Studies in Slavic Literature, Culture and Society

General Editor: Thomas Epstein, Visiting Scholar at Brown University

Volume 1
Vladimir Odoevsky and Romantic Poetics: Collected Essays.
Neil Cornwell

Volume 2
Women and Russian Culture: Projections and Self-Perceptions.
Edited by Rosalind Marsh

Volume 3
Russian Postmodernism: New Perspectives on Post-Soviet Literature.
Mikhail Epstein, Alexander Genis, and Slobodanka Vladiv-Glover

Volume 4
Sight and Sound Entwined: Studies of the New Russian Poetry.
Gerald Janecek

Volume 5
Cold Fusion: Aspects of the German Cultural Presence in Russia.
Gennady Barabtarlo

Volume 6
Russian Literature and Its Demons.
Edited by Pamela Davidson

Volume 7
Voices from the Void: The Genres of Liudmila Petrushevskia.
Sally Dalton-Brown

RUSSIAN LITERATURE AND ITS DEMONS

Edited by Pamela Davidson

Berghahn Books
New York • Oxford

2000

First published in 2000 by **Berghahn Books**

www.berghahnbooks.com

Editorial matter and selection © 2000 Pamela Davidson
The copyright of each contribution remains the property of the individual author concerned.

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means without the written permission of Berghahn Books.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Russian literature and its demons / edited by Pamela Davidson.
p. cm. -- (Studies in Slavic literature, culture, and society ; v. 6)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1-57181-758-1 (alk. paper)
1. Russian literature--History and criticism. 2. Demonology in literature. 3. Devil in literature. I. Davidson, Pamela.
II. Series.

PG2987.D45 R87 2000
891.709'37--dc21

99-045400

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue for this book is available from the British Library.

Printed in the United Kingdom on acid-free paper.

ISBN 1-57181-758-1 (hardback)

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations vii
Notes on Contributors x
Preface xiii
Russian Literature and Its Demons: Introductory Essay
Pamela Davidson 1

Part I: Traditions and Contexts

1. Nostalgia for Hell: Russian Literary Demonism and Orthodox Tradition
Simon Franklin 31
2. The Russian Folk Devil and His Literary Reflections
Faith Wigzell 59
3. Antichrist Enthroned: Demonic Visions of Russian Rulers
Kevin Platt 87
4. Divine Service or Idol Worship? Russian Views of Art as Demonic
Pamela Davidson 125

Part II: Literary Demons

5. The Muse and the Demon in the Poetry of Pushkin, Lermontov, and Blok
Pamela Davidson 167
6. Lermontov's *The Demon*: Identity and Axiology
Robert Reid 215

73. Iu.M. Lotman, "Zamysel stikhotvoreniia o poslednem dne Pompei," in his *Pushkin: Biografiia pisatelia; Stat'i i zametki; 'Evgenii Onegin' – kommentarii* (St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo-SPB, 1995), 293–99, esp. 295.
74. On the historical and cosmological construction of Merezhkovsky's novel, see Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky and the Silver Age: The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975), 86–105.
75. Wake, *Ivan the Terrible*, 184–85.
76. See Robert O. Crummey, *The Old Believers and the World of Antichrist: The Vyg Community and the Russian State, 1694–1855* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), 211; Gur'ianova, *Krest'ianskii antimonarkhicheskii protest*, 116.
77. M.M. Beliakova and T.V. Chertoritskaia, "Krug chteniia staroobriadtsa-spasovtsa pervoi poloviny XX v., ili tri biblioteki Dorofeia Utkina," in *Traditsionnaia dukhovnaia i material'naia kul'tura russkikh staroobriadcheskikh poselenii v stranakh Evropy, Azii i Ameriki*, ed. N.N. Pokrovskii and R. Morris (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1992), 306–12(309).
78. Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1855* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), 105–16(115).
79. Polevoi's rhetorically obtuse and rather mystically inspired idea is that the enthronement of Nicholas I one hundred years after the death of Peter serves as evidence of the close identification of the two emperors. The emphases are in the original. Cited in M.K. Lemke, *Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1826–1855: Po podlinnym delam Tret'ego otdeleniia Sobstv. E.I. Velichestva kantseliarii*, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg: S.V. Bunin, 1909), 102.
80. Kavelin, "Vzgliad na iuridicheskii byt," 1:47.
81. Cited in Mikhailovskii, "Ivan Groznyi v russkoi literature," 6:161.
82. Tucker, *Stalin in Power*, 60–64(63).
83. Ibid., 276–82(278).
84. Waclaw Lednicki, *Pushkin's "Bronze Horseman": The Story of a Masterpiece* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978), 81.
85. See Anthony R. Guneratne, "History as Propaganda: The Portrait of Stalin as Medieval Hero, and its Epic Frame," *Cinefocus*, 1990, no. 2:33–40.
86. For an insightful reading of Tynianov's treatment of Russian history and the allegorical relationship between Peter and Lenin, see: Dragan Kujundzic, *The Returns of History: Russian Nietzscheans After Modernity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 135–79.
87. Andrei Platonov, "Epifanskie shliuzy," in his *Povesti. Rasskazy* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1989), 85–118(118).
88. Voloshin, *Stikhotvoreniia i poemy*, 1:310–12.
89. Ibid., 1:311–12.
90. On the demonic image of Stalin in *The First Circle* see Vladimir Grebenschikov, "Les cercles infernaux chez Soljénitsyne et Dante," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 13 (1971):147–63. On the representation of Stalin in post-Stalinist literature in general, see Gary Kern, "Solzhenitsyn's Portrait of Stalin," *Slavic Review* 33 (1974):1–22; Rosalind Marsh, *Images of Dictatorship: Portraits of Stalin in Literature* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989); Margaret Ziolkowski, "A Modern Demonology: Some Literary Stalins," *Slavic Review* 50 (1990):59–69.

Chapter 4

Divine Service or Idol Worship? Russian Views of Art as Demonic

Pamela Davidson

> Oppose the devil and try to discern his wiles. He usually hides his gall under an appearance of sweetness, so as to avoid detection, and he fabricates various illusions, beautiful to look at – which in reality are not at all what they seem – to seduce your hearts by a cunning imitation of truth, which is rightly attractive. All his art is directed to this end – to oppose by all possible means every soul working well for God.
>
> Saint Antony the Great, from the *Philokalia*[1]

> Волшебный демон – лживый, но прекрасный
> [An enchanting demon – false, but beautiful]
>
> Pushkin[2]

The first three contributions to this volume have dealt with the perception of demons, as evident in the traditions of Russian Orthodoxy, folklore, and historiography. The present chapter concludes part I with an analysis of the way in which the understanding of the demonic shaped by these traditions infiltrated the perception of art itself. This process is central to the tradition of literary demonism, and its investigation forms a natural bridge to part II, which considers reflections of the demonic in individual works.

This essay does not therefore deal with demonism as a *theme* in Russian literature; it traces some of the sources and the historical development of the view of literary activity as intrinsically demonic, that is to say as deriving from evil forces which somehow possess the artist and obstruct the pursuit of higher goals. Art in this sense can be

understood in the light of the epigraph cited above as one of the many beautiful illusions or cunning imitations of truth by which the devil seduces the hearts of men. The study of this topic is by no means new; its history goes back to debates in the early Church on the relationship of Christianity to pagan culture. Surprisingly, however, its development and ramifications within the Russian tradition have never been the subject of a special investigation, despite its central importance for a literary culture which persistently emphasizes its preoccupation with religion.

The purpose of this chapter is to set out in very broad terms some of the pre-literary contexts for the view of art as demonic, and to consider the characteristic ways in which this view has manifested itself in Russia. Three main questions will be addressed. Firstly, what are the main sources for the notion of art as demonic? This will require an examination of two key traditions which have shaped Russian thinking on art – the Bible and classical antiquity – with particular reference to their differing views of art and its relation to divinely inspired revelation. Secondly, what were the particular historical circumstances surrounding the reception of these traditions in Russia, which resulted in the formation of a strong national preoccupation with the demonic potential of literature? This will entail a brief excursion through the development of Russian views of secular culture with particular reference to the impact of Peter's reforms. Thirdly, what were the typical approaches to art and its demonic attributes which emerged from this complex of cultural and historical influences? Here we shall consider some literary manifestations of the view of post-Petrine culture as inherently demonic; by way of a closing illustration, we shall examine the reflection of these issues in a thought-provoking poetic fragment by Pushkin, which resonates interestingly with Chaadaev's analysis of Russia's distinctive historical path.

We should note in passing that the various formative areas of influence considered in this article were, of course, supplemented by a further important strand: that of Western European literature, which, through writers such as Dante, Milton, Goethe, Byron, and Baudelaire – to name but a few salient examples – shaped the reception of the biblical and classical traditions in Russia and exerted an important influence on literary perceptions of the demonic. Despite its very considerable role, the study of this mediating channel of influence lies outside the scope of this essay, which concentrates on the pre-literary context leading up to the inception of modern Russian literature after Peter's reforms (even in the case of the earliest of these writers, Dante and Milton, the process of assimilation of their legacy through critical discussion, translation, and imitation did not begin until the late eighteenth century).[3] Furthermore, the works of these writers (with the possible exception of Baudelaire) were generally more concerned with the nature of evil as a moral, philosophical, or religious category than with the question of art itself as demonic – a preoccupation which, as we shall argue below, was peculiarly specific to the Russian literary tradition for a variety of historical and cultural reasons.

It should also be emphasized at the outset that this essay is intended only as a general introduction to a very large topic, which on its own could easily fill an entire book. This has necessarily led to a very selective approach and to a certain degree of schematization and simplification in the presentation of its argument. The issues raised aim to provide some contextual background for the study undertaken in part II of individual literary works which served to build up the tradition of art as demonic.

Biblical Views of Art and the Artist

Attitudes to the question of whether or not art is intrinsically "demonic" depend on a broader underlying issue: that of the relationship between art and religion, between beauty and the truth of revelation, or, in Shestov's phrase, between Athens and Jerusalem. Is artistic activity compatible with the pursuit of religious goals, or does it represent at best an unnecessary diversion, at worst a dangerous, potentially undermining threat? In order to set this question in its proper historical perspective, that of the Judaeo-Christian tradition which has shaped European attitudes to culture, it is necessary to return to the primary source of the Bible and to consider its treatment of this issue – particularly as many of the texts discussed below in part II allude directly to this tradition. First, however, a *caveat* concerning the use of the words "art" and "artist" throughout this section. These terms come to us laden with classical and post-medieval connotations, and, strictly speaking, are not applicable to biblical usage, which deals with the quite distinct concepts of the craftsman and his skill. They are nevertheless used in this section in a retroactive sense, as we are concerned here not so much with the original biblical text as with the various ways in which it could be interpreted by later artists as a source and model for their own understanding of the creative vocation.

Two distinct attitudes to the artist and artistic activity can be derived from a study of biblical references – one positive, and one negative. For the positive biblical image, for art to be viewed as supportive of religion, two conditions must be met: the work of art must be dedicated to the service of God and holy in purpose, and the artist called upon to execute it must be filled with an appropriate spirit of

wisdom. The original biblical prototype of the work of art is the Tabernacle with all its elaborate appurtenances, and the first model of the artist is provided by its maker, Bezalel.[4] The terms in which Bezalel is described on first appearance make it unambiguously clear that both the source of the artist's manifold gifts and the purpose of their deployment come from God: "And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying: See, I have called by name Bezalel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah; and I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship. ... in the hearts of all that are wise-hearted I have put wisdom, that they may make all that I have commanded thee" (Exod.31:1–3,6).[5]

The precise details of the construction of the Tabernacle and its contents were given directly by God, and constant stress is placed upon their holiness of purpose. The artist is therefore primarily a craftsman, endowed by God with a spirit of wisdom to appreciate this sacred purpose and with the necessary knowledge and skill to understand the instructions and to implement them. This is quite distinct from the modern image of the artist as an independent creator, following his own fantasy and devising his own techniques. Significantly, in the biblical account, the divine plan for the Tabernacle is first described in consummate detail (Exod.25–30); only then, in second place, is the artist designated (Exod.31) and the actual execution of the work described (Exod.35–39).

Biblical attitudes to verbal forms of expression, both oral and written, emphasize the divine origin and tremendous power of language. Through the spoken word of God the universe was created: "And God said: 'Let there be light.' And there was light" (Gen.1:3). The spoken language with which man was endowed was originally a very powerful force, as can be seen from the fact that Adam is entrusted with the task of naming the animals; after creating the animals and the birds, God "brought them unto the man to see what he would call them; and whatsoever the man would call every living creature, that was to be the name thereof" (Gen.2:19). Both the Tabernacle and the temple were built to house the stone tablets on which the ten commandments were engraved; these artefacts, inscribed by God with a divine message and given directly to Moses, provide the first and most striking example of the divine origin of the written word in the Bible. If we look beyond the tablets to the text of the Pentateuch, we see that Moses received the written law directly from God; his job was to write down that which was communicated from above, to be a faithful scribe rather than a writer of his own text.[6] Likewise the later prophets received and conveyed a message which was not of their own making.

