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The psyche is at cross purposes with itself
C. G. Jung

Introduction

This dissertation examines the poetry of the poet E. A. Baratynsky (1800-1844) through the prism of psychological theories developed by C. G. Jung (1875-1961). As readers from Pushkin to the present have noted, the conflict between thought and feeling forms one of the knots that tie Baratynsky’s poetry together. This dissertation will confront this conflict through a dual approach: by performing close readings and structural analyses of significant poems from Baratynsky’s oeuvre, and by connecting these close readings with Jung’s theories on psychological types. The main thrust of the argument will be that thought, which is generally considered the central preoccupation of Baratynsky’s poetry, is central because it serves as what Jung calls the inferior function in the psyche of Baratynsky’s poetic persona, while feeling, which often appears to occupy a lower position than thought, does so precisely because it acts as the dominant function, the bedrock of the psyche. The aim of this dissertation is not to overturn or polemicize against previous conceptions of Baratynsky’s poetry, but to provide a set of conceptual tools that may allow readers to reconceptualize this central conflict.

Taking theories from one discipline—in this case, psychology—and applying them to another—in this case, literature—can entail the risk of creating a theoretical chimera. In order to create an intellectually coherent argument, I have decided to use the
approach that interdisciplinary theorist Lisa Lattuca calls “informed disciplinarity.”

According to Lattuca, informed disciplinary research means that: “disciplinary questions may be informed by concepts or theories from another discipline or may rely upon methods from other disciplines, but these disciplinary contributions are made in the service of a disciplinary question” (*Creating Interdisciplinarity* 82). In the case of this dissertation, I will be consciously using the theories created for another discipline—psychology—in order to answer literature-focused questions about Baratynsky’s poetry.

Because analytical psychology, like many other branches of psychology, is both an empirical science that relies on evidence gathered from experiments conducted according to the scientific method, and a set of theories used to describe certain phenomena as the theorist perceives them, it, rather like astronomy, is partly grounded in proven facts (if one is of a psychological type that accepts that “facts” can be “proven,” that is), and is partly based on speculation about the nature of things that are currently beyond our knowledge. This speculation is meant to provide possible explanations for perceived phenomena, while not claiming to be the last word in explaining these phenomena—more can always be discovered. As Jung himself says of his theories in “The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche”:

> It is not a question of his [the psychologist’s] *asserting* anything, but of constructing a *model* which opens up a promising and useful field of inquiry. A model does not assert that something *is so*, it simply illustrates a particular mode of observation. (*CW* 8: 184)

This is the approach I will be using to apply analytical psychology to literary analysis: I assume that the theories utilized here provide useful perspectives on Baratynsky’s poetry which “open up a promising and useful field of inquiry.” These
theories and the illustrations of these theories may be drawn from both the “scientific” and “non-scientific” branches of Jungian psychology. My purpose in doing so is not to attempt to “prove” or disprove anything other than that the kind of cross-fertilization that takes place when one ventures outside one’s home discipline can reveal exciting insights back in the home discipline.

The use of theories developed in the early twentieth century on literature written in the early nineteenth century also raises the question of a potential anachronism. The answer to that is twofold. Firstly, the application of theories and techniques developed after a work was produced can be illuminating even if that work was not produced with those theories and techniques in mind. An example of this would be the use of Formalist techniques on nineteenth-century works of literature. Secondly, the psyches that stand behind the poetry of Baratynsky and the theories of Jung are not so different, informed as they both are by the spirit of Weimar Classicism. Leaving aside all claims that Jung’s theories describe transcultural and transhistorical psychic structures as being unprovable, this dissertation will make use of theories generated by one thinker profoundly influenced by Goethe, Schiller, and the philosophers of German Idealism—Jung—to explain certain aspects of poetry produced by another thinker—Baratynsky—who was also writing under the influence of these same poets and philosophers.

This brings us to an important caveat, which is that the psyche we will be discussing here will be that of Baratynsky’s poetic persona, not that of Baratynsky the person. While Baratynsky the poet and Baratynsky the individual may have shared much in common, and the psychic conflicts and structures in Baratynsky’s poetry may very well reflect those of Baratynsky’s own psyche, we only have access to the poetry, not
Baratynsky’s conscious psychology. Therefore, while this dissertation will occasionally reference Baratynsky’s biography and personal correspondence when it seems enlightening to do so, it will do so with the aim of illuminating the poetry, not the person.

I should add a warning that “thinking” in the Jungian sense,¹ that is, objective/logical systems of organization, will come under question. The problem, of course, is that Jung’s own system is an attempt to impose “thinking” as he defines it on things that are only partially categorizable into rational categories. Furthermore, I myself will be guilty of the same thing, as I also impose a “thinking” approach to poetry, which does not necessarily respond well to this kind of treatment. Not only that, but if my thesis is correct, then “thinking” is, at a certain level, inimical to Baratynsky’s poetry and worldview, and by taking an overly “thinking” approach, I am in danger of doing him and his poetry a great disservice.

On the other hand, it can be useful to classify and organize things, and doing so in a “thinking” fashion can be a very efficient method. In the case of my analysis, though, I would like to start with the warning that when analyzing poetry, clinging too hard to any one conceptual method is likely to obscure a whole host of other meanings inherent in the poem. Therefore, while I will be presenting a certain reading of certain poems and of Baratynsky’s oeuvre as a whole, I would like to say at the outset that this reading should not be taken as too cut-and-dried, even if at times it appears to be. I say this not to attack my own analysis and interpretation before I even offer it, but, I hope, to provide the kind of conceptual flexibility necessary for dealing with an organic entity such as a poem or

¹Thinking and the other psychological functions as defined by Jung will be described in more detail in Chapter Three.
poetry. And now, having laid down some general theoretical principles about the
dubious quality of theoretical principles, we should turn to the actual topic of this
dissertation, which is psychological conflict in Baratynsky’s poetry.

Because Baratynsky is the poet of the “quiet voice” and may not be a familiar
figure to readers, I will nonetheless begin with a brief biographical sketch in order to
orient the reader in the cultural and personal background against which the poems under
discussion were written. I will then give an overview of the scholarly and critical
literature on Baratynsky, concentrating on the criticism surrounding Baratynsky’s “poetry
of thought,” before moving in the second chapter to an in-depth analysis of several of
Baratynsky’s most significant poems on thought and the thought/feeling conflict. This
analysis will consider the structural and thematic features of these poems, the connection
between their structural and thematic features, and the meaning of this for the position of
thought in Baratynsky’s poetry. I will then provide a description of the relevant concepts
and theories from Jungian analytic psychology in the third chapter, and connect those
theories to the role of thought in Baratynsky’s poetry as outlined in the previous section.
To add further depth to the discussion of the thought/feeling conflict, I will follow this
with an analysis of several key poems on feeling in the fourth chapter, before concluding
in the fifth chapter with a discussion of instances when Baratynsky’s poetic persona
escapes the binary dualism that dogs it through the majority of the poetry. This contrast
is not only interesting in and of itself, but further highlights the central conflict of
Baratynsky’s oeuvre.
A note on citations: Unless otherwise indicated, all of Baratynsky’s poems will be quoted from the Новая библиотека поэта 2000 edition of Baratynsky’s Полное собрание стихотворений, referred to throughout as ПСС. Jung’s Collected Works will be referred to as CW, followed by the volume and page number. Unless otherwise indicated, all Russian-language sources will be cited and listed in the bibliography in the original, although occasional translations or transliterations may be provided within the text if it seems necessary to avoid confusion.
Есть милая страна, есть угол на земле,
Куда, где б ни были: среди буйственного стана,
В садах Армидиных, на быстром корабле,
Браздящем весело равнины океана,
Всегда уносили мы думою своей,
Где, чужды низменных страстей,
Житейским подвигам предел мы назначаем,
Где мир надеемся забыть когда-нибудь
И вежды старые сомкнуть
Последним, вечным сном желаем.
(ПСС 152)

Chapter One
The Poet of Thought

Evgeny Abramovich Baratynsky was born in 1800, the eldest child of a Russian noble family. He spent his early childhood at the family estate near Tambov, before moving to Moscow and then, at the age of 12, to St. Petersburg, where he was enrolled in

2The spelling of Evgeny Abramovich’s last name is a matter fraught with contention. Although he spelled it both “Baratynsky” and “Boratynsky” during his lifetime, and some scholars insist that the spelling “Boratynsky” is to be preferred, for the sake of simplicity I have chosen to render the first vowel as “а” rather than “о,” following the convention used in my source text. For a discussion of the biographical details related to the multiple spelling variants of his last name, see both the general biographies of Baratynsky listed below and also V. E. Andreev’s article «О начертании фамилии поэта. Еще раз о букве «О»», pp. 32-37, Венок Боратынскому, ed. В. И. Попков.

3For detailed scholarly biographies of Baratynsky, see Geir Kjetsaa (Хетсо), Евгений Баратынский: жизнь и творчество and A. M. Peskov (Песков), Летопись жизни и творчества Е.А. Баратынского. The dates for Baratynsky’s biography here are taken from the Летопись. For literary biographies of Baratynsky, see A. M. Peskov’s (Песков) Баратынский. Истинная повесть and Vladimir Peshkov’s (Пешков) two works, Звезда разрозненной плеяды... and Моя начальная любовь: Е. А. Баратынский в Маре.
the Corps of Pages, an elite school for sons of the nobility. There he imbibed the Weimar Classicist spirit of Schiller—so much so that, in response to the harsh conditions at his boarding school, he and his friends formed a “Society of Avengers” and plotted to do mischief together. The Society came to a sad end in the winter of 1816 when the teenage Avengers were caught stealing from the father of an absent member. The matter came to the attention of Tsar Alexander I himself, and Baratynsky and his fellow Avengers were expelled from school and forbidden to enter any type of service other than as common privates in the army. Although they were not stripped of their nobility, this ban excluded them from the military or government service young noblemen would be expected to perform. In 1818 Baratynsky returned to St. Petersburg, and in early 1819 he was given permission to begin his military duties. Although his expulsion from school and exclusion from the officer ranks was seen by himself and his family as a tragedy, it provided him with unexpected opportunities to develop his poetic craft.

While serving in St. Petersburg, he became acquainted with other young poets, including Alexander Pushkin. Pushkin recognized a kindred talent, and remained an admirer of Baratynsky’s verse for the rest of his life. In an unpublished article from 1830 Pushkin expressed his opinion of Baratynsky’s work with the words, «Баратынский принадлежит к числу отличных наших поэтов. Он у нас оригинален, ибо мыслит. Он был бы оригинален и везде, ибо мыслит по-своему, правильно и независимо, между тем как чувствует сильно и глубоко» (Пушкин, «Баратынский» 152). These intellectual tendencies noted by Pushkin, along with the frequent conflict between the intellect and the desires expressed in Baratynsky's poetry, have caused him to be called the “poet of thought.”
A posting to Russia’s newly acquired territory of Finland in January 1820 separated Baratynsky from the Petersburg literary scene, but he continued to write poetry. It was then, in the early 1820s, that he achieved fame for his erotic and meditative elegies on the fleeting nature of love, youth, and happiness. These early lyrics show the clear influence of his readings in French Classical poetry, the Russian poets Batyushkov and Zhukovsky, and the general “Ossianic” craze for Northern exoticism pervading the poetry of the times, so that, in the judgment of one critic, “[h]is first poems were little more than stylistic exercises…Commonplace metaphors and turns of speech abound” (Dees, Evgeny Baratynsky 27). While Baratynsky’s early work was in many ways derivative, he was already showing signs of a unique voice and artistic vision, and his time in Finland was instrumental in developing that.

In October of 1825 he returned to Moscow, and that winter he was given permission to retire from the army and take up the life of a member of the nobility. He married Nastasya Lvovna Engelgardt shortly after that, and the rest of his life was devoted to the management of his estates and to his literary activities.

In the late 1820s he became fascinated with German Idealism, especially the philosophical theories of Schelling. His poetry took a decidedly more abstract and

4For a more detailed discussion of Baratynsky’s literary influences, see for example I. L. Almi’s (Альмі) О поезії і прозі, the section “Poets of the Pushkin Pleiad: E. A. Baratynsky” from William Edward Brown's A History of Russian Literature of the Romantic Period: Volume 3, or Benjamin Dees’s Evgeny Baratynsky. For a discussion of Russia’s passion for Ossian and Ossianism, see for example The Reception of Ossian in Europe (ed. Howard Gaskill).

5For an in-depth discussion of the relationship between Baratynsky’s poems and the ideas of Schelling, see Sarah Pratt’s book Russian Metaphysical Romanticism: The Poetry of Tiutchev and Boratynskii.
metaphysical turn, although he never wrote rhymed philosophical tracts. Rather, having set forth insoluble conundrums on the meaning of existence he left his questions unanswered, as in this poem from 1831-2:

К чему невольнику мечтания свободы?
Взгляни: безропотно текут речные воды
В указанных брегах, по склону их русла;
Ель величавая стоит, где возросла,
Невластная сойти. Небесные светила
Назначенным путем неведомая сила
Влечет. Бродячий ветр не волен, и закон
Его летучему дыханию положен.
Уделу своему и мы покорны будем,
Мятежные мечты смирим иль позабудем,
Рабы разумные, послушно согласим
Свои желания со жребием своим—
И будет счастлива, спокойна наша доля.
Безумец! не она ли, не вышняя ли воля
Дарует страсти нам? и не ее ли глас
В их гласе слышим мы? О, тягостна для нас
Жизнь, в сердце бьющая могучею волною
И в грани узкие втесненная судьбою.
(ΠCC 75-6)

The poem begins with the argument that freedom is nonexistent and reconciliation to fate is the only possible avenue to happiness. The speaker then changes positions and argues against the previously stated position, so that, “[t]he arguments of both the conciliatory and protesting aspects of the persona are couched in questions that may or may not be rhetorical…The voices are balanced; neither one wins the argument, and any conclusions the reader might draw suffer from a high level of ambiguity” (Pratt, “‘К Chemу невол’niku Mechtaniya Svobody?’” 27-8). While the reader may be unable to draw any conclusions, the conclusion of the poem is one of despair in the face of insoluble dualistic dilemmas. The lack of a solution in this case implies that the only response is helpless suffering.
Poems such as these proved too heavy for most of the reading public, while his refusal to adhere to any specific philosophical system outraged other enthusiasts of Schelling. A writer primarily of lyric verse, he found himself unable to adapt to the public’s new taste for prose. His poetry lost popularity and many of his friends left him through death or disagreement. When, in 1842, he published Сумерки, his final volume of verse, it, like his sudden death in 1844 while traveling in Western Europe, went almost unnoticed.

Baratynsky’s work fell into obscurity, only to be revived half a century later during the Silver Age of Russian poetry. Twentieth- and twenty-first-century readers have discovered that “Baratynsky’s verse gives an impression of extraordinary modernity, with its contradictoriness and complexity; and his profound pessimism makes much of his contemporaries’ work seem childish and puerile” (Brown, “Poets of the Pushkin Pleiad: E. A. Baratynsky” 311). Сумерки, meanwhile, is considered “one of the finest volumes of verse in the Russian language,” according to the Handbook of Russian Literature (39). While the work of his last years as a poet, which was largely ignored during his lifetime, has garnered the greatest respect amongst recent scholars, the seeds of

Baratynsky produced a total of three volumes of verse during his lifetime: a collection from 1827, one from 1835 (which included a number of reworked versions of the poems from the 1827 collection), and Сумерки. He was not a very prolific author; his complete collected poems, including all his album verse, translations, and poems included in private correspondence, amounts to less than 300 works. He also wrote several long narrative poems in the early part of his career, the most significant of which are «Эда», first published 1825, «Бал», first published 1827, and «Наложница», first published in its entirety in 1831. The title «Наложница» engendered so much critical backlash that when it was republished in 1842 the title was changed to «Цыганка». Baratynsky also wrote one short story, «Перстень», from 1831. Although his long narratives poems and his prose are not without their charms, and Pushkin esteemed «Эда» and «Бал» very highly, the general critical opinion, with which I concur, is that Baratynsky's forte was lyric verse.
this “contradictoriness and complexity,” along with the psychological conflict that is our focus here, can already be found in his early poems.

Baratynsky himself considered psychological conflict to underlie the very process of poetic creation. In a letter from 1828 to his close friend N. V. Putyata, he said:

Poets are for the most part poor judges of their own work. The reason for this is the exceedingly complex relationship between them and their works. The pride of the intellect and the rights of the heart are in ceaseless conflict. One piece you love because you remember the feeling with which you wrote it. You are proud of a correction because you conquered an emotional feeling with the mind (Baratynkii, Selected Letters 76).

At the same time he seemed to consider intellect to have the upper hand, at least in outward expression of feeling, for in an 1831 letter to P. A. Pletnev he wrote: “I know that poetry is not contained in the dead letter, that one may be silent and be a poet; but I am sorry that you have abandoned art, which consoles us for life’s sadnesses better than any philosophy. To express a feeling is to resolve it, to control it” (74). This tension between the inner poetry of silence and the “resolved and controlled” poetry of outer expression will be important to my later analysis of the thought-feeling conflict.

Critical reviews of Baratynsky’s poetry also noted the tendency towards psychological conflict from the very beginning. Scholars continue to agree with Pushkin’s assessment that Baratynsky “is original because he thinks, while simultaneously feeling strongly and deeply.” There are two important points to note about it: one, that Pushkin recognized Baratynsky as a cerebral “poet of thought” while

7I have chosen to use Barratt’s translations here, rather than cite the letters in the original, because of their excellent organization and annotation.
also noting the presence of feeling in his work, and two, that thought occupies the more prominent place in Pushkin's evaluation.

While Pushkin was one of the first to note the importance of thought in Baratynsky’s poetry, he was far from the last. Gogol, in Выбранные места из переписки с друзьями, said of Baratynsky:

Баратынский, строгий и сумрачный поэт, который показал так рано самоытное стремление мыслей к миру внутреннему и стал уже заботиться о материальной отделке их, тогда как они еще не вызрели в нем самом; темный и неразвившийся, стал себя выказывать людям и сделался чрез то для всех чужим и никому не близким. (Гоголь 172)

Gogol’s description of Baratynsky as the “severe and gloomy” poet, cut off from society and concerned more with poetic form than with other people, emphasizes the intellectual side of Baratynsky’s work while seemingly ignoring the feeling, human aspect of it entirely. Although Gogol’s is one of the less sympathetic and more one-sided reviews, many other critics and scholars have agreed more or less with his overall judgment.

Belinsky’s assessment, while less one-dimensional than Gogol’s, is hardly any more sympathetic, and also emphasizes the importance of thought in Baratynsky’s poetry. In the article «Русская литература в 1844 году», Belinsky devotes a dense paragraph to alternating attacks on and defenses of Baratynsky the poet, saying:

Призвание Баратынского было на рубеже двух сфер: он мыслил стихами, если можно так выразиться, не будучи собственно ни поэтом в смысле художника, ни сухим мыслителем. Стихотворения его не были ни стихотворным резонерством, ни художественными созданиями. Дума всегда преобладала в них над непосредственностью творчества. Почти каждое стихотворение Баратынского было порождено не стремлением осуществить идеальные видения фантазии художника, но необходимостью высказать скорбную мысль, навеянную на поэта созерцанием жизни. Эта мысль, или, лучше сказать, эта дума всегда так тепла, так задушевна в
In the end Belinsky concludes that: «Вообще, поэзия Баратынского—не нашего времени; но мыслящий человек всегда перечтет с удовольствием стихотворения Баратынского, потому что всегда найдет в них человека—предмет вечно интересный для человека» (180).

Although, as I hope is clear from these quotations, Belinsky was certainly not Baratynsky's most devoted fan, he was not unappreciative of Baratynsky's poetic gifts, and, perhaps even more clearly than Pushkin (because expressed in a more tortured fashion), he also put his finger on a fundamental conflict in Baratynsky's poetry: that between thought and feeling. When Belinsky says «Эта мысль, или, лучше сказать, эта дума всегда так тепла, так задушевна в стихах Баратынского; она обращается к голове читателя, но доходит до нее через его сердце», he shows how closely these two antitheses are intertwined, and how difficult it is for the reader to tease them apart, if that is possible at all. 8

20th-century scholars and critics have continued to emphasize the importance of thought and its negative role in Baratynsky's poetry. In his 1915 monograph on

8This brings me back to the dangers of applying too much categorical thinking to literary analysis: while it is tempting to divide such things into neat categories, and define Baratynsky as either the poet of thought or the poet of feeling, or at least define his writing as being about either thought or feeling, the actual poetry tends to resist such facile definitions. I believe this was one of the reasons his poems provoked such a strong reaction of discomfort from critics such as Belinsky and Mirsky, both of whom preferred to apply a single system to their literary analyses.
Baratynsky-as-Symbolist, M. L. Gofman says: «Мысль является доминирующим началом в творчестве Баратынского, мысль является источником дисгармония мира и несчастья человека» (Гофман 13). D. S. Mirsky, whose assessment of Baratynsky was hardly less conflicted and contradictory than Belinsky's, says of Baratynsky's later poetry, when taken as the poetry of thought: «Меньше всего в «Сумерках» следует искать философской поэзии. Никакой системы извлечь из них нельзя...Это поэзия мысли, но мысли, бьющейся в плену своей слепоты, своих недоумений» (Мирский 241).

Having given such a negative evaluation of Baratynsky's poetry of thought, however, Mirsky goes on to say:

Но, будучи насквозь интеллектуальна, зрелая лирика Баратынского отнюдь не рассудочна, а этим она качественно отличается от его ранней лирики. Мысль и ее логическое движение насквозь пронизаны эмоцией, «сильным и глубоким чувством».
Именно глубина и сила эмоции и создает ту лирическую температуру, которая преображает интеллектуальный материал стихотворения в лирический образ (245).

Although Mirsky cannot decide whether or not he approves of this unsystematic, emotion-infused “poetry of thought,” he concludes that Baratynsky was worth reading as a «мастер, работавший на редком материале—эмоций, рожденных мыслью» (252). He says of the content of Baratynsky's “poetry of thought” that: «У Баратынского идеи были мало ценные, но это были идеи, и разрабатывал он их хорошо» (252).

Mirsky's opinion of Baratynsky's poetry is valuable not so much in and of itself, but because it sheds light on the conflict between thought and feeling that pervades so much of Baratynsky's poetry, and also because it highlights the discomfort such conflict provokes in readers looking for the poetry of easy answers. The fact that, when reading
Baratynsky's poems, «Ни какой системы извлечь из них нельзя», is precisely what makes them worth studying as poetry and not as philosophical tracts. Although later in this dissertation I will be attempting precisely to extract a system from Baratynsky's poetry of thought, it will be a psychological, not philosophical, system, and therefore prone to all the irrationality of the psyche and its products. Mirsky's inability to extract a rational system from Baratynsky's ideas indicates the need to approach these ideas from a non-rational, as Mirsky would understand it, or at least less-rational, direction.

Returning to the critical discussion of Baratynsky’s poetry of thought and his poetic relationship with thought, L. G. Frizman in his 1966 monograph says that the problem of over-analysis which faced Baratynsky’s generation explains much: «и напряженность его раздумий, и его союз с мыслью, и вражду с ней, и стремление освободиться от ее власти, и невозможность этого освобождения» (Фризман 72). This “attempt to liberate himself from its power, and the impossibility of this liberation”

9It is interesting to note that Schiller, who was so influential for Baratynsky in his youth, produced a similar impression on his readers, and suffered from a similar conflict between thought and feeling. According to Reginald Snell, in his introduction to his translation of *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*:

Schiller himself was well aware that he could not sustain the role of either pure thinker or pure poet for long at a time. ‘I want,’ he wrote to Fichte, ‘not merely to make my thoughts clear to another, but to surrender to him at the same time my whole soul, and to influence his sensuous powers as well as his intellectual.’ It is this duality in him that will always cause some lovers of poetry to find his poetry, and some lovers of abstract thought to find his philosophy, in some degree repellent (Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education* 6).

Schiller himself was also aware of this tendency, and in a letter to Goethe, quoted in the same source, he wrote:

I hover, like a kind of hybrid, between concept and contemplation, between law and feeling, between a technical mind and a genius. It is this that gave me, particularly in the earlier years, a somewhat awkward appearance both in the field of speculation and in that of poetry; for the poetic mind generally got the better of me when I ought to have philosophized, and my philosophical spirit when I wanted to be a poet. Even now it happens frequently enough that imagination interferes with my abstractions, and cold intellect with my poetry (6-7).
will be an important consideration for the understanding of the position of thought in the
personal typology of Baratynsky’s poetic oeuvre.

In the same vein as Russian scholars, the American scholar Benjamin Dees, in his
book on Baratynsky for the Twayne’s World Authors Series, says of the conflict between
thought and feeling in Baratynsky’s work, as well as the tendency towards duality in
general:

Forever immersed in oppositions with diverse connotations, he projects his
duality into all of life and even the afterlife. At the basis of this duality lay
the conflict between inherent individual sensitiveness and impressibility
and the reasoning proclivities imposed by a rationalistic education.
Reason was always a limiting factor for him, an entity which
constrained and impeded the spontaneous motion of passion and
imagination. In his early poems the earth came to symbolize the
confinement of reason, whereas in his later work, the earth is a symbol of
the inner struggle between reason and feeling. In a similar way his images
of paradise evolved from a home of fantasy and romance to a place where
opposing principles were balanced and synthesized (133-4).

The idea that “reason was always a limiting factor” for Baratynsky, that it
“constrained and impeded the spontaneous motion of passion and imagination,” will be
an important point to keep in mind when considering what, exactly, is the dynamic
between thought and feeling in Baratynsky’s poetry.

Continuing the discussion of Western scholarly opinion of Baratynsky and the
conflict between thought and feeling, or imagination and “reality,” Geir Kjetsaa, in his
comprehensive monograph on the life and works of Baratynsky, states that:

Творчество Баратынского основывалось на его остром сознании
непримиримых противоречий бытия: счастье—несчастье, чувство—
рассудок. Терзаемый сомнениями и погруженный в раздумье об этих
tяжелых противоречиях, поэт иногда уходит в квиетизм, но скоро
обнаруживает, что жизненный покой для человека чувствующего и
dумающего нестижим и что «жизнь для волненья дана: жизнь и
волненье—одно». Жизненные иллюзии тускнеют в остром луче
неутомимой мысли: на долю человека выпала тоска и печаль (Хетсо, Жизнь и творчество VI-VII).  

While echoing the general scholarly consensus on the irreconcilable conflict at the heart of Baratynsky’s poetry, Kjetsaa in this passage also alludes to a key poem to the understanding of the place of thought and the act of creation in his poetry: «Всё мысль да мысль!..». Baratynsky's depiction of thought as being a “sharp ray,” in «Всё мысль да мысль!..» will be discussed in the next chapter.

The connection between poetry and thought’s ambiguous effects, previously noted in Baratynsky’s letters to Putyata and Pletnyov, has also been noted by William Brown in his A History of Russian Literature of the Romantic Period. After decrying the low esteem in which Baratynsky’s poetry was held after his death and in the Soviet period, Brown says of the split between Baratynsky-as-person and Baratynsky-as-poet:

As a man, Baratynsky would give himself up in full measure to the emotional experience of life’s renewal in the spring, and merge himself with ‘the elements’; but he is a poet, and for the poet such an unthinking fusion is impossible. The poet’s medium is the word, and the word is thought, the antithesis of pure feeling (319).

Brown’s description of the difference between Baratynsky’s personal emotional response to events (in this case, spring), and the intellectual response of his poetic

10In a more detailed discussion of the thought-feeling conflict in Baratynsky’s poetry, Kjetsaa provides a quantitative analysis supporting the importance Baratynsky himself, as well as his readers and critics, had sensed in this antithesis:

Эта антитеза является едва ли не самой существенной из всех антитез в творчестве Баратынского. На это указывает само количество слов, относящихся к этой антитезе. Вот результат наших подсчетов таких слов в сборнике Сумерки. Для сравнения в скобках дается число слов в указанных выше последних стихотворениях Пушкина: чувство 5 (1), страсть 7 (0), сердце 9 (5), мечта 9 (2), мысль 11 (3), ум 4 (1). Как видно, в среднем слова из этих словесных групп употребляются приблизительно в четыре раза чаще в последних стихотворениях Баратынского, чем в последних стихотворениях Пушкина (560).
persona, or at least his poetry, is not only relevant to our discussion here of the conflict between thought and feeling, but also a reminder, especially once we begin to delve more deeply into the psychological theory behind such a reaction, that we are dealing here specifically with a literary artifact, not a biographical fact. Although it seems very likely that Baratynsky’s poetry was influenced by his personal life and personal experiences, especially once he turned decisively away from “the crowd” and began writing exclusively for himself and a small circle of friends, we must be on our guard against the temptation to read his poetry as autobiography, and remember that it is, ultimately, about something larger than that. Although his poems contained autobiographical references throughout his career, I consider it important not to put too much weight onto the facts behind the poems, but to focus on the poems themselves.

The temptation to read the poetry as largely autobiographical in nature is, perhaps, particularly strong in Baratynsky’s case because of the very “personal,” individual feel of many of his poems, as noted above by Belinsky.

Brown also struggles with the anti-biographical/autobiographical nature of Baratynsky's work, saying:

In his verse neither personal biography nor genre-label—elegy, epistle, etc.—plays any essential part. Many of his poems, designated under one label in the first edition, have another in the second. As regards that pivotal romantic characteristic, the expression in verse of the unique individual personality, it takes with Baratynsky a form almost anti-Byronic. It is not the poet’s emotional life that Baratynsky’s verse records, as is the case so often with Pushkin; it is rather the progression of his thought, his intellectual biography (313).

For a discussion of Baratynsky’s personal opinion of “the crowd” as expressed in his correspondence, see Appendix 2, Note 1.
As with much other criticism on Baratynsky, Brown here struggles to label and define what it is that Baratynsky was doing. As Brown suggests here, there is a biographical flavor to much of Baratynsky’s work, but it is not biography proper.

Furthermore, although I would (and will) argue that Baratynsky’s verse does record the poet’s emotional life, it is important to keep in mind that this is the emotional life of “the poet,” not Baratynsky the person. Baratynsky’s personal correspondence is the work of Baratynsky the person, or at least the persona he turned to his friends and family, but here I intend to treat his poetry as something suprapersonal, that may or may not reflect the personal but certainly goes beyond it.

Returning to the psychological conflict in Baratynsky’s poetry as reflected in scholarship, I. M. Tojbin, in the monograph Тревожное слово: О поэзии Е. А. Баратынского, expands it beyond mere thought and feeling into a more general conflict between heaven and earth within the human soul:

Русская поэзия не знала дотоле столь драматической картины раскола внутреннего мира «современного» человека, противоборства в нем земного и небесного, телесного и духовного, ангельского и демонического начал, света и тьмы, веры и безверия, их столкновения и борьбы, вызывающих в нем атмосферу «сумерек» и «дикого ада». Здесь многое на языке поэзии уже предвосхищало проблематику Достоевского (Тойбин 6).

This intense inner battle gives, as Tojbin and Brown both note, a sensation of “modernity” to Baratynsky’s verse, despite his archaisms in language and his Neoclassical heritage. While the medieval author may have placed the struggle between “earth and heaven, the carnal and the spiritual…light and darkness” largely outside of the
human soul, depicting it instead as possession by demons or obeying the will of God,\textsuperscript{12} in Baratynsky’s verse, the battle moves at least partly inside the human consciousness. Even when it appears that greater forces are controlling human destiny, as in «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы?..», there is still an awareness that human consciousness is part of the equation, and that, by its very ability to reflect on its fate, it in fact stands outside of the natural forces that control its fate—thereby, one might argue, escaping that control to a certain extent.

In the final chapter I will discuss other examples of Baratynsky's poetic persona escaping the trap of dualism, but in the bulk of his poetry the poetic persona remains firmly stuck between opposing forces. The authors I have cited above give ample evidence of the impression of tension and hopeless conflict that much of Baratynsky's poetry engenders, but let us now turn to some specific examples from the poems themselves.

\textsuperscript{12}See for example the stories of the blinding of Vasilko, in which Satan is the primary force behind the action, or of Brother Isaac and the demons, in which Brother Isaac is struck down by demons disguised as angels, or of Peter and Fevronia of Murom, in which Peter's sister-in-law is seduced by a devil-sent serpent who is identical to her own husband, all of which can be found in \textit{Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles, and Tales}, ed. Serge A. Zenkovsky.
Chapter Two
Sharp Rays: Baratynsky’s Poetry of Thought

This chapter will focus on the “strict heaven” of which Baratynsky speaks in the above poem, in contrast to the heaven created by «чудесная любовь» that will form the topic of Chapter Four. In this chapter I will discuss the psychological conflict that torments Baratynsky's poetic persona, and the role of thought in that psychological conflict. I will perform close readings on significant poems on thought from the early, middle, and later periods of Baratynsky's literary career, in order to draw out what thought represents in Baratynsky's poetry. Having done so, I will then turn in the next chapter to the connections between this and the Jungian concept of “thinking” and “feeling,” and how these relate to thought and feeling in Baratynsky’s work. In Chapter

---

13I. L. Almi says of the three periods of Baratynsky’s career: «Исследователи отмечают обычно три этапа творческой эволюции поэта: первый—с 1818 по 1824 г. (или 1827 г.), когда Баратынский выступает как поэт «арзамасского» направления, школы «гармонической точности»; второй—с 1824 по 1833-35 гг.—период увлечения шеллинганистством и перехода к философской тематике; третий—с 1833 по 1844 гг.—время расцвета философской лирики» (Альми 133).
Four I will then use examples of significant poems on feeling to illustrate this
thought/feeling conflict and how it plays out in the manner theorized by Jung.

Before I enter into the analysis proper, I should lay out my approach regarding
poetic form and poetic content. Although my main focus in this dissertation is thematic
rather than formal, I will also be discussing the formal aspects of the poems, since:

Any attempt to determine ‘what the poem means’ must necessarily
consider how the poet chooses to express this meaning. Questions of
verse technique, in short, are not tangential to a poet’s concerns. Rather,
they are the poet’s concerns and therefore—whether this is consciously
recognized or not—they become the reader’s concerns.
(Wachtel, The Development of Russian Verse 2)

Baratynsky's use of form is not normally considered ground-breaking, but it is
nonetheless interesting in its own right, as well as significant when examined in the
context of his poetry overall, and has received thorough attention from scholars, especialy
in its relationship to the formal aspects of the poetry of Pushkin and Batyushkov. To
quote Andrea Rolich's conclusion to her dissertation on the formal aspects of Baratynsky
and Batyushkov:

it may be said that while the poets followed the conventions of their times
in a number of respects, they also modified their use of traditional forms in
non-radical ways. Each poet’s usage included subtle changes in choice of
meters, rhyme schemes, or clausulae, and perhaps, in small ways, altered
existing perceptions of which forms were appropriate for a particular type
of poem or stanza and thus helped move Russian verse into new areas of
acceptable poetic practice. (“The Stanzaic Forms of K. N. Batyuskov and
E. A. Baratynskij” 149)

14See for example Kjetsaa, Geir, “A Norm for the Use of Poetical Language in the Age of
Puškin: A Comparative Analysis”; Shaw, J. Thomas, “Horizontal Enrichment and Rhyme
Theory for Studying the Poetry of Puškin, Batjuškov, and Baratynskij” (pp. 351-376),
Russian Verse Theory: Proceedings of the 1987 Conference at UCLA; Shaw, J. Thomas,
“Parts of Speech in Puškin’s Rhymewords and Nonrhymed Endwords.” The Slavic and
East European Journal, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Spring, 1993), pp. 1-22; and Shaw, J. Thomas,
Baratynskii: A Dictionary of the Rhymes and a Concordance to the Poetry. University of
With this in mind, we should not expect to find much overt formal experimentation in Baratynsky's poetry, but we should be aware of the “subtle” differences in his use of meter and rhyme, which make his poetry distinctly Baratynskyan and prevent it from fading into the background of general Romantic poetry. Baratynsky may have been the “poet of thought,” but if his verses were nothing more than metaphysical musings laid out on the page to look like poetry, he would not be counted as one of the Pushkin Pleiad.15 Even those critics who found his philosophical ideas wanting, such as Belinsky and Mirsky, were willing to concede his technical mastery. In this dissertation I intend to examine, among other things, how his use of form echoes and emphasizes the philosophical and psychological problems that are the content of his work.

In the early poetry the psychological conflict that would later become the crushing burden of thought was often portrayed as a conflict between happiness and experience. Although the conflict is not defined as clearly or delineated as sharply as it will be in Baratynsky’s mature work, these early poems on happiness and its unattainability point the way towards later poems such as «Всё мысль да мысль!..» (to be discussed in detail at the end of this chapter) and show the fundamental thought-feeling conflict that underlies the “psyche” I am positing for Baratynsky’s poetic œuvre.

15 A term that most likely refers to Baratynsky’s own poem «Князю Петру Андреевичу Вяземскому», in which he calls Vyazemsky «Звезда разрозненной плеяды». I have placed poems that are only mentioned in passing in an appendix for the convenience of the reader. For the full text of this poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 23.
One\(^{16}\) of the first signs of the happiness/experience conflict that would become the thought/feeling conflict in the poetry of the mature Baratynsky can be seen in this poem from 1821 (originally titled «К Делио. Ода. (С Латинского)»)\(^{17}\) dedicated to Delvig:

Напрасно мы, Дельвиг, мечтаем найти
В сей жизни блаженство прямое:
Небесные боги не делятся им
С земными детьми Прометей.

Похищенной искрой созданье свое
Дернул оживить безрассудный;
Бессмертных он презрел—и страшная казнь
Постигнула чад святотатства.

Наш тягостный жребий: положенный срок
Питаться болезненной жизнью,
Любить и лелеять недуг бытия
И смерти отрадной страшиться.

Нужды непреклонной слепые рабы,
Рабы самовластного рока!
Земным ощущеньем насильственно нас
Случайная жизнь покоряет.

Но в искре небесной прияли мы жизнь,
Нам памятно небо родное,
В желании счастья мы вечно к нему
Стремимся неясным желаньем!...

Вотще! Мы надолго отвержены им!

\(^{16}\)For further discussion of the relationship between «К Делио» or «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...» and Baratynsky's later works, see Dora Burton’s dissertation “Boratynskij: The Evolution of his Style and Poetic Themes.”

\(^{17}\)Baratynsky seems to have chosen the name “Delii” (Dellius in Latin) as a nickname for Delvig simply because of the similarities in sound between the two names. Although Dellius Quintus is the addressee of Horace’s Ode III from Book II, the reference to a Latin source in this poem by Baratynsky was a genre convention of the time and was unlikely to have been taken seriously by readers (Боратынский, Полное собрание сочинений и писем, Том I 405-6).
Сияет красою над нами,  
На бренную землю беспечно оно  
Торжественный свод опирает...

Но нам недоступно! Как алчный Тантал  
Сгорает среди влаги прохладной,  
Так, сердцем постигнув блаженнейший мир,  
Томимся мы жаждою счастья.  
(IIIC 117)

This poem, while being thematically typical of Baratynsky's work, is marked metrically by being written in ternary meter. According to the analyses of Andrea Rolich, over 90% of Baratynsky's poetry was written in iambic meter, the highest percentage for any poet of his time (127). However, several of Baratynsky's most serious metaphysical and philosophical poems were written in non-iambic meter, notably «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», «На смерть Гёте», 19 «Приметы», and «Пироскаф» (all in ternary meter), «Последний поэт» (written in mixed iambics and trochees), «Недоносок» 20 (in trochees), and «Мудрецу» 21 (elegiac distich). Although Baratynsky also used iambics to express serious metaphysical content, «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...» is noteworthy for being an early part of a trend to move away from Baratynsky's favored meter when dealing with particularly “high,” serious, or emotional topics.

18I am extremely grateful to Dr. Feinberg for providing me with a very interesting and detailed analysis of this poem. Unfortunately, for reasons of space I will be unable to share all of it with my readers, but I will refer to several points from it in my own, brief, discussion of this poem.

19For the full text of this poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 21.

20For the full text of this poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 26.

21For the full text of this poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 32.
The first stanza declares the impossibility of obtaining «блаженство прямое»—
“direct (or “unmediated”) bliss,” and also sets up the heaven/earth conflict that would be
repeated most notably in «Недоносок».22

In the second stanza the idea of reason is introduced with the lines «Похищенной
искрой созданье свое / Дерзнул оживить бесрассудный». Prometheus is called
“reckless” or “foolhardy,” but literally “reasonless.”23 Although in later poems
Baratynsky almost always equated reason with suffering, here being “reasonless” is the
cause of Prometheus’s suffering, as it led him to disdain the immortals. The first two
stanzas could, then, be read as a warning against being “reckless” or “reasonless”
(«безрассудный»). I see this as both a wavering on the part of Baratynsky's poetic

22 Dr. Feinberg’s observation on the phrase «блаженство прямое», the heaven/earth
conflict in this poem, and its relationship to form is as follows: “In the key phrase
блаженство прямое the modifying adjective is set in relief by its placement after
the head noun and—in a poem without exact rhyme – its occurrence in rhyming position,
where it forms a “consonance” with Прометей (/ója/-/éjá/). The opposition DIRECT vs.
OBLIQUE plays out on different thematic and structural levels throughout the poem.
Prometheus, as a lesser deity (Titan), occupies an intermediate station between the
Olympian gods and his human creations. The majestic firmament (торжественный свод)
is only the visible part of heaven, leaning against the ‘perishable earth.’ Although
Prometheus sins against the “immortals” by stealing their fi re to create humans, it is the
‘children of sacrilege’ who (at least within the compass of the poem) pay the price for his
transgression – a metonymic (i.e., oblique) displacement. On the grammatical level,
direct- and oblique-case forms are conspicuously balanced and contrasted throughout the
poem; the direct cases, in turn, contrast nominative and accusative—prototypically, the
case of the subject and the direct object, the former being the more indispensable of the
core verbal arguments. The text contains 40 substantives (counting the two
substantivized adjectives—II/2: безрассудный, II/3: бессмертных), which are evenly
divided between direct- and oblique-case forms (20 of each); the direct-case forms, in
turn, are split evenly between nominative and accusative (ten of each). The substantives
designating the gods are exclusively in direct cases (небесные боги, безрассудный,
бессмертных), as is the metonymic небо.”

23 Again, I would like to thank Dr. Feinberg for his observation that “Безрассудный 'the
reckless one' is an ironic epithet, given that the Greek name is usually interpreted as
meaning 'one who acts with forethought.’”
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persona between “reason” and “non-reason,” something that would continue to happen throughout his career, but also possibly a sign of his immaturity as a poet in 1821.

In the third stanza the conflict between the desire to cling to painful life («болезенная жизнь») and fear of joyful death («смерть отрадная») is introduced. Again, this foreshadows Baratynsky's more well-known poem on the joy of death, «Смерть», while leaving the issue relatively unexplored.

In the fourth stanza “we” are called the “slaves of fate” («Рабы самовластного рока»), a theme Baratynsky would develop more fully in «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы?..». In the final three stanzas he returns to the desire for unreachable happiness and the struggle of the earthly soul for the bliss of heaven, again foreshadowing «Недоносок».

This single poem, then, contains the elements that would later be developed in several of Baratynsky’s most well-known and typical poems, namely «Смерть», «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы?..», and «Недоносок». If one takes the adjective «безрассудный» to be a specific reference to reason, then the thought/feeling poems such as «Всё мысль да мысль!..» can also be included. All these themes are united in «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...» (and in the poetry as a whole) by the impossibility of achieving earthly happiness and the presence of irreconcilable conflict.25

24For the full text of this poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 15.

25Dr. Feinberg’s observation on the theme of poem is as follows: “Thematically the poem’s seven stanzas display a basic 4 + 3 division. The first four stanzas describe the tragic plight of ‘Prometheus’s children,’ created with a divine spark and yet, as the result of their creator’s hubris, unable to share in the “direct bliss” (блаженство прямое) of the gods. These quatrains turn on its head the traditional Christian notion of original sin. In this version of the Prometheus myth, the fall of humankind coincides with its creation. Hence the emphasis throughout these stanzas on an implacable fate, the denial of free
A second important early poem on the theme of happiness/experience is «Дало две доли провидение...», from 1823:

Дало две доли провидение
На выбор мудрости людской:
Или надежду и волнение,
Иль безнадежность и покой.

Верь тот надежде обольщающей,
Кто бодр неопытным умом,
Лишь по молве разновещающей
С судьбой насмешливой знаком.

Надейтесь, юноши кипящие!
Летите, крылья вам даны;
Для вас и замыслы блестящие,
И сердца пламенные сны!

Но вы, судьбину испытавшие,
Тщету утех, печали власть,
Вы, знанье бытия приявшие
Себе на тягостную часть!

Гоните прочь их рой прельстительный;
Так! доживайте жизнь в тиши
И берегите хлад спасительный
Своей бездейственной души.

Своим бесчувствием блаженные,
Как трупы мертвых из гробов,
Волхва словами пробужденные,
Встают со скрежетом зубов;

human agency: тягостный жребий, положенный срок, рабы самовластного рока. The three final stanzas depict the futile striving of humans toward a remembered heaven, a paradise that remains forever out of reach.” I would add to this that I find this inversion of the traditional Christian notion of original sin to be part of the overall questioning of the deity/mortal relationship, and the responsibility each bears to the other, in Baratynsky’s poetry. For example, in «На смерть Гёте», from Baratynsky’s middle period (Poem 21 in Appendix 1), and «Осень» (Poem 27 in Appendix 1), from his late period, we have the concept of the Creator's need to to be justified; in «На смерть Гёте», the poet says of Goethe that, «И нас за могильной доскою, / За миром явлений, не ждет ничего: / Творца оправдает могила его» (ПСС 154), while in Stanz 13 of «Осень» Baratynsky refers to «Промысел оправданный» (ПСС 268).
Так вы, согрев в душе желания,
Безумно вдавшись в их обман,
Проснется только для страдания,
Для боли новой прежних ран.
(PCC 93)

«Дало две доли...» is written in iambic tetrameter with alternating dactylic and masculine endings. The longer first line with its dactylic ending provides an open-ended beginning to each distich within the quatrain, drawing the reader or listener in, while the shorter second line with its masculine ending provides a definite sensation of closure.

The distichs are joined into quatrains by the alternating rhyme scheme, which links the first and second half of each stanza. Furthermore, the dactylic rhymes in each stanza are all from the same parts of speech, while the masculine rhymes are not necessarily so. Except for the final stanza, all the dactylic rhymes are made up not only of the same word type, but of words in the same case (in the final stanza «желания» is accusative plural, while «страдания» is genitive singular—this kind of break in the pattern is not uncommon in Baratynsky’s poetry, and, as I will argue later, suggests that values other than those of thought or thinking are guiding these poems’ composition), while except in the fourth and sixth stanzas, the masculine rhymes are either different parts of speech, or in different cases. There is therefore a contrast between the stable and uniform dactylic rhymes, and the less predictable and less uniform masculine rhymes.

The dactylic rhymes in the first and last stanzas are made up of neuter abstract verbal nouns, giving them a particularly undefined quality, and also emphasizing the trapped circularity of the lyrical “I,” who cannot seem to escape from this long-drawn-out abstraction implied by the form and meaning of this type of word. This open-ended and undefined quality of the neuter abstract verbal nouns is in contrast to the masculine
rhymes of the final stanza (обман/ран). The concluding word of the poem, «ран», is in fact a feminine noun (рана) that has been “masculinized” by being put into the genitive plural. This “masculinization” of a grammatically feminine word places a strong emphasis on the final masculine rhyme and provides a markedly abrupt ending to the poem.

The ending of the poem in a single-syllable word is even more marked, given the tendency in Russian verse to avoid using monosyllabic words in strong ictuses (Якобсон 243-4) —the syllables in the line that are most likely to carry stress in a given meter. Because in Russian verse stress is obligatory in the final ictus of a line (Scherr 13), the final ictus is always the strongest, while the strength of the other ictuses varies according to the particular meter and, in the case of iambic tetrameter, the time period in which the poem was written (48). Because, as was already mentioned, the fourth ictus (the eighth syllable) must bear stress and is therefore the strongest, it would be expected to have the fewest number of monosyllabic words. According to an analysis by Jakobson of Tatyana’s letter from Evgeny Onegin, for example, the fourth ictus contains a monosyllabic word only 15.3% of the time (Якобсон 247).

26During the 1820s—that is, when «Дало две доли...» was written—the iambic tetrameter was changing its rhythm, from a strong stress on the first ictus and weaker stress on the second ictus, to “a wavelike structure, with strong stresses on the second and fourth ictuses alternating with weaker stresses on the first and third” (Scherr 48). «Дало две доли...» seems to be caught in the middle of that transition, with an only slightly stronger second ictus (27 out of 28 possible stresses, or 96%) than first ictus (23 out of 28 possible stresses, or 82%). However, the first ictus also has a higher number of pronouns and monosyllabic words than the second ictus (8 out of 28, or 29%, vs. 1 out of 28 («прочь»), or 4%), making it in fact much weaker than the second ictus, even if it is technically stressed in 23 of the 28 lines.
In «Дало две доли...», there are only four monosyllabic words in the fourth ictus («сны», «власть», «часть», and «ран»). Fewer than a sixth (14%, or a very similar figure to what Jakobson found in EO), therefore, of all the lines end in a monosyllabic word. The scarcity of monosyllabic words in the final ictus, both in the poem and in Russian verse in general, makes «ран» stand out particularly clearly as a choice for the final word of the poem.

The truncation of its natural feminine ending gives it, and the line as a whole, a strong sense of completion, ending the poem on a very definite note. The contrast between the open-ended abstract verbal nouns and the final, single-syllable concrete noun with its abbreviated ending “cuts off” the poem at that point, leaving the reader with no hope of appeal against Baratynsky’s seemingly inescapable binarism. The form of this poem, therefore, emphasizes its theme of inexorable logic and hopeless, irreconcilable opposition between two unattractive options.27

The opening line of the poem—«Дало две доли провидение»—indicates that we will be dealing with a binary system here (две доли). The fact that it is given by Providence (провидение) suggests that it is immutable and inevitable. As in much of Baratynsky’s poetry, a third path is not even conceived of (something that will make his rare forays into reconciliation even more interesting). We therefore begin the poem already trapped in dualism.

The first stanza begins by setting up a dualist world view in general, and ends by setting up a specific binary opposition that would haunt Baratynsky in one form or

27As I have already mentioned, the occasional breaks in the strict pattern form an interesting counterpoint to this thematic and formal inescapability, and point to the presence of something other than thought in the poems.
another throughout his career: надежда и волнение (hope and agitation) versus безнадежность и покой (hopelessness and peace). There is, then, no unequivocally positive choice for the poet here: hope brings with it a life of trouble and care, while peace is purchased at the price of hopelessness.

