

ABSTRACT

This study examines the various phases of the maturation of Russian Symbolist poetry by using as a central figure Phoebe Apollo or Musagetes. Apollo, the god of music, art and literature, was the central figure of the Symbolist movement. The Symbolist movement was approximately three decades long, from the late 1890s to the early 1920s. It was a movement that widened and deepened the Symbolist movement. At this time there evolved three distinct waves of Symbolism which displayed an unprecedented awareness of aesthetic choices and attitudes. During the first two "generations" of Symbolists, the metaphysics and the techniques of various kinds of Symbolism created the most influential poetic school. In 1909, as the third wave of Symbolists emerged, the journal Apollon was founded. Instead of searching, as did other Symbolist journals, for the "truest" type of Symbolist creativity, the group in Apollon perceived and gradually articulated a new direction; it began to move Russian Modernism towards the pole of artistic and intellectual objectivity. But more than the other Symbolist directions, Apollon, unlike many other Symbolist groups, also sought to maintain bonds with the distant and recent cultural tradition. Occupying a "central" position on the Russian Modernist scene, Apollon had to determine whether to pursue an overarching metaphysical goal that would unite the disparate cultural activities or whether to concentrate on concrete goals of reaching the highest possible critical and creative standards. By the time Russian Modernism was swept away by external reasons, Apollon was fully advanced in the latter direction.

PHOEBUS APOLLO OR MUSAGETES:
THE POSITION OF APOLLON IN
RUSSIAN MODERNISM

by

Denis Mickiewicz

1967

A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Yale University in Candidacy for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

ABSTRACT

This study examines the various phases of the maturation of Russian Modernist poetry by using as a central theme the emergence and aesthetics of Apollon, the most prestigious journal on art and literature to appear in Russia. Within approximately three decades, the sensibilities of Russian Modernists widened and deepened so swiftly, that there evolved three distinct waves or "generations" which displayed an unprecedented awareness of aesthetic choices and attitudes. During the first two "generations" of Modernists, the metaphysics and the techniques of various kinds of Symbolism created the most influential poetic school. In 1909, as the third wave of Modernists emerged, the journal Apollon was founded. Instead of searching, as did other Modernist journals, for the "truest" type of Symbolist creativity, the group in Apollon perceived and gradually articulated a new direction; it began to move Russian Modernism towards the pole of artistic and intellectual objectivity. But more than the searching for new directions, Apollon, unlike many contemporary groups, also sought to maintain bonds with the distant and recent cultural tradition. Occupying a "central" position on the Russian Modernist scene, Apollon had to determine whether to pursue an overarching metaphysical goal that would unite the disparate cultural activities or whether to concentrate on concrete goals of reaching the highest possible critical and creative standards. By the time Russian Modernism was swept away by external reasons, Apollon was fully advanced in the latter direction.

PREFACE

The purpose of this study is to elucidate the aesthetic principles of Russian Modernism as they were perceived by, and developed in the journal Apollon (St. Petersburg, 1909-1917), especially with reference to poetry. Concerned with art and literature, Apollon began publication at the climax of the artistic and intellectual ferment which had been growing in Russia since the eighteen-nineties and which had considerably raised the level of Russian cultural life. The diverse forces within this ferment which, for want of a better generic term, will be referred to as "Modernism" involved, by creating a multitude of new artistic concepts and standards, a growing necessity to order and to evaluate the mounting achievements of the movement. In response to this need Apollon adopted the historical perspective as an orienting principle together with a leaning towards classical rigidity. On the other hand, being primarily concerned with the progress of Modernism, the young editors promoted works, or authors, or groups of authors whose influence seemed to promise the greatest vitality, as well as stability, for the future of the movement. Thus, the role of the new journal was rather to discriminate among, and appraise current trends, than to

introduce revolutionary ones, a role for which some of the earlier avant-garde journals had become famous.

As an arbitrating journal, Apollon sought to discern the patterns set by the succession of artistic and intellectual influences. The expounding of these patterns, i.e. the employment of historical, as well as theoretical, judgments allowed Apollon to anticipate and, to some extent, to direct future cultural developments. A journal which reflects these cultural patterns becomes, itself, a definable unit of cultural life; as a center, it reliably indicates the alliances of authors at any given time, just as the competition among journals pinpoints the most acute intellectual problems of the moment. The examination of patterns by which the influences of Apollon's milieu interacted and succeeded each other involves, therefore, the study of other modernist journals, not only for comparison, but also for increasingly refined clarification.

Apollon has not yet been studied as a cultural force, although in this most elegant of all Russian journals the final formulations of some of the leading tendencies in art and poetry were announced, the more mature work of most of the pioneers of the new trends were published, and many important new poets and critics made their debuts. In the available sources of literary history Apollon either appears as a bibliographical reference, or is vaguely mentioned as "another Modernist journal," an "organ of the

Acmeists," an "anti-Symbolist," or "bourgeois-decadent" journal. The lack of more detailed treatment is surprising in view of the fact that the standards of Apollon could never have been seriously attacked, nor could the vitality of the journal be doubted; as will be seen, of all the aesthetic journals in Russia it had the longest life span, and unlike its Modernist antecedents it closed down for external rather than internal reasons.

An analysis of the aesthetics of Apollon also makes it possible to understand another late Modernist current which, despite its fame, persistently eluded theoretical explanation. In 1912, a group of young poets, the best of whom rank among the most accomplished Russian Modernists, announced the emergence of Acmeism, a new poetic school. For a number of years these poets led vigorous battles against other schools but neither the Acmeists themselves, nor their critics, succeeded in defining the principles of cohesion of this association. In the eyes of later students, the rather obvious technical and thematic dissimilarities among the Acmeists seemed to reduce their "ideological" efforts to the value of a merely negative position: a call to dissent from Symbolism, an older and broader school. But Symbolism had been fragmented by an even greater multiformity of attitudes. This fact not only indicates that it would have been illogical to reject the Symbolist school as a whole, but it also accounts for an overlapping

of attitudes between certain members of the rival schools. Such "cross-departmental" kinship becomes apparent from the comparison of these poets' works, as well as, from the observation of their personal ties and professional indebtedness. Yet there were deeper reasons why the Acmeists insisted on being a new school. They epitomized the tendency toward objectivity which was initiated and articulated earlier in Apollon.

The Modernists' coping with traditional problems, such as the purpose of art, the self image of the artist, the creative art, etc. created a number of dichotomies, which were confronted by three distinct waves of Modernist "generations." Each "generation" fulfilled its own mission in relation to the movement; Modernism was first discovered, then deepened, and then objectified, by the transposing of the major intellectual dichotomies into different forms of cleavages which occurred roughly in the following chronological order: at first arose the polarity between the Aesthetes and the Utilitarians; then the Aesthetes versus the Transcendentalists and the Individualists versus the Populists; finally, the objectivist "Makers" versus the subjectivist "Seers," and the "Archaists" versus the "Innovators," created the artistic magnetic field. Acmeists, who belonged to the third "generation," leaned strongly towards Aestheticism and, slightly, towards Archaism; they insisted on being the "Makers" (or, as they would say, "namers"),

and rejected the esotericism of subjectivist Individualism, as well as the political implications of neo-Populism (neonarodničestvo). As such a scheme of abstractions indicates, the isolation of Acmeist sensibility and its system may be achieved only by analyzing the appropriate larger context revealed by Apollon, the closest contiguous unit of the school's cultural milieu. Apollon is also a most suitable source for the purpose of searching for a definition of Acmeism, since an important portion of Acmeist poetry first appeared, and was discussed, on the pages of the magazine.

To be sure, the relationship of Apollon and Acmeism never approached identification. Concerned with broader issues, and preceding and succeeding the school chronologically, the journal was the larger of the two units. The Acmeists, on the other hand, while by no means committed solely to Apollon, appeared among the major contributors to the standards of poetry in the journal. Their individual reputations as poets outlived, quite naturally, the reputations of collectives such as schools and journals; but their poetics and, especially their taste, owe their formation to the dictates of the Zeitgeist as perceived by Apollon.

The first chapter of this study opens with a number of defining characteristics of Russian Modernism; it then discusses the origins of the movement, and investigates the patterns set by Mir iskusstva ("World of Art"), the

first formal Modernist organization in Russia. The journal of this group was also host to a parallel trend which formed the basic antinomy to the Aestheticism of Mir iskusstva. The mystics, metaphysical or religious thinkers, who may be described generically as Transcendentalists, rebelled also, but on a different level against the "dormant" Russian society. The second group soon emancipated itself from Mir iskusstva, and started its own societies and journals; for the history of Russian Modernism the initiating role of this group was also far-reaching: it created various metaphysical avenues for the school of Russian Symbolists.

The second chapter studies the evolution of the theories of Russian Symbolists. The founding of the school, its basic characteristics and antinomies, as reflected by the major figures of the first and second "generation," and their journals, are examined in order to weigh the achievements and dangers of "specialized" Symbolism in relation to the maturing Modernist movement.

The third chapter deals with the initiation of Apollon; it occurred during the major "crisis of Russian Symbolism." The Entstehungsgeschichte, the membership, and the format of the journal are surveyed; the aesthetic principles as well as the quality of Apollon are illustrated by an analysis of a number of entries in the early issues.

These essays and poems sought to pinpoint the present status of Russian Modernism and the exact position of Apollon

in relation to it.

The fourth chapter is devoted to the study of the ties between Apollon and Symbolism. Apollon's relation to the Modernist press is discussed in the light of the struggle for the future of Modernism. Seeking new vitality, the Symbolists mobilized their forces towards even greater "specialization" (to use Valery's expression), whereas the third "generation" around Apollon, instead of searching for the roots of the Transcendental sources of cultural creativity, began to turn towards appreciating the significance of concrete facts and words as objects of reality.

The fifth chapter examines how the younger poets in Apollon gradually emancipated themselves from the tenets of Symbolism on the aesthetic as well as metaphysical levels. The elements of their new aesthetics are summarized, and the emergence of a new school, "Acmeism," and its relation to Apollon, are examined. The study concludes with an assessment of Apollon's general attitude towards the various schools of late Modernism, and toward serving the cause of culture by seeking out such works of art, the harmonious perfection of which transcends the excessive characteristics of any "ism" or trend.

The Emergence of Symbolism	xi
NOTES	xii
APPENDIX	xiii
BIBLIOGRAPHY	xiv

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
Chapter	
I. THE BEGINNINGS OF RUSSIAN MODERNISM	1
<u>Mir iskusstva</u>	12
II. RUSSIAN SYMBOLISM BEFORE APOLLON	27
The First "Generation" of Symbolists.....	30
Second "Generation" of Symbolists	43
The Symbolist Press before <u>Apollon</u>	62
III. THE LAUNCHING OF APOLLON	72
The Poetry in the First Issue of <u>Apollon</u> .	108
IV. APOLLON AND SYMBOLISM	132
Modernist Journals in 1909	138
Modernist Press after 1909	148
The Symbolist Movement during the	
Early Years of <u>Apollon</u>	151
The Debate on Symbolism in <u>Apollon</u>	158
V. APOLLON AND POST-SYMBOLISM	194
New Poets in <u>Apollon</u>	220
The Emergence of Acmeism	237
FOOTNOTES	272
APPENDIX	325
BIBLIOGRAPHY	346

CHAPTER I

THE BEGINNINGS OF RUSSIAN MODERNISM

It is my contention that the journal Apollon represented in substance, as well as in chronology, the cultural acme of Russian Modernism. In order to relate the specific events which determined the role of the journal, it is necessary to clarify certain basic characteristics of the movement. Russian Modernism may be properly regarded, in retrospect, as an entity, despite its multiform and rather hectic growth. It had, unlike that of most Western countries, a delimited history¹ and a specific inspiration which lay at the source of the movement and which consistently stimulated its aesthetic development: it was the excitement of a permanent, continually refining, discovery of the "world of art" which sustained that inspiration. The discovery of hitherto unnoticed expressive potentials of a work of art caused new differentiations among artistic sensibilities and perspectives. The Modernists diverged in their pursuit of maximal realization of the potentials of a work of art (and of themselves as artists) into two opposite but not mutually exclusive ideational trends. These trends, also, persisted throughout the development of the Modernist movement. One of them, henceforth referred to as

"Aestheticism,"² cultivated the intrinsic value of stylistic, i.e. structural, features of a work of art; the other, "Transcendentalism,"³ sought to project the symbolic potential of the work of art on the scale of universal significance. The polarity of these trends established the metaphysical boundaries of Russian Modernism. The chief practical characteristic of the movement was the tendency to view the elements in a work of art as closely as possible. In view of the allegorical transferability of artistic detail, such a tendency was particularly suitable not only for Aestheticist, but for Transcendentalist and psychological purposes, as well. This tendency strikingly changed the context in which the meaning of a work of art was now regarded: works of different artistic disciplines, emancipating from the traditional "public service" context, moved towards an abstract aesthetic context, establishing closer kinship among the arts. As the art forms became less and less representational, or traditionally "familiar," the artists found more and more kinship among the gestures and styles of the traditionally separate arts. Thus, in the words of Vjačeslav Ivanov, an important Modernist, "poetry freed itself from literature and joined the other arts, music, painting, sculpture and dance."⁴

The development of Russian Modernism had an unusual momentum; coupled with a number of new motivational drives,⁵ the newly discovered aesthetic perspectives

released the previously stifled creative and analytical energy. The proliferation of new subjects and modes of expression propelled the development of the movement to such an extent that there appeared, before one generation of the public, three distinct generations of authors. The conglomeration of factors which created the distinctions between the "generations" of Modernists mark, as it were, the stations of the progress of the movement. They will be discussed, with increasing detail, as the emergence, the deepening, and the objectivization of Modernism.

Diction

Diction

The acceleration of the cultural progress, combined with the results of the new aesthetic perspectives, enhanced the radical difference between the art and the sensibilities of Modernism and those of preceding and succeeding traditions. Being historically and communicationally⁶ in a compact environment, the members of all "generations" crystallized their principles closely upon each other's achievements. Russian Modernism may be conceived schematically as a self propelling world of the arts, whose interrelatedness increases with the emphasis on formal suggestiveness of each work of art. This "world" is longitudinally dissected by the Modernist trends (ranging between Aestheticism and Transcendentalism), which, in turn, were crossed by three planes representing, in ascending order, the levels of taste and standards of the three "generations." Apollon, the product of the third "generation" was,

therefore, the product and the expression of the development of the entire Russian Modernist movement.

Russian Modernism originated with the emergence of what Russian philosophers described as "spiritual renaissance" in Russia,⁷ and what was generally called the "new currents" in Russian culture. The art critics and poets who dealt with this phase of Russian culture pointed to the general anticipation of the unknown but glorious coming spiritual events, values, and art forms.⁸ The exalted sense of anticipation was heightened by the prevailing trends within the arts and the Weltanschauung of the intelligentsia during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The more active part of the intelligentsia endorsed or created what Osip Mandel'stam called the "pseudo-civic poetry and dull lyricism of the eighties."⁹ The socially more apathetic part of the intelligentsia lived, as Aleksandr Blok observed, in an atmosphere of "hollow, gypsy, Apuxtin years,"¹⁰ or, as Dmitriy Merežkovskij saw it, in a "black autumn" and a "dreadful twilight when the old gods have died and the new ones have not been born."¹¹

And yet in that stifling era there was a considerable amount of creative activity which ran counter to the prevailing attitudes and in some cases even foreshadowed the "new currents." Among the outstanding examples of such creativity in poetry are the works of Afanasij Fet (1820-1892) whose collection of poems, entitled Večernie ogni

(1883), served as a guiding light for many a Modernist by establishing standards of musicality in metaphysical lyricism. Vladimir Solov'ev (1853-1900) who had "defeated Černyševskij,"¹² developed, although less musically, a coherent system of mystical symbols and bequeathed to his disciples a poetic cult of universal absolutes.¹³ The poets Konstantin Slučevskij (1837-1904) and Konstantin Fofanov (1862-1911) wrote their verse in a less impressive form, but in content they approached the metaphysics of the later Symbolist poets. Also, the end of the nineteenth century saw the publication of the journal Severnyj vestnik (1885-1898), which under the editorship of Ljubov' Gurevič, "dared" to publish the early works of the first Modernist poets Bal'mont, Merežkovskij, Gippius, Minskij and Sologub, as well as translations of, and articles about, current Western literature. One of the most prominent contributors to this journal was the critic Akim Volynskij (Flekser, 1863-1926), whose energetic championing of the cause of idealism against the prevailing positivism and utilitarianism of the other journals attracted the budding Modernists.

However, these examples were too isolated, and not sufficiently striking to receive general attention and to consolidate a movement; they can with justice only retrospectively be described as the harbingers of the "new currents." These latter currents began to produce a serious impact on the arts and on society only when the Modernists'

radical protests against the prevailing trends became persistent, numerous, and claimed no less than "the transvaluation of all values" (pereocenka vsech cennostej).¹⁴ These re-evaluations began with the rediscovery of the spiritual potential of the individual and of his moral and psychological self-assertion.¹⁵ Revolutionary attitudes against the immediate past arose, creating a lasting sense of avant-gardism.¹⁶ The early Modernists also gave voice to an excited anticipation of cultural "dawns,"¹⁷ plus systematic efforts to assimilate Western cultural standards¹⁸ and reinforced curiosity and affection for past cultural epochs.¹⁹ At the turn of the century these tendencies were not yet differentiated and were branded by the shocked intelligentsia as "decadent." Sympathetic critics considered these tendencies as eager apprenticeship to modern Western thought and an attempt to relate the imported values to Russian contemporaneity. The involuntary solidarity of the Russian avant-garde, which found itself vigorously fighting for acceptance, created the impression of a monolithic movement of the "decadents."²⁰ But when within a few years many of these "decadents" were acclaimed as genuine Kulturtraeger²¹ it became apparent that their activities found many different directions, forms, and standards of expression. Combining artistic and intellectual creativity with passionate scholarship, the early Modernists revealed not only the natural differences in temperament, but a vast diversity of

thematic and stylistic sources capable of stimulating imagination and creative impulses.

The diversity of the sources from which the Modernists drew their inspiration, and the accompanying attitudes towards these sources, caused a proliferation of terms designed to characterize and to clarify the various directions. The persistent effort to instil the leading, all-inclusive, "correct" direction, not an uncommon motive for contention among kindred groups, aggravated the terminological confusion by the frequently highly subjective usage of all the "isms" which represented the "Silver Age," or, as some prefer to call it, the "Second Golden Age" of Russia. Originally, in their characterizations, scholars and witnesses used a number of terms synonymously. Such concepts as "new art," "modernism," "new currents," "neo-romanticism," "decadence," and "symbolism" appeared interchangeably. Thus, the official opening manifesto of Vesy, the most authoritative Symbolist journal, still interchanged three concepts: "decadence," "symbolism," "new art," in a non-discriminating manner.²² As the intensity of the debates increased, each writer, according to his taste, determined the proportions and shadings of the mixture of terms, establishing his own hierarchies among them. The literary historian S. A. Vengerov, whose commitment to socio-political issues (obščestvennost') frequently interfered with an unbiased understanding and appreciation of

Modernism, revised in 1910 the conclusions of his twenty-five-year-long close observation of that movement and was shocked by its unprecedented complexity and the almost "geological" proportions of its shiftings. He proposed to refer to the "new literature" as "synthetic Modernism" (sintetičeskij modernizm).²³ However, four years later even this term seemed inappropriate to enable the author to encompass the pluralistic phenomenon without violating precision. He probes, without reaching a conclusion, the validity of terms like "neo-Romanticism," "Decadence," "Modernism," and "Symbolism."²⁴ Because it is evident, even without special analysis that none of these terms taken separately can adequately describe even one artist of that period, one may agree with the critic, poet, and philologist Modest Gofman who in 1907 proposed to keep in mind several elements or currents when making an attempt to evaluate "the outstanding poets of the last decade."²⁵ Gofman discussed Romanticism, Symbolism, and Decadence.

Before delving further into specific subdivisions and cross-relations of currents, let us briefly summarize the usage of the above listed basic terms. The term "Decadence" did not appear frequently in the writings of critics who were sympathetic to Modernism. The term, originally accepted by some Modernists as a gesture of defiance of public opinion,²⁶ had, by the beginning of this century, become nearly forgotten as a description of Modernist atti-

tude. During the "civil war" of the Symbolists it was resurrected for polemical purposes to depict "misconceptions" or "malpractices" of Symbolism. After the appearance of Apollon the term was used occasionally "for old times' sake" in reference to the early days of Modernism. But, as a label to characterize the "new art," the Modernists rejected the term most energetically. In 1898 Sergej Djagilev answered the accusation of decadence:

We clearly and humbly bear the meaningless and insulting title of decadents. . . . There is no decline [upadok] and there can't be any, because we have nothing to fall [padat'] from, because in order to dare to announce a fall, a grandiose building would have to have been erected first. . . . Which temple of human genius are we defying? Show us; give us that temple, for we ourselves search for it longingly.²⁷

Elements of Romanticism (or neo-Romanticism) were manifested in the various themes of what Merežkovskij called, "artistic idealism" (xudožestvennyj idealizm)²⁸ of the impressionistically²⁹ and metaphysically (mostly Transcendentalist) oriented Modernists. The term--artistic idealism--is useful for distinguishing these Modernists from those who adhered to Classicism (or neo-Classicism) which was chiefly expressed in the works devoted to objective depiction of beauty and clear delineation of reality (mostly the orientation of the Aestheticians).³⁰ In Russia neo-Romantic notions and themes appeared frequently in the works of Modernists who consciously applied allusions and "correspondences" as a formal method to convey "inexpress-

ible" nuances or depths of their subjective experiences. These artists especially poets, developed a number of currents or fractions within a school, generally called Symbolism. The apparent applicability of Symbolist methods for impressionist, romanticist, and, finally, transcendentalist purposes marked the basic theoretical development of the Russian Symbolist school.

During the first two decades of Russian Modernism, Russian poetry was dominated by the Symbolist school. In the last decade the poets leaned towards objectivity and created a number of new schools. Apollon appeared at the critical point in the history of Russian Modernism when Symbolism was about to lose its domination over poetry, while other schools were about to emerge and judge which elements of Symbolism they should consciously retain, and which would endanger the further progress of Modernist culture. Problems of technique and taste presented at this point only a minor issue.³¹ The artistic crisis was brought about by the victory of the Transcendentalist fraction of Symbolism which firmly insisted that art strive to create or "recall" the non-existent³² rather than enhance the existent; i.e. art should change life radically³³ rather than merely beautify life.

The arrival of the Symbolists at such an extreme position and the reaction (articulated in Apollon) represent the course of the artistic and intellectual pendulum of

Russian Modernism, within the familiar frames of Transcendentalism and Aestheticism. This course described a curve rising towards the pole of subjectivism and stretching from it towards that of objectivism. This process involved not only the aesthetic, the moral, and the metaphysical realms, but also the everyday private and professional relations among the Modernists; for that reason the patterns of the progress of the movement, then quite vivid, and regarded as guideposts, or even taken for granted, now become elusive if viewed purely theoretically.³⁴ In order to clarify the specific influences and formative events it is necessary to resort to a historical investigation. Examining the formal activities of early Modernism as initiated by the "society" of Mir iskusstva, one must observe that already this nucleus of organized Modernism in Russia, established the characteristic two trends and the surrounding features discussed above, or, as the Modernist critic and a member of the circle, Dmitriy Filosofov remarked in 1909, "everything done lately in our Modernism is in one way or another related to the achievements of Mir iskusstva."³⁵ For the purposes of this study it is also important to regard the ideals and values of Mir iskusstva as those nearest to the circle of Apollon, and as the basis upon which the third "generation" of Modernists built its aesthetics.

Mir iskusstva

The concept Mir iskusstva ("World of Art") represented several levels of artistic activity,³⁶ all of which influenced to various degrees the development of Modernism. The slogan Mir iskusstva was conceived by a small club of enthusiastic men who discovered or rediscovered a universe of treasures, and who set forth to assimilate it and to transmit it to their society.

An account of the background of the group may be gained from the memoirs of Alexandre Benois,³⁷ who, among his many activities, was an artist, critic, librettist, co-editor of the journal Mir iskusstva, and later a contributor to Apollon. The origins of the Mir iskusstva circle date back to the late 1880's when its members, still in gymnasium, formed the nucleus of the society. In 1889 the group was joined by the painter Leon Bakst, who was later to be in charge of the illustrations, Sergej Djagilev, and Charles Birlé, a young official of the French consulate. Birlé introduced the group to French Modernism. Benois discusses other features of the relation of the early Modernists to the West:

Another important bond was our Europeanism or Westernism. By nature we all belonged to Europe rather than to Russia. The majority of us--Nouvel, Lanceray, Bakst, Nourok,³⁸ Birlé, and myself--had no Russian blood in us.

Benois presents the relation of the circle to Russia and her art as a highly conscious effort to enlighten

it by cautiously fusing Western and native values. While not being radical in any way, the group was nonetheless alien to a Parnassian "art for art's sake" aloofness.

In Russia much that was characteristically Russian annoyed us by its coarseness, triviality, and unattractive barbarism. It was this coarseness that we longed to fight and to uproot. But the problem had to be solved with the greatest care so as not to harm or break what was really precious. . . . It was indispensable to save all that was being threatened by the levelling spirit of time, or by false nationalism. . . . Our Western orientation had nothing to do with politics; . . .³⁹

This peculiar meeting of East and West was characteristic of St. Petersburg. Benois writes that "in St. Petersburg, especially, it was almost impossible not to become a 'Westerner,' . . . Our circle must therefore be regarded as a typical product of St. Petersburg."⁴⁰ The infatuation with the city itself became a cult with the circle of Mir iskusstva (as it was later, with Apollon). The group was consumed by

. . . a passionate interest and study of St. Petersburg and its surroundings, where the sad and lovely poetry of our northern nature was so wonderfully and romantically blended with the sumptuous splendor of the Tsar's residences and Court life.⁴¹

The infatuation with the glistening capital by those Russians who chose to avoid the chaotic elements of their country was aptly and also scornfully defined in Tjutčev's terms as "the love for the magic cover" (magičeskij pokrov) by Aleksandr Blok.⁴² As a source of artistic inspiration this "magic cover" deflected the aesthetes of Mir iskusstva

(much to the resentment of the metaphysically oriented Modernism) from the depths of Russian, or from mystical realities, to the glistening realities of French and Russian eighteenth century art. Since Russian art of that era was only in its beginning stages, the Modernist aesthetes turned to the era when Russia, i.e. St. Petersburg, flourished in its "Golden Age," otherwise known as the epoch of Puškin. Modest Gofman may speak for the circles of Mir iskusstva and Apollon when he articulates the attractiveness of the age of which Puškin was not the only, but the most perfect manifestation.

No epoch of Russian culture knew such a cult of beauty as did the epoch of Puškin; and this cult manifests itself in everything so absolutely, that it penetrates into life [and] everydayness (byt). . . . This cult of beauty no mramor sej ved' bog' appears in great art--poetry, music, and painting, as well as in small art, in the most graceful bric-a-brac, beautiful porcelain, in the extreme gracefulness of books [printing] and almanachs . . . [and] in everyday objects, . . . Everything touched by the hand of Puškin's epoch becomes a work of art, an aesthetic phenomenon.⁴³

The new wave of appreciation of Puškin, produced a great amount of close study of Puškin's texts,⁴⁴ Puškin as a person,⁴⁵ and his feeling for St. Petersburg.⁴⁶ Indeed, Puškin seemed to have symbolized the "magičeskij pokrov" of Russian Modernism. The closest affinity with Puškin, as ideal, was achieved by the artists of Mir iskusstva⁴⁷ and by the poets of Apollon.⁴⁸ Also the graphic and printing skills of that era inspired the artists of Mir iskusstva to study these crafts, and to create a new attitude in Russia

towards the book as a product of the publisher's art. According to a recent Soviet student, Mark Etkind, this attitude became one of the most important tenets of Mir iskusstva, which demanded the "propagation in society of artistic tastes and culture. Printing became one of the strongest means of exerting an aesthetic influence."⁴⁹

Sergej Makovskij, the editor of Apollon, points out another function of the revival of the "genuine spirit of graphics. Together with wood-cutting, medieval mysticism became reborn. The oldest became the newest."⁵⁰ The epoch of the early nineteenth century also affected the styles of Modernists by creating a drive to collect and preserve objects of that and of other periods. Mir iskusstva instilled a refined love for the past (starina), sometimes referred to as "Passeism."⁵¹

The above-mentioned fascination with French Rococo and the "Golden Age" and "passeism" in general introduced by Mir iskusstva, created a lasting influence on twentieth century Modernists; it corresponds with what Djagilev calls "The passion for being a Modernist [which] means the equal treatment of contemporaneity and history."⁵² This "treatment" may have been equal in the amount of attention planned for allotment to the different times; in practice, the artist usually took from history the styles of various epochs and from contemporaneity, emotional intensity. Strelkov writes that one common denominator in Mir iskusstva was the

practice of departing into the past while remaining in essence contemporary.⁵³ "There is little of the romantic in the eyes of Somov's 'Lady in Blue,' with their wan caste peculiar to the eyes of a contemporary person."⁵⁴ The contemporaneity which Alexandre Benois injects into the historical is somewhat different--a light, gentle melancholy of an inhabitant of a later century.⁵⁵ "Benois is the same kind of retrospectivist as Somov, only his [Benois'] retrospectivism goes even further. Sadness about a past celebration (otošedšee prazdnestvo) seeps through his landscapes."⁵⁶

Still another step in the identification with historical settings introduced by Mir iskusstva is what may be termed double stylization. The process begins with the detailed study of an historical epoch which is particularly akin to the psyche of the artist. He then transfers the assimilated stylistic products of this other epoch into his own composition as the most adequate means of expressing his own emotions. This point is more eloquently expressed by two lines from a poem by Mandel'stam written in 1914:

I snova skal'd čužuju pesnju složit
I kak svoju ee proizneset⁵⁷

It has been argued of Mir iskusstva that these forays into retrospection constituted the activity of dilettantes, understood as connoisseurs, and that in their quality of "Apollonian" taste lay the beginnings of a school. The editor of Apollon, Sergej Makovskij, called the stylists of

Mir iskusstva "retrospective dreamers . . . from that time on the school of Alexandre Benois was called that."⁵⁸ Many "retrospective dreamers" chose to look back into epochs, the remnants of which had scarcely survived. The exotic and virginal "morning of man" offered a vital arena for intuitive imagination and for an increasing interest in the archeological discoveries of that time.⁵⁹ The stylization of pre-historic realities developed an artistic current which shall be called "Primevalism." This current became influential not only in art⁶⁰ but also in music,⁶¹ in various forms of Modernist poetry⁶² and extended to the applied arts. Mir iskusstva demonstrated fine scholarship in its revival of interest in the applied arts, the chapman-book (lubočnyj) folklore, archeological findings, and objects of antique art, which it popularized by various exhibits and publications. The colorful aspects of "Primevalism" lent themselves to a fertile union with the decorative simplicity of the chapman-book folk-lore. From modest beginnings, like toy collections,⁶³ shops for applied arts,⁶⁴ and illustrations of folktales, this direction joined forces with Western Primitivism and became, too, a creative artistic current. The aesthetes of St. Petersburg enjoyed the refreshing and humorous eccentricities made available by this current.⁶⁵ Eventually they found themselves left behind in this direction by a new wave of Moscow Modernists who broke radically with the tradition-bound "conservative"

Modernists.⁶⁶

The historic interests of Mir iskusstva initiated a diverse set of directions in Russian Modernist arts. The same interest also stimulated the proliferation of journals devoted to the history of art. Some prominent examples of such journals were Benois' Xudožestvennye sokrovišča Rossii (1901-1907), Makovskij's Starye gody, (1907-1917), also his Russkie Ikony (1913-1914), and the Moscow journal Sofia, edited by P. P. Muratov (1914-1917). Besides its enlightening efforts, the "enterprise" Mir iskusstva also stood for a series of exhibitions of an increasingly large group of artists who, sponsored by Mir iskusstva, identified with its cause, especially with its aim to emancipate Russian art from the movement known as Peredvižniki. Much like the "civic" poets of the end of the nineteenth century, the "civic" painters of the same period dominated Russian art. Mir iskusstva launched a double attack against this "pseudo-nationalist" school and its drab outlook on life and art. On one hand, Djagilev organized spectacular exhibits of eighteenth and early nineteenth century Russian art and of contemporary Western paintings which seemed like fresh air after the shows of the Peredvižniki; on the other hand Mir iskusstva exhibited the paintings of its own members whose considerable craft and taste were mostly devoted to the values outlined in the preceding pages.⁶⁷

On another level of activity, one may recall that

the circle of Mir iskusstva achieved great international acclaim for its Gesamtkunstwerk activities such as creations and productions of ballets and opera for which they enjoyed the cooperation of leading European masters from all relevant disciplines of art. This feature lent the greatest prestige to Mir iskusstva and proved its vitality. Let us cite Benois' description of his circle in its drive to integrate the arts.⁶⁸

The ballet is one of the most consistent and complete expressions of the idea of the Gesamtkunstwerk, the idea for which our circle was ready to give its soul.⁶⁹

The syncretic activity of the productions of Mir iskusstva was the result of its circle's traditional tendency to create collectively. Many members of the circle believed that they worked as a school, and that they would, as a school, overcome the contemporary individualistic fragmentation and form an epoch-making style. During the thirty years of its existence Mir iskusstva never fulfilled that ambitious hope, but it did manage to excel in art criticism, to defend victoriously the best achievements of past and modern art, and to instill them in Russian life. For this purpose the group published collectively its own monthly journal, Mir iskusstva (1899-1903).

In terms of trends, values, tone, format, mode of operation, and effect on the cultural life of St. Petersburg, the journal Mir iskusstva set a much appreciated example for the future editors of Apollon. It was largely

the urbane Petersburgian classical sense of clarity, sharpness of outline, emotional restraint, and a certain festive optimism of the older journal that helped the poets of Apollon to "overcome Symbolism." The role of the journal Mir iskusstva was as important for the history of Russian Modernism as it was for the vision of Apollon. Zinaida Gippius, one of the leading early Modernists recalls the beginning of Mir iskusstva: "without Djagilev the founding of the journal would hardly be possible. . . . With his energy and . . . imperiousness. . . . Djagilev was a born dictator. . . ." ⁷⁰ In addition to providing the motive power for the review, Djagilev served as catalyst, transferring the atmosphere of his circle to the cultural elite of St. Petersburg, through his "Wednesdays." In fact, it was the custom in Russia for journals to serve as centers, or catalysts, for like-minded men. In his memoirs Stepun writes:

In all of the editorial offices, which represented a strange mixture of literary salons and university seminars, the most cultured students or simply the public gathered around leading thinkers and writers, in order to hear papers, fiction, poems and most of all in order to have talks and arguments. ⁷¹

Djagilev's "Wednesdays" took place in his elegant apartment, which also served as the editorial offices for Mir iskusstva. Gippius, a frequent visitor, described the meetings, which were quite similar to those of the later Apollon circle.

Only selected people were invited. It seems that they were the artistic and literary "cream" of that time--one way or another--under the sign of aestheticism, neo-aestheticism. Anything which had the slightest tinge of or resemblance to the sixties was purged, together with the ideas of social issues . . . One could not imagine, for example, any "peredvižnik" artist, or among men of letters--a writer or poet who had been "long accepted" for his civic inclination.⁷²

The editors of Mir iskusstva welcomed, however, the collaboration of "guests" even if their spheres of interest did not coincide with those of Mir iskusstva--provided they bring new ideas related to their own fields. Thus such poets as Minskij, Sologub, and Gippius, and such religious thinkers as Rozanov and Merežkovskij were invited; they, in turn, were grateful for the invitations, which involved the opportunity for publication. Gippius remarks that,

"Mir iskusstva" was the first journal in Russia which was an aesthetic journal--in the good sense. It began the needed struggle for the rebirth of the plastic arts in Russia. The rebirth of literature, even as verbal art, was not directly its mission. But with the broad views of the innovators, the creators of the journal, the new literature, too, could not remain aside. We enjoyed in it [the journal] a freedom to which we were not accustomed.⁷³

Thus, the first Russian Modernist journal came to represent the two trends of Modernism: that which sought primarily to enhance the beauty of life by means of art, and that which sought to reveal the meaning of life by means of art. This antinomy between Aestheticists and Transcendentalists found numerous manifestations. The aesthetics of Mir

iskusstva, for example, viewed a work of art as a full representation of the intentions of the artist and not as a mere symbol of his ideas which are intended to reach, beyond the work of art, a higher realm and to guide to it the audience. This principle has been expressed by the theater critic Prince Sergej Volkonskij in an article entitled "Art": "Art is not a cause which evokes spiritual activity on the part of the listener or viewer, but the result of spiritual and material labor of the artist."⁷⁴ Ideas, too, are not banished from art but are absorbed into the texture of the work of art. We may quote from Djagilev's first editorial article: "[In a work of art] any ideas are included automatically (sami soboj) at the very inception of true art, and the very power of creativity lies in the fact that it transmits to us involuntarily high ideas through the conception of human genius . . ."⁷⁵

Another significant manifestation of the antinomy between Aestheticists and Transcendentalists (at that state of Modernism they were usually called "the religious thinkers") in Mir iskusstva, was revealed by the manner with which they treated historical sources. While the former ordered their perceptions of historical "pictures" on the basis of the strict stylistic unity of what they see, the latter found unifying trends throughout various historical epochs in the symbolic revelation of ideas. Both trends sought to connect their contemporary thrusts with the

"eternal"; but the Aestheticist presented his invisible ego as an unobtrusive witness, and the Transcendentalist did not hesitate to invest with his own ideas the historical characters (večnye sputniki) about whom he wrote. Thus, as Poggioli expresses it, Merežkovskij in his "Metaphysical hindsight" method "turned his messianism towards the past, changing himself into a 'retrospective prophet.'"⁷⁶ This antinomy between the two trends also caused the divergence of views on the influence of Western Modernism on Russian poetry. The Aestheticists found the contemporary West full of devices and notions which they thought were relevant to new Russian art. The Transcendentalists, on the other hand, considered anything worth-while within Western Modernism to be just another manifestation of eternal values and felt, therefore, little indebtedness to Western, especially to French, art. Merežkovskij writes:

It is an unforgivable mistake to think that artistic idealism is some kind of a yesterday-ish invention of Parisian fashion. It is the return to the ancient, the eternal, to that which has never died.⁷⁷

Finally, to specify the position of Mir iskusstva in relation to the purpose of art, the editors shared neither the views of the pre-Modernist Utilitarians (art for life's sake), nor those of the Transcendentalists (art for the sake of higher ideas), and also not of the French Parnassians (art isolated from life). We may cite Djagilev, who rejects this very question: "Art and life are inseparable and [they] reflect each other."⁷⁸ Against the

accusation that Mir iskusstva "attempted to create an apotheosis of egotism"⁷⁹ Djagilev may be quoted once more from a passage in which he discusses the relationship between the "self" and "reality"; "We love more and in a wider scope (šire) than anybody ever did, everything, but we see everything through ourselves, and in this, only in this sense, do we love ourself."⁸⁰ As long as Mir iskusstva "was the only periodical in the vanguard of literature,"⁸¹ these differences among the editors and some of the collaborators were tolerated by both, although the Transcendentalists were offended occasionally by the lack of seriousness of the editors, especially in 1903, when frivolous paintings by Aubrey Beardsley were scattered through Merežkovskij's profound study, "Tolstoj i Dostoevskij."⁸² For various internal reasons, mostly because Djagilev lost interest in the journal, Mir iskusstva discontinued publication in 1903, but the group continued its other activities until well after the 1917 revolution, preserving its aesthetic views.

A few words need to be said about the further activities of the "religious thinkers" who were instrumental in establishing the mystical and the transcendentalist trends in Russian Modernism. Their attack on the aestheticism of Mir iskusstva led to the opening of a specific intellectual path. As early as 1901 Merežkovskij, Filosofov, Rozanov, and two other writers, Miroljubov and Ternavcev, formed the Religio-Philosophical Assemblies (Religiozno-

filosofskie sobraniija) (1901-1903).⁸³

The proceedings of the meetings were published in a specially founded magazine Novyj Put' which was directed by Merežkovsky, Gippius, and Pertsov in 1902-04. Stepun attributes three consequences to these meetings. First, they marked the return of the Russian intelligentsia to the tenets of the Church. Second, the meetings articulated the protest on the part of the returning intelligentsia against the "reactionary-synodal clericalism." Third, the meetings witnessed the emergence of a new Symbolist movement, which reacted against the tendentiousness of Naturalism in literature.⁸⁴ As Gippius sarcastically remarks, "the idea of the Petersburg Religio-Philosophical Assemblies was certainly not born in the circle Mir iskusstva."⁸⁵ The idea was born rather in the meetings at the Merežkovskijs. The "Sundays" there were as significant in their time as the later "Wednesdays" in Vjačeslav Ivanov's "tower," and attracted, in addition to the religious thinkers, poets such as Sologub, Blok, and Belyj, when he visited from Moscow. Brjusov was reluctant to move from Moscow to accept the secretaryship of Novyj Put' and became instead what he called an "honorary member of the staff." In addition to its efforts connected with the Religio-Philosophical Assemblies, Novyj Put' published Symbolist poetry and prose.⁸⁶ In 1904 Merežkovskij and his wife left Novyj Put'; it ceased to exist under that title shortly thereafter, but was soon back in publication under the title Voprosy žizni, edited by the philosopher

Nikolaj Losskij.⁸⁷ Although it, too, included Symbolist writing and employed Aleksej Remizov as secretary, it was primarily a philosophical journal, academic in tone. Only a year later it had ceased publication.⁸⁸

The journal Novyj Put' and the Assemblies created an impact that went beyond the short-lived Voprosy Žizni. After this latter journal had closed, the "Solov'ev Religio-Philosophical Society" was started in Moscow with its own journal Put' edited by Trubeckoj, Bulgakov, and Berdjajev. In 1912 an international neo-Kantian journal, Logos, began publication in Moscow under the editorship of Stepun.⁸⁹ From the point of view of Modernism the most important contribution of the religio-philosophical current was the revival of idealism and its influence on Russian Symbolism on one hand, and on the other, the willingness of the philosophical journals to publish the writings of Symbolists of all persuasions at a time when these were generally not accepted anywhere. This condition prevailed (after the closing of Mir iskusstva), until the founding of the Symbolist publishing house, Skorpion, with its periodical Vesy (1904-1909) and the rival publishing house, Grif, with its monthly Zolotoe Runo (1906-1909). The aesthetic and metaphysical dialectics among the Symbolists moved Modernism, especially its literature, away from the spirit of Mir iskusstva, but advanced greatly the art of writing and of observing and expressing the subjective experiences of Russian Modernists.

CHAPTER II

RUSSIAN SYMBOLISM BEFORE APOLLON

italics

If Russian Modernism stands as the general background of Apollon's aesthetics, Russian Symbolism, the dominant school in Modernist poetry--(at least until the appearance of Apollon)-- represents the specific milieu of literary thought out of which the journal emerged. Chronologically, Symbolism appeared in Russia with the "new currents," i.e., at the same time as Modernism, but the latter outlived Symbolism by approximately a decade. As a more compact unit than Modernism, Symbolism displayed the parallel ideational and "generational" divisions on a more narrow scale, and more intensely. For the purposes of this study, the controversies within Symbolism have a more immediate significance than the theoretically important divisions within general Modernism; the choice of which artists, musicians, theaters and writers to support, presented a relatively small problem for the journal. Apollon consistently upheld, and at times identified with, the basic aesthetic goals of Mir iskusstva,¹ promoted Modernist musical² and theatrical³ productions, as well as Modernist, though not necessarily Symbolist, prose fiction,⁴ of, mostly, St. Petersburg writers.⁵ But Modernist poetry was

refracted by Symbolism in too many directions; it developed too rapidly and under conditions too polemical. By 1909 it could no longer be accepted en gros. To analyze Apollon's painstaking job of discrimination, it is necessary to re-examine the history of the leading Symbolist factions, their progressive contributions, as well as the unattractive features, in order to reassess their influences upon the third "generation" Modernists.

When discussing the importance of the various Symbolist factions, one should keep in mind an additional characteristic of the school: its highly saturated atmosphere, described in Vladislav Xodasevič's vivid memoirs as the "Symbolist dimension" (simvoličeskoe izmerenie).⁶ This "dimension" was only partially embodied in the writings of the Symbolists,⁷ but it was an essential characteristic, because "the peculiar, Symbolist way of life" (svoeobraznyj stroj simvoličeskogo byta)⁸ generated "a truly collective creativity."⁹ The Symbolists, existing in a professionally dense community, discovered, while specializing in the various avenues of symbolization, that their own lives abounded in extra-verbal symbolic meanings which were not only transposable into their art, but could also be readily shared, like art and with art, on the existential level.¹⁰ The Symbolists, by merging the symbolic aspects of art and life, animated both realms, mobilized themselves maximally as artists, and multiplied the number of communicational

possibilities. They remained in the perpetual state of "discovering astonishing experiences" and, thus, maintained and intensified the creative momentum which the Modernist movement, in general, derived from the discovery of the "world of art." It is primarily because of the above outlined fusion of art and life that the epoch of Symbolism acquired, in the words of the critic Victor Žirmunskij: "the character of individualistic lyricism";¹¹ for the same reasons, many Symbolists swung the intellectual pendulum of Modernism towards the pole of subjectivity.

The possibility of cultivating real and/or fictitious subjective experiences on the one hand, and on the other, that of abstracting and transposing these experiences into universally relevant terms, created a new polarity or antinomy, stimulated and aggravated greatly the need among the Symbolists to defend their vital convictions, and to convince each other that alternative views were pernicious.¹² The famous "crisis of Symbolism" caused mainly by this antinomy, reached its climax after Apollon had been already active, and will be discussed in detail in connection with Apollon's "emancipation from Symbolism" in chapter four of this study; but, as the eminent Symbolist Vjačeslav Ivanov argued retrospectively, in his definition of the movement,¹³ the antinomy was created at the very inception of modern Symbolism. Ivanov points to Baudelaire's sonnet Les Correspondances. This "edifice" and "cornerstone" of the

school is

. . . sharply divided into two parts which . . . seem [doctrinally] very different, even incongruous. Precisely because of this discordance, there stand revealed the two opposite tendencies inherent in the movement being launched, pregnant with future contrasts which greatly weakened the impetus of its genius and divided its surging torrent into a confusion of rivulets.¹⁴

Ivanov observes that in the two quatrains of the sonnet

". . . symbols . . . constitute . . . a primordial imprint in the very substance of things and, as it were, an occult language . . . of 'universal analogy' . . ." ¹⁵ while in the tercets the author acts in an

. . . obviously subjective and contingent character . . . as an observer 'of his own psychic complexes and individual' synesthesias. . . . Here is prefigured simultaneously the fate of modern symbolism with its intrinsic split into two symbolisms: the one realistic (in the philosophic meaning of the term), the other subjectivistic.¹⁶

Ivanov, in accord with his own system of philosophy, applies the term "realistic" to the category described, in this study, as "objectivistic." (Ivanov also includes in the "subjectivistic" category such concepts as "decorative" and "associative" to characterize the methods of certain Symbolists.)

The First "Generation" of Symbolists

If the cleavage between objectivism and subjectivism, brought by Symbolism intensified the ferment within Modernism, it did not obliterate the basic divisions of the

movement, outlined in the preceding chapter. Within the Symbolist school, too, these divisions are strikingly influential. The first "generation" of Symbolists proper, became officially divided into Transcendentalists and Aestheticists. Both trends were greatly influential in advancing the movement: Merežkovskij, Gippius, Minskij, who belonged to the "religious thinkers" (Bogoiskateli) and, somewhat separately from them, Sologub stressed, like Vladimir Solov'ev, the "eternal" tangibility of symbols as tokens of universal meaning; they established, as recalled by Makovskij, the ". . . special tone of Symbolist art, which will endow it [Symbolist art] with romantic anxiousness, profundity and mysteriousness."¹⁷ The other trend, represented by Brjusov and Bal'mont, and somewhat differently, later by Annenskij, assimilated the current Western techniques of expression,¹⁸ introduced "daring" and highly subtle imagery and forms, "shadings instead of colors,"¹⁹ brightened the artistic palate of poetic vocabulary and phonology and, eventually, introduced in Russia the systematic study of poetics.²⁰

The notions of the Transcendentalists of the first "generation," who were never directly connected with Apollon, are significant for this study insofar as they were absorbed and realized by the second, more proximate to Apollon "generation" of Symbolists. Their transformed notions will be discussed below in connection with the latter

*why not
"God -
seekers"?*

group. But the Modernist taste and the appropriate techniques were almost fully elaborated by the early Aesthetic Symbolists, who in many respects shared the sensibilities of Mir iskusstva and Apollon. Especially Brjusov must be credited with the creation of a consciously Modernist style, and with organizing the Russian Symbolist school. It is he who in 1897 made the most specific prediction of the renaissance of Russian poetry and the designation of Symbolism.²¹ Brjusov's exact position in the history and theory of Russian Modernism is obscured by the contradictory evidence which can be derived from the two disciplines. As an innovator, an editor, indefatigable worker and a powerful personality, Brjusov was an undisputed leader of the first "generation" Symbolists; but as a poet, as Konstantin Močul'skij, one of his most thoughtful biographers observes:

Essentially, Brjusov was never a Symbolist . . . until 1904, for tactical reasons, he had to pretend to be a Symbolist, [but] in November [1904] he tears off the mask: the 'maître' of Symbolism 'under no circumstance considers himself a Symbolist.'²²

As a matter of fact, Brjusov's reputation as a maître de l'école of Russian Symbolism was created by him, before such a school ever existed,²³ which, too, was a strategic effort to publicize a budding enterprise. Brjusov's later official break with the second "generation" will be analyzed in chapter four, because it presents more than a biographical interest; at this point, it suffices to mention that while

Brjusov's innovations were assimilated by all Symbolists, the "teacher of poets"²⁴ absorbed very little in return. Consequently, by the time the younger poets had caught up with his craft, he had little more to add to their movement. Brjusov became dispensable for the second "generation" and, even, for the third,²⁵ although the latter also conflicted with the second, and was actually hailed by Brjusov.²⁶ But since Brjusov's innovations were shared by all Modernists and, at least, formally represent the movement, let us examine the most important of his earlier achievements.

In 1894-95, Brjusov gained a succés du scandale ^{e / de} when he published in Moscow three collections of translated and original poems entitled Russkie Simvolisty. These small volumes were not remarkable to later readers for their poetry, but they contained one of the earliest descriptions of Symbolist poetics in Russia. Russkie Simvolisty were intended to serve as "a little chrestomathy of the new poetry."²⁷ Brjusov's juvenilia established not only remarkably stable guidelines, but was welcomed by the Modernists also for the conspicuous psychological freedom brought by the free association of images and incomplete articulations (nedoskazannosti). Recalling the moods of the "spiritual renaissance," one may see how, according to Johannes Holthusen, "the enmity against any kind of canon endows the artist's personality with unlimited privileges in his creative subjectivity."²⁸ These privileges were

channeled by Brjusov along the lines of Impressionism. "The aim of Symbolism," he writes, "is to evoke a certain mood in the reader as if to hypnotize him, by means of a series of ordered images."²⁹ Brjusov continues that all poets involuntarily approached Symbolism ". . . when they wanted to express fine, barely expressible moods."³⁰ In the introduction to his second collection of Russkie Simvolisty, Brjusov narrows down the role of Symbolism even more strictly toward that of Impressionism: he segregates Symbolism from such "undoubtedly alien elements . . . as mysticism, . . . the effort to reform versification, the introduction of archaic words and metres, . . . the semi-spiritistic theories, . . . all these are accidental additions" ³¹

Young Brjusov saw "real" Symbolism embodied in three kinds of poetry:

- 1) Works . . . in which several essential signs are not indicated precisely. . . .
- 2) Works, . . . in which certain scenes are significant not . . . for the development of action, as for a certain impression created upon the reader . . .
- 3) Works, which are presented to you as an unconnected composition of images . . . ³²

The early Modernists joyously accepted Brjusov's chrestomathy in the spirit described by Holthusen as a flexible, undogmatic manifesto which required the adherence to no technical strictures and rejected the domination of ideas or philosophical positions. It was, however, the "insensitive" reaction of Vladimir Solov'ev which pinpointed the technical characteristics of the new school.

In his derisive essay, published the same season, in Vestnik Evropy,³³ Solov'ev convincingly demonstrated that the Russian part of Russkie Simvolisty poetry was rather unrelated to any Symbolism. But in his witty parodies Solov'ev revealed vividly a number of conscious technical innovations which, with variations, remained the trademark of Russian Modernism.³⁴ One is struck by Solov'ev's parody of the Modernists' use of the:

1) catachresis, in this case, the intrinsic contradiction between a noun and its epithet

Gorizonty vertikal'nye
V šokoladnyx nebesax

2) The use of a noun as a personifying epithet

No ne dražni gienu podozren'ja
Myšej toski

.....

Osly terpen'ja i slony razdum'ja
Bežali proč'

3) Emphasized alliterations

Mandragora imonentnaja
Zašursala v Kamysax
A šersavo - dekadentnye
Virši v vjanušcix usax

4) Exotic foreign words. (Example 3, line one)

5) Internal rhymes

Svoej sud'by rodila krokodila

6) Metric experiments: long rests between lines caused by the alternation of long (five feet) and short (two feet) verses. (Example 2)

7) Pyrrhic (isosyllabic) substitution. (Long

verse, example 2.)

8) In trochaic meter, such a substitution achieves still another rhythmic effect: the hypercatelectic odd verses (achieving a gesture of coyness) cause the withdrawal of ictus from the second foot, creating a triple pyrrhic effect; especially in the third line of the example below, the thesis in mecty accelerates the scansion greatly until the last foot. (v v v v v - v v)

Gorizonty vertikal'nye
 V šokoladnyx nebesax
 Kak mečty poluzerkal'nye
 V lavro - visnevyyx lesax

The above examples reveal jokingly the areas of poetry on which the Modernists began to concentrate;³⁵ Solov'ev exemplified the shift of attention from "the development of action" to that of "a certain impression," as proclaimed by Brjusov, and as achieved by the elaboration of technical detail. From a thematic point of view, Brjusov's early works also deserve some mention here. His first collection Chefs d'oeuvre (1895), pretentious and in spots tasteless, asserted, pour épater le bourgeois with its erotic, exotic (both somewhat dubious), and urban (Baudelairesque motives of contemporary metropolis) themes, a fresh youthful daring. The failure of this book prompted Brjusov to study poetics and philosophy seriously on one hand, and to publish even more bold assertions on the other. His second collection Me eum esse (1897) reveals that

Brjusov's university studies of the German romantic idealists Schelling, Tieck and Novalis, resulted in a drastic reduction of their philosophies to two positions: egotism and "artistism." Močulskij points out the important fact, however, that these examples of pioneering Aestheticism do not necessarily preclude Transcendentalist possibilities: "Me eum esse asserts the person of the artist-demiurge and his creative will on the soil of aesthetic Individualism, its abstract scheme established by Brjusov, was filled with concrete mysticism . . ." later by the second "generation" of Symbolists.³⁶ At first Brjusov's thematic "daring" was unobjectionable and even necessary for Modernism. His aestheticist preoccupation with the "how" of writing and his avowed eclecticism³⁷ enabled him to range far and wide in the themes of his work. Thus, he could write about a subject with which he had no intense connection or affinity. As Holthusen observes: "Brjusov's work makes it clear that he is concerned primarily with the structure (Schema) of the image, rather than with the substance of its content (stofflicher Gehalt)."³⁸

But around 1904 the striking absence of the first principles in Brjusov's philosophy caused the first major rift in the new Symbolist school. The Transcendentalists Merežkovskij and Gippius, motivated by reasons similar to those which caused them to break with Mir iskusstva, never forgave Brjusov for his exultant iconoclasm.³⁹ The depth

of this cleavage was articulated in the next "generation" by Andrej Belyj in 1909:

There are two lines of Russian Symbolism, its two truths. These truths are symbolically represented by two personalities: Merežkovskij and Brjusov. . . . Thus, Russian Symbolism is today split . . . in Russian literature by the truth of the people armed in sermon and the truth of the personality armed in form.⁴⁰

Eventually, by the time Belyj made this observation, i.e., by the time of the appearance of Apollon, both of these wings of Symbolism had, for opposite reasons, left the school. Merežkovskij, Gippius and Minskij, according to the younger Transcendentalist Belyj, from the point of view of form, or "external tokens of Symbolist poetry . . . while being close to Symbolism in their Weltanschauung, as poets are not at all Symbolists."⁴¹ Merežkovskij's and Minskij's increasing preoccupation with religious and civic issues led them further and further away from poetizing. According to the poet Vladimir Pjast (Pestovskij), by 1907 Merežkovskij "seldom even spoke about poems."⁴² By 1914, according to Brjusov, Merežkovskij had even "renounced his former idols, including Tjutčev. Ad majorem gloriam Dei, Merežkovskij now hastens to consume in his merciless auto-da-fe 'everything he had worshipped.'"⁴³ Brjusov, on the other hand, in his intellectual promiscuity "otdavšis' xolodnoj mečte (having succumbed to a cold dream), also weakened his craft. His 'careful attitude toward form became an empty game with technical difficulties,'"⁴⁴ as he

confessed towards the end of his life. But aside from a confession which may have been made for reasons other than poetic, and besides the already mentioned, serious doubts that he ever was, essentially, a Symbolist, Brjusov, like Merežkovskij, ceased to propagandize Symbolism as a school (surprisingly early). This fact is attested by Brjusov's correspondence in 1904,⁴⁵ 1907,⁴⁶ public statements in 1908,⁴⁷ his poems like "Mladšim" (1903), "Bliskim" (1905) and finally, his role in Vesy, which will be discussed below. Brjusov's merits as a prosodist⁴⁸ and translator⁴⁹ gained him a well deserved recognition, but after 1907, or even 1905, they did not contribute much to the progress of Russian Modernism.

Brjusov's closest first "generation" ally was Konstantin Bal'mont. During his brief period of poetic bloom (from about 1900 to 1905), Bal'mont was a striking innovator and an arrogant propagandist of the "new currents." In 1900 he wrote: "Realists are always simple observers, Symbolists [are] always thinkers."⁵⁰ This phrase should not be understood in the sense of, for example, Merežkovskij: Symbolists, to Bal'mont, are "detached from reality [and] see in it only their dreams. . . . In Symbolist poetry organically, not forcefully, two contents join: the latent abstraction and the apparent beauty, . . . However, regardless of the hidden meaning . . . its immediate, concrete content is always complete in itself;

the content has, in Symbolist poetry, an autonomous existence, rich in shadings . . ."⁵¹ This quotation illustrates rather clearly the poetic orientation of Bal'mont: "regardless of the hidden meaning" there is "richness in shadings." Bal'mont achieved this richness by consciously blatant euphonic use of assonances and alliterations. Relying heavily on Verlaine's slogan de la musique avant toute chose he, to quote Vjačeslav Ivanov, "equated such musicality with unconstrained immediacy and winged boundlessness of the lyric elan."⁵² Bal'mont still remains today one of the most "musical" poets of Russia. But the novelty of his technique soon yielded to surfeit. The content of Bal'mont's exultant bohemian vitality (budem kak solnce!) impressed the young poets of the time (as did his effort to introduce foreign literature through translations and lectures). But shortly after reaching his fame, he was drained of themes, and was forced to resort to naive and arrogant eccentricities and repetitions (perepevy).

The first "generation" of Russian Symbolists can boast two more major poets: Fedor Sologub and Innokentij Annenskij. Neither poet represents clearly any of the so far outlined categories of Modernism.⁵³ More Aestheticist than Merežkovskij and Gippius and more Transcendentalist than Brjusov and Bal'mont, as fine poets, Sologub and Annenskij their influence extended even beyond the limits of the second "generation." As both poets seem to have

produced no juvenilia their work showed also no senilia; a steady flow of accomplished verse without progress or regress. The highly individualistic content of both poets was profoundly pessimistic, but it was far from purely subjectivist. Sologub's brand of mythmaking or, as he would say, legend-creating (tvorimaja legenda) was purged of private esotericism; his most lyrical plots gained an epic quality of universal (vsenarodnoe) communication. Annenskij, on the other hand pursued no creating of such myths, and he was rather capricious; but his complex imagery, as opposed to early Brjusov or Bal'mont, allowed no "blurred spots," no "not-fully painted or articulated essentials." Annenskij's Impressionism had a pointillist's precision, and the "points" were of utmost concreteness. possibly because he "saw" rather than "heard" the reality which he depicted. Regardless how highly charged with emotion, and how elaborate symbolically, his verse are of objective clarity. (To prove this point it suffices to compare Annenskij's verse with those of Gippius, Bal'mont or Blok.)

