

Commentators, such as Vladimir Zlobin and Olga Matich, have interpreted her writings on this theme with honesty and insight. Temira Pachmuss tries to pretend that none of this exists or that it pertains to something abstract and intangible, such as “the mystery of sex” or “the ultimate spiritual reality.” Her denials and her out-of-context quotation of the poet’s statement to Boris Savinkov constitute a form of censorship, which Pachmuss seeks to impose on a poet whose work she herself has, paradoxically, made so abundantly available to the scholarly community.

Yes, by all means let us view Gippius as “an *enfant de son siècle*” — not of some imaginary, prim, Victorian age, where Temira Pachmuss seeks to place her.

SIMON KARLINSKY  
*University of California, Berkeley*

PROFESSOR PACHMUSS REPLIES:

I did not discuss Simon Karlinsky’s entire introduction because Hippius’s views of religion, politics, androgynous love, even her interest in sexual ambiguities are abundantly represented in my own books, articles, and introductions to her works. Moreover, I selected, translated, and published her stories concerning “sexual variants” precisely because these issues were very much in harmony with her *Zeitgeist*. Clearly, I never pretended that “none of this exists.” I also reproduced in both English and Russian Hippius’s spirited conversations with Merezhkovskii and others on the “mystery of sex,” the “mystery of two,” and the “mystery of three.” It is a question of emphasis: Karlinsky chooses to stress sexual issues in Hippius, whereas I prefer to emphasize the originality and literary value of her metaphysical universe.

What I specifically objected to in Karlinsky’s introduction are his statements that Hippius experienced “the enormous burden of frustration which her need for love and the impossibility of consummation imposed on her” (p. 8) and that Merezhkovskii was asexual (p. 14). Karlinsky believes that the passages omitted by me from Hippius’s diaries — some information which she explicitly wished to be withdrawn from publication in deference to the survivors of Savinkov and Filosofov, with whom she was intimate — support his emphasis on her supposed frustration and inability to achieve consummation. In fact, neither this material nor any of the available primary sources supports this interpretation. Furthermore, in her diary, *About the Cause*, Hippius speaks of Merezhkovskii’s love affairs with a number of women. Karlinsky chooses to disregard this information in order to fit Merezhkovskii into his preconceived notions about him.

Karlinsky takes me to task for simultaneously expressing gratitude and criticizing Zlobin and Makovskii, whose statements Karlinsky uses to support his hypotheses. The point, of course, is not gratitude or criticism, but how careful one is in using such material in formulating an interpretation. I am indeed grateful to Zlobin for his help in deciphering Hippius’s references to people, dates, and events mentioned in her letters and diaries. I am also grateful to Makovskii for occasionally insightful statements. I refrained, however, from asking Zlobin “to formulate religious and sexual modalities” of Hippius for obvious reasons, including his mental instability. And I do not trust Makovskii’s pronouncements about Hippius’s alleged biological inability to engage in heterosexual relations because he did not produce evidence to support his views.

I quite agree that scholars should not sweep substantive issues of a writer’s life and work “under the rug,” and I can think of only one critical gesture that performs a greater disservice to the writer: to “discover” things that are not there.

TO THE EDITOR:

In his exchange with Sidney Monas about, among other things, my role in the Western debate about Solzhenitsyn, John B. Dunlop made this statement: “Monas seems to adhere

to the view, first articulated by the historian P. N. Miliukov and lately resurrected (*without attribution*) by Alexander Yanov, that Slavophilism must degenerate, evolving *in the direction of the Black Hundreds*" (*Slavic Review*, 40, no. 3 [Fall 1981]: 458; emphasis mine).

I should like to address both italicized phrases in the quoted passage. First, Miliukov on Slavophilism and the Black Hundreds. Miliukov's article "Razlozhenie slavianofil'stva" was published in 1893 (*Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii*, no. 3), while the Union of the Russian People, with which the Black Hundreds are associated, did not emerge until 1905. How could Miliukov have written about the Black Hundreds twelve years before they appeared?

In support of his position, Dunlop refers to the Russian émigré Boris Paramonov, who "was the first to raise the issue of Yanov's debt to Miliukov" (p. 458). However, if Dunlop tried to verify his source, he would immediately see that Paramonov is wide of the mark. Miliukov was not the first to articulate the notion of the degeneration of Slavophilism; he was probably not even among the first dozen to do so. It suffices to cite Vladimir Solov'ev's article "Slavianofil'stvo i ego vyrozhdenie" in *Vestnik Evropy* (nos. 11–12 [1889]) or Sergei Trubetskoi's article "Razocharovannyi slavianofil" (*Vestnik Evropy*, no. 10 [1892]), or even an ordinary editorial in the same journal (no. 12 [1885]) to be convinced that the notion of the degeneration of Slavophilism was a commonplace in Russian liberal literature long before Miliukov wrote his article. Indeed, one cannot help but think in those terms when reading the "patriotic" works of A. Kireev, R. Fadeev, P. Astaf'ev, K. Giliarov-Platonov, S. Sharapov, K. Iarosh, or M. Skobelev, that is, the works of those who referred to themselves as legitimate heirs of classical Slavophilism at the time. In confirmation let me quote just one passage from Solov'ev's "Idoly i idealy."