10. M. Chagall, *Literature*, 1920. Oil on canvas, 212 × 79 cm. The Hebrew letters coming out of the animal's mouth spell the name Chagall.

Christian theology provided a strong further impetus to the original biblical emphasis on the divine, creative power of language. Although already known both in pagan and Jewish antiquity, the concept of *Logos*, the Creative Word or Reason, was developed in the Johannine writings of the New Testament (John 1:1, 14; 1 John 1:1; Rev.19:13) and in subsequent Patristic teachings with particular reference to the Second Person of the Trinity. When "the Word was made flesh" (John 1:14) through incarnation in the man, Jesus Christ, the gap between the Divine Word and the poetic word was potentially narrowed and the basis for a closer association between human and Divine creativity was strengthened.

Under what circumstances is art viewed as a negative force in the Bible? The answer to this question is important as it provides part of the context for the later literary view of art as demonic. Whenever

artistic activity is divorced from its true source and goal in God, it is invariably associated with idol worship and condemned (in other words, from a biblical perspective, there is no "neutral" middle ground secular art). The Old Testament is full of passages which decry and curse the makers of images and idols, the works of cunning craftsmen.[7] The fundamental difference between God – who cannot be represented – and man-made idols or images is constantly stressed, in both the Old and New Testaments. The spiritual danger which artists can present is spelled out in the Book of Revelation: an angel rejoices at the fall of the corrupt city of Babylon, from which all musicians and craftsmen will henceforth be excluded (Rev.18:22).

What of speech and the written word? The power of language with which God originally endowed man can be abused. Adam is corrupted through the subtle speech of the cunning serpent to Eve and loses his privileged status as a result (Gen.3:1–5). The expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise later becomes a key image of the exiled artist's or fallen angel's loss of intimate contact with the divine source of creativity.[8] This regression culminates in the account of the building of the Tower of Babel; when men strive to take the place of God ("let us make us a name," Gen.11:4), God restrains them by causing them to lose their "one language" (Gen.11:6), clearly a dangerous source of power, susceptible to misuse, and removed in the verbal confusion which ensues. That language, the gift of speech, and its power to curse or to bless, is ultimately controlled by God is clearly demonstrated by the tale of Balaam whose ass could talk and whose curses were turned into blessings against his will.[9]

The positive and negative images of art outlined so far might cause one to think that this distinction is always pleasingly black and white. Although the biblical distinction is not in fact inherently ambiguous, it is important for an understanding of the way in which it was developed in later literary tradition to recognize that it depends on a delicate balance which is easily subject to distortion. The artist does indeed derive his creative powers from God, and is therefore not an autonomous creator in his own right; however, the considerable powers with which he is endowed can lead to his being viewed as a mirror image of God the Creator.

If we return to our first example of Bezalel and the Tabernacle, we can see how such a view might arise. Jewish tradition teaches that Bezalel, although only thirteen when chosen for his task, knew the art of combining the sacred letters with which heaven and earth were created, and possessed a degree of wisdom similar to that with which God created the universe.[10] This suggests a symmetrical relationship between God the Creator and Bezalel the artist, a significant extension of the parallel between their two creations (the Tabernacle as the dwelling place of God can be viewed as a microcosm of the creation). This close association between the artist and God, the supreme Creator, was one which, as we saw above, had to be denied to avoid the danger of idol worship; and yet the Bible and traditions of biblical exegesis almost invite it.

Furthermore, the artists involved in making the Tabernacle clearly had the power of conferring holiness on their creation. Any reader of the account of the construction of the Tabernacle is struck by the fact that, as noted above, its details are first enumerated in the form of instructions, and then reiterated in equal fullness in the course of two further chapters describing their execution. Why was the concluding sentence that Bezalel and his helpers carried out the instructions as God had commanded them not deemed sufficient? Commentators suggest that the repetition comes in order to stress the vital importance of the artist's constant awareness of the sacred and symbolic holiness of the Tabernacle and its utensils. The original holiness of purpose could only be preserved if the artist bore it in mind all the time whilst engaged in his creative task; in this sense (as a mediator rather than originator) he has the power of conferring holiness on to the physical world through his art – an idea which the religious symbolists, following Vladimir Solov'ev, would later take up enthusiastically.

The pitfall of equating the holy powers of the artist with those of God can, of course, be avoided by remembering that the artist's gifts, however great, ultimately derive only from God, who chooses a fit vessel for his wisdom. This is aptly conveyed by the meaning in Hebrew of the name Bezalel, "in the shade of God,"[11] inviting the association, but at the same time establishing its hierarchical nature.

God is therefore in an absolute sense the only true artist, past, present, and future, both as the Creator of the universe and as the builder and maker of the ideal city (Heb.11:10). The human artist's gaze should be directed above at his Maker, rather than below at his own creation. In this upward-looking hierarchy of reverence, man is creature rather than creator. When he assumes the role of creator, he runs the danger of losing sight of his Creator and of his subordinate position in this vertical hierarchy; hence the link between artistic activity and idol worship.

Although considerably obscured by centuries of cultural accretions and sometimes lost from view, this is the original root in the modern Russian literary tradition of the demonic view of art. The analogy between the artist and the Supreme Creator, which was originally a reflection of the deep harmony perceived in the order of Creation, once divorced from a sense of hierarchy, led to the view of the artist as a demonic usurper of divine creativity. The gradual transformation which this analogy underwent in Russian literature

can be briefly illustrated by citing examples representing three different cultural periods: the late eighteenth century, early nineteenth century Romanticism, and post-symbolist modernism. Derzhavin's ode "God" (Bog, 1784) was the first work of Russian literature to acquire a substantial international reputation, and provides a striking early treatment of the parallel between artist and Creator.[12] In the third stanza God is described in terms which underline his role as Supreme Creator, past, present, and future:

> Создавый все единым словом,
> В твореньи простираясь новом,
> Ты был, Ты есь, Ты будешь ввек!
>
> [You who created everything with one word,
> Spreading throughout the new creation,
> You were, You are, You will be forever!]

The key question "And what before You am I?" (I chto pered Toboiu ia?) is introduced in the central stanza and marks the midway turning-point of the ode. The apparently straightforward answer "But I before You am nothing" (A ia pered Toboi – nichto) is then developed. Although man is nothing, because he is made in the image of God, he is a vessel for the divine and his "nothingness" becomes endowed with supreme significance. This leads to the arresting paradox at the heart of the poem: "I am a tsar – a slave, a worm – a god!" (Ia tsar' – ia rab, ia cherv' – ia bog!). The impact of this line was even more striking in the original manuscript versions of the poem, in which the word "god" was written by Derzhavin with an initial capital.[13] This controversial statement is followed, however, by an unquestioning affirmation of the hierarchy of creation and of the poet's dependent position within it:

> Твое созданье я, Создатель!
> Твоей премудрости я тварь!
> Источник жизни, благ податель,
> Душа души моей и царь!
>
> [I am Your creation, Creator!
> The creature of Your wisdom!
> Source of life, bestower of blessings,
> Soul of my soul and ruler!]

Some fifty years later, in the age of Romanticism, a similar parallel was drawn by Tiutchev. In his "Dream at Sea" (Son na more, 1830) the strong sense of hierarchy and explicit references to God which we noted in Derzhavin have been replaced by a more evenly balanced mirroring of man as microcosm and the Macrocosm, symbolized by the natural element of the sea. Man is presented as a builder of precarious dreams or artistic visions who strides "like a god" over the world which he has created:

> По высям творенья, как бог, я шагал,
> И мир подо мною недвижный сиял.[14]
>
> [Over the summits of creation, like a god, I strode,
> And the world beneath me, motionless, shone.]

Almost a century later, in a modernist poem by Khodasevich, "Dactyls" (Daktili, 1927–28), the demonic implications of the audacious image of man as god are taken one stage further:

> Мир созерцает художник – и судит, и дерзкою волей,
> Демонской волей творца – свой созидает, иной.[15]
>
> [The artist contemplates the world – and judges, and with the daring will,
> With the demonic will of a creator – he builds his own, a different one.]

In Derzhavin's ode, the artist, like Bezalel, only gains significance because of the divine spark inherent in him and does not hope to rival his Creator. Tiutchev shows how the godlike artist or dreamer attempts to impose his own fragile vision on the created universe, while Khodasevich, developing themes already latent in Lermontov and made plain by Blok, uncovers the demonic drive behind this creative impulse, viewed as an attempt to rival the work of the Supreme Creator. As Blok wrote, quoting the folklorist E.V. Anichkov: "without poetry man was nothing, but with poetry he became almost a god."[16]

Classical Images of Art and Inspiration

Not surprisingly, the biblical view of the artist as divinely inspired (and its demonic, idol-worshipping counterpart) strongly coloured Russian responses to the classical tradition. A revealing insight into this process of interaction can be found in a comment from the unpublished diary of Tat'iana Gippius about the leading religious poet and classical scholar, Viacheslav Ivanov. In her description of an all-night discussion held at the Tower in 1907, Gippius noted that "Viacheslav Ivanov upheld the incompatibility of art with religious ritual and, for the sake of preserving art, again [upheld] his mythopoeia (*mifotvorchestvo*)."[17] Her concise formulation pinpoints one of the ways in which an attempt was made to bridge the gap between both traditions: the creation of a new mythopoeic art form at the turn of the century was seen as a means of preserving the classical ideal of art without entirely relinquishing its links with religious ideals originally inspired by the Bible.

To understand the ways in which biblical and classical influences combined to nurture the Russian view of art as demonic, we first

need to establish the key areas of difference and overlap between the two traditions and their approaches to art. The classical tradition offered a quite distinct set of images from the Bible for the understanding of artistic inspiration and its relation to divine prophecy. Apollo was the god of all the fine arts (including music, poetry, and eloquence) and also received from his father Zeus the divine gift of prophecy. Although the two gifts of prophecy and artistic inspiration were thus united in one person, when it came to passing them on to humans, the lines of transmission diverged. Prophecy was communicated through the sibyls who presided over the oracles, whereas different forms of artistic inspiration were under the aegis of the nine muses, daughters of Zeus (according to most opinions) and of Mnemosyne. Under the guidance of Apollo, they elevated art to the level of the sacred and conferred this blessing on mortals who would invoke them before embarking on their creative work.

Two additional points are of particular significance for our topic. A part of the Apollo myth presents him as a figure who was banished by Zeus from the heavens (in other words a classical equivalent of the biblical Lucifer or the figure of the fallen angel). The act of expulsion or fall, viewed as irretrievable, thus plays a part in bringing about the transition from divine prophecy to the mediating of this prophecy to humans through art and oracles. It is also worth noting that in the classical tradition as in the biblical tradition humans cannot and should not attempt to rival the gods in the sphere of artistic inspiration. Two legends illustrate the dangers of any such attempt: the Sirens, who invited the muses to a contest in singing which they lost, and most vividly, the Pierides, the daughters of the king of Boetia, who challenged the muses to a trial in music and were changed into magpies following their defeat.

There is one further paradigm for artistic inspiration in the classical tradition, which differs quite substantially from the serene harmony of Apollo and his cortège of modest, virginal muses. This is provided by the altogether plumper, more sensual and less disciplined god, Dionysus, descended from the same father, Zeus, and usually surrounded by a group of half-naked and orgiastic female consorts, the Bacchantes or maenads. Although Dionysus is most commonly thought of as the god of wine and intoxication, he was also the god of tragic art and the protector of theatres (since Greek drama had grown out of the dithyrambic choruses recited at the festival of Dionysus). This allowed the link to be made in his cult between the states of intoxication and inspiration.

Whereas Apollo and the muses confer their gifts on man through a vertical hierarchy of patronage (the artist may invoke them in order to receive their gifts, but may not imitate them), the Dionysian paradigm of inspiration allows man to merge with the god, to enter the state of intoxication which brings about inspiration. The fairly passive and upward-looking hierarchy of receiving a divine gift is replaced by an active descent into chaos, which in turn can become an image for art as demonic (dark, chaotic, initiated by man). Therefore, while the Apollonian and Dionysian myths both reinforce the biblical view of the divine origin of artistic inspiration, they offer very different methods for attaining this state. The Apollonian reception of grace from above is more easily assimilated into the biblical tradition of the artist as prophet, whereas the Dionysian descent into chaos is subversive in its promotion of individual initiative over divine grace and accordingly more closely allied with idol worship.

