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News Of the Profession
A Note From the Editor

First of all, I hope you will all accept my apologies for failing to get the Newsletter out on schedule at the end of 1994. This had in part to do with competing demands on my time and energies made by my institution, and by my two children. But the delay was also due to what seemed like an unfortunate dearth of submissions (something which causes me to feel all the more grateful to those who did contribute to this issue). It is largely for this reason that Newsletter no. 12 may strike you as something of a “one-person show” in more ways than one. As you will note, I chose to make good the lack of material with a rather lengthy contribution of my own. I did so not out of a desire for self-promotion (“so this is where our money is going” you may be thinking at this point), but because, until very recently, I could think of no other way of getting to you anything thick enough to require a binding! (Ironically, and thankfully, some late submissions arrived in the nick of time. These, hopefully, will go some way to attenuating the impression of megalomania.)

Necessity being the mother of invention, then, I would like to propose that my (needless?) act of desperation serve as the prototype for a new, “Work in Progress” category of submission to the ABSN. If you have an essay, or part of an essay on Belyj that you are eventually planning to publish in another form elsewhere, and that you would like to “float” in draft form, then here is your opportunity. You would have the benefit of a (hopefully) sympathetic hearing from all the leading specialists in the Belyj field, and perhaps even some useful feedback on which to base your revision. I strongly urge subscribers to take up this idea and look forward to receiving “work in progress” submissions for inclusion in the next issue.

Overall, I think we can be optimistic about the continued success and relevance of our Newsletter. I have received a number of new subscription requests from both institutions and individuals in recent months. Issue no. 13 will contain reviews of some
important new books on Belyj. The two excellent articles on Belyj included in the most recent issue of *The Slavic and East European Journal* testify to the fact that the field remains vibrant and fruitful. I hope, therefore, that the gentle reprimand implied by the comments in my opening paragraph did not set the wrong tone.

One final note. I have finally been hauled kicking and screaming onto our university's branch of the Internet. Please feel free to send your communications to me by e-mail. I have listed the address on the inside of the front cover.

Stephen C. Hutchings
The Fourteenth Annual Andrej Belyj Society Meeting

The fourteenth meeting of the Andrej Belyj Society was held at the AATSEEL convention in San Diego, on Friday December 30, 1994. Here is a list of the papers read:

Chair: Rolf Hellebust, University of Toronto
Secretary: William J. Comer, U. of Kansas

“Sin and Sacrifice in Andrej Belyj's Silver Dove”
Peter G. Christensen, Marquette University

“Fabula and Sjuzet in Belyj's Petersburg”
Paul M. Mitchell, Miami University

“The Geometries of Andrej Belyj’s Petersburg”
David Rodeback, Cornell University
The Graphics of Aubrey Beardsley in the Poetry of Alexander Blok and Andrej Belyj

(Abstract by Virginia H. Bennett, University of Hawaii at Manoa)

Although some students of Blok and Belyj have focused upon the musical aspects of their verse, few have explored the visual subtexts of their works - specifically their poetry. Since it was politically incorrect to attribute not only political and material innovations and inventions to outside sources, but also artistic ones as well, Soviet scholars of the nineteen thirties through nineteen seventies focused upon the purely Russian sources of inspiration for the symbolists and rarely touched upon the themes they held in common with members of other symbolist movements. It is for this reason - i.e. the still productive area of the cross-fertilization of Russian symbolism with the themes, imagery and motifs from other European symbolist movements - that this study focuses upon one aspect of the phenomenon of Aubrey Beardsley in Russia.

It is clear to me that the visual arts - especially graphics and illustrations - frequently serve as subtexts for literary works and vice versa. I believe this same principle is at work with the illustrations of Aubrey Beardsley and the poetry of Aleksandr Blok and Andrej Belyj during their "period of disillusionment" - late 1904-1909. What originally pointed me in this direction was my own subconscious mental pictures when reading Blok's cityscape poetry, especially "Neznakomka." I frequently envisioned a "Beardsleyesque" silhouette of a woman as the embodiment of Blok's mysterious (anti)heroine. From there, I began thinking of other of Beardsley's images which seemed to find echoes in Blok's and Belyi's works. This leads me to the book-length project I am working on now. It deals with the cross-fertilization between Beardsley's work in The Savoy and The Yellow Book and the turn-of-the-century Russian symbolist journals.

