

Notes on the Hungarian Translation of *Peterburg*

In 1985, over seventy years after its first appearance, Andrej Belyj's *Peterburg* was published in Hungarian translation by the "Európa" publishing house in Budapest. The translator, Imre Makai, is to be congratulated for the ambitious undertaking. His name is well-known to any Hungarian reader of the Russian classics, as he has produced dozens of enjoyable renderings of mainly nineteenth-century Russian prose works. *Peterburg* is not the first novel by Andrej Belyj to appear in Hungarian; *Serebrjanyj golub'* was translated as early as in 1926 and *Kotik Letaeu* came out in Makai's translation in 1970.

The Hungarian title of Belyj's major novel is *Pétervár*: it was long awaited by the small circle of Belyj enthusiasts in Hungary. It is to be hoped that the novel will reach an audience which -- not reading Russian -- has up to now been unable to appreciate it. The publishing house was apparently not very optimistic about the marketability of the novel, however, since only four thousand copies were printed. This figure is very small: the average circulation of twentieth-century foreign classics in translation in Hungary is between twenty-five thousand and forty thousand. One wonders why the publishers should have so little faith in Belyj's masterpiece.

While this reader could not come up with a better translation than Makai's, he must confess to less than complete satisfaction with the Hungarian version of Belyj's novel. After reading the original and the Maguire and Malmstad translation on a number of occasions, the Hungarian reading proved less easy than either.

Experimental prose is always difficult --- nay impossible --- to translate. *Peterburg* is particularly so.¹ Instead of offering a mimetic image of a city, this novel traces inner visions, various, hierarchically valorized levels of consciousness --- all of this signified in a heavily symbol-laden, rhythmic prose. Drawing upon the traditions of the "ornamental" style, the text is filled with wordplay and unconventional grammatical forms. All this is not done gratuitously, of course: Belyj, in the best traditions of modernism, makes sense of the world by challenging several hackneyed linguistic and narrative conventions which generate a trite and good-for-nothing rationalism.

The novel's Hungarian translator faces a more difficult task than his English, French or German counterparts. Literary translation is a two-way process and its success, to a considerable extent, depends on the condition of the receiving culture. Hungarian literature has a four-hundred year old tradition of fine lyric and epic poetry, but its argumentative prose, let alone the novel, is historically underdeveloped. Makai thus had to create an experimental discourse for the novel without being able to rely on such a tradition in Hungarian.² Such an undertaking, however heroic, is bound to result in a text which sounds unnatural and does not read fluently. Further difficulties arise, since Hungarian --- a Finno-Ugoric language --- is phonologically, morphologically and syntactically, fully unrelated to Russian.

Makai's frequent use of the passive voice, which is stylistically cumbersome in Hungarian, does less than render with ease some of Belyj's linguistic idiosyncracies. Whenever possible, the translator tries

to find equivalents to puns and, if that did not work, he tries to compensate elsewhere in the text where Hungarian offered a good opportunity. He utilizes maximally the potential for alliteration which comes with natural ease in Hungarian.

The text of the novel is followed by the translator's afterword and the notes of György Bakcsi. Both of them blame Belyj for their own difficulties in translating and annotating the novel. Makai keeps complaining about the lack of "logic" in the original and, in particular, in the 1922 version which he translated. Belyj, of course, refuses to follow the conventions of either classic or socialist realism and, therefore, no central consciousness relates his plot to the regulations of "common-sensical" logic. In his attempt to overcome "logical" problems in the Hungarian version, Makai makes some blunders. He is quite wrong translating "kariatida" into the Hungarian "atlasz." His reasoning, "whoever, in Hungarian, has seen a bearded caryatid," speaks embarrassingly for itself. Bakcsi is similarly mistaken in suggesting that Belyj was "inaccurate" or that maybe the printer erred when, at the beginning of chapter four, an Irelli statue appears in the Summer garden; perhaps, Belyj thought of Rastrelli's equestrian statue, Bakcsi advises.³ These comments suggest that neither the translator nor the annotator understood the novel sufficiently and that they did not familiarize themselves with the current state of research on Belyj.

Makai and Bakcsi assume that Belyj makes fun of his characters -- hence the "impossible" names of Ableuxov, Lippančenko, Šišnarfnè.⁴ The relationship between author and text is much more complex, however: the discourse of the novel is intertextual and in its multi-voiced system the conscious authorial

dialogue with anthroposophy, Nietzschean and Symbolist views of the world is distinctly heard. These aspects are all but ignored in Bakcsi's commentary. While the notes are of little use to the scholar, they do provide some assistance to the reader who is not familiar with early twentieth-century Russian matters. It is hard to understand why the translator and the commentator failed to consult Lena Szilard of L. Eötvös University -- a senior and authoritative Belyj scholar with an encyclopedic knowledge of Russian modernism.

The novel contains Gyula Feledy's Cubist drawings which are not only impressive, but also in keeping with the essential spirit of Andrej Belyj's work.

