

<<Bethea ch. 25 opening, new page>>

<<CN>>25

<<CT>>Pushkin and the Literary Movements of His Time

<<CA>>V. E. Vatsuro

<<TXT>>The central position that Pushkin occupied in Russian literature of the nineteenth century was not merely the result of the uniqueness of his individual gift. At work here as well were more general laws of historico-literary process, forces that converged in the phenomenon of Pushkin as if in a single focus, advancing him to such a position. It is not by accident that the first third of the nineteenth century has come to be defined as the “Pushkin Epoch”: this term refers not only to an epoch that proceeded under the banner of Pushkin but also to the epoch that formed him.

Pushkin’s initial literary upbringing fed on the wellsprings of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment in its French and Russian variants. It is commonly accepted that the French Enlightenment played the dominant role, and on the whole this is true. Yet one should not underestimate the role of national origins in this upbringing. The Moscow literary environment, with which the family of the future poet was closely tied, was in the vanguard of the Russian literary movement at this time: both Karamzin and I. I. Dmitriev lived in Moscow, and Pushkin’s uncle Vasilii L’vovich, who was the young poet’s first mentor, also belonged to their close circle. The best Russian literary journals of Karamzinian orientation were published in Moscow; in the first decade of the nineteenth century V. A. Zhukovskii, the brothers Andrei and Aleksandr Turgenev, the young P. A. Viazemskii, and a bit later K. N. Batiushkov and Pushkin himself all contributed to Karamzin’s Herald of Europe [Vestnik Evropy].

We have sparse information for re-creating the literary atmosphere of Pushkin's childhood years. It is beyond doubt, however, that a vibrant tradition connected his family with the men of letters of the passing century. It's to such vibrant legend that reports, preserved by Pushkin himself, of his parents' and grandmother's interest in the life and activity of Fonvizin, go back.ⁱ To a large extent, this tradition predetermined the deep impression made on the young Pushkin by the famous scene at the 1815 lyceum examination, when Derzhavin declared him to be his poetic heir.

At the same time, already during his pre-lyceum, Moscow period Pushkin the boy became witness to the ever more antagonistic differentiation—a differentiation that eventually led to direct conflicts—of literary groups and movements. Pushkin's cultural maturation was an unusually rapid process; it coincided with the formation of "Discussions of Lovers of the Russian Word" [Besedy liubitelei russkogo slova] and the future Arzamas circle. The former brought together the "archaists," the opponents of Karamzinian literary reforms and, in a wider sense, the adversaries of European Enlightenment tradition. To this tradition the archaists opposed patriarchal-religious foundations in social life, and in literature, an orientation towards ahistorically understood models of the Russian eighteenth century, in particular the work of Lomonosov. The future Arzamasians came out strongly against the social and literary conservatism of the "Beseda" group, forming their own sort of "liberal front" in politics and literature. The polemical articles and verse epistle-pamphlets of D. V. Dashkov and V. L. Pushkin, dating from 1810–1811, initiated a direct literary polemic that in 1815 led to the creation of Arzamas.ⁱⁱ

By the time he moved to St. Petersburg and entered the lyceum (1811), Pushkin had

already accumulated a fairly wide range of literary impressions. Of course, his sympathies were fully with the future members of Arzamas, and the literary circle they would later officially organize; his literary art of the lyceum period is literally permeated with ideas and locutions from the Arzamas arsenal. The young Pushkin also closely followed the literary output of the Beseda group, responding with satires, epistles, and epigrams in the Arzamas spirit.ⁱⁱⁱ He directly numbered himself among the “Arzamas brotherhood,” and this group—Zhukovskii, Viazemskii, Aleksandr Turgenev, D. V. Davydov—later composed his literary circle.^{iv}

Out of this environment, two literary figures stand out as Pushkin’s direct literary mentors: Batiushkov and Zhukovskii. Traditionally, Batiushkov has been placed first. The question of the significance for Pushkin of the literary traditions represented by these two names presents a vast and complex problem, one extending beyond the limits of Pushkin studies proper. The essence of the artistic method of Batiushkov and Zhukovskii, its aesthetic foundations, the dominant characteristics of their poetical style—all this has been interpreted in a wide variety of ways in literary scholarship. In A. N. Veselovskii’s classic work Zhukovskii: The Poetry of Feeling and Heartfelt Imagination [Zhukovskii. Poeziia chuvstva i serdechnogo voobrazheniia], Zhukovskii is examined as a sentimentalist, and this view finds supporters to the present day. Yet already in the 1930s there began to prevail a view of him as a romantic poet, a representative of a conservative, or in Pushkin’s definition, “Gothic” romanticism, with clearly expressed elements—both ideological and poetci—of religious mysticism. B. S. Meilakh gives such an interpretation of Zhukovskii’s poetry in a somewhat simplified and, in accordance with the ideological tendencies of the time, crudely sociological form in his book Pushkin and Russian Romanticism [Pushkin i russkii romantizm (1937)], a work that had a considerable influence on

subsequent study of the problem. The young Pushkin's artistic explorations quite obviously did not harmonize with Zhukovskii's religious and philosophical aspirations, and more often than not this divergence has been interpreted as polemical in nature. There even seemed to be factual support for such a view: in Ruslan and Liudmila Pushkin openly parodied Zhukovskii's Twelve Sleeping Maidens, and in later years he clearly demonstrated indifference to "mystical" poetry. The hedonistically sensuous, object-based [predmetnaia] and "earthly" poetry of Batiushkov was closer to Pushkin; the poet's early lyrics are literally saturated with reminiscences from Batiushkov's poetry, especially from My Penates [Moi penaty]. The very figure of Batiushkov appears as a stylized symbol of "the heir to Tibullus and Parny" in Pushkin's lyceum-period epistles addressed to him; Batiushkov is a singer of love and aestheticized earthly delight, a symbol of poetic and (in a broad sense) spiritual freedom. This is the very same complex of poetic ideas that Pushkin himself incarnated in the poetry of his lyceum years.

G. A. Gukovskii gives a detailed analysis of the tradition of Batiushkov and Zhukovskii in his book Pushkin and the Russian Romantics [Pushkin i russkie romantiki (1946; reprinted, 1965)]. Analyzing the foundations of Batiushkov and Zhukovskii's poetic style (with the latter examined as a projection of a subjective, idealistic philosophy, a model that subsequently aroused well-justified doubts), Gukovskii states the dominant significance of Batiushkov for Pushkin. In Gukovskii's model, however, both these points of origin are not arranged in a rigid opposition. The poetic systems of Zhukovskii and Batiushkov, which at first glance appear quite different, are far from antagonistic at their foundational level; quite the opposite, they come together in their most substantial elements (in their understanding of the essence of the poetic word, nonverbal means, metaphoric language, and so on), defining the principles of that "school

of harmonious precision” to which Pushkin himself belonged. In the consciousness of their contemporaries, both Batiushkov and Zhukovskii were forefathers of the so-called “new school of poets,” a school in which Pushkin was included as well. V. V. Vinogradov’s book The Style of Pushkin [Stil’ Pushkina] contains extensive material confirming such a paradigm. The analysis of Pushkin’s lyrics at the linguo-stylistic level, was accompanied by, in Vinogradov, numerous parallels to the poetry of Batiushkov and Zhukovskii (forms of poetic word choice, lyrical formulas, syntactic composition, and so on).

All of these observations and conclusions brought about a corrective in our understanding of the literary relations of Zhukovskii and Pushkin. Drawn towards “Batiushkovian” hedonism in his choice of and way of looking at the topic, Pushkin, even during moments of the greatest divergence with Zhukovskii, continued to consider himself his pupil (for example, in a letter to P. A. Viazemskii of May–June, 1825 he stated: “I am not a result, but precisely his pupil [. . .] No one has ever had or will have a style equal in powerfulness and diversity to his”).^v By including a travesty of the plot of Twelve Sleeping Maidens in Ruslan and Liudmila, Pushkin acted as a direct disciple of the “school of harmonious precision”: the polemics that developed around this long poem to a significant degree implicated those forms of poetic style that were introduced into Russian poetry by Zhukovskii. One should also add that Pushkin’s personal relations with Zhukovskii had taken the form of literary apprenticeship and tutorship already in the lyceum years. Zhukovskii attentively and solicitously followed the young poet’s creative development, read his verse in manuscript form, and later on, introduced him into the Arzamas circle; Pushkin addressed epistles to Zhukovskii precisely as his poetic teacher (“To Zhukovskii” [K Zhukovskomu (1816)]; “To Zhukovskii” [Zhukovskomu (1818)]).^{vi}

In the first post-lyceum years new tendencies emerged in Pushkin's literary relations. Above all, he was caught up by theatrical impressions. Theater drew the young poet closer to the former adversaries of Arzamas—A. A. Shakhovskoi, P. A. Katenin, and A. S. Griboedov. These were not merely personal contacts but also a broadening of his aesthetic horizon.

In February 1826 Pushkin wrote to Katenin: "Many people (including myself) owe you much; you broke me of my one-sidedness in literary opinions, and one-sidedness is the ruin of thought."^{vii} The "archaists" and especially the "young archaists" (Katenin, Griboedov) were developing those spheres of literature that had little concern for poets of the "school of harmonious precision": national folklore, "high" biblical poetry, a tragedy that attempts to find modern parallels to both ancient classical and French classical tragedy, and a "simple folk" ballad (Katenin). Pushkin assimilated this artistic experience.

In the 1920s Iu. N. Tynianov raised the issue of the influence of "archaic" tradition on Pushkin (Archaists and Innovators [Arkhaisty i novatory]). In the years that followed scholars approached this topic on various levels: thus, V. V. Vinogradov emphasized its role in helping Pushkin to overcome the limitations of Karamzin's reforms of the literary language. On the whole, these formulations do not require reexamination. Here, however, it is important to avoid misplacing one's emphases. While Pushkin did enrich his artistic palette with the achievements of opposing literary parties, he did not break his ties with the school of Batiushkov-Zhukovskii (as occurs, for example, with Kiukhel'beker, who goes over to the position of the "young archaists"). In this sense the history of Pushkin's literary relations with Katenin, both complex and fraught with internal antagonism, is extremely illustrative. Highly valuing the boldness of his literary pursuits, Pushkin nevertheless reproached Katenin for his lack of "taste and harmony."^{viii}

This judgement was made in 1820, but the Karamzinian criteria for “taste”—“a sense of proportionality and conformity” [Otryvki iz pisem, mysli i zamechaniia]—remained one of the fundamental aspects of Pushkin’s aesthetics even in later years.^{ix}

An entirely unique sphere in the creative work of the young Pushkin was civic poetry. In the large and diverse socio-literary movement of the 1810s and 1820s, literature not only played the role of herald of and propagandist for freedom-loving views, but it also served as the transmitter of concrete socio-political programs. This role was solidified by the statutes of the Union of Prosperity [Soiuz Blagodenstviia]—a secret society out of which directly grew the revolutionary organization of the Decembrists, the Northern Society [Severnoe obshchestvo]. K. F. Ryleev, the leader of the Northern Society, was himself one of the most significant Russian poets of the 1820s. The St. Petersburg literary, theatrical, and social groups with which the young Pushkin came into close contact were all directly or indirectly connected with the Union of Prosperity. The most significant of them was the Free Society of Lovers of the Russian Letters [Vol’noe obshchestvo liubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti], which published the journal Competitor of Enlightenment and Philanthropy [Sorevnovatel’ prosveshcheniia i blagotvoreniiia. Trudy Vol’nogo obshchestva . . .] Though formally Pushkin was not a member of this society, he maintained a literary and personal connection with its active members and leaders affiliated with the liberal wing of literature—N. I. Grech and N. I. Gnedich as well as F. N. Glinka and later Ryleev and A. A. Bestuzhev, who in the future would all be prominent figures in the Decembrist movement. The society greeted Pushkin’s exile to the South in May 1820 with a sort of literary and political demonstration defending and supporting the poet. V. G. Bazanov has traced the history of this society in a special monograph entitled The Free Society of Lovers of

the Russian Letters [Vol'noe obshchestvo liubitelei rossisskoi slovesnosti]. This edition also contained protocols of the meetings—a most valuable collection of documentary materials that has been only partially utilized by scholars of preceding generations.

At this time Pushkin was more closely connected with the literary and theatrical circle “Green Lamp” [Zelenaia lampa] and an informal union composing the domestic circle of N. I. Turgenev—the younger brother of A. I. Turgenev, one of the founders and leaders of the Northern Society. For a long time Green Lamp was depicted as a circle of wild, rakish St. Petersburg youth. The movement has been studied in detail by P. E. Shchegolev (From the Life and Art of Pushkin [Iz zhizni i tvorchestva Pushkina]); B. L. Modzalevskii, who published extremely valuable materials from the circle’s papers (“Towards a History of Green Lamp” [K istorii Zelenoi lampy]), and B. V. Tomashevskii. After the publication of these works the society came to be viewed as a group with a rather significant social and aesthetic program similar to that of the Union of Prosperity. The society consisted of inveterate theater goers (N. Vsevolozhskii, D. Barkov), poets close to Pushkin (F. N. Glinka, N. I. Gnedich, A. A. Del’vig), the future historian of music A. D. Ulybyshev, and others. An entire series of Pushkin’s epistles is connected with the Green Lamp; in these poems religious and political free thought is stylistically fused with motifs from erotic and Bacchanalian verse.^x N. I. Turgenev’s circle, on the contrary, stimulated a type of “serious,” socio-philosophical lyric. Pushkin’s ode “Liberty” [Vol’nost’ (1817)] is a typical example of such poetry, inspired by the Green Lamp circle, it is one of the most significant and popular works of the “poetry of freedom” [vol’noi poezii] from the 1810s and 1820s.

