Volume 77 Number 3 July 1999

Offprint from

The Slavonic and East European Review

PUBLISHED BY W. S. MANEY & SON LTD
FOR THE MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
AND THE SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

SEER, Vol. 77, No. 3, July 1999

Review Article

Viacheslav Ivanov: Studies and Publications 1994–96

AVRIL PYMAN

Un Maître de sagesse au xxe siècle: Viačeslav Ivanov et son temps. Cahiers du monde russe, 35, 1–2, Éditions de l'école des hautes études sociales, Paris, 1994. Abstracts in French and English. 428 pp. FF 420.00.

Panov, S. I. (ed.). *Viacheslav Ivanov: Materialy i publikatsii. Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 10. Comp. N. V. Kotrelev. Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, Moscow, 1994. 312 pp. Illustrations. Price unknown.

Wachtel, Michael. *Russian Symbolism and Literary Tradition: Goethe, Novalis, and the Poetics of Vyacheslav Ivanov*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI, and London, 1994. 247 pp. Bibliography. Index. $47.50.

Wachtel, Michael. *Viaceslav Ivanov: Dichtung und Briefwechsel aus dem deutschsprachigen Nachlass*. Deutsch–russische Literaturbeziehungen Forschungen und Materialen, 6. Liber, Mainz, 1995. 317 pp. Index. DM 48.00

Keldysh, V. A. and Koretskaia, I. V. (eds). *Viacheslav Ivanov: Materialy i issledovaniia*. Rossiiskaia Akademiia nauk, Institut mirovoi literatury imeni A. M. Gor'kogo. 'Nasledie', Moscow, 1996. 360 pp. Price unknown.

Raphaël, Albert and Gfeller, Urs (eds). *D'Ivanov à Neuvecelle: Entretiens avec Jean Neuvecelle recueillis par Raphaël Albert et Urs Gfeller*. Preface by Georges Nivat. Les éditions noir sur blanc, Montricher, Switzerland, 1996. 327 pp. SwF 136.00.

Davidson, Pamela (ed. and comp.). *Viacheslav Ivanov: A Reference Guide*. G. K. Hall, New York, 1996. xiii + 382 pp. Bibliography. Indexes. £31.95.

Rizzi, Daniela and Shishkin, Andrej (comp.). *Archivio italo-russo: Russko-ital'ianskii arkhiv*. Dipartimento di Scienze Filologiche e Storiche, Labirinti, 28. Editrice Università degli studi di Trento, Trento, 1997. 626 pp. Index. Price unknown.

My original mandate from the *Slavonic and East European Review* was to write a review article of *Un Maître de sagesse: Viačeslav Ivanov et son temps* (hereafter *Un Maître de sagesse*), *Russian Symbolism and Literary Tradition:*

Avril Pyman is Reader Emeritus at the University of Durham.

Goethe, Novalis, and the Poetics of Vyacheslav Ivanov (hereafter *Russian Symbolism)*, and *Viaceslav Ivanov: Dichtung und Briefwechsel aus dem deutschsprachigen Nachlass* (hereafter *Dichtung und Briefwechsel*) of the above titles. As I was reading them, however, a further two Russian volumes on Ivanov — *Viacheslav Ivanov: Materialy i publikatsii, Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 10 (hereafter *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*) and *Viacheslav Ivanov: Materialy i issledovaniia* (hereafter *Materialy i issledovaniia*) — appeared, the important publications by Viacheslav Ivanov's son Dmitrii in these volumes were supplemented by *D'Ivanov à Neuvecelle* and the spate of materials from the Roman Archive was enriched by *Archivio italo-russo: Russko-ital'ianskii arkhiv* (hereafter *Archivio italo-russo*). In the course of writing, I have frequently felt the need to refer to Pamela Davidson's *Viacheslav Ivanov: A Reference Guide* (hereafter *Reference Guide*). Although it has been widely reviewed already in this journal and elsewhere, this book has, by mapping out past achievement, provided the criterion against which new contributions must now, to some extent, be measured, and has changed the face of Ivanov studies. The inclusion of all the titles listed in order of date of publication at the head of this review article has enabled me to achieve a certain mobility of cross reference by short title and page number within the text and obviated the need for footnotes or clumsy repetition. It also gives me liberty to look at these new publications not in chronological order, but rather to examine how far they complement one another. With this in mind I have tackled the symposia before Wachtel's monographs.

Nevertheless, I shall begin at the beginning with *Un Maître de sagesse*, the proceedings of the June 1991 conference at Cartigny near Geneva, Ivanov's home from 1903–05, the fifth in the series of symposia organized by the Ivanov Convivium. This is a luxuriously produced and spaciously type-set volume, presented, under a dust-jacket designed by Catherine Sautter featuring a drawing by Aleksandra Ekster, in the usual soft-cover format of *Cahiers du Monde Russe* of which it forms numbers 1 and 2 of volume 35. The languages are French, Russian and English. Bilingual French/English résumés/abstracts of all contributions are provided on pages 413–25 and a translation of all titles of papers into English is given at the beginning after the list of contents in the original languages, a translation which I have used throughout to avoid a conglomeration of various systems of transliteration from the Cyrillic.

Georges Nivat, in his aphoristic editor's Foreword, itself a classic encapsulation of Ivanov's creative philosophy and poetic personality, describes the purpose of the volume as follows: 'it will throw light on the personality of Ivanov, give a view of his poetics, offer exegeses of his works and provide a number of unpublished texts enriching his biography' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 13. Translations from French,

German and Russian originals, here and throughout unless otherwise stated, are my own).

'Profoundly dialogical', Nivat continues, 'Ivanov's work wishes to perceive itself as a banquet, a Platonic "symposium"' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 13). 'The "Banquet"' is the title of the first section, which opens with Andrei Shishkin's 'The Platonic and Sufi symposium at the "Tower" in St Petersburg: Berdiaev and Viacheslav Ivanov' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 15–80), translated into French by Claire de Morsier Praz and now available in Russian in the third *Kanun* almanac, *Russkie piry*, published in autumn 1998 in St Petersburg. It augurs well for the longer work. We are given a detailed account of the Tower Wednesdays (who was there, how the atmosphere was created, what was discussed, which poems were read) — based largely on Lidiia Zinov'eva-Annibal's unpublished letters to M. M. Zamiatina, skilfully deployed by Shishkin to show how ephemeral conversations later took more lasting form in the written works of the protagonists. By italicizing such expressions as '*the soirée had the merit of bringing together incompatibles*', he emphasizes the provocative yet conciliatory thrust of the symposiums. The Platonic model is foregrounded. The conscious aim of the gatherings was to engender spontaneous discussion, and Berdiaev's 'ideal' suitability as chairman is shown to have rested precisely on his inability to remain detached and objective; like Socrates, the young Russian philosopher would defend but not impose a particular point of view and his passionate interjections would prevent debate from degenerating into a series of monologues or — worse — 'papers'. One of the earliest and subsequently recurrent themes, that of 'Eros', passes from the philosophical and lyrical to discussion of Ivanov's eponymous verse cycle in terms of 'Symposium' both at later Wednesdays and within the Hafiz (or Sufi) circle, discussions which in turn lead to consideration of Zinov'eva-Annibal's *Tridtsat' tri uroda* and Ivanov's unpublished Preface to a mooted second edition of this work. The section on the post-Tower relationship between Ivanov and Berdiaev comprises, amongst much else of interest, an exegesis of the 'Road to Emmaus' cycle as a continuation of the ongoing 'disputing among themselves' amongst contributors to *Novyi put'* and *Voprosy zhizni* (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 56–59), an exegesis which illumines the Christianization of the Platonic dialogue. Further, in separate annexes, follow first publications of the dedicatory poem inscribed by Viacheslav Ivanov in Berdiaev's copy of *Cor Ardens*, the correspondence between N. A. and L. Iu. Berdiaev and Viacheslav Ivanov and Lidiia Zinov'eva-Annibal between 24 June 1906 and March 1917, and an extract from E. V. Anichkov's 1935 reminiscences of the Tower. The 164 footnotes are rich in further information from published and unpublished sources. As Nivat says, it is 'une belle étude'.

Three articles in the Banquet section are devoted to *Perepiska iz dvukh uglov* (translated into English as *Correspondence across a Room*), that essentially dialogical work which, according to Davidson in the Introduction to her *Reference Guide*, is the 'least prepared and most spontaneous' of Ivanov's Moscow period, its resounding international success 'responsible for the fundamental reorientation and change of emphasis away from Ivanov the poet to Ivanov the philosopher of culture that persists to this day' (*Reference Guide*, pp. xxi, xxiii). To some extent this trend is now in process of being reversed as scholars discover that close reading of the poetry yields richer insights into Ivanov's essentially poetic and creative thought than the sometimes 'unnecessary repetition and overlap' (*Reference Guide*, p. xxviii) in considerations of his prose. Indeed, these three studies, interesting enough in themselves, do appear to signal a welcome moratorium on the 'correspondence'. Michel Grabar, writing in French, gives a 'Draft of an Ivanovian Theory of Culture in the *Correspondence across a Room*' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 129–39), a close reading of Ivanov's text following up illusions to other texts and self-references. It is helpful and scholarly, if not particularly revealing. Konstantin Sigov's 'Beyond the Opposition Tabula rasa/Thesaurus. . .' is translated into French by Patricia Poupére in a fashion which occasionally, as in the discussion of 'pravdivost'' (integrity, truthfulness, honesty) rendered as 'vraisemblance' ('pravdopodobnost'' or 'verisimilitude') (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 115), obscures the author's meaning. Sigov invites us to look outside the binary opposition accepted by Ivanov but, as both Grabar and Sigov point out, rejected by Gershenson. For Sigov, the interest of the argument lies not in the Plato/Rousseau, Jew/Greek, Russia/West dichotomies raised in the course of the argument, but precisely in the sparks that fly from the clashing views, sparks engendered by the extreme ideological and ontological intransigence of the moment. The epistolary form selected is compared to a curtain between beds in a crowded ward, ensuring each thinker his own space and, at the same time, lending permanence to a hot argument between friends. This intimate, existential apperçu is, in a sense, supported by the first part of Alexandre Bourmeyster's 'The Correspondence across a Room: Dialogue or Representation?' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 91–103), which analyses the *Correspondence* on the basis of the 1979 *L'Age d'homme* edition in French translation. For Bourmeyster also, Gershenson's urgent awareness of the petrification of a culture he now sees as pregnant with tyranny is not necessarily *opposed* to Ivanov's insistence on the liberating power of memory. The interlocutors do not, he considers, make a clear enough distinction between the horizontal civilization they share and the vertical culture which divides them. They do not at first realize that their exchange is not so much a philosophical dialogue between

