Studies in Slavic Literature, Culture and Society

General Editor: Thomas Epstein, Visiting Scholar at Brown University

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RUSSIAN LITERATURE AND ITS DEMONS

Edited by Pamela Davidson

Berghahn Books
New York • Oxford

First published in 2000 by **Berghahn Books**

www.berghahnbooks.com

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

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

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

PG2987.D45 R87 2000
891.709'37--dc21

99-045400

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

Printed in the United Kingdom on acid-free paper.

ISBN 1-57181-758-1 (hardback)

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations vii

Notes on Contributors x

Preface xiii

Russian Literature and Its Demons: Introductory Essay
Pamela Davidson 1

Part I: Traditions and Contexts

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

Part II: Literary Demons

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

7. The Devil is in the Detail: Demonic Features of Gogol's Petersburg
Julian Graffy 241

8. The Devils' Vaudeville: "Decoding" the Demonic in Dostoevsky's *The Devils*
W.J. Leatherbarrow 279

9. Rozanov and His Literary Demons
Liza Dimbleby 307

10. The Demon. The Mythopoetic World Model in the Art of Lermontov, Vrubel, Blok
Avril Pyman 333

11. The Demonomania of Sorcerers: Satanism in the Russian Symbolist Novel
Adam Weiner 371

12. Symbolist Devils and Acmeist Transformation: Gumilev, Demonism, and the Absent Hero in Akhmatova's *Poem Without a Hero*
Michael Basker 401

13. Playing Devil's Advocate: Paradox and Parody in Zamiatin's "The Miracle of Ash Wednesday"
Philip Cavendish 441

14. Literary Representations of Stalin and Stalinism as Demonic
Rosalind Marsh 473

Index 513

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Above: I.V. Simakov, "The Devils," 1904. Zinc engraving. Illustration to A.S. Pushkin's poem "The Devils." From A.S. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. P.N. Krasnov (St. Petersburg: T-vo M.O. Vol'f, 1904).

1 B. Kustodiev, *The Bolshevik*, 1920. Oil on canvas, 101 × 141 cm. Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow. 18

2 "Demons Drag Kozmas to See Hell." Miniature from *The Vision of Kozmas*, late-eighteenth-century Russian manuscript. Private collection of Simon Franklin, Cambridge, England. 37

3 "Ioann and Saint Benedict on the Ladder." Miniature from *The Vision of the Monk Ioann*, late-eighteenth-century Russian manuscript. Private collection of Simon Franklin, Cambridge, England. 37

4 "Margaret ('Marina') of Antioch Tussles with the Devil." Miniature from *The Life of Margaret of Antioch*, early- to mid-nineteenth-century Russian manuscript. Private collection of Simon Franklin, Cambridge, England. 39

5 "The Temptation of Saint Antony," 1820s or 1830s. Copper engraving, 28 × 38,2 cm. From *The Lubok: Russian Folk Pictures. 17th to 19th Century*, ed. Alla Sytova, Elena Itkina and others, trans. Alex Miller (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1984). 41

6 "The Jester and the Female Jester," second half of the eighteenth century. Copper engraving. From *Russkii lubok XVII-XIX vv.*, ed. V. Bakhtin and D. Moldavskii (Moscow and Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva, 1962). 68

7 "The Drunkard in the Tavern," second quarter of the nineteenth century. Copper engraving, 35,5 × 27,5 cm. From *The Lubok: Russian Folk Pictures. 17th to 19th Century*, ed. Alla Sytova, Elena Itkina and others, trans. Alex Miller (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1984). 69

8 "The Secession of Satan and His Forces from the Angelic Order." Miniature from a late-sixteenth-century Russian manuscript. Pen, ink, tempera, 28,8 × 18,7 cm. From *Otkrovenie sv. Ioanna Bogoslova v mirovoi knizhnoi traditsii: Katalog vystavki* (Moscow: Indrik, 1992). 91

9 "Three Unclean Spirits, Coming out of the Mouths of the "Beast"-Antichrist (in the Image of Peter the Great), of Satan-"Dragon," and of a False Prophet (in the Image of Patriarch Nikon). Miniature from a late-nineteenth-century Russian manuscript. Pen, ink, tempera, 24 × 15,8 cm. From *Otkrovenie sv. Ioanna Bogoslova v mirovoi knizhnoi traditsii: Katalog vystavki* (Moscow: Indrik, 1992). 99

10 M. Chagall, *Literature*, 1920. Oil on canvas, 212 × 79 cm. Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow. 129

11 N. Kalmakov, *The Awakening of Bacchus*, 1913. Mixed media, 64 × 48 cm. Private collection, St. Petersburg. From *Il Simbolismo russo: Sergej Djagilev e l'Età d'argento nell'arte*, ed. V.A. Dudakov (Milan: Olivetti/Electa, 1992). By permission of the Electa Archive. 136

12 M. Dobuzhinsky, *The Devil*, 1907. From the journal *Zolotoe runo*, 1907, no. 1. 169

13 Mikhail Vrubel, *The Muse*, 1896. Oil on canvas, 106 x 96 cm. Private collection, Moscow. 191

14 "The Money-Lender's Blissful Dream," 1858. Lithographic transfer from a copper plate, 35 × 44 cm. From *The Lubok: Russian Folk Pictures. 17th to 19th Century*, ed. Alla Sytova, Elena Itkina and others, trans. Alex Miller (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1984). 258

15 "The Money Devil," second quarter of the nineteenth century. Copper engraving, 30,5 × 37 cm. From *The Lubok: Russian Folk Pictures. 17th to 19th Century*, ed. Alla Sytova, Elena Itkina and others, trans. Alex Miller (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1984). 261

16 "The Jester Farnos the Red Nose," second half of the eighteenth century. Woodcut, 36,5 × 29 cm. From *Russkii lubok XVII-XIX vv.*, ed. V. Bakhtin and D. Moldavskii (Moscow and Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva, 1962). 291

17 M. Vrubel, *Head of the Demon*, 1890-91. Black watercolour and white on paper, 23 × 36 cm. Illustration to M.Iu. Lermontov's poem, *The Demon*. Museum of Russian Art, Kiev. From M.Iu. Lermontov, *Sochineniia*, 2 vols. (Moscow: T-vo I.N. Kushnereva, 1891). 349

18 M. Vrubel, *Head of the Demon*, 1890-91. Sketch in watercolour and pressed charcoal on paper, 41 × 68 cm. Illustration to M.Iu. Lermontov's poem, *The Demon*. Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow. 349

19 M. Vrubel, *The Demon Cast Down*, 1901. Sketch in watercolour and white over graphite on cardboard, 27,6 × 63,9 cm. Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow. 351

20 B. Kustodiev, Illustration to E. Zamiatin's short story, "The Healing of the Novice Erasmus," 1922. From E. Zamiatin, *O tom kak istselen byl otrok Erazm*, illustrated by B. Kustodiev (St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 1922). 449

21 V. Komar and A. Melamid, *Stalin and the Muses*, 1981-82. Oil on canvas, 173 × 132 cm. Private collection of Robert and Maryse Boxer. From Ekaterina Andreeva, *Sots Art: Soviet Artists of the 1970s–1980s* (Roseville East, Australia: Craftsman House, 1995). 483

Illustrations are reproduced by kind courtesy of the individuals, museums, and publishers listed above. Every effort has been made to contact the relevant sources for permissions.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Michael Basker is Senior Lecturer in Russian at the University of Bristol, England. His main publications are on Nikolai Gumilev and Anna Akhmatova. He is the co-editor of Nikolai Gumilev, *Neizdannoe i nesobrannoe* (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1986), and is collaborating with the Russian Academy of Sciences (Pushkinskii Dom) as one of the editors of N. Gumilev's *Complete Works* (*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*) in ten volumes, currently in progress (Moscow: Voskresen'e, 1998–). He is the author of *Rannii Gumilev: Stanovlenie poeta-akmeista* (St. Petersburg: Russkii Khristianskii gumanitarnyi institut, forthcoming).

Philip Cavendish is Lecturer in Russian at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London. He is the author of articles on Pushkin and of *Mining for Jewels in the Russian Language: Evgenii Zamiatin and the Literary Stylization of Rus'* (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, forthcoming).

Pamela Davidson is Senior Lecturer in Russian at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London. In 1997 she was awarded a two-year British Academy Research Readership to study the relationship between religion and culture in the Russian literary tradition. Her publications include *The Poetic Imagination of Viacheslav Ivanov: A Russian Symbolist's Perception of Dante* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), *Viacheslav Ivanov: A Reference Guide* (New York: G.K. Hall, 1996), and an edited anthology of poems dedicated to Akhmatova, *Posviashchaetsia Akhmatovoi* (Tenafly, N.J.: Hermitage Publishers, 1991).

Liza Dimbleby is a painter. She completed her PhD thesis on "Rozanov and the Word" at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, in 1996, and is currently preparing further publications on Rozanov.

Simon Franklin is a Fellow of Clare College and Reader in Slavonic Studies at the University of Cambridge, England. His research interests are in Russian and Slavonic cultural history and Early Russia and Byzantium. Recent publications include *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991) and, with Jonathan Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus, 750–1200* (London and New York: Longman, 1996).

Julian Graffy is Senior Lecturer in Russian at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London. He is the editor, with Geoffrey A. Hosking, of *Culture and the Media in the USSR Today* (London: Macmillan, 1989), and, with Ian Christie, of *Protazanov and the Continuity of Russian Cinema* (London: BFI/NFT, 1993). He has also published a number of articles on Russian literature and Russian cinema, and is currently preparing a reception history of Gogol's story "The Overcoat" (London: Bristol Classical Press, forthcoming).

W.J. Leatherbarrow is Professor of Russian at the University of Sheffield, England. His publications include *Fedor Dostoevsky* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981), *A Documentary History of Russian Thought* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1987), *Fedor Dostoevsky: A Reference Guide* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1990), *Dostoevsky: The Brothers Karamazov* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), *Dostoevskii and Britain* (Oxford: Berg, 1995), and *Dostoevsky's 'The Devils': A Critical Companion* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1999). He is currently editing *The Cambridge Companion to Dostoevsky*.

Rosalind Marsh is Professor of Russian Studies and former Director of the Centre of Women's Studies at the University of Bath, England. In 1997 she became President of the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies. She is the author of *Soviet Fiction since Stalin: Science, Politics and Literature* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), *Images of Dictatorship: Portraits of Stalin in Literature* (London: Routledge, 1989), and *History and Literature in Contemporary Russia* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995). She is the editor of *Gender and Russian Literature: New Perspectives*, of *Women in Russia and Ukraine* (both published at Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), and of *Women and Russian Culture: Projections and Self-Perceptions* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1998).