Each of these unattractive choices is linked with ambiguous imagery that furthers the difficulty of choosing between them, while both emphasizing and undercutting the dualistic worldview presented in the poem. The words associated with the hope/hopelessness dichotomy can be divided into two columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Надежда</th>
<th>Безнадежность</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Волнение</td>
<td>Покой</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Обольщающий</td>
<td>Судьбу испытавший</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Бодрый</td>
<td>Тщета утеш</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Неопытный умом</td>
<td>Печали власть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Юноши</td>
<td>Знанье</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Кипящий</td>
<td>Тяжелая часть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Лететь</td>
<td>Тишь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Крылья</td>
<td>Хлад спасительный</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Блестящий</td>
<td>Бездейственная душа</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Сердце</td>
<td>Бесчувствием блаженный</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Пламенные сны</td>
<td>Труп</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Рой прельстительный</td>
<td>Мертвый</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Сгорев в душе желания</td>
<td>Гроб</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Безумно</td>
<td>Словами пробужденный</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Обман</td>
<td>Скрежет зубов</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Проснуться</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Страдание</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Боль</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Рана</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hope, then, is associated with warmth, heart, youth, wakefulness, liveliness, and flight, but also deception, foolishness, and pain. Hopelessness is associated with peace, quiet, knowledge, and salvation, but also sorrow, death, and black magic. Those who have gained the wisdom of experience at the expense of hope, furthermore, are still not
immune to the dangers of hope, for they nonetheless cherish (“keep warm”) desires, and may in fact give in to their deceptions. The apparent dualism, therefore, is in fact skewed in favor of hope.

This skewing is even more apparent if the emphasis of the stanzas is examined. Although at first glance it might seem that the balance is tipped in favor of hopelessness, as only two stanzas are dedicated to those who still have hope, while the final four stanzas are dedicated to those who have lost hope due to experience, in fact three of the stanzas ostensibly dedicated to hopelessness continue to describe hope (stanza four refers to утехи, stanza five to их рой прельстительный, and stanza seven to желания). In the final stanza of the poem those who have supposedly given up hope in favor of experience and hopelessness are once again awakened to its pain, giving hope, even in this negative guise, the last word.

In the final line of the poem, «Для боли новой прежних ран», the apparent dualism is given particularly strong emphasis through the direct juxtaposition of the adjectives новый and прежний. The grammatical forms of the two nouns in the line, боли and ран, highlight the reversal that has taken place in the final stanza as the formerly hopeless addressees have reawakened to their painful hopes. While боль and рана are both feminine, by being put in the genitive боль gains a syllable, while рана loses a syllable, so that they “switch places,” just as the addressees of the poem have the ability to transform from hopeful to hopeless and back again.

The transformation that is implied throughout the poem and that is made explicit in the final stanza undercuts the dualist structure set up in the first stanza, and its apparent

---

28The same thing happens in line 14 with печаль and утеха.
balance is undermined by the emphasis (even if frequently negative) given to hope throughout the poem, and the preference given to it in the poem’s conclusion. As we have seen in the criticism on Baratynsky, and as we shall see as we continue to analyze his poetry, seemingly straightforward systems have a tendency to collapse when examined closely. Ultimately, «Дало две доли...» seems to be less an exercise in pure dualism than an attempt to set up a dualist system that leads the poet into such despair that the only choice in the end is pain—a sort of monoism, instead of the intended binary system. This is not to say that there is not a strong element of dualism in this and many of Baratynsky's other poems, but rather that the dualism is less pure than a reader searching for simple solutions might like.

Another poem from 1823, entitled «Безнадежность» on its first appearance in print, echoes the themes of the earlier poems:

Желанье счастья в меня вдохнули боги:
Я требовал его от неба и Земли
И вслед за призраком, манящим издали,
Жизнь перешел до полдороги;
Но прихотям судьбы я боле не служу:
Счастливый отдыхом, на счастье похожим,
Отныне с рубежа на поприще гляжу
И скромно кланяюсь прохожим.

(ПСС 83)

As in «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», there is a heaven/earth split, while as in «Дало две доли...» there is the experience/inexperience dichotomy, and the peace/deception opposition, as well as the theme of hopelessness made explicit in the poem's original title.

This poem also develops the theme of withdrawal from society that would appear in several of Baratynsky's important later poems such as «На посев леса».

29For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 36.
Interestingly, this theme is underlined by the prefixes attached the “breath” words in the poem (вдохнуть, отдых). In the first half of the poem the gods “breath in” (вдохнули) a desire for happiness, while in the second half of the poem, the poet is “happy in ‘outbreath’” or a “breather” (счастливый отдыхом). The poem then could be seen as forming a single breath cycle— an inhale (a passive inhale in which the gods “exhale” inspiration into the protagonist) in the first, active, part of the poem, in which the protagonist, inspired by the gods, engages in movement, and an exhale in the second, passive, part of the poem, in which the protagonist, having completed a perfective verb of motion (перешел), comes to a halt and merely bows to passers-by. This reference to inspiration that is no longer in force strengthens the connection to the later “withdrawal” poems, particularly «На посев леса», in which the poet gives up poetry himself but passes it on to his descendents, somewhat in the same way as the protagonist in «Желань счастия...» now bows to passers-by, which could be seen as passing on the inspiration he received from the gods.

The “breath” theme also links this poem with «Когда исчезнет омраченье...»), which will be discussed shortly in connection with the happiness-themed poems, as well as «Недоносок» (the protagonist of which is described as a «крылатый вздох») and «Были бури, непогоды...»30 from Сумерки. «Желань счастия...», then, is not only thematically interesting for its main, “happiness” focus, but, again, it foreshadows important themes and poems from Baratynsky’s later career.

Formally, this poem is interesting for its rhymes. The first four lines form a ring rhyme, while the final four lines are in alternating rhymes. The first four rhyme words all

30See Appendix 1, Poem 28.
contain the sound «и», unstressed in the outer rhyme words of the ring and under stress in the inner rhyme words. The final four rhyme words all contain the sound «ж» between two vowels. The A and D rhymes are also extremely similar (-оги/-ожим), so that they could be perceived as being inexact rhymes with each other, and form a link between the two halves of the poem.

Желанье счастья в меня вдохнули боги: A
Я требовал его от неба и Земли b
И вслед за призраком, манящим издали, b
Жизнь перешел до поддороги; A
Но прихотям судьбы я боле не служу: c
Счастливый отдыхом, на счастье похожим, D
Отныне с рубежа на поприще гляжу c
И скромно кланяюсь прохожим. D

This use of rhyme and sound to blur the boundaries between different parts of a poem is a feature of Baratynsky's style to which I will return when discussing «Финляндия» in the final chapter. In the case of «Желанье счастья в меня вдохнули боги...», it should be noted that this is yet another example of an apparently binary system—here one of past/present, happiness/experience, illusion/truth, and activity/peace—being subtly undermined.

Another poem I have put in the “happiness/knowledge” cycle is this one from 1824, originally titled «Истина»:

О счастьи с младенчества тоскуя,
Всё счастьем беден я,
Или вовек его не обрету я
В пустыне бытия?

Младые сны от сердца отлетели,
Не узнаю я свет;
Надежд своих лишен я прежней цели,
А новой цели нет.
Безумен ты и все твои желанья—
Мне тайный голос рек;
И лучшие мечты моей созданья
Отвернул я навек.

Но для чего души разуверенье
Свершилось не вполне?
Зачем же в ней слепое сожаленье
Живет о старине?

Так некогда обдумывал с роптаньем
Я тяжкий жребий свой,
Вдруг Истину (то не было мечтаньем)
Узрел перед собой.

«Светильник мой укажет путь ко счастью!—
Вещала. —Захочу
И страшного, отрадному бесстрастью
Тебя я научу.

Пускай со мной ты сердца жар погубишь,
Пускай, узнав людей,
Ты, может быть, испуганный, разлюбишь
И ближних и друзей.

Я бытия все прелести разрушу,
Но ум наставлю твой;
Я оболью суровым хладом душу,
Но дам душе покой».

Я трепетал, словам ее внимая,
И горестно в ответ
Промолвил ей: «О гостья неземная!
Печален твой привет.

Светильник твой—светильник погребальный
Последних благ моих!
Твой мир, увы! могилы мир печальный,
И страшен для живых.

Нет, я не твой! в твоей науке строгой
Я счастья не найду;
Покинь меня: кой-как моей дорогой
Один я побреду.
Прости! иль нет: когда мое светило
Во звездной вышине
Начнет бледнеть и всё, что сердцу мило,
Забыть придется мне,
Явься тогда! раскрой тогда мне очи,
Мой разум просвети,
Чтоб, жизнь презрев, я мог в обитель ночи
Безропотно сойти».
(ПСС 72-3)

This poem contains thirteen stanzas of alternating lines of five-footed and three-footed iambics. The pentameter lines have feminine endings and the trimeter lines have masculine endings. This alternation of longer lines and feminine rhymes with shorter lines and masculine rhymes gives a similar effect of open-endedness abruptly cut off as the alternation of dactylic and masculine endings in «Дало две доли...». The poem is split into three sections: in the first five stanzas, the lyrical “I” laments his lot; in stanzas six, seven, and eight, “Truth” speaks, and in stanzas nine through thirteen the lyrical “I” responds to her offer. The poem therefore possesses a balanced structure, in which the lyrical “I” speaks for five stanzas on either side of Truth’s central proposition.

The first five stanzas, in which the lyrical “I” describes his unhappy situation, are dominated by the theme of “lack,” both explicitly and through word choice, prefixes, and prepositions. The first stanza contains a reference to lack in every line:

О счастьи с младенчества тоскуя,
Всё счастьем беден я,
Или вовек его не обрету я
В пустыне бытия?

The first line contains the word «тосковать»—to long for, something that implies lack. The second line has «бедный»—poor, which also implies lack. «Не обрету»—I will not acquire—implies the impossibility of ever coming into possession of the lacked
substance, in this case happiness. «Пустыня»—desert—contains the root «пуст», meaning empty.

The first line of the second stanza repeats the particle «от»—away from—twice, once as a preposition and once as a verbal prefix: Младые сны от сердца отлетели. This is followed by the word «лишен»—deprived of or lacking—in line three, while lines two and four both contain negations (Не узнаю; новой цели нет), including one as the final rhyme word in the stanza. It is also a single-syllable word in the strongest ictus in the line, something which further highlights it, as out of the 52 lines in «О счасти с младенчества тоскуя...», only seven, or approximately 13%, have single-syllable words in the final ictus. «Нет» thus receives special emphasis by being placed in a position in the line it would normally be unlikely to occupy.

Stanza three begins with «безумен», which further implies and emphasizes lack through the prefix «без»—without. The «от» prefix is then repeated in the final line of stanza three, «Отвергнул я навек», echoing the theme not just of lack but of loss that was created in stanza two.

In stanza four the themes of loss and negation are continued, but in a less explicit fashion. The first line contains the word «разуверенье»—dissuasion—with its prefix of «раз», which indicates dispersal. The second line contains one negation—«не вполне»—which is echoed in the stressed «не» of the rhymeword. The final rhyme-sound of the stanza is also a stressed «не», which, without being an explicit negation, allows the sound or sight of negation to remain in the listener's or reader's mind.

The fifth stanza, in which Truth makes her appearance, contains as it were two false negations: «некогда», which has the negative particle «не» but here implies the
presence rather than absence of something (in this case, a particular time); and «не было мечтаньем», which, while a negation, implies that what has appeared does have physical form, instead of being a mere daydream. The overall movement of the first five stanzas, then, could be seen as from true lack, loss, and negation to the appearance of a real being who is nonetheless brought into being through seemingly negative terms.

Truth begins by offering to show the lyrical “I” the path to happiness, a positive action. The seemingly positive and active nature of this offer is emphasized by the use of perfective verbs in the non-past conjugation, implying completed action in the future. In the first five stanzas, all the verbs are either imperfective (тоскуя, узнаю, живет, обдумывал), in the past (отлетели, рек, отвергнул, свершилось, узрел), or negated (не обрету). The repetition of positive perfective verbs in the non-past conjugation, then, makes stanzas six, seven, and eight, in which Truth lays out her plan for the poem’s hero, stand out for their active and definite nature.

The association of Truth not only with definite action, but also with first-person action, is further emphasized by the repetition of the sound «у/ю» (the ending for the first-person singular conjugation) in the stanzas in which she speaks. In the first five stanzas the «у/ю» sound appears in every stanza, but only three times in stanza one, twice in stanza two, three times in stanza three, twice in stanza four, and then, connected with the appearance of Truth, four times in stanza five. In stanza six it appears eight times, in stanza seven eight times again, and in stanza eight nine times. Once the lyrical “I” begins speaking again, however, «у/ю» is completely absent from stanza nine, used only once in stanza ten, three times in stanza eleven, once in stanza twelve, and only once again in stanza thirteen. The poem is reproduced below with the «у/ю» sounds highlighted:
О счастии с младенчества тоскуя,
Всё счастьем беден я,
Или вовек его не обрету я
В пустыне бытия?

Младые сны от сердца отлетели,
Не узнаю я свет;
Надежд своих лишен я прежней цели,
А новой цели нет.

Безумен ты и все твои желанья—
Мне тайный голос рек;
И лучшие мечты моей созданья
Отвернул я навек.

Но для чего души разуверенье
Свершилось не вполне?
Зачем же в ней слепое сожаленье
Живет о старине?

Так некогда обдумывал с роптанием
Я тяжкий жребий свой,
Вдруг Истины (то не был мечтаньем)
Узрел перед собой.

«Светильник мой указет путь ко счастью!—
Вещала. —Захочу
И страстного, отрадного бесстрастью
Тебя я науча.

Пускай со мной ты сердце жар погубишь,
Пускай, узнав людей,
Ты, может быть, испуганный, разлюбишь
И ближних и друзей.

Я бытия все прелести разрушу,
Но ум наставлю твой;
Я оболью суровым хладом душу,
Но дам душе покой».

Я трепетал, словам ее внимая,
И горестно в ответ
Промолвил ей: «О гостья неземная!
Печален твой привет.

Светильник твой—светильник погребальный
Последних благ моих!
Твой мир, увы! могилы мир печальный,
И страшен для живых.

Нет, я не твой! в твоей науке строгой
Я счастья не найду;
Покинь меня: кой-как моей дорогой
Один я побреду.

Прости! иль нет: когда мое светило
Во звездной вышине
Начнет бледнеть и всё, что сердцу мило,
Забыть придается мне,

Явись тогда! раскрой тогда мне очи,
Мой разум просвети,
Чтоб, жизнь презрев, я мог в обитель ночи
Безропотно сойти».

The «у/ю» sound, as can be seen by this, is present in the first third of the poem, but is associated with negation or lack until the appearance of Truth herself. In the first stanza it appears in the words or phrases «тоскуя», «не обрету», and «пустыне»; in stanza two in «не узнаю»; in stanza three in «безумен» and «лучшие мечты...отвергнул», which implies negation or lack; and in stanza four in «души разуверенье», which also implies negation or lack. It is only in stanza five, when Truth makes her entrance, that the «у/ю» sound is associated with positive action («обдумывал», «вдруг Истину», «узрел»), even if, as was discussed earlier, this positive action is associated with negative qualifications.

In the central three stanzas in which Truth speaks, as was already shown, the «у/ю» sound is heavily concentrated,31 and is associated with some sort of positive,

-------------------

31The «у/ю» sound appears 14 times in stanzas 1-5, 25 times in stanzas 6-8, and only 6 times in stanzas 9-13. Its use is therefore almost twice as frequent in stanzas 6-8 than in stanzas 1-5, and more than four times more frequent in stanzas 6-8 than in stanzas 9-13.
definite action, as opposed to the first section of the poem. However, even as Truth proposes a plan of action that will supposedly lead the poem's hero to happiness, her proposal, and its concomittant «у/ю» sounds, is also linked in every stanza to prefixes of negation and dispersal such as those that appeared in the first five stanzas. In stanza six there is the phrase «отрадному»32 бесстрастью, in stanza seven the words «испуганный» and «разлюбишь» (as well as the word «погубишь», which is also negative), and in stanza eight «разрушу». This strengthens the associations between the «у/ю» sound and negation or lack that were present in the first section of the poem, as well as its connection to the figure of Truth.

In the final section of the poem, as has already been mentioned, the «у/ю» sound all but disappears. Its first use in the last section of the poem is in stanza ten, in the word «увы»—“alas.” In stanza eleven it is first present in the phrase «в твоей науке строгой / Я счастья не найду», which has negative/negation connotations. In the second half of stanza eleven it is used again in the statement «Покинь меня: кой-как моей дорогой / Один я побреду», which is a declaration of positive action on the part of the lyrical hero, but one of denial and withdrawal from society (the society of Truth, at least—the lyrical hero's solitude and loneliness has already been described in the first two stanzas, with the phrases «пустыня бытия» and «Не узнаю я свет»). In stanza twelve its only appearance is in the phrase «и всё, что сердцу мило, / Забыть придется мне», which is a

32The word «отрадный», while having the meaning of “gratifying, pleasing; comforting” according to the Oxford Russian Dictionary, contains the root «рад», which is associated with “gladness,” and the prefix «от-», which again according to the Oxford Russian Dictionary implies 1) completion of action or task assigned. 2) action or motion away from given point. 3) action of negative character. So «отрадный», although having a positive meaning, appears that it could potentially have a negative meaning, something like the English phrase “out of joy,” which could be read two ways.
grammatically positive statement, but is of course actually a statement of negation and loss, in that the lyrical hero will have to forget everything that is dear to his heart.

In the final stanza the «у/ю» sound and the prefixes of negation and dispersal come together in a seemingly positive statement:

Явись тогда! раскрой тогда мне очи,
Мой разум просвети,
Чтоб, жизнь презрев, я мог в обитель ночи
Безропотно сойти».

However, this seemingly positive statement is in fact a request to Truth to make life so unpalatable to the lyrical hero that he is glad to die.33

The link between the «у/ю» sound and Truth (who, on first appearance, is both framed by and filled with the «у» sound—«вдруг Истину...узрел») not only provides a convenient sound marker for the subject of the poem (Truth), but also links Truth on the level of sound with what she promises to give the lyrical hero, which is «ум», or intellect.

«Ум» in one form or another appears once in each section of the poem:34 as «Безумен» in stanza three, «ум» in stanza eight, and «разум» in stanza thirteen. It

33Dr. Feinberg has also provided me with a number of interesting observations on this poem, including the following: “The phoneme /u/ is conspicuous as well in the unstressed vocalism of the middle stanzas, each of which contains five instances of this vowel in pre-/post-tonic position. In the surrounding ten stanzas /u/ occurs ten times under stress and ten times outside stress. The middle stanzas thus contain as many instances of stressed /u/ as all the other stanzas combined (10), while instances of unstressed /u/ outnumber those in the surrounding ten stanzas by a ratio of 3: 2. In respect to sound symbolism, the prominence of /a/ in the three middle stanzas coheres, on the one hand, with Truth’s majesty and imposing presence, and, on the other, with the impassive and disenchanted calm which she offers in the guise of happiness. For its part, the phoneme /u/, initially linked to the motif of elusive happiness (тоску - его не обрету я) now acquires a tinge of apprehension: the narrator-protagonist risks losing everything that is precious for the sake of achieving inner peace.”
therefore appears in its most “naked” form only once in the poem, in the quoted speech of Truth. In the first section, before the appearance of Truth, it appears in the negated form «Безумен», meaning “witless” or “crazy.” In the final section it appears in the form «разум», which, like «отрадный», is a positive word with a prefix that seems to imply dispersal or negation. If one charts the course of «ум» throughout the poem, then, it goes from genuine negation, to “nudity” (as part of Truth’s unappetizing proposition, however), to a “false” negation that is in fact associated with a negative sentiment. Nowhere in the poem does «ум» appear in an unambiguously positive light, and its association with Truth, also a negative figure, emphasizes the negativity of both characters.

In these four early poems, «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», «Дало две доли...», «Желанья счастья в меня вдохнули боги...», and «О счастии с младенчества тоскую...», the seeds of the thought/feeling conflict in Baratynsky's poetry are expressed as a longing for happiness which is rendered unobtainable by the deadening effects of experience. In the first three of the poems mentioned, the conflict, while taking place within the human soul, originates outside of it, and the responsibility for creating both the desire for happiness and the impossibility of reaching it, is given to not only suprapersonal but supernatural forces in the form of the gods or Providence. In «О

34I am not counting its possible use in the verb «обдумывать» here, which is certainly related to the idea of thinking, but seems to be more a more disguised reference to the concept of intellect than the very “naked” uses of the word «ум» that I will discuss here.
счастии с младенчества тоскуя…», however, the location of the conflict begins to move inside the poet's own psyche.\textsuperscript{35}

The lyrical hero's original abandonment of his dreams, in stanza three, is precipitated by the words of a “secret voice” («Безумен ты и все твои желанья— / Мне тайный голос рек»). The identity of this “secret voice” is never revealed, suggesting that it comes from within the psyche of the lyrical hero himself—that it is, in fact, his own voice. Its words occasion a conversation of the lyrical hero with himself about his fate («Так некогда обдумывал с роптаньем / Я тяжкий жребий свой»). The first section of the poem, therefore, is based on a conversation the lyrical hero has with himself about his own lot. Although his fate is something that is imposed on him from the outside, and the “secret voice” is also, even if it may be part of the lyrical “I’s” psyche, not explicitly identified with the lyrical “I,” nonetheless the conflict is less explicitly identified with suprapersonal forces such as the gods, but rather closer to the lyrical hero’s own sense of self, than in the earlier poems discussed in connection with this theme.

Truth is, of course, in her personified form here a suprapersonal force like Providence or the gods, but, as was shown in the analysis of the «ю/ю» sound associated with her, she is also linked with the concept of «ум/разум», bringing her down to a more human level and also placing her in a certain sense inside the lyrical hero's psyche. This

\footnotetext[35]{As I mentioned earlier, one reason for the impression of “modernity” given by Baratynsky’s verse could be this location of spiritual conflict within the human soul instead of between outside forces. The movement in Baratynsky’s verse towards identifying this conflict as explicitly internally, as opposed to externally, motivated, provides an interesting parallel with a similar movement observed by Jung in human culture as a whole.}
relocation of the happiness/knowledge (or experience) conflict to a space within or at least nearby the lyrical hero's own mind in this poem is an important moment in the development of the key theme of thought/feeling conflict in Baratynsky's poetry.

The next poem we will examine in connection with this theme was written, most likely, in 1831-2, and first published in 1835. This places it during Baratynsky's middle period, the time when he was both falling out of public favor as a poet and also most involved with the Wisdom Lovers and German philosophy. In this poem we see both the development of the theme of the deadly power of thought, and the theme of the abandonment of poetry.

Когда исчезнет омраченье
Души болезненной моей?
Когда увижу разрешенье
Меня опутавших сетей?
Когда сей демон, наводящий
На ум мой сон, его мертвящий,
Отыдет, чадный, от меня,
И я увижу луч блестящий
Всезаряющего дня?
Освобожусь воображеньем,
И крылья духа подыму,
И пробуждённым вдохновеньем
Природу снова обниму?

Вотще ль мольбы? напрасны ль пени?
Увижу ль снова ваши сени,
Сады поэзии святой?
Увижу ль вас, ее светила?
Вотще! я чувствую: могила
Меня живого приняла,

36 In the 1835 collection «Когда исчезнет омраченье...» was placed directly before «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», suggesting that Baratynsky, who took care in organizing the poems in his collections, may have also felt there to be a connection between them.

37 For a discussion of Baratynsky’s use of words meaning “in vain,” see Nils Åke Nilsson’s article “‘In vain’—‘perhaps’. The Russian romantic poets and fate.”
И, легкий дар мой удушая,
На грудь мне дума роковая
Гробовой насыпью легла.

(ПСС 116-117)

The poem is written in iambic tetrameter, Baratynsky's favored meter. It is divided into two unequal sections of thirteen and nine lines. In the first section, the lyrical hero describes the unpleasant situation in which he has found himself, and demands to know when he will be freed from it. In the second section, the lyrical hero demands again to know if he will be able to escape from his intolerable condition, but concludes that his position is inescapable and he has, in fact, been buried alive.

The theme of entrapment versus freedom, then, is central to the poem. Other central conflicts are those between dark and light, and sleeping and waking. The theme of darkness is introduced in the first line, with the word «омраченье». In lines three and four the poem demands «Когда увижу разрешенье? / Меня опутавших сетей?», introducing the freedom/entrapment dichotomy. The theme of sleep/death is brought in in line six, «На ум мой сон, его мертвящий». The first six lines of the thirteen-line first section of the poem therefore set up a situation of darkness, entrapment, and sleep or death. The seventh, central line of the section, «Отыдет, чадный, от меня», in which the demon associated with the deathlike sleep of which the poet complains goes away (even if rhetorically—in the second half of the poem the freedom will prove illusory), divides the strophe in half, between the negative first half and the positive second half. The exit of the demon, even if only suggested by the lyrical hero's question, heralds the

38«Разрешенье» is also used twice in the final two lines of the poem «Смерть», perhaps providing a further connection to the “death” theme. For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 15.
entrance of light («луч блестящий»), day («Всеозаряющего дня»), freedom («Освобожусь»), imagination («воображеньем»), flight («крылья духа подыму»), wakefulness («пробужденным»), inspiration («вдохновеньем»), and union with nature («Природу снова обниму»).

Although the first strophe divides neatly into these two halves, the positive second half is in fact less heavily weighted than the negative first half, for the negative first half is a description of the actual situation of the lyrical hero, while the positive second half is a description of what the lyrical hero would like to happen, but which he does not seem prepared to take any definite steps to bring about. The rhyme scheme also unites the two halves of the first strophe:

- Когда исчезнет омраченье A
- Души болезненной моей? b
- Когда увижу разрешенье A
- Меня опутавших сетей? b
- Когда сей демон, наводящий С
- На ум мой сон, его мертвящий, С
- Отыдет, чадный, от меня, d
- И я увижу луч блестящий С
- Всеозаряющего дня? d
- Освобожусь воображеньем, E
- И крылья духа подыму, f
- И пробужденным вдохновеньем E
- Природу снова обниму? f

As was already mentioned, the poem contains two strophes, the first of thirteen lines and the second of nine lines. This gives it a total of twenty-two lines, but divided unevenly. Strophe one is longer than strophe two, and, even though the poem as a whole has an even number of lines, each strophe has an odd number of lines. This odd number of lines means that the rhyme scheme in each strophe must be unbalanced. And in fact this is the case, with three “C” rhymes in the first strophe, two before line seven and one
after it. The last two “C” rhymes are «мертвящий» and «блестящий», linking the “death” and “light” themes that are seemingly opposed. The “A” and “D” rhymes are also almost identical («омраченье», «разрешенье», «воображеньем», and «вдохновеньем»), all of which are neuter abstract verbal nouns), providing a further connection between the two halves of the strophe.

The second strophe, with nine lines, has the potential to have a balanced rhyme scheme (three sets of three rhymes, for example), but it does not. Its actual rhyme scheme is as follows:

Вотще ль мольбы? напрасны ль пени? A
Увижу ль снова ваши сени, A
Сады поэзии святой? x
Увижу ль вас, ее светила? B
Вотще! я чувствую: могила B
Меня живого приняла, с
И, легкий дар мой удушая, D
На грудь мне дума роковая D
Гробовой насыпью легла с

As can be seen, the strophe has as it were a quatrain of parallel rhymes and a quatrain in a ring rhyme scheme, but with a non-rhymed line nested within what would have been the first quatrain, were it not for the non-rhymed line. This non-rhymed line is further underlined by its masculine ending sandwiched between two lines of feminine endings on either side. In fact, while strophe one has an almost equal number of feminine and masculine endings—seven feminine and six masculine lines—strophe two has twice as many feminine as masculine lines—six and three. The masculine endings are, however, strongly marked, being the one unrhymed line in the poem and the outer lines in the ring rhyme, including the concluding line of the poem. Their very scarcity, therefore, contributes to their noticeability and importance.
The most marked masculine line is the one unrhymed line: «Сады поэзии святой». This places “holy poetry” at the center of the poem while also placing it outside the poem’s structure: at the center because it is the most noticeable line in the poem, while outside because it is not part of the poem’s rhyme scheme. Poetry, then, is a possible avenue of escape for the trapped poet, and the unattainable promised land. It is unattainable because the poet is, in fact, buried alive under “fatal thought,” which is strangling his “light gift.” This theme of the «легкий дар» and the theme of strangling echoes the “weak gift” and voicelessness of the poet in Baratynsky’s most direct description of his experience of his poetic talent in «Мой дар убог, и голос мой не громок...»,39 from 1829. This poem also sets up the thought versus poetry opposition that would take on such significance in Сумерки.

«Последний поэт», the first poem after the dedication in Сумерки, forms a good bridge between the poems already discussed and the poems in Baratynsky’s last published volume of verse. It was written in 1835, during what Almi and others define as the end of Baratynsky’s middle period, but included in Сумерки, which was published during Baratynsky’s late period and can generally be seen as representative of that part of his career. In this poem the conflict between the poet and society (in the outer world), or between different modes of being (in the inner world), is expressed with particular clarity, as the two different points of view are not only presented in alternating stanzas, but in different meters: the stanzas ostensibly dedicated to “the world” are written in iambic pentameter, while to the stanzas apparently dedicated to “the poet” are in trochaic tetrameter.

39For the full text, see Appendix 1, Poem 14.
Последний поэт

Век шествует путем своим железным,
В сердцах корысть, и общая мечта
Час от часа насущным и полезным
Отчетливей, бесстыдней занята.
Исчезнули при свете просвещенья
Поэзии ребяческие сны,
И не о ней хлопочут поколенья,
Промышленным заботам преданы.

Для ликующей свободы
Вновь Эллада ожила,
Собирая свои народы
И столицы подняла;
В ней опять цветут науки,
Носит понт торгующи груз,
Но не слышны лиры звуки
В первобытном рае муз!

Блестит зима дряхлеющего мира,
Блестит! Суров и бледен человек;
Но зелены в отечестве Омира
Холмы, леса, брега лазурных рек.
Цветет Парнас! пред ним, как в оны годы,
Кастальский ключ живой струею бьет;
Нежданный сын последних сил природы—
Возник поэт: идет он и поет.

Воспевает, простодушный,
Он любовь и красоту
И науки, им ослушной,
Пустоту и суету:
Мимолетные страданья
Легкомыслием целя,
Лучше, смертный, в дни незнанья
Радость чувствует земля.

Поклонникам Урании холодной
Поет, увы! он благодать страстей;
Как пажити Эол бурнопогодный,
Плодотворят они сердца людей;
Живительным дыханием развита,
Фантазия подъемлется от них,
Как некогда возникла Афродита
Из пенистой пучины вод морских.
И зачем не предадимся
Снам улыбчивым своим?
Бодрым сердцем покоримся
Думам робким, а не им!
Верьте сладким убежденьям
Вас ласкающих очес
И отрадным откровеньям
Сострадательных небес!

Суровый смех ему ответом; персты
Он на струнах своих остановил,
Сомкнул уста, вещать полуотверсты,
Но гордыя главы не преклонил:
Стопы свои он в мыслях направляет
В немую глушь, в безлюдный край; но свет
Уж праздного вертепа не является,
И на земле уединенья нет!40

Человеку непокорно
Море синее одно,
И свободно, и просторно,
И приветливо оно;
И лица не изменило
С дня, в который Аполлон
Поднял вечное светило
В первый раз на небосклон.

Оно шумит перед скалой Левкада.
На ней певец, матежной думы полн,
Стоит…в очах блеснула вдруг отрада;
Сия скала…тень Сафо!..песни волн…
Где погребла любовница Фаона
Отверженной любви несчастный жар,
Так погребет питомец Аполлона
Свои мечты, свой бесполезный дар!

И по-прежнему блистаает
Хладной роскошью свет;
Серебрит и позлащает
Свой безжизненный скелет;
Но в смущение приводит

40Note the repetition of the «свет/нет» rhyme that also appeared in «О счасти с младенчества тоскуя...». 
Despite the obvious metrical difference separating the two alternating halves of the poem, they are united by other formal features: all the stanzas are eight lines long, with an identical AbAbCdCd rhyme scheme. This similarity of form between the two seemingly opposed meters in the poem highlights the connection between the two seemingly opposed voices in the poem.

The beginning of the poem sets up a binary system, in which the iambic pentameter stanzas are seemingly concerned with the current “iron age,” its cold, mercenary nature, and its enmity to poetry, while the stanzas in trochaic tetrameter apparently speak with the voice of the poet and contain motifs of flowering, joy, and love.

The poem opens with a stanza in iambic pentameter describing the present age, which travels on its «железный путь» and is devoted to money («в сердцах корысть») and industry («Промышленным заботам преданы») at the expense of poetry, which has “disappeared in the light of enlightenment” («Исчезнули при свете просвещенья / Поэзии ребяческие сны»). This sets up a correlation between the present age, light, and metal (something that is also bright).

The second stanza, which is the first in trochaic tetrameter, describes the awakening and reflowering of Greece («Вновь Эллада ожила»; «В ней опять цветут науки») after its recent liberation (in 1830) from Turkish rule. Despite this introduction of motifs of awakening and blooming, however, and despite the very different feel of stanza two that the use of trochaic tetrameter gives it, it is nonetheless devoted, like
Stanza one, to a description of the current age of trade at the expense of poetry («Носит понт торговли груз, / Но не слышны лиры звуки / В первобытном рае муз!»).

Stanza three returns to iambic pentameter and continues developing the motif of “brightness” begun in stanza one, while introducing a motif of cold, as well as one of paleness: «Блестит зима дряхлеющего мира, / Блестит! Суров и бледен человек». After opening with these two lines, which set up the cold, hard, pale, bright, and harsh present age, the rest of the stanza is spent describing in more detail the flowering of Greece, culminating in the appearance in the final line of stanza three of the poet himself. The poet, therefore, appears in a stanza seemingly dedicated to those forces opposed to him.

Stanza four (again trochaic tetrameter) is wholly devoted to a description of the contents of the poet's song and praise of the values of poetry as opposed to those of science and progress. In stanza five the poet transfers his attentions to the citizens of the current age, but with limited success: «Поклонникам Урании холодной / Поет, увы! он благодать страстей». Again, as in the previous stanza of iambic pentameter, only the opening lines of this stanza are dedicated to a description of the present, inimical, age, but the brief description («Поклонникам Урании холодной») repeats and emphasizes the motif of cold, while adding the motif of distance (Urania, being the muse of astronomy, implies distant stars and planets—that is, something far away and inhuman). The rest of the stanza, as well as the next stanza, are filled with the poet’s descriptions of the joys of dreams and love. The poem up to this point, therefore, has been devoted largely to

41The muse of astronomy.
describing the joys of poetry, even if against the background of a cold, inhuman, and unsympathetic audience.

It is not until the next stanza (stanza seven) that the poet’s song is ended, for «Суровый смех ему в ответом» (a repetition of «суровый», which also appeared in stanza three). This causes him to remove his fingers from his lyre, close his mouth, and go in search of solitude, only to find that such a thing no longer exists.

Stanza seven marks a turning inwards of the poet, as he closes his mouth and stops his fingers on his strings in response to the crowd’s cold reaction to his song. The solitude that he seeks is mental, rather than physical («Стопы свои он в мыслях направляет / В немую глуши»), but even so he is unsuccessful. The final line of stanza seven, «И на земле уединенья нет!», therefore seems to suggest that the flourishing of trade and technology has crowded out not only the possibility of physical retreat, but of mental retreat as well. This inability to find safety and poetry even within one's own mind could be seen as the absolute nadir of Baratynsky's poetic persona's depression. Although the outer world frequently appears threatening in Baratynsky's poetry, many of his poems hold out the hope of poetry and a rich inner life as a saving grace, but not in «Последний поэт». This is particularly interesting in a poem that is ostensibly about the conflict between the poet and the crowd, suggesting that the crowd has “infected” the poet’s thoughts, moving the conflict to a battle between internal, rather than external, forces.

_________________

42See, as well as «Когда исчезнет омраченье...» discussed above, «Финляндия», to be discussed later, and «Где сладкий шепот...», the complete text of which can be found in Appendix 1, Poem 18. Although the poet is being strangled alive by his «дума роковая» in «Когда исчезнет омраченье...», «поэзия святая» is at least a theoretical possibility, while in «Последний поэт» that is not the case.
In stanza eight the sea reappears after its brief appearances in stanzas two and five. In stanza two it made a veiled appearance as the «понт» that carried trade goods, while in stanza five it is the birthplace of Aphrodite. Here in stanza eight it shakes off whatever is left of its image as the obedient transporter of trade goods from stanza two, and is instead the one element that refuses to serve humankind («Человеку непокорно / Море синее одно»). And, while in the previous stanza the earth was too overcrowded to offer the poet solitude and shelter («но свет / Уж праздного вертепа не являет, / И на земле уединенья нет!»), the sea is «И свободно, и просторно, / И приветливо».

Stanzas seven and eight, therefore, give an earth/sea contrast. In the beginning of stanza eight the contrast is posed in familiar terms: the sea, unlike land, is disobedient and spacious. Having set up this earth/sea contrast between the two stanzas, however, the second half of stanza eight provides a slight twist, making the sea the emblem of stability rather than changeability:

И лица не изменило
С дня, в который Аполлон
Поднял вечное светило
В первый раз на небосклон.

Here the sea is both directly declared to be unchanging, and associated with eternity through the introduction of the «вечное светило».

Stanza nine continues the “sea” theme, with the poet standing on a seaside cliff, «мятежной думы полн», curiously echoing Pushkin's Peter I in «Медный всадник».

While standing there, «в очах блеснула вдруг отрада», and the poet realizes that this is

---

43For a comparison of this with stanzas eight and nine of «Медный всадник», see Appendix 2, Note 2.
the cliff from which Sappho supposedly committed suicide. The use of the verb «блеснуть»—“to flash”—echoes the use of the verb «блестеть»—“to shine”—twice in stanza three, and the use of «блестать»—a variant of «блестеть»—in stanza ten, reintroducing the theme of “shininess” that has been associated throughout the poem with the world/crowd side of the conflict. Here, though, it is used to describe the poet himself, as he realizes he still has one path to solitude and peace open to him—suicide in the sea’s waves.

This juxtaposition of the poet and the “brightness” motif that has hitherto been associated with the world of “enlightenment” and industrialization, which is in theory opposed to the world of poetry, begins an inversion in stanza nine that continues with the description of the site of Sappho’s suicide as «Где погребла любовница Фаона / Отверженной любви несчастный жар». This motif of “heat” seems to contrast with the overall theme of “coldness” that has been developed throughout the poem, particularly in the iambic stanzas. However, by appearing in the second half of the stanza, Sappho’s “heat” continues the tendency developed throughout the poem of having “anti-cold” themes in the latter parts of the iambic stanzas. Nonetheless, Sappho’s “heat” does stand out against the overall background of “cold” that has been created during the poem, emphasizing the inversion that takes place in the final two stanzas.

Stanza ten begins «И по-прежнему блистает / Хладной роскошью свет; / Серебрит и позлащает / Свой безжизненный скелет». Here we return to the theme of “coldness,” but this time in a trochaic, rather than iambic, stanza. The “shininess” theme, also associated primarily with the iambic stanzas, is also present not only in the verb «блестать» in line one, but in line three’s reference to shiny metals with the words
«Серебрит и позлащает». All this shiny metallic coldness decorates nothing more, however, than a «безжизненный скелет». This lifeless skeleton is contrasted in the second half of stanza ten with the sea, as line four, «Но в смущение приводит», changes the focus of the stanza from the lifeless society to the disturbing sea. The stanza is therefore split evenly between the two worlds: the shiny, luxurious, and dead world of the «свет» (implying light, the world, and society) and the noisy, disturbing, but presumably alive world of the sea.

The final two stanzas, as was mentioned above, create an inversion by focusing on the poet and his “heat” in the final odd-numbered iambic stanza, and the cold world of modern society in the final even-numbered trochaic stanza, after setting up what appears to be the opposite opposition between the two halves of the poem in the previous eight stanzas. However, as was shown above, this opposition is more apparent than actual, created by the opening lines of each stanza rather than the contents of each stanza as a whole. In fact, the poet and the crowd, and the flowering and living world of poetry and the cold, dead world of modern industrialization, bleed into each other in almost every stanza.

This inversion is further emphasized by the ellipses in stanza nine. Up until that point, the odd-numbered iambic stanzas had moved in a grim march along their “iron path,” but in stanza nine, as the action moves to the sea and the poet’s contemplation of suicide, this grim march is broken into fragmented half-sentences, as the logical development of the plot turns to stream-of-consciousness thinking, culminating in the poet’s implied but never directly described suicide.
In stanza ten we return to trochaic tetrameter, a meter with a rather jaunty sound, but in this final stanza it is far from jaunty, infected as it is in the first half of the stanza with the cold glitter of the dead industrial society, and the "тоскующая душа" of the closing line. These final lines also move the conflict from the external world to, as in the end of stanza seven, the internal world of the human soul—душа being, in fact, the last word of the entire poem. The first and last stanzas therefore form a contrast not only in meter but in subject: the poem opens with the line «Век шествует путем своим железным» and closes with the lines «И от шумных вод отходит / Он с тоскующей душой!». The opening stanza, then, is concerned with the «век», a broad, impersonal topic, while the closing lines are about the «человек» and the «душа», narrowing the focus to the strictly individual and personal. This difference can also be seen in the different verbs of motion used in the opening and closing stanzas: in stanza one the age «шествует», implying a stately, impressive, and probably straightforward procession, while in stanza ten the person «отходит», implying movement that is less impressive and also involved in retreat or avoidance.

The "тоскующая душа" is brought into the state not by the contemplation of the lifeless skeleton of the «свет» (in all its meanings), but by the sound of the sea waves. Despite the assertion in stanza eight that the sea has not changed its face since the first sunrise, in this final stanza it is no longer «приветливо», but rather a source of sorrow, suggesting that it is not nearly as stable a signifier as would seem in stanza eight, but has also undergone an inversion of meaning that undermines the earth/sea binary opposition that appears to be constructed in stanzas seven and eight.
The binary opposition between the “light of enlightenment,” on the one hand, and the flowering world of poetry, on the other, is also more apparent than actual. The word «свет» and its derivations appear in stanza one in the lines «Исчезнули при свете просвещенья / Поэзии ребяческие сны», in stanza seven with the lines «но свет / Уж праздного вертепа не является», but then in stanza eight in reference to the «вечное светило» that Apollo lifts up onto the horizon. «Свет» is used for the last time in the opening lines of stanza ten: «И по-прежнему блистает / Хладной роскощию свет». There is a play here throughout the poem on the meaning of the word «свет» as either “light” or “world/society,” for the most part with negative connotations: the dreams of poetry disappear in its glare, it offers no refuge for the poet, and in the final stanza it is associated with cold and death («свет» is even rhymed with «скелет»). However, in stanza eight it is associated Apollo, the sun, and the sea, undermining the straightforward connection of «свет» with the industrial society the poet rails against.

Brightness and light hold ambivalent positions in Baratynsky's poetry in general.44 The «острый луч» of thought in the poem «Всё мысль да мысль!..» will be discussed below; suffice to say here that “light” and “thought” are associated, and both have terrifying, death-dealing powers. To return briefly to «О счастии с младенчества тоскуя...»), Truth promises the poet that «Светильник мой укажет путь ко счастью!», but the happiness she promises will be achieved in an unwelcome form, for «Я обоью суровым хладом душу, / Но дам душе покой», leading the lyrical hero to conclude that «Светильник твой—светильник погребальный». Here, as in «Последний поэт»,

44Another example is the opening and closing stanzas of the long poem «Осень» from Сумерки. The poem is provided in its entirety in Appendix 1, Poem 27.
light is associated with cold, severity, and death. But also, as in «Последний поэт», the association is not a straightforward one. «О счастиі с младенчества тоскуя...» concludes:

Прости! иль нет: когда мое светило
Во звездной вышине
Начнет бледнеть и всё, что сердцу мило,
Забыть придется мне,

Явись тогда! раскрой тогда мне очи,
Мой разум просвети,
Чтоб, жизнь презрев, я мог в обитель ночи
Безропотно сойти.

As in «Последний поэт», «светило» holds associations with life, while «просвещенье» is associated with death. Interestingly, there is a confusion/conflation of night and day in these final stanzas of «О счастиі с младенчества тоскуя...». The lyrical hero is described as being a star, or like a star,45 in the penultimate stanza («мое светило / Во звездной вышине»). His impending death is described as his star going pale, implying that his death comes with the dawn. However, in the last stanza he asks Truth to “enlighten” him so that he can descend into the “abode of night” upon his death. Night is therefore associated with both life and death, with what the lyrical hero desires and what he fears, something that will reappear in other poems such as «Толпе тревожный день...» 46

45 Stars also feature prominently in Baratynsky’s poetry, frequently with positive associations, as in poems such as «Взгляни на звезды...», which makes the negative association with Urania, muse of astronomy, in «Последний поэт», stand out as another example of Baratynsky's “lack of system” that annoyed Belinsky so much. For the complete text of «Взгляни на звезды...», see Appendix 1, Poem 9.

46 For the complete text of «Толпе тревожный день...», see Appendix 1, Poem 31.
A similar undermining of the straightforward association of the «блестеть/блистать/блеснуть» verbs with the presumably negative “light of enlightenment” has already been noted. An examination of the use of the word «цвести» also shows a surprising confusion of roles. The word first appears in stanza two, which, after the first stanza with its grim “iron path” marching along its somber iambic pentameter, bursts into what has already been described as a rather jaunty trochaic tetrameter, declaring its apparent affinity to forces of life and good cheer with the lines «Для ликующей свободы / Вновь Эллада ожила». Line five tells us «В ней опять цветут науки», something that would seem positive if we had not been warned against the «свет просвещенья» in the previous stanza. Furthermore, while the sciences may be flowering in revived Greece, «не слышны лиры звуки / В первобытном рае муз!». This flowering, then, is of dubious quality and desirability.

Nevertheless, in stanza three we are told that, despite the shining winter of the dying year, «Цветет Парнас», and that this flowering Parnassus even manages to produce a poet. Given the poet's ultimate fate, though, this, too, is a fairly dubious accomplishment. «Цвести», then, has confusing associations, linking as it does science with poetry in stanzas two and three.

Yet another “character” in the poem that cannot seem to settle down to a fixed association is the sea itself. In stanza two, as has already been mentioned, it provides transportation for the trade goods produced by the rise of industrialization in the former home of poetry. In stanza five it is not only the birthplace of Aphrodite, but is directly linked the imagination and poetry, as the effect of the poet’s songs is described:
«Фантазия подъемлется от них, / Как некогда возникла Афродита / Из пенистой пучины вод морских». Then, as has already been discussed, the sea becomes the one place free of human activity and the one place that offers the poet any refuge, although that is the refuge of suicide. In the final stanza the sea is contrasted with the cold world of death, but the contrast is not unequivocally positive, for: «Но в смущение приводит / Человека вал морской, / И от шумных вод отходит / Он с тоскающей душой», thus ending the poem on a rather melancholy note.

This discussion of the contradictions, ambivalences, and general lack of a unified system of meaning in «Последний поэт» is not meant to complain about the lack of such a system, but to highlight the fact that, despite the apparently balanced and logical structure of the poem, the balance and logic breaks down under close scrutiny. Although Baratynsky is, as was shown in Chapter One, considered to be the “poet of thought” and reason, his poems are much less logical in some respects than might seem to be the case on first glance.

«Последний поэт» raised the ire of Belinsky for many reasons, but especially for its anti-enlightenment stance (Белинский, <Стихотворения Е. Баратынского> 173). This lack of logic in Baratynsky's poetry as a whole was also a target of Belinsky's criticism, for, as he said of Baratynsky's long narrative poems, «Очевидно, что причиною недостатка в целом всех поэм г. Баратынского есть отсутствие определенно выработавшегося взгляда на жизнь, отсутствие мысли крепкой и жизненной» (187). This might seem a surprising attack on a poet now known as the «поэт мысли», but, although I do not share Belinsky's opinion that alogic forms a «недостаток» in Baratynsky's poetry, I do believe that he was right on target in
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diagnosing it as suffering from an «отсутствие мысли крепкой». I will elaborate on this topic in greater depth later, but here I will merely say that the poems that have been examined thus far in this chapter, «Последний поэт» in particular, while giving the superficial appearance of strict logic, in fact break down into something other than logic under a close reading.

Another poem that Belinsky singled out for particular scorn in the above-cited article was «Приметы», written several years after «Последний поэт» (probably in 1840 (ПСС 487)) and placed in Сумерки just two short poems after «Последний поэт»:

Приметы

Пока человек естества не пытал
Горнилом, весами и мерой,
Но детски вещаньем природы внимал,
Ловил ее знаменья с верой;

Покуда природу любил он, она
Любовью ему отвечала:
О нем дружелюбно заботы полна,
Язык для него обретала.

Maude Bodkin’s analysis of Coleridge, in Archetypal Patterns in Poetry, contains some interesting parallels with Baratynsky’s conflict between intellect and nature as expressed in this poem. In discussing Coleridge’s relationship with nature, and his use of nature symbolism in The Ancient Mariner, she says:

Coleridge has told us how poignantly he felt an obscure symbolism in natural objects. “In looking at objects of Nature,” he writes, “I seem rather to be seeking, as it were asking for, a symbolical language for something within me that already and for ever exists, than observing anything new.” This is a typical expression of that attitude which Abercrombie describes as characteristic of the romantic poet—the projection of the inner experience outward upon actuality. There seems little doubt that, possessing this tendency to find in natural objects an expression of the inner life, Coleridge felt in wind and in stagnant calm symbols of the contrasted states he knew so poignantly, of ecstasy and of dull inertia. (33)

For further discussion of the psychological theory of projection, see Appendix 3. For now, it is worth noting that «Приметы», for all the ire it raised in Belinsky, was not an isolated incident, but an expression of a widespread literary device and worldview of Romanticism, that of feeling connected to nature by seeing one’s inner thoughts reflected in the outer world.
Почуя беду над его головой,
Вран каркал ему в опасенье,
И замысла, в пору смирясь пред судьбой,
Воздерживал он дерзновенье.

На путь ему выбежав из лесу волк,
Крутясь и подъемля щетину,
Победу пророчил, и смело свой полк
Бросал он на вражью дружину.

Чета голубиная, вея над ним,
Блаженство любви прорицала.
В пустыне безлюдной он не был одним:
Нечуждая жизнь в ней дышала.

Но, чувство презрев, он доверил уму;
Вдался в суету изысканий...
И сердце природы закрылось ему,
И нет на земле прорицаний.

(ПСС 253-4)

Given the outrage Baratynsky raised in Belinsky through his anti-progress stance in «Последний поэт», it is no surprise that Belinsky found «Приметы», with its equally strong anti-progress stance, equally distasteful. According to the notes at the back of the ПСС, in this poem «отразились позиции Баратынского в споре русских гегельянцев и шеллингянцев о соотношении логического и интуитивного начал в познании» (487). Baratynsky, as can be seen, comes down on the side of intuition over logic, which Belinsky must have found very painful.