conflicting ideas as a psychological drama in which the *personae* pass from an almost Chekhovian exchange, in which each participant is essentially following his own train of thought, to self-discovery, to awareness each of his own religio-cultural identity. We are thus back, not on the level of philosophy but on the level of the unconscious, to the Jew/Greek dichotomy declared secondary and misleading by Sigov. Somewhat battered by the repetition of the same quotations in different contexts from article to article, the reader emerges with the feeling that there is at least a consensus on the need to read the *Correspondence* as *dialogue*, rather than as the full expression of the historico-cultural philosophy of either correspondent.

Maria-Candida Ghidini pursues the classical connection in 'The Notion of Inner Form in Viacheslav Ivanov's Thought' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 81–90), linking Ivanov's use of the term *forma formans* to Plato, Aristotle, the neo-Platonists, Hesychast mystics and scholastic traditions. In so doing, she clears away the Romantic and post-Romantic overgrowth which has obscured the roots of the Russian classicist's thinking: that is, the connotations of 'organic' as opposed to 'mechanic' and 'inner' as opposed to 'outer' thought, as well as Humboldt's and Potebnia's concept of inner form as a means of cognizance. The ontological mainspring of *Ivanov*'s essentially mythological and poetic thought is personified in Sophia 'kak formu zizhdushchuiu, *forma formans* vselennoi v Razume Boga' ('as the founding form, *forma formans* of the Cosmos in the Mind of God': *Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 82). This tendency to regard 'the splendour of form' as the true *content* of art, Ghidini points out, received further impetus from Ivanov's association with Jacques Maritain, with whose aesthetic formulations his own had much in common (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 85) and with whom he enjoyed a cordial personal relationship (see Dmitrii Viacheslavovich's memoirs in *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 297–310). Both thinkers were acutely aware of the precarious balance between *forma formans* and *forma formata*, between potential and achievement, dynamism and stability. Towards the end of his life, however, Ivanov's understanding of inner form achieves, according to Ghidini, a kind of dynamic repose unknown to Plato which, as it were, reconciles both concepts: 'Slova den' sedmoi, ego pokoi, ego subbota' ('The seventh day of the Word, his rest, his sabbath').

A. Dioletta Siclari's 'Individuality and Ecumenism in the Light of Kantian Ethics' (published in Russian as 'Lichnost' i sobornost' v svete kantianskoi etiki': *Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 119–28) has an important point to make about Ivanov's reception of Kant in his formulations of the theory of mystic anarchism and in his writings on the theatre over the period of the Symbolist polemics between 1906 and 1909, when he makes more frequent reference to the German philosopher than at any

other time (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 120). In criticizing the 'categorical imperative', he found himself at odds with Belyi's quest for new gnoseological certainties in neo-Kantian philosophy over this same period. The artist, in Ivanov's view, could never settle for a conscious and reasonable compromise between the individual and the general good for the sake of a God whose existence is deduced by reason. His God is not 'deduced' but 'recognized' in the 'Ty esi', the moment individuals exceed themselves and recognize the 'Ia esm' of another, others, the Other and thus pass into 'Sobornost''. The article refers exclusively to first sources (that is, Kant and Ivanov) with one self-reference.

It is a curious fact of this collection that the Italian contributors choose to express themselves in faultless Russian (so much better when dealing with a term like *sobornost'*), whereas many Russians have felt impelled to write in French or have their contributions translated — with somewhat mixed results.

The next section, 'Poetics and Hermeneutics', ventures into less well-trodden ground and opens with a welcome study by Efim Etkind, in Russian, of 'Viacheslav Ivanov and the Questions of Poetics in the 1920s' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 141–54). On the basis of an unpublished conspect of Ivanov's lectures in Baku, Etkind demonstrates with quiet authority that the dialogue between Symbolists, Acmeists and Formalists on the nature of poetic language was — in spite of its vituperative excesses and Formalist insistence that the Symbolists neither knew nor cared for the theoretical study of prosody — a revolutionary process in itself. Briusov, Ivanov and, of course, Andrei Belyi, to some extent even Bal'mont, had themselves laid the foundation for the very 'formalist' approach which, in alliance with Russian Futurism, was to develop and extend their method and techniques in ways of which they might frequently disapprove but could never altogether disown. Much new material on this theme, modifying but mainly supporting Etkind's findings, has since been published in M. S. Al'tman's *Razgovory s Viacheslavom Ivanovym*, edited by K. Iu. Lappo-Danilevskii (St Petersburg, 1995), in Lappo-Danilevskii's contribution to this volume on Ivanov and Kruchenykh (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 401–22), in K. Iu. Postoutenko's publication of three unpublished Ivanov reviews from the early 1920s (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 237–52), S. I. Subbotin's publication of P. A. Zhurov's recollections of Ivanov from 1916–24 (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 209–36), and in A. E. Parnis's publication of Nikolai Aseev's *Moscow Notes* (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 151–70). Anyone tackling the subject of Symbolism, Futurism and Formalism in the future will do well to consult these publications, but Etkind's conclusion stands: 'However different, Viacheslav Ivanov's theoretical positions [. . .] may be from [those] of the Formalists of Opoiaz and the

linguists = "poetologists" (such as L. V. Shcherba), of V. Briusov and A. Belyi, Gumilev and Mandel'shtam, Zhirmunskii and Eikhenbaum, Shengeli and Tomashevskii — all together, "soborno", they made possible a many-sided study of Russian verse and poetic speech, and this *new sphere of philological discipline, arising at the beginning of the XX century, owed its genesis to the Symbolist poets*' (the italics are mine; *Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 153).

Rolf Fieguth of the University of Fribourg contributes, in Russian, an engaging article adumbrating the huge 'Question of the Category of the Sublime in Viacheslav Ivanov's Poetry' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 155–70), part of a wider attempt to revive interest in 'the sublime' in Russian literature as a whole. Whereas, according to Fieguth, the sublime is a discredited term in the context of post-modernism, in 1981 it was redefined by Jean-François Lyotard as the attempt (inevitably doomed) to express that which is beyond art and indeed beyond human compass and therefore as an antidote to the falsely 'harmonious' aesthetic of totalitarianism. Ivanov's 'sublimity' is here dissociated from his use of high language. The point that — ever since the Gospels — 'sublime' subject matter can well be expressed in 'low' style is valid, though surely, given Ivanov's explicit defence of the rhapsode's right to the lofty, incantatory mode and his insistence on the identity of form and content, he is not (as Akhmatova, for instance, undoubtedly is) the poet one would naturally choose to illustrate sublimity of content rather than of style. Only the *Roman Diary* shows that he eventually learned, in quite simple words, to express the essence of his 'sublime' aspiration. The article shows an agreeable readiness to enter into meaningful exchanges with other scholars.

More academic is L. Heller's 'Viacheslav Ivanov's Syntheticism' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 171–89). In the first editorial to *Trudy i dni*, the author perceives a declaration of intent to 'co-ordinate' art, science and religious thought in order to discover, at the point of intersection, an 'accomplished synthesis' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 171). In this context he examines Ivanov's dream of the dialectical synthesis of opposing trends within the 'critical' culture of the present in a new 'organic' culture as envisaged by Saint Simon and Nietzsche and highlights the persistence with which he sought examples of 'synthesis' in the art and music of friends and contemporaries: Ciurlionis, Kandinskii, Skriabin. The idea of synthesis is seen to have wider repercussions in the 1920s in the thought and practice of the scientist-theologian Florenskii, the mystic-artist Chekrygin, the writer-engineer Zamiatin. A shared preoccupation with the physical concepts of energetism (a favourite term of Ivanov's long before the 1920s) and entropy was projected by Florenskii, Ivanov, Zamiatin and Belyi into the socio-political, psychological and metaphysical dimensions and the artists Goncharova and

Larionov struggled to express energetism in their pictures. Symbolist enthusiasm for esoteric societies from Free Masonry to theosophy and anthroposophy is also seen as part of the quest for 'synthesis', as is their interest in the various manifestoes of European Symbolism (he specifically mentions Jean Moréas's 1886 manifesto), where the term 'synthesis' is already closely associated with synaesthesia and the Wagnerian concept of the *Gesamtkunstwerk*. The 'organic' cultures of the ancient world (Mexico, Egypt and Nineveh) were perceived by Baudelaire to harbour a 'synthetic barbarity', captured or at least pursued in the art of Gauguin, Cézanne, Van Gogh and their successors right down to the Cubists, whom Ivanov not surprisingly found too 'analytical', too arbitrary in their readiness to 'deform reality', just as he baulked at the Russian Futurists' deformation of 'the Word'. As stated in the previous article on the sublime, Ivanov's ambition was to produce a harmonious new synthesis from given materials (for the poet — language) — not an enforced dislocation of the cultural tradition. As I fear comes across all too clearly in this summary, the article is almost too wide-ranging, occasionally losing sight of Ivanov himself and of the way in which the exact meaning of a term like 'synthesis' can differ from generation to generation, even from person to person. It is, nevertheless, good to be reminded of the extent of Ivanov's influence and of the cultural continuity and European context of his thought.