Kevin Platt is Associate Professor of Russian at Pomona College, Claremont, U.S.A. He is the author of *History in a Grotesque Key: Russian Literature and the Idea of Revolution* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997) and of a number of articles on Russian literature and interpretations of history. He is currently working on a book-length study of Russian notions of political authority as they are communicated in representations of Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great.

Avril Pyman is Emeritus Reader in Russian Literature at the University of Durham, England, and a Fellow of the British Academy. Her publications include *The Life of Aleksandr Blok* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979-80), *Aleksandr Blok. The Twelve* (Durham: University of Durham, 1989), and *A History of Russian Symbolism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). As well as numerous articles on Silver Age culture, thought, and literature, she has also published several editions and translations of works of Russian literature.

Robert Reid is Reader in Russian Studies at Keele University, England. His publications include *Problems of Russian Romanticism* (Aldershot, Hants.: Gower, 1986), *Pushkin's "Mozart and Salieri": Themes, Character, Sociology* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), and *Lermontov: "A Hero of Our Time"* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1997). He is co-editor of the journal *Essays in Poetics* and is currently completing a critical study, *Mikhail Lermontov: From Russia to the Caucasus* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, forthcoming).

Adam Weiner is Assistant Professor at the Russian Department of Wellesley College, near Boston, U.S.A. He is the author of *By Authors Possessed: The Demonic Novel in Russia* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1998) and has published essays on Fedor Dostoevsky, symbolist poetry, Joseph Brodsky, and Vasilii Aksenov. He is currently researching Russian and Soviet poetry of the 1920s and 1930s.

Faith Wigzell is Reader in Russian at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London. She is the author of *Reading Russian Fortunes: Gender, Print Culture and Divination in Russia from 1765* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) and, under the name Faith C.M. Kitch, of *The Literary Style of Epifanij Premudryj: "Pletenije sloves"* (Munich: Otto Sagner, 1976), as well as of articles on Russian literature and folklore. She is the editor of *Russian Writers on Russian Writers* (Oxford and Providence: Berg, 1994) and, with Jane Grayson, of *Nikolay Gogol. Text and Context* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989).

PREFACE

A few words on the origins of this volume may be of interest to the curious. Each year, the Department of Russian at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies of the University of London organizes a series of seminars devoted to a particular topic. For some time I had been harbouring an interest in Russian literary demonism, and my suggestion of this subject as the theme for our next series was met with enthusiastic support by my colleagues. A preliminary outline of the project was drawn up and several specialists were invited to prepare contributions, both broadly contextual and more specific. Some of these papers were first aired during the seminar series which took place in 1996–97, giving rise to much lively debate. As drafts of the written essays arrived, they were circulated among all the contributors. The aim was to produce a multifaceted study, which on the one hand would not be limited by the imposition of any single point of view or approach, but on the other hand would be compiled and written with an awareness of the wider picture and of links with other contributions. This process of mutual collaboration was further refined during the various stages of detailed editing which the essays passed through.

Once the project was under way, it became apparent that demonism, as a field of academic enquiry, is alive and burgeoning, and has become a focus of widespread interest in recent years.[1] I hope that this collection will provide a stimulating impetus to further reflection on this intriguing strand of the Russian cultural tradition.

It remains for me to express my profound gratitude to the British Academy, which, by generously awarding me a Research Reader-

ship (1997–99) for a study of the relationship between religion and culture in the Russian literary tradition, made it possible for me to devote considerable time to this volume. I would also like to thank the School of Slavonic and East European Studies and Berghahn Books for their support of the project, and, last but by no means least, my loyal contributors for their hard work and patience with my editorial interventions.

Pamela Davidson
School of Slavonic and East European Studies
University of London

October 1998

Notes

1. A few examples of recent publications are given below. Adam Weiner's study, *By Authors Possessed: The Demonic Novel in Russia* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1998), traces the development of the demonic novel through works by Gogol, Dostoevsky, Bely, and Nabokov. A.E. Makhov, comp., *Sad demonov: Slovar' infernal'noi mifologii Srednevekov'ia i Vozrozhdeniia* (Moscow: Intrada, 1998), represents the first Russian attempt to produce a broad reference work on the Christian myth of the devil and demons. It complements the very useful earlier work by T.A. Novichkova, *Russkii demonologicheskii slovar'* (St. Petersburg: Peterburgskii pisatel', 1995). An aspect of seventeenth-century demonology is explored in A.V. Pigin, *Iz istorii russkoi demonologii XVII veka: Povest' o besnovatoi zhene Solomonii. Issledovanie i teksty* (St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo "Dmitrii Bulanin," 1998). Mikhail Iampol'skii, *Demon i labirint (Diagrammy, deformatsii, mimesis)* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 1996), discusses literary treatments of the body in the work of various nineteenth-century writers, including Gogol and Dostoevsky. S.L. Slobodniuk, *'D'iavoly' 'Serebrianogo' veka (Drevnii gnostitsizm i russkaia literatura 1880-1930 gg.)* (St. Petersburg: Aleteiia, 1998), carries the theme forward into the early twentieth century, covering writers such as Merezhkovsky, Briusov, Bal'mont, Sologub, Gumilev, Blok, and Zamiatin; the author's analysis of the evolution of the idea of world evil in Russian literature leads him to the conclusion that the Silver Age created an anti-Christian trend in literature, related to the ideas of the early Gnostics. Most recently, a new contribution to the field has been made by the study *Vostochnaia demonologiia: Ot narodnykh verovanii k literature* (Moscow: Nasledie, 1999).

RUSSIAN LITERATURE AND ITS DEMONS: INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

Pamela Davidson

> All Russian literature is, to a certain degree, a struggle with the temptation of demonism, an attempt to undress Lermontov's Demon
> Merezhkovsky[1]

One of the most memorable dreams in Russian literature occurs in Goncharov's novel *Oblomov* (1859). The slumbering hero recalls in detail the fantastic tales his nanny would tell him: after describing evil robbers, sleeping beauties, cities and people turned to stone, "at last she would turn to our demonology, to corpses, monsters and werewolves."[2] There is something curiously captivating about the rhythm of this sentence; in particular, the phrase "at last she would turn to our demonology" suggests that this topic was not only the long-awaited climax of the story-telling session, but was also regarded as quintessentially (and somehow comfortingly) Russian.

It would be rash, however, to draw any conclusions from Oblomov's dream about actual demonic beliefs in the Russian folk imagination: the demonic beings described form the subject of a story within a story, recollected through the prism of a dream, and have become creatures of the *literary* imagination (although, as the narrator stresses, this in no way diminishes their very considerable power).[3] This may serve to signal a warning: it is not the purpose of this volume to trace the manifold representations of Russian

demonology as a system of beliefs (although this aspect will inevitably be touched upon, particularly in the two opening essays on the devil in Orthodox tradition and Russian folklore). The intention is rather to investigate some of the forms which this body of beliefs assumes when transposed into a literary context. How did the devils and demons of Orthodox and folk tradition make the transition into literature? What forms or guises did they assume to survive in their new habitat? What was their impact on literature, both in terms of thematic concerns and formal technique?

Pushkin himself, albeit somewhat tongue-in-cheek, broached this very question. In a poem of 1827 he commented that in olden times a simple folk phrase of ritual exorcism, opening with a double "amen," would suffice to despatch any unwelcome Satanic spirit or vision. By contrast:

> ... В наши дни
> Гораздо менее бесов и привидений;
> Бог велает, куда девалися они.[4]
>
> [... In our days
> There are far fewer devils and visions;
> God knows where they have got to.]

And yet, as the poem continues to imply, demons were still at large in Pushkin's day, even if less outwardly manifest. The poet describes how his heart is captivated by the eyes, voice, and features of the charming lady to whom his verses are addressed. This new form of demonic possession is evidently more powerful than the earlier, undisguised varieties, as it successfully resists the poet's attempts at exorcism by ritual phrase.

The light-hearted tone of the poem masks its more serious import. The demons of Orthodox and folk belief may seem to have disappeared, but in fact they have merely been internalized. Whereas previously they were objectified as absolute, external forces, they are now absorbed into the individual's subjective and relative perception; indeed, the very fact of their assimilation makes them more invasive and less easily dispelled. This observation remains true even when Pushkin appears to be dealing with "real" devils, as in his well-known poem "The Devils" (Besy, 1830); a close examination of this text reveals the central role of the narrator's subjective consciousness in conjuring up the vision of demonic forces.[5]

This tendency to make demons immanent, to locate them in the here and now of individual perception, is not just a result of their displacement into literature; it is also, significantly, a distinguishing feature of their representation in both Orthodox and folk tradition. In his contribution to this volume Simon Franklin comments that "neither in Byzantium nor in Russia was there much emphasis on a towering figure of Satan in splendour;" likewise, Faith Wigzell, in her essay on the Russian folk devil, underlines the pervasive, ubiquitous nature of the *nechistaia sila* (unclean force), manifested through numerous spirits which inhabit a disconcertingly wide variety of natural and man-made locations. As a result, Russian writers in search of a powerful literary image of Satan with strong theological backing were often obliged to turn to other traditions, most notably to Catholicism or Protestantism (Dante's vision of Hell and Milton's portrayal of Satan were both widely influential). For example, Pushkin's most impressive depiction of Satan as the "cursed ruler" (prokliatomu vladyke), to whom the devils of hell bring Judas for torment, turns out to be a foreign import: a free rendering of an Italian sonnet, made via a French translation, with the addition of Dantesque motifs.[6] More surprisingly, given its specifically Russian frame of reference, Solzhenitsyn's *The First Circle* (*V kruge pervom*, 1968, revised version 1978) draws on Dante's description of Satan for its portrayal of Stalin.[7] The same relative lack of a grand-scale Devil in the Russian tradition may explain the magnetic attraction exerted upon Russian writers by the impressive demonic figures of European Romanticism: Byron's Cain, Vigny's Eloa, Goethe's Mephistopheles.

Russian writers therefore found themselves on the receiving end of several distinct traditions: an ingrained native preference for the shabby, immanent, and pervasive devil over the grand Devil in his majesty; a strong Western European theological tradition (often transmitted through its reflection in literary works), stressing the power and majesty of the Devil as a single figure; seductive literary images of the Demon as a figure of Western European Romanticism. All these different strands combined in various ways to produce the hybrid phenomenon of Russian literary demonism. Indeed, a particular difficulty involved in studying this complex phenomenon derives from its eclectic nature: disentangling native sources from foreign influences is not always an easy task, particularly given the innate Russian tendency to "Russify" Western sources. When Zhukovsky informed A.I. Turgenev that he had almost finished a long work with the devil as chief protagonist, he was referring to his ballad "Gromoboi" (written in 1810, first published in 1811), whose eponymous hero sells his soul to the devil and subsequently repents.[8] The work is set in medieval Rus and saturated with local colour, but on closer inspection what appears to be a Romantic retelling of an old Russian legend in fact turns out to be a reworking of an eighteenth-century German novel based on a medieval Catholic legend. Zhukovsky has clearly substituted old Russian names for the original German ones and changed the details of the background setting in

order to impart a national Russian flavour to this account of man's relations with the devil. Although Russian writers were able in this way to build a distinctively Russian tradition of literary demonism, many of the ingredients which they drew on were foreign.

