

Russian Literature

Croatian and Serbian
Czech and Slovak
Polish

XLIV-III

1 October 1998

**SPECIAL ISSUE
VJAČESLAV IVANOV**

CONTENTS

JACKSON, ROBERT LOUIS Prefatory Note	277
BIRD, ROBERT, JACKSON, ROBERT LOUIS Introduction	279
WEST, JAMES Večnaja pamjat'	285
JACKSON, ROBERT LOUIS Vjačeslav I. Ivanov and the Question of Art. The Roman Notebook: February 18, 1944 "Nudus salta! Cel' iskusstva"	289
WACHTEL, MICHAEL The "Responsive Poetics" of Vjačeslav Ivanov	303
KOSTALEVSKY, MARINA The Birth of Poetry from the Spirit of Criticism: Ivanov on Skrjabin	317
BLINOV, VALERY Vjačeslav Ivanov and Acmeism: Literary Polemics of 1912-1914	331

(continued on back cover)

NORTH-HOLLAND

couples issues devoted to special topics of Russian literature with contributions on related subjects in Croatian, Serbian, Czech, Slovak and Polish literatures. Moreover, several issues each year will contain articles on heterogeneous subjects concerning Russian literature. All methods and view-points will be welcomed, provided they contribute something new, original or challenging to our understanding of Russian and other Slavic literatures. Contributions should be sent directly to the editors, or any member of the editorial board.

Honorary Editor: J. van der Eng, University of Amsterdam, Slavic Seminar, Spuistr. 210, 1012 VT AMSTERDAM
Editor: W.G. Weststeijn, University of Amsterdam, Slavic Seminar, Spuistr. 210, 1012 VT AMSTERDAM
Editorial Board: A. Flaker (Zagreb), A.A. Hansen-Löve (München), R.L. Jackson (New Haven),
W. Schmid (Hamburg), L.M. O'Toole (Perth, Western Australia), V.N. Toporov (Moskva)
Editorial Center: Slavic Seminar of the University of Amsterdam, Spuistraat 210, 1012 VT AMSTERDAM
Editorial Assistants: G.J. Alleman and E.A. de Haard

Publication Information

RUSSIAN LITERATURE (ISSN 0304-3479). For 1999 volumes xlv and xlvi are scheduled for publication. Subscription prices are available upon request from the publisher. Subscriptions are accepted on a prepaid basis only and are entered on a calendar year basis. Issues are sent by surface mail except to the following countries where air delivery via SAL is ensured: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Hong Kong, India, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, PR China, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, USA. For all other countries airmail rates are available upon request. Claims for missing issues must be made within six months of our publication (mailing) date. Please address all your requests regarding orders and subscription queries to: Elsevier Science B.V., Journal Department, P.O. Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Tel.: 31-20-4853642, fax: 31-20-4853598.

© 1998, ELSEVIER SCIENCE B.V. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher. Elsevier Science B.V., Copyright & Permissions Department, P.O. Box 521, 1000 AM Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Special regulations for authors. Upon acceptance of an article by the journal, the author(s) will be asked to transfer copyright of the article to the publisher. The transfer will ensure the widest possible dissemination of information.

Special regulations for readers in the U.S.A. This journal has been registered with the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. Consent is given for copying of articles for personal or internal use, or for the personal use of specific clients. This consent is given on the condition that the copier pays through the Center the per-copy fee stated in the code on the first page of each article for copying beyond that permitted by Sections 107 or 108 of the US Copyright Law. The appropriate fee should be forwarded with a copy of the first page of the article to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. If no code appears in an article, the author has not given broad consent to copy and permission to copy must be obtained directly from the author. The fee indicated on the first page of an article in this issue will apply retroactively to all articles published in the journal, regardless of the year of publication. This consent does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as for general distribution, resale, advertising and promotion purposes, or for creating new collective works. Special written permission must be obtained from the publisher for such copying.

⊗ The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

Prefatory Note

The one-day conference devoted to Vjačeslav Ivanovič Ivanov, "Večnaja pamjat": A Symposium on Vjačeslav Ivanov", is the eleventh in a series of on-going symposiums and laboratories sponsored by Yale Conferences in Slavic Literatures and Culture. The twelfth conference, devoted to Aleksandr Puškin, will take place in November 1998.

Robert Louis Jackson

Director, Yale Conferences in Slavic Literatures and Culture

July 23, 1997

INTRODUCTION

ROBERT BIRD AND ROBERT LOUIS JACKSON

Dedicated to Dmitrij V. Ivanov and to the Memory of Lidija V. Ivanova

Over the years, Yale University has been a vibrant center of interest in Vjačeslav Ivanov (1866-1949). The richness of this tradition lent the miniconference of September 21, 1996, "Večnaja pamjat': A Symposium on Vjačeslav Ivanov", organized by Robert Bird and Robert Louis Jackson, the feeling of a homecoming. The first international conference on Ivanov, organized by Robert Louis Jackson, took place at Yale University on April 3-5, 1981. It was attended by Dmitrij V. Ivanov and Lidija Ivanova, who, along with the late Ol'ga Deschartes, were the major force behind revived studies in Ivanov. Participants included Sergej Averincev, Valery Blinov, Pamela Davidson, Victor Erlich, Robert Louis Jackson, Kirill Fotiev, Johannes Holtusen, Alexis Klimoff, Marina Kostalevsky, Fausto Malcovati, Vladimir Markov, Lowry Nelson, Jr., Riccardo Picchio, Aleksis Rannit, Vasily Rudich, Ilya Serman, Heinrich Stammeler, Edward Stankiewicz, Victor Terras, Tomas Venclova, René Wellek, James West, and others (see Blinov 1982). The proceedings of this meeting were published by the Yale Center for International and Area Studies (Jackson, Nelson 1986). The gathering marked the founding of the International Vjačeslav Ivanov Convivium (of which Robert Louis Jackson is president and Dmitrij V. Ivanov – honorary president) and the inauguration of an on-going series of international conferences held once every three years.

The history of Ivanov at Yale begins most probably with the arrival in 1926 of the renowned historian Michail Rostovcev, whom Ivanov had known for over thirty years (Bongard-Levin et al. 1993). Sterling Memorial Library holds a photocopy of Ivanov's doctoral dissertation 'Dionis i pradionisijstvo' (Baku, 1923), with the inscription:

Глубокоуважаемому и дорогому Михаилу Ивановичу Ростовцеву, от неизменно преданного ему автора.

Рим, май 1925

The first great advocate of Ivanov at Yale was the long-time curator of Slavic collections in Sterling Memorial Library, Aleksis Rannit, who had met Ivanov in Rome in 1949 (Rannit 1964: 94). Mr. Rannit organized an exhibition and reading at Yale in the spring of 1966 to celebrate Ivanov's centenary, and in 1971 organized the first academic meeting devoted to Ivanov, which took place at the annual conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies in Montreal.¹ Rannit also oversaw the purchase of several significant manuscript collections for Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, containing several of Ivanov's manuscripts and a wealth of correspondence by such pertinent figures as Ol'ga Šor and Fedor Stepun, who were the first to make the transition from admirers and friends of Ivanov to Ivanov scholars (Bird 1996). In the following years a particular magnetism seems to have developed between Ivanov and Yale, which can boast several prominent interpreters and translators of his works, including scholars such as Carol Anshuetz (now in Washington D.C.), Valery Blinov, Lowry Nelson, Jr., Aleksis Rannit, Vasily Rudich, Tomas Venclova, Marina Kostalevsky, Robert Bird, and, of course, Robert Louis Jackson. It was at Yale that Alexis Klimoff defended one of the first Ph.D. dissertations on Ivanov (1974). Many of these scholars were among those who gathered in 1981 at Yale at the first international conference on Ivanov.

The relevant point is that one can largely trace the history of the study of Vjačeslav Ivanov, the academic sub-field of *Ivanovedenie*, through the personalities of a few dedicated scholars whose investigations either grew out of or encouraged personal connections with Ivanov and his heirs. The central achievement of Ivanov's literary executors as preservers and promoters of his creative heritage must not be underestimated. As Vladimir Vejdle once noted, the task they performed would eventually prove invaluable for the poet's homeland, but at the time they knew full well that they "would not hear a kind word" from the then-masters of Russia (Vejdle 1976). Indeed, their own contributions have gained increasing significance with the passage of time. Today a large place in *Ivanovedenie* is still occupied by the works of Ol'ga Šor (Deschartes), who went from being Ivanov's closest companion to being his editor, biographer and most authoritative interpreter. Since her passage in 1979, her place at the head of *Ivanovedenie* has most capably been assumed by Dmitrij Vjačeslavovič, who has overseen the six international conferences devoted to his father, and in whose recent memoirs Vjačeslav Ivanov figures prominently (1994; 1996a; 1996b). Many of those present at the Yale mini-conference bear fond memories of Lidija Vjačeslavovna, whose commitment to her father's memory and work found marve-

lous expression in her own memoirs (1987; 1992), excerpts of which were first read at the 1981 Yale conference. And still, to a degree, does *Ivanovedenie* retain this close-knit sense, much more, it would seem, than comparable sub-fields within contemporary Russian literature. An important factor in this has been the regular series of conferences, which have brought many scholars from many countries together around the common task of *Ivanovedenie*, invariably under the chairmanship of Dmitrij Vjačeslavovič. In this way something of the convivial persona of Vjačeslav Ivanovič has been communicated to the dry world of Western academia. As scholars from the former Soviet Union have begun to participate, this community has become a microcosm of the rich cultural synthesis between East and West that Ivanov envisioned.

The ability of *Ivanovedenie* to transform itself into a vital intellectual community rests on two major qualities, one shared by all members of the Ivanov family. Firstly, Ivanov's works and ideas command a remarkably open-ended nature; they always guide one to new questions, often hinting at well-nigh inexpressible resolutions, but they never simply impose an answer to be accepted or rejected. It is not just "dialogism", since Ivanov usually made his own strong views clear and stood by them consistently, but a sincere respect for the dignity of each person's ability to aspire to such a committed stance, indeed a demand that each person face the ultimate questions with courage and independence, in order to form such views as might be firmly held. Secondly, and again a quality common to Vjačeslav Ivanov himself, these discussions are always open to all willing. Those of us who have not yet made any lasting contribution to *Ivanovedenie* can certainly attest to the warm and ready welcome given by accomplished and senior scholars of Ivanov's works.

The scholars who gathered at Yale and whose papers are published herein form the main contingent of Ivanov scholars in the English-speaking world. Professor James West is the author of the first book in English on Ivanov, published in 1970, the editor of two important reprints of Ivanov's prose collections, and has recently published a series of articles on the Symbolists and Russian Neo-Kantian thought (1991; 1995). Recently Michael Wachtel has published both a monograph on Ivanov, Goethe and Novalis, and a collection of Ivanov's correspondence in German – the first major monographic publication of Ivanoviana in any language (1994; 1995). Professor Wachtel is also collaborating on a collection of Ivanov's essays in English translation with Robert Bird, who is at present completing a major study of Ivanov's works. Dr. Carol Anshuetz, who has published several important articles on Ivanov, has translated Ivanov's first book, *The Hellenic Religion of the Suffering God*, which is to be published by Yale University Press. Valery Blinov is the author of a comprehensive chronology of Ivanov's life and works, which remains one of the major sources on his

biography, as well as of studies of Ivanov and the Acmeist movement (1986; 1988). And, finally, Robert Louis Jackson, who republished Ivanov's book on Dostoevskij and edited the first collection of articles on Ivanov in 1986, has recently contributed yet another article on Ivanov (1993). All in all, those present are responsible for all but two of the ten books published on or by Ivanov by English-speaking scholars. Pamela Davidson, the author of the other two, was unfortunately unable to attend, as was Tomas Venclova, whose important contributions to *Ivanovedenie* form the core of his most recent book of scholarly essays (1997).

The past several years have witnessed an increasing wave of publications and books on and by Ivanov, published both in Russia and the West. Apart from the works noted above, recent publications include Pamela Davidson's momentous reference guide, encompassing a bibliography of works by and on Ivanov; the complete memoirs of Ivanov's students Moisej Al'tman and Elena Millior, covering the period of Ivanov's professorship in Baku; two collections of "materials and studies" and a two-volume edition of Ivanov's poetry in the prestigious "Biblioteka poëta" major series.² Thanks in no small part to the untiring efforts of those present at the mini-conference, *Ivanovedenie* is gradually attaining proportions that are commensurate to the stature of its subject, Vjačeslav Ivanov. It can only be hoped that this growth will only invigorate the convivial nature of *Ivanovedenie*, so that it may always be, in the words of the master, "a matter native and universal", – "rodnoe i vselenskoe".

NOTES

¹ On these events see the notes in *Novoe russkoe slovo* for March 1, 1966, p. 3; March 13, 1966, p. 8; May 13, 1966, p. 3; May 15, 1971, p. 4. For further citations on many of the themes and scholars discussed in this introduction the reader is referred to the authoritative bibliography of Ivanoviana (Davidson 1996).

² Aleksej Zverev's review of Dmitrij Ivanov's book of conversations (1996) also discusses the significance of 1996 for the fate of Ivanov's Russian heritage (Zverev 1997).

REFERENCES

- Al'tman, M.S.
1995 *Razgovory s Vjačeslavom Ivanovym* (Ed. K.Ju. Lappo-Danilevskij). Sankt-Peterburg.
- Bird, Robert
1996 'V.I. Ivanov in Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University'. *Studia Slavica*, 41, 311-333.
- Blinov, Valerij N.
1982 'Meždunarodnaja konferencija, posvjaščennaja Vjačeslavu Ivanovu'. *Novyj žurnal*, 146, 241-249.
1986 'Chronology of the Life and Works of Vyacheslav I. Ivanov'. In Jackson, Nelson 1986, 415-474.
1988 'Vjačeslav Ivanov i vzniknovenie akmeizma'. *Cultura e memoria*, Vol. 2 (Ed. Fausto Malcovati). Pavia, 13-25.
- Bongard-Levin, G.M., Vachtel' [Wachtel], M., Zuev, V.Ju.
1993 'Michail Ivanovič Rostovcev i Vjačeslav Ivanovič Ivanov: Novye materialy'. *Vestnik drevnej istorii*, 4, 210-220.
- Davidson, Pamela
1996 *Viacheslav Ivanov: a reference guide*. New York.
- Ivanov, Dmitrij
1994 'Iz vospominanij'. *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 10, 297-310.
1996a 'Iz vospominanij'. *Vjačeslav Ivanov: Materialy i issledovanija*. Moskva, 34-71.
1996b *D'Ivanov à Neuvecelle: Entretiens avec Jean Neuvecelle recueillis par Raphaël Aubert et Urs Geller* (Preface by Georges Nivat). Montricher.
- Ivanova, Lidija
1987 'Vospominanija. Neizdannye pis'ma Vjačeslava Ivanova' (Ed. D.V. Ivanov). *Minuvšee*, 7, 45-77.
- Jackson, Robert Louis
1994 'Vision in His Soul: Vyacheslav I. Ivanov's Dostoevsky'. *Dialogues with Dostoevsky*. Stanford, Cal., 251-268.
- Jackson, Robert Louis, Nelson, Lowry, Jr.
1986 *Vyacheslav Ivanov: Poet, Critic, Philosopher*. New Haven.
- Klimoff, Alexis
1974 'Dionysus Tamed: The Late Poetry of Viacheslav Ivanov'. Ph.D. Dissertation. Yale University.
- Millior, E.A.
1995 'Besedy filosofskie i ne filosofskie'. *Vestnik Udmurtskogo universiteta*, special'nyj vypusk, posvjaščennyj Elene Aleksandrovne Millior, 11-27.

- Rannit, Aleksis
1964 'O Vjačeslave Ivanove i ego *Svete večernem*'. *Novyj žurnal*, 77, 74-94.
- Vejdle, Vladimir
1976 'O tech, kogo uže net. 16. Vjačeslava Velikolepnogo *opera omnia*'. *Novoe russkoe slovo*, May 25, 5.
- Venclova, Tomas
1997 *Sobesedniki na piru. Stat'i o russkoj literature*. Vilnius.
- Vjačeslav Ivanov
1996 *Vjačeslav Ivanov. Materialy i issledovanija* (Eds. V.A. Keldyš, I.V. Koreckaja). Moskva.
- Wachtel, Michael
1994 *Russian Symbolism and Literary Tradition: Goethe, Novalis and the Poetics of Vyacheslav Ivanov*. Madison, Wisc.
1995 *Vjačeslav Ivanov: Dichtung und Briefwechsel aus dem deutschsprachigen Nachlass* (= Deutsch-russische Literaturbeziehungen). Mainz.
- West, James
1970 *Russian Symbolism. A Study of Vyacheslav Ivanov and the Russian Symbolist Aesthetic*. London.
1991 'Kant, Kant, Kant: The Neo-Kantian Creative Consciousness in Bely's *Peterburg*'. *The Foundations of Russian Modernism* (Ed. Peter I. Barta). Lewiston, Ont., 87-135.
1995 'Art as Cognition in Russian Neo-Kantianism'. *Studies in East European Thought*, 47, 3-4, 195-233.
- Zverev, Aleksej
1997 'Da'. *Novyj mir*, 5, 237-240.

VEČNAJA PAMJAT'

JAMES WEST

While exploring different aspects of Vjačeslav Ivanov's work – his poetry, his religious philosophy and his relations with his contemporaries, both like-minded and not – the papers gathered in this volume have common threads that point to two of the most interesting characteristics of his creative genius. The first of these, most apparent in Ivanov's essays but easily discernible in his poetry, is an explicit "universalism", a quest for values that transcend the local and particular, whatever national identity they may necessarily possess. The second is a pervasive characteristic of Ivanov's method: the way in which much of his poetry springs from a particular stimulus, be it an event or an opinion, another's poem, a work of art or the inspiration of a contemporary.

Marina Kostalevsky's 'The Birth of Poetry from the Spirit of Criticism: Ivanov on Skrjabin' traces the development in Skrjabin, whom Sabaneev characterized as the only Symbolist musician, of the qualities that led Ivanov to discern in him a kindred genius. Professor Kostalevsky analyzes Ivanov's group of three essays on Skrjabin, delivered as lectures after the composer's premature death ended their short but mutually stimulating friendship. In the second of these, Ivanov responded to the frequently-made criticism that Skrjabin composed outside the Russian musical tradition, arguing that human creativity must clothe its expression in a national form even as it aspires to universal meaning, and declaring that "Skrjabin's aspirations represent the moment of universal self-determination on the part of the national Russian soul". This position reflects the core of Ivanov's religious aesthetic, the idea that the most exalted human perception of the universality of the divine spirit

can only be expressed through some realization of it in the particulars of the real world. More than that, as Professor Kostalevsky points out, Skrjabin's significance for Ivanov is that he represents the rise to universality of the Russian genius at a time when the "crisis of humanism" had robbed Western civilization of that role. Michael Wachtel, examining in another context Ivanov's sonnet on the death of Skrjabin, points out that he regarded the loss of the composer as a "personal, national and even universal tragedy". Acceptance of the paradoxical tension between the local and the universal pervades Ivanov's writing, not just the articles published under the title *Rodnoe i vse-lenskoe* in 1917. Valery Blinov's 'Vjačeslav Ivanov and Acmeism: Literary Polemics of 1912-1914' examines the definition of Symbolism that Ivanov put forward in the period when the Acmeists were asserting the need for a return to poetry with less ethereal objectives. In doing so, he highlights Ivanov's claim that the Symbolist aesthetic has a universal validity as the essential nature of all true art in any age. Robert Bird in 'Vjačeslav Ivanov and Theology' offers a fascinating account not just of Ivanov's possible influence on Orthodox theology in this century, but of the symbolic theology of the Blessed Virgin Mary as Earth Mother and the realized unity of the material and spiritual worlds. This is of course another sense in which Ivanov's aesthetic theory transposes into a theological position, again achieving a universal significance. Finally, James West's paper on 'Criticism, Mysticism and Transcendent Nationalism in Vjačeslav Ivanov's Thought' focuses on the distinction Ivanov drew between "zemlja ruskaja" and "Rus' svjataja", the one a physical, temporal entity, the other a universal spiritual value, Russia's contribution to the spiritual welfare of all humankind.

Much of Ivanov's writing has its point of origin in a response, though not in any sense that would diminish his creativity: on the contrary, he raised the reactive poetics that we usually associate with occasional verse into a serious aesthetic form. Sometimes Ivanov placed pointers in the form of epigraphs, subtitles or references in the text of the poem. Often the connection is left to be discovered through familiarity, achieved sooner or later, by quest or by happenstance, with the source of his inspiration. Michael Wachtel's paper on 'The "Responsive Poetics" of Viacheslav Ivanov' focuses on this characteristic, illustrating it with two carefully researched examples and exploring the way in which the discovery of the original stimulus can greatly enrich our understanding both of the particular poem, and of Ivanov's poetics as a whole. Professor Wachtel's example is the origin in one of Schiller's epigrams of the expression "nežnaja tajna", as both the title of Ivanov's 1912 collection of verse and a phrase used in several of the poems it contains. The poem 'Narciss' in the 1904 collection *Prozračnost*, with the subtitle 'A Pompeian bronze', provides a similar example in the visual realm: in this case the poem is somewhat cryptic as long as the bronze figure remains anonymous, but a deeper meaning is elucidated by the details of a well-known and am-

bivalent bronze that is described and illustrated in Johannes Overbeck's standard work on the antiquities of Pompeii. Though this property of Ivanov's creativity is not explicitly the subject of the other papers in this volume, it is quite striking how many of them point incidentally to other instances of the same thing. While Michael Wachtel shows how Ivanov responded in kind to Brjusov's poetic tribute to Skrjabin, Marina Kostalevsky presents a no less interesting example of the phenomenon in question outside Ivanov's poetry: his response in his essays on Skrjabin not only to the composer, but on the level of form to Dostoevskij's celebrated homage to Puškin. The central example in Robert Bird's paper is another "poem of response", with the icon of the "Mater' božija sporitel'nica" at Optina pustyn' as its inspiration, while Robert Jackson's paper analyzes what might be described as an internal variant of the genre – the poem "Nudus salta!.." from 'Rimskij dnevnik', the second part of which is a carefully constructed response to the first.

The Russian philosophical circles in which Ivanov moved were strongly influenced by contemporary German thought and by the rapid development of academic psychology in Western Europe, which drew in its turn on contemporary advances in the physiology of perception. In addition, Ivanov was familiar with late nineteenth-century German Classical scholarship, especially the work done on ancient Greek religion. In his *Ėllinskaja religija stradajuščego boga* Ivanov synthesized this learning with his own insights into its spiritual significance for contemporary humankind, producing a difficult text, couched in a dense and often metaphorical language that draws on the vocabularies of mythology, psychology and Orthodox theology. Though often related to Nietzsche's exploration of Dionysianism in his *Birth of Tragedy*, this work differs markedly in form, function and substance, and sheds light on every aspect of Ivanov's work, from his philosophical and religious ideas to his aesthetic and his poetic practice. Carol Anschuetz's paper compares Ivanov's interpretation of Greek religion in *Ėllinskaja religija* not with Nietzsche's, but with that of Walter Burkert, a distinguished scholar of early religion writing in the German tradition in the post-war years. In both Ivanov's and Burkert's presentation of pre-Christian religion, it is paradoxically only through the ecstasy of a ritualized death – in its Christian form, the mystery of the eucharist – that humans fully experience life. They differ, Dr. Anschuetz concludes, in the greater emphasis that Ivanov placed on the function of the ecstatic state as the psychological well-spring of all human creativity.

The papers of which this symposium is comprised collectively reinforce the point that Ivanov's philosophical essays are not a commentary on his poetry, nor his poetry just an exemplification of his ideas in verse. In this context it is very fitting that their presentation at Yale University in September 1996 was punctuated with readings of Ivanov's verses by Dmitrij

Vjačeslavovič Ivanov, who provided as so often on such occasions a gracious living link to the legacy of his father.

VJAČESLAV I. IVANOV AND THE QUESTION OF ART.
THE ROMAN NOTEBOOK: FEBRUARY 18, 1944
“NUDUS SALTA! CEL’ ISKUSSTVA”¹

ROBERT LOUIS JACKSON

[...] я слышал с неба зов:
“Покинь, служитель, храм украшенный бесов.”
И я бежал...
(V.I. Ivanov, ‘Palinodija’, 1937)

Как тяжело ходить среди людей
И притворяться непогибшим,
И об игре трагической страстей
Повествовать еще не жившим.

И, вглядываясь в свой ночной кошмар,
Строй находить в нестройном вихре чувства,
Чтобы по бледным заревам искусства
Узнали жизни гибельной пожар!
(Aleksandr Blok, May 10, 1910)

“Nudus salta! Цель искусства –
Без покровов, без оков
Показать, кто ты таков,
Темные поведать чувства
Заповедных тайников –

Все, что в омутах роится
Под блестящим, гладким льдом, –
Распечатать мертвый дом,
Где от бела дня таится
Подсознательный Содом.”

– Мне священна Муз ограда.
Жару чистых алтарей
Дар мой – агнец лучший стада
И плоды, первины сада,
Не гнездо нетопырей.

Музам горный ключ породы
Мил и в пустынях природы
Чобр и тмин, и дикий злак.
Лей очистительные воды,
Отвратясь, в подземный мрак.
(Iz 'Rimskogo dnevnika', Rim, 18 fevralja 1944)

Ivanov's untitled poem appears in his 'Rimskij dnevnik' with the date February 18, 1944. The poem is based on the final typescript copy of the poem. Three earlier typescript versions of the poem date from February 15 through 17, 1944.² The poem underwent some small but significant changes in those few days. In the course of my analysis I shall have occasion to refer to the evolution of the poem.

The poem consists of four stanzas of five lines each. On the semantic plane the poem may be divided into two parts, each consisting of two stanzas. The first two stanzas – for convenience's sake only I shall refer to them as part one of the poem – appear in quotation marks. In this part of the poem an unidentified persona issues a command: "Nudus salta!" ("Dance naked!"), declaring, in sum, that the "purpose of art" is to disclose the cavernous and carnal underground of human nature. In part two of the poem, that is, the third and fourth stanzas, the poet himself steps forth and, avoiding any direct polemic with the speaker in part one, declares his devout commitment to the Muses: a classical and pastoral world where art and the artist are characterized by their sacrificial and devotional functions. In the final line of the poem the poet returns to the theme of the underground, suggesting, with an imperative of his own, that art may play a purifying role in man's dark underworld.

Let me examine the poem in greater detail.

Part one of the poem posits a hidden netherworld of "temnye [...] čuvstva" (dark [...] feelings), a chthonic realm of passions out of sight and off limits. The poet speaks of "pokrovy" (covers), "okovy" (fetters), "zapoved-

nyj tajnik" (a secret hiding place or recess); he refers to "omuty [...] pod l'dom" (deep hollows or pits at the bottom of a river or lake³ [...] under the ice); a "mertvyj dom" and, finally – hiding in the dead house – an almost anthropomorphic "podsoznatel'nyj Sodom".

Ivanov's end rimes in the second, third and fifth lines of stanza one lead the reader to the nethermost "house" of debauchery – "l'dom", "mertvyj dom", "Sodom". Enclosure is the dominant spatial motif in the first part of the poem. In the early drafts of the poem the "unconscious Sodom" is not only inhabiting the "dead house", but is "hiding from God's punishment" ("[...] gde ot Bož'ich kar tait'sja/podsoznatel'nyj Sodom"); in a second version "a spellbound Sodom" ("zakoldovannyj Sodom") is hiding from God's punishment ("[...] gde ot Bož'ich kar tait'sja/zakoldovannyj Sodom"). In the final typescript of the poem Ivanov replaced "ot Bož'ich kar" with "ot bela dnja" and restored "podsoznatel'nyj Sodom", thus veiling the notion that Sodom – our unconscious – is under a spell in the dead house and that his great antagonist is God. We may note in passing that Ivanov's lines echo, though with a different emphasis, his view expressed in *Éllinskaja religija stradajuščego boga* (*The Hellenic Religion of the Suffering God*), "to wit, that "the principle of cosmos and order in everything, having effected a profound transformation of our inner primeval chaos yet not transformed it altogether, has outwardly subdued it and confined it to the sphere of the subconscious, whence it breaks out volcanically in destructive eruptions".⁴

The carnal instincts, then, have been committed to deep and dreamy dungeons. Art's function, according to the speaker in part one, is to give full expression to man's repressed or suppressed impulses and drives. In "dancing naked" we cast off our "fetters", our "covers", our restraints and awaken the "unconscious Sodom". Taken literally, the command "Nudus salta!" in Ivanov's poem might be seen as a call for a dance of debauchery and death, a kind of *danse macabre*; esthetically the injunction to "unseal the dead house" ("raspečatat' mertvyj dom") is a command to disclose human nature precisely and naturalistically. The purpose of art, one may conclude from the first two stanzas of the poem, is revelation of the flesh. The moral corollary of the speaker's naturalism is "vse dozvoleno".

The speaker in the first part of the poem is very clear about his prescription: to "dance naked", whether literally or figuratively, is not merely to disclose an *aspect* of ourselves hidden from the light of day, but "to show who you [i.e. we] are" ("pokazat' kto ty takov"). Sodom, then, defines our identity. In unsealing the dead house we disclose carnal nature, that is, *human* nature. Thus the esthetic program of the speaker in part one is predicated upon a distinct worldview – a thoroughly *despiritualized* view of man.

Part two of Ivanov's poem opposes the sacred world of the Muses to the profane world of Sodom. The poet, that is, the creator of the whole poem,

in contrast to the speaker in part one, acknowledges the existence of two worlds, each of which impinges upon the other. He himself, however, stands with the sacred and with the purified and purifying art that is organic to it.

Before turning to the second part of the poem I would like to call attention to two literary allusions that fortify the poet's critique of a de-spiritualized art and of a moral underground. I distinguish, of course, between the point of view of the unidentified speaker in part one and the point of view of the poet – a view that embraces the entire poem and organizes for us an organic and integrated structure of images and meaning.

