There were also poems by Merezhkovsky, Sologub, Balmont, Bely, Ivanov, and even Bryusov (including one of his most frequently anthologized pieces, "Orpheus and Euridyce").⁷ Bely published articles on Bryusov's poetry and on "expediency," about the meaning life had for him at that time, especially in serving the ideal of the Eternal Feminine. Blok became an important contributor, particularly with his reviews of books such as Bryusov's *Urbi et Orbi* ("the decadence has been left far behind").⁸ And Ivanov printed his long work, "The Hellenic Religion of the Suffering Divinity," about Dionysus, which was continued in *Voprosy Zhizni* the next year.

Voprosy Zhizni (*Questions of Life*), another grandiose title, even more all embracing than *The New Path* was a slightly different version of *Novyi Put'*, with many of the same contributors, but it lasted only twelve months, i.e., through 1905. In July of 1904 a young author named Georgy Chulkov, had "joined the editorial staff" of *Novyi Put'*, though not in an overtly official or announced way; at that time Chulkov was almost unknown, he had published a volume of poetry in the Symbolist mode in 1904 and before that he had been exiled to Siberia for political activity when he was a student.⁹ At first the Merezhkovskys, especially Hippius, treated him as their protégé, but by the end of 1904, his association with the journal had ended. But when *Novyi Put'* itself ceased publication in December, and *Voprosy Zhizni* appeared the following month, with essentially the same format and the same contributors, an important difference was Chulkov's position as the literary editor of this new journal; because Chulkov now had more influence, he was able to print his rather controversial views more widely.

Despite the new, more politically oriented direction advocated by Bulgakov, Berdyaev, and Chulkov, Symbolist authors were frequent contributors to *Voprosy Zhizni*, due in part to Chulkov's literary tastes. Merezhkovsky continued the publication of his *Peter and Alexis*, begun in *Novyi Put'*, and he also printed articles on political and religious matters. Hippius' work also appeared, though not under her own name, because of a dispute with Bulgakov about Blok's poetry.¹⁰ Balmont, Bely, Bryusov, Sologub, Blok, Ivanov, and Sergey Solovyov all printed poems there; Sologub and S. Solovyov also contributed short prose pieces, and Blok and Ivanov came to be seen as important contributors to the journal. Blok wrote numerous book reviews and articles and considered himself a "regular" at *Voprosy Zhizni*, though only until August of 1905. Ivanov printed not only reviews, but also his "Religion of Dionysus," the concluding part of his long study about the Hellenic religion of the suffering divinity, plus his major article of 1905, "The Crisis of Individualism," in which he attacked the individualistic approach to life and advocated a more religious and communal view.¹² Ivanov in fact placed works in all but two issues of the journal.

In addition to these better known Symbolists, others active in this area also found their way onto the pages of this journal, including Chulkov, Lydia Zinov'yeva-Annibal, and Aleksandr Kondratyev, who published poetry and prose on mythological subjects from 1905 through 1917, and emigrated after the Revolution. Translations of French, German, Belgian,

and even American authors also appeared here; Poe's "The Raven," for instance, was popular with the Symbolists and was rather frequently translated. The foreign authors selected for inclusion were those usually considered the forerunners of Russian Symbolism, particularly Baudelaire and Nietzsche.

Vesy

ABRUCY AS "CHAVES P/OJ MISTEROS"
(BRIVSSOV)

A clearly more significant event, however, was the publication, beginning in January 1904, of the journal Vesy. The nominal editor, and the person financially responsible for *Vesy*, as well as for *Skorpion*, was Sergey Polyakov, but once again Valery Bryusov provided the organizational and editorial leadership that was needed to establish the journal as the leading periodical of the movement. These excerpts from the programmatic statement show the journal's main orientation:

Vesy wants to create a critical journal in Russia. . . . Poems, stories, all works of belles-lettres are conspicuously excluded from *Vesy's* program. There is a place for such works in a separate book or anthology.

Vesy wishes to be impartial in its critical judgments, to evaluate artistic creations independent of its agreement or disagreement with the author's ideas. But *Vesy* cannot help devoting most of its attention to that important movement which, under the name of "decadence," "Symbolism," "the new art," has penetrated all fields of human activity. *Vesy* is convinced that the "new art" is the last point reached by humanity on its path until now, that precisely in the "new art" all the best forces of the earth's spiritual life are concentrated, that in bypassing it people have no other way forward, to the new, even higher ideals. . . .

Every issue of *Vesy* will be divided into two sections. In the first there will be general articles about questions of art, science, and literature. . . . The second section of *Vesy* is devoted to a chronicle of literary and artistic life. . . . *Vesy* has invited correspondents in various cities in Europe and Asia to contribute. *Vesy* hopes to significantly increase the number of these correspondents.¹³

The emphasis in the journal was on expository prose with an international flavor, leaving out all poetry and fiction, though by the end of 1905, belles-lettres and verse began to appear, followed by the publication of important novels by Bryusov (in 1907-08) and Bely (in 1909). *Vesy* used such magazines "as the English *Athenaeum*, the French *Mercure de France*, the German *Litterarisch Echo*, and the Italian *Marzocco*" as models, and there was a perhaps inordinate amount of space devoted to letters from various

1905
"CRISIS OF
INDIVIDUALISM"

European capitals.¹⁴ Some of *Vesy's* correspondents were Russians who happened to be abroad at the time, others were recognized writers in their own countries, such as William Morfill, a British Slavic specialist, and René Ghil, a member of the second generation of French Symbolists.

The initial group of editors and contributors to *Vesy* comprised Bryusov, Balmont, Baltrushaitis, Polyakov, and M. Semyonov (the originators of *Skorpion*), plus Andrey Bely. Soon they were joined by the Merezhkovskys, Blok, Ivanov, Sologub, and others; also included were works by those not as closely associated with the Symbolist camp: Rozanov and Minsky, for example. Artists who collaborated were Leon Bakst and N.N. Feofilaktov; *Vesy* did include artwork (in black and white reproductions), though of course not to the same degree as *Mir Iskusstva*. At this early stage, there was a sense of purpose uniting the Symbolist movement, which had been seen earlier in the *Severnye Tsvety* miscellanies. The overall tendency showed appreciation for serious art, but the specific preference favored the "new art," art that was related to Symbolism in some way, and with *Vesy's* inception, the movement was not under the sign of *Libra*.¹⁵

~~The lead article of the first issue was Bryusov's "Keys of the Mysteries," his lecture from 1903, which was accepted to a certain extent as a "manifesto" of *Vesy* and the movement as a whole.~~ Bryusov also printed some eighty-one articles in 1904, mostly book reviews and short pieces, often under pseudonyms (as many as twenty-two different pseudonyms have been counted for Bryusov during *Vesy's* existence, 1904-09).¹⁶ As with *The Russian Symbolists* collections, Bryusov wanted to make the Symbolists' ranks appear larger than they were. V. Ivanov published a large number of articles as well in 1904-05, more theoretical articles, in fact, than Bryusov. Ivanov saw *Vesy* as the focal point of Russian Symbolism, where writers from Petersburg and Moscow could join forces. Bely wrote theoretical articles, book review and necrologues, under thirteen pseudonyms, often about science and philosophy.¹⁷ Balmont offered articles on art, which was one of his main interests at the time. Blok, however, had a rather slow start with *Vesy*, he had contributed only two short pieces to the journal by the end of 1905; but after that time, the number of his contributions to *Vesy* increased.

Vesy was a novel undertaking in terms of Russian literary and cultural criticism, there were many new and unfamiliar names (particularly of the foreign correspondents and writers entering with the second wave of Russian Symbolism), and because of these factors, the number of subscribers at

the end of 1904 was extremely small (670). A normal, "thick" journal in Russia at that time, which featured political comment and belles-lettres, had a circulation between 5,000 and 15,000. It is not surprising, though, that a serious periodical would have a smaller circulation than one with mass appeal, nor does it somehow imply that authors who had higher visibility, in terms of printings, were necessarily more important; after all, pulp fiction and weekly tabloids available in supermarkets still far outsell serious literature and journals. And despite this numerical challenge, *Vesy* in a few years became a respected and even influential journal.

Anthologies

The miscellanies printed by Grif and *Skorpion* for 1904 and 1905 continued the short-lived tradition of cohesive, rather focused collections that had represented the Symbolist movement rather well. The Grif publishing house brought out its second and third collections in February 1904 and February 1905, respectively, and *Skorpion's* fourth collection of *Northern Flowers* appeared in January 1905.

Sergey Sokolov continued to edit the Grif anthologies; each year they grew in length and in the number of contributors, though the names of some who contributed to the first miscellany are noticeably missing in the second and third ones, chiefly Bryusov, and the Merezhkovskys did not print anything in these Grif collections. Though there were stories and articles, the main emphasis was on poetry. In the 1904 edition, well known poets appeared: Balmont, Bely, Blok, and Ivanov offered significant and recent verse, and a number of lesser known poets were also represented: Krechetov (i.e., Sokolov himself), Miropolsky, and Ellis, who later gained notoriety at *Vesy* and in his own books. There were stories by Bely ("A Luminous Fairy Tale"), by Nina Petrovskaya (three in all), and others. For the first time, translations of poems by Baudelaire and the Belgian author Georges Rodenbach (both translated by Ellis) appeared in a Grif miscellany.

In the 1905 edition, two poets made their first appearances on the pages of Grif: Sologub and Vladislav Khodasevich, who was close to the Symbolists in the early 1900s and later became a well respected émigré poet. A substantial portion of the collection was devoted to the poetry of Bely (a dozen poems), Blok (five), Sologub (twelve) and to Balmont (twenty poems in all, two under his pseudonym of Lionel).¹⁸ Again there

PULL
FRICTION

CHANGES
= MANIFESTO

were articles, such as Bely's "God is With Us," and stories by Krechetov, Nina Petrovskaya, Miropolsky, and others.¹⁹ Also included was a speech by Sokolov on the occasion of Anton Chekhov's death in July, 1904.

The fourth collection of *Severnnye Tsvety* (subtitled "Assyrian"), unlike all the other Skorpion miscellanies, has no introduction; neither does it have any articles, archival materials, or letters, as in the first three. The fourth collection is devoted instead to poetry, drama, and stories, almost entirely written by authors closely associated with Symbolism, though two of its rising stars in 1905 did not place works in it: Bely was not getting along with Bryusov at the time, and Blok sent nothing. There are poems by Bryusov, Ivanov, Sergey Solovyov, Max Voloshin, Minsky, and his wife Lyudmila Vilkina. Ivanov's wife Lydia offered a story, "Shadows of a Dream," as did Sologub ("In Captivity") and Hippus ("Creature," a so-called "Nighttime Idyll," later printed in her 1906 collection of stories, *The Scarlet Sword*).²⁰

Slightly over half of the miscellany was given over to drama: *Three Blossomings* by Balmont, *Earth* by Bryusov, and *Tantalus* by Ivanov.²¹ Balmont's effort, his only published drama, has rightly been called "a weak, unperformable piece about love," but he did manage to have it published separately as a book in 1907.²²

Bryusov's *Earth*, left unfinished, was included in his 1907 collection of stories and dramatic scenes, *Earth's Axis*.²³ In the play, Bryusov features the end of the world (sometime in the future), and he was particularly interested in Bely's reaction to it, because this topic was one of Bely's major interests at the time. Bely in fact found much to like in *Earth*, comparing it to Shakespeare's plays (without any foundation, however), and seeing "Symbolism incarnate everywhere" in it.²⁴

Ivanov's tragedy, *Tantalus*, was by far the most significant of the three.²⁵ He had written to Bryusov about this tragedy as early as 1903, and at that time he had hoped to complete a trilogy about Tantalus, Niobe, and Prometheus, though he ultimately wrote only the first and third of these three works. According to legend, Tantalus was a king of Sipylus, father of Niobe, Broteas, and Pelops. Ivanov depicts him as a vain man who willingly accepts the chorus' praise of him as a human god. But Tantalus is too proud and boastful: he offends the gods by rejecting their gifts and sending his son Pelops (whom he had sacrificed) to be eaten by them. The gods are angered and send Tantalus, King Ixion and the trickster Sisyphus (who had sided with Tantalus) to Tartarus, where the latter two curse Tantalus. Bely,

who thought highly of the play, praised Ivanov for his thorough knowledge of classical myths.²⁶ Ivanov's *Tantalus* clearly shares some thematic material with Annensky's play about Ixion, and though both authors were experts on ancient Greek drama, neither of these plays is suited for stage performance.

These anthologies were the last to be published by both houses for a number of years. Grif had financial problems in mid-1906 and only published one more miscellany in 1914; Skorpion had printed its fourth collection a year later than anticipated and put out its last one as an anniversary issue in 1911. During 1904-06, there was a stronger emphasis on publishing journals, rather than the "bouquets" of flowers that appeared only annually at best. And with the swing to publishing in journals specifically created to promote Symbolist authors and their views, the movement became better established and developed a broader base.

Symbolist Verse in 1904

1904 was a year of poetic excellence in the Symbolist movement. Three poets, Annensky, Bely, and Blok, who are all associated with Symbolism in thematic and stylistic areas, published their first collections of verse in this year. And others, who had previously brought out collections, including Ivanov and Balmont, also offered new books. These publications helped to increase the appreciation of Symbolist poetry and to broaden the perception that other talented writers could stand alongside the already acknowledged masters, Balmont and Bryusov.

Innokenty Annensky made his first appearance as a serious poet in February 1904 with his book, *Quiet Songs*.²⁷ He was characteristically modest in this book, which was published under the pseudonym Nik. T-o ('No one' in Russian), including translations of forty-seven poems originally written in English, French, German, and Latin, along with his own fifty three pieces. Many of the poets translated, such as Baudelaire, Verlaine, Mallarmé, and Rimbaud, were well respected by Symbolists throughout Europe, and the choice shows Annensky's affinity with the movement, though he was clearly not an active member. He had no close ties to Symbolist circles or publishing houses and only met some of the leading authors shortly before his death in 1909. Though his name is often mentioned in connection with the Acmeist movement — he was seen as a spiritual godfather by some in this group, which flourished in 1911-14 — Annensky's verse in this book shows strong ties to works by other Russian Symbolists.

Quiet Songs did not attract much attention among the reading public or from Symbolist critics. Bryusov reviewed it in the April 1904 issue of *Vesy*, and though he did not know Annensky personally, he praised him for his ability to give movement to verse, to construct stanzas beautifully, for his new, authentic images, and the musicality of his verse.²⁸ Blok also wrote favorably about *Quiet Songs* but was somewhat put off by what he considered to be decadent excesses. He also criticized the book's physical appearance, which he thought was ugly.²⁹

Annensky's identity was not discovered until later, and at this time he was still director of the lyceum at Tsarskoe Selo, which prevented him from seeking greater contact with the Symbolist groups. But it is clear in his poems in *Quiet Songs* that his interests, themes, and style all link him to the movement, especially its decadent phase, as seen in his pieces about insomnia, sunsets, death, graves, Greek gods and goddesses, poetry, ennui, drugs and hallucinations. One typical example is his poem "Ennui":

Flowers the color of steel,
Spilled with the mists of morning,
Are coiled like a fantastic bouquet
Along pale pink ovals.

And the temptations of nomadic flies,
Their luster concealing the poison,
Make the troublesome and idle,
Bare facets of existence gaudy.

But when you have lain for weeks,
Weary with fever,
You'll grasp the delightful hashish
Hidden in their monotony.

You'll understand, carefully counting the strokes
On the cabbage rose's luster,
As you unwillingly construct rhombuses
Between the stages of Ennui.³⁰

Bely's was the next book-length debut in verse; his first collection, titled *Gold in Azure*, was published by Skorpion in March of 1904.³¹ This book established his reputation as a serious poet, and after the appearance of his two experimental Symphonies, the book of verse made him seem more like a conventional writer, even though he did include some "lyrical fragments in prose," seven altogether, which are linked to a certain extent to his Symphonies and other prose works.³² His poems reveal a strong admiration for Balmont's *Let's Be Like the Sun* (the title of Bely's book refers to that gol-

den object in the azure sky). He also displays interests in bright colors, jewels, and sunsets, as well as more philosophical topics, like the World Soul and the call of eternity. One important image is the Golden Fleece from Greek mythology (here compared to the sun), and the connections with his group of Argonauts are of course numerous. An excellent example of his poetry from this period (1900-04), a poem that was later called a "hymn of the Moscow Symbolists," is the second poem from his "Golden Fleece" cycle:

The sloping sky is enveloped in fire. . .
And the Argonauts are sounding the trumpet,
Announcing their departure to us. . .
Attention, pay attention . . .
Enough of suffering!
Don the armor
Made of sunny fabric!

An old Argonaut calls back to us,
He appeals with his Golden trumpet:
"To the sun, to the sun, if you love freedom,
We'll race into the light blue ether! . . ."

The old Argonaut invites us to a sunny feast,
Trumpeting
Into the world glowing golden.

The sky is filled with rubies.
The sun - globe is resting:
The sky is filled with rubies
Over our heads.
On the mountain tops,
Our Argo,
Our Argo,
Preparing for departure, is beating
Its golden wings.

The earth flies away . . .
The wine-world
Burns with
Fire
Again:
The golden fleece,
Sparkling,
Floats out to shine
Like a fiery ball.

And, enveloped in brilliance,
 Our winged Argo,
 floating,
 Reaches the daystar,
 Burning again like a torch.
 Again it comes to
 Its golden fleece.³³

There are in addition poems about disappointment in love, the end of his religious ecstasies, about false Messiahs and false prophets; these poems are related to the change in his relationship with Nina Petrovskaya, from a rather mystical union of kindred souls based on brotherly love, to a purely sensual affair. At the beginning of their relationship, Nina Petrovskaya had seen Bely as a new Christ, but by January, 1904, Bely considered his affair with her a "fall" rather than a religious mystery. This shift in their relationship, which bothered Bely's conscience, is reflected in poems that show a growing suspicion of ideals, and at this time he exchanged his previous interests in mysticism and the Argonauts for the study of Kant and attempts to work out a system of Symbolism.³⁴

In August of 1904, Bely finally ended this phase of his relationship with Nina Petrovskaya, who in turn accused him of falling in love with Lyubov Blok, whom he had met for the first time in January 1904. Bely admitted that "her insight depressed me; I was trying to hide my feelings from myself."³⁵ During the early months of 1904, Blok also experienced a change in his outlook, reflected both in his poetry and his relationships. When Bely visited Blok and his wife at their country estate in the summer of that year, he realized that Blok was already turning his back on the poems devoted to the Beautiful Lady and showing a greater preference for dark and sinister topics. His former joyous mysticism was quickly disappearing. Sergey Solovyov, Bely, and Bely's friend A.S. Petrovsky tried to develop a cult of Lyubov Blok as the Beautiful Lady, partly as a joke, but also with some serious aspects. Blok essentially refused to go along; at this time he made two important admissions: to his friend Evgeny Ivanov that he felt a strong desire to do precisely the opposite of what V.I. Solovyov had taught, and to his notebook that his former devotion to the Beautiful Lady and to his own wife was over, exhausted.³⁶

Blok wrote the last of his poems about the Beautiful Lady in June 1904; in that poem, "There they are — the steps leading down to the grave," he describes his "tender companion" resting in a white coffin, her

hands waken.³⁷ And as he leaves her sleeping, he speaks of unknown roads and a castle lit at night that he wants to explore, thus indicated his future direction as poet. When *Verses about the Beautiful Lady* finally appeared in October 1904 (the cover has 1905), Blok was pleased with the book's outward appearance and wrote to his father that he had no "regrets for having published it."³⁸ And despite his later attempts to distance himself from the mystical flights of the book, it remains one of his most significant collections, in part because of the often brilliant images and the level of his poetic talent. Though "her image had changed," Blok continues to be seen as the devoted singer of praise and admiration for the Beautiful Lady.

Several months before the appearance of Blok's first book, Vyacheslav Ivanov had published his second collection, *Transparence* (Skorpion, May 1904).³⁹ And he made an extended visit to Russia, to a certain degree in order to oversee the printing of *Transparence*. Though he had come to his native city to meet with Bryusov, he still felt out of touch with the literary milieu. His views of Symbolism were different from those of Bryusov, Balmont, and Baltrushaitis at Skorpion, but they were all able to agree on the value of the "new art" and on the need for aesthetic excellence. Ivanov and Balmont became good acquaintances, and at this point in their careers they praised each other's works. Ivanov developed stronger ties with Baltrushaitis because of their shared religious feelings. But it was his relationship with Bryusov that was most important for the evolution of Russian Symbolism. Despite the similarities of their classical educations, Bryusov and Ivanov held opposing viewpoints on several key topics, among them the essential nature of Symbolism. Ivanov admired Bryusov as a poet and as the leader of Symbolism in Russia, but he was also strongly opposed to Bryusov's dabblings in black magic and dismayed by his lack of religious faith. Before returning to Switzerland, Ivanov also met the Merezhkovskys in Petersburg; this was the first time they had actually met in person. And there was a round of visits with the representatives of the World of Art group.

Unlike his first collection, *Transparence* is a fairly short book of eighty-seven poems, without the welter of internal divisions that faced the reader in *Guiding Stars*. This book is devoted more to reality, though quite naturally a reality perceived and described by a Symbolist poet. The title refers to the transparency of mystical reality, which must allow light and radiance to pass through, but not so transparent that the mystical *Res* is invisible.⁴⁰ The poems collected in *Transparence* are from the early 1880s through 1904

(mostly 1904) and include some of his best known poems, such as his "Nomads of Beauty":

Nomads of beauty — you are artists
People of Fire
 (unfinished novel
 by Lydia Zinovyeva-Annibal)

For you — the trees of your ancestors
 And the narrowness of graves!
 For us — Beauty has predestined
 Free territory to roam.

Every day a betrayal,
 Every day a new camp:
 The roving deceit of
 Desperate captivity.

Oh, believe in the miracle of distances,
 And the fairy tale of every veil,
 The emerald of every spring,
 Heavens' whole breadth!

Artists, keep watch over the
 Herds of your dreams;
 As you pass by, seed and
 Abandon the virgin soil!

And rush down in whirling hordes
 From your expanses
 Onto the fields of subjugation,
 Where the slave is proud of his yoke.

Trample on their paradise, Attila —
 And your stars,
 The flowers of your steppe,
 Will rise like the virgin soil of emptiness.⁴¹

Ivanov's second collection was well received by other Symbolists. Bely, for instance, felt that his *Gold in Azure* paled in comparison with Ivanov's book, and Blok wrote that it was more accessible and inspired than *Guiding Stars*.⁴² But Blok also believed it was a "book of trial efforts," that Ivanov was still testing his wings. Bryusov's review was more balanced: he gave Ivanov credit for his erudition, his "wisdom of the millennia," he praised the "bright, priestly chasuble" of his poetic language, but he also felt that the reader had a hard time reaching the imposing heights, that it was difficult to get to the "silver spring of his pure poetry."⁴³ And Bruysov's views are still applicable today.

Konstantin Balmont was of course already established as a poet, and in fact his publications after 1903 show, for the most part, a marked decline in quality. One exception is his book *Fairy Tales*, a short collection of child-like verses that appeared in September 1905 and won approval from Blok, Bely, and Bryusov.⁴⁴ His 1904 collection, *Liturgy of Beauty*, however, was not well received and unlike several of his other books, this collection only had one later edition, in his collected works (1911).⁴⁵ In *Liturgy*, he focuses on "rational poetry," which leads him to such topics as Eastern religion, the Koran, and Theosophy (he was interested in this belief system at the time, as were many of his Russian and West European contemporaries). Another trend is noted in the book's subtitle: "Elemental Hymns," and he devotes several pieces to the traditional elements. Bryusov was quite taken with one of the poems, "At an old, deserted cemetery," and called it a "pearl" of Balmont's lyric poetry.⁴⁶ And he praised some of the poems dealing with grief and love, but he felt that Balmont could not create another world in his poetry, as Baudelaire could, and that Balmont was quite literally out of his element in *Liturgy*.

Despite this failure to reach a high level of aesthetic accomplishment, Balmont's reputation as a poet and public figure continued to grow. In March 1904, he had printed a collection of essays on art and literature, *Mountain Heights*, where he delivered his opinions on such diverse authors as Calderón, Blake, Poe, Shelley, Wilde, Hamsun, and the Russian poets Tyutchev, Fet, and Nekrasov.⁴⁷ He also included translations of Spanish folk songs with his comments on Goya and "The Don Juan Type in World Literature." In addition, his lecture "Elementary Words about Russian Symbolism" (mentioned in Chapter 4) was printed in *Mountain Heights*.

During the time of the Russo-Japanese War and the Revolution of 1905, Balmont was very active and highly visible. Before the appearance of *Liturgy* in December 1904, he had traveled to Spain and Switzerland (May-July 1904), and left Moscow again in January 1905 for Paris. The following March, he set off again, this time on his famous journey to Mexico and the United States. While he was there, until July 1905 he wrote poetry and sent travel notes, which were later published in book form (*Serpent Flowers*, 1910).⁴⁸ He was most interested in pre-Columbian sites in Mexico from the Russian point of view and did some serious work as an observer and explorer.⁴⁹ During the second half of 1905 he was caught up by the revolutionary activities; he composed appropriate poetry, fashioned several satirical articles for newspapers, and in December 1905 he attempted to

give a speech to students at Moscow University, but he was prevented from doing so. During this time, he carried a gun in his pocket and feared that he would be arrested, so on New Year's Eve he left for Paris and a kind of self-imposed exile that lasted over seven years.⁵⁰

Fiction in 1904-1905

The years 1904-05 were also a time of important fictional works by Symbolist authors, though the output was certainly not as great in this area as in poetry. The stories printed in the Grif and Skorpion anthologies, mentioned above, had some impact, but from the point of view of the Symbolist movement, the most significant prose works of this period were Bely's *Third Symphony: the Return* and Sologub's most important novel, *The Petty Demon*.

Bely's *Third Symphony* appeared in October 1904 (the cover has 1905), and it was favorably accepted by his colleagues.⁵¹ It is indeed Bely's best effort in this "genre"; it was the only Symphony he reprinted after the Revolution, and he valued it more highly as a work of literature than his three other Symphonies.⁵² *The Return* is a good example of Symbolist prose because it features the interplay of two levels, the mundane and the cosmic; its style is often quite lyrical, and it displays a certain amount of ambiguity. There has been, in fact, some disagreement about the work's story line, especially in regard to the opening and concluding "movements" of the Symphony.⁵³

The first section of the work depicts an idyll on another planet, possibly a pre-natal or more "genuine" existence, but much more likely a dream. In the second part, Khandrikov, the hero, wakes from his dream to face his unpleasant everyday life. In the third and last part, Khandrikov moves to an insane asylum, ostensibly to avoid meeting certain enemies, but it is clear that he is truly insane. At the end, he dives into his reflection in a lake and drowns, though Khandrikov's dying vision has suggested to some that he is returning to his "cosmic homeland" or that he will be reborn.

What is clear, however, is that in *The Return* he describes his milieu at Moscow University, based on his student experiences. And the comments the hero makes about professors, whom he compares to centaurs, echo the feelings of the author, particularly the stinging attacks on positivism in the nineteenth century, which Bely felt represented a dead end for the develop-

ment of culture. As he later wrote about his *Third Symphony*: "I fought with disheveled liberalism, with the dust of scientific cellars."⁵⁴

The Petty Demon

Also in 1904, Fyodor Sologub printed two collections of prose. One slender volume (88 pages), *A Book of Tales*, was published by Grif in October 1904, and, more significantly, his *Sting of Death* came out in July 1904; this collection includes two of his better works in this genre, "Beauty" and "The Hoop," both of which are typical of Sologub's writings.⁵⁵ The salient features of "Beauty," which are likewise found in many of his other works, are well summed up by a specialist on Sologub:

"Beauty," written in . . . 1899, combines Sologubian decadence with a philosophic statement. In these pages there is madness (paranoia and manic depression), narcissism, hints at masturbation and lesbianism, voyeurism and suicide. But Sologub's credo is clear: through artifice and adulation of the naked body, an escape from "boring conventionality" is possible.⁵⁶

Sologub's novel, *The Petty Demon*, is his major work, certainly one of the outstanding fictional works of Russian Symbolism and indeed of Russian literature at the beginning of the century; it was an extremely influential novel in its time, "read by all of educated Russia," in the judgment of Blok.⁵⁷ It was first serialized in *Voprosy Zhizni* (Nos. 6-11, 1905), with the exception of the final chapters; the first separate edition appeared in 1907, and by the time Sologub died in 1927, *the Petty Demon* had gone through ten editions. He had worked on the novel for ten years, from 1892 to 1902, and once again he described a milieu that he knew intimately, that of a school teacher in a small provincial town. Though he was now living in Petersburg, he was still in the same profession until the appearance of this novel; because of the book's success, he was then able to retire as a school inspector and devote himself full time to literature.

The hero of the novel, Ardalion Peredonov, is much more like an anti-hero; he is a provincial school teacher who delights in torturing his pupils, often through beatings, and who becomes increasingly insane as the story progresses, to the point where he murders a friend at the end of the novel. Peredonov is associated with everything that is vulgar and evil; despite his position as teacher (and his ambition about becoming a school inspector in Petersburg!), Peredonov is not terribly intelligent and quite proud of his

ignorance. And now his name has become identified in twentieth century Russian society with all things petty and cruel, labeled with the epithet "Peredonovism."

In the preface to the second edition, written in January 1908, Sologub chides readers and critics who see Peredonov as a reflection solely of the author and feel that the book is, consequently, interesting but essentially harmless. Sologub claims that everything in his novel is based on precise observations of the "nature around him," that the work is like a highly polished mirror which is incapable of distorting anything; though his claims are somewhat exaggerated, *The Petty Demon* is sometimes seen as a realistic novel. And to the critics who persist in avowing that Sologub wrote the novel about himself, he answers: "No, my dear contemporaries, I've written my novel about the Petty Demon about you. . . ."⁵⁸

There is a second plot line in the novel that offers an alternate focus of interest to the rather gruesome depiction of Peredonov's progressive mental degeneration: a young woman initiates an attractive adolescent boy, Sasha, into eroticism and sexual awareness. The temptress, Lyudmila, adores beauty, and her invitation to experience sensuality can seem like an "alternative to, and escape from, the rampant Peredonovism."⁵⁹ But in effect, Lyudmila is loosing the Petty Demon of vulgarity and philistinism in her dealings with Sasha and is certainly destroying his innocence as a child, replacing it with glimpses of Peredonov's fascinating and at times repulsive world. Thus there is no "beacon of a bright heart" to counteract the baseness that is at first linked only to Peredonov and his cohorts, but finally with all of life.⁶⁰ this is a rather bleak conclusion, but the story is told in a very convincing way, and Sologub's pessimism is fully displayed in *The Petty Demon*.

War with Japan and Revolution in 1905

It would have been difficult for the Russian Symbolist movement to have ignored the contemporary trends in Russian political and cultural life in 1904-05, trends set by the disastrous war with Japan, which began in January 1904, featuring the elimination of the Russian navy and several humiliating defeats to the Japanese. The hostilities finally end in September 1905 (New Style), with the treaty concluded in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The spectacularly unsuccessful conflict with Japan was a determining factor in the increased level of revolutionary activities in 1905 and the con-

9/1/5 - PAZIGADA LIDERADA P/ UM PADRE!

cessions that Tsar Nicholas II was forced to make. The first significant impetus to revolt occurred on January 9, 1905, the day of a peaceful demonstration and attempt to offer a petition of workers' grievances to the tsar; the marchers, led by a priest and carrying icons, were fired upon by troops and scores were killed. After this violent attack on a group that was favorably disposed to the monarchy, many Russian citizens became disillusioned.

The Symbolists, generally speaking, supported the left wing parties and were sympathetic to the workers' plight. Bely, who happened to arrive in Petersburg on that day in January, visited Blok and the Merezhkovskys, all of whom expressed outrage and horror and pledged to help the "gray masses" (though this is how they usually saw urban workers, not so much as individuals but rather as gray masses). Chulkov was predisposed to favor revolutionary action, in part because of his earlier exile. Ivanov expressed a desire, later acted upon, to return to Russia from Western Europe because of the war with Japan and the revolutionary activity in 1905, and Balmont, as mentioned above, played an active role in events until his departure at the end of 1905. Bryusov, however, did not feel any strong sympathy for revolution, and later Chulkov cited Bryusov's pro-monarchical stance during these years.⁶¹

There were other events in 1905 that reached the same level of acute crisis, but from the point of view of profound or lasting changes, the revolution has to be seen as a failure. There was a short-lived mutiny of sailors on the Battleship *Potemkin* in early summer 1905. There were numerous strikes, political assassinations, and riots in the countryside later that year.

These actions compelled the government to issue a manifesto in October, offering some democratic freedoms (such as freedom of speech and assembly, which had never been previously guaranteed in Russia), extending the franchise to vote, and increasing the authority of the Duma, Russia's version of parliament. These concessions were correctly seen as halfway measures designed to placate the general public (which indeed happened), but revolutionary leaders denounced the reforms, which were not surprisingly rescinded to a certain extent in the years that followed, and many Symbolists felt that the government had not done enough to bring about needed change.

Although the 1905 revolution did not fundamentally alter the Symbolist movement in Russia, it did affect several of the Symbolists rather deeply. A certain shift in theme can be detected in the poetry of the major writers in this camp, a move toward a greater sense of greater social respon-

1905
SIMBOL
15 AS
ADRIAM
- BRUNO
BALMONT
ATVO

REFER
MAS
POLITICA
OUT 1905

MUDANCA DE TEMAS

APELO
AD
COLETIVISMO

POLOMIAR

SAN...
INTELLECTUAL

sibility and away from extreme individualism, all accompanied by a call for more collectivity (sobornost), though this last trend was also the cause of a good deal of controversy. Poems by individual Symbolists devoted to revolutionary outbursts and political events began to appear in 1905, but it was not until 1906 that more substantial evidence appeared in poetry and prose that signaled a shift toward more civic themes and anguish about the failed revolution. At Vesy, for example, the Russo-Japanese War was not a prominent topic, and since this was a literary and artistic journal, it took no official position in regard to the 1905 revolution. Some of the writers belonging to the first wave of Russian Symbolism, i.e., the Merezhkovskys (plus Filosofov) and Balmont felt obliged to leave Russia; they feared reprisals because of their strong support for revolution and their associations with revolutionary activists. Balmont left at the end of 1905, and the Merezhkovsky group followed in March 1906. It is ironic to note, however, that these very same people were among the first to leave Russia after the 1917 Revolution, for quite different reasons entirely.

Because of the strikes and unsettled atmosphere in 1905, there were problems getting Vesy out on time; the November 1905 issue was late, and the December issue, which came out after Christmas, is identical to the issue for January 1906. This was the first issue to include poetry and prose by Russian Symbolists. Also related to the unrest, though in a less direct way, is the fact that only two new books by major Symbolists appeared in all of 1905: Balmont's Fairy Tales, which came out in September, and Bryusov's Stephanos (The Wreath), which appeared in December 1905 and has 1906 on the cover.⁶² This development is in sharp contrast to both 1904 and 1906, which saw the publication of about ten new books by Symbolists in both of those years. 1905 instead marked the beginning of what can rightly be called a period of intellectual ferment in the Symbolist movement; and there were a number of "resonant" articles and statements, published mostly in Vesy, that helped to set the tone for this era of ferment.

Intellectual Activity

The first, and most influential, of these statements is Bryusov's "A Holy Sacrifice," printed as the lead article for the first issue of Vesy in 1905, and often seen as another of the manifestos of Russian Symbolism.⁶³ A close reading of the piece, however, reveals that Bryusov praised Russian authors for their accomplishments, not necessarily for their affiliations; he

19 ONDA
DEXIA
RUSSIA

1905
ABRE CERA
DE SACRIFICIO
INTELLECTUAL
OUT ERMA

SAN...
SACRIFICIO

does not call for writers to rally round the cause of Symbolism, and he devotes most of the article to his disagreements (and points of agreement) with Pushkin. Bryusov's main purpose in this article is to criticize artistic detachment and call for greater personal involvement in one's work:

We demand from a poet that he tirelessly bring his "holy sacrifices," not only with his verses, but with every hour of his life, with every feeling — his love, his hate, accomplishments, failures. Let the poet create, not his books, but his own life.⁶⁴

Bryusov's article was praised by Bely, who also noted that a poet must see himself in relation to the Apocalypse and the Woman Clothed in the Sun. Bryusov's response to that, printed in the May issue of Vesy, again emphasizes that a poet should devote himself to his craft, that a poem should be judged by aesthetic and intrinsic standards, not by external considerations, whether political or mystical.⁶⁵ This exchange of opinions was ended by Bely's second reply and Ivanov's observations, both printed in the June issue, 1905.⁶⁶ But Bryusov's original article is important precisely because it reveals his indifference to mysticism, particularly the mystical concepts admired by the second wave of Symbolists. In "A Holy Sacrifice," Bryusov shows his genuine interest in "the whole world . . . in all its manifestations, great and small, beautiful and ugly," but by outlining the limits of his artistic credo, he also set the stage for later, more fateful disagreements among the Symbolists in 1910.⁶⁷

Ivanov printed an article on a related topic, but with a vastly different approach, in the March issue of Vesy. In "The Poet and the Crowd," Ivanov also uses Pushkin's views as a way of illustrating how he saw Symbolism and the need for Symbolist poets to seek unity with the "crowd," to abandon the normal isolation that customarily surrounds a poet.⁶⁸ But where Bryusov points the way to real life and the "whole world," Ivanov sees hope in the infinite, inexhaustible, and genuine symbol, the secret and magic language of hints.⁶⁹ He feels that the way back to the soul of the people can be found precisely by using symbols, "metaphysical paths." And he concludes this line of argument with the thought that "we are following the path of symbol to myth. Great art is myth-making art."⁷⁰

In 1905, Blok printed a piece about Ivanov's article, expressing admiration for the analysis put forth in "The Poet and the Crowd" and for Ivanov's defense of Symbolism. Blok essentially agreed with Ivanov though he also faulted the older poet for his heavy style and difficult language. Blok had already recognized Ivanov as a theoretician of Symbolism

MAS...
INTEL...

EMANA...
CORAC...
INTEL...

JULGON

PRECO...

IVANOV...

IVANOV...
SACRIFICIO
BLOK
CONCORDIA
IVANOV

only about a year after *Vesy* began publishing, and in fact Ivanov was one of the most important theoreticians in the Russian Symbolist movement. Blok in addition hoped that Ivanov's personal, reticent poetry, combined with his mysticism, would offer rest "during the epoch of revolt."⁷¹

Hippius at this time was attacking decadence and those literary types who cut themselves off from society, as seen in her article in the May issue of *Vesy*, "Decadence and the Community."⁷² Among the decadents she singles out for criticism are Balmont, Blok, Bely, Sologub, and Bryusov, thus her comments are not narrowly targeted, and she goes on to attack the "herd mentality" and "bourgeois crystallization" of others around her as well. As an alternative, she offers "the truth of unity by means of distant, ultimate goals." She conveniently neglects to mention her own attraction to decadent poetry about a decade earlier, and it is difficult to imagine her (or Ivanov) mingling with the common people they so routinely praise, from a distance. But it is also evident that her views had been changed by the revolutionary events in 1905. By that year, decadence was on the decline among the Symbolists; consequently, Hippius is certainly not justified in condemning her colleagues for decadence, based on their earlier writings, and Bely pointed this out in his deft review of the book where Hippius' article was reprinted in 1908.⁷³ It is true that individualism was still strongly felt, but the sense of social responsibility in 1905 and the years that followed also permeated the works of many Symbolists.

Though the Merezhkovskys did not depart for Paris until March, 1906, their former preeminence as leaders of intellectual discussion and debate in Petersburg was already being challenged before the end of 1905. V. Ivanov and his wife had decided to return to their native country in 1905, though not to his hometown of Moscow, but rather to the imperial capital, Petersburg. They arrived at the end of July and quickly rented a somewhat unusual apartment that was very well situated. Their apartment, known as The Tower, because of the rounded corner of the building where it was located, looked out over the Tauride Gardens. The Tower soon became the center of modernist intellectual ferment, and the regular Wednesday meetings there, which began in September 1905, continued until spring 1912, with pauses for summers spent in the country and other interruptions. The years Ivanov spent in this apartment are sometimes referred to as the "Tower Period" of Russian Symbolism because it was here that all the various factions of modernism, not only Symbolists from Petersburg and Moscow, came together to read poetry, debate religious, philosophic, and artis-

tic matters, and discuss literature, often until late into the night. The Tower provided a central location in Petersburg for injecting added vitality into the Symbolist movement, particularly because of the projects in the areas of the theater and book publishing, which grew out of the discussions held there.⁷⁴

Zolotoe Runo

One of the most active periods in the seven year span at The Tower was the winter of 1905-06. At the same time in Moscow, a new Symbolist journal was founded by Nikolay Ryabushinsky, a wealthy businessman with an interest in art and literature; the journal was called *Zolotoe Runo* (*The Golden Fleece*, also known by its French title, *La Toison d'or*). Ryabushinsky, who sometimes printed his own compositions under the pseudonym of N. Shinsky, was the editor and publisher of the journal, which was devoted to literature, art, and criticism, a sumptuous and elegant successor to *Mir Iskusstva*. The name for the journal comes from the Greek legend about Jason and the Argonauts, and according to Bely, the title was "borrowed" from his poetry and his Moscow circle known as the Argonauts.⁷⁵

As with *Vesy*, there was a strong international flavor, and the first six issues of *Zolotoe Runo* were printed in Russian with parallel French translations of all prose (fiction, drama, articles, chronicles) and some poetry. After the sixth issue, however, the French translations were dropped, only the title page and picture captions continued to have French versions alongside the Russian original. Many color reproductions were included in the journal, and the visual arts in general were well represented. From the beginning, the Symbolists were the favored literary contributors, and all the major representatives of the movement printed prose, poetry, and articles there. Even though the journal later was, to a great degree, a rival of *Vesy*, the initial reaction to it was positive. And as the programmatic article shows, there was a strong sense of optimism about art at *Zolotoe Runo*, and since the first issue appeared in January 1906 there are indications of recent revolutionary events:

At this stormy time we set our course.

All around, renewing life seethes like a violent whirlpool. In the roar of the struggle, amid the pressing questions that each day raises, and the bloody answers that our Russian reality gives to them, for many the Eternal grows dimmer and recedes into the distance.

DECADENCE
NA EPHE
DA REVOLTA

HIPPIUS
DECAD
SERIE 1/1
1905

BELY
RESERVA
HIPPIUS
(DECAD-E
SERIE 1/1)

We sympathize with everyone who works for the renewal of life, we do not deny any of the contemporary tasks, but we firmly believe that it is impossible to live without Beauty, and together with free institutions we have to win for our descendants a free, bright creativity, lit by the sun, drawn by tireless searching, and preserve for them the Eternal values forged by many generations. And in the name of that new, future life, we, the seekers of the golden fleece, unfurl our flag:

Art is — eternal, because it is based on the immutable, on that which cannot be rejected.

Art is — indivisible, because its only source is the soul.

Art is — symbolic, because it bears within itself a symbol — the reflection of the Eternal in the temporal.

Art is — free, because it arises from a free, creative impulse.⁷⁶

Bryusov, Bely, and Nina Petrovskaya — "DRAMA DE PETERSBURGO"

Bryusov at first printed articles in *Zolotoe Runo* but soon found cause to disagree with its policies and after a few months took a negative view of the journal and some of its main contributors. In general he had published comparatively little in 1904 and 1905; as he noted in his diary: "I hardly existed in literature that year" [1905].⁷⁷ And one major reason for this development was his intense involvement with Nina Petrovskaya.

She apparently began to seek Bryusov's company as a way of getting revenge on Bely, whose ardor for her had cooled by early 1904. And Bryusov, who was at first mostly interested in seeing if he could indeed lure her away from Bely, fell in love with her. When Bely became aware of Bryusov's designs, the formerly peaceful relations between the two writers changed to a state of personal enmity, especially in October-December 1904, although they were able to maintain a "correct," polite working relationship at *Vesy*. As exemplary Symbolist poets, they exchanged sharp poems in November and December 1904 that revealed their views of each other.⁷⁸ And in the tense period that followed, they came close to having a duel in February 1905, ostensibly because of a disagreement about the Merezhkovskys and their views; the incident, initiated by Bryusov, certainly frightened Bely. Ivanov, who learned about the challenge to the duel, apparently felt that Bryusov would have indeed killed Bely had there been an actual duel, but fortunately the whole matter was concluded by the summer of 1905, and their personal relations returned to a more normal pattern.⁷⁹

At the same time, Bryusov's relationship with Nina Petrovskaya reached its high point, especially during a trip they took to Finland that summer of 1905 (both vacationers were of course still married to their respective spouses). After returning to Russia, Bryusov began writing his novel, *The Fiery Angel*, which was closely based on the triangle formed by Bely, Bryusov, and Nina Petrovskaya in 1904 and 1905 (more details about the novel in the next chapter).

Much of Bryusov's *Stephanos*, seen by some critics and scholars as his best collection of verse, was inspired by Nina Petrovskaya, particularly the cycle of poems "On Lake Saimaa" (a lake in Finland much beloved by Vl. Solovyov), and other love poems. Blok praised Bryusov's accomplishments, especially the cycle entitled "The Eternal Truth of Idols," and Bely wrote about the spellbinding simplicity of this cycle.⁸⁰ The poem "To Balder from Loki," about Bryusov's clash with Bely in late 1904, appeared in a cycle of poems dedicated to classical literature and Greek heroes.

Even though Bryusov complained in his preface that the poems of "calm reflection, eternal joys, and eternal suffering" in *Stephanos* were not needed after the revolutionary outbursts of 1905, that the time had come for military horns and battle songs, some of his poems are indeed devoted to current events, for example, in the cycle "Contemporaries."⁸¹ And he gives his feelings about the revolution in the poem "The Coming Huns," where he sees revolutionaries as barbarians who will destroy civilization: "Revolution is beautiful and majestic as an historical phenomenon, but poor poets have a hard time living with it, they're not needed."⁸²

The Coming Huns

Trample on their paradise, Attila
V. Ivanov

Where are you, Huns who are coming
Like a cloud hanging over the world?
I hear your cast iron stamping
On still undiscovered Pamirs.

~~Crash down on us like a drunken horde
From your dark camps.
To revive our decrepit bodies
With a wave of burning blood.~~

Pitch your tents, as before,
By the castles, oh captives of freedom.
Seed a gay field
In sight of a throne hall.

BRUSOV,
SOBKE
1905
↓
STEPHANOS
1906
"POLSIAN"
M E
NEEDN
RIAN

Toss the books on the bonfires,
 Dance in their joyous light,
 Do something abominable in the temple,
 You're innocent of everything, like children!

But we, the wise men and poets,
 The keepers of faith and mystery,
 We'll carry away our lights
 To the catacombs, deserts, and caves.

And what will the play of Fate
 Preserve from the winged storm,
 From this destructive thunderstorm?
 Which of our cherished creations?

Perhaps we will all disappear without a trace,
 Everything that we alone knew,
 But I greet you who will destroy me
 With a hymn of salutation.⁸³

Stephanos turned out to be a quite popular work, and its first edition of 2,000 copies was sold out in eighteen months. Bryusov, moreover, can be said to have reached his creative peak around 1906 with *Stephanos* and his novel *The Fiery Angel*.

Essays

During this same time, late 1905 and through 1906, critical works by Symbolists that were rather varied in content appeared, to be met by a mixed response. The least significant of these is a volume collection of articles, poetry, stories, and translations, *Free Conscience*, dedicated to the tenets of Vladimir Solovyov.⁸⁴ It appeared in 1906, thanks in large part to the efforts of Ellis, and its contributors included members of Symbolism's second wave: Bely, Ivanov, Sergey Solovyov, Ellis, and others. The reviews that appeared pointed to its weaknesses, and Bely himself called *Free Conscience* "a most obtuse, insignificant miscellany."⁸⁵

Innokenty Annensky's first *Book of Reflections*, collected essays on literary topics, also appeared in 1906, and all of the pieces, with the exception of the article on Balmont as a lyric poet, were panned by the reviewer for *Zolotoe Runo*.⁸⁶ Annensky's critical style is usually termed impressionistic, and indeed how he felt about an author or work was often more important to him than the merits he was trying to examine. Besides Balmont, the other authors he treats in this volume are Gogol, Dostoevsky, Turgenev, Pisemsky, Tolstoy, Gorky, and Chekhov.

PRECONCEITS
 DE PETERSON
 (RECONSTRUCTION)

MEREZH

ELIAS

POETAS P'AS CULORNAV CLAKI

ETKHEOU

MAS CRITICA P/

EJPAKHAREM

"IDEIAS HUMANISTAS"

MEREZH

SEBRE

1905

"OS BRUTOS

ESTAO

CHEGANDO"

1. POSITIVISTA

2. IG. OR. BRUX

3. CLASSE

POBRES

ANNENSKY

"BALMONT

CU POETA

LIRICO"

(CRITICA

IMPRESIONISTA)

APACADOS

Merezhkovsky also published an essay about Anton Chekhov and Maksim Gorky together with his essay *The Coming Brutes*; these essays appeared in one book in March 1906.⁸⁷ Merezhkovsky saw Chekhov and Gorky as the spiritual leaders of the Russian intelligentsia at the time (both were indeed quite popular), though he said that neither of them could be compared to the giants of earlier decades, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. He castigates both Gorky and Chekhov for spreading "humanistic ideas" and makes negative comments about Gorky's style as well. But it is highly revealing that despite Merezhkovsky's critical stance, readers are still attracted to these two writers today, while Merezhkovsky's works are largely passed over.

The other essay on this twin bill, *The Coming Brutes*, made a stronger impression, especially among the Symbolists. The essay was conceived as a response to the socialistic views of the nineteenth century, and Merezhkovsky saw as the main representatives of the Brutes: (1) Positivists, (2) the Russian Orthodox Church, and (3) the lower classes. He is rather vague (and quite shrill) in his geographical identification of the Coming Brutes with the Chinese (he calls them the yellow-faced positivists), who he feels will overrun Europe, but he also states that Europe, the epitome of bourgeois culture, may deserve its fate. Though his argument seems rather confused, he is fervent in his belief that Russia was morally superior to Western Europe, yet at the same time, he attacks Russian nihilists, materialists, Marxists, idealists, and realists (thus leaving out almost no one), and he calls for a new apocalyptic church that will change the entire situation. Merezhkovsky's view, however, should not be seen as representing the mainstream of Symbolist thought at this time because he increasingly withdrew from the activities of the movement and became more interested in political and historical topics.

His other critical piece, published in February, *Gogol and the Devil*, is more noteworthy, especially because some of Merezhkovsky's work on Gogol helped to illuminate aspects of the nineteenth century author's writings that had been previously neglected.⁸⁸ Merezhkovsky takes the view that the devil is always present in Gogol's works, that behind the masks of the "inspired dreamer, Khlestakov, and the positivistic wheeler-dealer, Chichikov" (the heroes of Gogol's play *The Inspector General* and novel *Dead Souls*, respectively), lies the devil, who Merezhkovsky claims is the double of all human beings. His point that Gogol's laughter is like a struggle between man and the devil is well taken. Bely, in his review of the

book, was quite enthusiastic, calling Merezhkovsky the leading Russian critic of the time. This view was extreme even then and has not stood the test of time, and though Merezhkovsky did make a contribution to Gogol scholarship in the early 1900s, other writings by Symbolist authors on Gogol have overshadowed this contribution.

April 1906 — PTO DE INFLEXÃO

The month of April in 1906 was a crucial time for the Symbolist movement in Russia; it marks the beginning of a significant shift in the development and perception of Symbolism. It represents, in some respects, the culmination of the struggle for recognition from the reading public; the Symbolists no longer had to scale a steep slope to achieve prominence. After April 1906, the upward, vertical movement is replaced by a more horizontal development, a broadening of Symbolist influence and significance at a kind of plateau. This plateau would quickly take on the dimensions of a battlefield for those seriously involved in the movement; though there had been polemics and disagreements before on fundamental issues, this internal dissension had previously not been serious enough to disturb the basic unity of purpose.

Several changes, however, can be noted in April 1906: the most significant of these are the appearance of Sologub's first book of poetry, *To My Homeland*, the publication of a few miscellany in Petersburg, *Fakely* (*Torches*), the major breaking point in the "Petersburg drama" (Bely's "affair" with Lyubov Blok), the publication of Blok's first play, *The Puppet Show*, and the composition of his poem, "The Stranger."

As mentioned above, the Symbolists' reactions to the war and revolutionary waves of 1904-05 tended to be rather strong; their views were expressed in poems, fiction, and critical articles during and immediately after these events. There was as well a perceptible tendency toward focusing more on Russia as a nation, especially in the works of Ivanov, Blok, Bely, Balmont, and the Merezhkovskys; this increased involvement and interest usually took the form of rejecting (or at least denigrating) decadence and deemphasizing the importance of mysticism to a certain extent. Patriotism and political content were more in evidence, and this is certainly the case with Sologub's *To My Homeland*, the title of which alone is so different from others, such as *Bad Dreams*, *Petty Demon*, "Light and Shadow."⁸⁹

SOLOGUB
MEREZH
[REVOLUÇÃO]

REACÇÃO
A 1905:
MUDANÇAS
NOS
INTERESSES
DOS
SIMBOLISTAS
+ CONT. POLÍTICO
+ FOCO NA RÚSSIA
(NACIONALISMO)

Sologub's political poems in this collection were well received by the public; the reviewer at *Zolotoe Runo* called them "songs of invocation," and Blok, who cautioned that a few of the pieces were among the weakest Sologub had ever written, nevertheless felt that many of the poems in this collection belonged to the best poetry of the Russian revolution.⁹⁰ Sologub was disappointed by the abortive nature of the revolution and disagreed strongly with other views of revolutionaries as brutes. He felt that Merezhkovsky was wrong in his assessment of socialist revolutionaries and correctly alluded to Merezhkovsky's consistently aristocratic point of view, which would never permit him to appreciate a revolution of the political kind, because he was too much of a nobleman.⁹¹ And Sologub's *To My Homeland* turned out to be the first of a number of books that reveal a change in Symbolism that will be discussed more in the next chapter.

The second major indication of a shift in the movement was the anthology edited by Georgy Chulkov, *Fakely*.⁹² Obviously, Symbolists had compiled miscellanies from the early 1900s, and there had been a more or less friendly rivalry (rarely intense and never really serious) between Bryusov's *Severnye Tsvety* and Sokolov's collections for *Grif*, but the first issue of *Fakely* (of three that appeared, 1906-08), represented a significant break with this relatively comfortable past. Symbolists are of course well represented in *Fakely*, including such authors as Ivanov, Zinovyeva-Annibal, Chulkov, Sologub, Blok and two poems each by Bryusov and Bely. But later these last two disagreed with the "manifesto" printed by Chulkov in the first issue of *Fakely* and felt quite outraged by the inclusion of works by the more popular realist writers Gorky, Leonid Andreev, and Ivan Bunin, which were perceived by many readers as the main reason for purchasing the miscellany. Bryusov and Bely felt that these authors were not well suited for promoting the "new art" and objected to their appearance in what had earlier been considered a "Symbolist" anthology, which for the most part it still was. *Fakely* contained mostly poetry, as well as a few short stories, but the most significant piece printed there was Blok's play, *The Puppet Show*, which has now become his best known work in this genre.

