SUSANNA WITT

CREATING CREATION

Readings of Pasternak's *Doktor Živago*

Creating Creation
Readings of Pasternak's *Doktor Živago*

AKADEMISK AVHANDLING

som för avläggande av filosofie doktorsexamen
vid Stockholms universitet offentligen försvaras
i hörsal 8, hus D, Frescati
lördagen den 27 januari 2001, kl. 13.00

av

Susanna Witt

fil. kand.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the process of creation in Boris Pasternak's *Doktor Živago* (1957), both as depicted in and as realized by the novel. Statements on art, on literature in general and on specific texts are found to have a bearing on the novel itself, thus providing clues to its own poetics and philosophy of art.

Ch. 1 examines the protagonist's understanding of art as *dopisyvanie*, or 'continuation of writing.' This notion is applied to the relationship between *Doktor Živago* and the Book of Revelation. One text appears to proceed from another as a continuation involving creative distortions. Such a manner of writing creates a literary continuum corresponding to the sensation of wholeness inherent in Pasternak. Ch. 2 examines the main hero's own creative activity, viewed as a process of articulation stretching throughout the novel. The analysis shows that writing is persistently modeled as painting: the semantics of the Russian word for painting, *živopis* ('life-writ'), is in various ways exploited narratively in the work.

Ch. 3 provides a case study of the novel's 'continuation' of another literary work: Dostoevskij's *The Brothers Karamazov*. Convergences on the level of character description and plot form a background to thematic lines of pertinence to both novels: the protagonists' articulation of a mute word as an "answer to death," the notion of immortality as "life in others," the memory theme conveyed by the image of the slanting rays of the setting sun.

Ch. 4 shows how the biological notion of *mimicry* connects with the implicit aesthetic discussion in *Doktor Živago*. Mimicry appears as an image of the essence and existential mode of art, comprising some of the features analyzed in the previous chapters: the novel's relationship with other texts, the relationship between its poetry and prose sections and the question of its genre.

Finally it is suggested that the *forest* serves as a stage for the demonstration of constitutive features of the novel's poetics and philosophy of art.

Stockholms universitet
Slaviska institutionen
S-106 91 Stockholm
<http://slav.su.se>

157 s.
Stockholm 2000
ISSN-0346-8496
ISBN 91-22-01905-7

CREATING CREATION

Susanna Witt

CREATING CREATION

Readings of Pasternak's *Doktor Živago*

Almqvist och Wiksell International
Stockholm/Sweden

A dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Stockholm University
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
S-106 91 Stockholm

Witt, Susanna

CREATING CREATION. Readings of Pasternak's *Doktor Živago*
(Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature 33)
Stockholm 2000, 157 pp. ISSN-0346-8496 ISBN 91-22-01905-7

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the process of creation in Boris Pasternak's *Doktor Živago* (1957), both as depicted in and as realized by the novel. Statements on art, on literature in general and on specific texts are found to have a bearing on the novel itself, thus providing clues to its own poetics and philosophy of art.

Ch. 1 examines the protagonist's understanding of art as *dopisyvanie*, or 'continuation writing.' This notion is applied to the relationship between *Doktor Živago* and the Book of Revelation. One text appears to proceed from another as a continuation involving creative distortions. Such a manner of writing creates a literary continuum corresponding to the sensation of wholeness inherent in Pasternak. Ch. 2 examines the main hero's own creative activity, viewed as a process of articulation stretching throughout the novel. The analysis shows that writing is persistently modeled as painting: the semantics of the Russian word for painting, *živopis'* ('life-writ'), is in various ways exploited narratively in the work.

Ch. 3 provides a case study of the novel's 'continuation' of another literary work: Dostoevskij's *The Brothers Karamazov*. Convergences on the level of character description and plot form a background to thematic lines of pertinence to both novels: the protagonists' articulation of a mute word as an "answer to death," the notion of immortality as "life in others," the memory theme conveyed by the image of the slanting rays of the setting sun.

Ch. 4 shows how the biological notion of *mimicry* connects with the implicit aesthetic discussion in *Doktor Živago*. Mimicry appears as an image of the essence and existential mode of art, comprising some of the features analyzed in the previous chapters: the novel's relationship with other texts, the relationship between its poetry and prose sections and the question of its genre.

Finally it is suggested that the *forest* serves as a stage for the demonstration of constitutive features of the novel's poetics and philosophy of art.

Key words: Russian literature, Pasternak, *Doktor Živago*, writing, Revelation, painting, Dostoevskij, mimicry, Vladimir Solov'ev, aesthetics, intertextuality

Cover drawing and cover design: Maja Witt

© Susanna Witt
ISSN-0346-8496

ISBN 91-22-01905-7

Printed in Sweden by Elanders Gotab, Stockholm 2000

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	7
Introduction	9
1 Creation as <i>dopisyvanie</i>	
1.1 Introduction	13
1.2 Text Junctures	15
1.3 Writing and Paper	21
1.4 Concluding Remarks	26
2 Creation as <i>živopis'</i>	
2.1 Introduction	30
2.2 Prologue to Creation	30
2.3 Varykino: Reading and Writing	38
2.4 Moscow: Finale and After	47
2.5 Concluding Remarks	51
3 Creation as <i>dopisyvanie</i> : 'A Kind of Continuation of Dostoevskij'	
3.1 Introduction	57
3.2 The Mute Word — and its Articulation	62
3.3 The Memory Theme	72
3.3.1 The Memory Theme and the Slanting Rays of Sun in <i>Brat'ja Karamazovy</i>	77
3.3.2 The Memory Theme and the Slanting Rays of Sun in <i>Doktor Živago</i>	82
3.3.3 The Image of the Sun and Sergej Durylin	88
3.4 Biographical and Metabiographical	91
3.5 Concluding Remarks	93
4 Creation as Mimicry	
4.1 Introduction: The Poem "Chmel'"	95
4.2 Mimicry in <i>Doktor Živago</i>	97
4.3 Mimicry and Text	106
4.3.1 "Roždestvenskaja zvezda" and "Elka u Sventickich"	109
4.3.2 "Na strastnoj" and "V doroge"	111
4.4 Vladimir Solov'ev's 'Aesthetics of Nature'	114
4.5 Mimicry: Two Earlier Contexts	121
4.6 Mimicry, <i>mimika</i> and Mimesis	125
4.7 Concluding Remarks	133
Instead of a Summary: A Second Glance	139
Bibliography	143
Index	156

Acknowledgements

Several people have, either unconsciously or consciously, contributed to this book. In the first group should be included my first tutors at the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Stockholm, especially Barbara Lönnqvist, whose pleasurable approach to literary texts had a most contagious effect. Here belong also my Russian teachers and friends whom I met during a year's stay in Moscow, which was made possible through a generous grant from the Swedish Institute.

As to the second group I am, above all, indebted to my faculty advisor Peter Albergh Jensen for his relentless encouragement, sensitive criticism and generous help at every stage of the writing. He is also the initiator of the network for doctoral students in Russian literature within the Nordic Academy for Advanced Study (NorFa), at whose seminars and conferences I have been privileged to present my work. I wish to thank the participants in these meetings, not only for valuable comments and discussions, but also for providing a truly stimulating milieu. The doctoral seminar at the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures has been indispensable to my work. My thanks are due to all its able participants, but especially to Karin Grelz and Natalya Galatsky, without whose inspirational companionship and unwavering support I would not have completed this study. I have appreciated my discussions with Per-Arne Bodin on matters concerning Pasternak and on many other topics. Thanks to the department's close collaboration with Tartu University, I have been fortunate to meet colleagues as Ülle Pärli, Ljubov' Kiseleva, Roman Lejbov, Michail Lotman and Peeter Torop. A grant from Kinander's Foundation was of decisive importance at the initial stage of my work. The department helped financing a research trip to Moscow.

I am also greatly indebted to my "other circle" — friends and colleagues in the multidisciplinary program "Cultures in Dialogue" at Södertörn University College. It has been a privilege to be included in the program's dynamic and creative atmosphere. For financing parts of my research I would like to express my gratitude to the Swedish Foundation for the Promotion of Research on the Baltic Sea Region and Central Europe.

I am deeply grateful to Lars Kleberg and Knut Andreas Grimstad who have read and commented on my final manuscript, to Charles Rougle who has helped me with the translation, to Ingunn Lunde who has commented on Chapter 3

(spending far too much time converting my files), to Igor Smirnov for reading and discussing Chapter 4, to Roland Castenberg for proof-reading and assistance with the index, and to Åke Zimmermann for guiding me through the technical labyrinth of word processing.

I owe much to Jerzy Faryno, whose series of lectures in Stockholm in the beginning of the 1990s evoked my interest in Pasternak's novel, and to Evgenij Borisovič and Elena Vladimirovna Pasternak who initially encouraged my project and kindly opened their home to me, granting me access to the Pasternak Archive. I have also benefited greatly from discussions with Konstantin Polivanov.

Finally, I would like to thank my sister Maja Witt, who made the original drawing for the cover of this book.

Stockholm, December 2000

Susanna Witt

Introduction

A great deal has been said, written, and theorized about Boris Pasternak's novel *Doktor Živago*.¹ Relatively little attention has been devoted to what the book says about itself. Yet viewed against the background of Pasternak's own understanding of art as manifested in his theoretical or "theory-like" discussions in works from various periods, the subject could serve as a rather natural starting point for a study. A prime example is the following passage in *Ochran-naja gramota*: "Самое ясное, запоминающееся и важное в искусстве есть его возникновение, и лучшие произведения мира, повествуя о наизычайнейшем, на самом деле рассказывают о своем рождении." (BP4, 186)² The very titles of a number of Pasternak's works signal an orientation toward (his own) text and (his own) writing: "Pro éti stichi,"³ "Opredelenie poëzii,"⁴ "Poëzija," "Povest'," "Chudožnik." Significant, too, is the fact that some of the most prominent figures in his character gallery are *readers*, such as Ženja Ljuvers (whose "secret reading by night" and "general interest in reading" are noted by Greber 1988), or *writers* like Spektorskij or Jurij Živago, as it represents the beginning of a thematization of text reception/text production.⁵

Several scholars have noted that self-reference is a feature in Pasternak's works, in *Doktor Živago* as well as in earlier texts: "In other words, what the novel has to say about the making of art is reflected and illustrated in how the novel itself is made" (Danow 1981, 901); "то, о чем говорится в романе, обусловливает то, как роман написан" (B. Gasparov 1989, 343); "There are some sentences in the novel in which Pasternak seems almost to make a declaration of his metonymic method" (Livingstone 1989, 93); "Уже первоначальный вариант названия, 'Я сам,' дает понять, что текст этот [the poem "Zerkalo,"

¹ Instead of an overall summary of the state of research, relevant references and other scholarship will be discussed below in connection with specific text analyses. The need for a summary has decreased owing to the excellent bibliographies and bibliographic surveys that have appeared in recent years; these are listed separately in the bibliography. For a detailed, thematically organized discussion of research, see Cornwell 1986.

² References to Pasternak's texts indicate the volume and page number in his *Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomach* in the form: BP 1-5, followed by page number; references to *Doktor Živago* (BP 3) indicate only page numbers.

³ For an analysis of this poem, see Nilsson 1995.

⁴ For an analysis of this poem, see Jensen 1987.

⁵ Avins (1995, 213) notes that *Doktor Živago* also contains a kind of reception history: "Through his treatment of Iurii Zhivago's readers, Pasternak probes two central issues bearing on the literary process in the Soviet period: how a work makes its way to the reader and how — meaning in what spirit, to what end — it is read."

S. W.] содержит элементы поэтического автопортрета и носит манифестный характер" (A. Ljunggren 1989, 225); "Actually, Pasternak himself described his creative process and gave the best characteristics of his world image. I have in mind the following passage from his *Povest*" (Taranovsky 1981, 340-341); "Будучи центральным, этот мотив ["second birth," S. W.] подчиняет себе форму стихотворения ["Marburg," S. W.], например, отпечатывается в многочисленных переносах, благодаря которым синтагмы получают двойное начало" (Smirnov 1981, 285). The *poëma* "Vysokaja bolezнь" has been described as "эпос о рождении эпоса" (M. Gasparov 1990a, 19) and "Pis'ma iz Tuly" as "a kind of literary confession" (Aucouturier 1970, 223) and as "трактат об искусстве и о рождении искусства, как 'втором рождении' действительности" (Flejšman 1977, 18).

Thus far, however, no attempt has been made to apply this insight on any large scale to *Doktor Živago*. The present dissertation seeks to investigate some of the implications of such an approach to the text for an interpretation of the novel.

Russian researchers have introduced the term *avtometaopisane* (Timenčik 1975) to describe texts that refer to/tell about/describe themselves. Western literary scholarship has displayed a theoretical interest in this type of text since at least the 1960s Linda Hutcheon summarizes the approach in her book *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox*, where she also develops further the theory and practice of "self-reflective," "autoreferential," etc. texts.⁶ According to her, such texts represent a kind of "mimesis of process," as against the "mimesis of product" that she associates in the first place with certain nineteenth-century works of realism. "Mimesis of process" is regarded above all in Hutcheon's study as characteristic of texts from the modernist period on, although she points out that beginning at least with *Don Quixote* there is an undercurrent of works to which this notion has varying degrees of relevance. With the exception of Nabokov's works in English, Hutcheon does not discuss any Russian writers,⁷ but "mimesis of process" obviously has points in common

⁶Unfortunately, in choosing her title Hutcheon yielded to a euphonic temptation that forces her to take a defensive position from the outset; "narcissistic" in this context is not meant as a value judgment — she also notes that it was not originally used that way by Freud — but common usage has probably marked it too deeply for the reader to ignore completely a certain connotative coloring.

⁷Nineteenth-century Russian literature offers some interesting material, for example, Dostoevskij's thematization of the narration itself (particularly obvious in *Podrostok*) and his preoccupation with *literatura* and *literatory*. Terras (1981) notes numerous instances of "baring the device" in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* which according to Hutcheon's typology could be classified as "covert diegetic narcissism" (in which the detective story is one typically exploited structure). Lachmann (1988) has analyzed anagrams and cryptograms in *Slaboe serdce*, which Hutcheon maintains are typical phenomena in texts representing a

with Pasternak's definition above of the essence of art, perhaps even more with the following one (from the same source): "Наставленное на действительность, смещаемую чувством, искусство есть запись этого смещения" (BP4, 187).⁸ Here art can be regarded precisely as a registration of a dynamic process or a chain of events that has to do with the aesthetic experience as such.

The methodological starting-point for the present study is that *Doktor Živago* constitutes a work that in different ways refers to itself and thus represents a type of text which largely provides the critical tools necessary for its own analysis.⁹

"covert linguistic narcissism." Cf. also Wolf Schmid's 1988 study "Die Parömie als narratives Kryptogramm: zur Entfaltung von Sprichwörtern und Redensarten in A. S. Puškins 'Hauptmannstochter' and his (1982) "Diegetische Realisierung von Sprichwörtern, Redensarten und semantischen Figuren in Puškins 'Povesti Belkina.'" Gogol' is another example: "Šinel'" has recently been discussed as a "самоописывающий текст" (see Tóth 1995).⁸ Boris Gasparov (1992b, 371) suggests a connection between this definition and W. Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle, that is, observation itself influences what is being observed.

⁹As expressed by Hutcheon (1991, 6): "the point of *metafiction* is that it constitutes its own first critical commentary, and in so doing, it will be argued, sets up the theoretical frame of reference in which it must be considered." Cf. also: "The critic too is freed from the restrictions of any single methodology by the fact, emphasized throughout this study, that metafiction embodies within itself its own critical frame of reference as part of its theme and often its form." (Ibid., 152)

Поговорим о физиологии чтения.

Осип Мандельштам

Creation as *dopisyvanie*

1.1 Introduction

Since *Doktor Živago* is a novel about a creative individual — the physician and poet Jurij Živago — reflections on art and its essence are more or less natural components of the narrative. As a point of departure for this study we shall take a closer look at the passage in the novel where the main character himself first formulates his thoughts on the tasks of art. This happens in the cemetery after the funeral of Anna Ivanovna Gromeko, in whose family the orphan Jurij has grown up and whose daughter soon will become his wife. In Živago's flow of thoughts conveyed in indirect speech art is a kind of answer to death:

В ответ на опустошение, произведенное смертью в этом медленно шагавшем сзади обществе, ему с непреодолимостью, с какою вода, крутя воронки, устремляется в глубину, хотелось мечтать и думать, трудиться над формами, производить красоту. Сейчас как никогда ему было ясно, что искусство всегда, не переставая, занято двумя вещами. Оно неотступно размышляет о смерти и неотступно творит этим жизнь. Большое, истинное искусство, то, которое называется Откровением Иоанна, и то, которое его дописывает. (91-92)

Art used to conjure up the nothingness of existence is in itself no new theme; already in the myth of Orpheus death appears as a creative impulse. More surprising in this context is the programmatic definition that concludes the passage and through a mention of the Revelation of St. John moves the novel in a very special direction.¹⁰

The Book of Revelation is alluded to already several chapters earlier in the monologue with which Živago attempts to calm the mortally ill Anna Ivanovna:

¹⁰The idea of death as a creative impulse is brought up and explicitly thematicized later in the novel, when Živago, who is ill with typhus, dreams he writes the poem "Smjatenie" in the presence of 'a boy with narrow Kirghiz eyes' (whom the reader identifies with his half-brother Evgraf): "Совершенно ясно, что мальчик этот — дух его смерти или, скажем просто, его смерть. Но как же может он быть его смертью, когда он помогает ему писать поэму, разве может быть польза от смерти, разве может быть в помощь смерть?" (206) Mossman (1989, 396) speaks in this connection of an "apocalyptic aesthetic" bound up with "metaphors of a struggle between death and life, constituting the impulse to creativity." Moreover, on the biographical level the novel's own genesis seems to illustrate the idea of a creative potential inherent in loss. Pasternak began writing it in the fall and winter of 1945-1946, that is, just after his father, the artist Leonid Osipovič Pasternak, died in exile in England. On this theme, see also my discussion in Chapter 3 below.

Смерти не будет, говорит Иоанн Богослов, и вы послушайте простоту его аргументации. Смерти не будет, потому что прежнее прошло. Это почти как: смерти не будет, потому что это уже видали, это старо и надоело, а теперь требуется новое, а новое есть жизнь вечная. (70)

Živago paraphrases and elaborates on Revelation 21:4: “И отрет Бог всякую слезу с очей их, и смерти не будет уже; ни плача, ни вопля, ни болезни не будет; ибо прежнее прошло” — the same verse that in an early manuscript version of the novel entitled “Смерти не будет” also functioned as its epigraph (editor’s commentary, 652). Thus it seems that the relevance of this Biblical text to the novel is clear. But what does it mean to say that art *dopisyvaet*, that is, continues to write, Revelation?

We can note two things: the formulation is peculiarly concrete and it should be able to relate to the novel itself. If *Doktor Živago* is to be regarded as “true art” — a claim implicit in the work, its *raison d’être*¹¹ — its relationship to Revelation must to some extent be describable as *dopisyvanie*.¹² In a text which thus presents itself as a kind of continuation it is of interest to examine its boundary — the place where this text may succeed another one. The natural place for such a juncture of texts is the beginning of the book. We shall therefore take a closer look at its first page.

The opening scene is also a funeral. Here the deceased is Jura’s mother Marija Nikolaevna Živago. Significantly, the novel begins in a kind of continuative mode: the funeral procession moving forward in the first paragraphs leaves its mark on the semantics of the entire text. The keywords here are “продолжают петь”:

Шли и шли и пели “Вечную память”, и, когда останавливались, казалось, что ее по-залаженному продолжают петь ноги, лошади, дуновения ветра.

Прохожие пропускали шествие, считали венки, крестились. Любопытные входили в процессию (7)¹³

When the coffin is lowered into the grave and covered with earth the little boy climbs up on the mound. His behavior is registered in detail:

Он поднял голову и окинул с возвышения осенние пустыри и главы монастыря отсутствующим взором. Его курносое лицо исказилось. Шея его вытянулась. Если бы таким движением поднял голову волчонок, было бы ясно, что он сейчас завоет. Закрыв лицо руками, мальчик зарыдал. *Летевшее навстречу*

¹¹Pasternak’s own opinion of the novel as his most important work is well known.

¹²Precisely the concreteness of this verb has been lost in many translations of the novel. Cf., for example, “He realised, more vividly than ever before, that art has two constant, two unending preoccupations: it is always meditating upon death and it is always thereby creating life. He realised that this was true of all great and genuine art; it was true of that work of art which is called the Revelation of St. John, and of all those works which have been completing it throughout the ages.” (Pasternak 1958, 89)

¹³All italics, if not otherwise noted, are mine, S. W.

облако стало хлестать его по рукам и лицу мокрыми *плетьюми* холодного ливня. (7)

If together with this passage we examine the first page of the Book of Revelation we may note that the seventh verse of the first chapter contains an accumulation of words that semantically and/or phonetically correspond to the italicized words in the quotation above:

Се, грядет с облаками, и узрит его всякое *око*, и те, которые *пронзили его*; и *возрыдают* пред Ним все *племена* земные. Ей аминь.

The collocation “грядет с облаками” in the Biblical verse has a counterpart of sorts in the novel’s “летевшее навстречу облако”; “узрит его” is repeated in “взором. Его <...>”; the “око” of the Bible echoes in “окинул”; “пронзили” in “искажилось”; “возрыдают” in “зарыдал” and, finally, “племена” echoes in “плетьюми” in the novel. Some of the elements coincide almost completely both semantically and phonetically (“возрыдать” is the Church Slavonic and “зарыдать” the Russian form of the same verb), while others share only phonetic features (“племена” — “плетьюми”).

Thus the text of Revelation seems to emerge from that of the novel: it peeks forth and shines through in patches, as if it had preceded *Doktor Živago* on a palimpsest that was not scraped entirely clean. We can also note that the pair of words “пронзили” (from the Bible)/“искажилось” (from the novel) seems to describe fairly well the relationship between the texts: the Biblical verse has ‘penetrated’ the page of the novel and at the same time has become slightly ‘distorted’. The word “искажилось” here can in this case be interpreted as referring not only to the face of the boy but to the text itself: thus it has a kind of metapoetic meaning. We may recall in this context that Russian uses a derivative of the word “лицо” to denote the front or outer side — “лицевая сторона” — of something. This word also occurs in a special meaning as an attribute of old manuscripts; it indicates that the manuscript is illustrated with pictures of some sort, often miniatures: “лицевая рукопись,” “лицевой летописный свод.”

We shall see below that the phenomenon noted here is not an isolated coincidence, but on the contrary occurs in several different variants in *Doktor Živago*. It seems to say something essential about the nature of the novel.

1.2 Text Junctures

The relationship between texts is something Pasternak’s novel explicitly contemplates. In part 12 (“Рябина в сахаре”) there is a description of a text juncture similar to the one suggested above, and the resulting distortions are com-

mented upon in the narrative text. A prisoner of the Siberian partisans, Živago witnesses Kubaricha, who is a kind of soothsayer (“ворожея”), trying to cure a sick cow through incantations. Her chanting, which is described as “бредовая вязь” (360) but is nevertheless given verbatim for two pages, is analyzed as follows:

Юрий Андреевич был достаточно образован, чтобы в *последних словах* ворожен заподозрить *начальные места* какой-то летописи, Новгородской или Ипатьевской, *наслаивающимися искажениями* превращенные в апокриф. Их целыми веками *коверкали* знахари и сказочники, устно передавая их из поколения в поколения. Их еще раньше *путали и перевирали* переписчики. (362)¹⁴

The discussion, which makes note of the *beginning* and *end* (the boundaries of the text) and the *distortions* piled upon each other, seems in connection with the first page of the novel to be a kind of description of the book’s own genesis. Also, the text to which the woman attaches her own — the chronicle text — functions itself according to a similar principle: the old Russian chronicles establish a connection between themselves and the Bible by opening with a retelling *in their own words* of Biblical history; before Nestor’s Chronicle comes to Slavic conditions, the first chapter, for example, has treated the distribution of the earth after the Fall, the second chapter deals with the Tower of Babylon and the confusion of tongues, and so on.

The “texts” Kubaricha produces also have traits in common with the content of the novel as a whole.¹⁵ In the previous chapter Živago accidentally hears her perform a folk song¹⁶ which is quoted *in extenso* and in some respects mirrors the novel itself:

Что бежал заюшка по белу свету,
По белу свету да по белу снегу.
Он бежал, косою, мимо рябины-дерева,
Он бежал, косою, рябине плакался. <...>
Пожалей меня, рябинов куст,
Что рябинов куст, краса рябина-дерево. <...>
В тот ли крайний дом с околицы,
В то ли крайнее окно, да в ту ли горницу,
Там затворница укрывается,
Милая моя, желанная. <...>
Я томлюсь во плену, солдат-ратничек,

¹⁴For a review of Pasternak’s use of Ural folklore in the novel, see Lekić 1983, 153-89; on the incantation passage, see especially 168-75.

¹⁵Although the texts are oral, the word used to designate them, “вязь,” connotes *writing*, cf.: “Соединение, сплетение смежных букв в один сложный знак.” (Ožegov 1986, 108).

¹⁶For a discussion of “The Rowan Tree Song” in relation to various folklore sources, see Lekić 1983, 179-89. The song as a whole is, however, Pasternak’s own work: “А вот песню о рябине я сам сочинил” (as quoted in Lekić 1983, 179).

Скучно мне, солдату, на чужбинушке.
А и вырвусь я из плена горького,
Вырвусь к яголке моей, красавице. (358)

Here there are parallels to the doctor's captivity, to Lara's situation¹⁷ and to the scene in which the rowan-tree on the edge of the partisans' camp (explicitly associated with Lara) comforts Živago and inspires him to escape (370).

Kubaricha's song, however, is linked to the novel in more than one way. It gives Živago occasion for reflections on the Russian folk song which Boris Gasparov (1989, 350) associates with the poetics of the entire novel: "в интерпретации Живаго бесконечные и беспорядочные повороты и наложения, контаминации, совмещения различных источников, характерные для поэтики фольклора, предстают в качестве одной из наиболее действенных моделей духовного преодоления времени." According to Gasparov, it is precisely this overcoming of time that is one of the main goals of the novel, which it achieves by various "contrapuntal" means.

Kubaricha herself can be regarded as a parallel to Živago — with her healing and her folk poetry improvisations she is a distorted mirror image of him in his dual identity of physician and poet, "a kind of folkloric embodiment of Iurii's literary persona" (Lekić 1983, 168).¹⁸ The artistic trait is emphasized in the narrative text's description of her as "артистка" ("Самолюбие артистки оставило ее," 359). For his part, Živago associates himself with the practice of folk medicine after his improvised monologue at Anna Ivanovna's sickbed: "Черт знает что, — думал он, — я становлюсь каким-то шарлатаном. Заговариваю, лечу наложением рук" (70).

There are further points at which Kubaricha's texts mirror the novel in its entirety. One is the metapoetic tendency itself. Her activity is clearly auto-referential in character, as she touches on the genre of incantation:

И она начала заговаривать корову. Вначале ее ворожба действительно относилась к скотине. Потом она сама увлеклась и прочла Агафье целое наставление о колдовстве и его применениях. (360)

¹⁷Cf. "Антипова жила на углу Купеческой и Новосвалочного переуллка" (291); "городские пустыри у реки" (293) can be seen from the window of the house (293). Danow as well notes: "The house in the song may, of course, refer in symbolic fashion to the house opposite the house of sculptures; and the woman to Lara" (Danow 1981, 900). This also, however, mirrors the information the reader is given by Živago about the house in Omsk inhabited by his half-brother Evgraf and Evgraf's mother: "Княгиня — затворница. Она безвыездно живет с сыном в своем особняке на окраине Омска на неизвестные средства. Мне показывали фотографию особняка. Красивый пятиоконный дом с цельными окнами и лепными медальонами по карнизу." (71)

¹⁸Livingstone (1989, 81) regards Kubaricha as one of three female figures who reflect aspects of Živago in the novel. The other two are Galuzina and Simuška.

Another is the connection with Revelation. There is an apocalyptic element in her composition:

Или тоже, например, теперь камни с неба падают, падают, яко дождь. Выйдет человек за порог из дому, а на него камни. Или иные видеху конники проезжали верхом по небу, кони копытами задевали за крыши. (362)

The first two sentences can be linked to Rev. 16:21:

И град, величинию в талант, пал с неба на людей; и хулили люди Бога за язвы от града, потому, что язва от него была весьма тяжкая.

The last sentence alludes to the four horsemen (Rev. 6:2-8), and perhaps especially to their various iconographic renderings.¹⁹ When Antipov/Strel'nikov mentions the Apocalypse in his first meeting with Živago he associates it in particular with "winged beasts": "Сейчас страшный суд на земле, милостивый государь, существа из Апокалипсиса с мечами и крылатые звери" (251).

Kubaricha's chant contains a strange image of a woman —

сия жена в себе заключает зерно, или мед, или куний мех. И латники тем заногощали плечо, яко отмыкают скрынницу, и вынимали мечом из лопатки у какой пшеницы меру, у какой белку, у какой пчелиный сот (362)

— which Živago associates with Lara:

Ларе приоткрыли левое плечо. Как втыкают ключ в секретную дверцу железного, вделанного в шкаф тайничка, поворотом меча ей вскрыли лопатку. (Ibid.)²⁰

This image, which originates from Nestor's Chronicle,²¹ is realized narratively in chapter 15:4 — in a form reminiscent of the "distortions" Živago reflects upon as he listens to the incantation. Here the text has been "translated" into the idiom of war communism in the young boy Vasja's story about the robbery and murder of the widow who tried to escape "изъятие излишков" (food requisitioning) by hiding her supplies with his help. A connection between this episode and the Kubaricha passage is also established lexically: "Выкопал я ей

¹⁹Lekić (1983, 173-74) associates this passage with popular notions of the cycle of the seasons, while Demkova (1997, 336) connects it with a legend in *Povest' vremennykh let*.

²⁰This association process leads Danow (1981, 901) to his conclusions on the self-reflective nature of the novel: "such transformation of imagery reflects the structure of the novel as a whole, itself a vast mosaic of interrelated images. Moreover, the novel's implicitly stated *ars poetica* is both mirrored in these passages and realized in the composition of the book itself."

²¹The editors associate the incantation with the following passage in the chronicle: "Однажды во время неурожая в Ростовской области явились два волхва из Ярославля, говоря, что-де мы знаем, кто запасы держит. И отправились они по Волге, и куда ни придут в погост, тут им называли знатных жен, говоря, что та жито прячет <...> Волхвы же, мороча людей, прорезали за плечами и вынимали оттуда либо жито, либо рыбу и убивали многих жен, а имущество их забирали себе" (707).

яму, как *тайничку* полагается” (465) corresponds to “тайничка” and “лопатку” in Živago’s transformation of the image above.

Two elements in Vasja’s account are of particular interest in this context. These are the words “кубарь” and “лататы” in the markedly folkish expressions “Ему бы от нас кубарем, наутек куда подальше” and “А сам из наших мест лататы и больше глаз не казал” (465; the references are to the suspected murderer). Both occur in the novel only in this context, and both are a kind of distortion; “кубарь” of “Кубариха” and “лататы” of “латники” (“И латники тем заногощали плечо, яко отмыкают скрынницу”).

The clearest allusion to the novel as a whole in Kubaricha’s incantation, however, is contained within her concluding words:

— Ступай, — говорила ворожея Агафье, — корову твою отчитала я, — выздоровеет. Молись Божьей Матери. Се бо света чертог и книга слова животного. (363)

The juxtaposition of “книга” and “животного” in the quote from the liturgy²² that Kubaricha chooses to include in her text evokes associations with “книга Живаго”; the word “выздоровеет” can be said to represent metonymically the element “Доктор.” Furthermore, the passage is an eminent example of the forces at work in Kubaricha’s speech. The liturgical quotation is compromised by its context; against the background of the word “отчитать корову” one can suspect that she has given it a folk-etymological interpretation. The Church Slavonic “животный” in “книга слова животного” (from “живот,” ‘life’) seems to have a Russian meaning for her connected to the word “животное,” ‘animal,’ which may account for the incorporation of this particular text into the incantation.²³ This feature also mirrors the novel as a whole: distortions caused by folk etymologies occur with remarkable frequency throughout the book, as Livingstone (1989, 97) and others have noted.

The partisan chapters abound with examples of this type of lexical transformations. For instance, Kubaricha herself is referred to as “баба-ветренянка” by one of the men, who, when corrected by Živago, maintains: “Я и говорю, — бабой-ветренянкой животные поветрия лечить” (356-357). In another passage the phenomenon is foregrounded by the narrator, who analyzes and com-

²²The quotation is identified by the editors as: “Слова из службы на Рождество Пресвятой Богородицы (вторая стихира на ‘Господи воззвах’ на великой вечерне).” (708)

²³In the preceding section of the novel the opposite also occurs, that is, a use of the word “живот” in its Church Slavonic meaning in a Russian sentence: “Однако созерцать и пребывать в бездействии среди кипевшей кругом борьбы не на живот, а на смерть было немыслимо и выше человеческих сил.” (329). Sima Tuncева’s “lecture” to Lara contains a translation of the word: “В другом случае девушка <...> дает жизнь младенцу, производит на свет жизнь, чудо жизни, жизнь всех, ‘Живота всех,’ как потом его называют.” (406)

ments on its specific features. After a firefight between the partisans and a White unit the doctor inspects the dead and wounded.²⁴ Around the neck of one of the dead men he finds a case containing a slip of paper with excerpts from Psalm 90, “с теми изменениями и отклонениями, которые вносит народ в молитвы, постепенно удаляющиеся от подлинника от повторения к повторению. Отрывки церковнославянского текста были переписаны по-русски.” (331)²⁵ The distorted text is compared with the original:

В псалме говорится: “Живый в помощи Вышнего”. В грамотке это стало заглавием заговора: “Живые помощи”. Стих псалма “Не убоишися... от стрелы летящая во дни (днем)” превратился в слова ободрения: “Не бойся стрелы летящей войны”. “Яко позна имя мое”, — говорит псалом. А грамотка: “Поздно имя мое”. “С ним есмь в скорби, изму его...” стало в грамотке “Скоро в зиму его”. (331)

One notes that the changes in the Biblical words in the folk variant are strongly reminiscent of the distortions of Revelation found on the first page of the novel. The transformation of “не убоишися” and “позна” to “не бойся” and “поздно” seems to be of the same kind as that from “возрыдают” to “зарыдал” and “племена” to “плетьми.”²⁶

The passage cited above, in which the slip of paper is called “грамотка,” also touches upon its function, which is to protect its bearer in battle: “Текст псалма считался чудодейственным, оберегающим от пуль.” Thus the title of another work of Pasternak’s is alluded to, namely *Ochrannaja gramota*.²⁷ Aucouturier (1979) and Flejšman (1980) have shown that this autobiography is a kind of “double text” that may be read on various levels, which means that it

²⁴For a detailed analysis of this episode, in which Živago is regarded as a “Fedorovian soldier” with death itself as his main enemy, see Masing-Delić 1981.

²⁵Cf. the biographical connection of this piece of information: “Pasternak’s great interest in Christian tradition during the post World War period is also revealed by his plans to translate the psalms of David from Church Slavonic into Russian. His intentions was to follow in the footsteps of the Russian Lomonosov and the Ukrainian Ševčenko by translating the Book of Psalms into the colloquial. This idea was dropped, among other reasons, because of the lukewarm interest of the publishers in such a project.” (Bodin 1976a, 12)

²⁶The corrupted text of the psalm is also cited by Boris Gasparov (1989, 351) in a discussion of the novel’s “контрапунктная духовная система”: “Канонический текст искажается, ‘перевирается’ в рукописной и устной передаче, превращается в апокриф, чтобы вернуться в сакральную сферу в виде заговора-заклинания, сама ‘темнота’ которого служит источником его мистической силы. То, что казалось лишь порчей и уничтожением под воздействием необратимого хода времени, предстает в виде вневременного контрапункта.”

²⁷Cf.: “*Охранная грамота* — книга с непривычным и загадочным заглавием. Непривычным, поскольку оно указывает не на содержание, а на назначение книги, что и сближает его, по функции, с жанровым обозначением. Загадочным, поскольку оно — метафорично, и напоминая о временах гражданской войны, намекает на какую-то угрозу, перед которой сама книга должна защитить ее автора.” (Aucouturier 1979, 338) For more on this title, see Flejšman 1980, 187-188, and my discussion in Chapter 4.

can be regarded as a semantic palimpsest. There is a rather clear reference to the time when *Ochrannaja gramota* was written in the novel's further description of the verse from Psalms: "гораздо позднее его [the Psalm, S. W.] стали зашивать в платье арестованные и твердили про себя заключенные, когда их вызывали к следователям на ночные допросы" (331).²⁸

1.3 Writing and Paper

Considering the novel's preoccupation with texts that in a certain sense are piled one upon the other, it is interesting to note that a specific type of relationship between paper and text appears to have been significant from the very outset to the author as he wrote. A number of biographical facts point in this direction.

Having abandoned his plans for a musical career, Boris Pasternak began studying at Moscow University, first law and then history and philology. In 1910 he attended Gustav Špet's seminar on Hume's theoretical philosophy. This is also when he began writing his first poems, and the way they came into being is from our perspective worthy of special attention:

На обороте страниц в тетрадке с черновиком его [Pasternak's, S. W.] реферата "Психологический скептицизм Юма", который был переписан и подан к 1 февраля 1910 года, записаны черновые наброски стихотворений. Среди них: "Опять весна в висках стучится...", "Безумный, жадный от бессонниц...", "Звуки Бетховена в улице..." (Е. В. Pasternak 1989, 120)

This seemingly trivial bit of information can be placed in a series of similar facts where a subsequent step concerns the collection *Sestra moja — žizn'* (1917, published in 1922). It has to do with writing that even in the concrete sense seems to emerge on the reverse side or on top of other texts:

Первоначальная рукопись "Сестры моей жизни" не сохранилась. Она была вшита в обложку "Поверх барьеров", ее стихотворения записывались на заклеенных страницах сборника. Она погибла во время войны, когда в дом попала бомба. О ней рассказывали братья Штихи и сама Елена Александровна [Vinograd, S. W.], но точно вспомнить ее состав и композицию никто не мог. (Е. В. Pasternak 1989, 297)

Another example of this phenomenon we find in Nikolaj Vil'mont's (the brother of Pasternak's sister-in-law) reminiscences about the next poetry collection, *Temy i variacii* (1923):

Быть может, только я и разве что Александр Леонидович, брат поэта, помним, что четвертая книга стихов должна была называться "Обратной стороной медали", то есть обратной стороной "Сестры моей жизни", как пояснил

²⁸For example, Aucouturier (1979, 345) notes in *Ochrannaja gramota* a subtle allusion to LEF member Vladimir Sillov, who was (presumably) executed in 1930.

мне автор. Впрочем, в другой раз, гораздо позже, он заявил, что — за отсутствием бумаги — он писал стихи, вошедшие в его четвертую книгу, на обратной стороне машинописного экземпляра “Сестры моей жизни” — отсюда, мол, и название, которое он считал “во всех отношениях символичным”. (Vil'mont 1989, 78-79)²⁹

In *Doktor Živago* we also find considerable attention devoted to the relationship between paper and text: there seems to be an important distinction between texts which are written on one side versus both sides of the paper. One example of the former is the newspaper *Živago* acquires in October 1917 as he is on the way to visit a colleague amid the street fighting shaking Moscow. It touches upon the latest events in the capital:

Экстренный выпуск, *покрытый печатью только с одной стороны*, содержал правительственное сообщение из Петербурга об образовании Совета Народных Комиссаров, установлении в России советской власти и введении в ней диктатуры пролетариата. Далее следовали первые декреты новой власти и публиковались разные сведения (191).

Later, the doctor will have reason to regret his initial fascination with the Revolution (“Какая великолепная хирургия!”) and his positive attitude to events; it is afterwards clear to the reader that this “one-sided” newspaper text in reality sentences his family to disintegration and Lara to death in a camp. The next time *Živago* is confronted with the written declarations of the authorities, he actually expresses a revised opinion. When after his long period of imprisonment with the partisans he returns to Jurjatin he encounters decrees, newspaper articles and proceedings of meetings covering the façade of the “house of sculptures” opposite Lara’s home:³⁰

Один раз в жизни он восхищался безоговорочностью этого языка и прямою этой мысли. Неужели за это неосторожное восхищение он должен расплачиваться тем, чтобы в жизни больше уже никогда ничего не видеть кроме этих на протяжении долгих лет не меняющихся шальных выкриков и требований, чем дальше, тем более нежизненных, неудобопонятных и неисполнимых? (375)

²⁹Exactly what point in time Vil'mont has in mind when he says “гораздо позже” is unclear, but ‘much later’ (1940) also Anna Achmatova motivates the palimpsest-like character of a poetic text with a reference to the paper shortage; cf. the introduction to *Poëma bez geraja*: “... а так как мне бумаги не хватило, / я на твоём пишу черновике. / И вот чужое слово проступает/ и, как тогда снежинка на руке, / доверчиво и без упрека тает.” (Achmatova 1977, 353)

³⁰“На углу стоял темно-серый дом с фигурами. На огромных четырехугольных камнях его наклонно скошенного фундамента чернели свежерасклеенные номера правительственных газет, правительственные декреты и постановления” (370); “И не отпирая квартиры и не снимая котомки с натруженного плеча, он сошел вниз на улицу и подошел к стене, на большом пространстве сплошь облепленной разнообразною печатью.” (375) On this building as “a palimpsest of the old and the new times,” see Greber 1997, 28.

The word “нежизненный” is a well chosen characteristic of these wall publications; the decrees, which threaten transgressors with terror and execution, are indeed dominated by a kind of semantics of death: “Неимение рабочей книжки или неправильное, а тем более лживое ведение записей карается по всем строгостям военного времени”; “Уличенные в хранении и сокрытии продовольственных запасов расстреливаются на месте”; “Не здавшие оружие или носящие его без соответствующего разрешения нового образца преследуются по всей строгости закона” (371); “пока не применим суровых мер террора вплоть до расстрела на месте к спекулянтам, не будет спасения от голода” (376).³¹ For our purposes, it is significant that we are dealing here with texts which *by definition* can only be printed on one side of the paper, because they are intended to be posted on walls and bulletin boards.

The description of the house wall covered in text takes up in fact two entire short chapters, one and three, in the thirteenth section of the novel, “Opposite the House of Sculptures.”³² In the chapter between them there is a description of a *two-sided* text whose author is Lara. In a note hidden in a prearranged spot together with the key to her apartment, she informs Živago that she and her daughter have left for Varykino. The reader’s attention is subtly drawn to the fact that the note has two sides because it is at first a source of misunderstanding: “Тут кончалась лицевая сторона записки. Доктор не обратил внимания, что бумажка исписана и с другой стороны. Он поднес разложенный на ладони листок к губам, а потом, не глядя, сложил и сунул его вместе с ключом в карман.” (374)³³ Živago realizes that his own family cannot still be at Varykino, and although he is glad to know Lara is alive, he is distressed and confused that the slip of paper should tell him nothing about their fate. This uncertainty spans four chapters, until one of the Tunceva sisters hints that his fami-

³¹On the theme of language in the novel, see Møller 1979; the topic is also addressed in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 below.

³²From the point of view of narrative technique, it is remarkable that the reader is given access before Živago to the content of the decrees; they are quoted abundantly in 13:1, whereas he does not read them until 13:3: “Не последнею заботой было ознакомление с развешанными на улице декретами. Время было нешуточное. Можно было по незнанию заплатить жизнью за нарушение какого-нибудь обязательного постановления.” (375)

³³The proximity of “key” and “text” points to the significance of the passage. It may also be observed that in a letter Pasternak wrote from Marburg to his sister Žozefina in 1912, the image of a key in a pocket is used in a discussion of the philosophy of art that the editors associate with central propositions in *Ochrannaja gramota*: “Замечательно, что первый предварительный набросок такой эстетики Пастернак дает в публикуемом ниже письме к сестре Жозефине. Потерянный ключ, который становится предметом заботы (чувства) и, следовательно, возможным предметом искусства, в отличие от ключа, лежащего в кармане, это пример изменения действительности ‘при прохождении сквозь нее столба силового’, пример действительности, смещаемой чувством, т.е. искусства.” (Pasternak & Polivanov 1990, 54).

ly is in Moscow. This is not confirmed, however, until he again takes out Lara's note and discovers the text on the other side: "Он извлек ее в перевернутом виде, не в том, в каком читал прежде, и только теперь установил, что листок исписан и с нижней стороны. Разгладив скомканную бумажку, он при пляшущем свете топящейся печки прочел: 'О ваших ты знаешь. Они в Москве. Тоня родила дочку.'" (386) Thus unlike the one-sided text, this two-sided one turns out to have a life-affirming content, speaking of life that has been preserved (both of the doctor's families) and a new life (Tonja's delivery).

Lara's note is of interest with respect to its form as well. The narrative text treats it with a precision worthy of a scholarly description of an old document: "Дальше шло несколько вымаранных строк. Потом следовало: 'Зачеркнула, потому что глупо в записке. Наговоримся с глазу на глаз. Тороплюсь, бегу доставать лошадь. Не знаю, что придумать, если не достану. С Катенькой будет трудно...' Конец фразы стерся и был неразборчив." (386). In these few lines we recognize several of the peculiarities examined above in connection with two-sided/palimpsest texts in the novel: the crossed-out words make up a double layer of writing that in itself resembles a palimpsest.³⁴ There is a metapoetic thrust in the peculiar circumstance that a *zapiska* is discussing the genre of *zapiska* (consider Kubaricha's incantation, which discusses the function of incantations). The part of the text that has been rubbed off is an example of the distortion we have witnessed in these contexts; it is also symptomatic that it occurs on the boundary of the text and that this boundary is given special attention ("Конец фразы стерся").³⁵

The shared formal features in these texts correspond to a common orientation toward "life": Kubaricha's incantation is intended to cure, the verse from Psalms to preserve life, and, as we have seen, Lara's note signifies a double confirmation of life.³⁶ They all seem to be variants of a certain type of text with which the novel itself (which has "life" in the very title) can be identified. A

³⁴The words "вымаранные строки" are reminiscent of Živago's poetry writing at Varyki-no: "Постепенно перемарывая написанное, Юрий Андреевич стал в той же лирической манере излагать легенду о Егории Храбром" (435).

³⁵Cf. the poem "Pro èti stichi" (programmatically metapoetic): "Буран не месяц будет мечь, Концы, начала заметет. Внезапно вспомню: солнце есть; Увижу: свет давно не тот." (BP 1, 110)

³⁶Just before Živago reads the reverse side of Lara's note he has mentally identified her with life itself: "Как сладко жить на свете и любить жизнь! О, как всегда тянет сказать спасибо самой жизни, самому существованию, сказать это им самим в лицо! Вот это-то и есть Лара. С ними нельзя разговаривать, а она их представительница, их выражение" (386). It is in fact these very thoughts that lead him to take out the note again: "О, как ему сейчас не доставало ее, как нуждался он в этот миг в чем-нибудь, осязательно исходящем от нее!" If Lara is 'a representative of life,' the note is a "representative of Lara," which further reinforces its semantics of life.

two-sided text and a palimpsest are equivalent in the sense that a palimpsest can be regarded as a text that is *in itself* two-sided. The facts that the novel alludes to Revelation in the manner of a palimpsest (and that the same book is also found in Kubaricha's incantation mirroring the novel) is in this connection interesting, since the distinction two-/one-sided text seems to be of significance in the Bible as well. This is evident in the description of the "sealed book" in Revelation 5:1: "И видел я в деснице у Сидящего на престоле книгу, написанную внутри и отвне, запечатанную семью печатями."

One apocalyptic element in the novel noted by Mossman (1989) is the disease the doctor contracts after returning to Jurajatin and from which Lara brings him back to life — "тиф, не описанный в руководствах" (388). The illness is called "четвертый тиф" in a manuscript variant, and Mossman associates it with the fourth horseman of the Apocalypse. He considers that it performs a special function in the novel. In connection with Živago's first illness in Moscow, when he dreams that he writes the poem "Smjatenie," Mossman observes: "Thus the delirium of typhus links up thematically with an apocalyptic aesthetic that 'relentlessly contemplates death and thereby relentlessly creates life.' <...> The delirium of typhus becomes a metaphor, drawn from Revelation, for the artist's activity" (Mossman 1989, 389). Of interest to the present study are the facts Mossman cites in his further discussion:

Where in the poetics of *Doctor Zhivago* lies the resolution of the seeming conflict between metaphors of death and creativity?

The manuscript sketch for the fourth typhus episode suggests an answer. There the state of suspension is portrayed as a common, though not a trivial experience: "Nightly death after a delirious dream [...] In transient death as in *Macbeth* on dreams: the death of each day." Pasternak was translating *Macbeth* at the time of composition of the fourth typhus episode (indeed, *the versos of the sketches for the episode are, in many cases, the rectos of the "Macbeth" manuscript*), and the reference is to Act III, scene 1 <...>

The Elizabethan conceit of sleep and death contributes to the condition of the fourth typhus. In *Macbeth* Pasternak isolates what I will term a catachresis – sleep is the death of recurring life – which Zhivago has observed in Revelation and in his earlier Moscow typhus. (Mossman 1989, 392)

It seems a new addition should be made to the biographical series of "symbolic" two-sided manuscripts (Pasternak's description cited in Vil'mont). Once again a piece of everyday information can be interpreted as having a deeper meaning: traces of *Macbeth* have evidently "penetrated" the paper in Pasternak's own manuscript, so that the two-sided manuscript text has become a "palimpsest" in the novel. In Pasternak's poetics — and in his practice — paper with two layers of text seems to be connected with the core of creation and, moreover, to acquire the character of a membrane possessing osmotic properties.

1.4 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter I have pointed to a peculiar connection between *Doktor Živago* in its entirety and Revelation which could be described as a realization of Živago's own definition of art: "Большое, истинное искусство, то, которое называется Откровением Иоанна, и то, которое его дописывает." The novel "follows" the Bible text by including traces of Rev. 1:7 in its introduction. I then provide examples where a similar relationship between different texts is depicted on the level of the action and is explicitly commented upon; specific descriptions of texts in the book prove to be related to the work itself. Furthermore, a "text-juncture text" like Kubaricha's incantation and a two-sided text like Lara's note may be interpreted as "life texts," in contrast to the one-sided "death texts" that are also commented upon in the novel. How are we now to interpret these observations? Can they be viewed as expressions of a particular poetics?

In his well-known work from 1969 Jurij Lotman analyzes the language in some of Pasternak's earliest poems. With the help of series of discarded variants he attempts to demonstrate the 'rules' that 'generate' verses of the type: "Как читать мне! Оплыли слова Ах откуда, откуда сквожу я," in which some words expected in the context are substituted for certain others.³⁷ Thus we have "Оплыли слова" instead of "Оплыла свеча," "сквожу я" instead of "ветер" and so on. According to Lotman, such texts are a result of the author's peculiar view of language, which seems to rest on distrust. Pasternak believes that language and our 'everyday consciousness' ("бытовое сознание") provide an inadequate picture of the world: the world is a continuous, undivided whole, whereas language constantly segments and delimits separate objects: "Действительность слитна, и то, что в языке выступает как отгороженная от других предметов вещь, на самом деле представляет собой одно из определений единого мира." (Lotman 1969, 226) It is as though Pasternak is trying to demonstrate this continuous wholeness on the level of language, in language: "Поэтому текст строится как сознательная замена одних, ожидаемых по законам бытового сознания, денотатов другими и параллельная взаимная подмена языковых функций." (Ibid.) The result is texts such as "Оплывает заженная книга" or "Оплывают, сгорают слова" where the boundary between "book" and "candle" has been completely erased.