The phrase "mertvyj dom" most obviously signals Dostoevskij's presence in the poem. Yet it is not only *Zapiski iz mertvogo doma* (or, for that matter, *Zapiski iz podpol'ja*) that is echoed here – to this specific allusion I shall return at the end of my discussion. The call to unseal the dead house and to awaken the unconscious Sodom brings to mind, also, the lugubrious and lubricious world of the "contemporary corpses" ("sovremennyj mertvec") in Dostoevskij's pseudo-grotesque sketch, 'Bobok' – a work in which Dostoevskij parodies, among other things, the debased realism, or naturalism, of a de-spiritualized world.⁵ This world finds its most perfect representative in the cynical and Sadean figure of Baron Klinevič. Awakening with other corpses and surveying a sepulchral world of still-living, yet rapidly decomposing corpses (only two months and then – "bobok", "bobok"), Baron Klinevič (a variant of the Marquis de Sade) invites his fellow corpses in their remaining time unashamedly to engage in a debauch of unbridled sensuality. Like Sade, Baron Klinevič has a very clear sense of the role of narrative art in the breakdown of moral culture. He proposes a kind of symposium, or Decameron, of the dead, in which nobody will lie. Here is Klinevič's "Nudus salta!":

- Мы все будем вслух рассказывать наши истории и уже ничего не стыдиться. Я прежде всех про себя расскажу. Я, знаете, из плотоядных. Все это там вверху было связано гнилыми веревками. Долой веревки, и проживем эти два месяца в самой бесстыдной правде! Заголимся и обнажимся!
- Обнажимся! обнажимся! – закричали во все голоса.
- Я ужасно, ужасно хочу обнажиться! – взвизгивала Авдотья Игнатьевна [...]
- Главное, что никто не может нам запретить.

("We'll each tell our stories to the others and be ashamed of nothing. I'll tell you about myself first of all. I'm a carnivore in essence, you see. Up there, all such things were held together with rotten ropes. Down with ropes! Let's live these two months in the most shameless truth! Let's bare our bodies and our souls!' 'Let us bare ourselves!' cried all the voices. 'I'm terribly, terribly

eager to bare myself,' squealed Avdot'ja Ignat'evna [...] – The main thing is that nobody can stop us. [...])

The frame narrator of 'Bobok' refers to this scene as "razvrat", "razvrat poslednich upovanij, razvrat drjablych i gnijuščich trupov" ("debauchery, debauchery of last hopes, debauchery of feeble and rotting corpses").

'Bobok' is Dostoevskij's discourse on the moral and esthetics of the grave of contemporary society: *Telling all* is the literary corollary of moral "bezobrazie"; it preludes for Dostoevskij the final breakdown of moral culture: the loss of all measure and restraint, the breaking of all taboos, imminent death. It is no accident that in 'Bobok' the symptoms of a declining moral and social order are felt first of all in the breakdown of the sense of form. Dostoevskij provides several illustrations, for example: the narrator, Ivan Ivanyč, who loses control of his language, whose "style" becomes hackneyed – "u tebja, govorit (moj prijatel'), slog menjaetsja, rublenyj. Rubiš', rubiš'" ("your style is changing [...] It's like mincemeat. You chop things finer and finer"); or the hackneyed artist who, painting in the style of a naturalistic realism, meticulously depicts the warts on the narrator's face. "Idei-to net, tak oni teper' na fenomenach vyezžajut. Nu i kak že u nego na portrete udalis' moi borodavki, – živye! Èto oni realizmom zovūt," Ivan Ivanyč exclaims ironically ("They don't have any ideas, you see, so now they go to town on these phenomena. But what a job he did on my warts in the portrait – they're alive! They call that realism").

Ivanov, in the first part of the poem, echoes the themes and imagery of 'Bobok': unbridled sensuality, fetters (the "rotten ropes"), nakedness and shamelessness. In this connection, it is noteworthy that he foregrounds precisely the motif of shamelessness in an early draft of his poem:

Nudus salta! Цель искусства,
Свободясь от всех оков,
Не стыдись, что ты таков... (и т. д.)
(my italics – R.L.J.)

("Nudus salta! The goal of art, / Freeing oneself from all chains, / showing no shame for what you are [...])

For poetic-semantic reasons, Ivanov changed the second and third lines to read: "Bez pokrovov, bez okov, / Pokazat' kto ty takov". On semantic and sound levels "Bez pokrovov" inaugurates the refrain of fetters that echo in the rimes of the second, fourth and fifth lines of stanza one ("okov", "-akov", "-ikov"). Ivanov dropped the words "ne stydjas" – yet shamelessness is clearly implicit in the moral-esthetic program of the unidentified speaker: "Nudus salta! [...] Bez pokrovov". The word "pokrov" means "cover", but it also has an important related use, as in "Pokrov presvjatyja Bogorodicy" – the Protective veil of the Virgin or in the feast of the Intercession. Thus an art

or esthetic that tears away the "pokrov" not only is shameless, but is implicitly devoid of spiritual-religious guidance or patronage. Such an esthetic opens up the abyss of metaphysical evil – a phenomenon that preoccupies Gogol' in his story 'Portret'.⁶

In the second part of Ivanov's poem the action shifts from darkness to the "light of day" ("bela dnja"). Here we cannot but note a contiguity between Ivanov's poem and Tjutčev's 'Den' i noč', Ivanov's "pod blestjaščim, gladkim l'dom", his "bela dnja", his "pokrov" recalls Tjutčev's "Den' – sej blistatel'nyj pokrov" ("Day – that brilliant cover") which hides the "bezymjannaja bezdna" ("nameless abyss").

День – сей блистательный покров –
 День, земнородных оживленье,
 Души болящей исцеленье,
 Друг человек и богов!

Ivanov's poem, as I shall point out again, echoes the motif of healing ("iscelenie") at its conclusion. The coming of night, however, in Tjutčev's poem brings an ominous baring of the abyss:

Но меркнет день – настала ночь;
 Пришла – и мира рокового
 Ткань благодатную покрыва,
 Сорвав, отбрасывает прочь...
 И бездна нам обнажена
 Со своими страхами и мглами,
 И нет преград меж ней и нами –
 Вот отчего нам ночь страшна.

The theme of "obnaženie" is central to both Dostoevskij's 'Bobok' and Ivanov's poem. Tjutčev does not link "obnaženie" with the motif of sensuality, but I think the suggestion is there. What "noč'" does in Tjutčev's poem is what Ivanov's speaker in part one calls upon art to do: it tears away the "pokrov", or cover, and opens up the abyss: Ivanov's "tajnik", "omut", "mertvyj dom", "Sodom". In Dostoevskij's subterranean dead house and Ivanov's underworld of the unconscious what is particularly ominous and terrible, to put it in Tjutčev's words, is that "there are no barriers between the abyss and us" ("I net pregrad mež nej i nami"). That is, the abyss is *in us*.

Unlike Tjutčev, however, Ivanov in his poem distances himself from his abyss by putting it in quotation marks, that is, making it the pronouncement of somebody else. Yet the poetic and dramatic power of part one suggests that the poet, even as he resolutely turns away from the abyss, fully acknowledges its depth and temptation, its power in human nature. Part one ends with the impressive and terrifying words: "Podsozatel'nyj Sodom" –

terrifying precisely because Sodom is not an external, visible enemy belonging to the day, but an internal, intangible, nocturnal enemy who inhabits the dungeon of the spirit and attacks by stealth.

This motif of turning away from the abyss is apparent not only in the final line of the whole poem, but in the opening line of part two: "Mne svjaščenna Muz ograda". The poet in part two of his poem does not engage in a point by point refutation of the views on art set forth in part one; he does not use prescriptive language; he does not heavy-handedly say: "the purpose of art" is this and that. He approaches his theme indirectly, but personally. "Mne svjaščenna Muz ograda". He forcefully reminds us here that he is *not* the speaker in the first two stanzas. His habitation is not "le dom (l'dom)",⁷ not the "mertvyj dom", not "Sodom". His use of the word "svjaščenna" immediately marks the shift from the profane world of the underground to the high ground of the sacred.

What is it that is sacred to the poet? "Muz ograda". The word "ograda" may be understood in two related ways: it may mean enclosure or fence or wall, but it may also mean the protection or patronage that somebody affords. And, indeed, the poet places himself under the protection or guardianship of the Muses (the theme of "ograda", it should be noted in passing, picks up the earlier image and motif of "pokrov", or Protective veil, in the poem's subtext). Yet "ograda" also means "enclosure", as I have noted. Sacred to the poet is the enclosure of the Muses ("Muz ograda"). He chooses the classic sacred ground and patronage of the Muses, of Dionysiā – grounds (I cite Ivanov's words in *Hellenic Religion*) where "great art" was born in the Dionysian rites and sacrifices, or services. Ivanov's "Muz ograda" most certainly alludes to a specific part of the Acropolis. Thus he writes again in *Hellenic Religion*:

This enclosure, which housed a theater and two temples of different antiquity, was the most important arena of Dionysiac art. Here the tragic muse first revealed herself to the human spirit in beauty's unfading forms.

Dionysiac worship or ritual, resulting in the art form of tragedy, is – in Ivanov's *Hellenic Religion* – a conflation of both Apollonian and Dionysiac elements, of both suffering and harmony: as in "rightful raving" – a madness expressing itself in sacred and prophetic ravings and raptures. "A fine line divided the redemptive from the destructive effects of the terrible Dionysiac element," writes Ivanov in *Hellenic Religion*. "They found rapture on the edge of the abyss, in the whirlwind of orgies, in the breath of a frenzied god."

How much of this vision of paradoxical and paroxysmal Dionysiac religious ethos, we may ask, is to be found in Ivanov's late poem "Nudus salta!"⁸ Do the Apollonian and Dionysiac, destructive and redemptive, the

sacred and the profane fuse with one another in Ivanov's poem as they do in *Hellenic Religion*? Do they exist in creative tension with one another as they do in Ivanov's later 'Precepts of Symbolism' ('Zavety simvolizma') – an essay in which Ivanov finds in Tjutčev's imagery and poetic thought the matrix of Russian Symbolism. The artist (and man), Ivanov writes there, in order to preserve his individuality,

limits his thirst to merge with the "limitless" [bespredel'nym], his striving for "oblivion" [samozabveniju], for "annihilation" [uničtoženiju], for "a blending with the slumbering world" [smešeniju s dremljuščim mirom].

He turns to the clear forms of daytime existence, to the patterns of "the gold-clothed veil" [zlatokannogo pokrova] thrown by the gods onto "the mysterious world of spirits" [mir tainstvennych duchov], onto "the nameless abyss" [bezdu bezymjannuju], that is, the [abyss] that does not find its name in the language of daytime consciousness and external experience [...].

Yet at the same time Ivanov insists on the centrality of the Dionysian element in experience and art.

And nonetheless [i vse ž], the most valuable moment in experience and the most prophetic in creation is submergence in that contemplative ecstasy where there are "no barriers" between us and the "naked abyss" that opens up – in Silence.⁹

The worlds of Tjutčev's "den" and "noč" ("we now call them Apollon and Dionysus," Ivanov remarks in 'Zavety')¹⁰ seem to complement each other in Ivanov's explication. In "Nudus salta", however, the Apollonian-Dionysiac tension or dialogue has been radicalized and transformed into stark antitheses and choices.¹¹ It is a sober and chastened poet (like the persona of Blok's poem in the epigraph of this essay) that composes in 1944 the cautionary, almost didactic "Nudus salta". Ivanov no longer celebrates "submergence in that contemplative ecstasy where there are 'no barriers' between us and the 'naked abyss'". The silent abyss now emerges as an ominous, carnal, Dostoevskian "podpol'e"¹² – one which has its own spokesman. The "mertvyj dom", on the one hand, and the "Muz ograda", on the other, stand in stark opposition to one another, despite the clear identification of the "ograda" with Ivanov's beloved sacred grounds of Dionysus. Dionysus is "more mighty in the soul of Tjutčev than is Apollon", Ivanov wrote in 'Zavety'.¹³ In "Nudus salta", however, we may say that Apollon is "more mighty" in the soul of Ivanov than is Dionysus, that is, it is Apollon who establishes the terms and direction of the dialogue in "Nudus salta".

Puškin in 'Poët' speaks of Apollon calling upon the poet to participate in "sacred sacrifice" ("Poka ne trebuet poëta / K svjaščennoj žertve Apollon"). In 'Poët i tolpa' he refers to the poet's art in terms of "služen'e, altar' i žertvoprinošen'e". These motifs recur in Ivanov's poem. The fires of Ivanov's "čistych altarej" seem readied for a ritual cleansing and purification of the soul of its "podsoznatel'nyj Sodom". And, indeed, the motif of healing, of "iscelenie", is central to the poem. Yet these sacred fires stand ready for another symbolic offering:

Жару чистых алтарей
Дар мой – агнец лучший стада
И плоды, первины сада,
Не гнездо нетопырей.

The poet's "dar", his "gift" – the "agnec lučšij stada; plody, perviny sada" – contrasts strikingly with the "гнездо нетопырей": bats, creatures of the caverns and of the night who lie outside or beneath the sacred grounds of the Muses. The poet's "gift" ("dar"), of course, is also his "talent" ("dar"), the art he dedicates to the Muses. That art with all its "fruits" is a product of his higher nature, not his darker side, the "nest of bats", the hellish world that he, like Dante, has passed through both as man and poet; for while the poet is not the speaker in part one of the poem, the speaker nonetheless is part of the poet and his experience. The negativity of that nocturnal world of bats and of the poet's emphatic rejection of it are conveyed obliquely in the thrice repeated syllables "ne, ne, ne" that structure the phrase: "Ne, гнездо нетопырей".¹⁴

The nest of bats signals a steep, if momentary, descent into the cavernous underworld. Space here is oppressive. In his choice of the Muses the poet also moves in a world of defined limits: the enclosure with its rituals of service and sacrifice. Yet in choosing the enclosure ("Muz ograda"), the world of Apollonian form, the poet in fact moves into the high and open spaces of the spirit, a divinized world of nature governed by the cyclical rhythms and rituals of the pastoral world of animal husbandry, the orchard, the garden and the desert.

The opening of the last stanza of the poem marks a radical ascent to the mountains: the highest point in the poem and in the poem's mythic universe. The habitation of the Muses is not a deep, not a dungeon, not a cavern inhabited by bats, but the mountains where water – not the roiling water in dark hollows at the bottom of a river, but the water of the pure spring – comes forth from the rock strata.¹⁵ The "gornyj ključ porody" of Ivanov's poem surely alludes to the Castalian Spring (sacred to the Muses) on the slopes of Parnassus in Greece. The mountain has two peaks, both frequented by the

Muses: one peak was sacred to Dionysus and the other to Apollo. Dear to the Muses, too, are the herbs and grasses that flourish in the deserts of nature.

The poem's final two stanzas with its references to "sad", "plody", the pair of spices "čobr i tmin", "gornyj ključ porody" and "čistitel'nye vody" may also echo lines, or images, from the biblical 'Song of Songs' ('Pesn' pesnej'), particularly from chapter iv, 14-16:

13:

Рассадники твои – сад с
гранатовыми яблоками, с
превосходными плодами, киперы с нардами.

14:

Нард и шафран, аир и корица со
всякими благовонными деревьями,
мирра и алой со всякими лучшими
ароматами;

15:

Садовый источник – колодезь живых
вод и потоки с Ливана.

16:

Поднимись ветер с севера и
принесись с юга, повеи на сад мой, – и
полюются ароматы его! Пусть придет
возлюбленный мой в сад свой и
вкушает сладкие плоды его.¹⁶

Allusions to the 'Pesn' pesnej' in Ivanov's poem would also mark a logical shift in the poem from the unbridled sensuality of "Sodom" in the first part of the poem to a richly sensuous, lyric eroticism of 'Pesn' pesnej' – an eroticism that constitutes a lofty counterpart to that of the "zapovednyj tajnik".

The fourth and final stanza of Ivanov's poem starts in the mountains and descends to the desert. The descent, however, ends at the entrance to the underground. The poem that begins with a command ends with another command:

Лей очистительные воды,
Отвратись, в подземный мрак.

Here is the poet Ivanov's most overt statement (significantly in the shape of an image) on the function of great art. The most lofty role of art is cathartic: purification of man's dark instinctual underworld – the "podzemnyj mrak". Indeed, Ivanov's whole poem performs this function. The poet, paradoxical-

ly, does in his poem what the speaker in part one calls upon art to do: he unseals the dead house, but not to celebrate the dark instincts of human nature, but to spiritualize, or, at least, to neutralize them.

The poet "turns away" as he pours his purifying waters into the poisonous subterranean darkness. His gesture contains an element of moral revulsion, but, I believe, not squeamishness. The poet, after all, already has descended into the underground and ascended to the heights of the Muses. He now returns to the underground entrance *not* to descend into it again but, like Dostoevskij in *Zapiski iz mertvogo doma*, symbolically to reclaim it. Thus Ivanov's poem, like Dante's *Commedia* and Dostoevskij's *Mertvyj dom*, is simultaneously a testimonial, an initiation and an act of redemption. As a work of art – here I borrow words from Ivanov's *Hellenic Religion* – the poem is a kind of "spiritual reeducation which the contemporary psyche undoubtedly needs".

Such were the thoughts of Vjačeslav I. Ivanov on the question of art February 18, 1944.

Ivanov's "Nudus salta" completes a movement that is already dramatically signalled in 'Palinodija' ('Recantation', 1927):

И твой гиметский мед ужель меня пресытил?
Из роци миртовой кто твой кумир похитил?
Иль в вешем ужасе я сам его разбил?
Ужели я тебя, Эллада, разлюбил?
Но, духом обнищав, твоей не знал я ласки,
И жутки стали мне души недвижимой маски.
И тел надменных свет, и дум Эвклидов строй.
Когда ж, подземных флейт разымчивой¹⁷ игрой
В урочный час ожив, личины полой очи
Мятежною тоской неукротимой ночи,
Как встарь, исполнились – я слышал с неба зов:
"Покинь, служитель, храм украшенный бесов."
И я бежал, и ем в предгорьях Фиваиды
Молчанья дикий мед и жесткие акриды.

The persona of 'Palinodija' presents himself as one who had not merely inhabited the "decorative temple of the devils", but as one ("služitel") who had served the cult of that temple. Like the traveller Dante in 'Purgatorio I', the poem's narrator has just escaped from the underground. His condition is purgatorial: "[...] em v predgor'jach Fivaidy / Molčan'ja dikij med i žestkie akridy."

In "Nudus salta" the poet's connection with the devils' temple has been completely severed. Only the unexpectedly personal and demonstrative line, "Mne svjaščenna Muz ograda", hints, perhaps, that the poet's choice of the Muses may also have come with a struggle. The poet, in any case, now

identifies himself with the purifying springs of the mountains and the lofty dwelling places of the muses. Yet the poet, as we have seen, has not abandoned entirely the world of Dionysian art. Rather, he has purified it. Even in 'Palinodija' Ivanov does not state directly that he had "fallen out of love" with Hellas. He only asks in astonishment whether he has, indeed, fallen out of love ("Uželi ja tebja, Éllada, razljubil?"). The answer, as "Nudus salta" confirms, is yes and no. The poet has turned away from the devil's dead house, but not entirely from the classical world.

'Palinodija' not only marks the poet's escape from the temple of the devils, but his return to the Apollonian world of Puškin. Not accidentally does Ivanov's poem, in theme and imagery, echo Puškin's disenchantment in 'V načale žizni' (1830) with the immobile sculptured, classical, underground world of "idols" ("kumiry, Del'fijskij idol, sladostrastnyj [...] lživyj ideal – volšebnyj demon") in the "alien garden" of his youth; and echo, equally, Puškin's renewed allegiance (in his 1830 poem) to the humble and heavenly beauty and wisdom of his Madonna-like mentor of school days.

Но я вникал в ее беседы мало.
 Меня смущала строгая краса
 Ее чела, спокойных уст и взоров,
 И полные святыни словеса.

The poet who had strayed – "i často ja ukradkoj ubegal / v velikolepnyj mrak čužogo sada" – now recalls the "stern beauty" ("strogaja краса") of his sanctified teacher, gives heed to her stern guidance:

Но видом величаяя жена
 Над школою надзор хранила строго.

The "gloom" of the classical garden *into* which the young Puškin "escapes" ("ubegal") as a youth, the mature Ivanov "escapes" *from* ("bežal"). Ivanov in 'Palinodija' responds to a "call from heaven", but it is also a call from Puškin, the poet of absolute truths.¹⁸

In "Nudus salta" Ivanov completes a movement from *Éllinskaja religija* through 'Zavety simvolizma' and 'Palinodija'. Old passions, old idols, have been cast out or exorcized; old syntheses outgrown. Not the gloom of Dostoevskij's "underground", not the ambiguous Dionysiac world, but Puškin's lofty Apollonian realm of "služen'e, altar' i žertvoprinošen'e" is celebrated. What emerges in the poem is the outline of a new synthesis of a purified classicism and Christianity. Of Christianity nothing is said in the poem, but what is *indicated* is unmistakable: "Dar moj – agnec lučšij stada."

NOTES

- 1 An earlier condensed version of this essay, read at the Sixth International Symposium of the *Vyacheslav I. Ivanov Convivium* in Budapest (June 12-16, 1995), was published under the same title in *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 41, Budapest 1996, pp. 87-95.
- 2 The original variants may be found in the archives of Vjačeslav I. Ivanov under the care of Dmitrij V. Ivanov in Rome.
- 3 Also a whirlpool, or rapid currents swirling in deep hollows or pits at the bottom of a river. A well known Russian proverb runs: "V tichom omute čerti vodjatsja", that is, under the quiet surface much that is devilish, unpleasant or simply unexpected may be taking place.
- 4 My citations in English here and elsewhere in my text from Ivanov's *Éllinskaja religija stradajuščego boga* are taken from Carol Anschuetz's English translation, *The Hellenic Religion of the Suffering God*, scheduled for publication by Yale University Press in 1998.
- 5 See my discussion of 'Bobok' in *The Art of Dostoevsky. Deliriums and Nocturnes*, Princeton, NJ 1981, pp. 288-303.
- 6 Gogol's corrupted painter in 'Portret', depicting-reality in a naturalistic way, not only opens up a demonic reality, but becomes an instrument of evil, of the devil. The "faithful, slavish imitation of nature", Gogol' writes in the second version of 'Portret', is like a "transgression" ("prostupok"); it affects you "like a piercing, discordant scream". See my essay, 'Gogol's "The Portrait": The Simultaneity of Madness, Naturalism, and the Supernatural', in *Essays on Gogol. Logos and the Russian Word* (edited by Susanne Fusso and Priscilla Meyer), Evanston, Illinois 1992, pp. 105-111.
- 7 "L'dom": Is there an echo here to the once popular historical novel *Ledjanoj dom* (1835) by Ivan I. Lažečnikov (1792-1869)? The central image of the novel, an "ice palace" ("ledjanoj dvorec") actually existed. In Lažečnikov's novel 'Ledjanoj dom' is a symbol of the reign of Anna Ioannovna and despotic authority; it casts a shadow on all aspects of the novel's intrigue and passions. The "ice house", then, is a fitting image for Ivanov's dark and ominous underworld.
- 8 One detects in the poem, as in a medieval palimpsest, a faint trace of the "breath of a frenzied god". Ivanov's oxymoronic "zapovednyj tajnik" may constitute a reminiscence of Dionysiac "rapture at the edge of the abyss". "Zapovednyj tajnik" does not lend itself to easy translation. "Tajnik" has the meaning of "hiding place", "cache", of "recess". "Zapovednyj" is often used in the sense of reserve, e.g. "zapovednyj les" – "forest reserve", "preserve" or "sanctuary" – a place where one may be forbidden to go, or, in any case, where one is forbidden to cut down trees. "Zapovednyj" carries with it the idea of prohibition, but also the notion of the "sacral" or the "holy" (see, for example, "zapoved'" – precept, commandment, as in the ten commandments). The notion of a "zapovednyj tajnik", then, presents a disturbing ambiguity of

meaning. In the context of the stanza the phrase suggests something sinister: a secret hiding place or dwelling where morally reprehensible things take place; yet in the Dionysiac context this same hiding place may be a holy place, recesses or grounds where primitive rites, rituals or sacrifices, may take place. "Zapovednyj tajnik", in this interpretation, takes on the character of a secret, yet sacred place of corruption, or, to borrow words from Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, a place where "holiness and pollution are not yet differentiated".

⁹ See 'Zavety simvolizma', in Vjačeslav Ivanov, *Sobranie sočinenij*, II, Brussels 1974, pp. 590, 591.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 591.

¹¹ Ivanov seems to have taken leave of the orgiastic underground with a shudder: "Nikogda ne dopuskaet v sebe podpol'e," Ivanov is reported to have said on one occasion to his daughter, Lydia Ivanova (from a conversation between Vasily Rudich [Yale University] and Lydia Ivanova). See also Ivanov's poem 'Palinodija' (1927), discussed in this essay, for an expression of his renunciation at least of the "devils" ("besy") of the Dionysiac world.

¹² Ivanov's "mertvyj dom", of course, is Dostoevskij's "podpol'e".

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ The dark and unsettling connotations of "gneздо netopyrej" find support in the Russian folk saying: "Netopyr' zaetaet v dom, k bede." Ivanov must also have been familiar with the lascivious couplet that belongs to the Dubia of Puškin: "Deva, nog ne topyr' / zaletit netopyr'."

¹⁵ The water, of course, comes from down *below*, but is purified in the mountain spring.

¹⁶ I am grateful to Professor Marina Kostalevsky of Bard College for calling my attention to possible reminiscences of images in Ivanov's poem to the 'Song of Songs', as well as for some other helpful comments.

¹⁷ In the original manuscript and in *Sovremennye zapiski* (Vol. LXV, 1937), where the poem was published for the first time, the penultimate word in the 8th line read: "bezumjaščeij" instead of "razymčivoj". For an exhaustive analysis of 'Palinodija', see Pamela Davidson's recent essay, 'Hellenism, Culture and Christianity: The Case of Vyacheslav Ivanov and His "Palinode" of 1927', *Russian Literature and The Classics* (edited by Peter I. Barta et al.), Amsterdam 1996, pp. 83-116.

¹⁸ In his discussion 'The Nest of Gentlefolk and the "Poetry of Marriage and the Hearth"', Waclaw Lednicki refers to Puškin as the poet of "absolute truths and the laws which derive from these truths, [laws which] in the poet's opinion, govern man's life inexorably". See *Bits of Table Talk on Pushkin, Mickiewicz, Goethe, Turgenev and Sienkiewicz*, The Hague 1956, p. 60. Lednicki earlier expounded these views in his book, *Aleksander Puszkyn*, Cracow 1926.

THE "RESPONSIVE POETICS" OF VJAČESLAV IVANOV

MICHAEL WACHTEL

1.

From the very inception of his literary career, Vjačeslav Ivanov's penchant for archaisms, complicated syntax, and esoteric allusions gave him the reputation of a "difficult" poet.¹ While these elements undoubtedly perplexed numerous contemporaries (one went so far as to deem his verse a "philological nightmare"),² there is little reason why they should remain stumbling blocks for today's scholars. To begin with, poets such as Pasternak, Mandel'stam, Chlebnikov, and Cvetaeva have inured Slavists to difficulty. To the careful and systematic reader, Ivanov's verse yields its mysteries more readily than that of many other modern Russian poets. His often convoluted syntax, for example, can be deciphered given sufficient patience and intellectual curiosity. His archaisms and obscure allusions can be traced through a host of dictionaries and encyclopedias (which, it might be noted, the *poeta doctus* Ivanov was himself not above consulting).³

It seems to me that for today's readers, the most fundamental difficulty in Ivanov's poetry lies elsewhere. Numerous memoirists recall Ivanov as an extraordinary conversationalist with a rare ability to comprehend and develop his interlocutors' ideas. Ivanov's poetic practice, I would argue, is linked to a similar impulse. With astonishing regularity, he uses his verses to *respond*: both to his contemporaries (the numerous personal dedications that precede individual poems give ample testimony to this) and to his "eternal companions" (as evidenced in the frequent epigraphs from the poets and thinkers who comprise his own highly selective canon). When Ivanov directly names

his interlocutor, he supplies essential information, which allows, even invites, the reader to reconstruct the context. The more exactly one can establish this "missing half" of a conversation (or, to use a slightly different image, this point of departure), the easier it is to comprehend the poem.

Particularly thorny problems arise when the interlocutor remains unnamed. In such cases, the reader may not even be aware that a discussion is underway. In other words, if – according to Goethe's celebrated dictum – every poem is an "occasional poem" ("Gelegenheitsgedicht"), then Ivanov's would-be interpreters are often in the unenviable position of having the poem, but not the vaguest notion of the occasion that inspired it.

Ivanov himself conceived of literary history as a conscious process of evolution: "Every poet finds poetry on a certain level of development. He tries either to move it further, or, if he finds that it has been moving in the wrong direction, to change its direction."⁴ As a rule, Ivanov belonged to the first category. His relationship to Dante, Goethe, and Puškin was not one of rivalry, but rather an eager desire to continue their cause. We find in Ivanov's poetics far less patricide than we do ancestor worship. It is true that Ivanov's attitude toward his contemporaries – even within the Symbolist camp – was hardly uncritical. Yet by clinging to his policy of "unity in necessity,"⁵ he either avoided direct disagreements altogether or kept his polemics well hidden.

Whether inspired by approbation or disagreement, Ivanov's poetry is fundamentally reactive, and it is in the poems without explicit outside referent where Ivanov tends to be most inscrutable. For the present, I can only suggest the extent of this phenomenon. However, I hope that a close investigation of a few instances will make clear its importance. My aim is not simply to identify previously unrecognized sources, but to examine Ivanov's approach to them and thus reach a better understanding of his creative process.

2.

