

V. K. Kantor

FYODOR STEPUN,
"MUSAGET",
EMILII MEDTNER¹

This historical-philosophical essay is dedicated to the Russian publicist, chief editor of the Musaget Publishing House Emil Metner and to Fyodor Stepun – the chief editor of the "Logos" magazine – and their contribution to the increasing influence of contemporary German thought on Russian philosophy. Emil Medtner and the Musaget Publishing House championed Neo-Kantianism in Russia.

Key words: Neo-Kantianism, Russian philosophy, German philosophy, Musaget Publishing House, "Logos" magazine.

One of the most difficult and tragic collision of Russian culture is the phenomenon, the fate and the internal contradictions of the "Musaget" associated with the names of Medtner, Bely and Stepun, with their Russian and German destiny. There were other characters in this drama, but the researcher has the right to choose a point of view. Its main "character" is Emil Karlovich Medtner (December 20, 1872, Moscow – July 11, 1936, Pillnitz near Dresden), who was a Russian writer, publisher, literary and music critic, the elder brother of composer Nikolai Medtner, chief and irremovable editor of the Musaget Publishing House from 1907 to 1914. This Publishing House published the books by A. Bely, Ellis (L. Kobylinsky), S. Soloviev and others, as well as F. Stepun and S. Hessen's magazine "Logos".

According to the fair observation made by Magnus Ljunggren, the author of the best book about Medtner, the latter was a widespread type of infertile man, who did not differ from the ordinary mediocrities in love for talent. He made himself a "pedestal" to the talent of his younger brother – composer Nikolai Medtner, even giving him his wife. *Ménage a trois* is a fairly usual type of relationship among the creative elite (Herzen, Ogarev Tuchkov, Turgenev and the Viardot family, Mayakovsky and the Brik family), so is it among common people.

¹ Individual research project No. 09-01-0041 «Preparation for publishing of the letters by the outstanding Russian emigrant philosopher F.A. Stepun" carried out within the program "Research Foundation of SU-HSE".

Yet a sexual trio of brothers with one woman was an “achievement” of the early twentieth century. The Russian poet and novelist Andrei Bely, whose “Symphony” Medtner considered to be a new trend in literature, was the second demon in his creative infertility complex. “Medtner feeling his own creative infertility... confided in Bely’s talent and sacrificed himself for the sake of his genius” [17, p. 15]. Bely recalled, in a certain degree of irritation: “Medtner – a sociable and curious man – became one of our friends very quickly... he was making his brother’s career with great diligence; as his brother, he tried to put me on the pedestal he had seen” [2, p. 307].

But Emil Medtner had another super-idea, perhaps his central idea, which turned out to be extremely important for Russian culture. “Germany,” he told himself, “is destined to achieve spiritual hegemony. Russia [a synonym of dark forces within himself] is an immature stage of culture, which needs German discipline” [19, p. 20]. Bely also wrote about it but with the post-revolutionary tone, actually justifying Russian chaos: “In the words about Moscow, which, as they say, fires rockets out of chaos, an old theme of his duality was mentioned: as though, on the one hand, we are ahead, and on the other hand, we are desperately lacking of culture, calling for plowing it with volumes of German studies; they say, it is necessary to build a tower of them and to lift a rocket on the tower: let it illuminate the prospects of culture. Medtner preached doctrinarianism; he did it not with a dogmatic zeal, but with romantic one” [2, p. 305]. Yet for the sake of Bely and for the sake of propaganda of the German spirit, Medtner using the money of Hedvig Friedrich², who was a German with Jewish blood from Dresden, established the Musaget Publishing House in 1909. However, the books did not make the difference – there was a need for a magazine. Therefore, he could not but make a contract with Stepun and Hessen for publishing the “Logos” magazine. Among other things, the contract provided:

