5 Viacheslav Ivanov's *Apollini*: A Moment in Modernist Poetics

Denis Mickiewicz

Mirate la dottrina che s'asconde
sotto 'l velame dei versi strani
(Dante)

APOLLINI

Когда вспоит ваш корень гробовой
Ключами слез Любовь, и мрак -- суровый
Как смерти сень, -- волшебною дубровой
Где Дант блуждал, обстанет ствол живой:

Возноситесь вы гордой головой,
О, Гимны, в свет, сквозя над мглой багровой
Синеющих долин, как лес лавровый,
Изваянный на тверди огневой.

Под хмелем волн, в пурпуровой темнице,
В жемчужнице -- слезнице горьких лон,
Как перлы бездн, родитесь вы в гробнице.

Кто вещих Дафн в эфирный взял полон,
И в лавр одел, и отразил в кринице
Прозрачности бессмертной? .. Аполлон!
(25 August 1909)[1]

This sonnet provides a good illustration of Ivanov's philosophy, diction, thematics and, particularly, of the type of semantic energy which pervades his art. As a mature work of Ivanov,[2] and as a product of wholly mature poetics of Russian Symbolism, this poem is in many ways instructive about modern poetic creativity in general. The external motive for creating the work was the launching of *Apollon*, Russia's finest journal of art and poetry (October 1909–November 1917).[3] For

the maiden issue, in keeping with the journal's dedication to the Leader of the Muses, the editors solicited, from the leading masters of the time, poems related in some way to the theme of creativity.[4] Historically this parade also signified the end of a major phase of the Silver Age, anticipating by only a few months the formal collapse of Symbolism as a ruling school of poetry.[5]

Ivanov himself had a high opinion of this sonnet, as is evident from his diary entry of 27 August: 'I received an impression of the grandeur of my poetry. I wish to present a book of perfect lyricism. It may have commenced with the new sonnet' (*Sobr.*, II 796). The sonnet objectifies (*verwirklicht*) Ivanov's fundamental doctrine of creativity: *a realia ad realiora*, and celebrates the memory of the path to epiphany and the 'return [via art] from extra-sensory to sensory consciousness'. This lyrical objective is constantly reiterated in Ivanov's theoretical writings as an age-old norm in compositional and technical decisions of all great artists. Having mastered this task in practice, Ivanov's poetics no longer undergo any cardinal changes, with the possible exception of some slackening of his 'Dionysian whirlwind'. Finally this poem displays a peculiar opaqueness, rhythmic force and formal clarity notwithstanding. The lucid sentences are somehow ambiguated, and the poem is difficult to memorise. An exegesis of a number of specific instances of obfuscation will shed light, however, on the poetics of Ivanov's brand of symbolism.[6]

MODES OF DEFAMILIARISATION

It may be helpful first to assemble some general thoughts (mostly Ivanov's) concerning the rationale for the part of his coding that seemed initially off-putting to many readers. These modes may be listed in order of increasing subtlety, as impediments in:

(a) syntactic flow (by delayed grammatical resolutions);
(b) ordinary vocabulary (by massive use of archaisms);
(c) digesting information (by rarefied allusions);
(d) identifying with the speaker (by withholding the lyrical persona);
(e) recognisability of settings (by withholding familiar referents);
(f) combined, these barriers may cause a desired degree of defamiliarisation (*ostranenie*).

Degrees of impediment and the mixing of its modes identify

modernist masters as surely as do their 'positive' thematic and stylistic features. What is commonly called 'poetic ambiguity' is ultimately a set of very precise markers. Their design bears the semantic and semiotic potential of the subject item. Instead of 'dampening of semantics' the new code semantically oversaturates the text units, dampening the everydayness of discourse, in favour of forcing attention to the various items of extraordinary perception. Ivanov seeks to endow his expressions with an energy capable of advancing the co-participant's (*souchastnik* – Ivanov's term) mind along the escalating connotations of what was said in the poem towards certain 'tokens of higher reality'. Conversely our mind should locate, in the expressions, grounds from which these generative trajectories spring. The exact grounds lie in the polysemeic contents of words. Withdrawal of access to the customary age-old univerbational meanings of expressions signals the presence of multivalent meanings. It is standard for modernism that the removal of *odnoznachnost'* of utterances is effected by the various obfuscations. Ivanov's modes of doing so, however, faced the serious objection that, instead of occurring ad hoc, they are too solidly integrated in a rigorous system, allowing for little play or genuine love of words.[7] We will see, however, that this is a case of careful purging of vagary; all expressions are so chosen that their arrangements present *multiple proofs of each point*, and that the points' circular interconnection is made possible precisely by the rigor of his system.

His studies of philology convinced Ivanov that communities (*polis*) have, since immemorial times, used art for sharing glimpses of the *realiora*. Language – our best means for that, after centuries of exclusive focusing on *realia* – requires new special uses in order to signify noumenal as well as phenomenal events. Direct cognitive or intuitive grasp of ecstatic, tragic, cathartic and other extraordinary experiences is not precluded from communication if the participant can be set into the right frame of mind. Once recognised, the defamiliarising hurdles do not block the 'tuned-in' mind, and negotiating them may even arm the novice participant. Considered individually, these modes are not excessively formidable.

(a) A prosaic paraphrase clears up the syntax quite readily, without even resorting to any lexical changes. We should note that the given syntactic impediments were by no means due to any vicissitudes of prosody; a virtuoso of Ivanov's stature can easily arrange very smooth sentences. Predictably, the original setting shows a much tighter welding within phrases, endowing the poetic diction with greater resonance, conviction and pathos:

No.1

О, гимны, когда любовь вспоит ключами слез ваш гробовой корень, и мрак -- суровый как сень смерти -- обставит живой ствол волшебной дубровой, где блуждал Данте, вы возноситесь гордой головой в свет, сквозя над багровой мглой синеющих долин, как лавровый лес, изваянный из огневой тверди. Вы родитесь, как перлы бездн, в пурпуровой темнице, в жемчужнице - слезнице горьких лон - в гробнице. Кто взял вещих Дафн в эфирный полон, и одел в лавр, и отразил в кринице бессмертной прозрачности? .. Аполлон!

(b) A part of Ivanov's theory of the poetic symbol spells out his reason for heightening the use of Slavic archaisms: 'symbol is energy'; it compels the mind to travel to the etymological, even paleontological, origins of the mentioned item. (Any etymological hitch introduces its own 'vertical' semantic series into the horizontal syntagmatic flow of an utterance.) The items thus reached are

> to this day, irresistible and are effective through the charm of ancient perception of deity that is concentrated in them. If music was aptly named an unconscious exercise in counting and accounting, then the creativity of a poet, and of a Symbolist poet by definition, can be called a subconscious immersion in the element of folklore. Atavistically, he perceives and gathers in him a fund of live antiquity, which colours all his conception, all combinations of ideas, and all his invention in images and expressions. Symbols are the experiencing of a forgotten or lost heritage of the national soul... psychologically necessary, they are metaphysically truthful.[8]

Further on we will see that all these

> 'корни гробовые', 'тверди огневые', 'жемчужницы - слезницы' и 'прозрачности криницы'

are not a mere heightening of sonority or baroque ornamentation but an etymologically documentable onomastics to signify previously unnamed realities.[9]

Mythopoeia

Abundance of archaisms, then, is not a mere stylistic extravaganza but a device for switching into the mode of myth making. Ivanov's theory of a subconscious memory of a whole people anticipates Jung's ideas of archetypes, but it does so with an eye to practical poetics. Archaisms afford a semi-conscious exit from everydayness, and access to co-participation in a mythical mode (the latter being conceived as a depiction of the realities of psychic acts). 'Myth is the remembrance of a mystical experience...' The function of myths is 'giving shape to things unknown' (*veschei nevedomykh oblichie*).[10] Ivanov focuses mostly on orgiastic or Dionysian experiences because he sides with those physiologists who believed that verbal and erotic impulses stem from the same or closely related neural centres.[11] This notion is aesthetically fertile, regardless of its neurological accuracy; it provides a dynamic fundamental model for the rhythmic–intonational drive of words and, by analogue, a vocal outlet for sexual energy.[12] Combined with the idea of racial memory, the so charged imagination can be diverted from particular phenomena towards noumenal *realiora* – states of mind sought, fundamentally, by *everyone*.