My research confirms the fact of the tremendous impact of Beardsley's graphic art
upon all of Europe, including Russia. D.S. MacColl, whom Diaghilev commissioned to write an article on Beardsey for *Mir Iskusstva* (Nos 7-8, 9-10, 1900) explains it by pointing out the great speed with which Beardsley’s prints were reproduced and disseminated throughout Europe. He notes the fact that Beardsley deliberately simplified his graphics in order to make their reproduction easier (*Mir Iskusstva*, p. 97 ff.). Beardsley’s art work echoed the conscious or subconscious weltanschauung of his fin-de-siècle contemporaries and gave visual life to many themes popularized in their literature. What is discussed in my study are the following topics: 1) Aubrey Beardsley’s direct and indirect connections with Russia; 2) the themes which Beardsley popularized world-wide; in connection with this: 3) certain imagery which is uniquely Beardsley’s and not repeated by his imitators; and finally 4) Beardley’s imagery as it is reflected in a number of specific poems of Blok and Belyj.

How was it that Blok and Belyj knew of Beardsley? First and foremost through Sergei Diaghilev. According to Beardsley’s English biographer, Sidney Weintraub: “The most important thing to Diaghilev about the new journal (*Mir Iskusstva*) was that its inaugural number had to feature Beardsley’s drawings as well as an authoritative article to accompany them.” This was to provide a striking statement about the journal’s art nouveau/symbolist orientation. Weintraub quotes Diaghilev’s letter to D.S. MacColl: “Being myself one of his greatest admirers and wishing to reproduce some of his works I should like them to be accompanied by an article acquainting our public with that refined and exquisite artist’s meaning, with the causes of the apparition of his art and with a general aspect of his personality...I knew Beardsey at Dieppe and can well understand what a loss it is as an artist and as a man...” Another direct connection could be a poet by the name of Raffalovich who published both in *Mir Iskusstva* and *Vesy*. Is this the same young poet described by Beardsey’s biographers as a minor poet of indifferent talent, but very rich, who generously supported Beardsley especially in the last months of his life?
The indirect connections were the articles in *Mir Iskusstva* and multiple printings of his graphics. There were actually two articles. The first was a rather short one of two pages which accompanied the first Beardsley prints in numbers 1-2 of *Mir Iskusstva* (1898--pp. 16-17) signed “A.N.” The second was the above mentioned article by D.S. MacColl which ran through several numbers of *Mir Iskusstva* (#7-8, pp. 74-85; and 9-10, pp. 16-17). MacColl thoughtfully supplies his readers with a bibliography of Beardsley’s works available in print including two editions of collections chosen by Beardsley himself shortly before his death of 50 prints each. We must not forget at this juncture that there were many educated Russians in both capitals and elsewhere who regularly bought English edition books and subscribed to English language magazines, including many within the circles of the Russian symbolists. One can well imagine that after the feature articles in *Mir Iskusstva* many readers hastened to acquire copies of Beardsley’s collected prints. Other indirect connections were the frequent appearances of Beardsley’s prints in subsequent issues of *Mir Iskusstva* (some unacknowledged), from his *Yellow Book* prints, his *Savoy* prints and his illustrations of Ernest Dowson’s “Pierrot of the Minute.” We also know that Blok and Belyj knew Beardsley’s work, because Belyj makes specific mention of Beardsley in a letter of 1907 to Blok.

