

“For Fear of Bears”: Ruskin in Russia (A Biblio-Historical Sketch)

Stuart Eagles

Despite the fact that Ruskin frequently travelled through Europe, he never visited Russia. In the autobiographical *Praeterita* (1885-89) he wrote, not entirely seriously, “I would not go to India for fear of tigers, nor to Russia for fear of bears, nor to Peru for fear of earthquakes” (35.312). Apart from a handful of references in his *Complete Works* relating to the Crimean War (1854-56), Ruskin scarcely mentioned the country, and cannot be said to have enjoyed a sophisticated understanding of its culture or people. Yet as Ruskin fell silent because of illness and old age and, perversely, his influence was felt more strongly in his native Britain, so an impressive range of individuals responsible for helping to forge the cultural renaissance of the Silver Age in late imperial Russia began to take an interest in his work and ideas.

It has become a commonplace to mention Ruskin and Tolstoy in the same breath, and Ruskinians have long asserted the influence of the Englishman on the Russian, although without subjecting the claim to hard scrutiny. As I have written at length on the subject elsewhere, I do not intend to repeat myself here, but in excluding Tolstoy from this survey, I do not wish to deny that he played a crucial role in disseminating Ruskin’s work and ideas in turn-of-the-century Russia (see Eagles). Tolstoy’s enthusiasm and personal intervention helped to secure the publication of around half the Ruskin-related titles published in Russia before 1917. Almost all of these were the work of Lev Niki-forov (1848-1917) who was described in an obituary as promoting

Ruskin with a “youthful ardour” through his “truly exemplary” translations (Partiya sotsialistov-revolutsionerov 13): “saving all the brightness and colour of the original” (25). Nikiforov, in particular, was responsible for promoting Ruskin as Tolstoy saw him, namely as “a philosopher, political economist, and Christian moralist” (Tolstoy CE 21.188 & Tolstoy PSS 31.96).

Ruskin’s influence in Russia has been largely ignored alike by Russianists and Ruskinians, and the subject particularly deserves attention now. In the past five years, as the Russian Federation emerges from the isolation of its Soviet past, not merely scholars, but readers more generally, are discovering Ruskin in new and reprinted editions of Russian translations of his books. Four substantial, if sometimes abridged, well-illustrated but affordably-priced translations of Ruskin have been published in hardback: new editions of pre-revolutionary translations of *Mornings in Florence* [*Progulki po Florentsii*] and *Lectures on Art* [*Lektsii ob iskusstve*] and original translations of works not previously available in Russian, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* [*Sem’ svetochi arkhitektury*], and *The Stones of Venice* [*Kamni Venetsii*]. In addition, *The King of the Golden River* is available in an anthology, *English Tales* [*Angliiskie Skazki*], and as a language primer in English and Russian, *English Language with J. Ruskin. The King of the Golden River* [*Angliiskii yazyk s Dzh. Raskinom. Korol’ zolotoi reki*]. Facsimiles of Nikiforov’s translations of Ruskin’s *A Joy For Ever* [*Radost’ navek*] and *The Laws of Fesole* [*Zakony Fiezolo*], as well as Robert de la Sizeranne’s *Ruskin et la religion de la beauté*, have also been published.

Some of Ruskin’s most important ideas on art, aesthetics, architecture, history, and political economy are once again accessible to Russians, albeit in modest editions with small print-runs. The extent of Ruskin’s cultural penetration is hinted at by the composition of a piece of instrumental music, “John Ruskin” [“Dzhon Reskin”], the seventh track on the 2006

album, *Legend* [*Legenda*] by the jazz musician, Alexey Kozlov. Once an underground artist in the Soviet Union, Kozlov is now not merely widely-accepted but also admired as a musical historian and journalist.

Yet Ruskin cut an even sharper figure in Russia from the 1890s until the revolutions of 1917, and particularly in the years around the turn of the century. Perhaps one of the reasons why most Western scholars have apparently not known anything about Ruskin's Russian reception, quite apart from the difficulty of accessing Russian-language material, is that Ruskin's editors, Cook and Wedderburn, were simply ignorant of it themselves. An unusually ill-informed E.T. Cook wrote in volume 38 of the *Library Edition* (published in May 1912), "I am not aware that Ruskin has been translated into Russian; but Tolstoy's appreciation of him is well known" (38.xxii).

Cook and Wedderburn note a "comic" error in one bibliography they consulted, which mistakenly recorded the publication of an article entitled "Growth of Ruskin" which turned out to be "Growth of Russia" (38.119). A more recent example can be found in Kirk H. Beetz's, *John Ruskin: A Bibliography, 1900-1974* which lists "Lavrin, Janko, *From Ruskin to Mayakovsky: A Study in the Evaluation of Literature*. Philadelphia: Richard West, 1973 (reprint of 1948 edition)" (Beetz entry 487). Not unexpectedly, "Ruskin" turns out to be a misreading of "Pushkin," a less puzzling association of literary figures. At the beginning of 2011, one can browse the website abebooks and find a New York bookseller offering *Millais and the Russians* [*sic*]! It must be a matter of both surprise and regret that no comprehensive and accurate bibliography let alone a wide-ranging study of Ruskin in Russia has hitherto been published.

Ruskin's biographer and secretary, W.G. Collingwood, writing in 1893, insisted:

[Ruskin's] works have not been popularized abroad by translations, to which he is opposed, feeling not only that

his style would be difficult to render, but that the audiences they would address could hardly be open to the appeal he makes so distinctly to the mind and associations of an English-speaking race. But his name is well enough known in Italy, and not unknown in France. (Collingwood 2.562)¹

In Russia alone, by 1917, 15 different Ruskin titles had been published in 21 unique translations, some of them serialized before being released in volume form. *The King of the Golden River* appeared in four original translations, *Lectures on Art* in three, and *Sesame and Lilies* in two. Seven anthologies were available. Five different studies of Ruskin had been translated from English, French, and German, with John Hobson and Robert de la Sizeranne both translated twice each. Finally, there were also eleven essay-length studies of Ruskin, some of them published as substantial pamphlets (and only one of them was by Nikiforov).² Besides what was available in Russian, among the most literary and educated households, particularly in St Petersburg, Russia's 'window on the west,' Ruskin could be read in the original English, as well as in French and possibly German translation.

Many Russian journals contained reviews, biographical sketches and discussions of Ruskin and his works. The earliest attempt at translating Ruskin into Russian apparently dates from 1888, when the active 'thick' journal, *Russian Treasure* [*Russkoe bogatstvo*], under the moderate populist editorship of Nikolai Mikhailovsky (1842-1904), published a short piece entitled "Morals in Political Economy" (see Belkind 10). Ruskin merited articles in periodicals ranging from popular literary journals such as *The Herald of Foreign Literature* [*Vestnik inostrannoi literatury*] and *The New Journal of Foreign Literature* [*Novyi zhurnal inostrannoi literatury*] to the popular St Petersburg 'thick' journal, *God's World* (*Mir Bozhii*). He was discussed in the modestly reformist Moscow-based *Russian Thought* [*Russkaya mysl'*] and *Herald of Europe* [*Vestnik evropy*] on the one hand, and in

the radical *Northern Herald* [*Severnyi vestnik*] on the other. By the turn of the century, Ruskin's ideas were part of the background to cultural debates in the organ of the Symbolist movement, *The World of Art* [*Mir iskusstva*] and the house magazine of acmeism, *Apollo* [*Apollon*].³

The year of Ruskin's death, 1900, marked the height of his popularity in Russia, with many new titles being published. As Elena Belkind has observed, "The mere number of Ruskin's books which circulated in Russia at the beginning of this [twentieth] century testifies to his great popularity" (Belkind 10) or, if not "his great popularity," then it at least indicates the extent of the familiarity of the Russian intelligentsia with Ruskin. Many Russian journals published obituaries of Ruskin with synopses of his work.⁴ Ruskin's protean nature meant that he could be invoked on almost all sides of an argument, though inevitably his presence was most keenly felt in the liberal press, which was interested in art, keen on social reform, and largely positive towards Western ideas. This was still a time when Russia remained culturally divided between those who embraced the influence of Europe and America, and those who wished rather to develop an indigenous culture, partly in contradistinction to it (the so-called debate between 'westernizers' and 'slavophiles'). Moreover, it was a period of intellectual crisis in which intellectuals sought to redefine the relationship between art, culture, and society.