The literary fates of Sologub and Annenskij differed greatly. Sologub began to publish in the pre-Modernist years of Severnye Zapiski and continued on until the 1920s. As a person he was feared for his schoolmasterish directness and "professional maliciousness,"⁵⁴ as a poet he was respected, but not even for a brief time as admired as were his colleagues, or he himself, as a writer of prose

fiction.⁵⁵ Sologub's fullest assertion of complete solipsism appeared in a poetic profession de foi entitled 'Ja' kniga soveršennogo samoutverždenija' in 1906.⁵⁶ His influence on Russian Modernist poetry was more thematic (satanism) than aesthetic since his preoccupation with beauty was abstractly ideational rather than concretely formal. Annenskij remained unknown as a poet until he was discovered by the founders of Apollon, a few months before his death at fifty-three in 1909.⁵⁷ The shy "poet's poet," translator of Euripides, author of lyrical tragedies exerted a decisive influence on the third "generation." Having matured amidst the wealth of Modernist achievements of the time, Axmatova reminisces, "When I was shown the proof of Kiparisovyj larets by I. Annenskij, I was stunned and read it forgetting everything in the world."⁵⁸ The aesthetics of this most sophisticated poet of his generation rather than his themes of "universal disharmony"⁵⁹ were greatly instrumental in supporting the eventual rebellion of the third "generation" of Modernist poets against Symbolism.

Summarizing the relation of the first "generation Symbolists to Modernism, and leaving aside their initiating role, one can conclude that their influence, not their reputation but their active contribution to the advancement of the movement, in no case lasted longer than a decade; that their efforts to create Russian Modernism were complementary rather than mutually exclusive. The latter

fact was made evident not only by the certain unity of the sum total of Modernist production, but also by the close, if sometimes uneasy collaboration of the extreme wings.⁶⁰ One may recall that Brjusov was a "honorary" secretary of Merežkovskij's Novyj Put', and Merežkovskij became a contributor to Brjusov's Vesy. The distinctions between the two major trends created a wide range of expressive possibilities for younger poets. Almost all poets of the first "generation" continued also, in the direction (begun by Mir iskusstva) of "historical imagination," "retrospective reveries," stylizations on scholarly and creative levels.⁶¹ Unlike the older Vladimir Solov'ev,⁶² or the younger Gumilev or Majakovskij,⁶³ the poets of the first "generation" remained without personal followers; exceptions may, perhaps, be seen in Annenskij (who enjoyed a rather short-lived cult but left behind no real "Annenskij-ite") and Bal'mont, who to some extent was imitated by Igor' Severjanin. With the exception of the Transcendentalist wing, all of these early Symbolists contributed to Apollon, and some of their best poems, which were submitted for the opening issue of the journal, will be examined in the following chapter.

Second Generation of Symbolists

The second generation took Symbolism far more seriously than did the first. Better craftsmen than the

early mystics, and deeper metaphysicians than Brjusov and Bal'mont, they virtually brought Symbolist poetry to its artistic and Transcendentalist limits, and it is against them that the poets of Apollon rebelled. The young Symbolists also had profound clashes among themselves. Their geographic location (although all of them were published in Moscow) reflected the division of their school until 1909. The "Argonauts," the Moscow branch of the "second generation," were headed by Belyj, while the Petersburg group was led by Vjačeslav Ivanov and Aleksandr Blok. Initially both groups were alien to the early Petersburg journals and, eventually, to Brjusov's increasing "conservatism." Belyj, in an article for Mir iskusstva, had departed markedly from the spirit of that journal, which, as seen above, tended towards Aestheticism and the preservation of form and clarity. Belyj, on the other hand, wrote of the progress of art as "a gradation from the inertness of spatial forms to the non-inert dynamism of the musical world. . . . The evolution of the world of art is from architecture to symphonic music."⁶⁴ In this article Belyj moves towards the "idea," from the concrete to the abstract. "Are we not concerned a little here with the transformation of life into a mystery?"⁶⁵ Blok, in his first letter to Belyj, applauded the Muscovite for expressing what neither the aesthetes of Mir iskusstva nor the "religious thinkers" (metaphysicians) of Novyj put' could see--that the new times were bringing with

them a singular spirit which was musical in nature.

From their first exchange of letters, Blok and Belyj were to be "faithfully united" in the quest for a similar goal, a goal variously referred to as the Golden Fleece, or Sophia, or the Prekrasnaja dama. For both Blok and Belyj the most vital question, that of defining or grasping the portentous coming epoch, was seen in the form of the search for the Golden Fleece. Both were interested in the "what" of poetry; unlike Brjusov, they were not interested primarily in poetics. They developed an esoteric language which was derived from the constant references to their quest. Belyj compares this process to the attempt by Bakunin to relate all experiences, even intimate ones of other people, to Hegelian terms, "so Blok and I tried to approach at once all problems of life . . . from the point of view of the new path . . ." ⁶⁶ This effort was of such urgency and significance, that their frequent personal dissension failed to separate them. However, they differed essentially in their approaches to the problem. While the early Blok believes that he sees the essence of the ideal as a concrete symbol ("ty lazuriju sil'na"), Belyj approaches the idea as a void, "nameless," which can be surrounded by symbols. Thus, to the latter, the symbol is a cover of the idea (Huelle der Idee), and Symbolism thus becomes "a method for the presentation of ideas in pictures." ⁶⁷

Belyj never developed a cult of an absolute.

"Since religion fell divided between ethics and aesthetics --personality [the individuum] escapes into the nameless."⁶⁸ Yet it is full, of course, of perceptions and experiences, all of which consciousness seeks to structure. "The metamorphosis of ideas like that of nature lends itself to exact observation and description."⁶⁹ In 1910 Belyj wrote, "One can express only that which one sees clearly around oneself; but you see clearly only that which you carry in yourself; and you carry in you that which you wish to carry."⁷⁰ Thirteen years later Belyj still writes, "The connection of all things lies in my ego. . . . The marriage between the ego and the world is knowledge."⁷¹ Thus, as Belyj said, "The object of knowledge becomes a method,"⁷² which leads him to define Symbolism as the "combination of literary technique and the musical soul . . . [which combination is] individualistic Symbolism."⁷³ In the period between 1907-1909 Belyj was the strongest upholder and the leader of the militant fraction of Individualistic Symbolism. But as opposed to some of his colleagues, like Blok, Belyj advanced simultaneously in two directions: as the philosopher Fedor Stepun saw it, "Essentially Belyj throughout his entire creative life concentrated on his ego and did nothing but describe the 'panoramas of consciousness.'"⁷⁴

On the other hand, Belyj was also increasingly preoccupied with the method and process by which consciousness may be expressed. He arrived at the conclusion that

the sorting of variables in a poet's consciousness proceeds according to the "rhythm of knowledge." Rhythm therefore, as an organizing force is constructive because it now becomes consciously the source of both, form and content. It is in this area that Belyj made his major contribution to Russian prosody. He was the first poet and theorist to overcome the "mechanistic dichotomy of form and content."⁷⁵ Belyj may be credited with the first "discovery" in Russia (in 1909), of patterns of rhythmical variations (substitutions) in which rhythm is distinguished from the traditional metrical norms.⁷⁶ He devoted a great amount of energy to activities of theorizing and formulating and persuading; his poetic output was surprisingly slight. Between 1900 and 1909 he had published only one volume of poetry. In that latter year two more volumes came out, but he wrote no verse again until ten years later. Oleg Maslenikov, in his biography of Belyj characterizes Belyj's early poetry as follows:

Although in their ethereal and mystical moods his verses undeniably reflect the influence of Fet, Tjutčev, and especially Vladimir Solov'ev, much in them is quite unlike anything that Russian readers had met before. His remarkable sense of rhythm enabled him to disregard set metrical patterns.⁷⁷

Much of Belyj's energy was devoted to his literary circle the Argonavty.⁷⁸ This group he founded in Moscow with the brother and nephew of Vladimir Solov'ev, Mixail and Sergej towards the beginning of this century. Later the

circle was joined by Ellis, E. Metner and Bobrov. Besides studying and writing Symbolist poetry and absorbing Nietzsche, Schopenhauer and neo-Kantian idealism and linking it with Individualism, the circle formulated the quest for the Golden Fleece and hence coined its title. The stand which the group took on problems of aesthetics underwent certain changes and re-evaluations. Originally they were bound closely to Blok who, in his person and in his poetry, symbolized for the Argonaut group the living pursuit of the Golden Fleece. However, the rational character which marked the course of the Argonauts to their goal, to the understanding and assimilation of the "musical tenor of the times," alienated Blok and therewith brought them nearer to Brjusov; they began to study method and form, his chief interest. The Argonauts, agreeing that individualism was the basis for creativity, set to work as a team on various problems of versification.

The circle of the Argonauts grew increasingly vigorous and influential, and in 1907 from mere participants, they secured the leadership of the journal Vesy; in like fashion they moved into the foreground of the "Society for Free Aesthetics." (This was also made largely possible by Brjusov's increasing aloofness in regard to the issues of Symbolism.) The Argonauts took a median stand between the Aestheticist and the Transcendentalist trends of the first generation. One of the group's theoreticians, Ellis

(L. L. Kobylnskij) defines in 1910 Symbolism as the best vehicle for combining both purposes:

Precisely because the searching for an adequate symbol . . . invariably constitutes the essence of all art, perhaps even, its only aim, we see in the 'contemporary Symbolism,' which is characterized by the refinement and complexity of its method, the most developed type of artistic creativity [and] for that very reason we see in it two exceptionally important virtues. First, [we see] its most intimate connection with the eternal and final task of art, . . . and secondly, its superior suitability for resolving this basic task. . . . If the essence of art is the 'searching for a symbol,' the method which is the most complete and the most conscious . . . [in] its penetration into the most coveted mystery of creativity is, so to speak, art par excellence,⁷⁹

One of the major trends of the second "generation" Symbolists became what the Moscovites called "aristocratic Individualism."no/3

When Vjačeslav Ivanov arrived on the literary scene, he articulated the opposing view. Not only did he believe that the main purpose of Symbolist poetry was to create myths, but he also saw in the materials of myth-making concrete objects, which by the intuition and will of the poet may be turned into symbols which will link the author with the higher reality of the mystical realm. Such mysticism, derived from the depths of reality, Ivanov called "mystical realism." Since both these terms represent an objective existence, Ivanov argued that his method could finally overcome the "decadent" solipsism of Individualism.⁸⁰ Ivanov's numerous and powerful arguments for Universalism (vsenarodnost') of poetry, as a unifying apocatastasis were

presented in scholastically precise terms which could also accommodate a far wider range of sensibilities than could the Individualists. Thus Ivanov could support the Mystics, the civically oriented, the "Mystical Anarchists," the Classicists, the Subjectivists, the Objectivists, and even those pure Aestheticists who appreciated his realistic basis for creative departure, what Ivanov called the realia. They attended Ivanov's "Poetic Academy" learning from the master the more obscure points of poetic craft. A number of Symbolists who were also enthusiastically patriotic saw in Ivanov's direction the possibility of uniting, elevating and liberating Russian society. The struggle between the Universalists and the Individualists was expressed by the rivalry between the journals Vesy and Zolotoe Runo, and will be analyzed in connection with the study of these journals' aesthetics. Apollon appeared during the climax of this struggle, known as the "Crisis of Symbolism," a crisis, from which the second-"generation" Symbolists never recovered, and because of which they found themselves forced to surrender the leading position to the third "generation" of Apollon.

Vjačeslav Ivanov's dazzling presence⁸¹ and his "collision of gifts," which Belyj lists as those of a "Mystic, lyricist, philologist, philosopher, professor, innovator, refined sceptic . . . [who] manages to combine science and myth,"⁸² were effective in attracting and

accommodating (as, have the "discoveries" of the first "generation"), all Modernists. But unlike the tempestuous gatherings of the Moscow Symbolists, the "Wednesdays," which he and his wife, the writer Lidia Zinovjeva-Annibal, introduced in December 1905 in their legendary "Tower"⁸³ *almost* created an aura of great prestige for the movement. These Wednesdays soon eclipsed the Sundays at the Merežkovskijs' as a national Mecca for, what Berdjaev called, the "cream of the Russian renaissance."⁸⁴ Makovskij went so far as to say that, "Almost our entire poetry, then still young, if it did not 'come out of' Ivanov's tower, went through it --."⁸⁵ Belyj, somewhat biased in his assessment of his one-time rival, does capture the impression of ambiguity that most of his contemporaries saw in Ivanov's impact on Symbolism:

The ambiguous . . . Ivanov . . . provided on the one side the basis for Symbolism; on the other-- [he] somehow broadened its sphere too far, and thus flooded Symbolism by broadening it into decadence on one hand, and alexandrianism--on the other; soon the Wednesdays of Ivanov in Petersburg became a breeding ground of syncretic currents, . . . [he] played a not unimportant role in the pulverizing of our tendencies.⁸⁶

Indeed, many strains entered and emanated from the creativity of Vjačeslav Ivanov. O. Deschartes in a biographical article points out some of them: "The intimate knowledge of Eastern Orthodox liturgy and of Church Slavonic . . . has left its mark on his style and on the structure of his verse . . ."⁸⁷ while studying abroad, an

interest in Nietzsche diverted Ivanov from his major field, Roman history, to Hellenic studies, and the study of Dionysian cults diverted him from Nietzsche to Dostoevskij and V. Solov'ev. The Orphic mysteries presented for Ivanov a stepping stone to Christianity."⁸⁸ After Rozanov and Merežkovskij most Russian thinkers saw Christianity in its tragic aspects, and Ivanov added from the Orphic mysteries the element of orgiastic will and theurgical pathos. Deschartes makes also the important point that whatever the differences among the major second "generation" Symbolists, Ivanov, Belyj and Blok, they shared the common spiritual parentage of Vladimir Solov'ev. The following lines from Nežnaja Tajna, dedicated to Blok with the intention to unify the school express aptly the main common elements.

. . . bratom budu ja t'eb'e
 Na veky večnye v rodimoj
 Narodnoj mysli i sud'be.
 Zat'em čto oba Solov'evym
 Tainstvenno my Kreščeny
 Zatem, čto obručen'jem novym
 S Edinoju obručeny.⁸⁹

The three "God-sons" of Solov'ev drew from his, to a certain extent equivocal, philosophy⁹⁰ differing emphases. In their lyricism Solov'ev's concept of mystical love⁹¹ served as a primary object and appeared in their themes, symbols and images. However, as theorists, the three differed greatly from each other. Especially divergent were Ivanov and Belyj, since Blok was not much given to theorizing. Ivanov was attracted particularly to that

element in Solov'ev's philosophy which interpreted Tjutčev⁹² while Belyj felt an affinity with Solov'ev's philosophy as it approached neo-Kantian idealism. Tjutčev's poetry impressed both Solov'ev and Ivanov by its constant division of reality into two (both real) realms, (den' i noč), both of which the "prophetic soul" witnesses with an almost mechanical objectivity. Solov'ev's viewpoint was that "there are lyrical poems in which beauty and life of nature [realia] are directly reflected in the poetic soul, like in a mirror, without leaving any place for its [the soul's] subjectivity. You see the image which has captured the poet, but the poet himself is not visible."⁹³ The poet's "will to witness" treats extraordinary or mystical experience as an integral part of reality. Solov'ev sees an example of such an extension of reality in the animation of nature by Tjutčev, in the "consonance of [his] inspiration with the life of nature, with his accomplished reconstruction of physical phenomena as conditions and actions of a living soul the advantage of Tjutčev . . . lies in the fact that he completely and consciously believed in what he felt; he accepted and understood the perceived beauty not as his fantasy, but as truth."⁹⁴ Anticipating the serious objections to Symbolism and Modernism raised by the recent critics Edmund Wilson and Georg Lukács, that if unconcerned with social issues Modernist art is doomed to exit from life entirely or cease to be

art,⁹⁵ Solov'ev, using the same example of Tjutčev, argues:

The deep and conscious conviction in a real and not only imaginary animateness of nature freed [Tjutčev] from the bifurcation of thought and feeling . . . from which most of the artists and poets suffer. . . . By accepting . . . the mechanistic view, these servants of beauty do not believe in their own cause. As artists they depict the life and soul of nature, but at the same time in their minds they are convinced that nature is lifeless and soulless and that their feeling and inspiration deceive them and that beauty is a subjective illusion. . . . Such poets either have to be insincere, or if they submit to poetic feeling, they have to refrain from all thought; otherwise they achieve an abstract and dead didacticism which does not at all need the "language of gods." Tjutčev was free from such a sad condition.⁹⁶

Ivanov, who formally declared Tjutčev to be the founder of conscious Symbolism in Russia,⁹⁷ aware of the twentieth-century aversion to naive faith, elaborated further on the Tjutčev-Solov'ev approach to creativity.⁹⁸

Ivanov drew a sharp distinction between the modern will to witness and the romantic wish to dream about the "night and day" realms.⁹⁹ It is the willing as opposed to the wishing; and the experience as opposed to a dream or nightmare that formed to Ivanov the object of witnessing and the conviction that the object of his vision is indeed a reality. However, because the experience is mystical in character, it is part of a higher reality. Thus, in the words of V. Zen'kovskij, "in the communication with the absolute . . . the place of aesthetics becomes sufficiently defined: artistic creativity is at the same time a mystical approach towards the absolute--which according to Solov'ev [and

Ivanov] determines the 'theurgical function of art and creativity."¹⁰⁰ The process of creativity is, for Ivanov, the transition from realibus ad realiora. The transition depends for its impetus on a prior descent into the chaotic depths; the dependence on organic chaos is partially derived from Nietzsche's Die Geburt der Tragödie.¹⁰¹ The organic connection of the two realities by a mystical act Ivanov assigns to the most suitable artistic school: Ivanov defines Symbolism as "mystical realism." The direct application of this view will be discussed in chapter four, in connection with the analysis of a poem, submitted by Ivanov for the opening issue of Apollon.

Vjačeslav Ivanov, combining his study of the earliest Dionysian rites with his notion of mystical reality, like Merežkovskij, sees in the dim historical past ideas and especially practices, the rediscovery, assimilation, and poetic transformation of which assume a vital, vsenarodnoe (all-national) importance, in view of the perilous pulverization of cultural principles instigated by humanism. Ivanov suggests the possibility of overcoming the crisis of culture in the efforts to create a vsenarodnyj cult. However, rather than offering the polis an invented artistic rite, which only separates the public from the stage, or a purely academic process, which only gathers isolated items for museums, Ivanov proposes to resurrect the primeval, orgiastic rites, organically inherent

Latin
↓
= a/?

"universal"
is perhaps
a better
equivalent
(as before)
Why not
remark on
the overtones
or pluri-
significa-
tion of
the term?

in man, but forgotten and buried under civilization. This task is now put to the Symbolist poet; the symbolistic act of resurrecting the ancient rites Ivanov calls mifotvorčestvo (myth-making). The method of mifotvorčestvo rests primarily on a kind of racial memory. He sees an affinity with this method in the works of the prehistorical retrospectivists of Mir iskusstva, especially Roerich and Bakst. In one of his major articles, Ivanov commented on Bakst's painting, Terror Antiquus and stated that "Apollo is the force of visual reflection in memory . . . All art of antiquity was dedicated to memory: behind Apollo, the leader of the muses, stood the silent inspiration--Mnemosyne."¹⁰² Unlike the stylists, on the one hand, or the impressionists, on the other, Ivanov's definition of the function of the symbol rests on mobility of the symbol, and immobility of the objective phenomena. "Like a ray of sun, the symbol cuts through all planes of existence and through all spheres of consciousness and signifies on each plane a different purpose."¹⁰³ The younger poet, Sergej Gorodeckij continues Ivanov's thought: "And like that of a ray of sun, the path of a symbol is straight and infinite 'a realibus ad realiora.'"¹⁰⁴

On the theoretical level, besides having a didactic impact upon his younger colleagues, Ivanov's artistic direction links two, thus far, unrelated trends of Modernism. It constructs an objectivistic foundation for a

Transcendentalist trend. In the light of this ambitious undertaking one can see why Ivanov so bitterly lamented the major Modernist cleavage between Aestheticism and Transcendentalism. Ivanov's ambiguous solution explains also how the second and the third "generation" Modernists were, both, repelled and attracted by his teachings. The subjectivistic Symbolists were drawn to Ivanov's Transcendentalism, whereas the Aestheticist oriented third "generation" was impressed by the realia aspects of Ivanov's objectivism and by what they thought was technically related to it, his virtuosity as a versifier.

The third major poet of the second "generation" Symbolists was Aleksandr Blok. He was, perhaps, the most talented, the most subjectivistic and the least rationalistic of all Russian Symbolists. Blok, himself, a symbol of Symbolism¹⁰⁵ produced neither an original system of prosody¹⁰⁶ nor a metaphysical dogma. But one may agree with Sir Maurice Bowra's opinion that, "More than any Russian poet, more than any European poet of his time, Blok gives the impression of being literally inspired."¹⁰⁷ To illustrate Blok's import as a representative of Modernism one may select two more retrospective characterizations. Georgij Adamovič writes:

Blok's poems, more than any other Russian poems must be read, not so much analyzing the texts as listening to the rhythm, and in any case, multiplying the sense by the sound . . . Blok's text is confused, its literal meaning in the majority of

cases, obscure. Yet [when] supported by the rhythm--in which case the intonation of the sentence sometimes lends it ten times as much force--the [same] text becomes dazzling in its brilliance.¹⁰⁸

In a recent study of Blok's rhythmic patterns Robert Kemball concludes that ". . . perhaps of all poets of all times-- [Blok is] the outstanding example of one who derives so tremendous a part of his total effect from his uncanny sense of rhythm."¹⁰⁹ Compensating for Blok's reluctance and/or inability to theorize, his lyrical talent and his artistic honesty placed Blok among the most influential figures of Russian Modernism.

All factions of the first and second "generation" Symbolists sought Blok's alliance. Belyj, whose early literary career was most closely linked with Blok's, defines the basic metaphysical difference between Blok and himself as that between a mystic and an antroposophist; the former searches for the unification of the mind and the heart in the "'mysticism' of feelings," while the latter seeks it in spiritual knowledge.¹¹⁰ It has been observed earlier how the philosophy of Vladimir Solov'ev provided the young Blok with the central symbol, which for the philosopher was Sofia and which Blok transformed into the "Beautiful Lady" (Prekrasnaja Dama) of his poetry. Blok bore this symbol as his ideal throughout his career, believing always in its reality but modulating it into increasingly negative images as he became aware that the realization of the

choose
between
"Sophia"
and the
capital of
Bulgaria
in English
form.

oncoming era would not be in accord with his early hopes. This unceasing and tragic "mystical" apprehension of the pulse of the era was achieved by listening to the "music" of the time.¹¹¹ In his preface to Vozmezdje Blok says: "[The sum of] all facts always creates a single musical impact."¹¹² No other poet of the Silver Age expressed the sense of impending disaster, crisis and doom as consistently as Blok.¹¹³ Blok's sense of crisis based on his private melancholy (he wrote in a letter to Belyj¹¹⁴ that the word calamity [gibel'] is his favorite word), which increased parallel with the increasing anguish of his "music,"¹¹⁵ was linked to a tremendous sense of social guilt, as part of a "repenting nobility" (Kajuščeessja dvorjanstvo). He was increasingly preoccupied with, and wrote many articles about, the relation of the intelligent to Russia and the Russian revolution. Blok was periodically repelled by the Symbolists' lack of true affinity with the future and by the mannered artificiality of the school, which he satirized in the play Balagančik, which the Symbolists, especially Belyj, took as a formal betrayal of their ideals.

Blok's semi-mystical concern with the fate of Russia was partially the result of the influence of Merežkovskij's ideas. Even as late as 1910 Blok was highly concerned with Merežkovskij's ethico-political judgments of his (Blok's) opinions.¹¹⁶ As an artist Blok was slightly influenced by Zinaida Gippius, in whose poetry he first saw

the possibilities of rhythmic latitude (dol'niki)¹¹⁷ which he himself developed to a far greater perfection. According to his own statements Blok was artistically most of all indebted to Brjusov. Already in 1904 he wrote that "Brjusov carries in him possibilities which Merežkovskij does not at all carry, . . ." ¹¹⁸ and in 1907 he still announces: "I considered, consider, and shall consider Brjusov to be my closest teacher after Vladimir Solov'ev." ¹¹⁹ Of the major second "generation" Symbolists, Blok was the only one who fully acknowledged the influence upon him of the first "generation" poets.

From the above observations it follows that Blok epitomized the virtues and the sins of hypersubjectivist Transcendentalism, he enhanced it by his consuming concern with universal, national and private calamity. Blok was, consequently, averse to any form of Aestheticism, to any kind of artistic optimism, he was alien to the hopes of various schools and directions, ¹²⁰ he eschewed meetings and associations especially by 1909-1910 when the third "generation" began to reappraise Symbolism. ¹²¹ Blok was perhaps less than any other Symbolist equipped to cope with the impending "crisis" within Symbolism. The critic Boris Ejxenbaum expresses aptly how Blok had to bear the "fateful problems" that arose before the subjectivist Transcendentalists:

Oppressed by that abstract culture life demanded attention for itself. Art demanded emancipation from the symbolism of meanings. Things revolted--they wanted to be dressed in flesh and to be touched. The crisis of Symbolism had begun--both as a principle of culture and as a principle of art. And Blok was destined to bear the entire tormenting process of that crisis. . . . Blok remained in the camp of the Symbolists but instead of the enraptured mystical illumination, which filled the first generation, in his soul now appeared 'the tragic awareness of the inability to merge and the indivisibility of everything--contradictions [which are] irreconcilable and [which] demanded reconciliation.' Instead of an inspired gliding toward abstract symbols and the effort to make life transparent so as to become a symbol--began the "juxtaposition of facts."¹²²

But the "crisis of Symbolism" was a result of a series of clashes among groups. After the examination of the basic artistic positions of the leading figures of Russian Symbolism the activities of groups can be observed better by surveying the activity of their press. This activity, as pointed out in the beginning of this chapter, only partially reflects the total of ideational and artistic transactions among the Symbolists who converged almost daily, in both capitals, in informal and formal sessions in study circles, private homes and numerous "societies."¹²³ (The overlapping membership among all these groups is a further indication of the density of the "Symbolist atmosphere.") We shall, in the following pages, survey only the major directions as revealed through the published polemics of the Symbolists.

The Symbolist Press before Apollon

After the closing of the Petersburg journals, Mir iskusstva, Novyj put' and Voprosy Žizni, the focus of journalistic activity of the Modernists shifted to Moscow.

There the literary ferment originated from small groups who, although active, had no formal outlet for their work. The first "generation" published individually until 1909 in the St. Petersburg journals; Bal'mont, Brjusov, and later Belyj submitted articles and poems. However, as noted above, the accepted journals displayed a reluctance to publish the "decadents," especially their critical work.¹²⁴ A few months after the founding of Mir iskusstva in 1899, the wealthy patron of the arts and linguist S. A. Poljakov opened the publishing house Skorpion, which published several Symbolist almanacs and separate works of Modernist authors. In 1903 the lawyer S. A. Sokolov (and minor poet under the pseudonym Sergej Krečetov) founded the publishing house, Grif, which challenged Skorpion by publishing three almanacs of Symbolist poetry, in its first year of existence. The flurry of publication in part prompted Brjusov to persuade Poljakov to open, in 1904 a monthly journal--Vesy, which in its first two years became the most important avant-garde organ of criticism and which served to introduce foreign, especially French, art and literature. As Georgette Donchin correctly observes, Vesy "stood out

clearly against the background of the traditional periodical press in Russia and its contemporary journalistic milieu."¹²⁵ The editors of Vesy felt that even Novyj put' which published some Symbolists' writings had a deliberately commonplace appearance "and was an unnecessary imitation of the traditional monthlies."¹²⁶ The overall evaluation *A general/* of Vesy will be offered in connection with the opinions voiced in Apollon upon the closing of Vesy; at this point let us observe the role of Symbolist journals in relation to the maturing Symbolist school.

In the winter of 1905 Vjačeslav Ivanov and Čulkov persuaded the rich Moscow merchant and art collector, Nikolaj Rjabušinskij to finance the publication of a journal, and Sergej Sokolov, a former member of the Argonaut circle and editor of Grif, suggested the title Zolotoe Runo. There seemed to be also a literary demand for such a journal: the Modernist literary almanacs, such as Severnye Cvety and Grif, did not appear with sufficient frequency; Vesy was consciously dedicated to critical rather than creative writing;¹²⁷ and there was a burst of Modernist literary creativity that sought an outlet.¹²⁸ *= openly by policy? etc.* Brjusov, the editor of Vesy, was invited to participate in the new journal, together with all of the prominent Modernists. He accepted, but for only a very short time, perhaps because of a conflict of interests with his own journal, which had then announced that it, too, would publish

creative writing. In January of 1906 the first issue of Zolotoe Runo appeared in Moscow. Its manifesto proclaimed its intimate concern with events of the day in Russia and its belief that art would outlast the turbulence of the times; it enunciated its commitment to the priority of art, but not to the independence of art. The earlier manifesto in Vesy had announced that journal's dedication to autonomous art and the introduction of Western thought into Russia. The newer journal published and edited by Nikolaj Rjabušinskij was mounted far more lavishly than Vesy. For the first two years Zolotoe Runo was published as a bilingual journal, in French and Russian; it was a marvel of printing; it had very expensive reproductions and was estimated to have lost about 70,000 rubles on every issue. The lavishness of the layout, the extravagance of the claims of the manifesto, and the prodigality of its expenditures aroused a caustic reaction in Vesy. Gippius writing in Vesy under the name of tovarišč German ironically asked why Zolotoe Runo felt it had to proclaim the importance of art, especially to the French, and in French.¹²⁹ In St. Petersburg the new journal was referred to as daubery, or "merchant modern."¹³⁰ But although somewhat immoderate in its tastes, the journal, dedicated primarily to fiction of mostly Petersburg writers, published also a number of highly interesting theoretical articles, especially those by V. Ivanov. Since 1907 Blok took charge of the literary criti-

cism section. Occasional Apollonian articles on art by Benois found no appreciation among the more tempestuous and "anarchical" Moscow painters and even among the editors, to whom Benois appeared too conservative.

The sixth Number of Zolotoe Runo of 1907 excited the literary world with the announcement of the coming of a "new realism."¹³¹ The theory was based on a book by Čulkov, "O mističeskom anarxisme," (published in 1906) which had a preface by Ivanov, "O neprijatii mira," and which put forth Čulkov's theory of "mystical anarchism." In 1906 several articles supporting the book appeared also in Fakely, a short-lived almanac edited by Čulkov. (Later Čulkov said of his book that it was hastily and inexpertly written.)¹³² It was an attempt to reconcile the various strains of Modernism, which Čulkov called decadence, so that there would be no rift between Individualism and vsenarodnost', for in the drive toward absolute freedom the true individualist aspires to voluntary union with all men. Čulkov later complained that his theory was misunderstood and treated as "anarchistic mysticism."¹³³ In any case, the theory and Zolotoe Runo were subjected to immediate criticism. Especially strong was the attack from Vesy: Brjusov wrote that the new theory was harmful to the Symbolist movement; ". . . Belyj published some of the most stinging and fiery polemics that Russian literature had known."¹³⁴ Ellis wrote that "Zolotoe Runo has quickly fallen into the hands

omit
italico

of people who had little to do with art." Čul'kov, in turn replied in both Zolotoe Runo and Fakely that Vesy had become commercial and conservative and that it had never had revolutionaries.¹³⁵ This dispute harmed the prestige of Zolotoe Runo more than it did Vesy.

In August 1907 Vesy, as well as most Moscow journals and papers published two letters to the editor in which the signatories announced their discontinuation of any association with Rjabušinskij's Zolotoe Runo. The first letter was signed by Merežkovskij, Gippius, Brjusov, and Belyj; the second, by Kuzmin, Baltrušaitis, and Likardopulo. Blok attempted to remain aloof and disclaimed to both sides any commitment to mystical anarchism, or, indeed, to any school. Belyj had applied strong pressure on Blok to induce him to break with Zolotoe Runo, Čul'kov and Ivanov, and a letter from Blok to Belyj defines in a strained and formal way the former's position.¹³⁶ To Čul'kov, also, Blok wrote to deny adherence to Mystical Anarchism.¹³⁷ Blok sent a letter of similar content to Vesy. Filosofov, a year later, wrote that he remembered distinctly that Blok and Ivanov had supported Čul'kov's theory. "They [Blok, Ivanov and Čul'kov] decided together with Mejerhold to produce a little 'mystical anarchist' scene, for which the famous Balagančik was written."¹³⁸ Filosofov stated that as long as Mystical Anarchism remained exotic, neither Vjačeslav Ivanov nor Blok turned his back on it, but when criti-

cism became serious, they did precisely that.¹³⁸ Modest Gofman, in an attempt to negotiate the serious rift between the factions, proposed a new doctrine, "ecumenical individualism,"¹³⁹ but this theory was found no more useful than Čulkov's and also much less original; the same judgment was given to Konstantin Erberg's attempt to define total freedom (even from any doctrine) as "innormalism."¹⁴⁰

Another polemic arose after Blok gave a speech in December 1908 in Moscow and in St. Petersburg, which was published in Zolotoe Runo under the title Rossija i intelligencija.¹⁴¹ According to Vladimir Pjast, it marked a "second period of Russian Symbolism."¹⁴² The article was prompted by an earlier novel by Gor'kij, "Ispoved'." Although Marxists were generally ignored by the Modernists, this novel from the unexpected quarter of the Bolshevik Gor'kij spoke about "peoples godliness" (narodobožie) and God-building (Bogo-stroitel'stvo). Here the Symbolists felt themselves directly concerned, for it was their domain, they presumed, to define and discuss the nature of the divine. In his novel Gor'ky had put forward the system for the creation of the deity through regarding the people as the object of the cult. As Blok took up the theme, his article was a passionate plea for the intelligentsia to apprise itself of the truth that events take place quite independently of the political awareness of the intelligentsia. He posed the question "which is the most painful

and feverish question for many of us . . . Does there not take place somewhere, while we talk here, a dreadful and silent act? Are not some of us predestined irrevocably to doom?" Blok's article was met with controversy and polemic. Petr Struve thought it politically naive and philosophically crude and refused to publish it in his journal, Russkaja Mysl'. In contrast, Merežkovskij thought it so significant and telling, that he left Struve's journal in protest.

Vjačeslav Ivanov, too, wrote a strong article in support of it.¹⁴³ In that article he maintained that Blok's fidelity to his thesis was evident in his poetry and, indeed, was consistent throughout his work: "'Neznakomka' became Faina in 'Pesnja Sud'by' and under her mask the poet frankly inscribed 'Russia.'" Sergej Gorodeckij, also writing, somewhat naively, in Zolotoe Runo upheld Blok's article principally because it was congenial with his, Gorodeckij's, own feeling that the time had come for the intelligentsia to return to political activism not as the Social Democrats and Social Revolutionaries advocated, but rather, in the "Modernist spirit," for the sake of literature. "National spirit cannot survive unless it [dwells] in activity [revolution]. Literature can only glow if it has content. Therefore, the content of literature should be revolution."¹⁴⁴ Čulkov also addressed an article to the questions raised by Blok in his essay. Čulkov called it a new "song," a "lecture on spirit"; he thought the lecture to be

in the tone of "anarchical mysticism" (as opposed to Čul-kov's mystical anarchism), and states that "if we forget Blok's attempts at ideational definiteness, but listen to the rhythm of his experiences revealed directly in his lecture, we have to admit that that abrupt and hurried rhythm indeed heralds a great revolt."¹⁴⁵ This debate highlighted the Symbolists' division between the Universalists or vsenarodniki, and the Individualists.

It is difficult to say whether Belyj revised his position on radical Individualism under the influence of the motion of Blok, or whether he was prompted by his own strategic considerations, but the principal forces of the second "generation" indeed made peace. Belyj's collection of verse entitled Pepel (1909) is directed to the values of Blok: the mysterious Russia. Furthermore, in the first issue for 1909 Belyj capitulates and formally announces that, "Vesy, understanding that the philosophy of the avant-gard minds of the recent past, which may be called "extreme individualism," now has outlived its age, Vesy join in the searching for new horizons of the spirit."¹⁴⁶ This passage was triumphantly quoted by Zolotoe Runo.¹⁴⁷ In 1909, in the same number of Vesy Brjusov announced that he would no longer be responsible for the general direction of the journal but only for those articles he signed.¹⁴⁸ And in the next year he was invited by Petr Struve, editor since 1907 of Russkaja Mysl', to edit their literary-

critical section.¹⁴⁹

The health of both Zolotoe Runo and Vesy had been steadily deteriorating. The former continued to lose money on a lavish scale and lost as well most of the leading lights of literature who had originally supported it. Vesy, too, had its financial problems which gave rise to some doubt in the mind of its financier-publisher, Poljakov. He had no further desire to continue with the journal even before Brjusov left. Thus, in December, 1909, both journals ceased publication.

Anticipating the discussion of the attitude of the third "generation" of Modernists toward Symbolism, one may conclude that in the intense search to reach the essence of art Russian Symbolism met the danger, as the critic Juriij Tynjanov has pointed out, of "becoming entrapped in its own poetic culture. Here--first of all [is] the problem of themes. Whole currents become imprisoned by their own themes,-- . . . Symbolism which only towards the end recognized its themes, as most important, as a propelling factor, --went after the themes,--and went out of living poetry."¹⁵⁰ Deschartes, speaking of the directions taken by Zolotoe Runo and Vesy, wrote that "both movements argued themselves out of Symbolism."¹⁵¹ On the other hand, it is necessary to agree with Ellis who wrote in 1910 that after Symbolism, modern poetry can no longer turn back and ignore the contributions of the school.¹⁵² Thus, toward the end of 1909,

it appeared to the discriminating younger Modernists that, while the motivational and thematic principles of the Symbolists have reached extreme and, therefore, impractical and exhaustive proportions, their conscious emphasis on artistic detail in poetry, whether for stylistic or metaphysical ends, has opened entirely new avenues for lyrical expression, and raised the standards of poetic creativity and appreciation to an unprecedentedly sophisticated level.

had left the literary scene, Voprosy žizni remained for a year, but although it published some Modernist literature, it was not centrally concerned with Modernist aesthetics. The geographical inconvenience for the St. Petersburg Modernists to publish through the agencies of the Moscow Symbolists was coupled with a growing need for an overall evaluation of Modernism i.e., the experimental and partisan efforts achieved by the various factions. As a Symbolist editor, Georgij Čulkov reminisces, "Approximately in 1910 the literary storms receded. It became necessary to take stock of all the searches and achievements on the path of aesthetics and poetics. There appeared the need for a good 'European,' cultured and 'decent' journal. Apollon became such a journal."¹ From its earliest issues, the journal acquired the role of "the highest arbiter."² The young group that gathered to initiate the new journal was steeped in the spirit of Mir iskusstva. Because of their youth the group had not had experience with the editorial activities

CHAPTER III

THE LAUNCHING OF APOLLON

During the bloom of Russian Symbolism St. Petersburg was left with no channel to accommodate the creativity of an increasing number of Modernists. After Mir iskusstva had left the literary scene, Voprosy Žizni remained for a year, but although it published some Modernist literature, it was not centrally concerned with Modernist aesthetics. The geographical inconvenience for the St. Petersburg Modernists to publish through the agencies of the Moscow Symbolists was coupled with a growing need for an overall evaluation of Modernism i.e., the experimental and partisan efforts achieved by the various factions. As a Symbolist editor, Georgij Čulkov reminisces, "Approximately in 1910 the literary storms receded. It became necessary to take stock of all the searches and achievements on the path of aesthetics and poetics. There appeared the need for a good 'European,' cultured and 'decent' journal. Apollon became such a journal."¹ From its earliest issues, the journal acquired the role of "the highest arbiter."² The young group that gathered to initiate the new journal was steeped in the spirit of Mir iskusstva. Because of their youth the group had not had experience with the editorial activities

of Mir iskusstva. Also because of their youth they had not participated in the formulations of the tenets of Symbolism; having remained aloof, they were not dogmatically committed, and could observe the field and chose their values freely. On the other hand, their youth also restrained them from undertaking the publication of the new journal without more experienced advisers, and they welcomed the participation of the established Modernist figures. Thus, they could achieve a blend of the Aestheticist orientation of Mir iskusstva and the literary experience of a number of Symbolist maitres. During this period between the closing of Mir iskusstva and the opening of the new journal (1904-1909), poetry, of all the arts, had made the greatest advances in Russia, so that even though the group around the new journal was aesthetically bound to Mir iskusstva, their attention was initially drawn to poetry as the major issue.

The best available information on the founding of Apollon is provided by the memoirs of Sergei Konstantinovič Makovskij, its founder, publisher, editor, and a poet and art historian. Born on August 15, 1877, the son of a very popular portraitist and historical genre painter, Konstantin E. Makovskij, he was naturally immersed in the cultural life of the capital. The artist Golovin, who was part of Mir iskusstva, observed that "Makovskij--is a direct offspring of Petersburg, with all the peculiarities of Petersburgian moods."³ Makovskij's ties to the Northern capital are

important not only because Apollon has often been described as a typical Petersburg journal, but also because they illustrate the degree to which Makovskij was bound to Mir iskusstva. In his early career in Petersburg's cultural life, Makovskij was attracted to the trends set by Mir iskusstva, both as a journal and as the sum of tastes and interests of the circle around the journal. In 1898 Makovskij had just published his first article on art, on Vasnecov's fresci in the Vladimir cathedral of Kiev, in the journal Mir Božij. He met Djagilev at the exhibition of English and German watercolors which Djagilev had organized. Makovskij has described the meeting: Djagilev, whose "innovating Westernism was somehow combined with the dream of the regeneration of Russian art, the roots of which go down to native folklore. . . . praised me for [my] 'Vasnecov' and promptly invited me to write for Mir iskusstva."⁴ In response Makovskij submitted an article on Boecklin; it was returned to him by Filosofov, who on behalf of the editorial board of Mir iskusstva, informed Makovskij that the article was not sufficiently specific and did not adequately treat the influence on the young German painters of the mythology of Boecklin. However, in his official capacity Filosofov also asked Makovskij to submit articles in the future and invited him to attend the Wednesdays of the Mir iskusstva circle. Makovskij regularly attended the gatherings and wrote of them that "they taught me a great deal.

I submerged myself into the atmosphere of exceptionally thoughtful and sophisticated service to art."⁵ Makovskij was too intimidated, however, to attempt to submit any further articles to Mir iskusstva.⁶

Also in another area, besides Modernism, Makovskij's tastes and activities were strikingly similar to those initiated by Mir iskusstva. Because he was only an amateur artist, Makovskij did not develop the skills of the stylists Benois and Dobužinskij. But he was profoundly interested in the directions they took and, like them, he was a collector of art. In 1907 he founded the journal Starye gody, which he edited until 1917, and which was dedicated to the rediscovery of ancient art. From 1913 to 1914 Makovskij was the founder and editor of another journal exploring the history of art, Russkie ikony. Following the direction set by Mir iskusstva Makovskij devoted much of his time to organizing and presenting exhibitions of art, not only in Russia, but also in Belgium, Germany, and France. They were of a very high caliber, though, perhaps lacking the dash and luster of Djagilev's famous exhibitions. In January 1909 Makovskij introduced a new procedure in Russia, wherein an exhibition showed "all" of the contemporary artists, instead of a particular artist or school; such was the "Salon 1909 goda."

It was in January 1909 at the "Salon" that the idea germinated to found Apollon; here Makovskij met the

young poet Gumilev and discussed with him the ideas about a new Petersburg journal. In an essay published posthumously Makovskij wrote about Gumilev and about that meeting. ë/?

Immediately we began to talk about poetry and about the project of a new literary journal; he already had heard from many writers about my intention to "continue" Diaghilev's Mir iskusstva. Right then . . . he offered to introduce me to Innokentij Annenskij. Placing great hopes on Annenskij's help to the writing youth [pisatel'skaja molod'ož], Gumilev spoke with the greatest enthusiasm about the author of Tixie pesni.⁷

Gumilev's idea was most fruitful and resulted in the mutual satisfaction of the relatively inexperienced entrepreneur and the unrecognized, older, lonely poet, who seized the opportunity of literary recognition and stimulating association. At the "Salon" a wealthy dilettante impressed by Makovskij's efforts, offered assistance for Makovskij's further enterprises. Thus, instrumental mainly through his financial help, N. Uškov became the co-publisher of Apollon.⁸

Like Gumilev, who "essentially did not belong to any literary school [at that time]" and who seemed to possess "not only talent, but [also] the freshness of some kind of original poetic truth,"⁹ Makovskij did not at all wish that his new journal should join the movements of the Moscow or Petersburg Symbolists. Thus, long before any formal anti-Symbolist trends were articulated, the young editorial board (redakcija molodyx) carried the sentiment of emancipation. This common tendency of emancipation and Gumilev's dedication to Apollon, determined Makovskij's decision to

ignore the doubts about Gumilev's intellectual ability to be the head of the prospective poetry section of the journal. (These doubts were voiced especially by V. Ivanov.)¹⁰

Even recently Makovskij has written that a precondition for the founding of a journal was to "unite poets" and that to do so "successfully" a "Society" had to be created. Thus, he refers to one of the characteristic features of the cultural scene in Russia at the turn of the century. Around each of the journals a society of adherents felt the need to rally, either to forge a new doctrine or to evaluate a new work, or in some cases, to maintain the cohesion of their own group. To be published by a journal a writer had to establish contact with its "Society" and, conversely, for the management of a prospective journal it was desirable to establish a "Society" in order to ensure the necessary number of capable contributors. Makovskij was in a favorable position to attempt to establish a "Society," because of his experience in journalism as editor of the art section of V. S. Miroljubov's popular Žurnal dlja vsex and as founder and editor of Starye gody and because of his excellent connections with influential artists and intellectuals. But if this enterprise was to become a leading national institution, the greatest possible prestige was necessary in order to distinguish the "society" from the many enthusiastic but short-lived circles which sprang up everywhere in Russia at this time.

Makovskij and his friends found an ideal opportunity for establishing such a "Society" in the cooperation of Vjačeslav Ivanov, whose willingness to work with the young poets and whose prestige created both a workshop and a salon of the highest caliber. Ever since his return from studies in Roman administration at the University of Berlin Ivanov's erudition and instinct in matters of poetic craft made "Vjačeslav Velikolepnyj" the undisputed arbiter for the Petersburg modernists. Of Ivanov, Makovskij wrote:

Vjaceslav Ivanov was invariably the "soul" of these meetings, which the apollonovcy called the "Poeticeskaja akademija," . . .

He [Vjačeslav Ivanov] was unusually broad-minded in evaluating others' creativity. He loved poetry-- . . . not his own role in it, as "mentor" (as we used to say), leader, teacher, ideologist, but the talent of every promising neophyte. . . . We all loved him for [his] temperamental [but] unselfish [ways], for his extravagant generosity, both in giving advice to his younger poet-brothers and in giving his views on art . . . and [for] his selfless attention₁ to anyone who came to the temple of Apollo.

Another older maître, Annenskij, exerted, also, an influence on the enterprise as a whole, Makovskij writes:

It is doubtful that Apollon would have appeared if it were not for my meeting with Innokentij Fedorovic. . . . Financial means were obtained. But I hesitated for a long time [to publish]. Not because I did not envision the program of the journal, but because I lacked an experienced older adviser (who would be recognized by all of the members of the future editorial board), to lend authoritativeness to me, a beginning writer, in the difficult task of chief editor . . . From the day of our "alliance" [March 1909] Annenskij set to work feverishly on articles and poems. . . . he proved to be exactly the kind of an older adviser I needed. I wanted to remain as objective as possible in the selection of

materials, without being influenced by cliques, and even more, editorial nepotism--Annenskij¹² was exceptionally independent and tolerant.

Annenskij stood apart from the struggle for supremacy of the literary schools; he did not join any of the circles that formed around the various maitres of Petersburg or Moscow Symbolists. Gumilev, who, according to Makovskij, was his most energetic and efficient helper, before he had made an arrangement with Annenskij at Carskoe Selo, introduced Makovskij to his friends Alexej Tolstoj, Sergej Auslaender, and Sergej Gorodetskij; Makovskij had already met Mikhail Kuzmin.

The possibility of opening a major journal posed the problem of converting Ivanov's private salon into a professionally run organization. The first steps are described by Makovskij:

Vjačeslav Ivanov was most of all concerned with the solution of this problem; he was already looking for another literary hearth to host the meeting at his "tower" (which demanded too much of his time and drained his financial resources). Here Gumilev with his youngsters helped a lot. Disregarding his disagreements with Vjačeslav Ivanov about the aim of poetry and the style of Russian verbal creativity, [slovotvorstvo] he took an active part in creating the Akademia Stixa . . . [soon re-named] Obščestvo Revnitatelei Xudožestvennogo Slova (pri Apollone). [Society of Adepts of the Artistic Word.]¹³

Makovskij's connections with high governmental officials helped him to obtain permission to hold public meetings. They took place in offices located at the Moika No. 24, near the Pevčeskij bridge, in the same building as the

restaurant "Donon," and the offices of the city planning journal Gorodskoe delo.¹⁴ Apollon's offices occupied luxurious (fešenebel'nye) suites which could also house small exhibits, concerts and lectures with a "selected formally dressed, audience . . . and invariably . . . tea and cookies."¹⁵

Under the chairmanship of V. Ivanov the executive committee was elected by the founders: it included I. Annenskij, S. Makovskij, M. Kuzmin, A. Blok, and N. Gumilev. When Annenskij died [November 30, 1909], he was replaced by professor F. F. Zelinskij, and somewhat later, professor Fedor Braun joined.¹⁶

Challenging the statement by Gleb Struve that the Akademia Stixa was organized in close collaboration with N. V. Nedobrovo and V. A. Čudovskij,¹⁷ Makovskij argues that

Valerian Čudovskij appeared only a year after Apollon was founded and after its secretary E. A. Znosko-Borovskij retired and was replaced by Mixail L. Lozinskij who was also introduced by Gumilev. Nedobrovo appeared only after the death of Annenskij.¹⁸

This society had as many as fifty-seven members, mostly poets, according to Leonid Strakhovsky (Shatskij).¹⁹ In addition to the staff members, mentioned above, other members of the society who became also regular contributors to the literature section of Apollon were M. Vološin, A. Tolstoj, Johann von Guenther, V. Pjast (Pestovskij), S. Gorodetskij, F. Sologub, J. Verxovskij, Kondratjev, O. Mandel'stam, G. Ivanov, V. Narbut, V. Borodaevskij, and V. Roždestvenskij. The society met formally once or twice a month.

In addition to lectures on rhythmic subtleties of Russian versification, instrumentation of verse, and the application of classical meters to Russian rhythms, given respectively by Ivanov, Annenskij and Zelinskij, these meetings had three basic purposes: to present and discuss unpublished fiction of special thematic or methodological interest,²⁰ to demonstrate "discoveries" in the history or theory of poetry,²¹ and (since the "Society" boasted among its members such a number of prominent classical philologists) recent translations and original stylizations of classic sources were read and discussed.²² Compared with similar work performed in the days of Mir iskusstva the level of scholarship and creative maturity was considerably higher in the era of Apollon.²³ It seems that the Russians have made the step from the discovery to assimilation of world culture. If the pioneering Modernists welcomed every new effort on the part of their colleagues,²⁴ now, at the almost solemnly formal sessions of the Akademijska judgments and verdicts were passed on each work after a punctiliously careful investigation,²⁵ and by standards which have neither before, nor after, been reached in Russia.

Perhaps the most noteworthy, for the wider public, were the sessions at which the leading poets gave their formal speeches about their philosophy of poetry, the direction, they thought, modern poetry should pursue, and on what the "true nature" of poetic art is to them and to their

intellectual and artistic allies. Such were, for example the speeches "Zavety simvolizma" by Vjačeslav Ivanov on March 26, 1910, Blok's "O sovremennom sostojanii russkogo simvolizma" on April 8, 1910,²⁶ and almost two years later, on February 18, 1912, Ivanov's "Mysli o simvolizme" and Belyj's "O simvolizme." Historically, the latter occasion = last/? was more significant since it witnessed the first formal break with Symbolism on the part of the younger Modernist poets.²⁷ D. V. Kuz'min-Karavaev, S. M. Gorodeckij and Gumilev expressed, as opponents, their principal disagreements with the objectives of Symbolism and the decision to part from that movement.

Since "essentially it was this society that created the literary background out of which the journal [Apollon] grew"²⁸ it is revealing to examine the question which prominent figures of Modernist poetry did not participate in the "Society" and what might have been the reasons for their alienation.

The lists of the most prominent members of the "Society of the Adepts of the Artistic Word" reveals the conspicuous absence of such recognized poets as Bal'mont, Belyj, Brjusov, Gippius, and Merežkovskij. The participation of such Symbolists as Ivanov, Blok, Sologub, and Annenskij on the other hand, indicates that Apollon was not intended as a counterforce to Symbolism, as is frequently suggested; nor did it reflect the geographical division

between Petersburg and Moscow, as the absence of the Merežkovskijs, and later of Blok, demonstrates. The reasons why some of these well known figures participated in the new journal and some did not, lead to the complex professional evolution of each individual poet which can be briefly only indicated here.

Bal'mont, for example, realized that he was no longer appreciated by the younger generation, and they, in turn, did not extend an invitation to him.²⁹ Gippius and Merežkovskij did not subscribe to delight in aesthetic values as the motivation and goal of a journal of the arts. Brjusov probably had several reasons why he did not participate to a significant degree in Apollon, although they must remain somewhat speculative. He was at the time already conducting negotiations with a monthly of great prestige, Russkaja Mysl', where he later became head of the literary section. Also, as the earlier, example of Novyj put' illustrated, he was reluctant to sever his ties with and relinquish his executive positions in Moscow to move to St. Petersburg. Also, perhaps, Brjusov's reluctance was influenced by the strong probability that in Petersburg the leading positions would be taken by Ivanov, Annenskij, and Sologub. Brjusov's own prestige as leading poet and maitre were clearly on the decline, and it is doubtful that the board of the new journal was anxious to secure his participation. There is no indication either in the pages of

Apollon or in any available correspondence or memoirs of any of his contemporaries that the new journal expressed a desire to invite Brjusov or regretted that he did not play a significant role in Apollon--this, in spite of the fact that he was undoubtedly in contact with the new journal. Blok attests to this contact by writing in a letter that he saw Brjusov at a meeting of the "Society" of Apollon. In addition, it is likely that he represented the position of the "journalist" in the "symposium" in the first issue of Apollon. Also in the first issue Brjusov was one of those prominent poets who contributed a poem which may be called a manifesto of the poet. At no time were relations between Brjusov and Apollon hostile or severed; they remained always cordial, if not intimate. In fact, Brjusov's interpretation of the aims of poetry is closer to that of the younger Apollon generation than to the Symbolists proper.

In the case of Belyj one may recall that his recent "enemies" from Zolotoe Runo, Ivanov, Gorodeckij and Čulkov were influential in the new enterprise, and that Apollon (i.e. Sergej Makovskij), according to Pjast, strongly disliked Belyj.³⁰ Belyj's scholarship was viewed with suspicion,³¹ and his antroposophical exploits evoked almost no interest in St. Petersburg. At this point one may also add that the circle of Apollon, especially Gumilev and Makovskij,³² avoided excessive contact not only with the "utilitarians" and revolutionaries but with "frenzied"

elements of any kind, among which they considered Belyj.

Blok was elected a member of the board of the Obščestvo Revnitatelej Xudožestvennogo Slova associated with Apollon upon insistent recommendations of Vjačeslav Ivanov and despite strong misgivings of Gumilev.³³ It seems evident that Blok's feelings about the circle of Mir iskusstva, if anything, had become stronger by the time of the appearance of Apollon. His mystically-political orientation and his sense of approaching doom could not help but alienate Blok from the academic and aesthetic goals of the optimistic and fashionable "Society." This estrangement did not cause Blok to withdraw entirely from the "Society" or from Apol- lon. His participation was, comparatively, slight, and became even slighter after the emergence of the anti-Symbolist group of Gumilev. Perhaps it was his vanity which made him accept the invitation to be on the board of the "Society."

At that time he wrote to his mother with great pride in his election to the group that boasted such names as Kuzmin, Makovskij, Vjačeslav Ivanov, Sologub, and Annenskij (he omitted Gumilev and added Brjusov, which contradicts the report of Makovskij). Blok urged his mother to subscribe to the journal, which, he was convinced, would be very fine indeed.³⁴ However, by the end of October, a letter to his mother registered disappointment with the new journal. He wrote: "Number 1 of Apollon is bad. Let us

see what will be later."³⁵ In December, his mother received more bitter complaints: "What trash is Apollon! I regret very much that I made you subscribe."³⁶ Further contact with the journal was suddenly cut off for awhile, when Blok received on November 30 of that year, news of his father's death in Warsaw. The next year, 1910, he was not often in St. Petersburg. According to E. Knipovič, the editor of Blok's diary, "Blok's revulsion from, and anger . . . [at] the sophisticated aestheticism of Apollon made him understand that . . . it [as a part of the old world features] formed a conspiracy."³⁷ In a 1912 entry in his diary Blok says of Marxist fiction, "'Thanks [be given] to Gor'kij and even Zvezda. After the aestheticism, futurisms, apollonisms, bibliophiles, one can perceive the real [events in literature].'"³⁸ A year later an entry reads: "' I am frightened by all these Mejerxol'ds . . . and Benois.'"³⁹ Blok's recoil from the Apollon circle was produced chiefly by the fact that he thought it was fiddling while Russia was burning. When he thought about Apollon he was struck by the marvel of printing and graphics that it represented and simultaneously horrified by its aristocratic isolation from real life and its extraordinary insensitivity to the symptoms of the oncoming cataclysm in Russia. Also, the academic nature of the "Society," and its approach to the tasks of a poet, together with the bright and "sunny" character of Apollon, were not at all concordant

with the poet's increasing sense of historic unrest and longing for calamity (gibel'). Nevertheless, Blok retained his membership in the "Society" and continued (although, comparatively seldom) to publish his verse in Apollon.

In terms of format of publications, Apollon was to publish ten numbers during the year; there would be no summer issues. Each issue would have approximately one hundred and twenty pages, and the entire journal would be divided into three major sections: a section of theoretical articles on art, literature, or music; a section called "Xronika" devoted to surveys and criticism, both domestic and foreign, of the contemporary cultural scene; and a "literary almanac" section. In 1910 the literary almanac was placed in the second position in the journal, and in 1911 it was published separately as Literaturnyj Almanax Apollon, except for some poetry which was retained by the journal in its first section. These three main sections of Apollon can be subdivided further into eight departments or divisions. The first division was devoted to major articles on the theory of art or on an individual artist or trend in art. In addition to members of the Mir iskusstva circle, contributions came from Kandinskij, N. Remizov (Re-mi), and K. Petrov-Vodkin. Some of these, especially the artists from Mir iskusstva like Bakst, Dobužinskij, Lanceray and Mitroxin provided the graphic design for the journal and were instrumental in imparting the polish, elegance, and

taste for which Apollon was noted. Lesser articles on art, such as reviews of particular exhibitions or events in the contemporary art world, were placed in the second section of the journal; Baron Vrangél' became increasingly prominent in this department.

Literary criticism was similarly divided into two types of offerings. In the first section were major articles on the theory of literature, or a major writer, old or new, domestic or foreign, or an analysis of a literary trend. In the second section were the smaller articles assessing current literary works and reviewing magazines, lectures etc. It should be borne in mind, however, that Apollon listed on the staff or its contributors to these two sections an impressive array of notables, all of whom by no means contributed regularly or even frequently. Such were, for example, Brjusov, Merežkovskij, Gippius and, after 1910, Belyj.

In the first section, devoted to major articles on art and literature, literary doctrines, historical and theoretical studies of foreign and native, classical and contemporary poetry and prose may be found. These essays are still among the best treatments of their subjects in Russia. (Since many of these articles will be discussed throughout his study, the reader may survey the list of the most pertinent of these essays in the bibliography section of this thesis.)

In the Xronika section of literary reviews and criticism, shorter articles toward the middle of the journal, were found such contributions as Gumilev's column, "Pis'ma o russkoj poezii,"⁴⁰ and Kuzmin's "Zametki o russkoj belletristike." This section also featured Apollon's correspondents who reported from foreign capitals, for example, Kandinskij from Munich and René Ghil from Paris.⁴¹ Events, exhibitions in museums or projects of city planning were also to be found reviewed or noted in this section.

The music and theater departments of Apollon featured very prominent and talented contributors and, depending on the events in question, were represented either by major articles in the first section or smaller, critical articles in the second section. The principal music critics for Apollon were Evgenij Braudo and Vjačeslav Karatygin. The music critic from Mir iskusstva, Nurok, joined the new journal, and such figures as Skrjabin, A. Korsakov and Kusevickij were contributors. The theater department was also very impressively represented by S. Volkonskij, N. Evreinov, Mejerxol'd, Nemirovič-Dančenko, and Stanislavskij, among others.

In the first section of Apollon, although only for three numbers of the journal, was a department of satire, called "Pčely i osy Apollona." It appeared in Numbers 1 and 3 of 1909 and Number 12 of 1910. Written by the editors, it criticized other journals or replied to their criticism

of Apollon. Later, the sections Rossica, which was devoted to Russian cultural achievements abroad (such as concerts, exhibits, books, or Djagilev's productions); Iskusstvo i vojna, which recorded artistic activities pertaining to war (i.e. charity auctions, concerts etc. the themes of war in art, and the destruction of monuments of art by war), and Letopis' revoljucii (also dedicated to the preservation of art treasures) were added to the Xronika.