Lotman similarly interprets the sound repetitions in the analyzed texts — they are not examples of any traditional poetic euphony, but have a different

³⁷On the Chomsky-inspired terminology, see Lotman 1969, 207.

function: “Она [phoneme repetition, S. W.] должна вскрыть мнимость разделения текста на фонетические слова <...> Поэтому отмеченный текст — это обязательно текст, фонологические повторы которого устанавливают структуру особого, сверхлексического единства.” (Lotman 1969, 232; cf. also Jensen 1986, 96-99).³⁸

In this case Lotman bases his analysis on the individual text in its various stages. Later on in another context, however, he argues that: “Семиотический подход к проблеме литературных связей и — шире — любых межтекстовых отношений вскрывает принципиальную однотипность их с внутритекстовыми процессами и отношениями.” (Lotman 1982, 3) Thus his conclusions in the earlier article may also be set in relation to the phenomenon I have shown here, namely “дописывание” as a physical continuation of other texts.

By analogy with Lotman it is then possible to assume that literature — or at least a certain type of literature — is, like reality in general for Pasternak, a continuous (“слитный”) whole,³⁹ and that our “everyday” division of it into delimited texts/works seems to him to be inadequate. The disintegration of boundaries that Lotman notes in the semantic structure of individual texts, therefore, can also be observed *between* different texts. And just as in the individual text it is a question of *concretely* illustrating this continuous wholeness on the level of language — through the fact that there is a boundary-erasing exchange of functions and features — it is in the relationship between texts on a *concrete* level that the whole is suggested, namely by the superimposing of one text upon another (paraphrasing Lotman, we may here speak of “установление сверхтекстового единства”). A palimpsest in the sense I have discussed can be said to represent abolished boundaries between texts and can be regarded as an outer manifestation of a given, immanent whole. It is a matter of the practical consequence — or illustration — of Živago’s own declaration in his diary:

Искусство первобытное, египетское, греческое, наше, это, наверное, на протяжении многих тысячелетий одно и то же, в единственном числе остающееся искусство. Это какая-то мысль, какое-то утверждение о жизни, по всеохватывающей своей широте на отдельные слова не разложимое, и, когда крупица этой силы входит в состав какой-нибудь более сложной смеси, примесь искус-

³⁸Referring to declarations in *Ochrannaja gramota*, Aucouturier (1979, 340-41) presents a similar picture of Pasternak’s “epistemology” (without any detailed treatment of its linguistic implications), which he associates with Bergson’s philosophy. Boris Gasparov (1992b) emphasizes Ol’ga Frejdenberg’s significance in the development of Pasternak’s “artistic metaphysics.”

³⁹Cf. Kubaricha’s “вязь.”

ства перевешивает значение всего остального и оказывается сутью, душой и основой изображенного. (279)⁴⁰

The mission to heal which is implied in Živago's vocation as a doctor, in this context reveals its literal meaning of 'making whole' (also present in the Russian verb "исцелять"); this applying to his artistic double, the cattlehealer Kubaricha, as well.⁴¹

If we thus can understand the tendency of the novel to proceed from other works of art (and the nature of the links), there is still the question of the specific significance of Revelation in the context. Several scholars have discussed this in connection with *Doktor Živago*. The most thorough attempt to relate the two texts to each other is Mary and Paul Rowland's reading of the novel — "an apocalyptic poem in the form of a novel" (Rowland & Rowland 1967, 200) — as a regular and consistently executed allegory. Bethea's analysis of apocalyptic elements centers on "three opposing views of historical time [represented by Živago, Strel'nikov and Komarovskij, S. W.] and the latter's relation to the fate of 'Russia the bride'" (Bethea 1989, 251). As I noted above, Mossman regards the significance of the Biblical text in connection with one of the novel's principal themes: "The Book of Revelation exemplifies to Yuriy Zhivago the confrontation of death and the affirmation of life that results thereby" (Mossman 1989, 387). In Livingstone's interpretation *Doktor Živago* "continues" the Book of Revelation in a dual sense: "First, it takes up the story where the other leaves off: it shows within the real, ordinary, well-known world, with all its deaths and burials, an already infinite sprouting of deathless resurrectional moments <...> In the second sense, it continues seeing the world as the Prophet, John the Divine, did, applying to modern history that ancient invocation of catastrophe." (Livingstone 1989, 71).

In addition to such points in common relating to content, we may suspect that another reason why Revelation is significant to *Doktor Živago* is the simple fact that it comes last in the Bible: it is a *boundary text*, and as such it acquires special weight in a poetics that is interested in how texts proceed from one another.⁴² It should be emphasized in this context that the "definition" of art that

⁴⁰Cf. also Bodin's (1990) description of "Pasternak's aesthetic principles of wholeness and of unity in life and in the world" and how these are expressed in various respects in the novel.

⁴¹Cf. Anna Han's (1988, 45) conclusion: "Пристальный анализ художественных (прозаических и стихотворных) текстов Пастернака доказывает, что именно в таком состоянии распада, несоставности пребывает мир, пока творческий процесс как вспомогательный и спасительный акт не претворяет его из хаоса в космос <...>."

⁴²The place of the Bible in the same poetics is suggested in an often cited passage in *Ochmannaja gramota*: "Я понял, что, к примеру, Библия есть не столько книга с твердым текстом, сколько записная тетрадь человечества, и что таково все вековечное." (BP4, 208)

served as the point of departure of this chapter — “*истинное* искусство, то, которое называется Откровение Иоанна, и то, которое его дописывает” — is semantically related to the following definition of the “book” in the article “Neskol’ko položenij” (1918, 1922):

Ни у какой истинной книги нет первой страницы. Как лесной шум, она зарождается Бог весть где, и растет и катится, будя заповедные дебри, и вдруг, в самый темный, ошеломительный и панический миг, заговаривает всеми вершинами сразу, докатившись. (ВР4, 368)

So far, I have concentrated on the meaning of the prefix of the key word *dopisyvaet*. In the next chapter, I shall, focusing on the rest of the verb, investigate how the novel presents Živago’s own writing.

Creation as *živopis'*

*Это все так важно и краска так впазд
ложится в задуманные очертания*
(*Perepiska*, 245)

2.1 Introduction

Doktor Živago is telling two stories at the same time: one about the most diverse “people and situations,” the other about itself. Certain elements can be lifted out of the narrative flow (“повествуя о наиразличнейшем”) and related to the novel as a whole (“на самом деле рассказывают о своем рождении”). Thus the work stands in a very specific relationship to itself. At the same time it also contains a regular “work within a work” — Jurij Živago’s poems, which comprise the seventeenth and concluding section of the novel. Živago’s own definition of art as a continuing effort (‘Great true art, that which is called the Revelation of St. John, and that which continues to write it’) should apply to them as well. How, then, does the novel present the main character’s act of creating? What is *dopisyvanie* in this context?

The verb “писать” has two principal meanings in Russian: ‘to write’ and ‘to paint.’ Below I will analyze the passages in the novel that are connected with Živago’s writing to see how these two meanings are realized.

2.2 Prologue to Creating

The reader is first informed about the young Jura’s literary activities in connection with a flashback to his introductory dissection exercises as he was studying medicine, “в глубине анатомического театра,” when ‘the secret of life and death’ becomes obtrusively palpable.⁴³ It is said that

Юра хорошо думал и очень хорошо писал. Он еще с гимназических лет мечтал о прозе, о книге жизнеописаний, куда бы он в виде скрытых взрывчатых гнезд мог вставлять самое ошеломляющее из того, что он успел увидеть и передумать. Но для такой книги он был еще слишком молод, и вот он отделивался вместо нее писанием стихов, как писал бы живописец всю жизнь этюды к большой задуманной картине. (67)

⁴³Mossman (1989, 387) notes that the description of the medical school contains literary reminiscences of Dante, which is even clearer in one manuscript variant that mentions him explicitly.

First of all, the context in which the writing of poetry is presented here suggests a connection with the definition of art, which ‘incessantly reflects upon death, thereby incessantly creates life’ (91-92); second, from the very outset writing is associated with painting. True, it is only a simile, but the point is that the word “писать” occurs with reference to Živago in both its meanings in a single sentence.

Behind the simile we can moreover glimpse a specific artist and a specific picture, namely Aleksandr Andreevič Ivanov and his enormous canvas *Appearance of Christ to the People* (“Явление Христа народу”), a legendary piece of art that if anything deserves the epithet “life’s work”: after doing more than 600 esquisses for the picture over a period of twenty years, Ivanov exhibited it in St. Petersburg in 1858 and died shortly thereafter. In the context of the novel this association has a very specific meaning, connected with the motif of the picture, which is built up on master-apprentice relationships: in the foreground is John the Baptist surrounded by his followers at the very moment they first become aware of Christ, who approaches as a blurred figure in the distance. Immediately after the painting simile, we learn of Jura’s relationship to his uncle Nikolaj Nikolaevič Vedenjapin:

Юра понимал, насколько он обязан дяде общими свойствами своего характера.

Николай Николаевич жил в Лозанне. В книгах, выпущенных им там по-русски и в переводах, он развивал свою давнишнюю мысль об истории как о второй вселенной, воздвигаемой человечеством в ответ на явление смерти с помощью явлений времени и памяти. Душою этих книг было по-новому понятое христианство, их прямым следствием — новая идея искусства. (67)

That they are united by more than just ‘general characteristics,’ however, is evident somewhat later when Živago formulates his view of art as an “answer” to death; in fact their relationship is clearly marked as one between an apprentice and a master.⁴⁴ It has been observed that the figure of Vedenjapin plays the role of a kind of John the Baptist in relation to the Christ role with which Živago can be identified.⁴⁵ Here we see how such a connection is prepared already in the preceding paragraph of the novel by the painting connotations attached to Jurij’s writing.

⁴⁴Sima Tunceva is also clearly one of Vedenjapin’s disciples (409). On other such relationships in the novel, see Jensen 1997, 76.

⁴⁵Cf. Lekić (1988, 179): “Vedenjapin’s thoughts provide readers with a moral and philosophical context in the work, and like John the Baptist, he prepares the way for the saviour who follows. Vedenjapin’s role as John the Baptist is quite pronounced in the pencil manuscript of the novel, where he enumerates the philosophical influences of the age that shape the thoughts of Jurij and his contemporaries.”

Živago's dual vocation as doctor and poet is also underscored the next time his writing is touched upon, in connection with the sleigh ride to the Sventickijs' Christmas party:

Этой зимою Юра писал свое ученое сочинение о нервных элементах сетчатки на соискание университетской золотой медали. Хотя Юра кончал по общей терапии, глаз он знал с доскональностью будущего окулиста.

В этом интересе к физиологии зрения сказались другие стороны Юриной природы — его творческие задатки и его размышления о существовании художественного образа и строении логической идеи. (80)

The emphasis on *seeing* in connection with creating has been observed by many scholars.⁴⁶ It is noteworthy, however, that an interest in the 'physiology of vision' and the 'nerve elements of the retina' are particularly relevant to form and color in the concrete sense and do not have so much to do with artistic image in the linguistic respect. The 'essence of the artistic image' here seems to be a — in a real sense — visual entity.

In addition to the scientific essay another text is then mentioned which has not yet been written:

На гордоновском факультете издавали студенческий гектографированный журнал. Гордон был его редактором. Юра давно обещал им статью о Блоке. Блоком бредила вся молодежь обеих столиц, и они с Мишей больше других. (81)

The planned article — as an illustration of Jura's "творческие задатки" — is literary, but phonetically a connection is established with the recently mentioned scientific study: in the emphatic formulation "статью о Блоке. Блоком" the element "око" stands out as yet another reminder of the visual aspect of creating, particularly in light of the previous use of the word "окулист" ("глаз он знал с доскональностью будущего окулиста").⁴⁷

⁴⁶See, for example, Lönnqvist 1993. Here we can note a parallel between Živago and the author of the novel; Lotman (1969, 227-228) has shown the significance of visual imagery in Pasternak's "text genesis": "Истинный мир не только эмпиричен, но, по Пастернаку, он и есть единственный подлинно эмпирический: это мир, *увиденный и почувствованный*, в отличие от мира слов, фраз <...> Поэтому те подлинные связи, которые организуют мир Пастернака, мир разрушенных рутинных языковых связей, — это почти всегда связи *увиденные* <...> Таким образом, общая идея у Пастернака — это *увиденная* идея." (Italics in the original.) Cf. also Pasternak's remarks: "Мне кажется, художественное дарование заключается вот в чем: надо роковым, инстинктивным и непроизвольным образом *видеть* так, как все прочие *думают*, и наоборот, *думать* так, как прочие видят." (Quoted in E. B. Pasternak 1989, 223; italics in the original.) The words "*видеть* так, как все прочие *думают*" seem to anticipate Jura's reflections on the 'structure of the logical idea' in the above quotation.

⁴⁷Pasternak's "Veter (Četyre otryvka o Bloke)," written in 1956, is interesting in this context. The third poem in this cycle, "Široko, široko, široko..." has a rhyme pattern that stresses the element "око" throughout the five stanzas: "широко," "толока," "протока" // "Блока," "наскоку" // "урока," "лежебока," "морочка" // "востока," "сроку," "осоку" // "морочка," "широко." Its final poem, "Zlovešč gorizont i vnezapen..." emphasizes Blok's

It is also a concrete visual impression — the warmly inviting apartments with lighted Christmas trees and the shadows of merry-makers on the windows that the sleigh passes on its way through frosty Moscow — that moves Jura to change his writing plans:⁴⁸

Вдруг Юра подумал, что Блок — это явление рождества во всех областях русской жизни, в северном городском быту и в новейшей литературе, под звездным небом современной улицы и вокруг зажженной елки в гостиной нынешнего века. Он подумал, что никакой статьи о Блоке не надо, а просто на-

(prophetic) *seeing* and its connection with the text: “Блок на небе видел разводы. Ему предвещал небосклон Большую грозу, непогоду, Великую бурю, циклон.// Блок ждал этой бури и встряски. Ее огневые штрихи Боязнью и жаждой развязки Легли в его жизнь и стихи” (BP2, 99-100).

⁴⁸The sleigh ride episode is of central importance to Pasternak's *dopisyvanie*; Jensen, for example, has pointed out connections with J. P. Jacobsen's novel *Niels Lyhne* (Jensen 1995b, 269-274), as well as with H. C. Andersen's *The Snow Queen* (Jensen 1997, 79, 89-90). We may add that Jura's gazing in from the biting cold on the bright and warm Christmas scenes in the windows is also reminiscent of Dostoevskij's story “Mal'čik u Christa na elke” (*Dnevnik pisatelja*, 1876), in which a freezing little boy wanders from one lighted window to another, shut out from everything but marveling at the wonders of Christmas taking place within. (For a fine analysis of this story which also discusses its metaliterary aspects, see Jackson 1981, 260-71.) There are other factors connecting the passages, both textually and with respect to plot: Dostoevskij's little boy has just left his dead mother; Jura and Tonja leave Anna Ivanovna on her deathbed when they go to the party at the Sventickijs. The celebration is in fact modeled in a certain sense as a “Christ's Christmas party”: Sventickijs' apartment is in *Mučnoj gorodok*, a toponym that very nearly coincides semantically with the meaning of the word “Bethlehem” (see, for example, Rowland & Rowland 1967, 75). During the sleigh ride we are told: “Их сани поднимали неестественно громкий шум, пробуждавший неестественно долгий отзвук под обледелыми деревьями в садах и на бульварах.” (82) The twice repeated “неестественно” draws attention to itself: the following passage from Dostoevskij's story suggests that the ‘unnaturally long echo’ may have a metatextual reference: “И какой здесь стук и гром, какой свет и люди, лошади и кареты, и мороз, мороз!” (Pss 22, 15) When (after freezing to death) the little boy comes to “Christ's Christmas party” his impressions are described as follows: “Где это он теперь: всё блестит, всё сияет и кругом всё куколки, — но нет, это всё мальчики и девочки, только такие светлые, все они кружатся около него, летают” (ibid., 16). “Мальчики и девочки” (which, incidentally, was for a while the title of Pasternak's novel) at the Sventickijs' party also move in circles, which is emphasized in the text: “Внутри круга бешено вертелись танцующие. Их кружил, соединял в пары и вытягивал цепью сын товарища прокурора <...> ‘Grand rond! Chaîne chinoise!’ — и все сделалось по его слову.” (83) (For a symbolic interpretation of these and other circular movements in the novel, see Bethea 1989.) The social tendency that distinguishes Dostoevskij's Christmas story (the uninvented poor boy is brutally thrown out from the rich people's party) also has a counterpart in the episode at the Sventickijs: Lara, “девочка из другого круга,” comes uninvited to shoot Komarovskij, but the shot happens to hit the prosecutor in the case against the striking railroad workers. Jura interprets the incident in political terms: “А она...Так это она стреляла? В прокурора? Наверное, политическая.” (87) Pasternak's extant notes on *Dnevnik pisatelja* as they relate to *Doktor Živago* are analyzed by Lekić 1983. She does not, however, discuss “Mal'čik u Christa na elke.” It has been observed that the sleigh ride episode in “Elka u Sventickich” has Blokian features (Segal 1981, 153) but Blok and Dostoevskij often seem to go together in Pasternak's works: “Имена Блока и Достоевского поставлены рядом в ‘Люди и положениях’ как ‘повод для вечных поздравлений, олицетворенное торжество и праздник русской культуры’” (Borisov & Pasternak 1988, 225). For more on the Dostoevskij connection, see Chapter 3 below.

до написать русское поклонение волхвов, как у голландцев, с морозом, волками и темным еловым лесом. (82)⁴⁹

It is clear that Živago himself also thinks of his writing in terms of painting. Painting has in addition become more prominent: if we learned earlier — from the narrator's comments — that Jura writes poetry as an artist paints etudes, now *both* tenor and vehicle unambiguously connote the visual arts. This new unwritten text materializes later in the novel in the form of the poem “Roždestvenskaja zvezda,”⁵⁰ whose links to various pictorial traditions have been noted by several researchers.⁵¹ In the qualifier “как у голландцев” there is a suggestion of a connection with the fact that most of Živago's poems with Christian motifs were collected at an early stage under the collective rubric “Starye mastera” (Bodin 1976a, 13).

The first description of the act of writing is in section 6 of the novel, “Moskovskoe stanovišče.” After a long stay at the front Živago returns to his old hospital, where in addition to his usual duties he is ordered to keep statistics.⁵² However, he also is able to devote himself to his own work:

Иногда урывками, кроме периодических записей для своих медицинских трудов, он писал здесь свою ‘Игру в людей’, мрачный дневник или журнал тех дней, состоявший из прозы, стихов и всякой всячины, внушенной сознанием, что половина людей перестала быть собой и неизвестно что разыгрывает. (183)

Judging by this passage, “Igra v ljudej” has several points in common with the novel itself, whose contents can be described precisely as ‘prose, poetry and all sorts of things.’ Reflections on human dissimulation and false posing are also

⁴⁹Cf. the biographical parallel: “Летом (1946 года. — В. Б., Е. П.) просили меня написать что-нибудь к блоковской годовщине, — говорил Пастернак на чтении романа 5 апреля 1947 г. — Мне очень хотелось написать о Блоке статью, и я подумал, что вот этот роман я пишу вместо статьи о Блоке” (Borisov & Pasternak 1988, 225). In “Veter” mentioned above, there is also a play on “Блок” and “статья”: “Но Блок, слава богу, иная, Иная, по счастью, статья.”

⁵⁰When the poem comes into being, elements from this early description are realized in the writing situation: it happens in Varykino, deep in the snowy forest, to the accompaniment of howling wolves. On Blok's significance in connection with “Roždestvenskaja zvezda,” see Masing-Delić 1984.

⁵¹For a discussion of the relationship of this poem to Western pictorial art and the Orthodox icon tradition, see Bodin 1976a, 73-75 and Helle 1998. For a more detailed analysis of connections with “композиционными особенностями иконы ‘Рождество Христово,’ с иконографическим каноном вообще, со спецификой ‘иконного’ видения описываемого события и мира в целом,” see Lerachin 1988.

⁵²“Каких только анкет, опросных листов и бланков ни просматривал он, каких требовательных ведомостей ни заполнял! Смертность, рост заболеваемости, имущественное положение служащих” (183). This activity is a kind of parallel to Vedenjapin's work on the galleys of Voskoboynikov's brochure in the introduction to the novel: “Между тем статистика смертей и рождений показывает, — диктовал Николай Николаевич. — Надо вставить: за отчетный год, — говорил Иван Николаевич и записывал.” (12)

central, especially in the immediately preceding chapter. There at a dinner with friends the doctor feels uneasy when he notices how they have changed: the gloomy Gordon tries to play the buffoon and uses 'words from someone else's vocabulary,' Dudorov speaks 'as though he were giving a lecture' (174-75). Not even Vedenjapin, with whom Živago has candid conversations when alone with him, is any longer himself: "среди людей он был другим, незнаваем <...> Ему льстила роль политического краснбая и общественного очарователя" (177). Anna Gromeko's old friend Šura Šlezinger, who early in the novel is presented as parodically absorbed in the Symbolist currents of the time, now plays the role of an enthusiastic supporter of the Revolution, even dressing the part: "Она прямо с какого-то собрания пришла в жакетке и рабочем картузе" and shouts her remarks 'as though she were using a megaphone' (179-80). The hat she wore earlier as a "teosofka" had diametrically opposite connotations: "Шура Шлезингер была высокая худощавая женщина с правильными чертами немного мужского лица, которым она несколько напоминала государя, особенно в своей каракулевой шапке набекрень, в которой она оставалась в гостях" (57). "Igra v ljudej" seems to be another example of the way in which descriptions of texts in the novel can also be related to the novel as a whole.

One striking feature of the specific act of writing that is portrayed in this context consists in the many words denoting colors, shades and light; the doctor's surroundings seems almost impregnated with them:

Светлая солнечная ординаторская со стенами, выкрашенными в белую краску, была залита кремовым светом солнца золотой осени, отличающим дни после Успения, когда по утрам ударяют первые заморозки и в пестроту и яркость поределых рощ залетают зимние синицы и сороки. Небо в такие дни подымается в предельную высоту и сквозь прозрачный столб воздуха между ним и землей тянет с севера ледяной темно-синей ясностью. Повышается видимость и слышимость всего на свете, чего бы то ни было. Расстояния передают звук в замороженной звонкости, отчетливо и разъединенно. Расчищаются дали, как бы открывши вид через всю жизнь на много лет вперед. Этой разреженности нельзя было бы вынести, если бы она не была так кратковременна и не наступала в конце короткого осеннего дня на пороге ранних сумерек.

Такой свет озарял ординаторскую, свет рано садящегося осеннего солнца, сочный, стеклянный и водянистый, как спелое яблоко белый налив.

Доктор сидел у стола, обмакивая перо в чернила, задумывался и писал, а мимо больших окон ординаторской близко пролетали какие-то тихие птицы, забрасывая в комнату бесшумные тени, которые покрывали движущиеся руки докатора, стол с бланками, пол и стены ординаторской и так же бесшумно исчезали.

— Клен опадает, — сказал вошедший прозектор, плотный когда-то мужчина, на котором кожа от похудания висела теперь мешками. — Поливали его ливни, ветры трепали и не могли одолеть. А что один утренник сделал!

Доктор поднял голову. Действительно, сновавшие мимо окна загадочные птицы оказались *винно-огненными* листьями клена, которые отлетали прочь, плавно держась в воздухе, и *оранжевыми* выгнутыми звездами ложились в стороне от деревьев на траву больничного газона. (183-184)

Although we seem to witness a sharpening of perception in general (cf. “слышимость” and “звук”), the visual elements dominate so strongly that even “синь” in “синица” functions in its original, now effaced, meaning of color. Under the described conditions vision assumes the character of prophetic clairvoyance: “Расчищаются дали, как бы открывши вид через всю жизнь на много лет вперед.”⁵³ This is an image that spatializes time in the same way as in the poem “Roždestvenskaja zvezda”: “И странным видением грядущей поры Вставало вдали все пришедшее после.” (531) According to Lepachin (1988, 258), there it is a typical iconographic device: “Здесь, как на иконе, время-вечность, ‘иконическое время’ передается с помощью особой организации пространственных отношений. Событие в его сиюминутном значении происходит здесь, рядом, но его вневременный смысл уже ‘стоит’, ‘видится’ вдали. ‘Вдали времен’ выражено через ‘вдали пространственное.’” One element in the passage quoted that can be associated directly with icons is the initially mentioned holiday — the Assumption of Mary (*Uspenie*), since the event it celebrates is also a popular icon motif.

Given the emphasis on vision that has been treated here and earlier in connection with writing, we might expect the eyes to play a central role in situations like this. Although the eyes as such are not mentioned explicitly, they are very much present in the form of *windows*, and not only in the traditional sense of windows being the “eyes of a house” (as when the window in Paša’s apartment in Kamergerskij Pereulok is called “глазок”).⁵⁴ Another identification of windows and eyes occurs in the dialogue between the doctor and his colleague in an indirect manner — through a “text juncture” of the sort that was treated in the preceding chapter. The doctors’ conversation on winterizing the windows may be connected with a verse in Revelation:

— *Окна замазали?* — спросил прозектор.

⁵³The formula reveals a kinship with a line from Gogol’s *Strašnaja mest’* — “Вдруг стало видимо далеко во все концы света” — that also serves as the epigraph to Pasternak’s poem “Raspad” in *Sestra moja — žizn’*; for a discussion of Gogol’s reminiscences in that collection, see A. Ljunggren 1992.

⁵⁴This conventional parallel is developed further in Živago’s reflections on his halfbrother’s house in Omsk: “И вот все последнее время у меня такое чувство, будто своими пятью окнами этот дом недобрый взглядом смотрит на меня через тысячи верст, отделяющие Европейскую Россию от Сибири, и рано или поздно меня сглазит.” (71) Cf., however, the following qualification of the frequent appearing motif of the window in Pasternak’s poetry: “Обращает на себя внимание малочисленность метафор с окном, в том числе напрашивающихся метафор ‘окна-глаза дома’” (Žolkovskij 1978, 29).

— Нет, — сказал Юрий Андреевич и продолжал писать.

— Что так? Пора.

Юрий Андреевич ничего не отвечал, поглощенный писанием.

— Эх, Тарасюка нет, — продолжал прозектор. — *Золотой* был человек. И сапоги починит. И часы. И все сделает. И все на свете достанет. *А замазывать пора.* Надо самим.

— *Замаски* нет.

— А вы сами. Вот рецепт. — И прозектор объяснил, как приготовить *замазку* из олифы и мела. — Впрочем, ну вас. Я вам мешаю.

Он отошел к другому *окну* и занялся своими склянками и препаратами. Стало темнеть. Через минуту он сказал.

— *Глаза* испортите. Темно. *А огня* не дадут. Пойдемте домой. (184-185)

This passage can be compared with Rev. 3:18, whose theme is the need for *clairvoyance*:

Советую тебе купить у Меня *золото*, *огнем* очищенное, чтобы тебе обогатиться, и *белую одежду*, чтобы одеться и чтобы не видна была срамота наготы твоей, и *глазною мазью* помажь *глаза твои*, чтобы видеть.

The elements from the novel that can be related to the Bible also exhibit the same sort of changes I have already examined. The “золото” of Revelation corresponds to “золотой,” “огнем очищенное” to “огня не дадут,” “глазною мазью” to “замазка,” “помажь глаза” to “Окна замазали? <...> Пора.” “Глаза” occurs once in both the Bible text and in the novel. A few pages later the complete identification between windows and eyes is confirmed when the narrator notes: “В комнате стало светлее. Заплакали окна, недавно замазанные Юрием Андреевичем по наставлениям прозектора.” (188) “Наставления” is a word that may be connected with “Советую тебе” in the Bible verse. The advisory role played by the doctor’s colleague is moreover emphasized on several occasions: “— Ну как печник? — Спасибо, что рекомендовали. Преинтересный человек” (185).

The white garments in Revelation (“белая одежда”) has no textually realized counterpart in this passage of the novel, but contextually it is present nonetheless in the two doctors’ white coats, “халаты.” When this word occurs explicitly in an earlier hospital scene it has clear religious connotations: after Tonja gives birth — which in keeping with *Živago*’s own notions of motherhood (278-79) is in the midst of allusions to the virgin birth — the nervous father is prevented from rushing into the delivery room by a physician who almost seems to be an angel of the Annunciation: “Растопылив руки, перед ним как из-под земли вырос мастодонт-гинеколог в белом халате.” (105) Incidentally, the word “халат” derives etymologically from an Arabic word meaning ‘почетное платье’ (Vasmer). This is precisely the meaning of the dress in Revelation: “Впрочем, у тебя в Сардисе есть несколько человек, которые не осквер-

нили одежду своих и будут ходить со Мною в белых одеждах, ибо они достойны. Побеждающий облечется в белые одежды; и не изглажу имени его из книги жизни, и исповедаю имя его пред Отцем Моим и пред Ангелами Его.” (Rev. 3, 4-5) In the network of symbols that is thereby established in the novel and that also includes a “сестра милосердия” such as Lara, it is hardly a coincidence that one of these medical figures should be named “Angeljar” (330).

To summarize, in this writing scene — where just as in the novel’s introduction the text itself may be related to Revelation — we can note a supra-abundance of words denoting colors and light, a strong emphasis on the visual aspects of creating, and a couple of elements that can more specifically be linked to icon painting. The latter can be expanded through the recipe for window insulation offered by the doctor’s colleague — “из олифы и мела”—substances which are important in icon painting.⁵⁵

2.3 Varykino: Reading and Writing

Varykino in the Urals, where Živago and his family seek a haven from the hardships following the Revolution and the threats they faced in Moscow, is from the creative viewpoint the most fruitful place in the novel. Here the doctor takes notes which constitute the novel’s second *work within the work*. They include the first nine chapters in part nine and thus make up a kind of compositional center in the seventeen-part-long book. Nothing is communicated in this diary about the act of writing itself;⁵⁶ its metaliterary features, however, are of special interest to us here as the notes are principally about literature and reading. All of Živago’s reflections on his own situation are in various ways connected with literary texts. For example: “Как часто летом хотелось сказать вместе с Тютчевым”; “Какое счастье <...> создавать свой мир, подобно Робинзону”; “Я не иду дальше сказанного, не проповедую Толстовского опровержения и перехода на землю” (274-275).⁵⁷

⁵⁵Cf. the extensive grounding of the piece of wood that is to be painted: “Когда побел высохнет, то в течение трех-четырех дней доска левкасится, причем грунтовка левкасом производится в шесть-семь раз; левкас делается из побела, к которому прибавляется 2/5 кипяченой горячей воды, *немного олифы, т.е. вареного масла, и мела*” (Florenskij 1985, 286). Icons are often compared to windows: “окна в вечность” (Florenskij 1985, 230).

⁵⁶The only introducing remarks are: “Зимою, когда времени стало больше, Юрий Андреевич стал вести разного рода записи. Он записал у себя” (274); “Несколько позднее доктор записал” (276); “Ближе к весне доктор записал” (278); “На этом кончались записи Юрия Андреевича. Больше он их не продолжал.” (285)

⁵⁷Cf. Segal’s (1981, 153) observation, which is, however, not developed further: “В художественной системе романа любой акт самопознания есть акт метаописания лите-

Živago devotes special attention to what seems to be a constant *interpretation* of texts: “Он [Samdevjatov, S. W.] все время ездит и что-то достает и привозит, и разбирает и толкует ‘Бесов’ Достоевского и Коммунистический Манифест одинаково увлекательно” (276); “Продолжающиеся по вечерам разговоры о Пушкине. Разбирали лицейские стихотворения первого тома. Как много зависело от выбора стихотворного размера!” (281)⁵⁸

In descriptions of the family’s *reading* there are salient features that are associated with or reflect the novel’s picture of how texts are born: “Без конца перечитываем ‘Войну и мир’, ‘Евгения Онегина’ и все поэмы”; “Без конца перечитываем Евгения Онегина и поэмы. <...> Бесконечные разговоры об искусстве.” (278, 279) As shown in the above, the notion of writing as *dopisyvanie* includes both a figurative and a literal interpretation of such ‘endlessness.’ It is hardly surprising that this is the context in which we find the pronouncement (discussed in Chapter 1) on the indivisibility of art: “Искусство <...> это <...> одно и то же, в единственном числе остающееся искусство” (279). That reading is presented as rereading (“перечитывание”) can be regarded as a counterpart to the fact that, as we shall see, writing is characterized to a great extent as rewriting (“переписывание”) in the remaining relevant scenes in the novel. The work thus internalizes something that Hutcheon (1994, 151) has noted with respect to metafictional texts in general: “Metafiction explicitly adds the dimension of reading as a process parallel to writing as an imaginative creative act.”

One particularly noteworthy circumstance is that in his diaries Živago appears as the reader and interpreter of *his own life as text*. For example, he reflects on his mysterious half-brother Evgraf’s role in his life as though his own biography were a fictitious story:

Вот уже второй раз вторгается он в мою жизнь добрым гением, избавителем, разрешающим все затруднения. Может быть, состав каждой биографии наряду со встречающимися в ней действующими лицами требует еще и участия тайной неведомой силы, лица почти символического, являющегося на помощь без зова, и роль этой благодетельной и скрытой пружины играет в моей жизни мой брат Евграф? (285)

ратуры в терминах литературы (ср. картина Рождества в Москве, воспринимаемая Юрием Андреевичем как созданная гением Блока.)”

⁵⁸The comments on the significance of the meter are later illustrated in Živago’s reflections on the genesis of the poem “Skazka”; see Lönnqvist 193, 164-65. See also my discussion of “internal” and “external” in Chapter 4 below.

Živago's own analysis of Evgraf as a character coincides with that of many interpreters of the novel, a reminder that one feature of the metafictional text is that it "constitutes its own first critical commentary" (Hutcheon 1994, 6).

While living at Varykino, Živago also makes several visits to the library in the local center Jurjatin, a place with considerable potential for metafictional play. We may note, for example, that the literature he borrows there characterizes him as a reader who has a great deal in common with the author of the novel: he becomes engrossed in 'some books on the ethnography of the area' and attempts to borrow 'a couple of works on the history of the Pugačev uprising' (287). In a manuscript note made while he was working on the novel Pasternak reminds himself to "Чередовать с чтением 'Уральского фольклора'" (quoted in Lekić 1983, 156)⁵⁹ and the Ural region itself is described in the narrative text through a reference to Pugačev: "В местности было что-то замкнутое, недосказанное. От нее веяло пугачевщиной в преломлении Пушкина" (228).⁶⁰

From a narrative point of view, the library plays a central role, since it is in the library's reading room that Živago meets Antipova again, this marking the beginning of their relationship.⁶¹ It is Lara as a reader with whom the doctor falls in love, and reading is included in a peculiar way in his description of her: "Как хорошо все, что она делает. Она читает так, точно это не высшая деятельность человека, а нечто простейшее, доступное животным."⁶² Точно она воду носит или чистит картошку." (289); "В читальне я сравнивал увлеченность ее чтения с азартом и жаром настоящего дела, с физической работой. И наоборот, воду она носит, точно читает, легко, без труда." (293). The observation brings out a theme that is typical of metafictional texts, namely the relationship between "literature" and "life." The same erasure of boundaries is suggested here as in the case noted above in which Živago "reads" his life as a text.

⁵⁹Cf. also: "The drafts of the novel reveal clearly how Pasternak took extensive notes from Biriukov's *Dorevoljucionnii fol'klor na Urale* in collecting folk expressions which Vakkh was to utter." (Lekić 1983, 161)

⁶⁰For a discussion of Pugačev's significance in this context, see Lekić 1983, 177-178.

⁶¹For an analysis of the "archeopoetics" of the library episode, see Faryno 1992b.

⁶²Cf. the play on "книга" and "животное," noted in the preceding chapter in connection with Kubaricha's incantation. With respect to Lara herself there is an allusion to the title of Pasternak's most famous collection, *Sestra moja — Žizn'*: "Антонина Александровна убеждала мужа не возвращаться в Москву, а проследовать прямо на Урал за этой удивительной сестрою, шествующей по жизни в сопровождении таких знамений и стечений обстоятельств" (131).

The most detailed and extensive depiction of situations involving actual writing occur during Živago's second stay at Varykino. After his captivity with the partisans he has fled the insecurity of Jurjatin with Lara and Katja and settled down in Mikulicyn's house, where he is granted several nights of almost intoxicating creativity.

The general painterly features of writing are reinforced in these scenes through an abundance of words associated with color. At the same time, the specific elements of icon painting noted in latent form in connection with "Igra v ljudej" are developed into a dominant factor in the semantic representation of writing. This is a process that goes far beyond the easily observable fact that several of the explicitly mentioned poems realize typical icon motifs, so that the poem "Skazka," for example, can be regarded as a variant of the icon "Čudo Georgija o Zmije" and the poem "Roždestvenskaja zvezda" is related to the "Roždestvo Christovo."⁶³ As we shall see, the doctor's nocturnal creation is also marked by both the theological and practical aspects of icon painting.⁶⁴

First, the act of painting itself is supposed to be preceded by a ritual cleansing consisting of prayers and fasting. In a certain sense, this rule is also observed by Živago, who does not immediately sit down at the inviting desk even though he is burning with eagerness ("простая чернильная страсть"): "Когда встали, Юрий Андреевич стал с утра заглядываться на соблазнительный стол у окна. У него так и чесались руки засесть за бумагу. Но это право он облюбовал себе на вечер, когда Лара и Катенька лягут спать. А до тех пор, чтобы привести хотя две комнаты в порядок, дела было по уши." (425) In this case, the cleansing that precedes writing is quite literal: the entire day is devoted to cleaning the house, washing clothes, and bathing. When the evening comes the doctor is ready: "К концу дня все помылись горячею водой, в изобилии оставшейся от стирки. Лара выкупала Катеньку. Юрий Андреевич с блаженным чувством чистоты сидел за оконным столом спиной к комнате, в которой Лара, благоухающая <...> укладывала Катеньку" (430). On the threshold of the writing situation itself, cleanliness, whiteness, and fragrance are strongly emphasized: "Смененное на ней [Lara, S. W.], на Катеньке и на постели белье сияло, чистое, глаженое, кружевное."

⁶³For an analysis of icon motifs (and features of Western painting) in Živago's poems, see Bodin 1976b.

⁶⁴With respect to icons, the boundary between "theological" and "practical" is in fact vague: "В самих приемах иконописи, в технике ее, в применяемых веществах, в иконописной фактуре выражается метафизика, которою жива и существует икона." (Florenskij 1985, 254)

Second, Živago's role in the process of creation is quite in keeping with the notions underlying the idea that the icon painter's position vis-à-vis his work is passive and mediative. The icon is not regarded as painted *by* the painter, but *through* him: "Иконописец, как и священник, выступает в роли передатчика, как орудие Божественной благодати" (Uspenskij 1977, 197). Živago's inspired state is described in similar terms:

В такие минуты Юрий Андреевич чувствовал, что главную работу совершает не он сам, но то, что выше его, что находится над ним и управляет им, а именно: состояние мировой мысли и поэзии и то, что ей предназначено в будущем, следующий по порядку шаг, который предстоит ей сделать в ее историческом развитии. И он чувствовал себя только поводом и опорной точкой, чтобы она пришла в это движение. (431)⁶⁵

It is less important that this 'which is higher than he' is not called 'God'; the main thing is the relationship between the artist and a kind of higher power: "Соотношение сил, управляющих творчеством, как бы становится на голову." (Ibid.)

On this point the theology of the icon coincides in a sense with the characteristic Romantic image of the divinely inspired artist.⁶⁶ We shall see, however, that the description of the writing itself is rich in concrete details that in various ways are connected specifically with icon painting:

Юрия Андреевича окружала блаженная, полная счастья, сладко дышащая жизнью тишина. Свет лампы спокойной желтизною падал на белые листы бумаги и золотистым бликом плавал на поверхности чернил внутри чернильницы. За окном голубела зимняя морозная ночь. Юрий Андреевич шагнул в соседнюю холодную и неосвещенную комнату, откуда было виднее наружу, и посмотрел в окно. Свет полного месяца стягивал снежную поляну осязательной вязкостью яичного белка или клеевых белил. Роскошь морозной ночи была непередаваема. Мир был на душе у доктора. Он вернулся в светлую, тепло испoпленную комнату и принялся за писание.

Разгонистым почерком, заботясь, чтобы внешность написанного передавала живое движение руки и не теряла лица, обездушиваясь и немея, он вспомнил и записал в постепенно улучшающихся, уклоняющихся от прежнего вида редакциях наиболее определившееся и памятное, "Рождественскую звезду", "Зимнюю ночь" и довольно много других стихотворений близкого рода, впоследствии забытых, затерявшихся и потом никем не найденных. (430)

⁶⁵The words "следующий по порядку шаг" cannot but remind us of the actual beginning of the novel's *dopisyvanie*: "Шли и шли и пели."

⁶⁶Cf. Nils Åke Nilsson's (1978, 64) comment on this passage: "Anyone familiar with Russian literature will be reminded of the well-known words Nikolay Gogol wrote while he was working on *Dead Souls*. Preoccupied with the thought of his calling as a poet, he felt himself a tool in the service of some higher divine power: 'Someone unseen is writing before me with a mighty rod.'"

It is clear from the outset that the doctor is not using ordinary ink. The liquid in the inkwell clearly has properties of gold — an obligatory element in “canonical icons”⁶⁷ — and his pen is more like a brush. The text contains a kind of inventory or enumeration of colors, as if these are set one by one in front of Živago before he can actually get down to writing/painting: “желтизною,” “белые,” “золотистым,” “чернил,” “голубела.”

Some elements in the description can be connected with the technical aspects of icon painting. These are words whose semantics are reminiscent both of the components of the colors of the icon and of the complex treatment the *doska* (the material on which the icon is done) undergoes before it can be painted. Both of these aspects are represented in the following sentence: “Свет полного месяца стягивал снежную поляну осязательной вязкостью яичного белка или клеевых белил.” *Eggs* are used as a vehicle in icon painting. *Glue* plays a significant role in the grounding process in many steps, which can be regarded as an “ontologically necessary” transformation of “доска” into “стена” (Florenskij 1985, 285). “Белила” (which itself is a paint) is reminiscent of “побел” which is part of the same process: “Спустя сутки доска побеляется, на ней наводится побел — хорошо размешанная жидкость из клея и мела.” (Ibid, 286)

When a kind of picture plane (what Florenskij calls “изобразительная плоскость иконы”) has thus been prepared in the text itself, and when vision has been underscored (“виднее,” “посмотрел в окно”),⁶⁸ the doctor may begin his work: “Он вернулся в светлую, тепло истопленную комнату и принялся за писание.” The emphasis on light in this scene (“свет лампы,” “свет полного месяца,” “светлую комнату”) can be connected with the fact that the background in an icon is technically called “свет”: “икона пишется на свету, и этим, как я постараюсь выяснить, высказана вся онтология иконописная. Свет, если он наиболее соответствует иконной традиции, *золотится*, т.е. является именно светом, чистым светом, не цветом.” (Florenskij 1985, 290; italics in the original.)

Surrounded by the three words denoting writing — “писание,” “написанного” and “записал” — are the words “рука” and “лицо” The face and

⁶⁷On the function and status of gold in icon painting, see Florenskij 1985, 275-80. A connection between “inkwell” and “icon” is established earlier in the novel in the description of the icon of the Virgin in Galuzina’s bedroom: “Богородица на иконе выпрастывала из серебряной ризы оклада узкие, кверху обращенные, смуглые ладони. Она держала в каждой как бы по две начальных и конечных греческих буквы своего византийского именования: метёр теу, Матерь Божия. Вложенная в золотой подлампадный темная, как чернильница, лампада гранатового стекла разбрасывала по ковру спальни звездобразное, зубчиками чашки расщепленное мерцание.” (311)

⁶⁸Cf.: “Иконостас есть видение.” (Florenskij 1985, 219; italics in the original.)

hands have special meaning in icon painting, in whose terminology they are combined under the common designation “лик.” An important distinction is made between that which is “лик” and that which is “доличное,” such as the body, clothing, buildings, trees, cliffs, etc. Usually the two areas were painted by different masters, “личники” and “доличники” respectively. An interesting detail is that the latter are not said to *paint* the icon; the word used is “раскрывать”: “доличник *раскрывает* одежды и прочие места доличного сплошными пятнами, *вприплеску*” (ibid., 135). This term expresses a notion that is central in icon painting in general: “процесс иконописания предстает как символический процесс постепенного раскрытия изображения <...> изображение, как бы уже заранее данное, проявляется, выступает на поверхности иконы: тем самым, иконописец, как бы не создает изображение, а открывает его.” (Uspenskij 1971, 189) Here we have a kind of parallel to the palimpsest motif discussed in the preceding chapter, and there are several shared points in this connection. The fact is that certain icons are quite literally palimpsests; owing to the tradition of painting over old icons (“записывание”), some can consist of several layers of old motifs (ibid.).

This is also the way Jurij Živago works as the poems flow from his pen during the magical evenings at Varykino. He continues what he has already written by writing over it:

Написанное ночью распадалось на два разряда. Знакомое, перебеленное в новых видоизменениях было записано чисто, каллиграфически. Новое было набросано сокращенно, с точками, неразборчивыми каракулями. Разбирая эту мазню, доктор испытал обычное разочарование (434).

Постепенно перемарывая написанное, Юрий Андреевич стал в той же лирической манере излагать легенду о Егории Храбром. (435)

The vocabulary used in the text to designate writing balances consistently on the border between verbal and visual art: the words “перебеленное,” “мазня” and “перемарывать” have strong connotations of the latter. (One is reminded here of the old epithet “боромаз” to denote an icon painter.) The more abstract figurative language as well helps to maintain the parallel between writing and painting: “Предметы, едва названные на словах, стали не шутя *вырисовываться в раме* упоминания.” (Ibid.)

Various lexical means emphasize the sacred atmosphere that reigns over the scene (in the second example interrupted by the howling wolves):

Чистота белья, чистота комнат, чистота их очертаний, сливаясь с чистотою ночи, снега, звезд и месяца в одну равнозначительную, сквозь сердце доктора пропущенную волну, заставляла его *ликовать* и плакать от чувства торжествующей чистоты существования.

“Господи! Господи! — готов был шептать он.” (431)

Вдруг в *безмолвии* далеких пространств, раскинувшихся за окном, он услышал заунывный, печальный звук. (432)⁶⁹

While “ликовать” belongs generally to a solemn religious usage, we must in this context, saturated with iconic connotations, pay particular attention to the element “лик-” (cf. “рука-лицо” above; this is the sole occurrence of “ликовать” in the novel.) The word “безмолвие,” through its connection with the Hesychastic tradition and Andrej Rublev’s icon *The Trinity* — which expresses precisely this divine, contemplative silence — is especially charged with piety and icon painting. The word is also the Russian designation of “Hesychasm,” which in turn comes from the Greek *hesychia*, meaning ‘rest,’ ‘stillness.’ This meaning as well sets its mark on the writing situation: “Свет лампы *спокойной* желтизной падал на белые листы бумаги <...> *Мир* был на душе у доктора” (430).⁷⁰

Against the background of the detailed parallels between writing and icon painting, attention should be paid to the possible link between the fictitious Jurij Živago and the real Pavel Florenskij, whose well-known works on the icon, *Obratnaja perspektiva* and *Ikonostas*, were written at about the same time as the main character is supposed to have composed his poems, 1920-1922.⁷¹

I have in mind the little boy Vasja Brykin, whom Živago first meets on the train trip with his family to the Urals and who, through one of the novel’s many “improbable coincidences” subsequently becomes his companion on the arduous trek back to Moscow. From the outset Vasja appears as a kind of living icon: “Вася был хорошенький мальчик с правильными чертами лица, как пишут царских рынд и Божьих ангелов.” (222) The arrival of the pair in Moscow in the spring of 1922 is described in icon-like features: “Солнечные бли-

⁶⁹Cf. Faryno’s (1992a, 149) general observation: “Когда в Варыкине Юрий Живаго записывает свои стихи-иконы Рождественскую звезду, Зимнюю ночь и Сказку, он пишет их по всем правилам иконописи, а окружающий его мир, собственно, тот же иконописный акт.”

⁷⁰A Hesychastic connection has been noted in Jurij Živago’s poem “Avgust,” which is set during the Church holiday celebrated in memory of the Transfiguration of Christ, Преображение (see Bodin 1991, 55-56). It was of special significance to the Hesychasts: they associated their own experience of luminous phenomena while praying with the light that Christ radiated on Mount Tabor (which is mentioned in the poem). “Avgust” contains several words denoting color that are directly connected with icon painting (“ochra,” “zolo-to,” “lazur”) and can in other ways as well be associated with iconographic representations of the Transfiguration (see Bodin 1976b, 207-210).

⁷¹“Obratnaja perspektiva” was written in 1922 and is based on a lecture Florenskij gave on 20 October 1920 to the commission of which he became secretary in 1918, “Комиссия по охране памятников искусства и старины Троице-Сергиевой Лавры.” The work was published in 1967 in the Tartu University *Semeiotike* series and in unabridged form for the first time in Florenskij 1985. It had circulated earlier, however, as *samizdat*. “Ikonostas” was written in 1922 and published in 1972 in abridged form in the Moscow Patriarchy publication *Bogoslovskie trudy*; a complete version is included in Florenskij 1985.

ки, отраженные золотыми куполами храма Спасителя, падали на мощеную четырехугольным тесаным камнем” (466). Here Vasja expresses his desire to study painting in popular religious terms: “Хочу маманин лик по памяти написать.” (467) It turns out, however, that something practical (“прикладная часть”) seems to suit him better, and through the doctor’s efforts he is admitted to a well-known school: “По знакомству Юрий Андреевич поместил его на общеобразовательное отделение бывшего Строгановского училища, откуда его перевели на полиграфический факультет.” (Ibid.) It was at this institution, then known as the VChUTEMAS,⁷² that Pavel Florenskij lectured in 1921-1924. As a member of the “печатно-графический факультет” (Florenskij 1985, 188), he taught the course “Анализ пространственности в художественно-изобразительных произведениях,” in the introductory declaration of which he spoke of the artist as an *eye*: “Ведь художник есть чистое простое око, взирающее на мир, чистое око человечества, которым оно созерцает реальность.” (Ibid., 395)⁷³

Vasja practices his skill in book ornamentation and typography on the little books *Živago* is writing at the time: “Доктор писал маленькие книжки в один лист, а Вася их печатал в училище в качестве засчитывавшихся ему экзаминационных работ.” (467)⁷⁴ As for the content of *Živago*’s writings, it can be

⁷²VChUTEMAS (Высшие государственные художественно-технические мастерские) had been founded as the Free Art Studios (Свободные художественные мастерские) in 1918 through a merger of the school mentioned in the novel (Строгановское училище) and the one with which Pasternak’s childhood was so intimately connected, namely the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture (Московское училище живописи, ваяния и зодчества) where his father Leonid Osipovič Pasternak was a professor and in whose building the family lived (see, for example, the introduction to the autobiography “*Ljudi i položeniia*”). Pasternak’s first wife Evgenija Vladimirovna Lur’e was studying at VChUTEMAS when they became acquainted in 1921 (E. B. Pasternak 1989, 357).