(c) Of course the *vsenarodnost'* argument and Ivanov's myth-making enterprise run into a simple contradiction: despite his theory of universal appeal, he deliberately makes his creativity inaccessible to unarmed readers. His fellow classicist and Symbolist, Innokentii Annenskii reproached Ivanov in the same issue of *Apollon* which carries this sonnet:

> The pedantry of Ivanov prevents one from breathing, let alone understanding, his poetry; [this is] due to more than just a lack of commentary.... While a myth is great, precisely, because it is always commonly accessible, it must not and cannot have any obfuscations.... And, in reading the piece, I feel bitter sorrow for the unapproachability of these iambs [here, trochees] which dance so temptingly before me, and for the secret writings of their traces on an arena which has absorbed so much noble sweat. ('O sovremennom lirizme', pp. 16–17)

Indeed archaist expression is joined by arcane content. The Slavicisms allude to classical myths and to Western literary models. The 'atavistically'-tuned reader fails to find a corresponding ethos. But Greek myth was to Ivanov the embodiment of a *common* primeval spirituality, a perfect ground for communal activity, be it a 'recol-

lection of a common past', a 'chorus', a 'dythiramb' or a 'myth'. Hellenic religion revealed to him the psychological importance of myth as a path towards a communal awareness of *realiora*. Together with appeals to racial memory as a ground on which to communicate, Ivanov also wisely allows a rational track to run through his design. Readers of *Apollini* who recognised three key terms would know that the dramatic part of the plot stems from the Thessalean version of Apollo's pursuit of Daphne, who is transformed into a laurel so that she may escape him. Lines 6 and 11, directly addressing the apostrophe, indicate that the rest of the poem deals with the birth and the rise of hymns. Regarding them as Apollo's properties, and linking the two mentions of 'laurel' (lines 7 and 13), one connects the three first stanzas with the last. Looking for further clues initiates the reader in co-creativity, that is, in realising together with the speaker the myth as a multi-tiered paradigm.

'Backgrounding' the Ego

(d) It was Ovid's popular rendition in *Metamorphoses* that first brought the Apollo/Daphne plot from the domain of religion to that of art and literature and to the world of the artists' private aesthetics.[13] Succeeding poets interpreted the metamorphosis of Daphne according to the cultural trends of their time and, increasingly, in a self-oriented way.[14] Ivanov reverses this trend from subjectivity towards seeking affinity with the universal spirit of all times.[15] He assumes that *all* have experienced or imagined a similar tremor in moments of amorous or creative ecstasy. Personal biographical psychic life provides opportunities for such experiences, but is of no ultimate interest. Of ultimate interest is one's immersion in the large pool, transcending times and cultures.[16] Ivanov sees the goal of all genuinely artistic symbolism to be a medium for a common 'catharsis as an event of inner experience'.[17] The personality of the subject imposes distracting external data; therefore Ivanov resolutely conceals his *lyrical I*. He appears only as a reporting witness of experiences with which he identifies but which pertain to a larger realm than his personal one.[18]

This 'facelessness' of speaker and absence of references to the everyday world lend to his Neoplatonic lyrical expression the semblance of universal objectivity.[19] It is, to quote Mandelstam from a different context, one of the ways of 'freeing oneself from the morbid cocoon of psychology' and even more from being chained to describing daily life which is 'a rotting plot, a prison cart, which psychology drags behind it because, after all, it has to lean on something'.[20] Here the plot wholly

omits even the commonplace *psychological evaluations*: the elegiac mood of a love conflict, the comic aspect of the perplexed Apollo and the grotesqueness of a girl turning into a plant. Such points would reflect, directly or not, the attitude of the speaker. Ivanov's rhetoric, too, is set on addressing neither self nor a few intimate souls, but a whole *polis* or commune. His apostrophe 'Hymns', as such, can neither listen nor respond; they, however, make a perfect interlocutor as a metaphor or synecdoche of those who create hymns. In a narrow sense the addressees are *Apollonovtsy*, the circle around the journal, and in the broader sense it is all who are 'subjects of love' (*danniki liubvi*), and have come to know the Orphic impulse. If Zinaida Gippius says that lyricists should speak not *o sebe* but *o svoem*, Ivanov insists on speaking *o nashem*. It is, of course, only in this sense of a common basis for experience that he speaks of *vsenarodnost'*, and not in the sense of being accessible to everyone.

(e) The marked absence of familiar things and familiar associations of things startled even Ivanov's literary contemporaries. This mode of defamiliarisation was noticed in 1908 by the poet Vladimir Piast:

> Perhaps no-one among contemporary Russian poets appears to the average reader as mysterious as Viacheslav Ivanov. Entering into the sacred wood of his poetry, dedicated to the muses and their radiant leader Phoebus, the reader feels a certain oddity. Where is all that which he is used to seeing and hearing in literature as well as in life? Where are the objects that surround him from day to day?... [With other poets, even if not stated overtly] the material setting enters the poem between lines and becomes inalienable from them.[21]

Ivanov seeks to neutralise the visible realities of this world by deflecting their denotations from the referents by a powerful attributive paraphernalia that removes them from familiar contexts or by viewing them as transparent items (*prozrachnosti*) through which one senses the tokens of *realiora*. Yet our only media for envisioning, encoding and, again, envisioning its tokens are well chosen items of the *realia*.

> True symbolism does not tear itself away from earth; it wants to combine the roots and the stars and grows up like a stellar flower from the near native roots. It does not substitute things and, in speaking of snowy heights... it means the tops of earthly mountains.... Symbolism seeks, as an art, only the elasticity of the image, its inner vitality and extensiveness in a soul into which it falls like a

seed, destined to grow and to yield an ear. Symbolism, in this sense, is the affirmation of the extensive energy of the word and of artistry. ('Mysli o simvolizme', pp. 611–12)

(f) Modernist form is what organises the display of the concert of modes of defamiliarisation. Discovery of meaning and import requires an examination of the 'strange harmonious measure' or symmetries of formal elements, the 'frequent shouts',[22] the phraseological crescendo,[23] and the didactic rhetoric.[24]

DEICTIC APPROACH

Ivanov is not explicit about wanting or not wanting his readers to reach his meanings through erudite, ultra-close reading. He gave credit to only one such reader – Annenskii – for having fully penetrated his codes.[25] Having deliberately obfuscated them, Ivanov may have expected *the people* to perceive his messages intuitively and sensorially, and not noetically. Even if such hopes are justified, we believe in the semantic accessibility of this text on the grounds that any artistically combined signs always lead to their meaning. The very ambiguity of combinations spurs to a quest of the role of formal complexes as clues to additional semantics. Thus the most formally 'poetic' feature – rhymes – foregrounds the comparison of meanings of the rhyming terms. In the two quatrains the impeccable enclosing end rhymes are quaternary; they rhyme even more deeply and accurately across the stanzas: 1 and 5, 2 and 7, 3 and 6 and 4 and 8. Above that, the masculine rhymes in the first quatrain display an oxymoronic opposition, and in the second they are tied metaphorically and establish cross-associations between nouns and adjectives. In the tercets we can see a witty deepening of the even rhymes: *lon – polon – Apollon*. From here the phonosemantic network lodges Apollo in the deep semantic structure of the text. His pervasive presence becomes multiplied by rhetorical means through:

(a) synonymy: the rhyming substantive, *polon* (captivity) is synonymous with the rhyming terms *temnitse–sleznitse–grobnitse*. Contiguity with the prison of the oyster shell, tear-chamber and tomb links Apollo with the classeme of *confinement*.
(b) metonymy: *krinitse* (pool), the fourth rhyming member with that suffix, is also a confiner. As Apollo's tool it associates him synec-

dochically with reflection, transparency and immortality, linking him with the classeme of (artistic *and* mystical) *permanence*. Furthermore the rhyming word *lon* (genitive plural of bosom or lap) injects its line's attributes of anguish (already associated with the confinement motif) into the figure of Apollo. And the graphically rhyming *v zhemchuzhnitse* captures his seme in the very core of creative conception.
(c) syllogism: all nine of these diverse notions become connected through Apollo's agency, thereby endowing the Apollonian principle with the above nine additional semes. His presence thus extends from the second tercet across the entire poem, and links Apollo with the classeme of *omnipresence*. All that is not stated explicitly because the subject of cognition is not the Absolute himself but only the features which mark his 'movement' and 'approach'.