Maria Cymborska-Leboda's 'Drama, Music and Theatre: The Symbolist Conception of Man' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 191–208) examines a slightly different aspect of 'synthesis' in the light of Bakhtin's concept of genre as bearer of memory. The Hellenic spirit, says Ivanov in his 'Elinskaia religiia stradaiushchego boga', is 'still a live force in Europe, a virus ever present in its veins. It is no romantic and dreamy nostalgia for the past which attracts minds towards the pagan pole of our dualistic culture, but the *thirst for synthesis*' (quoted *Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 194–95; the italics are mine). The critic seconds him: 'artistic forms proper to a particular genre can undergo a renaissance thanks to an enlargement of their boundaries, *thanks to a synthesis with other genres and art forms*, in particular with music' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 195). The ultimate goal of music, she explains, following Belyi, is 'epiphany, the sanctification of the world and the rebirth of mankind' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 197) and so a new synthesis is born, this time between aesthetics and a general philosophic statement about man in the Universe. There is no attempt to counterbalance Belyi's apotheosis of music by the other, 'Christian', pole of the Symbolist search for synthesis, though parallels are drawn between Ivanov's thought and that of Martin Buber (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 202 and in footnotes 78 and 79 on p. 208). On the contrary, the emphasis on 'a tendency to

efface frontiers between what emanates from the domain of aesthetics and what remains exterior to any aesthetic' as 'characteristic of the whole symbolist movement' leaves the reader with a sense of *huis clos*, not only within this article but, as it were, from article to article on synthesis and synaesthesia. Belyi, it is worth remembering, clamoured for a 'fortochka', a little window out of the endless dialectic, and Blok disputed Belyi's concept of 'Music' as the last synthesis in his very first letter, provoked by the article in which it is formulated: 'Formy iskusstva'. As for Ivanov, he sought to remember not only 'the Hellenic spirit' but also, though aware it was indeed 'exterior to any aesthetic', what the Orthodox Church calls 'the pre-Eternal' that which is outside time. (See Donata Gellidi Mureddu [*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 296] for a more exact formulation of this concept.)

We are still firmly bound up in temporal pan-aestheticism in G. Bobilewicz-Bryś's 'The Paintings of the Masters of the Italian Renaissance in Viacheslav Ivanov's Work' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 209–23). The word Ivanov used was 'bezyskhodnost'' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 211). Here, however, the resilience of Ivanov's art combats claustrophobia. The study shows us pictures not only through Ivanov's prose but through his poetry, and analyses the technical 'correspondences' between poetics and painting: shapes, colours, configurations of space, light and shade, and composition triumphantly re-created in verbal form. As to Ivanov's love of the Renaissance, curious, as Bobilewicz-Bryś remarks, in a generation profoundly influenced by the pre-Raphaelites, it was not without its dark side, for the poet perceived Renaissance man as a proud but doomed figure, powerless to exceed the boundaries of self-defining intellect. Yet this study is a lively reminder of Georges Nivat's characterization of Ivanov as 'perhaps the poet of the Renaissance which Russia never had' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 13).

Last in the section 'Poétique et Herméneutique', Aleksandr Etkind's 'Viacheslav Ivanov and Psychoanalysis' introduces Freud with the somewhat negative sentence: 'Net osnovanii somnevat'sia v tom, chto Viach. Ivanov slyshal o psikhoanalize i, vozmozhno, chital raboty Freida' ('There are no grounds for doubting that Viach. Ivanov had heard of psychoanalysis and, possibly, had read Freud's works': *Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 226). It is a pity that Etkind chooses to concentrate more on Freud than Jung and establishes no direct links between Ivanov and psychoanalysis. What he does do, however, is to point out a common interest in Nietzsche, mythology and Russian nineteenth-century literature and a common involvement with the Eros/Thanatos dualism embodied in the concept of Dionysos. Where the poet differed from the psychologists, according to Etkind, is that he sought to explore and experience the unconscious, whereas they tried to map it out and

build lighthouses. A very helpful supplement to the information contained in this article is to be found in Michael Wachtel's *Russian Symbolism and Literary Tradition* (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 224, n. 61).

The section 'Exegeses' opens with A. Kushner's 'The Mythological Themes in the Lyric Poetry of Viacheslav Ivanov and of I. Annenskii' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 235–47). Kushner clearly has more sympathy for Annenskii's description of myth as 'a child of the sun, the multicoloured ball of children playing in a meadow' than with Ivanov's more nocturnal, irrational and orgiastic vision, but states fairly at the end of the article that the one complements the other. He explains Annenskii's over-emphasis of Ivanov's darkness and mysticism by the fact that, having died in 1909, he never read the later poetry. The article opens the way to a more detailed comparison of these two, very different, Russian Symbolist classicists.

Pamela Davidson, in 'The Legacy of Difficulty in the Russian Poetic Tradition: Contemporary Critical Responses to Ivanov's *Cor Ardens*' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 249–67) establishes the detail on which she bases her interesting remark in the Preface to the *Reference Guide* that early attacks on Ivanov's poetry as 'too abstract' and 'too difficult' were in fact directed against precisely those 'two main areas in which Ivanov succeeded in effecting a major change in readers' perception of poetry [. . .] the use of implicit allusion through symbol, myth and intertextual reference' (*D'Ivanov à Neuvecelle*, p. xvii). It is a pleasure to retrace in this article how an enlightened readership, from the earliest reviews of *Kormchie zvezdy* to the émigré articles by Khodasevich and D. S. Mirsky, gradually became aware of the modernity of Ivanov's poetics, first asserted by Briusov, and how they followed him 'to simplicity through complexity' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 265, n. 27). Aleksandr Arkhangel'skii considers Ivanov's *Mladenchestvo*, Blok's *Vozmezdie* and Pasternak's *Detstvo Liuvers* and *Okhrannaia gramota* (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 285–94), recollecting Kuzmin's remark in a 1923 article that *Mladenchestvo* was the first of a series of literary parallels (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 290). Arkhangel'skii's thesis is that, unlike Blok, both Pasternak and Ivanov put sacrifice on the threshhold of the transfiguration from 'infancy' to creative maturity but do not regard this as a retributive process. An interesting supposition but not, I thought, wholly convincing.

Not so much exegesis as a fascinating essay on stone symbolism from ancient times to the present day is provided by Aminadav Dykman's 'Lithica Ivanoviana: Some Remarks about the Cycle "Prozrachnost'" ' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 269–83). The genesis rather than the reception of Ivanov's poetry is also the subject of Donata Gelli Mureddu's 'Memory of the Past, Classical motifs and Palinody in The Roman Diary of the Year 1944' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 295–300). In a rather beautiful sustained metaphor, Ivanov's life in poetry is compared to a

river which he is at the last ready to remount, against the stream, annulling his former self, in order to flow back to source (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 295). The 'palinody' lies not in negation or retraction of what has gone before, but rather in this personal return to source which allows the supra-personal to take over in a process of 'stirb und werde' ('die and become': Goethe). This source is seen as 'Eternal memory', something similar to Jung's 'collective unconscious' but animated by more than the collective: 'Human memory, of either great or small events, is entirely subject to the threat of Lethe. Yet everything flows into, and finds salvation in the all-encompassing Eternal Memory, which always lies beyond the realm of personal circumstances' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 296).

To be read, by those with a reading knowledge of German, in conjunction with Michael Wachtel's later publication of another variant of Ivanov's authorial translation of the first part of 'Chelovek' into German (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, pp. 269–82), is Roman Dubrovkin's important article 'The German Version of the Threnody "Chelovek": An Attempt at Interpretation' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 301–30). Ivanov's reinterpretation of his own poem not just in the German tongue but in terms of Germanic culture is an exegesis in itself, and both Dubrovkin's and Wachtel's introductory articles are valuable works of research and interpretation, essential reading for anyone tempted to expound further on this most complex poem. For those who do not read German, Dubrovkin himself writes in Russian and appends a literal translation of Ivanov's German version back into Russian, more helpful for comparison with the original than Wachtel's English version of Ivanov's German. The texts, Dubrovkin's from the Foundation Bodmer archive in Geneva and Wachtel's from the Ivanov archive in Rome, are basically the same, but Ivanov, as was his habit, continued to revise after sending off one version of the text to his publisher, so Wachtel's is a later, improved, though probably still far from final version. How important the German translation is to the understanding of the Russian can be judged from the letter Ivanov wrote to his son while working on it in 1931: 'Is it a translation? If so, then no one but the author himself has a right to such a "translation". No, it's a paraphrase. And at the same time all that is dark and too "mysterious" in the original is becoming clear and easily comprehensible, without losing, where needed, a good sense of mystery' (quoted in *Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 317).

