Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Personal and literary relations of Maksim Gorky and Leonid Andreyev, 1898-1919, with particular reference to the revolution of 1905

Barratt, Andrew

How to cite:

Barratt, Andrew (1976) *Personal and literary relations of Maksim Gorky and Leonid Andreyev, 1898-1919, with particular reference to the revolution of 1905*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/8080/

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
http://etheses.dur.ac.uk

PERSONAL AND LITERARY RELATIONS OF MAKSIM GORKY AND LEONID ANDREYEV, 1898-1919, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE REVOLUTION OF 1905

Ph D Thesis presented at the University of Durham

by Andrew Barratt B A (Dunelm)

1976

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged

'Revolution is no opium Revolution is a catharsis, an ecstasy
The opiums are for before and after'

Ernest Hemingway

ABSTRACT

Maksim Gorky's relations with Leonid Andreyev may be divided chronologically into three periods The first, 1898-1904, saw close personal contact and literary collaboration During the second, 1905-1911, differences over the nature and purpose of literature resulted in conflict and a break in relations The final years to 1919 witnessed an unsuccessful attempt at reconciliation followed by a period of open hostility

Traditionally, Gorky and Andreyev have been viewed by Soviet critics as opposites, the foremost representatives of 'revolutionary' and 'anti-revolutionary' literature, respectively The present study is the first in any language to examine this critical convention by detailed reference to the life and works of both writers

The structure of the thesis is chronological The first chapter covers the period to 1904, discussing the nature and extent of Gorky's influence on Andreyev and elucidating the common themes in their fiction Chapters two to five cover the crucial years 1904-1911, dealing in turn with the response of each writer to the 1905 Revolution and the period of reaction which followed The comparative element is contained in the chapters on Andreyev (chapters three and five) Chapter six provides an important postscript on Gorky's relations with the Bolsheviks in 1909-1910 and chapter seven discusses relations between the writers in the years to 1917

In the conclusion it is demonstrated that the traditional view of the Gorky-Andreyev relationship derives directly from Gorky's polemical reminiscences of Andreyev and hence stands in need of fundamental revision By discussing in turn the political, aesthetic and philosophical views of both writers, it can be seen that both shared a similar ideal of Utopian socialism but differed over the way this ideal should be incorporated into works of literature and over the question of the perfectibility of human nature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to a number of organizations and individuals who have helped me in many ways in the course of work on this thesis First, to the Department of Education and Science, for the award of a Major State Studentship, allowing me to study for three years in the Department of Russian at Durham, and to the British Council, for granting me a scholarship to work at Leningrad State University between September, 1971 and February, 1972

I would also like to record my gratitude to the staffs of the following institutions for their efficient services Durham University Library, The British Museum Library, The Saltykov-Shchedrin Public Library, and the Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkinskiy dom) in Leningrad

Of the individuals, I would like especially to thank my supervisor, Mr W Harrison, for his long and patient efforts in providing advice and stimulation at all stages of my work, Dr James B Woodward in Swansea and Dr Lyudmila Iezuitova in Leningrad for sharing with me their vast experience in the field of andreyevovedeniye, and my wife, Barbara, whose example, continual encouragement and practical assistance have proved quite invaluable Finally, I offer my thanks to Miss J Willis for typing the final draft of this thesis

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND DATES

The system of transliteration employed in this thesis is the one recommended by The Slavonic and East European Review, published by the University of London, except that the Russian vowel e is transliterated as 'ye' only when it is preceded by another vowel, otherwise it is rendered as 'e' Concessions to conventional usage are made in such cases as 'Gorky' and 'Dostoyevsky', which have been preferred to the more accurate 'Gor'kiy', 'Dostoyevskiy' In all cases, the names of journals, newspapers, publishing houses and the titles of literary works have been transliterated rather than translated

All pre-revolutionary dates are given according to the 'Old-Style' calendar

NOTE ON ABBREVIATIONS

For economy of space and effort, I have adopted the following abbreviations when referring to works which consistently recur in the notes to the chapters Where a conventional abbreviation already exists, this has been used in the interests of standardization

АГ , 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11	Архив А М Горького, т 1, История русской литературы, (М , 1939), т 4, Письма к К П Пятницкому, (М , 1954), т 5, Письма к Е П Пешковой, (М , 1955), т 7, Письма к читателям и И П Ладыжникову, (М , 1959), т 9, Письма к Е П Пешковой, (М , 1966), т.11, Переписка А М Горького с И А Груздевым, (М , 1966)
ВС	М Горький в воспоминаниях современников, (М , 1955)
Г-30	М Горький, Собрание сочинений в 30-и томах, (М , 1949-1953)
Г и революция 1905 г	М Горький в эпоху революции 1905-1907 годов (М , 1957)
ГЧ	Горьковские чтения, 1937-1938 - 1968, (М , 1940-1968)
КЛА	Книга о Леониде Андрееве, (СПб -Берлин, 1922)
ЛА 5	Литературный архив Материалы по истории литературы и общественного движения, (М -Л , 1960)
Ленин и Горький	В И Ленин и А М Горький Письма Воспоминания Документы, изд 3-е, доп , (М , 1969)
ЛЛТ 1-4	Летопись жизни и творчество А М Горького, вып 1-4, (М , 1958-1960)
ЛН , 2, 7-8, 27-28, 69, 72, 74, 84	Литературное наследство, т 2 (М , 1932), тт 7-8 (М , 1933), тт 27-28 (М , 1936), т 69, Лев Толстой (М , 1961), т 72, Горький и Леонид Андреев Неизданная переписка (М , 1965), т 74, Из творческого наследия советских писателей (М , 1965), т 84, Иван Бунин (М , 1973)
МИ , 1-4	М Горький Материалы и исследования, тт 1-4, (М -Л , 1934-1951)
ПРА , 1, 2	Л Андреев, Повести и рассказы в двух томах, (М , 1971)
ПССА	Л Андреев, Полное собрание сочинений в восьми томах, (СПб , 1913)
ПССГ	М Горький, Полное собрание сочинений, (М , 1968-)
Рев путь Г	Революционный путь Горького, (М -Л , 1933)
Реквием	Реквием Сборник памяти Леонида Андреева, (М , 1930)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND DATES

NOTE ON ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION 1

Notes 11

CHAPTER ONE PERSONAL AND LITERARY RELATIONS OF GORKY AND ANDREYEV (1898-1904) 14

A Aspects of the personal relations of Gorky and Andreyev, 1899-1904 15

B The influence of Gorky upon Andreyev's development as a writer and publicist, 1899-1904 19

1 Gorky's practical assistance to Andreyev 21

2 The influence of Gorky on Andreyev's early journalistic writings 22

3 Thematic links between the early fiction of Gorky and Andreyev 30

(a) The theme of revolution in Andreyev's early fiction 33

(b) Individualism and alienation in the early works of Gorky and Andreyev 40

(c) Reason and instinct The 'Harmonious Man' in the early works of Gorky and Andreyev 48

(d) Faith, truth and the 'Consoling Lie' in the early works of Gorky and Andreyev 58

C Literature and politics The seeds of dissension 75

Notes 86

CHAPTER TWO MAKSIM GORKY AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1905 94

A On the eve Tyur'ma, Bukoyomov, Karp Ivanovich and Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha 100

B Martyr for the cause Gorky and the events of 9 January, 1905 106

C Deti Solntsa the social and ethical problems defined 110

D Publicistic enterprises Gorky and the Bolsheviks in 1905 120

E Hopes and Fears Articles and stories to December, 1905 125

Г Varvary False prophets of the new world 133

Notes 144

CHAPTER THREE LEONID ANDREYEV AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1905 150

A The destruction of personality and the disintegration of society Andreyev's works on the eve of revolution 155

B Prizraki A hidden polemic with Gorky 163

C Revolutionary optimism Andreyev and the events to autumn, 1905 167

D Khristiane The power of light and the power of darkness 172

E Gubernator Punishment or vengeance? 174

F Tak bylo Andreyev and the 'mystique' of revolution 179

G K zvyozdam A pivotal work 183

Notes 201

CHAPTER FOUR MAKSIM GORKY IN THE YEARS OF REACTION 207

A Bolshevik ambassador to Europe and America 207

B In pursuit of the ideal 213

1 Vragi The conflict of 'anarchism' and 'socialism' 213

2 Mat' Resurrection and the two religions 218

C 1905 revisited Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka and Posledniye 228

D The return to the ideal Ispoved' and the philosophy of 'God-building' 246

Notes 265

CHAPTER FIVE LEONID ANDREYEV IN THE YEARS OF REACTION 271

A Savva The revolutionary and the Philistines 272

B To Finland and back The 'rape' of revolution 279

C Zhizn' Cheloveka Man is dead, long live Man' 283

D Capri Faith and scepticism Iuda Iskariot i diugiye 291

E Confrontation The Znaniye miscellanies and T'ma 303

F 1 Proklyatiye zverya The individual and the collective 321

2 Revolt or revolution? From Tsar' Golod to Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh 326

3 Freedom and the slave Moi zapiski 338

4 The 'strong' and the 'weak' the pragmatic concern in Anatema and Okean 345

Notes 353

CHAPTER SIX GORKY AND THE CAPRI SCHOOL THE DISILLUSIONMENT WITH POLITICS 363

A Gorky's works of the later Capri period 369

1 'God-building' continued Leto and Zemletryaseniye 369

2 The 'Okurov cycle' and 'Revolutionary Romanticism' 375

3 Chudaki The retreat from Utopia 383

B Echoes of revolution 'Critical Realism' in Gorky's works to 1917 386

Notes 392

CHAPTER SEVEN THE YEARS TO 1919 396

A Sashka Zhegulyov attempted reconciliation 396

B From the First World War to the Revolution The 'two poles' of Russian literature 411

Notes 423

CONCLUSION 426

Notes 444

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Materials relating to K zvyozdam 447

Appendix 2 Leonid Andreyev, Iz glubiny vekov (Extracts) 490

Appendix 3 Leonid Andreyev, Tsar' 492

Appendix 4 Leonid Andreyev, Pamyati Vladimira Mazurina 494

Appendix 5 Letter from Andreyev to N Drizen, 12 November, 1910 (Extracts) 496

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY 497

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Some fifty years ago, in the preface to his pioneering study of Gorky,[1] Alexander Kaun professed to have read not only all of the writer's own works but also the vast majority of the critical literature about him The present-day student would find it difficult to match this claim Although the volume of material written about Gorky had already reached daunting proportions by the time Professor Kaun's book was published, the massive expansion of Gorky criticism in the USSR since that date has rendered an exhaustive examination of the literature on the writer practically impossible Gor'kovedeniye, which has been accorded a status in the Soviet Union unrivalled even by the study of Pushkin or Tolstoy, now engages the efforts of many thousands of Soviet scholars and the output of monographs and articles dedicated to the study of his life and works is correspondingly voluminous

Given the extensive nature of gor'kovedeniye, it is at first sight surprising to find that many important topics have received only scant attention from Soviet scholars Leaving aside such obviously controversial questions as Gorky's relations with Stalin or his immediate reaction to the October Revolution, it is interesting to note that other subjects, like his complex relationships with women and his early attempt at suicide, are either studiously avoided or else given only superficial coverage in Soviet biographies Studies devoted to Gorky's works display a similarly selective approach Thus, whilst the number of books and articles dealing with Mat' and Vragi runs into hundreds, other works of the same period, like Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka and Ispoved', have received only a passing reference in general studies of the writer

The seemingly arbitrary nature of Gorky scholarship in the Soviet Union is explained by the unique position now occupied by the writer in his native land Il'ya Erenburg once remarked that "когда очевидцы молчат, рождаются легенды" [2] In the case of Gorky, however, it was the eyewitnesses and even the writer himself who were largely responsible for the creation of the legend which has subsequently been canonised by several generations of Soviet critics Before considering the immense consequences of the Gorky legend, we should look briefly at the history of Gorky criticism in order to appreciate the influences under which it has evolved

Immediately identified with the rise of the revolutionary movement in Russia at the turn of the century, Gorky was, from the beginning of his career, a controversial figure Hailed by some as the 'stormy petrel of the revolution', he was condemned by others as a dangerous and subversive influence on the society of his day With the coming of the 1905 Revolution and Gorky's open espousal of the Bolshevik cause, the polemic surrounding the man and his works became all the more fanatical Gorky now found himself the subject of political and aesthetic debates between critics who were concerned less with an objective assessment of the writer's achievement and his place in the history of Russian literature than with defending their own partisan views and discrediting those of their opponents With few exceptions, these critics were easily identified with the 'pro-Gorky' or the 'anti-Gorky' camp The 'anti-Gorky' campaign was spearheaded by the Symbolist critics Filosofov and Gippius,[3] who took Gorky to task for placing art at the service of a political cause The gist of their argument, which found wide acceptance amongst their contemporaries, is encapsulated in the opening sentence of Filosofov's famous article Konets Gor'kogo "Две вещи погубили писателя Горького успех и наивный, непродуманный социализм" [4] This uncompromising standpoint provoked an equal and opposite reaction from the 'pro-Gorky' camp, which was represented most volubly in the figures of Lunacharsky and Vorovsky Like all Marxists, they refuted any aesthetic theory that proclaimed art to be above politics and insisted that the only valid literature is that which is allied with the working-class movement [5]

The factional disputes surrounding Gorky and his works continued apace after the October Revolution both inside the Soviet Union and abroad Gorky's reconciliation with the Bolshevik government provoked a hostile reaction from Russians in emigration, who saw this as the ultimate act of betrayal [6] Within the Soviet Union writers of the 'proletarian' school and LEF commenced a vigorous 'anti-Gorky' campaign following the writer's departure from his native land in 1921 According to these critics, Gorky was not a true proletarian writer and hence his works could not be taken as models for the literature of the new era The subject was considered sufficiently important for the Communist Academy to organize a conference of literary critics to debate the issues involved in October, 1927 At the heart of this debate lay the vital question of Gorky's allegiance to the new regime,

a question which was eventually resolved not by the critics at the Communist Academy, but by the writer himself, when he made his first return trip to the Soviet Union the following year On this occasion, the following statement appeared in the editorial columns of Pravda Referring to the recent campaign initiated by the writers of the 'proletarian' movement, it read

> Мы должны оградить Горького от такой явно лицемерной и безграмотной "критики" Большевики не раз указывали на отдельные ошибки и недостатки А М Горького, да и он сам часто признает свои ошибки Но если А М Горького пытаются травить подобным недостойным образом, этому следует дать отпор 7

This single official pronouncement changed the entire face of Soviet Gorky criticism Within a matter of months, negative opinions had almost entirely disappeared from newspapers and periodicals to be replaced by a more favourable interpretation of his life and works Critics now stressed Gorky's close links with the revolutionary movement and his friendly relations with Lenin, his works began to be praised as models of proletarian literature The writer's final resettlement in the USSR in 1933, the foundation of the Union of Soviet Writers the following year, together with the adoption of Socialist Realism as the officially approved artistic method, served simply to reinforce his status as an establishment figure

The official view of Gorky, promoted by Stalin for reasons which have little to do with literature, has done untold damage to serious scholarship both inside and outside the Soviet Union The Soviet critic is forced to work within obvious constraints Gorky must be shown as the friend and follower of Lenin, his attitude to the revolution, therefore, is Leninist, any deviations from Lenin's views being simply temporary ideological errors, Mat' and Vragi, as the two works in which Gorky's revolutionary sympathies are most clearly displayed, must be presented as masterpieces of Socialist Realism, and so on The effect of the immoderate praise of Gorky as the founder of a new artistic method has been to inspire a reaction from his Western critics like that of David Shub, who has turned Soviet criticism on its head using the example of Gorky to discredit the Soviet regime [8] For the most part, however, the efforts of Soviet critics have simply deterred interest in the writer in the West In Britain the study of Gorky has become unfashionable to an extent that can be only partially

explained by the overriding didacticism of his fiction As a result, his work has been largely as underrated in the West as it is overrated in the Soviet Union Professor Kaun's book remains the only serious attempt at a full-length biography of the writer in English and, despite the existence of several good general introductions to his work,[9] there are few works in languages other than Russian which have studied in detail individual aspects of his life and works [10] Apart from the autobiographical trilogy and the play Na dne, few of Gorky's works have received more than superficial attention [11]

The Gorky 'legend' has had enormous implications not only for the development of gor'kovedeniye but also for the generations of Soviet authors who have been obliged to employ the artistic method linked with his name [12] No less important is the influence it has exerted on the study of other writers of the early twentieth century As the 'founder of Socialist Realism', Gorky is invariably the yardstick against which all other writers of this period are measured and classified by critics in the Soviet Union Their task has been facilitated by the vast extent of his relations, both professional and personal, with all the writers of his day, both major and minor Often these relations involved no more than a brief exchange of letters, as in the case of the numerous self-taught writers of peasant or proletarian background who sent Gorky their works for comment, but with the more important writers he almost invariably established personal contact, although not always of a friendly type (one thinks, for example, of his confrontations with Andrey Bely) As a result of these contacts, Gorky's letters, not to mention his published articles and memoirs, are peppered with references to contemporary writers, providing a large volume of material which has served as the foundation for an entire branch of gor'kovedeniye with its own growing body of literature

The study of Gorky's relations with contemporary Russian writers may be subdivided for convenience into a number of categories To the first category belong his dealings with the older generation of Russian writers, notably Chekhov, Korolenko and Tolstoy,[13] each of whom acted in some way as mentor to Gorky in the early years of his career At the other end of the scale are his relations with young Soviet writers in the 1920s and 1930s Here it is Gorky who plays the role of mentor, the father figure helping his less experienced colleagues with advice

and even material support, an image which is fostered not only by the works of Soviet critics on the subject[14] but also by the sycophantic reminiscences of the writers themselves[15] Dissident voices, like that of Mayakovsky, whose dislike of Gorky is well-known, are conveniently ignored in order not to spoil a neatly ordered picture of one of the most turbulent decades in the history of Russian literature Yet perhaps the most difficult category for the Soviet critic is the third and largest that of Gorky's literary relations in the period 1900-1917, it is in this area that the most gross oversimplifications abound