В дальнем вихре тайных звуков, в стройной мере
частых кликов
Свой поход и приближенье открывает Аполлон ...[26]

Herein the adjectives *distant* and *secret* belong to the category of *causa finalis* – a not yet deciphered meaning of unpronounced connotations of what was uttered. The plural noun *sounds* pertains to their reverberations in the reader's mind; their *whirlwind* is the crowding of 'new riddles perceived in what has been deciphered'; that is, the energies driving the mind towards still higher connotations.

On this point Ivanov theorises explicitly about basic distinctions between Symbolism and Romanticism. The latter he thought to be static in its *odium fati* recognition that the reveries they manufacture are doomed to be non-existent. Therefore he opposed the 'choleric temperament' of Symbolism to the 'melancholy temperament' of Romanticism. The new *amor fati* counterposes to the verbalism of romantic longing that of a volitional act of mystical self-determination. 'We mean not a necessarily exact predictive kind, but always a certain creative energy which anticipates and initiates the future, [and is] revolutionary in nature'.[27] Hence the imperative of portentously elevated speech.

'DEMONTAGING' THE STRUCTURE BY TIERS

The 'whirlwind' can be demonstrated in terms of colliding 'secret' thematic planes and heightened semeic activity. We will display the

former by way of a set of 'demontages', that is, by foregrounding different combinations of the given phrases. Such reshuffling displays, on the one hand, an unusually high degree of semantic saturation and, on the other, an equally high phonic and syntactic cohesiveness within the individual subphrases.[28] These two features allow us to envision a *vertical* cut through the entire sonnet, forming two complete and coherent poems. The lines, interrupted by an ambulatory caesura into two- and three-foot hemistichs, form two columns, each with a separate plot, logic and syntax.[29] These differences affect the cognitive–psychological as well as phonological distinctiveness of each column, adding special tiers to the multi-tiered emotional structure of the poem.

No. 2

А	Б
Когда вспоит	Ваш корень -- гробовой.
Ключами слез, Любовь,	И мрак суровый,
Как смерти сень,	Волшебною дубровой
Где Дант блуждал,	Обстанет ствол живой.
Возноситесь	Вы - гордой головой
О, Гимны, в свет	В пурпуровой темнице,
Сияющих долин.	Как лес лавровый
Изваянный	На тверди огневой.
Под хмелем волн,	Сквозя над мглой багровой
В жемчужнице,	Слезнице горьких лон,
Как перлы бездн,	Родитесь вы в гробнице.
Кто вещих Дафн	В эфирный взял полон
И в лавр одел	И отразил в кринице
Прозрачности бессмертной?	... Аполлон.

A creative adaptation of a myth always reworks its model. Here, while the poles of the spirit are expanded from the 'abysses' to 'ether', the distances between events are reduced to a minimum. All ground activities, like the pursuit of Daphne, her pleas and metamorphosis, and Apollo's surprise and frustration, are omitted. Only his anguish remains, and it is literally buried, until the act of apotheosis ensues at the very end. But the energies of the symbols spread across many levels of connotations. Apollo turns his *dura puella* into a 'live stem'; he surrounds her, not with the grove wherein she hunted, but with Dante's magic grove, on a figurative, connotative level. He makes Daphne's laurel his symbol; here he makes the hymns raise him and the laurel-

garbed maiden to the immortal level of transparent reflection. As we know from *Purgatorio*, conceiving such an act by mortals is predicated upon envisioning the foundation set by the *realia* and then ascending the steps of consciousness. Awareness would then include the memory of Apollo's failure as well as the scales of the hymnist's own experiences and associations.

CLASSEMES

The hymnist's ascent towards Apollo's light and the subsequent descent during the act of recording that experience are, in capsulated allegoric form, the dynamics of Ivanov's artistic creativity. By his act of will, such a vertical movement passes through the many levels of consciousness. As different levels represent different gatherings of semes, so, in texts, semantic echoing of related semes forms nests of meanings, called 'archsemes' (Lotman)[31] or 'classemes' (Greimas). All concrete signs of a relevant textual segment serve to modify such classemes. In turn the classemes organise the content by labelling the semantic substances of the segments. Here their extensional meanings indicate that the odd stanzas represent a *descent*, while the even ones reflect the *ascent* of the poet's spirit. These principles are critical in Ivanov's linking of a mystical experience with a creative communicative act.

In *Apollini*, the substances involved in the myth-making synaesthesia are stark enough to be genuinely universal. 'Darkness' and 'Light' are, respectively, the 'Below' and 'Above', and the soul/psyche/mind ambulates *vertically* between these poles. As Plotinus teaches, 'We may know we have had the vision when the Soul has suddenly taken light... The light is the proof of the advent... And this is the true end set before the Soul to take that light.'[32] And the Divine light descends, as in the opening of Dante's *Paradiso*, '*et risplende in una parte piu e meno altrove*'. The soul aspires, as do the hymns, towards that 'light shining through above the purple darkness' (*Apollini*, l. 6). The so-illuminated forest (ll. 6–7) reminds one of Dante's anticipatory first awareness of his forest being illuminated as he follows Matelda up the stream.[33] Descent is defined by Ivanov as 'return, good tidings, victory', whereas ascent is 'tragic – divorce and separation.... Ascent, as an abstract principle, has something haughty and cruel in it'[34] (Cf. *gordye* in l.5).

Oppositions among kin concepts may freely coexist within classemes. Thus in one classeme, words whose semes modify each other: 'Love', 'tears', 'intoxication', 'tear chamber', 'bitter bosom', 'Daphnae' create

a specific but *nameless* notion of uncrowned eroticism. In an antinomous classeme of *motherhood* 'Love' is associated with 'nurture', 'scarlet cell', 'born', 'cover' and 'stem'. One can discern just as easily antinomies in other classemes such as the *death*-related 'mortality', 'coffin', 'tear chamber', v. 'immortality', 'being sculpted', 'reflection' complexes; or the *light*-related 'shadow', 'unilluminated prison', 'darkness', v. 'glimmer', 'translucency'; or parts of *landscape*: 'sky', 'fire', 'etherealness', 'abysses', v. 'valleys', 'forests', 'firmament', 'pearls'. The transition from *confinement in depths* to *airy openness*: 'darkness', 'prison', 'pearl chest' to 'waves', 'intoxication', 'lap', 'shadow', and to 'laurel', 'pool', 'translucence', 'immortality', is accompanied by a change of the classemes of suffering to those of apotheosis.[35] This rendition of the myth, omitting but not forgetting the story of Apollo's failure, replaces it with the Orphic (hymn-bearing) attributes of a Dionysian death, arriving only in the last tercet at the triumph of Phoebus. The gods receive a common denominator: if the Dionysian orgies unite the participants with Earth, then the Apollonian pursuit of the daughter of Gaya cannot be alien to the same principle.[36]

The Daphne myth is rich in details (*realiora in rebus*) which are yearning to be named, and Ivanov's onomastics are factually precise symbols: the 'live stem' is that which Daphne became, and as which she was miraculously saved from her pursuer. It is a laurel tree into which her father, the river god Peneus, converted her. It is alive with her presence and it is both her tomb and her symbol. From the laurel's mirroring reflection emerges the symbol of Apollo's eroticism, which is buried in it, together with the object of his desire; and the honour bestowed by the laurel wreath upon a poet (*'l Lauro* in Petrarch) extends also the memory of that erotic venture upon him. Springs that wash the 'sepulchral root' are also Petrarch's metaphor of the weeping of a lover over the buried object of his passion.[37] Also Orpheus's

'путь рыданий к безнадежным глубинам / И живым увидеть оком дали тихой смерти дол ... / к нам восходит и заводит побудительный пэан'[38]

looms very near our text. Line 9 in *Apollini* is overtly Dionysian: intoxication from the tide of dark, subconscious physiological impulses means satiric abandon and hymnal ecstasy.