When Chulkov was collecting materials for this miscellany, he specifically asked Blok to compose a play, based on a poem he had written in July 1905, also called "The Puppet Show."⁹³ In the poem, a boy and a girl watch a puppet show, discuss the impending arrival of a certain queen with her suite, and are confronted at the end of clown with a cardboard helmet and a wooden sword who announces that he is bleeding cranberry juice. The

CHULKOV PERMITE REALISMO

BLOK
SOBRE
SOLOGUB:
"POEMAS
DA REVOLUÇÃO"

ABRIL 1906
FAKELY

ABRIL
1906
CHULKOV
PUBLICA
SINTESE/
CRÍTICA
BOLSHOY
- POEMAS

"TEATRO
DE
BUNIN'S
POEMAS
CONHECIDA
DE BLOK
(FEITA A
PARTIR
DE POEMAS
DE
CHULKOV!)

PUPPET SHOW (BLOK, PEGG)
MEIERHOLD MONTA 1906

poem is about a page in length, and the play that evolved from it is not a great deal longer, about twelve to thirteen pages in modern editions. And though the drama is more complex than the poem, it still resembles the poem, e.g., the transformation of the queen into an evil and threatening persona, plus the mocking tone.

With *The Puppet Show*, Blok firmly rejects many of his previous convictions, announces to his wife (and anyone else who might be interested) that there is no hope of improving their marriage, and at the same time embarks on his career as a playwright, an endeavor that met with some success. The play's main characters are from the Commedia dell'arte: Pierrot, Columbine, and the Harlequin. As the play opens, mystics "of both genders" are waiting for the arrival of a woman from a distant land, and Pierrot is waiting for his fiancée, Columbine, but The Author, a character who interrupts indignantly several times during the course of the play, quickly pops out to protest about how his play is being performed; he claims it is being misinterpreted. A short time later Columbine arrives, but she turns out to be Death, as pale as marble, carrying a scythe behind her. The Harlequin then appears to take her away, much to the consternation of The Author, who again criticizes the actor's interpretation of his work. Three couples conduct pseudo-mystical dialogues before the abandoned Pierrot, which satirize the real-life pronouncements of Moscow mystics (and themes of Blok's earlier poetry, especially in his *Verses about the Beautiful Lady*) rather well. The clown from the poem appears, bleeding his cranberry juice, and the Harlequin returns to announce that he is "going out into the world," through a window, which turns out to be only a painted prop; thus he flies "upside down into emptiness." Columbine comes back, again as Death, and Pierrot almost touches her outstretched hand, but The Author again interrupts. At the end, Pierrot is alone; he sings of his cardboard bride and asks the public not to laugh at him because the events depicted are "very sad."

Bryusov wrote to Blok that the play was "wonderful, quite good," and it is better than most Symbolist dramas. It is short, interesting to read, a rather artificial play about artificiality, which has the added attraction of being set in the present (and linked to a clear context), unlike Annensky's and Ivanov's tragedies mentioned above.⁹⁴ Bely, however, reacted very negatively to the "Lyrical Scenes" when he attended the play's first reading in February, 1906; he realized right away that the work depicted (and mocked) the relations between the Bloks and himself, particularly in

TRAGEDIA
DE REUS SATIUM
DRAAMA I DEU...
"CRISTIAN"
"MISTIC"

AUTOR APARE-
CENA PECAII
(BLOK)

BELY-
MEN
DELEVA
-BLOK

BLOK
SATIRIZA
MISTIC?

DRAAMA
DE
PIERROT
BURCO

BLOK
ALCOOL
"DEBRO
CHERKOV"

January and February 1906. And because Bely's "affair" with Lyubov Blok, which he later termed the "Petersburg Drama," was a public secret, other friends and acquaintances also noticed the rather obvious similarities between Blok and Pierrot, between Lyubov and Columbine, and finally Bely and the Harlequin. In fairness to Blok, it must be noted that he is harshest on himself in the play, and that Bely as well devoted two stories to this triangle: in "The Bush," written in May 1906, Bely depicts Blok as an ugly, anthropomorphic, and cunningly powerful bush, and in "The Mountain Princess," composed a few months later, Blok appears as a wicked mountain king.⁹⁵

Bely's romantic interest in Lyubov Blok had begun in 1904, and he formally declared his love in a note written in June 1905. Lyubov, who was flattered at the time, later reciprocated to a certain extent, and in March 1906 she wrote to Bely that she loved him and was prepared to leave her husband, and Russia, with him. According to her memoirs, she and Bely indulged in long, passionate kisses, and she even came to his apartment, her mind made up to commit adultery. A certain awkwardness, however, stopped the "affair" from developing further, and she left. She had been vacillating about whether to leave Russia with Bely, but after this incident (lovingly described in her memoirs) she resolutely decided to remain with her husband. When Bely finally left Petersburg for Moscow at the end of April, her mind was made up, though he still tried for several months after that to change her mind. His rather extreme reactions to her decision will be chronicled in the following chapter.⁹⁶

Thus the "Petersburg Drama," which had begun in February, ended in April. That same month, Blok, who had seemingly successfully remained neutral in Bely's struggle for his wife, was drawn more and more to drinking and debauchery. In his nocturnal wanderings around Petersburg and its environs, he found inspiration for one of his most popular poems, one that he valued highly, "The Stranger":

The Stranger

In the evenings above the restaurants,
The burning air is fierce and suppressed,
The decaying scent of spring
Drives the drunken shouts.

In the distance, over the dusty alleys,
Over the boredom of suburban summer houses,
A bakery's sign looks somewhat golden,
And children can be heard crying.

And every evening, beyond the crossing gates,
Experienced, witty fellows,
Cocking their derby hats,
Stroll with their ladies among the ditches.

Carlocks squeak over the lake,
A woman shrieks, and the disk in the sky,
The moon, accustomed to everything,
Grimaces senselessly.

And every evening my only friend
is reflected in my glass,
And, like, me, the acerbic and enigmatic fluid
Is dazed and subdued.

And at nearby tables,
Sleepy lackeys stick out,
And drunkards with rabbit eyes
Shout: "In vino veritas!"

And every evening, at the appointed hour
(Or do I only dream this?),
A girlish figure, swathed in silk,
Moves across the misty window.

And slowly, passing through the drunks,
Always alone, never accompanied,
Breathing scents and mists,
She sits by the window.

And her black-plumed hat,
And her slender, beringed hand,
And her resilient silks,
All waft ancient legends.

And I gaze through her dark veil,
Shackled by her strange proximity,
And there I see enchanted distances
And an enchanted shore.

Vague mysteries and someone's sun
Have been entrusted to me,
And the acerbic wine has penetrated
Into every bend in my soul.

And those drooping ostrich feathers
Sway in my brain.
And those bottomless, dark blue eyes
Bloom on the distant shore.

In my soul there is a treasure,
And only I have the key!
You're right, drunken monster!
I know: Truth is in the wine.

April 24, 1906⁹⁷

Blok 1906
MULHER TERRENA MISTICA?
INEXICRADA

Instead of an innocent Radiant Maiden or a Woman Clothed in the Sun, a tempting stranger in black has come. Instead of mystical, joyous adoration of the Eternal Feminine, the narrator can only gaze through his intoxication and with physical longing, at a more earthly woman. Instead of the previous locales of open fields and temples, the poem is set in a cheap, noisy restaurant in one of Petersburg's suburbs. This poem, which became one of the most significant of its type in Russian Symbolism, had an astounding effect; according to reports by those who heard it recited at Ivanov's tower, Blok's listeners were hypnotized.⁹⁸ The reverberations from this poem showed that Symbolism was changing in a dramatic and poignant way, becoming more mature; the enthusiasm of youthful ideals was waning, scepticism was increasing.

The hopes that had been kindled for achieving ever newer heights by practicing and promoting the "new art" had been realized to a large degree by the worthy contributions of verse and prose by the individual Symbolists; new and important journals were published; Symbolist miscellanies began to proliferate; valuable, and sometimes controversial articles were printed from 1904 through April 1906. By the spring of 1906, profound changes were beginning to be noticed in the movement, changes that served to reaffirm the significance of Symbolism as an entity in Russian cultural life, despite the differing interpretations of what its future course should be. One can see these twenty-eight months as Symbolism's golden era, a vibrant and exciting period of generally prevailing good will among the participants and of significant literary accomplishments.

500000
 "SCHLAFER" 11. 02
 RUSSE
 p. 120

CHULKOV - PETERSBURG
 HANDEL
 BLOK
 V.M.
 S. RUSSE

**6. Proliferation, Polemics, and Mystical Anarchism
 May, 1906 - 1908**

This period of increasing proliferation in the Symbolist ranks and fragmentation of the movement is marked by sharp polemics, particularly in connection with a variant of Symbolism as a world view, Mystical Anarchism, which was promoted by Chulkov, supported by Ivanov, and attacked by others, most notably Bryusov and Bely at Vesny. The polemic, initiated in May 1906, caused a major conflict in the movement, though the actual basis for disagreement was not very substantial and was indeed motivated to a great extent by personal factors; the polemic was largely concluded by the end of 1908, leaving the combatants with a feeling of exhaustion. By that time the movement had gained much greater recognition; there were now imitators among writers of the second and third ranks, and some of the established realist authors were not averse to including features formerly associated only with Symbolism in their works. During this period of thirty-two months, Symbolist authors published a good deal of verse and a number of important prose works, in addition to a veritable flood of essays. The theater took on an increasing importance in these years, which saw the first productions of Symbolist plays by Russian authors (Ibsen's last plays and Maeterlinck's dramas were already popular on Russian stages). And again there was an intensity of emotional experiences among the Symbolists: two challenges to duel, an attempted shooting, the death of Ivanov's wife, and one abrupt removal to Western Europe.

In the area of journals, there were two major developments: an exodus of writers from *Zolotoe Runo* in 1907 and the establishment of a new and short-lived Symbolist journal, *Pereval* (known variously in English as *The Divide*, *The Pass*, and *The Watershed*). A new publishing venture, *Ory* (*Horae*) was founded in Petersburg; it put out its first and only miscellany in 1907. Two more issues of *Fakely* appeared, causing further argument, which was accompanied by frequent sniping between *Vesny* and *Zolotoe Runo*, especially after August 1907. Major Symbolist authors also began to

POLEMICA
 MAI 1906
 FIM 1908
 IVANOV + CHULKOV
 X
 BRIUSOV + BELY
 (VESNY)

"VERDADIERE
 JORR. DE
 ENVIADOS"

CONFLITO
 INFUNDADO,
 "FACTORES
 PESSOAIS"

DUELO
 TIRO
 EMIGRAÇÃO

PEREVAL
 ADMISSÃO
 - 1907
 - 1908
 - 1909

BRUNO
 Z. RUSSE 1907 -> FIM 1908

print their works in periodicals that were more widely circulated, thus demonstrating the level of acceptance that the Symbolist movement had attained. There was a concomitant move away from mysticism (despite Chulkov's sloganeering about Mystical Anarchism), which helped to nudge the Symbolists closer to the mainstream of Russian literature and at the same time weakened the "purity" of the movement. More damage was done, however, by the polemics and the increased factionalization; in 1907, for example, Bryusov saw four main factions in the movement, two in Moscow and two in Petersburg. And it is worth noting that two authors who were less involved in the active exchange of sometimes scathing articles, Blok and Sologub, were able to publish a number of significant works during this period.

Polemics and Mystical Anarchism

The polemics began seriously in May 1906, with Bryusov's review (under his frequent pseudonym, Avrely) of the first *Fakely*, a general condemnation of the miscellany that appeared in May in *Vesy*.¹ Bryusov singled out only Blok's play, Ivanov's poems, and to a lesser degree, Andreev's story, for praise.² He saved his strongest attack for Mystical Anarchism, however, which he termed a new literary school that stood for often tendentious belles-lettres and which he felt was inimical to Symbolism as he conceived of it. He also felt that the contributors to *Fakely* (who were sometimes known as the Torchbearers — *Fakelshchiki*) were bland liberals, despite any support of revolutionary ideals they might express. Ivanov replied to this review in the next issue of *Vesy*, defending the Torchbearers and promoting the idea of *sobornost* (an ecumenical, collective spirit) as one of the main purposes of Symbolism.³ These terms, Mystical Anarchism and Ecumenism, along with related notions, such as Realistic Symbolism Innormalism and Collective Individualism (!) were quite literally bandied about in the months that followed the appearance of the first *Fakely*, generally speaking, without solid theoretical grounding or thorough explanation as to how they applied to Symbolism, though Ivanov, certainly an accomplished theoretician, did make some efforts in this regard.

Though it was common at the time to speak of Torchbearers and Mystical Anarchists in the plural, the only true adherent to Mystical Anarchism was its founder, Georgy Chulkov, the editor of *Fakely*.⁴ He had in fact begun to print his slogans (it would be wrong to think of Mystical Anarch-

ism as a fully developed theory or to call Chulkov a theoretician) in early 1905 in *Voprosy Zhizni*, particularly in two controversial articles, the first about Vladimir Solovyov's poetry (in May) and "From Private Correspondence: About Mystical Anarchism" (in July).⁵ But undoubtedly the most important statements about this subject are contained in Chulkov's book *On Mystical Anarchism*, published in July 1906, shortly after Bryusov's unfavorable review of the first *Fakely*.⁶

The book contains an introduction by Ivanov, "Mystical Anarchism and the Non-Acceptance of the World," and four essays by Chulkov. In his introductory piece, Ivanov links Mystical Anarchism (he feels mysticism and anarchism are closely related concepts, despite the oxymoron that results from their combination) to Mystical Energetism and Superindividualism, terms that he favors, though they seem even more opaque than Mystical Anarchism.⁷ As both Ivanov and Chulkov point out, one of the main tenets of Mystical Anarchism is non-acceptance of the physical, real world and its social structure, and they base their views on Ivan Karamazov's statements about not accepting God's world in *The Brothers Karamazov*, though Chulkov, characteristically, disagrees with Dostoevsky's original interpretation. In his first essay, "On the Paths of Freedom," Chulkov offers some thoughts about Mystical Anarchism, advocating as anarchism the freedom from all external, governmental, social, moral, and religious norms.⁸ As a model anarchist he singles out Nietzsche, not surprisingly; he praises Schopenhauer's interpretation of music and life; and he defines Mystical Anarchism as "teachings about the path to ultimate liberation . . . the ultimate affirmation of the individual personality." He associates Mystical Anarchism with "new realism," a kind of higher realism that Ivanov also advocated, and claims that the best representatives of Russian society are "unconsciously" anarchists.⁹

In the second essay, "Dostoevsky and Revolution," Chulkov tries to illuminate Dostoevsky's works from a Mystical Anarchist point of view. And even though he acknowledges Dostoevsky's reactionary articles, even though

Dostoevsky himself, the genius Dostoevsky, could not follow the true path to the ultimate affirmation of individual personality,

even though he

shamefully bowed to empirical statism and to the deathly image of the Christian Church,

MAY-JUL 1905
ARTICLES CHULKOV
ABR 1906
19 FAKELY
-MAY 1906
BRUSOV
X CHULKOV
JUL 1906
LIVRO CHULKOV
"SOBRE O ANARQ. MISTICO"
NOV 1906-07-07
"REVIVAL (COMMUNICITY)"

DIM. . .
MISTICO
+
CHULKOV
C) ANARQ.
MISTICO
FACCOS
(4 CF. BRUSOV)

1906 MAI
COMECO
POLEMICA:
BRUSOV
X 19 FAKELY
(VESE)
"BELLES-LETTRES TENDENCIOSA"
[19 FAKELY E ABR 1906]
"SOBORNOST"
EPIRITO
ECUMENICO
COLLECTIVE
PROPOSTO
DE SIMBOLISMO
FRAGILIDADE
TEORICA

SLOGANIS
99 CHULKOV
COMECO:
MAY 1905
JUL 1906
LIVRO
JUL 1906
"SOBRE O ANARQ. MISTICO"
"REVIVAL (COMMUNICITY)"
ACCEPTACAO
DE MUNDO
"SOBRE O ANARQ. MISTICO"
"REVIVAL (COMMUNICITY)"
CHULKOV
AD. MISTICO
"AFIRMA-
FAO MAXIMA
DA PERSONALIDADE INDIVIDUAL"
2º ENFOQUE
DE CHULKOV
CONTRA
"CRISTIA"

Chulkov still feels that his portrayal of Ivan Karamazov's unwillingness to accept the world was an evolutionary step on the way toward the development of Mystical Anarchism.¹⁰ In his third essay, he praises VI. Solovyov's poetry as the most important aspect of his work, more significant even than his philosophical writings. Chulkov believed that Solovyov was inimical to Russian Symbolists and decadents, but that he somehow supported the "new art." In all this muddleheadedness, he faults the philosopher for not taking the final leap to Mystical Anarchism and concludes the article with more slogans about Mystical Anarchism, praising the sexual act as the most significant type of mystical experience there is.¹¹ In his final article, about the affirmation of individual personality, Chulkov seeks to define Mystical Anarchism somewhat more clearly, saying that it is not a literary school and not a world view, but a path to the affirmation of mystical individuality. And he concludes the book with the rather grandiose proclamation that "Because we hear the voice of eternal Freedom, we participate in a new life; we are not decadents . . . but the 'initiators' of new creativity."¹² Based on this book alone, where the greatest mystery is why people bothered to read and take it seriously, one would have a difficult time predicting that Chulkov would eventually become a loyal supporter of the new social order after the Revolution, or that he would become a serious scholar of nineteenth century Russian poetry.

In the late 1920s, when Chulkov wrote his memoirs about the pre-Revolutionary period, he tried to diminish the significance of this book, avowing that it was poorly written and theoretically not well founded. But he did not totally abandon this set of slogans and even pointed out again that Ivanov essentially agreed with them. He flatly stated, moreover, that Blok remained a Mystical Anarchist to the end of his life.¹³ Blok, however, regularly printed disavowals of any association with Mystical Anarchism and even wrote to Chulkov in August 1907, rejecting Mystical Anarchism, Mystical Realism, and Collective Individualism.¹⁴ But Blok and Ivanov did maintain rather close ties with Chulkov during this period, which had some effect on "choosing the sides" for the polemic.

Ivanov, in fact, supplied some of the necessary weight to assist Chulkov in propagating his ideas, though the elder poet was careful not to offend Symbolists in Moscow too much and was cautious in his use of the term Mystical Anarchism, as seen in his June reply to Bryusov's review of the first *Fakely*: "He [Chulkov] says to me: 'Mystical Anarchism,' and I say to him: 'non-acceptance of the world, superindividualism, mystical

CHULKOV
APOLIA
CVT
1717

3. CHULKO
MAESTRO
SOLVICOV

SEKO COMO
A MINKA
EXA. MISTICA

4. CHULKOV
AFIENICADA
BESSAIDIA
AN MISTICA
PO. LIT. NEM
VISA DOCA. NEM
MAS CAMINHO P?
J. NEMARCA DA
INDIVIDUALITY
MISTICA

RUCKE
IVANOV LI-
GADLS A
CHULKOV
MAY N. TA O
DENTRO DO
ANARCO
MISTICA

11 A REALIBUS AD REALIORA

(IVANOV)
(VESY JUN 1906)

energeticism' — and we understand each other." ¹⁵ Though Ivanov preferred to use different terms, he felt very strongly that extreme individualism had to be overcome, and he used the slogan "a realibus ad realiora" (from the real to the more real) to express the direction he felt people should take. Thus he advocated moving from petty, earthly emphasis on individuals to a mystical plane where this kind of individualism could be left behind, in favor of a more collective identity. Though he maintained fairly good relations with the Moscow group throughout the polemic, it was clear that his views differed from those of Bryusov, who held rather egocentric opinions, and Bely, whose views were more difficult to pin down, though they were mostly based on Christian faith, interpreted more or less in a traditional way, at least at this point in his life.

Despite his condemnation of Mystical Anarchism in *Vesy* in August and *Zolotoe Runo* at the end of 1907, Blok never really broke with Chulkov or other Petersburg representatives of the Symbolist movement.¹⁶ Unlike the group of Symbolists who left *Zolotoe Runo* en masse in August 1907, Blok in fact became a frequent, leading, and regularly paid contributor. Blok's relations with Chulkov, who was also active at *Zolotoe Runo*, were also complicated by "personal factors," which were hinted at in books by Bely and Chulkov and which were only finally revealed in the memoirs of Lyubov Blok: after she broke with Bely, her first real "betrayal" occurred with Georgy Chulkov in the winter of 1906-07.¹⁷ Apparently Blok, who was aware of her involvement, was able to tolerate this infidelity with a married writer living in the same city and active in the same circles, though relations between Blok and Chulkov did cool somewhat.

Bryusov was much less equivocal in his published views about Mystical Anarchism. He totally opposed it, though his relations with Chulkov remained good until February 1907. In 1905, in fact, Bryusov had even written to Chulkov, offering to sever his ties with *Vesy* and become a regular contributor to *Voprosy Zhizni*, surely not a very serious proposal, seen with the wisdom of hindsight.¹⁸ But in early 1907, Chulkov's unflattering review of Bryusov's collection of stories, *Earth's Axis*, caused a permanent break between them; it led to Chulkov's voluntary exclusion from the list of *Vesy* contributors in April 1907, and most importantly to the sharper attacks on him by Bryusov and his supporters at *Vesy*.¹⁹ And as people joked at the time, the unceasing attacks on Chulkov become one of "the main literary missions of *Vesy*" in 1907 and 1908.²⁰ But Bryusov's bitterness toward Chulkov and Mystical Anarchism was also partly occasioned by the

SUPERAR
INDIVIDUAL
VAL
EXTRA
PELO
PLANO
MISTICAL
SUPERAR
BRYUSOV
COPIOSOS EGO
CENTRICAS
BIELI
CRITICAR
TRADICAO

VESY 1907-8 → ATAQUES INCESSANTES
A CHULKOV

BRIVUSOV + BIELI X CHULKOV (2. RUNO)

(MANTER PUREZA DO
S) AIBOL P - VESY)

UCCY TAS
PERSONAL
(CF. PETERSON)

threat he perceived to Skorpion's dominance of the Symbolist movement; Bryusov at this time was quite unwilling to relinquish his leadership, which he had so carefully cultivated. And he was able to enlist the willing support of Andrey Bely in this mission of discrediting Chulkov and maintaining the purity of Symbolism at Vesy.

In 1906 and 1907, Bely was occupied by other matters as well. In despair because of Lyubov Blok's rejection of his advances and offers, he challenged Blok to a duel; when his emissary, Ellis, was received by the Bloks at their country estate, however, the threat of a duel evaporated. Lyubov finally convinced Bely in late summer 1906, to accept a "trial separation," to last one year, and Bely left for Munich in September 1906, though he still nursed hopes of recapturing her affection. In Munich and Paris, he wrote articles critical of Mystical Anarchism, such as "About Preachers, Gastronomes, and Mystical Anarchists."²¹ After his return in March 1907, Bely increased the level of his attacks, particularly against Blok (whom he accused of blasphemy), and it is evident that one of the main reasons for his bitterness in print toward his two "rivals" was the deep feeling of rejection he felt, occasioned by the unsuccessful attempts to win Blok's wife back to his side.

Bryusov was able to count on the support of Hippus in 1906 and 1907 in the struggle against Mystical Anarchism, though the Merezhkovskys' religious views were alien to Bryusov and Vesy as a journal. Another defender of the Symbolist faith, Ellis, wrote some of the most enthusiastically fanatical articles condemning the "vulgarizers" and "epigones" of Symbolism in Petersburg. But because of the vituperative nature of Vesy's proclamations, it turned out that, instead of preserving its position as the bastion of orthodox Symbolism, it became another faction of the Symbolist movement, though clearly still the most important one. And instead of continuing the normal opposition to the "external enemies," i.e., the realists, the Symbolists at Vesy turned their attention more to perceived threats from "internal enemies," and from this point of view, the number of challengers was increasing alarmingly.

Pereval "NOVO DESAFIE A VESY"

One of the new developments in later 1906 in fact represented a new challenge to Vesy: the journal *Pereval*, which began publication with its first issue in November 1906, and concluded with its twelfth issue in October

1907. The editor of *Pereval, A Journal of Free Thought*, was Sergey Sokolov, Skorpion's old nemesis, who had left *Zolotoe Runo* (where he had been literary editor) in July 1906. In his letters to Blok, who was a frequent contributor to *Pereval*, Sokolov makes it clear that the journal was intended to be a serious competitor for Vesy's readers, and Sokolov indeed invited all the leading Symbolists and contemporary philosophers (especially Berdyaev and Shestov) to contribute.²² Bryusov, as expected, refused to participate, but others who actively contributed included Bely, Ivanov, Chulkov, Nina Petrovskaya, Blok, Sologub, and Annensky.

Unlike Vesy, with its apolitical stance and strong preference for the "new art," and *Zolotoe Runo*, where art and literature were the only featured topics, *Pereval* demonstrated a greater interest in radicalism and freedom, as the journal's subtitle indicates. These excerpts from the first issue's programmatic article give an idea of its tendencies:

In undertaking this endeavor, the editorial staff cannot ignore the difficulty of its task — the unification of free art and free society.

Life in its victorious march has turned out to be stronger than people. The fog of mutual alienation and mutual prejudice is dispersing little by little, and beyond it the consciousness that all who have risen in the name of the future are brothers is becoming more and more clear, be these brothers political activists, or destroyers of harmonious bourgeois morals, or defenders of the rights of free creativity in its struggle with civic tradition and congealed academism, or finally, the romantic seekers of ultimate freedom outside all compulsory social forms. All roads lead to the city of the sun, if their starting point is the hatred of chains.

We will define *Pereval's* attitude toward all progressive political parties . . . we reject the possibility of a party world view . . . The ideal of absolute . . . freedom is an ideal that rises above parties.

We note only one limit for our activities — the idea that not serving the creative principle is unthinkable. . . And so let our activity be imbued with the principle of freedom. We want to go all the way on the paths of freedom. And let our triple motto be: philosophical, aesthetic, and social radicalism!²³

The wording of the statement shows the rather palpable influence of Chulkov, especially the lines about "the oaths to freedom" and the "ultimate freedom outside all compulsory social forms." Bryusov was of course disposed against *Pereval*, as shown in a letter of October, 1906: "*Pereval*, or *Proval* [Flop or Failure] will campaign against Vesy."²⁴ And Comrade Her-

LYUBOV
REJEITA
BIEI
DESAFIA
BLOK A
DUEL

BIELI VA
MUNIQUE
SET 1906

E VOKTA
MAR 1907
ATA CANDU
BLOK E AVARU
MUTICA

HIPIUS
CONTRA
AN MIST
(1906-7)

WESY
COMO
FACCA
MASA
IMPERIA

BLOK
BERDY
SEV
SKOTOV

INFLU
NOVA DE
CHULKOV
(MAS
LIMITAD

ELLIS
WOLGA
RZADO
RES
DENGO
MOS

mann's review article on the first six issues of *Pereval*, printed in *Vesy*, calls *Pereval* a "collection of squalors."²⁵ Bely was somewhat more favorable about *Pereval*: after leaving *Zolotoe Runo*, effectively in May 1906 (though he did publish a cycle of poems in this journal in 1908), he moved to *Pereval*, where he wrote numerous reviews, articles, and poems for that journal, which he nevertheless still felt was inferior to *Vesy*.²⁶

Symbolist Verse in 1906-1907

In addition to the factionalization and polemics in late 1906 and early 1907, there were some positive achievements in the area of poetry. Blok printed two books of poems, Ivanov brought out his third collection, Balmont also published more collections of verse, and Bryusov's translations of poetry by Verhaeren appeared. Of these volumes, the two by Blok are the most significant, particularly since he had not published any books since *Verses about the Beautiful Lady* in 1904.

The title of Blok's second collection, *Unexpected Joy*, is taken from an icon important in Russian Orthodoxy; it represents the Madonna and child with a repentant sinner, but the cycles in the book give a very different impression.²⁷ The emphasis in *Unexpected Joy* (printed by Skorpion in December 1906, though the cover has 1907) is on swamps and little, hairy, silent creatures, particularly in the cycle, "Earth's Bubbles," the name of which originated in the line "The earth hath bubbles," in *Macbeth*, Act 1, Scene 3. Blok's ideal woman is now darker, a fairy tale flower that looks into the poet's eyes with its dark blue, bottomless, and unfamiliar eyes (in the long poem, "Night Violet," which is related to the Blue Rose imagery of Novalis). And the cycle "The City" features the approaching Apocalypse, the Babylonian Harlot, and unrest in Petersburg around 1905. The poems reflect his stronger feeling of pessimism about earlier religious and political hopes, symbolized especially by the colors lilac and dark blue, which accompany his general rejection of Christ and mysticism. Despite this departure from the imagery of his first book, *Unexpected Joy* was received fairly well by other Symbolist authors. But Blok was disappointed that "The Stranger" was not interpreted the way he had meant it to be; he was disappointed that some readers saw in it only an interest in female fashion, in scarves and perfume, when he had attempted to show the contrast between The Stranger and coarse, vulgar reality.²⁸

Blok's next book of verse, *A Snowy Mask*, was published by Ory in Petersburg in April 1907 and is devoted to his love affair with the actress

Natalya Volokhova.²⁹ Blok's interest in her lasted from December 1906 to early 1908, but the intense early phase of the relationship yielded thirty poems, written in January 1907. As with his courtship of Lyubov Mendeleeva, Blok tended to give this new relationship more idealistic trappings than Volokhova thought suitable. But she apparently enjoyed the company of an attractive young poet, and their affair was not carried on in secret. In fact, he printed a dedication to her in the volume (though the name was delicately omitted):

I dedicate these verses to You,
Tall woman in black, with wingéd eyes,
Infatuated with the fires and the fog of
My snowy city.

The dedication, the dark colors of the two cycles, "Snow" and "Masks," and their unconcealed meetings, often in restaurants, helped to give some the impression that Volokhova was *the* Stranger, though once again the poem preceded the reality, as in the case of his Beautiful Lady poems that were followed by his marriage to Lyubov. Because of the intensity of emotion and inspiration, *A Snowy Mask* once more demonstrated why Blok is seen as the foremost Symbolist poet.

Vyacheslav Ivanov's *Eros* appeared around New Year 1907 and was also published by Ory in Petersburg.³⁰ Like Blok's *A Snowy Mask*, it is a short collection of poems written in a short span (September-November 1906); it was published rather quickly. *Eros* also deals with a somewhat idealized passion, in this case, Ivanov's "platonic" attraction to the young poet Sergey Gorodetsky, about whom many poems in *Eros* were written, and who drifted rather freely from one literary movement to another and ended up as a loyal Soviet poet. Gorodetsky was living with the Ivanovs in the autumn of 1906, studying Greek and versification with the elder erudite. For two and a half months, Ivanov also tried to convince the young man with the "lithe, agile, youthful body" to join in a mystical triangle with himself and his wife Lydia,

Where we'll praise love thrice
In singular hymns . . .

But according to Ivanov's biographer, Olga Deschartes, this goal was never attained.³¹ The thirty-four poems of *Eros* made for a rather slight book, and the cycle was later republished in a larger collection of poems, *Cor Ardens*, the first volume of which appeared in 1911.

BELY

BLOK (DEC)
CYCLES (1906)
ACIDARE
APARECE
1905
PREJICUL
DE CRISTO
C DE
MISTIC

During the second half of 1906, Balmont printed two collections of poetry, and Bryusov, who had been devoting a lot of time to cultivating a correspondence with the Belgian Symbolist Verhaeren, published a collection of his poems in Russian. Balmont continued the strongly political tone of his recent poetry in *Poems*, a very short booklet (15 pages), published in July by the Znanie publishing house, which was founded by Gorky and other realist authors.³² This slight volume incensed the government so much that the whole printing was confiscated; the poems themselves are of little interest, but the fact that Balmont, a model aesthete and individualist, published poems with a realist, socially oriented house, incurred Bryusov's wrath at *Vesy*. Balmont's other 1906 collection, *Evil Spells*, was printed by *Zolotoe Runo* in Moscow in October, but as a separate book, not part of the journal.³³ This volume was also accorded official attention for its "blasphemous" poems. The book, subtitled *A Book of Incantations*, was "arrested" in 1907 and the case dragged on until 1913, when it was finally dropped.

Bryusov's translation of Verhaeren's verse appeared in June 1906; *Poems about Contemporary Life*.³⁴ It was originally intended as the first volume of a Library of New Poetry in Russia and contained, in addition to the poems, a biography of Verhaeren and bibliographies of works by and about him. This book turned out to be the only volume in the Library, but Bryusov was, however, able to meet his idol in Belgium in 1908. Verhaeren even journeyed to Russia in 1913; his warm reception there was due in large part to Bryusov's efforts.

Prose

In December 1906 Bryusov published his collected stories, *Earth's Axis*, which included his play, *Earth* as well.³⁵ The stories were collected from a decade of work in this genre, and the results were not very satisfying. The stories are more like stylistic exercises, in which Bryusov consciously (and diligently) imitated the style of Poe, and the French writers Anatole France and Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, among others. There is also an extreme emphasis on decadence, though in Bryusov's case, the decadence seems rather cold and not as shocking as he intended it to be. From his introduction to the second edition of the book (1910), we learn that he had a unifying purpose: "The sense that there is no well-defined boundary between the real and the imaginary world, between 'dream' and 'reality,' between 'life'

and 'fantasy'."³⁶ This purpose is well illustrated in the story "Now That I have Awakened," where the protagonist is unable to escape from his dreams. The best of these stories, and the one most frequently anthologized, is his "The Republic of the Southern Cross," which first appeared in the December issue of *Vesy* for 1905.³⁷ Like *Earth*, the story is set in the future, here a city on the South Pole called Star City, which is enclosed by a roof, where light and temperature are controlled by machines. The social system resembles the one developed in the USSR after the Revolution; life is regimented, but a disease breaks out, *Mania contradicens*, which eventually causes the citizens to destroy their city. Despite the sharply critical tone in his review, Chulkov does hit the mark on some points, especially that the stories reveal "a praiseworthy love for work, a bourgeois Przybyszewskianism, and a mechanical approach to life."³⁸

Other prose collections published by Symbolist authors at the end of 1906 were less controversial and indeed less important works in terms of their authors' careers: Hippus' *Scarlet Sword* (a compilation of her stories previously printed in journals and miscellanies) which came out in July 1906, and Sologub's *Political Fairy Tales*, which appeared in November.³⁹ In 1907, however, Sologub made important strides in his career as a playwright, launched seriously in November 1906, and was warmed by the success of his novel, *The Petty Demon*, which appeared in book form for the first time in March 1907.

1907

In general, 1907 is distinguished as a year of important drama and prose works in the Symbolist movement. It was also a time of increasingly fierce attacks within the Symbolist ranks, in journals, and in face to face encounters. In 1907 a number of new miscellanies appeared, and a new publishing house, Ory (whose name is likely related to *Horen*, a journal published by Friedrich Schiller in 1795-97), was active in Petersburg. Several second rank writers began publishing books around this time, increasing the number of the Symbolist flock, if not necessarily bringing it greater doses of talent. But along with this increase in number, a perhaps inevitable divergence of opinion about the movement itself arose.

22 MCGRADE
7906
BALMONT
TOM POLITICO
FORTE,
POEMS, PUB.
EDIT. DC
GORKY!!!
IMPRESSION
MISCELLANEOUS

MAY, 1906-1908

Drama in 1907

Two important milestones in the development of Symbolist drama occurred at the end of 1906 and the beginning of 1907: the performance of Sologub's play *The Triumph of Death* in November 1906 and the publication of his drama *The Gift of Wise Bees* in *Zolotoe Runo*, Nos. 2-3, 1907.⁴⁰ Sologub had developed an active interest in the theater around 1906 and wrote a lengthy statement about his views of the ideal theater, "The Theater of One Will," printed in 1908, in which he advocated the author's total control over all aspects of the performance, including the actors' every movement.⁴¹ In all, Sologub wrote eighteen plays and was a frequent adapter of his own and others' works for the stage; one of his most popular adaptations was his stage version of *The Petty Demon*, which had its première in 1910.⁴²

The Gift of the Wise Bees is derived from a Greek legend about Protesilaus and his wife Laodamia; Protesilaus was killed in the Trojan War, but Laodamia mourned so much for him that he was allowed to return to her for three hours. Afterwards, she died in flames, clutching the image of her husband. This legend was quite popular with the Symbolists: Annensky completed a drama on this topic, *Laodamia*, which appeared in a miscellany in 1906, and Bryusov published another version in 1913, *Protesilaus, Who Was Dead*.⁴³ Sologub read his play to a receptive audience in the autumn of 1906; the celebrated actress and promoter of modern drama, Vera Komissarzhevskaya, had organized a series of "Saturdays," at which new plays, including works by Sologub and Blok, were read. Vsevolod Meyerhold, a leading director of modern dramas both before and after the Revolution, wanted to produce *The Gift of the Wise Bees*, but his hopes were never realized and the play was not staged.

That honor belonged to Sologub's *Triumph of Death*, however, which was performed in November 1906 at Vera Komissarzhevskaya's theater in Petersburg. The performance was a success, and it marked the beginning of Sologub's association with the theater, which lasted until the early 1920s. *Triumph of Death* also deals with a legendary theme, this time from the Middle Ages. An ambitious, beautiful servant, Algista, cleverly substitutes herself for the ugly and deformed Queen Berta (the prototype for this character is Berthe, Charlemagne's mother). The king, Khlodoveg, loves Algista for ten years, believing she is his true queen, whom he had married, sight unseen, but the real Berta comes back with a son, sired by Khlodoveg. The king then abandons Algista, who had loved him; she retaliates by put-

ting a curse on them, turning the king and Berta into stone. In the end, all the main characters die, and thus death is triumphant.

Sologub's *Triumph of Death* was, technically speaking, not the first Symbolist play to be staged; Balmont's *Three Blossomings* had a very short and unsuccessful run at the Theater of Dionysus in Petersburg in January 1906, and Sologub's play was somewhat overshadowed by the performance of Blok's *The Puppet Show* in December 1906, which attracted more attention, though not all of it favorable.⁴⁴ In 1907, Blok published his two other lyrical dramas in periodicals, *The King in the Square* in *Zolotoe Runo* and *The Stranger* in *Vesy*. These three dramas were collected and published in one book in 1908.⁴⁵

The King in the Square was first written in prose in the summer of 1906 and then rewritten in a poetic version and read at one of Komissarzhevskaya's Saturdays that autumn. *The King in the Square* was received enthusiastically, but efforts to produce it were thwarted by the theatrical censor, who refused to pass it because of the political content. The play features a Poet (who in some ways represents Blok), an Architect, and the Architect's Daughter (based on Dmitry Mendeleev and his daughter Lyubov), all of whom are seeking the proper way of relating to the people and the revolution. At the beginning of the play, the people are waiting for the arrival of ships that will bring salvation and the end of history at the same time. They build structures to greet the ships, but the wait is a long one and the people become frustrated. Finally they rise up against the king in the square and topple him (quite literally) because the king is nothing more than a statue. The political background for the play is clearly the failed revolution of 1905, and the tone is therefore pessimistic, despite the Architect's pronouncement at the end that "He who moves the Stars will feed you."

Blok's next play, *The Stranger*, is another adaptation of a poem, and like *The King in the Square*, it was prohibited from performance when it was written and published, this time on religious grounds, though it was later staged in 1913, 1914, and again in 1917. The original title of the play, *Three Visions*, is reminiscent of Solovyov's poem, "Three Meetings," though the play is rather different from Solovyov's poem. The play has three "visions" instead of acts, and the Poet's search for the Beautiful Lady leads to a female Stranger who has transformed herself from a star into a human being. *The Stranger*, written in November 1906, features two male protagonists, The Poet and The Astrologer, who represent Blok and Bely;

1906-8
SOLOGUB
TEATRO
DAVON-
TAGE
UNICA

BLOK
1907:
BUREINA
PRAYA
EMERADA

PTEMKIN?

REIN
EMAIS
UMA
ESTATUA
|||

TEATRO (VERA
DE DIONIS) 109
|||

Bely's father was a mathematician and Bely himself had been a student of the natural sciences. Both of these men are inevitably attracted to The Stranger, but neither one can have her. As in *The Puppet Show*, the irony here is quite strong, and this antithesis to *Verses about the Beautiful Lady* is also a condemnation of bourgeois life in Petersburg. In the end, pessimism wins out over irony, and The Stranger returns to the heavens as a star, leaving the Poet and The Astrologer behind.

Anthologies

1907 was also an active year in terms of miscellanies. Symbolist authors contributed to over a half dozen anthologies, none of which, however, were closely associated with the main center of the movement in Moscow. Miscellanies from Petersburg in fact dominate in 1907; they contributed to spreading Symbolist influence. However, the fact that the works of Symbolists were printed alongside those of popular realist authors caused more factionalization.

The second issue of *Fakely*, which appeared in March 1907, served as the target of a biting attack in *Vesy*.⁴⁶ The second *Fakely* was in fact rather different from the first: this miscellany contained only articles, by Chulkov, Ivanov, Shestov, Gorodetsky, and others, that were devoted to philosophical topics, especially anarchism. Ellis called the anthology a "pantheon of contemporary vulgarity," and Bely directed his comments toward Petersburgers in general, accusing them of trying to cheapen Symbolism with this "new path."⁴⁷ Despite the polemical tone of these remarks, it must be noted that they have some validity and that the quality of the second and third issues of *Fakely* is not as high as that of the first, which was itself rather uneven.

Bely had returned to Moscow in March after spending six months in Munich and Paris. The time he spend abroad, however, did not do much to improve his outlook on his personal affairs; he returned to Moscow "dried-up, resentful, fanatical," and ready to do battle with the Petersburg "blasphemers" and heretics.⁴⁸ On his return, he was given greater responsibility at *Vesy* and became head of the theoretical section. He published articles in nearly every issue of *Vesy* from March 1907, until the end of its run in 1909, and it is evident that *Vesy* was as much Bely's journal during this period as it was Bryusov's.⁴⁹

CONDE -
NACAO DA
VITA
BURGUESA

2º FAKELY
SE ARTISTAS:
CHULKOV
IVANOV
SHESTOV (PEREVAL)
GORODETSKY
ETC
BIELI: BARATEA?
DO SIMBOL?
(REDUCAO/VILCA -
NIZACAO?)
BIELI VOLTARA
DA EUROPA
MAR 1907
"HEROES"

VESEJ IINHA
(SEKOTEGORICA)

Bely was also active as a lecturer at this time, and at one of his lectures Nina Petrovskaya appeared with a gun. She was distressed that Bryusov's affection for her was waning, and according to Bryusov's letter to Hippus, Nina Petrovskaya cocked the gun and was prevented from firing it at Bryusov, by her husband Sokolov, Ellis, and Sergey Solovyov, who grabbed the gun away. Bryusov had apparently given her the gun sometime earlier. His reaction to the incident (which took place on April 14, 1907) was quite calm, though later the event (or non-event) achieved some notoriety in the history of Symbolism. Bely gave a somewhat different version in his memoirs, and Khodasevich also devoted some space to this incident in his memoirs, but unfortunately his account is marred by serious factual errors.⁵⁰

NINA
PETROVSKAYA
KAYA
GLASE
ATIRA
EM
BRYUSOV

That same month, Chulkov formally announced his departure from *Vesy*, and in the attacks that followed for the next year and a half, *Vesy* was unstinting in its efforts to discredit Chulkov, the *Fakely* anthologies, and Mystical Anarchism. One typical example is the review by Bely of Chulkov's drama, *The Taiga* (printed in 1907), which begins as follows:

ABR 1914
CHULKOV
SEM FORMATE
DA VESY
C O ATIRA
ATE OUT
1905

Mister Georgy Chulkov has written a drama. (Eh-heh-!). Drama, as you well know, dearest reader, is the most mature form of poetic creativity (Attention!). Mister Chulkov has delivered a creative child in a very serious form — a poetic drama. This speaks to us in his favor as a (now mature) poet. (Listen, listen!). Now he's no longer Chulkov-the-poet, but Chulkov-the-dramatist. Let us taste of his fruit.

His drama is not simply a drama. His drama is a drama . . . with moods. (Ah!). If you are disposed to become acquainted with the story line, the collisions, or the catharsis of said drama — you are very naive! Mister Chulkov is a superman of letters (Down with literature!). He pictures the unpicturable, he sings of fierce, wild things. Sink your teeth into this one, dear reader, but don't look for any sense in it.⁵¹

BIELI X
"TAIGA"
(PECA CHUL)
"SEM
SENTIDOS
(1?)

Also in April, a miscellany appeared in Moscow, *Korabli (Ships)*, which brought together poetry by established Symbolists (Balmont, Ivanov, Sologub, Bryusov, Blok, and Bely) and poems and stories by their associates, followers, and imitators, especially minor writers who assembled around the Grif enterprises, such writers as Sokolov, Nina Petrovskaya, Khodasevich, Bryusov's brother Alexander, and Sergey Auslander. The next month other anthologies were printed, including *Protalina* (appropriate for the season, its title is a word that means a thawed patch in snow or ice), which is sometimes mentioned in connection with Symbolist miscellanies, though the only Symbolist of note to print works in it was

Blok, and *Belye Nochi* (*White Nights*, also appropriately named, for Petersburg's summer nights). Both miscellanies were published in Petersburg, and this fact is stressed in the subtitle of the second one: *A Petersburg Miscellany*. Chulkov played a major role in collecting material for *Belye Nochi*, and it is not surprising that Bely and Bryusov did not contribute to it. Blok and Ivanov were the main stars of the anthology, but Sologub, Gorodetsky, Chulkov, Lydia Zinovyeva-Annibal, Voloshin, and Ausländer also contributed. Ausländer was somewhat younger than the main representatives of Symbolism; he began to be noticed in 1908 for his stories and novels. Also featured in this miscellany was Mikhail Kuzmin's poems and story, "The Cardboard House," which is based on Blok's affair with Volokhova. Kuzmin was another writer temporarily allied with the Symbolists, though much more important than Ausländer; Kuzmin was quite prolific, writing poetry, stories, novels, and plays that were popular in the first two decades of this century, and which have found some admirers in the West several decades later.⁵²

But undoubtedly the most significant miscellany printed in May 1907 was *Tsvetnik Or, koshnitsa pervaya* (*The Flowerbed of the Horae, First Basket*).⁵³ Despite the title, there were no more "baskets" after the first miscellany, and in Bely's review of it, he claimed to have found more nettles than flowers.⁵⁴ The name of the publishing house, Ory, taken from the Greek word for "the hours," was founded by V. Ivanov; like *Fakely*, it was to be an all-encompassing literary and philosophical entity. Though it printed only one miscellany, Ory was able to publish several books in 1907, among them Lydia Zinovyeva-Annibal's *Tragic Menagerie* (summer 1907), Blok's *Snowy Mask* (April), Chulkov's *The Taiga* (May), Remizov's *Limonar: A Spiritual Meadow* (February), and Gorodetsky's *Perun* (September).⁵⁵

The "first basket" reveals Ivanov's presence throughout, beginning with his opening poem about the Horae and concluding with his seventeen poems, united under the title "Golden Veils."⁵⁶ he had convinced Bryusov to contribute a poem, and Blok and Sologub also offered poetry. His friends Chulkov, Kuzmin, and Gorodetsky were also well represented, and his wife contributed a play. Another participant in this venture, Balmont, printed eight poems. In 1907 he published two more books of poetry as well — *Songs of the Avenger*, in Paris (banned in Russia), and *The Fire Bird*, which combines Russian folkloric motifs with decadence and features a beautifully drawn cover by Konstantin Somov.⁵⁷ Some might say that the cover is better than the book; one critic has termed *The Fire Bird* a "catastrophic failure."⁵⁸

IVANOV (11/6/1910) IS FEMINIST (FRANCOLO) (1910) 113

Another of Ivanov's intellectual entanglements is also featured in *Tsvetnik Or*. Margarita Voloshina (née Sabashnikova, wife of Max), who lived with the Ivanovs in 1906-07, printed a cycle of four poems, under the general title "Forest Reed Pipe," which serve as a sort of prelude to Ivanov's poems in "Golden Veils" that follow.⁵⁹ Sixteen of Ivanov's love sonnets are devoted to Margarita Voloshina (one other poem is dedicated to his wife). After Ivanov's failure to draw Sergey Gorodetsky into a "thrice hymned love," he turned his literary attention to Margarita, who also studied Greek and versification with him. And together with Lydia, he tried to persuade Margarita to be the third person in their "unity." According to Olga Deschartes, "nothing" (her emphasis) happened; there was only an *amitié amoureuse*. Margarita was apparently attracted to Ivanov (despite her contemporaneous attachment to husband Max), and after Lydia's death in October 1907, she tried unsuccessfully to renew their relationship on a more intimate level, but he refused.⁶⁰ Not long after that she became a disciple of Rudolf Steiner, founder of Anthroposophy (in 1913), and moved to Western Europe, where she remained the rest of her life.

Also in 1907, a new series of widely circulated miscellanies began to appear in Petersburg, published by the Shipovnik publishing house (in English rendered either as Sweetbrier, Dog Rose, or Eglantine). One of Shipovnik's founders, Z.I. Grzhebin, was later very active in Berlin and had one of the leading private publishing houses in the 1920s. Shipovnik existed from 1906 to 1918 in Russia and put out twenty six miscellanies from 1907 through 1917, at the rate of two or three per year. The tendency in the early years favored Symbolists and other modernist writers, in part to challenge the realist anthologies distributed by Znanie. Bryusov, Bely, Balmont, and Chulkov all published poetry in the early Shipovnik miscellanies, but only Blok and Sologub, among the Symbolists, became major contributors to this series.

Factions

Because of the increasing variety of publications and publishing houses, especially with the arrival of Ory on the scene, there was an even stronger sense of Symbolist groups vying for pre-eminence. In June, for instance, Bryusov saw four factions of "decadents," as he called Symbolists, grouped around Skorpion, *Zototoe Runo*, *Pereval*, and now Ory. Even at this time, long after the decadent phase of Symbolism in the 1890s Bryusov still pre-

TRINIDADE IVANOV

MA. 1907

AS FLORESTE DE HORAE ED. ORA DE IVANOV
 GENE FAKELY
 TRINIDADE
 GENE ENTY//
 LITERARIA E
 FLOSOPHICA
 TRINIDADE

1907
 BALMONT
 LIVRO
 BANDO
 NA RUSSIA

STEINER 1913

ferred to use the term "decadence." In an article in September in *Vesy*, he acknowledges the victory of the "new art." as described by a newspaper in mid-1907; disagreeing, however, with Ivanov and Chulkov, who claimed to have "overcome individualism," Bryusov asserts that decadents are united by a world view — extreme individualism. and in a postscript to the article, he defines his terms:

P.S. So that I won't be incorrectly understood, I feel it's necessary to add that I strictly separate the history of "decadence" as a literary school from the fates of "symbolism" as a creative method in art. Symbolism, a characteristic of all great artists (even including such Naturalists as Zola and Alphonse Daudet), has only received its broadest application in the "decadent" school.⁶¹

And though Bryusov is rightly acknowledged as the *maitre* of Russian Symbolism, he did not use this term as frequently as we do today; in the next chapter it will become evident that his view of Symbolism differed from those of his colleagues in more than simple usage of terms.

Another grouping that was devised at this time was first given currency in an article that appeared in *Mercure de France*, July 16, 1907, which was the cause of disclaimers and exchanges of letters. In the article, Chulkov is quoted as an authority on the division among the Symbolists into: Parnasian decadents (Bryusov, Max Voloshin, Sergey Solovyov), pure decadents (Balmont, Sologub, Kuzmin), romantic neo-Christians (Merezhkovsky, Hippus, Filosofov, and Bely), and, most significantly, Mystical Anarchists (Chulkov, Ivanov, Gorodetsky, and Blok).⁶² Blok was particularly disturbed by the labeling; he informed Chulkov of his displeasure in a letter written in August 1907, and he printed a letter in the August *Vesy*, also disavowing any connection with Mystical Anarchism.

In August 1907, the factionalism in Russian Symbolism became even more serious when several Symbolists, in letters to various newspapers, announced their departure from *Zolotoe Runo*, ostensibly because of editor Ryabushinsky's poor treatment of a young writer, but basically because of a fundamental disharmony. Bryusov, Bely, Merezhkovsky, Hippus, Kuzmin, Baltrushaitis, and M. Likardopulo, the secretary of *Vesy*, all publicly rejected any future contact with *Zolotoe Runo*. Ryabushinsky announced various staff changes as well, the most important of which was naming Blok the editor of the journal's critical review section; this appointment in fact contributed indirectly to the other writers' departures. Ryabushinsky also invited Andreev and Bunin to participate in the journal, as a signal of pre-

SC1907
BRUSSU
X
IVANOV +
CHULKOV
DECADENTS
EXTREME
INDIVIDUAL
SYMBOLISM
SOMO
METODO
CRIATIVO
N' ESCOLA
LITERARIA
METODO
EXPLORADO
AK MAXIMO P/
ETC DECADENTE
DIVISION
CHULKOV
ACO 1907
SAIDA DA
Z. RUNO
NOMEAÇES
-BLOK
-ANDREEV
-BUNIN
-REUSS

ference for the "new realism." Although *Zolotoe Runo* had previously printed rather negative reviews of the *Fakely* miscellanies, the journal now became more closely allied with Chulkov and the new currents in Petersburg.

Bely was especially dismayed by Blok's refusal to join the general exodus from *Zolotoe Runo* and by his agreement to play a leading role in the "apostate" journal. He was also upset by an article Blok had printed in *Zolotoe Runo* on realist writers, in which he praised some of their accomplishments, and he accused Blok of "blasphemy" in his review of *Tsvetnik Or.*⁶³ So in August 1907 he wrote Blok, informing him that their relations were "broken off forever." Blok replied with a challenge to a duel, demanding that Bely take back his words. Bely fortunately did so, and the threat of a duel was rescinded.⁶⁴

Two months later, one of the factions that Bryusov had noted faded from the scene: *Pereval* ceased publication in October with its twelfth issue. Grif did not stop being active, however, and in 1907 and afterward, it published a number of books by Symbolists (Sologub, Annensky, Bely, Sokolov himself, Nina Petrovskaya) and others associated with the movement (Voloshin, Khodasevich), as well as a popular author with a realist tendency, Aleksey N. Tolstoy, later a favorite of Soviet readers, particularly with his historical novels. Grif went out of existence in 1914, but after the close of *Pereval*, Sokolov never again mounted a challenge to Skorpion and *Vesy* for leadership of the Symbolist movement.

Younger Authors

In 1906-08, some younger Symbolist authors printed books that helped to broaden the movement, though none of these new books reached the artistic level of works by the major Symbolists. These second level writers were generally active in miscellanies, especially those put out by Skorpion and Grif, and had books printed by these two houses. Among these authors are A. A. Miropolsky, Aleksandr Kondratyev, Aleksandr Kursinsky, Lyudmila Vilkina, Alexander S. Sokolov, Nina Petrovskaya, Sergey Solovyov, and Ellis. Thus the epithet "younger" has to be seen in a relative sense, but here it is taken to mean younger in terms of starting a career and having books published.