Indeed, a possible reason for the increased emphasis on art as demonic in turn of the century Russia may well have been the switch of emphasis from Apollo to Dionysus, following the popularization of Nietzsche's ideas in Russia from the 1890s onwards. Although Pushkin describes one of the incarnations of his muse as a frisky "little Bacchante,"[18] in his understanding the Bacchic spirit of the muses was closely allied with the "holy sun" of reason and therefore had little in common with later post-Nietzschean connotations of darkness and chaos.[19] Such references are in any case not typical – Apollo and the muses generally provide the norm up until the turn of the century, after which artistic inspiration is increasingly viewed as Dionysian and accordingly demonic.

An example of this shift in emphasis can be found in the description of the creative process given by Viacheslav Ivanov in an essay of 1905. His analysis is of particular relevance to our subject as his views on aesthetics were widely influential, both on the symbolist, acmeist, and futurist poets of his own time and on the writers, literary theorists, and philosophers of culture of subsequent generations. Ivanov distinguished three stages of artistic creation: a first stage, male, linked to Apollo, and termed "the feat of ascent" (podvig voskhozhdeniia); a second stage, female, linked to Aphrodite, referred to as the "grace of descent" (milost' niskhozhdeniia), and a third stage, the sphere of the bisexual Dionysus, representing the chaotic element of inspiration, and described as follows: "This sphere is indeed a shore 'beyond good and evil.' It is demonic in the demonism of its elements, but not evil. It is a fruitful source, not a diabolical numbness."[20] Although some writers, including Blok,[21] later took issue with Ivanov's attempt to define creativity in terms of a purely aesthetic, Dionysian demonism, far from the biblical view of demonism as immoral, this approach, once popularized, was remarkably enduring. A seductive visual expression of the equation of the demonic with the Dionysian was provided by Nikolai

Kalmakov in a painting of 1913 entitled *The Awakening of Bacchus* (Illustration 11). In sinuous outlines of green, grey, and brown, the artist depicted a naked and bearded Dionysus, goblet in hand, sitting astride a panther and above a serpent. His portrait evokes a curiously hellenized *Koshchei bessmertnyi* (Koshchei the Deathless), whose traditionally demonic features have been toned down and rendered aesthetically pleasing.[22]

We should also mention the figure of Orpheus, not only because he was the prototype of the singer, musician, and poet and widely represented as such in early twentieth-century Russian verse,[23] but also because he brought his Apollonian gift of poetry into a

11. N. Kalmakov, *The Awakening of Bacchus*, 1913. Mixed media, 64 × 48 cm.

Dionysian engagement with the demonic forces of death and the underworld, and, through the early Orphic mysteries, acted as a bridging figure between the classical and Christian traditions. In a short but profound essay on Orpheus Viacheslav Ivanov specifically emphasized Orpheus's relation to all three worlds, describing him as the "two-faced mysterious incarnation of both [Dionysus and Apollo]" and as "the creative Word which moves the world," who "represents the God-Word in early Christian symbolism of the first centuries."[24]

The points of overlap between the biblical and classical traditions illustrated by the myth of Orpheus are important: in both the gifts of prophecy and inspiration are linked by their common divine origin. In the biblical tradition there are no intermediaries; in the classical tradition the intermediary figures of muse, maenad, or Orphic poet open up different paths of access. The fundamental difference clearly revolves around the ontological status and moral content of the imparted revelation. The biblical vision is based on the revelation of pure truth, from above to below, whereas the classical tradition brings inspiration from above for the poet to express his own dreams and visions.

In this respect it is worth recalling the difference between the original meaning of the Greek term *daimon*, best translated as a "divinity," and the later significance which it acquired in Christian tradition. The Greek *daimon* was a being of intermediate nature between that of gods and men, sometimes identified with an individual's guiding force or destiny, whether for good or for evil. In *The Symposium* Plato uses the term of Eros, a divinity which has the power of "interpreting and conveying things from men to gods and things from gods to men;" through its realm "moves all prophetic art and the art of priests having to do with sacrifices and rituals and spells, and all power of prophecy and enchantment."[25] Elsewhere, in the *Phaedrus*, prophetic art is linked with the muses' gift of poetic inspiration, since both depend on a god-sent madness.[26] In the context of the creative process, the *daimon* of Eros can therefore be viewed as a positive mediating power through which divine madness possesses the poet. Later Greek tradition began to shift the emphasis towards the *daimon* as a malevolent, evil spirit, and, with the advent of Christianity and the translation of pagan gods into devils, this process was completed.[27] Although the distinction between the two types of spirit has been partially preserved in English (through the survival of the two variant spellings *dæmon* and *demon*), the existence of only one form of the word in Russian (*demon*) has blurred the difference and led to a greater degree of ambivalence in the use of the term. This confusion directly contributed to the gradual merging of

the amoral dæmon of inspiration or guidance with the malignant demon of later Greek and Christian tradition – a process which can be traced through its literary manifestations in the poetry of Pushkin, Lermontov, and Blok.[28]

The dual legacy of the biblical and classical traditions, intertwined through these various areas of overlap and confusion, played an important role in forming the self-image of Russian writers and the expectations which they brought to the literary vocation. It raised several important questions and challenges. Could literature serve as a means for retrieving the two "lost" golden ages of biblical revelation and classical inspiration (thereby carrying out a redemptive or transfiguring function)? Were these two traditions mutually exclusive or could they be reconciled? The longstanding debate over the proper interpretation of Pushkin's "The Prophet" (Prorok, 1826)[29] is just one instance of the fertile polemics surrounding the relation of these two traditions. Does the poem, saturated with biblical imagery, refer only to the figure of the prophet, or do its textual links with "The Poet" (Poet, 1827),[30] whom Pushkin depicts as summoned by Apollo, justify its common interpretation in the Russian tradition as an image of the poet? Is the muse's divine status an assurance of her purity and truth, or is she a freelance agent, a channel of artistic inspiration but not a medium of revelation, accountable only to the poet's fantasy and not to any higher truth? As we shall argue in the next essay of this volume, part of the Russian answer to these questions resulted in a most peculiar and unorthodox union, sanctioned by neither biblical nor classical precedent, but deriving from both: the marriage of the muse and the Demon.

The Historical Context in Russia

So far we have been looking at the background to literary demonism non-chronologically, in terms of essential issues and shaping traditions. The Russian reception of these influences cannot, of course, be properly understood without reference to the historical dimension. If one were to investigate the relationship of biblical revelation to Hellenic culture against the unfolding background of Western European history, one would have to trace its development through the heated discussions among the early Church fathers on the right place for classical culture and literary endeavour in a Christian context, and then in the transition from medieval culture to Renaissance humanism. One would note, for example, that Augustine (354–430) devoted large sections of *The City of God* to inveighing against the spiritual dangers of classical culture, regarded by him quite literally

as the work of devils (he severely condemned the stage plays of the Romans as one of the main methods adopted by "wily devils" – the pagan gods – for the corruption and blinding of men's souls).[31] By the late Middle Ages, however, the process of assimilation was much further advanced. Theologians and poets had a fairly sophisticated grasp of classical culture and ancient Greek philosophy (through Latin translations) and had succeeded in integrating these much more smoothly into the Christian faith, while nevertheless preserving a clear line of demarcation between the two. Dante, for example, inherited from Aquinas a body of Christianized Aristotelian and Platonic thought on which he was able to draw freely; indeed, he quotes Aristotle more frequently than any other body of writings apart from the Bible.[32] For him Aristotle was quite simply "the Master of those who know," while Virgil was dubbed "the great Poet."[33]

The same transition, played out on the Russian historical map, looks entirely different. Russia had no Renaissance and was more or less catapulted from medieval Rus into modern post-Petrine culture. There was no strong tradition of theological debate; arguments of any substance on the question of correct attitudes to secular culture and learning only began to emerge in the sixteenth century and did not gather much momentum until the mid-seventeenth century onwards,[34] largely because of a lack of systematic secular learning before this period. Simon Frankin has put the point succinctly: "There was no debate over classical learning because there was no classical learning to debate."[35]

Franklin notes only three times when book learning is represented as controversial in Kievan Rus. Two of these are relevant to our subject. The first concerns Nikita of Novgorod, an eleventh-century monk from the Monastery of the Caves at Kiev, who locked himself up in his cell to enjoy a bout of eremitic asceticism (despite having been denied permission). The devil appeared to him in the guise of an angel and instructed him to give up prayer and to pass his time reading books in order to converse with God. Nikita applied himself diligently to reading and soon had acquired quite a reputation for his learning, even for prophecy. However, he was faulted on two counts: his learning was not pious but vainglorious, and his erudition was suspiciously idiosyncratic. The brethren prayed for Nikita and, mercifully, the Lord intervened and reduced him "almost to a state of primal ignorance,"[36] thus ensuring his salvation. This story can perhaps be regarded as the first source in the Russian tradition for the "demonic" view of bookish activity (here reading, later translated into writing), regarded, quite literally, as inspired by the devil and as representing a false path to God.

The second example concerns Klim Smoliatich, a twelfth-century metropolitan of Kiev, who was charged with "abandoning the Scrip-

tures and citing instead from Homer, Aristotle, and Plato."[37] This is apparently the only example in Kievan Rus of an attack against classical culture, and one might begin to get quite excited about it. But there was in fact no real debate over the issue; in his defence Klim evaded the attack rather skilfully, leading Franklin to conclude that "this apparent twelfth-century Kievan controversy over the classics is a hollow form," borrowing "the terms, but not the substance" of an argument from Constantinople.[38]

For our purposes, it is important to note the following point. The accusation levelled against both Nikita and Klim that they are using book learning to promote their own personal glory rather than that of God is an ingrained and recurrent theme which can be directly related to the biblical differentiation between art as divine service and idol worship outlined above; thus it provides a link between the Bible and later literary representations of writing as a demonic form of self-aggrandizement.

These views persisted and were considerably amplified in the debate on the merits or perils of secular culture, which gradually established a firmer place for itself throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In an illuminating survey of attitudes to grammar and rhetoric during this period Boris Uspensky argues that opposition to the study of these subjects among the Russian clergy and monks was not the result of ignorance or obscurantism. It was motivated by two factors: the desire to resist Latinate influences (closely bound up with the traditional academic syllabus) and – on a much more fundamental level – by the perception of grammar as a tool by which language could be manipulated, thereby making it possible for man not only to distort the meaning of sacred texts, but also, eventually, to become the author of his own texts. Such an approach runs counter to the traditional reverence for the authority of Holy Scripture as the sole source of learning and medium through which all other subjects (including grammar) could be passively absorbed. Grammar and rhetoric constitute the foundation of modern literary studies, and opposition to them goes hand in hand with resistance to the concept of literature as an independent sphere of activity. This link is made clear by Evfimii, a monk from Chudov writing in 1684–85, whose trenchant formulation of the issues at stake interestingly includes reference to the art of poetry and leaves little doubt as to his own opinion on the matter: "Is it more useful for us to study grammar, rhetoric, philosophy and theology and the art of poetry and from there to get to know the Divine Scriptures, or, and without studying these subtleties, in simplicity to please God and by reading to get to know the meaning of Holy Scriptures?"[39] The demonic dimension of the study of such "subtleties" emerges from a letter in which Avvakkum berates a young lady for her pursuit of secular knowledge, mentioning grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, and philosophy; he warns her that all worthwhile knowledge can be found in the teachings of the Church and that leanings towards any other branches of learning should be resisted as the work of the devil: "Evdokeia, Evdokeia, why will you not shake off from yourself the proud devil? You are looking for high learning, from it people fall away from God, unnourished, like leaves. ... Fool, fool, great fool!"[40]

These attitudes to secular learning were mirrored in early views of what constituted correct art. Clearly, the only sort of art which could exist in a religious context was devotional art. The representation of holy truths in plain and unadorned fashion required the total effacement of the artist's individuality – hence the emphasis on collective or anonymous authorship (perceived as a sign of artistic humility), and on translation, compilation, or the imitation of existing models, rather than on original composition or invention. In the field of icon painting, which perhaps best exemplifies the ideal of devotional art, the strict instruction to maintain tradition went hand in hand with a deep-seated distrust of innovation; the artist was obliged to adhere to a formal canon with fixed rules of composition, which left no room for imagination or conjecture. The Church formulated numerous strictures against the deployment of any element of fantasy, issuing a stern warning to painters in the *Book of a Hundred Chapters* (*Stoglav*, 1551) "to create nothing from their own fantasy" (ot svoego zamyshleniia nichtozhe predtvoriati).[41] The medieval *ikonopisets* was therefore much closer to the biblical ideal of a craftsman, executing a holy design, than to the image of a modern artist, creating works out of his own imagination. The icon painter's talent was regarded as a God-given gift, to be used for holy purposes, and failure to lead a pure life (modelled on the monastic ideal) disqualified him from his appointed task.[42]

In theory, therefore, the issue of art as a form of demonic idol worship was unlikely to arise in relation to devotional art. Although devils made frequent appearances in icons and hagiographic literature, the purity of the *medium* of their artistic depiction, whether visual or verbal, was not to be questioned: absolute loyalty to a hallowed tradition, based on biblical precedent and safeguarded by the Church, guaranteed freedom from contamination by the demonic, even allowing the artefact itself, in the case of icons, to acquire the status of a holy object of veneration.