Psychologically, as the preposition 'beneath' indicates at the beginning of stanza III, 'Love', with its 'life-giving moisture' (as in Mandelstam's Прости живительная влага, the 'springs of tears',

descends even lower than these waves. It reaches the rock bottom source of the *memory* of death, the 'tomb' – a concrete symbol of loss, decay and of subjects departed. Therein rest the seeds of the laurel, and the ascent to their crown also starts there. This is also the moment of the conception of the poem, which begins with the conjunction 'when'. (The pairing 'then' is replaced by the conditions given in the first stanza.) Also the birth in the abysmal depths in a pearl shell recalls another unsuccessful love of Apollo – Aphrodite.[39] Representing, instead of the horizontal run of Daphne, the verticalness of the descent to her own conception and the 'rise with a proud head' towards apotheosis, Aphrodite is a structural variant of Daphne. The plurification of the nymph (genitive plural, *Dafn*) can be interpreted on a further level of connotations: the rising 'laurel forest' is a trope, a simile of 'hymns'; the substance of this simile is the laurel. With Apollo's command the laurel becomes a synecdochic metonym of Daphne. Since she is thus connected with hymns as their *pramater* each hymn carries its own Daphne as, according to Ivanov, in Dante's *selva oscura* each laurel contains a Daphne. Each poet had at least one Daphne and all of them are immortalised by Musagetes. The verbal tenses in lines 4 and 5 show that the action extends from antiquity into modern times, after Dante.

There is a semantic as well as syntactic connection between the multivalently understood mythical fate of the object 'Daphne' and the no less multiple concrete fate of the subject 'Hymns'.[40] It is carried out by the *semantic* link of the adverbial participle *skvozia* with the qualitative attribute *prozrachnosti* and the predicative verb *otrazil*. A linear reading, 'the poet's hymns sing of Daphne', would be inadequate; it would not elevate the creative act above a documentary reflection of deeds and things (*res in realibus*). Multilinear semantics are achieved here by deliberate non-restrictions of the meanings of words[41] and by the words' polysemy.

The term 'reflected' entails at least five classemes and over a dozen semes. This *optical effect* is conceivable as: (1) *physical* (mirror, inversion of symmetry, iconic precision, a copy, a record, an image); (2) *mental* (contemplation, memory, impression, imagination); (3) *metamorphic*: the object is transposed, literally and figuratively, into a different material (for example, life in art, resurrection in death, man in myth, apotheosis); (4) etymologically as *defence* (in the Russian sense of *otrazit' napadenie*, to repel, parry, deflect); and (5) as *communication* (expression, depiction, transmission, imitation).

SEMEIC MOTION

The text does not demand from the decoder a fixed selection between such semes, rather it offers plenty of space for their (and the mind's) mobility up and down the work, checking and rechecking the various mini-associations. For example, a double oxymoron foregrounds the multi-signification *otrazil... v prozrachnosti* and *krinice... bessmertnosti*. We should remember that the book is entitled *Speculum Speculorum*, suggesting that the 'tools' are neither materially hard nor physically penetrable. They provide a free transferability of semes from one level to another, which forms something like a mental hologram. Hence, instead of *v krinice zerkal'nosti*, *v krinice prozrachnosti*.[42] An oxymoron attracts colliding semes like a magnet, and creates around the image/concept compound a palpable aura of semantic polarity. With the concept 'death', however, its main seme of *lethalness* is dampened by the fact that we are given, instead of it, only its attributes: 'shadow', 'tomb' and 'immortality'. Thus, in entering indirectly the triumvirate of the apotheosis of Apollo's attributes 'Hymns', 'Love', 'Immortality', death does not outweigh their magnitudes. During the days of writing this poem, Ivanov taught:

> This is the image of life, the face of Dionysus. But when the night disperses, and in the morning fog, on the chilled lake the metallically forged laurels and the golden sky – Apollo – are reflected. This strictly sacred vision emerges, however, beyond life. The white image of Apollo appears to me as the image of death.[43]

The movement of semes in the arena of sub-lexical associations is seen in the neologisms, especially in the suffixes of *zhemchuzhnitsa – sleznitsa*. By removing the univerbation of the roots 'pearl' and 'tear' this marker expands their meaning on the basic lexical level. They become a *holder* in the double sense of guardian and container, potentially animate (as in *kliucharnitsa*) or inanimate (as in *chernil'nitsa*); both are feminine. The subsidiary clauses lead via the personal pronoun *vy* back to the subject of the preceding stanza, *Gimny*; the simile 'like pearls' ties the hymns and their place of birth (the tomb) *semantically* to their keeper – *zhemchuzhnitsa* – and to the 'source of tears' which makes the hospitable lap or bosom 'bitter'. The semes of these concepts carry us back to the semes of unfulfilled eroticism, and to the 'shadow of death' of the first stanza, *reifying* these two concepts: 'darkness severe' is materialised as 'scarlet prison/darkness/holder'

(*purpurovaia temnitsa*), adding to the classeme of *darkness* the seme of compulsory confinement. The anaphoras *kak smérti sen' – kak perly bézdn* both accentually and syntactically equate attributive modifier 'death' with 'abysses'. The classeme of *depth* containing, then, the germs of 'pearls' in the 'pearl holder', as well as the *darkness* of the submarine shell-tomb.[44]

Semeic mobility lends plasticity not only to images but also to concepts. Thus the tear-carrying 'Love' is concretised 'under the inebriation of waves, in the scarlet holder of darkness'. There is but one way out for such passionate unfructified love from that 'scarlet intoxication' or sanguine erotic 'captivity' (*polon*): qualitative metamorphosis of turning into a hymnal chant (*slavoslovie*). The fate of Daphne's phobia of sexual love becomes not only a metaphor but also a *reflection* of the fate of Ivanov's own love. Both ascend as captives unto the light: one to the 'ethereal captivity' of a myth, the other to the 'transparent' framework of art. This second instance of common fate brings together, on a *cathartic* level of connotations, the roles of Apollo and the laureate-poet as masters of the act of eternalising an experience.

THE BIOGRAPHICAL FACTOR

Above we saw the semantic webs of the text being presented as *vsenarodnaia* symbolics, open to the public. However Ivanov's private amorous experiences of three years' standing are also encoded in the poem.[45] His cycles *Eros* and *Zolotye zavesy* (1907) were devoted to them, and account for the morphogenesis of many constitutive image/concepts here. As Ivanov proof-read the two cycles for the third book of *Cor Ardens* he entered into his diary, on 16 August 1909, that is, immediately prior to writing this sonnet: 'Read *Eros*... and was astounded by the *intoxicated* and *dark* tension of some mania of passion, of mystery-seeing and mystery-knowing (*tainovidenia i tainovedenia*)'.[46] It is not surprising, then, that the onomastics and a key image of the ninth sonnet in *Zolotye zavesy* re-emerge here. The simile 'pearl' (line 11 in *Apollini*) 'is all too transparent: for *Margarita* in Latin, and *Marguerite* in French – are *zhemchuzhina*'.[47] Thus, an etymological translation becomes canonised as a symbol both of a person/object of passion and of 'what was not to be'

'Что зачалось, и быть могло, / Но стать не возмогло', (Эрос).

The fates of Apollo and Ivanov cross again, this time as those of passionate but unsuccessful catchers. In the dream of sonnet XIII, the lovers float

'... в смутных глубинах / эфирных бездн'

and in the first sonnet,

'Так вещий сон мой жребий отразил / В зеркальности нелживого обмана'[48]

And the concepts in the opening lines of *Zaklinanie* sound familiar, if in a different melodic key:

'Когда обвеет сумраком тихоярых свеч / Ключарница глубин глубоких ...' (Эрос).

The importation of these lexical signs into our sonnet proves the lasting effect of actual experience on subsequent creativity and also the transformation of the experience in creativity: the same salient concepts are invoked. According to the diary entry of 19 August, Gorodetskii appeared once again: 'Sergei is beautiful, tender as a girl; I love him as before, he excites me.' And the entry of 22 August reads: 'I am translating... poems.... I experienced a faint kind of ecstasy.' In this light, our poem presents grounds for conclusions about the subtle relationship between the biographical and creative factors.

(a) Ivanov's work is the testimony of the man about the life of his heart and his inner experience, and the testimony of the artist about the emergence of the instantly communicated artistic consciousness. The critical subject in both is ecstasy; it is, literally, a transport; it shuttles the psyche between the poles of the deep unconscious and *realiora*, with the artistic awareness settling somewhere in between. On the upswing, the senses register the ascent of the most authentic (*real'neishee*) state of being; it is remote enough from ordinariness to provide the sensation of exposure to, or a descent of, *realiora*.