The image of a "tender mystery" ("nežnaja tajna") is unquestionably central to Ivanov's poetry, yet no one has ever inquired as to its origin. In the verse from the years 1908-1912, this phrase becomes a mantra of sorts. It first appears in a poem in the second part of *Cor Ardens* and then serves as the title of an entire book of Ivanov's verse, where the phrase recurs in numerous poems and contexts. In 1924, twelve years after this book appeared, Ivanov was to tell his student Elena Millior: "Mir – èto Nežnaja Tajna. Razve ne nežny solnečnye luči? Razve priroda ne nežna? Razve ne nežno pokoitsja zarodyš v čreve materi?"⁶ ("The world is the Tender Mystery. Are not the rays of the sun tender? Is nature not tender? Does a child not rest tenderly in its mother's womb?"). Such insistent repetition of a single image suggests

that the "tender mystery" should be understood as a symbol in Ivanov's special sense of the word, i.e., an element within the phenomenal world that also participates in the transcendent world. Because the symbol is by its very nature multi-valent, it can refer to several different things, which are all related in some macrocosmic scheme.⁷ In the Millior citation, for example, the tender mystery is associated with several images, all of which suggest the interpenetration of the phenomenal and the noumenal: the sun's rays, nature itself, and the as yet unborn child. Like many of Ivanov's fundamental symbols, the "tender mystery" has an autobiographical dimension as well as a literary and philosophical function: in the words of Ol'ga Deschartes, the book *Tender Mystery* "celebrates the communion of the living with the dead and the 'tender mystery' of birth"⁸ – that is, Ivanov's contact with the deceased Lidija Dmitrievna Zinov'eva-Annibal and, through her daughter, Vera Švarsalon, the birth of a son. It is noteworthy (and characteristic of the Russian Symbolists' generous interplay between the biographical and the literary spheres) that people close to Ivanov were well aware of the personal significance with which he endowed his symbols. In his memoirs, for example, a close friend of Ivanov and his family speaks of the "nežnaja tainstvennost'" ("tender mysteriousness") of Ivanov's relationship to Vera Švarsalon, and expresses amazement that Michail Kuz'min could have failed to understand this.⁹

Because a number of the poems in the collection *Tender Mystery* are explicitly linked to German poetry, I always suspected that the title itself reflected German influence. This idea was indirectly encouraged by Sergej Averincev, who, in response to my query during a 1988 discussion, commented that the phrase "tender mystery" – while unproblematic when translated into other languages – had always struck him as sounding slightly odd in Russian. Now, almost a decade later, I can lend support both to my own hunch and to Averincev's intuition.¹⁰

Among Schiller's epigrams, there appears the following two-line poem:

Der Homerkopf als Siegel

Treuer alter Homer! Dir vertrau' ich das zarte Geheimnis,
Um der Liebenden Glück wisse der Sänger allein.¹¹

(The Seal in the Form of Homer's Head

Loyal old Homer! To you I entrust the mystery tender,
Only the singer should know all that the lovers enjoy.)

Several aspects of these verses are noteworthy. Their form, which I have preserved in translation, is that of the distich, a modern stylization of a favorite meter of antiquity. The distich appears with some frequency in Schiller's work. The present example owes its existence to the *Xenien*, a

joint project of Schiller and Goethe, originally intended as a series of epigrams directed at literary enemies. In time, however, the poets became carried away by the rich possibilities of the form and began to compose distichs on a wide variety of subjects. Recognizing that many of these miniatures had little or no polemical thrust, Schiller ultimately removed a few dozen and published them in a loosely knit collection entitled *Tabulae votivae* (*Votive Tablets*). While these poems are unabashedly minor, they are far from obscure, and there can be little doubt that Ivanov was familiar with them. One can even show evidence of such an acquaintance: in *Transparence* (*Prozračnost*; 1904), Ivanov included 'Einem Weltverbesserer' ('To one who wishes to improve the world'), a poem dedicated to A.S. Jašenko.¹² His German title unambiguously recalls Schiller's own 'An einen Weltverbesserer', a poem included in the *Votive Tablets*.

'The Seal in the Form of Homer's Head' has few pretenses to profundity. Rather, it treats the eternal theme of love in a somewhat light-hearted fashion. The "tender mystery" in Schiller's verses is nothing more than an amorous missive to the beloved, which the poet is in the process of sealing. The fact that Homer is asked to bear sole witness to this "secret" produces a humorous effect. Homer appears here less as the progenitor of Western poetry (although that may play a secondary role), but rather because he is loyal, old and – most importantly, like love itself – he is blind. Since he cannot see there is little chance that he will betray the letter writer, his fellow poet.

With Schiller's epigram in mind, we turn to Ivanov's first poem explicitly dedicated to the theme of the "tender mystery". Entitled 'Sub Rosa', it is found in 'Rosarium', the fifth and final book of *Cor Ardens*.

Sub Rosa

Тайна, о братья, нежна: знаменуйте же тайное – розой,
Нежной печатью любви, милой улыбкой могил.¹³

(Brothers, the secret is tender: the rose is the name of this secret,
Tender impression of love, smile so dear of the graves.)

Beyond the striking repetition of the key phrase "tender mystery", there are several similarities that link Ivanov's poem to Schiller's. To begin with, Ivanov's laconic verses are written in the identical form: a distich. In Ivanov, as in Schiller, the "tender mystery" refers to love. Ivanov even borrows Schiller's image of the seal for closing letters (the German "Siegel"), making it into a figurative seal of love (in Russian, "pečat"). Through its Latin title, 'Sub Rosa' (literally "under the rose", but meaning "in secret") recalls the Roman tradition (the source of the phrase *tabulae votivae* and the whole genre of *Xenien*).

It seems clear that Schiller's distich served as the initial impetus for Ivanov's own. However, it is essential to pay attention not only to the myriad links to Schiller, but to the equally striking differences, for Ivanov's poem is ultimately distinct in both tone and message. Most importantly, Ivanov adds the rose, one of his central symbols, to Schiller's distich. 'Sub Rosa' is itself part of the 'Anthology of the Rose', a group of 21 distichs in which Ivanov's basic strategy consists of taking a scene from literature or myth and then grafting a rose onto it. This procedure is characteristic of 'Rosarium' as a whole, for the entire book reflects Ivanov's fascination with the rose in any number of cultures and civilizations. In this poetry, the significance of the rose cannot be limited to love.¹⁴ Like all true symbols, the rose contains a variety of potential significations. While Schiller's distich can easily be construed as a love poem, Ivanov's 'Sub Rosa' defies such simple categorization. Ivanov equates the tender mystery with a rose, then defines the rose in terms of the seal of love ("nežnoj pečat'ju ljubvi"), but also with an unmistakable image of death ("miloj улыбкой могил"). His distich does not describe a love intrigue, but concerns the profoundly mystical relationship of love and death (a pairing familiar to the reader of *Cor Ardens* from the title of the fourth book, the one that directly precedes 'Rosarium'). Rather than addressing his statement to a blind poet of antiquity, he speaks to certain nameless "brothers" ("brat'ja"), thereby adding a certain religious gravity to his statement. In short, while borrowing extensively and – it would seem, unambiguously – Ivanov completely alters the spirit of his source, turning a minor poem (in the erotic tradition) into a serious philosophical statement. In subsequent treatments of the "tender mystery", the themes of death, birth, and love are invariably intertwined and placed in an expressly Christian context, with Schiller's input receding increasingly into the background.

It is worth briefly considering the expanded version of 'Sub Rosa', the eponymous title poem of the 1912 collection *Tender Mystery*. This poem is longer (twenty lines) and considerably more complex, yet one can still recognize its debt to Schiller. Once again, the poem is in distichs and, in the final lines, the seal of love recurs in an almost verbatim repetition of 'Sub Rosa'.

Тайна, о братья, нежна: знаменуйте же Тайное Розой,
Тихой улыбкой могил, милой печатью любви.¹⁵

(Brothers, the secret is tender: the Rose is the name of this Secret,
Smile so quiet of graves, dear the impression of love.)

Moreover, Ivanov makes clear – in a way only implicit in both 'Der Homeruskopf' and 'Sub Rosa' – that his underlying image is that of a signet ring.¹⁶

В сердце, разлуки кольцом, вписала Любовь благовестье;
Смерть, возврата кольцом, запечатлела обет.

(Love with the ring of parting wrote into the heart its good tidings;
Death with the ring of return, placed its own seal on the oath.)

In these verses, the familiar seal (“pečat”) is supplemented by repeated references to a ring (“kol’co”). This fuller context is of course fraught with religious significance (e.g., the word “blagovest’e”), only hinted at in Ivanov’s earlier distich, and, of course, completely absent from Schiller’s model. In this way, Ivanov integrates Schiller’s suggestive imagery into a larger and symbolically richer context. It is crucial to recognize that Ivanov does *not* treat Schiller’s distich polemically. He accepts it fully, but also *responds* to it, expanding its potential.

The larger question still remains – what is the value of recognizing the source? Schiller’s poem may not be essential to a valid interpretation of Ivanov’s specific text, but it adds considerably to our understanding of his poetic practice. To begin with, it reveals a pattern of formal continuity fundamental to Ivanov’s conception of verse. Simply put, one distich inspires another. Yet it also demonstrates Ivanov’s freedom, his “poetic license”. Ivanov borrows a basic motif from his predecessor, but alters it according to his own spiritual convictions, allowing a fleeting detail to become a genuine “Symbol”. Schiller’s unassuming little poem thus becomes part of the arch-symbolist ‘Rosarium’ project, in which Ivanov synthesizes concepts and beliefs bequeathed to him by earlier civilizations, subsuming them under the infinitely suggestive symbol of the rose. The tender mystery is only one of many minor images in *Cor Ardens*, but it emerges to take a central place not only in Ivanov’s subsequent poetry, but even in his worldview.

3.

My first inquiry into Ivanov’s “responsive poetics” was limited to a fixed form of two lines – the distich. My second comes from a fixed form of fourteen lines: the sonnet. Ivanov has always been recognized as a master of the sonnet. He turned to it repeatedly throughout his poetic career, using it in a variety of contexts, from the early Roman impressions in the “Italian sonnets” (*Pilot Stars*) to the celebrated “Roman Sonnets” of his final pilgrimage to Rome in 1924. It also served as the medium for his great love sonnet to Lidija Dmitrievna and later as the poetic outlet for his profound grief over her untimely death. The poem that I wish to examine is likewise commemorative, written on the occasion of the death of the composer Aleksandr Skrjabin. As he attested in numerous essays and poems, Ivanov con-

sidered Skrjabin a true artist-theurgist and perhaps the most powerful force in contemporary Russian culture. He explicitly compared Skrjabin to both Novalis and Orpheus¹⁷ – which, coming from Ivanov, was high praise indeed. In keeping with the concerns of this paper, I will focus on the specifically poetic dimensions of Ivanov’s sonnet, leaving its broader philosophical implications to others.¹⁸

Twelve days after Skrjabin’s unexpected death, Ivanov published a sonnet on the subject in the newspaper *Russkoe slovo* (*The Russian Word*). Given the proximity of dates, it would be logical to understand Ivanov’s poem as an unmediated response to what he perceived as a personal, national, and even universal tragedy.

Памяти Скрябина

Осиротела Музыка. И с ней
Поэзия, сестра, осиротела.
Потух цветок волшебный, у предела
Их смежных царств, а пала ночь темней

На взморие, где новозданных дней
Всплывал ковчег таинственный. Истлела
От тонких молний духа риза тела,
Отдав огонь Источнику огней.

Исторг ли Рок, орлицей зоркой рея,
У дерзкого святыню Прометей?
Иль персть опламенил язык небес?

Кто скажет: побежден иль победитель,
По ком, – немея кладбищем чудес, –
Шептаньем лавров плачет Муз обитель?¹⁹

(In Memory of Skrjabin)

Music has been orphaned. And
Her sister Poetry was orphaned with her.
The magical blossom has died at the border
Of their adjoining kingdoms, and night has fallen darker

On the shore, where the mysterious ark of newly-created days
Has surfaced. The raiment of the body has smoldered
From the refined lightning-bolts of the spirit,
Having given up its fire to the Source of fires.

Did Fate, hovering like a keen-eyed eagle, tear away
The sacred object from daring Prometheus?
Or did the language of the heavens set the earth afire?

Who can say: conquered or conqueror
Of him, whom – falling silent in the graveyard of miracles –
The abode of the Muses mourns with the whispering of its laurels.)

This particular sonnet can serve as a worthy illustration of Ivanov's technical mastery. In the octet, which features a number of expressive enjambments (most strikingly, between the fourth and fifth lines), Ivanov places the emphasis less on Skrjabin's death than on its effect on Music and Poetry, here personified as sisters. (It should be recalled that Skrjabin's final unfinished work – known as the 'Predvaritel'noe dejstvie' ['Preparatory Act'] – combined music and poetry, and that Ivanov viewed this as the crowning achievement of the Symbolists' much-desired synthesis of the arts.) While Music and Poetry mourn, the "raiment of the body" (presumably Skrjabin's body) dissolves from the "lightning of the spirit". Joining microcosm with macrocosm, the body has given its individual fire back "to the Source of all fire" ("Istočniku ognj"). In the sestet, the motif of fire is developed when Skrjabin is likened to Prometheus, the titan who stole fire from the gods and gave it to man. In moving from the octet to the sestet, the poet's intonation shifts from indicative to interrogative. Ivanov essentially asks how Skrjabin's death should be interpreted. Did Fate steal back the fire from Prometheus, thus marking a setback for mankind? Or did the language of the heavens burn the earth, cleansing it with fire? The former would of course be a defeat, the latter a victory, since in his final work Skrjabin had expressly eschatological aims. In the eleventh line, Ivanov relies on a series of double meanings that relate the specific to the general. In the word "jazyk", he combines a purely metaphorical depiction of otherworldly speech ("jazyk" as "language") with a pictorial representation of lightning (as in the Russian "jazyk ognja" – a "tongue of fire"). In "perst" he refers specifically to the "dust" of the deceased Skrjabin, but also to the earth in general (as opposed to the heavens). Ivanov poses the question: "Who can say whether Skrjabin was conquered or conqueror?" But in his references to the graveyard of mysteries and the whispering of laurels, one senses that the question is rhetorical. In some way, Skrjabin has indeed emerged victorious.

This brief paraphrase of Ivanov's sonnet should suffice to introduce what I consider the immediate source of his poem: *not* Skrjabin's death, but Brjusov's sonnet on that very subject. It should be emphasized that Brjusov's poem appeared in print eight days before Ivanov's own.

На смерть А. Н. Скрябина

Он не искал – минутно позабавить,
Напевами утешить и пленить;
Мечтал о высшем: Божество прославить
И бездны духа в звуках озарить.

Металл мелодий он посмел расплавить
И в формы новые хотел излить;
Он неустанно жаждал жить и жить,
Чтоб завершённым памятник поставить,

Но судит Рок. Не будет кончен труд!
Расплавленный металл бесцельно стынет:
Никто его, никто в русло не двинет...

И в дни, когда Война вершит свой суд
И мысль успела с жатвой трупов сжиться, –
Вот с этой смертью сердце не мирится!²⁰

(On the Death of A.N. Skrjabin)

He did not seek to amuse for [only] a minute,
To console and captivate through tunes;
He dreamed of the highest: to praise Divinity
And to illuminate in sounds the abysses of the soul.

He dared to melt the metal of melodies
And wanted to pour them into new forms;
He constantly sought to live and live,
In order to create a monument through his accomplishment,

But Fate judges. The work will not be finished!
The molten metal cools idly:
No one, no one can set it in motion...

And even in the days, when War makes its judgment
And our thought has had time to grow accustomed to the harvest of
corpses, –

With this death our heart cannot be reconciled!)

In the history of the sonnet, there is a special subgenre known as the "sonetto di risposta", or the "responsive sonnet".²¹ The basic idea is that one poet writes a sonnet, and another answers it by writing a different sonnet using the same rhymes. We know that this type of technical challenge enjoy-

ed popularity among the poets who frequented Ivanov's "Tower". *Cor Ardens* itself includes such sonnets, in which Ivanov answered models created by Verchovskij, Kuzmin, and Gumilev.²²

I would argue that Ivanov's poem 'In Memory of Skrjabin' represents a different kind of "sonetto di risposta". In terms of form, Ivanov departs from the rhymes and even the rhyme scheme of his predecessor.²³ Yet the content is in every respect an answer to Brjusov's poem. The most deliberate signal is of course the word "Fate" ("Rok"), written by both poets with a capital letter and placed in the identical position of the ninth line.²⁴ But this is only the first of many striking resemblances.

Close examination reveals that virtually every aspect of Ivanov's sonnet is meant as a rejoinder to Brjusov's. In both poems, the intonation of the octet contrasts with that of the sestet. By moving from declarative to interrogative, Ivanov subtly questions Brjusov's shift from declarative to exclamatory. Brjusov's octet praises Skrjabin's lofty intentions, while his sestet bemoans the fact that the composer failed to achieve his goals. In this sestet, one finds the first hint of the fire imagery that Ivanov will subsequently develop, for Brjusov compares Skrjabin's task to working with molten metal. (The specific image recalls Vulcan and thus paves the way for another mythological figure – Prometheus – who appears in Ivanov's sonnet.)²⁵ In Brjusov's view, Skrjabin's death is most definitely a conclusion, "Nikto ego, nikto v ruslo ne dvinet..." ("No one, no one can set it in motion..."). To this emphatic "nikto" ("no one") of Brjusov's eleventh line, Ivanov answers in line twelve with an interrogative "kto skažet?" ("who can say?") – thereby throwing into doubt the certainty with which Brjusov evaluates Skrjabin's failure.

Once we recognize that Ivanov's interrogative intonation is meant to question the entire thrust of Brjusov's poem, we can see that the polemic extends even to the titles. Brjusov's 'Na smert' A.N. Skrjabina' ('On the Death of A.N. Skrjabin') emphasizes death, finality, ending. Ivanov's 'Pamjati Skrjabina' ('In Memory of Skrjabin'), by placing memory in the central position, is a statement of continuity, for, in Ivanov's conception, "Nad smert'ju večno toržestvuet, / V kom pamjat' večnaja živet" ("He in whom eternal memory lives, / Eternally triumphs over death.")²⁶

Why did Ivanov react so strongly – and so swiftly – to the sonnet of his erstwhile comrade in arms? Most probably, he was upset not simply by what he viewed as Brjusov's misunderstanding of the meaning of Skrjabin's death, but even more by the fact that Brjusov dared to speak about Skrjabin at all. Brjusov had hardly known Skrjabin and barely appreciated his artistic goals, whereas Ivanov had worked closely with the composer and championed his cause. Skrjabin represented precisely the kind of theurgic symbolism that Ivanov desired, whereas Brjusov had always insisted that theurgy had nothing whatever to do with Symbolism. As is well documented, this very issue

was at the center of the crisis of Russian Symbolism, and it contributed toward the dissolution of the movement. The uncharacteristic speed with which Ivanov published this particular sonnet strongly suggests that he was using it to "correct" Brjusov's own sonnet and thereby claim for himself the position of authority that was rightfully his. There is in Ivanov's poem one detail that makes this point exquisitely: Prometheus. On the most basic level, the artist-theurgist Skrjabin can himself be understood as a Prometheus figure: in Ivanov's view, both mediated between man and the gods, and both were ultimately sacrificed for their gift to mankind. In addition, though, the figure of Prometheus has important intertextual dimensions. Besides developing Brjusov's own mythological referent (Vulcan), Prometheus also supplies a convenient link to Skrjabin himself, since 'Prométhée; le poème du feu' numbers among the composer's most celebrated works. Most crucial, however, is that fact that this mythological figure forges a direct link between Skrjabin's work and Ivanov's own, i.e., his recently completed drama *Prometheus*, the product of years of labor. In other words, through the image of Prometheus, Ivanov at once establishes his own spiritual kinship with Skrjabin while dismissing any such claims of Brjusov.²⁷

4.

Once again, Ivanov responds to a poem by using the identical poetic form. If in the example of the "tender mystery", Ivanov's relationship to his source was one of appropriation and development, his relationship to Brjusov's sonnet is most definitely polemical. In the first instance, one could more or less understand Ivanov's poem without recognizing its source. But in the latter case, the reader unaware of Brjusov's sonnet misses out on several crucial elements.

It may be argued that Ivanov did not really care whether we recognize his sources – if he had felt that this was essential, he could have noted them explicitly. This is to a certain extent true: it is a fact that Ivanov often pointed directly to his sources by appending epigraphs to his poems. But the question is not whether Ivanov desired it or not, but whether discovering the source allows us better to understand his poetic method. I believe that formal continuity is at the heart of Ivanov's poetry and that, by revealing his "models", we enrich our knowledge of his art. Ivanov's poetry, like his philosophy, is marked by syncretism, and it is essential to recognize the way images and concepts from precursors and contemporaries enter into his creative and combinatory consciousness.

NOTES

- ¹ For an overview of this issue, see Pamela Davidson, 'The Legacy of Difficulty in the Russian Poetic Tradition: Contemporary Critical Responses to Ivanov's *Cor Ardens*', *Cahiers du monde Russe*, Vol. XXXV (1-2), 1994, pp. 249-267.
- ² From a 1910 review by Al[eksandr] Voznesenskij, cited in Pamela Davidson, *Viacheslav Ivanov: a reference guide*, New York 1996, p. 32.
- ³ It is often erroneously assumed that Ivanov "knew everything" and was therefore intimately familiar with every possible primary source of a given myth or motif. Yet Ivanov, trained as an academic, was well aware of the value of secondary literature and did not hesitate to take advantage of it. To give but a single telling example: in a letter of 28/15 March 1900 (GBL f. 109, k. 9, ed. chr. 33) Ivanov asks M.M. Zamjatina to look in *Pauly's Real-Encyklopädie des klassischen Alterthums* to see whether there is anything connecting the myth of Niobe to Dionysus and, if so, to write down for him all of the relevant works. This request suggests quite a bit about Ivanov's approach to myth (i.e., using scholarship to confirm creative intuitions) as well as about his unfinished drama *Niobe*, but for present purposes, I would simply emphasize Ivanov's impulse to examine – for artistic, not scholarly, purposes – the most authoritative encyclopedia available. Vladimir Markov has noted that, in order to understand Ivanov's mythological references, it is often necessary to consult the *Pauly* (Vladimir Markov, 'Vyacheslav Ivanov the Poet: A Tribute and A Reappraisal', in Robert Louis Jackson and Lowry Nelson, Jr. [Eds.], *Vyacheslav Ivanov: Poet, Critic and Philosopher*, New Haven 1986, p. 56). This is not surprising, since Ivanov himself was quite possibly relying on this very source!
- ⁴ M.S. Al'tman, *Razgovory s Vjačeslavom Ivanovym*, Sankt-Peterburg 1995, p. 24.
- ⁵ Such was his slogan in a letter to Brjusov of 6/19 September 1904, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 85 (Valerij Brjusov), Moskva 1976, p. 459.
- ⁶ E.A. Millior, 'Besedy filosofskie i ne filosofskie', *Vestnik Udmurtskogo Universiteta*, special'nyj vypusk, 1995, p. 15.
- ⁷ Vjačeslav Ivanov, *Sobranie sočinenij*, Brussels, Vol. 2 (1973), p. 537.
- ⁸ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1 (1971), p. 137.
- ⁹ S.V. Trockij, 'Vospominanija', published by A.V. Lavrov in *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 10, 1994, p. 66.
- ¹⁰ Honesty compels me to note that Averincev, generally skeptical of subtextual approaches to poetry, remains unconvinced by my conclusions (I refer to a private communication dated 7 February 1997, in which he responds to an earlier version of this paper, making several suggestions that I have gratefully incorporated).
- ¹¹ Friedrich Schiller, *Werke und Briefe*, Frankfurt am Main, 1992, Vol. 1, p. 182.

- ¹² Ivanov, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, (1971), p. 788.
- ¹³ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, (1973), p. 504. Actually, as Robert Bird has generously brought to my attention, this is not the first time in Ivanov's poetry that the words "mystery" and "tender" are combined. Already in 'Love and Death', one finds the line "I Tajna vse nežnej" ("And the Mystery is always more tender" (*ibid.*, p. 400). However, in that instance the "tender mystery" is mentioned almost in passing, as part of a highly complicated series of visionary images. In contrast, in 'Sub Rosa', the phrase "tender mystery" is clearly spelled out and serves unquestionably as the poem's focal point.
- ¹⁴ In a comment of 1920, Ivanov criticized Bal'mont's poetry on precisely these grounds. He "took from the rose only one side – love" (F. I. Kogan, 'Kružok poëzii pod rukovodstvom Vjačeslava Ivanova', RGALI, f. 2272, op. 1, ed. chr. 33, l. 30).
- ¹⁵ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3 (1979), p. 30.
- ¹⁶ Annotated German editions of Schiller (including those of the nineteenth century that would have been accessible to Vjačeslav Ivanov) inevitably note a curious aspect of this poem: the "seal in the shape of Homer's head" refers to a signet ring that Schiller himself had ordered and that he was known to have used.
- ¹⁷ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3 (1979), pp. 175-176, 181.
- ¹⁸ For more on this subject, see Marina Kostalevsky's paper in this collection.
- ¹⁹ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3 (1979), p. 565.
- ²⁰ Valerij Brjusov, *Sobranie sočinenij*, Vol. 2, Moskva 1973, pp. 200-201.
- ²¹ See M.L. Gasparov, *Russkie stichi 1890-čh–1925-go godov v kommentarjach*, Moskva 1993, p. 210.
- ²² Ivanov, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2 (1973), pp. 335, 336.
- ²³ According to Gasparov's terminology (*op. cit.*, pp. 206-208), Ivanov uses the form of a French sonnet, while Brjusov's comes from the English tradition.
- ²⁴ Demonstrating one-upmanship characteristic of the "sonetto di risposta", Ivanov underscores the importance of this word through anagrams: "Istorg li rok, oricej zorkoj reja".
- ²⁵ I am grateful to Nina Chruščeva for this insight.
- ²⁶ From the poem 'Eternal Memory' ('Večnaja pamjat'), in Ivanov, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1 (1971), p. 568.
- ²⁷ It is hard to imagine that Brjusov could have missed the polemical thrust of Ivanov's poem. Brjusov was well aware of Ivanov's drama *Prometheus*, since the two had discussed it more than a decade earlier (see their correspondence in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, No. 85, 1976, p. 498).

THE BIRTH OF POETRY FROM THE SPIRIT OF
CRITICISM: IVANOV ON SKRJABIN

MARINA KOSTALEVSKY

If you lived in Russia at the time Andrej Belyj defined as “between two revolutions”, and if you could easily tell who wrote *The Three Conversations* and who was the author of *Also sprach Zarathustra*, the name of Aleksandr Skrjabin would most likely occupy a very special place in your “list of reverences”. “My god came back from Switzerland,” announced young Pasternak upon learning about Skrjabin’s return from Europe. In the same spirit of worship, Vasilij Safonov – one of the most respected musicians of the time and, incidentally, a deeply religious man – solemnly proclaimed to the orchestra as he held up the score at the beginning of the rehearsal of Skrjabin’s First Symphony: “Here is the new bible” (“Vot novaja biblija”).¹ The spell which Skrjabin cast on his admirers was created by two elements: his music and his aesthetics. Admittedly, while in music Skrjabin was the supreme professional, in philosophy he was an educated dilettante. Nonetheless all attempts to separate his music from his philosophical ideas simply fail.²

“Music lives through thought,” Skrjabin used to say. “My ideas constitute my design and they go into my music just as sounds do” (“Muzyka živa mysl’ju”. “Ėti idei – moj zamysel i oni vchodjat v sočinenie tak že, kak zvuki”).³

“It is difficult to name any other composer,” writes the Skrjabin scholar Del’son, “who strives with such determination to resolve philosophical, aesthetic, and even questions of logic by the specific means of symphonic music [...] the intellectual character of Skrjabin’s music must be considered deeply organic to his creative method” (“Trudno nazvat’ kakogo-libo drugogo kom-

pozitora, kotoryj s takoj opredelennost'ju stremilsja by rešat' filosofsko-estetičeskie, poroj daže čisto logičeskie problemy specifičeskimy sredstvami simfonizma [...] intellektual'noe načalo skrjabinskogo simfonizma dolžno rassmatrivat'sja kak gluboko organičnoe dlja ego tvorčeskogo metoda").⁴

It might be said that Skrjabin was the only musician who consciously grounded artistic imagery in philosophical concepts. In other words, he not merely exploited philosophical ideas as, for example, did Wagner, but even attempted to solve philosophical problems with music as his medium since he was convinced that music can express ideas.

Skrjabin's interest in philosophy, it would appear, began at an early age. At sixteen he wrote some notes from which it is clear that he was, for the most part, interested in matters of ethics and regarded faith in Christ as a necessary condition for morality. These notes are all the more interesting, as they demonstrate the initial Christological emphasis in Skrjabin's world view, one that would subsequently weaken, but which would gain strength again in his final years (without doubt under Vjačeslav Ivanov's influence). Of the philosophers, Skrjabin was particularly interested in Schelling, Kant, Fichte, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche.

At the very beginning of the 1900s, Skrjabin became friends with the philosopher Sergej Trubeckoj – a passionate admirer of his music. Trubeckoj belonged to a circle of friends and devotees of the recently deceased Vladimir Solov'ev. At Trubeckoj's invitation, Skrjabin conscientiously attended meetings of the Moscow Religious-Philosophical society.

What were the philosophical foundations of a man who was called by his good acquaintance, the Marxist theorist Plechanov, an "incorrigible mystic" ("mistik neispravimyj")?⁵ Skrjabin believed that humankind must attain the crown of its existence through the conquest of matter by art, in so far as the artistic, creative act constitutes the only means to save and transfigure the world. This act liberates the soul from sensuality and leads it – through victory over sensuality – to complete dematerialization. Skrjabin felt that he was predestined to perform this creative act. This act he called the *Mysterium* ("Misterija"); it was to lead to the fusion of all humankind in ecstasy and to the transformation of the world. Skrjabin viewed the project of the *Mysterium* as his "doctrine", his "philosophy", his "principal task" ("učenie", "filosofija", "bol'saja, glavnaja rabota").⁶

No wonder Skrjabin became closely involved with the Symbolists. "Skrjabin," writes Sabaneev, "to put it briefly, was none other than a symbolist in music, and all those premises which are now considered as traditional regarding Symbolists in poetry and literature are completely and even more categorically applicable to him" ("Skrjabin, vyražajas' kratko, byl ničem inym, kak simvolistom v muzyke i vse te predposylki, kotorye nyne stali tradicionnymi po otnošeniju k simvolistam poezii i literatury, celikom i daže v ešče bolee kategoričeskoj forme priložimy k nemu").⁷ The first

documented evidence of Skrjabin's association with the movement is a 1906 letter to Emil Medtner, the musical editor of the Symbolist journal *Zolotoe runo*, in answer to an invitation to collaborate with the magazine. In 1909, during his stay in St. Petersburg in connection with the premiere of his *Poem of Ecstasy* (*Poëma êkstaza*), Skrjabin became acquainted with Vjačeslav Ivanov. Soon after Skrjabin said to Sabaneev about Ivanov: "He is *close* to me and to my thoughts as is no one else" ("On *tak blizok* mne i moim mysljam, kak nikto").⁸ The attraction was mutual. As Ivanov recalled later, "my friendship with Skrjabin during the final two years of his life was a profoundly significant and luminous event along the passages of my spirit."⁹ The profound significance of their relationship was directly reflected in Vjačeslav Ivanov's philosophical and spiritual influence upon Skrjabin. "From the time when Vjačeslav Ivanov appeared on Skrjabin's horizon, something began to change rapidly in the latter's conception" ("So vremeni pojavlenija V. Ivanova na skrjabinskom gorizonte, čto-to stalo bystro menjat'sja v ego koncepcii"), reports Sabaneev.¹⁰ Indeed, as Malcolm Brown demonstrated in his comparative analysis of Ivanov's and Skrjabin's pronouncements, the final version of the *Mysterium* acquired a special lucidity and moved in a different direction.