The awareness that literary demonism was a highly eclectic phenomenon, to a large extent shaped by non-literary sources, and the desire to provide material for an exploration of these links, has determined the structure of this volume and its division into two parts. The first part, "Traditions and Contexts," considers some of the main formative approaches and traditions: Orthodoxy, folklore, historiography, and the view of art itself as demonic. Although these opening essays include some discussion of individual works of literature to illustrate their argument, they are primarily intended as broad introductions to the contexts in which the subsequent literary manifestations of demonism are rooted and best understood. By contrast, the ten essays which make up part II, "Literary Demons," are closely based on particular periods, authors, and texts, and seek to relate these to the background contexts previously explored. They testify to the pervasive presence of the demonic in Russian literature and to the many different forms in which this obsession manifested itself. The authors examined fall into distinct clusters, reflecting the periods when the cult of demonism was at its height in Russian literature: in poetry, this centres on Romanticism (Pushkin and Lermontov) and turn-of-the century modernism (particularly the symbolists and the acmeists); in prose, it leads to Gogol and Dostoevsky, to thinkers such as Vladimir Solov'ev and Vasilii Rozanov, and to a range of twentieth-century writers for whom the literary demonism of their predecessors acquired a tragic new resonance in the light of historical developments. Special attention has been devoted to works which have not previously been investigated from the point of view of their treatment of the demonic. A few well-known works of the Russian demonic tradition, such as Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* (*Brat'ia Karamazovy*, 1879–80), Sologub's *The Petty Demon* (*Melkii bes*, 1907), or Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* (*Master i Margarita*, 1928–40), although discussed in different parts of the volume, have not been included as the subjects of individual essays, since an extensive critical literature on their approaches to the demonic already exists.[9]

The volume opens with a wide-ranging study of the impact of Orthodox tradition on literary demonism. Simon Franklin chooses to focus on hagiography as the main medieval narrative genre which also had a particular influence on subsequent literature. His examples emphasize a feature which one might have thought to be more characteristic of later literary demonism than of medieval narrative: the ambiguity of the devil, inherent in his many deceptive appearances (good masked as evil as well as the reverse). The detailed analysis of Gogol's quasi-hagiographical tale "Christmas Eve" (Noch' pered rozhdestvom, 1832) reveals some of the salient areas of overlap and difference between medieval narrative and literary text. Franklin concludes with the paradoxical observation that perhaps the most important element of the literary legacy of Orthodox demonology was the gap created by the devil's *absence*, leading writers to invent or borrow surrogate demons or to create a new aesthetic.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of disentangling Orthodox belief from folk tradition (each absorbed and adapted features of the other), the next contribution by Faith Wigzell addresses the broad topic of the Russian folk devil in his multifarious guises and highlights elements that distinguish him from his Orthodox counterpart. A major difference concerns the moral dimension of the demonic: whereas in Christianity the devil is the very embodiment of sinful temptation, in folkloric tradition the unclean force is not necessarily evil, although it is always dangerous. Attention is also drawn to the respect bordering on worship accorded to the unclean force in order to placate it. It is possible that these two aspects – the lesser role played by morality and the respectful, utilitarian approach to the demonic – may have influenced the literary cult of demonism as a springboard to a poetics of transcendence and redemption. Although Wigzell is wary of assuming links between folklore and literature, recognizing that the main source of literary demonism lies in European Romanticism, she argues that some facets of folk belief may have underlain the pull of demonism for Russian writers. The association between the sorcerer, tapping the unclean force in charms, and the poet, casting spells with words, provides one example. This link was recognized by Blok, who, in his essay "The Poetry of Charms and Incantations" (Poeziia zagovorov i zaklinanii, 1906), paid particular attention to the invocation of demonic forces in folk literature, and asserted that the charms and incantations of folk belief are the primitive source from which true poetry draws its strength and to which it should return[10] – a claim which the experiments of writers such as Sergei Gorodetsky and Aleksei Remizov would certainly substantiate.

The various approaches to the demonic which emerge from the confluent traditions of Orthodoxy and folk belief were from an early date applied by Russians to the understanding of their own historical process. Indeed, given the traditional preoccupation of Russian writers with history, this developing area of awareness served as one of the main channels through which Orthodox and folk attitudes to the demonic passed into literature. In his contribution to this volume Kevin Platt shows how the demonization of Russian rulers – at times

anathematized as personifications of Satan or the Antichrist – resulted from their traditional elevation to the status of earthly god. The hermeneutic quandary presented by a ruler who deviates from the sacral notion of authority as divinely sanctioned was already tackled in late medieval writings and later generated a rich variety of conflicting historiographic and literary interpretations. Focusing on two particularly controversial tsars – Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great – Platt singles out for attention a number of works which, in his view, through their exploitation of this interpretive dilemma, are among the most talented and suggestive; these include Pushkin's *The Bronze Horseman* (*Mednyi vsadnik*, 1833) and part two of Eizenshtein's film *Ivan the Terrible* (*Ivan Groznyi*, 1946).

Part I of the volume concludes with an analysis of the way in which the understanding of the demonic shaped by the traditions of Orthodoxy, folklore, and historiography infiltrated the perception of art itself. Pamela Davidson sets out some of the broad contexts for the view of art as demonic, dwelling on biblical attitudes (illustrated through reference to the prototype of the artist and his creation, Bezalel and the Tabernacle) and classical models (Apollo, Dionysus, and Orpheus). She then examines the particular historical circumstances which coloured the reception of these traditions in Russia and led to a marked emphasis on the demonic properties of art. The debate over correct attitudes to secular culture, although not yet a major issue in Kievan Rus, gathered momentum in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and was considerably intensified as a result of Peter's reforms. The new culture which subsequently developed was a curious hybrid: to a large extent divorced from the Church, it carried the burden of displaced religious aspirations and thus provided an optimum climate in which a preoccupation with the demonic could flourish.

Part II marks the transition from shaping traditions and contexts to the study of particular texts and authors. It opens with an investigation of the way in which the view of art as demonic outlined in the previous essay took root and developed in the Russian literary tradition. Focusing on the treatment of the muse and the Demon in the work of three key authors – Pushkin, Lermontov, and Blok – Pamela Davidson illustrates the progression of the view of art as demonic from nineteenth-century Romanticism into early twentieth-century modernism. She argues that Pushkin laid the foundation for this view by introducing two different types of Demon in his verse: the benign Demon, closely associated with the sacred madness of poetic inspiration and the muse, and the destructive Demon of negation and doubt. Although a clear distinction between these two figures was maintained in Pushkin's work, it subsequently became blurred. This was largely due to Lermontov, who, by endowing the Demon of negation with a powerful new dimension of verbal artistry and enchantment, released his creative potential and paved the way for the association between the Demons of inspiration and corruption – an association later more fully developed by Blok, in whose verse the muse and the Demon merge into a single force for spiritual perdition.

The next essay returns to Lermontov's *The Demon*, this time from a philosophical perspective. After addressing the problem of the hero's identity, Robert Reid analyses the treatment of aesthetics and ethics in *The Demon*. He finds that both areas are problematized by the demonic nature of the protagonist, and that as a result a range of Romantic ideological issues is estranged. Awareness of the complexity of this problem intensifies in the course of the nineteenth century; indeed, as is argued, Lermontov's fundamental contribution to the development of the demonic tradition in Russian literature was largely a consequence of the very "fuzziness" of his demonic creature. Reid also points out that an essential stage in the process of secularizing demonism was marked by the later equation between Lermontov's two heroes – the supernatural Demon and the human Pechorin.

Although Gogol's Petersburg tales were published together for the first time in the same year as fragments of Lermontov's *The Demon* originally appeared (1842), their approach to the demonic could hardly be more different. Lermontov's demonism is on a grand scale, related to his Romantic maximalism; Gogol's approach, by contrast, although it clearly also derives from frustrated aspirations to transcendence, marks a return to the shabbier, immanent demons of the native Orthodox and folk traditions. Julian Graffy singles out a particular aspect of Gogol's treatment of the demonic in the Petersburg tales, showing how it is imbricated in the very nature of the city. Through a wide range of detailed examples he reveals how the demonic forces latent in Petersburg distort spatial and temporal coordinates, attack its inhabitants, undermine traditional expressions of heavenly perfection such as art and women, and lead to a total dismantling and final fragmentation of logical sense. His argument that Gogol's achievement was "to blend the folkloric consciousness of the devil that informed his earlier writings with a modern sensibility that finds the demonic expressed through elements of the illogical and of existential alienation" points to the importance of Gogol's role as an innovator. The Petersburg tales initiated an important new strand in Russian literary demonism, which later became particularly prominent in the work of the modernists: a concern with the pervasive, invisible demon of the modern urban environment was combined with the development of new literary techniques for conveying the dislocation of coherent meaning.

Both Gogol and Lermontov exerted a considerable influence on one of the central works of the Russian demonic tradition, published some thirty years later: Dostoevsky's *The Devils (Besy*, 1872). In his essay on this novel, W.J. Leatherbarrow links these sources to two distinct strands inherent in the novel's treatment of the demonic: the comic, grotesque strand, which he relates to Bakhtin's category of the carnivalesque, and its apocalyptic, redemptive dimension. The novel's first epigraph, taken from Pushkin's "The Devils" (1830), anticipates the carnival strand, associated with the revolutionary activities of Petr Verkhovensky and his circle, whose Gogolian antics degenerate into a grotesque farce, unable to sustain the serious import of the novel. As Leatherbarrow demonstrates, in his depiction of this devils' vaudeville Dostoevsky draws on the carnival traditions of folklore, the Russian puppet theatre, and the cultural-historical phenomenon of role-play and imposture. The second epigraph, Saint Luke's parable of the Gadarene swine, anticipates the apocalyptic theme of regeneration, which is superimposed on the carnival strand of the novel; through a blend of Christian tradition with Romantic motifs and echoes of Lermontov's Demon, the tragic figure of Stavrogin is lent a redemptive dimension.

Leatherbarrow's analysis of *The Devils* draws together several strands of the Russian demonic tradition explored in this volume: it relates the novel's treatment of the demonic to native Orthodox and folk traditions and to literary sources such as Lermontov and Gogol, and it explores the way in which existing historical and literary approaches to the nature of demonic power are used to construct a new vision of Russia's spiritual mission. Although Lermontov and Gogol had already introduced the metaphysical and historical aspects of the demonic character as a social type into Russian literature, Dostoevsky took this process one stage further by integrating the sociopolitical dimension of demonism into a broader Christian vision of its redemptive role within the scheme of Russia's religious destiny.

