19 Alexandrov is typical, and quite correct, in noting (among other differences) that in *The Baptized Chinaman* "Belyi moves the visionary, anthroposophical imagery which dominates the earlier work into the background," and that (as compared with Kotik Letaev) "the teleological component that converts cycles into whorls of a spiral is muted in *The Baptized Chinaman*. The narrator's identification with the transcendence that Christ represented earlier has become significantly weaker." See Andrei Bely, pp. 183, 190. I shall in due course suggest that the abandonment of a transcendent (i.e. atemporal) Christ, as well as the more clearly defined distinction between viewpoints ("adult" and "child") in the later work can in a significant sense be seen as an advance on, rather than a retreat from the innovations of Kotik Letaev. For more insightful remarks on differences separating the two Kotik Letaev novels, see Thomas Beyer's introduction to his translation of *Kreščenyj kitaec*: Andrej Belyj, *The Christened Chinaman*, translated, annotated and introduced by Thomas Beyer Jr, Tenafly, NJ, 1991.

20 N.V. Valentinov expresses this view with considerable vitriole in his *Dva goda s simvolistami*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969. Lazar Fleishman, however, provides an effective riposte which reasserts the basic authenticity of Belyj's account in "Bely's Memoirs".

21 Charlene Castellano quotes Georgij Ivanov's complaint that Belyj's memoirs are "extremely unpleasant and difficult to read because of their annoying manner" in her own very helpful "Andrey Bely's Memories of Fiction," in Harris 66-99 (p. 68).

22 Andrej Belyj, *Na rubežë stoletii*, Moscow: Xudožestvennaja literatura, 1989, p. 37. Further page references to the work are from this edition and are incorporated into the text in parentheses.

23 In Kotik Letaev, too, the nursery is consistently associated with creativity, childish fantasy and art, while the living room is the place where Kotik is introduced to the words of the outside world of professors: "In the mornings from my little bed I look: at
the bouquets of the wallpaper...I blink: all the walls fly across to their places...I become refined in experimentation; I move actuality across...I am an artist of actuality" (128); “...and I passed into the living room where pillars stood in a yoke of cigar opinions; into the cigarette dispenser, into an ashtray and into the red armchairs which were also occupied by luminaries...I don’t understand: the meaning of it all is dark to me” (144).

24 The theme of byt in Belyj’s works is treated en passant (and in somewhat lopsided fashion) by A. Dolgopolov’s otherwise excellent Andrei Bely i Ego Roman ‘Peterburg’. Leningrad: Sovetskij pisatel’, 1988. Dolgopolov portrays byt as something to be escaped from into the preferred realm of bytie, rather than transcended from within and made anew as žizn’. (This, in my view, is a misinterpretation that arises from the not uncommon tendency to treat the bytovoj issue in Russian symbolism in terms of a byt / bytie dichotomy (a contrast between two fixed states) rather than a byt / žizn’ opposition (a contrast between a fixed state and a motion of transcendence). Typical is the following assertion by Dolgopolov: “Freedom is acquired by the lyrical hero only in the process of...expressing the ‘I’ as a category of an order...outside of byt; the sphere in which his essence is realized is the sphere of Being (bytie)” (p. 123).

25 In Na rubeže Belyj confirms that “the period described [in Kotik Letaev]...stands under the slogan of the nursery, the carpet and my nanny; our apartment has yet to be fully studied by me” (181).

26 In Na rubeže, referring to the period in his infancy when he was sick with scarlet fever, Belyj writes “I already experienced the split between the Dionysian and the Apollonian elements during those sixty days as the collapse of the apartment into the nursery and its other unknown, and perhaps terrible spaces” (p. 182).

27 Carol Anschultz has, with great intelligence, explored the links between metaphor as transformation and memory in Belyj in her “Recollection as Metaphor in Kotik Letaev,” Russian Literature, no IV (1976), pp. 345-55.

28 Most studies differ from my interpretation in noting this feature of Belyj’s writing as
Most studies differ from my interpretation in noting this feature of Belyi's writing as the reflection of a conflict, a technical problem which the writer only partially overcomes. Andrew Wachtel, for example, writes: "In Kotik Letaev, Belyi faced technical problems that had not confronted other writers of pseudoautobiography. How could the inchoate memories of a child who did not yet know how to speak be presented in words? Throughout the novel...the adult narrator reminds the reader that the infant did not have the vocabulary to express what he felt...The adult's perspective...indicates that the adult narrator, although he can, with great effort, recall and verbalize the experiences he had as a young child, cannot return to that state."