The purpose of this paper is to map the cultural landscape in terms of late imperial Russia's critical engagement with Ruskin, providing a biblio-historical sketch of the broad Russian-Ruskin conspectus. It seeks to identify some of the common themes that connect different areas of interest in and wider academic debate about Ruskin, and to provide a general overview rather than unfold a detailed or exhaustive analysis. The argument is not that Ruskin was the only Western author of significance in late imperial Russia.⁵ Rather, the attempt here is to demonstrate

that Ruskin's values and ideas were adopted, adapted, and sometimes rejected, but crucially not ignored, by an impressively wide range of Russian men and women.

Svetlana Shustova is one of the few Russian academics to study Ruskin's Russian reception and his wider influence, a subject she first explored in two short conference papers given in 1969 and 1972, published respectively in the *Proceedings of the 10th* and *11th Scientific Conferences of Literature*. In the first of these she argued that Ruskin's appeal to Russians rested on his insistence that "human existence" should be predicated not on the destructive system of capitalism but on an appreciation of beauty and a oneness with nature: this "Christian path out of the impasse [of modern industrial capitalist society] ... preaches the need for people to live in close proximity to nature, and daily to create beautiful things with their own hands" (Shustova 1969; 201). This gets to the core of the Russian celebration of Ruskin as the "Apostle of the religion of beauty" and it offers a productive way of reading the Russian interpretation of Ruskin, particularly among visual and literary artists of the Silver Age.

One of the few historians of Russia writing in English to consider Ruskin is Rachel Polonsky, whose meticulous study of the Russian aesthetic renaissance pays him close attention. Polonsky traces the "fault lines between democratic and elitist aesthetics in the period of Ruskin's Russian reception" at the end of the nineteenth century, finding that the traditional focus of literary critics on the social and political utility of art could be reconciled with the 'art for art's sake' school through Ruskin's religion of beauty, at least in some cases: "Ruskin became a point around which discussions about aesthetics could be turned" (Polonsky 142). Polonsky makes the important point that Ruskin's thinking, developed over decades, was read all at once in Russia, and side by side with Shelley, the French Symbolists, the Pre-Raphaelites, and Oscar Wilde, consequently promoting similarities and perhaps ob-

scuring differences between them. She summarizes Ruskin's significance neatly: "Ruskin's writings had, as soon as they became known to Russian readers, become deeply absorbed in ongoing aesthetic debates" (Polonsky 141).

It is possible to go further and to assert that in Russia, Ruskin was taken seriously by those practising and writing about not only aesthetics (the particular concern of Polonsky's study), but philosophy more widely, covering subjects as diverse as the visual arts, literature, architecture, handicrafts, political economy, and education. Further, Ruskin's Russian champions can be found among workers in the printing industry and performers on the innovative Russian stage.

Ruskin was seen to be at the head of a European and, more specifically, an English movement, which held that art was an expression of society. Social reform might thus lead to more creative art, and for some, that association implied that art might, in turn, influence, and even redeem, society itself. Some of the contradictions, conflicts and chaos of the times might be resolved. More powerfully still, the aesthetic concept of beauty, and the pursuit of beauty, promised the possibility of connecting the fragments of modern life around one goal. Ruskin's celebration of the medieval, in particular Venetian Gothic, was an invitation to look to the past, and to learn its lessons. For the Russian intelligentsia, Ruskin's criticism of contemporary Britain, already more advanced in its processes of industrialization and urbanization than Russia, was not so much a commentary on the present, but a warning about a possible, even likely, Russian future.

Apollo's editor, the poet and art critic, Sergei Makovsky (1877-1962), was one of the most eminent figures to trumpet Ruskin as "the apostle of beauty" (Polonsky 22-23). Yet he was by no means alone, with the critic, translator, fabulist, and children's writer, Kornei Chukovsky (1882-1969), and the literary historian and ally of symbolism, Evgeny Anichkov (1866-1937), acknowledging Ruskin's impor-

tance (Chukovsky 77, Anichkov 145-46). The artist and critic, Alexander Benois (1870-1960), one of the founders of the *World of Art* group, recalled that Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites were surrounded by halos for young Russians, and especially those in St Petersburg (Benois 1.685-90).

Russian notions of Ruskin's thinking were particularly indebted to the study of the French art critic and historian, Robert de la Sizeranne (1866-1932), *Ruskin et la religion de la beauté*, which as noted was translated twice. This is most obviously reflected in the title of a study by Lev Bogdanovich (b. 1860), *John Ruskin. "Apostle of the Religion of Beauty" (An Essay) [Dzhon Reskin, "Apostol religii krasoty" (ocherk)]* a cheaply-priced, 26-page pamphlet published in Moscow by I.A. Mamontov just after Ruskin's death in January 1900. A closer look at the work fleshes out la Sizeranne's legacy, and crucially reveals many of the core themes and facets of the Russian understanding of Ruskin, particularly as it relates to the value of beauty in art and life.

Bogdanovich claimed that if anyone found themselves in Florence or Rome they would discover there a "*confraternita di Ruskin*" declaring his genius as "the only inspirational soul, which remains among us. ... If your interviewee knows that you are Russian, he will add, 'Ruskin is our Tolstoy'" (Bogdanovich 12). Bogdanovich was at pains to establish Ruskin as a towering figure in, as he calls it, the Anglo-Saxon world, as well-known and popular as Gladstone, Stanley, and Cecil Rhodes (3): Ruskin's admirers you might meet "anywhere and everywhere" (6); tourists at Mont Blanc and other mountain ranges he likens to a Ruskinian "army" (8). As such, he argues, Ruskin, who "is still too little known to Russian readers" (3), is someone whom Russians ought not merely to understand, but to appreciate, notwithstanding a silent protest in the Russian mind "against the Anglo-Saxon imagination, snaking its way slowly towards us, in Asia" (13). Russia should embrace Ruskin, he insisted revealingly, or

risk "lagging behind" (14), an assertion that underlines an acute anxiety felt in Russia, then and still, about the country's relative stage of development, its international status, and the degree to which the West should remain 'other.'

In his account, Bogdanovich firmly establishes Ruskin as the "father of the aesthetic" (3) and the "apostle of the religion of beauty" (3), varying the phrase to "the father of British aesthetics" (6) as he characterizes Brantwood as a site of pilgrimage to which disciples turn up with their "Kodaks" (5), and later still he again hails "the apostolic spirit of John Ruskin" (22). Deploying a significant metaphor, he compares Ruskin to a "Great Anglo-Saxon physician" (7) determined to "use his powerful means to cure his brothers" (8). Ruskin is the "eternal advocate of real virtues" whose writings are "monographs about the medicinal qualities and properties of beauty" (9).

The "fundamental idea of Ruskin" is that "the art of each country is an indicator of her social and political power" (6), a recognition of Ruskin's declaration in the first of his Oxford lectures that "the art of any country is the exponent of its social and political virtues" (20.39). Ruskin "moralizes about any picture, any statues" because the aesthetic and the ethical, art and society, are indivisible (Bogdanovich 9). Ruskin was interested in aesthetics as a "moralist and social reformer," which brought about a "move from aesthetics to political economy," which he characterizes as an evolution from "a concern for the living conditions of artistic workers" to serious contemplation of "the proper organization of human activities in the community" (15).

Noting that many of Ruskin's fellow Englishmen had rejected his ideas, and subjected him to ridicule, he insisted that the project in which Ruskin and his followers were engaged "with a noble enthusiasm" was an attempt "to establish the kingdom of beauty in all the minutest details of English life" (16). Bogdanovich commends Ruskin's practical en-

gement with art teaching in the Working Men's College, and the wider educational value of the Guild of St George with its working men's museum and its promotion of handicrafts: "the famous art critic did not disdain cares about every detail of life ... He was not satisfied with [merely] preaching" (19).

Acknowledging that some followers "have brought these concerns to extremes, often distorting the basic idea of Ruskin," he traced the sympathetic effect on domestic arts through William Morris, Walter Crane, and the arts and crafts movement (19). Because not everybody had time to travel or see the great works of art and properly contemplate them, Ruskin literally brought art and beauty into the home, a process of domesticizing and democratizing art that Bogdanovich applauded: "to make homes, clothes, utensils, furniture, everything you need in life both useful and beautiful for everyone" (23). Furthermore, Bogdanovich recognized this as part of a project to go "back to nature"; it was not an exercise in "refined luxury" because everything should be appropriate for its use (24). Bogdanovich ends, almost where he begins, by comparing Ruskin to Rousseau and Tolstoy in looking to nature: "He lifted the veil" to reveal what the "world often hides from our eyes" (25): the truth Keats taught, that "a thing of beauty is a joy for ever" (*Endymion*).