It was Skrjabin's notion of the role played by the artist-creator of the *Mysterium*, that is to say, by himself, that underwent a fundamental change. Earlier, during the composition of *Prometheus* (*Prometej*), he wrote:

I am God!
I am nothing, I am play, I am freedom, I am life,
I am the limit, I am the summit,
I am God.

("Ja bog! / Ja ničto, ja igra, ja svoboda, ja žizn', / Ja predel, ja veršina, / Ja bog.")¹¹ However, after he met Ivanov the idea of *sobornost'* pervaded his descriptions of the *Mysterium*. "There will be no question of the individual in the *Mysterium*. It will be collective [sobornyj] creation, a collective act. It will be one all-embracing, multi-faceted individuality, like the sun refracted in a thousand drops of water."¹²

After the composer's death Ivanov was among the founders of the Skrjabin society and took active part in many endeavors to commemorate his name.¹³ In subsequent years, Ivanov wrote over a dozen articles, speeches and notes on Skrjabin.¹⁴ In addition, Ivanov dedicated nine poems to Skrjabin, several of which form parts of the articles. It has been said that Vjačeslav Ivanov should be considered among the first scholars of Skrjabin and his most active propagandists.¹⁵

In the introduction to his collection of articles on Skrjabin Ivanov wrote: "Three speeches on Skrjabin, interwoven with verse dedicated to his

memory, comprise this belated book. The last of these speeches has already been published in my collection of articles 'Matters Native and Universal'. The first two were intended for a Skrjabin collection. It was not fated to be [...] Now the Skrjabin Society has ceased to exist. It was there that I, one of its founding members, delivered my speeches in the years 1915, 1916, 1917" ("Tri čtenija o Skrjabine s votkannymi v nich stichami, posvjaščennymi ego pamjati, sostavljajut soderžanie zapozdaloj knigi. Poslednee iz etich čtenij uže napečatano v moem sobranii statej 'Rodnoe i vselenskoe'. Pervye dva prednaznačalis' dlja Skrjabinovskogo sbornika. Emu ne suždeno bylo osuščestvit'sja [...] Rassejalos' i pervoe Skrjabinskoe obščestvo, v srede kotorigo ja, odin iz ego učreditelej, proiznosil svoi reči v 1915, 1916, i 1917 godach").¹⁶ The three speeches Vjačeslav Ivanov had in mind and prepared for publication were respectively 'Skrjabin's View of Art' ('Vzgljad Skrjabina na iskusstvo'), 'Skrjabin as the National Composer' ('Skrjabin kak nacional'nyj kompozitor'), and 'Skrjabin and the Spirit of Revolution' ('Skrjabin i duch revoljucii').

All three works are divided into sub-sections. These sections are linked in an unusual way: there are several cases when a section starts with the verse line from a poem found in the previous section. This results in the effect of sequence not unlike the one inherent in the construction of a corona of sonnets, a poetic genre favored by the Symbolists. This principle of sequence has prompted me to construct the rest of my article in the same fashion. I will proceed to discuss Ivanov on Skrjabin in a comparative mode matched to earlier literary and philosophical models, namely, Solov'ev on Dostoevskij, Dostoevskij on Puškin, Puškin on Mozart and Salieri.

Solov'ev on Dostoevskij

Ivanov's 'Three Speeches on Skrjabin' intersect in a number of ways with 'Three Speeches in Memory of Dostoevskij' by Vladimir Solov'ev. Both triptychs were written in comparable circumstances, in comparable span of time, and with comparable purpose. In each case the speeches were composed for public performance in the course of three consecutive years after the death of a prominent artist and personal friend. Both Ivanov and Solov'ev consciously shunned formal analysis of their subject's work, concentrating on its philosophical evaluation and on the mission of art as such. In each case, the author recounts the details of the unfulfilled creative plans of the deceased artist. Solov'ev speaks of the main idea that Dostoevskij had for a cycle of novels to follow *The Brothers Karamazov*; Ivanov elucidates many aspects of Skrjabin's planned *Mysterium*. The important matter, however, is not the formal similarities between the two triptychs, but their profound "elective affinities". Vladimir Solov'ev had more than a few followers and

disciples, but perhaps none of them synthesized his ideas so ingeniously and creatively as Vjačeslav Ivanov.

Speeches about Dostoevskij assume a special place in Solov'ev's legacy: they rank first among his critical and aesthetic works. Of course, his aesthetic conception began to take shape much earlier, and by the 1880s the philosopher's fundamental ideas had already been conceived and formulated. But in three speeches on Dostoevskij Solov'ev's ideas about art and about the role of the artist are argued not only in general terms but with reference to a concrete artist – Dostoevskij.

At the beginning of the triptych, in a brief discussion of the religious role of art as it took form in history Solov'ev writes, "poets were prophets and priests, the religious idea was master of poetry, art served the gods. Then as life grew more complicated and a civilization founded on the division of labor appeared, art, like the rest of human affairs, stood apart and separated itself from religion [...] Priests of pure art appeared, for whom the perfection of artistic form became the main thing, apart from any religious content [...] The heyday of new European art came to an end before our very eyes [...] Artists today are unable and unwilling to serve pure art, to produce perfect forms; they are searching for content" ("[...] poëty byli prorokami i žrecami, religioznaja ideja vladela poëzij, iskusstvo služilo bogam. Potom, s usloženiem žizni, kogda javilas' civilizacija, osnovannaja na razdelenii truda, iskusstvo, kak i drugie čelovečeskie delanija, obosobilos' i otdelilos' ot religii [...] Javilis' žrecy čistogo iskusstva, dlja kotorych soveršenstvo chudožestvennoj formy stalo glavnyj delom, pomimo vsjakogo religioznogo soderžanija [...] Na našich glazach končilsja rascvet novo-evropejskogo chudožstva [...] Teperešnie chudožniki ne mogut i ne choťjat služit' čistoj krasote, proizvodit' soveršennye formy; oni iščut soderžanija").¹⁷ According to Solov'ev, their search must lead them to aesthetic and religious synthesis, to new art. And it is Dostoevskij, in the eyes of Solov'ev, who is the forerunner of such art.

In the article 'Skrjabin's View of Art', Ivanov, elaborating upon the composer's concept of art, elaborates upon Solov'ev's cultural-historical analysis of the evolution of art as well. He brings to light not only the phases in the process of the separation of art from religion, but describes the structure of their ancient unity. Similar to Solov'ev, Ivanov sees in ancient art an imperfect model for the future synthesis of art and religion. But Ivanov proceeds beyond this thesis by projecting the forms of a new art, forms that should blend into one synthetic creation.

It is well known that Solov'ev's aesthetic ideas became the cornerstone of Ivanov's theory of Symbolism. In his articles on Skrjabin, the basic Solovievian conceptions defining the art of the future stand as the aspirations not only for the article's author, Ivanov, but also for the article's subject, Skrjabin. Solov'ev's vision of a new aesthetic which interprets beauty as the

“transfiguration of the material through the embodiment in it of some other, higher-than-material principle” (“preobraženie materii črez voploščenie v nej drugogo, sverchmaterial'nogo načala”)¹⁸ and his vision of new art as “a real force which must illuminate and regenerate the entire human world” (“real'naja sila, prosvetljajuščaja i pereroždajuščaja ves' čelovečeskij mir”)¹⁹ – all this became a credo for Ivanov and Skrjabin. If Solov'ev called Dostoevskij the forerunner of the new art, Skrjabin saw himself as destined for the role of its creator. This was also how Ivanov saw him.

In ‘Skrjabin’s View of Art’, Ivanov wrote: “Skrjabin had a particular presentiment of himself as providentially marked and, as it were, spiritually anointed for a great, universal task. Such a presentiment, or, I would say, such magnetism of his deep will essentially cannot deceive its bearer [...] This secret voice, this inner experience was, of course, neither a proud fiction nor, all the more, deception [...] In the words of Schopenhauer, ‘a tall man cannot help but know that he is above others’: Skrjabin’s self-awareness was just as spontaneous as this” (“Sebja samogo Skrjabin predčuvstvoval osobenno, providencial'no otmečennym i kak by duchovno pomazannym na velikoe vsemirnoe delo. Takoe predčuvstvie, – ja by skazal: takaja magnitnost' glubinnoj voli, – po suščestvu ne obmanyvaet svoego nositelja [...] Ètot tajnyj golos, ètot vnutrennij opyt ne byl, konečno, ni samoljubivym vymyslom, ni – tem menee – umyslom [...] Po slovam Šopengauera ‘čelovek bol'shogo rosta ne možet ne znat', čto on vyše drugih: tak že neposredstvenno bylo i samosoznanie Skrjabina”).²⁰

Dostoevskij on Puškin

Ivanov’s second article, unpublished during his lifetime, was to be entitled either ‘Skrjabin as a National Composer’ or ‘The National and the Universal in Skrjabin’s Work’. As the titles suggest, Ivanov addressed a problem that remains a subject of controversy among Skrjabin scholars.

The supporters of the “national” principle in Skrjabin’s music look for similarities of his melody in Čajkovskij, or, in the spirit of Panslavism, in Chopin, with whom the early Skrjabin has, indeed, much in common. Their opponents emphasize the complicated harmonies in the late Skrjabin, invoking the name of Wagner and quoting Rachmaninov’s description of Skrjabin as a “wholly non-Russian composer” (“sovsem ne russkogo”) standing in “no man’s land” (“stojaščego na nič'ej zemle”).²¹ This controversy remains meaningless unless one defines the notion of the “national”. Skrjabin himself fully understood the importance of the “national question” in art but was indignant at over-simplifications of the idea: “Is it true that, if I do not write variations on Russian themes, I am not a Russian composer?”

To resolve this quandary, Vjačeslav Ivanov starts with defining the intellectual perspective from which one should examine the notion of nationality. “In our days,” he writes, “the essence of nationality has become a matter of philosophical conceptualization, – this after many centuries when it sufficed as a given in terms of its externally manifested existence” (“V naši dni suščestvo nacional'nosti delaetsja problemomju filosofskogo osoznanija, posle togo, kak dolgie veka dovol'stvovalis' naličnost'ju ee vnešne vyjavlennogo bytija”).²² In his subsequent discussion of the correlation between the national and the universal as the correlation of the particular with the whole, Ivanov argues that individual creativity also acquires universal meaning only through the realization of its nationality. At the same time, the national element in music (and, by implication, in other spheres of art) as displayed in the form of folkloric motifs does not express the essence of a nation but merely conveys its outer appearance. This is why German music, which Ivanov employs as a natural example of the highest achievements in the past, attained greatness: because “it was not concerned with the preservation of its national soul, but sought to actualize music in general as the all-human universal language” (“ona [nemeckaja muzyka] ne zabolilas' o sočrnenii nacional'noj duši svoej, no iskala osuščestvit' muzyku voobščee, kak vsemirnyj, vsečelovečeskij jazyk”).²³ Ivanov believes, however, that German music exhausted itself with the arrival of the crisis of humanism; now the time had come for what he called “the historical impact of a different *Weltanschauung*”. Skrjabin, in Ivanov’s view, is precisely a representative of this “different *Weltanschauung*”. “Skrjabin has been guided,” he writes, “by his great Geist which led him away from the personal and the particular to the divine expanses of universal being” (“Ego [Skrjabina] voždem byl ego velikij duch, uvodivšij ego ot častnogo i ličnogo v božestvennye prostory vselenskogo bytija”).²⁴

Thus the flow of Ivanov’s argument re-affirms his initial premise: the national and the universal correlate as the particular and the whole. Consequently, the global task Skrjabin was destined to fulfill is coincident with the national task: “Skrjabin’s aspirations represent the moment of universal self-determination on the part of the national Russian soul.” And Ivanov concludes that “in his understanding of the artist’s responsibility, in the fervent zeal of his religious heart, in the ‘sobornyj’ inspiration of his creative work, which for him bordered on the sacrificial dissolution of his personal existence in universal and eternal being, Skrjabin was truly a Russian genius” (“Stremlenija Skrjabina predstavljajut soboj moment vselenskogo samoopredelenija nacional'noj russkoj duši [...] Po svoemu postiženiju otvetstvennosti čudožnika v žizni, po istovomu goreniju svoego religioznogo serdca, po sobornomu okryleniju vsego svoego tvorčestva, kotoroe graničilo dlja nego s žertvennym rastvorenijem ličnogo suščestvovanija v edinom i večnom bytii, Skrjabin – poistine russkij genij”).²⁵

The posing of the problem in these terms and, in part, the logic of the argument point to a famous prototype of this article by Ivanov – namely Dostoevskij's speech delivered during the Puškin Celebration of 1880.²⁶ For Dostoevskij's contemporaries it was clear that this speech was an open proclamation of the writer's most cherished ideals, presented in full for the first time, in a concise and simple general formula. According to this "formula" Puškin's genius became an incarnation of the Russian spirit precisely because its character proves to be all-European, universal ("vsemirnyj"), and all-human. For Dostoevskij Russian man is the universal man ("vsečelovek") by definition.²⁷ According to Dostoevskij, this faculty in Puškin manifests itself in the purest form, which is why Puškin was able to recreate the spirit of other nations in his works. But this faculty also might be regarded as prophetic. In Dostoevskij's eyes Puškin is the prophet who celebrates in his art the spirit of the Russian nation as ultimate manifestation of universal, Christian all-humanity.

The beauty of this vision conceals the paradox hidden within it. Lev Karsavin, noting "several incompatible ideas" in Dostoevskij's line of reasoning, comments: "Dostoevskij unwittingly identifies the universal humanity of the Russian people with their nationality, dissolving the latter in the former" ("Dostoevskij nevol'no otoždestvljaet ego [russkogo naroda] vsečelovečnost' s ego nacional'nost'ju, rastvorjaja vtoruju v pervoj").²⁸

In contrast to Dostoevskij, Ivanov in his treatment of the dialectic of the universal and the national avoided this trap. As he emphasizes in his article, the role of the national element in the universal is determined not by national exclusivity, but by its communal ("sobornyj") nature. This quality of Skrjabin's oeuvre – "sobornost'" – accounts for his being both a nationally Russian and a universal phenomenon.

Certainly Skrjabin would favor Ivanov's evaluation of the national in his music, since his own position on the question was based on the same premises kindred in spirit to Dostoevskij's Puškin speech. "Russian music," he said, "cannot be confined within the narrow frame of nationalism in its West European sense. It is national by breathing in the atmosphere of the international" ("Russkaja muzyka ne vmeščajetsja v tesnyh ramkach nacionalizma v zapadnoevropejskom ego ponimanii. Ona nacional'na, dyša v atmosfere internacional'nogo").²⁹

Puškin on Mozart and Salieri

Among the verses "interwoven" into Ivanov's articles on Skrjabin there is one deeply emotional and intimate recollection of their almost "perfect" friendship that was full of spiritual significance and creative expectations:

Двухлетний срок нам был судьбою дан,
Я заходил к нему на "огонек",
Он посещал мой дом. Ждала поэта
За новый гимн высокая награда, –
И помнит мой семейственный клавиш
Его перстов волшебные касанья.
Он за руку вводил по ступеням,
Как неопита жрец, меня в свой мир,
Разоблачая вечные святыни
Творимых им, животворящих слав...
А после, в долгой за полночь беседе,
В своей рабочей хранине, под пальмой,
У верного стола, с китайцем кротким
Из мрамора восточного, – где новый
Свершался Брак Поэзии с Музыкой, –
О таинствах вещал он с дерзновеньем...³⁰

In an uncanny way, this echoes yet another well-known text:

Я счастлив был: я наслаждался мирно
Своим трудом, успехом, славой; также
Трудами и успехами друзей,
Товарищей моих в искусстве дивном.
Нет! Никогда я зависти не знал,
О никогда! – ниже, когда Пиччини
Пленить умел слух диких парижан,
Ниже, когда услышал в первый раз
Я Ифигении начальны звуки
[...]
Нет! не могу противиться я доле
Судьбе моей: я избран, чтоб его
остановить – не то, мы все погибли,
Мы все жрецы, служители музыки.³¹

The juxtaposition of Ivanov's and Puškin's texts, opposite in terms of their content and message, demonstrates, however, a striking similarity of meter, rhythm, style, and even vocabulary – a fact which is hardly coincidental. The formal reflection of Puškin's dramatic monologue in Ivanov's poem is clear. But what is also clear, or at least, highly suggestive, is Ivanov's reading of Salieri's perception of art's nature. In his *Mozart and Salieri* Puškin was the first in Russian literature to formulate the problem of what is art. In his essay 'Skrjabin's View on Art' (as well as in the rest of the triptych) Ivanov inquires into the same problem.

The scholarly tradition in analyzing Puškin's tragedy had placed primarily one problem in the center of philosophical discussion: the problem of

“genius and villainy” (“genij i zlodejstvo”). Therefore Salieri’s aesthetic perception has been taken mainly as an explanatory reason for his ethical stand. Meanwhile, separately from other issues, Salieri’s “theory of art” has its own distinctive ontological significance and is based on ideas quite familiar to the chief theoretician of Russian “mystic” Symbolism. Needless to say, the affinity under consideration does not imply either moral or psychological parallelism between a fictional character – Salieri, and a real life person – Ivanov. The aim of my inquiry is to show that Vjačeslav Ivanov could easily perceive an ontological closeness between his own aesthetic theory and Puškin’s meditation on the nature of art as presented in the tragedy, regardless through whose mouth.

In Salieri’s attitude toward music one can clearly discern a mystical and religious element. At the very beginning of his first monologue he portrays his first experience of music almost as an act of initiation: “Zvučal organ v starinnoj cerkvi našej, / Ja slušal i zaslušivalsja – slezy / Nevol’nye i sladkie tekli.” It is not for nothing that Ivanov, speaking about Skrjabin’s vision of art borrows Salieri’s words: “net bol’še ni znakomoj grusti, ni izvedannoj prežde radosti, no celye miry unylosti i vesel’ja, i, kupjas’ v nich, duša ne sprašivaet sebja, čem ona tak sčastliva, ni o čem pečalitsja, kogda tekut *nevol’nye i sladkie slezy*...”³² Salieri conceives of himself and of his fellow musicians as high priests of music and as its servants. This attitude is manifested in particular in his apprehension of Mozart as a musical phenomenon. “Ty, Mocart, bog, i sam togo ne znaeš; / Ja znaju, ja,” Salieri proclaims in “fear and trembling”. In other words, he views Mozart’s genius as qualitatively different from the talents of all other musicians. Furthermore, in his opinion, Mozart’s music threatens the very existence of art, that is to say, the normative art that Salieri has learned and mastered. The perfection of Mozart’s music presents an ideal that cannot be attained either by Salieri or by any other artist, since none of them has the creative power of God. In the language of the Symbolists, Salieri apprehends Mozart as the “theurgic artist”. But this perception of the artist does not provoke in Salieri’s mind – as would happen in the Symbolist mind – any thought about the transformation of art itself, or of the communal character of such transformation. Salieri’s intuition of the mystical, religious nature of art engenders fear rather than inspiration.

The translation of Puškin’s text into the language of Symbolist language extends even further the parallel between Puškin/Salieri and Ivanov/Skrjabin mythologies of art. In both cases the “theurgic artist” has to be sacrificed in the name of art. Salieri realizes this to the point of bringing death to his friend Mozart. Ivanov realizes this to the point of accepting the death of his friend Skrjabin. As one scholar suggests: “Seen from the point of view of Ivanov’s conception of Dionysos, to be anointed for a heroic task means to be designated as a sacrifice and destined for a tragic death. Ivanov

understands Skrjabin’s untimely death from blood poisoning in just this way: Skrjabin’s death was not absurd, but symbolic and intrinsically necessary. In Ivanov’s metaphorical expression, Skrjabin, by dying, becomes ‘a new fixed star in the heaven of our achieved glories [v nebe našich sveršivšichsja slav zasvetilas’ novaja nepodvižnaja zvezda]’.”³³

And finally, there is one more argument in favor of seeing in Ivanov’s article on Skrjabin a poetic reference to Puškin’s play about Mozart and Salieri. In his tragedy Puškin outlined two conflicting worldviews. By holding Salieri responsible for villainy (“zlodejstvo”) traditional interpretations question his genius (“genij”) and implicitly his “theory of art”. Salieri’s “algebra” is opposed to Mozart’s “harmony”. In Ivanov’s eyes as well as in the eyes of many scholars Skrjabin was a composer who was in unique possession of both: a most refined and expressive musicality and an ability for rational, calculated design in his works. In other words, this was a composer who “was capable to check harmony with algebra, remaining at the same time antithetical to Salieri” (“kompozitor, sumevšij ‘poverit’ algebroj gármoniju’, ostavajas’ pri etom tvorčeskim antipodom Sal’eri”).³⁴ It seems to me that the affinity of Ivanov’s poem with Salieri’s monologue celebrates the synthesis of two methods in art which Ivanov found in Skrjabin. Moreover, what we see here is Ivanov’s indirect dialogue with Puškin on the philosophy of art. This indeed was a recurrent subject of meditation, discussion and inspiration in the case of all these great artists: Puškin, Dostoevskij, Solov’ev, Skrjabin and Ivanov.

NOTES

I would like to thank Robert Bird for a number of source references.

- ¹ M. Presman, *Reminiscences in A. N. Skrjabin*, Moskva 1940, p. 34.
- ² Soviet cultural propaganda persistently tried to dismiss the composer’s philosophy as irrelevant to his art or to reinterpret it in accordance with the ruling ideology. First, thanks to Lunačarskij and Plechanov, the revolutionary spirit of Skrjabin’s music quickly acquired a “red” tint and in the sixties Skrjabin’s cosmic vision of art made his works usable as an accompaniment to the Soviet space program.
- ³ Leonid Sabaneev, *Vospominanija o Skrjabinu*. Moskva 1925, p. 134.
- ⁴ Viktor Del’son, *Skrjabin*, Moskva 1971, p. 337.
- ⁵ R. Plechanova, *Reminiscences in A. N. Skrjabin*, Moskva 1940, p. 75.

- ⁶ Aleksandr Skrjabin, *Pis'ma*, Moskva 1965, p. 8.
- ⁷ Sabaneev, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 162.
- ⁹ Quoted in Malcolm Brown, 'Skrjabin and Russian "Mystic" Symbolism', *19th Century Music*, III/I (July 1979), 42-51, p. 48.
- ¹⁰ Sabaneev, *op. cit.*, p. 169.
- ¹¹ *A. N. Skrjabin*, Moskva 1940, p. 194.
- ¹² Quoted in Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
- ¹³ Skrjabin's death shocked his contemporaries by its suddenness and absurdity (he died of accidental blood poisoning).
- ¹⁴ This extensive literature has been documented by Myl'nikova, editor of Ivanov's important and hitherto unpublished texts on Skrjabin. See I.A. Myl'nikova, 'Stat'i Vjač. Ivanova o Skrjabine', *Pamjatniki kul'tury*, Moskva 1983, pp. 88-119.
- ¹⁵ The music critic Vjačeslav Karatygin, whose approach to Skrjabin was, incidentally, more "musical" than "philosophical", made a noteworthy comment on one of Ivanov's lectures: "How could we expect that a pronouncement about a musician made by a person who has little to do with music would be nearly the most significant and meaningful thing that has been said or written so far about the creator of the *Poem of Ecstasy* and *Prometheus*?" ("Kak mogli my oždat', čto slovo o muzykante, skazannoe čelovekom, malo imejuščim otnošenija k muzyke, okažetsja čut' li ne samym značitel'nym i polnovesnym iz vsego, čto do sich por prichodilos' slyšat' i čitat' o tvorce *Ėkstaza* i *Prometeja*?"); V. Karatygin, 'Lekcija-koncert pamjati A. N. Skrjabina', *Reč'*, 1915, No. 343, p. 4.
- ¹⁶ Quoted in Myl'nikova, *op. cit.*, p. 94. The proofs for Ivanov's collection have recently been published in a very limited edition: Vjačeslav Ivanov, *Skrjabin*, Moskva 1996.
- ¹⁷ Vladimir Solov'ev, *Stichotvorenija, estetika, literaturnaja kritika*, Moskva 1990, p. 168.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 97. This definition comes from Solov'ev's work 'Krasota v prirode'.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 169.
- ²⁰ In *Pamjatniki kul'tury*, p. 103.
- ²¹ *A. N. Skrjabin*, Moskva 1973, p. 160.
- ²² In *Pamjatniki kul'tury*, p. 96.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 98.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 102.
- ²⁶ This was promptly pointed out by Patricia Mueller in her article 'Ivanov on Skrjabin', *Cultura e Memoria*, Pavia 1988, p. 196.
- ²⁷ As Versilov declares in *The Adolescent* "In France I am a Frenchman, with a German I am a German, with the ancient Greeks I am a Greek, and by that very fact I am most typically a Russian."
- ²⁸ Lev Karsavin, 'Dostoevskij i katoličestvo', *F. M. Dostoevskij, stat'i i materialy*, Vol. 1 (Ed. A. S. Dolinin), Petrograd 1922, p. 41.

- ²⁹ *A. N. Skrjabin*, Moskva 1973, p. 158.
- ³⁰ In *Pamjatniki kul'tury*, p. 110.
- ³¹ Aleksandr Puškin, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij*, Vol. 7, Moskva 1948, p. 124.
- ³² In *Pamjatniki kul'tury*, p. 114. Italics are mine.
- ³³ Patricia Mueller, 'Ivanov on Skrjabin', p. 199. One cannot help noticing that Skrjabin's death from blood poisoning echoes Mozart's death from poisoning, as presented in Puškin's tragedy.
- ³⁴ L. Danilevič, 'Ot Tret'ej simfonii k "Prometeju"', *A. N. Skrjabin*, Moskva 1940, p. 302.

VJAČESLAV IVANOV AND ACMEISM:
LITERARY POLEMICS OF 1912-1914

VALERY BLINOV

In a previous article I have spoken of some aspects of the complex relationship between Vjačeslav Ivanov and the leading figures of the Acmeist movement: Achmatova, Mandel'stam and Gumilev.¹ Here I shall discuss the events that followed upon the founding of the first "Cech Poëtov" ("Guild of Poets") at the apartment of poet Sergej Gorodeckij on the 20th of October, 1911. This event marked the differentiation of Acmeism as an independent literary movement, although the very name "Acmeism" was only introduced somewhat later.

If Gumilev wisely limited himself to attempts to develop the aesthetic concept of Acmeism, while recognizing to a certain degree his genetic tie to Symbolism, then Gorodeckij, who owed his notoriety wholly to Symbolism and Vjačeslav Ivanov in particular, felt that aesthetics alone was insufficient. He aspired, no more and no less, to the creation of a new world-view. Obviously Gorodeckij was not up to such a task, and Acmeist claims to a new world-view soon came to nothing. Admitting his failure, Gorodeckij wrote in 1918, as if in self-justification: "V étoj neposil'noj dlja molodoj školy zadače – obosnovat' mirovozzrenie – byla glavnaja ošibka akmeistov, vpolne, vpročem, ob"jasnjaemaja zadorom molodeži" ("This task – of grounding a world-view – was beyond the powers of the young movement and was the main error of the Acmeists, although it is fully explained by the zeal of youth").

Subsequently, Osip Mandel'stam spoke of this matter also with an apologetic note:

Городецким в свое время была сделана попытка привить акмеизму литературное мировоззрение, "адамизм", род учения о новой земле и о новом Адаме. Попытка не удалась, акмеизм мировоззрением не занимался [...] Литературные школы живут не идеями, а вкусами.

("Gorodeckij once made an attempt to graft onto Acmeism a literary world-view, 'Adamism', a kind of teaching on the new earth and the new Adam. The attempt was unsuccessful, and Acmeism did not occupy itself with a world-view [...] Literary movements live not by ideas but by tastes.")²

This quotation contains a hidden but surprising admission that Acmeism had no ideas, and that the principal distinction can be reduced to a distinction of tastes. "It was not ideas, but tastes that proved fatal for Symbolism."³ One might dispute the justice of this claim with respect to the reading public, but this opposition of "ideas" and "tastes" might actually have proved a decisive factor in Vjačeslav Ivanov's attitude towards Acmeism, although in a paradoxical sense, opposite to that meant by Mandel'stam. For his part Gorodeckij might not have even been fully aware of the irony of his comment that the attempt to ground a world-view was the main error of Acmeism.

The year 1912 saw "Adamism" on the offensive, and this is when the second round of the Symbolist-Acmeist conflict took place.

The main difference in the distribution of forces with respect to the first round was the noticeable cooling of the romance between Vjačeslav Ivanov and Blok, who was generally experiencing a period of doubt over Symbolism and who was prepared to recognize Gumilev as "his own".⁴ As a result Blok to all intents and purposes declined to participate in the new dispute, despite pressure from Belyj, with whom Ivanov had then formed a close alliance.⁵ The second change was a consequence of the appearance of the "Guild of Poets", which had fortified the positions of young Acmeism, the leaders of which made their first public declaration of their negative attitude towards Symbolism at the meeting of the "Общество Revnителей Чудожественного Слова" (The Society of Lovers of the Artistic Word) on February 18, 1912, after Vjačeslav Ivanov read his 'Mysli o simbolizme' ('Thoughts on Symbolism') and Andrej Belyj – his paper 'Symbolism'.⁶

In Nikolaj Nedobrovo's report of the meeting we read: "Apropos of these speeches some members of the meeting noted that the main significance of V.I. Ivanov's and B.N. Bugaev's papers was their great repellent force, due to which they might aid the next regrouping of poetic forces."⁷ And further Nedobrovo writes: "apropos of the repellent force of some points contained in the papers, V.I. Ivanov declared that he had intentionally introduced this force into his thoughts."⁸ In his letter from April 16, 1912, Blok reproached Belyj for conducting polemics with Gumilev

"between the lines". In spite of Blok's admission, "can I not know the depths of his personal truths", this letter contains quite sharp attacks on Ivanov. Such hidden polemics were undoubtedly present in the papers, although it is not the main content of 'Thoughts on Symbolism'.

