

University of Massachusetts Interlibrary Loan



ILLiad TN: 343516

Borrower: MDY

Lending String: *AUM,AUM,BMC,NAM,NAM

Patron: Beyer, Thomas

Journal Title: Wiener slawistischer Almanach.

Volume: 35 **Issue:**

Month/Year: 1995 **Pages:** 97-132

Article Author:

Article Title: Thomas Beyer; "Marina Cvetaeva and Andrej Belyj; Razluka and Posle Razluki."

Imprint: [Wien, A.A. Hansen-L?ove]

ILL Number: 11394893



Call #: Per PG1.W53

Location: UM/W.E.B. Du Bois 16
(1985)-52(2003)-

Charge

Maxcost: \$30IFM

Shipping Address:

Middlebury College Library - ILL
15 OLD CHAPEL RD.
Middlebury, VT 05753

Fax:

Ariel: ariel.middlebury.edu

ARIEL

8/11
ML

Thomas R. Beyer, Jr.

**MARINA CVETAEVA AND ANDREJ BELYJ:
RAZLUKA AND POSLE RAZLUKI**

I believe that on this excursion I saw
Bely for the first time in his basic
element: flight, in his native and
terrible element of empty spaces, and so
I took hold of his hand so as to delay
him longer on earth.

Next to me there sat a captive spirit.¹

There is no more tender portrait of Boris Nikolaevič Bugaev, the man, than that presented so lovingly, in such soft detail, in Marina Cvetaeva's memoir, "A Captive Spirit". Marina began her memorial for Andrej Belyj who had died on January 8, 1934 on January 16 and completed it on February 26.² Her reminiscences of their brief, yet intense, relationship of May and June 1922 were her posthumous gift to him. It was the return of a favor. Andrej Belyj's own tribute to Cvetaeva, his collection of poems *Posle razluki* (After the Separation, Berlin: 1922) had been a response in verse to her *Razluka* (Separation, Berlin: 1922). The story of their special relationship has emerged in pieces over the years as Cvetaeva's own memoirs have been supplemented by the recollections of her daughter, Ariadna Ėfron.³ Anna Saakjanc has published several documents attesting to "the poetic relationship" between the two poets and their works suggesting that it ought to be the subject of a major article or monograph.⁴ She echoes the frequent, albeit never demonstrated conclusion, that Belyj's own poetic manner was a reflection and personal reworking of Cvetaeva's poetry. Simon Karlinsky notes: "Andrej Belyj was so impressed by the slim volume, *Razluka*, that he evolved for himself a new poetic manner which, in subtle homage to Cvetaeva, he tried out in a collection entitled, *Posle Razluki* (After the Separation).⁵ Boris Christa states:

While writing it, Bely was strongly under the influence of the personality of Marina Tsvetaeva, whom he had just met. [sic] The title has a double meaning. It refers to Tsvetaeva's volume of poems "The Parting", which had made a strong impression on him, and to the parting with Asya.⁶

Before turning to an examination of that poetic encounter, it is necessary to recount the essential facts of the personal relationship, so charged with the energy of these two shining stars of Russian literature.

Belyi had come to Berlin in November of 1921 after finally receiving permission from Russian authorities to go abroad.⁷ He had been trying for years to rejoin his wife, Asja Turgeneva, and to link up with his spiritual foster father, Rudolf Steiner in Dornach Switzerland, where Belyi had previously been an active member of the anthroposophical community until his return to Russia in 1916. The death of Alexandr Blok in August of 1921 and the arrest and execution of Nikolaj Gumilev introduced new urgency into Belyi's request. Upon his arrival in Berlin, he assumed a central and active role in the life of the Russian community gathering there. He quickly helped to organize the Russian House of the Arts in Berlin and a chapter of *Vol'fla* (The Free Philosophical Association). He was a frequent lecturer and guest speaker, the editor of the newly founded journal *Erporeja*, and 1922 would be one of the most prolific publishing years of his life.⁸ All of this activity is overshadowed by eyewitness accounts of Belyi in the second half of 1922 and 1923. Konstantin Močul'ski draws heavily upon the memoirs of Chodasevič and Svetaeva for his portrait of Belyi in Berlin. While there can be no disputing Chodasevič's gloomy assessment of Belyi, later echoed by Močul'ski, one should not lose sight of the time factor. The Belyi of early 1922 and even through the end of June, when Chodasevič and Nina Berberova arrived in the city, was a markedly different man from the drunken, tragic, dancing clown recalled by Chodasevič. Even Svetaeva notes that "beyond that begins the dancing Belyi, the Belyi whom I never once saw and probably could not have seen, the myth of the dancing Belyi, about whom Chodasevich, who has spoken about him *in toto* unsurpassably well, has spoken so deedly". (CS, 154).

Belyi hoped for a quick reconciliation with Rudolf Steiner and with Asja. His first day in Berlin, November 19, 1921, coincided with Rudolf Steiner's lecture "Anthroposophie und Wissenschaft". Having just arrived, Belyi hurried off to the lecture that same evening. Steiner, however, was unprepared for Belyi's appearance at the lecture. The result was far from the expected welcome for the Prudigal Son:

В условиях моего состояния, разумеется, падали все надежды, среди вопросов, свидания, самому Штейнеру, спросившему меня: "Ну, — как дела?" — я мог лишь ответить с гримасою сокращения лицевых мускулов под принудную улыбку: "Прудности с жилищным отделом". Этим и ограничился в 1921 году пять лет легельмый и нужный мне всядчески разговор.⁹

Belyi's disappointment with Steiner was mirrored in his rejection by his wife, Asja Turgeneva.¹⁰ Asja provided the base for another triangle — Belyi — Svetaeva — Asja. Svetaeva had known her and there is a hint of jealousy in Svetaeva's recollections. (CS, 110) Belyi's letter to Asja are filled with his conviction that if only he and Asja could meet, that all of their differences could be resolved. His own notes, "Rakkurs k 'dnevniku'", indicate that the two met in Berlin in November 1921 and describe December, 1921: "Час от часу не легче; ссора с Асей:..."¹¹ In a letter of January 15, 1922 to Ivanov-Razumnik he wrote:

Сердце сжимается болью: у меня трагедия: Ася ушла от меня; Штейнер — разочаровывает... От боли стискиваю зубы; и — длю... Провалилась Ася, Штейнер, движение, — все: нелегко мне вынести эту утрату.¹²

Asja returned to Berlin in March "Приезд Аси: час от часу не легче! Отчаяние мрачней..." (*Rakkurs*, 112/2). In April she departed again for Dornach. Little is known of the actual breakup save the minimal information in the dialogues of the poems and his note, almost an afterthought to *Zapiski sidaka*, Berlin, 1922, 232:

Нашли я видел недавно: она — изменилась; худая — и бледная. Мы посиживали с ней в кафе; раза два говорили о прошлом, но мало: ей нет уже времени разговаривать о пустяках:

— "Прошай!"

— "В Дорнах?"

— "В Дорнах..."

И мы распрошались: для утешения и духовного назидания меня подарила она мне два пикла, прочитанных Штейнером; пиклы со мной; Нашли — в Дорнахе.

Все?

Да... Все.

The strain of the breakup, which could have and should have been anticipated, and the physical toll of his multifaceted responsibilities forced Belyi, on the advice of his doctor, to move to the village of Zossen, south of Berlin, in early May of 1922.

Целый ряд месяцев я прожил в буржуазнейшем квартале Берлина; к весне я почувствовал, что более я не могу выносить этой жизни... Я бежал из Берлина и поселился в предместьях сонного городишки Цоссена, сняв себе комнату в бедном домишке, населенном наборщиками поссеновской типографии.¹³

In a letter to Jakšenko, the editor of *Novaja Russkaja Kniga*, Belyi complained that he was suffering from a case of frayed nerves and had moved because of his doctor's orders. "Если вы не почувствуете хотя бы на 3 месяца себя свободным от всех обязательств, то вы умрете: нельзя жить в такой нравственной загроможденности".¹⁴ Zossen was within commuting distance of Berlin and Belyi visited the city on several occasions, and when as he often did, he missed the last train, he could stay with friends, among them Abram Grigor'evič Višniak, publisher of Geilkon.

Into this world came Marina Ivanovna Cvetaeva, a 30-year-old poetess. Separated since 1916 from her husband, Sergei Efron, who had been in the war and then fought against the Reds, Cvetaeva had asked Piya Erenburg on his way to Europe to establish contact with Sergei if possible. In July 1921, Marina received a letter from Sergei. The following year, benefitting from improved relations between Soviet Russia and the Weimar Republic, Marina made her way to Berlin. She arrived with her daughter, Ariadna Efron, on May 15, 1922 and proceeded to the Prager Platz, where Erenburg hosted his famous Stammtisch at the Prager Diela. Cvetaeva moved into the Pension Pragerplatz and remained there for the next few weeks until moving to a Pension at Trautenu Strasse 9.

On the following evening, May 16, she "encountered" Belyi for the first time. They had met fourteen years previously and she had seen him on several subsequent occasions at the Musaget publishing house. But none of those earlier passing meetings would prepare her for meeting Belyi in Berlin. The power of Belyi's personality, his almost hypnotic eyes are attested to by many who knew him. E. Gollerbach in an article printed in May 1922 notes the overwhelming power of Belyi's presence.¹⁵ The attraction was mutual. Cvetaeva notes Belyi's fascination by what he perceived were their joint fates: both were children of deceased professors – Professors Bugaev and Cvetaev, both were poets. Marina's separation from her husband was associated by Belyi with his own painful separation from Asja. Coincidence had always profoundly affected Belyi and he undoubtedly grasped for ties to bind the two in his own attempt to defeat the loneliness of his existence in Zossen.

Razlika had recently appeared in Berlin and after their conversation, Belyi read the book the same evening and immediately wrote a note to Cvetaeva.

Zossen, 16. May 1922

Deeply respected Marina Ivanovna,
Allow me to express my deep enthusiasm before the utterly winged melody of your book *Separation*.

I read all evening – almost aloud and almost singing. It has been a long time since I had such aesthetic gratification.

And with respect to the melodiousness of the poetry, so necessary after sloppiness of the Muscovites and the deadness of the Acmeists, your book is *first* (that's beyond doubt).

I write and I ask myself: am I not overestimating my own impression? Didn't I hear the melody in a dream?

And – no, no. I open with immense boredom all new books of poetry. And today I opened *Separation* with boredom. And now the whole evening I have been in the power of its spell. Forgive me for the sincere expression of my rapture and accept my assurances of my complete respect and devotion.

Boris Bugaev (CS, 126, 127).