This summary of Bogdanovich ought to be read as an introduction to Russian interpretations of Ruskin, but there is another significant point to be made about the essay. It could hardly have found a more sympathetic and appropriate publisher than A[natoli] I[vanovich] Mamontov (1839-1905). Mamontov published at least five Ruskin volumes in Russian translation. A translator himself, he was, like his more famous brother, Savva Mamontov (1841-1918), a keen art connoisseur. Savva had founded the celebrated artisanal colony or "Circle" at Abramtsevo, just outside Moscow, which was a magnet for artists and craftsmen, and precisely the kind of environment in which the values of Ruskin and Morris thrived. The Mamontov brothers were both sponsors

of folk art and craft. They enjoyed the considerable means afforded to them by their father's lucrative investments in Russia's burgeoning railways, so that the spoils of industrialization were spent on reinvigorating and, to some extent, reinventing the past. The factory, Children's Education, founded in 1883 by Anatoli Mamontov's wife, Aleksevna (d. 1904), manufactured a number of toys for children, and it is often credited as producing Russia's first nesting doll (*matreshka*) at the end of the nineteenth century. More importantly, its shop was one of the first stores to stock goods made at Abramtsevo. The point is, that at least one of Ruskin's Russian publishers was intimately involved in several aspects of the art world.



Three of the most notable translators, admirers and promoters of Ruskin in Russia, besides Lev Nikiforov, were Olga Soloveva, Zinaida Vengerova and Adelaida Gertsyk, each of whom deserves special attention. The prominence of such women in disseminating Ruskin's ideas in Russia is partly a reflection of the literary status of translation, but all of them were keen champions of "English aestheticism," of which they saw Ruskin as the father, and they were particularly enthusiastic about the Pre-Raphaelites and the group of writers, including Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde, whom they associated with the historic university city of Oxford. These three women, in particular, promoted Ruskin and English notions of aesthetic value to a younger generation of modernists, and especially Symbolist writers.

The anthology of selected passages from Ruskin compiled by the professional portraitist and translator, Olga Soloveva (1855-1903), the sister-in-law of the hugely influential mystic philosopher, Vladimir Solovev (1853-1900), began to appear in *The Northern Herald* from June 1896 under the title, *Art and Reality: Selected Thoughts from the Works of John Ruskin* [*Iskusstvo i deistvitel'nost': izbrannye myсли iz sochinenii Dzhona Reskina*].⁶ Published in St Petersburg between

1885 and 1898, *The Northern Herald* was originally a populist (*narodnicheskii*) literary, scientific, and political journal, but was by then a leading radical organ, particularly interested in modernism and symbolism. Retaining some links to “realist” writers, including Tolstoy, who rejected aestheticism, it provided a perfect home for Ruskin, whose writings on art are shot through with social and political ideals, a point firmly established in the pairing of Soloveva’s title, *Art and Reality*.

The Northern Herald was at that time published and co-edited by the leading Russian female journalist, Lyubov Gurevich (1866-1940). The daughter of a St Petersburg educationalist, Gurevich was a university graduate of the new Higher Courses in Education for Women. She was an active member of the moderate Women’s Mutual Philanthropic Society, part of the women’s liberationist movement, and was later the close friend, adviser, and influence upon the celebrated actor-director, Konstantin Stanislavsky (1863-1938). In 1900 she wrote an obituary of Ruskin herself. Her article in the journal, *Life* [*Zhizn’*], “John Ruskin as a writer on social reality and man” [“Dzhon Reskin kak pisatel’ obshchestvennoi deyatel’nosti i chelovek”] underlined Ruskin’s success as a lecturer at Oxford, but ultimately criticized him as dogmatic.

Soloveva’s papers were collected and considerably expanded and issued as a single volume in Moscow in 1900 as *Art and Reality: Selected Passages* [*Iskusstvo i deistvitel’nost’: izbrannyya stranitsy*] almost simultaneously by two different publishers, I.N. Kushnerev and the familiar A.I. Mamontov.

Soloveva’s selection is impressively eclectic, with passages from *Modern Painters*, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, *The Stones of Venice*, *Elements of Drawing*, *The Two Paths*, *Sesame and Lilies*, *The Cestus of Aglaia*, *The Crown of Wild Olive*, *The Queen of the Air*, *Lectures on Art*, *The Eagle’s Nest*, *Aratra Pentilici*, *Ariadne Florentina*, *Val d’Arno*, *Fors Clavigera*,

Mornings in Florence, *The Laws of Fesole*, *Arrows of the Chace*, *The Art of England*, *The Pleasures of England*, and *On the Old Road*. The extracts are arranged into nine subtitled chapters: "Art and Morality" (with 10 sections), "Art and Religion" (6), "Art and Nature" (14), "Art and Knowledge" (5), "The Conditions of Creativity" (7), "The History of Art" (21), "Art and Industry" (8), "The Technique of Art" (14) and "The Public" (7).

Its influence in some key respects is worth noting because it was this most important of Ruskin translations (Tolstoy was probably the most influential figure to own a copy) that was read by her nephew, Alexander Blok (1880-1921), later the leading Russian Symbolist poet. As late as 1909 he (re-)read the volume and "made copious notes, finding much confirmation of his own ideas on art and nature, decadence and progress and the nature of genius" (Pyman 2.58). Soloveva and Blok's mother, who were the same age, were friends, and her only son, Sergei Solov'ev (1885-1942), himself a poet, worshipped his cousin as well as his uncle, Vladimir. In the words of Blok's biographer, Avril Pyman, "Olga's home was destined to become the nursery of the second generation of Russian Symbolism" (Pyman 1.70). Blok would stay with Olga at the home of her mother, Alexandra Kovalenskaya, in the summer of 1898, and would visit Olga and her family at their home in 1900:

From its inception, the Solov'ev group adopted Olga's mistrust of the "formless decadence" of St. Petersburg, of the aesthetic set which had formed around Mir Iskusstva and of the Merezhkovskys' new religious consciousness – even though they admitted a closer relationship to these than to any other contemporary trends and were prepared to enter into temporary tactical alliances with them (Pyman 1.73).⁷

Rachel Polonsky has presented a close reading of Blok's poetry to demonstrate Ruskin's influence, work matched in Bely's case by the dis-

tinguished scholar, Oleg Maslenikov. Polonsky agrees with Pyman that Blok's "profound sympathy with Ruskin" is evidenced by the heavily underlined copies of passages in his notebooks which were taken directly from Soloveva's anthology (Polonsky 151): "Blok weaves Ruskin's voice into his own so intricately that at times one is indistinguishable from the other. Ruskin gave words to Blok's aesthetic crisis" (146). Polonsky's reading of Blok's cycle of poems, "Florence" ["Florentsiya"] and "Lightning Flashes of Art" ["Molnii iskusstva"] (1909-20), and "Retribution" ["Vozmezdie"] (1919) finds parallels with Ruskin's apocalyptic visions in *Fors Clavigera*. In particular, Avril Pyman regarded Blok's rendering of an "uprooted, mechanized urban proletariat as a beast which is angered by culture but may be turned back into a human being by love and music" as a reflection of Ruskin's direct influence (Pyman 2.283n). Polonsky concludes that "Ruskin was an art critic, Blok, a poet; both saw the times they lived in as times that called for prophets" (Polonsky 151).

Blok's friend and literary colleague, Andrei Bely (1880-1934), was likewise indebted to Ruskin, specifically as mediated by Soloveva's presentations, and it was through her offices that he first met the influential Merezhkovskys as well as Blok himself. He fully acknowledged Soloveva's influence, and remembered her translating orally from Ruskin, Wilde, Verlaine, and Mallarmé on her couch, adding that his "interest in ... Ruskin" was aroused by her (Bely 370-71).

Maslenikov's close textual analysis of Bely's third 'symphony,' *The Return* (1904) [*Vozvrat*], written when the Solovev family's influence over the young poet had reached its apotheosis in 1901-2, convincingly argues that much of its frequently apocalyptic symbolism is drawn from the pages of Ruskin, including *The Stones of Venice* and *Fors Clavigera*, *The King of the Golden River* and "The Storm-Cloud of the Nineteenth Century." Tsar Wind and Southwest Wind Esquire is an obvious parallel, and given the cultural material

on which Bely was nourished in the bohemian home of the Solovevs, it is likely that the association of serpents with the devil of mechanized industry comes principally from Ruskin. Additionally, Maslenikov cites the personal testimony of Bely's first wife who confirmed that the poet knew Ruskin's work, despite not being able to read English, because of his personal and intellectual familiarity with Soloveva and her work (Maslenikov 22).