The subject of Gorky's literary relations in the first decade and a half of the twentieth century is one which has itself been subdivided under two main heads The first covers his dealings and debates with writers of vastly different aesthetic and philosophical views, notably the Symbolists and Decadents These were writers of whom Gorky had been uniformly critical from his early days as a newspaper correspondent in the provinces and who were themselves to form a body of vocal opponents of Gorky's own literary endeavour Although there are signs that relations between the two sides were more complex than is commonly assumed,[16] discussion of this subject in Soviet criticism has yet to transcend the level of accusation and vindication[17] Far more difficult for the Soviet critic has been the second aspect of the subject Gorky's relations with writers of the Realist camp Under Gorky's encouragement, many of these writers became regular contributors to such progressive journals as Zhizn' and Zhurnal dlya vsekh and, subsequently, to the Znaniye miscellanies, which began to appear under Gorky's editorship in 1904 and immediately won recognition as a forum for literature of a democratic and even revolutionary complexion In the years following the Revolution of 1905, however, the vast majority of these writers, including Andreyev, Kuprin, Serafimovich, Chirikov, Skitalets and Yushkevich, withdrew from Znaniye due to disagreements with Gorky over editorial policy[18] The Soviet version of events is put forward by Kastorsky "Литературная платформа Горького оставалась неизменной, а бывшие его последователи настаивали на ревизии ее в угоду тлетворному духу времени"[19] In order to explain the rapid transformation of Gorky's former colleagues from the supporters to the opponents of democratic literature, Soviet critics have been required to perform considerable feats of sophistry Quite typical is the following statement from the authoritative history of Russian literature published during the Stalin era

> будучи мелкобуржуазными, а в конечном итоге буржуазными демократами, не принимая непосредственного участия в революции знаньевцы тем самым не могли, ввиду быстрого наступления реакции, углубить и утвердить свои политические взгляды и потому не сумели противостоять натиску реакции 20

Recent years have witnessed considerable efforts by Soviet scholars to correct the excesses of their predecessors on the subject of Gorky's relations with the znan'evtsy In 1958, B V Mikhaylovsky wrote an important article on the problems of studying Russian literature of the early twentieth century in which he singled out the volume cited above for strong censure [21] Since then, great advances have been made Collected works of Bunin and Kuprin have been published for the first time in the Soviet Union and the authors themselves have become the subject of serious academic research In some cases, this has led to a fundamental revision of earlier critical opinions In 1962, for example, F Kuleshov, an authority on Kuprin, challenged the Stalinist Volkov over his interpretation of Kuprin's works of the post-1905 period [22] By means of detailed reference to the evidence of individual stories and of contemporary statements by the author, Kuleshov demolished Volkov's argument that Kuprin's departure from Znaniye signified his desertion of democratic literature Yet despite such advances, there is still a tendency amongst Soviet critics to tar all the znan'evtsy with the same brush The most recent literary history of the period,[23] although relatively sophisticated and extremely informative, adheres to many Stalinist traditions and often defends the views of older critics against the revisionism of younger Soviet scholars [24] Significantly, although there are numerous articles on the subject of Gorky's relations with the znan'evtsy,[25] there is only one full-length study of his relationship with an individual writer of that group [26]

Of all Gorky's contemporaries perhaps none has suffered as much at the hands of Soviet critics as Leonid Andreyev A writer whose immense popularity temporarily eclipsed even that of Gorky, Andreyev was an equally controversial figure, whose writings provoked the anger of churchmen and Marxists alike [27] His destiny in Soviet literary criticism has been determined by two basic factors, namely, his negative reaction to the October Revolution and his reputation as an 'anti-revolutionary' writer In retrospect, a remark by Korney Chukovsky

seems remarkably prophetic "Скоро настанет время", he had written in 1908, "когда к Андрееву будут жестоки и несправедливы, ибо эпоха, которая придет, будет жестока и несправедлива к нынешней" [28] The coming of the 'cruel and unjust epoch' in Andreyev criticism was heralded by the publication of Lunacharsky's vitriolic article Bor'ba s maroderami,[29] which revived the hostile spirit of earlier Marxist criticism (the term 'marauder' had first been applied to Andreyev by Vorovsky in 1908) [30] Lunacharsky's article, which depicted the writer as the enemy of revolution and the prime example of literary decadence in the pre-revolutionary period, set the tone for the next quarter of a century, during which time no edition of Andreyev's works was published in the USSR and the writer was accorded only a dismissive mention in general histories of Russian literature

In more recent years, however, Andreyev's fortunes in the USSR have risen In 1956, a new volume of his stories was published[31] and an exploratory article by L Afonin appeared in the provinces [32] This was followed, three years later, by a full-length study of Andreyev by the same author,[33] which coincided with the publication of a volume of Andreyev's plays [34] The Andreyev 'revival' reached its peak during the 1960s and culminated in the publication, in 1971, his centenary year, of a two-volume edition of his stories [35] Yet despite this resurgence of interest in Andreyev and the establishment of andreyevovedeniye as a legitimate branch of Soviet literary science, there has been a notable reluctance to revise the standard view of the author advanced by Stalinist critics This failing has been lamented by L Iezuitova, who states in the abstract of her candidate's dissertation that "до сих пор в учебниках, в трудах общего характера и даже специальных работах об Андрееве творческий путь его зачастую бывает представлен как путь художника, шедшего от демократизма к политической реакции, от оптимизма к пессимизму и упадку, от реализма к декадентству" and concludes that "такое изложение является слишком прямолинейным и несправедливым" [36] The same opinion was expressed by a number of speakers at a conference devoted to Andreyev's work held in Leningrad in October, 1971, at which I was fortunate enough to be present Nevertheless, published studies of the writer's work invariably perpetuate the simplistic approach deplored by Iezuitova V Chuvakov's introduction to the new edition of Andreyev's stories adheres to the view that such works as T'ma,

Tsar' Golod and Moi zapiski demonstrate the writer's 'betrayal' of the 1905 Revolution [37] None of the works mentioned has been republished in the Soviet Union

In Soviet studies of Andreyev, two elements in particular have dominated the attention of critics the writer's attitude to the Revolution of 1905 and his relations with Gorky These two elements are in fact very closely related, as the friendship of the two writers deteriorated rapidly in the years following 1905 due to their differing views on the subject of revolution It is to this important subject of personal and literary relations between Gorky and Andreyev with particular reference to their attitudes to the 1905 Revolution that the present study is dedicated

The subject 'Gorky and Andreyev' is one that has interested critics since the turn of the century Noting the link between Andreyev's rapid rise to fame and Gorky's patronage,[38] many of their contemporaries were tempted to draw comparisons between the two writers The majority, probably influenced by Andreyev's dedication of his first volume of stories to Gorky,[39] were persuaded to identify the author with the nascent 'Gorky school' Whilst some, like Mikhaylovsky,[40] were prepared to see this as a point in Andreyev's favour, others, like Basargin,[41] automatically labelled him an 'enemy of society' along with his friend and patron This tendency to identify the two writers was challenged as early as 1902 by Yablonovsky,[42] who argued that the differences between them were far more significant than the similarities Yablonovsky's view found an increasing number of supporters in the following years, when Andreyev had fully developed his own highly individual literary style and differences with Gorky had forced him to withdraw from the Znaniye school Review articles now tended to stress the contrasts between new works by the two authors [43] By the time of the first world war, they were firmly identified by their contemporaries as the representatives of two opposing movements in Russian literature,[44] an extreme oversimplification which has found credence with subsequent generations of Soviet critics [45] In the West also, Gorky and Andreyev have normally been presented as opposites The two standard works in English on Andreyev, by Alexander Kaun[46] and James B Woodward,[47] both stress the important practical role played by Gorky in promoting Andreyev's early career but otherwise see their relations as a tragic misalliance Professor Kaun makes this point by adopting Turgenev's distinction, seeing Andreyev as a 'Hamlet' figure and Gorky

as a 'Don Quixote'[48] Dr Woodward also suggests that the similarities between the two writers were purely superficial and denies that Gorky had any influence on the development of Andreyev's thought[49]

The recent publication of the full correspondence of Gorky and Andreyev, together with other valuable material relating to their friendship, has underlined the need for a detailed reexamination of the entire subject[50] This volume, with a well-documented introductory article by K D Muratova, has at last made such a study possible and has stimulated another Soviet critic, V Bezzubov, to devote a lengthy article to the subject, the most detailed to appear to date[51] Yet neither article is fully satisfactory, both contain a number of illuminating insights and Bezzubov's in particular corrects some of the critical myths with which the subject is fraught, but they are marred by an approach which still demands that Gorky be seen as the 'founder of Socialist Realism' and Andreyev as the representative of 'bourgeois modernism' Hence, although both critics provide considerable detail on the subject of personal relations and literary debates between the two writers, neither attempts a detailed comparison of their fiction To do so requires a fundamental reappraisal of the life and works of both men and has fatal consequences for the critical myth which has been deliberately fostered in the Soviet Union

The present study is the first attempt in any language to provide a full account of the long and complex relationship between Gorky and Andreyev Its subject comprises three main strands (1) an account of personal relations between the writers in the period 1898-1919, (2) an investigation of their views on aesthetics, and (3) a detailed analysis of their major literary works of the period of their closest contact (1902-1910) In contrast to earlier studies of the subject, it is this last aspect which receives the greatest emphasis in this dissertation as it is the literary works which provide the real insight into the nature of the contradictory relationship between the two men The exposition throughout is chronological Chapter one, which covers the period 1898-1904, is comparative in approach, as is chapter seven, which deals with the years 1911-1917 In the five intervening chapters, covering the crucial period 1905-1911, the comparative approach is abandoned in favour of a more detailed account of the life and work of each writer in turn Hence, chapter two deals with Gorky and the 1905 Revolution, chapter three with Andreyev and 1905,

chapter four with Gorky in the years of reaction, chapter five with Andreyev in the same period Chapter six provides an important footnote to Gorky's relations with the Bolsheviks in 1909 and 1910 In order to avoid unnecessary repetition and confusion, the comparative element of the study is confined to the chapters on Andreyev This method of organization has been selected for a number of reasons First, given the momentous importance of the 1905 Revolution and its aftermath to the Gorky-Andreyev relationship, it is vital that each writer's experience of and reaction to these events be studied comprehensively Secondly, if a true picture of the relationship is to emerge, it is doubly important that Gorky's life and works are subjected to detailed analysis, as it is from a false interpretation of his activity during these years that a great number of misconceptions about his friendship with Andreyev derive Furthermore, very few of Gorky's works of this period have previously been analysed in English studies of the writer Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly of all, this approach brings to light a factor of crucial importance, that the Revolution of 1905 was the single most significant influence on the thought of both writers

Finally, a few words on the critical method employed in this study would seem to be appropriate The analysis of individual works lays no claim to completeness The emphasis in all cases is on thematic elements, questions of style and form are touched upon only when these contribute to the central purpose For this no apology is offered, although it should be noted that the works of both Gorky and Andreyev are eminently suited to this type of enquiry as each writer was primarily concerned in his fiction with questions of a philosophical nature Ultimately, of course, the justification of any critical method must be sought in the fruitfulness of its results, it is hoped that the present study will provide a number of new insights not only into the immediate subject of the Gorky-Andreyev relationship, but also into some of the complexities of early twentieth-century Russian literature, of which they are both highly typical, although equally unique, representatives

INTRODUCTION. NOTES

1 Alexander Kaun, Maxim Gorky and his Russia, (New York, 1931), p xi

2 И Эренбург, Собрание сочинений в 9-и томах, т 8, (М , 1966), стр 8

3 Д Философов, "Конец Горького", в его кн. Слова и жизнь Литературные споры новейшего времени 1901-1908, (СПб , 1909), З Гиппиус, "Братская могила", Весы, № 7 (1907)

4 Философов, "Конец Горького", стр 50

5 А Луначарский, "Сборник товарищества "Знание" за 1908г , кн 23", в кн Литературный распад, кн 2, (СПб , 1909), В Воровский, "Максим Горький", в его кн Литературно-критические статьи, (М , 1948), стр 223-241

6 Е Чириков, Смердяков русской революции (Роль Горького в русской революции), (София, 1921)

7 Правда, 3 июня, 1928, стр 1

8 Д.Шуб, "Максим Горький и советская диктатура", Мосты, № 1 (1958)

9 F.Borras, Maxim Gorky the Writer. An Interpretation, (London, 1967), R.Hare, Maxim Gorky Romantic Realist and Conservative Revolutionary, (London, 1962), I.Weil, Gorky. His Literary Development and Influence on Soviet Intellectual Life, (New York, 1966).

10 Exceptions are provided by the following F.Holtzman, The Young Maxim Gorky 1868-1902, (New York, 1948), Bertram D. Wolfe, The Bridge and the Abyss. The Troubled Friendship of Maxim Gorky and V.I.Lenin, (London, 1967)

11 A recent work by a German scholar contains a plea for Zhizn' Klima Samgina Jurgen Ruhle, Literature and Revolution. A Critical Study of the Writer and Communism in the Twentieth Century, (London, 1969), pp.20-34.

12 On the subject of Gorky's heritage in the Soviet Union, see Weil, Gorky, C Vaughan James, Soviet Socialist Realism, (London, 1973).

13 М Горький и А Чехов Переписка Статьи Высказывания, (М.-Л , 1951), А.М.Горький и В.Г.Короленко Переписка Статьи. Высказывания, (М , 1955), И Груздев, Короленко и Горький, (Горький, 1946), Н Пиксанов, "Толстой и Горький Личные, идейные и творческие встречи", Ученые записки Горьковского университета, т 56 (1961), стр. 5-36

14 А.Волков, А М Горький и литературное движение советской эпохи, изд 2-е, доп , (М , 1971), К Муратова, М.Горький в борьбе за развитие советской литературы, (М -Л , 1958)

15 see, in particular, the contributions of Soviet writers to BC

16 see, for example I.Weil, 'Gorky's relations with the Bolsheviks and the Symbolists', Slavonic and East European Journal, (New Series) vol.IV (XVIII), pp.201-219, Э Литвин, "Горький и Брюсов (К истории личных и литературных отношений)", Труды Ленинградского государственного библиотечного института им. Н К Крупской, т 2 (1957)

17 see the 'standard' Soviet work А Волков, М Горький и литературное движение конца XIX-начала XX веков, (М , 1954)

18 В.Голубев, "М.Горький и "Знание"", Звезда, № 10 (1938), стр.216-230, Ю Олейников, "М Горький и "Знание"", Ученые записки Ленинградского педагогического института им А И Герцена, т 58 (1947), стр 123-239

19 С Касторский, "М Горький и писатели-реалисты конца Х1Х-начала ХХ веков", Звезда, № 6 (1948), стр 172
20 История русской литературы, т 10, (М -Л , 1954), стр.443
21 Б Михайловский, "Вопросы изучения русской литературы конца Х1Х-начала ХХ вв ", Научные доклады высшей школы Филологические науки, № 1 (1958), стр.142
22 А Волков, "Творчество А.И Куприна в годы реакции", Вопросы литературы, № 12 (1960), стр 155-165, Ф Кулешов, "Прав ли А.Волков?", Дальний восток, № 2 (1962), А Волков, "Между двух стульев", Вопросы литературы, № 10 (1962), стр 184-187
23 Б Бялик (ред), Русская литература конца Х1Х-начала ХХ вв., (М , 1968, 1971, 1972)
24 Русская литература конца Х1Х-начала ХХ вв. 1901-1907, (М., 1971), стр 177
25 А.Дун, "М Горький и Скиталец", Русская литература, № 3 (1960), стр.166-169, А.Максимович, "М Горький и Д Я Айзман", МИ 2, стр 305-320, П Акимов, "Горький и Серафимович", Простор, № 6 (1963), стр 92-94, В Голубев, "М Горький и "Поединок" Куприна", Ученые записки Ленинградского педагогического института им А И Герцена, т 24 (1939), стр 29-38
26 А Нинов, М Горький и Ив Бунин История отношений Проблемы творчества, (Л , 1973)
27 Епископ Георгий, "Индивидуалистическое миросозерцание Леонида Андреева (Литературно-богословско-философский очерк)", Вера и разум, №№ 9-10 (1909), стр 285-310, Протопоп Н. Вознесенский, "Анатэма" Разбор трагедии Л Андреева, (Благовещенск, 1910), В Воровский, "В ночь после битвы", Литературно-критические статьи, стр 180-196, А Луначарский, "Тьма", в кн Литературный распад, кн 1, (СПб , 1908), стр 149-170 A review of pre-revolutionary Marxist criticism on Andreyev is provided in. Л.Иезуитова, "Л.Н Андреев в оценке дооктябрьской социал-демократической критики", Ученые записки Ленинградского университета, № 355 (серия филологических наук, вып 76) (1971), стр.134-159
28 К Чуковский, От Чехова до наших дней, (СПб , 1908), стр 239
29 ЛН.2, стр 101-104
30 Воровский, "В ночь после битвы", passim.
31 Л Андреев, Рассказы, (М , 1956)
32 Л Афонин, "Леонид Андреев", в сб На родной земле (Орел, 1956), стр.345-369
33 Л Афонин, Леонид Андреев, (Орел, 1959)
34 Л Андреев, Пьесы, (М , 1959)
35 ПРА
36 Л.Иезуитова, "Творчество Леонида Андреева (1891-1904)", (Автореферат диссертации, Л , 1967), стр 7
37 ПРА, т 1, стр 34-38
38 In a particularly uncharitable study, one writer accounted for Andreyev's popularity solely as a reflection of Gorky's succes de scandale. А Доброхотов, Карьера Леонида Андреева, (М , 1909), стр 8
39 The dedication read "Посвящаю эту книгу Алексею Максимовичу Пешкову" Л Андреев, Рассказы, (СПб , 1901)
40 Н Михайловский, "Литература и жизнь Рассказы Л Андреева Страх смерти и страх жизни", Русское богатство, № 11 (1901), стр 58-74