The poem contains six four-line stanzas with alternating lines of amphibrachic tetrameter and trimeter, and alternating masculine and feminine rhymes. This is exactly the same meter and rhyme scheme as used in «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...» and very
similar to the one in «На смерть Гёте», which is also written in alternating amphibrachic tetrameter and trimeter, but with two lines of tetrameter at the end of each stanza. As was noted in relation to «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», given the relative rarity of ternary meter in Baratynsky's œuvre, its appearance must be taken to be significant. All three of these amphibrachic poems could be taken as united by the theme of the search for happiness—in «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...» the theme of happiness and its unattainability is, as was already discussed, addressed directly, while «На смерть Гёте» describes the life of someone who achieved happiness, or at least self-fulfillment, and «Приметы» describes a happier pre-industrial, pre-scientific state of existence in which humans and nature existed in harmony. «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...» and «На смерть Гёте» also contain a heaven/earth dichotomy, and all three poems contain a past/present dichotomy, in which the past represents a more perfect harmony than the present—in «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...» with the comparison between the previous existence in heaven and the current existence on earth («Но в искре небесной прияли мы жизнь, / Нам памятно небо родное, / В желании счастья вечно к нему / Стремимся неясным желаньем!..»), in «На смерть Гёте» through the implication that, while one should not mourn Goethe's death too much, earth has nonetheless lost him, and in

48 For the complete text of «На смерть Гёте» and a discussion of its significance in Baratynsky's poetry, see Appendix 1, Poem 21.

49 For a detailed discussion of the change from the pre-scientific to the scientific worldview, see Owen Barfield’s Saving the Appearances: A Study in Idolatry. In this book Barfield also discusses the relationship between Jung’s theory of the collective unconscious with what he (Barfield) sees as a “‘collective conscious’—in the shape of the phenomenal world” (135).
«Приметы» through the direct comparison with the former, more knowledgeable age and the current, blinder age.

Although, as has already been mentioned, Baratynsky frequently addressed serious topics in his favored iambic meter, these three poems suggest that he does appear to have used amphibrachs when making a particularly serious point about this past/present, happiness/unhappiness theme. «Приметы» can therefore be considered to be a continuation of a theme he began contemplating at the beginning of his career as a poet, and that he continued to write on throughout his career.

The lyrical hero in most of «Приметы» (excluding the opening and closing two lines) appears to be existing in the state of grace to which the poet in «Последний поэт» aspired but which he failed to find. He has a childish faith in nature, who responds (maternally) by watching over him and providing him with a language that enables him to interpret nature's signs. His experience of being alone is therefore diametrically opposed to that of the poet in «Последний поэт»: while the latter searches for solitude but cannot find it, the hero in «Приметы» is not alone even an apparently unpeopled desert («В пустыне безлюдной он не был одним: / Нечуждая жизнь в ней дышала»). It is only after he «Вдался в суету изысканий» (reminiscent of the «суета и пустота» of science in «Последний поэт») that the heart of nature is closed to him, and he becomes deaf to her language.

This deafness is brought about by his choice of intellect («ум») over feeling («чувство»), which leads him on the one hand into vanity and deafness, and on the other hand into tormenting nature through «Горнилом, весами и мерой». Although the themes of shininess and metal discussed above in relation to «Последний поэт» are not
explicitly mentioned here, they are implicitly present in the choice of crucible, scales, and measure as the instruments of torture.

«Приметы», as is common in Baratynsky's poetry, presents a seemingly insoluble conundrum, in which the result sought is destroyed by the act of seeking. By attempting to achieve knowledge, humankind has shut off the possibility of gaining knowledge, for (in this poem), the act of searching for truth has cut off humanity from the source of truth, by making humans deaf to the language of nature. This contrasts interestingly with «О счасти и младенства тоску...», in which the lyrical hero is offered truth or knowledge, but shuns it deliberately as being too bitter. In that poem «ум», or intellect, is presented as possessing the truth, but the hero does not wish to entrust himself to it. In «Приметы», on the other hand, the lyrical hero, in the shape of humankind, wishes to find truth, but, by trusting in intellect and the «суета изысканий» at the expense of feeling and faith, is unable to hear the truth that nature speaks.

Baratynsky's poetic persona, then, has transformed between the writing of «О счасти и младенства тоску...» and «Приметы». While in the earlier poems decrying the evils of experience his poetic persona was caught between the insistent voice of truth and knowledge, and the desire to hide from that voice in fantasies, in this later poem the poetic persona has tasted the fruit of knowledge, and discovered that it obscures knowledge rather than reveals it. What the earlier poetic persona took to be “truth” or “knowledge,” has in fact turned out to be another form of fantasy, even emptier.

Another poem from Сумерки that touches upon this theme, and is placed directly after «Последний поэт» and shortly before «Приметы», is «Предрассудок! он обломок». For the complete text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 33.
and more foolish than the original ignorance. This attitude could not but fail to find welcome amongst socially progressive critics, and is no doubt one of the reasons why Belinsky declared that Сумерки could awaken «болезненное страдание—больше ничего» (Белинский, <Стихотворения Е. Баратынского> 168).

Yet another poem that failed to find favor with Belinsky (491) was «Всё мысль да мысль!..», which was first published in 1840 and then reprinted in Сумерки, where it is placed between «Что за звуки.?..» and «Скульптор», also poems about the role of the artist:

Всё мысль да мысль! Художник бедный слова!
О жрец ее! тебе забвенья нет;
Всё тут, да тут и человек, и свет,
И смерть, и жизнь, и правда без покрова.
Резец, орган, кисть! счастлив, кто влеком
К ним чувственным, за грань их не ступая!
Есть хмель ему на празднике мирском!
Но пред тобой, как пред нагим мечом,
Мысль, острый луч! бледнеет жизнь земная.
(ПСС 263)

This poem is clearly about the problem of thought, and also the conflict between the literary arts and what Baratynsky refers to as the «чувственные» arts, which are

51 For the complete text of these poems and a discussion of their significance in Baratynsky’s poetry, see Appendix 1, Poems 34 and 35.

52 Note yet another appearance of the «свет/нет» rhyme we have already seen in «О счасти с младенчества тоскуя...» and «Последний поэт».

53 For another detailed analysis of this poem and its meaning, see Almi’s (Альми) article «Сборник Е. А. Баратынского «Сумерки» как лирическое единство», in which she calls «Всё мысль да мысль!..» the central work of the cycle. Of its meaning she says: «Главная мысль стихотворения...связана с теориями, занимавшими современников поэта, с шеллинговым определением двух родов искусства: «реального» и «идеального». Связь эту косвенно подтверждает расположение стихов в сборнике: за миниатюрой «Все мысль да мысль!..» следует стихотворение «Скульптор»:
presented here as sculpture, music, and painting. Unlike the physical, plastic, or graphic arts, the literary arts do not allow the artist to find forgetfulness in the practice of the chosen art, because the writer (according to Baratynsky), unlike the sculptor, musician, or painter, must constantly be engaged in thought. The physical arts, in this poem, are bound in a narrow sphere, and the artist who engages in them can do so safely without crossing out of that sphere into the wider world. The “poor artist of the word,” on the

«художнику слова» противостоит творец «чувственного искусства» (О поэзии и прозе 194). Of its relationship to «Последний поэт» and the image of thought as a “naked blade” in the final line she says:

Миниатюра «Все мысль да мысль!..» передает психологическую реальность мира Баратынского. Скрытый субъект стихотворения не имеет ни малейшего сходства с идеальным «певцом» «Последнего поэта». Поэзия приравнена к познанию; художник слова—не глашатай непосредственных чувств, но жрец и мученик мысли. Мученик, поскольку «острый луч» проникновения в суть вещей разоблачает непосредственную прелесть бытия...

Образ поэзии—«нагого меча» непривычен для эстетического сознания первых десятилетий XIX в. Мысль о том, что дисгармонический мир рождает «дисгармоническое» искусство, в России—открытие эпохи 30-х годов, причем открытие скорее практическое, чем теоретически осознанное. У самого Баратынского в начале 30-х годов новое представление о сущности поэзии возникает как своего рода оговорка, как жалоба на духовную болезнь. (195)

54 The issue of thought and its relationship to poetry as raised in «Всё мысль да мысль!..» is fascinatingly paralleled by Maude Bodkin's “thought experiments” with The Ancient Mariner, in which she engaged in introspective musings on lines from the poem, and then used the results of those musings to find potential sources, whether literary or archetypal, for the lines and their effect on the reader. Of this process she says:

To the mind of the present writer the magic of Coleridge’s poem is enhanced, not dissipated, by the play of thought around it, explaining the connexions of ideas that seem to contribute to the felt significance. For some minds, it appears, this is not the case. Analytic thought is regarded as an intruder that breaks the dream and mars the beauty, and can have little of value to contribute even to understanding. (35)

It seems, at least on the basis of «Всё мысль да мысль!..», that Baratynsky's poetic persona belongs more to the latter case than to the former, although it would prefer to belong, or thinks it should belong, more to the former case than the latter—rather as Tolstoy was, according to Isaiah Berlin, a fox who believed in being a hedgehog.
other hand, by being forced to engage in thought, must perforce cross out of that magic circle of art and engage with the outer world.

The image of the «праздник мирской» at which the non-literary artist can achieve a state of bliss contrasts interestingly with the «пир неосозаемых властей» in «Толпе тревожный день...», the full text of which is given in Appendix 1, Poem 31. In «Толпе тревожный день..» the «сын фантазии», while fearing the outside world, is able to participate safely, even joyfully, at the otherworldly feast that the «Толпа» fears. In «Всё мысль да мысль!..» the situation is reversed, though, and artists of the «чувственные» arts are able to enjoy themselves at the “this-worldly” feast, while the “poor artist of the word” can only look on in sorrow.

The structure of the poem demands the thought that the poem implies is the fate of the “poor artist of the word.” The poem is written in iambic pentameter with a fixed caesura after the second foot. The caesura after the fourth syllable was obligatory in the beginning of the 19th century, but by the time this poem written it had already begun to fall out of favor (Scherr 55). The exact structure of the meter, therefore, was in a state of flux when «Всё мысль да мысль!..» was written and published, and so the more erudite reader might have felt compelled to pause and search for the caesura in every line, slowing down the reading and requiring a great deal of “thought.”

The poem contains nine lines, with the following rhyme scheme:

Всё мысль да мысль! Художник бедный слова! А
О жрец ее! тебе забвенья нет; b
Всё тут, да тут и человек, и свет, b
И смерть, и жизнь, и правда без покрова. A
Резец, орган, кисть! счастлив, кто влеком с
К ним чувственным, за грань их не ступая! D
Есть хмель ему на празднике мирском! c
Но пред тобой, как пред нагим мечом, c
Мысль, острый луч! бледнеет жизнь земная. D

The poem is therefore composed of two four-line segments with symmetrical ring rhymes, separated by line five, which breaks the poem exactly in half. Line five, however, rhymes with the two middle lines in the second ring rhyme, weighting the balance of the poem in that direction.

The flow of the poem is further pulled towards the second half by the enjambment between lines five and six—the only transition between lines not marked by a strong syntactical break. A look at those two lines will show how the rhythm created in them mirrors their content:

Резец, орган, кисть! счастлив, кто влеком
К ним чувственным, за грань их не ступая!

In the first half of line five, different types of art are being listed, each separated by a comma. The final item of the list («кисть») comes immediately after the caesura and also carries a hypermetrical stress, as well as being followed by an exclamation point. All these things put «кисть» under very noticeable emphasis and create a strong syntactical break between the two halves of the line. However, while this breaks the line exactly in half (there are five syllables on either side of the exclamation point), it breaks it one syllable after the caesura, creating confusion in the reader over where the strongest break in the line is located. In contrast with line five, in the first two lines of the poem there is no word boundary between the fifth and sixth syllables, while in lines three and four the word boundary is between «и» and a noun, creating only a weak word boundary. There is also a strong syntactical break at the caesura in lines one, two, and four, emphasizing it and creating an expectation of a break in the rhythm after the fourth
syllable, and then a return to a more fluid rhythm in the latter part of the line. The break in the middle of line five is immediately followed by yet another stressed syllable, creating a cluster of three stressed syllables in a row. In the next ictus, though, the stress falls on «кто», a pronoun, which would be lightly stressed. The rhythm, therefore, is broken up in line five, forcing the reader to pause and consider even more carefully than in the preceding lines where the stress is supposed to fall and how the line is supposed to be read.

The enjambment «влеком / К ним чувственным» has the reader experience exactly what is being described, as they are drawn («влеком») from line five to line six and into the “sensual arts” along with the happy artist who practices them. Line six ends in another strong syntactical break, so that the reader does not “cross its boundary,” just as is described in the line itself («за грань их не ступая»).

The rhythm is further confused, further requiring thought from the reader, by the heavy use of monosyllabic words in the poem. Discounting the preposition «к», the poem contains 61 words, of which 37, or approximately 60%, are monosyllabic. There are 15, or approximately 25%, bisyllabic words, and only 9, or 15%, trisyllabic words. Scherr cites studies suggesting that on average, works by Russian authors tend to contain 15-30% monosyllabic words, over 30% bisyllabic words, and over 30% of words with three or more syllables (3-6). «Всё мысль да мысль!..», therefore, contains a much higher percentage of monosyllabic words, and a much lower percentage of trisyllabic words, than the average for works by Russian authors.

This heavy use of monosyllabic words not only breaks the norm for usage in Russian poetry, it also helps create more confusion about the exact nature of the meter
and its precise rhythmical structure.\textsuperscript{55} This confusion is exacerbated by the frequent hypermetrical stressing and the use of pronouns and prepositions, which normally bear little or no stress, in positions of stress. In the reproduction of the poem below I have highlighted words with potential or definite hypermetrical stress in red, and words that would not normally bear stress but here are in positions of metric stress, in blue.

Всё мысль да мысль! Художник бедный слова!
О жрец ее! тебе забвенья нет;
Всё тут, да тут и человек, и свет,
И смерть, и жизнь, и правда без покрова.
Резец, орган, кисть! счастлив, кто влеком
К ним чувственным, за грань их не ступая!
Есть хмель ему на празднике мирском!
Но пред тобой, как пред нагим мечом,
Мысль, острый луч! бледнеет жизнь земная.

As can be seen, the first three lines all contain either definite or possible hypermetrical stress on the first syllable («Всё» must be stressed, even if lightly, and «О», as an exclamation, could also carry emphasis). Furthermore, all the words before the caesura in the first four lines are either monosyllabic or pronouns, making the exact nature of the meter difficult to determine at the beginning of each line. This also creates an expectation in the reader/listener of an uncertain rhythm made up of monosyllabic or lightly stressed words in the first part of the line—an expectation that is broken in line five with its two bisyllabic words in the first two ictuses, and then in line six with the only trisyllabic word before the caesura in the poem. In the reproduction of the poem

\textsuperscript{55}For further discussion of the use or lack thereof of monosyllabic words in positions of strong metrical stress, see Jakobson’s article cited in reference to «Дало две доли...», analyzed above. An attempt to read a poem composed largely of monosyllabic words—Shakespeare's Sonnet 18, for example—out loud will give an idea of both the flexibility and the uncertainty the use of monosyllabic words gives to a poem's rhythm.
below I have marked the caesura with a slash, and also highlighted the bisyllabic words in green and the trisyllabic words in purple, in order to show their positions in the lines:

Всё мысль да мысль! / Художник бедный слова!
О жрец ее! / тебе забвенья нет;
Всё тут, да тут / и человек, и свет,
И смерть, и жизнь, / и правда без покрова.
Резец, орган, / кисть! счастлив, кто влеком
К ним чувственным, / за грань их не ступая!
Есть хмель ему / на празднике мирском!
Но пред тобой, / как пред нагим мечом,
Мысль, острый луч! / бледнеет жизнь земная.

As this shows, of the nine trisyllabic words in the poem, only «чувственным» is positioned before the caesura, while «Резец, орган» are the first fully-stressed bisyllabic words to appear before the caesura in the poem. This places the “sensual arts” and the tools used to create them under special emphasis, but also putting them outside side of the system of the poem’s structure. Line five is also the only line in the poem to have four bisyllabic words, and line six is the first to have two trisyllabic words (the final line also contains two trisyllabic words, but after the caesura). This sets line five and six off rhythmically from the first half of the poem, so that, while these lines are written in the same meter as the first four lines, the use of longer words gives the lines a very different sound, setting off the lines that describe the work of the “sensual artist” from that of the “poor artist of the word.”

Line seven, which describes the intoxication available to the “sensual artist” at the “worldly feast,” returns to the rhythmic pattern established in the first four lines of the poem, in which all the words before the caesura are either monosyllabic or pronouns, but it is nonetheless set off from the rest of the poem by being the only line which contains no syntactical break of some kind. As in lines five and six, the reader/listener is drawn
along with the sensations of the “sensual artist,” so that we are also given a taste of the
“intoxication” of a flowing, unchecked artistic experience.

In the final two lines of the poem “Thought” is addressed directly. Line eight is
striking for its use of potentially unstressed words («пред», «тобой», «пред») in the first
three ictuses, thereby giving heavy emphasis to the final two words in the line, «нагим
мечом». «Мечом» receives particularly strong emphasis not only being in the
strongest ictus of the line, but by being the last rhyme-word in a triple rhyme («влеком»,
«мирском», and «мечом»), and by being placed directly before a syntactic and line
break.

The transition between lines eight and nine, with a masculine ending in line eight
followed by a hypermetrical stress at the beginning of line nine, creates a cluster of
stressed syllables that slows the reader/listener down and forces them to pay close
attention to the meter—to engage in thought, that is. There is a similar transition between
lines two and three («забвенья нет; / Всё тут») and, as has already been discussed, at the
caesura in line five. However, the effect is even stronger at the transition between lines
eight and nine, as the collection of stresses at the transition between lines two and three is
made up entirely of monosyllabic words, while the collection of stresses at the caesura in
line five is not further emphasized by the presence of a rhyme word. The overall effect of
lines eight and nine is one of rising emphasis throughout line eight, with the most intense
emphasis at the beginning of line nine, with the hypermetrical stress on the word
«Мысль» (the subject and addressee of the poem), followed immediately by a fully-
stressed ictus («острый»), and then another stress and strong syntactic break at the
caesura («луч!»). The phrase «Мысль, острый луч!» is therefore the emotional and emphatic zenith of the poem.

The second part of line nine contains two trisyllabic words, making it only one of two lines in the poem to have two trisyllabic words, and the only line in the poem to have both trisyllabic words after the caesura. After the rough, uncertain rhythm created by the extensive use of monosyllabic words earlier in the poem, followed by cluster of stresses in the phrase «пред нагим мечом, / Мысль, острый луч!» (further emphasized by two consecutive «м» clusters—«нагим мечом, Мысль»), the appearance of two trisyllabic words at the very end of the poem smoothes out the rhythm, allowing the final line of the poem, especially with its feminine rhyme, to “fade away” just as earthly life does before the “naked blade” or the “sharp ray” of thought.

As with «Последний поэт», the appearance of a carefully thought-out structure to the poem and the presence of artistically significant formal features throughout the poem may serve to mask the alogical nature of the thematic organization of the poem. Instead of a logical flow of thoughts building to a carefully worked-out conclusion, the poem is made up of phrases that are only loosely connected and do not necessarily follow each other in a step-by-step fashion. For example, in the first two lines,

Всё мысль да мысль! Художник бедный слова!
О жрец её! тебе забвенья нет;

the logical flow of thought could be vertical (from the first part of line one to the first part of line two, and then the second part of line one to the second part of line two) just as easily, if not more so, than horizontal.56 Pronouns are used in general with a cheerful

56 In fact, it is tempting to attempt a vertical reading of the two halves of the poem, dividing it at the caesura—but thus far this has yielded nothing for me other than a partial
disregard for the need to indicate their referents, and the second person singular pronoun «ты» refers to two different figures in the poem: first to the «художник бедный слова» and then, with no warning that the switch is about to take place, to «мысль» herself.

Again, these observations about the lack of logical structure to certain aspects of the poem is not meant as a criticism, but to point out that there is something other than logic that stands behind the organization of this and other poems in Baratynsky's oeuvre. I will elaborate on this lack of logical structure with the thought/feeling conflict and theories from analytical psychology about this conflict in the following chapter. Before moving on to that, however, it is necessary to sum up the meaning of “thought” in this poem and Baratynsky’s poetry as a whole.

Thought, as was mentioned above, is both the subject and the addressee of «Всё мысль да мысль!», and possesses a number of attributes, the most important of which can be summed up in the following list:

1) It is omnipresent. «Всё» is repeated twice in connection with thought, first to declare that «Всё мысль»—all is thought—and then that «Всё тут»—all is here. Both times «Всё» is in a position of hypermetrical stress at the beginning of the line, lending it special emphasis. Thought is not only omnipresent in this world, but appears to transcend the «праздник мирской» at which the creator of the “sensual arts” can achieve intoxication, and the «жизнь земная» which grows pale before it.

system, which further strengthens my point that Baratynsky’s poetry is not systematized according to the generally accepted rules of logic.
2) It is connected with language. The «художник бедный слова» is explicitly contrasted with the person who is «влеком к ним [искусствам] чувственным».

3) It is connected with consciousness/self-consciousness. For the «жрец мысли», «забвенья нет», while for the «художник чувственных искусств», «есть хмель ему на празднике мирском».

4) It is connected with bareness/nakedness/uncovering by being associated with «правда без покрова» and a «нагой меч».

5) It is sharp. It is compared with a “naked blade” and addressed directly as a “sharp ray” («острый луч»).

6) It is bright. It contains «свет», the primary sense of which here is probably meant to be “world” or “society,” but which nonetheless also has the meaning of “light.” “Thought” is addressed directly as a “ray,” as in a ray of sunlight, and earthly life grows pale (бледнеет) before it, like a star before the sun. Being both bright and sharp, and compared directly with a sword, it is presumably also metallic.

7) It is associated with cutting tools, and therefore with the work of creation. As well as being sharp, bright, and metallic, like a sword, «Мысль» appears at or near the beginning of the first and last lines of the poem, while the sculptor's «резец”—chisel—appears at the beginning of line five, balanced precisely between the two appearances of the word «мысль» and providing another association between the two tools.

The chisel, however, is the tool of the worker in «чувственные...
искусства», while «мысль» seems to work on the world and the «художник бедный слова» in much the same way the sculptor uses a chisel to strip away extraneous material in order to create a sculpture. In «Скульптор», the next poem in the Сумерки cycle, the sculptor does in fact use a «резец» to strip away the «покров» hiding the nymph inside, providing a further association between the work of «мысль» and that of a sculptor's chisel in the act of creation.57

By describing thought as omnipresent, and associating it with light, the word, and the act of creation, Baratynsky creates a link between his conception of thought and the beginning of the Gospel of John,58 with its themes of creation, the light, and the Word.

57Dora Burton also notes this connection between the two poems in her article “The Poet of Thought in ‘Vse mysel ‘da [sic] mysl’: Truth in Boratynskij’s Poetry.” In contrasting the two poems, she says, “The irony of the poet of thought, and thus his tragedy, as compared with the sculptor, is in his reflective power—‘the naked blade.’ The object of the sculptor’s passion comes to life under his chisel; the object of the poet’s unredeem ing intellectual absorption—the earthly life—pales, withers. His mission is indeed heroic” (41-2).

58От Иоанна 1

1В начале было Слово, и Слово было у Бога, и Слово было Бог. 2Оно было в начале у Бога. 3Все чрез Него начало быть, и без Него ничто не начало быть, что начало быть. 4В Нем была жизнь, и жизнь была свет человеков. 5И свет во тьме светит, и тьма не объяла его. 6Был человек, посланный от Бога; имя ему Иоанн. 7Он пришел для свидетельства, чтобы свидетельствовать о Свете, дабы все уверовали чрез него. 8Он не был свет, но [был послан], чтобы свидетельствовать о Свете. 9Был Свет истинный, Который просвещает всякого человека, приходящего в мир. 10В мире был, и мир чрез Него начал быть, и мир Его не познал. 11Пришел к своим, и свои Его не приняли. 12А тем, которые приняли Его, верующим во имя Его, дал власть быть чадами Божиими, 13которые ни от крови, ни от хотения плоти, ни от хотения мужа, но от Бога родились. 14И Слово стало плотию, и обитало с нами, полное благодати и истины; и мы видели славу Его, славу, как Единородного от Отца. (Russian Synodal Version,
Furthermore, thought is not only linked with the Gospel of John, but seems to be taking on a very God-like role here. Thought in “Всё мысль да мысль!..” in fact stands in the place God might occupy in a more orthodoxy Christian description of creation.

However, thought is associated not only with God-like creative powers, using the artist as a tool, but is also, by its link with consciousness or self-consciousness, associated with the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Genesis 2:17) and the Fall of Man in Genesis 3—in which the snake uses humanity for its own purposes. In either case it should be noted that thought, on the one hand, has the qualities of an overwhelming and irresistible force, but on the other hand may or may not be good (like the snake and the


John 1:1-14: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made. In him was life, and that life was the light of men. The light shines in the darkness, but the darkness has not understood it. There came a man who was sent from God; his name was John. He came as a witness to testify concerning that light, so that through him all men might believe. He himself was not the light; he came only as a witness to the light. The true light that gives light to every man was coming into the world.

He was in the world, and though the world was made through him, the world did not recognize him. He came to that which was his own, but his own did not receive him. Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God—children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband’s will, but born of God.

The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth” (Holy Bible, New International Version).

One could in fact see the “trilogy” composed of “Что за звуки?..”, “Всё мысль да мысль!..” and “Скульптор” as all connected through a Johannine theme, with “Скульптор” being a description of the Word being made flesh, “Что за звуки?..” a description the world's inability to recognize the Word made flesh, and “Всё мысль да мысль!..” a description of the Word itself. A question that may not be answerable, however, is how conscious Baratynsky would have been of the Johannine subtext in these poems, as well as in, for example, “Мудрецу”, with its line “из ничтожества вызванным творчества словом тревожным”, given the omnipresence of Biblical themes and motifs in Christian culture.
tree of knowledge), and—in its incarnation as art—may or may not be recognized (like the snake, again—Eve and Adam fail to recognize its purpose—and also like the “true light” in John 1).

Having reached the apogee of Baratynsky's thoughts on thought with «Всё мысль да мысль!..», we should now sum up our findings before moving on to an interpretation of their overall meaning for Baratynsky's poetry.

The first poem dealt with in this chapter, «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», sets up a heaven/earth dichotomy, in which the children of Prometheus are banned from the bliss of heaven, which they nevertheless still remember and desire. This sets up a very similar conflict and message to the one in «Приметы», in which humankind has, by abandoning feeling for intellect, lost the ability hear the language of nature. In «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», Prometheus receives a terrible punishment for his “stolen spark,” and humanity is cast out of heaven. It is notable here that Prometheus, who stole fire from the gods for the sake of humanity and is associated with knowledge and science, is referred to as «безрассудный» and is considered at least partially at fault for humanity's fall from grace, while “the heart” still retains the knowledge of its former state of happiness. The poem ends:

Но нам недоступно! Как алчный Тантал
Сгорает средь влаги прохладной,
Так, сердцем постигнув блаженнейший мир,
Томимся мы жаждою счастья.

Although the gods and fate are held largely responsible in this poem for humanity's unhappy situation, and the thought/feeling conflict that would become central to Baratynsky's later poetry is only touched upon here, it is nonetheless significant that
Prometheus is associated with suffering here, while the heart is associated with knowledge and happiness.

A similar theme of suffering because of knowledge pervades the next three poems discussed here, «Дало две доли...», «Желанье счастья в меня вдохнули боги...», and «О счастьи с младенчества тоскуя...». The fourth, and central, stanza of «Дало две доли...» is directed to a rather Promethean addressee:

Но вы, судьбину испытавшие,
Тщету утеш, печали власть,
Вы, знанье бытия приявшие
Себе на тягостную часть!

Like Prometheus, the addressees here take on a heavy burden for the sake of the “knowledge of being.” They are called «своим бесчувствием блаженные», but, as the rest of the poem makes clear, they can hardly be considered “blessed,” as they have not only lost their earlier hopes, but they could at any moment be reawakened to fresh pain. This poem does, however, show the poetic persona wavering back and forth between coldness, «бесчувствие», and «покой», on the one hand, and warmth and desire on the other. The poetic persona will remain trapped in this dilemma for some time.

In «Желанье счастья в меня вдохнули боги...», the next poem discussed in this chapter, the poetic persona chooses to deal with the dilemma by withdrawing from the fray, and, after following for a time a beckoning sign, rejoices in an «отдыхом, на счастье похожим». In «О счастьи с младенчества тоскуя...», the lyrical hero temporarily refuses the gifts Truth offers, although the possibility of a future acceptance is held out. «Ум», or intellect, as has already been discussed, is portrayed in negative terms. In the final poem surveyed here from the pre-Сумерки poems, «Когда исчезнет
омраченье...», the lyrical hero is trapped in illusion and is being strangled by a «дума роковая». This represents an important shift in the treatment of intellect or thought from «О счастьи с младенчества тоскуя...». In the earlier poem, intellect or thought is associated with suffering, but also with truth. In this later poem, the «дума роковая» is literally fatal, as it is strangling the poet's «легкий дар», but it also seems to be associated with the «омраченье» and the «чадный демон» that is casting a deadly dream on the poet's «ум», and, it is implied, stifling his «воображенье». The mind of the poetic persona here, then, could be seen as divided against itself, and one part of its intellect seems to be deluding or obscuring the other.

In «Последний поэт», the first poem discussed here from the Сумерки cycle, the conflict between the poet and the crowd is a central theme, and the disappearance «при свете просвещенья / Поэзии ребяческие сны» is lamented. The «последний поэт», when he does appear, speaks out against too much enlightenment and knowledge:

Воспевает, простодушный,  
Он любовь и красоту  
И науки, им ослушной,  
Пустоту и суету:  
Мимолетные страданья  
Легкомыслием целя,  
Лучше, смертный, в дни незнанья  
Радость чувствует земля.

Ironically, this stanza, which praises simplicity and ignorance, requires the same kind of thought from the reader to untangle its tangled meaning as does «Всё мысль да мысль!..». At first glance, for example, line three appears to suggest that the poet is praising «науки», and it is not until the reader reaches the end of the next line and "backsolves," as it were, does it become obvious that «науки» is genitive singular, not
accusative plural, thereby changing the meaning of «науки» entirely, from positive to negative. Similarly, «целя», when read, could be taken for «целить», “to take aim, to aim at,” and not its real meaning, «целили», “to heal.” Although the meter and rhyme scheme make it clear that it is the second meaning, nonetheless in its printed form the first meaning could also be seen as hovering behind the “true” meaning of the word.

«Последний поэт», like earlier poems such as «О счастии с младенчества тоскуя...», seems to offer a contrast between mundane or unpleasant reality, on the one hand, and the world of fantasy or happiness, on the other, but unlike the lyrical hero of «О счастии с младенчества тоскуя...», the poet in «Последний поэт» cannot turn away from unpleasant reality, even in his thoughts, for, as was already mentioned, when he attempts to make a mental retreat, he discovers that it is impossible. Again, as in «Когда исчезнет омраченье...», the lyrical hero/poetic persona of «Последний поэт» has become divided against itself, infected by the outer world it attempts to flee.59

«Приметы» continues the past/present contrast that appeared in «Последний поэт» (and is implicit in «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...») in that that poem hints at a pre-Promethean past or pre-life in which humans had more direct access to the divine spark of happiness. «О счастии с младенчества тоскуя...» could also be construed as having a past/present contrast, but with the past/present confined to the lifetime of a single person, not an entire culture. While in «Последний поэт» the past/present contrast is presented in terms of the poetic versus the utilitarian or mercenary lifestyle, in «Приметы» it is presented in terms of knowledge versus ignorance, or hearing versus

---

59 Another early example of this “infection” is the poem «Порою ласковую фею», from 1824. For the complete text and a discussion of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 10.
deafness. Science and «ум» have closed the heart and ears of modern humanity, making them unable to access the knowledge that nature had to offer their ancestors.

In «Всё мысль да мысль!..», the last poem under discussion in this section, thought—мысль—has become overwhelming, and so bright as to be blinding. While the lucky artists who practice less cerebral art forms than poetry are confined to the narrow circle of their senses, the “poor artist of the word” seems to lose the sense of sight when over-illuminated (or enlightened) by thought, just as humanity in «Приметы» lost its sense of hearing when it entrusted itself to intellect rather than feeling.

Although, as has been mentioned several times before, attempts to extract a tightly systematic structure from Baratynsky's poetry are likely to end in disappointment, I do believe that some useful insights into the nature of thought in his œuvre can be summed up out of this summary.

1) Thought, intellect, or ratiocination is associated in some way with unhappiness or an undesirable situation, while feeling or the heart are associated with happiness or the desire for happiness.

2) Thought is initially associated with truth and feeling with illusion. This is often reversed in the later poems.

3) In the final poem discussed here, «Всё мысль да мысль!..», thought becomes omnipotent and omnipresent, taking on an ambiguous God/Satanlike role.

4) In relation to the previous point, thought, intellect, ratiocination, or truth play a central role in Baratynsky's poetry, and could be seen as his “Muse,” or one of his muses.
Having just said all this, I will now turn to a discussion of the position of thinking (as defined by Jung) in Baratynsky’s poetry or the “psyche” that I am positing for Baratynsky’s poetry. As can be seen by the lengthy analysis above, thinking in either the broad sense or the more narrow Jungian sense plays a crucial role in Baratynsky’s work. I shall now attempt to explain why I consider thinking, specifically extraverted thinking, to play the role of what Jung called the “inferior function.” Before doing so, however, I will devote a chapter to explaining in more detail the aspects of Jung’s theories that I intend to use.
Chapter Three  
The Psyche According to Jung

I chose to begin this chapter with this epigraph from Matthew because it expresses a key concept I will be dealing with here: the “dark side” of the human psyche, namely the unconscious and what is called the inferior function. Although these things do belong to the “dark side,” both in the sense of being negative and in the sense of being unknown, of our minds, they also possess the ability to transform from negative manifestations of the psyche to points of access to the unconscious and therefore the source of creativity—what could be called the Muse.

The appearance of these phenomena in Matthew gives us an (extremely broad) point of contact between the cultures of the 19th-century Russia of Baratynsky and the 20th-century German-speaking countries of Jung and other influential figures in analytic psychology. The influence of the New Testament on these in many ways disparate cultures provides a useful reminder that Baratynsky's poetry and Jung's theories were both reflecting and responding to deeply-ingrained cultural teachings. Baratynsky may have been a Russian nobleman from the early 19th century, and Jung a member of the Swiss bourgeoisie/intelligentsia from the early 20th century, but their intellectual and cultural backgrounds are close enough to allow us to use Jung’s theories profitably in an analysis of Baratynsky’s poetry.
I make this caveat of “close enough” because Jung’s theories posit a set of universals for the human psyche that may be less universal and more culturally specific than he believed. To touch upon one example, his concept of the anima (the feminine part of the male psyche), while, it seems, is quite an accurate description of certain aspects of the masculine psyche of post-Enlightenment European culture, is less enlightening, and at times actively obstructive, when considering the feminine psyche, which is subject to cultural pressures that were (and continue to be) so omnipresent that Jung for the most part failed to notice them at all.

Be that as it may, Jungian theory seems excellently suited for the analysis of the work of an upper-class male poet from the 19th century in general, and Baratynsky in particular. Aside from their obvious overarching connection of a basic Christian worldview, both Jung and Baratynsky have a shared background in the poetry and philosophy of the 18th- and early 19th-century German-speaking world. The teenage Baratynsky, as we remember from Chapter One, was inspired to form his “society of avengers” by reading Schiller. The more mature Baratynsky was an admirer of Goethe and, with the Wisdom Lovers, a student of German Romantic Idealism and Schelling. His fluency in French, his love of French literature, and his nickname of “the marquis” notwithstanding, Baratynsky was at least as much under the German influence as the French. Although he lamented his inability to master the German language (something which may have been less a true statement of his abilities and more a manifestation of his native modesty), and eventually broke away from the Wisdom Lovers, his creative and intellectual activities throughout his life were colored by his exposure to German culture.
Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961), meanwhile, was the son of a Swiss Protestant minister who chose to study medicine rather than religion, at his father’s specific advice (Peter Homans, Jung in Context 148, citing Jung’s autobiography, Memories, Dreams, Reflections). He became a clinical psychiatrist, and in 1902 published his dissertation, On the Psychology and Pathology of So-called Occult Phenomena, a study of a young female medium who was also, it was later revealed, a close relative. This was followed by work on a word association test. This research on the word association test confirmed, in Jung’s view, Freud’s theories of the unconscious (see for example Homans 45). It was from the word association test that Jung derived his theory of the complex (see Appendix 3 for a more detailed description of the complex). It was during this time that Jung also published an important work on schizophrenia, The Psychology of Dementia Praecox.

This early period in Jung’s professional life shows both his interest in empirical science and clinical practice (he was working at the time as a research psychiatrist at the Burghölzli Hospital in Zurich), and his interest in “so-called occult phenomena,” a dual focus that he would continue to hold throughout his career. In his research and theorizing Jung was just as interested in phenomena that could not be explained by “fixed theories and ‘law-and-order’ methodologies” (Barnaby and D’Acierno, C. G. Jung and the Humanities xvi) as those that could, even as he stressed the empirical science behind much of his work, such as the word association test.

Jung soon came to Freud’s attention as a promising young psychoanalyst, and the two entered into a lively correspondence that lasted from 1906 until 1913, when they broke off personal and professional relations, a rift between them that was never overcome. Although both men were affected by the break, Jung (the younger and
professionally junior of the pair) was particularly shaken by it, and it had lasting affects on his career. According to Homans:

> It was a break in every possible way—not only personally but also professionally, in terms of work techniques, and intellectually, in terms of theory. Total as it was, the break with Freud was also part of a wider, general withdrawal from the social world of everyday life. Not only did Jung resign from the *Jahrbuch* [a journal for which Jung acted as editor] and the International Psychoanalytic Association, he renounced his position as privatdocent at the University of Zurich. As a result he entered a phase of life characterized by an intense, long-term inner crisis—a period of turmoil and confusion in which he was beset by bizarre visions, dreams, and thoughts that he at first could not in the least comprehend. (74)

This breakdown lasted until 1918, when Jung, having engaged in a multi-year project of introspection and reflection, began publishing papers on what would become his own unique psychological theories.

In 1921 Jung published *Psychological Types*, a lengthy description of his theories of typology, based on his cultural studies and his clinical observations, as well as an appendix of definitions of his key terms. Although rarely used with conscious intent in literary criticism by literary scholars (as opposed to Jungians and other writers on typology and personality, who frequently make use of literary examples to illustrate their claims), the concepts from *Psychological Types*, as well as the earlier concept of the complex, have become widely used in popular culture, even if most people who use

---

60 According to Philip T. Zabriskie, for example, many humanities scholars “know little of Jung, or actively resist his ideas (though they occasionally may be heard to speak of complexes, of introversion and extraversion, even of archetypes)” (Barnaby and D’Acierno 3).

61 The popularization of Jung’s theories on typology was greatly helped by the creation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a forced-choice test to determine a person’s personality type according to a slightly elaborated version of Jung’s original theory. The MBTI has become a widely used tool; according to the official website: “Millions of
those terms do not know that they are referring to Jung. The theories I will be describing below will be taken largely from *Psychological Types*.

Although Jung and Jungians considered these theories to be universal, transpersonal, and transhistorical, later psychologists and scholars have questioned this claim. However, whether or not these particular theories do in fact describe something general to human nature, they unquestionably describe aspects of human nature that were important to the same German writers and philosophers of the 18th and 19th centuries that were so influential for Baratynsky.⁶²

The influence of Germanic culture on the Swiss-born Jung would seem obvious, but for my purposes it is important to stress that it was not just Germanic culture in general but Schiller and Goethe who provided a cultural and theoretical base on which Jung built his ideas. This is a commonplace in the scholarship on Jung, and is discussed comprehensively in Paul Bishop’s two-part work, *Analytical Psychology and German Classical Aesthetics: Goethe, Schiller, and Jung*. According to Bishop:

people worldwide have taken the Indicator each year since its first publication in 1962” ([The Myers & Briggs Foundation](https://www.16personalities.com)). The popularity of the MBTI in the field of education can be attested to anecdotally by the fact that I have been given the test three times during my college career—twice as part of mandatory career counseling as an undergraduate, and once during a (voluntary) MBTI seminar run by the Graduate School at UNC. UNC’s University Career Services webpage also provides a link to MBTI sources. Another widely-used testing instrument is David Keirsey’s Temperament Sorter, based on the theories of Myers and Briggs and therefore indirectly on the theories of Jung. According to the official website, the Keirsey Temperament Sorter has been used by over 40 million people ([Keirsey.com](https://www.keirsey.com)). Although both the MBTI and the KTS stray slightly from Jung’s original ideas, they nonetheless hold many of the same basic concepts and are no doubt in part responsible for the fact that concepts such as introversion and extraversion have become part of common parlance.

⁶²For a detailed discussion of the importance of German Idealist, and especially Schellingist, philosophy on Baratynsky’s work, see for example Sarah Pratt’s book *Russian Metaphysical Romanticism*. ⁹⁴
Jung’s work is shot through with concepts and vocabulary derived probably, and sometimes problematically, from Goethe. One might say that analytical psychology represents a renaissance of Classical precepts. In other words, it was from the spirit of Weimar classicism that analytical psychology was born. (1:34)

This Weimar classicism included not just Goethe but Schiller, who was at least as important for the development of Jung’s thought as Goethe, especially for the creation of some of Jung’s most well-known concepts, such as the one that concerns us most at the moment, that of psychological types. Again according to Bishop, “the structural correspondences between Jung’s notion of the unconscious and Schiller’s concept of the aesthetic are numerous and extremely close” (149), while:

later conceptual pairs, such as the Apollonian and the Dionysian in Nietzsche’s *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872), or ‘abstraction’ and ‘empathy’ in the aesthetics of Wilhelm Worringer (1881-1965)—both discussed by Jung in detail in *Psychological Types*—were developed, which would have been unthinkable without Schiller’s master concepts. (151)

In fact, as well as discussing his concept of the Apollonian and the Dionysian, which Bishop ascribes to Schiller’s influence, Jung devoted an entire section of *Psychological Types* to Schiller, in which he draws ideas from both “Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man,” which he uses to illustrate his concept of the superior and inferior functions, and “On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry,” which he uses to illustrate his concept of introversion and extraversion.

These are some of the most obvious examples of the influence of Goethe and Schiller on the formation of Jung’s key ideas, but there are many others. The importance of both writers to Jung’s thinking causes Bishop to declare, in the conclusion of his study, that:
the Jungian ‘self’ is…a Schillerian ‘self’—thus, a Weimar classical ‘self’, and so analytical psychology, when read through the prism of two of its main intellectual sources, Goethe and Schiller, reveals itself to be a late product of the literary culture of Weimar classicism. (2: 171)

One can therefore say that, although Jung may have been working and writing in the first part of the 20th century, there is enough in common in his theories and his worldview with the first part of the 19th century to find many profitable points of contact between his thinking—in both the Jungian and non-Jungian sense of the word—and that of Baratynsky. Whether or not the psychological structures that Jung described in *Psychological Types* and later works are as universal as he claimed—and he and those influenced by him produced many examples from non-modern, non-Western culture to support this claim—they seem to describe with considerable accuracy the psychological experiences of a male European steeped in Germanic culture from the late 18th and early 19th centuries.

When laying out his theories, Jung employed a number of terms to describe different aspects of the psyche, some of which may seem familiar (although they may be used in an unfamiliar way), and some of which may not. The ones that most closely relate to his theories of the psychological functions and thus to our main concern here, which is the conflict between psychological functions in Baratynsky's poetry, will be outlined in some detail later in this chapter; other psychic structures or behaviors that may be of interest to the reader but are only marginally related to the central discussion, such as archetypes or projection, are described in Appendix 3.

There are several things that are important to stress about the theories I will be using before I begin using them. First of all, Jungian analytic psychology (so called in
order to distinguish it from Freudian psychoanalysis) is a branch of depth psychology, meaning that it assumes the existence of an unconscious as well as a conscious aspect to the psyche. Second of all, because it is a branch of depth psychology, and because it was developed by Jung through a combination of observation and introspection, it is not “scientific” in the strict sense of the word, in that it is not generally possible to set up a hypothesis, test it under certain controlled conditions, and come up with results that definitively prove or disprove the theories.\(^\text{63}\) Although certain aspects of Jung’s research, such as the word association test, bore some resemblance to scientific research as we now understand the term, and the MBTI, which is based on Jungian typological theory, seems to be fairly effective in predicting academic and career-related strengths and preferences,\(^\text{64}\) it is simply not possible to test a great deal of Jungian theory and “prove” it in a way that someone of a scientific mindset would find satisfying.

This does not mean, however, that Jungian theories are not satisfying for many people. In their survey of important theories of personality in modern psychology, Hergenhahn and Olson conclude that, despite its many weaknesses from a strictly “scientific” point of view:

> Somehow Jung’s theory creates an image of the psyche that is believable in light of the times in which we live. He leaves us with an image of the psyche that is pushed by the past, pulled by the future, and attempts to make sense of itself in the present. It is a complex psyche struggling to give expression to its various components. Such a psyche causes a wide range of behaviors and interests, some of which might even be considered bizarre. Despite its criticisms, Jungian theory remains popular in

\(^{63}\)For more on the “non-scientific” nature of Jung’s theories, see for example Hergenhahn & Olson, *An Introduction to Theories of Personality*.

\(^{64}\)For a detailed discussion of this, see Myers & McCaulley, *Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indictator*. 
Returning to Jung’s theories, the third point to stress is that the Jungian concept of the psyche is a very grand one. In his definitions at the end of *Psychological Types*, Jung describes the psyche as “the totality of all psychic processes, conscious as well as unconscious” (*CW* 6: 463). The psyche therefore is not just what we know about ourselves or experience ourselves to be, but is much vaster than that, containing a large amount (how much is impossible to know) of unknown material that we may not be aware of or may not recognize when we encounter. The psyche also lacks any hard and fast boundaries, so that it opens up in one direction into the “real” world, the world of other people and physical phenomena, and in the other direction into the collective unconscious and the world of the archetypes. Human beings thus have a shared psychic structure, which pulls them towards homogeneity and gives them universal sets of behavior patterns and allows them to communicate with each other. At the same time, the psyche desires unity and wholeness within itself and therefore seeks to become complete and individual, in a process Jung called *individuation*. For visual reference, the Jungian concept of the psyche (of an introvert, since that is what Baratynsky’s poetic

---

65 For the converse argument—that Jungian theories are *not* popular—see for example the collection of essays *C. G. Jung and the Humanities* or Christine Gallant’s *Tabooed Jung*.

66 For descriptions of the collective unconscious and archetypes, two of Jung’s more well-known theories, see Appendix 3.

67 Jung defined individuation as “the process by which individual beings are formed and differentiated; in particular, it is the development of the psychological *individual* (q.v.) as a being distinct from the general, collective psychology…It is thus an extension of the sphere of consciousness, an enriching of the conscious psychological life” (*CW* 6: 448-50).
persona appears to be) would look something like this (see next page, with apologies for the distortions caused by the Graduate School’s formatting requirements):
The “Real” World

Consciousness

Unconscious

Collective Unconscious

Here Be Archetypes

Here Be Dragons

Here Be Archetypes

Here Be Dragons
In this map I have already introduced some of Jung’s most controversial and difficult concepts, so before continuing I will define the terms ego, persona, shadow, and anima/animus, which are necessary for understanding Jung’s concept of the psyche and my subsequent discussion of Baratynsky’s poetry. Other terms, such as complex and projection, which are also important for understanding analytical psychology but are only marginal to our central concern here, are defined in Appendix 3.

Before jumping into this rather loose and unbounded theoretical structure, it is worth reminding ourselves that it is a loose and unbounded theoretical structure, just like the psyche it attempts to describe. According to Murray Stein, from whom I borrow the concept of mapping the psyche as a foreign territory:

> The empirical world—life as it is experienced—is messy and does not fit neatly into the boxes made by human thought and imagination. Because Jung was both a visionary intuitive thinker and an empirical scientist, his map of the human psyche is both coherent and yet only loosely systematic and self-consistent. (Jung’s Map of the Soul: An Introduction 9)

Therefore, our “map” will (as the image above attempted to demonstrate) have few defined boundaries and many areas populated by dragons.

What we experience as our “psyche” in the small sense is normally the ego. In the definitions at the back of Psychological Types Jung says:

> By ego I understand a complex of ideas which constitutes the centre of my field of consciousness and appears to possess a high degree of continuity and identity…But inasmuch as the ego is only the centre of my field of consciousness, it is not identical with the totality of my psyche, being merely one complex among other complexes. (CW 6: 425)

The ego, although it is what each of us normally means when we say “I,” is therefore just a small spot of consciousness floating amongst the vastness of the psyche, which,
although in fact belonging to us, encompasses many aspects of ourselves which we fail to recognize or, if we do see them, may try to deny as belong to us. The ego is normally associated with the dominant or superior function (the functions and their ranking within the psyche will be discussed in greater detail later), which is our preferred mental process.

Although the ego is the “centre of our field of consciousness,” it is only what we experience of ourselves, not what others experience when they interact with us. The intermediary between ourselves and the outer world is the persona, which is “a functional complex that comes into existence for reasons of adaptation or personal convenience, but is by no means identical with the individuality” (465). The word “persona” was a name for an actor’s mask, and in Jung’s theory, we each don a “persona,” or mask, when we deal with the outside world. This is not a matter of being false or deceitful, but one of necessity: because, as has been stressed already, the psyche is vast and is full of material that cannot or should not be shared with the outer conscious world, we need to form a socially appropriate go-between that allows us to function adequately in society and achieve our conscious aims in the “real” world of people and things. However, the persona is just the persona, nothing more, and so seeing ourselves or others as being nothing more than our personae is unhealthy and can lead to unpleasant surprises as deeper layers of the psyche manifest themselves. In extraverts, who prefer to “put their best foot forward” and share their strongest mental process with the external world, the persona is generally associated with the superior or dominant function, while

68Extraversion and introversion will be discussed in greater detail below; for the moment it is sufficient to know that extraverts prefer to orient themselves to the external world, while introverts prefer to orient themselves to their inner worlds.
in introverts, in whom “still waters run deep,” the persona tends to be associated with their auxiliary function, or their second-favorite mental process\(^{69}\) (in the map of the psyche above, the auxiliary function is placed next to the persona, while the dominant function is next to the ego, as would be appropriate for an introvert). This suggests that extraverts are much more likely to associate themselves with their persona, while introverts are more likely to sense a clear distinction between their concept of “self” and their persona, even if outside observers may not be aware of this distinction.

Although there is the danger of becoming over-associated with either the ego or the persona, most “normal” people who possess even a modicum of self-awareness will be aware that they have a central sense of self (the ego) and a way of interfacing with the outer world (the persona). What may be less obvious to them are the aspects of their psyche that connect them to the unconscious. Two of the most important of these “bridging” complexes are the **shadow** and the **anima/animus**.

\(^{69}\)In *Gifts Differing*, her book outlining the MBTI for a lay audience, Isabel Myers gives the following description of the difference between the extravert’s and introvert’s methods of dealing with their outer and inner worlds using their dominant and auxiliary functions:

A good way to visualize the difference is to think of the dominant process as the General and the auxiliary process as his Aide. In the case of the extravert, the General is always out in the open. Other people meet him immediately and do their business directly with him. They can get the official viewpoint on anything at any time. The Aide stands respectfully in the background or disappears inside the tent. The introvert’s General is inside the tent, working on matters of top priority. The Aide is outside fending off interruptions, or, if he is inside helping the General, he comes out to see what is wanted. It is the Aide whom others meet and with whom they do their business. Only when the business is very important (or the friendship is very close) do others get in to see the General himself.