⁷³At the same time there is a biographical connection between Pasternak himself and Florenskij: they published together in the journal *Mažovec*, which was affiliated with a literary and artistic group of the same name (which is the name of the hill in Sergiev posad/Zagorsk on which the St. Sergei Trinity Monastery is located, Florenskij 1985, 390). The second issue of the journal in 1922 (the last to appear before it was banned), carried Florenskij’s article “*Nebesnye znamenija*,” which discusses the symbolism of colors, and Pasternak’s poem “*Neskučnyj sad duši*” (subsequently entitled “*Neskučnyj*” in the collection *Temy i variacii*, BP1, 678). Flejšman (1977, 58-59) also observes: “П. Флоренский — фигура, методически близкая к Пастернаку. Он присоединился к футуристическому (невыходшему) журналу ‘Слововед’, организованному литературным союзником ‘Центрифуги’ — группой ‘Лирень’. Завербовал Флоренского в журнал, по-видимому, В. Хлебников. <...> В 1922 г. центрифугисты (в том числе Пастернак) примкнули к журналу группы ‘Маковец’; идеологом ‘Маковца’ был П. А. Флоренский.” For a discussion of some philosophical convergences in Pasternak and Florenskij, see Bodin 1990, 385-86, 394.

⁷⁴When these books are mentioned somewhat later, the connection with the VChUTEMAS school is emphasized: “На столе лежали книжечки Юрия Андреевича в Васином раннем вхутемасовском издании.” (473)

said that in general it appears (as in the case of “Igra v ljudej”) to coincide with or mirror the novel itself:

Книжки содержали философию Юрия Андреевича, изложение его медицинских взглядов, его определения здоровья и нездоровья, мысли о трансформизме и эволюции, о личности как биологической основе организма, соображения Юрия Андреевича об истории и религии, близкие дядиным и Симушкиным, очерки пугачевских мест, где побывал доктор, стихи Юрия Андреевича и рассказы. (467)

Thus once again a characteristic of texts within the novel also says something *about* the novel.

2.4 Moscow: Finale and After

The last writing scenes in the novel take place in the room Evgraf has put at Živago’s disposal to afford him some time undisturbed by family and friends to realize his artistic plans — and which, incidentally, is the same room where ‘the candle was burning’ before Lara and Paša in the beginning of the novel. Here, in the description of Živago’s last burst of creativity, the parallel between writing and painting is maintained and reinforced:

Комната была более чем рабочей для Юрия Андреевича, более чем его кабинетом. В этот период пожирающей деятельности, когда его планы и замыслы не умещались в записях, наваленных на столе, и образы задуманного и *привидевшегося* оставались в воздухе по углам, как *загромождают мастерскую художника начатые во множестве и лицом к стене повернутые работы*, жилая комната доктора была *пиришествственным залом духа, чуланом безумств, кладовой откровений*. (480)

Significantly, the creating done by the hero is ultimately connected with the word “откровение” — quite in keeping with his own definition. Bordering on the semantics of this word is also “привидевшегося,” which again accentuates the specific meaning that seeing, vision, and eye have in the novel’s image of the creative process. The formulation also links artistic creation to revelation as an epistemological category; the verbal formula for revelation as such is precisely “и видел я.”

In the detailed account of Živago’s work we also recognize the motifs of *pere-* and *dopisyvanie* :

Юрий Андреевич стал приводить в порядок то из сочиненного, обрывки чего он помнил и что откуда-то добывал и тащил ему Евграф, частью в собственных рукописях Юрия Андреевича, частью в чьих-то чужих перепечатках. (480)

This is followed by a description of the work process which might be regarded as an image of the novel's own constitution and perhaps for the functioning of art in general:

Он скоро забросил эту работу и от восстановления неоконченного перешел к сочинению нового, увлеченный свежими набросками.

As I have shown, the novel itself arises in a kind of "восстановление" of Revelation (which according to the novel's own definition is "unfinished"), before it continues and 'creates something new.'

This is another case in which the makeup of the doctor's heterogeneous works is reminiscent of the novel itself: "Он составлял начерно очерки статей, вроде беглых записей времен первой побывки в Варыкине, и записывал отдельные куски напрашивавшихся стихотворений, начала, концы и середины, попеременно, без разбора." The autometadescriptive mixture of poetry and prose is recognizable from "Igra v ljudej" and the little books the doctor has published with Vasja's help, but to that is added an interesting note on the crystallization of the new texts in the "beginning," "middle," and "end," where it seems impossible to determine where the one ends and another begins (cf. my discussion above of Lara's note: "Конец фразы стерся").

In the novel's last depiction of Živago in the process of writing, both meanings of the verb "писать" are realized to the full:

Он торопился. Когда воображение уставало и работа задерживалась, он подгонял и подхлестывал их рисунками на полях. (481)

In this way the different art forms ultimately run together in his works in the purely concrete sense, which seems logical, given the dual connotations *writing* has had throughout the novel. The drawings also mirror the content of the novel:

На них изображались лесные просеки и городские перекрестки со стоящими посередине рекламным столбом "Моро и Ветчинкин. Сеялки. Молотилки". (Ibid.)⁷⁵

The doctor's manuscript may now in a factual sense be called a "лицевая рукопись."⁷⁶ Such an association is also supported by the fact that the word "скоропись" with its paleographic connotations is used to refer to his writing: "Иногда он еле справлялся с набегавшими мыслями, начальные буквы слов и сокращения его стремительной скорописи за ними не поспевали."

⁷⁵For different interpretations of the sign and its significance in the novel, see Rowland & Rowland 1967, 121; Lekić 1983, 165-166; Smirnov 1996, 115.

⁷⁶Cf. see my discussion in Chapter 1 on "искажение лица." The combination of text and image is also a constitutive feature of icons: "надписание, без какового, по церковному учению, изображение не есть икона" (Florenskij 1985, 247; italics in the original).

The creative situation is not treated further in the novel. In the following chapter (15:11), however, there are comments on an excerpt from Živago's manuscript that contains some thoughts on the significance of the city for modern art. Here the otherwise objective narrator is subjectivized in a curious manner, as the anonymity of the narrator's voice is broken by a reflection on which of Živago's poems might correspond to the description "Как раз в таких чертах хотел бы я написать о городе." (482) In an unusually cautious mode — which emphasizes that the narrator in this case is also a reader — the following hypothesis is suggested: "В сохранившейся стихотворной тетради Живаго не встретилось таких стихотворений. Может быть, стихотворение Гамлет относилось к этому разряду?"⁷⁷ However, Živago's notion of the urban essence of modern art proves to be more clearly relevant to the *prose* part of the novel, in the last chapter of which the capital Moscow is described as the 'heroine' of the story that constitutes the characters' lives: "И Москва внизу и вдали, родной город автора и половины того, что с ним случилось, Москва казалась им сейчас не местом этих происшествий, но главной героиней длинной повести, к концу которой они подошли, с тетрадью в руках, в этот вечер." (510; the characters themselves are thus ascribed a consciousness of their own fictionality that recalls Živago's own reading of his life as a text.) The cross-references between Živago's writings and the novel itself further complicate the relationship that is established through their coincidence in the diary entries and the concluding chapter of poetry.

It is not only the portrayal of the creative process that is connected with painting in the novel. There are numerous instances of figurative language that has been taken from the sphere of the visual arts and is marked by graphic visual qualities, for example: "Вечер был сух, как *рисунки* углем. Вдруг садящееся где-то за домами солнце стало из-за угла словно пальцем тыкать во все красное на улице: в красноватые шапки драгун, в *полотнище* упавшего красного флага, в следы крови, протянувшиеся по снегу красненькими ниточками и точками." (39-40)⁷⁸ In this manner the depiction sometimes even acquires a peculiar property of metadescription: "И только природа

⁷⁷For views of such a connection between the poem "Gamlet" and the modern city, see Obolensky 1978, 152.

⁷⁸Cf. the explosion of colors in another sunset scene: "Темно-пунцовое солнце еще круглилось над синей линией сугробов. Снег жадно всасывал ананасную сладость, которую оно его заливало. <...> Между тем темнело. Стремительно выцветали, гасли разбросанные по снегу багрово-бронзовые пятна зари. Пепельная мягкость пространств быстро погружалась в сиреневые сумерки, все более лиловевшие. С их серою дымкой сливалась кружевная, рукописная тонкость берез на дороге, нежно прорисованных по бледно-розовому, точно вдруг обмелевшему небу." (445)

оставалась верна истории и рисовалась взору такою, какой изображали ее художники новейшего времени.” (373)

Places connected with painting play an important part in the novel's plot. Lara's first apartment of her own is an artist's studio arranged for her by her benefactor, the radical factory owner Kologrivov,⁷⁹ “большой покровитель искусств” (9). What is more, Kologrivov himself represents a link to contemporary European painting and the avant-garde that has just appeared: “В Дюссельдорфе выставка открывается международная — живописи, скульптуры, садоводства. Собираюсь.” (95) Lara and Antipov's wedding celebration takes place in the studio (98), as does their farewell party before they leave for the Urals (99-102). Smirnov (1996, 68-85) suggests that Živago's last meeting with his friends in Gordon's room in Moscow may be associated with Raphael's painting *The Transfiguration of Christ* with respect to semantic composition as well as to the history and interpretation of the picture and even the artist's biography.

In this connection, a topos of special significance is the *railroad* that runs through the entire novel and constitutes the scene of many of its most dramatic events and central episodes, such as the railroad strike, Živago's father's suicide, Ginc' murder, Živago's meeting with Strel'nikov on his way to the Urals, Tanja's story of her childhood, not to mention all the journeys by train and along the tracks. Besides the obvious compositional and symbolic potential of the railroad,⁸⁰ the novel seems to exploit the polysemy of the Russian word “полотно” which means both ‘railroad bed’ and ‘canvas’; the “полотно” of the railroad forms a kind of background against which the entire novel is “painted.” Also, the railroad topos — and the word “полотно” — are explicitly linked to the problem of perception, as in the episode of Živago senior's suicide:

Когда они прыгивали на *полотно*, разминались, рвали цветы и делали легкую пробежку, у всех было такое чувство, будто местность возникла только что благодаря остановке, и болотистого луга с кочками, широкой реки и красивого дома с церковью на высоком противоположном берегу не было бы на свете, не случись несчастья.

Даже солнце, тоже казавшееся местной принадлежностью, по-вечернему застенчиво освещало сцену у рельсов, как бы боязливо приблизившись к ней,

⁷⁹“Есть у меня один художник знакомый. Он уезжает на два года в Туркестан. У него мастерская разгорожена переборками, и, собственно говоря, это целая небольшая квартира. Кажется, он готов передать ее вместе с обстановкой в хорошие руки. Хотите, устрою?” (96)

⁸⁰For various perspectives on the role of the railroad in *Doktor Živago*, see Danow 1981; Anderson 1987; Bethea 1989.

как подошла бы к полотну и стала бы смотреть на людей корова из пасущегося по соседству стада. (19)

This semantic ambivalence is reinforced in one passage during the trip to the Urals, where the words “Живаго,” “живописное” and “полотна” appear closely interrelated:

Место, куда ходили копать Живаго, было открытое, живописное. Местность в этой точке сначала опускалась на восток от полотна, а потом шла волнообразным подъемом до самого горизонта. (228)⁸¹

2.5 Concluding Remarks

The series of writing situations analyzed above can be connected with the opening scene of the novel discussed in the preceding chapter. “In the beginning was the Word,” says the prologue to the Gospel According to John. Specific to the “word” on the first page of *Doktor Živago* is the fact that it is not uttered — it is mute:

Только в состоянии отупения и бесчувственности, обыкновенно наступающих к концу больших похорон, могло показаться, что мальчик хочет сказать слово на материнской могиле. (7)

Nonetheless, the novel begins with this unuttered word, which can be regarded as the first, not fully realized step in a process of articulation that spans the entire book. From this perspective, *Doktor Živago* is really a story about two such processes, one of which refers to the main protagonist Jurij Živago and the other to the novel as a whole, whose origin and character are commented upon in various ways within the narrative itself.

To express his protest against death (the mute word shaped in gestures on his mother’s grave: “искажение лица”) Jura needs a language, a vocabulary in the broad sense. Eventually, he acquires one with considerable help from his uncle Vedenjapin. As far as Živago is concerned, the second funeral in the novel (of Anna Ivanovna) assumes features of an “examination” :

Сейчас он ничего не боялся, ни жизни, ни смерти, всё на свете, все вещи были словами его словаря. Он чувствовал себя стоящим на равной ноге со вселенною и совсем по-другому выстаивал панихиды по Анне Ивановне, чем в былое время по своей маме. (89)

Now the word may “become flesh” in a series of depicted or mentioned texts/creations of texts: (the mute word on the grave-mound) — Jura’s first poems — his paper on the physiology of the eye — (the planned article on Blok) — “Igra v ljudej” — Živago’s Varykino diary — the ecstatic writing of

⁸¹On “живописность места” in another context of the novel, see Faryno 1992c, 16.

poetry at Varykino — Živago's little books in Vasja's VChuTEMAS edition — the final burst of creativity — Živago's poems. As for these last works, their place in the sequence of events is not entirely clear; some of them are explicitly connected with Varykino, but poems are written on several occasions in the novel (and are also included in some of the other works mentioned). The placing of a collection of Jurij Živago's poetry as the concluding part of the work, however, marks their position as completed articulation and final remark regardless of their fictional date of origin. This articulated word stands as a posthumous word, and as such is a kind of victory over death.

Parallel to this story, the novel tells about its own articulation. It presents its genesis as a "continuation" of Revelation, demonstrating this relationship on the first page in the same paragraph where Jura's process of articulation begins and his mute word becomes a grimace.

As shown above, specific to the portrayal of Živago's writing is that both meanings of the verb "писать" are topicalized throughout; writing is modeled semantically as painting. This occurs in the novel with an amazing consistency. How should we interpret it?

The subject of Pasternak and painting has mainly been treated with a view to his early prose. In her analysis of the earliest fragments, di Simpliccio (1989) stresses the significance of the biographical fact that the author was the son of a prominent artist, maintaining that important features of Pasternak's aesthetic concept should be connected with Leonid Pasternak's art.⁸² Following Jakobson, di Simpliccio also identifies Cubist features in the texts, but considers that in the final analysis they express an aspiration to synthesis that distinguishes them from Futurist painting of the 1910s. Rudova (1994) stresses in her study of Pasternak's "pictorial prose" (especially in *Ochranaja gramota*, "Pis'ma iz Tuly," "Vozdušnye puti" and "Povest'") the legacy of Symbolism, with its syncretism and striving for synthesis, Pasternak's interest in Rilke's poetry (which was inspired by Rodin and Cézanne), and the influence of the Cubo-Futurists, who frequently crossed the boundaries between the arts.⁸³

⁸²In addition to concrete motifs in common between father and son, di Simpliccio also notes the emphasis on "Impressionism" as an exponent of "Realism" in art, and the stress on "fidelity" in the representation of reality. Gibian (1983) observes that Pasternak also seems to have been influenced by his father as a *writer*: a booklet Leonid Pasternak published on the Jews in Rembrandt's painting — *Rembrandt i evrejstvo v ego tvorčestve* (Berlin, 1923) — contains ideas that, according to Gibian, are transformed and incorporated into *Doktor Živago*.

⁸³On Pasternak and the boundaries of the various arts in the first decades of the century, see also Andersen 1991; on Pasternak and Cubism with a focus on *Sestra moja — žizn'* see Brita Lotsberg Bryn 1997, *Kraften, følelsen og prismet*. Ph. D. (ms.), Bergen; 155-181.

Obviously, Pasternak's father played an important part also in relation to his later works, not least as a corrective and possible biography, an idealized example of the vocation of artist as a philosophy of life. In his autobiographies and correspondence Pasternak repeatedly expresses his "debt" to his father and his admiration of him. In a 1948 letter to Frejdenberg he includes him among the people whose suffering and death he is trying to "atone for" through his novel. He also writes: "Главное мое потрясение, — папа, его блеск, его фантастическое владение формой, его глаз, как почти ни у кого из современников, легкость его мастерства" (Perepiska, 274). This touches upon some important points in the image of art and creation as presented in *Doktor Živago* — the emphasis on the eye and the mastery of form: "красота есть счастье обладания формой, форма же есть органический ключ существования" (449).

In many ways, the description in "Ljudi i položenija" of Leonid Pasternak's work on illustrating Tolstoj's *Voskresenie* appears like an image of ideal creation.⁸⁴ When working in Peredelkino, Pasternak was surrounded by his father's pictures (see photograph in de Mallac 1981, 177) and his writing — like *Živago's* — is repeatedly referred to in terms of painting. In a letter of October 1946 to his cousin, Pasternak describes his feelings towards the recently begun novel project: "Это все так важно и краска так впадет ложится в задуманные очертания" (Perepiska, 245). At a meeting with Moscow students in 1944 he declared — in words that later would echo in the novel: "стихи — этюды к будущему замыслу, который в итоге даст вселенную. Поэтому нужно для каждого этюда брать всю палитру" (Borisov & Pasternak 1988, 220). As late as 1955 *Doktor Živago* was still subtitled *Kartiny poluvekovogo obichoda* (ibid., 232).

But more interesting than the biographical aspects of the problem are the aesthetic — and ontological — ones. The synthesizing tendency underlying "the attempt to translate principles of one art into another" (Rudova 1994, 85) may in reference to the novel be described in the same terms as the "text continuations" in the preceding chapter. There I stated that Lotman's (1969) discussion of boundary erasures in Pasternak's early texts can be extended to include the relationship between texts: *Doktor Živago* presents itself as the continuation of another text (Revelation) and illustrates in itself the existence of a kind of *literal* literary continuum. The erasure of boundaries between the arts that the novel suggests through its persistent presentation of writing as painting could be explained in a similar manner. Another important aspect here concerns the specific properties of the different arts. The verbal text consists of discrete

⁸⁴See, for example, B. Gasparov 1992a, 113.

units, something that according to Lotman is undermined by Pasternak's texts which attempt to convey a reality characterized by continuity ("слитность"). A painting, on the other hand, can be regarded as a continuum whose very "physics" may seem closer to such an experience. That the production of texts is consistently portrayed in language marked by the vocabulary of painting can therefore be understood as a kind of incantation, an attempt to transfer something of this property to the text that is being created.

Živago's writing is modeled not only as painting in general, but also, to a particularly high degree, as icon painting. The religious themes in his poetry make religious painting especially relevant, but there are several aspects to be noted here. The epistemological problems that several scholars (Lotman 1969, Aucouturier 1979, B. Gasparov 1992a) have identified as central to Pasternak's art connect it with Florenskij's thinking on icons, which occupy a special position in his art hierarchy. In "Obratnaja perspektiva" Florenskij discusses the relationship between art distinguished by a linear perspective (i.e. "Western"/secular art) and that which uses a reverse perspective (i.e. Medieval icon painting); the former is associated with notions such as "illusion" or "screen," while the latter, 'pure painting,' represents a truer rendering of reality: "Декорация есть ширма, заставляющая свет бытия, а чистая живопись есть открытое настежь окно в реальность." (Florenskij 1985, 127)⁸⁵ Florenskij emphasizes in particular the inability of linear perspective to convey the dynamism, the 'life' of represented objects (ibid., 186) — a quality of vital importance in Pasternak's poet-ics.⁸⁶

However, creating maintains a balance on the boundary between *pisanie* and *živopis'* which can also be interpreted within the semantic network of the

⁸⁵Florenskij maintains that it is the "training" of the eye by hundreds of years of Western art and the linear perspective — "Обучение перспективе есть именно дрессировка" (Florenskij 1985, 160) — which underlies the widespread view of the former as "realism" and the latter as a manifestation of a primitive inability to render reality faithfully. Florenskij contends, in fact, that "Перспективная *правдивость*, если она есть, если вообще она есть правдивость, такова не по внешнему сходству, но по отступлению от него, т. е. по внутреннему смыслу, — поскольку она *символична*." (Ibid., 162; italics in the original.) At about the same time, artistic perspective is the hero of a Western, most influential work — Erwin Panofsky's likewise comprehensive essay "Perspective als 'symbolische Form'" (1924-1925).

⁸⁶Jerzy Faryno (1988b, 293) advances the following hypothesis: "Пастернаковский мир может рассматриваться как икона и в своем вертикальном строении и в диахроническом плане. По вертикали он пронизан 'Благодатью' от земных недр по "окна" небесные. Однако, это не пассивное приятие миром Благодати, а страстной путь к одухотворению (ср. "Детство Люверс" или "Уральские стихи") озаменованный 'трансформациями', которые не редко выражаются мотивами 'смерти-воскресения'. В диахронном плане в Пастернаковском мире реализуется основная идея литургии — искупительной жертвой. Примечательно при этом, что Пастернаковская 'икона' объемлет собой все мироздание и все времена."

novel. Florenskij recalls a term that has been used in Russia to designate prominent icon painters: *zograf*, from a Greek word with the same meaning as the “живописец” that designates Jura the first time his writing is mentioned. It is as a *zograf* that Živago appears at the peak of his powers during the nights of poetry writing in Varykino, and this essentially models him on the analogy of his half-brother Evgraf (in Russian: “благописец”).⁸⁷ This play on connotations emphasizes that the doctor “writes life.” In other words, the semantic network of the novel “proves” Živago’s declared understanding of the tasks of art: “неотступно творит этим жизнь.”⁸⁸ Here his art “continues” Revelation by illustrating in its own way the words “смерти не будет” (Rev. 21:4).

From this point of view, in the context of the novel Živago’s activity is a struggle: his “life writing” (“живопись”) is contrasted with what might be called the “death writing” (“смертепись”) emanating from the life-negating forces of the time exemplified by the one-sided texts discussed in the preceding chapter. Considering the role of the eye and vision in his own art, Živago’s description of these decrees, which associates their anti-creative essence with *blindness*, is important: “Какое завидное *ослепление!* — думал доктор. <...> Кем надо быть, чтобы с таким неостывающим горячешным жаром бредить из года в год на несуществующие, давно прекратившиеся темы и ничего не знать, ничего кругом *не видеть!*” (376)⁸⁹

The theme of struggle in the novel is expressed emblematically in “Skazka,” which is among the most “iconic” of Živago’s poems.⁹⁰ The portrayal of the work’s genesis in the Varykino episode allows its main character Jegorij Chrabryj/Svjatoj Georgij to be associated with Jurij Živago. Bodin (1976a, 65) main-

⁸⁷Cf. also the Symbolists’ play on the word “живопись” in, for example, Vjačeslav Ivanov: “Если поэт, я умею живописать словом (‘живописи подобна поэзия’ — ‘ut pictura poësis’ — говорила, за древним Симонидом, устами Горация классическая поэзия), — живописать так, что воображение слушателя воспроизводит изображенное мною с отчетливою наглядностью виденного, и вещи, мною названные, представляются его душе осязательно-выпуклыми и жизненно-красочными, огненными или осияниями, движущимися или застылыми, сообразно природе их зрительного явления” (Ivanov 1912, 3-4).

⁸⁸Even more concretely expressed in a manuscript variant as “делать жизнь,” cf.: “Юре в ответ на образовавшуюся щель в семье хотелось обратиться к чему-нибудь зиждительному, лепить, производить красоту, делать жизнь.” (592)

⁸⁹In a general discussion of the “philosophy of seeing” and its renaissance in the avant-garde, Smirnov (1999, 147) maintains: “Критика, направленная в адрес недостаточно видящих, — общее место для всех поколений авангарда”; on the blindness of Strel’nikov, see Jensen 1997, 91, 96.

⁹⁰Bodin notes that the central position of the poem “Skazka” imparts a character of *žitijnaja ikona* to the entire collection: “just as the icon is composed according to the principle central picture-surrounding pictures, the collection has the structure central poem-surrounding poems. In both cases St. George and the dragon is the central motif. The collection can thus be said to have been based on a principle of construction close to the biographical icon. The life of George becomes the life of Jurij.” (Bodin 1976a, 17)

tains that equating them would be incorrect, since unlike the protagonist of the poem Živago represents a passive principle: “Jurij only becomes a St. George in his imagination, never in reality.” However, if we focus on the creative process, we see that Živago’s writing is also a life-long, active resistance within the novel’s prose section. His weapon is not the lance, “копье” (“И копье для боя Взял на перевес”), but the pen, “непо” (a rhyming word), which creates counter-texts/life-texts. In this perspective, Živago’s road in life has a symbolic terminus: the streetcar he is riding in when he has a heart attack and dies is on its way to “Зоологический” (483). A Greek word with elements meaning ‘life’/‘animal’ and ‘word’ designates the goal toward which he is striving to the very end.⁹¹ Such a semanticization of his destination is reasonable, considering the instances of play on the meanings of ‘life’ and ‘animal’ in the Church Slavonic “живот” noted in the preceding chapter.

Already in the narrative section, in fact, the novel presents Živago’s posthumous victory in the struggle between living/life-giving and dead/death-dealing language. After the war — whose horrors, as Dudorov says, “были благом по сравнению с бесчеловечным владычеством выдумки и несли облегчение, потому что ограничивали колдовскую силу мертвой буквы” (499) — the friends meet to discuss the doctor’s writings. Their feeling that ‘this freedom of the soul was already there’ and their faith in the future seems to be connected with or even emanate from the book that Evgraf has compiled:

Счастливое, умиленное спокойствие за этот святой город и за всю землю, за доживших до этого вечера участников этой истории и их детей проникало их и охватывало неслышной музыкой счастья, разлившейся далеко кругом. И книжка в их руках как бы знала все это и давала их чувствам поддержку и подтверждение. (510)

Thus, the novel’s prose section is concluded with an image of the book as acting subject and an emphasis on the link between “life” and “text” — between *živ* and *pis’*.⁹²

⁹¹This interpretation may be reinforced by the fact that during his ride on the tram Živago himself is thinking in terms of “paths of life”: “Он подумал о нескольких развивающихся рядом существованиях, движущихся с разною скоростью одно возле другого, и о том, когда чья-нибудь судьба обгоняет в жизни судьбу другого, и кто кого переживает. Нечто в роде принципа относительности на житейском ристалище представилось ему” (483). For an analysis of this “principle of relativity” and its significance in the novel, see B. Gasparov 1989, 321-322. The motif of the road with its associations to the “path of life” is prominent both in “Skazka” and in other of Živago’s poems (Bodin 1976, 64); Masing-Delić (1991) points out that it is central in Pasternak’s *Peredelkino* cycle as well.

⁹²Cf. the definition of the “book” in “Neskol’ko položeniĭ” — which also includes words that clearly connote painting: “Книга — живое существо. Она в памяти и в полном рассудке: картины и сцены — это то, что она вынесла из прошлого, запомнила и не согласна забыть.” (BP4, 367)

Creation as *dopisyvanie*: 'A Kind of Continuation of Dostoevskij'

... Нас упрекают, что мы насоздавали романов.
А что же у защитника, как не роман на романе?
Не доставало только стихов.⁹³

3.1 Introduction

Doktor Živago displays certain peculiarities in the very reference of the text. We have seen examples of utterances concerning other texts — or art in general — which also have relevance to (or descriptive value for) the work itself. These utterances thus acquire a kind of dual reference. With the view of verbal art as a “continuation” in mind, in this chapter I will examine a specific metaliterary reference found in the novel, namely Živago’s remark about Majakovskij — ‘It’s a kind of continuation of Dostoevskij’⁹⁴ — and investigate its possible relationship to the novel as a whole.

The context of the remark is the family dinner celebrating Živago’s return from the front in 1917. The main course is the duck Jurij Andreevič has received as a farewell gift from the ‘deaf mute,’ ‘extremist,’ and ‘maximalist’ Pogo-revščich, his traveling companion on the train.⁹⁵ In the preceding part of the novel, the latter has been described as a character out of Dostoevskij:

⁹³Ippolit Kirillovič, *Brat’ja Karamazovy* (Pss 15, 174)

⁹⁴The Dostoevskij-Majakovskij theme has attracted various types of scholarly interest. In his book on Dostoevskij Viktor Šklovskij cites echoes of *Prestuplenie i nakazanie* in Majakovskij’s *Pro èto* (Šklovskij 1957, 196-97). Roman Jakobson comments on these and adds several more in his review of the book (Jakobson 1959). In an article modestly entitled “Predloženie issledovatel’jam” Lili Brik, too, presents a number of observations on Dostoevskiana in Majakovskij’s works mainly from *Pro èto*, whose very title refers to Dostoevskij: “Заглавие поэмы — самые два слова ПРО ЭТО и в ‘Карамазовых’, и в ‘Преступлении и наказании’ настойчиво выделены.” (Brik 1966, 203) A piquant detail is that Brik’s article in *Voprosy literatury* is followed by a commentary by Vadim Kožinov, who quotes this very remark from *Doktor Živago*: “Нельзя не привести здесь слова Пастернака о ранней поэзии Маяковского: ‘Это какое-то продолжение Достоевского. Или, вернее, это лирика, написанная кем-то из его младших бунтующих персонажей’ (архив Пастернака).” Apart from the excerpts from the novel included in *Novyj mir*’s letter of refusal in 1956, which was published in *Literaturnaja gazeta* on 25 October 1958 and also by *Novyj mir* (“B. L. Pasternaku,” appendix in *Novyj mir* 11 (1958), III-XVII; see Barnes 1998, 315, 343-344), this may be the only line from the prose section of the work ever to appear in the Soviet Union before 1988. For a further development of the Dostoevskij-Majakovskij theme with a focus on *Pro èto*, see Taranovskij 1977.

⁹⁵The deaf and dumb man’s duck has been connected with heavily symbolic birds in both Ibsen and Čechov; the link with Ibsen is developed further by Smirnov 1996, 145-46. For

Все это напоминало что-то давно знакомое. В духе такого радикализма говорили нигилисты прошлого века и немного спустя некоторые герои Достоевского, а потом совсем еще недавно их прямые продолжения, то есть вся образованная русская провинция (161-162).

Опять запахло Петенькой Верховенским, не в смысле левизны, а в смысле испорченности и пустозвонства. (162)

This theme recurs during the dinner conversation — as though the bird had brought it along — in the chapter's first dialogue, between Živago and Dudorov:

— Вы читали “Войну и мир” и “Флейту-позвоночник”?

Юрий Андреевич давно сказал ему, что думает по этому поводу, но Дудоров не расслышал из-за закипевшего общего спора и потому, немного погодя, спросил еще раз:

— Вы читали “Флейту-позвоночник” и “Человека”?

— Ведь я вам ответил, Иннокентий. Ваша вина, что не слышали. Ну, будь по-вашему. Скажу снова. Маяковский всегда мне нравился. Это какое-то продолжение Достоевского. Или, вернее, это лирика, написанная кем-то из его младших бунтующих персонажей, вроде Ипполита, Раскольников или героя “Подростка”. (175-176)

The mention of Majakovskij draws attention to itself for several reasons. First, the doctor's uncalled-for sharp tone and impolite remark are surprising since it is obviously not Dudorov's fault that he did not hear the answer; second, the matter is referred to three times before the reply comes again: “давно сказал ему,” “я вам ответил,” “скажу снова.” Anything which characterizes texts in *Doktor Živago* is potentially of interest to the novel itself, and in this particular case there is an additional circumstance to take into consideration, namely that “Majakovskij” as a component in Pasternak's work seems to have served as a kind of *stand-in*, taking the place of “Pasternak” in the text.⁹⁶

an interesting discussion from another perspective, see Møller 1979, 159. For an interpretation of the character based on a detailed analysis of his name, Maksim Aristarchovič Klinčov Pogorevšič, see Rowland & Rowland 1967, 91.

⁹⁶This is a principle that is formulated in *Ochrannaja gramota* (“Когда мне предлагали рассказать что-нибудь о себе, я заговаривал о Маяковском” ВР4, 221), and is demonstrated by the very fact that a significant part of both autobiographies is devoted to Majakovskij. Polivanov (1994, 78) refers to the relationship as a “функциональное тождество фигур Маяковского и автора внутри пастернаковских автобиографических текстов.” Although Pasternak seldom talks about himself, it is, on the other hand, striking that when commenting upon other writers and artists he often focuses on features that can be associated with his own texts: his description of Verlaine can be viewed as a description of himself (Sinyavsky 1978, 85); the description of Puškin's poetry in *Doktor Živago* seems like a “поэтический автопортрет Пастернака” (Žolkovskij 1978, 1); his notes on Goethe's *Faust* “may be seen to apply equally well to the author's attitude toward his own life's work” (Lekić 1983, 14). In a deleted fragment of *Detstvo Ljuvers*, a similar situation is described as typical of conversations between two ‘very different persons’: “Часто в беседе двух, очень несхожих, наступает минута, когда одному должно с необходимостью показаться, что, говоря о себе, другой собственно, имеет в виду его самого” (quoted in

Is it then possible — considering the view expressed in the work that art is *dopisyvanie* — to speak of *Doktor Živago* as a ‘continuation of Dostoevskij’? And which Dostoevskij? My point of departure in the following examination of these questions will be that the “word in the beginning” — Jura’s mute (expected but unuttered) word at his mother’s grave — connects this opening with Dostoevskij’s last great work, *Brat’ja Karamazovy*, at the beginning of which Aleša Karamazov behaves similarly in an analogous situation.⁹⁷

As a background to this analysis I will dwell briefly on some other links between the main characters in the two works. Closer examination reveals a series of parallels in their portraits and family circumstances.

Already in the foreword to *Brat’ja Karamazovy*, Aleša is described as a “чудак,” with attributes that also could refer to Jurij Živago:

Ибо не только чудак “не всегда” частность и обособление, а напротив, бывает так, что он-то, пожалуй, и носит в себе иной раз сердцевину целого, а остальные люди его эпохи — все, каким-нибудь наплывным ветром, на время почем-то от него оторвались... (Pss 14, 5)

In the introduction to *Doktor Živago* Vedenjapin describes Jura and his comrades as “страшные чудачи и дети” (42). During his last meeting with Gordon and Dudorov Živago experiences a feeling of alienation that he expresses to himself as follows: “Единственное живое и яркое в вас это то, что вы жили в одно время со мною и меня знали”(474); here he characterizes himself as a bearer of a kind of “серцевина целого.” His thought corresponds to what Christ says in the poem “Gefsimanskij sad”: “Он разбудил их: ‘Бас

Flejšman 1977, 25). As for *Ochrannaja gramota*, it has been maintained that “despite his apparent preoccupation with other personalities, Pasternak never ceases to speak of himself or, symbolically, of the poet” (Simmons 1988, 170); cf. also Greber’s (1992, 358) observation: “Man könnte sagen, *metaphor of self* sei bei Pasternak eine *metonymische Metapher des Selbst*: Substitution des Ich per Analogie durch die — metonymisch angrenzenden — Nachfolger.” On the relationship between Pasternak and Majakovskij, see especially E. V. Pasternak 1992.

⁹⁷The subject Pasternak and Dostoevskij has been treated previously mainly with respect to parallels between *Doktor Živago* and other works by Dostoevskij such as *Idiot* (Betha 1989, 232), *Prestuplenie i nakazanie* (Shore 1979; Lekić 1983, 106-107; Smirnov 1993) and *Besy* (Masing-Delić 1979; Mørch 1993, 62); only a couple of studies have addressed *Brat’ja Karamazovy* to any noteworthy extent (Grigorieff 1959, Witt 1994 and Smirnov 1996). Other scholars have treated *Netočka Nezvanova* in relation to *Detstvo Ljuvers* (Greber 1988) and “intertexts” from Dostoevskij in Pasternak’s poetry (see, for example, Gifford 1977, 42; Smirnov 1983; Smirnov 1985, 153; Faryno 1988, 181; Fateeva 1996). The Pasternak family archive contains a few pages with notes on Dostoevskij under the rubric “К странице о Достоевском. Соображения, выписки,” which, however, refer only to *Dnevnik pisatelja*. This material has been analyzed in relation to *Doktor Živago* by Lekić (1983, 104-52), who maintains that “Pasternak’s debt to Dostoevskii” can be traced chiefly in certain ideological motifs — centered on the relationship between the intelligentsia and the people — that have been incorporated into the *sužet* of the novel and that culminate “in the persona of the narodnyi poet, Pushkin for Zhivago, and Zhivago for Pasternak” (ibid., 110).

Господь сподобил Жить в дни мои, вы ж разлеглись, как пласт.”⁹⁸ A connection with Christ can also be noted in this context in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*. Diane Thompson (1991, 222) has investigated the implications of this definition of “чудак” in reference to Aleša: “Designating his hero as one who ‘carries within himself’ the ‘very heart of the whole,’ the author brings Alyosha’s image to the very limits of closeness to Christ, before it becomes identity or coincidence.”

“Чудак” is part of a kind of “alienation paradigm” that also includes the semantically close “странный” and “юродивый”: “был он и тогда уже очень странный, начав даже с колыбели” (narrator about Aleša, Pss 14, 18); “‘Странный, любопытный человек’, — думала она” (Lara about Živago, 128); “Алексей непременно из таких юношей, вроде как бы юродивых” (narrator about Aleša, Pss 14, 20).⁹⁹ As regards the portrait of Živago, this feature has been observed by several scholars; Borisov, for example, connects it with Jurij’s first name and patronymic: “Jurij” is phonetically close to “jurodivyj” and Andreevič can be associated with Saint Andrej Jurodivyj, whose vision of the Virgin Mary is celebrated during “Покров пресвятой Богородицы” — the holiday on which Jura’s mother is buried (Borisov 1992, 105-106; see also B. Gasparov 1989, 332).¹⁰⁰

A number of specific parallels can be noted in the descriptions of the parents of the two characters. Aleša’s and Jura’s fathers have several traits in common. Fedor Pavlovič Karamazov, to whom the first chapter in Dostoevskij’s novel is devoted, is described as a thoroughly irresponsible lecher: “сладострастнейший человек во всю свою жизнь,” “мигом завел в доме целый гарем и самое забубенное пьянство” (Pss 14, 8-9). He abandons his children from two marriages for a life of wandering and shows no interest in their further fate —

⁹⁸This connection between the prose and poetry sections is discussed in Obolensky 1978, 163-64. Cf. also Nils Åke Nilsson’s (1978, 66) reflections in his analysis of the poem “Gamlet,” which are very close to the formulation in Dostoevskij: “With Pasternak it is not the poet who has removed himself from the others; on the contrary, it is the others who have broken away.”

⁹⁹Terras (1981, 115) notes in connection with the epithets “чудак” and “юродивый”: “That there is a father and his three sons, with the youngest, a ‘God’s fool’ and ‘eccentric,’ projected to become the hero of Russia’s future, links the novel with the Russian folk tale.” Børtnes (1993, 198-99) links these features of Aleša with the hagiographic form of presenting life stories. Smirnov (1993, 158) notes a parallel between Jurij Živago and Aleša Karamazov with respect to their relationship to the saint Aleksej, čelovek Božij.

¹⁰⁰In the same chapter IV, “Tretij syn Aleša,” we encounter yet another epithet: “Заранее скажу мое полное мнение: был он просто ранний человеколюбец” (Pss 14, 17). Cf. Vodin’s (1976, 12) account of Pasternak’s excerpts from liturgical texts in connection with his work on the novel: “Another motif which interests the poet is Christ’s love towards mankind. The word ‘čelovekoljubec’ is continually repeated in the excerpts and then often underlined.”

the second chapter is entitled tellingly “Первого сына спровадил.” Belknap (1990, 81) has aptly characterized him as a “forgetter,” in contrast to Aleša, who is a “rememberer.” As for Jura’s father Andrej Živago, the reader is given information about him which is withheld from the boy himself and which largely corresponds to the description of Karamazov senior: “Юра не знал, что отец давно бросил их, ездит по разным городам Сибири и заграницы, кутит и распутничает, и что он давно просадил и развеял по ветру их миллионное состояние” (9). Eventually, Živago learns that in Omsk his father has had another family and a son he has likewise abandoned. The woman in that relationship, Princess Stolbunova-Enrici, is characterized as a “мечтательница и сумасбродка” (71), a description that could have been borrowed from the portrait of Karamazov’s first wife Adelaida Ivanovna, “из <...> знатного рода дворян Миусовых” — “дама горячая, смелая, смуглая, нетерпеливая” (Pss 14, 7, 9).

The mothers in both novels are suffering victims. They are sickly — “От этой болезни, со страшными истерическими припадками, больная временами даже теряла рассудок” (Pss 14, 13); “А потом у матери, всегда болевшей, открылась чахотка” (9) — and die early on; Sof’ja Ivanovna when Aleša is about four, Marija Nikolaevna when Jura is ten. Both, however, make an indelible impression on their sons: “Когда она померла, мальчик Алексей был по четвертому году, и хоть и странно это, но я знаю, что он мать запомнил потом на всю жизнь” (Pss 14, 13); “Мамочка была такая хорошая, не может быть, чтобы она была грешница, помилуй ее, Господи, сделай, чтобы она не мучилась” (15). The description of Jura’s childhood — “Так, в беспорядке и среди постоянных загадок, прошла детская жизнь Юры, часто на руках у чужих, которые все время менялись” (9) — can be said to be a summary of Aleša’s; after his mother’s death the boy is cared for by the servant Grigorij, then by a certain general’s wife, Vorochova, after whose death he ends up with Efim Petrovič Polenov, ‘Marshal of the Nobility in that province’ (Pss 14, 14), whose death is followed by another move: “Алеша попал в дом к каким-то двум дамам, которых он прежде никогда и не видывал, каким-то дальним родственникам Ефима Петровича, но на каких условиях, он сам того не знал” (Pss 14, 20).

But these genealogical and biographical coincidences in details become significant only in a broader context; they should be regarded as a kind of background to the line I shall be following, which begins in the scenes at the graves of the mothers in the two novels.

3.2 The Mute Word — and its Articulation

Aleša Karamazov's first visit to his mother's grave occupies a central position in the chapter devoted to him in the introductory part of the novel. Since the father, Fedor Pavlovič, cannot remember where he buried his second wife, it is the servant Grigorij — the only person who preserves her memory — who shows Aleša the way. This brief scene provides important details about both Grigorij — who has paid for and maintained the tombstone — and Aleša:

Алеша не выказал на могилке матери никакой особенной чувствительности; он только выслушал важный и резонный рассказ Григория о сооружении плиты, постоял понурившись и ушел, не вымолвив ни слова. (Pss 14, 22)

In the same way as in *Doktor Živago* ("могло показаться, что мальчик хочет сказать слово на материнской могиле," 7), a word that is expected remains unspoken and hanging in mid-air, as it were. Another circumstance uniting the episodes is that both funerals are connected with a monastery: "И вот довольно скоро после обретения могилы матери Алеша вдруг объявил ему [Fedor Pavlovič, S. W.], что хочет поступить в монастырь" (14, 22). After the funeral Jura spends the night with his uncle in a monastery cell.¹⁰¹

What happens next to the mute word in Dostoevskij's novel? To show how *Doktor Živago* may be regarded as a continuation of Dostoevskij, it is necessary to follow the development of this word through the course of *Brat'ja Karamazovy*. The next scene of interest is in the chapter "Tletvornyj duch" (Book 7, "Aleša"). In shock after Zosima's death, Aleša disappears from the cell but is eventually found again by one of the monks:

Обходя скит, отец Паисий вдруг вспомнул об Алеше и о том, что давно он его не видел, с самой почти ночи. И только что вспомнил о нем, как тотчас же и приметил его в самом отдаленном углу скита, у ограды, *сидящего на могильном камне* одного древле почившего и знаменитого по подвигам своим инока. Он сидел спиной к скиту, лицом к ограде и как бы прятался за памятник. Подойдя вплоть, отец Паисий увидел, что он, закрыв обеими ладонями лицо, хотя и *безгласно*, но горько плачет, сотрясаясь всем телом своим от рыданий. (Pss 14, 297)¹⁰²

¹⁰¹The graves of the mothers are also connected by a parallel: Aleša's mother's grave is said to be located "в дальнем уголке" [of the churchyard—S.W.] (Pss 14, 22); during Anna Ivanovna's funeral in *Doktor Živago* Jura recognizes a place he associates with his mother's burial: "Это было то самое, памятное кладбище, место упокоения Марии Николаевны. <...> В дальнем углу монастырского двора от стены к стене были протянуты веревки с развешанным для сушки стираным бельем <...> Юра вгляделся в ту сторону и понял, что это то место на монастырской земле, где тогда бушевала вьюга, измененное новыми постройками." (91)

¹⁰²On the location "в самом отдаленном углу," cf. the preceding note.

When Father Paisij urges the despondent Aleša to consider the significance of what has happened for Zosima himself (“сей день есть величайший из дней его”) and to rejoice on the latter’s behalf, the result is very nearly the opposite:

Алеша взглянул было на него, открыв свое распухшее от слез, как у *малого ребенка*, лицо, но тотчас же, *ни слова не вымолвив*, отвернулся и снова *закрылся обеими ладонями*.

Thus here Aleša is quite literally *on* a grave, and once again it is emphasized that he leaves a word unspoken. If we compare Aleša’s and Jura’s first behavior in the “graveyard contexts,” we can note a certain inversion: in the opening scene of *Doktor Živago* there are several elements that can be related to this *second* appearance of Aleša’s, where he is also compared to a little child: “*Подойдя вплоть, отец Паисий увидел, что он, закрыв обеими ладонями лицо, хотя и безгласно, но горько плачет, сотрясаясь всем телом своим от рыданий*” — “*Закрыв лицо руками, мальчик зарыдал. Летевшее навстречу облако стало хлестать его по рукам и лицу мокрыми плетью холодного ливня. К могиле прошел человек в черном, со сборками на узких, облегающих рукавах. Это был брат покойной и дядя плакавшего мальчика, расстриженный по собственному прошению священник Николай Николаевич Веденяпин.*” (7-8) In Pasternak’s novel, these elements appear in the opposite order. Inversely, Jura’s *second* appearance (during Anna Ivanovna’s funeral) has something in common with Aleša’s *first* visit to his mother’s grave, where he “*выслушал важный и резонный рассказ Григория о сооружении плиты*” (Pss 14, 22). Živago’s development after his mother’s burial is described here by means of his attitude toward the funeral service: “А теперь он слушал заупокойную службу как сообщение, непосредственно к нему обращенное и прямо его касающееся. Он *вслушивался в эти слова* и требовал от них *смысла, понятно выраженного*, как это требуется от всякого дела” (89).

Outside the “graveyard context,” there is in *Brat’ja Karamazovy* one more instance of pregnant silence on Aleša’s part, during his meeting with Ivan at the “Stoličnyj gorod” tavern (Book 5, “Pro i contra”).¹⁰³ Ivan’s reading of “Velikij

¹⁰³This meeting also connects with “the Word in the beginning.” As he expounds his ideas (in the chapter “Brat’ja znakomjatsja”), Ivan quotes this passage from John: “Итак, принимаю бога, и не только с охотой, но, мало того, принимаю и премудрость его, и цель его <...> верую в Слово, к которому стремится вселенная и которое само ‘бе к богу’ и которое есть само бог, ну и прочее и прочее, и так далее в бесконечность” (Pss 14, 214). “Слово” also figures in the drafts of book 11, where the Devil mentions it in a couple of connections in his monologue (Pss 15, 337-38). The commentary to the novel assumes that “черт должен был, по авторскому намерению, толковать первые строки Евангелия от Иоанна” (Pss 15, 442) and suggests a connection with Faust, who in Goethe’s drama translates the New Testament and reflects in particular on the prologue to John. Dos-

inkvizitor” is followed by an agitated discussion that ends when Aleša answers his brother by repeating Christ’s gesture as just described by Ivan in his ‘poem’:

Алеша *молча* глядел на него.

— Я брат, уезжая, думал, что имею на всем свете хоть тебя, — с неожиданным чувством проговорил вдруг Иван, — а теперь вижу, что и в твоём сердце мне нет места, мой милый отшельник. От формулы “все позволено” я не отрекись, ну и что же, за это ты от меня отречешься, да, да?

Алеша встал, подошел к нему и *молча* тихо поцеловал его в губы.

— Литературное воровство! — вскричал Иван, переходя вдруг в какой-то восторг, — это ты украл из моей поэмы! (Pss 14, 240)

Just as in Ivan’s portrayal of Christ — who remains silent during the Grand Inquisitor’s monologue — the narrator emphasizes Aleša’s silence during the reading: “Я не совсем понимаю, Иван, что это такое? — улыбнулся *все время молча* слушавший Алеша” (Pss 14, 228).¹⁰⁴ Later on, the Grand Inquisitor’s torrents of words take on dubious connotations. The chapter “Čert. Košmar Ivana Fedoroviča” describes another product of Ivan’s imagination, his uninvited guest the devil, as follows: “Гость говорил, очевидно увлекаясь своим *красноречием*, всё более и более возвышая голос и насмешливо поглядывая на хозяина; но ему не удалось докончить: Иван вдруг схватил со стола стакан и с размаху пустил в *оратора*.” (Pss 15, 84)¹⁰⁵ When “eloquence” is called into question like this (through guilt by association), silence in the novel acquires an axiological dimension.

There is a similar conflict in *Doktor Živago* where any vacuous cliché-laden “словоговорение” — whether this be the war correspondents’ “лингвисти-

toevskij was reading *Faust* as he worked on the novel, mentioning it especially in connection with book 11 (Pss 15, 443, 465-66). It may be noted here that parallel with *Doktor Živago* Pasternak was working on a translation of *Faust*, which was published in 1953, and that one of the titles he considered for his novel was *Opyt russkogo Fausta* (“Pervaja černil’naja redakcija,” Pasternak Family Archive).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Jerzy Faryno’s reflections on etymology in connection with this scene: “При этом показательно, что имя “Алеша”, восходя к греч. alexō, ‘защищать’, созвучно одновременно и греч. aleksis — ‘бессловесный, без слова’, что и реализуется в мотиве “молчания” как самого Алеши, так и его поэзного двойника, — Христа” (Faryno 1992a, 130). He also notes that the silence of both can be viewed as a repetition of Christ’s silence in response to the accusations of the false witnesses before Caipha and Pilate (Matt. 26:62-65; 27:11-14). Faryno’s analysis, however, does not go beyond the brothers’ conversation at the tavern. As for silence in general in Dostoevskij, there is an embryo to studies of such a theme in Bakhtin’s late notes: “Неизреченная правда у Достоевского (поцелуй Христа). Проблема молчания. Ирония как особого рода замена молчания” (Bakhtin 1986, 373). Jones (1997) emphasizes the significance of silence on all levels in *Brat’ja Karamazovy*, but his analysis does not follow the track I am taking here. Aage Hansen-Löve (1996) and Ingunn Lunde (2000) note in their analyses of *Podrostok* this novel’s thematicization of silence, connecting its narrative strategies with the apophatic tradition of the Eastern Church, which stresses the impossibility of expressing the essential.

¹⁰⁵ Like Aleša earlier, Ivan answers with a “borrowed” gesture that his guest immediately recognizes: “вспомнил Лютерову чернильницу!” (Ibid.)