“Liberty” and the series of Pushkin’s civic poems that followed it (“The Village”

[Derevnia], “To Chaadaev” [K Chaadaevu]) in many ways defined the poetics of the civic lyric in the 1810s and 1820s, in particular that of the Decembrists. By the beginning of the twentieth century the literary work of the Decembrist poets became the subject of special study: monographs appeared on Ryleev (V. I. Maslov), A. I. Odoevskii (N. A. Kotliarevskii), and others. But only in the 1930s did the work of the Decembrists begin to be interpreted as a kind of unified artistic corpus [nekaia khudozhestrennaia obshchnost']. Characteristic typological features of Decembrist poetry were described in the works of V. Gofmann, B. S. Meilakh, G. A. Gukovskii, V. G. Bazanov.^{xi} These features included a turning away from intimate lyrics to philosophical-journalistic genres, with a wide use of oratorical poetic speech; an orientation toward the heroic and tragic episodes of national history (always actualized and projected onto the contemporary situation); and social didacticism. With the latter were closely connected such characteristic features of poetic speech as allusion and “word-signals”—metaphoric images with fixed political meaning and predetermined value. Thus, the phrase “star of captivating happiness” [zvezda plenitel' nogo schast'ia] in the epistle “To Chaadaev” (1818) was infallibly decoded as “political freedom.” Similar examples are abundant in “The Village” and other political poems of Pushkin in the years 1818–1820. In “Liberty” abstract categories—ones through which political doctrines (in particular, those of Montesquieu) are deployed—become the subject of poetic analysis: “Law,” “the people,” “nature”; historical pictures arise as a chain of didactic examples for contemporary “masters.” Never a “Decembrist” in the exact sense of the word (that is, a member of the secret society), Pushkin created finished models of “Decembrist” political lyrics.^{xii}

The rapid growth of Pushkin’s political radicalism in the years following his graduation from the lyceum placed a distinct imprint on his literary relations. More than anything else, this

affected his attitude to Karamzin. Karamzin was the recognized spiritual leader for the majority of the Arzamas group; the group itself, arising spontaneously and without the knowledge of Karamzin, functioned in the orbit of his literary activity. V. L. Pushkin was a devoted disciple of Karamzin; Zhukovskii, Viazemskii (Karamzin's brother-in-law), Aleksandr Turgenev were all his close friends. Pushkin undoubtedly heard about Karamzin (and perhaps saw him) while still a child in Moscow; Karamzin's friend of many years and (literary) comrade-in-arms I. I. Dmitriev continually visited the Pushkin home. From 1816, when Karamzin moved to St. Petersburg and began spending his summer months at Tsarskoe Selo, the schoolboy Pushkin spent much time in the historian's family circle. He greeted the publication of History of the Russian State (1818) as a scholarly, literary, and social feat. Yet it is towards this time that Pushkin began (and not without the influence of the young Turgenev circle) to recognize the unacceptability for himself of Karamzin's conservative social position, in particular, his defense and grounding of autocratic forms of government as the optimal ones for Russia. Pushkin's famous epigram on Karamzin, "In his History elegance, simplicity . . ." (1818), in particular, serves as evidence of these differences of opinion. Rather obscure and fragmentary reports of Pushkin's arguments with Karamzin have also come down to us.^{xiii}

All of these diverse and at first glance contradictory aesthetic orientations came together in the artistic personality of Pushkin, forming from heterogeneous elements a unified artistic system. Already in the beginning of the 1820s Pushkin was outgrowing his contemporaries as a creative individuality. The most insightful of them—the Arzamasians Zhukovskii and Viazemskii and the new generation of poets emerging from the lyceum milieu—all understood this fact.

The latter group, originally including A. A. Del'vig and V. K. Kiukhel'beker, and later joined by E. A. Baratynskii and P. A. Pletnev (who were not members of the lyceum circle), made up an informal association under the designation "union of poets" [soiuz poetov]. This designation traced back to the poetic declarations of Pushkin ("holy brotherhood" [sviatoe bratstvo]) in the verse "To Kiukhel'beker" [Kiukhel'bekeru (1817)]; and of Kiukhel'beker (see his address to Del'vig, Baratynskii, and Pushkin in the lyric "Poets" [Poety (1820)]: "And so! Our union will not die, / Free, joyful, proud, / And firm in fortune and misfortune, / Union of the favorites of the eternal muses!" [Tak! ne umret i nash soiuz, / Svobodnyi, radostnyi i gordyi, / I v schast'i i v neschast'i tverdyi, / Soiuz liubimtsev vechnykh muz!]); and also of Del'vig, who was the first to predict Pushkin's poetic fame while still at the lyceum ("On the Death of Derzhavin" [Na smert' Derzhavina (1816)]). It also found modified expression in the many pamphlets and parodies of their literary adversaries. At times the "union of poets" has been defined as a "new school" inspired by Batiushkov and Zhukovskii, which was in fact the reality: as did Pushkin, these young poets came to perceive the principles of "taste" and a new understanding of the essence of the poetic word with its metaphoric connotations through these older poets; likewise they were attracted to the genre of the friendly epistle and the elegy through them. From the early Batiushkov they inherited a heightened interest in the artistic forms of the classical anthology as well as hedonistic tendencies (Del'vig). Anacreontic and erotic spontaneity, a cult of joy, youth, and poetry all combined in their creative work with elegiac motifs, just as in the early verse of Pushkin, whom they unanimously recognized as their poetic leader. This was a poetry of romantic life affirmation, one opposing the traditionally established literary norms and provoking

a reaction for that reason almost immediately: these “voluptuary,” “Bacchic” poets were perceived—and not without reason—as mouthpieces for liberalism in social life and literature. Together with the Arzamas group, this circle, at whose center stood Del’vig, formed Pushkin’s immediate literary milieu.

Pushkin’s political verse soon attracted the attention of the government: in May 1820 he was sent away from the capital—in essence, exiled, though the move was officially formulated as a transfer to a new place of service. He lived in Kishenev, then Odessa, whither he was officially sent into exile to Mikhailovskoe, the estate of his father, and there kept under police surveillance. For six-and-a-half years Pushkin was thus cut off from the active literary life of both capitals. During this time Ruslan and Liudmila (1820), The Prisoner of the Caucasus (1822), The Fountain of Bakhchisarai (1824), the first chapter of Evgenii Onegin (1825), and finally, The Verse of Alexander Pushkin (1826; first appeared 30 December 1825), which contained the best of his early lyric poetry, were published. It was during this period that Pushkin’s poetic maturation was completed. European and Russian political life introduced correctives to his ideas about the social mechanisms driving that life; the radicalism of Pushkin’s social position, reaching its apogee at the beginning of the 1820s, gave place to the “crisis of 1823,” which resulted in a growth of his historical consciousness. These factors forced the poet to reevaluate the problems of the individual and his environment, the historical actor (deiatel’) and the people—that is, in essence, the very foundations of an Enlightenment worldview—and consequently, to alter the axiological scale that had formed in his consciousness.

The southern period of Pushkin’s art began under the banner of Byron. The type of “modern man” represented by Byron’s Childe Harold finds reflection in The Prisoner of the

Caucasus, a long poem that gained particular popularity among the liberal youth, whose frame of mind resonated with the spiritual make-up of a disillusioned hero, a voluntary exile, inspired by the “joyful specter of freedom.” The Prisoner of the Caucasus introduced a series of Pushkin’s long poems that were typologically close to Byron’s oriental [“eastern”/vostochnye in the Russian] poems. Their problematics and poetics have been studied by V. M. Zhirmunskii who also defined Pushkin’s role in the formation and development of the Russian version of the Byronic poem.^{xiv} This influence can be observed in early classic models like I. I. Kozlov’s Chernets (1823–1824; separate edition, 1825) and Ryleev’s Voinarovskii (1823–1824; separate edition, 1825), as well as in the late long poems of Lermontov, where Russian Byronism reaches its apogee.

Pushkin’s long poems won a sound victory for the romantic movement and served as a powerful stimulus to theoretical thought. As early as 1822 P. A. Viazemskii published a detailed analysis of The Prisoner of the Caucasus; being close at the time to the critics of the Decembrist wing of literature, Viazemskii emphasized the social significance of the “povest” as well as the prisoner's own character. In Viazemskii’s interpretation, a close connection with the spiritual life of Russian society made Pushkin’s work a deeply national phenomenon. The publication of The Fountain of Bakhchisarai was preceded by Viazemskii’s extensive preface “A Conversation between a Publisher and a Classic from the Vyborg Side or Vasil’evskii Island” [Razgovor mezhdru Izdatelem i Klassikom s Vyborgskoi storony ili s Vasil’evskogo ostrova], which was written at the direct request of Pushkin. Here Viazemskii raised the problem of the popular character [narodnost’] of literature and with polemical harshness came down against the aesthetic norms of the “classics,” the bulwark of which, though not directly named by him, was the Herald

of Europe, edited by M. T. Kachenovskii.

Of all the critics of romantic orientation, Viazemskii was closest to Pushkin, although their positions by no means coincided in all matters. Pushkin was much less inclined to share Viazemskii's enthusiastic loyalty to the most eminent figures of the passing literary epoch, V. A. Ozerov and I. I. Dmitriev; yet at this time it was precisely Viazemskii that Pushkin viewed as his main epistolary interlocutor regarding questions of the essence of the romantic movement.^{xv} A. A. Bestuzhev, the author of literary reviews in the almanac Polar Star [Poliarnaia zvezda], was another critic whose articles served as a starting point for Pushkin's own reflections on the romantic movement. Bestuzhev's reviews formed the basis of the Decembrists' understanding of romantic literature; like Viazemskii, his starting point was the criteria of popular character and civic spirit. Bestuzhev also raised general questions regarding the development of literature, the shifts in its historical epochs, the correlation between literature and literary criticism, and so on. His judgments served as both points of agreement and disagreement for Pushkin: many of the critical articles Pushkin began or conceived in the first half of the 1820s represented either further development or detailed refutation of ideas presented by Bestuzhev.

The letters to Viazemskii, Bestuzhev, and Ryleev that Pushkin wrote in the South and during his exile in Mikhailovskoe are an organic part of Russian critical literature of the romantic movement. Apparently, his letters to Del'vig (of which only a small part has come down to us) were similar to these in nature. Naturally, Pushkin's works were often a subject of discussion in them. While emphasizing its social resonance, Viazemskii, Bestuzhev, and Ryleev considered their friend's creative work one of the greatest accomplishments of contemporary romantic literature; both Viazemskii and the Decembrist critics had a special interest in the problem of

“literature and society.” At the center of Pushkin’s long poems stands a strong personality with a tragic fate, and just as he is torn from society, so does he in his turn repudiate that society. The long poems thus corresponded to the aesthetic aims of Decembrist romanticism. Their passion for the poetry and the personality of Byron (in whom they saw the incarnation of the freedom-loving poet) also fed on such sources. Meanwhile, in The Gypsies [Tsygany (1823–1824; published separately in 1827)] Pushkin already subjected the Byronic hero-individualist type to revision, emphasizing the defining role of environment in his formation. When the first chapter of Onegin appeared, where the problem of “the individual and society” became a direct subject of artistic observation, Pushkin’s path and that of Bestuzhev and Ryleev sharply diverged. For Decembrist romanticism a “society man” [chelovek sveta], when taken in his everyday guise [ordinarnost], could only be a topic of satire. The reasons why these Decembrists could not accept Onegin lay in the Enlightenment foundations of their aesthetic system, one that demanded social and historical didacticism. Meanwhile, it was precisely from this system that Pushkin departed during his southern period. The “dispute over Onegin” that was begun in Pushkin’s correspondence with Bestuzhev and Ryleev found continuation in the later tales of Bestuzhev (who was then writing under the pseudonym “Marlinskii”).^{xvi} This dispute has usually been examined as the romantics’ disagreement with the realist method that was then taking shape. However, such a view demands revision. Historical and dialectical thought was precisely one of the achievements of romanticism; social didacticism remained an inheritance from preromantic, Enlightenment literature—and it was precisely this heritage that was already unacceptable for Pushkin by the mid-1820s. The tragedy Boris Godunov (1824–1825; published in 1830) may be seen as the culmination of this stage of Pushkin’s evolution.

In Boris Godunov Pushkin directly opposed the existing dramatic tradition. “Romantic tragedy” which oriented itself on the historical chronicles of Shakespeare, while demonstratively ignoring the required unities of time and place and alternating scenes in prose and poetry, opposed the norms of classical tragedy. The conflict between a strong, wise, and enlightened ruler and the supra-personal “opinion of the people”—an analogue to fate in ancient classical tragedy—served to resurrect several aspects of classical tragedy in the sense in which it was understood in the theoretical works of the romantic school (A. V. Schlegel’ and others). Finally, in his use of historical realia, in his depiction of daily life and morals at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and in particular, in his notion of the people (narod) as the ultimate moving force of historical processes, Pushkin in many ways relied on Karamzin’s History of the Russian State and drew widely from its sources. There is reason to believe that it was precisely during his work on the tragedy that Pushkin’s point of view changed regarding History of the Russian State: the question of the historian’s political position receded to the background, while historical, moral, and philosophical problematics proper advanced to the forefront (see the section on Pushkin’s drama in this handbook). Pushkin clearly did not follow Karamzin blindly; as before, the conceptual framework [kontsepsiia] of History of the Russian State entered his worldview as one of its core elements. He was primarily interested in the mechanism of historical process and the general laws directing this process; and the interests of different social groups find a place among these laws. Pushkin especially emphasized this “sociological” aspect of the historical tragedy; in the coming years his heightened interest in this aspect predisposed him to evaluate highly M. P. Pogodin’s tragedy Marfa, the Novgorod Governor’s Wife [Marfa, posadnitsa novgorodskaia (1830; separate edition in 1831)].