The Russian Editorial Board of “Logos” shall enjoy full editorial independence in all cases, being restricted only by the International Editorial Committee. It shall consist of the following persons: S. I. Hessen (St. Petersburg), F. A. Stepun (Moscow) and E. K. Medtner (Moscow). Each of these persons shall equally enjoy all the rights of a member of the Russian Editorial Board. Manuscripts are accepted by a unanimous decision of the Board. In case of a disagreement between the members of the Russian Editorial Board (as on the acceptance of manuscripts and other editorial matters), the differences shall be settled by the majority of votes of the International Editorial Committee according to the statutes of the latter. Of the three mentioned members of the Russian Editorial Board, E. K. Medtner, co-opted as its member only by the Russian Editorial Board, shall not be a member of the latter until the co-option by all members of the International Committee. The question of co-opting him as a member of the International Committee shall be solved at the earliest convenience on the basis of his personal acquaintance with all members of the Committee mentioned [8, p. 268–269].

Young publishers fully understood the significance of contemporary German thought for the Russian philosophy of that time. In fact, they were conductors of Neo-Kantianism in Russia. Not to mention the fact that the name “Logos” was suggested to the young students of Heidelberg by two German professors

² It is worth giving A. V. Lavrov’s comment to A. Bely’s memoirs: “Apart from Medtner’s ideological and esthetic affection, the orientation of the Musaget towards German culture was an essential condition put forward by Hedvig Friedrich, who financed the publishing house” [2, p. 539].

– H. Rickert and W. Windelband. In the “Logos” editorial in 1910 (by F. Stepun and S. Hessen) it was said that German philosophy played in the modern era the same role as Greek philosophy of Antiquity did. Quotation: “Wishing to be philosophers, we still must be Westerners. We must confess that no matter how significant and interesting some certain Russian phenomena in scientific philosophy are, philosophy, which used to be Greek, is now mostly German” [15, p. 798]. It is no coincidence that Kant has been often compared in importance with Plato. Classical German philosophy produced ideas and methods all over the world. Another quotation: “It is not so much modern German philosophy that proves it, but the indisputable fact that all modern original and significant phenomena of philosophical thought of other peoples bear the unmistakable imprint of the influence of German idealism; and vice versa, all the attempts of philosophical work ignoring this legacy can hardly be acknowledged as significant and really fruitful. Therefore, only having mastered this legacy, we will be able to go further with confidence” [ibid.].

The personnel of “Logos” were people of different views, but not nationalists.

Philosophizing “from the tender nail”, we were determined to cut hair and nails of Moscow Neo-Slavophiles. I wouldn’t say that we were all wrong, but we were too self-confident to take to reform the style of Russian philosophy.

Having become a part of “Musaget”, we felt at home and happily began to work. The aspiration for intertwining Russian and Western cultures spiritually and for laying a solid professional and technical foundation for the intuition and revelation of Russian creativity united us with “Musaget”.

The main question of the “Way” was “How do you believe?”; the main question of the “Musaget” was “Do you possess your skills?”. In contrast to Berdyaev, who despised the technique of modern philosophizing and did not want to put the “craft at the foot of art”, Bely despite his intuitionism passionately addressed the technical questions of metrics, rhythm, poetry and aesthetics. This naturally brought him closer to us, who were epistemologists, methodologists and critics. Moreover, at the time of our rapprochement with “Musaget” Bely himself was fond of Neo-Kantianism, he dug himself in it as if in a trench inaccessible for philosophical dilettantism, boasted of it as a sign of his serious attitude towards science, feeling in this seriousness a connection with his father, a real scientist, a philosopher and a mathematician [14, p. 218–219].

As usual, friendship “against somebody” does not lead to anything good. “Musaget” and “Logos” were conductors of German culture and opponents of neo-Slavophiles at the beginning of the 20th century. But when Fyodor Stepun and his co-publishers of the magazine based on the ideas of neo-Kantianism, Medtner and Bely, who at first were tempted by the new German philosophy, as it turned out later found other trends in Germany: each culture is rich and diverse. Even turning to Goethe as a center of German spirit did not help Medtner. Much more he inclined to German nationalism, which eventually led him to the camp of the Nazis, and Bely – to the Bolsheviks. In the meantime, there was a relatively civilized break-up between the magazine and publishing house.