Notes

¹For a detailed discussion on the difficulties of translating Belyj, see J.D. Elsworth, "Bely in English," *Irish Slavonic Studies*, 2, 1981, pp. 74-78.

²See Endre Török, "Pétervári apokalipszis," *Nagyvilág*, 21, 1986, pp. 1863-1869.

³A. Belyj, *Pétervár* (Budapest: Akadémiai Könyvkiadó, 1985), p. 483.

⁴Ibid, p. 468

Peter I. Barta
Texas Tech University

John Malmstad, ed. *Andrey Bely: Spirit of Symbolism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987. 375 pp., \$45.00 (cloth), \$17.95 (paper).

As its title suggests, *Andrey Bely: Spirit of Symbolism* is designed to pay tribute to the man and writer who aimed to suffuse the literature of his nation with a personal vision of its humanity. The book is comprised of a set of papers by a group of scholars who, at the invitation of John E. Malmstad and the Harriman Institute of Columbia University, gathered together in 1984 to mark the fiftieth anniversary of Bely's death. They made their mark by reviewing one another's efforts to make more widely known the meaning of Bely's work for Russia's literary life, and their findings are recorded here. As Malmstad notes in his prefatory comments, "Each essay was submitted well in advance, read by all the participants, and then subjected to intensive commentary and discussion over a five-day period. I decided not to invite highly specialized papers on a variety of narrow topics," he goes on, "in favor of long essays surveying Bely's major works" (11).

Happily enough, the volume succeeds to a considerable degree in all of its set tasks. While its ten constituent essays are not quite so uniform as to warrant Malmstad's calling the selections "a kind of monograph" (11), the volume does present in mosaic fashion (a form more congenial to Belyj anyway) the present state of art of that activity which this Society affectionately terms *Belovedenie*.

Six of the book's ten essays are devoted to Belyj's belletristic prose, and their chronological arrangement reflects the trajectory of this career from symphonies

and fictional narratives to autobiographical novels and memoirs. A second tracing of Belyj's path in poetry and verse theory opens out onto a wider view of the writer as esthetician and philosopher "of meaning" (333). This view closes with a personal reminiscence by Dmitrij Maksimov, whose testimony to the ineffability of Belyj's spirit befits the solemnity of the occasion and the enterprise which called this volume forth.

While the familiarity of chronologies and generic distinctions is comforting, other, more stimulating kinds of order do emerge. These features, while perhaps less planned, are the ones that speak to the real value of the book. For they reveal that a convocation of the keenest *Belovedy* has found that after many years of careful study, its subject matter continues to offer new challenges.

Perhaps the most far-reaching order of collective questioning is the one that surfaces quietly from Lazar Fleishman's essay on Belyj's memoirs. Although his stated intent is to "describe in general terms the changing historico-literary context that prompted Belyj to set down his memoirs and determined the political orientation they took at a given time," (217-18) Fleishman's richly detailed portrait of the writer attempting to negotiate the rapidly changing tides of his time leads us to wonder whether the very "persistence" of memory was for Belyj the spiritual wellspring of his own unchanging identity.

Some persuasively affirmative answers arise from an essay by Vladimir E. Alexandrov, who examines "the visual... apprehension of the past through memory" (155) in the 'middle' novels, *Kotik Letaeu*, *The*

Baptized Chinaman and Notes of an Eccentric. In *Kotik Letaeu*, Alexandrov uncovers a dynamic of memory pursuing metamemory as a vision guest. He describes how language comes to serve not as index to the present but as immanent experience of the past (165). John Elsworth would seem to second, in other terms, Alexandrov's view of language's immanence when he finds in Belyj's later novels the circumvention of conventional semantics via the rhythmic coloring of speech. By resourcefully applying to his prose the principles Belyj elaborated for the analysis of meter in poetry, Elsworth discovers that artistic language for Belyj is indeed "communicating to others the deepest subjective experience" (200).

Interestingly enough, Elsworth finds that some forms of this communication have "crept in accidentally from another genre, the memoirs" (204). Thus while we admire the breadth of knowledge with which Elsworth demonstrates how these novels place into highly fictionalized circumstances that which is traceable to Belyj's own inner experience, we might also wonder once again how deeply the roots of Belyj's memory and spirit intertwine.

Elsworth moves us toward an answer to this question when he unearths the connections between sounds and Belyj's vision in the workings of "natural synesthesia" (212). Roger Keys traces the theoretical grounding of this principle to Belyj's essay, "The Forms of Art," which elaborates Belyj's careful response to the challenge he perceived in Schopenhauer's implied insistence that sound and picture are not fused in the word. Keys's central concern is with Belyj's Symphonies and with the liaison they aim to effect between the worlds of matter and

spirit, and between the goals of art and therapy. He finds in the four Symphonies varying and very small degrees of success in making these connections. Keys measures the degree inversely by the disturbing presence of that narrative irony which arises when the musical immediacy of a spiritual mystery is forestalled by the narrative distance required to envision its meaning. In Keys's skillful diagnosis of the Symphonies' shortcomings lurks the suggestion that had Belyj attempted to remember rather than foresee, his Symphonies would have risen to Schopenhauer's challenge.