For both Blok and Bely Ruskin's influence must be seen in their preoccupation with the science of seeing [*nauka uvidet'*], and Polonsky asserts that Ruskin played a crucial role in promoting to both men the significance of "the beauties of shape and colour" (Polonsky 139). She neatly summed up Ruskin's influence on

Symbolist poets like Blok and Bely. In the wild, angered tones and the apocalyptic symbolism of the late Ruskin, the Symbolists found resonances that chimed with their own sense of the imminence of a social and spiritual cataclysm born of the world's loss of beauty, and the disintegration of the relations between art and life. (Polonsky 143)

Olga Soloveva's contribution to translating Ruskin did not end with her anthology. Her abridged translation of *Sesame and Lilies* [*Sezam i lilii*] which appeared in consecutive issues of *The New Journal of Foreign Literature* from January 1900 was later issued first as a 71-page pamphlet by that journal in St Petersburg, and again in 1901 by A.I. Mamontov in Moscow as a complete 214-page translation of all three of its lectures.

The World of Art [*Mir iskusstva*] carried her translation of Ruskin's "Pre-Raphaelitism" ["Prerafaelitzm"] in May 1900, but by then the journal had already largely rejected Ruskin's values, presenting the essays rather grudgingly "to acquaint the reader with the views of the recently deceased, famous English writer John Ruskin" (MI 17 [May 1900] 49). Yet this is itself proof that Ruskin could not be ignored. The critical

distance between the movement and Ruskin had been established in the first two numbers of the journal in January and February 1899. Under the title “Complex Questions” [“slozhnye voprosy”], signed by Sergei Diaghilev (1872-1929), but possibly written by his cousin and co-editor Dmitry Filosofov (1872-1940), what amounted to an editorial policy was unfolded, and it was clear that the young group wished to establish its newness from the beginning.⁸

The articles contended that although there was no dispute about the “social significance” of art, art must be seen as “an end in itself” (Diaghilev “I” 15). The second essay, sub-titled “The Search for Beauty” included a lengthy discussion of aesthetics which focused on a range of nineteenth-century writers. Crucially, Diaghilev compares Ruskin with the revolutionary socialist, materialist philosopher and aesthetically ‘utilitarian’ critic, Nikolai Chernyshevsky (1828-1889), asserting through a series of juxtaposed statements that Chernyshevsky’s focus on social reality, and Ruskin’s idealization of beauty “meet” because “For one of them life had not yet reached its ideal manifestation, whereas for the other it had already lost its ideal form” (Diaghilev “II” 44). In other words, if one accepted the interpretations of either of them, then it follows that true art simply was not possible in contemporary society. The article contentiously concluded that Ruskin is therefore closest to Tolstoy, in rejecting not merely art for art’s sake, but art itself. Rachel Polonsky concludes her detailed analysis of these essays with the observation that it was “a comparison which was soon to become embedded in Russian representations of Ruskin” (Polonsky 144), citing as an example the work of the Symbolist poet and critic, Valery Bryusov (1873-1924), in which he observed the similarity of Ruskin’s ideas with those of the utilitarians⁹ (Bryusov 4),

One of the foremost translators and critics of the English Pre-Raphaelites and a leading expert in English aesthetics, Zinaida Vengerova (1867-1941), was an influential admirer of Ruskin. Like Soloveva, she was part of a literary family: her brother Semen Vengerov

(1855-1920) was the expert bibliographer, editor, and literary historian. Having studied at St Petersburg University under Alexander Veselovsky (1838-1906), who as a literary historian specialized in the Italian renaissance as well as European and Russian medieval literature, and as a keen champion of Western culture proved most influential in forming his students' taste, Vengerova herself went on to write Ruskin's entry, and that of Pater, Morris, and the Pre-Raphaelites in Brockhaus and Efron's celebrated *Encyclopaedic Dictionary* (1890-1906), the 86-volume equivalent to the 1911 (11th) edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

In June 1900, Vengerova's lengthy obituary of Ruskin, "John Ruskin, 1819-1900" was published in *The Herald of Europe*, which shared some of the same anxieties about the potential of Ruskin's message to suppress creativity in its (mis-)perceived emphasis on the social utility of art, but her enthusiasm for him was always strong. Her essay was later collected under the title, "John Ruskin, Apostle of Beauty" ["Apostol krasoty"] in Vengerova's collection, *English Writers of the Nineteenth Century* [*Angliiskie pisateli XIX veka*] published in St Petersburg by Prometei in 1913. In 1903, she wrote in *Essays on the History of Foreign Literature* [*Ocherki po istorii zarubezhnoi literatury*]: "[Ruskin] caused a revolution in art, he managed to convince us that art is not a luxury but a necessity, that beauty is a necessary element of life" (Vengerova [1913] 173).¹⁰

This underlines the central role that Ruskin played in Russian debates, where he was cast alternately as a figure whose belief in the social utility of art threatened to stifle modern art production and creativity, yet also as a philosopher whose theories could be used to bridge the apparent gulf between aestheticism and social ethics with his concept of the ennobling and revelatory qualities of beauty. The belief that through beauty, art and society could be (re-)united and (re-)vitalized became a sort of aesthetic religion, and as its 'Apostle,' Ruskin was worshipped. It was while staying with Vengerova in Russia in 1904 that the prolific transla-

tor of Russian literary works into English, Constance Garnett (1861-1946), wrote home that Ruskin “is all the rage in the literary set to which [Zinaida] belongs” (qtd. in Polonsky 141).

Adelaida Gertsyk (1874-1925), later a notable and highly original Decadent poet, an essayist, critic, and theosophist was, with her sister, Evgeniya, responsible for translating a large number of works by Western writers, including Edward Carpenter, whom Tolstoy considered a natural successor to Ruskin and Morris. She contributed her essay on Ruskin, “The Religion of Beauty” [“*Religiya krasoty*”] to *Russian Treasure* in 1899. Gertsyk had studied languages and literature and had worked as a teacher, but from this period onwards she concentrated increasingly on writing. The Gertsyk sisters were descended from a noble Polish family and were very influential in early twentieth-century Russian literary circles. Their letters are considered a rich source for Russian literary historians. Her most notable contribution to Ruskin Studies was published in 1902, a back-in-print translation of *Mornings in Florence* [*Progulki po florentsii*].

Whatever their reservations and differences, Soloveva, Vengerova, and Gertsyk were united in presenting Ruskin as a potential saviour of art whose sustained sermon on beauty could also redeem society. As the intellectual godfather of Pre-Raphaelitism, Ruskin was a founder of what they perceived to be a new English aesthetic tradition that saw nature as the root of all worthwhile and creative art. Yet it is equally true that for some others, such as Diaghilev and Bryusov, Ruskin, in apparently arguing that art and society had only been in decline after Raphael, was seen as hopelessly wedded to the past. At a fundamental level, his ideas were too close to the thinking of their antecedents, who agreed about the social utility of art. But insofar as Ruskin provided even these critics with a means of defining themselves against established notions of art, Ruskin remained a significant point of reference in turn-of-the-century Russian cultural debates.



Theirs were by no means the only translations, selections, and analyses of Ruskin, and a brief overview of the literature here is intended to illustrate the extent to which Ruskin's work was disseminated in late imperial Russia, without identifying any broad connecting themes.

God's World published a number of Ruskin-related articles in addition to the pieces already identified. A. Rykachev contributed his study, "John Ruskin and Political Economy" ["Dzhon Reskin i politicheskaya ekonomiya"] in a series of articles in 1903, and E. Degen's two-part article was published the following year, entitled "The Popular Arts" ("Vsenarodnoe iskusstvo") focusing on Ruskin, Tolstoy, and William Morris.

Ruskin's *Lectures on Art* [*Lektsii ob iskusstve*] was translated three times into Russian, respectively by L.P. Nikiforov, N.A. Maksheev, and most influentially by the Marxist literary critic, Petr Kogan (1872-1932), whose comprehensive edition, originally published by A.I. Mamontov, is available as a reprint in modern-day Russia. In 1901, Kogan's translation of the second English edition of the first volume of *Modern Painters* [*Sovremennye khudozhniki*] was published, once again by Mamontov, and sold for one ruble, making it a very expensive purchase.

In 1905 an anthology appeared in Russian, V. Makulich's *On the Birthday, Thoughts for Every Day* [*Na den' rozhdeniya. Mysl' na kazhdyi*] possibly a translation of Maude Bateman and Grace Allen's 1883 anthology, *The Ruskin Birthday Book, a selection of thoughts, mottoes and aphorisms*. The book included a preface written by its publisher, Mikhail Menshikov (1859-1918), the Russian thinker, a prominent journalist and public figure who was a leading ideologist of nationalism, and a reactionary. He was a correspondent of Tolstoy, Vladimir Chertkov (1854-1936), and Intermediary [*Posrednik*] publisher, Ivan Sytin (1851-1934), who made so much worthy literature

cheaply available, and it is likely that his interest in Ruskin was stimulated by that association. An unidentified translator, "M. E.," also edited a further anthology, *Selected Thoughts. From the Works of John Ruskin* [Izbrannye mysli. Iz sochinenii Dzhona Reskina].