The date and place of the first meeting of the editorial board of Apollon can be determined from an inscription on a sketch by Benois of the profile of Innokentij Annenskij, which reads:

Inn. Fed. Annenskij
First session of Apollon
At the house of Donon 5.VIII.1909⁴²

The first issue of Apollon, printed by the Ephron publishing house Jakor',⁴³ appeared on October 15, 1909. The design of the journal surpassed in quality that of all preceding Russian journals. It adopted and improved the typographical innovations introduced by Mir iskusstva. It differed from Vesy not only in the quality of paper and print, but also in the style of its graphics. While Vesy leaned in its ornamentation and decoration mostly towards the style of art nouveau, Apollon in its stylization of Classical and neo-Classical taste stressed the value of a more aristocratic appearance. Not as lavish as Zolotoe Runo, Apollon in its restrained Schlichtheit was more

reminiscent of the aesthetics of the age of Puškin.

Besides the introductory manifesto of the editor, an introductory article was written by the former co-editor of Mir iskusstva, Alexandre Benois. It is a striking effort to make the vital task of the journal, the "Hymn to Apollo" as vivacious as possible, so that the curtain between art and life be transcended by a joyous dance. The editors have also published a semi-humorous symposium of the leading members of Apollon in order to show the diversity of ways in which the group will serve Apollo. The first out of three installments of an elaborate critical review of the entire scene of contemporary poetry in Russia by Annenskij appeared in this issue; it will be discussed together with those of the next issues. These reviews were the first of their kind in Russia; they startled their readers by the devious way in which the author expressed his judgements, seemingly treating good and bad poets alike. A less refined, but more straightforward essay was the first of the series of "Letters about Russian Poetry" by Gumilev. This "letter," by discussing four young poets, attempts to demonstrate what does and what does not constitute material for good poetry.

As customary, the projected direction is stated, in very general terms, in the first issue's address by the editor.⁴⁴ "The very title suggest our chosen direction." But Makovskij felt the need to insist that this "direction"

is least of all a newly found road towards the dogmas of ancient art. Wishing to avoid the path of schoolteachers, the editor said, "Classicism . . . if at all possible again, [can] only [appear] as a flighty infatuation, or as a protest against the formless darings of a creativity which forgot the laws of cultural heritage. Indeed, this protest . . . is bound to become more clear and more formal." Thus, the projected primary motivation of the journal is "protest . . . against disjointed experiments . . . and psuedo-innovations. . . ." The only "new truth" which the journal will seek will be the path "toward mastery . . . [toward] style, beautiful form, and toward a life-giving dream." These aims by Modernist standards, conservative and modest, are stated amidst vigorous assurances that the journal will "fight against dishonesty in all areas of creativity" and since art is to "touch upon all the fields of cultural consciousness, [it will] certainly lead us beyond the limits of specifically artistic tasks and themes." Like Mir iskusstva and unlike Vesy, Apollon in its opening manifesto does not insist on the autonomy of art, although art shall remain the main raison d'être of the journal.

In his memoirs Makovskij wrote: "Apollon turned out to be a direct descendant of Mir Iskusstva . . . This is why I asked A. Benois to write the introductory article dedicated to the god of the Muses for the first issue of Apollon."⁴⁵ Benois' article "V ožidanii gimna Apollonu"⁴⁶

is a striking effort to instill at its inception a durable vitality into the new journal, which, Benois might have feared, would succumb to an academic aestheticism divorced from life. Benois brings to the fore again the idea of crisis and re-evaluation of values, but here in Apollon it is an urgent plea for a new order of life in which Apollo is served, in which rejoicing in beauty is fused with life itself. He counsels the development of a new hymn to Apollo. Earlier, in 1906, in Zolotoe Runo⁴⁷ he had written in a similar vein, but his voice went then unheard. Now, with the forum of Apollon open to him, he urges the new journal to take the lead in an attempt to bring about the new era, the uniting of art and life, and end their centuries-old separation.

The "symposium" may be examined as an example of a typical discussion (without beginning and end) among the divergent leaders of Apollon; no matter how different their approaches may be, these artists share a mutual respect for each other's views, and for that reason, rather than forming a particular ideology, they agree on treating the journal as a workshop, rather than as a temple of art. This "discussion" was placed in the satirical section, "Pčely i osy Apollona," and in this discussion humor was turned gently on Apollon itself. Entitled "Skučnyj razgovor" ("A Boring Discussion")⁴⁸ the symposium is composed of figures who can be recognized as real actors on the literary scene by the

coincidence of statements attributed to them here with those made elsewhere in their works. The participants in the symposium are a professor (Annenskij), a philosopher (Vjačeslav Ivanov), a journalist (Brjusov), an artist (Benois), a lover of literature (Makovskij), a sceptical lady (Kuzmin?) and a young composer (?).

The creative accommodation of divergent views emphasized in part by the humorous tone of the presentation of the statements, but not the individual statements which are very much in earnest. The Professor "(somewhat solemnly)" begins the discussion with the conclusion: "And thus you agree? This Apollo has no high priests and will have no temple. He will be content with the sky and with mortals." It is proposed, therefore clearly, that the journal begin its existence free from exclusive mysticism or Transcendentalism. He continues: "A hierarchy? Yes, but it will be defined by the opinion of the workshop on the quality of work, and only that." This idea suggests the approach of the Cex poetov ("guild of poets"), founded by Gumilev in 1911.

The Lover of Literature ridicules subjectivism in saying, "Yes, for a Russian writer the pen is still--only a tool for liberation from the torment of one's own bewilderment." The Artist interrupts the flow of the discussion to question the Professor about his substitution of a portico for the temple of Apollo: "I am interested in the

'style' of that portico, . . . a portico, which leads nowhere: seems like an arch of triumph." The Professor retorts that "No. It is a very wide portico: --for the walks of the 'Athenian school.'" The Poet then expresses dismay that no room will be left for mystery, for the gods to descend and to be crucified; and when the Professor cautions the participants not to be diverted to Dionysus, the Philosopher replies in terms typical for Ivanov, that Apollo and Dionysus are inseparable.

One cannot think of one and forget the other. . . . Remember, that the Apollo of Delphi himself for centuries planted the cult of Dionysus . . . the roots of Apollonic art are in Dionysus. Dante passed through selva oscura and would not have written the 'Paradise' without having seen the 'Inferno.' This is the image of life, the face of Dionysus. . . . Apollo . . . the sacred vision arises beyond the limits of life. . . . I do not see whither Apollo can lead in life.

The participants bring out obscure myths and hone their arguments into more and more refined edges, until at last the sceptical lady announces her perplexity, and the journalist suggests that the symposium leave the gods of Greece and look at a "contemporary" Apollo who descends to modern cities with their factories and machines and who grapples with modern life in its urgency and ugliness. His is a plea for the realism of the "lower depths" and for him Apollo is the symbol of progress. The Philosopher demurs and remarks that "progress consists of removing norms and values. Dionysus destroys norms and Apollo asserts new ones. Progress is the resultant of the two forces." But

the Artist, quoting himself, reminds the symposium that Apollo is always victorious and the "new man will learn to sing and dance again." The Lover of Literature, who has made some humorous remarks about this "serious trend" evokes the wrath of the sceptical lady who brands his attitude decadent. The Professor then defines, in Annenskij's words, decadence as the introduction into literature of an element which is purely formal or intimate. If this is so, the Poet observes, then the great poets have been guilty of the sin of decadence. But, the Professor replies, "decadence need not be a sin . . ." The Philosopher expands the concept and, evidently addressing Gumilev, defines the concept as "the art of the conquistadors of the newly discovered area of sensations and experiences. . . . Decadence is the apotheosis of method. . . . The result of the decadent method was illusionism, and for that reason one may hope that decadence has been overcome. . . . We need no further irritations of the senses, 'à rebours' . . ." The Lover of Literature gracefully suggests taking decadence as a spice for a literary dish and when asked by the Philosopher where to place truth, the Lover of Literature concludes the symposium by answering that the object of discourse is merely to express articulately one's point of view; for to convince someone would only be intellectual impoliteness.

Annenskij's proposal that the journal should not

specialize in Transcendentalism or any other "ism" is apparently acceptable to all. The individual misgivings or questions may be accommodated by his broad policy statement that their Apollo will be content "with the sky and the mortals." The objectivist element appears in the editorial outlook that the hierarchical treatment of value will be based exclusively on the criteria of quality of work. The assertion of Apollo's continuous victory over Dionysus indicates the journal's decision to "assert rather than destroy norms." Decadence defined as "the apotheosis of method" is not feared by the new Modernists; it simply may be incorporated into, and thus enhance, a work of art. Neither universalist truth nor individualist esotericism is going to be pursued. Apollon is merely going to "express articulately the points of view" germinated from its "workshop."

The "stock taking" of all the achievements of Russian Modernist poetry was undertaken for Apollon by Innokentij Annenskij. Under the general title 0 sovremenom lirizme, the author intended three articles Oni (published in Nos. 1 and 2 of Apollon),⁴⁹ One⁵⁰ (published in No. 3) and Ono (Annenskij died before writing this third essay). These essays contain a peculiar blending of historical, critical and theoretical information. As mentioned above, Annenskij's evaluations displayed an unusual style which combined incisive perceptiveness with aloofness,

scholarship with whimsy.

The beginning of the first article sounds, at the very least, irreverent: "The jasmine thyrsuses of our first maenads quickly waved themselves out."⁵¹ By that Annenskij suggested that symbolism has lost its energy both in Russia and abroad. Praising the magnificent rhythms and neologisms of Vjačeslav Ivanov, Annenskij was quick to point out Ivanov's weakness in Ivanov's own terms--that is, that his myths had reached a stage of such complexity that they had lost all hope of vsenarodnost'; it is a pity, Annenskij writes, "that this desert of obscure pedantry had accumulated so much noble sweat."

Of Brjusov's lyricism Annenskij wrote that "it is a record of his work rather than of his experiences." To Sologub's poetry (which "abuses the words 'sick' (bol'noj) and 'mean' (zloj)) two things are most alien: directness and the ability or desire to stand outside his own poems." Being among the earliest Russians to profess sound instrumentation, Annenskij urges the readers to count the "a's" and the "e's" rather than to worry about the meaning of the excellent poems of Sologub. About Belyj, who was frantically active as a litterateur, Annenskij asks: "When does Belyj think?" Like Leconte de Lisle, Max Vološin, the enthusiastic aesthete "goes to church for metaphorical prayers. . . . But what can we do with his prayers--a stylized opera in bluish shades?" About the sophisticated, elusive

Kuzmin, who in a deceptively simple fashion "would also like to pray," Annenskij asks: "By the way, did Kuzmin, author of Prazdniki Presvjatoj Bogorodicy, ever read Sevcenko's poems on Presvjataja Deva? No; because if he had, he would have burned his." Blok, according to the author, is not only a natural Symbolist but became himself a symbol. With such praise and scorn he goes through the work of thirty-three different poets, treating each with an amazing intuitive perception that revealed the person behind the poetry. Without paying special tribute to the better poets, he marked the degree to which they had achieved maturity or, in some cases, over-maturation.

Annenskij's articles were sprinkled with theoretical "asides" which influenced greatly his third "generation" pupils.⁵² His definition of decadence in poetry (transplanted into the above cited "symposium"), is an attempt to isolate poetry from heteronomous aims and techniques; decadence, or to use a better word, recently applied in France--Byzantinism--"may be called the introduction into general literary use of various refinements in the technique of versification which have no immediate relation to the aims of poetry." The latter he defines as the intent to imbue others, by verbal influence which is close to that of music, with one's Weltempfindung (mirovosprijatie) and Welterkenntnis (miroponimanie). "Poetic language," as a concept, requires a clear distinction between image and

symbol; the traditional notion, strengthened by the then popular teaching of Aleksandr Potebaja, that imagery plays the pre-eminent role in poetic language, is challenged by Annenskij:

The poetic image, although an ancient expression, is a positively unfortunate one. It makes one presuppose the existence of poetry not only outside of rhythm but also outside of words, because in words there cannot be an image or generally anything limited. Words are open, transparent; words not only flow, but also shine. In words there is only the flickering possibility of an image. . . . Music, on the other hand, does not come any closer to poetry. Even though flowing as a word and as divisible--music lives only in absolutes and even Wagner could not come further than an operatic compromise between music and poetry.

Poetry has only relativities, (otnositel'nosti), only approximations--for that reason it cannot be anything but symbolic, . . .⁵³

It is noteworthy that Annenskij sides in this issue with those Modernists (Ivanov) who regard the Symbolic nature of poetry as an extra-historical category, not bound to any particular school. On the other hand, Annenskij points out carefully the exact time and place of the origin of the term "Symbolism" as applied to the French XIX century school. On August 6, 1885, Paul Bourde, a collaborator of Le Temps brands the contemporary poets with the term decadentism, and in a reply in XIX-me Ciecle [August 11] Jean Moreas suggests the term symbolisme as the most just and appropriate label.⁵⁴ The emphasis on "symbolization" (simvolizirovanie) Annenskij ascribes to the urban psyche of Modernism. "Symbols exist where there are still no

myths, but where there is no longer any faith." Annenskij does not allow himself here to give vent to his impatience with the extreme philosophical wings of Modernism, the faith-seeking Transcendentalists (Merežkovskij, Blok)⁵⁵ and the rhetorical Aestheticists (Bal'mont and Brjusov),⁵⁶ because these essays are dedicated to the realm of poetic craft exclusively; but he does delineate the extent to which the ambiguities of myths are poetically justifiable: "I have no need for the necessity of a single and universal way of understanding. On the contrary, I consider it a merit of a lyrical piece if it can be understood in two or more ways, or if not fully understood, only be felt. . . . But I do not like to oscillate (kačatsja), and I absolutely do not need any puzzles nor anagrams."⁵⁷ Unlike Brjusov, a/ Annenskij does not believe that poetry will replace philosophy, because poetry should be "personal, irrational, god-like and unexpected." Annenskij, wishing to remain undogmatic, did not spell out his effort to isolate the nature of poetry from the domain of the customary categories. But from such scattered notions as the resigning to "only approximations," and appreciating the "symbol as a psychic act," irrationality, and the plurality of voluntary interpretations of each poem, one can see that Annenskij refrains from imposing an objectivist attitude upon his readers. On the other hand he is decidedly departing from an aesthetics of subjectivity. Eschewing any discussion of

metaphysics or of the "mystic fog" even in his analysis of Transcendentalist poets, Annenskij states unambiguously his aversion to any kind of "riddles." He segregates the realm of poetry from that of music and insists on precision. In his article Čto takoe poezija which appeared only posthumously in Apollon⁵⁸ but which he was preparing for publication at the same time as Oni and One⁵⁹ Annenskij writes:

Instead of the boring hyperbolae by means of which old poetry used to convey complex and, frequently, invented feelings, new poetry seeks exact symbols for sensations, i.e. the real substrata of life, and for moods, i.e. that form of spiritual life, which most of all relates people with each other, entering the psychology of a crowd with the same right as [it enters] an individual psychology.⁶⁰

In the second part of his second article Annenskij draws some general conclusions from his survey of Modernist poetry. First, of all the poets surveyed, he finds that there are four names which represent fully developed types of lyricism--Bal'mont, Brjusov, Ivanov, and Sologub. Second, although the new poetry has hardly any of the soulfulness (zaduševnost') and charm of the lyricism of the Puškin school, it does provide compensation in its ability to depict moods more precisely and with a greater variety of nuances. Third, modern lyricism reflects particularly the complexities of metropolitan life, and as a result of the increased tempo of life, "contemporary lyricism seems at times either neurotic or oppressed." Finally, in referring to the influences and styles of the new poetry, Annenskij writes:

Among Modernists the strong influence of French poetry is noticeable--in recent times especially of Verhaeren and Hérédia.

Occasionally there appear attempts at Slavo-Byzantine stylization, and a capricious return to the old times.⁶¹

Wandering in such a sinuous way across the contemporary poetic scene, Annenskij's contribution to the orientation of the new journal is not so much an effort to explain what is good and what is not in Modernist poetry, as it is an attempt to create a detached view, to extricate criticism from the norms of fashion and tradition. Annenskij achieved this formally by fragmenting the usual patterns of thematic exposition and re-assembling his thoughts into new patterns of associative digressions alternating between characterizations of poets, discussions on general poetics and historical information while omitting value judgements. His avoidance of repetition demanded that the readers connect the various levels of discussion in an unusually rapid and lightfooted fashion. Also, Annenskij's tone with its intricate causerie, mannered humor, devious subtlety and elaborate irony, struck an unprecedented note in Russian criticism. Annenskij's tone implied an equal amount of reverence to established as well as to beginning poets. In terms of public relations such an approach was a disservice to Apollon. Quite accustomed to unsophisticated shocks, the public was highly irritated and even insulted by the lack of conventional seriousness.⁶² Even the

well established maitres, especially Sologub, were offended; despite the benevolent intentions of the author, the semi-humorous casualness of the review insulted them more than even harsh criticism would have.⁶³ Because most of the protests were directed against Apollon for publishing Annenskij's essay, the author felt compelled to write an explanatory letter and the editors published it in the Xronika section of the following issue.⁶⁴ Assuming the full responsibility, and apologizing neither for style nor content, the author speaks about "the intent and the very conception of the article." Annenskij considered his "task to be strictly Apollonian." Contemporary lyricism "is worthy of being considered not only from an historical point of view, i.e. for the purposes of justification, but also from the aesthetic point of view, i.e. in relation to the future . . ." Annenskij stresses that he intentionally characterized the vital issues of the present ("traditions, credo, hierarchy, egotisms, occupied positions"), as "indifferently transient."⁶⁵

Perhaps not all members of the Apollon circle agreed with Annenskij's treatment of the literary scene,⁶⁶ but the intention to discuss poetry purely aesthetically was totally recognized, and consistently practiced by all critics of Apollon. Only their tone became less and less mannered as the intended position of the pioneering article became more and more domineering. Whatever differences in

aesthetic taste the younger critics developed, they rather superseded Annenskij in his own directions than countered them. This important debt Apollon acknowledged posthumously. The third issue of Apollon⁶⁷ carried an obituary in which the editors besides lamenting the loss of the "brilliant . . . erudite . . . and enthusiastic . . ." collaborator promised to do anything in their power to make the Russian society appreciate worthily "one of the best representatives of Russian culture (kul'turnost')".⁶⁸ Indeed the January issue carried four essays, by F. Zelinskij, G. Čulkov, M. Vološin and V. Ivanov examining Annenskij as a classical philologist, lyricist and writer of tragedies. These articles, consisting of not only praise, but also of serious criticism, belong to the most thoughtful literature so far published on Annenskij.

Another assessment of modern poetry was given by Gumilev in the first of his series entitled "Pis'ma o ruskoj poezii."⁶⁹ This series, published in 1923 as a separate book, unlike Annenskij's essays did not purport to take stock of the poetic characteristics but rather to scrutinize the poetic potential of contemporary creativity. If Annenskij's treatment appeared as too sinuous, Gumilev could certainly not be blamed for the lack of direct value judgments. Gumilev selected for his first review four young poets, who differed markedly from each other, and who can be analyzed as manifestations of four mutually opposed

attitudes towards poetic creativity. Already his first "letter" revealed Gumilev's impartiality to themes and partiality to manner. In a manner, which Gumilev later refined, but did not alter essentially, he attempts to combine the evaluation of a poet (the degree to which the author accomplished the tasks which he set himself), with the assessment of what that poet's achievement may contribute to poetry in general.

First Gumilev discusses "Rus'," in a collection of poems by Sergej Gorodeckij subtitled "Pesni i dumy." Gumilev speaks of the collection as a delightful, but basically wordless mood which the author hastily set to words, a process which revealed his lack of taste or style. "Gorodeckij forgot all that he ever knew, or should have known as a poet. Whether [his book] has any relation to literature I do not know, but to poetry, I think, it does." This, somewhat paradoxical, separation of poetry from literature and even from good taste and intelligence is also not untypical of the later Gumilev.⁷⁰

In the "Stixotverenija" by Valerian Borodaevskij Gumilev sees quite the opposite problem. Here are considerable skill and tension which borders on hysteria, and in these spoken, rather than sung, verses Borodaevskij does sometimes achieve solemnity and the unexpected. "But [his] deep discontent with the world, and a burning thirst for another [world] do not allow the poet to concentrate on his

images, which are not always thoroughly conceived and show annoyingly accidental features." The ascribing of imprecision despite skill and pathos to the lack of appreciation of this world (as opposed to the characterization of Gorodeckij), is a diagnosis which anticipates fully Gumilev's philosophy of Acmeism which he (and Gorodeckij) formulated three years later.

The third poet, Boris Sadovskoj, is primarily a prose writer, and Gumilev considers that his "Pozdnee utro," a collection of poems of the last five years shows neither progress nor decline. Sadovskoj looks with suspicion at the values of other poets and therefore chooses for himself rather modest themes. Gumilev decides the poet should be praised for knowing his limitations; he will not make a conquistador of poetry, but a fairly good colonizer. Almost the exact opposite is found in the qualities of the fourth poet to be reviewed, Ivan Rukavišnikov; he is one who dares. "Doubtlessly talented, conscientious, and thinking, he is completely deprived of a poet's sense,-- taste. Sometimes it even helps him . . . His book presents material for poets . . . but it would be frightening to call its author a poet."⁷¹

Although in the later reviews Gumilev displays, of course, an increasing mastery and skill, this first review is a good approximation of the type of column with which he became identified in Apollon. But most important,

this review illustrates how the young generation will approach Modernist poetry. There is no longer any discussion of "true" Symbolism; in fact, there is no Symbolist category of any kind applied, and Symbolism is not even mentioned. However, the debt to the lessons of Symbolism is definitely manifest in what we may call "post-Symbolist awareness" in Gumilev's criticism, when he speaks, for example, of Gorodeckij's vital "morning mood" song, which renders words unnecessary, or the "surprises" in the solemn parts of Borodaevskij's "Byzantine spirit." On the other hand, Gumilev shows great appreciation of very modest themes, that is, of the humble realism in Sadovskoj's poetry. At no point does Gumilev show an interest in formal innovations or an adherence to any particular school or technique. With great tolerance toward the choice of themes and styles, but insisting on artistic plausibility, he seems to look for poets rather than for poetics.

The Poetry in the First Issue of Apollon

In the literary section of the first issue Apollon published fourteen poems by nine leading poets. It is a rare historical occasion that an impressive group of poets published simultaneously some of their best and most characteristic works, and addressed it to the same, most important subject: the source of their inspiration, Apollo.

The very broad understanding of the theme gave room for a wide range of poetic and philosophical statements; thus, each poem in this collection bears to some degree the stamp of a profession de foi. These poems can serve as an excellent reference for a comparison of the artistic and philosophical merits of the direction of each master. Together, these poems indicate the journal's very high projected standards on one hand, and its relatively low interest in artistic innovation on the other. Because the best exposition of the poems are the texts themselves, and because most of them are not generally available, they are reproduced in the appendix I in order to aid the examination of the various poets' position in relation to Russian Modernism in 1909.⁷²

The first poem, signed by M. (Makovskij) requires little comment. Presented as "Editorial poem," it was the most programmatic of the collection and, perhaps for that reason, its suggestive qualities do not extend beyond the overtly stated determination to appear as a paean. But it is necessary to comment more extensively on the other poems of this collection because their "unequal" (line 7) deviations from the "Editorial poem" and from each other reveal their author's true position on the complex scene of the late period of Russian Symbolism.

Ivanov's compact sonnet interprets the birth of hymns by reasserting the author's metaphysical principles

which were mentioned in the preceding chapter of this study. Here, too, Ivanov departs from what V. Solov'ev described as the "reconstruction of physical phenomena as conditions and actions of a living soul."⁷³ Such a mirror-like reflection, in this poem too leaves no room for the display of the author's subjectivity; he "tells" the hymns about the facts of their birth with the assertiveness of a witness who had observed nature objectively, and not as an impressionistic dreamer whose moods have determined his romantic vision.⁷⁴

It is the witnessing, as opposed to the dreaming; the willing, as opposed to the wishing; and the experience, as opposed to a dream or nightmare, as the object of the witnessing; that come together to form Ivanov's conviction that the object of his vision is indeed a reality. However, because the experience is mystical in character, it is part of a higher reality. In this poem the twofold nature of reality is emphasized by endowing the simile: "hymns are like forests" with a twofold definition (lines 3 and 8).

The impulse to higher reality Ivanov calls the process of creativity, and as such, it is the transition from realibus ad realiora. The transition depends for its impetus on a prior descent into the chaotic depths; with a gravity typical of Ivanov's pathos, the "observer" descends in the first tercet of the sonnet to the bottom of the

abyss, where in the "bitter mother-of-pearl-bed-grave-tear-chamber" hymns are born (not unlike the birth of Venus) which then proudly ascend to the "transparency immortal." This poem is perhaps the best illustration of Ivanov's mystical dialectics of the Dionysian descent (vnizsxoždenije) symbolic death (line 3) and the Apollonian rise a realibus ad realiora into transparent light and above the valleys (lines 6-7).⁷⁵ Such a dialectic is possible for Ivanov only when elements of mythical reality are employed. In this case his mifotvorčestvo is based on items like sepulchral roots, tears of love, and the death-like darkness of Dante's "inferno," the bottom of the sea of chaos (where, as Belyj says, the beautiful shells are an example of how the soft bodies of content create the impeccable shape and colors of form).⁷⁶ This poem is mythical not only because it draws its images from the "depths" and "forests" of primeval imagination but also because it endows in its entity the reader with "the key to the imaginative cognition of extrasensory entities. A true myth is far from being fiction or allegory; it is the hypostasis of a certain entity or 'energy.'"⁷⁷ In this sense the poem represents the realia in rebus. As can be readily seen, the dense⁷⁸ and striking verbal texture, characteristic of Ivanov, neologisms (obstanet, sleznica), archaisms (dubrova), the shifting syntactical position of the verbs (lines 11, 12, 13) and the consistently triumphant tone, lend the son-

net its potent virility (volenie), willfullness, and communicates to the reader the ever present sense of "mature youthfulness"⁷⁹ despite the intended grave pathos.

The two short poems of Bal'mont appear, by comparison, to be an effortless chatter. The "depressing ease,"⁸⁰ the "musical" samosožžennosti and stozvonnosti as well as the "empty" lines (6 and 10), of the first poem, explain why Vjačeslav Ivanov and, after him most of the younger poets, regarded Bal'mont as being "naively-direct."⁸¹ This "decadent" solipsism is openly asserted (lines 3 and 4), and his "I" is rather noisy.⁸² It is true that the poetic standards in Russia rose considerably during the second decade of Bal'mont's creativity, yet the above criticism even though just, should not flippantly dismiss this early Symbolist's merit. If the first of the two poems has a claim to represent Bal'mont's attitude towards poetry, it presents an unexpectedly rich content.

For the individualist Bal'mont in his poem "Kupina" the divine center is "here in the breast." Bal'mont uses the Biblical symbol of the burning bush (kupina neopalimaja) as ognepalimaja; his kupina addressed indirectly is divine eternity, but here the Apollonic principle of light has its source in Promethean fire of the artist burning in ecstasy (line 5) and in Daniel's torments (line 6) whose pure psalms achieved universal significance (lines 7 and 8). If interpreted in this way, Bal'mont's Symbolism

is not naive even by V. Ivanov's standards, who uses the same symbols for the same purpose in the conclusion of one of his major articles.⁸³ Bal'mont's individualism is also not as blatant as Mandel'shtam makes it out to be. It is not accidental that in the poem which, otherwise, has consistently only two stresses per line, the two lines which emphasize Bal'mont's universality (lines 8 and 11) have three and even four accents; speaking of the rhythm of this poem one should note the elegant consistency by which the trochaic meter is skillfully superimposed by the succession of a pyrrhic-paeon-pyrrhic, in odd lines, and a pyrrhic-paeon succession in the even lines.

The second poem is remarkably restrained. It is but an evening reflection of the fire of the first poem. The "psalms of rays" transform the tormenting liturgy of the first poem into the pacifying vesper, the bezglasnyj zvon (voiceless ringing) of which spreads across the horizon of life. It is curious to compare once more such un-similar poets as Bal'mont and Ivanov. Formally, this poem corresponds to the first half of Ivanov's sonnet. Despite the opening, the person of the artist moves into the background. The process of creating the vision is identical with the method advocated by Ivanov: the intuition of the artist submerges into the roots of realia (realibus) and raises, enriched by the experience, above the realia ad realiora. It is surprising to see how, especially, the

second quatrain is close to the spirit of Ivanov. In the entirely objective setting the ascending Apollonian light (line 2) conquers the Dionysian torment (lines 3 and 4). It must be said to Bal'mont's credit that despite its Ivanovian intensity, this quatrain is no less, if not more musical than Ivanov's verse. Bal'mont's poem is in accord with his definition of Symbolism; it can exist well even if its allegorical significance were removed. Such an intrinsic cohesion is mainly possible because of Bal'mont's clarity of speech, the simplicity of which approaches that of Puškin. (It appears that the title of the poem was inspired by a line from Puškin's verse). It is interesting also to note that the sentiment of this poem evokes a parallel with Ivanov's collection Svet večernij, which he prepared for publication thirty years later. The title of this collection is derived from the eighth line of a third century Byzantine chant "Svete tixij" sung at vespers to evoke a mood identical with the one illustrated by Bal'mont.

Brjusov chose to submit for the opening issue of Apollon a "Petersburgian" poem which he wrote in April of that year. As the swift pace of the unfolding functions of the poem's rich imagery supports its unslackening pomp and intensity, Brjusov reveals his impressive skill not only as a craftsman, but also as a Symbolist.⁸⁴ The poem's "commanding image" (konstruirujuščij element),⁸⁵ the stare of a dreaming monument, is persuasively transformed or

transposed⁸⁶ in order to display the author's metaphysical or (since these are no gods but only their emblems) aesthetical eclecticism with which Brjusov was traditionally associated. The imposing emblems do not symbolize to Brjusov, the absolutes for which they were originally devised. But their juxtaposition does symbolize to the poet the relative and temporal nature of cults.

In the other poems of this collection the poets treat Apollo as an absolute before whom they are but worshipping cultists; but for Brjusov there is no absolute, hence a plurality of cults. Actually Brjusov does not even consider the cults;⁸⁷ he sees merely their emblems--monuments gazing at each other across Petersburg which, like Brjusov, gathered them eclectically as aesthetic adornments. Not only does Brjusov differ from Ivanov in his approach to culture, but he also ascribes a different function to the symbol.

In this poem the association created by the emblems beholding each other evokes the comparison between their present ornamental function and their function in the past as objects of veneration; the past appears to them now as a realm of unreal dreams⁸⁸ and not at all the "transparency immortal" of Apollo. The beholding, or the "constructing element" in this poem, is presented in a triple reflection: the author sees the column of Aleksandr I which evokes the double association with Alexandria and

with Rome (line 9). The column itself sees the pair of ancient sphinxes placed in the dark fog of the Neva who, in their millenium-old silence must, in turn, see the newer emblems and their settings as well as their own past as dreamy apparitions and by seeing the setting sun recall how it burned "in the sands over a fallen obelisk." This poem, with its impartial treatment of contemporary and ancient objects, reflects more clearly than any other poem of Brju-sov, and of this collection, the Alexandrian spirit of Russian Modernism. In the words of Poggioli, that spirit is "eclectic [if not nihilist] in thought and syncretic in belief. . . . [And] by joining together . . . contrasting modes, by pursuing at once that showy pomp and that hidden elegance which respectively mark Asian and Attic taste."⁸⁹

Kuzmin presents two poems which express a very personal, almost narcissist, approach to adoration. One may assume that the adoration is directed to some transcendental figure, Apollo, and not to an actual object, because of the central position of the verb to "seem" (mnitsja) that links the two poems, [Lines 8 (I) and 5 (II)] and because of the fact that this linkage is emphasized by the coupling of the linking verb with celestial images (same lines). Yet, the object of adoration is addressed neither as a myth nor as a revery. The "non-liturgical" tone marks Kuzmin's departure from the solemnities of Symbolism, while unfolding a distinctly Modernist style and attitude which is

highly characteristic of the poet. Kuzmin strips Apollo of the traditional attributes and instead clothes him in the poet's own highly personal trappings. Apollo here has the form of a tender, but virile youth, and the hymn is the lover's hymn. The poet regards Apollo not for what Apollo symbolizes traditionally, but rather as material out of which he may create the image of his own personal ideal. For the object of the hymn becomes the idealized reflection of the artist himself, and the passion associated with that love and recognition drives the artist to creativity. His art lies in his capacity to bedeck the symbol with his personal expression, in terms increasingly resonant with the image.

Kuzmin begins with a perplexing double oxymoron (lines 1 and 2, I). First, Apollo here is paradoxically given the aura of a monk.⁹⁰ Then he is connected strangely by the adverbial "ne darom" with three epithets, "proud," "straight," and "savage." Kuzmin's blending of the heathen-Christian concepts is superseded by his attention to the interplay of tenderness and virility (line 8, I). The second octoverse differs in meter from the first because of an additional iambic foot, but they are linked formally, as already mentioned, by the repetition of the verb mnitsja.

The second poem continues to develop the theme of the first. Kuzmin addresses his lover as a double, but

improved version of himself (lines 2, 3, II). He ties the youth to himself by sharing with him a common but unspoken sense of fulfillment (sbudetsja) in which the two, as if looking into the same mirror, see themselves reflected. The mirror is thus the third factor in progression which ties the artist to his vision. The alchemy of creativity ends with the words "and something will happen, as it is bound to." This personal adoration of the beautiful youth is more reminiscent of Stefan George's cult of Maximilian than of any cult in Russian poetry.

Leaving the inexpressible "by agreement" unexpressed (lines 5 and 8, II) Kuzmin is extremely articulate in what he chooses to say. If, in other poems, he frequently approaches, somewhat provocatively, the brink of triviality, as Georgij Ivanov's remark cleverly points out: "prekrasnaja jasnost'--opasnaja legkost'," ⁹¹ these poems are gravely serious. Avoiding any allusions to the most important things ("that which seems the paradise") Kuzmin concentrates on the articulation of the most tangible features which guide his experience of recognition and love. The mirror-like clarity made possible by the conscious narrowing of the perimeter of his vision, characterizes Kuzmin as one of the early successful post-Symbolist Modernists.

Vološin's three poems "Delos," "Sozvezd'ja," and "Polden'" are concerned with the abode of Apollo. Unlike Bal'mont and Kuzmin, Vološin perceives the god as an objec-

tive force; unlike Brjusov he sees it is an absolute, and unlike Ivanov, he finds it not after descent and death but enthroned in an appropriate setting. For Vološin, who himself chose to dwell in the scorched eastern Crimea, it seems natural that Apollo selected the parched islands of the Greek archipelago as a base. In the words of Marina Cvetæva, Vološin's "own creativity--dense and ponderable--almost the creativity of matter itself, with [its] forces which do not descend from above, but [are] supplied by earth . . . [which is not just] thoroughly warmed [but] is parched, dry as flint, on which he himself walked . . . tirelessly."⁹² The process of creativity lies in the association with the essence of earth, attraction to it, and the acceptance of its gifts; art then is the product of the essence of nature, and Apollo is pleased to accept the gifts of nature transformed by the artist. Apollo the archer and "leader of moments" (Moiry) as well as of Muses seeks, according to Vološin, elemental purity in a substance devoid of cultural paraphernalia (line 30). Delos pleases the god (lines 26, 27). The two following poems represent a mythological stage of the separation of the gods from man. When "the earth became drained of the immortals," the activities of both did not diminish; only the distance between them increased. Thus, "all the names, all glories and all victories" congregate now in the constellations which openly bear the names of the gods, and he who

travels in the sea can perceive the full impact of divine activity. The panic moment, "Polden'," (Noon), like art, is the apex of man's self-awareness. Man brings forth the secrets of earth which the sun, or Apollo, receives from him as the noon extracts fragrances from the grasses. It has been argued that for Vološin it is not a mere image, that time of day condenses reality through the greatest intensity of light and heat. Cvetaeva writes:

The hour of [Vološin's] essence. For . . . of all the hours of the day [it is] the most substantial, material, with bodies without shadows and bodies sleeping without dreams, and if having any [dreams] then only the solid dream of earth. And at the same time it is the most magical, mythical, mystical hour . . . the same as that of midnight. The hour of the great Pan, the Demon du Midi.⁹³

Like Ivanov, Vološin treats myths as concrete phenomena witnessed by the author (see third poem). In this sense, his mysticism is also "realistic." However, in Ivanov the realia is still treated only as a stepping stone for realiora, while Vološin's decorative "realism," especially in the first two poems (which lack, contrary to characteristic Symbolist practice such devices as metaphors, similes, correspondences and allusions), outweighs the symbolic message of the poems. Since this victory of "realism" by no means diminishes the intensity of the author's experience, or the energy generated by the imagery of these poems, it is possible to consider them, like the above quoted poems by Kuzmin, as successful examples of

early post-Symbolist poetry, and even to accept Vološin's own term "neo-Realism."⁹⁴

Gumilev's "Kapitany," the most famous cycle of his early period, contains even fewer "Symbolist" elements than the poems of Kuzmin and Vološin. The functions of both Dionysus and Apollo are now performed by daring captains who look for "beacons amidst the stars" and instead of drawing, as Ivanov draws, the essence of beauty from the pearls of the bottom of the sea, they draw from the same depths motivation to discover lands that are exotic enough to have real wonders and "where the pearls shine in clear water." In the fifth stanza of the second poem Gumilev explains his motivation as an artist.

The poet who traces the dreams of the heroes gains access to a marvelous and still vital world; but once on such a journey unlike ordinary beings, the artist will never find the human rest of harbors and taverns. His curse brings him in the last poem of the cycle into "other areas which are tormented by moonlight" and are not accessible even to the bravest of the explorers. The victory of the mysteriously romantic over the adventurous side of Gumilev does not bring him nearer to Symbolism. His journey which now takes him into the realm of the illusory corona or St. Elmo's fires, the same which guide the romantic ship of the Flying Dutchman, permits him to glimpse at the mysterious and dreadful road "beyond Capricorn"; but the

question arises whether a record of such a journey symbolizes an actual intellectual or emotional experience? This question, if answered negatively need not make Gumilev an inferior poet, but it does indicate that Gumilev is not among those poets who, as Symbolists, seek to reveal the meaning of their visions. To Gumilev, who is fascinated with the dramatic aspect of an invented act rather than with its (symbolical) meaning, the confrontation with the exotic is no less mysterious than if it had been with the metaphysical. The description of imaginary sensations, rather than of actually experienced events or thoughts, need, however, not be purely romantic. Twentieth century Modernists who have witnessed the ages of Realism, Naturalism and Symbolism have inherited a wealth of additional post-romantic sensibilities and techniques. Especially when, like Gumilev, they could reap the benefits from the exposure to all arts which at that time converged in the circle of Apollon. In short, the new note struck by Gumilev expresses imaginary experiences so vividly and with such a sensitivity to detail that they assume the realistic quality of concrete events and objects. Gumilev's artistic task is to lend conviction to his "decorative painting"; he achieves that by finding effective expressions to produce a festively-heroic tone. The stress on the "quality of voice," as this example shows, tends to outweigh, in Gumilev the concern for (over-all architectonic)^e structure. As the thoughtful

g

critic M. Tumpovskaja remarked, his "verbal material is far superior to form."⁹⁵

Gumilev was more concerned with the effect of the exotic sites and the imaginary action in his poetry than with the workings of his own psyche. Unlike most Symbolists, (with the exception of a relatively small number of his love poems) and despite his great personal ambition and his outspoken manner which reveals his person at all times, he is not a subjectivist. He does not even face Blok's and Belyj's problem of how to gain universality. In that sense Tumpovskaja is correct in refusing to see a true lyricist in Gumilev, "because self awareness does not come to him directly, but by sensing of other objects."⁹⁶ It is worth noting the stress on the act of "sensing," because not only Gumilev but an entire group of his generation declared it to be its historic mission in poetry, which was overburdened by thought, to return to mankind its primeval gift to sense reality rather than to reflect on it.⁹⁷

Annenskij's poems "Ledjanoj trilistnik" examine and evaluate the impact of Apollo on the fragile and dream-like potential of life. Apollo here is the sun which burns the ice enshrouding spring, mercilessly stripping bare its tender budding contours. This inexorable rite splits Annenskij into the artist, who must similarly transform reality, and the dreamer, who pities the cruel violation. This conflict renders Annenskij a passive observer dominated by

pity (I, lines 4, II, 13). Pity is the mainspring of Annenskij's message and reaches at times almost strident⁹⁸ proportions; it turns him away from the bright and merciless god, and reduces him to a compassionate and confused witness of the act (I, line 4).

In the tragedy of what Kierkegaard calls "the devouring of the possible by the actual"⁹⁹ the symbols of the coming spring, the passive victim, and those of the passive witness, Annenskij, become intertwined: the mečta vesny of the first stanza becomes ty ne mečta in the fourth, because the inevitability of the victim's transformation will not allow the dream of spring to retain its form (sinij led); but the "witness," Annenskij, becomes the real dream, because he is endowed with memory. He himself, as a dream, has the passive capacity to retain the image. Annenskij, an impressionist or associative Symbolist, as Ivanov calls him, because of his overwhelming sense of pity is a pessimist (I, lines 7-8) who finds himself unable to form commitments: the vanishing winter of the poem "Sneg" bears too much despair (lines 1-2). Yet the lyricist cannot bear the spring, because it, too, carries the quality of its sacrifice (vsesožženje) by the rays of Apollo in whose presence the pure dreams (neporočnye sny) are suspended (line 19). As if in response to Vološin's "Polden'," Annenskij begins his third poem "Doč Iaira" with the confession of man's weakness (line 1) in the presence of reality

and the triumphant sun. But the passive witness, recalling the gentle compassion of Christ, blames Apollo in the creative artist for the crude intensity of light and fire and for the cacophony of sounds which tear the snowy shroud from the tender contours of the spring-child instead of softly rousing her.

Annenskij, tolerant to poets like Gumilev, whose muse bore exactly the brassiness which Annenskij so intensely lamented, could not reconcile himself with the crudeness of reality. Even though his feelings represent virtually the opposite of what the younger generation stood for, the verse of "the poet of universal disharmony" served as standards for the younger generation of Apollon because of their extraordinary fidelity of expression which transmits the most refined sensations more exactly than the verse of any other Russian Symbolist.

Sologub, like Annenskij, does not accept (Ne priemlet) the tyrannic despot of the processes of creativity. More vital and therefore less desperate (line 12) than Annenskij, Sologub seeks to steel an "illegitimate" contact with the world without the interfering leader of the Muses (Musagetes).

Sologub hated the sun.¹⁰⁰ The sun governs the process of life, which is a progression away from its original virtues: the Bal'mont-like naive purity, original tranquility, and freedom. Apollo, the symbolic sponsor of

this deterioration, endowed with Gothic brutality (line 3) is Sologub's chief adversary. Creativity, based on free fantasy, to Sologub is possible only during the moments of the original condition of life, during the absence of Apollonic tyranny. Sologub's untitled poem is dedicated to Apollo's absence. During the brief moment when the thunderous Archer is asleep, the earth, the sky, and the poet return to the clear and joyous sight of early youth (lines 6-12). Through the exaggerated use of such adverbs as "again," "before," and "anew" Sologub shows that in his tenacious struggles he, too, had achieved repeated victories (lines 1, 2, 12, 13, 14).

The diversity, as well as the high standards of these nine poets is, of course, apparent, and Apollon at its inception enters the history of literature affirming this diversity, stating the standards of a mature stage of Modernism. It is striking that among the poets of this group only one, Vjačeslav Ivanov represents the second "generation." It seems that, once more, the rule holds true that in terms of Modernist "generations," the "sons," omitting the values of their "fathers" seek those of their "grandfathers." It is characteristic for all these poems that they represent no longer any "searches" (iskanija). All poets, even the young ones, have found their philosophy, their poetic idiom, their style or "tone" and their specific sphere of images. Perhaps the most noteworthy common

element among the poems in the first issue of Apollon is, compared to those of the "second generation" Symbolists and their epigones, the determined effort to achieve clarity and precision especially in view of the very complex nature of the theme of these poems.

The general reaction of press which greeted the arrival of Apollon was anti-climactic; it ranged from mild interest to indifference. The history of Modernism was too full of revolutionary theories, explosive experiments, and striking achievements, in order to allow a journal with no shock value to score a great impact. Apollon was regarded as still another in the broad array of journals in Russia of that time. In its third issue of 1909 Apollon carried a survey of the reviews its first issue had received, for the most part in the minor and provincial press. The survey appeared in the Pčely i osy section and was lightly satirical. Of the important reviews only Zolotoe Runo took considerable interest although highly critical, in the new journal. Novoe Vremja produced a review in the form of the parody for which its literary editor Burenin had become famous. Since the time of Severnye cvety he had established himself as a conservative and anti-Modernist, and his satirical comments on the new Apollon predicted that its appearance would be followed by the closing of the two Moscow Modernist journals, Vesy and Zolotoe Runo. In Russkoe Slovo Filosofov reviewed the opening of Apollon scarcely for

the specific features of the journal but rather in terms of an essay on the death of Modernism; the new journal was hardly commented on. Vesy paid no attention to the opening of Apollon, and Belyj, in his articles and memoirs, barely ever mentioned the journal. Only Zolotoe Runo showed considerable interest in the new venture. Even before the first issue was published, a notice appeared in Zolotoe Runo, in the sixth number of 1909, announcing the transformation of the Poetičeskaja Akademija into a larger organization dedicated to studies in form. The Akademija, the notice said, was sure to be successful because of the presence of an "elderly poet" (Vjačeslav Ivanov), and its transformation was regarded as a sign of an interest in form "characteristic of the most recent tendencies in Russian poetry."¹⁰¹

By the transformed Akademija the notice meant the Society of the Adepts of the Artistic Word, that would soon found Apollon, and the notice reflected the view that the Petersburg poets were becoming formalists. When Apollon did appear, it was reviewed in Number 7-8-9 of Zolotoe Runo, 1909, in an article entitled "O Peterburgskom 'Apollinizme,'" written by Čulkov, under the name of Empirik.¹⁰² The article begins sarcastically by drawing attention to the manifesto as calculated either for easy appeal to the public or for harm to art. The manifesto is harmful in that, as interpreted by Čulkov, it opposes Dionysianism, and secondly, it proposes once more to separate aesthetics from ethics.

About Benois' article, Čul'kov writes that its optimism puts the development of art back twenty years, to the early days of Modernism, and ignores the tremendous torments and turmoil that became part of the development of Modernism. And in reading the symposium Čul'kov finds that the remark of the Lover of Literature that decadence might nicely be used as a spice for a dish, is incautious in the extreme. He fears that the formidable staff of Apollon, its highly capable philosophers and poets, will be condemned to inactivity under the present leadership. "With sadness one has to state that already from the first issue Apollon is completely alien not only to the new directions of Russian art, but in general, to its organic development and daily tasks." A short while after this article appeared, Čul'kov became an ardent contributor to Apollon, a fact which tends to dilute the criticisms of this earlier article. A further factor that indicates that the article was actually less critical than, perhaps, might be thought, derives from the polemics between Zolotoe Runo and Vesy; the former among other disputes energetically criticized the latter for its l'art pour l'art attitude, and by momentum turned its criticism to Apollon, which explains why the author soon saw fit to join that new venture.

In a second review of Apollon in Zolotoe Runo, Sergej Gorodeckij wrote about "Formotvorčestvo."¹⁰³ Gorodeckij, too, became an enthusiastic contributor to the

pages of Apollon and later a leading member of Cex Poetov. But before this later activity, Gorodeckij's article pointed to a more specific criticism of Apollon than had Čulkov's. Gorodeckij speaks with suspicion of its budding formalism. He sees three trends in modern Russian literature: the myth-making (mifotvorčestvo), the pseudo-myth-making or idol-making (idolotvorčestvo), and now, the triumph of formalism. Like Čulkov, Gorodeckij holds Makovskij responsible for the policy of the new journal, but takes him to task more severely for his role as a leading formalist. Gorodeckij also accuses Vološin and Kuzmin of betraying Dionysianism to turn to formalism. "The academy of formalism united itself with the academy of historicism and created Apollon. The historicism, in Gorodeckij's view, was brought to Apollon by the artists from Mir iskusstva. From the manifesto, Gorodeckij gathers that Apollon wishes to be champion, but it is unknown what it wishes to champion, since it has set itself no tasks. The article concludes: "Now we need songs that are understandable to all, [that are] saturated with pity and love and life, God and earth, and [instead] the high-school boys and girls chant about Loyola and Vasco-de-Gama."¹⁰⁴

It is not necessary to restate here which points Gorodeckij and the other critics slighted in discussing the shortcomings of Apollon. What they thought was the lack of a specific program for the new journal reflected, actually,

the conviction of Apollon that it was an established fact that the views of the masters about creativity had become extremely diverse, as was powerfully illustrated by the set of poems dedicated to Apollo. The fact that the opening manifesto only permitted rather than emphasized ideological considerations, indicates the journal's intention to maintain the freedom to select among the basic tenets of Modernism those elements from which the art of the individual masters will benefit most. As will be seen in the next chapter, that development took turns which ran counter to Symbolism or, more precisely, it selected only a very restricted number of features from it. Vasy and Belotas Hunc,

but as a promoter of a fresh, although eclectic, and not yet clearly definable aesthetic direction. However, in its attitude toward poetry, as well as the other arts, the Apollon circle soon began to anticipate a swinging back of the pendulum of artistic thought, away from the subjective efforts to "specialize" Symbolism more and more highly, and towards the lessening of its intensity in poetic themes, language, as well as in general sensibility. The old traditional oscillation between the poles of objectivity and subjectivity, seemed to bring artistic thought toward the former.

The impending general change of orientation threatened to leave the orthodox ideologists of Symbolism in a dilemma: whether to abandon their vital principles or

CHAPTER FOUR

APOLLON AND SYMBOLISM

The young staff of Apollon started its journal in the most "up-to-date" Modernist, as well as distinctly Petersburgian spirit. The editors were successful in combining the aesthetic values of the journal Mir iskusstva with the artistic standards currently deliberated by the Symbolist maîtres. Thus Apollon began its activity not as a successor to the still functioning Vesy and Zolotoe Runo, but as a promoter of a fresh, although eclectic, and not yet clearly definable aesthetic direction. However, in its attitude toward poetry, as well as the other arts, the Apollon circle soon began to anticipate a swinging back of the pendulum of artistic thought, away from the subjective efforts to "specialize" Symbolism more and more highly, and towards the lessening of its intensity in poetic themes, language, as well as in general sensibility. The old traditional oscillation between the poles of objectivity and subjectivity, seemed to bring artistic thought toward the former.

The impending general change of orientation threatened to leave the orthodox ideologists of Symbolism in a dilemma: whether to abandon their vital principles or

to face intellectual isolation. In the light of the historical evolution of Russian Symbolism and the tremendous commitment of its champions to their tenets, the first solution appeared to be unthinkable. The second solution involved the loss of subscribers, financial losses and, ultimately, the closing of the outlets so vital for the movement's principles, which were, more than ever, in need of inner support. It would be incorrect to assume that at that time (1909-1911) a new set of principles had arisen to challenge or to replace those of Symbolism. There arose only symptoms of fatigue from partisan efforts to define and to practice the "right," or the "most Symbolist," way. The vigorous and less experienced young generation began to wonder about these symptoms of fatigue. It could not escape their notice that the ideological surrender of the more respectable Vesy before the "wilder" Zolotoe Runo did not rejuvenate either journal. The victorious campaign of V. Ivanov to create Vsenarodnye (everyman's) myths did not produce a more effective stimulus for creativity than had the discarded esoteric Individualism of Belyj. not
"universal"
?

Thus, in the eyes of Apollon, the Symbolist journals found themselves with battered principles, with doctrines questioned by friend and foe, but still with excellent poets who, being only part-time ideologists, were technically and morally likely to abandon their loyalties to militant periodicals in favor of new associations which

could, at any given time, promote their professional advancement more effectively. The publishing houses, too, realized that, by now, the recognized Modernists could find a market for their works if they chose to publish them in individual collections. Such considerations reduced the commercial, as well as the ideological and operational utility of Symbolist periodicals to a minimum. It appeared that the most graceful way for the publishers and editors to "abandon their fortresses" was to announce that the journals would close, not for any disagreeable reasons but, on the contrary, because their ideological victory had rendered the further continuation of the periodicals unnecessary. At the same time, the works of former contributors could still be offered to the public in the form of almanacs, which could be conveniently published at intervals, depending on the accumulation of suitable material. The success of such publications, resting mainly on the reputation of the authors, relieves the editors from the strain of having to conduct continuous ideological polemics, and to choose and to align their contributors accordingly.

One is tempted to conclude from the above solution that the aesthetics of the Symbolists could not only survive a separation from their ideologies, but also outlast the latter as vital influences upon Modernism. However, unlike those of the first "generation," the almanacs of the second, deprived of any ideological charge, appeared

insignificant and non-modern;¹ their aesthetics already had been too well absorbed into the texture of Modernist practice in order to stand out as a path-breaking revelation. *diction*

Published outside the familiar, if by now threadbare, critical and theoretical setting, and divorced from the total context of a poet's work, these almanac poems badly needed, at least, the atmosphere of a fresh approach to taste, if not an entirely new affirmation of their raison d'être. But as it is impossible to create a new play in order to revive an old set, the style and technique of Symbolism, despite excellence, could not be simply transplanted in their entirety into any kind of new poetic motivation. It became evident that de-ideologizing could not save Symbolist aesthetics from the loss of vitality.

The demise of Symbolist periodicals and the lack of vitality of their late almanacs gave rise to the question of the purpose and promise of Apollon as a Modernist periodical. The initial reception given to Apollon by the general press (from cool to negative) reflected a sound, if not a subtle, diagnosis: the new periodical can't be really new; its ties to the Modernist tradition are as obvious as is the absence of a new trend in it. At best, the journal may be only a new variation on an old theme. How then can Apollon generate a new vitality, and formulate any new values, which art and public badly need? It is in this context that credit must be given to Apollon's editors for

sensing, if only half-consciously, the above mentioned swinging back of the intellectual and artistic pendulum. This motion is readily traceable in retrospect, but it was not yet perceived by the other organs of the Russian press.

The turning back towards objectivity, was bound to appear to many as a confusing "new" direction; first of all, a movement backward implies the departure from modernity, which seemed contrary to the intent of Apollon. Secondly, the semi-conscious nature of the motion bereft it of the probability that gradual formulations and elaborations would successfully articulate the turning of the intellectual tide towards a new aesthetics. Thirdly, all such efforts were cuttingly challenged at their core by the sophisticated minds of the Symbolist mâitres, who adhered to their present metaphysical and artistic goals. Later these challenges were replaced by those of the radical experimentalists who insisted on forcing the intellectual and artistic pendulum still further, beyond the limits of Symbolism.

Apollon could boast several assets which allowed it to keep a steady course. Paradoxically, among the major assets was the circle's little concealed snobbery;² although it antagonized certain portions of the Russian intelligentsia, it was the prime source for the indispensable, driving self-assurance of the journal. The conviction of the editors that their taste was superior, and that they published the most elegant and prestigious journal ever to

appear in Russia, allowed them to display the necessary calmness and avoid any rash moves that could jeopardize respectability on one hand, and on the other, to select for publication only the most carefully tested materials. Needless to say, such a policy flattered any contributor the editors desired to invite, and consequently a good public could be attracted by sheer quality, rather than by sensational "newness" or similar provocative devices to arrest attention.

Apollon's qualitative level was asserted from the start; but soon the journal became even more important because it became the only periodical which was purely "Modernist." As such it was forced to carry many of the familiar Modernist issues. The Symbolists, who after a short pause in their formal ideological activities realized that their school can not exist without an ideological content, re-opened their polemics on the pages of Apollon. Apollon, while not interested in the survival of Symbolism, was vitally concerned with the "heritage" of the artistic standards of Symbolism; as the only known form of Modernist poetry; but the editors saw simultaneously to what extent Symbolist art was intertwined with Symbolist metaphysics, and that to extricate the former would practically mean to "untangle [Modern poetry] from the fetters of Symbolism,"³ althogether. The elaborate process of the ensuing emancipation shows no exact chronological boundaries, just as on

the theoretical level it involved personal emancipation from the aesthetics of individual Symbolist maîtres. In short, one may characterize this emancipation as an evolution of a new taste, not ideology. But the ideological crisis within Symbolism cleared the air of Modernism from the ten-year old Symbolist domination, creating the opportunity to view Modernist poetry in other than ideational terms.

Modernist journals in 1909

The swiftly moving cultural developments of the time became more unpredictable with the impending disappearance of Symbolist periodicals. In its third issue (December 1909), Apollon published a small note about this fact. In the column called "Moscow Chronicle," written by the Moscow correspondent M. Vološin who called himself "Outsider"⁴ was the statement that rumours predicted the closing of Vesy. This possibility was viewed as a serious and notable event, since, in its six years of existence the journal had been an important force in Russian cultural life. At the same time, there was noted an increased activity at the publishing house Skorpion, where Vesy was published; Skorpion had plans for an impressive tenth-anniversary almanac for the following year, and a series of books by contributors to Vesy. A smaller announcement from

"Outsider's" pen suggested that Zolotoe Runo also might soon cease publication; only six of the scheduled twelve issues had come out that year. During this month the two journals did, in fact, close, and with their final issues each published a manifesto. Not unlike their opening manifestoes, the closing manifestoes differed greatly. Vesy spoke in an assured, satisfied tone of its role in aesthetics, and Zolotoe Runo discussed its role in serving national causes.

The contrast between the outlooks of these journals and that of Apollon is formally revealed in their closing manifestoes. In the manifesto of Zolotoe Runo, which intended "to determine to what extent [its] tasks have been fulfilled"⁵ the editors of the journal, which "was conceived during the most poignant epoch of social crisis,"⁶ stress the linkage between Russia's political developments and its spiritual values. The aim of the journal "to seek the Golden Fleece right here in the depths of the Russian spirit"⁷ is opposed to that "reflected by Mir iskusstva . . . [whose] formula of 'aestheticism' and 'historicism' . . . in literature and painting is bound to bring Russian art inevitably to a dead end."⁸ This notion is, of course, identical with that expressed in the articles by Čulkov and Gorodeckij which Zolotoe Runo published about Apollon.⁹ The rest of the manifesto restates the journal's familiar principles which "no longer can be

silenced or obliterated by anything."¹⁰

Apollon saw, apparently, little reason to comment extensively on the departure of Zolotoe Runo.¹¹ Historically these journals were not directly connected, and the obvious ideological difference was not even that of a disagreement. Concerned almost exclusively with research about artists and their works, the surviving journal avoided a stand on partisan Symbolist issues on one hand, and on the pursuit of the national spirit on the other. In terms of a national cause Apollon conceived its task in serving the enlightenment of Russia principally through that juste milieu which took Western aesthetical and ethical standards for granted; Apollon was, thus, unconcerned by the complaints of those who thought with Zolotoe Runo that the aims of Apollon were unclear and unpatriotic. In terms of sheer aesthetic appreciation Apollon had little use for the artistic taste¹² and for the imprecise but emphatic "Dionysian" tone of the editors of Zolotoe Runo.

The closing of the aesthetically more sophisticated Vesy produced a greater reaction in Apollon. It also took notice of the more elaborate closing manifesto¹³ in which the editors, first of all, insisted that no considerations external to the journal resulted in its decision to end publication; that decision was prompted wholly by internal considerations. To explain how this internal situation arose, the manifesto traces the important trends in

the history of the journal. The manifesto sees the task of the journal, at its inception, to be that of a vehicle for the whole "organically connected cycle of ideas and experiences known . . . as 'Symbolism,' 'Modernism,' 'New art' and even 'Decadence.'"¹⁴ In its first issue the journal Vesy had announced that it would support the new currents, and as the closing manifesto maintains, it consistently carried out that intention and itself became representative of a movement in Russia very much like Symbolism in other countries. Vesy, the closing manifesto (without Brjusov) remarks, was never oriented exclusively toward aesthetics, but it always emphasized the inseparable connection between aesthetics, on the one hand, and mysticism, metaphysics, and religion, on the other.¹⁵ There is no mention of political concerns. Admitting that there was much flux among the contributors, that disagreements flared and contributors joined and left, the manifesto says:

During the existence of Vesy significant changes occurred in the membership, the role, and the ideological physiognomy of the various contributors to the journal, whereby the most prominent representatives of the direction did not avoid the metamorphosis of their own Weltanschauung.¹⁶

But the editors hasten to assure that these "metamorphoses were merely the result of their movement's dialectical process of maturation"; they continue:

We do not wish to say by this, that the Symbolist movement is dead, that Symbolism has ceased to play the role of the ideological slogan of our epoch, . . . but tomorrow the same word will burn with

another flame, and it already shines differently above us.

By making "tomorrow" the symbol of a distinctly "different" process or phase of cultural growth, the admission is implied that Vesy sees its task only in "yesterday's" phase, which is now "successfully" accomplished. Its relatively clear cultural role the journal defines thus:

Vesy was a sluice which was necessary until the two ideological levels of the epoch fused, and it [the sluice] becomes useless, when this has been reached finally through its endeavors. With the victory of the ideas of Symbolism, in the form they were professed, and had to be professed, by Vesy, the journal itself becomes unnecessary. The end is reached and eo ipso the means become aimless! New aims are emerging.¹⁸

This document may be regarded as more than a mere apology of a journal and an articulation of its role as distinguished from that of other journals. In the history of Russian Modernism this manifesto stands as a milestone at the important point at which Modernist thought, having fully absorbed the benefits of all the forms of Symbolism, has exhausted its capacity to envision further aims. The coming phase of Modernism now had to set new aims, rather than to choose from existing ones. The new generation had at its disposal an impressive artistic heritage, but also a bewildering complex of intellectual directions, mutually contradictory and, for the most part, exhausted.