The object of the polemics must have been comments made in the papers and in discussion of topics which became the leitmotifs of later Acmeist manifestos, which appeared only in 1913. Ivanov opened polemics in two directions. Firstly, he defended symbolist art in his own interpretation: "Ja ne simbolist, esli slova moi ravny sebe, esli oni ne echo drugich zvukov, o kotorych ne znaeš', kak o Duché, otkuda oni prichodjat i kuda uchodjat" ("I am not a Symbolist if my words are equal to themselves, if they are not an echo of other sounds, about which, as of the Spirit, you do not know whence they come and whither they go").⁹

This is a direct negation of Gumilev's basic thesis that "the word must mean only what it means".¹⁰ If the question is posed in this way the Acmeists' subsequent declaration, "that means we are not Symbolists", seems quite just. Secondly, Ivanov speaks against attributing to Symbolism features that it does not exhibit in its true, "realistic" incarnation:

Истинному символизму свойственнее изображать земное, нежели небесное: ему важна не сила звука, а мощь отзвука [...] Истинный символизм не отрывается от земли [...] Он не подменяет вещей и, говоря о море, разумеет земное море, и, говоря о высях снеговых [...] разумеет вершины земных гор.

("It is more characteristic of true Symbolism to depict the earthly than the heavenly: it considers the power of the echo to be more important than the volume of the sound. [...] True Symbolism does not tear itself from the earth [...] It does not falsify things; when it speaks of the sea it means the earthly sea, and when it speaks of the snowy heights [...] it means the peaks of earthly mountains.")¹¹ Nonetheless, judging by Gumilev's subsequent theoretical writings, it is precisely this point that he did not want or was unable to assimilate.

Blok found that in 'Thoughts on Symbolism' Ivanov made exclamations about catharsis "in exactly the same tone in 1912 as in 1905".¹² This accusation of Ivanov's repeating himself is unjust. Blok also was unable or unwilling to see that 'Thoughts on Symbolism' was one of Ivanov's most profound contemplations of this subject. Moreover, 'Thoughts on Symbolism' is distinguished by the introduction of new accents, themes and ideas, absent in his 'Zavety simbolizma' ('The Testaments of Symbolism'), although rooted in his meditations on drama and choral action from the first decade of the century, which were now presented in another key of the Sym-

bolist teaching and concerned a rethinking of the interrelationship between the creative and receptive agents. The lyrical incantations of the first section shift the focus from “poet, singer and sage” to “listener”. Further, Ivanov writes:

Символизм означает отношение и само по себе произведение символическое как отделенный от субъекта объект, существовать не может [...] О символизме можно говорить, лишь изучая произведение в его отношении к субъекту воспринимающему и к субъекту творящему, как к целостным личностям.

(“Symbolism denotes a relation [which one might add should be seen in the wider context of ‘sobornost’ – V.B.], and a symbolic work cannot exist by itself, as an object removed from the subject. [...] Symbolism arises only when one studies a work in its relation to the integral personalities of the perceiving subject and the creative subject.”)¹³

From this follow important conclusions. Firstly, “Symbolism lies outside of aesthetic categories”,¹⁴ representing not a literary movement, but an attitude towards the world. Secondly, “every work of art can be evaluated from the viewpoint of Symbolism”.¹⁵ Here we see the full theoretical grounding of the hallowed Symbolist tradition of seeing Symbolists in such distant figures as Aeschylus or Dante. Thirdly, “Symbolism is tied to the integrity of the personality, both that of the artist himself and that of the person experiencing the artistic revelation”.¹⁶ Here art is postulated as “syzygy”, to use one of Ivanov’s favorite words, combining souls like Plato’s Eros. Moreover, insofar as “Symbolism denotes the relation of the artistic object to a double subject, creative and perceiving”, each of these elements of “syzygy” is equally dependent on whether the given work of art is indeed symbolic or not. Here we are dealing with a formulation of the very essence of Ivanov’s critical method, in other words with an affirmation that a work may be symbolic regardless of the intentions and aspirations of its creator, and that therefore the critic must use various kinds of analysis, including an analysis of his own perception, to discover this symbolic nature. Ivanov consistently applied this method to such dissimilar artists as Goethe, Dostoevskij and Lermontov.

One cannot but be amazed at the revolutionary nature of this approach, and its similarity to certain recent trends of post-modernist and post-structuralist poetics. The difference, of course, is that the latter rest on the belief in a relative and arbitrary sovereign consciousness, whereas Vjačeslav Ivanov based himself on absolute categories that are maximally transcendent, and he did not tolerate reticence on this account. Thus he immediately corrected the afore-mentioned thesis concerning the possibility of defining a work as symbolic on the sole opinion of its perceiver with the following antithesis: “S

drugoj storony, issledujuj otnošenie proizvedenija k celostnoj ličnosti ego tvorca, my možem, nezavisimo ot sobstvennogo vosprijatija, ustanovit’ simvoličeskij karakter proizvedenija” (“On the other hand, by studying the relationship of a work to the integral personality of its creator we can establish the symbolic character of a work independent of our own perception”).¹⁷ The synthetic definition of symbolism as “creative interaction”¹⁸ represents the basis of Symbolism as a world-view, the kind of theoretical achievement that the Acmeists were unable to achieve with respect to their own movement. As we shall see, an elaboration of this idea would later allow Ivanov to include Acmeism, and also even Futurism, into his universal doctrine of art.

The positions of the Acmeists and Symbolists were consolidated in March and April of 1912. The journal *Trudy i dni* was initiated as a fundamentally Symbolist organ in opposition to the more “Acmeized” *Apollon*.¹⁹ On the Acmeists’ side, a program was announced at the March 1, 1912 meeting of the “Guild of Poets”, a program aimed at a break with the Symbolists. Michail Kuzmin, who was present at this meeting, noted in his diary: “Gorodeckij and Gummi pronounced theories [that were] not completely articulate.”²⁰

This second round of the conflict between the Acmeists and Symbolists was essentially cut short by Vjačeslav Ivanov’s unexpected departure for Italy in May 1912. Ivanov’s absence, however, seems to have allowed the Acmeists to unleash a feverish activity. In his review of Gorodeckij’s *Iva*, Gumilev first used the word “Acmeist” in print.²¹ October saw the publication of the first issue of the journal *Giperborej*, conceived of and produced as an exclusively Acmeist organ, despite the editors’ assurances to the contrary. The “Guild of Poets” gradually replaced the “Academy of Poetry”, which had faded after the departure of its head. Ivanov’s absence also seems to have paralyzed Blok, who soon began to feel annoyance at Acmeism. On November 21, Blok noted in his diary that he had spoken about this to Gorodeckij “openly, cursing and not taking seriously what he [Gorodeckij] considers a serious and important matter”.²² Later, on December 17, Blok writes: “I shall have to do something about this impertinent Acmeism and Adamism.”²³ Two days after this notation Gorodeckij read his scandalous address in the “Brodjačaja sobaka”, sermonizing the “birth of Adam”. Aleksandra Čebotarevskaja belatedly informed Ivanov of this in a letter from March 3, 1913:

Городецкий, кроме того, что он ведет кампанию за акмеизм, позволял себе неоднократно вылазки чисто личные против Вас, Блока, публично. В подвале, читая об акмеизме, он разбирал один Ваш сонет из ‘Золотых завес’, на каждом шагу

спрашивая, “что это значит”, “какой тут смысл”, а также одно стихотворение Блока, над которым прямо издевался.

(“Gorodeckij, as well as carrying on a campaign for Acmeism, has repeatedly permitted himself purely personal attacks on yourself, Blok, – in public. When reading about Acmeism in that basement, he analyzed one of your sonnets from ‘The Golden Veils’, asking on each step: ‘what does this mean’, ‘what is the sense of this’, and also a poem of Blok’s whom he simply ridiculed.”)²⁴ Further she informs Ivanov of an occurrence of February 1913, when Dmitrij Filosofov was invited by the Acmeists to chair one of their meetings, at which they “began to curse Symbolism and its representatives so indecently” that Filosofov “indignantly told them that they were dishonorable people who themselves had grown up in Symbolism and now, due to some personal ‘psychology’, profit, etc. were attacking an utterly innocent movement; he refused to serve any further as chairman and left.”²⁵ The Acmeist movement enjoyed a definite success, however, about which Vasilij Gippius, a constant participant in the “Guild of Poets”, recalled:

Публика [...] посмеялась над словами “цех поэтов”, “акмеизм” и т. д., но, в общем, приняла новаторов с сочувствием куда более искренним, чем их учителей символистов. Это и понятно. Уклон к реализму был публике по душе: символизм с его религиозным и мистико-философским одушевлением должен был остаться поэзией для немногих.

(“The public [...] ridiculed the words ‘Guild of Poets’, ‘Acmeism’, etc., but in general it welcomed the innovators with much more sincere sympathy than their teachers the Symbolists. This is understandable. The [Acmeists’] tendency towards realism was closer to the public, and Symbolism with its religious and mystico-philosophical animation was fated to remain poetry for the few.”)²⁶

By this time the two major Acmeist manifestos had been published in the first issue of *Apollon* for 1913: Gumilev’s ‘Nasledie simbolizma i akmeizma’ (‘The Heritage of Symbolism and Acmeism’), and Gorodeckij’s ‘Nekotorye tečeniia v sovremennoj russkoj poëzii’ (‘Some Tendencies in Modern Russian Poetry’).²⁷ Both manifestos undoubtedly contain a certain amount of theoretical muddle. Thus, for example, Gumilev’s text makes clear that, despite Ivanov’s exhortations in articles and lectures, he still did not have a correct understanding of the theory of correspondence that lay at the basis of “realistic Symbolism” and which was tied to the famous slogan “a realibus ad realiora”.²⁸ Thus we read, for example:

Французский символизм, родоначальник всего символизма, как школы, выдвинул [...] пресловутую “теорию соответст-

вий”. Последнее выдает головой его не романскую, и следовательно, не национальную, наносную почву; [...] Символическая слиянность всех образов и вещей, изменчивость их облика могла родиться только в туманной мгле германских лесов.

(“French Symbolism, the forefather of all Symbolism as a doctrine, put forth [...] the so-called ‘theory of correspondences’. The latter utterly gives away its non-Romance, and therefore non-national, imposed soil [...] the symbolic unity of all images and things, the variability of their appearance, could only be engendered in the nebulous gloom of Germanic forests.”)²⁹

Of course there can be no question of any “symbolic unity of all images and things” or “variability of their appearance” in Ivanov’s Symbolism. In variability, “illusionism”, Ivanov recognized the pathos of “idealistic Symbolism, for which ‘all phenomenal’ is the illusion of Maya.”³⁰

To characterize the theoretical level of Gorodeckij’s manifesto it is sufficient to cite his declaration that Vjačeslav Ivanov consistently “introduced into Symbolism mystical experience, religion, theosophy and spiritism”.³¹ As a literary curiosity one might point to a claim Gorodeckij made in his 1926 memoirs of Esenin, that the latter was “a fully consistent pupil of Vjačeslav Ivanov”: “Esenin’s death was a practical application of Vjačeslav Ivanov’s formula ‘a realibus ad realiora’, – from the real to higher reality, that is from the earth to the other world.”³² Much more significant was Mandel’stam’s article ‘O sobesednike’ (‘On the Interlocutor’), the main thesis of which – “there is no lyricism without dialogue”³³ – could be included fully into Ivanov’s context. Mandel’stam was developing a train of thought parallel to that of Ivanov, leading to the conclusion that “poetry as a whole is always directed towards a more or less unknown addressee, whose existence the poet cannot doubt without doubting himself”.³⁴ A more interesting formulation is the following: “the taste of communicability is inversely proportionate to our actual knowledge of the interlocutor, and directly proportionate to our desire to interest him in ourselves.”³⁵

Only on a superficial level does this seem to contradict what Ivanov had written in ‘Mysli o simbolizme’ (‘Thoughts on Symbolism’): “So, we, Symbolists, do not exist – if there are no Symbolists listening.”³⁶ For if Symbolism is conceivable as an eternal world-view, the Symbolist artist, striving to “interest [the listener] with himself” cannot doubt the existence of this interlocutor (one of Ivanov’s favorite words), without “doubting himself”. This is what Ivanov is essentially claiming in ‘Thoughts on Symbolism’. “Is Symbolism dead?”, our contemporaries ask. ‘Of course it is dead!’ answer some. It is for them to know whether Symbolism has died for them. We, however, the dead, bear witness by whispering to those feasting at our funeral repast that death does not exist.”³⁷

Mandel'stam's second article in 1913, 'François Villon', contains Acmeist positions, primarily the stress on architectonics, in such a general tone that it is impossible to consider it polemical. *Apollon* published in its third issue a wide selection of poems by Gumilev, Achmatova, Zenkevič, Narbut, Gorodeckij and Mandel'stam, as a presentation of the new Acmeist movement. Another selection with a similar goal of presentation was published in the May issue of Ivanov-Razumnik's journal *Zavety*, which generally held an anti-Symbolist orientation.³⁸ Finally, the entire July issue of *Giperborej* was devoted to the publication of Gumilev's single-act play *Akteon*, which, as Michael Basker has shown, was also conceived as a kind of Acmeist manifesto, although there is no proof that anyone perceived it as such at the time.³⁹

Vjačeslav Ivanov remained abroad until the autumn of 1913. Gorodeckij visited him in Rome, whether to seek reconciliation or for reconnaissance. In Petersburg, Blok's irritation with the Acmeists continued to grow, but neither he nor his Symbolist circle undertook any discernible anti-Acmeist acts. Judging by several diary entries, it is not out of the question that this caused him to see Ivanov's presence as desirable: "Vjačeslav Ivanov has not returned, is translating Aeschylus in Rome [...] My impressions of recent days: hatred for the Acmeists."⁴⁰ With regard to Gorodeckij's return Blok wrote: "I asked him about Vjačeslav Ivanov, about Italy [...] Vjačeslav Ivanov cursed him even more [in Rome] than I."⁴¹

There are grounds for believing, however, that during his stay abroad Ivanov's own interests changed somewhat. He returned to serious scholarly work, forming the foundation of his future study *Dionis i Pradionisijstvo* (*Dionysus and Predionysianism*).⁴² He returned not to Petersburg, but to Moscow, which gathered a new circle of people around him, in which philosophical and religious, rather than literary interests were dominant. Ivanov's next works were devoted to the underlying issues of creative psychology ('O granicah iskusstva' ['On the Limits of Art']) and his redoubled interest in the mystical dialectics of emotional life and the synthesis of arts ('Čurljanis' ['Čurlionis']), possibly under the influence of his friendship with Skrjabin.

All of this leads one to suspect that by this time Ivanov had inwardly resolved his relationship with the young literary movements, putting them in the context of the ideas expressed in 'Mysli o simbolizme' ('Thoughts on Symbolism'). He put the aspects of Acmeism he found constructive to a Symbolist interpretation, discarding the rest as superfluous. Moreover, one feels that his view of the problem of Symbolism attains its final form, which explains his gradual shift away from its thematics.⁴³ This was the situational and ideological context of his speech on Symbolism at the Kalašnikov Exchange on January 20, 1914.

We have a stenogram of this address, published in the afore-mentioned journal of Ivanov-Razumnik *Zavety*.⁴⁴ Ivanov reworked his speech for the

excursus 'O sekte i dogmate' ('On Sect and Dogma'), appended to 'Thoughts on Symbolism' in the collection *Borozdy i meži* (*Furrows and Boundaries*), and excluded several interesting nuances present in the *Zavety* text.

The dispute of January 20, 1914, was apparently seen originally as a somewhat belated reaction by the Symbolist camp to the noisy and partly unanswered appearances of representatives of new literary groups throughout the previous season. One feels that, despite Blok's departure from literary polemics and Ivanov's long absence, by the end of 1913 Symbolism had slowly but surely mobilized sufficient strength. This was done, however, largely due to the zeal of secondary figures like Anastasija Čebotarevskaja and Georgij Čulkov, who seemed to be rushing into battle in order to revive the polemic with the Acmeists and Futurists. According to a newspaper account, in the discussion following Čulkov's polemic lecture in Tenišev College, entitled 'Are we waking or not',⁴⁵ "Mssrs S.M. Gorodeckij, N.S. Gumilev, and O.Ė. Mandel'stam broke their spears in defense of Acmeism, delimiting themselves [...] from Symbolism and Futurism, but the limits of Acmeism in their accounts seemed symbolic."⁴⁶

The Symbolists, however, seemed less concerned with Acmeism than with Futurism, which greatly influenced the conception and conduction of the dispute, which turned from being a "summing-up" to a much more programmatic event. Thus, for example, Anastasija Čebotarevskaja wrote to Ivanov in her invitation letter of December 16, 1913: "The ideological goal is to formulate the positive contribution made to literature by the so-called Symbolist movement, a contribution that is now being partly silenced in the general muddle or being 'expropriated' by the Mssrs Futurists."⁴⁷ Later, however, she informs Ivanov that "it has been decided to reject that term 'summation'".⁴⁸ Moreover the wide publicizing of the dispute was bound to lend it a somewhat commercial status in the eyes of the public; a recent commentator has noted that "the notices for the dispute [...] looked like advertisements for a parade of Symbolists".⁴⁹

It is significant, however, that Vjačeslav Ivanov had to be persuaded to participate in the dispute. Apart from the two afore-mentioned letters, we know of at least two other letters from Čebotarevskaja and an analogous letter from Sologub.⁵⁰ It is likely that the deciding factor in Ivanov's agreement to participate (which he gave on January 8, 1914) were Merežkovskij's renewed attacks, touching upon the artist's social responsibility, a subject important to both.⁵¹ He refused to serve as chairman, however, giving this privilege to Sologub.

The note on the dispute published together with the stenogram of Ivanov's speech in the journal *Zavety* tells us that essentially "there was no dispute, only the exposition of the Symbolists' own opinion of Symbolism from various points of view",⁵² and the newspaper *Novoe vremja* characterized the event as "a thorough muddle". The speeches, however, must have made an

impression on the opponents, as the anti-Symbolist journal *Zavety* noted: "The thoughts on Symbolism of such major representatives as F[edor] Sologub and V[jačeslav] Ivanov cannot help but be profoundly interesting and instructive [...] even if one must disagree with them."⁵³

Although it is natural to ask whether the dispute marked the success or failure of the Symbolists, from the very first lines of the stenogram of Ivanov's speech it becomes clear that this question is posed incorrectly. He begins with the paradoxical declaration that "ja vynes to vpečatlenie, što bol'sšej čast'ju nas, simbolistov, chvalili, provozglašali naše napravlenie pobedonosnym. Ja ne znaju ničego po éтому povodu. Čto kasaetsja simvolizma ne našego napravlenija, [...] to on pobedil" ("I have formed the impression that we Symbolists have mostly been praised, our movement declared victorious. I know nothing on this account. As far as the Symbolism of the opposing movement is concerned, [...] it has won").⁵⁴

Further Ivanov develops intuitions expressed already in his early articles and clearly formulated in 'Thoughts on Symbolism'. This is the central part of the speech which Ivanov laid at the basis of the previously mentioned excursus 'On Sect and Dogma':

Итак, Данте символист! Что это значит в смысле самоопределения русской символической школы? Это значит, что мы упраздняем себя как школу. Упраздняем не потому, чтобы от чего-либо отрекались и думали ступить на иной путь: напротив, мы остаемся вполне верными себе и раз начатой нами деятельности. Но секты мы не хотим; исповедание же наше – соборно.

("So Dante is a Symbolist! What does this mean for the self-determination of the Russian symbolic school? It means that we are abolishing ourselves as a school. We are abolishing ourselves not because we have disavowed something and have decided to set upon a new path: on the contrary, we remain fully true to ourselves and the activity we have begun. But we do not want a sect; our confession is catholic.")⁵⁵

Then Symbolism is postulated as an artistic world-view independent of artistic movements and history:

В самом деле, прямой символист заботится, конечно, не о судьбе того, что обычно называют школою или направлением, определяя это понятие хронологическими границами и именами деятелей, – он заботится о том, чтобы твердо установить некий общий принцип. Принцип этот – символизм всякого истинного искусства. Мы убеждены, что этой цели достигли, что символизм отныне и навсегда утверждён, как принцип всякого истинного искусства, – хотя бы со вре-

менем оказалось, что именно мы, его утвердившие, были вместе с тем наименее достойными его выразителями.

("Indeed, a sincere Symbolist is concerned, of course, not with the fate of what is usually called a school or movement, defining this concept by chronological limits and the names of those active in it; he is concerned with establishing some general principle. This principle is the symbolism of any true art. We are convinced that we have achieved this goal, that Symbolism is from now on affirmed forever, even if with time it turns out that we who affirmed it were at the same time its least worthy exponents.")⁵⁶

Then Ivanov compares Symbolism as the basis of all true art to the formulation of Church dogma. Those who pronounced Orthodox teaching looked on their predecessors "as teachers who had long marked and prepared the true confession, or else who had held to it in silence". Thus Aeschylus, Dante and Goethe are understood as Symbolists, and thus Ivanov can proclaim: "It is not our school, not our skills and canons that I defend, but I consider that by praising Symbolism I am proclaiming a dogma of artistic Orthodoxy."⁵⁷ The text of the stenogram then contains a portion dropped in the printed 'Excursus':

Но после того, как утверждено искусство как символизм, должны были прекратиться все толки о том, кончилась школа или не кончилась, каков специальный канон символистов и т. п., ибо если самое искусство символично, то может быть символизм футуристический, если футуризм окажется чем-нибудь достойным внимания.

("After art is affirmed as Symbolism, all talk about whether the movement has ended or not, what the particular canon of the Symbolists was, etc., should have ceased, for if art itself is symbolic, then there can be classical Symbolism, Romantic Symbolism, even Futurist Symbolism, if Futurism turns out to be something worthy of attention.")⁵⁸

Further Ivanov declares: "Nado različat' vozraženija, napravlennye na školu, ili na ee predstavitelej, i vozraženija, napravlennye na samyj dogmat, samyj princip, inače my budem putat'sja" ("One has to distinguish objections directed at the movement or its representatives from objections directed at the dogma itself, the very principle; otherwise we shall get confused").⁵⁹

In this light Ivanov's final view of Acmeism is clarified: together with "Idealistic Symbolism" he understood it as an "aesthetic heresy".

By this time the Acmeists' failure to create a "new world-view" had become self-evident. They did not offer any new ideas capable of challenging the "principle" of Symbolism on a fundamental level (let us recall Mandel'stam's opposition of "ideas" to "tastes"), and therefore they ceased to present any theoretical or polemic interest for Ivanov. The criticisms of the

Acmeists were understood to refer only to a technical aspect of poetry without presenting any danger for the dogma itself:

Перестать быть символистом для того, чтобы сделаться наивным и жизнерадостным акмеистом, которые говорят, что если вы рассуждаете о Боге, о душе, то это плохо, а если о каких-то экзотических странах, то это хорошо, — это простое ребячество.

("To stop being a Symbolist in order to become a naive and buoyant Acmeist, who say that it is bad if you talk about God and about the soul, but good if you talk about some exotic countries, — this is simply childishness.")⁶⁰

On the other hand Ivanov creates a situation in which the best representatives and works of the Acmeist movement could be found commensurable to the Symbolist Symbol of Faith. Blok once asked Gorodeckij: "Why do you want 'to be called' something? You are no different from us,"⁶¹ and this opinion was supported by many contemporaries.⁶²

It is characteristic that both in the stenogram and in the 'Excursus' more space is given to the "utilitarian heresy" of Vladimir Merežkovskij than to the "aesthetic heresy" of Acmeism. Merežkovskij's writings presented not a harmless attack on Ivanov's dogma, but an attempt to distort this dogma by substituting a mortal and human cause for the "immortal and divine cause" that Symbolism "craves".⁶³ Ivanov's entire chain of reasoning serves to suspend dialectically the entire matter of the "crisis of Symbolism".

Naturally, later, in conditions of revolution, war and destruction, Ivanov could wistfully say to his Baku Eckermann, Moisej Al'tman: "Ach, kak vremja vse obernulo. Kogda my, simbolisty načali, nam predstavljalos' soveršenno inoe. I vot nas uže ob'javili otošedšimi" ("Oh, how time has upset everything. When we 'Symbolists' began we saw everything in another light. And now we have been declared passé").⁶⁴ But this did not prevent him, even in Roman exile on the verge of another world catastrophe, from retaining faith in the main work of his life and "foreseeing in the distant or not-so-distant future and in new forms a purer appearance of "eternal Symbolism".⁶⁵

NOTES

- 1 Valerij Blinov, 'Vjačeslav Ivanov i vzniknovenie akmeizma', *Cultura e memoria: atti del terzo simposio internazionale dedicato a Vjačeslav Ivanov*, a cura di Fausto Malcovati, 2 vols., Pavia 1988, 2, pp. 13-25.
- 2 O.Ė. Mandel'stam, *Sobranie sočinenij*, 4 vols., New York-Paris 1966-1981, 2, p. 299.
- 3 *Ibid.*, 2, p. 299.
- 4 See diary entry for April 17; A.A. Blok, *Sobranie sočinenij*, 8 vols., Moskva-Leningrad 1963, 7, p. 140. Hereafter quoted as SS. For an analysis of the relationship between Ivanov and Blok see E.L. Bel'kind, 'Blok i Vjačeslav Ivanov', *Blokovskij sbornik*, Tartu 1972, 2, pp. 365-384.
- 5 Blok, SS, 8, pp. 383, 386; see also Aleksandr Blok, 'Novye materialy i issledovanija', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 92, 3, Moskva 1980, p. 382; hereafter quoted as LN.
- 6 Both articles were published in the first issue of *Trudy i dni*.
- 7 *Trudy i dni*, 2, 1912, p. 27. See also an entry in Kuzmin's diary from the day after the meeting: "There was a scandal in the Academy. Whom shall I choose? The Symbolists or the 'Workshop'?", A. Morozov, 'Mandel'stam v zapisjach dnevnika S.P. Kablukova', *Vestnik RSCHD*, 129, Paris 1979, p. 145.
- 8 *Sobranie sočinenij*, p. 27.
- 9 Vjačeslav Ivanov, *Sobranie sočinenij*, 2, Brussels 1974, p. 609; hereafter quoted as Ivanov, SS.
- 10 See also Blok's diary entry for April 17, 1912 in Blok, SS, 7, p. 140.
- 11 Ivanov, SS, 2, p. 611.
- 12 Afore-cited letter to Belyj; Blok, SS, 8, p. 386.
- 13 Ivanov, SS, 2, p. 609. A kind of response to this train of thought might be contained in Mandel'stam's article 'O sobesednike', *Apollon*, 1913, no. 2, pp. 49-54.
- 14 *Ibid.*
- 15 *Ibid.*
- 16 *Ibid.*
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 610.
- 18 *Ibid.*
- 19 See the introduction by Ol'ga Deschartes in Ivanov, SS, 1, 818. *Trudy i dni* did not last long in this role.
- 20 Morozov, 'Mandel'stam v zapisjach dnevnika S.P. Kablukova', p. 145.
- 21 N. Gumilev, *Sobranie sočinenij*, 4 vols., Washington, 1962-1968, 4, p. 308. Hereafter quoted as Gumilev, SS. The review was printed in *Apollon*, 1912, no. 9.
- 22 Blok, SS, 7, p. 181.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 7, p. 193.
- 24 LN, p. 413.

- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 413.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 415.
- ²⁷ Nikolaj Gumilev, 'Nasledie simvolizma i akmeizm', *Apollon*, 1913, no. 1, pp. 42-45; Sergej Gorodeckij, 'Nekotorye tečenija v sovremennoj russkoj poëzii', *ibid.*, pp. 46-50.
- ²⁸ See Nadežda Mandel'stam's words *in sancta simplicitate*: "As is often the case, he spent much time studying the articles and theories of the Symbolists, and he kept on thinking that he was not fully grasping something in them," Nadežda Mandel'stam, *Vtoraja kniga*, Paris 1972, p. 38.
- ²⁹ Gumilev, SS, 4, p. 172.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 173.
- ³¹ Gorodeckij, 'Nekotorye tečenija', *Apollon*, 1913, no. 1, p. 46.
- ³² Sergej Gorodeckij, 'O Sergee Esenine: vospominanija', *Novyj mir*, 1926, no. 2, p. 143. This might confirm Nadežda Mandel'stam's claim that Gorodeckij experienced a premature "marazm", see N. Mandel'stam, *Vtoraja kniga*, pp. 40-41.
- ³³ Osip Mandel'stam, 'O sobesednike', *Apollon*, 1913, no. 2, p. 51. Mandel'stam's immediate target was Bal'mont, and Ivanov could not have but agreed with this polemic with an "idealistic Symbolist".
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 52.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 51.
- ³⁶ Ivanov, SS, 2, p. 610.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*
- ³⁸ See Blok's notation on March 10, 1914; in Aleksandr Blok, *Zapisnye knižki*, Moskva 1965, p. 215.
- ³⁹ Michael Basker, 'Gumilyov's "Akteon": A Forgotten Manifesto of Acmeism', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 63, 1985, pp. 498-517.
- ⁴⁰ Diary entry of April 12, 1913; Blok, SS, 7, p. 207.
- ⁴¹ Diary entry of April 20, 1913, *ibid.*
- ⁴² Ivanov, SS, 1, p. 141. The fundamental article 'On the Essence of Tragedy', published in the November-December 1912 issue of *Trudy i dni* is a natural parallel to this work.
- ⁴³ The Symbolist aspects of his subsequent works and addresses (the lectures 'On the Limits of Art' on January 22 and 'The Aesthetic Norm of the Theater' on January 30; see the commentary in Ivanov, SS, 2, pp. 820, 689) do not appear to develop the Symbolist doctrine, with Symbolism present in them only insofar as it might be relevant to the main theme.
- ⁴⁴ 'Simvolisty o simvolizme', *Zavety*, 1914, no. 2, pp. 80-84.
- ⁴⁵ Later published as the article 'The Justification of Symbolism'.
- ⁴⁶ LN, p. 429.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 428.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.* See also Blok's notation from January 20, 1914, Blok, *Zapisnye knižki*, p. 202.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*; see the quotation from Čebotarevskaja's letter of January 6 and also Ivanov's letter to Anastasija Čebotarevskaja from January 3, 1914; Vjačeslav Ivanov, 'Pis'ma k F. Sologubu i An.N. Čebotarevskoj', *Ežegodnik Rukopisnogo otdela Puškinskogo Doma*, Leningrad 1976, pp. 145-146.
- ⁵² *Zavety*, p. 71.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 82.
- ⁵⁵ Ivanov, SS, 2, p. 613.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁷ In the stenogram this phrase is much harsher: "I [...] am not inclined to defend our movement" (*Zavety*, p. 82).
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 82.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 83.
- ⁶¹ Blok, *Zapisnye knižki*, Diary entry from April 20, 1913.
- ⁶² See the letter to Gumilev from one I.M. Šapiro from January 5, 1914: "I am only unable to understand why this is not Symbolism but Acmeism [...] I see nothing that I could call Acmeism [...] I sincerely request that you not refuse to send me a detailed explanation: what is Acmeism?" (Gumilev, *Neizdannoe i nesobranoe*, Paris 1986, p. 143).
- ⁶³ Ivanov, SS, 2, p. 614.
- ⁶⁴ Entry from 17 January 1921; M.S. Al'tman, *Razgovory s Vjačeslavom Ivanovym*, St. Peterburg 1995, p. 27.
- ⁶⁵ Ivanov, SS, 2, p. 667.