These books began to be published in significant numbers starting in 1905, with the appearance of a book by Miropolsky, friend of Bryusov and

BLOK
ELEGIA
REALISMO
(2. RUNO)
ALEXEI
TOLSTOI
VIRGO
X FOLIO
104

CHULKOV
MAY 1907
ALEX. CHULKOV

in fact his assistant in compiling *The Russian Symbolists* collections in 1894-95. Miropolsky's two long poems, "The Witch" and "The Staircase," were printed together as a book in 1905 by Grif, accompanied by an introduction written by Bely.⁶⁵ Aleksandr Kondratyev was another author who started publishing books fairly early and became a prolific writer, starting in 1905 with his first book, *Poems*, and continuing until 1917, when he published his last book in Russia (about Helen of Troy) before emigrating. Kondratyev was a pupil of Annensky and was very interested in mythological subjects, as seen in the titles of some of his works: *Satyress, A Mythological Novel*, printed by Grif in 1907, and *The White Goat, Mythological Stories*, printed in 1908.⁶⁶

Aleksandr Kursinsky was another who made his debut at this time; his book of poems, stories, and translations, *Through the Prism of the Soul*, which came out in 1906, was given a fairly good review in *Vesy* and he was called a "good poet of the Balmont school."⁶⁷ Lyudmila Vilkina, Minsky's wife, was a frequent contributor to miscellanies, and her first book of stories and sonnets, *My Garden*, was published by Grif in 1906. In his review, Bryusov found her book bland and awkward, and he also faulted her outmoded decadence.⁶⁸ Bryusov's younger brother Alexander (who used this Latin version of his first name as a pseudonym) was active at *Pereval* and published one book of poems, the title of which can be translated as *Off the Beaten Path, or Where There Are No Roads*, in 1907. In addition to his own poems, he printed translations from Spanish, English, and Italian. In an eight-line review in *Vesy*, Bryusov said Alexander was not a poet and should choose another profession.⁶⁹

Sergey Sokolov published his first book in April 1907, a volume of verse called *The Scarlet Book* (scarlet, *alyi*, was obviously quite a popular color with Symbolist authors). But it was confiscated by the authorities upon publication. Despite this official action, Bryusov received a copy and reviewed it for *Vesy*; he stressed that Sokolov was not a poet and that the verse in the book was boring, loud, and bad.⁷⁰ The review is of course not totally free of bias, but in general Sokolov was more significant as an editor and publisher than as a poet. His wife Nina Petrovskaya published her book of stories, *Sanctus Amor* (title borrowed from a Bely poem), the following year; her stories have been seen as a diary of her life during those years, especially of her love affairs with Bely ("The Last Night") and with Bryusov ("The Slave").⁷¹ Bely, reviewing the book for *Vesy*, criticized the book for depicting mannequin love instead of holy love, and Bryusov felt it was an

average book, deserving of a C+ if he were grading it from the point of view of a high school teacher.⁷² *Sanctus Amor* was dedicated to Sergey Ausländer, who was infatuated with her at the time. Ausländer's first book of stories, *Golden Apples*, printed by Grif in 1908, draws on themes from Italian and French history and literature.⁷³ Bely called it boring and trifling; he compared it to a room full of little porcelain statues but added that the book was well produced.⁷⁴ In 1913, Ausländer published a novel that depicted Bryusov, Nina Petrovskaya, Kuzmin, and himself in a way that made the characters familiar to those associated with Symbolism.⁷⁵

Sergey Solovyov, who in 1907 was becoming an increasingly active member of the staff at *Vesy*, published his first book of verse, *Flowers and Incense*, in April 1907.⁷⁶ Like Bely, Sergey Solovyov was disturbed by Blok's "abandonment" of his former ideals and had broken with Blok in 1905, renewing their relations only in 1910. Sergey had supported Bely in his struggle to "save" Lyubov Blok from her husband. Blok subjected Sergey's first book to a rather violent attack, calling the poems banal student exercises, useful on as a guidebook for poets.⁷⁷ Bryusov's review was kinder in tone but offered essentially the same point of view, that Sergey had imitated and echoed others.⁷⁸ The younger poet replied to these reviews in his next book, a collection of poems and polemical essays called *Crurifragium*, in which the title of one essay is indicative of the book's tone: "Mr. Blok on Agriculturists, Aryans with Beards, Steam from Beer, Me, and Much Else Besides."⁷⁹ Blok responded in kind with a review written in August 1908, "Letters about Poetry," where he lumped *Crurifragium* together with other Muscovite writings that had attacked him.⁸⁰ Fortunately the strain in relations between Blok and his younger relative eased a little, in print at least, after the appearance of this last piece, along with the general fading of the Moscow-Petersburg polemic.

Another author who was active during this polemic was Ellis, one of *Vesy*'s staunchest supporters. Ellis still had not yet published any of his own works, but he had published translations of Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du mal* and *Petits poèmes en prose*, as well as poems by Georges Rodenbach.⁸¹ Ellis' translations are uneven, and though some of his verse translations are still read in the Soviet Union, most of his work in this area has been forgotten.

S. Sokolov
 REVIEW
 SLUR
 (ARMADILLO)
 (POETRY)
 H/POLKEM
 (POETRY)
 (POETRY)

Prose in 1907

1907 can be seen as a year of important prose works, especially by Bryusov and Sologub, and could, with some justification, be called Sologub's year. In 1907, for example, he printed two plays, *The Gift of the Wise Bees* and *A Liturgy for Me*; his sixth book of poetry, *The Serpent* (in which the sun is compared to an evil serpent); his third book of stories, *Decaying Masks*; in March his major novel *The Petty Demon* came out in a separate edition; and his trilogy, *A Legend in Creation*, was begun in the third Shipovnik miscellany (November, 1907).⁸² And though Sologub is respected for his verse and plays, it is his prose works, especially his stories and novels, that have received the greatest share of attention.⁸³

Decaying Masks, which contains ten stories, was published by Grif in June 1907. The title refers to "masks dissipating over reality," to appearances winning out over reality.⁸⁴ One of the best stories in this collection, "The Youth Linus" (originally "The Miracle of the Youth Linus"), is set in the Roman Empire and is undoubtedly one of the gloomiest of Sologub's short prose works. The youth Linus is murdered by Roman cavalry officers for protesting about their earlier massacre at a local village, but he comes back as a specter to haunt them. They keep trying to hack his body to pieces and are finally led by the hot sun and the apparition to the sea, into which they all ride to their deaths. The other stories in the book deal with injustice (Sologub was angry about the failure of the 1905 revolution), but there is also a noticeable trend toward fantasy (featuring a four-headed creature in "The Uniter of Souls") and even some humor (in "Little Man," plus a mass of bad puns in "Two Gotiks"). This is one of his better collections, though there is the customary decadence, people drinking blood, and a bevy of swarthy youths with naked legs.⁸⁵

His trilogy, *A Legend in Creation*, is his most ambitious work, a complex and ultimately unsuccessful attempt to combine fantasy with the political events around 1905. It began appearing in the third Shipovnik miscellany under the title *A Legend in Creation* (*Tvorimaya legenda*, literally *A Legend Being Created*, usually rendered in English as *A Created Legend*). The second installment was included in the seventh Shipovnik miscellany (December 1908) and was called *Drops of Blood*; these two sections were later combined to make the semi-independent novel *Drops of Blood* (1914).⁸⁶ The third installment of the work, *Queen Ortruda*, appeared in the tenth Shipovnik miscellany in July 1909, but under a different general title,

Corpses' Spells (*Nav'i chary*), which was the original title for the whole trilogy and is sometimes still used. *Queen Ortruda* became the second volume of the trilogy and the nineteenth volume of his collected works.⁸⁷ The final volume, *Smoke and Ash*, came out in two installments, in the tenth and eleventh miscellanies of *Zemlya* (*Earth*), in November 1912 and January 1913, respectively.⁸⁸ These installments had no general title, and the sequence of the chapters, which had been maintained through the first two volumes, was changed, so that *Smoke and Ash* started over again with chapter one. If the reader is confused, it is not surprising. In 1914, when *A Legend in Creation* appeared in its final form, the former title, *Corpses' Spells*, had been dropped, chapters had been rearranged, and cuts had been made because of censorship.⁸⁹

The plot line of the work is somewhat less complex than the publication history, but it, too, is challenging because of its different levels, especially the symbolic ones, and the sometimes rather loose ties between the three volumes.⁹⁰ The main character, Georgy Trirodov, is an enigmatic poet who has supernatural powers and an interest in revolutionary activity; he also represents the author to a certain extent. He resembles Sologub physically (bald, wears a pince-nez), and his statements frequently repeat lines of Sologub's poetry. The name Trirodov — thrice born — refers as well to a third aspect of his personality. Prince Tankred, Trirodov's alter ego, who is also like Tsar Nicholas II in many ways. Trirodov's lover, Elizaveta Rameeva, also has a counterpart in the second novel, Queen Ortruda herself; Ortruda dies at the end of her book in a volcanic eruption, but Elizaveta comes with Trirodov to replace her. Other characters worthy of mention in the work are Peredonov (!), who appears as a vice-governor, and Phillipo Macchio, a revolutionary modeled on Lenin.

The first volume introduces Trirodov and Elizaveta plus other characters. Trirodov's eccentric house is described; there he keeps children, particularly "quiet children," zombies who have been brought back to an eerie life. He is a retired chemist and probably an alchemist, but he is also drawn to revolution. The second volume takes place in a mythical island kingdom in the Mediterranean Sea (possibly a reference to Shakespeare's *The Tempest*), the Kingdom of the United Islands. The story of Ortruda's life is recounted, including her marriage to Prince Tankred of Burgundy. The royal couple mirrors Nicholas and Alexandra, especially in their disastrous conduct of war and their ignorance of revolutionary fervor. The political situation in the kingdom gradually deteriorates; Tankred the outsider is not trusted by the citizens, and the eruption at the end claims not only Ortruda

MAR 1907
SOLOGUB
PETTY
DEMON

SOLOGUB

1908-14

UMA LENDA
EM CRIAÇÃO

FANTASIA
+ EVENTOS
POLITICOS
1905

TRILOGIA
PROCESSO
MENTO-
DA
EXPERI-
ENCIA
HISTÓRI-
CA
RETA
REVOLU-
CIONÁRI-
O
TSAR,
LENIN

BRUSSOV LANDA DOL' FALIS... M... E

PROLOGUE
PETERSON!!!

FRAGILE
CENTRAL

but also many of her citizens. The last volume shifts the locale back to Russia, where Trirodov, who has taken an interest in the Kingdom of the United Islands, decides to offer himself as a candidate to succeed Ortruda. Elizaveta agrees to come with him, and the candidacy is soon a hot topic in newspapers all over Europe. This causes unwanted attention in Russia, and just as a mob is closing in on Trirodov, he leaves with Elizaveta and some other people . . . in his flying greenhouse. This rather improbable event is soon followed by Trirodov's election as king (no other candidates challenged him), and at the end, King Georgy I arrives by air to take the reins of power in his new country.

The trilogy was bitterly attacked by Gorky and others for mixing eroticism with revolutionary themes and for Sologub's supposed "abandonment" of a realistic writing style. Legend represents a departure from his earlier works, in that it seems more optimistic, but the fact that Symbolist elements predominate is merely indicative of his desire to express his genuine interests in what he hoped would be his major life's work. Clearly one of the main reasons for this increased optimism was his marriage to Anastasia Chebotaryovskaya in the autumn of 1908, not long after he started writing the trilogy. His sister Olga had died in 1907, and after a brief courtship, he married Anastasia, a young poet and translator, a nervous woman who actively promoted her husband's career, and according to Sologub's testimony, helped him to write some of his works.⁹¹ She also helped to change his lifestyle after the marriage, generally for the better, though some felt that the Russian Schopenhauer had become too bourgeois and indeed less talented after the marriage.

GORKY
XEROTOM
FCLTWA

The Fiery Angel

Bryusov also began publishing an important prose work in 1907, his most significant work in this genre, *The Fiery Angel*, or, according to the full title:

The Fiery Angel, or a True Story, Which Tells of the Devil, Who Appeared on Numerous Occasions in the Form of a Bright Spirit to a Certain Maiden, and Tempted Her to Perform Diverse, Sinful Deeds, Also of Mystical, Astrological, Cabalistic, and Necromantic Pursuits Loathesome to God, Of the Judgment of the Certain Maiden, Presided over by the Reverend Archbishop of Trier, and Also of Meetings and Discourses with a Knight, with Thrice Doctor Agrippa von Nettesheim, and with Doctor Faust, Written by an Eyewitness.⁹²

1907
BRUSSOV
FIERY
ANGEL
L
ALLEGORIA
DAVIDA
PARADICULAR
BRUSSOV - BELI
MIRA PEREKURAYA

The title alone gives some indication of the setting and the story line, and Bryusov made a concerted effort to convince readers that he had found a German manuscript and translated it into Russian. He was successful in this quest because after the book's appearance in a German translation in 1910, a German reader even asked to see the original German manuscript.⁹³ The "editor" composed a preface as well, which told of the "author's" life in Cologne in the 1500s (the story is set in 1534-35), and supplied about twenty-five pages of notes to accompany the novel (according to the 1974 edition pagination), notes on religious and philosophical trends, historical personages and books, all of which Bryusov knew about from his extensive research.

The novel is narrated by one of the main characters, Ruprecht, a former student from Cologne, later a landsknecht, who returns to Germany after a five year stay in Mexico. On his way home, he meets Renata, a woman possessed by demons, who tells him about herself. As a child she had known an angel, Madiel, and as a young woman she had wanted to "unite with him physically," which prompted the angel to disappear, but she soon encountered an Austrian, Count Henrich von Otterheim, whom she believes is her angel in human form. They went off to his castle, but after a couple of years, he lost interest in her and left. This is the point where she meets Ruprecht, while she is searching for Count Henrich, and much of the rest of the novel is devoted to their joint search for him. In order to help, Ruprecht is forced to study black magic, the occult, and to serve the Devil, all because of his love for Renata. She meets Henrich in Cologne, but he has joined a secret society and taken a vow of celibacy. Her love quickly turns to hate, and she urges Ruprecht to fight Henrich in a duel; Ruprecht is wounded, and Renata cares for him until the angel Madiel returns. Ruprecht then has to search for her and finally locates her, in a dungeon, awaiting execution as a witch during the Inquisition. She dies, after which Ruprecht meets Henrich; their former differences are resolved, and Ruprecht then leaves again for the New World.

Though Bryusov was praised, and criticized for his audacity in the novel, the historical setting that is so carefully reproduced served as a backdrop for his main story, a romance based on the real relations of Nina Petrovskaya, Bely, and himself (as Renata, Count Henrich, and Ruprecht). Moreover, he sometimes provoked certain actions from these other two people in order to depict the characters with greater accuracy. And because these affairs were no secret in Symbolist circles, the biographical content of

the book was evident to readers in 1907-08. Nina Petrovskaya, who at this time was involved with Sergey Ausländer, realized immediately that this fictionalized portrait was to be an important part of her biography and wrote to Bryusov, before the conclusion of the novel's serialization in *Vesy*, that she "wished to die . . . so that you could describe Renata's death according to mine, so that I could be the model for the last, beautiful chapter." She even traveled to Cologne to see where the novel was set, and according to recent scholarship, joined the Catholic Church in the 1910s, taking the name Renata.⁹⁴

Generally speaking, people in the Symbolist camp saw the novel as a work of talent and genius, though it was correctly noted that *The Fiery Angel* is not a very symbolic novel, despite the pages devoted to the occult and the supernatural. Bely aptly pointed out that it "will always remain an example of 'high literature' for a small circle of genuine admirers of the refined."⁹⁵ Though *The Fiery Angel* is indeed not a novel with mass appeal, it is an absorbing book and certainly one of the high points of prose fiction in the Symbolist era.

1908

1908 witnessed the effective end of Symbolist miscellanies, though anniversary issues of *Grif* and *Severnye Tsvety* came out in 1914 and 1911. It also saw the return of the Merezhkovskys and Filosofov to Russia and their more active participation in publishing, lecturing (particularly Merezhkovsky), and related activities.⁹⁶ In 1908 there were continued polemics between *Vesy* and *Zolotoe Runo*, and Bely's list of "heretics" was lengthened to include Sologub. Bely also printed the last of his Symphonies that year, though the Fourth Symphony was more a work from past, rather than current, writing. That year there were also several collections of poetry published and important lectures delivered, particularly Blok's on "The People and the Intelligensia," at the end of 1908. The sense of exhaustion in the movement is indicated in the title of Bely's book *Ashes*; Blok was tired of the struggle, Bryusov was tired of *Vesy*, the disagreements about Mystical Anarchism were coming to an end. But the movement itself now represented the leading approach to poetry in Russia and it included Russia's best poets in the first decade of this century.

NINA
ASSUME
ROMANCE
RENATA
VIDA
MISTIC

CRITIC
SIMBOLICA
USRA
BELY
ALTA LITERATURA

1908
RETORNO
3 MEREZHKS

VESEY
X
ZOL-RUNO

EXAL
STAD

SEM
ANARO
MISTICE
(EM ARTIGOS)

Anthologies in 1908

The publication of the third *Fakely* marks the last of the Symbolist miscellanies to appear in 1901-08.⁹⁷ By the end of 1908 it was common for Symbolists to print their works in books or Symbolist (and non-Symbolist) journals, though the publication of miscellanies outside the Symbolist camp remained quite popular. In this connection, we note the widespread circulation of anthologies of the *Zemlya* (Earth) and *Zhizn* (Life) publishing enterprises. And in 1908, Bryusov, Blok, Sologub, Balmont, Bely, and others printed work in the *Shipovnik* collections, though Bely criticized the publishing house and its miscellanies for supporting "symbolic realism" and Mystical Anarchism.

Zemlya, organized and led by Mikhail Artsybashev (a popular writer whose works were quickly translated in Western Europe and America), published twenty miscellanies, from 1908 to 1917, which brought together Symbolists and others who were interested in modern topics and who were generally opposed to Gorky and the realist writers at *Znanie*. Symbolist participation was fairly limited, however, and in the first *Zemlya* collection in 1908, only Blok and Chulkov, among the Symbolists, contributed. Thereafter, the most frequent participant from this group was Sologub, who printed his long story "The Old House" in the third *Zemlya* anthology (1909) and the final installments of *A Legend in Creation* in 1912 and 1913.⁹⁸ *Zhizn*, the title of another literary collection initiated by Artsybashev, appeared in March 1908 and included poetry by Blok, Bryusov, and Sologub. The collection had the goal of promoting a more modern approach to art and life, with an emphasis on sexual matters, something still fairly new in Russian literature around the turn of the century. For the Symbolists who published in it, the miscellany meant broad circulation (12,000 copies) and recognition as leading writers in Russia.

The third *Fakely* appeared in February, 1908, and contained prose, poetry, and drama, with no articles about Mystical Anarchism. The poetry was supplied by Blok and Ivanov; stories were offered by Chulkov, Ausländer, and Boris Zaytsev, who got his start in Symbolist circles and later earned a reputation as a leading émigré writer (and was even called "The Dean of Russian Literature") after leaving his homeland in 1922. Remizov and Sologub printed mysteries; mystery plays and modern versions of mysteries were popular with the Symbolists and others interested in the theater in the early 1900s. Chulkov also gathered material for a book about The

3^o FAKELY

BELY
SHIPOVNIK
APOIA
REALISM
BLOK
ANARCHISM

ARTYBASHEV
ZEMLYA
(X GORKY)

ZHIZN
(VIDA!)
MAR 1908
POPULAR
ZAR EN-
FOQUE

DE ARTE
ESTUDANTES
GIPPO

New Theater, a collection of essays by Bryusov, Sologub, Bely, and others, that was printed in 1908.⁹⁹

Noticeably absent from the last *Fakely* were Bryusov, Bely, and others from Moscow, however. The *Vesy - Zolotoe Runo* polemic was still running and in fact heated up a bit in May when Bely took issue with a lecture by Ivanov about Symbolism, and a reply was printed in *Zolotoe Runo* with comments about "pure Symbolism, theurgism, and nihilism." Early in 1908, Chulkov had already predicted a crisis in Symbolism and labeled the *Vesy* contributors "contemporary decadents."¹⁰⁰ About a year later, the dimensions of that crisis would indeed be clear to all the active members of the movement.

Bely provided his thoughts about the various groups associated with Symbolism in his October 1908 lecture, printed in *Vesy* under the title "Symbolism and Contemporary Russian Art."¹⁰¹ In it, he characteristically warned about the dangers of Mystical Anarchism, explained who the true Symbolists were, and defined the relationship between Symbolist and realist writers, especially those allied with the *Zname* house. Rather surprisingly, Bely revealed disenchantment with Solovyov's philosophical tenets and expressed a preference for Merezhkovsky's views, though he later again recognized Solovyov's importance.

The Merezhkovskys Return to Russia

Hippius and Merezhkovsky (and of course Filosofov) had continued to publish while abroad, though the quantity of these works was smaller. Publications of note from this period are the play *Poppy Blossom* (or *Poppy Color*), co-written by Hippius, Merezhkovsky, and Filosofov (though Hippius was the main author), which deals with the 1905 revolution, and a collection of political essays directed against the monarchy, *Le Tsar et la révolution*, printed in Paris in 1907, once again co-authored by these three writers.¹⁰² According to Hippius, they left Paris in April 1908, shortly after the death of Merezhkovsky's father, and arrived in Petersburg in July.¹⁰³ There they found a newly reconstituted Religious-Philosophical Society, with branches in Petersburg and Moscow, and they soon became active participants in the meetings. But this new version was not the same as the earlier Religious-Philosophical Meetings, in part because of the absence of the clergy (who were not allowed to participate officially), and according to Hippius, the level of discussion had sunk to bickering about political and quasi-religious topics.¹⁰⁴

CRITICA
ANTOLOGIA

OUT 1908
BIELI:
O SYMBOLIZME I
ARTE RUSIA
CONTEMPORANEA

LITERARY
DIARY

MEREZH
RETURNAM
JUL 1908

SOCIETY
RELIG-PHILOSOPH

BAIKO
KOROL

CRITICA
BIELI

Merezhkovsky and Hippius each published two new works in 1908 that have some significance for their careers, but by this time it is more difficult to speak of their writings as Symbolist works, and they were now less closely associated with the movement. Hippius still published occasionally in *Vesy*, but Merezhkovsky published in other journals, mostly *Russkaya Mysl* (*Russian Thought*), an established "thick" journal with a large readership. He printed his play in that journal in February: *Paul I* (*Russian emperor, 1796-1801*), which he adapted from his novel about Peter and Alexis.¹⁰⁵ The drama is devoted to Paul's murder and quickly became the subject of a civil case, which continued until 1912. He was allowed to print the play in his collected works, however, in 1911 and again in 1914, and after the case was dropped, the play was even performed in 1917 (September, after the abdication of Nicholas II) in Petersburg, where it was warmly received. Late in 1908, he gave lectures about Mikhail Lermontov which stressed the 19th century writer's role as "The Poet of Superhumanity" and that same year he printed a collection of articles, mostly on religious and political topics, *In a Quiet Pool*, in Petersburg.¹⁰⁶

Hippius published her *Literary Diary* (under her frequent pseudonym — Anton Krayny), in February 1908; in it she collected twenty-six pieces she had written from 1899 to 1907 on literature, art, and other subjects.¹⁰⁷ Her personal feelings and opinions, however, generally overshadow the subjects she addresses and make her literary judgments less valuable, as has been noted:

In her prose writings, Gippius was at her weakest in the area where Merezhkovsky was at his best and most enduring: in literary criticism. The very qualities that made her such an original thinker and poet also made her blind as a critic. . . . By and large, as a critic she expected her own kind of metaphysical subtlety from all other writers and was incapable of taking an interest in any writing that did not derive from Dostoevsky. This *parti pris* led her to condemn as frivolous and insignificant prose writers of the caliber of Anton Chekhov (who was for Gippius a provincial dullard able to describe only the animal side of human existence and devoid of any understanding of women) and Vladimir Nabokov ("a writer who has absolutely nothing to say"), and to treat with contempt almost all the important post-Symbolist poets . . . In the case of Tsvetaeva, the attitude of Gippius . . . could on occasion take the form of irrational hatred that verged on the paranoid.¹⁰⁸

In his review of her book for the March issue of *Vesy*, Bely fences with her, lunging at her "ignorance of terminology": "Heavy is the backword of

methodological investigation for the hand of our talented poetess"; "the collection reveals a vulnerable spot: a forced carelessness." Bely's light review, though, is an example of polemics at their best and at the same time a perceptive examination of this book.¹⁰⁹

Also in 1908, Hippius' fifth book of stories, *Black on White*, appeared; it contains twelve stories, among the most significant of which are "Eternal Femininity" and "Pilgrim," both devoted to grief caused by losing loved ones.¹¹⁰ In all, the collection reveals a pervasive shallowness, however, and Bely's review, which praises her as the best woman writer in Russia, also points out that the stories are too intellectual, too clever, and too superficial in handling important topics, that the stories are tendentious and not as good as her *Twilight of the Spirit*.¹¹¹

Symbolist Verse and Prose in 1908

Balmont at this time was still abroad, but he continued to publish sizeable amounts of poetry. In 1908, for example, Shipovnik printed three of his books of verse: *Birds in the Air*, subtitled *Melodious Lines, The Calls of Antiquity*, and *The Green Garden: Kissing Words* (this last volume appeared in October 1908 though the cover has 1909).¹¹² As with the volumes of 1906-07, the quality of his poetry was again low, and the subjects that he treated (his trip to Mexico in *Birds in the Air*, ritual songs that he reworked for *The Calls of Antiquity*, and sectarian songs for *The Green Garden*) were generally not handled well. One exception in these collections is the poem "Starry Countenance," about the image of Christ in the Book of Revelation, which was later set to music by Igor Stravinsky.¹¹³

Also in 1908, Balmont printed his second collection of essays, *White Summer Lightning*, devoted to Goethe, Maeterlinck, Whitman, Wilde, "The Slavic soul," and folk beliefs.¹¹⁴ And Skorpion began to print his *Complete Collected Poetry*, in ten volumes (1908-1914).¹¹⁵ Balmont was not finished as a poet, despite the failings of verse collections after the 1905 revolution. He was still capable of good poetry, but it was clear that he had already written most of his best work, and that it was now appropriate to review and collect his works.

Bryusov also began to collect his verse around this time, and the first two volumes of his *Paths and Crossroads* appeared at the end of 1907 and in April 1908, respectively.¹¹⁶ The first volume includes poetry from 1892 to 1901, essentially his books *Chefs d'oeuvre*, *Me eum esse*, and *Tertia vigilia*,

in addition to poems from *The Russian Symbolists*, from the *Book of Reflections*, and previously unpublished verse. The second volume, poems from 1901 through 1905, includes *Urbi et Orbi* and *Stephanos*. At the end of July 1908, Bryusov and his wife left Russia for a three-month stay in Western Europe — Italy in August, France in September, a meeting with Verhaeren in Belgium in October. Bryusov was glad to leave Moscow and Vesny and was quite pleased with his trip to Western Europe (with the somewhat strange exception of the artwork by Michelangelo and Raphael, which he found "too classical").¹¹⁷ While he was there, the translation he made (together with Ivanov) of Gabriele D'Annunzio's *Francesca da Rimini* was performed in Moscow and appeared in book form in autumn 1908, once again demonstrating that personal relations between Bryusov and Ivanov had remained good during the polemic.

Sologub also published a sort of retrospective collection of verse, in May of 1908: *The Fiery Ring*, called his eighth book of poetry, though it contains work from the 1890s through 1908.¹¹⁸ It was his best book of verse, one that Gorky, who was more inclined to heap abuse on Sologub, called a book with lasting value.¹¹⁹ In his cycles and groupings, Sologub reveals his interest in philosophical systems and his training as a teacher, a profession that he had been able to leave because of the success of *The Petty Demon*, and because the school authorities were pleased to release someone with such obvious revolutionary sympathies. Sologub also devotes poems to mythology, solitude, the torment of earthly life, as well as love and nature, transformations, and to the exercise of will, in terms reminiscent of Schopenhauer. The "ring" is closed with the cycle about Eternal Return, "The Final Consolation" (death). Blok also found much to admire in *The Fiery Ring*, particularly the perfection and simplicity of Sologub's style.¹²⁰

Sologub's fourth collection of stories, *The Book of Partings*, was likewise printed in 1908.¹²¹ The four stories in the book feature death rather prominently, and two of the stories are of particular interest. "Death by Advertisement" parodies Sologub's preoccupation with death by showing a woman who agrees to portray (and personify) the hero's Death, for fifty rubles, in a vulgar and at times absurd milieu. She does kill him, but she also dies, leading some readers to hope that Sologub had given up his decadent attraction to death by killing Death.¹²² "In the Crowd" is based on an event during Nicholas II's coronation, when over 3,000 people were crushed to death in an effort to collect small gifts the new tsar was handing out at Khodynka.

B. 21 US 534

S. 10 638

BALMONT

LYUBOV, BLOK
MEYERHOLD
(1908)

Blok's third collection of verse, *The Earth in Snow*, was published in September 1908 by Skorpion; it is his third collection, if one overlooks the hastily printed *Snowy Mask* (which is also printed here), and generally much of the book is devoted to his love affair with Natalya Volokhova, which ended in June 1908.¹²³ Blok at this time was increasingly estranged from his wife; Lyubov had joined a troupe of actors led by Meyerhold which toured Southern Russia in 1908. While traveling, she had an affair with another actor, whom she calls "Page Dagobert" in her memoirs, and when she returned from the Caucasus in August, she was pregnant by him.¹²⁴ Blok encouraged her to have the child and offered to treat it as his own. Her son Dmitry was born in January 1909, but lived for only eight days. Much of this trauma went into his next play, *The Song of Fate*, which will be examined in the next chapter.

In addition to the previously printed cycles, "Snow" and "Masks," *The Earth in Snow* features a cycle of poems, about "Faina" and "Free Thoughts." Most of the poems in "Faina" are about Volokhova, the personification of "the Russian woman," though this time the image is darker and more demonic, linked with snakes ("Song of Faina") and witches ("Snowy Maiden"), and the poet's love is now more ambiguous. A sub-cycle within this grouping, "Incantation by Fire and Darkness," also composed in a short period, deals with the purging effect of a snowstorm, wiping away the traces of a tragic love. "Free Thoughts," a cycle of four longer poems, written in June and July 1907, had appeared earlier in the third *Fakely*. In "Free Thoughts," Blok recounts his walks around Petersburg in a fairly straightforward and technically accomplished manner.¹²⁵

Blok and Bely had a serious falling out in April-May 1908, brought about by the publication, in April, of Bely's Fourth Symphony, *A Goblet of Snowstorms* (the similarity in title with Blok's works is surely not accidental).¹²⁶ In a bitter and unreserved letter to Bely, Blok complained that the symphony was blasphemous and hostile to him; he felt that the two poets did not understand each other.¹²⁷ Bely, in a reply on May 3, agreed with that viewpoint and "liquidated" their relationship; this status remained in effect for two years, until a reunion took place in the autumn of 1910.¹²⁸

The cause of this break, *A Goblet of Snowstorms*, is Bely's least accessible Symphony. He had started to work on it as early as 1902 (excerpts were printed in the first Grif miscellany in 1903, but these were later revised); he then wrote and rewrote it until 1907. In his preface, he asks the reader, "Who will read it? Who needs it? . . . is the Symphony an artistic

work or a document . . . of interest to a future psychologist?" And he feels that he still does not know if it has a right to exist.

Bely had hoped to depict Holy Love in *Goblet*, following in the footsteps of Plato and Dante, a love that could lead to a new religious consciousness.¹²⁹ The love in *Goblet* is depicted on two different levels, but in such a confusing and jarring way that the reader is left at a loss to understand the book. Some of the more coherent passages are satirical and poke fun at Bely's friends and fellow polemicists, such as Ivanov, the Prophet of Super-Energetism, Remizov, Voloshin, Sologub, Gorodetsky, and Churkov (called Georgik Nulkov, as in "null and void"). Blok indeed had reason to be offended by Bely's Symphony: in one passage Bely ridicules Blok (using his name directly). Blok offers to make a snowy "fire" with icicles, he hops on the "fire," does not burn, and goes home to report: "I burned on a snowy fire."¹³⁰ *Goblet* was generally passed over in embarrassed silence, only Sergey Solovyov praised it enthusiastically and claimed (without any basis, unfortunately) that Bely's Symphonies were very influential on Russian literature.¹³¹ A considerably dimmer view, put forth by Konstantin Mochulsky, Bely's first biographer — that the preface is significantly more interesting than the work itself — is more accurate.¹³²

Bely's second collection of poetry, *Ashes*, printed by Shipovnik in December 1908 (the cover has 1909), provides a striking contrast to his earlier poems in the *Gold in Azure* collection.¹³³ *Ashes*, written in 1906-08, is dedicated to the memory of the nineteenth century poet Nikolay Nekrasov, whose style and themes are rather foreign to Symbolism. In his preface, Bely explains his abrupt about-face from his earlier period, saying that he was now just as concerned about the suffering of the proletariat as he was drawn to pearly dawns, that both were equally fine subjects for artistic creation. He expresses his profound concern for Russia and links the spread of capitalism to the breakdown of patriarchal society in the villages. The tone of the book is pessimistic, and the poems of cycles on "Russia" and "Madness" are of greatest interest because of their points in common with other works of this period, after the abortive revolution, particularly the themes of insanity, despair, fleeing from captivity, being drawn to open fields, and death.¹³⁴ Some of these themes are found in his story, "Adam," which appeared in *Vesy* in April 1908.¹³⁵ And his cycle "Madness" includes his best known poem, "To My Friends," a sort of prophetic epitaph, written in Paris in 1907 and dedicated to Nina Petrovskaya:

ESKILAH
BR 05
AMICS

BLOK

PRECON
CE TOS
DE AE
TERRA
LONZA
1908

BELL:
PROLET
ARADO
COMO
TEMA

TRAD B M
AT
AMICIS

TEMAS P55-1905

PRELUDIO / TEM DO PATRIAR-
CADO NAS ALICIA - NARODNIK?

FIM 1908 - EXAUSTÃO E RESIGNAÇÃO

MAY, 1906-1908

131

130

A HISTORY OF RUSSIAN SYMBOLISM

A MEUS AMIGOS (POEMA FAMOSO DE BÉLY)

I believed in the golden radiance.
And the sun's arrows brought my death.
I spanned the centuries with my thoughts,
But I couldn't live out my life.

Don't laugh at the dead poet,
Bring him a laurel wreath.
My porcelain wreath bangs
On the cross summer and winter.

The flowers by it are trampled,
The icon has faded,
The stones are heavy. I'm waiting
For someone to lift them.

I loved the sound of bells ringing,
And the sunset, only these;
Why do I hurt so much, so much?
I'm not to blame.

Come, have pity; I'll rush
To meet you with my wreath.
Oh, love me, love me —
Perhaps I haven't died,
Perhaps I'll wake up.
I'll return.

A mood of resignation of exhaustion pervaded the Symbolist movement at the end of 1908. The problems that had been so intense died down somewhat at this time. Chulkov had changed his tone in his next volume of collected essays, *The Veil of Isis*, which came out in November of 1908 (the cover has 1909), toward more serious philosophical investigation and with less emphasis on Mystical Anarchism.¹³⁷ Bryusov at this time was looking for a way to lighten some of his editorial burdens at *Vesy*; he was now as popular as Balmont and was less interested in holding the banner of Symbolism aloft. But when Polyakov threatened to revoke his subsidy for *Vesy* in the autumn of 1908, Bryusov fought to keep the journal alive; Polyakov relented and agreed to keep supporting *Vesy*, but only for one more year, which turned out indeed to be its last.¹³⁸ In 1908 Blok felt increasingly alone; he had broken with Bely and Sergey Solovyov and had estranged himself in various ways from others in the Symbolist camp. In his lecture on "The People and the Intelligentsia," for the Religious-Philosophical Society (November), he expressed his resigned belief in an irreconcilable split between educated Russians and the mass of Russian people in the country and suffering in urban areas. The lecture, which appeared in *Zolotoe Runo*

ALI
CINZAS
PONTO
ALTOT
PO?
RECONHECITO
DÁ O MÉRITO
??!

the following January, under the title "Russia and the Intelligentsia," was met with criticism by liberals and radicals, who took Blok to task for their efforts, and the police tried to stifle debate about the lecture.¹³⁹ Thus the title *Ashes* is appropriate for the end of this period in the Symbolist movement, which had started in May 1906, with the first real volleys in the polemic. At the same time, however, Symbolism in these thirty-two months had become the leading "school" of poetry in Russia. The verse collections of Balmont, Bryusov, Blok, Bely, Hippius, Sologub, and Ivanov represented a high point in Russian literature during the first years of the twentieth century.¹⁴⁰ There was in fact little competition from other groups, since many of the popular writers preferred prose, one exception being perhaps Bunin's poetry, though even he is better known for his prose. And the Symbolist poets were filling a rather large void, in a sense, but of course the fact that their poetry continues to be appreciated shows that there was lasting merit in it. In most cases, there would be continued individual growth in the careers of the Symbolists, but the movement itself was headed for a serious crisis in 1909-10.

CHULKOV 1908
VÉU DE MENOS ANARQUISMO

FIM DE VESY

BLOK 1908 =
ABISMO INTRANSPONÍVEL
INTELLECTUALS (P. 20) MASSAS

A. ...
 DO ... CRISE COM ...
 MOVIMENTO ...
 ...

**7. Years of Crisis and Transition:
 Art vs. World View
 1909-1910**

For the Symbolist movement, the years 1909 and 1910 were a time marked by crisis and change. A number of the movement's activities came to an end, and there were some new beginnings, but the endings and summations were more substantial, most especially the demise of both *Vesy* and *Zolotoe Runo* and the realignment of authors according to the evolution of their views on Symbolism. Various collections of poetry and articles about literature appeared, and Sologub was the first Symbolist to be accorded the honor of having his collected works printed, in twelve volumes, ten of which had been published by the end of 1910. There were a number of deaths in this short span of twenty-four months and a significant commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of Nikolay Gogol's birth, held in 1909. Among the new undertakings, we note Bely's first novel, *The Silver Dove*, the inception of a new and influential modernist journal, *Apollon* (*Apollo*), and the founding of a new Symbolist publishing house, Musaget. But the general trend in literature and culture, however, is away from the Symbolist movement, and the polemic in 1910 between Ivanov, Blok, and Bely, on the one side, defending Symbolism as a world view, and Bryusov on the other, claiming that it is only art, essentially signaled the end of Symbolism's reign as the preeminent literary movement.

A-FINS
 C. COMEÇOS

FIM DO SIMBOLISMO
 COMO MOV. PREEMINENTE

↑
 POLEMICA 1910

VISÃO DO MUNDO X JOGOS DE ARTE
 IVANOV BRYUSSOV
 BLOK
 BIELI

APOLLO

12 de Maio 1909

VESY
 I.
 BRYUSSOV

~~VESY ...
 ...
 ...~~

Vesy and Apollon

VESY OUT NO. MAR 1910

The closure of *Vesy* with its twelfth issue for 1909, which was actually distributed in March, 1910, had been anticipated over a year earlier. As mentioned in the last chapter, the publisher and nominal editor of the journal, Sergey Polyakov, was reluctant to continue his subsidy for *Vesy* but agreed in January 1909 to continue it for one more year. Bryusov had attempted to

gain sole editorial control over *Vesy*, but after noting how his demands had disturbed Polyakov, he lost interest in "his" journal. Bryusov even took the rather drastic measure of writing a letter to the editor, which appeared in the February issue of *Vesy* that year; in that letter, he announced that he could no longer be a leading contributor to the journal, he chided critics and others for considering it "Bryusov's journal," and he hoped that no one would hold him responsible for articles appearing after January 1909 that were not signed by him personally. He also asked people to stop sending him mail intended for *Vesy* and said that he would leave it unanswered.¹

The remaining active participants at *Vesy* did not get along well together, and much of the responsibility for managing *Vesy's* operations fell to Mikhail Likiardopulo, who antagonized most of the other writers. Balmont in fact broke publicly with *Vesy* and announced in May, in letters to the editors of newspapers, that he would not publish there any more. Ellis was accused (unfairly) of library theft in the summer of 1909, and the resulting "scandal" negatively affected the journal, though he was soon found innocent for lack of evidence. These problems, combined with the delays in printing the issues, helped to erode confidence in the journal, which showed up in the smaller number of subscribers and press runs (the last issue was printed in 1,300 copies).

Another factor that weakened *Vesy's* position as the leading modernist journal was a change at *Russkaya Mysl* (*Russian Thought*, 1880-1918 [in Russia, later continued as a newspaper in W. Europe]); efforts were made to make this already established, liberal journal, which featured politics and literature, a more widely read journal, and Symbolists were invited to participate actively. Merezhkovsky was appointed the chief of the literary section (though he in fact did not remain long in this position), and several of the regulars at *Vesy* — Hippius, Bely, Blok, Sologub, Sergey Solovyov, and others — took advantage of the opportunity to have their works printed in an organ with a larger circulation.³ Bryusov too used *Russkaya Mysl* as his new literary base and printed few of his works in the last issues of *Vesy*; in September of 1910, he was made literary editor at *Russkaya Mysl*, a position which he held until September of 1912. Though the Symbolists were able to reach a larger audience at *Russkaya Mysl*, this move also helped to weaken the movement because more of its "purity" was lost.

Another important shift that affected *Vesy's* general tone all through 1909 was the virtual cessation of hostilities with *Zolotoe Runo*. And though there was not a complete reconciliation between the *Vesy* staff and Georgy

VESEY
LIT.
MAR
1910

Z-RUNO
OCT NO.
ABR. 1910

BALMONT
SAI D. VESEY
MA 1909

VESEY
ULTIMO
NO.
1300 EX.
(NO. 7
BAIKO)

RUSSKAYA
MISL
PUBLICA
E DILU
SIMBOL

CESSAM
HOSTILII/S

VESEY X Z-RUNO
↳ N. P. PRECISO + "DEFENDER O SIMBOL?"

Chulkov, the need to "defend Symbolism" had been greatly diminished. In its own last year, *Zolotoe Runo* printed rather more art than literature, and there were on the whole relatively few disparaging comments about *Vesy*. The final, combined issue of *Zolotoe Runo* (Nos. 11-12) also appeared after a significant delay, no earlier than April 1910. In the closing statement, the accomplishments of *Zolotoe Runo* were reviewed: the main emphasis was on the support of the fine arts, mostly painting, and of young painters, plus the task of acquainting Russia with West European art. There was mention of the polemic about the true nature of Symbolism, and a victory for the religious-mystical aspect was claimed; Sologub was singled out for special praise, and the other writers named in connection with "achievements" were Balmont, Ivanov, Blok, and Chulkov. *Zolotoe Runo* felt that it "had accomplished its mission," that the new art was solid and independent.⁴ Thus this journal, ostensibly devoted to the fine arts, but frequently a source of discord and bad feelings, ended its existence at roughly the same time as *Vesy*.

These two journals were replaced, to a certain extent, by another, *Apollon*, which rather quickly became the leading modernist organ. It was published in Petersburg by Sergey Makovsky, an art historian and critic with an interest in literature, beginning in October 1909 and running through the end of 1917. Its early start in the fall of 1909 helped to increase the tendency for writers to look for places other than *Vesy* where their works could be printed. Initially, it seemed that *Apollon* would continue the best of the traditions established by *Mir Iskusstva* and *Vesy*, and in its programmatic statement, the editors advocated giving "all the new shoots of artistic thought" room to grow: "*Apollon* wishes to recognize as its own only the strict quest for beauty, only art that is free, well-ordered, clear, strong, and vital, only art that exists beyond the bounds of morbid spiritual disintegration and pseudo-innovation."

This statement is in sharp contrast, however, with the rather long proclamation, printed six months later in the last issue of *Vesy*, which essentially claimed victory for Symbolism, as seen in these excerpts:

Most of all *Vesy* sought to be the champion of a whole cycle of complex and organically connected ideas and experiences, even an entire world view, known under certain conditions as "Symbolism," "Modernism," "the new art," and even "Decadence." It has tried simultaneously to give direct examples of creativity and a critical review of all works that come into contact with this cycle.

APOLO
OUT 1909

FIM 1917

APOLO
O O ARTE
O BUSQUE
A BELEZA

CONTRA A
(PSEUDO) IN
VAGAN

X
VESEY
BASTIAO
DE UM
MOVIM

(Tudo um ciclo?)
VISA DO MUNDO

These two missions of *Vesy* (propagating new ideas and cultivating young, talented writers) have as a result created the "Symbolist movement" in Russia, organized it and changed Symbolism from the object of derision and scorn into an all-pervasive cultural phenomenon . . . all the literary journals (with only rare exceptions) have had to come to grips, in one way or another, with the cycle of ideas and images of Symbolism . . . ideas for which *Vesy* has fought. Not only the journals which arose later, like *Iskusstvo*, *Zolotoe Runo*, *Pereval*, *Apollon*, and publishing houses like Grif, Ory, Musaget, were undoubtedly influenced by the ideas accepted and inculcated into Russian society by *Vesy*, but even certain organs, initially (and principally) inimical to Symbolism, saw it was necessary to recognize this influence in some way . . .

The goal has been reached and eo ipso this medium serves no further purpose! Other goals will thrive!

We won! *The future will show everyone and justify us!*

If another, new path leads us or other seekers into different spheres and toward different goals, it will still start at the place where we now stand, where our path ended.⁶

The style of the address to *Vesy* readers is very similar to that of Ellis, who must have played a leading role in its composition, and its rather defensive tone hints that the "path" taken by *Apollon* was indeed more in tune with the current trends in Russian cultural life.⁷

Many of *Apollon's* early contributors were at one time associated with *Vesy*, though two of the younger writers, Mikhail Kuzmin and Nikolay Gumilyov, who were largely in the background at *Vesy*, became leaders of the new journal. Among the literary contributors listed in *Apollon's* first issue, we find: L. Andreev, Annensky, Ausländer, Balmont, Bryusov, Bunin, Voloshin, Cherubina de Gabriak (a fictitious but rather frequent collaborator, supposedly a young poetess), Hippus, Gumilyov, Ivanov, Kuzmin, Merezhkovsky, Sergey Solovyov, Sologub, Khodasevich and Chulkov.⁸ Noticeably absent from this list are Blok and Bely, both of whom indeed published little in *Apollon*. In general, Symbolist authors printed some significant pieces, but their role in the new journal was limited, particularly after 1910, when more space was devoted to art, at the expense of literature, and the main direction of *Apollon* coincided more and more closely with the views of the Acmeists, led by Gumilyov.

The main area of continuity from *Vesy* to *Apollon* was the interest shown in Western European arts and letters. This facet of *Vesy* had been particularly prominent in the years 1904-08, but with Bryusov's decreasing interest in 1909, a new preference for Russian culture and history emerged.

!!
BELY
VESY
1909
LITERAT
TENDEN
CLOSA
+ HAN
+ BLOK
BRITISH

The main instigator of this new tendency was Bely, whose influence on *Vesy* as the head of its theoretical section was substantial. In an important article in the journal's second and third issues that year, "The Present and Future of Russian Literature," he claimed that the inclination toward the West and art as an autonomous entity was obsolete: the tastes of the Russian Symbolists were more attuned to "old, tendentious Russian literature" and to the national culture.⁹ Bely thus joined forces with Ivanov and Blok and opposed Bryusov's emphasis on Western culture. The marked preference for Russian literature was evident in this last year in the articles devoted to the Gogol centennial in the April issue and the serialized printing of Bely's *Silver Dove*, a novel that also addresses the emptiness of Western ideas and their effect on the Russian intelligentsia. There was also stress on Symbolism's "mystical line," stimulated by Bely and Ellis, once again diametrically opposed to Bryusov's views. Though Bryusov was still acknowledged as the leader of Russian Symbolism, his views had changed, so that now he was out of step with the main body of Symbolists, who placed more emphasis on the religious, mystical and national aspects of Symbolism. Bryusov was in fact closer to what could be called the Acmeist point of view and would never again be a major advocate of Symbolism.

Musaget and Other Circles

Another result of *Vesy's* demise, which was accompanied by a decline in activity at the Skorpion publishing house from 1910 to its end in 1916, was the founding of the Musaget publishing house in Moscow in December of 1909. The name Musaget is derived from an epithet for Apollo (*mous + agetes*: leader of the Muses), but the choice of the name was apparently not connected to the name of the new journal. Musaget began its publishing activities, which included various literary and philosophical circles, an anthology, a journal, and a number of important books, in early 1910 and continued until the Revolution in 1917. Its founders — Bely, Ellis, and Emil Medtner, a writer and former censor who wrote about philosophy and music, intended that Musaget be a focal point for elaborating a theoretical basis for Symbolism, as well as printing works devoted to aesthetics and philosophy. Cooperation among the three leaders at Musaget was good in 1910, and at that time Bely was the most prominent of the three. He was the leader of the "academy" that formed around Musaget, especially a number of circles where discussions were held on topics ranging from Ger-

NOVAS
CAMINHOS
COMEGARAO
DE NOVE
PARAMOS

GUMILIOV
ERA BACK
VESY, VIROU
FRONT NA
APOLA

SEM
BIELI
BLOK
Pós-1910
+ ATENAS
PI PINTURA
E VISTA
ACMEISTA

BRYUSOV PROX PINTURA
ACMEISTA

IMPÓS
O SIMBOL?
COMO
FENÔMENO
CULTURAL
ARRABENTE
REVISTA
ERDEVO
CAPITULO
(II)

man Romanticism and philosophy to French Symbolism and Russian poetry. Bely, who led a "seminar" on rhythm in Russian poetic meter (especially iambic tetrameter), was regarded as the "soul" of this "academy" by the young Boris Pasternak, who was a participant in some of the Young Musaget activities.¹⁰

Other Symbolists also stepped in to fill some of the void left by Bryusov's "abdication" as the active leader of the movement. Ivanov was an important teacher for younger writers, and he was in fact well suited for this role because of his education. He helped to found a "Poetic Academy" in the fall of 1909 in Petersburg, at his Tower apartment, where he gave lectures on the theory of verse. By the spring of the following year, this "academy" had evolved into a formal organization, the Society of Adepts of the Artistic Word, which convened lectures and poetry evenings. The Society was closely associated with *Apollon* and was administered by those in charge of the journal; its main leaders were Ivanov, Makovsky, Blok, Kuzmin, Gumilyov, Annensky (until his death in November 1909), and Bryusov, when he was in the capital city.¹¹

One important development from this undertaking was the initial support given to the poets who would later become the leading Acmeists, especially Nikolay Gumilyov and Osip Mandelstam. Ivanov was in fact helpful toward these younger writers (though he did not always agree with their poetry), and it was later that he first coined the term Clarism (in August 1909), a name that was applied to Acmeism.¹² Ivanov and Annensky were also recognized as forerunners of this post-Symbolist movement, though Annensky has a better claim to this title.

Neither of these two poets, however, were as influential as Bryusov in his role as organizer and editor. It is a sign of how Symbolism developed as a movement that poets, who were mostly in their early to mid thirties, could be venerated as older masters, but indeed they were, and Symbolism had a record of solid achievement. It would be an exaggeration to claim that when Bryusov removed himself from consideration as the *maitre* of Symbolism, that the movement therefore came to an end. No, there were further developments in the history of Russian Symbolism, largely initiated by others, but with the closing of *Vesy* and the change in Bryusov's view of Symbolism itself, the movement had to face a major crisis, one from which it would never fully recover.

→
"TEMP
DE REUNIR
E COTEJAR
(←) ASPEC
TO S VÁRIOS
DO MOVIM^{to}

→
BIBLI:
A CAMPINA
VERDE^s
1905
GOGOL
RÚSSIA
COM
CAMPINA
CONCRUA
NO FUTURO
DA RÚSSIA

Collections, Essays

One of the important indications of a new milestone in the movement is the number of volumes printed in these two years that helped to sum up the accomplishments in a number of genres. In 1909 and most particularly in 1910, there was quite an outpouring of "collections": volumes of collected articles (often devoted to Symbolism), collected verse, and ten volumes of Sologub's collected works. There were also continuing activities in poetry and prose, but there was a feeling that the time had arrived for gathering and assessing various aspects of the movement. In regard to the collected essays devoted to Symbolism, it is worth noting that the representatives of the second wave (Ivanov, Bely, Ellis) were most active and were moving into leadership positions.

In 1910, Bely published two books of articles, collected from the periodicals where they first appeared in the previous eight years. Both *Symbolism*, which came out in May 1910, and *The Green Meadow* (July 1910) contain several articles that attempt to convey Bely's views about Symbolism; but because of the changing nature of his views on this topic, from his first article, "The Forms of Art" (1902), to the latest statements in 1910, it is difficult to give a coherent delineation of his views.¹³ In *Symbolism*, for example, he sees Symbolists standing on a threshold, making themselves ready to be transformed, in a religious sense, so that Symbolist theory can be changed into a new religious-philosophical teaching. His expectations, extreme to begin with, are not something that could be fulfilled, but his investigations of Russian poetry have proved to be more fruitful. In fact the scientific analysis of iambic tetrameter which he conducted provided a basis for later examinations of Russian versification by the Formalist school (though there have been some unconvincing denials, especially by Zhirmunsky), and by others abroad.¹⁴ JUL 1910

The articles in *The Green Meadow* are more accessible: they deal with Symbolism and with individual Russian authors: Gogol, Chekhov, Merezhkovsky, Sologub, Bryusov, and Balmont. The title essay, from early 1905, evokes the mood of Gogol's story "The Terrible Vengeance": Bely compares Russia to a "great, green meadow" and says, "I believe in Russia. It will be, we will be."¹⁵ He sees, in another essay devoted to the future of Russian literature, that literature will become like a religion and that Russian Symbolism offers, or at least should offer, a world view.¹⁶ Generally, however, the more valuable portions of these articles present surveys,

1902-10
BIBLI:
MUDANCA
DE VIDA
Q. ATE
DIFICULTA
RESUMIR

BIBLI
BASE P/
FORMALI
ITATI
(ANALISE
DO TEMA
METAF
LAMBDA

VISÃO DO
MUNDO

either of the current situation, or of authors' works, as interpreted by Bely.

Vyacheslav Ivanov's collection of essays *By the Stars*, had appeared the previous year, in July 1909.¹⁷ These "essays and aphorisms," originally published 1904-09, cover a rather broad range of interests, from poetry and drama to his favorites, Nietzsche and Dionysus, from Wagner to the crisis of individualism. Two fairly long essays cover Symbolism: "On the Merry Craft and Intelligent Merriment," which treats art as a trade, a craft that strives for universal applicability, and "Two Elements in Contemporary Symbolism."¹⁸ Of the two, the latter is the more significant; it was first delivered as a lecture and then printed in *Zolotoe Runo* in 1908.¹⁹ The two elements Ivanov perceives are realism in mimicry and idealism in transformations; he of course advocates the need to move from mundane reality to a "higher reality" by means of Symbolism. When he published this essay in *By the Stars*, he included two excurses, one on Verlaine and Huysmans, the other a reply to Bely's article "Symbolism and Contemporary Russian Art." In the second excursus, he was able to state his views succinctly, and again he calls for "universal art" and for moving from the Symbol to Myth. Annensky, for one, thought that Ivanov had constructed a system that was more like a burden than a guide, that Symbolism as explained by Ivanov was impossible for younger writers to apply to their works, and Annensky has a point.²⁰ Ivanov's thoughts on Symbolism are extremely erudite and well written, but they have little application to literature as practiced in the early twentieth century.

Ellis published his more concrete views on Symbolism in his 1910 book, *The Russian Symbolists*; the title was clearly chosen to echo the booklets published by Bryusov in 1894-95, at the very beginning of the movement.²¹ Ellis' book appeared the same month as Bely's *The Green Meadow* and was one of Musaget's first published books. Ellis had been a strong supporter of Bryusov as the leader of *Vesy* and of Symbolism itself, and he was somewhat disappointed by the change in the "master's" views. In *The Russian Symbolists*, he outlined the essence of Symbolism, then focused on three major representatives of the movement — Balmont, Bryusov, and Bely — and concluded with an essay on what he thought the future course of Symbolism should be. Though he acknowledged that Symbolism was facing a crisis, he believed that Symbolism still had a bright future in Russian literature. Ellis also provided a schematic diagram of Symbolism, which linked Balmont to Symbolism's past, its Romantic phase; Bryusov was its present, the "classical" Symbolism of correspon-

IVANOV
JUL 1909

(?)