The Mikhailovskoe exile brought Pushkin closer to the capitals and to some extent facilitated his literary contacts. During this time Pletnev, Del'vig, and Pushkin's brother Lev prepared The Verse of Alexander Pushkin [Stikhotvoreniia Aleksandra Pushkina] for publication in St. Petersburg. Del'vig also visited Pushkin in Mikhailovskoe. Pushkin continued his collaboration with St. Petersburg publications, primarily Bestuzhev and Ryleev's almanac Polar Star and Del'vig's almanac Northern Flowers, the latter of which Del'vig had been publishing since 1825. In addition to Del'vig himself, Baratynskii, Pletnev, Zhukovskii, Viazemskii, Gnedich, Krylov, and others contributed their work to the latter. Pushkin also established new contacts: beginning in 1825 the journal Moscow Telegraph, founded by N. A. Polevoi in the close collaboration with Viazemskii, began to appear.

With its independent and sharply polemical position the Moscow Telegraph immediately established itself as a consistent supporter of the new romanticism. Its publisher, Nikolai Polevoi, was a member of the intelligentsia from a merchant background; he acquired his encyclopedic interests and wide, though not particularly deep, knowledge through self-education. Polevoi presented himself as a talented journalist and critic, pamphleteer, novelist, historian, and political writer. His primary orientation was on French romantic historiography, philosophy, sociology, and literature. Already in the first years of its existence, the Moscow Telegraph became one of (if not the) most popular literary journals of an encyclopedic nature in all Russia, familiarizing its readers with news of European literary and social life. Polevoi advertized himself as an ardent admirer of and propagandist for Pushkin's poetry, and Viazemskii tried persistently to lure Pushkin as a collaborator in the Moscow Telegraph.

Pushkin was ready to support Polevoi's journal, submitting several lyrics and critical

articles, but he had reservations about its overall stance. He was made cautious by its superficiality and, as he saw it, Polevoi's insufficient training as a journalist and critic. These reservations were combined with doubts about the peremptory nature of Polevoi's judgments and evaluations and the hastiness of his assessments regarding the preceding literary tradition, which he regarded according to his own internal axiological scale. Pushkin's mistrust continued to grow in the coming years. He planned to found his own journal uniting the literary forces closely aligned to him (of which intention he wrote to Viazemskii as early as 1824), and he intended that the range of contributors be quite wide.^{xvii} The chances for realizing such a project were slight, however, particularly with Pushkin still in exile; of the existing periodicals, the Moscow Telegraph remained the most kindred. By 1828 Pushkin was writing M. P. Pogodin (the journalistic adversary of Polevoi): "The Telegraph is a kind and honest man, and I do not wish to quarrel with him."^{xviii} The articles about Pushkin in the Moscow Telegraph have been reprinted in Pushkin in Criticism during His Lifetime [Pushkin v przhiznennoi kritike]; here one can also find information on Pushkin's relations with the journal at the time as well as secondary literature on this issue.^{xix}

The rebellion of 14 December 1825, the wave of repressions that followed, and the trial and inquest against the Decembrists sharply altered the social and literary situation in Russia. Figures torn from active work or from life itself included: Ryleev, who was executed on 13 July 1826; Bestuzhev, Kiukhel'beker, and F. Glinka, who were imprisoned or exiled. The publication of the literary almanac Polar Star ceased; N. I. Grech and F. V. Bulgarin, formerly liberal publishers of the journal Son of the Fatherland and the newspaper Northern Bee, quickly evolved into supporters of the semi-official government line. Under such conditions Pushkin

unexpectedly found himself free: the author of antigovernment verse that figured into the testimonies of members of the secret societies as one of the sources of free thought, he was summoned to Moscow in September 1826 for an audience with the new emperor. Hoping to neutralize and even enlist the services of the elite forces of the former opposition, Nicholas I brought Pushkin back from exile and gave him the opportunity to publish his work under his personal censorship (this prerogative eventually placed Pushkin in a situation of double censorship).

Moscow greeted the freed Pushkin triumphantly. Readings of Boris Godunov were arranged in several homes, resonating widely throughout society. These readings were conducted against a backdrop of growing interest in historical tragedy (thus simultaneously with Godunov the public was introduced to A. S. Khomiakov's tragedy Ermak, stylistically a lyrical drama); under such conditions, the innovative nature of Pushkin's work became quite clear, but it was far from accepted by all. Pushkin found enthusiastic supporters of his art in the circle "Lovers of Wisdom" [Liubomudry], which included D. V. Venevitinov, S. P. Shevyrev, M. P. Pogodin, V. P. Titov, and V. F. Odoevskii, who by this time had left for St. Petersburg. This group consisted of advocates of German romantic philosophy, primarily Schelling, and they possessed a heightened interest in problems of general aesthetics and the philosophy of art, painting, music, history, and folklore. These were in fact the very same problems that occupied Pushkin throughout the mid-1820s; thus through common interests and activities there came about a sense of togetherness [sblizhenie]. The idea arose to publish a journal with Pushkin's participation, and so the first issue of the Moscow Herald (1827–1830) appeared. This stage of relations is depicted quite fully in Pogodin's memoirs and diaries^{xx} and in the foundational multivolume work of N. P.

Barsukov, The Life and Works of M. P. Pogodin [Zhizn' i trudy M. P. Pogodina]—perhaps the only biographical chronicle of such magnitude that presents a panoramic view of literary life from 1810 to 1860 and makes abundant use of unpublished materials.

The activity of the Lovers of Wisdom, from whose ranks there emerged such significant cultural figures as Venevitinov, Shevyrev, Pogodin, V. F. Odoevskii, and to whom A. S. Khomiakov and I. V. Kireevskii also belonged, has already been the subject of intensive study back in the nineteenth century. We have at our disposal the collected works and letters of D. V. Venevitinov, A. S. Khomiakov, and I. V. Kireevskii.^{xxi} Pogodin's selected works have been reprinted.^{xxii} S. P. Shevyrev's literary legacy has been studied in much less detail: in 1939 a separate edition of his verse was published with an introductory article and commentary by M. I. Aronson;^{xxiii} his numerous articles and reviews remain uncollected; his extensive journal has been published only in small part. The greater portion of studies and publications of texts has been devoted to V. F. Odoevskii, which will be discussed in greater detail later.

All of these publications establish a foundation upon which we can reconstruct the philosophical and aesthetic position of the circle. Z. A. Kamenskii has examined the philosophical aspect of the group's activity in his monograph The Moscow Circle of the Lovers of Wisdom [Moskovskii kruzhok liubomudrov], which contains specific chapters on the philosophy of V. F. Odoevskii and D. V. Venevitinov. Its primarily aesthetic aspect—with focus on the works of D. V. Venevitinov, I. V. Kireevskii, V. F. Odoevskii, and the young Shevyrev—has been treated in Iu. V. Mann's Russian Philosophical Aesthetics [Russkaia filosofskaia estetika]. Moreover, both Kamenskii and Mann are quite justified in including an analysis of the critical work of N. I. Nadezhdin, the publisher of the journal Telescope [Teleskop (1831–1836)],

who made his debut in the pages of Kachenovskii's the Herald of Europe as an uncompromising opponent of "romanticism"; in 1829 Nadezhdin, who was a target of Pushkin's epigrams, published harsh and offensive analyses of Count Nulin and Poltava in the Herald. Never a "classic" nor one to remain abreast of the main currents of literature, Nadezhdin was the creator of a peculiar philosophical and aesthetic system, which had points of contact with the philosophical aesthetics of the Lovers of Wisdom. Mann prepared a collection of Nadezhdin's critical articles,^{xxiv} while N. K. Kozmin began the study of Nadezhdin's critical stance with a monograph^{xxv} that has since been supplemented by Mann's works and by Z. A. Kamenskii's slim monograph N. I. Nadezhdin.

Here it is important to mention the relatively few works devoted to the poetry of the Lovers of Wisdom: L. Ia. Ginzburg's On the Lyric [O lirike] and E. A. Maimin's Russian Philosophical Poetry: The Poet-Lovers of Wisdom, A. S. Pushkin and F. I. Tiutchev [Russkaia filosofskaia poeziia. Poety-liubomudry, A. S. Pushkin i F. I. Tiutchev].

This entire mass of published and analyzed materials is sufficient to give one an idea of the overall stance of the circle with which Pushkin entered into literary relations—but the nature of this contact, its dynamics, and evolution are subjects that still require detailed and wide-ranging study. Pushkin's relations with the Moscow Herald were far from smooth. For a time he entertained hopes that he had at last found "his own" journal and a more or less constant source of income from his participation in its publication, but neither calculation proved fully justified. Organizational and financial difficulties arose;^{xxvi} differences of opinion in literary matters followed not long after. The aesthetic position of the Lovers of Wisdom was rather rigid; similar to Polevoi, though using different criteria, they judged critically contemporary literature,

spurning all that did not correspond to their own aesthetic parameters. Thus, in the pages of the Moscow Herald there appeared cold or negative reviews of Baratynskii's (for instance, Shevrev's) and Del'vig's verse—verse by poets whom Pushkin highly valued. Several times Pushkin was forced to interfere in the politics of the journal, printing an epigram directed against A. N. Murav'ev ("Iz Antologii"), despite Pogodin's resistance, or demanding that Odoevskii retract his—to Pushkin's mind—disrespectful references to Derzhavin and Karamzin. By the beginning of March 1827 Pushkin was writing Del'vig: "You reproach me for the Moscow Herald and for German metaphysics. God only knows how much I hate and despise it [such metaphysics] . . ." ^{xxvii} As for the Lovers of Wisdom, while they recognized the perfection of form in Pushkin's verse, they did not find in it the necessary philosophical depth; in their correspondence and diaries highly critical evaluations of Pushkin are common.

The mutual dissatisfaction of Pushkin and the Lovers of Wisdom did not turn them into ideological adversaries, however. The historical studies of Pogodin and, in particular, his attempts to write a historical tragedy, aroused Pushkin's deep interest. ^{xxviii} Like the Lovers of Wisdom, Pushkin searched for ways of entering the sphere of the philosophy of history, concentrating on related problems (historical law and chance, cause-and-effect relations in the historical process), but often with different results. ^{xxix} Despite Pushkin's polemical declaration in the letter to Del'vig, the principles underlying the philosophical aesthetics of the Lovers of Wisdom were not alien to him; it was after all in their milieu that the idea arose of the direct influence of Schelling's philosophy on Pushkin. Maintained by P. V. Annenkov and a series of scholars after him, this idea was subjected to criticism only in the 1930s. ^{xxx} This is in fact a complex question, however, one far from settled: both in Pushkin's work of this period as well as

in his aesthetic views one may find traces of the ideas of the Lovers of Wisdom; as before, these ideas are integrated into Pushkin's overall worldview.

Pushkin's attitude to the literary program of the Lovers of Wisdom, particularly their philosophical poetry, poses a special problem. The Lovers of Wisdom wanted to see in Pushkin a "philosophical poet" as they understood the term. Herein was the source of their epistles and verse declarations to him (D. V. Venevitinov's "To Pushkin" [K Pushkinu] and Shevyrev's "Epistle to A. S. Pushkin" [Poslanie k A. S. Pushkinu]). Shevyrev outlined an agenda for Pushkin's literary activity in the future: the reform of Russian versification (with a turn to more complex, "metaphysical" poetry), a break with the "epigones" (by whom is meant, though never mentioned, Del'vig and Baratynskii), a poetic alliance with N. M. Iazykov. These expectations were only partially justified. Valuing the poetry of Venevitinov and supporting the experiments of Shevyrev ("Ja esm'," "Mysl'," which he called "one of the most remarkable poems of the current literature"^{xxxii}), Pushkin nevertheless maintained the principles of the "school of harmonious precision" in his own poetry.^{xxxiii}

Iu. N. Tynianov subtly sensed the difference in poetic methods of Pushkin and the Lovers of Wisdom at his time, situating this difference at the center of his interpretation of Pushkin's early literary relations with the young Tiutchev. In a review of the Morning Star [Dennitsa] for 1830, Pushkin mentioned Shevyrev, Khomiakov, and Tiutchev, remarking, "The true talent of the first two is indisputable,"^{xxxiiii} thus seeming to exclude Tiutchev from the ranks of talented poets. This made it possible for Tynianov to raise the issue of literary antagonism.^{xxxv} This idea lasted for many years, though with significant revisions; only very recently did L. S. Sidiakov show that Pushkin's phrase is in essence a synopsis of a part in I. V. Kireevskii's article in the

Morning Star and not Pushkin's original judgement.^{xxxv} And in the case of these two poets the difference in their initial poetic principles did not become the basis for confrontation; six years later Pushkin published Tiutchev's verse in the Contemporary.