41 А.Басаргин, "Талант особого рода (Леонид Андреев и его критик-панегирист из "Мира божьего")", Московские ведомости, 10 мая 1903
42 С Яблоновский, "Свет и тени Из жизни текущей", Русское слово, 24 апреля 1902
43 А Редько, "М Горький о виноватых и Л Андреев о неповинных", Русское богатство, № 2 (1905), стр 47-61, А Е Р , ""Враги" М Горького и "Жизнь Человека" Л Андреева", Русское богатство, № 6 (1907), стр 106-114
44 М Рейснер, Пролетариат и мещанство (Две души русского народа в учениях Л Андреева и М Горького), (Пг , 1917)
45 A fuller discussion of Soviet critical opinion of the Gorky-Andreyev relationship is contained in the conclusion
46 Alexander Kaun, Leonid Andreyev A Critical Study, (New York, 1924)
47 James B. Woodward, Leonid Andreyev. A Study, (Oxford, 1969).
48 Kaun, Andreyev, p.62.
49 Woodward, Andreyev, p.40.
50 ЛН.72
51 В.Беззубов, "Леонид Андреев и Максим Горький", Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып 217 (труды по русской и славянской филологии, 13) (1968), стр 85-169

CHAPTER ONE

CHAPTER ONE

PERSONAL AND LITERARY RELATIONS OF GORKY AND ANDREYEV (1898-1904)

The circumstances which first caused the paths of Gorky and Andreyev to cross were symptomatic of the times in which they lived On 9 February, 1898, publication of the provincial newspaper Nizhegorodskiy Listok, to which Gorky was a subscriber, was suspended for censorship reasons The paper's editorial board responded to the situation by requesting that the Moscow Kur'er be distributed to subscribers during the suspension period, which in fact lasted until 9 May [1] The request was granted and thus it was that on 5 April Gorky came to read a story by an unknown writer, Leonid Andreyev, which appeared on the front page of Kur'er that day The story, entitled Bargamot i Garas'ka, made a strong and favourable impression on him On the same day he wrote of it to Mirolyubov, one of the editors of the magazine Zhurnal dlya vsekh "В пасхальном № московской газеты "Курьер" помещен рассказ "Бергамот и Гараська"(sic) Леонида Андреева Хорошая у него душа, у черта' Я его, к сожалению, не знаю, а то бы к вам направил" [2] The subsequent course of events is not entirely clear Recalling his initial enthusiasm for the story, Gorky stated in his memoirs of Andreyev that he immediately wrote a letter to the author and himself received a 'humorous reply' [3] However, it would seem that on this point Gorky's reminiscences are inaccurate It was not until almost a year after reading Bargamot i Garas'ka that he wrote to Nikolay Asheshov, an acquaintance from his days in the provincial press and a colleague of Andreyev, requesting the latter's address [4] Asheshov gave Gorky's letter directly to Andreyev, who replied to it without delay [5] On 14 April, Andreyev in turn received a telegram from Gorky, asking that he contribute a story to Zhurnal dlya vsekh, a request which was repeated in a letter written about a week later [6] This letter marks the beginning of a stormy relationship which was to span two decades

The year that intervened between reading Andreyev's story and his first contact with the author was extremely important for Gorky Following the publication of the first two volumes of his Ocherki i rasskazy in March and April, 1898, he had risen from obscurity to nationwide fame Eager to extend his influence on contemporary Russian literature, Gorky immediately began to seek editorial work His first

efforts were directed towards Zhurnal dlya vsekh, with which he had been closely involved since the end of 1897, when Mirolyubov had written asking for his support [7] Initially, Gorky's ability to influence the editorial policy of the magazine was extremely limited, indeed, Mirolyubov himself did not have full editorial control until February, 1899 By November, 1898, however, Gorky was sufficiently confident to write to Mirolyubov, outlining his own views on how the magazine should develop "Ведь ваш журнал, - это, я вам скажу, - такое хорошее дело! И у него будущее прекрасное, если около него будут здоровые, бодрые, порядочные люди" [8] It was the task of discovering these 'healthy, vigorous, decent people' and of attracting them to work for Zhurnal dlya vsekh that Gorky evidently envisaged as his own By this time there were other opportunities for Gorky to satisfy his penchant for editorial activity In November, 1898, he entered into consultations with V A Posse, who had for some time been planning the reorganization of the magazine Zhizn' A Marxist, Posse had been angling for Gorky's cooperation in the venture since the May of that year, when he had claimed that, without Gorky, Zhizn' would be stillborn [9] Although he did not totally abandon his allegiance to Mirolyubov, it was to Zhizn' that Gorky eventually committed himself On 21 August, 1899, he became a shareholder in the magazine and from that date he took on the responsibilities of literary editor, which he retained until the closure of Zhizn' by the authorities in 1901 [10]

Gorky's invitation to Andreyev in April, 1899 was, therefore, a part of his attempt to attract democratic writers to the literary journals in which he had an interest At the same time as writing to Andreyev, Gorky sent a similar letter to Bunin, to whom he suggested, referring to Zhizn' "Давайте соберемся - вся молодежь - около этого журнала, тоже молодого, живого, смелого" [11] Gorky did not limit himself to young or unknown authors, however Well-established writers, like Chekhov, Veresayev, Garin-Mikhaylovsky and Mamin-Sibiryak all published works in Zhizn' on Gorky's invitation [12] In the case of older and younger writers alike, Gorky sought works which were realistic in form and democratic in content

A Aspects of the personal relations of Gorky and Andreyev 1899-1904

The nature of Gorky's relationship to Andreyev was clear from his very first letter, where, after offering his practical assistance

in publishing Andreyev's works in the important literary journals, he wrote "Вы пишете год, я - семь По праву старшинства моего, позвольте дать и вам несколько советов" [13] Although only two years older than Andreyev, whose literary career had in fact begun in the same year as Gorky's own,[14] Gorky was nevertheless justified in talking of his 'seniority' No doubt remembering the invaluable advice that he had himself received at a comparable stage in his development from Korolenko,[15] Gorky felt it his duty to share the fruits of his experience with beginning writers Although inspired by the best motives, Gorky's propensity for offering advice was not always welcomed by its recipients In later years, Bunin referred ironically to Gorky's tendency to preach when in the company of writers,[16] and Kuprin also reacted strongly to what he considered to be interference by Gorky with his artistic freedom [17]

Initially, Andreyev felt no such antipathy towards Gorky and accepted his tutelage readily He adopted the role of protégé with gratitude, looking upon Gorky as an 'elder brother', a term he applied to his friend in a letter of September, 1903 [18] He was obviously flattered by Gorky's interest in his work and the promise of publishing his stories in journals with a large circulation gave him new hope of abandoning his newspaper work and devoting himself full-time to his literary pursuits, a hope he voiced constantly in his correspondence of these years [19] However, these considerations alone do not fully explain Andreyev's profound attachment to Gorky, a feeling which grew rapidly after their first meeting in March, 1900, and which he described in a letter the following May, when he confessed to Gorky himself

> В вас я нашел и имею такого друга, какого у меня не было со времени отрочества, когда любилось и верилось бессознательно и стихийно, - нашел человека которого я мог единовременно любить и уважать 20

From this and other similar statements in his correspondence it is clear that Gorky was far more than just a literary colleague in Andreyev's eyes An introvert by nature, Andreyev was subject to fits of depression which drove him, at various times in his life, to alcohol and even to attempted suicide Lacking faith in himself, he continually looked to others for affection and support The early years of his friendship with Gorky were no exception A letter of January, 1901, to E Yantarev, reveals his sense of insecurity both as a man and as a writer "Часто мне приходится переживать дни тяжелых и

мучительных сомнений, да и до сих пор, говоря по правде, я еще не знаю своей дороги" [21] To Andreyev, Gorky was the embodiment of the very stability that he lacked and which he desperately wanted to discover "В разговорах, в письмах, в рассказах - всюду ты один, самому себе равен, и есть именно ты, а не кто другой", he wrote to Gorky in December, 1901 and added "Меня, который говорит по-одному, письма пишет по-другому, фельетоны строчит по-третьему, а рассказы валяет по-четвертому - это удивляет и наводит на некоторые глупо-идеальные размышления" [22]

Gorky's personal feelings towards Andreyev during this period were by no means unambiguous In his self-appointed role of mentor to his literary protégé, he was prepared to sacrifice both time and energy, in the belief that he was furthering the cause of democratic literature Additional proof of Gorky's unselfish efforts in helping other writers is provided by Skitalets, who was even closer to him than Andreyev at this time Skitalets wrote of Gorky's guardianship in a letter to his brother

> Живу на полном его содержании Под влиянием Горького я быстро развиваюсь и развертываюсь Горький возится со мной, как с ребенком, нянчится, учит меня, заставляет до бесконечности переделывать мои работы, сам поправляет их, дает мне темы и т д Он руководит моим чтением [23]

From Andreyev's letter to Gorky of late April, 1902,[24] it appears that the question of their living and working together in the same way had been discussed, but the plan was never realized, possibly due to Andreyev's marriage, to which Gorky alludes in a letter of the following January [25] Nevertheless, Gorky's assiduous efforts in ensuring the publication of Andreyev's first volume of stories, his continual encouragement and advice, and his great happiness at his friend's success indicate his sincere concern

Despite his considerable efforts to promote Andreyev's career as a writer, Gorky was unwilling to allow their relations to transcend the professional level By the turn of the century he had become convinced of the need to devote himself totally to his work as a writer and editor This may well have been a contributing factor in the breakdown of his first marriage Some years later, Bunin's wife remarked "Горький один из редких писателей, который любил литературу больше себя" [26] Having consciously

sacrificed his personal life to his social duty as a writer, Gorky was understandably reluctant to allow the personal affairs of others to distract him from his work The first sign of discord between him and Andreyev came in August, 1900, when he received a letter in which his friend evidently gave expression to his innermost feelings The letter has not been preserved, but Gorky's reply is indicative of its contents and leaves no doubt as to his disinclination to play the role of personal confidant to Andreyev "Грустное письмо вы написали Все, что вы переживаете, я тоже переживал, только мне писать об этом некому было"[27] This rebuff caused Andreyev to ruminate on the true nature of Gorky's feelings towards him, upon which subject he dared to approach Gorky himself only in May, 1902, when he confessed "Много времени я отдаю решению вопроса, который тебе, быть может, покажется праздным друг ты мне или не друг?"[28] This letter did not provoke the angry reply which Andreyev obviously anticipated However, Gorky's letters to Pyatnitsky provide an indication of the exasperation he felt towards both Andreyev and Skitalets, who was proving to be an equal nuisance at this time In January, 1903, he wrote sarcastically

> Хорошие у меня товарищи То женятся, то стонут, вообще делают глупости, вместо того, чтобы работать, и уснащают мою жизнь сотнями различных пустяков, с которыми мне, право, некогда разбираться . Когда почитаешь письма разных господ с нервиями не в порядке и послушаешь видоплясовских воплей - еще более оценишь ваше спокойствие, сдержанность и здоровье духа 29

Ironically, it was probably Andreyev's growing uncertainty as to Gorky's feelings that provoked his disgraceful behaviour when he visited Nizhniy Novgorod the following month Anticipating an unpleasant confrontation with his friend, Andreyev succumbed to his weakness for alcohol whilst en route and arrived completely drunk Once in Nizhniy, he proceeded to drink even more heavily and ended by making a declaration of love to Yuliya Kol'berg, a close friend of Gorky's family, attacking Aleksin with a knife when the latter attempted to intercede The event had a profound effect on Gorky Recounting the entire affair to Pyatnitsky, he wrote "Мне противно видеть Леонида Андреева так омерзительно, так гадко, что по всей вероятности - мои к нему отношения уже не возобновятся в той форме, в какой были возможны до сей поры" [30] After a break of

seven months, relations between the two men were resumed, much to their mutual relief [31] But, as Gorky had predicted, the Nizhniy affair left an indelible mark on their future relationship Andreyev could no longer command Gorky's full respect and he was forced to accept the unpleasant fact that Gorky was not so much a friend as a close colleague Indeed, he had sensed as much even before the fatal meeting in Nizhniy Novgorod, when he wrote to Gorky "Было время, когда я пытался стать тебе другом Но это прошло, и я примирился с тем, что неизбежно быть тебе только товарищем по оружию, служить честно под твоим знаменем и не обольщать себя надеждой на близкие личные отношения" [32] Behind the tone of resignation in this letter one can detect the profound disillusionment that this discovery had caused Andreyev It is interesting to note that Gorky's other protégé, Skitalets, underwent exactly the same experience In later years, he confided to Bunin's wife

> Горького я боготворил Я думал вот настоящий друг' Верил, что он любит меня, Степана, а оказалось, что ему важны были мои писания да выгоды от них, а не я сам Это самое большое разочарование в моей жизни. 33

The personal tension between Gorky and Andreyev, which was to rise to the surface again on several occasions in the future, did not at this time affect their professional relationship, which is discussed in the following sections

B The influence of Gorky upon Andreyev's development as a writer and publicist 1899-1904

Andreyev made several statements at various stages of his career upon the extent of Gorky's influence upon his work The first, in a letter to the critic Izmaylov, who had requested details of the author's biography, is typical Stressing his indebtedness to Gorky, Andreyev explained "Считаю нужным упомянуть об этом потому, что (во) 1-х) Горький оказал на меня очень сильное влияние в смысле серьезного и строгого отношения к себе и работе и (во) 2-х) он же сократил для меня срок обычного "испытания", введя меня сперва в "Журнал для всех", а затем в "Жизнь"" [34] Subsequent statements, in a letter to the Czech writer and translator, Prusik, [35] and in Iz moey zhizni, his first published autobiographical sketch, contain a similar acknowledgement to Gorky's practical assistance In the latter, we read "Сильно помог мне в литературном отношении

своими всегда дельными советами и указаниями Максим Горький" [36] The official tone of this statement contrasts with the effusiveness of a letter to Pyatnitsky, written somewhat earlier, in May, 1902, and which suggests that the importance of Gorky to Andreyev was far greater than he had admitted in public In this letter, he transmitted instructions for his German translator, who was preparing the introduction to the first German edition of his works "И пусть Шольц упомянет о влиянии Горького - не литературном, а влиянии рыцаря духа на колеблющегося и нерешительного любителя этого самого духа" [37] In March, 1903, in a letter to Botsyanovsky, he pointed explicitly to the profound influence of Gorky upon his overall world view "В жизнь я поверил, узнавши Горького" [38] Some five years later, by which time relations between the two writers had become severely strained, Andreyev continued to refer to Gorky's influence on the development of his philosophical views In an interview with Izmaylov, he stated unambiguously "Ему я обязан бесконечно в смысле прояснения моего писательского мировоззрения" [39]

In later years, Andreyev's references to Gorky became considerably more reserved His remarks in an autobiographical sketch of 1910, written for F Fidler's Pervye literaturnye shagi,[40] although positive, are vague (perhaps deliberately) "Если говорить о лицах, оказавших действительное влияние на мою писательскую судьбу, то я могу указать только на одного Максима Горького" [41] The indeterminate nature of this statement is symptomatic of Andreyev's cooling friendship for Gorky at the time when it was written A more obviously discordant note is present in his conversation with L Kleynbort in 1914 Although he once again expressed his gratitude to Gorky for practical assistance rendered in the early stages of his career, Andreyev was at pains to deny that his friend had ever exercised anything but a superficial influence upon him as a writer When Kleynbort reminded him of his early articles, in which the influence of Gorky was unmistakable, Andreyev responded

> Да, было это, - подбадривал я себя Но это так чего не напишешь в фельетоне' Когда же, однако, говорил как художник, а не как фельетонист, я сразу показал свое лицо В первых рассказах уже нет того, чем подстегивал меня друг Конечно общество в те годы представляло меня по-своему Мои рассказы тоже звучали для

> него "безумством храбрых", и нас с Горьким соединяли вместе Но в натуре и тогда мы были так же мало похожи, как и теперь 42

Interesting though they are as a statement of Andreyev's concern to dissociate himself from Gorky in 1914, by which time their relations had deteriorated to the point of hostility, these retrospective remarks cannot be accepted as a balanced judgement by Andreyev of Gorky's influence on his development Thus Dr Woodward's contention that 'there can be no question of any influence by Gorky on the development of his thought',[43] which is founded upon the evidence of Andreyev's conversation with Kleynbort and the erroneous view that only Na dne and Mat' of Gorky's works met with his approval, is not supportable Andreyev's own statements suggest three areas in which Gorky's influence may be detected and which might conveniently be labelled 'practical', 'aesthetic' and 'literary-philosophical' The sections which follow will examine, firstly, the extent of Gorky's practical assistance to Andreyev and then the degree and nature of his influence on Andreyev's early articles and fiction The question of Gorky's influence on Andreyev's political views will be discussed in the final section of this chapter

1 Gorky's practical assistance to Andreyev

All of Andreyev's statements on Gorky's influence, whether condemnatory or adulatory, have one feature in common, namely, an acknowledgement of his indebtedness to his friend for his unceasing practical support in the early stages of his career As this aspect of the writers' relationship has been covered in detail in existing studies of Andreyev,[44] I will confine myself here to a few general remarks on the subject

Although Andreyev experienced doubts about Gorky's personal feelings towards him, he never questioned his friend's professional interest in him Indeed, Gorky more than lived up to the promise expressed in his first letter to Andreyev, that he would help him to find a suitable outlet for his works Not only did he use his influence with Mirolyubov to ensure the publication of Andreyev's works in the popular Zhurnal dlya vsekh, but he also included some of his stories in Zhizn'[45] It was primarily due to Gorky also that the first volume of Andreyev's stories came to be published, with such far-reaching consequences for his future career[46] Equally important was the moral

support given by Gorky in what were difficult years for Andreyev In an interview with P Pil'sky in 1908, he gave an example of the beneficial influence of Gorky's encouragement

> Все время он умел меня только окрылять и бодрить "Василия Фивейского" я писал долго, много работал над ним, наконец он мне надоел и стал показаться просто скучным Как раз приехал Горький, и я ему прочитал "Фивейского" Читаю, устал, не хочется языком ворочать, все знакомо Наконец кое-как дошел до конца Думаю никуда не годится Поднимаю голову - смотрю у Горького на глазах слезы, - вдруг он встает, обнимает меня и начинает хвалить моего "Фивейского", - и так хвалит, что у меня снова - вера в себя, и любовь к этому надоевшему мне "Фивейскому" 47

Statements by other writers confirm Gorky's ability to inspire faith in their talent [48] In Andreyev's case, the beneficial influence of Gorky was further reflected in the significant increase in his literary output