The prominent educationalist, scientist, writer and bibliographer, Nikolai Rubakin (1862-1946), wrote a book entitled, *J. Ruskin. Education* [Dzh. Reskin. Vospitanie], published in Moscow in 1901. Rubakin later wrote a huge survey of Russian literature, *Among Books* (1913) and had worked for the Tolstoyan publisher, Intermediary. It ought also to be noted that *The King of the Golden River*, because it is aimed at children and is therefore the first experience of Ruskin that many people have, must be regarded at a fundamental level as educational, and was translated into Russian by Nikiforov, Barbara Charlton, M.A. Troitska, and in an edition by Semen Zaymovsky and Edvard Radunsky.



Ruskin's view of art and society, ethics and aesthetics, his quasi-organic concept of their inextricability, interdependence, and mutuality, interested thinkers other than those involved in the theory and practice of art and literature. Three areas are worth considering, albeit briefly, in more detail: political economy, architecture, and handicrafts, where leading figures can be identified who engaged directly with some of Ruskin's key ideas.

A significant contribution to the Russian political and economic interest in Ruskin came in 1909, when Sergei Bulgakov (1871-1944) wrote "The Social Philosophy of John Ruskin" ["Sotsial'noe mirovozzrenie Dzhona Reskina"], an essentially Christian Socialist interpretation, published in Russia's sole philosophical journal, *Problems of Philosophy and Psychology* [Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii]. Influenced by Marxism in his youth, Bulgakov founded the Union of Christian Politics in 1905. Like Blok and Bely, he had been influenced by the philosophy of Vladimir Solovev, and his intellectual antecedents are found in the Orthodox

Christian philosophers, Nikolai Fedorov (1827-1903) and Sergei Trubetskoi (1863-1905), as well as Ruskin. Catherine Evtuhov, Bulgakov's biographer, wrote:

A final point of reference for Christian socialism was the social thought of John Ruskin, whose religious-ethical understanding of political and social questions, idea of a hierarchical ordering of society, and belief in the significance of the individual Bulgakov incorporated in his own doctrine. (Evtuhov 107)

This neatly summarizes the concluding words of Bulgakov's essay, which argued that the significance of Ruskin's contribution to social and political issues is his insistence that an ordered society is most effectively and lastingly improved as a result of the full (spiritual) development of the individual. Bulgakov later became the leading theologian of Russian Orthodoxy. He was one of the many religious and political philosophers, along with Nikolai Berdyaev (1874-1948) and Ivan Ilyan (1883-1954), expelled from the Soviet Union at the end of 1922.

Neither Evtuhov nor any other scholar appears yet to have analyzed Ruskin's influence on Bulgakov, whose crucially significant contribution to the theory of economics, *The Philosophy of Economy* [*Filosofia khozyaistvo*] appeared in 1912. "Khozyaistvo" means both economy and housekeeping in Russian and also has an agricultural significance, implying a relation to the farm as well as industry and production. It is therefore close to the Greek, *oikonomia*. Bulgakov's subtitle, *The World as Household*, not coincidentally recalls the familial and household metaphors in *Unto This Last* which underlay Ruskin's conception of economics as an expression of social relationships: the law of the house (17.34).

Yet Bulgakov was not uncritical of Ruskin. In his treatise he argued that all schools of political economy are "equally valid" and "equally arbitrary" (Bulgakov 249):

ranging from the early economists' narrow mercantilism and the equally narrow economic materialism of the physiocrats, Adam Smith, and the socialists, to List's and the historical school's broader definition, and finally to John Ruskin's complete fuzziness. Wealth is money, whose source is commerce; wealth is agricultural products, whose source is agricultural labor; wealth is the material products of all labor, whose source is the work of the industrial or agricultural worker; wealth is everything that gives joy and adorns life, everything that is useful and pleasant: political economy has tried all these and other definitions on for size focusing alternately on one another aspect of this concept (248-49).

Specifically, he dismissed Ruskin's attack on the abstract scientific figure of 'economic man,' by asserting that it is a "crucially instrumental concept of political economy that we can either indignantly deny with Ruskin and Carlyle, as a slander of reality; or judiciously apply, so long as we find it of practical use, ever conscious of its instrumental and contingent nature" (253).¹¹ Fundamentally, though, Bulgakov accepts Ruskin's *istina*, the external moral truth of his arguments, on which Ruskin was himself focused, and questions only Ruskin's rejection of the usefulness of *pravda*, specifically the truth offered by ephemeral political ideology.

Another economist to write seriously about Ruskin was Vakhan Totomians (1875-1964). Born into an Armenian family, he taught at Kharkov, Kiev, Moscow, and St Petersburg Universities, and between the world wars at institutions in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria. He would become one of the leading theorists of cooperative economics, writing *The Theory of Co-operation* [*Teoriia kooperatsii*] (1918), *A History of Economic and Social Studies* [*Istoriya ekonomicheskikh i sotsial'nykh uchenii*] (1921), *The Foundations of Co-operation* [*Osnovy*

kooperatsii] (1923), and *The History of Russian Economic Thought* [*Iz istorii russkoi ekonomicheskoi mysli*] (1956).

In the revolutionary year of 1917 Totomiants, who had graduated with a Ph.D. from Kiev in 1915, completed his essay *John Ruskin as an economist and reformer* [*Dzhon Reskin kak ekonomist i reformator*], published in the *Great Englishman* [*Velikii Anglichanii*] series. He argued that Ruskin's conception of beauty was more ethical than aesthetical, and made a powerful case for the relevance of his utopianist ideals and economic thinking, asserting that Ruskin's legacy is comparable to Tolstoy's.

Totomiants pursued one aspect of Ruskin's influence in another essay entitled simply "John Ruskin" in his collaboration with Prof. V.M. Ustinov, *Utopia (Social Paradise on Earth)* [*Utopii (Sotsial'nyi rai na zemle)*]. An analysis of Isaac Broome's Ruskin Cooperative Association in Dickson County, Tennessee, it is a study of the failure of a cooperative colony that concludes that neither leaders nor members properly understood the economics and politics of cooperation, losing themselves in socialism and anarchism, and surrendering to unresolved disputes over policy. It must be regarded as highly significant that he took an interest in Ruskin and his legacy during an early stage of what became an influential career in the academic study of economics in Russia.

Many Russian practitioners, theorists and critics of architecture were familiar with Ruskin's ideas, and many responded particularly positively to his apparent exhortation to assimilate into contemporary designs materials and methods from the past. Ruskin's interpretation of the Gothic and his advocacy of an organic unity of structure and appearance were most celebrated. Writers including Konstantin Bykovsky (1841-1906), Pavel Makarov (1872-?), and Evgeny Baumgarten (1866-1923?) discussed Ruskin in articles in *The Architect* [*Zodchii*] and *Architectural Museum* [*Arkhitekturnyi Muzei*]. Some who

wrote about him, such as Vladimir Apyshkov (1871-1939), who believed that the Austrian architect, Otto Wagner (1841-1918), was ultimately more important to modern architecture than Ruskin, nevertheless “carefully cited” Ruskin’s works, although it is true that others, such as Pavel Strakhov, who supported the use of technology in architecture, pointedly criticized what he saw as Ruskin’s unacceptably backward-looking ideas (Brumfield 58). Even with Strakhov, Ruskin was not ignored or dismissed as unimportant. As the scholar William Brumfield has argued, “Architectural journals frequently referred to John Ruskin, William Morris, the English arts and crafts movement, and the work of the Abramtsevo community, demonstrating the vigor of aestheticism in both design and architecture during this era of commercial and industrial expansion” (63).

The architect, scholar and leading conservationist, Natalia Dushkina, a modern-day Russian advocate of Ruskin’s ideas, has recognized “the creative legacy of Ruskin, which had a significant influence on the artistic life of Moscow and St. Petersburg in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.”¹² She demonstrates that Ruskin’s conception of the living city, particularly his characterization of Venice in *Stones* as an organic entity, was an influence on the historian and regional ethnographer, Nikolai Antsiferov (1889-1958), the author of the seminal work, *The Soul of St Petersburg [Dusha Peterburga]* whose ideas and principles guided the outreach programmes of the great Hermitage museum with lasting effect (Antsiferov 202).

