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**ABSTRACT**

J. R. R. Tolkien once remarked in a 1949 letter to George Allen & Unwin that his friends were so impressed by Pauline Baynes’ illustrations for *Farmer Giles of Ham* that they labelled his text an adjunct to her drawings. This apparently light-hearted anecdote conceals an interesting truth: the relationship between text and image can be problematic and the reading of an illustration depends largely on the culturally acquired “discursive precedents” which an individual viewer brings to the act of looking. This situation may be further complicated when account is taken of any incidences of visual borrowing (motif) within the illustration. The primary purpose of this dissertation is to identify such incidences of visual borrowing and, by extension, intertextuality within nine of Sergei Lukhimov’s Soviet era illustrations for Natalya Grigor’eva and Vladimir Grushetskij’s 1993 Russian translation of *The Lord of the Rings*. In Chapter One I define two distinct types of visual borrowing detectable within the nine case studies: *general correspondence* and *direct visual prototype*. I then establish a context for the research by reviewing the previous scholarship in the area, followed by a short biography of Lukhimov, which is supplemented by his own words on the creative process. Chapter One concludes with an explanation of my methodological approach, describing how elements of the semiotics and iconography paradigms are synthesised to form a new theoretical model for the visual analysis of the case studies. Chapter Two provides a detailed examination of the cultural and socio-political backstory to Lukhimov’s work, tracing the history of Russian Tolkienism and translation from the early 1960s until the official publication of the G&G translation in 1993. The final chapter begins with a holistic survey of the corpus after which the case studies are divided into sub-categories according to their visual borrowing and the strength of any resulting intertextual implications. Subsequent visual analysis reveals within the case studies a diversity of borrowed biblical and historical motifs, derived from sources such as hagiographic paintings, manuscript miniatures and archaeological artefacts - many of which are entirely new to Tolkien scholarship. I also demonstrate how, in several case studies, certain borrowed motifs retain enough of their original iconography that, when combined with the new Tolkienian motif, give rise to polysemy. To conclude, I postulate that Lukhimov’s corpus functions most effectively when viewed as a visual affirmation of the plurality of images which existed outside of Soviet totalitarianism.
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Chapter One:

**Introduction: Text, image, prototype**

In their 1999 introduction to the golden anniversary edition of J.R.R. Tolkien’s *Farmer Giles of Ham*, Christina Scull and Wayne G. Hammond describe the process behind George Allen & Unwin’s commissioning of Pauline Baynes, a young English artist whose faux-medieval line drawings had been of particular interest to Tolkien.¹ Unlike the publisher’s earlier candidate Milein Cosman, Baynes had quickly embraced her new role as book illustrator, creating a series of images for *Farmer Giles of Ham* which successfully encapsulated both the historical and fairy-tale elements of Tolkien’s narrative. Impressed with the finished results, Tolkien wrote a letter to George Allen & Unwin dated 16th March 1949 stating that, for him, the artist’s work surpassed “even the expectations aroused by the first examples.”²

This must have been welcome news for Baynes, who would go on to enjoy a fruitful association with Tolkien, producing illustrations for several of his works. However, for myself, it is the subsequent lines of Tolkien’s letter which are especially interesting; “They [Baynes’ images]” he continues “are more than illustrations, they

---


are a collateral theme. I showed them to my friends whose polite comment was that they reduced my text to a commentary on the drawings.”

Of course, there may be no way of independently corroborating this episode, and Tolkien might simply have included the anecdote as a light-hearted aside, but the words hold a kernel of truth: for some readers Pauline Baynes’ illustrations, with their delicate blending of medieval manuscript and modern fairy-tale imagery may have overshadowed, even diminished the power of Tolkien’s text. These images, which for Tolkien so elegantly complemented his words, could, if manipulated, or simply viewed from a different perspective, contradict or undermine them.

So how might this impact upon my study of Sergei Iukhimov? The answer, I believe, resides in the problematic relationship between text and image (and to a further extent between what Bal and Bryson would refer to as predetermined and polysemous meaning) which is implied in the Baynes anecdote. Ostensibly, the function of a book illustration is to illustrate a passage of text, however, like any piece of visual art, the reading of an illustration is dependent on the individual viewer. As can be seen from the example of Tolkien’s “friends”, a viewer invariably brings his or her own set of culturally acquired “discursive precedents” to the act of looking, and these precedents may, on occasions, provoke a reading which digresses from, ironizes, or contradicts the subject matter of the “illustrated” text. Further layers of complexity, and instability, are also imposed on the act of image-reading when account is taken of any perceived general correspondences/motifs (i.e., derived from two or more similar sources), or direct visual prototypes/motifs (i.e., derived from one single visual source)

3 Carpenter and Tolkien, Letters, 133.


5 Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson, “Semiotics”, 207.
within the image, and b) any intertextual implication (meaning) which may result from this borrowing.

Baynes herself makes use of such visual borrowing in her illustrations for Farmer Giles of Ham; for example witness her whimsical Chrysophylax (Fig. 1,) who displays a general correspondence based on several E.H. Shepard’s illustrations of the Reluctant Dragon (Fig. 2.); or her minstrel with vielze on page 57 (Fig. 3.) which is, in fact, a direct visual borrowing of a single element from folio 399r Meister Heinrich Frauenlob (Fig.4.) of the 14th century Codex Manesse.6 Both these prototypes appear to be in keeping with the “no-time” atmosphere of Tolkien’s Little Kingdom, where the authentically medieval and the humorously anachronistic are juxtaposed, and the musician in particular may even possess intertextual implications.7 But, as demonstrated by Tolkien’s 1944 anecdote, even illustrations which incorporate motifs as complimentary to their source text as these remain subject to the individual interpretation of the viewer, and as such, may stand or fall accordingly.

Therefore, if the relatively modest text-image interrelations of Farmer Giles of Ham can embody these issues, what about the infinitely more complex, multi-layered narrative of The Lord of the Rings? How might perceived signs of general or direct visual borrowing within an illustration of, say, Boromir pierced by orc arrows, or Samwise Gamgee bearing the One Ring into Mordor, combine with the cultural backstory of an individual viewer to invoke intertextual meaning?

It is the process of identifying these incidences of visual borrowing (within select illustrations of The Lord of the Rings), plus the elucidation of any consequent meaning,
which comprises the major part of my dissertation. Regarding a corpus to study, I have
opted to focus on lesser-known works from the pre-Peter Jackson visual era,
particularly those created within the former Soviet Union, which provide fertile ground
for such analysis. Naturally, the methodology I am proposing may also be extrapolated
to encompass the entire visual corpus for *The Lord of the Rings*, however that would
be beyond the scope of this study.

The illustrations I have chosen to examine are all taken from a set of thirty-two
gouache paintings by Ukrainian artist Sergei Iukhimov which were included in the 1993
revised two-volume edition of Natalya Grigor’eva and Vladimir Grushetskij’s Russian
translation of *The Lord of the Rings* Властелин колец (Vlastelin Kolets). Ostensibly,
each of the images in question portrays a moment from Tolkien’s narrative, and an
iconographic reading of the correspondence between the visual motifs perceivable in
each image and the original source text will be an important component of my
analysis. However, such is the complexity of the visual borrowing intrinsic to each
composition, that many of these perceivable motifs are, in fact, borrowed from
sources outside of Tolkien’s text: medieval manuscripts, frescoes, even archaeological
artefacts (the majority of which I shall endeavour to identify). These borrowed motifs
are then employed, not in the traditional iconographic manner which would see, for
instance, a motif borrowed from a Biblical image linked back to the appropriate Biblical
text, but rather to construct a new iconographic correspondence between the motif as
it appears in the Iukhimov illustration and *The Lord of the Rings*. At times, the
iconography of the borrowed motif is so strong that the original meaning may still
shine through, and when this is combined with the motif of the new work, may give
rise to intertextuality. By applying this new methodology, which I will refer to as visual
intertextuality, I shall seek to evaluate any such incidences of meaning, and in the process also identify fresh parallels and sources of images which are entirely new to the field of Tolkien visual analysis. In doing so I will create a theoretical model to deal with the analysis of an alternative, non-western visual approach to Tolkien’s work which predates the Jackson movies.

Background to research

A useful starting point for my foray into the field of Middle-earth illustration would be an assessment of J.R.R. Tolkien’s own visual corpus. Tolkien’s output as an illustrator is often overlooked, and true art historical treatments of his work are rare. John R. Holmes, in his *Art and Illustrations by Tolkien* from Michael D. C. Drout’s edited volume *J.R.R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment* (2007) cites a comment by Christopher Tolkien to the effect that any study of Tolkien is (in Holmes’ words) “incomplete without a consideration of his drawing and painting.” Holmes covers some interesting ground himself, particularly in his comparison of the “temporal movement” in Tolkien’s two-part watercolour *The Land of Pohja* (1914) (Fig. 5.) with that displayed in Sassetta’s triptych *The Meeting of St Anthony and St Paul* (circa 1430-1435) (Fig. 6.).

There are two particularly significant texts devoted exclusively to Tolkien’s artwork. The earliest, chronologically speaking, is *Pictures by J.R.R. Tolkien* (1979), a primarily catalogue-based volume annotated and compiled by Christopher Tolkien, the author’s

---


youngest son, and sole literary executor of his estate. The definitive collection of its time, *Pictures by J.R.R. Tolkien* contains forty-nine of the author’s paintings and drawings; the majority pertaining to *The Hobbit, The Lord of the Rings and The Silmarillion*. Christopher Tolkien, in his capacity as editor of the twelve volume *The History of Middle-earth* (1983-1996), is fully acquainted with the scholarly analysis of his father’s work, including the text-image minutiae of the Middle-earth maps.\(^\text{10}\)

However, *Pictures by J.R.R. Tolkien* lacks any meaningful visual analysis of the pieces shown and Christopher Tolkien freely admits that “the range of my father’s work, especially that of his early years, is by no means fully represented here”.\(^\text{11}\)

As a comprehensive account of the author’s artistic output, *Pictures by J.R.R. Tolkien* has been largely superseded by Christina Scull and Wayne G. Hammond’s 1998 volume *J.R.R. Tolkien: Artist and Illustrator*. Scull and Hammond are meticulous in their approach to the subject matter, and their catalogue-style account of the corpus is exhaustive in its scope and detail. The book contains a large percentage of Tolkien’s visual output, including some 196 of his pieces, of which 105 are reproduced in full colour. The works are arranged in themed chapters; *Early Work, Art for Children, Patterns and Devices*, which themselves bookend the more specific sections relating to *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*.\(^\text{12}\) The authors combine detailed chronological accounts of the formulation (often via numerous permutations) of visual motifs such as *Doors of Durin* (Fig. 7.), and *Untitled (Kirith Ungol)* (Fig. 8.) whilst simultaneously


drawing parallels with the development of themes and concepts within Tolkien’s written work.\textsuperscript{13} Mention is made of several incidences of visual borrowing within Tolkien’s art, for example the links between Jennie Harbour’s \textit{Hansel Comforted His Sister} (Fig. 9.) and Tolkien’s \textit{The Trolls} (Fig.10.), however Scull and Hammond do not embark on any extended analysis of this sort.

Christopher Tuthill addresses the wider field of Tolkien illustration in his essay \textit{Art}, which is published as part of \textit{A Companion to J.R.R. Tolkien} (2014) edited by Stuart D. Lee.\textsuperscript{14} However, Tuthill appears to be primarily concerned with making comparisons between artistic depictions of pivotal moments/motifs from \textit{The Lord of the Rings} by artists John Howe, Alan Lee, Jef Murray and Ted Nasmith rather than engaging with the possibility of any semiosis. He does occasionally venture a potential visual prototype, for instance the Egyptian Mortuary Temple which allegedly informed Ted Nasmith’s \textit{Minas Tirith at Dawn}, however the bulk of his analysis remains focussed upon compositional elements and straightforward image-text relationships.\textsuperscript{15}

A more thorough investigation can be found in Emily E.Auger’s \textit{The Lord of the Rings Interlace: Tolkien’s Narrative and Lee’s Illustrations} (2008). This is an intriguing piece advancing the hypothesis that Alan Lee (English book illustrator and conceptual designer for Peter Jackson’s Middle-earth film trilogies) incorporated a series of repeated visual motifs into his illustrations for HarperCollins’ 1991 edition of \textit{The Lord of the Rings}, therefore augmenting the existing “interlace structure” of Tolkien’s

\textsuperscript{13} Scull & Hammond, \textit{J.R.R.Tolkien}. 158, 176.
\textsuperscript{15} Christopher Tuthill, \textit{Art}, 497-498.
narrative.\textsuperscript{16} For Auger this “interlacing” can also be manifested visually and represents an “analogue of the complex patterns found in a wide range of medieval visual media, including stone, metal, fabric, and paint.”\textsuperscript{17} She insists that Lee’s habitual use of visual motifs such as mountains, blocked paths, sensory invocations, examples of visibility/invisibility and confluences of time and space are designed to echo this interlacing and operate most effectively when viewed as “sets - pairs, sequences, and series - that cross-reference each other and the text.”\textsuperscript{18} From Lee himself we learn very little, other than some minor facts Auger has gleaned from his book \textit{The Lord of the Rings Sketchbook} (2005) and fascinating though Auger’s article is, the iconographic correspondences are confined purely to Tolkien’s secondary universe, to \textit{The Lord of the Rings} and in extension \textit{The Hobbit} and \textit{The Silmarillion}.

Thomas Kullman’s paper \textit{Intertextual Patterns in J.R.R. Tolkien’s \textit{The Hobbit} and \textit{The Lord of the Rings}} (2009), although not strictly visual in its subject matter possesses a degree of applicability. Kullman focusses on the efficacy of intertextuality and discourse (in this case defined as the “conventional ways of speaking which inform a given text”) as tools for cultural and literary analysis in Tolkien’s work.\textsuperscript{19} Understandably for a literary-based work, Kullman’s borrowing of motifs is focussed on

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} Shippey defines this interlacing as an “ancient and pre-novelistic device”, familiar to medieval French prose tales such as the \textit{Vulgate Cycle} and which forms the “basic structural mode of \textit{The Lord of the Rings}”.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Tom Shippey, \textit{The Road to Middle-earth: How J.R.R. Tolkien Created a New Mythology}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. (London: HarperCollins. 2005), 181.
\end{itemize}
what Mitchell might term *verbal images* (i.e. metaphor, description) rather than visual prototypes.\(^{20}\) However, if, as Mitchell does, we may consider verbal images as part of a wider “family tree” of images, which also encompass graphic, optical, perceptual and mental groupings, then Kullman’s work has a relevance to the visual analyses of my project. \(^{21}\)

There exists, at the heart of my project, a centre-periphery (or western-eastern) dichotomy which is reflected in my choice of texts regarding the reception history of visual aspects of Tolkien’s creation. From a western perspective, scholarly works on the subject appear to be primarily focussed on critical appraisals of Peter Jackson’s Middle-earth film franchises. One particularly illuminating example is the multidisciplinary volume *Picturing Tolkien: Essays on Peter Jackson’s The Lord of the Rings Film Trilogy* (2011) edited by Janice M. Bogstad and Philip E. Kaveny, which showcases a diverse selection of essays based upon twin themes of story-structure and character-culture. Visual pretexts are touched upon in several of the contributions, with Michael D.C. Drout’s *The Rohirrim, the Anglo-Saxons and the Problem of Appendix F: Ambiguity, Analogy and Reference in Tolkien’s Books and Jackson’s Films* particularly salient in its discussion of the potential for the “visual icon” (in this case Théoden’s Sutton Hoo-inspired helmet from Jackson’s movies) to supplant authorial ambiguity with definitive meaning.\(^{22}\) Dimitra Fimi’s discourse on “internal” and “external” folklores, and their impact on Jackson’s visuals in *Filming Folklore: Adapting Fantasy*...


for the Big Screen through Peter Jackson’s The Lord of the Rings also provides an intriguing slant on the book versus film debate. Her analysis of the neo-Celtic design aesthetic underpinning Jackson’s Elves is well considered and her exploration of the link between John Duncan’s Celtic Revival painting The Riders of the Sidhe (1911) (Fig. 11.) and several scenes from Jackson’s trilogy has commonality with aspects of my own study.

Paul Simpson and Brian J. Robb’s volume Middle-Earth Envisioned: The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings: On Screen, On Stage, and Beyond (2013) provides a rather less scholarly view of the reception to Tolkien. Once again, film analysis comprises a large part of the text, and the book owes a visual debt to Peter Jackson’s conceptual designers Alan Lee and John Howe, both of whom feature heavily within its pages. Worthy of a mention however are passages devoted to peripheral adaptations of Tolkien’s work, particularly Timo Torikka’s 1993 Finnish television abridgement of The Lord of the Rings known as Hobitit (“The Hobbit”), and the Soviet-era live-action retelling of The Hobbit produced for the Leningrad TV Channel in 1984.

The eastern reception of Tolkien is the primary focus of Olga Markova’s 2004 work When Philology Becomes Ideology: The Russian Perspective of J.R.R. Tolkien (translated by Mark T. Hooker), which highlights the travails involved in translating Tolkien’s literary works for a Russian audience. She also highlights the dichotomy between the hard-line early Soviet viewpoint of The Lord of the Rings as pro-western political allegory and the later post glasnost ideas of modern Communists who perceived the

---

24 Dimitra Fimi, “Filming Folklore,” 89.
author’s anti-industrialism as a blueprint for recapturing a form of “primordial communism”.  

The important subject of translation is given full rein in Mark T. Hooker’s comprehensive monograph Tolkien Through Russian Eyes (2003). Using the practice as a key to unlock Russian literary, ideological and religious attitudes towards Tolkien, Hooker attempts to unravel the fiendishly complex backstory behind the ten separate translations of The Lord of the Rings which vie for popularity in Russia today. The focus of Hooker’s text is a comparative study involving selected passages from the ten translations and Tolkien’s original text. The results are impressive, if rather alarming, and give a clearer understanding of the inaccuracies within many of these translations, as well as the difficulties inherent for any artist attempting to illustrate them.