On May 19 Marina read her poetry at the Berlin House of the Arts, and while Belyi was a founding member and on the board of directors, it is not known whether he attended the meeting. Marina did reply to Belyi's letter and his own response was a review of *Razlika* on May 21, 1922.¹⁶ Belyi's praise of the work, his characterization of the poetry as songs, his almost too enthusiastic critical response remains to be examined. Cvetaeva admits that she did not understand three fourths of the article which was filled with the technical jargon of Belyi's own metric studies, familiar to readers of his *Symbolism*. (M, 1910)

For the next few days, Belyi would be a frequent visitor in Berlin, often staying at the Višniak's. He helped to arrange for the publication of Cvetaeva's *Car'-Devica* with Ėroxa and published her poems in *Ėropeja* as well as an article about Boris Pasternak.¹⁷ And then came according to Cvetaeva: "An interval which it would be best to fill in graphically – with a hyphen: did he go away, did he write, was he dreary – I don't know. He simply dropped out of sight for a week or ten days. And he suddenly reemerged in the Pragerdiela Cafe". (CS, 130)

What Cvetaeva did not know was that Belyi was busy at work with a new volume of poetry, stimulated in part by her own poetry. Belyi recalls that in May, 1922: "Выдалось часто с В. Дурье, Е. Б. Сабашниковой, Мариной Цветаевой: пишу рецензии и фельетон (в газеты). Под конец месяца овладевает личное лирическое настроение: начинаю писать стихи цикла "После разлуки" (*Rakurs*, 113/2). For June the notation continues "Единым махом пишу цикл "После разлуки"."

When he finally returns to the Pragerdiela in early June, he is embarrassingly loquacious and frank in his declaration that *she* is his *light*, his *calm*. "You, I missed you so much! I felt so dreary! The whole time I felt that I was lacking something, lacking the main thing, only I couldn't guess what it was". (CS, 130)

For Belyi, the relationship had progressed and matured into an intellectual and spiritual union. The pain, the hurt, the reliving of the experience with Asja devastated Belyi and he returned to his "harbor" as Ariadna Efron so touchingly put it:

Израелка в Берлин наезжал из ближнего Пюссена Андрей Белый, сраженный разрывом с женой Асей Тургеневой,

потерянный, странный, глубоко несчастный, с безумными, за- пределными глазами. Удар его белы Марина тотчас же при- няла на себя, в себя, естественно и привычно впряглась в эту упряжку. Несмотря на то, что окружающие относились к не- му сердечно, бережно, хоть и не без доли почтительного стра- ха, одна лишь Марина оказалась в ту пору пристанищем его смягнутой души (1975, 156).

Belyu was in constant need for female companionship. They saw each other several times over the next few weeks: Svetaeva visiting Belyu in Zossen and he coming to walk the streets of Berlin with her. He read to her from *Posle razluki*, recounted the despicable character and conduct of Asja and her relationship with Kusikov. Belyu had been wounded and was outraged by Asja's raiding of Alexander Kusikov before his eyes. He was convinced that Asja's behavior was revenge for *Pilevye zametki* which had appeared in May. Asja later wrote: "После 'Путев. заметок' я сочла нужным показать ему жизненно что мы жизненно разошлись".¹⁸ And he described in detail the painful and shameful history of his relationship to Ljubov' Dmitrievna Blok some sixteen years previously. At one point Belyu with a penchant for hyperbole complained at a meeting with Svetaeva that "three days ago my life ended" (CS, 132-133). Later Belyu recollected: "В конце 20-х числах ужасная встреча с Асей, после которой пыю; доктора и Сабашникова гонят меня в Свиномюнде" (*Rakkyrs*, 114/1). Svetaeva mixes memories of conversations with a letter from Belyu dated June 24, 1922, which serves as the denouement of their relationship.

What was the relationship for Belyu? Svetaeva was certainly not a sexual attraction for him. Roman Gul' was struck by her "masculine" quality: "As woman, Svetaeva was not attractive".¹⁹ What was decisive was that a woman, a fellow poet, a kindred spirit could communicate with him, or at least react to his normal "out-of-this-world" rambling. In a letter written June 24, 1922 he admits the depth of his gratitude, affection and dependence.

Моя милая, милая, милая, милая
Марина Ивановна,

Вы остались во мне, как звук чего-то тихого, милого: сегодня утром хотел только забежать, посмотреть на Вас; и сказать Вам: "Спасибо"... В эти последние особенно тяжелые дни Вы опять прозвучали мне: ласковой, удивительной нотой: дове- рия, и меня, как маленького, так танет к Вам. Так хотелось только взглянуть на Вас, что уже когда был на вокзале, то следил усиленн над собой, чтобы не вернуться к Вам на мгно- вение, чтобы пожать лишь руку за то, что Вы следили для меня. Вывают ведь чудеса! И чудо, что иные люди на других веток благодушно-радостно: и — ни от чего. А другие — прино- сят тяжесть. И прежде еще, в Москве я поразила, почему от

Вас веет — теплым, ласточкиннм ветерком. А когда Вы при- ехали в Берлин и я Вас увидел, так совсем повеяло весной. А вечера?... Знаете ли, что за день был вчера для меня? Я окон- чательно поставил крест над Асей: всюю душою моею оттолк- нулся навсегда от нее. И мне показалось, что вырвал с Асей свое сердце; и сердцем всего себя; и от головы до груди была пустота; и так с утра до вечера ходил по Берлину, не зная где приткнуться с чувством, что 12 лет жизни оторваны; и конеч- но с этим куском жизни оторван я сам от себя. И заходил в скверы, тупо сидел на лавочке, и заходил в кафэ и в пивные; и тупо сидел там без представления пространства и времени. Так до вечера. И когда я появился вечером, — опять повеяло дурут, неожиданно от Вас: щебетом ласточек, и милой, ми- лой, милой вестью, что какая-то роина — есть; и что ничто не погбило. Голубушка, милая, — за что Вы такая ко мне? Мне даже жутко: помните, что теперь как-то со мной то, что в словах Дельвига:

Куда, душа просиялась ты:
Погибнуть, или любить...

Я ведь только могу жить, когда есть для кого жить и для чего жить.

И вот сегодня проснулся, и в сердце — весна: что-то оконча- тельно оторвалось от сердца (и катится глухими провалами), и сердце обращено к свету; и легко; и милый ветерок весны; и — ласточки!

И это от Вас: не покидайте мне Духом.

Б. Бугаев (Saakjanc, 1988, 380-381)

For Belyu, at least for a moment, Marina was his "spring", and the "someone to live for" and "someone to love". In her Belyu sought and found the catalyst for his own re-incarnation, his ascent out of the depths of disappoint- ment, rejection and despair. At the same time her poetry inspired Belyu's own poetic catharsis which culminated in his collection, so appropriately named as we can now appreciate. For the time "After the Separation" was over, not in a new union, but in a complete irrevocable parting of the ways for Belyu and Asja.

What motivated Marina? There must have been some of the secret admirer in her for the older and well established poet. But she also saw in him special qualities. Much as he noted in her the light, she found him aglow with color:

I never saw him pale, always rosy, yellowish-vividly rose, copper color. From that rosiness both the blue of his eyes and the silver of his hair were intensified. And from the silver of his hair his gray suit too seemed silver, sparkling. Silver, copper, azure — those are the colors Belyu remained in for me, the summer Belyu, the Berlin Belyu, the Belyu of his summer misfortune of nineteen twenty-two. (CS, 145)

She perceived him larger than life, as more than a mere man. "Every piece of earth under his feet turned into a tennis court, his palm into a racquet. The earth seemed to be sending him back to the place from which he had been tossed out, and *that place* again returned him. In short, earth and heaven played ball with him. We watched". (CS, 152)

Her own assessment of the relationship was that it began at a high level and remained constant, but never developed. It was her presence, merely being with him, another human being, a woman interested in him, his thoughts, his pain, his world – nothing more. To this must be added Svetaeva's own ability for excess in declarations of love and affection.

Early in July Sergej Efron arrived from Prague. Belyi met him and his private moments alone with Svetaeva came to a natural end. The brilliant flame had flickered, and now like a pilot light it glimmered quietly in both of their souls. Belyi would soon be occupied by new plans, new ideas, and a vacation in Switzerland. These distractions in July coincided with Marina's own departure at the end of the month for Prague. They would not meet again.

For Svetaeva the memories of Belyi would re-appear. In a letter to Pasternak of November 19, 1922 she wrote: "Лучшее мое воспоминание о жизни в Берлине – это Ваша книга и Белый. С Белым я, будучи знакома почти с детства, по-настоящему подружилась только этим летом" (Saakjans, 1988, 383). Svetaeva also showed her deep concern for Belyi's welfare in her letters to Alexandr Vachtrach, who was at the time in Berlin and saw Belyi often. 20 In her July 20, 1923 letter she writes:

[Бориса] [Николаевича] нежно люблю. Жаль, что тогда про-
ждал Вас даром. Он одинокое существо. В быту он еще беспо-
мошнее меня, совсем безумен. Когда я с ним, я чувствую себя
– собакой, а его – слепцом! Чужая (однородная) слабость ис-
целяет нашу. Лучшие мои воспоминания в Берлине о нем.
Если встретитесь, скажите. (1960, 311)

In a letter a few days later (July 25) contemplating a trip to Berlin, Marina asks Vachtrach if Belyi will be there in the middle of September. In a second letter also dated July 25 she displays a maternal instinct and thanks Vachtrach for his attention to Belyi:

Умиляет меня Ваше нянчание с Б.Н., узнаю себя. Думаю, что
это дитя глубоко-неблагодарно (как все дети!) но неблаго-
дарностью какой-то умилительной. Вспоминаю его разгне-
ванный взгляд – вкось, точно вслед копылю – на дракона
(Штейнера или еще кого-нибудь). Встречу с Б.Н., как недав-
ную встречу с Штейнером, раскажу. "Книга разлук и встреч"
– вот моя жизнь. Вот всякая жизнь. Я счастлива на разлук!

О Б.Н... У него никого нет, все эти поклонники – вздор.
(1960, 317)

Again in a letter to Vachtrach of September 5/6 she demands that he write her about Belyi and what is happening.

Marina's concern for Belyi was answered by letter from him to her in early October 1923. 21 Belyi's letter is that of a reluctant bridegroom. Klavdija Nikolaevna Vasil'eva, a fellow anthroposophist and acquaintance from Moscow, had arrived in Berlin in January 1923, probably to return Belyi to Russia and to rescue him from his own lunacy. She met with Rudolf Steiner in February and was instrumental in bringing the two men together for an important exchange of views in March in Stuttgart. 22 Belyi and Klavdia Nikolaevna made plans shortly thereafter to return to Russia and Belyi had seen her off in July. He himself waited impatiently for a visa to return. His letter of October shows that he had final doubts, the nightmare described in an "epistolary howl" of four pages.