ческая графомания словесного недержания,” Commissar Ginc’ patriotic phrases, or revolutionary rhetoric — is marked negatively.¹⁰⁶ The revolutionary rhetoric in particular is thematicized in the novel, for example, in Živago’s reflections on the partisan leader Liverij Mikulicyn, whose speechifying keeps him awake at night. Here, just as in Dostoevskij, rhetoric is in a literal sense demonized: “Завел шарманку, дьявол! Заработал языком! Как ему не стыдно столько лет пережевывать одну и ту же жвачку? <...> А этот все ораторствует, не унимается, ненавистное, бесчувственное животное!” (336) Another occasion when Živago is upset over this sort of speech is after the meeting with the commander in Meljuzeevo, where the naïve Ginc has demonstrated his rhetoric talents. This commentary ends in a description of the positive antipode of meaningless speech: “И все это извергалось потоком слов, лишнее, несуществующее, неяркое, без чего сама жизнь так жаждет обойтись. О, как хочется иногда из бездарно-возвышенного, беспросветного человеческого словоговора в кажущееся безмолвие природы, в каторжное беззвучие долгого, упорного труда, в бессловесность крепкого сна, истинной музыки и немеющего от полноты души тихого сердечного прикосновения!” (138-139) As an answer to torrents of empty words, muteness appears as a creative category, that is intimately related to life and art.¹⁰⁷ It is no coincidence that in his next breath the doctor thinks of ‘nurse Antipov’ — Lara is a personification of this positively marked silence, “загадочно немногословная и такая сильная своим молчанием” (160).

We find a late reference to Aleša’s silence a bit into the epilogue. He witnesses the scandalous meeting between Mitja and Katja at the hospital after the verdict, and his reaction to the agitated scene is markedly non-verbal: “Алеша стоял *безмолвный* и смущенный; он никак не ожидал того, что увидел” (Pss 15, 187).

The importance of the theme being discussed here is confirmed by the fact that the entire novel ends in a scene in which Aleša finally utters his “word,” and the graveyard context is brought up once again. This takes place in his speech to the boys after Пјуša’s funeral (“речь у камня”): “Господа, мне хо-

¹⁰⁶See Møller 1979. Thus a criticism of empty talk accompanies the criticism of “dead writing,” analysed in the preceding chapter. Mørch (1993) associates the deaf and dumb, but mechanically eloquent Pogorevščin in *Doktor Živago* — who in this respect is an emblematic figure — with the revolutionaries in *Besy*, who also suffer from “speech deficiencies.”

¹⁰⁷Cf. my analysis in Chapter 2 above of the writing scene at Varykino, in which silence is accentuated and which has Hesychastic connotations; a creative premise of an apophatic nature is also declared in the scene (“Роскошь морозной ночи была непередаваема,” 430).

телось бы вам сказать здесь, на этом самом месте, одно слово.” (Pss 15, 194)¹⁰⁸

In his speech, which is almost a sermon (“слово,” of course, can also have this meaning in Russian), Aleša dwells mainly on the significance of *memory* and the Resurrection. His performance, like the boys’ accompanying exclamations, is veritably saturated with words such as “вечная память,” “воспоминание,” “запомнить,” “припомнить,” “помнить,” “не будем забывать” — they occur more than twenty times in two and a half pages. The crucial significance Aleša attributes to memory suggests that he — like Jura Živago — has had some guidance in learning the vocabulary necessary for the articulation. As is pointed out in the title of that chapter, it was Aleša who recorded Zosima’s *Life*, which speaks of precious childhood memories and their powerful role in the life of the individual: “Из дома родительского вынес я лишь драгоценные воспоминания, ибо нет драгоценнее воспоминаний у человека, как от первого детства его в доме родительском, и это почти всегда так, если даже в семействе хоть только чуть-чуть любовь да союз. Да и от самого дурного семейства могут сохраниться воспоминания драгоценные, если только сама душа твоя способна искать драгоценное.” (Pss 14, 263-264)¹⁰⁹ When in Pasternak’s novel Jura is said to have acquired his “vocabulary” by literally domesticating culture — “Все эти двенадцать лет школы, средней и высшей, Юра занимался древностью и законом Божьим, преданиями и поэтами, науками о прошлом и о природе, как *семейной хроникой родного дома, как своею родословною*. Сейчас он ничего не боялся, ни жизни, ни смерти, все на свете, все вещи были словами его словаря” (89) — it can be regarded as a variation on Zosima’s phrase about memories: “К воспоминаниям же домашним причитаю и воспоминания о священной истории, которую в доме ро-

¹⁰⁸The scene reinforces Aleša’s associations with Christ — like the disciples, the boys are twelve in number: “Всех их собралось человек двенадцать, все пришли со своими ранчиками и сумочками через плечо.” (Pss 15, 189) They are moreover called “школьники” that is, disciples in the most concrete sense (*ibid.*, 189). Ivan depicts a “negative” parallel to Aleša’s process of articulation in his portrait of the Grand Inquisitor: “Тут дело в том только, что старику надо высказаться, что наконец за все девяносто лет он высказывается и говорит вслух то, о чем все девяносто лет молчал.” (Pss 14, 228)

¹⁰⁹Zosima’s teaching on the significance of childhood memories appears in Dostoevskij’s own “речь у камня” — his speech at the Puškin celebration on 8 June 1880. Cf. here his description of Tat’jana in *Evgenij Onegin*: “У него [Onegin, S. W.] никакой почвы, это былинка, носимая ветром. Не такова она вовсе: у ней и в отчаянии и в страдальческом сознании, что погибла ее жизнь, все-таки есть нечто твердое и незыблемое, на что опирается ее душа. Это ее *воспоминания детства*, воспоминания родины, деревенской глуши, в которой началась ее смиренная, чистая жизнь, — это ‘крест и тень ветвей над могилой ее бедной няни’. О, эти воспоминания и прежние образы ей теперь всего драгоценнее, эти образы одни только и остались ей, но они-то и спасают ее душу от окончательного отчаяния.” (Pss 26, 143)

дательском, хотя и ребенком, я очень любопытствовал знать” (Pss 14, 264).¹¹⁰ Zosima describes the book from which he learned to read — “священная история с прекрасными картинками” (ibid.) — as an especially treasured memory; the only book of Jura’s mentioned in *Doktor Živago* is precisely his “иллюстрированное Священное писание” (15).

Aleša’s speech — with all its references to memories — ends in the cry “вечная память!” which together with the Resurrection theme runs like a refrain through the final pages of the novel:

Не забудем его никогда, вечная ему и хорошая память в наших сердцах, отныне и во веки веков!

— Так, так, вечная, вечная, — прокричали все мальчики своими звонкими голосами, с умиленными лицами. <...>

— И вечная память мертвому мальчику! — с чувством прибавил опять Алеша.

— Вечная память! — подхватили снова мальчики.

— Карамазов! — крикнул Коля, — неужели и взаправду религия говорит, что мы все встанем из мертвых и оживем, и увидим опять друг друга, и всех, и Илюшечку?

— Непременно восстанем, непременно увидим и весело, радостно расскажем друг другу всё, что было, — полусмеясь, полу в восторге ответил Алеша.

— Ах, как это будет хорошо! — вырвалось у Коли.

— Ну, а теперь кончим речи и пойдемте на его поминки. Не смущайтесь, что блины будем есть. Это ведь старинное, вечное, и тут есть хорошее, — засмеялся Алеша. — Ну пойдемте же! Вот мы теперь и идем рука в руку.

— И вечно так, всю жизнь рука в руку! Ура Карамазову! — еще раз восторженно прокричал Коля, и еще раз все мальчики подхватили его восклицание. (Pss 15, 196-197)

With regard to *Doktor Živago* as a continuation of *Brat’ja Karamazovy*, it is significant that Pasternak’s novel literally takes up where Dostoevskij’s leaves off, with a walk accompanied by the same emblematic expression of the memory theme: “Шли и шли и пели ‘Вечную память’” — in what might be read as a literal realization of Aleša’s summon and the last words of Dostoevskij’s novel, “подхватили его восклицание.” The semantic content of ‘continuation’ in the introduction to *Doktor Živago* is also striking: “и, когда останавливались, казалось, что ее по-залаженному *продолжают* петь ноги, лошади, дуновения ветра.” The first two short paragraphs produce the intense impres-

¹¹⁰Zosima’s juxtaposition “домашние воспоминания” — “воспоминания о священной истории” is also recalled by Vedenjapin’s (Jura’s spiritual father) expression “у себя в истории” in his disquisition on the philosophy of history to Voskobjnikov: “Только после него [Christ, S. W.] началась жизнь в потомстве, и человек умирает не на улице под забором, а у себя в истории, в разгаре работ, посвященных преодолению смерти, умирает, сам посвященный этой теме.”(14) (For another aspect of the expression “у себя в истории,” see Livingstone 1979.)

sion of an *ongoing* movement, which is especially accentuated through the anaphoric repetition of the prefix *pro-*: “*прохожие пропускали шествие.*” The image of a kind of joining is also reinforced by the formulation “Любопытные входили в процессию.”

Resurrection, the second main theme in Aleša's speech to the boys, is encountered in Pasternak's novel even before the book is opened — it is latent in the title through the link that the Gospel text has established in the cultural memory: “что вы ищете *живого* между мертвыми? Его нет здесь: *Он воскрес*” (Luke 24:5-6).¹¹¹

These two themes, Resurrection and memory, are woven together in Živago's sermon to the dying Anna Ivanovna, where eternal life is defined as memory:

Человек в других людях и есть душа человека. Вот что вы есть, вот чем дышало, питалось, упивалось всю жизнь ваше сознание. Вашей душою, вашим бессмертием, вашей жизнью в других. И что же? В других вы были, в других и останетесь. И какая вам разница, что потом это будет называться памятью. (69-70)

The same thought is expressed in concentrated form in the poem “Svad'ba”:

Жизнь ведь тоже только миг,
Только растворенье
Нас самих во всех других
Как бы им в даренье.

Compositionally, Živago's poems can in fact be compared to Aleša's speech at the stone — both are the result of a long process of articulation, and both are placed at the end of the novels. There are also thematic parallels. The lines cited above from “Svad'ba,” for example, can be viewed as an aphoristic honing of Aleša's speech to the boys, where he talks about them — and Iljušečka — literally *dissolving*:

Я слово вам даю от себя, господа, что я ни одного из вас не забуду; каждое лицо, которое на меня теперь, сейчас, смотрит, припомню <...> Да разве я могу забыть, что Карташов есть на свете и что вот он не краснеет уж теперь <...> Все вы, господа, милы мне отныне, всех вас заключу в мое сердце, а вас прошу заключить и меня в ваше сердце! Ну, а кто нас соединил в этом добром хорошем чувстве, об котором мы теперь всегда, всю жизнь вспоминать будем и вспоминать намерены, кто как не Илюшечка, добрый мальчик, милый мальчик, дорогой для нас мальчик на веки веков! Не забудем же его никогда, вечная ему и хорошая память в наших сердцах, отныне и во веки веков! <...>

¹¹¹The word “живаго” in the collocation “Бога живаго” occurs in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* twice in the story of Zosima's life: “Страшно впасть в руки бога живаго.” (quotation from Hebrews 10:31, Pss 14, 281); “Бога живаго без ненависти созерцать не могут и требуют, чтобы не было бога жизни, чтобы уничтожил себя бог и все создание свое.” (Pss 14, 293)

— Будем помнить и лицо его, и платье его, и беденькие сапожки его, и гробик его, и несчастного грешного отца его (Pss 15, 196)

Resurrection is a central theme in Živago's poems as well.¹¹² It culminates in Christ's remarks in the final stanza of "Gefsimanskij sad" — "Я в гроб сойду и в третий день восстану, И, как сплавляют по реке плоты, Ко мне на суд, как баржи каравана, Столетия поплывут из темноты" — which has the same flavor of *futurum exactum* as Aleša's reply to Kolja Krasotkin: "Непременно восстанем, непременно увидим" (Pss 15, 197). Thus, the last poem of Jurij Živago's, and with it the novel as a whole, ends in an image of Judgement Day and hence in the Apocalypse. The work not only begins with Revelation, it ends with it as well.

It is characteristic of both novels that they have an epilogue, which implies that they actually have several endings. This has been noted with respect to *Doktor Živago* by Cornwell (1986, 123), who identifies "four or five endings — at least two of them false." Dostoevskij's novel also ends before the epilogue in "Judgement Day" — Mitja's trial, which is modeled semantically as "страшный суд." In "Traktat o Smerdjakove" the prosecutor expresses himself as follows: "Итак, он признался, почему же, опять повторю это, в предсмертной записке не объявил нам всей правды, зная, что завтра же для безвинного подсудимого *страшный суд*?" (Pss 15, 141) For his part, the defense lawyer in "Preljubodej mysli" refers to Mitja with the following epithet: "Вот что он несколько раз воскликнул и, однако же, забыл упомянуть, что если *страшный подсудимый* целые двадцать три года столь благодарен был всего только за один фунт орехов" (Pss 15, 168) The verdict of the jury ("Да, виновен!") is followed by a more elaborate allusion to Revelation:

Мертвая тишина залы не прерывалась, буквально как бы все окаменели — и жаждавшие осуждения, и жаждавшие оправдания. Но это только в первые минуты. Затем поднялся страшный хаос. (Pss 15, 178)

Consider Rev. 8:1-5:

И когда Он снял седьмую печать, сделалось безмолвие на небе, как бы на пол часа <...> И взял Ангел кадильницу, и наполнил ее огнем из жертвенника, и поверг на землю: и произошли голоса и громы, и молнии и землетрясение

In this context there is nothing surprising in the apocalyptic tinge to Mitja's final words to the court: "Клянусь богом и *Страшным судом* его, в крови отца моего не виновен!" (Pss 15, 178) Thus "страшный суд" is explicitly

¹¹²See, for example, Bodin 1976, 134-135; Masing-Delić (1977) considers it to be the central theme in poems number 3, 22, 24 and 25.

present in one of the novel's endings — just before the note “Конец четвертой и последней части,” but before the epilogue.¹¹³

The concluding scene with Aleša's speech at the stone is linked to the absolute beginning of the novel — the epigraph Dostoevskij borrowed from John: “Истинно, истинно говорю вам: если пшеничное зерно, падши в землю, не умрет, то останется одно; а если умрет, то принесет много плода.” (John 12:24) Here one of its possible meanings is *realized* in what can be regarded as an answer to the problem of theodicy developed in the novel, especially as presented by Ivan, who concentrates on the suffering of children. The final scene demonstrates how something as incomprehensible and seemingly meaningless as the death of a child still acquires a kind of meaning — through the spiritual and moral regeneration that Aleša's requiem for Iljušečka brings about in the boys and through the community that is established thereby.¹¹⁴

Pasternak's novel as well treats the meaning of loss. As noted in Chapter 1, loss becomes a kind of creative impulse that is expressed most clearly in the scene following Anna Ivanovna's funeral (“В ответ на опустошение, произведенное смертью <...> ему <...> хотелось мечтать и думать, трудиться над формами, производить красоту,” 91), but demonstrated also, for example, in connection with Lara's departure from Varykino. For Živago, loss and memory (the cornerstones in Aleša's church) are the paradoxical prerequisite for creation: “Прелесть моя незабвенная! Пока тебя *помнят* вгибы локтей моих, пока еще ты на руках и губах моих, я побуду с тобой. <...> Я запишу *память* о тебе в нежном, нежном, щемяще печальном изображении” (446).¹¹⁵

Just as Aleša's ideas can be related to Zosima's teaching, so too Živago's notion of art has a great deal in common with Vedenjapin's understanding of *history* as an answer to death, which also stresses the significance of memory: “мысль об истории как о второй вселенной, воздвигаемой человечеством в ответ на явление смерти с помощью явлений времени и памяти” (67). In the narrator's text these ideas are linked directly to art: “Душою этих книг

¹¹³The degree to which “Dostoevskij” in Pasternak is associated with the apocalyptic is demonstrated in the unfinished play “*Étot svet*” (1942), where Gordon asks Dudorov (several characters have names that later recur in the novel): “Откуда в тебе такая достоевщина?” The latter replies: “Я русский человек, мне приходят последние денечки, а в сумме это Достоевский, как такое-то вещество плюс такое-то, дает синтетический каучук.” (BP4, 525)

¹¹⁴Other aspects of the role of the motto in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* are addressed by Thompson, who is inclined to view the entire novel as “an elaborated realisation of Christ's parable” (Thompson 1991, 68).

¹¹⁵Smirnov (1996, 194), in this connection, speaks of Živago's creating in terms of “sublimation”; against the background of the overall pattern of loss and creation in the novel this, however, appears as a narrow notion.

было по-новому понятое христианство, их прямым следствием — новая идея искусства.” (Ibid.)

Thus, loss bears fruit in both novels, but we may still note a difference: in *Doktor Živago* a shift has occurred from the *ethical* — spiritual and moral — plane to the *aesthetic* one. What in Aleša’s speech becomes a sermon, Živago transforms into art. Significantly, when in “Ljudi i položenijsa” Pasternak paraphrases the parable of the grain of wheat — “Терять в жизни более необходимо, чем приобретать. Зерно не даст всхода, если не умрет. Надо жить не уставая, смотреть вперед и питаться живыми запасами, которые совместно с памятью вырабатывает забвение” (BP4, 328) — he does so apropos of *his own texts* which have at various times been lost.¹¹⁶

A study of *Doktor Živago* as a ‘continuation of Dostoevskij’ must also take note of the fact that *Brat’ja Karamazovy* presents itself as the introductory part of a larger work. The reader is carefully informed in the foreword that the novel is only the first part of two, of which the second is even said to be of greater interest: “беда в том, что жизнеописание-то у меня одно, а романов два. Главный роман второй — это деятельность моего героя уже в наше время, именно в наш теперешний текущий момент. Первый же роман произошел еще тринадцать лет назад, и есть почти даже и не роман” (Pss 14, 6). The narrator brings this up again after introducing Mitja’s conflict with his father: “Вот это-то обстоятельство и привело к катастрофе, изложение которой и составит предмет моего первого вступительного романа или, лучше сказать, его внешнюю сторону.” (Pss 14, 12) Although no second part was ever written, there is evidence that Dostoevskij intended to return to the novel (see, for example, Pss 15, 485-87). Maximilian Braun has researched the extent to which the existing work displays the formal characteristics of an *exposition*, focusing on “plot” and “ideological scheme.” He maintains that the figure of Aleša and the story line exclusively associated with him really do point forward: “It is not until the end of the novel that Alesha seems to become a really prominent protagonist, but not within the main plot: he starts to develop

¹¹⁶Obolensky (1978, 164) notes that the parable of the grain of wheat may serve as an illustration of Živago’s entire path in life, which “though filled with human weakness and riddled with failure, has ended in triumph.” On loss and creation in the poem “Duša” (in the collection *Kogda razguljaetsja*), see Livingstone 1978, 169 and Sinjavskij 1978, 70, neither of whom, however, connect the theme with the Gospel parable, even though the central image of the “перемалывание” in the poem corresponds to “зерно” semantically. Sinjavskij, furthermore, describes Pasternak’s poetry as “a living plant, which, using history as its soil, serves as the accumulator of goodness and humanity, drawing life-giving juices from death itself” (ibid.). In another article Livingstone (1979, 139) links the idea to Schopenhauer: “Der Tod ist der eigentlich inspirierende Genius.” On the poet’s own death as the prerequisite for the birth of poetry, see A. Ljunggren 1984, 81. On “идея потери” as the driving force in Pasternak’s artistic biography, see B. Gasparov 1992a, 121-22.

a byplot of his own, so to speak, set apart from the crime story. Besides, even then Alesha remains an unfinished personality" (Braun 1972, 202). Thus from the novel's own perspective, a potential 'continuation of Dostoevskij' that would take thematical note of this complex in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* can be said to be well motivated.¹¹⁷

That *Doktor Živago* may be interpreted as a continuation of *Brat'ja Karamazovy* in this respect is also suggested by the title Pasternak gave his novel at an early stage: "Мальчики и девочки." It is mentioned, for example, in two letters to Ol'ga Frejdenberg dated 5 and 13 October 1946 (Perepiska 243, 245). The title has been associated with Blok's Easter poem "Вербочки" ("Мальчики да девочки/ Свечечки да вербочки/ Понесли домой...").¹¹⁸ Lekić analyzes its ties to the novel as a generational portrayal and views the role "the childhood of 1905" plays as a "metaphor for the innocent age of the revolution" (Lekić 1988, 182). As Borisov and E. B. Pasternak point out, however, this title may also contain an allusion to the rubric of book ten of *Brat'ja Karamazovy*, "Mal'čiki" and the epilogue that is connected with it thematically: Ф. М. Достоевский, в частности 'Братья Карамазовы', не раз упоминается Пастернаком в письмах в связи с его работой над романом. Имена Блока и Достоевского поставлены рядом в 'Людах и положениях' как 'повод для вечных поздравлений, олицетворенное торжество и праздник русской культуры" (Commentary, 654).¹¹⁹

As we have seen, memory is a significant part of Aleša's theme. In the next section, I will treat this, more specifically, as an important aspect of *Doktor Živago* viewed as a 'continuation of Dostoevskij.'

3.3 The Memory Theme

Several scholars have recently noted the significance of memory in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*. Belknap, who devotes a chapter to it in his *The Genesis of the Brothers Karamazov*, characterizes the novel as "an essay on remembering and

¹¹⁷Cf. also Bachtin (1979, 48): "В сущности, только 'Братья Карамазовы' имеют вполне полифоническое окончание, но именно поэтому с обычной, то есть монологической точки зрения роман остался незаконченным."

¹¹⁸According to Konstantin Fedin's note on an invitation from Pasternak to a reading, at this stage the novel had an epigraph from Blok (Commentary, 653).

¹¹⁹In the later letter to Frejdenberg in which the title "Мальчики и девочки" occurs, Pasternak also mentions Dostoevskij explicitly in a description of his novel project: "Я в ней хочу дать исторический образ России за последнее сорокапятилетие, и в то же время всеми сторонами своего сюжета, тяжелого, печального и подробно разработанного, как, в идеале, у Диккенса и Достоевского, — эта вещь будет выражением моих взглядов на искусство, на Евангелие, на жизнь человека в истории и на многое другое." (Perepiska 244-245) Another aspect of this title is treated by Jensen 1997, who connects it with the boy and girl in H. C. Andersen's *Snow Queen*.

forgetting” (Belknap 1990, 79). Likewise, Thompson, in her thorough and comprehensive monograph *The Brothers Karamazov and the Poetics of Memory* (Thompson 1991), regards memory not only as a central theme but also as a compositionally active artistic principle. Erika Greber takes a similar approach in her articles on memory and the “art of memory” in Pasternak’s works, finding both classical mnemonic devices and various phenomena related to human memory to be of greatest significance: “The memory theme in fact appears in Pasternak’s work in such surprising multiplicity that it might seem as if Pasternak himself had made a special study of the art of memory.” (Greber 1997, 25) But although this theme has attracted a great deal of interest in both authors individually, they have not yet been viewed in relation to each other in this respect.

It will be useful to introduce the rest of this chapter by juxtaposing one of the central passages concerning memory in *Doktor Živago* — Jura’s “sermon” to his dying mother-in-law discussed above — with an earlier text of Dostoevskij’s, which itself was conceived in a similar situation. I have in mind the remarks the writer made in his notebook at the bedside of his wife Marija Dmitrievna Isaeva’s just after she died on 16 April 1864. These are a collection of philosophical reflections centered on the possibility of love as commanded by Christ (“возлюбить человека, как самого себя”), the fusion of the ‘self’ in ‘others’ as a goal for the development of humanity, and the nature of the life that follows (“будущая райская жизнь”). The notes are introduced brusquely with the line “Маша лежит на столе. Увижусь ли с Машей?” (Pss 20, 172), and the problem of immortality is a central concern:

Есть ли в таком случае будущая жизнь для всякого я? Говорят, человек разрушается и умирает *весь*.

Мы уже потому знаем, что не *весь*, что человек, как физически рожающий сына, передает ему часть своей личности, так и нравственно оставляет память свою людям (NB. *Пожелание вечной памяти* на панихидах знаменательно), то есть входит частию своей прежней, жившей на земле личности, в будущее развитие человечества. Мы наглядно видим, что память великих развивателей человека живет между людьми (равно как и злодеев развитие), и даже для человека величайшее счастье походить на них. Значит, часть этих натур входит и плотью и одушевленно в других людей. Христос *весь* вошел в человечество, и человек стремится преобразиться в я Христа как в свой идеал. Достигнув этого, он ясно увидит, что и все, достигавшие на земле этой же цели, вошли в состав его окончательной природы, то есть в Христа. (Синтетическая натура Христа изумительна. Ведь это натура бога, значит, Христос есть отражение бога на земле.) Как воскреснет тогда каждое я — в общем Синтезе — трудно представить. Но живое, не умершее даже до самого достижения и отразившееся в окончательном идеале — должно ожить в жизнь окончательную, синтетическую, бесконечную. (Pss 20, 174; italics in the original)

As pointed out earlier, the same problem is the subject of Živago's speech, which he delivers to calm the terminally ill Anna Ivanovna — 'so that he was even astonished at himself':

— Воскресение. В той грубейшей форме, как это утверждается для утешения слабейших, это мне чуждо. И слова Христа о живых и мертвых я понимал всегда по-другому. <...> Вот вы опасаетесь, воскреснете ли вы, а вы уже воскресли, когда родились, и этого не заметили.

Будет ли вам больно, ощущает ли ткань свой распад? То есть, другими словами, что будет с вашим сознанием <...>.

Итак, что будет с вашим сознанием? Вашим. Вашим. А что вы такое? В этом вся загвоздка. Разберемся. Чем вы себя помните, какую часть сознавали из своего состава? Свои почки, печень, сосуды? Нет, сколько ни припомните, вы всегда заставляли себя в наружном, деятельном проявлении, в делах ваших рук, в семье, в других. А теперь повнимательнее. Человек в других людях и есть душа человека. Вот что вы есть, вот чем дышало, питалось, упивалось всю жизнь ваше сознание. Вашей душою, вашим бессмертием, вашей жизнью в других. И что же? В других вы были, в других и останетесь. И какая вам разница, что потом это будет называться памятью. Это будет вы, вошедшая в состав будущего. (69-70)

Despite the obvious differences — Živago himself describes his attitude as "мнение естествовника" — there is a certain convergence with respect to the question of personal immortality: both texts define it, to a greater or lesser degree, as *memory*, 'myself in others.' For Dostoevskij this reflects materially the significance of incarnation and the ultimate 'synthesis' which will bring about the resurrection of the self.¹²⁰ As Živago presents it, this *is* immortality — resurrection is immanent, "earthly"; instead, a paragraph or so farther on, death itself is denied with a reference to Rev. 21:4. In both texts, however, the idea is expressed in the same peculiarly technical, almost mechanical terms: "человек <...> оставляет *память* свою людям <...> то есть *входит* *частью* своей *прежней, жившей на земле личности, в будущее развитие человечества*" (Dostoevskij); "Чем вы себя помните, *какую часть* сознавали из своего

¹²⁰In connection with "immortality realized as memory," "жизнь в других" one may note a dialogue between several of Dostoevskij's later texts. In *Podrostok* (1875), Makar Dolgorukij presents an argument that eliminates the basis for such "immortality": "Знаешь ли ты, милый выюнош, — начал он опять, как бы продолжая прежнюю речь, — знаешь ли ты, что есть предел памяти человека на сей земле? Предел памяти человеку положен лишь во сто лет. Сто лет по смерти его еще могут запомнить дети его али внуки его, еще видевшие лицо его, а затем хоть и может продолжаться память его, но лишь устная, мысленная, ибо пройдут все видевшие живой лик его. И зарастет его могилка на кладбище травкой, облупится на ней бел камушек и забудут его все люди и самое потомство его, забудут потом и самое имя его, ибо лишь немногие в памяти людей остаются — ну и пусть!" (Pss 13, 290) As pointed out above, the idea is realized again in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* in Aleša's speech to the boys. Cf. in this connection Šklovskij's (1957, 223) observation: "Не только герои спорят у Достоевского, отдельные элементы сюжетного развертывания как бы находятся во взаимном противоречии <...>."

состава? <...> И какая вам разница, что потом это будет называться *памятью*. Это будет вы, *вошедшая в состав будущего*" (Pasternak). Dostoevskij's *nota bene* on the actual significance of the funeral/requiem ritual — "*Пожелание вечной памяти на панихидах знаменательно*" [italics in the original, S. W.] — could also serve as a guide to reading Pasternak's novel; it looks like a brief formula for the relationship between the work as a whole and the opening sentence, "Шли и шли и пели вечную память."

A discussion of a possible connection between this particular text of Dostoevskij's and Pasternak's novel must take into account the special circumstances surrounding the publication of the former. It first appeared in Boris Vyšeslavcev's 1932 article "Dostoevskij o ljubvi i bessmertii. Novyj fragment," in the Paris journal *Sovremennye zapiski*. Vyšeslavcev (1877-1954) was among the many philosophers and other academics who were deported from Russia in 1922. Like Pasternak, he had studied in Marburg, and after his doctoral dissertation, *Ėtika Fichte* (1914), had become a professor at Moscow University.¹²¹ In the article he publishes Dostoevskij's notes of 16 April 1864 and comments on them in detail.¹²² Vyšeslavcev's text is to a great extent a polemic with materialist philosophy in general and contemporary Soviet Marxism in particular, and on many points it is of interest to *Doktor Živago*.¹²³

Dostoevskij's notes give Vyšeslavcev occasion to reflect on the philosophical and ethical meaning of death. He maintains that all materialist philosophy is helpless in the face of the tragedy of death: "Инфантильная философия марксизма не додумалась до мысли о смерти." This, he continues, has special consequences: "Как бы ни была задавлена личность в коллективизме, личное горе и личный трагизм имеют для нее абсолютное значение. Отсюда невероятное количество самоубийств в коммунизме и притом со стороны лиц, наиболее значительных и талантливых." (Vyšeslavcev 1932, 289; here and below I have modernized his orthography, S. W.) The observation

¹²¹Vyšeslavcev figures in Smirnov's discussion of "отказ Пастернака от кантианства" in *Ochrannaja gramota* and *Doktor Živago*: "Дистанцируясь от Фихте, Пастернак временно отмежевывал себя от марбуржца, учившегося у тех же, что и он, философов, Б. П. Вышеславцев, который защитил в 1914 г. в Московском университете магистерскую диссертацию на тему "Этика Фихте"" (Smirnov 1996, 60).

¹²²Here there are some minor departures from the text published in Pss 20; with respect to the passage quoted above they are as follows: "Поминание вечной памяти" instead of "Пожелание вечной памяти"; "этой цели" instead of "этой же цели"; "Как воскресает тогда каждое я" instead of "Как воскреснет тогда каждое я."

¹²³Vyšeslavcev's article in *Sovremennye zapiski* is followed immediately by Marina Cvetaeva's essay "Iskusstvo pri svete sovesti," one of her most important "theoretical" texts. In all likelihood, the journal was accessible to Pasternak during — if not before — his trip to Paris in 1935 (see, for example, Flejšman 1984, 236-67), when he also met Cvetaeva for the first time since their intense correspondence in the 1920s.

can be illustrated through Antipov-Strel'nikov and his fate in *Doktor Živago*. A suicide victim, he fulfills both criteria: as a Red commissar he occupies an important position, and his talent is emphasized repeatedly throughout the novel ("Так действовало присутствие одаренности," Živago notes, for example, during their meeting in the train car, 248). Marxism, however, is not only infantile but also has vulgar and *comical* pretensions: "Почему так пошло сказать, что смерть есть мелкобуржуазное явление? А потому, что отношение к смерти здесь выводится из социализма; тогда-как, наоборот, отношение к социализму должно выводиться из вопроса о смерти или бессмертии личности и человечества. Пошлость марксизма и даже его комизм состоит в извращении иерархии ценностей и иерархии идей." (Vyšeslavcev 1932, 290) The comical feature is touched upon in Pasternak's novel by Sima Tunceva in a conversation with Lara: "Что же касается до понимания жизни, до философии счастья, насаждаемой сейчас, просто не верится, что это говорится всерьез, такой это смешной пережиток." (407)

Vyšeslavcev comments on Dostoevskij's notes on the relationship of the individual to the collective ("я-все") as follows: "Здесь Достоевский с поразительной пронизательностью формулировал совершенно парадоксальный принцип христианской этики: *индивидуум и всеобщность равноценны*. Эта мысль была совершенно непонятна античному миру, была непонятна платоновскому коммунизму и остается непонятной коммунизму современному. Для них — личность никогда не может быть *равноценна* общине и государству." (Vyšeslavcev 1932, 301; italics in the original, S. W.) This historical perspective on the Christian idea of the individual's significance is absent from Dostoevskij's text, but may on the other hand be viewed as a pattern for Vedenjapin's (46) or Sima Tunceva's (407) reflections on the same theme. The parallel in Vyšeslavcev's article between the world-view of Antiquity and that of contemporary Communism is also drawn in Pasternak's novel in a semantic modeling of Moscow as ancient Rome.¹²⁴

Vyšeslavcev goes on to note of Dostoevskij: "В приводимом отрывке выступает все философское величие Достоевского. Всегда и везде он философствует из глубины *трагического конфликта*. Всякую другую спокойную и успокоительную философию он называет 'пищеварительной'

¹²⁴See, for example, Masing-Delić 1989, who maintains that both capitalism and socialism in the novel are connected to the Roman theme and realize different aspects of it. A feature they have in common, however, is their view of the individual: "These two models together constitute the Janus-face of Roman history then. Opposed to each other as the two models seem to be, they nevertheless rest on a common 'neck.' This 'neck' or common base may be found in the contempt for the individual, shared by both models" (Masing-Delić 1989, 373).

философией.” (Vyšeslavcev 1932, 290; italics in the original, S. W.) One representative of this type of ‘digestive’ philosophy in *Doktor Živago* is the radical Voskoboynikov, who lends a purely literal realization to the notion: to Vedenjapin’s historico-philosophical exposition Voskoboynikov replies: “Метафизика, батенька. Это мне доктора запретили, этого мой желудок не варит.” (14)¹²⁵ Vedenjapin’s teleological philosophy of history, which emphasizes the creative aspects of evolution (“А что такое история? Это установление вековых работ по последовательной разгадке смерти и ее будущему преодолению. Для этого открывают математическую бесконечность и электромагнитные волны, для этого пишут симфонии”, *ibid.*) is reminiscent of Vyšeslavcev’s argument: “История человечества есть тоже развитие, но творческое, такое, которое ставит себе вопрос: во что человечество желает развиваться? Это творческое развитие содержит в себе особую творческую идею бессмертия. <...> Вот это есть особое бессмертие через творческий идеал, специально христианское динамическое бессмертие, не даруемое, а создаваемое усилием, бессмертие через конечную цель, бессмертие ‘в конце концов.’” (Vyšeslavcev 1932, 300)¹²⁶

3.3.1 *The Memory Theme and the Slanting Rays of Sun in Brat’ja Karamazovy*

The memory theme appears in *Brat’ja Karamazovy* in connection with a specific image, namely the setting sun and its slanting rays. The motif in Dostoevskij’s œuvre has been observed and discussed elsewhere,¹²⁷ but not directly as a vehicle — or emblem — of this theme. Let me give a few examples of this connection in *Brat’ja Karamazovy* and then show the relationship in *Doktor Živago* as well.

¹²⁵In the same passage, Vyšeslavcev speaks of death as “великий метафизик”: “она считается только с метафизическими сущностями и с метафизическими проблемами <...> И она каждого делает метафизиком <...>.” He also states that “Пред нею становятся бессмысленными иные проблемы, и особенно проблема производства и распределения”; Vedenjapin and Voskoboynikov are working on the proofs of the latter’s book “по земельному вопросу,” from which Vedenjapin reads aloud: “Жизненным нервом проблемы пауперизма,” “Между тем статистика смертей и рождений показывает” (12). On Vedenjapin versus Voskoboynikov, see Rowland & Rowland 1968, 23-27, who note that the book “inevitably suggests the basis of Lenin’s blueprint for the Bolshevik New Order.”

¹²⁶Vedenjapin’s philosophy of history also has affinities with Berdjaev’s work *Smysl istorii: opyt filosofii čelovečeskoj sud’by*, and, as B. Gasparov (1989) notes, with Fedorov’s philosophy. On possible prototypes for Vedenjapin, see Lavrov 1992; he concludes that Vedenjapin’s portrait may be a conglomerate of different representatives of the Russian religious renaissance, but he does not mention Vyšeslavcev. On Berdjaev in connection with *Doktor Živago*, see also Stepun 1959, 205.

¹²⁷See, Durylin 1928; Drouilly 1974; Catteau 1989, 428-434; Børtnes 1993, 187.

The image is introduced in the chapter entitled “Tretij syn Aleša,” in Aleša’s early memories of his mother, Sof’ja Ivanovna, whom Fedor Pavlovič Karamazov calls a “кликуша”:

Кстати, я уже упоминал про него, что, оставшись после матери всего лишь по четвертому году, он запомнил ее потом на всю жизнь, ее лицо, ее ласки, “точно как будто она стоит предо мной живая”. Такие воспоминания могут запоминаться (и это всем известно) даже и из более раннего возраста, даже с двухлетнего, но лишь выступая всю жизнь как бы светлыми точками из мрака, как бы вырванным уголком из огромной картины, которая вся погасла и исчезла, кроме этого только уголочка. Так точно было и с ним: он запомнил один вечер, летний, тихий, отворенное окно, косые лучи заходящего солнца (косые-то лучи и запомнились всего более), в комнате в углу образ, пред ним зажженную лампадку, а пред образом на коленях рыдающую как в истерике, со взвизгиваниями и вскрикиваниями, мать свою, схватившую его в обе руки, обнявшую его крепко до боли и молящую за него богородицу, протягивающую его из объятий своих обеими руками к образу как бы под покров богородице... и вдруг вбегает нянька и вырывает его у нее в испуге. Вот картина! Алеша запомнил в тот миг и лицо своей матери: он говорил, что оно было иступленное, но прекрасное, судя по тому, сколько мог он припомнить. Но он редко кому любил поверять это воспоминание. (Pss 14:18)¹²⁸

This passage, which is saturated with memory semantics (nine words relating to memory in six sentences), establishes the connection between the slanting rays of the setting sun and the memory theme.¹²⁹ The same childhood memory, with an even clearer accentuation of the slanting sunbeams, figures later in the novel as a possible reason behind Aleša’s decision to enter a monastery: “Из воспоминаний его младенчества <...> Может быть, подействовали и косые лучи заходящего солнца пред образом, к которому его протягивала его кликуша-мать.” (Pss 14, 25)

The link is subsequently reinforced by the biography of the elder Zosima as recorded by Aleša (“Russkij inok”). Zosima tells about his consumptive brother Markel and the marvelous change the latter undergoes during the last days of his life: from an irritable atheist he is transformed into a preacher of a doctrine that has Franciscan undertones.¹³⁰ One scene in particular has engraved itself in Zosima’s memory:

¹²⁸On possible sources of this text, see Belknap 1989, 89-109.

¹²⁹The significance of this connection is also suggested by its being present already at an early stage in the genesis of the novel, as is evident from Dostoevskij’s manuscript note: “Может быть, 4-х лет воспомина<ние>, луч солнца, амвон и мать” (Pss 15, 200).

¹³⁰Cf.: “Птички божии, птички радостные, простите и вы меня, потому что и пред вами я согрешил” (Pss 14, 263); Berdjaev associates Zosima himself with Francis: “Можно было бы тут искать черт сходства со Св. Франциском Ассиским, религиозным гением, выходящим за пределы официальных образцов святости. Но земля Умбрии очень отличается от русской земли и на них произрастают разные цветы.” (Berdjaev 1923, 214-215; orthography revised by me, S. W.)

Помню, однажды вошел я к нему один, когда никого у него не было. Час был вечерний, ясный, солнце закатывалось и всю комнату осветило косым лучом. Поманил он меня, увидав, подошел я к нему, взял он меня обеими руками за плечи, глядит мне в лицо умиленно, любовно; ничего не сказал, только поглядел так с минуту: “Ну, говорит, ступай теперь, играй, живи за меня!” Вышел я тогда и пошел играть. А в жизни потом много раз припоминал уже со слезами, как он велел жить за себя. (Pss 14, 263)

In this context the memory theme is elevated to a metalevel: it is here that Zosima discusses the significance of “драгоценные воспоминания,” the earliest childhood memories and experiences of reading religious works mentioned above. One important factor here is the transformative power of memory: a valuable memory has the potential to change a person morally. This idea is at the same time realized in the work: in the story of Zosima’s life, the memory of his dying brother Markel becomes a transformative memory of a man’s transformation.

Yet another childhood memory that evidently has the same effect is a visit to a church that is described in detail a page later. Here as well, the sun and its rays play a central role:

Но и до того еще как читать научился, помню, как в первый раз посетило меня некоторое проникновение духовное, еще восьми лет от роду. Повела матушка меня одного (не помню, где был тогда брат) во храм господень, в страстную неделю в понедельник к обедне. День был ясный, и я, вспоминая теперь, точно вижу вновь, как возносился из кадила фимиам и тихо восходил вверх, а сверху в куполе, в узенькое окошечко, так и льются на нас в церковь Божьи лучи, и восхося к ним волнами, как бы таял в них фимиам (Pss 14, 264).

This memory is associated with a *text* (“и принял я тогда в душу первое семя слова Божия осмысленно”), namely the story of Job, which Zosima retells and comments upon. He develops the philosophy that Aleša will later adopt as his own and express in his speech at the stone, where he speaks of memory as transforming suffering and giving it meaning. At the same time, in Zosima’s summarizing formulation the connection between the memory theme and the sun becomes extremely clear:

“Да как мог бы он, казалось, возлюбить этих новых [children, S. W.], когда тех прежних нет, когда тех лишился? Вспоминая тех, разве можно быть счастливым в полноте, как прежде, с новыми, как бы новые ни были ему милы?” Но можно, можно: старое горе великою тайной жизни человеческой переходит постепенно в тихую умиленную радость; вместо юной кипучей крови наступает кроткая ясная старость: благословляю восход солнца ежедневный, и сердце мое по-прежнему поет ему, но уже более люблю закат его, длинные косые лучи его, а с ними тихие, кроткие, умиленные воспоминания, милые образы из всей долгой и благословенной жизни — а надо всем-то правда божия, умиляющая, примиряющая, всепрощающая! (Pss 14, 265)

Thus Aleša's and Zosima's significant — and in different respects decisive — memories appear in the novel as though they were threaded on the rays of the sun.

Before proceeding to the memory theme in Pasternak's novel, I will dwell upon a couple of details in Živago's portrait that link him to Zosima and Markel, the characters who together with Aleša are most closely associated with the theme in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*.

Zosima dies of heart failure: "Он вдруг почувствовал как бы сильнейшую боль в груди, побледнел и крепко прижал руки к сердцу" (Pss 14, 294); Živago — whose name, among many other things, may be seen as a translation to Church Slavonic of the Greek word "zosimos" ('living') upon which Zosima is based¹³¹ — dies from the same disease (having lived out his last days in a room that has in effect served as a hermit's cell): "и вдруг ощутил небывалую, непоправимую боль внутри и понял, что сорвал что-то в себе, что он наделал что-то роковое и что все пропало" (484). In the doctor's self-diagnosis — "Плохо мое дело. Это аорта. Первые предупреждения наследственности со стороны бедной мамочки, пожизненной сердечницы. Неужели правда? Так рано? *Не долгий я в таком случае жилец на белом свете*" (280) — we can hear an echo of Markel, who also predicts his own end: "Впрочем, и сам уже знал, что давно нездоров, и еще за год пред тем проговорил раз за столом мне и матери хладнокровно: '*Не жилец я на свете меж вами, может, и года не проживу*', и вот словно и напроорочил"; the same expression occurs in the doctor's comment to their mother: "*Не жилец он на свете, ваш сын*" (Pss 14, 261-262).¹³² The presence of "матушка" and "доктор" in Dostoevskij's novel can be said to correspond to "бедная мамочка" and the doctor (implicitly as the subject of the direct speech and metonymically through the medicinal terminology: "это аорта") in *Doktor Živago*. Thus traits from both Zosima (actual death) and Markel (predicted death) are incorporated into Živago's biography in addition to the elements I have earlier related to Aleša.¹³³ In fact, this "synthesis" underscores an essential feature of

¹³¹Linnér (1975, 166) notes the significance of Zosima's name in Dostoevskij's novel: "A network of threads, most of which are invisible to the actors themselves, bind the Karamazovian life-problems to Zosima's figure and teaching. Dostoevskij indicates the connection in the very name he gives his starets, which is related etymologically to the Greek *zosimos*, 'living.'" The name Zosima may in Pasternak's novel echo in *Sima* Tunceva, whose philosophy unites her with Vedenjapin, Živago and Lara.

¹³²Livingstone (1989, 68) links Živago's "tendency to happiness" and "gratitude for existence" to Markel and his deathbed sermon on the immanent paradise; she assumes that "Pasternak may have remembered this when he gave one of his characters the unusual name 'Markel.'" (Markel is the Gromeko/Živago family's doorman and the father of Marina, the last woman in Živago's life.)

Brat'ja Karamazovy with respect to the interrelationship of these characters. Psychologically and ideationally they constitute a trinity: Markel transforms Zosima, who in turn transforms Aleša. They are all representatives of a kind of life-affirming Christian ideal.¹³⁴

There is another allusion to Zosima's — and Aleša's — biography in the mention of “ускорение тления” and “источение запаха” in the portrayal of the dead Živago. It is said of the flowers around the coffin: “Они не просто цвели и благоухали, но как бы хором, может быть, ускоряя этим тление, источали свой запах и, оделяя всех своей душистою силой, как бы что-то совершали” (486). In a very compressed form, these remarks represent the action in the central chapter “Tletvornyj duch,” which describes Zosima's death and the following universal expectation of a miracle that becomes a disaster for Aleša, when, instead of giving off “благоухание,” the body begins to decay unusually rapidly.

Incidentally, this episode is brought up by Ol'ga Frejdenberg in her last letter to Pasternak (on 17 November 1954) when commenting on his nomination for the Nobel Prize:

Я горда и счастлива твоим высоким оптимизмом. В тебе сидит старец Зосима и дышит с тобой светом вечности. Боже, как это хорошо у Достоевского, что все ждут чуда при “успении” Зосимы, а его тело “пропахивает” и прованивает еще быстрее, чем у всех грешников. Соблазн получается полный; даже Алеша отказывается от своего учителя. Высокое через смердящее! Максимум света и богооткровения через “дни нашей жизни” и тлен. (Perepiska 326)¹³⁵

Thus Frejdenberg describes *Brat'ja Karamazovy* in the same terms several commentators have used to characterize *Doktor Živago*.¹³⁶

¹³³When describing the relationship between *Detstvo Ljuvers* and *Netočka Nezvanova*, Greber (1988, 65) uses the term “condensation.”

¹³⁴For a compositional analysis of the biographical section of Zosima's sermon, see Eikeland 1994; the three different “ethopoetical speeches” she distinguishes here all center on a “spiritual transformation or metamorphosis.”

¹³⁵During this period Pasternak's work on the novel had reached its final phase (see the letter to Markova, 26 June 1955 (Perepiska 330-331)). Frejdenberg died in July 1955; E. B. Pasternak (1989, 624) identifies traces of her death in the novel: “Писавшиеся в те дни страницы эпилога окрашены горечью этой потери и верой в творческое бессмертие духа.”

¹³⁶Cf., for example: “everyday reality is elevated to the symbolic realm” (Lönqvist 1993, 182). The principle is in fact declared in the novel in Vedenjapin's thoughts on the Gospels: “а для меня самое главное то, что Христос говорит притчами из быта, поясняя истину светом повседневности” (45); Børtnes' (1994, 363) comment on this passage suggests that we have to do with a typologically determined feature: “Расхождение между ‘приниженностью’ формы и ‘возвышенностью’ содержания всегда считалось отличительной чертой христианского учения.”

3.3.2 The Memory Theme and the Slanting Rays of Sun in Doktor Živago

In one of the first articles to discuss affinities between Pasternak and Dostoevskij, Dmitry Felix Grigorieff (1959, 339) notes: "By their particular way of describing nature and emphasizing certain of its aspects in relation to man's inner life ('sticky little leaves,' 'slanting rays of sunset,' 'flowers which compensated for the absence of ritual') Dostoevskij and Pasternak asserts the ontological unity of the whole created world."

However, Grigorieff provides no concrete illustrations of his observation; it is also unclear whether he really means that the things mentioned by him are common to both writers or that these things are simply related phenomena. Some of them have been noticed by other scholars,¹³⁷ but the slanting rays of the sun have so far not attracted any interest.

But the sunsets in *Doktor Živago* really seem to be charged with special significance. They are often associated with the memory theme, with the motif of farewell and separation, and with a state of change/transformation ("преображение"). One scene in which this is particularly clear takes place while Živago is a prisoner of the partisans:

В лесу было еще много непожелтевшей зелени. В самой глубине он почти весь еще был свеж и зеленел. *Низившееся послеобеденное солнце пронизывало его сзади своими лучами. Листья пропускали солнечный свет и горели с изнанки зеленым огнем прозрачного бутылочного стекла.* (339)¹³⁸

As in *Brat'ja Karamazovy* the image is linked to childhood, and the situation is marked by an element of change/transformation ("преображение"). Živago himself is literally pierced by the sun and the entire scene leads to a kind of materialization of Živago's most consequential memory — that of Lara:

Юрий Андреевич с детства любил *сквозящий огнем зари вечерний лес*. В такие минуты точно и он *пропускал сквозь себя эти столбы света*. Точно дар живого духа потоком входил в его грудь, пересекал все его существо и парой крыльев выходил из-под лопаток наружу. Тот юношеский первообраз, который на всю жизнь складывается у каждого и потом навсегда служит и кажется ему его внутренним лицом, его личностью, во всей первоначальной силе пробуждался в нем и заставлял природу, лес, *вечернюю зарю* и все видимое *преобразаться* в такое же первоначальное и всеохватывающее подобие девочки. "Лара!" — закрыв глаза, полусшептал или мысленно обращался он ко всей

¹³⁷"Klejkie listočki" in Pasternak's works, especially in the poem "Vesna," has been connected repeatedly with Dostoevskij, see, for example, Gifford 1977, 42; Smirnov 1983, 286; Faryno 1988, 181; *Doktor Živago* has also been discussed in this context (Faryno 1992a). For an analysis of "Pasternak's aesthetic principles of wholeness in life and in the world" and especially its implications for *Doktor Živago*, see Bodin 1990 (who does not mention Dostoevskij).

¹³⁸Lekić (1983) analyses this chapter (11:7) in her study of how an image, "the autumn forest," has found its way into the novel from two of Pasternak's earlier sketches.

своей жизни, ко всей божьей земле, ко всему расстилавшемуся перед ним, солнцем озаренному пространству. (Ibid.)¹³⁹

It is also a sunset — one of the most magnificent in Russian literature — that serves as the background as Lara leaves Varykino together with Komarovskij to disappear forever from Živago's life (444-447). A characteristic feature here is the anthropomorphization of the sunbeams: "Доктор почти отмахивался от этой осязаемой красоты часа, как от толпы навязывающихся сострадателей, почти готовый шептать лучам дотягивавшейся до него зари: 'Спасибо. Не надо'" (446). The contact thus established between the rays and Živago corresponds to Durylin's description of the role of the sunrays in Dostoevskij's novels: "всегда у Достоевского любимый 'косой луч' непременно окажется самым прямым и деятельным участником в судьбах и делах людей, станет их другом, помощником, утешителем или укорителем" (Durylin 1928, 167).