CRITICISM, MYSTICISM AND TRANSCENDENT
NATIONALISM IN VJAČESLAV IVANOV'S THOUGHT

JAMES WEST

The title of this paper directs attention to three components of turn-of-the-century Russian philosophy that are linked in an interesting way, and are reflected in Vjačeslav Ivanov's thought. The principal focus is the element in Ivanov's writing, particularly in his essays from the second decade of the century, of something that cannot escape the label of "nationalism", at least to the extent that he finds in the Russian tradition something that can offer Russians – and not only Russians – resolution of the contemporary philosophical and spiritual crisis.

It is not possible to appreciate this component of Ivanov's thinking without a clear understanding of the context in which it occurs. It has an obvious background in a phenomenon that characterizes much of Russian intellectual life in the last third of the nineteenth century and on into the twentieth: the assertion of Russian national values, and, more importantly for our purposes, something which is not quite the same – the search for Russian values to assert. This is too vast and complex a phenomenon to summarize in a short presentation, but a quick overview is needed of one small part of it, its manifestation in Russian academic philosophy from the 1880s onwards. Russia's leading Symbolists were close to contemporary developments in philosophy, both European and Russian, and were themselves contributors to the intense reevaluation of the Western philosophical heritage that was taking place in Russia in this period, a process which involved a rediscovery, and to some extent a redefinition, of the Eastern tradition. The "Eastern tradition" in this context is not of course the Asian tradition, although at the time Russians

and Europeans alike were enthusiastically exploring the wisdom of Asia. The "Eastern tradition" here is the other face of ancient Greece, Greece filtered through Byzantium, Orthodoxy and early Christian Russia rather than the Greek tradition that was passed down to Western Europe by way of ancient Rome, through centuries of Western Christianity and Classical scholarship, and brought into post-Petrine Russia with the European Enlightenment.

A large proportion of Russia's academic philosophers after about 1880 were concerned with the "problem" of the predominance of rationalism in mainstream nineteenth-century European philosophy, and its culmination in positivism. In the period of interest to us they are represented in particular by the contributors to *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*, whose founding editor, Nikolaj Grot (1852-1899), was a professor at Moscow University, and held views that evolved from materialism through positivism to a system of his own in which he tried to reconcile thought with sensory experience, and science with religion. The journal welcomed variety and controversy in its pages; its contributors over the years were fairly representative of Russian philosophy, and included Aleksandr and Aleksej Vvedenskij, Lapšin, Čelpanov, Radlov, Losev, and also Vladimir Solov'ev.

There were basically three respects in which Russian thinkers of this loosely-defined group found the rule of reason to be a hindrance to the solution of certain kinds of philosophical problem. In the first place, there was a widespread dissatisfaction with the extent to which strictly rational philosophy left the religious side of human experience unaccounted for – at best a part of human nature that can be acknowledged as a reality, but not integrated with philosophy as such, at worst a characteristic of primitive societies, out of place in an age when being educated ought to imply being agnostic if not atheistic. Secondly, contemporary advances in psychology, emerging as a science in the modern sense, made it clear that there is more to the human mind than the reasoning intellect, and that the irrational plays a greater role in human mental activity than was generally acknowledged. Of course, the thinkers of the Romantic era had already made this point, and the legacy of their ideas was apparent long after their heyday, but an important component added to the picture in the latter part of the nineteenth century was the concept of the subconscious mind, brought into the realm of rigorous scientific and philosophical thought by Eduard von Hartmann in 1869, and its reverberations over ensuing decades. The implication was that a new definition of knowledge was now needed, and an appropriate revision of the philosophical theory of cognition. Thirdly, rationalism was felt to provide an unsatisfactory basis for ethics and morality, since the argument that absolute truths, if such existed, could be approximated but never fully known, had led inexorably to the position that all values are relative. This meant that philosophy could not be a practical force in a world that was desperate for moral

guidance, but was doomed to the discussion of ever more refined abstractions.

Russia's academic philosophers argued their way around these difficulties in appropriately formal language, using the more or less familiar concepts of contemporary, particularly German, critical philosophy, but taking greater account than their European counterparts of the new psychology as a necessary part of the philosopher's arsenal. They developed a number of characteristic preoccupations, four of which are particularly important, and are sequentially connected:

1) They focused on the possibility of a synthesis of reason and faith, of deduced and revealed truths, and on a corresponding revision of the philosophy of knowledge. The assumption that the absolute was unknowable had been thought of for almost a century as the legacy of Kant, and the Russian thinkers of this period joined in the European-wide reevaluation of the Sage of Königsberg. They placed great emphasis on a neglected part of Kant's legacy: the hints he leaves in the *Critique of Judgment* that the absolute might be knowable through other, non-rational modes of human discourse.

2) Building on their revisionist view of the nature and scope of human knowledge, they emphasized the importance of ethics as the branch of philosophy which distills all the other branches into practical wisdom, and makes all philosophical enquiry meaningful.

3) They discerned in Russia's Slavophile philosophers a peculiarly Russian first step in this direction, based in the experience of Russian reality, an important part of which was the survival of the wisdom of the people and the tradition of Orthodox religious teachings.

4) They began to see their endeavors as the foundation-stones of a distinctly Russian national philosophy. The "Russian school" would not be isolated from that of the West, but consciously based on all that was best in it. However, it would resolve in its own syncretic way problems that had eluded the best minds of the European tradition, and would offer to the world a practical solution to the ills of contemporary civilization.

These developments in Russian philosophy in the thirty years that span the turn of the century provide the key to what Ivanov has to say about Russia. Most of what was characteristic of Russia's academic philosophers in this period is reflected somewhere in Ivanov's work, and his thinking to some extent mirrors the progressive pattern described here. Like his contemporaries in the field of academic philosophy, he perceived the legacy of Kant as a barrier to be surmounted, he worked to integrate knowledge derived both from faith and from reason, and he asserted the need for philosophy to become a basis for action. To an extent matched by none of his contemporaries, he turned to the Eastern Christian tradition, and the threads that link it to the mysteries of ancient Greek religion, perceived as the matrix from which Christianity sprang. It would in fact be surprising if he had not joined his

contemporaries in calling for a revival of a kind of religious consciousness found preeminently in the Russian tradition.

Where Ivanov differs most obviously and sharply from the "professional" philosophers of his day is in his language: he replaces the philosophers' mode of discourse, the analytic language of critical philosophy, with his own language, metaphorical, imagistic and mythopoeic. It can in fact be argued that Ivanov's language is no less analytic, in its own way; its strength is that it is more appropriate to the task of reconciling reason with the mysteries of religious experience, of expressing the psychological implications of knowledge, and of giving shape simultaneously to the conscious and the subconscious dimensions of thought. Beyond the matter of language, the "nationalist" component in Ivanov's work departs in some more significant ways from the prevailing vein of philosophical nationalism.

Ivanov's work abounds in echos of the intellectual preoccupations he shared with his contemporaries. Their widespread uneasiness about the relativity of modern scientific thought finds very pointed expression in his 'Kruči', in a section entitled 'Krizis javlenija' ('The Crisis of the Phenomenal') which focuses on the damaging effect of relativism on the spiritual health of the human race. And where the academic philosophers embraced the new psychology in all its scientific rigor, including neuroscience and the physiology of the senses, Ivanov achieved throughout his work, theoretical and poetic alike, an impressive elucidation of the archetypes of human psychology in metaphorical constructs.

Ivanov, too, called for philosophy to be less removed from action, and he recognized a national dimension in the quest of his generation of Russian thinkers for philosophical solutions with a social application: he concluded the first section of his essay 'O ruskoj idee' (1909) with the observation that all the characteristically Russian questions of social philosophy – the individual and society, civilization and anarchy ("kul'tura i stichija"), the intelligentsia and the people – are at root attempts at national self-definition. This position is very similar to the view expressed by Nikolaj Grot twenty years previously, in the opening editorial of *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*. Grot claimed in his programmatic introduction that philosophy is intensely personal and individual, and the more significant individualism is in any human endeavor, the stronger the influence on it of national characteristics ("narodnost"), which are more apparent in philosophy than in any other human activity. Grot declined to pass final judgment on the future of Russian philosophy.

But there can surely be no doubt that the Russian people's view of life is in many ways different from that of other peoples, both past and present. The inability to believe in the exclusive dominance of reason in life and of strictly rational principles in knowledge has

manifested itself not only in the view of the populace, but in the doctrines of Russian thinkers, for example the Slavophiles.

At the same time, he observed, an interest in ethics has always prevailed in Russian thought at the expense of both rational and aesthetic philosophy (Grot 1889: xvi).

In 'O ruskoj idee' Ivanov went on to distinguish between "primitive culture" and "critical culture", but he regarded these states of mind as typological rather than strictly historical – the architects of the European middle ages, as well as the ancient Egyptians, were "primitive". "Critical" culture, meanwhile, was distinguished precisely by its failure to integrate the individual and the social group, intellectual creativity and faith, and by the

tireless quest for a more reliable truth and a more perfect form, a quest that is critical in essence, because it derives its character from [...] the inevitable competition of one-sided truths and relative values, the inevitably false assertion of abstract principles that have not yet been fully reconciled in the spirit of the New Testament.

Ivanov's vision clearly extended to a future that would reach beyond a reconciliation of the "primitive" and the "critical". He expressed it as an eventual reconciliation of the "intelligentsija" and the "narod", and when he uses these terms they seem more highly charged than in the usage of his contemporaries; they have in fact an almost mythic metaphoricity, embracing the epic struggle of Westernizers and Slavophiles. Russia, too, he held, had given rise to a "critical" culture, but had preserved deep within itself the vestiges of a "primitive" culture, and Russians feel keenly the resulting discomfort. This is not the nostalgia for a primordial social order that was fashionable in some circles in this period. Ivanov presents the "critical" component positively as the agent that releases the energy trapped in the "stagnancy" ("kosnost") of the primitive. He observes that the efforts of the typologically "critical" intelligentsia to reshape the people in its own image have failed, and the unexpected outcome may be that the intelligentsia transcends its own "critical" fetters. This might lead to deification of the people – but that would be an aberration, because God is to be sought in our *hearts* (Ivanov 1909: 331-332). Ivanov's wording here is remarkably close to that of the philosopher Aleksandr Vvedenskij some years earlier in his objections to a rationalist contemporary, but it also foreshadows the kind of language he would use later in his essays on Dostoevskij.

What variety of nationalism, then, does Ivanov's typology of Russian culture represent? Ivanov, like others, was careful to define his position in relation to the Slavophiles. In 'O ruskoj idee' and in several articles written over the next decade, particularly 'Živoe predanie' (1915), 'Dva lada ruskoj duši' (1916) and 'Kruči' (1919), he addressed the rise of a kind of thinking

among some of his contemporaries to which he referred as "Neo-Slavophilism". Even as they acknowledged its importance, the academic philosophers were generally careful to treat Slavophilism as a historical phase rather than a contemporary cause. P. Miljukov, for example, had written a piece on "the disintegration of Slavophilism", in which he maintained that Slavophilism was an organic product of the generation that gave rise to it, and should have died with that generation. Latterday Slavophiles, he held, are philosophically more consistent than the movement's originators, but their dialectic has taken leave of reality. "True Slavophilism [...] which is more than a theory, but a vital type of social thought, – this kind of Slavophilism no longer exists" (Miljukov 1893: 96). Ivanov was quite aware that historically Slavophilism had a reputation among his contemporaries as a reactionary political movement, and that his name was being associated with its revival. He was consequently careful to point out that the "national idea" quickly becomes false if it degenerates into national egoism, or becomes confused with the idea of the state, which is why "the egotistical assertion of our statehood among Neo-Slavophiles" is repulsive (Ivanov 1909: 325-326). However, he defended what he saw as the essential idea of Slavophilism – "belief in Holy Russia" – and he made clear his agreement with Tjutčev that Russia was an entity knowable only through belief. In this context he offered his own insights on the development of Russian thought, which match those of Aleksandr Vvedenskij (Vvedenskij 1924: 36-39), but cut more quickly to the heart of the matter. If early Slavophilism fell under the influence of German metaphysics, Ivanov held, this was significant only to the extent that German metaphysics was fashionable at that point and commanded attention. It was not long before Slavophilism found its true self in the metaphysics of the Eastern Church, in which "the ancient legacy of Platonism was preserved intact". For the Westernizer, meanwhile, the Russian idea became "a psychological rather than an ontological concept", a secular hope vested in the people rather than a spiritual identity.

In the essay 'Živoe predanie' Ivanov explicitly defends Slavophilism against the tendency to interpret it as national chauvinism. The belief in Holy Russia is not an assertion of national supremacy, he claims, since it is not exclusive, does not impugn the similar claims of other nations, and is founded in fact on the acknowledgment of "the general law of the mystical reality of national identities [narodnych lic]" (Ivanov 1915: 341). This defense recalls Grot's striking assertion in an 1890 article on metaphysics that philosophy, as distinct from metaphysics, *must* be national (Grot 1890: 127-128). Slavophilism, Ivanov continues, in sharp disagreement with Berdjaev, has overcome dialectically its "tendency to national phenomenology (a tendency known these days as 'provincialism')", and it is only a few aberrant Slavophiles who "forgetting the ecclesiastical and universal meaning of the Russian idea, adopt the standpoint of biological nationalism, and see Russia's

cause as a battle for the historical supremacy of a particular 'cultural type'" (Ivanov 1915: 343-345).

Solov'ev, Ivanov remarked in the conclusion of 'Živoe predanie', was a Slavophile, while Count Tolstoj was a Westernizer. What of Dostoevskij? Some of the academic philosophers occasionally referred for illustration to Russian writers and artists, including Dostoevskij. Grot included in a description of Russia's eventual contribution to philosophy an oblique reference to Dostoevskij: "The ideal of philosophy consists in the reconciliation of reason, the senses and the will, – of science, art and religion." Russians, he continued, have historically emphasized the religious and the ethical, but now they seek a synthesis, inspired perhaps by the ideals of the ancient Greeks, who sought harmony among the elements of human nature. "*The philosophy of the salvation of the world from evil*, its moral perfection, will surely be our peculiar philosophy. Even from beauty we expect 'salvation', and the same from truth" (Grot 1889: xvii-xviii). However, nobody acquainted with Ivanov's work needs reminding that he did not engage in passing references to Dostoevskij; he explicated Dostoevskij's work in detail, and very fruitfully, as a mythic typology of the human psyche, and of the quest for spirituality and salvation, and of the specifically Russian variety of the human condition. The best examples of Ivanov's national vision of Russia are in fact to be found in his writing on Dostoevskij.

The article 'Dostoevskij i roman-tragedija' in *Borozdy i meži* (1916) is followed by an excursus on the fundamental myth of *The Devils*. In this short but dense article Ivanov explicates the image of Dostoevskij's lame girl ("chromonožka") as essentially equivalent to Goethe's Gretchen image, the woman longing for the loved one's salvation, and he sees it as the "song of the Russian Soul", the longing for a mysterious "bridegroom" who will be the "bearer of God" ("ženich-bogonosec") and will enable the Russian people to become Christ-like. This language, which echos the earlier 'O ruskoj idee', could begin to sound chauvinistic, but the article's conclusion is on the contrary one of the clearest examples of Ivanov's universalism. The key question for Russians, he explains, is "how can Russia become Holy Mother Russia [kak zemlja ruskaja mozet stat' Rus'ju svjatoj]?" The key here is the antinomy between the two: "the Russian land" ("zemlja ruskaja") is a temporal world, Russia as an ethno-geographical entity, but "Holy Mother Russia", "Rus' svjataja" is a spiritual entity, a universal, and he concludes with a reference to Father Zosima's vision of the mysterious herald of "a new race of people and a new life". However, what is extraordinary about the term "Rus' svjataja" in Ivanov's usage is that it is not an abstraction, but a concrete image, the epitome of the Russian people's resistance to abstractions. In 'Lik i ličiny Rossii', which is a continuation of his explication of Dostoevskij, Ivanov explains the term as denoting a "concrete religious communality, based on the concrete persons of Christ himself and [...]"

Christ's true witnesses, His saints...". His elaboration of this idea explains more clearly than reams of analysis what Ivanov saw in Dostoevskij, and strove for in his own work: it is a key part of his bid to go beyond merely decrying abstraction, which was so widespread as to be fashionable. As a contributor to *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii* had put it many years earlier:

Surely it is not absolutely necessary to be an abstract philosopher in order to be a consciously good person? No, it just means that for conscious moral convictions one must have a philosophy of life that is founded in morality [nравstvenno-osmyslennoe mirosozercanie]. Human beings have an inner goal and direction; they cannot abide a fundamental discord between thought and deed; [...]. (Lopatin 1890: 71-72)

Ivanov's ambition, it would appear, was to actually banish abstraction, which is extraordinarily difficult for a philosopher to do. His writing about Russia is no less antithetical to abstractions, and we should be careful therefore to read it on a metaphorical level. His claim to rise above narrow nationalism rests less on the fact that he occasionally argued explicitly against national chauvinism, than on his achievement in raising Russia to the level of a transnational metaphorical language for the ideas that mattered most to him and to many of his contemporaries.

Ivanov saw in the particular condition of modern Russia the best possibility for the survival of humanity at large. His Hellenism is an exploration not so much of ancient Greek religion in its own right, as of the wellspring of human spirituality. It seems to me that his is not a nationalism of the ethnocentric type – its quality, to coin a term by analogy, is of the “ethnofugal” type, and in this sense it transcends the particulars of the nation that, he hoped, could show the world the way. As a matter of fact, the title of this symposium is, among other things, a term in Ivanov's vocabulary for the spiritual community that is both Russian and universal. In ‘Lik i ličiny Rossii’ he wrote, in a gentle reminder that this idea is timeless and as alive today as it was then:

Spiritual community [sobornost'] is, first and foremost, communion with the departed, – [...] not the earthly memory of them, but their eternal memory, not an attachment to their erstwhile deeds and physical appearance, but a faithfulness to their immortal [...] countenance” (Ivanov 1917: 478).

REFERENCES

- Grot, Nikolaj
 1889 'O zadačach žurnala'. *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*, t. 1, p. xvi.
 1890 'Čto takoe metafizika?'. *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*, t. 2.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav
 1909 'O ruskoj idee'. *Sobranie sočinenij*, t. III. Reprint: Brussels 1986, pp. 321-338.
 1915 'Živoje predanie'. *Sobranie sočinenij*, t. III. Reprint: Brussels 1986, pp. 339-347.
 1917 'Lik i ličiny Rossii'. *Sobranie sočinenij*, t. IV. Reprint: Brussels 1987, pp. 445-481.
- Lopatin, L.
 1890 'Položenie etičeskoj zadači v sovremennoj filosofii'. *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*, t. 2.
- Miljukov, P.
 1893 'Razloženie slavjanofil'stva'. *Voprosy filosofii i psichologii*, t. 18.
- Vvedenskij, Aleksandr
 1924 'Sud'by filosofii v Rossii'. *Filosofskie očerki*. Praga.

VJAČESLAV IVANOV AND THEOLOGY¹

ROBERT BIRD

Это был долгий период смутных поисков,
глухого брожения умов, алчущих религи-
озной гармонии, миросозерцания целост-
ного и утешительного. Рождались причуд-
ливые сказания, возникали иррациональ-
ные “могилы богов”.
(Ivanov 1994: 71)

Горних стран потребна мера,
Недр земных измерить дно.
Говорят душе равно
Умозрение и вера:
Вифлеемская пещера,
Новый гроб в скале – одно.
(III, 556)

1.

The fact that Vjačeslav Ivanov was not a theologian has limited both his acknowledged influence on professional theologians and the attention paid to the theological implications of his works by his readers. Yet this does not mean that his works have not proven of value to theologians, nor that non-theologians can view Ivanov's potential theology as a merely incidental aspect of his thought. Ivanov himself fully realized the significance of theology in his work, as well as that of his work for theology, as he hinted in an article from 1908:

[В] эстетических исследованиях о символе, мифе, хоровой драме, *реалиоризме* [...] я подобен тому, кто иссекает из кристалла чашу, веря, что в нее вольется благородная влага, – быть может, священное вино. (II, 571)

As this quotation indicates, Ivanov saw an organic, crystalline unity at the base of his topical studies in aesthetics, cultural typology and religious psychology. His articles do yield definitive and closely argued conclusions, but they also seek to communicate aspects of their author's inscrutable, pre-rational intuition, as well as a sense of the immeasurability of the full task at hand. Both the intuition and its incommunicability are expounded in Ivanov's articles through abundant quotation of poetry (mostly his own), oblique intellectual allusions, implicit polemic and selective self-revelation ("umalčivanie").² Few of Ivanov's theoretical works were spontaneous in genesis, most being evoked by some more or less incidental commission or arising from literary polemics; still, he always used the immediate occasion to explore the implications of a silent, but stable and perceptible basic position. Therefore, while Ivanov never formally addresses theology, it is not difficult to sense that his various phenomenological studies involve some theological precepts.

Unfortunately, Ivanov's expectation that readers would divine his underlying theological meaning and inspiration through its immediate expression has not often been met. The most lurid example of misguided appreciation is the following passage from an essay by the Symbolist poet and future priest Sergej Solov'ev:

В своем стремлении к разрушению основ христианской веры, искусно лавируя между различными течениями современной русской мысли, он, в целом ряде статей и стихотворных произведений, выводит христианство из недр греческой мистики, отождествляя символы Диониса и Христа, не останавливаясь перед такими выражениями, как "Христос-Геракл" и даже "Голгофа Вакха". Туманный язык часто затемняет от читателя истинный смысл теорий В. Иванова, и этим можно объяснить такие явления, как сопоставление В. Иванова чуть ли не с отцами церкви в книге В. Эрн о Сковороде. (Solov'ev 1916: 52)³

Sergej Solov'ev was not the only one to accuse Ivanov of heresy. In the context of the émigré church schism in the nineteen-twenties, Georgij Grabbe traced the Russian Church's decline back to the Symbolist period, and specifically to Ivanov's meeting Anna Minclova, which allegedly gave a foothold to the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross in Russia (Grabbe 1927: 10). A view characteristic of conservative commentators is the following:

В двадцатом веке "радения" совершались не в лесах, а в петроградских гостиных и отдельных кабинетах ресторанов. Кровь "культурно" вытаскивали и пили с вином. Пляски, хороводы – сохранились. Мэнад, вакханок – заменили философы, артисты, поэты – те, кто пытается ныне учить нас Православию! (*Vozbuditeli raskola* 1927: 20)

This passage is revealing in several regards. Acknowledging the mystical basis of Russian modernism, the anonymous author finds Ivanov's patented terms symptomatic of its ambivalent religious inspiration, encompassing ancient orgiastic and the Russian sectarians (Chlysty). Moreover, he discerns a direct link between these religious ambitions and the theology of such thinkers as S.N. Bulgakov, A.V. Kartašev, and other prominent émigré thinkers grouped around the St. Sergius Theological Institute in Paris. The author testifies not only to the notoriety of some of Ivanov's ideas, but also to the common impression that, in some unfathomable way, they aspired to have significance for the Church.⁴

However, all of these critiques underscore the danger of making judgments on the basis of a hasty reading of Ivanov's works. One must not seek to label the defining unity of his thought with individual formulations culled from isolated sources, whether they be Ivanov's own articles or memoiristic literature. Superficial readings are particularly misleading with respect to his writings' religious import. For example, in his 1909 article 'Ancient Terror' Ivanov postulates an ancient belief in a cosmic goddess, what he terms thelmonotheism (III, 103). Despite his obvious (though vague) sympathy with this belief he would later warn one student against interpreting it "as an integral part" of his own religion (Segal 1994: 343). Another example is revealed by contemporaries' diaries, which preserve two contradictory statements on the virginity of Mother of God, pronounced only four months apart in 1909 (Obatnin 1994: 143; El'čaninov 1984: 61); taken together they bear witness only to his particular interest in this Christian mystery and his knowledge of esoteric and allegorical traditions. A piecemeal approach to Ivanov's "religion" can only lead to its fragmentation and distortion.⁵ In order to receive guidance in its interpretation, one must turn to the most immediate and integral part of his creative heritage – his poetry.

As poet, Ivanov understood himself roughly as fulfilling the role, and exercising the rights, of prophet, as expounded by Vladimir Solov'ev in his tripartite vision of theocracy.⁶ Solov'ev understood prophecy, not as the prediction of future events, but as the "free and living activity" of the Holy Spirit, that unites the divinely-ordained Church and state in the common, divine-human task (Solov'ev 1948: 206; cf. II, 87). Charismatic prophecy hovers above traditional realms of human activity, whether they are concerned with phenomena immanent to the world (aesthetics) or transcendent

(religion), presaging and prefiguring the future unity of the two cosmic realms. Accepting this definition at least for Ivanov's self-perception, one must seek to determine Ivanov's "prophetic" message within the dynamic process of cosmic integration, without substituting any of its parts for the whole. For this reason we shall commence our consideration of Ivanov's theological significance with the analysis of a poem.

Есть в Оптиной пустыни Божия Матерь Спорительница.
По видению старца Амвросия
Написан образ Пречистой:
По край земли дивное
Богатство нивное;
Владычица с неба
Глядит на простор колосистый;
Спорятся колосья,
И множатся в поле снопы золотистого хлеба...

Тайныя церкви глубин святорусских Затворница,
Руси боримой со светлыми духи Поборница,
Щедрая Благотворительница,
Смут и кровей на родимой земле Умирительница,
Дай нам хлеба в скорости, –
Добрый всходам спорости,
Матерь Божия Спорительница!

22 декабря [1917]

(Ivanov 1918; with inaccuracies IV, 75)

This poem is the seventh and final one in a cycle written in response to the October Revolution, entitled 'Songs of the Time of Troubles' ('Pesni smutnogo vremeni'). At the time, according to a later memoirist, the cycle was perceived as "malicious, counter-revolutionary verse";⁷ this, together with the fact that Ivanov did not include it in his posthumous collection *The Evening Light* (*Svet večernij*), has led to its marginalization in Ivanov's poetic corpus. Still, the poems of the cycle crystallize large themes in Ivanov's creative work and grant entrance into the world of the integral poet-thinker.

This is certainly true with respect to the historiosophical and political stance adopted in the cycle, which moves from an empirical reaction to the events of late 1917 towards their metaphysical basis and religious resolution. In the closing months of 1917, Ivanov had already inscribed the following prognosis:

Революция протекает внерелигиозно. Целостное самоопределение народное не может быть внерелигиозным. Итак, революция не выражает донныне целостного народного самоопределения. [...] Для истинного свершения своего [...] она

должна явить целостное и, следовательно, прежде всего религиозное самоопределение народа. (III, 364)

Such a probing reaction to the Revolution was well characterized by D.H. Lawrence: "It is the absence of the Easter kiss which makes the Bolshevik bread barren, dead. They eat dead bread, now" (1962: 238). Ivanov, however, would never have agreed that religion could be completely and irrevocably absent, and he fully appreciated the spiritual value of suffering and deprivation; he concludes his cycle on the revolution envisioning new crops of enlivened bread. Here, perhaps, we see an example of the Christian aesthetic principle Ivanov called "prophesying in hope", instead of "in memory", which was the realm of pre-Christian art (III, 97). The vision of humanity as a ripe field is essentially eschatological: instead of seeking causes of events in a lost Golden Age, it seeks their ends in the age to come.

The cycle is also significant in the way that it appropriates the traditions of Russian literature for illustration and confirmation of the inevitably religious destination of culture, as it achieves unity with religion in the future synthesis in a transformed cosmos. In previous poems of the cycle reference is made to such texts as Puškin's 'The Demons' ('Besy') and *The Bronze Horseman*, Lermontov's 'Meditation' ('Duma'), Dostoevskij, even Nekrasov's 'Morning Stroll' from *On the Weather*, all works containing prophetic statements and images concerning the Russian Revolution. Ivanov's final poem in his cycle on the revolution is both the culmination of this implicit meditation on the ways of Russian literature and a step away from literature in the strict sense towards semi-liturgical writing, a kind of overture to the symphony of Russian literature.

The first clearly liturgical feature of the poem is its subject, the Icon of the Mother of God "Sporitel'nica chlebov", which was revealed in about 1890 to St. Amvrosij of Optina, just before his repose in 1891.⁸ The degree of Amvrosij's participation in the icon's composition is not entirely clear: he probably named the icon and may himself have directed its composition, but he might simply have directed that the harvest scene be added to an existing icon; some accounts claim that he merely was presented the icon in its existing state.⁹ In no account of the origin of "Sporitel'nica chlebov", contrary to Ivanov's poem, is there any mention of the icon being conceived in a vision. Whatever its actual origin, Amvrosij presented the icon to the Šamordino Convent he founded near Optina Pustyn', indicating that its feast be celebrated on October 15. For its liturgical celebration Amvrosij also composed a short verse to be added to every other stanza of the Akathist Hymn to the Mother of God: "Rejoice, o Full of Grace, the Lord be with Thee! Grant also us unworthy ones the dew of Thy grace and show Thy mercy!" Subsequently a new Akathist Hymn to the icon has been composed, along with a special

devotional prayer and the shorter hymns used in regular church services, the troparion and kondakion.