“However, peace and love between “Musaget” and “Logos” publishers,” recalled Stepun, “lasted, but not for long. In the third volume of his memoirs Bely himself told how, having cooled to Kant and neo-Kantianism, he supported by Blok insisted that Medtner did not renew the contract with us. Fortunately, we immediately managed to settle the magazine in a famous St. Petersburg publishing house of M.O. Wolff” [14, p. 218–219]. It seems that Bely really played the role of a “black man” in the relations between the Heidelberg boys and the pub-

lisher. His memoirs convey this dislike: Medtner “hooked Simmel’s ‘runts’ as a little three of ‘real’ philosophers: Fedor Stepun, Yakovenko and Hessen; the ‘real’ of the first revealed in the most grotesque behavior of a commissar in the frontlines (under Kerensky)” [Ibid].

M. Bezrodny wrote that in November 1909 Medtner made a contract with the editors of “Logos” S.I. Hessen and F.A. Stepun, according to which “Musaget” assumed responsibility to publish the Russian version of the magazine starting the following year. It was consistent with the pretence of “Musaget” to respectability: “Logos” announced the involvement of prominent Russian scientists. During the four years of partnership between “Logos” and “Musaget” nine issues of the magazine with the articles of 18 Russian and 19 foreign authors were published, including the articles by W. Windelband, N. Hartmann, E. Husserl, B. Croce, G. Simmel, H. Rickert and K. Vossler. The cost of involving the “professors” was the same as during the negotiations with the “Vekhi” magazine: it was immediately made clear to Medtner, who was co-opted as a member of the Russian Editorial Board, that his ideological leadership is not needed. (Contrary to the hopes of Medtner, the close relations between “Musaget” and “Logos” did not bring international fame to Bely as a theorist of arts: his participation in the journal of professional philosophers was episodic.) The influence of Stepun on the Publishing House and the youth concentrated around it could not be overlooked. Even Bely, who was jealous of it, recalled: “By the autumn of 1910, the philosophical youth gathered around Stepun, who appeared in “Musaget”; he set up a seminary in the editor’s office; Boris Leonidovich Pasternak, whose poetry was a great contribution to our lyrics, was among his students” [2, p. 342].

Bely in his memoirs endlessly reproaches Medtner with the fact that the latter did not give him freedom and expanse, calling his aspirations a “chaos”. But even these memoirs shows that Bely felt for a long time that he was the master of “Musaget”:

“Musaget” has just settled in the apartment: three rooms with a private bathroom, kitchen and a tiny room for servant Dmitry; furnishings were tasteful; the editor’s office looked itsy-bitsy; an oval sofa was ordered into the room with an oval wall, in front of the sofa there was a round table; the carpet, furniture, drapery were in pleasant blue on a warm, orange background (wallpaper); having closed the door to the reception room (white wallpaper, book shelves, two tables: for a secretary and a corrector) and having pulled down the curtain, we found ourselves in the sitting room, where the noise did not penetrate; every day there sat a company (Shpet or Raczynski, or Boris Sadovsky, or Ellis, Mashkovtsev and others); there from six to eight I received visitors for the “Musaget” affairs; there were a lot of talks made there – with Ivanov, Mintslova, Blok, Turgenev, Stepun, Shpet; the room became my home salon [2, p. 349–350].