(b) 'It is natural and easy for the *real'neishee* (most real matter), which fell into the depths of the spirit and was preserved in its safeguarding quiet, to rise towards the isomorphic (*soprirodnye*) *realiora* [as signified in a myth].[49]

(c) 'Ecstasy is the manifestation of such a mutual attraction' (ibid.). Occurrence of ecstasy in life is important for Ivanov – the artist – in

terms of its psychological rather than circumstantial significance.

(d) Art has the capacity to re-create, at least in the author himself, the reflection of the original experience.

(e) Inevitably, however, to use Akhmatova's words,

'Память от солнца в сердце слабеет ...'

(f) As a poet Ivanov is not disturbed by such a weakening of emotion. It is compensated by the fact that 'the vision is reduced in memory to its defining features, as if condensed into a substance, or collected in a crystal; it is sharper and bolder defined, and it is told in a voice and tone that is firm, unwavering and impassionate' (ibid.). Certainly the bearing undergoes here a drastic, one may say, ontological change from the wonder of the original 'most real other-existence of ecstasy'.

(g) This change is called, quasi-metaphorically, a 'descent', and it is associated with the difficulty of transmitting the essence of a unique moment. Loss of, or the departure from, the exact essence is compensated by the tangibility of what can be given to readers.

(h) 'The artist descends in order to show us the path of ascent... we feel ourselves elevated above ground under the influence of lyric charms, and we imagine that we see the ineffable and unutterable, that is permeated by celestial rays and transfused by celestial harmony, and what [the artist] Petrarch did not articulate but only hinted at.'[50]

(i) The subject matter, then, is definitely a concrete biographical event. However all circumstantial things and all personal trappings are expunged from that factuality, and what remains is encoded in 'enduring' archetypal terms:

лирический поэт сам себе не дан, а задан как миф ... в едином и через единое открывать всеобщее и вселенское [51]

and

поэт уменьшает до минимума расстояние между уровнями восхождения и нисхождения, почитая своим долгом строгую точность в передаче виденного, запрещая себе какой бы то ни было вымысел. [52]

Such an approach to factual experience reduces our biographical information to 'harmless antiquarianism' with little insight into the meaning of the terms of the events, unrecognisably transformed by all

the expunging on the one hand, and by the addition of layers of connotations on the other.

MULTI-TIERED CONTENT

If the economy of such poetics expunges from its thematics all circumstantial elements of chance and of superfluity, the weight of attention shifts to the *logos*. The words become more highly charged with semeic voltage. Together the polysemies account for the cross-referential type of multi-tiered unity and for the spiralling circularity of thought in this sonnet. By the psychological and rhetorical elevation of a private experience to the level of myth Ivanov depicts, in Gumilev's words, 'not a lake and a sky, but a sky reflected in a lake'. Gumilev's metaphor is a good example of imposing two opposite entities upon one field of vision.

The field of vision or 'the idea in this sonnet' can be expressed with about one-quarter of the total words. But while such reductions do obvious damage to form, they do greater damage to the meaning. The shape, the flavour and the melodics of the verse are affected, but the multi-tieredness of the content is entirely eliminated. With every omitted word a half-dozen or more semes are lost. Here the reduction leaves us with two separate, narrowly linear themes:

No. 3

Гимны, ... вы родитесь — в гробнице. Когда любовь
вспоит ваш корень, вы возноситесь, сквозя над мглой.
Аполлон одел Дафн в лавр и отразил в бессмертной
прозрачности.

The apotheosis unites the two themes, and serves as a symbol of the *realiora* that are being reached; as pointed out above, neither is conceivable without the build-up of the deep and connective layers of consciousness. These strata are, of course, fragile, susceptible to mutation, and they generally require to be fixed in a strict logical order. Astonishingly, here their expressed order can be rearranged without damage to the various individual aspects or 'principles' (*nachala*). This possibility attests, on the one hand, to the unusual semantic and phraseological cohesion of the wide imagerial and conceptual variety of the terms, and, on the other, to an exceptional logical independence

of the sentences. The calculus of cohesion featured concurrently with the independence of phrases represents an even more rational approach to verbalisation.[53] Let us then, by way of graphically demontaging the poetic order, regard the various principles active in this poem.

No. 4 The Apollonian Principle

Когда любовь вспоит
Ваш корень
Возноситесь вы, Гимны,
Гордой головой
В свет, сквозя над мглой.

Кто вещих Дафн
В эфирный взял полон,
И в лавр одел, и отразил
В прозрачности бессмертной?
... Аполлон!

No. 5 The Tragic Principle

Ваш корень -- гробовой,
И мрак -- суровый
Родитесь вы в гробнице
Горьких лон.
Ключами слез вспоит
Любовь вас,
Как смерти сень,
В пурпуровой темнице,
Взял Аполлон в полон
Эфирный Дафн,
И в лавр одел,
И отразил в кринице.

No. 6 The Organising Orphic Principle

Вспоит Любовь ваш корень
В пурпуровой слезнице,
И мрак суровый обстанет вас
Дубровой, как лес лавровый.
Как перлы бездн, в жемчужнице
Родитесь вы, О, Гимны,
Сквозя на свет багровый,
Возноситесь вы гордой головой.
Дафн отразил в кринице
Прозрачности бессмертной --
... Аполлон.

If art stems, according to Nietzsche–Ivanov, historically from Dionysian tragedy, than the erotic impulse is, indeed, the basis of artistic creativity. 'In these bowels of pregnant night, where the [*deep roots*] of sex are nesting, there is no separation by sex... the becoming [*stanovlenie*] unites both sexes by the dark feel of conceptions. This area is demonic by the demonism of the elements, but not of evil. It is a fruitful lap (*lono*) and not a demonic ossification.'[54]

No. 7. The Orgiastic Principle

Любовь вспоит
Ваш корень
Под хмелем волн
Пурпуровой темницы
Обстанет
Ствол живой.

В жемчужнице,
Как перлы бездн
Над мглой багровой
Горьких лон
Возноситесь вы
Гордой головой
И Аполлон взял Дафн
В полон, и отразил
На тверди огневой

No. 8. The Segregation Principle

Ствол живой -- обстанет мрак
Как смерти сень,
Где Дант блуждал
Волшебною дубровой
В слезнице горьких лон,
Любовь вспоит ваш корень
Родитесь вы,
В пурпуровой темнице,
Когда над мглой багровой
Взял Дафн в полон,
И отразил в кринице,
Аполлон

Besides making a bow to antiquity, Ivanov bows to the succeeding literary tradition. It is Dante whose type of allegorisation informs Ivanov most as a myth maker. Pushkin informs him as a word maker, and Baudelaire as a Symbolist proper. Ivanov's ornateness of images is inspired by Petrarch's *concetti*.[55] It was Pushkin, however, who found such Russian equivalents as *shirokoshumnye dubrovy* (towards which he ran), *surov i dik* (upon a summon by Apollo).[56] Ivanov uses the Franco-Russian reduction of the name as in

'Суровый Дант не презирал сонета'.

With a simile like

'Гимны -- как лес лавровый'

or an adverb of circumstance like

'волшебною дубровой, где Дант блуждал',[57]

one thinks of another myth taken by Pushkin from Hesiod, about the birth of Rhyme in the Forest of Taigetes, where Echo, the daughter of Mnemosyne – Memory and mother of the Muses – visited the exiled Apollo. From the same *selva oscura* comes another line of thought,

from Baudelaire, '... L'homme y passe à travers des forêts de symboles', and the preceding verse:

> La nature est un temple où de vivants piliers
> Laissent parfois sortir de confuses paroles.[58]

Speaking of a remembered chorus of predecessors, we should also mention Nekrasov's wording of essentially the same theme[59] and Tiutchev, 'whom we consider to be the greatest representative of realist symbolism in our literature'.[60]

No. 9 Echoes of Dante, Petrarch, Pushkin, Nekrasov, Tiutchev and Baudelaire

> Где Дант блуждал волшебною дубровой
> Синеющих долин, где лес лавровый,
> И мрак суровый - как смерти сень
> Обстанет ствол живой
> Ключами слез вспоит Любовь вас, Гимны,
> И в лавр одев, как Аполлон,
> В прозрачности бессмертной отразит.