"Dearest, dear friend! Only you. I want only to come to you!... You are my one and only salvation. Work a miracle. Arrange it!" (CS, 155) Indeed, Svetaeva had been able to arrange with Mark Slonim, editor of *Volja Rossii*, a position for Belyi and she had written to Vachtrach on October 4 imploring him to get him on the train:

У меня к Вам большая просьба – если Вы еще в Берлине – т.ч.
если не в Берлине, то уже ничего не можете сделать. Дело в
том, что необходимо перевести (перезагити) Белого в Прагу,
он не должен ехать в Россию, слава Богу, что его не пустили,
он должен быть в Праге, здесь ему дают иждивение (stricte
не-сезаите) и здесь, в конце концов, я, которая его нежно
люблю и – что лучше – ему предана.

... Я знаю, что Прага для него – спасение... Я, т.е. моя
готовность ему помогать и о нем заботиться: ЛЮБЯ, С
РАДОСТЬЮ – и – НЕУСТААННО.

Все это ему передайте.

... Итак еще раз напоминаю о Белом. Если еще не уехал –
пусть едет в Прагу... Так ему скажите. И передайте ему от
меня всю мою нежность и память. ЗАГОВОРИТЕ, ЗАВОРО-
ЖИТЕ его, – иначе его не возьмешь! (1961, 337–338)

It was unfortunately for all concerned too late. Belyi left Berlin on October 23 and arrived in Moscow on October 26. For him, his escape from the abyss provided by Svetaeva had been a temporary one. He would turn into a shell of his former self, bitter about Germany and Berlin. Yet there remained in Berlin something of Svetaeva and Belyi – the memories and the poems, *Razlika* and *Posle razliki*.

Razluka: *Kniga stichov* was published by Gelikon in Berlin in 1922 and printed at the Sinaburg & Co. Printing House. The slim volume (29 pages) contained eight numbered, but untitled, poems and the longer "Na krasnom kone: Poema" dedicated to Anna Achmatova. Belyj in his review of the volume cited this longer poem and it is structurally similar in several aspects to the first eight poems, but they constitute the thematic and structural unity which occasioned Belyj's own poetic response. The first poem is simultaneously a thematic statement of the whole and a particularly illustrative example of Cvetaeva's collection.

1

Вашенный бой
Где-то в Кремле.
Где на земле,
Где —

Крепость моя,
Кротость моя,
Доблесть моя,
Святость моя!

Вашенный бой.
Брошенный бой.
Где на земле —
Мой
Дом,
Мой — сон,
Мой — смех,
Мой — свет,
Узких подшв — след.

Точно рукой
Сброшенный в ночь —
Бой.
— Брошенный мой!

Karlinsky has described many of the features of Cvetaeva's poetic signature: her simple and direct vocabulary and syntax, her verblessness, her violation of traditional poetic meters by frequent use of irregularly-spaced or additional stresses in a line (132ff.). This last point, the irregular or "logaedic" meter is also noted by Jurij Ivask: "Ритмы Цветаевой. Ее специальность — т.н. догазды: т.е. силлабо-тонические стихи отличные от пяти традиционных силлабо-тонических размеров (ямбов, хореев, анапестов, амфибрахов, дактилей)".²³ Belyj was also highly impressed by this one feature of her poetry,

Karlinsky also cites Cvetaeva's use of the dash, her enjambement, internal rhymes, and the repetition of the same word. G.S. Smith who has written frequently on the formal aspects of Cvetaeva's verse also points to the short line, often only four or five syllables, and states that "Cvetaeva prefers alternations that incorporate contrasting numbers of iambuses per line".²⁵

Cvetaeva's first poem is a stark vision in four stanzas: three are four lines in length and the third stanza is nine lines long. Belyj would point to the simplicity, the poverty at first glance of poetic devices and yet the verse reverberates like the bong from the Kremlin bell tower. The first stanza beats with the alliterative "b", the sound of the bong, and three choriambs are capped by a single stressed, thrice repeated "gde". In the second stanza the "kr" sound of the "Kremli" reappears in the "krepост" and "krotost". Again choriambs dominate and rhyme is achieved by the repetition of the modifier "moja" four times in a row. In the third stanza the tower's bong (boj) is tossed away in a two line alliterative sweep of "b": "Vašennij boj. / Brošennij boj". The three choriambs are topped by eight successive stresses until the relief of the final line, a choriamb plus an additional stress "—": "Узких подшв — след". The fourth and final stanza rhymes "nikoj", "boj" and "moj", recalling the "moj" repeated three times in the previous stanza. While the word "razluka" is never mentioned in the poem, it is phonetically reproduced in the images of the earth and the hands. The "z" and "l" of earth "zemlja" are twice repeated in the poem and are also embedded in "razluka". Phonetically the "k" and "r" sounds of the "Kremli" are reversed in "rika", the hand which is an attempt to bridge the separation *razluka*. The hands will become a unifying feature in several of the remaining poems.²⁶ Sound supplements sense in a poem organized around the sound of the Kremlin bell which as it reverberates reminds the poet of her own beloved fortress. Like the bong cast off from the tower, she asks where is home and peace and the trace of him. Like a hand outstretched into the night, the bong is cast away, to Sergej Efron to whom the poems are dedicated.

These same hands appear in the second poem now upraised and thrust into midnight's bong: "В пустое черное окно / Пустые руки / Бросяю в полуночный бой". The poet contemplates suicide, throwing herself from the tower; but somewhere her waltz spreads his wings. Cvetaeva's rhymes in the second poem extend the theme of hands "nikoj" and her own "moj" with head "golovoj" and home "domoj" as well as square "ploščadnoj" and young "molodoj".²⁷ The twelve lines alternate between four and two feet with aBavBosss cDcD rhyme. One could argue that the alternating four and two feet iambic lines disguise the more traditional iambic hexameter. By splitting the longer lines into segments Cvetaeva increases the number of end rhymes.

In the third poem the connection between the hands and the separation are made explicit as the two are rhymed "raki" and "razliki" and give rise to a third image of the rivers "reki" which are heavenly and eternal "naveki".

3

Все круче, все круче
Заламывать руки!
Меж нами не версты
Земные, – Разлуки
Небесные реки, лазурные
земли,
Где друг мой навеки уже –
Неотъемлем.

It is there in the celestial mythological realm that her loved one is unreachable. Cvetava introduces elements of the legend of Bellerophon referring to the silver bridles given by Minerva in order to tame Pegasus. Both dare to challenge the gods; as her winged warrior pushes toward her, she promises:

Я в смерти – нарядной
Пребуду – твоей быстроте
элатоперой
Последней опорой
В потерях простора!

In this poem a standard amphibrachic meter predominates. The three stanzas have seven, eight and seven lines respectively; yet they too are designed to disguise the sixteen amphibrachic feet per stanza. The eight lines of the second stanza, for example, yield eight rhymes, four of which would be hidden or internalized in the traditional quatrain. Alliteration is again used for musical effect, the "s" of the "Стремит столбовая / В серебряных сбруях". In addition the "r" "z" "l" and "k" of "razlika" reinforce the dominate sound-theme of separation.

In the fourth poem the image of the heavenly river is recalled. Cvetava alludes to Pallas Athene the goddess of wisdom and the offspring out of the head of Zeus conceived without a mother. Her sacred plant was the olive, "Смутлой оливой / Скрой изголовье". The poet warns that the gods are jealous of mortal love: "Боги ревнивы / К смертной любви". She cautions her warrior to fear not earth's inhabitants but the unseen one, for the heart of Zeus is insatiable: "Божья не тины – / Тверди небесной! / Ненасытимо – / Сердце Зевеса!" The nine quatrains are strikingly similar. Each line consists of two stresses –'–', and each quatrain rhymes ABAB. The dash occurs frequently, but it does not affect the regular meter and the orthography is not remarkable.

In that realm of the ancient gods the fifth poem depicts a world of unearthly beings where by hand she quietly loosens the shackles (Рапугатю путы); the winged one clatters and neighs, but between them is the river Lethe, the river of forgetfulness for departed souls. Two six line stanzas from one to four feet in length each contain sixteen amphibrachs. Achieving additional rhymes is again the underlying motivation for expanding four into six lines.

In the sixth poem the poet again defies the gods, declaring that they shall not see her old and gray. She threatens to go herself to that city: "Where mothers dare not take their children". There she will remove once and for all time the stone from his shoulders. The thirty lines are broken into six stanzas. But this organization again disguises a pattern. The first four stanzas, each four lines long, alternate between twenty four and fifteen syllables, while the fifth and sixth stanzas, each six lines long contain the twenty four plus fifteen syllables. The recurring amphibrachs contained in the section with twenty four syllables are supplemented by additional stresses in the shorter sections. In several instances the final word and stress of the stanza is moved onto the last line as a separate entity. As could be expected rhyme also increases in direct proportion to the number of lines: "На всю твою муку, / Раззор – ллчч. / – Брешь руки! / Оставь ллаши!"

In the seventh poem as the heavens thunder she prepares the sacrificial lamb, love, and prostrates herself in a prayer that Zeus not raise her beloved. The four stanzas consisting of either four or five lines actually can be read as iambic pentameter. The orthography, the use of the dash, the break up of the poetic line, all help to emphasize the "s" and "z" of "Zevex" and of course "razlika". The separation of the traditional pentameter line into shorter units also permits Cvetava to introduce a series of dactylic rhymes, which otherwise might have escaped notice.

In the final poem (#8) the poet admits that earthly delight (prelest' zemnaja) is a chalice, and no more ours than the air, the stars or the nests hanging in the sunsets. And she admits to knowing who is the owner of the chalice! But with one foot forward from the tower, an image which returns us to the point of departure of the first poem, she casts herself – not down to death but up the aquiline heights to seize that chalice from the terrifying and rosy lips of God!

Я знаю, я знаю,
Кто чаше – хозяин!
Но легкую ногу вперед –
башней
В орлиную высь!
И крылом – чашу
От грозных и розовых
уст –
Бога!

The amphibracs of the first stanza give way to added stresses and omitted syllables in the second stanza, where the rhymes and the alliteration of "s" and "z", presumably preparing the way for the reappearance of Zeus, are instead supplanted by the ever increasing assonance of stressed "o" (*bole*, *vozduch*, *zvëzdy*, *gnëzda*, *zofjach*, *lëgkuju*, *nogu*, *vperëd*, *groznyuch*, *rozovuch*) which culminate in the delightful surprise "Voga!" In the face of separation from her loved one, the poet is brash and defiant. The heavenly powers which have destined that the two lovers not be united is not a defeat for her, but a challenge, a summons to which she rises. In defiance of the will of God, Cvetaeva as poet dares to go beyond life itself to reach out to Sergej.