The last 'Biographica' section contains information collated by D. Segal from the archives of the National and University Library at Jerusalem on Ivanov's relations with David Solomonovich and Evsei Davidovich Shor, uncle and first cousin respectively to Ol'ga Aleksandrovna Shor (Dechartes), the editor of the first volumes of Ivanov's

Collected Works and closest friend of his later years (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 331–52). Segal publishes letters from Ivanov and Ol'ga Shor written to Evsei Davidovich between 1927 and 1934 and two letters to David Solomonovich, a musician who early emigrated to Israel, Evsei's father. The name of Evsei Shor also occurs frequently in Wachtel's publications of Ivanov's letters to German publishers in *Dichtung und Briefwechsel* as, before the Nazis came to power and Evsei Davidovich emigrated via Italy to Israel in 1934, he was the most energetic translator and propagator of Ivanov's works in Germany. Ivanov's gratitude is shown in a letter recommending Shor to Martin Buber as translator of his 'Russian Idea' and collaborator on *Dostoevskii* (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 45 and *Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 349, 351), and begging Buber's assistance in finding a publisher for Shor's own monograph on Georg Simmel. To Herbert Steiner, Ivanov writes of his need to rework Shor's translations, with some of the freedom be brought to his own poetic self-translations because 'language, for me, alters the focus of the mind's eye' (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 169). Steiner wanted a different translator for 'Russian Idea' in *Corona* (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 111). Clearly, Ivanov was deeply concerned lest Shor should be offended (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 164) and did all in his power to secure him proper remuneration from his own new German-speaking contacts (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, pp. 194, 198). A casualty of Shor's emigration was a volume of Ivanov's articles on the theatre (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 180) and in Segal's study we see the genuine friendship and respect in which the Russian poet held both father and son. Of exceptional interest is Ivanov's account of his own development in the letter of 20 August 1928 (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 342–45) and the correspondence ranges over Israel, Russia, Europe, and the Roman Catholic faith. Further publications from the same source promised at the end of the article (*Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 352) are awaited in the proceedings of the Vienna Conference of July 1998.

The next contribution to 'Biographica' is M. Wachtel's 'Viacheslav Ivanov, a Student at Berlin University' (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 353–76), here in Russian and in more detail than in the chapter 'The Years of Apprenticeship: Vyacheslav Ivanov's *Lehrjahre*' (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 21–42). Outstandingly well-sourced in published and unpublished German and Russian materials, the article is followed by Addenda from the Archive of the Berliner Humboldt-Universität showing, first, which courses Ivanov followed (demonstrating, as Wachtel points out in his article, that Ivanov and his circle tended to overstress his discipleship to Mommsen) and, secondly, the correspondence between the Russian research student and his supervisor Hirschfeld during the former's stay in Rome (consisting largely of explanations for the need for extensions of time in which to complete

his thesis!). We know, of course, that Ivanov did complete the thesis but never turned up to defend it orally, having decided to devote his life to literature, but the last letters, dated 14/1 March 1906, request that the thesis be forwarded to the Imperial University Library in Petersburg or he himself be permitted to collect it, according to Wachtel to satisfy the interest of M. I. Rostovtsev (see *Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 376, n. 24), which indicates that even during the most Bohemian years at the Tower the *poeta doctus* had not lost all interest in Roman taxfarming and the academic life to which he was to return in Baku and Pavia.

Vera Proskurina's 'Viacheslav Ivanov and Mikhail Gershenson on the Way to the Correspondence across a Room' *(Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 377–92) is a significant contribution to our knowledge of Ivanov's Moscow years, based on his unpublished correspondence with Gershenson and the private, humoristic 1915 journal *Bul'var i pereulok*, to which Proskurina devotes a pioneering and richly illustrated publication in *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 173–208. Contributors were Ivanov, Berdiaev, their wives, and V. F. Ern, S. N. Bulgakov, Jurgis Baltrushaitis, Lev Shestov and 'the Zhukovskiis'. Much further information about this circle and the Moscow publishing house 'Put'' patronized by M. K. Morozova is also contained in V. Keidan's publication 'Put', chto na kartu ne popal: Pis'ma russkikh filosofov 1911–1914 gg.' (*Archivio italo-russo*, pp. 157–340).

New material on Ivanov's attitude to the Futurists, both published but little known and unpublished, is assembled in K. Lappo-Danilevskii's 'Viacheslav Ivanov and Aleksei Kruchenykh in a Debate on Nietzsche and Dostoevskii' *(Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 401–12), mentioned briefly above in connection with Efim Etkind's conceptual article. Ivanov 'debated' with Kruchenykh from the post-1913 Moscow period to the early 1920s, when a dispute between the two in Baku was reported in the local press. In Ivanov's contribution *(Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 408–10), Lappo-Danilevskii perceives a distinct evolution in the poet's attitude to Nietzsche's 'aesthetic' view of human life *(Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 404). An amusing addendum is Kruchenykh's phonetic portrait or 'sound diagram' of Ivanov, subtitled 'K rokochushchei poezii' *(Un Maître de sagesse*, p. 410).

This special number of the *Cahiers du monde russe*, then, has, all the eclectic elegance proper to a collection of conference papers, some closer in genre to browsers' essays, others combining the publication of new and exhumation of little-known material with focused analysis, still others falling somewhere between. N. V. Kotrelev's *Viacheslav Ivanov: Materialy i publikatsii* is more utilitarian in appearance and business-like in content. The criterion is 'contribution to knowledge' and the standard of scholarship throughout what one would expect of a collection in direct line of descent from the *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* series

which Kotrelev took over after the death of I. S. Zil'berstein. Alas, Kotrelev does not now dispose of the same funding and the value of publications of new or rare facsimile and photographic materials is, regrettably, much detracted from by poor-quality paper. The Italo-Russian provenance of most contributors reflects Viacheslav Ivanov's life and the firm axis now established between the Roman Archive managed by Dmitrii Viacheslavovich Ivanov and Andrei Shishkin and more scattered holdings of materials in private collections and State Archives in the CIS.

The curators of the Roman archive publish two original poems, a 1915 sonnet and the 1916 'Merlin' not included in *Svet vechernyi*, and hitherto unknown verse translations from the ancient Greek, Horace, Dante, Goethe (four lyric poems) and Mickiewicz (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 7–20). Dmitrii Viacheslavovich further publishes an excerpt from his memoirs (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 297–310) which cover the period from the fall of Mussolini in 1943 through the German occupation of Rome and the liberation until the early 1950s. Until his father's death in 1949, D. V. Ivanov, himself a distinguished journalist, served as a living link between the bustling world of the Vatican and the diplomatic community and Viacheslav's book-lined retreat on the Aventine, where the old poet worked 'every day, slowly and with delight' on *Svetomir*, from which he would, on occasion, read aloud to his family. 'In no way did Viacheslav read like an actor. He never declaimed. Nor did he chant his verses, nor "cast a spell", nor "make an incantation". But he had the ability to move his reader, to frighten with a terrible word, whereas the "archaic" word never seemed so, but emerged simply and naturally from the depths of language' (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, p. 303). This direct and natural feeling for the far past wells up also in the way in which Dmitrii Viacheslavovich shows historico-cultural classical motifs in the *Roman Diary* to have arisen from Ivanov's everyday life in the Eternal City, as it does in father and son's shared love of the pomp and circumstance of Papal ceremony (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 306–07). At the same time, the twentieth century comes knocking on Ivanov's door in the person of Jacques Maritain, first Ambassador from Gaullist France to the Vatican. Claudel and Cocteau also figure in these memoirs, though they came to Rome after the poet's death.

In the context of this Russian publication from D. Ivanov's memoirs, I would like to direct the reader's attention to the book *D'Ivanov à Neuvecelle*, written by two Swiss journalist colleagues (Raphaël Albert and Urs Gfeller) of Dmitrii Viacheslavovich from recorded interviews and with a preface by Georges Nivat. In this book Ivanov (Neuvecelle is his *nom-de-plume* taken from the village in the French Alps where he was born) recounts his own adventurous, cosmopolitan life and answers

questions about his father. It is another essential part of the jigsaw of the poet's long life now in process of being assembled and is of great value in that it shows the mutual independence as well as the interdependence of this remarkable, essentially cosmopolitan family. There are many rare and previously unpublished photographs.

To return to the 1994 *Materialy i publikatsii*, these include the untitled articles 'O tipicheskom' published by Maria-Candida Ghidini (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 21–26) and 'O mnogobozhii' published by Guido Carpi (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 27–40). Viacheslav Ivanov's correspondence with the editor of *Apollon*, S. K. Makovskii, from May 1909 when the journal was first mooted to September 1915 (Makovskii's polite refusal of and complete failure to understand 'Chelovek' is of particular interest for students of that notoriously enigmatic threnody) is introduced by N. A. Bogmolov who was assisted in the publication by S. S. Grechishkin and in the compilation of notes by O. A. Kuznetsova. K. Iu. Postouenko publishes reviews of works by Tomashevskii, Jakobson and Iarkho written between 1919 and 1921. The review of Jakobson's *Briusovskaia stikhologiia i nauka o stikhe*, in particular, throws much light on differences between Symbolists and Formalists on questions of poetics, differences which have too long been regarded exclusively from the Formalist point of view (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 237–51). From the archives of Musaget, G. V. Obatnin publishes Ivanov's rebuttal of N. Bryzgalov's 'Simvolizm i fal'sifikatsiia' (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 165–72), which is a belated extension of the 1910 crisis of Symbolism, provoked not only by Bryzgalov but by the Acmeist manifestoes of 1913 and Gumilev's insistence on the separation of art from the 'beautiful Lady Theology' and so, in Ivanov's thinking, of form from content. It remained unpublished because of the demise of the journal *Trudy i dni*.

Of considerable importance for the reconstitution of Ivanov's relationship with Soviet Russia, where he left many close friends, colleagues and pupils with whom he kept in touch during the early years in Italy, is G. Bongard-Levin's publication of a letter of 6 July 1922 to S. F. Ol'denburg, secretary to the Russian Academy of Sciences, delivered by the Rector of the University of Baku and requesting, on the one hand, books for teaching and research and, on the other, renewed support for Ivanov's application for a year's research fellowship to pursue his studies of Aeschylus and the Greek religion in Italy, an application disallowed, in spite of Lunacharskii's support, in 1920 (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 253–56). As we know, Ivanov's persistence in an ever-changing situation won the day. His meeting with Meierkhol'd and Zinaida Raikh in Rome in the summer of 1925 led to an exchange of letters (from 12 July 1925 to 12 August 1926) published by Kotrelev and F. Malcovati together with Ivanov's

inscription to Raikh on a photograph of Michelangelo's 'Moses' and the contracts drawn up between him, O. Signorelli-Resnevich and Meierkhol'd's 'Teatral'nyi Oktiabr'' (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 257–80). A case is made (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, p. 276, note 5) for further revision of the text of Ivanov's article on Gogol' and Aristophanes as reprinted in the *Collected Works*, IV, p. 753, in the light of the letter to Raikh of 23 August 1926 (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, p. 275). Difficulties of communication, financial and otherwise, clearly did not altogether undermine the longstanding friendship between Ivanov and Meierkhol'd. The introduction, however, reminds us of their second meeting in the winter of 1937, already heavily overshadowed by impending tragedy, and of Meierkhol'd's eventual renunciation, under intense pressure, of Ivanov and all his works (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 259–60).