Baxtin's theory of novelistic discourse, too, speaks, in iconic terms, not of the mechanistic articulation of a parole according to the fixed rules of a Saussurean langue, but of an individually contextualized reaccentuation of the word of the other which is preserved in all its richness within the newly rearticulated word. In a very insightful article Amy Mandelker points to links between Belyi's positive interpretation of language as, from its inception, an inherently social activity, and the linguistic theories of Vygotskij and Vološinov: "Vygotskij's critique of Piaget...resists the perception of socialization as an encroachment on the child's individual language and argues...that language is social from its earliest appearance, a position adopted by Volosinov into a model of dialogism where every utterance is double-voiced, representing and reacting to other speech acts." See Amy Mandelker "Synaesthesia and Semiosis: Icon and Logos in Andrej Belyi's Glossalolija and Kotik Letaev", Slavic and East European Journal, vol. 34, no. 2 (Summer 1990), 158-76 (p. 173). I would add that socialization is, for Belyj (as for Baxtin/Vološinov), positive in it's intimate, interactive "I-Thou" mode but not in its impersonal, third-person version in which "I" is subordinated to "They". Mandelker, incidentally, follows Steven Cassedy in indicating
Belyj's debt to Orthodoxy's concept of the Icon. Both Mandelker and Cassedy focus on one aspect of iconic language (the icon as a physical embodiment of Logos). My analysis broadens the notion of icon and extends it to plot and narration. See Steven Cassedy, “Bely's Theory of Symbolism as a Formal Iconics of Meaning,” in Malmstad, 285-313.

30 In his theory of novelistic discourse Baxtin states: "The prose writer does not purge words of intentions and tones that are alien to him...he does not eliminate those language characterizations...glimmering behind the words and forms...the writer of prose does not meld completely with any of those words, but rather accents each of them in a particular way.” Mikhail Bakhtin, “Discourse in the Novel,” in The Dialogic Imagination, edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988, pp. 259-423 (pp. 298-99). We sense here the strong influence of the iconic notion of (divine) meaning emanating forth from within ("glimmering behind") the (human) form in which it is incarnate, which contains it, and which is necessary to its articulation.

31 Steven Cassedy astutely notes the affinity between Belyj's earlier theory of the symbol and Orthodox concepts of iconicity, stressing the shared emphasis on the coexistence of meanings - divine and human, transcendent and corporeal: "The important notion is the duality of Christ's nature, the coexistence in him of a transcendent (divine) and an immanent (corporeal) component...[l]icons have the same status...Thus when we experience an icon we experience divine grace...we are coming as close as the intrinsic limitations of our corporeal natures allow to the actual experience of the divine...Bely's system is iconic through and through. Replace Value with God the Father and the Symbol Embodied with...divine grace and you have...a Russian Orthodox theology of icons" (pp. 304-05). However, Cassedy leaves aside the idea of the interdependence of meanings - of divine grace and the corporeal - implicit in many Orthodox interpretations of our relationship to God. He goes on to suggest that
Belyi’s system is, however iconic, not truly religious because its components are self sufficient and do not allow a transcendent God and/or divine grace to be posited as first principles external to that system. (p.310). This seems to go against Orthodox conceptions of the Triune God - precisely a “self-contained system” in which, because the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father and the Son, but from the Father through the Son, there is no external, abstract principle that can be removed from the divine economy in which God is immanent. In implying that the icon somehow accords human beings (limited) access to a fixed essence from which they are separate also contradicts the spirit of Orthodox ideas about the dynamic, energetic nature of created beings’ participation in God from whom they are different only “in that they change and move towards Him” (Meyendorff). Godhood is not merely embodied, whole and complete, in man, it is realized by Man through the dynamic, transfiguration of his corporeal existence. (Belyi’s iconic meaning is articulated through the fixed, linguistic concepts that it reaccents and so overcomes. It is not merely embodied statically in those concepts). 

32 Ansheutz’s article gives many skilful analyses of Kotik’s literal understanding of metaphors.

33 Belyi’s essay “The Principle of Form in Aesthetics,” for example, employs complex mathematical notation and numerous algebraic equations. This is included in The Selected Essays of Andrey Belyi, pp. 205-222.