In practice, however, this was not always the case: the canon of iconographic representation was surrounded by a considerable amount of controversy, and revered icons were occasionally even regarded as the work of the devil.[43] Viktor Bychkov's fascinating

account of the historical development of the aesthetics of the icon highlights a constant tension between official theory and evolving artistic practice. By the mid-sixteenth century, numerous innovations had been introduced into the traditional canon of icon painting; these included the depiction of real historical people, allegorical subjects, and symbolic representations of Christ, not based on scenes from his real life. These innovations aroused deep feelings of indignation among traditionalists such as Ivan Viskovaty, who brought his worries to the attention of Ivan IV. The Council of 1554 was convened to deal with this crisis, but was not able to do much more than condone and legitimize existing practice. Some ten to fifteen years later, the controversy resurfaced on an even more fundamental level in a lively debate between Feodosii Kosoi and the monk Zinovii Otensky. Feodosii opposed icons on the grounds that they were forbidden by the biblical prohibition against idol worship. Zinovii countered this charge by invoking a different scriptural precedent; he argued that the verse which describes God showing Moses the design of the candlestick for the Tabernacle (Exod.25:40) was in actual fact a reference to icons and included the command that Moses should make them (as further support for the creation of icons Zinovii also cited the commandment to fashion two cherubs for the cover of the ark [Exod.25:18]).[44] This example is of particular interest in the context of our opening discussion of attitudes to art in the Bible, as it demonstrates the continuing relevance of biblical tradition to the Russian debate on art as divine or idolatrous.

We can see from the foregoing that the notion of secular learning and even of devotional art as potentially demonic or idolatrous was already present in latent form in early Russian culture, from the times of Nikita of Novgorod in the eleventh century through to the debates of the late sixteenth century. For the wider application of this attitude to Russian culture as a whole, we must look ahead to the time of Peter the Great and to later perceptions of this important turning-point in Russian history. During Peter's reign various changes already set in motion during the seventeenth century[45] came to fruition and altered the existing situation radically. Two areas of Peter's reforms were destined to have a particular impact on later views of culture and its "demonic" associations. The first concerns the reform of the Russian Orthodox church. The weakening of its autonomous authority and the subordination of all its values to the needs of autocracy totally undermined its role as a preserver of spiritual principles.[46] This in turn opened the way for a fundamental shift in the focus of faith from traditional orthodoxy to sectarian movements. Peter was widely denounced as Antichrist by Old Believers and other conservative traditionalists because of his endorsement of Nikon's liturgical reforms and enforced modernization of religious ritual.[47] As a consequence, the new culture which grew up in the wake of Peter's reforms later came to be regarded as tainted by the demonic attributes of its founder; furthermore, the subjection of church to state and the resulting disengagement of religious aspirations from their traditional moorings in Orthodox teaching facilitated the subsequent adoption of these aspirations by other "oppositional" groupings, whether sectarian (in the first instance) or literary (in later developments).

The second area concerns various steps which marked a move towards the eventual secularization of culture. It is interesting to note in relation to our earlier examples that a substantial section of the *Spiritual Regulation (Dukhovnyi reglament*, 1721) was devoted to refuting the notion that education and book learning undermine faith and lead to heresy.[48] Peter clearly did not aim to establish a new culture independent of the Church, nor was this achieved under his reign (society and culture without God and the Church were unthinkable in early modern Russia, and churchmen played a central role in elaborating the new culture for Peter). Nevertheless several of the reforms which he introduced contributed both directly and indirectly to the gradual process of secularization. These reforms are well-documented; they ranged from institutional changes, such as the foundation of secular schools and of the Academy, to numerous practical measures, including the publication of new textbooks and translations, the introduction of the civic script (grazhdanskii shrift), which to a large extent (although not completely) relegated the superseded alphabet to specifically ecclesiastical use,[49] and the general undermining of the prestige of Church Slavonic (according to some opinions, "the most fruitful of all languages and most dear to God").[50] All these changes "helped to lay the foundations of a literacy ... no longer focused on religious purposes and the reading of sacred texts."[51]

At the same time the existing barrier between the domains of the secular and the religious was further reinforced by the introduction of new measures. At Peter's personal direction an article was added to the *Supplement to the Spiritual Regulation (Pribavlenie k Dukhovnomu reglamentu)*, which forbade monks from keeping ink and paper in their cells or from writing anything in private, subject to severe corporal punishment.[52] Although this measure was originally undertaken for political reasons (to stem the flow of seditious attacks on Peter emanating from the monasteries) and was not in any case intended to apply to the upper clergy, who spearheaded educational reform, one can nevertheless appreciate the effect which it had on the development of Russian culture, where, unlike the West, secular

literature was effectively cut off from the potential input of monks or members of the lower clergy, leaving little or no space in which the secular and the devotional could mingle.[53]

Literary Views of Post-Petrine Culture as Demonic

The combined effect of Peter's reforms was to prepare the ground for what would eventually become a new "secular" culture, paradoxically both sustained and burdened by the weight of displaced religious aspirations. Russian writers were heirs to a tradition which restricted the function of literacy to religious purposes; in this respect they were no different from their Western counterparts. However, rather than breaking free from this precedent and creating an alternative secular culture, devoid of religious content, in the main they chose to harness the existing tradition to their own sphere of activity. They appropriated the notion of literature as sacral, instead of challenging or rejecting it, and came to regard their mission in this light as the re-creation of moral and religious values through literature. This attitude has been remarkably persistent in the Russian tradition, finding one of its most extreme manifestations in the symbolist movement with its theory of theurgic art. The poet Aleksandr Blok – whose own art was entirely shaped by the legacy of this approach – went so far as to state that its uncritical acceptance in his country was the principal source of the Russian artist's tragic predicament.[54] And yet the attitude was so well entrenched that it became a prism through which works of literature were not only conceived but also read; this use of works of imaginative literature as a source of historical and religious "truths" for the definition of the nation's spiritual identity is a curious and typically Russian phenomenon, taken for granted and largely unquestioned within the native tradition. Blok's friend Evgenii Ivanov, for example, in an unpublished essay entitled "The Demon and the Church" (Demon i Tserkov', 1906), elaborated an entire interpretation of Lermontov's *The Demon* (*Demon*, 1839) in terms of the historical relationship between culture and religion in Russia. According to his reading, the Demon represents the tragedy of the Russian intelligentsia, seeking knowledge and freedom while striving for union with the Church, represented by Tamara. The tragedy lies in the fact that the Church has rejected the intelligentsia and its gifts of culture because it wrongly considers culture to be the work of the devil. Yet "the Demon is not a devil," it is also "a Church, but one which has descended into Hell," a holy martyr abandoned by God. The arresting solution envisaged by Ivanov is for the Church to "become a Tamara who loves the Demon."[55]

As is evident from this example, the transfer of the functions of religion into the literary domain created an optimum climate within which the demonic could flourish. From the writer's point of view, frustrated literary aspirations to transcendence would often result in an undue emphasis on the demonic, as the sublimated inner urge to prayer resolved itself through curses; in the words of Bely, writing in 1907 of Pushkin and Lermontov, "secretly they prayed, outwardly they cursed."[56] From the historical point of view, just as Peter was regarded as Antichrist in the religious sphere, so in the cultural sphere he came to be seen as the initiator of a new phase of antichristian, secular, hence "demonic" culture.[57] He had, after all, not only appropriated the biblical greeting formerly reserved for the Patriarch, but was also in triumphal processions "cast in the personae of Mars or Hercules, pagan gods who owed their victories to their own strength or valour."[58] Significantly, in the draft notes for his unfinished *History of Peter I* (*Istoriia Petra I*, 1831–37) Pushkin noted several features of Peter's rule which were relevant to the ruler's heretical, idolatrous image: the popular view of him as Antichrist, his attempt to suppress this opinion by denying monks the right to keep ink and paper in their cells, his unceremonious acceptance of the manifold new titles bestowed on him, and his refusal to appoint a new Patriarch (including anecdotal evidence, excised by the censor, that in 1721 he slapped himself on the chest, bared his dagger, and announced "Here's your new Patriarch").[59]

This idol-like image already carried within it the seed of its own dissolution into one of demonic hubris. The dynamics of this process of transformation can be traced through the fluctuating styles of various literary treatments of Peter. In the eighteenth century, the tendency to compare the tsar to God and to mix pagan and biblical images in panegyric eulogies of his virtues was widely practised by writers, but without any heretical intent; it was not until the time of Romanticism that the idolatrous implications of this trend were treated as problematic in literary texts. The transition from Lomonosov's tones of hyperbolic adulation to Pushkin's ambivalent and demonically tainted portrait of Peter provides an apt illustration of this shift of perspective. In an ode of 1743, which disconcertingly mixes pagan and Christian motifs, Lomonosov has Minerva and Mars describe Peter as a God (*Bog*, with an initial capital), who descended from the heavenly regions to Russia, took on fleshly form, and then returned to shine among the stars for all eternity.[60] In *The Bronze Horseman* (*Mednyi vsadnik*, 1833)[61] Pushkin continued this tradition of representing Peter as an idol (translating rhetorical conceit into literal image through the device of the statue), but gave it a new polemical twist. His portrayal of Peter in this work is of particu-

lar significance for our purposes, in that it unites in one person the historical figure and the image of the *artist-creator*, and hints at the way in which the transition from deified mortal to demonic idol operates in the spheres of both history and artistic creation. The parallel drawn in the introduction between God, the Creator of the universe, and Peter, referred to simply as "He," the creator *ex nihilo* of a new city and a potent symbol of the artist contemplating his impending act of creation, can be read in two ways: as an extreme form of praise for Peter, or as an indictment of his idolatrous pretensions. The source on which Pushkin modelled his opening in fact made the link between Peter the *artist* and God the creator even more explicit: in a prose work of 1814 K.N. Batiushkov described Peter surveying the swamps on which he would build his "wonder of the world" and emphasized that the projected city was conceived specifically as a demonstration of the triumph of *art* over nature.[62] Batiushkov was in turn drawing on a much earlier tradition, well developed in Peter's day, of comparing the tsar in his role of historical transformer to an artist-creator (as in the depiction of Peter as Pygmalion, carving the image of New Russia as Galatea), and, by extension, even to the Supreme Creator.[63] Pushkin, however, was the first poet to bring out the demonic implications of this analogy so clearly. His description of the subsequent flood suggests that Peter's attempt to usurp the role of Creator was indeed an act of hubris which unleashed the wrath of God (in a letter to his brother written at the time of the catastrophe, Pushkin openly compared the flood to the biblical deluge of Noah's generation, now visited upon "cursed Petersburg").[64] It was perhaps this dimension of divine retribution which the poet was alluding to at the end of various drafts of his introduction, when he expressed the not entirely convincing hope that his narrative would be "just an evening tale" (vechernii lish' rasskaz) for his readers, "and not an ominous legend" (a ne zloveshchee predan'e).[65] It has even been suggested that "Pushkin's use of the unnamed 'he'" in the poem's introduction "implies an identification of Peter not with God but with the devil, who by tradition was left unnamed and who challenged the good works of God."[66]

We can see, therefore, that a key aspect of Pushkin's tale in the context of our topic was the subtle link which it established between the demonic forces which operate in history and those which inform the creative impulse. This association of historical and artistic demonism in one work played an important role in laying the foundation for a specifically Russian, historically defined, tradition of literary demonism, linked to the figure of Peter and to the city of St. Petersburg, a fitting image of the new culture which he created. Some of the works which developed the demonic dimension of the theme of Peter and his city, building directly on the precedent set by Pushkin, are explored later in this volume. These include Gogol's story "The Portrait" (Portret, 1835, second version 1842), Merezhkovsky's novel *Antichrist (Peter and Aleksei)* (*Antikhrist [Petr i Aleksei]*, 1904), Bely's *Petersburg* (*Peterburg*, 1916), and Akhmatova's *Poem Without a Hero* (*Poema bez geroia*, 1940–62). The discussion could also be extended to numerous other works, including the representation of Petersburg in the poetry of the symbolists. An interesting development of *The Bronze Horseman* occurs, for example, in Blok's *The Twelve* (*Dvenadtsat'*, 1918). Whereas Pushkin portrays a cycle which leads from an opening vision of the natural elements through the imposition of artistic order (Peter as creator of his new city) to the final release of demonic forces (Peter as Bronze Horseman), Blok's poem opens with blackness and wind, an intensified vision of elemental chaos, tinged with the demonic, and yet brings forth from this dark picture a closing image of redemption in the person of Jesus Christ. Blok's line "a man cannot stand on his feet" (na nogakh ne stoit chelovek)[67] ironically echoes Pushkin's anonymous introduction of Peter through the phrase "He stood" (stoial On), as well the ruler's plans "to stand by the sea with a firm foot" (nogoiu tverdoi stat' pri more).[68] The forceful figure of Peter portrayed by Pushkin has been swept away in Blok's demonic wind, but this is only in order to prepare the ground for a new figure of salvation. This late symbolist development of the demonic forces already latent in Pushkin's portrayal of Peter and his city testifies once more to the innate Russian tendency to magnify the demonic in order to create a springboard for the sacred.