The seriousness of Dostoevsky's preoccupation with demonism as a social and spiritual reality perhaps precluded too great an engagement with the possibility that the medium of his message – the art of writing – might itself be demonically tainted. The most extreme example in Russian literature of a writer whose literary output was almost entirely motivated and became increasingly dominated by this awareness was Vasilii Rozanov, a mysterious and controversial figure, whose paradoxical ideas on the sacred potential and yet demonic danger of the word form the subject of Liza Dimbleby's contribution. Rozanov never tired of inveighing against the printed word and literary forms of expression, despite the fact that this was the only medium of expression available to him. His concern about the demonic temptations surrounding print and publication prompted the development of his "manuscript" genre, where intimate thoughts, private family documents and conversations are set in print for publication alongside reflections on the pernicious influence of journals and the printing press. The same attitudes determined his approach to other writers. While championing Lermontov as a true prophet of a sacred verbal tradition, rooted in an understanding of the physical nature of the word, he demonized Vladimir Solov'ev and Merezhkovsky for their loss of a sense of sacred reality in everyday life, evident in their empty, "bloodless" words. In his late writing he directed his attack at Gogol, who is portrayed as the supreme Devil of Russian literature, the originator of the nihilist and satirical tendencies that would destroy Russian life. Rozanov's examination of other writers was clearly a way to further his own self-questioning, since he felt the conflicts, the demonic temptations with which verbal activity was fraught, most acutely in himself and yet was unable to resolve them. His awareness of the demonic properties of art became a central driving-force in his work, stimulating his own experiments in the area of stylistic innovation and leading him to categorize other writers as devils or prophets, while himself aspiring to the role of prophet.

Avril Pyman's essay on the mythopoetic world model in the art of Lermontov, Vrubel, and Blok introduces two new perspectives of particular value to this collection. Firstly, it considers the evolution of the image of the Demon from Lermontov's Romantic individualism to the *mifotvorchestvo* (mythopoeia) of Vrubel and Blok within the context of the mythopoetic world model, as elaborated by Toporov; this approach reinstates the image of the Demon as an archetypal, primitive force and avoids the pitfalls of either completely identifying him with Christian tradition or totally disassociating him from it. Secondly, it demonstrates that the tradition of literary demonism did not develop in isolation from the other arts. As well as dwelling on the role of Rubinshtein's opera of 1875, Pyman shows how Vrubel's visual images of the Demon served as a stepping-stone between Lermontov and Blok by acting as a catalyst to the symbolist revival of faith in the mythic dimension of Lermontov's Demon.

The translation of text into myth noted by Pyman served to bridge the gap between Romanticism and modernism. A further aspect of this transition is reflected in the trend away from religion towards myth, a shift of emphasis which allowed demonism to shed its ethical dimension and facilitated its transformation from a moral category into a purely metaphysical or aesthetic one; from being viewed as an impediment to spiritual growth it became a means to self-transcendence, defined in relation to the artist's own goals rather

than in terms of any absolute values. This attitude is well illustrated by Blok's statement, written at the beginning of the century: "there is no difference – whether one struggles with the devil or with God, they are equal and alike."[11] While Blok's words may relate to either the metaphysical or the aesthetic aspects of the artist's search for self-transcendence, the following lines from Bal'mont give clear prominence to the aesthetic dimension:

> Я люблю тебя, дьявол, я люблю тебя, Бог,
> Одному – мои стоны, и другому – мой вздох,
> Одному – мои крики, а другому – мечты,
> Но вы оба велики, вы восторг Красоты.[12]
>
> [I love you, devil, I love you, God,
> To one – my groans, and to the other – my sigh,
> To one – my cries, and to the other – dreams,
> But you are both great, you are Beauty's delight.]

The shift of focus from moral absolute to a personal aesthetic led to the unprecedented peak in the cult of demonism which manifested itself at the turn of the century in the work of the symbolists. This area has already been explored in this volume in relation to poetry in the essays of Pamela Davidson and Avril Pyman; its further ramifications in the area of symbolist prose form the subject of the next contribution by Adam Weiner. Through a detailed analysis of three representative works – Merezhkovsky's trilogy *Christ and Antichrist (Khristos i Antikhrist*, 1895–1904), Briusov's *The Fiery Angel (Ognennyi angel*, 1908), and Sologub's *The Created Legend (Tvorimaia legenda*, 1914) – Weiner demonstrates that symbolist fiction in its chronological development reveals not only a progressive demonization of the authorial personae (protagonists, narrator, and implied author), but also an increasingly disorientating use of narrative point of view. This points towards the infiltration of the theme of demonic possession into the very form, manner, and style of its literary expression – an area which prose (following the example of Gogol) could develop more successfully than lyric verse, given its greater freedom in the use of multiple, shifting points of view. It would be interesting to speculate on which came first: was the loss of ethical absolutes a cause or an indirect consequence of the fragmented viewpoint of the modernist aesthetic which gradually took hold in Russia? Whatever the case, these twin aspects of the legacy of symbolist demonism (the obsession with the theme and its impact on literary technique) had a strong influence on the work of later writers in ways which will be discussed below.

Before taking leave of symbolism, however, we should perhaps note one further point. A considerable amount of space in this volume has been devoted to the symbolist cult of the demonic, not just

because it was such a prominent feature of Silver Age culture, but also because of its "organizing" role in establishing a self-conscious tradition of literary demonism in Russia. The symbolists stood at a crossroads between their twentieth-century successors and an earlier chain of nineteenth-century writers (principally Lermontov, Gogol, and Dostoevsky), who, while dealing with demonic themes, did not regard themselves as the bearers of any clearly defined "demonic" tradition. Taking their lead from Vladimir Solov'ev's late essay of 1899 on Lermontov,[13] the symbolists were the first to construct a "genealogy" of demonic writers, thus establishing the existence of such a tradition, defining their own place within it, and to a large extent determining the perspective of future generations. By advancing a new reading of the past, they created a platform for themselves and a foundation for subsequent developments.

Two different aspects of the symbolists' catalytic role are illustrated by the next pair of contributions. The first aspect relates to the symbolist transformation of the demonic from a moral category into a metaphysical or aesthetic one. This could prompt two different types of reaction: it could either win adherents by casting its spell over like-minded disciples, or it could provoke a "corrective" response, a desire to overcome or exorcize the legacy of symbolist demonism by reinstating its moral dimension. Both responses and their intriguing interaction are evident in Michael Basker's exploration of the demonic in the work of two leading acmeists: Nikolai Gumilev, a true child of symbolism and the most persistent acmeist demonist, and Anna Akhmatova, who sought to overcome aspects of the symbolist legacy of demonism in her own poetry and through her reading of Gumilev. Although the anti-demonic went hand in hand with the anti-symbolist in Gumilev's formulation of an acmeist aesthetic, his exorcism of former demons was never complete. This unresolved aspect of his literary output had a profound influence on Akhmatova and underlies an important strand of her most demonic creation, *Poem Without a Hero* (*Poema bez geroia*, 1940–62). This work is demonic both in its chosen theme (the representation of turn-of-the-century Petersburg) and in its self-avowed literary genesis and formal strategies. Basker argues that Gumilev, commonly identified as the "absent hero" of the *Poem*, and thus, implicitly, as an antipode to the demonic, is in fact demonically associated or "doubled" with each of the poem's major negative prototypes. Akhmatova's particular reading of Gumilev's "creative path" and of certain key texts by him suggests that this apparent paradox finds its resolution in terms of a conscious, morally exacting self-transformation. Her "absent hero" is specifically one who attempts, at immense personal cost, to "overcome demonism." Just as for Gumilev, however, Akhmatova's

exorcism of demons in practice remains incomplete. Not only certain demonic imagery of the early Gumilev, but also the sense that she was, biographically, the chief demon behind his texts, returns to haunt some of her late poetry.

Another aspect of the legacy of symbolist demonism noted above was the impact that it had on techniques of literary narration. Later writers may no longer have been obsessed with the moral, metaphysical, or even aesthetic dimensions of demonism, but many of them retained a strong interest in the formal innovations which this preoccupation had engendered: the literary techniques developed for portraying an unstable world of shifting appearances, and the very notion of writing as inherently ambiguous or indecipherable, infected by the demonic reality which it seeks to express. Philip Cavendish's discussion of Zamiatin's miracle tales (chudesa) stresses the playful rather than serious intent in their blasphemous subversion of the conventions of hagiography. His detailed analysis of "The Miracle of Ash Wednesday" (O chude, proisshedshem v Pepel'nuiu Sredu, 1926) uncovers a further significant development in the author's demonic strategy: the tale presents a disturbing enigma and riddle, tainted by the devil of absurdity and nonsense, which effectively resists all attempts at a coherent or logical interpretation. As Cavendish argues, this may well have been a reaction to the increasing seriousness of Soviet literature in the 1920s.

Gratuitous playfulness in literary demonism was, however, largely eroded by the advent of Stalinism, which introduced a tragic new dimension into the understanding of the demonic. For most writers of this era the preoccupation with demonism, which had earlier been purely literary or abstractly metaphysical, was now firmly grounded in historical reality. Rosalind Marsh's discussion of literary representations of Stalin and Stalinism takes up some of the issues raised by Kevin Platt in his analysis of Russian attitudes to sacral authority. Not surprisingly, the same process identified by Platt – the translation of idolization into demonization – occurs in literary responses to the quasi-religious cult of Stalin. Although these exhibit a considerable variety of style and genre, ranging from realism through fantasy and allegory to carnivalesque comedy, they do not, as a general rule, reflect the same degree of inherent ambiguity as some of the representations of Ivan the Terrible or Peter the Great discussed by Platt. Unlike his predecessors, whenever he is not being eulogized as the object of cultic veneration, Stalin is generally portrayed as wholly evil and demonic. A certain degree of ambiguity is, however, retained in the value attributed to the historical process of which he formed a part. As Marsh points out, the extreme demonization of Stalin, together with the redemptive, purgatorial value sometimes assigned to the evil and suffering which he inflicted on Russian society, could in certain instances, by appearing to absolve the Russian people of their guilt and complicity, lead to yet another myth of Russia's positive historical development.