Keys does note that while the Symphonies for the most part fall short of their visionary aims, *Petersburg* places these aims on a new esthetic basis and raises them to unexpected heights. Robert A. Maguire together with Malmstad surveys that fictional skyline in a hermeneutic reading of *Petersburg* generated from two other prose pieces Belyj wrote while he was at work on the novel. These are the theoretical essay, "The Line, the Circle, and the Spiral --- of Symbolism" and the quasi-fictional "lyrical musings" (101) entitled "Circular Movement."

With the elegance we have come to expect from these scholars, Maguire and Malmstad enlarge once more upon the mounting riches of *Petersburg's* many meanings. In bringing this new material to bear, they are particularly interested in the novel's Nietzschean sympathies and antipathies; they bring these carefully to the surface without disturbing the novel's other foundations. Maguire and Malmstad themselves insist that the relationship between the many genres in which Belyj expresses the same ideas should not be considered prescriptive. Yet the works with which

they surround *Petersburg* give it some center and balance, and thus this treatment could provide an approach for 'teaching' the novel.

More importantly, however, this piece by Maguire and Malmstad sounds another question which echoes through the *Spirit of Symbolism*: from our present vantage, do we consider Belyj to be as inconsistent in his aims and ideas, especially those expounded in his theoretical prose, as many of his contemporaries did? Or are we convinced that the painful striving for ideological unity which typifies his early works continued to direct him throughout his creative life? Maria Carlson seems to suggest the latter when she "subordinates Belyj the theorist to Belyj the poet-critic" (62) in her ambitious exegesis of *The Silver Dove*. Her points of reference are "three fundamental concepts that Belyj developed and refined between 1903 and 1909 and emphasized in the theoretical articles of *Symbolism* and *Arabesques*" (62). Carlson delineates the meanings of *žiznetvorčestvo* (creation of life), *theurgy*, and *pereživanie* (which she takes to mean mystical experience), describing the stylistic techniques by which they are manifested in the novel. While Carlson steers a clear course through the bewildering cross-currents of popular mystical tradition, her emphasis on those narrative strategies which challenge the conventions of literary realism point toward a more extended interpretation of Belyj as moving deliberately toward a single, prescribed aim.

Both Carlson and Steve Cassedy seem to place high stakes on Belyj's fidelity to an organic conception of art as finding all meaning in the mysteries of human creativity. Cassedy contributes two essays on

the subject; one deals specifically with Belyj's theory of Symbolism while the other more generally assesses Belyj as "Thinker." These essays are designed, Cassedy tells us, to further the argument made by Belyj himself (in "Why I Became a Symbolist...") for the "formal constancy" of his "idea and logic of Symbolism" (287).

The fervor with which Cassedy portrays Belyj's intellectual integrity and singularity is moving, and it makes Cassedy, as G. S. Smith points out in another context in this volume, something of a pioneer (283). Coming from Smith this is high praise, for he seems personally affronted that the scholarly community has expended so little of its effort in isolating Belyj's talents as a verse theorist, and more importantly, as a poet-practitioner. Smith offers a number of complex explanations for this oversight, but, in the context of this book the most cogent of these is the mistaking of the verse theory as prescriptive of the practice. For according to Smith, the theory speaks only to a limited portion of the total range of Belyj's verse skills.

Smith is clearly intrigued when he finds in Belyj "a mind more complex than is normally found in a poet, especially a Russian poet" (246). In his breathless and incisive survey of the poetry's most compelling features he communicates a genuine excitement. One can't help but wonder what the response to Smith's peremptory call for more of this kind of analysis will be. One can't help but hope that others like Smith will soon lengthen with a luminescent appreciation of Belyj's poetry the string of pearls that adorns the beauty of his art.

As I attempt further to imagine the impact this volume will have on *Belovednie*, I am drawn to ponder the relationship of the name, *Spirit of Symbolism*, to the "Captive Spirit" that entitles Marina Cvetaeva's poignant reminiscence of Andrej Belyj. Could it be that the ten authors of *Spirit* are joined by an unspoken intention to set Belyj free of conventional ways of defining a writer's "place" in literary history? Could the real substance of the "agreement to disagree," by which Malmstad coyly describes the spirit of their meeting (12), in fact be a sober admission that to capture successfully the spirit of Andrej Belyj would mean no longer to be captivated by it? The volume's greatest strength might then lie in the willingness of its authors to refrain from passing the final word. For in delimiting their ambitions rather than their object, they testify to the 'Spirit's' enduring viability.