In this scene Lara becomes, in a very concrete sense, the focal point for the semantics of sun and memory. First, she glides together with the setting sun in a phrase that Živago has taken from the repertoire of fixed expressions in folklore (*byliny, pričitanija*): "Закатилось мое солнце ясное" — повторяло и утверждало что-то внутри его." Then, she is given an epithet that makes her a *personified memory*: "Прелесть моя незабвенная!" Quite in keeping with the principle formulated earlier, the loss of Lara becomes a creative impulse; her memory is transformed in Živago's thoughts into art. At the same time, the process itself — the aestheticization of memory — is commented upon in a singular image of the memory possessed by the *body*, by the *place*, and by writing as a concrete, physical *trace*:

Пока тебя *помнят* вгибы локтей моих, пока еще ты на руках и губах моих, я побуду с тобой. Я выплачу *память* о тебе в нежном, нежном, щемяще печальном изображении. Я останусь тут, пока этого не сделаю. А потом и сам уеду. Вот как я изображу тебя. Я положу черты твои на бумагу, как после страшной бури, взрывающей море до основания, ложатся на песок следы сильнейшей, дальше всего доплескивавшейся волны. Ломаной извилистой линией накидывает море пемзу, пробку, ракушки, водоросли, самое легкое и невесомое, что оно могло поднять со дна. (446)¹⁴⁰

It is significant that the novel ends with a scene of sunset — which, moreover, demonstrates one of the chief ideas in its treatment of the memory theme. Several years after Živago's death, Gordon and Dudorov meet one evening to

¹³⁹For an analysis of this scene, see Chapter 4 below.

¹⁴⁰For a discussion of Živago's writing in relation to the water theme in the novel, see Lönnqvist 1993. Karlinskij (1989, 51-52) notes that the marine realia in Živago's thoughts about how to portray Lara include specific elements from Cvetaeva's poem "S morja"; Marina Cvetaeva's "presence" in *Doktor Živago* is also discussed by Polivanov 1992.

read and discuss his poems and to *remember* (the memory aspect is emphasized by the note that they knew them 'by heart'). The scene can be regarded as an illustration of Živago's own view of immortality realized as memory, as an individual's 'life in others.' But it also points to the special circumstances that obtain when this individual happens to be an artist and can extend immortality to a life in the work¹⁴¹ — which, however, is real only so long there are readers such as Gordon and Dudorov.

Above I associated the notion of memory as 'life in others' with Aleša Karamazov and his speech at the stone. In the final scene of *Doktor Živago* we are reminded of Aleša by a number of specific elements from his early memory of his mother — through which the link between the image of the sun and the memory theme is established in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*:

Прошло пять или десять лет, и однажды тихим летним вечером сидели они опять, Гордон и Дудоров, где-то высоко у раскрытого окна над необозримой вечерней Москвою. Они перелистывали составленную Евграфом тетрадь Юрьевых писаний, не раз ими читанную, половину которой они знали наизусть. Читавшие перекидывались замечаниями и предавались размышлениям. К середине чтения стемнело, им стало трудно разбирать печать, пришлось зажечь лампу. (510)

Consider Aleša's childhood memory:

он запомнил один вечер, летний, тихий, отворенное окно, косые лучи заходящего солнца (косые-то лучи и запомнились всего более), в комнате в углу образ, пред ним зажженную лампадку (Pss 14, 18).¹⁴²

Corresponding to the sacred in Dostoevskij's scene with its "образ" are the Biblical connotations surrounding Živago's writings, "тетрадь Юрьевых писаний," leading to notions such as "тетраевангелие," "Книги Священного писания" etc. Compiled by Evgraf, they are a kind of "Gospel according to Jurij."¹⁴³

¹⁴¹Cf. the lecture "Simvolizm i bessmertie" (1913) as summarized by Pasternak in "Ljudi i položenija": "хотя художник, конечно, смертен, как все, счастье существования, которое он испытал, бессмертно и в некотором приближении к личной и кровной форме его первоначальных ощущений может быть испытано другими спустя века после него по его произведениям" (BP4, 320).

¹⁴²Belknap's (1990, 98-100) observations on the same element in various Dostoevskij texts suggest that it is a kind of invariant; it may therefore function synecdochally as an allusion to Dostoevskij's work as a whole. Cf. Smirnov's (1985, 153) comments on the Dostoevskij elements in Pasternak's poem "Poëzija": "Объединяя реалии, взятые из двух произведений Достоевского, Пастернак вкладывает в эти предметы один и тот же виталистический смысл и тем самым намекает на инвариантную для прозы Достоевского тему невычислимой, непредсказуемой и не подлежащей досрочному обрыву 'живой жизни.'"

¹⁴³Jensen (1997, 104) relates the final scene to the children's reading of the Bible at the end of H. C. Andersen's *Snow Queen*.

The only work that the reader becomes acquainted with *in extenso* is Živago's poetry, which may be described as a single long quotation incorporated into the novel as its seventeenth and concluding part. There is an intricate network of links between the prose and poetry parts¹⁴⁴ and this applies also to the image of the slanting rays of the sun. It introduces the poem "Avgust,"¹⁴⁵ the events of which are, characteristically enough, connected with the Transfiguration, "Преображение господне" (as we have seen, there is an element of "преображение" in solar contexts in both Dostoevskij and Pasternak):

Как обещало, не обманывая,
Проникло солнце утром рано
Косою полосой шафрановою
От занавеси до дивана.

Оно покрыло жаркой охрою
Соседний лес, дома поселка,
Мою постель, подушку мокрую
И край стены за книжной полкой.

Several elements in "Avgust" relate to what was noted above in connection with the solar imagery in the novel: the memory theme, the farewell/separation motif, the anthropomorphization of the rays of the sun. Also, the memory theme here includes a kind of dialogue with the opening of the novel — the funeral procession and singing of "Večnaja pamjat":

Я вспомнил, по какому поводу
Слегка увлажнена подушка.
Мне снилось, что ко мне на проводы
Шли по лесу вы друг за дружкой.

Вы шли толпою, врозь и парами,
Вдруг кто-то вспомнил, что сегодня
Шестое августа по-старому,
Преображение Господне.

We are here dealing with a morning sun rather than an evening sun, which in turn can be regarded as a kind of concrete 'continuation' of Dostoevskij; as Durylin (1928, 194) notes in his discussion of the polysemy of the sun symbol in Dostoevskij's work: "солнце заката, тихое и преклонное, есть вместе и солнце восхода: единое солнце." The scene in the poem is reminiscent of two charged awakenings in Dostoevskij's work, one in *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, the other in *Besy*, both connected with the image of slanting rays of sun. In the former Raskol'nikov is shown coming to his senses after his illness:

¹⁴⁴See my analysis in 4.3 below.

¹⁴⁵Other, less marked, occurrences of the sun are seen in the poems "Ob"jasnenie" (516), "Svad'ba" (519), "Roždestvenskaja zvezda" (530, 532; note also there: "Он спал, весь сияющий, в яслях из дуба, Как месяца луч в углубленье дупла").

“Произошло это утром, в десять часов. В этот час утра, в ясные дни, *солнце всегда длинною полосой проходило по его правой стене и освещало угол подле двери*” (Pss 6, 92);¹⁴⁶ in the latter, Stavrogin describes in his confession (in the deleted chapter “U Tichona”) how he woke up after his utopian dream of the Greek archipelago: “Всё это ощущение я как будто прожил в этом сне; я не знаю, что мне именно снилось, но скалы, и море, и косые лучи заходящего солнца — всё это я как будто еще видел, когда проснулся и раскрыл глаза, в первый раз в жизни *буквально омоченные слезами*. Ощущение счастья, еще мне неизвестного, прошло сквозь сердце мое даже до боли. Был уже полный вечер; в окно моей маленькой комнаты *сквозь зелень стоящих на окне цветов прорывался целый пук ярких косых лучей заходящего солнца обливал меня светом*.” (Pss 11, 21-22)¹⁴⁷

One of the stanzas in the poem alludes specifically to *Brat'ja Karamazovy*, more precisely, to the crucial event in Aleša's spiritual biography: the transformation, or “новое рождение” (Berdjaev), that he undergoes after Zosima's death and his temptation in connection with the odor of the corpse.¹⁴⁸ After his vision in the monastery cell (of the wedding in Canaan) — where Zosima uses the symbol of the sun in a direct allusion to Christ (“А видишь ли солнце наше, видишь ли ты его?”, Pss 14, 327) — outside the building Aleša has a sudden sensation of wholeness of being and oneness with the universe, and he falls to his knees and kisses the earth, weeping. His experience of this meaningful wholeness is presented through the following image: “Осенние роскошные цветы в клумбах около дома заснули до утра. Тишина земная как бы сливалась с небесною, тайна земная соприкасалась со звездною...” (Pss 14, 328) “Avgust” contains the same image in its description of the trees in the cemetery, “имбирно-красный лес кладбищенский”: “С притихшими его вершинами Сосеждествовало небо важно, И голосами петушиными Перекликалась даль протяжно.” (525) The voice heard in the poem, “То прежний голос мой пророческий Звучал, нетронутый распадом” may be

¹⁴⁶Smirnov (1985, 41) discusses this passage in connection with the Venice chapter in *Och-rannaja gramota*.

¹⁴⁷Stavrogin's confession is relevant in this connection in several respects. First, it is a text that thematizes memory and the process of memory; cf., for example “Занову это именно, чтобы доказать, до какой степени я мог властвовать над моими воспоминаниями и стал к ним бесчувствен” (Pss 11, 21); “Не само представляется, а я его [the memory, S. W.] сам вызываю и не могу не вызывать, хотя и не могу с этим жить.” (Ibid., 22) Second, Stavrogin's dream is itself an example of an “itinerant text”: Dostoevskij moves the scene from the deleted chapter in *Besy* to Versilov's dream in *Podrostok* (see the discussion in Durylin 1928, 188).

¹⁴⁸On this “рождение новой души,” see Berdjaev 1923, 215-217.

associated with the dead Zosima (closely connected with “распад” in the passage in the novel), whose voice Aleša thinks he hears in the cell: “Алеша глядел с полминуты на гроб, на закрытого, недвижимого, протянутого в гробу мертвеца <...> Сейчас только он слышал голос его, и голос этот еще раздавался в его ушах.” (Pss 14, 327)¹⁴⁹ The transformation episode in Dostoevskij’s novel is also relevant because of its strong connection with the memory theme: “И никогда, никогда не мог забыть Алеша во всю жизнь свою потом этой минуты.” (Pss 14, 328)

The poem’s mention of the bookshelf in connection with the image of the sun may be related to a special feature in Dostoevskij, namely the fact that the slanting rays of the sun appear especially strongly in memories of *situations involving reading* and can even be regarded as a kind of intertextuality marker. In *Netočka Nezvanova*, the protagonist remembers reading Walter Scott: “В комнате было ярко-светло от последних, косых лучей заходящего солнца, которые густо лились в высокие окна на сверкающий паркет пола” (Pss 2, 239).¹⁵⁰ In *Podrostok*, this circumstance appears in double exposure when Trišatov reminisces to Arkadij about reading *The Old Curiosity Shop* in the slanting rays of the sunset at the same time as the sun is setting in Dickens’ work as well: “И вот раз закатывается солнце, и этот ребенок на паперти собора, вся облитая последними лучами, стоит и смотрит на закат с тихим задумчивым созерцанием в детской душе <...> Мы сидели с ней на террасе, под нашими старыми липами, и читали этот роман, и солнце тоже закатывалось” (Pss 13, 353).¹⁵¹ Similarly, Pasternak himself relates a memory of his own reading in “Ljudi i položenija”: “Я хорошо помню. Лучи садившегося осеннего солнца бороздили комнату и книгу, которую я перелистывал. Вечер в двух видах заключался в ней. Один легким порозовением лежал на ее страницах. Другой составлял содержание и душу стихов, напечатанных в ней” (BP 4, 328; the writer he is reading is Achmatova, the text — ‘presumably *Podorožnik*’). It is almost as if the memory of Dostoevskij’s texts has shaped the memory of Pasternak’s own experience.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹There is a link between Zosima and the theological reference in the poem “Avgust” (“преображение”) in a manuscript note Dostoevskij made for Zosima’s speech: “Изменится плоть ваша. (Свет фаворский.) Жизнь есть рай, ключи у нас” (Pss 15, 245); for more on the note, see Hackel 1983, 152.

¹⁵⁰For a discussion of Walter Scott in connection with *Netočka Nezvanova* and *Detstvo Ljuvers*, see Greber 1998, 69-70.

¹⁵¹For an analysis of this scene, see Durylin 1928, 186-187.

¹⁵²Cf. also the memory of the deceased Tolstoj in the same work: “Садившееся солнце четырьмя наклонными снопами света пересекало комнату и крестило угол с телом крупной тенью оконных крестовин и мелкими, детскими крестиками вычертившихся елочек.” (BP4, 322)

3.3.3 The Image of the Sun and Sergej Durylin

One text that may have drawn Pasternak's attention to the image of the setting sun and its slanting rays in Dostoevskij's works is the study by Sergej Durylin (1886-1954) that I have cited several times above: "Ob odnom simvole u Dostoevskogo. Opyt tematičeskogo obzora," published in a collection of articles entitled *Dostoevskij* (Moscow, 1928).

Pasternak began a life-long friendship with Durylin already around 1910, when both men were members of Julian Anisimov's group "Serdarda," contributing to the literary calendar *Lirika*. In "Ljudi i položenija," Durylin is explicitly associated with Pasternak's entry into literature ("Это он переманил меня из музыки в литературу, по доброте своей сумев найти что-то достойное внимания в моих первых опытах," BP4, 317), and in his reminiscences of Pasternak Durylin himself touches on the same theme: "В 1927 году встретился я с ним после 5-летнего незнакомства на концерте Н. К. Метнера, и он мне первые же слова сказал: 'Сережа, ведь вы привели меня в литературу'. Это были слова — благодарности человека, который рад, что он там, где он есть теперь, ибо там — настоящее его место." (Pasternak & Fejnberg 1993, 58) The five-year long period of not seeing each other was probably due to Durylin's problems with the authorities in the 1920s. In 1918 he was ordained a priest together with Sergej Solov'ev, Valentin Sventickij, and Sergej Bulgakov, and in 1922 he was arrested for the first time. In the beginning of 1929, he was arrested once again and exiled 'to the north.' Flejšman (1981, 229) notes that the mention of Durylin in *Ochrannaja gramota* is a "диалог" с находящимся в ссылке и вычеркнутым из литературной жизни лицом." In fact, these lines in *Ochrannaja gramota* — which Durylin learned about in letters from friends while exiled in Tomsk — inspired him to write down his reminiscences of Pasternak (Raškovskaja 1988, 108). As can be seen from their extant correspondence between 1929 and 1952, this dialogue led to a renewal and deepening of their friendship.¹⁵³

In a letter of 27 January 1946, Pasternak writes about his work on the novel he has just begun and — in his idiosyncratic way — includes Durylin among its group of addressees: "Если я не сказал, что в числе немногих, для кого я в

¹⁵³ Both the correspondence and Durylin's memoir notes are in RGALI, fond S.N. Durylina, no. 3980, novoe postuplenie (Raškovskaja 1988, 110). An edition containing memoir materials, diary entries and notes was published in 1991 (Durylin 1991). Indicative of the relationship between the two men is the fact that in a letter of 20 June 1945, Pasternak asked Durylin to edit and write a foreword to an edition of his Shakespeare translations prepared for publication by Goslitizdat. At the same time he suggested that he write an article for *Literaturnaja gazeta* on the collection *Zemnoj prostor*, which in fact Durylin did. The article, however, was refused by the editors. For a more detailed discussion, see Raškovskaja 1988, who also publishes the article in its entirety.

данные дни пишу свою вещь, я пишу ее для тебя, то только оттого, что это, верно, выше моих сил и я этого сказать не смею” (cited in Raškovskaja 1988, 109). Although Durylin never read the finished text of *Doktor Živago*, his approving and incisive judgment of its first part has been preserved in a 1949 letter (Raškovskaja 1988, 109, 114-15). After his friend’s death in 1954, Pasternak expressed in a letter to the widow the same sense of spiritual indebtedness which permeates the passages dealing with Durylin in both autobiographies: “Я очень любил Сережу и в далеком прошлом, когда закладывались основания нашей будущей жизни, многим обязан ему” (15 November 1955, cited in Raškovskaja 1992, 243). Durylin’s death drew Pasternak’s attention to a biography that had many points in common with his own: “На Дурылине сходились многие темы пастернаковской творческой судьбы: его постоянный возврат к юности, интерес к драматургии и театру, нарастание духовного напряжения в творчестве, ощущение нравственного обязательства перед страдающим безвинно” (Raškovskaja 1992, 244).

In his article, Durylin does not address the “slanting rays of the sun” as part of a memory theme, but he does bring up, in concentrated form, a number of contexts in Dostoevskij’s work in which this link is implicit, as for example in his discussion of Trišatov’s portrait (Durylin 1928, 187). He also notes the connection between solar symbolism and situations of *existential transformation*: “Решающий момент времени, некий узловый час жизни, здесь символически совпадает с часом закатным” (ibid., 168); “Человек видит *по-новому*: ‘новый взгляд, новые мысли’ <...> Бытие может явить совсем иную историческую и бытовую действительность” (ibid., 171; italics in the original, S. W.).

Durylin’s summarizing description of the “символ заката и косых лучей” in Dostoevskij is of particular interest: “Во всех аспектах он оказывается эстетически прекрасным, действенным и творчески оправданным. Выражая *realiora*, он не умаляет ничем *realia*” (ibid., 196). Here he touches upon a subject that very much occupied Pasternak — and that the two friends discussed: the question of realism in art.¹⁵⁴ In a letter to Pasternak apropos of his article “Šopen” and the poem “Pamjati Mariny Cvetaevoj” Durylin reflects on the notion of realism in terms that connect to the Dostoevskij article: “У тебя слово ‘реализм’ в приложении к Шопену опять освежает, начинает пахнуть бытием, а не затхлой комнатой в современной редакции... Когда говорят о реализме, всегда вспоминаю Вячеслава Иванова с его

¹⁵⁴The article also begins with a discussion of Dostoevskij’s realism, in which, according to Durylin (1928, 164) “метод символизма служит орудием в руках реалиста.”

излюбленной формулой: 'A realibus ad realiora'. 'Реальное' всегда понимается как покорно и покойно пребывающее в своей раз и навсегда отмеренной и измеренной области: отсюда и досюда. А между тем, оно неизменно, это 'реальное' и несовместимо ни с какой исчерпанностью и ограниченностью пределов. 'Реальное' всегда со знаком бесконечности, неисчерпаемости, продолжаемости, *ad infinitum*." (July 1945, cited in Raškovskaja 1992, 242) Durylin's positive definition of "реальное" as an aesthetic category can also be associated with the central position of the category "быт" in Pasternak's poetics (see, for example, Lotman 1969, 228; Erlich 1978a, 18; Livingstone 1978, 166; Taranovsky 1981; M. Gasparov 1990b; B. Gasparov 1994). As Taranovsky (1981, 340-41) emphasizes, in the prose work "Povest'" (1929) Pasternak himself provides a description of the creative process which includes this aspect: the sources of creation are defined as "общенье восторга с обиходом." In *Doktor Živago* (subtitled for a time *Kartiny poluvekovogo obichoda*),¹⁵⁵ the significance of "быт" is emphasized in Vedenjapin's thoughts on the Gospels ("а для меня самое главное то, что Христос говорит притчами из быта, поясняя истину светом повседневности", 44-45), which, as noted above, may apply to the novel itself as well.¹⁵⁶

Flejšman (1981, 228) connects Durylin — who in his youth was deeply influenced by St. Francis of Assisi and at the time of "Serdarda" and *Lirika* contributed to several publications devoted to the saint — with the origin of *Sestra moja žizn'*: "Можно предположить, что концепция сборника Пастернака 'Сестра моя жизнь', в названии которого Г. Гиффорд уловил переключку с 'Гимном солнцу' Франциска Ассизского, складывалась в результате контактов с Дурылиным." After the above analysis of the sunset scenes in *Doktor Živago* as a kind of continuation of Dostoevskij, it seems reasonable to attribute to Durylin and his Dostoevskij article a similar status in relation to this aspect of the novel.¹⁵⁷ This connects the image of the sun with the memory theme on the metalevel as well — as a tribute to a friend and colleague.

¹⁵⁵Cf.: "The novel traces the fate of this generation to its end, and the result is a fifty-year history of Russia. The work's scope is reflected in the subtitle "Картинны полувекового обихода," which was written in pencil beneath the words "Doktor Živago" on a coversheet for a copy of the text destined for the printer. Pasternak uses the word "обиход" specifically, for it denotes not just ordinary aspects of life, but life in all its spiritual and cultural richness, encompassing art, culture, the Gospels, and man's place in history." (Lekić 1988, 185) The subtitle was removed as late as 1955 (Borisov & Pasternak 1988, 232).

¹⁵⁶For more on the significance of "byt" in *Doktor Živago*, see my article "Gastronomičeskaja metafizika Pasternaka" (Witt 2000b).

¹⁵⁷Lekić (1983, 6) connects Durylin with Vedenjapin's portrait in the novel, but bases herself on the incorrect assumption that Durylin "left the priesthood by his own wishes around 1903."

3.4 Biographical and Metabiographical

On 1 November 1910, Andrej Belyj delivered his paper “Tragedija tvorčestva u Dostoevskogo” to the Religious-Philosophical Society in Moscow.¹⁵⁸ In it he describes the tragic tensions between life and works that tear Russian geniuses apart, dwelling on this aspect in particular as it relates to Dostoevskij: “Мы ждем последней черты, чтобы признать в Достоевском пророка; но тут умирает сам Достоевский; и мы не знаем, кто Достоевский; и ‘Братья Карамазовы’ остается недоумением — большой дорогой в небо через безумие и ужас.” (Belyj 1971, 29) There is a strong feeling in the text of something being *unfinished* in Dostoevskij’s works.

It is clear from Konstantin Loks’ memoirs that Pasternak was an enthusiastic spectator at this event: “Я слушал, стоя в проходе и чувствуя, что возле меня кто-то, не безразличный мне. Оглянувшись, я прежде всего увидел глаза. Это было очень странно, но в тот момент я увидел только глаза стоявшего возле меня. В них была какая-то радостная и восторженная свежесть. Что-то дикое, детское и ликующее. Я припомнил фамилию и протянул руку. Мы уже встречались в кулуарах историко-философского факультета. То был Борис Леонидович Пастернак.” (Pasternak & Fejnberg 1993, 35) Pasternak’s perception of the lecture should probably be seen in relation to his “apprenticeship” to Belyj at this time, a relationship Lavrov describes in terms of a special kind of “подражание.”¹⁵⁹ Magnus Ljunggren (1982, 16-17) notes that *Brat’ja Karamazovy* had become particularly topical in Moscow in the autumn of 1910 thanks to the early November premiere of the dramatization of the novel at the Moscow Art Theater, and that Sergej Solov’ev also gave a lecture on the work for The Religious-Philosophical Society at about this time.¹⁶⁰ This means that *Brat’ja Karamazovy* was brought to Pasternak’s attention in various ways during a crucial period of his biography, a time to which Frejdenberg maintains he returns repeatedly in *Doktor Živago*.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸The lecture was published in an expanded version as *Tragedija tvorčestva: Dostoevskij i Tolstoj* (Moscow 1911; see Belyj 1971).

¹⁵⁹“Весь ‘роман с философией’, с ‘паломничеством’ к главе марбургской школы неокантианства Герману Когену для ‘младомусажетца’ Пастернака мог скрывать и дополнительный смысл: это был поступок правоверного ‘ученика’, опыт ‘подражания Белому’, руководителю ‘Мусагета’, — своеобразного эстетико-‘жизнетворческого’ подражания; до конца неосознанная, вероятно, попытка повторения пройденного Белым пути.” (Lavrov 1994, 45)

¹⁶⁰The date for Belyj’s lecture is, unfortunately, given incorrectly here as 21 November (M. Ljunggren 1982, 13).

¹⁶¹In a commentary to the novel’s poems published in 1954 in the journal *Znamja*, Frejdenberg writes: “мне показалось, что еще ни один цикл твоих стихов так не приближал тебя к твоим молодым началам, так не возвращал к Близнецам в тучах, словно ты шел по кругу и в наибольшем уходе от робкого вступлениья оказался, в своей зрелости, в двух шагах от своей юности <...> Хорошо, когда творец, подобно детскому воздуш-

With regard to Dostoevskij's and Pasternak's last great works there is a parallel which has left its mark in the biographical *self-reflection* of both writers. On 24 December 1877, just as he was beginning *Brat'ja Karamazovy*,¹⁶² Dostoevskij drew up a work plan for the rest of his life: "Memento. На всю жизнь. 1) Написать русского Кандида. 2) Написать книгу о Иисусе Христе. 3) Написать свои воспоминания. 4) Написать поэму 'Сороковины'. NB. (Все это, кроме последнего романа и предполагаемого издания 'Дневника', т.е. minimum на 10 лет деятельности, а мне теперь 56 лет.)" (Pss 17, 14)¹⁶³ Considering that Dostoevskij died three years later, this note (accessible to Pasternak in Grossman 1935, 268) further supports the notion that there is something unfinished in his oeuvre that leaves it open for a continuation. When Pasternak began his novel in 1945-1946, he was also precisely 56 years old, a fact he gives special attention in a letter to Frejdenberg of 5 October 1946. Here the novel figures under the title *Mal'čiki i devuški*, which as we have seen is associated with Dostoevskij: "А с июля месяца я начал писать роман в прозе "Мальчики и девочки", который в десяти главах должен охватить сорокалетие 1902-1946 г., и с большим увлечением написал четверть всего задуманного или пятую его часть. Это все очень серьезные работы. Я уже стар, скоро, может быть, умру, и нельзя до бесконечности откладывать свободного выражения настоящих своих мыслей. Занятия этого года — первые шаги на этом пути, — и они необычайны. Нельзя без конца и в тридцать, и в сорок, и в пятьдесят шесть лет жить тем, чем живет восьмилетний ребенок: пассивными признаками твоих способностей и хорошим отношением окружающих к тебе, — а вся жизнь прошла по этой вынужденно сдержанной программе." (Perepiska, 243)

In her study of Pasternak's and Dostoevskij's *first* novels, *Detsvo Ljuvers* and *Netočka Nezvanova*, Erika Greber defines their relationship as follows: "In this sense, DL is not an intertextual citation of Dostoyevsky's general poetics; rather, Pasternak projects his story back to one particular point in Dostoevsky's literary development. The two young authors are at the same threshold, trying to write their first novel" (Greber 1988, 73). As the above analysis has shown, this description may be apt also for the two authors' *last* novels.

ному шару, всегда привязан ниткой к своей молодости и к своему детству" (Perepiska, 321-322). This view is supported by Jensen's (1995, 1997) studies highlighting the significance of J. P. Jacobsen's *Niels Lyhne* and H. C. Andersen's *Snow Queen* in connection with *Doctor Živago*.

¹⁶²The earliest extant notes to the novel date to April 1878 (Pss 15, 411).

¹⁶³As observed by Thompson (1991, 319), all the points on the list are in some way related to *memory*. For more on their possible relation to *Brat'ja Karamazovy*, see Belknap 1990, 50-51.

3.5 Concluding Remarks

In a letter to Varlam Šalamov of 9 July 1952 Pasternak writes in a critical description of 1920s literature: “а Леонов считал, что можно быть последователем Достоевского, ограничиваясь внешней цветистостью якобы от него пошедшего слога” (BP5, 498). In Pasternak’s opinion, ‘following Dostoevskij’ evidently comprises something more or different than purely stylistic features. In the present study, I have found deeper connections that crystallize around a couple of main points at which *Doktor Živago* can be said to “continue” Dostoevskij, more specifically, *Brat’ja Karamazovy*.

On one level, both novels are stories about a process of articulation, a portrayal of the protagonists’ attempt to formulate an answer to the question they confront in their respective encounters with death. The answer given in *Brat’ja Karamazovy* is intimately connected with *memory*: through its transformative power memory gives meaning even to the death of a child. Markel’s death becomes meaningful through Zosima’s transformation; the good memory of Iljuša, whose figure literally dissolves in Aleša and the boys on the final pages of the novel, transforms and unites them forever (“Будем вечно помнить”). This would imply both a kind of immanent resurrection for Iljuša and a moral resurrection for the boys. Immortality realized as memory, as ‘life in others,’ is the idea Jurij Živago proposes in his first articulated attempt to answer the question, which, in his case, is posed by the dying Anna Ivanovna. It is also the answer he eventually *writes down* — in the poem “Svad’ba.” According to the definition Živago formulates for himself after his mother-in-law’s funeral, the poem, as a work of art, is already itself an answer (“ответ на опустошение”).

Writing itself also becomes a significant part of the articulation process for Aleša, who reports Zosima’s thoughts about memory and its meaning in his *Life* of the monk. Although Aleša shapes and structures Zosima’s words in such a way that he may be called “a literary artist,”¹⁶⁴ there is an essential difference between the two novels: In Dostoevskij the final remarks are *ethical* in nature, while in Pasternak they are *aesthetic*. Aleša’s articulated utterance, his speech at the stone, is a sermon, whereas Živago’s utterance consists of his poetry. Here we may speak of a *do-pisyvanie* with a stress on the second component; Živago continues Aleša’s work by *embodying* what his predecessor postulates.

¹⁶⁴Cf.: “Alyosha, then, has represented Zosima’s discourses as a literary artist, omitting all repartees which would have detracted from his ‘artistic picture’ of his elder <...> The *Life* is Alyosha’s own artistic composition which contains his selected words of Zosima and it is he who has shaped his notes into a *vita*, complete with hagiographical headings” (Thompson 1991, 96).

The image of the setting sun and its slanting rays, whose significance in the works of Dostoevskij may have been pointed out to Pasternak by his friend Durylin's article of 1928, is a vehicle for the memory theme in *Brat'ja Karamazovy*. The rays also beam down in *Doktor Živago*, they penetrate the protagonist during his partisan captivity and focus in the poem "Avgust," without losing their connection to this theme and to the transformative power with which memory is associated throughout in Dostoevskij. Emblematically, this power is expressed in the key word which links the episode in the forest with "Avgust," namely "преображение" (in the prose section represented by the verb "преображаться"). In the next chapter, I will address this topic looking at another aspect of creation in the novel — creation as mimicry.

Creation as Mimicry

Method is hidden in the style of the critical approach and does not become fully apparent until the journey is complete.

Jean Starobinski¹⁶⁵

4.1 Introduction: The Poem "Chmel'"

By way of an introduction I will briefly analyze the ninth of Jurij Živago's poems "Chmel'" ('Hopbines'). It is the shortest piece in the collection, a seemingly uncomplicated text which has attracted little scholarly attention. Nevertheless, it touches upon several factors that are central to the novel as a whole, particularly to the third aspect of creating that will be treated below.

Под раkitой, обвитой плющом,
От ненастья мы ищем защиты.
Наши плечи покрыты плащом,
Вкруг тебя мои руки обвиты.

Я ошибся. Кусты этих чащ
Не плющом перевиты, а хмелем.
Ну так лучше давай этот плащ
В ширину под собою расстелем.

The poem is about a kind of misreading. The first stanza presents a situation — a couple seeks shelter from inclement weather under a willow entwined with ivy — which in the second stanza turns out to contain a misinterpretation. The lyrical subject corrects himself: it was not ivy winding around the tree, but hops — a plant that connotes bacchanalia and inebriation (the word "хмель" in Russian has the dual meaning of 'hops' and 'intoxication'). Then there is a kind of adaptation to the new situation (the phrase "ну так лучше" implies a causal connection), in which the coat spread on the ground is a metonymical image of erotic intoxication.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁵Starobinski 1989, 114.

¹⁶⁶Cf. the erotic connotations of the word "покрыть" as reflected, for example, in the following saying: "Батюшка Покров, покрой мать сыру землю, и меня, молодую!" (Dal' III, 247). It displays in a more blasphemous form the same popular interpretation of the Feast of the Intercession of the Holy Virgin (Покров Пресвятой Богородицы, 1 October), as the beginning of the novel suggests in connection with Marija Nikolaevna's funeral: "Был канун Покрова <...> С неба оборот за оборотом бесконечными мотками падала на землю белая ткань, обвивая ее погребальными пеленами." (8)

"Misinterpretations" such as this also occur in the novel's prose section, where they are noted and commented upon by the narrator. Descriptions of objects or events prove suddenly to be unreliable and demand modifications or re-interpretations. One example is the writing scene at the hospital, where Živago, absorbed in his notes, thinks he sees large birds gliding past the windows — a moment later they turn out to be falling maple leaves: "Доктор поднял голову. Действительно, сновавшие мимо окна загадочные птицы оказались винно-огненными листьями клена" (184).¹⁶⁷ Another instance occurs during the doctor's train trip with the deaf-mute to Moscow: "У него под диваном валялось что-то вроде половой тряпки. Вдруг кончик ветошки зашевелился, и из-под дивана с хлопотливою вознею вылезла вислоухая легавая собака." (158) Such situations are in fact so frequent in the novel that the pattern may be regarded as one of the narrative principles of the text.¹⁶⁸ The work is marked by what might be called a "poetics of the second glance."¹⁶⁹

The obvious reason for these initial misinterpretations is that something *resembles* something else: hops resemble ivy, the leaves look like birds, the dog resembles a rag. But resemblance can also be an active process: the lyrical subject in "Chmel'" imitates the clinging plant by winding his arms around his beloved; just as the tree is covered with (what in this stanza is presumed to be) "плющ," the couple cover themselves with the rhyming "плащ" (which in turn phonetically and functionally echoes "защита"). Terminologically this case could be subsumed under the notion of parallelism. However, that does not capture the specific element in the relation, namely that what is simulated or imitated is something present and nearby. The context of the poem — the fact that the imitators are seeking shelter ("защита") — suggests instead a notion from the area of evolutionary biology that is given attention in the prose section of the novel: *mimicry* or "protective similarity." In a conversation with Lara, Živago declares his special interest in the subject: "Я помешан на вопросе о мимикрии, внешнем приспособлении организмов к окраске окружающей среды. Тут, в этом цветном подлаживании, скрыт удивительный переход внутреннего во внешнее." (402) The behavior of the couple in the new situation in the sec-

¹⁶⁷This feature undermines the narrator's credibility, especially since the transition between an omniscient perspective and the characters' point of view often is diffuse. On peculiarities in the point of view of the novel, see Ščeglov 1991.

¹⁶⁸For other examples, see Livingstone 1989, 90ff., who speaks of "integral errors."

¹⁶⁹This is my own term, but cf. in this connection Pasternak's formulation in a fragment of an unpublished article written in 1943: "Первоначальное ознакомление — развлечение, искусство начинается со вторичного узнавания." (Pasternak Archive, cited in Bodin 1976a, 136)

ond stanza of the poem can also be viewed from this perspective; the lovers “adapt” to their surroundings.

The fact that the main character of the novel is ‘obsessed’ with mimicry suggests that it may be a thematic complex of central significance to the work. If we agree with Boris Gasparov’s (1989, 343) opinion, that ‘that which is *mentioned* in the novel determines *how* the novel is written,’ an analysis from this perspective should be a particularly urgent task.¹⁷⁰ In the following analysis, I will try to show how the notion is connected with an aesthetic discussion: how mimicry in *Doktor Živago* verges on categories of creation and the consequences this may have for our interpretation of certain characteristic features of the work itself.

4.2 Mimicry in Doktor Živago

The scientific term “mimicry” was developed in 1862 by the English biologist Henry W. Bates in a study of Brazilian butterflies.¹⁷¹ Since then it has come to designate a biological phenomenon involving a form of resemblance between two or more organisms which are not closely related to each other, a similarity which has evolutionary causes: “This resemblance confers an advantage — such as protection from predation — upon one or both organisms through some kind of ‘information flow’ that passes between the organisms and the animate agent of selection. The agent of selection (which may be, for example, a predator, a symbiont, or the host of a parasite, depending on the type of mimicry encountered) interacts directly with the similar organisms and is deceived by their similarity” (*The New Encyclopaedia Britannica* 24, 144). The most important types of mimicry are *Bates’ mimicry*, where a defenseless organism acquires protection by emulating a poisonous species that signals its properties through warning colors; *Müller’s mimicry*, in which two or more unrelated and inedible species imitate each other to limit the number of individuals that fall prey to inexperienced predators; *aggressive mimicry*, which involves a predator imitating its prey or the food of its prey; and *automimicry*, where certain members of a species achieve advantages by imitating others of the same species. These are, however, very complicated processes that cannot always be described in such

¹⁷⁰Livingstone (1989, 79) notes that mimicry “is an important motif in *Doctor Zhivago*.” She provides some examples but does not elaborate much further. As for Pasternak’s other works, Masing-Delić, analysing the “wandering poems” in the Peredelkino cycle, uses the notion “the poetics of mimicry,” “which is based on the principle that what is difficult to discover proves to be the most rewarding once it is discovered by those who can discern living patterns in both nature and poetry, in the cosmos and in art.” (Masing-Delić 1991, 30 [translated from Swedish, S. W.])

¹⁷¹Henry W. Bates, *Contributions to an Insect Fauna of the Amazon Valley: Lepidoptera: Heliconidae*, (London, 1862).

simple terms: "The roles of mimic, model and receiver may be juxtaposed and multiplied to provide intricate and remarkable relationships, the unraveling of which may take years of study." (Ibid., 144-145)¹⁷²

The adaptation to the environment of which Živago speaks in his definition is, according to modern notions, considered not really mimicry but camouflage, another type of protective coloration that is distinguished from the former on semiotic grounds: "in mimicry the signals have a special significance for the receiver and for the sender, which has evolved the signals in order to be perceived by the receiver; in camouflage the sender seeks to avoid detection by the receiver through imitation of what is neutral background to the receiver." (Ibid., 144) However, this fact has no practical significance for my study which will be based on the understanding of the notion expressed in the novel and which in this respect seems to correspond to the view codified in reference works of the time.¹⁷³

The phenomenon of mimicry appears in *Doktor Živago* on various levels. First, it is realized narratively (that is, demonstrated on the level of *sujet*), second, it is a topic of discussion (metalevel), and third, features are distinguishable in the text itself which I maintain can be linked to mimicry (a "morphological" level). This latter, as we shall see, applies both to the relationship of the novel to other texts and to the internal relationship between its prose and poetry sections. To this may be added a "meta-metalevel": the reader is informed that Živago himself writes (and lectures on) mimicry. This information is of special interest in view of the fact that Živago's own texts, as I have noted in Chapter 2, frequently reflect the content of *Doktor Živago* as a whole.

The mimicry theme is introduced by the protagonist himself. This occurs during his captivity with the Red partisans ("the forest brotherhood"), in an episode that is central to this theme in general: the short chapter (11:8) is structured completely as an illustration of mimicry. At the same time, it reports Živago's thoughts on the phenomenon.

¹⁷²For modern views of mimicry, see, for example, *The American Naturalist*, Vol. 131, Supplement, June 1988, which contains contributions that "reaffirm Fisher's (1930) view that protective mimicry provides the most clear-cut post-Darwinian example of natural selection." (Brower 1988, S3)

¹⁷³Cf. the definition of mimicry in the near contemporary (1949-1957) edition of *Bol'shaja sovetskaja enciklopedija* (27, 496): "защитное приспособление животных и растительных организмов, заключающееся в их сходстве с предметами окружающей природы, с другими животными или растениями"; "В одних случаях в результате мимикрии животное становится незаметным для его врага — криптическая или покровительственная, окраска и форма, в других — лжепредостерегающая или псевдоапосематическая, окраска и форма."

On the way to a patient in the forest camp the doctor is overcome by exhaustion (after many sleepless nights due to the partisan leader Liverij's tirades) and lies down to rest in a clearing. Here *Živago* blends into his surroundings like an animal using protective mimicry — under the influence of a play of light, form, and color that completely dominates the passage:

Он прилег на одном из незаросших мест в лесу, сплошь усыпанном золотыми листьями, налетевшими на лужайку с окаймлявших ее деревьев. Листья легли в клетку, шапками, на лужайку. Так же ложились лучи солнца на их золотой ковер. В глазах рябило от этой двойной, скрещающейся пестроты. Она усыпляла, как чтение мелкой печати или бормотание чего-нибудь однообразного.

Доктор лег на шелковисто шуршавшую листву, положив подложенную под голову руку на мох, подушкой облежавший бугристые корни дерева. Он мгновенно задремал. Пестрота солнечных пятен, усыпившая его, клетчатым узором покрыла его вытянувшееся на земле тело и сделала его необнаружимым, неотличимым в калейдоскопе лучей и листьев, точно он надел шапку-невидимку. (341)

The concentration of words designating form and color is as striking here as in the writing situations analyzed in Chapter 2, where I observed how the writing process approximates painting. Here we may note that in this passage the text itself is also marked by a kind of mimicry — on the morphological level. The words themselves adapt to their surroundings, their micro-context, “mimicking” one another: “шелковисто шуршавшую,” “положив подложенную под голову.” Thus form realizes the semantics of the text (‘mimicry’) — an example of the kind of “подчеркнутая в тексте смысловая связь между разными уровнями” that Timenčik (1975) calls “автометаописание,” ‘autometadescription.’

A few paragraphs later, the *action* demonstrates the principal function of this protective mimicry with the explicitness of a biology textbook. *Živago* wakes up and becomes aware of a group of partisans, ‘conspirators’ who in his immediate proximity negotiate about something ‘secret’ and ‘illegal.’ The narrative text stresses the danger of the situation — discovery equals death: “Очевидно, сговаривающиеся не заметили его, не подозревали его соседства. Если бы он теперь пошевелился и выдал свое присутствие, это стоило бы ему жизни.” (342)

It is not only *Živago*'s own body that participates in an illustration of mimicry. In the same scene he also *witnesses* a case of mimicry, the classic example of the butterfly's protective coloration:¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁴This scene is also analyzed by Møller (1979, 167-168), who associates it with the novel's immortality theme; just as the butterfly survives by “dissolving into its surroundings,” so *Živago*, when transformed into art, survives dissolved in others.

Цветным складывающимся и раскрывающимся лоскутком пролетела с солнечной стороны коричнево-красчатая бабочка. Доктор сонными глазами проследил за ее полетом. Она села на то, что больше всего походило на ее окраску, на коричнево-красчатую кору сосны, с которой она и слилась совершенно неотличимо. Бабочка незаметно ступала на ней, как бесследно терялся Юрий Андреевич для постороннего глаза под игравшей на нем сеткой солнечных лучей и теней. (342)

Here, too, there is an abundance of words denoting light and color — and there occurs a morphological “imitation” similar to that in the passage quoted above: “Она села на то, что больше всего походило на ее окраску, на коричнево-красчатую кору сосны, с которой она и слилась совершенно неотличимо.” It is in this situation that the doctor begins to reflect on mimicry, and toward the end his thoughts pass on to art:

Привычный круг мыслей овладел Юрием Андреевичем. Он во многих работах по медицине косвенно затрагивал ее. О воле и целесообразности как следствии совершенствующегося приспособления. О мимикрии, о подражательной и предохранительной окраске. О выживании наиболее приспособленных, о том, что, может быть, путь, откладываемый естественным отбором, и есть путь выработки и рождения сознания. Что такое субъект? Что такое объект? Как дать определение их тождества? В размышлениях доктора Дарвин встречался с Шеллингом, а пролетевшая бабочка с современной живописью, с импрессионистическим искусством. Он думал о творении, твари, творчестве и притворстве. (342)

The words of the last line display the same type of morphological imitation as above, making the theme of art itself appear in the midst of a “mimicry process.”

As presented here, the question of mimicry brings up the intense 1920s debate between neo-Lamarckians and Darwinists which acquired such symbolic significance for Osip Mandel'shtam and was thematized in a couple of his works around 1930 (the prose sketch “Putešestvie v Armeniju” and the poem “Lamarck”).¹⁷⁵ More precisely, the passage reflects the conflict between the neo-Lamarckian view of evolution as dynamic and “creative” — a process in which an important role is played by the inner striving of organisms in interaction with the external environment — and the Darwinian notion, which stresses the decisive importance of external factors (natural selection).¹⁷⁶ (The doctor's reflections, however, seem to end in a kind of reconciliation of these positions:

¹⁷⁵See B. Gasparov 1992c, 1994b.

¹⁷⁶There is a description of Antipov in the novel which almost parodies the neo-Lamarckian attitude: “этот человек представляет законченное явление воли. Он до такой степени был тем, чем хотел быть, что и все на нем и в нем неизбежно казалось образцовым. И его соразмерно построенная и красиво поставленная голова, и стремительность его шага, и его длинные ноги в высоких сапогах, может быть грязных, но казавшихся начищенными, и его гимнастерка серого сукна, может быть мягкая, но производившая впечатление глаженной, полотняной.”(248)

“может быть, путь, откладываемый естественным отбором, и есть путь выработки и рождения сознания.”)

In fact, the mention of “Impressionist art” in this context establishes a clear connection with Mandel’shtam’s “Putešestvie v Armeniju” (published 1933), in which a chapter about a visit to an art museum (“Francuzy”) borders on a discussion of Lamarck and Darwin, Pallas and Linnaeus (the chapter “Vokrug naturalistov”).¹⁷⁷ Common to both these sections is a focus on the *eye* and *seeing*. The first, in which the Impressionists play a central role, becomes a guide on how to look at a picture;¹⁷⁸ in the second, seeing is thematicized in different ways, most strikingly in the image of a butterfly whose wing patterns yield the following peculiar effect on the narrator: “И вдруг я поймал себя на диком желании взглянуть на природу нарисованными глазами этого чудовища.” (Mandel’shtam 1991, 164) Likewise, in Pasternak the passage discussed above is clearly connected with the problem of perception (“сонными глазами проследил,” “слилась совершенно неотлично,” “незаметно ступевалась”).

In Mandel’shtam’s text “biology” and “literature” are in various ways drawn closer to one another. The great systematists here are above all narrators: “Я хочу лишь напомнить, что натуралист — профессиональный рассказчик, публичный демонстратор новых интересных видов” (Mandel’shtam 1991, 166); the book in turn appears as a part of nature: “Вчера читал Фирдуси, и мне показалось, будто на книге сидит шмель и сосет ее.” (Ibid., 167)¹⁷⁹ In Pasternak’s novel, the description of Živago mimicking — “В глазах рябило от этой двойной, скрецающей пестроты. Она усыпляла как чтение мелкой печати” — leads one to think of Mandel’shtam’s formulation about the ‘physiology of reading’ (ibid., 163). This “incorporation” of Mandel’shtam into the novel may be seen as an answer to Pasternak’s own “presence” in “Putešestvie v Armeniju” (and “Lamark”) as noted by Boris Gasparov (1994b, 199-200), who concludes that “художник-творец оказывается на одном полюсе с органической природой.”

However, the mimicry scene in the forest is not the first occasion on which a connection is made between biology and art. As I pointed out in Chapter 2, the young Živago’s interest in the ‘physiology of vision’ is linked to the ‘essence

¹⁷⁷On Impressionism and Lamarck as equivalents in Mandel’shtam’s paradigm for the opposition between romantic and realist epochs, see B. Gasparov 1992c, 1994b.

¹⁷⁸In this respect, Mandel’shtam’s “Journey to Armenia” seems to correspond to the description, found in the work itself, of Delacroix’s “Journey to Morocco” as a “обязательный для каждого мыслящего европейца кодекс зрительного воспитания” (Mandel’shtam 1991, 145).

¹⁷⁹A similar notion is expressed at an early stage by Pasternak as well; cf. his article “Neskol’ko položenij” (1918, 1922): “Книга — живое существо” (BP4, 367).

of the artistic image.' A corresponding interest in the physiological details of perception is manifested in Mandel'shtam's chapter "Francuzy": "Стояние перед картиной, с которой еще не сравнилась телесная температура вашего зрения, для которой хрусталик еще не нашел единственной достойной аккомодации — все равно, что серенада в шубе за двойными оконными рамами <...> Тончайшими кислотными реакциями глаз — орган, обладающий акустикой, наращивающий ценность образа" (Mandel'shtam 1991, 161). In both works there seems to be a link to Goethe in the background: Gasparov observes that the mention of "optical laws" in Mandel'shtam's text (in his discussion of Signac's book on Impressionism) "отсылает к открытиям Гете в области оптики" (1992c, 159); Živago's critical colleagues in the novel label his lectures on mimicry as "натурфилософия Гете," and Goethe is alluded to in his diary entries dealing with creating: "Каждый родится Фаустом, чтобы все обнять, все испытать, все выразить" (282).¹⁸⁰

The theme of the eye and the 'physiology of vision' also brings up Henri Bergson's *L'Évolution créatrice* (1911).¹⁸¹ In this work it is precisely the formation of the eye in molluscs and vertebrates with its complex structure that serves as evidence of the *élan vital*, the force that according to Bergson's philosophy drives evolution forward (Bergson 1929, 95-106).

The proximity between biology and art may also be placed in a Russian philosophical context which I will discuss later. Prior to that, I will continue my in-

¹⁸⁰"Optical laws" figure in *Doktor Živago* in the bizarre Elena Proklovna's "interrogation" of the Živago family at Varykino: "Перечислите, пожалуйста, каких видов бывают увеличительные стекла и в каких случаях получаются изображения действительные, обращенные, прямые и мнимые?" (274) Optical instruments are associated with the fatally "life-improving" human type represented by Liverij Mikulicyn (on his 'stereoscopic pictures of the Urals,' see Masing-Delić 1979, 34). Elena Proklovna's knowledge of optics, too, turns out to derive from the "life-improving" Antipov. On the magnifying glass as a link to H. C. Andersen's *Snow Queen*, see Jensen 1997, 77, who also refers to a manuscript note Pasternak made to read about "optics" in the encyclopedia (Commentary, 635).

¹⁸¹Masing-Delić (1982) has studied Bergson's influence on *Doktor Živago*. She concentrates mainly on the characters' personalities and Lara's relationship to Komarovskij, Antipov and Živago, which according to her reflects central thoughts in *L'Évolution créatrice*. Rowland & Rowland (1968, 159-162) also address convergences between Bergson's philosophy and Pasternak's novel; in connection with the butterfly episode and mimicry they refer to *Deux sources de la morale et de la religion*: "By drawing on the pictorial, scientific and philosophical connotations of the butterfly, Pasternak has presented a germinal idea of his novel, one which lies at the core of Yuri Zhivago's counter-creation. At one point the hero states it simply: 'People must be drawn to good by goodness' (8:5). In his words we hear again the echo of Bergson's voice, telling of the miraculous changes that could be wrought out in our nature if we but followed the example of 'a person admired and venerated, whose image we bore in our heads and with whom we would aspire to become identified, as the copy to the original.'" (Ibid., 162) Aucouturier (1979, 340-341) discerns a connection with Bergson in Pasternak's "творческая эстетика" as presented in *Ochranaja gramota*.

vestigation of “mimicry” and its various connections with the creative processes and the results of these processes in the novel.