The Illustrator

Серге́й Бори́сович Юхимов, or Sergey Borisovich Juhimov (I refer to him as Sergei Lukhimon in accordance with his own favoured Latin script spelling), was born in 1958 in the Black Sea port of Odessa, a part of what was then known as Украинская Советская Социалистическая Республика (Українська Соціалістична Республіка “Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic”). Details pertaining to Iukhimov’s background are sparse, however he is known to have studied graphic arts at the Odessa Pedagogical Institute; a training school for teachers of the “elementary and

secondary school system” which, until 1992 was “under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education of the Ukrainian SSR”27 The Institute, which in 1994 was renamed the South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University, today lists its Faculty of Arts and Graphics specialisms as being “Artistic corrections of educational editions [sic]”, “Visual art” and “Artistic Crafts”, leading to the qualification of “Teacher of Graphical Art”.28 Whether Iukhimov was educated in these particular specialisms is unclear, however it is likely that he received a training in artistic practice and visual culture commensurate with being able to teach at “secondary education” level.29 According to Rossenberg, Iukhimov graduated in 1981, subsequently working as a professional artist, exhibiting and producing illustrations for ten books, including Russian-language editions of Oscar Wilde’s The Selfish Giant and Alice in Wonderland by Lewis Carroll.30

Like many eastern bloc readers, Iukhimov’s first experience of Tolkien’s fiction came via a copy of Vladimir Murav’ev and Andrej Kistyakovskij’s 1982 abridged translation of The Fellowship of the Ring, entitled Кхранители (Khraniteli “Guardians”). Iukhimov recorded his recollections of this time, as well as his general musings on Tolkienian myth, and several interesting facts concerning the development of his own Middle-earth illustrations, in a brief series of part-autobiographical, part-polemical blog entries on the Russian social networking service Живой Журнал (Zhivoj Zhurnal “LiveJournal”). The blog itself, entitled simply lukhimov runs for five entries only,


dating between December 28th 2008 and February 22nd 2009. Of his initial encounter with the Murav'ev and Kistyakovski translation, Iukhimov writes;

For the first time I read the Guardians on November 2, 1982. Unforgettable days! Unforgettable nights!...Three times I read the book and did not understand anything at all. What is it? Fairy tale? Saga? Novel? No, not that. In the 'Literary Encyclopedia' a dozen lines, nothing to explain. In the libraries - nothing. Friends have nothing. I seemed to hang in the air.

It was not until 1986, that Iukhimov was moved to attempt any visual interpretation based on his reading of Guardians;

...I started sketching something, and sketching it, without having the slightest idea of what I was actually doing. In general, the whole process of creation was akin to the work of Melkor: the tree grew on its own, without special quibbles on my part.

It smelled of Dickens and the Victorian era. It seemed to me, for some reason, Mr. Pickwick, together with Sam, going on a long and dangerous journey... all 1988 I languidly worked on the first volume...Finally, in the spring of 1989 a miracle happened: a friend of my friend gave me the Polish text of The Lord of the Rings...I bought a dictionary and learned by the method of Schliemann: took the first volume of Murav'ev and Kistyakovskij's and the first volume of Polish, reading them in parallel... I first received the first and third volumes of the Polish translation, the second came later...

Later in the same entry, Iukhimov offers a brief insight into his creative process;

\[31\text{ It is possible that the "Literary Encyclopedia" Iukhimov is referring to here may in fact be the Краткая литературная энциклопедия (Kratkaja literaturnaja jenciklopedija "Concise Literary Encyclopedia"), a nine-volume work published in the USSR between 1962-1978. According to Glad, the KLE was "undoubtedly the most basic and important reference tool to appear from the Soviet Union." Soviet dissidents were largely barred from the work, and foreign writers were given emphasis in volume nine, which Glad claims was "largely intended to fill in the gaps regarding modern writers and schools." John Glad, "The Soviet Concise Literary Encyclopedia: A Review Article," The Slavic and East European Journal 25 (1981): 80-84.}\]

\[32\text{ This most detailed of the entries, is entitled ТОЛКИЕН, and is dated February 22nd 2009, 12.45am. Sergei Iukhimov, ТОЛКИЕН, Iukhimov, 2009, https://iukhimov.livejournal.com/, 5 January 2018.}\]
Here I first thought that such a multicultural symphony cannot be depicted in terms of an ordinary illustrative series: we need cultural depth and variety. And I started to play with styles, epochs, cultures. As Christina Scull said: "You are doing with pictorial material what Tolkien was doing with languages and words."\(^{33}\)

...Finally, I came to understand when reading *The Silmarillion*: everything fell into place.\(^{34}\) There was a firm and clear hierarchy of both light and dark forces. How is it possible to clearly and adequately convey the said hierarchy in a picture? With the help of nimbuses, which exist not only in the Christian tradition. - although there is no way to do without Christianity...

Origen asserts that angels are balls of fire...I do not argue.\(^{35}\) But if I draw such a glowing ball, no one will understand anything without a detailed comment; if we portray an anthropoid creature in white robes with wings and a halo, then any fool will understand that something pure, bright and blissful is before him. Say "bread" and everybody imagines their homeland; draw a loaf and everyone will be dissatisfied.\(^{36}\)

Iukhimov produced 112 Middle-earth illustrations in total, encompassing not only *The Lord of the Rings*, but also *The Hobbit* and *The Silmarillion*.\(^{37}\) Although he latterly attempted to create a faux art-historical Middle-earth “visual culture” based upon his Tolkien images; a process encapsulated in his detailed 5\(^{th}\) February 2009 blog entry entitled *TOLKIEN*, his final creative work on the corpus consisted of renderings of the hobbit family trees from Appendix C of *The Return of the King*.\(^{38}\) As Iukhimov himself wrote; “The last thing I did...were the hobbits’ genealogies, without them I saw neither

---

\(^{33}\) It is not clear from Iukhimov’s text whether he was ever in actual correspondence with Christina Scull.

\(^{34}\) There is no record of which edition of *The Silmarillion* Iukhimov is referring to.

\(^{35}\) Greek scholar and Christian theologian, Origen of Alexandria (185-254 AD) when describing “the substance of angels” writes “As God then is a fire, and the angels a flame of fire...”.


unity nor integrity. This is the basis, the soil on which all the flowers of Francis of Assisi grow.”

Iukhimov died in Odessa in 2016, leaving behind a series of unpublished illustrated cycles, including works devoted to William Shakespeare, Ernst Hoffman’s Klein Zaches genannt Zinnober and an ABC for Children, inspired by Tolstoy’s fictional author Kozma Petrovich Prutkov.

Methodology

As can be seen by my previous analysis of the existing literature on visual interpretations of Tolkien, the subject of intertextuality as a tool for understanding illustrations of his work has been neglected. My dissertation, therefore, with its emphasis on the method of visual intertextuality, will be original in its scope and approach. Also, the number, and diversity, of motif-identifications within the Iukhimov images will ensure it is a pioneering work.

When it comes to the actual identification of motifs within the illustrations, Erwin Panofsky’s theory of iconographic analysis, as detailed in Iconography and Iconology: An Introduction to the Study of Renaissance Art (1939), will provide a methodological foundation. Panofsky’s methodology is concerned with “the subject matter or meaning of works of art as opposed to their form.”

three levels; 1) primary or natural subject matter (“the world of artistic motifs”). 2) secondary or conventional subject matter (images, and combinations of images which become stories and allegories). 3) intrinsic meaning or content (the interpretation of the previous elements as symptomatic of “the world of “symbolical” values.”). 42 My investigation of the iconographic correspondences between the lukhimov images will be primarily concerned with the use of Panofsky’s first and second levels. The former, which we may refer to as pre-iconographical description, requires a familiarity with “the world of artistic motifs” and the way in which “objects and events” have traditionally been expressed by forms. 43 The latter, iconographical analysis, is an interpretive act reliant on a “knowledge of literary sources” for the successful identification of visual themes or concepts within a work of art. 44 This knowledge, according to Panofsky may be acquired through “purposeful reading” and “oral tradition”, and in the case of lukhimov’s work the primary literary source would be The Lord of the Rings. 45 As previously mentioned, there is a complex form of visual borrowing inherent to lukhimov’s illustrations; with the iconographic Tolkien motifs present often having been constructed out of other borrowed motifs removed from their original iconographic contexts. Therefore, the initial identification of any general correspondence/direct visual prototype will be performed using the pre-iconographical method, whilst the subsequent evaluation of the new Tolkienian motif will be performed via iconographical analysis. 46

42 Panofsky, Meaning, 61.  
43 Panofsky, Meaning, 58.  
45 Panofsky, Meaning, 61.
Determining the point at which a perceived general correspondence or direct visual prototype may acquire intertextual significance is dependent on several factors. Bal and Bryson, in their *Semiotics and Art History* (1991), define intertextuality as referring to “the ready-made quality of linguistic-and, one can add, visual-signs, that a writer or image-maker finds available in the earlier texts that a culture has produced.”

This “ready-made” element indicates that the intertextual sign, or prototype, comes complete with a meaning. Therefore, unlike iconographic analysis, which often avoids engaging with the actual meaning of “borrowed” motifs, intertextuality actively imports the meaning, together with the visual sign, out of the historical text (or image) and into the new. Of course, as is the case with many of Lukhimov’s images where the borrowed motif is used as the basis for a completely new iconographic reference, this predetermined meaning may be altered, subverted, discarded, or, when subject to the “discursive precedents” of the viewer replaced by polysemy. Nevertheless, it must be reckoned with in some capacity. For an Lukhimov case study to qualify as an intertextual piece, it must meet these criteria and demonstrate a potential meaning, or range of meanings, occurring from the intersection of 1) “ready-made” prototype (general correspondence or direct visual) 2) new work (Lukhimov illustration containing potential iconographic Tolkien motif) and, by extension, also 3) viewer subjectivity.

Of the thirty-two illustrations which comprise Lukhimov’s published corpus for *The Lord of the Rings* I have selected nine examples which I believe demonstrate incidences of perceived general correspondence or direct visual prototypes (motif) together with varying levels of intertextual potentiality (meaning). The illustrations in question, which I will refer to as the case studies are: 1) *On a Visit to Tom Bombadil*. 2) *Wraith* –
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King. 3) Bridge of Khazad-dûm. 4) Farewell Galadriel. 5) The Death of Boromir. 6) Fearless Samwise. 7) Gandalf and the Wraith-king at the gate of Minas Tirith. 8) March of the Rohirrim. 9) Pyre of Denethor.

For convenience I have listed the case studies here in chronological order according to their location within Tolkien’s narrative. However, for the purposes of the visual analysis, each illustration will be assigned to one of four distinct sub-categories in accordance with the manner of their perceived prototype (general correspondence/direct visual) and the strength of any resulting intertextual implications. The categories are 1) General correspondence – weak intertextuality 2) General correspondence – strong intertextuality 3) Direct visual prototype – weak intertextuality and 4) Direct visual prototype – strong intertextuality.

As these categories imply, it is quite possible for a case study to display a general correspondence but strong intertextuality, or conversely a direct visual prototype but weak intertextuality. To illustrate this point; a hypothetical image of Gandalf bestowing the White Crown upon Aragorn (Book Six, Chapter V of The Return of the King; The Steward and the King), might have perceivable within it only a general motif derived from several medieval manuscript depictions of Popes crowning Carolingian monarchs. However, from this general motif alone it might still be possible to extrapolate a strong intertextual meaning, for instance the symbolic importance in both Tolkien’s work and medieval society of a “divine” figure, whose power transcends earthly rule (such as a Pope, or Gandalf) in the authentication of kingship. Likewise, an image of Gandalf appearing to Aragorn, Legolas and Gimli (as in Book Three, Chapter V of The Two Towers: The White Rider) which incorporates, say, a direct visual motif borrowed from Theophanes the Greek’s 1408 Transfiguration of Jesus may still have
little intertextual meaning beyond the divine symbolism of the nimbus of white light around the central protagonists.

My methodological approach to the individual analysis of each case study will be characterised by five distinct stages of investigation; 1) Synopsis of the ‘illustrated’ source passage from Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings*. 2) Brief analysis of the corresponding passage from the Natalya Grigor’eva and Vladimir Grushetskij’s *Vlastelin Kolets* translation, highlighting differences in tone or narrative discrepancies. 3) Identification and analysis of iconographic correspondences (perceivable within the case study) which relate to Tolkien’s source text and/or Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s translation: with reference to Panofsky’s method 4) Identification and analysis of general correspondences or direct visual prototypes which are perceivable within the case study and 5) Identification and analysis of any potential intertextual implication (meaning) which may be extrapolated from the identification of either general correspondences or direct visual prototypes within the case study.

Before I embark on the analysis of the case studies, however, it is necessary to take a moment to properly contextualise the Lukhimov illustrations within the overall reception history of *The Lord of the Rings* in the Soviet Union and Russia.
Chapter Two:

A Certain Experiment: Reimagining the Ring from a Russian Perspective

Olorin I was in my youth in the west that is forgotten, in the south Incánnus, in the north Gandalf; to the east I go not.

—J.R.R. Tolkien, The Two Towers

In his monograph entitled Tolkien Through Russian Eyes (2003), Mark T. Hooker quotes from an interview that Tolkien translator and poet Maria Kamenkovich gave to the St Petersburg newspaper Смена (Smena, “The New Generation”). In this interview, dated 01/06/95, Kamenkovich offers up a small vignette from Fyodor Dostoyevsky’s The Brothers Karamazov as the prism through which Western readers may better comprehend Russian perspectives on Tolkienian myth. Specifically, she refers to the scene in which Alyosha, the youngest Karamazov recounts a criticism made by a German visitor concerning the character of Russian youth. “Show a Russian schoolboy,” [says Alyosha, quoting the German] “a map of the stars, and even if he knows nothing about it he will give you back the map next day with corrections on it.” For the purposes of the novel this is an effective metaphor, and a neat cautionary aside intended to instil a little humility into Kolya, the nihilistic fourteen year-old whom Alyosha is addressing. However, for Kamenkovich, Dostoyevsky’s boy with the
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star-map is also emblematic of a uniquely Russian mind-set, one which accepts the natural influx of imported ideas and material but wishes to bring to them something more, a desire to improve and perfect. Of course, the subsequent “No knowledge and unbounded conceit” interpretation of Alyosha is a step too far, but Kamenkovich implies that within the Russian psyche there often exists a sense of entitlement, “superiority” even. In the case of Tolkien this may manifest itself as a need to expand the canon, to finish what the author started. Or, as Kamenkovich states (with more than a hint of irony), “It’s only an Englishman. What could he write? We are the ones who know what life is.” 52

Originally, however, this need to alter and elaborate upon Tolkien’s work had its roots in practicality. According to Hooker, whose text provides a useful guide to this area, the distrust of western literature in the USSR ensured that the publication of any officially-sanctioned Russian translation would prove exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. 53 The state censor charged with policing the publishing industry during the Soviet era was a powerful entity known as Главлит (Glavlit), and prospective authors were required to submit their work for examination. Established in 1922 as a countermeasure against the explosion of unregulated literature that followed the October Revolution, Glavlit was originally tasked with upholding six overarching requirements for effective Soviet censorship: “(1) control of every (national and foreign) printed work, with the right to adopt heavy sanctions; (2) prohibition to contradict Soviet ideology; (3) constant participation of the secret police in censorship interventions; (4) professionalism of censors; (5) political evaluation of
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works being reviewed; (6) compilation of a list of banned books.”  
Works in contravention of Glavlit’s code could be either “mutilated”, destroyed or sent to secret holding archives, known as spetskhrany, where only Party members were permitted to view them.  
Contemporaneous accounts of the official Soviet reception to the original English texts of The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings are difficult to find, therefore it is unclear as to whether any of Tolkien’s works were subject to Glavlit’s scrutiny or were ever relegated to spetskhrany. However, around 1975, a copy of The Lord of the Rings was discovered at the Library of Foreign Literature in Moscow by the writer and linguist Aleksandr Gruzberg. Its presence in a state-run library at that time suggests that the book had, at some point or other, been monitored by Party officials. Gruzberg duly purchased a microfilm of the text and over the course of the following year created his own hand-written Russian translation.  
A brief, but telling appraisal of The Lord of the Rings was also included in the Russian Encyclopedic Dictionary (Советский Энциклопедический Словарь). Last published in its Soviet form in 1991, the Dictionary describes Tolkien’s work as “a pessimistic conception of the inexorable influence of evil on the course of historical development.” Contrast this with the enforced positivity of the Union of Soviet Writers’ socialist realism mandate (also backed by Glavlit), which stipulated that every artist should produce “an accurate, historically concrete representation of reality in its revolutionary development” combining “the veracity and historical concreteness of the artistic representation of
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reality...with the task of ideologically transforming and educating the workers in the
spirit of socialism.”