Accordingly, Apollon courteously acknowledged its indebtedness to the older journal, but never made any

commitments to continue the policies of Vesy. Especially, since in the post-Brjusov period Vesy (1907-1909) stressed its "assertion of inseparable ties between aesthetics and mysticism," the debt, which Apollon felt all Russian culture owed to Vesy was for its earlier accomplishments: the authoritative guidance of Russian minds towards the current level of international standards in literature. In the words of the third-"generation" Modernist, Osip Mandel'stam, "The great merit of Symbolism, its correct position in relation to the Russian reading public lay in its mentorship (učitel'stvo), in its in-born authoritativeness, in the patriarchal solidity and rule-making weightiness towards which it educated its reader."¹⁹

In the April issue of Apollon, Number 7 of 1910, Gumilev wrote about Vesy in a note which he appended to an article on another subject. He explained the break in the continuity of his article by noting that news had just reached him of the closing of Vesy, an event which warranted present attention. Gumilev made, in that brief statement, two important points about the existence of Vesy; his attitude may be regarded as representative of the attitude of Apollon not only in regard to this particular event, but also in regard to the place of Vesy in the history of poetry. First, Gumilev expresses his conviction that Vesy was successful in its role as a militant organ of Modernism:

Russian Symbolism, most fully represented by Vesy, regardless of the fact that it appeared as an inevitable movement in the history of the human spirit, also had the task of being the champion of cultural values which from Pisarev to Gorkij have been treated rather irreverently. This task it fulfilled brilliantly and impressed upon the savages of the Russian press, if not respect for great names and ideas, at least, [it evoked] fear before them.²⁰

The second point to which Gumilev attaches importance in this discussion of the closing of Vesy relates to the place of Symbolism in the history of literature. Gumilev writes that regardless of the fate of the journals and of the Symbolist movement and even regardless of the fate of Symbolism itself, in the history of art and in philosophy the modern artists have accepted Symbolism. Gumilev, who soon became the noted leader of Acmeism, seeking to replace Symbolism, here acknowledged the unquestionable heritage of Symbolism. "Now we can not avoid being Symbolists. This is not a challenge, or a wish, it is only a fact to which I attest."²¹

In the same number Apollon rather injudiciously published an article by Čulkov which also treated the closing of Vesy and which has been called by Georgij Ivanov a "cannibalistic dance over the corpse of his enemy."²² It was in fact a very rude obituary in which Čulkov devoted only one line to the merits of Vesy, among six pages of harsh criticism. That single point for which Čulkov praised Vesy said only that Kuzmin had started his literary

career with that journal. Čul'kov, one of the most partisan former leaders of Zolotoe Runo, in his article divided the history of Vesy into two periods; he wrote that in its first period Vesy preserved a unity under the autocratic direction of Brjusov which gave way, in the second period to "decadence and conservatism."

On the basis of rather different reasoning Apollon found the division useful. The three /early years of Vesy did represent precisely what Gumilev called "the citadel of avant-gardism," under Brjusov, followed by the years of the "over-specialization" of Symbolism in the period of Belyj and Ellis. Čul'kov ironically asserted that the major weakness in Vesy, from its very inception, was that it lacked any ideology. He writes:

Apparently when this journal began, its founders did not finally decide themselves where they should go and what they should preach. They limited themselves to the announcement that Vesy elected for itself as external examples such publications as the British Athenaeum, the French Mercure de France, the German Literarisches Echo . . . In the policy article "Ključí Tajn" one could not find anything essentially new. Its author Valerij Brjusov was trying to base his aesthetics partially on the teaching of Potebnja and partially on the theories of French Symbolists. And, it seems, he felt no chagrin about such eclecticism . . . But indeed it is improper to demand from a poet scientific pedantry and a strict method.²³

The editors of Apollon were embarrassed by the article, an embarrassment that was compounded by the complaints about its unfairness in a letter from a group of former contributors to Vesy. Apollon's editors reiterated

its policy that its articles do not necessarily reflect the views of the journal and apologized for the accidental placing of Culkov's article as first in the series about Vesy.

Recognizing the colossal importance of Vesy and having deep respect for, and the brightest memory, of that journal, the editors [of Apollon] in the nearest future will realize their intention . . . to illuminate all aspects of all its unforgettable and valuable activity.²⁴

The intensity of the issue soon diminished, and in the subsequent issues of Apollon little appeared about the question of Vesy. In Number 7 of 1910 Kuzmin wrote in Apollon that he hesitated to comment upon the end of Vesy since the publishing house Skorpion would still issue the works of its former contributors and its almanacs; thus, Vesy would continue to exist in another form. But in its original form, as a journal, dedicated to introducing and instilling the avant-garde principles into Russian culture, its influence would continue to be felt and the success of its task would be assured.²⁵ In an article about the art section of Vesy 'Baron Wrangel', in No. 10 of Apollon for 1910, had high praise and sobering observations. His sympathetic observations might as well have been applied toward Apollon. He wrote that he knew how difficult a task it was to promote not only the new and advanced in art, but even what was taken for granted by the educated, and concluded that "the whole trouble is that there are almost no people of juste

[&]

milieu in Russia."²⁶ He further expressed amazement that the reaction to the appearance of Vesy had been one of shock at what was thought to be a decadent journal, while, Wrangel' comments, it was simply intelligent. In tribute to Vesy Wrangel' writes that the articles and reproductions, with some minor exceptions, featured in its pages are not démodé, something which cannot be said of Zolotoe Runo.²⁷

In the issue of July-August of 1910, Apollon published two "polite" articles on Vesy's prose fiction and poetry, by Kuzmin and Gumilev, respectively.²⁸ Kuzmin praised the circle of Vesy for having "unity within freedom," and its leaders for displaying a cohesive and organizing force, which Zolotoe Runo and Pereval lacked. About Vesy's literary role of presenting Modernist prose Kuzmin asks calmly: What praise does a journal deserve for bringing forth such works as Ognennyj Angel and Serebrjannyj solub'? Brjusov's masterful novel is a "guidepost on the path to the future novel, as well as a valuable proof of [this path's] purposefulness (celeustremlennost'), and a Russian sample for those who travel on the path of the historical novel."²⁹ The technical shortcomings of Belyj's novel are rendered insignificant by its unslackening pathos, and by the dazzling, at times ecstatic feeling of Russia, which had been heralded in his poems.³⁰ This work presents another new path, that of a symbolical "narrative of manners" genre (simvoliko-bytoopisatel'naja poema).³¹

Gumilev pointed out two merits of Vesy: until 1905, when Vesy decided to arbitrate belletristics, Russian poetry was in a state of chaos, since even journals like Mir iskusstva and Novyj put' were not adequately selective as far as the choice of authors.³² Secondly, Vesy made a wise division of roles among its Modernists: "The leaders maintained the right to revolutionize while the youths were assigned the duties of rear-guard";³³ under such a system progress was swift and reasonably secure. But, nevertheless, he continues, "Symbolism was fading There appeared new tasks, specific for each master, and their works were [still] called Symbolist, only because there was no title that was more appropriate. . . . But, despite all its errors, the history of Vesy may be recognized as the history of Russian Symbolism in its major current."³⁴ It is important to notice that in August 1910, despite the "eclipse of the major current," Gumilev still saw no "more appropriate" description for the works of the Modernist masters.

Modernist Press after 1909

Apollon became, strictly speaking, the only Modernist journal to which writers of both capitals could contribute on a scale, and in a way, that would influence the development of Russian aesthetics. Other outlets either lacked the interest in Modernism per se, or their standards

were below, or behind, those reached by the Modernists. To be sure, there was Petr Struve's Russkaj Mysl'. This "best of our monthlies"³⁵ belonged to the tradition of the so called "stout" (tolstye) journals dedicated primarily to liberal political thought. But because of the journal's "extra-artistic, although high cultural level (Kul'turnost')"³⁶ its large literary section (despite being now headed by Brjusov), according to the critics in Apollon, had the "general character of respectable boredom."³⁷ Russkaja Mysl' chose not to make a strict qualitative selection of which poets to publish,³⁸ nor did the choice reflect a particular aesthetic direction, not even that of novelty (value). As Čudovskij ironically remarks, "The issues [of Russkaja Mysl'] are not meant to be pompous twenty-fifth-anniversary editions of Russian Symbolism."³⁹ Also, Russkaja Mysl' lacked a modern type of literary criticism, because "Brjusov wrote only sporadically, short specialized notes . . . Anton Krajnij [Gippius] writes seldom . . . [because] the 'professorial' depth of knowledge of literature . . . [in the journal] is felt to be insufficient for the demands of Modernist aesthetics; one feels a source of . . . artistic perceptions which is alien to us."⁴⁰ Parenthetically, it should be noted that the appointment of Brjusov as head of the literary section was not necessarily intended as a step to modernize it, because the journal's first choice for that position was Merežkov-

skij, who retired after a short period of uneasy collaboration.⁴¹ Brjusov, too, according to Gippius, found it very difficult to maintain his new office.⁴² According to a report from Moscow by Vološin, Brjusov in his new office will not in any sense continue the policies of Vesy. Russkaja Mysl' is too strongly tied to its thirty-year old tradition in order to change its direction; on the other hand, Brjusov himself, apparently departs from the 'young' literature and will not draft for his cabinet his former colleagues from Vesy.⁴³ "Thus," reports Vološin, "after the closing of Vesy and Zolotoe Runo . . . Moscow remained without an aesthetical journal."⁴⁴ The Modernists from the old capital, as Georgij Ivanov reminisces, ". . . now unemployed or desirous of sabotaging [Apollon, the new undertaking], began to frequent Petersburg."⁴⁵ There were, to be sure, still other minor outlets; but the organs which accommodated them were either, like Russkaja Mysl' not sufficiently Modernist-oriented⁴⁶ or, like the daily Reč,⁴⁷ too restricted in scope to conduct an aesthetic activity consistent enough to be influential.⁴⁸ One should also mention as an outlet the large, commercially oriented, publishing house Šipovnik which popularized those who were already popular and were sure to appeal to wide circles. Mandel'stam described the tradition of Šipovnik as "illiterate, monstrous in its dauby and boorish pretentiousness of almanac literature."⁴⁹ This may have been too vicious an evaluation, but basically,

it was shared by Apollon.⁵⁰

The Symbolist Movement During the Early Years of Apollon

Neither the "too swift and too easy victory"⁵¹ nor the lack of tangible new aims, nor the absence of an influential outlet demobilized the Symbolists. While some of them joined Apollon, others busied themselves with the organization of new centers of which three began to represent distinct directions. The mostly first-generation Aesthetists, traditionally rallied around the publishing house Skorpion, the Transcendentalists founded in Moscow in 1910 their own publishing house, Musaget and the "neo-populists" (neo-narod-niki), a carry-over of one of the principles of Zolotoe Runo, headed by Blok, Pjast, and Čulkov, spent the 1910-1911 season in efforts to establish their own journal under the prospective names Simvolist, Strelec, and Sputnik.⁵² None of the currents produced a periodical, but they all came out, a year later, with representative almanacs, Severnye Cvety, Antologija Musageta, and Sirin, respectively. The "populist" current, representing merely an emotion rather than a professionally articulated political or aesthetic trend, soon dissolved between such diverse forces as the left-wing press, Musaget, and Apollon.⁵³ Most of the old Aesthetes, by now classics of Modernism, felt no need to forge and defend a new common ideology. Consequently,

mat ?

Musaget emerged as the only organization, besides Apollon, dedicated to the advancement of Modernist culture.

The direction, alternative to Apollon, elaborated by the strong coalition of Belyj and his circle, Vjačeslav Ivanov, E. Metner, and a group of professional philosophers headed by F. Stephn, N. Losskij and B. Jakovenko, demands a deeper explication than that provided by the merely distinguishing term Transcendentalists. Technically, like Apollon, Musaget was not only a publishing house but also a center for various activities: literary workshops, lectures and other public presentations.⁵⁴ Unlike Apollon, Musaget did not sponsor art exhibits and showed comparatively little interest in the visual arts; instead it emphasized its members' philosophic inclination by metaphysically approaching "the problem of culture which is the most complex problem of our days."⁵⁵ The traditional Modernist dichotomy became clear once more, only on a more advanced and, perhaps, a more serious level. While, in its approach to culture, Apollon sought to discriminate among and to stimulate certain carefully selected achievements, Musaget sought to discover the very roots of culture in the depths of human spiritual experience. The discovery of the basic cultural creative stimuli, which coincide with mankind's primary truths would, according to Musaget's ideologists blaze a clear path for aesthetic creativity as well as effect the transformation of life by means of consciously

elevating, universally relevant art. The present artistic creativity with its highly sophisticated formal dexterity has become more suitable to express experiences than to produce them, or to find their origins. Hence there is a need to go back to the primeval sources of such experiences. And, these lie clearly beyond the realm of art.

The editor and publisher Emilij K. Metner,⁵⁶ renowned for his interpretations of German, especially Wagnerian philosophy of music, "to spite the French oriented Vesy [promoted] a Germanic approach to culture."⁵⁷ The basic principles of the publishers' Transcendentalist philosophy and policy are summed up in an advertisement for a projected bimonthly: ". . . to isolate philosophy, science, art, and religion [as autonomous disciplines] was the purpose of the cultural labors of yesterday; the task of the near future is to find a single basis for this plurality; it [the basis] coincides with the aim of evolving the ideal of a harmonious life; the meaning of culture [lies] in the establishing of [the] ideal."⁵⁸ And thus, "Musaget outlines its task as [the] modest participation in this search, and in the continuation, of the path to culture."⁵⁹ The "unifying," or syncretizing faculty of Musaget was realized by a four-pronged effort: philosophical studies, translations of and studies in mystical literature, publications of, and about, poetry, and workshops for practical study projects.

In 1910 Musaget began to publish a philosophical

journal, the task of which was to "master our Orphic experiences in the strict and objective forms of the lofty art of . . . logism"⁶⁰ and to submit all cultural values, ancient and modern, to the "organizing power of Logos in order to obtain them [values and experiences] again in the finished, accomplished form of a metaphysically-symbolizing system."⁶¹ This was an inter- or supra-national journal dedicated to abstract philosophical essays, interpretative studies on various thinkers, currently in vogue, and specialized works on the problems of language. The journal appeared under the title Logos,⁶² its Russian editor was Fedor Stepun and the publisher was Musaget until 1912.

Musaget's second culture-searching path was also designed to enhance the possibilities of Symbolism on an ideational basis. It was a series of selected works on mystical literature entitled Orfej. According to Ivanov's manifesto, published for the first time in Russia, such books were to reveal the development of European mysticism, "the roots of which lie in Christianity, on one hand, and in Hellenism on the other. The criterion for selection . . . [was] the authenticity of the author's inner experience, which he truthfully depicts."⁶³ The publishers refrained from objective evaluations of these "inner," or mystical, experiences, in order to abstain from any form of dogmatism. For the same reason the communicative value of these "depictions" was not questioned. "Musaget, on the contrary,

departs from the assumption that mystical cognition is partially communicable, and that the very communicability of it realizes the possibilities of Symbolism in speculation, as well as, in art.⁶⁴ These cognitions are of practical, not theoretical value. "The typical son of the age of neuroticism, . . . is aware of himself in a more complex but also in a dimmer way than the men of the past. . . . The proper distribution of his polar forces [the realm of "I" and "not I"] which opens for man the roads to simultaneous cognition of the . . . rational and the irrational, . . . returns man to his creative instinct within sanity and not insanity, it enforces his religious will, coinciding with his spiritual freedom. . . ." ⁶⁵ In a second manifesto of this series, Belyj augments Ivanov's argument:

Manifold are the roads of ascension to the eternal. . . . Our epoch ascends peculiarly to the synthesis sought by us: in art, more than ever has resounded a mystical note; under the passing images of art we see more often a permanent meaning. This coalescence or, rather, subordination of meanings contained in the material artistic image, we call so far Symbolism. . . . But now we no longer can stop at a symbol. We ask ourselves more and more often: 'A given symbol is a symbol of what?' The What of any symbol can only be a religious reality, many times, and in many forms, captured in the material imagery of the arts. . . . Looking back [at the religious experiences of mystics] we see rows of symbolic images, which express within Christianity in a covert way (pokrovenno) an open (otkrytyj) image; in this sense one may speak of a hieratic system of religious images, subordinated to the central image of all religions. The searching for these subordinations reveals to us the hidden (sokrovennyj) meaning of historical religious forms; involuntary Symbolism becomes voluntary symbolics:

religious culture is where such symbolics are present.⁶⁶

As a third avenue in the effort to penetrate into the essence of culture and to advance it, Musaget published an untitled series of books specially dedicated to artistic creativity. The best illustration of the calibre and direction of this series can be derived from a partial list of works published since its inception by Musaget. They were, for example, such famous books as Belyj's Simvolizm (1910), Arabeski (1911), Tragedija tvorčestva (1911), Ellis' Russkie simvolisty (1910), Boris Sadovskoj's Russkaja Kamena (essays on poetry) (1910), Ivanov's Ellinskaja religija stradajušćego Boga (1913), Borozdy i Meži (1916), Wol'fing's Modernism i Muzyka, G. Račinskij's (ed. and transl.) Adolf Hildebrand's Problema formy v tvorčestve (1913). These titles are sufficient to show how seriously Musaget set to work to revitalize Russian Symbolism. To serve practical poetry, Musaget published collections of poems, for example, of Blok (four books in 1911 and 1912), Gippius (1910), Sergej Soloviev's Aprėl' (1910) and Cvetnik Carevny (1913), Ellis' Stigmata (1911) and in the same year his translations of Baudelaire's prose poems. As a survey of contemporary poetry Musaget published in 1911 the almanac Antologija.

The "study groups" of Musaget were dedicated to practical analysis of Symbolist works, and to attracting

young blood to the movement. According to Vološin's report, "Ellis conducted a course on Baudelaire; B. Sadovskij --on Fet; V. Nilender leads a seminar on Orphyc hymns.

. . . Many young poets and students who have not yet appeared in print have joined Musaget. This [fact] creates roots for the publishers within the growing literary generation. . . ." ⁶⁷

The most notable of these study groups was Belyj's circle of ten to fifteen students known as the "circle of rhythmists" (Kružok ritmistov); this group was "engaged in statistical counting of the rhythm of all Russian poets, according to the method of experimental aesthetics formulated by Andrej Belyj in his book Simvolizm." ⁶⁸

Both, Belyj's method and the book Simvolizm were severely criticized in Apollon ⁶⁹ and even by his colleagues in Musaget ⁷⁰ even after his work was modified by the efforts of his circle. But Belyj initiated an approach which Apollon's students of poetics ⁷¹ and, later, the Russian Formalists adopted as a point of departure. As Victor Erlich concludes: "in spite of their deficiencies, Belyj's studies in versification were an important milestone in the development of Russian scientific poetics. The effort to trace the evolution of a metrical pattern . . . was a long step toward the concrete, historical study of Russian verse.

. . . He painstakingly described the peculiar rhythmic tendencies exhibited by Russian iambic tetrameter. . . ." ⁷²

According to Belyj himself, who lectured on this subject in

St. Petersburg's Society of Adepts of the Artistic Word,⁷³ on January 18, 1912, this task would involve years of computing and charting until they would be able to reach significant conclusions.⁷⁴ Because of Belyj's departure from the country, and the outbreak of World War the "final conclusions" were never reached,⁷⁵ but the second part of Simvolizm, especially the chapters Lirika i eksperiment, Smysl iskusstva and Princip formy v estetike, indicate Belyj's purpose and his anticipated proof that the theory of Symbolism provides the basis for the thesis that form is inseparable from content. Conversely, his verified hypothesis provides the scientific proof that all good poetry (such poetry in which form and content are inseparable, and in this case, in which rhythmic distribution of accents complements fully the expressive intent of the logos), is, and must be Symbolist.⁷⁶ Belyj himself remarked that the collective work of his group improved his method by removing his personal analytic arbitrariness; many gaps in his theory became filled and a number of new statistical methods were invented by other members.

The Debate on Symbolism in Apollon

In their efforts to reach the deepest sources of culture simultaneously on the philosophical, mystical, psychological and aesthetic levels, the leaders of Musaget did

not neglect the value of direct communication through informal and formal speeches and lectures which they delivered in both capitals. The most important literary forum of the time, the Society of Adepts of the Artistic Word, which convened under the auspices of Apollon, was host to a number of such Musagetian excursions.⁷⁷ The drive to re-integrate poetry into culture, which these speeches expressed, achieved two historical results: V. Ivanov's and Blok's speeches on Symbolism given in March and April of 1910 revealed a gap in intellectual awareness between the second and the first "generations."⁷⁸ Later speeches by Pjast, Verxovskij, Belyj and V. Ivanov effected a formal break with the third "generation." Apollon published the first two speeches, and two ensuing responses: that of Brjusov and the reply to it by Belyj. This group of articles achieved great acclaim as "the debate on Symbolism conducted by its four leaders during the night of the crisis of the school," and somehow appears as the major achievement of Apollon's literary career and even becomes causally connected with the "rise of Apollon's Acmeism." To be sure, they are excellently written articles, but of the "four leaders" two, Brjusov and Blok, would hardly agree with such a title; the "crisis" had already ended, since the second "generation" finally consolidated. Apollon, as the only remaining journal, harbored these articles, more or less, accidentally out of personal respect to V. Ivanov and

and Blok. Brjusov's reply was published in order to be disassociated from, and lessen the impact of, the speeches, and Belyj's contribution was published in a backhanded, if not insulting fashion, as will be seen below. Acmeism "arose" almost three years later, and was in no way influenced by this debate. Nevertheless, it is rewarding to examine the debate as an illumination of its participants' views, and as a reflection on the general ferment in Modernism in 1910.

Three days before V. Ivanov's first speech in St. Petersburg, and shortly after a major battle in Moscow's Svobodnaja estetika society, after which "Musaget split away decisively from Skorpion"⁷⁹ Brjusov wrote a letter to V. Percov couched in terms which would have been applicable in the early days of Vesy but which now showed surprisingly little contact with the current literary scene:

In our circle of ex-decadents [?] there is a huge rift: the battle between 'clarists' and 'mystics.' The Clarists are--Apollon, Kuz'min, [sp] Makovskij and others. Mystics are--the Moscow circle of Muzaget [sp], Belyj, Vjač. Ivanov, Solovjev and others. Essentially [they] renewed the most decrepit argument about free art and tendence [?]. 'Klaristy' defend clarity . . . but this is only form, while essentially they defend 'poetry whose aim is poetry' as the old Ivan Sergaevič [Turgenev] said. The Mystic's preach about a 'renewed Symbolism,' 'Mythmaking,' etc. wishing basically that poetry serve their Christianity [?], and be an ancilla [?] theologiae. . . I, as you guess, am wholeheartedly with the 'clarists.'⁸⁰

But the "clarists" of Apollon, although radically alien to the "mystics" were so, not at all on the grounds suggested

by Brjusov. On the contrary, they agreed with Musaget that to serve life was a more noble task than to serve only art;⁸¹ also, they did not deny that there is an underlying principle which may unify the ideas of various arts.⁸² Besides, they did not have to "defend clarity" because nobody argued against writing as clearly as possible. The "Mystics," on the other hand, never advocated a tendency which was tangible enough to be "served" by poetry. As Pjast said correctly in his speech:

Now, nobody argues any longer about the right of Art to exist, about its autonomous value Nobody today defends the point of view of the 'tendentious-ists' ('napravleny'); nobody speaks of the need for the works of art to express 'honest ideas'; in other words the argument is conducted among the victors inter se. . . . The 'content of a work of art' became something different from that which used to be understood under 'content.' It is now generally recognized that the content of a work of art--lies outside of that which is expressed in it, if one were to retell [that which was] expressed, in one's own words. . . . A work will become a work of art if [the work] is spoken in the 'Language of Gods.' The 'Language of Gods' may speak on whatever subject one wishes . . . [therefore] content is only a part; the whole is the 'Language of Gods.' Thus, the argument is not conducted about the 'part' but about the whole. . . . Is the 'Language of Gods' that of the artist and artist only? Or is it the language spoken by somebody behind the artist? Does that language evoke in us only aesthetic emotions, or does it stir our soul unto its depths, which are other than the aesthetic depth, by lighting [the soul] with a new and unknown flame? Need an artist be only an artist in order to speak the 'Language of Gods'? These are the questions which constitute the subject of the argument among those who are in the avant-garde of artistic consciousness.⁸³

Pjast, hereby, supplied the argumentation for the Musaget question that, after art had finally been recognized as free and autonomous, do the artists wish to, and can they be, significantly creative if they deliberately stay free from extra-aesthetic associations?

The original text of the Ivanov speech given on March 26, 1910, was enlarged and made more argumentative in the Apollon version.⁸⁴ As all Ivanov writings, the essay is impressively compact and capable of "convincing even those who continue to disagree."⁸⁵ If reduced to its barest logic, Ivanov's familiar argument that Symbolist poetry is more than art proceeds as follows: its starting point lies in Ivanov's observation that certain excellent artists have used the method of symbolization to endow their works with extra-verbal spiritual meaning. Among these artists Ivanov judges successful those who most extensively avail themselves of the method of symbolization. Because this method appears throughout the history of art, Ivanov reasons, art is symbolistic in nature. It is only good art, however, that partakes of "true" Symbolism; antisymmetrically, however, Symbolism surpasses good art, for the spiritual meaning to which true Symbolism and true Symbolism alone has access lies in the realm of religion. Therefore, concludes Ivanov's argument, good art is religious, and the good artist is a theurgist. Such a view of the artist in his capacity as theurgist suggests two implica-

tions: one, that the source of inspiration is outside the individual ego; and two, that the artist as theurgist has universal relevance. This article Ivanov directs also against two other interpretations of Symbolism. One is illusionism, or romantic urges, which Ivanov calls the "universal tragedy of isolated individuals" and the other is "art for art's sake." To lend objectivity and the commendments of tradition to his thesis, Ivanov uses arguments drawn from history. He thus equates the nature of art with its origin, the Dionysian rites, and in Russia the origins of conscious Symbolism as Ivanov understands it, he attributes to Tjutčev.

Ivanov argues that Symbolism as an artistic method is only the means for the communication of noumenal experiences; it is, however, the sole means for such communication. He begins his article by quoting from Tjutčev's *"Silentium"* "Mysl' izrečennaja est' lož'". He thus identifies Tjutčev's poetry as the clearest statement and illustration of the rift between man's spiritual growth and his modern means of "logical" or discursive communication. Tjutčev, the article states, was the first Russian to reveal the necessity of the dual language for a double viewing of a dual existence and creativity, for adds Ivanov, "such is [the nature of] the subconscious." The dual language of Symbolism recalls the almost immemorial era when the rhythmical speech or chant was used to evoke universal order in all life.

Such were the direct tasks of ancient poetry: hymnal, epic, or elegiac. Ivanov argues that "art for art's sake" was alien to ancient art, because such a notion has no direct concern for divine purposes as well as for the audience. Vjačeslav Ivanov, who sees ancient art as the intermediary between man and the gods, and Symbolism as the resurrection of that function, finds that the "Parnassian" interpretation of Symbolism deprives it of its purpose and violates its nature. Ivanov says that cosmic themes now permeate the content of poetry. In order to perceive this content, or this new Welterkentniss, modern poetry mobilizes all its sophisticated resources to devise a system of mystical signals for universal communication. Thus, Ivanov argues, art has arrived at the stage where illusionism has been outlived, and man may be liberated from his solipsistic microcosm.

The stress on the "liberation of the artist" was not made sufficiently clear in this article-speech; if it had been, there would have hardly ensued a debate. The younger "generation," who were all Ivanov's pupils, were familiar with, and respectful of, his "commandments." Without proposing a counter-doctrine they simply began to find their own creative inspiration and method in other sources than did Ivanov, regardless of how the older poets interpreted Symbolism. But the leaders of the two trends within the older generation, Merežkovskij and Brjusov, did take a

strong stand against Ivanov's linking art with religion: the first for not doing so sufficiently, and the second, for inhibiting the freedom which both of them had originally won for poetry. The issues became even more muddled, after Blok gave his accompanying speech,⁸⁶ the intent of which was to supply Ivanov's historic-theoretical treatise with a personal-experiential aspect; Blok introduced two additional notions: populism and hell. In order to clarify the position of Blok's speech one must recall some of his personal or biographical characteristics. Lacking the inclinations and the talent for polemics, Blok avoided, as much as he could, taking part in any schools, as well as in theorizing about his vocation. The latter he cursed, because the ethical gap between the intelligentsia and the people produced a parallel gap in his consciousness between the artist and the voice of Russia. As the gap widened, he was painfully aware that the activities of the intelligentsia to which he, as an artist, belonged, struck invariably false notes with him, vis-a-vis the essential issues, and with the social reality. Thus he refused to be on the editorial board of Musaget⁸⁷ and avoided periodically the contact with such allies as Belyj or Čulkov or Ivanov.⁸⁸ It was exceedingly difficult for them to persuade the unwilling⁸⁹ but famous, and potentially so evocative, lyricist as Blok to make a formal appearance. Finally, in the name of a "greater cause than we ourselves"⁹⁰ on April 8, 1910,

use
English

assured by Ivanov that he could "speak frankly about whatever he liked"⁹¹ and that Ivanov too, "essentially spoke about the same subject--the people,"⁹² Blok delivered his lyrical report. It was supposed to be a companion speech, but although not opposed to Ivanov's thesis, it had very few points coinciding with it.⁹³ The notes Blok took during the Ivanov speech reveal that Blok's impression was that, what Ivanov described as salvation from solipsism, or universal communication, was the artist's turning towards the people artističeskoe narodničestvo;⁹⁴ it was an idea which, for years preoccupied Blok. The element of hell Blok forcefully analyzed in relation to artistic solipsism. Blok was rather dissatisfied with the quality of his speech, but changed his mind "after it looked unexpectedly important in print,"⁹⁵ later he even considered it to be his best essay,⁹⁶ although he still was not sure about its communicative value.⁹⁷ The accuracy of Blok's title "On the Present Condition of Russian Symbolism" (O sovremennom sostojanii russkogo simvolizma) could also be questioned, since the announcement, at the beginning, that Blok will use the model of his own creative process as a guide through Ivanov's theories, did not specify to what extent this model represents Ivanov's argument, and Russian Symbolism in general. *would/*

At the start Blok apologizes that even to approach such a difficult and elusive subject, he must himself use

symbolic language. Indeed, his attempt to portray symbolically the ineffable process of creativity is at times almost incomprehensible, thus illustrating negatively, in the privateness of the vision, what Ivanov wrote that art should not do. Blok's biographer Konstantin Močul'skij argues on the other hand, that Blok made it clear that he who will not understand this "guide" will also not understand the "lands." "One must remember that the 'land' described by Blok is a mystical reality; his language . . . is that of a mystic. . . . The author . . . writes '[that all] my poems are only a detailed and consistent description of what I am saying in this article.'"⁹⁸ Močul'skij goes as far as saying that this article is the most remarkable and the most successful of all attempts to symbolize the inexpressible. He considers Blok to be a creation of a new genre of artistic prose which "undertakes the difficult task of fixing musical waves verbally . . ."⁹⁹ Blok distinguishes three stages in the creative process. The first is what he calls the "prophetic stage," the initial step in which the artist perceives events and forces which are visible to him alone. In the second stage, the "tragic stage," he must fasten that vision to concrete forms and defined articulation, thus producing the work of art. At the third, the "pathetic stage," or alienation, after the vision has been embodied in the work of art, the prophet has become only a poet; he is now divorced from the mystical sources

Give
Russia

of his prophecy.

Throughout his career Blok revealed a sense of the immediacy of his visions. (In that sense he leaned to the trend of "realistic-mysticism" of Ivanov.) In this article in Apollon it can be seen how deeply subjective Blok actually was. For him central to creativity was the stage of tragedy, which was precisely that tragedy which Ivanov believed that true Symbolist creativity had overcome. Blok writes of the most intimate perceptions and places them in the private settings of his sensory reception. He speaks of

. . . worlds, which call more and more; . . . from their depths surge painful musical sounds, calls, almost words. At the same time they begin to assume colors (here appears the first profound knowledge of colors); finally a color appears as predominant which I would find best named purple-violet (although this name is perhaps not completely accurate).

The golden sword, which pierces through the violet worlds begins to burn dazzlingly--and pierces the heart of the theurgist. A face begins to appear amidst celestial roses, one recognizes a voice; a dialogue begins, . . .¹⁰⁰

The second "dialectical" stage of creativity, which Blok also calls the antithesis, is no less subjectivistic; this is the stage of the shift from prophetic perception to poetic expression. At this stage the artist is subjected to hellish torment, and he who goes through the stage is no longer alone. "He is full of many demons (otherwise called 'doubles') out of which his evil creative will arbitrarily makes constantly changing groups of conspirators. At every

moment through these conspiracies he hides some part of his soul from himself."¹⁰¹ After passing through this unholy alchemy, the artist finds himself with a product that is neither alive nor dead. "My miraculous world became my own arena . . . a show booth (balagan) where I myself play a role next to my marvelous dolls."¹⁰² Life and art have become fused in the "hell" he sees is art. At this stage Blok ponders the great questions about civic duties, about the "people and the intelligentsia," and about the return to life of the artist.

Here, Blok feels, the choice between a pessimistic or an optimistic attitude, is irrelevant. The sin and the guilt are too great; there is no solution for the [subjectivist] artist because he is trapped in "art which is a monstrous and a magnificent hell."¹⁰³ In his conclusion, Blok departs further from Ivanov's thesis. Blok counsels the artist to remember the price for the "fusion of art and life . . . [and to] remain humble even in daring."¹⁰⁴ Remaining in life, and as "simple men" [not theurgists] artists should cherish the example of "the pilgrimage of Signorelli, who in his old age arriving at the strange and rocky Orieto, humbly asked its citizens to permit him to decorate their new chapel."¹⁰⁵ To become a craftsman and not a prophet; to blend in with the belief of the citizens, rather than to impose one's own creed on them, and to "ask their permission" rather than to "burn their hearts"--such

mak?
Orieto?
?

pleas, unexpectedly, anticipate the attitudes of the post-Symbolists in Apollon, perhaps Mandel'shtam and Axmatova, and their "Guild of Poets." Another deviation from Ivanov's thesis was the transplantation of the "more than art," "Language of Gods" concept into the setting of social service, not even on the grounds of the mystical Vsenarodnost', but on the simple basis of occasion and permission. It is likely that Blok arrived at such a cadence under the influence of his recent Italian journey. According to his notebook, the trip could deliver him from the "demon of irony" and "stir the spirit of curiosity and humility."¹⁰⁶ Blok observed Signorelli's fresco in which the painter depicts himself as a passive observer of the casting down of the devil. The idea that an artist only observes an experience but does not create it, Blok had already expressed in his Ital'janskije stixi in the January issue of Apollon; the poem Maria da Spoleto employs several images to appear later in the speech (the piercing swords, the dazzling apparition of the Girl-deva, the monk martyrdom etc.), and in it Blok exclaims:

Liš' kak xudožnik smotrju za ogradu
Gde ty sryvaeš' cvety, . . .¹⁰⁷

This, in Puškin's terms, "echoing" function of the humble artist lends, for the first time in Blok, a "professional" aspect to the Romantic notion of offering oneself to the people.¹⁰⁸ Already in August 1909, thinking of young poets

as apprentices Blok wrote in similar words as in the conclusion of his speech: "If you wish to learn, come to us, we will perhaps accept some of you as pupils under the condition of [your] modesty and obedience."¹⁰⁹ Thus we can see perhaps what association came to Blok's mind while he listened to Ivanov's "synthetic," or "dynamic stage of Symbolism" and the "canon": Blok exclaimed in his notebook in italics: "Art has a practical purpose!"¹¹⁰

Brjusov launched his energetic protest against the speeches of Ivanov and Blok promptly and on the same arena. Instead of publishing it in his own Russkaja Mysl', Brjusov submitted his reply for the very next issue of Apollon under the rather heroic title On 'Slavish Speech' in the Defense of Poetry (O 'reči rabskoj' v zaščitu poezii).

Brjusov charged his colleagues with contempt for "mere poets"¹¹¹ and with illegitimate use of the term "Symbolism."¹¹² The attack was easy: Brjusov used a mocking approach to show how absurd it is to demand that a poet absolutely has to be something other than a poet: a chemist, a member of Parliament or a theurgist.¹¹³ Re-wording Blok's question: "is there a possibility to cease being a 'poet' and to become again a 'theurgist'?"¹¹⁴ Brjusov replies, "It seems sufficiently clear that the question is not at all related to Symbolism."¹¹⁵ "Symbolism is an artistic method, realized in the school which received the name "Symbolist."¹¹⁶ There is sufficient proof, Brjusov

argued,¹¹⁷ that the "Symbolist movement" is a definite historical phenomenon, connected with specific names and dates. . . . It found followers in all literatures of Europe, fertilized with its ideas other arts, and could not help being reflected in the Weltanschauung of the epoch. But, nevertheless, it always developed, exclusively, in the realm of art."¹¹⁸ Disqualifying, thus, Ivanov's "historical distortions," Brjusov attacks Blok's motivation: "One can by no means recognize [his] path as typical for a contemporary poet. Those sins of which (A.) Blok repents, 'Symbolism' does not recognize as pertinent, and it has nothing to 'redeem.'"¹¹⁹ With their radical measures Ivanov and Blok will not change the ten-thousand-year-old course of poetry, but they might inhibit their own excellent gifts as poets, by becoming theurgists of dubious quality.¹²⁰ With this conclusion and with the noticeable call "Give it [art] finally, its freedom!"¹²¹ Brjusov fought only a strawman. Neither Ivanov nor Blok talked about, or meant, any restriction on the arts or on the poets. Speaking about creativity, the source of inspiration, and universal relevance, they spoke about an attitude and not about a profession; with the intent to supply artists with dynamic resources (which, by the way, Brjusov had begun to lack as a poet), they clearly meant to enhance and not to alter the historical course of poetry. They recommended no radical measures (as Brjusov had done, fifteen years earlier), but simply the mobilization of the

already available means. Despite his tragic outlook, Blok did not repent his path, which he also strongly emphasized later;¹²² he neither inhibited his talent nor did he call for theurgy as a ritualistic (in the strict sense) practice. He and Ivanov only urged contemporary poets to maintain, (only) during the process of creativity, in a constant rapprochement with the original source of inspiration, or vision, whether it be of a subconscious, extra-sensory, ecstatic or mystical nature. Since the nature of such a vision, they thought, allows communication only by a symbolic transmission, they adhered to the methods pondered by the Symbolist school. The conscious addition of a philosophical motivation to these methods, was, to them, consistent with the ancient properties of Symbolism. Brjusov's historical correction of this argument is irrelevant, because his opponents regarded their connection with the particular school, which in 1886 adopted the title "Symbolist," as purely coincidental. One need only recall, that from the standpoint of Symbolist practice, the thoughts of Tjutčev, Solov'ev, Nietzsche, and Ibsen were far more relevant to the Musaget circle, than the techniques of Verlaine, Mallarmé or René Ghil, or the sensibilities of Baudelaire and Rimbaud.

For (the above listed) reasons, Blok was not at all disturbed by Brjusov's reply. He sent in September of 1910 (to Brjusov) a collection of poems to be published in

Russkaja Mysl' with the flattering remark that he did not see how he could have collaborated with that journal before Brjusov's editorship. Further below, in reference to Brjusov's rebuttal Blok wrote: "I could reply to each point of your article in Apollon but, is it worth it to prolong printed controversies? Such articles, I feel, are always dogmatic, and personal truths (pravdy), written between the lines, are convincing to the outside reader only once, when he makes the choice between this or that Weltempfindung (mirootnošenie). And then, this choice is [made] forever."¹²³

Blok was far more disturbed by the response of Merežkovskij which "resounded as if from somewhere above, as if from a huge distance."¹²⁴ The distance between Merežkovskij's critique and its subject (Ivanov's and Blok's articles) was indeed larger than that allowed by Brjusov, but it touched Blok's sore point, especially by the thoroughly "contemptuous and biased approach to the matter."¹²⁵ Merežkovskij charged the younger poets with mania grandiosa and with betraying the cause of civil liberties.¹²⁶ In an "Open letter to D. Merežkovskij,"¹²⁷ which Blok wrote in November 1910, but did not publish,¹²⁸ Blok explained at length why it was no "satanic pride" to draw analogies between the psyche of Russia and that of the individual. In the above cited letter to Belyj,¹²⁹ Blok also complained that Merežkovskij could not, or did not want to,

understand when Blok wrote candidly of himself.¹³⁰ Most of all, on the basis of Merežkovskij's article, he, Blok, began to suspect the lucidity of his own essay.¹³¹

The Moscovite members of Musaget essentially ignored Merežkovskij, but reacted to Brjusov's response. Ellis, Pjast, Ivanov, and especially Belyj, remembered the articles Ključī tajn ("Keys to Mysteries") and Svjaščennaja žertva ("Sacred Sacrifice") published by Brjusov in Vesy in 1904 and 1905, and attacked him ad hominem for betraying¹³² his former theurgical ideals,¹³³ and regretted that he had become "a formalist, a one sided aesthete, and an immoralist."¹³⁴ The first reply to Brjusov's article per se, appeared, two issues later, in Apollon.¹³⁵ It was written by Belyj and it was his only contribution to that journal as an essayist. Belyj argues that besides the fact that, historically, Symbolism developed along not one, but two avenues--French, as a school, and German, as a Weltanschauung (Mirovozzrenie). "It is important for us not how Symbolism was formed historically, but what is . . . Symbolism, as a school--and . . . as a Weltempfindung (Mirooščuščenie). The recognition on the part of the two major Russian Symbolists that Symbolism is not merely a literary school, does not at all point to a betrayal of the tenets of Symbolism, but [it points] to the character of Russian Symbolism, originally realized."¹³⁶ The betrayal, Belyj argues, was committed by Brjusov, who in 1910 disavowed his

own principles of 1905, and who pronounced "woe to him who will exchange a crown for a wreath" (Gore kto obmenit / Na venok venec).¹³⁷ Claiming that it is Brjusov, who imposes historical and geographical limitations on the growth of Symbolism, Belyj argues that it is only natural for the progress of humanity to expand beyond the boundaries of the French school which did not possess a metaphysical foundation in the first place, and actually, vulgarized art, by reversing the process of Symbolization: "they only clouded the (formerly clear) external appearance of an image while losing its internal mysteriousness."¹³⁸ Belyj contrasts the creativity of the "democratic" French Symbolists with that of the "aristocratic" Symbolists like Goethe, Nietzsche and Ibsen whose ". . . tone is that of a sermon because they recognize in an artist a creator of life . . . from art will come new life and the salvation of mankind."¹³⁹ Historically, Belyj sees Symbolism as a worldwide phenomenon which "lies still completely in the future."¹⁴⁰

Belyj's prediction, as we now can see, did not come true; certainly not literally, but at the time of the debate in Apollon, in summer 1910, the Musaget group showed a remarkable foresight when they proposed to forge a Symbolist orthodoxy to save Symbolism as a dogma, if not as a sect. It was clear to them that neither Brjusov's nor Merežkovskij's alternatives could possibly have a future

from the standpoint of Symbolism. The "heresy of public utilitarianism"¹⁴¹ of Merežkovskij, which sought to infuse symbols of spirituality into the civic cause of the revolution, no longer promised any future for most Modernists. Brjusov, on the other hand, was not able to provide a further direction for Symbolism, either.

The alternative of the aestheticist branch of Russian symbolism should not be confused with that of French Parnassianism. The sensibilities of the twentieth-century Russian Modernists were much too finely tuned to their psyches. Bal'mont's, Annenskij's and Sologub's and even Brjusov's brand of Symbolism was closer to what Edmund Wilson defined as "an attempt by carefully studied means-- a complicated association of ideas represented by a medley of metaphors--to communicate unique personal feelings,"¹⁴² or, as Ivanov said more vividly: "to contain a metaphor not in one particular utterance but to develop it into a whole poem."¹⁴³ Such a practice, even in its most deliberate manifestations represents the use of impressionistic means for illusionistic ends. The pastime of "charming the imagination" which, in Mallarmé's words, provided "three quarters of the enjoyment of the poem which is derived from the satisfaction of guessing little by little, . . ."¹⁴⁴ could no longer be taken as a serious purpose for creativity after 1910. Indeed, if limited to the pursuit of such "Mystery," or to Valéry's definition as "the common intent

of several families of poets to recover their own birth-right from music,"¹⁴⁵ international Symbolism had run its course.¹⁴⁶ If it became apparent that after the formal achievements of the Parnassians a new content had to be breathed into poetry in order to keep it alive, it became similarly clear that the enormous technical refinement, introduced by the "aesthetic," or "associative" Symbolists will fade into vapidness or, into sterile over-specialization, unless these refinements are used as a means for new and more vital "manly" purposes. And even if such were found, it was likely that the elaborate mechanism of the "illusionists" would turn out to be too fragile, too cryptic, and too subjective a vehicle for the messages of any new, more "manly" sensibility.

After the debate in Apollon, with the dead end of the directions of the first "generation" Symbolists in sight, the issue emerged whether to mobilize Symbolism further for the goals set by the second "generation" in Musa-geset, or to abolish Symbolism, as a generic concept of creativity altogether. Apollon's young editorial board and its third generation of Modernists, began, almost from the inception of the journal, that is, from approximately a year before the debate, to take the second view. For want of original theoretical principles Apollon's alienation from Symbolism proceeded along gradual and non-militant lines. By the time of the debate, this alienation had proceeded

far enough for Apollon to stay completely aloof from its issue. Not a single remark appeared in Apollon for or against either interpretation of Symbolism.¹⁴⁷ Gumilev's article about Vesy, which appeared in the same issue as Brjusov's contribution to the debate, implied clearly that the debate on Symbolism was irrelevant to the present reality of art as Gumilev saw it, since "the movement . . . is sufficiently clarified"; its historic course ended with Vesy, and "the very arguments about Symbolism show that the poets are no longer satisfied with the term."¹⁴⁸

Belyj's contribution was put in small print in the Xronika sections with a footnote of the editors explaining that for "lack of space" this "important" debate will be continued outside of the main section.¹⁴⁹ But there appeared no further contributions in Apollon to justify the editors' concern about space.

One may speculate that, despite closer contact with Ivanov and Blok¹⁵⁰ than with Brjusov, the sympathies of Apollon were on the side of the latter; such alliance could occur not because Brjusov may have represented a "truer" Symbolism, but because he refrained from ideologizing, and treated the movement as if it were an academic matter of the past. It is also not insignificant that immediately preceding Belyj's essay, the editors printed in the main section of the same issue an annihilating criticism of Belyj's book Simvolizm by Brjusov.¹⁵¹ Besides

casting doubts on Belyj's "encyclopedic erudition," by accusing him of giving a most random bibliography, and embarrassing the author of this book on verbal art by showing examples of his very careless writing, Brjusov attacked Belyj's claim to have offered a scientific method. Belyj, who for obvious reasons was forced to choose for his analysis a limited number of poets and of their verse, failed to convey his method of selection, or to explain why his conclusions, reached from a study of random material, lend themselves to objective generalizations. The gravest error was to claim a scientific or any, gain from analyzing the pyrrhic foot, only one of many rhythmical factors in the iambic tetrameter, with the assumption that it will provide comparative insights about the rhythmic characteristics of the analyzed poets. Brjusov concludes his review with the observation that Belyj has all the potential to fulfill his task, but that the failures on his part are the results of hastiness. This diletantish hastiness Brjusov attributes to Belyj's urge to build bridges immediately, from his scanty observations of the laws of versification, to Symbolism, Theosophy, Antroposophy, etc., instead of patiently collecting materials for a foolproof research.

Undoubtedly this review of Brjusov diminished the impact of Belyj's article. It appears also, without a doubt, that the editors of Apollon were well aware of such an effect. Furthermore, merciless criticism of this type

was highly cultivated in Apollon (Brjusov himself fell victim to it later)¹⁵² becoming from year to year more subtle. The critics in Apollon assumed higher and higher standards for the works which they reviewed. By becoming increasingly factual and less ideologically polemical, Apollon, departing from Brjusov's type of criticism advanced Russian Modernism not only towards new standards for judging artistic purposes and achievements, but, most importantly, towards a new taste in criticism and creativity. Questioning the methods of a scholar before attacking his ends, and analyzing the effect of a work of art before discussing the motivation of the author, was not an innovating idea, but carried out consistently, it was an unusual, as well as, alas, unspectacular if not unpopular practice which Apollon introduced into the impulsively developing Russian Modernism.

The combat among the Symbolists did not cease after the debate in Apollon. Musaget, in view of the alienation from its host Apollon, and to accommodate Ivanov's idea to publish intimate, diary-like theoretical notes of the leading Symbolists, decided to publish in Moscow their own periodical Trudy i Dni.¹⁵³ This bi-monthly was designed as an intimate "diary of thinkers" (primarily of Belyj, Ivanov and Blok) but officially, its dual purpose was announced thus: "1) To aid the spreading and the affirmation of the principles of genuine Symbolism in the sphere of

artistic creativity. 2) To interpret the ideational connection . . . of artists and thinkers [who are] consolidated under the flag of Musaget." ¹⁵⁴ The journal was edited by E. Metner and Belyj. ¹⁵⁵ In its fifth issue the journal announced that in keeping with its intention to serve as an organ of ideas (rather than surveys of temporal events), the journal will appear at irregular intervals. In 1916 Trudy i Dni ceased to appear. But although now generally forgotten, the journal published a number of impressive articles, for example, some of the best essays of V. Ivanov, (Lico, manera i stil', Granicy iskusstva, O suščestve tragedii). ¹⁵⁶ N. Nedobrovo's considerable methodological improvement over Belyj's approach to prosody entitled Ritm metr i ix vzaimootnošenie, ¹⁵⁷ Blok's essay Ot Ibsena k Strindbergu, ¹⁵⁸ O liričeskoj teme by S. Bobrov, ¹⁵⁹ and smaller articles by Stepun, S. Durylin, Belyj, Sidorov, S. Solov'ev, B. Sadovskoj, plus a number of reviews by V. Ivanov, Kuzmin and S. Solov'ev. ¹⁶⁰ The first two issues were dedicated almost entirely to the debate on Symbolism published in Apollon. Trudy i Dni, as mentioned earlier, printed a number of subsequent speeches given by Pjast (Oct. 30, 1911), Verxovskij (same date) and Ivanov and Belyj (Dec. 1911 and Feb. 18, 1912). Whereas the original motive of those speeches was to prove that Symbolism does not (as Brjusov feared) demand that poetry serve a heteronomous end, now, two years later the arguments became more

pointed against the younger, third "generation" poets, who did not dispute the "right of poetry to serve an even higher cause" but who doubted that the "higher cause" had to be Transcendental.¹⁶¹ In their impatience towards those who misinterpret or subvert the precious structure of Symbolist metaphysics, the leaders of the school, especially in the ensuing discussion, applied terms "consciously designed to repel"¹⁶² the epigones and the heretics. Such an effort must have been successful; the second "generation" Symbolists became closely united (Ivanov moved to Moscow) and the situation in Petersburg crystallized, as described rather accurately, in a March 1913 entry of Blok's diary:

The entire literary front experiences a clearing of atmosphere. This is gladsome but also sad. People cease to pretend that they 'understand Symbolism' and supposedly like it. Soon they will cease feigning their love to art. Art and religion are dying in [this] world; we are going into catacombs, we are completely despised. The most cruel form of persecution [is] complete indifference. But, thank God, because of that we will be smaller in number, and we will become qualitatively better . . .¹⁶³

As a parallel development, in the June issue of 1912, Apollon published a letter to the editors¹⁶⁴ in which Kuzmin presents a number of reasons why he decided to break with the "renewed Symbolism as it is expressed in Trudi i Dni."¹⁶⁵ Kuzmin is not only offended by the editor's unexplained omission of the ending of his review of Ivanov's Cor Ardens,¹⁶⁶ which was done apparently because the editors "disagree with [Kuzmin's] views," and by Cunctator's

(Belyj's) reference to the "police district of clarity" (a hint that it is Kuzmin's insistence on clarity¹⁶⁷ which imposes unwarranted restrictions upon artistic creativity); Kuzmin, like Brjusov, argues that any Transcendentalist demands, no matter how correct, are unrelated to the theory of art; furthermore, the notion that a Symbolist work of art includes a built-in calculated assessment of its impact upon the recipient, is to Kuzmin, based on very shaky grounds since Ivanov's alleged transmissional devices, "echoes" and "overtones"¹⁶⁸ are mathematically tangible, which is something one can by no means say about the properties of Symbolism. Also, like Brjusov, Kuzmin "belonging to the district of Clarism," objects to Musaget's non-historical treatment of the term "Symbolism."

If the rift was clearly apparent between the poets of the second and the third "generation," Apollon's position remained courteous, but circumspectly specific. Valerian Čudovskij, one of Apollon's most thoughtful columnists, undertook in a review of Trudy i Dni¹⁶⁹ the task to define his journal's official relation to the last and purest stronghold of Russian Symbolism. Čudovskij stresses repeatedly that, taken separately, all articles in Trudy i Dni are "good and even magnificent; in many [of them] I felt the genuine vision of the truth by which I [myself] live";¹⁷⁰ but together these articles reflect the underlying intention to unite internally poetry, art and religious

philosophy. Čudovskij admits that integration of all culture and life is a profound and beautiful wish but, to him, the tendency to resist diffusion or atomization of culture which may be caused by individual "formalist" searches of most contemporary artists, is dangerous and unnecessary.

"Apollon feels that such a tendency is dangerous" because it will turn life, as well as art, into an abstract speculative gnosticism and, thus, isolate these areas from the nature of man. It is an unnecessary tendency because

artistic life will acquire its unity from within itself. . . . Our task, the task of Apollon, is to demonstrate that the seeming diffusion of the artistic searches . . . has its own synthesis, distinct from that which religion calls the One (Edinyj), --[it is] the synthesis of pure Beauty. We do not argue with them [the Transcendentalists] if they tell us: 'There is only one God,' we will reply, 'Yes, but for art, his name is--Sun.'¹⁷¹

Čudovskij fears that the heterodoxy of Trudy i Dni is of a greater danger than if it had been a plain heresy, which would have perished automatically; "the heterodoxy of [our] brother may eventually corrupt our own faith."¹⁷² Čudovskij warns that, even though Stepun writes on behalf of Trudy i Dni that extreme Transcendentalism may produce "the ugliness of extracultural saintliness," he also regards extreme formalist creativity as "luciferianism." Čudovskij feels that the fear of the latter might drive Musaget and Trudy i Dni so far towards "the ugly extracultural saintliness" that an artist could not be blamed if, to save his art, he were to turn towards the opposite, Luciferian pole

of "extreme formalism."

Thus, officially Apollon maintained an affinity with "our beloved" individual masters, rejecting only their collective ideology. But the individual members of Apollon became critical not only of the ends of "true" Symbolism but of the means of its representatives as well. For example, one might have expected that the decision of the former publishers of Vesy and Zolotoe Runo to issue Symbolist verse in almanacs, without polemical essays, would have caused universal acclaim, but neither the Antologija of Musaget nor the Severnye Cvety of Skorpion¹⁷³ created any enthusiasm on the part of the third "generation." Gumilev who appeared in, and reviewed, both volumes,¹⁷⁴ blamed Musaget not only for being unrepresentative and unselective (Musaget excluded all first "generation" poets and many "established" younger ones; on the other hand at least twenty "worthless" authors were printed), but, primarily for making no editorial effort to order the material in a way that would demonstrate either some hierarchical concept, or point in some definable direction. Giving a usual praise to the usually recognized masters, Ivanov, Blok, Belyj, Kuzmin and S. Solov'ev, Gumilev mercilessly chides their young epigones. With the exception of Vladislav Xodasevič whose verse "delight with free and sure strokes, seriousness and hidden melancholy . . . and faultless form,"¹⁷⁵ all others lack either taste or originality,

or both. It is curious to compare Gumilev's response with the even more negative reaction to the almanac expressed by Blok. In his notebook Blok marked that it was "a totally worthless book"¹⁷⁶ and in a letter to Belyj (the editor), Blok questions the very purpose of almanacs at this stage of Modernism.¹⁷⁷ The Aestheticist Severnye Cvety carrying the works of former friends of Vesy received Gumilev's praise for a well worded preface which asserts that the authors are not and never have been a particular literary group; there only common conviction is to serve "higher art" as the highest value. Gumilev writes that at the first sight, Somov's cover and the list of familiar time-tested names of authors are reassuringly pleasant, but with the exception of a tiny comedy by Kuzmin (Gollandka Liza), and a couple of brilliant poems by Brjusov, "there is nothing [in the volume] that does not cause annoyance": Gippius coyly entitles her poor assonances as "Inappropriate rimes," Bal'mont fails to see that even sugar-sweet words need some connection, Sadovskoj thrives on a wornout eroticism, and the younger authors are "very poor, . . . and promise nothing."¹⁷⁸ The most interesting point in this review is the observation, that, if relieved from ideologizing, Symbolism is ineffectual, at least in a collection of pieces which stand isolated from the total environment of their author's works. "What was good six, seven years ago in Vesy, with the support of articles and reviews, now

appears helpless and unconvincing."¹⁷⁹

But even on the level of individual artistic standards, aside from schools and ideologies, for disparate reasons, the third "generations" began to "outgrow" the aesthetics of the so recently revered, and still respected, veterans of Modernism. In relation to the older Transcendentalists, going beyond Sadovskoj's observation that "the so called 'searches' substitute the ineffectualness of life with a semblance of verbal power,"¹⁸⁰ the critics in Apolon rejected such efforts not because of their tendentiousness, but because their apparent verbal impotence debases the artistic, as well as the extra-artistic value of their work.¹⁸¹ Thus, Gumilev lamented that the occasional poetic efforts of Merežkovskij produced not only poor verse, but also poor representations of Merežkovskij.¹⁸² On the other hand despite, or actually because of, the extraordinary dazzling language of "Vjačeslav the Magnificent" (Vjačeslav Velikolepnyj),¹⁸³ as Makovskij recalls, the Apollonovcy did not care much for Ivanov's erudite verse.¹⁸⁴ Even more than the complexity of his content, his dense verbal texture is extremely difficult to assimilate or commit to memory (one of Gumilev's requirements for good poetry).¹⁸⁵ More exact reasons for his pupils' alienation from Ivanov's poetics will be discussed in the next chapter in connection with the emergence of their own aesthetic principles; suffice it to say, here, that the younger poets objected to

the purely intellectual approach as the only way to assimilate and enjoy poetry. They preferred to rely on words as organic vehicles of gesture that can be perceived by the senses as well as the intellect. Such a criterion would seem to qualify Blok as their maître, since his rhythmic and melodic "gestures" spoke more directly to the senses than the lines of almost any other poet. But this irrational subjectivist avoided to delineate his visions, his overflowing feeling (*raspuščenost' čuvstva*) lead, according to Adamovič, to undesirable exaggerations: Tout ce qui est exagéré, est insignifiant.¹⁸⁶ Gumilev, too, felt that the nature of Blok's splendid gift allowed him to be a "will-less victim of his own lyricism,"¹⁸⁷ and he was disdainful about Blok's poems "getting out of hand,"¹⁸⁸ Xodasevič cites Blok's own confession to be unable to recollect the meaning of some of his own verse.¹⁸⁹ Makovskij, as Apollon's editor, and in retrospect, roundly criticized Blok for his attitude toward precision. In Makovskij's judgment, the seizure of the visual moment hardly justified ill-defined use of language and faulty grammar.¹⁹⁰ In a letter to Makovskij, Blok politely refuses to correct his grammar; he insists on placing the fidelity to the original feeling above the precision of expression.¹⁹¹ It is clear that such aesthetics was not conducive to a rapport with the graphically minded fellow Petersburgian artists of Apollon.