Charlene Castellano
University of Pittsburgh

Andrej Biely *The Dramatic Symphony*. Translated by Roger and Angela Keys, and *The Forms of Art*. Translated by John Elsworth. New York: Grove Press, 1986. \$16.95.

In his review of Andrej Belyj's *Second Symphony*, *the Dramatic* (1902), Aleksandr Blok characterizes Belyj's text by quoting from Vladimir Solov'ev's poem, "Les Revenants:" "Čto—to v slovo prositsja, čto—to nedoskazano, čto—to sovershaetsja, no—ni zdes', ni tam." In this way Blok transmits the sense of nuance and mystery, the ambiguity, and the impenetrability that are distinctive features of the symbolist text. In attempting a translation of Belyj's *Dramatic Symphony* into English, Roger and Angela Keys have tackled a difficult task indeed. The Keys chose *The Dramatic Symphony* over Belyj's other symphonies "since it embodied better than any of them the themes which would engage his attention over the next few years and the literary strategies he would develop to express them" (5).

Given that it is impossible to translate the Russian language's inflected flexibility and potentially high degree of musicality and rhythm into the more severe English idiom, the Keys have succeeded uncommonly well in their translation of *The Dramatic Symphony*. Belyj's text forces the translator to make difficult choices: should Belyj's rhythmic qualities be emphasized at the expense of his sound structure? Is it more important to retain the text's formal structural features or to preserve the vividness and accuracy of its imagery? And how does one transmit Belyj's puns and neologisms without sounding silly in English? The Keys have made their choices wisely and succeeded in producing a translation that reads

like Belyj in English, without the stiffness from which most translations suffer.

The major contributions of the Keys translation are twofold. First, *The Dramatic Symphony* serves those who have long wished for a decent translation of a Belyj symphony to use in Russian Literature in Translation courses as an example of early symbolist prose and a counterpoint to the later *Petersburg* or *Kotik Letaeu*. Second, *The Dramatic Symphony* provides access to an early, experimental Belyj work for readers who have no Russian. It should be of particular interest to those Comparative Literature and Modernism specialists who discovered Belyj for the first time in Maguire and Malmstad's translation of *Petersburg* or Janecek's of *Kotik Letaeu* and are still wondering how Belyj got that way.

A detailed and useful introduction by Roger Keys, placing *The Dramatic Symphony* in both general and specific contexts, precedes the translation. Thirty notes accompany the text; they are sufficient to illuminate esoteric references that add meaning to the symphony, but not so excessive that they intrude upon the reader's experience of Belyj's unusual text. The Keys translation of *The Dramatic Symphony* is further enhanced by the inclusion of Belyj's earliest programmatic article, "The Forms of Art," translated by John Elsworth. The article itself and John Elsworth's brief introduction reveal the organic relation between Belyj's art and his theory. This "novel, with an essay" can only expand the reader's appreciation of Belyj's early work.

Maria Carlson
University of Kansas

Belyj, Andrej. *Gibel' Senatora (Peterburg)*. *Istoriches-kaja drama*. Edited with an Introduction and an Afterword by John E. Malmstad. Modern Russian Literature and Culture, Studies and Texts, Vol. 12 (Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 1986). 240pp.

Only two instances exist where Symbolist writers attempted to dramatize their novels: Sologub with *The Petty Demon* and Belyj with *Petersburg*; yet until this date, neither has been published in large quantities. This publication of Belyj's dramatization of *Petersburg* is a valuable addition to both Russian Symbolist and Belyj scholarship. This work is rendered even more valuable by an introduction and afterword by Professor John E. Malmstad, who discusses the manuscript from which this text was taken. He also presents the history of the novel's dramatization for Mixail Čexov of the Moscow Art Theater's First and then Second Studios in 1925, and highlights some changes which Belyj made in converting his novel into a drama.

As Malmstad indicates, this text of some 188 pages, divided into ten "pictures" (*kartiny*), is much too long to be staged -- except in some exceptional kind of theater. Indeed, Čexov's production, which premiered on November 14, 1925, adapted only some of the scenes from Belyj's dramatic text. In general, this is not a "great" play (few dramatizations are), but, as the Afterword concludes, it provides us yet another perspective to appreciate the original novel.

Of course, one can anticipate extreme difficulties, even at first glance, in bringing this particular novel to the stage. *Petersburg* is written for the enjoyment of reading. It is highly intellectual; one reads it to encounter Belyj much more so than to identify with

any of the characters. Most people would agree that the joy of the novel lies in the various games played with the narrative and not so much in the dialogue of the characters. Unfortunately, the devices of the drama have requirements quite different from those of the novel. For one, drama cannot handle narrative very well and Belyj, knowing this, found himself converting narrative into dialogue. In addition, Belyj also found it necessary to create some sort of catharsis, and to do this, had to "humanize" a few of his characters, characters whose strong points in the novel were precisely their non-human, perhaps ghost-like, qualities. The difficulty with Belyj's dramatization lies in the fact that he did not completely want to let go of these rather striking features of his novel in the play; while one can detect an attempt by Belyj to use the devices of the drama, *Gibel' Senatora* remains hanging somewhere in limbo, half way between a play and a novel, leaving us a compendium of old images superimposed on an occasional dramatic device, here and there.