Olga Markova insists that the main issue regarding *The Lord of the Rings* and the
censor is the assumption made by many Soviet officials that the book contains a
“hidden allegory” of cold war conflict between the democratic, capitalist West and
“the totalitarian, Communist East”. Indeed, a belief in the existence of veiled
ideological messages within Tolkien’s work has proved a persistent phenomenon, even
during the post-Soviet era. As recently as 1997, the Russian daily newspaper
Независимая газета (Nezavisimaya Gazeta, “Independent Newspaper”) described *The
Lord of the Rings* as a “political pamphlet” designed to propagate the message that the
fall of Mordor was analogous to the demise of the USSR. For Nik Perumov, author of
the 1985-1993 Russian Tolkien-esque duology Кольцо Тьмы (*Ring of Darkness*),
however, the real roots of *The Lord of the Rings* reside not in the cold war but in World
War II. “No matter how much the Professor [Tolkien] disavows the fact that *The Lord*
(sic) is not an allegory,” says Perumov, “that it does not have anything to do with the
war, [his assertion] strained and strained and gave way.” In addition, Perumov believes
that Tolkien’s red banner of the Haradrim was intended as an allegory for the red flag
of the Revolution; a perceived slight on the Russian national character which Perumov
himself maintains inspired his own fictional work.
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Allegorical readings such as these are in direct contradiction to Tolkien’s express intentions. In a letter to his publisher Allen & Unwin, dated 23rd February 1961 Tolkien vociferously refuted a similar claim made by the Swedish translator Åke Ohlmarks (in the introduction to the 1959 Swedish translation of *The Lord of the Rings*) that Sauron was analogous with Joseph Stalin,

I utterly repudiate any such ‘reading’, which angers me. The situation was conceived long before the Russian revolution. Such allegory is entirely foreign to my thought. The placing of Mordor in the east was due to simple narrative and geographical necessity, within my ‘mythology’. The original stronghold of Evil was (as traditionally) in the North; but as that had been destroyed, and was indeed under the sea, there had to be a new stronghold, far removed from the Valar, the Elves, and the sea-power of Númenor. 63

Tolkien reiterated this sentiment several years later in his 1965 “Foreword” to the revised second edition of *The Lord of the Rings*, when he wrote “I cordially dislike allegory in all its manifestations, and always have done so since I grew old and wary enough to detect its presence.” 64 Of course, as Shippey reminds us, Tolkien also chose to qualify this statement by adding “I much prefer history, true or feigned, with its varied applicability to the thought and experience of readers. I think that many confuse “applicability” with “allegory”; but the one resides in the freedom of the reader, and the other in the purposed domination of the author.” 65 Based on this premise, it is plausible that an individual reader of Tolkien’s work (be they ordinary citizen or literary censor) might encounter certain elements within the “sub-creation” which appear to have their correlation in real world history. 66 I stress encounter here
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rather than identify because, at times, these parallels may be met unexpectedly and experienced on a subconscious level without the recipient being entirely aware of their nature. Witness the eagle-messenger’s song in The Steward and the King which begins; “Sing now, ye people of the Tower of Anor, for the Realm of Sauron is ended for ever, and the Dark Tower is thrown down.” A reader may respond to the Psalm-like mode of the piece without necessarily possessing any prior knowledge of its dual meaning. Elsewhere, the links may be more tangible, rooted in clearer resemblances between Middle-earth and the real world. For example, there are noticeable cultural similarities which can be traced between Ancient Egypt and Númenórean Gondor (acknowledged by Tolkien in his 1958 letter to Rhona Beare), including closely aligned royal crown designs and a shared penchant for tomb-building and veneration of the dead. Or, alternatively, there is the episode during The Siege of Gondor when Sauron’s forces breach the Rammas Echor, the great defensive wall that encircles Minas Tirith and the Pelennor Fields. For a post-war readership, this moment, (cleverly foreshadowed by Gandalf’s earlier exhortation to Ingold and his fellow wall-builders to “leave your trowels and sharpen your swords!”) may well have evoked memories of the German Wehrmacht’s dramatic bypassing of the Maginot Line. But these connections, like the “socialism” of Sharkey’s Shire, are largely dependent on individual interpretation and always remain subservient to the primary story arc. For Tolkien plain allegory was simply too constrictive, it rendered meaning one-dimensional and imposed far too many limitations on a narrative. More appropriate, and effective, was the approach
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of the Beowulf poet where “the large symbolism” of a work could be brought “near the surface,” but never be permitted to “break through, nor become allegory.”

Leaving aside matters of artist’s agency, to the Russian Tolkienists of the early 1960s censorship remained the major obstacle to the publication of a Russian translation of The Lord of the Rings. However, Zinaida Bobyr, a professional translator, did make several concerted attempts at bringing Tolkien’s book to print. Bobyr had considerable pedigree in the field, having worked since 1943 as a translator for the popular science magazine Техника – молодёжи (Tekhnika Molodehzi, “Technology for the Youth”), where she produced Party-endorsed translations of short science fiction stories and articles. She had also been very active in the underground translation scene, and was instrumental in the dissemination of a number of esoteric English-language works, particularly those by renowned science fiction authors such as Brian Aldiss, Isaac Azimov, and Clifford Simak. Her translations helped cement interest in a genre which (in its most uncritical state at least) was considered an officially sanctioned literary form.

Of course, rather than the western model, the authorities preferred their own peculiarly Soviet brand of science fiction, one where character and plot were designed to mirror and aggrandise the technological achievements of the revolutionary age. This was unsurprising, considering how greatly post-war Soviet cultural policy had been overshadowed by zhdanovshchina, Andrei Zhdanov’s doctrine which, according to Dobrenko, was designed “to “tame” the intelligentsia” and discourage any affinity with
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the west. Zhdanov himself had once repudiated a theory (put forward by certain critics) that Russian literature owed a creative debt to the work of foreign writers such as Rousseau and Dickens. In the process, he had branded the “foundation” of western culture as “rotten and putrid,” and insisted that “kowtowing to bourgeois culture or [playing the role] of pupils” was unsuitable for “representatives of forward-looking Soviet culture, of Soviet patriots.” The Soviet Union, he claimed, embodied “everything that is best in the history of human civilisation and culture.”

This belief in the superiority of east over west could also be detected in the Soviet attitude towards scientific progress, a mindset which Ryklin likens to that of the pyramid builders of Egypt. When the USSR mobilised resources to achieve great feats of technology it was, in fact, demonstrating mastery over that same technology, in contrast to the situation in the West, where technology exercised mastery over man. In this way major scientific breakthroughs like the satellite Sputnik could be viewed as symbolic of the “divine power of human [Soviet] reason”. In such a rarefied climate only those authors who extolled the near-supernatural wonders of this Soviet technological mastery were likely to find official patronage. Those who preached the unpatriotic, degenerate failings of western art or religion would find precious little state support.
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So, what of *The Lord of the Rings*? Could Tolkien’s work could be moulded to fit this state-approved model? It was no science fiction story, that much was clear, and Tolkien himself certainly never subscribed to the cult of modern technology which so enthused the Soviets. In fact, for Tolkien, the headlong rush towards industrial mechanisation was deplorable.  

John Garth paraphrases Tolkien’s own Sindarin translation for Melkor’s fortress of Angband when he brands the process of such unrestrained industrialisation as the “Hells of Iron, [where] the higher arts and sciences are subsumed or crushed in the service of mechanical industry - endlessly repetitious and motivated by nothing but the desire for more power”. For Tolkien this scenario was indicative of coercion and the instantaneous exercising of one person’s will over another via the use of “external plans or devices (apparatus).” Hardly a view compatible with Soviet doctrine.

For Bobyr, however, the impetus to bring *The Lord of the Rings* to print was evidently too strong to for her to dissuaded from adapting Tolkien’s work to fit Glavlit’s requirements. Unsurprisingly, the resulting manuscript, a drastically abridged amalgam of both *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*, which Bobyr entitled Повесть о Кольце (Povest’ o Kol’tse. “The Tale [Lay] of the Ring”), bore very little resemblance to the either original works. Bobyr’s changes to the narrative included the insertion of several archetypal socialist characters (echoing Stanislaw Lem’s starship crew from his 1959 novel *Eden*, also translated by Bobyr), and the mutation of the One Ring into a pseudoscientific, information-storing device, discovered as part of a failed geological

---

85 Markova, “Philology,” 164.
experiment. Overall then, as an entry point, a window onto Middle-earth for the Eastern reader, *The Tale of the Ring* presented a truly poor prospect. Nevertheless, due to certain socio-political changes that were occurring at the time, there was a more realistic chance of the manuscript reaching print in the early 1960s than there would be at any time during the next twenty years.

To understand why this might be, it is necessary to return briefly to 1953 and the aftermath of Joseph Stalin’s death. The dictator’s protracted demise (from a massive stroke and stomach haemorrhage combined) left a power vacuum which the ruling *troika* of Georgy Malenkov, Vyacheslav Molotov and Lavrently Beria attempted to exploit. Their triumvirate did not last however, and the *Troika* collapsed when Malenkov and Molotov conspired with Nikita Khrushchev to have Beria arrested, then later executed for treason. Khrushchev was subsequently made First Secretary of the Communist Party in September 1953, and his appointment heralded an era which (when compared to the later “Stagnation” years under Brezhnev) would be looked back on as one of dynamism, particularly in the field of literature. Socialist realism, which for many years had received the support of Stalin, was dealt a heavy blow by the dictator’s demise, and the Union of Soviet Writers were forced to adapt and reform their doctrine, re-introducing previously taboo concepts such the “ideal hero” in an attempt to revitalise literary discussion. The Union was also impelled to examine its own membership, and after the Second Congress in December 1954 several of the more hardline Union members were removed from office and replaced.
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developments in the cultural milieu of the time were characterised by the emergence of fresh literary criticism, with writers inspired to produce articles on subjects such as lyric poetry, and “Sincerity” in literature. Ilya Ehrenburg’s 1954 novel Оттепель (Ottepel, “The Thaw”) also emerged as a significant work and despite receiving a critical reception from the Second Congress subsequently lent its name to the entire era of change: Khrushchev’s Thaw. The First Secretary himself later denounced Stalin and his cult of personality during a closed session of the Twentieth Party Congress, proclaiming the dictator guilty of thousands of needless deaths during the purges. In October 1961, Khrushchev’s efforts at “De-Stalinisation” finally resulted in the removal of Stalin’s body from Lenin’s Mausoleum, and the following year the First Secretary presided over the landmark publication of ex-Gulag prisoner Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn’s anti-Stalinist novella One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich.

Despite the climate of hope and reform engendered by the Thaw, Bobyr’s The Tale of the Ring was still deemed unsuitable for publication. Whether it figured on the censor’s radar or was simply lost in the white noise of failed translations is unclear, but, either way, few will have noted its loss. Bobyr remained determined however and quickly attempted a second reimagining of The Lord of the Rings, this time in the form of that other state-sanctioned literary favourite, the Fairy story. Once again she opted to radically condense and abridge the original work, and in a transgressive break from the source text introduced a major new component to the narrative, namely an object of power which she referred to as The Silver Crown of Westernesse. According
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to Bobyr, this Crown originated in Númenor and had the capacity to bestow either omniscience or instant death upon its wearer, depending on the worthiness of the individual concerned. Both Aragorn and Sauron were rivals for its power, but ultimately only Aragorn could wield it safely.95

Unfortunately for Bobyr, *The Tale of the Ring* was turned down a second time, leaving her with little option but to publish the manuscript, which was now more Tolkienian fan-fiction than true translation, in самиздăт (samizdat “self-published”) form.96 Outlawed by the Soviet authorities, samizdat was a clandestine underground press, (what Zalambani refers to as a “counter-institution”) concerned with the copying and distribution of banned literature.97 Samizdat were originally produced in the guise of open letters from prominent dissident authors to the Union of Soviet Writers and other official bodies, but later the form expanded to include full books which were disseminated primarily among the intelligentsia.98 Russian historian and human rights activist Ludmila Aleekseva referred to the practice as the “backbone” of dissidence.99 Zalambani describes samizdat as “a symptom of the struggle fought by non-official culture against official institutions” and adds that “it was the struggle of heretics and ‘pretenders’ against the orthodox and the ‘rulers’ of the literary field.”100

In true samizdat tradition *The Tale of the Ring* was typed out three times by hand and bound into books which, according to Markova “made the rounds of a small circle
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of the translator’s friends.”101 This was how Tolkien’s Middle-earth was first disseminated to a Russian readership, in amateurishly packaged form, massively condensed and filled with characters and motifs which had very little basis in the legendarium. Bobyr’s The Tale of the Ring was a fundamentally flawed work and is often disregarded by modern Russian Tolkienists.102 However, during the long years of the Brezhnev era, which saw Stalin rehabilitated and Glavlit’s authority reinforced, samizdat copies of Bobyr’s text remained in circulation, providing readers with both a means of contact with Tolkien’s creation and fuel for their own imaginations. For future translators such as Semen Ya. Umanskij (who produced an updated, edited version of the manuscript in 1975-1978) and Natalya Grigor’eva and Vladimir Grushetskij (whose early 1980s samizdat translation would later be supplemented with translated verse by I. Grinshpun), it also provided a launch pad for their own manuscripts. So much so that Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s translation is believed to contain “phrases, sentences and paragraphs that are word for word the same” as Bobyr’s.103 Perhaps then the Tale of the Ring should be considered a liminal piece: upon reading a copy, the Russian Tolkienists, possessed of the spirit of Dostoyevsky’s boy with the star-map, could perceive a route to an alternative creative future. No longer would they be straitjacketed into simply reading and translating canonical works. Bobyr may have made alterations to the source text for the purposes of circumventing the censor, but the resulting manuscript was proof that Middle-earth could be a canvas for anyone’s creation.
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A decade later, Aleksandr Gruzberg’s microfilm-based 1975 translation, now entitled Властелин колец (Vlastelin Kolets, “The Lord of the Rings”) and complete with poems translated by his daughter, was also published in samizdat form. Like Bobyr, Gruzberg had previous experience in the clandestine translation of western science fiction and employed the same means of distribution for his Tolkien samizdat as he did for works by Isaac Azimov and Edgar Rice Burroughs. Manuscripts were therefore produced in batches of six and circulated throughout the Soviet Union via Leningrad (St Petersburg). Unfortunately, as with many samizdat, cheap materials, difficulties in accessing even the most basic of equipment, and numerous typographic errors on the copies themselves, made the actual reading of these works problematic. However, as Evgeniya Smagina, owner of an extant copy of Umanskij’s edited version of Bobyr’s Tale of the Ring, says, “reading uncensored, free speech gave you a feeling of freedom, a breath of fresh air (which made up for the literary imperfections of many of these texts).”

The first officially-sanctioned publication of Tolkien’s work was produced in 1982 by Детская литература (Detskaja literatura, “Children’s Literature”), a Moscow publishing house established by the Communist Party in 1933 with the express aim of producing “books that are attractive and accessible, but also strong, principled and on a high ideological level.” The book was not a full translation of all three volumes of The Lord of the Rings, but rather an abridged retelling of The Fellowship of the Ring entitled Кхранители (Khraniteli “Guardians”). It was couched in such politically-charged language that, despite Volume I selling 100,000 copies on its first print run, Volumes II
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and III were delayed from publication until after the onset of Perestroika. The translators, Vladimir Murav’ev and Andrej Kistyakovskij (the latter died before all three volumes were completed) have been accused of incorporating an overly fatalistic tone to their translation, stripping away much of the element of hope present within Tolkien’s original work.¹⁰⁷ For an example of their doom-laden approach, first witness Tolkien’s words from The Stairs of Cirith Ungol, “There the hobbits took what they thought would be their last meal before they went down into the Nameless Land, *maybe the last meal they would ever eat together* [my emphasis].” ¹⁰⁸ Now contrast these (as Hooker does), with Murav’ev and Kistyakovskij’s version of the same line, which ends; “…*maybe even the last meal of their lives* [again my emphasis].” ¹⁰⁹ This darker tone may have a basis in the translators’ distinctly Russian interpretation of a literary mode which Tolkien himself termed the Northern Theory of Courage; namely, the “creed of unyielding will” which Tolkien believed existed within much Northern literature.¹¹⁰ This notion was embodied by the character of Byrhtwold from the Anglo-Saxon poem The Battle of Maldon, who, when confronted with the prospect of his impending death in battle, tells his companions,

(Hige sceal þe heardra, heorte þe cenre, mod sceal þe mare þe ure maegen lyltað.)

Will shall be the sterner, heart the bolder, spirit the greater as our strength lessens.¹¹¹

Tolkien’s touches upon the Northern Theory of Courage in *The Lord of the Rings* but the characters do not succumb completely to predestination. In *The Choices of Master Samwise*, Sam exhibits the indomitability of the Northern heroes but he chooses not to die with Frodo (as Byrhtwold and his retainers may have done), or seek revenge upon the orcs, instead he puts his duty to the greater battle first, the destruction of the Ring.\(^{112}\) Murav’ev and Kistyakovskij are far more liberal with their application of the motif of resistance without hope, perhaps seeking to capitalise on the Russian people’s long history of endurance in the face of great hardship.\(^{113}\) From an etymological perspective, they also make changes from Tolkien’s original, again in ways which might resonate with their own readership. In their translation *Isengard* becomes Скальбъург (Skal’burg, “Hostile castle located on a cliff”) which for Soviets of a certain age would have evoked memories of Nazi strongholds and pre-USSR names such as St Petersburg.\(^{114}\) Murav’ev and Kistyakovskij are also at odds with Tolkien in the way in which they base much of their Shire nomenclature on the following incorrect definition of the word *Hobbit*: “ho(mo) [Latin for man] + (ra)bbit.” Mistake, or intentional, this provides ample opportunity for Russo-centric allegory and allusion.\(^{115}\)

With the publication of volumes II and III of Murav’ev and Kistyakovskij’s translation delayed, the onus fell once again onto the *samizdat* writers to provide a continuum. Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s *Tale of the Ring* inspired version remained a popular choice, and their (abridged) translations of *The Two Towers* and *The Return of the King*
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would often be circulated together with Gruzberg’s *The Fellowship of the Ring* to form a unified three volume set.\textsuperscript{116}

Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s complete translation of *The Lord of the Rings* was finally published (after considerable revision) in 1991 by Санкт-Петербург (Zevero-Zapad) a St Petersburg publishing house. The two-volume version illustrated by Ukrainian artist Sergei Iukhimov was released two years later by ТО Издатель (TO Izdatel’) of Moscow. Volume one of this edition includes an introductory passage by the translators, prefaced with a loose interpretation of Tolkien’s “green sun” quote from *On Fairy Stories* (erroneously cited Из письма or *Iz pis’ma* “From a letter”).\textsuperscript{117} The introduction itself is entitled Несколько слов вначале… (*Neskol’ko slov vnachale*…“A few words in the beginning…”), and opens with a brief account of the emergence, during the mid-1960s, of what the translators refer to as the “cult of Tolkien”.\textsuperscript{118} However, of the actual reception of *The Lord of the Rings* in the USSR there is very little mention, whilst information concerning the western perspective appears to have been gleaned from a paraphrased (and anonymous) 1968 “Daily Telegraph Magazine” article.\textsuperscript{119}

Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s translation retains a version of Tolkien’s *Prologue*, here entitled О хоббитах [sic] (*O hobbimah* “About hobbits”).\textsuperscript{120} However, there is no mention, in either of the translated volumes to the actual titles of Tolkien’s three
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original volumes, with Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s two books simply entitled *Vlastelin Kolets I* and *I* respectively. Regarding the six books of *The Lord of the Rings*, these are all retained in the translation, with three books assigned to each volume. Volume two also contains a version of the *Appendices* (ПРИЛОЖЕНИЯ or PRILOZhENIJa [sic]), complete with *Family Trees*, and the original Tengwar and Angerthas tables, although the latter is included without its English letter values.121

Elsewhere by this time, many other works (both Russian and foreign) which previously would have been barred by the censor now achieving publication, and the wider reading public had become increasingly accustomed to material which had once been the sole province of the *samizdat*-reading intelligentsia.122 When Menzel and Dubin’s “epoch of perestroika” finally ended decades of “censorship, party and ideological control” many of the long-held notions of what constituted literature in the Soviet Union were thrown into doubt.123 The institutional framework which had provided the *samizdat* writers with so much of their opposition, inspiration and readership was replaced with a very different social and cultural landscape.124
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Chapter Three:

Case Studies: Sergei Iukhimov’s *The Lord of the Rings*

The corpus

The two volumes of Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s translation contain, in total, thirty-two full colour illustrations by Iukhimov; including separate front and back covers for Volume I, a separate front cover for Volume II (the back cover here repeats an internal illustration), and one endpaper illustration printed in both volumes. The internal illustrations each comprise full page ‘plates’, which are printed on heavier paper than the pages of text. The plates are bound together in sets of four, with four sets included in Volume I, and three sets in Volume II. In the actual case studies, I have labelled each plate accordingly by *Volume, Set and Plate Number*, therefore as an example, *A Visit to Tom Bombadil* would be Volume I. Set I. Plate 3, or Vol I.I.3.