Even Annenskij did not really belong with the third "generation," in spite of the fact that his precision was so highly acclaimed by the poets in Apollon, who had been taught by him the concept of delineation (razdel'-nost')¹⁹² and who shared many of his views on Ivanov, Blok, and other contemporary poets.¹⁹³ Annenskij's "posthumous poems outshone those of all lyricists of the beginning of the century"¹⁹⁴ and he left only the brightest memories with the Apollon circle,¹⁹⁵ but even so this venerated "old servant of Dionysus," according to Makovskij, never felt really at home in the "Apollon" group that discovered him: ". . . looking back I see clearly that Innokentij Fedorovič, if he had remained alive, could not have played in the future the leading role in Apollon which I had first envisioned."¹⁹⁶ Annenskij's views, in many ways extremely advanced, allowed him somehow to be tolerant of such popular sources of "poor taste" as Znanie, Šipovnik, Leonid Andreev, etc., a tolerance which his younger colleagues would have eventually resented. Brjusov, the former arbiter of Modernist taste, who took "wholeheartedly the side of the Clarists in Apollon" and whose verse ring with metallic strength and precision, after the founding of Apollon received a hail of annihilating criticisms from the third "generation."¹⁹⁷ Yet, reviewing his Zerkalo tenej in the spring of 1912, Gumilev remarks that

Brjusov added something which may be the foundation of a school which will replace Symbolism. . . . Such a fully finished decorating of each image, absolute honesty with oneself is it not a dream for us, who so recently emancipated ourselves from the fetters of Symbolism. This dream is no longer a dream for Brjusov--[the] wise Daedalus.¹⁹⁸

But by that time Brjusov was possibly only a symbol of emancipation. According to Močulskij, he symbolized his own turning from Modernism toward Classicism when he presented on January 19, 1912 in Moscow's Obščestvo svobodnoj estetiki his splendid translation of the fourth song of Vergil's Aeneid;¹⁹⁹ but his "neo-Classicism turned into cold academism"²⁰⁰ and, as mentioned earlier, he had almost no followers.²⁰¹ In a review of a "popular" speech given by Sologub on March 1, 1913, on contemporary art,²⁰² Georgij Ivanov somewhat condescendingly outlines the attitude of Apollon towards the views of this Symbolist.²⁰³ Sologub's lecture "gave nothing new . . ."; it presented the opinion that "contemporary creativity leans towards the tragic, democratism and individualism" and that the most relevant myth today is the relationship of Cervantes's Aldonza-Dulcinea. G. Ivanov remarks that the goal of "dulcinization of Aldonza" may be perfectly fine for Sologub as an individual but can not be extended to the purpose of all art. "Does an artist have to seek to . . . change the world?" The many references of Sologub to his own works were "certainly of great interest to the wide public . . . which of course is a good thing."²⁰⁴ Of Sologub's

creativity even his fellow Symbolist, Ellis, wrote in 1910, that it had arrived at essentially trivial realism and solipsism.²⁰⁵

The above survey of Apollon's gradual emancipation from the aesthetics of the Symbolist mâitres does, by no means, imply any severance of relations. Both their poetry and articles continued to appear in Apollon. Respect for the former teachers, too, never seemed to diminish, only their creativity made increasingly less impact on the younger poets. As if from some distance appeared an "apology" for the criticism of Ivanov and Annenskij written by a Symbolist critic Konstantin Erberg.²⁰⁶ He states that the critical writings of Ivanov, especially when he discusses other writers, are actually only bridges to his own realiora, or "castles in the air." The bridges make the castles accessible, but even if the reader does not wish to follow Ivanov there, the bridges themselves are still magnificent. In Annenskij's "impressionistic" criticism Erberg does not find such castles or even the wish to erect them; but he does stress how very high are the "bridges." The height of the "bridges" Erberg attributes to the tension in Annenskij's own spirit and in the literature he has chosen to analyze.

Neither the "castles" nor the "bridges" were any longer necessary, or relevant, for Apollon. In their passion for reality, the poets and critics of the journal

treated the reality of art, at times, with an ever greater zeal than the reality of life. Fully aware that after Symbolism the reality of art had irrevocably changed, they were neither afraid, like Sadovskoj, that their Aestheticism is "groundless and crude"²⁰⁷ nor like Ellis, that stylistic and technical preoccupations on one hand and interest in stylization on the other, will lead them to inevitable decay.²⁰⁸ On the contrary, Apollon displayed an optimistic vigor that had not been seen since the early years of Modernism.

the small but notorious group of the radical Futurists, the third "generation" Modernists in Apollon sought to abolish as few as possible of the Modernist tendencies—only those which seemed to actively hamper the creative processes of the future. Thus the Apollon circle never lost respect for the achievements of the Symbolists; it also regarded the styles of other cultural epochs as vital and suggestive sources for creative possibilities. Despite greater discrimination and restraint the Apollonovci were inspired by such "thematic" possibilities in much the same way as were the members of Mir Iskusstva, who had dedicated their art to the re-discovery of these sources. Apollon's taste for graphic sharpness, also inherited from Mir Iskusstva, reflected the movement towards objectivity discussed earlier. Gradually this direction became recognizable as a post-Symbolist orientation indicated by the tendency to stress the delineations of objects, rather than to project

CHAPTER V

APOLLON AND POST-SYMBOLISM

The meticulousness with which Apollon developed its aesthetics appears among the most characteristic merits of the enterprise. Apollon's policy to "observe the ties with the cultural past" extended also to the recent past. Unlike the small but notorious group of the radical Futurists, the third "generation" Modernists in Apollon sought to abolish as few as possible of the Modernist tendencies--only those which seemed to actively hamper the creative processes of the future. Thus the Apollon circle never lost respect for the achievements of the Symbolists; it also regarded the styles of other cultural epochs as vital and suggestive sources for creative possibilities. Despite greater discrimination and restraint the Apollonovci were inspired by such "thematic" possibilities in much the same way as were the members of Mir iskusstva, who had dedicated their art to the re-discovery of these sources. Apollon's taste for graphic sharpness, also inherited from Mir iskusstva, reflected the movement towards objectivity discussed earlier. Gradually this direction became recognizable as a post-Symbolist orientation indicated by the tendency to stress the delineations of objects, rather than to project

any ties from the objects to absolutes. The drive for delineation extends to the area of expression of lyrical notions as well as to the depiction of concrete reality.¹ The premium, now placed on clarity and vividness above the power of symbolization, released a greater energy and incisiveness of the artistic gesture. Accordingly, the liberation from the intellectual demands of Transcendentalism shifted the process of creative perception from the "viewing with the mind" to a greater employment of the senses; the artistic objects now created, stripped of their intellectually symbolic functions, acquired a stark nakedness revealing their intrinsic colorful and multiform suggestiveness. Authors were now challenged by the "manly" task of mastering the temptation to diffuse their images and meanings, by observing firmly the factual perimeter of each object. Such an outlook, termed in 1912 in the poetic circles as "Adamism,"² complemented the prominence allotted to the treatment of primeval themes in painting, music, ballet and prose. The "Adamistic" outlook revitalized stylization from being predominantly decorative; this practice now assumed the full-blooded kinetic function of a gesture. Taste in objects of beauty, also, shifted from enjoying "discoveries" and longing to imbue them with extra meaning, to the gusto of possessing concrete items. The range of possibilities of expression within this attitude was extremely wide: from a primitivist enjoyment of the most

elemental forms to a Gothic complexity of increasingly refined delineation. The treatment of taste as a more reliable standard for convention than profundity, encouraged, as in Mir iskusstva, a lively practice of collaboration and cooperation among the arts. Best examples for such practice are the theatrical productions in the Starinnyj³ and Basennyj teatr⁴ in which many members of Apollon collaborated.

In terms of traditional artistic trends, it appears from the above description that Apollon's third "generation" combined in their tastes and practices in varying proportions, the properties of such diverse trends as Classicism, Realism, and Primitivism. A brief glossary may be the swiftest means to demonstrate why the individual artists could, relatively easily, adopt and blend the various practices of the seemingly unreconcilable trends. Below, in the analysis of specially chosen articles from Apollon, these notions will be illustrated in some detail.

<u>Practice</u>	<u>Trend</u>
adherence to tradition	
retrospectivism	
scholarship	Classicism
formal and stylistic "clarism"	

<u>Practice</u>	<u>Trend</u>
de-symbolization, insistence on concrete objects of beauty	Realism
tangible values "here and now"	
vividness of gesture	
stress on simple delineation and "naked" purity of objects	Primitivism
perception and communication through the senses	
primeval themes, "manly" austerity	

The issue of retrospectivism is featured already in the first number of Apollon. M. Vološin's article entitled Arxaizm v ruskoj živopisi⁵ is an interpretation of the use of symbols by three Mir iskusstva artists, Bakst, Bogaevskij, and Roerich. Vološin describes what the artists saw as the historic past of mankind, but more importantly, he discusses the stimulus which the discovery of the past may have on art. He speaks particularly of the discoveries of the archeologists Schliemann and Evans, and says that they have revealed whole new cultural epochs. Their findings have opened up for the soul something new. Art has now acquired not only the proof which the ancient myths had hinted at, but also the greater possibility for

further dreams and remote guesses.

The dream of the archaic is the latest and most treasured dream of contemporary artists who so searchingly peer into all historical epochs looking in them for what is rare, pungent, and secretly related to them.

Painters and poets turn the many-faceted mirror of world history in order to find in each prism a fragment of their own face.⁶

This article is a specific articulation of the trend called historical retrospectivism that was discussed earlier in connection with Mir iskusstva. But here the discussion of the treasures of history for the creative artist is extended further back to classical times and to the prehistoric past. Vološin himself was an artist, art critic, poet, and amateur archeologist, and in his person provided an example of that peculiar syncretizing artist of Apollon.

In the next two issues of Apollon, Bakst himself wrote an article called "Puti klassicizma v iskusstve."⁷ In this discussion Bakst takes a kind of neo-Classicist position that is more advanced for Russian Modernism than the positions discussed heretofore. By "advanced" we mean that as these positions are applied to poetry, they presage what the "Adamists" or "Acmeists" would later advocate in the "Guild of Poets." For Bakst's own development the set of positions enunciated in this article bespeaks a considerable evolution away from his association with Mir iskusstva a decade earlier. Then he had been among the first

to advocate the emancipation of art from heteronomous purposes and immersion in the joy of stylization. Now in the Apollon article he examines the pitfalls of Modernism. He finds that most of the schools of art are continuations of what was begun in the nineteenth century, and what he feels strongly, had become obsolete.

For theoretical reasons he scorns the nineteenth century, because it was then that artists became isolated from each other; they had lost interest in, and attachment to, the past and therefore had no common heritage; the loss of this bond led to greater interest in themselves, and hence to increasing "Individualism." Individualism for Bakst is the loss of tradition and the loss of the sense of pure craft. As such, individualism is the most frightening enemy not only of art in general, but also of schools of art. As Bakst here recognized, it is only when many artists share recognized values that an important style can be created. A solution might well be a return to Classicism, which might serve as the unifying factor, if not for art as a whole, at least for the formation of a school of art. Such a return would also serve to strip away the many insignificant features which now crowd art and which have been added by artists, posing as stylists or mystics. Bakst sees the future art as pure: "future art will turn toward the cult of man, his nakedness."⁸ This bareness of the new man is strikingly similar to what Gumilev,

Gorodeckij, and Zenkevič will describe as the outlook of the newly awakened man who sees reality again, as if for the first time, and reminiscent of the poems of Vološin cited in the third chapter. Speaking of what constitutes content in art, Bakst writes: "Elements of recent art--are air, the sun, greenery; the elements of the future are stones and men."⁹ This prediction is also closely related to a trend in Acmeist poetry, especially prominent in the collection of Mandel'stam entitled Kamen' ("Stone," 1913).¹⁰

In music, also, the need was stressed to find a way out of the confusion created by the imposing of extra-musical idealism which, since Wagner, isolated composers from each other because they now pursued the realization of subjective philosophic ideas instead of creating conventions based on objective properties of sound and rhythm.

The music critic of Apollon, Evgenij Braudo, in an article entitled "Muzyka posle Vagnera,"¹¹ devotes a study to the question: whither art and whither the new man? He writes that "the new music reveals a real picture of the experiences of the new, coming man, thus, it links us to the spiritual life of the future."¹² Like Bakst, Braudo sees a disintegration and atomization of art forms since the nineteenth century. In Wagner's time Braudo writes, the style of pure musical forms was crushed by the overpowering force of Wagner's slogan: "Das Wort steht ueber dem Ton."¹³ What Wagner brought about in music was

the domination of idealistic, or Transcendentalist thought which rid music of pure musical forms. Thus, according to Braudo, music, which became now connected with idealism, was open to a much greater number of interpretations and forms and resulted in the chaos of the profusion of subjectivistic expressions.

The first pronouncements to strike a new chord in Russian literary thought appeared in the fourth issue (January 1910) of Apollon. They were essays by Kuzmin and Vološin.¹⁴ The latter's article on Henri de Régnier states directly, and officially for the first time, that Symbolism is overcome. Vološin uses as a vehicle for his argument, the work of Henri de Régnier: "The creativity of Henri de Régnier represents the transition from Symbolism to new Realism. For us who have outlived Symbolism and who enter a new organic epoch of art, this example of the harmonious, strict and consistent metamorphosis is infinitely important."¹⁵ Vološin intends to show exactly how the new realism enters into Régnier's art by analyzing his poem "Les médailles d'argile," of which he writes, "there is a sculptor's plasticity of images. Here is strict realism in which the eye recognizes only a faint gilding of extinguished symbols."¹⁶ For Vološin, quite justly, this neo-Realism "which emerges from Symbolism certainly cannot be like the Realism which emerged from the soil of Romanticism."¹⁷ The function of Symbolism in literary history is given by

Vološin as follows: "Symbolism was an idealistic reaction against Naturalism. Now that the struggle for the flag of Symbolism is over and the re-evaluation of all things in art from the point of view of the Symbolists is finished, comes the time to create new Realism, resting on the foundations of Symbolism."¹⁸

The effect of Vološin's argument is difficult to assess. There are no available records of any printed reactions to his thesis. Doubtless, its subject was discussed among the Modernists, but most likely, his suggestions such as the call for "sculptor's plasticity of images" were too general, the example of Henri de Régnier--too distant to stir up concrete visions of a new creative path. But if Vološin's article did not defeat Symbolism in artistic practice, it clearly stated the proposition within the ranks of the Modernists.

Kuzmin's essay, on the other hand, did not even mention the issue of schools and "isms." It defined three contemporary approaches to style; but the now famous essay presented a challenging contrast to Symbolism and to non-Modernism by its very appearance and spirit; its aloof tone, its own easy-going but precise wording, a deceptively simple language which is soft and polite but merciless to the uncultured, if they are cultured enough to catch the arguments, presents in every line a conscious articulation of a new sensibility. Kuzmin begins his article by showing

how natural it is for mankind to delineate reality. For art this natural inclination signifies clear forms and a striving for precision and harmony. Kuzmin, like the early Symbolists of the Brjusov school, turns to Romance literatures for examples. For Kuzmin one of the most delightful features of this literature, which ranges from Apuleius to Henri de Regnier, lies in the assurance that there will be no confusion and no stylistical faux pas. In clarifying the concept of style, Kuzmin defines three categories of stylists. In the first are stylists such as Anatole France who manifest great purity of logic and language. Such purity should, however, not be confused with the purity of Mallarmé that drains the language of its vitality; in this sense Mallarmé is not a stylist. Equally, among Russian authors, then, Belyj, Gippius, and Remizov are not stylists in this sense, either. The second category of stylists includes those authors who clearly transmit their individuality. Kuzmin is aware that any significant artist must leave a strong imprint of the self in his work of art, but for inclusion in this category of stylist, he has in mind those features which make one author distinct from another not in terms of form or plot, but in some kind of an individuality of language, some sort of aroma, some tone of voice. In this, fairly recent category belong Belyj, Gippius, and Remizov. The third category, which Kuzmin observes, is now strongly rooted especially in Russia, is

closely connected to "stylism and stylization." This category, derived from historicism, is distinguished by "a special correspondence between language and a given form of the work of art in its historical and aesthetic meaning."¹⁹ When involved in this category, an unerudite writer is likely to commit the error of sacrificing the first two essential categories. Stylization, which Kuzmin defines as the "transfer of one's own design into a certain epoch and dressing it in the exact literary form of [that] given time,"²⁰ truly becomes an "artistic fake, an aesthetic game, a tour de force,"²¹ if the author does not choose with deliberation his setting as the most expressive medium of his own individuality²² and if he infringes on the purity of his native language.²³ Puškin, of course, sets the example for all three categories: his individuality is always felt; his language, impeccable, although it changes distinctly according to the forms of his subject matter. The lack of correspondence between form and content, the violation of syntactical logic and, above all, the "absence of contours, unnecessary fog," Kuzmin exclaims, "we shall modestly call--tastelessness."²⁴ Having thus equated style with taste, Kuzmin, in conclusion, formulates his aesthetic precept for young Modernists: ". . . you will find the secret of a marvelous thing--'beautiful clarity' which I would call 'klarizm.'"²⁵

To diminish any possibilities of controversy,

this essay was modestly subtitled "notes on prose" (zametki o proze) and it ended with the deprecatory remark that all the lecturing was done for the author's own benefit. But this article did produce a great impact, especially on poetry, due to several well calculated features: it contained nothing that did not apply to poetry; its unusual tone, reminiscent of, but not as esoteric as, (I.) Annenskij's criticism, applied indisputable terms which, even when ironic, lacked the usual dogmatic offensiveness, and yet, were general enough not to appear pedantic. Most of all, this well worded call for, simply, clarity re-introduced Annenskij's practice of discussing aesthetic values without referring to all the current doctrines.²⁶ This last point, achieved only by omission, was, apparently, not quite fully perceived by the readers. Kuzmin drove it harder, a year later, in a historical essay (rather adequate from a musical point of view) entitled Orfej i Evridika kavalera Gluka.²⁷ After discussing Gluck's revolutionary position at the time of one of history's great debates among musical schools on creating operas which, of course, by definition include extra-musical creativity, Kuzmin concludes his essay thus: "We do not wish hereby to diminish the trust in, and dampen the tendency to found schools, [nor to attack] conscious principled-ness in creativity; we only wish to remind [you] that these are not the [factors] that should be regarded as the principal virtues when a work of art is

2

patronizing?

awk-

evaluated, and that in the historic perspective [such] reformatory activity of artists retreats to a very distant plane."²⁸ But the incontestable nature of his prekrasnaja jasnost', alien to the problematic approaches of the metaphysicists, stands as a value, historically tested, distinctly in the foreground of other artistic merits. For that reason Kuzmin places at the beginning of his essay the words of Gluck: "My efforts have to be directed to find beautiful simplicity, and I consciously avoided the ostentatious trickiness which would harm it . . ."²⁹ This quotation had an additional advantage for Kuzmin; it enabled him to show to the "Orfeists" and theoreticians of Musaget his own views as identical to those of a venerable master, who still holds the reputation of one of the finest interpreters of the Orpheic spirit and myth.

Whatever the reaction in Musaget, the younger generation of Modernists in Apollon rejoiced in Kuzmin's pronouncements. Georgij Ivanov recalls their reaction: "Yes, yes--exactly. All are tired of high style, all wanted [the] 'beautiful clarity' proclaimed by Kuzmin."³⁰ He mentions how enthusiastically the younger generation greeted the collection of Kuzmin's early poems,³¹ the first one of which began with the lines which succinctly state the main problem of creativity as Kuzmin saw it:

Gde slog najdu, čtob opisat' progulku,
 Šabli vo l'du, podžarennuju bulku,
 I višen spelyx sladostnyj agat?

The question of how to create a worthy description of simple objects, beautiful in their concreteness, and the gusto of depicting their external appearance preoccupied all the young poets of Apollon.

If Vološin and Kuzmin proposed new, post-Symbolist directions and titled them as "neo-Realism" and "Clarism," Gumilev, in his essay Žizn' stixa³² ("Life of a Verse," which was written at the same time),³³ does not yet urge a specific new school, although his interpretation of the topic, also, differs considerably from that given in the standard Symbolist writings. Gumilev does not yet endow this difference with an explicit title; moreover, unsure of what exactly will be the further ideological direction of Modernist poetry, he concludes his essay with the belief that modern poets cannot help but be Symbolists, at least, at present.³⁴ Departing from the ancient but, in its presumptuousness (necelomudrennost'), futile question of the purpose of art, Gumilev asserts his basic outlook that art, "as any other phenomenon has the right to maintain its intrinsic value (samocennost') without any need to justify its raison d'être, and [art] has also the even loftier right--to serve other [ends]."³⁵ Combining cautiously these two principles throughout his essay, Gumilev regards them as severe formal and ethical obligations³⁶ and as a cradle for newer outlooks. The long history of cultivating these two principles has brought modern poetry to

the point at which simplicity and refinement must merge, since "the future is open only for [the first],³⁷ whereas the latter represents "the live acceptance of continuity of all the joys and sorrows of past ages."³⁸ Similarly, the sense of pure beauty, lacking in the Utilitarians, (" . . . and Apollo . . . the cruel but insanely beautiful God" destroys the freaks), requires the crossfertilization with elemental sensuousness (lacking in many Aestheticists), and with the deity of the author (lacking in "mere athletes"). Thus, Gumilev ambitiously states that a poem now has to "satisfy all requirements."³⁹

Most important for Gumilev's poetic hierarchy are "style" and "gesture." He elevates these concepts not for the Parnassian reasons of formal perfection but for reasons of communication. "By [His] style God reveals himself in His creation, [and] the poet gives himself; but it is a mysterious not known to himself [person, which] he allows the readers to guess . . ."⁴⁰ The role of "gesture" Gumilev interprets similarly, to, though more concisely and specifically than the American critic, R. P. Blackmur, in his Language as Gesture.⁴¹ Gumilev describes how the choice of phonological and rhythmic devices causes the reader to assume involuntarily the pose and histrionics of the hero; the reader, by "the suggestive means of his own body, experiences the same [impulses] as the poet, so that the uttered thought becomes no longer a lie, but truth."⁴²

Here Gumilev suggests that aesthetic plausibility will overcome the intrinsic pessimism of the Symbolists. Like them, he realizes the necessity of extraverbal means to communicate or reveal "oneself," but by means of physical directness rather than devious correspondences, abstract schemes and obscure myths.

Gumilev quotes four "alive" poems as examples of close ties between the world of images and that of people. Regarding these works of Symbolists, Gumilev says, "Beautiful poems, like live beings, enter the circle of our life."⁴³ Neither the revery-bound Aestheticists nor the *ambiguous* mythmaking Transcendentalists could have been flattered by such a "degradation." They, who sought to escape the "circle of life, capitalized on the elevating function of their verse. Brjusov's poem V sklepe displays passion and "almost genuine tenderness . . . the two most characteristic features of his creativity [which] help him to build an image, a mould of, perhaps, moments of a meeting of irrevocably separated lovers . . ." ⁴⁴ The viril power of Ivanov's Geliady creates the image of Phaeton. "He transforms a bright ancient fairy-tale into an eternally young truth."⁴⁵ Phaeton's fate becomes "tormentingly enviable." The nature of Annenskij's power, to Gumilev, is human rather than viril. Unlike with most poets, with Annenskij, it is not "the feeling which evokes a thought, but rather the thought itself gains in strength, to such an extent, that it be-

comes a feeling.⁴⁶ Annenskij's poems torment with their immediacy. Gumilev quotes the famous poem "Smyček i skripka." Against such wounds one has to fight "by evoking times and spaces." This latter task is illustrated by a sample from Kuzmin's Kuranty ljubvi. The words of these verses seem to represent the most natural form of human speech, they would make a prose passage sound like a frightening whisper. The quoted verse "completely enchants our imagination of tomorrow."⁴⁷ As if to illustrate the progress of Russian Modernism Gumilev presents these love poems, his proof of the merging of the two equals, art and life, in an order which is both chronological and suggestive of his and his "generation's" evolutionary stages of apprenticeship.

Further explications of Gumilev's concepts of "style" and "gesture," and of his and Apollon's practical criticism, can be seen in the reviews of Ellis's Stigmata and Annenskij's Kiparisovyj larec written by Gumilev also almost concurrently with Žizn' stixa for the column Pis'ma o russkoj poezii.⁴⁸ Gumilev finds that Ellis--"the important theoretician [of Symbolism and] well known translator of Baudelaire, is surprisingly boring."⁴⁹ This is so because of the lack of "gesture" in his verse. He thinks in theories rather than in images, and therefore his process of symbolization proceeds in the wrong direction: Ellis's symbols become mere allegories because, instead of "going

from the real to the other-worldly," he does the reverse and his symbols can never become images.⁵⁰ After this rather annihilating criticism exercised by Gumilev on Symbolist grounds, Gumilev points out Ellis's stylistic lapses in the realm of syntactical "musicality." Such faults show that to Gumilev a poet like Ellis, despite important themes and profound experiences, simply lacks poetic talent. Annenskij's poetry is, of course, another matter. Gumilev chose him for comparison to show that a poet can write verse with almost no subject matter, no themes and no great events. The poems are concerned with Annenskij's central value--pity, but he is able to find the word. In the process of developing his thought to the pitch of an acute emotion, Annenskij is always able to find the most proper linguistic equivalents; his images become absolutely convincing as well as flexible because they have all the intonation of a spoken language. But unerringly, Gumilev points out the principal shortcoming of the revered older master: Annenskij's verse do not sing.⁵¹ *this word?*

Gumilev, Vološin, and Kuzmin, in their views on the creative process, all seem to depart from V. Ivanov's notion that observation of objective reality serves as the basis of the process. But whereas Ivanov wishes to rise to the realiora, and Vološin marks the "existence of a work of art not from the moment of its creation, but from its acceptance by the cognition"⁵² of the beholder (he, thus,

returns to a subjectivist position), Kuzmin and Gumilev remain objectivists in their treatment of imagery. More than the refined but easy-going Kuzmin, Gumilev urges "gesture" in poetry even if it may become theatrical, in order to create a stronger linkage between verse and reality. Stressing such "bodily" vividness of verse, Gumilev approaches a formal stylistic category defined later as skaz (the narrative manner designed to immitate oral speech). Gumilev's fellow critic in Apollon, Valerian Čudovskij saw, in 1915, in this category the possibility of applying objective units for the observation of each verse.⁵³ "Gesture" appeared thus as the most successful method for revealing the author's individuality which to Gumilev was the main task of poetry.⁵⁴ (In this sense, the third "generation" supported Individualism.) Furthermore, this category transferred the concept of style from the function as a criterion of decorative perfection to that of fidelity of expression. The "complete harmony of all details" became essential in order to make the poem "ring" and "ring true" (zvenet' istinno).⁵⁵ Gumilev's efforts to approach this task on a practical and massive level of a workshop, which he called Cex poetov (Poets' Guild) will be discussed below, in connection with his partisan ideology of "Acmeism," which led him somewhat beyond the sphere of interests of Apollon.

Gumilev's criticism received posthumously full

acclaim from diverse sources.⁵⁶ His column in Apollon surprised his colleagues with virtues they would not have suspected from his oral performances. The arrogant leader of a new school never allowed his school's ideology to interfere with his job as a critic in Apollon. All his reviews are attempts to combine the judgment of a poet on his own grounds with the general current standards of the field. Gumilev's avoidance of "going beyond the limits of only poetry" made his remarks practical and uncontroversial. Gumilev, who did not have the reputation of an intellectual, and could be frequently trapped in logical inconsistencies or lapses of erudition, was remarkably thoughtful in his writings. Not only did he rely on his large instinctive resources with prudent restraint, but he displayed considerable elegance by understating many of his own conclusions (nedoskazannosti).⁵⁷ A case in point may be the seemingly easy reliance on "gesture" as a criterion. Like "style" (in Kuzmin's sense) the term implies not only a multitude of constituting elements but also their proportionate distribution. Since this proportion is infinitely variable in relation to the objects of expression, and since applied quantitative mathematics were at less than a rudimentary stage, Gumilev, as a practical critic, foresaw little results from the statistical efforts of Belyj's group. On the other hand, the objective, quantifiable aspects of the poetic craft attracted the younger "genera-

tion"; as in an actors' studio--they gathered around Gumilev to study the ingredients and the rules of poetic gesture. Once again, Gumilev's efforts demonstrate the movement, this time on a workshop level, from the abstract to the concrete.

In his analysis of Ivanov's poetics Gumilev demonstrates the same movement of his "generation" on the level of the approach to poetic language. The extraordinary powerful, virtuosic language of Vjačeslav Ivanov struck Gumilev "more like that of a philologist than of a poet."⁵⁸ With due admiration Gumilev, rather subtly, discerns here an alienation from a common poetic attitude caused by Ivanov's aloof treatment of words:

To him all words are equal . . . for him there is no secret classification into words which are "one's very own" and "not one's very own," [he has] no profound, often inexplicable sympathies and antipathies [for words]. He does not care about their age or origin. . . . But his always intensive thinking, the exact knowledge of what he wishes to say make his selection of words so amazingly diverse . . . [and so] apart from the language of other poets.⁵⁹

Ivanov, the most objectivist of the Transcendentalist poets treats his words objectively, but not as objects. "To him words, like images are only covers for ideas."⁶⁰ It is in this aspect of the attitude towards words that Ivanov had an important affinity with Belyj.⁶¹

It is the essentially abstract nature of Ivanov's "verbalism" that eventually repelled the younger poets.

Oriented toward concreteness, they relished the potential of word-images as building materials for phonological and intellectual constructions, relying on their intimacy with the "physique" of their words to convey in verbal gestures the dictate of their psyche.⁶² With Ivanov, according to Gumilev, "it is not the verse that gives the poet wings, but it is he who lends wings to his poems."⁶³ Thus, Ivanov's poems did not lift the younger Modernists. But it is not because of his complex and lofty content or profound themes⁶⁴ that "the Apolonovcy ceased to care for his poetry."⁶⁵ Nor did they object to the density of his verbal texture, its oversaturation with images, references and metaphysical energy. The third "generation" turned away from his method because his verse could be perceived only intellectually not allowing the joy of a sympathetic sensory communication. It seems that even greater erudition and a frequent re-reading would not have helped them to assimilate Ivanov's verse as "play." Even the recognition of Ivanov's perfection as a versifier appeared to Gumilev not as a satisfying fruition, but as a realization of being bereft of something essential: the author's own enjoyment. "It seems, there is not a single most complicated device which Ivanov would not know. But for him device is not a friendly aid, a golden joy but, also, only a means. This is why Ivanov likes to write in difficult, ambitious, but already pre-established (gotovye) forms."⁶⁶

= available / ?

V. Ivanov scorned the new outlook articulated in Apollon. But, as a master debater he did not shrink from, indeed he relished, ideological arguments. Nor could have the intellectual inferiority of his opponents provided a reason for contempt, for he was a patient teacher, who repeatedly made serious efforts to be close to such "unintellectual" poets as Blok, Gorodeckij and Čulkov. It must have been the persistently practical, non-theoretical level on which the alienation of the younger poets took place in Apollon that was as infuriating as it was incontestable. Ivanov himself articulated his scorn towards the circle of Apollon in one of the poems of his collection Nežnaja tajna, which he dedicated to Kuzmin; a stanza of it reads:

Sojuznik moj na Gelikone
 Čuzoj mez svetskix peredr' jag
 Moj brat v del'fijskom Apollone
 A vtom--na Mojke--čut' ne vrag!

In the "Xronika" section of Apollon Vjačeslav Ivanov discussed Gumilev, Vološin, and Kuzmin.⁶⁷ In a long treatment of Kuzmin's prose, Ivanov begins by quoting after Thucidides from Pericles's speech in words that Ivanov thinks correspond to Kuzmin's ideal. "We Athenians love beauty without splendour, and we philosophize with sober measure."⁶⁸ The whole article is very favorable to Kuzmin's prose, especially to Podvigi Aleksandra, a novel in which the hero goes to Rome in order to bring Catholicism back to Orthodoxy. Of this work Ivanov exclaims:

What a new word in our literature and how unexpectedly has it resounded! A wise word about the necessity for union--in the spirit of the believers and not in the letter of statutory agreements--of the Christianity of the East and the Christianity of the West. By this the novel of Kuzmin, which has social significance, answers the burning question of contemporary religious searchings.⁶⁹

The fact that Ivanov praised highly Kuzmin's fiction and at the same time scorned his literary theory may be partially attributed either to agreement with the theme (a theme by no means typical of Kuzmin) or to the ambivalence of Ivanov, which has been discussed earlier. It is clear, however, that by stressing the quality of Kuzmin's content, Ivanov avoided the discussion of form and style, thus bypassing the topic of concern of the younger generation.

Vološin and Gumilev received a much more critical review than did Kuzmin. In writing about Vološin's collection of poetry, "Stixotvorenija" Ivanov noticed a sound set of values, fine technique, and a solid course of apprenticeship. However, Ivanov's serious reservations arise from his conviction that Vološin, in his wanderings, failed to learn one paramount element, the mystery of life. Ivanov cautions that, even though one may enjoy the book, one would not wish it to influence young poets. Vološin has

admirable synthetic copies, but lack beautiful originals . . . Vološin is a poet of great talent and of original bitter charm; but he is not yet established as an independent poet. His taste is not faultless, and the general tendency of his

poetry is lifeless. . . .

He will find himself only when the Apollo of his harmony . . . will like a brother meet with the Dionysus of life.⁷⁰

It is apparent that Ivanov's familiar theory of Symbolism is applied here to criticism of a poet who earlier spoke of the necessity of overcoming Symbolism.

Ivanov was harder on Gumilev. Reviewing Zemčuga⁷¹ Ivanov begins with the statement that Gumilev is a promising pupil of Brjusov's, but still is a pupil. He is imitative in pose, style and themes; he blows up the exotic Romanticism of young Brjusov, naively revealing sometimes a secret Symbolism which allows him to confuse life and dreams. This, Ivanov writes is natural, because Gumilev is unable to find an authentic experience. The "restrictedness of his poetic scope and the lack of responsiveness to anything which lies outside of his dreams, bordering, at times, with the naive lack of comprehension, causes the dissimilarity with [Puškin's] poet-echo . . ."⁷² At times Gumilev, like the "silly 'parrot of the Antilles islands' leans towards Aestheticism revealing the dilemma of his consciousness." Who is right--the romantic Eagle or the aesthetic Parrot? "And of course, at this stage, the poet does not know yet [where to find] Jacob's Ladder."⁷³ Compared to other reviews of Ivanov, the one above, on Gumilev, is unusually harsh; it must be explained as a sortie against an enemy who probably appeared to the author as a

more formidable foe than the review indicates.

Brjusov reviewed Zemčuga quite differently. He wrote:

N. Gumilev did not create any new manner of writing, but, assimilating the devices of poetic technique from his predecessors, he managed to improve, develop and deepen them, which perhaps one should recognize as a greater feat, than the search for new forms [which] only too frequently [has] led [poets] to pathetic results.⁷⁴

Two years later, in his book Dalekie i blizkie Brjusov praises Gumilev as a master "who is familiar with all the mysteries of poetic technique. [But] Gumilev is no teacher, no preacher; the importance of his poetry lies less in what he said than in how he said it."⁷⁵ However, after Gumilev had asserted himself as a teacher and a leader of a new movement, Brjusov, first of all condemned the movement⁷⁶ and became much more sparing in the praise of Gumilev.

Kuzmin, in a review of Gumilev's Čužoe Nebo⁷⁷ points out three principles of Gumilev's poetics which are reflected in the "most characteristic lines":

1. V každoj luze zapax okeana
V každom kamne vejanje pustyn'
2. I v junom mire junoša Adam,
Ja ulybajus' pticam i cvetam
3. Sozdanje tem prekrasnej
Čem vz'atyj material bezstrastnej
Stix, mramor il' metal.

The first principle does not bring Gumilev closer to Symbolism; it is simply a method to make a projection of any experience and lyrical episode; but, Kuzmin warns, this

projection may travel so far that it might obscure the original feeling. Kuzmin feels that the second principle is the most precious. "It is a confession which carries with it, perhaps, important consequences."⁷⁸ The third principle, a translation from Gautier represents exactly the approach to language as a concrete medium which Gumilev found lacking in Ivanov, and which many of the third-generation poets developed to a still greater extent.

New Poets in Apollon

It was not so much the older maîtres, Vjačeslav Ivanov and Innokentij Annenskij, as their respective pupils Kuzmin and Gumilev, who attracted a number of young talents augmenting the original circle of Apollon. Besides the already mentioned members Valerian Čudovskij, Mixail Lozinskij and the sixteen-year-old Georgij Ivanov, new forces appeared when in its ninth issue, Apollon launched in July 1910 the poems of Mixail Zenkevič,⁷⁹ Nikolaj Karpov⁸⁰ and, five "astonishing"⁸¹ poems of the nineteen-year-old Osip Mandel'stam⁸² the beginnings of whose poetic career are amusingly told by S. Makovskij.⁸³ In 1910, after a fairly successful publication of his first collection of poems⁸⁴ Vladimir Narbut was invited to contribute to Apollon.⁸⁵ That same year, Gumilev introduced his young wife Anna Andreevna (nee Gorenko) who, according to Pjast, surprised

the circle by turning out to be "instead of at least an Ethiopian princess, . . . a most ordinary (samaja obyknovennaja) woman."⁸⁶ Her poetry, however, like that of Mandel'stam, arrested instantly everybody's attention, not on the strength of its modest themes (rather despite them)⁸⁷ but with the density and directness of her speech, strikingly unusual in the setting of her "chamber style."⁸⁸ Taking advantage of a temporary absence of Gumilev who, according to many reports did not welcome his wife's professional advancement, Makovskij, "on his own responsibility"⁸⁹ launched Axmatova on a poetic career by printing four of her poems in the April issue of Apollon.⁹⁰ The circle of Apollon's young poets included also count Vasilij A. Komarovskij, highly esteemed by his contemporaries but now relatively unknown because of his early death in 1914, a secluded life⁹¹ and a relatively small output. Komarovskij left behind only one collection⁹² and some posthumous poems in Apollon. Gumilev in his column on poetry described Komarovskij as a master, who "brilliantly realized the idea of combining the [power of] aesthetic observation of the French poet [Henri de Régnier] with the nervous lyricism of the Russian [Innokentij Annenskij] revealing [his own] creative originality . . ."⁹³ The relative lack of influence is attributed to the fact that Komarovskij's poetics did not open any creative avenues which could be fruitfully pursued by other poets.⁹⁴

As mentioned earlier, all these poets displayed, from the beginning of their careers, the awareness of the rich creative possibilities derived from the combination of Symbolist techniques, the love for objective reality and the will to clarity. As Znosko-Borovskij points out, this tradition started with Kuzmin,⁹⁵ whose love of everydayness which he portrays with such vivid detail conveys the very atmosphere of daily routine (byt) in the objectivist, not sociological sense.

In a review of a group of Kuzmin's later poems⁹⁶ Čudovskij comments on the poet's artistic success that "the beautiful, classically flawless [verses] are the best denials of the author's pessimistic lines [which refer to the problem, quoted earlier, of the difficulty to find adequate terms]

Bledny vse imena
I stary vse nazvan'ja⁹⁷

Znosko-Borovskij maintains that other poets, like Vološin are infatuated with conglomerations of colors, which may dominate their works; or, like Gumilev, [and Gorodeckij] avoid intimate details, like exotic colors, but use them as signs to identify objects and moods. Axmatova, in her spare style, selects a minimum of external detail, but the chosen ones are essential in portraying her psychological reactions.⁹⁸ Kuzmin's example, according to Renato Poggioli, "inspired [G.] Ivanov's first booklet The Embarkation

for the Island of Cythera (1912),⁹⁹ which, as its title indicates, found its theme in the masterpiece of Watteau, one of those eighteenth-century artists of whom Kuzmin was such an ardent devotee!"¹⁰⁰ The adverse effects of extreme objectivism are exemplified by Vladimir Narbut, a poet with mixed virtues and faults who, according to Gumilev, ". . . writes about nature but not about his views . . . could this mean specialization creeping even into poetry? . . ." ¹⁰¹

Brjusov wrote in 1911, in Russkaj Mysl' on the same occasion: "Mr. Narbut treats his themes with some kind of a bored indifference. To him, it seems, it does not matter what to write about . . . it is hardly the task of a poet to be a phonograph which records indiscriminately anything that can be heard around one."¹⁰² A more favorable, but still very cool, reception was given by Brjusov to Zenkevič's collection Dikaja Porfira in July 1912. Zenkevič's fascination with "matter" intrigued Vjačeslav Ivanov. In his review entitled Marginalia in Trudy i Dni,¹⁰³ Ivanov devotes a substantial passage to the basic difference between his and Brjusov's criticism of the youngest poet's orientation. He agrees with Brjusov's warning that "despite their drive towards the elemental (stixijnost') they are threatened by one thing: mediocrity and pedantry."¹⁰⁴ But where Brjusov doubts that the young poets will be able to forge a "scientifically objective new synthesis" of reality beyond the reach of the present-day scientists, in

order to justify their earth-bound direction, Ivanov emphatically argues that "scientism" here is beside the point. Impressed earlier by Zenkevič's pathos (pafos), originality and awe, and his almost clairvoyant feeling of matter, Ivanov questions the "whence" of his spirit; if Zenkevič's intuition "will not develop further, his lot will be--insignificance; if he will not be pacified,--will he find a way?"¹⁰⁵

Of all the young poets, Osip Mandel'štam embodied almost all the qualities of mature Russian Modernism, and is regarded by some as the best Russian poet of this century.¹⁰⁶ In keeping within the scope of this study, we shall limit ourselves only to those trends which were characteristic of his "generation," but which found in Mandel'štam the most accomplished champion. Unlike, for example, Narbut, Mandel'štam's treatment of objective reality elevated his imagination to a new level, enhancing his highly individualistic manner of expression. Mandel'štam's liberation from subjectivist "searches" and fogs, Gumilev described as follows: "He is, as far as I can remember, the only poet who so [very]completely purged himself of Romanticism, without touching at the same time the poet [in him]."¹⁰⁷ Mandel'štam's "up to dateness" was well expressed in retrospect by Sergej Makovskij who wrote that "Mandel'štam understood better than anybody else the lesson of the great French innovators, and connected Russian verse with

the 'surrealistic' insights of the age."¹⁰⁸ Artur Lurje speaks of Mandel'shtam's emotional need for order, his panicky fear before the chaos of "slumbering life" ('dremućej žizni strax') and desperate need of his "eschatological consciousness" for patterns, in form and in time.¹⁰⁹ Earlier in this study, in connection with the historicism initiated in Russia by Mir iskusstva, Mandel'shtam's verses were cited as examples of "retrospective reverie" of the period of mature Modernism. Linking historicism with the emotional world of Mandel'shtam, Lurje writes: "As memory builds form in music, history built form in the poetry of Mandel'shtam. . . . [He] lived in awe and ecstasy of the passion of others. . . . Symbols of history . . . had magical power over him; but frozen historical facts and formulae Mandel'shtam converted into a mode of life (byt) of an epoch."¹¹⁰ From such a byt, Mandel'shtam picked often the simplest elements, which a child might notice, and capriciously arranged them into a touchingly fragile, Mandel'shtamian paradise. Sergej Gorodeckij, during the period of his "alliance" with the Cex poetov explained in Reč in 1913, that "the haughtiness of astrologists [a hint at Ivanov's Po zvezdam] is absolutely alien to Mandel'shtam. The proud modesty of a mason marks his entire poetry."¹¹¹ In a poem dedicated to Mandel'shtam he wrote enthusiastically in 1914 of Mandel'shtam's love for concrete reality, expressing thus also his own, newly acquired, orientation.

On verit v ves, on čtit prostranstvo,
 On nežno ljubiti material.
 On veščestvo ne ukorjal
 Za medlennost' i postojanstvo. . . .¹¹²

In an article devoted to the second edition of Kamen',¹¹³ Gumilev observes equally enthusiastically, that this "lover of material" [unlike V. Ivanov and Blok] frequently gains impulse for creativity from, even trifling, objects. "Everything arrests his attention, generates in him the most diverse ideas. . . . Everything to him is pure, everything is a pretext for a poem: . . ." ¹¹⁴ With such a type of sensitivity Mandel'štam develops our empathy with the character and words per se (kak takovye) and with the art of other epochs. The latter avenue, by no means uncommon in Russian Modernism, gained depth with Mandel'štam.¹¹⁵ As Jrina Bušman imaginatively points out, his affinity with subjects of antiquity is expressed "not as external Hellenization but as internal Hellenism."¹¹⁶ His "intuitive proximity to the very roots of the secrets of [past] styles"¹¹⁷ prevented Mandel'štam from "robbing the past" for his own ends (of which he accused Brjusov),¹¹⁸ or (as Merežkovskij) of "finding in it one's own ideas";¹¹⁹ rather like Annenskij,¹²⁰ only more so, Mandel'štam enriched through his empathy, the available fragments of ancient life, as well as his own language with the spirit of timeless actuality. If Mandel'štam was able to arrive from style at the essence of the sources, the process worked

also in reverse: historical subjects affected his language. From the numerous examples of this phenomenon, let us quote from one of his most poignant poems, "K nemeckoj reči," the exclamation:

Mne xočetsja ujti iz našej reči
Za vse čem ja objazan ej bessročno

and from a very solemn poem, "Evxaristija":

Zdes' nužno grečeskoe slovo

Many critics commented like the philologist Močulskij, that Mandel'stam's words are sound with an unusual music. It seems that they are written in a foreign language, ancient and solemn, like the language of Pindar.¹²¹ The Soviet critic N. L. Stepanov explains that, in his treatment of words, Mandel'stam transcends the quest for precision. "Words are no longer chosen in the name of clarity, but each word leads after it a row of words, connected with it by very distant and unexpected associations. Words--themes grow surrounded by a whole labyrinth of divergent meanings through which the reader gropes towards the plot of the poem."¹²² To illustrate this point let us choose, at random from the many animal images, the word kuznečik (grasshopper) as an example. Mandel'stam associates this word with kuznec [(little) blacksmith] and, connecting the acoustic effect of the insect with the professional function of the smith, and endowing this connection, by means of a new alliterative association, with a specific, re-

freshingly new, kind of agony:

i molotočkami kaznili [and put to death
with tiny hammers].¹²³

The image of the functioning of grasshoppers as a choir reflects the well-being (or the ticking) of reality, immanent in Mandel'stam's mind, and in the cosmos. When the loss of creative vision becomes as desperately inevitable as insomnia, the poet "forgets the Word" (ja slovo pozabyl . . .); it rests in unconsciousness among the crickets as well:

Sredi kuznečikov bespamjatstvuuet slovo.¹²⁴

In another poem, this external (and therefore autonomous) image serves as a thematic link between Mandel'stam's senses and the objective reality.

Segodnja durnoj den'
Kuznečikov xor spit.¹²⁵

[Today is a bad day; the choir of crickets sleeps]. Besides enhancing the responsory character of choral speech, the accentuated rhythmical breaks between words and the gap caused by the omission of a foot (a "mental beat") also allows rests between logically unconnected lines. This effect can be better illustrated by still another poem which, too, evolves from the word-image kuznečik. The intense ticking sound of crickets suggests the metaphoric identification with the incomprehensibly "singing" watch (časj) as images, and as words, by leaping over perhaps such an alliterative trajectory: kuznečik, četčik (derivative of reader, cantor) četkij (articulate), časti (parts), častyj

(frequent), to časy: čto pojut časy-kuznečik.¹²⁶ The dual association, imagistic and phonemic, generates, respectively, the thematic "element of construction" and the developmental progression of the poem, the theme, suggested by the word, is wide but logical: the intensive drawing together, almost merging, of the agents of cosmic and mechanical time, breeds the acute awareness of "forgivable" impotence in the face of the mechanical naturalness of personal disaster, which is brought by the author's lyrical vulnerability. On the other hand, the development of this theme--the temptation to analyze it must be resisted here--proceeds along phonemic and psycho-phonemic associations, which, at the level of plot, produce only isolated images. The largest logical unit, as usually in Mandel'stam, is only one line. But his theme is rich, it can accommodate many lines. The lines do not address each other; this is emphasized in this poem formally, by the absence of a single "proper" rhyme. But they address the theme: each line with its own, exact intensity. They are ordered rigorously to correspond with the "breath" of the theme, and against that "organic motion" the meter remains classically rigid.

We have dwelled sufficiently on the example of just one word, kuznečik, demonstrating Mandel'stam's brand of Modernism. It is clear, that his method imposes no thematic restrictions; on the contrary, it eliminates any commitment to thematic sources allowing his mind to touch

any desired object with the "swiftness of a typist's nimble fingers."¹²⁷ For example, his fragile and capricious ego, which is vividly apparent behind every verse, never serves as the object of ponderous preoccupation. Mandel'stam treats his ego as a refined instrument, but never as an end. Like most poets of Apollon's third "generation," he radically differs in this, among other respects, from Blok's emotional and Belyj's intellectual subjectivism. This radically different approach to language has already been demonstrated in relation to Ivanov. It applies also to all subjectivists who do not treat a word as a separate thing in itself, and to Symbolists proper, who fit the word into already preconceived abstract schemes. The objectivist and not-so-Symbolists Brjusov, from the point of view of Modernism was left behind;¹²⁸ Mandel'stam, achieving the same sonorous precision showed an infinitely greater variety of viewpoints, gestures and meanings because of the above described tension within his method of logical and alogical associations. The same applies to the difference between his and Annenskij's poetry. Mandel'stam's treatment of language as a resounding and speaking body (plot') which is "breathing" and is, for that reason, "historic,"¹²⁹ was completely shared by his colleagues in Apollon. Gumilev, "who was exotic not only in his themes but also in the luxuriousness of [his] words,"¹³⁰ and who wrote solemnly about the Word

No zabyli my, čto osijanno
Tol' 'ko slovo sred' zemnyx trevog,

spoke for the entire group when he commended Mandel'štam for deriving most of his inspiration from the Russian language.¹³¹

Axmatova, who was said to have received her verbal inspiration mostly from the language of Russian folk songs,¹³² never expressed any theoretical considerations; her intimate Muse, unlike those of Mandel'štam and Gumilev, never prompted her frugal language to expand into distant times or places, but endowed her words, perhaps, with more weight than what her colleagues have produced. If Axmatova did not treat her "material" as tenderly, heroically, elegantly or "primevally" as they, she chose her words with stern seriousness and epigram-like brevity. Writing about love with pithy directness she achieved instant and serious acclaim primarily for her post-Symbolist language.¹³³ In one of the first reviews of her first collection, Večer,¹³⁴ V. Čudovskij pointed out also other than verbal features. He remarks on what a long road had been covered by Modernism until Annenskij fully adopted in Russia the manner of synthetic perception cultivated by the artists in Japan. "The same dispersion of perspective, the same disregard for "empty" space which separates the foreground from background; the same capacity to find . . . that single hardly traceable cone, that will give the sensation of extraordinary

'mountainousness.'"¹³⁵ But, Čudovskij writes, whereas the Japanese skill creates the sense of joy, with us that skill becomes a vehicle of tragedy. He perceives Axmatova's sense of tragedy precisely in her ability to present a minimum of characteristics, i.e. in her failure to capture the entire picture of her objects, which is what lends such a poignant power to her expressions, and allows her to be alogical.¹³⁶ Čudovskij, probably seduced by her themes, regards Axmatova's method as purely feminine: "Oh, how free are women in their fanciful incongruities."¹³⁷ It is true that the proximity in Axmatova's verse of folksy and sophisticated images and sounds, and her "Japanese" ability to leap over spaces and concepts (Čudovskij quotes as a typical example "Iva na nebe pustom rasplastala veer skvoznj. Mozet byt' lučše, čto ja ne stala vašej ženj,") presents a different freedom of associations than that of Mandel'stam. But I would argue that Axmatova too, presents a new kind of Modernism that is post-Symbolist in sensibility as well as in language, rather than merely feminine orientation.

If Axmatova's themes are subjective, her capricious method-impressionistic, her meters-not Classical, how does she fit into the third "generation" stage of Russian Modernism, which had been earlier defined as Objectivist, Realist, and Classicist? These terms have been used broadly to describe the progress of a large movement, the sum of

artists rather than individual figures. The features of the individual members require a smaller scale of measures. Axmatova, as opposed to her teacher Annenskij, uses gestures and not symbols as a vehicle of expression. Her "impressionism" or the "Japanese" leaps, endow her highly concrete images with the necessary energy to become gestures. I do not even need to quote another example to show that, she is, in any sense, an Objectivist. The same example suffices to show that neither in her imagery, nor in motivation, style, speech or subject does she deviate from what is usually called Realism. The last point may be argued (by the same example) by negative proof. Non-Classical style is imprecision, asymmetry or grotesque; here we have neither quality. Axmatova's clear delineations are so graphic, that she hardly even uses colors in her poetry. (In this respect she represents an opposite to Vološin.) Non-Classical themes are Romantic or Primitivist. Mandel'stam once made the following distinction in Apollon: "The Decadents did not like reality, but they knew it [reality], which distinguishes them from the Romantics."¹³⁸ Axmatova also knew reality. If her methods at times are folksy, her themes are never primitivistic. All this does not necessarily make her a Classicist, but it allows her to be placed in that category if the latter is regarded in a broad, comparative sense.¹³⁹

It was mentioned earlier that the third

"generation" displayed a tendency towards Primitivism. On the linguistic level this meant a greater employment of the senses as a vehicle for perception, as opposed to the primarily intellectual mode of the Symbolists. If Axmatova perceived her word-image-objects very keenly with the monochrome eyes of the "Grey-eyed King" of her first poem published in Apollon, other poets of her group sought to employ even less complicated devices. Gumilev applauded Zenkevič, whose poetry is a "reminder of an important but forgotten knowledge, that of primitive perceptions."¹⁴⁰ Gumilev quotes his lines which present this idea in its extreme form:

I u poslednej slizkoj tvari
Prozrenju temnomu učis'

Such a "dark insight" provides means of extra-verbal communication not by the elaborate "instrumentational" devices or abstract "hints" of the Symbolists but by perceiving the "gesture" of things by means of close rapport with the objects. Gumilev quotes another young poet, Karpov:

Teper' ja znaju, čto pojmu
Nemuju reč zverej

The Primitivist direction had, also, a wider than verbal application. Gumilev describes the process as follows:

The first generation of Russian Modernists was captivated, among other things by Aestheticism. Their poems abounded in beautiful, sometimes contentless words, [ornamental] labels. The reaction against that appeared in the second generation

(with Blok and Belyj) but it was, somehow undecisive and short-lived. The third generation went in this direction all the way. M. Zenkevič and, even more Vladimir Narbut grew to hate not only meaningless beautiful words, but all beautiful words, not only cliché elegance but any elegance in general. Their attention was attracted by all that was really rejected slime, dirt and soot of this world.¹⁴¹

After quoting a sample Gumilev exclaims: "Hallucinating realism!" But, Gumilev wisely continues, "It would appear that all this choice of strong, earthy . . . vocabulary, . . . would have been simply a chamber of curiosities if there had not been the poem "Gadalka." It contains the explanation of the poet's dream which is entranced and subjugated by the surrounding matter."¹⁴²

But anti-Aestheticism was only one of the post-Symbolist directions in Apollon. In the preceding issue of the journal Gumilev praised the virtuosity and good taste of Georgij Ivanov. But it is important to distinguish his assimilated Aestheticism from that of the early Modernist "discoveries." "It is rare that young poets have a refined verse which can be either precipitating and swift or retarded, always in correspondence with [its] theme. This is why reading each poem creates an almost physical feeling of satisfaction. Upon closer reading we find other major virtues . . . unexpectedness of themes and a kind of graceful "intellectual guilelessness" (glupovatost') in a degree as demanded by Puškin."¹⁴³ The tradition of studied glupovatost' as well as G. Ivanov's themes were, as

mentioned earlier, initiated by Kuzmin. Reviewing Kuzmin's second book Osenie ozera, Gumilev makes some interesting remarks about the "salon quality" salonnost' of this master who "occupies one of the first places among the contemporary Russian poets. Only few are granted such an amazing harmoniousness of the whole with free variety of particularities . . . his fully developed technique never obscures the image, it only gives wings to it."¹⁴⁴ Gumilev sees in Kuzmin's salonnost' a distinct addition to genuine poetry. Like Mandel'shtam, Kuzmin touches upon all the available cultural achievements; only, instead of unfolding each word-object into a theme, he presents a rather concrete myth-image under the guise of every object, every style and even, every theme. "Always the same Amor with the traditional quiver descends to the poet. . . . Here and there--the same 'znakomyj lik'. It is insanity, yes, but it also has another name--poetry."¹⁴⁵

It has been demonstrated that within two-to-three years the Apollon circle developed a number of highly varied yet distinctly post-Symbolist directions. Beginning their development under the aegis of the same high cultural and poetic standards ^{but} and without an ideological dogma, they branched out into a bewildering range of themes and styles, but they shared a number of essential characteristics which distinguished them from the Modernists of the preceding two "generations." They liked concrete objects better than

imaginary ones; they depicted these with sharp delineation; they enhanced the perception of reality (including that of art and language) by means of senses as well as intellect, and their treatment of words assumed an organic "physical" character. For all the above reasons, the young poets in Apollon relied, in their poetic expressions on gestures rather than on symbols.

The Emergence of Acmeism

Due to their sense of emancipation and their desire to elucidate the new developments in poetry, the third "generation" Modernists in St. Petersburg sought to establish their own, independent "societies." Several such attempts had been made. The brothers Gorodeckij, Pjast, P. P. Potemkin, and Blok's friend Evgenij Ivanov arranged as early as 1908, "Evenings of Art" (Večera iskusstv) sponsored by their "Circle of the Young" (Kružok molodyx) which, for lack of leadership, lasted only for a year.¹⁴⁶ The following year, Nedobrovo, Sadovskoj and E. G. Lisenkov started their "Society of Poets" (Obsčestvo poetov), called Fiza.¹⁴⁷ Shortly after, within the philology departments of the university a circle also entitled Kružok molodyx¹⁴⁸ sprang up and was headed by Larisa Raisner and Vsevolod Roždestvenskij, and patronized by Mandel'stam and Lozinskij. Meetings of these circles plus countless private meetings at

the Arts

diction

the poets' homes, and in the night club Brodjačaja sobaka, provided the general milieu of Modernist poetic activities. But the formal Society of Adepts of the Artistic Word (Obščestvo revnitelej xudožestvennogo slova) associated with Apollon, remained by far the dominating organization respectfully attended by the young poets of the smaller groups.¹⁴⁹

But towards the fall of 1911, the younger poets from the Apollon circle, who had become aware of a newer brand of Modernism, founded a more vital society which they named Cex poetov ("Guild of Poets"). As the stylized title implies, this organization was intended, very much as expressed two years earlier by Annenskij, as a professional workshop-association "for poets of different orientation who [wished to] work together on perfecting their verse."¹⁵⁰ The intellectual strength of this "society" lay not in scholarly presentations that could match those offered by the Obščestvo revnitelej, nor in a common philosophy or, even common tastes; the leaders of the Cex adopted a far more incontestable approach. They learned from Annenskij and Kuzmin a very practical cautiousness regarding values: style may be criticized but taste has to be cherished privately. Remembering that de gustibus non est disputandum they concentrated on the discussions of form and technique in individual works, without forgetting that form and technique were only a common means¹⁵¹ to the individual

poet's ends, left respectfully alone. As recently told by Anna Axmatova

The meetings of the Cex Poetov [began] in November 1911 and lasted until April 1912 (i.e. our departure to Italy): approximately fifteen meetings were held . . . from October 1912 until April 1913 approximately ten meetings [were held], . . . Gumilev and Gorodeckij were the trustees; Dimitrij Kuz'min-Karavaev--the business manager; Anna Axmatova--secretary; [among the members were] Osip Mandel'stam, Vladimir Narbut, N. Zenkevič, N. Bruin, Georgij Ivanov, Georgij Adamovič, V. V. Gippius, M. Moravskaja, Elena Kuz'minca-Karavaeva, Černjavskij, M. Lozinskij. The first meeting was held at the Gorodeckij's . . . it was attended by Blok and [some] French [visitors] . . .¹⁵²

It was during that period, that the Musaget Symbolists gave their lectures "designed to repel the epigones and heretics," in the Obscestvo revnitelej xudozestvennogo slova, on Symbolism. Gumilev, Gorodeckij and Kuz'min-Karavaev opposed, and Nedobrovo and Čudovskij supported the speakers.¹⁵³ But there was no dialogue between the lecturers and the audience; the interests were too diverse. The enormous prestige of Ivanov did not permit a direct attack. All Gumilev could argue in his review of the second part of V. Ivanov's Cor Ardens was to say that "those who do not possess his [Ivanov's intellectual and technical] means should not follow him for that would mean to undertake a risky, and probably pernicious, adventure. He is dear to us as an indicator of one of the extremes [the Oriental strain] contained in the Slavic soul. But defending the integrity of the Russian idea we must, loving this

extreme, say 'no' to it, and remember that . . . the heart of Russia is plain Moscow and not the magnificent Samarkand."¹⁵⁴ It need not be too surprising that the "African" and "South Sea Island Conquistador," Gumilev objected to the exotic character of Ivanov. He objected neither to the themes nor to the images. He objected to the "monstrous tension which gives a purely intellectual pleasure but which excludes any 'unpremeditated joy' (Nečajannaja radost') of an accidentally obtained image, an instantaneous notion."¹⁵⁵ Gumilev concludes that if King Gaspar had written poetry it would have been similar to Ivanov's. "For him, the wisest, the joy of recognition, preference or hatred of things, ideas and names . . . is precluded. . . ." ¹⁵⁶ At best, all these elements are only symbols, clad in a barbarically luxurious style.