The employees of “Logos” did not take into account an important component in Medtner’s outlook (and did not really pay attention to it). What is meant here is his violent anti-Semitism³. I shall refer to the book by Ljunggren again:

Medtner later insisted that the question of race had interested him since his “childhood”. Anti-Semitism, which had developed in him in Nizhny Novgorod, had ideological roots in the tradition of Russian conservative thought, which he supported. He grew up in an atmosphere of an active policy of state anti-Semitism,

³ Later in his letter to Jung he tried to explain his anti-Semitism in the Freudian manner – by castration anxiety. But of course, socio-cultural reasons played a more important role in this case.

which had been pursued in the eighties and nineties. And then, in 1903, this policy yielded fruit in the form of brutal massacres when a St. Petersburg periodical published a preliminary version of "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" – a fake claiming the disclosure of details of the mythical international Jewish conspiracy organized to establish the world domination. Reading of German authors strengthened his racism: anti-Semitic attacks were in particular in Wagner's works, whose hatred of Jews in his later polemical articles was part and parcel of the German Renaissance. At the time, Medtner seemed to begin projecting his own instincts upon the Jews, bringing his latent libidinal and aggressive impulses on them. <...> Wagner's anti-Semitism was also partly explained by the suspicion of his own Jewish roots [19, p. 21].

E. K. Medtner had enough complexes as well. All his love affairs were somehow strangely connected with Jewish women, a kind of masochistic complex. His nationalism and racism, as rightly showed by M. Bezrodny, are clear from his publications:

There were two books published by "Musaget" that manifested this line: the translation of Chamberlain's "Arische Weltanschauung" and a collection of Medtner's articles "Modernism and Music", which, in particular, had the idea that the Jews introduce alien exoticism into Aryan music and the spirit of commerce into the musical life. With these publications were artificially associated the translations of Deussen's "Wedanta und Platonismus im Lichte der Kantischen Philosophie" and Wagner's "Nibelungen". The former was announced as "the introduction to the worldview of Indo-Aryans" and the publication of the latter enabled Medtner to speak in the preface about the recognition of "the nearest racial kinship between the *pure* 'Germanics' and the *pure* 'Slavs'" by modern ethnography and to express his passion for "Saxon (i.e. typical Slavic-German) art". Medtner's propaganda of his racial sympathies was taken by the "Musaget" staff as an organic part of his apology for the old German culture: "Your Kantianism, Goethianism, absolute hatred for modern German music," Ellis writes to him, "are the fruit of deep, light and suffered bigotry. Remember your cry about the Chinese when we were in the summer house: 'The whole races should be driven into the sea and destroyed!'" [1, p. 157 – 198].

Bely also fell under influence of anti-Semitism. In the famous article "Stamped culture" Bely wrote about Jewish perversion of Aryan culture with Russian culture being part of it, in his opinion:

Undeniable is the sensitivity of Jews to the arts; but being equally unfounded in all areas of national Aryan Art (Russian, French, German) Jews cannot be closely attached to one area; it is natural that they are equally interested in everything; but this interest can not be a genuine interest in understanding the objectives of given national culture, and is an indicator of instinctive desire to convert, to nationalize (to Hebraize) these cultures (and consequently to enslave the Aryans spiritually); and now the process of this instinctive and quite legitimate Jewish absorption of foreign cultures (application of their stamp) is presented to us as an aspiration for the international art [3, p. 339]⁴.

⁴ It should be mentioned that the perception of Jews as a kind of international force was very much peculiar to the public consciousness. In Platonov's novel "Chevengur" the guardsmen ask two Communist revolutionaries, Kopenkin and Dvanov, who they are. "We are international," Kopenkin answers recalling the title of Rosa Luxemburg, who called herself 'an international revolutionary'. Then another question comes: "Kinda Jews?" – and a significant reply: "Kopenkin coolly unsheathed his saber <...> 'I'll finish you off right here for such a word.'" In a sense, this is Platonov's response.

In Bely's prose (e.g., in "Petersburg") it is said about "Semitic-Mongolian" danger. This strange connection of Soloviev's mongolophobia and Medtner's anti-Semitism led to a split. Soloviev's philosemitic "Logos" was expelled from "Musaget" by Bely.