Thirty-one of the illustrations are rendered in portrait format (only the endpaper is landscape), and all twenty-eight plates have italicised Cyrillic title captions in the left-hand bottom corner. Iukhimov has provided each plate with an illustrated border; twenty-one possess simple lines of contrasting colour; seven have more elaborate designs. Each plate bears the signature S. Iukhimov, accompanied by their date of creation. The earliest are dated 1987 (A Visit to Tom Bombadil, Wraith – King and Fearless Samwise). Most plates are dated around 1990-1991, with 1991, coincidentally, being the latest date for any of the illustrations. Those illustrations which display the highest incidences of general correspondences or direct visual prototypes of a religious nature appear to be primarily (but not exclusively) dated between 1987-1990 period.

Stylistically, the illustrations range from the representational, such as Lodging for the Night at Bree to the highly symbolic (Fearless Samwise), with various permutations in between. They also conform to distinctive stylistic categories, which appear to be influenced primarily by the artistic period from which the motifs are borrowed: Byzantine, Carolingian, Romanesque and Neo-Gothic being the major trends.
General correspondence - weak intertextuality

As previously indicated in my discussion regarding Methodology, the case studies/study (there is only one) in this sub-category display an instance of visual borrowing which take the form of a general correspondence: that is a visual motif derived from an amalgam of several similar sources. A hypothetical example might be a motif derived from four manuscript miniatures of Mark the Evangelist. The borrowed motif is then employed to construct a new iconographic motif which, in turn, is linked, in accordance with Panofsky's model, to the text of The Lord of the Rings. However, the prospect of visual intertextuality (meaning) arising from this intersection of borrowed and new motifs is poor.

The case study in question is Volume II. I. Plate 20 Gandalf and the Wraith-king at the gate of Minas Tirith (Гэндальф и Король-Призрах у ворот Минас Тирита, Gzndal"f i Korol"-Prizrah u vorot Minas Tirita, dated 1987) (Fig. 12.), which depicts a pivotal moment in the narrative of The Siege of Gondor (Book V Chapter IV of The Return of the King). To set the scene; the gate of Minas Tirith has been broken by Sauron’s forces, allowing the Lord of the Nazgûl to ride into the city, his shape grown to “a vast menace of despair”. Only Gandalf, seated on his horse Shadowfax, holds his ground. The Lord of the Nazgûl halts to face Gandalf and after a brief exchange with the wizard, raises his fiery sword to attack. However, as Tolkien writes;

Gandalf did not move. And in that very moment, away behind in some courtyard of the city, a cock crowed. Shrill and clear he crowed, recking nothing of wizardry and
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125 Panofsky, Meaning, 61.
war, welcoming only the morning that in the sky far above the shadows of death was coming with the dawn.¹²⁶

The corresponding chapter of Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s translation is entitled Осада Города (Osada Goroda “The Siege of the City”). Their version of the confrontation at the gate follows the original sequence of events, however, the language is less evocative, and Tolkien’s subtly ambiguous “shadows of death [my emphasis]” becomes something rather more defined in its meaning;

But Gandalf did not move. At that very moment, somewhere far away, in the center of the City, in a sonorous and clear voice a cock began to sing. For him there was no ancient magic; he felt there, high in the sky, the morning rising over the shadow of death.¹²⁷

Iukhimov’s illustration depicts the two protagonists armed with swords and without their mounts. On the left stands Gandalf, with closely cropped hair and beard, clad in a purple chlamys (a form of Byzantine cloak fastened with a fibula brooch), whilst on the right, stands the Lord of the Nazgûl, portrayed as a tall, skeletal creature wearing a crown and wrapped in a black cloak and hood.¹²⁸ The titulus M besides Gandalf most likely represents the first letter of Mithrandir (mith “grey + ”randir “pilgrim, wandering man”)¹²⁹ which is the Sindarin name for Gandalf, common parlance in Gondor.¹³⁰ Next to the Nazgûl stands the initial W, which could signify either the canonical title Witch-king or Grigor’eva, Grushetskij and Iukhimov’s more favoured Wraith-king (which I will use when referencing the subject of this case study).

Above Gandalf’s head is a brightly coloured cockerel, an obvious visual reference to both the crowing bird of the text and a sunrise which will herald the arrival of the Rohirrim. Above the Wraith-king swoops a red and black dragon-like creature, suggestive of one of the Nazgûl’s winged steeds; primeval creatures referred to by Tolkien as being survivors of “older geological eras.”\(^{131}\) Below the two symbolic animals, Gandalf and the Wraith-king face each other across a simplified landscape containing a castle keep, (abutting a pyramid-shaped central mountain), surrounded by a triangular inner wall and a circular outer wall, all with crenellated battlements. The castle (complete with a black, open gateway), almost certainly symbolises Minas Tirith after Grond’s assault has broken the gate, and the mountain behind is no doubt representative of Mindolluin. Tolkien, however, describes the textual Minas Tirith as having been “built on seven levels, each delved into the hill” and makes it clear that each level possesses its own separate wall and gate.\(^{132}\) Iukhimov’s outer wall does feature seven turrets, although only one displays a gate, and the two walls combined have nine individual turrets. It could be that the outer wall symbolises the Rammas Echor, the great defensive rampart enclosing the Pelennor Fields, in which case the outer turrets may be the Causeway Forts.\(^{133}\)

The composition of *Gandalf and the Wraith-king at the gate of Minas Tirith* with its two monumental, elongated figures facing each other over a fortified settlement parallels works from the icon-painting tradition of the Solovetsky Monastery, a religious settlement situated on the Solovki Islands in the White Sea in Northern Russia. The two founders of the original 15\(^{th}\) century monastery, Saints Zosima and
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\(^{133}\) J.R.R. Tolkien, *The Return of the King*, 817.
Savvatii were often included in paired iconographic images, depicting the two monks stood face-to-face, venerating a symbol such as the Holy Trinity or Transfiguration, which would be positioned above them. These images would then form the focal point of hagiography icons detailing the lives of the saints and their various associated miracles.\(^{134}\)

Two notable examples from the Solovetsky paired icon tradition that display a degree of general correspondence with Lukhimov’s image are the 17th century tempera painting *The Holy Monks of St Zosima and St Savvatii of Solovki* (Fig. 13.) and the 18th century *Icon of Transfiguration with Saints Zosima and Sabbatius and Solovetsky Transfiguration Monastery* (Fig. 14.). The St Zosima and St Savvatii painting especially shares many common elements with *Gandalf and the Wraith-king at the gate of Minas Tirith*, particularly in the positioning of the background features, such as the Virgin and Child symbol; the placement of which is mirrored by Lukhimov’s iconographic animals. The semicircular composition of the Saints’ backdrop also closely corresponds with the stylised sunrise behind Mount Mindolluin, and the pointed white form of the Solovetsky monastery is almost perfectly echoed by the outline of Lukhimov’s White Mountains peak.

Another saints’ pairing of general relevance may be that of St Zosimas of Palestine and St Mary of Egypt, as depicted in the 17th century Monastery of Rousanno icon *St. Mary of Egypt communing the Holy Mysteries from St. Zosimas* (Fig. 15.). This painting illustrates an encounter between the Palestinian monk Zosimas and the emaciated desert-dweller Mary, which took place in the arid wilderness beyond the Jordan river,

\(^{134}\) E. S. Sisov, *Treasures from the Kremlin* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979), 134.
where Mary had lived for forty-seven years.\textsuperscript{135} In St Sophronius’ 7\textsuperscript{th} century account Mary appears naked before Zosimas, as she does in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century French text \textit{Life of St Mary the Egyptian} Mary, where her skin is also described as being “burned by the sun and the frost.”\textsuperscript{136} However, in the Rousanno icon Mary is presented swathed in a ragged cloth which partially covers her body, leaving her torso and skeletal limbs exposed to the elements. Iukhimov’s Witch-king is also clad in a tattered cloak, with his bare limbs appearing almost completely stripped of flesh. The primary significance of the Rousanno icon however, at least as far as its role as a general correspondence for Iukhimov’s illustration is concerned, resides in the motif itself; that of two physically contrasting but spiritually potent individuals confronting each other across the backdrop of a highly symbolic, miniaturised landscape.

The Rousanno icon figures are set against a ground of burnished gold leaf, representative of divine light and sacral space.\textsuperscript{137} In \textit{Gandalf and the Wraith-king at the gate of Minas Tirith} the spiritual/magical power of the two protagonists is embodied by their haloes, both of which are rendered in a style used by early Christian artists to symbolise a sacred figure.\textsuperscript{138} Gandalf’s halo is gold in appearance, with a black border, similar in design to those displayed by the eponymous saints of the \textit{The Holy Monks of St Zosima and St Savvatii of Solovki} icon. By painting their haloes in this manner both Iukhimov and the 16\textsuperscript{th} century Solovetsky artist appear to be drawing upon far earlier works such as the 6\textsuperscript{th} – 7\textsuperscript{th} century encaustic icons of \textit{Saint Peter} (Fig. 16.) and \textit{The

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{135} Andrew P. Schell, “Bodies and Boundaries in the Old English Life of St Mary of Egypt,” \textit{Neophilologus} 84, no 1 (2000): 137.
\end{thebibliography}
Virgin and Child with Saints (Fig. 17.) found in St Catherine’s Monastery at Mount Sinai in Egypt. The Wraith-king’s halo is similar in style (if not colour) to Gandalf’s but also contains a two-dimensional rendering of a radiating star, a symbol traditionally employed to denote a sun god. This design is particularly reminiscent of the solar discs displayed in depictions of the Roman sun deity Sol (who was worshipped from the time of the Republic), and also in portrayals of the god’s later incarnation Sol Invictus (“Unconquered Sun”), who became especially prominent during the reign of Emperor Aurelian between 270-275 AD (Fig. 18.).

It appears then, that Gandalf and the Wraith-king at the gate of Minas Tirith is based upon a composite of correspondences. The Solovetsky icons appear to provide a compositional framework for Iukhimov’s image, dictating the placement of key design elements such the monumental figures, the miniaturised buildings, the semicircular, mountainous background, and the symbolic haloes. The Rousanno icon meanwhile supplies the central motif of the two visually contrasting protagonists.

The intertextual implications of the piece, however, are difficult to determine. Unlike Gandalf and the Wraith-king, neither the Solovetsky monks, nor the saints Zosimas and Mary of Egypt face each other as enemies. Therefore, if the meaning of these prototypes (the interchange between two spiritual individuals) has not been imported, can there be any real intertextual element? One might exist in the juxtaposition of the two haloes, with the contrasting Christian and pre-Christian symbols having been incorporated into the new image to paraphrase Tolkien’s clash of “light”, and “darkness”. However, as a meaning, this is rather inadequate, and would
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appear to rest primarily on the erroneous assumption that the viewer will automatically equate Christianity with light, and pre-Christian beliefs with darkness.

**General correspondence - strong intertextuality**

The case studies in this sub-category display the same form of visual borrowing as witnessed in *Gandalf and the Wraith-king at the gate of Minas Tirith*. However, such is the power of the iconography inherent to their borrowed motifs, that, when combined with the Tolkienian motif of the new work, the potential for intertextual meaning to arise is strong.

The first example is Volume I. III. Plate 11 *The Death of Boromir* (Смерть Боромира *Smert’ Boromira*, 1988) (Fig 19). To place the case study in its context; Book Three Chapter I of *The Two Towers* (*The Departure of Boromir*) opens with Aragorn searching for Frodo on the summit of Amon Hen. Suddenly he hears the clamour of Orc voices “in the woodlands below”, followed by the “deep-throated call” of the Horn of Gondor, which Boromir always carries.141 Aragorn rushes down the hillside until he comes to a glade in the woods near Nen Hithoel. Here he finds Boromir:

> He was sitting with his back to a great tree, as if he was resting. But Aragorn saw that he was pierced with many black-feathered arrows; his sword was still in his hand, but it was broken near the hilt; his horn cloven in two was at his side. Many Orcs lay slain, piled all about him and at his feet.142

---
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The beginning of Book Three Chapter I of *Vlastelin Kolets I* (again entitled Смерть Боромира - *Smert' Boromira* “The Death of Boromir”) follows Tolkien’s narrative closely. Boromir is discovered approximately a mile from Parth Galen, the green shore above the Falls of Rauros, and the circumstances of his demise displays many of the details contained within the original scene;

He sat, leaning against a tree, and seemed to rest. But seeing the broken sword, the chopped horn, the set of black arrows in the body of the Gondorian and the corpses of the orcs around, Aragorn understood everything.\(^{143}\)

Grigor’eva and Grushetskij, however, have presented us with an Aragorn who appears to be in possession of far more knowledge of the preceding events than Tolkien’s, something which is at odds with the canonical version. Tolkien’s Aragorn may have made a quick assessment of the scene, and absorbed enough information about Boromir’s battle with the orcs to realise that the Gondorian had fought bravely in defence of the hobbits, thus redeeming any transgression he may have previously committed.\(^{144}\) However, he also remains unaware of the whereabouts of Frodo and Sam, or whether the orcs had captured them along with Merry and Pippin.\(^{145}\) Tolkien’s Aragorn is certainly in no position to understand “everything”. Of course, Grigor’eva and Grushetskij may simply have intended the statement to indicate that Aragorn knew everything about Boromir’s battle with the orcs; namely, he had killed many of them in the defence of the hobbits, but, had suffered too many arrow wounds to
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\(^{143}\) J.R.R. Tolkien, *Vlastelin Kolets I*, 337.

\(^{144}\) In Book Two Chapter X of *The Fellowship of the Ring* (entitled *The Breaking of the Fellowship*), Aragorn is dismayed to discover that that Frodo has vanished, and suspects Boromir may have had a hand in it. Unable to prevent the remaining members of the Fellowship from running off in mad pursuit of Frodo, he cries “Boromir! I do not know what part you have played in this mischief, but help now! Go after those two young hobbits [Merry and Pippin], and guard them at the least, even if you cannot find Frodo.” J.R.R. Tolkien, *The Fellowship of the Ring*, 405.

prevent the orcs from capturing his friends. But, that accepted, the statement is open to misinterpretation, and its presence in the text undermines the accuracy of Grigor’eva and Grushetskij subsequent translation of Aragorn’s exchange with Gimli and Legolas, which mirrors the general sentiment (if not the precise wording) of Tolkien’s original.\textsuperscript{146}

\textit{Iukhimov’s The Death of Boromir} centres upon the figure of black-haired man in a dark \textit{chlamys}, and green tunic, slumped against a tree trunk, pierced all over by eight red-feathered arrows and one short (or broken) spear. The man holds a broken sword in his right hand and his left arm is partially extended above his head as though pinned to a branch by two of the arrows. The man’s \textit{chlamys} has an eight-spoked wheel, or star, design on each shoulder and is fastened at neck with a circular \textit{fibula}. At the man’s feet lies a black and silver war-horn, broken in two pieces, which, combined with the manner of his injuries, clearly identifies him as Boromir. Scattered around him are the bodies of three green-skinned, helmeted orcs, who are clad in matching chainmail and studded gambesons. A circular black shield lies on the ground near one of the orcs. It bears the insignia of a “white hand in the centre of a black field”, revealing that these orcs (possibly Uruk-hai) are in the service of Saruman.\textsuperscript{147}

The woods that surround Boromir have a wintry feel, with thick leaf litter on the ground and bare branches on the trees. This resonates with Tolkien’s own description of the hills around Nen Hithoel which, he says “were clad with trees” whose “heads were bare, cold-gleaming in the sunlight.”\textsuperscript{148} Behind Boromir, three figures approach out of the trees (from left to right); a short, bearded individual with an axe and a

\textsuperscript{146} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{Vlastelin Kolets I}, 338.
\textsuperscript{147} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Two Towers}, 415-416.
\textsuperscript{148} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring}, 393.
shield; a slim, cloaked and hooded character with a bow and quiver of arrows on his back and a man in blue with a wide-brimmed hat and long sword. The three obviously correspond with Gimli, Legolas and Aragorn (although Aragorn’s clothing is unusual), with the latter bearing the re-forged sword Andúril. However, their arrival together would appear to contradict the textual narrative (both original and translation), which sees Aragorn reach Boromir first to be followed some minutes later by Gimli and Legolas.  

An eight-pointed wheel, or star design is shown emblazoned on Boromir’s cloak. This is an intriguing inclusion, as the motif does not appear to possess any visual correlation within the Tolkien canon, save for the eight-pointed Fëanorian star from Tolkien’s illustration for the Westgate of Moria, which differs considerably in appearance. Perhaps, in this incidence, the motif may be a shadowy premonition of the “wheel of fire” later perceived by both Frodo and Sam as they approach Mount Doom. Portraying Boromir with such a symbol on his person would be a way for Iukhimov to mark the Gondorian out as a casualty of the lure of the Ring.