George Cheron's publication of Ivanov's letter to Boris Zaitsev on the death of Georgii Chulkov (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 289–91) furnishes an essential and deeply touching footnote to the whole strange saga of 'mystic anarchism'.

Of great interest but not, alas, a new Ivanov text, is M. L. Gasparov's 'Lektsii Viach. Ivanova o stikhe v Poeticheskoi Akademii 1909 g' (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 89–106), a publication of M. M. Zamiatina's imperfect verbatim reports of lectures 4 to 8, delivered between 14 April and 16 May 1909, which Gasparov sets in the context of Belyi's work on poetics at that time (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, p. 90). Together with the Postouenko publication (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 237–51) this revises our impression of the degree of mutual awareness in later Symbolist poetics.

Letters *to* Ivanov which figure in this collection are N. A. Bogomolov's publication of letters of 23 September 1906 and 20 April 1911 from A. A. Kondrat'ev (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 107–13), the second of which is devoted to the subject of rhyme, and two letters and verses from B. M. Zubakin from Gor'kii's villa in Capri published by Stefano Garzonio, who calls this mildly eccentric Freemason and amateur alchemist an 'epigone of religious symbolism' (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 281–88). Ivanov's own relationship with Gor'kii on Capri and with his journal *Beseda*, incidentally, are described in Nikolai Kotrelev's publication of their correspondence in *Europa Orientalis*, 14, 1995, 2, pp. 183–208.

Richly evocative and often amusing is the gossipy glimpse of Viacheslav Ivanov's earlier years in Petersburg afforded by his first translator F. F. Fidler's diary 'Epizody', presented in Russian by K. Azadovskii in excerpts from a prepared Russo-German publication of the whole diary (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 115–36). Extracts from P. A. Zhurov's diaries, notebooks and letters for the years

1916–24 are published by S. I. Subbotin (*Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, pp. 209–36) and provide precious evidence of this notable memorist's mainly literary conversations with Ivanov, the text of a poem dedicated to him (published in a slightly different variant under the title 'Molodomu poetu' in *SS*, IV, p. 56) and ten poems by Zhurov with marginalia in Ivanov's hand. S. V. Trotskii, characterized here by A. V. Lavrov as a 'listener symbolist, the essential interlocutor posited in Ivanov's '"Mysli o simvolizme" 1912', a personal friend since the Tower years who arrived destitute in Baku in 1923 and was given a bed in the poet's bath until the latter's departure for Rome in 1924, wrote his reminiscences at the request of V. A. Manuilov in 1934, but requested that they be kept out of the public domain until after his death. Trotskii was arrested in 1937 and died in a prison camp in Uzbekistan on 18 November 1942. Manuilov left it to Lavrov to publish this 'tender', 'sincere' and very private account of Ivanov as 'confessor', husband, poet, philosopher and friend.

'Manuscripts', as Bulgakov famously remarked, 'do not burn.' As a whole, this book of 'Publications and Materials' contributes significantly both to our knowledge of Ivanov's life and work and to the establishment of a canonic corpus of his texts.

The same could be said of *Viacheslav Ivanov: Materialy i issledovaniia*, edited by V. A. Keldysh and L. V. Koretskaia. Though fifth in order of appearance, this volume in fact consists of papers prepared for publication between 1991 and 1992 and read at the Ivanov Conference in IMLI-RAN, Moscow, in 1991, and so invites comparison with *Un Maître de sagesse*, though, not surprisingly, there are also a number of publications complementary to the similarly Moscow-based *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*. As with the latter, format, paper quality, and layout all speak of the need to economize, and there are no such luxuries as abstracts in English and French. Italian, American and English contributions are all in Russian, but the editors have provided a brief introductory overview of contents (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 3–4) and a useful index of works by Ivanov mentioned in the text (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 353–56). Contributions are scholarly, focused and well-annotated, and editing, unlike some more recent IMLI-RAN publications, of the highest standard throughout.

Amongst the materials, Dmitrii Viacheslavovich's 'Iz vospominanii' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 34–71) and publication of his father's letters to himself and his sister in 1927 (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 14–33) combine to highlight his own conversion to Roman Catholicism as a schoolboy and Viacheslav's reaction. An affecting human story, this is essential reading for anyone who wishes to understand Ivanov's attitudes to the Russian Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Church and also his attitude to his own children: a mixture of lively concern for

their spiritual and indeed physical health with detachment and respect for their right to choose. The reminiscences also show us a younger, grander Viacheslav, not to be disturbed by very small boys yet ready and willing to introduce them into the world of his poetry, never talking down, the Chief Cat, occasionally affectionately condescending to take part in the kittens' games.

Shishkin's publication of Ivanov's rough notes on Dante (5.7–13) further enlarges the canon of his writings on the Italian poet and a densely-documented publication of sixteen letters (November 1906–March 1916) between Ivanov and Lidiia Zinov'eva-Annibal and the Berdiaev family with introductory article (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 119–44) complements the author's study of Berdiaev's role in the Tower (*Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 15–80).

A. M. Gracheva provides a trail-blazing introduction to her and O. A. Kuznetsova's publication of Ivanov's correspondence with A. M. Remizov (thirty-six letters in all from June 1904 to the autumn of 1917) (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 72–118). The letters themselves tend to be brief and enigmatic, but they do show the extent of the collaboration between the two writers (initially, of Ivanov's patronage of Remizov) and also the Baroque 'zhiznetvorchestvo' about the Tower and the love of both correspondents for the world of Slavonic legend and the habits, customs and language of an older Russia which yet went hand in hand with a keen interest in contemporary European literature. The notes, which often exceed the letters themselves in length, are exemplary in the range and pertinence of additional information, itself often drawn from unpublished sources.

I. V. Koretskaia's publication of authorial inscriptions (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 45–150) from various sources, including the private collection of the Gol'd family with whom the poet and his family stayed in 1919–20, gives extracts from the diary of L. V. Gol'd with glimpses of Ivanov and his daughter visiting the dying Vera on Serebrianyi bor at the time of the Winter Sonnets.

Nikolai Aseev's *Moscow Notes*, originally republished from the Vladivostok *Dal'nevostochnoe obozrenie* in 1920 and exhumed for *Russkaia mysl'* (12 June 1992, no. 3933) by A. E. Parnis appear here in revised form with an extended commentary (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 151–67). Even for the few who did not miss the earlier, ephemeral publications there is much here to be gleaned about the relationship between Symbolism and Futurism, particularly from the discussion between Aseev, Khlebnikov and Ivanov on the 'restoration' of language and the 'backbone of roots' ('kosiak kornei', *Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 152–54).

Henryk Baran, in the second section entitled 'Studies' (Issledovaniia), pre-empts the theme of Ben Hellman's *Poets of Hope and Despair* (Helsinki, 1995) in a much narrower study of World War I in the poetry

of Viacheslav Ivanov (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 171–85). Michael Wachtel makes a contribution 'To the Theme of Viacheslav Ivanov and Goethe' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 186–91) in which he examines how the Russian poet and thinker 'absorbs' and 'transfigures' Goethean motifs from the 'Bride of Corinth' in the lyric poems 'Lunnye rozy' and 'Krasota' and the threnody 'Chelovek'. There is a chapter on the 'Bride of Corinth' in *Dichtung und Briefwechsel* (pp. 43–61), where Wachtel treats the same subject in slightly more detail in English.

N. K. Gei discusses 'Povest' o Svetomire Tsareviche' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 192–208) in the context of 'the poetics of nomination' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, p. 199). The name 'Svetomir', found, not given, irradiates the imagery of the entire *Povest'* and 'is the metaphysical, metahistorical and meta-artistic nucleus of the cosmos of the "*Povest'*"' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, p. 201). The name unites sky and earth, contains the possibility of the kingdom 'on earth as it is in heaven', yet, at the same time, like all names it stands for a real individual, not an abstraction. Gei looks at the problem through the prism of Bakhtin, Florenskii and Losev, but does not ignore Ivanov's extra-literary sources: the mystic genesis of the *Povest'* and the author's sympathy for the *imiaslavtsy*.

Pamela Davidson sets out to remedy her own finding that Ivanov's poetry remains largely unexplored (*Reference Guide*, p. xxviii) with a close analysis of the genesis of the Winter Sonnets (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 209–31). Having established the story of the text, she proceeds to analyse the sonnets themselves in terms of the well-known Nietzschean formulation of a journey through Dionysian intoxication (Rausch) to Apollonian clarity and also of Ivanov's insistence on the horizontal and vertical, the horizontal journey over the snowy flats working as a paradigm for the vertical journey of the soul *de profundis* to an ever more immediate presentiment of Spring, Dawn and Resurrection. Subtexts are exhumed from Pushkin, the Psalms, the Book of Revelation, Dante and John of the Cross. From the third sonnet, a double is seen to emerge: the 'mortal part' of the poet (a term suggesting yet another, Faustian sub-text) is physically close to death, while his 'immortal part' or spiritual self continues calmly to construct the temple of his soul. His Protectress, Sophia, the Theotokos, the Woman clothed with the sun or more vaguely the Eternal Feminine, is powerfully invoked by the Apocalyptic nature of the times and by the actual Christmas season, but is present only as a distant vision. Davidson compares the remoteness of the figure to a more immediate, erotic presence in the 1895 'Trizna Dionisa' and the 1910 'Zimnye sumerki', both bound up with thoughts of winter/death/spring/Resurrection, but sees in the Winter Sonnets an unprecedented rift between Flesh and Spirit. The hope here lies not in the renewal of earthly love, nor in

the pagan renewal of spring, for all earthly life is now winter, but in the belief that Easter follows Christmas, Resurrection–Incarnation, Ascent–Descent:

> V noch' zimniuiu paskhal'nyi zvon lovliu,
> Stuchus' v groba i mertvykh toropliu,
> Poka sebia v grobu ne primechaiu . . .