An element of mimicry seems to be required for creating in general to come about: this takes place throughout the novel in situations where Živago is “hidden” or “camouflaged.” Already the strong impulse that grips him after Anna Ivanovna’s funeral to write something contains such an element: “Юра с вождением предвкушал, как он на день, на два исчезнет с семейного и университетского горизонта и в свои заупокойные строки по Анне Ивановне вставит все, что ему к той минуте подвернется” (92). The word “исчезнет” corresponds to the doctor’s actual mimicry in the forest. This scene has in fact been preceded by a very real disappearance: the family is searching in vain for Jura, who has fallen asleep behind the bookshelves in the library (90). It is also worth noting the *dependence on context* in the last formulation (“все, что ему к той минуте подвернется”); the creative process is associated with whatever happens to be at hand in the immediate surroundings at the moment of creation.

Varykino, the place that in the novel is most fertile from a creative point of view, is associated with the search for protection and with camouflage. It is here that the family flees from Moscow “в поисках незаметности” (263), a phrase which can be compared with the formulation “бабочка незаметно ступала” in the forest scene discussed above.¹⁸² Here are created both the central diary entries in which Živago formulates his philosophy of art and a portion of his poetry. In order to find the time to write the diary Živago *conceals* his true identity as a physician: “умалчиваю о том, что я доктор, чтобы не связывать своей свободы” (275). The poems are written after another flight — this time from Jurjatin — which is undertaken on Lara’s initiative: “А надо шитокрыто, чтобы никто ничего не увидел <...> На какое-то время нам надо провалиться сквозь землю. Пускай этим местом будет Варыкино” (419).

Back in Moscow again Živago disappears without a trace from his new family in order to live — for a last intensive period of writing — hidden in the room that his half-brother provides for him. The description of this “тайное убежище” (478), which his loved ones fail to discover, expresses something of the very essence of camouflage: “А между тем он жил в нескольких шагах от них, совсем у них под носом и на виду, в теснейшем кругу их поисков” (479). Živago himself in this situation is “winged” — “Поддержка брата окрыляла Юрия Андреевича” (480) — like the butterfly that led him to think

¹⁸²This is also the reason Živago himself gives when he meets Antipov-Strel’nikov during a stop on the train journey: “Из Москвы и вдруг в такой медвежий угол. — Именно с этой целью. В поисках тишины. В глушь, в неизвестность.” (251)

of mimicry. This creative room may in several ways be linked to the mimicry scene with the partisans. It is here Živago's body is brought after his death, and the coffin put on the desk is surrounded by so many flowers that they resemble a forest: "Его окружали цветы во множестве, целые кусты редкой в то время белой сирени, цикламены, цинерарии в горшках и корзинах." The very state of death is emphasized through a freezing of the mimicry effect that earlier saved his life: "Свет скупо просачивался сквозь наставленные цветы на восковое лицо и руки покойника, на дерево и обивку гроба. На столе лежал красивый узор теней, как бы только что переставших качаться." (485)

Both these periods of writing produce results in the form of works that are included in the novel: poems that can be assumed to belong to the concluding poetry chapter, and prose — Živago's diary entries from Varykino and a fragment from his last work in Moscow on the theme of "the city." The latter cohere as aesthetic reflections in which "imitation" is a central theme.

In his discussion of the significance of the city to modern art, Živago discerns in its representatives a poetics that emphasizes "similarity to life": "Беспорядочное перечисление вещей и понятий с виду несовместимых и поставленных рядом как бы произвольно, у символистов, Блока, Вержарна и Уитмена, совсем не стилистическая прихоть. Это новый строй впечатлений, подмеченный в жизни и списанный с натуры." (481)¹⁸³ Thus art imitates life, but it does not seem to be a question of any traditional mimetic realism — in Živago's description it appears instead to be a "morphological" imitation: formal factors in the poem seem to portray iconically things in "life" (which in fact assigns to the text properties of painting). The aesthetic vocabulary here brings up a "biological" context: this applies not only to the expression "списанный с натуры," but also to what appears as the central evaluative category, namely "естественность": 'pastoral simplicity' (which has no place in modern art because it has none in modern life) is called "неестественное мажорничание"; the language of today is the language of urbanism, "живо сложившийся и естественно отвечающий духу нынешнего дня" (481). Živago's description of the style of Symbolism may be connected with his only really urban poem, "Rassvet,"¹⁸⁴ which depicts the life of the waking city and illustrates

¹⁸³The formulation recalls Pasternak's discussion of realism and description of Chopin in the 1945 article of the same name: "Его творчество насквозь оригинально не из несходства с соперниками, а из сходства с натурой, с которой он писал." (BP 4, 404)

¹⁸⁴Masing-Delić briefly treats this poem in her analysis of "alternating opposites" in Živago's poetry (1977, 443-44). She states that "The poet of *Rassvet*, in his illuminated state, is able to identify to an extraordinary degree, not only with other people, but also na-

precisely this “беспорядочное перечисление вещей”: “Со мною люди без имен, Деревья, дети, домоседы.” (533)¹⁸⁵ This feature also seems close to the formulation noted earlier concerning ‘all those random things which life would send his way’ as a kind of principle for the creation of art. At the same time, this poem is clearly connected with the mimicry theme. The lyrical subject expresses his experience of oneness with his surroundings through a kind of physical adaptation to it: “Я чувствую за них за всех, Как будто побывал в их шкуре, Я таю сам, как тает снег, Я сам, как утро, брови хмурю.”¹⁸⁶

The discussion of style in the novel is obviously linked to the mimicry theme when Živago reflects on his own literary style during his second visit to Varyki-no. Here he formulates his stylistic ideal with the help of keywords from the vocabulary of mimicry:

Всю жизнь мечтал он об оригинальности сглаженной и приглушенной, внешне неузнаваемой и скрытой под покровом общеупотребительной и привычной формы, всю жизнь стремился он к выработке того сдержанного, непритязательного слога, при котором читатель и слушатель овладевают содержанием, сами не замечая, каким способом они его усваивают. Всю жизнь он заботился о незаметном стиле, не привлекающем ничего внимания, и приходил в ужас от того, как он еще далек от этого идеала. (434-435)¹⁸⁷

Once again we may note the presence of the word “незаметный” in connection with creating — and there is a strikingly emphatic use of the word “жизнь.” This stylistic ideal also corresponds to the earlier formulation concerning the young Jura’s literary ambitions, which have clear connotations of camouflage: “Он еще с гимназических лет мечтал о прозе, о книге жизнеописаний, куда бы он в виде *скрытых* взрывчатых гнезд мог вставлять самое ошеломляющее из того, что он успел увидеть и передумать.” (67)

In his diary notes Živago explicitly links what is “hidden” to the very essence of art. This occurs in a formulation which at the same time, curiously, questions its own communicative effectiveness: “И мне искусство никогда не ка-

ture, with an endless variety and range of objects in his surrounding reality,” but she does not address the mimicry theme as such.

¹⁸⁵Cf. Greber’s observations of the passage on Blok in “Ljudi i položeniya” which supports her argument concerning Pasternak’s “art of memory” but which also is relevant to the discussion of mimicry here: “In this passage, Pasternak’s words form an iconic memorial for Blok’s poetry, since subliminally — imitating Blok’s devices — they quote the famous urbanistic poem ‘Noč’, ulica, fonar’, apteka.’ The implication is that Pasternak’s language itself virtually remembers Blok’s poetical signs.” (Greber 1997, 41)

¹⁸⁶Actually, two different types of mimicry are represented here: the phrase “побывать в чьей-нибудь шкуре” can be associated with the pseudoaposematic form of the phenomenon, in which an animal simulates another, defensively better equipped animal, while the imitation of snow realizes a protective adaptation to the environment.

¹⁸⁷This image incorporates features of so-called aggressive mimicry, in which the mimic is a predator imitating the food of its prey.

залось предметом или стороною формы, но скорее *таинственной и скрытой* частью содержания. Мне это ясно как день, я это чувствую всеми своими фибрами, но как выразить и сформулировать эту мысль?” (279) The link between *light*, *organic reaction* and *creative expression* that is established in the last sentence, anticipates Živago’s later definition of mimicry as a “удивительный переход внутреннего во внешнее.” (402)

In the diary he also ponders over the nature of aesthetic evolution. Here “imitation” is a key concept; in contrast to progress in science, which takes place “по закону отталкивания” and is driven by an aspiration to overthrow ‘prevalent errors and false theories,’ in art it is ‘the contagious example’ that moves development forward: “Шаг вперед в искусстве делается по закону притяжения, с подражания, следования и поклонения любимым предтечам.” (282) This may be compared with Živago’s earlier discussed definition of art, which also involves an evolutionary element, namely the notion of *dopisyvanie*. Thus the “continued writing” should also be based on “подражание,” that is, a manifestation of mimicry. A parallel is established in the novel between art and mimicry owing to the fact that the former, according to Živago’s definition, “неотступно размышляет о смерти и неотступно творит этим жизнь” (*ibid.*), and that the goal of the latter as biological process is precisely to preserve life.

Having now found yet another key to analyzing the novel’s continuational relation to other texts, we have reason to take a look at — or cast a Pasternakian “second glance” — on the textual examples discussed in Chapter 1.

4.3 Mimicry and Text

I analyzed above the novel’s “continuation” of Revelation in philological terms. The first page of *Doktor Živago* appeared as a palimpsest in which traces of the Biblical text could be distinguished in the semantics of the words of the novel and their phonetic form. As I pointed out, the novel itself contains a depiction of a process that generates texts of this type: a commentary on the incantation read by Kubaricha which connects to a chronicle text. Furthermore, the commentary’s relevance to the novel as a whole is reinforced by the fact that Kubaricha, who is a kind of folk parallel to Živago, includes in her incantation features that with respect to content and form mirror the novel itself (among other things, its metapoetical tendency). Another instance of this sort of text creation was identified in the novel’s discussion of the two variants of the “protective” psalm that the doctor finds during a battle.

We see now that these examples may be related to the mimicry complex, which in the latter case is actually brought up by the very function of the psalm. The juxtaposition of words from Revelation and from the novel respectively —

грядет с облаками — летевшее навстречу облако
узрит его — взором. Его
око — окинул
пронзили — исказилось
возрыдают — зарыдал
племена — плетьюми

— as well as from the canonical and non-canonical versions of Psalm 90:

Живый в помощи Вышнего — Живые помощи
Не убоишися... от стрелы летящая во дни (днем) — Не бойся стрелы летящей войны
Яко позна имя мое — Поздно имя мое
С ним есмь в скорби, изму его... — Скоро в зиму его

— shows that the words and collocations that make up the second member of the pairs *resemble* their correlates in a way that can be described as imitative. Just as the words may be described as a “distortion” of an original text, so they may be said to connect to that text through imitation. How can these two perspectives be combined? How can “подражание,” ‘imitation,’ understood as *moving closer* (Živago uses the word parallel with “по закону притяжения”) be combined with “искажение,” ‘distortion,’ which, after all, may be understood as *moving away*? And can imitation in general lead to any sort of “development”? The answer to these questions seems to be related to the manner in which the novel presents the very prerequisites for creation.

Creative imitation in the novel is far from being a blind reproduction, which is, on the contrary, depicted as death-dealing — as in the case of Antipov and his ‘gift of imitation.’¹⁸⁸ The portrait of Antipov, who as a child “с большим сходством и комизмом передразнивал все, что видел и слышал” (37), is marked down to the smallest detail by a kind of rectilinear semantics — from the little boy’s “прямой пробор” (ibid.) to the adult man’s personification of the name he adopts: “ясность понятий, прямолинейность, суровость принципов, правота, правота, правота. Стрельников!” (450) Antipov’s imitative talents obviously do not allow any deviations, and his disposition is the direct opposite of Živago’s receptive nature with its attitude of “что подвернется”: “его [Antipov, S. W.] уму недостовало дара нечаянности, силы, непредвид-

¹⁸⁸“Этот человек должен был обладать каким-то даром, не обязательно самобытным. Дар, проглядывавший во всех его движениях, мог быть даром подражания.” (248) Cf. the description of Jura: “В Юриной душе все было сдвинуто и перепутано, и все резко самобытно — взгляды, навыки и предрасположения.” (66)

енными открытиями нарушающей бесплодную стройность пустого предвидения.” (250)

The creative element in the novel's presentation of creating as imitation seems to be linked instead to “искажения”— but these are distortions that arise in *attempts to imitate*; similarities that are at the same time differences. Seen from the viewpoint of the “model texts,” they involve shifts or transformations, while from the perspective of the “mimic texts” it is a form of imitation. From the poet's point of view it is obviously a question of *life*.

In his diary Živago links the beginning of creation to imitating; creating appears as growing from imitation. In a commentary on the significance of versification in Puškin's artistic development, he notes: “Но едва с подражаний Оссиану или Парни или с ‘Воспоминаний в Царском Селе’ молодой человек нападал на короткие строки ‘Городка’, или ‘Послания к сестре’, или позднейшего кишиневского ‘К моей чернильнице’, или на ритмы ‘Послания к Юдину’, в подростковом пробуждался весь будущий Пушкин.” (281) As in other examples given above in Chapters 2 and 3, Živago's description of Puškin seems at the same time to be formulating something which concerns the novel itself.

Doktor Živago thus appears to *continue* other texts by imitating them on a concrete level, and the novel *describes* texts that have arisen in the same way. These are circumstances which focus on the *proximity of texts* to one another. From such a perspective, the novel's own composition is of special interest as the work itself, after all, consists of two adjacent texts. The boundary between them is one between prose and poetry that also marks the hero's transition from earthly life to ‘life in others.’ The internal relationship between these two parts displays certain properties that deserve attention in the light of the mimicry theme.

The existence of connections between the prose and poetry sections of the novel is quite natural: the fiction also includes the fact that it is Živago who is the author of the poems and that they have been written in the time and space of the prose. In some cases Živago is shown conceiving or writing works which obviously correspond to certain poems in the 17th part of the novel (for example, “Skazka” and “Razluka” in the Varykino episode). In other instances, poems and prose clearly share thematic points: for example, “Magdalina I” and “Magdalina II” are connected with an argument Sima Tunceva advances on

Christ and Mary Magdalene in a conversation with Lara and which Živago overhears (408).¹⁸⁹

In addition to these self-evident connections, there is, however, a special kind of similarity between words and expressions in the prose and poetry sections that cannot be related to a common context or theme, but instead is reminiscent of the relationship analyzed above between the novel and other texts.

Thus there are obvious and natural correspondences between the poem “Roždestvenskaja zvezda” and the passage in the novel depicting the Christmas party at the Sventickijs’. As noted above (2.2), the name and address of the hosts have Biblical connotations: “Sventickij” contains the root “holy” (which in this form also constitutes the Polish word for religious holiday, *święto*), and they live in “Mučnoj gorodok,” which may be seen as a slightly corrupted translation of the word Bethlehem, ‘the city of bread,’ a word which occurs in the poem: “Мерцала звезда по пути в Вифлеем.” On the way to the Sventickijs’ Živago has an idea for a poem — “русское поклонение волхвов, как у голландцев, с морозом, волками и темным еловым лесом” (82) — which can be identified with his “Roždestvenskaja zvezda.”

Beyond that, however, a comparison of the poem and the prose passage shows that there is a number of cases in which the texts converge “gratuitously” in a way that seems to be analogous with what we observed earlier concerning the novel and Revelation. My examination of a few such cases below will also involve a comparison between the poem “Na Strastnoj” and the seventh part of the novel.

4.3.1 “Roždestvenskaja zvezda” and “Elka u Sventickich”

The text passages to be compared consist of about two and a half pages of poetry and six pages of more or less continuous text. For the first example I will begin with stanza 12 of the poem and the shepherds’ lines:

— Пойдемте со всеми, поклонимся чуду, —
Сказали они, *запахнув кожухи*. (531)

The italicized words have a counterpart in the prose description of Tonja during a break in the dance:

В перерыве, когда они сидели в столовой, Тоня отказалась от чая и утоляла жажду мандаринами, которые она без счета очищала от *пахучей* легкой отделившейся *кожуры*. (86)

¹⁸⁹Certain connections between the prose and poetry sections are addressed by, for example, Obolensky 1978.

Between the specific expressions “запахнув коужухи” and “пахучей <...> коужуры” there is the same sort of “kinship” as between the “племена” of Revelation and the “плетьми” of the novel, a closeness which in this case is partly phonetic, partly semantic. It is a question not of identity but of imitation — a similarity that also involves a slight shift.

In the same way, there is a certain proximity between the following stanza (13) of the poem and a prose passage which somewhat earlier depicts the dance itself and then the hosts’ preparation of the gifts:

От шарканья по снегу сделалось жарко.
По яркой поляне листьями слюды
Вели за хибарку босые следы.
На эти следы, как на пламя огарка,
Ворчали овчарки при свете звезды.

И все аплодировали, и эту движущуюся, шаркающую и галдящую толпу обносили мороженым и прохладительным. Разгоряченные юноши и девушки на минуту переставали кричать и смеяться, торопливо и жадно глотали холодный морс и лимонад (83)

Старики Свентицкие расписывали номерки к подаркам <...> Им помогал Жорж, но часто сбивался в нумерации, и они раздраженно ворчали на него. (84)

Here it is a question of similarities that include small shifts of form (“шарканья” — “шаркающую”), semantics (“жарко” — “разгоряченные,” “по снегу” — “мороженым”) and syntax (“ворчали овчарки” — “ворчали на него”) in a complex of quite specific words. The same can be said of stanzas 19 and 20 in relation to the continuation of the prose passage about the tangerines, where Tonja has just put her fragrant handkerchief in Jura’s hand:

Он спал, весь сияющий, в яслях из дуба,
Как месяца луч в углубленье дупла.
Ему заменяли овчинную шубу
Ослиные губы и ноздри вола.

Стояли в тени, словно в сумраке хлева,
Шептались, едва подбирая слова.
Вдруг кто-то в потемках, немного налево
От яслей рукой отодвинул волхва,
И тот оглянулся: с порога на деву,
Как гостья, смотрела звезда Рождества.

Детски-наивный запах был задушевно-разумен, как какое-то слово, сказанное шопотом в темноте. Юра стоял, зарыв глаза и губы в ладонь с платком и дыша им. Вдруг в доме раздался выстрел.

Все повернули головы к занавеси, отделявшей гостиную от зала. (86)

The similarities here include slight shifts in form such as “стояли” — “стоял,” “слова” — “слово,” “в потемках” — “в темноте,” “шептались” —

“сказанное шепотом”; semantic shifts as in “гостья” — “гостиную” and “губы и ноздри” — “губы <...> дыша,” and a syntactic shift as in the case of the word “вдруг.”

With respect to rhythm, meter and rhyme as well there is a kind of approximation between the poems and the prose. For instance, we note the strongly rhythmicized prose sequence “сказанное шепотом в темноте.” The tenth stanza of the poem contains a masculine rhyme that corresponds semantically to a nearly equivalent masculine “rhyme” in the opening of the prose chapter — where we also find the numerical indication “в десять”:

И странным виденьем *грядущей* поры
Вставало вдали все пришедшее после.
Все мысли веков, все мечты, все миры,
Все будущее галерей и музеев,
Все шалости фей, все дела чародеев,
Все елки на свете, все сны *детворы*.

С непамятных времен елки у Свентицких устраивали по такому образцу. *В десять*, когда разъезжалась *детвора*, зажигали вторую для молодежи и взрослых, и все веселились *до утра*. (82).

It is remarkable that the word “образец” should appear in this context, considering that the “model” according to which Christmas is celebrated is given in the poem. The word also brings up the icon painting theme which is relevant to “Roždestvenskaja zvezda.”

4.3.2 “*Na strastnoj*” and “*V doroge*”

The seventh part of the novel, “*V doroge*,” describes the Živago family’s trip to the Urals in April 1918. As was pointed out above, the journey is a kind of flight that must be concealed from others, and it is worth noting the element of mimicry in the course of action itself: “В доме Громеко шли спешные сборы в дорогу. Перед многочисленными жильцами <...> эти хлопоты выдавали за генеральную уборку перед Пасхой.” (207-208) Here there is a natural thematic link to the Easter poems — for example, the first line of “*Magdalena II*”: “У людей пред праздником уборка.” Already in the conclusion of the sixth part the theme of the poem “*Na strastnoj*” is woven into the prose through a description of the poem that the fever-stricken Živago dreams he is writing: “поэму не о воскресении и не о положении во гроб, а о днях, протекших между тем и другим. Он пишет поэму ‘Смятение.’” (206) Both this passage and the poem “*Na strastnoj*” stress the paradox in the burial of Christ: “Он всегда хотел написать, как в течение трех дней буря червивой земли *осаждает, штурмует бессмертное воплощение любви*” — “И взгляд их ужасом

объят. Понятна их тревога. Сады выходят из оград, Колеблется земли уклад: *Они хоронят Бога.*" (which corresponds to the oxymoronic exchange that introduces the novel: "Кого хоронят? <...> Живаго"). Shared as well is the motif "sleep-awakening" ("Надо проснуться," Živago dreams; in the poem we find "И если бы земля могла, Она бы Пасху проспала Под чтение Псалтыри") and the resurrection motif ("Надо воскреснуть" in the prose, "Смерть можно будет побороть Усиьем Воскресенья" in the poem).¹⁹⁰

In addition to such more or less given thematic correspondences we can discern a type of relationship that seems to be analogous to what was noted above on the prose-poems relation. I will illustrate with a comparison of the poem "Na strastnoj" with the short prose chapters VII:4-6 (about three pages of text) describing Antonina Aleksandrovna packing for the trip and the family's departure from their apartment on Sivcev-Vražek.

И шествие обходит двор
По краю тротуара,
И вносит с улицы в притвор
Весну, весенний разговор
И воздух с привкусом просфор
И вешнего угара. (stanza 9)

В растворенную форточку тянуло весенним воздухом, отзывавшимся свеженадушенной французской булкой. На дворе пели петухи и раздавались голоса играющих детей. Чем больше проветривали комнату, тем яснее становился в ней запах нафталина, которым пахла вынутая из сундуков зимняя рухлядь. (210)

The situation in stanza nine — where the procession, during the symbolic burial of Christ on Good Friday returns to the church with the "плащаница" (a piece of cloth with a picture of the dead Christ), bringing in with it 'spring' and 'air with the taste of consecrated wafers' — has a counterpart in the 'spring air' with its fragrance of 'a fresh bite of French bread' that pours into the apartment. The same sort of part semantic, part phonetic similarity which we noted earlier can be observed between "И вносит с улицы в притвор" and "В растворенную форточку"; semantically approximate are "весенний разговор" and "раздавались голоса играющих детей" and "вешнего угара" and "запах нафталина" ('a pungent odor associated with spring').

The description of the apartment has parallels with that of the church in the poem: the empty rooms ("опустелые комнаты") with their naked windows ("оголенные окна", 212) through which the snowstorm 'looks in' ("заглядывала") parallel the room in the church into which the trees peer in horror.

¹⁹⁰For an analysis of the oppositional pair "sleep-vigil (awakening)" in Živago's poems, see Masing-Delić 1977.

Like the churchgoers during the service, the family in the apartment thinks of death; a funeral is also explicitly mentioned: “Каждому она [the snow storm, S. W.] что-то напоминала. Юрию Андреевичу — детство и смерть матери, Антонине Александровне и Александру Александровичу — кончину и похороны Анны Ивановны.”(212) In this passage there is yet another network of connections between the prose and the poem on the word and phrase level:

И видят свет у царских врат,
И *черный плат*, и свечек ряд,
Заплаканные лица (stanza 8)

каждый про себя пересматривал жизнь, протекшую под этим кровом, и *бо-ролся с наворачивавшимися на глаза слезами*.

Это не мешало Антонине Александровне соблюдать перед посторонними светские приличия. <...> Чтобы не *платить* за одолжение *черной* неблагодарностью, она каждую минуту с извинениями отлучалась в соседнюю комнату, откуда тащила этой особе в подарок то какой-нибудь *платок*, то блузку, то кусок ситцу или полушифона. (212)

Also the following examples are analogous to those analyzed above: they give the impression that the texts are imitating each other, yet at the same time they contain shifts which distinguish this relationship from complete identity.¹⁹¹

А в городе, на небольшом
Пространстве, как на сходке,
Деревья смотрят намишом
В церковные решетки (stanza 6).

И все материи были темные в белую клетку или горошком, как в белую крапинку была темная снежная улица, *смотревшая в этот прощальный вечер в незанавешенные голые окна*. (212)

Еще кругом ночная мгла.
Еще так рано в мире. (stanza 1)
На дворе еще было темно. (213)
Еще кругом ночная мгла.
Такая рань на свете. (stanza 2)
На вокзал уходили *рано на рассвете*. (212)

In a letter to Ol'ga Frejdenberg (16 April, 1954) Pasternak himself touches on the relationship between the novel's poems and prose, in a formulation that connects to the discussion above. He writes about the poems from *Doktor Živago* which were published in the fourth issue of *Znamja* in 1954: “Там за вычетом двух-трех стихотворений, раньше написанных, — все новое. Тебе

¹⁹¹The phenomenon recalls the way in which some other texts are rendered in the novel: in his diary *Živago* quotes Tjutčev — “Какое лето, что за лето! Ведь это, право, волшебство” (274) — on which the editors comment: “Неточная цитата; у Тютчева — ‘колдовство’”(702). The hero also quotes *Evgenij Onegin* in the same manner (283, 702).

приятно будет увидеть в нынешней печати такое простое, естественное и не похожее на нее. Главное, конечно, не в них, а в прозе, в 'системе' которой они вращаются и к которой тяготеют." (Perepiska, 316)¹⁹² My analysis shows how the poems may be concretely related to the 'system' of the prose: if they 'gravitate' toward the prose text, this seems to occur through "imitation" — which is reminiscent of Živago's definition of evolution in art, taking place "по закону притяжения, с подражания." In this way, the work acquires an inner coherence that seems to be based on mimicry.¹⁹³

4.4 Vladimir Solov'ev's 'Aesthetics of Nature'

The connections between "biological" and "aesthetic" that appear on several levels in *Doktor Živago* may be viewed in a Russian philosophical context in which German Romantic philosophy and nineteenth-century science have entered into a peculiar alliance.

In the central episode where a kind of mimicry saves Živago's life, we saw that his thoughts, too, are focused on this phenomenon. He reflects on the 'path of natural selection' as the 'path leading to the formation and emergence of consciousness,' and especially on the relationship between 'subject' and 'object':

Что такое субъект? Что такое объект? Как дать определение их тождества? В размышлениях доктора Дарвин встречался с Шеллингом, а пролетевшая бабочка с современной живописью, с импрессионистическим искусством. Он думал о творении, твари, творчестве и притворстве. (342)

If Darwin in this passage appears as a personification of "natural selection," Schelling in connection with the subject-object problem leads us into the area of art. In his philosophy of art as formulated in *System des transzendentalen Idealismus* (1800), Schelling describes the subject as infinite while the object is finite, and it is the task of art to overcome the opposition between them by providing an idea of the infinite in the finite. Art thereby becomes the highest form of knowledge. According to Schelling the link between art and philosophy is thus indissoluble; art is a continuation of philosophy by other means: "Если эстетическое созерцание не иное что, как объективированное трансцен-

¹⁹²The poems in the novel published in *Znamja* were "Mart," "Belaja noč'," "Vesennja-ja rasputica," "Ob"jasnenie," "Leto v gorode," "Veter," "Chmel'," "Svad'ba," "Raz-luka," and "Svidanie." The publication was evidently of great symbolic significance to Pasternak: "И слова 'доктор Живаго' оттиснуты на современной странице, запятнаны им!" (Perepiska, 316).

¹⁹³Cf. also Frejdenberg's first reaction to the novel, which concludes with a reflection on the attached poems: "Стихи, тобой приложенные, едины с прозой и с твоей всегдашней поэзией. И очень хороши." (Perepiska, 274)

дентальное, то становится ясным само собой, что в искусстве мы имеем как документ философии, так и ее единственный извечный и подлинный органон, беспрестанно и неуклонно все наново свидетельствующие о том, чему философия не в силах подыскать внешнего выражения, а именно о бессознательном в действии и творчестве в его первичной тождественности с сознательным. Именно только поэтому искусство является философу чем-то высочайшим” (Šelling 1936, 393).¹⁹⁴ One aspect of Schelling’s relevance to Pasternak’s novel — and to his view of art in general — is precisely this: *Doktor Živago* is a work that uses specifically *artistic* means to develop a philosophy of its own, a work that *shows* something that actually cannot be said.¹⁹⁵

However, the encounter between Schelling and Darwin in *Živago*’s reflections, points further, namely to Vladimir Solov’ev’s philosophy.¹⁹⁶ In his works

¹⁹⁴I quote from I. Ja. Kolubovskij’s Russian translation to underscore the remarkable appearance of Schelling’s work in the Soviet Union of 1936, awaiting the peak of the Great Terror. This is also the time of Pasternak’s attempted novel “Zapiski Patrika” — referred to by Pasternak himself in the 50s as “начало прозы 36-го года” — a most important step on the way to *Doktor Živago* (see Borisov & Pasternak 1988, 216-218; Flejšman 1991).

¹⁹⁵In this respect Flejšman’s (1993, 73) description of the early Pasternak seems to apply to his later period as well: “В русской поэзии двадцатого века Пастернак — наиболее ‘философский’ поэт. Философия выступает в его творчестве не всегда и не обязательно как тема, но неизменно как *метод* работы над словом, как способ, логика развертывания словесного материала, каковым бы ни было заявленное содержание того или иного стихотворного или прозаического текста. Именно в этой особенности таятся специфические трудности анализа творчества всего раннего периода Пастернака, увенчивающегося *Охранной грамотой*.” And indeed, viewed from a Schellingian perspective, the much discussed transition from “philosophy” to “literature” in Pasternak’s biography and artistic evolution emerges as a natural development — a continuation — and not as the dramatic “break” of which it has become a cliché to speak. Schelling’s philosophy of art in relation to Pasternak’s œuvre is discussed from another perspective by Boris Gasparov (1992a, 133). Jensen (2000, 166) traces the idea of history as spectacle — as expressed in “Gamlet” — to Schelling’s *System des transzendentalen Idealismus*. Smirnov (1996, 53) reads the reference to Schelling in the novel as a polemic with Max Stirner’s philosophy, presumably embodied by Pamfil Palych (whom the doctor is on his way to see when he lies down to rest in the forest): “Штирнерианской абсолютизации субъекта и его мира Пастернак противопоставляет шеллингианскую идею тождества субъекта и объекта <...>.”

¹⁹⁶Cf., for example, the following characterization which includes references to Schelling as well as to Darwin: “Представляя из себя первый набросок будущей системы Соловьева, ‘Sophie’ заключает в себе некоторые положения, которые Соловьев отстаивал всю жизнь. Здесь in пусе весь будущий Соловьев. Во-первых, стремление примирить мистические откровения древних религий и христианства с выводами новой философии и естественных наук. <...> При изъяснении космогонического процесса в известных границах принимается теория Дарвина, по поводу непорочного зачатия Христа от Марии Соловьев ссылается на явление партогенезиса у пчел. В философии — преобладающее влияние Спинозы и Шеллинга, в богословии — тяготение к апофатическому богословию Востока.” (S. Solov’ev, 1977, 145) On Schelling’s significance for Solov’ev, see also A.V. Gulyga’s introductory article in Solov’ev 1988, I, 35-36, 41. Lev Šestov’s view of Solov’ev in this respect was that “Schelling so permeated him that he apparently

on aesthetics — the articles “Krasota v prirode” (1889) and “Obščij smysl iskusstva” (1890) — Solov’ev draws many examples from the works of ‘the great Darwin’ (Solov’ev 1988 II, 376). Darwin’s significance consists in the fact that he — according to Solov’ev, the most prominent contemporary representative of a positivistic scientific world view — “показал независимость эстетического мотива от утилитарных целей даже в животном царстве и чрез это впервые положительно обосновал истинно идеальную эстетику.” (Ibid., 384)

Solov’ev is referred to in other passages in the novel; it is said, for example, that Jura “начитался Смысла любви” (42).¹⁹⁷ The self-reflective character of this information is hinted at by Masing-Delić (1979, 31), who observes that the relationship between Živago and Lara realizes central thoughts on the significance of love in this work by Solov’ev.¹⁹⁸ In my opinion, Živago’s ruminations cited above, in which a biological-evolutionary theme is interwoven with the art theme, can also be related to Solov’ev, to some of the theses in his articles on aesthetics, whose point of departure is: “Эстетика природы даст нам необходимые основания для философии искусства.” (Solov’ev 1988 II, 353)¹⁹⁹ I will now examine this relation in greater detail.

Both Schelling and Solov’ev view art as a kind of continuation, but in the latter it is a part of biological evolution carried on by humanity. Art is to effect a transfiguration (“преображение”) of matter, which, in turn, shall lead to the immortality that nature itself has failed to achieve: “Задача, не исполнимая средствами физической жизни, должна быть исполнима средствами человеческого творчества” (Solov’ev 1988 II, 398; the doctor’s series “творение-тварь-творчество-притворство” is reminiscent of such an order). This immortality is to be realized concretely and physically, and be based on a kind of essential connection between ‘internal’ and ‘external,’ through which matter partakes of the immortality of the spirit: “совершенная красота не как отражение только идеи от материи, а действительное ее присутствие в материи — предполагает прежде всего глубочайшее и теснейшее взаимо-

lost his ability to distinguish himself from him” (quoted in Terras 1998, 522). For arguments maintaining Solov’ev’s independence of Schelling, see Lazarev 1998.

¹⁹⁷See also the manuscript version in which Živago’s generation is described as follows: “Все эти мальчики и девочки нахватались Достоевского, Соловьева, социализма, толстовства, нищестанства и новейшей поэзии. Это перемешалось у них в кучу и уживается рядом. Но они совершенно правы. Все это приблизительно одно и то же и составляет нашу современность” (575).

¹⁹⁸As Hutcheon points out, the theme of excessive reading is typical of metafictional texts.

¹⁹⁹Cf. Smirnov’s (1996, 192) remark (in another context): “Именно художественность придает миру его окончательную форму. Пастернак был, судя по всему, заморожен статьей Владимира Соловьева ‘Общий смысл искусства’ (1890), в которой эстетическому было вменена в заслугу способность изображать ‘последние вещи’ <...>.”

действие между внутренним или духовным и внешним или вещественным бытием. Это есть основное собственно-эстетическое требование, здесь специфическое отличие красоты от двух других аспектов абсолютной идеи [truth and good, S. W.] <...> Для полноты этого последнего качества [the beautiful, S. W.] требуются таким образом: 1) непосредственная материализация духовной сущности и 2) всецелое одухотворение материального явления как собственной неотделимой формы идеального содержания <...> при непосредственном и нераздельном соединении в красоте духовного содержания с чувственным выражением, при их полном взаимном проникновении материальное явление, действительно ставшее прекрасным, т.е. действительно воплотившее в себе идею, должно стать таким же пребывающим и бессмертным, как сама идея.”(Ibid., 396)²⁰⁰ Such a concrete link between internal and external — in other words, between “content” and “form” — is what appears to constitute the very essence of mimicry for Živago: “Тут, в этом цветовом подлаживании, скрыт удивительный переход внутреннего во внешнее.” (402)

The significance of Solov’ev for Pasternak’s novel probably offers material for a larger separate study. Here I will only briefly address a few more points. Considering the role of Revelation in *Doktor Živago*, it is interesting to note that Solov’ev’s definition of ‘the triple task of art’ — which elaborates on the immortality theme — includes this component: “1) прямая объективация тех глубочайших внутренних определений и качеств живой идеи, которые не могут быть выражены природой; 2) одухотворение природной красоты и чрез его 3) увековечение ее индивидуальных явлений. Это есть превращение физической жизни в духовную, т.е. в такую, которая, во-первых, имеет сама в себе свое слово, или Откровение, способна непосредственно выражаться вовне, которая, во-вторых, способна внутренне преображать, одухотворять материю или истинно в ней воплощаться и которая, в-третьих, свободна от власти материального процесса и потому пребывает вечно.” (“Obščij smysl iskusstva,” Solov’ev 1988 II, 398)²⁰¹

The link in the novel between Revelation and immortality is strong. As I noted in Chapter I above, an early manuscript version was entitled “Smerti ne bu-

²⁰⁰The articles on aesthetics and “Smysl ljubvi” are in fact intimately linked to each other: art and love are for Solov’ev complementary parts of the same project, aspiring to a union of the spiritual and the material, a transfiguration of matter which will lead to concrete immortality.

²⁰¹Thus, according to Solov’ev, art possesses a kind of concrete salvation function. It is therefore possible to understand quite literally the Dostoevskij quotation — “Красота спасет мир” — that Solov’ev chose for the epigraph to his article “Krasota v prirode.” This quotation also occurs in *Doktor Živago*, where it is uttered ironically by the caricatured “Tolstoyan” Vyvolochinov (44).

det" and carried Rev. 21:4 as its epigraph: "И отрет Бог всякую слезу с очей их, и смерти не будет уже; ни плача, ни вопля, ни болезни уже не будет; ибо прежнее прошло" (652). In the final version, however, Živago paraphrases these lines in his monologue to Anna Ivanovna. In so doing, he quite literally realizes Solov'ev's remarks on Dostoevskij in "Zametka v zaščitu Dostoevskogo ot obvinenija v 'novom' christianstve" (1883, an addendum to his "Tri reči v pamjat' Dostoevskogo"). Referring to the same Biblical verse (Rev. 21:4), Solov'ev writes: "Вот какую всемирную гармонию и благоденствие разумел Достоевский, повторяя только своими словами пророчества новозаветного откровения." (Solov'ev 1988 II, 323) Both Živago's exposition to Anna Ivanovna and the novel as a whole ("imitating" Rev. 1:7 in its introduction) can be said to correspond to this description.²⁰²

On the motif level, too, there is ample reason to relate *Doktor Živago* to Solov'ev's articles on aesthetics. I shall address two cases in which a link to the Russian philosopher is moreover connected to the mimicry theme. One of the more puzzling and seemingly unmotivated episodes is the attempted burglary which occurs during Lara and Paša's farewell party before leaving for the Urals, an episode which in fact narratively realizes mimicry. At the party Lara receives a present in the form of a piece of jewelry, "редкой красоты ожерелье," which turns out to possess chameleonic properties: someone says the stones are "розовый гиацинт <...> камень не ниже алмаза," (101) but the giver maintains that they are "желтые сапфиры." The necklace changes character from one moment to the next: "оно переливалось, горело и то казалось стечением по каплям набежавшей влаги, то кистью мелкого винограда." (Ibid.) This property is also what saves it when a burglar breaks into the apartment that night. Left behind on the table, the jewelry blends into its surroundings, thus demonstrating a kind of protective mimicry: "Ожерелье лежало на месте среди крошек хлеба и огрызков карамели, и недогадливый злоумышленник не замечал его в куче объедков" (ibid).

It is the attributes of the object of art — "редкой красоты" and "не ниже алмаза" — that are reminiscent of Solov'ev, who allots the diamond an impor-

²⁰²The extent to which the significance of revelation/The Book of Revelation for Solov'ev — and Pasternak — may be related to Schelling's "Philosophie der Offenbarung" cannot be addressed here, but it obviously deserves research in its own right; such a study is prompted by Smirnov's (1996, 61) categorical but brief remark: "Роман Пастернака в целом зиждется на 'Философии Откровения' Шеллинга. Та философия истории, которую исповедует в 'Докторе Живаго' Пастернак, взята из Шеллинга его последнего периода. 'Доктор Живаго' есть роман о христианине, оставшемся без родителей и обоготворяющем историю. В соответствии с Шеллингом, Откровение, зачинающее человеческую историю, состоит в Христе — в сыновности человека. История — свобода Сына от Отца <...>."

tant role as an example of “красота,” being an ideal interplay between something material (carbon) and something supra-material (light): “как преобразование материи чрез воплощение в ней другого, сверхматериального начала” (“Krasota v prirode,” 358-59). This image, which later resonates in the works of Symbolists such as Vjačeslav Ivanov,²⁰³ also figures in a significant context in an earlier text of Pasternak’s, “Vozdušnye puti” (1924):

Два редких алмаза розно и самостоятельно играли в глубоких гнездах этой полутемной благодати: птичка и ее чирикание. Пугаясь своего одиночества и стыдясь ничтожества, птичка изо всех сил старалась без следа раствориться в необозримом море росы, неспособной собраться с мыслями по рассеянности и спросонья. Ей это удавалось. Склонив головку набок и крепко зажмурясь, она без звука упивалась глупостью и грустью только что родившейся земли, радуясь своему исчезновению. (BP4, 91)

Here the diamond participates in the depiction of a kind of “beauty in nature” and is connected to the mimicry theme.²⁰⁴ The failed burglary in the novel may be regarded as a demonstration of the life-creating/life-preserving potential of art that functions according to the mimicry principle.²⁰⁵

The role of light, demonstrated in Solov’ev’s discussion of the diamond, is in general given special emphasis in his aesthetic philosophy :

Свет или его невесомый носитель — эфир есть первичная реальность идеи в ее противоположности весоному веществу, и в этом смысле он есть первое начало красоты в природе <...> Таким образом, материя становится носителем красоты чрез действие одного и того же светового начала, которое ее сперва *поверхностно озаряет*, а затем *внутренно проникает, животворит и организует*. (Solov’ev 1988 II, 363-364)

This description may be compared to the episode in Pasternak’s novel — quoted in 3.3.2 above — when Živago during his partisan captivity finds himself standing in the play of the light of the setting sun:

Юрий Андреевич с детства любил *сквозящий огнем зари* вечерний лес. В такие минуты точно и он *пропускал сквозь себя эти столбы света*. Точно дар *живого духа потоком входил в его грудь*, пересекал все его существо и парой

²⁰³Cf.: “Ivanov’s poetry repeatedly uses Solov’ev’s image of the transformation of coal into a diamond. It appears in ‘Diamond’ (‘Almaz,’ in the collection *Prozrachnost’*, 1904), ‘Dispute’ (‘Spor,’ in *Cor Ardens*, 1911), ‘Language’ (‘Jazyk,’ 1927, in *Svet Vechernii*).” (Paperno 1994, 20)

²⁰⁴Cf. also the poem “Naša groza” of the cycle “Zanjat’e filosofiej” in *Sestra moja — žizn’*: “Но даже зяблик не спешит Стряхнуть алмазный хмель с души.” (BP1, 138)

²⁰⁵Sinjavskij (1989, 367) perceives a symbol of the novel itself in the necklace: “Это ожерелье, мне кажется, и должно служить путеводительной аллегорией по роману Пастернака. То есть, фигурально выражаясь, сам этот роман, взятый в общем виде, и представляет собой подобного рода драгоценное ожерелье, покоящееся однако, посреди разнообразного жизненного ‘сора’, разбросанного по тексту там и сям, в естественном беспорядке.” He does not, however, touch upon the phenomenon of mimicry.

крыльев выходил из-под лопаток наружу. Тот юношеский первообраз, который на всю жизнь складывается у каждого и потом навсегда служит и кажется ему его внутренним лицом, его личностью, во всей первоначальной силе пробуждался в нем и заставлял природу, лес, вечернюю зарю и все видимое преобразаться в такое же первоначальное и всеохватывающее подобие девочки. “Лара!” — закрыв глаза, полусшептал или мысленно обращался он ко всей своей жизни, ко всей божьей земле, ко всему расстилавшемуся перед ним, *солнцем озаренному пространству*. (339)

We recognize elements from Solov’ev’s text (‘external illumination,’ ‘internal penetration,’ ‘lifegiving’) in the same word order but with a slight semantic shift. This moment of creative epiphany²⁰⁶ occurs in a situation that is marked by mimicry on several levels. When Živago lets the column of light pass through his body, he behaves in the same way as his surroundings: the sentence “он пропускал сквозь себя” is analogous with an earlier formulation concerning the forest, “листья пропускали солнечный свет” (ibid.), and the active construction underscores the imitation as a process. With his imaginary wings the doctor also resembles the dragonflies which passed him in the preceding paragraph — and which, in turn, exemplify mimicry: “Позванивая стеклянными крылышками, медленно проплывали по воздуху рябые и прозрачные, как огонь и лес, стрекозы.” What happens is precisely a kind of ‘passing of internal to external’ (Živago’s definition of the essence of mimicry) — the ‘inner face’ makes itself felt in external manifestations. The Solov’evian element is continued in the word “преобразаться” — “преображение” is one of the fundamental concepts in Solov’ev’s aesthetics. As Irina Paperno (1994, 2) puts it: “For Solov’ev <...> the notions of transfiguration and incarnation, used in conjunction, provide the paradigm for the aesthetic process.” The episode as a whole can be said to anticipate the central mimicry scene in the following chapter, where the camouflaged Živago himself ponders over mimicry and art.

To summarize: there are convergences between the novel and Vladimir Solov’ev’s aesthetics in the connection between biology and art; the evolutionary perspective; the focus on a link between “internal” and “external”; the role of light; and, above all, in the life-creating/life-preserving function that in both writers is ascribed to art. A Solov’evian note is in fact discernible already in Jura’s creative point of departure as formulated at Anna Ivanovna’s funeral: “В ответ на опустошение, произведенное смертью <...> ему <...> хотелось мечтать и думать, *трудиться над формами, производить красоту*.” (91)²⁰⁷ And if

²⁰⁶The expression “в такие минуты” is contextually linked in the novel to the creativity theme; cf. the description of the rush of inspiration at Varykino: “В такие минуты Юрий Андреевич чувствовал, что главную работу совершает не он сам” (431).

²⁰⁷“Krasota v prirode” and Pasternak’s novel share other motifs, such as the city as an aesthetic phenomenon. Solov’ev discusses the manner in which *sounds* — in the inorganic

we take a close look at Pasternak's formulation of his own point of departure and his strivings with the projected novel in a letter to Olga Frejdenberg of October 13, 1946, we now recognize the manner in which writing as *živopis'* merges with his concept of mimicry in a Solov'evian cast: "Это все так важно и краска так впопад ложится в задуманные очертания что я не протяну и года, если в течение его не будет жить и расти это мое перевоплощение, в которое с почти физической определенностью переселились какие-то мои внутренности и частицы нервов." (Perepiska, 245)

4.5 Mimicry: Two Earlier Contexts

It is beyond the scope of the present study to provide a complete picture of the mimicry complex in Pasternak's works as a whole. Nevertheless, I would like to draw attention to two examples which demonstrate how early this theme appears in the context of a philosophy of art — in fact, in two of Pasternak's very first attempts to formulate his thoughts on the nature of art.

The word "mimicry" itself (spelled *mimicri* in latin letters) figures in a 1912 text that is connected with the question of literature as a vocation, so painfully urgent for Pasternak at the time. In a letter to his friend Aleksandr Štich he writes about his meeting with his cousin Ol'ga Frejdenberg in Frankfurt, where he had hastily come from his studies in Marburg. The meeting was a disappointment, and she immediately sent off a letter in which, referring to the summer of 1910 in Mereküla and the burst of poetic inspiration Pasternak experienced in her company, she declares that now she "expected more" of him (Perepiska 45-48). In the letter to Štich Pasternak regrets this belated confirmation that then, in 1910, Frejdenberg had contrary to expectation nevertheless understood him.

world, as an expression of its *life* — acquire "свойство красоты." Certain sounds that individually are mechanical in character and therefore do not generate any impression of beauty, can, taken together, express the life of a collective whole, and in this capacity they assume aesthetic significance. He cites the example of the city: "кому случалось подходить к большому восточному городу, например Каиру, от тех сторон, где он граничит с пустыней, тот наверно, с наслаждением прислушивался к звучащей жизни этого собирательного животного." (Solov'ev 1988 II, 369) In his notes, *Živago* writes about the aesthetic significance of the city — and he attributes particular importance to acoustic impressions: "В двадцать втором году, когда я вернулся в Москву [on foot, S. W.] я нашел ее опустевшею, полуразрушенной. <...> Но и в таком виде она остается большим современным городом, единственным вдохновителем воистину современного нового искусства. <...> Постоянно, день и ночь шумящая за стеною улица так же тесно связана с современною душою, как начавшаяся увертюра с полным темноты и тайны, еще спущенным, но уже заалевшимся огнями рампы театральным занавесом. Беспреданно и без умолку шевелящийся и рокошующий за дверьми и окнами город есть необозримо огромное вступление к жизни каждого из нас." (481-482) The notion of the city as a living organism is expressed in concentrated form at the end of the novel, where Moscow is personified and assumes the status of a literary character (510).

Her silence on that occasion had actually been a measure of the power of his own expression. Pasternak says of her explanation:

она молчала тогда (1910), потому что происходило чудо — я говорил — говорил за себя, за нее, за ее отца, за ее жизнь и ее город: и именно так, как я тогда говорил (это было время товарных вагонов и двойников), — надо было говорить (BP5, 59).

After this, the author goes on to exclaim:

Боже, если бы она мне все это сказала тогда; если бы я не считал, что предстоит дисциплинарная обработка — в которой погибло все — в целях уподобления — классическому и рациональному; Боже, если бы я тогда держал это Франкфуртское письмо в Марбурге! Ну что же тогда? О, я послал бы ей все, что я писал; — то есть: — я послал бы ей знаки; — она бы приняла их, чудо бы продолжалось, — это было бы знаком мне, чтобы допустить то *mimicri*, которое создается завтрашней жизнью по отношению к сегодняшней строфе: жизнь училась бы у знаков; нашли бы вы меня в Марбурге на уроке? Где вы нашли бы меня через эти два года? Разве не имею я права быть искренним? Разве я не оторвал от себя весь этот мир чувств и их препаратов *насильно!*” (Ibid.; italics in the original)²⁰⁸

The ‘miracle’ that can be linked to art is contrasted with the study of philosophy to which Pasternak had devoted himself since 1910 as a result of his “дисциплинарная обработка.” If Frejdenberg had given him ‘signs,’ the ‘miracle’ would have continued; he would have dared to ‘release the *mimicri* that tomorrow’s life creates in relation to today’s stanza.’ In other words, he would have allowed tomorrow to continue with its creation today by ‘imitating’ it, whereby life would have acquired coherence and meaning — instead of being purposely interrupted to be given a new direction. *Mimicri* here seems to designate not only a principle that has to do with art, but also that which gives life meaning by establishing continuity.

It is worth noting that *mimicri* here may be related to one of the fundamental poetic categories, namely rhyme: “то *mimicri*, которое создается завтрашней жизнью по отношению к сегодняшней строфе”. In fact, rhyme includes several of the features addressed in our discussion of mimicry. It involves a *similarity* which depends on *proximity* (for a rhyme to be perceived as such the distance between the rhyming words cannot be too great), and which, moreover, excludes identity; the similarity must involve a certain shift (“плющом/плащом,” “чаш/плащ” to take a couple of examples from “Chmel”). Furthermore, the rhyme is the turning point in an intricate play between “internal” and “external” in the stanza: an internal (semantic) connection between the lines is

²⁰⁸Е. В. Pasternak (1989, 159) explains “мир чувств и их препаратов” as “лирика”; in connection with this letter he also refers to Jurij Živago’s interest in mimicry. The 1912 meeting with Frejdenberg is also discussed in Fleishman, Harder, Dorzweiler 1996, 57-60.

expressed at the end of the line in an external (morphological) similarity. It is a kind of swing: the first rhyming word affects the following line's content, which acquires a new expression in other rhyming words, and so on.