Although this volume does not aim to be comprehensive or exhaustive, the range of its contents, outlined above, should nevertheless give some indication of the wide variety of ways in which the Russian interest in the demonic has manifested itself in literary tradition. At first glance this variety may appear bewilderingly heterogeneous, but on closer inspection it can be seen to harbour a number of key themes, which recur throughout the collection and suggest the possibility of drawing some preliminary conclusions. The first most striking point is the fact that the preoccupation with the demonic in Russian literature invariably has its roots in the aspiration to transcendence, and is at its most prominent when this aspiration is most fully developed. This can be seen in the religious sphere in hagiographical texts (the greater the saint, the stronger the demons which beset him), in the historical sphere (the sacralization of rulers leads to their demonization), and in the literary sphere (art is regarded as demonic precisely because it is burdened with the functions of sacred prophecy). In other words, as demonstrated in diverse ways in the essays of part I, demonic concerns tend to proliferate when the impulse towards sacralization is frustrated. The same root cause informs the appearance of demonic themes in the literary works discussed in part II. For example, as Julian Graffy shows, it is because Gogol first dreams of Petersburg as a "paradisaical place" that he later comes to invest it with demonic attributes.

One should add that two interrelated types of demonism can result from this cycle, one dynamic, the other static and inert. The first continues the dynamic of frustrated aspirations to transcendence and represents a sort of Luciferian fall from grace, which can, however, be regarded as a possible springboard to redemption. The second type embodies the stagnation which follows the exhaustion engendered by the failure of the original impulse towards the sacred. The close link between both types is well captured by the critic Dmitrii Pisarev in his characterization of the painful struggle taking place in the hero of Turgenev's novel *Fathers and Children* (*Ottsy i deti*, 1862): Bazarov is described as torn between "hatred and love, a merciless, steely and cold, spasmodically smiling, demonic scepticism, and a hot, melancholy, sometimes happy and rejoicing romantic striving into the distance."[11]

Both these extremes can be traced back to Lermontov's Demon, whose combination of frustrated idealism and cosmic, existential

boredom made him a rich source model for later demonic heroes. Lermontov's subsequent satiric dismissal of his early Demon as a "mad, passionate, childish delirium" (bezumnyi, strastnyi, detskii bred) and attempted introduction of a new breed of demonic hero ("But this devil is of a quite other kind" [No etot chort sovsem inogo sorta]) in his unfinished *Fairy-tale for Children* (*Skazka dlia detei*, 1840) suggests the beginning of a shift of emphasis away from the Romantic strand of demonism towards its more negative, stagnant extreme,[15] such as that described in Gogol's Petersburg tales. For a later, unadulterated expression of this inert variety of demonism, entirely stripped of its potentially redemptive dimension, one would need to turn to Sologub's novel *The Petty Demon*, or, in poetry, to some of Blok's later cycles, such as "The Dances of Death" (Pliaski smerti, 1912–14) or "The Life of a Friend of Mine" (Zhizn' moego priiatelia, 1913–15), with their frozen images of shadowy dream and living death.[16]

It is important, however, to emphasize that this state of stagnation, although it may appear to be a complete dead end, can in fact turn out to be productive. This paradoxical ambivalence originates in the religious sphere. Many Christian mystics, including the fourth-century monk Evagrius, whose writings entered the Russian tradition through translations of the *Philokalia* (published in a Slavonic translation in 1793, and in Russian from 1877), interpreted the Psalmist's "destruction, that doth waste at noon-day openly" (Ps. 91.6) as the "demon of noontide" who instils the dangerous state of *acedia* or spiritual aridity. Evagrius gives special prominence to this sin, commenting that the "demon of despondency," while generally "more grievous than all others," can nevertheless, if conquered, lead to a "peaceful state" of "ineffable joy." *Acedia* is therefore in a sense almost a precondition to achieving celestial bliss.[17] The embracing of nothingness was subsequently cultivated by a number of spiritual seekers as a *via negativa* to prepare the soul for mystic receptivity. In similar fashion, the state of ennui, a modern secularized form of *acedia*, although usually linked with artistic sterility, was regarded by many as conducive to creativity.[18] It has been demonstrated, for example, that Albrecht Dürer's engraving *Melencolia I* (1514) is a representation of Artist's Melancholy, "frustrated because she cannot attain her goal," and, although herself sterile, "the source of another's artistic endeavour." The potential fertility of sterility is also reflected in Goethe's well-known description of boredom as the "mother of the Muses."[19] Among leading modern exponents of the aesthetics of ennui, one thinks in the first instance of Baudelaire, the poet of spleen *par excellence*, or, in the Russian tradition, of Blok, who significantly identified his own states of apathetic depression and emotional aridity with the very "demon of dejection" (demon pechali) described by Evagrius in the *Philokalia*, and yet insisted that this particular demon was "essential to the artist."[20] This association finds an echo in the close link between depression and creativity experienced by artists suffering from manic depression.[21]

It would seem therefore that, whichever type of literary demonism is encountered (whether dynamic or stagnant), one is dealing with an extremely fluid and constantly self-renewing cycle, in which the apparent antipodes of the demonic and the sacred keep translating themselves into their opposites. One of the most European of Russians, Viacheslav Ivanov, identified this very tendency to merge antithetic categories as an endemic trait of the Russian national character. In an early fragment entitled "The Jews and the Russians" (Evrei i russkie, 1888) he wrote of the "inability to distinguish between the clean and the unclean," which makes the fate of certain non-Jewish nations "a series of wanderings along muddled paths, a series of passions and falls." In his view this characteristic is manifest in its purest form among the Slav peoples, who exhibit a particularly strong syncretic sense of the unity inherent in diversity. As a result, "a Russian sees the link between good and evil more clearly than anyone else and is therefore usually sinful when righteous and righteous when sinful."[22] Many years later, in conversation with one of his students in post-Revolutionary Baku, Ivanov made a comment which casts some light on why this might be the case: "the Russian people ... is either God-bearing (Bogonosets) (Christopher) or Satan-bearing (satanonosets), but it is not self-bearing (sebianosets), as are the German, the Frenchman, the Greek, the Englishman."[23] It may well be that the flexible attitude to opposite extremes, which Ivanov had earlier identified as a specifically Russian trait, is related to the tendency to define national identity in terms of abstract absolutes, which, once juxtaposed, can more easily be interchanged. This idea, expressed intuitively by Ivanov in his usual aphoristic style, finds further support in the more recent academic work of Lotman and Uspensky on the defining role of binary models in the dynamics of Russian culture.[24]

We have seen that the demonic and the sacred consistently function together as a pair of interconnected and sometimes interchangeable opposites, inextricably linked in a close symbiotic relationship. We should now consider the question of the variable "value" which is attached to the demonic element of this duo: when is it regarded as a purely aesthetic category, and when is it invested with moral significance?

Demonism as an aesthetic category is closely related to the problem of artistic representation. In an ideal world, the individual's cre-

ative energies are in harmony with the will of God, fulfilment of the artist's divinely inspired intuition is possible, and artistic representation or analogy are part of a meaningful chain of being. When this link is broken, however, representation becomes demonic, leading to what Mallarmé described as the "démon de l'analogie,"[25] and to the substitution of demonic doubles for the original intuited ideal. The aesthetic dimension of demonism – as an aspect of the problem of artistic *voploshchenie* (embodiment) – can already be found in Gogol, or, even more prominently, in Dostoevsky's *The Double* (*Dvoinik*, 1846); it was extensively developed by Bely and Blok, whose poetry, prose and criticism abound in images of doubles, who function as the artist's demons and provide a false mirror reflection of his deeper intuitions.

Although this aesthetic dimension of demonism does not necessarily carry a moral value, it is often invested with one by the artist or his audience. A particularly vivid example of this phenomenon can be found in a telling episode from the life of one of Russia's most talented and demonically obsessed artists, the painter Mikhail Vrubel. One of his last, unfinished works was a portrait of Valerii Briusov, commissioned by the editor of *Zolotoe runo*. In 1905 Briusov made a series of trips to the psychiatric clinic in Moscow at which Vrubel was then confined, in order to sit for the portrait. After the painter's death in 1910, he wrote a short memoir, full of remarkable observations about his visits. He notes that on one occasion Vrubel was found entirely naked, circling his room in a squatting position; he explained to his doctor that he was obliged to perform this act a hundred times as a penance for the expiation of his sins. Vrubel was apparently also subject to hallucinations and heard voices; as he confessed to Briusov, he was tormented by the feeling that he had lived a sinful life and found that improper scenes were appearing of their own accord on his paintings to punish him for his sins. He was particularly worried about his recent painting *The Pearl* (*Zhemchuzhina*, 1904), in which an additional second figure had unexpectedly appeared. Briusov recorded Vrubel's hushed confession to him as follows: "'It's him' (Vrubel meant the Devil), 'he is doing this to my paintings. He has been given this power because I, without being worthy, painted the Mother of God and Christ. He has distorted all my paintings...'."[26] Thus, the creation of artistic images came to be regarded by the artist as more than a problem of aesthetic representation: it was a form of demonic possession, the direct work of the Devil, sent to punish the artist for his unqualified and misguided attempts to represent the sacred.

This view was not just the product of Vrubel's own state of demented paranoia, it was shared by a number of his contemporaries. Shaliapin, for example, who took Vrubel's Demon as his inspiration when he sang the title role of Rubinshtein's opera *The Demon* in 1904, believed that Vrubel's demons were directly suggested to him by the archangels which he had earlier painted in churches – thus reinforcing the view that the pursuit of the sacred gives rise to the demonic.[27] Emilii Metner took the same point even further, warning Bely that he and Blok were both afflicted by the "demon of art," a form of divine punishment for their act of hubris in attempting to depict religious subjects.[28]

In general, therefore, it would appear that although the aesthetic dimension of demonism as a problem of artistic representation established a fairly firm footing for itself in the Russian tradition, leading to several interesting experiments in modernist literary techniques, it was all too often eclipsed by the predominant tendency to invest it with a moral value, particularly at times of personal or historical crisis. We should note, however, that the idea of demonic possession as a form of moral punishment was a fairly elastic one, open to a number of different interpretations. Sometimes it was viewed as an end in itself, as a purely negative, punitive experience, but more commonly it was seen as a stage of penitential, redemptive suffering. Although the demonic undoubtedly represents a hell of sorts, hell in the Russian tradition is a more fluid concept than in Catholic teaching. Because the Russian Orthodox church lacked the developed doctrine of Purgatory which exists in Catholic theology, hell often had to serve a dual function: while remaining a place of damnation and suffering, it could also acquire a certain purgatorial value and become a stage of transit rather than a complete dead end. Russian writers sometimes even adapted the Catholic tradition to reflect this perspective; as a licence for their approach, they would cite Dante's representation of his fictive poetic persona as a traveller, who descends into hell and emerges to climb Mount Purgatory and to ascend through the heavenly spheres of Paradise, while ignoring the fact that for the "real" sinners in Dante's inferno there is no hope of escape or possible redemption, only eternal torment.