Pushkin's "Enchanting Demon" and Russia's Historical Path

Peter's reforms and his associated public image came to be regarded by writers and historians as marking a decisive turning-point in Russian history, and a highly accelerated version of the shift from medieval Christianity to the humanist revival of paganism which Western Europe went through more gradually. Many of the same issues were at stake, including the problematic status of art as idol worship or divine service within the context of the relation of secular culture (based on the classical model) to religious revelation (based on the biblical model). The fact that Peter came to be seen as the focus of these issues was no doubt a simplification from the strictly historical point of view; nevertheless, from the broader, literary/cultural perspective which Russian writers adopted, the figure of

Peter appeared as pivotal and all-embracing; as Pushkin put it in a letter to Chaadaev, "à lui seul est une histoire universelle!"[69]

This complex of cultural and historical influences produced a wide range of approaches to the demonic properties of art. Among these, the intriguing lyric fragment by Pushkin, "At the beginning of my life I remember a school..." (V nachale zhizni shkolu pomniu ia..., 1830)[70] is of exceptional interest for our topic. It occupies a unique place in Pushkin's *œuvre* and merits our close attention at this point, as it raises the issue of art as demonic in the context of the cultural and historical factors discussed above. It offers a stylized, yet highly personal exploration of the relationship between secular culture and religious values in its twin philosophical and historical dimensions. The autobiographical tone which it adopts blends with what we shall argue is in effect an allegorical representation of the transition from medieval Christianity to Renaissance humanism, with particular emphasis on the question of the relation of artistic beauty to religious truth. Dante achieved a similar combination of personal autobiography, philosophical enquiry, and historical perspective in *The Divine Comedy*, and Pushkin signals his debt to this work in a number of ways, most obviously by adopting the same verse form of *terza rima* in his poem.[71]

The lyric persona of Pushkin's poem recalls his early life at school: strict order was kept by a "stately woman" (velichavaia zhena), described in one early variant as a "wondrous woman" (divnaia zhena), whose "veil" (pokryvalo) and "eyes clear as the heavens" (ochi svetlye, kak nebesa) he remembers with particular clarity. This female figure is clearly associated with religion and spiritual guidance, and may be a personification of Divine Wisdom or Theology.[72] Her speech is described as "words full of holiness" (polnye sviatyni slovesa) and her role in the hero's spiritual salvation is made even more explicit in an earlier variant, which refers to her "saving reproaches" (spasitel'nye ukory) and to the "deep meaning of spiritual conversations" (glubokoi smysl dukhovnykh razgovorov) held with her. While the autobiographical elements of the poem place her in a Russian context, other features link her with the world of medieval Catholicism and suggest a more specific analogy with Beatrice, Dante's "dolce guida,"[73] his teacher in matters of faith and the instigator of his spiritual journey, also regarded as an allegory of Divine Wisdom or Theology.[74]

The truthful teachings of this lady are distorted by her errant pupil who prefers to escape to the "splendid gloom of an alien garden" (velikolepnyi mrak chuzhogo sada) where, in an environment shaped by human artifice (iskusstvennyi), he begins to dream idle thoughts (prazdnomyslit'). Pushkin, in keeping with many artists, regarded the state of idleness (prazdnost') as highly conducive to poetic inspiration, and it is the link between this fruitful creative idleness and the arid spiritual state of boredom (skuka), in which the devil traditionally makes his entrance, which allows for the possibility of pure art becoming contaminated by the demonic.[75] In Pushkin's poem, this connection is demonstrated with economic precision: it is just at the moment of idle thoughts that the sight of statues, referred to as *kumiry*, the biblical word for pagan idols, brings about "tears of inspiration" (slezy vdokhnoven'ia). The transition from aesthetic inspiration to the demonic follows. Two further statues in particular captivate him with their "enchanting beauty" (volshebnaia krasa); significantly, these are described as "images of two devils" (dvukh besov izobrazhen'ia), a phrase which underlines their demonic connotations more strongly than the earlier variant, "images of two gods" (dvukh bogov izobrazhen'ia). In a variant of an earlier line they are referred to as "the artists' other two creations" (khudozhnikov drugie dva tvoren'ia), a description which brings out the specific link between the statues as works of *art* and the demonic. The first statue, a Delphic idol, exudes awesome pride:

> Один (Дельфийский идол) лик младой –
> Был гневен, полон гордости ужасной,
> И весь дышал он силой неземной.
>
> [One (a Delphic idol) of youthful face –
> Was angry, full of terrible pride,
> And breathed all over with unearthly power.]

This is evidently a statue of Apollo, patron of the arts, nurtured by pride, the root of all sin and of demonic (Luciferian) art. The second statue is described as follows:

> Другой женообразный, сладострастный,
> Сомнительный и лживый идеал –
> Волшебный демон – лживый но прекрасный.
>
> [The other was of womanly form, voluptuous,
> A doubtful and false ideal –
> An enchanting demon – false, but beautiful.]

Although most commentators have interpreted this as a reference to Aphrodite, the goddess of beauty and love, the use of the adjective *zhenoobraznyi* (would a female goddess be described as "*like* a woman" in form?), the terms "demon" (demon) and "devil" (bes), as well as a variant of the tercet's middle line which describes the statue as "the false ideal of naked nature" (nagoi prirody lzhivyi ideal) make it more likely that it represents Dionysus, the effeminate and sensual god of intoxication and inspiration.[76] Alternatively, it is possible that the statues are purely allegorical representations of the two sins or "devils" which gained particular ascendancy during the Renaissance: pride, fuelled by anger, and unbridled sensuality.[77]

The flight from the humble, modestly attired lady to the seductive statues of the garden suggests a move from medieval Christian culture to Renaissance humanism with its revival of pagan idols and attendant shift of values. This allegorical landscape is crossed by an unidentified narrator, who has been linked by several commentators with Pushkin.[78] Autobiographical elements are indeed suggested by the intimate, personal tone, as well as by close textual echoes of other poems in which Pushkin evokes the gardens and statues of Tsarskoe Selo, where he went to school, as the backdrop to his first encounter with poetic inspiration.[79] If so, we have a curious amalgam – a Russian poet trying to find his bearings in a "philosophical" landscape defined by the evolution of Western European culture. This is altogether different from the more purely "Russian" experience of demonic disorientation which Pushkin had evoked immediately before in "The Devils" (Besy, 1830).[80] There the traveller's journey lay through "unknown plains" (nevedomykh ravnin) devoid of mileposts (apart from demonic ones), and any attempt at establishing a linear sense of direction is sabotaged by the swirling scores of swarming devils which fill the night. By contrast, "At the beginning of my life..." introduces a philosophical and historical perspective into this picture of elemental chaos and dark forces. Its setting, described by Annensky as the "garden of Tsarskoe Selo transformed,"[81] already contained the necessary elements for such an approach: from its original conception to the details of its execution, Tsarskoe Selo was a literal and visual embodiment of the renaissance of classical antiquity on Russian soil.[82] Sculpture, which was a particularly prominent feature of its landscape, was not an accepted art form in the Russian Orthodox tradition and was therefore a particularly fitting symbol of pagan resistance to religous values, embodied in aesthetic form. Pushkin's poem exploits this ready-made, richly suggestive allegorical setting to raise the key issue of the relation of artistic inspiration and beauty (associated with the demonic "idols" of classical culture) to revealed religion and truth (the sphere of the "stately woman") – and also of Russia's relation to the historical unfolding of this relationship in Western Europe. However, both issues are left unresolved:[83] the fragment ends with the hero wandering gloomily all day, a Russian Dante of the modern age, lost in a dark garden in which the original certainties of faith are overshadowed by later artistic images:[84]

> ...всё кумиры сада
> На душу мне свою бросали тень.
>
> [... still the idols of the garden
> Cast their shadow on my soul.]

The link between the state of artistic inspiration and demonic idol worship or possession, which we have highlighted in this relatively late poem, is not one which most readers would normally associate with Pushkin's view of art. And yet, as we can see from the elusive, haunting quality of the poem, many of the biblical, classical, and historical contexts for the view of art as demonic examined in this essay, as well as the problematic issues which arise from their interaction, had an intimate, personal resonance for Pushkin. His poem suggests an awareness of the spiritual danger presented by following the path of art, devoid of religious purpose, together with a strong sense of the magnetic attraction of this path for the artist. If the faith in pure ideals (represented by the "stately woman") is forsaken, and if, as a consequence, the pursuit of art is divorced from the source of spiritual guidance that nourishes it, and becomes an end in itself (signalled by the flight into the enclosed space of the garden), then art will become a form of demonic idolatry (hence the description of the statues as demons or idols). This is entirely consonant with the conflict outlined earlier in this essay between the biblical ideal of art (subject to religious revelation) and the classical ideal of art (dependent on aesthetic rather than moral values). In his formulation of the problem, Pushkin reveals a deep understanding of its central significance for the modern Russian poet, depicted as standing at a crossroads, torn between the two traditions to which he is heir. His poem provided an important precedent for later treatments of this issue, anticipating by almost eighty years Viacheslav Ivanov's explicit characterization of the post-medieval artist as a "maker of idols" (kumirotvorets).[85]

Pushkin's poem is so distinctive and rich in historical and philosophical insights that one is tempted to speculate on what external influences might have prompted its genesis. Several factors point to the role of Petr Chaadaev, who, as Pushkin's early mentor, encouraged him to think deeply about historical issues. In a letter of March-April 1829, Chaadaev wrote to Pushkin that his "most fiery wish" was to see his friend "initiated into the mystery of time," adding pointedly that "there is no more distressing spectacle in the world of morals than the spectacle of a man of genius, who does not understand his time (vek) and his calling." Chaadaev appealed to Pushkin to retire into himself in order to discover the inner light within his soul, and expressed his faith that Pushkin could bring "infinite blessing to this poor Russia, wandering lost on the face of this earth."[86] Pushkin's poem, written in the following year, may be seen as a response to this challenge: it takes up the consideration of Russia's plight from a religious and historical perspective, adopting a tone of spiritual introspection. In this context, we should also note the sig-

nificance of the poem's setting, as Pushkin was closest to Chaadaev during his years at the Lyceum in Tsarskoe Selo.

For more specific evidence of the impact of Chaadaev's ideas on Pushkin's poem, we need to turn to Chaadaev's first philosophical letter, dated 1 December 1829 by its author, but thought to date from 1828 or early 1829.[87] We know that Pushkin had read the original French version of this letter by June 1830,[88] a few months before he wrote "At the beginning..." in October. Chaadaev's letter is cast in the form of a personal address to a friend (E.D. Panova), who is urged to develop her religious feelings by turning to the practice of Christian ritual; Chaadaev advises her to take up the contemplative life and to don the "robe d'humilité" which suits her sex so well.[89] From these individual admonitions, Chaadaev moves on to a general consideration of Russia's spiritual needs as a nation. He argues that Russia has no place in history, because she is excluded from European history, represented as one unified march towards the realization of a single Christian ideal.[90] As a result, the Russian people is well and truly lost ("égaré dans le monde");[91] it has no awareness of the past or memories to treasure, no meaningful present or individual identity, and no sense of the future: "Nous ne vivons que dans le présent le plus étroit, sans passé et sans avenir, au milieu d'un calme plat. ... nous n'avons rien d'individuel sur quoi asseoir notre pensée; mais, isolés par une destinée étrange du mouvement universel de l'humanité, nous n'avons rien recueilli non plus des idées traditives du genre humain."[92] Russia cannot appropriate or transfer to her own experience the slow process of historical maturation which Europe has been through, nor is she free to develop her own independent path towards civilization, because she has no meaningful Christian heritage of her own to develop.[93] The only solution, therefore, is for her to turn to the path of true religion (although Catholicism is not named, it is clearly implied).