In terms of general correspondences, the motif of a man (often young), tied to a tree, or post, his body pierced by arrows, has clear associations with the early Christian saint and martyr Sebastian. According to the Legenda Aurea (“Golden Legend”), a collection of hagiographies by the 13th century chronicler Jacobus de Voragine, Sebastian was a “citizen of Milan” and a soldier under “the pagan emperors Maximian and Diocletian”, who was eventually martyred for his Christian beliefs. Having been
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150 J.R.R. Tolkien. The Fellowship of the Ring, 305.
denounced by the prefect of Rome to Diocletian, Sebastian was sentenced to be tied
to a stake in the Campus Martius in Rome and shot through with arrows. However,
Sebastian survived this ordeal, and days later appeared on the steps of the Imperial
palace to harangue Diocletian and reproach him for his treatment of Christians;
whereupon the Emperor had Sebastian beaten to death and his corpse thrown into the
Roman sewer.\textsuperscript{153} It is the circumstances of Sebastian’s official “execution” at the hands
of the Emperor’s bowmen which we find alluded to in the visual iconography of the
saint, hence the multiple arrow motif. Sebastian is usually depicted partially clothed,
often clad in little more than a loincloth (witness Sandro Botticelli’s 1474 painting \textit{St
Sebastian}, for example Fig. 20.).\textsuperscript{154} Occasionally, however, he is portrayed fully
dressed, as in the image of the Saint found on the early 15\textsuperscript{th} century \textit{Thouzon
Altarpiece}, attributed to Jacques Yverni (Fig. 21.).\textsuperscript{155}

The staging of Boromir’s death in Iukhimov’s illustration suggests a familiarity with
these stories and the iconographic imagery that is associated with St Sebastian. The
“new” image which Iukhimov has constructed, namely a mythographic depiction of
Tolkien’s Boromir; a character whose redemptive death, according to Forest-Hill,
facilitates a transition from Anglo-Saxon “doomed man” to Christian warrior hero,
takes as its basis a motif borrowed from several Christian martyr images.\textsuperscript{156} The
resulting hybrid may be, to quote Bal and Bryson again, “fractured...ready at any time

\textsuperscript{153} Jacobus de Voragine, \textit{The Golden Legend}, 100.

\textsuperscript{154} Silvia Malaguzzi, \textit{Botticelli: The Artist and His Works} (Florence: Giunti Editore, 2003), 28.

\textsuperscript{155} Cathleen A. Fleck, “Seeking Legitimacy: Art and Manuscripts for the Popes in Avignon from 1378 to
1417,” in \textit{A Companion to the Great Western Schism}, eds. Joëlle Rollo-Koster and Thomas M. Ibicki
(Leiden: Brill, 2009), 252-253.

\textsuperscript{156} Lynn Forest-Hill, “Boromir, Byrhtnoth and Bayard: Finding a Language for Grief in J.R.R. Tolkien’s The
to fall apart”, but, conversely, certain common strands (both visual and textual) succeed in holding it together. 157

One such textual strand is the narrative thread which traces Boromir’s seemingly futile attempt to defend Merry and Pippin from the orcs. Superficially, Boromir’s bravery appears to achieve nothing besides his own death, but, as with Sebastian against Diocletian, his sacrifice is an honourable one despite its lack of efficacy. Of course, this interlacing between the two texts (by “texts” I mean Tolkien narrative and hagiography) may not have a direct impact on the content of Iukimov’s illustration. However, its presence does underpin the more obvious visual blending of Boromir and St Sebastian, so apparent in the multiple arrows and the positioning of the body. The resulting combination of motifs gives rise to a potential intertextual reading in which Tolkien’s man of Gondor becomes a martyr in the Christian symbolic mode.

Volume I. II. Plate 6. King - Wraith/Wraith - King (Король - призрак Korol’ - prizrak, 1987) (Fig. 22.) is set at the very culmination of Frodo’s desperate attempt to escape from the Black Riders in Book I Chapter XII of The Fellowship of the Ring (Flight to the Ford). Glorfindel’s horse Asfaloth has carried the hobbit across the Ford and onto the eastern bank of the river and, although Rivendell lies just a few miles ahead, Frodo finds himself impelled to halt at the riverbank. In a final act of defiance, Frodo brandishes his sword at his pursuers. The subject of the illustration is not Frodo, however, but rather the foremost of the Black Riders who has just urged his own horse forward into the river. Tolkien himself describes the moment thus;

157 Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson, Semiotics and Art History 207.
Then the leader, who was now half across the Ford, stood up menacing in his
stirrups and raised up his hand.\(^{158}\)

Grigor’eva and Grushetskij interpret the scene in a similar fashion, but they go a
step further than Tolkien at this early point in the narrative by assigning the leader of
the Black Riders a name.\(^{159}\)

The Wraith – King, already past the middle of the Ford, rose in the stirrups and
imperiously raised his hand.\(^{160}\)

The presence of the word “imperiously” here implies a degree of self-regard on the
part of the leader of the Black Riders which contrasts with what Shippey believes to be
the “state of nothingness” characteristic of the Tolkien’s Witch-king.\(^{161}\) Visually,
Iukhimov’s depiction inclines towards Shippey’s interpretation, with the black void
beneath the cowl of the Wraith-king (I will favour this name purely when referencing
the subject of Iuakhimov’s illustration) suggestive of the “material presences and
immaterial absences” inherent to the Ringwraiths.\(^{162}\) The Wraith-king’s appearance is
not entirely canonical, however. Although he wears a crown over a chainmail hood,
Tolkien’s Witch-king in fact favoured a crown on top of (or integral to) a helmet, an
important detail which is only revealed when Frodo puts on the Ring at Weathertop.
By the time they have reached the Ford, Tolkien’s Riders have thrown off their black
cloaks and hoods and are now “robed in white and grey.”\(^{163}\) Grigor’eva and Grushetskij
have their Riders clad in “grey shrouds and armour”, which is closer to Iuakhimov’s
illustration, but still somewhat removed from the swirling black cloak of the Wraith-

\(^{159}\) Previously, on page 198 of *Flight to the Ford* Tolkien has Strider (Aragorn) refer to the leader of the
Black Riders as “that dreadful King.” However, at no point during the Ford of Bruinen scene is the leader
again referred to by any other title or name.
\(^{161}\) Shippey, *The Road to Middle-earth*, 167.
\(^{162}\) Shippey, *The Road to Middle-earth*, 168.
In the background of the illustration Lukhimov has painted eight black spears jutting into the air, indicating the Wraith-king’s followers. Beneath the Wraith-king’s cloak (between the belly of his horse and the ground) there can also be seen traces of three further spear shafts, possibly blocked out by a semi-opaque layer of gouache. Whether this was an intentional addition, or a partially corrected error is unclear.

Arranged in a rough semi-circle in the sky around the Wraith-king are nine eight-pointed black stars, the largest of which resembles a comet with a trailing tail. The presence of this comet may be a significant feature within the illustration. Firstly, perhaps, it may be intended to represent the Wraith-king himself, with his fellow Ringwraiths symbolised by the surrounding eight stars. However, looking beyond the iconography of the legendarium, additional readings are also possible. Historically, the notion of the comet as a heralder of calamitous events has been an enduring theme, particularly during the medieval period. In the Bayeux Tapestry (commissioned by William of Normandy’s half-brother Odo) the 1066 appearance of Halley’s Comet was used as a visual portent for the terrible bloodshed that would occur as a direct result of Harold breaking his sacred oath to William (Fig. 23.). Over three hundred years earlier, the Venerable Bede had drawn his own apocalyptic conclusions regarding two separate sightings of a single comet in his chronology Historia Ecclesiastica Genis Anglorum (“Ecclesiastical History of the Anglo-Saxon People”),

In the year of our Lord 729, two comets appeared around the sun, striking terror in all who saw them. One comet rose early and preceded the sun, while the other
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followed the setting sun at evening, seeming to portend awful calamity to east or west alike.\textsuperscript{166}

In another conflation of myth and historical tradition, Boeckl states that comets traditionally were considered harbingers of “pestilential air” and when combined with certain meteorological phenomena were believed capable of “causing miasmic air to form, which, in turn, breeds disease.”\textsuperscript{167} By acknowledging these traditions and applying, what Panofsky calls, the “specific themes and concepts” regarding visual depictions of comets, it is possible to surmise that the astronomical imagery presented in *King-wraith* is indicative of an impending calamity.\textsuperscript{168} In *The Lord of the Rings* itself this would resonate with the approaching cataclysm of the War of the Ring, whilst the “pestilential air” theme intersects with the narrative of the Ringwraith’s most insidious weapon; the Black Breath, a malady causing sickness, “deadly cold” and often death in those who have prolonged contact with them.\textsuperscript{169}

The theme of future calamity can also be detected in one of the potential general correspondences for Lukhimov’s Wraith-king; namely “The Last of the Spirits”, the so-called “Phantom” which portends doom for Ebenezer Scrooge in Charles Dicken’s *A Christmas Carol*.\textsuperscript{170} The combination of the Wraith-king’s hunched, cloaked figure and skeletal outstretched hand closely mirrors Dickens’ textual Phantom; which the author describes as being “shrouded in a deep garment which concealed its head, its face, its form, and left nothing of it visible save one outstretched hand.”\textsuperscript{171} However, rather

\textsuperscript{168} Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning*, 66.
\textsuperscript{169} J.R.R. Tolkien, *The Return of the King*, 860.
\textsuperscript{171} Charles Dickens, *A Christmas Carol*, 102.
than drawing upon a single direct prototype (which could have been too proscriptive in this instance) it appears that Iukhimov may have incorporated a generic Phantom correspondence based on an amalgam of closely aligned images, from which he has subsequently extrapolated his Wraith-king figure.

Likely correspondences for the Wraith-king would be Harry Furniss’ 1910 india-ink and wash drawing The Last of the Spirits (Fig. 24.),172 Charles Green’s 1912 Scrooge and the Third Spirit (Fig. 25.)173 and Arthur Rackham’s 1915 illustration Heading to Stave Four (Fig. 26.).174 Additionally, the atmospheric black and white set-pieces captured by cinematographer John F. Seitz’s as part of Edwin L. Marin’s 1938 film A Christmas Carol (Fig. 27.) also display certain visual parallels with the Wraith-king, particularly regarding the peculiar shape of both characters’ hoods.

Although these images tend to portray the Phantom’s hand as pointing downwards, often towards Scrooge’s gravestone, or, as in the photographs, to some future cinematic horror about to be revealed, aspects of the apparition’s form remain clearly detectable in Iukhimov’s Wraith-king. The resulting intertextual implication is also clear: in King-Wraith, as in the climax of Tolkien’s Flight to the Ford the Witch-king (like Dickens’ Phantom), offers the viewer or reader a glimpse into a dark future. In the text this glimpse is prefaced by the Ringwraiths’ chilling cry; “‘Come back!...To Mordor we will take you!’”.175 In Iukhimov’s King-Wraith, it is the Wraith-king’s gesturing hand, like that of the illustrated Phantoms’, which visually approximates this foreboding effect.

---

Volume I.III. Plate 9. *Farewell Galadriel* (Прощание Галадриэль Proshhanie *Galadrizl*, 1990) (Fig. 28.) portrays an episode from Book Two Chapter VI of *The Fellowship of the Ring* (entitled *Farewell to Lórien*) where the remaining eight members of the Fellowship set out from Lothlórien in three Elven boats. As they pass out of the Silverlode into the current of the Great River Anduin, they catch a final glimpse of Galadriel stood on the bank watching them. To the travellers, the distant “white form” of Galadriel appears to shine “like a window of glass upon a far hill in the westering sun”. Tolkien takes up the description thus;

> Then it seemed to Frodo that she lifted her arms in a final farewell, and far but piercing-clear on the following wind came the sound of her voice singing. But now she sang in the ancient tongue of the Elves beyond the Sea, and he did not understand the words: fair was the music, but it did not comfort him.¹⁷⁶

In Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s chapter, also translated as *Farewell to Lorien* (Прощание с Lórienom or Proshhanie s Lorienom) the corresponding passage reads;

> It seemed to Frodo that Galadriel raised her hand in a farewell gesture, and suddenly the wind clearly conveyed her voice. She sang in the ancient language of the Overseas Elf, the words were not understood, and in the beautiful melody there was an alarm.¹⁷⁷

Galadriel’s song, which Tolkien subsequently includes in the text in both his invented Quenya (the ancient language of the Elves of Valinor) and in English, is usually referred to as *Namárië* (“Farewell”) or *Altariello nainië Lóriendessë*. (”Galadriel’s Lament in Lórien”).¹⁷⁸ Although Frodo possesses some prior knowledge of Quenya, Tolkien describes the hobbit as unable, at this point in the narrative, to understand the

---

meaning of Galadriel’s words.\textsuperscript{179} One thing Tolkien does make clear, however is that despite the beauty of Galadriel’s song it “did not comfort” Frodo.\textsuperscript{180} Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s Frodo is also unable to understand the actual words of Namárië (here translated by I. B. Grinshhpuna), but for him, rather than simply gaining no comfort in the song, he instead detects within it an “alarm”. This would suggest that Galadriel was communicating impending danger through her voice, which is at odds with the melancholia of Tolkien’s original. The canonical Galadriel laments for the city of Valimar, which, in her song, is symbolic of Valinor, the land of the Valar lost “from the East” by the Changing of the World.\textsuperscript{181} Because Frodo finds no comfort in the melody should not imply that the song was intended to invoke fear within him, as Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s choice of words might imply.

Iukhimov’s illustration depicts nine figures in total. The primary figure is a tall, golden-haired female clad in a pale blue gown and a trailing black headcloth which appears to swirl about her as if caught by the breeze. She is positioned to the right of the image, on a small promontory at the river’s edge with woodland beyond; a position strongly reminiscent of Tolkien’s Galadriel who had watched the Fellowship’s departure from a “green bank” near to the point of the “Tongue”, the strip of grassland where the Silverlode met the Anduin.\textsuperscript{182} The woman’s two raised hands mirror Galadriel’s gesture from \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring} rather than Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s Galadriel, who is described as raising only one hand “in a farewell

\textsuperscript{179} In the chapter \textit{Three is Company}, upon meeting Gildor Inglorion, Frodo utters the Quenya greeting “\textit{Elen síla lúmenn' omentielvo}” which translates as “a star shines on the hour of our meeting”. In reply, Gildor cries “Speak no secrets! Here is a scholar in the Ancient Tongue.” then adds “Bilbo was a good master,” implying that Frodo’s uncle was the primary source of his Quenya knowledge. J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring}, 81.

\textsuperscript{180} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring}, 377.


\textsuperscript{182} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring}, 371.
“gesture”. Distances here have been condensed so that immediately left of Lukhimov’s Galadriel, on the waters of the river float three wooden canoes with graceful curving prows, and black and blue designs painted along their sides. These canoes appear rather more elaborate than the “small grey boats” of Tolkien’s text, but their occupants correspond with members of the Fellowship, so they are almost certainly intended to represent the elven craft gifted to them by Galadriel. Of those occupants, eight of whom are present in the text, seven are depicted here. These seven correspond to (from right to left); Aragorn; Legolas (with his arms raised as if responding to Galadriel’s song); Sam, Frodo (with eight-pointed cross perhaps symbolising the act of Ringbearing); a third Hobbit which could be either Merry or Pippin; Gimli (reaching out to Galadriel) and a fourth hobbit, who could again be either Merry or Pippin.

The sky above is a deep blue in colour, dotted with eight-pointed gold stars, possibly as an approximation of the “blue vaults of Varda” featured in Namárië. In the top left corner of the illustration the sky parts to reveal an angelic figure, complete with wings, halo and a palm frond clutched in one hand. This visitation, revealed in conjunction with visualisation of Galadriel singing, may be intended as a representation of Varda, the most revered being for the Elves, who is invoked during Namárië. In the light of this possibility, Legolas’ gesture may, in fact, be directed towards the Varda figure, although his gaze, (like all of the depicted members of the Fellowship, save Aragorn) is fixed upon Galadriel, suggesting any awareness he may have of the visitation above is communicated to him via her.

---

The winged and haloed Varda-like figure in the top left of the image holds a palm branch in its outstretched left hand, seemingly offering it to Galadriel. The palm branch holds an iconographic significance in both classical and Christian art. In the classical sphere it was often used to represent victory. This could be a victory in the physical world, as depicted in the 4th century Coronation of the Winner Mosaic (Fig. 29.) from the Villa Romana del Casale, or in the spiritual world; as in the front panel of a 2nd century marble Garland Sarcophagus from Phrygia, where the palm branch symbolises victory in the transition to the afterlife. In Christian art, the palm branch would become indicative of martyrdom; as the palm tree triumphed over the ravages of the desert, so the martyr triumphed over the torments of the flesh.

Returning to the subject of Galadriel and the Fellowship, the tableau of a lone figure stood upon a shore, hands raised, beckoning or hailing a boat out on the water could be interpreted as a visual homage to the Miraculous Draught of Fishes; specifically, the second miracle of that name attributed to Jesus, which is recounted in the Gospel of John 21: 1-14. Unlike the first miracle (as detailed in the Gospel of Luke 5: 1-11), which occurs during Jesus’ lifetime and includes him sitting within a boat, the second is set after the resurrection and sees Jesus stood on the shore of the sea of Tiberias calling to a boat carrying seven of his disciples. The disciples, who are named as Simon Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the sons of Zebedee (James and John), and “two other disciples” have been fishing, both that morning and the night before, but have caught nothing;  

Early in the morning, Jesus stood on the shore, but the disciples did not realize that it was Jesus.

He called out to them, “Friends, haven’t you any fish?”

“No,” they answered.