34 See the epigraph to Chapter 2, as well as the brief section on Belyi at the end of the chapter.

35 As for Gogol, Čexov and Sologub, the unreal effect engendered by the subjugation of the trivial and everyday to the normative in Belyi is an indication that the embodiment of abstract evil constitutes (an albeit minor) deviation from that evil in the direction of its opposite. The distance is not great between the (unwittingly) bizarre effect of Anna Ivanovna’s cheese sandwich and the more calculated resistance of
Andrej Belyj, *Krešćenji kitaec*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1969, pp. 52-53. All further references to *The Christened Chinaman* are from this edition and are included in the text with page numbers given in parentheses. For translation, I rely extensively (though not exclusively) on Thomas Beyer’s excellent rendering of the text. The “real” prototype on whom Malinovskaja is based was a woman called Marija Ivanovna Ljaskovskaja to whom Belyj devotes an entire chapter (where he repeats many of the details found in *The Christened Chinaman*) in his *Na rubeže* (pp. 108-115).

In Baxtinian terms, this might be seen as the capitulation of dialogistic discourse (specific individuals’ contextualized reaccentuations of the words of multiple others) to monologism (the subordination of the individual’s word to the language of a single, monolithic Other).

Amy Mandelker writes: “Rather than depicting a Lacanian loss of meaning with the acquisition of language, Belyj’s narrative suggests that early childhood is an age of union with language in its fullest significance” (p. 171). She is, presumably, referring to the “iconic” stage of Kotik’s linguistic socialization in which he was able creatively to interact with his father - the stage which precedes his crystallization as “a second mathematician” and his entry into the world of language as abstract symbols which does involve a kind of Lacanian loss wherein words no longer “sparkle” with inner meaning. In Belyj’s conception of his spiritual development it is Vladimir Solov’ev (or “He” as he is cryptically referred to in the novel) who is to return to rescue Kotik from the bytovoj grip of both parents and instal a new area of mythic creativity based on interchange of the sort that Kotik enjoyed in the apartment of Mixail Solov’ev. The coincidence in names is not fortuitous. Mixail Solov’ev was in fact the younger brother of the famous philosopher and, as Gerald Janecek points out, reputedly the person who suggested the theurgic identity of “Andrej Belyj” to Boris Bugaev. See Janecek’s introduction to *Andrey Bely: A Critical Review*, Lexington Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1978, p. 5.

40 The identification of Letaev senior as the Chinaman, and the role of the Eastern elements in The Christened Chinaman is a puzzling one. Alexandrov, for example, writes “The change to the final title of the work [it was to have been called The Crime of Nikolai Letaev] is difficult to understand, as is the function of the Asiatic imagery in the novel as a whole” (p. 185). The association of “Chineseness” with edakoe takoe svoe provides an explanation consistent with the focus of the novel as a whole as I understand it.

41 Critics traditionally make much of the complexity of narrative viewpoint in the Letaev novels and disagree as to the relationship between the different perspectives. Wachtel notes “the rapidity with which [Belyi] cuts back and forth between the two points of view” [adult-narrator and child-hero] but claims that the narrator “is not supposed to be the author himself”(p. 158). Ellsworth insists that the narrator’s viewpoint is identical to that of the author (p. 120). If, however, the novel is seen as an act of transfigurative theurgy, the problem of narrative perspective (which, by definition, involves a “viewpoint” or “viewpoints” on something outside the viewing subject) is circumvented. The narration in Kotik Letaev does not, then, give voice to a perspective external to what it depicts, it enacts the transformation by which Boris Bugaev becomes Kotik Letaev. There is, in this sense, no dual viewpoint (child and adult), there is only Kotik Letaev - the Childman - who is constituted through the act of transfiguration and cannot be “viewed” outside that act.

42 The term “deus ex machina” is used by Ansheutz (p. 354).

43 In Na rubeži Belyj writes: “In Jesus I recognized the theme of my innocent
44 This interpretation receives support in Lazar Fleishman’s account of Belyj’s notion of the human individual as a “collection of personalities” in potentia, and his assertion that the little Boren’ka of the memoirs is always simultaneously both Andrej Belyj and Kotik Letaev. See “Belyj’s Memoirs,” p. 227.