The next step is to identify the major themes illustrated throughout Beardsley’s graphics. His art reflects ideas of current interest to his intellectual peers during his short career from 1892-1898 and their images were to become common currency in the works of the Russian symbolists. Like Blok and Belyj, Beardsley seems to have moved from idealism to disillusionment as is reflected in his choices of inspiration. The following list of themes is sure to have a familiar ring to historians of Russian culture. First was the romanticization of the medieval era as first popularized by such English pre-Raphaelites as William Morris and Arthur Burne-Jones. Beardsley gave his rendition of them in his illustrations for a 1893 of Sir Thomas Mallory’s “La Morte
d’Artur.” Next, the era most favored by Beardsley was the 18th century. Here we have his illustrations of Alexander Pope’s “The Rape of the Lock,” Ben Jonson’s “Volpone” (à la 18th century), illustrations for “Don Juan,” grotesques for Samuel Foote’s “Bon Mots,” Edgar Allan Poe’s “The Masque of the Red Death,” and an unfinished series based on Les Liaisons Dangereuses.

Another of Beardsley’s favorite themes was the characters from the Commedia dell’arte, specifically Pierrot, Columbine and Harlequin. Prints featuring these personae were printed in The Yellow Book and The Savoy and in his illustrations of Ernest Dowson’s “Pierrot of the Minute” which were reprinted in Mir Iskusstva. Another interest which Belyj and Blok shared with Beardsley was the operas of Richard Wagner. He made illustrations depicting a night at “Tristan and Isolde,” prints for “Die Gotterdammerung” and was composing his own very naughty version in prose with illustrations of the Tannhauser and Venus legend. It was to be entitled “Under the Hill.” There were many variations on the theme of the predatory, seductive woman as found in Beardsley’s individual illustrations for The Yellow Book and The Savoy, for Theophile Gautier’s Mlle de Maupin, for Oscar Wilde’s “Salome” and a collection of raucously bawdy and lighthearted illustrations for Aristophanes’ “Lysistrata.”

The problem of proper attribution of Beardsley’s themes is also addressed in my upcoming work. Blok’s and Belyj’s contemporaries were quite ready to admit that there was a flurry of imitations of Beardsley’s works. I believe it is fair to name Russia’s most famous art nouveau illustrators among them, but most prominent were three: Konstantin Somov, Aleksandr Benois and Evgenij Lancere. Journalists comment upon this phenomenon as well as memoirists. Once again we note the fact that Russian scholars were either unwilling or unable to attribute importance to Beardsley’s influence. For example, the introduction to the “Biblioteka Poeta” edition of Belyj’s poetry mentions the predominance of images from Somov, while ignoring the fact that Somov was drawing his inspiration from Beardsley.
Finally, it will be noted that the characteristically Beardsleyan mixture of the grotesque and the beautiful -- i.e. interspersing dwarfs, crones, and foetus-like homunculi among his seductive women -- is a technique adapted by both Belyj and Blok in their poetry of the years 1905-1909.
Accounts of Symbolism evolving as a reaction to positivism are legion. However, while two “schools” of symbolism have been generally described - the “mystic” and the decadent - very little attention has been accorded the possibility that mystical Symbolism was formulated as an alternative metaphysic to replace the one dismissed by dialectical materialism and positivism. Some representatives of the “mystical” group strove, constantly and even fanatically, to construct all-encompassing systems with a final outcome marking a new world order different by far from the Marxian-Hegelian system; their new world order would be subordinate to the logic of the human soul. This group of artists was therefore dedicated to revealing the light of the human spirit.

Two artists working in disparate media and from strikingly dissimilar philosophical premises, Andrej Belyj and Aleksandr Skrjabin, developed personally and artistically in a strikingly similar manner, even finding correspondences in their philosophical systems. Despite differences in background and personalities, they share many similar traits and artistic landmarks. While the remarkable coincidence of their progression extends roughly from 1899-1913, this paper will concentrate on the early years 1899-1904 and will examine their motivation for writing their respective first and second symphonies.

At first glance, it may seem dubious at best to compare a man of 19 whose genius was virtually untried with a man of 27 who had completed the full requirement at his educational institution and was already recognized as a prominent figure in his field. Nonetheless, at the turn of the century Belyj and Skrjabin display many similar features, perhaps most noticeably their compulsion to rationalize their creativity and to
theorize their positions and their artistic points of view. While Belyj exceeds Skrjabin in published theoretical work, Skrjabin himself produces hundreds of pages of personal notes, later diligently transcribed and stored as “Propylaen.”