Before we are too hard on Belyj, we should be reminded that, for the most part, persons who go to see a dramatization of a novel are fairly well acquainted with the original work; even if they have not read it, they have a general idea about its contents. Thus, *Gibel' Senatora* can take short cuts, which a drama written from scratch cannot. In 1925, Belyj's spectators were probably those who were already familiar with the novel and who were interested in how already familiar scenes would be treated on the stage. Likewise, most persons reading the play today will be making the same comparisons. Thus, what might appear clumsy at first glance, really is not. If theater is ritual, the way Belyj had stated

many times it was, then here the ritual would be to recall the original work together with the director and the actors during the act of performance.

Since *Petersburg* is considered the supreme "Symbolist" novel, it would be interesting to see how *Gibel' Senatora* is likewise "symbolistic." It should be noted that not all Symbolist drama was necessarily non-realistic. Belyj among many of the other Symbolists entertained the notion that Symbolist drama may also be realistic on the surface, hiding symbolism within realism, in the manner of Ibsen's plays. For the most part this is the case with *Gibel' Senatora*, but Belyj also includes several scenes with non-realistic elements, such as dreams. Malmstad identifies the masquerade scene as being particularly effective.

In the final analysis there is much in this work for anyone interested in Russian Symbolism, and indeed, the history of Russian literature. For some it will provide insights into Belyj's literary activities of the 1920's, to others it will provide information on the history of Russian drama. The publication of *Gibel' Senatora* is a landmark occasion in the history of Belyj studies. Professor Malmstad, the Harriman Institute, Berkeley Slavic Specialties and all concerned are to be commended for providing this contribution to knowledge.

George Kalbous
The Ohio State University

Andrej Belyj: A Bibliography 1987-1988

Compiled by Julian Graffy

(N.B. Some materials from before 1987 have only recently come to my notice and are included here. Some materials from 1987 were included in last year's bibliography.)

I. Primary Material: Recent Publications and Reprints

"Derviš," *Knižnoe obozrenie*, 10, 1988, supplementary pp. 204-207.

"Lik golubinin" (extract from *Serebrjanyj golub*), *Nauka i religija*, 6, 1988, pp. 58-60.

"Material k biografii (intimnyj)" (beginning of publication), in "Andrej Belyj i Antroposofija," *Minuščee*, 6, 1988, pp. 337-448 (text, pp. 344-415, introduction by John Malmstad, pp. 337-343).

"Predislovie Andreja Belogo k romanu *Kotik Letaeu*," publ. A.V. Lavrov, *Russkaja literatura*, 1, 1988, pp. 217-220.

"Reč' Andreja Belogo pamjati Bloka (1921 g.)," publ. S.S. Grečiškin and A.V. Lavrov, in *Aleksandr Blok. Nove materialy i issledovanija, Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 92, book 4, Moscow, 1987, pp. 759-773.

Seven poems in *Poetičeskie tetenija v russkoj literature konca XIX-načala XX veka* (Moscow: Vysšaja škola, 1988), pp. 187-193.

Several "pictorial souvenirs" in *Risunki russkiz pisatelej XVII-načala XX veka* (Moscow: Sovetskaja Rossija, 1988), pp. 207-213.

II. Translations

"The Jaws of Night," in *Doubles, Demons and Dreamers. An International Collection of Symbolist Drama*, ed. and intro. Daniel Gerould (New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1985), pp. 169-180.

"Wie schön es in Berlin ist," in *Russen in Berlin. Literatur. Malerei. Theater. Film 1918-1938*, ed. &

trans. Fritz Mierau (Leipzig: Verlag Philipp Reclam jun., 1987), pp. 56-68 (from *Odna iz obitelej carstva tenej*; collection also includes a German translation of Cvetaeva's "Plennyj dux").

III. Letters

Five letters to P.N. Medvedev of 1928-1930, in *Vzgljad. Kritika. Polemika. Publikacii* (Moscow: Sovetskij pisatel', 1988), pp. 430-444.

Letter to Zinaida Gippius of 1907, *Minuščee*, 5, 1988, pp. 205-221.

Letter to Fedor Gladkov of 1933, *Naše nasledie*, 1, 1988, pp. 92-94.

Correspondence of Belyj and the Georgian *Golubye rogi* poets, in "Andrej Belyj i poëty gruppy 'Golubye rogi,'" *Voprosy literatury*, 4, 1988, pp. 276-282.

Letter to Remizov of 1922 in "Andrej Belyj i Aleksej Remizov. Neopublikovannye materialy" biblioteki Fedora Liba', Basel," publ. F.F. Ingold, *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach*, 20, 1987, pp. 169-185.