Finally, Davidson looks at the reception of the Winter Sonnets and finds that they struck a chord with readers (from Akhmatova on) not, as popularly supposed, because words and syntax are simpler or even because the poems arose directly from experience, but because Ivanov was here speaking for the community, voicing a *general* winter of the heart which had set in for a whole generation, and because he was able to find words also for the individual spirit, the immortal part which will not yield to entropy and inertia. The twelve sonnets are seen as an answer to Blok's *The Twelve*, the Christmas and Winter poem of the previous year, in which the poet as individual appears, if at all, in the role of onlooker, the incarnation occurs not in the heart of the poet but in the heart of Night, Chaos and Revolution, and Easter remains 'outside the brackets'. It is hard to do justice to this finely-wrought exegesis in one short paragraph, but I found it interesting that here, as in the consideration of the 'name' examined above, the emphasis is on the individual.

Comparison between Ivanov and Blok is also a feature of E. V. Ermilova's 'Zatochnik vol'nyi' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 232–46), here in relation to symbols of freedom ('svoboda') and penury ('nishcheta'), a happy choice since the words (in various forms) recur frequently in the works of both poets. The author starts from the general: how the word 'svoboda' was understood by artists of the Silver Age. Situating Berdiaev at one extreme and Ivanov at the other with Blok somewhere in between, she suggests that 'svoboda' could be understood as pride and self-assertion or as the Christian 'service' that 'is perfect freedom'. There is much truth in this as a general statement, but it might have led to a deeper understanding of Blok and Ivanov had there been a close comparison of the particulars of the use of the word 'svoboda' and its derivations in their poetry without introducing the abstract formulations of a philosopher which entail comparison with their prose, a medium in which neither was at his most profound. Too many names are introduced: Georgii Ivanov, Poplavskii, Belyi, Kuzmin, Tiutchev. By the time we get to the discussion of 'nishcheta' we have lost focus. Nevertheless, the author has much of interest to say in this context on the two poets' different understanding of the 'way of descent', though not on Ivanov's use of the key word in the poem 'Nisch i svetel . . .', which positively begs comparison with Blok's line

'A ia, pechal'nyi, nishchii, zhestkii' — in which he *distinguishes* himself from Ivanov's splendour and wealth.

In 'Viacheslav Ivanov i Dostoevskii' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 247–61), V. A. Keldysh writes: 'Nyne my nachinaem zanovo postigat' opyt vydaiushchegosia poeta, filosofa, kritika' ('Now, we are beginning anew to assimilate the experience of this outstanding poet, philosopher and critic', *Materialy i issledovaniia*, p. 248). In the twenties, Komarovich and Bakhtin showed considerable interest in Viacheslav Ivanov's reception of Dostoevskii, but repressive policies thereafter meant that scholars who remained in the USSR have now to look to the *émigrés* (Berdiaev, Stepun and Florovskii) for further studies, and then to the proceedings of the various international Ivanov conferences. From Ivanov's four principal publications on Dostoevskii of 1911, 1914, 1916 and 1932 and scattered references throughout Ivanov's work, Keldysh extrapolates his view of the novels as a lode-star for the further development of Russian literature. Dostoevskii's central achievement, according to Ivanov, is seen as the way in which, through catharsis, he projected the labyrinthine complexity of the social and psychological worlds of his characters on to a higher, metaphysical plane of supreme simplicity. Whereas Annenskii, Belyi and many other Silver Age readers of Dostoevskii were attracted precisely by the unresolved contradictions ('antinomichnost'') of the novels, Ivanov saw their author rather as a great resolver and attempted the same blend of Dionysian inspiration and 'theorem' in his own 'Prometei' and 'Chelovek'. Like Bakhtin after him, Ivanov was particularly attracted by Dostoevskii's characters' 'clairvoyant penetration into the other's "I", the affirmation of the existence of "the other" so that "I experience your being as my own"' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, p. 252). In the context of Russia in the early 1990s when this article was written, these clearly presented, impeccably sourced ideas come across as fresh and exciting, though in the context of this 1998 review article there may be some sense of *déjà vu* or *déjà lu*.

This goes also for I. V. Kondakov's '"Vertikal'" i "gorizontal'" v kul'turfilosofii Viacheslava Ivanova' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 262–73), a title which has passed into the domain of the exam question and the student's essay. There is, however, an unusual twist in the approach: the 'vertical' of myth and memory and the 'horizontal' of contemporary culture are viewed in the light of the Silver Age perception of 'Russia and the Intelligentsia', the folk element and culture, a legitimate exercise which again encourages comparisons with Blok. Ivanov takes his stance on the 'line' ('nekaia cherta') which, according to Blok (*Sobranie sochinenii*, v, p. 324), still constitutes common ground between Russia and the Intelligentsia, on the intersection of the cross formed by the horizontal and vertical, a concept which is seen

here as 'somewhat obscured by mystic overgrowth' but acknowledged as 'a great cultural-philosophic truth important to us today' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, p. 272). Also deeply concerned with Ivanov's significance for Russia today is V. B. Mikushevich in his 'Inobytie i forma v estetike pozdnego Viacheslava Ivanova' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 305–18), an impassioned essay by a poet and translator deeply involved with contemporary European literature. Ivanov's 1938 article 'Mysli o poezii' (published only in 1962) serves as a taking-off point for a consideration of the poet's inclusive feeling for the Greek and Slavonic roots of the Russian language and for the dimension of myth and invocation inherent in all language, enthusiastically taken up by the Futurists but derogated by Khodasevich and early Acmeists. Ivanov's *zaum'*, however, differs from the Futurists' 'sound speech that wants to become language' — essentially, except with Khlebnikov, a literary device — in that it is rather 'the prophetic speech of wisdom' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, p. 315), an instrument with the power to initiate the reader into the slow, laborious process of creation, the *forma formans*, and thus into that relationship between person and image which is 'inobytie' ('another' being, but not a being 'beyond'). It is Ivanov's belief that poetry is *communication* (albeit beyond the normal possibilities of ordinary communication, as was the Apostles' speaking with tongues) that distinguishes him from poets like Rilke who commune with 'things', still more from the *neue Sachlichkeit*, as well as from those such as Maiakovskii, Sartre, André Breton and Gottfried Benn who sing 'nihil', *le néant*. For Mikushevich, such yea-saying to Despair is directly linked to the acceptance of totalitarian ideologies and, if poetry is to be reborn after what he sees as the dearth of the 1960s (utilitarian sociological declamation in Russia, irrelevance and neglect in the West), Ivanov's thoughts about 'inobytie' are of the utmost importance for poets today (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, p. 314).

I. V. Koretskaia's 'Viacheslav Ivanov i "Parnas"' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 274–91) uses an unpublished review of Leconte de Lisle and his poetry to introduce an examination of Ivanov's attitude not only to the Parnassians but to the younger Symbolists (future Acmeists) who so admired them. Also on the Acmeist/Symbolist relationship, theirs to him this time and more narrowly focused, is O. A. Lekmanov's 'Po povodu odnoi tsitaty (K teme "Mandel'shtam i Viacheslav Ivanov")' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 292–96). Lekmanov discusses the younger poet's highly contradictory attitude to his one-time mentor and, in particular, the parallel he draws between Ivanov and Stepan Trofimovich Verkhovenskii in Dostoevskii's *Besy*, a parallel elaborated (albeit, as the author supposes, unconsciously) by Akhmatova and Nadezhda Mandel'shtam.

D. M. Magomedova takes up the theme of 'dialogue' adumbrated in 'The Banquet', the first part of *Un Maître de sagesse*, from a different angle. In her article 'Stikhotvornye dialogi Viacheslava Ivanova', (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 297–304), she offers three definitions of uses of the word in contemporary literary criticism and opts for the third: 'dialogue as literary genre, that is texts where the "voices" of characters are given a distinct compositional presentation and totally define the structure of a work'. From the point of view of formal poetics and of genesis from ancient forms, the genre of the poetic dialogue has, she claims, been little studied. Magomedova's own specialism on the interaction of Symbolism and the literatures of ancient Greece and Rome gives her particular authority in this sphere; the discussion of the part of the choir and of the gender roles of male and female choirs, of dialogue between earthly and transcendant voices, between mortal man and spirit is enlightening and no less fascinating is the way she goes on to situate Ivanov's dialogues in the nineteenth-century Russian poetic tradition.

M. V. Mikhailova, in 'Lidiia Zinov'eva-Annibal i Viacheslav Ivanov: sotvorchestvo zhizni' (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 319–32), returns us to biography, but this is the story of a marriage perceived as creative collaboration. Aware, as was Zinov'eva-Annibal herself, of the weaknesses of her heroine's literary style, Mikhailova is at the same time sensitive to the dynamic poetry of her life and death. The article is rich in new material, much from Lidiia's explicit letters to Mariia Zamiatina. Telling use is made of scattered published sources: Ivanov's discussion of his wife's literary achievement with M. S. Al'tman and contemporary letters and reviews (often extremely catty). The degree of mutual influence or inspiration is gauged from Ivanov's forewords to his wife's works and borrowings from them for epigraphs to his poems, and also from her quotations in the unfinished novel *Plamenniki* of lines from authors they must have read or discussed together which *he* uses as epigraphs. Neither, it seems, was complete without the other, whether as human being or artist, which rather puts paid to what Mikhailova calls the 'temptation' to include *Thirty-three Monstrosities* in the framework of feminist literature (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, p. 327).