The notion of demonic possession as a form of *redemptive* punishment becomes particularly prominent when viewed from a collective standpoint and linked up with the national idea – no doubt because the need to sustain faith in a better future even in the midst of the darkest experiences is magnified when projected onto the grand historical scale. This tendency towards a purgatorial interpretation of demonic suffering is noted in relation to the ages of Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great by Kevin Platt, and also discussed by Rosalind Marsh in connection with literary treatments of Stalin and Stalinism. In between the periods covered by these two contributions, the same trend can be observed in the literary responses to one of the greatest

"demonic" upheavals of Russian history – the Revolution of 1917. Among the many poems published in the immediate aftermath of the Revolution, demonic motifs with a redemptive dimension proliferate, no doubt as a legacy of the symbolist obsession with demonism, now elevated onto a new plane of historical significance. Viacheslav Ivanov's cycle "Songs of Troubled Times" (Pesni smutnogo vremeni, first published in December 1917 and February 1918) was closely echoed by Voloshin in several poems on Russian history, both past and current, such as "Deaf and Dumb Demons" (Demony glukhonemye, 29 December 1917), "Petrograd" (Petrograd, 9 December 1917), "Deaf and Dumb Rus" (Rus' glukhonemaia, 6 January 1918), and the later "Severovostok" (Northeast, 1920).[29] Blok's enigmatic *The Twelve* (*Dvenadtsat'*, first published in March 1918) was followed by Bely's more explicit rejoinder, *Christ is Risen* (*Khristos voskres*, first published in May 1918). Despite their considerable differences, these works are united by the fact that they interpret historical events as a form of elemental, demonic possession, and place this in a wider, Christian, redemptive context. In this, they are all following Dostoevsky's lead in *The Devils* and perpetuating the myth of Russia's positive historical development.[30] The common tendency to demonize the present in order to provide a springboard for its translation into a projected, holy future, confirms our earlier remarks about the interdependence and even interchangeability of the two extremes of the sacred and the demonic in Russian culture.

1. B. Kustodiev, *The Bolshevik*, 1920. Oil on canvas, 101 × 141 cm.

At the beginning of this introduction we posed a key question: how would the devils and demons of Orthodox and folk tradition make the transition into literature? In what forms or guises would they survive? One is tempted now to give the following answer: they survived, but were forced out of the relative "open" of religious and folk awareness into a literary underground. From the cells of monks and the marshes, woodlands and ravines of the peasant world, they migrated into literature and set about the business of adapting to this new habitat. Their main sphere of action became the literary world, their target – writers and readers, and their principal weapon – the creative process and the literary text. Although this shift of environment brought about various inevitable changes, many essential features were retained: literary demons remained ubiquitous and dangerous agents of temptation or manifestations of the unclean force, ambivalent in their many different guises, and highly elusive. The ease with which Blok was able to identify the literary demons which beset him as a writer with the spiritual demons described by the fourth-century monk Evagrius reflects his profound awareness of this thread of continuity, of the survival of "real" demons in the literary process.

That demonism is in a sense a literary phenomenon, constructed and conveyed through words, is nothing new. There are two principal reasons for this close association. Most obviously, one can point to the demonic power of literature as a corrupting force. Once detached from its traditional moorings in religious or moral values, literature can easily lead astray, distorting the reader's vision and inciting to sin. This aspect of the potentially demonic nature of literature is not a modern invention; it was already recognized in the Middle Ages, at a time when secular literature was just beginning to establish itself through popular courtly romances. A vivid illustration of the danger presented by the new literature is given by Dante in one of the most memorable episodes of the *Inferno*, concerning the fate of the carnal sinners Paolo and Francesca.[31] When Dante asks Francesca, "by what and how" she and her lover came to know their "dubious desires," she explains that the "first root" of their love was their joint reading of a romance (*Lancelot du Lac*), which, through its description of an adulterous kiss, brought them to sin. Thus a book, the very act of reading, reveals their love to them and causes them to sin. Francesca acknowledges this directly by describing the book and its author as a "Gallehault" or go-between. The power of the written or spoken word is demonstrated in three ways by Dante: firstly, in the explicit content of Francesca's account; secondly, in the impact that her tale has on Dante (he weeps from pity and, at the end of the canto, faints "as if in death");[32] thirdly, in the powerful effect it is

designed to have on the reader. In each case it is *verbal* art, the way in which the story is told, which captivates, seduces, and distorts purity of judgement.

This particular aspect – apparent innocence and its fated corruption – has been well captured by the French artist Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres in his portrayal of the scene.[33] Francesca, attired in a long flowing pink robe, eyes modestly downcast, looks the very picture of demure and maidenly innocence; in her right hand she holds the book, still open at the fatal page. Paolo, seductively clad in matching pink tights and cap, his blue cape stretched out behind him, half kneels at her left side, while implanting the forbidden kiss on her cheek. Behind him, on the very edge of the picture, a sinister cloaked figure, only half revealed, crouches as he prepares to unsheathe his sword. Although this man clearly represents Francesca's husband, Giovanni Malatesta (the crippled brother of her lover, Paolo, who surprised the couple and killed them both), in the painting he comes to epitomize the demonic presence, the evil latent in the scene and so much at odds with its seeming charm and domestic intimacy.

In Russia the tale of Paolo and Francesca became one of the most popular episodes of the *Divine Comedy* (it was first translated in 1827 by A.S. Norov, whose versions of Dante were known to Pushkin).[34] Although it was frequently alluded to by critics and writers, attention was usually focused on the sin of forbidden erotic love, rather than on the role played by a literary text in determining the lovers' tragic fate. It was not until the early twentieth century that its relevance to the view of literature as demonic was highlighted in Blok's poem, "She came in from the frost..." (Ona prishla s moroza..., 6 February 1908).[35] The poet describes an encounter between a man (the narrator) and a woman, in which literary texts play a highly significant role. When the female visitor arrives in the man's room, she immediately drops a weighty volume of a literary journal on the floor. At her request, he begins to read *Macbeth* out loud to her. As he reaches the phrase "bubbles of the earth" (puzyrei zemli), they are both overtaken with excitement (volnenie). The sight of a large cat outside the window, watching over a pair of kissing doves, causes the narrator to regret that the doves, rather than he and his visitor, are kissing, and that "the times of Paolo and Francesca had passed" (proshli vremena Paolo i Francheski).

Since the narrator's description of his response to reading a particular passage from *Macbeth* is directly modelled on Francesca's account of her reaction to the scene of the fatal kiss in the romance,[36] one can assume that the allusion to the era of Paolo and Francesca having passed refers not so much to the intrinsic situation (revolving in both cases around an act of reading which provokes erotic excitement), as to the possibility (or impossibility) of these erotic feelings being realized. In Blok's poem the transition from reading to erotic fulfilment does not take place; instead, with a distinct sense of anticlimax, it is transferred from the living protagonists to the symbolic image of the kissing doves outside the window (in Dante's account Paolo and Francesca are compared to doves).[37] The change of the couple's reading matter from medieval romance to Shakespearean tragedy is significant in this context. *Macbeth* was one of Blok's favourite works; the phrase "bubbles of the earth" (from *Macbeth*, 1.3) was used by him as the title and in the epigraph of his cycle of poems, "Bubbles of the Earth" (Puzyri zemli, 1904–1905),[38] where it merges with the murky marshland world of the Russian folk devil.[39] In Blok's poem, Dante's flesh and blood lovers, observed by the murderous Malatesta, have been replaced by the symbolic image of the kissing doves, watched over by a malevolent cat (an animal with strong demonic connotations in Russian folklore). This substitution suggests that, although the medieval tale of Paolo and Francesca is still a reference point for the power of literature as demonic, it has been overlaid by the later influence of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, which, through its association in Blok's verse with the Russian folk consciousness of the demonic, precludes the possibility of any resolution, whether erotic (through the kiss) or tragic (through death). Times have changed, and so has the nature of the demonic power of literature. In the age of Paolo and Francesca, literature corrupted seeming innocence, but did not take away from life; in Blok's age, literature is demonic not only because it corrupts innocence, but, more importantly, because it leads away from, or even excludes, real life. The protagonists of Blok's poem are immured in a closed and bookish world, tainted by the folk demonic, where literary images become a substitute for action, and real life only takes place in an imagined outside world, on the other side of the window.

Blok's poem gives a modernist twist to a traditional theme, which had already assumed a central importance in Pushkin's *Evgenii Onegin* (1823–31, published in full in 1833).[40] Throughout chapter three the narrator makes it abundantly clear that Tat'iana's innate purity of vision is tainted by her literary diet. When he rhymes the line "Chitaet sladostnyi roman" (Reads a sweet novel, 3:9.2) with "P'et obol'stitel'nyi obman" (Drinks the seductive deception, 3:9.4), he succinctly conveys the way in which deception, masked as sweetness, poisons the soul. Byron's "hopeless egotism" (beznadezhnyi egoizm, 3:12.14), dressed up as "gloomy romanticism" (unylyi romantizm, 3:12.13), has become a corrupting "idol" (kumir, 3:12.7). Through Tat'iana, Pushkin also emphasizes the corrupting effect of

literature on the writer as well as on the reader, as is neatly demonstrated in the transition from Tat'iana the reader, wandering in the woods "with a dangerous book" (s opasnoi knigoi, 3:10.5), to Tat'iana the writer, reciting in a whisper her first composition – the letter addressed to her hero (3:10.11–12). By implication, therefore, the demonic power of literature affects the writer and the creative process itself as much as the reader. It is in this context that Pushkin the narrator makes an ironic reference to being possessed by the "new devil" (novyi bes, 3:13.4) of prose.

In addition to the corrupting power of literature, there is a second, even more fundamental reason for the close association between demonism and literature. Perceptions of demons (testifying to their very existence) have always depended on their description, whether iconographic or verbal; the act of writing is a key instrument in articulating the awareness of demonic powers. In his well-known study, *Europe's Inner Demons,* Norman Cohn has shown that the demonization of heretical Christian sects by Christians in the Middle Ages had its sources in the pagan Graeco-Roman demonization of early Christians, regularly accused of such crimes as erotic orgies or the ritual slaughter of babies. He surmises that these pagan accusations were copied into early Christian manuscripts and from there picked up and used by Christians against heretical Christian sects. The lack of evidence of any *real* worship of Lucifer or Satan leads him to conclude that the persistence of the myth of demonic sects was a mere "fantasy preserved in a literary tradition."[41] This awareness of the fundamentally literary nature of demonism permeates the portrayal of the hero of *Evgenii Onegin.* Tat'iana's "fateful tempter" (iskusitel' rokovoi, 3:15.14) has the reputation of a "Satanic monster" (satanicheskim urodom, 8:12.6) or "Demon" (Demonom, 8:12.7). After studying his collection of books, however, Tat'iana comes to the realization that "this angel, this arrogant devil" (sei angel, sei nadmennyi bes, 7:24.8) has crafted his identity out of fictional prototypes and is in many ways a purely literary phenomenon: a "Muscovite in Harold's cloak" (Moskvich v Garol'dovom plashche, 7:24.11), an empty "imitation" (podrazhan'e, 7:24.9), an "interpretation" (istolkovan'e, 7:24.12), a "parody" (parodiia, 7:24.14), or even a "complete lexicon of modish words" (slov modnykh polnyi leksikon, 7:24.13). As all these phrases emphasize, Evgenii's demonic identity is exposed as nothing more than a verbal construct.