2 The influence of Gorky on Andreyev's early journalistic writings

The impact of his association with Gorky was nowhere more clear than in the articles Andreyev wrote for Kur'er between 1900 and 1902 The unmistakable imprint of Gorky's views on these articles was first noted by L'vov-Rogachevsky in 1914, when he wrote "в его фельетонах, театральных рецензиях о художественном театре, в небольших очерках, которые печатались в "Курьере" заметно в этот период большое влияние "Максима Горького"" [49] The same conclusion is to be drawn from Afonin's detailed examination of the subject in his study of Andreyev [50] However, the reference to Gorky's 'great influence' in this context would seem exaggerated, or at least misleading Certainly, Gorky did not exert a profound influence on the general tenor and character of Andreyev's journalistic writings In his articles written both before and after his acquaintance with Gorky, Andreyev displayed a consistently critical attitude towards the existing social order in Russia Kur'er was the only radical newspaper in Moscow at that time,[51] and Andreyev's articles had echoed its oppositional tone from the beginning After the February Revolution, Andreyev recalled the vigilance with which the censors read his contributions and claimed that, thanks to them, he was forced to forfeit "fifty per cent of what he had written" [52] Amongst the other contributors to the newspaper were the so-called 'Legal Marxists', Friche,

Fridman, Kogan and Shulyatnikov Although it would be wrong to suggest that Andreyev himself was close to the ideas of 'Legal Marxism', as the memoirs of Kogan clearly show, Fatov's conclusion that Andreyev was alien to the progressive spirit of Kur'er is unconvincing [53] To use the terminology of the 1920s, Andreyev's position in the paper can perhaps best be classified as that of a 'fellow-traveller'

The most obvious sign of Gorky's impact on Andreyev's Kur'er articles are the direct references to the man and his works, which crop up regularly from 1900 onwards and which are invariably cited by Soviet critics as 'proof' of his influence However, these references indicate only the most superficial level of influence, if indeed the term 'influence' is the correct one here The first such reference, dating to 4 February, 1900, betrays nothing more than Andreyev's familiarity with Gorky's first novel "Во тьме копошатся раздавленные ложью Фомы Гордеевы, загнанные в футляр страхом жизни человечки" [54] In subsequent articles, however, Andreyev is far more explicit In Tiraniya melochey i prestupnost' individual'nosti and Aktyor, he expresses his approval of Gorky, who, with his Russian blouse, is presented as the enemy of bourgeois convention [55] In O rossiyskom intelligente, Gorky is identified more specifically with the new revolutionary mood which has challenged the fin-de-siècle scepticism of Russian society

> Впрочем, сейчас настроение повышается Наступают времена Максима Горького - бодрейшего из бодрых, и вместе с ними замечается неудержимое падение курса на хандру и представителей оной [56]

A similar tribute is found in O pisatele

> Спасибо Максиму Горькому пришел он со дна жизни и хоть кое-какие свежие вести принес он оттуда на своей спине крючника, в своих мозолистых руках молотобийца, в своей широкой груди вольнолюбивого босяка [57]

Although quite clearly indicative of Andreyev's solidarity with Gorky, such statements can no more be seen as a sign of Gorky's 'great influence' than Andreyev's ostentatious gesture of copying his friend's unconventional style of dress These remarks suggest only that Andreyev detected in Gorky a kindred spirit, with whom he shared both an antipathy to the inequalities and iniquities bred by the Tsarist regime, and the desire to achieve a more just social and political order in

Russia His defence of Gorky over the Dyadya Vanya incident in Russkiy chelovek i znamenitost',[58] like his later article describing Gorky's passage through Moscow on his way to exile in the South in 1901 (which was refused publication by the censors)[59] are important in the same way

Andreyev's Kur'er articles do, however, contain elements which reveal a more profound level of influence by Gorky Particularly important are Andreyev's articles on the Russian intelligentsia, which, as Afonin has noted,[60] echo the critique of the intellectuals contained in Gorky's O 'razmagnichennom' intelligente Like Gorky, Andreyev saw the main faults of the Russian intellectual in his isolation from the common people and also in the cynicism which paralyses his ability for positive action In Lyudi tenevoy storony, we read

> Беллетристу или драматургу, улавливающему в свои сети современность, я рекомендовал бы обратить внимание на одну фигурку, довольно распространенную Искони он был человеком теневой стороны и в свое время имел успех теперь он остается за штатом и занимается тем, что мефистофельствует подсмеивается, иронизирует, и каркает
> - Не бывать солнцу' Не бывать погоде' 61

The image of the intellectual 'cawing' his pessimistic message was almost certainly inspired by Gorky's O Chizhe, kotoryy lgal, i o Dyatle, lyubitele istiny, in which the crows embody the spirit of cynicism

> Тон всему в роще давали вороны, птицы по существу своему пессимистические и, кроме более или менее громкого карканья, ни к чему не способные 62

Another of Andreyev's articles on the same subject, Influentiki, neyrasteniki i alkogoliki, contains a passage which begs comparison with the central theme of Gorky's Pesnya o Sokole

> - Господа, полезем на крышу, - говорит нейрастеник в порыве внезапного стремления в высь, к идеалу - Я еще ни разу на крыше не был, но, говорят, хорошо, - вся Москва видна
> - Полезем - восторженно отзывается алкоголик
> - И я тоже - присоединяется инфлуэнтик И они лезут Но уже на высоте первого этажа нейрастеник садится, спускает ноги и мрачно заявляет
> - А я не верю в крышу Нет крыши
> - А я и калоши забыл, - плачет инфлуэнтик

Алкоголик же давно свалился - без слов 63

In these examples, the influence of Gorky upon a specific area of Andreyev's views is suggested The problem of scepticism, which is a dominant theme in Gorky's literary works, also occupies an important place in the early fiction of Andreyev [64]

The strongest influence of Gorky can be detected in Andreyev's statements on literature and the role of the writer This was a subject which had concerned Gorky from the very outset of his literary career His views were first formulated in Ob odnom poete Written in 1894, this sketch takes the form of a debate between a poet and three Muses, each of whom represents a different theory of art Rejecting the arguments of the first two Muses, who are the apologists of l'art pour l'art and escapist literature, respectively, the poet turns to the third, who promises

> Я помогу тебе, я' . Мои слова - как бичи и иглы терновика Ничто так не двинет людей, как удары Их нужно бить, от этого у них будет тоньше кожа, тверже мускулы . Нужно бить рабов - может быть, они озлятся и будут гражданами 65

The poet dies, unable to bear the tremendous responsibility that the third Muse places upon him However, Gorky's meaning is clear Following in the tradition of Belinsky, Dobiolyubov and Pisarev, he endows literature with a definite educative purpose It was from this premise that he developed the argument presented in Chitatel', which was written the following year but published only in 1898, and which remains the most complete statement of Gorky's aesthetic theory In this work, a writer, who is returning home from a literary soirée at which he has read his latest story, is confronted by a 'devil', who proceeds to ask him searching questions about the writer's role The devil begins by stating the purpose of literature as he sees it

> цель литературы - помогать человеку понимать себя самого, поднять его веру в себя и развить в нем стремление к истине, бороться с пошлостью в людях, уметь найти хорошее в них, возбуждать в их душах стыд, гнев, мужество, делать все для того, чтобы люди стали благородно сильными и могли одухотворить свою жизнь святым духом красоты 66

In order to achieve this aim, says the devil, the writer must have a positive philosophy and he poses the writer with the 'fateful question' "Кто есть твой бог?"[67] Most importantly, this need for the

writer to have a clearly defined artistic credo is presented as an integral element in the revolutionary process The devil tells the writer

> Пойми, - твое право проповедовать должно иметь достаточное основание в твоей способности возбуждать в людях искренние чувства, которыми, как молотками, одни формы должны быть разбиты и разрушены для того, чтоб создать другие, более свободные, наместо тесных 68

The work is not concerned simply with a theory of art, it is a fundamental statement of the author's commitment to the practice of revolutionary literature

Chitatel' was included, together with Eshchyo o chyorte, which was a defence of the views contained in the former work, in the third volume of Gorky's Ocherki i rasskazy, published in October, 1899 [69] It was presumably in this edition that Andreyev first came to read the work, which made a very strong impression upon him In December, 1900, he wrote to Gorky "разговора с вами я жду с отчаянным нетерпением И накипело и наболело Все те же вопросы, которые вы затронули в "Читателе"" [70] From their further correspondence it would seem that the questions raised in Chitatel' were indeed a recurrent subject of discussion between the two writers during these years In a letter of August, 1900, Gorky had written in terms that immediately bring to mind the central thesis of Chitatel' "Одно дело - писать, другое - быть литератором, Леонид Николаевич" [71] Gorky's views met with a positive response from Andreyev and were reflected in many of the latter's articles and literary works In Mysl', for example, Kerzhentsev gives the following justification for the murder of the writer Savelov

> Не убил бы я Алексея и в том случае, если бы критика была права и он действительно был бы таким крупным литературным дарованием В жизни так много темного и она так нуждается в освещающих ее путь талантах, что каждый из них нужно беречь Но Алексей не был талантом В то время, как писатель силою своей мысли и таланта должен творить новую жизнь, Савелов только описывал старую, не пытаясь даже разгадать ее сокровенный смысл 72

In this passage one can detect not only the influence of Gorky's general formula for revolutionary art, but also, in the final sentence, an echo of his specific views on naturalistic literature In Chitatel' the

devil had criticised the writer's work in exactly the same way that Kerzhentsev criticises Savelov's

> Твое перо слабо ковыряет действительность, тихонько ворошит мелочи жизни Ты уверен, что это полезно - рыться в мусоре буден и не уметь находить в них ничего, кроме печальных, крошечных истин, устанавливающих только то, что человек зол, глуп, бесчестен, что он всегда зависит от массы внешних условий, что он бессилен и жалок один и сам по себе? 73

On subsequent occasions, Andreyev was many times to proclaim himself the enemy of naturalism, and, like Gorky, was highly critical of Zola [74]

The influence of Gorky's aesthetic theories was particularly pronounced in Andreyev's Kur'er articles In Kogda my, zhivye, edim porosyonka, he launched an attack against literature which simply caters to the public taste Andreyev parodies the view of the philistine, who complains of the tendency of some newspapers to report the unpleasant aspects of contemporary life

> Как человек, у которого в жилах течет не молоко, а кровь, я не в силах остаться равнодушным к несчастью ближнего и дальнего, и в то же время - имею же право я на отдых И я прошу, я требую, чтобы меня обманули Скройте от меня все темное - от него давно уже мраком застилаются мои глаза Дайте мне светлое, дайте мне радостное, - я жажду его всей моей наболевшей совестью современного человека Выдумайте его! 75

In Eshchyo o chyorte, Gorky had voiced a similar view in his criticism of those writers who confuse their profession with that of a tailor "употребляя перо свое, как иголку, они шьют из тканей вымысла костюмы для Правды, с целью скрыть ее наготу" [76] In O pisatele, Andreyev's indebtedness to Gorky is even more pronounced, as he not only supports Gorky's views on art, but also adopts the same allegorical form in which he had expressed them Like Gorky's Chitatel', O pisatele presents a dialogue between a writer and his 'devil', with the aim of elucidating the writer's social duty In the same way that Gorky distinguishes between a 'writer' (pisatel') and a 'literary man' (literator), Andreyev's 'devil' argues that "один талант не делает человека писателем",[77] and criticises those writers who do not practise in real life what they preach in their works

The proximity between the views of Gorky and Andreyev on the question of the social purpose of literature is complemented by their similar attitudes to contemporary literary movements The affinity of their opinion of naturalism has already been noted Of the modernists, who were becoming increasingly popular towards the end of the 1890s in Russia, they were equally critical Writing of the decadent movement in 1896, Gorky stated quite explicitly "какой социальный смысл во всем этом, какое положительное значение может иметь эта пляска святого Витта в поэзии и живописи?"[78] The critique of modernist poetry contained in this and other articles was carried over into a number of Gorky's early stories, such as Nepriyatnost', which depicts the corrupting influence of insincere decadent verse on an innocent teenage girl In Grustnaya istoriya he parodies the pessimistic tone characteristic of much modernist poetry

> Я жизнью жестоко обманут,
> И столько я бед перенес,
> Что больше в душе не воспрянут
> Рои погребенных грез' 79

Andreyev was equally scathing in his criticism of the decadents His article Kitayskiy roman contains a merciless parody of decadent prose, with its penchant for the mysterious and the occult and in O stikhakh Siiotinina and Bezumstvo khrabrykh he took especial delight in ridiculing the new poetry

Particularly important for the light they shed on the views of Gorky and Andreyev on literature at this time are the review articles they each wrote on Edmond Rostand's play, Cyrano de Bergerac Gorky saw the play in Nizhniy Novgorod on 30 December, 1898[80] and published his review early in the new year In his article, Gorky gives a detailed synopsis of the plot, quoting freely from the Russian translation He concludes by defending the play against those who find it unrealistic

> Быть может, в жизни Бержерак был не таков, каким является в изображении умного французского писателя, - что нам до этого?
> Пьеса Ростана возбуждает кровь, как шампанское вино, она вся искрится жизнью, как вино, и опьяняет жаждой жизни 81

Andreyev, who saw a production of the play later in the year in Moscow, reviewed the work for Kur'er on the 17 September,[82] an act which was in itself unusual, as he only rarely wrote theatrical or literary reviews Like Gorky, Andreyev was enthusiastic about the play and defended its

romanticism against the criticism of an imaginary interlocutor Looking from his cab at the sordid scenes of Moscow night life, Andreyev asks the rhetorical question

> Почему в эту кроткую, тихую ночь все, что видели мои глаза улица, залитая электрическим светом, наглые лихачи, кричащие, смеющиеся и взаимно продающиеся люди казались мне какой-то невероятной, дикой и смертельно ужасной ложью, а выдуманный, не существующий театральный Сирано, на глазах публики снявши свой роковой нос, - единственной правдой жизни? 83

In this passage Andreyev's implicit defence of 'romantic realism', a concept which has become inseparably linked with the name of Gorky, is quite plainly detectable [84] Like Gorky, Andreyev believed that it was the purpose of literature to provide man with an inspiring legend

Signs of another level of influence by Gorky can be discovered in Andreyev's statements on the 'new reader' In December, 1901, Gorky had written to Andreyev suggesting that he should not publish his story Stena He based his opinion on the fact that "для настоящего, самого ценного читателя - которого ты еще не знаешь, не видел наверное - "Стена" - пока не ясна" [85] Although Andreyev ignored Gorky's advice and included Stena in the enlarged, 1902 edition of his stories, his friend's words about the 'real reader' evidently struck a sympathetic note In O chitatele, Andreyev may well have recalled Gorky's remarks when he wrote "Я не знаю тебя, читателя" [86] Towards the end of the same article he also referred, somewhat cryptically, to the 'real reader'

> Но не "читателя" я имею в виду, не того, который равнодушно "почитывает" Существует десяток-два людей, которые близки мне мыслью, настроением и чувством, и для них я пишу Я не знаю ни где они, ни кто они, ибо они молчаливы, как другие, но они есть где-то - они должны быть. 87

Later, in March, 1904, unhindered by censorship considerations, Andreyev restated his views more overtly in a letter to Pyatnitsky "И читатель будет новый, и требования у него будут новые, и песни ему нужно петь новые, и благо тому, у кого есть слух и голос" [88]

From the above it can be seen that there were considerable areas of agreement in the views of Gorky and Andreyev on the subject of literature and the writer's role in society Both men believed that it was essential for the writer to have a positive philosophy of life and,

furthermore, that the philosophy should be revolutionary Finally, they each saw their duty in terms of a commitment to the 'new reader' As an additional illustration of Andreyev's support for Gorky's aesthetic views, I reproduce here a fragment of a typescript, discovered amongst the materials of the Russkoye bogatstvo collection held in the Saltykov-Shchedrin library, Leningrad The first sheet of a story entitled Meteor, it describes a provincial writer, who is unmistakably modelled on Gorky, and reinforces Andreyev's statements on the 'new reader' contained in O chitatele In addition, Andreyev's story implicitly acknowledges the invaluable role played by Gorky in helping beginning writers like himself

> (Знаменитый) Писатель Николай Васильевич Заречный проснулся по обыкновению в девять часов, хотя работал всю ночь до шести В окно его маленького кабинета, служившего ему также и спальней, било яркое зимнее солнце, с улицы, занесенной пухлым снегом доносились мелодичные удары в колокол ближайшей церкви и Николай Васильевич, все еще полный фантастическими образами вдохновенной ночи, когда даже и во сне продолжалась работа воображения, пришел в себя и вспомнил, что он живет в тихом провинциальном городке, по целым месяцам не выходя из квартиры, никому невидимый здесь, а между тем именно отсюда-то и гремит его голос, к которому прислушивается вся страна. Сюда к нему стекаются из столиц деятели всех сортов, он же никогда еще не появился в Петербурге Как бы восстание какое-то поднял он, и вот откуда-то из глубины идет на старые твердыни За ним вздымается наростающая волна всеобщего подъема и он, как Спартак, как Гарибальди, должен собрать и соединить вокруг себя все сильное, все талантливое и боевое
> В литературе теперь - безлюдье никого нет, кроме стариков. Но он чувствует, что где-то близко уже есть молодые, новые таланты, им нельзя не быть, их требует время То там, то здесь промелькнет рассказ или стихотворение неизвестного автора, в которых уже чувствуется новая сила, почти созревшая и много обещающая Он ждет их Ищет Они нужны именно теперь Для него самого еще слишком недавним 89

3 Thematic links between the early fiction of Gorky and Andreyev

The subject of Gorky's influence on Andreyev's works of the period 1898-1904 is one which, surprisingly, has been accorded no detailed or

systematic study Whereas comparative studies of Andreyev and Chekhov,[90] Andreyev and Tolstoy,[91] and Andreyev and Garshin[92] have concentrated on the stylistic and thematic parallels in the works of the writers in question, in studies of Andreyev and Gorky it is the question of their personal and literary relations which has dominated the attention of critics to the extent that their works have been subjected to only the most superficial comparison Early studies contain sweeping generalizations In 1914, L'vov-Rogachevsky wrote "В первых своих очерках, правда слабых, часто сантиментальных, Л Андреев светил отраженным Горьковским светом, заражаясь его настроением и настроением нового поколения в целом ряде произведений" [93] In the Soviet period, Kastorsky came to essentially the same conclusion, indicating the 'social protest' in Vesenniye obeshchaniya and Marsel'eza as a sign of Gorky's beneficial influence on Andreyev's early fiction [94] Recent critics, although more specific in their approach to the subject, have noted only superficial similarities between the early works of Gorky and Andreyev F Levin sees a reflection of Gorky's studies of the 'lower depths' in Andreyev's V podvale and Gostinets [95] B Mikhaylovsky also detects the influence of Gorky in V podvale and refers to its 'thematic link' with Gorky's own Babushka Akulina [96] With somewhat greater justification, V Bezzubov cites the ironic treatment of a traditional humanistic subject in Andreyev's Sluchay and Alyosha-Durachok as an aspect of Gorky's influence [97]