45 Kotik’s identity can thus be interpreted as a chronotopic unity of two times and two spaces. This is a point made implicitly in Amy Mandelker’s article which suggests, in the context of Belyj’s theories of language, that the writer was aware of the unity of time and space in art years before Baxtin’s now famous essay on the Chronotope was penned.

46 “And now: I will crawl up to Mommy like a Bolognese, straight towards her plush slipper - to sniff it; and, putting my hand to my back, I cunningly wag my little tail...Mommy would laugh and say: ‘Baby...’” (Kotik Letaev, p. 162).

47 See Chapter 1, Part 2.

48 This, of course, was the dilemma with which Dostoevskij struggled with in each of his major works, from Notes From Underground to The Brothers Karamazov.

49 The unnaturally childlike Aleša and the unnaturally adult-like Kolja Krasotkin are Dostoevskij’s equivalents to the adult-as-child and the child-as-adult. Many of Dostoevskij’s characters can be seen as prototypes of the Childman/Godman - explorations of ways in which childhood innocence and adult reason can be combined in such a way that both categories are transcended in the resulting synthesis. Sonja in Crime and Punishment, Prince Myškin in The Idiot, Dmitrij, Aleša, Lise Xoxlokova, Kolja Krasotkin, Grušenka, and even Fedor Pavlovič in The Brothers Karamazov are just a few of many examples. In every case the result is far from satisfactory; the childishness in the adults tends to be artificial and unconvincing (Sonja, Aleša), or insufficiently developed (Grušenka, Dmitrij), or else akin to foolishness (Myškin). The
adult-ness in the children, on the other hand, comes across as mere precociousness (Krasotkin, Xoxlakova). In Lise Xoxlakova's character we see clearly the iconic affinities of Baxtin's dialogism. Baxtin's own analysis of Lise's voice role in the novel in *Problems in Dostoyevsky's Poetics* points out that the word of Ivan is an implicit presence in everything that she says; she finds him worthy of a "backwards glance" (ogljadka) at every step of her elucidation of the nihilistic consequences of his "everything is permissible" formula. At the same time her position is an example of Baxtin's "word with a loophole" (slovo s lazejkoj) - a loophole to the Christlike Aleša whom she (crucially, still a child, albeit on the threshold of adulthood) calls upon to save her. Unlike that of Aleša, the word of Lise as the future Godman will therefore be spoken from within the depths of Ivan's diabolically humanistic rationalism upon which it depends for its articulation. That Lise is a woman might be seen as confirmation of the Baxtinian notion that the self (Dostoevskij's sought after Godman) can be constituted solely through "otherness".

50 This is perhaps why, as noted earlier, Belyj accords the infant Kotik the capacity for divine creativity. The problem here is that Belyj is attempting both to represent the bi-directional iconic process (God-becomes-man-becomes God) while enacting only the "secondary," human element in the formula (Man becomes God). The transcendent, atemporal nature of Kotik's self-identity (his fixed status as figure of Christ) comes into conflict with the necessarily temporal manner in which the iconic likeness of man to God is achieved in Christ. For Kotik's transcendent nature, see also note 19.

51 Sanctification, we recall, depends on the preservation of the human material to be transfigured in order to generate the energy by which we recognize the work of grace. See Chapter 1.