These issues may be raised in a playful tone, but they are serious ones nevertheless. Pushkin is demonstrating that demons have moved into the sphere of literature, and may indeed be nothing but a figment of the literary imagination. This does not, however, detract from the very real danger which they present. Artistic representations of the demonic, as Pushkin shows, affect life as well as literature. In the Russian tradition they have often been treated as if they were of real historical substance, leading to debates about Pechorin's role as a demonic social type, or to earnest discussions of a novel such as Dostoevsky's *The Devils,* as if it were a factual source for the understanding of Russia's past history and future destiny. In similar fashion, arresting literary treatments of real historical figures, marked by extreme tendencies towards idolization or demonization, have frequently obscured or even supplanted the perception of their original prototypes in the public mind.

In the twentieth century these twin areas of association between literature and demonism (the power of the text to corrupt both reader and writer, and the demonic as a literary construct) have all been developed much more explicitly. Later essays in this volume will consider examples such as Rozanov's attacks on the latent demonism of the printed word, or Blok's seductive evocation of the Muse as a Demon.[42] To these one could add Remizov's comment that "books are from the Devil,"[43] or Kliuev's damning evocation of the literary world as a paper hell, in which writers are tormented by a horrible new type of devil, the very letters of the Church Slavonic alphabet:

> Бумажный ад поглотит вас
> С чернильным черным Сатаною,
> И бесы: Буки, Веди, Аз,
> Согнут построчников фитою.[44]
>
> [A paper hell will swallow you
> With a black ink Satan,
> And the devils: *Buki, Vedi, Az,*
> Will bend the scribblers into a *fita.*]

Not surprisingly, such an overriding preoccupation with the demonic powers of art infiltrated the very modes of narration, resulting in new literary techniques designed to convey the hallmark of the devil: shifting ambivalence or lack of coherent meaning. This trend was to a large extent (but not entirely) reversed by the advent of Stalinism, which brought about a return to social and moral concerns and to more "literal" forms of demonization. Although Stalin died almost half a century ago, Russian literature is still working through his legacy, and demonic themes related to the historical context accordingly continue to play a prominent role.

In the first part of this volume we saw that the devils and demons of Orthodox and folk tradition were renowned for their pervasive presence and ambivalent multiplicity of guises. In passing into literature, as demonstrated in the essays of part II, they succeeded in retaining these characteristics. The firm place which they were able to

establish for themselves in their new habitat was due in large part to the ingrained religious orientation of Russian literature, further reinforced by historical circumstance. Whether welcome or unwelcome, these visitors adapted to their new environment so successfully that it is doubtful if they will ever be dislodged. One is reminded of Dostoevsky's description of Ivan Karamazov's shabby but respectable visitor: the devil is likened by him to a parasitic guest, who, rather than remaining upstairs in the room set aside for him, prefers to come downstairs to drink tea with his host and sits in silent expectation, ever ready to engage in conversation, should his host initiate it.[45] In the same way, demons are always a latent presence in the Russian literary tradition, just waiting for an opportunity to manifest themselves.

Merezhkovsky's claim, quoted as an epigraph to this introduction, that "all Russian literature is, to a certain degree, a struggle with the temptation of demonism" has so far been amply validated, and shows no signs of being disproved as this century draws to its close.[46] The tremendous upsurge of interest in various forms of occultism which Russia has witnessed, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, has led to a renewed preoccupation with the demonic, not unlike the one which took place at the turn of the last century; as before, this phenomenon will undoubtedly continue to have a strong impact on literature.[47] The popularity of occultism, reflected in the large sections devoted to this topic in the bookshops of Moscow and St. Petersburg, is developing even faster on Russian sites of the world wide web. Demons have evidently found an ideal new home in this protean environment. A recent browse through the web turned up a wide variety of demonic materials of mixed literary, political, historical, and religious orientation, a potent combination fuelled by millennial expectations.[48] Speculation as to what may lie ahead falls outside the scope of this book; however, the range and vitality of manifestations of the demonic throughout Russian literary history, as testified to by the contents of this volume, leads us to surmise that notions of the demonic will continue to play a central role in defining Russia's literary tradition.

Notes

1. D.S. Merezhkovskii, "M.Iu. Lermontov. Poet sverkhchelovechestva" (1909), in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 17 vols. (St. Petersburg and Moscow: Izdanie T-va M.O. Vol'f, 1911–13), 10:287–334(315).
2. I.A. Goncharov, *Oblomov* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," 1979), 144 ("Son Oblomova," part I, chap. 9).
3. "Skazka ne nad odnimi det'mi v Oblomovke, no i nad vzroslymi do kontsa zhizni sokhraniaet svoiu vlast'." Ibid., 147.

4. "Ek.N. Ushakovoi" ("Kogda, byvalo, v starinu...") (1827), in A.S. Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. D.D. Blagoi and others, 10 vols. (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1974–78), 2:100.
5. For the text of "Besy," see ibid., 2:227–29. For further discussion of this poem in this volume, see Faith Wigzell, "The Russian Folk Devil and His Literary Reflections."
6. ["Podrazhanie italiianskomu"] ("Kak s dreva sorvalsia predatel' uchenik...") (1836), in Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:380. For a discussion of Pushkin's reworking of "Sonnet de Gianni. Supplice de Judas dans l'enfer," a translation by Antoni Deschamps of "Sonetto sopra Giuda" by Francesco Gianni (1760–1822), see A.D. Grigor'eva and N.N. Ivanova, *Iazyk liriki XIX v.: Pushkin. Nekrasov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), 185–94.
7. Discussed in this volume in Rosalind Marsh, "Literary Representations of Stalin and Stalinism as Demonic."
8. See *Dvenadtsat' spiashchikh dev: Starinnaia povest' v dvukh balladakh* (comprising "Ballada pervaia: Gromoboi" and "Ballada vtoraia: Vadim"), in V.A. Zhukovskii, *Sochineniia v trekh tomakh*, ed. I.M. Semenko, 3 vols. (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1980), 2:74–121 (text) and 2:464–66 (notes). For Zhukovsky's reference to this ballad in his letter to A.I. Turgenev of 7 November 1810, see ibid., 3:434.
9. On demonic themes in *The Brothers Karamazov*, see, for example, Victor Terras, "Turgenev and the Devil in *The Brothers Karamazov*," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 6 (1972):265–71; Victor Terras, "On the Nature of Evil in *The Brothers Karamazov*," in *Text and Context: Essays to Honor Nils Åke Nilsson*, ed. P.A. Jensen and others, Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature, no.23 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1987), 58–64. For further references to critical discussion of *The Brothers Karamazov* see W.J. Leatherbarrow, *Fedor Dostoevsky: A Reference Guide* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1990). On Sologub's *The Petty Demon*, see Milton Ehre, "Fedor Sologub's *The Petty Demon*: Eroticism, Decadence and Time," in *The Silver Age in Russian Literature*, ed. John Elsworth (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992), 156–70. On Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* see W.J. Leatherbarrow, "The Devil and the Creative Visionary in Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*," *New Zealand Slavonic Journal* 1 (1975):29–45; Elisabeth Stenbock-Fermor, "Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita* and Goethe's *Faust*," *Slavic and East European Journal* 13 (Fall 1969):309–25; A.C. Wright, "Satan in Moscow: An Approach to Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*," *Proceedings of the Modern Languages Association* 88, no.5 (1973):1162–72; E. Ericson, "The Satanic Incarnation: Parody in Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*," *Russian Review* 33 (1974):20–36; Edward E. Ericson, *The Apocalyptic Vision of Mikhail Bulgakov's "The Master and Margarita"* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991), esp. 43–68 ("Satan and the Fallen Angels"); George Krugovoy, *The Gnostic Novel of Mikhail Bulgakov: Sources and Exegesis* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991); the chapter on *The Master and Margarita* in David M. Bethea, *The Shape of Apocalypse in Modern Russian Fiction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 186–229; Andrew Barratt, *Between Two Worlds: A Critical Introduction to "The Master and Margarita"* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), esp. 133–72 ("Who the Devil?..."); J.A.E. Curtis, *Bulgakov's Last Decade: The Writer as Hero* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), esp. 168–76 ("Woland").
10. Aleksandr Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. V.N. Orlov, A.A. Surkov, and K.I. Chukovskii, 8 vols. (Moscow and Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1960–63), 5:36–65, esp. 37, 49, 63–65.
11. ["Nabrosok stat'i o russkoi poezii"] (December 1901–January 1902), in Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 7:21–37(28).
12. From the collection *Tol'ko liubov'* (1903), which, significantly, takes as its epigraph a quotation from Dostoevsky's *Besy*: "Ia vsemu molius'." K. Bal'mont, *Izbrannoe:*

Stikhotvoreniia. Perevody. Stat'i, comp. V. Bal'mont with notes by R. Pomirchii (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1980), 194.