Пречистая Дево Мария, Мати Царя Небеси и Земли! Благоутробно призираеши на любящих Сына Твоего, Христа Бога нашего, и трудящихся во имя Его вечного ради спасения, и подаеши им вся обильно к наслаждению, Спорительнице сущи хлебов им, избавляя их всякия нужды и утеснения и устрояя им рабом Твоим сущим, избавление вечныя муки и жизнь вечную.

Честное жилище бывшее неизреченного естества Божественнаго, выше слова и паче ума и грешным еси Споручица, Подаваеши благодать и исцеление, яко Мати всех царствующих. Моли Сына Твоего получитьи нам милость в день судный. ('Akafist' 1992)

The icon "Sporitel'nica chlebov", like the similar "Bogomater' Deržavnaja" (Panteleimon 1958: 530-531), has thus seen a rapid spread from local veneration to regular liturgical status in the Russian Orthodox Church.

The unusual structure of Ivanov's poem is actually quite reminiscent of a troparion and kondakion, which are sung together in Orthodox services in honor of whatever or whomever is being celebrated on any given day.¹⁰ Either kind of liturgical stanza can consist of a descriptive exposition, as seen in the first stanza of Ivanov's poem, or a direct and encomiastic appeal, as seen in the second stanza. Although both stanzas of the "Sporitel'nica" hymns as we have quoted them are addressed to the Mother of God, the same combination as in Ivanov's poem can be found, for example, for the feast of the Annunciation. In the hymns composed to the "Sporitel'nica" icon, however, one can notice a concentration of epithets in the kondakion (the second hymn), as in Ivanov's poem. In addition to the bipartite structure, another hymnic feature is the devotional tone of Ivanov's poem, which can be compared to that of the famous Akathist, a long series of kondakia and oikoi. Some have seen the Akathist as excessively devotional with respect to the Mother of God, Who, in Orthodox tradition, must not be separated in devotion from Her Son (a prescription followed in both hymns to the "Sporitel'nica" icon). The poem's liturgical feel is augmented by a pair of Church Slavic grammatical forms (the genitive singular feminine "tajnyja cerkve" and the instrumental plural "duchi"; the form "Mater" might also be included), and many of the words of the poem, especially the epithets of the Mother of God, are perhaps more common in Church Slavic than in Russian.

In 1913, Ivanov had confessed that "in his long meditations on the essence of poetry" he had "lost the ability to recognize the limits of holy allotments", so that some of his poems would doubtless seem to many "to be

dedicated to subjects inaccessible to the Muse by their loftiness or their 'transcendence'" (III, 7). While unable to judge "desirable from undesirable" according to content, Ivanov claims that the ultimate measure of appropriateness is "the integrity of form" (III, 8). Not too long before writing "Songs of the Time of Troubles", Ivanov had again defended the mixture of faith and artifice in his religious poetry by alluding specifically to the "most difficult and refined form" of the Akathist Hymn (Ivanov 1916). While affirming the artist's freedom to use such forms as "an expression of the pure need of strict prayer", he notes that the poet is most convincing when he is "true to his own style" (*ibid.*). Following Ivanov's indications, one easily sees that, despite its liturgical accoutrement, his poem remains decidedly a modern poem. Firstly, the lines are rhymed in an irregular fashion. The rhymes are, moreover, very significant for the meaning of the poem, for example "Amvrosija" is linked by rhyme with "kolos'ja", and by an inner rhyme to the word "Božija" from the first line; the ripening ear of wheat ("kolos") and laboring hermit are likened to each other in their devotion, both achieving a divine state of perfection, as the Eucharistic bread and divine-humanity, respectively. The word "Sporitel'nica" is marked in the first stanza by its lack of rhyme, and in the second stanza by ending the only non-paired line (which does, however, rhyme with two other lines). The word's odd position links the beginning and end of the poem; its meaning stresses the organic nature of the spiritual of growth patronized by the Mother of God and concentrates the reader's attention on the word "Sporitel'nica" itself. Among the poem's other non-liturgical formal features is its loose but clear rhythm, alternating between two- and three-foot meters, and combinations thereof.

The second main distinction between Ivanov's poem and liturgical hymnography concerns the epithets of the Mother of God. "Prečistaja" is traditional, and "Sporitel'nica" stems from the icon, but all of the remaining epithets ("Pobornica", "Blagotvoritel'nica", "Umiritel'nica", and "Zatvornica") are not themselves used with any frequency in liturgical texts, although similar ones are (cf. "Voevoda", "Zastupnica"; "Vratarnica"¹¹ is the actual name of the revered Iveron Icon of the Mother of God). Also, the epithets are given in the nominative case, not the vocative of Church Slavic hymns (e.g., "Nevesto nenevestnaja" from the original Akathist Hymn to the Mother of God).

Therefore the poem exists in some space between poetry and liturgy, incorporating the two, linking them at the root, but giving itself wholly over to neither. It asserts both the religious destination and creative freedom of art, in accordance with Ivanov's understanding of art as prophecy. It would be an injustice, therefore, to view the poem as a contamination of poetry and liturgy that subordinates both to some arbitrary criterion. It would be more accurate to see it as a myth of the prophet-poet, caught in his eternally artistic movement towards the final reunification of culture and religion in the King-

dom of God, whether the latter is understood as Solov'ev's millennial Empire or as the fulfillment of the Church in a more traditional sense. In this sense the poem clarifies the role and position of the prophetic artist while demonstrating that for Ivanov, at least in the late 1910s, the presaged and prefigured reunification, eschatological reality, would preserve forms more or less traditional in Russian Orthodoxy. We find not only a myth of the poet's general stance as prophet, but also a symbol of his positive confession of Orthodoxy in this particular period.

Both the prophetic nature of art and Ivanov's personal faith refer us to the central principle of his world-view: the belief in two, mutually dependent worlds, heavenly and earthly. The two worlds are one in principle, in possibility, and – eschatologically – in reality; but in time, in space, the two worlds appear as dichotomous. In his book on Skovoroda, mentioned by Sergej Solov'ev as the apotheosis of Vjačeslav Ivanov, Vladimir Ėrn called such a world-view “dualistic monism”, or “supra-essential realism” (1912: 263). In the poem under consideration this principle is reflected with particular clarity in the person of the Mother of God, who is simultaneously a supra-essential being with dominion over the earth and the earth itself, both the prototype and the icon of the cosmos. The connection between the Mother of God and the earth is expressed in the lines:

Владычица с неба
Глядит на простор колосистый;
Спорятся колосья,
И множатся в поле снопы золотистого хлеба...

The two levels of reality are parallel: the Mother of God looks, the earth brings forth fruit. Indeed the two levels are in a sense identical, which is what allows the poet, when speaking of the icon, to say “There *is* in Optina Pustyn' the Mother of God...”. This relationship of identity, for Ivanov, is symbolic, and therefore he can speak both of the earth and of the icon as symbols of the Mother of God, i.e., as manifestations of her essence in time and space. The symbolic nature of the cosmos also extends to the particular actions of beings, what Ivanov would call myths. The Mother of God not only is the earth. She brings forth fruit – “the Fruit of her womb, Jesus” in the traditional “Hail Mary” prayer, the literal fruit of the earth in this poem, or the Eucharistic bread that makes all of these levels of reality present simultaneously and in the same place. Each of these acts is mythical insofar as it is performed by a transcendent subject within the bounds of time and space.

In these images Ivanov's Symbolism reveals its principal significance for understanding the interplay of divine and natural realities in Christianity, preeminently in the sacraments. Indeed, Eucharistic symbols were prominent

in Ivanov's theories as early as 1905, in the early article ‘On Descent’, which details aesthetic principles characterized by phrases from the Eucharistic canon.¹² The doctrine of real presence is an obvious model for Ivanov's Realistic Symbolism, but this doctrine itself is of limited value without a broader understanding of the nature of symbolic relations, and of the realities that are being made present. Ivanov places the principle of symbolism, and the symbol itself, at the center of an entire complex of doctrines, covering everything from aesthetics to cosmology. Ivanov's achievement logically leads back to reflection on the Eucharistic vision that lay at its beginning.

This points to Ivanov's first major and lasting contribution to Orthodox theology: the symbol and myth as categories that explain embodiments of transcendent reality and truth. As we have seen, the symbol itself is a particularly rich and powerful concept, singularly “prophetic” in its ability to integrate entire doctrines in its very definition. Ivanov's gradual contemplation of the symbol revealed a distinct metaphysics (“monistic dualism”) and the kernel of a renewed sacramentology. In the absence of direct documentary evidence, it is premature to speak of Ivanov's direct influence on theologians who have elaborated a revitalized Orthodox sacramentology and aesthetics, from Pavel Florenskij to Vladimir Lossky and Alexander Schmemmann,¹³ but Ivanov's writings on the symbol undoubtedly played a central role in establishing the ontological dignity of the religious principle of representation, as an expression of transcendent reality that remains in some true sense identical to that reality (cf. Lepachin 1988). The importance of his theories for Onomatodoxy (“imjaslavie”), which promotes belief in divine names as icons or symbols of the divinity, has recently begun to receive due attention (Evtuhov 1997: 213-214; Ghidini 1996). But Ivanov's contribution was broad and rich enough that it inspired not only an enriched understanding of liturgical art and the sacraments, but even of dogma as symbolic and antinomial formulations of transcendent truth (cf. II, 613-614). Whatever his direct influence may have been, the reader of Ivanov recognizes much in the modern Orthodox theology of the symbol that can be traced to him and which might benefit from renewed acquaintance with this source.

The symbols and myths of Mary discussed above make manifest the energies of her nature. Perhaps the central symbol of the Mother of God in the poem is the untranslatable epithet and symbol “Sporitel'nica”, both the principle and agent of fertility. The word “Sporitel'nica” is both clear and obscure. It is clear that the word refers to some aid rendered to the organic process; etymologically the word is connected to the English “spore”, a kind of parcel of life. Yet there appears to be no single word in English that would describe precisely what is meant by the phrase “sporjatsja kolos'ja”. It is not fertilization, nor is it ripening; it is the intermediate stage when the fertilized grain accepts life and begins its growth. Moreover, no biological term in English seems fully appropriate for the Mother of God; “Facilitator” is a

weak compromise for the rich "Sporitel'nica", the obscurity of which underscores both its great semantic capacity and, ultimately, its transcendent origin. It effectively communicates the silence inherent in any work of art, the poet's silence before the fact of creativity and before the object of his contemplation (cf. Ivanov 1916).

In the case at hand both aspects of the poet's creative-receptive act are united in a single image: the object of contemplation is precisely the creative potential of the cosmos. The life-giving aspect of the Mother of God had particular interest for Ivanov, engaged as he was in reuniting the two separate realms through the receptivity of the lower realm. The Mother of God, identified in the Orthodox tradition as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Jacob's Ladder, joining heaven to earth, is the patron of all human growth, and particularly of art, the preeminent objectification of, and witness to, ontological growth. As such, She becomes for Ivanov and other Symbolists the preeminent patron of "prophecy", this prefiguration of ontological and phenomenal unity.¹⁴ In this sense the Mother of God is even present in this poem on another level, as the leaven on which it has grown.

If we identify the symbol as Ivanov's first important contribution to Orthodox theology, then his second will be this view of spiritual growth through the receptivity of divine energies, and of holiness as a palpable gift.¹⁵ It is significant that the poem is not only about the Mother of God, but also about Starec Amvrosij, one of the pillars of modern Russian sanctity. Apropos of Dostoevskij, Ivanov wrote that "he understands how incomparable is the joy of the people when on its earthly fields, amid the stunted stalks half-choked by weeds, a blade shoots up that is born in God as the precursor of the coming crop of a better humanity; like a Eucharistic stalk in which the Holy Ghost has invisibly transformed the Earth into the Sun, the grains of wheat into the body of the Lamb" (1989: 160; Russian text III, 316, cf. IV, 584). The "good crops" called for by Ivanov in the poem are personified by Amvrosij, whose name after all rhymes with "Božij" and "kolos'ja". If we read a couple of individual lines from the poem this picture stands out with particular clarity:

По видению старца Амвросия
Написан образ Пречистой:
[...]
Глядит на простор колосистый;
Спорятся колосья.

Amvrosij-Božij kolos, ripening on the field of the Mother of God, is himself as it were an icon of the Most Pure One. His being serves as another ladder to heaven, "the angels ascending and descending", and it was of such men that Ivanov wrote in his long poem 'Man' (Čelovek): "Creator of icons and

himself an Icon" (II, 198; cf. Lepachin 1988: 105).¹⁶ In modern Russian culture, and especially in the work of Ivanov, Vološin, and other poets, the greatest image of iconic humanity is St. Seraphim of Sarov, who was especially closely identified with the Mother of God.¹⁷ The words She addressed to St. Seraphim, "He is of our kind" ("On našego roda"), are echoed in Ivanov's reference to "native land" ("rodimaja zemlja"). Again we note a deep connection between Symbolism in human life and the Mother of God.

The source and focus of this full vision of the symbol is precisely in the importance it imparts to the reality and strangeness of mystical experience. Without exaggerating the degree of his personal asceticism, it must be acknowledged that Ivanov was one of the first, if not the first major cultural figure to incorporate the language of monasticism in aesthetics, utilizing unusual terms that have since become commonplace and generally understandable: "umnoe delanie", "molitvennoe delanie".¹⁸ Moreover Ivanov placed these terms in the context of an aesthetic that was influential among theologians. Compare, for example, this later assertion by Florenskij:

Право на символотворчество принадлежит лишь тому, кто трезвенно мыслью и жезлом железным пает творимые образы на жизненных пажах своего духа. Не виртуозность разработки, но аскетическое трезвение в самом буйстве творческих порывов есть признак истинного творчества.
(Florenskij 1991, II: 121)

Again, it is very difficult to prove any particular influence of Ivanov on the renewed understanding of monasticism in recent Orthodox theology, although some of the main scholars and popularizers of Russian sanctity, including Pavel Florenskij, Georgij Fedotov and Ioann Kologrivov, do cite Ivanov in their works. Central to this new understanding of personal sanctity is the image of illumination by divine light, that is the aesthetic expression of an inner, ontological transformation of the individual into an icon of the divine.

Ivanov's contribution to understanding mystical experience was countered somewhat by his role in the general "inflation" of mysticism during the Silver Age. Ivanov easily equated "prophets" both with "artists" and "mystics" so that any artist seemed mystically blessed automatically. Entire nations, if graced with a particular historical role, might become "nations of mystics" (III, 324). Even in 1916, long after the heady days of the Tower and the Petersburg Religious-Philosophical Society, Ivanov remained quick to defend artists as mystics (1916). Ivanov's own mystical experiences were closely tied to a period of deep interest in extra-ecclesial mysticism, such as Russian sects and Western "mysteries".¹⁹ As in many areas of Ivanov's creative work, it is difficult here to isolate a primordial basis of this confusing

array of interests and appellations, which, to some extent, excuses those who saw Ivanov's religious task as the perversion of traditional Christianity through "mystical inflation" and Rosenkreuzerism. Against this background the poem under analysis represents a rather safe harbor from which forays can be made along the dark shores of Ivanov's thought.

The two particular contributions identified here, the symbol and a new or simply revitalized image of sanctity, are of course closely interrelated. It is worth recalling that Ivanov's symbolism organically grew out of, and to a certain extent superseded, his Dionysianism, understood as the mystical experience of divine all-unity. Direct mystical experience was for Ivanov always a precondition of any artistic or theoretical expression of the more real ("realiora"), the true, which coincides with the divine aspect of the cosmos. It may seem almost blasphemous to recall Dionysus in the context of Christian theology, and indeed many, like Sergej Solov'ev, have found the implied connection profoundly inappropriate. Yet the analysis of the poem at hand provides a proper context. Mystical experience is the fruit of individual labors, but also of a divine willingness to facilitate individual growth and effect cosmic reunification. In the poem the Mother of God comes first, granting a vision to Amvrosij. Amvrosij communicates this vision to the icon-writer, who with a necessary amount of spiritual ability expresses it in the icon. Even in the fourth generation the icon communicates to the poet energies of the Mother of God, so that of this poem we can say that "She is there". Reading the poem is therefore not simply an aesthetic exercise, but – in a theological sense – the acceptance of a sacramental gift of grace that affects the entire person, in a moral, ontological, and aesthetic way.

In a very direct sense Ivanov's meditations on the divine presence in human existence, on the immanence of the transcendent, are a reflection of the trinitarian debates that dominated Russian intellectual thought at the beginning of the century (cf. Meerson 1996: 119-143). It was Vladimir Solov'ev who placed at the forefront of the contemporary Russian consciousness the problem of how the transcendent God achieves immanence, most notably in his *Lectures on Divine Humanity*. The Trinity itself is an expression of God's desire for *otherness* (the Logos) and unity (the Spirit); this pre-eternal process achieves embodiment in Sophia, the shared being of the triune Godhead. The objectivization of this multiplicity-in-unity is the cause of the creation, but the latter always remains a reflection of the inner life of the Trinity. Like Florenskij, Ėrn, Sergej Bulgakov and many of their contemporaries, Ivanov saw the resolution of humanity's dilemma in the realization that human (or, more generally, cosmic) life is the manifestation of divine being, the life of God. The intrinsic shortcoming of their attempts, in the context of Orthodox theology, is that their theories had little need for the Trinity itself, nor for its revelation in the world, as they dealt with its embodiment – the divine creation or Sophia.

The foregoing exposition of Ivanov's significance for Orthodox Christian theology has centered on the figure of the Mother of God, the Theotokos, whereas Christ Himself has been mentioned only in passing. This single fact is sufficient to illustrate some of the objections raised to the understanding of symbols and symbolic being common to Ivanov and such contemporaries as Vladimir Ėrn and Florenskij. As shown briefly above, symbols are for them less a gift of grace than the very principle of existence: things *are* to the extent that they *share* in divine being, to the extent that they symbolize their divine potential. Nature's or humanity's natural receptivity to the divine is often seen, in such Christian pantheism, to dwell in the *seeds* of divinity ("logoi spermatikoi"). The human soul (for Ivanov) or fleshly image (for Florenskij) must come to renounce its worldly independence and accept its potential divinity: Psyche seeks Amor, Anima – Animus, and the Earth – Spirit. Since humanity is already *in principle* identical to the divinity, Christ-Logos, the accent shifts to the almost natural process of growing into one's inherent divinity, revealing or illuminating one's inner *logos* or *countenance* ("lik"). This aesthetic focus is the basis of the one direct critique of Ivanov's Symbolism as theology:

Символ и символизм только констатируют наличие в земной действительности несовершенных отражений более реальных, потусторонних предметов и явлений. [...] Приглашая человека унести в *realibus ad realiora* символ и символизм от самого человека не требует выявить собственную реальность, т. е., *очиститься от грехов*, сбросить с себя ветхого человека. (Popov 1949: 16)

It is quite common in Russian religious thought for deification to be understood in this way as an "eternal relationship" instead of a moral-religious *process* (Swoboda 1996: 245). The primordial matter of creation and the prophetic principle of receptivity and unity combine into the image of the Mother of God: on the one hand she is the earth, the passive principle of creation, creature, the receptacle of the divine logoi. On the other hand, however, she is the "shower of the way" (Hodegetria),²⁰ "the prophetic sign" ("Znamenie"),²¹ "the facilitator" ("Sporitel'nica"), which are also characteristics of the Spirit. The various roles of the Mother of God are in their turn identifiable almost at will as Mary, the World Soul (Earth), or Sophia (Heaven). The Holy Spirit ("the chorus-leader of life"; II, 743), which Ivanov sometimes evokes as the male counterpart to feminine matter/earth/universe, is also in the final analysis identical to the divine creation. The Spirit and the Divine Mother merge as the immanent aspect of transcendent divinity, and this confusion is repeated on other levels. Primordial paradise, for example,

actually turns out to be identical to the accomplished cosmos, which calls into question the value of real cosmic life, development and history.

The imagery of seminal logos and receptive soil-flesh is not necessarily heterodox, recalling, for example, of the following passage from St. Justin Martyr (2nd century):

All that [the pagans] have well said belongs to us, the Christians. [...] These writers were able to perceive the Truth obscurely (*amudros*) thanks to the sowing (*spora*) of the Word which had been placed within them. But it is one thing to possess a seed (*sperma*), and a likeness proportioned to one's capacity, and quite another to possess the reality itself, both the partaking and the imitation of which are the results of the grace which comes from him.
(*II Apology* XIII, 4-6; cited by Daniélou 1973: 42)²²

The difference between Ivanov and Justin lies in their view of the source of grace, which bridges the gap between the created logos and Divine Logos: Justin sees grace as originating in Christ, Ivanov often speaks as if it issues from a continuation of this sowing (*spora*), on the part of the "Sporitel'nica", who is either the immanent aspect of the divine or the cosmos as divinity. St. Justin identifies such views as Ivanov's as a fundamentally pre- or extra-Christian religiosity, based on the mere illumination of natural symbolic relations inherent in the *logoi spermatikoi*. Indeed, there can hardly be much account of such historical developments in such a radically anti-historicist cosmology as that of Ivanov. His eschatological orientation is, in the final analysis, effortlessly transmuted into a Romantic longing for the Golden Age. As Ol'ga Deschartes (Šor) insisted, Ivanov's work is filled with the prophetic and mystical vision of "heaven on earth" (I, 49-51), but without an account of historical development this vision could be consistent with most religious teachings. On the other hand, the absence of a clear explanation for death and time ruling on the earth, or of their defeat, may be the result of "prophetic" blindness caused by the glory of that final vision.

It is the inherent divinity of the cosmos that allowed the "Christians before Christ", from Ivanov's Dionysians to the Platonists and Virgil, to grasp Christian truths before their revelation from beyond the cosmos. This religious continuity is the basis of Pavel Florenskij's view of the icon of the "Sporitel'nica":

Ведь что же есть эта Спорительница Хлебов, как не видение Богоматери во образе, в канонической форме Матери Хлебов – Деметры? Сквозь не подчинившиеся духовному импульсу живописные приемы 80-х годов, ощущением однако прозреваешь именно это таинственное видение, церковное

"да" древнему образу благостной Деметры, в котором собрали Эллина часть своих предчувствий о Матери Божией.
(Florenskij 1995: 84)

To many such a proliferation of divine truth in the Symbolist vision smacks of pantheism, which seems always to be the scourge of mystically-inspired theological systems and of "prophecy" in general, oriented as it is to eschatological unity. Subsequent theologians (such as Vladimir Lossky, Georges Florovsky and John Meyendorff), attempting to reconcile Symbolism with a more traditionally dualistic understanding of an entirely separate creation and an absolutely transcendent God, have found it necessary to reintegrate this vision of unity with a lucid account, first of the creation itself, and then of the means of its reunification with God (Meyendorff 1983: 30-37). While the traditional domains of such concerns has been christology and pneumatology, post-Symbolist Orthodox theologians have concentrated their energies on an ecclesiological cosmology: the Church is not only taken as the mediator between God and man, but is limited by history and sacramental membership. Discussing the confusion of the cosmos with the transfigured creation of the Church in mystic theologians from Boehme to Solov'ev and Bulgakov, Vladimir Lossky noted: "It is not legitimate to accord to origins that which belongs to vocation, to accomplishment and the final end" (Losskij 1957: 112). Still, Lossky must admit the positive value of Russian religious philosophy as a stimulus and inspiration for further theological inquiry. The Trinitarian ecclesiology of Lossky, Florovsky, Meyendorff and others is in many ways a logical development of turn-of-the-century attempts to locate human life within the Trinity, whether through outright pantheism or a religion "of the Spirit". Ivanov's particular contribution lies in his powerful account of Symbolism (in realms from aesthetics to ontology) and his inspired, if effusive vision of mysticism and sanctity.

Ironically, the vague and unformulated nature of Ivanov's theological intuitions may help to accord him his rightful place in religious thought as a Solovyevian "prophet", the herald of potential, but non-existent unity. In this he differs significantly from, say, Fr. Sergij Bulgakov, whose single-minded attempt to elaborate a full dogmatic system, resulting in open conflicts with ecclesiastical authorities, has inevitably hindered a fair assessment of his thought. While Ivanov's basic theological intuition may be consistent with that of Bulgakov, he appears much more conscious of the difficulties inherent in granting it systematic account. Ivanov is more willing to use his inspiration to inspire, rather than teach. And, while his vision cannot be called theology, it has undoubtedly inspired theologians; while Ivanov's precise formulations may be unsuitable for dogma, his artistic embodiments of these same truths present the fullness of a reality that craves dogmatic expression. In the limited sense intended here, with respect to the life of the church,

Ivanov's view of himself as "prophet" has been fully justified, and that his prophetic vision of the symbol and sanctity remain vital sources of religious creativity.

NOTES

- ¹ All references to Ivanov's *Sobranie sočinenij* (Ivanov 1971) indicate volume (Roman numeral) and page (Arabic numeral). The author would like to express his sincere gratitude to Dr. Michael Hagemester, Mr. Boris Jakim and Prof. Igor' Višneveckij for invaluable help in the preparation of this article.
- ² From the draft of letter to Andrej Belyj from April 9, 1908; RGB 109.9.8 ll. 3-4.
- ³ Solov'ev refers to Vladimir Ėrn's book *Grigorij Skovoroda* (Ėrn 1912), discussed below.
- ⁴ Both Grabbe and the anonymous author base their accounts mostly on Belyj's 1922 *Vospominanija o Bloke* (Belyj 1995: 219-220, 267-270), but the anonymous author also refers to V.V. Rozanov's (uncorroborated, but unchallenged) assertion that Ivanov and his wife were among the thirty or forty participants in a blood-drinking ritual at the house of poet N.M. Minskij, apparently around 1905 (Rozanov 1932: 142), and to N. Arsen'ev's quite derivative study of Dionysian religion (1926).
- ⁵ Ivanov often called for circumspection in labelling his aesthetics as a religious teaching (see, e.g., II, 567-572; Sapov 1994, II: 291, 303). In a later lecture, in 1927, Ivanov spoke of the crucial difference between "religious thought" and "theology" (Ivanova 1992: 171); for a summary of this lecture series (on the Westernizers and Slavophiles, Dostoevskij, Solov'ev, and others) see dell'Isola (1927). Fedor Stepun also notes the precedence of poetry over reflection in Ivanov's thought (Ivanova 1992: 376).
- ⁶ Here, of course, Ivanov opened himself up to new criticism, as when N. Arsen'ev commented: "Ein Sophist, kein Prophet. Oder wenn ein Prophet, so von welchem Geiste?" (1929: 254).
- ⁷ On the history of the cycle see Ueland (1992: 77-80); Kotrelev (1982: 163).
- ⁸ Information on the icon's history is taken from: Četverikov (1912: 311-312); Agapit (1900: 103-104); *Skazanija* (1958: 491-493).
- ⁹ The composition of "Sporitel'nica chlebov" is strikingly similar to "Bogomater' Novgorod-Severskaja", also called "Spasitel'nica utopajuščich", on which the Mother of God holds her protective veil over loggers who are

floating rafts of logs down a river to disastrous effect. This icon is, in turn, a variation on the popular "Pokrov" type of icon, in which the Mother of God's protection is symbolized by her holding her veil and/or by her wing-like, flowing omophorion (see Gębarowicz 1986: 168-169, ill. 133; for poems on this icon see Novgorod-Severskij 1966: 40, 46). Despite the absence of a veil in "Sporitel'nica chlebov", it might be seen as a regular development of the "Pokrov" tradition.

- ¹⁰ Themes from hymnography appear in many of Ivanov's poems, from the psalm-like 'Chory misterij' of 1904 (I, 812-815) to the 1914 poem 'Roždestvo' (III, 556), and later the Catholic-inspired poem from *The Roman Diary* (*Rimskij dnevnik*) for May 1 (III, 609).
- ¹¹ Taking "Zatvornica" to be "Gatekeeper" and not "Recluse", which is also possible.
- ¹² The significant section-headings (e.g., 'Grace of Peace') were included only in the original publication (*Vesy*, No. 5, 1905, pp. 26-36), and dropped in subsequent publications of the essay under the new title 'The Symbolics of Aesthetic Principles' (I, 823-830).
- ¹³ See in particular Schmemmann's 'Sacrament and Symbol' (1988: 135-151; cf. also the echo of Ivanov's "realist" terminology in Šmeman (1984: 48).
- ¹⁴ Tomas Venclova has presented a full analysis of the "nuptial encounter" of earth and spirit in Ivanov's 1926 sonnet 'Jazyk'. Venclova concludes that "language – and poetry – is just a portent, a prototype, a forerunner [predteča] of a future universal ecumenic bond of people" (Venclova 1986: 121). If one also considers that "And the Word become flesh" ("I Slovo plot' byst"; Jn 1:14), the original epigraph of the poem, is also the name of an icon of the Mother of God (of the "Sign" ["Znamenie"] type), one can see that in 'Jazyk' the Mother of God plays a role analogous to the one presented in our analysis.
- ¹⁵ Cf. Makovskij (1955: 298); Gercyk (1973: 70).
- ¹⁶ This imagery was by no means unusual for Ivanov; cf. the second poem "d" in Part Four of 'Čelovek':

Пою: из мертвенных борозд
Богооставленного поля
Святая всколосится воля
Упавших наземь Божиих звезд.
(III, 236)

- ¹⁷ On St. Seraphim in Ivanov's works see Docenko (1996).
- ¹⁸ There is now a wide literature on these terms; for one of the earliest items from modern Russian thought see Solov'ev's strange (although incompletely preserved) note on "umnoe delanie" and also its bowdlerized use in Pisemskij's novel *Masonry* (Florovsky 1965).
- ¹⁹ See II, 771-780; Wachtel (1990: 124-125, 137-139; 1994); Carlson (1988); Blok (1927: 242); Gercyk (1973: 46-55).

- ²⁰ Ivanov calls mystical anarchism "*Hodegetics*, i.e., [it] is subordinated to the general concept of philosophizing on the ways (and not goals) of freedom" (III, 89). Thus the epithets of the Mother of God are taken as technical terms denoting immanent religious experience.
- ²¹ See III, 625-626, I, 8-9; see also note 11 above.
- ²² Ivanov cites the first phrase of this passage in his 1934 letter to Alessandro Pellegrini on "Docta pietas" (III, 440, 443).