SOBRE
BELY 1908,
IVANOV - JUL 1909

RESPONDE:
"ARTE UNIVER-
SAL" IR DO
SIMBOLOFI
O (MITO)

POSICOES DE JEN
EM 1910 - "PRES"
TOS DO SIMBOLOFI
(P. 152)

ELLIS
SIMBOLOFI
COMO
BELY,
BRYUSOV
BALMONT
(B. 1910)

dences and individualism; and Bely represented Symbolism's future, he would lead others in transforming ecstatic, clairvoyant Symbolism into a world view.²² Ellis felt that only Bely, and especially his book *Symbolism*, held any hope for Symbolism's further development. Ellis also found Ivanov's pronouncements more to his liking, now that peace had been made among the warring factions in the Symbolist camp, but he still attacked Sologub for solipsism and Blok for following a path already blazed, and beaten down, by Balmont. And though his analyses have some worthwhile insights, particularly in regard to Bely's leading role in the Symbolist movement, his claim that the pillar of fire that is Symbolism would never die out is perhaps too grandiose.²³

Merezhkovsky and Annensky also published volumes of collected essays in 1909-10, but neither author devoted any significant comments to Symbolism in these works. Merezhkovsky, who suffered a serious heart attack in the winter of 1908-09, was obliged to spend a good part of the next few years at health resorts in Western Europe. At this point he seems to have lost his interest in Symbolism and was not active in the movement. His book *Ailing Russia*, which appeared in June 1910, contains essays that deal often more with social issues than literary topics.²⁴ Annensky's *Second Book of Reflections* had appeared the previous April, and as in the first, his impressions about various authors were featured.²⁵ In the 1909 collection, he focused mostly on nineteenth century Russian authors (Lermontov, Turgenev, Dostoevsky), leading West European authors (Heine, Shakespeare, Ibsen), and devoted only one essay to a contemporary Russian author, Leonid Andreev.

However, Annensky's long essay, "On Contemporary Lyricism" printed in the first three issues of *Apollon* in 1909, contains a sizeable examination and analysis of Symbolist poetry.²⁶ He is particularly positive about Balmont, Bryusov, Sologub, and Ivanov, whom he considers accomplished poets, he covers over thirty poets in his survey, which is again another indication of summing up the Symbolist movement. Annensky also gives his own views on poetry. He speaks positively about Symbolism as an approach to art; he commends Symbolist poets, who realize "proudly and sorrowfully" that they are the link between the worlds of image and word.²⁷ Annensky is highly subjective in his assessments of poetic talent, however; this can be seen in his estimation of Balmont as the "brightest" star, though he acknowledged that Balmont had reached the end of one phase in his career and still had not begun another.²⁸ Blok and Bely are not given the

SIMBOL. COMO ENFOQUE ARTISTICO. LIGACAO EN-
TRE OS MUNDOS DA IMAGEM E DA PALAVRA

ELLIS: VITAE DE MUNDO
COMO OUTRA... SIMBOLFI
1909-10 MEREZHKOVSKY
IMPRESSO DE SIMBOLFI
CRISIS AND TRANSITION, 1909-1910

ANNENSKY'S
APPLI
CATIONS

JUL 1909

recognition due them, and Annensky chides Bely for being so multi-talented: "A richly gifted nature, . . . but sometimes I feel sorry for Andrey Bely. When does this person think, and when does he find time to burn and crush his creations?"²⁹ Annensky does devote space to female lyric poets, especially Hippius, of whom he writes: "Hippius is a poetess of the first rank. The whole fifteen-year history of our lyric modernism is in her works."³⁰

Verse

Hippius' *Collected Verse* (second volume) appeared in May 1910; it covers her poetry from 1905 through 1909.³¹ And a few months later Merezhkovsky's *Collected Verse, 1887-1910*, was published.³² These collections added to the sense of accomplishment and review that pervaded the Symbolist movement in 1909-10. Of the two, Merezhkovsky's has the least claim to attention; it contains forty-nine lyric poems, thirteen "legends" and long poems, as well as his autobiographical "Octaves from the Past." Hippius, as usual, produced a more noteworthy collection, and Bryusov's review of it is mostly filled with praise. He points to her mastery, her achievements in lyric poems about nature, and her verse on contemporary subjects, especially the 1905 Revolution. He does note, however, that although all her poems are successful, the ones dedicated to religious themes are the weakest and that generally she seemed to have reached the limits of her talent.³³

Annensky's *The Cypress Chest*, which had been printed in April of 1910, is an important event in Russian modernism and was recognized as such as soon as the book appeared.³⁴ In this volume, named for the small wooden chest where Annensky kept his notebooks in which he wrote his poetry, there is a strong tendency toward short cycles of verse, grouped by threes, "trefoils," twos, and "scattered leaves," i.e., individual poems. Most are included in the trefoils, and the themes of these cycles, as in his first volume, are again twilight, ennui, poppies, nightmares, mourning, though there are some optimistic trefoils. Bryusov's review in *Russkaya Mysl* was almost entirely positive; he called Annensky a true poet (high praise from Bryusov) and compared him to Verlaine, especially because of the freshness of his epithets and his avoidance of banality. Bryusov had a few reservations about Annensky's "capricious rhythms" and "incorrect style" but felt they were permissible in light of Annensky's talent.³⁵ N.

Gumilyov's review of the book in *Apollon* was even stronger in praising Annensky, and he pointed out that although Annensky was not closely associated with the Symbolist circle, "he still learned from the same teachers . . . and worked on the same problems. . . . He called *The Cypress Chest* a "catechism of contemporary sensitivity" and he felt that not only Russia but all of Europe had lost a great poet when Annensky died, six months before this book was published.³⁶

Other poets also published books of verse in 1909-10; two who completed collections of poetry were Balmont and Bryusov. Balmont's *Circle Dance of Time*, which came out in February 1909, was the tenth and last volume of his *Complete Collected Poems*, published by Skorpion.³⁷ It was one of his weakest efforts in this genre and had no subsequent editions, something rather unusual for Balmontian verse. Bryusov's *All Melodies*, which appeared in March 1909, was the third and final volume of his series *Paths and Crossroads*.³⁸ It maintained the names of cycles from his earlier collections, but it also indicated new directions in his poetry, especially toward greater concreteness, toward the view that "all art is derived from observing reality."³⁹ Sergey Solovyov's review noted the similarities between the verse of Bryusov and Pushkin's contemporaries (and Pushkin too); he also pointed to the algebraic formulation of the stanzas.⁴⁰ Of interest are a cycle of "sonatas," a cycle devoted to Sweden, which he had visited, and admired, in 1906, and poems related to travels to Italy and France.

Two other volumes of collected verse, both of which appeared in March 1910, are worth noting: Sergey Solovyov's *April* and Max Voloshin's *Poems MCM-MCMX*.⁴¹ Solovyov did not break free from his image as a "promising poet" and remained in the second rank. Blok thought that his second book of verse showed "pathological talent," but also wrote that the poem "Six Cities" was good.⁴² Bryusov felt Solovyov was still a "student" and not a master; he deemed the poems on historical figures weak and liked the lyrical eclogues better.⁴³ Max Voloshin, who is often referred to as a Symbolist poet, was in fact distancing himself from the movement at this time and was gaining prominence at *Apollon*, where he became one of the main contributors, especially in the area of art (he was a painter as well). The five sections in *Poems* display an interest in world history and ancient civilizations, and they reveal his own painterly nature, particularly in their vivid depictions of landscapes. Bryusov felt that Voloshin wrote well and compared the book to a little museum full of rarities; he noted the influence

BRIL
NOVOT
CYPRESS

nd 1919
ANNENSKI

of French poets (Voloshin also translated these poets) and said that *Poems* was a good guide for younger writers.⁴⁴

The tendency in Blok's poetry at this time was to focus more on Russia and its destiny, as seen in a major cycle of five poems, "On Kulikovo Field," printed in the tenth Shipovnik miscellany, in July 1909.⁴⁵ The poems are devoted to a major battle in 1380, when the Russians defeated the Mongols for the first time and began the process of striving for independence from them. Blok wrote the cycle from June to December 1908, weaving elements of ancient accounts of the battle at Kulikovo into his current perceptions about Russia. In the final poem, he predicts turbulence ahead for his native land, and of course his prediction came true. Several other Symbolists were very favorably impressed with this cycle and compared it to the heights he had reached in *Verses About the Beautiful Lady*.

Bely's *Ashes*, which also dealt with similar concerns, appeared in December 1908, and his third volume of verse, *The Urn*, was published in March 1909.⁴⁶ *The Urn* was more personal in nature and not as important as *Ashes* in his career as a poet. In his preface to *The Urn*, Bely explains the title he chose for the poems written in 1904-09: "I have gathered my own ashes . . . I have put my dead 'I' in *The Urn* and another, living 'I' awakened in me . . . The leitmotiv of this book is thoughts about the frailty of human nature, with its passions and outbursts."⁴⁷ There is more attention to form in *The Urn*, connected to his investigations into poetic rhythm, and the influence of Pushkin, Tyutchev, and other nineteenth century poets can be felt in these poems. The volume is dedicated to Bryusov and opens with a cycle of lyric poems about this "poet, magus, and creator." The cycle "Winter" deals effectively with his love for Lyubov, Blok, and the images of coldness, iciness, are related to the cruelty he perceived (cf. his story "The Mountain Princess," where Mrs. Blok is depicted as the princess of a snowy kingdom). The cycle "Philosophical Melancholy" is the best, and most personal, recounting the various disappointments he experienced in his study of philosophy, especially of Kant and the Neo-Kantians. Another tendency noticeable in *The Urn*, more in the preface than in the poems themselves, however, is Bely's increased interest in the occult. He mentions Rosicrucians in the preface, and in 1909 he was already displaying some interest in Theosophy. More about this topic will follow in subsequent chapters.

The Silver Dove

That same month, March 1909, Bely's first novel, *The Silver Dove*, began appearing in installments in *Vesy*; it was printed in full by the end of that year's run and appeared as a separate book in 1910.⁴⁸ Bely later claimed that the ideas for the novel were first developed in August of 1906, and that his short story "The Bush," written in May 1906, served as the testing ground for the novel.⁴⁹ The hero of *The Silver Dove* is Pyotr Daryalsky, an intellectual who resembles Bely in many key areas: he is attracted to mysticism, writes decadent poetry and is vaguely interested in social reform, that is, he wants to see conditions changed but does not know quite how to bring that about. He spends his summers in the country and falls in love with a young noblewoman, Katya (modeled after Anna, or Asya, Turgeneva, with whom he became acquainted in 1909 and who later became his first wife). Daryalsky and Katya become engaged, but he is soon drawn into a religious sect, the Doves, and leaves his intellectual milieu behind. He lives with a sensuous, pockmarked peasant woman, Matryona (based to a certain extent on Lyubov [Blok]); together they are supposed to beget a new messiah.⁵⁰ The Doves' sectarian rituals, especially ecstatic worship sessions, are attractive, and Daryalsky is not eager to break the spell. He believes he is experiencing "true Russia," something he is not able to do in the more Westernized parts of his homeland. When he fails to make Matryona pregnant, however, the sect, led by the carpenter Kudeyarov (modeled somewhat on Blok and Merezhkovsky), turns against him, and the novel ends with the last conversation of the sectarians as they murder him. J.D. Elsworth has summed up the novel's dilemma well:

Daryalsky comes to grief because he succumbs to the wrong kind of mysticism, to an intoxication with *theosophy*, which represents the oriental aspect of Russia; the occidental aspect is also shown in the decayed grandeur and cold rationalism which Daryalsky flees from. A synthesis of the two is called for, but is not yet found.⁵¹

The style of *The Silver Dove* owes much to Gogol (which Bely later acknowledged in his study of Gogol's craft), and Dostoevsky's influence can also be felt. Though Bely deals with Russia's unique position as an Eastern and Western nation, he is mostly depicting, again, the people who moved in Symbolist circles (including Ellis and Sergey Solovyov, as well as those mentioned above). J. Rice even claims that Daryalsky's death represents the "healing ritual murder of Russian Symbolism."⁵² And though the

BICLI

CERN MAR 1909

+ ATEVCAU

HERVA

FRUSTRATED

KANT

dark side of the Russian masses is graphically depicted, the intellectuals themselves fare no better.

Bely later considered the novel a successful effort, and it was in fact a major event in Russian literature in 1909-10.⁵³ Readers followed it closely in *Vesy*, and the separate edition in 1910 pushed Bely to the front ranks of Russian novelists in the early decades of this century. Blok stated publicly that it was a "work of genius," though he must have realized that he was one of the targets of Bely's satire.⁵⁴ Bryusov also praised *The Silver Dove*: "In this novel . . . he has revealed spontaneous feeling and an understanding of our reality, he's given us a series of striking pictures of contemporary Russia."⁵⁵ In this time of crisis and disagreement, Bryusov reiterated his earlier statement that Bely "is one of the most remarkable figures in contemporary literature."⁵⁶

Georgy Chulkov is another author who served as a prototype for a character in *The Silver Dove*, namely the mystical anarchist Chukholka. In 1909-10, Chulkov published two volumes of short stories, and though they are unremarkable, the reactions to these volumes in *Vesy* and *Zolotoe Runo* are worth noting. The *Vesy* review of the first collection, simply titled *Stories, Book One* (which appeared in February 1909), is unremittingly negative.⁵⁷ Chulkov is deemed as "unsuccessful in prose as he is in poetry, philosophy, and drama." The reviewer concludes by saying that such works are burned by high school students when they grow up, and he recommends that Chulkov do the same. The view in *Zolotoe Runo* in regard to *Stories, Book Two* (March 1910) has precisely the opposite tone.⁵⁸ Chulkov is praised for his originality; he is placed above other contemporary prose writers, such as Kuzmin and Ausländer; and he is said to remind readers of Knut Hamsun (!). In a shorter notice later in the same issue, some deficiencies are mentioned: his stories can seem too abstract, monotonous, and dry at times, but his language is praised, and his book is seen as an important part of contemporary truth.

Sologub

Sologub also published a collection of short stories in 1909, *A Book of Spells*, which appeared in April.⁵⁹ His fifth volume of stories contains ten pieces, all of which deal with spells, transformations, and searching.⁶⁰ The first two stories retell parables from the New Testament, about turning water into wine and about the wise virgins. One story, which was first

printed in 1898, "Hide and Seek," has twice been translated into English.⁶¹ It features a little girl who is inordinately fond of playing hide and seek with her mother. One of the servants warns the mother that this game is a bad omen, that it will lead to the girl's death, and not surprisingly the child soon dies. The mother is left on the brink of madness because she has lost her only, much beloved, child. *A Book of Spells* is one of Sologub's better efforts in this genre, and he again displays a strong interest in the lives of children.

As mentioned earlier, Sologub was the first Symbolist writer to have his collected works published.⁶² The Shipovnik publishing house in Petersburg began printing them in December 1909, and the twelve-volume set was completed by 1912. He was a well regarded author at that time and had written enough quality pieces to merit this new edition. The twelve volumes contain two novels (*Bad Dreams* and *The Petty Demon*), five of his dramas (*The Triumph of Death*, *The Gift of the Wise Bees*, *Loves*, *Vanka the Butler and the Page Jean*, and *Night Dances* (all in volume 8, published in 1910), a volume of tales and articles (No. 10, 1910), three volumes of verse, and five volumes of stories (fifty-six of these works). In all, it was quite an output for only a decade and a half (roughly speaking) of publishing activity.

In these years, Sologub was in fact one of the leading Russian writers, not only among readers who followed Symbolism, but in general; his dramas produced in 1909 and 1910 helped to increase his popularity. His *Vanka the Butler and the Page Jean* was first performed at Komissar-zhevskaya's theater in Petersburg in January 1909 and appeared that same year in a separate edition.⁶³ The play depicts amorous scenes involving French and Russian servants and their masters; it was revived in 1912, included a third romantic involvement, and was given a new title, *Amorous Intrigues Forever*, which proved extremely popular with Russian audiences.⁶⁴ In the summer of 1909, his play *Night Dances* was performed in Petersburg, and the rather daring staging featured scantily clad women dancing barefoot; this was inspired by the innovations of American dancer Isadora Duncan, whom Sologub very much admired. In March 1910, his stage version of *the Petty Demon* was performed in Moscow, and once again it was a hit with the public.

Blok's fourth major play, *The Song of Fate*, first published in the ninth Shipovnik miscellany in May 1909, suffered the opposite reaction.⁶⁵ When he first read it to Stanislavsky and others from the Moscow Art Theater in

TEATRO DE KOMISSAR ZHEVSKAYA - S. PETERSBURGO

May 1908, they were impressed, but not enough to stage the play. *The Song of Fate* is clearly based on events and people from Blok's life: the hero Hermann represents Blok himself, his wife Elena — Lyubov Blok, his lover Faina — Natalya Volokhova, and his friend — Georgy Chulkov. One reason why the Moscow Art Theater rejected the play (and Blok felt that this was the only theater for his play; thus, he refused to allow a production of it elsewhere) was that the characters were less like people than allegorical figures, and *The Song of Fate* is less successful than his earlier *Puppet Show*. The scenes in the play, besides depicting the love affairs of the characters and their prototypes, also deal with themes from his poetry, especially about Faina, the image of "free Russia," and "On Kulikovo Field."

REVIS
The Gogol Anniversary

VISTA ATÉ ENTÃO CA REALISTA E
COMENTADOR SOCIAL

In March and April 1909, Blok, Bryusov, Bely, and other Symbolists displayed their interest in native literature and their appreciation of Russian writing in a major way: on the occasion of Nikolay Gogol's 100th anniversary, they made statements that offered a new, more valid interpretation of the nineteenth century classic, who had previously been seen almost exclusively as a realist and social commentator. There were highly visible celebrations of this anniversary, though, perhaps appropriately, the actual events sometimes turned out differently from what had been expected. The opinions expressed by these three authors mentioned above, however, were significant and have enduring value. Blok's essay, "Gogol's Child," originally a public lecture delivered in March and printed in a newspaper immediately afterward, compares Gogol's literary productions to a mother giving birth to a child, and he makes a further comparison, saying that Russia is Gogol's child.⁶⁶

Vesy devoted much of its April 1909 issue to the anniversary; the essays by Bryusov and Bely included in it are longer and examine Gogol's style more closely. Bely was the Symbolist most drawn to Gogol, and his essay reveals his appreciation for the extremes of Gogol's style, his originality that defies categorization, and the fantastic and grotesque qualities of Gogol's supposed "realism."⁶⁷ Bely effectively uses Gogolian hyperbole to describe the author and concentrates most of all on Gogol's early, Ukrainian tales, most especially "The Terrible Vengeance," which in fact influenced a number of Bely's own works.

BRUSSOV:
"HIPERBOLE
FANTASIA
EXPO DA
VULGARII//

MAR 1909
BLOK =
"RUSSIA É
CRIA DE
GOGOL =

ABR 1909
BRUSSOV
E BELY (VESY)
ANÁLISE DO
ESTILO
BELY =
ORIGINALI//
QUALI//
FANTÁSTICA
E GROTESCA
HIPÉRBOLICA
GOGOLIANA

Bryusov's treatment, "Burned to Ashes," is characteristically more sober and workmanlike, but it also provides insights which may seem commonplace now, but were rather novel in that era.⁶⁸ Bryusov read his lecture at an anniversary celebration before printing it in the April issue of *Vesy*; it was then released as a separate booklet in 1909 and it had a second edition in 1910. As Bely had done, Bryusov also focused on Gogol's use of hyperbole, though in a more thorough and scholarly way. He claims, quite correctly, that Gogol is not a realist who writes about everyday life, as the textbooks had it, but a "dreamer, a person interested in fantasy... who incarnated only the ideal world of his own visions."⁶⁹ Bryusov cites a number of excellent examples to show precisely how unrealistic Gogol's characters, their actions, and their statements really are, and he praises Gogol for the marvelous way he exposes human vulgarity and banality. But he does note some shortcomings in Gogol's style: that he cannot depict women in a realistic way at all, and that his tendency to exaggerate was sometimes carried over into his own life, and thus Gogol was "burned to ashes" by this overwhelming urge.

Deaths

Four deaths in 1909-10 were important to the Symbolists and, in various ways, added to the perception of finality at this stage in the movement. The most significant was Annensky's death in November 1909, but the deaths of actress and theater director Vera Komissarzhevskaya in February 1910, artist Mikhail (Vrubel) in April 1910, and the international giant, Leo Tolstoy, in November of that year, also made a strong impression. Tolstoy of course was not close to the Symbolist movement, but he was revered by several of its representatives, especially Bely and Merezhkovsky; his death was not unexpected, but it did have great resonance. More relevant to the modernist cause were the losses of Komissarzhevskaya, who had actively supported Symbolist drama, most particularly works by Sologub and Blok; and Vrubel the leading Symbolist painter at that time. Both Blok and Bryusov considered him a genius, and Vrubel did a charcoal portrait of Bryusov in 1906, without doubt one of the best portrayals of the author and one of the more famous works by Vrubel.

Annensky's premature death was more tragic, however, from the point of view of modernist literature. He was in fact only beginning to acquire the fame he deserved in the few short months before his death. He had agreed

to contribute substantially to the new journal *Apollon*, but after writing some pieces for it, he died of heart failure in Petersburg, shortly before he was to give a public lecture on a literary topic. His death was prominently noted in *Apollon*, which devoted several articles to his career in the fourth issue (1910). As is the case with other Russian writers who met their ends unexpectedly and before their time, though, the early conclusion of Annensky's life has indeed helped to increase the appreciation of his works and has made him a relatively "safe" writer in the official view in the USSR.

The Polemic About Symbolism

If 1909 had been an active year, which witnessed the winding down of *Vesy* and *Zolotoe Runo* and the inception of both *Apollon* and *Musaget*, 1910 was a less busy year, using this criterion. One of the main events in 1910 for the Symbolist movement was the polemic, conducted for the most part on the pages of *Apollon*, about the true nature of Symbolism. These statements revealed irreconcilable differences among the major Symbolists, and the appearance of several "necrologues" of *Vesy* in the early issues of *Apollon* demonstrated a clear trend away from the excesses of Symbolism. And despite subsequent attempts to continue or revive the movement, particularly by second wave members, fewer and fewer people were willing to support its existence.

Ivanov's lecture, "The Precepts of Symbolism," delivered in March 1910 (and printed in *Apollon*, No. 8), is a fundamental statement of his beliefs in this area.⁷⁰ He begins by remarking on the impossibility of expressing oneself in an honest way; thus symbols and myths are the only means available for self-expression. He examines dualism (as so many times before): "This same dualism of day and night, of the world of perceptible 'phenomena' and the world of supersensible revelations . . . We call them Apollo and Dionysus."⁷¹ He favors the Dionysian elements in life but advocates a combination of the two, and he feels that Symbolist poetry is capable of doing this; he sees the Symbolist movement as a reminiscence about ancient religious practice, a time when priests interpreted the secret world for the masses. For Ivanov, Symbolism is a return to that religious language, mythological speech. And he relies on Pushkin as an authority who can support the view that a poet is a theurgist, a religious organizer of life, an interpreter and consolidator of the divine connection of that which

POETA COMO TEURGO, "ORGANIZADOR RELIGIOSO DA VIDA" (// & LEE!!)

IVANOV
"NÃO É APE-
NAS ARTE"

REJEIÇÃO
AO SIMBOLISMO

TXT
ANTHOLOGY
IVANOV
MAR 1910

SIMBOLISMO
COMO
RETORNO À
FUNÇÃO ANTIGA
DA LINGUAGEM
MÍTICA
E DA MÍTICA

exists."⁷² He feels the Western influence on Russian Symbolism was shallow, compared with the native influences, and he names several precursors to the movement, especially Fet, Vl. Solovyov, Pushkin, Gogol, and Lermontov. He acknowledges that Symbolism has not achieved its goals but feels it has some lasting achievements, which have provided a basis for the cultural changes he foresees for the future. Towards the end of the essay, he mentions the leading Russian Symbolists: Hippius, Sologub, Blok, Bely, Dobrolyubov (!), and Merezhkovsky. In terms of the polemic (and in fact one of the basic disagreements), the important line from this essay is: It follows that Symbolism neither wanted to be nor could be 'only art'.⁷³

Blok's statement, "On the Present Status of Russian Symbolism," also first delivered as a lecture in April 1910 and published in the same issue of *Apollon* as Ivanov's "Precepts," later became Blok's most widely recognized essay.⁷⁴ It marked a "return" of sorts to the Symbolist canon, which Blok had seemed to stray from (as some saw it) after the publication of *Verses about the Beautiful Lady*. In this essay, Blok firmly identifies himself with Symbolism; though it is sometimes claimed (based on Blok's own entries in his diary) that he did not want to make this public affirmation of his Symbolist leanings, the opposite claim (i.e., that he considered himself primarily a Symbolist poet) is at least as valid. In a statement about the death of Vera Komissarzhevskaya, written at about the same time, he wrote quite confidently about the Symbolist reaction to her death, using such expressions as "we Symbolists."⁷⁵

In "On the Present Status," Blok replied to Ivanov's lecture and claimed that he was illustrating Ivanov's formulations, "painting illustrations for his text." Blok does focus somewhat more on the recent history of the Symbolist movement and notes the steps Symbolists had followed as theurgists, from the freedom of the magical world to transformation by the real world to the creation of art. He also gives a capsule history of his own experiences and the evolution of the feminine image in his poetry and dramas, from the Beautiful Lady to the Stranger. He professes not to know if there is a future for Symbolism, but he counsels "learning again from the world and that infant who still lives in our burned soul."⁷⁶

Bryusov was obviously displeased with both of these lectures/essays and wrote a rather acerbic reply, "About 'Servile Speech,' in Defense of Poetry," which *Apollon* printed in the ninth issue.⁷⁷ He chided Ivanov and Blok for holding the view that poetry is somehow more than simply poetry, and he most definitely declines the title of theurgist, applied by Ivanov and

BLOK
ABR 1910
TXT ANTHOL
RETORNO
AO CANON
SIMBOLISTAS

"APRENDER
UMA VEZ
DO MUNDO"

BRYUSOV
APOLLON 9
(1910)

REJEIÇÃO
TÍTULO DE
TEURGO

Blok to Symbolist poets. Bryusov focuses particularly on the Symbolist movement in Russia and Western Europe, on Blok's claim that poetry is "servile speech," that is, in a religious sense, a view that Bryusov found objectionable. He defends poetry and states unequivocally "Symbolism wanted to be and always was only art," and "Symbolism is a method of art realized in that school, which received the name 'Symbolist.'" In this article, Bryusov is quite opposed to associating Symbolism with religion, but he has no fears that the calls made by Ivanov and Blok will have an effect on the future development of literature. This fundamental disagreement reveals, once again, the difficulty mentioned in the first chapter of this book of defining Russian Symbolism in a succinct way, for if the main adherents have such a radically different perception, how can later interpreters find the task any easier?

Bely was, in turn, disappointed by Bryusov's statements and his own reply was printed in the eleventh issue of *Apollon*: "A Wreath or a Crown."⁷⁸ He supports the views expressed by both Ivanov and Blok and correctly points out how these views are similar to Bryusov's own statements in his 1905 essay "A Holy Sacrifice." Bryusov indeed had changed his position in just five years, from a view that advocated shaping a poet's life to serve art, to one where extraneous considerations did not matter at all, "it's only art." Bely defines Ibsen and Nietzsche as Symbolists, leaders of the new era in the Symbolist interpretation of life and says that "Symbolism is a phenomenon of worldwide historical significance."⁷⁹ And, using a quotation from Bryusov's own poetry for his title and main theme, Bely asks, rhetorically, if Bryusov has not exchanged the priestly crown of the poet for a lowly laurel wreath.

The importance of this polemic is indicated by the amount of attention it received; by the time Bely's comments were printed in the fall of 1910, the polemic had been taken up by the general press, and other writers felt compelled to print their own views.⁸⁰ One who did so was Merezhkovsky, who took issue with the views of Ivanov and Blok, mostly the latter.⁸¹ Merezhkovsky, writing from the viewpoint of "religious society," attacked Blok for his supposed "treason" against the 1905 revolution and accused both of "Satanic pride," especially for claiming to represent Russia. There followed an exchange of letters between Blok and Merezhkovsky, and Blok wrote an "open letter" to him, that was printed only after Blok's death.⁸² In this "open letter" Blok said that Merezhkovsky had no business denouncing the Symbolist school, to which Merezhkovsky himself belonged. In

BRYUSSOV

SIMB
JEMPRES FOI
SO' ARTISTE

OUTONDA
1910

BIELI
APOLLONMI
1910

CONTRA BRYUSSOV
RESSATA
BRYUSSOV-1905

COROA
SACERDOTAL
DO POSTA
COROA DE
LOUROS
VIL/VULGAR/
BARATA

MEREZH-
KOVSKY
CONTRA
IVANOV &
BLOK
"ORGULHO
SATANICO"
A PRETENSOM
REPRESENTAR A
RUSSIA)

November 1910, Blok decided to sever relations with the Merezhkovskys, but this break did not last long, and they were all back on good terms again in early 1911.

The exchange of opinions in *Apollon* did have a positive result, however; because Blok had come out so strongly in favor of Symbolism, Bely wrote to renew their friendship after a break of two years. In his letter, written in September 1910, he apologized for his part in the rupture, and Blok was quite pleased to continue their friendship, though relations would never again be the same as before the "Petersburg drama." Around the same time Sergey Solovyov also renewed his relationship with Blok, largely because of the article in *Apollon*.

But despite the newly found solidarity among the main representatives of Symbolism as it was now constituted, and the concerted efforts of the Musaget house to hold aloft the banner of Symbolism, the trend in Russian literature and culture at the time was away from Symbolism. Evidence for this can be found in articles printed in early issues of *Apollon* that either commented directly on *Vesy* or on topics dear to Symbolists. An additional factor in the decreasing amount of support for the Symbolist movement is the tendency for important Symbolist authors to leave Russia in 1909-10, expressing a desire to escape from the oppressiveness of their native land and the crisis atmosphere in the movement itself. Bryusov and Blok, for example, both traveled to Western Europe: Bryusov in the summer and fall — Germany, Switzerland, France, and Belgium — and Blok in April through June — Italy and Germany. Bely left Russia for several months at the end of 1910, during which time he visited countries around the Mediterranean; his departure, a rather crucial time, not long after the founding of Musaget and certainly did not help to make this enterprise a more permanent fixture in Russian literature.

The Apollonian approach to Symbolism deserves some attention because some of the statements made around the time of *Vesy's* demise have lasting value, in terms of the individual writers' careers, and in showing how eager some were to denigrate the Symbolist movement. The first of these articles, and the most influential, was Kuzmin's "On Beautiful Clarity," subtitled "Notes on Prose," published in *Apollon* in January 1910.⁸³ This former contributor to *Vesy* emphasized clarity in literature; he advised other authors to write logically, to match form with content, to make themselves understandable, to be precise, and not to mix genres together. He introduced the term he preferred for this beautiful clarity — Clarism, this

BIELI
RESSATA
BLOK

TENDE
NCIA
GERAL
E
AWAY
FROM
SIMB.

KUZMIN = CLARISMO
(BASE PRO ACRISMISMO (1912-14))

name, and the essay too, later went into the theoretical apparatus of the Acmeist movement, which was especially active 1912-14.⁸⁴ In that same issue of *Apollon*, Voloshin claimed, in an article about Henri de Régnier, that he and others had "outlived" Symbolism and were moving towards greater realism in their works.⁸⁵

Chulkov's necrologue of *Vesy*, however, was a direct attack on that journal, and the opinions expressed are highly colored by personal feelings.⁸⁶ The original intention was for *Apollon* to print several statements about various aspects of *Vesy* after the appearance of its last issue, and three were printed, though Chulkov's appeared first and had the most sting. He dwelled primarily on the role of Bryusov in the journal, saying that it was very good (and essentially monolithic) when he was directing it, especially 1904-06, but he claims that Bryusov "left" the journal in 1906 and that it fell into an hysterical campaign against him and others and eventually foundered because of Bryusov's supposed early "abandonment." Chulkov names as the leading authors at *Vesy* only Balmont, Blok, V. Ivanov, Merezhkovsky, and Sologub (not Bely or any others), but goes on to say that they all published better works in *Mir Iskusstva*, *Novyi Put*, and *Voprosy Zhizni*. This pronouncement drew a strong protest from former *Vesy* writers, who sent a collective letter to the editor of *Apollon* in May 1910, signed by Bryusov, Bely, Ellis, and others.⁸⁷ *Apollon* declined to print it and instead invited Kuzmin and Gumilyov to write about prose and poetry, respectively, that had appeared in *Vesy*; these necrologues appeared in the ninth issue in 1910. Gumilyov meanwhile had written a short article, "The Life of Verse," which had appeared in the same issue with Chulkov's unkind words.⁸⁸ Gumilyov praises some Symbolist poets, particularly Bryusov, Ivanov, and Annensky, and at the end of the article he notes the passing of *Vesy* in a quite positive way, but his final conclusion is that "we cannot call ourselves Symbolists" now, that this was a fact, not an appeal or a wish.⁸⁹

Gumilyov's generalization is at once too broad (some authors considered themselves Symbolists even after the Revolution) and appropriate for his generation, sometimes called the "third wave." There was still demonstrable support for Symbolism as a concept and as an approach to art, but less for the movement as a thriving, developing entity; those actively involved in Symbolism were better as writers and speakers than as organizers and editors. And the kind of attack on *Apollon* mounted by Zolotoe Runo in the fall of 1909, saying that *Apollon* was not needed, that it was

foreign to the new aspirations in Russian art, was incorrect. Despite the urgings of Ivanov, Blok, Bely, and Ellis, and the efforts of the Musaget regulars, the future of Symbolism at the end of 1910 looked less secure than it had at the beginning of 1909. Without a major journal of their own, the Symbolists were obliged to publish in periodicals that did not always suit their views, and the movement lost more of its already weak and crumbling unity. The final official words of *Vesy* are in fact quite appropriate: there were new paths that led to other spheres and other goals, but they began where *Vesy*'s path had ended. And the end of the Symbolist movement was now coming into sight in 1910; the signals were clear and unmistakable.

1910: AVISTA-SE O
FIM DO SIMB.

NECROLOGIOS
APOLLON SOBRE
VESY (TRANSIÇÃO
P) ACMEÍSMO)

GUMILYOV
APOLLON - 9 1910
NÃO PODEMOS NOS
CHAMAR DE SIMBOLISTAS
AGORA

MBS 6 U | SKORPION
GRIF
MUSAGET

J. PETER | SIRIN

p. 159 = ANNENSKY MESTRE DOS ACMEISTAS
BRIUSSOV
(IVANOV)

ELLIS - MUSAGET (ESTER) - STEINER - MAS
JE DESINTERESSA POR ELAS NA FIM 1913

8. The Beginning of the Decline 1911-1914

There are no more Symbolisms; -
I'm alone, I answer for myself.
— Aleksandr Blok, Feb. 1913

During the four years after the crisis of Symbolism, it became increasingly clear that the movement had lost its place as the favored poetical "school," especially in 1912-14. Two new movements had gained prominence: Acmeism, with its stress on craftsmanship and clarity (at least in its pronouncements and slogans), and Futurism, particularly in its efforts to shock the general public and to renovate the language. There was an attempt by representatives of the Second Wave to revive, or maintain, Symbolism as an active movement, but this effort cannot be termed successful. Individual Symbolists continued, however, to produce important works, in all three of the major genres, most especially in prose, and they gained even more acceptance as established writers and bearers of culture. During this period, we also see a tendency to sum up, to put an end to various activities: the final anthologies of Skorpion and Grif appear, the collected works of various Symbolists are published, and the start of The Great War in 1914 helped mark the end of various efforts to elevate aesthetics and mysticism, not only by the Symbolists, but by modernist writers in Pre-Revolutionary Russia.

ACMEISMO
(ARTESATO E
CLAREZA)
FUTURISMO
(CHOCQUE E
RENOVACAO)

SIMBOLISTAS COMO
EXECUTORES ESTAB-
LECIDOS E DETENTO-
RES DE CULTURA

1914: FIM DE
VARIOS ESFORÇOS A)
AVANÇAR / ELEVAR A ESTÉTICA E O
MÍSTICO

Acmeism "MAU PÓS-SIMBOLISTA" (p. 159)

As several scholars have already pointed out, the Acmeist movement was not a "reaction to Symbolism," despite the energetic attempts of Nikolay Gumilyov and Osip Mandelstam (two of the leading adherents of this movement) to distinguish it from its "father."¹ Rather, the development of

this poetic style, of "taste," as Mandelstam described it, was a "continuation and reform" of Symbolism.² And it can indeed be claimed, with solid justification, that because of the changes that had already taken place in the Symbolists' own thoughts about literature, society, and world view, that the "existence of a [separate] 'Acmeist school,' in the sense of a literary group with a coherent and well-defined poetic theory, is in this instance highly doubtful."³

These comments, however, are not intended to denigrate the accomplishments of the poets associated with Acmeism. Indeed, Anna Akhmatova and Mandelstam are two of the most important Russian poets of this century, and both of these respected contributors to Russian culture retained fond memories of their links to the short-lived and somewhat loosely organized Acmeist tendency.

Acmeism has been properly viewed as a Post-Symbolist movement which mirrored developments in French Post-Symbolism during the first two decades of this century.⁴ The main members of the Russian group, in addition to Gumilyov, a poet, sometimes essayist, and adventuresome traveler whose career was cut short by a firing squad in 1921 (for his openly anti-Bolshevik activities), were Akhmatova, who is probably the greatest Russian poetess, and Mandelstam, whose poetry and prose are still gaining a wider international reputation. Also active were such lesser known figures as Sergey Gorodetsky, who had previously been a supporter of Symbolist ideas, Vladimir Narbut, and Mikhail Zenkevich, the latter two minor poets.⁵ These writers, and a few others, maintained an organization, called the Poets' Guild (or Workshop), and constituted a "band of young poets led by a self-proclaimed rebel [Gumilyov] against an older, established literary generation": they had a journal to rally around (Apollon . . .); manifestoes . . .; a publishing venture (Giperborej [Hyperborean]); meetings and studio exercises.⁶ But, as one scholar has pointed out, "the group was amorphous," "the manifestoes were carelessly written," "the organization consisted of willful individualists who interpreted the manifestoes to suit themselves."⁷ Of course the same could be said of the Symbolist authors, particularly around the beginning of the 1910s.

The proclaimed emphasis in Acmeism was on "craftsmanship in art, and concreteness of imagery, as opposed to Symbolist abstraction," and this rather extreme partiality led Mandelstam to claim, in his essay "On the Nature of the Word," to revere "the stern and strict craftsman, Maestro Salieri," more than the "idealist-dreamer Mozart."⁸ And in his "Morning of

ACMEISMO
ESTILO/ESTO
CONTINUAÇÃO
E REFORMA DO
SIMB?

VALORES
DOS SIMB?

PO'S-SIMB,
FRANÇES

GUMILYOV
FUZILADO 1921
(ANTI-BOLCHEVIA)
AKHMATOVA
MANDELSTAM

GRUPO
FRAUXO
FRÁGIL

ARTESANATO
CONCRETUDE
DOS IMAGENS

Acmeism," he waxes enthusiastic about "A = A being such a beautiful poetic theme."⁹ Yet, despite the emphasis on "beautiful clarity," a slogan developed by Mikhail Kuzmin (another of the accompanying, chameleon-like figures of the modernist movements), and the supposed rejection of Symbolist teachings, many of Gumilyov's themes are strikingly similar to Balmont's (masculinity, travels to exotic lands, themes from world history), and some of his later writings were deemed mystical.¹⁰ Mandelstam's verse and prose fiction, moreover, are less comprehensible and precise than much of the Symbolists' output. Here one could say Acmeist strivings for vivid imagery and excellence in the poetic craft are not that distant from precepts offered by Symbolists a few years earlier.

While it is true that Acmeist tastes owed much to French Post-Symbolist poets (including direct contacts in Paris, not only through books), and to Annensky, who was a teacher at the school where Gumilyov and Akhmatova studied, Bryusov should clearly be acknowledged as a mentor, in particular because of his aesthetic views, as should Ivanov, whose famous Tower meetings provided the locus for much of the early organizational and literary activity of the Acmeists. Thus it seems somewhat disingenuous to avow, as Gumilyov did in 1913, that "Symbolist works are no longer appearing, and if they appear, they are extremely weak, even from the point of view of Symbolism," while the Symbolists themselves, as we will see later in this chapter, were in fact productive and needed to make no apologies about the quality of their works during this period.¹¹ Gumilyov does give a nod to Symbolism as "his" movement's "worthy father," but his enthusiasm for praise here is visibly lacking.¹²

Lest this analysis of the Acmeist movement sound too negative, it should be stated that the poetic creations of its adherents, especially of Akhmatova and Mandelstam, far outweigh the theoretical claims for the movement. As is the case with Symbolism, however, the most important standard of evaluation is the quality of work produced, and the verse published by Acmeists in 1912-14, when they were most active as a "school," and later, can easily stand alongside the best Russian poetry of this century, and thus it is no criticism if this phenomenon is called a "worthy" successor, an exemplary Post-Symbolist movement.

KUZMIN=
BELA
CLAREZA

GUMILYOV
BALMONT
(TEMAS)

MANDELSTA
MEMS PRE-
CISA Q OS
JIMB)

ANNENSKY
MESTRE
DOS
ACMEISTAS

BRYUSOV
L-
VSOES
ESPETKAS

POESIA
SUPERIOR
A TEORIA
ACMEISTA

MOV. PO'S-SIMBOLISTA

FUTURISTAS — SIMBOLISTAS

DECADÊNCIA
COMO CONTRA-CULTURA

BEGINNING OF THE DECLINE, 1911-1914

Futurism

A competing literary and artistic movement that shared the spotlight in the years between the demise of *Vesy* and the Revolution, Russian Futurism, also has its roots in Symbolist circles. In some ways Futurism continues tendencies initiated by its "parent," which ran counter to the tenets expressed by Acmeists. Similarly to these poets just described above, the Futurists developed manifestoes critical of Symbolist shortcomings, yet at the same time the debt to their forerunners and trailblazers in this area should not be forgotten. In fact the leading authority on Russian Futurism has noted: "individual futurists and whole futurist groups made their debuts as imitators of Symbolism or as neosymbolists (or neodecadents)." ¹³

In this case, however, the independence of Futurism as a Post-Symbolist entity is much more solid than was true of the Acmeists. There was, first of all, strong influence from the area of painting, especially avant-garde art in Russia, France, and Germany, on the development of Futurist groups, and most of the members were also accomplished artists. ¹⁴ The educational and cultural backgrounds of these new "young Turks," moreover, were rather different from those of the Symbolists and Acmeists; they were generally speaking not classically educated and had much more immediate, politically restless, and in some cases, peasant and working class, concerns.

The importance of adhering to radically new manifestoes, however, should not be overestimated. In the most famous of them, for example, the *Slap in the Face of Public Taste* (formulated in December 1912), the signatories attacked not only "Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, etc., etc.," and called for them to be "thrown overboard from the ship of modernity," they also pointedly denounced Balmont's "perfumed lechery" and attacked his masculinity, along with Bryusov's courage, and consigned the Bloks, Sologub and others to a "cottage on a river." ¹⁵ Though these audacious Futurists did achieve the effect they desired, both here and in other forums, of "shocking the bourgeoisie," they did not seriously undermine the literary establishment, which by now of course included Symbolist authors. Note, however, that neither Bely nor Ivanov are called to task in this famous manifesto, in part because these two authors shared some of the Futurists' interests in "increasing the poet's vocabulary with neologisms," and Ivanov, in addition, had given instruction and encouragement to a prominent Futurist, Velimir Khlebnikov. ¹⁶ Other notable members of this movement

included Vladimir Mayakovsky, Boris Pasternak, Vasily Kruchyonykh, and David and Nikolay Burlyuk.

Generally speaking, the Futurists had much more organizational diversity and verve than their immediate rivals, the Acmeists, and their movement lasted, in various incorporations, through the mid-1920s. ¹⁷ Furthermore, because of the desire to move away from "common sense and good taste," which are clearly attributable to Acmeist tenets, we can see the Futurists carrying on functions that had originally been allocated to Symbolists, especially in the areas of revitalizing culture, not just language and poetry, praising decadence (decades later, this phenomenon could have been described as creating an alternative or counter culture), and scaling new heights of investigation and experience. Ultimately, these efforts led to some interesting cul-de-sacs, such as Kruchyonykh's "trans-rational" language, which made his poetry largely incomprehensible, poetic forms that were so innovative that they could not be continued (reinforced concrete poems, for instance), and to the invention of miscellany titles that sound like the name of punk rock groups in the 1980s: *Croaked Moon, Canned Rat, Shattered Skulls, Eagles Over the Abyss*, etc.

As a literary and cultural phenomenon, however, Futurism was more significant than Acmeism; it evoked more sympathy from the Symbolists, particularly from Blok who disliked the Acmeists and felt that a number of Futurist authors were important. ¹⁸ And although many Futurists cut their teeth on the "classics" of Russian Symbolism (B. Pasternak, for example, had idolized Bely and Blok), the Futurists as a whole took off in some new directions, creating their often anti-aesthetic values, and aligning their efforts more toward current technology, to avant-garde art, and later to supporting political revolution in Russia. ¹⁹

Second Wave Revival

Symbolism continued of course as an element of Russian literary culture, even after the end of its active phase. The Musaget publishing house was now the major source of Symbolist publications, and it sponsored two new journals, which had a more philosophical, rather than purely literary, thrust and which were not exclusively Symbolist in orientation. These periodicals were: *Trudy i Dni* [*The Works and Days (of Musaget)*] and *Logos*. *Logos*, an "International Annual [devoted to] the Philosophy of Culture," which was published between 1910-14, has less relevance to this study than *Trudy*

CONTRA BOM SENSO E BOM GUSTO (X ACMEISMO) FUNÇÃO DA SINAL DA SIMBOLIS!!

MARKOV: FUT, COME RAM COM IMITADORE DA SIMBOLIS INFLUÊNCIA DA PINTURA (71) SIMBOLIS?

FORMAÇÃO N-CLÁSSICA E PREOCUPAÇÕES MUITO MAIS IMEDIATAS, POLÍTICAMENTE RESTLESS, E LIGADAS AO CAMPESINATO E AOS SOVIETOS

CONTRA BALMONT SOLOGUB E BLOK = PATCHA NO RIO

IVANOV E BIELI POV- PADOS = NEOCLOSISMOS

IVANOV KHLEBNIKOV

NOMES PUNKS !!

BO FE TA DA [1912]

?

SIMBOLIS: COMO VISÃO DE MUNDO

i Dni, which can be seen as a largely unsuccessful effort to maintain one branch of Symbolism, the trend toward seeing it as an all-embracing world view, especially as previously expressed by Ellis in his 1910 book and by Ivanov, Blok, and Bely in their 1910 articles in *Apollon*.

The main editors and leaders of *Trudy i Dni* in its infancy were Andrey Bely and his friend Emil Medtner, the editor of *Musaget* and an authority on music who also wrote under the pseudonym Wolfing. Two others closely associated with the leadership of this journal were Blok and Ivanov. Looking at the list of contributors, one can see many names already familiar from earlier Symbolist publications, such as Bryusov, Margarita Sabashnikova, Sergey Solovyov, Ellis, and others (including B. N. Bugaev!), but other, newer names also appear, and these contributors, such as Fyodor Stepun, and Gustav Shpet, had philosophical interests that were not identical with Symbolist precepts.

Trudy i Dni began as a "Bi-monthly of the Musaget Publishing House," in January-February of 1912, with a programmatically composed by (Ivanov) excerpts of which are offered here to give an idea of its main directions:²⁰

Trudy i Dni posits a dual goal for itself. The first, *special* purpose of the journal is to facilitate the disclosure and affirmation of the principles of genuine Symbolism in the field of artistic creativity.

Its other more *general* purpose is to serve as the interpreter of the ideological connection that joins the multi-faceted efforts of groups of artists and thinkers, united under the banner of *Musaget*.

In accordance with this goal, the journal consists of two parts.

The object of the first section is the development and deepening of those artistic quests which [. . .] distinguish themselves as the *Symbolist* school of art, in the true meaning of this word. . .

Since *Musaget* affirms [. . .] systematically grouping conclusions of artistic self-determination, philosophical, historic, and religious thought — the second section of *Trudy i Dni* is an organ of synthesizing review and summarizing [. . .]

[. . .] Symbolism properly understood and realized, is promoted [. . .] by the faithfulness of its likeness, the correspondence of its symbolic image to the eternal realities of universal Truth.²¹

Note that Symbolism is emphasized as a constituent element of the journal's program, yet simply promoting the Russian Symbolist movement is not seen as the primary goal. The broader focus on interpreting and carrying forward culture occupies a higher place, and this choice is consistent

PROGRAMA
E DE
IVANOV

TXT
ANTHOLOGY

BELY
+ ELLIS
STEINER
X
MEDTNER

SIMB. N. E.
PAUTA UNICA
27 ONDA
1910-12

with the development of views among the members of the second wave of the Symbolist movement in 1910-12.

Even though one of the basic goals of the new journal was to "continue the ideological line of *Vesy*," the emphasis in the two journals was quite different.²² *Trudy i Dni* was much more Germanophilic (as opposed to Bryusov's interest in French literature and culture) and more heavily "universal" than the earlier periodical devoted to modernist literature and current topics. Blok, in fact, contributed only one article to the journal, even though he was supposed to be one of the most prominent contributors; he was attracted by the ideas behind Musaget's new enterprise, but soon found that it represented the "pseudo-face of a non-existent school," that it was weak in its "terribly clever" appeals to "immortal values."²³ And Bryusov, who was included in the original list of contributors, never placed an article there.

Indeed there was not much editorial or ideological unity, leaving the journal's pages to be filled often with the works of lesser known members of the Young Musaget (e.g., A.S. Petrovsky, S.N. Durylin, A.A. Sidorov, S.P. Bobrov, N.P. Kiselev) and the *Logos* regulars (S.G. Gessen, F.A. Stepun, B.V. Yakovenko), even though the journal had been originally created to provide a forum for works by Bely and Ivanov.²⁴ These two authors did indeed contribute, and Ivanov's article "Thoughts on Symbolism" in the first issue and Bely's articles on Symbolism in the first several issues are of some note, but it was also soon announced, in the combined 4th-5th issue, that Bely was "compelled to give up his editorial duties at *Trudy i Dni*," since he was remaining in Western Europe, and after this double issue in 1912, Bely's contributions were rare and not terribly significant.²⁵

The other main source of material and editorial guidance, therefore, became Emil Medtner, whose views were initially quite favorable toward Bely and the idea of continuing the Symbolist movement in this form. But once Bely (as Ellis before him) had become acquainted with Rudolf Steiner, an Austrian who was then a leader of Theosophy, Medtner became increasingly exasperated with his former co-editor. He apparently felt that these two "apostates" would try to make his journal a mouthpiece for Steiner's views, whereas he wished to keep the journal "true to Kant, Goethe, Wagner."²⁶ This disagreement about Steiner, and the latter's views of Goethe in particular, later led to sharp polemics and the exchange of book-length mutual accusations.²⁷

POLEMICA STEINER

Even during 1912, though, it was clear that the journal was not going to succeed. Medtner and Ivanov also spent considerable time abroad; there was not enough good material; the circle of contributors and readers was too limited. It was no surprise, then, that 1912 was the only active year of existence for *Trudy i Dni*, with numbers 1 through 6 appearing fairly regularly. It was announced by Medtner in Nos. 4-5 that starting in 1913 the journal would no longer come out as a bi-monthly, but that the format would still be similar.²⁸

That turned out not to be the case, however, because the combined 1st and 2nd issue for 1913 developed a radically different structure; two sections were devoted to *Goetheana* and *Wagneriana*, and they were later joined by one on *Danteana*. In addition, we find articles by younger Russians and even a German, Arthur Luther, later a historian of Russian literature. The subsequent issue abandoned all pretense of regular, even annual, publication; this issue came out in 1914 and was called the "seventh booklet," since six "booklets" had appeared previously (five in 1912, containing six issues, and one in 1913, with the combined 1st and 2nd issues).²⁹ And after a two-year pause, the final, eighth booklet brought to a close this journal's activity in 1916. By then, of course, no one felt that it was needed at all; Bely even compared it to a "total corpse."³⁰

The various actors in *Trudy i Dni* assigned blame to different cohorts, especially in private correspondence.³¹ But as the leading scholar of this journal has pointed out, the reasons for its demise can be found in the:

total obsolescence of the Symbolist school's creative possibilities, in the gradual loss of its active and stimulating role in the literary process [. . .] In the 1910s [the Symbolist movement] had reached the stage of disintegration, and the story of *Trudy i Dni* serves as a convincing affirmation of this.³²

This is not the last journal of Symbolist authors, though, as we will see in the final chapter of this study.

Summations

Another indication of the sun setting on the Symbolist movement can be seen in the various miscellanies and anthologies that were published during these four years. There were anniversary issues of *Severnnye Tsvety* and of the Grif publishing house, as well as new entries by houses that had started up later. And the appearance of the first book about a prominent Symbolist

author (Sologub, in this case) demonstrates both the importance of summing up his career and the level of readership involved; having a collection of articles, contributed by Bely, Hippius, Shestov, Ivanov, Chulkov, and many others, printed in 1911 showed that at least one Symbolist had "arrived."³³

The mood of attending the wake of a formerly flourishing movement is quite evident in the preface to the fifth and last *Severnnye Tsvety* anthology, which appeared in July of 1911, almost exactly ten years after the first one in April, 1901.³⁴ Half of this preface is given over to reminding the readers of the first issue of this miscellany and its purpose, especially to "unite the writers of quite varied points of view." The second half repeats the same statements, pointing to the "friendship, rather than complete congruence of literary views," that has reunited the same authors. Finally, Bryusov asserts, quite correctly, that the contributors share a "belief in the lofty significance of art" and continue "to serve precisely this 'higher art'." And this valediction conveys what remained one of the main goals of the Symbolist movement: to focus attention on art and its meaning rather than using it as a vehicle for social commentary.

The miscellany itself contains a mixture of poetry, stories, and articles, in addition to portions of an unfinished novel by Bryusov, *The Seven Earthly Temptations*. Bryusov and Hippius are best represented, with one selection each of poetry and prose. Early adherents to the movement are there, including Balmont (an essay), Baltrushaitis (poems), but other names are noticeably absent (Blok, Bely, Ivanov), and later arrivals to the camp are prominent: Kuzmin (a short comedy), Max Voloshin (an article), and Gumilyov (poetry). The preface is appropriate in its expressions, but the quality of the book is certainly not as high as in similar previous undertakings. With the exception of Bely, who compared the miscellany favorably to other contemporary collections by young writers,³⁵ the reviews were generally negative.

The fourth and final Grif miscellany, which came out in January 1914, recounted, with even more joyous satisfaction, the gains made in the development of its activity as a publishing house and the "victory" of the new art.³⁶ In contrast to the last appearance of *Severnnye Tsvety*, Grif's swan song contains poems and stories by every author who had been associated with it, in addition to a listing of all Grif publications and a bibliography of the author's separate works, accompanied by a photograph of each and a facsimile of his or her signature. Prominent Symbolists included Annensky,

Bely, Blok, Bryusov, Balmont, Ivanov, Sologub, along with twenty-two others. Although the preface ends with the editor smugly anticipating "the second decade of activity," this simply did not come to pass, and although this anniversary edition is valuable as a historical document in Russian literature of this period, it was not an example of current trends, rather an indicator of the movement's past existence and essentially the end of Grif as an active publisher.