13. V.S. Solov'ev, "Lermontov" (1899), in *Sobranie sochinenii Vladimira Sergeevicha Solov'eva*, ed. S.M. Solov'ev and E.L. Radlov, 2d ed., 10 vols. (St. Petersburg: Prosveshchenie, [1911–13]), 9:348–67.
14. D.I. Pisarev, "Realisty" (1864), in his *Literaturnaia kritika v trekh tomakh*, ed. Iu.S. Sorokin, 3 vols. (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1981), 2:6–165(25).
15. *Skazka dlia detei* (3.5, 10), in M.Iu. Lermontov, *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii*, introd. D.E. Maksimov, ed. E.E. Naidich, Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaia seriia, 2 vols. (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1989), 2:490. For further discussion of Lermontov's *Skazka dlia detei* and its influence on images of the demonic, see Tomas Venclova, "K demonologii russkogo simvolizma," in *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs*, vol. 3, *Russian Literature in Modern Times*, ed. Boris Gasparov and others, California Slavic Studies, no.18 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 134–60, and in this volume, Avril Pyman, "The Demon. The Mythopoetic World Model in the Art of Lermontov, Vrubel, Blok."
16. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 3:36–40 and 47–53, respectively.
17. See Evagrius's "To Anatolius: On Eight Thoughts," in the abridged English translation of *Dobrotoliubie: Early Fathers from the Philokalia*, selected and trans. E. Kadloubovsky and G.E.H. Palmer (London: Faber and Faber, 1954), 111–12.
18. For a study of the link between *acedia* and ennui, which traces the secularization of *acedia* back to Petrarch and the advent of the Renaissance, see Reinhard Kuhn, *The Demon of Noontide: Ennui in Western Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 39–64. On the "dark night of the soul" traversed by Saint John of the Cross and Saint Theresa of Avila, see ibid., 45.
19. On Dürer and Goethe, see ibid., 75–76 and 184–85, respectively.
20. On Blok's demon of dejection, see in this volume Pamela Davidson, "The Muse and the Demon in the Poetry of Pushkin, Lermontov, and Blok." Examples of the link between idleness (prazdnost') or boredom (skuka) and creativity can also be found in Pushkin's verse and are discussed in this volume in Pamela Davidson, "Divine Service or Idol Worship? Russian Views of Art as Demonic."
21. Kay Redfield Jamison, *Touched with Fire: Manic-Depressive Illness and the Artistic Temperament* (New York: The Free Press, 1993), analyses the overlapping natures of the artistic and manic-depressive temperaments and advances various psychological and biological arguments for this close relationship.
22. Viacheslav Ivanov, "Evrei i russkie," ed. K.Iu. Lappo-Danilevskii, *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 21 (1996):191–93(191, 192).
23. M.S. Al'tman, *Razgovory s Viacheslavom Ivanovym*, comp. and ed. V.A. Dymshits and K.Iu. Lappo-Danilevskii (St. Petersburg: INAPRESS, 1995), 17.
24. Iu.M. Lotman and B.A. Uspenskii, "Rol' dual'nykh modelei v dinamike russkoi kul'tury (do kontsa XVIII veka)," in *Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 414, *Trudy po russkoi i slavianskoi filologii* 28 (1977):3–36.
25. On demonic analogy, see Gabriel Josipovici, *The World and the Book: A Study of Modern Fiction* (St. Albans: Paladin, 1973), 304–6, 308, 311–15.
26. Valerii Briusov, "Posledniaia rabota Vrubelia," in *Vrubel': Perepiska. Vospominaniia o khudozhnike*, comp. and ed. E.P. Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia and Iu.N. Podkopaeva (Leningrad and Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1963), 263–69(267). Briusov's memoir was first published in the journal *Iskusstvo* (Kiev) in 1912, and reprinted in his collection *Za moim oknom* (Moscow: Skorpion, 1913). For reproductions of Vrubel's portrait of Briusov and *The Pearl* (*Zhemchuzhina*), see Mikhail Guerman, ed., *Mikhail Vrubel*, comp. Alla Gaiduk and others, trans. John Greenfield and Valery Dereviaghin (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1985), plates 148 and 132, respectively.
27. F.I. Shaliapin, *Maska i dusha: Moi sorok let na teatrakh* (Paris: Izd-vo "Sovremennye zapiski," 1932), 163.
28. On Bely's recollection of Metner's warning, see in this volume Davidson, "The Muse and the Demon."
29. The first three poems are in Maksimilian Voloshin, *Demony glukhonemye*, 2d ed., (Berlin: Knigoizdatel'stvo pisatelei v Berline, 1923; reprint, London: Flegon Press, 1965), 7, 17, 21, respectively. "Severovostok" was published in Maksimilian Voloshin, *Stikhi o terrore* (Berlin: Knigoizdatel'stvo pisatelei v Berline, 1923; reprint, Berkeley: 1983), 7–9.
30. See, for example, the article by Magomedova comparing Blok's *Dvenadtsat'* to Voloshin's "Severovostok." The author traces the myth of Russia's demonic possession back to Pushkin's "Besy" and to Dostoevsky's *Besy*, and argues that Blok and Voloshin develop it in two different directions: Blok's version is active, dependent on moral self-indictment and purification, while Voloshin's is based on a more passive, collective endurance of suffering, epitomized by the attitude of "terpen'e." D.M. Magomedova, "Blok i Voloshin (Dve interpretatsii mifa o besovstve," *Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo universiteta* 917, *Blokovskii sbornik XI* (Tartu: TartuÜlikool, 1990), 39–49.
31. Paolo and Francesca are tormented in the second circle of hell, together with the other carnal sinners. Their story is told by Dante in *Inferno*, 5:73–142.
32. For quotations from Dante (in the order cited), see *Inferno*, 5:119, 120, 124, 137, 141. All translations from Dante's *Divine Comedy* are taken from *Inferno: I: Italian Text and Translation*, the first part of volume one of the following edition: Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy*, trans., with a commentary, by Charles S. Singleton, 2d ed., 3 vols. (in 6 parts), Bollingen Series, no.80 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).
33. Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres (1780–1867), *Paolo and Francesca*, oil on canvas, 35 × 28 cm, The Barber Institute of Fine Arts, The University of Birmingham. The picture is one of a group of small, brightly coloured "troubadour" works with medieval or Renaissance subjects, painted by Ingres mainly between 1814 and 1820.
34. For details of A.S. Norov's translation of the fifth canto of *Inferno*, see V.T. Danchenko, *Dante Alig'eri: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' russkikh perevodov i kriticheskoi literatury na russkom iazyke 1762–1972* (Moscow: Kniga, 1973), 37 (item no.178). Norov was a minor writer and poet, who worked at the Ministry of Interior Affairs. Pushkin made good use of his excellent library, but took a dim view of his capacities as a translator of Dante (ibid., 8).
35. Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:290–91.
36. Compare stanza 4 of Blok's poem with *Inferno*, 5:130–32.
37. *Inferno*, 5:82.
38. On Blok's love of *Macbeth*, see the extract from his letter to Ellis of 5 March 1907, quoted in Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2:436. For the cycle "Puzyri zemli" and its epigraph, see ibid., 2:8.
39. On folk motifs in this cycle, see in this volume Wigzell, "The Russian Folk Devil."
40. Pushkin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 4:7–162. References to *Evgenii Onegin* are given in the text by chapter, stanza and line number.
41. Norman Cohn, *Europe's Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians in Medieval Christendom*, revised edition (London: Pimlico, 1993 [first published in 1975]), ix.
42. See in this volume the essay on Rozanov by Liza Dimbleby, and the analysis of Blok's "K Muze" (1912) and "Demon" (1916) in Davidson, "The Muse and the Demon."
43. A.M. Remizov, "Chertik," in his *Izbrannoe*, ed. Iu.A. Andreev (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1978), 96, cited in this volume in Adam Weiner, "The Demonomania of Sorcerers: Satanism in the Russian Symbolist Novel."

44. The opening quatrain of "Bumazhnyi ad poglotit vas..." (1916–17), from the cycle addressed to Sergei Esenin, in Nikolai Kliuev, *Sochinentiia*, ed. G.P. Struve and B.A. Filippov, 2 vols. (Munich: A. Neimanis, 1969), 1:416–18(416). *Buki*, *Vedi*, *Az* and *Fita* are all names of letters of the Church Slavonic alphabet. In Kliuev's poem, the first three are represented as devils, who torment writers by bending them into the shape of a *Fita*, i.e. into a round circle. Unlike the other letters' names, *fita* is not capitalized in the poem; this suggests a possible allusion to a further meaning of *fita*, given in Dal's dictionary as "shkoliarnyi gramotei, doshlyi pisaka." *Tolkovyi slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo iazyka Vladimira Dalia*, 2d ed., 4 vols. (St. Petersburg and Moscow: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa-tipografa M.O. Vol'fa, 1880–82; reprint, Moscow: Russkii iazyk, 1978), 4:683.

45. See "Chert. Koshmar Ivana Fedorovicha" (*Brat'ia Karamazovy*, part 4, book 11, chap. 9), in F.M. Dostoevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridstati tomakh*, ed. V.G. Bazanov and others, 30 vols. (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972–90), 15:70–71.

46. Viktor Pelevin's recent novel *Chapaev and Emptiness* (*Chapaev i Pustota*), first published in *Znamia*, 1996, no.4:27–121, no.5:23–114, is rife with demonic characters and incidents; in chap.7 Baron Iungern, a demonic character somewhat reminiscent of Bulgakov's Woland, takes Petr Pustota to a Day of Judgement at a Satanic gathering. For further examples of recent works with demonic themes, see in this volume the section on "The Late and Post-Soviet Era" in Rosalind Marsh, "Literary Representations of Stalin and Stalinism as Demonic."

47. For a stimulating collection of essays on this important context for literary demonism, see Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *The Occult in Russian and Soviet Culture* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997); recent developments are covered in Holly DeNio Stephens, "The Occult in Russia Today," 357–78.

48. Internet publications, downloaded in October 1998, included the first twelve chapters of a novel by Aleksei Zikmund, *Doch' satany ili Po etu storonu dobra i zla* (http://www.zhurnal.ru slova zikmund kniga 1.htm). This work deals with the struggle between good and evil, due to take place in Russia. Its main action takes place in Moscow in 1941. Flashbacks to Germany in 1921 include the account of how Georg/Lucifer turns his daughter, Lina, into Lilith during her childhood, following the advice of an old Rumanian witch. When she grows up, he arranges for her to be impregnated by a German professor of philosophy, who collects books on black magic. The twelfth chapter concludes with Lina/ Lilith asking for political asylum in Moscow as she is about to give birth. Many of the characters involved in black magic have Jewish names (e.g. the old *koldun* Miler, or Boris Solomonovich, who organizes a seance in which a demon is raised, using the blood of a freshly killed boy); this suggests an anti-Semitic slant to the novel's portrayal of the action of demonic forces in history. The novel also makes reference to early twentieth-century occultism, thereby hinting at its link with turn of the century Russian demonism. A further, non-literary work, entitled *Apokalipsis 2000* (http://www.apokalipsis.com/win/index.html, version of 7 July 1998), opens with a Dostoevskian epigraph ("Velichaishim dostizheniem D'iavola iavliaetsia obshchee mnenie o tom, chto D'iavola net") and draws on the Book of Revelation and the writings of Nostradamus; it sets out seven stages in the arena of international politics, which will lead to a final nuclear disaster and to the End of the World (predicted to start in January 2000 – will there be any readers left to read this note?). It is not clear whether the "Rezhisser Apokalipsisa" who controls this grim scenario represents God or the Devil. The journal *Anomaliia. Gazeta o neopoznannom* (http://www.dux.ru/anomalia, issue of 5 June 1998), produced in St. Petersburg with the help of the "Ufologicheskaia assotsiatsiia," contains an eclectic mix of articles. I am most grateful to my colleague Arnold McMillin and to Efim Slavinsky for providing me with these materials.

Part I

TRADITIONS AND CONTEXTS