If we return to our suggested reading of Pushkin's poem as an allegorical description of a Russian trying to find his bearings in a "philosophical" landscape defined by the evolution of Western European culture, we can now see that it takes as its point of departure the very same problem posed by Chaadaev: Russia's place in relation to the development of European history. By contrast, however, Pushkin's poem suggests that Russia *does* have a place in history, including a strong sense of her own past and interest in the future. Chaadaev's accusation that Russia has no clear identity or memories to treasure is countered by Pushkin's allegorical representation of Russia through an individual lyric voice, together with the emphasis which he places on the memory of his teacher's voice ("I remember" [ia pomniu] is repeated twice within the first ten lines of the poem, and the teacher's voice is described as "lovely, sweet" [priiatnym, sladkim]).

Pushkin also challenges Chaadaev's views on two related issues. Although he would doubtless agree that Russia cannot easily assimilate the historical process which Europe has been through, he shows his lyric hero grappling with this problem and lost in deep reflection. Chaadaev's idea that Russia has no independent path towards civilization, because she lacks a meaningful Christian heritage, is also disputed through the portrait of the wise woman, who embodies a rich legacy of deep spirituality, on which Russia can draw. Pushkin echoes Chaadaev's use of the predicament of an individual person to mirror national preoccupations, but reinstates the dimension of faith by replacing Chaadaev's move from a *lack of faith* to the need to discover true faith with a move from a *faith once held* to its subsequent overshadowing.

Pushkin, therefore, is taking up the issues raised by Chaadaev, but suggests a different answer, based on the belief that Russia does have its own form of spirituality and distinctive place in history. Furthermore – and here we return to the question of art as demonic – in this very distinctiveness there is perhaps a positive virtue. Chaadaev argued that Europe's synthesis of Christianity and classical antiquity had enabled it to elaborate an ideal of beauty, but that Russia had missed out on this opportunity: "en se repliant sur l'antiquité païenne, le monde chrétien avait retrouvé les formes du beau qui lui manquaient encore. Relégués dans notre schisme, rien de ce qui se passait en Europe n'arrivait jusqu'à nous."[94] The fact that Pushkin places his lyric hero in an allegorical setting evocative of Tsarskoe Selo, replete with classical statues, not only demonstrates that Russia has had her own encounter with pagan antiquity, but also puts a new slant on this encounter: his hero, as we saw, is troubled by the demonic connotations of the statues, which he recognizes as idols, representing "an enchanting demon – false, but beautiful" (volshebnyi demon – lzhivyi, no prekrasnyi). This raises a question mark over the European synthesis of Christianity and pagan antiquity advocated by Chaadaev: is this the best path, or does the Russian tendency to regard this synthesis as potentially problematic, and to dwell more closely on the demonic properties of art, point to a different spiritual path of superior value?

Pushkin's lyric fragment does not, after the manner of prose, refute Chaadaev's arguments directly; it engages with them obliquely, using poetry, the language of faith, to repudiate philosophy. A more explicit confirmation of its underlying drive can be found in the fuller response which Pushkin elaborated in his letter to Chaadaev of October 1836,[95] shortly after the publication of the first

philosophical letter in Russian translation.[96] Many points of Pushkin's letter echo the ideas that he expressed earlier in his poem. One senses that he is feeling his way towards a positive definition of Russia's national identity and historical development in relation to the two pivotal points of Chaadaev's critique, Europe and Christianity. His letter argues more openly than the poem that Russia does have a clearly defined history, marked by a growing closeness towards Europe, and also defends Russian spirituality as a basis for national identity.

Although the influence of Chaadaev's letter on Pushkin's poem cannot be proven indisputably, there is enough internal textual evidence to suggest a real connection.[97] This points to an important further dimension, initiated by Pushkin, which the discussion of art as demonic acquired in the context of polemics over Russia's distinctive historical path and relation to the European tradition.

The biblical, classical, and historical contexts, outlined in this essay, combined to produce a strong Russian emphasis on the demonic properties of art, which manifested itself in a wide variety of approaches. These can be summarized, according to the main sources of non-literary influence, as follows:

Biblical influences. In the first instance, literature was regarded as demonic because of its inability to live up to the religiously inspired ideal of the writer as prophet, or of the written word as an echo of the sacred *Logos.* Failure to meet this lofty ideal resulted in its inversion: if the writer was no prophet, he was a Demon, a victim of his own hubris; if the literary word was not sacred, it was seen as demonically tainted and corrupting. The writer therefore became a demonic double of his ideal self, and the word was reduced to a demonic travesty of its sacred origins. Prayers give way to curses, revelations are displaced by solipsistic dreams, and intuitions by parodic doubles. Literature, divorced in this way from its ideal source in religion and morality, came to be seen as a form of demonic idol worship, spreading false teachings and corrupting true values, as described by Pushkin in "The Demon" (Demon, 1823). Although this version of literary demonism had its source in the negation of *moral* values, it subsequently gave rise to many manifestations of a purely *aesthetic* character, particularly in the productive area of literary experimentation.

Folk influences. An alternative model for the demonic attributes of literary activity was provided by the folk tradition. Its view of the word as incantation led to the representation of the writer as sorcerer or "black book man" (chernoknizhnik), manipulating language in order to cast spells.

Classical influences. Literature was further seen as demonic in the classical sense, by dint of its ability to "possess" the artist. Pushkin also wrote of this demon, the morally neutral demon of poetic inspiration. This form of artistic demonism later gained particular popularity as a result of the impact of Nietzsche on the Russian tradition; it was extended to include a religious dimension by Viacheslav Ivanov, whose theory of a fruitful form of chaotic Dionysian demonism could be used as a way of overcoming the "negative" connotations of demonism, defined as immoral by the Bible, or as dangerous by folk tradition.

Historical influences. Finally, on a historical level, superimposed upon the preceding traditions of influence, literature was viewed as demonic simply by virtue of the fact that it forms a part of post-Petrine culture and thereby, following the popular view of Peter as Antichrist, becomes invested with the demonic attributes of its founder. Pushkin laid the literary foundation for a recognition of Peter's role as a demonic figure in both history and artistic creation – a fatal combination for which the city of Petersburg served as a potent symbol.

The many ways in which these varied approaches to art as demonic were interwoven and developed within the Russian literary tradition are investigated in relation to different authors and their works in part II of this volume. The evolution of the relationship between the muse and the Demon in the poetry of Pushkin, Lermontov, and Blok, is traced in the next essay by Pamela Davidson. Gogol's early development of the theme of art as demonic is studied by Julian Graffy with particular attention to the relevance of Petersburg as demonic city. Rozanov, whose ideas on art are discussed by Liza Dimbleby, perhaps represents the furthest (and most paradoxical) extreme to which Russian writers took the concept of the very act of writing as demonic. A similar awareness informs the works of the symbolist novelists, whose literary techniques for portraying their metaphysical vision of the demonic were increasingly infiltrated by the disorientating, illusory nature of their subject, as demonstrated by Adam Weiner. Michael Basker shows how Akhmatova, through her reading of Gumilev's creative path, attempted to overcome the legacy of symbolist demonism but was unable to achieve a complete exorcism. A secularized version of the literary techniques elaborated by the symbolists found its way into the work of later prose writers such as Zamiatin, who, as Philip Cavendish argues, used demonic methods to describe and undermine notions of the sacred and demonic. All these contributions provide ample evidence of the deeply ingrained Russian conviction that "art is Hell,"[98] a conviction shaped by the interaction of the different cultural traditions and historical contexts examined in this essay.

Notes

1. Saint Antony the Great, "Directions on Life in Christ," in *Early Fathers from the Philokalia*, selected and trans. from the Russian text *Dobrotoliubie* by E. Kadloubovsky and G.E.H. Palmer (London: Faber and Faber, 1954), 50.
2. From "V nachale zhizni shkolu pomniu ia..." (1830), in A.S. Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. D.D. Blagoi and others, 10 vols. (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1974–78), 2:252–53(253). For a detailed discussion of this poem, see the concluding section of this essay. Unless otherwise stated, all translations in this essay are mine.
3. The first reference to Dante in Russia occurs in 1762; the first translation from his works did not appear until 1798. See M.P. Alekseev, "Pervoe znakomstvo s Dante v Rossii," in *Ot klassitsizma k romantizmu: Iz istorii mezhdunarodnykh sviazei russkoi literatury*, ed. M.P. Alekseev (Leningrad: Nauka, 1970), 6–62; V.T. Danchenko, *Dante Alig'eri: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' russkikh perevodov i kriticheskoi literatury na russkom iazyke 1762–1972* (Moscow: Kniga, 1973), 6, 51. Milton's *Paradise Lost*, although first translated in 1745, was not published in Russian until 1780, the date at which the first Russian imitations also began to appear. See Valentin Boss, *Milton and the Rise of Russian Satanism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 16–17, 20. On the early reception of Goethe in Russia, see André von Gronicka, *The Russian Image of Goethe*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968–85), 1:7–59 (chaps. 1 and 2), and V.M. Zhirmunskii, *Gete v russkoi literature*, ed. N.A. Zhirmunskaia (Leningrad: Nauka, 1981), 30–126 (chaps. 2 and 3); although translations of Goethe began to appear from 1780 (30), it was not until Zhukovsky's translations of 1818 that Goethe entered Russian poetry (77–78). On the Russian reception of Byron, see V.M. Zhirmunskii, *Bairon i Pushkin. Pushkin i zapadnye literatury* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1978), esp. 397–407 for a bibliography of translations from 1822. The Russians were remarkably quick off the mark in their response to Baudelaire, whose first essay on Edgar Allan Poe appeared in Russian in 1852 (the earliest translation of Baudelaire into any language); the first Russian translation of a poem from *Les Fleurs du Mal* (1857) was published in 1869. See Adrian Wanner, *Baudelaire in Russia* (Gainesville, Fla.: University Press of Florida, 1996), 10.
4. The example of Noah, also a divinely inspired builder, provides a precedent. However, the biblical description of the construction of the ark is purely technical and does not make reference to the specifically artistic attributes of craftsmanship, wisdom, and beauty, constantly stressed in the account of the building of the Tabernacle by Bezalel.
5. In order to convey the meaning of the original Hebrew as closely as possible, all quotations from the Old Testament have been taken from the authoritative translation *The Holy Scriptures*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955). For similar descriptions of Bezalel and his helpers, see Exod.35:30–35, 36:1–4. Quotations from the New Testament are given from the King James Authorized Version.
6. Moses tried several times to get out of the job for which he was chosen, invoking lack of eloquence as his final excuse: "'Oh Lord, I am not a man of words, neither heretofore, nor since Thou hast spoken unto Thy servant; for I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue'" (Exod.4:10). God's reply – "'Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh a man dumb, or deaf, or seeing, or blind? Is it not I, the Lord? Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt speak'" (Exod.4:11–12) – makes it clear that God is the source of both the content of the message and its eloquent form.
7. See, for example, the well-known lines: "Their idols are silver and gold, / The work of men's hands. / ... / They that make them shall be like unto them; / Yea, every one that trusteth in them" (Ps.115:4,8).
8. This view directly informs the treatment of the artist-Demon in the works of Lermontov and Blok; see in this volume Pamela Davidson, "The Muse and the Demon in the Poetry of Pushkin, Lermontov, and Blok." The subject also became popular among modernist painters; see, for example, Kuz'ma Petrov-Vodkin, *The Expulsion from Paradise* (1911) and Nataliia Goncharova, *The Expulsion from Paradise* (1912–13), reproduced in Valerij Aleksandrovič Dudakov, ed., *Il Simbolismo russo: Sergej Djagilev e l'Età d'argento nell'arte* (Milan: Olivetti/ Electa, 1992), 110, 153.
9. "And the Lord opened the mouth of the ass" (Num.22:28). "And the angel of the Lord said unto Balaam: 'Go with the men; but only the word that I shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak.' ... And Balaam said unto Balak: 'Lo, I am come unto thee; have I now any power at all to speak any thing? the word that God putteth in my mouth, that shall I speak'" (Num.22:35,38).
10. *The Babylonian Talmud*, Sanhedrin 69b, Berachos 55a.
11. *The Babylonian Talmud*, Berachos 55a.
12. Although not published until 1784, "Bog" was already substantially completed by 1780. The text is cited from *Sochineniia Derzhavina s ob"iasnitel'nymi primechaniiami*, ed. Ia. Grot, 2d ed., 7 vols. (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk, 1868–78), 1:130–33 (text), 133–48 (notes). For a close analysis of the poem's non-linear structure, which emphasizes the centrality of the parallel between God and the poet Derzhavin, see Anna Lisa Crone, "The Chiasmatic Structure of Deržavin's 'Bog': Poetic Realization of the 'Chain of Being'," *Slavic and East European Journal* 38, no.3 (1994), 407–18.
13. The daring comparison of the poet to God in this line was debated in 1838 by Shishkov and a professor of Kazan University. After citing their discussion, Grot defends his editorial decision to change Derzhavin's original capital "B" to a lower-case "b" on the grounds that Derzhavin always wrote "Bog" with a capital letter, even when referring to pagan gods, and was hardly likely to have intended to compare the poet with the Supreme Creator (Grot, ed., *Sochineniia Derzhavina*, 1:143). This editorial intervention is, however, highly questionable, as it destroys the symmetry between man and God which informs the rest of the poem.
14. F.I. Tiutchev, *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii*, ed. V. Gippius and K. Pigarev, Biblioteka poeta (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1939), 44. The poem was first published by Pushkin in *Sovremennik* in 1836. Although previously dated 1833, it is now thought to date from 1830; see *On the Heights of Creation: The Lyrics of Fedor Tyutchev*, trans. with introduction and commentary by Anatoly Liberman (Greenwich, Conn. and London: JAI Press, 1993), 197. In some editions "kak bog, ia" is replaced with the more muted "ia gordo."
15. Vladislav Khodasevich, *Stikhotvoreniia*, ed. N.A. Bogomolov and D.B. Volchek, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaia seriia (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1989), 189.
16. "Poeziia zagovorov i zaklinanii" (October 1906), in Aleksandr Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. V.N. Orlov, A.A. Surkov, and K.I. Chukovskii, 8 vols. (Moscow and Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1960–63), 5:36–65(53).
17. M. Pavlova, "Ivanovskie 'sredy' i upominaniia o Viach. Ivanove v dnevnikakh T.N. Gippius," an unpublished paper read at an International Symposium on Viacheslav Ivanov, held at the University of Vienna in July 1998. M. Pavlova is currently working on the unpublished diaries of T.N. Gippius, housed at Amherst University. I am grateful to her for allowing me to quote this fragment from the entry headed "27 January [1907], midnight."