Andrei Shishkin contributes a well-documented piece (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 333–52) on the title image of 'Cor Ardens' as an echo of Dante, in a sense providing a mystic sequel to the preceding article. Lidiia, having crossed the threshhold of death, doffs the pagan mask of Diotima (or Demeter, as Ivanov himself called her) to reveal herself as Beatrice. The theme of Ivanov and Dante, which Davidson (*Reference Guide*, p. xxviii) sees as almost overstudied and already engendering overlap, is still in fact being enriched by new publications such as

Shishkin's 'Iz chernovykh zapisei o Dante' in this same volume (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 7–13).

Ivanov and Dante also form an important part of Shishkin's article-publication on Ivanov in Italy (*Archivio italo-russo*, pp. 503–61), which he edits together with Daniela Rizzi. This is the last general collection to come within the scope of this review article. The epigraph, from Ivanov's unpublished 'Sketch of Russia and Italy', suggests the possibility of judging the character of an epoch by *how* people love Italy and *what* they love about her. He describes his own countrymen as the 'grand-nephews' of Italy. The Russian Symbolists' Italy has engendered countless studies, and Shishkin is only right to insist that Ivanov's place in the 'larger dialogue' of Symbolists with Italian culture is 'so significant, complex, and idiosyncratic, that it is essential to raise the question of his relationship with Italy as a separate historico-literary and culturological problem' (*Archivio italo-russo*, p. 504). Indeed, this article is conceived and felt as preparatory. Shishkin outlines the biographical significance of Italy for the Russian poet and his direct responses to the country at various times in his own poetry, his use of Italian images, the placing of Italian words and names in the semantically loaded (for Ivanov no less than for Maiakovskii) rhyming position (*Archivio italo-russo*, p. 507), his love of Italian forms, particularly the Petrarchan sonnet and the crown of sonnets. From this he proceeds to a consideration of Ivanov and Dante, giving due credit to predecessors, and of the actual and mooted 'Russian' Dante, the 'Russian' Petrarch and the 'Russian' Michelangelo in Ivanov's translations, which sought 'to recreate ideas, images, and symbols in the framework of the same firm poetic form but by means of a different poetic language' (*Archivio italo-russo*, p. 513). Rome is a special subject, and of this, too, one might say from Shishkin's account that Ivanov, even in his conversion to the Roman Church, created a 'Russian' Rome: the Universal, Eternal City where he felt at home and was glad to lay his bones. The story of the abortive Russian Academy in Rome is purely factual and is good background to publications of Ivanov's correspondence with Lunacharskii (*Archivio italo-russo*, pp. 549–57) and his dealings with Meierkhol'd, Gor'kii and Ol'denburg discussed above. New light is thrown on Ivanov's years in Pavia, largely from Italian sources. There is a section on the *Roman Diary*, a discussion of Ivanov's original works in Italian in verse and prose and of his translations of his own poetry into Italian (always, it seems, undertaken in collaboration with a native speaker) (*Archivio italo-russo*, p. 527). Publications appended include original poems in the Italian and translations (*perelozheniia*) of the First Roman Sonnet (with Lo Gatto) and of poems by Pushkin, Novikov and Vechorka; Ivanov's correspondence with Nikolai Otsup between 1930 and 1947 with Dmitrii Viacheslavovich's

reminiscences about his wartime visit (or, more precisely, escape) to the Ivanovs; a letter from V. Ivanov to S. Aleramo (1945) and various documents: a contract for an edition of Dante's *Divine Comedy* with the ex-Brockhaus and Efron publishing house (not realized); correspondence with Lunacharskii (1924–25), an extract from a Narkompros protocol of 16 November 1929 turning down Ivanov's last request for an extension of his 'komandirovka' and the letter from the Soviet Representative in Rome of 25 September 1928 which prompted the refusal on the entirely negative grounds that Ivanov had failed to keep in regular touch and had written nothing in the Italian Press in defence of the Soviet Union. Lastly, there is Ivanov's letter of 14 March 1926 (in Italian with Russian translation in the footnotes) asking for a concession for him to be allowed to use Vladimir Solov'ev's formula for joining the Catholic Church and the resolution of the Congregazione della Chiesa Orientale: negative on 18 March, two days later agreed. These documents, modest as they appear, are of prime importance for Ivanov's sojourn in Italy during the 1920s. Background for Ivanov's Moscow years is provided in V. Keidan's 'Put', chto na kartu ne popal. Pis'ma russkikh filosofov 1911–1914' (*Archivio italo-russo*, pp. 157–340), mentioned above in connection with other new material on this period of the poet's life. The publication has an introductory article tracing, among other things, 'Put"s' relations with 'Musaget' and the philosopher's interest in the *imiaslavtsy*. The letters give an intimate insight into the milieu and, notably in Ern's letters to his wife written in the spring of 1914 when he was actually staying with Ivanov, some remarkable close-ups of that most hospitable poet 'at home', posing for Golubkina and, together with Ern, attending Florenskii's defence of his Master's dissertation at Sergiev Posad. Keidan's much fuller book *Vzyskuiushchie grada* (Moscow, 1997), however, is a richer source which includes this material and more. There is some reference to Ivanov's influence on Sergei Solov'ev in I. Vishnevetskii's 'Zhivye i "blistatel'naia ten"': Transformatstiia obraza Italii v pozdnei poezii Sergeia Solov'eva' (*Archivio italo-russo*, pp. 341–85) and, for those who read Italian, D. Ruffolo publishes Ivanov's correspondence with his translator Rinaldo Küfferle. The *Archivio* is a beautiful volume, clearly printed and with indices of names in Cyrillic and Latin script.

All these compendiums of articles, publications and interviews add considerably to our knowledge of Ivanov's life, thought and poetry. If there is some lingering difference between the volumes published in Russia and those from Western Europe (and one must remember that many Ivanov specialists contribute across the board), I would say that it is to be found in the freshness of the subject for the Russian scholars, the urgency with which they ask themselves and us: what is the significance of Viacheslav Ivanov now? What can they learn from him

and what have they missed? How does he fit into the history of Europe and Russia and what is the function of his work for us all in the present? On the whole, American and West European authors tend to be more detached. They also, with a few exceptions, make less use of archival material.

A notable exception is Michael Wachtel, who over this period has produced two ground-breaking monographs: a study of 'Goethe, Novalis and the Poetics of Vyacheslav Ivanov' under the perhaps misleading title of *Russian Symbolism and Literary Tradition*, and a book of publications from archival material, *Dichtung und Briefwechsel aus dem deutschsprachigen Nachlass*, in which all materials are printed in the original language (usually German) with Wachtel's own German translations of passages and phrases in Russian or other languages. The research extends from the Ivanov Archive in Rome to Marbach, Paris, Moscow, Harvard, Jerusalem, Munich and Geneva. A list of sources is given (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, pp. 22–25) and Wachtel, in his Preface, makes the case for the importance of the publication of archival minutiae as a necessary step in the restoration of a fragmented cultural tradition and for the importance of the poet's non-Russian writing not only for 'the understanding of Ivanov's last period' (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 21) but for the light thrown on his work in Russian both by his self-translations and by the 'authorized' translations by others which often provide a kind of commentary to the Russian poetical texts in a new cultural idiom (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 19). Of the articles Ivanov wrote in German expressly for such élite opinion-formers as *Die Kreatur*, *Corona* and *Hochland*, Wachtel writes: 'Instead of the lament of a homesick *émigré* one hears the confident voice of a European Humanist whose wish it is to mediate between East and West' (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 17). The informatively introduced and meticulously prepared publications of Ivanov's correspondence with Martin Buber, Ernst Robert Curtius and Herbert Steiner allow us to trace Ivanov's intellectual and business relationship with his German-speaking colleagues and publishers, and the correspondence with Steiner (the most copious and the only one not published in full) is also an invaluable biographical source; that with Bernt von Heiseler gives us more insights into the poet's thought on translation; the brief exchange with Hans Vaihinger touches on such central themes as Dionysos, myth and tragedy, and, in the letters to Erich Müller-Gangloff, written in the last year of his life, Ivanov formulates his differences with Rudolf Steiner, more particularly on the concepts of 'Lucifer' and 'Ahriman': for Ivanov two hypostases of evil, for Steiner separate cosmic powers. Müller-Gangloff, who had initiated the correspondence on coming across the Lucifer/Ahriman dichotomy in Ivanov's German book on Dostoevskii, which he acknowledges influenced his own understanding

of Hitler as an emissary of evil in the book *Vorläufer des Antichrist* (Forerunners of Antichrist), first approached the poet to ask whether he were indebted to 'the for me unreadable writings' of Rudolf Steiner, and thanked him for 'translating' Steiner's confusing thought with such clarity in his answer (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, pp. 264–65).

The translations proper in the second, much shorter, section (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, pp. 269–310) amply justify the claim made for them in the Preface. We have already spoken of the version of 'Chelovek' in the discussion of Dubrovkin's publication in *Un Maître de sagesse*, pp. 301–30. 'Swätomir's Heiligenleben' is equally remarkable, from the title on, for the way in which it clarifies the author's hidden agenda — the Russian 'Povest'' does not necessarily suggest hagiography, yet in the Russian Ivanov prefers it to 'Zhitie', leaving the reader to recognize or discover the sacramental significance of his epic tale — or to disregard it. In the translation of the definitive lyric poem from 'The Way to Emmaus', on the other hand, the Russian poet's delight in the alliterative rhythms of German medieval verse leads him rather to accentuate the Pagan/Christian ambiguity of what, in Russian, is a transparently Christian text. The last four lines read:

> Und jemand, ein Fremder, wunderlicher Wanderer,
> Gesellt sich zu uns auf dem Weg und spricht uns
> Vom sich opferten, vom toten Gotte —
> Und das Herz atmet auf und brennt
> (*Dichtung und Briefwechsel*, p. 303).