Belyj, in his analysis, does not refer to this theme of defiance, but he could not have overlooked, especially given his own mystical leanings, the presence of the gods and the implied challenge to the transitory nature of time and space. The meter of final poem, with its powerful statement, is not irregular, but amphibrac dimeter with only a few variations. The short lines permit greater end rhyme and a corresponding enhancement of their poetic effect. There are also the rhy-mes-imperfect and yet striking: "vozduch" "zvëzdy" and "gnëzda" which violate the principle that all syllables following the ictus be identical. It was to this often striking, bold and yet in many places quite traditional, poetry that Belyj issued both a critical analysis and a poetic response.

The essence of Cvetaeva's poems for Belyj was found in the melody, in the song. His letter of May 16, the same evening he read the book after meeting Cvetaeva, is filled with references to "melody".

Allow me to express my deep enthusiasm before the utterly winged melody of your book *Separation*.
I read all evening – almost aloud and almost singing. It has been a long time since I had such aesthetic gratification.
And with respect to the melodiousness of the poetry, so necessary after the sloppiness of the Muscovites and the deadness of the Acmeists, your book is *first* (that's beyond doubt).
I write and I ask myself: Am I not overestimating my own impression? Didn't I hear the Melody in a dream? (CS, 126)

Belyj's question about "overestimating" contains a hint of caution which as a critic he would soon brush aside. The recognition of the music in Cvetaeva's poetry was strikingly close to a note in Cvetaeva's notebook: "Книга должна быть исполнена читателем, как соната. Знаки – ноты. В воле читателя осуществлять или искажать".²⁸ This initial impression would grow stronger, the word giving added credibility to the thought, when Belyj published his review just days later on May 21 entitled "Poëtesa-pevica".

Belyj indicates his own confusion over the cause of the overwhelming effect of the work, based as it would appear at first glance on "weak" images and "petty" lines easily achieved. "В чем же сила?" He answers with a reference as applicable to Cvetaeva's poems as to his own situation: in the "passion of separation". This "poruy" is accomplished, claims Belyj, in the opening choriamb "и как в 5-ой симфонии у Бетховена хориямбическими ударями бьется сердце". For Belyj, the lines defy a reading; they simply must be sung.

Cvetaeva by her own admission did not and could not understand most of Belyj's own explanations of her poetry. His imposition or assignment of the choriamb to Cvetaeva's opening lines is somewhat arbitrary; one could speak of a combination of trochees and iambs in the same line. The decisive factor for Belyj in May of 1922 was the repetition of an earlier and often repeated theme that rhythm in poetry was created not by slavish devotion to poetic meter, but by a deviation (ostuprenie) from that meter. As K. Taranovskij has illustrated, Belyj's own poetry was substantially based on experimentation which embodied in practice his own theories of metrics. One need only recall Belyj's article in *Simvolizm* (1910) "Опыт характеристички četurechstopnogo jamba", in which he had ranked poets qualitatively on the basis of the quantity of deviations (or as Nabokov later called them, "suds").²⁹ The search for music in poetry, or rather the elevation of poetry to the greater perfection of musical form had, of course, been a constant element in Belyj's artistic credo from its inception, for example in his article "Формы искусства" and his early *Symphonies*. He was also busy with the preparation of *Glossolalia*. *Poëma o zvuke*.³⁰ The music and the melody which Belyj claimed to have found in *Razlika* were as much a creation of his own idiosyncratic poetic-aesthetic response as they were elements clearly identifiable in the text.³¹

Belyj's highly impressionistic response hails Cvetaeva as one who has returned poetry to its rightful place: "слава Богу, поэзия наша от ритма и образа явно восходит к мелодии, уже утраченной со времен Трубадуров". Now exactly this melody is created is elucidated by Belyj in several excerpts from *Razlika*, where he notes "Мелодический лейтмотив слышим в целом всех строф". He goes on to illustrate:

И три нудных спондея, –

Мой – сон,

Мой – смех,

Мой – дом, –

подготовлены тремя хориямбическими " – строфами, в которых последняя строчка усилена в инник – " ' что создает великодушный трамплин: для полета спондеев; и без чего они бы – жалко плюхнулись.³²

Belyi identifies and likewise admires the "amfibračii", "bakčiii", "paci-česki stich" and "glikonova stročka" (some of which are taken from "Na krasnom kole"). Variation in meter in Belyi's own aesthetic system is a positive element and it forms the basis of his critical appraisal and evaluation of the text: "Мелодия Марини Цветаевой явлена целым многообразия ритмов". These "rhythms" are highlighted in the poem "М.И. Цветаевой" as "nerobedimye ritmy" and Belyi's memoirs, (*Mezdu dvuch revoljucij*, 1934, 384) recall one final time her "roskosnyje ritmy". Almost as an afterthought Belyi mentions one image "Urloč do nogi urpugoј vzletaet penjuј klok" and Svetaeva's progressive alliterative stransitions from "s" and "r" to "l", and "v" to "m" in the *zvykoslovie* "str-sib-sbr-rlm" found in

Стремит столбовая
В серебряных сбурах.
Я рук не ломаю.³³

For Belyi the poetess and her poems ultimately merged into the image of a sound. In his letter of June 24 he wrote:

Вы остались во мне, как звук чего-то тихого, милого... В эти последние особенно тяжело, страдные дни Вы опять прозвучали мне: ласковой, ласковой, удивительной ногой... [emphasis added, TRV] (Sakjanc, 1988, 380)

Svetaeva's own footnote to the musical connection comes in her comment that when Belyi read his own poetry: "He taps over the pages as if over piano keys" (CS, 139).

Against this backdrop of aesthetic perception and preference, Belyi, the perceptual experimenter, summarizes in his preface to *Rosle razliki*, "Vudem iskat' melodii", five points in his own search for melody. Admitting that his own work is a search for form – and that "melodism" grows out of the ordering of image and sound, meter and rhythm, Belyi outlines his own poetic program for the work.

- 1) Лирическое стихотворение – песня.
- 2) Поэт носит в себе мелодии: он – композитор.
- 3) В чистой лирике мелодия важнее образа.
- 4) Неумеренное употребление посредственных элементов стиха (образа, и звуковой гармонии) насчет мелодии и самые богатства этих элементов превращает в верное средство – убить стихи.
- 5) Довольно метафорической перенасыщенности: поменьше иماجнизма; побольше песни, побольше простых слов, поменьше звуковых трещаний (меньше труб) – гениальные композиторы гениальны не инструментами, а мелодией и оркестровкой

Берговена прошле оркестровки Штрауса.
Firm in his convictions (at least temporarily), Belyi exclaims, "Впереди русский стих ожидает богатство неисчерпаемых мелодийных миров. И да здравствует – 'мелодиям!'".

The title of Belyi's work, *Posle razliki*, contains both an echo of Svetaeva's *Razlika* and an ironic expression of finality. Belyi had mentioned the explicit connection to Svetaeva:

After your *Separation* I am writing poems again. I think I am not a poet. I can go for years without writing poems. That means I am not a poet. But now, after your *Separation* – it has flooded me. I can't stop. I am writing you – furthering you. It will be a whole book: *After the Separation*, after the separation from her and after your *Separation*. (CS, 138–139)

Svetaeva and her work would become the foundation, the home port for Belyi as he floundered in a sea of complex, conflicting stresses. In addition to the stress provoked by Asja's arrival in Berlin in March and departure in April, Belyi had been told by his doctor to slow down or risk serious health problems. When he moved to Zossen in May, Belyi intended to work on the third part of the *Vospominanija o Bloke* and a revision of the poems in *Zoloto v lazuri*. The third section of the *Vospominanija* covered the most painful period of time for Belyi, concerned with the strange intrigues of Ljubov' Dmitrievna Blok. (Belyi would refer to her in the *Vospominanija* as SC, but the disguise was rather transparent). Amid this intellectual and spiritual torment and turmoil, Svetaeva proved to be both an attraction and a distraction for Belyi. Even if this represented wishful thinking and fantasizing on his part, her poems and his perception of them served as the organizing principle for his own earlier efforts, current revisions and new creations. *Posle razliki* would emerge as Belyi's last original poetry.

Posle razliki. Bertinskiј resetnik was published by Erocha and printed in Berlin by M. Mattisson in September of 1922. The 123 page volume contains fifteen poems varying in length from the thirteen lines of "М.И. Цветаевой" to the twenty parts and over three hundred lines of "Malenkiј valagan na malenkoј plane "Zemlja". The poems represent three interconnected, but clearly distinguishable moments of poetic inspiration. Three poems were written prior to May 1922. Thematically they are all connected with Asja Turgeneva-Vugueva: "Bessonica" and "Vol'nica" are both dated in the text "The Hospital 1921". "Ту – ten' tenej" is dated Berlin 1922 and the 1923 edition of Belyi's poems adds the notation "Феврляу 1922". All three of these poems appeared in print prior to Belyi's major efforts on the collection inspired in part by Svetaeva.³⁴ Another three poems represent revisions and thematic reworkings of poems published earlier in the collection *Zoloto v lazuri* (M., 1904). "О ролятом рокое" is followed by the

notation "Moscow-Zossen" and is based on the poem "Žizn". "Kladbišće" 1901–1922 Moscow-Zossen is based on "Přizyv". "Net" 1901–1922 Moscow-Zossen is based on "Na zakate".³⁵

The nine remaining poems were written in May or June 1922 in Zossen: "Veselnjaja melodija" – June 1922; "Večer"; "Poetsja pod gitaru" noted in the 1923 collection as May 1922; "Orijat' gitara"; "Prorok" – May 1922; "Malen'kij balagan na malen'koj planeti "Zemlja" no date but later identified as June 1922; "V gorax" dated in *Eropeja*, II, as May 1922; "Ja" no date; and finally "M.I. Cvetaevoj" – Zossen.³⁶

The first poem, "Veselnjaja melodija", bears the subtitle of the mandolin. It is one of five poems associated directly with a musical instrument: two mention a guitar, one a cello, one a balalajka and there is the additional implied drum (Boom! Boom!). Written in June 1922 it is separated into six parts.

1

Слышу утрами

Зовы

Я...

Вижу – огни...

– Дни –

Вирюзовые

Полные смысла...

Крутом не ям [меня] –

Березовые

Пни;

И –

– Перламутровые пни;

И –

– Перламутрами

Унизанные,

Розовые –

– Крылья коромысла.

Most striking is the curious arrangement of the poem on the page, in which the traditional hallmark of Russian verse, the line, has been sacrificed, broken up and scattered into multiple pieces. When compared with Cvetaeva's first poem, Part I reveals several areas of similarity: the brief lines, several of which are inset from the margin, the frequent use of dashes, and enjambment. There is also the distinct departure from traditional meters. Cvetaeva's poem opens with a series of choriamb. Belyi attempts to duplicate her effect in even more complicated rhythms. His first lines, "Слышу утрами / Зовы / Я", can be read as a choriamb followed

by a trochee and then a single stress. If, however, the three lines are combined as one it can be scanned as a choriamb followed by two iambs: '- - - - -'.