As for Bely's novel, Berdyaev wrote that his style "was not consistent, the ending was accidental and internally unnecessary" [4, p. 316–317]. But is it really so? The context of the ideological struggle of those years; the collision of the neo-Kantianism supporter F. Stepun with V. Ern, who was an admirer of H. Skovoroda; the *break-up* of "Logos" and "Musaget" allow us to see the logical ending of the famous novel. At the end of the novel "Petersburg" (1913–1914), written at the time of the break-up between "Logos" and "Musaget", the main character and the dreamy patricide Nikolai Apollonovich Ableukhov, having abandoned the idea of parricide, stopped reading Kant⁵ ("What about Kant? Kant is forgotten") and "lived alone; did not have visitors and did not visit anyone, went to church; he has been reading the philosopher Skovoroda lately". V. Ern, the author of a work about H.S. Skovoroda, wrote that Kant's philosophy led to non-being: "Meonizm fundamentally and permanently consolidated its grip in Kant's transcendentalism" [16, p. 78]. Then he even deduced German militarism from Kant (in the article "From Kant to Krupp"): "The internal transcription of the German spirit in Kant's philosophy naturally and fatally converges with the external transcription of the same German spirit in Krupp's weapons" [17, p. 309].

Inspired by the ideas of Dr. Steiner, Bely turns away from neo-Kantianism. Medtner writes a polemical book, in which is trying to oppose his Goethe and his Kant to Steinerism. Ellis supported him. In a review of his book, unpublished during his lifetime, "Reflections on Goethe. Book I: Analysis of Rudolf Steiner's views in connection with the issues of criticism, symbolism and occultism" (which, however, was known to the author), he wrote about Medtner: "He has a gift of speaking not only about Goethe, as the best among the Goethians, but also about *Kant*, as the best among the Kantians; he also can, which is infinitely more valuable, speak about Goethe, remaining a complete Kantian, and about Kant, without being unfaithful in anything to the most sacred commandments of Goethianism" [18, p. 325].

Bely objected Medtner but for a few more years remained an adherer of Steiner. He does not interrupt his relations with Germany but changes the address.

It is also important to note that in 1914 Medtner left for Germany, in fact stopping the leadership in the Publishing House: "...leaving Russia, Medtner entrusted the new secretary of "Musaget" V. V. Pashukanis to administer the Publishing House" [8, p. 272]. Medtner never returned to Russia. In Germany, Medtner having gone through a lot of temptations (Steiner, Jung), came to the cult of Hitler in 1936, and being emotional over the western criticism of Hitler's policy, "he saw himself and Hitler — the two Wodans, who had been driven to the edge of death by the living conditions hostile to them" [19, p. 191]. It is interesting that later Medtner nevertheless acquired Swiss citizenship. It is difficult to speak about the reason, but it should not be forgotten that Switzerland was a neutral country. This step provoked a scathing reaction from Bely: "...the Ger-

⁵ I would like to remind that, according to Golosovker's idea, it is Kant who was a real patricide in "The Karamazov Brothers".

man-Russian fantasies of Medtner were broken by the war and he became a resident of Switzerland, alien to him" [2, p. 307].