The intellectual stalemate between Cex and Ivanov's 'Society' resulted in separation. Cex exited but maintained a cordial relation and solidarity with the older 'Society.'¹⁵⁶ But as the younger group began to acquire a more and more distinct character, it began to lose its more peripheral members, like Blok and Nedobrovo. The latter, with his group, joined the "Society of Adepts . . ." (now weakened also by Ivanov's departure for Moscow), which now was referred to as the Akademija stixa. The Cex in the meanwhile, moved towards closer consolidation. Ideologically, the official principles were still defined only as

"honesty [fidelity to real experiences] of poetry" and pursuit of "the line of the greatest resistance."¹⁵⁷

In December 1911, according to Axmatova, at one of the meetings of the Cex poetov, at the house of the Gumilev's in Carskoe selo, it was decided to name the emerging school "Acmeism."¹⁵⁸ The title was to reflect the effort of the poets to detect and to express the highest point (akme) or the most characteristic feature, the climax of any development of phenomena. There exist several versions of the origin of the term. Apparently it was not invented by the Acmeists. Blok and Belyj name Ivanov's Tower as its cradle. Belyj recalls how Ivanov, "instigating an agon between Apollo and Dionysus"¹⁵⁹ challenged Makovskij, Čudovskij and especially Gumilev who "responded not so much with words as with his [formal] appearance."¹⁶⁰ "One day," Belyj continues, "Ivanov ironically suggested to Gumilev, 'Why don't you, N. S., instead of rejecting Symbolism, invent your own current, . . .'" Belyj joined in "using, perhaps, the expression 'Adamism'" Ivanov continued, and "somehow the word acme sprang up and Ivanov solemnly proposed that Gumilev become an "Acmeist." But how enormous was his amazement when Gumilev said, maintaining his coolness, and crossing his legs: "Well, splendid: let it be then-- 'Acmeism.'" Blok recalls that it was he who gave Gumilev "the only useful idea" that "Adamism will bring a manly-- firm and clear view on life" at the time of the famous

debate on Symbolism.¹⁶¹ Pjast has an amusing theory that the term Acmeism was subsonsciously derived from the pseudo-name Axmatov. "Isn't here the Latin suffix 'at,' 'atum,' 'atus' . . . 'Axmatus'; by the rules of the French language it would, precisely, turn into the French 'Acmais,' as 'amatus' [became] 'aime,' the French name Aimee, and armatus [became]--arme."¹⁶² It is curious to recall that the eclectic Brjusov anticipated the notion of Adamism in 1907, in his poem Sejatel', in which he assumes the task of Adam to name reality,

Vnov', Kak Adam v raju nevedomom i novom
 Ves' mir uvižu ja
 I budu zaklinat' prostym i veščim slovom
 Vse tajny bytija

Even earlier, in 1906 he wrote in Zolotoe Runo, "The task of art is to find authentic names for objects and phenomena of the world. An artist can not do more than reproduce reality faithfully, even if in new, fantastic combinations of its elements."¹⁶³ Apollon welcomed the taste of the Acmeists, seeing in their school a potential of rigorous criticism unburdened by ideologies.¹⁶⁴ In 1913, the journal published a series of articles, which sought to explain the relation of the new school to Symbolism and a number of poems which sought to exemplify it.

In the early stages of the new school the terms Acmeism and Adamism seemed to coexist as descriptive titles. It is not entirely clear which of the two leaders, Gumilev

and Gorodeckij, preferred which title.¹⁶⁵ Professor Struve, perhaps somewhat too strongly, stresses (as other critics) the theoretical vagueness of the school, and the "unnaturalness" of the alliance of the two poets who had "nothing at all in common."¹⁶⁶ It is true that Gorodeckij could change his philosophical principles as easily as he could write verse. He was in the avant-garde of Symbolism, then Mystical Anarchism, later Artistic Populism, now Acmeism, and wound up as a "Socialist Realist." But there is no reason to doubt that he was a sincere and intense Acmeist in 1912-1913. Ever since his collection Jar' (1907) he manifested a flair for bright colors, clearly delineated objects, ringing words, primeval images and very little metaphysics. But if one recalls the directions in which the aesthetics of the third "generation" developed, at a time when they reached definable proportions, they still required, and corresponded to, no specific metaphysical system. In fact, the intent of Acmeism, to detect and define things at the peak of their manifestation, and of Adamism, to discover and name virgin reality by its most vital characteristics, the rejection of any ideational trends, excluded the possibility of any systems. Acmeism was by its nature anti-theoretical. Mandel'shtam wrote retrospectively, that

Acmeism brought a series of new sensations [which are] far more valuable than ideas and [it brought] mainly the taste for the entirety of a verbal

imagination, an image, in a new, organic conception. Literary schools live not by ideas, but by tastes; to bring a whole batch of new ideas without bringing new tastes means to fail to make a new school, but only to found a poetics.¹⁶⁷

At a lecture on Acmeism as late as 1937, Mandel'stam defined Acmeism simply as "a longing for world culture" (toska po mirovoj kul'ture).¹⁶⁸

Neither the exaggerated vagueness with which the cryptoclastically precise Mandel'stam defined Acmeism, nor the noumenal dualism, nor the elusiveness of the object under definition, negates the fact of a substantial newness, and, consequently, a positive difference of the new poetry. It is important to repeat this point not only because it has been overlooked in retrospect even by close witnesses,¹⁶⁹ but also because that fact serves as the main motivation for the leading Acmeists to define their new current.¹⁷⁰ On December 19, 1912, Gorodeckij gave a lecture in Brodjačaja Sobaka which provoked a lively debate, and might have been the first public announcement of Acmeism.¹⁷¹ A written definition had been published one month earlier by Gumilev in a review of Gorodeckij's Cvetuščij posox. In it Gumilev remarked that the poet understood that he must adopt the Acmeist outlook in order to make his myth work.¹⁷² But the formal attempts to describe the new departure did not appear until 1913, in the January and February issues of Apollon. These essays have generally been received as somewhat incongruous programmatical statements; but it

seems wiser to regard them as descriptive surveys by writers who show different degrees of critical sophistication.

Gumilev's article Nasledije simvolizma i akme-izm¹⁷³ ("The Heritage of Symbolism and Acmeism") presents no observations and norms that would be new to the readers of his "Letters on Russian Poetry." It is, however, the first formal attempt to embrace all the major features of the latest Modernist poetry. But it is only that. Observing the demise of the current Symbolist creativity Gumilev said that it is being replaced "by a new trend, no matter what its name may be."¹⁷⁴ Like the early Symbolists in Vesy Gumilev, quite undogmatically, mentions two names: "whether Acmeism (from the word ἀκμή --the highest degree of anything, color, blooming season), or Adamism (manly, firm and clear outlook on life), in any event it is a direction which demands a greater balance of forces and a more exact knowledge of the relation between subject and object, than [was evident] in Symbolism."¹⁷⁵ To people who are more familiar with Gumilev's poetry than with his criticism, this statement may appear as an arrogant call for performing an impossible task. But for Gumilev, who knew professionally and intimately the creative problems of his colleagues, it must have been plain that in the second decade of this century, no pure "isms" could provide first-rate poetry. If the swinging towards Objectivism went as far as concreteness of words-objects, then a demand to pro-

ject the individuality of the author, in lyricism, calls for a proportionately greater effort. The variety of solutions, made it obvious to Gumilev that it was a matter of choosing a personal "balance of forces," whereas with the Symbolists it was a matter of increasing the range of isoclinal forces.

In the tradition of the first "generation" Modernists Gumilev, like Vološin before him, speaks of the infatuation with masters of other epoch. He uses this infatuation as a device to indicate his colleagues' sources of values, to search for a possible unity. "Beloved graves tie people more [to each other] than anything else. In the circles close to Acmeism the most frequently pronounced names are Shakespeare, Rabelais, Villon and Théophile Gautier. The choice of these names is not random."¹⁷⁷ Here too, no matter what critics like Brjusov thought,¹⁷⁸ Gumilev's statement is a sensible and successful example of the "balance" which he said was so demanding. First of all, if these names reflect the ideals of the circle, they show an overwhelming predominance of Gallic (and no German) orientation which is quite distinct from that of the second "generation" Russian Symbolists. Secondly, these names dispel the notion that Acmeism was a return to Parnassianism. It was that, but only to the extent of the one-fourth of its orientation which involved Gautier. Thirdly, Gumilev, as can be seen from the above quotations, made it clear

that the mentioning of this disparate quartet describes an already observable trend among his colleagues and not a norm which he, Gumilev, sought to project. Fourthly, the "physiological" vitality of the Renaissance masters (and even Gautier, as Gumilev demonstrated in a special article),¹⁷⁹ corresponds to the primevalistic notion of Adamism. "As Adamists, we are forest animals, somewhat, and under no circumstance will we give up that which is animal in us in exchange for neurasthenia."¹⁸⁰

The virtues of Gumilev's article proved also to be its faults. Like the misunderstood article of Annenskij "On Contemporary Lyricism," and like the Kuzmin essay, this article refrained from the usual value judgments but also from "pulling punches." Its vigorous nature and brevity and, of course, the term Acmeism, endowed this dense article with the character of a manifesto. The latter fact did Gumilev and Acmeism a disservice because it prompted the readers to search vainly for a "clear theoretical foundation of a new school," whereas, in their disappointment, they failed to see that the essay was a restrained attempt to describe accurately and approvingly a multifarious artistic development.

Gorodeckij's more flamboyant essay entitled Nekotonye tečeniija v sovremennoj russkoj poezii,¹⁸¹ (Some Currents in Contemporary Russian Poetry) includes a very partial comparison of Symbolist and Acmeist poets; Gorodeckij

summarized his survey of the first group by the statement that the "catastrophe" of Symbolism indicates that it failed to be the expressing agent of the spirit of Russia,¹⁸² *-ive/?* whereas, Gorodeckij strongly implied, Acmeism would master that task.¹⁸³ Gorodeckij also said that Cex, which began its work without any preconceived theories, has now, after a year, crystallized its theses which can be clearly articulated. But although Gorodeckij does not do that (he only describes some "Adamistic" themes like animals in Gumilev's verse, primeval man in those of Zenkevič, earthy items in Narbut's poems, and in Axmatov's verses he sees the naming of the products of neurotic civilization together with the caressing of the "remnants" from Adam which they still bear. This essay added greatly to the impression that it was an accompanying work of a manifesto. This effect was heightened by the somewhat pompous ending of the article. Comparing Acmeism with other trends of Modernist poetry, Gorodeckij concluded that the Acmeists are not Parnassians,

because they [the Acmeists] do not cherish the road itself which leads to abstract eternity. They [the Acmeists] are not impressionists, because each ordinary moment does not appear to them as the artistic end in itself (samoceli). They [the Acmeists] are not symbolists, because they do not seek in each moment an aperture to eternity. They are Acmeists, because they bring into art those moments which may be eternal.¹⁸⁴

Mandel'st'am's essay O sobesednike (On the Interlocutor)¹⁸⁵ does not mention Acmeism; it is a vigorous

attack on the latest Symbolist theory about communication with the reader. It is possible to assume that this article was written several months before it was published, also because the argument seems to be directed specifically against Ivanov's speech Mysli o simbolizme which was published a year earlier in Trudy i Dni; its epigraph is taken from Kormčie Zvezdy,

Priroda-simvol, kak sej rog. Ona
Zvučit dlja otzvuka. I otzvuk Bog.
Blažen kto slyšit pesn' i slyšit otzvuk¹⁸⁶

and Belyj's poems Barbarussa published in the June 1911 issue of Apollon,¹⁸⁷

My-rycari dal'nix stran

and

Ja--rog gud'aščij iz t'my

also

Rycar' . . .
Skačet ne v skazky--v byl'

which corresponds with Blok's verses taken by Belyj as an epigraph,

Mne cvety i pčela vljublennye
Rasskazali ne skazku--byl'

Ivanov accordingly argues that the attribute of symbols is their ability to depict the earthy (elements) rather than the celestial; therefore, for true Symbolism, not the volume of sound (which corresponds with the original source) but the force of resonance (artistic echo) becomes important as the vehicle of perception.¹⁸⁸ Mandel'stam argues

that the Symbolists blur the question of who, exactly, is addressed by the poet, precisely because they picture themselves as technicians of communication. This presumes that they know the addressee. In such a case they can never create a mystery, because "the unknown can not be unknown if it is addressed to the known."¹⁸⁹ Moreover, "there is no lyricism without a dialogue," but the interlocutor has to be distant. "The taste for communication is in inverse ratio to our real knowledge of the interlocutor, and in direct proportion to the wish to interest the addressee."¹⁹⁰ Mandel'stam quotes some convincing examples of successful communication with the "unknown reader" from Baratynskij and Sologub in order to conclude acmeistically that "poems exist as events and not as traces of experiences" as is implied by Ivanov's theory of echo.

Far more revealing of the nature of Acmeism, than these essays, are the nine poems of six young poets, published in the following issue of Apollon,¹⁹¹ and reproduced here in Appendix II. The editor's notice said that these poems are printed in order to illustrate the ideas expressed in the articles of Gumilev and Gorodeckij. "The verses belong to poets who are united by these ideas . . ." The words "Acmeism" or "Adamism" are not mentioned. The degree of "unity" of the authors remains the same as it was before the appearance of the new titles. Bypassing the aesthetic value of these fine poems, they shall be examined

briefly from the point of view of range and cohesion of the school. Gumilev's poem, modestly entitled Pjatistopnye jamby (Five-foot iambs), is one of his most autobiographical ones. In a later edition he even substituted for the last four stanzas a biographically more up-to-date (wartime, and post-Acmeist) ending.¹⁹² The poem does fulfill the task, central to Gumilev, of fully revealing the creator behind his style, which has to pursue the line of the greatest resistance.¹⁹³ We shall limit the examples of such pursuit to the analysis of only one aspect of this poem, its pattern of rhymes. The twelve stanza form (of the Apollon version) with six lines in each stanza is divided into three equal thematic parts which reflect Gumilev's interests: travel, woman (Axmatova) and Cex. But the rhyme scheme divides the poem into two equal parts of which six stanzas follow the A B A B A B pattern of perfect rhymes, whereas the other six stanzas present every time a new combination of A and B exhausting a symmetrical half of the total possibilities of combinations. The varied pattern (stanze II - VII) follows the dramatic development of the plot reaching a metallic temper-color, (expressed in V), by an A A A B B B pattern of brilliant alliterations (A = ant'e and B = al'). In VII the blow of the separation is enhanced by a hollow A B B B A A (B = uk) sound. The transition to calm resignation is accompanied in stanza VIII by a return to the pattern of the first stanza, which

explains the cyclic overlapping of the rhyme scheme. While this poem abounds in technical finesse on all the other prosodic levels, making this to be one of Gumilev's liveliest poems, none of these virtues obscures the other plane on which the figure of the manly loneliness of the author comes closer and closer to the reader. Such double plane development distinguishes the poems of the Acmeists from those of the Symbolists in that the latter subordinate word-images as devices to the unreal level of their abstractions, whereas the Acmeists operate simultaneously on two concrete levels allotting equal treatment to the unfolding of thematic and imagistic associations. This is why Gumilev considered being an Acmeist a more difficult task.¹⁹⁴

Gorodeckij's short poems Adam and Zvezdy (stars) are contrastingly simple and emphatically informal. The farewell to the chaotic depths of Symbolism is expressed with a casual matter-of-factness:

Nexoču čitat' ja vecnyx
Nepon'atnyx mne pis'men

or

Postroen mir i mnogozvučen

• • •

I vot Adamu on poručen

Such poetry is clearly anti-Symbolist, and it is easy to read. But it does not supersede Symbolism. It does not promise that the author will fulfill the "... first exploit that is new," and, "tear away the veils of vain

mysteries . . . "195

Vladimir Narbut, on the other hand, seems "new." He, too, writes simply, carefully avoiding any "prettiness." But he does it with "beautiful difficulty" (Prekrasnaja trudnost') which even very refined poets could envy him, because from the uniformly dull colors and sounds, and the plain amphibrachic meter, broken by a strong caesura (only once effectively isolated), emerges a poignantly affectionate image of his homely Muse:

Ona---nekrasiva: pripljusnut
Slegka eja nos, i glaza,
Smotrjaščie dolgo i grustno, . . .

In his other poem: Kak bystro vysyxajut kryši ! he arrives by means of "materialistic" mood and language unexpectedly at a religious situation:

gradinoj vixrj na cerkvi vyšib
Pod samym kupolom--steklo

The rest of the poem, developing on one plane a peasant's language and Christian legends on the other, arrives at a shattering climax based, like in Mandel'stam on the word-image-object.

. . . ja bolen,
Ja bogoxul'stvuju, ja lgu--
Tvoja razdroblennaja golen'
Na kazdom snitsja mne sagu.

Axmatova's now famous poems: "Ja prišla tebja smenit' sestra" and "Cabaret Artistique" require little comment in addition to what was already said about her art. The remarkable dialogue of two sisters is truly polyphonic. The

reader does not even need the capricious rhythmic and formal changes to hear that the alto voice of the older alter-ego sounds on the dominant, a fourth lower, creating what contrapuntalist call, a "real answer." Even Blok could seldom achieve such a musical realism. And Axmatova takes the "harder line" of exact delineation of each word and, to use V. Vinogradov's term, each "grimace of dialogue."¹⁹⁶

Zenkevič's epic Smertj Losja (Death of an Elk), is the most thunderously kinetic poem of the collection, and its "copper uterus" emits a more elemental roar than perhaps any verse in Russian poetry, including Majakovskij's and Burlyuk's; it also has an elemental swing:

I lopasti rogov, kan jakor', vglinu vryv,
S razmaxa ruxnul los'

and a literally muscle bound language:

Dymils'a sev parnoj na traure krovavom,--
Kak muskul'nyj gluxoj otgul na terpkij rog.

It is interesting to observe how the theatrically ornate expression na traure krovavom (on the bloody mourning clad) interacts with dymits'a sev parnoj (smokes [the] steamy sowing) enhancing, rather than neutralizing, each image.

The collection concludes with two "architectonic" poems of Mandel'stam: Aja-Sofija and Notre Dame. Reflecting, by their very texture, the difference between Eastern and Western Christianity,¹⁹⁷ they also reflect the transition from the lofty to the concrete.¹⁹⁸ But the concrete is no less divine. It is more organic. In that sense the

poem Notre Dame unites the elements of Acmeism and of Adamism. The stone vault of the Basilica "spreads its nerves like the joyous primeval Adam, and plays with its muscles." But what makes it all possible is the skillful design of the "Gothic soul's rational abyss." It creates the incomprehensible forest of small and huge particles. The relevance to poetry is that, the more Mandel'stam studies the cathedral's "monstrous ribs," the more he thinks that he too, someday, will create Beauty out of the menacing weight.

Recalling the cricket-clock connection let us look a little further on how Gothicism represented in Mandel'stam's mind the point at which mechanical complexity approaches, and merges with, organic life. In an elegant essay entitled Fransua Villon,¹⁹⁹ Mandel'stam discovers in the figure of François Villon a triple source of affinity: a similar psyche, a similar cultural condition, in which the life of the literary art is widely segregated from general life, and a parallel attitude towards literary schools: Villon's challenge to the powerful Medieval rhetoric school is the same as in Mandel'stam's time, the challenge to Symbolism. After drawing partially unconsciously, a number of psycho-biographical parallels,²⁰⁰ Mandel'stam returns to the source of his inspiration, Gothicism. "The physiology of Gothic--and there was such, . . . specifically the physiological genius of the epoch, replaced for

Villon a Weltanschauung and bountifully rewarded him for the absence of contact with the past."²⁰¹ The same description applies to the Acmeists. In the article Utro Akmeizma (The Morning of Acmeism) which Mandel'stam published only in 1919 but probably wrote in 1913,²⁰² Mandel'stam makes the connection: "Acmeists share their love for the organism and organization with the physiological genius of the Middle Ages."²⁰³ What does Mandel'stam mean by "physiological"? In a review of a translation of J. K. Huysman's Parižskie arabeski,²⁰⁴ Mandel'stam regards the book as "purposely physiological. [Because] . . . The clash of defenseless but refined external organs of perception with the insulting reality [Paris is hell], that is its theme. . . . In order to perceive the infinite viciousness of the Medieval Age a physiological sophistication is indispensable."²⁰⁵ In Utro Akmeizma Mandel'stam continues:

In its chasing after refinement the XIX century lost the secret of genuine complexity. That which in the XIII century seemed the logical development of the concept of organism--the Gothic cathedral--now has the aesthetic effect of something monstrous: Notre Dame is the celebration of physiology, its Dionysian debauch. We do not wish to divert ourselves with a stroll in the forest of symbols, because we have a more virgin, a denser forest--divine physiology, the boundless complexity of our dark organism.²⁰⁶

Mandel'stam sees associations of objects on the same scale, or level, (unlike the Symbolists' association of a realia^{bus} ad realiora) in a simple formula which he now calls a theme: "A = A." For that reason he argues: "We do not

give
French

X

fly, we climb up only on such towers as we ourselves can build." The connecting bricks may be astonishingly identical, thus, one of the most "surprising" masters, Mandel'stam confesses: "The ability to feel surprise is the poets greatest benefactor." But above all, the Middle Ages are dear to us because they possessed in the highest degree the feeling of border and partition.²⁰⁷

In addition to the six poets whose poems have been discussed above, other young poets joined to form the Acmeist school; among the more talented ones were Georgij Adamovič, Georgij Ivanov, Mikhael Lozinskij, Vsevolod Roždestvenskij and Elena Kuz'mina-Karavaeva.²⁰⁸ They all, to a varying extent, manifested the qualities described above as the properties of the last stage of Russian Modernism which they called Acmeism. Because such "physiological" qualities are difficult to compare, more difficult than style or themes, and because of the diverse double plane, but equally objective, sources which enter the process of creativity of the better Acmeist poets, many contemporaries, and even today's critics refuse to concede that the latest brand of Russian Modernism was a distinct historic reality. Brjusov predicted that in two years, the term "Acmeism" will be as readily forgotten as was "Mystical Anarchism."²⁰⁹ Blok was totally unable to see any human texture not to mention divine spark, in such a school.²¹⁰ But the fact that the name did not become for-

gotten and the poets were inspired, proves, regardless of whether or not the word "Acmeism" is the most appropriate term, the persistent rationale of the concept.

Apollon shared the aesthetic views of most Acmeists, but did not identify itself with them as an organization. Reviewing Merežkovskij's novel Alexandr I, Valerian Čudovskij, who did not join the Acmeist school, extended the potential of its aesthetics considerably beyond what the poets themselves expected. Indicating as one of the merits of Merežkovskij a serious antinomy between the demands of modern historicism and modern art wherein the former develops an approach of "fluidity" while art demands specific delineation, Čudovskij writes, "I am deeply convinced that Acmeist science will reject the borderless fluidity of the present day historical thought."²¹¹ Makovskij, too, did not join the new school, but retained close personal and professional contact with its members. Retrospectively, he too, doubted the existence of positive Acmeist features. The critic Victor Žirmunskij saw a certain ambivalence in Acmeist values: while accepting their stylistic gains, he was not very sure about their ultimate artistic purpose.²¹² He appreciated their "loyal prerogative of epic quietness," their psychological empiricism and artistic realism, which in the case of Axmatova brought them towards Puskin, French Classicism and an unexpected rationalism.²¹³

The Acmeists unfolded between 1912 and 1914 a

direction

very busy activity. They founded in 1912 their own journal of poetry Giperborej and a publishing house Cex poetov; neither was officially "Acmeist, but the listed names almost totally coincided with those which appeared in association with Acmeism. As their reputation grew, they were invited to publish in various other journals. According to G. Struve, Gumilev and Axmatova became permanent contributors to Russkaja Mysl'. When in 1914 Gumilev joined the armed forces, while the aesthetics of Acmeism persisted, as an organization, it began to lose momentum. But throughout the war the Acmeists, including Gumilev, maintained their ties with Apollon.

Apollon's Quest for Artistic Balance

Not much needs to be said about the relation of Apollon to the left wing-extremist groups like Ego-Futurism and Futurism which sprang up at about the same time as Acmeism.²¹⁴ These groups, especially the Moscow Futurists, based their entire thrust on the categorical rejection of all culture (including Puškin).²¹⁵ While the talent of many Futurists was undeniable²¹⁶ and some of their positions logically supportable,²¹⁷ Apollon even if it wanted to welcome the radicals, was too deeply committed to, and reached too high a sophistication in, traditional culture to be able to share any goals with the Futurists. According to

Vladimir Markov most of the attacks came from the radicals.²¹⁸ At first Apollon was simply amused by the considerable humor of, for example, the collection Sadok Sudej,²¹⁹ excerpts from which Apollon printed in the section Pčely i osy Apollona.²²⁰ Gumilev wrote in 1912 that "Grigorij Novickij and, after him, the Ego-Futurists published manifestos which, in their pompous illiteracy surpass even the posters of provincial movie-theaters."²²¹ In Nasledie simvolizma which described Ego-Futurists and Futurists as hyenae who follow the vanishing Lion-Symbolism, Gumilev stated in a footnote that he does not categorically reject all extremism.²²² Gumilev was quite justified to feel that the vanishing Symbolists did leave an aesthetic vacuum by achieving an extraordinary esoteric art, which, especially in the field of language, was no longer able to develop any further. The critic Boris Ejxenbaum, in his Formalist period, interpreted the post-Symbolist condition as a dilemma: "It became necessary either to create a new 'kosnojazyčie' a new primitive lingo, or to liberate the traditional poetic language from the chains of Symbolism and to bring it to a new balance. In other words there arose the question of a revolution or evolution."²²³ Apollon, as it was demonstrated, took from its inception, the latter direction, and announced in 1910 that it had a double role: to examine contemporary artistic developments and to maintain and strengthen the ties with the past.²²⁴ This is why, besides

aiding the Acmeists, the journal was mostly devoted to publishing historical monographs concerning all art forms and ignoring the clamorous "right" and "left" and the provincial "below."

However, by the fall of 1913, the "left" has made considerable advances. On the one hand, some radical artists, especially painters, moved from the religious and chapman-book (lubochnaid) tradition towards folksy Primitivism and from Symbolism towards Expressionism. On the other hand, a current began to develop a direction of "scientism." It is at this point that Apollon saw it necessary to respond. Valerian Čudovskij published an article entitled Futurizm i prošloe.²²⁵ At the outset Čudovskij conceded that the young tempestuous movements, which seemed at first like foreign news items, are here to stay. "They are a very significant phenomenon; more than a school; their unquestionable novelty lies in their total, basic, complete, unequivocal, rejection of the past. Of course the idea of futurism is ancient: the reverencing of future. Spiritually, these notions emerged with the Encyclopedists. They became more actual in 1848 when "men without past" replaced those with the past. The idea of "art for art's sake" germinated from the psyche of the alienated worker. For the artist who does not care about the significance and meaning of his art, work becomes an end in itself. It follows logically that the means of production become the expression.

Thus, Futurism only seems new; the Futurists are only the last link of a progression, and they are deceived by their personal physiological youth. So they think they are creative, but we know that this orientation long had ceased to be creativity." Čudovskij concludes with the statement that "Alas, these young people do not know what a pure, lofty, holy fortune it is to carry ideas which were nurtured through milleniums . . . by so many demi-gods and heroes."²²⁶ Compared with Čudovsky's review of Trudy i Dni the metaphysical position of Apollon becomes clear from this article. The violent divorce of creativity from meaning makes the Futurists even less acceptable to Apollon than the concerted effort to imbue art with "ugly extra-cultural saintliness" by the Symbolists of Musaget. But Apollon saw between these positions sufficient space to continue to pursue independeltly a broad course in the quest for harmonious art.

Guarding Modernism against excesses, transcending the proliferating "isms," Apollon decried the new tendency of the extreme Objectivist Futurists to espouse "scientism." In a formal article entitled "Novoe' iskusstvo i 'četvertoe izmerenie"²²⁷ Makovskij voices his grave concern about this trend; to him it represents a mixture of powerfully innovative talent, outrageous illiteracy, partly understood modern mathematics and, most dangerous of all, a real affinity for the pace of contemporary civilization. Makovskij traces N.

Burljuk's assertion that the newest schools seek to "infiltrate the work of art with the fourth dimension" to the theories of Georg F. B. Riemann and Charles H. Hinton. Their teachings stimulated the artists to improve the human perception of objects by creating a four-dimensional view either by means of a plurality of viewpoints (imaginary motion or the subject), or by integration of the element of time (imaginary motion of the object). The ultra-concrete presentation (industrial figures, re-introduced black colors etc.) of abstractions (purely intellectual imagination) dehumanizes artistic creativity as well as appreciation of it, because such a presentation desecrates the only familiar perceptions of beauty sought by the art of the "old world" "tender and religious." Makovskij concludes that there is hope that nature, human, artistic or spiritual, will ultimately reject the attempts to fuse art and science; otherwise, "scientific metaphysics . . . [will] devour Apollo" which, of course, would mean finis artis.²²⁸

Extreme anti-intellectual trends such as Suprematism or, in poetry, extra-rationalism (zaum') produce at best extreme stylizations of extreme primitivism;²²⁹ and excessive "stylizationism" (stilizatorstvo); whether carried out by artists of Mir iskusstva or Futurists, it is bound to either obscure the identity of the author or the work of art, or to divorce the artist's method from his original purpose. Gumilev, for example, suspected that

stilizatrostvo masks the identity of an author who is not powerful enough to project his own style.²³⁰ An example of stilizatorstvo obscuring a work of art may be found in a review by Čudovskij of Stanislavskij's production of Puškin's "Little Tragedies,"²³¹ for which the expert stylist Benois designed the sets. Čudovskij explains how the merits of Benois' admirable knowledge of the periods and his taste overburden the stage with impressive stylistic detail which "Puškin himself could not have known" and diminished the impact of the plays to the extent that the entire production proved a failure. The case of Stravinskij's brilliant music exemplifies the third type of danger. In Balety Igorja Stravinskogo, A. Rimskij-Korsakov²³² traces the typically Modernist development of Stravinskij's "objective" music from the character of fairy, to chapmanbook (lubok) and to primitiv; such a progression, in itself quite legitimate (Stravinskij's aggressive empathy with refined modes compensates for lyricism), requires increased stilizatorstvo. The reliance on the physiological rather than ideational capacity of sounds to communicate the material (or "bodily") substance of his music, demands an unprecedented complexity of instrumentation and composition. In order to re-create the reality of, let us say, a primitive village, Stravinskij is forced to overwhelm his audience with sophisticated calculations which fail to bring the bewildered listener closer either to that village or to the

author's psyche, concealed by his music, despite the obvious predominance of the quest for expressiveness rather than beauty.

But Apollon always made it clear that directness, too, even if accompanied by a worthy tendency, articulate observation, and impeccable form, do not yet justify a work of art. The critic M. Tumpovskaja demonstrates in 1917, in her article 'Sem' cvetov radugi' Valerija Brjusova²³³ that it is only Brjusov's vanishing power of imagination that occasionally in the historical or "passeist" passages produces a sense of artistic relevance; otherwise, Brjusov's collection, despite the announcement that "it is necessary and timely to depict the rewarding aspects of life," and despite his classical clarity, is lifeless and boring. On the other hand, and on a more sophisticated level, an essential shortcoming of Gumilev reveals the danger of over-energetic imagination. Again in 1917, reviewing Gumilev's first "fully mature" collection, Kolčan,²³⁴ Tumpovskaja arrives at a crack in the very core of Gumilev's creativity. His work evokes the expectation of formal perfection with all the sonorous, chiseled, verses, rich in plastic images and virile themes. Such is the demand of the "large canvas" or decorative mode of Gumilev's art. But this expectation is frustrated by the too noticeable abundance of devices. Gumilev reveals not only himself in his work, but also the mechanism, the "progression of his creative pro-

cess." Since there is no "classical" divorce between the process of constructing and the finished work, the latter is not a perfect separate object. In the visual arts it is the genre of the sketch which allows the public to delight mentally in developing further each feature, or to follow back to that feature's original designatory motive. But his rare gift of reaching "that ineffable moment of combining calmness and motion"²³⁵ and his tone belong to the genre of a painting, not a sketch. Thus the various parts of his poems are left with their own devices to seduce the reader. They do this fully, but they do not satisfy, because Gumilev mixes the two basically alien genres. Architectonically, this means that the poems can not hold their own weight, they contain too many isolated effects. In Gumilev's art creative action predominates over creative reflection. Apollon's critic charges the Acmeist maitre with the lack of intellectual rigor; this shortcoming makes his art neither totally simple nor enigmatically unreachable.

To the extent that Tumpovskaja's article represents the criticism of Apollon's mature period, it is important to observe that the application of "classical" standards in the case of Gumilev, happens to be prompted by the poet's own ambition, and not by the journal's "requirement." A less ambitious Symbolist poet, Boris Sadovskoj, received high praise from Georgij Ivanov for his careful and beautiful execution of very modest tasks.²³⁶ On the other

hand, G. Ivanov chided his fellow Acmeist, Gorodeckij, of whose creativity Apollon was suspicious ever since Annenskij's survey in 1909, for expanding his usual glibness and dubious folksy taste into themes of the World War.²³⁷ It is not that Apollon was averse to war poetry; the journal published and commented rather enthusiastically on many first-rate samples of this type.²³⁸ But the grave thematic content raised the artistic "demands to a much higher level than that of skill and patriotism. An impression of "classicism" was created by almost all the critical writings in Apollon because, unlike those of the earlier Modernist "searches," the critics in Apollon did not seek to judge the artist's intentions (technical or metaphysical) per se, but pointed them out only as agents, which do or do not contribute to the harmonious whole of the work of art. Reflections on war, accordingly, demand that the work of art also reflect the scope and intensity of the author's psyche to the degree proportionate with his theme. This is why, in the column "Iskusstvo i vojna" Apollon pointed out that artists may help the war effort more by arranging benefit performances and sales for the various reliefs, than by adhering at all costs to patriotic themes.²³⁹

At this point, a few words can be said about Apollon's relation to Russian politics. Since the overwhelming majority of journals, even those which dealt with Modernist art were, by tradition, saturated with

political issues, the Russian public was accustomed to regard pure Aestheticism as egotistical and decadent. When the victorious "decadents" of Mir iskusstva and early Vesy capitalized on all the strategies which could segregate them from the "retarded" intelligentsia in order to defend their cause, they overstated the extremism of their position (a similar move was made in Apollon's time by the Futurists). But neither the value of épater le bourgeois which, to use Arthur Symons's expression, "is an action, which in itself is a mark of the 'middle class,'" ²⁴⁰ nor the radical Modernists' valuation of aesthetics as an absolute, could be shared by Apollon. ²⁴¹ In its quest for balance and proportion the journal eschewed this extreme position, as well as that of Transcendentalism or Utilitarianism. For that reason politics, the humanistic "sister of aesthetics," ²⁴² was neither expelled from nor particularly honored in the "Apollonian" circle of considerations. Because such an attitude appeared as almost incomprehensible to a large portion of the intelligentsia, Apollon published in 1913 two "once and for all" statements about politics. In the article O Merežkovskom, Nekrasove i o politike v iskusstve ²⁴³ Čudovskij counter-attacked a typical charge of the radical intelligentsia against (Modernist) Aestheticism. According to Merežkovskij, Russian aesthetes reject Nekrasov because he introduced "anti-aesthetical" politics into poetry. Čudovskij, on behalf of Apollon, argues that not

hardly
his alone

politics, but "rhymed politicking" is anti-aesthetical. "Poetry inspired by . . . and even born from politics is beautiful. Only, it is necessary that it be real poetry and even real politics."²⁴⁴ Nekrasov's fault does not lie in his merging of current politics with poetry (Čudovskij cites Ševčenko and Mickiewicz as examples of true poets who were politically inspired). But Nekrasov mixed the attitudes of a lyricist and a journalist and thus sacrificed the intensity of a Fet or a Černyševskij. Čudovskij sees in Merezkovskij's "new" [radical 1860's] path a desperate, but absurd and impotent effort of "one of the strongest minds of his generation" of Modernists to revitalize his Utopianism by seeking to forge a formula which is based on the very faults of Nekrasov. In the preceding issue Makovskij answered the charge that the "reactionary" Apollon deprives Modernism of the "sacred [revolutionary] unrest" which existed even in the early Symbolists. Replying to V. V. Gippius, Makovskij, in his article entitled 'Duša reakcii' i 'svjatoe bespokojstvo'',²⁴⁵ addresses himself to "a series of misunderstandings which are amazingly characteristic for the Russian 'intelligent' . . . and concern also Apollon, . . . in order never to return to them again."²⁴⁶ Vouching for his colleagues that they are alien to the alleged "cold and lifeless aestheticism which is deprived of the creative sacred unrest," Makovskij, distinguishing between aesthetics and "aestheticising"

(estetstvo), writes that "we are even prepared to insist on that distinction between our aesthetics and the "estetstvo" of the preceding decadents."²⁴⁷ The latter attitude, to Makovskij, must be superficial, purely-egotistical and, therefore, dilettante. "A genuine artist, . . . in order to create beauty, even the one most distant from life, must assimilate all life, with all the riches of its religious, moral and even civic unrests. For us now, this is like two and two is four. 'Estetstvo' à la Hedda Gabler has passed at least a fifteen-year mark. . . . If, nevertheless, Nekrasov's 'Poetom možeš' ty ne byt' appears to us as barbarism, this is because to us 'to be a poet' already means 'to be a citizen.'" But Makovskij feels the radical intelligentsia will never understand an unself-conscious, calm service to art and culture, because they are too blinded by their "unrests."

Rejecting extremes and therefore avoiding currents which may lead to "isms," Apollon oriented its criticism towards pursuing artistic standards by evaluation of the perfection of a scholarly or artistic work, rather than of any form of relevance, whereas the other Modernist organs (whether for purposes of enlightenment, elevation or usefulness), sought to establish by linking the work with other cultural disciplines. Nor did Apollon regard "criticism itself very largely . . . as an exercise in navigation"²⁴⁸ as formulated by I. A. Richards, to whom it is the

"art of knowing where we are wherever, as mental travelers we may go."²⁴⁹ Communicative power was a priori demanded from the work under examination. To Čudovskij criticism simply meant the joy of participating in the process of contemplating Great Art.²⁵⁰ The arrival at such a point was possible only after Russian Modernism had traveled the long road from "discovering" art, through defending what seemed shocking, to polemic about trends and workshop methods and to finally participating in the world's Great Art. The balance between formal perfection and thematic weight was for Apollon a clear enough criterion for the admission of a work to Apollo's temple. As Russians, for a practical way of looking up towards Phoebus, the poets and theorists of Apollon²⁵¹ unanimously turned to Puškin,²⁵² "the idle reveller ('guljaka prazdnyj'), whose name is the symbol of sunny rebirth, bright briskness, 'young life.'"²⁵³

Apollon closed down in 1918. Its last issues appeared after the October Revolution under the editorship of the former secretary Mixail Lozinskij; Makovskij had already emigrated.²⁵⁴ It was clear by then, that Russian Modernism would not survive unless it abandoned its two defining characteristics: Aestheticism and Transcendentalism. Apollon, the most accomplished bearer of these two trends, found itself almost automatically thrown overboard from "the ship of contemporaneity."

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Russian Modernism proper began to develop around 1895 and lasted for approximately three decades.

2. For the purposes of this study, this term covers a wide range of attitudes which give highest priority to the aesthetic values in a work of art; it includes also the pejorative connotation estestivo (aestheticising).

3. This term will be used throughout this thesis to connote the various "metaphysical" artistic trends; they include various forms of Bogostizatel'stvo (God-searching), mysticism, mifotvorstvo (mythmaking), etc.

4. Vjačeslav **FOOTNOTES** "O veseleni remesla i umnoj veselii," Zolotoe Runo, No. 5, (1907), p. 53.

5. See notes 15 through 19 in this chapter.

6. See Chapter II, pp. 26-29 of this study and Notes 6-10, same chapter.

7. Nicholas Earnov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper Row, 1963). Berdjaev, Russkaja Ideja (Paris, 1948), Chapter I. Fedor Stepan, byvšie i nasovyvšiesja (New York: Chekhov Press, 1956), I, p. 209.

As a curious parallel to the German and Italian Renaissance Stepan also notes the fact of fertile collaboration between creative artists and the rich merchant patron, who subsidized most publications.

8. This "change of wind in the psychological atmosphere," as Andrej Belyj calls it, may be summed up in the words of the philosopher Berdjaev.

In those years Russia received many gifts. . . . New souls appeared; new sources of creativity were discovered; people saw new horizons. We saw the glow of a glorious dawn and the end of an old age coinciding with a new era which [era] would bring about a complete transfiguration of life.

Berdjaev, Samopoznanie (Paris, 1949), p. 131.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Russian Modernism proper began to develop around 1895 and lasted for approximately three decades.

2. For the purposes of this study, this term covers a wide range of attitudes which give highest priority to the aesthetic values in a work of art; it includes also the pejorative connotation estetstvo (aestheticising).

3. This term will be used throughout this thesis to connote the various "metaphysical" artistic trends; they include various forms of Bogoiskatel'stvo (God-searching), mysticism, mifotvorstvo (mythmaking), etc.

4. Vjačeslav Ivanov, "O veselom remesle i umnom veselii," Zolotoe Runo, No. 5, (1907), p. 53.

5. See notes 16 through 19 in this chapter.

6. See Chapter II, pp. 28-29 of this study and Notes 6-10, same chapter.

7. Nicholas Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper Row, 1963). Berdjaev, Russkaja ideja (Paris, 1946), Chapter X. Fedor Stepun, Byvšee i nesbyvšeesja (New York: Chekhov Press, 1956), I, p. 209.

As a curious parallel to the German and Italian Renaissance Stepun also notes the fact of fertile collaboration between creative artists and the rich merchant patron, who subsidized most publications.

8. This "change of wind in the psychological atmosphere," as Andrej Belyj calls it, may be summed up in the words of the philosopher Berdjaev.

In those years Russia received many gifts.
. . . New souls appeared; new sources of creativity were discovered; people saw new horizons. We saw the glow of a glorious dawn and the end of an old age coinciding with a new era which [era] would bring about a complete transfiguration of life.

Berdjaev, Samopoznanie (Paris, 1949), p. 131.

9. Osip Mandel'stam, "O sobesednike," Apollon, No. 2, (1913), 53. The best single source for this type of poetry are the almanacs issued by the publishing house Znanie: V. Bonč-Bruevič (ed.), Izbrannye proizvedenija russkoj poezii (5th ed., St. Petersburg, 1909). This edition offers 231 authors, at least 200 of whom represent this tendency.

10. Aleksandr Blok, Preface to "Vozmezdje," Zapiski mečtatelej, Nos. 2-3 (St. Petersburg, 1921), 100.

11. Dmitrij Merežkovskij, quoted in Modest Gofman (ed.), Kniga o russkix poetax poslednego desjatiletija (St. Petersburg, 1909), p. 201.

12. Nikolaj Berdjaev, Russkaja ideja (Paris, 1946), p. 221.

13. Solov'ev's influence will be more fully discussed in connection with the "Argonaut" group in the Symbolist movement in Moscow, and with the philosophies of the Petersburg Symbolists Vjačeslav Ivanov and Aleksandr Blok.

14. Historians usually regard as the earliest formal notice of the new era, a lecture given in 1892 in St. Petersburg by the novelist, critic, and poet, Dmitrij Merežkovskij. In his analysis of the current status of literature, he said, "mysterious growths of new life, of new poetry feebly, but invincibly, are making their way toward the open, while on the surface the triumph of literary vulgarity and barbarism is reaching its ultimate limits."

See D. Merežkovskij, "O pričinox upadka i o novyx tečenijax sovremennoj russkoj literatury," Polnoe sobranie sočinenij (St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1912), XV, p. 303.

15. The spirit of the "unprecedented intellectual emancipation" (Ibid., p. 244.) is captured in his slogan, "No barriers! We are free and lonely!" (Ibid.)

16. It must be remembered, however, that most leaders of Modernism, at some point retired from the progressing avant-garde wave. Thus, by the time Apollon appeared, many of the original avant-gardists no longer insisted on that title for themselves.

17. For a description of such "anticipation" see, besides Symbolist poetry of that period, Andrej Belyj, "Epoxa do pervoi vstreči," Zapiski mečtatelej, No. 6,

1922, pp. 10, 12.

See also Blok's mystical description of that anticipation in the preface to his collection Nečajannaja radost' in Sočinenija v odnom tome (Moscow-Leningrad, 1946), p. 577.

Also Valerij Brjusov, "Pis'ma k Percovu," Ruskij Sovremennik, No. 4 (1927), p. 227; Gippius, Dmitrij Merežkovskij (Paris, 1951), p. 79 and the work by Merežkovskij cited above.

18. For general references to Western influences on Russian Modernism see V. Zen'kovskij: Ausder Geschichte der Aesthetischen Ideen in Russland in 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (The Hague, 1958) and Georgette Donchin: The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry (The Hague, 1958).

19. The most popular among the Russian Modernists were the periods of French Rococo, the Age of Puškin, Hellenism, Renaissance and, to a lesser extent, art nouveau.

20. See Prince D. S. Mirsky, Modern Russian Literature (London, 1925), p. 101.

21. See Georgij Adamovič, Odinočestvo isvoboda (New York: Chekhov Press, 1955), p. 43. Also Andrej Belyj, "Nastojščee i buduščee ruskoj literatury," II Vesny, No. 3, (1909), 75.

22. "K čitateljam," Vesny No. 1, (1904), iii.

23. Vengerov, "Geroičeskij xarakter ruskoj literatury," Chapter II, "Modernism sintetičeskij," pp. 61-64; Chapter III, "Evoljucija modernisma," pp. 195-198, Sobranie Sočinenij S. A. Vengerova Vol. I (St. Petersburg, 1911), xx veka.

24. Vengerov (ed.), "Pereocenka vsech cennostej," Russkaja literatura, II, Part I, pp. 3-31.

25. Gofman, "Romantizm, simvolizm, i dekadentstvo," Kniga o russkix poetax, p. 31. Himself, a Symbolist, the author regards the other two currents as tributaries of Symbolism.

26. A concise survey of the "immoralist" and the "agonic phase of the Decadent state of mind" may be found in Renato Poggioli's The Poets of Russia (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 80-87.

27. Djagilev, "Složnye voprosy, naš mnimyj upadok," Mir iskusstva No. 1 (1898), 3, 11.

Thirty years later a younger witness to that epoch, the poet and critic Vladislav Xodasevič, expressed the same thought.

Decadence, declining [upadočničestvo]--is a relative concept. The decline is defined by the relation to the original height. Therefore, when applied to the art of the early symbolists, the term decadence was senseless: that art in itself was not a decline of any kind in relation to the past.

V. F. Xodasevič, Nekropol', Vospominanija (Brussels, 1939), p. 13.

28. This term is borrowed from Merežkovskij; see his O pričinox . . . , p. 247.

29. This term was frequently applied by the metaphysically oriented critics (esp. V. Ivanov) to poets like Bal'mont or Annenskij who "merely" sought to record their reveries.

30. Generally, during the late- and the post-Symbolist phases, Russian Modernism swung away from neo-Romantic ideals toward those of Classicism.

31. In such matters leaders of even the most militant showed invariably great mutual respect.

32. This was the phase of "mythmaking" or "legend-creating" (mifotvorstvo and tvorenie legendy).

33. See A. Belyj, "Venok ili venec," Apollon No. 11, (1910), p. 3 (2nd pagination). The extreme expression of this trend was formulated by the "non-acceptance of this world" (neprijatie mira) concept of "Mystical Anarchism." See the discussion of pp.

34. See p. 28 of this study.

35. Dmitrij Filosofov, "Tože tendencija" Zolotoe Runo No. 1, (1908), 73.

36. In his memoirs published in 1962, Sergej Makovskij refers to Miriskusstva as an "entire epoch which even now has not yet ended . . . [it is] the epoch of decorative fancy, stylism and lyrical grotesque. I have in mind first of all painting and graphics, but this definition

may be applied, with some modification, to literature, and even to music . . ." Makovskij, Na parnase serebrjanogo veka, (Munich, 1962), pp. 276-277.

37. See Aleksandr Benua, Ovozni Knovenii 'Mir iskusstva' (Leningrad, 1928). Also Alexandre Benois, Reminiscences of the Russian Ballet, trans. Mary Britnieva (London, 1941), p. 159.

38. Ibid., p. 150.

39. Ibid., pp. 182-183.

40. Ibid., pp. 150, 153.

41. Ibid., p. 182.

42. See Blok's review of A. Miropol'skij's Ved'ma i lestnica in Zolotoe Runo, No. 1 (1906), p. 149.

43. Modest Gofman, "Puškin i ego epoxa," La Russie Illustree (Paris, 1937), p. 127.

44. In Apollon see notes 250-3 to the last chapter. For Puškinology of Russian Formalists see Victor Erlich, Russian Formalism (The Hague, 1965), pp. 260-268.

45. Besides the numerous biographies attention may be called to the collections of objects pertaining to Puškin's biography gathered by Djagilev, Benois and Lifar.

46. See Mark Etkind, Aleksandr Nikolaevič Benua (Leningrad-Moscow, 1965), p. 48.

47. Mir iskusstva's Puškinism revealed in the large amount of illustrations, set designs and fantasies devoted to Puskin, remains according to most critics, unsurpassed. Cf. Makovskij, Na parnas'e . . . , p. 282.

48. Cf. Erlich, Russian Formalism, pp. 264-265. Also Victor Žirmunskij, "Preodolevšie simbolizm," Voprosy teorii literatury (Reprinted by Mouton & Co, The Hague, 1962), pp. 281-282.

49. Etkind, p. 46. According to Aleksandr Strelkov, Russian Magazine covers were better done, at that time, than anywhere in Europe. Aleksandr Strelkov, "Mir iskusstva," Iskusstvo, No. 35 (1923), p. 26.

50. Makovskij, Na parnase . . . , p. 286.

51. This term is also used to label the trend which is directly opposite to Futurism.

52. Sergej Djagilev "Osnovy xudožestvennoj ocenki," Mir iskusstva No. 3, (1899), p. 57.

53. Strelkov, p. 15.

54. Ibid., p. 6.

55.1 Benois' paintings of Fontainebleau in my collection depict the mood of its XVIII c. architecture, but the trees (then recently planted) are of today's fullgrown size.

56. Strelkov, p. 10. It is important to note that one of the poets of Apollon, Osip Mandel'stam, expresses literally the same sentiment in a poem in 1915, Ya opazdal na prazdnestvo Rasina.

57. Makovskij also notes the characteristic presence of irony in the works of Passeists (Na parnase . . . pp. 281-282.

58. Makovskij, Portrety sovremennikov (New York: Chekhov Press, 1955), p. 409.

59. Mir iskusstva was especially affected by the findings on Crete (Evans & Schliemann), which the members of the circle popularized by writing about them and reproducing them as vignettes and stage settings. See Aleksandr Golovin, Vstreči i vpečatlenija (Moscow, 1940), p. 121. Also see Max Volosin, "Arxaizm v ruskoj živopisi," Apollon No. 1, (1909), pp. 43-54.

60. See the paintings of Roerich, Bakst, Bogaevskij and Bilibin.

61. Stravinskij, Prokof'ev, N. Čerepnin and later N. Nabokov.

62. The elements of this trend in poetry will be discussed in connection with the style of the "Mythmakers," the "Adamists" and the "Futurists." (Cf. Vladimir Markov, The Longer Poems of Velimir Khlebnikov, University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1962, pp. 73-96.)

63. See Benois, "Igruški," Apollon, No. 2 (1912), 49-54. Cf. Makovskij, Na parnase . . . , p. 282. Also N. D. Bartram, "O vozroždenii narodnogo tvorčestva v igruškax," Apollon, No. 2, (1912), pp. 55-64; Emil Magne, "Sovremennaja

igruska," Ibid., pp. 65-68.

64. A group of Mir iskusstva established such a workshop of the estate Talaškino of Princess M. K. Teniševa; another group established a similar shop at S. I. Mamontov's Abramcevo.

65. Striking examples of "Primitivism," as it developed in St. Petersburg may be seen in Benois', Stravinskij's and Fokin's Petruška, or in Blok's, Mejerhol'd's and Kuzmin's Balagančik, or in much of A. Remizov's work.

66. At the end of the last chapter of this study this rift will be discussed in connection with Apollon's attitude towards Futurism in art and poetry. According to some writers, Futurism was anticipated already in St. Petersburg by the exhibits Treugol'nik and Venok (1910-11) organized by Aleksandr Gorodeckij and Nikolaj I. Kul'bin; see Vladimir Pjast, Vstreči (Moscow, 1929), pp. 76, 191. Also Georgij Ivanov, Peterburgskie Zimy (New York: Chekhov Press, 1952), pp. 32-33.

67. The numerous references to the exhibits of Mir iskusstva in Apollon show that the younger journal, throughout its existence, even when critical was the champion of the values and the purposes of that group.

68. One should remember that in the case of Mir iskusstva the practical collaboration among the artists preceded the theories on syncretic culture of later Modernists (as for example the group in Musaget).

69. Benois, Reminiscences . . . , p. 370. Also see Poggioli, pp. 64-65.

70. Gippius, Dmitrij Merežkovskij, p. 80.

71. Stepun, Vstreči (Munich, 1962), p. 163.

72. Gippius, Dmitrij Merežkovskij, p. 80.

73. Ibid., p. 81.

74. Sergej Volkonskij, "Iskusstvo," Mir iskusstva, No. 4 (1899), p. 68, [emphasis mine]. This difference was later articulated in the Symbolist journal Zolotoe Runo by N. Toporkov, who explains that Classicism stresses the final result of art while Symbolism emphasizes the initial motivation and effort of the artist's thought and will. (Zolotoe Runo, No. 12, (1909), pp. 69-74.)

Osip Mandel'stam, in 1913 in Apollon, went further in saying that the poem is an event and not a record of experiences ("O sobesednike").

75. Djagilev, "Složnye voprosy," Mir iskusstva, No. 1 (1899), p. 16. [Emphasis mine.]

76. Poggioli, p. 72. See also the series of essays by Vladimir Rozanov entitled "O drevne egipetskoj krasote." They appeared in Volumes I and II of Mir iskusstva, Nos. 11-14, (1899).

77. Merežkovskij, O pričinox . . . , pp. 246-247.

78. Djagilev, "Osnovy xudožestvennoj ocenki," Mir iskusstva, Nos. 3-4 (1899), p. 52.

79. Vengerov, Geroičeskij Karakter, pp. 195-196.

80. Djagilev, "Složnye Voprosy . . .," p. 2, [emphasis mine].

81. Donchin, The Influence of French Symbolism . . . , p. 40.

82. Georgij Čulkov implied that the Merežkovskijs left Mir iskusstva because of this insult. See his article "Vesy," Apollon, No. 7 (1910), 15-16.

83. For a description see Makovskij Na parnase . . . , pp. 15-33. Also Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance . . . , pp. 90-91.

84. Stepun, Byvšee i nesbyvšeesja, p. 265.

85. Gippius, Dmitrij Merežkovskij, p. 82.

86. After the closing of Mir iskusstva it was the only periodical to publish Russian Modernists.

87. For the history of Novyj Put' and Voprosy zizni see Georgij Čulkov, Gody Stranstvij (Moscow, 1930), pp. 56-68.

88. The "disjointed" nature of this journal was described by Merežkovskij in his article "Vse protiv vsech," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1, (1906), pp. 90-97.

89. For a description of this journal see p. of this study and the note 62 to Chapter IV.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. See the beginning of the following chapter; besides the overlapping of the personnel of Mir iskusstva and Apollon, the reviews in Apollon invariably showed exceptional concern with if not always full appraisal of, the exhibits of Mir iskusstva.

2. Apollon opened its own halls for first performances of Modernist works by Modernist composers and performers (Scriabine, Stravinskij, Prokofiev, Koussevitsky etc.). The journal devoted its reviews mostly to Modernist Music of Petersburg, occasionally to rarely performed old music and very seldom to standard classical performances.

3. Best examples are theatrical productions in which many members of Apollon took part. Most notable are the Starinnyj teatr (directed by such prominent men as N. Evreinov, A. Trubnikov and Baron Drizen), mostly dedicated to revivals of Renaissance and pre-Renaissance plays; in the enlarged "Tower" of Ivanov, on the other hand, experimental work took place, in the Basennyj teatr, usually directed by V. Mejerxol'd, or V. Solov'ev.

4. Apollon published at first in its regular issues, and after fall 1911 in separate almanacs short stories of authors who belonged to rather diverse schools, for example, Aleksej Tolstoj, Sergej Auslender, Osip Dymov. A regular column by the eminent stylist Mixail Kuzmin, entitled Pis'ma o russkoj belletristike surveyed the entire field of Russian prose fiction, favoring, of course, the Modernists.

5. Apollon, was admittedly, rather snobbish towards provincial Modernist efforts (which included Moscow). After 1913, the editors changed their attitudes from condescension to alarm vis-a-vis the radical left wing art of the Moscow Rayonists, Cubists and Futurists.

6. Xodasevič, "O simvolizme," Literaturnye statji i vospominanija (New York: Chekhov Press, 195), p. 156.

7. Ibid, pp. 156-158. Andrej Belyj also recalls that "among the symbolists one could also meet personali-

ties, who had no relation to literary symbolism, [who] never wrote a single line or [who] later wrote under different precepts, . . . It is precisely they who brought out in their private searching positions of the future symbolism." Belyj, "Vospominanija ob A. A. Bloke," Zapiski Mectatelej, No. 6 (1922), p. 14.

8. Xodasevič, Nekropol', p. 8.

9. Xodasevič, "Osimvolizme," p. 158.

10. Xodasevič reminisces: "That is why symbolists were so entangled in the common net of the personal and literary loves and hates . . . of those who found themselves in this symbolist dimension." pp. 156-158.

11. Žirmunskij, "Preodolevšie . . .," p. 279.

12. The poet Sergej Gorodeckij states during one of the "crises" of Russian Modernism in 1909, "For many poets that problem appears fateful. Where to direct the creative energy: towards signifying the existant or towards transforming that which is seeming?" "Idolotvorčestvo," Zolotoe Runo, No. 3 (1909), p. 96.

13. Vjačeslav Ivanov, "Symbolism" Enciclopedia Italiana (Vol. 31, 1936, pp. 793-795), transl. by Thomas E. Bird The Russian Review, Vol. 25, No. 1, (Hanover, N. H., January 1966), pp. 24-34.

14. Ibid., p. 29.

15. Ibid., pp. 29-30.

16. Ibid., p. 30.

17. Makovskij, Na parnase . . ., p. 25.

18. It is perhaps not accidental that Brjusov and Bal'mont first joined forces at the opening meeting of the "Society of Lovers of Western Literature" (Obščestvo ljubitelej zapadnoj literatury) in Moscow on Sept. 28, 1894.

19. In an interview on Symbolist poetry (Novosti dnja, August 30, 1894) Brjusov cited Verlaine's doctrine Nous voulons de la nuance, pas le couleur, rien que la nuance. [Quoted in "Brjusov--teoretik simvolizma," Literaturnoe nasledstvo, Nos. 27-28, (Moscow, 1937), p. 268.]

20. See Erlich, "Russian Poets in Search of a Poetics," Comparative Literature, IV (Winter, 1952), pp. 56-60

65. Also his Russian Formalism, pp. 33-43 and Robin Kemball, Alexander Blok, (The Hague, 1965), Chapter I.

21. Močul'skij, Valerij Brjusov (Paris, 1962), 16. Brjusov's Djagilev-like leadership is vividly described by Xodasevič in Nekropol' pp. 33, 49-50 and Victor Erlich in The Double Image (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1964), pp. 83-84.

22. Močul'skij, Valerij Brjusov, p. 110. See also Gippius, Dmitrij Merežkovskij, p. 130 and Čul'kov, Gody stranstvija, p. 350 and his "Isxod i sobranie socinemij v" (St. Petersburg, 1912), p. 39.

23. Močul'skij, Valerij Brjusov, p. 35.

24. Expression used in Vladimir Veidle's preface to Močul'skij's Valerij Brjusov, p. 5.

25. An array of deprecations against Brjusov on the part of the third "generation" will be cited in Chapter V.

26. See Brjusov's letter to Percov quoted in Asukin, N. S., Valerij Brjusov v autobiografičeskix zapisjax, pis'max, vos pominanijax sovremennikov i otzyvax kritiki (Moscow, 1929), p. 275.

27. Ibid., p. 90.

28. Johannes Holthusen, Studien zur Aesthetik und Poetik des Russischen Symbolismus (Goettingen, 1957), p. 17.

29. Ašukin, Valerij Brjusov, p. 56.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., p. 63.

32. Ibid.

33. Vladimir Solov'jev, "Russkie Simvolisty," Sobranie sočinenij, VI (St. Petersburg), pp. 505-515.

34. Močul'skij points out two of these (Valerij Brjusov, p. 34).

35. Cf. Donchin, pp. 164-215; Holthusen, Erlich Russian Poets . . . , pp. 57, 65.

36. Močulskij, Valerij Brjusov, p. 47.

37. Brjusov dedicated with contumely his famous non-Absolutist poem which begins with the lines:

Nekolebimoj is tine
ne verju ja darno

in 1901 to Gippius.

38. Holthusen, p. 59. See also Xodasevič, Nekropol', pp. 52-53.

39. See Erlich, The Double Image, p. 87.

40. Belyj, "Nastojasčee i buduščee russkoj literatury," Vesy, No. 3 (1909), pp. 80, 81.

41. Belyj, "O simvolizme" Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), p. 18.

42. Pjast, Vstreči, p. 98.

43. Brjusov, quoted in C. H. Bedford, "Dmitry Merežkovsky, the Intelligentsia, and the Revolution of 1905," Canadian Slavonic Papers, III (1959), p. 28.

44. Quoted in Holthusen, p. 20.

45. See Brjusov's letters to Čul'kov (quoted in Gody stranstvij, p. 319), and to Blok (quoted in Douchin, p. 77).

46. See Brjusov's letter to Čul'kov quoted in Gody stranstvij, pp. 346-347); also Brjusov's letter to his father (quoted in Donchin, p. 45).