Pushkin's final withdrawal from the Moscow Herald took place in 1829. By then Pushkin was already living in St. Petersburg and taking steps toward the creation of his own periodical. Pushkin returned to his kindred literary milieu, the center of which remained Del'vig's home. At this time the almanac Northern Flowers brought together the elite literary forces of both capitals. In addition to men of letters from the elder generation, it also counted among its contributors talented representatives of the younger one: M. D. Delariu, A. I. Podolinskii, E. F. Rozen (who, although almost the same age as Del'vig, began his literary career much later), and V. N. Shchastnyi. Beginning in 1829 N. V. Gogol published his early work here. The history of Northern Flowers (1826–1832) is essentially the history of Pushkin's circle of writers during the most active period of its existence.^{xxxvi}

Toward the end of 1829 the Literary Gazette [Literaturnaia gazeta (1830–1831)] is conceived in this circle. Pushkin's anonymous piece "In one of our journals . . ." [V odnom iz nashikh zhurnalov . . .], where he formulated the periodical's tasks, appeared in the third issue of the Literary Gazette. Pushkin believed the paper should create principled criticism that would serve to stimulate the development of literature. The newspaper was seen as a platform for writers who "for various reasons were not able to appear in any of the Petersburg or Moscow journals under their own names."^{xxxvii} Pushkin realized his long-held plan: to consolidate and at the same time set apart writers close to his circle—a union that was still conceived of rather broadly (thus in the newspaper Katenin's "Reflections and Analyses" were published). Pushkin's

piece was taken as a declaration of elitist exclusiveness even by the publications close to Pushkin, which included, for example, the Moscow Herald. The critical articles of Pushkin (those written during his time in St. Petersburg: from the beginning of March and from the middle of July to the middle of August 1830), Del'vig, and Viazemskii defined the stance of the newspaper. The first thirteen issues of the newspaper, those relating to the time of Pushkin's most intense involvement in its publication, have now been reprinted;^{xxxviii} in addition, there is an inventory of the newspaper's contents, complete with commentary.^{xxxix}

The most intense reaction to the appearance of the new publication was that of Grech and Bulgarin of the Northern Bee, who saw the new paper as a direct competitor and literary adversary. As a matter of fact, a significant portion of the newspaper's most biting polemical pieces were directed at Bulgarin. The history, different stages, and overall significance of Pushkin's polemics with Bulgarin in 1830–1831 began to attract the attention of scholars beginning with the end of the nineteenth century.^{xl} The external aspect of the problem has been studied quite thoroughly. The main focus of attention has been the political meaning of the polemics, which acquired particular severity following the appearance of Bulgarin's libellous "Anecdote" (11 March 1830) about a Byronic poet casting his rhymes at all that is holy, boasting with his free thought before the crowd and fawning before the powerful. Directly after this Bulgarin published his sharply negative review of Evgenii Onegin. Pushkin answered with his article on Vidok, the "detective" for the police who occupies himself with literary pursuits in his free time—a clear hint at Bulgarin's connection with the infamous Third Division, whose function included political investigations.

However, this is only one side to their relationship, even if it is a substantive one. The roots of their antagonism lie deeper. Bulgarin's odious reputation hindered objective study and complicated the re-creation of the whole picture in all of its variety; it is sufficient to say that we still lack a full biography of Bulgarin as well as a detailed analysis of his literary activity. Bulgarin's archive, which contained extremely valuable materials, in particular, epistolary ones, remains lost at this time—but even the extensive published material of the Northern Bee has only been studied in part and selectively. Such work is urgently needed: only a thorough, widely documented study of the “phenomenon of Bulgarin” will allow us to see clearly the processes at work in Russian society and literature beginning in the 1820s. Bulgarin's name is indelibly connected with the establishment of a literature basically oriented toward the tastes and demands of the “mass” reader, the “middle class”—petty officials, provincial landowners, the urban bourgeoisie, the literate peasantry. This literature was characterized by its didactic descriptions of everyday life [bytopisatel'stro] (the depiction of social “mores”), with a clear-cut division between positive and negative characters (who were often endowed with “talking names”), adventure intrigue, and often elements of melodrama. Bulgarin's “moralistic satirical novel,” the model of which was Ivan Vyzhigin (1829), is built on principles that resurrected the archaic model of satirical journalism from a half-century earlier. Devoid of psychological characterization, held within the bounds of a neutral stylistic norm, Bulgarin's novel nevertheless enjoyed tremendous success within the sphere of readers to whom it was and for whom such literature was already customary. This was so-called “commercial literature,” the prototype of the mass culture that would succeed it, a concept inherently alien to the elitist culture of Pushkin's circle. From the very beginning a polemic formed around Ivan Vyzhigin and the “moralistic

satirical novel,” one which later acquired the characteristics of an open social antagonism. As far back as 1826 in a note about censorship submitted to the censors in the Third Division, Bulgarin sketched a sort of social cross-section of society: he declared the “middle class” to be the true foundation of the government and the guarantee of social stability; in his depiction, the “distinguished and wealthy” were a constant source of opposition, amoralism, religious free-thought, and so on.^{xli} By appealing to the “taste of the public,” who were “buying up” and reading his literary works, Bulgarin had in mind precisely this “middle class”; the “aristocracy,” among whom he included those of Pushkin’s circle, ought naturally to descend from the historical arena.

Paradoxically, Bulgarin’s concept of “conservative democracy” drew him closer to N. Polevoi, who had come to similar conclusions from a completely opposite vantage point: an adherent of social renewal based on bourgeois-democratic origins, Polevoi saw the middle class as the main driving force of new European history. Thus, he bore the principles of bourgeois radicalism in his worldview, conducting his war against the “aristocracy” in cultural and social life with even greater intensity than Bulgarin. As opposed to Bulgarin, Polevoi was a man whose fate was dramatic: for several years the Moscow Telegraph aroused the ire of the government, and in 1834 it was closed down; its publisher, at one time an independent journalist with considerable means and ambitious plans, saw himself transformed into a semiofficial playwright and a nearly destitute journalistic toiler. In 1829–1831, however, this sad end was still in the future; in 1829 Polevoi published a critical analysis of Karamzin’s History of the Russian State, followed by the publication of his own History of Russian People, with the intention of reexamining Karamzin’s work from the position of French romantic historiography.^{xlii} In his

reviews and surveys in the Moscow Telegraph Polevoi consistently advanced an “anti-aristocratic” point of view.

Polevoi’s legacy has been studied in more detail than Bulgarin’s. An edition of the notes of his brother Ksenofont Polevoi, complete with superb commentary, was prepared for publication by V. N. Orlov; it contains in condensed form the biographical and historico-literary material on Polevoi known by the beginning of the 1930s;^{xliii} N. K. Kozmin’s monograph Essays on the History of Russian Romanticism. N. A. Polevoi as the Mouthpiece for the Literary Trends of His Epoch [Ocherki po istorii russkogo romantizma. N. A. Polevoi kak vyrazitel’ literaturnykh napravlenii sovremennoi emu epokhi (published as early as in 1903)] is devoted to an analysis of his literary position. In the recent decades V. G. Berezina and V. A. Salinka have worked on determining the authorship of anonymous articles published in the Moscow Telegraph^{xliv} (a collection of critical articles by N. A. and K. A. Polevoi has also appeared^{xlv}).

All of these publications and studies give us a clearer idea of the nature and origin of Polevoi’s journalistic alliance with Bulgarin against the Literary Gazette, as well as the individual positions of the participants in these polemics. Despite its intensity, the literary battle with Polevoi never took on the form of literary lampoon. Pushkin responded to the publication of Polevoi’s History of the Russian People with a serious review, restrained in tone and containing perhaps the only attempt in the literature of those years to polemicize conscientiously with the author’s underlying historical ideas; Pushkin objected to transposing the ultimate conclusions of French historiography onto the Russian historical process; he raised the issue of the peculiarities of national development and the fates of social groups, primarily the nobility. This last issue was in fact central in the polemics surrounding the “literary aristocracy”: the Literary Gazette

consistently rejected accusations of class prejudice, at the same time it emphasized that it was specifically the enlightened nobility that preserves historical and cultural traditions and those norms of social ethics that allow it to maintain relative independence from the ruling elite.^{xlvi} In these arguments Pushkin developed those historical and social ideas that would be reflected later in drafts of critical articles and tales from 1829–1830; traces are also present in The Bronze Horseman.

The Literary Gazette did not survive long. Its polemical publications attracted the attention of the government, which suspected Pushkin, Del'vig, and Viazemskii of political opposition. In 1830 it was shut down and appeared again under the editorship of O. M. Somov. In January of 1831 Del'vig died unexpectedly. His death was an irreparable blow to the entire circle. The internal divisions in the group had begun, however, even while Del'vig was still alive. The political situation in the country made these division even more acute. Thus, the Polish insurrection of 1830 provoked disagreements between Pushkin and Viazemskii, which spilled over into outright arguments touching on broader questions concerning Russia's path in history. Viazemskii, a confirmed "westernizer," was far more loyal than Pushkin to the public outcry of the Polish insurgents. Pushkin, for whom the question of the uniqueness of national development was now first and foremost, reacted harshly towards the insurgents, particularly toward the pro-Polish and anti-Russian atmosphere in France. This confrontation has been recorded in the notebooks of Viazemskii, in the written testimonies of contemporaries (A. I. Turgenev, P. A. Mukhanov), and in the verse of Pushkin; it became a prototype of the future polemics involving the westernizers and Slavophiles.^{xlvii} Del'vig's death accelerated the breakup of the circle; in part a new stage in the relations between Pushkin and Baratynskii was connected with Del'vig's

death.

The history of Pushkin's relations with Baratynskii extends well beyond the sphere of their personal connections and represents one of the lines of Russia's literary evolution as a whole. Baratynskii, who began his literary career under the leadership of Del'vig as a pupil and follower of Pushkin, started to free himself from this influence beginning in his early verse, and during the Finnish period of his creative work (1820–1824) he established himself as an independent and significant literary personage. He appeared primarily as an elegiac poet, having created a new type of elegy where the very emotion of the lyrical persona becomes the subject of relentless rational analysis. Baratynskii's elegies aroused the delight of Pushkin, who predicted that Baratynskii would occupy one of the leading positions among Russian elegiac poets. Pushkin saw in Baratynskii's poems a union of "taste" and "thought," and he took vigorous objection to those critics (for example, Shevyrev) who underestimated the value of Baratynskii's work. The romantic long poem Eda (1824; published separately in 1826) elicited Pushkin's unconditional approval: "a work . . . noteworthy for its original simplicity, the charm of its narration, the vitality of its palette—and the outline of its characters . . ."xlvi As for Baratynskii, already in Eda he made it his aim to extend beyond the borders of Pushkinian tradition; in the preface to the first edition he noted that he "did not take a lyric tone in his povest' [tale] not daring to enter into competition with the singer of The Prisoner of the Caucasus and The Fountain of Bakhchisarai," and that "to follow in Pushkin's footsteps seems more difficult and bolder to him than to set off in his own new direction."xlix

Contemporary critics did not appreciate the innovative nature of Eda; the poem was looked at as an imitation of Pushkin. It has been argued that it was this "artistic tragedy" that

“complicated the relations between Baratynskii and Pushkin, who in essence remained on friendly terms to the end.”^l In 1826 these two poets got on amiably in Moscow; however, towards the end of the 1820s slight symptoms of a mutual cooling did in fact appear. In the beginning of the twentieth century this version of events received a primitive biographical explanation: the legend—which, by the way, finds its roots in the rumors about their relations that circulated while both poets were still alive—that Baratynskii “envied” Pushkin.^{li} Baratynskii’s estrangement from Pushkin and his close circle should be evaluated, however, as a historico-literary fact first and foremost: in the second half of the 1820s Baratynskii entered a new phase of his creative work; his philosophical poetry of this period arose had different underpinnings than that of Pushkin, and from these new vantage points Baratynskii reevaluated tradition. His letter to I. V. Kireevskii in March 1832, where he characterizes Evgenii Onegin as an “imitative” and “schoolboyish” [uchenicheskoe] work, attests to the fact that he was reevaluating both Pushkin’s work as well as his own earlier opinions;^{liii} simultaneously, Baratynskii also altered his literary milieu. Del’vig’s death severed his St. Petersburg connections; I. V. Kireevskii became his closest literary friend at the beginning of the 1830s. In 1839 he wrote to Pletnev: “For a long, long time there have been no relations between us [Baratynskii and Pushkin]; on the other hand I have not written verse for a long, long time, and I have left that world where we once came together and became close.”^{liiii}

Pushkin’s death deeply shook Baratynskii, while his familiarity with Pushkin’s unpublished works somewhat unsettled his skepticism. In February 1840 he informed his wife: “[These works are of] an astonishing beauty, completely new in spirit and form. All of his last lyrics are distinguished by—can you believe it? Strength and depth! He had only just begun to

mature.”^{liv} All of these facts, long known and continually referred to in general works on Baratynskii (M. L. Gofman, P. P. Filippovich, I. N. Medvedeva and E. K. Kupreianova, L. G. Frizman, I. M. Toibin, S. G. Bocharov, G. Khetso, and others) need to be elucidated in the general context of Baratynskii’s artistic evolution; a special monographic work is much needed, one which would touch on the problems of the evolution of Pushkin’s circle and the evolution of its poetic worldviews and styles. It should lead us directly to the problem of literary epochs.