I have been reproached lately with having gone over from the Slavophile camp to the Westernizing one. . . . These personal reproaches only give me an occasion to pose the following question, which is by no means personal: where can I now find the Slavophile camp where I could and should stay? Who are its representatives? What and where do they preach? . . . It suffices to ask this question to see immediately that Slavophilism is at this time no longer a real quantity, . . . that the Slavophile idea does not subsist and is not developing, unless we consider those views and tendencies which we find in the present "patriotic" press to be a development of it. For all the differences between their tendencies, from proserfdom to populist, from tooth-grinding obscurantism to incompetent scoffing, the organs of this press have one element in common — spontaneous and unthinking nationalism, which they take and give out to be Russian patriotism; they also coincide in the most vivid manifestation of this pseudo-national principle —namely, anti-Semitism (V. S. Solov'ev, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2nd ed., vol. 5 [St. Petersburg, 1911]: 386–87).

Now, a commonplace does not call for citation, which is exactly why I did not bother to attribute the idea of degeneration of Slavophilism to any particular source.

Dunlop asserts that "the Miliukov-Yanov 'model' is obviously inadequate" (p. 458). But no "Miliukov model" (in the sense in which Dunlop uses this expression) ever existed, much less a "Miliukov-Yanov" model. For many years I have been arguing a position essentially different from that advanced by Trubetskoi and Gradovskii, Miliukov and Solov'ev. My thesis, however, was not about the degeneration of Russian nationalism as such, but about the character of that degeneration, its motive forces, its political mechanism. All of the aforementioned writers spoke of "disintegration" of Slavophilism (as the title of Miliukov's article suggests), of a mysterious "chemical process" which breaks up the amalgam of liberal and authoritarian ideas constituting, in their opinion, the Slavophile doctrine. In brief, their analyses involved only Slavophile *ideas*. I myself have been interested in another aspect of the matter. By offering a concept of an original

duality in Russian nationalism — “dissident” versus “establishmentarian” — which, through a series of stages, completes a complex and tortuous journey from mutual confrontation to convergence, I have been trying to introduce a new political dimension into the old debate. This is where the Black Hundreds come in, and this is my unforgivable sin in the eyes of modern Russian “patriots,” headed by Solzhenitsyn, who have tried to hide their political authoritarianism behind grandiloquent preaching about a religious renaissance. Hence the storm of personal insinuations about me, which Monas mentioned in his article.

I understand these “patriots”: as in Solov’ev’s time, *ad hominem* arguments are still their only weapon. But I cannot understand why an American scholar, brought up in an atmosphere of academic courtesy and mutual respect, should involve himself in this “patriotic” campaign. Why should he, citing an insinuating émigré publication, throw out dark and sinister hints about me, advising readers “interested in Yanov to read carefully the articles which Yanov published in the Soviet press before emigrating” (p. 458)? These hints are particularly puzzling because the articles of mine under discussion were published and translated long ago into many languages, including English. (Some of them were published in the West while I was still living in Moscow.) There is nothing to prevent anyone from reading the special issue of *International Journal of Sociology* (Summer-Fall 1976) devoted to my essays published in Moscow, *Soviet Studies in Philosophy* (Fall 1970), *Soviet Sociology* (Winter 1971–72), or other works of mine which have appeared in Italian, Dutch, Polish, and French.

Dunlop’s primary argument (and that of the other *Solzhenitsynovedy* like him, who are trying — too hard and too soon — to create a classical monument out of a living and fallible human being hopelessly lost between literature, politics, and pseudohistory) is not with Monas or Yanov or Miliukov. The chief problem of *Solzhenitsynovedenie* is Solzhenitsyn himself. He is systematically pulling the ground out from under the feet of his admirers and supporters and is mercilessly destroying the classical image they have created, thereby compelling them to resort more and more frequently to “patriotic” rather than academic polemical techniques.

ALEXANDER YANOV

PROFESSOR DUNLOP REPLIES:

Alexander Yanov does not believe that it was necessary for him to acknowledge an indebtedness to Miliukov and Solov’ev. Paramonov and I obviously disagree. (In his *Kontinent* article, incidentally, Paramonov stresses Yanov’s dependence on Solov’ev, something I should have mentioned.) A citation of sources was particularly necessary in light of the fact that two of Yanov’s books, *Détente After Brezhnev* (1977) and *The Russian New Right* (1978), are aimed at a “popular” audience, that is, persons unfamiliar with the writings of Miliukov and Solov’ev.

Yanov is of course correct in stating that Miliukov’s 1893 article could not have referred to the Black Hundreds. I was attempting to compare Miliukov’s and Yanov’s views on the “inevitable” degeneration of the Slavophile tendency. I continue to think that there are more similarities between the schemas proposed by Miliukov and Yanov (and Solov’ev and Yanov) than Yanov is prepared to admit.

The list of names which Yanov provides to illustrate the degeneration of nineteenth-century Slavophilism (“A. Kireev . . . M. Skobelev”) represents a hodgepodge of individuals blatantly dissimilar in significance. Thus Sharapov — a third-rate journalist whom Yanov is fond of featuring in his scholarship — is illegitimately compared with serious, if controversial, thinkers such as Fadeev. And even if the individuals cited by Yanov deemed themselves to be heirs of the Slavophiles, this does not mean that they should be so considered by historians.