Other choriamb appears in the lines "Вижу – огни" and "Полные смысла". In the forward to *Zovы utremi* Belyi described the violence he chose to impose on his poetry: "Я силюсь разбить канон какой-то строки, такой-то строфы, заменя его каноном живого, звучного слова в сплетении его с целым" (94). And in somewhat simpler terms Belyi returns to the thought expressed in the beginning of *Rosle razliki* and notes that the poet is a composer in his arrangement of word: "в расстановке слов – композитор ритма, он сочиняет мелодию; вернее ищет внешним ухом отразить свой внутренний слух" (98).

While Belyi claims to be inventive and innovative his arrangement of lines disguises visually, but not necessarily audibly, a fairly traditional iambic rhythm with an added stress on the initial syllable in a line. As we have seen this technique of separating the traditional line into two or more segments is a distinguishing characteristic of Cvetaeva's *Razliki*. With his segmentation of the poetic line, much in the manner of Cvetaeva, Belyi achieves a multiplication of end rhymes, a highlighting of what would normally be internal rhymes. Thus "odni", "dni", "i", "pni", and "i" all stand out and spotlight the major stressed of Part I. Of twenty-four accented vowels, twelve are either "i" or "y". Is this repetition of the high pitched "i" an attempt to capture the sound of the mandoline? The additional words in final position such as "utami" and "zovy" are amplified and then echoed in "perlamutrami" and "brizgolove". This opening section is both an audio and visual image: the sounds of the calls, the sights of the sapphire days, fires burning, mother-of-pearl birch stumps and the rosy wings of a yoke.

In Part II a cloud hangs low on the horizon, its edges illuminated by fire and summers, and it gives rise to a vision of nature's holidays of lost meaning, like the once meaningful yokes gleaming in the sun. Twenty eight lines contain a total of thirty two words; the result is a dramatic increase in end rhymes, which in traditional lines might remain hidden.

Part III has the narrative voice now heading with a sensitive ear the disgusting flies, and silver meters from a window cover him like a gleaming emerald flock of flies and a spider web splashing to the wind. Again rhymes abound as twenty-nine words are moved into twenty-one lines. The opening lines ("Внимаю: – / – Цутким / Ухом / Жутким / Мухам – / Я") can be read as an amphibrach followed by a series of trochees and the striking series of stressed "u" sounds. But the familiar iambic meter sounds in one's head even if it is concealed by the typesetting as well as pagination. By this point one notices that the typography separates each section of the poem onto at least two pages with the resulting abundance of blank space on each page. (A cynic might suggest that this was done in an attempt to achieve the critical mass necessary for the book slightly longer than 100 pages, but which could have easily been printed in twenty-five or less).

In Part IV the song makes its first appearance: like silvery breezes, like meters, like visions of lights, it penetrates the firmament and the land, the sight of the soul, and the secret of inspiration penetrates the soul. — Где-то / Дыша / В тиши, — / Обвигивает серебряными ветрами. / Как метрами / Мне — / Ухо / Дух / И / Душу — / — Пенне...

In Part V rhymes abound again: "Sveta" and "Osveta", "Vzvizgi" and "Vbuzgi", "Slov" and "Strof", but even more startling is the assonance of the stressed "o": of twenty-eight stressed vowels fourteen are "o/e". The resulting associations of "vozduch" with "otdych" and with "slov" and "strof", sprinkle the heart with the "tozovuju tozu" and "rosami". Belyi enhances his instrumentation with an abundance of "s" and "z" sounds which occur twenty five times in thirty words. These same sounds echo the key elements in Cvetaeva's last poem.

In the final section, Part VI, the primary stressed vowel is "e" (sixteen of twenty eight are "e"). The rhymed groupings provide curious associations between of "Verno-Verno serdze" and the concepts of "licemeriem" (hypocrisy) and "neveriem" (disbelief) with the "ravnovesie" (equilibrium) and "bezvesie" (weightlessness) of the "podnebesie" (sky). The sense of soaring, floating weightless like a tuft above the clouds over the leaves, is anything but a cry of despair. In opening his collection with one of the later poems, i.e. composed in June 1922, Belyi re-affirms the salutary and salvational aspect of poetic vision (and hearing) and the creative act. The poet hears and sees and the resulting multimedia song expresses itself in words and stanzas which free the poet from the restraints of gravity. The upbeat "Vesemlja melodiia" is a rousing overture to the concert which follows.

In contrast to the dawn's early light and sounds of life, the second poem, "Večer", is filled with "edges of golden-brown clouds" which hang over the poet with a "poison". The sky is replaced by the swamp, alive with its own creatures, the cricket and the lull. The mood created by the blackness and the thunder is threatening — the "zloj" (evil) and "ukavyj" (wicked), a gleaming pupil out of the darkness. The poems is divided into five six-line stanzas, but can be read as five quatrains of anapestic trimeter, or as a series of anapestic hexameter couplets. What Belyi gains by the artificial enjambements is once again a greater concentration and resulting doubling or tripling of end rhymes. For example in the second stanza:

И взгонят беспризорные выси	А
Перелетным	В
Болотным глазом;	С
И — зарыскают быстрые рыси	А
Над болотным, —	В
Над черным — леском	С

In terms of sound orchestration, "o" and "y" predominate in the above stanza, where of twelve stressed vowels only one is not an "o" or "y". (Vzgoniat), "Večer" continues the lyrical creation of a poetic mood and once more the poet sensitive to sight and sound recreates a video production. There is also the curious synaesthesia of the poet who "hears" the "želtye chochoty ryši".

"O poljanom pokoe" introduces the second stringed instrument — the cello. The long, sonorous draws of the bow are reproduced in Part I of the poem with fourteen "a/ja" combinations out of twenty-one stressed vowels. The slow pace of the cello is captured in the amphibrach in contrast to the quicker iamb of the mandolin in "Vesemlja melodiia". The visual image is of clusters of ice blocks and amber lances of the sunset which blind us as the schooner casts off into the steel of the waves. In Part II seafarers appear highlighted against the ruby red sail and fortified by their "song". In Part III the song is carried and tossed about by the waters. The lyrical vision is interrupted in Part IV for an observation of the constancy of the environment: "Ничто не изменится!... / Только — / — Мятежится / Море, / Да решится / Кит — ". The peace and well-being of the schooner are displaced in Part V when winter descends in a cloud of white ash and the polar darkness tightens its grip in a fiery darkness of welded clumps of ice. In reworking the themes of *Zoloto v laziri*, Belyi returned to his poem "Žizn". (1901)

1901

Бесстрашно отчалил
среди хлопьев тумана
от берега с песней помор.

1922

И —
Окрепшено
Песней —
— Под зорькой —

— Отчалили —
— В хлопья
Тумана —
— Повороти

The distinctive staircase arrangement of the new version is not only an extension of Cvetaeva's brief lines. Rather, it continues a tradition already found in Belyi's prose. Here the separation of lines in a revision of an earlier poem does not result in an increase in end rhyme. The visual effect is intended to produce a new "rhythm" in spite of the regular pattern of amphibrachs. Ultimately, these "step-ladder" (lesenki) structures of Belyi would profoundly affect the poetry of Majakovskij and other Soviet poets.³⁷

"Kladbišče" is a reworking of the poem "Prizyv" written in 1901 and dedicated to Mikhail Sergeevič Solov'ev. An examination of the poem and its new form illustrates much of what is "innovative" in *Posle razluki*. "Prizyv" has four quatrains of iambic tetrameter with an a-B-a-B rhyme scheme of alternating masculine

and feminine rhymes. "Kladišče" has forty six lines divided into fourteen stanzas ranging from two to six lines in length. By tripling the number of lines, Belyi is able to increase the rhymes from sixteen in the first poem to forty-six rhymed words in final position. Thematically Belyi retains the memories and images of the previous poem inspired by the grave of Solov'ev in Novodevičij Monastery. The sound of the wind, the shadows of crosses on the white snow, the "good news", the lantern (now crimson over the grave), the lonely oak standing watch. But the tension has been changed, now charged with poetic sound effects. Compare the two verses:

1901

Там... далеко... среди равнин
старинный дуб в тяжелой муке
стоит затерян и один,
как часовой, подъявший руки.

1922

Тяжелый дуб, как часовой
Печально венмелт
Звукам муки; —
Косматый снегами, — в
Подземлет
суровый вой
Руки...

The new version contains additional elements of sounds — the sounds of torment and the severe howl. The meter remains the same, but the new lines offer an extra rhyme of "venmet — pod'emlet". There is one additional "u" sound in the second poem which enhances the effect of the "sounds of torment" (*zvukam muki*). The new version eliminates all stressed "i" sounds (*stedi, ravni, starni, ni, stoi, odin*) in the stanza. Belyi's ear is attuned to a different drummer.

Several of Belyi's contemporaries, including Cvetaeva and Chodasevič, note that Belyi's fiddling with his poems was undesirable and detrimental to his poetic gift. One could argue which poem is more artistically complete and pleasing. There can be no doubt, however, of the quantitative poetical elements of language which call attention to themselves, while preserving the pristine simplicity of the word. Another unanswered question concerns the inclusion of this poem at this particular place. Belyi had originally intended to revise his poems from *Zoloto v lazuri*; his memories of Blok also focused his attention on important events and personages of the first decade of the century. To these must be added the shocking assassination in Berlin of V.D. Nabokov, father of the writer, who was a well-respected political and moral force in the Russian emigration. Nabokov was shot on March 28, 1922 and was buried in the Russian cemetery in Berlin after a funeral service which Belyi attended. Belyi also divided his life into seven year sequences, 1901–1908 / 1909–1916 / 1917–1923, and twenty one years separate the first version from the second one.

What remains after the speculation and what constitutes the new element in the poem is the sound image of the closing stanza in which into the silence there resounds the voice of a friend, now forgotten in the snow! "И только: — / В тишину / Звучит. / Забытый / В снеге, — / — Голос друга..."

The poem "Poëisia pod gitaru" is a gloomy admission of the poet's own mortality, a recognition of the futility and folly of existence. Not only the title, but the arrangement on the page, mostly bleak single words dangling from the left margin and the dashes, recalls Belyi's own perception of Cvetaeva's poems. The rhythms are also uneven; this poem is one of the more complex to classify or to define an underlying metrical pattern. One thought is that the lines as they alternate between one and more stresses are meant to resemble the pluck and the brush of the guitarist's rhythm.³⁸ As with the previous poems, rhyme abounds and is used to associate words and meanings by sounds — "nem-vsem", "suždeno-vse ravno", the "izumrudnaja" (emerald) tale with the "trudnaja" (difficult) life; and "nakomec" (finally) with "odin konec" (the inevitable end) which hangs over our "sud'boju" (fate) and over the poet "soboju" (himself). The poet has come the full cycle of life in his first five poems: from the dawning of spring and poetic flights of fancy to evening darkness, the challenge of the seafarers' song engulfed in winter's clutches, to the cemetery and the realization that death will come for him, too!