In his lecture "Simvolizm i bessmertie" given six months later (in February 1913), Pasternak provides a description of the very process of creating art which implies the image of mimicry. This paper, a thesis outline of which has been preserved, was delivered in a circle that regularly met 'to investigate problems in aesthetic culture and Symbolism in art' (E. B. Pasternak 1989, 176). Here Pasternak's arguments center on a subjectivity which is disengaged from the subject and linked to the notion of immortality. Under the rubric-like formulation "Восприятие и вдохновение творчества" an epistemology is outlined according to which the poet perceives and renders not reality itself, but the signs ("признаки") of its search for such a free subjectivity: the poet yields to reality, imitates the search and 'behaves like the things around him':

Действительность, доступная личности, проникнута поисками свободной субъективности, принадлежащей качеству. Признаки этих исканий, исходящих от самой действительности и в ней же сосредоточенных, воспринимаются потом как признаки самой действительности. *Поэт покоряется направлению поисков, перенимает их и ведет себя как предметы вокруг.* Это называют наблюдательностью и письмом с натуры. (BP 4, 683)²⁰⁹

²⁰⁹The discussion on the philosophical background of the lecture has included Husserl (Flejšman 1977, 8, 12), Andrej Belyj, Berdjaev, Frank and Vjačeslav Ivanov (Barnes 1989, 151-52). But there is also something about subjectivity as a "качество родовое, сверхличное," "субъективность человеческого мира, человеческого рода" (from the account in "Ljudi i položenijsa," BP4, 320), which corresponds to Vladimir Solov'ev's conclusions in "Krasota v prirode" on an objective "beauty" that exists in nature independently of human subjective consciousness. What is usually understood to be subjective and belonging to consciousness appears here as a category which belongs to the objects and constitutes the basis for their generic existence: "Человек находит известные явления в природе красивыми; они доставляют ему эстетическое наслаждение; большинство философов и ученых уверены, что это есть лишь факт субъективного человеческого сознания, что в самой природе нет красоты, так же как в ней нет добра и правды. Но вот оказывается, что те самые сочетания форм, цветов и звуков, которые нравятся в природе человеку, нравятся также самим существам природы — животным всевозможных типов и классов, нравятся им так сильно, имеют для них столь важное значение, что поддержание и развитие этих бесполезных, а иногда и вредных (в утилитарном смысле) особенностей ложится в основу их видового существования. Мы уже никак не можем сказать, что крылья тропической бабочки или павлиний хвост красивы только по нашей субъективной оценке, ибо точно так же ценят их красоту самки бабочки и павлины. Разумеется, если в данном случае вовсе нет никакого чувствующего субъекта, то нет и ощущения красоты; но дело не в ощущении, а в свойстве *предмета*, способного производить однородные ощущения в самых различных субъектах. Если же вообще красота в природе объективна, то она должна иметь и некоторое общее онтологическое основание, должна быть — на разных ступенях и в разных видах — чувственным воплощением одной абсолютно объективной всеединой идеи." (Solov'ev 1988 II, 388; italics in the original)

Striking in this text is the self-illustrating feature that words behave like the words around them, especially in the marked key sentence with its *Po-, po, naprav-, po-, pere-, pred-*. The result of such an imitation is what is usually called alliteration, which is precisely what the preceding paragraph is about: “Вдохновение – синтаксис поэзии, он конкретен, между прочим, в аллитерации.” Thus already here we have an example of the concrete realization of the semantics of the work that becomes so obvious in *Doktor Živago*.

We can follow yet another line from the lecture to the novel: the episode in which Živago (the poet) lies down and “yields” to nature can be viewed as a fictionalization, or narrative realization, of the cited passage from Pasternak’s first public statement on the philosophy of art. Živago assumes the guise of his surroundings, and he moreover displays “наблюдательность” when despite his sleepiness he registers in such detail (“с солнечной стороны,” “коричнево-крапчатая”) the butterfly’s illustration of the mimicry principle in a text that besides can quite literally be designated “письмо с натуры.” This principle, of course, is also directly connected with the subject that appears — or rather hides — in Pasternak’s poetry: a passive, receptive, “страдательный субъект”²¹⁰ that is penetrated or allows itself to be deformed by the external milieu. Roman Jakobson does not mention mimicry in his classic work on ‘the poet Pasternak’s prose’ (1935), but his aphoristic definition of the subject-world relationship in Pasternak’s texts comes very close to the phenomenon: “Покажи мне, где ты живешь, и я скажу, кто ты.” (Jakobson 1987, 334)²¹¹

In another letter to Štich in the summer of 1912 Pasternak gives an indirect definition of the artist which contains a grammatical image of this relationship. Once again, he is in anguish over the prospect career in science. After a malicious description of the representatives of academia, he ruthlessly concludes: “Да, они не существуют; они не спрягаются в страдательном. Они не падают в творчестве. Это скоты интеллектуализма” (BP 5, 69).

²¹⁰Boris Gasparov’s (1992a, 133) term; according to him this is Pasternak’s answer to romantic philosophy’s search for a synthesis between subject and object.

²¹¹Interestingly, about the same time mimicry was addressed from a biological, psychological as well as aesthetic perspective by the French writer Roger Caillois, who in his essay “Mimicry and Legendary Psychastenia” draws parallels between the way mimicking insects blend into the environment and the human psychic state known as “psychastenia,” that is, “depersonalization by assimilation to space” (Caillois 1988, 72). Caillois finds examples of mimicry in this sense in art as well, for instance, in Flaubert and Dali. Of interest in connection with *Doktor Živago* is his definition of mimicry “as an incantation fixed at its culminating point and having caught the sorcerer in his own trap” (ibid., 69, italics in the original); cf. my analysis (Chapter 1) of Kubaricha’s incantation, which in various ways can be linked to the novel itself. (I am indebted to Igor Smirnov for bringing Caillois to my attention.)

Both of the early contexts I have discussed in relation to mimicry are significant: the first (the letter about Frejdenberg) concerns Pasternak's own birth as an artist, while the second ("Simvolizm i bessmertie") has to do with the origin as such of art. Thus the thoughts on mimicry in the novel seem to be rooted in a sphere to which the author (according to Frejdenberg in many ways returned as he worked on the book, "словно ты шел по кругу и в наибольшем уходе от робкого вступления оказался, в своей зрелости, в двух шагах от своей юности" (Perepiska, 322).

4.6 *Mimicry, mimika and Mimesis*

The process of creation encountered in *Doktor Živago* — in which mimicry was found to be a central category — is connected to yet another notion related to the Greek root *mim-*, namely *mimika* (facial expressions). One peculiarity in Živago's formerly quoted definition of mimicry is that it includes a description which also applies to *mimika*: "Я помешан на вопросе о мимикрии, внешнем приспособлении организмов к окраске окружающей среды. Тут, в этом цветовом подлаживании, скрыт удивительный переход внутреннего во внешнее." (402)²¹² *Mimika* has to do precisely with a change of something internal into something external — "Движения мышц лица, выражающие внутреннее душевное состояние" (Ožegov 1968, 343) — and it is crucial to the theme of articulation, discussed in Chapter 3.

Facial expressions play a conspicuous role in the novel's opening. When Jura climbs up on his mother's grave and it seems he 'wants to say a word' the only expression is not verbal but facial: "Его курносое лицо исказилось. Шея его вытянулась." The pressure of what remains unarticulated gives rise to a kind of deformation which retrospectively — in light of what is said about art as an answer to death — appears as a sign of an awakening creative impulse.

From this perspective, it is instructive to compare Jura with Vasja, who accompanies the Živago family on the train to the Urals. There is a conspicuous focus on Vasja's face as well in the narrative text. It is described as the opposite of Jura's snub-nosed physiognomy: "Вася был хорошенький мальчик с правильными чертами лица, как пишут царских рынд и Божьих ангелов. Он был на редкость чист и неиспорчен." (222) His favorite pastime on the trip — listening to the adults' stories — is commented on as follows: "Тогда по игре его лицевых мускулов, которыми он сдерживал готовы хлынуть слезы или боролся с душившим его смехом, можно было восстановить содер-

²¹²It may be noted that this text also realizes its semantics by the keywords "imitating" one another: "внешнем приспособлении организмов к окраске окружающей среды."

жание сказанного. Предмет беседы отражался на лице впечатлительного мальчика, как в зеркале.” (222) Here impressions are reflected on the surface, and there is no deforming change between internal and external, that is, no creative reworking of experience. In many respects, Vasja is a double of Živago’s antipode Antipov, “чистоплотный мальчик с правильными чертами лица” (37), who is also associated with reflections and mirrors (Jensen 1997, 95-96), representing precisely the anti-creative attitude that is connected with exact copying.²¹³

Jura’s situation at the beginning of the novel can be linked to the opening of the first poem in Živago’s cycle, “Gamlet”: the moment when the lyrical subject — an actor playing Hamlet — has come out on the stage but has not yet begun to speak.²¹⁴ There is a parallelism in the description of a sudden silence followed by the protagonist’s appearance: “Гул затих. Я вышел на подмостки” has a kind of counterpart in the prose section: “Отбарабанил дождь комьев, которыми торопливо в четыре лопаты забросали могилу. На ней вырос холмик. На него взошел десятилетний мальчик.” The Shakespearean notion of the world as a stage resounds clearly in the poem,²¹⁵ imparting on it an existential tone which reinforces the connection with the novel’s beginning where Jura, climbing onto the grave mound, enters life as he would enter onto a stage.²¹⁶ The folk saying which concludes the poem — “Жизнь прожить — не поле перейти” — can, on a concretized level, be connected with the “осенние пустыри” Jura surveys from his elevated position, on the one hand, and with the “pedestrian” semantics which permeates the entire opening, on the other: “Шли и шли и пели,” “прохожие” etc. (see Chapter 1 above).

²¹³Vasja’s intellectual development parallels that of Antipov’s. After arriving in Moscow the boy “outgrows” Živago in the same way that Antipov after arriving in Juratin thinks he grows away from everyone around him, including Lara (107-08). Cf.: “Вася необычайно развился. Он стал говорить и думать совсем не так, как говорил и думал босой и волосатый мальчик на реке Пелге в Веретениках. Очевидность, самодеказательность провозглашенных революцией истин все более привлекала его. Не вполне понятная, образная речь доктора казалась ему голосом неправоты, осужденной, сознающей свою слабость и потому уклончивой.” (468) It is significant that Vasja associates Živago with “неправота”; “правота,” “правильность” etc. are Antipov’s attributes *par excellence*.

²¹⁴Analyses of “Gamlet” include Nilsson 1959 and Bodin 1976a, neither of whom, however, link the poem to the opening of the novel. Jensen (1995, 285) points out the textual connection between the remark at the beginning “Кого хоронят?” and the cemetery scene in Shakespeare’s play.

²¹⁵As expressed in, for instance, *As You Like It*: “All the world’s a stage And all the men and women merely players” (Act II, Sc. 7).

²¹⁶The word “подмостки” (‘boards’) in this connection recalls Schiller’s “die Bretter die die Welt bedeuten” in the 1802 poem “An die Freunde.” The basic meaning of the word, ‘настил из досок на возвышении’ (Ožegov 1968, 528), is brought to the fore in the very concrete description of the coffin in the opening scene: “Гроб закрыли, заколотили, стали опускать;” Jura as well actually climbs up on “boards.”

The two central stanzas of the poem elaborate on the lyrical subject's hesitation before the task that he — a quadruple exposure of poet, actor, Hamlet and Christ — faces: the 'cup' he is expected to drink.²¹⁷ "What, then, is the task of the poet?" Nils Åke Nilsson (1959, 198) asks in his analysis of the poem, and concludes: "What the poem has to say about the poet's task one has to look for in the last line with its tone of contemplation and gravity: 'Living life is no easy matter.' Life is the poet's task." This is also what appears to be Jura's task in the beginning of the novel, but it implies still another one: to articulate the 'word' that is not uttered on the grave. Jura does not yet have a language for what he wants to say; in this sense he is "nature" and in fact is indirectly compared to a wolf cub ("Если бы таким движением поднял голову волчонок, было бы ясно, что он сейчас завоет").²¹⁸ Only as a poet can he formulate the 'word'; how he becomes one is, as noted earlier, described in a passage dealing with his second encounter with death (Anna Ivanovna's funeral). Here the earlier situation, which appears as an unconscious natural state, is contrasted with

²¹⁷The actor theme in the poem is of obvious interest in connection with the discussion of the notions of mimicry/*mimika* (the word *mimika*, incidentally, comes from the Greek *mimos*, 'actor') and deserves a separate study. I will merely note that it may also be linked to one of the possible sources of the entire mimicry complex in Pasternak, namely Nietzsche's *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*, in the fifth part of which, under the heading "Vom Probleme des Schauspielers" (aphorism nr. 361), there is a discussion of acting, art and mimicry and of acting as something inherent in Jews and women (Nietzsche, 310-12). (My attention was drawn to this passage by Savelij Senderovič and Elena Švarc's article "Nabokovskij paradoks o evree" (ms.), in which it is mentioned in connection with Nikolaj Evreinov's ideas on the "theatrical instinct" and their role in Nabokov's works. I would like to express my gratitude to the authors for giving me access to their manuscript. The theme of mimicry in Nabokov and possible links to Pasternak in this respect obviously deserves a special study, an impression that is confirmed by Aage Hansen-Löve's recent article on Nabokov's "calypso" poetics, cf. Hansen-Löve 2000; regrettably, I have not been able to take these works into account in the present study.) In "Gamlet" in particular imitation is of central concern: the lyrical subject imitates an actor playing Hamlet (another kind of imitation) and in addition imitates Christ (the line from Mark 14:36); at the same time, in the second stanza ("На меня наставлен сумрак ночи Тысячью биноклей на оси) the poet "imitates" a line from Lermontov's poem "Mtsyri": "И миллионом черных глаз Смотрела ночи темнота Сквозь ветви каждого куста" (Lermontov 1976 II, 89; cf. in the same stanza "Терновник, спутанный плющом," with its link to "Chmel"). Further, "Gamlet" seems to "imitate" Rilke's poem "Todeserfahrung" (see Jensen 2000). As for "mimika," it is worth noting that Pasternak incorporates it into his notion of realism in the Chopin article: "Очевидно, большой трагический дар немислим без чувства объективности, а чувство объективности не обходится без мимической жилки" (BP4, 406).

²¹⁸From a somewhat different perspective, Jensen (1995, 264) finds in his comparison of *Doktor Živago* and Jacobsen's *Niels Lyhne* that Jura's climb onto the grave already distances him from the natural state that Niels never leaves: "Сцены на могиле — грань противопоставления человеческого духа и природы. Нильс буквально настаивает на земле — он остается с природой. А после соответствующей вещественной фразы о 'комьях' и 'лопатах' у Пастернака его герой, восходя на могилу, выступает из природы. И дождь комьев земли заменяется небесным дождем." The relationship between Jura and Niels is described by Jensen as a "комплементарность образов" with respect to the characters' relationship to God, nature and history.

the adult's reflective existence in culture. As a little boy Jura experiences his surroundings as a 'forest' in which he has 'lost his way' ("Этот лес составляли все вещи на свете," 88); his religiosity is 'animal' in character ("Тогда всей своей полузвериной верой Юра верил в Бога этого леса, как в лесничего").

The adult Živago has distanced himself from nature by *studying* it — at school ("занимался <...> науками о прошлом и о природе") and at the university (medicine) — and he has acquired a language. 'Things' are no longer a 'forest' but 'words in his dictionary.'²¹⁹ This also implies that Jura has established a relationship to tradition, a necessary object for creative imitation. *Mimika* may now become *mimesis*.²²⁰ An example occurs almost immediately in the form of the memorial poem Jura conceives during Anna Ivanovna's funeral: "две-три лучших отличительных черт покойной; образ Тони в трауре; несколько уличных наблюдений по пути назад с кладбища; стираное белье на том месте, где давно когда-то ночью завывала вьюга и он плакал маленьким." (92) It is significant that the concrete description of Živago's creative impulse also mentions his weeping as a child. Jura's reaction on the grave in the opening scene, "мальчик зарыдал," can now be transformed into poetry — which provides a formula for art that resembles Lara's description of the funeral ritual Živago himself cannot be given: "Как жаль все-таки, что его не отпевают по-церковному! Погребальный обряд так величав и торжественен! Большинство покойников недостойны его. А Юрочка такой благодарный повод! Он так всего этого стоил, так бы это 'надгробное рыдание творящее песнь аллилуя' оправдал и окупил!" (492)²²¹ The sob on the grave that eventually gives rise to a song in praise of life may be seen as the briefest possible summary of the novel itself.

Thus Živago's poems can be said to be a shaping of the (inner) striving suggested by the opening scene. The change of something internal into something

²¹⁹Jura's experience of things as a forest corresponds to B. Gasparov's (1992b, 125) description of the childhood state of linguistic syncretism in *Detstvo Ljuvers*: "имя действительности сливается с самой действительностью в неразложимый симбиоз."

²²⁰I am using the notion of mimesis here in a wider sense. In my view, particularly relevant with regard to Pasternak's novel is the broadening of the concept proposed by Hutcheon in her study of metafictional texts: "In demanding recognition of diegesis or narrative process as part of mimesis, metafiction is in a sense demanding a reworking of the Aristotelian theory" (Hutcheon 1991, 41); "In fiction, this critical awareness or self-consciousness has been more and more structurally internalized, moving from the Preface into the content, and finally into the narrative structure of the novel itself. This movement suggests the need for a broader concept of mimesis which would enlarge the range of objects of imitation from those of the empirical world to include the problems of reading and writing." (Ibid., 45); cf. Hutcheon's distinction (referred to in my Introduction) between "mimesis of product" and "mimesis of process" (ibid., 38-39).

²²¹Cf. also my discussion in Chapter 1 of death as a creative impulse.

external that according to Živago lies “hidden” in mimicry also proves to be the starting point of his art. With the definition of mimicry appearing as a definition of art, mimicry should be regarded as an image of the birth of art as it is demonstrated in the novel.

Moreover, the “internal-external” relationship is central in a number of senses. In the poem “Rassvet,” which portrays the birth of the poem or, perhaps, of poetry in general, the change from “internal” to “external” is presented in spatial terms as a part of the creative impulse, which is expressed in the — inspired — lyrical subject’s “outward” striving: “Мне к людям хочется, в толпу, В их утреннее оживление. <...> И я по лестнице бегу, Как будто выхожу впервые” (532).²²² As noted above, there is also an obvious link to mimicry in the final stanzas of this poem, where the lyrical subject ‘feels for everybody,’ as if he ‘were in their skin.’

However, art is not simply a transition from internal to external; it involves an organic connection between the two — as in the case of “content” in relation to “form.” This is manifested in the novel when the form realizes the semantics of the text and we encounter examples of ‘autometadescription.’ The tendency for characters in the novel to realize the meaning of their names²²³ can also be regarded from such a perspective: the name (external) is organically united with the essence of the character (internal). This is concretely demonstrated when Živago names his son: “Юрий Андреевич тогда уже решил назвать сына в честь тестя Александром. Неизвестно почему он вообразил, что так кричит его мальчик, потому что это был плач с физиономией, уже содержащий будущий характер и судьбу человека, плач со звуковой окраской, заключающей в себе имя мальчика, имя Александр, как вообразил Юрий Андреевич.” (171)

In cases where the connection between internal and external is broken and there is a discrepancy between what is experienced and what is expressed — as in various types of opportunism and political adaptation — there arises the kind of mechanical, lifeless language that characterizes Živago’s “retrained” friends with their “пружины пафоса” and “механизм рассуждений” (474). This

²²²Cf. “Я вышел на подмостки” in “Gamlet” and Jura’s impulse when he wakes up at night after his mother’s funeral: “Первым движением Юры, когда он слез с подоконника, было желание одеться и бежать на улицу, чтобы что-то предпринять.” (8)

²²³Cf., for example, Rowland & Rowland 1967, 9-11; Faryno 1990; Borisov 1992. This is true not only of the novel; cf. in connection with *Ochrannaja gramota*: “Обычно, когда мы встречаем в Пастернаковском тексте ‘имя’, мы можем ожидать игру в той или иной форме на его ‘значении’ или историко-культурных ассоциациях, им вызываемых. <...> оживляется ‘внутренняя форма’ личного имени” (Flejšman 1981, 227). For an extensive study of the problem of naming in the context of the avant-garde, see Hansen-Löve 1988.

state is fateful; according to Živago's diagnosis, it may, quite literally, result in death: "В наше время очень участились микроскопические формы сердечных кровоизлияний. Они не все смертельны. В некоторых случаях люди выживают. Это болезнь новейшего времени. Я думаю, ее причины нравственного порядка. От огромного большинства из нас требуют постоянного, в систему возведенного криводушия. Нельзя без последствий для здоровья изо дня в день проявлять себя противно тому, что чувствуешь" (476).

It is as a skillful diagnostician that Živago distinguishes himself professionally, a talent on which he himself reflects in the conversation with Lara just before touching on "mimicry," and which he associates with the phenomenon of intuition: "Но ведь сами они [the hostile milieu, S. W.] в один голос кричат: гениальный диагност, гениальный диагност. И, правда, я редко ошибаюсь в определении болезни. Но ведь это и есть ненавистная им интуиция, которой якобы я грешу, цельное, разом охватывающее картину познание." (402) Other scholars have commented on this gift of his,²²⁴ which — as has now become clear — is specifically correlated with the hero's and the novel's notion of mimicry. The creative ability to transform content into form also includes the opposite ability to read content in form. Intuition is the capability of inferring something internal from external, barely noticeable signs, as when Živago notes (quite correctly) in his diary about his wife: "Мне кажется, Тоня в положении. Я ей об этом сказал. Она не разделяет моего предположения, а я в этом уверен. Меня до появления более бесспорных признаков не могут обмануть предшествующие, менее уловимые." (278) This phenomenon is formulated almost declaratively in an episode in which Živago senses the cause of a patient's death: "Юрий Андреевич утверждал, что у нее эхинококк печени. Все с ним спорили. Сегодня ее вскроют. Вскрытие установит истину." (103) To his colleagues' great surprise, his diagnosis proves to be correct.²²⁵

As a poet, Živago reflects on his own creation in a way that also brings up the relationship between "internal" and "external." During his intense nocturnal writing period at Varykino he is concerned with the "внешность написанного" (430); here it is significant that his dissatisfaction with the metre he

²²⁴See, for example, Masing-Delić 1982, who discusses Živago's gift in connection with Bergson's *L'Évolution créatrice*. Cf. also Aucouturier 1979, 340-341 on the role of intuition in Bergson's philosophy and its possible links to Pasternak's "творческая эстетика."

²²⁵Smirnov (1996, 194) associates this competence with Schelling: "Даром, если не чудодейственным, то все же превосходящим нормальные человеческие умственные силы, обладает и Юрий Живаго, выдающийся диагност, субъект, как бы переходящий (нужно ли еще раз говорить: по-шеллинговски?) в свой объект."

first selected for his poem about Egorij Chrabryj, pentameter, is based on an inadequate correspondence between expression and content: “Независимое от содержания, самому размеру свойственное благозвучие раздражало его своей казенной фальшивой певучестью.” (435) When, eventually, he finds the “right” measure (trimeter), the content grows forth organically: “узость строчных промежутков сама подсказывала, чем их наполнить.”

The novel’s explicit and implicit aesthetic discussion can be followed in the next generation of protagonists as well, which, in the light of the evolutionist implications of mimicry, is not so surprising. An examination of the traits that are passed on by the main characters to their offspring reveals that all the children — Jurij and Tonja’s son Šura (Aleksandr), Lara and Antipov’s daughter Katja, Jurij and Lara’s daughter Tanja — inherit some feature of relevance to what has been noticed above in connection with creation.

Šura is described in some detail in connection with the family’s arrival at Varykino and later in Živago’s diary; both occasions are related to a kind of creative activity that involves features of mimicry:

Шурочка, бессознательно привыкший к тому, что его ребяческие изречения на детском языке принимаются взрослыми восторженно, и потому, *подлаживаясь под их вкус*, с увлечением и охотно несший околесину, был не в своей тарелке. (271)

На радостях, что Анфим привез ядрового мыла, закатали генеральную стирку, и Шурочка два дня *без присмотра. Забирается, когда я пишу, под стол*, садится на перекладину между ножками и, *подражая Анфиму*, который в каждый приезд катает его на санях, *изображает*, будто тоже вывозит меня в розвальнях. (280)

First, a key word from the definition of mimicry occurs here, namely “подлаживаясь.” Second, it is a question of a creation that especially connotes pictorial art and that is realized through imitation: “подражая Анфиму <...> изображает.” In the second instance, the situation itself implies a kind of mimicry: the boy left without supervision looks for protection next to his father at his writing desk — a proximity which in view of the child’s creative activity also becomes a similarity.²²⁶

The qualities that describe Katja can be gathered from Lara’s conversation with Evgraf near the conclusion of the novel:

У Катюши открылись замечательные способности, частью драматические, а с другой стороны и музыкальные, *она чудесно всех копирует и разыгрывает целые сцены собственного сочинения*, но кроме того, и поет по слуху целые партии из опер, удивительный ребенок, не правда ли. (491)

²²⁶Note also the connection between “охотно несший околесину” and the formulation in *Ochran'naja gramota* that ‘art lies’ in the sense of “нести лишнее” (BP4, 179).

On an aesthetic level, the little girl has assumed features that distinguish her father's behavior: Antipov's talent for exact copying and his dramatization of different situations in which he plays with the lives and deaths of others. Katja also exemplifies a non-organic relationship between "internal" and "external," as can be seen during Živago's visit to Lara in Jurjatin: "Она уже за дверью обнаружила, что у матери гость, но, показавшись на пороге, сочла нужным изобразить на лице нечаянное удивление" (296).²²⁷

The only child who provides tangible evidence of creativity is Tanja, whose brutal childhood story is a "text within the text" in the epilogue. Just as she herself reproduces certain of Živago's physical characteristics (the smile, "курносость," 501), in her text we may discern a connection with her father's work. This consists in a singular relationship to the Gospels — a text that many of Živago's poems render with "creative shifts."²²⁸ Tanja's story contains a network of semantic approximations to the Biblical text that forms a pattern reminiscent of the structure of the poem "Durnye dni": a kind of recapitulation of important stages and elements in Christ's life.

The most striking signal of this connection is the name of the place where the events — the savage attack on Tanja's foster family — take place: "станция Нагорная," with its obvious link to "Нагорная проповедь," the Sermon on the Mount. This may be said to be one of the two elements Vedenjapin singles out and contrasts in his discussion of the Gospels early on in the novel: "До сих пор считалось, что самое важное в Евангелии нравственные изречения и правила, заключенные в заповедях, а для меня самое главное то, что Христос говорит притчами из быта, поясняя истину светом повседневности." (44-45) The other element — "притча" — is represented lexically in Tanja's remark about the soldiers who are coming to their rescue: "красноармейцы на полотно, говорят 'в чем дело?', удивляются, что за *притча*" (509). Besides such words as "Христа ради" (506) and "Господь," we can also note the expression "какие страсти" (ibid.). Tanja's description of the train whistle — "Словно бы петух по-родному пропел" (507) — alludes to the Passion, recalling Peter's denial of Christ in Matthew 26:74 ("И вдруг запел петух"); the name Peter, moreover, echoes in the little crippled boy Pe-

²²⁷Here, with the opposite result, Katja reproduces Antipov's behavior during his meeting with Živago on the train: "Он из вежливости не показал, что присутствие постороннего удивляет его или стесняет. Наоборот, он обратился ко всем с таким видом, точно он и доктора относил к их обществу." (248)

²²⁸Distorting shifts are linked to Tanja already in a discussion of her surname, Bezočeredeva, which is declared to be a 'street corruption' of the word "bezotčaja" (501). there are similar distortions in her own story: her mother's name, for example, is changed to "Raisa Komarova," and Komarovskij becomes "Komarov."

ten'ka.²²⁹ Like the story of the Passion, Tanja's tale ends with a crucifixion — the soldiers' punishment of the robber: “Вытащили его на шпалы, руки ноги к рельсам привязали и по живому поезд провели — самосуд.” (509)

A narrative element connects to the last of the events remembered by Christ in “Durnye dni” — the raising of Lazarus: “Припомнился <...> И сборище бедных в лачуге, И спуск со свечою в подвал, Где вдруг она гасла в испуге, Когда воскресенный вставал...” Tanja's foster mother Marfa, who has the same name as Lazarus' sister (John 11:1), lures the robber into the cellar of the house. The elements “спуск” and “свеча” are present in her argumentation: “Я тебе лучше, говорит, с верхней ступеньки *посвечу*. Ты не бойся, я для твоей верности вместе с тобой дочку вниз *спущу*” (507). What happens in the cellar, however, is no awakening but a child-murder (of Peten'ka, “ангельская душенька”), which itself relates to another of Christ's memories, “бегство в Египет” in the sixth stanza of the poem.

Thus Tanja's text displays a proximity to the version of the Biblical events in the poem,²³⁰ while, at the same time, representing a serious distortion of it. Gordon's reaction to her story — “Так было уже несколько раз в истории. Задуманное идеально, возвышенно, — грубело, овеществлялось. Так Греция стала Римом, так русское просвещение стало русской революцией” (509-510) — appears in this context as the novel's commentary on itself on a stylistic level.

4.7 Concluding Remarks

From my analysis it becomes clear that what Živago perceives to be the latent essence of mimicry, an ‘amazing change from internal to external,’ is closely connected with the ontology of art. His definition of mimicry, however, may also apply to the rhetoric of art, to its “how.”²³¹ The attribute “цветовое подлаживание” captures two central phenomena in the novel's account of the origins of art as I understand it: art as *dopisyvanie* realized through imitating adaptation (with the relationship of the novel to Revelation and *Brat'ja Karamazovy* as

²²⁹The voice Tanja hears (“словно опять кто мне из лесу”) and which helps her to act in the difficult situation, can be compared with the mother's voice Jura thinks he hears in the forest during his visit to Voskoboynikov: “он звучал Юре в мелодических оборотах птиц и жужжании пчел.” (15) Cf.: “Нужли, думаю, и я вместе с тетей Марфушей не в своем уме, что со мной всякая живая тварь, всякая машина бессловесная ясным русским языком говорит?” (508). The episode with Jura is also linked to a stopped train — a halt caused by his father's suicide.

²³⁰As to the divergences of the poem from the Biblical text, Bodin (1976, 96) notes its connection with Rembrandt's painting *The Raising of Lazarus*.

²³¹Here I am borrowing Arne Melberg's use of Plato's distinctions between “logos” and “lexis” in Kittang, et al., 1997, 107.

examples),²³² and writing as *živopis'* in which there is a continuous focus on color and light in the writing situation. The accentuation of the role of *light* and *vision* in connection with the creation of art also has a bearing on the mimicry theme. Light plays a decisive role in the processes involved in mimicry: on the one hand, light is a prerequisite for the sensory (to some extent *aesthetic*, since it is oriented toward color and form) experience of the environment that underlies the ability of the organism to adapt; on the other, light participates in the interplay with the body surface of the organism that produces defensive mimicry. The organism *sees*, receives impressions, and what is seen is exteriorized in some form on its own surface. In this sense the essence of biological mimicry can actually be regarded as 'transition from internal to external.' To perceive and then to express with a view to "подлаживание" — whereby the very act of expression involves a certain degree of "искажение," 'distortive shift' — is also the artistic practice that is demonstrated in *Doktor Živago*.

Once observed, the significance of mimicry in the novel offers an interpretative framework which enables us to integrate several important points that have been made over the years on the features of Pasternak's poetics.²³³ As I noted above, it is for example obvious that the notion of mimicry is relevant to Roman Jakobson's 1935 article, in which he notes the lyrical subject's fusion with his surroundings. However, as suggested by the analysis of "Chmel'," mimicry can also be related to the much discussed question — highlighted by Jakobson — of "metaphor" and "metonymy." It has been pointed out that categorizations of Pasternak's texts in this respect are problematic: it is often difficult to determine what represents a metaphor and what a metonymy.²³⁴ Perhaps the problem has to do more with the externally imposed categories than with the object itself. If with the support of the novel's implicit poetics we regard mimicry as a rhetorical figure, we see that it combines the distinctive features of the two: mimicry (in the sense that is given in *Doktor Živago*) means that a *relation of proximity* (the principle of metonymy) gives rise to a *relation of similarity* (the

²³²Note how this view of art is anticipated — lexically as well — in the image that opens the novel: "Шли и шли и пели 'Вечную память', и, когда останавливались, казалось, что ее по-залаженному продолжают петь ноги, лошади, дуновения ветра."

²³³Mimicry seems to be able to play a similar cognitive role in its original context — biological research: "the phenomenon of protective mimicry is not simply an umbrella subsuming diverse research topics. Rather, its multifaceted manifestation in the biological world allows both a conceptualization and an integration of diverse and complex biological ideas. Indeed, not only does mimicry remain a well-known application of natural selection, but it continues to be a powerful intellectual tool for investigating the process of evolution." (Brower 1988, S3)

²³⁴Apparently, this ambiguity extends to other tropes as well. As Björling (1976, 178) observes, it is also "frequently impossible to unravel Pasternak's similes into two constituent parts, *comparandum* and *comparatum*."

principle of metaphor).²³⁵ The couple in “Chmel’” resemble and are likened to a union of bush and climbing plant precisely because they *are next to one*.²³⁶

Imitation as a process can also be related to the complex of questions concerning the relationship of the text to other texts. A significant share of recent Pasternak scholarship has been devoted to just this problem (Smirnov, Greber, Evans-Romaine, and others). But whereas there has been a tendency to use Pasternak’s texts to illustrate various aspects of “intertextuality” as such, I have attempted to show that we are dealing with a very specific “mimicking” of texts — his own and others’ — which in itself seems to be a central component of Pasternak’s poetics, with its idiosyncratic form of *dopisyvanie*.

Pinpointing Pasternak’s ‘artistic metaphysics,’ Boris Gasparov (1992a) maintains that its singularity lies in its joining of a “Futurist” and a “Tolstoyan” basis: Pasternak’s poetics is related to that of the Futurists (“сдвиг,” “смещение”), but has inherited Tolstoj’s notion of “страдательная роль художника” and “телеологическая задача искусства.” Both of these factors are contained in the notion of mimicry as I have approached it: the creative shift of imitation and the subject’s exposition to the forming/deforming influence of the environment. What Gasparov sees as the ultimate goal of art in Pasternak — “Искусство призвано завоевывать бесконечность и бессмертие” (Gasparov 1992a, 133) — may also be said to touch upon the chief task of mimicry, which is to preserve life. Several scholars have explicitly discussed the “protective function” of art in Pasternak (Aucouturier 1979; Flejšman 1981, 188; Flejšman 1991, 118; Greber 1997), although without reference to the mimicry theme.²³⁷

²³⁵Pasternak does not himself use the term “metonymy,” but speaks in, for example, the article “Vassermanova reakcija” of metaphors based on “ассоциативная связь <...> по смежности (BP4, 353). It is worth noting that the discussion of the rhetorical figures in this passage of the article brings up precisely the image of mimicry: “Самостоятельная потребность в сближении по сходству просто немыслима. Зато такое, и только такое сближение может быть затребовано извне. Неужели Шершеневич не знает, что *непропицаемое в своей окраске слово не может заимствовать окраски от сравниваемого*, что окрашивает представление только болезненная необходимость в сближении, та чересполосность, которая царит в лирически нагнетенном сознании.” (Ibid., 354)

²³⁶Cf. Mossman’s (1989, 396) view: “the trope which is central to the poetics of *Doctor Zhivago* is the catachresis, not the ‘mixed’ metaphor of common usage but the metaphorical complex that results from wresting one metaphor from another.” It seems, however, that “mimicry” better satisfies the demands Mossman himself poses: “A satisfactory statement of the poetics of *Doctor Zhivago* will require the direct confrontation of Jakobson’s proposition in the context, first, of the novel’s dispute with Formalism and, second, at the level of trope. Moreover, no statement of the poetics of *Doctor Zhivago* will be complete which does not encompass the poetry of the novel as well as the prose.” (Ibid.)

²³⁷The scholars mentioned here have pointed out that the title *Ochrannaja gramota* has to do with this protective function (which, one may add, is also discernible in the title of Pasternak’s early article “Černyj bokal,” named after the symbol for “Fragile!” on packages and the like). As the name of a work of art, however, it can be understood in a more specific sense in light of the present analysis. *Ochrannaja gramota* itself performs a kind of mim-

However, mimicry is relevant to the novel not only in the aesthetic respect; the phenomenon also has ties to a political and ethical discussion in the work that has been noted by several researchers, namely the question of revolution versus evolution.²³⁸ It is most clearly expressed in a conversation between Živago and the partisan leader Liverij Mikulicyn, in which the doctor's praise of life's own potential for renewal takes the form of an argument for evolution: "Переделка жизни! Так могут рассуждать люди, хотя, может быть, и издавшие виды, но ни разу не узнавшие жизни, не почувствовавшие ее духа, души ее. Для них существование — это комок грубого, не облагороженного их прикосновением материала, нуждающегося в их обработке. А материалом, веществом, жизнь никогда не бывает. Она сама, если хотите знать, непрерывно себя обновляющее, вечно себя перерабатывающее начало, она сама вечно себя переделывает и претворяет, она сама куда выше наших с вами тупоумных теорий." (334)²³⁹ Mimicry is a significant factor in the *modus operandi* of evolution and as such, in the novel, it can be regarded as its exponent through a kind of *pars pro toto* relationship; mimicry is synecdochically connected with evolution.²⁴⁰

icry: for example, when speaking of the Italian Renaissance, it is "actually" speaking of its own time. This is one way in which the text is an "охранная грамота," a text that ensures its *own* existence and thereby the continued existence of everyone it is about. (On this function as "охранная грамота футуризма," see Greber 1997, 40). Similarly, much that was unnameable and therefore doomed to oblivion seems capable of living on in a concealed form in *Doktor Živago*, among them *Ochrannaja gramota* itself — cf. Livingstone's (1989, 36) observation: "Closest of all to the novel is the autobiographical work *A Safe Conduct*. Some of its sentences reappear in *Doctor Zhivago* in 'smoothed out and unnoticeable' form, and many of its themes are expanded there; indeed in 1946 Pasternak called his novel 'the world of *A Safe Conduct* once again, only without the theorising.'"

²³⁸See, for example, Møller 1979, who uses the term "transformism" to describe the revolutionary standpoint: "The novel contrasts transformism, that is, the idea that by means of insight into certain laws humanity's vanguard can transform existence, with the opposite viewpoint according to which humanity should be concerned with living life — not with interrupting or jeopardizing it in order to rework it." (Møller 1979, 151-52 [translated from Danish — S. W]) When this term occurs in the novel ("Книжки содержали философию Юрия Андреевича <...> мысли о трансформизме и эволюции", 467), it is, however, also possible to understand it in its Bergsonian sense; the pair "transformism and evolution" may refer not to the opposition between revolution and evolution, but to the conflict between neo-Lamarckian and Darwinian views.

²³⁹The "blindness" Živago observes in Liverij — "Какая близорукость! <...> Какое самоослепление!" (334) — acquires its meaning also by virtue of the role the eye and vision play in connection with mimicry: evolution is connected with seeing, revolution with not seeing.

²⁴⁰A good example of a rhetorical usage of "evolution" in Russian post-revolutionary political discourse is in Michail Bulgakov's (1990 V, 446) description of his ideological attitude in a letter to the government in 1930: "глубокий скептицизм в отношении революционного процесса, происходящего в моей отсталой стране, и противопоставление ему излюбленной и Великой Эволюции <...>."

This becomes clear in another exchange of views on the same theme, namely the discussion between Vedenjapin, who has recently returned from abroad to Moscow, and Aleksandr Aleksandrovič Gromeko, just before the events of October 1917 (177-179). The now pro-Bolshevik Vedenjapin champions the necessity of the revolution — “Вы знаете, что частичное подновление старого здесь не пригодно, требуется его коренная ломка” — while Gromeko obviously wants to take the opposite viewpoint. While Vedenjapin is eloquent (“Ему льстила роль политического краснбая”), Gromeko, with his “мямлющие паузы” and “эканье и меканье,” has trouble formulating any substantive counterarguments. His objections are rather ethical in nature; the Socialist Revolutionary journalists Vedenjapin cites in order to back up his opinions, Gromeko characterizes as “люди без совести. Говорят одно, а делают другое.” The “evolutionary counterargument” is instead Gromeko’s *physical appearance*, with its connection with mimicry: “Верхняя губа у Александра Александровича с подстриженными усиками чуть-чуть выдавалась над нижней. Так же точно оттопыривался галстук бабочкой на его груди. Было нечто общее между этою губой и галстуком, и оно придавало Александру Александровичу что-то трогательное, доверчиво-детское.” Central to this chain of resemblances (“галстук” is compared to “бабочка,” which in turn resembles his mustached upper lip) is of course the butterfly, the symbol of mimicry not only in the novel but also in the popular conception. Gromeko acquires his status of antirevolutionary counterargument through Živago’s positive evaluation of him, which both underscores historical continuity and, in itself, focuses on yet another case of imitation: “Юрий Андреевич с наслаждением слушал тестя. Он обожал эту хорошо знакомую старомосковскую речь нараспев, с мягким, похожим на мурлыканье громековским подкартавливанием.”²⁴¹

Instead of a verbalized argument we are given an embodied word which is synecdochically connected with the theme of evolution.

Mimicry in *Doktor Živago* is an image of the essence and existential mode of art. It also applies to the novel itself: to its relationship with other texts (their presence in its interior and exterior), to the relationship between the poetry and prose sections, and to its genre. The work emerges as a kind of chameleon novel which — like Lara’s miraculously preserved necklace — seems to assume now

²⁴¹In his verbal behavior Gromeko also has something in common with Živago, for whom *loss*, as we have seen, serves as a creative impulse: “Разговорчивость находила на него [Aleksandr Aleksandrovič, S. W.] во время розысков чего-нибудь потерянного, например при подыскивании второй калоши к первой” (178-179).

one appearance, now another.²⁴² The link thus established between the novel's "content" and "form" has itself to do with mimicry and its 'amazing transition of the internal to the external,' to use Živago's words. In this connection, I have suggested the possible significance of Vladimir Solov'ev's works on the philosophy of art: the fusion of biology and aesthetics in *Doktor Živago* is reminiscent of their union in Solov'ev's 'aesthetics of nature.'

A much cited passage in *Ochrannaja gramota* offers the following description of a 'good' work of art: "Самое ясное, запоминающееся и важное в искусстве есть его возникновение, и лучшие произведения мира, повествуя о наизычайнейшем, на самом деле рассказывают о своем рождении." (BP4, 186) Characteristic of mimicry and its role in the novel is precisely that it is less a static image which relates to the novel as a finished product, than a dynamic symbolization of its coming into the world. Mimicry is the main hero in the story of its own birth that *Doktor Živago* — in addition to everything else — contains. And if we cast a Pasternakian "second glance" at the definition in *Ochrannaja gramota*, we realize that by insisting on the necessity of an 'in fact' ("на самом деле"), it renders mimicry in some form a *conditio sine qua non* for all genuine art.

²⁴² This very feature has often been criticized as a shortcoming. Cf., for example, Aleksandr Gladkov's (1973, 139) opinion: "Отчетливо подражательны многие сюжетные реминисценции: все бесконечные ночные разговоры, объяснения, выстрел Лары и уход от нее мужа. Это все 'литература', как и почти все другие необыкновенные встречи и совпадения, вплоть до появления дочери в конце. Мне кажется, что беда Б. Л. — в неверном выборе жанра для того большого сочинения в прозе, к которому его так тянуло всю жизнь." To this may be objected that it was not Pasternak who chose the genre, but the genre that chose Pasternak, in the meaning that it grew organically out of the premises of his poetics.

Instead of a Summary: A Second Glance

*There is a man haunts the forest, that abuses our young
plants with carving "Rosalind" on their barks; hangs
odes upon hawthornes, and elegies on brambles*

William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*

The Forest as Stage

This study of *Doktor Živago* has presented certain aspects of creation, both as depicted in the novel and as realized in the form of the work itself. These aspects have proved to be intimately connected with each other. Several of the central points in question share a link to a definite place, namely the forest. My contention here is that the forest serves as a *stage* whereupon the novel demonstrates important features of its poetics and philosophy of art.

One example is the forest passage that contains the partisan woman Kubaricha's incantation. Crucial in many respects (see Chapter 1.2 above), it illustrates Živago's definition of art as 'continued writing,' while reflecting certain other characteristics of the novel as a whole, such as the link to Revelation and the metapoetic stance. In this situation, the element of staging is underscored by Kubaricha's appearance as a *performer* (albeit not a voluntary one) with an audience:

Стоявшие кучкою поодаль любопытные мешали знахарке. Она недобрым взглядом смеривала их с головы до ног. Но было ниже ее достоинства признаваться, что они ее стесняют. Самолюбие артистки останавливало ее. И она делала вид, что не замечает их. Доктор наблюдал ее из задних рядов, скрытый от нее. (359)

The forest is also the setting of the mimicry episode, in which the main hero, lying on the leaf-covered ground, embodies the principal notion of the novel's poetics and, in addition, *realizes* a formulation from Pasternak's early lecture "Simvolizm i bessmertie," expressing a philosophy of art (see 4.2 and 4.5 above). Likewise, a preceding passage, in which Živago is penetrated by the rays of the setting sun provides important clues to the aesthetics and poetics of the novel. First, it contributes to the image of the novel's being a 'continuation of Dostoevskij' (the slanting rays of the sun as a vehicle for the memory theme, the element of transfiguration; see Chapter 3.2 above); second, it relates to Vladimir Solov'ev's aesthetic philosophy as outlined in his 'Beauty in Nature' (see 4.4 above). Actually, the scene may also be viewed as a staging of an important

statement on art, namely Pasternak's sketch for a 'creative aesthetics' in *Och-rannaja gramota*, which is based on the image of a penetrating ray.²⁴³

As regards *Živago's* own creation, we note that the most important part of his poetry writing — which is semantically modeled as painting throughout — takes place in the forest village of Varykino (see 2.3 above). "Chmel'," the poem which becomes — through its staging of an instance of mimicry — emblematic of the novel's poetics, is also set in a forest.

However, not only the poetics and the philosophy of art are to a high degree localized in the forest; this is also a place for the staging of other kinds of philosophy. Masing-Delić (1981), for example, has shown that one of the forest chapters can be interpreted down to the smallest details as a literal demonstration of Nikolaj Fedorov's philosophy, with *Živago* himself in a leading role.²⁴⁴ Other scholars have pointed to the forest as a metaphor in the novel's presentation of its philosophy of history.²⁴⁵ The forest has apparently taken on specific functions which in turn motivates its overwhelming presence in the novel.

Defining Pasternak's position in 1913, when he presented his "Simvolizm i bessmertie" lecture, Flejšman (1993, 73) observes: "Характерно, что если по приезде в Марбург Пастернак испытывал искушение 'бросить теорию' и уйти в лес, то теперь первое публичное выступление его в литературной среде было красноречивой данью 'теории' <...>." In *Doktor Živago*, then, Pasternak really 'goes out into the forest,' but he takes the philosophy along with him — and stages it.

In conclusion, I will suggest a source for the idea of the forest as a stage. In order to do so, we must examine a passage which is crucial to the discussion of the novel's philosophy of history (Lekić 1983, Mossman 1986). The following lines are part of *Živago's* reflections as he, left by Lara in Varykino, devotes himself to writing poetry:²⁴⁶

²⁴³"Если бы при знаниях, способностях и досуге я задумал теперь писать творческую эстетику, я построил бы ее на двух понятиях, на понятии силы и символа. Я показал бы, что, в отличие от науки, берущей природу в разрезе светового столба, искусство интересуется жизнью *при прохождении* [italics in the original, S.W.] сквозь нее луча силового. Понятие силы я взял бы в том же широчайшем смысле, в каком берет его теоретическая физика, с той только разницей, что речь шла бы не о принципе силы, а о ее голосе, о ее присутствии. Я пояснил бы, что в рамках самосознания сила называется чувством." (BP4, 187)

²⁴⁴This theatre metaphor is mine.

²⁴⁵Cf.: "The forest, and the plant kingdom in general, may serve as central components in Pasternak's metaphor of history" (Lekić 1983, 40); "History is like the forest world. It is self-perpetuating and alive, preserving and itself preserved by all the natural means of generation and self-selection" (ibid, 46); "The metaphor of history is concentrated in Part XI of the novel, "The Forest Band" (*Lesnoe voinstvo*), where the struggle for existence echoes in its title." (Mossman 1986, 255)

²⁴⁶On the creative potential of loss, see 1.1 and 3.2 above.

Он снова думал, что историю, то, что называется ходом истории, он представляет себе совсем не так, как принято, и ему снова рисуется наподобие жизни растительного царства. Зимой под снегом оголенные прутья лиственного леса тощи и жалки, как волоски на старческой бородавке. Весной в несколько дней лес преобразается, подымается до облаков, в его покрытых листьями дебрях можно затеряться, спрятаться. Это превращение достигается движением, по стремительности превосходящим движения животных, потому что животное не растет так быстро, как растение, и которого никогда нельзя подсмотреть. Лес не передвигается, мы не можем его накрыть, подстеречь, за переменою места. Мы всегда застаем его в неподвижности. И в такой же неподвижности застаем мы вечно растущую, вечно меняющуюся, неуследимую в своих превращениях жизнь общества, историю. (448)

Živago's ideas about history contains an allusion to Shakespeare's *Macbeth*: he is implicitly commenting on the image of a forest on the march, a central element in the play's depiction of a dramatic historical chain of events.²⁴⁷ According to the prophecy, Macbeth can stay in power until "Great Birnam wood to high Dunsinane hill Shall come against him" (Act IV, Sc. 1). This moment seems to occur with the messenger's report (Act V, Sc. 5): "As I did stand my watch upon a hill, I look toward Birnam, and anon, methought, The wood began to move. <...> Within this three mile may you see it coming; I say, a moving grove."²⁴⁸ Živago, however, is quite right — the forest does not move.²⁴⁹ The action is a kind of *mimicry* initiated by Malcolm in the preceding scene: "Let every soldier hew him down a bough, and bear't before him: thereby shall we shadow The numbers of our host, and make discovery Err in report of us." Eventually, the plan is revealed to the enemy: "Now, near enough: your leafy screens throw down, And show like those you are." (Act V, Sc. 6) In his translation of *Macbeth*, Pasternak renders these lines as "Мы перед замком. Бросим ветви прочь И явимся без лиственных прикрытий." (Šekspir 1951, 689) Lexically, this corresponds to the element of mimicry found in Živago's comparison of history to a forest: "Весной в несколько дней лес преобразается, подымается до облаков, в его *покрытых листьями* дебрях можно затеряться, спрятаться."

But more than the connection with *Macbeth* I wish to emphasize the presence of Shakespeare in the novel's forest context. To my mind, this is a major

²⁴⁷Cf. the discussion in 1.3 above of Pasternak's translating *Macbeth* while working on *Doktor Živago* and that parts of the novel were written on the reverse side of the manuscript of this translation.