52 Another version of the same basic antinomy that Belyj explored throughout his fiction is the roj (swarm)/ stroj (form) distinction and which is mentioned in precisely those terms in *Kotik Letaev*. Critics have consistently pointed this out in association
with the apparent paradox inherent in Belyi’s goal. Wachtel writes: “That Belyi saw the
relationship between ‘swarm’ and ‘form’ as one of conflict can be seen from the
following passage: ‘I know that form; it is the opposite of swarm, form bound swarm;
form is a stronghold in formlessness; everything else is fluid.’ ...This paradox is what
made the task of pseudo-autobiography particularly difficult for Belyi” (Wachtel, p. 164).
To see the pair iconically means to cease regarding them as a permanent dichotomy
and rather as the two elements necessary for the articulation of a third term (Son
needs Father to generate Childman; Man needs God to become Man-God, etc.)
53 For the definitive treatment of the apocalyptic theme in Petersburg, see David
Bethea, The Shape of Apocalypse in Modern Russian Fiction, Princeton: Princeton
54 For example, “Vse ...griffonitsja, grimasiruet, l’ovitsja” (pp. 60-61).
(“Everything...griffonizes, grimaces, lionizes.”)
55 As a number of Dostoevskij specialists have shown, each son (Dmitrij, Ivan, Aleša)
participates in some way in the murder of the father (Fedor), each, in his own fashion,
joins Ivan’s rebellion against God the Father, each has his separate path to
reconciliation, redemption and Godmanhood marked out in the novel.
56 As we recall from the comments of Florenskij and Meyendorff in Chapter 1, to
commit oneself to the multiple negations of apophatic logic (“Kotik Letaev is neither
Boren’ka Bugaev, nor Boris Bugaev, nor Andrej Belyj”) is equivalent to a dynamic act of
faith (Florenskij), or a revelation (Meyendorff).
57 In conferring divine grace upon us, the Holy Spirit enables each of us to become
God: “The Son has become like us by the incarnation; we become like him by
deification, by partaking of the divinity in the Holy Spirit, who communicates the divinity
to each human person in a particular way” (Lossky, p. 109). Wachtel, incidentally,
confirms that for Belyj “the Holy Spirit ...was linked both religiously and personally to
the idea of poetic creation” (p. 170). The idea is also implicit throughout Mandelker’s
discussion of Belyi's *Glossalolija* - itself based around the image of the "tongues of fire."
Andrej Belyi: A Bibliography 1993-1994

(Compiled by Julian Graffy, SSEES, UK)

Some materials from 1993 were included in the last bibliography. Some materials from before 1993 have only recently come to my notice and are included here. The delivery of issues of Russian journals to Western libraries continues to be beset with problems. Entries marked with an asterisk* have not been seen.

Corrigenda to last year's bibliography

p. 27

The entry on “K buduščemu učebniku ritma” should read as follows:
“K buduščemu učebniku ritma,” Učenye zapiski Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 515, Trudy po znakovym sistemama, 12, 1981, [sic] pp. 119-31
“K voprosu o ritme,” Učenye zapiski Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 515, Trudy po znakovym sistemam, 12, 1981, [sic] pp. 112-18

p. 30

The page numbers in the entry for “Perеписка P. A. Florenskogo s Andreem Belym” should read pp. 23-51, 52-61 [and not 23-5, 52-61]
The page numbers for the letter in the entry for “Pis’mo Andreja Belogo A.M. Gor’komu” should read pp. 350-52 [and not 198-215]

p. 34

For Izkritskaia read Iskržitskaia
In the entry under Ljutij, for V. read B. [i.e. Belyj]

For Točeva read Točieva

I. Primary Material: Recent Publications and Reprints.

“Antixrist. Konspekt i detskij nabrosok k nenapisannoj misterii,” publ. D. Rizzi, Russian Literature, 34, 1993, 4, pp. 519-40 [see also Rizzi in section IV]


“Xarakteristiki sovremennikov”, publ. and notes by M. Mironova, Australian Slavonic and East European Studies, 7, 1993, 1, pp. 18-23 [On Sologub, Bal’mont, Brjusov, Merežkovskij, Vjačeslav Ivanov, Boris Zajcev and Vladimir Lidin]. Source is given as Otdel rukopisej FBL, fond 439 V.A. Desnickogo, kart. 25, ed. xr. 16.

“O Sofii-Premudrosti”, publ. and introd., pp. 418-21, I. Višneveckij, Novyj žurnal, 190-191, 1993, pp. 418-27 [source is given as Otdel rukopisej RGB, fond 25, kart. 37, ed. xr. 5.]

Simvolizm kak miroponimanje, comp., introd., pp. 3-16, notes, pp. 494-515, list of names, pp. 516-26, L. A. Sugaj, Mysliteli XX veka, Moscow, Respublika, 1994, 528 pp. The works in this volume are collected under the headings ‘Simvolizm i filosofija
kul’tury’, pp. 18-326; and ‘Simvolizm i tvorčestvo’, pp. 328-493.


There are 17 poems, introd. I.V. Koreckaja, in Russkaja poezija serebrjanogo veka 1890-1917. Antologija, resp. eds. M.L. Gasparov and I.V. Koreckaja, Rossijskaja Akademija nauk, Institut mirovoj literatury im. A.M. Gor’kogo, Moscow, Nauka, 1993, pp. 246-57.