Other landmarks in these artists’ lives are remarkably coincidental, including major turning points in their personal and creative lives. During a formative period in their youth they both suffered serious personal affliction - in Belyj’s case psychological (his warring parents), in Skrjabin’s case physical (his withered right hand) - which promoted “serious thinking: the beginning of analysis” in Skrjabin’s words at a very young age; they both read Schopenhauer and Nietzsche at about the same time; both of them lost a critical paternal figure in 1903 (Belyj’s father, Skrjabin’s patron, Beljaev); at about the same time, both engaged in a protracted separation from a former lover (Belyj’s Nina Petrovskaja and Skrjabin’s first wife, Vera); both began forging new psycho-sexual attachments with a woman in 1902-1904 with mystical significance for the artists, etc. However, these coincidences form the background to the artistic artistic development: both artists wrote four symphonies between 1899 and 1907. It must be noted from the outset that the two artists often arrived at the same path due to very different impeti. Clearly, though, the philosophical paths of both artists are parallel in their goal of transforming experience into an unprecedented unity.

By 1907 both artists had finished four symphonies. Skrjabin would write one more; Belyj would move to more conventional prose styles. Both of these artists’ early symphonies could be taken as pseudo-religious expressions. In fact, both Skrjabin and Belyj could be called “arxaiysty-novatory” attempting a trassubstantiation of the essential, ergo lost human nature. Eliade explains: “The symbol, the myth, the rite, express on different planes and though the means proper to them, a complex system of coherent affirmation about the ultimate reality of things, a system that can be regarded as constituting a metaphysics” (3). Thus, it is plausible that both Belyj and Skrjabin intuited the possibility of creating a godless metaphysics through invoking the
Both Belyj and Skrjabin believe that they have changed the world though their art, with some of the most advanced minds agreeing with them. Writing much later, Danilevic claims: “What Skrjabin did constituted a tremendous contribution to the general process of evolution in music’s expressive resources at the beginning of the century” (314). And Lavrov seconds him: “How right was Šklovskij when he noted in passing that, without the symphonies of Belyj, ‘modern Russian literature would have been impossible’” (Zab. kn., 34).


"Belyi's Annus Horribilis: The Crisis of 1909"

Abstract by Maria Carlson, University of Kansas

Anyone who has worked on Andrej Belyj has seen numerous elliptical references to the “difficult year” ("god duševnogo pereloma") 1909. Rumors have persisted: something traumatic happened to Belyj in 1909. He had some kind of nervous breakdown. There was a problem with another writer. Voices had been raised. Insults had been thrown. Somebody fainted. Belyj was shipped off to Bobrovka as a result. But what really happened in early 1909? What was the “skandal”? We know that Belyj had over-extended his already neurotic personality, but what specifically sent him over the brink? And was the episode relevant to our understanding of *Serebrijanyj golub’* which he began writing shortly after the skandal?

Contemporary newspaper records and unpublished memoir literature are the two major sources of information about the episode: the press provides the realia and the memoirs, the realoria of the scandal. The paper summarizes the events of 1908 and early 1909; it furnishes the details of the screaming match and the breakdown itself (which happened at Vjaceslav Ivanov's lecture, given Tuesday January 27th, in Moscow at the Literaturnyj Xudožestvennyj kružok; Ivanov's presentation on “O poslednix tečenijax v literature” focussed on “The Russian Idea” as it was expressed in the most recent symbolist literature); and finally it speculates on the consequences of Belyj's breakdown for his subsequent work.