Ruskin’s significance to supporters of the late nineteenth-century Russian arts and crafts movement was even more palpably felt. In the words of the historian, Wendy Salmond, “In Moscow, no less than in London, Dublin, Warsaw, Vienna, or Oslo, the ideas of John Ruskin and William Morris found enthusiastic supporters” (Salmond 2). The painter and designer, Elena Polenova (1850-1898), believed that she could go beyond Ruskin and “that the roots of a new Russian

grammar of ornament lay within the individual artist and that it was possible to relearn, not simply the dead external forms and syntax of peasant art, but the creative process itself" (9). The products of Abramtsevo and Solomenko, were part of the revival of peasant tradition in Russia, a modernized folk industry that sought to rediscover and revivify an aspect of the indigenous culture that simultaneously and not uncontroversially looked to the West, and in particular to Ruskin, Morris, and the British and American arts and crafts movements for inspiration. Among those unapologetic in advocating Ruskinian values was the archaeologist, art historian, and critic, Adrian Prakhov (1846-1916).

The journalist, Aylmer Vallance (1892-1955), comparing English and Russian rural crafts in the *International Studio* in 1906, made a powerful observation:

For whereas in our own land the artistic tradition was long since broken, so that whatever decorative industry our artisans and peasants pursue is necessarily the result of intervention and demonstration received from teachers who have acquired their knowledge of it only through conscious and deliberate effort, in Russia, on the contrary, the practice of traditional art is instinctive, it having never wholly died out. Decorative designs and decorative processes, handed down through generations of skilled craftsmen and craftswomen, are still to this day the heritage of which neither the tyranny of the privileged classes nor bureaucratic misgovernment has availed to rob the Russian peasant. How precious is the heritage he possesses he is, perhaps, scarcely conscious, but it is one which we in England, notwithstanding our vaunted superiority and enlightenment, may well envy him. For if Ruskin's

definition of art as “the expression of man’s pleasure in labour” is true ... then the lot of the Russian peasant cannot be altogether unhappy. That which Ruskin deplored as forever lost to ourselves, and Morris despaired of our regaining save through the ordeal of social revolution ... Russia has already got without revolution, and always did preserve through centuries of repression. (Vallance 242-43)

It is perhaps when one discovers Ruskin’s pivotal, sustaining influence on the life of a leading turn-of-the-century Russian actress that his all-pervading presence is thrown into sharpest relief. Any student of Ruskin’s legacy will be struck by the fact that because of the breadth and multiplicity of his writings, because he wrote and did so much over so many decades, he emerges in the most unlikely places and the least familiar of contexts.

Vera Komissarzhevskaya (1864-1910) wrote of Ruskin to her lover, the actor Nikolai Khodotov (1878-1932), “The disciplined soul of this truth-seeker can be a tremendous help in moments of doubt. To read him is to feel that you are conversing with the most sensitive and dearest friend. I love him too because he is like my father. They are my two favourite old men” (Borovsky 137). It is an instructive pairing, for she could scarcely have been closer to her father, the opera singer and tutor at St Petersburg’s Marinsky Theatre, Fedor Kommissarzhevsky (1832-1905). When asked by her lover what she should like as a gift, she requested a portrait of her favourite philosopher, Ruskin. Her biographer, Victor Borovsky, wrote that “she shared literally all [Ruskin’s] views on the world, on life and on man’s mission. Her letters contain numerous quotations from his writings” (137). She is perhaps the perfect example of an individual for whom Ruskin, in Bogdanovich’s word, acted as “physician”: Vera’s physical health was bolstered by Ruskin because he helped to strengthen her

inner life: "Her interest in the English thinker had its own logic. Physically weak (she was subject to frequent and protracted illnesses), Komissarzhevskaya was able to draw on inexhaustible inner resources in order to give strength and inspiration to others" (137). Her success as an actress was partly predicated on her ability outwardly to manifest her inner understanding.

It is undeniably true that Ruskin's influence was strongest among the artistic elite, who enjoyed the benefits of a network of personal and professional interaction. Ruskin, as an inspirational figure in all manner of Russian academic debates, helped to inform and stimulate their perpetual dialogue, and he provided intellectual nourishment to the most productive movements of the Russian Silver Age. It was a period of crisis and of cultural re-birth, and many of the key participants in it looked keenly to Ruskin for guidance. There is also some evidence that Ruskin's influence trickled down at least to some of the most skilled workers, among whom those in the printing industry were some of the best paid, most highly respected and, because they were involved in the manufacture of books and journals, the most intimately connected with cultural production in the most literal sense.

Russia's first legal craft-paper, *The Compositor* [*Naborshchik*], founded in St Petersburg in 1902, which was produced entirely by workers and their supervisors and was therefore a forefather of trade-union papers, developed what is arguably a Ruskinian ethic and a theory of co-operative industrial relations under the obscure figure of its editor, Andrei Filippov. The paper's motto was a rough, worker-friendly translation of Ruskin's aphorism from "The Three Colours of Pre-Raphaelitism" (*Nineteenth Century*, 1878): "Life without labour is thievery; labour without art is barbarism" (34.174).¹³ Such an affinity between Ruskin and a pioneering industrial-worker publication is all the more interesting when considering the role of the printers in the 1905 Russian revolution. After 1905, censorship was significantly

relaxed, and it is the year in which a large volume of selected passages from *Fors Clavigera* was first published, in the Tolstoyan Niki-forov's translation.

The attempt here has been to sketch some of the ways in which Ruskin's impact on Russia and the Russians might be further explored, not to exhaust every facet and nuance of these associations. No judgement has been made about the validity of the various Russian interpretations of Ruskin, but these have nevertheless been represented as faithfully as possible. Some connecting themes have been identified, but no assertion has been made of an official, singular, or uncontested "Russian Ruskin." The argument is not that Ruskin informed Russian cultural debate to the exclusion of other voices, but rather that as a significant thinker, not merely appreciated in his British homeland but throughout the world, he was not merely heard, but listened to, and as such his significance deserves to be better recognized and more fully understood.

It is difficult to avoid Rachel Polonsky's conclusion that "Ruskin and Carlyle appeared as prophets of both beauty and social justice, calling on the beauty of the past to redeem the aesthetically and socially degraded present" (Polonsky 23). As the master of religious painting, and a leading member of the *World of Art* movement Mikhail Nesterov (1862-1942), put it in his memoirs, "I and my generation were raised on the views and concepts of art of Ruskin and theorists like him" (Nesterov 113). Ruskin, regarded as the "Apostle of Beauty" by many artistic and literary innovators of the Russian Silver Age, offered them an idealized version of a harmonious past that promised the possibility of reconnecting art and society in the present or the future. His arguments gained currency in Russia, as in Britain and elsewhere, at precisely the time when modern life seemed most fragmented, and his threatening visions of apocalypse struck readers as most relevant and revelatory. For leading Russian thinkers, in art, craft and industry, literature, political

economy, and architecture – and even for one of St Petersburg's leading actresses – Ruskin was an inspiration.

Reading, England

Notes

A Note on Transliteration

I have used the British Standard system to transliterate Russian terms and titles (without diacritics). To assist readers who do not know Russian, I have simplified Russian names, or have sometimes used their accepted alternative rendering in English, e.g. Alexander not Aleksandr, Soloveva not Solov'ëva, Diaghilev not Dyagilev etc., except in quotations, which remain faithful to the original at all times. Unless otherwise stated, translations from Russian sources are by me.

¹ Theodore Savory, in his *Art of Translation*, considered the difficulties of translating Ruskin (in this case into French):

Suppose that we have succeeded in writing a faithful [French] translation of a characteristic [English] page of Ruskin, and that we submit it for criticism to two well-educated French friends, one of whom has but little acquaintance with English, while the other has an intimate knowledge of our language. If the first were to say "A fine description! Who is the author?" and the second 'surely that is Ruskin, though I do not remember the passage,' then we might be confident that in respect of style our translation did not fall too far short of our ideal. We should have written French that was French, while it still kept the flavour of the original. (Qtd. Friedberg 121)

² All Russian texts, besides those by Nikiforov (already listed in Eagles 30-31), are detailed in the appendices (below).