As N. Plotnikov wisely noted, "the tragedy of "Logos" and at the same time the greatness of its design was that its founders in Russia and Germany — F. A. Stepun, S. I. Hessen, B. V. Yakovenko, R. Kroner, G. Melis — came forward with their project of "eternal peace" in philosophy on the eve of the moment when Europe fell into the abyss of ethnic slaughter, forcing the editors literally to fight with each other" [7, pp. 618–619]. It is no less important that the idea of "Logos" was the idea of a supranational magazine on culture. German culture was equal to Ancient Greek culture for Stepun, therefore, it bore supranational and universal principles. But the times were different. Nationalist tendencies in Germany won over the universal ones. Nationalism infected the Russian thought as well. Bely, as I mentioned, took over anti-Semitism from Medtner. Then no one had the idea of the Nazi racial laws, which declared Russians to be subhuman categorically denying their Aryan kinship. It seems that those days there was not a sharp break-up between Stepun and Medtner and Bely; Sapov probably was right in this respect. The discrepancy was internal. The true German Stepun had never been a nationalist. Hitler became the reincarnation of Wodan for Medtner and that of the enemy of Christianity (like Bolshevism) for Stepun. Bely accepted Bolshevism and Stalinism, he was even going to write the article "Socialist Realism" in 1933 [10, p. 436]. When he was already out of Russia, Medtner wrote a new work on Bely: his affections remained the same but the state of mind obviously was coming down to a disaster. In a letter to C. G. Jung (of November 15, 1917), he connects all his experiences in a single knot but his own self-analysis is sad: "The unpleasant scene between Rachel and me happened after but not before the fit. I had to suspend the work on the book about Bely then, because I felt completely exhausted. <...> I really became a spiritual cripple. Because all my thoughts were gone and I didn't have any skills. <...> I seem to be going to idiocy"⁶. Medtner needed a guide and he found it in Hitler.

Stepun's position was the one of a sober and reasonable person. Being a follower of V. S. Solovev, he could not but accept his maxim that Christianity is "the triumph of reason in the world" [9, p. 37]. Stepun saw it very well that Germany, in her own way, was drifting to "the underworld of nothingness", where Russia had already slid to. In 1931, he wrote to his friend Gustav Kullmann⁷: "With the help of the theory of Nietzsche and Bachofen, the theories of myth and organic thinking, such stupid chauvinism is being imposed among German public teachers that it is becoming frightful for the future of Germany and humanity. Conscious, naturalistic paganism is being imposed; metaphysical thinking is being forcibly separated from ethical thinking; the state is represented as the mystery of blood history is presented in a mythical and patriotic

⁶ Medtner's letter to Jung [19, p. 232].

⁷ Gustav Kullmann (1896-1961), a Swiss, was born in Holland, studied in Yale University. He was a lawyer and an admirer of Russian culture. He met the Russian philosophers ex-patriated aboard the Philosophers' Ship and helped them to find jobs. He was one of the founders and co-editors (with Berdyaev) of the journal "Put" ("The Way"), worked for "YMCA-Press" and from 1931 for international organizations for intellectual cooperation. From 1938 he was Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees in the League of Nations, later in the United Nations, dealt with the issues of the Displaced Persons (DP), helped Jewish refugees; one of the kibbutzim in Israel was named as a tribute to him. Stepun became his friend in the 1920s.

manner. <...> Such a mixture of Nietzsche and Ilovaysky, of myth and provincial opera that there is really nothing to breathe with. And all this is hammered into the heads of public teachers as compulsory hearing of philosophy courses. It really seems sometimes that Germany, with all her great gifts, was not provided with the gift of political thought" [20].

Stepun became a recognized *consultant on Germany* for the Russian emigration. In the journals "Annales contemporaines" ("Contemporary Annals") and "Novy Grad" ("The New City") he wrote several articles specifically devoted to the German problems [11–13], without taking into account the comparison of German and Russian thoughts, which was constant and usual for him. The problems of Germany could not but worry the Russian intelligentsia expatriated from their country. The emigrants found too much in common between the rising National Socialism and Bolshevism. Russia and Germany were too closely intertwined in these two revolutions – from the support of Germany by the Bolsheviks to the support of the Nazis by Stalin. Stepun noticed that the Nazis themselves saw this closeness. He captures the idea of Goebbels that "Soviet Russia is destined by the fate to become Germany's ally in her passionate fight against the devil's stench of the decaying West. The shortest way of National Socialism to the realm of freedom goes through Soviet Russia, where the "Jewish teachings of Karl Marx" has long been sacrificed to the red imperialism, a new form of native Russian "Pan-Slavism" [15, p. 890].