The “scandalous episode” ended with Belyj's being led off by the enigmatic Theosophist Anna Mintslova, and subsequently being “exiled” to Bobrovka, where he began writing *Serebrijanyj golub’*. The episode serves to reveal the nature of Belyj’s own creative process, and for this reason perhaps he himself chose to report its contours, but not its content in his memoirs, even to the point of denying that the
papers had reported it. All of the elements of the scandal - the attack on the unity of the narod and intelligentsia and on the mystical narodničestvo of the god-seeking intelligentsia, "Nekrasovskaja tema", the sense of personal persecution, the problematics of East and West, religious sectarianism, occult Tatars on the astral plane, Theosophy, unspecified "temnye sily", "navoždenie," mystical anarchism, - all form the "text of life" which Belyj absorbed and assimilated and translated into Serebrjanyj golub' and Petersburg. Belyj's personal neurosis became a national identity crisis expressed in the literary texts. This is the very essence of žiznetvorčestvo.
"The Seventh Eclogue of Theocritus in Andrej Belyj's Silver Dove"

Abstract by Maria Carlson, University of Kansas

Andrej Belyj is not an author we associate with extensive classical references (such as we may meet, say, in Brjusov or Ivanov); nevertheless, the presence of the Greek bucolic poet Theocritus (c. 310-250 BC) in Silver Dove is somehow apt in a pastoral novel written by a Russian poet with a classical education and ulterior motives.

Theocritus's seventh eclogue (the "Thalysia," also called the "Regina Elogarum") is the topic of conversation Petr Darjal'skij introduces while having tea with his betrothed, Katja Ugoleva, and her grandmother, the haughty Baroness Todrabe-Graaben. He proceeds to tell them about some of the eclogue's more eccentric features: that "someone" was locked up in a cedar box; that Pan was being beaten with stinging nettles and left in a ditch, scratching himself. Seeking, possibly, to astound the Baroness (who hates him) and to divert Katja, Darjal'skij precipitously goes on to discuss various philological arguments about why the Great God Pan scratched: was it because he was lying on nettles in the ditch, or was it because he had been beaten with them? It is scintillating tea-time conversation.

The episodes Darjal'skij mentions are in fact in the eclogue. But why include this eccentric episode in the novel at all? Possible reasons include:

1. The source of the episode comes from Belyj's own life (a confrontation he witnessed between Sergej Solov'ev and his grandmother, Mme. Kovalenskaja, at Dedovo in the summer of 1906 - see the first chapter of Meždu dvux revoljucij). Life becomes art.

2. It provides the possibility of a horrible pun (about Pan and pan), and subsequently Evseeiť's confusion of nettles and onions (which recur in a subsequent episode); Belyj liked horrible puns, and, in this case, a schoolboy jokes achieves its apotheosis in a
3. The eclogue generates associative fields of images central to the meaning of the novel. The reader might associate the poet shut up in the cedar box in Theocritus with the dying and resurrected god Osiris shut up in a cedar tree coffin, and those images to the soon-to-be-"sacrificed" Petr Darjal'skij inside a hollow oak, crowned like Dionysus Dendritos with a fir branch (a representative associative series). Most important, at the heart of the classical pastoral, beneath the illusory gentleness of its bucolic idyll, lies the atavistic, passionate and destructive Dionysian spirit that is a central theme of Belyj's novel.

4. It reinforces the "bucolic" and rural subject matter of the novel and connects it to a modern variant of the phenomenon, the "mističeskoe narodničestvo" of the bogoiskatelskaia intelligencija that is an important dimension of Belyj's novel. Both Belyj and Sereža Solov'ev were taken with mystic populism in the summer of 1906, when Sereža walked around in a red shirt and boots and went off with village girls.

5. On a very important philosophical level, the eclogue underscores Dar'jalskij's trans-temporal identification of Greek and Russian peasant culture. Young Dar'jalskij, who would go "to the narod," was after all a classics scholar and a poet. Dar'jalskij identifies the Greek narod, which gave rise to Dionysus and the choral dance, with the Russian narod and its xorovod; as he continues to discuss Theocritus, he describes the Russians carrying on the tradition of the Greeks. This identification, given Belyj's interest in Vjačeslav Ivanov's theory of the Russian Dionysus and Darjal'skij's role as a dying and resurrected god in a modern Symbolist mystery drama, is also thematically important.