“Beseda o proletarskoj kul’ture v Vol’file 21 marta 1920 goda”, introd. and notes E.V. Ivanova, de visu, 1993,7, pp. 5-27 [includes contributions by Belyj as chairman]
There are photographs of Belyj as a child with his mother A. D. Bugaeva; of A.D. Bugaeva [March 1905]; and of Belyj as a child in “Moskovskie znamenitosti”, text by T. Šipova, Rodina, 1994, 2, pp. 123-27 [these photographs pp. 123, 125, 127]

See also under the correspondence with P.N. Zajcev in Section III

II. Translations

iii. Letters

“‘I s vremenem cto-to neladnoe...’ Pis’mo A. Belogo R.V. Ivanovu-Razumniku. 8 mart 1925 g.”, introd., pp. 144-49. notes, pp. 169-75, S. Šumixin, Neizvestnaja Rossija, XX. vek, 2, Moscow, Istoričeskoe nasledie, 1992, 144-75

Letter of 22. 3. 1912 to the publisher K.F. Nekrasov, in “Provincial’nyj roman v pis’max”, Rodina, 1992. 8-9, pp. 130-34 (p. 132)


This completes the publication begun in Minuvšee 13 and noted in ABSN, 11, p. 30.

IV. Secondary Sources

Adamovich, G.

“Andrej Belyj i ego vospominanija”, Vospominanija o serebrianom veke, introd. and notes V. Kreid, Moscow, Respublika, 1993, pp. 219-22, 504-05 [partial republication of 1938 original]

Babieva, I.R.


Bavin, S.

“Andrej Belyi”, in S. Bavin, I. Semibratova, Sud’by poetov serebrianogo vecka, Moscow, Knižnaja palata, 1993, pp. 52-70

Bicilli, P.M.


Bugaeva, K

Bugrov, B.S.

*Dramaturgija russkogo simvolizma*, Moscow, Skify, 1993, 54 pp. [considers Past' noči and Prišedšij]

Carlson, M.


Chafacińska-Wiertelak, H

*“Fenomen ‘Petersburga’ Andrieja Bielogo. Powieść i esej”, Studia Rossica* Posnaniensia, 23, 1993, pp. 23-30

Čursina, L.K.


*“O xudožestvennoj strukture poemy Andreja Belogo ‘Pervoe svidanie’”, Russkaja literatura*, 1992, 4, pp. 39-58

D'jakova, E.A.

Dioletta Siolari, A


Egorova, A.

"Trudovaja povinnost' ' Andreja Belogo", Eženedel'naja gazeta 'Spasenie', no. 38 (98), November 1993, p. 5 [Belyj and Vesy]

Gasparov, M. L.

Russkie stixi 1890-x - 1925-go godov v kommentarijakh, Moscow, Vysšaja škola, 1993, 272 pp [two pieces of rhythmic prose and four poems by Belyj are discussed pp. 15-17, 18-21, 62-65, 66-68, 83-85]

Gavrikova, I. Ju.


Ginzburg, M.

"Predystorija v licax", Eženedel'naja gazeta 'Spasenie', no. 38 (98), November 1993, p. 5

Jur'eva, Z.

"Kosmizacija peizaža u Andreja Belogo", Novyi žurnal, 189, 1992, pp. 212-26
Kahn, A.


Kling, O.

“‘Peterburg’: Odin roman ili dva? (Transformacija poetiki ‘Peterburga’ Andreja Belogo v xode raboty nad redakcijami romana)”, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 6, pp. 45-71

Lavrov, A


Loks, K.


Malinin, N


Mazaev, A.I.

“Ideja ‘misterii’ v estetike Andreja Belogo i sintez iskusstv”, in his Problema sinteza iskusstv v estetike russkogo simvolizma, Rossijskaja Akademija nauk, Moscow, Nauka,

Mironova, M.

“Andrej Belyj - memuarist”, Australian Slavonic and East European Studies, 7, 1993, 1, pp. 1-17

Obatnin, G.V.

“Neopublikovannye materialy Vjačeslava Ivanova. Po povodu polemiki o ‘mističeskom anarxizme’", Lica, Biografičeskiy al’manax, 3, comp. and ed. A.V. Lavrov, Moscow and St Petersburg, Feniks, Atheneum, 1993, pp. 466-77 [for Belyj see 471-76]

Petrovskaja N. I.