In Russia the practice of systematically animating nature – the 'reconstruction of physical phenomena as a condition and action of a living soul', began, according to Vladimir Solov'ev, with Tiutchev.[61] It is crucial for Ivanov's set on mythical remembrance and mystical intuition that the bonds of these two faculties with *realia* not be adversarial (as seen by romantics), but that they form a dynamic alliance. Hence the salient phenomena are drawn preferably from nature; the chosen arsenal favours permanent things, to be recalled affirmatively, and with maximal evocative energy.[62] Because the phenomenal things are made to be inseparable from the noumenal beings, they are accorded equal weight. Or rather, all are made to float equally weightless between the timeless elements of dark and light.

No. 10 Nature's Bosom

> Вспоит любовь ваш корень
> В пурпуровой слезнице,
> И мрак суровый обстанет вас
> Дубровой, как лес лавровый.
> Как перлы бездн, под хмелем волн,

В жемчужнице
Родитесь вы, О, Гимны,
Возноситесь, сквозя на свет багровый.
Кто Дафн взял в эфир и отразил
В кринице прозрачности бессмертной?

CONCLUSION

Returning to the poem proper, what can be said about its overall meaning and effect? It is obviously susceptible of multiple interpretations. Neither a finite number of meanings nor a fixed hierarchy among the allegorical forces has been determined. Is the dominant figure he who is the recipient of the dedication and the answer to the rhetorical question? Or is more attention allotted to the apostrophe, to the images of the suffering principle, the all-underlying idea of Eros, the organising role of Orpheus, the illustrative fate of Daphne, or to tragedy, triumph, firmness, transparence, light or dark, to poetry or to Ivanov's personal passion? Having examined only a part of the signs and, clearly, without exhausting their possible meanings, we saw enough data to suggest that all of the items in these wide dimensions seem counterpoised as to their relative import. Our exegesis set out to investigate how a poem fulfils its author's stated norms. We found that Ivanov's multivalent symbols do indeed traverse various levels of consciousness, as each of these notions dominates our awareness at some unspecified point. It is conceivable that in this poem the symbols work better than the symbolism; that is, the extensive energies stemming from individual strains, rather than a total message, are assigned to carry the mind towards higher levels of awareness. Such a possibility may be suggested by the structure of the plot (no mandatory succession of events) and by the greater weight given to the complex didactic (intellectual) rather than aesthetic (emotional) coherence.

The susceptibility of easy reshuffling of the poem's phrase/situation order proves the lack of a solid line of chronological or causal dependencies in the plot (for brevity's sake let us bracket here the last tercet).[63] The adverbial conditions of 'when' and 'where' in the first stanza are spelled out by allegorical symbols (semi-metaphors/multivalent items – I hesitate to call them 'images') and relations of items that bear no linear narrative relations towards each other. The *real*

subjects of response to these adverbial conditions are *unnamed*, they are *states of mind* associated with the given vehicles. And if these states of mind are the main residences of meaning, which of their equally energised vehicles mark which states as prevalent? In other words where, exactly, are the *realiora*? Some ephemeral semes of ecstasy, tragic, cathartic or of some other sense of extraordinary presences, seem to flicker around and amidst this impressive agglomerate of symbols. We know that it is not the Absolute but only its 'advance and approach' that are supposed to be heard in the semantic echoes emanating from the composition. We have seen that it does generate dynamic semantic trajectories, one end of which is grounded in the primary referents of the text's portentous *realia*, while the other end approaches a whirlpool of semantic possibilities. By design and definition, this other 'loose end' does not terminate anywhere. The feeling is therefore justified that new associations of meanings will keep emerging with each return to the poem. The poem's strata of meanings will expand, the nuances will vary, and Ivanov may be right in asserting that 'For true symbolism... important is not the volume of the sound, but the power of the reverberation.'[64]

Ivanov accords much respect to his readers in allowing them to do or not to do all or some of the restricting of the given meanings. It is for them to tell whether the poem's impeccably designed semantic and acoustic echoes actually linger long enough in the mind to satisfy it by forming a unified moment. If the poem is difficult to commit to memory, the fragmented nature of its echoes seems even more difficult to savour. (This may in turn be an additional reason why this poem is hard to memorise.) Alternatively a long nurturing of the text and its aura may not be sought; perhaps the increment of meaning comes simply with many readings. Readers may delight in mouthing the rich hemistichs while sensing a vortex of ideas rushing in and out of each of them. Such aesthetic 'reverberations' may please, regardless of whether it is what Ivanov thought of as the anticipation of extraordinary events of the soul. His sheer willing them and his mode of presenting them do not guarantee infection but make the seduction possible. Ivanov may have been optimistic in assuming that such a grace will descend, like erotic excitement, on any and all respondents, but he laboured meticulously on such a chance. For this reader, such a chance becomes realisable when the connection between Ivanov's topos and mythos becomes tangible. His careful concatenations of the seme-

bearing formal features establish, I believe, the grounds for such a connection.

We have seen that Ivanov admittedly did not invent his theories; they hail from many different first-rate sources. It is a credit to his intellect that he welded the eclectic material into a coherent body. That body clearly encapsulated his creativity, and kept all those amazing verbalisms from making surprising turns and sudden lunges of the imagination and from inventing new poetic forms. On the other hand, complete integration and control of a comprehensive theory allowed him to marshal his ambitious lyrical themes, methods and norms with magisterial ease and remarkable coherence. Although the reliability of his work capacity was a source of psychological envy to his peers, this generous sage, a friend to so many poets, found no significant followers. His contemporaries and successors adopted neither his weighty, perhaps overly coherent theories of myth making nor his elaborate modes of making verse. Yet his mark on the Silver Age is indelible because almost all the poets borrowed substantial elements from the riches of his poetics.

Notes

1. *Apollon*, No.1, October 1909; this poem concludes, without the title, the second book of *Cor Ardens, Speculum Speculorum*, 1911; it is reprinted in V. Ivanov, *Sobranie sochinenii* (henceforth *Sobr.*) II (Brussels, 1974) pp. 358–9.
2. Ivanov was 44 at that time; we should note that even his early works, collected in the first book, *Kormchie Zvezdy* (1903), display no juvenilia.
3. Cf. Denis Mickiewicz, 'Apollo and Modernist Poetics', in Carl Proffer (ed.), *Silver Age of Russian Culture* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1975) pp. 360–95.
4. Besides a paean to Apollo by the young editor Sergei Makovskii, poems were submitted by Bal'mont, Briusov, Kuzmin, Voloshin, Ivanov, Gumilev, Annenskii and Sologub.
5. In December of that year the two Symbolist journals, *Vesy* and *Zolotoe Runo*, closed down, and in the following spring *Apollon* published what became the final debate on 'true Symbolism' conducted among its leaders, Ivanov, Blok, Bely and Briusov. (See note 3 above.)
6. We chose *Apollini* rather than any of Ivanov's more popular, accessible, or formally dazzling works to serve as a representative which combines all of the above characteristics, shared to various degrees with the other works.