But the associative field of "Theocritus" plays one more important role in Belyj's novel. The quintessential Greek pastoral poet, Theocritus also serves as the key to Belyj's larger system of citatnost' in Silver Dove. His name is the central clue to the enormous body of pastoral "citations" (literary, artistic, personal, religious, etc.).
contained in the novel. Through these citations Belyj summarizes not only the tradition of Russian rural prose, but also the development of the Russian intelligentsia's attitude toward the narod, making *Silver Dove* a philosophical and intellectual, as well as literary, statement.
A Tragic Collision: Language and Values in Belyj’s Silver Dove

(Abstract by Laura Goering, Carleton College)

In his 1910 article on Potebnja’s Thought and Language, Belyj describes language as a “tragic collision” between language as process and language as product (or energeia and ergon in Humboldt’s terminology). Each utterance is fraught with the tension between the individual creative act and the “petrified legacy of the past.” The resulting “tragedy of language in antinomies” is, for Belyj, an analogue of the Dionysian/Apollonian duality laid out in Nietzsche’s Birth of Tragedy. If tragedy for Nietzsche is born out of the “spirit of music,” for Potebnja it arises out of the “volcanic madness” that he knows to be bubbling beneath the “terminological abstraction” of words, like underground streams beneath the earth’s crust.

In this paper I first examine the various incarnations of the “tragic collision” in three works written between 1909 and 1911: the Logos article on Potebnja; “The Tragedy of Creation: Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy”; and the newspaper essay “Russia.” In these works, Belyj’s conceptions of language, art, the creative life, and the fate of Russia are all undergirded by a common structure. In each case an element of ergon/product/Apollonian form undergoes a “tragic collision” with energeia/process/Dionysian “volcanic madness.” The end result can never be grasped by logic; it can only be known by means of a symbolic act of synthesis. It cannot be explained or reproduced; it can only be experienced.

Belyj’s description of language as “a tragic collision” is a formulation that captures a central problem of the symbolist novel in general and The Silver Dove in particular. How can a view of language according to which “the image is immovable [but] meaning is changeable, can be determined only in each individual instance, and is in many cases limitless (p. 101, his emphasis) be incorporated into a work which clearly
had something to say, both about good and evil, and about the relationship between Russia and the West?

In fact, the principle of "tragic collision" operates in the novel on two different and entirely compatible levels. On one hand, the "tragedy of language in antinomies" is a structural principle, used to create images that dissolve into ambiguity if we look at them too closely. Belyj uses the abyss as a recurring metaphor to describe this "process of infinite deepening." Each time we believe to be focused on the bottom, we find that the apparent bottom "slips away into infinity." Each new illusory bottom is a new stage along the endless "inner path" toward truth. On the other hand, the "tragic collision" is a thematic principle to be conveyed symbolically by means of the plot. Darjalskij finds himself at the point of conflict between the Apollonian world of Gugolevo and the Dionysian world of the Doves; he reenacts the tragedy of Russia and perishes in the third act. The problem is that to convey a "message" about the fate of Russia requires certain constants of meaning. The closer the abyss is to a static conventional meaning, the clearer becomes the theme of Darjalskij's failure to achieve the necessary synthesis. The closer the use of abyss imagery is to the ideal of a receding bottom, the less effective it is in conveying the same theme on a macro level. In the end, the novel itself is yet one more "tragic collision" between fixed meaning and dissolving images.
Nina A. Koževnikova has written a first rate book, which brings together significant contributions representing her life's work on Belyj's prose. At long last a book on Belyj appears that incorporates a holistically philological approach, written by a scholar thoroughly at home with Belyj's entire creative output. While Western scholars have been acquainted with Koževnikova's dozen or so articles which appeared over a decade in Russian journals, those essays were not always readily accessible. But Язык Андрея Белого is more than a compilation of previously published and revised articles. Far surpassing what was covered by L. Hindley's Die Neologismen Andrej Belyjs and L.A. Novikov's Stilistika ornamental'noj prozy Andreja Belogo, Professor Koževnikova pursues her investigation of Belyj's language and style by examining topics such as: narrative strategies, literary devices, onomastics, leitmotifs, sound orchestration, intertextuality, rhythm. She even coins a term: "okkazionalizmy." Again and again she illuminates her study with a dizzying avalanche of examples, resorting sometimes to the same penchant Belyj possessed for word-weaving. Indeed, Язык Андрея Белого impresses one for its sheer impressiveness. For Belyj, Koževnikova notes, "word-building is tantamount to world-building" (166). This is exactly the way one can interpret Koževnikova's own approach: by illustrating how the word in Belyj evolves into phrases, sentences, paragraphs, etc., the reader gains insight into the unit-by-unit creation of Belyj's world.