According to V.F. Ern, "in April, as if saying goodbye, Medtner visited Nikolai and Anna [his brother and ex-wife] in London. In June, he followed the advice of his doctor and went to the water resort in Teplitz-Schönau in Bohemia, which was once visited by Goethe and Wagner. After spending a few weeks there, he went to Pillnitz, where in early July he fell seriously ill; the illness was accompanied by severe bouts of dizziness. He was placed in the local psychiatric hospital. Apparently, the split of psyche, which had been a constant threat for him, really caught up with him by then. In a state of complete regress, raving only about the past and being unable to clearly perceive the present, he died in the early morning of July 11, 1936" [16, p. 191]. It would seem that the ways of Stepun and Medtner dispersed once and for all. But fate plays strange jokes. Sapov mentions an important fact about who laid Medtner to rest. He writes: "They, apparently, didn't have common business with Stepun, but they always kept warm and friendly feelings to each other later on". The fact that Stepun and his wife were there when Medtner died (in the psychiatric clinic in Dresden on the night from 10 to 11 July 1936) is known from a letter to his brother, composer Nikolai Medtner. "The presence of Russian friends, close not only in culture but also in spirit, was happiness and last joy for him" [8, p. 272]. And this fact stands as a result of Medtner's life – something what his heart belonged to, the place where "he left more traces". That is why I would not agree with the researcher that Medtner's influence was more significant in Germany: "The fate of Medtner was to be "used" by two of the greatest and most active representatives of the European culture of the twentieth century (Bely and Jung. – V.K.), who have equally become today the objects of a relentless international interest. His mediation demonstrates profound convergence between these two people, each of which in his own way and by their own means highlighted the crisis of consciousness of the modern individual. The paradox lied in the fact that Medtner, who wanted to breathe German spirit into Russia, ultimately brought something specifically Russian into German culture" [19, p. 193]. It was the Russian people who kept the memory of him. It is no mere chance that people say that the one who hears your last breath is really the significant other.

There is a letter that tells Stepun's story of the death of Medtner, which provides some important facts. For example, the real cause of the death was not a mental illness (which is not excluded in principle) but pneumonia. The letter was written by an old friend of the Russian philosopher, who was German by birth, but who was losing his place in the changing Germany, where a new Wodan, so admired by Medtner, ruled – his name was Adolf Hitler.

Dresden, July 21, 1936

Dear Maria Mikhailovna and Gustav Gustavovich

You are probably surprised that we have not answered your card yet. But we did not know until recently whether we can take advantage of your generous invitation. Of course, it would be much more decent to heartily thank you straight away, and then after clarifying all the circumstances to answer to the point. But it seems that we will never reach the decent life, which we aspire to; we have so much of all this now.

Now it turned out, unless there are any unexpected difficulties, that we will be able to go to you in early August, which we are eternally happy about and thank you with all our hearts.

Besides different formal difficulties and monetary issues (only recently we learned that the government lets the money for Switzerland), another hindering circumstance kept us here. Emil Karlovich Medtner⁸, who has come from Teplitz to his old Dresden friends⁹, was taken to hospital with severe pneumonia. He didn't have anybody here (his friends were two helpless, sick women) besides us. It was absolutely impossible to leave him ill. Last Wednesday we buried him. In this truly tragic way our fate set us free for Switzerland. I don't know whether you knew Emil Karlovich, but as for me, the best and brightest period of my life, probably, is connected with him: Moscow, symbolism, the Logos, Musaget, in short, everything that had been destroyed by the war and buried by the revolution. I think that we will be able to leave on the 4th, at the latest on the 5th of August. I would be very happy if our meeting happened in full as you write. I especially want to talk to Boris Petrovich¹⁰. We're terribly cut off from the immigrant Russian here; that is why it seems to be particularly important for me to try myself on him, who is in the center of Paris disputes. Although you write that it is impossible to arrange lectures in August, I still want to inform you just in case that it is possible to speak only about private lectures in Russian because it is necessary to obtain permission from a number of German governmental institutions for public lectures in German, which I have not requested about. And indeed, it may be better to keep silent¹¹.