7. Space limitations compel us to bypass the controversy with Acmeism, notably with Gumilev (see his 'Pis'ma o russkoi poezii' series in *Apollon*, especially the reviews written in 1911–13).
8. 'Poet i chern'' (1904), *Sobr.*, I, p. 713. Ivanov recollects 'the verse of the old vatic singer from a signifying epoch – Dante [as cited in our epigraph]: "Marvel at the teaching concealed under the veil of strange verse.... Man... recalls other-worldly events with an unclear, only a signifying, memory: in this opaqueness of memory lies the deepest essence of myth"' ('Dve stikhii v sovremennom simvolizme' (1908) *Sobr.*, II, pp. 549, 556).
9. 'A myth is already contained in a symbol, and is immanent to it; the very reflection upon a symbol reveals a myth in the symbol' (*Sobr.*, II, p. 554). For allegorical references see also notes 37 and 42 below.
10. 'The nature of mythmaking is most typically revealed in those moments of hesitation, when during the awaiting of a flowering myth, which must not be an invention but an acquisition, one does not know exactly what the concealed substance will be of the established but not yet revealed, or lost or forgotten religious magnitude' (Ibid., p. 556).
11. It is interesting to note that Innokentii Annenskii, the author of *Tikhie Pesni*, also voices the same idea ('O sovremennom lirizme', *Apollon*, 1 (1909) p. 27).
12. As fine realisations of such symbiosis we may cite the opening poem in Ivanov's First Book of *Cor Ardens*, *Menada* and Annenskii's *Decrescendo*, *Apollon*, 11 (1910) p. 5.
13. M. E. Bernard, *The Myth of Apollo and Daphne from Ovid to Quevedo: Love, Agon and the Grotesque* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1987) pp. 4, 49.
14. Thus Ivanov's contemporaries Gabriele D'Annunzio and Ezra Pound describe themselves as direct participants in Daphne's metamorphosis. In *La Pioggia Nel Pineto* (1902), D'Annunzio entreats 'Herminia' to hear in the sounds of the rainy forest *la favola bella*, until the greenery begins to entwine their feet. His consistently intense 128 lines of seduction also avoid the grotesquerie and redirect the attention from the build-up of apotheosis to that of realia. Therein 'the children of the air' (cicadas) grow silent and the 'coarser song of the children of mud' (frogs) is heard from out of the shadow of depth. In *I stood still and was a tree amid the wood* (1908), Pound, having experienced an epiphany, becomes himself a tree, and establishes for the gods 'A hearth in his heart's home'.
15. Almost all of Ivanov's articles touch upon this theme; it became especially acute in the period 1906–9, during the polemics with Belyi in the journals *Vesy* and *Zolotoe Runo*.
16. Here, too, Ivanov acknowledges his model: 'In Vladimir Solov'ev, the internal events of private life, once apprehended... serve as objects of his poetic inspiration in such a way that he only has to paint that which transpired as a realistic myth of his person' ('Dve stikhii... ', *Sobr.*, II, p. 557).
17. 'Mysli o Simvolizme', *Trudy i Dni*, 1 (1912) pp. 3–10; reprinted *Sobr.*, II, p. 611. I believe it was this point that Mandelstam chose to attack in his contribution to the Acmeist rebellion the following year. As far as I

know, Mandelstam scholarship has not yet determined the polemical target of his article 'O sobesednike' (*Apollon*, 2 (1913) pp. 49–54).

18. It is noteworthy that such a profound subjectivist as Aleksandr Blok, at least in theory, in the conclusion of his important article 'O sovremennom sostoianii russkogo simvolizma' (*Apollon*, 8 (1910) p. 30), subscribes to Ivanov's notion of 'witnessing'. Also in *Ital'ianskie stikhi*, two lines in 'Maria da Spoleto' read: Lish' kak khudozhnik smotriu za ogradu / Gde ty sryvaesh' tsvety... (Ibid., 4 (1910) p. 40).
19. Willem G. Weststeijn quotes on this occasion T. Silman: 'Thus, not only a deepening of introspection takes place, but also a generalized depiction of the hero of the lyrical poem, his distancing from the personality of the poet and, on the whole, from concrete names and personages, their objectivization, their transfer to a "super-concrete" situation' ('Liricheskij subiekt v poezii russkogo avangarda', *Russian Literature*, XXIV (1988) p. 236).
20. 'Literaturnaia Moskva. Rozhdenie fabuly', *Sobranie Sochinenii*, II (New York: Inter-Language Literary Associates, 1966) pp. 378, 377.
21. 'Viacheslav Ivanov', in M. Gofman (ed.), *Poety simvolizma* (St Petersburg 1908, reprinted Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970) p. 265. In this respect Ivanov radically differs from Mandelstam who, almost infantilistically, drafts the most intimate objects (*domashniaia utvar'*) for his imagery.
22. This perfect iambic pentameter is highly articulated. The total of 70 feet gets 55 ictuses. Unaccented even beats occur only with tetrasyllabic words and thrice with trisyllabic masculine rhymes after odd beats. The ambulatory caesura follows the second accented beat, except in line 2, foregrounding the key word *love*, and in lines 7 and 14, where it follows the third foot.
23. The 14 lines have 13 subsidiary clauses; all of the closely-knit parts of speech are distributed highly symmetrically: every third line of all but the last stanza contains a simile. Both quatrains feature an attributive clause in the instrumental case. The semantic connection among the sentences is somewhat veiled. The temporal conjunction, *kogda*, is separated from the logical subject, *Gimny*, by five subordinate clauses, and from the predicate *voznosites'* by four. Double and full stops at the end of each stanza stabilise the perfect fit of a periodic thought per stanza. The full stops divide the stanzaic thematics into three sections: the quatrains are united into one period, governed by the temporal conjunction, *kogda*, and, of course, by the act itself of the ascension of the Hymns. The period of the third stanza presents the exact location of the departing point of the same act, while the last stanza relates the exact destination. Thus the even stanzas define the action and the odd stanzas the conditions 'when' and 'where'.
24. To the weightiness of the aforementioned exotically archaic Slavicisms, didacticism is added: Hymns – the most ancient form of poetry – are *told* about their own origin in a fact-certifying manner. The leap from narration to rhetorical questions and the answer to them places, it would seem, the crowning role of Apollo outside the action. The subject and apostrophe of the whole poem is foregrounded by the personal pronoun

vy, and the direct address *o* (both on an unaccented syllable). The imagerial concretisation is created by the scenes through which the personified, indirect object and attributive synecdoche *proud head* ascends to its laurels.

25. Cf. Ivanov's poem, *Ultimum Vale*, dated 'September 1909' and dedicated to Annenskii. About a genuine meeting of their minds see editor's notes, *Sobr.*, II, p. 742.
26. 'Misterii poeta', *Sobr.*, I, p. 579.
27. 'Predchuvstviia i predvestiia' (1906), *Sobr.*, II, p. 87.
28. Innokentii Annenskii observed in 1909 that Ivanov's 'severe verbalisms... seem at times to be forged together' ('Chto takoe poeziia?', *Apollon*, 3 (1911) p. 16.
29. Eight of the 14 lines of column A begin with conjunctions, prepositions or pronouns, indicating the conditions of the events, whereas column B concentrates on the qualities of the phenomena. Column B begins three lines with a locational preposition, two of which are *v*. That consonant, however, is unusually stressed. It occurs 23 times (only eight and a half times in A; the next frequent consonant in B is *r* – only 15 times); *v* is also marked by opening five lines. Such massive amplification may distinguish the phoneme *v* as a sound gesture and make it correspond with the lexical concentration on the driving search for the central germinal core of the poetic experience.
30. This is a rare example of literally contrapuntal poetic writing whereby the two parts, like two hands in a piano score, make full sense whether heard together or separately. The consistency of this counterpoint is even more astonishing if it is accidental.
31. *Arkhisema* was coined by analogy with N. Trubetskoi's *archifonema*; it is a 'semantic nucleus that emerges at the crossing of fields of meaning of each of the basic semantic units' (Iurii M. Lotman, *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta*, reprinted Providence: Brown University Press, 1971, p. 181). Because of their familial nature, we will refer to such collections of semes associated by synonymic, antonymic of metonymic kinship as *classemes*.
32. Quoted in Gwendolyn Bays, *The Orphic Vision* (Lincoln, NE: University Press, Nebraska, 1969) p. 5. Ivanov argues analogously that 'the concern of a direct [*priamoi*] symbolist is to establish a certain general principle. That principle is the symbolism of all genuine art ('Ekskurs: O sekte i dogmate', *Sobr.*, II, p. 613). 'Its aim is the liberation of the soul (catharsis as an event of inner experience)' 'Mysli o simvolizme', ibid., p. 612.
33. *Purgatorio*, XXIX, 16–18. Shortly thereafter Dante 'saw the flames advance, leaving the air behind them painted...' (ibid., XXIX, 73–4 (see *Apollini*, 1. 8)). The replacement in this poem of Dante's Christian God by Apollo is in keeping with the theme of artistic creativity rather than of all creation.
34. 'Simvolika esteticheskikh nachal' (1905), *Sobr.*, I, p. 827. Later Ivanov saw these principles as equivalent, in the sense that ascent is more significant, but descent requires greater artfulness. His analyses of Dante's sonnet in the Third Canto of *Vita Nuova*, and of Petrarch's 34th

sonnet on *Morte di Laura* (Sobr., II, pp. 628–36), give lucid explanations of these concepts.