Letters to Belyj's mother of 1906–1907 and 1911–1912, publ. S.D. Voronin, *Pamjatniki kul'tury. Novye otkrytija 1986* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1987), pp. 64–76.

Letters to Belyj's mother, È.K. Metner, A.S. Petrovskij and A.M. Kožebatkin, in "Putešestvie na Vostok. Pis'ma Andreja Belogo," publ. N.V. Kotrelev, *Vostok–Zapad. Issledovanija. Perevody. Publikacii* (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), pp. 143–177.

Correspondence with M.K. Morozova in "Andrej Belyj i Antroposofija," *Minuščee*, 6, 1988, pp. 415–440.

Letters of 1927–1933, publ. T.V. Ančugova, *Perspektiva–87*, Moscow, 1988, pp. 486–507.

Three letters from Marietta Šaginjan of Dec. 1908–Jan. 1909, *Sovetskaja kul'tura*, 1 January 1988, p. 5.

IV. Secondary Sources

Alexandrov, V.E.

"Andrej Belyj and the Problem of the Symbolist Novel," in *Pro et Contra*, pp. 9–16 (see details below).

"Andrej Belyj i Antroposofija," *Minuščee*, 6, 1988, pp. 337–448. (This consists of intro. by John Malmstad, pp. 337–343; "Materialy k biografii (intimnyj)," (part 1), pp. 344–415; Correspondence with M.K. Morozova, intro. J. Malmstad, pp. 415–440; and register of names, pp. 440–448).

Andrej Belyj. Pro Et Contra. Atti del I Simposio

Internazionale Andrej Belyj, a cura della Sezione di Slavistica dell'Istituto Universitario di Bergamo (Milan: Edizioni Unicopoli, 1986), Testi e studi, 52, 273 pp. (this contains 26 articles, listed individually; henceforth abbreviated as *Pro et Contra*).

Biernat, E.

"Problem odbiorcy w powieściach A. Bielogo: *Srebrny gajg* i *Petersburg*," *Zeszyty Naukowe Wydziału Humanistycznego, Filologia Rosyjska*, Gdańsk, 13, 1984, pp. 7–16.

Bulič, V.

"'Četvertoe izmerenie'. (Pamjati Andreja Belogo)," *Russkaja mysl'*, 3730, 1988, *Literaturnoe priloženie*, 6, p. X.

Burkhart, D.

"Mythoide Verfahren der Welt-Geherierung in Andrej Belyjs *Peterburg*," in *Mythos in der Slavischen Moderne, Wiener Slavistischer Almanach, Sonderband*, 20, 1987, pp. 169–192.

Casari, R.

"Personaž u rannego Belogo: Xandrikov iz 'tretej Simfonii,'" *Pro et Contra*, pp. 17–22.

Cassedy, S.

"Belyj, zaum', and the Spirit of Objectivism in Modern Russian Philosophy of Language," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 23–30.

Catteau, J.

"Du grotesque dans le *Petersbourg* d'Andrej Belyj (Structure et fonctions)," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 31–38.

- Cazzola, P. & Laura Ferrari
"Le 'Gogol'" de A. Belyj: une originale
interpretation," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 39-44.
- De Michelis, C.
"Putešestvie po Italii Andreja Belogo," *Pro et
Contra*, pp. 53-60.
- Deppermann, M.
"Belyj and Dilthey: Preliminary Notes on an
Unknown Relationship," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 61-74.
- Dolgopolov, L.
"Andrej Belyj i ego roman "Peterburg" (Leningrad:
Sovetskij pisatel', 1988), 416 pp.
- "Simfonija 'Vozvrat' kak etap v esteticeskom i
filosofskom razvitii A. Belogo," in *Issledovanija po
drevnej i novoj literature*, resp. ed. L.A. Dmitriev
et al. (Leningrad: Nauka, 1987), pp. 68-72.
- Ejxenbaum, B.
"Moskva Andreja Belogo (M., 1926)," in his *O
Literature. Raboty raznyx let* (Moscow: Sovetskij
pisatel', 1987), pp. 424-426, 518-521 (first pub.
1926).
- Fedjusin, V.B.
"Andrej Belyj-Porträt eines Symbolisten und
Anthroposophen," in his *Russlands Sehnsucht nach
Spiritualität. Theosophie, Anthroposophie, Rudolf
Steiner und die Russen* (Leck: Novalis Verlag, 1988),
pp. 222-256.
- Fialkova, L.L.
"Xudožestvennoe prostranstvo i vremja v romane A.