Koževnikova begins with the premise that Belyj embodied two personae in his being: the persona of the poet and the persona of the scholar. This formula can be extended
to embrace the following deduction: his prose was poetic, and his poetry was prosaic. Embodying what for Belyj was his single most important aesthetic credo, namely that form and content are one, Язык Андрея Белого illustrates throughout how the rule of thumb applies to each and every one of Belyj’s novels. Koževnikova elaborates on how this principle dominated Belyj’s scholarly essays from “Алрика и эксперимент” to his final treatises culminating in Как мы пишем, in which Belyj himself added: “Главное задание в написании — чтобы звук, краски, образ, сюжет, тенденция сюжета пронизали друг друга до полной имманентности, чтобы звук и краска вскричали смыслом, чтобы тенденция была звучна и красочна.”

One can ascertain the richness of Koževnikova’s scholarship by glancing at the chapter headings in Язык Андрея Белого: Эстетические взгляды Андрея Белого и их отражение в его художественном творчестве, Поэзия и проза А. Белого как единый контекст, Структура повествования, Типы повторов, Ритм и синтаксис прозы А. Белого, Тропы (сравнения и метафоры), Окказионализмы А. Белого, Имена собственные, Звуковая организация текста. While space does not permit a thorough critique, this reader will attempt to focus on a few gems.

Repetition is such a basic device, and yet very little attention has been devoted to its importance in Belyj’s texts. Belyj’s earliest experimental forays in the symphonies exploited musical principles that keep reappearing in the novels. Indeed, Belyj exemplifies the very same quality which Edmund Wilson discerned in Joyce, namely that “he is symphonic rather than narrative. His fiction has its progressions, its developments, but they are musical rather than dramatic.” (Axel’s Castle, p. 209.) Koževnikova traces the development of repetition in hierarchical terms, and yet she
comes to the conclusion that no matter how many different types of repetition Belyj employed they are all tied to the theory of correspondences and to the theme of eternal return. Utilizing cinematic terminology, Koževnikova illustrates how the technique of “montage,” literally assembling fragments of leitmotifs, creates a holistic pattern of associations. Just as in the context of “cutting” film, juxtaposing leitmotifs from earlier parts of the text comes to represent a form of self-quotiation. In Belyj there is always an underlying attempt to make a thematic point. The chapter on “povtory’ is so convincing (especially satisfying is the chapter devoted to Petersburg), for it draws on a profound knowledge of patterns and associations strewn throughout Belyj’s oeuvre. Concluding her chapter, Koževnikova maintains that Belyj went much further than Gogol with repetition: ‘Повтор, идущий от Гоголя, это, в первую очередь, 'жестовой рефрен', а вслед за ним словесный рефрен, характеризующий определенного персонажа как маринетку” (98).

Koževnikova often goes to great lengths to elaborate on the function of naming as an integral part of Belyj’s creative process. Not unlike James Joyce, who is often considered the master of onomastic devices, Belyj availed himself of carnivalesque humor -- this is Belyj at his ludic best. Naming has to be understood as playing a stylistic role very similar to repetition, in that it personifies a “circle of associations” (194). It stands to reason that the works where naming assumes a life of its own are the novels where the device seems to run rampant, namely in Moskva and Maski. In his final novels Belyj exercised his wildest imagination, listing names in an obsessive fashion. With the dictionary of Dal’ for a portable Bible, it can be said that Belyj knew no bounds. What is clear, however, from Koževnikova’s analysis is that Belyj’s tricks with language are not purposeless games, but rather meaningful. Thus, one cannot rule out that a pun may be used humorously and embellish a text in a variety of decorative ways. This would not seem foreign to a word-weaver like Belyj who after all...