35. The same process is underscored by the transformation of the symmetrically (diagonally) placed *water-related* classeme (springs' – 'tears' and 'pool' – 'transparence'.
36. 'The Apollonian vision arises above the twilight of the Dionysian turbulence: the pythian diad is inalienable and unfusable' (*nesliannaia*), 'Mysli o simvolizme', *Sobr.*, II, p. 607.
37. In Ovid the 'root' is *pigris radicibus* (*Metamorphoses*, I, Zurich and Dublin 1966) p. 551; the 'springs of tears of love' stem from *Canzoniere* of Petrarch where, stripped of the mediaeval Christian allegories as well as of Ovid's play and ironic stance, Daphne is the prototype of Laura, and Apollo the personification of the figure of the inconsolable lover. This figure is even more strongly emphasised by the poet of doleful courtly songs, Garcilaso de la Vega.
38. 'Orfei', *Sobr.*, I, p. 579, lines 3, 4 and last.
39. 'Out of the foaming chaos emerges, like a skyward growing flower, the goddess...' (*Sobr.*, I, p. 830).
40. Finding more exact relationships between subject and object was one of the items on the agenda of the Acmeist rebellion against Symbolism.
41. While there is no incompatibility among the phrases, the causal, logical and attributive dependencies or subordinations are concentrated *within* phrases, not between them.
42. According to Dal', *krinitsa* is 'a spring, a source, a shallow dugout, a well...' The word could have also been paronomastically suggested, in the same context, by the Latin and Italian word *crines*, *crine* for 'locks'. Ovid says, 'in frondem crines... crescunt' and Petrarch has, in his 246th sonnet, 'L'aura che 'l verde lauro et l'aureo crine / soavemente sospirando move'. The aura of the golden locks is reflected (as in Ivanov's pool). In order to embody a spiritual reality 'sreda dolzhna byt' prozrachnoi, chtoby ne prepiatstvovat' prokhozhdeniiu solnechnogo lucha, kotoryi eiu, neprozrachnoi, mozhet byt' zaderzhan, libo zatemnen i ne vidim; no ona ne dolzhna byt' absoliutno prozrachnoi, dolzhna prelomliat' luch – inache Res ne budet vidna' (O. Deshart, 'Vvedenie', *Sobr.*, I, p. 63). In the poem also entitled *Prozrachnost'* we read: 'Prozrachnost'! kupel'iu kristal'noi / Ty tverd' ulegchila... / Chto polnoch' v tvoi sumrak uronit / V bezdonnosti tonet zerkal'noi...' (*Cor Ardens*, Book II). 'Navedennoe na zerkala razdroblennykh soznanii, ono vosstanavlivaet iznachal'nuiu pravdu otrazhennogo... *Speculum speculorum* – delaetsia khudozhestvo, vse v samoi zerkal'nosti svoei – odna simvolika edinogo bytiia... simvola simvolov, Ploti Slova' ('Zavety simvolizma' (1910) *Sobr.*, II, p. 601). This idea must stem from *Paradiso*, XXIX, 13–30, that speak of the creation wherein God is said to create mirrors that reflect His light back to Him.
43. As retold by the editors ('Skuchnyi razgovor', *Apollon*, 1 (1909) p. 81). On Ivanov's participation in this talk see my doctoral dissertation, 'Phoebus Apollo or Musagetes: The Position of 'Apollon' in Russian Modernism', Yale University, 1967, pp. 93–7; K.F. Taranovskii, 'Zametka o dialoge "Skuchnyi dialog" v pervom nomere Apollona',

Russian Literature, XXVI, (1989), pp. 417–24; and A.V. Lavrov and R.D. Timenchik's publication in *Ezhegodnik russkogo otdela Pushkinskogo doma za 1976g.*, cited in Taranovskii. The images remind one again of Dante's vision in the *Purgatorio*.

44. Ivanov placed into his collection *Prozrachnost'*, under the title *Beskonechnost'*, his translation of a poem by Leopardi, which contains the line 'il naufragar m'è dolce in questo mare'.
45. About the importance for both Ivanovs of the unrealised affairs with Sergei Gorodetskii and then with Margarita V. Sabashnikova-Voloshina, see the editor's note in *Sobr.*, II, pp. 756–67, 808–10, 835.
46. Ivanov thus defines the Platonic state of 'being out of one's mind'. He also defines that state as 'the most real other-existence of ecstasy'.
47. Moisei S. Altman's subtle morphonogenetic analysis of Ivanov's onomastics of the ninth sonnet of *Zolotye zavesy* is quoted in the editors' 'Commentaries', *Sobr.*, II, pp. 764–5.
48. Ivanov refers to a dream he had of Margarita Voloshina during their courtship.
49. O. Deshart, 'Commentaries', *Sobr.*, II, p. 762.
50. 'O granitsakh iskusstva' *Sobr.*, II, p. 629. Thus Ivanov sees in Dante 'how much remains unsaid and altogether bypassed, and how all that was foggy, diffused and darkly disturbing, unperceived and unconscious in vision, became more comprehensible and qualitatively impoverished in magnificent poetry'. Ibid.
51. O. Deshart, 'Vvedenie', *Sobr.*, I, (1971) p. 116.
52. 'O granitsakh iskusstva', *Sobr.*, II, p. 630.
53. Balance in favour of such rationality over the *nechaiannaia radost'* of spontaneous creativity was named as one of the major reasons why the succeeding generation of poets chose not to emulate the poetics of this maitre. Gumilev, 'Pis'ma o russkoi poezii', *Apollon*, 6 (1912) p. 53.
54. 'Simvolika esteticheskikh nachal' (1905) *Sobr.*, I, p. 829. 'When the aesthetic [matter] is experienced erotically, the artistic creativity becomes symbolist' ('Zavety simvolizma' (1910) *Sobr.*, II, p. 606).
55. For example, 'Vspoit vash koren'... kliuchami slez' is reminiscent of Petrarch's 'river of tears (of the poet) led by Love to the foot (root) of the harsh laurel' (*Canzoniere* XXX, lines 22–3). Ivanov models his 'Kantsony i sonety posviashchennye imeni Lidii Dmitrievny Zinov'evoi – Annibal', his late wife, on the poems in the later part of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, commonly described as 'in morte di Laura', and quotes the first of these (Poem CCLXVIII) as an epigraph for Part Two of *Cor Ardens*. Another epigraph from Petrarch, 'Di pensier in pensier, di monte in monte / Mi guida Amor...', introduces the sonnet cycle *Zolotye Zavesy*, in Part One of *Cor Ardens*.
56. Cf. such borrowings of Ivanov as in the first stanza in the poem 'Zemlia', *Sobr.*, I, p. 550: 'Bratia! uidem v sumrak dubrov sviashchennyi / Na berega pustynnykh voln...'
57. 'Dant prokhodil skvoz' selva oscura, i ne napisal by 'Skuchnyi razgovor'', p. 81.
58. 'Correspondances', *Les Fleurs du Mal* (1857). Ivanov analyses, in 1908, the quatrains of this sonnet as the preferable, 'realist' symbolism, and the

tercets as 'idealist' symbolism (*Sobr.*, II, pp. 535–61). In 1934, he expounds this sonnet again, as the foundation of international artistic symbolism, in his article in *Enciclopedia Italiana*.

59. Ivanov is bound to have seen these verses by Nekrasov as quite 'one-dimensional', but rich in tonal changes: *Stikhi* moi! Svideteli zhivye / Za mir prolitykh slez! / Rodites' vy v minuty rokovye / Dushevnykh groz / I b'etes' o serdtsa liudskie, / kak volny ob utes.
60. 'Dve stikhii...', *Sobr.*, II, p. 557. See also 'Zavety simvolizma', sections I and II, ibid., pp. 589–93.
61. Vladimir Solov'ev, 'Poeziia F.I. Tiutcheva', *Sobranie Sochinenii*, vol. VI (St Petersburg, 1911) p. 464.
62. Ivanov insists in the last stanza of the opening poem in *Prozrachnost'*: 'Ne mni: my v nebe taia, / S zemliei razlucheny: – / Vedet tropa sviataia / V zaoblachnye sny' (*Sobr.*, I, p. 737).
63. The extensive ties of the last tercet with the rest of the poem are discussed above, under 'Classemes' and 'Semeic Motion'. Let us reiterate that these ties are entirely inferential and connotative and do not affect the sequences of the poem's plot or diction.
64. 'Mysli o simvolizme', *Sobr.*, II, p. 611.