The “epoch of the 1830s” ripened from seeds planted in the preceding one, and symptoms of the approaching fracture in Pushkin's circle were felt from time to time in private episodes in the history of its members. One of these episodes was the conflict between the “older” and “younger” generations of Del’vig’s circle: Del’vig (with Pushkin to some degree supporting him) on one side and Podolinskii and Rozen on the other; these latter, offended by the harsh analyses of their work (from Del’vig), opted to leave the Literary Gazette. The underlying thrust of Del’vig’s reviews consisted of the struggle against epigonism, the appearance of which is a symptom of the death of literary schools and movements. In a letter to Pletnev around 14 April 1831 Pushkin characterized the poetry of M. D. Delariu and Podolinskii as “art” [iskusstvo] without “creativity” [tvorchestvo];^{lv} at about the same time in a letter to Baratynskii of March 1829 Del'vig ironically described the “smooth” verse of Podolinskii, which was composed with great “ease.”^{lvi} Thus both Pushkin and Del’vig were aware of the danger of reproducing the ready-made poetic models created by Pushkin; Pushkin himself clearly was drawn to poets “dissimilar” to himself. Yet in Pushkin’s eyes, this “dissimilarity” should not spread so far as to destroy the foundations of the aesthetic system posited by him. The influence of “frenetic literature” [neistovaia slovestnost’] could be felt in Podolinskii’s “Borskii” and “The Mendicant”

[Nishchii]: a rejection of logical thinking in characters and a shift to a drama of conflict and scene—a characteristic tendency in the development of the “Byronic poem” of the 1830s, where the motivations [motivirovki] of plot weaken and the role of chance increases. A long poem of this type was seen to encroach on the principle of the “truth of the passions” and the “verisimilitude of feelings,” which Pushkin formulated in relation to drama, but which spread to other forms of emplotted narration as well.

In the sphere of poetic language the developing poetry of the 1830s was also guided by an emphasis on expressiveness; while in search of emotional tension, it lost the logical precision of the word, creating the impression of direct lyrical self-expression.^{lvii} This expansion of “frenetic” poetics was on the whole unacceptable to Pushkin; it was in part in polemical response to this phenomenon that Pushkin began in the 1830s to resurrect literary models hostile to it, ones which it would seem, had already faded into the past but whose artistic potential he was now activating: epistles in Alexandrine meter modeled on Voltaire and Boileau (“K Vel’mozhe” [To a Grandee] and “Frantsuzskikh rifmachei surovyi sudia” [A Rigorous Judge of French Rhymesters] 1833), the “just tale” [spravedlivaia povest’] of the 1810s (The Belkin Tales). This emphatic traditionalism was also directed against the “destroyers of tradition,” among whom Pushkin numbered, in particular, Polevoi. Despite all this Pushkin continued to follow the positive achievements of the French “frenetic school” (Hugo, Janin), to which his attitude can hardly be characterized as “negative” or as a “rejection.” As before, Pushkin highlighted productive principles even in a phenomenon essentially alien to him. This multidimensionality may be observed in his evaluations of typical representatives of the poetry of the 1830s: N. V. Kukul’nik (E. A. Drashusova conveys his words: “a fire not of poetry, but of fever”^{lviii}) and V. G.

Benediktov, who was greeted with enthusiasm by Pushkin's close circle (the latter problem has been studied in detail by L. Ia. Ginzburg).^{lix} On the other hand, Pushkin's attitude toward the poetry of V. G. Tepliakov, in whose work the same tendencies could be found, was ambiguous: “brilliance and energy” gave Tepliakov, in Pushkin’s opinion, the right to an “honorable place among our poets,” but the “strength of expression” often crossed over into an “inflated quality,” and the “clarity of description” was, according to Pushkin, eclipsed by “imprecision” (“Frakiiskie elegii. Stikhotvoreniia Viktora Tepliakova. 1836”).^{lx} This complexity in Pushkin’s relationship to the “poets of the 1830s” should be taken into account in any analysis of his reception by the succeeding poetic tradition, in particular by to Lermontov.

Similar processes are at work in Pushkin’s prose, determining the place of his tales (povesti) within the overall evolutionary process of Russian prosaic genres. In 1822 in the brief article “On Prose” [O proze] Pushkin proclaimed “precision and brevity” as the primary merits of this kind of literature. Prose “demands thoughts and thoughts—without them brilliant expressions do not serve any purpose.”^{lxi} This declaration contained an inner polemic: it was directed against the periphrastic lyrical prose of the epigones of Karamzin; Pushkin considered Karamzin himself to be the best Russian prose writer, but in a relative sense, keeping in mind how underdeveloped Russian prose still was as a whole. In 1831, apropos Viazemskii’s translation of B. Constant’s Adolphe, Pushkin raised the question of creating a “metaphysical language” of prose suitable for expressing philosophical concepts and analyzing the most subtle nuances of psychological life. The Belkin Tales was Pushkin’s first finished work of prose narration to appear in print; it is based on the notions of “precision and brevity” and is characterized by the same retrospectivism that Pushkin had cited earlier: in The Belkin Tales

Pushkin turned to the trivial plots of journalistic literature of the 1810s and 1820s, tapping into their artistic potential. His innovation was not acknowledged; F. Bulgarin, who had aspirations to a leading place in this arena, faulted the Tales for just such an “archaic” plot construction. Over the course of the 1830s Pushkin began to write in the genres of the society tale, the historical novel, and so forth; several of his ideas were directly related to the problematics and even plots of contemporary novels (compare Roslavlev [1831], which takes as its starting point M. N. Zagoskin’s novel Roslavlev, ili Russkie v 1812 godu [Rosavlev, or Russians in 1812]). All of these writing plans remained unrealized; yet Pushkin continued to follow the new developments in Russian prose, especially in the genre of the historical novel (Zagoskin, I. I. Lazhechnikov); his own intensive study of history fueled this interest. His primary attention to documentary, memoiristic, and essayistic prose already began to take shape at this time: for instance, the historical essays of A. O. Kornilovich and the historico-ethnographic work of A. P. Kriukov, which he used in both The Blackamoor of Peter the Great and The Captain’s Daughter. All of these tendencies became most clearly apparent in the journal the Contemporary [Sovremennik (1836)], in which Pushkin made a last attempt to unite his circle of writers and to establish his agenda in the complex literary and social situation of the 1830s.

Toward the middle of the 1830s three journals existed around which the main literary forces tended to concentrate. One of them was N. I. Nadezhdin’s Moscow Telescope [Teleskop (1831–1836)] with the newspaper supplement Rumor [Molva]; another was V. P. Androsov’s Moscow Observer [Moskovskii nabliudatel’ (1835–1837)], which in its final two years (1838–1839) was published under the secret editorship of V. G. Belinskii. Pushkin’s temporary

journalistic alliance with the first of these (he published the lyric “Hero” [Geroi] and two polemical articles aimed at Grech and Bulgarin under the pseudonym-mask of Feofilakt Kosichkin in Telescope) did not lead to a closer relationship; after 1831 Pushkin did not publish in periodicals edited by Nadezhdin. His relations with the Moscow Observer, around which former contributors to the Moscow Herald and other men of letters close to them gathered, were even more complex. The primary critical impetus behind the journal was S. P. Shevyrev; M. P. Pogodin, Baratynskii, V. F. Odoevskii, N. F. Pavlov, N. M. Iazykov, Khomiakov, and A. I. Turgenev all took part in its publication; N. V. Gogol actively participated in discussions of its agenda. Both Pushkin and those involved with the journal entertained plans of a joint publication. Pushkin published “The Stormcloud” [Tucha] and a broadside directed at S. S. Uvarov entitled “On the Convalescence of Lucullus” [Na vyzdorovlenie Lukulla]; he also followed closely the direction of the journal’s activity. As time went on, however, Pushkin’s dissatisfaction with both the organization of the publication and, apparently, its aesthetic program became more and more clear. From its very first issues the Moscow Observer began to wage war with “market-based literature,” the principal bastion of which it considered the St. Petersburg Library for Reading [Biblioteka dlia chteniia] (see for example, Shevyrev’s article “Literature and Trade” [Slovestnost’ i trgovlia]); Baratynskii’s lyric “The Last Poet” [Poslednii poet], with its romantic concept of an “iron age” that was killing literature, served as a sort of poetic declaration for the journal. These ideas were energetically discussed in the St. Petersburg circle surrounding Pushkin. Both Pushkin and Gogol were inclined to recognize the historical inevitability of literature’s gradual transformation into a marketable good and to make the subject of their critical analysis only the aesthetic quality of this “good.” As far back as in “A

Conversation between a Bookseller and a Poet” [Razgovor knigoprodavtsa s poetom] Pushkin created a formula for the gradual “professionalization” of literature: “Inspiration isn’t sold, / But a manuscript you may sell” [Ne prodatsia vdokhnoven’e, / No mozhno rukopis’ prodat’]. For Pushkin the struggle against Bulgarin’s “mass culture” was primarily a struggle against the sale of “inspiration,” but not “a manuscript”: both in 1830 and later Pushkin considered that the “market-based direction” of literature was “ordinary” [obychnoe].^{lxii} This basic disagreement about one of the central questions of the sociology of literature did not prevent Pushkin in his article “Journey from Moscow to Petersburg,” however, to declare his preference for Moscow men of letters over those of St. Petersburg, who “for the most part are not men of letters, but enterprising and clever literary wheeler-dealers” [otkupshchiki]. “Erudition, love for art, and talent are unquestionably on the side of Moscow. Moscow journalism will kill Petersburg journalism.”^{lxiii} Immediately after this Pushkin named the main contributors to the Moscow Observer—Shevyrev, Pogodin, and I. V. Kireevskii. Moreover, by May 1836, during his last visit to Moscow, Pushkin wrote his wife: “I am flirting with literary Moscow the best I can, but the Observers don’t regard me with favor” [Nabliudateli menia ne zhaluiut];^{lxiv} when he returned to St. Petersburg, he sent his friend P. V. Nashchokin a copy of the Contemporary with a request to pass it on—“unnoticed by the Observers” [tikhon’ko ot Nabliudatelei] together with his regrets that he “was unable to meet with him”^{lxv}—to V. G. Belinskii.

All of this disparate factual evidence points to a problem of utmost complexity and one clearly in need of additional study. The history, internal editorial relations, aesthetic and polemical positions, and the evolution of the Moscow Observer have been insufficiently studied. Meanwhile, N. I. Mordovchenko’s work of sixty years ago has already demonstrated that such

study is absolutely necessary for elucidating important moments in the history of Pushkin's immediate circle; without such study much also remains unclear about Pushkin's own position as publisher of the Contemporary.^{lxvi} The barely noticeable and largely unrealized connection between Pushkin and Belinskii, who by this time had already declared himself an adversary of the "Observers," has received significantly more attention. In a "Letter to the Editor" in the third volume of the Contemporary (with the signature A. B.), Pushkin referred to Belinskii as a "talent inspiring great hope." "If he could combine the independence of his opinions and his sharp wit with more erudition, more respect for tradition [predanie], more circumspection—in a word, more maturity—then we would have a most remarkable critic."^{lxvii}

The history of Pushkin's relations with the third large journal of the 1830s, Library for Reading, was more short-lived and less complex. The journal was founded in 1834 by O. I. Senkovskii and the bookseller A. F. Smirdin. Its entire literary and political program was autocratically directed by Senkovskii. Library for Reading was an outstanding phenomenon of Russian journalism, and Senkovskii himself was far from an ordinary figure. A prominent scholar and expert on the East, a linguist and polyglot, an encyclopedically educated historian, ethnographer, and musicologist for whom both the exact and natural sciences were also not alien, he began his activity in Poland. Having mastered Russian only late in life, Senkovskii moved to the foremost ranks of Russian writers in the course of several years. He made Library for Reading a model journalistic enterprise, securing it a wide readership and bringing out the issues in an impeccably timely fashion. Commercial respectability was maintained with generous authorial honoraria. Senkovskii was able to attract the best authors to publish in Library for Reading: Zhukovskii, D. Davydov, I. I. Kozlov—and Pushkin, who published "The Queen of

Spades,” a section from The Bronze Horseman, his Songs of the Western Slavs, fairytales, and other works. Such collaboration was short-lived, however: these famous men of letters began to leave Senkovskii’s journal, unable to come to terms with his dictatorial ways as an editor, which he justified as a matter of principle. Senkovskii changed the wording of and otherwise revised the texts of his contributors, contaminating them according to his own caprice. The other reason for what could be called the isolation of Senkovskii was his critical stance, which was emphatically subjective and included ironic games with his readers; the feuilleton-like tone of the critical surveys of “Baron Brambeus” (the name of the literary mask he created for himself) was often taken, and not without reason, as a sign of his disrespect towards literature, which he sacrificed to the undemanding tastes of his readers. His adversaries viewed the journal as a phenomenon of “mass culture” and “commercialized literature.” Such a characterization, while partially justified, requires at the same time considerable refinement. The paradoxical wit of Senkovskii as critic, who at times descended to the level of journalistic buffoonery, did not exclude, but merely masked, the positive system of his aesthetic orientation. Thus, while harshly evaluating the literary experiments of Gogol, whom he declared to be a talented but unexacting humorist, Senkovskii was one of the few to give an ecstatic review of Pushkin’s prose, seeing in it the beginning of a new stage of Russian prose as a whole.^{lxviii} Senkovskii’s activity, as well as the literary material from Library for Reading, has been studied little, in part due to the negative reputation that Senkovskii formed in Russian history; V. A. Kaverin’s study remains the only monograph on him in Russian; among other things, it sheds light on the evolution of Senkovskii’s relations with Pushkin and is based on substantial and carefully analyzed material.^{lxix} Also important are general essays on Library for Reading by L. Ia. Ginzburg and V.