That neither Soviet nor Western critics have sought more profound parallels between the works of the two writers can be explained by their general acceptance of the view that Andreyev's early association with Gorky was an historical accident which at first blinded critics to the gulf which separated them Like Gorky's memoirs and Andreyev's statement to Kleynbort, both of which emphasize the differences which had destroyed their relationship, this critical view is founded largely on the retrospective knowledge of the conflicts which arose in later years The following discussion will challenge this traditional opinion and reveal several important thematic links between the early fiction of Gorky and Andreyev The term 'influence' has been deliberately avoided in this context Unlike the works of Skitalets, Chirikov, Yushkevich and others of the so-called Gor'kiada,[98] Andreyev's early fiction displays no obvious signs of inspiration by Gorky

Whereas Yushkevich's Korol' and Ayzman's Ternovyy kust are so similar to Gorky's drama as to be virtually plagiaristic, Andreyev's stories owe little to Gorky in the way of style, form or even subject matter It is rather in the philosophical subtext of their works that the important similarities between the two writers are to be found

Before turning to a detailed examination of the thematic parallels in the works of Gorky and Andreyev, the following cases of purely superficial similarity should be noted In terms of plot the most striking example is that of Andreyev's Predstoyala krazha, which, as B Mikhaylovsky has remarked, has obvious affinities with Gorky's Kak poymali Semagu [99] It should, however, be stressed, firstly, that this sentimental story of the criminal with the heart of gold is highly untypical of Gorky and, secondly, that Andreyev had almost certainly never read it [100] Thus it would seem that the remarkable similarity of these two stories is either coincidental or else a case of both writers being influenced by the same outside source An almost certain case of coincidence is the bell-ringing scene in Vesenniye obeshchaniya, which resembles Gorky's early story Kolokol Significantly, the motif is used for totally different purposes by the two writers For Andreyev's Merkulov the bell-ringing is a sublimation of his subconscious desire for fulfilling activity, whereas for Gorky's Prakhov the bell is a symbol of his power over his fellow townsmen There can be equally little question of Gorky's stylistic influence on Andreyev's works, although Andreyev's predilection for bird allegory in Chto videla galka, Utyonok and at the beginning of O chitatele can almost certainly be seen as an exception to this general rule

At this point it is pertinent to consider the reason for Gorky's enthusiastic reception of Andreyev's early works, and in particular of Bargamot i Garas'ka L'vov-Rogachevsky's contention that Gorky saw in the story a reflection of his own studies of life in the 'lower depths' is unconvincing [101] A recent Soviet critic has suggested that Gorky was attracted by Andreyev's ironic treatment of the traditional 'Easter story' and draws a comparison with Gorky's own O mal'chike i devochke, kotorye ne zamyoizli [102] However, this theory also fails to withstand close scrutiny Gorky's story, which deliberately eschews the sentimentality characteristic of the genre, was written with the express aim of ridiculing the unconvincing picture of life

contained in these conventional works Bargamot i Garas'ka, on the other hand, with its highly sentimental dénouement, is quite typical of the genre Indeed, Gorky's first letter to Andreyev reveals that he was far from satisfied by the story "лучший ваш рассказ "Баргамот и Гараська" - сначала длинен, в середине - превосходен, а в конце вы сбились с тона" [103] Later, Gorky persuaded Andreyev to tone down the sentimentality of the work when it was republished in the first collected edition of his stories [104] Gorky's praise for the middle section of Bargamot i Garas'ka, in which Andreyev gives a general description of life in back-street Oryol, suggests the real reason for his positive response to the story Here there was no sentimentality, but a mocking irony which had been a feature of many of his own stories of provincial Russian life, like the early novel, Goremyka Pavel This was probably enough to warrant Gorky's initial interest in Andreyev, who was soon to write a number of stories which seemingly justified the great hopes Gorky had pinned on him

(a) The theme of revolution in Andreyev's early fiction

The first story by Andreyev to meet with unconditional praise from Gorky was V tyomnuyu dal', which was published in the Christmas Day number of Kur'er for 1900 The story was a variation of the 'fathers and sons' motif that had been present in Molchaniye and was to feature prominently in such later works as V tumane The story's plot is simple Nikolay, an ex-student, returns to his family home after an absence of seven years The event is greeted with joy by his family, but their initial mood soon gives way to an inexplicable sense of foreboding Nikolay's presence awakens the latent discontent of his sister Ninochka and eventually provokes a confrontation with his father, a wealthy industrialist Referring to the argument which had caused Nikolay's original departure, his father asks

> - Ты сказал когда-то, что ненавидишь всю нашу жизнь Ты и теперь ненавидишь ее?
> Так же размерно и медленно звучал серьезный ответ Николая
> - Да, я ненавижу ее от самого дна до самого верху Ненавижу и не понимаю
> - Ты нашел лучше?
> - Да, нашел [105]

The story's message is contained in this exchange The conflict between the generations symbolizes the conflict between two opposing

philosophies of life

V tyomnuyu dal' marks the beginning of a new direction in Andreyev's fiction It is the first of his works to contain a positive social message and, as such, evoked a delighted response from Gorky ""В темную даль" - хорошо'", he wrote to Andreyev in January, 1901 [106] Whereas his remarks on Andreyev's previous works had been confined primarily to questions of style, on this occasion he commented at some length on the social significance of the story

> В темной дали этой есть нечто чрезвычайно определенное и крепкое - в ней разрастается чувство человеческого достоинства, здоровое, упругое чувство! Вырастает человек новый - личность ясно - хотя может быть и узко - сознающая свое право творить жизнь новую, жизнь яркую, жизнь свободную, и уже теперь эта личность умеет ненавидеть всей силой души жизнь теплую, жизнь сытую, жизнь скучную, жизнь уютно-мещанскую 107

Although Gorky quite correctly identifies Nikolay as the enemy of philistinism, his statement that there is 'something extraordinarily definite' about the symbolic 'dark distance' is somewhat mystifying Andreyev himself took great pains to make Nikolay an enigmatic figure Of his past we know only that he had been expelled from his technical institute and we learn nothing about his activities during his seven-year absence from home The mysterious aura surrounding Nikolay is emphasized by linguistic means, his words and actions are continually qualified by the indefinite statements kazalos', kak budto, chto-to, neulovimo, etc In this respect, Andreyev's Nikolay differs sharply from the hero of Chirikov's Na porukakh, a story which bears a marked resemblance to V tyomnuyu dal' [108] Unlike Andreyev, Chirikov makes the past of his hero abundantly clear A student who had been arrested for his part in a political demonstration in Kiev, Chirikov's hero, who is also named Nikolay, adopts an uncompromisingly militant stance against the provincial life to which he is forcibly returned His death at the end of the story is clearly intended to invest him with the significance of a revolutionary martyr The tone of Andreyev's story is entirely different His Nikolay plays the role of a catalyst, his calm dignity remains unruffled in the face of the alarm and confusion he creates in others His symbolic departure into the 'dark distance' is not an act of capitulation or escape, it signifies the inevitable victory of the new life over the old

V tyomnuyu dal' was the first of a series of stories which reveal Andreyev's interest in the subject of revolution at this time In November 1901, he wrote Nabat, a short piece, which was published in Kur'er and included in the enlarged edition of his stories the following year It is quite possible that the work was inspired by the rise in revolutionary activity in Moscow, of which Andreyev had written to Gorky in the same month that Nabat was composed [109] However, one would look in vain for any specific reference to contemporary events in the work As in V tyomnuyu dal', Andreyev's primary aim in Nabat is to create a mood of tension and alarm but, in contrast to the earlier work, his method here is symbolic rather than realistic The similarity with Poe's poem The Bells has been remarked by both Kaun[110] and Woodward[111] Nabat presents an apocalyptic vision of a huge conflagration irresistibly sweeping the countryside, a symbol which would have been as clear to the contemporary reader as the symbol of the coming storm in Gorky's Pesnya o Burevestnike Gorky himself was enthusiastic about the work ""Набат" - великолепно!", he wrote to Andreyev in December, 1901 [112] Nabat is not, however, simply a clarion call to revolution, even though Gorky evidently saw it as such It is an intensely personal statement of the author's own ambiguous attitude to the coming revolution in Russia ""Набат" - отражение мною переживаемого", he admitted in his reply to Gorky's letter [113] The work reflects not only Andreyev's awareness of the inevitability of revolution but also his doubts as to the form it might take The reference in the story to the senseless murder committed by the peasants and the image of the madman who pursues the narrator must be taken as an expression of the author's fear that social revolution might simply unleash dormant animal instincts rather than herald the dawn of the 'new life' that the radical intellectuals, together with Andreyev himself, hoped to witness in Russia

In Nabat, as in V tyomnuyu dal', Gorky was inclined to see only a reflection of his own positive philosophy, a tendency which had been strengthened by reading Andreyev's Stena Written a month before Nabat, Stena was considered by Gorky to be even more significant [114] Andreyev's method in this work is allegorical Mankind is depicted as living in the shadow of an immense wall, so tall and impenetrable as to make it impossible to know what lies beyond it The wall provokes vastly different reactions amongst those whose lives it

dominates Some ignore its existence and indulge in pleasures of the flesh, whilst others, driven to despair, make it their god and address their prayers to it For others still the only escape from the evil and suffering that surrounds them is suicide Amongst these people, the narrator and his companion, who are both lepers, stand out by their refusal to submit to the authority of the wall, which they repeatedly attempt to break down Their efforts to incite others to join them in their hopeless struggle are equally unsuccessful and the narrator's companion eventually falls victim to the prevailing spirit of cynical resignation The work ends, however, on a note of defiant optimism, when the narrator proclaims

> - Пусть стоит она, но разве каждый труп не есть ступень к вершине? Нас много и жизнь наша тягостна Устелем трупами землю, на трупы набросим новые трупы и так дойдем до вершины И если останется только один, - он увидит новый мир 115

These words encapsulate the meaning of the work, as Andreyev explained in a letter to Antonina Mikhaylovna Pitaleva, who had been sufficiently confused by Stena to ask its author for an explanation of its significance [116]

The same optimistic message is contained in an article written at the same time as Stena, a review of Ibsen's The Wild Duck, which had been performed by the Moscow Art Theatre on 19 September, 1901 [117] Interpreting the symbol of the wild duck as any ideal which may inspire a man to positive activity, Andreyev wrote in this article

> И мне нисколько не страшно, когда я вижу всех этих людей борющимися каждый за свою "дикую утку" Я рад этой борьбе Победит не истина, не ложь, победит то, что находится в союзе с самой жизнью, то, что укрепляет ее корни и оправдывает ее Остается только то, что полезно для жизни, все вредное для нее рано или поздно гибнет, гибнет фатально, неотвратимо. Пусть сегодня оно стоит несокрушимою стеною, о которую в бесплодной борьбе разбиваются лбы благороднейших людей, - завтра оно падет Падет, ибо оно вздумало задержать самую жизнь 118

Like this passage, which already contains the image of the wall, Stena is a eulogy to revolutionary activity In the letter to Pitaleva, Andreyev refers to the "дружный, революционный натиск на стену" [119] The revulsion, scorn and pity that is provoked amongst

the 'healthy' people by the narrator's leprosy is an allusion to the fate of the revolutionary in contemporary Russia where he was a social outcast A A Achatova's interpretation of this 'leprosy' as a symbol of the disease of slavery[120] would therefore seem mistaken, as would Dr Woodward's contention that the whole story is set in a leprosarium[121] This latter view is contradicted by the evidence of the story itself, from which it is clear that the majority of the characters are not lepers[122]

It has been noted by several writers that Stena, like other works by Andreyev betrays the influence of Garshin[123] In terms of form and style there are certainly considerable similarities with Garshin's allegorical tales Certain western critics have seen the story as a reflection of the parable of the wall in Dostoyevsky's Zapiski iz podpol'ya[124] However, although the image of the wall may well have been suggested by Dostoyevsky's work, the influence is entirely superficial In Zapiski iz podpol'ya, the wall symbolizes the ultimate barrier to human rationalism In Andreyev's work, the allegory has a totally different purpose, and is far closer to Gorky in its conception than to Garshin or Dostoyevsky The theme of inciting others to seek an unknown 'new life' had been presented in O Chizhe, kotoryy lgal, i o Dyatle, lyubitele istiny, where the Siskin, like Andreyev's leper, is faced with cynicism, incomprehension and, ultimately, animosity The same situation recurs in Pesnya o Burevestnike, where the Stormy Petrel is contrasted with the Seagulls, Loons, and Penguins, who seek only to shelter from the impending storm A more precise parallel is found in Pesnya o Sokole The repeated refrain "Безумству храбрых поем мы песню", which Andreyev took as the title for one of his Kur'er articles, sums up the message contained in Stena and the contemporaneous Dikaya Utka The Falcon in Gorky's work dies a seemingly futile death, but the 'song of the waves' contains the same optimistic note as the final speech of Andreyev's leper

> В бою с врагами истек ты кровью Но
> будет время - и капли крови твоей горячей,
> как искры, вспыхнут во мраке жизни и
> много смелых сердец зажгут безумной жаждой
> свободы, света' 125

Common to both Pesnya o Sokole and Stena is the view that the revolutionary struggle, even when doomed to inevitable failure and confronted with philistine indifference is preferable to capitulation to the 'wall'

of circumstance, as the present sacrifice will inspire the victory of future generations

It is interesting to note that the symbol of the wall is employed by Gorky at the end of Troye, when Il'ya Lunyov deliberately dashes his head against a wall in order to end his life It is not possible, however, to establish any direct influence by Gorky upon Andreyev, or vice versa, it is more likely that both writers borrowed the symbol independently from Dostoyevsky [126] Given the distinct similarity between Stena and his own allegories, it is perhaps surprising to find that Gorky should have advised Andreyev not to include the work in the enlarged edition of his collected stories [127] His judgement was based not on any dissatisfaction with the message contained in Andreyev's work but rather on his conviction that the message was insufficiently clear, of which he had informed the author in an earlier letter [128] If the value of an allegory is that its meaning be easily translatable (and this was certainly Gorky's view), then Stena is manifestly unsuccessful As Gorky feared, the Kafkaesque mixture of symbolism and allegory was a source of confusion not only to Andreyev's contemporaries but also to subsequent generations of critics, who have interpreted the work in many different ways Andreyev's own conception of the work was extremely complex as his letter to Pitaleva reveals Explaining the significance of the wall, he wrote

> Стена - это все то, что стоит на пути к новой, совершенной и счастливой жизни Это, как у нас в России и почти везде на Западе, политический и социальный гнет, это несовершенство человеческой природы, с ее болезнями, животными инстинктами, злобою, жадностью и пр , это вопросы о цели и смысле бытия, о боге, о жизни и смерти - "проклятые вопросы" 129

These remarks provide an insight into the immense scope of Andreyev's conception of revolution which embraces problems of a social, psychological and philosophical nature

Further evidence of Andreyev's continuing interest in the theme of revolution is provided by an unfinished story, of which he first wrote to Gorky in December, 1901 "Скоро напишу "Бунт на корабле" - зарождение, развитие, ужас и радость бунта" [130] Gorky read the manuscript of the new story the following year and informed Pyatnitsky in July that Andreyev had almost completed the work, which he considered 'most interesting' [131] This evidence of Gorky's positive response

disproves A Kaufman's hypothesis that the work was not published due to Gorky's dissatisfaction with it [132] In fact the story was never completed, probably because of the problems imposed by its form The manuscripts of Bunt na korable have recently been published,[133] enhancing our understanding of Andreyev's approach to the theme of revolution at this time

Like Nabat, Bunt na korable may well have owed its inspiration to contemporary events L Iezuitova has detected elements in the work which support her view that the story is a response to the defeat of the Orange Free State and Transvaal in the Boer War However, as always with Andreyev, the historical event merely provided the idea for a work which is essentially abstract and timeless in nature The story concerns the experiences of a man who has been forced to flee his native land His small boat is picked up during a storm by a huge ship of foreign origin His situation on the ship bears certain similarities to that of the time traveller in H G Wells's The Time Machine, when he makes his first journey into the future Like the time traveller, Andreyev's narrator is confronted with a way of life totally alien to him Unable to speak the language of the people he observes, he slowly comes to the realization that their life is founded on an irreconcilable conflict between the 'masters' and their 'slaves'

Despite these superficial similarities, Andreyev's aim in Bunt na korable differs clearly from that of Wells In The Time Machine, Wells sought to depict the decadence to which he felt the capitalist order would ultimately lead human society Thus, the Eloi and the Morlocks are equally repugnant to the time traveller, although in totally different ways In Andreyev's work also, the conflict between the masters and the slaves has a political significance, reflecting the class antagonism inherent in early twentieth-century Russian society His main purpose, however, is to examine the psychology of the master-slave relationship The masters in Bunt na korable are handsome, strong and fearless, the very opposite of Wells's feeble Eloi The slaves, on the other hand, provoke the disgust of Andreyev's narrator, who remarks of them "эти не были горды и не уважали себя" [134] The suggestion is (and here Andreyev diverges completely from Wells) that the degradation of the slaves is the product of their own slavish mentality Sensitive to their suffering, the narrator pledges himself to the task of arousing in the slaves a spirit of

resistance and an understanding of the freedom which they have forfeited by their subservience The plot is not developed beyond this point, but the ideas raised by the work continued to concern Andreyev As an investigation into the nature of the slave-mentality, Bunt na korable is the precuisor of Tak bylo and, especially, of Tsar' Golod, which deals with exactly the same subject of the revolt of slaves against their masters