Other similar anthologies appeared around this time as well; two that deserve some brief mention are those of the Musaget and Altsiona houses, especially since these collections are designed primarily to feature works by Symbolists.³⁷ The Musaget offering, which came out in June 1911, not long before *Severnye Tsvety*, contains poems by 30 authors and includes the work of leading non-Symbolists, such as Vladislav Khodasevich, Vladimir Solovyov, and Marina Tsvetaeva, though the bulk of contributions belongs to Symbolists and Post-Symbolists such as Gumilyov. Bryusov did not participate because he found the *Anthology* a "feast that left one with a headache."³⁸ And Blok felt it was a "totally unnecessary book," even though his works were printed there.³⁹ The first and only miscellany of the Altsiona publishing house (a branch of Musaget), which appeared in March 1914, featured mostly stories and articles by younger and less well known authors, in addition to a story by Bryusov and a comedy by Kuzmin.

A more important series of anthologies also ended the same month in Petersburg; the miscellanies published by the Sirin house, named after a mythological Russian bird, owned and operated by a wealthy businessman, Mikhail Tereshchenko, which was founded December 1912, to compete with the Moscow houses, including *Skorpion*, *Grif*, and *Musaget*.⁴⁰ And in sharp contrast to the miscellanies just described, Sirin's three offerings (October and December 1913, and March 1914), provided a forum for new and important work, such as poetry by Blok, Sologub, Hippus, Bryusov, and Ivanov, plus Blok's drama, *The Rose and the Cross*, a story by Sologub, "Miss Liza," and, most importantly, Bely's major novel *Petersburg*. Furthermore, these books, with their press runs of 8,100, garnered a great deal of (not always positive) attention, particularly in regard to Bely's novel. But the publishing house was liquidated in the spring of 1915, because of the war, and this Petersburg enterprise for good works by Symbolists ground to a rather rapid halt.

Comings and Goings

These four years were a fairly active period for travel to and from Western Europe, and a number of Symbolist authors were abroad the year the war broke out. Also during this time, important visitors arrived from Western Europe to meet with their Russian admirers and survey the cultural scene in the early 1910s. Among these visitors we note Filippo T. Marinetti, a leading Italian Futurist, who met with his Russian counterparts in 1914; one cannot, however, characterize meetings between the Italian and the Russian Futurists as a perfect love-feast. The Russians felt they owed no homage, and indeed one cannot speak of much direct influence in either direction here; and Marinetti's appearance in Russia was more sensationalistic than substantial.⁴¹

But one of the most important visits, in terms of the Symbolists in Russia, was that of the Belgian poet whom Bryusov very much admired and whose works he translated, Émile Verhaeren. Bryusov had been corresponding with Verhaeren regularly since 1906, and in response to Bryusov's invitation, Verhaeren paid a visit to Petersburg and Moscow in November-December, 1913. Unlike Marinetti, whose intention had been to shock and arouse the "barbarians" with his unorthodox views, Verhaeren was quite impressed by the audiences which attended his lectures and readings of his verse, and with the level of interest in his works there. Moreover, his tour, which lasted three weeks, was followed closely in the daily press, and it became an "event, not only in Russian literature, but also in Verhaeren's own life."⁴²

After his return from Russia, he wrote articles and poems about his experience there; these were quickly translated by Bryusov for publication in newspapers. And this successful visit once again shows an undeniably important feature of the Symbolist movement, the efforts to increase cultural exchange with the West, particularly by bringing it (in the form of a tour here) to the Russian public.

Bryusov, who had made all the arrangements for Verhaeren's trip, had not traveled himself much in 1911-14, in part because of his activity as head of the literary section of *Russkaya Mysl*, but after his resignation from that post in 1912, because of strong differences with its publisher, Peter Struve, he had more time for other activities. One diversion was a visit to Verhaeren in Callou-qui-Bique in August, 1913, and another turned out to be a serious attraction to a young poet and protégée, Nadezhda G. Lvova,

MARINETTI:
"MUITA
INFLUÊNCIA"
NOS RUSSOS

БИЕЛИ:
PETERSBURGO
8100
EXPLAIES

who committed suicide in November 1913. Bryusov blamed himself for her death and was quite distraught, especially since it coincided precisely with the start of Verhaeren's stay in Petersburg. ~~And this tragic event was reflected in his poetry of the time.~~

Yet another important arrival was that of Konstantin Balmont to Russia, after a seven-year exile; the occasion was the three-hundredth anniversary of the Romanov dynasty in 1913. Balmont, however, had not been languishing in lonely isolation during this time; he had in fact made an extended round-the-world tour in February-December 1912, visiting such places as India, Australia, New Zealand, and Polynesia. He was granted permission to return to his homeland in February 1913, and by May he had arrived triumphant in Moscow, where he was met by the press and a delegation of his colleagues led by Bryusov. Numerous receptions were given in his honor, and it was clear that his reputation had been enhanced during, and by, his absence. But he did not prefer staying at home for long, and in 1914 he made two journeys to Paris, the second of which caused him to be abroad when the war started, and he was obliged to make his way back to Russia by a northerly route, arriving in May, 1915.⁴³

More numerous than the arrivals during this period, nevertheless, were the departures, some for short periods, others for more extended stays. Blok and Sologub, for example, both toured Western Europe with their wives, Sologub in 1914 and Blok in 1911 and again in 1913. The Merezhkovskys as a rule spent their winters, between Christmas and Easter, in Western Europe, frequently Paris, and like Balmont they also returned to Russia because of the war. Ivanov was also gone much of 1912; he and his third wife Vera had gone to Switzerland; they spent the summer in Savoy, in connection with her pregnancy, and they then wintered in Rome, so that he could do more research on Dionysus for his book on that Greek deity. And when they returned, in the fall of 1913, Ivanov chose to live in Moscow rather than return to Petersburg, but he was just as active in literary and intellectual life in the former capital, especially at meetings of the Religious-Philosophical Society.

The departures from Russia involving Ellis, Nina Petrovskaya, and Bely are of more significance, however. Ellis had been one of the mainstays of Musaget and of *Trudy i Dni*, to which he sent "Letters from Munich" in 1912 (Nos. 4-5 and 6), and he moved permanently to Switzerland in 1913, in part because of his attraction to Rudolf Steiner and his teachings. Though this predilection was over by late 1913, Ellis remained there, active

BALMONT
VOLTA APÓS
7 ANOS (!)
DE EXÍLIO!
MAI 1913
"TRIUNFO"

BIELI
FORA DA
RUSSIA
1912-16
DIFIC.
FINANCEIRA
EMPRESTI
MÁS DE
BLOK

SE JUN-
TA A
STEINER

IVANOV
LIVRO
SOBRE
DIONÍSIO

ELLIS
MUDA
P/ JUÍCA
DEFINITIVAMENTE
1913 (STEINER)

BIELI-STEINER = MEIO 1912 →

as a scholar of Russian literature, and published a number of books in German. Nina Petrovskaya, who had been living in Western Europe on a fairly regular basis since 1908, because of "complex and purely intimate reasons" connected with personal relationships, decided in November of 1911 to move to Western Europe for the rest of her life.⁴⁴ Although she did publish some other works, including stories, translations, and articles, it is clear that, away from her homeland, she essentially disappeared from Russian literature after this time.⁴⁵

Andrey Bely's departure in March 1912, was somewhat different from the two just mentioned; he went to Brussels with Asya Turgeneva, who was already considered his wife (they were officially married in Bern in March 1914), and though he stayed in Western Europe for over four years before returning to his homeland, he remained a Russian writer.⁴⁶ He had in fact left for one of the same reasons that had caused Dostoevsky to spend so much time abroad — financial exigency.

The year before, he and Asya had been in Italy, Africa, and the Holy Land in early 1911, and he later published his *Travel Notes* about his impressions during this journey.⁴⁷ When they returned in May 1911, the financial situation worsened, and since he was trying to complete work on *Petersburg*, and living with various friends and relatives, the generous loans provided by Blok at the time were a godsend that allowed them to return to Belgium.

While in Brussels they found themselves mysteriously attracted to Rudolf Steiner (both already knew about him from friends); they traveled to Cologne to meet him, and by the summer of 1912 they had decided to join his entourage. They followed him on lecture tours around Northern Europe and eventually settled with him in Switzerland, where he soon founded the Anthroposophical Society, in February 1913, and where they helped in the construction of the first Goetheanum, then called the Johannesbau, the center of the worldwide Anthroposophical movement in Dornach. As has been noted by Bely scholars, the Russian author felt he had found a father figure in Steiner, both in the filial and religious sense.⁴⁸ Bely, moreover, believed that the most important experiences of his life had taken place in Norway in October 1913, in connection with Steiner's lectures in Oslo and Bergen, when Bely experienced an epiphany that led him to feel he was a new Christ who had been "adopted" by Steiner, his Teacher and Father.⁴⁹ Though there have been some conflicting statements on the subject, it is clear that Bely nourished a lifelong reverence for "The

BIELI NOVO CRISTO! STEINER MEU PAI

Doctor," which caused some misunderstandings and even breaks with former friends in the Symbolist movement.⁵⁰

As the situation with the journals, miscellanies, and various travels shows, the Symbolists at this point are going their own ways. They are for the most part established, recognized figures on the literary scene, active in journals with broader appeal, such as *Russkaya Mysl*; and there is, consequently, no real need to rely on the movement and its organs for support and normal publication. As Blok noted in a letter to Bely (6 June 1911):

The time for miscellanies is over . . . The *talented* movement called "the new art" is finished; i.e., the minor tributaries have given themselves and filled the ancient, eternal stream, in whatever way they could. Now there is only good and bad. art and non-art.⁵¹

This process is in fact quite normal in any avant-garde movement which seeks to rejuvenate art or literature: the most creative members soon join the mainstream (to continue Blok's metaphor) because of their talent, and in the course of the Russian Symbolist movement there was a good deal of talent; the former members continued to produce important works and remain creative, despite Gumilyov's unfounded claim. As one scholar notes: "The leading Symbolists promised new achievements; many of their first-rate creations were still ahead."⁵²

Prose

In the area of Symbolist prose during this period, we see that Andrey Bely has clearly moved to the forefront, and not only among modernist writers, but as one of the most important authors in Russia. After the flurry of activity in 1909-10, when his first novel and collections of essays had come out, two more works helped to solidify his status as a significant contributor to Russian literature in this century: his collection of essays and reviews called *Arabesques* and his most important novel, indeed one of the outstanding works in this genre in 20th century literature, *Petersburg*.⁵³

Thus the statement that new achievements were still ahead after the cessation of the movement as an active force is quite applicable in this case.

Arabesques, which takes its name from a somewhat similar collection published by Gogol in 1835, was brought out by Musaget in March 1911.⁵⁴

This work is like Bely's two previous collections, *Symbolism* and *The Green*

Meadow, in that it brings together essays on Symbolism and other literary and philosophical topics, but there is much greater variety in this volume. The essays and occasional pieces are grouped into four categories: 1) "The Creativity of Life," which comprises essays on figures important to Bely (Dostoevsky, Ibsen, Nietzsche) and topics which had interested him in activities with *Novyi Put*, *Vesy*, and other periodicals (e.g., drama and language); 2) "Symbolism and Modern Life," three essays devoted to Ibsen, art, and Symbolism as a world view; 3) "A Literary Diary," a collection of twenty-eight periodical pieces united under the rubric "On the Divide"; 4) and finally, articles and reviews of books about his contemporaries, including Solovyov, Chekhov, Merezhkovsky, Hippus, Bryusov, Blok, Ivanov, and others. Most of the pieces had previously appeared, but a few were new, such as his important work on "The Crisis of Conscience and Henrik Ibsen."⁵⁵ Though the emphasis in this particular publication is retrospective, Bely's message was unchanged: only through Symbolism could literature and art reach its highest form of expression.

Petersburg 1911-13-14-16

More has been written about Bely's number one novel than about any other prose work of the Silver Age, and Vladimir Nabokov's comment about its place alongside Joyce's *Ulysses*, Proust's *Remembrance of Time Past*, and Kafka's *The Metamorphosis* as one of the four most important works of the twentieth century has been quoted often enough in the secondary literature, particularly to convince non-Russian speaking readers of the work's significance.⁵⁶ Readers of this study are of course encouraged to acquaint themselves with this work, which is in fact central to the story of Symbolism in Russia and does deserve a wider readership.⁵⁷

Not only is the novel itself a complex, thoroughly challenging work that can both charm and vex readers, the history of its publication is multifaceted as well.⁵⁸ Briefly stated, one can see several stages in its development: the initial work began in 1911, intended for publication in *Russkaya Mysl*; after Struve's refusal to print it there (purportedly because it was too long), Bely agreed to have it printed as a book in Yaroslavl, but this deal also fell through. He was finally able to bring it out in the newly founded Sirin anthologies in 1913-14, and the reaction was at first rather negative, in

large part because of the novel's extreme originality. It appeared for a second time in April of 1916 in book form (taken directly from the earlier Sirin

LIFE ->
- CREATION
??

BIELI
|
JOYCE
|

1913-14

1-25 REAPES
NEGATIVE
("RIG WOLLA EXTREMA")

edition). After the Revolution Bely cut the novel substantially for a new edition that appeared in Berlin in 1922 and changes were again introduced for the Moscow editions in 1928 and 1935. In more recent years, *Petersburg* has been reprinted twice, with the full version of the work in all its variants, plus copious commentary and contextual material, finally appearing in 1981.⁵⁹

Bely had originally conceived his second novel as a sequel to *The Silver Dove*, in line with his hope to create a trilogy on the theme of East or West, but by the time he had completed it in 1913, a separate work had now taken shape, with rather few references to the previous novel. *Petersburg* is similar to Bely's 1908 story "Adam," in that both pieces deal with generational and political conflict in Russia, between young people involved in revolutionary activities (the novel is set in September 1905) and older people with their considerable interests in maintaining the established order.⁶⁰ There are many other contributing ideas and Dostoevsky-like doubles in the novel, plus subplots involving the notion of police provocation, allusions to nineteenth century Russian prose works, most especially Gogol's story "The Overcoat" and Dostoevsky's novels *The Devils* and *The Brothers Karamazov*. Throughout there is reinforcement for the view of Peter's capital as an unreal city and Russia as a special (elusive) nation.

It is difficult to give a comprehensive summary of the novel, but in brief one could say that the main plot line charts the torturous path Nikolay Apollonovich Ableukhov follows in his agreement to plant a bomb at his home to kill his own father. Apollon Apollonovich, a senator and representative of conservatism. After a fair amount of vacillating, hesitant actions, and the workings of his conscience, the bomb finally explodes, harmlessly in the sense that no one is physically injured, and pointlessly, since the senator had already retired, because of his son's rather insane behavior. Ultimately, the two antagonists are reconciled before the senator's death.

The ~~style~~ and philosophical arguments raised are in fact as important as the story line, however, as are the biographical and geographic underpinnings. For it is worth recalling Bely's unhappy experiences with residents of the imperial capital, such as Lyubov Blok and Georgy Chulkov. A good example of some focal points in this work can be seen in the Prologue, where the whole notion of Petersburg's ominous unreality is presented with Bely's characteristic humor and Muscovite bias, accompanied by Gogolian commentary on the Russian nation:

"INACESSIVEL PELO TEMA E PELA EXECUÇÃO" (// JOYCE!)

CONFLITO GERACIONAL E POLITICO

BOMBA CONTRA O PAI! APOLO!

ESTILO E ARGUMENTOS FILOSOFICOS TAMBEM IMPORTANTES QUANTO AO ENREDO

IRREALIDADE DE PETERSBURG

Your excellencies [. . .]

What is our Russian Empire?

Our Russian Empire is a geographical entity, which means: a part of a certain planet[. . .]

Our Russian Empire consists of a multitude of cities:

The primary capital city is Moscow; and Kiev is the mother of Russian cities.

Petersburg, or Saint Petersburg, or Pieter (which are the same), genuinely belongs to the Russian Empire [. . .]

On the basis of these judgments, Nevsky Prospekt is a Petersburg Prospekt [. . .]

Nevsky is straight (this is just between us), because it's a European avenue; every European avenue is not just a street, but (as I've already said) an avenue that is European, because ... h'm ...

Because Nevsky Prospekt is a straight street.

Nevsky Prospekt is a street not without significance in this, non-Russian — capital — city. The other Russian cities therefore are no more than wooden clumps of tiny houses.

If you continue to affirm that most absurd legend of the existence of Moscow's existence with a million and a half in population, then you have to admit that Moscow is the capital, for only capitals have a population of one and a half million . . . And according to this legend, it turns out that Petersburg is not the capital.

If Petersburg is not the capital, then there is no Petersburg. It only seems to exist.

But it does turn up — on maps . . . energetically announcing that it does exist; from that point a whole swarm of printed books flows out . . .⁶¹

Initial reaction to Bely's magnum opus was largely negative; often the reviewers were unable to deal with the novel's originality and they tried to dismiss it as: "uneven." "wandering in a dark, impenetrable forest."⁶² It was not until the first separate edition in April 1916 that critics gave it the serious attention it deserved, noting that Bely had reached the "highest point of his creative path," calling it "perhaps the most significant Russian novel since the times of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy," while still correctly acknowledging that the "novel for now is not accessible to everyone, not only because of its theme, but also its execution."⁶³ But, as with the example of ~~the author~~ with whom Bely is now so often compared, the efforts made to comprehend his works, and this novel most of all, are rewarded.

REACAOES 1913-14 NEGATIVAS
REACAOES 1916 POSITIVAS

MAS BATEADA NA HISTORIA (GOGOL?)

Merezhkovsky and Hippius also devoted a great portion of these years to prose compositions. Hippius, for example, printed her "Life Description in 33 Chapters," *The Devil's Doll*, in *Russkaya Mysl* in 1911 (separate edition in May of that year).⁶⁴ In it she deals with the reaction that followed the 1905 revolution in the character of one person, Yury Dvoekurov, who (according to her preface) represents contemporary life, especially the stagnation and religious emptiness of the revolutionaries of the time. Her sixth collection of stories, *Lunar Ants*, which appeared in February of 1912, also deals with contemporary topics, such as the lack of faith among young Russians, the devil, and suicide.⁶⁵ Her other novel of this period, *Roman the Tsarevich, The Story of an Inception*, which first appeared on the pages of *Russkaya Mysl* in 1912 (separate edition in 1913), is devoted to another contemporary type, who supposedly represents what is vile in contemporary man, as opposed to the positive example of "the simple Russian's faith in God."⁶⁶ As noted previously, the negative view of Russian revolutionaries here again shows Hippius's unabashed admiration for Dostoevsky's novel *The Devils*.

Merezhkovsky's novel about Alexander I was printed alongside Hippius' novel in *Russkaya Mysl*, and it came out in book form in February of 1913.⁶⁷ As was the case with his wife's prose, Merezhkovsky sought to reflect on current revolutionary thinking, but he placed the action in 1825, during the time of the Decembrist uprising against the Russian imperial family, between the death of Alexander I and the beginning of Nicholas I's reign. The novel was not well received, and indeed it suffers from an excess of schematic linkages, and the "determination to make everything conform to . . . his preconceptions," which led to historical distortions.⁶⁸

Merezhkovsky was accorded much recognition during this period, however, as seen in the publications of his *Complete Works* in 1911-13 (17 volumes) and again in 1914 (24 volumes).⁶⁹ The latter collection, which is the most complete set of his works, includes not only all of the novels, literary studies, essays, short stories, translations, and poems he had printed up to that time, there are also notes and commentary to the volumes, which give such information as place of first publication, later editions (if any), and translations of these works into other languages. Thus the *Complete Works*, which have been reprinted in more recent years, is a valuable source of information about this author, especially since it contains, generally speaking, his best and most important writings.

HIPPIUS

HIPPIUS

ROMANCE

SOBRE A

VIDA

CONTEMPORANEA

E

OS REVOLUCIONARIOS

CRITICA

CETICISMO

RELIGIOSO

DO HOMEM

CONTEMPORANEO

ADMIRAO

DOSTOEVSKI

COS O 14 BOSTON

Bryusov too was occupied with prose but his second novel, *The Altar of Victory*, could not be called a success, particularly against the background of his own first novel and Bely's masterpiece.⁷⁰ For this novel, Bryusov chose a rather distant epoch, Rome in the early Christian era. As he explained in his preface to the separate edition (1913), Bryusov wished to expose the "daily life and morals of the fourth century," and one can see that his main intention here is not so much fictional as historical, for the pages of historical commentary and the bibliography appended to the book may contain details "not without interest to the reader," but these sometimes "have no direct bearing on the action of the story."⁷¹

Bryusov had been interested in "Aurea Roma" since his university years, and in this novel he wanted to counter the accepted view of Rome in this era as a declining power; he instead saw it as the pinnacle of "Roman cultural maturity," when there was no need for further conquests, rather there was time to enjoy the fruits of what had already been accomplished.⁷² But he also recognized that Rome was destined to be overcome by German barbarians and by Christian culture, just as he felt Russian and European culture had reached a zenith and was then awaiting the onslaught of Asians and Africans, who would destroy the culture.

The novel is set in 382-383, and as in *The Fiery Angel*, the story features a love triangle, here involving the hero, Decimus Junius Norbanus, and two women: Rea, who represents the simple people and the future of culture (including the heresies popular at the time), and Hesperia, who is linked to earthly, wealthy Roman pleasure. The Altar of Victory, where Roman "Senators had offered incense since the reign of Augustus," and from which Bryusov had taken his title, was restored by pagans in 383 in an attempt to reassert their supremacy, but the effort was crushed by the church.⁷³ Bryusov had in fact hoped to continue his story in a sequel to this novel, to be called *Jupiter Dethroned*, set in 393-394, but this work was never finished, and the fragments were printed only after his death.⁷⁴

Bryusov's second collection of stories and dramatic scenes, *Nights and Days*, appeared around the same time, April, 1913, but in contrast to his narrow, historical focus on Rome, the stories show a diversity of interests, from "A Nighttime Journey," an "episode" which develops some satanic themes from *The Fiery Angel*, to "In Fifteen Years," a "story of our contemporary," to "For Myself or For Another Woman," which is set in Interlaken and deals with female psychology.⁷⁵ But without question the most famous of these stories is "The Last Pages of a Woman's Diary," a longish

BRYUSOV

ROMA

ANTIGA

(1)

BRYUSOV'S PERIOD
FICELAND

story taken from a trial of a woman convicted of having her husband murdered for insurance benefits. The story, told from the woman's point of view, shocked the censors, but most critics and reviewers agreed that it represents a high point in Bryusov's creativity, that it showed "realism in the highest sense of the word."⁷⁶

As noted by scholars, "many of the heroine's features Bryusov later used in the creation of his literary mystification," Nelli's Poems, With a Dedication by Valery Bryusov, which Skorpion brought out in November of 1913; "the poems in it, written by an imagined poetess [with some connections to Nadezhda Lvova], contain descriptions of meetings and love affairs from this story."⁷⁷ And though Bryusov specifically denied he was the book's author (the title is ambiguous in Russian), everyone knew of the "open secret."⁷⁸ Apparently it was a way for him to write verse in a manner rather unlike his own and from the point of view of a society lady.

BRYUSOV
LIVRO DE
POEMAS
ASSINADO
P/1 MULHER

As we can see, then, Bryusov also focused his efforts on poetry during this period, and another significant gathering of verses is his Mirror of Shadows, published by Skorpion in March of 1912, with poems from 1909 to the beginning of 1912.⁷⁹ The book, with cycles devoted to more earthly themes, to dreams, shadows, love, passion, the future, friends, and of course his holy craft, was well received by everyone and regarded as a new stage in his career. The poems selected for special praise are those which celebrate his craft, his nurse, native language, and his "enslavement" to Aphrodite.

LIVRO
CANTANDO
SEU FARRA
DE POETA

Another of Bryusov's important collections also appeared in this fecund period, this time his first volume of collected essays, Those Far and Near, brought out by Skorpion in October 1911 (the book has 1912 on the title page).⁸⁰ As befits his image of an industrious writer and editor, a "hero of labor" (in Marina Tsvetaeva's view), Bryusov was the author of over six-hundred non-fiction pieces, which if collected could fill several volumes.⁸¹

ENSAYOS
REUNIDOS
BRYUSOV
EM 1
DE
600/111

He selected fifty for this book, articles on Russian poetry from Tyutchev to the present that had originally appeared in periodicals, thus in some ways it resembles Bely's Arabesques but is less personal than this predecessor. While the selection is limited to modernist poets, the articles' scope often does not match the poet or book under review (because of the vagaries of the publishing situations, Blok gets very short shrift and minor poets are the subject of long articles), these pieces are nevertheless valuable for the insights offered by a perceptive and intelligent contemporary who was very much interested in his subject. This collection was followed

ENSAYOS
DE
Tsvetaeva

by a shorter, less significant one, devoted to non-literary topics, Outside My Window, in June of 1913.⁸²

Also in this same period of issuing collections of poetry and prose, Bryusov was able to make an agreement with the new Sirin house to print his Complete Works in 25 volumes.⁸³ The project was begun in May 1913, with the first volume, a gathering of his poetry from 1892-99. Bryusov hoped that this edition would be the crowning achievement of his career, but unfortunately only eight of the projected twenty-five volumes appeared, those containing Bryusov's collected poetry, the novel The Altar of Victory, his plays, and translations of verse and drama by French and Belgian authors. The publication was broken off because of Sirin's halt in activity, and in fact no complete edition of Bryusov's works has yet appeared.

Poetry

These years also witnessed a number of new collections of poetry by Symbolist authors, as well as other editions of collected works. Some of the leading poets, such as Ivanov, Blok, and Balmont, issued new and important books, and other, younger Symbolist poets also printed their verse, once again disproving the charge made by Gumilyov. It is true that there was a somewhat different emphasis in some of the poetry (except in the case of Ivanov, who continued to develop and deepen his religious interests); the themes showed more concern for mundane, political, national, and daily interests.

Ivanov's two-volume collection, Cor Ardens, which was printed by Skorpion in May 1911, and April 1912, represents the pinnacle of his creativity, in fact, and contains much of his best work in verse.⁸⁴ Ivanov had been working on gathering the material for these volumes since the publication of his Transparence in 1904, and the cycles in Cor Ardens include works that had appeared earlier, such as "Specula Speculorum" and "Golden Veils." The themes of Ivanov's verse are much in evidence in the various sections, especially the emphasis on the flaming heart, the heart as a sun, fire, and religious topics; and the dedication to his late wife Lydia, "whose strongly beating heart has stopped," reinforces this imagery, especially since the title had been chosen while she was still alive.

As with all of Ivanov's writing in this genre, the poems are dedicated to a wide circle of friends and acquaintances, and the references to classical

PRECIOSAS + MUNDANAS/POLITICAS

IVANOV
ERUDICAO
(CLASS)CA

1-RELIGIOSO//

civilization are almost overwhelming; modern editors of his works, therefore, are quite understandably obliged to equip new editions with copious notes, commentary, and even mini-dictionaries of names from classical antiquity. The reviews were justifiably rather positive: Gorodetsky wanted to accord Ivanov a place alongside Balmont and Bryusov at the summit of Russian poetry; Bryusov was more reserved, calling it "the most significant event in our poetry in recent months."⁸⁵

A few months later, in January of 1913, another, much less compendious collection of Ivanov's verse appeared. *A Tender Mystery*, plus an appendix called *A Mite*, was brought out, after a long silence, by the Ory publishing house.⁸⁶ In some senses, Ivanov saw this work as an example of "relaxation," with poems on trivial aspects of daily life, in addition to the expected ones on religious themes and on antiquity. The appendix follows a tradition of composing verses for friends, "in imitation of Alexandrian poets"; and the reaction was one of puzzlement, with reviewers wondering why a poet of Ivanov's obvious talent was departing from his formerly "significant" efforts.

It is no understatement to say that Blok was also active in this period, less so with writing new poems than with collecting them for editions of his verse, including a new volume, *The Night Watches*, which appeared in November of 1911.⁸⁷ The book carries the subtitle *Fourth Collection of Verse*. These new poems from 1909-10 differ from his earlier periods, in that he featured poems on Russia and its people (in addition to the Italian poems from 1909). The critical reaction to this new thrust was favorable: Bryusov praised the earthly feelings expressed in Blok's poetry, and other reviewers were eager to link him to the two giants of nineteenth century Russian poetry, Pushkin and Lermontov.⁸⁸ Blok also showed another facet of his creativity in 1913 by publishing two books of children's verse, *A Fairy Tale* and *The Whole Year Round*.⁸⁹

By far the most important publication in Blok's career at this time, though, was the three-volume *Collected Verse*, printed by Musaget from May 1911 through April 1912.⁹⁰ These volumes met with a positive response, one that stressed greater understanding of Blok's "creative path," as the Russians like to say; but even more importantly, Blok was correctly perceived as a poet who was still maturing, still discovering new possibilities in his poetic creations. His reputation, moreover, was enhanced by the new edition, and as one scholar has noted, "this stream of publications — including much hitherto unpublished work from an earlier period [poems

BALMONT
RETORNO
A POEMAS
+ BELOS
EMUSICAS
OCOMA
10 ANOS
ATRAS
(1902)

BLOK
↓

TEORIA
DE VOGAIS
E CONSONANTES
(ESTRUTURA)
AINDA
DESCO-
BRANDO
NOVAS
POSSIBILIDADES
NAS SUAS
CRIACOES
POETICAS

BALMONT: 650L COMO JOIA BRILHANTE

included in the expanded version of *Verses about the Beautiful Lady* — explain the steady growth of his reputation in this period."⁹¹

Konstantin Balmont's next collection of poetry, *The Glow of Dawns*, appeared the same month as the second volume of Blok's *Collected Verse*, January 1912.⁹² As noted earlier, if there is any work which can approximate Ivanov's attainments in *Cor Ardens*, it is Balmont's poetry. And in fact his work during this period, up to the Revolution in 1917, marks a return to better, more "beautiful and musical poems," as noted by Bryusov, "much better than in the last three or four collections."⁹³ Balmont's talent had not really grown, nor had his topics (especially the sun as a bright jewel, poems on dusk and night, forests, his travels [Egypt in this case]) changed from his successful efforts a decade earlier. Rather this return to a more normal style and content showed that he was still capable of writing decent verse.

This book was followed by a selection of poems from 1900 to 1912, called *Links*, published by Skorpion in 1913, and then by another significant collection of his new verse, *The White Architect*, which Sirin brought out in May of 1914.⁹⁴ Although the work earned Bryusov's condemnation (not totally accurately) as a repetition of what he had said earlier, a more recent scholar has pointed to it as an "important . . . culmination of the new Balmont": "No other book of Balmont's approaches this one in variety of subject matter . . . in styles that encompass self-parody and new sonorities."⁹⁵ Balmont did gain more attention as a lecturer during this period (as he had before), this time with a lecture called "Poetry as Magic," delivered in March 1914, and later published as a book.⁹⁶ In it he gives a rather personal account of the meaning of poetry, and tries to draw some rather far-fetched conclusions, such as the view that vowels are women and consonants are men. And even though he often spoke and wrote about poetry, the level of his scholarship is not near that of other Symbolists.

Perhaps Gumilyov had other Symbolists in mind when he thought he found no vigor in the Russian Symbolists' output. It is true that collections of verse by poets of lesser stature appeared in these years, especially by such early and consistent contributors to *Vesy* as Ellis, Baltrushaitis, and Sergey Solovyov. Ellis' first and second books of poetry, for example, came out in February 1911 and March 1914, respectively: *Stigmata* and *Argo*.⁹⁷ As usual for this time in his career, he dwells on religious themes of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (especially Catholicism), but his strength as a poet is lacking. Baltrushaitis' first two collections, *Earthly Steps* and

The Green Path, were brought out by Skorpion, which he had helped found over a decade earlier, in April 1911 and April 1912.⁹⁸ His efforts are of higher quality than Ellis', but the reception was not much warmer; one reviewer said that the author of *The Green Path* viewed the world through the eyes of a somnambulist.⁹⁹

Sergey Solovyov, who had experienced mental and physical exhaustion in the autumn of 1911, suffered a nervous breakdown in October, after which he was obliged to rest for several months. Shortly thereafter, however, he married Tatyana Turgeneva (the sister of Bely's first wife Asya) in September 1912; they spent their honeymoon in Italy, and soon Sergey took religious instruction, so that he could later become a priest. His one book of poetry during this period, *The Tsarevna's Flower Garden*, the third of his collections, features verse from 1909 through 1912, gathered in cycles on religious themes, antiquity, and the poetic craft.¹⁰⁰ In his preface, he acknowledges the influence of Goethe, the nineteenth century Russian poet Konstantin Batyushkov, and André Chénier on his work, which had hoped would be the last of his "student" efforts; he also replies sharply there to Bryusov's criticisms of his earlier works and states one of the main tenets of his philosophy: that science and art lead to the same goal — religious knowledge and creativity.

Drama

In addition to the noteworthy accomplishments in poetry and prose made by the Symbolist authors during this pre-war period, their plays too became widely accepted as a part of the Russian theater. The increased recognition was not simply the result of more plays being written (though indeed there were new additions) or a total change in style or subject matter, but rather because of a change that had taken place since the early 1900s in the views of people outside the Symbolist circle, which made it possible for Symbolist works to be perceived as an integral part of drama in Russia.

A good example of this cultural advancement is offered by Annensky's last tragedy, *Thamyras the Cithara Player: A Bacchic Drama*, which he had developed in 1906 but which was first printed only after his death; it appeared in June of 1913, in a very small edition of 100 numbered copies.¹⁰¹ *Thamyras* was the only one of his four dramas to be staged before the Revolution, at the Moscow Kamerny Theater, in November 1916, to generally favorable reviews.

The play, once again, deals with a legend from ancient Greece, conveyed in somewhat modern language, with a message for his contemporaries. As stated in Annensky's preface:

Thamyras or Thamyrides, the son of the Thracian king and the nymph Argiope, has been praised for his ability to play the cithara, and his haughtiness reaches the point where he calls on the muses to compete with him; but he is defeated, and as a punishment he is blinded and deprived of his musical gift.¹⁰²

Annensky cheerfully admits that he had "departed from the classical theater," by including prose and other elements of contemporary drama, but he feels the choices are artistically justified. One aspect that he places in the foreground deals with Argiope's love for her own son, whom she had not seen for many years and whom she wishes to know sexually; thus there are two stories running through the tragedy: the impossibility of challenging the gods and the unfortunate lack of congruence in more earthly attractions and affection.

BLOK That same year Blok's drama *The Rose and The Cross* was printed in the first issue of the Sirin miscellany, together with Bely's *Petersburg*.¹⁰³ The play, first conceived in 1906, bears some resemblance (not surprisingly) to Wagner's opera *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*, since it was intended to be a "ballet-cum-opera-cum-drama" dealing with medieval France, based on his own impressions of that country and research he had done in this area.¹⁰⁴ Many of the characters in the play reflect on Blok's own circle of relatives, including his wife (who partly contributed to the character Izora), mother, and step-father, in addition to Blok himself and the father of his wife's child, who is portrayed as Aliskan in the play.

ANNENSKY Blok had hoped to have the piece performed, initially as an opera, then as a drama with ballet, preferably by Stanislavsky and his Moscow Art Theater, but since Stanislavsky would have altered it too much to make it more appealing as a stage piece, this aspiration remained unfulfilled. And despite the fact that the play presented people in a setting that reflected Russia in 1906 (according to Blok), the public reaction was not very positive, some reviewers pointing to a lack of passion and feel for real life, though Andreev did find it well-founded psychologically and truthful.¹⁰⁵ After many false starts and even numerous rehearsals by the Moscow Art Theater just before the Revolution, the play was finally performed for the first time shortly before Blok's death, at the Kostroma Municipal Theater during the 1920-21 season.¹⁰⁶

Another Symbolist author, Bryusov, also offered a play during this period, The Traveler: A Psychodrama in One Act, which deals with one of his favorite topics, a woman's psychology.¹⁰⁷ But by far the most active of these authors in this genre was Sologub, who was the first Symbolist to experience the production of a play at a major imperial theater. This success was followed, as we shall see in the next chapter, by other productions of plays by Symbolists, which are indicative of the process by which formerly avant-garde works are joined to the mainstream. In this case Russian drama was changing in a direction that favored more creativity and experimentation. The theaters were recognizing new works as their own, rather than solely clinging to the traditions established in the nineteenth century.

BRYUSOV
SOLOGUB

Sologub was riding a crest of popularity, because of the staging of his Amorous Intrigues Forever by Evreinov in 1912, and that same year two more of his plays reached stages in Petersburg: The Conqueror Dream, and most importantly his Hostages of Life, which was produced at the Imperial Aleksandrinsky Theater, directed by V. Meyerhold.¹⁰⁸ Hostages was the first modernist work to be performed there, and it was "interpreted as a triumph for modernism."¹⁰⁹ The play, an optimistic, contemporary piece about an engineer and his two loves, was well received by the public, and the run lasted through twenty-six performances. The critical reaction, however, was less enthusiastic; some reviewers pointed to the play's undoubted false notes and unfulfilled aspirations, and Blok aptly points out that because Sologub's former love of death had been rejected, his talent had suffered.¹¹⁰

SOLOGUB
1912
SOLOGUB
MONTADO
PAR
MEYERHOLD

Sologub had indeed become more positive in his attitudes about life at this time, reflecting his own contentment as a successful author and happily married man. His Collected Works continued to appear in 1913-14, now taken over by the Sirin firm. Volume XVII, for example, which appeared in May 1914, contained his poetry from 1913, Enchantments of the Earth, a book almost entirely devoted to triolets and presented in nineteen cycles, which deal with more earthly concerns and other poets, including Blok, Bryusov, Ivanov, and Futurist poets whose works Sologub found of interest and in whose miscellanies Sologub sometimes participated.¹¹¹ But though it does contain worthy poems, this book does not represent his best effort.¹¹²

LIVRO
POETAS
1914
FALA DE
OUTROS
POETAS
INCLUSIVE
FUTURISTAS

"Dispute"

NEIVANOV! É OUTRO

As mentioned several times in this chapter, retrospection was evident in this pre-war period; another sign was the so-called "public dispute" (more of a presentation of different views than a debate) about the current trends in Russian literature, organized in January of 1914 by Ivanov-Razumnik, on behalf of the editorial board of Zavety, a short-lived journal with Acmeist and Left Socialist Revolutionary sympathies. This forum for the presentation of statements, which were printed as articles in the second issue of the journal for 1914, featured Sologub, Chulkov, and Ivanov as the Symbolist spokesmen, with additional speakers of less visibility and importance representing Acmeism and Futurism.¹¹³ Though Ivanov-Razumnik was critical of certain Symbolist positions, as stated clearly in his introduction to the "Dispute" papers, he did come to admire the works of Bely and Blok to a great extent, and both of them printed poetry in the journal, which was later succeeded by the Skify [Scythians] miscellanies in 1917-18.

JAN 1914:
DISPUTA
PUBLICA
FORRE AS
CORRENTES
ATUAIS
ORG. P/
IVANOV-RAZU
MNIK JAN 1914
- SOLOGUB
- CHULKOV
- IVANOV
- ACMEISTA
- FUTURISTA

Note, however, that the representatives selected to present Symbolist views are not exactly the most appropriate; only Ivanov from this group was a bonafide Symbolist theoretician. But Bely was still abroad, and Bryusov and Blok were no longer interested in defending Symbolism at this point. Despite the choices, the statements by Ivanov and Sologub are of interest, and in fact the writers who commented on the "Dispute," who sometimes disagreed and felt that Symbolism had long ago passed its prime, still were engaged most by these presentations.

BRYUSOV
E BLOK
N QUEREM
+ DEFEND
SIMB?

In Sologub's speech, which was designed to be the opening statement for the whole group, he begins with some general comments about art and creativity, objecting to the view of art as a mirror. He then goes on to recount the recent story of Symbolism in Russia as a manifestation of realism, as opposed to boring naturalism; by this he means that Symbolism can produce a more exact depiction artistically, which offers the reader or viewer glimpses of a higher art. Finally, he outlines three stages in the development of this movement: 1) Cosmic Symbolism, 2) Individual Symbolism, and 3) Democratic Symbolism. The first is represented by meditation, especially by poets such as Tyutchev and Ivanov, the second by expressed consciousness of separate personalities, which can be seen in works that affirm freedom and aspiration to the universal will. Democratic Symbolism, which he saw as the then current stage of Russian Symbolism, demanded that the poet, and people in general, love life, no matter how

DECLAR.
DE SOLOGUB
"A SPEECH
ABOUT
SYMBOLISM"
- SIMB?
COSMICO =
MEDITAÇÃO
- INDIVI
DUAL:
PERSONALIS
SEPARADOS
LIBERII
- DEMOCRÁTICO
AMAR A VIDA

ugly and repulsive it is, and in this way one's own life could be transformed.¹¹⁴

In Ivanov's shorter and more concise speech, he takes a different tack from Sologub's, for he is less concerned with the immediate evaluation of the Symbolist movement in Russia than with Tyutchev, Goethe, Dante, Hesiod, and Aeschylus as Symbolist authors and with the creation of "the principle which Symbolist art aspires to affirm": true art in its orthodox form.¹¹⁵ Thus he comprehends Symbolisms of various types: "Classical, Romantic, and perhaps even Futurist Symbolism."¹¹⁶ He does respond to points of criticism and takes issues with Acmeist condemnations of some Symbolists' predilections for preaching God and the soul, instead of describing "exotic lands" (a dig at Gumilyov's poetry), and he closes with a warning against "superficial aestheticism."¹¹⁷ The speech was followed by "prolonged applause," as noted in the journal, which showed that although the Symbolist spokesmen here were describing a movement that was already past, the ideas and formulations were still valid as an approach to literary creativity.

This example provided by the "Dispute" is quite indicative of the trends evident in the Russian cultural scene before the war. The Symbolist preferences were now a bit out of fashion, in terms of current tastes, and despite the various attempts to either revive it or claim victory, the movement had clearly run its course. Acmeism and Futurism, which had sprung up more recently, were more in the limelight as movements, but the Symbolist works and ideas of merit still were accorded the recognition they deserved.

This is certainly the case with Bryusov, Blok, and Bely; the latter was in fact seeing a rise in his popularity by the beginning of the war because of his Petersburg. Other authors were of course also popular in Russia at the time, in particular Maksim Gorky and the Norwegian Nobel laureate Knut Hamsun. But as we shall see in the next chapter, with the declaration of war in the summer of 1914, the entire literary landscape was changed. There was no longer as much time or as many resources for concentrating on the issues that had engaged the Russian intelligentsia for a decade and a half. Instead we find most authors turning their attention to the war, to social and political issues.

S PETERSBURGO → PETROGRADO (NO INICIAL (HESLAVO'S P. 195) GUERRA)

CESTIAE DANTE
SIMBOLISTAS
PRINCIPIO
SIMBOLIA
ARTES
VERDADERA
MAYOR
FORMA
LITODORA
CONTRA
ESTET.
SUPER-
FICIAL

FORMALISMO
RAIZES TB
NAS ANALISES
DA S SIMBOLIA

MELI
NABARA

AUTORES
POPULARES
BIELI
GARKI
HAMSON
AK
GUERRA

SEM TEMPO/RECURSOS
P/ AS QUESTOES DAS
ANOS 1910-14

ATENCAO
VOLTA JS
P/GUERRA
QUESTOES
E POLITICAS

9. Symbolism in the Past Tense, War, Revolution 1915-1917

During the years of war and increasing political chaos in Russia, up to the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, there is no clear perception of Symbolism as an active, even loosely organized movement. There are of course Symbolist authors still quite productive; now they are seen as authorities, as the venerables of modernist tendencies and of Russian literature. By this time Futurism is the most visible and watched movement; it has gained a certain acceptance, even from some of the Symbolists.

The Formalist school, which later had much impact on literary criticism, not only in the USSR but in Europe and North America as well, begins to have an impact in 1916, and though there are attempts (as had been the case with early Futurist and Acmeist statements) to distance this new fledgling from its predecessor, this phenomenon too has its roots partly in literary analyses begun in the Symbolist era. Still, the perception that Symbolism is no longer the vibrant and exciting movement it had been, that it had run its course, that it could now be described only in the past tense, is an accurate one. The intrusion of the war, moreover, aids in the general move away from appreciating art primarily for its aesthetic value.

Formalism and Futurism

5000 EX

Yet another indication of the shift in tastes related to literary movements is the appearance of an important Futurist miscellany, *The Archer*, in February 1915.¹ The range of contributors was considerable and included such leading Futurists as Mayakovsky, Kruchyonykh, Khlebnikov, Sologub and Blok lent their weight to the undertaking and by so doing helped the newer movement to gain more attention and respect. In fact the reaction among the public and reviewers tended toward the opinion that these "widely recognized authorities," such as Sologub and Blok had sponsored the Futurists, "who had come over to their side, becoming better mannered . . .

1º COLETANEA
"O ARQUEIRO"
BLAK + SOLOGUB

2000 EX

2^a
"O ARQUEIRO"

seeking shelter" under the protection of the writers with "names," whereas the Symbolists themselves had received similar brickbats only a few years earlier.² The second issue of *The Archer* came out in 1916, with a much smaller press run — 2,000 as opposed to 5,000.³ It was not as successful, perhaps because there were fewer participants of note; Sologub was the only Symbolist represented there.

It was also clear, however, that by this time Futurism was in decline, after a rather short-lived flowering, and the Acmeist group was no longer an active force in literary matters.⁴ But, as had been true of the leading Symbolists, authors such as Mayakovsky, Pasternak, Mandelstam, Akhmatova, Kruchonykh, Khlebnikov, and others would go on to win even more acclaim for their works, independent of the movements that had provided the milieu for their beginnings.

Because of the cultural evolution taking place in Russia, the time was now right for the emergence of a new group, this time not a gathering of poets or prose writers, but of literary critics, the Formalists. Although some of the Formalists' views might seem antithetical to the more mystical and theurgic interests of Second Wave Symbolists, there was some communality of thought, particularly in the focus on language and analysis of poetry. In fact, as the most prominent American scholar of Formalism has pointed out,

The emergence of the Symbolist movement raised conspicuously the level of poetic craftsmanship in Russia. [...] And in the wake of this poetic revival came a renaissance of verse study [...].⁵

The Symbolist most responsible for giving impetus to more serious study of poetic technique was Bely, whose "studies in versification were an important milestone in the development of Russian scientific poetics," and his "statistical methods," though substantially modified, were put to good use by the Formalist students of verse. . . .⁶ Other groups of writers also contributed to laying the groundwork for Formalism, to be sure, most notably the Futurists with their frequent preference for form over content. Thus Formalism can be seen as a natural outgrowth of Symbolist efforts to focus attention on literature and a scholarly corollary to Futurist sloganeering, since the latter group as a whole did not possess the erudition of most Symbolist authors or the Formalist critics. These judgments about Formalism and its relation to Symbolism in particular are positive, in part because of the passage of time, but when the events connected with Formalism's beginnings were actually taking place in the second half of 1916, the stated

FORMALISTAS
SIMBO.
LISTAS
(FOCAL NA LINGUAGEM)
ELEGANCIA DO CRAFTSMANSHIP
RENERCI DO ESTUDO DO VERSO
BIELI
METODOS ESTADISTICOS

BRYUSOV
PATRIOTISMO
(#OPINIAO)
ANTERIORE

HAUVE UMA
"POLEMICA BIELI-ZHIRMUNSKI"
(U. NOTAG)

SET 1916
COLECAO
SOBRE A
TEORIA DA
LINGUA (GEM)
POETICA
(1 DE 3)
TAREFA
DE ATACAR
OS SIMBOLISTAS

views were somewhat different. Formalism was essentially "born" with the appearance of the first of three *Collections on the Theory of Poetic Language* in September of 1916.⁷ It was not long before the school, which included such luminaries as Roman Jakobson, Boris Eichenbaum, Boris Tomashevsky, Yury Tynyanov, Viktor Shklovsky, and Viktor Zhirmunsky, had established itself as a viable, and even influential entity. But one of the first "duties" was the development of a polemic with Russian Symbolist authors and an attack on their literary standpoints.

As Prof. Erlich has pointed out, there was of course a difference in the approaches to literary scholarship favored by Symbolists and Formalists, particularly in the view of metaphysics and its relation to poetry.⁸ But at the same time the young Formalists were in fact interested in the work done by Bryusov, Bely, and Ivanov, especially the latter's *Furrows and Boundaries*, a collection of essays on Symbolism and theater which appeared in April 1916.⁹ The Formalists quite naturally did not agree with Ivanov's views and saw them as something to be "overcome," but both the Symbolist and Formalist contributions have their own validity, and the quality of their work remains the most important criterion.

INTERE
SSE DOS
FORMALISTAS
EM
BRYUSOV
BIELI
IVANOV

War

The turbulence of political events in these years was not conducive to the calm flowering of literary achievements. Clearly the deprivations and shortages caused by the war effort, which for Russia was rather unsuccessful, added to the view that a movement like Symbolism was no longer necessary. Yet there was a good deal of solid activity, as we will see in this chapter, in which the Symbolist authors were involved.

PRIVACOES
SIMBOLISTAS
NECESSARIO

As with all Russians, the war did occupy the Symbolists' attention, especially when it was officially declared on 19 July 1914 (Old Style, August New Style) and through the autumn of 1914. Bryusov, for example, became a war correspondent for a daily newspaper less than a week after the start of the war. He soon grew tired of this rather arduous activity, but his willingness to serve in this capacity and his manifest patriotism are in sharp contrast to opinions he had held earlier in his career.

BRYUSOV
JORNALISTA
DIARIO

Other Symbolists responded, quite typically, by composing poems about the war; among this group we find Balmont, Sologub, and Blok; Blok was in fact later called up to active duty in May 1916. Hippus was somewhat more reserved in her reaction, but she felt the war could have a

OUTROS
SIMBOLISTAS
POEMAS
SOBRE A
GUERRA

positive effect on young people, that it could give some sense to their lives.¹⁰ Merezhkovsky shared this view of war as a purging agent, but he grew gradually disappointed with it and with revolutionary activity in general, as shown in his *Non-War Diary*, which came out in September of 1917.¹¹ By this time the public had cooled to Merezhkovsky's essays, though he continued to print them, in particular his *Past and Future, A Diary of 1910-14* and *Two Mysteries of Russian Poetry: Nekrasov and Tyutchev*, both of which came out in 1915.¹²

HIPPUS
SVE RRA
SEN 700
P) A VIDA
DOS JOUENS

Bely's reaction to this war, however, is more complex and in some ways more representative of Symbolist thinking at its most extreme and eccentric. Bely was still in Switzerland when the war started, but from his location near Basel he could hear artillery and follow the events of the war well. According to the most vivid account, his *Notes of An Eccentric*, a "diary in story form" that should not be taken simply at face value. Bely apparently imagined that his own thoughts were somehow responsible for the war's outbreak.¹³ Because of the difficult psychological conditions he was experiencing at the time, including the break-up of his marriage and some estrangement from certain of the Anthroposophical adepts, he interpreted the war very differently from his vantage point, stating in late 1916 that war was less important as a topic than consciousness.¹⁴

BIELI
SEUS PENJA
C. MO ORSEM
DA GUERRA
(!!!)

He was obliged to return to Russia, ostensibly to be on call for active military duty, and he left Dornach and wife Asya in July of 1916. After traveling by train and boat through France and England, he passed through Norway and relived, with much more pain this time, his earlier emotional experiences in that country, finally coming to Petrograd in August.¹⁵ Soon after that he was once again active on the literary scene in Moscow, but not as a citizen filled with blind patriotism, who wished to see the war "to its victorious conclusion," as was true of some fellow Symbolists.¹⁶

CONSCIENCIA
+ IMPOR. D.
GUERRA
DEIRA
PERNACH
JUL 1916
PETROG
AGO 1916
RETORNO

Prose

With the war diverting much attention, it is not surprising that fewer works of fiction by the Symbolists were printed during these years. Bely continued to be the most important Symbolist prose writer, and indeed his presence in Russian literature at this time was rather strong. The main reasons for his more solid reputation, particularly in 1916-17, were the new, separate edition of *Petersburg* and the initial appearance of his third major novel *Kotik Letaev*, the title of which is taken from the name of the main character.

DESENVA TO
DA CONSCIENC
NUMA
CRANCA
(REL. STEINER)

These books both drew quite a bit of attention from critics and readers, yet not all of the remarks showed that these commentators fully understood either work; in some ways Bely's most astute reader at this time was Ivanov-Razumnik, who wrote cogent essays on Blok and Bely in the latter half of the 1910s. A few years later, after the separate edition of *Kotik Letaev* in 1922, Prince Mirsky initiated the trend toward better appreciation of this charming, delightful novel, calling it Bely's "most unique and original work."¹⁷

Kotik Letaev ESCRITO SUICID 1915-16 VOLUME TERRORADO
TROCOT JORNALS NOV DEZ 1916 1922
VERSAO INTEGRAL 1916-17

Bely wrote this work while still in Switzerland, in 1915 and 1916, and it does offer some indications of the place of creation in the context of his attraction to Anthroposophy. His original intention for the novel was to begin another series of novels under the general title *Épopée — My Life*. Thus this first part provides a somewhat fictionalized account of Kotik Letaev's (for which read Boris Bugaev's) life from ages three to five. And though other autobiographical novels followed, including the sequel to *Kotik Letaev*, first called *The Crime of Nikolay Letaev* (1922), and then renamed *The Baptized Chinaman* (second edition 1927), plus the *Notes of an Eccentric* (1921-22), the plans for a developed, unified series of volumes were not brought to full fruition, as was often the case with Bely.¹⁸ One central image, however, does serve to link these works: the main character's crucifixion and modern imitation of Christ, which is featured in various ways in each of these publications.

The first portions of *Kotik Letaev* appeared in newspapers in 1916.¹⁹ The editor of one of them received so much criticism about the excerpts that he felt he had to justify including this "attempt to study a person's subconscious world" in his paper. Bely's novel does indeed deal with the development of consciousness in a child, in this case accompanied by childhood disease, as seen through the eyes of an adult looking back at these early experiences:

I am thirty-five years old . . . I stand before myself on the threshold of my third year. We speak to one another. We understand each other.²⁰

Because of the rather unusual subject matter for a Russian novel and the resonance of Bely's Anthroposophical thinking, mixed with investigations of life before birth, one can understand how its readers may not always find it totally accessible on first reading. But the philosophical con-

structs, and especially the emphasis on contrasting chaos and order, or swarm vs. form (*roy vs. strov* in Russian), and the revelations about childhood misperceptions, as finally comprehended by the adult, are fascinating. The style, moreover, engages the reader with its musicality and lyric energy.

When the full version was brought out in the first and second issues of the new *Skify* miscellany (1917-18), it was overshadowed by the war and revolutionary activity; thus it was not until the separate edition came out in 1922 that the novel began to attract more sympathetic and knowledgeable readers.²¹ *Skify*, edited by Ivanov-Razumnik and others, printed material by the leading modernist writers, not just Symbolists, in its two issues. It was unfortunate that this enterprise had to be discontinued after the Revolution, insofar as the appearance of the first collection in August 1917 was warmly greeted as a sensation, "well published on beautiful paper," in contrast to the standard, gray, wartime brochures and other publications.²²

Bryusov and Sologub continued their efforts in this genre, but neither published a work that could be compared to *Kotik Letaev* during the war years. Sologub's *Violent Year*, a collection of short stories, came out in April 1916, at the same time that Bely's *Petersburg* appeared in a complete edition.²³ The themes of this collection's seventeen stories are typical for Sologub in that melancholy seems to predominate, but the book went largely unnoticed since there are no truly outstanding stories in it. Sologub at this point reached the audience for his short prose through re-issues of earlier stories in press runs of 15,000, though he continued to print new ones, as he had in the twelfth and fourteenth volumes of his *Collected Works* (in 1912 and 1913), and some stories of interest appeared after the Revolution.²⁴

Bryusov also published a couple of slim volumes of short prose works, *Dasha's Betrothal* and *Rea Silvia*, once again dealing with some of his favorite topics, including the late Roman Empire and events viewed by a female.²⁵ These works attracted little attention, though from a more distant vantage point they have a place among his better efforts in this genre.