18. "I kak Vakkhanochka rezvilas'," from *Evgenii Onegin* (8:3.9), in Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 4:141.
19. In "Vakkhicheskaia pesnia" (1825) the description of Bacchanalian revelries is associated with the muses, reason, and the light of the holy and immortal sun of the mind, directly opposed to darkness. See Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:33.
20. "Simvolika esteticheskikh nachal" (1905), in Viacheslav Ivanov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. D.V. Ivanov and O. Deschartes, 4 vols. (Brussels: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1971–87), 1:823–30(829).
21. See in this volume Davidson, "The Muse and the Demon."
22. Reproduced in Dudakov, ed., *Il Simbolismo russo*, 155.
23. On representations of Orpheus in poetry of this period, see Lena Szilard, "'Orfei rasterzannyi' i nasledie orfizma," *Studia Slavica* 41 (1996):209–46.
24. "Orfei" (1912), first published in the opening issue of *Trudy i dni* 1912, no.1:60–63, cited from Ivanov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 3:706.
25. *The Dialogues of Plato*, vol. 2, *The Symposium* (202d–203a), trans. with comment by R.E. Allen (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991), 146.
26. Plato, *Phaedrus* (244a–245a), with translation and commentary by C.J. Rowe (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1986), 57, 59. On Plato's daemons, see the "Excursus on the History of the Doctrine of Daemons," in *The Myths of Plato*, trans. J.A. Stewart, ed. G.R. Levy, 2d ed. (London: Centaur Press, 1960), 384–401.
27. See the article on δαίμων in Hermann Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, trans. from German by William Urwick, 4th ed. (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1895, reprint, 1977), 168–71.
28. See in this volume Davidson, "The Muse and the Demon."
29. Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:82–83. For examples of the debate surrounding this poem, see the essays by Vladimir Solov'ev, "Znachenie poezii v stikhotvoreniiakh Pushkina" (1899), Mikhail Gershenzon, "Mudrost' Pushkina" (1917), Viacheslav Ivanov, "Dva maiaka" (1937), Sergei Bulgakov, "Zhrebii Pushkina" (1938), and the response to the latter in Vladislav Khodasevich, "'Zhrebii Pushkina,' Stat'ia o. S.N. Bulgakova", in *Pushkin v russkoi filosofskoi kritike: Konets XIX- pervaia polovina XX vv.*, comp. R.A. Gal'tseva (Moscow: Kniga, 1990), esp. 55–81, 219–20, 254–55, 282–83, 489–91.
30. Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:110.
31. See, for example, Saint Augustine, *The City of God (De Civitate Dei)*, trans. John Healey, ed. R.V.G. Tasker, Everyman's Library, no. 982, 2 vols. (London: J.M. Dent, 1945), 1:37 (book 1, chap.31).
32. See David Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (London: Longman, 1962), esp. 221–23 and 255–68; R.W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London: Hutchinson, 1967), esp. 164–77. On Dante's knowledge of Aristotle, see Lorenzo Minio-Paluello, "Dante's Reading of Aristotle," in *The World of Dante: Essays on Dante and his Times*, ed. Cecil Grayson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 61–80(64).
33. *Inferno*, 4:131, 80, respectively. All quotations and translations from Dante's *Divine Comedy* are taken from the following edition: Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy*, trans., with a commentary, by Charles S. Singleton, 2d ed., 3 vols.(in 6 parts), Bollingen Series, no. 80 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).
34. See B.A. Uspenskii, "Otnoshenie k grammatike i ritorike v Drevnei Rusi (XVI–XVII vv.)," in his *Izbrannye trudy*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Gnozis, 1994), 2:7–25. Uspensky's first example of a critical attitude to secular learning is taken from the early sixteenth-century epistle of the monk Filofei of Pskov (7); he notes that the polemics surrounding this question subsequently became particularly acute at the time of Nikon's reforms (10).
35. Simon Franklin, "Echoes of Byzantine Elite Culture in Twelfth-Century Russia?," in *Byzantium and Europe. First International Byzantine Conference*, ed. A. Markopoulos (Athens: European Cultural Center of Delphi, 1987), 177–87 (184), cited in Francis J. Thomson, "The Distorted Mediaeval Perception of Classical Antiquity: The Causes and the Consequences," in *Medieval Antiquity*, ed. A. Welkenhuysen, H. Braet, and W. Verbeke, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia, 1st ser., no. 24 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995), 303–364(303). I am grateful to Simon Franklin for his helpful suggestions on this essay.
36. Simon Franklin, "Booklearning and Bookmen in Kievan Rus': A Survey of an Idea," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12–13 (1988–89):830–48(837).
37. Ibid., 838. Franklin is quoting Klim's own description of the charge levelled against him.
38. Ibid., 839.
39. Uspenskii, "Otnoshenie k grammatike," 13.
40. Ibid.
41. For the phrase cited, and on the *Stoglav* and its views on icons, see V.V. Bychkov, *Dukhovno-esteticheskie osnovy russkoi ikony* (Moscow: Nauchno-izdatel'skii tsentr "Ladomir," 1995), 179–84(180). See also Robin Cormack, "Moscow between East and West," in *The Art of Holy Russia: Icons from Moscow, 1400–1660* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1998), 25, and in the same volume Yuri Malkov, "The Icon Painter in Medieval Russia," 79–85.
42. Bychkov, *Dukhovno-esteticheskie osnovy russkoi ikony*, 182.
43. See in this volume, Franklin, "Nostalgia for Hell," n.82.
44. For these examples, see Bychkov, *Dukhovno-esteticheskie osnovy russkoi ikony*, 184–90.
45. Victor Zhivov emphasizes the extent to which the seventeenth century was an age of crucial changes, a "critical," not an "organic" epoch in Russian history, and credits it with establishing the distinction between the secular and spiritual spheres; Victor Zhivov, "Religious Reform and the Emergence of the Individual in Russian Seventeenth-Century Literature," in *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Russia and Ukraine*, ed. Samuel H. Baron and Nancy Shields Kollmann (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997), 184–98(187–88).
46. For a detailed account see James Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1971). See also Evgenii V. Anisimov, "Reforming the Clerical Rank," a chap. in his *The Reforms of Peter the Great: Progress through Coercion in Russia*, trans. John T. Alexander (Armonk, N.Y. and London: M.E. Sharpe, 1993), 203–216, esp. 216, and Robert K. Massie, "Supreme under God," a chap. in his *Peter the Great: His Life and World* (London: Abacus, 1982), 783–94. On Peter's own approach to religion see L.R. Lewitter, "Peter the Great's Attitude towards Religion: From Traditional Piety to Rational Theology," in *Russia and the World of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. R.P. Bartlett, A.G. Cross, and Karen Rasmussen (Columbus: Slavica, 1988), 62–77.
47. On views of Peter as the Antichrist, see Lindsey Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998), 451–53; Robert O. Crumney, *The Old Believers and the World of Antichrist: The Vyg Community and the Russian State, 1694–1855* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), 63. For further discussion in this volume see Kevin Platt, "Antichrist Enthroned: Demonic Visions of Russian Rulers." I am grateful to Kevin Platt for his helpful suggestions and critical comments on this essay.
48. *The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great*, trans. and ed. Alexander V. Muller (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1972), 30–37.
49. On the civic script, introduced in 1708–10, see A.P. Vlasto, *A Linguistic History of Russia to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 39, 375. Lind-

sey Hughes (to whom I am most grateful for her helpful and perceptive comments on this essay) points out that "it is hard to agree that the two 'opposing' scripts were 'linked with the opposition of two cultures, Petrine and anti-Petrine' in an entirely consistent way" as "a third of the titles printed in the old script during Peter's reign were actually secular in content." Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, 319.