“Iz perepiski N.I. Petrovskoj”, publ. R.L. Ščerbakov and E.A. Murav’eva, Minuvšee, 14, 1993, pp. 367-96 [letters, mainly to Xodasevič. Many references to Belyj]

Poljakova, S.V.

“Dva etiuda o tvorchestve A. Belogo”. Blokovskij sbornik, 12, Tartuskij universitet. Kafedra russkoi literatury, Tartu, 1993, pp. 110-23

Postoutenko, K. lu


Pustygina, N.G.

“Tragedija tvorčestva’ (A. Blok i roman A. Belogo ‘Serebrjanyj golub’)”, Blokovskij
Rizzi, D.

"Misterija Andreja Belogo 'Antixrist'," Russian Literature, 34, 1993, 4, pp. 487-517

Šabašnikova, M.V.

See Vološina M.

*Sapov, V.V.

"Žurnal 'Logos' - prervannyj na poluslove dialog", Vestnik Rossijskoj Akademii nauk, 63, 1993, 3 [this publication has not been seen, but apparently it includes letters from Stepun to B.]

Sul'pjakov, G.

"Serebrjanaja počta, ili Pis'ma bez otveta", Ėzenedel'naja gazeta 'Spasenie', no. 38 (98), November 1993, p. 5

Smola, O.P.

"Černyj večer, Belyj sneg..." Tvorčeskaja istorija i sud'ba poemy Aleksandra Bloka "Dvenadsat", Moscow, Nasledie, 1993 [on Belyj's reaction to the poem, see pp. 155-59]

Stepun, F.

"Pamjati Andreja Belogo" [1962], Vospominanija o serebrjanom veke, introd. and notes V. Kreid, Moscow, Republika, 1993, pp. 191-202, 500-02
Szilárd, L.

“Roman Andreja Belogo među masonstvom i rocenkreicerstvom”, Rossija, Russia, 7, 1991, pp. 75-84

Tarasevič, I.

“Andrej Belyj v Moskve i Peterburge”, Kontinent, 76, 1993, pp. 322-26

Toporov, V.N.

“Kust’ i ‘Serebrjanij golub’ Andreja Belogo: k svjazi tekstov i o predpolagaemoj ‘vneliteraturnoj’ osnove ix”, Blokovskij sbornik, 12, Tartuskij universitet. Kafedra russkoj literatury, Tartu, 1993, pp. 91-109
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*****

Maria Carlson (University of Kansas) writes that she is continuing work on her book about Belyj’s unfinished trilogy. She hopes to show how (and where) the novels are related and to speculate on the possible content of the unwritten third volume.

*****

Rolf Hellebust (University of Calgary) is currently at work on Belyj in the context of European modernism.

*****

The current project of Vladimir Alexandrov (Yale University) is a study of Hermenutics and Tolstoy.

*****

Marina Ledkovsky is working on emigre writers (Zaicev, Šmelev, Teffi).

*****

Cyndie Berthezene (University of Pennsylvania) writes that her topic of research is Belyj and Bulgakov: musical affinities.

*****

Milica Banjanin (Washington University, St Louis) is researching commedia dell’arte in early twentieth-century Russian literature.

*****

Peter Christensen (Dep’t of English, Marquette University) is working on The Silver Dove and the nature of sacrifice.

*****

John Malmstad (Harvard University) writes to inform that he and Alexander Lavrov plan to finish their complete edition of the correspondence between Belyj and Ivanov-Razumnik in 1994. If the gods of Russian publishing smile, we will see this published
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in 1995, following which Professor Malmstad will turn his attention to other biographical documents.

*****

Amy Mandelker (CUNY) is writing a book provisionally entitled *Icons of Theory and Theories of Iconicity in Russian and Western Aesthetics*, the first chapter of which will include material on Belyj and is to be called “Invitation to the Dance: Belyj, Mallarmé and Yeats.”

*****

Gerald Janeček (University of Kentucky) is at work on a book about *zaum*, and is also editing a collection of articles on East European Dadaism.

*****

Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal (Fordham University) has two projects currently underway. One involves continued work on Nietzsche and Soviet culture, the other is on the occult in modern Russian and Soviet culture.

*****

Stephen Hutchings (University of Rochester) has completed a first draft of his book provisionally entitled *Icons of the Ordinary: Everyday Life and the Semiotics of Anti-Plot in Silver-Age Russian Fiction*.

*****