Poetry

By contrast, the poetic output by Symbolists was much more plentiful, if not always at the zenith of each poet's creativity. Two who were already recognized for consistent production, Blok and Balmont, in fact came out with works of lasting value. Bryusov and Sologub also printed verse, and much of the interest in these works was naturally focused on their war poems. On the whole, there was less innovation and experimentation than in the earlier years of the movement, but the greater maturity was not necessarily a drawback.

The same statements made about Sologub's prose also hold true for his verse at this time. Some of his works are up to the usual standard, others are not, but there is a perceptible shift toward patriotic and war-related themes, a change not unlike the one that took place around the time of the 1905 revolution. His *War*, for example, which appeared in January of 1915, features contemporary images and a strong desire for a Russian victory.²⁶ Another collection of poems that appeared in May 1917, *The Scarlet Poppy*, deals with the revolutionary events during that year.²⁷

Balmont's next two collections of poetry, *The Ash: Visions of the Tree* and *Sonnets of the Sun, Honey, and Moon*, came out in 1916 and 1917, respectively.²⁸ The first deals rather effectively with some of Balmont's favorite topics, in this case Yggdrasil, the ash tree that binds the earth and sky, according to Norse mythology, and figures from world culture like Edgar Allan Poe and Leonardo da Vinci. Balmont exercised more editorial restraint in these poems, thereby producing a better collection than in previous years. *Sonnets of the Sun, Honey, and Moon*, according to Prof. Markov, is "perhaps the best book of his whole career . . . a unique achievement in Russian poetry [that] deserves to be admired, enjoyed, and studied."²⁹ These sonnets again display the quite broad sweep of his geographical, mythological, literary, historical, and religious interests.

One of the sonnets is dedicated to the Russian composer Alexander Scriabin, whose music was much admired by the Symbolists. Balmont in fact wrote a short book on Scriabin, printed in 1917: *Light-Sound in Nature and Scriabin's Symphony of Light*.³⁰ But it is frequently admitted that Balmont is more at home in verse than essays.³¹

Bryusov too published a collection of verse during the war, *The Seven Colors of the Rainbow*, which was "arrested," and after one poem was replaced, the book made its appearance in May 1916.³² As Bryusov points

ROY

STROY

MUSICALITY
ENERGIA
LIRICA

SOLOGUB

BRYUSOV

SOLOGUB

THEMES
PATRIOTIC
JAN 1915

BAL-
MONT

SOL,
MEL E
LUA
1917

BRYUSOV

out in his preface, he wanted to offer a book devoted to the "joys of earthly life," to counteract the practice of some of his contemporaries — and Bryusov's own some years earlier — of scorning it.³³ Critical reaction to this change was favorable and Bryusov was recognized as a master who clearly loved poetry, but that there was precious little that was new in it; in many ways this book summed up his career in this genre.³⁴

The poems are divided into seven sections, not surprisingly, each one devoted to a color name; but there are also sub-cycles dealing with Finland, Western Europe, the earth, antiquity, nature, urban settings, his fellow poets, and three groupings of war poems. These poems thus reflect his activities and interests from 1911-12, when he began work on the collection, through 1916, including his travels and war experiences.

Blok's poetry was much in the public eye during the war, thanks to two undertakings: a book of selected poems, including some new material, entitled Verses About Russia, May 1915, and a revised issue of his Collected Verse in three volumes, published by Musaget in 1916, after the collapse of Sirin and the plans to have this edition brought out in Petersburg by that firm.³⁵ Blok was not very actively involved in writing poetry during this period, though he did experience a strong need to earn a living from his writings because of difficulties connected with the war and his late father's inheritance. Thus these selections and collections were able to aid, not only in the economic sense, they also helped him to gain more favor and a wider readership. The new poems, in particular those about the war, were measurably better than those by other poets on the same topic, and as Prof. Pyman points out, that these poems set him, "finally and decisively, outside and above any particular school as a great 'national' poet."³⁶

A new and important work did appear in January of 1917, his autobiographical poem "Retribution."³⁷ Blok had been working on this piece essentially since 1909, when his father died, and more consistently since 1910, though in its final form it remains an uncompleted work, judging by Blok's intentions. This longish narrative poem presents a biographical account of Blok and members of his family, in particular his father, Prof. A.L. Blok (1852-1909), against the historical backdrop of Russia's war with Turkey in the 1870s, cultural and civic life in Russia and in Warsaw at the turn of the century, and the events leading up to World War One. Blok had hoped it would be worthy of placement alongside Pushkin's novel in verse, *Evgeny Onegin*, as a representative work dealing with various aspects of Russia, but this intention was not realized.

BLOK

VERSOS
SOBRE A
RUSSIA
MAI 1915

POEMAS
SOBRE
GUERRA

SUB-MELHORES
DOS
OUTROS

"RETRIBUICAO"
POEMA
AUTOBIO
GRAFICO
DE SI

EDA
RUSSIA
(EVGENY
ONEGIN)

HIPPIUS: O ANEL VERDE FEV 1915
MEM. AGEM
MEYERHOLD

Another of Blok's significant publications during these years was his edition of nineteenth century Russian poet Apollon Grigoryev's Poems, which had appeared in November, 1915.³⁸ For this edition, which still commands respect from later scholars, Blok collected Grigoryev's verse, supplied commentary, and wrote a rather personal introductory article. As a matter of fact, the choice of a relatively second rank writer like Grigoryev (whom Blok found a sympathetic poet) is less important than the fact that he devoted so much time to this scholarly undertaking, which once again demonstrates the Symbolists' clear interests in furthering not only the actual craft, but also the study and propagation of verse. Thus Blok joined the ranks of such colleagues as Bryusov, Bely, Ivanov, and Annensky.

Generally speaking, there was a strong sense of summing up, as noted by the reviewers at the end of 1916, in Russian poetry of this time:

It is no accident that in one year the books that have appeared by those whales of Symbolism [Balmont's *Ash*, Bryusov's *Seven Colors*, and the second edition of Blok's *Collected Verse*] bring the past to a conclusion.³⁹

And indeed the sense that the movement had reached its conclusion was evident during the wartime, though to maintain that the Symbolists were through as authors and poets in particular would be quite mistaken.

Drama

Some of these same sentiments can be applied to the plays of the Symbolists at this time. There is a clear mood of retrospection in the appearance of Blok's collected plays, called Theater, in 1916; this book in fact constituted the fourth volume of his Collected Verse and Plays, issued by Musaget.⁴⁰ Other Symbolists who had been involved in the theater continued in this direction, including Sologub, Hippius, and Merezhkovsky. Ivanov, in contrast, published rarely in this genre. He produced a short tragedy based on the Prometheus legend, first titled The Sons of Prometheus when it appeared in *Russkaia Mysl* in January 1915; later he renamed it simply Prometheus, and it was issued as a separate book in 1919.⁴¹ This play was conceived many years earlier as a part of a proposed trilogy on Greek legends, but by the time it appeared, there was not much interest in it.

Hippius had received more recognition as a playwright, and her new offering, The Green Ring, performed first in February 1915 (separate edition 1916), deals with a contemporary topic, the necessity of allowing the younger generation to create a better world than the existing one.⁴² The

SENJO
DE R
JIMB?
ACABOU

HIPPIUS = "O CIRCULO/ANEL VERDE" FEV 1915/1916

HIPPUS/ANGL
VERDE → MONTADA
Y MEYERHOLD II

staging was of interest to those in the Symbolist circle, and Blok, among others, attended several of the rehearsals, noting that *The Green Ring* was "a clumsy play, but with some visible maturity."⁴³ Because the play was directed by Meyerhold and featured the leading actress Maria Savina, it gained some attention.

Sologub was less successful with his plays of this period, including *A Stone Tossed into the Water*, but Merezhkovsky was fortunate to have three of his plays performed during these years: *Paul I*, about which there had formerly been a great deal of governmental fear, plus *There Will be Joy* and *Romantics*.⁴⁴ It should be noted, however, that the last two, which deal with the "bright future" offered to those who have the proper religious and social leanings, are disappointing pieces staged by important names in Russian dramatic circles.

SOLOGUB
MEREZH

When *There Will be Joy* was put on by the Moscow Art Theater, for instance, the reviewers in a chorus condemned the play's heavy-handedness.⁴⁵ *Romantics*, which deals with the early years of Russian revolutionary Mikhail Bakunin, was presented at the Imperial Aleksandrinsky Theater in Petrograd in October 1916, to a somewhat better reception, but it is not the best offering by a Symbolist in this genre. The response to *Paul I*, which is somewhat more successful as a play, drew more enthusiasm, because the play was staged after Nicholas II's abdication and is critical of the ruling family.

Revolution

As was true of many intellectuals in Russia, the February Revolution and Nicholas II's subsequent departure from the throne were greeted quite favorably by the Symbolists, although not always for the same reasons. The times were still difficult because of the war, but the sense of relief and greater freedom that accompanied these events spread to publishing enterprises and eased the strictures of censorship. Thus the period between the February and October Revolutions turned out to be exciting, yet for certain Symbolists, it marked a time of growing disappointment. Their reactions to the Bolshevik seizure of power in late October showed a perhaps natural divergence of opinions.

FEVEREIRO

SIMBOL
APOSIAM
FEVEREIRO
CENSURA
AFRUXA

By the end of February in 1917, Nicholas' government was in a state of total collapse; it had been weakened earlier by various factors, including the poor leadership offered by the rulers and the influence of Grigory Ras-

putin on their circle (the Symbolists and others were relieved at his murder in December 1916). In addition, Russia's unenviable position in the war made conditions worse.

Thus in the first weeks after the turnabout in February, the Symbolists created poetry, wrote articles, gave lectures, and spoke at meetings on the theme of "A Free Russia." Bryusov, for instance, printed a poem with that title the day after the abdication.⁴⁶ Another common theme then was unity—the title of a poem by Balmont in March.⁴⁷ Sologub and Hippius also dedicated poems to the revolution, and Hippius wanted to rechristen her city with its original name, which had been changed to the more Slavic Petrograd at the beginning of the war.⁴⁸ Bryusov, Bely, Voloshin, and others spoke at a meeting held at the Moscow Art Theater on the unity needed to reinforce the freedom just won.⁴⁹ Blok hoped that Russia would be a democracy in the future.⁵⁰ Finally, Ivanov's poems written in June reflect a different and more profoundly religious point of view, but he also looked forward to a "new Russia."⁵¹

SIMBOL
ALIVIAOOS
Y ANGLAS
DE MONTADA
FEB 1917

RUSSIA
LIVRE
UNDADE

Slightly later, some of the Symbolists found themselves more in harmony with members of the Socialist Revolutionary Party and their sympathizers than the Bolsheviks; these choices were true of Bely and Blok, Hippius and Merezhkovsky. But others took a more patriotic view of the war and were closer to conservative views (Balmont, Bryusov and Sologub, for example). As the Provisional Government in Petrograd became better established, the differences widened, and a certain disappointment with the February Revolution began to be expressed. In terms of literary-political alliances, Blok and especially Bely moved nearer to Ivanov-Razumnik and his Scythian group, and later the two leading figures grew stronger in their support of the Revolution. Balmont was deeply pessimistic by September and did not believe that the revolutionary developments were the way to improve Russia's lot. Hippius and Merezhkovsky too were disappointed with Bolshevik politics, particularly in regard to religious and social issues, and Sologub was disturbed by increasing revolutionary unrest and lack of order in the country.

PROX AOS
SRs
-BELI
-BLOK
-HIPPIUS
-MEREZH
PATRIOT?
-BALMONT
-BRYUSOV
-SOLOGUB

Thus when the "Great October Socialist Revolution" took place on 25 October (Old Style; now celebrated on 7 November with the new calendar) the divisions among the Symbolists were deep and lasting. Of the major Symbolists, only Bely, Blok, and Bryusov "accepted" the Revolution; they felt that Russia was in a sorry state and the Provisional Government led by Aleksandr Kerensky so ineffectual that something major had to be done.

OUTU
BRD

BELI, BLOK E BRYUSOV (!!!) ACEITAM A
REVOL. OUTUBRO

Bely hoped the new turnabout would bring "true freedom (not mere political freedom)." and he welcomed the Revolution in a mystical sense as a harbinger of spiritual renewal. Blok also took a more emotional view, committing himself to the "mists of Bolshevism," to the destructive elements. (Bryusov) who had always displayed greater self-control and the ability to shift with the changing winds, even joined the Communist Party in 1919, an act that disappointed a number of his former friends. Their reactions to the Bolshevik Revolution were also reflected in their poems of the next few years, in particular Blok's celebrated *The Twelve*, which combines Christian and revolutionary imagery, and Bely's *Christ is Risen*.⁵⁵

Other Symbolists made different choices that did not display much agreement with the new order. Using standard and frequently used Soviet diction, one could say that they "did not accept the Revolution": "Balmont greeted the October Revolution with enmity"; "Sologub reacted negatively to the October Revolution." Hippit and Remizov were sorely disappointed with the new regime, which "denied personality and the Russian spiritual and cultural heritage."⁵⁷ Ivanov's position was somewhat similar to theirs, though based on a deeper understanding of spiritual culture; his defenses of religious thought were drowned out by the new clamor for revolutionary, i.e., anti-religious, action. These writers did remain for a while in their homeland (Sologub in fact never left after the Revolution), their feelings of disappointment and desperation increasing.

As we shall see in the next chapter, the decisions the Symbolists made in terms of adapting to the new order or emigrating have had an important and long-lasting effect on their reputations, not only in the USSR, which is to be expected, but also abroad. Clearly the political change was so profound in its influence on the fates of the Russian Symbolists that it affected both the individuals and the subsequent perceptions of the movement itself. Thus it is time to bring the chronographic portion of this study to a close. Because of internal causes and the interference of war and revolution, Symbolism was truly a part of Russia's past by the beginning of the Soviet era, and further detailed description of the Symbolists' lives belongs to other studies and other books.

1919:
BRUSSOU
SE FILIA
AO PARTIDE
11111
11111

BALMONT
SALGUB
CENTRAL CUT
URBO

HIPPIT
NEW
REGIME
NEGAVA A
PERSONAL
E A HERANCA
CULT E SPIRIT
RUSSA

AUTOREIS
PERMONE -
CEM +
ALCUM
CHIPS NA
RUSSIA, C/
CRESENTES
FRUSTRA
E DESPERA

BLOK +
1921

10. Epilogue: The Symbolists' Fates and Their Influence

As we know, fairy tales often close with the words: "And they all lived happily ever after." The story of Russian Symbolism unfortunately does not end this way, and the accounts of the Symbolists' last years are often sad. It is also possible to claim that the Symbolist movement has not received its full share of appreciation in the land where it was formed and flourished, because this recognition has been stymied by various factors, particularly from the time of the Revolution. In the West, recognition of this phenomenon has also been limited, primarily to those who know the Russian language or something of its culture. But there are some hopeful signs, both in the USSR and the West, that more attention is being devoted to this significant contribution to Russian culture and to European Symbolism. Since the movement and the Silver Age as a whole had ended with the coming of war and revolution, remarks in this chapter are brief, designed mostly to round out the story.

→ "A MELHOR REVISTA SIMBOLISTA DESDE VEJY" (!)

Zapiski Mechtateley REVISTA - 6 NOS. 1919-22
BIELI-BLOK-IVANOV

It should first be pointed out, however, that the literary alliance among certain of the major Symbolists continued to produce fruit after the Revolution, as seen in the journal *Zapiski Mechtateley* (*Notes of Dreamers*), published by a new house in Petersburg that was set up in 1918, Adkonost, whose name is linked to the halcyon bird.¹ Six issues of this journal, which was designed as a forum for works by Bely, Blok, and Ivanov, appeared in 1919 through 1922.

Blok unfortunately died after the combined 2nd and 3rd issues in 1921, though articles, poems, and Blok's only "story," "Neither Awake nor Asleep," did appear in all issues but the last.² Ivanov actually contributed rather little, only some verse and short pieces in the first three issues. Other participants included: Remizov, Evgeny Zamyatin, Akhmatova, Sologub,

Khodasevich and Chukovsky. Thus many of the prominent writers of the early twentieth century were represented there.

The "dreamer" whose presence is most palpable in the journal, Andrey Bely, began several longer works on these pages. Among these works we find The Notes of an Eccentric, The Baptized Chinaman, and the beginnings of a very substantial book of reminiscences, Memoirs about Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Blok.³ Because of Blok's death, Bely's absence for part of this time, and the new political conditions, it was not possible to continue this endeavor, but on the whole it was much more successful than *Trudy i Dni* had been, in fact the best Symbolist journal since *Vesy*.

The Symbolists After the Revolution

In the overviews of the Symbolists' last years that follow, emphasis is placed on developments that affected their lives and reputations after the Revolution. We can see, for example, the importance of choices they made, in particular the decision to stay in their homeland or emigrate, and how these choices have influenced appreciation of their works, both at home and abroad.

It is not always possible to formulate perfectly symmetrical generalizations about their choices of residence after the Revolution, but one rule of thumb generally applies: if the author had lived for considerable periods abroad before the Revolution, that person usually made the decision to emigrate; Balmont, Hippius, Merezhkovsky, and Ivanov are good examples. Conversely, if that person had remained primarily in Russia, with occasional visits to Europe, he tended to stay there after the Revolution: e.g., Bryusov, Blok, and Sologub. Bely, as so often noted before, does not fit this bipolar opposition very well: he had lived abroad for a number of years, but he also spent the early part of the Soviet era in Germany. 1921-23, before returning to Russia forever.

A corollary to this guideline is that those Symbolist writers who remained in the USSR and spoke favorably about the Revolution have fared better there, especially in terms of works published and in comments printed about them. Merezhkovsky and Hippius are the best examples of the opposite effect, but as we will see below, there are always exceptions to these sorts of generalizations.

BLOK +
1921
BRYUSOV +
1924

BIELI NA
ALEMANHA
1921-23
DEPOIS
RUSSIA P/2
SEMPRE

Bryusov, Blok, Bely ENGAJAM-SE NAS ORG. LITERARIAS AJUDAM JOVENS ESCRITORES A CONHECER MELHOR ELETO'S DO FAZER DELES

The major Symbolists who maintained their reputations and influence were, rather naturally, the some ones who had held similar positions before. They continued to write and publish their works, especially Bely, who printed novels, memoirs, and volumes of other materials from 1918 to his death in 1934.⁴ In welcoming the new order, each of these three writers expressed their positive regard for the turnabout and began working actively with the new literary organizations, helping especially to make elements of their craft better known to younger writers. And they are accorded a measure of respect that has continued to the present, though at varying degrees of warmth and enthusiasm.

Blok and Bryusov died rather early, the former in 1921, apparently somewhat disillusioned with his situation, and the latter in 1924. Blok's reputation as a poet has kept his works prominent among the reading public in the USSR and abroad. Numerous editions of his selected and collected works have been printed, and a definitive edition of his *Complete Works* is commencing in the Soviet Union; several volumes of the important *Literary Heritage* (*Literaturnoe nasledstvo*) have been devoted to him and to his correspondence with contemporaries. A number of collections of scholarly papers, the *Blokovskie sborniki*, have appeared as the results of conferences. Finally, dozens of books and scores of articles about him have been published in his homeland and abroad.⁵

Bryusov has been the subject of fewer scholarly treatments in the USSR and very few books in the West; some of his works have been collected and printed in a hundredth anniversary edition in seven volumes, but no *Complete Works* set has appeared.⁶ Although he is considered politically acceptable, many of his writings are not compatible with the precepts of Socialist Realism, as they were outlined at the First Writers Union Congress in 1934. Some efforts have been and are being made to print his archival materials, however, and several volumes of *Bryusov Readings* have appeared in the 1960s and 1970s.⁷

Bely's situation in regard to Soviet publishing authorities is less solid. He did work with the regime and "died a Soviet poet," in the words of official terminology. But thus far the bulk of his writings, over forty-five separate volumes alone, published from 1902 to 1934, has been reprinted only in the West, primarily by the Wilhelm Fink Verlag in Munich. By 1984, the fiftieth anniversary of his death, no book about him had appeared in the

BLOK
ESTUDADO

BRYUSOV
INADEQUA-
DO AO
REOL?
SOCALISTA

BIELI
MAL-QUISTO
NAS
EDICAO'S
SOVIETICAS

Soviet Union though over a dozen had in the West. A great deal of his most important archival materials have been printed abroad as well, though some significant pieces were printed in a volume of the *Literary Heritage* in 1937 and others are promised for another volume in that same series.⁸

Since Stalin's death, moreover, they have published only one of his novels, *Petersburg* and a selection of his poetry as separate books.⁹ And so he has not fared as well as his two compatriots, but abroad his reputation is increasing substantially. The Andrej Belyj Society was founded in 1981, for example, to promote scholarship on him, and translations appear regularly in the major European languages, accompanied by growing recognition of his importance as an author in the twentieth century.¹⁰

Sologub and Annensky

Obviously one cannot trace the events of Annensky's life after the Revolution, since he had died eight years before it, but his reputation since that time is certainly a subject for examination. In fact, neither Sologub nor Annensky can be claimed as Soviet writers, yet both are recognized there as masters of modernist tendencies.

Annensky has received well deserved attention both here in the West and in his native land. He is praised for his poetry; and his *Books of Reflections* have been reprinted on both sides of the USSR border. The standard Soviet edition of his verse and tragedies, moreover, is a solid contribution to Annensky studies.¹¹ Recognition is given for his role as the mentor of Akhmatova and others. Because of his early death, moreover, there are no complicating political considerations.

Sologub presents somewhat of a problem, however, in that he does not fit patterns well. The Revolution gave him no cause for jubilation, and he initially tried to maintain a life style that would permit him to ignore governmental authorities, but these efforts were not long-lived. He and his wife Anastasia petitioned for a visa to leave Russia, but she committed suicide in 1921, throwing herself into the river in Petersburg. Sologub never fully recovered from her death, and although he began to participate more actively in literary organizations and published a number of books and translations, he remained alone until his death, after a long illness, in 1927.

Appreciation of his works has not been as forthcoming as one would expect, given the lasting value of many of his creations. Most of the attention, in the Soviet Union and abroad, has been focused in more recent

years on his poetry and his major novel, *The Petty Demon*, although some scholarship has been directed to his short stories, his plays, and other novels, almost all of this printed in the West. Thus far, however, no standard biography or edition of his life and works has been published anywhere; this gap is felt particularly keenly.

Balmont and Ivanov

These two poets do fit the general rule of geographically based decision-making, for each had lived a number of years abroad before the Revolution, had developed relationships and formed attachments there, and was deeply disappointed by the turnabout. Similarly, the Soviet attitude toward them is rather lukewarm; only some of their poetry, and a few of Balmont's essays have been reprinted there. One major difference in these two poets' satisfaction with their situations, however, is that Ivanov was very much at home in his new location, Italy, whereas Balmont felt isolated in his exile in France, particularly toward the end of his life.

Although Balmont did participate in literary activities for a while after the Revolution, he did not try to disguise his negative feelings about the new order. By the end of 1920, he and several members of his family left Russia, ostensibly so that Balmont could do research for one year, but he never returned and it was not long before he took a position inimical to the Soviets. He continued to write a great deal of verse, and even a novel and short stories; he received honor and recognition in Eastern Europe, particularly for his numerous translations; but his last years were fraught with poverty, increasing mental illness, and isolation. He finally died in 1942.

Despite the publication of anti-Soviet works and participation in émigré activities, Soviet critics have not been entirely negative about Balmont. Vladimir Orlov, for example, has done much to aid scholarship on him, and some attention, in the form of monographs on aspects of his works, has been paid to him in the West. But there is no full-length study of Balmont and his writings; generally speaking, there is less interest in this former king of Russian poetry than in others of his confrères.

Ivanov stayed longer in his homeland, and in fact some of his best writing was done between the Revolution and his departure for Rome in 1924. This includes his "Winter Sonnets" and the *Correspondence Between Two Corners (with Mikhail Gershenzon)*.¹² Because of the death of his third wife Vera, at the age of thirty, Ivanov tried to obtain an exit visa, but without

ANNENSKI

BALMONT
SAI FIM 1920
† 1942

SOLOGUB

IVANOV
SAI 1924
P/RAMA

success at this time. He left Moscow, though, and soon found a teaching position at the University of Baku, where he was an immensely popular lecturer. Finally permitted to leave Russia in 1924, he expressed one wish: "I want to die in Rome." In Italy, Ivanov was able to teach, publish, do research, and write. And in a sort of reprise of the famous Wednesdays at the Tower, he often received guests from all over Europe before his death in 1949.

Ivanov's publications have received by far more attention in the West, while only a small selection of his verse has been printed in the USSR in recent decades.¹³ Because of the efforts of his family and Olga Deschartes, a family friend and keeper of the flame, his *Collected Works* have been appearing in Brussels since 1971. Scholarship on Ivanov could also be a great deal more plentiful, but there has been growing interest in the West since around 1980. Naturally, his views are not likely to strike many sympathetic chords in official Soviet criticism, in particular his decision to join the Catholic Church in 1926; his poetry and other writings, moreover, are now so far removed from current Soviet reality that any audience there is bound to be limited.

Merezhkovsky and Hippius

As was true of these last two poets, the Merezhkovskys had established residence abroad and had traveled there frequently from the last part of the nineteenth century to World War One. Thus although they stayed in Soviet Russia for a short time, there was no question of remaining, and they often thought of ways to escape.¹⁴ They were able to leave Petersburg at the end of 1919, purportedly so that Merezhkovsky could lecture to Red Army troops (!), with Filosofov and a young student named Vladimir Zlobin, later confidant and chronicler of Hippius' life.¹⁵ After crossing Russian-Polish lines, they traveled on to Warsaw, where they tried to rally the Poles against the Bolsheviks. These efforts were not only ~~unsuccessful~~ but deeply disappointing, as was Filosofov's decisive break with the group.

Nevertheless, they carried on their ~~crusade~~ against Bolshevism from France, where they were able to live because Hippius had purchased a small place in Passy before the war. This fixation ~~on France~~ as the implacable enemy ultimately led to embracing some Fascist positions, particularly around the time of the Second World War, and Merezhkovsky even gave speeches favorable to Hitler, whom they did not really care,

MEREZH
+ DE 12
LIVROS
ATÉ MORRER
(1941)

HIPPIUS

WAW!!!

HITLER
!!!

but who was seen as the lesser of two evils.

Merezhkovsky continued to publish at the same, overwhelming rate as before, bringing out over a dozen books on religious and historical themes before his death in 1941. These works feature more of his same thinking about the Third Testament, in relation to such figures as Jesus, Augustin, Dante, and Francis of Assisi. Because of the importance of these names and Merezhkovsky's already established popularity, his works were quickly translated, thus keeping the Russian writer very much in the public eye. As we can see from a later vantage point, however, the works he printed while in emigration cannot be compared to his earlier pieces, and they have been mercifully consigned to near oblivion.

Hippius not only shared in her husband's activities, she also continued to write poetry, stories and reminiscences, the three primary forms of her creativity after the Revolution, in addition to political articles. Her poetry from this period still holds some interest, and her memoirs about leading writers of the Silver Age, especially Blok, Bryusov, Sologub, and Rozanov, constantly find readers, though the statements in them are extremely subjective. The same can be said of her book about her husband, one of the main sources of information about this couple's life.¹⁶

Because of their outspoken views and undying hatred of the Soviet state, the Merezhkovskys are not popular in the USSR. They are mentioned as substantial participants in Russian culture, and some helpful information about them is available there, though no more than is strictly necessary. None of their literary works have been printed there since their departure, and only some of Bryusov's correspondence with Hippius has appeared.¹⁷ This relative silence is not mandatorily accorded all émigré writers, however, as we have already seen with Ivanov and Balmont; and the Soviets regularly print the works of other outspoken émigrés such as Ivan Bunin and Aleksandr Kuprin.

Thus almost all the work on the primary and secondary sources has been carried out in the West, with increased interest in the late 1960s through the 1970s. Because of the lack of newer standard editions, an honor given at least in part to all the Symbolists mentioned above, the Merezhkovskys' works have been only reprinted from earlier editions. Some decent scholarship is available on both writers, but other books have unfortunate tendencies, either to protect and promote, or to repeat previous work.¹⁸

Significant Others

We can also note that other writers who were in some way connected with Symbolism in Russia split in regard to their allegiance to the new order, some going abroad to continue their activities, others remaining in the USSR, often shifting their emphases and tastes. A number of these people are now nearly forgotten, in part because of political views, but clearly the natural process of literary activity and the production of works that are read and reread (or not) has much to do with this development. After all, not every writer will be remembered by a wide circle of readers, even if he or she played a part in this important movement.

Of the writers most closely involved with Skorpion, Grif, and *Zolotoe Runo*, for example, Baltrushaitis, Ellis, Likiardopulo, Polyakov, S. Solovyov, Sokolov, Petrovskaya, and Chulkov, only two continued to have fairly active careers in literature, Chulkov and Baltrushaitis. After the Civil War, Baltrushaitis continued to live in Moscow, as the representative of the newly independent state of Lithuania, though he changed his main literary language to Lithuanian for publications of his poetry. He lived the last five years of his life in Paris and died in 1944; since that time new editions of his works have appeared in the USSR.¹⁹ Chulkov was in fact quite prolific in his further career, writing more stories and poetry; he also turned to literary scholarship on Tyutchev and Dostoevsky and published an interesting though biased volume of memoirs about his acquaintances before his death in 1939.²⁰

The activities of Petrovskaya and Ellis have already been mentioned in Chapter Eight; they were no longer a part of Russian literature after World War One. Some receded into the background, after having been active at *Vesy*, such as Sergey Polyakov, who died in 1943, and Mikhail Likiardopulo, whose life ended in London in 1925. The other two Sergeys in this group, Solovyov and Sokolov, had quite different fortunes: Sergey Solovyov remained in the USSR, active as a Catholic priest; he wrote a biography of his famous uncle, suffered deprivation and arrest and finally died in 1942.²¹ Sergey Sokolov had moved to Berlin, where he established a new publishing house called The Bronze Horseman (*Medny Vsadnik*), after the statue of Peter the Great; he published more poetry, in particular *The Iron Ring*, before his death in 1936.²²

Of those who were associated with the beginnings of Symbolism's first wave, such as Miropolsky, Minsky, Dobrolyubov, and V.V. Hippius, only

MINSKI
SERVIU COMO
REPRESENTT
DOS SOVIETES
EM LONDRES
1920s
!!

CHULKOV
ESTUDOS DE
TYUTCHEV E
DOSTOEVSKY

SOKOLOV
BERLIN

Hippius and Minsky continued their former literary activity. Miropolsky disappeared from scholarly records, and even his date of death is unknown; Dobrolyubov, as mentioned earlier, abandoned this vocation long before the Revolution, but some of his books have been reprinted in the West.²³ Vladimir Hippius stayed in the USSR and continued to publish poetry; like Chulkov, he also became a literary scholar, and he died in the first year of the "Great Patriotic War," in 1941. Minsky had already emigrated to France before the First World War and stayed abroad after the Revolution, primarily in London, Berlin, and Paris (he died in 1937). He did continue his activities in poetry and drama, and he also served as a representative of the Soviet government in London in the 1920s.²⁴

Kuzmin, Ausländer, and Voloshin, writers who participated in noteworthy Symbolist enterprises but mostly struck out on their own paths, all stayed in the USSR and found it a challenge to maintain their former interests and literary tastes, yet each continued to be a part of Russian literature. Of the three, Ausländer was the least talented, and his name has been largely forgotten; he moved to Siberia in the 1920s and wrote for children from that time until his death in 1943.

Voloshin and Kuzmin, however, are experiencing a renaissance of interest in their works, particularly in France, West Germany, and North America, and books by them have been republished and translated. Voloshin lived in the Crimea after the Revolution, where his large house was always open to friends and acquaintances from the intelligentsia; he tried to stay above the fray during the Revolution and Civil War, which caused some problems, but he continued to paint, write poetry, and participate in cultural life until he died in 1932.²⁵

From the beginning of the Soviet era, Kuzmin was quite active in literary organizations, translating, staging plays, composing (he had studied at the Petersburg Conservatory), and writing more of his own works. Because of his open homosexuality and the lack of congruence of his views with official ones, he began to experience serious difficulties by the end of the 1920s and died nearly forgotten in 1936. The bulk of attention devoted to him and his writings has therefore been concentrated in the West.²⁶

Symbolism's Influence

Any attempt to assess the influence of the Symbolist movement in Russian literature and culture generally is at best a complex task, one that can offer

imperfect results. While most well-informed scholars in the West agree that it was and continues to be influential, Soviet statements, especially as presented in official histories of Russian literature, tend toward the view that the revolutionary realist authors so predominated in that era that Symbolism was just a stage in the march toward Socialist Realism, that there was no place for it in the new Russia:

The Revolution separated the people active in artistic endeavors, tossing aside those who tried to stand in its way or who could not comprehend its magnitude . . . and it thrust forth those whose lot it was to create new artistic traditions, which would respond to the goals and aims of the revolutionary epoch.²⁷

The bourgeois movements in pre-October literature [this includes the Symbolist movement] were dealt a mighty blow by Gorky, who relied on Lenin's teachings.²⁸

Indeed because of the political events and the enduring trait that Russian literature is closely connected with its society, that its literary critics wield much power, Symbolism's overt presence in literature of the Soviet era is largely limited to Zapiski Mechtatelei and the efforts by Symbolist authors to instruct young proletarian poets. With its stress on form, aesthetic accomplishment, the artist as an individual (and not a part of a collective), and the mystical subtexts of daily life, Symbolism is not compatible with novels about 5-Year-Plans, with building a mature, developed socialist society, or with the notion of a party-oriented literature. Because of the dispersion of some previous adherents and the shifts in emphases of others, influence after the Revolution is certain to be less easily found. Yet the Symbolist movement had a more lasting effect. Unlike their French forerunners, who saw Symbolism as an approach to art, the Russian Symbolists took their calling more seriously, and this characteristic is revealed in developments that can be traced.

As described earlier, Symbolism had attained a certain currency by the early part of the twentieth century. On a more vulgar level, it was even fashionable to associate oneself with this movement. One contemporary noted that the ladies of the night in Petersburg began calling themselves "Strangers" after Blok's poem.²⁹ Mirsky saw a multitude of new poets and several movements spawned by Symbolism around this time:

PRINCÍPIOS
PASSADOS
ADIANTE:
- PERÇÃO
INDIVIDUAL
- PRESENÇA DA
PERSONA DO
POETA NA OBRA
- BASE LÍRICA P/
EXPREISSÃO DO
PENSAR

SIMB:
PRESENÇA É
ZAPISKI
MECHTATELEI
E ENSINO P/
JOVENS POETAS
PROLETAS

POETAS PROLETAS
C/ OBRAS S/RITMO
NÍVEL DE ESTÉTICA
SIMBOLISTAS

≠ SIMB.
FRANÇÊS
(ENFAQUE ARTÍSTICO)

FORMAS
EDUCACIONAL DAS
SIMB

?

the metaphysical and mystical school; the school of rhythm and verbal pageantry; the academic school . . . ; the "orgiastic" school . . . ; the school of glorified vice; and the school of sheer technical acrobatics.³⁰

On a more serious level, we can again point to the major Post-Symbolist movements, including Acmeism, Futurism, and to a lesser extent Formalism. The Symbolists had opened wide the gates to improved poetic technique and a greater variety of styles, which held sway from the first decade of this century through the early years of the Soviet era. The stress on individual perception, on the poet's persona in his works, and the "lyrical basis" for expressing the poet's thoughts were taken up by its immediate followers.³¹

Even poets, such as Khodasevich and Tyutchev, who eschewed allegiance to any literary school, were raised on this newer poetry. By the time of the Revolution this style no longer seemed new or unusual, but rather the accepted norm. Evgeny Zamyatin and Boris Pilnyak, outstanding prose writers of the 1920s, as well as Yury Libedinsky and Aleksandr Tarasov-Rodionov, who are less memorable, also absorbed techniques from examples provided by Bely and Remizov.³² A good case has also been made for the similarity in approaches of the Symbolists and the Serapion Brotherhood, an extremely loosely organized group (of which Zamyatin and Pilnyak were leading members), in that both proclaimed the independence of art and an aversion to its serving ideology.³³

Since some of the Symbolists had "lectured on the techniques of poetic composition," during the Civil War period, proletarian poets "celebrated the cosmic sweep of their revolution in poetic rhythms that suggest work of Symbolist aesthetes."³⁴ And even such an accepted practitioner of the "right sort of literature" as Aleksandr Serafimovich owes a certain debt to Bely for the prose style in his novel *The Iron Flood*.³⁵

There are several reasons why this particular group of poets, prose writers, essayists, and theoreticians stands out as the leading modernist movement in Russia's Silver Age, but certainly one reason must be the education the Symbolists received, which broadened their horizons considerably and raised the level of interest in affairs beyond Russia. Since these education tended to be strongly classical and included the study of Greek and Latin, there was naturally more thought given to the literary models and cultural traits of those civilizations.

Of the nine major Symbolists whose careers have been traced in the course of this study, six (Annensky, Bely, Bryusov, Blok, Ivanov, and

Merezhkovsky) completed university degrees, and each of them, with the exception of Merezhkovsky, had experience teaching, either as professors (Ivanov and Bryusov after the Revolution), teachers at the lyceum level (Annensky and Sologub, who completed a teachers training institute), or as instructors in the poetic craft (Bely and Blok). Balmont attempted to study at the tertiary level but did not succeed in obtaining a degree, and Hippius was mostly taught at home, but both were extremely diligent in self-education, Balmont in particular. Others associated with this movement also completed university degrees (Ellis, S. Solovyov, Baltrushaitis, V. Hippius) or made beginnings (Voloshin, Chulkov).

The same is true of the Acmeists and Formalists, who by and large were well educated, but this is not the case with Futurists generally or prose writers who were most popular at this time. Gorky, for instance, received essentially no formal education and was self-taught. Other writers who reached a large audience had more schooling, though usually not at the tertiary level; these include Mikhail Artsybashev, Dmitry Mamin-Sibiriyak, Vladimir Korolenko, Aleksandr Kuprin, and Ivan Bunin. Of the most widely read authors, only Leonid Andreev had a university degree. Note as well that these writers who had more solid educational backgrounds, Andreev and Bunin in particular, often participated in Symbolist undertakings. Generally speaking, the interests of realist writers who focused on social conditions were naturally different from those of the classically educated Symbolists.

Yet it is not simply a matter of educational exposure that produced the Symbolist movement. As Prof. Erlich notes: "The literary and philosophical erudition" was a "strong asset of Symbolist theoreticians."³⁶ The ability to put this education and erudition to use was important, and individual Symbolists were respected for their knowledge and ability to broaden the scope of Russian literary endeavors through their statements and publications.

Because of their catholic interests, it was possible not only to assist in raising the level of culture in Russia by producing outstanding verse and prose, but also to add new and important views of Russian classics, which had suffered from misinterpretation. With their plays and related activities in drama, they helped to send the Russian theater off in exciting and worthwhile new directions. Symbolists' appearances at meetings of the Religious-Philosophical Society were closely followed; the lectures they delivered at that unique forum were often significant. If Symbolism had been merely

FORMAÇÃO
ESCOLAR DOS
SYMBOLISTAS

FORMAÇÃO
ESCOLAR
ACMEISTAS
FORMALISTAS
X
FUTURISTAS
GORKI

AN?

RE-VISÃO DOS
CLASSICALS
INOVAÇÃO NO
TEATRO

N For "SO' ARTE"

"just art" its ties to modern art circles and several of the more innovative composers, such as Scriabin, might not have existed, yet they did.

In recent decades the level of interest in Russia's Symbolist movement has been steadily increasing. A brief flurry of activity occurred in the USSR in 1937 with the publication of the double issue of *Literary Heritage* devoted to Symbolism, and since the 1960s more publications of Symbolists' works or studies on them have appeared. One could even say that Blok, Bryusov, and Bely in particular are becoming more popular and better known there as the years pass. The same is essentially true in the West, where scholarly interest in the movement and its individual members is expanding. Much more remains to be done, especially in monographs on Symbolist authors, and these will come in time, not just out of faddish interest, but because Russian Symbolism and its outstanding adherents made a significant contribution to Russian culture and to literature in general.

Notes

Chapter 1

1. Dmitry S. Mirsky, *A History of Russian Literature*, ed. Francis Whitfield (New York: Knopf, 1949), p. 430.
2. There is a difference of opinions about the exact dates of the Silver Age. Some say it began around 1900, though 1898 is a better year, because the World of Art's journal *Mir Iskusstva* and the Moscow Art Theater were both founded that year; some scholars feel that the beginning of World War One in 1914 marks the close of the Silver Age, but 1917 represents a much more definitive break in the development of Russian culture.
3. The Russian term is *bezvremen'e*.
4. Anton Chekhov was able to write as he wished, though he was sometimes criticized from both sides of the political spectrum; see *Letters of Chekhov*, ed. Simon Karlinsky, trans. Michael Heim (New York: Harper and Row, 1973).
5. See, for example, the explanation of this polemic in Nicholas Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 3rd edn. (New York: Oxford, 1977), pp. 401-404; and Alexander Piatigorsky, "Philosophy or Literary Criticism," in *Russian Literature and Criticism: Selected Papers from the Second World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies*, ed. Evelyn Bristol (Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 1982), pp. 235-244.
6. For more on Solov'ev's relations to Symbolism, see Armin Knigge, *Die Lyrik Vl. Solov'evs und ihre Nachwirkung bei A. Belyj und A. Blok* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1973), and Samuel Cioran, *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Knighthood of the Divine Sophia* (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1977).
7. A detailed bibliography devoted to Nietzsche's reception in Russia is provided by Richard Davies, "Nietzsche in Russia, 1892-1917: A Preliminary Bibliography," in *Germano-Slavica*, Vol. 2 (1976 and 1977), pp. 107-146 and 201-220.
8. A sampling of works by Rozanov, Shestov, and Leontiev can be found in Spencer E. Roberts, ed., *Essays in Russian Literature: The Conservative View: Leontiev, Rozanov, Shestov* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1968); see particularly his introduction, pp. vii-xiii.
9. The most complete study of the Religious-Philosophical Society is Jutta Scherrer's *Die Petersburger Religiös-Philosophischen Vereinigungen* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1973).
10. John Bowlt has published two works which outline the Symbolists' ties to the World of Art: "World of Art," in *The Silver Age of Russian Culture*, ed. Carl and Ellendea Proffer (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1975), pp. 397-432, and *The Silver Age: Russian Art of the Early*

Twentieth Century and the "World of Art" Group (Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1979).

11. For more on drama in the Silver Age, see Harold Segel, *Twentieth Century Russian Drama, from Gorky to the Present* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979); Laurence Senelick, ed., *Russian Dramatic Theory from Pushkin to the Symbolists* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981); Michael Green, ed., *The Russian Symbolist Theater: An Anthology of Plays and Texts* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1986; and George Kalbous, *The Plays of the Russian Symbolists* (East Lansing: Russian Language Journal, 1982).
12. A good (and fairly balanced) presentation of Russian Symbolism and its Western European context is found in the article, by Efim Etkind and L. K. Dolgoplov, devoted to Symbolism in the *Kratkaia literaturnaia entsiklopediia*, Vol. 6 (Moscow, 1971), pp. 831-840.
13. Cf. Henri Peyre, *What is Symbolism?*, trans. Emmett Parker (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1980), p. 151.
14. See, for example, Roger Keys, "Symbolism and the Novel," *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (1983), pp. 43-57.
15. On Symbolist aesthetics, see James West, *Russian Symbolism: A Study of Vyacheslav Ivanov and the Russian Symbolist Aesthetic* (London: Methuen, 1970), and Johannes Holthusen, *Studien zur Asthetik und Poetik des russischen Symbolismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).
16. These lines from the end of *Faust, Part Two*, could be rendered as "All that is transitory/ Is only a resemblance," or "All that we see, which passes by/Is only a symbol."
17. See the *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* volume devoted to Symbolism, Nos. 27-28 (Moscow, 1937), especially the article by V. Asmus. "Filosofiiia i estetika russkogo simbolizma."
18. For an introduction to the traditional system for grouping Symbolists, see Georgette Donchin, *The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry* (The Hague: Mouton, 1958).
19. This delineation of the "waves," and their characteristics, is from Donchin's book, cited above.
20. Z. Hippius, *Literaturnyi dnevnik, 1899-1907* (Petersburg, 1908), pp. 329-346.
21. The Symbolists' views on Symbolism and other aspects of literature can be found in *The Russian Symbolists: An Anthology of Critical and Theoretical Writings, op. cit.*
22. On the relation of Acmeism to Symbolism, see Elaine Rusinko, "Acmeism, Post-Symbolism, and Henri Bergson," *Slavic Review*, Vol. 41, No. 3 (1982), pp. 494-510.
23. See Vladimir Markov, *Russian Futurism: A History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), on this topic.
24. Mirsky, p. 432; Mirsky's views are generally quite useful, though it is not possible to agree with him on every point.

Chapter 2

1. Z. Vengerova's "Poety'simvolisty vo Frantsii" appeared in the September issue of *Vestnik Evropy* (1892); articles about Nietzsche began to appear in the November (1892) issue of *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii*.
2. Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, *Stikhi 1883-1887* (Petersburg, 1888).
3. Renato Poggioli, *The Poets of Russia* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1950), p. 82.
4. N. M. Minskii, *Pri svete sovesti* (Petersburg, 1890).
5. D. Merezhkovskii, *Novye stikhotvoreniia 1891-1895* (Petersburg, 1896).
6. D. Merezhkovskii, *Simvolii* (Petersburg, 1892).
7. Valerii Bryusov, *Dnevnik 1891-1910* (Moskva, 1927), p. 13.
8. D. Merezhkovskii, *O prichinakh upadka i o novykh techeniakh sovremennoi russkoi literatury* (Petersburg, 1893).
9. *Ibid.*, the chapter "Nachala novogo idealizma v proizvedeniakh Turgeneva, Goncharova, Dostoevskogo i L. Tolstogo," especially pp. 37-43; the quotation from Zola is on page 39.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 42-43; the line from Tyutchev's poem "Silentium!" is "Mysl' izrechennaia est' lozh'."
12. "Mne nuzhno togo, chego net na svete," from "Pesnia" (1892); see her comments about this poem in her *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1951), p. 63.
13. Zinaida Hippius, *Novye liudi* (Petersburg, 1896). Books printed in the last months of one year were given the date of the next year so that they would be "fresher" longer.
14. Hippius, *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*, p. 67.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
16. D. Merezhkovskii, *Otverzheniia: Iulian Otstupnik*, in *Severnyi vestnik*, Nos. 1-6 (1895).
17. Any Barda, *Bibliographie des oeuvres de Zenaïde Hippius* (Paris, 1975).
18. Hippius, *Novye liudi*, p. 210.
19. Fedor Sologub, *Teni*, "Severnyi dnevnik", No. 12 (1894).
20. F. Sologub, *Tiazhelye sny*, in *Severnyi Vestnik*, Nos. 7-12 (1895), separate edition, Petersburg, 1896. Fedor Sologub, *Stikhi, Kniga pervaiia* (Petersburg, 1896).
21. Konstantin Bal'mont, *Sbornik stikhotvoreniia* (Iaroslavl', 1890). The three poems appeared in *Zhivopisnoe Obozrenie*, 24 November — 7 December, 1885; see Vladimir Orlov, "Bal'mont, Zhizn' i poeziia," in Konstantin Bal'mont, *Stikhotvoreniia* (Leningrad, 1969), p. 19.
22. K. Bal'mont, *Pod severnym nebom* (Petersburg, 1894).
23. S. A. Vengerov, ed., *Russkaia literatura XX veka, 1890-1910* (Moscow, 1914), Vol. 1, p. 111.

214 A HISTORY OF RUSSIAN SYMBOLISM

24. K. Bal'mont, *V bezbrezhnosti* (Moscow, 1895).
25. Max Nordau, *Vyrozhdenie*, trans. R. I. Sementkovskii (Petersburg, 1893).
26. V. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, pp. 9-13.
27. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, p. 13.
28. V. Bryusov and A. Miropol'skii, *Russkie simvolisty*, *Vypusk 1* (Moscow, 1984).
29. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, p. 16.
30. VI. Solov'ev, "Russkie simvolisty," *Vestnik Evropy*, No. 8 (1894).
31. V. Maslov, *Russkie simvolisty*, *Vypusk 2* (Moscow, 1894); Bryusov used the pseudonym of Maslov (and others as well) in these booklets.
32. VI. Solov'ev, "Russkie simvolisty," *Vestnik Evropy*, No. 1 (1895).
33. See N. Gudzii's informative article about this early stage in the development of Russian Symbolism, "Iz istorii rannego russkogo simvolizma: Moskovskie sborniki 'Russkie simvolisty'," *Iskusstvo*, Vol. 3, Book 4 (1928), pp. 180-218.
34. *Russkie simvolisty*, *Vypusk 3* (Moscow, 1895).
35. Solov'ev's review in the October issue of *Vestnik Evropy* for 1895 has his famous parodies of Symbolist poems, pp. 847-851.
36. V. Bryusov, *Juvenalia*, in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i perevodov*, *Tom 1, Stikhi 1892-1899* (Petersburg, 1913).
37. V. Bryusov, *Chefs d'oeuvres* (Moscow, 1895); for Bryusov's comments on the title, see his *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*, Vol. 1 (Moscow, 1973), p. 572.
38. Hippius, *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*, pp. 65-66.
39. Aleksandr Dobroliubov, *Natura Naturans, Natura Naturata* (Petersburg, 1895), reprinted by Berkeley Slavic Specialties in 1981. Bryusov's comments about Dobroliubov are in his *Dnevnik*, pp. 17-18. For more on Dobroliubov, see Jean Hellie, "Dobroliubov, Aleksandr," *Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literature*, ed. Harry Weber, Vol. 5 (Gulf Breeze, Florida: Academic International Press, 1981), pp. 182-189 (includes bibliography).
40. P. and V. Pertsov, *Molodaia poezia* (Petersburg, 1895).

Chapter 3

1. D. Merezhkovskii, "Nauka liubvi," *Severnyi Vestnik*, No. 8 (1896); "Liubov' sil'nee smerti," *Severnyi Vestnik*, No. 8 (1896); "Liubov'," *Zhivopisnoe Obozrenie*, No. 5 (1898).
2. D. Merezhkovskii, *Voskresshie bogi: Leonardo da Vinchi*, in *Nachalo*, Nos. 1-3 (1899), not the whole novel, however; the full novel appeared in *Mir Bozhii*, Nos. 1-12 (1900); separate edition 1901. The first English edition, *The Romance of Leonardo da Vinci*, appeared in London in 1902.
3. D. Merezhkovskii, "Selenie Vinchi," *Kosmopolis*, No. 2 (1897).
4. D. Merezhkovskii, *Vechnye sputniki: Portrety iz vseмирnoi istorii* (Petersburg, 1897).

5. Z. Hippius, *Zerkala: Vtoroi sbornik rasskazov i stikhotvoreniia* (Petersburg, 1898).
6. Z. Hippius, *Bez talismana*, in *Nabliudatel'*, Nos. 5-9 (1896).
7. Z. Hippius, "Zlatotsvet," *Severnyi Vestnik*, Nos. 2-4 (1896).
8. Z. Hippius, "Sredi mertvykh," *Severnyi Vestnik*, No. 3 (1897).
9. Z. Hippius, *Pobediteli* (Petersburg, 1898).
10. Hippius, *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*, pp. 72-73.
11. Akim Volynskii, "Apollon i Dionis," *Severnyi Vestnik*, No. 11 (1896).
12. N. M. Minskii, *Pri svete sovesti*, 2nd edn. (Petersburg, 1897).
13. N. M. Minskii, *Genrikh Ibsen: Ego zhizn' i deiatel'nost'* (Petersburg, 1896).
14. See Nils Åke Nilsson, *Ibsen in Russland* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958); and Ronald E. Peterson, "Ibsen and Russian Literature," *Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literature* (volume forthcoming).
15. M. Maeterlinck, *Piat'dram* (Moscow, 1896); see also Bialik, Vol. 1, p. 348.
16. F. Sologub, *Teni: Rasskazy i stikhi* (Petersburg, 1896).
17. Sologub's *Melkii bes* appeared for the first time in 1905 in Nos. 5-11 the journal *Voprosy Zhizni* (but without the final chapters). The first publication of the entire book as a separate edition occurred in Petersburg, 1907.
18. K. Bal'mont, *Tishina: Liricheskie poemy* (Petersburg, 1898).
19. A. Volynskii, review of *Tishina*, in *Severnyi Vestnik*, Nos. 8-9 (1898).
20. Bryusov, *Chefs d'oeuvre*, 2nd edn. (Moscow, 1896).
21. V. Bryusov, *Me eum esse; Novaia kniga stikhov* (Moscow, 1897).
22. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, p. 23.
23. V. Bryusov, "O sobranie sochinenii Tiutcheva: Bibliograficheskie zametki," *Russkii Arkhiv*, No. 10 (1898).
24. Joan D. Grossman, "Me eum esse: Valerii Bryusov and the Caucasus Tradition in Russian Literature," *Russian Review*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (1980), pp. 285-300.
25. V. Bryusov, *Ognennyi angel*, in *Vesy*, Nos. 1-3, 5-12 (1907), 2-3, 5-8 (1908).
26. L. N. Tolstoi, *Chto takoe iskusstvo*, in *Sochineniia*, Vol. 15 (Moscow, 1898).
27. V. Bryusov, *O iskusstve* (Moscow, 1899).
28. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, p. 53.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 70, 78.
30. Ivan Konevskoi, *Mechty i dumy* (Petersburg, 1899); *Stikhi i proza: Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow, 1904); this collection came out in November, 1903, and was reprinted by Wilhelm Fink Verlag in 1971, as *Sobranie sochinenii*.
31. Bal'mont, *Stikhotvoreniia*, p. 122: this is the first stanza of his poem "Ia vol'nyi veter, ia vechno veiu."
32. Hippius, "Sonnet," *Zerkala*, p. 298.

33. F. Sologub, *Stikhotvoreniia*, ed. M. I. Dikman (Leningrad, 1975), p. 83.
34. A. Dobroliubov, *Sobranie stikhov* (Moscow, 1900), and *Iz knigi nevidimoi* (Moscow, 1905).
35. Two translations of Nietzsche's *Also sprach Zarathustra* appeared in Russian in December, 1898, for example; see Bialik, Vol. 1, pp. 410, 476.