47. See Brjusov's open letter to Vesy No. 2, (1909), p. 89.

48. Brjusov was an extremely prolific writer on prosody. His major books are: Opyty po metrike i ritmike, po evfonii i sozvucijam, po strofike i formam (stixi 1912-1918 g.) So vstupitel'noj stat'jej "Remeslo poeta" (Moscow, 1918). Kratkij kurs nauki o stixe; Castnaja metrika i ritmika russkogo gazyka (Moscow, 1919).

49. Throughout his career, especially in its later stages, Brjusov was of great service to the Russian public as an avid translator of foreign verse. It is sufficient here to mention that between 1913 and 1914 four

volumes of his translations were published.

50. K. D. Bal'mont "Elementarnye slova o simboličeskoj poezii" quoted in Russkaja literatura XX veka ed. N. A. Trifonov (Moscow, 1962), p. 337.

51. Ibid., p. 338.

52. V. Ivanov, "Symbolism," p. 26.

53. The relatively small notoriety which these poets enjoyed during the bloom of the first "generation" may be attributed precisely to the fact that they had few enemies and allies.

54. Pjast, p. 47.

55. The painter Jurij Annenkov may speak for his generation of Modernists when he recollects that Sologub was primarily important to his colleagues as a writer of prose. Dnevnik moix vstreč, Inter-Language Literary Associates, (New York, 1966), Vol. II, p. 173.

56. Sologub, "'Ja' kniga soveršennogo samoutverždenija," Zolotoe Runo, No. 2 (1906), pp. 55-65.

57. Annenskij's first collection of poems "Tixie pesni" which he published under the pseudonym Nik-to and which appeared in 1906 attracted almost no attention; even Brjusov made only a non-committal remark in Vesy about the "young poet."

58. Anna Axmatova, Stixotvorenija (1909-1960) (Moscow, 1961), p. 7.

59. The expression is borrowed from the title of A. Gizetti's article on Annenskij "Poet mirovoj disgarmonii," Petrograd, No. 1, (1923), pp. 47-71. Professor Vsevolod Setchkarev in his Studies in The Life and Works of Innokentij Annenskij (The Hague, 1963) observes that "there is a constant insistence on the objective, concrete conciseness of his [Annenskij's] poetry as opposed to the 'sweet airness' of the symbolist poet." (p. 71)

60. See Donchin, p. 42.

61. See Erlich, The Double Image, p. 87.

62. V. Solov'ev's influence on the second "generation" Symbolists will be discussed below.

63. Gumilev's role will be examined in Chapter V of this study.

64. Belyj, "Formy iskusstva," Mir iskusstva, No. 3, (1902), quoted in Belyj, "Vospominanija ob A. A. Bloke," p. 17.

65. Ibid.

66. Belyj, "Vospominanja . . .," p. 9.

67. Holthusen, p. 36.

68. Belyj, "Nastojasšee i budusšee ruskoj literatury," Vesy No. 2 (1909), p. 62.

69. Belyj, Na perevale (Berlin, 1923), p. 14.

70. Belyj, "Dorogoj panjati J. A. Sidorova," preface to Jurij Sidorov, Stixotvorenija (Moscow, 1910), p. 11.

71. Belyj, Na perevale, p. 25.

72. Ibid., p. 12.

73. Ibid., p. 25.

74. Stepun, Vstreči, p. 167.

75. Erlich, "Russian Poets . . .," p. 56.

76. For a description of his theories see Erlich, Ibid., pp. 56-63.

77. Oleg Maslenikov, The Frenzied Poets (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952), p. 72.

78. Originally the group started at the home of M. S. and O. S. Solov'ev but as it intensified its search for the Golden Fleece it also grew in life and prestige at which point they abandoned in 1908 the "unimportant" journal Pereval. Around 1910, Belyj mobilized the circle for the pursuit of his statistical methods in prosody. Belyj's frenzied activities in "circles" are well described by Stepun in Vstreci, pp. 164-165.

79. Ellis (L. L. Kobylinskij) Russkie simvolisty (Moscow, 1910), pp. 5, 6. [emphasis mine]

80. See his article "Predčuvstvija i predvestija," Zolotoe Runo, No. 4 (1906), p. 72.

81. See Georgij Adamovič, Odinočestvo i svoboda (New York: Chekhov Press, 1955), p. 260.

82. Belyj, Sirin učenogo varvarstva (Berlin, 1922), p. 3.

83. The meetings at Ivanov's "Tower" which began on Sept. 2, 1905 are mentioned in almost all memoirs and diaries of the Modernists.

84. Nikolaj Berdjaev, Russkaja ideja, p. 247.

85. Makovskij, Portvety, p. 274. r/3

86. Belyj, "Vospominanija ob A. Bloke," quoted in Sud'ba Bloka (O. Nemerovskaja and C. Vol'pe eds., Leningrad, 1930), p. 92.

87. O. Deschartes, "Vyacheslav Ivanov," Oxford Slavonic Papers, V (1954), pp. 42-43.

88. Ibid., p. 42.

89. Quoted Ibid., p. 45.

90. Berdjaev, Russkaja ideja, p. 141.

91. Cf. Solov'ev's essay "Smysl ljubvi," Sobranie socinenij 2nd ed., (St. Petersburg, 1911), VII, pp. 3-57.

92. See V. Solov'ev, "Poezija F. I. Tjutceva," Sobranie socinenij, VI, pp. 400-464.

93. V. Solov'ev, "O liriceskoj poezii," Sobranie socinenij VI, p. 236.

94. Solov'ev, "Poezija . . .," p. 464.

95. See Edmund Wilson, "Axel and Rimbaud," Axel's Castle (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1931), p. 287 and Georg Lukacs, "The Ideology of Modernism," Realizm in Our Time (New York: World Perspectives, c 1964), pp. 17-46.

96. Solov'ev, "Poezija . . .," pp. 468-469.

97. V. Ivanov's "Zavety simbolizma," Apollon, No. 8 (1910), pp. 6-7.

98. Čulkov, "O Tjutčeve," Sočinenija, V, p. 41.
99. See his "Predčuvstvija i predvestija," pp. 68-71.
100. V. Zen'kovskij, Aus der Geschichte . . ., pp. 36-37.
101. Cf. Friedrich Nietzsche Die Geburt der Tragoedie (Leipzig, 1930), p. 56.
102. V. Ivanov, "Drevnij užas," Zolotoe Runo, No. 4 (1909), p. 57.
103. Ivanov, "Dve stixii v rusckom simbolizme," Ibid, Nos. 3-5 (1908), p.
104. Gorodeckij, "Idolotvorčestvo," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1 (1909), p. 95.
105. Annenskij, "O sovremennom lirizme," Apollon No. 2 (1909), p. 8.
106. See Reeve, p. 28. Mandel'stam wrote that "in respect to literature, Blok was an enlightened conservative." "Barsucja nora," Sobranie sočinenij.
107. Maurice Bowra, The Heritage of Symbolism (London, 1951), p. 178.
108. Adamovič, Sovremennye zapiski X - XII, (1931), p. 300.
109. Robert Kemball, Alexander Blok (The Hague, 1965).
110. Belyj, "Vospominanija . . .," pp. 56-57.
111. See Erlich, The Double Image, p. 102.
112. Blok, preface to "Vozmezdje," p. 97.
113. See Močul'skij, Aleksandr Blok, pp. 213-216.
114. Blok, Sočinenija v odnomtome (Moscow-Leningrad, 1946), p. 540.
115. See this cycle Strašnyjmir (Poems 1909-1916).
116. See pp. 174-175 of this study.

117. Mixail Kuzmin, "Pis'ma o russkoj poezii," Apollon, No. 8 (1910), p. 63.

118. Letter of Blok to S. Solov'ev, March 8, 1904 in Valerij Brjusov ed. Ašukin, pp. 193-194.

119. Letter of Blok to Čul'kov, August 26, 1907, in Ibid., p. 224.

120. In 1907 Blok announced publicly and in private letters, that he did not wish to belong to any school.

121. In 1910 Blok refused to join the editorial staff of Musaget and in 1912 that of Trudy i Dni, Novoe vino Russkoe Slovo and Russkaja Molva.

122. Ejxenbaum, Skvoz' literaturu (Leningrad, 1924), p. 224. L/

123. See Chapter IV of this study.

124. See Donchin, pp. 42-44, 67.

125. Ibid., p. 67.

126. Ibid., p. 43.

127. See the editor's opening manifesto: "K citatel'jam," Vesy, No. 1 (1904), iii.

128. Realizing this demand Vesy opened, after 1905, its pages to fiction as well.

129. Tovarišč German (Gippius), "O zurnalax," Vesy, No. 6 (1906), p. 73.

130. Stepun, Byvšee i nesbyvšeesja, p. 209.

131. "Ot redakcii," Zolotoe Runo, No. 6 (1907), p. 68.

132. Čul'kov, Gody stranstvij, p. 168.

133. Čul'kov, "Licom k licu," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1 (1909), pp. 105-108.

134. Maslenikov, pp. 211-212.

135. Čul'kov, "Ob odnoj literaturnoj metamorfoze," Zolotoe Runo, No. 4 (1907), pp. 79-80. Cf. Ellis, "O

zurnalax," Vesy, No. 8 (1907), p.

136. Letter of Blok to Belyj, August 6, 1907, in Aleksandr Blok, Sočinenija v odnom tome, p. 518.

137. Letter of Blok to Čul'kov, August 26, 1907, in Ibid., p. 524. Blok refers to E. Semenov's article, "Lettres russes. Le misticisme an archique," Mercure de France, No. 242 (July, 1907), p. 361.

138. Filosofov, "Dela domašnie," Tovarišč, No. 373 (1908), pp. 8-9.

139. Sobornyj individualizm; see Gofman, Kniga o russkix poetax, p. 31.

140. Konstantin Erberg, "Simvolizmi bezvlastie," Zolotoe Runo, No. 3 (1907), pp. 42-67.

141. Blok, "Rossija i intelligencija," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1 (1909), p. 79.

142. Pjast, Vstreči, p. 149.

143. Ivanov, "O rusckoj idee," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1 (1909), p. 90.

144. Gorodeckij, "Idolotvorčestvo," Zolotoe Runo, No. 3 (1909), pp. 93-100.

145. Čul'kov, "Licom k licu," p. 105.

146. Vesy, No. 1 (1909), p. ii.

147. "Melkie svedenija," Zolotoe Runo, No. 3 (1909), p. 120.

148. Open letter of Brjusov in Vesy, No. 1 (1909), p. 89.

149. See Valerij Brjusov, ed. Ašukin, p. 262. The editor Petr Struve offered this job originally to Merezkovskij.

150. Jurij Tynjanov, "Promežutok," Russkij Sovremennik, No. 4 (1924), p. 215.

151. Deschardes, p. 52.

152. Ellis, p. 325.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Čulkov, Gody stranstvij, p. 184.
2. Ilja Ehrenburg, People and Life (London, 1961), p. 81. See also Yurij Annenkov, Dnevnik moix vstrec (New York: Inter-Language Literary Associates, 1966), Vol. II, p. 231.
3. A. J. Golovin, Vstreči i vpečatlenija (Leningrad-Moscow, 1930), p. 97.
4. Makovskij, Portrety sovremennikov, p. 194.
5. Ibid., pp. 195-196.
6. Ibid.
7. Makovskij, "Nikolai Gumilev. Po licnym vospominanijam," Novyj Žurnal, No. 77 (September, 1964), p. 162.
8. Makovskij, Na parnase . . ., pp. 197-198.
9. Ibid., p. 199.
10. Ibid., pp. 199-200.
11. Makovskij, Portrety . . ., pp. 274-275.
12. Ibid., pp. 252-253.
13. Makovskij, "N. Gumilev . . .," p. 166. Gleb Struve translates the term slovotvorstvo more accurately as "verbalism" (Introductory essay in Anna Axmatova, Sočinenija eds. Struve and Filippov, Vol. I, (Munich, 1965), p. 13)).
14. Makovskij, "Osip Mandel'štam," Novoe Russkoe Slovo (New York), July 23, 1950, p. 7. Two years later Apollon moved to Razjezžaja Street.
15. See Čulkov, Gody stranstvij, p. 184 and Pjast, Vstreči, p. 144.

16. Makovskij, "N. Gumilev," p. 166. Faddej Francevič Zelinskij was a distinguished classical philologist, translator of Sophocles, and president of the newly founded "Society of Classical Philology" in St. Petersburg. Professor Fedor A. Braun was the dean of the philological faculty at the University of St. Petersburg. According to Makovskij, although being the single editor, he never published anything without the consent of this board. (Naparnase . . ., pp. 356-357).

17. Gleb Struve, ed., Neizdannyj Gumilev (New York: Chekhov Press, 1952), p. 49.

N. V. Nedobrovo was a student of philology, a critic and a theoretician of poetry. In 1911, when that society was reorganized he became the vice-president of the Poetičeskaja Akademija which competed with Gumilev's Cex poetov, also founded at that time. Valerian A. Čudovskij became one of the major critics and theoreticians of aesthetics in Apollon. He too chose to be affiliated with the Akademija rather than Cex.

18. Makovskij, "N. Gumilev . . .," p. 166.

19. Leonid Strakhovskij, Craftsmen of the Word (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 15. This book, however, is severely criticized by Anna Axmatova, who found glaring faults in it.

See Axmatova, "Mandel'stam," Vozdušnye puti, No. 4 (1965), p. 42.

20. Examples of such sessions are Blok's presentation in November, 1909 of his Ital'janskije stixi (a cycle which earned him fame a "second time.") In the ensuing debate Makovskij was assigned to criticize Blok's use of grammar (see Letter of Blok to Makovskij in Aleksandr Blok Sobranie . . ., pp. 538-539). In January, 1914 Gumilev presented his play Mik i Lui after which he theorized that the form of his opus is the only suitable one to create a contemporary epos.

21. In January, 1912, J. Verhovskij gave his report on the "Three Basic Types of Russian Lyricism." Belyj reported on the work of his Kružok ritmistov. Both theoreticians were severely criticized.

22. V. Ivanov recited in January 1914, his translation of "Agamemnon." Gumilev at that occasion pointed out that this work concluded the series of translations of the Athenian tragedians by Annenskij, Zelinskij and Ivanov who, for reasons of poetic affinity, selected Euripides, Sophocles and Aeschylus respectively.

23. Merežkovskij's excursions into the "eternal past" were viewed as "lacking of erudition, and a pretentious effort to be profound (Setchkarev, pp. 52-53). Brjusov's painstaking research, on the other hand, did not save his "stylizations" from occasional lack of affinity between author and source. At the same time, even Ivanov admitted that Kuzmin's erudition "in the late legends of Alexander of Macedonia . . . could not be matched to anyone in Russia." (See Znosko-Borovskij's article on Kuzmin, Apollon Nos 4-5 (1917).)

24. One may recall the violent support on principle given by the "decadents" to the "shocking" lectures of Bal'mont and Brjusov in the days of early Modernism.

25. Thus Zelinskij attacked strongly certain methods of translation by Annenskij which introduced "low" style into "high" tragedy. Professor V. V. Rostovcev challenged Zelinskij's and Ivanov's use of sources.

26. See pp. 162-178 of this study.

27. Ibid., pp. 182-185.

28. Makovskij, "N. Gumilev," p. 166.

29. Innokentij Annenskij's not unkind evaluation of Bal'mont's status as a poet in 1909 may speak for the opinion of Apollon: ". . . Bal'mont already concluded one very significant period of his creativity. But the beginning of a second one, so far, has not yet come." "O sovremennom lirizme," Apollon, No. 1 (1909), p. 19.

30. Pjast, Vstreči, p. 153.

31. Ibid. Also see Brjusov's article in Apollon. "Ob ofnom voprose ritma," No. 11, (1910), pp. 52-60.

32. Pjast's expression may sum up the opinions of most observers like Stepun, Blok, Xodasevič, Culkov and Rozdestvenskij. "Of all the snobs I have ever encountered undoubtedly Makovskij was the most snobbish." Vstreči, p. 143.

33. Makovskij quotes Gumilev: "Blok is a fine man--but he understands little about poetry." "Na parnase . . . , p. 157. Referring to one of the sessions in the "Society of Adepts," Makovskij writes about Blok, "The extremely touchy poet probably never forgave me for [my] impudence of being [his] 'academic' antagonist." Ibid.

34. Sud'ba Bloka, ed. O. Nemerovskaja and C. Vol'pe (Leningrad, 1930), p. 140.

35. Ibid., p. 141.

36. Ibid., p. 142.

37. E. Knipovič, "Aleksandr Blok v ego dnevnikaх," Pecat' i Revoljutija, II-III (1929). Quoted in Sud'ba Bloka, p. 173.

38. Blok, quoted in Sud'ba Bloka, p. 177.

39. Ibid., p. 188.

40. During World War I the "letters" of Gumilev (who volunteered into the army and therefore could not write regularly) appeared in the first section. Sometimes his letters were substituted by those of Georgij Ivanov and V. Tumpovskaja.

41. Another feature of Apollon was its impressive list of foreign writers. Donchin has counted fifty-one foreign correspondents, and among these were such noted writers as Bernard Shaw, Hugo von Hofmansthal, Arthur Schnitzler, and Andre Gide. Donchin, pp. 72-73.

42. The "New Style" date would be August 18, 1909.

43. Ephron discontinued to publish Apollon after he learned that A. L. Volynskij withdrew from its staff (because too many "decadents" were allowed in the journal). Makovskij continued to publish by himself aided by M. K. Uškov. Baron N. N. Vrangel', who was also in charge of the art history section until 1912, was co-editor until that year.

44. Editor's opening manifesto, Apollon, No. 1 (1909), pp. 3-4.

45. Makovskij, Portvety . . . , p. 205.

46. Aleksandr Benna, "V ožidanii gimna Apollonu," Apollon, No. 1 (1909), pp. 5-11.

47. See for example his "Xudožestvennye eresi," Zolotoe Runo, No. 2 (1906), pp. 80-88 and the editor's response (Ibid.).

48. "Pčely i osy Apollona," Apollon, No. 1 (1909), pp. 79-84.
49. Innokentij Annenskij, "O sovremennom lirizme," Apollon, Nos. 1, 2, (1909), pp. 12-42; pp. 3-29.
50. Apollon, No. 3 (1909), pp. 5-29.
51. Translated by Vsevolod Setchkarev, Studies in the Life and Work of Innokentij Annenskij (The Hague, 1963), p. 223.
52. It is sufficient to recall the poems dedicated to him by Gumilev and Axmatova.
53. Oni, p. 22.
54. Twenty-seven years later Vjačeslav Ivanov began his definition of Symbolism in the Enciclopedia Italiana (Vol. 31, 1936, pp. 793-795) with almost the same words. (Ivanov, "Symbolism," p. 24.)
55. See Setchkarev, pp. 38-39; also A. V. Fedorov, preface to Innokentij Annenskij Stixotvorenija i Trag-edii (Leningrad, 1959), p. 23.
56. Ibid.; also Setchkarev, p. 218.
57. "Oni," p. 17.
58. "Čto takoe poezija?" Posmertnaja stat'ja Innokentija Annenskago, Apollon, No. 6 (1911), pp. 51-57.
59. Makovskij, Na Parnase . . . , pp. 139-140.
60. "Čto takoe poezija?" p. 56.
61. Oni 2. Apollon, No. 2 (1909), p. 29.
62. Makovskij, Portrety . . . , pp. 223-224.
63. Makovskij, "Iz vospominanij ob Innokentii Annenskom," Novoselje, Nos. 39-41 (Paris-New York, 1949), p. 127.
64. The letter was addressed to Makovskij; see Apollon, No. 2 (1909), p. 34.
65. Ibid.
66. This, of course, is implied in Annenskij's letter.

67. Apollon, No. 3 (1909), n. p.
68. F. Zelinskij, "I. F. Annenskij kak filolog-Kalšsik," Apollon, No. 4 (1910), pp. 1-9 (2nd pagination). G. Culkov, "Traurnyj estetizm. I. F. Annenskij-kritik," Ibid., pp. 9-10. M. Vološin, "Liki tvorčestva. I. F. Annenskij-lirik," Ibid., pp. 11-16. Vjačeslav Ivanov, "O poezii I. F. Annenskogo," Ibid., pp. 16-24.
69. Gumilev, "Pis'ma . . .," Apollon, No. 1 (1909), pp. 22-23 (2nd pagination).
70. For example, Xodasevič could never understand how and why Gumilev, a maitre and a snob, could tolerate in his Cex poetov the membership of Sergej Nel'dixen, whose lack of taste and intelligence Gumilev was the first one to admit; Gumilev argued that these shortcomings, although lamentable, do not prevent Nel'dixeu to be a genuine poet, perhaps even endowed with a certain talent. (See Xodasevič, Nekropol', p. 39.)
71. Gumilev, "Pis'ma . . .," Apollon, No. 1 (1909), p. 23. [Emphasis mine.]
72. See Appendix I of this study.
73. Solov'ev, "Poezija Tjutčeva," p. 464.
74. See V. Ivanov, "Predčuvstvija i proročestva," Zolotoe Runo, No. 4 (1906), pp. 68-73, especially the section entitled "romantika ili proročestvo."
75. Ivanov, "Mysli o simvolizme," Trudy i Dni, No. 1, (1912), p. 5.
76. Belyj, "O simvolizme," Ibid., p. 13.
77. Deschartes, pp. 50-51.
78. See review by M. Kuzmin, "Cor ardens," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), p. 50. Kuzmin points out that Ivanov frequently skips superfluous logical steps as a result of which his poetry never shows any "empty" lines.
79. Ibid., p. 51.
80. Il'ja Gruzdev, "Utilitarnost' i samocel'," Petrograd, No. 1 (1923), p. 182.
81. V. Ivanov, "Granicy iskusstva," Borozdy i Mežy (Moscow, 1916), p. 204.

82. O. Mandel'stam, "O sobesednike," Apollon No. 2 (1913), p. 51.

83. Ivanov, "Granicy iskusstva," pp. 228-229.

84. This poem may be safely included among Brjusov's best poems of that and of later periods; its symbolic impact does not necessarily prove that Brjusov was still a Symbolist in 1909 (in this sense the poem is rather exceptional) but it does demonstrate Brjusov's command of the Symbolist method.

85. For definition of this concept see Gruzdev, pp. 177-178.

86. This image is possibly inspired by Vjaceslav Ivanov's sonnet "Sfinksy nad Nevoj" written two years earlier. Compare lines 16 and 17 with Ivanov's:

Drug drugu v oči--devy il' cari
Glajadite vy . . .

87. Cf. Brjusov's poem "Ja" written ten years earlier in 1899.

88. The stress on "dreams," consistent with the early Brjusov, is very prominent in this poem (see lines 3, 15, 19, 22, 27); it underlines the essential difference in metaphysical perception between the "dreaming" Brjusov and the "witnessing" Ivanov.

89. Poggioli, p. 4.

90. In Russia, the name Apollon is found seldom except in monasteries where it sometimes was given to novitiates. One may recall Kuzmin's associations with Orthodox and Old Believer communities during his early creative period. See Znosko-Borovskij, "O tvorčestve Kuzmina," Apollon, Nos. 4-5 (1917), p. 31.

91. Georgij Ivanov, Peterburgskie ziny (New York: Chekhov Publishing House, 1952), p. 140.

92. Cvetaeva, Proza, p. 137.

93. Ibid., p. 136.

94. See pp.

95. M. Tumpovskaja, "Kolčan," Apollon, No. 6-7 (1917), p. 60.

96. Ibid., p. 68.
97. See pp.233-234 of this study.
98. Makovskij, Portrety . . . , pp. 244-246.
99. Soren Kierkegaard, Philosophical fragments (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1936), p. 61.
100. Mirskij, p. 111.
101. "Xronika," Zolotoe Runo, No. 6 (1909), p. 77.
102. Culkov, (Empirik) "O Peterburgskom Apollinizme," Zolotoe Runo, No. 10 (1909), pp. 136-138.
103. Gorodeckij, "Formotvorčestvo," Zolotoe Runo No. 10 (1909), p. 58.
104. Gorodeckij hints at the poems of Gumilev and at Čerubina de Gabriac. The latter was a fictitious "Young poetess" impersonated (upon the idea of M. Vološin) by Elizaveta Ivanovna Dmitrieva in order to mystify the infatuated young editors of Apollon. See Cvetaeva, Proza, pp. 149-154; also Makovskij, Portrety . . . , pp. 335-358.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

9. See above pp. 128-131.

10. Zolotoe Runo, "Ot redakcii," p. 7.

11. Apollon published one note about the closing of Zolotoe Runo; it praised the journal in general terms for its unselfish desire to serve culture for introducing the works of young painters, but the author also pointed out the confusion which resulted from the coming and leaving of the various contributors and from the failure to outline a systematic program. A. Rostislavov, Zolotoe Runo, Apollon, No. 9 (1910), pp. 42-44 (2nd pagination).

12. M. Vranget: "Iskusstvo v 'Vesax'," Apollon, No. 10 (1910), p. 17; also N. Radlov: "Sovremennaja russkaja grafika i risunki, I," Apollon, No. 6 (1910), p. 10.

13. S. J. Poljakov: "K Sitabuljav," Vestn. No. 12 (1908), pp. 185-191.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. See below pp. 186-188.
2. See Pjast, Vstreči, p. 144; Roždestvenskij, Stranicy žizni, p. 148; Stepun, Byvšee i nesbyvšeesja, Vol. I, pp. 296-297, and Makovskij, Povtrety ..., p. 253.
3. Gumilev, "Pis'ma ...," Apollon, Nos. 3-4 (1912), p. 100.
4. Outsider, "Literaturnaja žizn' (Moskovskaja xronika)," Apollon, No. 3 (1909), p. 20. In later issues this column was signed M. Vološin; stylistic and thematic similarity with those articles allows one to assume that this one was also written by Vološin.
5. Zolotoe Runo, "Ot redakcii," No. 12, Vol. II (1909), p. 105.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. See above pp. 128-131.
10. Zolotoe Runo, "Ot redakcii," p. 7.
11. Apollon published one note about the closing of Zolotoe Runo; it praised the journal in general terms for its unselfish desire to serve culture for introducing the works of young painters, but the author also pointed out the confusion which resulted from the coming and leaving of the various contributors and from the failure to outline a systematic program. A. Rostislavov, Zolotoe Runo, Apollon, No. 9 (1910), pp. 42-44 (2nd pagination).
12. N. Vrangel': "Iskusstvo v 'Vesax'," Apollon, No. 10 (1910), p. 17; also N. Radlov: "Sovremennaja russkaja grafika i risunok, I," Apollon, No. 6 (1913), p. 10.
13. S. J. Poljakov: "K čitateljam," Vesy, No. 12 (1909), pp. 185-191.

14. Ibid., p. 186.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., p. 187.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., p. 190.
19. Mandel'stam, "Vypad," Sobranie sočinenij, p. 329.
20. N. Gumilev, "Žizn' stixa," Apollon, No. 7 (1910), p. 14.
21. Ibid., p. 13.
22. Georgij Ivanov, Peterburgskie zimy, p. 104.
23. Georgij Čulkov, "Vesy," Apollon, No. 7 (1910), pp. 16-17.
24. "Ot izdatelej," Apollon, No. 8 (1910), p. 71.
25. Kuzmin, "Zametki o russkoj belletristike," Apollon, No. 7 (1910), p. 45.
26. N. Vrangel', "Iskusstvo v 'Vesax'," Apollon, No. 10 (1910), p. 17.
27. Ibid.
28. M. Kuzmin, "Xudožestvennaja proza 'Vesov'," Apollon, No. 9 (1910), pp. 35-41. M. Gumilev, "Poezija v 'Vesax'," ibid., pp. 42-44.
29. "Xudožestvennaja proza ...," p. 38.
30. Belyj had just published his collections Pepel and Urna.
31. "Xudožestvennaja proza ...," p. 40.
32. Poezija v 'Vesax', p. 42.
33. Ibid., p. 43.
34. Ibid., pp. 42-43.

35. See V. Čudovskij, "Russkaja Mysl'," Apollon, No. 8 (1911), p. 62, and also his "Russkaja Mysl' i romany V. Brjusova, L. Gippius, D. Merežkovskogo," Apollon, No. 2 (1913), p. 72.

36. "Russkaja Mysl' i romany ...," p. 73.

37. Kuzmin, "Zametki o russkoj belletristike," Apollon, No. 8 (1910), p. 58.

38. Georgij Ivanov, "Stixi v žurnalax 1912 g.," Apollon, No. 1 (1913), p. 76.

39. "Russkaja Mysl' i romany ...," p. 72.

40. Ibid., pp. 73-74.

41. Močul'skij, Valerij Brjusov, p. 176.

42. Ibid., p. 178.

43. M. Vološin, "Literaturnye gruppirovki," Apollon, No. 12 (1910), pp. 16-17.

44. Ibid., p. 16.

45. Peterburgskie zimy, p. 105.

46. For example the "stout journal" Severnye Zapiski "which was founded in 1910 in St. Petersburg by J. L. Saker and S. J. Čackina according to Stepun also with the intension "to attract young new contributors who were repelled by the snobish aestheticiam of Apollon ..." (See Byvšee i nesbyvšeesja VI, p. 296) or the better established Vestnik Evropy.

Even less "Modernist" were the Marxist oriented publications of Sovremennik Znanie, the social democrat monthly Pravda, Novoe Slovo, or the conservative Russkoe Bogatstvo, Novoe Vremja, and Zizn' dl'a vsej, or the philosophical S. Frank's and P. Struve's weekly Svoboda i kul'tura and Merežkovskij's later Golos žizni, not to speak of the numerous provincial or less authoritative organs.

47. This constitutional-democrat daily appeared in St. Petersburg since 1906. Its editors, V. D. Nabokov and I. I. Petrunkevich, like P. Struve, dedicated the main bulk of the paper to legislative and socio-political issues; therefore their art and literature section, which featured

articles by A. Benojs and, occasionally, revues by such Modernists as I. Annenskij and even Gumilev (See Gleb Struve's "Innokentij Annenskij i Gumilev," Novyj žurnal, No. 78 (March, 1965), p. 283) did not suffice quantitatively to represent a significant direction.

48. Even less formidable papers than Reč, like E. Rumanov's Russkoe Slovo, and A. V. Tyrkova's Russkaja Molva occasionally boasted such contributors as Blok, Ajxenval'd and Ivanov-Razumnik. *ital*

49. Mandel'stam, "Vypad," p. 328.

50. Makovskij, Portrety ..., p. 253.

51. Ellis, Russkie simvolisty, p. 324.

52. See Pjast, Vstreči, pp. 149-151, and Blok, Sobranie sočinenij, p. 6.

53. Some "neo-populists contributed to all three of these outlets.

54. See "Literaturnye gruppirovki," p. 17.

55. Belyi, "Orfej," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), p.60.

56. Previously a member of Astronavty, music critic in Zolotoe Runo (Vol'fing), brother of the composer Nikolaj Metner.

57. Byvšee i nesbyvšeesja, Vol. I, p. 208.

58. Advertisement of Trudy i Dni in Apollon, No. 12 (1911), n.p.

59. Emilij Metner, "Musaget, vstupitel'noe slovo redaktora," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), p. 60.

60. Fedor Steppun, "Logos," ibid., p. 73.

61. Ibid.

62. The German title of this journal was also: "Logos, Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie der Kultur." This journal was issued 2-3 times a year; asserting that "philosophical activity is equally sharply distinct from empirical knowledge, mystical experience, and religious revelation, Logos sought to provide contemporary creativity

with a theoretical framework achieved and articulated by a purely philosophical inquiry into cultural activities. The supra-national character of the journal was conceived in such a way as to allow each participating country (Russia, Germany and Italy) to publish autonomously, concentrating on its specific cultural needs, and at the same time, to give access to the latest advances in World thought. Thus, in addition to studies of Russian philosophers and specialists the issues carried the contributions by men like Hussel, Croce, Varisco, Rikkert, Kroner, Vossler, etc. Although predominantly German transcendentalist, the journal insisted that it was not an agency of any particular school. See Metner, Pis'mo v redakciju Apollon, No. 1 (1911), p. 26, and "Katalog izdatel'stva Musaget," (1910-12), March, 1912, pp. 22-23. Spelling

63. V. Ivanov, "Orfej," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), p. 60.

64. Ibid.

65. Ibid., p. 62.

66. Belyj, "Orfej," ibid., p. 65.

67. "Literaturnye gruppirovki," p. 17.

68. Ibid.

69. See note 31 to Chapter III; also below note 75.

70. See N. V. Nedobrovo, "Obščestvo revnitatelej xudožestvennogo slova," Trudy i Dni, No. 2 (1912), pp. 24-25. At a meeting of this society on January 28, 1912, V. Ivanov and Nedobrovo raised annihilating objections to Belyj's failure to take into account the rhythmical role of permanent and ambulatory caesura in iambic pentameter, which failure, in Belyj's own terms (see Simvolism, p. 278), invalidates the statistical data.

See the revue of V. Čudovskij's lecture on the "New school" of criticism, given in "Obščestvo revnitatelej ..." published in Apollon's supplement Russkaja xudožestvennaja Letopis', No. 16 (1911) and his large studies published in Apollon, Nos. 1-2 (1914), pp. 108-121; Nos. 8-9 (1915), pp. 55-95 and Nos. 4-5 (1917), pp. 58-69. Also see Brjusov's note on "Putnik", Apollon, No. 2 (1911), pp. 10-11.

71. Especially Čudovskij.

- p. 60.
72. "Russian Poets in Search of a Poetics,"
73. Pjast, Vstreči, p. 137.
74. See "Literaturnye gruppirovki," p. 17.
75. Four years later Čudovskij concludes: "Belyj's method is purely inductive ... He ... waits what general conclusions will come of it. So far one received - very little: "O ritme puškinskoj 'Rusalki'," Apollon, Nos. 1-2 (1914), p. 111.
76. It is interesting to compare Belyj's dialectics with Ivanov's in "Zavety simvolizma" which, by very different means, arrive at the same notion (see below, pp. 162-164).
77. See Nedobrovo's account in "Obsčestvo revnitatelej ...".
78. See below the responses of Merežkovskij and Brjusov, the two "extreme wings of symbolism." The speeches which "repelled" the younger "generation" were Ivanov's and Belyj's on February 18, 1912, Pjast's on October 30, 1911, Verxovskij's report on January 18, 1917 and Ivanov's Dispute on January 19, 1914.
79. Letter of Brjusov to V. Percov on March 23, 1910 quoted in Sud'ba Blok, p. 141.
80. Ibid.
81. Gumilev, Žizn' stixa Apollon, No. 7 (April, 1910), pp. 5, 6.
82. Čudovskij, "Trudy i Dni," Apollon, No. 5 (1912), p. 55.
83. Pjast, "Nečto o kanone," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), pp. 27-28.
84. "Zavety simvolizma," Apollon, No. 8 (1910), pp. 5-20.
85. Čudovskij, "Trudy i Dni," p. 55.
86. Aleksandr Blok, "O sovremennom sostojanii russkogo simvolizma," Apollon, No. 8 (1910), pp. 21-30.

87. See letter of Blok to Belyj on June 6, 1911 and to Pjast on January 23, 1911 in his Sočinenija, pp. 544-545; pp. 541-542.

88. See Sud'ba Bloka, p. 102.

89. See "Primečanija," in Aleksandr Blok, Sočinenija, p. 620.

90. See letter of Blok to Belyj of October 22, 1910 in ibid., p. 541.

91. Letter of Ivanov to Blok quoted in V. V. Gol'cev (ed.) Aleksandr Blok o literature (Moscow, 1931), p. 326.

92. Ibid.

93. See "Necto o kanone," p. 31.

94. The term is borrowed from the title of S. Frank's essay on Ivanov, "Artističeskoe narodničestvo," Russkaja Mysl', No. 1 (1915), pp. 27-38 (2nd pagination).

95. Blok, Sočinenija ..., p. 620.

96. Ibid.

97. See letter of Blok to Belyj of October 22, 1910 (ibid., p. 540).

98. Močulskij, Aleksandr Blok (Paris, 1948), pp. 267-268.

99. Ibid., p. 267.

100. Blok, "O sovremennom ...," p. 23.

101. Ibid., p. 24.

102. Ibid.

103. Ibid., p. 28.

1104. Ibid., p. 30.

105. Ibid.

106. Zapisnye knižki Al. Bloka, Medvedev, ed. (Leningrad, 1930), p. 131.

107. Apollon, No. 4 (1910), p. 40.
108. See Gol'cev, p. 325.
109. Blok, "Zapisnye knižki," p. 128.
110. Ibid., p. 137.
111. Valerij Brjusov, "O rečirabskoj v zaščitu poezii," Apollon, No. 9 (1910), p. 31.
112. Ibid., pp. 32, 33.
113. Ibid., p. 33.
114. Ibid.
115. Ibid.
116. Ibid.
117. Ibid.
118. Ibid., p. 32.
119. Ibid., p. 34.
120. Ibid.
121. Ibid.
122. Letter of Blok to Belyj in Blok, Sočinenija ..., p. 540.
123. Letter of Blok to Brjusov of September 3, 1910, Blok, Sočinenija, p. 539.
124. Pjast, "Nečto o kanone," p. 32.
125. Blok, "Otkrytoe pis'mo D. Merezkovskomu," Blok, Sočinenija, p. 448.
126. Merežkovskij, "Balagan i tragedija," Russkoe slovo, No. 211 (September 14, 1910).
127. Blok, "Otkrytoe pis'mo," pp. 448-450.
128. It was first published posthumously in Russkij sovremennik, No. 3, 1924.

129. Letter of Blok to Belyj, pp. 540-541. "...as long as I wrote 'half-humanly' about the intermediate--on intelligentsia,...Merezkovskij accepted it, but as soon as the human being spoke, he started to shout about mania grandioza."

130. Ibid., p. 541.

131. Ibid.

132. Belyj, "O simvolizme," p. 24.

133. Ellis, "Russkie simvolisty, pp. 335-336, and Ivanov, Borozdyi mezi, p. 204.

134. Russkie simvolisty, p. 334.

135. Andrej Belyj, "Venok ili venec," Apollon, No.11(1910), pp. 1-4 (2nd pagination).

136. Ibid., p. 2.

137. Belyj's essay was constructed on the implications of these lines.

138. "Venok...", p. 3.

139. Ibid.

140. Ibid.

141. V. Ivanov, "O sekte i dogmate," Borozdy i mezi, p. 161.

142. Edmund Wilson, "Symbolism," Axel's Castle, pp. 21-22.

143. V. Ivanov, "Mysli o simvolizme," p.9.

144. Quoted in Axel's Castle, p. 20.

145. Translated in Geoffrey Brereton's A Short History of French Literature (Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1961), p. 305.

146. In connection with the Franco-English brand of Symbolism, Edmund Wilson came in 1931 to the conclusion that there "are in our contemporary society, for writers who are unable to interest themselves in it..., only two alternative courses to follow--Axel's [from Villiers de l'Isle Adam's tragedy] or Rimbaud's. If one chooses the first of these, the way of Axel, one shuts oneself up in one's own private world..., ultimately mistaking one's chimeras for reality [plus suicide] . If one chooses the second, the way of Rimbaud, one tries to leave the 20th century behind...and follow that hysterical excitement over modern 'primitives' [and give up creativity]."

Axel's Castle, pp. 287-288.

147. The only printed response to come from a third generation Modernist appeared in a little read paper Protiv tecenija, No. 114 (October 15, 1911), by the former member of Zolotoe Runo, Sergej Gorodeckij, under the title, "V strane reveransov i purpurovo-lilovyx Bedekerov," in which the author urged to concentrate on mythology rather than to search for further potentials of Symbolism.

148. "O poezii v 'Vesax'," p. 43.

149. See Editor's footnote, Apollon, No. 11 (1910), p.1 (2nd pagination).

150. Ivanov was a member of the editorial board of Apollon, and both were members of the "Society for Adepts..."

151. Valerij Brjusov, "Ob odnom voprose ritma," Apollon, No. 11 (1910), pp. 52-60.

152. See Čudovskij's review of Brjusov's article on Maigrón's "Le Romantisme et les Moeurs," Apollon, No. 8 (1911), p. 66.

153. Trudy i Dni. Dvuxmesjačnik izdatel'stva Musaget (Moscow, 1912-1916). The title "Works and Days" was obviously borrowed from that of the work of Hesiod.

154. Editor's announcement, Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), p. 1.

155. The editors announced that Belyj was going to retire from the editorship because of his prolonged stay abroad (Trudy i Dni, No. 6 (1912), p. 149.).

156. Trudy i Dni, Nos. 4-5 (1912), pp. 1-12.

Ibid., Book 7 (1914), pp. 81-106.

Ibid., No. 6 (1912), pp. 1-15. Respectively

157. Ibid., No. 2 (1912), pp. 14-23.

158. Ibid., pp. 8-14.

159. Ibid., Nos. 1-2 (1913), pp. 116-136.

160. Ibid., 1912-1914.

161. See Gumilev, "Žizn' stixa."
162. Nedobrovo, "Obščestvo revnitatelej," p. 31.
163. Sud'ba Bloka, p. 182.
164. Kuzmin, "Pis'mo v redakciju," Apollon, No. 5 (1912), pp. 56-57.
165. Ibid., p. 57.
166. Kuzmin, "Cor Ardens," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), pp. 49-51.
167. See below, pp. 202-206.
168. See below, pp. 249-250.
169. Čudovskij, Trudy i Dni Apollon, No. 5 (1912), pp. 54-56.
170. Ibid.
171. Ibid., p. 55.
172. Ibid., p. 56.
173. Both almanacs appeared in Moscow in 1911.
174. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 7 (1911), pp. 76-77.
175. "Pis'ma...", Ibid., No. 7, p. 77.
176. Zapisnye knižki, p. 152.
177. Letter of Blok to Belyj.
178. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 8 (1911), p. 68.
179. Ibid., p. 67.
180. Boris Sadovskoj, "Pamjati druga," in Jurij Sidorov, Stixotvorenija, p. 14.
181. See below, pp. 267-269.
182. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 2 (1911), p. 49.

183. This nickname was "made official" by Lev Shestov in his article "Vjačeslav Velikolepnyj. K karakteristike russkogo upadničestva," Russkaja Mysl', No. 10 (1916), pp. 80-110 (2nd pagination).
184. Makovskij, Portrety..., pp. 276-277.
185. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 10 (1915), p. 52.
186. Georgij Adamovič, "Iz zapisnoj knižki," Novosel'e, Nos. 39-41 (Paris, 1949), p. 146.
187. Kornej Čukovskij, "Poslednie gody Bloka," Zapiski mečtatelej, No. 6 (1922), p. 160.
188. Ibid.
189. Xodasevič, Nekropol', p. 126.
190. Makovskij, Na parnase..., pp. 156, 170.
191. Letter of Blok to Makovskij, December 29, 1909. Blok, Sočinenija..., pp. 538-539.
192. See his poem "Poetu."
193. See Sečkarev, pp. 222-224.
194. Makovskij, Portrety..., p. 276.
195. Gumilev, "Pamjatji Innokentija Fedoroviča Annenskogo," Apollon, No. 9 (1912), pp. 46-47.
Axmatova, "Pamjatji Innokentija Annenskogo," Zvezda, No. 1 (1946), p. 72.
196. Makovskij, "Iz vospominanij ob Innokentii Annenskom," Novosel'e, Nos. 39-41 (Paris, 1949), pp. 117-129.
197. Thus Mandelštam brands Brjusov's philosophy as primitive nihilism (ubogoe ničevičestvo) [Mandelštam, Sobranie sočinenij, p. 349]; Culkov scolds him for insensitivity [Culkov, Isxod, p. 39]; Cvetaeva, for lack of inner musicality [Cvetaeva, Proza, pp. 202-209]; Ajxenval'd, for lack of true passion [Julij Ajxenval'd, Siluety russkix pisatelej (Berlin, 1923), III, p. 129]; Xodasevič, for faking a concern for "burning themes" [Xodasevič, Nekropol', pp. 52-53.];

Tumpovskaja, for being boring [M. Tumpovskaja, "Sem' cvetov radugi," Apollon, No. 1 (1917), p. 42.]; and S. Parnok, for producing a meaningless "rhymed catalogue" [Sofija Parnok, "Poezija Brjusova," Russkij sovremennik, No. 1 (1924), p. 20.]. Gumilev withdrew from the second edition (1916) of his Zemčuga the inscription "to my teacher" which introduced in the first edition the first poem.

198. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, Nos. 3-4 (1912), p. 100.

199. Močul'skij, Valerij Brjusov, p. 155.

200. Ibid., p. 157.

201. An exception may have been Igor' Severjanin, whose verse show some resemblance to Brjusov's "stixi Nelli."

202. Untitled survey by G.I., Apollon, No. 4 (1913), p. 50.

203. See Mandel'stam's letter to Sologub, Sobranie sočinenij, p. 366.

204. G.I., p. 50.

205. Ellis, Russkie simvolisty, p. 324.

206. Erberg, "O vosdusnyx mostax kritiki," Apollon, No. 2 (1909), pp. 54-62.

207. Sadovskoj, "Pamjati druga," p. 13.

208. Ellis, Russkie simvolisty, p. 324.

12. Ibid., p. 53.

13. Quoted in Erberg, p. 55.

14. Rusain, "O prekrasnoj jasnosti,"

Apollon, No. 2 (1910), pp. 5-10.

Volosin, "Anrič on Kerje," Apollon, No. 4 (1910), pp. 15-16.

15. Volosin, "Anrič on Kerje," p. 15.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1. This trend is perhaps most vividly illustrated by Axmatova's collection Cetki (Petersburg, 1912).
2. See below, pp. 233-235; pp. 245-247.
3. This theater under the direction of Baron Osten-Drizen was mostly devoted to the performance of Renaissance plays.
4. This was an experimental theater directed usually by V. Mejerxol'd and N.N. Lvreinov. This name was given because the performances took place in Ivanov's tower.
5. Vološin, "Arxaizm v russkoj zivopisi," Apollon, No. 1 (1909), pp. 43-54.
6. Ibid., p. 43.
7. Leon Bakst, "Puti klassicizma v iskusstve," Apollon, No. 2 (1909), pp. 63-78, and No. 3 (1909), pp. 46-61.
8. Ibid., p. 60.
9. Ibid.
10. Giperborej (St. Petersburg, 1913).
11. Evgenij Braudo, "Muzyka posle Vagnera," Apollon, No. 1 (1909), pp. 55-69.
12. Ibid., p. 55.
13. Quoted in Braudo, p. 55.
14. Kuzmin, "O prekrasnoj jasnosti," Apollon, No. 4 (1910), pp. 5-10.
Vološin, "Anri de Renje," Apollon, No. 4 (1910), pp. 18-34.
15. Vološin, "Anri de Renje," p. 25.

16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., p. 26.
19. Kuzmin, "O prekrasnoj jasnosti," p.9.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. See the article by Volosin, cited above.
23. Kuzmin points at Brjusov's Ognennyj Angel as an example of successful stylization which is genuinely creative.
24. "O prekrasnoj...", p. 6.
25. Ibid., p. 10.
26. This point was well illustrated later by Apollon's secretary, E. Znosko-Borovskij, who declared in his analysis of Kuzmin's creativity: "...with a conscious and joyous intention...we refrain from discussions of Symbolism, Realism, stylization, etc...." See his "O tvorcestve M. Kuzmina," Apollon, Nos. 4-5 (1917), p. 27.
27. M. Kuzmin, "Orfej i Evridika Kavalera Gluka," Apollon, No. 10 (1911), pp. 9-19.
28. Ibid., p. 19.
29. Ibid., p. 9. This quote must have been taken from the conclusion of Gluck's preface to the Italian version of Alceste, written in 1767.
30. Georgij Ivanov, Peterburgskie zimy, p. 139.
31. Seti, pervaja kniga stixov (Moscow, Skorpion, 1908).
32. See Chapter IV, Note 20.
33. The ending of this article mentions the recent closing of Vesy.

34. "Žizn' stixa," p. 14.
35. Ibid., p. 5.
36. Ibid., p. 6.
37. Ibid., p. 8.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
41. R.P. Blackmur, Language as Gesture, First edition, n.d. (New York: Harcourt, Brace), p. 12.
42. "Žizn' stixa," p. 8.
43. Ibid., p. 9.
44. Ibid., p. 10.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., p. 11.
47. Ibid., p. 12.
48. Gumilev, "Pis'ma....," Apollon, No. 3 (1909), pp. 46-47 (2nd pagination).
49. Ibid., p. 46.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. Volosin, "O teatre," Ibid., p. 49.
53. Valerian Čudovskij, "Neskol'ko myslej k vozmožnomu učeniju o stixe," Apollon, Nos. 8-9 (1915), pp. 55-94.
54. Gumilev, "Pis'ma....," Apollon, No. 9 (1910), p. 36.
55. Nikolaj Ocuq, in "Nikolaj Stepanovič Gumilev," Opyty I (1953), pp. 117-142, observes correctly

that "although Gumilev did not make an epoch as a theoretician....in the enormous household of Russian poetry which arrived at a chaotic state, it was precisely he who created an order." (p. 135) Simon Karlinskij remarks that Gumilev "showed enviable foresight" as one of the earliest critics of Cvetaeva. [Marina Cvetaeva, Her Life and Art (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), p. 34.] Vladimir Markov made a similar observation in his study on Xlebnikov. The Longer Poems of Velimir Xlebnikov (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962), p. 34.]

57. Makovskij, Na parnase..., p. 199.
58. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 1 (1911), p. 75.
59. Ibid., pp. 75-76.
60. Ibid., p. 75.
61. See Chapter II, Note 67.
62. "Žizn' stixa," p. 11.
63. "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 7 (1911), p. 76.
64. Čudovskij review of Ivanov's lecture, Apollon, No. 8 (1911), p. 67.
65. Makovskij, Portrety..., p. 277.
66. "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 7 (1911), p. 76.
67. V. Ivanov, "O proze M. Kuzmina," Apollon, No. 7 (1910), pp. 46-51.
68. Ibid., p. 46.
69. Ibid., pp. 50-51.
70. V. Ivanov, "Pis'ma o rusškoj poezii," Apollon, No. 7 (1910), p. 38.
71. Ibid., pp. 38-40.
72. Ibid., p. 39.
73. Ibid.

74. Brjusov, review in Russkaja Mysl', No. 7 (1910). Reprinted in Nikolaj Gumilev, Sobranie socinenij, I, p. XVI.
75. Brjusov, Dalekie i blizkie (Moscow, 1912), p. 138.
76. Valerij Brjusov, "Novye tečenija v russkoj poezii Akmeizm," Russkaja Mysl', No. 4 (1913), pp. 134-142 (2nd pagination).
77. Kuzmin, "Pis'ma....," Apollon, No. 2 (1912), pp. 73-74.
78. Ibid., p. 74.
79. Apollon, No. 9 (1910), pp. 9-11.
80. Ibid., pp. 11-12.
81. G. Ivanov, Peterburgskie zimy, p. 118.
82. Apollon, No. 9(1910), pp. 5-7.
83. Makovskij, Portrety...., pp. 377-381.
84. See pp. 223, 234.
85. Apollon, No. 8 (1911), p. 31.
86. Pjast, Vstreči, p. 186.
87. Jurij Tynjanov, "Promežutok," Russkij Sovremennik, No. 4 (1924), p. 216.
88. Znosko-Borovskij, "Tvorčeskij put' Anny Axmatovoj," Volja Rossii, No. 10 (1923), pp. 67-79.
89. Makovskij, Na parnase, pp. 214-215.
90. Apollon, No. 4 (1911), pp. 20-22.
91. See Makovskij, Na parnase, pp. 223-250.
92. Graf V.A. Komarovskij, Pervaja pristan' (St. Petersburg, 1913).
93. Gumilev, "Pis'ma....," Apollon, No. 8 (1913), p. 79.
94. See the review by Prince Sviatopolk-

Mirskij reprinted in Makovskij, Na parnase..., pp. 226-227.

95. Evgenij A. Znosko-Borovskij, "Tvorčeskij put' Anny Axmatovoj," Volja Rossii, No. 10 (June, 1923), pp. 65-81.

96. "Osennij Maj," Antologija Musageta (1911).

97. Čudovskij, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 7 (1911), p. 76.

98. "Tvorčeskij put'...", p. 67. Kuzmin's artistic "parentship" was clearly manifested when Axmatova's first collection Večer (St. Petersburg, Cex Poetov, 1912) was published with his preface.

99. Georgij Ivanov, Otplytie na ostrov Citeru (St. Petersburg, 1912).

100. Poggioli, The Poets of Russia, p. 236. To continue this concise but accurate description: "In the years that followed...Ivanov took his cue directly from the Acmeists, and published...poems conveying with fresh objectivity the charms of the physical world. The best book...is Gardens (1921), where perhaps under the influence of Anna Axmatova, he reflected the experiences of the senses in the mirror of feeling." (Ibid.)

101. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 6 (1911), p. 75.

102. Brjusov, "Stixi 1911 goda," quoted in Russkie pisateli o literaturnom trude, ed. B. Majlax, Vol. IV (Leningrad, 1956), p. 299.

103. V. Ivanov, "Marginalia," Trudy i Dni, Nos. 4-5 (1912), pp. 38-45.

104. Ibid., p. 44.

105. Ibid.

106. See Emmanuel Raj's, introductory article, "Tvorčestvo Osipa Mandel'stama," in Osip Mandel'stam. Collected Works, Vol. I (Inter-Language Literary Associates, Washington, 1914), pp. LXXI-LXXX.

107. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 6

(1913), p. 72.

108. Makovskij, Portrety..., p. 385.
109. Artur Lurje, "Detskij raj," Vozdušnye Puti III (1963), pp. 169-171.
110. Ibid., p. 170.
111. Quoted by Gleb Struve in Osip Mandel'stam, Collected Works, pp. 354-355.
112. Ibid., p. 355.
113. "Pis'mo...", Apollon, No. 1 (1916), pp. 30-32.
114. Ibid., p. 31.
115. See Victor Terras, "Classical Motives in the Poetry of Osip Mandel'stam," The Slavic and East European Journal, X (Fall 1966), pp. 251-256.
116. Irina Bušman, Poetičeskoe iskusstvo Mandel'stama (Munich, 1964), p. 66.
117. Rajs, p. XCV.
118. Mandel'stam, "Barsuč'ja nora," Sobranje sočinenij, p. 361.
119. Modest Gofman, Kniga o russkix poetax..., p. 199.
120. See Mandel'stam, "O prirode slova," Sobranie sočinenij, pp. 345-346.
121. Močul'skij, quoted in Osip Mandel'stam, Collected Works, p. 365.
122. Quoted in Ibid.
See also Terras, p. 251.
123. Mandel'stam, Collected Works, p. 31.
124. Ibid., p. 81.
125. Ibid., p. 13.
126. Ibid., p. 69.
127. Gumilev, "Pis'mo...", Apollon, No. 1 (1916), p. 32.
128. Brjusov himself was consciously turning

toward Classicism. See also "O prirode slova," p. 340.

129. Mandel'stam, "Slovo i kul'tura,"
Cex poetov (Berlin, 1922), p. 83.

130. Ocup, N. Gumilev, p. 21.

131. Gumilev, "Pis'mo...", Apollon, No. 1
(1916), p. 31.

132. Čudovskij, "Po povodu stixov Anny
Axmatovoj," Apollon, No. 7 (1912), p. 47.

133. Brjusov, Nedobrovo, and Žirmunskij in
Russkaja Mysl'; Ejzenbaum and Vinogradov in separate
studies. Kuzmin wrote the introduction to her first
volume Vecer.

134. This collection was published by
Giperborej (St. Petersburg, 1912).

135. See Čudovskij, "Po povodu...", p. 48.

136. Ibid.

137. Ibid.

138. Mandel'stam, "J.K. Gjuismans,"
Apollon, No. 3 (1913), p. 74.

139. Victor Žirmunskij, "Dopolnenija,"
Voprosy teorii literatury (The Hague), pp. 323-324.

140. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Nos. 3-4
(1912), p. 100.

141. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", No. 6 (1912),
p. 53.

142. Ibid.

143. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, Nos. 3-
4(1912), p. 101.

144. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 8
(1912), p. 62.

145. Ibid.

146. Sud'ba Bloka, pp. 135-136.

147. Pjast, Vstreči, p. 212.
148. Ibid. See also Roždestvenskij, p. 146.
149. Pjast, Vstreči, pp. 212-213.
150. See preface to Cex poetov, and the "symposium" of the founders of Apollon (pp. 92-96 of this study).
151. In this, Apollon differed from the left-wing aesthetic radicals.
152. Anna Axmatova, "Mandel'stam," Vozdušnye puti, Almanax IV (New York, 1965), p. 30.
153. See Nedobrovo, "Obščestvo...", p. 31.
154. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 6 (1912), p. 53.
155. Ibid., p. 52.
156. Makovskij, Portrety..., p. 276.
157. Preface to Cex poetov.
158. Axmatova, "Mandel'stam," p. 31.
159. Belyj, quoted in Sud'ba Bloka, p. 104.
160. Ibid.
161. Blok, "Bez božestva, bez vdoxnoven'ja," quoted in Russkaja literatura, ed. N.A. Trifonov (Moscow, 1962), p. 450.
162. Pjast, Vstreči, p. 156.
163. Valerij Brjusov, "Karl V," Zolotoe Runo, No. 4 (1906), p. 69.
164. Mandel'stam, "O prirode slova," p. 348.
165. One would assume that the theorist Gumilev would prefer the first, while the myth-maker Gorodeckij, the latter; but Gorodeckij seldom used the term Adamism.
166. See Gleb Struve, "Tvorčeskij put' Gumileva," Gumilev sobranie socinenij, Vol. II, pp. X, XV.
167. Mandel'stam, "O prirode slova," p. 348.

168. Axmatova, "Mandel'stam," p. 42.
169. Makovskij, Na parnase..., p. 217.
Ocup, "Nikolaj Stepanovic Gumilev," p. 22.
170. Unlike the Symbolists, the Acmeists showed little natural propensity to theorize.
171. For the description of Gorodeckij's lecture in the night club Brodjačaja sobaka, see "Smes'," Apollon, No. 1 (1913), pp. 70-71.
172. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 9 (1913), p. 53.
173. Gumilev, "Nasledie simvolizma i akmeizm," Apollon, No. 1 (1913), pp. 42-45.
174. Ibid., p. 42.
175. Ibid.
176. Ibid., p. 44.
177. Ibid.
178. Brjusov, "Novye tečenija...", pp. 134-142 (2nd pagination).
179. Gumilev, "Teofil' Got'je," Apollon, No. 9 (1911), pp. 53-58.
180. Gumilev, "Nasledie...", p. 44.
181. Gorodeckij, "Nekotorye tečenija v sovremennoj ruskoj poezii," Apollon, No. 1 (1913), pp. 46-50.
182. Ibid., p. 46.
183. Ibid., p. 47.
184. Ibid., p. 50.
185. Mandel'stam, "O sobsednike," Apollon, No. 2 (1913), pp. 49-54.
186. Quoted by V. Ivanov as an epigraph to his speech, "Mysli o simvolizme," p. 3.

187. Belyj, "Barbarussa," Apollon,
No. 6 (1911), pp. 30-32.
188. V. Ivanov, "Mysli o simbolizme," p. 6.
189. Mandel'stam, "O sobsednike," p. 52.
190. Ibid.
191. Apollon, No. 3 (1913), pp. 31-39.
192. See N. Gumilev, Sobranie sočinenij,
Vol. I, pp. 222, 327.
193. "Nasledie....," p. 44.
194. Ibid.
195. See Gorodeckij's poem "Adam" in the
appendix to this study.
196. V.V.Vinogradov, Poezija Anny Axmatovoj
(Leningrad, 1925), pp. 149-113.
197. These poems reflect also the difference
between Eastern abstract and lofty and Western concrete
and weighty intellectual and aesthetic values.
198. In terms of artistic craft it is the
latter poem that corresponds to the Acmeist theory.
199. Mandel'stam, "Fransua Villon," Apollon,
No. 4 (1913), pp. 30-35.
200. Ibid., p. 31.
201. Ibid., p. 35.
202. In addition to the fact that Mandel'stam
had little reason to write this article in 1919 and
entitle it "The Morning of Acmeism," the imagery in
this article corresponds most closely to that in his
poetry and articles of the early Acmeist period.
203. Taken from the original translation
by Clarence Fleetwood Brown in his unpublished doctoral
dissertation, "The Life and Art of Osip Mandel'stam," Part II,
pp. 130-136 (Harvard University, 1962).

204. Mandel'stam, "J.K. Guismans Parižskie arabeski," Apollon, No. 3 (1913), p. 74.
205. Ibid.
206. "Morning of Acmeism," pp. 133-134.
207. Ibid., p. 134.
208. J. S. Ežov and E. J. Šamurin list in their anthology Russkaja Poezija XX veka (Moscow, 1925) ten poets connected with Acmeism.
209. Brj sov, quoted in N. Gumilev, Sobranie socinenij, pp. XV-XVI.
210. See Blok, "Bez božestva..."
211. Čudovskij, "Russkaja Mysl' i romany...", p. 77.
212. Žirmunskij, p. 283.
213. Ibid., p. 308.
214. See Vladimir Markov, The Longer Poems..., p. 5.
215. Ibid., p. 9.
216. See below, pp. 261. 262.
217. See Markov, p. 8.
218. Ibid.
219. Ibid., p. 1.
220. Partly with a satirical intention.
221. Gumilev, "Pis'ma...", Apollon, No. 10 (1912), p. 75.
222. Gumilev, "Nasledie...", p. 42.
223. Boris Ejxenbaum, Poezija Anny Axmatovoj (Petrograd, 1923), p. 19.
224. See advertisement page in Apollon after 1911.