REFERENCES

- Agapit, Archimandrit
1900 *Žizneopisanie v Bože počivšego optinskogo starca Ieroschimona Amvrosija s ego portretom i faksimile, v dvuch častjach.* Moskva.
- 'Akafist'
1992 'Akafist ikone Božiej Materi "Sporitel' nice chlebov"', *Grad Kitež*, 3 (8), 15-18.
- Arsen'ev, N.
1926 'Pessimizm i mistika v drevnej Grecii'. *Put'*, 4, 66-77; 5, 51-65.
- Arseniew, Nicolas von
1929 *Die russische Literatur der Neuzeit und Gegenwart in ihren geistigen Zusammenhängen.* Mainz.
- Belyj, Andrej
1925 *Vospominanija o Bloke.* Moskva.
- Blok, A.A.
1927 *Pis'ma Aleksandra Bloka k rodnym*, t. 1. Leningrad.
- Carlson, Maria
1988 'Ivanov-Belyj-Minclova: the Mystical Triangle'. *Cultura e memoria. Atti del terzo Simposio Internazionale dedicato a Vjačeslav Ivanov*, I. Pavia, 63-79.
- Četverikov, Sergej
1912 *Opisanie žizni blažennoj pamjati Optinskogo Starca Ieroschimona Amvrosija v svjazi s istoriej Optinoj Pustyni i ee starčestva.* Kozel'sk.
- Daniélou, Jean
1973 *A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea: Volume Two. Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture* (Transl., ed., with a Postscript by John Austin Baker). London, Philadelphia.
- dell'Isola, M.
1927 'Il Pensiero religioso russo'. *Bilychnis*, Vol. XXIX, No. 4 (Anno XVI, Fasc. IV), 270-273.
- Docenko, Sergej
1993 'Ob odnom primere anagramatičeskogo postroenija teksta: Vjač. Ivanov'. *De visu*, 6, 44-45.
- 1996 'Legenda o Serafime Sarovskom v tvorčestve Vjač. Ivanova'. *Studia Slavica*.
- El'čaninov, A.
1984 'Vstreči s Vjačeslavom Ivanovym (iz dnevnika 1909-1910 gg.)'. *Vestnik RSCHD*, 142 (III), 60-65.
- Ėrn, Vladimir
1912 *Grigorij Skovoroda.* Moskva.
- Evtuhov, Catherine
1997 *The Cross and the Sickle: Sergei Bulgakov and the Fate of Russian Religious Philosophy, 1890-1920.* Ithaca.
- Florenskij, P.A.
1991 *Sočinenija v dvuch tomach.* Moskva.
- 1995 *Ikonoostas.* Moskva.
- Florovsky, G.
1965 'Ein unveröffentlichter Aufsatz von Vladimir Solov'jov'. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, Bd. XXXII (1), 16-26.
- Gębarowicz, Mieczysław
1986 *Mater Misericordiae, Pokrow, Pokrowa w sztuce i legendzie środkowo-wschodniej Europy* (Studia z Historii Sztuki, t. XXXVIII). Wrocław, etc.
- Gercyk, Evgenija
1973 *Vospominanija.* Paris.
- Ghidini, Maria Candida
1996 'Vjačeslav Ivanov i imjaslavie'. *Studia Slavica Hungarica*, 41, 77-86.
- Grabbe, Georgij
1927 *Korni cerkovnoj smuty: Parižskoe bratstvo Sv. Sofii i rozenkrej-cery.* Beograd.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav
1916 'O mysli izrečenoj'. *Utro Rossii*, No. 166, April 16, 5.
- 1917 'Pesni smutnogo vremeni'. *Narodopravstvo*, Nos. 18-19, December 25, 2-3.
- 1918 'Pesni smutnogo vremeni'. *Narodopravstvo*, Nos. 23-24, February, 1, 2.
- 1963 'Perepiska S. L. Franka s Vjač. Ivanovym' (Publ. by V.S. Frank). *Mosty*, 10, 357-369.
- 1971-1987 *Sobranie sočinenij*, 4 Vols. Brussels.
- 1989 *Freedom and the Tragic Life: A Study in Dostoevsky.* Wolfeboro, NH.
- 1994 *Dionis i pradijonisijstvo.* Sankt-Peterburg.
- Ivanova, Lidija
1992 *Vospominanija ob otce.* Moskva.

- Kotrelev, Nikolaj
1982 'Iz perepiski Aleksandra Bloka s Vjač. Ivanovym'. *Izvestija Akademii nauk SSSR: Serija literatury i jazyka*, t. 41, No. 2, 163-176.
- Lawrence, D.H.
1962 'Preface to Dostoevsky's *Grand Inquisitor*'. *Dostoevsky, A Collection of Critical Essays* (Ed. René Wellek). Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 90-97.
- Lepachin, Valerij
1988 'Ikona v poezii i stat'jach Vjačeslava Ivanova'. *Cultura e memoria: Atti del terzo Simposio Internazionale dedicato a Vjačeslav Ivanov*, II. Pavia, 105-115.
- Losskij, Vladimir
1936 *Spor o Sofii. "Dokladnaja zapiska" prot. S. Bulgakova i smysl Ukaza Moskovskoj Patriarchii*. Paris.
1957 *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. London.
- Makovskij, Sergej
1955 *Portrety sovremennikov*. New York.
- Meerson, Michael Aksionov
1996 'The Love Paradigm and the Retrieval of Western Medieval Love Mysticism in Modern Russian Trinitarian Thought (from Solov'ev to Bulgakov)'. Ph.D. Dissertation, Fordham University.
- Meyendorff, John
1983 'Creation in the History of Orthodox Theology'. *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, 27, 1, 27-37.
- Novgorod-Severskij, Ivan
1966 *Mater' Božija Deržavnaja. Čudny liki Tvoi Presvjataja*, Paris.
- Obatnin, Gennadij
1994 'Vjač. Ivanov: Doklad "Evangel'skij smysl slova "Zemlja"'. *Pisma. Avtobiografija (1926)*. *Ežegodnik Rukopisnogo otdela Puškinskogo Doma na 1991 god*. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Panteleimon, Archimandrite (ed.)
1958 *Skazanija o zemnoj žizni Presvjatoj Bogorodicy, o čudotvornych ikonach, i o eja velikich milostjach rodu čelovečeskomu*. Jordanville, NY.
- Popov, N.
1949 'O smysle vetchozavetnych proobrazov'. *Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarchii*, 3, 13-17.
- Rožanov, V.V.
1932 'Napominanija po telefonu'. *Obonjatel'noe i osjazatel'noe otnošenje evreev k krove*. Stockholm, 140-147.
- Sapov, V.
1994 'V. I. Ivanov i Ė. K. Metner. Perepiska iz dvuch mirov'. *Voprosy literatury*, II, pp. 307-346; III, pp. 281-317.

- Schmemmann, Alexander
1988 *For the Life of the World*. Crestwood, NY.
- Segal, Dmitrij
1994 'Vjačeslav Ivanov i sem'ja Šor (po materialam rukopisnogo otdela Nacional'noj i Universitetskoj Biblioteki v Ierusalime)'. *Cahiers du Monde russe*, XXXV (1-2), janvier-juin, 331-352.
- Skazanija
1958 *Skazanija o zemnoj žizni Presvjatoj Bogorodicy, o čudotvornych ikonach, i o eja velikich milostjach rodu čelovečeskomu* (Ed. Archimandrite Panteleimon). Jordanville, NY.
- Šmeman, A.
1984 *Evcharistija: tainstvo Carstva*. Paris.
- Solov'ev, Sergej
1916 *Bogoslovskie i kritičeskie očerki. Sobranie statej i pūbličnyh lekcij*. Moskva.
- Solov'ev, Vladimir
1948 *Russia and the Universal Church* (Transl. Herbert Rees). London.
- Swoboda, Philip
1996 "'Spiritual Life" versus Life in Christ: S.L. Frank and the Patristic Doctrine of Deification'. *Russian Religious Thought* (Eds. Judith Deutsch Kornblatt and Richard F. Gustafson). Madison, Wis., 234-248.
- Ueland, Carol
1992 'Viacheslav Ivanov's "Malicious, Counter-Revolutionary Verses": *Pesni smutnogo vremeni* Reconsidered'. *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, Vol. 26, Nos. 1-3, 77-96.
- Venclova, Tomas
1986 "'Jazyk": An Analysis of the Poem'. *Vyacheslav Ivanov: Poet, Critic, Philosopher* (Eds. Robert Louis Jackson and Lowry Nelson, Jr.). New Haven, 108-122.
- Vozbuditeli raskola
1927 (Publ. M. Gorčakov). Paris.
- Wachtel, Michael
1990 'Iz perepiski V. I. Ivanova s A. D. Skaldinym'. *Minuvšee*, 10, Paris, 121-141.
1994 'Viacheslav Ivanov: From Aesthetic Theory to Biographical Practice'. *Creating Life. The Aesthetic Utopia of Russian Modernism*. Stanford, 151-166.

VIOLENCE AND THE SACRED:
VJAČESLAV IVANOV AND WALTER BURKERT

CAROL ANSCHUETZ

The figure of Vjačeslav Ivanov as a poet's poet and the magus of Symbolism in Russia has eclipsed his figure as author of two brilliant studies of the cult of Dionysus, the first of which is *The Hellenic Religion of the Suffering God* (1903-1905).¹ It was written in the same burst of insight as *Pilot Stars* (*Kormčie zvezdy*), his first collection of verse, and like both *Pilot Stars* and the better part of his vast subsequent production, it reflects Ivanov's fascination with ecstasy as the stimulus for all human creativity. For that reason *The Hellenic Religion* has often been cited as a gloss to his lyric and dramatic poetry or a key to his critical and theoretical essays. Yet it has never been evaluated or even read in its own terms as a philological contribution to history and anthropology. Soviet scholarship assigned it to oblivion for its inconsistency with Marx and Engels and from more than fifty years of oblivion translation alone can rescue it – as it is indeed about to do. These remarks are made by the translator in eager anticipation of the broad response that Ivanov's book will no doubt elicit from scholars and non-scholars alike when Yale Press offers it to the Western public.

The argument of *The Hellenic Religion* invites comparison with the argument of a profound and subtle book published by the Swiss historian Walter Burkert, now the foremost authority on sacrificial ritual and myth in pre-Homeric Greece. Burkert's book is *Homo Necans* (1972): "man the killer". On the basis of inferences about pre-Homeric worship these books set forth two theories of the origin of religion, both of which involve a relationship between violence and the sacred. The object here is to explore how

each author deals with only one example of pre-Homeric ritual: the cult of the god and prophet Zalmoxis, to whom the Getae, "noblest and most just of all the Thracian tribes", offered human sacrifice in hope of immortality. The cult of this dying god is attested in Herodotus 4.93-96. How does Walter Burkert lead us to interpret this text in *Homo Necans*? How does Ivanov interpret it in *The Hellenic Religion*? What do their conclusions imply for the future of modern culture and the possibility of its renewal?

Each of them undertakes, as an historian, to discover the nature and origin of religion, which both equate with the origin of humanity. They propose to discover it by hypothetically reconstructing the ritual forms of pre-historic Greek religion. Moreover, in offering this reconstruction, each one addresses what he believes to be the central issue of his own contemporary society. Burkert addresses the issue of human aggression. Ivanov addresses the issue of individuality that we know from Nietzsche. Although they wrote at different times and could not read each other, Burkert agrees firmly with Ivanov on two cardinal points. One is that blood sacrifice was the earliest form of religious action and laid the foundation for human culture in general and for the Christian eucharist in particular. The other is that, in blood sacrifice, the victim killed, be he man or beast, was always meant and felt to be human. Agreement on this point closes the door to potentially endless debates about whether the Greeks, the Hebrews or any other ancient people actually practiced human sacrifice – a point on which Ivanov and Burkert do not agree.

Now for the god and prophet Zalmoxis. Herodotus tells us that he is the only god of the Getae. When it lightens and thunders, they aim their arrows at the sky and threaten him. When they depart this life they believe they go to join him. Herodotus records a ritual in which the Getae act out this belief. Every five years they cast lots to choose one man among them whom they designate as messenger to the god. They entrust this man with requests. Then they send him off as follows. Seizing him by his hands and feet, they toss him up so he will fall on the upraised spears of his fellow tribesmen. If he dies impaled on the spears, they say that Zalmoxis has blessed them. If he does not die, they hold him unworthy and choose another messenger. Here ends the first part of Herodotus's account.

The second part gives the view of Zalmoxis held by Greeks from the Hellespont and the Pontus. They identify him with a Thracian slave who once belonged to the philosopher Pythagoras at Samos. This slave, once freed, grew rich and returned to Thrace where, having already learned the doctrine of his former master and the ways of the Ionian Greeks, he wine and dined his simple countrymen in an especially designated chamber where he taught them that neither he nor they, his guests, nor any of their descendants would ever die but would all go to a place where they would continue to enjoy every imaginable good. While wine and dining his countrymen he

was also digging the pit for a chamber underground where he secretly withdrew once it was ready and where he remained for three years. For those three years he was mourned as dead. When he emerged from underground and showed himself to his companions, they believed the truth of what he had taught them about the after-life.

Since readers of *Russian Literature* can be expected to know the work of Ivanov better than that of Burkert, let us take up *Homo Necans* first. For 50,000 years before he became a farmer, man was a hunter and he continued to hunt five times longer than he has farmed. It was as a hunter that he made the transition from primate to *homo sapiens*. Man can virtually be defined as "the hunting ape".² Biologically he was not suited to be a hunter as the predatory animals are. But he had to kill in order to live, so he taught himself to hunt. Man did not merely compensate for his biological deficiencies by making weapons and using fire to temper them: he left women behind and worked cooperatively with other men rather than engage in the intraspecific aggression provoked by sexual or territorial rivalry. His energy, both psychological and biological, found another object in the hunter's quarry, which hunters treated as a quasi-human enemy and a sacrificial victim. Killing became a ceremonial as well as a utilitarian activity. It began with preparation (abstinence both from women and from food), followed by the irrevocable "act" of killing an animal, which then provided a meal at which abstinence ceased and restitution for the act of killing might be made.

"A discussion of religion," Burkert declares, "must be anything but religious,"³ and he observes that those who turn to religion for salvation from the evil of aggression are confronted with murder at its very heart. His reconstruction of prehistoric ritual draws on Konrad Lorenz's biological study, *On Aggression* (1963), read in the light of Sigmund Freud's interpretation of the Oedipus myth in the book entitled *Totem and Taboo* (1924). Burkert proceeds from Lorenz's study to argue that community is always founded on aggression, which in turn is linked with male sexuality. This he understands in terms of the Oedipal complex. The sons of primeval man band together to murder their father for denying them his women but the father's murder is avenged by the sons' guilt. They renounce the newly acquired women and engage in inordinate veneration of their father. Burkert concedes that Freud's interpretation is a myth, but discerns a grain of historical truth in it: "Conscious killing is a kind of patricide,"⁴ and the hunting feast enjoyed immediately afterward is a kind of restitution for the guilt incurred by committing it.

Konrad Lorenz defines ritual as a behavioral pattern that loses its primary function – present in its unritualized model – but which acquires instead the function of communication. The ritualized behavior pattern replaces reality with symbols, i.e. signs, whether verbal or non-verbal, in place of objects. In this new function ritual provokes and affirms social interaction; it

fosters the continuance of group identity. It does so by simulating reality and, should it fail in this, there may be a regression from symbolism back to reality itself.⁵ This means human sacrifice and even cannibalism. In the rituals of the hunt and of blood sacrifice, aggressive behavior is diverted from men to animals; however, in myth, which is a verbal form of communication, the as-if dimension of ritual becomes reality, and the sacrificial victim becomes human. This would explain to Burkert why Ivanov reads the myths as evidence that human sacrifice was a fundamental institution in all prehistoric communities.

Archeology confirms that, whether or not gods were worshipped in the Paleolithic era, animal sacrifice did indeed occur, most often at burials, where it served to renew the memory of death. The sequence of events in these funerary rituals corresponded to the sequence of events in the hunt: abstinence, the "act" of killing itself, and then the funerary meal. However, there was another occasion for sacrifice. This was the initiation of the young by confrontation with death in male societies formed in order to strengthen the community of men: Burkert uses the word *Männerbund* to describe them. When man became a farmer, these male societies endured as secret societies where, in Burkert's expression, the activities wavered between demonic possession and horseplay.⁶ Young men no longer learned to hunt and the sacrifice performed at their initiation became one at which the boy to be initiated was threatened with death, only to be replaced by an animal at the last moment. It is such a *Männerbund* that Burkert discerns in the cult of Zalmoxis.

Burkert cites the cult at the very end of his book as a conclusive and final example of how communal aggression in the form of blood sacrifice produces a sense of community. He does not explicitly analyze the cult but a kind of analysis is implied in the conclusion that he draws from it. He observes that, like the initiates at Eleusis, the Getae are "an elite group that sees the future 'bliss' of the initiate only in contrast to the lot of the uninitiated, who 'will lie in the mire'". The sacrifice itself Burkert takes to be an initiation ritual.

The Getai [...] were convinced by Zalmoxis that "he and his drinking companions would not die": membership in the tribe and participation in festive eating and drinking guaranteed one's hopes for the next world.⁷

How does Burkert arrive at this conclusion? By the complex analogy that follows.

In chapter II of *Homo Necans* Burkert interprets the myth of Lycaeon, ancestral king of the Arcadians, who slaughtered a boy at the altar together with the sacrificial animals and mixed the boy's entrails with their meat, which he served up to the gods at his table. Zeus put an end to the commu-

nity of men and gods established at this meal and turned Lycaeon into a wolf (hence his name). The myth of Lycaeon as Burkert reads it serves to explain an initiation ritual hypothetically reconstructed from ancient sources that associate it with the altar of Zeus on the summit of Mount Lycaeon. The ritual was a nocturnal feast at which all participants ate from a dish they were led by tradition to fear might contain human entrails. The youngest participants were boys who, being most open to the power of suggestion, often believed themselves to be turned into wolves and who then, either spontaneously or as a result of manipulation, fled into the night to return nine years later as men. The boys must die before they enter the sphere of manhood.

Given that Burkert believes the Getic tribesman in Herodotus constituted a *Männerbund*, he would presumably read the myth of Zalmoxis much as he does the myth of Lycaeon. The boys of Thrace, like those of Arcadia, would have to "die" before they could enter the sphere of manhood. The Getic tribesmen would toss them not onto the row of upheld spears but just beyond them. Then they would feast with the boys on a sheep impaled and subsequently roasted in their stead. However this may be, Burkert's conclusion moves deliberately from the initiation ritual with its simulation of death in sacrifice to the actual experience of death. He maintains that once ritual has assimilated death into a pattern, "a real death [he does not say "one's own death" although that, apparently, is what he means] seems no more than a repetition, anticipated long ago." This is as close as Burkert comes to individual experience. Death for him is a social phenomenon. "The death of the individual," he writes, "is an integral part of communal life, for which reason the encounter with death is unavoidable. This, in turn, can elicit both the triumphant ecstasy of survival and the willingness to die."⁸

Now for Ivanov. Although community is no less a concern to Ivanov than it is to Burkert, Ivanov is intensely concerned with depth psychology as experienced by the individual and his discussion of religion is, if not dogmatically religious, nevertheless written in an idiom that recognizes the authenticity of transcendental experience in its own terms. Whereas Burkert bases his argument on a foundation of biology, anthropology and academic psychology, Ivanov's constructs his argument on personal intuition, for which he presents evidence *ad hoc*. The argument is elaborate but its kernel is simple. Every man is a god by virtue of his death. No other scholar has maintained this thesis: not Frazer before or Burkert after him. The god in question is of course Dionysus. In sacrifice, the priest of Dionysus who slaughters him also becomes identified with him, as both victim and god; so that in effect Dionysus falls victim to Dionysus and every man is a god by virtue of his own real or symbolic death, which is identified with that of Dionysus. Zalmoxis is the pivotal example of this thesis in *The Hellenic Religion*. Ivanov writes: "The dual nature of Zalmoxis is this: before death a man, after death a god."⁹

How can every man be a god by virtue of his death? By losing himself in ecstasy. Every man can be a god if, and only if, the outer change wrought by death goes hand in hand with an equally fundamental inner change. This change implies ambivalence and violence of feeling. The pleasure and pain of it are so intense that pleasure can bring pain and pain pleasure. It entails giving up one's rationally or socially defined self and, at the same time, gaining unity with the reality that lies beyond that self. It is by no means limited to physiological experience but it does take place in death and in orgasm understood as a temporary death. On these two physiological experiences Ivanov bases the two rituals of the Dionysus cult: human sacrifice and sexual revelry, the latter providing relief from the pity and fear aroused by the spectacle of death in the former. Human sacrifice and sexual revelry later developed into the art forms of tragedy and comedy. The history of masks provides a clue to the original unity of art and ritual. The first masks to be made were the death masks of fallen heroes. Later these masks came to be worn by stage performers who acted out the heroes' death. By their very nature they symbolize change and loss of self, for the easiest way to cease being oneself is to put on a mask.

Ecstasy is a no less visceral experience than aggression but, since it presupposes the temporary suspension of reason (and therefore also the presence of reason), it constitutes an exclusively and definitively human faculty. It destroys order. It also creates it. So Ivanov speculates that it may have generated the very faculties of language and reason which it suspends. "It is hardly possible to distinguish the origin of language from the general awakening of rhythmic and musical faculties, for the ecstasy of rhythm was also the first intuition of a religious order."¹⁰ Ivanov singles out ecstasy as both the religious and the human faculty: man was a religious animal before he became a political animal and, as his first "human" behavior was ecstatic, he was and remains above all an ecstatic animal. Moreover, it is his ecstatic faculty that breaks the socially established bonds that separate him from other individuals and establishes true community.

To Ivanov the cult of Zalmoxis recalls periodic memorial feasts once held in honor of dead heroes who, in the person of masked surrogates, would return from the grave to join their votaries. Such feasts gave rise to the cults of many heroes, but only in the cult of Zalmoxis is the hero's surrogate said to be a messenger. The cult of Zalmoxis also recalls the equation of victim with god on the one hand and of priest with god on the other: that, in fact, is the obvious significance of the messenger in Herodotus's account. He is a new Zalmoxis, and the requests entrusted to him are prayers addressed to the god who descends to the underworld, whence he has power to bless or curse the living. Here is the religion of Dionysus at its inception: human sacrifice, orgiastic worship at funerary and memorial feasts, a god that dies and comes to life again. Zalmoxis is obviously no more than an abstraction of periodi-

cally repeated sacrifices or, in other words, of deification by sacrificial manslaughter. The logic of Getic ritual points to the same conclusion. If the one whom Herodotus calls the emissary is not pierced with spears, he cannot be god and the participants in the bloody revel are deprived of the communion with god that they would have obtained by staining themselves crimson with his sacrificial blood; he is clearly just a wicked man because he has not been graced with deification.¹¹

The Getae deny death, it is true: death is just a temporary removal from this world. Yet though they deny death, they also worship it. Their god is not spared the necessity of that removal, transformation and restoration. He must taste death together with mankind, in whom he dwells. Every member of the ritual community is a Zalmoxis by virtue of his participation in the sacrifice and his right to become a victim. Every executioner is a potential victim. They are Zalmoxeis in the plural by analogy not just to the communities of Bacchoi but also to those of Bassars and Saboi, which Ivanov describes as proto-Dionysian. The god is hence the continuity of victims and, in that sense, the deification of death, which Ivanov understands to be, like orgasm, a form of ecstasy (and not vice versa).

If those facts of life, basic though they are, exhausted Ivanov's idea of religion, it would be roughly analogous to Burkert's idea. But the god is also the deification of ecstasy, which is broader still than death and sex. Ecstasy embraces all of human creativity, which results from the continual disintegration and reintegration of the human self and even, historically, of human culture, which through all changes remains, like Ivanov's concept of Dionysus, forever the same. The point of Ivanov's thesis is that Christianity has come to block the very impulse that originally motivated it: the impulse to change from within. Whenever religion blocks that impulse, it ceases to respond to the human condition. Open yourself to the confusion and hell of life: to the fear of being hurt. Then life is possible. Opening up means letting go of one's self-assigned self. It is repentance without the layers of dogmatized morality. A true penitent sees what he is and what he has done. He answers the Baptist's cry by gambling his identity in change.

Whereas Ivanov views religion as a way of expanding and fulfilling human potentiality, Burkert views it as a way of containing and inhibiting human aggression. He laments the breakdown of the ritual tradition and hopes for its renewal or for the appearance of a "new, non-violent man". The act of sacrifice, as Burkert conceives it, implies a transgression that brings with it the communal guilt of murder just as it also brings the possibility of expiating that guilt. It is, at its very origin, a highly ambivalent moral act. The crux of Burkert's theory is that, whenever this act is ritually performed or commemorated, the sacred turns violence against itself. The logic that underlay the ritualization of the hunt and once diverted the energy of *homo sapiens* from intraspecific aggression to other objects can now perhaps ward

off regression to brutality and even nuclear destruction. The observance of sacrificial ritual from generation to generation, which once taught each member of the species how to face his death, can still make death part of communal life. Death is overcome for social purposes by confrontation with death.

To Ivanov death is just one of an infinite series of inner changes. This holds true both in the individual and in the species. Violence is peripheral to his theory and he seldom uses the word, however often he may describe brutality and gore. Sacrifice knows no moral distinctions. Its principle is ecstasy, not guilt or fear, and though ecstasy crosses the borders of the self it is not transgression. It motivates both those religions which, like Christianity, are based on sacrificial ritual, and those religions which, like Buddhism, have no sacrificial ritual and replace frenzy with what Ivanov calls "the ecstasy of contemplation", which he compares with the philosopher's "aha" experience. The figure of Socrates, who knows the ecstasy of contemplation and dies for the truth at the hands of his fellow Athenians, becomes comparable in these terms with the figure of Jesus Christ.

Ivanov believes that religion at its inception was not a social institution: it was a visceral experience from which social institutions subsequently arose. Sin implies someone else's law. When I transgress that law, I sin. But if god dwells in me, then I am no longer preoccupied with sin. Since this experience opens the door to human intimacy, ethics necessarily and inevitably accompanies it. But it is a reflex of inner experience and not its cause. Ivanov and Burkert disagree on the nature and function of religion. Nevertheless, they are both right. If death and sex are the basic facts of life, this is reason at once for inhibition and for celebration. The cup of the eucharist, as sacrifice and funerary meal, is the suppression of the primitive. It is also the recovery of it.

NOTES

¹ Chapters I through V of *The Hellenic Religion of the Suffering God* (*Ėllinskaja religija stradajuščego boga*) first appeared in *Novyj put'* (*New Way*), 1904, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9 but, as that journal was abruptly closed, chapters VI through X (renumbered VI through X) were placed in another journal, *Voprosy žizni* (*Questions of Life*), 1905, Nos. 6 and 7. The title of Ivanov's study was changed in this second journal to *The Religion of Dionysus: Its*

Provenance and Influences (*Religija Dionisa: Ee proischoždenie i vlijanija*). A revised edition under the original title was printed and bound in 1917 by M. and S. Sabašnikov but, owing to a warehouse fire, it was never actually published. All quotations here refer to the periodical edition.

² Walter Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Transl. Peter Bing). Berkeley 1983, p. 17.

³ *Ibid.*, p. xxi.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 295.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 296.

⁹ *The Religion of Dionysus*, III, 'Orgiastic Clans', *Questions of Life* (*Voprosy žizni*), 1905, No. 6, p. 215.

¹⁰ *The Religion of Dionysus*, V, 'Conclusions', *Questions of Life* (*Voprosy žizni*), 1905, No. 7, p. 318.

¹¹ This and the following paragraph very closely paraphrase *The Religion of Dionysus*, III, 'Orgiastic Clans', *Questions of Life* (*Voprosy žizni*), 1905, No. 7, pp. 214-215.

159

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

To facilitate editorial work and to enhance uniformity of presentation, authors are requested to prepare their manuscripts in accordance with the conventions summarized below. Manuscripts *not in conformity* with this style sheet will be returned to the authors for amendment before being circulated among the editors.

Upon acceptance of an article, the author(s) will be asked to transfer the copyright of the article to the publisher. This transfer will ensure the widest possible dissemination of information.

Manuscripts. The languages of publication are English and Russian; only in exceptional cases will contributions in French or German be accepted.

Manuscripts should be type-written first copies (no carbon copies) with a wide margin and double spacing between the lines. Please use one side of the paper (no onion skins) only. The first page should be the title page only (stating title, author's name, full address, and an abbreviated title not exceeding 40 characters including spaces. This short title is to be printed at the top of each page). All pages are to be numbered consecutively. Tables, diagrams, reference lists, and illustrations should be presented on separate sheets.

References. Quotations in the text should be included within double quotes. References should be given in the main text (not in footnotes) by the name of the author, followed by the year of publication and the page or section number in brackets. For example:

As Sapir has already noted (1921: 39) ...

Sapir has already said: "All grammars leak" (1921: 39).

... the well-known maxim "All grammars leak" (Sapir 1921: 39).

A reference list, alphabetically arranged and typed double-spaced, should be added on separate sheets. For example:

Bloomfield, L., 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt and Co.

Hamp, E.P., 1974. The major focus in reconstruction and change. In: J.M. Anderson and C. Jones (eds.), *Historical linguistics*, vol. 1, 141-168. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers B.V.

If several publications by the same author of the same year are cited, small a, b, etc. should be added after the year of publication. These should be made to correspond with the references in the body of the text.

Footnotes. The number and length of footnotes should be reduced to a minimum. They also should be typed with double spacing, on separate sheets, and numbered consecutively.

Illustrations and tables. Drawings, trees, and other illustrations must be camera-ready originals or glossy photographs. They should be presented on separate sheets, drawn in India ink in large size, and carefully lettered. All illustrations must have an Arabic number and a caption. The place where they are to be inserted in the text must be clearly indicated in the manuscript.

For illustrations to be redrawn by the publisher, authors will be charged. Authors are requested to limit the number of diagrams and illustrations as much as possible.

Tables must be typed on separate sheets. Each table should have an Arabic number and a caption. Their approximate place in the text should be indicated.

Symbols. Authors are requested to select current types and to restrict as far as possible the use of symbols and diacritical marks.

If you have any doubts or questions, please consult the editors before submitting your manuscript.

No responsibility is assumed by the Publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein.

Although all advertising material is expected to conform to ethical standards, inclusion in this publication does not constitute a guarantee or endorsement of the quality or value of such product or of the claims made of it by its manufacturer.