Chapter 4

1. Quoted in Temira Pachmuss, *Zinaida Hippus: An Intellectual Profile* (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971), p. 9.
2. Lev Shestov, "Filosofia tragedii," *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 7, Nos. 2, 4-6 (1902), Vol. 8, Nos. 7-10 (1902).
3. Lev Shestov, *Dobro v uchenii gr. Tolstogo i F. Nitshe* (Petersburg, 1900).
4. See Oleg Maslenikov's *The Frenzied Poets: Andrey Biely and the Symbolist Poets* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952), the first major study in the West of Belyi and the other Symbolists.
5. The phrase "knights of St. Sophia" is derived from the title of S. Cioran's book mentioned above, *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Knighthood of the Divine Sophia*.
6. Andrei Belyi, "My zhdem ego vozvrashcheniia," *Sovobodnaia sovest'*, Vol. 1 (Moscow, 1906), pp. 160-163; reprinted in a. Belyj, *Rasskazy*, ed. R. E. Peterson (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1979), pp. 20-23. A. Belyi, *Pervoe svidanie* (Petersburg, 1921).
7. Sergei Solov'ev *Zhizn' i tvorcheskaiia evoliusiia Vladimira solov'eva* (Brussels: Zhizn' s Bogom, 1977).
8. Vl. Solov'ev, *Tri razgovora. Kratkaia povest' ob antikhriste* (Petersburg, 1900).
9. *Kniga razdumii* (Petersburg, 1899).
10. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, p. 60.
11. Konevskoi, *Mechty i dumy*.
12. *Al'manakh dennitsa* (Petersburg, 1900).
13. "Svobodno iskusstvo, skovana zhizn'," a motto that occasionally appeared on the pages of that journal.
14. *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 5, No. 5 (1901), for example, contains poems by Merezhkovskii, Vl. Hippus, Z. Hippus, Bal'mont, and Minskii, each on a separate page, illustrated by the artists of the World of Art group.
15. For more on the Symbolists' participation in *Mir Iskusstva*, see the Bowlt article, "World of Art," mentioned above.
16. Z. Hippus, "Dve dramy A. Tolstogo," *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 1, No. 5 (1899), and "Torzhestvo v chest' smerti: 'Al'ma' — tragediaia Minskogo," Vol. 2, Nos. 17-18 (1900).
17. Z. Hippus, "Na beregu Ionicheskogo moria," *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 1, Nos. 7-12 (1899).
18. Z. Hippus, *Sumerki dukha*, in *Zhizn'*, Nos. 5-7 (1900); the second appearance of this novel was in her *Tret'ia kniga rasskazov* (Petersburg, 1902).
19. See Note 2 for Chapter 3.
20. D. Merezhkovskii, "Lev Tolstoi i Dostoevskii," in *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 3, Nos. 1-12 (1900), Vol. 4, Nos. 13-24 (1900), Vol. 5, Nos. 2-4, 6 (1901), Vol. 6, Nos. 7-12 (1901), Vol. 7, No. 2 (1902).
21. See Simon Karlinsky's introduction to Vladimir Zlobin, *A Difficult Soul: Zinaida Gippius* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 1-21.
22. Hippus, *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*, p. 112.
23. See Scherrer, *Die Petersburger Religiös-Philosophischen Vereinigungen*, for further information on these meetings.
24. Ibid.
25. Dobroliubov, *Sobranie stikhov*.
26. K. Hamsun, *Siesta: Ocherki* (Moscow, 1900), *Pan* (Moscow, 1900), *Drama zhizni* (Moscow, 1902); H. Ibsen, *Kogda my mervye prosnemsia* (Moscow, 1900); G. D'Annunzio, *Tragedii* (Moscow, 1900); A. Schmitzler, *Zelenyi popugai* (Moscow, 1900).
27. Ivan Bunin, *Listopad* (Moscow, 1901).
28. V. Bryusov, *Tertia Vigilia: Kniga novykh stikhov 1897-1900* (Moscow, 1900).
29. Bryusov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1 (1973), pp. 588-589.
30. *Severnye Tsvety*, I (Moscow, 1901).
31. Ibid., p. 1.
32. *Severnye Tsvety*, II (Moscow, 1902).
33. Ibid., p. 1.
34. Sologub, "Ia — bog tainstvennogo mira," in *Stikhotvoreniia* (1975), p. 176.
35. *Severnye Tsvety*, III (Moscow, 1903), p. v.
36. Pyman, Vol. 1, pp. 160-161; A. Belyi, *Nachalo veka* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1933), pp. 229-232.
37. *Al'manakh Grif*, I (Moscow, 1903).
38. For more on Annenskii, see Vsevolod M. Setchkarev, *Studies in the Life and Work of Innokentij Annenskij* (The Hague: Mouton, 1963). Plays by Euripides and Annenskii translated are: *Bachanae*, *Rhesus*, *Herakles Furens*, *Phoeniciae*, *Iphigenia at Aulis*, *Orestes*, *Alcestis*, and *Medea*.
39. Innokentii Annenskii, *Melanippa filosof: Drama* (Petersburg, 1901).
40. I. Annenskii, *Tsar' Iksion: Tragediia* (Petersburg, 1902).
41. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, p. 122.
42. Ibid.
43. A. Belyi, *Simfoniia (vtoraia, dramaticheskaiia)* (Moscow, 1902).

44. Belyi, *Simfoniia*, in the reprint, *Chetyre simfonii* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971), p. 125.
45. Aleksandr Blok, "Andrei Belyi. Simfoniia, 2-aia, dramaticheskaiia," *Novyi Put'*, No. 4 (1903).
46. Bowlt, "World of Art," p. 401.
47. A. Belyi, "Formy iskusstva," *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 8, No. 12 (1902).
48. A. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 8 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1963), pp. 51-54.
49. Viacheslav Ivanov, *Kormchie zvezdy* (Petersburg, 1903); see Ol'ga Deschartes' lengthy introduction to Viacheslav Ivanov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1 (Brussels: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1971), pp. 7-227, especially p. 34.
50. See Bialik, Vol. 2, p. 376.
51. A. Blok, *Ante Lucem*, in *Sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow, 1911); A. Blok — A. Belyi, *Perepiska*, ed. VI. Orlov (Moscow, 1940).
52. A. Blok, "Iz posviashchenii," *Novyi Put'*, No. 3 (1903).
53. A. Blok, "Predchuvstvuiu Tebia," *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1960), p. 97.
54. D. Merezhkovskii, "Sud'ba Gogolia," *Novyi Put'*, Nos. 1-3 (1903).
55. Hippius, *Tret'ia kniga rasskazov*.
56. K. Bal'mont, *Goriashchie zdaniia: Lirika sovremennoi dushi* (Moscow, 1900).
57. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, pp. 130-131.
58. V. Bryusov, "kliuchin tain," *Vesy*, No. 1 (1904), pp. 3-21.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
60. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, p. 131.
61. K. Bal'mont, *Budem kak solntse* (Moscow, 1903).
62. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5 (1962), pp. 528-30, 546; I. Annenskii, "Bal'mont — lirik," *Kniga otrazhenii* (Petersburg, 1906), p. 213; V. Briusov, "Budem kak solntse," *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 10, Nos. 7-8 (1903), pp. 35-36.
63. Bryusov, *ibid.*
64. Bal'mont, "Ia — izyskannost' russkoi medlitel'noi rechi," in *Stikhotvoreniia* (1969), pp. 232-233.
65. Pyman, Vol. 1, pp. 171-176.
66. Liubov' Blok, *I byl', i nebylitsy o Bloke i o sebe* (Bremen: K-Press, 1977), pp. 51-52.
67. K. Bal'mont, *Tol'ko liubov'* (Moscow, 1903).
68. Z. Hippius, *Sobranie stikhov* (Moscow, 1904).
69. *Ibid.*, p. ii.
70. D. Merezhkovskii, *Sobranie stikhov* (Moscow, 1904).
71. F. Sologub, *Sobranie stikhov* (Moscow, 1904).

72. F. Sologub, *Tvorimaia legenda* (also known as *Nav'i chary*) appeared in full for the first time in Vols. 18-20 of his *Sobranie sochinenii* (Petersburg, 1914).
73. V. Bryusov, *Urbi et Orbi* (Moscow, 1903).
74. Pyman, Vol. 1, p. 147.
75. A. Belyi, *Severnaia simfoniia (pervaia, geroicheskaiia)* (Moscow, 1904).
76. S. Grechishkin and A. Lavrov, "Biograficheskie istochniki romana Briusova *Ognennyi angel*," Part 1, *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach*, No. 1 (1978), pp. 80-82.
77. A. Belyi, "O teurgii," *Novyi Put'*, No. 9 (1903).
78. Grechishkin and Lavrov, "Istochniki," Part 1, pp. 84-85; see Belyi's "Svetovaia skazka" in *Rasskazy*, pp. 11-19.
79. Bryusov, "Kliuchi tain"; Bal'mont, "Elementatnye slova o simbolicheskoi poezii." *Gornye vershiny: Sbornik statei* (Moscow, 1904), pp. 75-95 (Bal'mont's essay was first given as a lecture in Paris in 1900); Belyi, "Formy iskusstva."

Chapter 5

1. Bowlt, "World of Art," p. 403.
2. A. Belyi, "Simvolizm kak miroponimanie," *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 11, No. 5 (1904).
3. K. Bal'mont, "Gimn solntsu," "Voda," "Ogon'," *Mir Iskusstva*, Vol. 12, No. 12 (1904).
4. C. Harold Bedford, *The Seeker: D. S. Merezhkovskiy* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1975), pp. 80-90.
5. The view of Peter the Great as the Antichrist was especially widespread among the Russian Old Believers.
6. Z. Hippius, "Svetloe ozero," *Novyi Put'*, No. 1-2 (1904); "Suor Maria," No. 11 (1904).
7. V. Bryusov, "Orfei i Evridika," *Novyi Put'*, No. 8 (1904).
8. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5 (1962), p. 545; V. Ivanov, "Ellinskaia religiia stradaushchego boga," *Novyi Put'*, Nos. 1-3, 5, 8-9 (1904), and *Voprosy Zhizni*, Nos. 6-7 (1905).
9. Georgii Chulkov, *Gody stranstvii* (Moscow, 1930), p. 383; G. Chulkov, *Kremnisty put'* (Moscow, 1904).
10. Z. Hippius, *Zhivye lisa*, Vol. 1 (Prague, 1925), pp. 27-28.
11. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 8 (1963), p. 138.
12. V. Ivanov, "Krizis individualizma," *Voprosy Zhizni*, No. 9 (1905).
13. "K chitateliu," *Vesy*, No. 1 (1904), pp. iii-iv.
14. *Ibid.*
15. See Ronald E. Peterson, "Vesy: Its Zodiacal Title," *Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Spring, 1984), pp. 89-92.
16. K. M. Azadovskii and D. E. Maksimov, "Briusov i 'Vesy' (Kistoriiu izdaniia)," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85 (Moscow, 1976), pp. 261-276.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 268.
18. *Al'manakh Grif*, III (Moscow, 1905).
19. A. Belyi, "Bog s nami," *Al'manakh Grif*, III.
20. Lidia Zinov'eva-Annibal, "Teni sna," F. Sologub, "V plenu," Z. Hippius, "Tvar'" *Severnye tsvety assiriiskie*, IV (Moscow, 1905). Z. Hippius, *Alyi mech* (Moscow, 1906).
21. K. Bal'mont, *Tri rastsveta*, V. Briusov, *Zemlia*, V. Ivanov, *Tantal*, in *Severnye tsvety*, IV.
22. Rodney L. Patterson, "Konstantin Bal'mont," *Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literature*, Vol. 2, p. 83.
23. V. Bryusov, *Zemmaia os'* (Moscow, 1907).
24. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 384.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 439-40.
26. V. Ivanov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 2, p. 679.
27. I. Annenskii, *Tikhie pesni* (Petersburg, 1904).
28. Bryusov's review appeared in *Vesy*, No. 4 (1904), under the pseudonym Avrelii.
29. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5 (1962), pp. 619-621.
30. I. Annenskii, "Toska," *Stikhotvoreniia i tragedii*, ed. A. Fedorov (Leningrad, 1959), p. 93.
31. A. Belyi, *Zolotoe v lazuri* (Moscow, 1904).
32. For more about the "liricheskie otryvki v proze," see Ronald E. Peterson, *Andrei Bely's Short Prose* (Birmingham: Birmingham Slavonic Monographs, No. 11, 1980), pp. 11-16.
33. Konstantin Mochul'skii, *Andrei Belyi* (Paris, 1955), p. 61; A. Belyi, *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy*, ed. T. Iu. Khmel'nitskaia (Moscow-Leningrad, 1966), pp. 74-75.
34. Grechishkin and Lavrov, "Istochniki," Part 1, pp. 85-86.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
36. Pyman, Vol. 1, p. 172; A. Blok, *Zapisnye knizhki, 1901-1920* (Moscow, 1965), pp. 66-67.
37. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1 (1960), p. 323.
38. *Ibid.*, Vol. 8, p. 111.
39. V. Ivanov, *Prozrachnost'* (Moscow, 1904).
40. Deschartes, p. 63.
41. Viacheslav Ivanov, "Kochevniki krasoty," *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1, p. 778.
42. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5 (1962), p. 18; Belyi, *Nachalo veka*, p. 328.
43. Bryusov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 6 (1975), pp. 300-301.
44. Reviews of K. Bal'mont's *Feinye skazki* (Moscow, 1905) — by Belyi in *Zolotoe runo*, No. 1 (1906), p. 140, and Bryusov in *Vesy*, No. 12 (1905), pp. 66-67. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5, pp. 618-619.
45. K. Bal'mont, *Liturgiia krasoty* (Moscow, 1905).

46. Bryusov's review of Grif's third miscellany appeared in *Vesy*, No. 3 (1905), p. 61.
47. K. Bal'mont, *Gornye vershiny* (Moscow, 1904).
48. K. Bal'mont, *Zmeinye tsvety* (Moscow, 1910).
49. Orlov, "Bal'mont: Zhizn' i poeziia," p. 30.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
51. A. Belyi, *Vozvrat: Tret'ia simfoniia* (Moscow, 1905).
52. See Ronald E. Peterson, "Andrei Belyi's Third Symphony: Return or Demented Demise?" *Russian Literature and Criticism: Selected Papers from the Second World Congress*, pp. 167-175.
53. *Ibid.*, pp. 167-168.
54. Belyi, *Nachalo veka*, p. 197.
55. F. Sologub, *Kniga skazok* (Moscow, 1905), and *Zhalo smerti* (Moscow, 1904).
56. Murl Barker, Introduction to Fedor Sologub, *The Kiss of the Unborn and Other Stories* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1977), pp. xxvii-xxviii.
57. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5, p. 284.
58. F. Sologub, *Melkii bes* (Berlin-Petrograd-Moscow), p. 6.
59. Barker, p. xx.
60. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5, p. 284.
61. G. Chulkov, *Gody stranstvii*, p. 100.
62. V. Bryusov, *Stephanos: Venok* (Moscow, 1906).
63. V. Bryusov, "Sviashchennaia zhertva." *Vesy* No. 1 (1905).
64. *Ibid.*
65. A. Belyi, "Apokalipsis v russkoi poezii," *Vesy*, No. 4, and V. Briusov, "V zashchitu ot odnoi pokhvaly (Otkrytoe pis'mo Andreiu Belomu)," *Vesy*, No. 5 (1905).
66. A. Belyi, "V zashchitu ot odnogo narekaniia," *Vesy*, No. 6, and V. Ivanov, "Iz oblasti sovremennykh nastroenii," *Vesy*, No. 6 (1905).
67. Bryusov, "Sviashchennaia zhertva."
68. V. Ivanov, "Poet i chern'," *Vesy*, No. 3 (1905).
69. *Ibid.*
70. *Ibid.*
71. A. Blok, "Tvorchestvo Ivanova," *Voprosy Zhizni*, Nos. 4-5 (1905).
72. Z. Hippius, "Dekadenstvo i obshchestvennost'," *Vesy*, No. 5 (1905). The article is signed by her husband in *Vesy*, but it is clearly hers and appeared in her *Literaturnyi dnevnik* (under the pseudonym Anton Krainii), pp. 329-346.
73. A. Belyi, "Anton Krainii, *Literaturnyi dnevnik*," No. 3 (1908).
74. For more about The Tower, see Ivanov's *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1, pp. 92-116, and Vol. 2, pp. 821-825.

75. See John Malmstad's edition of Belyi's *Sukhorvoreniia*, 3 volumes, (Munich: Centrifuga, 1982, 1984).
76. [untitled], *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 1 (1906), p. 4.
77. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, p. 136.
78. Bryusov, "Balderu Loki," written in November, 1904, and Belyi, "Starinnomu vragu," written in December, 1904.
79. Grechishkin and Lavrov, "Istochniki," Part 1, p. 99.
80. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5, p. 617; Belyi's comment is quoted in Briusov, *sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1, p. 625.
81. Bryusov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol 1, p. 620.
82. *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 635.
83. The poem, "Griadushchie gunny," is in *ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 433.
84. *Svobodnaia sovest'*, Parts 1 and 2 (Moscow, 1906).
85. See especially Blok's review of Part 1 in *Vesy*, No. 2 (1906), and Part 2 in *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 10 (1906); Belyi, *Nachalo veka*, p. 465.
86. Sigurd [Vladislav Khodasevich], "Kniga otrazhenii" I. F. Annenskogo," *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 3 (1906).
87. Merezhkovskii, *Griadushchii kham*, *Chekhov i Gor'kii* (Moscow, 1906).
88. D. Merezhkovskii, *Gogol' i chert* (Moscow, 1906). Belyi's review of this book appeared in *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 4 (1906).
89. F. Sologub, *Rodine* (Petersburg, 1906).
90. Krechetov's review appeared in *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 5 (1906); Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 5, p. 163.
91. These comments are from Sologub's review of Merezhkovskii's *Griadushchii kham*, printed in *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 5 (1906).
92. *Fakely*, I, ed. G. Chulkov (Petersburg, 1906).
93. Blok's poem, "Balaganchik," written in July, 1905, is in his *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 2, pp. 67-68. His drama *Balaganchik* is in *ibid.*, Vol. 4, pp. 7-21.
94. Z. G. Mints and Iu. P. Blagovolina, "Perepiska Bloka s V. Ia. Briusovym," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 92, book 1 (Moscow, 1980), pp. 494-495.
95. A. Belyi, "Kust" and "Gornaia vladychitsa," both in *Rasskazy*, pp. 24-37 and pp. 38-48; for more about them, see Peterson, *Andrei Bely's Short Prose*, pp. 34-37 and pp. 46-49.
96. Liubov' Blok, *I byl', i nebylitsy*, pp. 54-59.
97. Blok, "Neznakomka," *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 2, pp. 185-186.
98. Pyman, Vol. 1, p. 240. Vladimir Orlov, *Hamayun: The Life of Alexander Blok*, trans. Olga Shartse (Moscow, 1980), p. 142.

Chapter 6

1. Bryusov's review of *Fakely I* appeared in *Vesy*, No. 5 (1906); see also *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 285.
2. L. Andreev, "Tak bylo," in *Fakely I*.
3. Ivanov, "O 'fakel'shchikakh' i drugikh imenakh sobiratei'nykh," *Vesy*, No. 6 (1906).
4. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 284.
5. Chulkov, "Poeziia Vl. Solov'eva," *Voprosy Zhizni*, No. 5 (1905), and "Iz chastnoi perepiski: o misticheskom anarkhizme," *Voprosy Zhizni*, No. 7 (1905).
6. Chulkov, *O misticheskom anarkhizme* (Peterburg, 1906); the page numbers that follow refer to the 1971 reprint (Letchworth:Prideaux), which omits the Ivanov essay.
7. Ivanov, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 3 (1979), pp. 79-90.
8. Chulkov, *O misticheskom anarkhizme*, p. 4.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 45-46, 51, 55.
13. Chulkov, *Gody stranstvii*, pp. 84, 134.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 376.
15. Ivanov, "O 'fakel'shchikakh . . .," p. 54.
16. Blok, letter to the editor in *Vesy*, No. 8 (1907), and "Literaturnye itogi v 1907 godu," *Zolotoe Runo*, Nos. 11-12 (1907).
17. L. D. Blok, *I byl', i nebylitsy*, p. 60.
18. Chulkov, *Gody stranstvii*, p. 327.
19. Chulkov's review of Bryusov's *Zemnaia os'* appeared in *Pereval*, No. 4 (1907).
20. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 285.
21. Belyi, "O propovednikakh, gastronomakh, misticheskikh anarkhistakh, i t. p.," *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 1 (1907).
22. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 92, Book 1, pp. 544-48.
23. "Ot redaktsii," *Pereval*, No. 1 (1906), pp. 3-4.
24. Kornei Chukovskii, *Iz vospominanii* (Moskva, 1959), p. 453.
25. Tovarishch Germann [Hippius], "Trikhina," *Vesy*, No. 5 (1907).
26. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, pp. 402-03; Andrei Belyi, *Mezhdv dvukh revoliutsii* (Leningrad, 1934), p. 248; Belyi published a cycle of poems under the general title "Melankholiia" in *Zolotoe Runo*, Nos. 3-4 (1908).
27. Blok, *Nechaiannaia radost'* (Moskva, 1907); Pyman, Vol. 1, p. 188.

28. Blok, *Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh*, Vol. 2 (Moskva, 1955), pp. 680-1.
29. Blok *Snezhnaia maska* (Peterburg, 1907).
30. Ivanov, *Eros* (Peterburg, 1907); according to a letter quoted by Ol'ga Deschartes, *Eros* appeared on January 9, 1907 see *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 2, pp. 743.
31. Ivanov, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 1, pp. 98, 99, 100, 101.
32. Bal'mont, *Stikhotvoreniia* (Peterburg, 1906); Briusov's review of Bal'mont's book is in *Vesy*, No. 9 (1906), p. 53.
33. Bal'mont, *Zlye chary* (Peterburg, 1906).
34. E. Verhaeren, *Stikhi o sovremennosti* (Moskva, 1906).
35. Bryusov, *Zemnaia os'* (Moskva, 1907).
36. *Zemnaia os'*, 2-oe izdanie (Moskva, 1910), p. vii.
37. Bryusov, "Respublika iuzhnogo kresta," *Vesy* No. 12 (1905).
38. Chulkov, review of *Zemnaia os'*, mentioned above; Stanislaw Przybyszewski was a Polish writer popular at the turn of the century, known for his (then) rather shocking works and views.
39. Z. Hippus, *Alyi mech* (Moskva, 1906); Sologub, *Politicheskie skazochki* (Peterburg, 1906).
40. Sologub, *Pobeda smerti*, *Fakely* III (Peterburg, 1908); *Dar mudrykh pchel*, *Zolotoe Runo*, Nos. 2-3 (1907).
41. Sologub, "Teatr odnoi voli," in *Teatr: kniga o novom teatre* (Peterburg, 1908).
42. Eighteen plays, according to George Kalbous, *The Plays of the Russian Symbolists*, p. 142; see also Daniel Gerould, "Sologub and the Theatre," pp. 79-84.
43. Annenskii, *Laodamia*, in *Severnaia rech'* (Peterburg, 1906), pp. 137-208; Bryusov, *Protesilai umershii*, first published in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 9 (1913).
44. Harold B. Segel, *Twentieth Century Russian Drama: From Gorky to the Present*, p. 68.
45. Blok, *Korol' na ploshchadi*, in *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 4 (1907); *Neznakomka*, in *Vesy*, Nos. 5-7 (1907); *Liricheskie dramy* (Peterburg, 1908).
46. *Fakely* II (Peterburg, 1907); Belyi, "Shtempelovannaia kalosha," *Vesy*, No. 5 (1907).
47. Belyi, *ibid.*; Ellis' review of *Fakely* II was included in *Vesy*, No. 6 (1907).
48. Mochul'skii, p. 98.
49. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 288.
50. Grechishkin and Lavrov, "Istochniki," part 2, *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Band 2 (1978), pp. 85-86; *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, pp. 693-4; Belyi, *Nachalo veka* (Moskva-Leningrad, 1933), pp. 285-86; V. Khodasevich, "Konets Renaty," in *Nekropol'* (Bruxelles: Les Éditions Petropolis, 1939), p. 19; the information on this incident in the introduction to Andrei Bely, *Complete Short Stories* (Ann Arbor, 1979), p. 16, is based too closely on Khodasevich's version and is incorrect.
51. Bely's review of Chulkov's *Taiga* appeared in *Vesy*, No. 6 (1907), pp. 69-70.

52. *Korabli* (Moskva, 1907); *Protalina* (Moskva, 1907); *Belye Nochi* (Peterburg, 1907). See also Chulkov, *Gody stranstvii*, pp. 147-8; the Russian title of Kuzmin's story is "Kartonyi domik."
53. *Tsvetnik Or*, *koshnitsa pervaiia* (Peterburg, 1907).
54. Belyi's review of *Tsvetnik Or* appeared in *Vesy*, No. 6 (1907).
55. Lidia Zinov'eva-Annibal, *Tragicheskii zverinets*; Blok, *Snezhnaia maska*; Chulkov, *Taiga*; Remizov, *Limonar'*; Gorodetskii, *Perun*, all published by Ory in Peterburg in 1907.
56. The Russian title of Ivanov's cycle is *Zolotyie zavesy*.
57. Bal'mont, *Pesni mstitelia* (Paris, 1907); *Zhar-ptitsa* (Moskva, 1907).
58. V. Orlov, introduction to Bal'mont, *Stikhotvoreniia* (Leningrad, 1969), p. 65.
59. The title of Sabashnikova's (Voloshina's) cycle is *Lesnaia svirel'*.
60. Ivanov, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 1, pp. 102-05, Vol. 2, pp. 765, 808-10.
61. B. Bakulin [Bryusov], "Torzhestvo pobeditelei," *Vesy*, No. 9 (1907), p. 57.
62. See Chulkov, *Gody stranstvii*, p. 376.
63. Belyi's review of *Tsvetnik Or*, mentioned above.
64. A. Blok-A. Belyi, *Perepiska* (Moskva, 1940), p. 192; Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 8, pp. 191-2.
65. A. Miropol'skii, *Ved'ma. Lestvitsa* (Moskva, 1905); *Lestvitsa* had appeared in 1902 as a book put out by Skorpion in Moscow.
66. A. Kondrat'ev, *Stikhi* (Peterburg, 1905); *Satiressa* (Moskva, 1907); *Belyi kozel* (Peterburg, 1908); *Elena: dramaticheskii epizod iz epokhi troianskoi voiny* (Petrograd, 1917).
67. A. Kursinskii, *Skvoz' prizmku dushi* (Moskva, 1906); Bryusov's review of Kursinski's book appeared in *Vesy*, No. 7 (1906).
68. L. Vil'kina, *Moi sad* (Moskva, 1906); Bryusov's review of her book appeared in *Vesy*, No. 1 (1907).
69. Alexander, *Po bezdorozh'iu* (Moskva, 1907); Bryusov's review appeared in *Vesy*, No. 3 (1908).
70. S. Sokolov, *Alaia kniga* (Moskva, 1907); Bryusov, *Vesy*, No. 5 (1907), and *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 6, pp. 336-7.
71. N. Petrovskaiia, *Sanctus Amor* (Moskva, 1908); see Grechishkin and Lavrov, "Istochniki," part 2, p. 84, for the autobiographical context of the stories.
72. Belyi's review is in *Vesy*, No. 3 (1908); Bryusov's comments are in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 773.
73. S. Ausländer, *Zolotyie iabloki* (Moskva, 1908).
74. Belyi's review is in *Vesy*, No. 6 (1908).
75. S. Ausländer, *Poslednii sputnik* (Moskva, 1913); see Grechishkin and Lavrov, "Istochniki," part 2, pp. 84-85.
76. S. Solov'ev, *Tsvety i ladan* (Moskva, 1907).

77. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 5, pp. 151, 155-6.
78. Bryusov's review is in *Vesy*, No. 5 (1907).
79. S. Solov'ev, *Crurifragium* (Moskva, 1908); the title of the essay mentioned is "G. Blok o zemledelakh, dolgoborodykh ariitsakh, pare piva, obo mne i o mnogom drugom."
80. Blok, "Pis'ma o poezii" [section entitled "Dva aiaksa"], *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 10 (1908).
81. Ch. Baudelaire, *Tsvety zla* (Moskva, 1908); *Stikhotvoreniiia v proze* (Moskva, 1910); Georges Rodenbach, *Pokryvalo* (Moskva, 1906).
82. Sologub, *Liturgiia mne*, in *Vesy*, No. 2 (1907) and in a separate edition published in Moscow that same year; *Zmii* (Peterburg, 1907); *Istlevaiushchie lichiny* (Moskva, 1907); *Tvorimaia legenda* [first 13 chapters], in *Shipovnik, Tre'i al'manakh* (Peterburg, 1907).
83. See the following books, for example: Carola Hansson, *Fedor Sologub as a Short-Story Writer* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1975); Andreas Leitner, *Die Erzählungen Fedor Sologubs* (München: Sagner, 1976); Stanley Rabinowitz, *Sologub's Literary Children: Keys to A Symbolist's Prose* (Columbus: Slavica, 1980); Johannes Holthusen, *Fedor Sologubs Roman-Trilogie (Tvorimaja legenda)*, (The Hague: Mouton, 1960); and G. Selegen', *Prekhitraia viaz'* (Washington: Kamkin, 1968).
84. Evelyn Bristol, introduction to F. Sologub. *Rasskazy* (Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialities, 1979), p. 38.
85. The Russian titles of the stories mentioned are: "Otrok Lin," "Soediniaiuschcii dushi," "Malen'kii chelovek," and *Dva Gotika*."
86. Sologub, *Kapli krovi*, Vol. XVIII of his *Sobranie sochinenii* (Peterburg, 1914).
87. Sologub, *Koroleva Ortruda*, Vol. XIX of *ibid*.
88. Sologub, *Dym i pepel*, Vol. XX of *ibid*.
89. See Holthusen's monograph cited above, and Samuel Cioran's translation: *Drops of Blood, Queen Ortruda, and Smoke and Ashes* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1979), general title *The Created Legend*.
90. The best introduction in English to this trilogy is Andrew Field's article "The Created Legend: Sologub's Symbolic Universe," *Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (1961), pp. 341-9, which is in fact better than Cioran's introduction included in *Drops of Blood*, pp. 11-22.
91. K. D. Muratova, ed., *Istoriia russkoi literatury kontsa XIX — nachala XX veka. Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'* (Moskva-Leningrad, 1963), pp. 387-8.
92. Bryusov, *Sob. soch.* Vol. 4, p. 11; *Ognennyi angel* was originally published in installments in *Vesy*, Nos. 1-3, 5-12 (1907), and 2-3, 5-8 (1908).
93. Bryusov, *Sob. soch.*, Vol.4, p. 346.
94. Grechishkin and Lavrov, "Istochniki," part 2, pp. 83-4.
95. Belyi's review of *Ognennyi angel* in *Vesy*, No. 9 (1909).
96. Zlobin, *Difficult Soul*, pp. 101-02, 121.
97. *Fakely III* (Peterburg, 1908).
98. Sologub, "Staryi dom," *Zemlia III* (Moskva, 1909).

99. *Teatr: kniga o novom teatre* (Peterburg, 1908).
100. Belyi, "Realiora," *Vesy*, No. 5 (1908); *Empirik*, "O 'chistom simbolizme,' teurgizme, i nihilizme," *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 5 (1908); Chulkov, "Razoblachennaia magiia," *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 1 (1908).
101. Belyi, "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo," *Vesy*, No. 10 (1908).
102. *Makov tsvet*, in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 11 (1907); *Le Tsar et la révolution* (Paris, 1907).
103. Hippius, *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*, p. 185; *Between Paris and St. Petersburg: Selected Diaries of Zinaida Hippius*, ed. Temira Pachmuss (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), p. 145.
104. Hippius, *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*, p. 186.
105. Merezhkovskii, *Pavel I*, in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 2 (1908).
106. Merezhkovskii, *Lermontov. Poet sverkhchelovechestva* (Peterburg, 1909); *V tikhom omute* (Peterburg, 1908).
107. Hippius, *Literaturnyi dnevniki. 1899-1907* (Peterburg, 1908).
108. Karlinsky, introduction to Zlobin, *Difficult Soul*, p. 20.
109. Belyi's review of Hippius' book in *Vesy*, No. 3 (1908).
110. Hippius, *Chernoe po belomu* (Moskva, 1908).
111. Belyi's review of this book is in *Vesy*, No. 2 (1908).
112. Bal'mont, *Ptitsy v vozdukh: stroki napevnye* (Peterburg, 1908); *Zovy drevnosti: gimny, pesni i zamysli drevnykh* (Peterburg, 1908); *Zelenyi vertograd: slova potselunnye* (Peterburg, 1909).
113. Bal'mont., *Stikhotvoreniiia* (Leningrad, 1969), p. 640.
114. Bal'mont *Belye zarnitsy: mysli i vpechatleniia* (Peterburg, 1908).
115. Bal'mont, *Polnoe sobranie stikhov*, Vols. 1-10 (Moskva, 1907-14).
116. Bryusov, *Puti i pereput'ia*, Vol 1 & 2 (Moskva, 1908); Vol.3 appeared in 1909 and will be examined in the next chapter.
117. Bryusov, *Dnevnik*, pp.139-141.
118. Sologub, *Plamennyi krug* (Moskva, 1908).
119. Maksim Gor'kii, *Sobranie sochinenii v tridsati tomakh*, Vol. 30 (Moskva, 1955), p. 57.
120. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 5, p. 285.
121. Sologub, *Kniga razluk* (Peterburg, 1908); the stories are: "V tolpe" and "Smert' po ob'iavleniiu."
122. Muri Barker, "Introduction," pp. xxxi.
123. Blok, *Zemlia v snegu* (Moskva, 1908); see Pyman, Vol. 1, p.0322.
124. L. D. Blok, *I byl, i nebylitsy*, pp. 61-64.
125. The titles of the cycles mentioned are "Faina," "Zakliatie ognem i mrakom," and "Vol'nye mysli."

126. Belyi, *Kubok metelei. Chetvertaia simfoniia* (Moskva, 1908).
127. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. , p. 238.
128. Blok-Belyi, *Perepiska*, p. 232.
129. Belyi, *Kubok metelei*, pp. 1-3.
130. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-24, especially p. 24.
131. Sergei Solov'ev's review is in *Vesy*, No. 5 (1908).
132. Mochul'skii, p. 134.
133. Belyi, *Pepel* (Peterburg, 1909).
134. Belyi, *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy* (Moskva-Leningrad, 1966), pp. 543-5; the titles of the cycles mentioned are "Rossiia" and "Bezumiie."
135. "Adam, zapiski naidennye v sumasshedshem dome," *Vesy*, No. 4 (1908); *Rasskazy*, pp. 49-62.
136. "Druz'iam," in *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy*, pp. 249-50.
137. Chulkov, *Pokryvalo Izidy* (Moskva, 1909).
138. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, pp. 302-3.
139. Blok, "Narod i intelligentsiia," *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 5, pp. 318-28.
140. Annenskii is not included in this listing because his major verse collections, *Kiparisovyi larets* (Moskva, 1910) and *Posmertnye stikhi* (Petrograd, 1923), were not published until after his death in 1909, and Merezhkovskii cannot be said to have significantly influenced Russian poetry with his verse, either before 1908 or afterward.

Chapter 7

1. *Vesy*, No. 2 (1909), p. 89.
2. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 312.
3. Hippus, *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*, p. 187.
4. "Ot redaktsii," *Zolotoe Runo*, Nos. 11-12 (1909), pp. 105-07.
5. "Vstuplenie," *Apollon*, No. 1 (1909), p. 4. For more on *Apollon*, see the article by Denis Mickiewicz on it in the *Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literature*, Vol. 1 (1978), pp. 188-97.
6. "Ot redaktsii," *Vesy*, No. 12 (1909), pp. 185-91.
7. Poliakov announced ("Ot knigoizdatel'stva 'Skorpion'," same issue, p. 192) that *Vesy* would continue as an irregular publication devoted to bibliographic information about literature and art, but this never took place.
8. For more about Cherubina de Gabriak and how this poetess, created by Voloshin and portrayed by E. Dmitrieva, came into being, see Sergei Makovskii, *Portrety sovremennikov* (New York: Izd. im. Chekhova, 1955), pp. 333-58.
9. Belyi, "Nastoiashchee i budushchee russkoi literatury," *Vesy*, No. 3 (1909), p. 35.

10. Belyi, *Mezdu dvukh revoliutsii* (Leningrad, 1934), pp. 374, 383; Belyi, *Vospominaniia o A. A. Bloke* (München: Fink, 1969), p. 649; R. E. Peterson, "Andrej Belyj and Nikolaj N. Vedenjapin," *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, No. 9 (1982), pp. 111-17.
11. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, pp. 523-24.
12. Ivanov, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 2, p. 736; see also Vol. 1, p. 125.
13. Belyi, *Simvolizm* (Moskva, 1910); *Lug zelenyi* (Moskva, 1910).
14. See Thomas Beyer, Jr., "The Bely-Zhirmunsky Polemic," *Andrey Bely: A Critical Review*; ed. G. Janecek (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1978), pp. 205-13.
15. *Lug zelenyi*, pp. 3, 15, 17.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 51-52.
17. Ivanov, *Po zvezdam* (Peterburg, 1909).
18. *Ibid.*, "O veselom remesle i umnom veselii," pp. 220-46, "Dve stikhi v sovremennom simvolizme," pp. 247-90.
19. Namely, *Zolotoe Runo*, Nos. 3-4 and 5 (1908).
20. Annenskii, "O sovremennom lirizme," *Apollon*, No. 1 (1909), pp. 15-16.
21. Ellis, *Russkie simvolisty* (Moskva, 1910).
22. *Ibid.*, p. 319.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 327.
24. Merezhkovskii, *Bol'naiia Rossiia* (Peterburg, 1910).
25. Annenskii, *Vtoraia kniga otrazhenii* (Peterburg, 1909).
26. Annenskii, "O sovremennom lirizme," *Apollon*, Nos. 1, 2, 3 (1909).
27. *Ibid.*, No. 1, p. 23.
28. *Ibid.*, No. 1, p. 19.
29. *Ibid.*, No. 2, p. 13.
30. *Ibid.*, No. 3, p. 8.
31. Hippus, *Sobranie stikhov. Kniga 2-aia* (Moskva, 1910).
32. Merezhkovskii, *Sobranie stikhov 1887-1910* (Peterburg, 1910).
33. Bryusov's review of Hippus' book in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 7 (1910).
34. Annenskii, *Kiparisovyi larets. Vtoraia kniga stikhov* (Moskva, 1910).
35. Bryusov's review of Annenskii's book in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 6 (1910).
36. Gumilev's review of Annenskii's book in *Apollon*, No. 8 (1910).
37. Bal'mont, *Khorovod vremen* (Moskva, 1909); see also his *Morskoe svechenie* (Peterburg-Moskva, 1910) and *Zmeinye tsvety* (Moskva, 1910).
38. Bryusov, *Vse napevy* (Moskva, 1909).
39. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 312.
40. S. Solov'ev's review of Briusov's book appeared in *Vesy*, No. 5 (1909).

41. S. Solov'ev, *Apriel'* (Moskva, 1910); Voloshin, *Stikhotvoreniia MCM-MCMX* (Moskva, 1910).
42. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 7, p. 93.
43. Bryusov's review of S. Solov'ev's book in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 6 (1910).
44. Bryusov's review of Voloshin's book in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 5 (1910).
45. Blok, "Na pole Kulikovom," *Shipovnik X* (1909).
46. Belyi, *Urna* (Moskva, 1909).
47. Belyi, *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy*, pp. 545-46.
48. Belyi, *Serebrianyi golub'*, in *Vesy*, Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 10-11, 12 (1909); also (Moskva, 1910 and 1917), (Berlin, 1922), reprints (München: Fink, 1967) and (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1980).
49. Belyi, et al., *Kak my pishem* (Leningrad, 1930), p. 13.
50. Belyi, "Lettre à Ivanov-Razumnik," p. 65; this citation applies to Liubov' Blok, Al. Blok, and Merezhkovskii as prototypes.
51. J. D. Elsworth, *Andrey Bely* (Letchworth: Bradda, 1972), p. 66.
52. James Rice, "Andrej Belyj's *Silver Dove*: The Black Depths of Blue Space, or Who Stole the Baroness's Diamonds?" *Mnemozina* (München: Fink, 1974), p. 306.
53. *Kak my pishem*, p. 15.
54. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 5, p. 335.
55. Bryusov, *Sob. soch.*, vol. 6, p. 307.
56. Ibid.
57. Chulkov, *Rasskazy. Kniga 1* (Peterburg, 1909); Boris Sadovskoi's review of this book in *Vesy*, No. 3 (1909).
58. Chulkov, *Rasskazy. Kniga 2* (Peterburg, 1909); this volume was reviewed twice in *Zolotoe Runo*, Nos. 11-12 (1909), by G. Tasteven in a separate review, and in the *Melkie svedeniia* section at the very end.
59. Sologub, *Kniga ocharovanii* (Peterburg, 1909).
60. For more see Evelyn Bristol's introduction to Sologub's *Rasskazy*, pp. 39-40.
61. "Priatki" was first published in *Sever*, No. 1 (1898).
62. Bal'mont's *Polnoe sobranie stikhov* consisted mainly of re-issues of individual volumes. Sologub's *Sobranie sochinenii* was a true collection of diverse works, all presented in the same printed format.
63. Sologub, *Van'kakliuchnik i pazh Zhean* (Peterburg, 1909).
64. The information about various performances of Sologub's plays is taken from Gerould's article cited above.
65. Blok, *Pesnia sud'by*, in *Shipovnik IX* (1909).
66. Blok, "Ditia Gogolia," *Rech'*, 20 March 1909.
67. Belyi, "Gogol'," *Vesy*, No. 4 (1909).

68. Bryusov, "Ispepelennyi," *Vesy* No. 4 (1909); included in his *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 6, pp. 134-59.
69. Bryusov, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 6, p. 136.
70. Ivanov, "Zavety simvolizma," *Apollon*, No. 8 (1910), pp. 5-20; included in his *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 2, pp. 588-602.
71. Ibid., p. 7.
72. Ibid., p. 12.
73. Ibid., p. 16.
74. Blok, "O sovremennom sostoianii russkogo simvolizma," *Apollon*, No. 8 (1910), pp. 21-30; included in his *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 5, pp. 326-36.
75. Blok, "Vera Fedorovna Komissarzhevskaiia," *Rech'*, 12 February 1910.
76. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 5, p. 336.
77. Bryusov, "O 'rechi rabskoi' v zashchitu poezii," *Apollon*, No. 9 (1910), pp. 31-34; see his *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 6, pp. 176-79.
78. Belyi, "Venok ili venets," *Apollon*, No. 11 (1910), pp. 1-4 (second pagination).
79. Belyi, *ibid.*, p. 4.
80. Ibid., p. 1.
81. Merezhkovskii, "Balagan i tragedii," *Russkoe slovo*, 14 September 1910.
82. Blok's "Otvét Merezhkovskomu" first appeared in the journal *Russkii sovremennik*, No. 3 (1924).
83. Kuzmin, "O prekrasnoi iasnosti, zametki o proze," *Apollon*, No. 4 (1910), pp. 5-10.
84. Ibid., p. 10.
85. Voloshin, "Henri de Régnier," *Apollon*, No. 4 (1910).
86. Chulkov, "Vesy," *Apollon*, No. 7 (1910), pp. 15-20.
87. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, pp. 526-27.
88. Gumilev, "Zhizn' stikha," *Apollon*, No. 7 (1910), pp. 5-14.
89. Ibid., p. 14.
90. See the comments of Empirik, *Zolotoe Runo*, Nos. 7-8-9 (1909), p. 136, and Empirik, "O peterburgskom apollinizme," *Zolotoe Runo*, No. 10 (1909).

Chapter 8

1. Elaine Rusinko, "Acmeism, Post-Symbolism, and Henri Bergson," p. 494.
2. Samuel Driver, "Acmeism," *Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (1968), p. 144.
3. Driver, p. 141.
4. Rusinko, p. 499.

5. Driver, p. 154.
6. Driver, p. 142.
7. Ibid.
8. O. Mandelshtam, "O prirode slova," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 2 (New York: Inter-Language Literary Associates, 1971), p. 259.
9. Mandelshtam, "Utro akmeizma," in *ibid.*, p. 324. For these essays in English, see O. Mandelshtam, *The Complete Critical Prose and Letters*, ed. Jane G. Harris (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1979).
10. Driver, 144.
11. N. Gumilev, "Nasledie simbolizma i akmeizm," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 4 (Washington: Kamkin, 1968), p. 171.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 172. For this essay in English, see Nikolai Gumilev, *On Russian Poetry*, ed. David Lapeza (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1977), pp. 21-24.
13. Vladimir Markov, *Russian Futurism: A History*, p. 2.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.
15. N. L. Brodskii, ed., *Literaturnye manifesty ot simbolizma k Oktiabriu*, 2nd edn. (Moskva, 1929; reprint München: Fink, 1969), pp. 77-78. The full text of this statement is also given in English in Markov, *Futurism*, pp. 45-46.
16. *Lit. manifesty*, p. 78; Markov, *Futurism*, pp. 12, 46.
17. See also Halina Stephan, *Lef and the Left Front of the Arts* (München: Sagner, 1981).
18. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 7, p. 232.
19. For Pasternak's views of Belyi, see R. E. Peterson, "Andrej Belyj and Nikolaj N. Vedenjapin," *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, No. 9 (1982), pp. 111-17.
20. A. V. Lavrov, "Trudy i Dni," *Russkaia literatura i zhurnalistika nachala XX veka, 1905-1917. Burzhuazno-liberal'nye i modernistskie izdaniia*, gen. ed. B. A. Bialik (Moskva, 1984), p. 191.
21. "Ot redaktsii," *Trudy i Dni*, No. 1 (1912), pp. 1-2.
22. Lavrov, "Trudy i Dni," p. 193.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 202-03; the article Blok printed there was his "Ot Ibsena k Strindbergu."
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 203, 205, 207.
25. "Ot redaktsii," *Trudy i Dni*, Nos. 4-5 (1912), p. 149.
26. Lavrov, *op. cit.*, pp. 204-05.
27. Wolfing, *Modernizm i muzyka: stat'i kriticheskie i polemicheskie (1907-1910)*, (Moskva, 1912); A. Belyi, *Rudolf Shteiner i Gete v mirovozzrenii sovremennosti* (Moskva, 1917).
28. "Ot redaktsii," *Trudy i Dni*, Nos. 4-5, p. 149.
29. "Nashim chitateliam," *Trudy i Dni*, No. 7 (1914), pp. 7-8.
30. Lavrov, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

31. These letters are brought to light in Lavrov's article on the journal.
32. Lavrov, *op. cit.*, p. 210.
33. A. Chebotarevskaia, ed., *O F. Sologube: kritika, stat'i i zametki* (Peterburg, 1911).
34. "Predislovie," *Severnye Tsvety. Al'manakh piaty* (Moskva, 1911).
35. Belyi's review appeared in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 10 (1911).
36. "Predislovie," *Al'manakh Grif, 1903 1913* (Moskva, 1914).
37. *Antologii* (Moskva: Musaget, 1911); *Al'manakh "Al'fisiona." kn. pervaiia* (Moskva, 1914).
38. Bryusov's review in *Russkaia Mysl'*, No.8 (1911).
39. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 7, p. 185.
40. Actually, the Skorpion and Grif houses in Moscow were not as active as they had been by the time Sirin was founded.
41. Markov, *Futurism*, pp. 147-163.
42. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 554.
43. Orlov, introduction to Bal'mont's *Sikhovoreniiia*, pp. 33-34.
44. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, p. 773.
45. *Ibid.*
46. For more on Belyi's marriage to Asya Turgeneva, see R. E. Peterson, "The Enigma of Andrey Bely's First Marriage," in *Andrey Bely Centenary Papers*, ed. Boris Christa (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1980), pp. 63-67.
47. Belyi, *Putevye zametki* (Berlin, 1922).
48. For more on the biographical connections between Belyi and Steiner, see J. D. Elsworth, *Andrey Bely, and Magnus Ljunggren, The Dream of Rebirth: A Study of Andrej Belyj's Novel Petersburg* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1982).
49. Ljunggren, p. 115; R. E. Peterson, "Andrej Belyj and Norway" (forthcoming).
50. Good sources here are Ljunggren's book and Belyi, *Vospominaniia o Shteinere*, ed. F. Kozlik (Paris: La Press Libre, 1982).
51. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 8, p. 344.
52. Lavrov, "Trudy i Dni," p. 211.
53. For one recent, highly favorable comment, see Clarence Brown's introduction to excerpts from *Petersburg* printed in Brown's *The Portable Twentieth-Century Russian Reader* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1985), p. 79.
54. Belyi, *Arabeski* (Moskva, 1911).
55. "Krizis soznaniia i Genrik Ibsen," in *ibid.*, pp. 161-210.
56. A sample of some of the more interesting and useful studies of this novel are: Ljunggren's book cited above; J. D. Elsworth, *Andrey Bely: A Critical Study of the Novels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Ivanov-Razumnik's lengthy article about the history of *Petersburg's* creation in his *Vershiny* (Petrograd, 1923); and the critical apparatus in the most recent Soviet edition of the novel (Moskva, 1981).

57. For the best translation of this work, please consult Bely, *Petersburg*, trans. Robert Maguire and John Malmstad (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978).
58. Elsworth's study of the novels sums this up well, pp. 88-89.
59. See *ibid.*
60. See R. E. Peterson, *Bely's Short Prose*, pp. 53-62.
61. Belyi, *Petersburg* (Moskva, 1981), pp. 9-10.
62. Bialik, *Russkaia literatura*, Vol. 3, p. 561.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 645.
64. Hippius, *Chertova kukla* (Moskva, 1911).
65. Hippius, *Lunnye murav'i* (Moskva, 1912).
66. Hippius, *Roman-Tsarevich. Istoriia odnogo nachinaniia* (Moskva, 1913); Pachmuss, *Zinaida Hippius*, pp. 175-76.
67. Merezhkovskii, *Aleksandr I* (Peterburg, 1913).
68. Bedford, p. 120.
69. Merezhkovskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1-17 (Peterburg & Moskva, 1911-13); *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1-24 (Moskva, 1914). The fuller edition was reprinted by Georg Olms (New York, 1973).
70. Bryusov, *Altar' pobedy* (Moskva, 1913).
71. Bryusov, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 5, p. 7.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 544.
73. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602*, Vol. 1 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964), pp. 113-14.
74. Bryusov, *Neizdannaiia proza* (Moskva-Leningrad, 1934).
75. Bryusov, *Nochi i dni. Vtoraia kniga rasskazov i dramaticheskikh stsen* (Moskva, 1913). See also the commentary by Grechishkin and Lavrov to Bryusov, *Povesti i rasskazy* (Moskva, 1983).
76. Grechishkin and Lavrov, Notes, p. 351.
77. *Sikhi Nelli s posviashcheniem Valerii Briusova* (Moskva, 1913); Grechishkin and Lavrov, Notes, p. 351.
78. Bialik, Vol. III, p. 565.
79. Bryusov, *Zerkalo tenei* (Moskva, 1912).
80. Bryusov, *Dalekie i blizkie* (Moskva, 1912).
81. See Marina Tsvetaeva, "From 'A Hero of Labor': Notes on Valery Bryusov," in Joan D. Grossman, ed., *The Diary of Valery Bryusov (1893-1905)*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 161-173.
82. Bryusov, *Za moim oknom* (Moskva, 1913).
83. Bryusov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i perevodov*, Vols. 1-4, 12-13, 15, 21 (Peterburg, 1913-14).

84. V. Ivanov, *Cor Ardens* (Moskva, 1911-12).
85. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 481; Briusov's review in *Russkaia Mysl*, No. 6 (1911).
86. Ivanov, *Nezhnaia taina. Lepta* (Peterburg, 1912).
87. Blok, *Nochnye chasy* (Moskva, 1911).
88. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 497.
89. Blok, *Skazki. Stikhi dlia detei*, and *Kruglyi god. Stikhotvoreniia dlia detei* (both Moskva, 1913).
90. Blok, *Sobranie stikhotvoreniï*, Vol. 1-3 (Moskva, 1911-12).
91. Pyman, Vol. 2, p. 127.
92. Bal'mont, *Zarevo zor'* (Moskva, 1912).
93. Bryusov's review in *Russkaia Mysl*, No. 7 (1912).
94. Bal'mont, *Zven'ia: izbrannye stikhi. 1890-1912* (Moskva, 1913); *Belyi zodchii: Tainstvo chetyrekh svetil'nikov* (Peterburg, 1914); see also his *Krai Ozirisa* (Moskva, 1914), essays on various aspects of Egypt.
95. Bryusov's review in *Russkaia Mysl'* No. 7 (1914); Markov, "Bal'mont: A Reappraisal," *Slavic Review*, vol. 28, No. 2 (1969), pp. 247-48.
96. Bal'mont, *Poeziia kak volshebstvo* (Moskva, 1915).
97. Ellis, *Stigmata: kniga stikhov* (Moskva, MCMXI); *Argo* (Moskva, 1914).
98. J. Baltrushaitis, *Zemnye stupeni: Elegii, pesni, poemy* (Moskva, 1911); *Zelenaia tropa: vtoraia kniga stikhov* (Moskva, 1912).
99. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 545.
100. S. Solov'ev, *Tsvetnik tsarevny: tretii sbornik stikhov* (Moskva, 1913); for biographical details, see *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 92, Book 1, p. 318.
101. Annenskii, *Famira Kifared. Vakkhicheskaia drama* (Moskva, 1913).
102. Annenskii, *Stikhotvoreniia i tragedii*, p. 511.
103. Blok, *Rosa i krest*, in *Sirin I* (Peterburg, 1913).
104. Pyman, Vol. 2, p. 159.
105. Bialik, Vol. 3, pp. 561-2.
106. Blok, *Stikhotvoreniia. Poemy. Teatr v dvukh tomakh*, Vol. 2 (Leningrad, 1972), p. 425.
107. Bryusov, *Putnik, psikhodrama v I deistvii* (Moskva, 1911).
108. Sologub, *Mechta-pobeditel'nitsa*, in *Biblioteka teatra i iskusstva*, No. 5 (1912); *Zalozhniki zhizni*, in *Al'manakh Shipovnik*, No. 18 (1912).
109. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 526.
110. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 7, p. 185.
111. Sologub, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 17, *Ocharovanie zemli: Stikhi 1913 goda* (Peterburg, 1914).
112. Sologub published another play around this time, also of lesser quality, *Liubov' nad bezdnami*, in the 22nd Shipovnik miscellany in 1914.

113. "Simvolisty o simbolizme," *Zavety*, No. 2 (1914), especially Sologub's speech, pp. 71-77 and Ivanov's, pp. 80-84.
114. For this essay in English, see R. E. Peterson, *The Russian Symbolists: An Anthology of Critical and Theoretical Writings*, pp. 189-193.
115. Ivanov's speech in *Zavety*, pp. 81-82.
116. *Ibid.*, p. 82.
117. *Ibid.*, p. 83.