³ See, for example, *Russkaya mysl'* 7 (July 1895) 347-54; 5 (May 1896) 216; 8 (August 1899) 274; 10 (October 1899) 371-73; 4 (April 1901) 95-96; 7 (July 1901) 210; 3 (March 1905) 104; *Russkoe bogatstvo* 11 (January 1901) 17-18; 9 (September 1902) 31-33; *Vestnik inostrannoi literatury* 3 (March 1898) 329-33; *Novyi zhurnal inostrannoi literatury* 7 (July 1898) 1-11; 10 (October 1901) 147-48; *Mir Bozhii* 1 (January 1895) 216; 7 (July 1895) 48; 10 (October 1895) 36; 1 (January 1899) 62-86; 2 (February 1899) 91-115; 3 (March 1899) 189-216; 9 (September 1899) 164-182; 10 (October 1899) 73-96; 11 (November 1899) 54-73; 12 (December 1899) 177-95; 2 (February 1901) 84-87; 5 (May 1901) 119; 3 (March 1902) 100.

⁴ See, for example, *Vestnik inostrannoi literatury* 2 (February 1900) 330-5; *Mir Bozhii* 2 (February 1900) 54; 4 (April 1900) 55-57; *Novyi zhurnal inostrannoi literatury* 2 (February 1900) 211-16; 5 (May 1900) 199-203; and *Russkoe bogatstvo* 5 (May 1900) 41-45.

⁵ The exemplary study here is Edith W. Clowes' book on Nietzsche in Russia.

⁶ See O.M. Soloveva. "Iskusstvo i deistvitel'nost': izbrannye mysli iz sochinenii Dzhona Reskina," *Severnyi Vestnik* 6 (June 1896) 103-21, 10 (October 1896) 80-95; 11 (November 1896) 71-82; 12 (December 1896) 89-98.

⁷ Pyman explains further, "Zinaida Gippius [1869-1945] and Dmitry Merezhkovsky [1865-1941], the literary couple who, in the course of the 1890s, had become acknowledged leaders of aesthetic taste and of the 'new religious consciousness in St. Petersburg' founded the influential journal *Novy Put'* [*New Path*] (Pyman 1.70).

⁸ See Diaghilev and also I.S. Zil'bershtein and V.A. Samkov, *Sergei Dyagilev i russkoe iskusstvo* (Moscow: Izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo, 1982), 1.16.

⁹ Bryusov's Scorpio Press in Moscow was in many ways the counterpart to the World of Art movement in St Petersburg.

¹⁰ For an English-language biography of Vengerova, see Rosina Neginsky, *Zinaida Vengerova: In Search of Beauty, A Literary Amba-*

sador *Between East and West* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2004).

¹¹ This repeats an earlier point: see Bulgakov 232-33.

¹² I thank Natalia Dushkina for providing me with an electronic draft copy of her essay, "'Velikaya Planeta': Dzhona Reskina."

¹³ For more, see Steinberg 89-122.

Bibliography

- Anichkov, Evgeny. "Ocherk razvitiya esteticheskikh uchenii." *Voprosy teorii i psikhologii tvorchestva*. Kharkov, 1915.
- Antsiferov, N.P. *Iz dum o bylom. Vospominaniya*. Moscow, 1992.
- Belkind, E.L. "Ruskin and Russia." *Fors, The Letters of the Companions of the Guild of St. George* (Summer 1994): 10-12.
- Beetz, Kirk H. *John Ruskin: A Bibliography, 1900-1974*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1976.
- Bely, Andrei. *Na rubezhe dvukh stoletii*. St. Petersburg: Khud. Lit., 1930.
- Benois, Alexander. *Moi vospominaniya*. 2 vols. Moscow: Nauka, 1990.
- Borovsky, Victor. *A Triptych from the Russian Theatre: An Artistic Biography of the Komissarzhevskys*. London: C. Hurst & Co., 2001.
- Brumfield, William Craft. *The Origins of Modernism in Russian Architecture*. U of California P, 1991.
- Brysov, Valery, "klyuchi tain." *Vesy* 1 (January 1904) 1-14.
- Bulgakov, Sergei. *Philosophy of Economy: The World as Household*. Ed. and tr. Catherine Evtuhov. Yale UP, 2000.
- Chukovsky, Kornei. *Oskar Uaidd*. Petersburg, 1922.
- Clowes, Edith W. *The Revolution of Moral Consciousness: Nietzsche in Russian Literature, 1890-1914*. Northern Illinois UP, 1988.
- Diaghilev, Sergei. "Slozhnye voprosy." *Mir iskusstva* 1 (January 1899): 1-16 and 2 (February 1899): 37-61.
- Eagles, Stuart. *Ruskin and Tolstoy*. Bembridge: Guild of St George, 2010.

- Evtuhov, Catherine. *The Cross and the Sickle: Sergei Bulgakov, and the Fate of Russian Religious Philosophy, 1890-1920*. Cornell UP, 1997.
- Friedberg, Maurice. *Literary Translation in Russia: A Cultural History*. Penn State UP, 1997.
- Makovsky, Sergei. *Talachkino: L'art decoratif des ateliers de la Princesse Tenichef*. St Petersburg: Sodruzhestvo, 1906.
- Maslenikov, Oleg A. "Ruskin, Bely, and the Solovyovs." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 35.84 (December 1956): 15.23.
- Neginsky, Rosina. *Zinaida Vengerova: In Search of Beauty, A Literary Ambassador Between East and West*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Nesterov, M.V. *Vospominaniya*. Moscow: Sovetskii khudozhnik, 1985.
- Partiya sotsialistov-revolutsionerov [Socialist Revolutionary Party]. *Pamyati L'va Pavlovicha Nikiforova: Materialy dlia biografii* [In Memory of Lev Pavlovich Nikiforov: Biographical Materials.] Moscow: Zemiya i volya, 1917.
- Polonsky, Rachel. *English Literature and the Russian Aesthetic Renaissance*. Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Pyman, Avril. *The Life of Aleksandr Blok: Vol. 1, The Distant Thunder, 1880-1908*. Oxford UP, 1979.
- Pyman, Avril. *The Life of Aleksandr Blok, Volume 2: The Release of Harmony, 1908-1921*. Oxford UP, 1980.
- Ruskin, John. *Angliiskii yazyk s Dzh. Raskinom. Korol' zolotoi reki*. [English Language with J. Ruskin. The King of the Golden River]. [Metod chteniya Il'i Franka/the learning method of Ilya Frank: dual Russian-English edition.] Tr. Ilya Frank. Moscow: AST, 2008.
- . *Kamni Venetsii*. [The Stones of Venice.] Ed. and tr. A.V. Glebovskaya and L.N. Zhitkova. St Petersburg: ABC Classics "Khudozhnik i znatok" [The Artist and the Connoisseur" series], 2009.
- . *Radost' navek* [A Joy For Ever]. Tr. L.P. Nikiforov. Moscow: Komkniga. "Iz naslediya mirovoi filosofskoi mysli. Estetika"

- [“World Heritage of Philosophical Thought. Aesthetics” series], 2007). [Reprint of Moscow: V.N. Lind and I.A. Balandin, 1902 edition.]
- . *Sem’ svetochei arkhitektury*. [The Seven Lamps of Architecture.] Ed. and tr. M. Kurennaya, N. Lebedeva, and S. Sukharev. St Petersburg: ABC Classics. “*Khudozhnik i znatok*.” [“The Artist and the Connoisseur” series], 2007.
- . *Zakony Fiezolo*. (Laws of Fesole). Tr. L.P. Nikiforov. Moscow: Komkniga “Iz naslediya mirovoi filosofskoi mysli. Estetika” [“World Heritage of Philosophical Thought. Aesthetics” series], 2007. [Reprint of Moscow: Knizhnoe Delo, 1904 edition.]
- *et al.* *Angliiskie Skazki*. [English Tales] [includes *The King of the Golden River*. Tr. A. Zherebilova. Ed. T.A. Komzalova. Smolensk: Rusich, 2009.
- Salmond, Wendy. *Arts and Crafts in Late Imperial Russia: Reviving the Kustar Art Industries, 1870-1917*. Cambridge UP, 1996.
- la Sizeranne, Robert de. *Ruskin et la religion de la beauté*. Paris: Hachette, 1897.
- . *Reskin i religiya krasoty*. [Ruskin and the Religion of Beauty.] Tr. L.P. Nikiforov. Moscow: Komkniga, 2007. [Reprint of Moscow: Magazina “Knizhnoe Delo” and I.A. Balandin, 1900 edition.]
- Steinberg, Mark. *Moral Communities: The Culture of Class Relations in the Russian Printing Industry, 1867-1907*. U of California P, 1992.
- Tolstoy, L.N. *Tolstoy Centenary Edition (CE)*. Ed. Aylmer Maude. 21 vols. London: Tolstoy Society, 1928-1937.
- Tolstoy, L.N. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (PSS)*. Ed. Vladimir Chertkov *et al.* 90 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literature, 1928-1958.
- Vallance, Aylmer. “Russian Peasant Industries.” *International Studio* 28.iii (May 1906).
- Vengerova, Zinadia. *Anglisskie pisateli XIX veka*. St. Petersburg: Prometei, 1913.