D. Morozov.^{lxx}

Having become the editor of the Contemporary, Pushkin made a last attempt to unite his circle of writers and establish his aesthetic program. His possibilities in this regard were limited in 1836 by a ban on new periodicals. The Contemporary was granted permission as a literary anthology in four volumes, that is, a publication similar to an almanac, and right from the beginning and throughout the 1830s the pressures on the journal grew due to the intensification of literary censorship. In a sense the journal followed the program set out earlier by Pushkin for the Literary Gazette: to allow those writers who for various reasons did not desire to collaborate with other periodicals an outlet for publication. This isolated group included almost all of Pushkin's literary circle: Zhukovskii; Viazemskii (who in addition to his verse, also published their most significant critical articles of the second half of the 1830s in the Contemporary; "Napoleon and Julius Caesar," "A New Long Poem by E. Kine," "The Inspector General, a Comedy Composed by Gogol"); Baratynskii (his poem "To Prince P. A. Viazemskii"); D. Davydov (his poems and the articles "On the Guerilla War" and "The Taking of Drezden, 10 March 1813"); Pletnev; V. F. Odoevskii (his articles "On the Enmity Towards the Enlightenment Observed in the Most Recent Literature" and "How We Write Novels"); and N. M. Iazykov. Pushkin also attracted new literary forces: A. V. Kol'tsov, N. A. Durova, the Sultan Kaza Girei, and others.^{lxxi} Pushkin himself published The Covetous Knight, The Captain's Daughter, and a series of important critical articles in the Contemporary.

The history of the Contemporary reflects the social and aesthetic orientation of the late Pushkin and his literary relations: almost all that we know about those latter from the year 1836 is tied to his work on the Contemporary. As a journalist, Pushkin had to take into account his

own position in the journalistic politics of opposing publications, behind which stood already-formed or still-forming literary and social groups. The very emergence of Pushkin's journal, which became a magnet for the most talented men of letters in the two capitals, was an unavoidable fact of this competitive struggle—and thus the internal editorial disputes around Gogol's article “On the Movement of Journalistic Literature in 1834 and 1835,” which appeared unsigned in the first volume of the Contemporary, are quite illustrative in this regard.

The problem of “Gogol and Pushkin ,” which has biographical, historico-literary, and typological elements, is one of the keys for understanding the literary process in the 1830s (and beyond). The personal contacts between the writers began in the early 1830s and continually became stronger.^{lxxii} The publication of Gogol's Evenings on the Village near Dikanka (1831) elicited an ecstatic reaction from Pushkin: “Here is real gaiety, sincere, unforced, without affectedness, without any stiffness. And in places—what poetry! What sensitivity! All of this is so unusual in our current literature that I have still not come to my senses.”^{lxxiii} Gogol knew Pushkin's unpublished polemical articles; from his part, Gogol read to Pushkin or gave him while still in manuscript the beginning of his comedy Vladimir of the Third Order, “The Tale of How Ivan Ivanovich Quarreled with Ivan Nikoforovich,” Taras Bul'ba, and “Nevskii prospect.” Gogol's reminiscences of his debt to Pushkin for the plots of The Inspector General and Dead Souls are well known. In 1834 Pushkin advised Gogol to begin work on a history of Russian criticism.

It is precisely as a critic that Gogol appeared in the first volume of Pushkin's journal, and the sharp point of his criticism was aimed at Library for Reading. This sally on Gogol's part was immediately perceived as the polemical program of the new publication. Given the conditions of

ensorship in 1836, which held a decidedly negative attitude towards journalistic polemics in general, Gogol's piece threatened the very existence of the Contemporary. In the third issue of the journal, under the initials A. B., there appeared the answer already mentioned above as well as a note where the publisher attested that the article "On the Movement of Journalistic Literature . . ." in no way represented the program of the Contemporary.

As far back as 1916 V. P. Krasnogorskii proposed that the article signed "A. B." belonged to Pushkin; in 1924 this supposition was irrefutably by Iu. G. Oksman. This at first glance personal episode in the history of the journal was later, as a result of detailed analysis, revealed to have its own deeper significance concerning both questions of journalistic tact as well as, in all likelihood, the more and more substantial disagreements between Pushkin and Gogol over the contemporary literary process. This last problem has still not been sufficiently studied; to do so, one must reconstruct the entire context of aesthetic and journalistic relations in the mid-1830s, taking into account the positions of Library for Reading and the Moscow Observer as well as that of Belinskii in Rumor [Molva].^{lxxiv} It has been argued that these disagreements left an imprint on the relations between Gogol and Pushkin and led to a mutual cooling, but neither in Gogol's letters nor in his critical articles do we find any trace of a conflict with Pushkin. Quite the opposite, in his later years Gogol developed and deepened the understanding of the phenomenon of Pushkin that he had originally set forth in the article "A Few Words on Pushkin" [Neskol'ko slov o Pushkine (1832)], which was published in Arabesques [Arabeski (1835)]. Here Pushkin appears as an expression of the national basis of Russian poetry. Beginning in the summer of 1836 Gogol was abroad, and the article "A. B." thus appeared in his absence; simultaneously

with its publication, Gogol's story "The Nose" appeared in the third issue of the Contemporary, with editorial commentary by Pushkin where he spoke of the work in the most glowing terms. These notes were almost a defiant gesture of support, since the story had been rejected by the Moscow Observer and provoked negative responses in Pushkin's circle (for example E. F. Rozen's). After Pushkin's death Gogol continually returned to the poet's image and his creative work, relating the latter to his own. In the article "What, in the End, Is the Essence of Russian Poetry, and What Makes It Unique" [V chem zhe nakonets sushchestvo russkoi poezii i v chem ee osobennost'], which was included in Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends (1847), Gogol attempted to give a unified picture of Pushkin as the focal point of the literary strivings of his time and, moreover, the incarnation of the ideal of the poet in general. For Gogol Pushkin acquired the significance of a kind of symbol; he viewed his own literary work as the fulfillment of the genius's behests, almost a sacred mission. It is in such a context that one should consider his stories of Pushkin's role in the creation of The Inspector General and Dead Souls—"transmission of plots" understood as an almost symbolic act.

<<EXT>>He [Pushkin] had been encouraging me to undertake a large work for a long time . . . and finally gave me his own plot, from which he wanted to create something similar to a long poem and which, in his words, he would not have given to anyone else. This was the plot of Dead Souls. (The idea of The Inspector General also belongs to him.) . . . Pushkin found the plot of Dead Souls good for me because it would allow me the full freedom to travel together with my heroes across all of Russia and to introduce a multitude of the most diverse characters.^{lxxv}<<ENDEXT>>

Pushkin's support of Gogol is thus beyond doubt, a fact confirmed by all of the historical

and literary information we possess on the subject. Significantly more complex is the question of literary succession. In Gogol's prose there are direct responses to Pushkin's creative discoveries;^{lxxvi} in many instances he develops Pushkinian themes (the theme of the "everyday hero" personified, in particular, by the St. Petersburg civil servant, and so on); yet on the whole his prose has different structural and stylistic foundations and a different provenance; it is dominated by a folkloric and lyrical element, hyperbole, the grotesque; in other instances it is directly opposed to the precise, "unembellished" prose of Pushkin. All of these issues extend beyond the bounds of the purely literary relations between Pushkin and Gogol, and into the area of the evolution of Russian narrative style in the nineteenth century.^{lxxvii}

Gogol was the most prominent literary figure and the most colorful individuality in Pushkin's circle while he (Pushkin) was publisher of the Contemporary, and this fact determined the special nature of Gogol's relations with him.

In the journal, the work of V. F. Odoevskii, who had already acquired a visibility among Russian prose writers of the 1830s, evolved quite differently. Like Gogol, Odoevskii appeared both as an author of tales as well as a critic highly esteemed by Pushkin. Odoevskii had already published critical articles in Mnemozina which he edited together with Kiukhel'beker; he belonged to the Lovers of Wisdom circle and was part of the editorial nucleus of the Moscow Herald; however, his connection to the journal, was complicated, because he lived in St. Petersburg beginning from the middle of 1826. In 1830 he began to participate in the Literary Gazette and became closer to Pushkin's circle.

As a fiction writer, philosopher, and critic Odoevskii has been studied more thoroughly than many of his contemporaries. His works have been reprinted several times.^{lxxviii} A

fundamental monograph by P. N. Sakulin condenses in both published and manuscript form, the exhaustive material connected with Odoevskii's work up to 1840.^{lxxxix} In the last decades monographs of a biographical and historico-literary nature have appeared that shed light on the history of Odoevskii's relations with Pushkin.^{lxxx} Their prehistory can be traced as far back as the Mnemozina years; in 1827 Pushkin read a critical article of Odoevskii's for the Moscow Herald, and while he approved of it on the whole, he demanded that the author remove his harsh references to Derzhavin and Karamzin. On the other hand, Odoevskii's story "Beethoven's Last Quartet," which Pushkin read in Northern Flowers for 1831, elicited ecstatic remarks on his part: in his words, he "has scarcely read an article in Russian as remarkable both for its thoughts and its style," one which showed the promise of a writer of European distinction.^{lxxxxi} From the beginning of the Contemporary's publication Odoevskii became one of Pushkin's most active assistants: in a letter to Odoevskii of early April 1836 Pushkin regretted that his young colleague had not managed to include anything of his own in the first volume, and he informed Odoevskii of his intention to begin the next volume with the latter's article "On the Enmity towards Enlightenment Becoming Noticeable in the Most Recent Literature"—an article Pushkin called "sensible, intelligent, and forceful."^{lxxxii} Like Gogol, Odoevskii came out against the Northern Bee and Library for Reading, but his disagreements were not of a personal, but of a more general, theoretical nature: he directed his criticism at the anti-Enlightenment, irrational tendencies in contemporary literature; the imitation of models from "frenetic literature"; and moralistic description of everyday life that were not based on a thorough study of real social processes. From Pushkin's point of view, Odoevskii's own society tales ("Princess Zizi" and others) opposed these tendencies, and Pushkin strongly encouraged him to finish working on them so

they could be included in the journal; his reaction to Odoevskii's fantastic prose was significantly colder.^{lxxxiii}

In the history of the Contemporary Odoevskii's name, as well as that of another close collaborator of Pushkin's, the young A. A. Kraevskii, is linked with the issue of internal editorial disagreements within the journal. A letter from Odoevskii and Kraevskii to Pushkin was published in 1952; in it they discuss plans for reorganizing the Contemporary.^{lxxxiv} Both authors of the letter were close to the editorial staff of the Moscow Observer, and in scholarly literature there arose an opinion that a crisis in the circle of the Contemporary had come to a head, one with rather serious social and aesthetic grounds.^{lxxxv} This idea seemed to find confirmation in Pushkin's expressed intention to attract, "unnoticed by the Observers," the collaboration of Belinskii, who had already come out in print against the Moscow journal. The most recent studies of Odoevskii's position, however, do not confirm his participation in some kind of anti-Pushkin coalition, whose purpose was to limit Pushkin's influence on the journal.^{lxxxvi} It goes without saying that the internal history of the Contemporary, which is poorly documented and little known to us, requires further study. One needs to take into account the individual positions of the participants in the journal: although they differed on many accounts, such disagreements did not necessarily always produce antagonism. The differences of opinion between Pushkin and the young Belinskii concerned issues quite essential to Pushkin (the relationship to "tradition" (predanie), that is, to the naturally forming literary and historical hierarchy, and so on), but that did not prevent Pushkin from beginning negotiations about Belinskii's participation in his journal.

The unique quality of Pushkin's journalistic politics must also be taken into account when

speaking of the complex issue of “Pushkin and Tiutchev.” The Contemporary describes the late phase of their relations: Pushkin published two large selections (taken from Tiutchev’s notebooks that had been delivered to the journal by I. S. Gagarin) from Poems Sent from Germany [Stikhotvoreniia, prislannye iz Germanii], with the signature “F. T.,” in volumes 3 and 4; Gagarin informed the author that Viazemskii and Zhukovskii were captivated with his verse and intended to publish them in the journal and later in a separate book, and that Pushkin also “had given them a just and deeply felt evaluation.” It still remains unclear how closely this phrasing corresponds to Pushkin’s actual opinion; a number of scholars (G. I. Chulkov, N. V. Koroleva, M. N. Darvin, V. V. Kozhinov) consider these comments, as well as the fact that Tiutchev’s poems were published, as evidence of Pushkin’s unconditional recognition of Tiutchev’s poetry; others (A. A. Nikolaev, A. L. Ospovat), building off the observations of Tynianov, emphasize the nature of the selection of verse, seeing in it an act of interpretation.^{lxxxvii} As with the case of Gogol, the fact of Pushkin’s literary support of Tiutchev cannot be doubted; the question of their historico-literary interrelations remains open to discussion, and in any case cannot be viewed as a direct succession.

“Pushkin and Tiutchev” is the last of the major historico-literary problems concerning Pushkin’s literary relations and those connected with the Contemporary; more specific issues have been examined in general works on the journal. Pushkin’s death severed these ties, and as an event it coincided with, and in many ways accelerated, the shift in literary epochs. The “Pushkin epoch” gradually receded into the past. By the 1840s new names and new preferences were being put forth—but all subsequent Russian literary life, whether to a greater or lesser degree, measures itself against this historical epoch, which has come to be known as the “golden

age” of Russian literature.