These early works reveal that Andreyev was already engaged in a study of the social and ethical questions raised by revolution long before the advent of the 1905 Revolution For Andreyev, as for Gorky, the subject of revolution raised other fundamental problems of human existence The first such set of problems, which occupies a significant place in the early fiction of both writers, are the related questions of individualism and alienation

(b) Individualism and alienation in the early works of Gorky and Andreyev

In Gorky's early stories it was the figures of the proud individualists, the amoral tramps, that immediately captured the imagination of the Russian reading public Recalling the impact created by Gorky's first collections of stories, Marshak wrote

> "Емельян Пиляй", "Макар Чудра", "Старуха Изергиль" - эти причудливые имена звучали для нас как музыка
> Горький как бы открыл нам или напомнил, что есть где-то не за морями-океанами, а у нас в России привольные степи и морские побережья, что есть у нас, а не где-нибудь за тридевять земель, гордые, самобытные, вольнолюбивые люди 135

In early critical studies also it was Gorky's nonconformist heroes that dominated the attention of contemporaries The influential Populist critic N K Mikhaylovsky devoted two articles to the subject of 'Maksim Gorky and his heroes' [136] Noting the 'extreme individualism' of Gorky's heroes in his first article,[137] Mikhaylovsky detected the influence of Nietzsche on Gorky's thought [138] Following Mikhaylovsky's lead, other critics devoted full-length studies to the question of Nietzschean elements in Gorky's early fiction,[139] Nevedomsky characterized his heroes as 'nihilists'[140] and Ivanov-Razumnik classified all Gorky's works of the period 1892-1898 as 'ultra-individualistic' [141]

Critics were equally quick to indicate the importance of individualism as a major theme in the early fiction of Andreyev However,

if Gorky's proud individuals were seen as a sign of the author's optimism, Andreyev's heroes were interpreted as the embodiment of his essentially pessimistic view of human endeavour As the Marxist critic Friche pointed out, individualism is almost invariably a source of weakness rather than strength to Andreyev's characters [142] In other studies, the heroes of his works were presented as 'weak people',[143] and as men dominated by 'the fear of life and the fear of death' [144] The strikingly different nature of the individuals in the works of Gorky and Andreyev was stressed by Professor Kaun in his study of Andreyev Kaun drew the distinction between Andreyev's characters, who 'exuded impotent despair and writhed under the whip of circumstance', and Gorky's heroes, who are 'solitary, with the solitude of the strong, of the self-sufficient' [145] The conclusion, implicit in this statement, is that Andreyev's attitude to the problem of individualism differs fundamentally from that of Gorky L'vov-Rogachevsky suggested the same when he wrote "Герой Горького живет вне себя, герой Андреева ушел в себя" [146] In the analysis which follows, these judgements will be challenged in order to reveal the underlying unity of Gorky's and Andreyev's conception of the problem of individualism

Gorky's attitude towards the individualists in his early stories is by no means as straightforward as his first critics would have us believe Although the romantic appeal of such characters as Chelkash, Mal'va and Varen'ka Olyosova is quite evident, this in itself cannot be taken as proof of the author's defence of the philosophy of ultra-individualism In each of the cases mentioned, the hero is presented not so much as a Nietzschean 'Superman', but rather as the embodiment of an active approach to life Each of these heroes appears as the antithesis of a character who displays a passive attitude to life, Chelkash's bravery contrasts with the cowardice of the peasant Gavrila, the haughty pride of Mal'va conflicts with the self-abasement of Vasiliy and Yakov, who vie for her love, Varen'ka Olyosova's natural joie de vivre is the opposite of Polkanov's intellectualism

It is in his hatred of the slave, then, rather than in his idealization of the individualist, that Gorky comes closest to Nietzsche In Makar Chudra, a work often cited as an example of Gorky's apology of individualism, there are clear signs of the author's negative attitude to the philosophy preached by his hero The clue to the viewpoint of Gorky is provided by the position adopted by the narrator

with regard to Makar's cynical opinion of human endeavour, which is contained in his aphoristic statement "Так и надо ходи и смотри, насмотрелся, ляг и умирай - вот и все!" The passage continues

> - Жизнь? Иные люди? - продолжал он, скептически выслушав мое возражение на его "так и надо" - Эге! А тебе что до того? Разве ты сам не жизнь? Другие люди живут без тебя и проживут без тебя Разве ты думаешь, что ты кому-то нужен? Ты не хлеб, не палка, и не нужно тебя никому - Учиться и учить, говоришь ты? А ты можешь научиться сделать людей счастливыми? Нет, не можешь 147

Gorky's attitude to Makar is revealed not only by the narrator's objections to his egoistic philosophy, but also by the fact that his character is made deliberately unattractive His boastfulness, his cynical attitude to women and the fact that he had once contemplated suicide are all elements intended to deflate Makar's romantic image The same purpose is served by the legend of Loyko and Radda, which occupies the bulk of the story In this story of the fatal conflict of two individualists, it is the figure of the amoral Loyko who appeals to Makar Of Radda, who refuses to become his slave, he remarks deprecatively "дьявольская девка была!"[148] The narrator's view is, once again, the opposite of Makar's At the end of the story, he conjures up the images of the heroes of Makar's tale

> Мне не хотелось спать Я смотрел во тьму степи, и в воздухе перед моими глазами плавала царственно красивая и гордая фигура Радды . А за нею по пятам плыл удалой молодец Лойко Зобар . А они оба кружились во тьме ночи плавно и безмолвно, и никак не мог красавец Лойко поравняться с гордой Раддой 149

Thus what was intended by Makar as a hymn to the amoral Loyko is seen by the narrator as a eulogy to Radda, who prefers death to bondage

The complexity of Gorky's views on individualism can be seen in another of his early stories Starukha Izergil' Like Makar Chudra, this work takes the form of a 'story within a story', although in this case the central character recounts not one, but two, legends In the first, Izergil' tells the story of Larra, who, like Loyko, kills a girl who refuses to submit to his will For this act, Larra is condemned to eternal solitude, which Izergil' considers a just punishment

for the sin of pride In the second legend, she tells the story of Danko, who tears out his heart in order to light a path through the darkness for the sake of others Danko is the antithesis of Larra, the epitome of altruism, and his sacrifice meets with the full approval of Izergil' However, as in Makar Chudia, the views of the author do not totally coincide with those of his central character The key to Gorky's own position is provided by his negative portrayal of the old storyteller Izergil' herself is a somewhat pitiful figure Her continual references to the beauty of Danko strike the narrator as incongruous with her own physical ugliness His other remarks are equally unflattering for Izergil' After she has concluded the legend of Larra, we read

> Старуху одолевал сон, показалось мне И стало почему-то страшно жалко ее Конец рассказа она вела таким возвышенным, угрожающим тоном, а все-таки в этом тоне звучала боязливая, рабская нота 150

The same 'slavish note' can be detected in Izergil''s self-effacing love for the Pole

Thus, by putting the story of Danko into the mouth of Izergil', Gorky revealed his own dualistic attitude to the question of altruism The suggestion is that Danko's sacrifice, although beautiful, does not necessarily change the slavish nature of those it was intended to help The same doubt is voiced more directly in Kain i Artem, a story written four years later, in 1899 In this work, the strong, proud individualist, Artem, feels obliged to offer his protection to the weak, submissive Kain, who had cared for him after he had been badly beaten by his rivals However, the role of protector soon proves intolerable to Artem, who feels uncomfortable in the presence of the wretched Kain His eventual abandonment of Kain is inevitable, reflecting Gorky's belief that the slave cannot change his nature by relying on the protection of the strong based on pity

To summarize Gorky follows Nietzsche in dividing mankind into two categories, the 'strong' and the 'weak' or the 'master' and the 'slave' (in exactly the same way as Andreyev had in Bunt na korable), yet this in no way implies his (or Andreyev's) acceptance of the notorious conclusions derived by the German philosopher from this premise If he admires the strong for their positive approach to life and their active opposition to the philistinism of the slavish majority,

he nevertheless was convinced that unbridled individualism was a socially harmful phenomenon In an article for the new year issue of Samarskaya Gazeta for 1896, he linked his continual critique of scepticism with an attack on individualism, which he isolated as one of its major causes "В наше время", he wrote in this article

> есть только серенькая, бледная жизнь людей, утомленных жизнью и запутавшихся в ее противоречиях, - людей сухих и черствых, с отсохшими сердцами, с темным умом, без интереса к жизни как к общему явлению, всецело поглощенных собой, верующих только в себя (да то и слабо'), живущих исключительно для себя, считающих центром жизни себя, - нет ничего нового, и нет стремления к новости в людях, нищих духом'. Оторванное от общей почвы, каждое из этих "я" так бессильно, так жалко, так нищенски бедно надеждами, желаниями, думами 151

This view is developed in an article published later in the year in Nizhegorodskiy Listok On this occasion the target of Gorky's criticism was 'art nouveau', which was enjoying a considerable vogue amongst his contemporaries Writing about the work of Vrubel', Gorky defended his own artistic principles

> Роль искусства - педагогическая, цель его - установить возможно более полную общность ощущений и чувств Ощущения и чувства всего более разделяют людей, о вкусах и цветах не спорят, их считают чисто личными, и вот для того, чтобы более объединить и сроднить людей, нужно, так сказать, социализировать их ощущения и чувства, подметить в них одну и ту же всем людям общую черту, выразить ее нотами, красками, словами, и таким образом, до некоторой степени сделать ощущения и чувства тождественными у того и другого лица 152

This extract has been quoted at length not only because it contains a statement of Gorky's commitment to the principle of didactic art, but also because it reveals his belief that this art should have the specific purpose of arousing the collective consciousness of its audience His critique of Vrubel' is founded on the belief that his pictures, which had become the centre of a heated controversy, serve only to disunite men and hence hinder social progress

The anti-individualistic message contained in Gorky's publicistic articles is repeated in several of his literary works A particularly unpleasant picture of the consequences of a life founded on self-

interest is presented in Odinokiy In this work Gorky evokes the utter futility of a life spent in isolation At the end of his life, the lonely old man who is the 'hero' of the story becomes aware of his tragic error

> Семьдесят лет жизни! Уметь много думать, много понимать, много чувствовать и делать - и за всем этим не уметь оставить по себе никакой тени в жизни, никакого яркого, поучительного, памятного другим пятна 153

In another story, Za bortom, the same message is contained in the subtitle " подумайте, как мучительно живому быть одиноким!"[154] In this 'elegy', Gorky introduces the concept of a man who is "за бортом жизни",[155] i e who has deliberately isolated himself from life in order to observe it with detached cynicism His cynicism is ultimately sterile as it leads him to doubt the value of his own existence In Za bortom, as in Odinokiy, Gorky mounts an attack against 'passive individualism', the total withdrawal of the individual from his social environment which results in his alienation In later, and better-known stories, such as Suprugi Orlovy and Konovalov, he reveals that the fate of the militant individualists Grisha Orlov and Konovalov is similarly tragic Konovalov's suicide and Orlov's endless quest for self-fulfillment illustrate the self-destructive nature of a world-view founded on militant self-interest

Andreyev first addressed himself to the question of individualism in a number of his Kur'er articles In Detskiye Zhurnaly, he criticizes the widespread habit of diary-writing, which, he believes, leads the individual to introspection and isolation

> Люди с их горем и радостью остаются где-то в стороне, вся действительная жизнь проходит в тумане - и только "я" растет и ненасытимо пьет кровь сердца и ума 156

Writing in reply to the critics of his story V tumane, Andreyev restates the view, expressed by Gorky in the articles cited above, that individualism is a barrier to social progress

> В этом наивном самодовольстве культурных людей, в их незнании границ собственного я, (а, точнее, по ницшеанской терминологии, своего "сам") - я вижу опасность и препятствия к дальнейшему развитию и очеловечению их несовершенной породы 157

However, this explicit condemnation of the individualist ethic is balanced by Andreyev's fear of the threat posed by the 'herd instinct',

against which the personality must guard itself He gives voice to this fear in Putevye zapiski

> Теряется ощущение личности, твое "я", отраженное тысячью плоских зеркал, испуганно прячется в глубину и совсем слабо, как больная собака, повиливает оттуда хвостиком 158

For Andreyev, as for Gorky, the rejection of individualism as a philosophy of life does not entail that the individual should submit to the power of philistine conformism The character of Nikolay, in V tyomnuyu dal', embodies this ideal, his unbending resistance to the influence of his middle-class background is coupled with his dedication to the cause of the 'new life' This is exactly the constructive individualism of which Gorky approved

Many of Andreyev's early literary works illustrate the view of individualism formulated in his articles In Mysl', for example, he describes the crisis of militant individualism Keizhentsev's experiment to prove the omnipotence of his will results in his madness, symbolizing the futility of his endeavour In U okna, Andreyev turns his attention to the problem of 'passive individualism' The story's central character, Andrey Ivanovich, is the descendant of Gogol's Akakiy Akakiyevich and Chekhov's Belikov (Chelovek v futlyare) His leisure hours are spent at the window of his room, from which he observes life in the street below The work is highly reminiscent, both in subject, treatment and purpose, of Gorky's Chasy otdykha uchitelya Korzhika, which was published in Samarskaya Gazeta in March, 1896 Like Andreyev's Andrey Ivanovich, the teacher in Gorky's story shuts himself away from life, preferring the solitude of his own room to the dangers and uncertainties of the world outside His only contacts with the outside world are the pictures of his mother and his ex-friends, to whom he addresses his thoughts as he takes refuge from his solitude in alcohol

Andreyev's positive ideal found its fullest expression at this time in Na reke, a story which appeared in Mirolyubov's Zhurnal dlya vsekh in May, 1900 The hero, Aleksey Stepanovich, is a gloomy introvert who has been ostracised by the community in which he lives He is at war not only with his fellow men but also with himself "Противно было все, что в нем и что вокруг него" [159] His isolation is stressed by the description of the symbolic darkness which

surrounds him at the beginning of the story " не видно было ничего, точно мир кончался в двух шагах от Алексея Степановича, а дальше был бездонный провал, и там не слышалось ни звука и не виднелось ни огонька, ни светлого пятна" [160] The escape from solitude and the impotent frustration it breeds is provided by the calamity of the flood, which threatens both life and property, and which awakens in Aleksey Stepanovich a natural desire to help those in danger His altruistic action reestablishes the contact he had lost with his fellow men The final description of the Easter bells symbolizes the spiritual community of which Aleksey Stepanovich is now a part

> Со всех концов темного горизонта лились медные голоса, одни важные, старые и задумчиво-серьезные, другие молоденькие, звонкие, веселые и сплетались между собою в разноцветную гирлянду, и, как ручьи, вливались в мощную глубину соборного колокола [161]

As in so many of Andreyev's early stories, the Easter festival coincides with the spiritual 'resurrection' of the central character Psychologically speaking, the work is unconvincing, the transformation of Aleksey Stepanovich is too obviously designed to demonstrate a particular idea Significant in this respect is the opinion of Tolstoy, who liked the story, but considered its ending to be weak [162] Gorky had no such reservations "'На реке" очень хорошо Да, сударь мой!'", he wrote to the author in September, 1901 [163] The work appealed to him in particular as the expression of an optimistic philosophy which was close to his own

In their critique of individualism, both Gorky and Andreyev may be considered the followers of Dostoyevsky, who was the first to formulate the ethical problems of self-assertion and self-transcendence in modern terms However, Dostoyevsky's advocacy of Christian humility as the antidote to individualism was alien to both men Their conception of collective humanity was anarchistic rather than Christian Yet, despite the close similarity of their philosophical views on this subject, Andreyev's studies of individualism differ from those of Gorky in one important respect In Gorky's works, the problem is stated in humanistic terms, i e the philosophy of individualism is analysed from the viewpoint of its practical ability to improve human society In a number of Andreyev's works, such as Smekh, Lozh', Molchaniye

and Net proschcheniya, the theme is presented in metaphysical terms In each of these works, which suggest that the barrier between men is ultimately insurmountable, Andreyev is close to existentialism Gorky himself was not immune to such metaphysical speculation In Otkrytiye, for example, he describes a man's sudden discovery of the gulf of incomprehension which separates him even from his wife, a discovery which Andreyev later depicted in Net proshcheniya Yet it is interesting to note that Gorky puts these thoughts into the mind of an 'anti-hero' The author of the first-person confession in Otkrytiye is a distinctly odious figure, who bears a marked resemblance to Dostoyevsky's 'Underground Man'

> Я не думаю, что мне удалось бы найти что-нибудь положительное и сильное, что-нибудь достойное внимания в человеке таком, как я кроме разве способности думать какими-то бесконечными спиралями, увлекающими мысль куда-то в пропасть без дна и без намека на свет. 164

In this way, Gorky suggests that the problem of alienation is a product only of a diseased mentality and hence that it is not an inescapable feature of the human predicament Such 'philosophizing' on so-called 'accursed questions' (proklyatye voprosy) was always for Gorky a pointless exercise, in later years, Andieyev was to take him to task for his deliberate avoidance of such vital philosophical issues For the time being, however, such arguments were in the future, in essence, the views of both men on the problems of individualism and alienation were the same

(c) Reason and instinct The 'Harmonious Man' in the early works of Gorky and Andreyev

In his memoir of Andreyev, Gorky made a special mention of his disagreements with his colleague over the question of human reason "Наиболее острым пунктом наших разногласий", he wrote, "было отношение к мысли" He developed his argument as follows

> Я чувствую себя живущим в атмосфере мысли и, видя, как много создано ею великого и величественного, - верю, что ее бессилие - временно Может быть, я романтизирую и преувеличиваю творческую силу мысли, но это так естественно в России, где нет духовного синтеза, в стране язычески чувственной
> Леонид воспринимал мысль, как "злую шутку дьявола над человеком", она казалась ему лживой и враждебной Увлекая человека к пропасти необъяснимых тайн, она обманывает его, оставляя в мучительном и бессильном одиночестве пред тайнами, а сама -

> гаснет Столь же непримиримо расходились мы во взгляде на человека, источник мысли, горнило ее Для меня человек всегда победитель, даже и смертельно раненный, умирающий . Андрееву человек представлялся духовно нищим, сплетенный из непримиримых противоречий инстинкта и интеллекта, он навсегда лишен возможности достичь какой-либо внутренней гармонии Все дела его - "суета сует", тлен и самообман А главное, он - раб смерти и всю жизнь ходит на цепи ее 165