- Belogo Peterburg," in *Tvorčestvo pisatelja i
literaturnyj process* (Ivanovo: Ivanovo U.P.,
1987), pp. 135-142.
- Flaker, A.
"Pobeda šuta nad teurgom ("Nad gorax" i
"Ananas" Andreja Belogo)," *Pro et Contra*,
pp. 87-98.
- Gagen Torn, N.
"Andreju Belomu" (poem), *Znamja*, 3, 1988, p. 184.
- Geršenzon, M.O.
"Pis'ma k L'vu Šestovu," publ. A. d'Amelia and V.
Alloi, *Minuščee*, 6, 1988, pp. 237-312 (on Belyj, see
esp. pp. 247-253, 260-263, 272-274, 286-288,
299-301, 310-312).
- Hughes, R.
"Belyj i Xodasevič: k istorii otnošenij," *Vestnik
russkogo xristianskogo dviženija*, 151, 1987, pp.
144-165.
- Jovanovič, M.
"Dialektika dobra i zla v moskovskoj dilogii A.
Belogo," *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach*, 20,
1987, pp. 41-88.
- Jur'eva, Z.
"Kosmičeskaja tema v rannem tvorčestve Andreja
Belogo," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 99-114.
- Jurkina, L.A.
"Problematika romana A. Belogo Peterburg,"
*Naučnye doklady vysšej školy. Filologičeskie
nauki*, 4, 1988, pp. 16-21.

Koschmal, W.

"Zur mythischen Modellierung von Raum und Zeit bei Andrej Belyj und Bruno Schulz," in *Mythos in der Slawischen Moderne, Wiener Slavistischer Almanach, Sonderband, 20*, 1987, pp. 193–214.

Kozlik, F.

"André Belyj: Vers une définition fondamentale du symbolisme littéraire," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 121–138.

Krjukova, A.M.

"M. Gor'kij i Andrej Belyj," in her *Tvorčeskoe vzaimodejstvie. Stat'i o sovet'skoj literature* (Moscow: Sovremennik, 1988), pp. 73–98.

Ljunggren, M.

"The Patricide in Petersburg," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 115–120.

Malcovati, F.

"Andrej Belyj e il teatro," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 139–144.

Nag, M.

"Andrej Bjelyj i Norge," in his *Kulturformidlere mellom Russland og Norge: Noen nye navn, Meddelelser*, 52, Oslo, 1987, pp. 2–15 and 43–45.

Nicolescu, T.

"Ob odnom prieme prostranstvennogo videnija v romane *Moskva*," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 145–152.

Nivat, G.

"Belyj et le visible," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 153–162.

"Andrej Biély," in *Histoire de la littérature russe. Le XX^e siècle – L'Age d'argent*, ed. E. Etkind et al. (Paris: Fayard, 1987), pp. 111–130.

Peterson, R.E.

"Andrej Belyj and Norway," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 163–172.

Piskunov, V.

"O nekotoryx formax dviženija v Peterburge A. Belogo," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 173–180.

Potthoff, W.

"Zu Andrej Belyjs *Putevye zametki. I. Sicilija i Tunis*," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 181–190.

Robakidze, G.

"Andrej Belyj," *Literaturnaja Gruzija*, 2, 1988, pp. 133–146.

Roganova, Z.

"Trudnosti perevoda na ital'janskij jazyk romana Andreja Belogo *Peterburg*," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 191–200.

Siclari, A.D.

"Neokantizm v myšlenii Belogo," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 75–86.

Skaza, A.

"Andrej Belyj i teorija groteska v XX veke (K postanovke problemy)," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 201–206.

Smirnov, I.

"Tvorčestvo Andreja Belogo v vosprijatiji Pasternaka," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 207–219.

Štejnberg, A.

"Vremja i prostranstvo v romane Belogo Moskva," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 237–246.

Szilard, L.

"Meždu Bogom i grammatikoj (ešče o *Peterburge*)," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 221–236.

Tamarčenko, A.

"Andrej Belyj i Marina Cvetaeva (Zaroždenie intonacionnoj teorii stixotvornogo ritma," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 247–262.

Ternovskij, E.

Vesikolepnaja neudača. Essai sur l'histoire du poème russe de la fin du XXè et du début du XXè siècle (Paris: Aux Amateurs de livres, 1987), pp. 181–215.

Verč, I.

"Nekotorye istoričesko-teoretičeskie voprosy ritmičeskoj prozy (Razrušenje normy ili estestvennost' literaturnoj èvoljucii?)," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 265–273.

Waszink, P.M.

"The Example of Belyj's *St. Petersburg*," in his *Such Things Happen in the World: Deizis in Three Short Stories by N.V. Gogol*, Studies in Slavic Literature and Poetics, 12 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988), pp. 260–265.

Weber, R.W.

"On Modernist Syntax," *Essays in Poetics*, 13, 1988, 1, pp. 47–62 (on *Peterburg* and *Finnegans Wake*).

Xužvaj, A.

"Nekotorye elementy sootvetstvij meždu motivnymi strukturami i sistemami simvoličeskix detalej v *Peterburge* Andreja Belogo i *Inyz zvukaz, inyz komnataz* Trumèna Kapotè," *Pro et Contra*, pp. 45–52.