At the bottom of this abyss, Belyi engages in his next poem for the first time the theme of Asja: "Opjat' gitara". Here again the poetic meter and line have been sacrificed to achieve additional rhymes. There is also a heavy sound orchestration and concentration of stressed "a" and "u". In the lovely raspberry-orange sunset of today, memories of golden waters, the crunch of snow, of the years "there" (там) in Switzerland, call forth silver sorrows and clash with the words: "Мертвых слов не говори, / Не тверди — / Дюпора!..." "To which the response is a simple and final: "— Тебе одна дорога, а мне — / 'Дюра!" So simple, so brief, so unsatisfactory and incomplete for Belyi. While he had been waiting since 1916 for this meeting, and its outcome should have never been in doubt, given Asja's cavalier approach to his entreaties, her presence in Berlin had given him hope for a restoration of the old order. Her failure to return to him was the greatest single cause of Belyi's anguish and his deteriorating health and erratic behaviour, both of which would become the cause of some concern among his friends over the next few months. Thematically Belyi moves from his pre-occupation with the lyrical experience itself to the inner recesses of his own pain, spite and spleen.³⁹

In a peculiar combination of time and place, the rejection by Asja is now combined with a memory and poem of another love lost. The poem "Net" is a revision of the 1901 poem, "Na zakate", which have five quatrains of anapestic tetrameter with alternating masculine and feminine rhyme. "Net" contains nine

stanzas, the first eight are quatrains with lines of variable length and the final stanza has six lines. While the meter is also primarily amapestic, there are several examples of an additional initial stress. The stanzas have alternating rhymes throughout with the exception of the fourth stanza. Both poems speak of a rejection highlighted by brilliantly-colored backgrounds: pale red sunset, the azure distance, and the poet's realization that he and she are merely spectators "prizraki" who will now be separated by time and space. The new element in "Net" introduced in the final stanza is the "penie" (song) and "videnie" (vision).

В этом пении где-то – в кипении
 В этом пении света – Видение –

Мне:
 Что – с Тобой!

This was the only solution remaining for Belyi, an optimistic faith that in the future, in another transearthly existence in which the ties that bound his soul to Asja would be restored to their former state. It is a vision of hope – a victory over the confines of earthly space and time! Again I wish to emphasize the essentially optimistic vision of the poet that has been largely overlooked by critics including Močul'skij, who sees *Posle razliki* merely as "Krik boli i oščuščajija" (246).

The midpoint of the collection is the poem, "Prorok" with its inevitable comparison to Pushkin's poem of the same name. The poem is very traditional, written in Zossen in May 1922 in iambic tetrameter with alternating feminine and masculine rhymes in nine quatrains. It is almost as if Belyi pauses for a moment with his formal experiments. The poem seems unconnected with the Asja theme unless one take into account the plural first person pronoun and personal modifiers. Repeatedly there are references to "our" (naš) and the question "na nas tekučij". Beyond the lyrical statement of the poet overwhelmed by the shining silvery moon, there is reason here to believe that the poem re-asserts the important spiritual-mystical bond which Belyi shared with Asja. From this point, Belyi retraces the loneliness, the despair and the anguish of not having Asja his companion at his side. The next two poems "Bessonica" and "Vol'nica" were written in January 1921 when Belyi was in a Moscow hospital. The typographical arrangement of "Bessonica" is characterized by the now familiar disregard for the poetic line; instead one, two or three words are frequently suspended at the left margin. There is also no separation into stanzas of the forty lines. The effect is the accumulation of end rhymes. Indeed, when lines contain more than three feet, splitting the line at the caesura does not provide a rhyme. Other versions of the poem combine these dangling words into regular quatrains of iambic hexameter, and the poem is iambic if one ignores the typography. The significance is that in *Posle razliki*, Belyi goes far beyond previous (and future) attempts to impose his own order on the poetic line. The vision of "Bessonica" is one of days filled with

doubts and nights of torment: "Мои, / Сомнением / Испорченные / Дни, / Мои / Томлением / Искорченные / Ночи..." The shadows and the silent Arab hallucinated into existence in the corner are echoes of earlier fears in the nursery of *Koiki Letaeu* and *Kreščer'ju kivaec*. Thematically *Posle razliki* is a continuation of earlier themes, while formally it is a new departure.

"Vol'nica" which was published in *Европея* under the title "Ase" was written from the same hospital room, but the vision now is of Asja, already prefiguring the predestined parting. "Мне выпилсья оягьт – / Язвительная, – ты / Но – не язвительная, а холодная: забыла". And in his dream amid the sickness, death and hunger he asks for his eyes to be closed by the disappearance of everything that had been into the other world of non-being. Belyi was forever at the edge of separate existences of the phenomenal and the other noumenal world. The poem is an example of iambic hexameter, but end rhymes are less prevalent, an aspect of the poem evident in the lengthier lines and the sparsity of one-word lines. The typography of the poem varies little from the version printed in March 1922. Belyi was already experimenting with the length of the poetic line before his "encounter" with Cvetaeva; what is missing in Belyi's poems before *Razlika* is the abundance of end rhyme.

The next poem, "Ту – ten' tenej" was composed in February of 1922, before the final break with Asja and has traditionally been seen as an address to Asja (It was first published in *Европея* I, 1922 with the title "Ase"). The word "ten" (shadow) has special significance. After his return to Soviet Russia in 1923, Belyi published in 1924 a short book of his Berlin memoirs called *Одна из обителей царства теней*. The "kingdom of shadows" was the emigration. The poem is stylistically intriguing in the placement of the lines. The original iambic pentameter quatrain of the *Европея* version has been arranged into stanzas alternating between four lines and two lines with each stanza containing two lines of iambic pentameter.

Ты – тень теней... Тебя – не назову,	Ты – тень теней...
Твое лицо – холодное и злое.	Тебя не назову.
Плыву туда – за дымку дней – зову	Твое лицо –
За дымкой дней, – нет, не Тебя: былое, –	Холодное и злое...

While the new typography highlights such statements as "You are a shadow of shadows", and "My soul – you are the light", it does not seem based on any need to increase the amount of end rhymes. It does, however, disturb at least graphically the traditional iambic pentameter line of the first version. Meter and "rhythm" exchange places. This example confirms that poems written prior to May and June, i.e. before the encounter with Cvetaeva, have far fewer rhymes even when the typography imposes shortened lines and new enjamblings. What the "lost poet" reaches out to find and embrace is that soul of light, hidden beyond

The reference to the "devil" has been identified as Rudolf Steiner in the writings of Chodasevič and Mokul'skij. Belyj's feelings toward Steiner were mixed at this point in time and the rejection by Asja, his inability to meet face-to-face with Steiner undoubtedly soured the relationship. It would be incorrect, however, as does Mokul'skij to see in this temporary estrangement a long term rejection of Steiner and his teachings. Part XIII is a respite – from the cursing and the swearing – to the wish for escape "to swim through the centuries" so that the Lethe grant forgetfulness. The Lethe reference, at once a bind with Cvetaeva's own image, also embodies the concept of a new life, a thought dear to Belyj, and the promise of escape from the tortments.

Part XIV reinvoles the devil who separated us. Stanza XV and XVI are con-nected by an enjambment between the two: "Все ушло – / Далекое – / – Все – иное: / Не то – / О, легко мне / Легко – / – Все – иное: / Не то / – Потому что – / leads to the admission "Исплакались – / – Очи / И плакать – / – Нет мочи –"

An alternation at once hopeful while still deeply disturbed occurs one more time in Stanza XVII: "Были ли / Мы, / Любили ли / Мы – / – Друг / Друга!" But the poet soars like a bat higher, higher, higher, where everything is simple, all is different: where eyes open into the native, barren nothingness: "В вызове / Твоем – / Ложь!... / Взбрызня же / В очи / Забвение..." Belyj would write to Cvetaeva: "Yesterday I put a cross on Asja". He had finally laid her to rest. In the poem his heart takes wings like a martin to soar away from earthly trials. "Boom-boom", the drum resounds again. It is finished – and it was. The pages of Asja had finally been closed. It now remained for the poet to transcend the experience and to continue in a life without her. Only a few months later when the poem was included in Belyj's *Sichotvoreniija* there is added the notation: "Фор-точка заглаживается. Комната наполняется звуками веселого джимми". Dance would soon replace the song.⁴⁰

"V gorax" is a return to more traditional poetic lines – four quatrains with AbAb rhyme, but with a curious rhythm, closer to the logaedic, three stresses per line than any of the other poems. When the poem was printed in the 1923 edition, it too would be split into an additional number of lines, the primary purpose being to increase end rhyme:

1922

Взирарю в серые туманы;
Разлирарю: рубище – я ...
Оборвут, как прах, – урараны:
Разорвут – в горах меня.

1923

Взираю
В серые туманы;
Разлирарю:
Рубище – я.
Оборвут,
Как прах, –

Урараны:
Разорвут
В горах
Меня!

From the abyss the poet rises to the mountains, where he invokes the image of the ancient scald and his song. There at the altar stone he encounters the "Буко-rogij bog" who thrusts his horn into the breast of the poet's corpse.⁴¹

"Ja" to be sung to the accompaniment of a balalaika returns to the theme of music and the ultimate assertion the self. It is in some respects the last page of *Posle razliki*. The irony, of course, was that Cvetaeva's separation would soon end with the arrival of her husband, Sergej Efrom, from Prague. For Belyj, the separation with Asja would end not with a reconciliation but with the complete break of their marriage and their relationship. Trochees skip along dashing from single words to brief lines in rapid succession. The fourteen sections are sometimes no more than a pair of words. Part 2 is simply:

Глухи-
Духи!...

The search is for the spirits, the souls, for God. "Где – / Вы – / Духи? / Где – / Вы – / Души? / Где – / Ты – Бор!" Instead the moon looms threaten-ing over the "zloe pole". Time is an executioner and the threads of events are woven into a pattern of non-being. In this terrifying search for God in a world of evil, we are confronted with the claim: "– 'Бора – / Нер' – / –'Бора – / Нер!...' But the poet does not embrace the despair and hopelessness of existence without God. Instead there is a new road to Nazareth, the road of the individual, of the self. And then there arises a pillar of fire which bears the glad tidings: "'Это – / Я / С / Вами!'"