²⁴⁸Pasternak's rendering of these lines is: "Я был сейчас в дозоре И вдруг увидел, как Бирнамский лес Как бы задвигался <...> В трех милях виден Навстречу замку шествующий лес. Шагающая роща." (Šekspir 1951, 689)

²⁴⁹Cf. the image of the trees in the poem "Gefsimanskij sad," striving in vain to get away: "Лужайка обрывалась с половины. За нею начинался Млечный Путь. Седые серебристые маслины Пытались вдаль по воздуху шагнуть." (538)

source for Pasternak's concept of the forest as a stage — the forest being not only a frequent setting in Shakespeare's plays, but a topos specifically linked to philosophy, poetry, and love. A good example is *As You Like It*, in which the forest — as opposed to the castle — is the place of philosophical dialogue, poetry-writing and love-games. Here the melancholy Jaques is found in a Živago-like position, philosophizing "as he lay along Under an oak, whose antique root peeps out Upon the brook that brawls along this wood" (Act II, Sc. I). A little later he recites his poetry (Act II, Sc. 5) and utters the famous line "All the world's a stage..." which can be linked to the poem "Gamlet."

The importance of Shakespeare in this case raises questions as to the role of the translations in Pasternak's œuvre. His philosophy of "writing *on*" (*dopisyvanie*) and mimicry with its inherent life-giving "deviations" may throw new light on Pasternak's personal approach to the theory and practice of literary translation. But these questions take us beyond the limits of the present study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographical works

- Sendich, Munir 1991a "Boris Pasternak in Literary Criticism (1914-1990): An Analysis," *Russian Language Journal*, Vol. XLV, Nos. 151-152; 129-183
- 1991b "Boris Pasternak: A Selected Annotated Bibliography of Literary Criticism (1914-1990)," *Russian Language Journal*, Vol. XLV, No. 150; 41-259
- 1994 *Boris Pasternak: A Reference Guide*. New York, Toronto etc.
- Sendich, Munir & Greber, Erika 1990 *Pasternak's Doctor Zhivago: An International Bibliography of Criticism (1957-1985)*. East Lansing, Mich.
- Zacharenko, N. G. (ed.) 1995 *Russkie pisateli poëty (sovetskij period). Bibliografičeskij ukazatel'. 18. B. Pasternak*. Rossijskaja nacional'naja biblioteka, Sankt-Peterburg.

Primary sources

- Achmatova, Anna 1977 *Stichotvorenija i poëmy*. Leningrad.
- Bulgakov, Michail 1990 *Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomach*. Moskva
- Dostoevskij, Fedor 1972-1992 *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij v tridcati tomach*. Leningrad. (= Pss 1-30)
- Durylin, Sergej 1991 *V svoem uglu: Iz starych tetradaj*. Moskva.
- Lermontov, Michail 1975-1976 *Sobranie sočinenij v četyrech tomach*. Moskva.
- Mandel'stam, Osip 1991 *Sobranie sočinenij v četyrex tomach*. Pod red. G. P. Struve i B. A. Filippova. Tom 2. Moskva.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich [without year] *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft. Gesammelte Werke* 6. Ungekürzte Ausgabe. München
- Pasternak, Boris 1989-1992 *Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomach*. Moskva. (= BP1- 5)
- 1981 *Perepiska s Ol'goj Frejdenberg*. Pod red. i s komentarijami Elliotta Mossmana. New York and London. (= Perepiska)
- 1958 *Doctor Zhivago*. Translated by Max Hayward and Manya Harari. London.
- Pasternak, Evgenij & Polivanov, Konstantin 1990 "Pis'ma Borisa Pasternaka iz Marburga," *Pamjatniki kul'tury. Novye otkrytija. Pis'mennost'. Iskusstvo. Archeologija. Ežegodnik 1989*. Moskva; 51- 75

- Pasternak, Elena, Fejnberg, M. (eds.) 1993 *Vospominanija o Borise Pasternake*. Moskva.
- Pasternak, Žozefina 1990 "Patior," *Znamja*, no. 2; 183-193
- Šekspir, Viljam 1951 *Tragedii [Romeo i Džul'etta, Gamlet, Otello, Korol' Lir, Makbet]*. Perevod B. Pasternaka. Leningrad
- Šelling, Fridrich Vil'gel'm Iosif 1936 *Sistema transcendental'nogo idealizma*. Perevod I. Ja. Kolubovskogo. Leningrad.
- Vil'mont, Nikolaj 1989 *O Borise Pasternake: Vospominanija i mysli*. Moskva.

Secondary sources

- Andersen, Troels 1991 "Mellem musik og malerkunst — improvisation og opgør," *Boris Pasternak och hans tid. Föredrag vid symposium i Vitterhetsakademien 28-30 maj 1990*. Red. Peter Alberg Jensen, Per-Arne Bodin, Nils Åke Nilsson. Stockholm; 55-64
- Anderson, Roger B. 1987 "The Railroad in *Doktor Živago*," *Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 4; 503-519
- Aucouturier, Michel 1979 "Ob odnom ključe k Ochrannoj gramote," Boris Pasternak 1890-1960: Colloque de Cerisy-La-Salle (11-14 septembre 1975). Paris; 337-348
- 1970 "The Metonymous Hero or the Beginnings of Pasternak the Novelist," *Books Abroad. An International Literary Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Spring); 222-26
- 1963 *Pasternak par lui-même*. Paris.
- Averincev, Sergej 1990 "Pasternak i Mandel'stam: Opyt sopostavlenija," *Izvestija Akademii nauk SSSR. Serija literatury i jazyka*, tom 49, no. 3; 213-217
- Avins, Carol J. 1995 "Iurii Zhivago's Readers: Literary Reception in Pasternak's Novel and in His Time," *Freedom and Responsibility in Russian Literature: Essays in Honor of Robert Louis Jackson*. Ed. by Elizabeth Cheresch Allen and Gary Saul Morson. Evanston, Ill.
- Bachtin, Michail 1986 *Ėstetika slovesnogo tvorčestva*. Moskva.
- 1979 *Problemy poëtiki Dostoevskogo*. Moskva.
- Barnes, Christopher 1989 *Boris Pasternak: A Literary Biography*. Vol. I. Cambridge etc.
- Belknap, Robert 1990 *The Genesis of the Brothers Karamazov. The Aesthetics, Ideology, and Psychology of Making a Text*. Evanston, Ill.
- 1967 *The Structure of the Brothers Karamazov*. The Hague-Paris.
- Belyj, Andrej 1971 *Tragedija tvorčestva. Dostoevskij i Tolstoj*. Letchworth.

- 1910 *Simvolizm: Kniga statej*. Moskva.
- Berdjaev, Nikolaj 1923 *Mirosozercanie Dostoevskogo*. Praga.
- Bergson, Henri 1929 *L'Évolution créatrice*. Paris.
- Bethea, David 1989 *The Shape of Apocalypse in Modern Russian Fiction*. Princeton, N. J.
- Björling, Fiona 1976 "Aspects of Poetic Syntax: Analysis of the Poem 'Sestra moja žizn' i segodnja v razlive' by Boris Pasternak," *Boris Pasternak. Essays*. Ed. by Nils Åke Nilsson. Stockholm; 162-179
- Bodin, Per-Arne 1991 *Den oväntade glädjen*. Skellefteå.
- 1990 "Boris Pasternak and the Christian Tradition," *Modern Language Studies*, Vol. XXVI; 382-401
- 1986 "God, Tsar and Man: Boris Pasternak's Poem 'Artillerist,'" *Scottish Slavonic Review*, No. 6 (Spring); 69-80
- 1976a *Nine Poems from Doctor Živago. A Study of Christian Motifs in Boris Pasternak's Poetry*. Stockholm
- 1976b "Pasternak and Christian Art," *Boris Pasternak. Essays*. Ed. by Nils Åke Nilsson. Stockholm; 203-214
- Bol'shaja sovetskaja enciklopedija*. Vtoroe izdanie. Gosudarstvennoe naučnoe izdatel'stvo, Moskva. Vol. 1-50. 1949-1957
- Borisov, Vadim 1992 "Imja v romane Borisa Pasternaka 'Doktor Živago,'" *"Byt' znamenitym nekrasivo...": Pasternakovskie čtenija*. Vyp. 1. Moskva; 101-109
- Borisov, Vadim & Pasternak, Evgenij 1988 "Materialy k tvorčeskoj istorii romana B. Pasternaka 'Doktor Živago,'" *Novyj mir*, no. 6; 205-248
- Braun, Maximilian 1972 "The Brothers Karamazov as an Expository Novel," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1; 199-208
- Brik, Lili 1966 "Predloženie issledovateljam," *Voprosy literatury*, no. 9; 203-208
- Brower, Lincoln P. 1988 "Preface," *The American Naturalist*, Vol. 131, Supplement, June 1988; S1-S3
- Børtnes, Jostein 1994 "Christianskaja tema v romane Pasternaka 'Doktor Živago,'" *Evangel'skij tekst v ruskoj literature XVIII-XX vekov. Citata, reminiscencija, motiv, sjužet, žanr*. Sbornik naučnych trudov pod red. V. N. Zacharova. Petrozavodsk; 361-377
- 1993 *Polyfoni og karneval*. Oslo.
- 1981 "Orthodox Symbolism in Russian Literature," *Svantevit, Årgang VII*, Nr. 1, 1981; 5-16
- Caillois, Roger 1988 "Mimicry and Legendary Psychastenia," *"October."* *The First Decade*. Ed. by Annette Michelson, Cambridge, Mass.; 58-74

- Catteau, Jacques 1989 *Dostoyevsky and the Process of Literary Creation*.
Translated by Audrey Littlewood. Cambridge-New York-New Rochelle-
Melbourne-Sydney.
- Cornwell, Neil 1986 *Pasternak's Novel: Perspectives on "Doctor Zhivago,"*
Keele.
- Čudakova, Marietta 1992 "Pasternak und Bulgakov: An der Scheidelinie
zweier literarischer Zyklen," *Michail Afanas'evič Bulgakov 1891-1991:
Text und Kontext*. Hrsg. von Dagmar Kasek und Peter Rillberg. Berlin;
67-85
- Dal', Vladimir 1990 *Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikoruskogo jazyka*. Tom I-IV.
Moskva.
- Danow, D. K. 1981 "Epiphany in 'Doctor Zhivago,'" *The Modern Language
Review*, Vol. 76; 889-903
- Demkova, N. S. 1997 "Iz istoriko-literaturnogo komentarija k romanu B.
Pasternaka 'Doktor Živago': Drevnerusskie temy i paralleli," *Ars
philologiae. Sbornik statej*, Sankt Peterburg; 329-349
- Drouilly, Jean 1974 "L'image du soleil couchant dans l'œuvre de Dostoïevski.
Essai de critique thématique," *Études slaves et est-européennes*, Vol. XIX,
Montreal; 3-22
- Durylin, Sergej 1928 "Ob odnom simvole u Dostoevskogo: Opyt tematičeskogo
obzora," *Dostoevskij, Trudy Gosudarstvennoj akademii chudožestvennyh
nauk, Literaturnaja sekcija*. Vyp. 3, Moskva; 163-198
- Eikeland, Kristin 1994 "Ethopoiia in the Life of Zosima," *Scando-Slavica*,
tomus 40; 14-22
- Erlich, Victor 1978a "Introduction: Categories of Passion," *Pasternak. A
Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. by Victor Erlich. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.;
1-20
1978b "A Testimony and a Challenge — Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago*,"
Pasternak. A Collection of Critical Essays. Ed. by Victor Erlich.
Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; 131-136
- Evans-Romaine, Karen 1997 *Boris Pasternak and the Tradition of German
Romanticism*. München.
- Faryno, Jerzy 1992a "Klejkie listočki, ucha, čaj, varen'e i spirty (Puškin-
Dostoevskij-Pasternak)," *Tradicii i novatorstvo v russkoj klassičeskoj
literature (... Gogol' ... Dostoevskij...): Mežvuzovskij sbornik naučnyh
trudov*. S.-Peterburg; 123-165
1992b "Jurjatsinskaja čital'nja i bibliotekarša Avdot'ja (Archeopoëtika
Doktora Živago. 6)," *Sbornik statej k 70-letiju prof. Ju. M. Lotmana*.
Tartu; 385-411

- 1992c "Živopis' Kologrivovskoj panoramy i Mučnogo gorodka (Archeopoëtika 'Doktora Živago'. 4)," *Studia filologiczne*, Zeszyt 35, Filologia Rosyjska 14. Bydgoszcz; 5-49
- 1990 "Knjaginja Stolbunova Enrici i ee syn Evgraf (Archeopoëtika 'Doktora Živago'. 1)," *Poëtika Pasternaka. Studia filologiczne*, Zeszyt 31, Filologia Rosyjska 12. Pod. red. Anny Majmieskułow. Bydgoszcz; 155-221
- 1988a "Grečeskaja gubka na zelenoj skamejke v 'Vesne' Pasternaka," *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae, Dissertationes slavicae. Sectio historiae litterarum*, XIX. Szeged; 181-221
- 1988b "Ikonizm i ikonnost' poëtiki Pasternaka (tezisy)," *Musica Antiqua Europae Orientalis*, VIII, vol. 2, Acta Slavica. Bydgoszcz; 283-298
- Fateeva, N. A. 1996 "Pasternak i Dostoevskij: opyt intertekstual'nogo analiza," *Slovo Dostoevskogo. Sbornik statej*. Red. Ju. N. Karaulov. Moskva; 14-34
- Flejšman, Lazar' 1993 "Nakanune poëzii: Marburg v žizni i v 'Ochrannoj gramote' Pasternaka," *Pasternak-Studien I. Beiträge zum Internationalen Pasternak-Kongress 1991 in Marburg*. Hrsg. von Sergej Dorzweiler und Hans-Bernd Harder unter Mitarbeit von Susanne Grotzer. München; 59-74
- 1991 "Ot 'Zapisok Patrika' k 'Doktoru Živago,'" *Izvestija Akademii nauk SSSR. Serija literatury i jazyka*, tom 50, no. 2; 114-123
- 1984 *Boris Pasternak v tridcatye gody*. Jerusalem.
- 1981 *Boris Pasternak v dvadcatye gody*. München.
- 1977 *Stat'i o Pasternake*. Bremen.
- Fleishman, Lazar, Harder, Hans-Bernd, Dorzweiler, Sergei 1996 *Boris Pasternaks Lehrjahre: Neopublikovannye filosofskie konspekty i zametki Borisa Pasternaka*. Tom I. Stanford.
- Florenskij, Pavel 1985 *Sobranie sočinenij: I. Stat'i po iskusstvu*. Paris.
- 1972 "Ikonostas," *Bogoslovskie trudy*. 9. Moskva; 83-148
- Gasparov, Boris 1994a "Byt kak kategorija poëtiki Pasternaka. (K interpretacii stichotvorenija 'Zerkalo')," *Temy i variacii. Sbornik statej i materialov k 50-letiju Lazarja Flejšmana*. Ed. by Konstantin Polivanov, Irina Shevelenko, Andrey Ustinov. Stanford; 56-69
- 1994b "Lamark, Šelling, Marr (Stichotvorenje 'Lamark' v kontekste 'perelomnoj' épochi)," *Literaturnye lejtmotivy*. Moskva; 187-212
- 1992a "Gradus ad Parnassum. (Samosoveršenstvovanie kak kategorija tvorčeskogo mira Pasternaka)," "Byt' znamenitym nekrasivo...": *Pasternakovskie čtenija*. Vyp. 1. Moskva; 110-135
- 1992b "Poëtika Pasternaka v kul'turno-istoričeskom izmerenii (B. L. Pasternak i O. M. Frejdenberg)," *Sbornik statej k 70-letiju prof. Ju. M. Lotmana*. Tartu; 366-384

- 1992c "Tridcatye gody — železnyj vek (k analizu motivov stoletnega vozvraščeniya u Mandel'stama)," *Cultural Mythologies of Russian Modernism. From the Golden Age to the Silver Age*. Ed. by Boris Gasparov, Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno. Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford; 150-179
- 1989 "Vremennoj kontrapunkt kak formoobrazujuščij princip romana Pasternaka 'Doktor Živago,'" *Boris Pasternak and His Times. Selected Papers from the Second International Symposium on Pasternak*. Ed. by L. Fleishman. Berkeley; 315-358
- Gasparov, Michail 1990a "Rifma i žanr v stichach Borisa Pasternaka," *Russkaja reč*, no. 1; 17-22
- 1990b "'Gastronomičeskij' pejzaž v poëme Mariny Cvetaevoj 'Avtobus,'" *Russkaja reč*, no. 4; 20-26
- Gibian, George 1983 "Doctor Zhivago, Russia, and Leonid Pasternak's Rembrandt," *The Russian Novel from Pushkin to Pasternak*. Ed. by John Garrard. New Haven-London; 203-224
- Gifford, Henry 1977 *Pasternak. A Critical Study*. Cambridge-London-New York-Melbourne.
- Gladkov, Aleksandr 1973 *Vstreči s Pasternakom*. Paris.
- Greber, Erika 1997 "The Art of Memory in Pasternak's Aesthetics," *Russian Literature*, Vol. XLII; 25-46
- 1992 "Das Erinnern des Erinnerns. Die mnemonische Ästhetik Boris Pasternaks," *Poetica*, 24. Band, Heft 3-4; 356-391
- 1988 "Pasternak's 'Detstvo Lyuvers' and Dostoyevsky's 'Netochka Nezvanova': An Intertextual Approach," *Irish Slavonic Studies*, No. 9; 62-79
- Grigorieff, Dimitry Felix 1959 "Pasternak and Dostoevskij," *Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. XVII (New Series, Vol. III); 335-342
- Grossman, Leonid 1928 *Put' Dostoevskogo*. Moskva.
- 1935 *Žizn' i trudy F. M. Dostoevskogo. Biografija v datach i dokumentach*. Moskva-Leningrad.
- Hackel, Sergei 1983 "The Religious Dimension: Vision or Evasion? Zosima's Discourse in *The Brothers Karamazov*," *New Essays on Dostoyevsky*. Ed. by Malcolm V. Jones and Garth M. Terry. Cambridge etc; 139-168
- Han, Anna 1988 "Osnovnye predposylki filosofii tvorčestva B. Pasternaka v svete ego rannego èstetičeskogo samoopredelenija," *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae, Dissertationes slavicae, Sectio Historiae Literarum*, XIX. Szeged; 39-134

- Hansen-Löve, Aage 2000 "Ėstetika 'Kaliptiki': Apollinskie koncepcii v metafizičeskoj poëtike Nabokova," *Severnij sbornik: Proceedings of the NorFa Network in Russian Literature 1995-1999*. Ed. by Peter Alberg Jensen and Ingunn Lunde, Stockholm (in print)
- 1988 "Velimir Chlebnikovs Onomatopoeik: Name und Anagram," *Kryptogramm. Zur Ästhetik des Verborgenen*. Hrsg. von Renate Lachmann und Igor P. Smirnov (= *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Band 21); 135-223
- Helle, Lilian J. 1998 "Between Poetry and Painting. Pasternak's 'Christmas Star,'" *Scando-Slavica*, tomus 44; 57-74
- Hutcheon, Linda 1991 *Narcissistic Narrative. The Metafictional Paradox*. London-New York.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav 1912 "Mysli o simbolizme," *Trudy i dni*, no. 1
- Jackson, Robert Louis 1981 *The Art of Dostoevsky: Deliriums and Nocturnes*. Princeton, N. J.
- 1978 "Doctor Zhivago: Liebestod of the Russian Intelligentsia," *Pasternak. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. by Victor Erlich. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; 137-150
- Jakobson, Roman 1987 "Zametki o proze poëta Pasternaka," *Raboty po poëtike*. Moskva; 324-338
- 1959 "Za i protiv Viktora Šklovskogo," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*, I/II; 305-310
- Jensen, Peter Alberg 1997 "Strel'nikov i Kaj: 'Snežnaja koroleva' v 'Doktore Živago,'" *Scando-Slavica*, tomus 43; 68-107
- 1995a "Boris Pasternak kak chudožnik ėstetičeskogo sklada (v k'erkegorovskom smysle)," *Put'.* *Meždunarodnyj filosofskij žurnal*, 8; 181-217
- 1995b "Nil's Ljune i Jurij Živago: Forma i preemstvennost'," *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs. III. (Russian Literature in Modern Times)*. Ed. by B. Gasparov, R.P. Hughes, I. Paperno, O. Raevsky-Hughes. Berkley-Los Angeles-London; 244-287
- 1986 "Boris Pasternak's 'Opredelenie poëzii'," *Text and Context: Essays to Honour Nils Åke Nilsson*. Stockholm; 96-110
- Jones, Malcolm 1997 "Silence in The Brothers Karamazov," *"Die Brüder Karamazow": Dostojewskijs letzter Roman in heutiger Sicht*. Hrsg. von Horst-Jürgen Gerigk. Dresden; 29-45
- Karlinskij, Simon 1989 "Pasternak, Puškin i okean v poëme Mariny Cvetaevoj 'S morja,'" *Boris Pasternak and His Times. Selected Papers from the*

- Second International Symposium on Pasternak*. Ed. by L. Fleishman. Berkeley; 46-5
- Kittang, Atle et al. 1997 *En introduktion till den moderna litteraturteorin*. Stockholm-Stehag.
- Kjetsaa, Geir 1984 *Dostoevsky and His New Testament*. Oslo-Atlantic Highlands, N. J.
- Lachmann, Renate 1988 "Zu Dostoevskijs *Slaboe serdce*: Steckt der Schlüssel zum Text im Text?," *Kryptogramm. Zur Ästhetik des Verborgenen*. Hrsg. von Renate Lachmann und Igor P. Smirnov (= *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Band 21); 239-265
- Lavrov, Aleksandr 1994 "Andrej Belyj i Boris Pasternak," *Temy i variacii. Sbornik statej i materialov k 50-letiju Lazarja Flejšmana*. Ed. by Konstantin Polivanov, Irina Shevelenko, Andrey Ustinov. Stanford; 40-55
- Lazarev, V. V. 1998 "Filosofija Vl. Solov'eva i Šelling," *Filosofija Šellinga v Rossii*. Pod obščej red. V. F. Pustarnakova. Sankt-Peterburg; 477-498
- Lekić, Maria 1988 "Pasternak's 'Doctor Živago': The Novel and Its Title," *Russian Language Journal*, Vol. XLII, No. 141-143; 177-191
- 1983 *The Genesis of the Novel "Doctor Zhivago": Four Modes of Literary Borrowing*. Ph. D. diss., University of Pennsylvania.
- Lepachin, V. 1988 "Ikonopis' i živopis', večnost' i vremena v 'Roždestvenskoj zvezde' B. Pasternaka," *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae, Dissertationes slavicae, Sectio Historiae Literarum*, XIX. Szeged; 255-278
- Linnér, Sven 1975 *Starets Zosima in The Brothers Karamazov: A Study in the Mimesis of Virtue*. Stockholm.
- Livingstone, Angela 1994 "A Transformation of Goethe's *Faust*," *Temy i variacii. Sbornik statej i materialov k 50-letiju Lazarja Flejšmana*. Ed. by Konstantin Polivanov, Irina Shevelenko, Andrey Ustinov. Stanford; 81-92
- 1989 *Boris Pasternak. Doctor Zhivago*. Cambridge-New York-New Rochelle-Melbourne-Sydney.
- 1979 "At Home in History: Pasternak and Popper," *Slavica Hierosolymitana*, Vol. IV; 131-145
- 1978 "Pasternak's Last Poetry," *Pasternak. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. by Victor Erlich. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; 166-175
- Ljunggren, Anna 1992 "Gogol' i Pasternak," "Byt' znamenitim nekrasivo...": *Pasternakovskie čtenija*. Vyp. 1. Moskva; 143-153
- 1989 "'Sad' i 'Ja sam': Smysl i kompozicija stichotvorenija 'Zerkalo,'" *Boris Pasternak and His Times. Selected Papers from the Second*

- International Symposium on Pasternak*. Ed. by L. Fleishman. Berkeley; 224-237
- 1984 *Juvenilia B. Pasternaka: 6 fragmentov o Relikvimini*. Stockholm.
- Ljunggren, Magnus 1982 *The Dream of Rebirth: A Study of Andrej Belyj's Novel Peterburg*. Stockholm.
- Lotman, Jurij 1982 "Ot redakcii," *Tipologija kul'tury. Vzaimnoe vozdejstvie kul'tur. Trudy po znakovym sistemam*, XV. Tartu; 3-9
- 1969 "Stichotvorenija rannego Pasternaka i nekotorye voprosy strukturnogo izučeniia teksta," *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*, IV. Tartu; 206-238.
- Lunde, Ingunn 2001 "'Ja gorazdo umnee napisannogo': On Apophatic Strategies and Verbal Experiments in Dostoevskii's *A Raw Youth*," *Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 79, No. 2 (forthcoming)
- Lönnqvist, Barbara 1993 "From Dewdrops to Poetry: the Presence of Egorij Chrabryj in *Doctor Zhivago*," *Russian Literature*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2; 161-185
- Masing-Delić, Irene 1994 "Creating the Living Work of Art: The Symbolist Pygmalion and His Antecedents," *Creating Life: The Aesthetic Utopia of Russian Modernism*. Ed. by Irina Paperno and Joan Delaney Grossman. Stanford; 51-82 (notes: 242-250)
- 1991 "Pasternaks naturfilosofiska vandringsdikter från Peredelkinocykeln," *Boris Pasternak och hans tid. Föredrag vid symposium i Vitterhetsakademien 28-30 maj 1990*. Red. Peter Alberg Jensen, Per-Arne Bodin, Nils Åke Nilsson. Stockholm; 27-38
- 1989 "Capitalist Bread and Socialist Spectacle: The Janus Face of 'Rome' in Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago*," *Boris Pasternak and His Times. Selected Papers from the Second International Symposium on Pasternak*, ed. by L. Fleishman. Berkeley; 372-385
- 1982 "Bergsons 'Schöpferische Entwicklung' und Pasternaks 'Doktor Shiwago,'" *Literatur- und Sprachentwicklung in Osteropa im 20. Jahrhundert*. Hrsg. von Eberhard Reissner. Berlin; 112-130.
- 1981 "Zhivago as Fedorovian Soldier," *The Russian Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3; 300-316
- 1979 "Some Allusions to *Besy* in *Doctor Zhivago*," *Bulletin. International Dostoevsky Society*, 8; 31-41
- 1977 "Some Alternating Opposites in the Zhivago Poems," *The Russian Review*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (October); 438-462
- Matlaw, Ralph 1959 "A Visit with Pasternak," *The Nation*, Vol. 189 (12 September); 134-135

- 1957 *The Brothers Karamazov: Novelistic Technique*. 's-Gravenhage
- Miłosz, Czesław 1970 "On Pasternak Soberly," *Books Abroad. An International Literary Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Spring); 200-209
- Mossman, Elliott 1989 "Toward a Poetics of the Novel Doctor Zhivago: The Fourth Typhus," *Boris Pasternak and His Times. Selected Papers from the Second International Symposium on Pasternak*. Ed. by L. Fleishman. Berkeley; 386-397
- 1986 "Metaphors of History in 'War and Peace' and 'Doctor Zhivago,'" *Literature and History: Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies*. Ed. by Gary Saul Morson. Stanford; 247-262
- Møller, Peter Ulf 1979 "Doktor Živago — en lyrikers verdensbillede," *Mennesker og temaer i sovjetlitteraturen*. Red. Erik Egeberg, Sigurd Fasting, Geir Kjetsaa. Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø; 147-173
- Mørch, Audun J. 1993 "Dostoevskij's *Besy*: Revolutionaries with a Speech Deficiency," *Scando-Slavica*, tomus 39; 62-73
- The New Encyclopaedia Britannica in 32 Volumes*. Chicago etc. 1994
- Nilsson, Nils Åke 1995 "Pasternak's My Sister — Life: The Faustian Connection," *Freedom and Responsibility in Russian Literature: Essays in Honor of Robert Louis Jackson*. Ed. by Elizabeth Cheresch Allen and Gary Saul Morson. Evanston, Ill.; 199-212
- 1978 "Life as Ecstasy and Sacrifice: Two Poems by Boris Pasternak," *Pasternak. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. by Victor Erlich. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; 51-67 (First published in *Scando-Slavica*, tomus 5, 1959; revised version)
- Obolensky, Dmitry 1978 "The Poems of Doctor Zhivago," *Pasternak. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. by Victor Erlich. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; 151-165
- Ožegov, Sergej 1968 *Slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Moskva
- Paperno, Irina 1994 "The Meaning of Art: Symbolist Theories," *Creating Life: The Aesthetic Utopia of Russian Modernism*. Ed. by Irina Paperno and Joan Delaney Grossman. Stanford; 13-23
- Pasternak, Evgenij 1989 *Boris Pasternak. Materialy dlja biografii*. Moskva.
- Pasternak, Elena 1992 "'Ty car' — živi odin..." (Boris Pasternak i Vladimir Majakovskij)," *Scando-Slavica*, tomus 38; 64-76
- 1990 "Leto 1917 goda: 'Sestra moja — žizn' i 'Doktor Živago,'" *Zvezda*, no. 2; 158-165
- Polivanov, Konstantin 1994 "K 'intimizacii' istorii," *Temy i variacii. Sbornik statej i materialov k 50-letiju Lazarja Flejšmana*. Ed. by Konstantin Polivanov, Irina Shevelenko, Andrey Ustinov. Stanford; 71-80

- 1992 "Marina Cvetaeva v romane Borisa Pasternaka 'Doktor Živago,'" *de visu*, no. 0; 52-58
- Raevskaja-Ch'juz, Ol'ga 1971 "Boris Pasternak i Marina Cvetaeva," *Vestnik russkogo studenčeskogo christianskogo dviženija*, no. 100; 281-305
- Raškovskaja, Marija 1992 "Dve sud'by (Pasternak i Durylin. K istorii vzaimootnošenij)," *"Byt' znamenitym nekrasivo...": Pasternakovskie čtenija*. Vyp. 1. Moskva; 235-244
- 1988 "Boris Pasternak v poslevoennye gody (Novye dokumenty)," *Literaturnaja učeba*, no. 6; 108-116
- Rowland, Mary & Rowland, Paul 1967 *Pasternak's "Doctor Zhivago,"* Carbondale, Ill.
- Rudova, Larissa 1994 *Pasternak's Short Fiction and the Cultural Vanguard* (= *Middlebury Studies in Russian Language and Literature*, Vol. 6). New York etc.
- Ščeglov, Jurij 1991 "O nekotorych spornych čertach poëtiki pozdnego Pasternaka. Avantjurno-melodramatičeskaja tehnika v 'Doktore Živago,'" *Boris Pasternak 1890-1990*. Norvičskij simpozium. Pod redakcij L'va Loseva. Northfield, Vermont; 190-216
- Schmid, Wolf 1988 "Die Parömie als narratives Kryptogramm: zur Entfaltung von Sprichwörtern und Redensarten in A. S. Puškins 'Hautmannstochter,'" *Kryptogramm. Zur Ästhetik des Verborgenen*. Hrsg. von Renate Lachmann und Igor P. Smirnov (= *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Band 21); 267-285
- 1982 "Diegetische Realisierung von Sprichwörter, Redensarten und semantischen Figuren in Puškins 'Povesti Belkina,'" *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Band 10; 163-195
- Segal, Dmitrij 1981 "Literatura kak ochrannaja gramota," *Slavica Hierosolymitana*, Vol. V-IV; 151-244
- Senderovič, Savelij 1991 "K genetičkoj éjdologii 'Doktora Živago'. 1. Doktor Živago i poët Čechov," *Russian Language Journal*, Vol. XLV, No. 150; 3-16
- Shore, Rima 1979 "A Note on the Literary Genesis of *Doctor Zhivago*," *Urbardus Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1; 186-193
- Simmons, Cynthia 1988 "An Autobiography for the Twentieth Century: Pasternak's *Ochrannaja gramota*," *Russian Language Journal*, Vol. XLII, No. 141-143; 169-175
- Simpliçio, Daša di 1989 "B. Pasternak i živopis'," *Boris Pasternak and His Times. Selected Papers from the Second International Symposium on Pasternak*. Ed. by L. Fleishman. Berkeley; 195-211

- Sinjavskij, Andrej 1989 "Nekotorye aspekty pozdnej prozy Pasternaka," *Boris Pasternak and His Times. Selected Papers from the Second International Symposium on Pasternak*. Ed. by L. Fleishman. Berkeley; 359-371
- 1978 "Pasternak's poetry," *Pasternak. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. by Victor Erlich. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; 68-109 (A revised version of the introduction to Boris Pasternak, *Stichotvorenija i poëmy*. Moskva-Leningrad, 1965)
- Šklovskij, Viktor 1957 *Za i protiv*. Moskva.
- Smirnov, Igor' 1999 *Homo homini philosophus: Čelovek čeloveku filosof*. Sankt-Peterburg 1999
- 1996 *Roman tajn "Doktor Živago."* Moskva.
- 1993 "Rafael' i Jurij Živago," *Pasternak-Studien I. Beiträge zum Internationalen Pasternak-kongress 1991 in Marburg*. Hrsg. von Sergej Dorzweiler und Hans-Bernd Harder unter Mitarbeit von Susanne Grotzer. München; 154-171
- 1991 "Dvojnoj roman (o Doktore Živago)," *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Band 27; 119-136
- 1985 *Poroždenie interteksta. Ėlementy intertekstual'nogo analiza s primerami iz tvorčestva B. L. Pasternaka* (= *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 17). Wien.
- 1983 "Dostoevskij i poëzija Pasternaka," *Dostoevskij und die Literatur*. Hrsg. von Hans Rothe. Köln-Wien; 275-296
- Solov'ev, Sergej 1977 *Žizn' i tvorčeskaja évoljucija Vladimira Solov'eva*. Brjussel'.
- Solov'ev, Vladimir 1988 *Sočinenija v dvuch tomach*. Moskva
- Starobinski, Jean 1989 "The Critical Relation," *The Living Eye*. Cambridge, Mass.-London; 112-128
- Stepun, Fedor 1978 "Boris Pasternak," *Pasternak. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. by Victor Erlich. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; 110-125 (An abridged version of Stepun 1959)
- 1959 "B. L. Pasternak," *Novyj žurnal*, kn. 56; 187-206
- Struve, Gleb 1970 "The Hippodrome of Life: The Problem of Coincidences in *Doctor Zhivago*," *Books Abroad. An International Literary Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Spring); 231-236
- Taranovskij, Kirill 1979 "Poëma Majakovskogo 'Pro éto'. Literaturnye reminiscencii i ritmičeskaja struktura," *Slavica Hierosolymitana*, Vol. IV; 114-125
- 1981 "On the Poetics of Boris Pasternak," *Russian Literature*, Vol. X, No. 4; 339-357

- Terras, Victor 1998 "Schellingianism," *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. 8; 520-522
- 1981 *A Karamazov Companion: Commentary on the Genesis, Language, and Style of Dostoevsky's Novel*. Madison, Wisconsin.
- Thompson, Diane Oenning 1991 *The Brothers Karamazov and the Poetics of Memory*. Cambridge-New York-Port Chester-Melbourne-Sydney.
- Thomson, R. D. B. 1989 "Cvetaeva and Pasternak 1922-1924," *Boris Pasternak and His Times. Selected Papers from the Second International Symposium on Pasternak*. Ed. by L. Fleishman. Berkeley; 58-90
- Timenčik, Roman 1975 "Avtometapisanie u Achmatovoj," *Russian Literature*, No. 10-11; 213-226
- Tóth, Csaba 1995 "Na puti k samoopisjujuščemu tekstu," *Slavica Tergestina* 3. *Studia comparata et russica*; 73-120
- Uspenskij, Boris 1977 "Prolegomena k teme 'Semiotika ikony,'" *Rossija-Russia. Studi i recherche a cura di Vittorio Strada*, vol. 3; 189-212
- 1971 "O semiotike ikony," *Trudy po znakovym sistemam*, V. Tartu; 178-222
- Venclova, Tomas 1986 *Neustojčivoje ravnovesie: Vosem' russkich poëtičeskich tekstov*. New Haven, Conn.
- Vetlovskaja, Valentina 1977 *Poëtika romana "Bratj'a Karamazovy"*. Leningrad.
- 1971 "Razvjazka v 'Brat'jach Karamazovyh,'" *Poëtika i stilistika russkoj literatury*. Leningrad; 195-203
- Witt, Susanna 1994 "Doktor Živopis': O 'romanach' Borisa Pasternaka 'Doktor Živago,'" *Klassicism i modernizm: Sbornik statej*. Tartu; 140-167
- 2000a "Mimikrija v Doktore Živago," *V krugu Živago: Pasternakovskij sbornik*. Stanford; 87-122
- 2000b "Gastronomičeskaja metafizika Pasternaka," *Severnyj sbornik: Proceedings of the NorFa Network in Russian Literature 1995-1999*. Ed. by Peter Alberg Jensen and Ingunn Lunde, Stockholm (in print)
- Vyšeslavcev, Boris 1932 "Dostoevskij o ljubvi i bessmertii (Novyj fragment)," *Sovremennye zapiski*, tom 50. Pariž; 288-304
- Žolkovskij, Aleksandr 1992 "O trech grammatičeskich motivach Pasternaka," *"Byt' znamenitym nekrasivo...": Pasternakovskie čtenija*. Vyp. 1. Moskva; 55-66
- 1978 "Mesto okna v poëtičeskom mire Pasternaka," *Russian Literature*, Vol. VI, No. 1; 1-38

Index

- Achmatova, Anna; 22; 87
 Andersen, H. C.; 33; 72; 84; 92; 102
 Andersen, Troels; 52
 Anderson, Roger B.; 50
 Aucouturier, Michel; 10; 20; 21; 27; 54;
 102; 130; 135
 Avins, Carol J.; 9
 Bachtin, Michail; 64; 72
 Barnes, Christopher; 57; 123
 Bates, Henry W.; 97
 Belknap, Robert; 61; 72; 78; 84; 92
 Belyj, Andrej; 91; 123
 Berdjaev, Nikolaj; 77; 78; 86; 123
 Bergson, Henri; 27; 102; 130
 Bethea, David; 28; 33; 50; 59
 Björling, Fiona; 134
 Blok, Aleksandr; 32; 33; 34; 51; 72; 105
 Bodin, Per-Arne; 20; 28; 34; 41; 45; 46;
 55; 56; 60; 69; 82; 96; 126; 133
 Borisov, Vadim; 33; 34; 53; 60; 72;
 90; 115; 129
 Braun, Maximilian; 71
 Brik, Lili; 57
 Brower, Lincoln P.; 98; 134
 Bulgakov, Michail; 136
 Bulgakov, Sergej; 88
 Børtnes, Jostein; 60; 77; 81
 Caillois, Roger; 124
 Catteau, Jacques; 77
 Čechov, Anton; 57
 Cézanne, Paul; 52
 Chlebnikov, Velimir; 46
 Cornwell, Neil; 9; 69
 Cvetaeva, Marina; 75; 83
 Danow, D. K.; 9; 17; 50
 Dante; 30
 Darwin, Charles; 101; 114; 115; 116
 Demkova, N. S.; 18
 Dickens, Charles; 87
 di Simpliccio, D.; 52
 Dostoevskij, Fedor; 10; 33; 57-60; 62-
 67; 69-78; 80-85; 87-94; 116-118;
 139
 Drouilly, Jean; 77
 Durylin, Sergej; 77; 83; 85-90; 94
 Eikeland, Kristin; 81
 Erlich, Victor; 90
 Evans-Romaine, Karen; 135
 Evreinov, Nikolaj; 127
 Faryno, Jerzy; 40; 45; 51; 54; 59; 64;
 82; 129
 Fateeva, N. A.; 59
 Fedin, K. A.; 72
 Fedorov, Nikolaj; 77; 140
 Fejnberg, M.; 88; 91
 Fichte, J. G.; 75
 Flejšman, Lazar'; 10; 20; 46; 59; 75; 88;
 90; 115; 122; 123; 129; 135; 140
 Florenskij, Pavel; 38; 41-46; 48; 54
 Frank, S.; 123
 Frejdenberg, Ol'ga; 27; 53; 72; 81; 91;
 92; 113; 114; 121; 122; 125
 Gasparov, Boris; 9; 11; 17; 20; 27; 53;
 54; 56; 60; 71; 77; 90; 97; 100; 101;
 102; 115; 124; 128; 135
 Gasparov, Michail; 10; 90
 Gibian, George; 52
 Gifford, Henry; 59; 82; 90
 Gladkov, Aleksandr; 138
 Goethe, J. W. von; 58; 63; 102
 Gogol', Nikolaj; 11; 36; 42
 Greber, Erika; 22; 59; 73; 81; 87; 92;
 105; 135; 136
 Grigorieff, Dmitry Felix; 59; 82
 Grossman, Leonid; 92
 Gulyga, A. V.; 115
 Hackel, Sergei; 87
 Han, Anna; 28
 Hansen-Löve, Aage; 64; 129
 Heisenberg, W.; 11
 Helle, Lilian; 34
 Husserl, E.; 123
 Hutcheon, Linda; 10; 11; 39; 128
 Ibsen, Henrik; 57
 Ivanov, Aleksandr; 31
 Ivanov, Vjačeslav; 55; 119; 123
 Jackson, Robert Louis; 33
 Jacobsen, J.P.; 33; 92; 127
 Jakobson, Roman; 57; 124; 134; 135
 Jensen, Peter Alberg; 9; 27; 31; 33; 55;
 72; 84; 92; 102; 115; 126; 127
 Jones, Malcolm; 64
 Karlinskij, Simon; 83
 Kožinov, Vadim; 57
 Lachmann, Renate; 10
 Lamarck, J. B. de; 100; 101
 Lavrov, Aleksandr; 77; 91
 Lazarev, V. V.; 116

Lekić, Maria; 16; 17; 18; 31; 33; 40; 48;
 59; 72; 82; 90; 140
 Lepachin, V.; 34; 36
 Lermontov, Michail; 127
 Linnaeus, Carl; 101
 Linnér, Sven; 80
 Livingstone, Angela; 9; 17; 19; 28; 67;
 71; 80; 90; 96; 97; 136
 Ljunggren, Anna; 10; 36; 71
 Ljunggren, Magnus; 91
 Loks, Konstantin; 91
 Lomonosov, Michail; 20
 Lotman, Jurij; 26; 27; 32; 53; 54; 90
 Lotsberg Bryn, Brita; 52
 Lunde, Ingunn; 64
 Lur'e, Evgenija; 46
 Lönnqvist, Barbara; 32; 39; 81; 83
 Majakovskij, Vladimir; 57; 58; 59
 Mandel'stam, Osip; 100; 101; 102;
 Masing-Delić, Irene; 20; 34; 56; 59; 69;
 76; 97; 102; 104; 112; 130; 140
 Mossman, Elliot; 13; 25; 28; 30; 135;
 140
 Møller, Peter Ulf; 23; 58; 65; 99; 136
 Mørch, Audun; 59; 65
 Nabokov, Vladimir; 127
 Nietzsche, Friedrich; 127
 Nilsson, Nils Åke; 42; 60; 126; 127
 Obolensky, Dmitry; 49; 60; 71; 109
 Pallas, P. S.; 101
 Panofsky, Erwin; 54
 Paperno, Irina; 119; 120
 Pasternak, Elena; 59; 88; 91
 Pasternak, Evgenij; 23; 33; 34; 46; 53;
 72; 81; 90; 115; 122; 123
 Pasternak, Leonid; 13; 46; 52; 53
 Polivanov, Konstantin; 23; 58; 83
 Puškin, Aleksandr; 11; 58; 59; 66; 108
 Raškovskaja, Marija; 88; 89
 Rembrandt; 52; 133
 Rilke, Rainer Maria; 127
 Rodin, Auguste 52
 Rowland, Mary & Paul; 28; 33; 48; 58;
 77; 102; 129
 Rublev, Andrej; 45
 Rudova, Larissa; 52; 53
 Šalamov, Varlam; 93
 Ščeglov, Jurij; 96
 Schelling, F. W. von; 114; 115; 116;
 118; 130
 Schiller, F. von; 126
 Schmid, Wolf; 11
 Schopenhauer, A.; 71

Scott, Walter; 87
 Segal, Dmitrij; 33; 38
 Senderovič, Savelij; 127
 Šestov, Lev; 115
 Shakespeare, W.; 88; 126; 139; 141;
 142
 Shore, Rima; 59
 Simmons, Cynthia; 59
 Sinjavskij, Andrej; 58; 71; 119
 Šklovskij, Viktor; 57; 74
 Smirnov, Igor'; 10; 48; 55; 58; 59; 60;
 70; 75; 82; 84; 86; 115; 116; 118;
 124; 130
 Solov'ev, Sergej; 88; 91
 Solov'ev, Vladimir; 114-121; 123; 138;
 139
 Spinoza, B.; 115
 Špet, Gustav; 21
 Starobinski, Jean; 95
 Štepun, Fedor; 77
 Štich, Aleksandr; 121
 Švarc, Elena; 127
 Sventickij, Valentin; 88
 Taranovsky, Kirill; 10; 57; 90
 Terras, Victor; 10; 60; 116
 Thompson, Diane; 60; 70; 73; 92; 93
 Timenčik, Roman; 10; 99
 Tjutčev, Fedor; 113
 Tolstoj, Lev; 87; 135
 Tóth, Csaba; 11
 Uspenskij, Boris; 42; 44
 Verlaine, Paul; 58
 Vil'mont, Nikolaj; 21; 22; 25
 Vyšlavcev, Boris; 75; 76; 77
 Witt, Susanna; 59; 90
 Žolkovskij, Aleksandr; 36; 58

Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature

Published by Stockholm University

Founded by Nils Åke Nilsson

Editor: Peter Alberg Jensen

Subscriptions to the series and orders for single volumes should be addressed to any international bookseller or directly to the publishers:

Almqvist & Wiksell International

P.O. Box 4627, SE-116 91 Stockholm, Sweden

Universities, libraries, learned societies, and publishers of learned periodicals may obtain the volumes of the series and other publications of Stockholm University in exchange for their own publications. Inquiries should be addressed to Stockholms Universitetsbibliotek, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden.

1. NILS ÅKE NILSSON, Osip Mandel'stam: Five Poems. 1974. 87 pp.
2. BENGT JANGFELDT & NILS ÅKE NILSSON (editors), Vladimir Majakovskij. Memoirs and Essays. 1975. 196 pp.
3. CAROLA HANSSON, Fedor Sologub as a Short-Story Writer. Stylistic Analyses. 1975. 136 (+62) pp.
4. SVEN LINNÉR, Starets Zosima in The Brothers Karamazov. A Study in the Mimesis of Virtue. 1975. 237 pp.
5. BENGT JANGFELDT, Majakovskij and Futurism 1917–1921. 1976. 133 pp.
6. PER ARNE BODIN, Nine Poems from Doktor Živago. A Study of Christian Motifs in Boris Pasternak's Poetry. 1976. 179 pp.
7. NILS ÅKE NILSSON (editor), Boris Pasternak. Essays. 1976. 214 pp.
8. CHARLES ROUGLE, Three Russians Consider America. America in the Works of Maksim Gor'kij, Aleksandr Blok, and Vladimir Majakovskij. 1977. 175 pp.
9. BARBARA LÖNNQVIST, Xlebnikov and Carnival. An Analysis of the Poem *Poët*. 1979. 166 pp.
10. NILS ÅKE NILSSON (editor), Russian Romanticism. Studies in the Poetic Codes. 1979. 226 pp.
11. NILS ÅKE NILSSON (editor), Art, Society, Revolution. Russia 1917–1921. 1980. 271 pp.
12. LUDMILA HELLGREN, Dialogues in Turgenev's Novels. Speech-Introductory Devices. 1980. 148 pp.
13. BENGT JANGFELDT (editor), V. V. Majakovskij i L. Ju. Brik: Perepiska 1915–1930. 1982. 299 pp. (+32 pp. ill.)
14. NILS ÅKE NILSSON (editor), Studies in Russian 20th Century Prose. 1982. 246 pp.
15. MAGNUS LJUNGGREN, The Dream of Rebirth. A Study of Andrej Belyj's Novel *Peterburg*. 1982. 179 pp. (+8 pp. ill.)

16. KURT JOHANSSON, Aleksej Gastev. Proletarian Bard of the Machine Age. 1983. 170 pp.
17. KAZIMIERA INGDAHL, The Artist and the Creative Act. A Study of Jurij Oleša's Novel *Zavist'*. 1984. 172 pp.
18. ANNA LJUNGGREN, Juvenilia B. Pasternaka: 6 fragmentov o Relikvimini. 1984. 172 pp.
19. LARS KLEBERG & NILS ÅKE NILSSON (editors), Theater and Literature in Russia 1900–1930. 1984. 123 pp.
20. NILS ÅKE NILSSON (editor), Velimir Chlebnikov. A Stockholm Symposium. 1985. 150 pp.
21. MÄRTA BERGSTRAND, Från Karamzin till Trifonov. En bibliografi över rysk skönlitteratur i svensk översättning. 1985. 430 pp.
22. LARS KLEBERG & HÅKAN LÖVGREN (editors), Eisenstein Revisited. A Collection of Essays. 1987. 145 pp.
23. PETER ALBERG JENSEN, FIONA BJÖRLING, BARBARA LÖNNQVIST, LARS KLEBERG & ANDERS SJÖBERG (editors), Text and Context. Essays to Honor Nils Åke Nilsson. 1987. 202 pp.
24. BENGT JANGFELDT & REIN KRUIUS (editors), Igor' Severjanin: Pis'ma k Avguste Baranovoj 1916–1938. 1988. 166 pp. (+16 pp. ill.)
25. ANNA LJUNGGREN & NILS ÅKE NILSSON (editors), Elena Guro: Selected Prose and Poetry. 1988. 214 pp. (+9 ill.)
26. BENGT JANGFELDT (editor), Jakobson-budetljanin. 1992. 185 pp. (+16 pp. ill.).
27. MAGNUS LJUNGGREN, The Russian Mephisto. A Study of the Life and Work of Emilij Medtner. 1994. 242 pp. (+32 ill.)
28. NINA GOURLANOVA & ANNA LJUNGGREN (editors), Elena Guro, Writer and Artist. Selected Writings from the Archives. 1994. 132 pp. (+4 ill.)
29. KAZIMIERA INGDAHL, A Graveyard of Themes. The Genesis of Three Key Works by Iurij Olesha. 1994. 167 pp.
30. ILYA KUTIK, The Ode and The Odic. Essays on Mandelstam, Pasternak, Tsvetaeva and Mayakovsky. 1994. 211 pp.
31. HÅKAN LÖVGREN, Eisenstein's Labyrinth. Aspects of a Cinematic Synthesis of the Arts. 1996. 139 pp.
32. ANNA LJUNGGREN, At the Crossroads of Russian Modernism. Studies in Innokentij Annenskij's Poetics. 1997. 144 pp.
33. SUSANNA WITT, Creating Creation. Readings of Pasternak's *Doktor Živago*. 2000. 157 pp.
34. INGUNN LUNDE & PETER ALBERG JENSEN (editors). Severnyj sbornik. Proceedings of the NorFA Network in Russian Literature (1994-1999). 2000. 320 pp.