Žemčužnikova, M.N.

"Vospominanija o moskovskom antroposofskom obščestve (1917–1923)," publ. J. Malmstad, *Minuščee*, 6, 1988, pp. 7–53.

News from the Front

Vladimir M. Piskunov of Moscow is the editor of Belyj's forthcoming *Izbrannoe v dva tomata*, which will be published in 1989 by Xudožestvennaja literatura. The first volume will include: "Stixi raznyx let," "Pervoe svidanie," "Vtoraja i tret'ja simfonii," and *Serebrjanyj golub'*. Prof. Piskunov's preface and commentaries will accompany the selected works. Volume II will consist of the 1928 edition of *Peterburg*, *Kotik Letaev* and *Moskva pod udarom* (the first part of *Moskva*).

There is yet more news from our fellow Belyj scholars in the Soviet Union. In addition to editing Belyj's Soviet trilogy of memoirs, which are anticipated in 1989, Aleksandr V. Lavrov has begun editorial work on "Rakkurs dnevniku" and "Material k biografii (intimnyj)," for *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*. The following materials may also be included: Belyj's correspondence with Ivanov-Razumnik, Ivanov and Remizov, and possibly his letters to his mother and Morozova.

Charlene Castellano of the University of Pittsburgh writes of her forthcoming article: "Andrey Bely's Memories of Fiction," *Autobiographical Statements in Twentieth Century Russian Literature*, edited by Jane G. Harris, Princeton University Press, 1989.

From Harvard University John Malmstad sends the following news: "The last issue of *Minuščee* (Paris),

No. 6, 1988, contained two relevant publications. [See Julian Graffy's bibliography]... Because of the enormous size of the piece it had to be, unfortunately, broken into two parts. The second part will appear in issue No. 8, autumn of 1989. So issue No. 6 contains the first half of Belyj's account of the years 1913-1915 from the 'Material k biografii (intimnyj)' plus a letter of Margarita Morozova to Belyj and his long reply to her on Anthroposophy. The second half of the publication will conclude the 'material' and have as appendices the following materials: 'Kasanija k teosofii,' two letters to K. P. Kristoforovoj, 'Slyšannye lekcii po teosofii v nemeckoj sekcii,' 'Svidanija s Doktorom,' 'Okkul'tnye pereživanija,' 'Raspredelenie zanjatij v ruskom antroposofičeskom obščestve v 1918-19,' 'Proekt raspisanija goda,' a letter to Boris Pavlovič Grigorov, excerpts from 'Sebe na pamjat'" listing Belyj's anthroposophical lectures and activities. It will be a good 150 pages!" Professor Malmstad also informed us that he is well along in his edition of Belyj's correspondence with Petr Zajcev. His paper on "Belyj and St. Serafim of Sarov" will be in the proceedings of the Berkeley conference held in May, 1988. And a piece entitled "Abroad: Andrej Belyj, 1921-1923," materials relating to Belyj's stay in Berlin (letters to his mother and others, an unpublished book review, etc.) will be appearing next spring in the Italian journal, *Europa Orientalis*.

Christine Tomei from Brown University writes that she is compiling a new text of *Petersburg*: "I have put the entire text of the novel (1928) onto computer disk and am in the process of entering the other major texts, 1916 and 1922, in a cross-referenced form.

This type of text is called a 'hypertext,' since it expands the form of a text by one dimension. I will then make a linear text of the three-in-one edition and from that, a concordance."

Magnus Ljunggren tells us that Vindrose has recently published the Danish version of *Petersborg* (*Petersborg*), translated by Niels Brunse.

Editor's Afterword

As many of our subscribers already know, future issues will contain information about a proposal to organize an International Symposium on Russian Symbolism. Perhaps the event could coincide with the 10th anniversary of the Belyj Society in 1992. Professors Maria Carlson and Peter Barta will join me in a discussion at the next meeting of the Belyj Society in Washington. While a symposium of this nature could take 3 years to plan, your creative ideas are most welcome now. It is our express wish to invite participants from all over the world. Although a call for papers will be announced, please do not hesitate to contact us if you are interested (Prof. Carlson teaches at the University of Kansas and Prof. Barta at Texas Tech University).

I would like to thank all concerned parties for suggesting new titles for the *Newsletter*. It seems that the present title misrepresents the expanding size and evolving nature of the annual publication. Here is a sampling of the suggestions, some of which are intended to make us chuckle: Belyj Studies Journal, The Whitebook, The Bely Bulletin, Andrej Belyj's Heritage, The Andrej Belyj Yearbook, Journal of the Andrej Belyj Society (JABS), Belyj Studies Forum, Neznakomka, Andrej Belyj Society Notes, Andrej Belyj Studies, The Andrej Belyj Society Notebook. While the title could do wonders for increasing memberships, "Beloved," I am afraid, may quickly catch the eye of Harlequin romance enthusiasts. Be prepared to cast ballots.