<<UNN>>Translated by Clint Walker. Unless noted otherwise, quotations from Russian sources are also translated by Clint Walker.<<ENDUNN>>

<<NH>>Select Bibliography

<<TXT>>This overview includes only the main, primarily monographic works. Articles on more specific themes of Pushkin's relations with individual writers are registered in general bibliographies such as Istoriia russkoi literatury XIX veka. Bibliograficheskii ukazatel', edited by K. D. Muratova. Moscow and Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR, 1962; and compendia on Pushkin such as L. G. Frizman's Seminarii po Pushkinu. Khar'kov: ENGRAM, 1995; and L. A. Chereiskii's Pushkin i ego okruzhenie. 2nd ed., supplemented and revised. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otd., 1988.

<<BIBTXT>>Al'tshuller, M. G. Predtechi slavianofil'stva v russkoi literature. (Obshchestvo "Beseda liubitelei russkogo slova"). Ann Arbor: Michigan, 1984.

Aronson, M. "Poeziia S. P. Shevyreva." In Stikhotvoreniia. By S. P. Shevyrev. Leningrad: Sov. pisatel', 1939. v–xxxii.

Baratynskii, E. A. Polnoe sobranie stikhotvoreniia. Leningrad: Sov. pisatel', 1957.

———. Stikhotvoreniia. Pis'ma. Vospominaniia sovremennikov. Moscow: Izd. Pravda, 1987.

Barsukov, N. P. Zhizn' i trudy M. P. Pogodina. 27 vols. St. Petersburg: Tip. M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1888–1910.

Bazanov, V. G. Ocherki dekabristskoi literatury. Poeziia. 1953. Rpt. Moscow and Leningrad: Gos. izd. khudozh. lit., 1961.

———. Vol'noe obshchestvo liubitelei rossisskoi slovesnosti. 1st ed. Petrozavodsk: Gos. izd. Karelo-Finskoi SSR, 1949.

Blinova, E. M. Literaturnaia gazeta A. A. Del'viga i A. S. Pushkina. 1830–1831. Ukazatel' soderzhaniia. Moscow: Kniga, 1966.

- Borovkova-Maikova, M. S., ed. Arzamas i arzamasskie protokoly. Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei v Leningrade, 1933.
- Cornwell, N. The Life, Times, and Milieu of V. F. Odoevsky. 1804–1869. London: Athlone Press, 1986.
- Del'vig, A. A. Sochineniia. Leningrad: Khudozh. lit., Leningradskoe otd., 1986.
- Department of Philology. Ocherki po istorii russkoi zhurnalistiki i kritiki. Vol. 1. Leningrad: Izd. Leningradskogo gos. univ., 1950.
- [Drashusova, E. A.] "Zhizn' prozhit' ne pole pereiti. Zapiski neizvestnoi." Russki vestnik 155.9 (1881): 117–157.
- Eidel'man, N. Ia. Pushkin. Iz biografii i tvorchestva. 1826–1837. Moscow: Khudozh. lit., 1987.
- Eikhenbaum, B. M. Lermontov. Opyt istoriko-literaturnoi otsenki. Leningrad: Gos. izd., 1924.
- Eremin, M. P. Pushkin—publitsist. 2nd ed. Moscow: Khudozh. lit., 1976.
- Fomin, A. G. "Pushkin i zhurnal'nyi triumvirat 1830-kh godov." In Pushkin. Ed. S. A. Vengerova. Vol. 5. St. Petersburg: n.p., 1911. 451–492.
- Frizman, L. G. Seminarii po Pushkinu. Khar'kov: Izd. ENGRAM, 1995.
- . Tvorcheskii put' Baratynskogo. Moscow: Nauka, 1966.
- Frizman, L. G., comp. Severnye tsvety na 1832 god. Moscow: Nauka, 1980.
- Gille'son, M. I. Molodoi Pushkin i arzamasskoe bratstvo. Leningrad: Nauka, 1974.
- . Ot arzamasskogo bratstva k pushkinskomu krugu pisatelei. Leningrad: Nauka, 1977.
- . P. A. Viazemskii. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo. Leningrad: Nauka, 1969.
- Ginzburg, L. Ia. O lirike. 2nd ed. Leningrad: Sov. pisatel', Leningradskoe otd., 1974.
- . "Pushkin i Benediktov." Pushkin. Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii 2 (1936): 148–182.

- Gippius, V. V. "Pushkin v bor'be s Bulgarinym v 1830–1831 gg." Pushkin. Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii 6 (1941): 235–255.
- Gippius, V. V. "Literaturnoe obshchenie Gogolia s Pushkinym." Uchenye zapiski Permskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. A. M. Gor'kogo 2 (1931): 61–126.
- . Pushkin. Zhurnal'naia polemika ego vremeni. St. Petersburg: n.p., 1900.
- Gofmann, V. "Ryleev—poet." In Russkaia poeziia XIX veka. Ed. B. M. Eikhenbaum and Iu. N. Tynianov. Leningrad: Academia, 1929. 1–73.
- Gogol, N. V. Arabeski. St. Petersburg: tip. vdovy Pliushar s synom, 1835.
- . Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. 14 vols. Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR, 1937–1952.
- Gorodetskii, B. P., N. V. Izmailov, and B. S. Meilakh, eds. Pushkin. Itogi i problemy izucheniia. Moscow and Leningrad: Izd. Nauka, 1966.
- Gukovskii, G. A. Pushkin i problemy realisticheskogo stilia. Moscow: Gos. izd. khudozh. lit., 1957.
- . Pushkin i russkie romantiki. Moscow: Izd. khudozh. lit., 1965.
- Iezuitova, R. V. Zhukovskii i ego vremia. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otd., 1989.
- Izmailov, N. V. Ocherki tvorchestva Pushkina. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otd., 1975.
- Kallash, V. V. "Pushkin, N. Polevoi i Bulgarin." Pushkin i ego sovremenniki 2 (1904): 32–49.
- Kamenskii, Z. A. Moskovskii kruzhek liubomudrov. Moscow: Nauka, 1980.
- . N. I. Nadezhdin. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1984.
- Kasatkina, V. N., ed. Literaturnaia gazeta A.S. Pushkina i A.A. Del'viga. 1830 god, N. 1-13. Moscow: Sov. Rossiia, 1988.
- Kaverin, V. A. Baron Brambeus. Istoriia Osipa Senkovskogo, zhurnalista, redaktora "Biblioteki

- dlia chteniia." 1929. Rpt. Moscow: Nauka, 1966.
- Khomiakov, A. S. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. 8 vols. Moscow: Univ. tip., 1900–1907.
- . Stikhotvoreniia i dramy. Leningrad: Sov. pisatel', Leningradskoe otd., 1969.
- Kireevskii, I. V. Kritika i estetika. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979.
- . Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. 2 vols. Moscow: Tip. Imp. moskovskogo univ., 1911.
- Koshelev, A. I. "To V. F. Odoevskii." 21 Feb. 1881. Russkaia starina 118 (1904): 205–206.
- Kozmin, N. K. Nikolai Ivanovich Nadezhdin. Zhizn' i nauchno-literaturnaia deiatel'nost'. 1804–1836. St. Peterburg: Tip. M. A. Aleksandrova, 1912.
- . Ocherki po istorii russkogo romantizma. N. A. Polevoi kak vyrazitel' literaturnykh napravlenii sovremennoi emu epokhi. St. Peterburg: Tip. I. N. Skorokhodova, 1903.
- Lemke, M. K. Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1826–1855 gg. St. Petersburg: S.V. Bunin, 1908.
- Lotman, Iu. M. Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin. Biografiia pisatel'ia. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie, Leningradskoe otd., 1981.
- Maimin, E. A. "Filosofskaia poeziia Pushkina i liubomudrov. (K razlichiiu khudozhestvennykh metodov)." Pushkin. Issledovaniia i materialy 6 (1969): 98–117.
- . Russkaia filosofskaia poeziia. Poety-liubomudry, A. S. Pushkin i F. I. Tiutchev. Moscow: Nauka, 1976.
- Makogonenko, G. P. Gogol' i Pushkin. Leningrad: Sov. pisatel', Leningradskoe otd., 1985.
- . Lermontov i Pushkin. Problemy preemstvennogo razvitiia literatury. Leningrad: Sov. pisatel', Leningradskoe otd., 1987.
- Mann, Iu. V. Russkaia filosofskaia estetika. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1969.

- Medvedeva, I. "Rannii Baratynskii." In Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii. By E. A. Baratynskii. Vol. 1. Leningrad: Sov. pisatel', 1936. xxxv–xxxvii.
- Meilakh, B. S. Pushkin i russkii romantizm. Moscow and Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR, 1937.
- Mersereau, John Jr. Baron Del'vig's Northern Flowers. Literary Almanac of the Pushkin Pleiad. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1967.
- Modzalevskii, B. L. "K istorii Zelenoi lampy." In Dekabristy i ikh vremia. By Vsesoiuznoe obshchestvo politicheskikh katorzhan i ssyl'noselentsev. Vol. 1. Moscow: Izd. politkatorzhan, 1928. 11–61.
- Mordovchenko, N. I. "Gogol' i zhurnalistika 1835–1836 gg." In N. V. Gogol'. Materialy i issledovaniia. Ed. V.V. Gippius. Vol. 2. Moscow and Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR, 1936. 106–150.
- . Russkaia kritika pervoi chetverti XIX veka. Moscow and Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR, 1959.
- Morozov, V. D. Ocherki po istorii russkoi kritiki vtoroi poloviny 20-kh–30-kh godov XIX veka. Tomsk: Izd. Tomskogo univ., 1979.
- Nadezhdin, N. I. Literaturnaia kritika. Estetika. Moscow: Khudozh. lit., 1972.
- [N. D.] "K istorii russkoi literatury. F. V. Bulgarin i H. I. Grech." Russkaia starina 103 (1900): 559–591.
- Odoevskii, V. F. O literature i iskusstve. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1982.
- . Pestrye skazki. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996.
- . Russkie nochi. Leningrad: Nauka, 1975.
- . Sochineniia v 2-kh tomakh. 2 vols. Moscow: Khudozh. lit., 1981.

- Odoevskii, V. F., and A. A. Kraevskii. "To A. S. Pushkin." Aug. 1836. In Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Ed. A. M. Egolin et al. Vol. 58. Moscow: Izd. ANSSSR, 1952. 289–290.
- Odoevskii, V. F., I. S. Mal'tsov, and S. A. Sobolevsii. "To Moskovskii vestnik." 25 Oct.–7 Nov. 1827. In Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Ed. A. M. Egolin et al. Vol. 58. Moscow: Izd. ANSSSR, 1952. 68–70.
- Oksman, Iu. G. "Perepiska Belinskogo." In Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Ed. A. M. Egolin et al. Vol. 56. Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR, 1950. 201–254.
- Orlov, V., ed. Nikolai Polevoi. Materialy po istorii russkoi literatury i zhurnalistiki tridtsatykh godov. Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei, Leningrade, 1934.
- Ospovat, A. L. "Kak slovo nashe ovzovetsia . . ." O pervom sbornike F. I. Tiutcheva. Moscow: Kniga, 1980.
- . "Tiutchev i Pushkin. istoriia literaturnykh otnoshenii." In Tynianovskii sbornik. Chetvertye tynianovskie chteniia. Ed. M. O. Chudakova et al. Riga: Zinatne, 1990. 60–76.
- Pedrotti, Louis. Josef-Julian Senkowski: The Genesis of a Literary Alien. Berkeley: U California P, 1965.
- Pereverzev, V. F. "Pushkin v bor'be s russkim plutovskim romanom." Pushkin. Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii 1 (1936): 164–188.
- Peskov, A. M. "Pushkin i Baratynskii. Materialy k istorii literaturnykh otnoshenii." In Novye bezdelki. Ed. S. I. Panov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 1995–1996. 239–270.
- Petrunina, I. M., and G. M. Fridlender. "Pushkin i Gogol' v 1831–1836 godakh." Pushkin. Issledovaniia i materialy 6 (1969): 197–228.
- Pogodin, M. P. Povesti. Drama. Moscow: Sov. Rossiia, 1984.

- Polevoi, N. A. Istoriia russkogo naroda. Originally published in 6 vols. Moscow: tip. Avgusta-Semena pri Imp. mediko-khirurgicheskoi akademii, 1829 –1830. Rpt., 3 vols. Moskva: Veche, 1997.
- . Literaturnaia kritika. Stat'i i retsenzii 1825–1842. Leningrad: Khudozh. lit., Leningradskoe otd., 1990.
- . Materialy po istorii russkoi literatury i zhurnalistiki tridtsatykh godov. Leningrad: Izd. pisatelei, 1934.
- Pugachev, V. V. “Predystoriia Soiuza Blagodenstviia i pushkinskaia oda ‘Vol’nost’.” Pushkin. Issledovaniia i materialy 4 (1962): 94–139.
- Pushkin, A. S. Novonaidennyi avtograf Pushkina. Moscow and Leningrad: Nauka, 1968.
- . Perepiska A. S. Pushkina v dvukh tomakh. 2 vols. Moscow: Khudozh. lit., 1982.
- . Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Ed. V. D. Bonch-Bruевич et al. 17 vols. Moscow and Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1937–1959.
- . Pushkin. Pis'ma poslednikh let. 1834–1837. Leningrad: Izd. Nauka, Leningradskoe otd., 1969.
- . Stikhotvoreniia litseiskikh let. 1813–1817. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1994.
- Ryskin, E. I. Zhurnal A. S. Pushkina Sovremennik. 1836–1837. Ukazatel' sodержaniia. Moscow: Kniga, 1967.
- Sakulin, P. N. Iz istorii russkogo idealizma. Kniaz' V. F. Odoevskii. Myslitel'. Pisatel'. Vol. 1. Moscow: Izd. M. i S. Sabashnikovoykh, 1913. 8–324.
- Serman, I. Z. “Pushkin i russkaia istoricheskaiia drama 1830-kh godov.” Pushkin. Issledovaniia i materialy 6 (1969): 118–149.