Belyj can only be understood in the context of the mystery of Christ's passion and resurrection, the way of the cross and the glorious rising from the dead. This mystery of hope, of life after death, was for him the only answer to the unknown and unknowable in this life. Belyj's reunification with God at the end of the poem recalls the Christ of Blok's "Dvenadcat'" and restates the theme of resurrection in Belyj's own "Christos voscikese", *Kreščenyi kitanec* and in passages *Glossolaliija*. In the 1922 introduction to "Christos voscikese" for his *Sichotvoreniija* (1923, 349) Belyj wrote: "приятие распятия пресуществляет тему смерти в тему воскресения; в этой теме каждое 'Я' или Ich становится I. Сп. – моно-граммой божественного 'Я'". Critics and scholars have overlooked this essen-tial optimism which emerges from *Posle razliki*. Yes, it is the product of a wounded ego, of an injured, confused man. As poetry, as was all of his art, it was Belyj's own tortuous path of psychoanalysis and therapy through which the equilibrium could be restored. It is the recognition that poetry affects this

transcendence that is contained in the final poem, actually a thank-you note to Cvetaeva for her own poetry.

"M.I. Cvetaevov" is the last poem in the collection and it replaces the dedication which Belyi had indicated would have been difficult if not impossible to write: "I am mentally dedicating it to you, and if I don't put it in an explicit dedication, it is only because the book is yours, it comes from you, I can't give you what is yours, that would be immodest" (CS, 139).

Ненечисляемы
 Орбиты серебряного прискорбья,
 Где праздничномыслия
 Повисли —
 Тучи...

Среди них
 Тихо пою стих
 В неосвязаемые углодия
 Ваших образов:

Ваши молитвы
 Малиновые мелодии
 И —
 Непобедимые ритмы.

The poem is an ode to her songs which Belyi would make even more personal by the addition of two "I's" in the version printed in *Эпопея II* in August 1922. As we know, Cvetaeva claims to have been unaware of the poem until after Belyi's death, somewhat strange considering that it is placed on a facing page to Cvetaeva's own poem in *Эпопея II* (see pp. 10–11). The poem has three stanzas. It is a work of affirmation expressed in three negatives. "Neisčisljaemy" are the "orbits of silver sorrow" which the poet experiences. And among them and clouds of idle thoughts he sings his own verse to the "neosjazaemye ugodičja" of her images, her prayers, her crimson melodies and "Nepobedimye ritmy". (In the revised version, these "intangibles" would become "non-demonstrable" *nedokazuemye ones*).

Belyi's own poem contains equally brilliant silvery images and his melodies and rhythm echo the irregularity of Cvetaeva's own *Razlika*. There is no classical meter, just a series of one to three stresses per line. The poet's message is conveyed by the frequent alliterations — the smooth "s/z" and "r" of neisčisljaemy orbity, serbežjanogo priskorbja, prazdnomyslja, povisi. The third stanza accentuates the "m" and "l" in "molitvy, malinove melodič" and the "nepobedimye ritmy" and the stressed "i" "molitva" "malinove" and "nepobedimye ritmy". His own melody is in fact an anagram of *M a r i n a* and of *R a z l i k a*.

How did *Posle razliki* differ from Belyi's earlier poetry, how great was the influence of Cvetaeva? Three aspects of form stand out: tyrography, rhyme, rhythm. The brief poetic line, the column and step-ladder arrangement are all viewed as contributions of Belyi to Russian poetry dating back to his collection, *Zoloto v lazuri*. Working on a revision of those poems, Belyi was undoubtedly struck by similarities in *Razlika*. He would take his own work and Cvetaeva's poetry to go one step further in tyrographical experimentation. The main influence of Cvetaeva was in the multiplication of rhyme. More than ever before, and most notably in the poems composed in Zossen in May and June, Belyi concentrated the energy of each line in the end rhyme. Like Cvetaeva he frequently used repetition of a given word to achieve this rhyme. "Rhythm", the music of the poems, was centered around this rhyme. In spite of this experimentation, much was very traditional, such as the sound effect produced by alliteration and assonance. Tyrography often obscured the traditional meters which, while they escape the eye's first glance, emerge from reading or listening to the poems. Even so there is a new intonation, a "stop and go" effect which counteracts the monotony of regular rhythm. Both Cvetaeva and Belyi heeded an inner music of poetry. Belyi had always been fascinated by deviations from meter to create rhythm and had in his poetry experimented widely. In Cvetaeva he found a refreshingly new melody. It is also true that Belyi embraced her poetry because it echoed the very *melodism* he was hearing at the time, in his own revision of *Zoloto v lazuri* and in his *Glossolilija*. It may be prudent to speak of confluence or conjunction, rather than influence of the one upon the other. And the music of *Posle razliki* was only a temporary.

For a brief period Belyi would place greater emphasis on rhyme than ever before. He would take Cvetaeva's short line and use it to increase the number of his rhymes. His attention for at least a few days was to sound, and everything else could be sacrificed for its sake. In a few months Belyi would move from the composer and the singer to dancer. In his introduction to these same poems now called "Posle zvezdy" (1923, 471) he wrote "Меня влечет теперь к иным темам: музыка 'пути посвящения' сменялось для меня музыкой фокстрота, бостона и джамми; хороший джазобанд [sic] предпочиталю я колоколам Парсивалля; я хотел бы в будущем писать соответствующую фокстроту стихи".

Thematically there was little that bound Belyi and Cvetaeva, save the fact of "separation". Belyi borrowed the reference to the Lethe, but seemed resigned to the doings of the devil, while Cvetaeva boldly challenged the gods. She was defiant, he was submissive. His chief image is the sunset. Cvetaeva defies the night. He would take refuge; she would take to flight. She was free. But when she finally let go of his hand, he was once again the "captive spirit". Yet her preference, her poems, her song had inspired his own song, had freed his spirit

and exorcized his devil. *Razlika* for a brief moment restored Belyi to the poetic brilliance of his youth. *Posle razliki*, after the separation – he would never shine again.

Notes

- 1 M. Tsvetaeva, *A Captive Spirit. Selected Prose*, trans. J. Martin King, Ann Arbor, 1980, 154. "Plennyi duch" was originally published in *Sovremennye Zapiski*, 55, 1934, 198–255.
- 2 A. Saakjanc, "Vstreča poetov", *Voprosy literatury*, 4, 1982, 275.
- 3 A. Efton, "Stranicy bylogo", *Zvezda*, 6, 1975, 148–161, *Stranicy bylogo*, Paris, 1979.
- 4 Saakjanc, "Vstreča poetov", *Andrej Belyi. Problemy tvorčestva*, M., 1988, 367–385. Saakjanc reprints Belyi's review of Tsvetaeva's *Razlika* and prints a letter of Belyi to Tsvetaeva dated June 24, 1922. The 1988 effort, which is an elaboration of her article by the same name of 1982, begins the analysis she had previously called for.
- 5 *Marina Cvetaeva. Her Life and Art*, Berkeley, 1966, 53–54. Karimsky also cites an article by V. Chodasevič, "Knigi i ljudi", *Vozroždenie*, May 31, 1934 (no page given) which asserted the influence of Tsvetaeva.
- 6 *The Poetic World of Andrej Bely*, Amsterdam, 1977, 123. Note that "The Parting" does not convey precisely the Russian word *razlika*. Simon Karimsky has translated it as "separation." In fact, the key issue in both collections of poetry was not the parting of loved ones, but extensive separations.
- 7 For an overview of Belyi's activities in Berlin see Th. R. Beyer, Jr., "Andrej Belyi – the Berlin Years 1921–1923", *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, L, 1990, 1–53.
- 8 Among his major projects of 1922 were the revision of the novel, *Peterburg*, the monumental *Vospominanija o Bloke* along with the publication of *Glossolalija*, *Zapiski čitaka*, *Zvezda*, *Putevy zametki*, *Poezija slova*, *O smysle žizni*, and of course, *Posle razliki*. K. Močul'skij, *Andrej Belyi*, Paris, 1955, 239, lists sixteen books published by Belyi from 1921 to 1923.
- 9 A. Belyi, *Počemu ja stal simvolistom*, Ann Arbor, 1982, 114. It was in a discussion with Frédéric Kozlik that I realized the true impact of this coincidental meeting. Kozlik's monumental work is a valuable resource for scholars of the Belyi – Steiner connection. 1981, *L'influence de l'anthroposophie sur l'oeuvre d'Andréi Biélyi*, Frankfurt. For Belyi, whose life it sometimes seemed centered around the teachings and person of Steiner, the doctor's cool but proper Getman "Wie geht es Ihnen?" was an enormous disappointment

which carried over until the two men met in Stuttgart for a private conversation in March of 1923.

- 10 Asja was also in no hurry to see her husband even though Belyi's departure was motivated not so much by a desire to leave as it was a need to see and speak with Asja. "Моя милая, милая, милая, милая деточка! Боже мой, до чего я соскучился по тебе...", Belyi wrote in February of 1920. They had been bound together uniquely by mystical and spiritual experiences. "Соединяла не радость: вопрос – тот единственный, который стоит перед каждым: 'Как жить?'", A. Belyi, *Putevy zametki*, T. 1, Berlin, 1922, 73. Belyi described how in 1912 the two had experienced a mystical togetherness which came to full fruition in the person of Rudolf Steiner, and thus the triangle (Belyi's favorite form) of Belyi – Asja – Steiner. After his return in 1916 Belyi kept alive the hope of a relationship with Asja. He referred to her with tenderness (albeit paternalistic – she was ten years his junior) and harbored the conviction that a face meeting and bating of their souls would restore the unity between the two. His own expectations were in sharp contrast to those of Asja. In her own mind the relationship had already ended before Belyi's departure in the summer of 1916. "Лишь в последние недели, прощаясь с прошлым, он вновь обрел спокойствие. Но вера в то, что самое значительное, что мы пережили, сохранится неприкосновенным, была надломлена. Он это знал. Будущее показало, что и сохраняя ему верность, убедить его он не сумел." (А. Плугенева, "Andrej Belyi i Rudolf Šteiner", *Mostr*, 13–14, 1967–1968, 248). Belyi continued to send letters to her and regardless of her perception, he intended to join his wife and refers to her often. The best indication of Belyi's true desire to see Asja is in the November 1921 letter from Kowno. (*Vozdišnye piti*, 5, 1967, 296–309). After chiding her for the tone of her own letters, her lack of understanding of Soviet reality and his accusation that "Ты покинула меня в самое критическое время" (309), Belyi nonetheless affirms: "Тебя лично я глубоко люблю; но эта любовь – все эти года доставляла одно сплошное страдание; и от этой любви – ни привета, ни ответа." (307).
- 11 A. Belyi, *Rakkurs k 'Dnevniku'*, CGALD, 53, op. 1, ed. ch. 100, 111/1–2. Only recently has the *Rakkurs* been made available to scholars. I am grateful for the complete cooperation and extensive access to the archival holdings concerning Belyi's stay in Berlin at the Institut Russkoj Literatury AN SSSR (Puškinskij Dom), the Rukopisnyj otdel Gosudarstvennoj publiknoj biblioteki im. Saltykova-Ščedrina, the Rukopisnyj otdel Gosudarstvennoj biblioteki im. Lenina and the Centralnyj gosudarstvennyj arhiv literatury i iskusstva (CGALD).
- 12 CGALD, 1782, op. 1 No. 73 quoted in A. Lavrov, "Rukopisnyj arhiv Andreja Belogo v Puškinskom Dome", *Ežegodnik Puškinskogo Doma na 1979 god*, L., 1981, 54.
- 13 A. Belyi, *Odna iz obitel'ej carstva tenej*, L., 1924, 63.