We will inform you about the day and hour of our arrival, of course, in advance. Natasha and I send you the most cordial greetings. Thank you very much again.

Your F. Stepun [20]

Fate plays strange but meaningful jokes. The friendship of creative youth turned out for a Christian Stepun to be more important than ideological differences.

⁸ See also the works about E.K. Medtner [5, p. 165–169; 6, p. 232–246].

⁹ It apparently refers to E. K. Medtner's friend, who helped him with money in setting up "Mesaget" – Hedvig Friedrich.

¹⁰ Boris Petrovich Vysheslavtsev (1877–1954) was expatriated with other Russian intellectuals abroad in 1922. In the 1930s Vysheslavtsev together with E.K. Mendtner, and after his death in 1936 alone, published a collection of Jung's works in 4 volumes in Russian.

¹¹ He could not do that because he was expelled from the university by the Nazis.

Bibliography

1. *Безродный М.* Из истории русского германофильства: издательство «Мусагет» // Исследования по истории русской мысли: ежегодник за 1999 год. М., 1999.
2. *Белый А.* Между двух революций. М., 1990.
3. *Его же.* Штемпелеванная культура // Империя и нация в русской мысли начала XX века. М., 2004.
4. *Бердяев Н. А.* Астральный роман. (Размышления по поводу романа А. Белого «Петербург») // *Бердяев Н. А.* О русских классиках. М., 1993.
5. *Поступенко К. Ю.* Метнер Э. К.: метаморфозы национальной идентификации // Блоковский сборник XIII. Русская культура XX века: метрополия и диаспора. Тарту, 1996. С. 165–169.
6. *Его же.* «Душа и маска "Мусагета" (к истории имперского сознания в России) // Казань, Москва, Петербург: Российская империя взглядом из разных углов. М., 1997. С. 232–246.
7. *Плотников Н.* Репринтное переиздание журнала "Логос" (1910–1914, 1925) // Исследования по истории русской мысли: ежегодник-2004/2005. М., 2007.
8. *Сапов В. В.* Журнал «Логос» – прерванный на полуслове диалог // Вестник Российской академии наук. 1993. Т. 63, №3.
9. *Соловьев В. С.* Христос воскрес! Пасхальные письма // Собр. соч.: в 10 т. СПб., б. г. Т. 10.
10. *Сливак М.* Андрей Белый – мистик и советский писатель. М., 2006.
11. *Степун Ф. А.* Германия // Современные записки. 1930. Кн. 42.
12. *Его же.* Письмо из Германии. Формы немецкого советофильства // Там же. Кн. 44.
13. *Его же.* Письмо из Германии. (Национал-социалисты) // Там же. 1931. Кн. 45.
14. *Его же.* Бывшее и несбывшееся. СПб., 2000.
15. *Его же.* Соч. М., 2000.
16. *Эри В. Ф.* Нечто о Логосе, русской философии и научности // Соч. М., 1991.
17. *Его же.* От Канта к Крушпу // Там же.
18. *Элиис.* Теософия перед судом культуры (Размышления по поводу «Размышлений о Гёте» Эм. Метнера) // *Элиис.* Неизданное и несобранное. Томск, 2000.
19. *Юнгрен М.* Русский Мефистофель. Жизнь и творчество Эмилия Метнера. СПб., 2001.
20. *Stepun Fedor Avgustovich to Maria and Gustave Kullmann / Columbia University Libraries. Bakhmeteff Archive. mrs Coll Zernov. Box 9.*

About author

Prof. Vladimir Kantor, State University – Higher School of Economics, member of the editorial boards of the “Voprosy Filosofii” and the “Vestnik Evropy XXI vek” journals, writer and literary critic, member of the Union of Russian writers, e-mail: Wlkantor@mtu-net.ru