He said, “Throw your net on the right side of the boat and you will find some.” When they did, they were unable to haul the net in because of the large number of fish.¹⁸⁹

Iukhimov’s image displays seven members of the Fellowship sat in the three elven boats. By this point in their journey, however, the Fellowship numbered eight. Gandalf had been lost in Moria of course, but also missing from Farewell Galadriel is the figure of Boromir. From a Tolkienian perspective, Boromir’s omission from the image may have been a deliberate visual foreshadowing of his impending fall at the climax of The Fellowship of the Ring. However, if we are to embrace the motif of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes then the absence of Boromir facilitates a closer match with the motif of the seven disciples.

There exist several viable general correspondences for Farewell Galadriel. The first of these, which, incidentally, takes a departure from the Miraculous Draught theme, is Giotto di Bondone’s lost Navicella (Fig. 30.) (circa 1305-13 AD), a large mosaic destroyed in the demolition of Old St Peter’s Basilica.¹⁹⁰ The mosaic originally depicted the Matthew 14:24–32 account of Christ walking on water and contains many of the important iconographic elements; most notably the key combination of Christ, disciples and angel, a detail particularly evident in Parri Spinelli’s 15th century drawing of the work (Fig. 31.).

Regarding the Miraculous Draught motif, there are correspondences between Farewell Galadriel and Sebastiano Ricci’s Late Baroque oil painting Christ at the Sea of

¹⁸⁹ John 21: 4-6 (NRSV).
¹⁹⁰ Jules Lubbock, Storytelling in Christian Art from Giotto to Donatello (London: Yale University Press, 2006), 156-158.
A commonality exists in the serene expressions of Galadriel and Christ, and the way their golden hair frames their faces. Galadriel's headcloth also echoes the drapery around Christ's shoulders (which appears to billow in the wind) and underneath her blue gown she is clad in red, as is Ricci's Christ beneath his blue cloak. In the background of Iukhimov's picture, the lines of the shore and trees slant from right to left, terminating at the upright figure of Aragorn. This compositional feature corresponds to the horizontal sweep of the coastal town in Ricci's painting, where the buildings taper towards the vertical lines of the boat's mast. Although Iukhimov's image, unlike the Gospel account, depicts three boats, they are positioned closely together, as if to suggest a single craft. As previously mentioned, there are also seven members of the Fellowship shown which matches the number of Ricci's canonical seven disciples. Additionally, the bearded Gimli, who reaches out his hand towards Galadriel in Iukhimov's illustration, could be perceived as echoing the outstretched form of Ricci's Simon Peter.

The iconography of the biblical motifs is too powerful to be entirely subsumed by the Tolkienian motif of *Farewell Galadriel*. By inserting the discourse of these New Testament images into a particularly transcendental moment from *The Lord of the Rings*, Iukhimov has produced (intentionally or not) a potent hybrid imbued with religious and mythographic meaning. Galadriel and Christ have become closely aligned visually; almost interchangeable depending on the perspective of the viewer. This parallel not only reinforces the emotion of Gimli's gesture (he now also equates with Peter, reaching out towards Christ), but lends a greater, if non-canonical, significance to the seven depicted members of the Fellowship. For early Christians, of course, Jesus was believed to be a martyr, and through the conflation of his and Galadriel's figures in...
Iukhimov’s image, Galadriel too may appear as a martyr. She has resisted the lure of the Ring, offered to her by Frodo (another prospective martyr), and the angelic figure proffering the palm branch may signify Varda bestowing this hypothetical status upon her.

**Direct visual prototype - weak intertextuality**

This sub-category features case studies displaying incidences of visual borrowing derived from a direct visual prototype: that is, a motif which is derived from a single visual source. This could be one entire piece, for example an oil painting, an archaeological artefact, or selected elements of one larger piece (such as single figure from a tableau of figures). Again, the borrowed motif is used to create a new iconographic motif referencing the text of *The Lord of the Rings*. However, despite the use of a direct visual prototype, the potential for intertextual meaning arising from the conjunction of borrowed and new motifs (even when allowing for viewer subjectivity) remains weak.

Volume II. I. Plate 18. *Fearless Samwise* (Бесстрашный Сэмьяс Besstrashnyj Szmjus, 1987) (Fig. 33.) is a typical example of the sub-group. The image itself depicts a significant scene from Book IV Chapter X of *The Two Towers (The Choices of Master Samwise)* where Sam Gamgee, having made the decision to abandon the body of his

---

Master and venture into Mordor alone, finds himself trapped in the steep-sided Cleft
by approaching orcs;

In a minute they would reach the top and be on him. He had taken too long in
making up his mind, and now it was no good. How could he escape, or save himself,
or save the Ring? The Ring. He was not aware of any thought or decision. He simply
found himself drawing out the chain and taking the Ring in his hand.\textsuperscript{193}

Grigor’eva and Grushetskij (in whose hands \textit{The Choices of Master Samwise}
becomes \textit{Сем на распутье}, “Sam at the Crossroads”)\textsuperscript{194} interpret the same passage in
more prosaic fashion. Their version contains very little of Sam’s panic or his frantic
internal debate concerning the Ring. Significantly, for the contextualisation of
Iukhimov’s illustration, they also describe no single instant when the Ring rests in
Sam’s hand,

A minute and the orcs would be at the top and see him. He had thought too long!
Still unaware of himself, he groped for the chain around his neck. At the moment
when the first enemies appeared on the pass, right in front of him, he put on the
Ring.\textsuperscript{195}

Visually, \textit{Fearless Samwise}, is one of the most arresting images in the corpus. The
identity of the character depicted is plain enough, given the illustration’s title and the
titulus arranged about his head reading \textit{SAMWISE GAMGEE}, but the execution of the
figure is unconventional, and makes little concession to the figurative. The elongated
bell-shape of the body may hint at the drapery of Sam’s elven cloak, given to him in
Lothlórien, however, the intricate design contained within omits any direct reference
to the garment’s subtle colour-shifting properties.\textsuperscript{196} The position of Sam’s right hand

\textsuperscript{193} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Two Towers}, 734.
\textsuperscript{196} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring}, 370.
does closely echo Tolkien’s description (see above), and the placement of the Ring on the hobbit’s palm (sans chain) provides a strong visual-textual link and a suitable focal point for the entire image. The radiating halo which emanates from the Ring itself contains sixteen beams, alternating eight red and eight blue, which in turn culminate in an eight-pointed star.

The star is encircled by an excerpt from the original Tolkien Ring verse (as opposed to Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s translated Russian); *ONE RING TO BRING THEM ALL AND IN THE DARKNESS BIND THEM IN THE LAND OF MORDOR* (sic). To Sam’s left there is an image of a mountain, floating beneath a second, smaller *titulus* which reads (in the Classical Latin style) *ORODRVIN*. Orodruin, (meaning “burning mountain”) is, of course, the Sindarin name for the forging place of the One Ring, the volcano known as Mount Doom.\(^\text{197}\) In the immediate foreground of the picture, (from inside the inner border), a dark hand with red nails reaches forward, ostensibly towards Sam, although at no point do either texts mention such an occurrence. The hand itself most likely signifies the approach of one of Gorbag’s orcs, who had been patrolling up the pass from Minas Morgul below. This is an interesting addition on Iukhimov’s part, as the introduction of such an “outside” element has the potential to shift the narrative mode away from Tolkien’s own. *The Lord of the Rings* might normally be considered an example of an omniscient narrative, with the passage in question from *The Choices of Master Samwise* internally focalised upon (or, reflecting the subjective point of view of), Sam.\(^\text{198}\) However, the simple addition of the hand lends a component of uncertainty to the image. Exactly who are we supposed to be focalising upon here,

\(^{197}\) J.R.R. Tolkien, *The Return of the King*, 1134.

Sam, an anonymous orc, or someone else, lurking off-frame? Perhaps the viewer is meant to assume the visual perspective of the orc, suddenly confronted by the sight of Samwise Gamgee as Ringbearer? Graphically, this would appear unlikely, because, although the orc’s hand may overlap the inner border of the illustration (suggesting a different spatial or temporal plane perhaps), the presence of another, outer border ensures that the hand remains firmly located within Tolkien’s secondary world.

This second border contains a double ourobóros design, in the form of a pair of stylised black and red dragons devouring each other’s tails. Within early medieval art, the ourobóros was considered symbolic of (amongst other things) eternity, the encircling sea, and on occasions, when motivated by Gnostic thought, of darkness and the Underworld.\(^{199}\) There is also a triple spiral triskele motif on Sam’s body/cloak, similar to Insular designs which were often used as artistic expressions of the Holy Trinity.\(^{200}\) Bettina Arnold claims that the number three (as displayed in the triskele) was considered an auspicious configuration in late Iron Age society, with its occurrence in the archaeological record often being associated with episodes of “drinking and feasting” from the literature of the time.\(^{201}\) Framing the triskele design on Sam are the Cyrillic letters СГ (Es and Ge) which transliterate as the English S and G, the initials for Sam Gamgee.

Sam’s unusual body-shape may be best understood when the image is compared with its possible direct prototypes, which appear to be primarily early medieval in nature. One of the most obvious prototypes can be seen in folio 21v *The Man of*

---


Matthew (Fig. 34.), an illuminated page prefacing the Gospel of Matthew in the 7th century Insular manuscript the Book of Durrow. Here the Durrow artist (possibly an Irish or Northumbrian monk) has created a highly stylised version of the Evangelist symbol for Matthew. Unlike those from later Insular books such as the Lindisfarne Gospels or the Book of Kells, the symbol here is depicted “naked”, that is, (as Martin Werner says) “lacking wings, haloes, books or other attributes.” The block-like outline of The Man of Matthew very much corresponds to that of Sam’s, and both figures share an elaborate chequerboard design on their torsos. The titulus Samwise Gamgee uses a red and yellow Insular half-uncial script borrowed directly from folio 209b Saint John the Evangelist from the Lindisfarne Gospels (Fig. 35.). A possible prototype for the triskele design on Sam’s body could be the lower central portion of folio 3v, one of the six extant carpet pages from the Book of Durrow. (Fig. 36.)

According to Nees, “images of the Evangelists and/or their symbols” such as those found in the Book of Durrow, may have served an apotropaic function and, in Britain particularly, would often be assigned a “magical potency”. This potency was believed to be increased when the Evangelist symbol, or symbols, were placed in conjunction with the similarly apotropaic power of the cross. A particularly evocative example of this practice, cited by Nees, was the “elaborate ritual prescription for the fertilisation of bewitched fields” which occurs in a 10th–11th century Anglo-Saxon collection of prayers and medical texts known as the Lacnunga. The ritual itself

---

entailed the burying of four crosses (each inscribed with the names of the four Evangelists), at the furthestmost corners of a barren field to ensure a good harvest for the following year. An examination of Iukhimov’s Samwise reveals a similar conjunction of apotropaic symbols depicted on the hobbit’s body, with his torso, based on *The Man of Matthew* Evangelist symbol enclosing within it two elaborate cross designs. It could be that *Fearless Samwise* constitutes a visual approximation of the talismanic images found in Insular manuscripts such as the *Book of Durrow*. Obviously, as an illustration for a fictitious narrative, *Fearless Samwise* has no ritual significance in a real-world sense, unless, by the simple act of inserting apotropaic symbols into the discourse of a modern illustration it is possible to assign such a significance.

Defining a precise intertextual meaning stemming from the direct visual prototype of *The Man of Matthew* is also problematic. Perhaps it could be hypothesised that the relationship between Sam, the “salt-of-earth”, honest hobbit and his “Master” Frodo, might mirror that of St Matthew the Evangelist (considered symbolic of Christ's human nature) and Christ himself. However, such a reading is tenuous, and difficult to substantiate, and even if it could be proved, the obscurity of the intertextuality may preclude many viewers.

Volume II. II. Plate 21. *March of the rohirrim* (sic) (*Поход рохирримов* *Pohod rohirrimov*, 1991) (Fig. 37.) displays perhaps the most obvious direct visual prototype of all the case studies. To place the image in context; Book V Chapter VI of *The Return*

---

of the King (entitled The Battle of the Pelennor Fields) opens with the Lord of the Nazgûl departing the gate of Minas Tirith as Théoden and the host of Rohan sweep through the northern half of the Pelennor, killing many orcs and sending others “flying towards the River like herds before the hunters”. 209 Théoden then directs his force southwards to face the might of the Haradrim. The Rohirrim swiftly break through the Southron ranks and the Haradrim “chieftain” is slain by Théoden and his “black serpent” standard hacked down. At this point, however, a great shadow falls over the battlefield, heralding the return of the Lord of the Nazgûl on his winged steed. Tolkien writes;

“But lo! suddenly in the midst of the glory of the king his golden shield was dimmed. The new morning was blotted from the sky. Dark fell about him. Horses reared and screamed. Men cast from the saddle lay grovelling on the ground.

“To me! To me!” cried Théoden, “Up Eorlingas! Fear no darkness!”210

Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s version of the same scene, part of a chapter entitled Пеленнорская битва (Pelennorsakja bitva “The Pelennor Battle”) feels less immersive (at least in translation);

“But suddenly the shine of the golden shield of Théoden faded. The sky darkened, the shadow fell to the ground. The horses began snorting and snarling, dropping their riders.

“To me! To me!” cried Théoden “Do not be afraid of shadows!”211

By omitting the third line of Tolkien’s original passage, the translators have stripped the scene of its internal focalisation.212 The reader is no longer inside the narrative,

---

212 Genette, Narrative Discourse, 189-194.
witnessing events (for however brief a moment) from Théoden’s point of view. The King’s perspective has been pared away, and Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s have left us no vehicle through which we can directly experience the horror of the Lord of the Nazgûl’s arrival.

Iukhimov’s illustration offers an alternative perspective to both of passages above. It differs from the two texts by displaying all the elements of the scene (both seen and unseen) together in one image. The primary details of the illustration are contained within a form of central panel which is bordered by a lower frieze. The focal point of the central panel is a mounted warrior with a teardrop, or kite shield and raised sword who is spurring his horse on over the fallen bodies of what appears to be two black men in red chainmail and pointed helms. One of the fallen men clutches a sword, while the other stretches over a broken sword with a rictus of pain on his face. Beneath them is a frieze depicting further combat between three bare-headed white men, armed with sword, spear and sling, and a large dog-headed creature with a spiked club flanked by a black man in red garb who has been pierced by a spear. *Tituli* accompanying the figures in the frieze read *Rohirrim* and The ENEMY (sic) respectively.

Returning to the central panel; to the far left of the first mounted warrior is a second armoured man on horseback, entering the scene wielding a long spear. A cloaked, skeletal figure armed with a bow and riding a curious winged creature also appears in the top left of the panel, aiming a red arrow towards the central rider’s horse. A Latin *titulus* above the central warrior (in part bisected by the skeletal character) reads *THEODEN REX INTERFECTUS EXT*, which translates as “King Théoden has been killed”. Obviously, this would imply that the central mounted warrior is indeed Théoden, although discrepancies exist between the warrior depicted and the
canonical description. A recurring motif in both Tolkien’s text and the translation is Théoden’s “golden shield” (see above), but Iukhimov’s Théoden carries a shield which is painted blue and red (at least on the inside). There is also no reference in either text to the shield being teardrop shaped like the one depicted in the illustration.

Additionally, there is the matter of Théoden’s horse Snowmane. Tolkien describes the animal as being, rather unsurprisingly, “white as snow”, whereas the horse featured in March of the Rohirrim is primarily blue and green in colour, with a bright yellow mane and tail. The quasi-pointillist treatment of the horse’s body could be intended to suggest chainmail but this is unlikely, and again would be uncanonical. It is more likely that this effect is designed to simulate a three-dimensional texture of some sort. The two injured or slain men left in Snowmane’s wake probably represent allies of Sauron felled by Théoden. Their red clothes and black skin may be indicative of their ethnicity as Haradrim. The second “ENEMY” figure in the border could also be a Haradrim warrior, a theory strengthened by the fact that he has just dropped a curved scimitar. His compatriot, the dog-headed creature with a club may be an orc or, perhaps, a rather loose embodiment of the half-troll like men “out of Far Harad”.

The titulus THEODEN REX INTERFECTUS EXT could be considered misleading, as, ostensibly, we are not witnessing the actual moment of Théoden’s death, but rather one of the events immediately preceding it. However, it is the killing of Théoden’s horse Snowmane which seals the King’s fate, and Iukhimov’s illustration depicts the moment prior to the firing of the projectile which fells the animal. Tolken describes the

---


Grigor’eva and Grushetskij refer to these figures as полулюдей-полутроллей “half-people-half-trolls”. J.R.R. Tolkien, Vlastelin Kolets II, 177.
missile as a “black dart” but never actually identifies it as having been fired by the Lord of the Nazgûl.\textsuperscript{217} In Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s text the dart becomes a “black spear” which strikes Snowmane in the chest, but again the firer is never identified.\textsuperscript{218} Lukhimov’s image, however, leaves little doubt as to who the culprit is. The offending missile here is a red arrow, clearly about to be fired from a bow held by the skeletal figure who must surely equate to the Lord of the Nazgûl, descending on his winged steed.