If people do not realize that there is a General in the tent who far outranks the Aide they have met, they may easily assume that the Aide is in sole charge. This is a regrettable mistake. It leads not only to an underestimation of the introvert’s abilities but also to an incomplete understanding of his wishes, plans, and point of view. The only source for such inside information is the General. (14-15)
The shadow is everything about ourselves that we reject from our conscious selves. For example, someone whose conscious attitude is one of generosity will also have selfish thoughts and desires—but these selfish thoughts and desires, especially if this person is not very introspective or self-aware, will not reach consciousness, residing instead in the unconscious. This will not prevent this “shadow-side” from manifesting itself from time to time, frequently in undesirable ways, so that generous people might find themselves giving in to the most selfish impulses, ascetic people engaging in unbridled indulgence—or selfish people suddenly giving generously to those in need, or cruel people engaging in unexpected acts of mercy, but all against their conscious will and their conscious images of themselves. In any case:

The shadow is a moral problem that challenges the whole ego personality, for no one can become conscious of the shadow without considerable moral effort. To become conscious of it involves recognizing the dark aspects of the personality as present and real. This act is the essential condition for any kind of self-knowledge, and it therefore, as a rule, meets with considerable resistance. (Jung, *Aion* 6-7)

As well as being tied to those aspects of ourselves that we like least, the shadow is often associated with the *inferior function*, which is the inverse of the dominant function—that is, it is the mental process that we least enjoy using, and also the one that “cancels out” the dominant function, meaning that the two functions cannot be used simultaneously. As the inferior function is that mental process that makes us feel “least like ourselves,” it tends to be disassociated with our conscious selves and pushed into the unconscious, as well as onto other people whom we dislike.
Difficult as acknowledging the shadow may be,\(^{70}\) it is generally the most accessible of the “bridge” complexes leading to the unconscious. The shadow as a rule connects to the personal unconscious, that part of the psyche made up of forgotten or repressed personal experiences, which are still reasonably close to consciousness. More difficult can be the second of the two main “bridge” complexes, the anima/animus.

While the shadow is generally associated with those aspects of ourselves that we recognize as possibly belonging to our outer gender identity, but reject as not being part of ourselves, the other main “bridge” complex is normally associated with the opposite sex. The anima (for a man) or animus (for a woman) is the part of the psyche that is made up of what Jung calls the contrasexual parts of the self, meaning that which we associate with members of the opposite sex.\(^ {71}\) Like the shadow, the anima/animus will

---

\(^{70}\) Russian literature contains so many images of the shadow that I cannot even begin to list them. For a good description of the battle (sadly, unsuccessful) with the shadow in Russian poetry from the time when Jung himself was theorizing about it, see Esenin’s «Черный человек».

\(^{71}\) In the complex relationship between Jungian theory and feminism, it is the concept of anima and animus that has probably drawn the most fire. Although from a feminist perspective the idea that each person has a contrasexual aspect to their psyche is potentially liberating, and the idea that what we tend to see in people of the opposite sex is not so much how they “really are” but our own inner vision of how women or men are “supposed to be” is potentially very illuminating when applied to the depictions of women in cultural productions by men, this theory is not without its problems. As Jung’s own theories would predict, his treatment of women and “the feminine” is, while groundbreaking for its day, biased, and frequently in an unfriendly direction, as can be seen from, for example, this charming passage from the essay “Marriage as a Psychological Relationship”:

Every man carries within him the eternal image of woman, not the image of this or that particular woman, but a definite feminine image… I have called this image this ‘anima,’ and I find the scholastic question *Habet mulier animam?* especially interesting, since in my view it is an intelligent one inasmuch as the doubt seems justified. Woman has no anima, no soul, but she has an *animus*. The anima has an erotic, emotional character, the animus a rationalizing one. Hence most of what men say about feminine eroticism, and particularly about the emotional life
contain aspects of the self that the conscious rejects as foreign, but in the case of the anima/animus, these qualities will be marked as belonging not to our own sex, but to the opposite one. Furthermore, while the shadow is entirely negative in our conscious estimation (as in the aforementioned example of selfishness for a generous person), the anima/animus may possess qualities that we consider desirable, but that are (we believe) unavailable to us because of our gender. People who encounter members of the opposite sex who correspond to their anima/animus images are likely to feel a strong “charge” on contact, although they may not know why, as these images tend to remain unconscious.

The anima/animus is the complement to the persona, so that, just as the persona is our interface with the conscious, external world, the anima/animus is our interface with the unconscious, inner world. Jung describes them as an “outer personality” (turned towards the external world) and an “inner personality,” which is “the way one behaves in relation to one’s inner psychic processes; it is the inner attitude, the characteristic face, that is turned towards the unconscious” (CW 6: 467). It is therefore broader in scope than the shadow, although, like the shadow, it is concerned largely with one’s inner life and

of women, is derived from their own anima projections and distorted accordingly. On the other hand, the astonishing assumptions and fantasies that women make about men come from the activity of the animus, who produces an inexhaustible supply of illogical arguments and false explanations. (198-9)

Although much could be said, both positive and negative, about Jung’s treatment of women (both in theories and in his relationships with his patients), it is entirely outside the scope of this project to delve into it in any detail. For further description of Jungian ideas of “the feminine” see for example Erich Neumann’s The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype; for further discussion of the relationship between Jung and feminism see for example Gallant’s Tabooed Jung, Susan Rowland’s Jung: A Feminist Revision, Ann Ulanov’s The Feminine in Jungian Psychology and in Christian Theology, or Demaris S. Wehr’s Jung & Feminism: Liberating Archetypes, although this in no way exhausts the feminist celebrations and critiques of Jung’s theories.
may remain entirely on the level of the unconscious, so that we may not know why we behave in certain ways towards our inner processes, or react so strongly to certain people in the outer world.

To give a greatly simplified summing-up of the structure of the psyche according to Jung, we can see that, despite its looseness and its potentially chaotic nature, it has a balanced, fourfold structure, in which the conscious ego has its unconscious complement in the shadow, and the conscious persona has its unconscious complement in the anima/animus. The psyche therefore has two feet in the “real” world (meaning the realm of consciousness), and two feet in the “other” world (meaning the realm of the unconscious). However, because two of those feet are planted in the unconscious, the ego may not be aware of them or may refuse to recognize their existence.

This concept of the human psyche as full of opposing or seemingly unconnected elements, which are nonetheless shared with the rest of the human race, and which strive towards unity and individuality, has several implications for the study of literature through a Jungian lens. First of all the application of Jungian theory to a work of literature implies a certain approach to, or a certain set of assumptions regarding, what it means to be a “work of literature.” A work of literature, to provide a meaningful ground for a Jungian analysis, must be assumed to possess a certain set of significant features, like a human psyche. Like a human psyche it may be vast and contradictory, but nonetheless at least potentially balanced and whole. Its manifestations, while perhaps irrational, are not entirely random, and in fact serve as signposts, pointing to some significant and potentially coherent meaning or structure.
Second of all, it is possible for the reader to understand at least some of what the author intended, for the reader and author are connected via the archetypes and the collective unconscious. Because human psyches have certain innate structures that make them specifically human, and because humans are capable of projection, introjection, and empathy, works of art produced by humans are capable of evoking a specific and predictable (at least in theory) response in other humans. The artist and reader accomplish this act of empathy through their mutual response to the archetypes present in the work of art. Or as Christine Gallant puts it in *Tabooed Jung*:

> The ground of connection between reader and literature, the cause of their interaction, are the archetypal materials present. As the analyst is pulled into a participating involvement with the patient because of the activating archetypal materials in the patient’s dreams and experience, so the reader is engaged in literature because of its archetypal dimension. Nor is the literary creation fully independent of its creator, a world made by its author that then goes spinning off on its way. It is a ‘work’ that came from human labor, not a ‘text’ that has been mysteriously found. The configurations of archetypes in the literary work are due to the author’s presence as creator, with the reader responding to the work precisely because of the collective experience that is evoked. To a great extent, its archetypal materials give the literary work its power to create response and understanding in the reader. (105)

Third of all, while a work of art possesses a structure, like a human psyche, it is farther from the “real world” and closer to the collective unconscious than an ordinary human psyche. In his essay “On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetry” Jung specifically cautions against giving too much weight to the “real-world” or personal basis for a work of art, as great works of art receive their power from the collective, not the personal, unconscious. Therefore, while the superficial contents of a work of art may be

---

72For definitions of these terms as used by Jung, see Appendix 3.
taken from the artist’s conscious life or personal unconscious, what makes it a “work of art” is its foundation in the collective unconscious.

To return to our main subject, if we apply Jung’s theories to Baratynsky’s poetry, we can assume that we can understand this poetry and respond to it appropriately because our psyches are linked through a shared set of fundamental psychic structures. Like a human psyche, Baratynsky’s poetic oeuvre also has its ego, its persona, its shadow, and its contrasexual figures. But while one can see these “characters” in Baratynsky’s poetry, its most striking feature is not its ego, its anima, or its shadow, but, as was discussed in detail in the previous chapters, the conflict between thought and feeling. This conflict, while not unrelated to the issue of the ego and persona’s conflict with the shadow and anima/animus, given that these complexes tend to take on the features of different psychological functions, is related most directly to Jung’s theory of psychological types.

Psychological Types was, as was previously mentioned, published in 1921, after Jung’s break with Freud and his lengthy period of psychological crisis. Psychological Types, along with the theory of psychological types laid out in it, therefore indicate the new, independent direction of Jung’s thought, and form the basis of his mature theories.

The basic assumption underlying Jung’s type theory is that, despite our fundamental connection via the archetypes and the collective unconscious, not everyone is the same. On the contrary, different people focus their attention on different things, see different things in the areas in which they focus their attention, and make decisions according to different decision-making processes. These differences are, Jung assumes,

73 For a good example of ego-literature one might look to Tolstoy, for anima-literature to Pushkin, especially Eugene Onegin, and for shadow-literature to Dostoevsky.
innate to that particular person’s nature. However, these differences are not infinite and random. In fact, they are rather limited. From his clinical practice and his study of literature, myth, and culture, Jung deduced the existence of two basic attitudes and four basic functions. It is the specific weight and combination of the attitudes and functions that gives each individual her or his basic type.

Because different people see different things, different observers will see different things in the same person. Depending on the psychological type of the observer, they may be more observant of their subject’s conscious, intentional behavior, or (unfortunately for the subject), their unconscious, unintentional behavior. Because of this, Jung states, “I therefore base my judgment on what the individual feels to be his conscious psychology” (CW 6: 360). By basing his system on the conscious psychology of the individual, Jung felt that he had removed, as much as possible, the danger of the observer contaminating the observed, for:

> there [in consciousness] at least we have a definite objective footing, which completely drops away the moment we try to base our psychological rationale on the unconscious. For in that case our observed object would have no voice in the matter at all, because there is nothing about which he is more uninformed than his own unconscious. The judgment is then left entirely to the subjective observer—a sure guarantee that it will be based on his own individual psychology, which would be forcibly imposed on the observed. To my mind, this is the case with the psychologies of both Freud and Adler.\(^74\) The individual is completely at the mercy of the judging observer, which can never be the case when the conscious psychology of the observed is accepted as a basis. He after all is the only competent judge, since he alone knows his conscious motives. (360)

\(^74\)This refers to Freud’s concept of the pleasure principle as the driving force in human behavior, versus Adler’s concept of the will to power as the driving force. Jung, in contrast to both Freud and Adler, saw the ultimate goal of the human psyche to be individuation.
According to Jung’s type theory, all sorts of things “just happen” to people, and people manifest all sorts of different and frequently contradictory behavior, but what matters when assigning a person’s type is not what “just happens” to them, or who other people think they are, but what they consciously believe themselves to be and do. In regards to the use of Jungian theory for the analysis of literature, this means that we can apply these theories to works of literature or characters in works of literature, as in most cases we have access to the “conscious psychology” of the work of literature. We do not, however, have access to the conscious psychology of the producer of the work of literature, which may be different from that which is manifested in the work itself. Therefore, while a work of literature may of course reveal much of interest about its author, it cannot be used to make a definitive declaration about the author’s own conscious psychology or personality type.

The most obvious difference between people is their basic attitudes towards the outer world. Jung identified two attitudes, which he labeled *introversion* and *extraversion* (while it is also spelled *extroversion* in English, the preferred spelling by Jungians is *extraversion*, following the convention set by Jung himself). Although the terms “introversion” and “extraversion” have passed into common usage, it is worth defining them more clearly for our purposes, as, being commonly used terms, they are also often loosely used terms as well.

In the section “General Description of the Types,” Jung describes the two attitude-types thusly:
The introvert’s attitude is an abstracting one; at bottom, he is always intent on withdrawing libido\textsuperscript{75} from the object, as though he had to prevent the object from gaining power over him. The extravert, on the contrary, has a positive relation to the object. He affirms its importance to such an extent that his subjective attitude is constantly related to and oriented by the object. The object can never have enough value for him, and its importance must always be increased. The two types are so different and present such a striking contrast that their existence becomes quite obvious even to the layman once it has been pointed out. Everyone knows those reserved, inscrutable, rather shy people who form the strongest possible contrast to the open, sociable, jovial, or at least friendly and approachable characters who are on good terms with everybody, or quarrel with everybody, but always relate to them in some way and in turn are affected by them. (\textit{CW} 6: 330).

Jung believed the difference between introverts and extraverts to have a biological basis, and later research suggests he was correct. Jung defined an extravert as someone who “has a positive relation to the object,” meaning someone who reacts positively to the outside world, while an introvert, by contrast, has a negative relation to the object, meaning someone who reacts negatively to the outside world, preferring instead the inner world. Or in other words, extraverts gain energy from the outside world, while introverts lose energy to it. Later research on introverts and extraverts by Hans Eysenck and others suggests that these differences manifest in infancy and continue throughout a person’s life, and that they are based on differences in brain chemistry. According to studies conducted by Eysenck and others, introverts have naturally higher levels of cortical arousal than extraverts. Introverts are therefore easily over-aroused by outside stimulus, while extraverts need outside stimulus in order to reach a comfortable level of stimulation. Conversely, because they are always “on high alert,” introverts are more

\textsuperscript{75}Jung considered libido to be psychic energy of any form, not just sexual energy, as it is in Freudian theory. In general Jung considered Freudian theory to place too great an emphasis on sexual matters.
sensitive to pain than extraverts, but less responsive to sedatives. On the other hand, there is a strong correlation between introversion and what is commonly considered to be “intelligence,” or at least academic ability. Extraversion is more common than introversion; in populations that do not self-select for introversion (such as graduate school), the normal ratio of extraverts to introverts is normally somewhere between 2:1 and 3:1.

What makes an introvert an introvert and an extravert an extravert by Jung’s definition is their preference for one attitude over the other; each is capable of accessing the other attitude at any given moment. Introverts are thus capable of extraverting, and extraverts of introverting, and either will engage in both behaviors in the course of their daily affairs, but introverts prefer introverting, need to spend more time introverting than extraverting, and are likely to suffer from mental and physical disorders if forced to extravert for too long, while the reverse is true of extraverts. Jung noticed this in his work with his patients, and the research into the base levels of cortical arousal for the two types gives a plausible explanation why: introverts can extravert for a little while but then become overstimulated, while extraverts can introvert for a short time, but then will run out of the energy necessary to raise their arousal levels to functional levels, and will need to seek sources of outside stimulation. However, because of this capability to engage in the opposite behavior for short periods of time, an individual’s preferred attitude-type

76 For more discussion of this topic, see, for example, Hergenhahn & Olson, pp. 225-270.

77 For more on this see MBTI literature, such as Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.
may not be immediately apparent to the casual observer; close study over a period of time may be required.

In the case of the poetry of Baratynsky, it seems obvious that we are dealing with an expression of introversion rather that extraversion. Throughout his career, Baratynsky’s poetic persona, while not immune to the pleasures of wine, women, and wild partying, expresses a basically introverted point of view, shunning too much company and preferring the pleasures of solitude and reflection. As is typical of introverts, Baratynsky’s poetic persona fears being overwhelmed by the object, as Jung would put it, and therefore seeks to fend it off, with the result that he finds it very easy to feel alone and depressed in a crowded room.  

In *Psychological Types* Jung discusses the relationship between Schiller’s concept of naïve and sentimental poetry, and his own concept of the two attitudes of introversion and extraversion. According to Schiller, the naïve poet identifies with nature, while the sentimental poet wants to identify with nature but is separated from it. The attitude of the naïve poet therefore appears to be that of extraversion, while the attitude of the sentimental poet appears to be that of introversion. However, as Jung cautions:

> His division into naïve and sentimental is one which, in contrast to our type division, is not in the least concerned with the individual mentality of the poet, but rather with the character of his creative activity, or of its product. The same poet can be sentimental in one poem, naïve in another. (130)

---

78 Baratynsky’s 1821 poem «Рассеивает грусть пиров веселый шум», originally titled «Уныние», expresses a typically introverted attitude, in which the subject is firmly entrenched within his own subjective experience, and outside forces, such as a party, are unable to break through, or form at best an annoying distraction. For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 5.
This accords well with Baratynsky’s poetry, which is not without its “ naïve” poems—for example, «Весна, весна! как воздух чист!..»79—but is overall sentimental (for more on this, see Sarah Pratt’s Russian Metaphysical Romanticism: The Poetry of Tiutchev and Boratynskii, 15). Baratynsky’s poetic persona is highly subjective, in the sense of being more aware of the subject, which is itself, than the object, and is therefore sentimental according to Schiller’s definition. The ability of the lyrical hero to lose himself in the object is the exhilarating exception, while his tendency to remain trapped in his own thoughts is the gloomy rule. Although this paints a rather bleak picture of introversion, that it is introversion seems clear. But the introversion/ extraversion dimension of the personality is only a part, although often the most obvious part, of anyone’s story. It does not, for example, explain the conflict between thought and feeling. For that we must turn to Jung’s definitions of the psychological functions.

Along with the two attitudes Jung also identified four functions: thinking, feeling, sensing, and intuition. At first he believed that introverts were thinking types and extraverts were feeling types, but he later expanded his theory to include introverts and extraverts of all the types (CW 6: 7). However, the tendency to equate extraversion and feeling is significant for our study of Baratynsky’s poetry, as feeling in the extraverted attitude is normally the only kind of feeling recognized by the outside observer, while introverted feeling normally goes unnoticed. This hidden kind of feeling and its role in Baratynsky’s poetry will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter, after the psychological functions and psychological types have been described.

79For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 20.
Jung defined thinking as “the psychological function which, following its own laws, brings the contents of ideation into conceptual connection with one another” (CW 6: 481). Jung’s concept of thinking as a psychological function is perhaps best understood as the use of impersonal logic; Jungian thinking is not simply the act of engaging in mental activity, but the act of judging according to standards of “logical/nonlogical” or “true/not true.” Its opposite is feeling, which is “a process that takes place between the ego…and a given content, a process, moreover, that imparts to the content a definite value in the sense of acceptance or rejection (‘like’ or ‘dislike’)” (434). Thinking and feeling are therefore two contrasting ways of judging, evaluating, or making a decision about something: thinking by using the criteria of logic or “truth” (whatever that means to the individual), and feeling by using the criteria of values or morality. Feeling in the Jungian sense is therefore separate from either physical sensation or emotional response (“affect”), although physical sensations can certainly generate a feeling response and strongly held feeling-values can certainly generate emotional attachments—as can strongly held thinking-beliefs.

Sensing, or sensation, “is the psychological function that mediates the perception of a physical stimulus. It is, therefore, identical with perception” (461). Sensing tells us “what is” by registering the existence of physical objects. Its opposite is intuition, which “is the function that mediates perceptions in an unconscious way” (453, emphasis in original). Jung distinguishes it from physical perception, and also from thinking or feeling judgments, and tells us that, “In intuition a content presents itself whole and complete, without our being able to explain or discover how this content came into
existence” (453). This is commonly experienced as hunches, flashes of insight, or divine inspiration.

We therefore have four basic modes of dealing with the world: logical thinking, moral feeling, earthy sensing, and airy intuition. All four modes are present in every psyche, but only one can be accessed at a time, with thinking being particularly antithetical to feeling, and sensing particularly antithetical to intuition. This constant clash between the functions leads to inevitable psychological conflict, as we struggle to fit the best function to the particular situation, and to integrate into our psyche the information our various functions are telling us, including information we might prefer not to integrate. This fourfold tension is something Jung considered basic and essential to the human psyche, for:

the psyche is at cross purposes with itself. Alchemy teaches us that the tension is fourfold, forming a cross which stands for the four warring elements. The quaternion is the minimal aspect under which such a state of total opposition can be regarded. The cross as a form of suffering expresses psychic reality, and carrying the cross is therefore an apt symbol for the wholeness and also for the passion which the alchemist saw in his work. (“The Psychology of the Transference” 305)

The psyche, thus, is doomed to be “at cross purposes with itself,” and in fact needs this conflict in order to function properly, for Jung saw the psyche as a self-regulating, self-balancing energetic system (“On Psychic Energy” 26). Too much emphasis on any one area will cause it to fall out of balance, until some manifestation from the unconscious, such as dreams or, in severe cases, neuroses, forces the subject to achieve a more balanced psychical state. Furthermore, to return to the psychological functions, none of them are self-sufficient. Each individual must at times access all four of the functions in order to gain a sufficiently clear picture of the situation and make the
appropriate decisions about it. This may be easier said than done, however, as each person has a strong inclination to use their *dominant function* and a strong disinclination to use their *inferior function*, to be defined below.\footnote{For Potterites, it may be helpful to think of the four functions as represented by the four Hogwarts houses, although admittedly there is (as is often the case) a certain amount of mixing of the functions. Cold-blooded Slytherin (whose symbol is the snake) is clearly thinking, while airy and intellectual Ravenclaw (which is located literally up in the air, at the top of a tower, and is represented by an eagle—a bird that soars and pounces, instead of moving in a linear and step-by-step fashion) appears to be intuition. From the initial descriptions one might assume that Gryffindor, which emphasizes courage, is sensing, while Hufflepuff, which emphasizes goodness, is feeling, but over the course of the series the Hufflepuffs seem more like stolid, earthy sensing (their Head of House is Professor Sprout, who teaches Herbology), while the Gryffindors’ courage is less the carefree thrill-seeking of sensation, and more the moral outrage of feeling. The fact that the main conflict in the series is between Slytherin and Slytherin-values (as represented in their most twisted form by Voldemort) and Gryffindor and Gryffindor-values (as represented in their most shining form by Harry) is further evidence that the two houses represent thinking and feeling, respectively. The connection between the four functions, and between thinking and feeling especially, is highlighted throughout the series: there are constant parallels between Harry and Voldemort, and occasionally between Harry and Snape, and in the end we discover that there is actually a piece of Voldemort’s soul in Harry. However, in a plot point that (from a psychological point of view) moves the series out of reality and into fantasy, not only does Snape die, but Harry is able, through his own death and resurrection, followed by further heroics, to kill off the piece of Voldemort’s soul that has taken root in his own, and then kill off Voldemort himself. Thinking, in the form of Slytherin and certain Slytherins such as Draco Malfoy, is allowed to survive, but only a very diminished and chastened form. In what sensation-types would probably be pleased to call “real life,” thinking is not nearly so easily done away with.}
be that particular type (as in an “introverted thinking type” or an “extraverted feeling type”),\textsuperscript{81} to be described in greater detail below. Its opposite is neglected and sinks into the unconscious, where it becomes the \textit{inferior function}. These two functions—the dominant and inferior—are not inherently better or worse than any of the other functions; it is the individual’s constant practice with the one, and constant neglect of the other, that makes them better or worse in this particular instance.

The inferior function is opposite in attitude to the dominant or superior function, meaning that if the dominant function is introverted, the inferior function is extraverted and vice versa. Because the inferior function is less developed or, to use Jung’s term, differentiated, than the other functions, it will tend to be partly or wholly unconscious. If, however, it is extraverted, (as I am positing in the case with Baratynsky’s poetry and poetic persona), it will nonetheless be turned to the outside world or the “object,” as Jung calls it, so that while the person possessing it may have little control or awareness of it, it will still be visible to the observer—perhaps much more visible than the subject’s dominant function.

Although the subject may have little or no conscious awareness and control of the inferior function and attitude, they will still experience it through the unconscious. In \textit{Psychological Types} Jung gives the following description of the attitude of the unconscious of the extraverted and introverted types. Although the unconscious of the introvert interests us more here, let us start with a description of the unconscious of the extravert for the sake of comparison.

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{81}Jung defined eight different types. Briggs and Myers, by adding the two possible auxiliary functions to each of the eight possible superior functions (something Jung had already touched upon in \textit{Psychological Types}), increased the number of types to sixteen.
\end{quote}
An extravert (or someone who is in the process of extraverting) will focus their energy and attention on the outside world, attempting to adapt themselves and their inner worlds (inasmuch as they are aware of them) to external demands. However, this adaptation can only ever be partially successful, as the subjective, internal experiences and demands still remain, even if they do not reach the person’s conscious awareness. If the subjective experiences and desires are repressed too much, they “take on a regressive character according to the degree of repression; the less they are acknowledged, the more infantile and archaic they become” (CW 6: 338).

Because these impulses are introverted, they are comparatively easy to hide from the external world and even from the person having them, at least until they burst free, at which point they can wreak havoc on the person experiencing them and anyone around them in a very unexpected manner, for:

The more complete the conscious attitude of extraversion is, the more infantile and archaic the unconscious attitude will be. The egoism which characterizes the extravert’s unconscious attitude goes far beyond mere childish selfishness; it verges on the ruthless and brutal. Here we find in full flower the incest-wish described by Freud. It goes without saying that these things are entirely unconscious and remain hidden from the layman so long as the extraversion of the conscious attitude is not extreme. But whenever it is exaggerated, the unconscious comes to light in symptomatic form; its egotism, infantilism, and archaism lose their original compensatory character and appear in more or less open opposition to the conscious attitude. This begins as an absurd exaggeration of conscious standpoint, aiming at further repression of the unconscious, but usually it ends in a reductio ad absurdum of the conscious attitude and hence in catastrophe. (338-9)

This picture of a person who appears to be going along wheeling and dealing, or running a family, or conducting a successful sports career, or otherwise “making good” in the outside world, only to collapse unexpectedly by having a nervous breakdown,
betraying their conscious ideals, or in some other way acting completely out of character, is quite familiar. What is important to note for our purposes here is that such people tend to do well in their dealings with the external world, only to be betrayed by their own inner worlds. In contrast, Baratynsky’s poetic persona tends to have the opposite problem: inner harmony and happiness are destroyed by outside forces, as is symptomatic of the introvert who is unable to come to grips with the demands of the outer world and the extraverted attitude. According to Jung’s description of the general behavior of the inferior function in the introvert:

The predominance of the subjective factor [in the introvert] in consciousness naturally involves a devaluation of the object…if the ego has usurped the claims of the subject, this naturally produces, by way of compensation, an unconscious reinforcement of the influence of the object. In spite of positively convulsive efforts to ensure the superiority of the ego, the object comes to exert an overwhelming influence, which is all the more invincible because it seizes on the individual unawares and forcibly obtrudes itself on his consciousness. As a result of the ego’s unadapted relation to the object—for a desire to dominate is not adaptation—a compensatory relation arises in the unconscious which makes itself felt as an absolute and irrepressible tie to the object. The more the ego struggles to preserve its independence, freedom from obligation, and superiority, the more it becomes enslaved to the objective data…The object assumes terrifying proportions in spite of the conscious attempts to degrade it…These efforts are constantly being frustrated by the overwhelming impressions received from the object. It continually imposes itself on him against his will, it arouses in him the most disagreeable and intractable affects and persecutes him at every step. A tremendous inner struggle is needed all the time in order to ‘keep going.’ The typical form his neurosis takes is psychasthenia, a malady characterized on the one hand by extreme sensitivity and on the other by great proneness to exhaustion and chronic fatigue. (378-9)

Such a person will tend to experience their problems not as welling up from the inside, but as imposed from the outside by an unpleasant external reality that seeks to destroy their individuality and overwhelm their inner reality. Although, just as in the
case of the extravert, the introvert's psychic troubles do in fact come from within, they are normally triggered by and attached to specific external objects or events, and experienced as something specifically external and alien. In the case of Baratynsky's poetry, we can see examples of the object assuming “terrifying proportions” in works such as «Всё мысль да мысль!..» and «Толпе тревожный день приветен...»,$^{82}$ while its “persecution” can be seen in poems such as «Порою ласковую фею...»,$^{83}$ and the sensation of being enslaved by the outer world and by fate can be seen in poems such as «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», «Дало две доли...», and «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы?..», all of which exhibit an inner world/outer world dichotomy in keeping with that of the introverted attitude trying to grapple with the external world. The most extended depiction of the introverted attitude trying and failing to come to grips with the outer world is in «Последний поэт», in which the Last Poet, who acts completely at cross purposes to society, is unable to win over the rest of the world and so seeks solace in his thoughts—only to discover that the outside world has invaded his inner world as well.

Whatever its attitude, the inferior function will be the person's “sore spot,” so that:

Most people, when their inferior function is in any way touched upon, become terribly childish: they can’t stand the slightest criticism and always feel attacked. Here they are uncertain of themselves; with that, naturally, they tyrannise everybody around them because everybody has to walk carefully. If you want to say something about another person’s inferior function it is like walking on eggs; people cannot stand any criticism there. (Marie-Louise von Franz, “The Inferior Function” 9)

$^{82}$In fact, the phrase «исполинский вид» is used to describe “earthly cares” in the poem. For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 31.

$^{83}$For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 10.
This “soreness” and sensitivity about the inferior function is a weak area in every person’s psyche, but it is not without its benefits. While use of the dominant function is easy and natural, it is not the best function to use in every situation (e.g., trying to solve issues around personal relationships with impersonal logic, or attempting to make decisions in areas governed by rules of logic according to feeling values), so that everyone will be forced at a certain point to exercise their non-dominant, and possibly inferior, function. Furthermore, excessive use of the dominant function can lead not only to one-sidedness, but also to boredom and mental sterility. It is here that accessing the inferior function can have great benefits, for it gives access to the unconscious, so that:

a tremendous charge of emotion is generally connected with its processes. As soon as you get into this realm people easily become emotional…you can see the negative side of this connection to the emotions, but there is also a very positive aspect. In the realm of the inferior function there is a great concentration of life, so that as soon as the superior function is worn out—begins to rattle and lose oil like an old car—if people succeed in turning to their inferior function, they will rediscover a new potential of life. Everything in the realm of the inferior function becomes exciting, dramatic, full of positive and negative possibilities. There is tremendous tension and the world is, as it were, rediscovered through the inferior function…The inferior function brings a renewal of life if one allows it to come up in its own realm.\(^\text{84}\) (11)

---

\(^{84}\)The experience of the inferior function could be compared to the literary device of \textit{остранение} (estrangement), in which familiar things are “made strange” and presented to us in an unfamiliar light. This also parallels interestingly with Freud’s theory of the uncanny. In all three cases there is a sensation of disorientation as our ordinary reality is not only disrupted but turned on its head, so that we may see the same objects but from a disturbingly opposite angle to our normal view. Although Freud’s essay on the uncanny was produced several years after he and Jung had broken off personal and professional relations, Gallant claims that “There were…definite Jungian echoes in Freud’s essay ‘The Uncanny’” (55), suggesting that the idea of the uncanny can be fruitfully combined with Jungian theory.
She goes on to connect the inferior function with access to the unconscious and the possibility of inspiration:

The inferior function is the door through which all the figures of the unconscious come into consciousness. Our conscious realm is like a room with four doors, and it is the fourth door by which the Shadow, the Animus or the Anima and the personification of the Self come in. They do not enter as often through the other doors, which is in a way self-evident: the inferior function is so close to the unconscious and remains so barbaric and inferior and underdeveloped that it is naturally the weak spot in consciousness through which the figures of the unconscious can break in. In consciousness it is experienced as a weak spot, as that disagreeable thing which will never leave one in peace and always causes trouble. Every time one feels he has acquired a certain inner balance, a firm standpoint, something happens from within or without to throw it over again. This force always comes in through the fourth door, which cannot be shut. The other three doors of the inner room can be closed. But on the fourth door the lock does not work, and there, when one is least prepared for it, the unexpected will come in again... The inferior function is the ever-bleeding wound of the conscious personality, but through it the unconscious can always come in and so enlarge consciousness and bring forth a new attitude. (54)

At the end of the previous chapter I discussed the God-like nature of thought in Baratynsky’s poetry, in that it is overwhelming and uncontrollable, and the subject of the lyrical hero’s deepest desires and darkest fears. We can see by reading von Franz’s description how the inferior function has these “God-like” qualities of evoking fear and yet also providing inspiration. Von Franz says that the inferior function tends to appear in stories as an “evil god” (2) and also a “divine fool” (7). The God/Satan-like nature of thought in Baratynsky’s poetry described at the end of Chapter Two thus points to an identification of thought with the inferior function.

While accessing the inferior function does theoretically have positive aspects, and is an often necessary step towards individuation, it is not without its unpleasant side. Because it is the hidden side to our personality, it is often experienced as frighteningly
alien, and its irruptions into our conscious selves often carry with them a number of negative consequences, which, even if they prove to be beneficial in retrospect, are often highly painful at the time of the outburst. In her study of the manifestations of the inferior function, Naomi Quenk, a clinical psychologist and writer on type theory, describes further signs that the inferior function has been triggered as including “Tunnel vision,” so that the person experiencing it can see no way out of the terrifying situation; “Loss of sense of humor,” so that the person experiencing it is incapable of appreciating their own bizarre, uncharacteristic behavior; and “all-or-none statements,” as the person under the control of their inferior loses their ability to make finer judgments or grasp differences in scale (Beside Ourselves 52-3).

The similarities between “thought” in Baratynsky’s poetry and Quenk and von Franz’s description of the experience of the inferior function should be obvious. To give a brief overview, the despair and hopelessness typical of an encounter with the inferior function can be seen in «Когда исчезнет омраченье...», in which the protagonist is being strangled by “fatal thought,” for example, while the “all-or-nothing,” “black-or-white” nature of the inferior function can be seen in, for example, «Дало две доли...», which sets up a system of inescapable dualism in which the protagonist is caught between two unattractive options. The appearance of Truth in «О счастьи с младенчества тоскуя...» also corresponds with the action of the inferior function, as Truth appears to the protagonist as a disagreeable messenger of unwanted information, against which the protagonist fights a hopeless rearguard action. At the same time, the preoccupation of Baratynsky's lyrical persona with “thought” and “Truth” suggests that these encounters with these undesirable figures actually serve as a source of poetic inspiration.
In order to delve deeper into this issue, as well as manifestations of the other functions in Baratynsky’s poetry, I will give a general description of the different psychological types. We can then examine the “thought” of Baratynsky’s poetic persona in light of these descriptions.

The four functions (thinking, feeling, sensing, and intuition, as described briefly above) are divided into two pairs: the *rational* functions of thinking and feeling, and the *irrational* functions of sensing and intuition. (For those familiar with the Myers-Briggs approach, there they are called the *judging* and the *perceiving* functions). Jung chose these terms because:

*Thinking* and *feeling*...are rational functions in so far as they are decisively influenced by *reflection*. They function most perfectly when they are in the fullest possible accord with the laws of reason. The irrational functions, *sensation* and *intuition*...are those whose aim is pure *perception*; for, as far as possible, they are forced to dispense with the rational (which presupposes the exclusion of everything that is outside reason) in order to attain the most complete perception of the general flux of events. (*CW* 6: 459)

These rational functions, then, form a set of laws about how things “ought” to happen, and exclude everything that falls outside of those laws. The rational functions are how one makes decisions (passes a judgment, according to Myers-Briggs theory) about things. The irrational functions, by contrast, have no preconceived set of laws about how things “ought” to happen, but merely “perceive,” to use Myers-Briggs terminology, data and events.

Before moving on to a more detailed description of the functions, it is worth noting Jung’s grouping of the functions and its radical potential for feminist theory—something that the feminist critiques of Jungian theory with which I am familiar have ignored. Although Jung does declare thinking an inherently masculine function, and
feeling an inherently feminine function, and engages in a number of gender stereotypes, most of which are not flattering or helpful to women, he does name them both rational functions—that is, he puts feminine feeling in the same category as masculine thinking, elevating it to the station of “rational” or “reasonable.” Sensing, on the other hand, however “rational” it is often perceived to be, is demoted in Jung’s typology to the realm of the “irrational,” down (or up—the value of intuition varies wildly, depending on how it manifests itself—with intuition). Jung, it should be mentioned, felt that the rational was overemphasized in his time, and was a champion of the irrational, but in the post-Enlightenment culture of which both Jung and we are heirs, “rational” is normally the more highly valued in the binary pairing “rational-irrational.”

The equation of thinking with masculinity and feeling with femininity, something which Jung also believed to be true (as will be demonstrated below), is significant for our discussion of the functions in Baratynsky’s poetry, as a masculine persona, poetic or otherwise, despite the emphasis on feeling in the Sentimentalist and Romantic movements, would be expected to have “rational” in the non-Jungian sense, i.e., thinking, attributes, and would inevitably be trespassing on feminine territory whenever it ventured into feeling. The effect could be to suppress feeling and emphasize thinking, even if that went against the natural preference of the psyche in question. Furthermore, a male-identified psyche with dominant feeling would be constantly forced to confront its inferior thinking, throwing the inferior function into even brighter relief than it might be otherwise. The assumption of the rational function’s gendered nature should be kept in mind as we examine manifestations of thinking and feeling, as male psyches (poetic or otherwise) will have been conditioned to act as thinking types, while female psyches
(poetic or otherwise) will have been conditioned to act as feeling types. Cultural conditioning for gender norms thus distorts the true type-picture of a person’s (or persona’s) rational functions.  

Even if somewhat distorted by cultural conditioning, the rational types will have one of the rational functions, in either the introverted or extraverted attitude, as their dominant function; the other rational function, in the opposite attitude, will be the inferior. Two irrational functions will be sandwiched between the dominant and inferior functions, and, while remaining subordinant to the dominant function, can be brought into consciousness and used as reliable helpers (one is tempted to think of them as scouts in the case of a rational type, as they are used to gather information about which the dominant function can make decisions) to the dominant function. In the case of an irrational type, the opposite is true: one of the irrational functions, in one of the attitudes, will be the dominant function, while the other irrational function, in the opposite attitude, will be the inferior function, and two rational functions will serve as the auxiliary and tertiary functions, helping the individual organize and “rationalize” their perceptions.

We therefore have the following eight contrasting pairs:

Dominant extraverted sensing-inferior introverted intuition
Dominant introverted intuition-inferior extraverted sensing
Dominant extraverted intuition-inferior introverted sensing
Dominant introverted sensing-inferior extraverted intuition
Dominant extraverted thinking-inferior introverted feeling

In illustration of this, the MBTI uses different scales for rating the thinking/feeling dimension in men and women.

The attitude of the auxiliary function is the opposite of the attitude of the dominant; hence, an extravert will have an introverted auxiliary function, while an introvert will have an extraverted auxiliary function (and so may “pass” as an extravert when out in the world).
Dominant introverted feeling-inferior extraverted thinking
Dominant extraverted feeling-inferior introverted thinking
Dominant introverted thinking-inferior extraverted feeling

Although it is the rational functions that interest us the most here, I will give a quick sketch of the irrational functions, and a brief discussion of some of their most significant appearances in Baratynsky's poetry.

In Jung's terms, as was mentioned above, the irrational functions are sensing (or sensation) and intuition. They are “irrational” because they are used to perceive things and events, without attempting to organize or judge them by a particular set of criteria.

Sensing is the ability to perceive objects through the five senses. When it is extraverted, it is turned towards “concrete, sensuously perceived objects or processes” (362-3). A person in whom extraverted sensing is dominant is an “extraverted senser” or “extraverted sensation type.” Of such people Jung says:

No other type can equal the extraverted sensation type in realism. His sense for objective facts is extraordinarily developed. His life is an accumulation of actual experiences of concrete objects, and the more pronounced his type, the less use does he make of his experience. In certain cases the events in his life hardly deserve the name “experience” at all. What he experiences serves at most as a guide to fresh sensations; anything new that comes within his range of interest is acquired by way of sensation and has to serve its ends. Since one is inclined to regard a highly developed reality-sense as a sign of rationality, such people will be esteemed as very rational. But in actual fact this is not the case, since they are just as much at the mercy of their sensations in the face of irrational, chance happenings as they are in the face of rational ones. (363)

The inferior function of the extraverted sensation type is introverted intuition, which can manifest itself in phobias and “primitive, ‘magical’ superstitions” (365) that contrast to the conscious attitude of realism.
While extraverted sensing focuses on concrete objects in the external world, a relatively easy phenomenon to judge, its opposite, introverted intuition, is focused in the opposite direction, towards the inner world of the unconscious, which is more difficult for the outside observer to grasp. In his definition of the function Jung says:

Introverted intuition is directed to the inner object, a term that might justly be applied to the contents of the unconscious. The relation of inner objects to consciousness is entirely analogous to that of outer objects, though their reality is not physical but psychic. They appear to intuitive perception as subjective images of things which, though not to be met with in the outside world, constitute the contents of the unconscious, and of the collective unconscious in particular…

Like sensation, intuition has its subjective factor, which is suppressed as much as possible in the extraverted attitude but is the decisive factor in the intuition of the introvert. Although his intuition may be stimulated by external objects, it does not concern itself with external possibilities but with what the external object has released within him. Whereas introverted sensation is mainly restricted to the perception, via the unconscious, of the phenomena of innervation and is arrested there, introverted intuition suppresses this side of the subjective factor and perceives the image that caused the innervation. (398-9)

In everyday speech this would be called imagination. This conscious side of the personality is balanced by “a compensatory extraverted sensation function of an archaic character. The unconscious personality can best be described as an extraverted sensation type of a rather low and primitive order” (402).

While introverted intuition focuses on the inner image, “In the extraverted attitude, intuition as the function of unconscious perception is wholly directed to external objects” (366). Even in the extraverted attitude, intuition is less concerned with concrete...

87Although it is, of course, impossible to be certain of a person’s type without their direct confirmation of their conscious psychology, this description seems to me to have much in common with what we know of Pushkin’s personality, with its contrast between startling flights of imagination, on the one hand, and its compulsive gambling and dueling, not to mention numerous affairs, on the other.
objects and more concerned with “transmit[ting] images, or perceptions of relations between things, which could not be transmitted by the other functions or only in a very roundabout way” (366). The extraverted intuitive

is never to be found in the world of accepted reality-values, but he has a keen nose for anything new and in the making. Because he is always seeking out new possibilities, stable conditions suffocate him. He seizes on new objects or situations with great intensity, sometimes with extraordinary enthusiasm, only to abandon them cold-bloodedly, without any compunction and apparently without remembering them, as soon as their range is known and no further developments can be divined. So long as a new possibility is in the offing, the intuitive is bound to it with the shackles of fate…

It goes without saying that such a type is uncommonly important both economically and culturally. If his intentions are good, i.e., if his attitude is not too egocentric, he can render exceptional service as the initiator or promoter of new enterprises. He is the natural champion of all minorities with a future. (368-9)

There is, however, the danger that “the intuitive may fritter away his life on things and people” (369). Furthermore, inferior introverted sensation may manifest itself in “compulsive hypochondriacal ideas, phobias, and every imaginable kind of absurd bodily sensations” (370).

The concept of introverted sensation, our final irrational function to describe, may seem a very strange one: if sensation is taking in perceptions through the five senses, what kind of sensation can be introverted? What Jung means by introverted sensation is “the subjective component of perception” (393). He goes on to explain:

What I mean by this is best illustrated by works of art which reproduce external objects. If, for instance, several painters were to paint the same landscape, each trying to reproduce it faithfully, each painting will be different from the others, not merely because of differences in ability, but chiefly because of different ways of seeing; indeed, in some of the paintings there will be a distinct psychic difference in mood and the treatment of colour and form. These qualities betray the influence of the subjective factor. The subjective factor in sensation is essentially the same as in the other functions we have discussed. It is an unconscious
disposition which alters the sense-perception at its source, thus depriving it of the character of a purely objective influence. In this case, sensation is related primarily to the subject and only secondarily to the object. How extraordinarily strong the subjective factor can be is shown most clearly in art…True sense-perception certainly exists, but it always looks as though the object did not penetrate into the subject in its own right, but as though the subject were seeing it quite differently, or saw quite other things than other people. Actually, he perceives the same things as everybody else, only he does not stop at the purely objective influence, but concerns himself with the subjective perception excited by the objective stimulus. (393-4)

The difference between the two introverted irrational types can be seen here: the introverted intuitive “sees” imaginary images that are only loosely suggested by external stimuli, while the introverted sensation type sees real external objects, but through her or his own specific lens. This lens is not one of value judgments (as in the case of the introverted feeling type, to be discussed below), but one of perceptions untroubled by truth or value judgments, so that such a person “lives in a mythological world, where men, animals, locomotives, houses, rivers, and mountains appear either as benevolent deities or as malevolent demons” (397). If the inferior extraverted intuition of the introverted sensing type is triggered (or constellated, in Jung’s terminology) such things are more likely to appear as malevolent demons than as benevolent deities, for inferior extraverted intuition is constantly suggesting the evil possibilities of every course of action, “producing compulsive ideas of the most perverse kind” (398).

Although the irrational functions are not our primary concern here, as we consider the connections between these theories and Baratynsky’s poetry it is worth noting Jung’s emphasis on the connection between introverted intuition and imagination, or introverted sensing and painting. Jung implies, and later developers of his theories such as Briggs and Myers or Keirsey and Bates state explicitly, that sensing and intuitive types not only
see different things, they are likely to be drawn to different activities. Specifically, intuition (whether introverted or extraverted) is related to an ability in and love for symbols and working in the symbolic order, as well as quickness in perception (because the intuitive makes “intuitive leaps” and skips the intervening steps between point A and point Z), while sensing (whether introverted or extraverted) is related to an ability in and love for reality and working in the “real” world, as well as thoroughness in perception (because the sensing type goes through things in a step-by-step fashion). In our current society this translates into sharp differences in academic ability, with the intuitive minority far outperforming the sensing majority\(^88\) in both standardized tests and regular coursework, especially when a preference for intuition is combined with a preference for introversion (for those familiar with Myers-Briggs terms, those are the IN types).

Contrary to what might be expected, the thinking-feeling preference, while affecting people’s areas of specialization, has a minimal effect on academic ability and IQ scores.\(^89\) Furthermore, because they “see” different worlds, sensing and intuitive types have much more difficulty bridging the gap between their two different modes of perception than thinking and feeling types have in bridging the gap between their two different modes of

---

\(^{88}\)In Myers’s surveys from the 1950s, intuitives made up less than 15% of the population in high schools that did not select for academic merit, but made up over 80% of National Merit finalists (Gifts Differing 36-9). Because of the strong self-selection by intuitives for activities in which they would be likely to take the MBTI, such as higher education, it is difficult to estimate the ratio of intuitives to sensing types in the general population, but most literature on the subject suggests that sensing types outnumber intuitives somewhere between 2:1 and 3:1.

\(^{89}\)For example, both the Myers-Briggs types of INFP and INTP tend to score highly on tests of scholastic aptitude, although one has dominant feeling and the other has dominant thinking. It appears that their introversion draws them to the world of introspection and reflection, while their auxiliary extraverted intuition allows them to test well. For more on this topic, see Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.
For our purposes this sheds light on the "poetry/other arts" dichotomy present in Baratynsky’s poetry, as well as aspects of the unhappiness expressed by his poetic persona. Jung suggests, and later writers such as Keirsey state directly, that the “sensual arts” such as painting and sculpture, as well as the performative arts such as music and dance, are the province of sensing, while the symbolic arts, i.e., literature, are the province of intuition. Although intuitive types can of course take up the “sensual arts,” and sensing types can produce literature, hands-on art forms such as sculpture or music require an intensive use of sensing skills, while writing requires very little in the way of physical ability and much more in the way of symbolic or imaginative thinking. Even sculpture, music, or painting that are highly symbolic in conception require the artist to use the sensing function and be “in the moment” during actual production, while the same is not the case for the “poor artist of the word,” who must tap into intuition, not sensing. And although artists of the word may speak of feeling possessed or experiencing divine inspiration while they write, it is nonetheless a fundamentally different—and frequently much less pleasurable—experience than “going with the flow” while doing, making, or performing.

Sensing and intuitive types also experience life itself, as well as their creative process, differently. In comparing the two types Isabel Myers says that sensing types “Are by nature pleasure lovers and consumers; loving life as it is and having a great capacity for enjoyment, they are in general contented” (Gifts Differing 63), while
intuitives “Are by nature initiators, inventors and promoters; having no taste for life as it is, and small capacity for living in and enjoying the present, they are generally restless” (63). This restlessness, combined with a mixture of envy and disdain for the easy-going sensing types, is visible not only in Baratynsky’s poetry,90 but in the work of other Russian authors as well (Tolstoy springs to mind).

This tension between the irrational functions of sensing and intuition seems to stand behind certain aspects of some of Baratynsky’s most important poems, such as the “verbal arts/sensual arts” dichotomy in «Всё мысль да мысль!..».91 However, the greatest conflict is still that between thought and feeling. Although “thinking” and intuition seem to bleed into each other somewhat in Baratynsky’s poetry (as they do in many people’s conception of the two functions), and feeling and sensation likewise might

90For examples of this, see the above-mentioned «Рассеивает грусть пиров веселый шум...» or the 1820 poem «Поверь, мой милый друг, страданье нужно нам...», dedicated to his friend Konshin. The full text of both poems is in Appendix 1, Poems 1 and 5.

91It can also be seen in the longer poem «Последняя смерть», from 1828. The poem begins in apparent praise of imagination, as the lyrical “I” recounts a vision he has received, but stanza six describes the effect of too much reliance on imagination (or intuition) and thinking at the expense of personal relationships (or feeling) and the physical (or sensing):

Желания земные позабыв,
Чуждася их грубого влеченья,
Душевных снов, высоких снов призыв
Им заменил другие побужденья,
И в полное владение свое
Фантазия взяла их бытие,
И умственной природе уступила
Телесная природа между ним:
Их в эмпирей и в хаос унosiла
Живая мысль на крыльях своих;
Но по земле с трудом они ступали,
И браки их бесплодны пребывали.
For the complete text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 13.
appear to bleed into each other (as they do in «Последняя смерть»), I believe they are separate enough to justify calling what Baratynsky generally means when he refers to «мысль» or «ум» or «дума» “thinking” in the Jungian sense, while «чувство» more often means “feeling” in the Jungian sense than it does physical sensation. It is therefore time to turn to a definition and description of these functions.

I will begin with extraverted thinking, both because this is the function of greatest interest to us, and because it is common to begin typological descriptions with extraverted thinking, perhaps following Jung's example in *Psychological Types*, and perhaps because it is still true that “our age and its most eminent representatives know and acknowledge only the extraverted type of thinking…the extraverted intellect oriented by objective data is actually the only one that is recognized” (*CW* 6: 343). Although I (following the lead of von Franz and Lenore Thomson, who both see modern American culture as emphasizing extraverted sensation) consider this to be less true than it was a hundred or two hundred years ago, it is still nonetheless the case that anything that is supposed to pass as “thought” is expected to be organized and presented according to the principles of extraverted thinking.