Chapter 9

1. *Strelets. sbornik pervyi* (Petrograd, 1915).
2. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 608.
3. *Strelets. sbornik vtoroi* (Petrograd, 1916).
4. See Markov's book on Futurism for more on this decline, Chapter 7.
5. Victor Erlich, *Russian Formalism: History-Doctrine*, 3rd edn. (The Hague: Mouton, 1969), p. 33.
6. Erlich, p. 38. See also T. Beyer's "The Bely-Zhirmunsky Polemic," noted above.
7. *Sborniki po teorii poeticheskogo iazyka*, No. 1 (Petrograd, 1916); No. 2 (Petrograd, 1917); No. 3 (Petrograd, 1919). See also Erlich, p. 70.
8. Erlich, p. 72.
9. Ivanov, *Borozdy i mezhi: opyty estenicheski i kriticheskie* (Moskva, 1916).
10. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 596.
11. Merezhkovskii, *Nevoennyi dnevnik 1914-1916: Ot voiny k revoliutsii*, (Petrograd, 1917).
12. Merezhkovskii, *Bylo i budet. Dnevnik 1910-14* (Petrograd, 1915); *Dve tainy russkoi poezii: Nekrasov i Tiutchev* (Petrograd, 1915).
13. Belyi, *Zapiski chudaka* (Moskva and Berlin, 1922); see also J. D. Elsworth, "A Diary in Story Form: *Zapiski chudaka* and Some Problems of Bely's Biography," in *Poetry, Prose and Public Opinion, Aspects of Russia 1850-1950, Essays Presented in Memory of Dr. N. E. Andreyev*, ed. W. Harrison and A. Pyman (Letchworth: Avebury, 1984); one should at the same time avoid the account given in K. Mochulsky, *Andrei Bely: His Life and Works*, trans. N. Szalavitz (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1977).
14. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 659.
15. Elsworth, *Critical Study of the Novels*, p. 182.
16. The pro-victory attitude was shared by Sologub and Bal'mont, for example.
17. Mirsky, *Contemporary Russian Literature* (New York: Knopf, 1926), p. 234. Belyi also received attention for the new editions of his First and Second Symphonies, and part of *Serebrianyi golub'*, printed in Moscow by V. Pashukanis in 1917, as part of a planned *Sobranie epicheskikh poem* series; only Books 1 and 4 appeared.
18. Belyi, *Prestuplenie Nikolaia Letaeva*, in *Zapiski Mechtatelei*, No. 4 (1921); separate edn. *Kreshchennyi kitaets* (Moskva, 1927).
19. Belyi, "Otryvki iz detskikh vpechatlenii (iz povesti "Kotik Letaev")," *Russkie Vedomosti*, 13 November, 4, 25, December, 1916 (a portion had also appeared in *Birzhevye Vedomosti*, 2 May 1916); see also Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 658.
20. Belyi, *Kotik Letaev* (Petrograd and Berlin, 1922), p. 9.
21. *Skify. Sbornik 1* (Petrograd, 1917); *Sbornik 2* (Petrograd, 1918).
22. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 682.
23. Sologub, *Iaryi god. rasskazy* (Moskva, 1916).
24. Sologub, *Alaia lenta* (Petrograd, 1917), is a good example of the tendency to re-issue his works. The Chronology in Bialik is incorrect here (Vol. 3, p. 676), since this work consists of prose, not poetry, as listed there. Sologub's 12th volume in the *Shipovnik Sovernanie sochinenii* consists of prose (Peterburg, 1912). This collection was taken over by Sirin, and the 14th volume (of 20 in all) consists of short prose as well (Peterburg, 1913).
25. Bryusov, *Obruchenie Dashi* (Moskva, 1915); *Reia Sil'via. Eluli, syn Eluli* (Moskva, 1916).
26. Sologub, *Voina. Stikhi* (Petrograd, 1915).
27. Sologub, *Alyi mak. kniga stikhov* (Moskva, 1917). Again the Chronology in Bialik errs here: the title of the book is *Alyi mak*, not *Alyi tsvet*, as listed, Vol. 3 p. 676.
28. Bal'mont, *Iasen'. Videnie dreva* (Moskva, 1916); *Sonety solntsa, meda i lunny* (Moskva, 1917), 2nd edn. (Berlin, 1921).
29. Markov, "Bal'mont: A Reappraisal," p. 249.
30. Bal'mont, *Svetozvuk v prirode i svetovaia simfoniia Skriabina* (Moskva, 1917).
31. See especially comments made by Erlich, p. 36.
32. Bryusov, *Sem' tsvetov radugi. Stikhi 1912-1915* (Moskva, 1916).
33. Bryusov, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 2, p. 416.
34. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 417-18; Bialik, Vol. 3 p. 648.
35. Blok, *Stikhi o Rossii* (Peterburg, 1915); *Sobranie stikhotvorenii i teatra v 4 knigakh* (Moskva, 1916).
36. Pyman, Vol. 2, p. 219.
37. Blok, "Vozmezdie," *Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 1 (1917).
38. Apollon Grigor'ev, *Stikhotvoreniiia*, sobral i primechaniiami snabdil Aleksandr Blok (Moskva, 1916).
39. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 661.
40. Blok *Teatr*, in his *Sob. stikh. i teatra* noted above.
41. Ivanov, *Syny Prometeia, Russkaia Mysl'*, No. 1(1915); *Prometei* (Petrograd, 1919).
42. Hippius, *Zelenoe kol'tso* (Petrograd, 1916).
43. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 8, p. 441.

44. Sologub, *Kamen', broshenni v vodu (Sem'ia Vorontsovykh)*, (Petrograd, 1915); Merezhkovskii, *Budet radost'* (Petrograd, 1916); *Romantiki* (Petrograd, 1917).
45. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 637.
46. Bryusov, "Svobodnaia Rossiia," *Birzhevye Vedemosti*, 3 March 1917.
47. Bal'mont, "Edinenie," *Russkoe Slovo*, 7 March 1917.
48. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 667.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 669.
50. Blok, *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 8, p. 479.
51. Ivanov, "Khorovaia pesn' novoi Rossii," *Russkoe slovo*, 18 June 1917.
52. Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 683.
53. Elsworth, *Andrey Bely*, pp. 94-5.
54. Pyman, Vol. 2, p. 272.
55. Blok, *Dvenadsat'. Skify* (Petrograd, 1918); Belyi, *Khristos voskres. Poema* (Peterburg, 1918).
56. Orlov's introduction to Bal'mont, *Stikhotvoreniia*, p. 35; Dikman's introduction to Sologub, *Stikhotvoreniia* (Leningrad, 1975), p. 66.
57. Pachmuss, *Intellectual Profile*, p. 199.

Chapter 10

1. *Zapiski Mechtatelei*, Nos. 1-6 (Peterburg, 1919-22); reprint of entire run, with introduction by J. D. Elsworth (Letchworth: Bradda, 1971).
2. Blok, "Ni sny, ni iav'," *Zapiski Mechtatelei*, No. 4 (1921), pp. 12-15. See the bibliography of Blok's works compiled by Nikolai Ashukin (Moskva, 1923), p. 49.
3. These works were published in Nos. 1, 2-3, 4, and 6, respectively. The 1969 reprint of *Vospominaniia o Bloke* has been cited above.
4. See the bibliography compiled by Georges Nivat of Belyj's works, "L'oeuvre polémique, critique et journalistique d'Andrej Belyj," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*, Vol. 15, Nos. 1-2 (1974), pp. 22-39.
5. See Lucy Vogel, ed., *Blok: An Anthology of Essays and Memoirs* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1982), pp. 201-226, for a listing of works from 1960-81.
6. Bryusov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, cited above.
7. *Briusovskie chteniia*, Nos. 1-5 (Erevan, 1962-1976).
8. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, Nos. 27-28 (Moskva, 1937); see especially K. N. Bugaeva and A. S. Petrovskii, "Literaturnoe nasledstvo Andreia Belogo," pp. 575-638.
9. Belyi, *Petersburg* (Moskva, 1978; Moskva, 1981).
10. *Andrej Belyj Society Newsletter*, ed. Olga M. Cooke, Nos. 1 — (Riverside: The Society, 1982 —).

11. Annenskii, *Knigi otrazhenii* (München; Fink, 1969); *Knigi otrazhenii* (Moskva, 1979); *Stikhotvoreniia i tragedii* (Moskva, 1981); the edition of his poetry and tragedies has been cited above.
12. Ivanov, "Zimnye sonety," in *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 3, pp. 568-73; Ivanov and Mikhail Gershenson, *Perepiska iz dvukh uglov* (Peterburg, 1921); in *Sob. soch.*, Vol. 3, pp. 383-415.
13. Ivanov, *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy*, ed. R. E. Pomirchii (Leningrad, 1978).
14. Hippius, *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*, pp. 242-47.
15. Zlobin was later to write a book about Hippius, *Tiazhelaia dusha*, cited above, particularly in the English translation, *A Difficult Soul*.
16. Hippius, *Zhivye litsa* in two vols. (Praha, 1925).
17. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, pp. 686-702. A more recent edition of her poetry is Zinaida Hippius, *Izbrannaia poeziia*, ed. T. Pachmuss (Paris: YMCA, 1984).
18. See Pachmuss, *An Intellectual Profile*, and Bedford, *The Seeker*, pp. 124 and 114; 181 and 143; 188-89 and 144; 202 and 145; 204 and 147, for some examples of blatant borrowing.
19. A recent Soviet retrospective is Baltrushaitis' poetry is *Derevo v ogne* (Vilnius, 1969).
20. Chulkov, *Gody stranstvii*, cited above.
21. S. Solov'ev, *Zhizn' i tvorcheskaiia evoliutsiia Vladimira Solov'eva* (cited in Chapter 4); see also *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 92, Book 1, pp. 388-413.
22. Sokolov, *Zheleznyi persten'* (Berlin, 1922); see also *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 92, Book 1, pp. 527-531.
23. See his *Natura Naturans, Natura Naturata* and *Sobranie stikhov*, ed. Joan D. Grossman (Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 1981), and *Iz knigi nevidimoi* (same publisher, 1983).
24. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, pp. 663-66.
25. Voloshin, *Stikhotvoreniia* (Leningrad, 1977); *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy v 2 tomakh* (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1982-84).
26. See especially Kuzmin, *Wings; Prose and Poetry*, ed. and trans. Neil Granoin and Michael Green (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1972); *Selected Prose and Poetry*, trans. Michael Green (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1980); *Sobranie stikhov*, ed. John Malmstad and Vladimir Markov (München: Fink, 1977-78). The information about Kuzmin's date of birth given in the Index (1872, rather than 1875, which is the date on his tombstone) is from Malmstad's biography, included in the third volume of this edition.
27. *Istoriia russkoi sovetskoi literatury v chetyrekh tomakh 1917-1965*, Vol. 1 (Moskva, 1967), p. 9.
28. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, Vol. 10 (Moskva-Leningrad, 1954), p. 801. These examples should not be interpreted to mean that all scholarship on this topic done in the USSR is without merit. The publications of A. V. Lavrov, S. S. Grechishkin, D. E. Maksimov, L. K. Dolgoplov, and others are in fact often quite good.
29. Quoted in Bialik, Vol. 3, p. 216.
30. Mirsky, *A History of Russian Literature* (New York, 1954), p. 472.

31. See the end of the article on Symbolism in the *Kratkaia literaturnaia entsiklopediia*, cited above, p. 839.
32. Edward Brown, *Russian Literature Since the Revolution*. Revised and Enlarged Edition (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), pp. 6, 114.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
36. Erlich, p. 50.

A select bibliography

Since the works by the Symbolists listed in the notes form a bibliography of publications from that era, those citations will not be repeated here. The focus in the bibliography is on the main sources used for this study, without which a history of the Russian Symbolist movement could not have been undertaken.

1. Bibliographies

- Althaus-Schönbucher, Silvia. 1975. *Konstantin D. Bal'mont, Parallelen zu Afanasij A. Fet: Symbolismus und Impressionismus*. Bern: Verlag Peter Lang, pp. 198-199.
- Ashukin, Nikolai. 1923. *Aleksandr Blok: Sinkhronicheskie tablitsy zhizni i tvorcestva 1880-1921. Bibliografiia 1903-1923*. Moskva.
- Barda, Any. 1975. *Bibliographie des oeuvres de Zenaïde Hippus*. Paris: Institute d'Etudes Slaves.
- Bedford, C. Harold. 1975. *The Seeker: D. S. Merezhkovskiy*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, pp. 195-214.
- Bialik, B. A., 1968-72. (gen.ed.) *Russkaia literatura kontsa XIX — nachala XX veka*. Moskva.
- Cooke, Olga M. and Ronald E. Peterson. 1983. "Andrej Belyj: A Bibliography since 1964," *The Andrej Belyj Society Newsletter*. No. 2, pp. 15-60.
- Donchin, Georgette. 1958. *The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 216-233.
- Hansson, Carola. 1975. *Fedor Sologub as a Short-Story Writer*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, p. 129-136.
- Hönig, Anton. 1965. *Andrej Belyjs Romane: Stil und Gestalt*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, pp. 117-124.
- Leitner, Andreas. 1976. *Die Erzählungen Fedor Sologubs*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, pp. 32-34.

- Maslenikov, Oleg. 1952. *The Frenzied Poets: Andrey Biely and the Symbolist Poets*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 225-230.
- Muratova, K. D. 1976. *Bibliografiia V. Ia. Briusova 1884-1973*. Erevan.
- Muratova, K. D. (ed.) 1963. *Istoriia russkoi literatury kontsa XIX — nachala XX veka. Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'*. Moskva-Leningrad.
- Nivat, Georges. 1974. "L'oeuvre polémique, critique et journalistique d'Andrej Belyj," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique*. Vol. 15, Nos. 1-2, pp. 22-39.
- Pachmuss, Temira. 1971. *Zinaida Hippus: An Intellectual Profile*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, pp. 455-477.
- Rosenthal, Bernice G. 1975. *D. S. Merezhkovsky and the Silver Age: The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality*. The Hague: Nijhoff, pp. 234-236.
- Setchkarev, Vsevolod. 1963. *Studies in the Life and Work of Innokentij Annenskij*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 260-263.
- Vogel, Lucy, (ed.) 1982. *Blok: An Anthology of Essays and Memoirs*. Ann Arbor: Ardis, pp. 201-226.
- West, James. 1970. *Russian Symbolism: A Study of Vyacheslav Ivanov and the Russian Symbolist Aesthetic*. London: Methuen, pp. 231-245.

2. Primary Sources (recent editions)

- Annenskii, Innokentii. 1959. *Stikhotvoreniia i tragedii*. ed. A. Fedorov. Leningrad.
- . 1979. *Knigi otrazhenii*. ed. N. T. Ashimbaeva, et al. Moskva.
- Bal'mont, Konstantin. 1969. *Stikhotvoreniia*, ed. V. Orlov. Leningrad.
- Belyi, Andrei. 1981. *Peterburg*. ed. L. K. Dolgopopov. Moskva.
- . 1966. *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy*, ed. T. Khmel'nitskaia. Moskva-Leningrad.
- . See the reprints of his works by Fink, Bradda, Prideaux, and Russian Language Specialties, listed in the bibliography compiled by Cooke and Peterson.
- Blok, Aleksandr. 1960-63. *Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*. ed. V. Orlov, et al. Moskva-Leningrad.
- . and Andrei Belyi. 1940. *Perepiska*, ed. V. Orlov. Moskva.
- Bryusov, Valerii. 1927. *Dnevnik 1891-1910*. ed. I. M. Bryusova, et. al. Moskva.

- . 1983. *Povesti i rasskazy*. ed. S. Grechishkin and A. Lavrov. Moskva.
- . 1973-75. *Sobranie sochinenii v semi tomakh*. ed. P. Antokol'skii, et al. Moskva.
- Hippius, Zinaida. See reprints of her works by Fink and Oriental Research Partners.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav. 1971-79. *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vol. 1-3. ed. D. Ivanov & O. Deschartes. Bruxelles: Foyer Oriental Chrétien.
- . 1978. *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy*, ed. R. Pomirchii. Leningrad.
- Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, Nos. 27-28 (1937), 85 (1976), 87 (1978), 92 (1980-85).
- Merezhkovskii, Dmitrii. 1973. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Moskva, 1914; reprint New York: Georg Olms.
- Sologub, Fedor. 1975. *Stikhotvoreniia*. ed. M. Dikman. Leningrad.

3. Secondary Sources

- Andrej Belyj Society Newsletter*, (ed.) 1982 —. Olga M. Cooke. Riverside, California: The Society.
- Barker, Murl. 1977. Introduction to Fedor Sologub, *The Kiss of the Unborn and Other Stories*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. pp. xii-xxxvi.
- Bedford, C. Harold. *The Seeker*. see section 1.
- Blok, Liubov' D. 1977. *I byl', i nebylitsy o Bloke i o sebe*. Bremen: K-Press.
- Blokovskie sborniki* Nos. 1-4. Tartu, 1964-1981.
- Bowlt, John. 1979. *The Silver Age: Russian Art of the Early Twentieth Century and the "World of Art" Group*. Newtonville, Mass.: Oriental Research Partners.
- . 1975. "World of Art," in Carl and Ellendea Proffer, ed. *The Silver Age of Russian Culture*. Ann Arbor: Ardis pp. 397-432.
- Bristol, Evelyn. 1979. Introduction to Fedor Sologub. *Rasskazy*. Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, pp. 11-51.
- Briusovskie chteniia*. Nos. 1-5. Erevan, 1962-1976.
- Chulkov, Georgii. 1930. *Gody stranstvii*. Moskva.
- Cioran, Samuel. 1973. *The Apocalyptic Symbolism of Andrej Belyj*. The Hague: Mouton.

- . 1977. *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Knighthood of the Divine Sophia*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Donchin, Georgette. *The Influence of French Symbolism*. see section 1.
- Elsworth, J. D. 1972. *Andrey Bely*. Letchworth: Bradda.
- . 1983. *Andrey Bely: A Critical Study of the Novels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erlich, Victor. 1969. *Russian Formalism: History — Doctrine*. 3rd edn. The Hague: Mouton.
- Field, Andrew. 1961. "The Created Legend: Sologub's Symbolic Universe." *Slavic and East European Journal*. Vol. 5. No. 4, pp. 341-349.
- Gerould, Daniel. 1977. "Sologub and the Theatre." *Drama Review*. Vol. 21. No. 4, pp. 79-84.
- Grechishkin, S.S. and A.V. Lavrov. 1978. "Biograficheskie istochniki romana Bryusova *Ognennyi angel*." *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*. No. 1, pp. 79-107, No. 2, pp. 73-96.
- Grossman, Joan D. (ed.) 1980. *The Diary of Valery Bryusov, 1893-1905*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hansson, Carola. *Sologub as a Short-Story Writer*. see section 1.
- Hippius, Zinaida. 1951. *Dmitrii Merezhkovskii*. Paris: YMCA Press.
- Holthusen, Johannes. 1960. *Fedor Sologubs Roman-Trilogie (Tvorimaja legenda): aus der Geschichte des Russischen Symbolismus*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ivanov-Razumnik. R. V. 1923. *Vershiny*. Petrograd.
- Janecek, Gerald. ed. 1978. *Andrey Bely: A Critical Review*. Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.
- Kalbouss, George. 1982. *The Plays of the Russian Symbolists*. East Lansing, Michigan: Russian Language Journal.
- Karlinsky, Simon. 1980. Introduction to Vladimir Zlobin. *A Difficult Soul: Zinaida Gippius*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 1-21.
- Khodasevich, Vladislav. 1939. *Nekropol': Vospominaniia*. Bruxelles: Les Editions Petropolis.
- Knigge, Armin. 1973. *Die Lyrik Vl. Solov'evs und ihre Nachwirkung bei A. Belyj und A. Blok*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Lavrov. Aleskandr V. 1984. Articles on *Vesy*, *Zolotoe Runo*, *Pereval*, *Trudi i Dni*. in B. A. Bialik, gen. ed. *Russkaia literatura i zhurnalistika nachala XX veka, 1905-1917. Burzhuazno-liberal'nye i modernistskie izdaniia*. Moskva, pp. 65-211.

- Leitner, Andreas. *Erzählungen F. Sologubs*. see section 1.
- Ljunggren, Magnus. 1982. *The Dream of Rebirth: A Study of Andrej Belyj's Novel Peterburg*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Markov, Vladimir. 1969. "Balmont: A Reappraisal." *Slavic Review*. Vol. 28. No. 2, pp. 221-264.
- . 1968. *Russian Futurism: A History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles University of California Press.
- Maslenikov, Oleg. *The Frenzied Poets*. see section 1.
- Mirsky, D. S. 1926. *Contemporary Russian Literature*. New York: Knopf.
- . 1949. *A History of Russian Literature*. ed. Francis Whitfield. New York: Knopf.
- Mochul'skii, Konstantin. 1955. *Andrei Belyi*. Paris: YMCA Press.
- . 1962. *Valerii Briusov*. Paris: YMCA Press.
- Orlov, Vladimir. 1980. *Hamayun: The Life of Alexander Blok*. trans. Olga Shartse. Moscow, 1980; Russian edition *Gamaiun: zhizn' Aleksandra Bloka*. Leningrad.
- Pachmuss, Temira. *An Intellectual Profile*. see section 1.
- Peterson, Ronald E. 1980. *Andrei Bely's Short Prose*. Birmingham: Birmingham Slavonic Monographs, No. 11.
- . 1986. *The Russian Symbolists: An Anthology of Critical and Theoretical Writings*. Ann Arbor: Ardis.
- Poggioli, Renato. 1950. *The Poets of Russia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Pyman, Avril. 1979-80. *The Life of Aleksandr Blok*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rabinowitz, Stanley. 1980. *Sologub's Literary Children: Keys to a Symbolist's Prose*. Columbus: Slavica.
- Rice, Martin. 1975. *Valery Bryusov and the Rise of Russian Symbolism*. Ann Arbor: Ardis.
- Reeve, F. D. 1962. *Aleksandr Blok: Between Image and Idea*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rosenthal, Bernice. D. S. *Merezhkovsky*. see section 1.
- Scherrer, Jutta. 1973. *Die Petersburgers Religiös-Philosophischen Vereinigungen*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Setchkaev, Vsevolod. *Innokentij Annenskij*. see section 1.
- Vickery, Walter. (ed.) 1984. *Aleksandr Blok Centennial Conference*. Columbus: Slavica.
- Vogel, Lucy. *Blok*. see section 1.

- West, James. *Russian Symbolism*. see section 1.
 Zlobin, Vladimir. 1970. *Tiazhelaia dusha*. Washington: Kamkin, 1970;
 English edition cited above under Karlinsky.

Index

A

- Acmeism, 10, 11, 71, 136-138, 154, 157-161, 183-186, 207, 208, 212
 Akhmatova, Anna A. (1889-1960), 10, 158, 159, 186, 197
 Alexander [Aleksandr Ya. Bryusov] (1885-1966), 116, 225
 Alkonost [Halcyon], publishing house (1918-1923), 197
 Altsiona [Alcyone], publishing house, miscellany, 166
 Andreev, Leonid N. (1871-1919), 7, 91, 98, 114, 136, 141, 181, 208, 223
 Annensky, Innokenty F. (1856-1909), 11, 35, 47-49, 56, 71, 72, 88, 92, 103, 108, 115, 116, 136, 138, 140-143, 149, 150, 154, 159, 165, 180, 181, 193, 200, 207, 208, 217, 218, 220, 224, 228, 229, 235, 239
 Anouilh, Jean (1910-), 49
Apollon [*Apollo*], journal (1909-1917), 133, 135, 136, 138, 141, 143, 150-154, 158, 162, 228, 229, 231
 Artsybashev, Mikhail P. (1878-1927), 123, 208
 Ashukin, Nikolay S. (1890-1977), 238
 Asmus, Valentin F. (1894-1975), 212
 Ausländer, Sergey A. (1888-1943), 111, 112, 117, 122, 123, 136, 146, 205, 225
 Avrely, see V. Ya. Bryusov.
 Azadovsky, Konstantin M., 219
- ### B
- Bakst, Léon [Lev S. Rosenberg] (1866-1924), 68
 Bakulin, see V. Ya. Bryusov.
 Bakunin, Mikhail A. (1814-1876), 194
 Balmont, Konstantin D. (1867-1942), 8, 9, 20-22, 27, 30, 33, 34, 38, 41-47, 55, 56, 58-60, 64-66, 68-72, 75, 77, 81, 82, 84, 88, 90, 104, 106, 109, 111-114, 116, 123, 126, 130, 131, 134-136, 139-141, 143, 154, 159, 160, 165, 166, 168, 176, 178, 179, 187, 191, 193, 195, 196, 198, 201, 203, 208, 213-16, 218-221, 224, 225, 227, 229, 230, 233, 235-238
 Baltrushaitis, Jurgis K. (1873-1944), 42, 44, 68, 75, 114, 165, 179, 204, 208, 235, 239
 Barda, Any, 213
 Barker, Murl, 221, 227
 Batyushkov, Konstantin N. (1787-1855), 180
 Baudelaire, Charles P., (1821-1867), 7, 22, 47, 58, 67, 69, 71, 77, 117, 226
 Bedford, C., Harold (1929-), 219, 234, 239
 Bely, Andrey [Boris N. Bugaev] (1880-1934), 8-10, 16, 35-37, 43, 46, 47, 49-51, 53, 57, 59-61, 63-72, 74, 76-78, 81, 83-93, 97, 101-104, 109-117, 121-126, 128-131, 133, 134, 137-132, 144-146, 148, 149, 151-155, 160-166, 168-173, 175, 176, 180, 181, 183, 184, 186-190, 193, 195-200, 207-209, 216-234, 236-238
 Benois, Alexandre N. (1870-1960), 39, 64
 Berdyaev, Nikolay A. (1874-1948), 65, 66, 103
 Beyer, Thomas R. (1947-), 229, 236
 Bjørnson, Bjørnstjerne (1852-1910), 30
 Blagovolina, Yuliia P., 222
 Blake, William (1757-1827), 77

- Blok, Aleksandr A.** (1880-1921), 8-10, 14, 34-37, 43, 46, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 65, 66, 68-72, 75-77, 79, 81, 83, 84, 87, 91-93, 95, 98, 100, 101, 103-105, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, 122, 123, 128-131, 133-135, 137, 138, 141, 143-149, 151-155, 157, 160-163, 165, 166, 168, 169, 171, 176-179, 181-185, 187, 189, 191-199, 203, 206-209, 218-228, 230-233, 235, 237, 238
- Blok, Aleksandr L.** (1852-1909), 230
- Blok, Lyubov D.** [née Mendeleeva] (1881-1939), 54, 57, 74, 90, 93, 101, 102, 105, 117, 128, 144, 145, 148, 172, 218, 222, 227, 230
- Bobrov, Sergey P.** (1889-1971), 163
- Bowit, John E.**, 211, 216, 218, 219
- Bristol, Evelyn**, 211, 226, 230
- Brodsky, Nikolay L.** (1881-1951), 232
- Brown, Clarence** (1929-), 233
- Brown, Edward J.** (1909-), 240
- Bryusov, Valery Ya.** (1873-1924), 8-10, 13, 15, 16, 21-26, 30-32, 34, 35, 38, 42-47, 49, 50, 52-56, 59, 60, 65-72, 75-77, 81-84, 86-88, 91, 92, 97-104, 106, 108, 110-118, 120-124, 126, 127, 130, 131, 133, 134, 136-144, 146, 148, 149, 151-154, 159, 160, 162, 163, 165-168, 171, 174, 176-180, 182-184, 187, 190-193, 195, 196, 198, 199, 203, 207-209, 213-227, 229-231, 233-235, 237, 238
- Bugaev, Nikolay V.** (1837-1903), 49, 51, 55, 162
- Bulgakov, Sergey N.** (1871-1944), 65, 66
- Bunin, Ivan A.** (1870-1953), 32, 43, 44, 91, 114, 131, 136, 203, 208, 217
- Burlyuk, David D.** (1882-1967), 161
- Burlyuk, Nikolay D.** (1890-1920), 161
- Byalik, Boris A.** (1911-), 215, 216, 218, 232, 234-239
- C**
- Calderón de la Barca, Pedro** (1600-1681), 77
- Chebotaryovskaya, Anastasia N.** (1876-1921), 120, 233
- Chekhov, Anton P.** (1860-1904), 5, 25, 27, 44, 49, 70, 88, 89, 125, 139, 171, 211
- Chénier, André de** (1762-1794), 180
- Chukovsky, Korney I.** (1882-1969), 198, 223
- Chulkov, Georgy I.** (1879-1939), 66, 81, 91, 97-103, 107, 110-115, 123, 124, 129, 130, 135, 136, 146, 148, 154, 165, 172, 183, 204, 205, 208, 219, 221-225, 227, 228, 230, 231, 239
- Cioran, Samuel D.** (1941-), 211, 216, 226
- D**
- D'Annunzio, Gabriele** (1863-1938), 42, 127, 217
- Dante Alighieri** (1265-1321), 129, 164, 184, 203
- Daudet, Alphonse** (1840-1897), 114
- Davies, Richard**, 211
- De Gabriak, Cherubina**, 136, 228
- Delvig, Anton A.** (1798-1831), 43
- Deschartes, Olga** [Olga A. Shor] (1894-1978) 105, 113, 202, 218, 220, 224
- Diaghilev, Sergei P.** (1872-1929), 38-41, 51, 64
- Dikman, M.I.**, 216, 238
- Dmitrieva, Elizaveta I.** (?-1928), 228
- Dobrolyubov, Aleksandr M.** (1876-1944?), 25, 32, 34, 42-44, 46, 151, 204, 205, 214, 216, 217
- Dolgoplov, Leonid K.**, 212, 239
- Donchin, Georgette**, 212
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor M.** (1821-1881), 2, 13, 15, 30, 36, 40, 65, 88, 89, 99, 125, 141, 145, 160, 169, 171-174, 204
- Driver, Sam N.** (1929-), 231, 232
- Duncan, Isadora** (1878-1927), 147
- Durnov, Modest A.** (1868-1928), 38
- Durylin, Sergey N.** (1877-1954), 163

- E**
- Eichenbaum, Boris M.** (1886-1959), 187
- Ellis** [Lev L. Kobylinsky] (1879-1947), 59, 69, 88, 102, 110, 111, 115, 117, 134, 136, 137, 139-141, 145, 154, 155, 162, 163, 168, 179, 180, 204, 208, 229, 235
- Elsworth, John D.**, 145, 230, 233, 234, 236, 238
- Erllich, Victor** (1914-), 187, 208, 237, 240
- Etkind, Efim G.** (1918-), 212
- Euripides** (480?-406 BC), 48, 217
- F**
- Fakely** [*Torches*] (1906-1908), 63, 90, 91, 97-100, 111, 112, 115, 123, 222-224, 226
- Feofilaktov, Nikolay P.** (1879-1948), 68
- Fet, Afanasy A.** [Shenshin] (1820-1892), 44, 45, 77, 150
- Field, Andrew** (1938-), 226
- Filosofov, Dmitry V.** (1872-1940), 39-41, 64, 65, 82, 114, 122, 124, 202
- Formalism**, 139, 185-187, 207, 208
- France, Anatole** (1844-1924), 106
- Futurism**, 10, 11, 157, 160, 161, 167, 184-186, 207, 208
- G**
- Gerould, Daniel** (1928-), 224, 230
- Gershenson, Mikhail O.** (1869-1925), 201, 239
- Gessen, S.G.**, 163
- Ghil, René** (1862-1925), 68
- Giperborey** [Hyperborean], journal (1912-13), 158
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von** (1749-1832), xii, 7, 126, 163, 164, 180, 184
- Gogol, Nikolay V.** (1809-1852), 6, 54, 88-90, 133, 137, 139, 145, 148, 149, 151, 170, 172
- Gorky, Maksim** [Aleksy M. Peshkov] (1868-1936), 7, 43, 88, 91, 106, 120, 123, 127, 184, 208, 227
- Gorodetsky, Sergey M.** (1884-1967), 105, 110, 112-114, 129, 158, 178, 225
- Grechishkin, Sergey S.**, 219, 220, 22, 224-226, 234, 239
- Green, Michael A.** (1937-), 212
- Grieg, Edvard H.** (1843-1907), 30, 59
- Grif** [Griffin], publishing house and miscellanies (1903-1914), 46, 47, 58, 60, 63, 69, 71, 78, 79, 91, 111, 115-118, 122, 128, 136, 157, 164-166, 204, 221, 233
- Grigoryev, Apollon A.** (1829-1864), 193, 237
- Grossman, Joan D.**, 215, 234, 239
- Grzhebin, Zinovy I.** (1869-1929), 113
- Gudzy, Nikolay K.** (1887-1965), 23, 214
- Gumilyov, Nikolay S.** (1886-1921), 10, 11, 136, 138, 143, 154, 157-159, 165, 166, 170, 177, 179, 184, 229, 231, 232
- H**
- Hamsun, Knut** (1859-1952), 5, 30, 42, 77, 146, 184, 217
- Hansson, Carola**, 226
- Hauptmann, Gerhart** (1862-1946), 5, 27
- Heine, Heinrich** (1797-1856), 141
- Hellie, Jean**, 214
- Hippius, Vladimir V.** (1876-1941), 32, 216
- Hippius, Zinaida N.** (1969-1945), 8, 9, 16, 19, 21, 27, 28, 33-35, 38, 39, 41, 43-46, 49, 51, 55, 58, 65, 66, 70, 84, 102, 107, 111, 114, 124-126, 131, 134, 136, 142, 151, 165, 166, 171, 174, 187, 193, 195, 196, 198, 202-205, 208, 212-221, 224, 227-229, 234, 237, 239
- Hofman, Viktor V.** (1884-1911), 47, 208
- Holthusen, Johannes**, 212, 226
- Huysmans, Joris-Karl** (1847-1907), 140
- I**
- Ibsen, Henrik** (1828-1906), 5, 16, 22, 27, 29, 30, 32, 42, 59, 97, 141, 152, 171, 217
- Iskusstvo** [Art], journal (1905), 136, 211, 214

- Ivanov, Evgeny P. (1879-1942), 74
 Ivanov, Vyacheslav I. (1866-1949), 8, 10, 16, 29, 43, 46, 49, 51, 52, 56, 61, 65, 66, 68-71, 75, 76, 81, 83, 84, 86-88, 90-92, 95, 97-101, 103-105, 110-114, 123, 124, 127, 129, 131, 133, 135-141, 150-152, 154, 155, 159, 160, 162-166, 168, 171, 177-179, 182-184, 187, 193, 195-198, 201-203, 207, 208, 218-221, 223-225, 229, 231, 235-239
 Ivanova, Vera K. [née Shvarsalon] (1890-1920), 168
 Ivanov-Razumnik, R.V. [Razumnik V. Ivanov] (1878-1946), 183, 189, 190, 195, 233
- J**
 Jakobson, Roman O. (1896-1982), 187
 Janeczek, Gerald, 229
 Jones, Arnold H.M. (1904-1970), 234
 Joyce, James (1882-1941), 171, 173
- K**
 Kafka, Franz (1883-1924), 171
 Kalbous, George, 212, 224
 Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804), 74, 144, 163
 Karlinsky, Simon, 211, 217, 227
 Kerensky, Aleksandr F. (1881-1970), 195
 Keys, Roger J., 212
 Khlebnikov, Velimir (1885-1922), 10, 160, 185, 186
 Khodasevich, Vladislav F. (1886-1939), 69, 111, 115, 136, 166, 198, 207, 222, 224
 Kirienko-Voloshin, see M.A. Voloshin.
 Kiselev, Nikolay P. (1884-), 163
 Knigge, Armin, 211
 Komissarzhevskaya, Vera F. (1864-1910), 5, 108, 109, 147, 149, 151
 Kondratyev, Aleksandr A. (1876-1966), 66, 115, 116, 225
 Konevskoy, Ivan I. [Oreus] (1877-1901), 32, 33, 38, 42-45, 215, 216
- Korolenko, Vladimir G. (1853-1921), 208
 Krayny, Anton, see Z.N. Hippius.
 Krechetov, see S.A. Sokolov.
 Krinitsky, Mark [Mikhail V. Samygin] (1874-1952), 46
 Kruchyonykh, Aleksey E. (1886-1968), 161, 185, 186
 Krylov, Ivan A. (1769-1844), 46
 Kuprin, Aleksandr A. (1870-1938), 203, 208
 Kursinsky, Alexander A. (1873-1919), 115, 116
 Kuzmin, Mikhail A. (1872?-1936), 112, 114, 117, 136, 138, 146, 153, 154, 159, 165, 166, 205, 225, 231, 239
- L**
 Lancéray, Evgeny E. (1875-1946), 64
 Lavrov, Aleksandr V. (1949-), 219, 220, 222, 224-226, 232-234, 239
 Leitner, Andreas, 226
 Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), 28, 191
 Leontiev, Konstantin N. (1831-1891), 211
 Lermontov, Mikhail Yu. (1814-1841), 31, 125, 141, 151, 178
 Libedinsky, Yuri N. (1898-1959), 207
 Likiardopulo, Mikhail F. (1883-1925), 114, 134, 204
 Lionel, see K.D. Balmont.
 Ljunggren, Magnus, 233
 Logos, journal (1910-1914 in Moscow), 161, 163
 Lvova, Nadezhda G., 167, 176
 Luther, Arthur (1876-1955), 164
- M**
 Maeterlinck, Maurice (1862-1949), 5, 13, 22, 27, 29, 97, 126, 215
 Makovsky, Sergey K. (1877-1962), 135, 138, 228
 Maksimov, Dmitry E. (1904-), 219, 239
 Mallarmé, Stéphane (1842-1898), 47, 71
 Malmstad, John E., 222, 239

- Mamin-Sibiryak, Dmitry N. [Mamin] (1852-1912), 208
 Mamontov, Savva I. (1841-1918), 39
 Mandelstam, Osip E. (1891-1938), 10, 11, 138, 157-159, 186, 232
 Marinetti, Filippo T. (1876-1944), 167
 Markov, Vladimir, 212, 232, 233, 235, 237, 239
 Maslenikov, Oleg A. (1907-1972), 216
 Maslov, see V. Ya. Bryusov.
 Mayakovsky, Vladimir V. (1893-1930), 10, 161, 185, 186
 Maykov, Apollon N. (1821-1897), 15
 Medtner, Emil K. (1872-1936), 51, 137, 162-164, 232
 Merezhkovsky, Dmitry (1865-1941), 4, 8, 9, 13-18, 21, 22, 27-30, 32-34, 39-41, 43, 45, 46, 48-52, 54, 58, 64-66, 68, 69, 75, 81, 82, 84, 86, 89-91, 102, 114, 122, 124, 125, 134, 136, 139, 141, 142, 145, 149, 151-154, 168, 171, 174, 188, 193-196, 198, 202, 203, 208, 213, 214, 216-218, 222, 227-231, 234, 236, 238
 Meyerhold, Vsevolod E. (1874-1940), 108, 128, 182, 194
 Mickiewicz, Denis (1929-), 228
 Minsky, Nikolay M. [Vilenkin] (1855-1937), 14, 18, 29, 30, 32, 39, 44, 45, 65, 68, 70, 116, 204, 205, 213, 215, 216
 Mints, Zara G. (1927-), {Zinaida ?} 222
 Mir Iskusstva [World of Art], journal (1898-1904), 4, 38, 39, 41, 44, 51, 53, 63, 64, 68, 85, 135, 154, 216-219
 Miroljubov, Viktor S. (1860-1939), 41
 Miropolsky, Aleksandr A. [Lang] (1877- after 1917), 22, 23, 43, 44, 46, 69, 70, 115, 116, 204, 205, 214, 225
 Mirsky, D.S., 1, 11, 89, 206, 211, 212, 236, 239
 Mochulsky, Konstantin V. (1892-1948), 129
 Morfill, William R. (1834-1909), 68
 Moscow Art Theater, 147, 181, 194, 195, 211
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756-1791), 158
 Muratova, Ksenia D. (1904-), 226
 Musaget, publishing house and miscellany (1910-1917), 133, 136-138, 140, 150, 153, 155, 161-163, 166, 168, 170, 178, 192, 193
- N**
 Nabokov, Vladimir V. (1899-1977), 125, 171
 Narbut, Vladimir I. (1888-1944), 158
 Nekrasov, Nikolay A. (1821-1877[OS]), 44, 55, 77, 129
 Nietzsche, Friedrich W. (1844-1900), 3, 14, 28, 29, 35-37, 64, 67, 99, 140, 152, 171, 211, 213, 216
 Nik. T-o, see I.F. Annensky.
 Nilsson, Nils Ake, 215
 Nivat, Georges, 238
 Nordau, Max S. (1849-1923), 22, 214
 Novyi Put' [New Path], journal (1903-1904), 40, 41, 51, 61, 63-66, 154, 171, 218, 219
- O**
 Orlov, Vladimir N. (1908-1985), 201, 213, 221, 222, 225, 233, 238
 Ory [Horae], publishing house and miscellany, 97, 104, 105, 107, 112, 113, 136, 178, 225
 Ostrovsky, Aleksandr N. (1823-1886), 5
- P**
 Pachmuss, Temira (1927-), 216, 238, 239
 Pasternak, Boris L. (1890-1960), 10, 138, 161, 186
 Patterson, Rodney, 220
 Pereval, [The Divide], journal (1906-1907), 97, 102-104, 113, 115, 116, 136, 223
 Pertsov, Pyotr P. (1868-1946), 26, 41
 Peterson, Ronald E. (1948-1986), 215, 216, 219-222, 229, 232-234, 236

- Petrovskaya, Nina I. (1844-1928), 46, 59, 61, 70, 74, 86, 87, 103, 111, 115-117, 121, 122, 129, 168, 169, 204, 225
 Petrovsky, Aleksey S. (1881-1959), 59, 74, 163, 238
 Peyre, Henri (1901-), 212
 Piatigorsky, Alexander, 211
 Pilnyak, Boris [Vogau] (1894-1937), 207
 Pisemsky, Aleksey F. (1820-1881), 88
 Plato (427?-347 BC), 53, 129
 Poe, Edgar Allan (1809-1849), 14, 20, 58, 67, 77, 106, 191
 Poggioli, Renato (1907-1963), 213
 Polyakov, Sergey A. (1874-1943), 42, 67, 68, 130, 133, 134, 204, 228
 Proust, Marcel (1871-1922), 171
 Przybyszewski, Stanislaw (1868-1927), 107, 224
 Pushkin, Aleksandr A. (1799-1837), 6, 31, 43-45, 47, 83, 143, 144, 150, 151, 160, 178, 192
 Pyman, Avril (1930-), 192, 217-220, 222, 235-238
- R
- Rabinowitz, Stanley, 226
 Régnier, Henri de (1864-1936), 154
 Religious-Philosophical Meetings; Religious-Philosophical Society, 4, 211
 Remizov, Aleksey M. (1877-1957), 112, 123, 129, 197, 207, 225
 Riasanovsky, Nicholas V. (1923-), 211
 Rice, James L., 145, 230
 Rimbaud, J.N. Arthur (1854-1891), 71
 Roberts, Spencer, 211
 Rodenbach, Georges (1855-1898), 69, 117, 226
 Rozanov, Vasily V. (1856-1919), 3, 4, 44-46, 50, 65, 68, 203, 211
 Rusinko, Elaine, 212, 231
Russkaya Mysl [Russian Thought], journal (1880-1918 in Russia), 125, 134, 142, 167, 170, 171, 174, 227, 229, 230, 233, 235, 237
 Ryabushinsky, Nikolay P. [pseudonym Shinsky] (1876-1951), 85, 114

S

- Sabashnikova, see Margarita Voloshina.
 Sadovskoy, Boris A. (1881-1952), 230
 Salieri, Antonio (1750-1825), 158
 Savina, Maria (1854-1915), 194
 Scherrer, Jutta, 211, 217
 Schiller, J.Ch. Friedrich von (1759-1805), 107
 Schnitzler, Arthur (1862-1931), 42, 217
 Schopenhauer, Arthur (1788-1860), 9, 30, 32, 33, 99, 120, 127
 Scriabin, Alexander N. (1871[OS]-1915), 191, 209
 Segel, Harold (1930-), 212, 224
 Selegen, Galina V. (1899-), 226
 Semyonov, Mikhail N., 68
 Senelick, Laurence, 212
 Serafimovich, Aleksandr S. [Popov] (1863-1949), 207
 Serapion Brothers, 207
 Setchkarev, Vsevolod M., 217
Severnye Tsvety [Northern Flowers], miscellanies (1901-1911), 43-47, 49, 54, 68, 70, 91, 122, 164-166, 217, 233
Severnyi Vestnik [Northern Herald], journal (1885-1898), 16-19, 27-29, 213, 215, 220
 Shakespeare, William (1564-1616), 32, 70, 119, 141
 Shelley, Percy B. (1792-1822), 20, 77
 Shestov, Lev [Schwartzman] (1866-1938), 3, 4, 36, 103, 110, 165, 211, 216
 Shipovnik [Sweetbrier] publishing house (1906-1918), 113, 118, 123, 126, 129, 144, 147, 226, 235, 237
 Shklovsky, Viktor B. (1893-), 187
 Shpet, Gustav G. (1879-1940), 162
 Sidorov, Aleksey A. (1891-1978), 163
 Sigurd, see V.F. Khodasevich.
 Sirin, publishing house and miscellanies (1912-1915), 166, 171, 177, 179, 181, 182, 192, 233, 237
Skify [Scythians], miscellanies (1917-1918), 183, 0190, 2371

- Skorpion [Scorpio], publishing house (1900-1916), 42, 43, 46, 50, 58, 60, 63, 67-72, 75, 78, 102-104, 113, 115, 126, 137, 143, 157, 166, 176, 177, 179, 180, 204, 233
~~Sokolov, Alexander S., 115, 225~~
~~Sokolov, Sergey A. (1878-1936), 46, 47, 69, 70, 91, 103, 111, 116, 204, 222, 239~~
~~Sologub, Fyodor K. [Teternikov] (1863-1927), 8, 9, 18-21, 27, 30, 32-34, 38, 43-47, 58, 65, 66, 68-70, 78-80, 84, 90, 91, 98, 103, 107-109, 111, 113-115, 118-120, 122-124, 127, 129, 131, 133-136, 139, 141, 146, 147, 149, 151, 154, 160, 165, 166, 168, 182-187, 190, 191, 193-198, 200, 203, 208, 213, 215-222, 224, 226, 227, 230, 235-238~~
 Solovyov, Mikhail S. (1862-1903), 53
 Solovyov, Sergey M. (1885-1942), 53, 57, 59, 66, 70, 74, 88, 111, 114, 115, 117, 130, 134, 136, 143, 145, 153, 162, 179, 180, 204, 208, 211, 216, 225, 226, 228-230, 235, 239
 Solovyov, Vladimir S. (1853-1900), 3, 23, 24, 35-37, 44, 46, 50, 52, 60, 74, 88, 99, 100, 109, 124, 129, 151, 166, 171, 214, 216
 Solovyova, Olga M. (1855-1903), 53
 Somov, Konstantin A. (1869-1939), 44, 112
 Stanislavsky, Konstantin S. [Alekseev] (1863-1938), 147, 181
 Steiner, Rudolf (1861-1925), 113, 163, 168, 169, 233
 Stephan, Halina, 232
 Stepun, Fyodor A. (1884-1965), 162, 163
 Stravinsky, Igor (1882-1970), 126
 Strindberg, August (1849-1912), 30
 Struve, Peter B. (1870-1944), 167, 171
 Suvorin, Aleksey S. (1834-1912), 41
- T
- Tarasov-Rodionov, Aleksandr I. (1885-1938), 207
 Tasteven, Genrikh E., 230

- Tenisheva, Princess Maria K. (1867-1928), 39
 Tereshchenko, Mikhail I. (1886-1956), 166
 Ternavtsev, V.A., 41
 Tolstoy, Aleksey K. (1817-1875), 39, 215
 Tolstoy, Aleksey N. (1882[OS]-1945), 115
 Tolstoy, Leo N. (1828-1910), 2, 19, 22, 25, 27, 32, 36, 40, 88, 89, 149, 160, 173
 Tomashevsky, Boris V. (1890-1957), 187
 Tovarishch Germann, see Z.N. Hippus.
Trudy i Dni [Works and Days], journal (1912-1916), 161-164, 168, 198, 232
 Tsvetaeva, Marina I. (1892-1941), 20, 125, 166, 176, 207, 234
 Turgenev, Ivan S. (1818-1883), 2, 21, 44, 88, 141
 Turgeneva, Anna A. [Asya] (1890-1966), 145, 169, 233
 Turyanova, Tatyana A., 180
 Tynyanov, Yury N. (1894-1943), 187
 Tyutchev, Fyodor I. (1803-1873), 6, 31, 44, 46, 77, 144, 176, 183, 184, 204, 213
- U
- Urusov, Prince Aleksandr I. (1843-1900), 44
- V
- Vengerov, Semyon A. (1855-1920), 213
 Vengerova, Zinaida A. (1867-1941), 22, 213
 Verhaeren, Émile (1855-1916), 104, 106, 127, 167, 168, 224
 Verlaine, Paul (1844-1896), 13, 16, 18, 22, 23, 47, 71, 140, 142
Vestnik Evropy [European Herald], journal (1866-1918), 23, 214
Vesy [Libra], journal (1904-1909), 10, 42, 56, 63, 64, 68, 82-86, 97, 98, 101-

- 104, 106, 107, 109-111, 114-117, 122, 124, 125, 129, 130, 133-138, 140, 145, 146, 148-150, 153-155, 160, 163, 171, 179, 198, 204, 219-221, 223-228, 230, 231
- Vilkina, Lyudmila N. (1873-1920), 70, 115, 116
- Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, Auguste de (1838-1889), 106
- Vogel, Lucy, 238
- Voloshin, Maksimilian A. [Kirienko-Voloshin] (1878-1932), 47, 55, 70, 112, 114, 115, 129, 136, 143, 144, 154, 165, 195, 205, 208, 228, 230, 231, 239
- Voloshina, Margarita [Woloschin, née Sabashnikova] (1882-1973), 113, 162, 225
- Volynsky, Akim L. [Flekser] (1863-1926), 17, 18, 29, 215
- Voprosy Zhizni [Questions of Life], journal (1905), 65, 66, 79, 99, 101, 154, 215, 219, 223
- Vrubel, Mikhail A. (1856-1910), 149
- W
- Wagner, Richard (1813-1883), 140, 163, 164, 181
- Wanderers [Peredvizhniki], 4
- West, James D., 212
- Whitman, Walt (1819-1892), 126
- Wilde, Oscar (1854-1900), 5, 47, 77, 126
- Wolffing, see E.K. Medtner.
- Y
- Yakovenko, Boris V., 163
- Z
- Zamyatin, Evgeny (1884-1937), 197, 207
- Zapiski Mechtateley [Notes of Dreamers], journal (1919-1922), 197, 206, 237, 238
- Zavety [Precepts], journal (1912-1914), 183
- Zaytsev, Boris K. (1881-1972), 123
- Zenkevich, Mikhail A. (1891-), 158
- Zhirmunsky, Viktor M. (1891-1971), 139, 187, 229
- Zinovyeva-Annibal, Lydia D. (1866-1907), 43, 52, 66, 76, 91, 112, 220, 225
- Zlobin, Vladimir A. (1894-1968), {1967?} 202, 217, 226, 227, 239
- Zola, Émile (1840-1902), 16, 22, 114
- Zolotoe Runo [The Golden Fleece], journal (1906-1909), 63, 85, 86, 88, 91, 97, 101, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 113-115, 122, 124, 130, 133-136, 140, 146, 150, 154, 204, 220, 222-224, 226-231

In the series LINGUISTIC AND LITERARY STUDIES IN EASTERN EUROPE the following volumes have been published and will be published during 1993:

1. ODMARK, John (ed.): *LANGUAGE, LITERATURE & MEANING. I: Problems of Literary Theory*. Amsterdam, 1979.
2. *ibid.*
II: Current Trends in Literary Research. Amsterdam, 1980.
3. BAUR, Rupprecht S., et al.: *RESÜMIERENDE AUSWAHLBIBLIOTHEK ZUR NEUEREN SOWJETISCHEN SPRACHLEHRFORSCHUNG (gesteuerter Fremdsprachenerwerb)*. Amsterdam, 1980.
4. KIEFER, FÉRENC (ed.): *HUNGARIAN GENERAL LINGUISTICS*. Amsterdam, 1982.
5. ZIMA, Peter V. (ed.): *SEMIOTICS AND DIALECTICS: Ideology and the Text*. Amsterdam, 1981.
6. FIZER, John: *Psychologism and Psychoaesthetics: A Historical and Critical View of Their Relations*. Amsterdam, 1981.
7. SMITH, Barry (ed.): *STRUCTURE AND GESTALT: Philosophy and literature in Austria-Hungary and her successor states*. Amsterdam, 1981.
8. STEINER, P., M. ČERVENKA & R. VROON (eds): *THE STRUCTURE OF THE LITERARY PROCESS: Studies dedicated to the Memory of Felix Vodička*. Amsterdam, 1982.
9. *PRAGUE STUDIES IN MATHEMATICAL LINGUISTICS*, vol. 7. Amsterdam, 1981.
10. SCHMID, Herta & Aloysius Van KESTEREN (eds): *SEMIOTICS OF DRAMA AND THEATRE*. Amsterdam, 1985.
11. BOJTÁR, Endre: *Slavic Structuralism in Literary Science*. Transl. from the Hungarian. Amsterdam, 1985.
12. VACHEK, J. (ed.): *PRAGUIANA: Some Basic and Less Known Aspects of the Prague Linguistic School*. Amsterdam, 1983.
13. MELČUK, Igor A. & Nikolaj V. PERTSOV: *Surface Syntax of English: a Formal Model within the Meaning-Text Framework*. Amsterdam, 1987.
14. ŠVEJČER, A.D.: *Contemporary Sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam, 1986.
15. ŠVEJČER, A.D. & L.B. NIKOL'SKIJ: *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam, 1986.
16. SGALL, Petr (ed.): *CONTRIBUTIONS TO FUNCTIONAL SYNTAX, SEMANTICS, AND LANGUAGE COMPREHENSION*. Amsterdam, 1984.
17. *PRAGUE STUDIES IN MATHEMATICAL LINGUISTICS*. Volume 8. Amsterdam, 1983.
18. SHCHEGLOV, Yu & A. ZHOLKOVSKY: *Poetics of Expressiveness: A Theory and Application*. Amsterdam, 1987.
19. MEY, Jacob (ed.): *LANGUAGE AND DISCOURSE: TEST AND PROTEST. A Festschrift for Petr Sgall*. Amsterdam, 1986.
20. DIRVEN, R. & W. FRIED (eds): *FUNCTIONALISM IN LINGUISTICS*. Amsterdam, 1987.
21. ANDRÁS, László & Zoltán KOVECSES (comps): *HUNGARIAN-ENGLISH SLANG DICTIONARY*. Taken from the program.
22. *PRAGUE STUDIES IN MATHEMATICAL LINGUISTICS*. Volume 9. Amsterdam, 1987.
23. CHLOUPEK, Jan and Jiří NEKVAPIL (eds): *READER IN CZECH SOCIOLINGUISTICS*. Amsterdam, 1987.

SBD/FELGH/USP

SEÇÃO DE

Línguas

AQUISIÇÃO

VALOR

Aragon 15/11/87

11/200

24. VOLEK, Bronislava: *Emotive Signs in Language and Semantic Functioning of Derived Nouns in Russian*. Amsterdam, 1987.
25. BUSZKOWSKI, W., W. MARCISZEWSKI & J. van BENTHEM (eds): *CATEGORIAL GRAMMAR*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1988.
26. RADOVANOVIĆ, Milorad (ed.): *YUGOSLAV GENERAL LINGUISTICS*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1989.
27. TOBIN, Yishai (ed.): *THE PRAGUE SCHOOL AND ITS LEGACY*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1988.
28. TOMASZCZYK, Jerzy and Barbara LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK (eds): *MEANING AND LEXICOGRAPHY*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
29. PETERSON, Ronald E.: *A History of Russian Symbolism*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1993.
30. FISIĄK, Jacek (ed.): *FURTHER INSIGHTS INTO CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
31. RANCOUR-LAFERRIERE, Daniel (ed.): *RUSSIAN LITERATURE AND PSYCHOANALYSIS*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1989.
32. MILOSAVLJEVIC, Petar (ed.): *YUGOSLAV LITERARY-THEORETICAL THOUGHT*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. n.y.p.
33. WRÓBEL, Janusz: *Language and Schizophrenia*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1989.
34. *PRAGUE STUDIES IN MATHEMATICAL LINGUISTICS*. Volume 10. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.
35. BONDARKO, Alexander V.: *Functional Grammar. A Field Approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
36. CHLOUPEK, Jan and Jiří NEKVAPIL: *STUDIES IN FUNCTIONAL STYLISTICS*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1993.
37. TESITLOVA, Marie: *QUANTITATIVE LINGUISTICS*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
38. FISIĄK, Jacek and Stanisław PUPPEL (eds): *PHONOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
39. SGALL, Peter, Jiří HRONEK, Alexander STICH and Ján HORECKÝ. *VARIATION IN LANGUAGE, Code Switching in Czech as a Challenge for Sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
40. LUELSDORFF, Philip A. (ed.): *PRAGUIANA 1945-1990*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. n.y.p.

R. BUCARDO (46, NP.6
(TRAD. C. 2000))