The visual prototype for \textit{March of the Rohirrim} is one of the more straightforward in the corpus, as the image obviously combines several elements borrowed directly from that famous example of Romanesque art, the \textit{Bayeux Tapestry}. The \textit{titulus THEODEN REX INTERFECTUS EXT} (“King Théoden has been killed”) in Lukhimov’s illustration borrows from the Bayeux Scene 59 \textit{titulus HIC HAROLD REX INTERFECTUS EXT} (“Here King Harold has been killed”) (Fig. 38.). This would suggest a hypothetical conflation of Bayeux Harold and fictional Rohan King, perhaps intended as a way of magnifying the symbolic power of the image. The figure of Théoden himself, seated on his horse Snowmane is very similar to the Norman horseman depicted to the far right of Scene 56, directly below the letters \textit{OLDO} of the \textit{titulus HIC FRANCI PUGNANT ET CECIDERUNT QUI ERANT CUM HARALDO} (“Here the French are fighting and have killed those who were with Harold”) (Fig. 39.). When compared with the prototype, the source of the unusual texture on Lukhimov’s Snowmane now becomes evident, with the quasi-pointillist rendering obviously designed to replicate the contouring effect of the Bayeux couching stitch.\textsuperscript{219} Between Théoden and the Norman there is a difference

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{217} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Return of the King}, 840.
\item \textsuperscript{218} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{Vlastelin Kolets II}, 172.
\item \textsuperscript{219} Trevor Rowley, \textit{An Archaeological Study of the Bayeux Tapestry: The Landscapes, Buildings and Places} (Barnsley: Pen and Sword Books, 2016), 7.
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as regards their weapons; Théoden wields a sword, rather than a spear, although it should be noted that, by this point in Tolkien’s text, the King had broken his spear bringing down the Haradrim chieftain, therefore the change is not an uncanonical one.220 However, the tear-drop, or kite shield, remain almost identical, as do the finer details of horse’s bridle, saddle and even the leg-wrappings and spurs on both men’s feet. 221

The combination of a central illustrated panel and accompanying frieze, as seen in *March of the Rohirrim*, has traditionally been employed in Classical and Medieval arts to convey a continuous pictorial narrative (via the central panel) with a possibly “ironic, satirical” and occasionally humorous commentary (the frieze).222 When used in conjunction with a sequence of battle scenes in the central panel (also referred to as the “main frieze”), the accompanying frieze would be used to emphasise the rhythm of battle or, as Rowley calls it, “the debris of conflict: a litany of corpses, armour and discarded weaponry”.223

Compositionally, the central panel and frieze of *March of the Rohirrim* most resemble the layout of Bayeux scenes such Scene 32 *ISTI MIRANT[UR] STELLA[M]*: ("These (people) are looking in wonder at the star") (Fig. 40.) and Scene 38 *HIC WILLELM[US] DUX IN MAGNO NAVIGIO MARE TRANSIVIT ET VENIT AD PEVENESÆ* ("Here Duke William in a great ship crossed the sea and came to Pevensey") (Fig. 41.). These scenes, although they do not portray actual hand-to-hand combat, more closely

---

reflect Lukhimon’s composition than most Bayeux sequences, as they incorporate only a single frieze, as opposed to the two friezes (at top and bottom) which are displayed in larger part of the tapestry.

Tolkien himself appears to have pondered the visual similarities between Anglo-Saxon and Rohirrim culture, evidenced by his reply to Rhona Beare’s 1958 letter concerning (amongst other questions) the style of clothes worn by the peoples of Middle-earth. In a carefully-worded response Tolkien remarked that, although he would not class the Rohirrim as medieval, he found that the visual styles of the Bayeux Tapestry (save for what he called the Bayeux artists’ “clumsy conventional sign for chainmail”) fitted the Riders of Rohan “well enough”.224

Any potential visual merging of Harold and Théoden is further strengthened by the symbolism of the arrow, a factor common to both kings’ stories. Of course, as contemporaneous accounts testify (witness Norman ‘propagandist’ William of Poitiers, for example), rather than receiving an arrow in the eye, the real Harold was far more likely to have been hacked apart and dismembered by William’s knights.225 Also, modern analysis of the tapestry has suggested that the appearance of an arrow piercing the eye of the Anglo-Saxon warrior depicted in Scene 57 (Fig. 41.) was probably a result of over-zealous “restoration of the needle-work” rather than any real intention by the original artist.226 However, despite this, in modern visual media the conjunction of the “arrow”, and the medieval warrior, remains a strong semiotic sign for the death of a king in battle. When viewed in tandem with the words HIC HAROLD

225 Elizabeth Carson Pastan, Stephen D. White and Kate Gilbert, The Bayeux Tapestry, 248.
226 Trevor Rowley, An Archaeological Study, 100.
*REX INTERFECTUS EXT* we have a direct link to the *Bayeux Tapestry* which brings with it the added weight of almost a thousand years of European history.

Nevertheless, such a link does not necessarily equate with a strong intertextual significance. In fact, it could be said that elements of the Tapestry have simply been incorporated into *March of the Rohirrim* in the style of a collage. This might result in a strong visual resemblance between prototype and new image (possibly advantageous for lukhimov), but the meaning itself remains unclear. Are we being asked to conflate William and his Norman knights with Théoden and the Rohirrim, and so, by extension, Harold’s men with the Haradrim? Such an interpretation would contrast with Tolkien’s source text, where it is the Haradrim, as part of Sauron’s army, who are the invaders not the Rohirrim. Of course, historical tradition dictates that the *Bayeux Tapestry* was given Norman patronage as a form of “legal justification for regime change in England” which might suggest another reading where William (Théoden) is just in his actions on the battlefield and Harold (Haradrim) an unjust traitor. Again, this is contentious, and leads to the conclusion that, in this case, a direct visual prototype has not produced a clearly defined intertextual meaning.

**Direct visual prototype - strong intertextuality**

The final sub-category includes those case studies which display visual borrowing derived from a direct visual prototype: that is a motif derived from a single source, or elements of a single source. Unlike the previous sub-group, however, the iconography
of the borrowed motif is potent enough that when combined with the Tolkienian motif of the new work, the potential for intertextuality (meaning) is strong.

The first case study in this sub-grouping is Volume II. II. Plate 22. *Pyre of Denethor* (Костер Денетора Koster Denetora, 1989) (Fig. 43.). As always, before commencing with the analysis we must first refer to the text. At the beginning of Book Five Chapter VII of *The Return of the King (The Pyre of Denethor)* Tolkien’s narrative takes a temporal shift. He leaves the aftermath of the Pelennor battle with its brief flashforward to the “song of the Mounds of Mundburg”, and returns once more to Gandalf, sat motionless on Shadowfax as the Lord of the Nazgûl departs the city gate. Pippin approaches Gandalf and urges the wizard to accompany him to the House of the Stewards, where Denethor has built a funeral pyre for himself and Faramir.227 Here they find Beregond, Captain of the Guard, holding the door against Denethor’s servants. Gandalf duly rescues Faramir from the pyre, and addresses Denethor, calling on him to return to the defence of the city. When Denethor refuses, Gandalf likens the Steward’s desire to kill himself and his son to that of “the heathen kings” who, he says, would slay themselves “in pride and despair, murdering their kin to ease their own death.”228 Denethor is unmoved, and suddenly reveals the *palantir*, the Seeing Stone of Minas Anor. After a bitter exchange with Gandalf, Denethor makes his final, decisive move;

Then Denethor leaped upon the table, and standing there wreathed in fire and smoke he took up the staff of his stewardship that lay at his feet and broke it on his


knee. Casting the pieces into the blaze he bowed and laid himself on the table, clasping the *palantir* with both hands upon his breast.\(^{229}\)

In the corresponding chapter of *Vlastelin Kolets*, translators Grigor'eva and Grushetskij present us with a rather prosaic interpretation of the same passage;

Then Denethor leaped on the table, grabbed the Ruler’s staff lying there and breaking it over his knee, threw it into the fire. Then he clutched the Palantir [sic] to his chest with both hands and lay down.\(^{230}\)

By employing the phrase *Ruler’s staff* in the place of Tolkien’s *staff of his stewardship* to describe the white rod which was the physical symbol of Denethor’s office, Grigor’eva and Grushetskij have missed an opportunity to reiterate a key aspect of Denethor’s paranoia. From their description we could almost equate Denethor with a king. However, as Steward, the canonical Denethor is painfully aware that he is not the ruler of Gondor, but simply a custodian, awaiting the arrival of the true king. He suspects someone of higher lineage is coming to Minas Tirith and that he will be expected to surrender “his charge”, namely the kingdom of Gondor, to that person. It is this prospect, along with the death of his eldest son, and his mistaken belief in the invincibility of Sauron (erroneously glimpsed through the *palantir*) which has fuelled his madness and despair. Tolkien’s inclusion of the words “staff of his stewardship” placed as they are at the very point of Denethor’s demise, underlines the fatal mixture of pride and insecurity his office has afforded him, something which Grigor’eva and Grushetskij “Ruler’s staff” fails to accomplish.

In *Pyre of Denethor* Iukhimov has presented an image of strong vertical symmetry, based around the central axis of an old man with white hair and beard, enveloped by


the flames of a stylised funeral pyre. The pyre is set on a large black and blue dais, and, if any doubt still existed as to the identity of the central figure, a *titulus* at the front of the dais reads *DENETHOR II*. The surrounding architectural features of chequered floor, pillars and arched windows are mirrored vertically along the axis of Denethor’s body. The Steward himself is adorned with an elaborately patterned burnished gold halo which surrounds his head and upper torso. The halo contains seven black and white crosses, bordering an inner radiating pattern of blue, red and black rays. At his chest, Denethor also clasps a glowing orb; the colour of which is suggestive of the “inner flame” of the *palantir*. 231 From this, it is possible to infer that the seven crosses of the halo may be symbolic of the seven *palantiri*; the great scrying stones made by Fëanor, of which (at the time of the War of the Ring) the Minas Anor stone was one of four extant in Middle-earth. 232 Overall, then, the halo could be intended as a visual expression of the supernatural power of the *palantir*.

On either side of Denethor, situated between the edge of the great halo and the framing vertical lines of two black pillars is an additional two-part *titulus* which reads *RATH DINEN*. This is a Sindarin name meaning “Silent Street” and refers to the road which leads to the House of Stewards in the Hallows of Minas Tirith (rather than the actual House itself, which its placement in Iukhimov’s image appears to infer). 233 To the rear of Denethor, positioned in front of two identical arched doorways are three figures resembling knights, all of them clad in plate armour with plumes on their helmets. On Denethor’s left are two of the knights; one with a red cloak who appears to be disarmed and fleeing, and a second with a green cloak who looks as though he

---

may have just entered through the door behind. It could be that the green cloaked knight represents Pippin, and the red cloaked character one of Denethor’s attendants, perhaps attempting to escape from the drawn sword of the lone knight on the right. This third knight may be Beregond, although his red plume and cloak differ from the canonical Beregond whose livery (like Pippin’s) was said to have been “the black and silver of the Guard”.

However, Iukhimov’s knight does bear a shield with a T device which theoretically could be intended to signify the knight’s rank as a member of the Guard of the Tower of Gondor, therefore making the case for Beregond somewhat stronger.

The image of Denethor on the pyre echoes the burning martyr motif seen in images such as *Jan Hus at the Stake* from the *Jena Codex* (circa 1490-1510) (Fig. 44.) or the 16th century *Richard Bayfield being burnt at the stake* (Fig. 45.). However, Iukhimov’s work appears most closely associated with images of Polycarp, the 2nd century Bishop of the Greek city of Smyrna, on the Anatolian coast, who was sentenced to death for refusing to show reverence to the Roman Emperor. Initially, Polycarp was burnt at the stake: an attempt by the Romans to destroy his body, an act, they believed, would deny Polycarp any hope of resurrection. When this apparently failed, the proconsul had Polycarp stabbed to death. Pictorially, Polycarp is usually depicted as a white haired old man, dressed in Byzantine vestments embroidered with black and red crosses, as can be seen in the 14th century frescoes in the church of the Holy Ascension at Visoki Dečani monastery (Fig. 46.). When portrayed as a martyr he is invariably

---

pictured engulfed in flames, sometimes tied to a stake or occasionally kneeling on his pyre with both hands raised in supplication.

The direct visual prototype for Iukhimov’s Pyre of Denethor appears to be a section of 16th century, possibly Cretan school, fresco painting, which depicts (according to the accompanying Greek titulus) The Martyrdom of Saint Polycarp of Smyrna (Fig. 47). The most obvious similarities between Pyre of Denethor and the fresco in question concern the figures of Denethor and Polycarp. Both are depicted as venerable old men with short white hair, white beard and gaunt, lined face. Each of them is positioned within the centre of a small burning pyre, which is fed by neatly arranged pieces of wood placed at the base. Red flames shoot up from the fires, reaching waist-height on both men, but neither man appears to experience any physical pain. Both Denethor and Polycarp have their hands raised to chest height, with Denethor clutching the palantir “upon his breast” and Polycarp making a palms-outward gesture as if conversing with an unseen presence. Superficially their garments may appear to differ, with Denethor’s robe being a plain ochre, whereas Polycarp’s vestments are embroidered with black and red cross designs. However, if we are to re-examine the halo which surrounds Denethor, an echo of the black-on-white cross design from Polycarp’s vestments is clearly detectable within the seven radiating “palantir” motifs. The inner circle of Denethor’s halo containing the black, red and blue rays, also closely corresponds in size with the white nimbus surrounding Polycarp’s head, whilst the

---

237 I make this assumption based upon the close resemblance between the Polycarp fresco and George / Tzortzis the Cretan’s depiction of the martyrdom by fire of Anastasia of Sirmium in the katholikon of the Dionysiou monastery on Mt. Athos, which can be viewed at: http://pemptousia.com/files/2013/12/Anastasia-Farmacolitria-Dionisiou-1547.jpg

portion of blue sky which frames the saint’s head and shoulders matches the approximate dimensions of Denethor’s entire halo.

The fresco also features two men (probably intended to represent servants of the Proconsul responsible for Polycarp’s execution) standing on either side of the saint, stoking the flames of his pyre. Excepting the obvious differences in scale between the two sets of figures, the position of the two men in the fresco directly mirrors the placement of the three small figures in the background of Iukhimov’s illustration. The case for a visual link between Iukhimov’s image and the Polycarp fresco is further strengthened by the correlating diagonal compositions of the sloping Rath Dinen rooftops and the mountains in the fresco.

How we might respond to the resulting hybrid of Tolkienian and Christian martyr imagery is, in part, dependent on our degree of familiarity with the Denethor and Polycarp narratives. On a superficial level, the similarities between the two are obvious; both works portray an elder statesman, (a Steward and a Bishop respectively), who have chosen to be burnt alive, rather than compromise their principles and beliefs. Firstly, there is Denethor; who, as Steward of Gondor, refuses to cede any authority to Aragorn, a man he deems “an upstart...one of a ragged house long bereft of lordship and dignity”. For Denethor, if he can no longer be “Lord” of Minas Tirith himself then he will choose “naught: neither life diminished, nor love halved, nor honour abated.” Then there is Polycarp, who would rather embrace the flames than renounce his belief in God, or deny the vision which prophesises his own martyrdom. In combining these two motifs of resolve in Pyre of Denethor, Iukhimov

---

has imbued his Denethor illustration with the ready-made philosophical and moral complexity of the older Christian image. This new layer of meaning may reinforce the visual potency of the Lukhimov’s illustration, however for those acquainted with both narratives, it also adds an element of irony. By merging Denethor with a Christian Saint and martyr, Lukhimov’s Pyre of Denethor takes Tolkien’s canonical “heathen” suicide figure; the man who Shippey claims possessed an excess of “the ancient Ragnarök spirit”, and subverts him.241

Flames feature once again in Volume I. II. Plate 8. Bridge of Khazad-dûm (Мост Казад Дума Most Kazad Duma, 1988) (Fig. 47.), in this instance forming the backdrop to the climactic scene from Book Two Chapter V of The Fellowship of the Ring where the Balrog (meaning “Demon of might” in Sindarin)242 confronts Gandalf on the “slender bridge of stone” spanning “the chasm near the eastern gates of Moria.”243 Tolkien describes the creature’s reaction to Gandalf’s initial challenge as follows,

...suddenly it drew itself up to great height, and its wings were spread from wall to wall; but still Gandalf could be seen, glimmering in the gloom; he seemed small and altogether alone: grey and bent, like a wizened tree before the onset of a storm.

Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s encounter is similar in content, however they immediately assign the Balrog a gender, something which Tolkien (as narrator) does not.244

241 Shippey, The Road to Middle-earth, 196.
244 As Christopher Tolkien confirms in The Treason of Isengard, p206, from the earliest drafts of the encounter, the Balrog had always been referred to as ‘it’. Later, however, in The Two Towers, Book III Chapter V, The White Rider Gandalf (when relating his tale of the Battle of Zirakzigil) repeatedly refers to the Balrog as “him” or “he”.
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He took a step and suddenly grew, filling the full volume of the mountain hall. The darkness in his wings thickened and stretched from wall to wall. The small, shining figure of Gandalf stood alone against the backdrop of a rolling storm cloud.\footnote{J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{Vlastelin Kolets I}, 273.}

Iukhimov’s portrayal of the scene encompasses many of the most important elements; the Balrog is armed with blade and whip (although not a flaming blade, as in the original description); its form is huge and dark, and fire rises from a fissure in the “smooth floor” of the chamber behind it.\footnote{Two trolls had just bridged the fissure with stones, however the Balrog had simply leapt across. See J.R.R. Tolkien. \textit{The Fellowship}, 343.} Iukhimov’s bridge is depicted, correctly, as being too narrow to be crossed save in single file and Gandalf bars the way with his sword Glamdring shining brightly in his hand. The wizard’s apparent human frailness in the face of the Balrog is effectively conveyed, and the nimbus of light around the sword points to both the blade’s Gondolin origins and Gandalf’s own divine power as a Maia. There are discrepancies, however. As a structure, the bridge appears a good deal shorter and more rectangular than Tolkien’s “curving spring of fifty feet.”\footnote{J.R.R. Tolkien. \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring}, 329.} To Gandalf’s right, at the edge of the chasm, there stands a hobbit with a sword (possibly Frodo), whereas in Tolkien’s text only Aragorn and Boromir held their ground at the eastern end of the bridge.\footnote{J.R.R. Tolkien. \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring}, 330.} The most contentious feature of Iukhimov’s image, however, must surely be the Balrog’s wings; or more pointedly, the validity of Iukhimov employing an obviously figurative (albeit elaborate and ornamental) component to illustrate what, in fact, could be a purely metaphorical descriptive detail. His inclusion might well resonate with Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s description, where the Balrog advances towards the bridge with its “two wings of darkness” flung open
behind it. But Tolkien himself was more ambiguous in his wording. If his bridge scene were to be taken literally, then indeed, the textual Balrog would appear to possess actual wings. However only two paragraphs prior to this description, Tolkien writes, “His enemy [the Balrog] halted again, facing him [Gandalf], and the shadow about it reached out like two vast wings [my emphasis].”