According to von Franz's description of the extraverted thinker:

This type is to be found among organisers, people in high office and government positions, in business, in law and among scientists. They can compile useful encyclopedias. They dig up all the dust in old libraries and do away with the inhibiting factors in science which are caused by clumsiness or laziness or a lack of clarity in language...They put clarifying order into the outer situation. At a business meeting, such a man will say

---

92 For more on the meaning of «чувство», and its distinction from «чувственность», see Burton's article “The Poet of Thought in ‘Vse myself [sic] ‘da mysl’: Truth in Boratynskij’s Poetry.”
that one should get at the basic facts and then see how to proceed. A lawyer who has to listen to all the chaotic reports of contending parties is able, with his superior thinking function, to see which are the real conflicts and which the pseudo-contentions, and then to arrange a solution satisfactory to all parties. The emphasis will always be upon the object, not on the idea. Such a lawyer will not fight for the idea of democracy or domestic peace; his whole mind will be absorbed with and swallowed up by the outer objective situation. If one were to ask him about his subjective attitude or ideas on a certain subject, he would be at a loss, for he is not concerned with that area of life and would be completely unconscious of any personal motive. (38)

According to von Franz (herself a dominant introverted thinker), thinkers, either extraverted or introverted, are in fact unaware for the most part not only of what other people are feeling (except as a negative projection of their own unconscious feelings), but also of what they themselves feel. When describing the “slowness” and frustration typical of attempts to reach the inferior function, she says:

For instance, thinking types have no idea whether they have feeling or what kind of feeling it is. They have to sit half an hour and meditate as to whether they have feelings about something and, if so, what they are. If you ask a thinking type what he feels, he generally either replies with a thought or gives a quick conventional reaction;93 and if you then insist on knowing what he really feels, he does not know. (8)

Extraverted thinkers in particular will not normally like to spend too much time dwelling on internal states and subjective values, preferring to focus their energy on getting things done in the real world. If their inferior introverted feeling is constellated, frequently through provocations such as “Accusations of coldness and lack of concern for

93Von Franz later says, as illustration of this: “For example, I have drawn up a form letter of condolences with certain phrases which have struck me as being very nice and touching. If I tried to express my real feelings, I would stick at such a letter for three days! So in all these situations I make a cocktail of the conventional phrases I have collected throughout my life” (12).
others…[or] fears of having been excessively harsh with someone” (Quenk 78), the extraverted thinker may show exaggerated signs of introverted feeling, which Quenk characterizes as “hypersensitivity to inner states, outbursts of emotion, [and] fear of feeling” (79). When this happens, feelings and emotions intruding into the consciousness of an extraverted thinker who is in the grip of inferior introverted feeling are experienced as so alien and overwhelming that they are inexpressible. From a thinking point of view, the eruption of ‘illogical,’ uncontrolled, and disorderly feelings is like being at the mercy of strange and overwhelming forces that threaten a person’s equilibrium, if not whole existence…In extreme instances, they may be terrified that they are going crazy. (82)

To return to Baratynsky’s poetry for a moment, this aversion to internal states and subjective values is entirely at odds with the preferences of his poetic persona. Although the poetry we have examined thus far has been his “poetry of thought,” and therefore has thought or thinking as its focus, the importance of the lyrical hero’s inner state, and the search for personal happiness, can be seen in poems such as «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг…», «Желанье счастья в меня вдохнули боги…», «О счастьи с младенчества тоскуя…» and «Когда исчезнет омраченье…», while the poetic persona's resolute rejection of industrial society and the extraverted thinking lifestyle that goes with it can be seen in «Приметы» and «Последний поэт». This suggests that extraverted thinking does not act as the dominant function in Baratynsky's poetic psyche. With that in mind, let us now turn to its negative form, extraverted thinking as the inferior function of an introverted feeling type. A detailed examination of these two aspects of it will give us greater insight into what kind of thinking is manifested in Baratynsky's poetry.
Regarding inferior extraverted thinking, Jung says of that “Its habitual mode is best expressed by the two words ‘nothing but’” (CW 6: 353), while von Franz says that “Inferior extraverted thinking has just the same negative tendencies of becoming tyrannical, stiff and unyielding, and in that way not quite adapted to its object, that all other inferior functions have” (49-50). These two characteristics, of a “nothing-but” understanding of the world and of being “tyrannical,” are typical for thought in Baratynsky’s poetry, as we have seen in «Дало две доли...», with its inescapably dualist worldview, or «Когда исчезнет омраченье...», in which “fatal thought” strangles the poet’s “light gift.” The sensation of being strangled by thought which is expressed in «Когда исчезнет омраченье...» also suggests the specifically extraverted nature of thinking for Baratynsky’s poetic persona, for, as von Franz explains in her description of people with inferior extraverted thinking:

If they want to use their extraverted thinking in a creative way, they have the usual extravert’s difficulty of being overwhelmed by too much material, too many references and too many facts, so their inferior extraverted thinking sometimes just gets lost in a morass of details through which they can no longer find their way. The inferiority of their extraverted thinking very often expresses itself in a certain monomania: they have actually only one or two thoughts with which they race through a tremendous amount of material. (48-9)

As was discussed in the previous chapter, “thought” in Baratynsky’s poetry tends to have just this characteristic of being overwhelming, expressed in the sense of being “strangled” in «Когда исчезнет омраченье...» and most clearly in «Всё мысль да мысль!..». The concern for and fear of truth and knowledge as expressed in poems such as «Дало две доли...» and «О счастии с младенчества тоскуя...» also seems like an example of the “hypersensitivity to truth and accuracy” (Quenk 93) that is typical of inferior extraverted thinking.
When inferior extraverted thinking takes over, it can cause the psyche under its control to fall into “a banal and overweening desire to dominate, into vanity and despotic bossiness” (391). Quenk describes such people when they are what she terms as “in the grip” of the inferior function:

In the early stages of their inferior function, introverted feeling types often project their unconscious fears of their own incompetence. They may become hypersensitive to others’ mistakes. Because of the extraverted attitude of their inferior, the projections often extend to large segments of the outer world, encompassing much of humanity…

Introverted feeling types in this state may complain loudly about others’ gross ineptitude. ISFPs and INFPs [introverted feeling types] seem to turn into the very opposite of their accepting, nonjudgmental, and flexible selves, coming across as harsh critics and judges whose standards of competence are too extreme to be met. (96-7)

Although I will not give a detailed discussion of this aspect of Baratynsky’s poetic persona, I will mention briefly that this hypersensitivity to mistakes and tendency towards harsh criticism can be found in Baratynsky’s polemics with literary critics and those he considered to be his literary enemies. Attacks on his enemies can be found, for example, in «Бокал», «Осень», and «На посев леса», which are presented in Appendix 1, Poems 24, 27, and 36. He also produced a number of stinging epigrams, of which the following, first published in 1827, is representative:

Как сладить с глупостью глупца?
Ему впопад не скажешь слова;
Другого проще он с лица,
Но мудреней в житье другого.
Он всем превратно поражен,
И всё навыворот он видит;
И бестолково любит он,
И бестолково ненавидит.
(ПСС 103)
Baratynsky’s rebuttal of his critics in «Антикритика», his response to criticism of the long narrative poem «Наложница» («Цыганка»), also demonstrates both the general sensivity of a psyche whose inferior function has been criticized, and the specific sensitivity of inferior thinking towards criticisms of intellectual ability or the use of logic.

It should be emphasized that inferior extraverted thinking, and the consequent concern for truth and hypersensitivity to mistakes which can disintegrate into hypercritical despotism, may well be the most visible aspect of the subject’s behavior. Even if inferior extraverted thinking has not taken over the personality, dominant introverted feeling will still tend not to reveal itself to strangers, so that an introverted feeling type may come across as cold and “unfeeling.” Jung’s description of the type emphasizes the tendency towards a cool exterior and the avoidance of strong expressions of emotion:

Their outward demeanour is harmonious, inconspicuous, giving an impression of pleasing repose, or of sympathetic response, with no desire to affect others, to impress, influence, or change them in any way. If this outward aspect is more pronounced, it arouses a suspicion of indifference and coldness, which may actually turn into a disregard for the comfort and well-being of others. One is distinctly aware then of the movement of feeling away from the object. With the normal type, however, this happens only when the influence of the object is too strong. The feeling of harmony, therefore, lasts only so long as the object goes its own moderate way and makes no attempt to cross the other’s path. There is little attempt to respond to the real emotions of the other person; they are more often damped down and rebuffed, or cooled off by a negative value judgment. Although there is a constant readiness for peaceful and harmonious co-existence, strangers are shown no touch of amiability, no gleam of responsive warmth, but are met with apparent indifference or a repelling coldness. Often they are made to feel entirely superfluous. Faced with anything that might carry her away or arouse enthusiasm, this type observes a benevolent though critical neutrality, coupled with a faint trace of superiority that soon takes the wind out of the sails of a sensitive

---

94Jung uses the feminine pronoun in describing both the feeling types.
person. Any stormy emotion, however, will be struck down with murderous coldness...As far as possible, the feeling relationship is kept to the safe middle path, all intemperate passions being resolutely tabooed. Expressions of feeling therefore remain niggardly, and the other person has a permanent sense of being undervalued once he becomes conscious of it. (CW 6: 389)

To sum up: a person or psyche with dominant introverted feeling and inferior extraverted thinking may often come across either as cold and reserved, or as “childish and banal” (389), especially at first or in public situations. This is, however, a complete misunderstanding, as the introverted feeling type in fact has a strong sense of moral and aesthetic values and (if they are a “normal” representative of their type) a deeply caring nature, even if they rarely give outward expression to their feelings, or, when they do, their values do not align neatly with the pervading standards of the day. To the casual observer, though, especially if the person being observed is under stress or otherwise “in the grip,” to borrow Quenk’s phrase, the introverted feeling type may appear demanding, controlling, and judgmental, like a caricature of a normal extraverted thinking type (best typified by the successful executive or lawyer). This may particularly be the case if something the person values highly is under threat, or if the person feels that others are trespassing on their feeling values and imposing arbitrary outer standards on their subjective judgments.

The thinking of such a person, if one probes it more deeply, will tend to come across as black-and-white, all-or-nothing, or “tyrannical,” as von Franz says. Because

---

95In keeping with our Harry Potter examples, Harry himself, along with Ron Weasley, appears to be an introverted feeling type, probably with auxiliary extraverted sensing (hence his prowess on the Quidditch pitch and poor performance in the Potions chamber). Both boys, despite constantly falling afoul of the rules of extraverted judgment that surround them, have strong innate moral sensibilities and very little of what extraverted types would probably call “common sense.”
this thinking is associated with the frightening world of the outside object, the person to
whom it belongs may experience it as alien, terrifying, and overwhelming, and all
attempts to escape or evade it are doomed to failure. They are doomed to failure
precisely because it is the subject’s own thinking that is creating this impression, but the
subject will be conscious of this fact only with great difficulty, if at all.

To conclude our discussion of extraverted thinking versus introverted feeling, and
bring it back to our main subject, “thought” in Baratynsky’s poetry has many of the
attributes of the inferior function, while his poetry has many of the qualities of inferior
thinking. As has been noted previously in relation to, for example, «Дало две доли...»,
his poems tend to be constructed according to the principles of an inescapable binary
dualism, reminiscent of Jung’s “nothing-but” inferior thinking or the “all-or-none
statements” and “tunnel vision” Quenk associates with outbreaks of the inferior function.
Furthermore, the poetic persona experiences “thought” or “thinking” as an
overwhelming, terrifying, outside force. This can be seen in an early poem such as «О
счастии с младенчества тоскуя...», in which the “truth” that Truth offers the lyrical hero
is, while accepted as “truth,” rejected with horror, as well as a late poem such as «Все
мысль да мысль!...», in which thought becomes so omnipotent and all-encompassing that
it blinds its beholder to “earthly life.”

Before developing this theme further, though, I will touch briefly upon the
characteristics of extraverted feeling and introverted feeling, in order to clarify exactly
what functions we are dealing with here, and to show that Baratynsky’s poetic persona is
not demonstrating the (more masculine, and hence more frequently depicted in literature)
terror of the introverted thinking type for the world of extraverted feeling.
Just as extraverted thinking is the most “masculine” of the functions, extraverted feeling is the most “feminine” of the functions. Jung says that, “Examples of this type that I can call to mind are, almost without exception, women” (CW 6:356), and, in a move that is both refreshing in its willingness to include women as part of humanity, and disturbing in its willingness to conflate the results of nature and nurture, despite the basic premise that psychological type is innate, typifies this type thusly:

The woman of this type follows her feelings as a guide throughout life. As a result of upbringing 96 her feeling has developed into an adjusted function subject to conscious control…Her personality appears adjusted in relation to external conditions. Her feelings harmonize with objective situations and general values…

But one can feel ‘correctly’ only when feeling is not disturbed by anything else. Nothing disturbs feeling so much as thinking. It is therefore understandable that in this type thinking will be kept in abeyance as much as possible. This does not mean that the woman does not think at all; on the contrary, she may think a great deal and very cleverly, but her thinking is never sui generis—it is an Epimethean appendage to her feeling. What she cannot feel, she cannot consciously think…So far as her feeling allows, she can think very well, but every conclusion, however logical, that might lead to a disturbance of feeling is rejected at the outset. It is simply not thought. Thus everything that fits in with objective values is good, and is loved, and everything else seems to her to exist in a world apart. (CW 6: 356-7)

As can be seen from the above description of the “normal” extraverted feeling type, they tend to be outgoing, friendly, conventional, and (if they encounter something that does not fit into their picture—which has been formed from conventional models taken from the external world—of “how things should be”) unrealistic, ignoring everything that does not fit into their worldview. Questioning “how things should be” and engaging in serious speculation about alternative possibilities may cause them considerable difficulty, for:

96!!!
The extraverted feeling type dislikes thinking, because that is his inferior function, and what he dislikes most of all is introverted thinking—thinking about philosophical principles or abstractions or basic questions of life. Such deeper questions are carefully avoided, and there is the reaction that thinking about such problems is melancholy. The unfortunate thing is that he does think of such things, but is not aware of it, and because his thinking is neglected, it tends to become negative and coarse. It consists of coarse, primitive thinking judgments, without the slightest differentiation and very often with a negative tinge. I have also seen in the extraverted feeling type very negative thoughts about the neighboring people, very critical, I would say over-critical thinking judgments, which he never allows really to come out. Jung says that the extraverted feeling type can sometimes be coldest person on earth. (Franz 44-5)

Like introverted feelers, extraverted feeling types are strongly attached to their moral and aesthetic values, although unlike the self-generated values of introverted feeling types, the values of extraverted feeling types are likely to be learned from outside influences. They may also be sensitive about their intellectual capabilities (Quenk 127). These can cause them to respond to a perceived attack on their values or intellectual abilities with “excessive criticism, convoluted logic, and a compulsive search for the truth” (130).

This could potentially be seen as appropriate to the depiction of “thought” or thinking in Baratynsky’s poetry. However, for our purposes here, an important distinction between the two feeling types is their response to facts that go against their feeling values. According to Myers, “when faced by the same cold, inharmonious fact, extraverted feeling denies its existence, [while] introverted feeling condemns its existence” (Gifts Differing 94). Perhaps because extraverted feelers take their values from seemingly objective external sources, they are less likely even to notice things that go against their feeling values, while introverted feelers, who are likely to be the only person in their milieu to hold those particular values, will be more ready to acknowledge
an unpleasant fact’s presence, although they may rail against it. In the case of

Baratynsky’s poetic persona, we can see that it does not seek to deny the existence of

unpleasant facts, but rather it constantly dwells on them and their interference with

happiness. Extraverted feeling would be unlikely to produce poems such as «Напрасно
мы, Дельвиг...» or «О счасти с младенчества тоскуя...» because extraverted feeling

bases its happiness on external forces and would either harmonize with them or ignore

them entirely. It is introverted feeling that would be more likely to notice the impositions

unpleasant reality places on its search for happiness and inner peace.

Extraverted feeling, as was noted above, is opposed to introverted thinking.

Introverted thinking, according to Jung, “formulates questions and creates theories, it

opens up new prospects and insights, but with regard to facts its attitude is one of reserve.

They are all very well as illustrative examples, but they must not be allowed to

predominate” (CW 6: 380). The judgement of the introverted thinking type, meanwhile,

appears cold, inflexible, arbitrary, and ruthless, because it relates far less

to the object than to the subject. One can feel nothing in it that might

possibly confer a higher value on the object; it always bypasses the object

and leaves one with a feeling of the subject’s superiority. He [the

introverted thinker] may be polite, amiable, and kind, but one is constantly

aware of a certain uneasiness betraying an ulterior motive—the disarming

of an opponent, who must at all costs be pacified and placated lest he

prove himself a nuisance. (384)

Jung also gives a detailed description of the “dark side” of this type. Because

extraverted feeling, or the ability to harmonize with others, tends to be so unadapted in

the introverted thinker:

In his personal relations he is taciturn or else throws himself on people

who cannot understand him, and for him this is one more proof of the

abyssal stupidity of man. If for once he is understood, he easily

succumbs to credulous overestimation of his prowess. Ambitious women

have only to know how to take advantage of his cluelessness in practical
matters to make an easy prey of him; or he may develop into a misanthropic bachelor with a childlike heart. Often he is gauche in his behavior, painfully anxious to escape notice, or else remarkably unconcerned and childishly naive. (385)

Such a person, according to Jung, fears “‘magical’ influences” (387) and sets up defences against them, particularly against influences by the opposite sex.

Introverted thinkers, then, are generally interested in formulating ideas and asking searching questions, and are not afraid to engage in what other types might experience as a tough debate in order to come to a clearer understanding of their topic. They may come across as cold and arrogant, and may be unwilling or unable to “get with the program” of societal expectations. On the other hand, they may go back and forth between being completely clueless about, and hypersensitive to, the emotions of others, which can lead them to ending up alienated from others, or, conversely, engaged in fiery wars over seemingly trivial points, or possibly becoming the pawn of someone with more emotional savvy. 97

As it may appear (as it does to me) that introverted thinking, as well as introverted feeling, could also be a good potential dominant function for Baratynsky’s poetry, let us compare introverted thinking and feeling and the typical behaviors of people who use them as dominant functions, as well as the actions of their respective inferior functions, extraverted feeling and thinking. This will allow us to focus in more closely on what, exactly, we are dealing with here.

97Carrying on with our Harry Potter theme, Professor Snape seems a good example of an introverted thinking type whose inferior extraverted feeling both leads him astray—in his alliance with Voldemort—and also saves him from completely going over to the “dark side,” first through his attachment to Harry’s mother, and later, Harry himself.
Both introverted feeling and introverted thinking types may appear to others as reserved, even haughty or arrogant. Both dislike excessive emotionalism in others, and may respond negatively to strong expressions of extraverted feeling. Both construct their own subjective, internal conceptual systems, and may choose to “drop out” (or end out up dropping out inadvertently) of the external, socially acceptable forms of behavior and social organization.

However, introverted feelers create their own system of values, while introverted thinkers construct their own systems of logic. Introverted feelers prefer quiet and harmonious relationships, and may shrink from giving or receiving criticism, unless their sore spot is touched, in which case they may become hypercritical and judgmental.

Introverted thinkers, on the other hand, enjoy giving and receiving criticism, although if their sore spot is touched, they may become hyperemotional. Introverted feelers experience everything through the prism of their subjective feeling-values (Lenore Thomson describes it as being “a way of looking at life, a lens ground by direct experiences of good and evil” (Personality Type: An Owner’s Manual 372)), while introverted thinkers examine things through their self-generated systems of objective logic.

Thomson compares the two functions directly, saying that “Introverted Thinking is dispassionate and impersonal, prompting an interest in systemic logic: the probable consequences of immediate choice” (366), while “Introverted Feeling focuses our attention differently. It encourages a personal relationship to an evolving pattern, a will to gauge the situation by an experiential ideal” (366). This is an important point in our consideration of Baratynsky’s poetry: introverted thinking sees itself as standing outside,
emotionally, of what it is doing, while introverted feeling experiences itself as being
directly involved in whatever it is doing or whatever is happening to it—and demands
that a value judgment be made about what is happening.

If we return yet again to «Всё мысль да мысль!..», we can see how this
difference is expressed there. As was discussed in the previous chapter, the poem, while
possessing a number of interesting and artistically striking formal features, lacks a clear
and logical organization of ideas. Instead of building on each other in a step-by-step
fashion, the themes and ideas of «Всё мысль да мысль!..» are scattered somewhat
haphazardly through the poem, so that the poem could be read almost as easily vertically
as horizontally, although it does not appear to be written in order to be read both ways, as
might be the case with a novelty poem. Instead, the words and ideas in this poem are
united by an overall relationship to thought and the process of artistic creation. Their
logical connection is subordinated to the “feeling-tone” of the poem, so that individual
words and phrases are presented according to their artistic effectiveness and emotional
strength, rather than logical coherence. This gives the reader/listener the impression that
the poem is organized according to a system, but an attempt to extract a logical flow of
ideas from the poem is likely to end in failure, because the system is made up of the
good/bad values of feeling, not the true/false values of thinking. The fact that both
feeling and thinking are rational functions could be the source for potential confusion on
the part of the reader/listener, who will recognize that a rational system is in place but
may not be sure which one. The poem’s focus on thought will naturally turn the
reader/listener in the direction of thinking as opposed to feeling, but, as was discussed
above, the most obvious psychological function may not be the dominant one, and may in fact be the inferior one.

In the case of this poem, we can see how thought is the target of obsessive worry, but that feeling stands invisibly behind the poem and is the guiding force in its organization and composition. A similar thing can be seen in «Последний поэт»: although the apparent thematic organization of the poem according to meter breaks down under closer scrutiny, so that the two worlds of commerce and poetry bleed into each other in almost every stanza, the poem as a whole is united by a specific feeling-relationship to commerce and poetry. Ultimately, the poem is organized not according to principles of logic, but of moral and aesthetic feeling, even if its superficial appearance is one of strict logic or “rationality” in the non-Jungian sense. As was discussed above, this would be typical of dominant introverted feeling and inferior extraverted thinking: the inferior extraverted thinking would give a work its exterior form, but the guiding principles would be those of the hidden but dominant introverted feeling.

Returning to the difference between introverted feeling and introverted thinking, a further important point in the comparison of the two functions and types is their response to emotional ties. The weak spot for introverted thinking types is interpersonal relationships, which often leads to a fear of emotional involvement with or personal responsibility for others. Introverted thinking types will therefore tend to shrink from emotional involvement with others, and do their best to escape from relationships that
they believe are burdensome to them or that are holding them back from accomplishing some important intellectual task.  

Introverted feelers, on the other hand, would tend to feel the call of a religious vocation, not an intellectual challenge. This religious vocation may or may not have anything to do with religion as it is traditionally understood in any given society, but the call is nonetheless to something in the realm of morals and/or aesthetics, however that is interpreted, not the intellect. The intellect, while it may be allowed to be of use in furthering introverted feeling’s aims, is not allowed to act against them, at least not consciously. Feeling types will, therefore, as was mentioned above, attempt to deny or resist, not emotional ties, but factual or logical barriers to their emotional ties. Their emotional ties may be to individual people, or to important ideas or causes, but if they support an intellectual idea or an abstract or external cause, they are driven to do so by their underlying feeling values, not because of the application of some kind of logic.

With this important distinction—that feeling-types, especially introverted feeling types, are people-oriented, and tend see the outside world as drawing them away or distracting them from the people or causes who matter to them, while thinking-types, especially introverted thinking-types, are idea-oriented, and tend to see other people as drawing them away or distracting them from ideas that are important to them (extraverted thinking types might resent other people’s demands on their time and emotional energy, but they would be more likely simply to ignore them, or to organize things so that they, for example, spent a certain amount of time each week with friends and family members,

---

98 An example of this is Robert Musil’s story “Tonka.” For a discussion of the thought/feeling conflict in “Tonka,” see Appendix 2, Note 3.
thereby doing their duty by them)—bearing this distinction in mind, let us look at
Baratynsky’s poetry of feeling.
Chapter Four
Child of Passion and Doubt: Baratynsky’s Poetry of Feeling

Our epigraph for this chapter, a poem originally composed in 1824 and republished in 1827 and 1835 (ПСС 463), introduces two important themes for this chapter: the declared preference of Baratynsky’s poetic persona for quiet, unthreatening women who do not jolt the (implicitly or explicitly male) perceiver out of his emotional equilibrium with their physical attractiveness, and the ostensible dedication of these poems to real women.

I use the word “ostensible” because, as will be discussed below, even if these poems were addressed to particular women, they describe female figures with such similar characteristics that they can be taken as all facets of the same “person”: the anima-figure, or feminine aspect, of Baratynsky’s poetic persona. In the case of «Очарованье красоты...», although dedicated to Aleksandra Andreyevna Voeykova (ПСС 463), it bears marked similarities to the description of the ideal mate described the 1821 poem «Пора покинуть, милый друг...» (for the full text, see Appendix 1, Poem 7).
and the 1824 poem «Взгляни на звезды...» (for the full text, see Appendix 1, Poem 9), as well as the Muse in the 1830 poem «Муза» or «Не ослеплен я музою моею...» (for the full text, see Appendix 1, Poem 17), and the poems assumed to be dedicated to Baratynsky's wife.

It is the poems presumably about or for Baratynsky's wife that will be the focus of the first part of this chapter and the discussion of his poetry of feeling, specifically introverted feeling. In order to form a full picture of the meaning of feeling in Baratynsky's poetry, after looking these overtly feeling-oriented poems in the first part of the chapter, we will then turn to the changing attitude towards feeling of Baratynsky's poetic persona during different stages in his career. This will be followed by a comparison of the depiction of feeling in these feeling-oriented poems with that of the depiction of thought, and a discussion of the poetic persona's attempts to flee from the “hell” of daily existence into both thought and feeling. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the poetic persona’s attempts to objectify thought as feminine, thereby enabling him to distance himself from it. Throughout the chapter we will be examining feeling and thought as two complementary and yet opposing poles of the poetic persona’s psyche, with the intent of deciding which is the preferred pole, and which is the one that serves as a source of sick fascination and fear.

The first poem we shall consider, sometimes titled «Она», was written in 1827, shortly after the poet's marriage to Nastasya Lvovna Engelgardt,99 but was never included in any of the poetry collections published during his lifetime.

99Nastasya Lvovna is described both in Baratynsky’s poetry assumed to be about her, and in the descriptions of her by Baratynsky’s acquaintances, as being of unprepossessing appearance but extremely kind-hearted. Interestingly, in poems written before his first
Есть что-то в ней, что красоты прекрасней,
Что говорит не с чувствами—с душой;
Есть что-то в ней над сердцем самовластней
Земной любви и прелести земной.

Как сладкое душе воспоминанье,
Как милый свет родной звезды твоей,
Какое-то влечет очарованье
К ее ногам и под защиту к ней.

Когда ты с ней, мечты твоей неясной
Неясною владычицей она:
Не мыслишь ты—и только лишь прекрасной
Присутствием душа твоя полна.

Бредешь ли ты дорогою возвратной,
С ней разлучаясь, в пустынный угол твой—
Ты полон весь мечтою необъятной,

acquaintance with her, Baratynsky described a woman very much like her in his poems about his ideal woman, as can be seen in the above-mentioned poems «Пора покинуть, милый друг...» or «Взгляни на звезды..». The full text of both poems can be found in Appendix 1, Poems 7 and 9.

Nastasya Lvovna, according to her husband's poetry about her, and descriptions of her by his friends (some of which are hardly flattering, but nonetheless do suggest that she was well-endowed with sweetness of nature, while underendowed with personal charms—for more on this, see Летопись 180-1), seems to have fulfilled many of these requirements, although if I were attempting to psychoanalyze Baratynsky himself, I would be forced to ask how much Nastasya Lvovna actually possessed these qualities, and how much she merely possessed these qualities in his eyes. However, as a figure in his poetry she invariably figures as safe haven of peace, tenderness, and understanding—the opposite of his heroines Nina, from «Бал», or Sara, from «Наложница». Nastasya Lvovna, as well as the unnamed «она» in the earlier poems, seems to act in Jungian terms as a positive anima figure in Baratynsky's poetry, while Nina, Sara, and their passionate and high-tempered sisters act as negative anima figures. As the character of «она» in the earlier poems, or of the woman who is ostensibly Nastasya Lvovna in the later poems, has many of the characteristics of an introverted feeling type, I consider this further proof of the dominant, or positive, character of introverted feeling in Baratynsky's poetry. The more negative anima figures in his poetry, such as Nina and Sara, have many of the characteristics of extraverted feeling and extraverted sensing types, which would both be disturbingly alien to introverted feeling, although without quite the same doom-laden terror of extraverted thinking. Although, as was discussed in the previous chapter, the anima/animus tends to be associated with the inferior function, extraverted thinking is such a stereotypically masculine function that it would be difficult to create a heroine who embodied it. The way in which thinking is femininized in Baratynsky's poetry will be discussed at the end of this chapter.
Ты полон весь таинственной тоской.

(IIcc 291-2)

In the first stanza the «она» is described as transcending physical beauty and earthly charms. Interestingly, she speaks «не с чувствами—с душой». Given the importance, and the ambiguous position, of the words «чувство» and «чувственный» in Baratynsky's poetry, this line deserves consideration. According to Dora Burton, Baratynsky was careful throughout his career to differentiate between «чувство» and «чувственность»: the former was associated with the role of the poet, and the capacity for both deep suffering and true happiness, while the latter was associated with shallowness and the false illusion of happiness (for a detailed discussion of Baratynsky's usage of the two words, see "The Poet of Thought in 'Vse mysel' [sic] da mysl': Truth in Boratynskij’s Poetry"). In this poem, however, the «она» of whom the poet speaks transcends not only «чувственность», which is implied in her transcendence of physical beauty and earthly charms, but «чувство» as well, speaking directly with the soul instead. This transcendence of «чувство» is emphasized in the next line, with the phrase «над сердцем самовластней». Although the meaning of the phrase, as becomes clear in the next line, is that she has more power over the heart than earthly love and earthly charms, it nevertheless suggests that she is not only above earthly love and earthly charms, but above the heart—«над сердцем»—as well.

The second stanza continues to elevate the heroine, on both the physical and the metaphorical plane. The first two lines, «Как сладкое душе воспоминанье, / Как милый свет родной звезды твоей», compare her to a star, thereby placing her “above” once again, while the last two lines, «Какое-то влечет очарованье / К ее ногам и под защиту к ней», associates her both with magical figures (through the word
«очарованье») and overwhelming forces of nature (because she attracts («влечет») as a natural force would).

This stanza contains echoes of the earlier poem «Взгляни на звезды...», not only in its star imagery, but in its connection of the star imagery with fond memories, as is suggested by the third stanza of «Взгляни на звезды...»:

Нет! утешает свет ее
Расставшихся друзей:
Их взоры, в синей вышине,
Встречаются на ней.

(ПСС 137)

With its use of the word «влечет», it also prefigures the 1831-2 poem «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы?..», quoted in the introduction. In that poem, «Небесные светила / Назначенным путем неведомая сила / Влечет». In «Есть что-то в ней...», however, the «она» is not pulled or attracted, but is the target towards which the lyrical hero is pulled or attracted, placing her outside of the doomed situation of the heavenly bodies in the later poem. She therefore, while sharing in their exalted, celestial nature, is free of the tragic fate that the heavenly bodies of the later poem share with the lyrical hero of both poems.

The third stanza describes her as the mistress of, and transcendent of, both fantasy and thought. In the first two lines she is the “obscure mistress of your obscure dream,” while in the final lines she so fills the soul of the lyrical hero that “you do not think.” She has therefore transcended the physical realm (in the first stanza), the human realm, and possibly fate (in the second stanza), and the intellectual realm (in the third stanza). This progression is significant—she has moved through the levels of what is often treated as
evil, dangerous, or soul-crushing in Baratynsky’s poetry, from the misery of physical existence, to the inevitability of fate, to the curse of thought and intellectual activity.

In the final stanza the lyrical hero separates from the heroine, and describes the result of his interaction with her. The first two lines set up the theme of separation, emptiness, and smallness or containment through the words «разлучась», «пустынный» (which, while meaning “deserted,” has the same root as «пустой»—empty), and «угол».

This forms a direct contrast with the final two lines of the stanza and the poem, which both begin with the words «Ты полон весь». In the first of the final two lines, the “you” is filled with a “vast (literally “unembraceable) dream, which contrasts with the “deserted corner” of the previous line, and parallels the “obscure dream” of the previous stanza. In the final line, the “you” is full of a “mysterious (or secret) sorrow (or yearning).” This ambiguous ending could potentially subvert or undercut the entire message of the poem—does the «она» make the lyrical hero sad? Or is he simply longing for her presence? Concluding the poem with the word «тоска», in any case, causes it to finish on a somber note. There is almost a hint of Keats's “La Belle Dame sans Merci”100 in the lyrical hero’s forelorn state on being separated from his lady, with her seemingly supernatural powers.

This unexpectedly downbeat ending, however, gives the poem more life than something more cloyingly positive might have, and also serves to highlight the positive qualities of the «она» as she is presented in the first three stanzas. It is not until we leave her company that we fall into a state of depression. This slide into a minor scale in the final stanza shows us where the true high point of the poem is—in the end of stanza three, ________________

100 For the text of Keats’s poem, see Appendix 2, Note 4.
when the lyrical hero is so overwhelmed by the presence of his beloved that he is free of thought. The retreat into depression in the closing lines of the poem, could, in the context of Baratynsky's poetry, signal a return of unwelcome ratiocination.

It would seem an obvious statement that a love poem is about feeling. I consider this poem to be an example of primarily introverted, as opposed to extraverted, feeling, however, because it is primarily concerned with the inner emotional state of the lyrical hero. The heroine herself is a blank image—all we know of her is her lack of ordinary earthly features. How she feels, or even how she looks or acts, is not even mentioned as a possible topic for consideration; the only thing we know of her is how she makes the lyrical hero feel. This is very similar to von Franz's description of the experience of introverted feeling by someone else, in which she compares it to Rilke's statement “‘Ich liebe dich, was geht’s dich an?’ (‘I love you, but it’s none of your business!’)” (Franz 39). She goes on to say, “Feeling is very strong, but it does not flow towards the object. It is rather like being in a state of love with oneself. Naturally, this kind of feeling is very much misunderstood, and such people are considered very cold. But they are not at all; the feeling is all within them” (39). It is just this sort of feeling that seems to be operational in «Есть что-то в ней...».

«Есть что-то в ней...» presents a spiritual connection between the lyrical hero and his beloved as the height—in every sense of the word—of happiness, while separation from the beloved brings about a state of depression. Although this poem does, as was discussed above, contain parallels of theme and image with other works in Baratynsky's oeuvre, and can be considered typical for him for that reason, there is nothing especially unique about a poem celebrating the poet's love for his beloved, and
sorrow at his separation from her. Therefore, while I consider this poem to be an example of introverted feeling appearing in a positive light in Baratynsky's poetry, it alone is insufficient to show that introverted feeling acts as the dominant function in his work. More interesting from that regard is the following poem, written in 1831-2 (the same time as «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы...»), and included in the 1835 collection:

О, верь: ты, нежная, дороже славы мне.  
Скажу ль? мне иногда докучно вдохновенье;  
Мешает мне его волненье  
Дышать любовью в тишине!  
Я сердце предаю сердечному союзу:  
Приди, мечты мои рассей,  
Ласкай, ласкай меня, о друг души моей!  
И покори себе бунтующую муzu.  
(ПСС 147)

In this poem, the poet declares that his beloved is dearer to him than glory, and that he prefers her to writing poetry. Inspiration brings with it «волненье»—agitation or disturbance—which prevents the lyrical hero from enjoying his love in peace. The beloved is not the Muse; in fact, she is directly opposed to the Muse, whom she must subdue so that the poet can rest and experience his love untroubled by the demands of creative activity. The poet therefore declares in this poem that his highest good is a personal relationship, rather than inspiration or creative activity.

101 Another poem in which Baratynsky links art with «волненье» is «Мудрецу», from Сумерки. The full text of the poem can be found in Appendix 1, Poem 32.

102 Baratynsky presents quite another picture of his Muse, one who is not «бунтующая», in his 1830 poem, «Муза». The full text of the poem can be found in Appendix 1, Poem 17. In this poem the Muse appears closer to the star in «Взгляни на звезды...» or the «она» in «Есть что-то в ней...», being notable not for her physical beauty, but for her
Whether or not this was actually true in Baratynsky's life, and whether or not his poetic persona “truly” preferred love to poetry, the fact remains that, in his poetry, the pleasures of a peaceful meeting of souls are portrayed in emphatically positive terms, even when that meeting of souls prevents intellectual activity, as in «Есть что-то в ней...», or creative effort, as in «О, верь: ты, нежная...». Baratynsky's poetic persona feels no sense of doom from these close personal attachments, unlike the annoyance occasionally occasioned by creative activity, as in «О, верь: ты, нежная...», or the terror sparked by thought.

The last poem to be discussed in relation to this theme is a late poem dedicated to Nastasya Lvovna, written the winter of 1843-4:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Когда, дитя и страсти и сомненья,} \\
\text{Поэт взглянул глубоко на тебя,} \\
\text{Решалась ты делить его волненье,} \\
\text{В нем таинство печали полюбя.} \\
\text{Ты, смелая и кроткая, со мною} \\
\text{В мой дикий ад сошла рука с рукю;} \\
\text{Рай зрела в нем чудесная любовь.} \\
\text{О, сколько раз к тебе, святой и нежной,} \\
\text{Я приникал главой моей мятежной,} \\
\text{С тобой себе и небу веря вновь.} \\
\text{(ПСС 299)}
\end{align*}
\]

In this poem, the addressee, a feminine «ты», effects a kind of intercession for the poet. In the first stanza, the poet is a “child of passion and doubt,” but when he gazes

inner qualities. In the case of the Muse in «Муза», as opposed to the «бунтующая муза» of «О, верь: ты, нежная...», she also appears easy to ignore, which may be one of her greatest charms from the point of view of Baratynsky's poetic persona, who claims not to care for overly striking women.
upon his beloved, she decides nonetheless to share his «волненье», one of Baratynsky's favorite words for both the troubles of earthly life and the process of artistic creation.

In the next stanza, the beloved descends into his “wild hell,” and her love beholds heaven in it. There is a parallel and yet reversed action of looking in the first two stanzas: in the first stanza, the poet “gazes deeply” at his beloved, and his gaze seems to cause her to share his fate; in the second stanza, the poet’s beloved beholds his “wild hell,” but her “marvelous love” sees paradise in it. Both the poet and his beloved, then, effect action with their gazes: the poet’s gaze causes his beloved to take pity on him, while the beloved’s gaze transforms hell into paradise.103

In these first two stanzas the movement is downwards, implied by the word «глубоко» in the second line of the first stanza, and stated explicitly by the verb «сошла» in the second line of the second stanza. In the first stanza this movement downwards is accompanied by a sense of separation, brought about by the word «делить», which means both “to share” and “to divide.” Although here «делить» implies sharing the lyrical hero's fate, the use of the word meaning “to divide” causes the concept of division to remain in the reader’s consciousness, underscoring the fact that the poet and his beloved are still separated at this point.

In the second stanza the movement downwards is, conversely, accompanied by a sense of union. The preposition «с» is repeated twice in the stanza, both times connected to a rhyme-word: «со мною» and «с рукою». In both instances the beloved is explicitly...

103 The verb «зреть» has the double meaning of “to see” and “to ripen,” which are identical in the past tense form. Although the context and the presence of a direct object imply the meaning of “to see” in this line, the idea of ripening could also be hovering in the background of this line, as without the presence of the word «рай» it would be unclear whether the «чудесная любовь» “saw” or “ripened.”
joined with the lyrical hero. The preposition «с» is echoed by the prefix «с» in the verb «сойти», placed between the two uses of the preposition. While «сойти» here implies downward movement, it contains background implications of both separation, through its association with the other meaning of «сойти», to move off of/away from, and union or joining, through its association with its reflexive form, сойтись, meaning to come together.

In the third and final stanza the movement is towards the beloved and upwards, towards heaven. This movement towards the beloved, and attachment to her, is implied through the use of the preposition «к» in the first line, and the verb «приникать», with its «при» prefix, in the second. In the final line the preposition «с» is repeated in the phrase «с тобой», paralleling the use of «со мною» at the end of the first line of the second stanza, emphasizing the union that has now taken place between the poet and his beloved. Now joined with her, he is able to turn inwards, towards himself (in contrast to the first stanza, in which his attention was focused outwards, on the beloved, as shown through the phrase «взглянул...на тебя»), and upwards, towards heaven.

In this poem, then, the poet is helped out of his self-inflicted hell through the love and intercession of his beloved, who appears in a very Marian light. She is not a distraction or a burden, but rather a source of strength. She is also not a person in her own right, but rather, as in the poems discussed above, the focus for the lyrical hero's own inner emotional state. While her actions, and his feelings for her, are what turn his gaze from downwards to upwards, we know very little about her, and nothing at all about what the lyrical hero intends to do on her behalf. This is not to accuse the lyrical hero of selfishness, but to underline the presence of the kind of feeling best described as “Ich
liebe dich, was geht’s dich an?”  The focus of this introverted type of feeling is not on what the subject can do for the object, although it may very well lead to the subject acting on the object’s behalf, but on the subject’s own inner valuation of the object, just as the focus of introverted thinking is on the subject’s own inner analysis of the object, the focus of introverted sensation is on the subject’s own inner impression of the object, and the focus of introverted intuition is on the subject’s own inner vision sparked by the object.  All four of the introverted functions are “abstracting,” as Jung would say, meaning that the subject abstracts something out of the object, instead of merging with the object.

In these three poems, then, we have a picture of introverted feeling as portrayed in Baratynsky’s poetry from the late 1820s, a transitional phase for him, the early 1830s, when he was in his middle phase, and the mid 1840s, which is necessarily the final phase of his poetry, although there are hints that, had his career not been cut short, his poetry might have evolved into a fourth, and less tragically toned, phase.  Although the poetic persona’s “persona,” in the Jungian sense, evolves considerably in that time, the portrayal of experience through the prism of introverted feeling, and of introverted feeling as nuanced and largely positive, remains constant.  Whether the lyrical addressee is a distant and awe-inspiring figure of power, as in «Есть что-то в ней...», a haven of peace who will subdue the «бунтующую муzu» of «О, верь: ты, нежная...», or a Madonna-like intercessory, as in «Когда, дитя и страсти и сомненья», the feelings she inspires in the lyrical hero are positive, and those feelings, rather than other considerations, are primary in his poetry.
The futile search for happiness of the earlier poems, and the frequently negative attitude of the lyrical hero of that period towards love,\textsuperscript{104} might seem to contradict the claim that feeling, and specifically introverted feeling, occupies the position of favored or dominant psychological function. However, while the poetic persona in Baratynsky’s early poetry often complains of the pain of feeling, and claims to long for oblivion, the very fact that he is aware of the problem at all suggests a high level of attunement towards the feeling process, and specifically towards the introverted feeling process. A true thinking person or persona would be more likely to become too caught up in career or intellectual pursuits to waste much energy on contemplating inner emotional states.

Although a thinking type might have every reason to say, as Baratynsky does in the 1824 poem «Притворной нежности не требуй от меня...», that «Я сердца моего не скрою хлад печальный» (ПСС 133-4), a true thinking type would be less likely to recognize the need to make that statement than a feeling type. The marriage of convenience described later in the same poem would also be less likely to strike horror in the heart of a true thinking type:

\begin{quote}
Кто знает? мнением сольюсь я с толпой;  
Подругу, без любви—кто знает?—изберу я.  
На брак обдуманный я руку ей подам,  
И в храме стану рядом с нею,  
Невинной, преданной, быть может, лучшим снам,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{104}Perhaps the clearest example of the poetic persona’s seeming disdain for love in the early period is the poem «Мы пьем в любви отраву сладкую», from 1825. The full text of the poem can be found in Appendix 1, Poem 11. Aside from the “twist” at the end that casts doubt on the poisonous nature of love, it is significant that a poem detailing the poet’s inner emotional life was written at all. As we recall from von Franz’s description of the inner emotional life of dominant thinking types, such people may not be aware of their inner emotional life at all, or may be incapable of expressing it if they do achieve some level of awareness. Noticing the phenomena associated with a particular function, and having confidence in one’s knowledge of those phenomena, is one of the signs that the function has reached some level of differentiation.
Although a true thinking type (or an extraverted feeling type) would, according to Jung, be much more likely to end up in such a marriage, they would also be much less likely to see anything wrong with it. The uniting of hearts and exchange of secret thoughts is something that tends to concern feeling types, especially introverted feeling types; thinking types may be completely oblivious to such things, while an extraverted feeling type might assume that standing at the altar automatically brings everything else along with it. The concerns of the lyrical hero in this poem point to the expression of introverted feeling, even if the feelings themselves that are expressed here are negative.

Another early poem that gives a seemingly negative evaluation of feeling, while demonstrating the introspective awareness of inner states typical of introverted feeling, is «Разуверение», from 1821:

Не искушай меня без нужды
Возвратом нежности твоей:
Разочарованному чужды
Все обольщенья прежних дней!
Уж я не верю увереньям,
Уж я не верую в любовь
И не могу предаться вновь
Раз изменившим сновиденьям!
Слепой тоски моей не множь,
Не заводи о прежнем слова
И, друг заботливый, больнова
В его дремоте не тревожь!
Я сплю, мне сладко усыпление;
Забудь бывалые мечты:
В душе моей одно волненье,
А не любовь пробудишь ты.
Already we see two key words in Baratynsky's poetic vocabulary: «тревожь» and «волненье». Here the verb «тревожить», “to disturb,” is negated, as the poet asks the addressee not to disturb him in his slumber. The adjectival form, «тревожный», will be used later in the poems «Люблю я красавицу...» (for further discussion of the significance of that poem, see the footnote on the next page), «Мудрецу», and «Толпе тревожный день приветен...». In all three poems it is associated in some way with physicality: in «Люблю я красавицу...» with the love of the lover for his black-eyed beauty, in «Мудрецу» with the process of creation (it is used in the line «Нам, из ничтожества вызванным творчества словом тревожным»), and «Толпе тревожный день...» with the day and the un-poetic crowd. This word, then, is associated in Baratynsky's poetry with awakening, arousal, and the physical self (which is not surprising, given its meaning), and also has an ambiguous valuation: it is used to describe unpleasant states or processes, but is essential for the production of art or life.

«Волненье» also appears both in «Разуверение» and «Мудрецу», and again, it has an ambiguous valuation: although unpleasant, it is essential for life and the creative process. In «Разуверение» «волненье» is most obviously contrasted with «любовь», but it is also contrasted, and linked via rhyme, with «усыплене»—lulling to sleep. «Волненье», and not «любовь», is in fact the opposite of sleep in «Разуверение», while in «Мудрецу» it is specifically stated that «Жизнь для волненья дана: жизнь и волненье—одно». «Разуверение», then, has the oft-repeated theme in Baratynsky's poetry of life versus death, pain versus sleep, and seems to prefer the death/sleep option over the life/pain option.
Although this poem, which went on to have a distinguished musical career after Glinka set it to music (ПСС 469), declares a disbelief in love and a desire to sink into sleep, it also, as in the previous poems, shows an awareness of inner emotional states that suggests the differentiation of introverted feeling. Furthermore, this desire, repeated throughout Baratynsky's poetry, to avoid strong emotional excitement is, as we recall from Jung's description of it, typical of introverted feeling and dominant introverted feeling types, who, like all introverts, need to “damp down” their constant state of mental arousal. Introverted feeling types in particular seem to need to keep themselves on an even emotional keel as much as possible, something that Baratynsky’s poetic persona stresses repeatedly as the highest form of bliss.105 Again, while this poem does not present the experience of feeling as positive, it shows an awareness of feeling that a

105 Aside from the poems already cited above, Baratynsky praises the charms of a peaceful kind of love, as opposed to something more passionate, in «Я люблю красавицу...» (1831, published 1835), in which he compares the “peaceful bliss” a lover experiences under the gaze of a blue-eyed beauty, whose “azure eyes” are the “heavenly sign of her heavenly soul,” to the “disturbing love” (любовь тревожная) of a “black-eyed beauty,” whose cradle was rocked by the Devil. The full text of the poem can be found in Appendix 1, Poem 19. This same light/dark, peaceful/disturbing, pleasant/unpleasant dual characterization of women is also present in his long poems «Бал» and «Наложница» (later renamed «Цыганка»), in which dark-complexioned and frighteningly passionate women lose their lovers in a competition with light-complexioned and cool-tempered girls, although not without fatal consequences for themselves and others. In all cases the ideal woman in Baratynsky's poetry is presented as light-complexioned, calm-natured, and not especially attractive, although such female figures do not necessarily inspire the most poetry—the real heroine of both «Бал» and «Наложница» is the “disturbing” woman in the pairing, and there are a number of other lyric poems, especially those ostensibly inspired by Agrafena Fyodorovna Zakrevskaya, describing the “disturbing” type of woman. Agrafena Fyodorovna was the wife of the Governor-General of Finland while Baratynsky was serving in Helsinki, and was «Известная своей красотой, пылким характером, пренебрежительным отношением к светской морали» (ПСС 461). She also attracted the attention of Pushkin, who wrote the poem «Портрет», about her. For the text of the poem and a discussion of Pushkin and Baratynsky’s take on “dark” beauties, see Appendix 2, Note 5.
thinking type, according to von Franz, is unlikely to have. The feeling functions, and
dominant feeling-types, encourage the acceptance, examination, and enjoyment of all
feelings, the negative as well as the positive. Even introverted feeling types, who prefer
to maintain a calm exterior, will tend not to shy away from the examination of their own
feelings of sadness or gloom, and will tend to gain, rather than lose, energy from an
immersion in their own feelings.

If we compare the poems just discussed above with «Молитва», from 1842-3, we
can see the difference in energy levels required to deal with thinking versus feeling:

Царь небес! успокой
Дух болезненный мой!
Заблуждений земли
Мне забвенье пошли,
И на строгий твой рай
Силы сердцу подай.
(ПСС 298)

This poem is yet another example of the theme of peace and forgetfulness, and the
desire to free oneself from the entanglements of earthly life. The important part for our
purposes are the final two lines, in which the poet prays for strength for a “strict
paradise.” This poem was written within a year of «Когда, дитя и страсти и
сомненья...», and so gives us a counterbalancing image of paradise from approximately
the same creative period. In «Когда, дитя и страсти и сомненья...» the love of the
beloved turns a «дикий ад» into «рай», while in «Молитва» the lyrical hero wishes to
escape the pains and confusion of earthly existence for a «строгий рай», for which he
will need strength of heart. In both cases we have the pain of existence, which is marked
by «заблуждение» in «Молитва» and «волненье» in «Когда, дитя и страсти и
сомненья...», and some form of escape from it, which is marked by the absence of
In «Молитва», however, the escape is to a «строгий рай», while in «Когда, дитя и страсти и сомненья...» it is into the arms of the beloved. In either case, though, the poetic persona is seeking protection from the troubles of daily life and earthly existence. The poet of these two poems seems to see two ways out of his suffering: either to a “strict heaven,” which we can think of as thinking, or into the peaceful bliss of his beloved’s company, which we can think of as feeling. Thinking and feeling are thus two potential ways out from what the poet considers to be the “hell” of daily life.