- Shchegolev, P. E. Iz zhizni i tvorchestva Pushkina. 1908. Moscow and Leningrad: Gos. izd. khudozh. lit., 1931.
- Shiklo, A. E. Istoricheskie vzgliady N. A. Polevogo. Moscow: Izd. Moskovskogo univ., 1981.
- Sidiakov, L. S. "O stat'e Pushkina 'Dennitsa.' (K sporam o Pushkine i Tiutcheve)." Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii 18 (1983): 47–52.
- Sovremennik. Literaturnyi zhurnal, izdavaemyi Aleksandrom Pushkinym. 1836. Facsimile rpt. Moscow: Kniga, 1987.
- Stolpianskii, P. I. "Pushkin i Severnaia pchela. (1825–1837)." Pushkin i ego sovremenniki 19–20 (1915): 117–190; 23–24 (1916): 127–194.
- Sukhomlinov, M. I. Issledovaniia i stat'i po ruskoi literature i prosveshcheniiu. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg: n.p., 1889.
- Toibin, I. M. Pushkin i filosofsko-istoricheskaia mysl' v Rossii na rubezhe 1820-kh–1830-kh godov. Voronezh: Izd. Voronezhskogo univ., 1980.
- . Trevozhnoe slovo. Voronezh: Izd. Voronezhskogo univ., 1988.
- Tomashevskii, B. V. Pushkin. Kniga 1. 1813–1824. Moscow and Leningrad: Izd. AN SSSR, 1956.
- Tsiavlovskii, M. A. Stat'i o Pushkine. Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR, 1962.
- , ed. "Pushkin po dokumentam arkhiva M. P. Pogodin." In Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Ed. I. S. Zil'bershtein and I. V. Sergievskii. Vol. 16–18. Moscow: Zhurnal'no-gazetnoe ob"edinenie, 1934. 679–724.
- Tur'ian, M. A. "Strannaia moia sud'ba . . ." O zhizni Vladimira Fedorovicha Odoevskogo. Moscow: Kniga, 1991.

- Tynianov, Iu. N. Arkhaisty i novatory. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.
- . Poetika. Istoriia literatury. Kino. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.
- . Pushkin i ego sovremenniki. Moscow: Nauka, 1969.
- Vatsuro, V. E. Severnye tsvety. Istoriia al'manakha Del'viga - Pushkina. Moscow: Kniga, 1978.
- Vatsuro, V. E., and M. I. Gille'son. Skvoz' "umstvennye plotiny". Ocherki o knigakh i presse pushkinskoi pory. 2nd ed. Moscow: Kniga, 1986.
- Vatsuro, V.E., and S. A. Fomichev, eds. Pushkin v prizhiznennoi kritike. 1820–1827. St. Petersburg: Gos. pushkinskii teatral'nyi tsentr, 1996.
- Vatsuro, V. E., and M. I. Gille'son, comps. Novonaidennyi avtograf Pushkina. Zametki na rukopisi knigi P. A. Viazemskogo Biograficheskie i literaturnye zapiski o Denise Ivanoviche Fonvizine. Moscow and Leningrad: Izd. Nauka, 1968.
- Vatsuro, V. E., and A. L. Ospovat, eds. Arzamas. Sbornik v 2kh knigakh. 2 vols. Moscow: Khudoz. lit., 1994.
- Vatsuro, V. E., et al., comps. A. S. Pushkin v vospominaniakh sovremennikov. 2 vols. Moscow: Khudozh. lit., 1974. 2nd ed. Moscow: Khudozh. lit., 1985.
- Venevitinov, D. V. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Moscow: Academia, 1934.
- . Stikhotvoreniia. Proza. Moscow: Nauka, 1980.
- Veselovskii, A. N. Zhukovskii. Poeziia chuvstva i serdechnogo voobrazheniia. St. Petersburg: Tip Imp. akademii nauk, 1904.
- Vinogradov, V. V. Iazyk Pushkina. Moscow and Leningrad: Academia, 1935.
- . Stil' Pushkina. Moscow and Leningrad: Ogiz, Gos. izd. khudozh. lit., 1941.
- Zhirmunskii, V. M. Byron and Pushkin. 1924. Rpt. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otd., 1978.

<<NH>>Notes<<to be set before Select Bibliography.>>

-
- i. Pushkin, Novonaidennyi avtograf.
 - ii. Al'tshuller, Predtechi slavianofil'stva; Borovkova-Maikova, ed., Arzamas i arzamasskie protokoly; Vatsuro and Ospovat, eds., Arzamas.
 - iii. Pushkin, Stikhotvoreniia litseiskikh let.
 - iv. Gillel'son, Molodoi Pushkin and Ot arzamasskogo bratstva.
 - v. Pushkin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 13:183. Hereafter referred to as Pss.
 - vi. See also Iezuitova, Zhukovskii i ego vremia.
 - vii. Pushkin, Pss, 13:262.
 - viii. Ibid., 11:10.
 - ix. Ibid., 11:52.
 - x. See Lotman, Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin, 45–47.
 - xi. Gofmann, “Ryleev-poet”; Meilakh, Pushkin i russkii romantizm; Gukovskii, Pushkin i russkie romantiki; Bazanov, Ocherki dekabristskoi literatury.
 - xii. Pugachev, “Predystoriia Soiuza Blagodenstviia”; Tomashevskii, Pushkin, 129–193.
 - xiii. Tomashevskii, Pushkin, 222–227; Eidel'man, Pushkin. Iz biografii, 177–259.
 - xiv. Zhirmunskii, Byron and Pushkin.
 - xv. See his letters to Viazemskii 1822–1826 in Pushkin, Perepiska, 1:147–253; cf. Mordovchenko, Russkaia kritika, 280–313; Gillel'son, P. A. Viazemskii, 76–84, 97–127; the articles about Pushkin have been reprinted in Vatsuro and Fomichev, eds., Pushkin v prizhiznnoi kritike.
 - xvi. Bazanov, Ocherki dekabristskoi literatury, 406–418.
 - xvii. See his letter of 7 June 1824 in Pushkin, Pss, 13:96–97.
 - xviii. Pushkin, Pss, 13:21.

-
- xix. See Vatsuro and Fomichev, eds., Pushkin v prizhiznennoi kritke, 485–486.
- xx. See Vatsuro, et al., comps., Pushkin v vospominaniakh, vol. 2.
- xxi. Venevitinov, Polnoe sobranie and Stikhotvoreniiia. Proza; Khomiakov, Polnoe sobranie and Stikhotvoreniiia i dramy; Kireevskii, Polnoe sobranie and Kritika i estetika.
- xxii. Pogodin, Povesti. Drama.
- xxiii. Aronson, “Poeziia S. P. Shevyreva.”
- xxiv. Nadezhdin, Literaturnaia kritika.
- xxv. Kozmin, Nikolai Ivanovich Nadezhdin.
- xxvi. See Tsiavlovskii, “Pushkin po dokumentam arkhiva”; and Odoevskii, Mal'tsov, and Sobolevskii, “To Moskovskii vestnik.”
- xxvii. Pushkin, Pss, 13:320.
- xxviii. Serman, “Pushkin i russkaia istoricheskaia drama.”
- xxix. Toibin, Pushkin i filosofsko-istoricheskaia mysl'.
- xxx. See Gorodetskii, Izmailov, and Meilakh, eds., Pushkin. Itogi, 215–217.
- xxxi. Pushkin, Pss, 14:21.
- xxxii. Aronson, “Poeziia S. P. Shevyreva”; Maimin, “Filosofskaia poeziia.”
- xxxiii. Pushkin, Pss, 11:105.
- xxxiv. Tynianov, Pushkin i ego sovremenniki, 166–191; first appeared in 1926.
- xxxv. Sidiakov, “O stat'e Pushkina” (with a bibliography of preceding works).
- xxxvi. Mersereau, Baron Del'vig's Northern Flowers; Vatsuro, Severnye tsvety. Istoriiia al'manakha; See also Frizman, comp., Severnye tsvety na 1832 god.
- xxxvii. Pushkin, Pss, 11:89.
- xxxviii. Kasatkina, ed. Literaturnaia gazeta.
- xxxix. Blinova, Literaturnaia gazeta.
- xl. Sukhomlinov, Issledovaniia i stat'i, 267–300; Lemke, Nikolaevskie zhandarmy, 232–358;

Gippius, Vl., Pushkin. Zhurnal'naia polemika; Kallash, "Pushkin, N. Polevoi"; Stolpianskii, "Pushkin i Severnaia pchela."; Fomin, "Pushkin i zhurnal'nyi triumvirat"; Gippius, V. V., "Pushkin v bor'be" —which is the fullest and most substantive analysis.

xli. [N. D.], "K istorii russkoi literatury," 580–581.

xlii. Polevoi, Istoriia russkogo naroda; see also Shiklo, Istoricheskie vzgliady.

xliii. Polevoi, Materialy po istorii.

xliv. For a composite bibliography with references to the sources for their authorial attributions, see Shiklo, Istoricheskie vzgliady, 177–222.

xlv. Polevoi, Literaturnaia kritika.

xlvi. For a more detailed discussion of this polemics, see Gorodetskii, Izmailov, and Meilakh, eds., Pushkin. Itogi, 220–225.

xlvii. Pushkin, Novonaidennyi avtograf.

xlviii. Pushkin, Pss, 11:74.

xlix. Baratynskii, Polnoe sobranie, 383. For a comparison of Eda and The Prisoner of the Caucasus, see, for example, Toibin, Trevozhnoe slovo, 124–146.

l. Medvedeva, "Rannii Baratynskii," lxxi.

li. For the most current analysis of this legend and the fullest resume of the facts surrounding the poets' relations, see Peskov, "Pushkin i Baratynskii."

lii. Baratynskii, Stikhotvoreniia, 237.

liii. *Ibid.*, 264.

liv. *Ibid.*, 270.

lv. Pushkin, Pss, 14:162.

lvi. Del'vig, Sochineniia, 335; a review of Podolinskii's "Mendicant" may also be found here, 225–229.

lvii. See Eikhenbaum, Lermontov.

lviii. [Drashusova], "Zhizn' prozhit' ne pole pereiti," 152.

lix. Ginzburg, “Pushkin i Benediktov.”

lx. Pushkin, Pss, 12:82–91.

lxi. *Ibid.*, 11:19.

lxii. Letter to A. K. Benckendorff from July–August 1830 in Pushkin, Pss, 14:253.

lxiii. Pushkin, Pss, 11:247–248.

lxiv. Pushkin, Pushkin. Pis'ma, 139.

lxv. *Ibid.*, 142.

lxvi. Mordovchenko, “Gogol’ i zhurnalistika.”

lxvii. Pushkin, Pss, 12:97. For a review of the scholarship on this problem, see Gorodetskii, Izmailov, and Meilakh, eds., Pushkin. Itogi, 36–49; here one can also find Belinskii’s views of Pushkin’s work; see also Oksman, “Perepiska Belinskogo.”

lxviii. See his letter to Pushkin from January–the first half of February 1834 in Pushkin, Pss, 15:109–11.

lxix. Kaverin, Baron Brambeus. See also Pedrotti, Josef-Julian Senkowski.

lxx. Department of Philology, Ocherki po istorii russkoi zhurnalistiki; Morozov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kritiki.

lxxi. Table of contents of the journal: Ryskin, Zhurnal A. S. Pushkina; facsimile edition of the Contemporary, 1987.

lxxii. Factual material concerning these relations has been summarized and analyzed in Gippius, VI. V., “Literaturnoe obshchenie”; Petrunina and Fridlender, “Pushkin i Gogol’.”

lxxiii. Pushkin, Pss, 11:216.

lxxiv. For a historiography, see Gorodetskii, Izmailov, and Meilakh, eds., Pushkin. Itogi, 231–234.

lxxv. From “An Author’s Confession” [Avtorskaia ispoved’] in Gogol, Polnoe sobranie, 8:440.

lxxvi. Tsiavlovskii, Stat’i o Pushkine.

lxxvii. See Makogonenko, Gogol’ i Pushkin; for a bibliography of works on this topic, see

Frizman, Seminarii po Pushkinu, 241–242.

lxxviii. Odoevskii, O literature i iskusstve. The most complete edition: Sochineniia v 2-kh tomakh; editions with scholarly commentaries: Russkie nochii; Pestrye skazki; articles on Pushkin and articles in the Contemporary: O literature i iskusstve.

lxxix. Sakulin, Iz istorii.

lxxx. Cornwell, The Life, Times, with an extensive bibliography; Tur'ian, "Strannaia moia sud'ba . . ."

lxxxii. Koshelev, "To V. F. Odoevskii," 206.

lxxxiii. Pushkin, Perepiska A. S. Pushkina, 2:436.

lxxxiiii. Izmailov, Ocherki tvorchestva, 303–325.

lxxxv. Odoevskii and Kraevskii, "To A. S. Pushkin," 58:289–295.

lxxxvi. See Gorodetskii, Izmailov, and Meilakh, eds., Pushkin. Itogi, 232–233.

lxxxvii. Tur'ian, "Strannaia moia sud'ba . . .", 280–294.

lxxxviii. Ospovat, "Kak slovo, 19-28, with a historiography; Ospovat, "Tiutchev i Pushkin."