This deliberate oversimplification, which is typical of Gorky's polemical statements about Andreyev of the Soviet period, found wide credence amongst critics of the Stalin-era --In-the-tenth volume of the official history of Russian literature we read of Andreyev's stories Bezdna, V tumane and Mysl' "В основе этих трех рассказов лежит идея противопоставления инстинкта и интеллекта в пользу первого" [166] Gorky's statement has also been taken at face value by Afonin,[167] but, more recently, this unenlightened and unenlightening approach has been criticised by a number of writers [168] It is significant, however, that none of these critics has attempted a direct comparison of the treatment of the theme of human reason in the early fiction of Gorky and Andreyev Let us first consider two of Andreyev's most notorious works, Bezdna and V tumane, and Gorky's reaction to them

Bezdna, published in Kur'er on 10 January, 1902, was the first of Andreyev's stories to touch upon the sensitive issue of man's sexual instinct The plot is uncomplicated Nemovetsky, an idealistic youth, and his girlfriend are attacked by a group of ruffians when they stray into a wood on their return from a walk in the country Nemovetsky is knocked unconscious and recovers to find that his girlfriend has been raped However, the initial feeling of horror that is aroused by the discovery of her naked body gives way to a lust which he is unable to suppress The animal act with which the work ends is the antithesis of the lofty notion of love which Nemovetsky and the girl had so recently discussed In this way, Andreyev illustrated his belief that civilization is only skin-deep, that human reason is unable to control the instincts which betray our animal origin Upon a reading public, reared on the almost puritanical attitude to sex of the great Russian novelists of the nineteenth century, Andreyev's story, with

its explicit naturalistic details, was bound to create a sensational impact

In the heated controversy which followed the publication of Bezdna, 1902, Andreyev had the full support of Gorky In a letter of January, 1902, he informed the author of the 'fantastic impression' he had derived from the story [169] Some ten days later, he wrote again to Andreyev, who was depressed by the scandal his work had aroused and by the inability or unwillingness of his critics to understand the serious purpose which had inspired him to write the story In this second letter, Gorky gave Andreyev some much-needed encouragement "Разумеется, за "Бездну" будут ругать - ну и что же?" Stating his opinion that the story was a fine 'slap in the face of bourgeois morality', he recommended "Девизом нашим должно быть - не - вперед только, а - вперед и выше!"[170] Andreyev received Gorky's letter as he was preparing an article in defence of Bezdna Published in Kur'er on 27 January, this article ended on an optimistic note which was almost certainly inspired by Gorky's words

> Культурное общество уже высоко поднялось над этими творениями доктора Моро - но еще выше, еще выше должно стремиться оно! Пусть ваша любовь будет так же чиста, как и речи о ней - перестаньте травить человека и травите зверя Путь впереди намечен людьми-героями По ему следам, орошенным их мученической кровью, их слезами, их потом, должны идти люди - и тогда не страшен будет зверь [171]

This is not simply a slavish adoption of the 'motto' contained in Gorky's letter, it is an expression of Andreyev's solidarity with Gorky's fundamental vision of man

The scandal surrounding Bezdna had hardly abated when Andreyev wrote another work, V tumane, similar in subject and treatment to the first The hero of the story is Pavel Rybakov, a student from a good family, who contracts venereal disease as a result of his visits to a brothel The infection awakens in Pavel an awareness of the tragic conflict with his own nature, between the animal instinct which had caused his secret degradation and his 'higher self' which had nourished a pure, unspoken love for Katya Reymer, a friend of his sister The story reaches its climax when Pavel encounters another prostitute, whom he murders before taking his own life Once again Andreyev sought to reveal the terrible power of sexual instinct, against which even civilized man is impotent

The murder of the prostitute, whom Pavel ironically calls 'Katya', represents his vain attempt to destroy the animal side of his nature which has poisoned his existence The symbolic importance of the crime is clear from the author's description of the prostitute's death "она закричала в лицо Павлу хрипло и пронзительно, все время на одной ноте, как кричат животные, когда их убивают" [172] Even when the woman is dead, the animal cry continues to ring in Pavel's ears, suggesting the futility of his wish to suppress his subconscious impulses

The storm of protest which greeted this new story, published in Zhurnal dlya vsekh in December, 1902, even exceeded that which had been provoked by Bezdna The anti-Andreyev campaign received an unexpected fillip when Tolstoy's wife wrote a letter to the editor of the right-wing Novoye Vremya, in which she expressed her view that V tumane was pornographic [173] Once again, Gorky was quick to make his own position clear His reaction on first reading the work has been recorded by M F Andreyeva

> Однажды он прочел у меня "В тумане" Л Андреева Вещь эта произвела на всех слушающих потрясающее впечатление Но надо было видеть радость и восторг самого Алексея Максимовича, он весь дрожал и вибрировал, как натянутая струна [174]

As the polemic surrounding the work intensified, Gorky expressed his intention to write an article in its defence That the article was never written was probably due to Andreyev's own opposition to the idea, of which he informed Gorky in a letter of January, 1903 [175]

Gorky's support for Bezdna and V tumane is no mere act of comradely loyalty The central idea behind Andreyev's works had occupied an important place in his own early fiction In Varen'ka Olyosova, he had depicted a scene which clearly foreshadows Nemovetsky's fall in Bezdna In the final chapter of Gorky's work, Polkanov undergoes a similar transformation when he chances upon the heroine of the story bathing naked in a stream Polkanov is a narrow academic, an intellectual 'Man in a Case', who seeks to rationalize all his experience

> он не любил ничего неясного и неопределенного Он заботился прежде всего о сохранении внутреннего равновесия, и, если нечто неясное нарушало это равновесие, - в душе его поднималось смутное беспокой-

> ство и раздражение, тревожно побуждавшее его поскорее объяснить это непонятное, уложить его в рамки своего миропонимания. 176

Polkanov's sexual attraction to Varen'ka initially provides his 'inner equilibrium' with such a threat, which he is, nevertheless, able to explain "Что же? - это естественно при ее красоте ..."[177] The final scene therefore represents the total collapse of Polkanov's rationalistic approach to life In Gorky's story, the moment of enlightenment is a source not of tragedy but of bathos Incensed by Polkanov's shameless behaviour, Varen'ka strikes him down and beats him, leaving him prostrate in the mud on the river bank

Published in 1898, Varen'ka Olyosova was only one of a series of works in which Gorky mounted a critique of pure rationalism In Mudraya Red'ka, a work written some four or five years earlier but published only posthumously, he had presented a satirical picture of the destructive power of human intellect The work is a parody of idealistic philosophy The 'wise radish' declares "Я существо, одаренное способностью мыслить" [178] On the basis of his own narrow experience, he comes to the conclusion, which he expresses in bookish language, that life has no meaning or purpose, to which subject he intends to devote a learned tome entitled Mir, kak oshibka i nelepost' (an obvious parody of Schopenhauer's The World as Will and Idea) Idealistic philosophy is not rejected simply because of its pessimistic nature, but because it is the product of logic divorced from life, symbolized by the radish's self-destructive act of pulling itself up by the roots A similar 'critique of pure reason' is advanced in a more serious tone in Ob odnom poete

> Довольно мыслить, нужно снова научиться чувствовать! Ибо в жизни нет цельных чувств, как нет ничего цельного Все разбито и растатано могучими ударами ума, и слишком много яда подлила в чашу жизни острая, как игла, и злая, как змея, мысль человека Смотри, какие великие умы есть в жизни, но где - укажи мне - великие души? 179

This passage reiterates the question posed in Razgovor po dushe, written a year earlier, in 1893 "Где цельный человек?"[180] and could in fact be taken as subtitle to Andreyev's Bezdna and V tumane The notion of the 'Integrated Man', in whom reason and instinct were perfectly balanced, remained in Gorky's mind throughout these early years He touched on the subject again in Muzhik, where

the problem of reason and instinct is discussed at a provincial intellectual soirée The ideal is stated by Shebuyev

> А жизнь хочет гармоничного человека, человека, в котором интеллект и инстинкт сливались бы в стройное целое Человек должен быть всесторонен и лишь тогда он будет жизнеспособен и жизнедеятелен, то есть будет уметь не только примениться к жизни, но и изменять ее условия сообразно росту своего "я" 181

Gorky's work, which was never completed, was serialized in Zhizn' in March and April, 1900, where it would have undoubtedly been read by Andreyev Particularly conspicuous in Shebuyev's speech is the identification of the 'Harmonious Man' with the concept of radical social-change It is significant to note that the two ideas are similarly linked at the end of Andreyev's article on Bezdna, quoted above

In the early works of Gorky and Andreyev, the critique of rationalism is often combined with the theme of alienation, of which it is seen to be a primary cause The two themes are dovetailed in Andreyev's Rasskaz Sergeya Petrovicha, the story of a man who, under the influence of Nietzsche's philosophy, comes to the rational decision to commit suicide The work bears a considerable resemblance to Gorky's Samoubiystvo, which was published under the title of Stolknoveniye in Nizhegorodskiy Listok in January, 1895 Like Andreyev's Sergey Petrovich, the hero of Gorky's story, Pyotr Efimovich, is caught between the rational decision to end his life and the instinctive desire to live

> Петр Ефимович чувствовал себя расколотым на две половины одна из них, нервно напряженная и болезненно вибрирующая, торопилась прожить как можно дольше, а другая, решительная и твердая, с холодным презрением следя за деятельностью первой, учащенным биением сердца как бы говорила "Пора, пора, пора'" 182

This conflict is externalized in the hero's chance encounter with the prostitute, Masha, who embodies the intuitive approach to life The confrontation ends, somewhat unconvincingly, with the 'resurrection' of both characters, Pyotr Efimovich abandons his thoughts of suicide and Masha is ennobled by the part she plays in his salvation In Andreyev's story, the hero actually carries out his intention, but the author makes it plain that his suicide contradicts the urgings of his

nature Despite their strikingly different denouements, both works illustrate the view that the purely rational approach to life can result only in the inevitable destruction of personality

The same idea is demonstrated most graphically by the fate of Dr Kerzhentsev, the hero of Mysl', one of Andreyev's most interesting early works Ostensibly, Mysl' comprises Kerzhentsev's notes, written for the benefit of a board of psychiatrists, whose task it is to judge his sanity before he is committed to trial for the murder of his friend, Aleksey Savelov From these notes the reader learns the details of Kerzhentsev's crime and is left to form his own opinion of the murderer's mental state Kerzhentsev's motive in committing the crime was vengeance, not against Savelov himself, but against his wife, Tat'yana Nikolayevna, who had once humiliated the doctor by rejecting his proposal of marriage In order to achieve his objective, Kerzhentsev sets himself two conditions which must be fulfilled by the murder First, it is essential that Tat'yana Nikolayevna witness her husband's death, and, second, Kerzhentsev himself must avoid punishment for the crime He sees the murder primarily as a challenge to his intellect, rather like the chess problems he takes pleasure in solving The plan he formulates is seemingly foolproof, to simulate fits of insanity prior to the crime, so that the murder of Savelov will seem to have been committed whilst the balance of his mind was disturbed It is this plan which Kerzhentsev proceeds to put into operation with such tragic consequences for himself

Like Dostoyevsky's Raskol'nikov, to whom he refers with scorn,[183] Kerzhentsev's underestimates the power of the subconscious, which he fails fully to bring under control Much to his own disbelief, he learns that he had killed Savelov not with the three blows he considered necessary, but with a number of blows which had completely crushed his victim's skull Equally illogical is his semi-crazed state after the murder has been committed However, it is not the rebellion of the subconscious against the act of violence that is the primary source of Kerzhentsev's torment Indeed, it is his intellect which provides the seed of doubt which destroys him The thought suddenly occurs to him that, in simulating insanity, he had actually been insane This paradox is ultimately insoluble by reference to the power of logic alone and leads Kerzhentsev to the unpleasant discovery that he had

worshipped a false idol It is in the vain hope of discovering the answer to this paradox that the notes come to be written But, instead of providing a solution, they involve him in yet another paradox If he succeeds in convincing the psychiatric experts of his sanity, Kerzhentsev will render himself liable to punishment, and hence his rational scheme will have failed to have achieved one of its main objectives If, on the other hand, he is found insane, his worst fears will have been realized, proving that he is not the master of thought but its pitiful slave Significantly, the reader is not informed of the outcome of Kerzhentsev's trial and the psychiatric experts are divided on the question of his sanity However these questions are resolved, Kerzhentsev is defeated, and it is the knowledge of this defeat which constitutes his real punishment

Gorky greeted Andreyev's work with unfeigned enthusiasm "Рассказ хорош", he wrote to his friend in April, 1902, "Леонид Андреев свой человек в области неизвестного".[184] The story would certainly have appealed to him as a condemnation of self-assertive individualism It is quite probable also that Andreyev's investigation into the limitations of logic was sympathetic to him Gorky himself had depicted the futile existence of a 'paradoxalist' who thinks in 'endless spirals' in Otkrytiye [185] A year later, in 1896, he returned to the subject in a work of the same title In the new version of the story, a wife confronts her husband with the 'discovery' that he no longer commands her love and respect On the following day, however, she suggests that she had deliberately lied in order to test her husband's love This provokes the husband to pose the insoluble question "Когда ты лгала вчера или сегодня, сейчас?"[186] Like Kerzhentsev, Gorky's hero has discovered that logic alone is unable to distinguish between truth and falsehood The dilemma is expressed by Kerzhentsev "Где судья, который может рассудить нас и найти правду?"[187]

Of particular interest is Gorky's oblique reference to Andreyev's work in a letter of May, 1902, which contains the following exhortation "Пощипли "Мысль" мещанскую, пощипли их Веру, Надежду, Любовь, Чудо, Правду, Ложь - ты все потрогай!"[188] Unmistakable here is the similarity to vocabulary used in Chelovek, which was written a year later, and which has traditionally been interpreted as the antithesis to Mysl', a view which has found credence with a

recent British scholar [189] This theory is seriously challenged not only by Gorky's enthusiastic response to Mysl', but also by Andreyev's positive reception of Chelovek when the work was read by the author at a gathering of the Sreda group [190] Let us examine Chelovek in order to determine its relation to the view of man expressed in Andreyev's Mysl'

Chelovek occupies an important place in Gorky's work In this single 'prose poem' is distilled a faith which provided his motivation both as a man and as a writer The work represents the culmination of certain fundamental themes which had concerned him over a number of years Its central idea is clearly foreshadowed in Chasy, a work which appeared in Nizhegorodskiy Listok in November, 1896

> Когда природа лишила человека его способности ходить на четвереньках, она дала ему, в виде посоха, - идеал' И с той поры он бессознательно, инстинктивно стремился к лучшему - все выше' Сделайте это стремление сознательным, учите людей понимать, что только в сознательном стремлении к лучшему - истинное счастье Больше внимания к мысли' . Если люди захотят, они всего достигнут, если они захотят, они будут владыками жизни, а не рабами ее, как теперь 191

The key to Gorky's attitude to thought here, as in Chelovek, is to be found in his belief that reason must be harnessed to man's instinctive drive towards an ideal The 'instinct' to which Gorky refers here is obviously not the same instinct which he had described in Varen'ka Olyosova or in such works as Vyvod and Pogrom, with their terrifying picture of the destructive power of the human subconscious This is not a case of contradiction, in effect, Gorky is postulating the existence of two types of instinct, 'base' instincts, which are purely subconscious and therefore harmful, and 'higher' instincts, such as the need for an ideal to live by, which serve to unite men and hence enrich the life of the species

This dual concept finds expression in Chelovek Thought is presented, not as an end in itself, but as a weapon in the struggle against the base instincts which threaten to enthral Man "В груди его ревут инстинкты Все чувства овладеть желают им, все жаждет власти над его душою" [192] However, the conquest of base instinct by the power of reason is only the first stage towards a complete metamorphosis which will be achieved when Thought is allied

with the urgings of Man's higher instincts

> - Настанет день - в груди моей сольются
> в одно великое и творческое пламя мир
> чувства моего с моей бессмертной Мыслью,
> и этим пламенем я выжгу из души все темное,
> жестокое и злое, и буду я подобен тем
> богам, что Мысль моя творила и
> творит' 193

Tolstoy identified Chelovek with the theories of Nietzsche, seeing in the work an expression of Gorky's 'cult of the personality' [194] Many of his contemporaries were also inclined to see Nietzschean elements in the work, a view which has recently received the qualified support of the Soviet critic N K Piksanov [195] But although Gorky shares with the German philosopher a belief in the perfectibility of man and faith in the omnipotence of the 'Man-God', his Man should not be simply equated with Nietzsche's 'Superman' Chelovek contains no apology of individualism, indeed the obverse is true Whilst he scorns the petty instincts of the 'market-place rabble', to use Nietzsche's phrase, Gorky's Man is pledged to the ideal of egalitarianism "Непримиримый враг позорной нищеты людских желаний, хочу, чтоб каждый из людей был Человеком'"[196] It is significant to note that, in the later article Razrusheniye lichnosti, Gorky both praises Nietzsche for his defence of the active approach to life and condemns him for the cult of individualism his works had inspired in Russia [197]

Gorky attached great importance to Chelovek, to which he referred as his 'credo' in a letter to Divil'kovsky [198] It was as such that the work appealed to Andreyev In a letter to Gorky of April, 1904, he wrote

> И в твоем "Человеке" не художественная
> его сторона поразила меня - у тебя есть
> вещи сильнее - а то, что он при всей сво-
> ей возвышенности передает только обычное
> состояние твоей души . . . И это делает
> тебя таким особенным, таким единственным
> и загадочным, а в частности для меня
> таким дорогим и незаменимым. 199

These words clearly imply Andreyev's support for the positive ideal contained in Gorky's work, an ideal of which he saw the author himself as the prime embodiment Mysl', like Bezdna and V tumane, not only does not contradict this ideal, but actually complements it, by exposing those phenomena which threaten its realization Gorky himself was in no doubt as to the solidarity of Andreyev's views with his own In December, 1903, he had written to Andreyev with reference

to their plans for living and working together "Дорогой собрат! Вперед! И - да здравствует общежитие, в пользу которого я и пишу вам это убедительное письмо" [200] Although these plans were not realized, Gorky's enthusiastic support for this project may be taken as a sign of the empathy which existed between the two writers at this time