- 14 L. Flejšman, et alii., *Russkij Berlin 1921-1923*, Paris, 1983, 222.
- 15 E. Gollerбах, "Andrej Belyj, kak mysлитel", *Literary Supplement #3 to Nakamie*, May 14, 1922, 5-6. "Дело в том, что так я думал о Белом до личной встречи с ним. Считаю его поэром, краснобаем, кривлякой. Удивлялся его таланту и - негодовал на его легкомыслие. И только встретившись летом прошлого года с автором "Эпопей", я понял до конца, как значительна его личность".
- 16 "Poetessa-pevica" *Golden Rossi*, 971, May 21, 1922, 7-8. Reprinted in Saakjanc, 1988, 374-377. Cvetaeva mistakenly gives the title of the newspaper as *Дни*, which was first published in October of 1922.

17 See M. Cvetaeva, "Отрок", *Эпопея*, II, 1922, 7-10 and "Svetovoi živn", *Эпопея* III, 1922/1923, 10-33. In a curious coincidence Belyj's own poem, "Marine Cvetaevoi", appears on the facing page to her own "Vinogradny tščno v sadax ržaveli", *Эпопея*, II.

18 G. Struve, "K biografii Andreja Belogo: A. Belyj i A.A. Turgeneva", *Annali dell'Instituto Universitario Orientale, Sezione Slava*, 13, Napoli, 1970, 65. Belyj still refers to Asja as his "wife". "I dedicate this book to the one who wrote it together with me, Anna Alekseevna Turgeneva-Bugaeva". Her conduct gave rise to rumors which Asja tried to dispel. "Dear Borja, from time to time rumors reach me, that I have married for second time. I don't know what you could think and say about my behavior for the outside world... For you I personally repeat that besides the fact that I have no desire to marry, I could unite my life only with a man, with whom I was connected by mutual interests and mutual aspirations. In any case, anyone who saw me together with Kjusikovj could not have concluded that from my behavior". The letter was published by Nina Berberova in *Kursiv moj* (Munich, 1972), 188. It is difficult to establish the exact chronology, but for a brief period Asja was seen in the company of the poet Aleksandr Kuskov, who had arrived in Berlin in February 1922. Cvetaeva recalls that Belyj had seen Asja and Kuskov in a cafe in June 1922.

19 R. Gul', *Rossija v Germanii*, t. 1 of *Jalnes Rossija*, New York, 1981, 58.

20 The original letters are now housed at Columbia University's Butler Library in New York. The letters were printed with some omissions in *Mosy*, V, 1960, 299-318 and VI, 1961, 319-341.

21 She incorrectly notes the date of the letter as November 4, 1923, but by that time Belyj was already in Moscow. Her own letter to Bachrach was written on October 4.

22 See Th. R. Beyer, Jr., "Belyj and Steiner: The Berlin Period 1921-1923," *Andrej Belyj Society Newsletter*, 6, 1987, 13-26 and "Andrej Belyj's First and

Last Encounters with Rudolf Steiner: Two Letters to Marie von-Sivers," *Journal for Anthroposophy*, XLVI, Winter 1987, 71-76.

23 "Cvetaeva-Majakovskij-Pasternak." *Novyj žurnal*, 95, June, 1969, 161.

24 Karlinsky (156-157) indicates this aspect of Cvetaeva's poetry as the key element adopted by Belyj for his own *Posle razluki*: "A prominent feature of Cvetaeva's versification beginning with *Versy I* is her predilection for additional and irregularly placed stressed syllables, resulting in combinations not always explicable in terms of traditional Russian metrics. It was this aspect of Cvetaeva's versification that Vladislav Chodasevič had in mind when he wrote of her impact on the versification of Andrej Belyj in terms of Belyj's use of the spondee and the molossus (a succession of three stressed syllables)."

25 "Compound Meters in the Poetry of Marina Cvetaeva," *Russian Literature*, VIII, 2 March 1980, 112. See also his "Logaeic Metres in the Lyric Poetry of Marina Tsvetaeva," *Slavonic and East European Review*, LIII, 132, 1975, 330-354.

26 Hands recur as an image of Marina. Gul' (58) remembered her hands, and Ariadna Efron (12) talks of her hands. Marina too was struck by the beauty of Asja Trugeneva's hands (CS, 107).

27 The second poem is dated May 1921. Poem 3 is dated June 1921, Poem 4-12 June 1921, Poem 6-15 June 1921, Poem 7-16 June 1921, Poem 8-17 June 1921. It is a curious footnote to the whole affair that this collection was written exactly one year prior to Belyj's *Posle razluki*, written in May and June of 1922.

28 Quoted by Saakjanc, 1988, 374.

29 K. Taranovskij, "Četyrexstopyj jamb Andreja Belogo", *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*, X, 1966, 127-147. For a fuller discussion of this aspect of Belyj's career see Th.R. Beyer, Jr., *Andrej Belyj's Realnyj Criticism*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1974.

30 *Glossolalija* was written in 1917. Belyj read excerpts from the work at an April 1922 meeting of the Berlin House of the Arts. Saakjanc (1988, 379) quotes Cvetaeva in a letter to Bachrach "Белый свою 'Глоссополию' написал после моей 'Паззукки'..." Cvetaeva overestimates her own impact on the work which had been written in 1917 and was already being revised in April before her arrival.

31 A useful overview is provided in B. Christa, "Music as Model and Ideal in Andrej Belyj's Poetic Theory and Practice", *Russian Literature*, IV, 1976, 4, 395-411. Curiously there is only a brief mention of the preface to *Posle razluki* and to the concept of "melodism".

- ³² In reprinting the review (Saakjanc, 1988) "nudnych" is replaced by "trudnych". The reproduction of Belyj's text also contains several errors in the representation of poetic meters. In the original article Belyj (or the typesetter) is not always reliable.
- ³³ In the second line of the 1988 reprint "sbruja" (harness) is replaced by "struja" (stream) eliminating the mythological allusion.
- ³⁴ "Bessonica" was published in *Zapiski mečtatelej*, V, 1922, 47. "Bol'nica" under the title "Ase" appeared in the journal edited by Belyj, *Еропеја*, I, 1922, 25, which was available in March 1922. "Ty – ten' tenej" appeared in the same issue on page 26.
- ³⁵ "После разлуки написана в две недели... в 1922 году в Цоссене я пытаюсь продолжить правку [Золото в лазури], но вместо нее из передвижения строк и слов вырастает часть, стихов, напечатанная в *После разлуки*". A. Belyj, "Zovy vremen: Vmesto predislovija", *Novyj žurnal*, 102, 1971, 91–92.
- ³⁶ Several of these poems would appear in Belyj's, *Stichotvorenija*, Berlin: Gržebn, 1923, in the section "Posle zvezdy". Belyj revised one final time the poems for his proposed *Zovy vremen* and *Zvezda pod urnoj*. For a more detailed discussion of textual variants see J. Malmstad, ed. A. Belyj, *Sobranie stichotvorenij*, 3 Vols. 1982–1984, Malmstad's work is indispensable for the study of Belyj's poetry which underwent such extensive re-working and re-organization.
- ³⁷ For an examination of Belyj's influence and a review of the literature on the subject see Vjačeslav Vs. Ivanov, "O vozdejstvii éstetičeskogo éksperimenta Andreja Belogo, *Andrej Belyj. Problemy tvorčestva*, M., 1988, 338–366.
- ³⁸ Karen Handelsman of Middlebury first brought this fact to my attention. Belyj would most likely be pleased by the comparison.
- ³⁹ When the poem was published in *Golos Rossii* #1067, September 24, 1922, 6, the three lines beginning "Don't speak dead words" were omitted.
- ⁴⁰ In fact Belyj did take up dancing in the summer of 1922. Many have commented on his wild dance steps as symbolic of his mental degeneration. The dancing was intended to be physical exercise as prescribed by his physician. Belyj remembers that when he left Zossen in July 1922 for a vacation in Swinemünde: "Усиленно занимаюсь физ-культурой: ...начинаю ради физ-культуры учиться фокстроту, джимми, бостону, уан-степпу" (Rakkurs, 114/1).
- ⁴¹ Malmstad, III, 322 points to similarities between the first lines of the poem and a quatrain composed in 1901 for *Pepel*.

ЗНАКИ ПРЕПИНАНИЯ В ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ КОМПОЗИЦИИ ЛИРИКИ

Стиху Марины Цветаевой присуща определенная ценность – каждого слова, каждого предложения, каждой вещи, которая дана чаще всего в дальнейшем хотелось бы остановиться: в дальнейшем хотелось бы остановиться: в дальнейшем хотелось бы остановиться: здания образа автора в узком смысле, ни, а поскольку мы отдаем себе отчет о значимости этой проблемы, то ограничиваемся лишь кратким анализом знака препинания (ЗП) в некоторых произведениях. Впервые мысль о ЗП, творящих образ автора, высказана В.В. Виноградовым, была высказана в 1930-е годы в строенных по принципам такой разницы, как киносценарий (Мартыанова 1930).

"Широко понимаемый монтажный принцип в поэтической речи, восходящее в своей сущности к мерностям внутренней речи, – характерная черта, явившаяся во всех видах искусства" (Кружков 1930). Значительных средств и семиотических методов становится в последнее время (Григорьев, Северская, Фатеева 1993; в научной литературе уже была высказана мысль о ЗП в поэзии (Тынянов 1974), в частности о ЗП в прозе (Григорьев, Северская, Фатеева 1993), о ЗП в драматургии (Пухначев 1981). Возможна киносценарийная организация стихотворений ("Бабушка", "Вдруг во фокус восприятия обусловлен точкой зрения, а именно: определяющим фактором сущности являются альные элементы кадра, последовательность текстовую информацию об эмоциональном состоянии героя, его мыслях, действиях, так как всегда дает не сумму, а произведение