The question that remains, though, is which is the preferred escape. If we refer back to our map of the psyche, we will recall that for the introvert, which is what the “psyche” represented in Baratynsky’s poetry seems to be, it is the auxiliary function that is the primary interface with the outer world. Escape from the outer world could then come from either the dominant function, which is the one most firmly introverted, or, potentially, from the tertiary or inferior functions, which provide “bridges” from consciousness and the “real world” to the unconscious, even though, in the case of an introvert’s inferior function, it also provides a bridge to the outer world through the extraversion of its attitude. The inferior function also, though, provides an escape from the ego, while at the same time allowing a great deal of unwanted unconscious or repressed material to come leaking in. We must therefore attempt to determine which form of escape is the most closely associated with the poetic persona’s conscious ego, and which form is most closely associated with the poetic persona’s inferior function.

Although in the early poetry the threatening external world was often depicted as being the world of feeling, as shown in unhappy love affairs with beautiful but cruel or
careless mistresses, as Baratynsky's poetry became more original, the problem of 
unworthy mistresses dwindled away, while the theme of the external world and physical 
reality as such grew in importance. «Порою ласковую фею...», from 1824, has already 
been mentioned as an early example of external reality infecting the inner fantasy, while 
in the 1825 poem «В дорогу жизни...» external reality demands inner fantasy as 
payment.\textsuperscript{106} 

Imagination, then, is treated as desirable yet fragile in much of Baratynsky's 
poetry, while (as has already been discussed at length), physicality and the “real world,” 
with few but significant exceptions such as «Последняя смерть», acts to crush, take, or 
poison the poet’s fantasy. The poet must therefore seek inventive ways of escaping from 
earthly cares. In «Смерть», from 1829, it is Death that is presented as salvation from 
earthly troubles.\textsuperscript{107} In «Толпе тревожный день...»}, fantasy provides the way out of 
«заблужденье», as well as away from «людские суеты», «заботы юдольные», and 
«забота земная». In this later work fantasy is much more robust than in «Порою 
ласковую фею...» or «В дорогу жизни...», while still remaining within appropriate 
limits, unlike the overdeveloped fantasy and intellectualism that caused people to 
abandon their earthly ties entirely in «Последняя смерть». Engaging in fantasy to the 
point of starvation and sterility is, in Baratynsky's poetic world, taking it too far, even if 
escape from the common lot of physicality and suffering is still desirable. The Death in 
«Смерть» is part of the nature of things, ensuring that no organism or activity goes 

\textsuperscript{106}For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 12. 
\textsuperscript{107}For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 15.
beyond its reasonable bounds, and therefore welcome; the death in «Последняя смерть»
is caused by imbalance and disharmony from excessive one-sidedness—rather as in a
neurosis according to Jungian theory. That being said, the poetic hero still longs to
escape from whatever is oppressing him, and what is oppressing him is frequently the
“real world.” Whether escape takes the form of imagination or annihilation, though, in
both «Смерть» and «Толпе тревожный день...» the ideal is freedom from the burden of
physical existence.

In the poems about the beloved that we have surveyed in connection with feeling
as depicted in Baratynsky's poetry, the beloved acts as a protector from or (as in «Когда,
дитя и страсти и сомненья...») intercessory with the outside or otherwise threatening
world, as the anima/animus, being a bridge figure for the less preferred function(s) and
attitude, would for an introvert, according to Jung's theory. The forms that the external
threat take is significant for our purposes: while in, for example, the 1831 poem «Где
сладкий шепот...» she protects him from the “storms of being,” 108 in «О, верь: ты,
нежная...» the beloved also acts to protect the poet from his own Muse, and in «Есть
что-то в ней...» she prevents him from thinking.

Her interference with his thinking is, we remember, more positive than negative.
Even though she may strike a somewhat awesome and sinister figure—being the empress
of all being, more or less—her thought-clouding powers seem to be welcomed by the
poet. If we compare the feeling of «Есть что-то с ней...» and the thought of «Всё

108 In the first two strophes of the poem a bleak winter landscape is described, and
contrasted with the poet’s own safe and comfortable situation inside and in front of a fire.
In the final strophe the poet’s meditations take him farther afield, to the “storms of
being,” but, warmed by his beloved’s tender love, is able to forget his troubles
temporarily. For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 18.
мысль да мысль!..», we can see that in both poems there is a focus on some
overwhelming power: the poet's feelings for his beloved in the first poem, and the poet's
experience of thought in the second. In «Есть что-то в ней...» the emphasis is on
«неясность», while in «Всё мысль да мысль!..» it is on sharpness and clarity, but the
«неясность» of the first poem seems comforting and welcome, while the sharpness and
clarity of the second poem, impressive as it is to the poet, and essential as it is to his art,
is terrifying and alien.

The attitude towards art displayed in Baratynsky's poetry in general is ambivalent
at best. «Всё мысль да мысль!..» is a prime example, showing as it does the poetic
persona's awe in the face of the “art of the word,” while also showing his fear of it. In
«На посев леса» the poet speaks of giving up his lyre, although in the hope that it will be
taken up by poetry's «могучие и сумрачные дети». In «О, верь: ты, нежная...» the
poet seeks protection from his «бунтующая муза» in the arms of his beloved, while the
following poem, written at the same time as «На посев леса» (ПСС 499), treats the
pleasures and pains of poetic creation half-jokingly, but with an emphasis on the pains
nonetheless:

Люблю я вас, богини пенья,
Но ваш чарующий находим,
Сей сладкий трепет вдохновенья,—
Предтечей жизненных невзгод.

Любовь камень с враждой Фортуны—
Одно. Молчу! Боюсь я,
Чтоб персты, падшие на струны,
Не пробудили вновь перуны,
В которых спит судьба моя.

И отрываясь, полный муки,
От музы, ласковой ко мне.
И говорю: до завтра, звуки!
Both this poem and «O, верь: ты, нежная...» are much lighter in tone than «Всё мысль да мысль!..» and «На посев леса», but all four poems show a certain uncertainty about the poet's relationship with poetry: is it a desirable visitor or something to evade or seek protection from? «O, верь: ты, нежная...» is the only poem of the four to give a definitive answer to that: there, the poet certainly does want to be protected from poetry. In the other three poems mentioned, though, the poet seems to respect or desire poetry, but would still rather be doing something else. Poetry means trouble, and Baratynsky's poetic persona would just as soon avoid trouble as much as possible.

«Болящий дух врачует песнопенье...» and «Когда исчезнет омраченье...» (discussed in Chapter Two), however, both speak of poetry as an escape from whatever is troubling the poet, and refer to «поэзия святая». This could be seen as simply a sign of poetic wavering (or avoidance of one-sidedness), but it is important to note that the aspects of poetic creation that are praised in «Болящий дух врачует песнопенье...» are different from the aspects of poetic creation that the poet seeks to avoid in the other poems:

Болящий дух врачует песнопенье.
Гармонии таинственная власть
Тяжелое испутит заблужденье
И укроит бунтующую страсть.
Душа певца, согласно излияна,
Разрешена от всех своих скорбей;
И чистоту поэзия святая.

109 This can be compared to the attitude towards poetic creation expressed in Pushkin’s 1827 poem «Поэт». For the full text of the poem and a comparison of it with Baratynsky's treatment of poetic creation, see Appendix 2, Note 6.
И мир отдаст причастнице своей.
(ПСС 137)

In this poem it is poetry that «укротит бунтующую страсть», while in «О, верь: ты, нежная....» the poet's beloved is told: «покори себе бунтующую муzu». Poetry and the beloved therefore serve the same purpose in these poems: they both tame forces that are raging or out of control, just as Death does in «Смерть». The enemy in all three cases is anything that is disturbing or agitating. Thought, life, love, and poetry are all unwelcome when they cause trouble or upset, but love and poetry at least have the possibility of bringing a little more harmony to life, as in the following poem from 1831:

В дни безграничных увлечений,
В дни необузданых страстей
Со мною жил превратный гений,
Наперник юности моей.
Он жар восторгов несогласных
Во мне питал и раздувал;
Но соразмерностей прекрасных
В душу носил я идеал:
Когда лишь праздников смятенья
Алкал безумец молодой,
Поэта мерные творенья
Блистали стройной красотой.
Страстей порывы утихают,
Страстей мятежные мечты
Передо мной не затмевают
Законов вечной красоты;
И поэтического мира
Отранный очерк я узрел,
И жизни даровать, о лира!
Твое согласье захотел.
(ПСС 160-1)

In this poem, as in «Болящий дух врачует песнопенье...», the dangers of passion are counterbalanced by the harmony of poetry. Both poems use the word «страсть» to describe the force that poetry is supposed to fight, «Болящий дух...» once as a rhyme word, and «В дни безграничных отвлечений...» three times, once as a
The force that stands against «страсть» is harmony. In «Болящий дух...» it is referred to in line two as «Гармонии таинственная власть», and in line five with the phrase «согласно излита». In «В дни безграничных...» the forces of harmony are associated with measure and control, while «страсть» is equated with being disharmonious and out of control. On the “out of control” side we have «безграничные увлечения»; «необузданые страсти», a negation; «жар восторгов несогласных», another negation; and «безумец», yet another negation. Passion is thus associated with negation or lack, as well as lack of control, and also, through the word «раздувал», with exaggeration or inflation. Passion is also, unsurprisingly, associated with warmth, through the word «жар». This last association, while negative here, places the contrast between the two forces in this poem in a somewhat, and perhaps unintentionally so, ambiguous light. Although the heat of passion is not necessarily the most positive kind of heat, by implying its opposite, coolness or coldness, as being associated with the opposite forces of harmony, the forces of harmony are, even if only slightly, associated with a force that often has a negative cast in Baratynsky's poetry, including in such important poems as «Последний поэт» and «Осень».

Harmony, in the form of «согласье», only appears in the last line of «В дни безграничных...», but its way is paved by the words «соразмерность» and «мерный», referring to measuredness, as well as «утихать», «закон», «стройный», and
— things associated with control or with being outside of the ordinary course of life, but not necessarily with being alive. Not only that, but the poet's «мерные творенья / Блистаи стройной красотой». The root «блест» or «блес(к)», and anything referring to shininess, will, in «Где сладкий шепот...», from the same year as «В дни безграничных...», as well as significant later poems such as «Последний поэт», «Всё мысль да мысль!...», and «Осень», generally be associated with coldness, winter, death, or the terrifying power of thought, as has already been discussed. The poetry of «В дни безграничных...» thus forms the positive side of the normally, though not always, negative coin of cold, winter, thought, and death in Baratynsky's poetry.

Death, we recall from «Смерть», is positive when she contains and controls things that are getting out of bounds or too “hot”—one of Death’s powers is to drive off the «жар любострастия». It is only when she removes someone too soon, as in the end of «Осень» or in the poem «Когда твой голос, о поэт...», or when the forces of cold and the “iron age” lack any counterbalance from the forces of poetry and life, that they become, in Baratynsky's poetic world, evil. The dedication of his poetic persona to the «соразмерности прекрасные» means that even those very «соразмерности» cannot be allowed to gain more sway than is appropriate for them.

We can therefore see Baratynsky's poetic persona as generally shunning whatever is imbalanced, out of control, or, in both the general and the specifically Jungian sense of the word, irrational. This is not to say that the lyrical “I” of much of his poetry does not long for some kind of communion with the irrational world of natural or poetic phenomena, and even, as will be discussed in the conclusion, occasionally achieve it, but

110For the full text and a discussion of this poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 37.
its highest and most natural ideal seems to be that of the rational world of mental
constructions. The question then becomes: what kind of rational world is its “dominant
function,” meaning the place where it feels most comfortable and sure of itself, and what
kind is its “inferior,” meaning the place where it means least comfortable and sure of
itself, where it is closest to the nightmare world of the unconscious. When choosing how
best to order its world according to a rational system of judgment, which does
Baratynsky’s poetic persona prefer, the cool and objective system of thinking or the
warm and subjective system of feeling?

In the earlier poems surveyed in the previous chapter, namely, «Напрасно мы,
Дельвиг...», «Дало две доли...», and «Желанье счастья в меня вдохнули боги...»,
feeling seems to be the less preferred option. The poet desires happiness, but feels unable
to obtain it, and therefore, in a kind of “sour grapes” reaction, tries to turn his back on
feelings in general, although with limited success. There is also, in for example the 1820
poem originally titled «К Коншину»,\(^{111}\) the idea that the suffering inflicted by the
feelings and the pursuit of unobtainable happiness is more ennobling than its absence
would be, and even leads to a more real happiness than the «мнимое счастье» of less
sensitive souls.

In these early poems, then, the poetic persona has a hazy vision of what happiness
is, and an ambiguous view of the relationship between feeling and happiness. Feeling or
feelings are troublesome, but fate is harsh and cruel. The poetic persona blames his
feelings for his suffering—because they make him want to rail against fate instead of
accepting it, so that he cannot find the peace he longs for. This theme is especially

\(^{111}\)For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 1.
prominent in Baratynsky's early works, but is repeated in poems from his more mature period, notably in «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы...». Feelings or feeling in these early works are for the most part opposed to peace, which is the poetic persona's ideal of happiness, although at this point happiness and peace tend to be opposed rather than united.

In these early poems the intellect seems to the poetic persona to offer a viable alternative to feeling for the achievement of happiness, or at least peace. Reconciliation with fate and repression or abandonment of desires, the poetic persona imagines, will save him from all this trouble and suffering. Unfortunately (he thinks), the feelings and passions keep bursting out despite his best efforts to contain them and channel them into some peaceful direction.

In these early poems the conflict between thought and feeling is so ambiguous and unclarified that it is difficult, therefore, to know which is dominant and which is not. It is very easy to read some of these poems as dominant thinking fighting against the pressure of inferior feeling trying to burst out and take over, and that is the way the poetic persona seems to experience it. However, there is a significant shift in the more mature works, as the conflict is articulated more clearly, and some of the experience the poetic persona of the early 1820s was complaining of is actually acquired.

«О счасти с младенчества тоскуя...» is the first poem surveyed here in which the shift is clearly evident. In this poem, intellect or «ум» is presented as an alternative to the pains of living and feeling, but is rejected by the lyrical hero, after consideration, as being the way to death, not life. Although the message that «Истина» offers is believed to be true, it is too harsh for the lyrical “I” to accept, at least for the present. The truth of
the intellect is declared to be appropriate for the resignation of death, not the struggles of life.

In «Последний поэт», which appeared in Сумерки but was written in the mid-1830s, the poetic persona has taken another step away from the intellect and towards feeling, although intellect holds the upper hand, ruling in both the external world and even in the “last poet’s” own mind, as he is unable to achieve freedom or solitude even in his thoughts. Nonetheless, his doomed struggle against the forces of commerce and enlightenment is presented as a brave one. «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы?..» also promotes the brave if doomed struggle of the passions and feelings against the crushing powers of outside forces.

These poems from the middle period of Baratynsky's verse show a reverse of the conflict that appeared in the earlier poems. At first the poet was attempting to calm the storms of passion through coolheaded intellect and experience; now the poet is attempting to flee or fight against the imposition of intellect, enlightenment, and the iron age of commerce and industry. At the same time, if we take into account poems such as «О, верь: ты, нежная...», written at approximately the same time as «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы?..» and slightly before «Последний поэт», we can see the poetic persona longing to escape trouble and excitement for the pleasures of «тишина». This desired «тишина», however, as opposed to the cold quiet of death or the intellect, is full of «любовь» and a «сердечный союз». It is this other kind of «тишина», free of the ever-troublesome «страсть» but still allowing for a «сердечный союз» with a beloved (and not disturbing) woman, while also protecting the lyrical hero from thought, that seems to be the ideal. Glimpses of it appeared in early poems such as
«Пора покинуть, милый друг...» and «Взгляни на звезды...», while by the early 1830s it seems to be firmly entrenched as the summit of happiness—even as Baratynsky was writing his long narrative poems «Бал» and «Наложница» about the dangers of passion.

From a Jungian perspective, the thought/feeling conflict in the early poems is too muddled to draw any useful conclusions, other than the fact of its existence. The fear of the poetic persona of «страсть» and overly demanding romantic entanglements, combined with the stated desire to achieve calmness through a withdrawal from life and society, often seems like the fear of introverted thinking when faced with inferior extraverted feeling.

The longing for a «сердечный союз», however, and the desire to retire to its protection in a retreat from the external world, which appears early on in «Пора покинуть, милый друг...», and then more and more often starting in the second half of the 1820s, is characteristic of feeling, and specifically introverted feeling, as we recall from Jung's description of the introverted feeling type, which keeps its feelings to itself and prefers to turn inwards, towards those inner feelings, rather than outwards, towards the demands of the external world. Introverted feeling is rarely visible to other eyes, and often does not seem like feeling at all, as it does not like to express itself strongly or respond to the strong feelings of others. The rejection of «страсть» is as characteristic of introverted feeling as it is of the thinking types. It is extraverted feeling types, or the extraverted irrational types, who are most likely to display and seek out «страсть».

Another aspect of introverted feeling is also relevant to its reticence in Baratynsky's poetry: namely, that Jung, who was living in the tail-end of the era that was beginning to flower when Baratynsky was writing, considered it to be a “feminine” type.
Although all men, according to Jung’s theory, possess introverted feeling, and some men, according to MBTI results, are in fact dominant introverted feeling types (and may even elevate its values to a position of cultural prominence, as seems to have been the case in the Sentimentalist movement), it is a “feminine” function now and, if one looks at gender role norms for the nineteenth century in Europe and Russia, a “feminine” function then as well (we can think of the “angel of the house” and other such stereotypes of quiet, domestic, and faithful women). Even in an activity in which feeling is essential, such as poetry, the writer would have to be careful not to be too “girly,” and be engaged in constant warfare with the tendencies of femininity to overwhelm his carefully constructed masculinity.\(^\text{112}\) Despite the legacy of Sentimentalism, expressing introverted feeling values in a genuine manner would have meant getting out of step with society at large, including its more progressive members, as can be seen by Belinsky’s mixed reactions to Baratynsky’s verse and much of the other criticism he drew from contemporaries and later critics such as Mirsky.

This sense of being not in tune with the rest of society pervades Baratynsky’s poetry, especially the later works,\(^\text{113}\) and is characteristic of the introverted attitude.

\(^{112}\) For a detailed discussion of gender issues, including narrative transvestism and the use of deixis to objectify and control the female characters in Baratynsky’s long poems, see Luc Jean Beaudoin’s dissertation, “Evgenij Baratynskij’s Narrative Poems and Evgenij Onegin: The Transformation of the Romantic Poema,” as well as his articles “Baratynskij’s Tales in Verse: The Social Implications of Poetic Genre” and “Character Associations and the Romantic Absolute in E. A. Baratynskii’s The Gypsy Girl.” Narrative transvestism itself is described in detail in Madeleine Kahn’s book Narrative Transvestism: Rhetoric and Gender in the Eighteenth-Century English Novel.

\(^{113}\) As well as works also discussed such as «Рассеивает грусть пиров веселый шум» (Appendix 1, Poem 5) and «Когда твой голос, о поэт...» (Appendix 1, Poem 37), other poems praising solitude or describing the poet's isolation include «Бокал», written 1835
When using the extraverted attitude, one either accepts the status quo as a given and attempts to adapt oneself to it, or decides to change it. In either case, one engages with it directly. It is when one is using the introverted attitude that one prefers to withdraw from the outside world, as Baratynsky’s poetic persona so often does.

The withdrawal from the outside world which becomes so marked in Baratynsky’s poetry as it matures, combined with a highly sensitized awareness of inner psychological states and a rejection of strong emotional reactions, suggest an orientation towards the introverted attitude in general, and the introverted feeling function in particular, in Baratynsky’s poetic persona during the middle period of his career. Its very lack of visibility is suggestive of its presence, for introverted feeling tends to keep itself to itself, and, being as a general rule not only “feminine,” but antithetical to the commercial values of the “iron age,” would have been discouraged.

In the later poems surveyed in this dissertation, “thought” takes on the sinister tone to be expected from something mired in the unconscious. In «Приметы» overuse of «ум» causes humans to become deaf to the voice of nature, while in «Всё мысль да мысль!..», «мысль» is a terrifying weapon that overwhelms earthly life. This is not to say that «ум» and particularly «мысль» do not have a positive place in Baratynsky’s poetry: being the gateway to the unconscious, they possess a sick fascination for the poet, who returns to them again and again in an attempt to come to grips with them.

__________________________

and published in Сумерки, (see Appendix 1, Poem 24), especially the third stanza; «Алкивиад», the first poem in the trilogy of anthology poems written in elegiac distichs (see Appendix 1, Poem 25); «Осень», stanza 14 (Appendix 1, Poem 27); and «На посеv леса» (Appendix 1, Poem 36), stanzas six and seven. The lines «Всех чувств благих я подавал им голос / Ответа нет!» from «На посеv леса» seem particularly characteristic of frustrated introverted feeling.
The connection between thought or thinking and the creative process is also suggestive of its connection to the unconscious and its role as the inferior function. In the following two poems, «мысль» is directly linked to the process of growth, death, and rebirth:

From 1831-2: О мысль! тебе удел цветка: 
Он свежий манит мотылька, 
Прельщает пчелку золотую, 
К нему с любовью мошка льнет, 
И стрекоза его поет; 
Утратил прелесть молодую 
И чередой своей поблек—
Где пчелка, мошка, мотылек? 
Забыт он роем их летучим, 
И никому в нем нужды нет; 
А тут зерном своим падучим 
Он зарождает новый цвет. 
(ПСС 143)

From 1838; reprinted in Сумерки:

Сначала мысль, воплощена 
В поэму сжатую поэта, 
Как дева юная, темна 
Для невнимательного света; 
Потом, осмелевшись, она 
Уже увертлива, речиста, 
Со всех сторон своих видна, 
Как искушенная жена 
В свободной прозе романиста; 
Болтунья старая, затем 
Она, подъемля крик нахальный, 
Плодит в полемике журнальной 
Давно уж ведомое всем. 
(ПСС 260-1)

Here, as in «Всё мысль да мысль!..»), «мысль» is associated with the process of creation, and the last poem, specifically poetic creation. In these two poems, however,
«мысль» and the creative process is linked not with coldness, brightness, or sharpness, but with flowering, fading, and—in the earlier but not the later poem—rebirth.

This theme of flowering, fading, and corruption is again linked explicitly to female beauty in the poem «Цветок»,\textsuperscript{114} from 1821, and «Филяда с каждой зимою...», written sometime before the death of its addressee, Elizaveta Mikhailovna Khitrovo, in May of 1839\textsuperscript{115} (\textit{PICC} 488-9). These two poems, as well as being rather ungallant, allow us to see a connection between “thought” or “thinking” and female figures, as we would expect to find if thinking is, in fact, an unconscious function, and therefore linked with the anima-complex. Although, as has already been discussed, thinking is a stereotypically masculine function, and therefore difficult to depict in feminine form, in these poems Baratynsky does manage to connect thought and femininity, and in the negative terms we would expect. The association of “thought” with blooming and fading in «О мысль! тебе удел цветка...» associates it with flowering and creativity (presumably “feminine” attributes), but, in «Цветок», these attributes have already been linked with vanity, foolishness, and failure. Furthermore, in «О мысль! тебе удел цветка...» the poetic persona is distancing himself from and objectifying the «мысль» that is the subject of the poem. The «мысль» of «О мысль! тебе удел цветка...» is separate from the poetic persona, just as it is in «Всё мысль да мысль!..», although in the first case the poetic persona sees the «мысль» as an object to be scrutinized, and in second case, the poetic persona sees himself as the object of the «мысль». In neither case, however, is the «мысль» an organic and welcome part of the poetic persona's being.

\textsuperscript{114}For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 6.

\textsuperscript{115}For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 30.
In «Филида с каждой зимою...» and «Сначала мысль, воплощена...», another poem from Сумерки, we have depictions of the corruption and decay of female attractiveness: physical attractiveness in the first poem, and psychological attractiveness in the second.116 Although there is no mention of «мысль» in «Филида с каждой зимою...», its appearance in Сумерки along with «Сначала мысль, воплощена...» makes the similarities between the two poems clear.117 Here, even more so than in the

116In The Second Sex, Simone de Beauvoir discusses the peculiar horror of female aging for the male psyche:

However, this is woman’s first lie, her first treason: namely, that of life itself—life which, though clothed in the most attractive forms, is always infested by the ferments of age and death. The very use man makes of woman destroys her most precious powers: weighed down by maternities, she loses her erotic attraction; even when she is sterile, the mere passage of time alters her charms. Infirm, homely, old, woman is repellent. She is said to be withered, faded, as might be said of a plant. To be sure, in man, too, decrepitude is terrifying; but normally man does not experience older men as flesh; he has only an abstract unity with these separate and strange bodies. It is upon woman’s body—this body which is destined for him—that man really encounters the deterioration of the flesh...The old woman, the homely woman, are not merely objects without allure—they arouse hatred mingled with fear. In them reappears the disquieting figure of the Mother, when once the charms of the Wife have vanished. (192)

In the case of Baratynsky’s poetry, the comely woman generally replaces the homely woman in this description, but other than that, it is quite an accurate description of his poetic treatment of women.

117Although the appearance of the following poem in Сумерки might seem to offer a more positive depiction of female aging, the differences between it and «Филида с каждой зимою...» are significant:

Всегда и в пурпуре и в злате,
В красе негаснущих страстей,
Ты не вздыхашь об утрате
Какой-то младости твоей.
И юных граций ты прелестней!
И твой закат пышней, чем день!
Ты сладострастней, ты телесней
Живых, блестательная тень!
(ПСС 254)
pairing of «Цветок» and «О мысль! тебе удел цветка...», which were written ten years apart, the disgust the poetic persona feels for both alien aging female flesh and «мысль» is evident.

The attempts of the poetic persona to distance himself from both «мысль» and the flesh (especially female flesh) are in contrast to his close association with the feelings that his beloved arouses in him in «Есть что-то в ней...», «О, верь: ты, нежная...», and «Когда, дитя и страсти и сомненья...». In those poems we have a very unclear picture of what the beloved is like, but a very clear picture of the lyrical hero's inner feelings for her; in «Цветок», «О мысль! тебе удел цветка...», «Филида с каждой зимою...», and «Сначала мысль, воплощена...» we have a clear picture of our heroine, whether she is called «Людмила», «Филида», or «мысль», seemingly uncorrupted by the poet's subjective feelings about her. This seeming uncorruption is, of course, false, for the poetic persona's attempts to distance himself from his heroines and give an objective description of them is highly indicative of his own subjective relationship to them—that is to say, that he wishes to distance himself from them and gain control over them as much as possible. While the poet is at the mercy of «мысль» in «Всё мысль да мысль!..», by transforming «мысль» into physical form, and specifically female physical form, he is able to gain the illusion of having the upper hand over it in «Сначала мысль, воплощена...».

Although this poem seems to be a celebration of aging female beauty, as well as passion and carnality, it is in fact dedicated to a shadow, and so any physicality it possesses is purely imaginary.

It is also possible to see parallels between this and «Скульптор» (see Appendix 1, Poem 35), in which the sculptor engages in the act of creation, and also control, by sculpting a female figure. Once again the control of the male artist over his female
This illusion is, of course, illusory. The «мышь» of «Сначала мысль, воплощена...» is no more under the control of the poet than the «мышь» of «Всё мысль да мысль!..» is. The «мышь» of «Сначала мысль, воплощена...» begins her career in the close confines of the «поэма сжатая поэта», but she soon twists out of his control and makes for the open spaces of the «свободная проза романиста», before becoming old and loud in journalistic polemics. The «мышь», then, transcends poetry (albeit in a negative and unattractive form) here, just as she does in «Всё мысль да мысль!..».

In short, the poetic persona of Baratynsky’s later works has an ambivalent attitude towards thought or thinking, bouncing back and forth between admiration and fear. He makes attempts to objectify or control by identifying it with femaleness and physicality, but his victories are incomplete and short-lived. In «Всё мысль да мысль!..» his submission to thought is complete, as he is overwhelmed by its omnipresent sharpness and brightness, and declares himself “thought’s priest,” using the word «жрец», which is related to the word «жертва», or sacrifice, to describe his status.

This ambivalent, half-fearful, half-desiring, as well as half-controlling and half-submissive, attitude towards thought is indicative of the inferior function. It is the part of ourselves that feels least like our ourselves, that we would most like to be rid of and most like to gain conscious control of. It is also the most exciting and potentially creative

subject is undermined, this time by his own submission to the forces of «нера», although it is made very clear who is the subject and who is the object here, and who wields the upper hand, not to mention the weapon.

This poem is considered to be a response to the debate over poetry versus prose taking place in the 1830s, in which Baratynsky, despite his occasional forays into prose, took the side of poetry (ПСС 490). It seems impossible that this is not also some kind of response to the «даль свободного романа» of the penultimate stanza of Eugene Onegin. Baratynsky was familiar with the novel and held a mixed opinion of it, considering it to be brilliant and yet also too derivative of Byron.
aspect of our personalities, acting as it does as a link with the unconscious. Because of
the difficulty of gaining any sort of conscious control over it (full conscious control is
impossible), and the fascination it often holds for its bearer, it may become the most
obvious part of the personality, especially in the case of the introvert, whose inferior
function is extraverted.

Because of the “tremendous charge of emotion” (Franz 11) connected with the
inferior function, a person may not always know what their inferior function is, believing
that they are most themselves when they encounter these intense emotions brought up by
the inferior function, even if they are in fact “most themselves” when they are doing what
they do most habitually and easily. To find the inferior function, however, it is necessary
to ask: “what is the greatest cross for the person? where is his greatest suffering? where
does he feel that he always knocks his head against the obstacle and suffers hell?” (16).
It is the constant struggle and frustration that mark the inferior function, as well as the
excitement and attraction.

From that perspective, Baratynsky is the “poet of thought” because of his constant
struggle with thought, and his inability to come to grips with it. Thought stands in the
position of the inferior function in the “psyche” of his poetry precisely because it is
where his poetic persona is most helpless and yet most creative.

This struggle with thought and the thought-feeling conflict is, as we have seen,
present in most of Baratynsky’s poetry from the beginning to the end of his career.
Occasionally, though, his poetic persona would find some kind of reconciliation of the
binary oppositions haunting. In the final chapter we will look at two moments of such
reconciliation in his poetic oeuvre, one associated with the beginning of his career, and one from the very end of it.
Chapter Five
Many Stormy Questions Have I Resolved: Finland, Italy, and the Reconciliation of Opposites in Baratynsky’s Poetry

The poem quoted above, most likely written in 1831 (ПСС 476), introduces two important themes of this concluding chapter. First is the theme of place and of foreignness versus the homeland. In this poem, the lyrical hero contemplates his sojourn in Finland after having returned to his homeland—that is, Russia. This poem thus sets up an important dichotomy in Baratynsky’s poetry: that between the homeland and the foreign countries he visited, either willingly (in the case of Italy), or unwillingly (in the case of Finland).

The second theme this poem introduces is that of the reconciliation of opposing forces or ideas. In “Мой неискусный карандаш...», the lyrical hero envisions the “stern
view” and “bare cliffs” of “mournful Finland,” the place where he “set aside his belief in happiness”—but he smiles as he does so. Although this poem revisits the idea of giving up on happiness that we have seen in poems such as «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг…», «Дало две доли…», and «Желанье счастья в меня вдохнули боги…», he does so with a smile. This suggests a fundamental shift in the attitude of the poetic persona, one that enables him to accept the presence of contradictory concepts or external conditions that prevent him from achieving happiness. In this chapter I will examine two poems in which Baratynsky's poetic persona demonstrates this shift and transcends the binary conflict that occupies so much of the poetry: one originally composed in the beginning of his career and set in Finland, his lyrical hero's land of exile, and the other from the end of his career and set in Italy, his lyrical hero's “promised land.” The use of the word “transcend” above is not accidental, as this transcendence of binary conflict by Baratynsky’s poetic persona will also be connected with Jung’s concept of the transcedent function, to be described below.

We will begin in Finland, where, as was mentioned in Chapter One, Baratynsky spent several years serving in the military. In January of 1820, shortly after he had begun his military service, he was transferred from Petersburg to Fredrikshamn (now Hamina), a town in southeastern Finland. Although in his poetry he depicts his service in Finland as a tragic exile and himself as a prisoner, and although before his posting to Finland he had perhaps been in danger of real exile (Xerco 57), his actual situation was not so bleak. Far from being a prisoner, during his three years in Fredrikshamn he often journeyed from it for both official and personal reasons. His regiment was quartered in

---

120 See Appendix 4 for photographs of the towns where Baratynsky lived in Finland.
Villmanstrand (now Lappeenranta) in the summer of 1820. According to his friend and commander N. M. Konshin, while at Villmanstrand Baratynsky «сознавался, что в жизни еще не имел такого поэтического лета, что чувствует себя как бы перенесенным в мир баснословной старины с его колоссальными размерами и силы и страсти» (Летопись 98). He was also allowed lengthy personal leaves, during which he returned to Russia, often for months at a time. His military duties were light, and he was able to devote much of his time to writing poetry.

In January of 1823 he was transferred to Ruotsinsalmi (now Kotka), another town in southeastern Finland, where he began work on his first long narrative poem, «Эда».

For the next two years he was largely stationed in Ruotsinsalmi, although he also passed most of the fall of 1824 in Helsingfors (Helsinki), before being transferred to Kymen that January. He spent the summer of 1825 in Petersburg, returning to Helsinki via Vyborg in August. That winter he returned to Russia, retired from the army, and never returned to Finland.

While in Finland he wrote several poems about the country and his sojourn there. In most of these poems the attitude of the poetic persona towards Finland is ambiguous. In «К Кюхельбекеру» and «Послание к Барону Дельвигу» he depicts himself as the victim of cruel fate, separated from his friends and exiled to a “deserted” and “severe” country, but still a poet. In «Эда» Finnish nature is not entirely without its charms, but the emphasis is on its severity, stoniness and coldness. And in the poem «Отъезд» or «Прощай, отчизна непогоды» Finland is explicitly called the “fatherland of bad

\[121\] For the full text of these poems, see Appendix 1, Poems 3 and 4.

\[122\] For the full text, see Appendix 1, Poem 8.
weather.” Nonetheless, in «Прощай, отчизна непогоды» the poet describes being haunted by the memory of Finland as he returns to his homeland, and concludes that, despite his unhappiness there, he was able to remain true to his muses. In «Финляндия» this motif of the lonely poet wandering amongst stony Finnish nature and finding comfort in his craft is given the most explicit, and most explicitly positive, treatment. In its final redaction, which is the one we will consider here, the poet does in fact appear to achieve the happiness or peace of mind he so desperately craves.

Baratynsky first composed «Финляндия» in late winter or early spring of 1820, shortly after arriving in Hamina. The poem was read to the Free Society of Amateurs of Russian Letters (Вольное общество любителей русской словесности) on April 19, 1820 (Летопись 97), and appeared in both the 1827 and 1835 collections of Baratynsky’s verse (97). Like most of Baratynsky’s poems, it was extensively edited between its first and last publication. Its placement as the first poem in both the 1827 and 1835 volumes demonstrates the importance Baratynsky gave it. This version is from the 1835 collection and so represents Baratynsky’s final vision of the poem. The use of the 1835 version as the canonical one, which most collections of his work do, also means that we will be examining the product of fifteen years of poetic development, so that this “early” poem in fact evolved through Baratynsky’s early and middle periods, receiving its final form in the same year that «Последний поэт» was written. In that context, its celebration of poetic creation is even more striking.

I will discuss some of the differences between the 1820 and 1835 versions later, but for now it should be noted that in the final redaction the descriptions are of a summer

123 For the original version of «Финляндия», see Appendix 1, Poem 2.
landscape. The first draft of the poem, however, was written during Baratynsky’s first winter in Finland and contains a much more wintry atmosphere. The conclusion of the 1820 version is also less emphatically positive than the conclusion of the 1835 version, as in the 1820 version the poet’s escape into poetry is, it is suggested, as much the result of self-delusion as a real devotion to the act of creation.

Since the Finnish landscape plays a central part in the lyrical hero’s search for self in this poem, scholars have repeatedly raised the question of the realism or lack thereof in Baratynsky’s depiction of Finnish nature. Their conclusions, however, are not uniform, with some emphasizing the accuracy of the descriptions, some emphasizing the presence of Romantic clichés about wild Northern nature, and some emphasizing the individual coloring Baratynsky puts on these images. In his discussion of the poem, Dees mentions its “realistic account of [the] landscape and northern nightfall” (37). Kjetsaa, on the other hand, says that «природа Финляндии показана в поэзии Баратынского не такою, какою она есть в действительности, но какою она представлялась ему в его романтическом воображении» (Хетсо 352), while Tojbin considers «Финляндия» to show «картины романтического Севера через призму оссиановской поэзии» (Тойбин 49). Otto Boele agrees with Kjetsaa and Tojbin, but adds, “although many of the elements of the conventional northern landscape are still there (especially the rocks), it has acquired a modal coloration which is quite refreshing” (“Finland in the Work of Jevgenij Baratynskij” 30). Dora Burton, however, claims:

In ‘Finljandija’ there is no concrete, visual, objectively descriptive imagery of Finland. In its place there is imagery which appears symbolic of time, or sound, or space; and the reader ‘sees’ the Finnish landscape as it is being abstracted, reflected upon, and appraised by the lyrical hero…All that surrounds the lyrical hero, all that he meditates upon becomes important only so far as he reflects upon it, and it is through this
reflective meditation on the theme of times past that the lyrical hero of ‘Finljandija’ acquires concrete individual and emotional color, and the lyrical theme of the poem is developed.” (“Boratynskij: The Evolution of his Style and Poetic Themes” 99)

This opinion seems to contradict the “realistic account” of Finnish nature Dees sees in the poem. Judging by the criticism, the reader may be left to wonder whether “Finland” is a faithful travelogue of Baratynsky’s visit there, or a series of self-reflections blind to the poet’s external environment.

These contradictory statements suggest that all points of view have merit. The area around Hamina/Fredrikshamn, where Baratynsky was stationed when he wrote «Финляндия», does in fact possess coniferous forests and rocky seashores, as well as stony outcroppings that to the Romance-addled eyes of a young poet from the Tambov steppe would seem like cliffs. However, the reference to the piracy of “Odin’s children” is, quite aside from its Romantic hyperbole, more appropriate for Finland’s Swedish conquerors, not the native Finnish population. And, as shall be shown in the following analysis of «Финляндия», while the poem begins with the poet’s gaze trained outward, it ends with the poet’s gaze fixed firmly inward, rendering external circumstances entirely incidental.

124 Appendix 4 contains photographs of the landscape around Hamina.

125 Finnish mythology is distinct from that of its Indo-European neighbors. It would be more correct to call Finns the children of Väinämöinen, the hero of the Finnish national epic Kalevala. Furthermore, as Finns have historically been the conquered rather than the conquerors, Baratynsky’s claims of their warlike nature only add insult to injury. In The Popular Poetry of the Finns, from 1900, Charles J. Billson gives this condescending but probably more accurate description of pre-20th-century Finnish culture: “The war-songs are very few...although the Finn can fight well when obliged to fight, he is not naturally warlike, and his songs of war are few and feeble” (18).
In all Baratynsky’s poems about Finland, Finnish nature serves as both a mirror and a foil for the Russian lyrical hero’s moods and meditations. In the final redaction of «Финляндия» it is not presented as overtly gloomy or hostile, although it does have its “stern” and “stony” aspects. In fact, the poet refers to it as “marvelous” (чудно, from the word чудо, meaning “miracle”). Marvelous, however, implies the unexpected. In spite of its beauty, Finnish nature in «Финляндия» is shaky and shifting. Its uncertain, unpredictable character is echoed in the formal aspects of the poem, to which we will now turn our attention. The full text of the 1835 redaction of the poem is provided below.

Финляндия (1820)
В свои расселины вы приняли певца,
Граниты финские, граниты вековые,
Земли ледяного венца
Богатыри сторожевые.
Он с лирою между вас. Поклон его, поклон
Громадам, миру современным;
Подобно им, да будет он
Во все годы неизменным!

Как всё вокруг меня пленяет чудно взор!
Там необъятными водами
Слился море с небесами;
Тут с каменной горы к нему дремучий бор
Сошел тяжелыми стопами,
Сошел—и смотрится в зерцале гладких вод!
Уж поздно, день погас; но ясен неба свод,
На скалы финские без мрака ночь нисходит,
И только что себе в убор
Алмазных звезд ненужный хор
На небосклон она выводит!
Так вот отчество Одиновых детей,
Грозы народов отдаленных!
Так это колыбель их беспокойных дней,
Разбоям громким посвященных!

Умолк призывный щит, не слышен скальда глас,
Воспламененный дуб учас,
Развеял буйный ветр торжественные клики;
Сыны не ведают о подвигах отцов,
    И в дольном прахе их богов
Лежат низверженные лики!
И всё вокруг меня в глубокой тишине!
О вы, носившие от брега к брегу бои,
Куда вы скрылись, полочные герои?
    Ваш след исчез в родной стране.
Выль, на скалы ее вперив скорбящи очи,
Плывете в облаках туманною толпой?
Выль? дайте мне ответ, услышьте голос мой,
    Зовущий к вам среди молчанья ночи.

Сыны могучие сих грозных, вечных скал!
Как отделились вы от каменной отчизны?
    Зачем печальны вы? зачем я прочитал
На лицах сумрачных улыбку укоризны?
И вы скрылись в обители теней!
И ваши имена не пощадило время!
Что ж наши подвиги, что слава наших дней,
    Что наше ветреное племя?
О, всё своей чредой исчезнет в бездне лет!
Для всех один закон, закон уничтоженья,
Во всем мне слышится таинственный привет
    Обетованного забвенья!

Но я, в безвестности, для жизни жизнь любя,
    Я, беззаботливый душою,
Вострепещу ль перед судьбою?
Не вечный для времен, я вечен для себя:
    Не одному ль воображенью
Гроза их что-то говорит?
Мгновенье мне принадлежит,
    Как я принадлежу мгновенью!
Что нужды до былых иль будущих племен?
Я не для них бренчу незвонкими струнами;
Я, невнимаемый, довольно награжден
За звуки звуками, а за мечты мечтами.

(ПСС 67-8)

In its final redaction, «Финляндия» is composed of four strophes of unequal length, and is written in mixed four- and six-foot iambics. As was discussed at the beginning of Chapter Two, in general Baratynsky did not challenge the formal
conventions of his time. His use of form nonetheless serves to create an individual and striking result that underscores the poem’s content.

The first strophe is written in simple alternating masculine and feminine rhymes, while the three subsequent strophes have more complex rhyme schemes. In the first, and shortest, strophe, the scene is set amongst the Finnish granite. The poet of the poem describes these boulders of Finnish granite as being the contemporaries of the world itself, and declares that he, like them, will be immortal. In the first strophe, therefore, Baratynsky sets up the idea of constancy throughout time, and also the first union of opposing elements in the poem: the poet will be like the boulders of Finnish granite in his changelessness, while the boulders themselves are animate. This creates a merging of the human and natural worlds, as the bard becomes like rock, while the rocks are “Guardian heroes” (богатыри сторожевые).

The second strophe begins with a description of Finnish nature, one that, as Otto Boele notes, is “very animated” (“Finland in the Work of Jevgenij Baratynskij” 30). In the first three lines there are three “characters”: the stone hill (echoing the “stone” theme of the previous strophe), the sea, and the pine woods (бор). The stone hill (which brings us back to the first strophe) and the sea are brought together by the movement of the woods. The woods themselves are a very interesting character. They are described as “дремучий”, meaning “thick,” but the word sounds similar to “дремлющий”, or “dozing,” which was in fact the word used in the original version of that line. This suggests that the forest is half asleep. At the same time, it moves about and looks at itself in the mirror, making it seem not only awake, but quite human. This parallels what happened in the first strophe: there, the human poet was like the natural world of rocks;
here, the forest develops human characteristics. Similarly, the mirror it looks into is actually the sea, so that natural and artificial objects are conflated.

The next two lines continue the melding of incompatible elements, while also returning to the theme of time introduced in the first strophe. We are told: «Уж поздно, день погас; но ясен неба свод, / На скалы финские без мрака ночь нисходит». Here we have a night without darkness—an obvious contradiction—as well as the idea of time, introduced through the sunset and the night. This sunsetless sunset and this night without darkness continue not only the theme of time, but of timelessness—the witness to this scene has stepped out of the ordinary rules of time and space.

The night here is not only without darkness, but is anthropomorphized, like the forest, or the boulders from the first strophe. The darkless night arrays herself in the needless finery of diamond stars, giving her a very human character and also—as with the mirror of smooth waters—turning a natural object (in this case, stars) into an artificial one—an убор, that is, decoration or fancy attire.

The strophe ends with the wondering statement that this is the fatherland of Odin’s warlike children. Concluding with a description of the fighting Finns sets up a nice opposition with the next strophe. Before moving onto strophe three, though, it is necessary to examine the structure of strophe two more closely.

It contains 15 lines, making it the only strophe with an odd number of lines (strophe one has 8 lines, strophe three has 26, and strophe four has 12). Interestingly, in the first redaction of the poem, all the strophes had an even number of lines. The original version of strophe two (available in Appendix 1, Poem 2), had twenty lines, and could be subdivided into five quatrains, with a regular pattern of three lines of iambic hexameter.
followed by a line of tetrameter. In the final version it is reduced to fifteen lines, setting it apart from the other strophes and also giving it an interesting rhyme scheme and distribution of line lengths, which are schematized below:

**Strophe 2—Rhyme Scheme**

```
Как всё вокруг меня пленяет чудно взор! а
Там необъятными водами B
Слилося море с небесами; B
Тут с каменной горы к нему дремучий бор а
Сошел тяжелыми стопами, B
Сошел—и смотрится в зерцале гладких вод! с
Уж поздно, день погас; но ясен неба свод, c
На скалы финские без мрака ночь нисходит D
И только что себе в убор a
Алмазных звезд ненужный хор a
На небосклон она выводит! D
Так вот отечество Одиновых детей, e
Грозы народов отдаленных! F
Так это колыбель их беспокойных дней, e
Разбойм громким посвященных! F
```

The unusual nature of the rhyme scheme is most clearly seen with the “а” and “B” rhymes. The “а” rhyme (-оп) appears in lines one and four as the outer pair in a ring rhyme. Then in lines nine and ten it is the inner couplet in another ring rhyme. The “B” rhyme (-ами), meanwhile, is the inner couplet in the first ring rhyme, but there is also a lone “B” rhyme at the end of line five, making it the odd rhyme out. The “B” rhyme also has a different sound quality from those around it, further isolating it as anomalous. The “с” and “D” rhymes both contain a stressed «од/от» sound—вод, свод, нисходит, выводит. The “а” rhyme also contains a stressed «о»—взор, бор, убор, хор. Eight out of the first eleven lines thus have almost, but not quite, identical rhymes, potentially destabilizing or failing to fulfill the listener's expectations.
The distribution of line lengths also contributes to the instability of the first eleven lines. Because of the odd number of lines, the alternation between hexameter and tetrameter appears to almost, but not quite, follow a predictable pattern. It begins with a ring structure, moves to alternation, and then goes into sets of three, as can be seen by the graphical layout of the poem on the page. This unsettling unpredictability in line length is combined with instability in the combination of line length and rhyme. Lines one and four, the first –op rhyme, are in hexameter, while lines nine and ten, the second –op rhyme, are in tetrameter. The D rhyme (одит) combines a line of hexameter and a line of tetrameter. This structure, and the similarities in sound between the “a,” “c,” and “D” rhymes combined with the odd number of “B” rhymes, create an effect of melding, but also of disorientation, perhaps similar to that of someone witnessing this animate landscape in which the sea and the sky flow together and the night comes without darkness. It is only in the final four lines that we return to the stability of alternating rhymes and line lengths, reorienting ourselves to the more human world of Odin’s warring children.

In the third, and, at 26 lines, the longest, strophe, the poet confronts the fact that all things are not unchanging. He begins by describing the disappearance of the pagan Nordic customs ascribed to Finland, before exclaiming, “И всё вокруг меня в глубокой тишине!” This echoes the opening of strophe two, while simultaneously contrasting with it: in strophe two the poet’s gaze is captivated by Finland’s animate landscape, while in strophe three the poet is surrounded by the silence of a landscape that is populated only by the shades of dead heroes. This leads him to meditate on the inevitable decay and disappearance that faces everything and everyone. Strophe three ends with a statement of
universal destruction and oblivion, in direct contrast with the declaration of the
immutability of both the natural and human worlds that concludes strophe one.

In strophe four the poet contemplates the ephemerality of life and fame that was
introduced in strophe three, and, while not denying it, denies its relevance to him. While
in strophe one the poet had sought physical immortality through identification with
nature, here in strophe four he achieves a subjective immortality through merging with
time itself—not through an attempt to live for eternity, but by becoming one with the
moment. In this strophe the poet turns away from the outer world of nature or human
fame, and turns inward to the subjective, inner world of dreams and sound, rejecting
human fame in favor of his own song. There is also another contradictory statement here,
as the poet “strums his soundless strings” («бренчу незвонкими струнами») which
nonetheless produce rewarding sounds. This last contradiction further emphasizes the
turn inward of the lyrical hero in the final strophe: his strings may be soundless to others,
just as he himself is unheeded (невнимаемый), but he can still hear his own music.

The turn to the self in strophe four is also emphasized by the prevalence of the
pronoun “I” (я). While in strophes one and three the pronoun «вы»—the second person
plural—and its variations are the most frequent, in strophe four the pronoun “I” is
repeated six times in twelve lines, including at the beginning of three lines, while the
second person plural pronoun does not appear at all.

This sudden concentration on the lyrical “I” marks the final, and most important,
contradiction and reconciliation in “Finland,” as the poet, having animated and then
deanimated everything about him, finally appears himself in the first person. In the first
two strophes the poet describes a merging with and within the natural world—the singer
becomes like the stones, the sea becomes one with the sky, and so on—in strophe three everything is united by the “law of destruction,” and in the beginning of strophe four the poet and the moment belong equally to each other. The poem concludes, however, with a declaration of absolute self-sufficiency in the act of poetic creation. Instead of being driven to despair by the forces of fate and nature, as is so often the case for Baratynsky’s poetic persona, the lyrical “I” is invigorated by his contact with the eternal rocks, the marvelous undark night, the shades of fallen heroes, and time itself. His identification with these non-human powers allows him to forge his own identity as a poet.

Strophe two is the section of the poem that allows this transformation in the final lines to take place. Without it, there would be a binary opposition between the eternal granite of the first strophe and the law of destruction of the third strophe, and nothing between them to provide a way out. As has been discussed at length in previous chapters, this is the trap into which Baratynsky’s poetic persona often falls: hopeless, irreconcilable conflict between two mutually exclusive but seemingly equally viable (if unhappy) positions. In the 1820 version of «Финляндия», the lyrical hero resorts to the partial comfort of illusion, a strategy also employed by the lyrical hero of «О счасти...» The lyrical hero of the original version of «Финляндия» considers his happy state to be the result of «золотые призраки» and considers himself to be «обманутый душой» (Боратынский, Полное собрание сочинений и писем, том 1 144), and sets up the same binary conflict between happiness and reality that we have seen in the other earlier poems. In the 1835 version, though, the lyrical hero passes through the disorienting effects of strophe two’s unpredictable structure and undark night,
which cast doubt on the very concept of binary opposition. This frees him from his usual irreconcilable conflict, permitting him to seek eternity not in time, but in himself.