The overall composition of *Bridge of Khazad-dûm* does not appear to be derived from any direct visual prototype. Unlike many images in the corpus, the design displays a strong three-dimensional element, with the geometric lines of the stone floor, chasm and bridge helping to channel the gaze towards the Balrog. Outside of the Balrog, the focal point of the illustration is the eight-pointed star, or octogram, emanating from the tip of Gandalf’s sword Glamdring. Compositionally, this feature forms both an inner core around which the Balrog’s wings and, whip thongs curl and a counterbalance to the creature’s helmeted head. It is also meaningful from an iconographic perspective as the eight-pointed star has often been considered (in Christian art), a symbol of, to quote Carman, “regeneration and divine inspiration”. Particularly salient in this regard (at least as far as the Glamdring octogram is concerned) is an illustration from Volume II page 29 of Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia* (Fig. 49.) which depicts a kneeling man clutching a vertical length of chain connected to a shining eight-pointed star in the sky overhead. Underneath the illustration there is the telling caption, *Congiunzione delle cose Umane con le Divine* (“The Conjunction of Human things with the Divine”).

---

Interestingly, lukhimov’s Balrog wears an ornate helmet complete with mask and cheek-guards, something which would make it considerably difficult for the creature to breathe fire through its nostrils. This helmet design itself appears to have a direct visual prototype in the early 7th century iron and bronze Anglo-Saxon helmet discovered in 1939 as part of the Sutton Hoo ship burial excavation (Fig. 50.). As an artefact, the original helmet suffered considerable damage whilst still underground, possibly as a result of a collapse in the burial chamber, and therefore has been reconstructed several times since its excavation (the most recent effort being in 1970-71). Among the most notable features which have survived are the bronze-gilt winged dragon motif which forms the eyebrows, nose and mouth pieces of the helmet, and the downwards facing serpent’s head which comprises part of the iron crest running from back to front.

An examination of the helmet on lukhimov’s Balrog reveals a very similar design, which, although lacking the actual dragon heads of the Sutton Hoo prototype, visually corresponds to the geometric pattern of the original motif. The roundness of the eye holes on the Balrog helmet design has been accentuated, and a gilt edging added which, although missing from the original damaged Sutton Hoo helmet, can be viewed on the early 1970s Royal Armoursies complete reconstruction which was created for (and now displayed at) the British Museum (Fig. 51.). This version of the helmet had been extensively photographed prior to 1988 (when lukhimov painted Bridge of Khazad-dûm) and showcases the complex array of figural scenes and zoomorphic

interlacing which would have decorated the original Sutton Hoo artefact. The small, radiating interlace panels which adorn the top and bottom section of the Royal Armouries face mask, plus the horizontal band which separates the two, is reflected, in a simplified form, on the corresponding section of the Balrog’s helmet.

The original helmet was found in Mound 1 of the Sutton Hoo site, to the left of the (presumed, as no body was found) final resting place of an East Anglian, or possibly East Saxon king, who had lain undisturbed for over twelve hundred years. The Balrog of Moria, Durin’s Bane, had itself remained “hidden at the foundations of the earth since the coming of the Host of the West” and it was only by the delving of the Dwarves in Moria that it was brought to the surface. It is not infeasible therefore, that the conflation of these two motifs; the iconic symbol of the ancient king whose grave has been uncovered, and the Balrog figure roused from its subterranean rest might evoke a strong intertextual message: the long buried warrior-kind have returned.

The final case study of the corpus is Volume I. Set I. Plate 3. On a Visit to Tom Bombadil (В гости к Тому Бомбадилу V gosti k Tomu Bombadilu, 1987) (Fig. 52.). The image itself portrays the conclusion of Book One Chapter VI of The Fellowship of the Ring, (The Old Forest), when Tom Bombadil, having just released Merry and Pippin from Old Man Willow’s grasp, urges all four of the hobbits to follow him home,

‘...Goldberry is waiting. Time enough for questions around the supper table. You follow after me as quick as you are able!’ With that he picked up his lillies, and then

---

with a beckoning wave of his hand went hopping and dancing along the path eastward, still singing loudly and nonsensically.

Too surprised and too relieved to talk, the hobbits followed after him as fast as they could.\textsuperscript{258}

The corresponding passage in Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s translation reads,

‘…Zlatenika [Goldberry] is waiting. At the table we’ll talk. Well, march after me, but – mind you! - Do not you lag behind!’ Lifting the lilies, he made an inviting gesture and, still dancing and loudly singing all the nonsense, started down the path. The hobbits, happy and dazed, threw themselves out to catch up with their wonderful savior, but immediately fell behind.\textsuperscript{259}

It appears that the translators have preserved very little of the ambiguity of Tolkien’s original prose. In their interpretation Bombadil’s exhortation contains an obvious note of caution, the implication here being that any delay on behalf of the hobbits might place them in peril again. The lilies Bombadil has picked for his wife Goldberry remain in the translated passage, and Goldberry herself is referred to as Zlatenika, transliterated from the Russian Златеника. This is a name which Grigor’eva and Grushetskij have formed from the “archaic” Russian word злато (zlato) “gold” and the ending -nika (-nika), as in земляника (zemlyanika) “strawberry” (wild).\textsuperscript{260}

Grigor’eva and Grushetskij unambiguous tone pervades right through to the final line of the passage. No longer are the hobbits simply “Too surprised and too relieved to talk”; a state which could imply many things (for instance, sheer relief after the horror of Old Man Willow’s attack, tempered by a nervousness of Bombadil), now they are unquestionably “happy” and unequivocal in their view of Bombadil as “saviour”.

\textsuperscript{258} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{The Fellowship of the Ring}, 120.

\textsuperscript{259} J.R.R. Tolkien, \textit{Vlastelin Kolets I}, 108.

\textsuperscript{260} Hooker, \textit{Russian Eyes}, 235.
Iukhimov’s illustration depicts the following five figures distinguished by *tituli* (from left to right); Iarwain Ben-adar, or Bombadil, Frodo, Pipin (sic), Marry (sic) and Sam. The name Iarwain Ben-adar refers to the fuller Sindarin title for Tom Bombadil and is loosely translated as “Oldest and Fatherless.” A sixth, unidentified winged figure hovers directly above the hobbits, blowing a trumpet, the end of which is encircled by the letter *r* of Ben-adar. Iukhimov’s Bombadil has no lillies and is clad in an ankle length blue *chlamys* fastened with a *fibula* instead of the “blue coat” of Tolkien or Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s “faded blue jacket”. The inclusion of the eight-spoked wheel design embroidered onto Bombadil’s *chlamys* is intriguing addition, bearing a resemblance to a similar design in *The Death of Boromir*. Perhaps its occurrence here, may be indicative of Bombadil’s unique status as one who appears impervious to the Ring.

Bombadil’s physical stance indicates that he may be climbing the incline near the “short [water] fall” at the edge of the Old Forest, although temporal and spatial elements have been altered and the hobbits are pictured approaching this point with Bombadil still in view. Bombadil wears no yellow boots, only sandals. At his feet snakes the Withywindle (complete with fish and crayfish), whilst above and to his left looms a tree, its twisting bough, overhanging branch and waterside location suggestive of Old Man Willow.

It appears that the figure of Bombadil takes its direct visual prototype from the illuminated folio 25v (*Moses Receives the Tables of the Law*) (Fig. 53.) of the 9th century

---

The biblical miniature in question depicts Moses, on top of Mount Sinai, reaching upwards to accept the Tables from God’s hand. The prototype figure has been reversed to correspond with the right to left progression of figures in the Iukhimov image, however the salient features remain, down to the distinctive sandals worn by both Moses and Bombadil. In addition, three of the hobbits (excluding Merry) appear to directly correspond to figures featured in the miniature _Joshua, Moses, Aaron and the Israelites_ (Fig. 54.) which accompanies _Moses Receives the Tables of the Law_ in folio 25v of the _Moutier-Grandval Bible_.

Aaron, shorn of his beard, rod and other accoutrements clearly equates to Frodo; the Israelite directly behind Aaron to Pipin (sic) and the Israelite with his right hand at his chin to Sam.

Returning to the subject of the winged figure hovering above the hobbits; its incongruous appearance alone possibly marks it out as a visual borrowing of some sort. Fortunately, the source of the prototype is quite clear, with the figure almost certainly taken from the Evangelist symbol featured in folio 25b (St Matthew) of the 7th century illuminated manuscript the _Lindisfarne Gospels_ (Fig. 55.). There are some slight differences between the two images (Iukhimov’s figure has no book, for instance) however the closeness of their linear designs is undeniable.

The calligraphic elements in _On a Visit to Tom Bombadil_ also seem to possess direct prototypes derived from the _Lindisfarne Gospels_. The _titulus iarwain Ben-adar_ employs the elaborate Insular half-uncial script seen in the decorated initial pages folio 29 (Fig. 56.) and folio 211 (Fig. 57.). The words _or Bombadil_ plus the hobbits’ names are

---


266 Janet Blackhouse, _The Lindisfarne Gospels_, 40-47.

267 Janet Blackhouse, _The Lindisfarne Gospels_, 45, 57.
rendered in an unadorned version of the same script but also float in space more akin to Aldred’s Old English interlinear gloss.268

Is there an intertextual implication discernable amidst this mosaic of visual prototypes? In keeping with the manner of visual borrowing discussed in these case studies, there appears to be no iconographic link between the direct visual motif of the *Moutier-Grandval Bible* as it appears in l’ukhimov’s image and the biblical text to which it refers (Exodus). Instead, the visual motif of Moses and the Israelites is employed to construct a new iconographic motif which references Bombadil and the hobbits. However, such is the strength of the original biblical iconography that it continues to be detectable even after the borrowed motif has been recycled, giving rise to a possible blending of the two narratives. Of course, this is not to say, that Tolkien himself intended any such conflation, we are simply exploring the possibility as it exists within the context of the illustration.

But what about the mysterious winged figure? Neither Tolkien or Grigor’eva and Grushetskij’s reference any such creature in their respective texts and yet l’ukhimov places it at the heart of his image. The key to this may reside, not in the winged figure itself, but rather in the motif of the trumpet, an instrument which has its own connection with the *Exodus* story: witness Chapter 19:16-17 where “the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud” incites Moses to lead his people out of their camp and up to the foot of Mount Sinai.269 The embodiment of this motif in visual form (the winged figure), facilitates a more thorough transfer of meaning from prototype to new work. Bombadil (functioning as Moses), can now respond to the divine trumpet call and lead

---

269 Exod.19: 16 English Revised Version.
the hobbits (the Israelites) out of the Old Forest to the foot of the hill upon which his house is situated. From this basis it is also perfectly possible to extrapolate the meaning to encompass the wider Exodus narrative, equating Bombadil’s deliverance of the hobbits from the Old Forest to Moses, inspired by Yahweh, leading the Israelites out of Egypt.

Conclusion

Whether Sergei Iukhimov’s illustrations for *The Lord of the Rings* could ever be considered a “collateral theme” in the manner of Pauline Baynes’ *Farmer Giles of Ham* images, is a matter for conjecture. Outwardly, the two bodies of work (*The Lord of the Rings* and Iukhimov’s illustrations) may appear too divergent to be descended from the same stock. Tolkien’s stated preference for applicability, his determination that the “the large symbolism” of the story should never be permitted to “break through, nor become allegory” would seem at odds with the modus operandi of an illustrator whose appropriated motifs often conflated Middle-earth characters with Old Testament prophets, Christian martyrs and historical archetypes (see Théoden as Norman knight, for example). It might also be argued that Iukhimov’s experience of *The Lord of the Rings*, refracted as it was through the prism of several Russian and Polish translations, was linguistically too far removed from the original English source text for his visual interpretations to possess real veracity. However, if we advance beyond the obvious outward differences for a moment, a certain level of kinship between author and illustrator may be detected. As Tolkien’s philological enquiries underpinned and

---

intertwined with his literary creation, contributing to the sense of depth that was characteristic of his work, so Iukhimov’s visual play with “styles, epochs, cultures” brings a similar feel to his unique, if at times uncanonical, vision of Middle-earth.

Throughout the case studies I have endeavored to incorporate a degree of comparative analysis between the visual content of the Iukhimov illustrations and the narrative content of the Tolkien and Grigor’eva and Grushetskij texts. Such comparisons are of obvious importance for the contextualisation of the images, as is an awareness of the cultural and socio-political backstory to their creation. In Chapter Two A Certain Experiment I describe how Zinaida Bobyr’s attempts to reimagine *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings* as first science fiction and then fairy story provided the model for the formation of a distinctively Russian approach to Tolkien’s work. Subsequent translators may have adhered more closely to Tolkien’s original text than Bobyr, however their interpretations often reflected the zeitgeist of both Cold War existence and the Soviet dissident movement whilst the “alternativist” writers of the 1980s and 1990s viewed Middle-earth as a starting point for their own creations. Iukhimov’s work appears rooted in these varied traditions: his initial encounter with Tolkien came via Murav’ev and Kistyakovski’s stark 1982 abridgement of *The Fellowship of the Ring*, consequently his imagination would have been kindled by this bleak, highly Russified version of the tale. However, unlike his near contemporary, the writer Nik Perumov - whose *Ring of Darkness* duology constitutes a virulent reaction to a perceived philosophical position of Tolkien’s – Iukhimov’s illustrations convey an obvious affinity for both author and original narrative which belies these alternativist beginnings.
Naturally, the question might arise as to whether the illustrations could be considered politically progressive; a visual analogue to the earlier Russian literary model of *The Lord of the Rings* as representative of the struggle between totalitarianism and freedom. Their period of creation alone (circa 1987 – 1991) lends a certain credence to this argument; however, it is my belief that such a conclusion would be an oversimplification. Admittedly, the stark geometric environments into which Iukhimov inserts Tolkienian horrors such as the Balrog or the Barrow-wight (from Vol I. Set I. Plate 4. *In Peace*) could be construed as pictorial evocations of Soviet brutalist architecture: the implication being perhaps that such edifices often concealed intrinsic evils. However, in my opinion the corpus functions most effectively when viewed as an affirmation of the plurality of images which existed beyond the rigid confines of Soviet doctrine. Iukhimov may have found his access to the diversity of contemporaneous global imagery severely restricted, nevertheless he was able to acknowledge this visual plurality through the careful manipulation of images from the past.

Additionally, there is the question of the existence of a distinct eastern visual inflection within the corpus: one which goes beyond the Russian “boy with the star-map” mind-set and makes its presence evident within the actual style and content of the illustrations themselves. There is definite veracity to this notion; for example, I have demonstrated the influence of the Solovetsky icon painting tradition upon *Gandalf and the Wraith-king at the gate of Minas Tirith*, and the importance of Tzortzis’ Cretan school frescoes to *Pyre of Denethor*. But Iukhimov does not belabour these individual connections and makes frequent recourse throughout to western sources such as the Insular Gospels of the British Isles and the Bayeux Tapestry. Where
the eastern inflection, remains most evident perhaps is in the Orthodox iconography of the halo. This, for Iukhimov, becomes an indispensable tool for the translation of what he refers to as Tolkien’s “hierarchy of both light and dark forces” into a visual language that is easily comprehensible to a primarily Russian audience. A similar approach may have been approximated in recent years by the British Tolkien artist Jay Johnstone; whose Orthodox icon-inspired artworks - according to Thomas Honegger - translate an “older ‘Middle-earth pictorial tradition’” into a form at once familiar, and yet foreign, to the “north-western European Protestant” viewer.272

The primary purpose of this paper is not to make straightforward image-text or east-west cultural comparisons, or even to pass judgement on the effectiveness of Iukhimov’s images as accurate illustrations of The Lord of the Rings (although this has a certain relevance). Rather, my primary research goal has been the identification of incidences of visual borrowing and, by extension, intertextual meaning within the case studies themselves. This has proved a fruitful exercise, with many prototypes successfully identified, and the polysemy generated by these correspondences properly evaluated.

To illustrate, we have seen how Farewell Galadriel, exhibits only a general correspondence (identifiable via Panofsky’s method of pre-iconographical description), derived from an amalgam of Miraculous Draught and Navicella motifs. Despite this lack of a direct prototype the iconography of the original biblical motif is enduring enough, that when combined with the Tolkienian motif of the case study, a clear message of self-sacrifice, or martyrdom arises. Conversely, with Fearless Samwise we have

272 Thomas Honegger, Ut pictura tractatio – Some Thought’s on Jay Johnstone’s Isildur’s Bane, Academia.edu, 2017, https://www.academia.edu/12234866/_Ut_pictura_tractatio_Some_Thoughts_on_Jay_Johnstone_s_Isildur_s_Bane_
witnessed an example of the opposite occurrence: here is a powerful direct visual prototype, namely, folio 21v *The Man of Matthew* from the *Book of Durrow*, but the resulting intertextual implications are weak and difficult to justify.

As demonstrated by the individual case study analyses, a large proportion of the visual borrowing within Iukhimov’s illustrations has a biblical or historical source, with hagiographic paintings, illuminated Gospel miniatures and archaeological artefacts all providing material for the creation of new motifs. Much of this material is transferred directly from its historical source, as is the case with *March of the Rohirrim* and the motifs derived from the Bayeux Tapestry, or *On a Visit to Tom Bombadil* and the Moutier-Grandval Bible. However, there are other instances where I argue for the existence of a more generalised evocation based on an amalgam of well-known visual motifs, obvious examples being *Farewell Galadriel* and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes and Navicella motifs, and *King - Wraith/Wraith - King* with its general correspondence of Phantom illustrations. Iukhimov’s knowledge of these various sources may have its foundation in his visual culture training at the Odessa Pedagogical Institute, and it is partly this nuanced connection with the past, which helps to distinguish his *The Lord of the Rings* from other, technically more accomplished, or textually accurate interpretations. It should also be remembered that the work is a product of the Soviet Union, and as such developed both separately from the western Tolkien aesthetic of the 1980s and 90s, and before the hyperreal neo-medievalism of the Jackson era. Emergent intertextual themes of martyrdom, calamity, prophecy, reanimation, and salvation, all contribute to making the corpus a viable alternative visual model, a potential other Middle-earth. Of course, incidences of polysemous meaning may not be unheard of within the field of Tolkien illustration, however, the
complex method by which they are arrived at in the Lukhmov case studies can have very few precedents.
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