Vengerova, Zinaida. *Ocherki po istorii zarubezhnoi literatury*. St. Petersburg: Promotei, 1903.

Appendices: Ruskin in Russian Translation

A. Chronological List of Imperial Russian Translations of Ruskin's Works (Excluding L.P. Nikiforov – see Eagles 30-31.)

- 1891: *Korol' zolotoi reki ili chernye brat'ya, legenda o shtirii*. [*The King of the Golden River or The Black Brothers, A Legend of Styria*]. Tr. Barbara Charlton (London).*
- 1900: "Prerafaelitzm" ["Pre-Raphaelitism"]. *Mir iskusstva* [*World of Art*] 17 (May 1900): 49-60.
Iskusstvo i deistvitel'nost': izbrannyya stranitsy [*Art and Reality: Selected Passages*]. Ed. and tr. Olga Soloveva. Moscow: 1) I.N. Kushnerev; 2) Moscow: A.I. Mamontov.
Leksii ob iskusstve, chital'nyya v oksfordskom universitite v 1870 godu [*Lectures on Art, read at Oxford University in 1870*]. Tr. P.S. Kogan. Moscow: A.I. Mamontov. [Re-published, Moscow: B.S.G. Press, 2006].
- 1901: *Sezam i lilii* [*Sesame and Lilies*]. Tr. Olga Soloveva. Moscow: A.I. Mamontov.
Sovremennye khudozhniki [*Modern Painters*]. Tr. P.S. Kogan. Moscow: A.I. Mamontov [nb. 2nd ed. *Modern Painters I*].
- 1902: *Progulki po florentsii: zametki v khristianskom iskusstve*. [*Mornings in Florence: Notes on Christian Art*]. Tr. Adelaida Gertsyuk. St Petersburg: L.F. Panteleev. [Re-published, St Petersburg:

Stuart Eagles, "For Fear of Bears: Ruskin in Russia"

ABC Classics. "Khudozhnik i znatok" [The Artist and the Connoisseur" series.] Ed. A.G. Obradovich. 2007.

- 1904: *Korol' zolotoi reki ili chernye brat'ya* [The King of the Golden River or The Black Brothers.] [Public School Reading Series.] Tr. M.A. Troitska. St Petersburg: N. Morev.
- 1905 *Na den' rozhdeniya. Mysli na kazhdyi* [On the Birthday, Thoughts for Every Day]. Ed. and tr. V. Makulich (with a preface by Mikhail Menshikov). St. Petersburg: M.O. Menshikov.
- 1907 *Leksii ob iskusstve* [Lectures on Art]. Tr. N.A. Maksheev. St. Petersburg.
- 1910 *Izbrannye mysli. Iz sochinenii Dzhona Reskina* [Selected Thoughts. from the Works of John Ruskin]. Tr. "M.E." Moscow: A.A. Levenson.
- 1911 *Sovremennye angliiskie stilisty* [Modern English Stylists]. [Including *The King of the Golden River*.] Tr. Semen Zaymovsky and Edvard Radunsky. Moscow: Mir. **

B. Chronological List of Translations of Non-Russian Studies of Ruskin

- 1899 Hobson, John Atkinson. *Obshchestvennye idealy Reskina*. [The Social Ideals of Ruskin]. [I.e. John Ruskin, Social Reformer.] Tr. N. Konchevskaya and V. Libin. Ed. Dmitry Protopopov. St Petersburg: M.D. Rudometov.

- 1900 Ward, Mary Alden. *Tri Biografii: Tomas Karleil, Dzhon Reskin, Lev Tolstoi*. [Three Biographies: Thomas Carlyle, John Ruskin, Lev Tolstoi]. [I.e. *Prophets of the Nineteenth Century*.] Tr. I.S. Durnovo. Moscow: M.V. Klyukin, 1900.
- la Sizeranne, Robert de. *Dzhon Reskin, Religiya krasoty* [John Ruskin. *The Religion of Beauty*.] Tr. T. Bogdanovich. St Petersburg: I.N. Skorokhodova.
- 1904 von Bunsen, Maria. *Reskin, ego zhizn' i deyatel'nost'* [Ruskin, *His Life and Work*.] [I.e. *John Ruskin: sein Leben und sein Wirken. Eine Kritische Studie von Marie von Bunsen*]. Tr. V.V. Bitner. St Petersburg: V.V. Bitner.

C. Russian Studies of Ruskin Cited

- Bogdanovich, L.A. *Dzhon Reskin, "Apostol religii krasoty" (oherk)* [John Ruskin. *"Apostle of the Religion of Beauty" (An Essay)*]. Moscow: A.I. Mamontov, 1900.
- Bulgakov, S.N. 'Sotsial'noe mirovozzrenie Dzhona Reskina' ["The Social Philosophy of John Ruskin"]. *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii* [Problems of Philosophy and Psychology] 100 (1909): 395-436.
- Degen, E. "The Popular Arts" ["Vsenarodnoe iskusstvo"]. *Mir Bozhii* [God's World] 3 (March 1904) and 4 (April 1904).
- Gertsyk, Adelaida. "Religiya krasoty." *Russkoe bogatstvo* [Russian Treasure] 1 (January 1899): 30-44.
- Gurevich, Lyubov. *Dzhon Reskin kak pisatel' obshchestvennoi deyatel'nosti i chelovek* [John Ruskin as a writer on social reality and man]. *Zhizn'* [Life] 2 (February 1900).
- Rubakin, N.A. *Dzh. Reskin. Vospitanie* [John Ruskin. Education]. Moscow, 1901.

- Rykachev, A. "Dzhon Reskin i politicheskaya ekonomiya" ["John Ruskin and political economy"]. *Mir Bozhii* [God's World] 10 (October 1903): 90-109; 11 (November 1903): 12-97; and 12 (December 1903): 80-102.
- Shustova, S.R. "K istorii publikatsii Dzhona Reskina v Rossii." ["On the History of the Publication of John Ruskin in Russia."] *Materialy X nauchnoi konferentsii literaturovedov povolzh'ya* [Proceedings of the 10th Scientific Conference of Literature]. Ulyanovsk, 1969.
- Shustova, S.R. ("K voprosu o roli L. N. Tolstogo v raspostranii trydov Dzhona Reskina v Rossii" ["The role of Leo Tolstoy in the dissemination of the works of John Ruskin in Russia"]). *Materialy XI nauchnoi konferentsii literaturovedov povolzh'ya* [Proceedings of the 11th Scientific Conference of Literature]. Kyibyshev, 1972.
- Shustova, S.R. *Literaturno-khudozhestvennaya kritika v publitsistike Dzhona Reskina (1819-1900) i sud'ba ego naslediya v Rossii 1888-1970* [Literary and Art Criticism in the Journalism of John Ruskin (1819-1900): Legacy in Russia 1888-1970]. [Department of History of the Foreign Press and Literature.] Moscow University, 1981. [Unpublished doctoral thesis.]
- Totomiants, V.F. *Dzhon Reskin kak ekonomist i reformator*. [John Ruskin as an economist and reformer]. *Velikii Anglichanii* [Great Englishman] series. Moscow: N.N. Orfenova, 1917.
- Totomiants, V.F. and Ustinov, V.M. "Dzhon Reskin" ["John Ruskin"]. *Idem., Utopii (Sotsial'nyi rai na zemle)* [Utopia (Social Paradise on Earth)]: 37-62. Moscow: Bibliotena "Revolyutsiya i Kult'ura" ["Revolution and Culture" Books]. 1917.
- Vengerova, Z.A. "Dzhon Reskin, 1819-1900." *Vestnik evropy* [The Herald of Europe] 6 (June 1900): 674-92.

* There is no trace of this book in either of the two main Russian Libraries, the Russian State Library (Rossiiskaya Gosudarstvennaya Biblio-

teka) in Moscow or the Russian National Library (Rossiiskaya Natsional'naya Biblioteka) in St. Petersburg. Uniquely, Charlton Russified Ruskin's name, so that it appears on the title page as "*Ivan Ruskin*" rather than what became the standard "Dzhon Reskin/Rëskin" and she also unnecessarily Russifies her own name to "*Gospozheĭ Barbaroĭ Charl'ton.*"

** It ran to at least three editions, the second has not been identified, but the third was reissued by Mir in 1917.