From that perspective, the question of whether or not «Финляндия» is a realistic description of Finland can be answered by saying that «Финляндия» is a realistic description of Finland as Baratynsky experienced it. He saw it as a stern but magical land, populated, not with real Finns, but with the ghosts of fallen heroes. His perception of it as empty allowed him to fill it with the characters and concepts that best suited his own ends. That is not to say that it had no effect on him. On the contrary, its unstable identity in his eyes also destabilized his own identity, opening new possibilities for his poetry. This can be seen in «Отъезд» and the early version of «Финляндия» as well, but it comes across most clearly in the final version of the poem.

«Финляндия», with its ecstatic escape from the trap of binary oppositions into the refuge of poetry, was a high point of poetic purpose for Baratynsky’s lyrical persona. Ultimately, Finland—both the poem and the country—seem to signify for Baratynsky the primacy of poetry over logical traps and petty human problems. Amidst its changeable, contradictory, and marvelous nature, the poet was able to find his own solid self-definition in his craft.

The thought/feeling conflict that plays such a central part in so many of the poems under discussion here is, as was mentioned above, touched upon in the original version, when the lyrical hero complains of his exile and unhappiness, but is notably absent in the final version. Although the lyrical hero notes various opposites or contradictions in the final version of «Финляндия», he is not overcome with despair by them, but, as was discussed above, invigorated by his contact with them. This poem, thus, seems to be a
manifestation of the poetic persona's transcendent function. Unlike the other functions, the transcendent function is not linked with a particular mental process, but is the psyche's ability to bring the other functions together in a creative and generative fashion. A close reading of Jung's definition of the transcendent function and its part in the creation of symbols will show how similar his conception of it is to the experiences of the lyrical hero in «Финляндия»:

But precisely because the new symbol is born of man's highest spiritual aspirations and must at the same time spring from the deepest roots of his being, it cannot be a onesided product of the most highly differentiated mental functions but must derive equally from the lowest and most primitive levels of the psyche. For this collaboration of opposing states to be possible at all, they must first face one another in the fullest conscious opposition. This necessarily entails a violent disunion with oneself, to the point where thesis and antithesis negate one another, while the ego is forced to acknowledge its absolute participation in both...

From the activity of the unconscious there now emerges a new content, constellated by thesis and antithesis in equal measure and standing in a compensatory (q.v.) relation to both. It thus forms the middle ground on which the opposites can be united. If, for instance, we conceive the opposition to be sensuality versus spirituality, then the mediatory content born out of the unconscious provides a welcome means of expression for the spiritual thesis, because of its rich spiritual associations, and also for the sensual antithesis, because of its sensuous imagery. The ego, however, torn between thesis and antithesis, finds in the middle ground its own counterpart, its sole and unique means of expression, and it eagerly seizes on this in order to be delivered from its division. The energy created by the tension of opposites therefore flows into the mediatory product...

If the mediatory product remains intact, it forms the raw material for a process not of dissolution but of construction, in which thesis and antithesis both play their part. In this way it becomes a new content that governs the whole attitude, putting an end to the division and forcing the energy of the opposites into a common channel. The standstill is overcome and life can flow on with renewed power towards new goals.

I have called this process in its totality the transcendent function, “function” being here understood not as a basic function but as a complex function made up of other functions, and “transcendent” not as denoting a metaphysical quality but merely the fact that this function facilitates a transition from one attitude to another. The raw material shaped by thesis
and antithesis, and in the shaping of which the opposites are united, is the living symbol.  
(CW 6: 478-80, emphasis my own)

While most of Baratynsky’s poetry describes the clash between opposing functions but stops before that clash reaches its zenith and forces the thesis-antithesis-synthesis which Jung defines as the transcendent function, «Финляндия», especially in its final version, describes the process of passing through the thesis-antithesis phase and achieves the phase of synthesis or transcendence, at which point art is produced.  
«Финляндия» is thus a high point for Baratynsky's lyrical persona not only because said lyrical persona is not unhappy in it, but because, if we are examining the poetry through the lens of analytical psychology, it demonstrates the achievement of a significant goal in the individuation process—the discovery of the transcendent function.

All the Jungian functions make their appearance in this poem. We begin with sensing in the first two stanzas, as the physical world is described. In the third stanza the lyrical hero turns to intuition and has visions of “midnight heroes” and “past and future tribes.” This leads him to contemplate the all-encompassing “law of destruction.” This “law of destruction,” with its negative, black and white, and impersonal character, can be seen as representing thinking. Instead of being sucked into despair, as in «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы...», for example, here the lyrical hero merely notes its presence before moving on to a description of his inner state—that is, feeling, which is allowed to trump all. We therefore end with the triumph of the function I am positing as dominant for Baratynsky's poetic psyche, but this triumph only takes place after the other functions have been acknowledged and accepted.
This acceptance is achieved, as was discussed above, through the disorientation
effected by strophe two, in which the lyrical hero contemplates nature, which I have just
declared to be an example of the use of the sensing function. The disorientation caused
by strophe two, and the visions of strophe three, are both thus the effects of embracing
the irrational functions of sensing and intuition. I have already described how the second
strophe creates a bridge between the “eternal granite” of strophe one and the “law of
destruction” at the end of strophe three through an analysis of form. From a
psychological perspective, strophe two and the beginning of strophe three, with their
focus on the irrational functions, create a bridge between the clashing rational functions,allowing them to coexist within the psyche and to produce art. Again, from a
psychological perspective, the poems about nature allow the lyrical hero to achieve
happiness because they cause him to activate the irrational functions, especially sensing.
This provides a buffer for the thought/feeling conflict and gives the lyrical hero a way
out, through transcendence of the problems that stalk him through the rest of his work.

The joy the lyrical hero experiences in nature, and his ability to shed the binary
conflict haunting him, both of which we find in «Финляндия», appears even more
strongly in one of the final poems Baratynsky wrote, «Пироскаф». If «Финляндия»
forms the high point of Baratynsky's early and middle periods, «Пироскаф» forms the
high point of Baratynsky's very last poetic period, during his journey from Russia to Italy
in 1843-1844. These two high points, then, are located in two foreign countries that
bookend Baratynsky's literary career: the first in Finland, the land of his poetic persona's
self-perceived exile, and the second in Italy, a country that had formed the focus of
Baratynsky's poetic and personal longings for most of his life.
Returning to Baratynsky's biography for a moment, his childhood «дядька», or tutor/caretaker, was Giacinto Borghese, an Italian who emigrated to Russia after the collapse of the Neopolitan republic (II CC 500) and never returned to the West, eventually finding employment with the Baratynsky family. He regaled the young Baratynsky with tales of Italy and its wonders, and the adult Baratynsky retained a strong desire to visit the country, as well as the rest of Western Europe. Family and financial circumstances prevented him from setting off, with his wife and older children, until 1843.

To return to the poetry, Italy features positively in Baratynsky's oeuvre. It is the country to which his (ultimately doomed) heroine Nina proposes to escape with her lover in «Бал», and it is specifically linked with faith, something Baratynsky's poetic persona struggled to gain, in the poems «Княгине» З. А. Волконской» and «Мадона».

 Otto Boele proposes that Finland is the “realm of the dead” in Baratynsky’s work. Italy,

\[126\] For the full text of the poems, see Appendix 1, Poems 16 and 22. As in Pushkin’s 1830 poem of the same name, Baratynsky used one «н» rather than two. In his commentary on Pushkin’s «Мадона», Michael Wachtel, citing Averintsev, notes that “the spelling with one ‘n’ reflects French usage. Such a spelling appears to have been widespread in Pushkin’s day” (A Commentary to Pushkin’s Lyric Poetry 185).

\[127\] In his article “Finland in the Work of Jevgenij Baratynskij: Locus Amoenus or Realm of the Dead,” Boele discusses Finland as a “locus terribilis” in Baratynsky’s poetry, where: “The lyric ‘I’ experiences his surroundings without any trace of pantheistic admiration, but rather as a place which is abandoned by God and is left to the mercy of chaotic forces” (32). Boele concludes by saying that:

Since Finland is implicitly being compared to a cemetery [in «Эда»], to a place of the dead, it can also be interpreted, not just as the ‘dead fatherland’ («мертвая отчизна»), but also as an «отчизна мертвых», a Realm of the Dead. Without suggesting any conscious borrowing on the part of Baratynskij, I would like to point to the striking resemblance between this modeling of Finland and the demonical nature of the north in the folklorist tradition, according to which the dwelling of the dead is believed to be located in the north (Мелетинский: 270). This does not apply to Scandinavian mythology, but to popular belief in medieval Russia as well. We can conclude, then, that on the one hand Baratynskij stands in the fixed tradition of conceptualizing the north as a barren and deserted place,
however, is also the “realm of the dead” for Baratynsky’s poetry, but in its positive form: as paradise or its stand-in. This is expressed most explicitly in «Княгине» З. А. Волконской», in which the princess's departure for Italy is compared directly to the departure of a loved one «в лучший край и лучший мир» (ПСС 124), but is also implicit in «Мадона», in which the icon of Madonna, a picture of a dead person painted by a dead person (Antonio da Correggio, the artist referred to in the poem, died in 1534), effects an intercession for the poem's protagonists, thereby justifying the old woman's «вера живая». Although the daily life of Italy in «Мадона» is depicted at the beginning of the poem in the same bleak style as is often the case in Baratynsky's other poetry, the Italian protagonists are rescued by the intercession of a saint, unlike the protagonists of poems about Russia, Finland, or Greece. Italy, then, possesses the possibility of rescue for the poetic protagonist, even if that rescue is effected through death or the dead.

Returning to biographical details, the Baratynsky family left Russia in the fall of 1843 and spent the winter of 1843–4 in Paris, before setting off for Marseilles and then Italy in the spring of 1844. They travelled by steamship from Marseilles to Naples, arriving in Naples in the middle of April, 1844 (Летопись 408). «Пироскаф», which means “steamship” in Greek, was composed while Baratynsky was en route from France to Italy.

while on the other hand he contributes to the development of this concept by, consciously or unconsciously, reviving the mythic image of the north as the Realm of the Dead. (42-3)

128 Along with «Последний поэт» and «Алкивиад», another significant poem with a Greek theme is «Ахилл», from Сумерки. It is also the other of Baratynsky's poems which uses the phrase «живая вера», although the poem is less emphatically positive than «Мадона»—its meaning and its relationship to «живая вера» are in fact ambiguous. For the full text of the poem, see Appendix 1, Poem 29.
In a letter written in Naples to his friend Putyata Baratynsky described his impression of the special place in the world occupied by Italy, and its connection with happiness and faith:

В три дня, как на крыльях, перенеслись мы из сложной общественной жизни Европы в роскошно-вегетативную жизнь Италии—Италии, которую за все ее заслуги должно бы на карте означать особой частью света, ибо она в самом деле ни Африка, ни Азия, ни Европа...Вот Неаполь! Я встаю рано. Спешу открыть окно и упиваюсь живительным воздухом...Вы знаете, что Италия не богата деревьями: но где они есть, так они чудно прекрасны. Как наши северные леса, в своей романтической красоте, в своих задумчивых зыбях выражают все оттенки меланхолии, так ярко-зеленый, резко отделяющийся лист здешних деревьев живописует все степени счастья. Вот проснулся город: на осле, в свежей зелени итальянского сена, испещренного малиновыми цветами, шажком едет неаполитанец полуотки, но в красной шапке; это не всадник, а блаженный. Лицо его весело и гордо. Он верует в свое солнце, которое никогда его не оставит без призрения.
(quoted in Летопись 408-9, emphasis my own)

In this letter the journey to Italy is thus described as a magical journey to a land that cannot be located on a map of the world as it is currently drawn, full of marvelous plants that depict happiness and inhabited by cheerful saints who have a justified faith, like that of the old woman in «Мадона», in the source of their welfare. The journey to Naples is described in similarly positive and magical terms in «Пирскаф»:

Дикою, грозною ласкою полны,
Бьют в наш корабль средиземные волны.
Вот над кормою стал Капитан.
Визгнул свисток его. Братствую с паром,
Ветру наш парус раздался недаром:
Пенясь, глубоко вздохнул океан!

Мчимся. Колеса могучей машины
Роют волнистое лон и пучины.
Парус надулся. Берег исчез.
Наедине мы с морскими волнами;
Только что чайка вется за нами
Белая, рея меж вод и небес.

Только вдали, океана жилица,
Чайке подобна, вод его птица,
Парус развив, как большое крыло,
С бурной стихией в томительном споре,
Лодка рыбачья качается в море,—
С брегом набрежное скрылось, ушло!

Много земель я оставил за мною;
Вынес я много смятенной душио
Радостей ложных, истинных зол;
Много мятежных решил я вопросов,
Прежде чем руки марсельских матросов
Подняли якорь, надежды символ!

С детства влекла меня сердца тревога
В область свободную влажного бога;
Жадные длань я к ней простирал.
Темную страсть мою днесь награждая,
Кротко щадит меня немочь морская,
Пеною здравия брызжет мне вал!

Нужды нет, близко ль, далеко ль до брега!
В сердце к нему приготовлена нега.
Вижу Фетиду,129 мне жребий благой
Емлет она из лазоревой урны:
Завтра увижу я башни Ливурны,130
Завтра увижу Элизий земной!

This poem is based on a 3x4 pattern, which places the merging of opposites—that of even and odd—at its structural core. It is in dactylic tetrameter, so each line contains four feet in a ternary meter. It is composed of six stanzas, each with six lines, for a total of 36 lines, or 3x3x4. Each stanza has a regular AAbCCb rhyme scheme, giving it 12 (3x4) lines with masculine endings and 24 (2x3x4) lines with feminine endings. The rhyme scheme’s 2x3 structure of three sets of two rhymed lines per stanza also echoes the

129Фетида, or Thetis, was a Nereid and the mother of Achilles.
130An archaic spelling of Livorno.
poem’s overall 4x3 (which is 2x2x3) structure, while its AAbCCb pattern gives each stanza a strong ternary impulse. This ternary impulse of the rhyme scheme both mimics and contrasts with the poem’s ternary meter: the dactylic meter puts emphasis on the first beat in each instance of the three-stress foot, but the AAbCCb rhyme scheme, with its masculine endings in the third and sixth lines, puts emphasis on the third and sixth “beats” of each stanza’s endings, in a kind of “anapestic” rhythm of rhymes. There is thus an opposing yet complementary tension between the poem’s meter and rhyme scheme.

Although the dactylic tetrameter meter is part of the 3x4 structure of this poem, none of the lines actually contain a full 12 syllables, as none of the lines have dactylic endings. There are 22 lines with 11 syllables, 11 with 10 syllables, and 3 with 9 syllables. As a strict adherence to the meter should give us 24 lines with 11 syllables and 12 lines with 10 syllables, we can see that five lines do not follow the metric pattern with complete faithfulness. The poem is reproduced again below, with the syllable count indicated for each line, and the anomalous sections in bold:

Дикою, грозною ласкою полны, (11)
Бьют в наш корабль средиземные волны. (11)
Вот над кормою стал Капитан. (9)
Визгнул свисток его. Братствуя с паром, (11)
Ветру наш парус раздался недаром: (11)
Пенясь, глубоко вздохнул океан! (10)

Мчимся. Колеса могучей машины (11)
Роют волнистое лоно пучины. (11)
Парус надулся. Берег исчез. (9)
Наедине мы с морскими волнами; (11)
Только что чайка вьется за нами (10)
Белая, рея меж вод и небес. (10)

Только вдали, океана жилица, (11)
Чайке подобна, вод его птица, (10)
Парус развив, как большое крыло, (10)
С бурной стихией в томительном споре, (11)
Лодка рыбачья качается в море,— (11)
С брегом набрежное скрылось, ушло! (10)

Много земель я оставил за мною; (11)
Вынес я много смятенной душою (11)
Радостей ложных, истинных зол; (9)
Много мятежных решил я вопросов, (11)
Прежде чем руки марсельских матросов (11)
Подняли якорь, надежды символ! (10)

С детства влекла меня сердца тревога (11)
В область свободную влажного бога; (11)
Жадные дланя я к ней простирал. (10)
Темную страсть мою днесь награждая, (11)
Кротко щадит меня немочь морская, (11)
Пеною здравия брызжет мне вал! (10)

Нужды нет, близко ль, далеко ль до брега! (11)
В сердце к нему приготовлена нега. (11)
Вижу Фетиду; мне жребий благой (10)
Емлет она из лазоревой урны: (11)
Завтра увижу я башни Ливурны, (11)
Завтра увижу Элизий земной! (10)

As can be seen, all the anomalous lines are in the first four stanzas, with one in
stanza one, two in stanza two, one in stanza three, and one in stanza four. Two-thirds of
the stanzas thus have a metric irregularity, which could be seen as part of the 2x3 or 4x3
pattern of the poem. In each case, the anomaly is formed by dropping a syllable between
the second and third foot (yet another appearance of the 2x3 or 2/3 pattern), so that the
third stress shifts one position forward, to the sixth rather than the seventh syllable.
Three of the five instances of syllable dropping occur at the third line in the stanza, while
one occurs in the fifth line and one in the second line. This relative infrequency of
syllable dropping, and its placement in the inner lines of the stanza and at the middle of
each line, means that on the one hand it creates a disruption of the strong ternary impetus
that has been created around it, but on the other hand it does not disrupt the overall ternary structure of the poem. This is in direct opposition to, for example, the rhythmic strategy of «Всё мысль да мысль!..», which was discussed in detail in Chapter Two. In «Всё мысль да мысль!..» the iambic flow of the meter is rendered uncertain by the frequent use of hypermetrical stresses and monosyllabic words; in «Пироскаф» the dactylic structure is never in doubt, despite these occasional metric irregularities. Unlike the case of the meter of «Всё мысль да мысль!..», little thought is therefore required from the reader/listener to make out the rhythm of «Пироскаф».

At the same time, the position of the dropped syllables appears at first to be following a definite pattern, that of placement in the central line of each stanza, but that pattern is not followed with complete consistency. We must therefore look beyond the form itself to find the meaning of this formal structure.

The dropped syllables place the lines in which they occur under special emphasis. These lines, in turn, emphasize the main themes of the poem. In the first shortened line, «Вот над кормою стал Капитан», we have the Captain standing over the stern of the steamship. This brings in the theme of the human world and/or human and technological dominance, while also emphasizing height or highness. In the second shortened line, «Парус надулся. Берег исчез», there is a separation from the human/land-based world while the idea of flight is introduced through the filling sails. The third shortened line, «Только что чайка вьется за нами», takes us into the natural world and natural flight. The fourth shortened line, «Чайке подобна, вод его птица», continues the theme of flight, while explicitly conflating the technological and natural worlds. In these first four shortened lines we thus begin in the human world of technology, although already
hovering above it, and then separate from it and merge with the natural world, so that birds and boats become the same.

The bird acts as an intermediary between the opposing elements of sky and water, as it soars between “the waters and the heavens” in the last line of stanza two, a connection that is subtly strengthened by the presence of ten syllables in each of the last two lines of stanza two. The fourth shortened line also contains same number of syllables as the line following it, and these lines also stress the water/sky connection, as well as explicitly comparing the boat to a bird. In stanza three, therefore, the human and natural worlds, as well as the marine and heavenly worlds, have been merged, something the shortened lines serve to emphasize.

The fifth and final shortened line, «Радостей ложных, истинных зол», may seem to fall out of this movement towards a merging of the human and natural worlds, but it keeps with the theme of a reconciliation of opposites, as it highlights a series of contradictions that are solved in the next line. The fifth shortened line appears in the fourth stanza, at which point the poem switches both its protagonist and its focus. In the first three stanzas, the focus of the poem is on the steamship and its ability to bridge the human and natural worlds. The only pronouns that appear are «его», used twice, and «мы», used twice in the second stanza, and its possessive form, «наш», used twice in the first stanza. Since the identity of this «мы» is not established, this use of the first person plural pronoun creates a sense of hazy communality, echoing the merging that is described in the first three stanzas. The use of the third person singular possessive also adds to the sense of haziness and merging. In the first use of «его», «Визгнул свисток его», it is unclear to whom it refers—the Captain or the steamship—while in the second
use, «вод его птиц», it refers to the ocean, further conflating the human and natural worlds.

There is a sharp shift away from this hazy communality to the first person singular in the second half of the poem. In the fourth stanza, the first person singular pronoun «я» and its variants are used four times, in the fifth stanza (counting the possessive «мою») it is used five times, and in the final stanza it is used twice. We therefore see a concentration on the lyrical hero in the fourth and fifth stanzas, and then a deconcentration on him in the final stanza. In fact, the final two lines of the poem, «Завтра увижу я башни Ливурны, / Завтра увижу Элизий земной!», have an identical construction apart from the removal of the pronoun in the second line. The arrival at the “earthly Elysium” is accompanied by a disappearance of the lyrical “I,” something that will be discussed in more detail in the comparison with «Финляндия» below.

This concentration on the lyrical “I” in the latter part of the poem parallels what happened in «Финляндия», in which the lyrical hero also turns away from a contemplation of marvelous nature to a contemplation of his own feelings engendered by his contact with this marvelous nature. In both poems the lyrical hero is rewarded at the end for his participation in this contact with nature: in «Финляндия» the reward is poetry, and in «Пироскаф» it is entrance to the «Элизий земной». In «Финляндия», therefore, the reward is self-created, while in «Пироскаф» the reward is external to the lyrical hero. This, combined with the erasure of the first person pronoun in the final line of «Пироскаф», serves to underline the merging between the human and natural or non-human worlds that takes place in «Пироскаф».
In «Финляндия», as was discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the gaze of
the lyrical hero begins by being trained outwards, but ends by being turned inwards,
towards the lyrical hero's own inner world. In «Пироскаф», the lyrical hero's gaze
begins by being trained outwards, as in «Финляндия», and then turns inwards, also as in
«Финляндия». However, in the final stanza of «Пироскаф» the lyrical hero, having
declared in the previous stanzas that he has “solved many stormy problems” and achieved
his long-held goal of being at sea, turns his attention back outwards, to the external
world. While the lyrical hero of «Финляндия» responds to the shifting and disorienting
outside world by finding comfort in his own song, the lyrical hero of «Пироскаф» is able
to find a “living faith” in the unstable sea to which he has entrusted himself, and thus
open back up to the external world, which has become an earthly paradise. Instead of
insistently affirming his own individuality, as he does at the end of «Финляндия», the
lyrical hero in «Пироскаф» is able to remove himself from the foreground and turn the
focus to the “earthly Elysium” awaiting him. But although he removes the first person
pronoun referring to him from the final line, the repetition of “увиду”, a perfective verb
in the first person singular conjugation, signals his presence and his faith in his presence
in the future.

The final two stanzas of «Пироскаф» contain several key words from
Baratynsky's poetry, but all recast in a positive light. The first line of stanza five, «С
dетства влекла меня сердца тревога», recalls the first line of «О счастье с
младенчества тоскуя...», while also incorporating the word «тревога», which in its
adjectival form has appeared in «Люблю я красавицу...», «Толпе тревожный день...»,
and «Мудрeren». In those poems it is presented negatively, as something that upsets
harmony, brings unhappiness, or is associated with unwanted or frightening “earthly cares.” In the fourth line of stanza five of «Пироскаф» it also initially appears as if it will bring about unhappiness for the lyrical hero, for the «сердца тревога» is linked to his «темная страсть» for the sea. However, in contrast to the normal ethos of a Baratynsky poem, the lyrical hero's “dark passion” is rewarded with mildness, mercy, and health. This surrender to his passions is not punished by misery and destruction, as happens in several of the lyric poems discussed above, as well as in all three long narrative poems, but in fact leads him to the “earthly Elysium” of the next stanza.

The first line of the last stanza, «Нужды нет, близко ль, далеко ль до брега!», echoes the end of «Финляндия», with its line «Что нужды до былых иль будущих племен?», but, in this as in the use of the first person pronouns, the rest of the stanza differs from the end of «Финляндия». While the final section of the final strophe of «Финляндия» begins with the rhetorical question «Что нужды до былых иль будущих племен?» and then moves into a series of negations that deny the external world («Я не для них бренчу незвонкими струнами; / Я, не внимающий, довольно награжден»), the final stanza of «Пироскаф» begins with the emphatic negation «Нужды нет, близко ль, далеко ль до брега!», before moving on to a series of affirmations that end with the double use of a perfective verb, thereby asserting the hero's positive intent and faith in the future.

The third line of the final stanza contains the word «жребий», one's lot or destiny, a concept that figures frequently in Baratynsky's work, and generally in a negative fashion. In «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», we are told:

Наш тягостный жребий: положенный срок
Питаться болезненной жизнью,
Любить и лелеять недуг бытия
И смерти отрадной страхиться.
(ПСС 117)

while in «К чему невольнику мечтания свободы...» we are advised «Рабы разумные, послушно согласим / Свои желания со жребием своим—» (ПСС 76). In «Пироскаф», however, and in direct contrast to the above-mentioned works, especially «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», the lyrical hero expects Thetis to pull a «жребий благой» out of an azure urn for him. The attitude of the lyrical hero towards fate and the gods in «Пироскаф» is thus completely reversed from what it was in «Напрасно мы, Дельвиг...», showing in this as in his attitude towards the natural world the “living faith” that has eluded him elsewhere. In the second half of «Пироскаф», the “stormy questions” have been solved, the contradictions have been reconciled, the lyrical hero has surrendered to his “dark passion” and has been rewarded for it by the kind elements, and he is, unlike his previous incarnations, able to turn a trusting face to the future. While his earlier self had consistently expected the future to bring nothing but misery in the form of experience and dashed dreams, this late version of Baratynsky’s lyrical hero sees the future as bringing further fulfillment of earlier dreams.

This poem, like «Финляндия», shows the lyrical hero breaking away from his binary conflict by turning to the irrational functions, especially sensing, but keeping the rational functions as the two poles that balance his psyche and his poetry. While the poem itself is largely about the present (the focus of sensing) and the future (the focus of intuition), the poem's highly structured form means that it is surrounded and contained by the action of thinking. As in «Всё мысль да мысль!..», thought transcends the physical world of the poem by providing the poem itself with its physical form and its means of
expression, but unlike «Всё мысль да мысль!»), it does no more. Rather than being the focus of the lyrical hero's horror, the problem of thought is resolved in stanza four of «Пироскаф», along with the “stormy questions,” the “false joys,” and “true evils.”

Thinking, as we recall from Chapter Three, operates according to a true/false paradigm, and it is this true/false paradigm with which Baratynsky’s lyrical hero struggles so vainly throughout most of the poetry. Here, though, this true/false paradigm has been resolved, and the operations of thinking have been contained within the structure of the poem that they contain, without spilling out and taking over the content.

Furthermore, the structure, while being highly controlled, is not dominated by a blind adherence to itself. The shortened lines not only create slight breaks in the meter, they are also organized according to principles other than those of purely formal considerations. While they do not fall into a strictly predictable pattern, however, they are not distributed at random. Rather, they, like the tension between even and odd inherent in the poem’s meter, stanzaic form, and rhyme scheme, point to a reconciliation of opposing forces and a harmony between disparate elements.

This harmony—harmony with the human world, harmony with the natural world, harmony with the self, and harmony with fate—is ultimately what «Пироскаф» and its lyrical hero express. The lyrical hero is able to turn away from himself at the end of «Пироскаф» not because of any negation of the self, but because the self's inner feeling values and its outer circumstances are finally in harmony. In «Пироскаф» external reality is not the “hell” that it is in the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Four. The lyrical hero in «Пироскаф» has no need to attempt to escape from the pain of being, one of the repeated motifs of Baratynsky’s poetry, and so instead of casting himself back and
forth between the “strict heaven” of thought and the “marvelous love” of feeling, he is able to remain balanced between them.

Earlier I discussed the transcendent function in connection with «Финляндия». Here in «Пироскаф» the focus is turned even more strongly towards the achievement of transcendence of psychological conflict and inner turmoil. While before the lyrical hero had only been able to find harmony in the production of poetry (and then only occasionally), and peace of mind in the shelter of his beloved, in «Пироскаф» disharmonious truth has been put behind him or resolved, while his feelings are allowed to flourish unopposed in the wider world, giving him a new hope for the future.

Baratynsky's sudden death of unknown causes on June 29 (old style), 1844, while still in Naples, occurred before «Пироскаф» was first published, along with «Дядьке-итальянцу», the last poem he wrote before his death, in the July 1844 edition of «Современник» (Летопись 411). These two poems mark a sharp departure from the ethos of the majority of Baratynsky's earlier work, and suggest that, had he lived, he might have been about to embark on a new phase in his literary career. Unfortunately, we can only speculate as to what poetry that new phase might have brought. While the conflict that fills his earlier works is still present in these last two poems, the treatment of it and the ultimate conclusions of these poems differ significantly from most of the previous poetry. While these poems share the same contents as many of their predecessors, the feeling-tone of these last poems is quite different, as if the spirit behind them had finally found the peace of mind it had been searching for, but not, as it had
feared for so long, at the expense of its dreams and desires. It is therefore, and perhaps quite fittingly, both satisfying and unsatisfying to read these last poems at the end of a survey of Baratynsky's poetry: satisfying because they both, particularly «Пироскаф»
provide an uplifting ending to his poetic trajectory, and unsatisfying because they both, particularly «Пироскаф», suggest that Russian poetry is much the poorer for having lost one of its poets at this stage in his career.

On the other hand, that may all be a moot point, as the age was moving on its iron path, as Baratynsky had lamented in «Последний поэт», and leaving its poets behind. When Baratynsky's body was transported back to Petersburg for burial in the Tikhvinsky cemetery, it was a quiet ceremony attended by few. As someone from the first generation to squander its poets, to misquote Roman Jakobson, there were not many from Baratynsky’s original literary circle to mourn his passing: Ryleev, Delvig, and Pushkin had already died or been killed, and Kyukhelbeker was in Siberia. The poetic flowering that Baratynsky experienced in his last months might have nipped at the bud upon his return to Russia, and he might have found himself just as alone as he had been before his departure for the South.

But if at the time of his death Baratynsky may have been, as Gogol accused him, «для всех чужим и никому не близким» (Гоголь 172), he did eventually find “readers in posterity,” as he had hoped. Although in his mature poetry Baratynsky seemed unable to march in lockstep with the demands on the popular literature of his own age, later generations, beginning with the Symbolists, saw, and less begrudgingly than Belinsky, that in Baratynsky's poetry one could find: «человека—предмет вечно интересный для человека» (Белинский, «Русская литература в 1844 году» 180).
This humanity inherent in Baratynsky’s verse remains as evident today as it did for Belinsky. If the psyche is indeed at cross purposes with itself, as the epigraph to the introduction claims, then the psychological conflict that forms the bedrock of Baratynsky’s poetry is also what enables it to reach across time and space to find those readers in posterity for whom Baratynsky had been searching.

“Bedrock” is of course the wrong word for psychological conflict. When seeking to describe the base strata of Baratynsky’s poetry, we would do well to follow his example and turn away from granite to something more changeable. The stability the lyrical hero finds in the unstable sea may be the ultimate, as well as the final, reconciliation of opposing forces, in Baratynsky’s poetry, in that it suggests that this reconciliation can only be found, as he himself said in «Пироскаф», in “an agonizing argument with the stormy element.”

As has already been said, what the result of the transcendence and resulting harmony in «Пироскаф» would have been for Baratynsky’s poetry if he had been able to continue writing is impossible to say. In the final strophe of «Дядьке-итальянцу», motifs that had appeared throughout his career appear again, this time brought together by the joining of North and South as well as sea and sky and all the other contradictions and oppositions his poetic persona had sought in vain to unite:

О тайны душ! меж тем как сумрачный поэт,
Дитя Британии, влаживший столько лет
По знойным берегам груди своей отравы,
У миров, у олив, у моря и у лавы,
Молил рассеянка от думы роковой,
Владеющей его измученной душой,
Напрасно! (Уст его, как древле уст Тантала,
Струя желанная насмешливо бежала)—
Мир сердцу твоему дал пасмурный навес
Метелью полгода скрываемых небес,
Earlier in this chapter it was suggested that both Finland, a representative of the North, and Italy, a representative of the South, serve as different aspects of the “realm of the dead” in Baratynsky’s poetry. If so, then in these lines those two different realms, North and South, are brought together, and, while not collapsed into each other, allowed to coexist side by side. It is this acceptance of the coexistence of opposing elements that sets the poems discussed in this final chapter apart from the others in Baratynsky’s oeuvre. Just as night and day, sea and sky, North and South, or eternity and an instant can have their place without encroaching on the place of their counterpart, so can, in these last poems, the forces within the human psyche. And whatever constitutes the outside elements in any particular poem, it is, in our final reconciliation of opposites, these inner forces that remain constant through their constantly changing conflict.
Appendix 1

This appendix contains poems which are significant in Baratynsky’s work but are only mentioned in passing in the dissertation and/or are too long to be included easily in the main body of the text. Poems are presented in chronological order of first composition.

1: (1820)
Поверь, мой милый друг, страданье нужно нам; Не испытав его, нельзя понять и счастья: Живой источник сладострастья Дарован в нем его сынам. Одни ли радости отрадны и прелестны? Одно ль веселье веселит? Бездейственность души счастливец тяготит; Им силы жизни неизвестны? Не нам завидовать ленивым чувствам их:
Что в дружбе ветреной, в любви однообразной И в ощущениях слепых Души рассеянной и праздной?
Счастливцы мнимые, способны ль вы понять Участья нежного сердечную услугу? Способны ль чувствовать, как сладко поверять Печаль души своей внимательному другу?
Способны ль чувствовать, как дорог верный друг?

Чью душу тяготит мучительный недуг, 
Тот дорожит врачом душевным. 
Что, что дает любовь веселым шалунам? 
Забаву легкую, минутное забвенье; 
В ней благо лучшее дано богами нам 
И нужд живейших утоленье! 
Как будет сладко, мильй мой, 
Поверить нежности чувствительной подруги. 
Скажу ль? Все раны, все недуги, 
Всё расслабление души твоей большой; 
Забыв и свет, и рок суровый, 
Желанья смутные в одно желанье слить 
И на устах её, в её дыханье пить 
Целебный воздух жизни новой! 
Хвала всевидящим богам! 
Пусть мнимым счастием для света мы убоги, 
Счастливцы нас бедней, и праведные боги 
Им дали чувственность, а чувство дали нам. (ПСС 140)

2: Финляндия (1820)
Громады вьчныхъ скалъ, гранитныя пустыни,
Вы дали страннику убьёжище и кровь!
Ему нужн’й покой обманчивыхъ даровъ
Слъпой, взыскательной и в’йтреной богини!
Забытый отъ людей, забытый отъ молвы,
Доволень будетъ онъ уголомъ уединеннымъ.
Онь счастье въ немъ найдетъ; онъ будетъ, какъ и вы,
Въ прем’няхъ рока неизм’еннымъ!
Какъ все вокругъ меня пл’няетъ грозно взорь!
Пустынный неба сводъ, угрюмый видъ Природы,
О каменистый брегъ дробящася воды
И дремлющий надъ ними борь!
Скалы далека подернулись туманомъ;
Въ зеркал’ зъбыкъь въдь глядится черной л’сь!..
Все тихо! все молчитъ! и бл’дный сводъ небесь
Слился съ безбрежнымъ Океаномъ!
Здсь все бес’дыетъ съ унын’емъ моимъ—
И рощи шумъ глухой и волнъ неясной лепетъ,
Какъ будто бы знакомъ, какъ будто внятень имъ
Младова сердца томный трепетъ.
Здсь осв’жаемый прохладной тишиной
Природы дремлющей, подъ кровомъ ночи зв’здной,
Люблю сид’ть одинъ надъ сумрачною бездной,
Молчать—и въ даль лет’ть душой…
Здсь въ думу важную невольно погруженной,
На лицах сумрачных улыбку укоризны?
И вы сокрылись в обители тней!
И ваши имена не пощадило время!
Что наши подвиги? что слава наших дней?

Что наше влтреное племя?
О! все своей чредой изчезнет в безднѣ лѣт!
Для всѣхъ одинъ законъ—законъ уничтоженья!
Во всемъ мне слышится таинственный привѣт
Обѣтованнаго, глубокаго забвенья!

Но я, въ безвѣстности для жизни жизнь любя,
Могу-ль себя томить неясною тоскою?
Пусть все разрушится; пусть все умретъ со мною:
Невѣчный для времени, я вѣчень для себя.
Златые призраки! златья сновидѣнья!
Желанья пылкѣя слетятся толпою:
Пусть жадно буду пить, обманутой душой,
Изъ чаші юности волшебство заблужденья.
Что нужны до быльыхъ, иль будущихъ племенъ!
Я не для нихъ бренчу незвонкими струнами—
Я, невнимаемый, довольно награжденъ:
За звуки звуками, а за мечты— мечтами.
(Е. А. Боратынскій, Полное собраніе сочинений и писем, том 1 142-4).

3: К Кюхельбекеру (1820)
Прости, Поэт! Судьбина вновь
Мне посох стражника вручила;
Но к музам чистая любовь
Уж нас навек соединила!

4: Посланіе к барону Дельвигу (1820)
Гдѣ ты, безпеченый друг? гдѣ ты, о Дельвиг мой,
Товариш радостей минувших,
Товариш ясныхъ дней, недавно надо мной
Мечтой веселою мелькнувших?

Ужель душе твоей так скоро чуждым стал
Друг отлученный, друг далекий,
На финских берегах между пустынных скал
Бродящий с грустью одинокой?
Где ты, о Дельвиг мой! ужель минувших дней
Лишь мне чувствительна утрата,
Ужель не ищешь ты в кругу своих друзей
Судьбой отторженного брата?
Ты помнишь ли те дни, когда рука с рукой,
Пылая жаждой сладострастья,
Мы жизни вверились и общей тропой
Помчались за мечтою счастья?
«Что в славе? что в молве? на время жизнь дана!»
За полной чашей мы твердили
И весело в струях блестящего вина
Забвенье сладостное пили.

И вот сгустилась ночь, и всё в глубоком сне—
Лишь дышит влажная прохлада;
Н стогнах тишина! сияют при луне
Дворцы и башни Петрограда.
К знакомцу доброму стучится
Купидон,—
Пусть дремлет труженик усталый!
«Проснися, юноша, отвергни,—
шепчет он,—
Покой бесчувственный и вялый.

Взгляни! ты видишь ли: покинув ложе сна,
Перед окном, полуодета,
Томленья страстного в душе своей полна,
Счастливца ждет моя Лилета?»

Толпа безумная! напрасно ропщешь ты!
Блажен, кто легкою рукою
Весной умел срывать весенние цветы
И в мире жил с самим собою;
Кто без уныния глубоко жизнь постиг
И, равнодушием богатый,
За царство не отдаст покоя сладкий миг
И наслажденья миг крылатый!
Давной румяный Феб прогнал ночной тень,
Давно проснулись заботы,
А баловня забав еще покоя лень
На ложе неги и дремоты.

И Лила спит еще; любовию горят
Младые свежие ланиты,
И, мнятся, поцелуй сквозь тонкий сон манят
Ее уста полуоткрыты.

И где ж брега Невы? где чаш веселый стук?
Забыт друзьям друг заочной,
Исчезли радости, как в вихре слабый звук,
Как блеск зарницы полуночной!

И я, певец утеш, пою утрату их,
И вокруг меня скалы суровы,
И воды чуждые шумят у ног моих,
И на ногах моих оковы.
(ПСС 81-3).

5: Уныние (1821)
Рассеивает грусть пирос веселый шум.
Вчера, за чашей круговою,
Средь братьев полковых, в ней утопив мой ум,
Хотел воскреснуть я душою.
Туман полуночный на холмы возлегал,
Шатры над озером дремали,
Лишь мы не знали сна—и пенистый бокал
С весельем буйным осушили.
Но что же? вне себя я тщетно жить хотел:
Вино и Вакха мы хвалили;
Но я безрадостно с друзьями радость пел:
Восторги их мне чужды были.
Того не приобрести, что сердцем не дано,
Рок злобный к нам ревниво злобен,
Одну печаль свою, уныние одно,
Унылый чувствовать способен.

(ПСС 76)

6: Цветок (1821)
С восходом солнечным Людмила,
Сорвав себе цветок,
Куда-то шла и говорила: «Кому отдать цветок?
Что торопится? мне ль наскучит
Лелеять свой цветок?
Нет! недостойный не получит
Душистый мой цветок».
И говорил ей каждый встречный: «Прекрасный твой цветок!
Мой милый друг, мой друг сердечный,
Отдай мне твой цветок».
Она в ответ: «Сама я знаю,
Прекрасен мой цветок;
Но не тебе, и это знаю,
Другому мой цветок».
Красою яркой день сияет,—
У девушки цветок;
Вот полдень, вечер наступает,—
У девушки цветок!
Идет. Услыша повстречала,
Он прелестно цветок.
«Ты мил!—она ему сказала. — Возьми же мой цветок!»
Он что же деве? Он спесиво: «На что мне твой цветок?
Ты мне даришь его—не диво:
Увянул твой цветок».

(ПСС 84-5)

7: (1821)
Пора покинуть, милый друг,
Знамена ветреной Кирпиды
И неизбежные обиды
Предупредить, пока досуг.
Чьих ожидать увещеваний!
Мы лишиены старинных прав
На своеvolие забав,
На своеvolие желаний.
Уж отлетает век младой,
Уж сердце опытнее стало:
Теперь ни в чем, любезный мой,
Нам иступление не пристало!
Оставим юным шалунам
Слепую жажду сладострастья;
Не упоения, а счастья
Искать для сердца должно нам.
Пресытись буйным наслажденьем,
Пресытись ласками цирцей,
Шепчу я часто с умиленьем
В тоске задумчивой моей:
Нельзя ль найти любви надежной?
Нельзя ль найти подруги нежной,
С кем мог бы в счастливой глуши
Предаться неге безмятежной
И чистым радостям души;
В чье неизменное участие
Беспечно веровал бы я,
Случится ли вьёдро иль ненастье
На перепутье бытия?
Где ж обреченная судьбою?
На чьей груди я успокою
Свою усталую главу?
Иль с волненьем и тоскою
Ее напрасно я зову?
Или в печали одинокой
Я проведу остаток дней,
И тихий свет ее очей
Не озарит их тьмы глубокой,
Не озарит души моей!...

(ПСС 138)

8: Отъезд (1821)
Прощай, отчизна непогody,
Печальная страна,
Где, дочь любимая природы,
Безжизненна весна;
Где солнце нехотя сияет,
Где сосен вечный шум,
И моря рев, и всё питаёт
Безумье мрачных дум;
Где, отлученный от отчизны
Враждебною судьбою,
Изнемогал без укоризны
Изысканны молодой;
Где, позабыт молвой гремучей,
Но всё душой пить,
Свою музыю летучей
Он не был позабыт!
Теперь, для сладкого свиданья,
Спешу к стране родной;
В воображенье край изгнанья
Последует за мной:
И камней миштые громады,
И вид полей нагих,
И вековые водопады,
И шум угрюмый их!
Я вспомню с тайным сладострастьем
Пустынную страну,
Где я в размолвке с тихим счастьем
Провел мою весну,
Но где порою, житель неба,
Наперекор судьбе,
Не изменил, питомец Феба,
Ни музам, не себе.
(ПСС 113-114).

9: (1824)
Взгляни на звезды: много звезд
В безмолвии ночном
Горит, блестит кругом луны
На небе голубом.

Взгляни на звезды: между них
Милее всех одна!
За что же? Ранее встает,
Ярчей горит она?

Нет! утешает свет ее
Расставшихся друзей:
Их взоры, в синей вышине,
Встречаются на ней.

Она на небе чуть видна,
Но с думою глядит,
Но взору шлет ответный взор
И нежностью горит.

С нее в лазоревую ночь
Не сводим мы очей, 131
И провожаем мы ее
На небе и с небес.

131 The collection Евгений Абрамович
Боратынский. Федор Иванович
Тютчев. Поэзия. Проза has «оче»
rather than «очей». Neither it nor the
ПСС provide an explanation for their
choice of «оче/очей», making it
uncertain which version Baratynsky
himself preferred.
Себе звезду избрал ли ты?
В безмолвии ночном
Их много блещет и горит
На небе голубом.

Не первой вставшей сердце вверь
И, суетный в любви,
Не лучезарнейшую всех
Свою назови.

Ту назови своей звездой,
Что с думою глядит,
И взору шлет ответный взор,
И нежностью горит.

(ПСС 136-7)

10: (1824)
Порою ласковую фею
Я вижу в обаянье сна,
И всей наукою своей
Служить готова мне она.
Душой обманутой ликуя,
Мои мечты ей лепечу я;
Но что же? странно и во сне
Непокупное счастье мне:
Всегда дарам своим предложит
Условье некое она,
Которым, злобно смышлена,
Их отравит иль уничтожит.
Знать, самым духом мы рабы
Земной насущной судьбы;
Знать, миру яному дотоле
Наш бедный ум порабощен,
Что переносят поневоле
И в мир мечты его закон!
(ПСС 68-9)

The “infection” of the mind by outer
reality is clearly in evidence here,
although outer reality here appears to be
privileged as “truth,” while the inner

11: (1825)
Мы пьем в любви отраву сладкую,
Но всё отраву пьем мы в ней,
И платим мы за радость краткую
Ей безвесельем долгих дней.
Огонь любви, огонь живительный!
Все говорят; но что мы зрим?
Опустошает, разрушительный,
Он душу, обятую им!

Кто заглушит воспоминания
О днях блаженства и
страдания,
О чудных днях твоих, любовь?
Тогда я ожи бы для радости,
Для снов златых цветущей младости
Тебе открыл бы душу вновь.
(ПСС 122)

12: (1825)
В дорогу жизни снаряжая
Своих сынов, безумцев нас,
Снов золотых судьбы благая
Дает известный нам запас:
Нас быстро годы почтовые
С корчмы дозвоем до корчмы,
И с нами теми путевые
Прогонь жизни платим мы.
(ПСС 89)
13: Последняя смерть (1828)
Есть бытие; но именем каким
Его назвать? Ни сон оно, ни бденье;
Меж них оно, и в человеке им
С безумием гранчит разуменье.
Он в полноте понятия своего,
А между тем, как волны, на него,
Одни других мятежней, своенравней,
Видения бегут со всех сторон:
Как будто бы своей отчизны давней
Стихииному смятенью отдан он;
Но иногда, мечтой воспламененный,
Он видит свет, другим не
откровенный.

Созданье ли болезненной мечты
Иль дерзкого ума соображенье,
Во глубине полнолуна темноты
Представшее очам моим виденье?
Не ведаю; но предко мной тогда
Раскрылись грядущие года;
События вставали, развивались,
Волныся, подобно облакам,
И полными эпохами являлись
От времени до времени очам,
И наконец я видел без покрова
Последнюю судьбу всего живого.

Сначала мир явил мне дивный сад;
Везде искусства, обилия приметы;
Везде дворцы, театры, водометы,
Везде народ, и хитрый свой закон
Стихи все признать заставил он.
Уж он морей мятежные пучины
На островах искусственных седил,
Уж рассекал небесные равнины
Прихоти им вымышленных крил;
Всё на земле движением дышало,
Всё на земле как будто ликовало.

Исчезнули бесплодные годы,
Оратаи по воле призвывали
Ветра, дожди, жары и холода,
И верною стороней воздавали
Посевы им, и хищный зверь исчез
Во тьме лесов, и в высоте небес,
И в бездне вод, сраженный
человеком,
И царствовал повсюду светлый мир.
Вот, мысли я, прельщенный дивным веком,
Вот разума великолепный пир!
Врагам его и в стыд и в поученье,
Вот до чего достигло просвещенье!

Прошли века. Яснет очам моим
Видение другое начинало:
Что человек? что вновь открыто им?
Я гордо мнил, и что же мне
предстало?
Наставшую эпоху я с трудом
Постигнуть мог смутившимся умом.
Глаза мои людей не узнавали;
Прывыкшие к обилью дольных благ,
На всё они спокойные взирали,
Что суеты рождало в их отцах,
Что мысли их, что страсти их, бывало,
Влечением всесильным увлекало.

Желания земные позабыть,
Чуждаясь их грубого влеченья,
Душевных снов, высоких снов призыв
Им заменил другие побужденья,
И в полное владение свое
Фантазия взяла их бытие,
И умственной природе уступила
Телесная природа между них:
Их в эмпирий и в хаос уносил
Живая мысль на крыльях своих;
Но по земле с трудом они ступали,
И браки их бесплодны пребывали.

Прошли века, и тут моим очам
Открылась ужасная картина:
Ходила смерть по сушам, по водам,
Свершалась живущего судьбына.
Где люди? где? скрывались в гробах!
Как древние столпы на рубежах,
Последне семейства истлевали;
В развалинах стояли города,
По пажитям заглохнувшим блуждали
Без пастырей безумные стада;
С людьми для них исчезло
пропитанье;
Мне слышалось их гладное блеянье.

И тишина глубокая вослед
Торжественно повсюду воцарилась,
И в дикую порфиру древних лет
Державная природа облачилась.
Величествен и грустен был позор
Пустынных вод, лесов, долин и гор.
По-прежнему животворя природу,
На небосклон светило дня взошло,
Но на земле ничто его восходу
Произнести привета не могло.

Один туман над ней, синея,
Вился и жертвою чистительной дымился.
(ПСС 148-50)

14: (1829)
Мой дар убог, и голос мой не громок,
Но я живу, и на земли мое
Кому-нибудь любезно бытие:
Его найдет далекий мой потомок
В моих стихах; как звать? душа мой
Окажется с душой его в сношенье,
И как нашел я друга в поколенье,
Читателя найду в потомстве я.
(ПСС 147)

15: Смерть (1829)
Тебя из тьмы не изведу я,
О смерть! и, детскою мечтою
Гробовый стан тебе дарую,
Не опочу тебя косой.

Ты дочь верховного Эфира,
Ты светозарная краса,
В руке твоей олива мира,
А не губящая коса.

Когда возникнул мир цветующий
Из равнovesь диких сил,
В твоев храненье Всемогущий
Его устройство поручил.

И ты летаешь над твореньем,
Согласе прям его лия,
И в нем прохладным дуновеньем
Смиряя буйство бытия.

Ты укрощаешь восстающий
В безумной силе ураган,
Ты, на брега свои бегучий,
Вспять повращаешь океан.

Даешь пределы ты растенью,
Чтоб не покрыл безмерный лес
Земли губительною тенью,
Злак не восстал бы до небес.

А человек! Святая дева!
Перед тобой с его ланит
Мгновенно сходят пятна гнева,
Жар любострастия бежит.

Дружится праведной тобою
Людей недружная судьба:
Ласкаешь тою же рукою
Ты властелина и раба.