50. The words of Ioann Vishenskii, cited in Uspenskii, "Otnoshenie k grammatike," 8.
51. M.S. Anderson, *Peter the Great*, 2d ed. (London and New York: Longman, 1995), 130.
52. Muller, ed., *The Spiritual Regulation*, 78–79, 118 n.138. This measure was first introduced in 1701; see Anisimov, *The Reforms of Peter the Great*, 211.
53. This point is made in general terms by Victor Terras in *A History of Russian Literature* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991), 116. One should not, however, exaggerate the specific impact of Peter's article, which was clearly impossible to enforce in a systematic way.
54. "O Merezhkovskom" (21 March 1920), in Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 6:393–95(393).
55. E.P. Ivanov, "Demon i Tserkov'" (1906), from the collection of M.S. Lesman. Extracts from this article are published in L.A. Il'iunina, "A. Blok i E. Ivanov v gody pervoi russkoi revoliutsii (K voprosu o genezise obraza Khrista v poeme 'Dvenadtsat'')," *Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 881, *A. Blok i russkii simvolizm: Problemy teksta i zhanra. Blokovskii sbornik X* (Tartu: Tartuskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1990), 21–31(30–31 n.12). My thanks to Avril Pyman for drawing my attention to this extract.
56. "Nastoiashchee i budushchee russkoi literatury" (written 1907, first published 1909), in Andrei Belyi, *Simvolizm kak miroponimanie*, ed. L.A. Sugai (Moscow: Respublika, 1994), 350.
57. This view was later extensively popularized by Merezhkovsky in the third volume of his historical trilogy, *Antikhrist (Petr i Aleksei)* (1905), discussed in this volume in Platt, "Antichrist Enthroned."
58. Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire. 1552–1917* (London: HarperCollins, 1997), 82.
59. See Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 8:12, 80–81, 304. After Pushkin's death, Nicholas I forbade the publication of this work, which remained unprinted until 1938.
60. See M.V. Lomonosov, "Oda na den' Tezoimenitstva Ego Imperatorskogo Vysochestva Gosudaria Velikogo Kniazia Petra Feodorovicha 1743 goda" (stanza 13), in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 8 vols. (Moscow and Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1950–83), 8:109, and other examples cited in this volume in Platt, "Antichrist Enthroned."
61. A.S. Pushkin, *Mednyi vsadnik*, ed. N.V. Izmailov, Seriia "Literaturnye pamiatniki" (Leningrad: Nauka, 1978). For further discussion of this work in this volume, see Platt, "Antichrist Enthroned."
62. "I voobrazhenie moe predstavilo mne Petra, kotoryi v pervyi raz obozreval berega dikoi Nevy, nyne stol' prekrasnye! ... velikaia mysl' rodilas' v ume velikogo cheloveka. Zdes' budet gorod, skazal on, chudo sveta. Siuda prizovu vse khudozhestva, vse iskusstva. Zdes' khudozhestva, iskusstva, grazhdanskie ustanovleniia i zakony pobediat samuiu prirodu. Skazal – i Peterburg voznik iz dikogo bolota." K.N. Batiushkov, "Progulka v Akademiiu khodozhest" (1814), in Pushkin, *Mednyi vsadnik*, ed. Izmailov, 130–34(132).
63. The image of Peter as Pygmalion was used by Peter on his personal seal in the 1710s, included in a panel on C.B. Rastrelli's bronze bust of Peter (1723), and echoed by Feofan Prokopovich in his eulogy after Peter's death: "All Russia is your statue, transformed by you with skilful craftsmanship" (1726). See Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, 470, 563 n.159. For a discussion of views of Peter as divine, including reference to G.I. Golovkin's declaration in 1721 that Peter brought Russia "from nothingness into being" (like God in Genesis), and raised Russia as from the dead (like Christ), see ibid., 96, 452. For further discussion of the analogy between tsar and God, including comments on Peter as the "planter" and "gardener" of Russia (and occasionally St. Petersburg), represented as a new Eden, see Stephen Lessing Baehr, *The Paradise Myth in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Utopian Patterns in Early Secular Russian Literature and Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 16–18, 27–29, 65–66.
64. "Chto eto u vas? potop! nichto prokliatomu Peterburgu! voilà une belle occasion à vos dames de faire bidet. ... Chto pogreba? Priznaius', i po nikh serdtse bolit. Ne naidetsia li mezhdu vami Noia, dlia nasazhdeniia vinograda?" Letter to L.S. Pushkin of November 1824, in Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 9:114.
65. See the first and second drafts of the poem in Pushkin, *Mednyi vsadnik*, ed. Izmailov, 64, 73.
66. Baehr, *The Paradise Myth*, 166.
67. *Dvenadtsat'*, in Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 347–59(347).
68. Pushkin, *Mednyi vsadnik*, ed. Izmailov, 9.
69. Letter to P.Ia. Chaadaev of 19 October 1836, in Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 10:285–87(286).
70. The poem is an incomplete fragment of fifty-one lines, assumed to date from October 1830, and unpublished in Pushkin's lifetime. The received text is based on two sources: a final manuscript version (ll. 1–42) and a second draft version (ll. 43–51). For the text and earlier variants, see Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. V.D. Bonch-Bruevich, 17 vols. (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1937–59; reprint, Moscow: Voskresen'e, 1994–97), 3(book 1):254–55 (text), 862–66 (variants) and 1222 (note). Hereafter the poem will be referred to in the text and notes by an abbreviated version of its first line.
71. This association was given particular prominence by Zhukovsky who first published the poem in 1841 as one of Pushkin's "Podrazhaniia Dantu."
72. As, for example, is argued by Viacheslav Ivanov in his essay on Pushkin, "Dva maiaka" (1937); Ivanov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 4:330–42(334).
73. "The light of the sweet guide (dolce guida), whose holy eyes (occhi santi) were glowing as she smiled" (*Paradiso*, 3:23–24). The analogy with Beatrice is developed in a number of ways. The most memorable features of Pushkin's lady, her veil and heavenly eyes, are constantly emphasized attributes of Beatrice. When Dante first glimpses her at the scene of their climactic meeting in Purgatory, her veil is mentioned several times and linked with the mention of her eyes which she directs at Dante (*Purgatorio*, 30:31, 65–67); later in the same canto, in her famous speech of rebuke, she reminds Dante of the role of her eyes in ensuring his spiritual salvation: "showing him my youthful eyes I led him with me toward the right goal" (*Purgatorio*, 30:122–23).
74. One of Beatrice's names is Sapientia (Wisdom); a hint at this allegorical role is found in the olive-green crown worn over her veil (*Purgatorio*, 30:31), which links her with Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, whose tree is the olive. See the commentary on this line in Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, 2(part 2):738.
75. An example of the link between idleness (prazdnost') and poetic inspiration occurs in a poem of the same year, "K vel'mozhe" (1830), addressed to Prince N.D. Iusupov. Pushkin expresses his certainty: "Chto blagosklonstvuesh' ty *muzam* v tishine, / Chto imi v *prazdnosti* ty dyshish' blagorodnoi." The association is reinforced in the later line: "Tak, vikhor' del zabyv dlia *muz* i negi *prazdnoi*" (emphasis mine). See Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:222. The associated link between boredom (skuka) and the demonic is wittily captured in the memorable opening lines of Pushkin's "Stsena iz Fausta" (1825). To Faust's complaint "Mne skucho, bes," Mephistopheles replies "Chto delat', Faust?," thus making it clear

that boredom provides the cue for the devil's entrance (Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:43). The connection between ennui and artistic creativity in Western literature is explored in Reinhard Kuhn, *The Demon of Noontide: Ennui in Western Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976) from antiquity through the Middle Ages to contemporary literature; regrettably, although Kuhn points out the need for a special study of this important theme in Russian literature, he includes no discussion of Russian authors apart from a few pages on Leskov.

76. The adjective *zhenoobraznyi* does not occur anywhere else in Pushkin's verse; see *Slovar' iazyka Pushkina*, 4 vols. (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarei, 1956–61), 1:783–84. The closely related adjective *zhenopodobnyi* is used in "Safo" ("Schastlivyi iunosha, ty vsem menia plenil...," 1825) to characterize the beauty of a *male* youth (Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:35). As a counter-argument to the Dionysus interpretation, one could cite the fact that the variant phrase "nagoi prirody" replaced an even earlier variant "prirody zhenskoi," suggesting a woman. For a discussion of different interpretations of the identity of this god see B.A. Vasil'ev, *Dukhovnyi put' Pushkina* (Moscow: Sam and Sam, 1994), 182–83.
77. As suggested in Ivanov, "Dva maiaka," 4:334.
78. See Vasil'ev, *Dukhovnyi put' Pushkina*, 182.
79. See, for example, the early "Vospominaniia v Tsarskom Sele" (1814), "Tsarskoe Selo" (1817–19), in which Pushkin describes the "volshebnye mesta" where he first experienced love and came to know poetry, "Dubravy, gde v tishi svobody..." (1818), and the later revival of this theme in "Vospominaniia v Tsarskom Sele" (1829) and "Tsarskosel'skaia statuia" (1830), both dating from the period shortly before "V nachale zhizni..." was written (Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 1:9–14, 49, 510; 2:192–93, 233, respectively). The autobiographical reading of "V nachale zhizni..." is given a particularly literal application by Vasil'ev; in an ingenious but not altogether convincing attempt to relate the poem to the realia of Pushkin's experience, he identifies the "velichavaia zhena" with the figure of the Virgin Mary depicted on the seventeenth-century miracle-working icon known as the "Bogomater' Znamenie" in the Znamenskaia Church near the *litsei* at Tsarskoe Selo. See Vasil'ev, *Dukhovnyi put' Pushkina*, 185–92.
80. Pushkin wrote the first version of "Besy" in October and early November 1829, and completed it on 7 September 1830, just before composing "V nachale zhizni..." in October. See Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 3(book 1):226–27(text), 830–37 (variants), 1211–12 (note).
81. "Pushkin i Tsarskoe selo" (1899), in Innokentii Annenskii, *Kniga otrazhenii*, ed. N.T. Ashimbaeva, I.I. Podol'skaia, and A.V. Fedorov (Moscow: Nauka, 1979), 304–21(312).
82. "Bringing antiquity to life here took on a concrete meaning. ... A considerable part of the Tsarskoye Selo park had been turned into an allegory." Dimitri Shvidovsky, *The Empress and the Architect: British Architecture and Gardens at the Court of Catherine the Great*, trans. from Russian (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996), 105. On the way in which Catherine II's intention to build a "Greco-Roman rhapsody" in the garden of Tsarskoe Selo was put into practice, see Dmitri Shvidovsky, *St. Petersburg. Architecture of the Tsars*, trans. from French by John Goodman (New York, London, and Paris: Abbeville Press, 1996), 224–26. For a survey of literary treatments of Tsarskoe Selo, see N.P. Antsiferov, *Prigorody Leningrada. Goroda Pushkin, Pavlovsk, Petrodvorets* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennyi literaturnyi muzei, 1946), 7–79 (44–46 on "V nachale zhizni..."), and the more recent collection, Lev Losev and Barry Scherr, eds., *A Sense of Place: Tsarskoe Selo and its Poets* (Columbus: Slavica, 1993).
83. The same unresolved quality marks another poem composed in the same month, "Stikhi, sochinennye noch'iu, vo vremia bessonnitsy" (October 1830), in Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:248. The experience of night-time insomnia generates an obscure metaphysical or religious anxiety in the poet's soul and expresses itself through a series of stark questions, growing in intensity, and supplanting his earlier attempt to "explain" the night through poetic metaphors (in ll.5–7). If "V nachale zhizni..." describes the way in which the lyric hero is diverted from the pursuit of religious truths by the false idols of art, "Stikhi, sochinennye noch'iu, vo vremia bessonnitsy" evokes – albeit in a totally different manner – the attempt to reverse this process, to recover contact with a deeper level of religious enquiry. Although the two poems are quite different in style, it is possible that they were informed by similar preoccupations.
84. The link between Pushkin's lyric hero and Dante rests on the fact that they both deserted the straight path of faith. Just as Dante received his first spiritual guidance from Beatrice but was then sidetracked to his dark wood by "false images of good" (*Purgatorio*, 30:131), so Pushkin's lyric persona was initially under the tutelage of a wise woman but escaped to a dark garden where he was seduced by false ideals. Since Pushkin's poem is only a fragment, it is possible that he intended to develop this analogy more fully. As it stands, his poem functions on several different levels simultaneously: the poet's autobiographical experience is filtered through the prism of Dante's spiritual journey, and both are given an allegorical treatment which projects them on to a broader historical canvas and raises universal philosophical issues. Critics who read the poem wholly in terms of Pushkin's autobiography, or who go to the opposite extreme and regard its narrator and subject as Dante (D.D. Blagoi, *Tvorcheskii put' Pushkina* [Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1967], 519) significantly reduce its profound complexity.
85. Ivanov characterizes the artist as a "kumirotvorets-genii" in "Khudozhnik," a poem from the collection *Eros* (1907); Ivanov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:380. His essay "O veselom remesle i umnom veselii" (1907) includes a section entitled "Khudozhnik-kumirotvorets," dealing with the transition from the medieval craftsman artist (khudozhnik-remeslennik) to the modern artist; ibid., 3:64–66.
86. Letter to A.S. Pushkin of [March-April] 1829, in P.Ia. Chaadaev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis'ma*, ed. Z.A. Kamenskii and others, 2 vols. (Moscow: Nauka, 1991), 2:66–67(66).
87. For the original French text of the first letter of "Lettres philosophiques adressées à une dame" and for a discussion of its date, see ibid., 1:86–106, 695 n.23.
88. See Pushkin's letter to M.P. Pogodin, dated second half of June 1830, in Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 9:321. Pushkin asks Pogodin's opinion of "Chaadaev's letter," but does give any more detailed description of it. The editors of Pushkin's letters identify it as Chaadaev's first philosophical letter (ibid., 9:455), as do the editors of Chaadaev's works (Chaadaev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 1:690).
89. Chaadaev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 1:88.
90. Ibid., 1:100–101.
91. "Il est dans la nature de l'homme de se perdre quand il ne trouve pas moyen de se lier à ce qui le précède et à ce qui le suit; toute consistance alors, toute certitude lui échappe; le sentiment de la durée permanente ne le guidant pas, il se trouve égaré dans le monde. Il y a de ces êtres perdus dans tous les pays; chez nous, c'est le trait général." Ibid., 1:94.
92. Ibid., 1:91. For related points of Chaadaev's argument, see ibid., 1:92, 96.
93. Ibid., 1:98–100.
94. Ibid., 1:98.
95. Letter to P.Ia. Chaadaev of 19 October 1836, in Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 10:285–87.

96. *Teleskop* 24, no.15 (October 1836).

97. Chaadaev may have had Pushkin's poem in mind, and, in particular, its Dantesque allusions, when, after expressing his approval of Pushkin's plan to write a history of Peter the Great, he wrote to him "Mne khochetsia skazat': vot, nakonets, iavilsia nash Dant." Although the text of this letter is torn at this point, it seems likely that Chaadaev is referring to Pushkin; see his letter to Pushkin of 18 September 1831, in Chaadaev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 69–73(73).

98. Aleksandr Blok, "O sovremennom sostoianii russkogo simvolizma" (1910), in his *Sobranie sochinenii*, 5:433.

Part II

LITERARY DEMONS