225. Valerian Čudovskij, "Futurizm i prošloe," Apollon, No. 6 (1913), pp. 25-30.
226. Ibid., p. 230.
227. Sergej Makovskij, " 'Novoe' iskusstvo i 'četvertoe izmerenije'," Apollon, No. 7 (1913), pp. 56-60.
228. Ibid., pp. 58-59.
229. See Z. Aškinazi, "Leipzig 1914 g.," Apollon, No. 3 (1915), pp. 70-71.
230. Gumilev, "Pis'ma....," Apollon, No. 10 (1915), pp. 48-49.
231. Čudovskij, "Xudožestvennyj teatr v Peterburge," Apollon, Nos. 4-5 (1915), p. 103-104.
232. A. Rimskij-Korsakov, "Balety Igorja Stravinskogo," Apollon, No. 1 (1917), pp. 38-43.
233. M. Tumpovskaja, "Sem' cvetov radugi," Apollon, No. 1 (1917), pp. 38-43.
234. M. Tumpovskaja, "Kolčan," Apollon, Nos. 6-7 (1917), pp. 58-66.
235. Tumpovskaja observes that Gumilev achieves this effect because his perceptions rest on sense and spirit rather than on emotion and intellect.
236. "O novyx stixax," Apollon, No. 3 (1915), p. 73.
237. Ibid.
238. See, for example, G. Ivanov's "Voennye stixi," Apollon, No. 2 (1915), pp. 18-20.
239. See, for example, Z. Askinazi, "Pis'mo is Moskvy," Apollon, No. 2 (1915), p. 70.
240. Arthur Symons, Symbolism (New York, 1919), p.7.
241. Apollon always considered this to be an extrem st position.
242. See V. Čudovskij, "O Merežkovskom, Nekrasove i o politike v iskusstve," Apollon, No. 7

(1913), pp. 47-52.

243. Ibid.

244. Ibid., p. 49.

245. Sergej Makovskij, "Duša reakcii i svjatoe bespokojstvo," Apollon, No. 6 (1913), pp. 44-47.

246. Ibid.

247. Ibid.

248. I.A. Richards, Practical Criticism (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1935), p. 11.

249. Ibid.

250. Valerian Čudovskij, "Neskol'ko myslej k vozmožnomu učeniju o stixе," Apollon, Nos. 8-9 (1915), p. 58.

251. See such articles as:

P. Morozov's "Puškin i anglijskaja poezia," Apollon, No. 1 (1917), pp. 44-52.

Vladislav Xodasevic, "Peterburgskie povesti Puškina," Apollon, No. 3 (1915), pp. 33-50.

B. Tomaševskij, "Franzuzskie poety XVIII veka," Apollon, Nos. 6-7 (1915), pp. 63-85.

252. One may recall the authoritative opinions of Ejxenbaum or Žirmunskij, who believed that of all Modernists the poets of Apollon have come closest to the Apollonian limpidity of Puškin.

253. J. Tugenol'd, "Puškinskij spektakl'," Apollon, Nos. 4-5 (1915), pp. 99-102.

Богъ грозныхъ чаръ и строгихъ пѣсенъ,
Ты сходишь вновь въ земные доли!
Священны древніе престолы,
И ликъ Твой гнѣвнъ и чудеснъ!

И за Тобою вереницей
Несутся сестры въ пляскѣ плавной!
Всѣ девять дружныхъ, но—не равно
Твоей внимающихъ цѣвницъ!

Всѣ девять дивныхъ—вновь покорны
Таинственнымъ Твоимъ обрядамъ!
Заворожилъ Ты мѣрнымъ ладомъ
И даль небесъ, и лугъ нагорный!

Ликующимъ внемли осаннамъ,
Владыка сновъ Серебрулюкій!
Къ Твоимъ лугамъ обѣтованнымъ,
Къ Твоимъ престоламъ осіяннымъ
Съ мольбой мы простираемъ руки!

М.

ВЯЧЕСЛАВЪ ИВАНОВЪ,

А П О Л Л И Н І

Когда вспоить вашъ корень гробовой
Ключами слезъ Любовь, и мракъ—суровый,
Какъ Смерти сѣнь,—волшебною дубровой,
Гдѣ Дантъ блуждалъ, обстанетъ стволъ живой:

Возноситесь вы гордой головой,
О Гимны, въ свѣтъ, сквозь надъ мглой багровой
Синѣющихъ долинъ, какъ лѣсъ лавровый,
Изваянный на тверди огневой.

Подъ хмелемъ волнъ, въ пурпуровой темницѣ,
Въ жемчужницѣ—слезницѣ горькихъ лонъ,
Какъ перлы безднъ, родитесь вы—въ гробницѣ.

Кто вѣщихъ Дафнъ въ эфирный взялъ полонъ,
И въ лавръ одѣлъ, и отразилъ въ криницѣ
Прозрачности безсмертной?.. Аполлонъ!

К. Д. БАЛЬМОНТЪ

КУПИНА

Купина огнепалимая,
 Это сердце здѣсь въ груди,
 Какъ вошелъ въ огонь и въ дымы я,
 Такъ назадъ меня не жди.

Я горю въ самосожженности,
 Въ распалюемой печи,
 Чтобы яркія стозвонности
 Міру бросили лучи.

Купина огнепалимая
 И хранимая во вѣкъ,
 Всѣмъ сердцамъ, какъ свѣточъ, зримая,
 Да не гаснетъ человѣкъ.

ПОСЛѢДНЯЯ ЗАРЯ

Я вижу свѣтъ моей зари послѣдней.
 Она вдали широко разлилась.
 Безгласный звонъ. Мольбы цвѣтной обѣдни.
 Псалмы лучей. Предвозвѣщенный часъ.

И служба дня смѣняется вечерней.
 Встаетъ Луна и паутинитъ нить,
 Чтобы душѣ, гдѣ пытки—равномѣрнѣй,
 Для всенощной смиряющей свѣтить.

ВАЛЕРІЙ БРЮСОВЪ

АЛЕКСАНДРІЙСКІЙ СТОЛПЪ

На Невскомъ, какъ прибой нестройный,
Растетъ вечерняя толпа.
Но неподвиженъ сонъ спокойный
Александрійскаго столпа.

Гранитъ суровый, величавый,
Обломокъ довременныхъ скалъ!
Какъ знакъ побѣдъ, какъ вѣстникъ славы,
Ты передъ Царскимъ Домомъ сталъ.

Ты выше, чѣмъ колонна Рима,
Поставилъ знаменье креста.
Несокрушима, недвижима
Твоя тяжелая пята.

И, черезъ гребни никлыхъ зданій
Все озирая предъ собой,
Ты видишь въ сумрачномъ туманѣ
Двухъ древнихъ сфинксовъ надъ Невой.

Глаза въ глаза вперивъ, безмолвны,
Исполнены святой тоски,
Они какъ будто слышать волны
Иной, торжественной рѣки.

Для нихъ, дѣтей тысячелѣтій,
Лишь сонъ—видѣнья этихъ мѣстъ,
И эта твердь, и стѣны эти,
И твой, взнесенный къ небу, крестъ.

И видя, что багрянымъ дискомъ
 На Западъ солнце склонено,
 Они мечтають, какъ, давно,
 Въ пескахъ, надъ падшимъ обелискомъ
 Горѣло золотомъ оно.

М. КУЗМИНЪ

1

Ты, именемъ монашескимъ овѣянъ,
 Не даромъ гордымъ выросъ, прямъ и дикъ.
 Но къмъ духъ нѣжности въ тебѣ посѣянъ,
 Струею щедрой брызжущій родникъ?

Ты въ горести главою не поникъ:
 Глаза блеснутъ сквозь черныя рѣсницы,
 Опять погаснутъ,—и на краткій мигъ
 Мнѣ грозный ангелъ въ миломъ ликѣ мнится.

2

Какъ странно въ голосѣ твоёмъ мой слышенъ голосъ,
 Моею нѣжностью твои глаза горять,
 И мой чернѣется, густой когда-то, волосъ
 Въ кудряхъ томительныхъ, что дѣлать скромный рядъ.

Молчимъ условленно о томъ, что мнится раемъ,
 Любовью связаны и дружбой къ одному.
 Глядимъ, какъ въ зеркало, и въ немъ другъ друга знаемъ,
 И что-то сбудется, какъ быть должно тому.

[7]

МАКСИМИЛІАНЪ ВОЛОШИНЪ

д э л о с ь

Окомъ мертвеннымъ Горгоны
 Обожженная земля:
 Горъ зубчатя короны,
 Бухтъ зазубренныхъ края.

Рѣетъ въ морѣ бѣлый парусъ.
 Какъ вѣнецъ съ пяти сторонъ—
 Сизый Сирось, синій Парось,
 Мирто, Накось и Миконъ.

Гнѣвный лучникъ! Вождь мгновеній!
 Предводитель Мойръ и Музы!
 Налагатель откровеній!
 Разрѣшитель древнихъ узъ!

Самъ изъ всѣхъ святынь Эллады
 Ты своей избралъ страной
 Каменистыя Циклады,
 Дэлось знойный и сухой.

Ни священныхъ рощъ, ни кладбищъ,
 Здѣсь не видятъ корабли,
 Ни луговъ, ни тучныхъ пастбищъ,
 Ни питающей земли:

Только лавръ по склонамъ Цинта,
 Да въ тѣнистыхъ щеляхъ стѣнь
 Влажный стебель гіацинта,
 Кустикъ бѣлыхъ цикламенъ.

Но среди скалистыхъ кручей
 Сердцу бога сладко миль
 Терпкій духъ земли горючей,
 Запахъ жертвъ и дымъ кадилъ.
 Дѣлось! Ты престоломъ Феба
 Нагъ стоишь среди морей,
 Подымая къ солнцу въ небо
 Дымы темныхъ алтарей!

с о з в ѣ з д ь я

„Такъ силы небесныя нисходятъ и восходятъ,
 простирая другъ къ другу золотыя бадья“.

Жене.

Звенятъ Вѣсы и клонятъ коромысла,
 Нисходитъ внизъ, возносится бадья...
 Часы идутъ, смѣняя въ небѣ числа,
 Пути міровъ чертя вкругъ остія.
 Струится ночь. Журчить и плачетъ влага.
 Ладья скользитъ вдоль темныхъ береговъ,
 И чутокъ сонъ въ водахъ Архипелага,
 Гдѣ въ морѣ спятъ созвѣздыя острововъ.
 Гнѣздо Гіадъ... и гроздь огней—Плеяды...
 Великій Возъ и зоркій Волопасъ...
 Свой правя путь чрезъ темныя Циклады—
 Какой пловецъ въ умѣ не числилъ васъ?
 И вашъ узоръ предъ взоромъ Одиссея
 Въ иныхъ вѣкахъ искрился и мерцалъ,
 И ночь текла, златыя зерна сѣя,
 Надъ лономъ водъ въ дрожаніи зеркаль.
 И, ставя сѣть у древнихъ стѣнъ Хавона,
 Въ тиши ночей видали рыбаки
 Алмазный торсъ гиганта Оріона—
 Ловца звѣрей, любовника зари.

Когда-жъ земля безсмертными изсякла,
Лишь глубже сталъ и ярче небосклонъ.
И Солнцу путь затмила тѣнь Геракла,
И Зевсъ воздвигъ на небѣ льдистый Тронъ.

Всѣ имена, всѣ славы, всѣ побѣды
Сплетались тамъ въ мерцаніи огней.
Надъ головой жемчужной Андромеды
Чертилъ круги сверкающій Персей.

Въ себѣ тая всѣ лѣтописи міра,
Свѣтятся въ вѣкахъ безсмертной красотой,
Златыми пчелами расшитая порфира
Спадала съ плечъ Іоніи Святой.

П О Л Д Е Н Ъ

Звонки стебли травы—и движенья зноя пахучи.
Горы, какъ рыжіе львы,—стали на грани пустынь.
Въ сине-черномъ огнѣ—расцвѣтають мѣдныя тучи.
Горечью дышитъ полынь.

Въ ярыхъ горнахъ долинъ,—упоенныхъ духомъ лаванды,
Темнымъ золотомъ смоль—медленно плавится зной.
Нимбы свѣта, вѣнцы—и сіяній тяжкихъ гирлянды
Въ зноѣ плывутъ надъ землей.

Травы древнихъ могилъ—мы выросли изъ камней и праха,
Къ зною изъ ночи и тьмы,—къ солнцу на зовъ возросли.
Къ полднямъ вынесли мы,—трепеща отъ сладкаго страха,
Мертвыя тайны Земли.

Въ зноѣ полдней глухихъ—мы пьянѣемъ горькія травы,
Млѣя по краснымъ холмамъ—съ изсиня-сѣрыхъ камней
Душный льемъ оиміамъ—благовонья сладкой отравы
Въ морѣ расплавленныхъ дней.

Н. ГУМИЛЕВЪ

КАПИТАНЫ

Часть 1

На полярныхъ моряхъ и на южныхъ,
 По изгибамъ зеленыхъ зыбей,
 Межъ базальтовыхъ скалъ и жемчужныхъ
 Шелестятъ паруса кораблей.

Быстрокрылыхъ ведутъ капитаны,
 Открыватели новыхъ земель,
 Для кого не страшны океаны,
 Кто извѣдалъ мальстремы и мель.

Чья, не пылью затерянныхъ хартій,
 Солью моря пропитана грудь,
 Кто иглой на разорванной картѣ
 Отмѣчаетъ свой дерзостный путь.

И, взойдя на трепещущій мостикъ,
 Вспоминаетъ покинутый портъ,
 Отряхая ударами трости
 Ключья пѣны съ высокихъ ботфортъ.

Или, бунтъ на борту обнаруживъ,
 Изъ за пояса рветъ пистолетъ,
 Такъ что сыплется золото съ кружевъ,
 Съ розоватыхъ брабантскихъ манжетъ.

Пусть безумствуетъ море и плещетъ,
 Гребни волнъ поднялись въ небеса,
 Ни одинъ предъ грозой не трепещетъ,
 Ни одинъ не свернетъ паруса.

Развѣ трусамъ даны эти руки,
 Этотъ острый, стремительный взглядъ,
 Что умѣеть на вражьи фелуки
 Неожиданно бросить фрегатъ,

Мѣткой пулей, острой желѣзной
 Настигать исполинскихъ китовъ,
 И примѣтить въ ночи многозвѣздной
 Охранительный свѣтъ маяковъ?

2

Вы всѣ, паладины зеленаго Храма,
 Надъ пасмурнымъ моремъ слѣдившіе румбъ,
 Гонзальво и Кукъ, Лаперузъ и де-Гама,
 Мечтатель и царь, генуезецъ Колумбъ!

Ганнонъ Карфагенянинъ, князь Сенегамбій,
 Синдбадъ-Мореходъ и могучій Уллисъ,
 О вашихъ побѣдахъ гремятъ въ диѳирамбѣ
 Сѣдые валы, набѣгая на мысъ!

А вы, королевскіе псы, флибустьеры,
 Хранившіе золото въ темномъ порту,
 Скитальцы-арабы, искатели вѣры,
 И первые люди на первомъ плоту!

И всѣ, кто дерзаетъ, кто хочетъ, кто ищетъ,
 Кому опостылѣли страны отцовъ,
 Кто дерзко хохочетъ, насмѣшливо свищетъ,
 Внимая завѣтамъ сѣдыхъ мудрецовъ!

Какъ странно, какъ сладко входитъ въ ваши грезы,
 Завѣтныя ваши шептать имена,
 И вдругъ догадаться, какіе наркозы
 Когда-то рождала для васъ глубина.

И кажется, въ мірѣ, какъ прежде, есть страны,
 Куда не ступала людская нога,
 Гдѣ въ солнечныхъ рощахъ живутъ великаны
 И свѣтятъ въ прозрачной водѣ жемчуга.

Съ деревьевъ стекаютъ душистыя смолы,
 Узорные листья лепечуть: „Скорѣй,
 Здѣсь рѣютъ червоннаго золота пчелы,
 Здѣсь розы краснѣе, чѣмъ пурпуръ царей“.

И карлики съ птицами спорятъ за гнѣзда,
 И нѣженъ у дѣвушекъ профиль лица...
 Какъ будто не всѣ пересчитаны звѣзды,
 Какъ будто нашъ міръ не открытъ до конца!

3

Только глянетъ сквозь утесы
 Королевскій старый фортъ,
 Какъ веселые матросы
 Поспѣшатъ въ знакомый портъ.

Тамъ, хвативъ въ тавернѣ сидру,
 Рѣчь ведетъ болтливый дѣдъ,
 Что сразить морскую гидру
 Можетъ черный арбалетъ.

Темнокожія мулатки
 И гадаютъ и поютъ,
 И несется запахъ сладкій
 Отъ готовящихся блюдъ.

А въ заплеванныхъ тавернахъ
 Отъ заката до утра
 Мечутъ рядъ колѣдъ невѣрныхъ
 Завитые шуллера.

Хорошо по докамъ порта
И слоняться, и лежать,
И съ солдатами изъ форта
Ночью драки затѣвать.

Иль у знатныхъ иностранокъ
Дерзко выклянчить два су,
Продавать имъ обезьянокъ
Съ мѣднымъ обручомъ въ носу.

А потомъ блѣднѣть отъ злости,
Амулетъ зажать въ полу,
Все проигрывая въ кости
На затоптанномъ полу.

Но смолкаетъ зовъ дурмана,
Пьяныхъ словъ безсвязный летъ,
Только рупоръ капитана
Ихъ къ отплытью призоветъ.

4

Но въ мѣрѣ есть инья области,
Луной мучительной томимы,
Для высшей силы, высшей доблести
Они навѣкъ недостижимы.

Тамъ волны съ блесками и всплесками
Непрекращаемаго танца
И тамъ летитъ скачками рѣзкими
Корабль Летучаго Голландца.

Ни рифъ, ни мель ему не встрѣтятся;
Какъ знакъ печали и несчастій,
Огни святого Эльма свѣтятся,
Усѣявъ борть его и снасти.

Самъ капитанъ, скользя надъ бездною,
За шляпу держится рукою,
Окровавленной, но желѣзною
Въ штурвалъ вцѣпляется—другою.

Какъ смерть блѣдны его товарищи,
У всѣхъ одна и та же дума:
Такъ смотрять трупы на пожарищѣ
Невыразимо и угрюмо.

И если въ часъ прозрачный, утренній
Пловцы въ моряхъ его встрѣчали,
Ихъ вѣчно мучилъ голосъ внутренній
Слѣпымъ предвѣстіемъ печали.

Ватагъ буйной и воинственной
Такъ много сложено исторій,
Но всѣхъ страшнѣй и всѣхъ таинственнѣй
Для смѣлыхъ пѣнителей моря—

О томъ, что въ мірѣ есть окраина—
Туда, за тропикъ Козерога!—
Гдѣ капитана съ ликомъ Каина
Легла ужасная дорога.

1. Ледяная тюрьма

Пятно жерла стѣною огибая,
 Минутно ледъ туманный позлащень...
 Мечта весны, когда-то голубая,
 Твоей тюрьмой горящей я смущень!
 Истомлена сверканіемъ напраснымъ,
 И плачешь ты, и рвешься трепеща,
 Но для чудесь въ дыму полудня красномъ
 У солнца нѣтъ побѣднаго луча.
 Ты помнишь ликъ свѣтила, но иного,
 Въ тебя не тѣ глядѣлися цвѣты,
 И твой конецъ на сердцѣ у больного,
 Коль подъ землей не задохнешься ты.
 Но не желай свидѣтелемъ безмолвнымъ
 До чаръ весны сберечь свой синій плѣнь...
 Ты не мечта, ты будешь только тлѣнь
 Раскованнымъ и громозвучнымъ волнамъ.

2. Снѣгъ

Полюбилъ бы я зиму,
 Да обуза тяжка...
 Отъ нея даже дыму
 Не уйти въ облака.
 Эта рѣзанность линий,
 Этотъ грузный полетъ,
 Этотъ нищенски-синій
 И заплаканный ледъ!
 Но люблю ослабѣлый
 Отъ заоблачныхъ нѣгъ—
 То сверкающе-бѣлый,
 То сиреневый снѣгъ...

И особенно талый,
 Когда, выси открывъ,
 Онъ ложится усталый
 На скользящій обрывъ;

Точно стадо въ туманѣ
 Непорочные сны—
 На томительной грани
 Всесожженья весны.

3. Дочь Іаира.

Слабы травы, бѣлы плиты,
 И звонить побѣдно мѣдь:
 Голубые льды разбиты,
 И они должны сгорѣть.

Точно кружить солнце, зимній
 Долгій плѣнъ свой позабывъ:
 Только мнѣ въ пасхальномъ гимнѣ
 Смерти слышится призывъ.

Вѣдь подъ снѣгомъ сердце билось,
 Тамъ тянулась жизни нить,
 Ту алмазную застылость
 Надо было разбудить...

Для чего-жъ съ контуровъ нѣжной,
 Непорочной красоты
 Грубо сорванъ саванъ снѣжный,
 Жечь зачѣмъ ея цвѣты?

Для чего такъ сине пламя,
 Раскаленность такъ бѣла,
 И гудя съ колоколами
 Слили звонъ колокола?

Тотъ, грѣхи подъявшій міра,
Осушившій рѣки слезъ,
Такъ-ли дочь Іаира
Поднялъ нѣкогда Христось?

Не мигнулъ фитиль горящій,
Не зазыбилъ вѣтеръ ткань...
Подошелъ Спаситель къ спящей
И сказалъ ей тихо: „Встань“!

ФЕДОРЪ СОЛОГУБЪ

Я опять, какъ прежде, молодъ,
И опять, какъ прежде, малъ.
Поднимавшій въ небѣ молоты
Надо мною задремалъ.

И съ врагомъ моимъ усталымъ
Я бороться не хочу.
Улыбнусь цвѣтками алыми,
Зори въ небѣ расцвѣчу.

Бѣлыхъ тучекъ легкой мраморъ—
Изваяній быстрыхъ рядъ.
Пѣна волнъ плескучихъ на морѣ
Вновь обрадовала взглядъ.

Я слагаю сказки снова,
Я опять, какъ прежде, малъ.
Дремлетъ молнія лиловая,
Громовержець задремалъ.

СТИХОТВОРЕНИЯ *

И. Гумилевъ

ПЯТИСТОПНЫЕ ЯМБЫ

Я помню почъ, какъ черную паяду,
 Въ моряхъ подъ знакомъ Южнаго Креста.
 Я плылъ на югъ. Могучихъ волнъ громаду
 Врывали злобно лопасти винта,
 И встрѣчныя суда, очей отраду,
 Брали почти мгновенно темнота.

О, какъ я ихъ жалѣлъ! Какъ было странно
 Мнѣ думать, что они идутъ назадъ
 И не открыли бухты необманной,
 Что дощъ Жуанъ не встрѣтилъ донны Анны,
 Что горъ алмазныхъ не нашелъ Сипдбадъ
 И Вѣчный Жидъ несчастливъ во сто кратъ!

Но проходили мѣсяды; обратно
 Я плылъ и увозилъ клыки слоновъ,
 Картины абиссинскихъ мастеровъ,
 Мѣха пантеръ, — мнѣ нравились ихъ пятна, —
 И то, что прежде было непонятно —
 Презрѣнье къ міру и усталость словъ.

Я молодежь былъ, былъ жадець и увѣренъ,
 Но Духъ Земли молчалъ, высокобренъ,
 И умерли сѣпящія мечты,
 Какъ умирають птицы и цвѣты.
 Теперь мой голосъ медленъ и развѣренъ,
 Я знаю, жизнь не удалась... И ты,

Ты, для кого искалъ я на Левапѣ
 Непѣвиный пурпуръ королевскихъ мантий,
 Я проигралъ тебя, какъ Даманти
 Когда то проигралъ безумный Назъ!
 Взлетѣли кости, звонкія какъ сталь,
 Упали кости — и была печаль.

Сказала ты задумчиво и строго:
 Я вѣрила, любила слишкомъ много,
 А ухожу, не вѣря, не любя;
 Но предъ лицомъ Всевидащаго Бога,
 Быть можетъ самое себя губя,
 Навѣкъ я отрекаюсь отъ тебя.

Твоихъ волосъ не смѣлъ поцѣловать я,
 Ни даже сжать холодныхъ тонкихъ рукъ,
 Я самъ себѣ былъ гадокъ, какъ паукъ,
 Меня пугалъ и ранилъ каждый звукъ,
 И ты ушла, въ простомъ и темномъ платьѣ,
 Похожая на древнее Распятъе.

Я не скорблю. Такъ было надо. Правый
 Передъ собой, не знаю я обидѣ.
 Ни тайнами, ни радостью, ни славой
 Мгновенный міръ меня не обольститъ,
 И женскій взоръ, то пѣжный, то лукавый,
 Лишь изрѣдка, во снѣ, меня томитъ.

Лишь изрѣдка надменно и упрямо
 Во мнѣ кричитъ ветшающій Адамъ,
 Но тотъ, кто видѣлъ лилію Хирама,
 Тотъ не груститъ по сказочнымъ садамъ,
 А набожно возводитъ стѣны храма,
 Угоднаго землѣ и небесамъ.

Насъ много здѣсь собралось съ молотками,
 И вѣстѣ намъ работать веселѣй;
 Одна любовь сковала насъ цѣпями,
 Что адаманта тверже и свѣтлѣй,
 И машетъ бѣлоснѣжными крылами
 Какихъ то небывалыхъ лебедей.

Часъ много, по одни во власти ночи,
 А колыбель другихъ еще пуста,
 О тѣхъ скорбятъ, а о другихъ пророчить
 Земныхъ зеленыхъ весень красота,
 Я жъ—Прошлаго увидѣвшій очи,
 Градущаго разверстыя уста.

Все выше храмъ торжественный и дивный,
 Въ немъ дышетъ ладанъ и поетъ органъ;
 Сіяютъ нимбы; облакъ переливный
 Свѣчей и солнца—радужный туманъ;
 И слышенъ голосъ Мастера призывный
 Намъ, каменщикамъ всѣхъ временъ и странъ.

Сергій Городецкій

АДАМЪ

Прости, пѣвнательная влага,
 И первозданія туманъ!
 Въ прозрачномъ вѣтрѣ больше блага
 Для сотворенныхъ къ жизни странъ.

Просторенъ міръ и многозвученъ
 И многоцвѣтнѣй радугъ онъ,
 И вотъ Адаму онъ порученъ,
 Изобрѣтателю именъ.

Назвать, узнать, сорвать покровы
 И праздныхъ тайнъ и ветхой мглы—
 Вотъ первый подвигъ. Подвигъ новый—
 Живой землѣ пропѣть хвалы.

ЗВѢЗДЫ

Не хочу читать я вѣчныхъ,
 Непонятныхъ мнѣ писемъ,
 Что на тѣмъ и въ лентахъ млечныхъ
 Держитъ звѣздный небосклонъ.

Смутной вѣсти въ этихъ блескахъ
 Не найду душой простой,
 Какъ въ восточныхъ арабскахъ,
 Съ ихъ пріятной пестротой.

Но въ сумятицу узоровъ
 Линіи радостный законъ
 Я съ моихъ спокойныхъ взоровъ
 Вознесу на небосклонъ.

Но зеленый двѣтъ Сатурна,
 Алый Марса вижу я—
 Дружбу смерти съ жизнью бурной
 На путинахъ бытія.

Владимиръ Нарбутъ

Она—некрасива: приплюснуть
 Слегка ея носъ, и глаза,
 Смотрящіе долго и грустно,
 Не разъ омывала слеза.

О чемъ она плачетъ—не знаю,
 И врядъ-ли придется узнать,
 Какая (святая? земная?)
 Печаль ее пѣжитъ, какъ мать.

Она—молчалива. И могутъ
 Подумать пные: горда.
 Но только оранжевый поготъ
 Подыметъ луна изъ пруда,—

Людское измѣнится мѣнѣе:
 Бѣжитъ по дорожкѣ сырой,
 Чтобъ сгорбленной нищенской тѣнью
 Скитаться ночью порой.

Блуждаетъ, вѣдыхая и плача,
 У сонныхъ растрепанныхъ извъ,—
 Пока не плеснется на дачу
 Кровавый восхода разливъ.

И вновь на потухшей терасѣ
 Сидитъ молчаливо-грустна,
 Какъ сонъ, что ушелъ во-своиса,
 Но высосалъ душу до дна.

Какъ быстро высыхаютъ крыши!
 Гдѣ буря? Солнце припекло.
 Градиной вихрь на церкви вышибъ—
 Подъ самымъ куполомъ—стекло.

Какъ будто выхватилъ проворно
 Острокопечную звѣзду—
 Метавшій ледяныя зерна,
 Гудѣвшій въ небѣ на-лету.

Овсы—лохматы и корявы.
 А оржаныя-то поля:
 Здѣсь пересѣчены суставы,
 Колѣнды каждаго стебля.

Христось! Я знаю, ты изъ храма
 Сурово смотришь на Пилью:
 Какъ смѣлъ пустить онъ градомъ въ раму
 И тропуть скниію твою!

Но мнѣ—прости меня, я боленъ,
 Я богохульствую, я лгу—
 Твоя раздробленная голень
 На каждомъ чудится шагу!

Анна Ахматова

Я пришла тебя смѣнить, сестра,
У лѣсного, у высокаго костра.

Посѣдѣли твои волосы. Глаза
Замутила, затуманила слеза.

Ты уже не понимаешь пѣнья птицъ,
Ты ни звѣздъ не замѣчаешь, ни зарницъ.

И давно удары бубна не слышны,
А я знаю, ты боишься тишины.

Я пришла тебя смѣнить, сестра,
У лѣсного, у высокаго костра.

Ты пришла меня похоронить,
Гдѣ же заступъ твой, гдѣ лопата?
Только флейта въ рукахъ твоихъ.
Я не буду тебя винить,
Развѣ жаль, что давно... когда-то
Навсегда мой голосъ затихъ.

Мои одежды одѣнь,
Позабудь о моей тревогѣ,
Дай вѣтру кудрями играть.
Ты пахнешь, какъ пахнетъ сирень,
А пришла по трудной дорогѣ,
Чтобы здѣсь озаренной стать.

И одна ушла, уступая,
Уступая мѣсто другой,
И невѣрно брела, какъ слѣпая,
Незнакомой узкой тропой.

И все чудилось ей, что пламя
Близко. Бубельъ держать рука.
И она, какъ бѣлое знамя,
И она, какъ свѣтъ маяка.

CABARET ARTISTIQUE

Всѣ мы бражники здѣсь, блудницы,
Какъ невесело вмѣстѣ намъ,
На стѣнахъ цвѣты и птицы
Томятся по облакамъ.

Ты куришь черную трубку,—
Какъ страшенъ дымокъ надъ ней.
Я надѣла узкую юбку,
Чтобъ казаться еще стройнѣй.

Навсегда забыты окошки,
Что тамъ—изморозь, или гроза?...
У затравленной дикой кошки
На твои похожи глаза.

О, какъ сердце мое тоскуетъ,
Не смертнаго ль часа жду?...
А та, что сейчасъ танцуетъ,
Непремѣнно будетъ въ аду.

М. Зенкевичъ

СМЕРТЬ ЛОСЯ

Дыханье мощное въ жерло трубы лглось,
Какъ-будто мѣдное влагалище зывало,
Изсохнувъ и изнывъ. Трехгодовалый,
Его услышавши, взметнулся сонный лось.

И долго въ сумракѣ сквозь дождикъ что-то нюхалъ
Ноздрей горячихъ хрящъ, и, вспѣнившись, языкъ
Лизалъ мохры губы, и, вытанувшись, ухо
Ловило—самкою млчащей трубный звукъ.

И, заломивъ рога, вдругъ ринулся сквозь прутья
По впадинамъ глазнымъ хлеставшихъ жестко лозъ,
Роня въ бѣгѣ шерсть, какъ войлока лоскутъ,
И желтую слюну скисившихъ пасть железъ.

Въ гниломъ валежникѣ черезъ богото кратокъ
Зеленый, вязкій путь... Онъ, какъ сосунъ, не крылъ
Еще увертливыхъ и боязливыхъ матокъ,
Въ погоняхъ бѣшеныхъ растрачивая пылъ.

Все яростнѣй отвѣтъ, стремящійся къ завалу,
Къ ствозамъ охотничьимъ на жалостный призывъ.
Поляны темный кругъ... Свинцовый посвистъ шалый...
И лопасти роговъ, какъ якорь, въ глинѣ врывъ,

Съ размаха рухнулъ лось. И въ выдавленномъ ложѣ
По тѣлу теплomu перепорхнула дрожь,
Какъ бы предчувствіе, что въ нѣжныхъ тканяхъ кожи
Пройдется, весело свѣжуя, острый ножъ,

А надо лбомъ пла... Да пѣтухамъ безглавымъ
Подобенъ въ трепетѣ, тамъ возлѣ заднихъ ногъ
Дымился слѣвъ парной на траурѣ кровавомъ, —
Какъ мускульный глухой отгулъ на терпкій рогъ.

О. Манделъштамъ

АЙЯ-СОФІЯ

Айя-Софія—здѣсь остановиться
Судилъ Господь народамъ и царямъ.
Вѣдь куполъ твой, по слову очевидца,
Какъ на дѣлѣ подвѣшенъ къ небесамъ.

И всѣмъ примѣръ—года Юстиніана,
Когда похитить для чужихъ боговъ
Позволила Эфесская Діана
Сто семь зеленыхъ мраморныхъ столбовъ.

Куда жъ стремился твой строитель щедрый,
Когда, душой и помысломъ высокъ,
Расположилъ апсиды и экседры,
Иль указавъ на западъ и востокъ?

Прекрасенъ храмъ, купающійся въ мѣрѣ,
И сорокъ оконъ—свѣта торжество.
На парусахъ, подъ куполомъ, четыре
Архангела прекраснѣе всего.

И мудрое сферическое зданье
Породы и вѣка переживетъ,
И серафимовъ гудкое рыданье
Не покоробитъ темныхъ позолотъ.

NOTRE DAME

Гдѣ римскій судія судилъ чужой народъ,
Стоитъ базилика, и, радостный и первый—
Какъ вѣкогда Адамъ, распластывая нервы,
Играетъ мышцами крестовый легкій сводъ.

Но выдастъ себя снаружи тайный планъ:
Здѣсь позаботилась подпружныхъ арокъ сила,
Чтобъ масса грузная стѣны не сокрушила—
И свода дерзкаго бездѣйствуетъ таранъ.

Стихійный лабиринтъ, непостижимый лѣсъ,
Души готической разсудочная пропасть,
Египетская мощь и христіанства робость—
Съ тростинкой рядомъ дубъ, и всюду царь-отвѣсъ.

Но чѣмъ внимательнѣй, твердыня Notre Dame,
Я изучалъ твои чудовищныя ребра—
Тѣмъ чаще думалъ я: изъ тяжести подоброй
И я, когда-нибудь, прекрасное создамъ...



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamovic, Georgij, "Iz zapisnoj knižki," Novosel'e, Nos. 39-41 (1949), pp. 144-149.
- _____, Odinočestvo i svoboda (New York: Chekhov Press, 1955).
- _____, "Aleksandr Blok," Sovremennye zapiski XLVII (Paris, 1931), pp. 283-305.
- Ajxenval'd, Julij, Siluety russkix pisatelej (Berlin, 1923), III.
- Annenkov, Jurij, Dnevnik moix vstreč (Inter-Language Literary Associates, New York, 1966).
- Annenskij, Innokentij, "O romantičeskix cvetax," Rec, No. 308 (December, 1908); reprinted in Novyj žurnal, No. 78 (March, 1965), pp. 285-287.
- Ašukin, N. S. (ed.), Valerij Brjusov v avtobiografičeskix zapisjax, pis'max, vospominanijax sovremennikov i otzyvax kritiki (Moscow, 1929).
- Axmatova, Anna, "Mandel'stam," Vozdušnye puti, Al'manax IV (1965).
- _____, Sočinenija (Gleb Struve and Boris Filippov, eds.), Vol. I (Munich, 1965).
- Bal'mont, Konstantin, "Elementarnye slova o simvoličeskoj poezii," quoted in Russkaja literatura XX veka (ed. N. A. Trifonov, Moscow, 1962).
- Bedford, C. H., "Dmitry Merezhkovsky, the Intelligentsia, and the revolution of 1905," Canadian Slavonic Papers, III (1959), p. 281.
- Belyj, Andrej (Boris Bugaev), "Epoxa do pervoj vstreči," Zapiski mečtatelej, No. 6 (1922).
- _____, Na perevale (Berlin, 1923).
- _____, "Nastojščee i buduščee russkoj literatury," Vesy, Nos. 2-3 (1909).
- _____, "Orfej," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (January, 1912), pp. 63-68.

_____, "O simbolizme," Trudy i Dni, Nos. 1, 2 (1912),
no. 10-24; pp. 1-14.

_____, Sirin učenogo varvarstva (Berlin, 1922).

_____, "Vospominanija ob A. A. Bloke," Zapiski
Meštatelej, No. 6 (1922).

_____, Vstupitel'naja stat'ja in Jurij Sidorov:
Stixotvorenija (Moscow, 1910), pp. 9-12.

Benois, Alexandre, Reminiscences of the Russian Ballet,
trans. Mary Britnieva (London, 1941).

Benua, Aleksandr, "Xudožestvennye eresj," Zolotoe Runo,
No. 2 (1906), pp. 80-88.

_____, O vzniknovenii 'Mir iskusstva' (Leningrad,
1928).

Berdjaev, N., Russkaja ideja (Paris, 1946).

_____, Samopoznanie (Paris, 1949).

Blackmur, R. P., Language as Gesture, First Edition, n.d.
(New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co.)

Blok, Aleksandr, "Bez božestva, bez vdoxnoven'ja,"
Sovremennaja literatura (Leningrad, 1925).

_____, "Nečajannaja radost'," Sočinenija v odnom
tome (Moscow-Leningrad, 1946).

_____, O literature (ed. V. V. Gol'cev) (Moscow,
1931).

_____, "Rossija i inteligencija," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1
(1909), pp. 78-85.

_____, Sočinenija v odnom tome (Moscow-Leningrad,
1946).

_____, Sud'ba Bloka, O. Nemerovskaja and G. Vol'pe
(eds.) (Leningrad, 1930).

_____, review of A. L. Miropolskij's "Ved'ma i
Lestnica," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1 (1906), pp. 149-150.

_____, preface to "Vozmezdie," Zapiski mečtatelej, Nos. 2-3 (St. Petersburg, 1921).

Bonč-Bruevič, V. (ed.), Izbrannye proizvedeniya russkoj poezii (5th ed.; St. Petersburg, 1909).

Bowra, C. M., The Heritage of Symbolism (London, 1951).

Breton, Geoffrey, A Short History of French Literature (Baltimore, 1961).

Brjusov, Valerij, Dalekie i blizkie (Moscow, 1912).

_____, "Karl V," Zolotoe Runo, No. 4 (1906, pp. 65-71).

_____, "Ključ i tajn," Vesy, No. 1 (1904).

_____, Kratkij kurs nauki o stixe. Častnaja metrika i ritmika russkogo jazyka (Moscow, 1919).

_____, "Novyja tečeniya v russkoj poezii. Akmeizm," Russkaja mysl', No. 4 (1913), pp. 134-142 (2nd pagination).

_____, Opyty po metrike i ritmike, po evfonii i sozvučijam, po strofike i formam (Stixi 1912-1938 gg.). So vstnpitel'noj stat'jej "Remeslo poeta" (Moscow, 1918).

_____, "Pis'ma k Percovu," Russkij sovremennik, No. 4 (1927).

_____, "Stixi 1911 goda," quoted in Russkie pisateli o literaturnom trude (Leningrad, 1956).

_____, "Žemčuga," Russkaja mysl', No. 7 (1910). Reprinted in Nikolaj Gumilev Sobranije sočinenij, I, p. XVI.

Bušman, Irina, "Poetičeskoe iskusstvo Mandel'stama," (Munich, 1964).

Čukovskij, Kornej, "Poslednie gody Bloka," Zapiski mečtatelej, No. 6 (1922).

Čulkov, G., Gody stranstvija (Moscow, 1930).

_____, "Isxod," Sobranie sočinenij V (St. Petersburg, 1912).

- _____, "Licom k licu," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1 (1909), pp. 105-108.
- _____, "Ob odnoj literaturnoj metomorfoze," Zolotoe Runo, No. 4 (1907), pp. 79-80.
- _____, "O Tjutčeve," Sočinenija V (St. Petersburg, 1912).
- Cvetaeva, Marina, Proza (New York: Chekhov Press, 1953).
- Deschartes, O., "Vyacheslav Ivanov," Oxford Slavonic Papers, V (1954), pp. 41-53.
- Djagilev, Sergej, "Osnovy xudožestvennoj ocenki," Mir iskusstva, Nos. 3-4 (1899), pp. 50-62.
- _____, "Složnye voprosy, naš mnimyj upadok," Mir iskusstva, No. 1 (1898), pp. 1-16.
- Donchin, Georgette, The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry (The Hague, 1958).
- Ehrenburg, Ilya, People and Life (tr. Anna Bostock and Ivonne Kapp, London, 1961).
- Ejxenbaum, Boris, "Anna Axmatova" (opyt analiza) (Petrograd, 1923).
- _____, Skvoz' literaturu (Leningrad, 1924).
- _____, "V ožidanii literatury," Russkij sovremennik, No. 1 (1924), pp. 280-290.
- Ellis (L. L. Kobylinskij), "O žurnalax," Vesy, No. 8 (1907), p. 79.
- _____, Russkie simvolisty (Moscow, 1910).
- Erberg, Konstantin, "Simvolizim i bezvlastie," Zolotoe Runo, No. 3 (1907), pp. 47-62.
- Erlich, Victor, "Russian Poets in Search of a Poetics," Comparative Literature, IV (Winter, 1952), pp. 51-74.
- _____, Russian Formalism, 2nd ed. (The Hague, 1965).
- _____, The Double Image (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1964).

- Etkind, Mark, Aleksandr Nikolaevič Benua (Leningrad-Moscow, 1965).
- Filosofov, Dmitrij, "Tože tendencija," Zolotoe Runo, No. 1 (1908), pp. 71-74.
- Frank, S., "Artističeskoe narodničestvo," Russkaja mysl', No. 1, pp. 27-38 (2nd pagination).
- Gippius, Zinaida, Dmitrij Merežkovskij (Paris, 1951).
 _____, (Tovarišč German), "O žurnalax," Vesy, No. 6 (1906), pp. 73-74.
- Gizetti, A., "Poet mirovoj disgarmonii," Petrograd, No. 1 (1923), pp. 47-71.
- Gofman, Modest (ed.), Kniga o russkix poetax poslednego desjatiletija (St. Petersburg, 1909).
 _____, "Puškin i ego epoxa," La Russie Illustree (Paris, 1937).
- Golovin, Aleksandr, Vstreči i vpečatlenija (Moscow, 1940).
- Gorodeckij, Sergej, "Idolotvorčestvo," Zoltoe Runo, No. 1 (1909), pp. 93-100.
 _____, "Formotvorčestvo," Zoltoe Runo, No. 10 (1909), pp. 52-58.
- Gruzdev, Il'ja, "Utilitarnost' i samocel'," Petrograd, No. 1 (1923), pp. 172-190.
- Holthusen, Johannes, Studien zur Aesthetik und Poetik des Russischen Symbolismus (Goettigen, 1957).
- Ivanov, Georgij, "Peterburgskie zimy," (New York: Chekhov Publishing House, 1952).
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav, "B. N. Bugaev i 'realiora'," Vesy, No. 7 (1908), pp. 73-75.
 _____, "Drevnij užas," Zoltoe Runo, No. 4 (1909), pp. 51-65.
 _____, "Dve stixii v simbolizme," Zoltoe Runo, Nos. 3-5 (1908).

- _____, "Granicy iskusstva," Borozdy i meži (Moscow, 1916), pp. 189-229.
- _____, "Manera, lico i stil'," Trudy i Dni, Nos. 4-5 (1912), pp. 1-12.
- _____, "O suščestve tragedii," Trudy i Dni, No. 6 (1912), pp. 1-15.
- _____, "Mysli o simbolizme," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), pp. 3-10.
- _____, "Orfej," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (January, 1912), pp. 60-63.
- _____, "O russkoj idee," Zoltoe Runo, No. 1 (1909), pp. 85-93.
- _____, "O veselom remesle i umnom veselii," Zoltoe Runo, No. 5 (1907), pp. 47-55.
- _____, "Predčuvstvija i predvestija," Zoltoe Runo, No. 4 (1906), pp. 68-73.
- _____, "Symbolism," Enciclopedia Italiana (Vol. 31, 1936, pp. 793-795), trans. Thomas E. Bird, The Russian Review, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Hanover, January, 1966), pp. 24-34.
- Kemball, Robin, Alexander Blok, A Study in Rhythm and Metre (The Hague, 1965).
- Kierkegaard, Søren, Philosophical Fragments (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1936).
- Kuzmin, Mixail, "Cor Ardens," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), pp. 49-51.
- Literaturnoe Nasledstvo, Nos. 27-28 (Moscow, 1937).
- Literaturnye manifesty (N. L. Brodskij and V. Lv'ov-Rogačevskij, eds., Moscow, 1929).
- Luka'čs, Georg, Realism in Our Time (New York World Perspectives, 1964).
- Lurje, Artur, "Detskij raj," Vozdušnye puti Al'manax III, pp. 161-172.

- Makovskij, S., "Iz vospominanij ob Innokentii Annenskom," Novosel'e, Nos. 39-41 (Paris-New York, 1949), pp. 117-129.
- _____, Na parnase serebrjanogo veka (Munich, 1962).
- _____, Nikolaj Gumilev. Po ličnym vospominanijam," Novyj žurnal, No. 77 (September, 1964), pp. 157-189.
- _____, "Osip Mandel'stam," Novoe russkoe slovo (New York), July 23, 1950.
- _____, Portrety sovremennikov (New York: Chekhov Press, 1955), p. 409.
- Mandel'stam, Osip, Collected Works, in two volumes, ed. G. P. Struve and G. A. Filipoff (Interlanguage Literary Associates, Washington, 1964).
- _____, "O prirode slova," Sobranie sočinenij (New York: Chekhov Press, 1955), pp. 337-350.
- _____, "Slovo i kul'tura," Cex poetov, I (Berlin, 1922), pp. 81-89.
- _____, "Vypad," Sobranie sočinenij, pp. 327-330.
- _____, "Zametki o poezii," Sobranie socinenij, pp. 351-354.
- Markov, Vladimir, The Longer Poems of Velimir Klebnikov (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1962).
- Maslenikov, Oleg, The Frenzied Poets (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1952).
- Medvedev, P. N. (ed.), Zapisnye knižki Al. Bloka (Leningrad, 1930).
- Merežkovskij, Dmitrij, "O pričínax upadka i o novyx tečenijax sovremennoj rusckoj literatury," Polnoe sobranie sočinenij (St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1912), Vol. XV, pp. 209-305.
- _____, "Vse protiv vsech," Zoltoe Runo, No. 1 (1906), pp. 90-97.

- Metner, Emilij, "Vstupitel'noe slovo redaktora," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), pp. 53-60.
- Mirsky, D. S., Modern Russian Literature (London, 1925).
- Močul'skij, Konstantin, Aleksandr Blok (Paris, 1948).
- _____, Valerij Brjusov (Paris, 1912).
- Musaget, "Antologija" (Moscow, 1911).
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, Die Geburt der Tragoedie (Leipzig, 1930).
- Nedobrovo, N. V., "Obsčestvo revnitatelej xudožestvennogo slova," Trudy i Dni, No. 2 (1912), pp. 24-25.
- _____, "Ritm, metr i ix vzaimootnošenie," Trudy i Dni, No. 2 (1912), pp. 14-23.
- Ocup, Nikolaj, preface to N. Gumilev: Izbrannoe (Paris, n.d.)
- _____, "Nikolaj Stepanovič Gumilev," Opyty, I (New York, 1953), pp. 117-142.
- Parnok, Sofija, "Poezija Brjusova," Russkij sovremennik, No. 1 (1924).
- Paxmuss, Temira, "Zinaida Gippius i Sergej Esenin," Novyj žurnal, No. 83 (1966), pp. 98-111.
- Pjast, Vladimir (Pestovskij), "Nečto o kanone," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (1912), pp. 28-33.
- Paggioli, Renato, The Poets of Russia (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960).
- Poljakov, S. I., "K čitateljam," Vesy, No. 12 (1909), pp. 185-191.
- Rajs, Emmanuil, "Tvorčestvo Osipa Mandel'stama," Osip Mandel'stam Collected Works (Inter-Language Literary Associates, Washington, 1964), pp. LXXXI-CII.
- Reeve, Franklin D., Aleksandr Blok (Columbia University Press, New York and London, 1962).
- Richards, T. A., Practical Criticism (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1935).

- Rozanov, Vladimir, "O drevne egipetskoj krasote," Mir iskusstva, Vols. I and II, Nos. 11-14 (1899).
- Roždestvenskij, Vsevolod, Stranicy žizni (Moscow, 1962).
- Sadovskoj, Boris, "Pamjati druga," introductory essay in Jurij Sidorov: Stixotvorenija (Moscow, 1910), pp. 13-15.
- Setchkarev, Vsevolod, Studies in the Life and Work of Innokentij Annenskij (The Hague, 1963).
- Severnye Cvety Al'manax (Moscow, 1911).
- Shestov, Lev (Schwarzman, L. T.), "V jačeslav Velekolepnyj. K karakteristike ruskogo upadničestva," Russkaja mysl', No. 10 (1916), pp. 80-110.
- Slonimskij, Aleksandr, "Belaja staja," Vestnik Evropy (September-December, 1917), pp. 403-407.
- Sologub, Fedor (Teternikov), "'Ja', kniga soveršennogo samoutverždenija," Zolotoe Runo, No. 2 (1906), pp. 76-79.
- Solov'ev, Sergej, "Jurij Sidorov," Introductory article in Jurij Sidorov: Stixotvorenija (Moscow, 1910), pp. 16-21.
- Solov'ev, Vladimir, "O liričeskoj poezii," Sobranie sočinenij (2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1911), VI, pp. 27-41.
- _____, "Poezija F. I. Tjutčeva," Sobranie sočinenij (2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1911), VI, pp. 400-464.
- _____, "Smysl ljubvi," Sobranie sočinenij (2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1911), VII, pp. 3-57.
- Stepun, Fedor, Byvšee i nesbyvšeesja (New York: Chekhov Press, 1956), Vols. I and II.
- _____, "Logos," Trudy i Dni, No. 1 (January, 1912), pp. 68-73.
- _____, Vstreči (Munich, 1962).
- Strakhovskij, L., Craftsmen of the Word (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949).

- _____, "The Silver Age of Poetry," Canadian Slavonic Papers, IV (1959).
- Strelkov, Aleksandr, "Mir iskusstva," Iskusstvo, No. 35 (1923).
- Struve, Gleb, "Innokentij Annenskij i Gumilev," Novyj žurnal, No. 78 (1965), pp. 281-292.
- _____, (ed.) Neizdannyj Gumilev (New York: Chekhov Press, 1952).
- _____, "Osip Mandel'stam," "Opyt biografii i kritičeskogo komentarija," Osip Mandel'stam, Sobranie sočinenij (Inter-Language Literary Associates, Washington, 1964).
- Terras, Victor, "Classical Motives in the Poetry of Osip Mandel'stam," The Slavic and East European Journal, Vol. X, No. 3 (Fall, 1966), pp. 251-267.
- Toporkov, A., "O tvorčeskom i sozercatel'nom estetizme," Zolotoe Runo, Nos. 11-12 (1909), pp. 69-74.
- Tynjanov, Jurij, "Promežutok," Russkij sovremennik, No. 4 (1924), pp. 209-218.
- Vengerov, S., "Geroičeskij karakter ruskoj literatury," Sobranie sočinenij S. A. Vengerova, Vol. I (St. Petersburg, 1911).
- _____, (ed.) Russkaja literatura XX veka (1890-1910), (Moscow, 1915).
- Vesy: "K čitateljam," No. 1 (1904), iii.
- Vinogradov, V. V., Poezija Anny Axmatovoj (Leningrad, 1925).
- Volkonskij, Sergej, "Iskusstvo," Mir iskusstva, No. 4 (1899), pp. 66-72.
- Wilson, Edmund, Axel's Castle (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1931).
- Xodasevic, Vladislav, "O simbolizme," Literaturnye statii i vospominanija (New York: Chekhov Press, 1956).
- _____, Nekropol': Vospominanija (Brussels, 1939).

- Zen'kovskij, V., Aus der Geschichte der Aesthetischen Ideen in Russland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (The Hague, 1958).
- Zernov, N., The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper Row, 1963).
- Žirmunskij, Viktor, "Preodolevsie simbolizm," Voprosy teorii literatury (Leningrad, 1928, reprinted by Mouton & Co., The Hague, 1962), pp. 278-321.
- _____, "Dopolnenija," Voprosy teorii literatury, I-III, pp. 322-336.
- Znosko-Borovskij, Evgenij, "Tvorčeskij put' Anny Axmatovoj," Volja Rossii, No. 10 (1923), pp. 67-79.
- Zolotoe Runo, Closing Manifesto "Ot redakcii," No. 12, Vol. II (1909), pp. 105-107.

WRITINGS IN APOLLON CITED IN TEXT

- Anneskij, Innokentij, "Čto takoe poezija?," No. 6, pp. 51-57.
- _____, "Estetika 'mertvyx duš' i ee nasledie," No. 8 (1912), pp. 50-58.
- _____, "O sovremennom lirizme," Nos. 1-3 (1909), pp. 12-42; pp. 3-29; pp. 5-29.
- Aškinazi, Zigfrid, "Leipzig 1914 g.," No. 3 (1915), pp. 70-71.
- _____, "Pis'mo iz Moskvy," No. 2 (1915), p. 70.
- _____, "O sovremennom teatre," No. 5 (1915), pp. 41-47.
- Bakst, Leon, "Puti klassicizma v iskusstve," No. 2 (1909), pp. 63-78; and No. 3 (1909), pp. 46-61.
- Bartram, N. D., "O vozroždenii narodnogo tvorčestva v igruškax," No. 2 (1912), pp. 55-64.
- Belyj, Andrej, "Venok ili venec," No. 11 (1910), pp. 1-4 (2nd pagination).

- Benua, Aleksandr, "Igruški," No. 2 (1912), pp. 49-54.
- _____, "V ožidanii gimna Apollonu," No. 1 (1909), pp. 5-11.
- Blok, A., "O sovremennom sostojanii russkogo simvolizma," No. 8 (1910), pp. 21-30.
- Brando, Evgenij, "Muzyka posle vagnera," No. 1 (1909), pp. 55-69.
- Brjusov, V., "Ob odnom voprose ritma," No. 11 (1910), pp. 52-60.
- _____, "O'reči rabskoj' v zaščitu poezii," No. 9 (1910), pp. 31-34.
- Čudovskij, Valerian, "Neskol'ko myslej k vozmožnomu učeniju o stixe," Nos. 8-9 (1915), pp. 55-95.
- _____, "Neskol'ko utverždenij o russkom stixe," Nos. 4-5 (1917), pp. 58-69.
- _____, "N. K. Čurljanis," No. 3 (1914), pp. 22-58.
- _____, "O Merežkovskom, Nekrasove i o politike v iskusstve," No. 7 (1913), pp. 47-52.
- _____, "O ritme puškinskoj 'Rusalki,'" Nos. 1-2 (1914), pp. 108-131.
- _____, "Russkaja Mysl'," No. 8 (1911), pp. 61-63.
- _____, "Russkaja Mysl' i romany V. Brjusova, Z. Gippius, D. Merežkovskago," No. 2 (1913), pp. 72-77.
- _____, "Trudy i Dni," No. 5 (1912), pp. 54-56.
- _____, "Xudožestvennyj teatr v Peterburge," Nos. 4-5 (1915), pp. 103-104.
- Čulkov, Georgij, "Traurnyj estetizm. I. F. Annenskij--kritik," No. 4 (1910), pp. 9-10 (2nd pagination).
- _____, "Vesy," No. 7 (1910), pp. 12-17.
- Erberg, Konstantin, "O vozdušnyx mostax kritiki," No. 2 (1909), pp. 54-62.
- Gorodeckij, S., "Nekotorye tečenija v sovremennoj russkoj poezii," No. 1 (1913), pp. 46-50.

Guenther, Johannes von, "Istoki novoj nemeckoj literatury,"
No. 9 (1912), pp. 33-34.

_____, "Novye nemeckie knigi," Nos. 3-4 (1911), pp.
91-94.

_____, Starye novosti o nemeckoj literature, No. 6
(1913), pp. 80-82.

Gumilev, Nikolaj, "Nasledie simvolizma i akmeizm," No. 1
(1913), pp. 42-45.

_____, "Pis'ma o russkoj poezii," 1909-17.

_____, "Poezija v 'Vesax'," No. 9 (1910), pp. 42-44
(2nd pagination).

_____, "Teofil' Got'je," No. 9 (1911), pp. 53-58.

_____, "Zizn' stixa," No. 7 (1910), pp. 5-14.

Introductory Manifesto No. 1 (1909), pp. 3-4.

Ivanov, Georgij, "O novyx stixax," No. 3 (1915), pp. 72-73.

_____, "Pis'mo v redakciju," No. 6 (1913), p. 91.

_____, "Stixi v žurnalax 1912 g.," No. 1 (1913), pp.
75-76.

_____, "Voennye stixi," No. 2 (1915), pp. 72-74.

Ivanov, Vjaceslav, "Čurljanis i problema sinteza iskusstv,"
No. 3 (1914), pp. 5-21.

_____, "O poezii T. F. Annenskogo," No. 4 (1910),
pp. 16-24 (2nd pagination).

_____, "O proze kuzmina," No. 7 (1910), pp. 46-51.

_____, "Pis'ma o russkoj poezii," No. 7 (1910),
pp. 38-41 (2nd pagination).

_____, "Zavety simvolizma," No. 8 (1910), pp. 5-20
(2nd pagination).

Kuzmin, Mixail, "O prekrasnoj jasnosti," No. 4 (1910),
pp. 5-10.

_____, "Pis'mo v redakciju," No. 5 (1912), pp. 56-57.

- _____, "Xudožestvonnaja proza 'Vesov'," No. 9 (1910), pp. 35-41 (2nd pagination).
- _____, "Zametki o russkoj belletristrike," 1909-17.
- Magne, Emile, "Sovremennaja igruška," No. 2 (1912), pp. 65-68.
- Makovskij, Sergej, "Duša reakcii i svjatoe bespokojstvo," No. 6 (1913), pp. 44-47.
- _____, "'Novoe iskusstvo' i 'četvertoe izmerenie,'" No. 7 (1913), pp. 53-60.
- Mandel'stam, Osip, "Fransua Villon," No. 4 (1913), pp. 30-35.
- _____, "O sobesednike," No. 2 (1913), pp. 49-54.
- Morozov, P., "Puškin i anglijskaja poezija," No. 1 (1917), pp. 44-52.
- "Pčely i osy Apollona," No. 1 (1909), pp. 79-84.
- Pjast, Vladimir, "Pamjati Meja," No. 5 (1912), pp. 39-44.
- Radlov, N., "O Futurizme i 'Mire iskusstva'," No. 1 (1917), pp. 1-17.
- _____, "Sovremennaja russkaja grafika i risunok I," No. 6 (1913), pp. 5-24.
- Tomaševskij, B., "Francuzskie poety XVIII veka," Nos. 6-7 (1915), pp. 63-85.
- Tugendhol'd, J., "Puškinskij spektakl'," Nos. 4-5 (1915), pp. 99-102.
- Tumpovskaja, M., "Kolčan," Nos. 6-7 (1917), pp. 58-66.
- _____, "Sem' cvetov radugi," No. 1 (1917), pp. 38-43.
- Vološin, Maximilian, "Anri de Renje," No. 4 (1910), pp. 18-34.
- _____, "Arxaizm v russkoj živopisi," No. 1 (1909), pp. 43-54.
- _____, "Auguste Villiers de l'Isle-Adam," Nos. 3-4 (1912), pp. 1-29.

- _____, "Liki tvorčestva. I. F. Annenskij--lirik,"
No. 4 (1910), pp. 11-16 (2nd pagination).
- _____, "Literaturnaja žizn'," No. 3 (1909), p. 20.
- _____, "Literaturnye gruppirovki," No. 12 (1910),
pp. 16-17.
- Vrangel', N., "Iskusstvo v Vesax," No. 10 (1910), pp.
16-17.
- Xodasevič, Vladislav, "Peterburgskie povesti Puškina,"
No. 3 (1915), pp. 33-50.
- Zelinskij, Fadej, "I. F. Annenskij kak filolog-klassik,"
No. 4 (1910), pp. 1-9 (2nd pagination).
- Znosko-Borovskij, Evgenij, "Bašennyj teatr," No. 8
(1910), pp. 31-38.
- _____, "O tvorčestve M. Kuzmina," Nos. 4-5 (1917),
pp. 25-44.