Недоуменье, принужденье—
Условье смутных наших дней,
Ты всех загадок разрешенье,
Ты разрешенье всех цепей.
(ПСС 98-99)

16: К<нягине> З. А. Волконской
(1829)
Из царства виста и зимы,
Где, под управой их двойкой,
И атмосферу и умы
Сжимает холод одинокой,
Где жизнь какой-то тяжкий сон,
Она спешит на юг прекрасный,
Под Авзонийский небосклон—
Одушевленный, сладострастный,
Где в кущах, в портиках палат
Октавы Тассовы звучат;
Где в древних камнях боги живы,
Где в новой, чистой красоте
Рафаэль дышит на холсте;
Где все холмы красноречивы,
Но где не стыдно, может быть,
Герои, мира властелины,
Ваш Капитолий позабыть
Для Капитолия Коринны;
Где жизнь игрива и легка,
Там лучше ей, чего же боле?
Зачем же тяжкая тоска
Сжимает сердце поневоле?
Когда любимая краса
Последним сном смыкает вежды,
Мы полны ласковой надежды,
Что ей открыт с небеса;
Что лучший мир ей уготован,
Что славой вечною светло
Там заблестит ее чело;
Но скорбный дух не уврачеван,
Душе стесненной тяжело,
И неутешно мы рыдаем.
Так, сердца нашего кумир,
Ее печально провожаем
Мы в лучший край и лучший мир.
(ПСС 123-4)

17: Муза (1830)
Не ослеплен я мугою мою:  
Красавицей ее не назовут,  
И юноши, узрев ее, за нею  
Влюбленою толпой не побегут.  
Приранивать изысканным убором,  
Игрою глаз, блестящим разговором  
Ни склонности у ней, ни дара нет;  
Но поражён бывает мельком свет  
Ее лица необьим выраженьем,  
Ее речей спокойной простотой;  
И он скорей, чем едким осужденьем,  
Ее почитит небрежной похвалой.  
(ПСС 142)

18: (1831)

Где сладкий шепот
Моих лесов?
Потоков ропот,
Цветы лугов?
Деревья гольы;
Ковер зимы
Покрыл
Холмы,
Луга и долы.
Под ледяной
Своей корой
Ручей немеет;
Всё цепенеет,
Лишь ветер злой,
Бушуя, вает
И небо кроет
Седою мгла.

Зачем, тоскуя,
В окно слежу я
Метели лёт?
Любимцу счастья
Кров от неастья
Оно дает.
Огонь трескучий
В моей печи;
Его лучи
И пыл летучий
Мне веселят
Беспечный взгляд.
В тиши мечтаю
Перед живой
Его игрой,
И забываю
Я бури вой.

О провиденье,
Благодаренье!
Забуду я
И дуновенье
Бурь бытия.
Скорбя душою,
В тоске моей,
Склонюсь главою
На сердце к ней,
И под мятежной
Метелью бед,
Любовью нежной
Ее согрет;
Забуду вскоре
Крутого горе,
Как в этот миг
Забыл природы
Гробовый лик
И непогоды
Мятежный крик.

(ПСС 155-6)

19: (1831)
Люблю я красавицу
С очами лазурными:
О! в них не обманчиво
Душа ее светится!
И если прекрасна
С любовию томною
На милом покойт их,
Он мирно блаженствует,
Вовек не смутит его
Сомненье грозное.
И кто не доверится
Сиянью их чистому,
Эфирной их прелести,
Небесной души ее
Небесному знаменю?

Страшна мне, друзья мои,
Краса черноокая;
За темной завесою
Душа ее кроется,
Любовник пылает к ней
Любовью тревожной
И взорам двусмысленным
Не смее довериться.
Какой-то недобрый дух
Качал кольцеболь ее;
Оделась тьмой она,
Вспылала причудою,
Закралось в сердце к ней
Лукавство лукавого.

(ПСС 74-5)

20: (1831-2)
Весна, весна! как воздух чист!
Как ясен небосклон!
Своей лазурью живой
Слепит мне очи он.

Весна, весна! как высоко
На крыльях ветерка,
Ласкаясь к солнечным лучам,
Летают облака!

Незримый жавронок поет
Заздравный гимн весне.

Что с нею, что с моей душой?
С ручья она ручей
И с птичкой птичка! с ним журчит,
Летает в небе с ней!

Зачем так радует ее
И солнце и весна!
Любит ли, как дочь стихий,
На пире их она?

Что нужды! счастлив, кто на нем
Забвенье мысли пьет,
Кого далёко от нее
Он, дивный, унесет!

(ПСС 157-8)

This poem, written in 1831-2,

prefigures the imagery of «Недоносок»
(1835), but lacks the deeply tragic
element of the later poem, describing
instead a joyous union with nature,
instead of an inability to transcend the
physical realm.

21: На смерть Гёте (1832)
Предстала, и старец велики и смежил
Орлиные очи в покое;
Почил безмятежно, зане совершил
В пределе земном всё земное!
Над дивной могилой не плачь, не
жалей,
Что гения череп—наследье червей.
Погас! но ничто не оставлено им
Под солнцем живых без
привета;
На всёт отозвался он серцем своим,
Что просит у сердца ответа;
Крылатою мыслью он мир облетел,
В одном беспредельном нашёл ей
предел.
Всё дух в нем питало: труды
мудрецов,
Искусств вдохновенных
созданья,
Преданья, заветы минувших веков,
Цветущих времен упованья.
Мечтою по воле проникнуть он мог
И в нищую хату, и в царский чертог.
С природой одною он жизнью дышал;
Ручья разумел лепетанье,
И говор древесных листов понимал,
И чувствовал трав прозабанье;
Была ему звездная книга ясна,
И с ним говорила морская волна.
Изведан, испытан ми весь человек!
И ежели жизнью земною
Творец ограничил летучий наш век
И нас за могильной доскою,
За миром явлений, не ждет ничего:
Творца оправдает могила его.
И если загробная жизнь нам дана,
Он, здешней вполне
отдышавший
И в звучных, глубоких отзывах
сполна
Всё дольное долу отдавший,
К предвечному легкой душой
возлетит,
И в небе земное его не смутит.
(ПСС 153-4)

Here Goethe is praised for
achieving perfect harmony with nature
and the world, as pre-industrial humans
are able to do in «Приметы».

According to Sarah Pratt:

Goethe … at least according to
Boratynskii, has survived the fall
from the state of innocence and
returned to a higher, conscious
state of grace through his genius:
his intuitive understanding of art,
his rational comprehension of
philosophy, and his thorough
understanding of the living
organism that is nature.
Schelling maintains that this
higher state of consciousness
achieved through art and
philosophy is superior to the
totally naïve state of grace. It is
certainly the only form of
philosophical salvation open to
such inveterate thinkers as Schelling, Boratynskii, and the romantic saint with Orthodox roots that Boratynskii saw in Goethe. (*Russian Metaphysical Romanticism: The Poetry of Tiutchev and Boratynskii* 203)

Belinsky held mixed views on this poem, declaring it on the one hand to be «из лучших между мелкими стихотворениями г. Баратынского», while on the other hand suffering from «неопределенность идеи, неверность в содержании», as «Не было, нет и не будет никогда гения…который бы один все постиг и все сделал» (quoted in *IISC* 478). Here, as in other cases, Belinsky found Baratynsky's refusal to adhere to literal reality and strict logical principles to be frustrating.

22: Мадона (between 1832 and 1835)

Близ Пизы, в Италии, в поле пустом (Не зрелося жилья на полмили кругом)

Меж древних развалин стояла лачужка;
С молоденькой дочкой лижа в ней старушка.

С рассвета до ночи за тяжким трудом, А все-таки голод им часто знаком.

И дочка порою душой унывала; Терпеньем скудя, на Бога роптала.

«Не плачь, не крушися ты, солнце мое!—
Тогда утешала старушка ее.—

Не плачь, переменится доля крутая: 
Придёт к нам на помощь Мадона святая.

Да лик ее веру в тебе укрепит: 
Смотри, как приветно с холста он глядит!»

Старушка смиренная с речью такою, 
Бывало, крестилась дрожащей рукою, 

И с теплою верою в сердце простом 
Она с умиленным и кротким лицом

На живопись темную взор подымала, 
Что угол в лачужке без рам занимала.

Но больше и больше нужда их теснит, 
Дочь плачет, старушка свое говорит.

С утра по руинам бродил любопытный! 
Забылся, красе их дивясь, ненасытный.

Кров нужен ему от полдневных лучей: 
Стучится к старушке и входит он к ней.

На лавку садился пришлец утомленный, 
Но вспрянул, картиною вдруг пораженный:

«Божественный образ! чья кисть это, чья,
О, как не узнать мне! Корреджий, твоя!

И в хижине этой творенье танется,
Которым и царский дворец возгордится!

Старушка, продай мне картину свою,
Тебе за нее я сто пиастров даю».

«Синьор, я бедна, но душой не торгую;
Продать не могу я икону святую».

«Я двести даю, согласись продать».
— «Синьор, синьор! бедность грешно искушать».

Упрямства не мог победить он в старушке: Осталась картина в убогой лачужке.

Но вскоре потом по Италии всей Летучая весть разнеслась о ней.

К старушке моей гость за гостем стучится, И, дверь отворяя, старушка дивится.

За вход она малую плату берет И с дочкой своей безбедно живет.

Прекрасно и чудно, о вера живая! Тебя оправдала Мадона святая.

(ПСС 145-6)

For a comparison of this poem with Pushkin's poem of the same name, see V. E. Andreyev's article «Пушкин и Боратынский. Две «Мадоны», in Новые страницы Боратыноведения, pp. 91-104.

23: Князю Петру Андреевичу Вяземскому (1834)

Как жизни общие призывы, Как увлеченья суеты, Понятны вам страстей порывы И обаяния мечты; Понятны вам все дуновенья, Которым в море бытти Послушна наша ладия. Вам приношу я песнопенья, Где отразилась жизнь моя: Исполнена тоски глубокой, Противоречий, слепоты И между тем любви высокой, Любви, добра и красоты.

Счастливый сын уединенья, Где сердца ветреные сны И мысли праздные стремления Разумно мой усыплены; Где, другу мира и свободы, Ни до фортунь, ни до моды, Ни до молвы мне нужды нет; Где я простил безумству, злобе И позабыл, как бы во гробе, Но добровольно, шумный свет,— Еще порою покидаю Я Лету, созданную мной, И степи мира облетаю С тоскою жаркой и живой. Ищу я вас, гляжу: что с вами? Куда вы брошены судьбами. Вы, озарившие меня И дружбы кроткими лучами, И светом высшего отня? Что вам дарует провиденье? Чем испытует небо вас? И возношу молящий глас: Да длится ваше упоенье, Да скоро минет скорбный час!
Звезда разрозненной плеяды!
Так из глуби моей стремлю
Я к вам заботливые взгляды,
Вам высшей благости молю.
От вас отвлечь судьбы суровой
Удары грозные хочу,
Хотя вам прозою почтовой
Лениво дань мою плачу.

(ПСС 249-50)

Judging by Baratynsky's correspondence
and the apparent reference in the final
 strophes to the illness of Vyazemsky's
daughter, who died in 1835, this poem
was most likely composed in 1834. It
was first published in «Современник»
in 1836, and then republished as the
dedication to Сумерки in 1842 (ПСС 486).

24: Бокал (1835)
Полный влагой искрометной,
Зашипел ты, мой бокал!
И покрыл туман приветливый
Твой озябнувший кристалл...
Ты не встречен братьей шумной,
Буйных оргий властелин,—
Сластолюбец вольнодумный,
Я сегодня пью один.

Чем душа моя богата,
Все твое, о друг Аи!
Ныне мысль моя не сжата
И свободны сны мои;
За струею вдохновенной
Не рессеян данник твой

Бестолково оживленной,
Разногласною толпой.
Мой восторг неосторожный
Не обидит никого;
Не откроет дружбе ложной
Таин счастья моего;
Не смутит глупцов ревнивых
И торжественных невежд
Излияньем горделивых
Иль святых моих надежд!

О бокал уединенья!
Не усилены тобой
Пошлой жизни впечатленья,
Словою чашей круговой;
Плодородней, благородней,
Дивной силой будишь ты
Откровенья преисподней
Иль небесные мечты.

25: Алкивиад (1835)
Облокотясь перед медью, образ его
отражавший,
Дланью слегка приподняв кудры
златые чела,
Юный красавец сидел, горделиво задумчив, и, смехом
Горьким смеясь, на него мужи казали перстом;
Девы, тайно любуясь чеalom
благородно-открытым,
Нежна взор отводя, хмурили брови свои.
Он же глух был и слеп; он, не в меди
глядясь, а в грядущем,
Думал: к лицу ли ему будет лавровый венок?
(ПСС 256)

26: Недоносок (1835)
Я из племени духов,
Но не житель Эмпирея,
И, едва до облаков
Возлетев, паду слабея.
Как мне быть? Я мал и плох;
Знаю: рай за их волами,
И ношу, крылатый вздох,
Меж землей и небесами.

Блещет солнце—радость мне!
С животворными лучами
И играю в вышине
И веселыми крылами
Ластусь к ним, как облачко;
Пью счастливо воздух тонкой,
И пою я птицей звонкой.

Но ненастье заревет
И до облак, свод небесный
Омрачивший, вознесет
Прах земной и лист древесный:
Бедный дух! ничтожный дух!
Дуновенье роковое
Вьет, крутит меня, как пух,
Мчит под небо громовое.

Бури грохот, бури свист!
Вихорь хладный! вихорь жгучий!
Бьет меня древесный лист,
Удушает прах летучий!
Обращусь ли к небесам,
Оглянуся ли на землю—
Грозно, черно тут и там;
Вопль уныл я подземлю.

Изнывающий тоской,
Я мечусь в полях небесных,
Надо мной и подо мной
Беспредельных—скорби тесных!
В тучу прячуся я, и в ней
Мчуся, чужд земного края,
Страшный глас людских скорбей
Гласом бури заглушая.

Мир я вижу как во мгле;
Арф небесных отголосок
Слабо слышу...На земле
Оживил я, недоносок.
Отбыл он без бытия:
Роковая скоротечность!
В тягость роскошь мне твоя,
О бессмыслия вечность!
(ПСС 254-6)

27: Осень (1837)
1
И вот сентябрь! замедля свой восход,
Сияньем хладным солнце
блещет,
И луч его в зерцале зыбком вод
Неверным золотом трепещет.
Седая мгла внеться вокруг холмов;
Росой затоплены равнины;
Желтеет сень курявая дубов,
И красен круглый лист осины;  
Умолкли птиц живые голоса,  
Безмолвен лес, беззвучны небеса!

2  
И вот сентябрь! и вечер года к нам  
Подходит. На поля и горы  
Уже мороз бросает по утрам  
Свои серебристые узоры.  
Пробудится ненастливый Эол;  
Пред ним помчится прах летучий,  
Качаясь, завоет роща, дол  
Покроет лист ее падучий,  
И набегут на небо облака,  
И, потомнев, запенится река.

3  
Прощай, прощай, сияние небес!  
Прощай, прощай, краса природы!  
Волшебного шептанья полный лес,  
Златочешуйчатые воды!  
Веселый сон минутных летних нег!  
Вот эхо в рощах обнаженных  
Секирою тревожит дровосек,  
И скоро, снегом убленных,  
Своих дубров и холмов зимний вид  
Заstasyлый ток туманно отразит.

4  
А между тем досужий селянин  
Плод годовых трудов сбирает;  
Сметав в стога скошенный злак долин,  
С серпом он в поле поспешает.  
Гуляет серп. На сжатых бороздах  
Снопы стоят в копнах блестящих  
Иль тянутся вдоль жнивы, на возах,  
Под тяжкой ношею скрывающих,  
И хлебных скрид золотоверхий град  
Подъемлется кругом крестьянских хат.

5  
Дни сельского, святого торжества!  
Овины весело дымятся,  
И цеп стучит, и с шумом жернова  
Ожившей мельницы круятся.  
Иди, Зима! на строги дни себе  
Припас оратаий много блага:  
Отрадное тепло в его избе,  
Хлеб-соль и пенистая брага;  
С семьей своей вкусит он без забот  
Своих трудов благословенный плод!

6  
А ты, когда вступаешь в осень дней,  
Оратаий жизненного поля,  
И пред тобой во благостье всей  
Является земная доля;  
Когда тебе житейские бразды,  
Труд бытия вознаграждая,  
Готовится подать свои плоды  
И спет жатва дорогая,  
И в зернах дум ее собираешь ты,  
Судеб людских достигнув полноты,—

7  
Ты так же ли, как земледел, богат?  
И ты, как он, с надеждой сеял;  
И ты, как он, о дальнем дне наград  
Сны позлащенные лелеял...  
Любуйся же, гордись восставшим им!  
Считай свои приобретенья!..  
Увы! к мечтам, страстям, трудам мирским  
Тобой скопленные презренья,  
Язвительный, неотразимый стыд  
Души твоей обманов и обид!

8  
Твой день взошел, и для тебя ясна  
Вся дерзость юных легковерий;  
Испытана тобою глубина  
Людских безумств и лицемерий.  
Ты, некогда всех увлечений друг,
Сочувствий пламенный искатель,
Блистательных туманов царь—и вдруг
Бесплодных дебрей созерцатель,
Один с тоской, которой смертный стон
Едва твоей гордыней задушен.

9
Но если бы негодованья крик,
Но если бы вопль тоски великой
Из глубины сердечныя возник,
Вполне торжественный и дикой,—
Костями бы среди своих забав
Содроглась ветреная младость,
Игр ающий младенец, зарыдав,
Игрушку б выброшил, и радость
Покинула б чело его навек,
И заживо б нем умер человек!

10
Зови ж теперь на праздник честный мир!
Спеши, хозяин тароватый!
Прости, сажай гостей своих за пир
Затейливый, замысловатый!
Что лакомству пророчит он утюх!
Каким разнообразьем брашен
Блистае он!.. Но вкус один во всех
И, как могила, людям страшен;
Садись один и тризну соверши
По радостям земным твоей души!

11
Какое же потом в груди твоей
Ни водоритись озаренье,
Чем дум и чувств ни разрешится в ней
Последнее вихрещенье—
Пусть в торжестве насмешливом своем
Ум бесполезный сердца трепет
Угомонит и тщетных жалоб в нем
Удушит запоздаль лепет,
И примешь ты, как лучший жизни клад,
Дар опыта, мертвящий душу хлад.

12
Иль, отряхнув видения земли
Порывом скорби животворной,
Ее предел завидя невдали,
Цветущий брег за мглою черной,
Возмездий край, благовестящим снам
Доверясь чувством обновленным,
И бытия мятежным голосам,
В великом гимне примиренным,
Внимающий, как арфам, коих строй
Превышенный не понят был тобой,—

13
Пред Промыслом оправданный ты ниц
Падешь с признательным смиреньем,
С надеждою, не видящей границ,
И утоленным разумьем,—
Знай, внутренней своей вовеки ты
Не передаш земному звуку
И легких чад житейской суеты
Не посвятишь в свою науку;
Знай, горняя иль дольная, она
Нам на земле не для земли дана.

14
Вот буйственно несется ураган,
И лес подъемлет говор шумный,
И пениться, и ходит океан,
И в берег бьет волной безумной;
Так иногда толпы ленивый ум
Из усыпления выводит
Глас, пошлый глас, вещатель общих дум,
И звучный отзыв в ней
находит,
Но не найдет отзыва тот глагол,
Что страстное земное перешел.

15
Пускай, приняв непривильный полет
И вспять стези не обретая,
Звезда небес в бездонность утечет;
Пусть заменит ее другая;
Не явствует земле ущерб одной,
Не поражает ухо мира
Падения ее далекий вой,
Равно как в высотах эфира
Ее сестры новорожденный свет
И небесам восторженный привет!

16
Зима идет, и тощая земля
В широких лысинах бессилья,
И радостно блистали поля
Златыми классами обилья,
Со смертью жизнь, богатство с
Нищетой—
Все образы годы бывшей
Сравняются под снежной пеленой,
Однообразно их покрывшей,—
Перед тобой таков отвчин свет,
Но в нем тебе грядущей жатвы нет!
(PCC 264-9)

Note the use of words refering to
“shining,” “silver,” and “gold” in these
stanzas, and their association with the
arrival of cold and the dying of the
year—something that is portrayed as not
entirely negative but certainly not good,
either. Regarding the composition of
«Осень», Baratynsky wrote to
Vyazemsky, «Известие о смерти
Пушкина застало меня на последних
строфах этого стихотворения» (cited
in PCC 491), and, in another letter,
«есть люди в Москве, узнавшие об
общественном бедствии с
отвратительным равнодушием» (491).
The final stanzas of the poem are
therefore generally interpreted as
refering to the irreparable loss of
Pushkin and society's indifference to his
fate (491). For a detailed analysis of the
poem see pages 483-493 in Geir
Kjetsaa's (Hetso) Евгений
Баратынский: Жизнь и творчество,
in which he saysof «Осень» that «Его
можно назвать философской
исповедь, в которой мирпонимание
поэта находит свое наиболее глубокое
и сильное выражение» (483).

28: (1838)
Были бури, непогоды,
Да младые были годы!

В день ненастный, час гнетучий
Грудь подымет вздох могучий;
Вольной песнь разольется,
Скорбь-невзгода распоется!
А как век-то, век-то старый
Обручится с лютой карой,
Груз двойной с груди усталой
Уж не сбросит вздох удалый,
Не положишь ты на голос
С черной мыслью белый волос!

(ПСС 259)

29: Ахилл (From between 1838 and 1842)
Влага Стикса закалила
Дикой силы полноту
И кипящего Ахилла
Бою древнему явила
Уязвимым лишь в пяту.
Обречен борьбе верховой,
Ты ли, долею своей
Равен с ним, боец духовный,
Сын купели новых дней?
Омовен ее водою,
Знай, страданье над собою
Волю полную ты дал,
И одной пятой своему
Невредим ты, если ею
На живую веру стал!

30: (From before 1839)
Филида с каждою зимою,
Зимою новою своей,
Пугает большой наготою
Своих старушечьих плечей.
И, Афродита гробовая,
Подходит, словно к ложу сна,
За ризой ризу опуская,
К одру последнему она.

(ПСС 257)

31: (1839)
Толпе тревожный день приветен, но страшна
Ей ночь безмолвная. Боится в ней она
Раскованной мечты видений своевольных.
Не легкокрылых грех, детей
волжениной тьмы,
Видений дня боимся мы,
Людских сует, забот
юдольных.

Ощупай возмущенный мрак—
Исчезнет, с пустотой сольется
Тебя пугающий призрак,
И заблужденью чувств твой ужас
улыбнется.
О сын фантазии! ты благодатных фей
Счастливый баловень, и там, в
заочном мире,
Веселый семьянин, привычный гость
на пире
Неосвязаемых властей!
Мужайся, не слабей душою
Перед заботою земною:
Ей исполинский вид дает твоя мечта;
Коснися облака нетрепетной рукою—
Исчезнет; а за ним опять перед тобою
Обители духов откроются врата.

32: Мудрецу (1840)
Тщетно меж бурною жизнью и
хладною смертью, философ,
Хочешь ты пристань найти, имя
daешь ей: покой.
Нам, из ничтожества вызванным
творчества словом тревожным,
Жизнь для волненья дана: жизнь и
волненье—одно.
Тот, кого миновали общие смуты,
заботу
Сам вымыщает себе: лиру, палитру,
резец;
Мира невежда, младенец, как будто
закон его чув,
Первым стенаньем качать нудит свою
колыбель!
(ПСС 257)

33: (1841)
Предрассудок! он обломок
Давней правды. Храм упал;
А руин его потомок
Языка не разгадал.

Гонит в нем наш век надменный,
Не узнав его лица,
Нашей правды современной
Дряхлотетнего отца.
Воздержи младую силу!
Дней его не возмущай;
Но пристойную могилу,
Как уснет он, предку дай.
(ПСС 252)

34: (1841)
Что за звуки? Мимоходом
Ты поешь перед народом,
Старец нищий и слепой!
И, как псов враждебный стая,
Чернь тебя обстала злая,
Издеваясь над тобой.
А с тобой издавна тесен
Был союз камены песен,
И беседовал ты с ней,
Безымянный, роковою,
С дня, как в первый раз тобою
Был услышан соловей.
Бедный старец! слышу чувство
В сильной песне…Но искусство…
Старцев старее оно;
Эти радости, печали—
Музыкальные скрижали
Выражают их давно!
Опрокинь же свой треножник!
Ты избранник, не художник!
Попечень гений твой
Да отложит в здешнем мире:
Там, быть может, в горнем клире,
Звучен будет голос твой!
(ПСС 262-3)

For a discussion of the three
poems «Что за звуки?..», «Всё мысль
da мысль!..», and «Скульптор» as a
trilogy about the image of the poet, see
S. Miyosi's article «О переделке образа
поэта в романтический период:
Боратынский и Пушкин», Новые
страницы Боратыноведения, pp. 14-
24. Miyosi claims that in «Что за
звуки?..», «Иронически изображая
пoэтa, слишком предающегося
чувствам, Боратынский напоминает
пoэтaм o важности такого мастерства,
кaк у «художника» (17). Of the
meaning of the trilogy overall, Miyosi
says: «Противостояние мысли (или
разума, умения) и чувства—это основной мотив данной трилогии» (20).

35: Скульптор (1841)
Глубокий взор вперив на камень, Художник нимфу в нем прозрел, И пробежал по жилам пламень, И к ней он сердцем полетел.

Но, бесконечно вожделенный, Уже он властует собой: Неторопливый, постепенный Резец с богини сокровенной Кору снимает за корой.

В заботе сладостно-туманной Не час, не день, не год уйдет, А с предугаданной, с желанной Покров последний не падет,

Покуда, страсть уразумея Под лаской вкрадчивой резца, Ответным взором Галатея Не увлечет, желаньем рдея, К победе неги мудреца. (ПСС 263-4)

Miyosi says of this poem: «Там поэт, в виде независимого от слова скульптора, изображается как «художник», отлично согласующий свой разум и чувство. ... Равновесие же между чувством и разумом оживляет произведение и вознаграждает автора за труд. Таким образом, в «Скульпторе» исчезает трагический конфликт, замеченный в двух предыдущих стихотворениях, и поэт достигает гармонии и счастья» (21). Of the trilogy as a whole and the thought/feeling conflict played out in it and its relationship to art, Miyosi says that, by giving into his passions at the end of «Скульптор», the artist loses the equilibrium between thought and feeling, becoming one more the artist entirely of feeling. This creates a thought-feeling cycle, of which Miyosi says: «Но оригинальность Боратынского состоит в том, что этот конфликт кольцевидно продолжается без конца. В классических трагедиях конфликт разрешается (хотя это приводит к гибели), и тогда кончается история. А Боратынский не поставил точку на трилогии, на истории о поэте, и изобразил поэта, мечущегося бесконечно в конфликте» (22),

247
something Miyosi sees as typical of
Baratynsky's poetry.

36: На посев леса (1842)
Опять весна; опять смеется луг,
И весел лес своей младой одеждой,
И поселян неутомимый плуг
Браздит поля с покорством и
надеждой.

Но нет уже весны в душе моей,
Но нет уже в душе моей надежды,
Уж дольный мир уходит от очей,
Пред вечным днём я опускаю вежды.

Уж та зима главу мою сребрит,
Что греет сев для будущего мира,
Но праг земли не перешел пить,—
К ее сынам еще взывает лира.

Велик Господь! Он милосерд, но прав:
Нет на земле ничтожного мгновенья;
Прощает Он безумию забав,
Но никогда пирам злоумышленья.

Кого измял души моей порыв,
Тот вызвать мог меня на бой кровавый;
Но подо мной, сокрытый ров изрыв,
Свои рога венчал он падшей славой!

Летел душой я к новым племенам,
Любил, ласкал их пустоцветный колос,
Я дни извел, стучась к людским
сердцам,

Всех чувств благих я подавал им
голос.

Ответа нет! Отвергнул струны я,
Да хрящ другой мне будет
плодоносен!
И вот ему несет рука моя
Зародыши елей, дубов и сосен.

И пусть! Простятся с лирою моей,
Я верую: ее заменят эти,
Поззиии таинственных скорбей,
Могучие и сумрачные дети.

ПСС 297-8

37: (1843)
Когда твой голос, о поэт,
Смерть в высших звуках остановит,
Когда тебя во цвете лет
Нетепреливый рок уловит,—

Кого закат могучих дней
Во глубине сердечной тронет?
Кто в отзыв гибели твоей
Стесненной грудью восстонет,

И тихий гроб посетит,
И, над умолкшей Аонидой
Рыдая, пепел твой почтит
Нелицемерной панихидой?

Никто!—но сложится певцу
Канон намеднишним зоилом,
Уже кадящим мертвечу,
Чтобы живых задеть кадилом.

ПСС 298

This poem, written in 1843, is considered a response to Pushkin’s death and
Belinsky’s criticism of Сумерки, and is also possibly Baratynsky’s response to
Lermontov’s death (ПСС 499). For further discussion of this poem’s connection with
Pushkin, as well as the themes of mourning the death of a poet and Hamlet, see Stephanie Sandler’s article “Baratynskii, Pushkin, and Hamlet: On Mourning and Poetry.”
Appendix 2

This appendix contains discussions of Baratynsky’s correspondence and comparisons of Baratynsky’s poems with works by other authors, in cases where the discussion seemed sufficiently interesting to include, but was only obliquely related to the main topics covered in this dissertation. These discussions are presented in the order in which they arise in the main body of the text.

Note 1: Baratynsky often spoke pejoratively of “the public” and society in his correspondence, and considered his temperament and his poetry to be unfit for society life. In an 1831 letter to I. V. Kireevsky he says:

In society I have often experienced that dullness of which you speak…For us society conversation is a learned labour, a dramatic production, because we are alien to the real life, the real passions of society. I will note one more thing: that ease that makes us skilful in society is a quality natural to those who are limited. It is given to them by self-sufficiency, always inseparable from stupidity. (Barratt, Selected Letters 85-6)

In another letter to I. V. Kireevsky from the same year, he wrote in response to Nadezhdin’s criticism of «Наложница»: “It would be a fine thing if I spoke Nadeždin’s language. Among his thousand subscribers, I doubt if there is one who understood a word of the page on which he attempts to explain the beautiful” (87). In the same letter he tells Kireevsky: “I am not renouncing writing, but for a while, and even for a long while, I wish to stop publishing. Poetry is not a vain pleasure for me. I do not need their praises (I mean, of course, the crowd’s), and do not see why I should subject myself to their abuses” (87).
Baratynsky’s low opinion of “the crowd’s” ability to distinguish good poetry was not limited to his own work: in an 1828 letter to Pushkin he wrote:

I like the broad plan of your ‘Onegin’ very much, but the majority do not understand it. They seek a romantic plot, they seek the usual, and, of course, do not find it. The great poetic simplicity of your work seems to them poverty of imagination, they do not notice that old and new Russia, life in all its variations, passes before their eyes, but the devil take them and God bless them! I think that here in Russia a poet can hope for great success only with his first, immature efforts. Behind him stand all young people, finding in him almost their own feelings, almost their own thoughts, clothed in dazzling colours. The poet develops, writes with greater deliberation, greater profundity; he bores the officers, but brigadiers cannot be reconciled with him because his verses, after all, are not prose. (65)

Baratynsky was equally indignant of the public’s reception of “Poltava,” writing to Vyazemsky:

It is criticized quite without discernment. Strange! I say this not because I respect the judgement of the public overmuch and am amazed that on this occasion it is wrong; but “Poltava,” it seems, apart from its proper worth, has what is needed for success: a respectable title, diverting contents, a new and popular subject. I confess that I do not know what our public wants. Vyžigins, it seems! Do you know that 2,000 copies of that rubbish have been distributed? Either the public is growing stupid or it will decidedly come to, and say, with just indignation, who do they take me for? (68)

In Baratynsky’s case, unfortunately for him, the public did not “come to” until several decades after his death.
Note 2: Compare stanzas eight and nine of «Последний поэт» with the beginning of «Медный всадник»:

На берегу пустынных волн
Стоял он, дум великих полн,
И вдаль глядел. Пред ним широко
Река неслася; бедный челн
По ней стремился одиноко.
По мхиствым, топким берегам
Чернели избы здесь и там,
Приют убогого чухонца;
И лес, неведомый лучам
В тумане спрятанного солнца,
Кругом шумел.

И думал он:
Отсель грозить мы будем шведу.
Здесь будет город заложен
Назло надменному соседу.
Природой здесь нам суждено
В Европу прорубить окно,
Ногою твердой стать при море.
Сюда по новым им волнам
Все флаги в гости будут к нам,
И запируем на просторе.
(Пушкин, Собрание сочинений в десяти томах: III: Поэмы 260-1).

The beginning of «Медный всадник» was published in Библиотека для чтения in 1834 (364), one year before «Последний поэт» appeared in Московский наблюдатель (ПСС 486). I do not know whether Baratynsky intended a deliberate contrast with «Медный всадник», but the striking similarities of the situations and rhymes make it seem unlikely to be coincidental. Interestingly, in «Последний поэт» the order of the rhyme-words is reversed («полн/волн», as opposed to «волн/полн» in «Медный всадник»), perhaps echoing the reversal of sentiment in the poem. While Peter I is full of «великие думы», planning to conquer nature and his neighbors, Baratynsky's poet is full of a «мятежная дума» against the forces of industrialization.
Pushkin's Peter invisions the sea as being the cooperative beast of burden it appears to be in stanza two of «Последний поэт», while Baratynsky's poet in stanza nine colludes with the sea to escape from the same industrial progress that Pushkin's Peter intends to use it to promote.

Note 3: In “Tonka” the protagonist, a young chemist, struggles with his relationship with his mistress, who is pregnant and appears to be suffering from a venereal disease that he does not have, casting doubts on her fidelity, although she denies any wrong-doing. This conundrum:

serves primarily as a point of departure for the presentation of an unpleasant parable about the viability of the one-sided individual who is characteristic of the modern world.

The specific effect of Tonka’s pregnancy and illness upon her friend is to erect a barrier between the two lovers. It can be broken down only if he accepts the fact that other possibilities have weight at least equal to that of the conclusions he reaches based on “knowledge.” Although he is willing to concede that other possible conclusions exist, he cannot bring himself to grant them any status of practical validity. He reasons that while such explanations for Tonka’s condition are theoretically possible, they are not really probable. At the same time, he views the probability that he is not responsible either for her pregnancy or her illness as something close to surety.

As a committed representative of the twentieth-century technological order, the young scientist is a product of civilization’s tendency to destroy or at least suppress the sense of possibility. The utter weakness of that faculty renders him completely unable, in his effort to penetrate to the truth of Tonka’s being, to transcend the limit of empirical facts, logic, and rational argumentation. Because his perception of himself is unshakably rooted in fixed, material reality, any suggestion of circumstances that do not fit such a context threatens his very existence. It changes his identity, imbuing it with an uncertainty that is incompatible with his chosen life. (Bangerter, Robert Musil 93-4)

The protagonist in this story appears as an introverted thinker with inadequately developed perceiving functions, tying him inescapably to his logic and cutting him off from the irrational world of perception, as well as the feeling world of interpersonal
relationships. Luckily for him, he is able (so he thinks) to escape his inferior function when his mistress and child die. A protagonist with introverted feeling, by contrast, would most likely feel torn, not between his intellectual path and his tiresome familial obligations, but between his personal relationships and his tiresome practical obligations to career and the outer world of business and getting things done. The gender stereotypes of the two functions should be stressed once again: while the conflict in “Tonka” is a stereotypically masculine one and has received much press over the years, the reverse conflict, dealing as it does with the hyper-“feminine” (although also, of course, present in men) function of introverted feeling, has not been explored in nearly as much depth by the male writers writing for male readers that make up the majority of our literature.

Note 4:
Keats, John, 1795-1821: LA BELLE DAME SANS MERCI [from The Poetical Works (1906)]

I

1 Ah, what can ail thee, wretched wight,
2 Alone and palely loitering;
3 The sedge is wither'd from the lake,
4 And no birds sing.

II

5 Ah, what can ail thee, wretched wight,
6 So haggard and so woe-begone?
7 The squirrel's granary is full,
8 And the harvest's done.

III

9 I see a lilly on thy brow,
10 With anguish moist and fever dew;
11 And on thy cheek a fading rose
12 Fast withereth too.
IV

13  I met a lady in the meads
14    Full beautiful, a faery's child;
15  Her hair was long, her foot was light,
16    And her eyes were wild.

V

17  I set her on my pacing steed,
18    And nothing else saw all day long;
19  For sideways would she lean, and sing
20    A faery's song.

VI

21  I made a garland for her head,
22    And bracelets too, and fragrant zone;
23  She look'd at me as she did love,
24    And made sweet moan.

VII

25  She found me roots of relish sweet,
26    And honey wild, and manna dew;
27  And sure in language strange she said,
28    I love thee true.

VIII

29  She took me to her elfin grot,
30    And there she gaz'd and sighed deep,
31  And there I shut her wild sad eyes---
32    So kiss'd to sleep.

IX

33  And there we slumber'd on the moss,
34    And there I dream'd, ah woe betide,
35  The latest dream I ever dream'd
36    On the cold hill side.
X

37 I saw pale kings, and princes too,
38 Pale warriors, death-pale were they all;
39 Who cry'd---"La belle Dame sans merci
40 Hath thee in thrall!"

XI

41 I saw their starv'd lips in the gloam
42 With horrid warning gaped wide,
43 And I awoke, and found me here
44 On the cold hill side.

XII

45 And this is why I sojourn here
46 Alone and palely loitering,
47 Though the sedge is wither'd from the lake,
48 And no birds sing.

There does not seem to be any reason to suspect that Baratynsky was consciously using this poem as a model, or that he was even familiar with it. Although in many ways very different, the two ladies in question have similar effects upon the lyrical heroes, who are both enthralled by their lady’s presence and stricken by her absence. Significantly for the discussion here, however, Baratynsky’s lyrical hero does not resent his lady’s effect on his mind, nor does he seem to suffer any long-term ill effects from his encounter with her. «Есть что-то в ней...» could therefore be seen as a rewriting of the genre of poems and stories detailing the encounter with the fatal lady. While his characters do encounter fatal ladies, especially in the long narrative poems, the danger they pose is physical and social rather than mental. The emotional thralldom of Baratynsky's male protagonists tends to fade fairly quickly, so that their main problem is the practical one of disentangling themselves from an unwanted relationship. Although Baratynsky's lyrical
hero often fears being carried away by his passions, being overwhelmed and controlled by love or emotional attachment has little fear for him.

Note 5:

Портрет
С своей пылающей душой,
С своими бурными страстями,
О жены севера, меж вами
Она является порой
И мимо всех условий света
Стремится до утраты сил,
Как беззаконная комета
В кругу расчисленном светил.
(Пушкин, Собрание сочинений том II 129)

Zakrevskaya also served as inspiration for Pushkin's “The Guests Gathered at the Dacha” and as the prototype for the passionate and tragic Nina from «Бал» (Boele, The North in Russian Romantic Literature 204). Pushkin was delighted with Nina, saying in his unpublished article on «Бал»:

Нина исключительно занимает нас. Характер ее совершенно новый, развит con amore, широко и с удивительным искусством, для него поэт наш создал совершенно своеобразный язык и выразил на нем все оттенки своей метафизики—для нее расточил он всю элегическую негу, всю прелесть своей поэзии.

... Напрасно поэт берет иногда строгий тон порицания, укоризны, напрасно он с принужденной холодностью говорит о ее смерти, сатирически описывает нам ее похороны и щуткою кончит поэму своей. Мы чувствуем, что он любит свою бедную страстную героиню. Он заставляет нас принимать болезненное соучастие в судьбе падшего, но еще очаровательного создания. («Бал» Баратынского» 58-9)

Pushkin was not the only one to be struck by Nina's innovative character. Kjetsaa says, in reference to the above-quoted article by Pushkin:
тип страстной, демонической женщины, подчиняющейся только своим желаниям, был введен в русскую литературу именно Баратынским. Впоследствии поэт получил в этом многочисленных последователей, сначала в романтических поэмах 1830-х годов, а потом в реалистических романах хотя бы Тургенева и Достоевского. (Хетсо, Жизнь и творчество, 381)

In the same article Bocharov touches upon the difference between Pushkin and Baratynsky's central heroines of their major works: «Однако при этом «беззаконная комета»—не подлинная, не центральная героиня у Пушкина, тогда как в мире Баратынского этому характеру принадлежит (не только в «Бале», но и в целом ряде стихотворений) одно из центральных мест» (95).

Pushkin, for all his delight in Baratynsky's Nina, created as his most iconic female figure the mild-mannered (compared with Nina) Tatyana of Eugene Onegin, while Baratynsky, for all his extolling of mild-mannered women, created as his most noticeable, and significant for the development of Russian literature, character the hot-blooded Nina. This, I would argue, stems from the fact that, from the Jungian point of view, true inspiration comes from the unconscious, and the unconscious images we hold of the opposite sex tend to represent those qualities we consciously hold as antithetical to our own self-image. So while the female figures that are consciously presented as positive in Baratynsky's poetry seem to be introverted feeling types who cause
differentiated introverted feeling to respond positively, the female figures who served as
the best “bridges” to the unconscious source of inspiration seem, by contrast, to be
extraverted perceiving types. While extraverted perceiving is not so diametrically
opposed to introverted feeling as extraverted thinking, our images of the opposite sex are
formed largely by the culture surrounding us, and extraverted thinking was not (and is
not) generally believed to be the province of women.

Note 6:

Пост
Пока не требует поэта
К священной жертве Аполлон,
В заботах суетного света
Он малодушно погружен;
Молчит его святая лира;
Душа вкушает хладный сон,
И меж детей ничтожных мира,
Быть может, всех ничтожней он.

Но лишь божественный глагол
До слуха чуткого коснется,
Душа поэта встрепенется,
Как пробудившийся орел.
Тоскует он в забавах мира,
Людской чуждается молвы,
К ногам народного кумира
Не клонит гордой головы;
Бежит он, дикий и суровый,
И звуков и смятенья полн,
На берега пустынных волн,
В широкошумные дубровы...
(Пушкин, Собрание сочинений, том II 104)

The similarities between this poem and several of Baratynsky's poems on poetry
are striking: both refer to the outer world as full of «забота» and «суета», and both
describe the non-poetry-writing state as being one of sleep or sleepiness, while the
poetry-writing state is one of wakefulness and agitation. However, in this poem Pushkin
seems to be celebrating the state of poetry writing, for all its troublesomeness, while
Baratynsky's poetic persona can never seem to muster up anything more than a sort of
resigned acceptance of anything that involves «волненье» or «смятенье». 
Appendix 3

This appendix contains a description psychic structures that are not essential for understanding the main thrust of my argument in this dissertation, but may prove helpful and/or satisfy some readers’ curiosity.

To begin with, a complex, one of Jung’s first original concepts, is a node or knot of emotion, of which we may not be aware. According to Murray Stein:

The results of his experiments convinced Jung that there are indeed psychic entities outside of consciousness, which exist as satellite-like objects in relation to ego-consciousness but are able to cause ego disturbances in a surprising and sometimes overwhelming way. They are the gremlins and inner demons that may catch a person by surprise. (Jung’s Map of the Soul 40)

Christine Gallant, in her book Tabooed Jung, refers to them as “splinter psyches” (88). Although we may not consciously know that we have complexes, they may reveal themselves through unexpected, out-of-character, or compulsive behavior. This description of complexes fits in fairly well with our popular understanding of them, but Jung often used the term to mean any aspect of the psyche that had a strong emotional charge or “pull” associated with it.

Some complexes, particularly the shadow and the anima/animus are, instead of being acknowledged, likely to be projected onto people in the external world. According to Jung, projection is:

a process of dissimilation…by which a subjective content becomes alienated from the subject and is, so to speak, embodied in the object. The subject gets rid of painful, incompatible contents by projecting them, as also of positive values which, for one reason or another—self-depreciation, for example—are inaccessible to him. (CW 6: 457)

An important aspect of projection, which can perhaps be gleaned from this passage, is that, while it is not always negative, it can result in seeing one’s “bad side” (or
shadow) not in oneself, but in other people. It can also, of course, result in seeing one’s hidden “good side” (especially if it is associated with the opposite sex) in other people, and in feeling a peculiarly strong sense of attachment and understanding with other people and/or things—Jung defines empathy, for example, as a type of active projection (458). When projection latches onto things rather than people, we can have the sensation that the things onto which we are projecting our unconscious contents have some invisible sympathy with us, that they in fact “speak” to us—as pre-intellectual nature in Baratynsky’s poem «Приметы», for example.

While projection causes us to see ourselves in others, its opposite, introjection, causes us to see others in ourself or to take in the outer world as a part of ourself; it is, in Jung's definition, “an assimilation of object to subject” (CW 6: 452), and is linked with empathy. While projection causes us to expel a part of our psyche into an external person or object, introjection causes us to absorb an external person or object into our psyche. In either case, these two activities allow us to link our psyches with the outer world.

Our projections and introjections, thus, cause (or allow) us to feel empathy or a sense of connection with the people and objects around us, giving us a strong emotional connection with them, whether positive or negative. We also tend to have strong emotional responses to archetypes. Archetype is one of those Jungian words that tends

\[132\]

In keeping with our Matthew theme, an example of such projection can be seen in the following passage from the Sermon on the Mount:

Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? How can you say to your brother, “Let me take the speck out of your eye,” when all the time there is a plank in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother's eye. (MT 7:3-5)
to be bandied about a fair amount, but defining what an archetype is rather more challenging. In *Psychological Types* Jung gives the following description of archetypes:

> The primordial image, elsewhere also termed *archetype*, is always collective, i.e., it is at least common to entire peoples or epochs. In all probability the most important mythological motifs are common to all times and races; I have, in fact, been able to demonstrate a whole series of motifs from Greek mythology in the dreams and fantasies of pure-bred Negroes suffering from mental disorders.\(^\text{133}\)

> From the scientific, causal standpoint the primordial image can be conceived as a mnemonic deposit, an imprint or *engram* (Semon), which has arisen through the condensation of countless processes of a similar kind. In this respect it is a precipitate and, therefore, a typical basic form, of certain ever-recurring psychic experiences. As a mythological motif, it is a continually effective and recurrent expression that reawakens certain psychic experiences or else formulates them in an appropriate way. From this standpoint it is a psychic expression of the physiological and anatomical disposition. If one holds the view that a particular anatomical structure is a product of environmental conditions working on living matter, then the primordial image, in its constant and universal distribution, would be the product of equally constant and universal influences from without, which must, therefore, act like a natural law. (443-4)

This particular description of archetypes appears to veer dangerously close to a Freudian “anatomy is destiny” assumption. As later Jungian theorists continued to

---

\(^\text{133}\)This passage, like the one cited above in reference to the anima/animus complex, demonstrates the value and the problematic nature of Jungian theory for non-privileged members of a society. As with his treatment (both as a clinician and a theorist) of women, Jung’s treatment of non-whites and non-Christians can (correctly) seem maddeningly condescending and essentialist to the modern reader—probably in part because it shows up our own collective shadow, which is in no way free of the same attitudes for which we would like to criticize Jung. This activation (or *constellation*) of our own shadow can blind us to the real of achievement of Jung, who assumed that non-whites and non-Christians, like non-males, not only had psyches, but that these psyches were worth serious study and were in many ways not too dissimilar to those of white Christian males. For more on the post-colonial critique of Jungian theory, see for example Gallant’s *Tabooed Jung* or Rowland’s *C. G. Jung and Literary Theory: The Challenge from Fiction.*
develop the concept of the archetype, it took on a broader and less apparently “stereotypical” expression. Susan Rowland’s definition of archetypes is as follows:

structuring potentials are inherited; contents are not. Given that archetypal images can never exhaust the multiple possibilities of the archetype and are refracted through the personal, they can be described as fictional, metaphorical versions of an unrepresentable reality. That is, archetypal images are fictional and metaphorical, not because they are arbitrary but because they are the partial and imaginative expressions of fundamentally plural potentials for meaning. (C. G. Jung and Literary Theory 11)

The most important point of Rowland's definition, following Jung, of the archetype, is that an archetype has no fixed form, but is an empty “space” in the psyche, designed to be filled with specific contents relating to specific areas of human experience, such as interactions with parents, children, friends, enemies, or members of the opposite sex, as well as countless other experiences. The contents that fill this empty potentiality are determined by a person’s cultural and personal context.

Because archetypes are numinous (Jung’s term), meaning they compel a strong affective or emotional response at the unconscious level, and because they are transpersonal, tied to the collective unconscious, they also form psychic bridges, like the shadow and the anima/animus (which are archetypes themselves), but bridges that link not only different parts of the psyche, but different psyches. It is this linking of psyches via shared archetypes (facilitated, most likely, by projection) that (according to the theory) allows readers and writers to form a connection over a single work of literature.

Archetypes are, as was mentioned above, shared through the collective unconscious, another Jungian term that is much bandied about without necessarily being
In Psychological Types Jung discusses his theory of the two areas of the unconsciousness, and says that:

We can distinguish a personal unconscious, comprising all the acquisitions of personal life, everything forgotten, repressed, subliminally perceived, though, felt. But in addition to these personal unconscious contents, there are other contents which do not originate in personal acquisitions but in the inherited possibility of psychic functioning in general, i.e., in the inherited structure of the brain. These are the mythological associations, the motifs and images that can spring up anew anytime anywhere, independently of historical tradition or migration. I call these contents the collective unconscious. (485, emphasis in the original)

The collective unconscious, therefore, is the basic substratum of the human psyche, formed by millenia of human evolution, and makes up the underlying structure of the human mind, differentiating it by its fundamentally human shape from, for example, the chimpanzee, the elephant, or the orca mind. According to Jungian theory, a human being is not born as a tabula rasa, but comes into the world with a brain ready-formed to become a specifically human psyche. According to Jungian theory, a child raised by wolves a la Mowgli (should it survive such a process at all), would not become a wolf who walks upright, but would inevitably become a human being, even if a strange one (as happens with Mowgli). This collective unconscious, which is filled with archetypes, is

---

134 According to Gallant, in the appropriation of Jungian theory for literary criticism, “All that critics took from his analytical psychology were his general ideas that there is a collectively shared unconscious and that a transpersonal structure of archetypes informs human experience” (64-5).

135 One might compare the concept of the collective unconscious with the ability to acquire language: humans appear to be born with a nature tendency to acquire language, but the actual language each individual acquires depends on specific cultural factors. In much the same way, the collective unconscious could be seen as the ability to become human, but the forms of the archetypes and the complexes are culturally specific.
(along with projection and the archetypes that fill it) what allows us to experience a sensation of shared humanity with other members of the human race.
Appendix 4

All photographs were taken during my summer 2010 visit to Finland. All maps are from Wikipedia Commons http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Maps_of_Finland

Map of Finland in Europe: Area where Baratynsky served (marked in dark green):

The uniquely star-shaped bastion in Hamina, where Baratynsky wrote «Финляндия»
The bastion today
Seascapes around Hamina
Finnish granite near Hamina
Midnight in Hamina
Vyborg. Although now part of Russia, Vyborg or Viipuri has historically been Finnish territory. Baratynsky visited Vyborg and dedicated a poem to Avrora Shernval, the daughter of the region’s governor and a famous beauty. For a biography of Avrora, see Temira Pachmuss’s book *A Moving River of Tears: Russia’s Experience in Finland.*
The fortress at Lappeenranta (Villmanstrand)

The Imatra waterfall, which inspired Baratynsky’s poem «Водопад», now a hydroelectric dam
Fort Elisabeth, Kotka (Ruotsinsalmi)

Gulf of Finland at Kotka


---. "The Poet of Thought in ‘Vse Mysel ‘da Mysl’: Truth in Boratynskij’s Poetry." Rocky
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