Here the New Testament subtext gives way, though not, of course, altogether, to Wagnerian reminiscences of those other 'wunderliche Wänderer': Wotan, Siegfried and Parsifal. The form, the punctuation, everything about the poem is not just translated into German but has become Germanic, 'verdeutscht'.

The book concludes with an index of works by Ivanov and an index of proper names which greatly facilitates its use for quick reference. *Russian Symbolism and Literary Tradition* complements *Dichtung und Briefwechsel* in that it shows Ivanov not as a contributor to but as a recipient of German culture. His relationship with Goethe was fundamental to his whole life and thought. Such, indeed, is Goethe's importance for late nineteenth- and twentieth-century European culture in general as virtually to justify the all-embracing 'Literary Tradition' of the title. Anyone who wishes to look more closely at Ivanov and Jung, Ivanov and Rudolf Steiner or Ivanov and Vladimir Solov'ev will do well to make a close study of 'Part One' of this book: 'Ivanov and Goethe' (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 21–110). 'The Years of Apprenticeship' (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 21–42), as we have said in the discussion of Wachtel's Russian-language study of Ivanov at the University of Berlin (*Un Maître*

de sagesse, pp. 353–76), takes a more lyrical, Goethe-orientated view of the same period, and the 'Bride of Corinth' chapter (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 43–61) is almost identical with the (Russian) conference paper on the same subject (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 186–91). To the tremendous theme of Ivanov and Goethe's Faust three chapters are devoted: 'Faust and Ivanov's Conception of the Symbol' (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 62–77); 'Faustian Allusions in *Pilot Stars*, *Transparence* and *Tender Mystery*' (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 78–96); and 'Goethe's Poetry in the Mythology of *Cor Ardens*' (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 97–110), which last should perhaps be read alongside Shishkin's study of the Dantean subtext (*Materialy i issledovaniia*, pp. 333–52). Goethe, of course, also loved Ivanov's beloved Italy and was a conduit of its culture, and, indeed, of all the classical Mediterranean cultures for eighteenth-century Germany in something of the same way as Ivanov was for twentieth-century Russia, saving always that Ivanov would never have written a 'classical *Walpurgisnacht*' but had found his own, Slavic road back to the Ancient World via Jerusalem, Rome and Byzantium. In speaking of Goethe and Ivanov, then, we are speaking of affinity rather than 'influence'. Ivanov 'interiorizes' the message of the final scene of Faust to suggest that Salvation is inherent in rather than above and without dark human reality. He understood Goethe's 'Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichnis' (translating the word 'Gleichnis' as 'simvol' rather than 'podobie') — as expressive of an organic relationship between *realia* and *realiora*. Wachtel calls the mistranslation 'deliberate' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 67) and writes: 'Ivanov repeatedly expresses this conviction in his poetry, where emissaries of the 'realiora' (for example, the female figure in "beauty") invariably belong to the terrestial world *as well as* to the world beyond [. . .] true art, according to Ivanov, is a process of discovery, not invention' (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 64–65). The study shows how Ivanov, growing, as it were, from the same Platonic and neo-Platonic subsoil as Goethe, gently but inexorably, by equating Goethe's aesthetics with his own, draws the German sage into his own understanding of myth and symbol as expressions of one imponderable religious truth: 'In this way' claims Wachtel, 'Goethe's connection to "Symbolism" appears much more definite than is actually the case' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 67). How this is done is further demonstrated by a brilliant analysis of the correspondences and differences between the opening scene of *Faust* Part Two, when Faust, unable to endure the rising sun, lowers his eyes and perceives its 'Abglanz' ('otblesk', reflection) in the rainbow, and Ivanov's lyric poem 'Utrenniaia zvezda (Morning Star, *Russian Symbolism*, pp. 68–77). Wachtel concludes: '"Morning Star" is no mere paraphrase of Goethe. The passage in *Faust* is based on a moment of insight inspired by the physical presence of the symbol (the rainbow). Ivanov's poem follows the symbol (in this

case, the morning star) from its ascent to its disappearance and beyond. In the final stanza, the poet urges the now invisible star to continue to perform its intermediary function between man and the transcendent. The implication is obvious and important — the symbol can function independently of physical presence. Even when imperceptible to the human eye, it acts as a bond linking mankind to the eternal' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 77). In other words, one might add, Ivanov's poetry fulfils an encoded liturgical function whereas Goethe's, even when he uses religious imagery, is essentially secular.

Yet Ivanov, Wachtel considers, 'actively invites the reader to understand his verse as an extension of Goethe's' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 78). Moving easily between prose and verse, Wachtel shows how Ivanov 'uses intertextuality to affirm his ties to tradition rather than to rupture them' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 84). In *Pilot Stars* this process is clearly sign-posted by explicit reference and epigraphs. In *Transparence* and *Tender Mystery* it is the correspondences in subject and metre which point to Faustian analogies. In an analysis of 'Son' (The Dream, *Russian Symbolism*, pp. 92–96), Wachtel shows how Ivanov, like Jung but also from his own experience, extrapolates the concepts of archetypes, animus and anima, from the story of Faust and Margarete. In the *Cor Ardens* chapter Wachtel takes the image of the moth and the flame from Goethe's 'Selige Sehnsucht' (Blessed Yearning) as central to Ivanov's collection (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 97) but not, of course, as the sole subtext, for 'Ivanov incorporates Goethe's image into a texture already saturated with allusions' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 108).

The Novalis section (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 111–227) shows how central was Ivanov's reception of that poet to Russian twentieth-century perception of him as one of their own, a living link between Symbolism and Romanticism. Again, the German poet is adapted by a whole process of subtle references, exegesis and, above all, translation, to Ivanov's own poetic philosophy, though his absorption in Novalis's poetry was not, like his absorption with Goethe, a life-long fascination. Wachtel is surely right to see the original stimulus as essentially biographical — the cult of a dead love — and demonstrates his thesis that the discovery of his affinity with Novalis after Lidiia's death in 1907 and at the time he was most deeply interested in 'zhiznetvorchestvo' was a gift to the stricken Ivanov who, in a series of inspired 'translations' (not all of which have come down to us), re-created the German poet after his own image.

My only criticism of this perceptive and scholarly book is perhaps more a criticism of editorial policy than of the author. This is a highly specialized study which is unlikely to be read by those not linguistically qualified to follow the close comparisons between Russian and German texts, and the obligatory English translations of both (especially of the

poetry) obscure rather than clarify. One feels Wachtel sometimes simply got impatient, as is perfectly clear from footnote 33, where he explicitly connects 'Blagovestnaia' to 'Blagoveshchenie' and 'Blagovest'', and must therefore know the word stands for 'harbinger of blessedness' not 'blessed one' (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 70–71); equally 'dol'nyi mir' should read in the translation, as it does elsewhere in the text of the exegesis, as 'the vale of this world' or 'world below' rather than 'earthly world' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 75); 'murder' is a curious translation for 'kazn'' ('execution' or 'retributive punishment', *Russian Symbolism*, p. 92); 'foreign' for 'chudnyi' ('uncanny, wondrous', *Russian Symbolism*, p. 93) can only have resulted from a misreading of the Russian; 'butterfly' for 'motylek' ('moth', *Russian Symbolism*, p. 101) makes nonsense of the image; 'man' and 'person' for 'Menschen' and 'Chelovek' ('human being', *Russian Symbolism*, p. 139) are stylistically awkward. One could multiply such oversights which are vexatious rather than misleading. There is only one point of linguistic interpretation which is perhaps worth raising on principle: I do not think, as Wachtel does, that Ivanov's use of the word 'Vozhd'' 'strongly implies Christ since there is no other antecedent' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 155). On the contrary, Ivanov uses this word in conjunction with 'provozhatyi' in the sense of 'guide', as Virgil to Dante in the *Divine Comedy*, and, in his parlance, it is a perfectly acceptable substitute for Novalis's [guardian] 'angel'.

These are tiny quibbles. Wachtel's two books have presented us with a great wealth of new material and a meticulously constructed demonstration of the subtle way in which Ivanov disinterred, in his own original work in prose and verse, 'the relevance of the past for the present' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 219) and of how easily and authoritatively, in his translations and critical works, he overstepped the borders of language, and interpreted one culture in terms of the idiom and beliefs of another. The conclusion (*Russian Symbolism*, pp. 210–27) in which the author in fact summarizes the findings of both books and of much other recent research, offers an important formulation of the Russian poet's role: 'In the intellectual history of the twentieth century, Ivanov, Curtius and Bakhtin belong to a small number of scholars who were capable of discerning order amidst cultural chaos. Isolated in their specific historical circumstances, they were nonetheless united by a conception of memory as a creative and liberating force that extended far beyond the confines of their own era' (*Russian Symbolism*, p. 226).

Reviewed here are only some of the major publications on Ivanov over the past four years. We still lack a general book or biography. The process of assembling Ivanov's entire *œuvre* is only beginning. Thanks to the energy and enthusiasm of scholars all over the world, this great Russian and great cosmopolitan writer is gradually taking shape from

the fragments of a mosaic constantly begun over again and shattered over again during his lifetime. The in-dwelling form, the creative will, the *forma formans* is now beginning to emerge with such lucidity that it can only be a question of time before it becomes *forma formata* in an authoritative academic Complete Works.