(d) Faith, truth and the 'Consoling Lie' in the early works of Gorky and Andreyev

In the preceding sections it has been seen that the early works of Gorky and Andreyev share the same guiding ideal, which is expressed in the concept of the 'Harmonious Man' It is the constancy of this ideal which renders comprehensible the complex and often seemingly contradictory attitudes of both writers to the fundamental issues raised in their works Thus individualism is depicted as a source of good when it is directed towards the establishment of a society based on the freedom of mankind from all forms of tyranny, but as a source of evil when the individual seeks to subordinate the interests of the community to his own will Similarly, reason is presented as a force for good when it is employed as a weapon in the struggle to free man from the tyranny of his instincts, but as a force for evil when considered an end in itself It is in the context of the same guiding ideal that the theme of faith in the works of Gorky and Andreyev should be viewed

Faith had been singled out by Gorky as one of the most insidious evils hindering the progress of the 'Harmonious Man' In Chelovek we read

> Свободная подруга Человека, Мысль всюду смотрит зорьким, острым глазом и беспощадно освещает все
> - Любви коварные и пошлые уловки, ее желанье овладеть любимым, стремленье унижать и унижаться
> - пугливое бессилие Надежды и Ложь за ней, сестру ее родную, нарядную, раскрашенную Ложь, готовую всегда и всех утешить и - обмануть своим красивым словом
> Мысль освещает в неподвижной Вере и злую жажду безграничной власти, стремящейся поработить все чувства, и спрятанные когти изуверства, бессилие ее тяжелых крылий, и - слепоту пустых ее очей 201

The passage has been quoted at length because it seemingly provides such a striking contrast to the sentiments Gorky had expressed elsewhere On 31 July, 1896, during the polemic surrounding the works of Vrubel',

he wrote in Nizhegorodskiy Listok "Задача искусства - облагородить дух человека, скрасить тяжесть земного бытия, учить вере, надежде и любви"[202] A similar thought had been voiced at the beginning of the same year "Ах, как грустно, что мы не умеем больше верить и разучились надеяться и нечем нам любить, ибо сердце потеряли мы!"[203] In order to explain this apparent paradox, we should examine the theme of faith as it occurs in Gorky's early works

In Gorky's view, faith is a positive attribute of man in his struggle against the dominant mood of scepticism in contemporary Russian society Such is the message contained in his statement of July, 1896 on the subject of Edmond Rostand's play, La Princesse Lointaine

> она проста, трогательна, и каждое слово ее полно чистого и сильного идеализма, - в наше скучное, нищее духом время она является призывом к возрождению, симптомом новых запросов духа, жаждой его в вере 204

The confrontation of idealism and scepticism had formed the subject of Gorky's earlier allegory, O Chizhe, kotoryy lgal, i o Dyatle, lyubitele istiny In this work, the Siskin is the embodiment of hope His bold songs contrast with the pessimistic cawing of the Crows, who advocate submission in the face of a hostile fate, to the birds who live in the grove where the weather is symbolically 'grey and overcast'[205] he brings the promise of a better life Inspired by the Siskin's beautiful song, the birds prepare to follow him to the 'land of happiness', which, he tells them, lies beyond the grove The illusion is shattered, however, by the intrusion of the Woodpecker, who supplies the sobering truth about the dangers which face any bird who ventures beyond the safety of the grove Convinced by the Woodpecker of the futility of the Siskin's plan, the birds return to their original state of passivity, leaving the Siskin to ruminate on his defeat

> "Я солгал, да, я солгал, потому что мне неизвестно, что там, за рощей, но ведь верить и надеяться так хорошо! Я же только и хотел пробудить веру и надежду, - и вот почему я солгал Он, дятел, может быть, и прав, но на что нужна его правда, когда она камнем ложится на крылья?" 206

The reason for the Siskin's failure, as Gorky explains to the reader in the final paragraph, is that he has only hope, but no real faith

"чиж благороден, но не имеет веры и поэтому нищ духом" [207] His fervent speech in support of an active struggle for the better life contrasts with his abject submission when faced by the disillusioning truth of the Woodpecker Indeed, Gorky's later comment on the failing of the 'demagnetized' intellectual could be applied equally to the Siskin "он - не верит, ибо верить - значит и жить по вере твоей" [208] It is only by means of active faith, Gorky believed, that man can overcome the cynical truth of facts to build the new life

In O Chizhe Gorky first expressed his fear that hope, whilst presenting a challenge to cynicism, need not necessarily result in the active faith which will provide the only true antidote to it In a later article, Samara vo vsekh otnosheniyakh, he developed this idea further "Привычка человека всегда на что-нибудь надеяться очень дурно влияет на его жизнедеятельность", he stated, drawing the conclusion that "если б положение людей было безнадежнее, это, наверное, пробудило бы их энергию" [209] The pernicious influence of hope upon human activity is illustrated in a number of Gorky's early stories, most notably in Dvadtsat' shest' i odna, one of his best-known works The choice of the first-person narrative structure for this story is a subtle irony, which has been missed by those critics who have seen in the work a reflection of Gorky's compassion for those who suffer under the yoke of capitalism [210] This interpretation is based on the mistaken tendency to identify the author's purpose with that of his narrator In reality they are quite distinct, whilst the narrator seeks to arouse the reader's sympathy for his misfortune, Gorky himself endeavours to make his character rather less sympathetic in, as a closer reading of the story will reveal

The story opens with an emotive description of the endless routine of soul-destroying labour which makes up the lives of the twenty-six bakers, for whom the narrator is the spokesman Under the inhuman conditions of their work the twenty-six are reduced to 'living machines' [211] They are 'dull' and 'indifferent', [212] submissively accepting their fate Their natural desire to rebel against their degradation is sublimated in the song, which allows them momentarily to escape their immediate surroundings, just as their hatred of their employer is sublimated in their envy of the other bakers, who work under better conditions There is, therefore, an unmistakable irony

in Tanya's habit of referring to the twenty-six as arestantiki, for they are indeed 'prisoners' of their own passive nature This is particularly revealed by the episode to which the bulk of the narrative is devoted Tanya, a sixteen-year-old maid-servant who works in the same building, endears herself to the bakers, who see in her the epitome of the beauty and innocence of which their own lives are devoid Gradually, they come to worship her as a goddess and their daily gifts of pretzels take on a new significance "Мы вменили себе обязанность давать ей горячие крендели", the narrator states, "и это стало для нас ежедневной жертвой идолу, это стало почти священным обрядом" [213] The deification of Tanya, which begins as a harmless act of escapism, becomes more sinister when a new chief baker appears on the scene Strong, healthy and self-assured, he is the embodiment of everything to which the twenty-six aspire but which they could never achieve and, as such, he immediately gains their respect and admiration These feelings become compounded by fear and mistrust as the bakers come to recognise in the new baker a threat to the sanctity of their deity Their fear is outweighed, however, by the fatal desire to test the worthiness of the object of their faith Thus the wager between the twenty-six and the chief baker is a battle between two faiths, the faith of the twenty-six in the power of a deity outside themselves to resist evil, and the faith of the baker in his own sexual prowess His successful seduction of Tanya results in the inevitable destruction of the faith the twenty-six had placed in her Yet one feels no real sympathy for them in their disillusionment, their impotent 'revenge' is as pathetic as their faith had been and reveals the palpable falsehood of the narrator's assertion "хотя каторжный наш труд и делал нас тупыми волами, мы все-таки оставались людьми" [214] In the final scene the twenty-six stand ultimately condemned, together with their pride they have lost the right to be considered human beings

Dvadtsat' shest' i odna is one of Gorky's most pessimistic works and represents his first attempt to explore the mentality of the weak The 'faith' of the twenty-six has several features which distinguish it from the faith which Gorky himself was seeking to inspire with his art First, their faith is purely passive in nature, in return for their absolute devotion, the twenty-six expect to be absolved from all moral responsibility Thus none of them is prepared to accept that

the guilt for Tanya's seduction lies ultimately with them, although it was quite obviously their challenge to the chief baker which precipitated her 'fall' Secondly, their faith is founded on an act of self-deception, as they were aware from the outset that Tanya was hardly a suitable subject for deification The narrator explains

> Мы должны были любить Таню, ибо больше было некого нам любить
> Порой кто-нибудь из нас вдруг почему-то начинал рассуждать так
> - И что это мы балуем девчонку? Что в ней такого? а? Очень мы с ней что-то возимся!
> Человека, который решался говорить такие речи, мы скоро и грубо укрощали - нам нужно было что-нибудь любить мы нашли себе это и любили Мы любим, может быть, и не то, что действительно хорошо, но ведь нас - двадцать шесть, и поэтому мы всегда хотим дорогое нам - видеть священным для других. 215

By placing their desire for faith higher than their respect for truth, the twenty-six have abased themselves beyond redemption Furthermore, their faith, by its escapist nature, is a weapon in the hands of those who seek to exploit them Referring to the excitement experienced by the twenty-six prior to the wager, the narrator notes "мы даже не заметили, как хозяин, пользуясь нашим возбуждением, набавил нам работы на четырнадцать пудов теста в сутки".[216] In this way, Gorky suggests that the twenty-six are themselves largely responsible for their own exploitation, their slavery is the result of their own slavish nature In Dvadtsat' shest' i odna, this slavish faith is shown to be an incurable disease, in his later works, especially Na dne, Gorky returned to the subject in the search for an antidote

Andreyev could hardly have been indifferent to Gorky's investigation into the problems of scepticism and faith, indeed, these were questions which had for him a personal significance no less profound than for Gorky himself Gorky's youth and early manhood had been characterized by his determination to discover a practical faith by which he could live, a determination which had led him, at various times, to Tolstoyanism and Populism For Andreyev also, the desire for faith was a fundamental part of his psychological make-up However, the need for faith was balanced by an equal and opposite tendency towards nihilism, which expressed itself from an early age This duality in Andreyev's nature is reflected in his attraction as a youth to the

works of Tolstoy, on the one hand, and those of Pisarev, on the other[217] Relevant in this context are Andreyev's later comments to Brusyanin on his early interest in Tolstoy

> Увлекся я произведением Толстого "В чем моя вера?", увлекся и проштудировал книгу великих исканий Прочел, но веры толстовской целиком не воспринял Положительную часть учения - веру в Бога, совершенствование личной жизни ради одной цели - Бог, не воспринял и отбросил, как нечто чуждое мне, и осталось только то, что отрицалось Толстым до пределов его положительного учения 218

The profound effect of this conflict between faith and nihilism upon Andreyev's personality is revealed by an entry in his diary, dated 23 August, 1892

> Не знаю просто, что с собою делать Не могу описать того состояния, в каком нахожусь все эти дни Меня мучает мое "я" Как будто разделился я на две половины Одна смеется, скучает, говорит, ухаживает, целуется, а другая не сводит с нее глаз и ежеминутно спрашивает "Ну что, как, весело, а зачем это, к чему?" И никуда уйти не могу от этого "я" 219

This awareness of his own split personality, to which he later referred in conversation with Belousov,[220] often resulted in fits of depression and seems to have been a contributory factor in his three suicide attempts In his diary, Andreyev specifically noted his 'atheism' and the question k chemu? as the basis of his 'wish for death'[221] The depression which led to Gorky's own suicide attempt, an event which is still swathed in mystery, may also have resulted from his feeling that the faith he craved was ultimately unattainable But if the doubt in each case was the same, the source from which it emanated was quite different Andreyev's doubts stemmed from his observations on his own personality, Gorky's were the result of his bitter experience of a world which, for a time, seemed hostile to his every ideal The distinction is important, as it helps to explain the conflict which was to arise between the two writers in later years over the very question of faith

For Andreyev, as for Gorky, cynicism was identified as the fundamental spiritual disease afflicting modern man and preventing him from creating a better life on earth This view is expressed most clearly in his article Dikaya Utka As an example of the pernicious effect

of cynicism, Andreyev chose in this article the case of his pet cat In a humorous passage, he describes its transition from a kitten, when "вся его жизнь была сплошной иллюзией", to its present state of adulthood "Теперь он возмужал - и более скучного, отвратительного и пошлого существа я не знаю Иллюзий никаких"[222] For the author, the cat is the symbol of that pessimism founded on the 'truth of facts', which renders all activity meaningless He counters this philosophy with his own definition of truth

> Правда то, что оправдывает жизнь и углубляет ее, а то, что вредит жизни, - всегда и всюду ложь, хотя доказана она была математически 223

This passage reads like a commentary to Zhili-byli, a story which had been written in February, 1901 and appeared in the March number of Zhizn'

The setting for this story is a clinic and the protagonists are two of its patients, a merchant, Kosheverov, and a church deacon, Speransky Both are incurably ill, but their attitudes to their impending death are totally different For Kosheverov, who is 'exhausted by life',[224] the prospect of death is a matter of total indifference "Он не верил в бога, не хотел жизни, и не боялся смерти"[225] For the others in the clinic he has only scorn He has a particular dislike of Speransky, whose fear of death will not allow him to accept its inevitability Speransky places his faith in the doctors' assurances that he will be cured and, despite the all too obvious signs of the inexorable progress of his illness, he sustains his faith with plans for the future The contrast between the two men is emphasized by their physical characteristics, Kosheverov is obese, Speransky emaciated, and by their attitude to their fellow patients Speransky displays true sympathy for all those in the clinic and nourishes their hopes of recovery with his indomitable optimism Kosheverov, on the other hand, is taciturn and unsociable and derives his only pleasure from destroying the illusions by which others live He delights in taunting the student who shares their ward when his girlfriend ceases to visit him and confronts Speransky with the brutal facts of his incurability with the deliberate aim of undermining his faith However, life takes its revenge on Kosheverov Before he dies, he is momentarily united in sorrow with Speransky as he contemplates the memory of the life which has slipped away from him The story ends on a dominant note Andreyev describes the morning after Kosheverov's death

> Днем доктора уверяли его (т е Сперанского, А Б), что он будет жить, и он поверил им и был счастлив кланялся с постели одной головой, благодарил и поздравлял всех с праздником
> Счастлив был и студент и спал крепко, как здоровый В этот день девушка приходила к нему, горячо целовала его и просидела дольше назначенного часа ровно на двадцать минут
> Солнце всходило 226

The finale is a hymn to Speransky and symbolizes his victory Even though he will soon die himself, he is still linked with life (personified here in the figures of the student and his girlfriend) His faith, founded on an illusion, is an example of the truth which 'justifies life', whilst Kosheverov's truth, which 'is harmful to life', is discarded as a 'lie'

It would be a mistake to conclude from the above analysis of Zhili-byli and Dikaya utka that Andreyev is the advocate of faith based on illusion as a positive philosophy of life In each work it is the negative element, viz the critique of cynicism, which is more broadly representative of Andreyev's views In other stories of this early period he had revealed the tragic nature of faith based on illusion Kusaka tells the story of a stray dog, befriended by a family holidaying at their dacha but finally abandoned when they return to the city at the end of the summer Similar is the fate of Pet'ka (Pet'ka na dache), who believes his summer holiday in the country to be the beginning of a new life, only to be recalled to the drudgery of the barber's shop where he works In each case, faith is betrayed, illusion is unable to withstand the test of reality, just as the wax angel in Angelochek (itself a symbol of illusory faith) is unable to withstand the heat of the room in which it is placed

An interesting variation on this theme is presented in Inostranets, where we encounter an illusory faith that is totally self-induced Disgusted by the realities of Russian life and by the aimless existence of his fellow students, Chistyakov, the hero of this story, creates for himself the illusion of escaping abroad, to the 'real, wide and sensible life' [227] In his total dedication to this ideal, he cuts himself off from his peers, who ironically dub him 'the foreigner' Andreyev suggests the hopelessness of Chistyakov's 'Wild Duck' in a number of ways His hopes of becoming a foreigner contrast with his typically

Russian features and voice Furthermore, his tireless efforts to earn the money for his fare threaten to undermine his fragile health A warning of the fate which awaits Chistyakov abroad is provided in the figure of the Serb, Rayko, whose yearning for his homeland is a constant source of entertainment to Chistyakov's acquaintances Awakened to the falseness of his ideal, Chistyakov rejects it in favour of a new-found love for the native land he was so recently planning to leave The contrast with Zhili-byli is remarkable In the former work, it was Speransky's illusory faith which had formed his inseparable bond with life In Inostranets, it is the same faith which had isolated Chistyakov from life The works are not entirely contradictory, however, if they reveal that Andreyev's attitude to faith, like Gorky's, was dualistic, they both illustrate Andreyev's underlying belief in the need for the individual to discover his spiritual links with the community

The complexity of Andreyev's attitude to faith is further apparent in Rasskaz o Sergeye Petroviche, published in Zhizn' in October, 1900. The hero of the story, Sergey Petrovich is, in Dr Woodward's words, 'the quintessence of mediocrity' [228] A student, he is undistinguished either in his appearance or in his intellectual abilities All the more surprising, therefore, is his friendship with Novikov, a handsome and brilliant student, who introduces Sergey Petrovich to the works of Nietzsche, an event of great significance "Когда Сергей Петрович прочел часть "Так сказал Заратустра", we are told, "ему показалось, что в ночи его жизни взошло солнце" [229] Sergey Petrovich's attitude to Nietzsche's work differs totally from that of Novikov, who has the facility both to understand the importance of Nietzsche's philosophy and also to examine it critically For Sergey Petrovich Thus Spoke Zarathustra is a bible containing a faith which is to be accepted unquestioningly The religious nature of his conversion is suggested by means of a simile

> И как пламенно верующий юный жрец, к которому спустилось долгожданное божество, он таил его от посторонних взглядов и испытывал боль, когда к божеству прикасались грубые и дерзкие руки 230

However, Sergey Petrovich's new faith does not help him to discover the fulfillment he desires His attraction to the Nietzschean concept of the strong and active individual to whom all is permissible contrasts strikingly with his own passive attitude to life Unlike the bosyaki,

whom he envies, he is unable to cast aside habit and convention in order to attain freedom

The urge for freedom, reflected in Sergey Petrovich's dreams of visiting the mountains and seas, has to be satisfied by a visit to the panorama, where he watches a pale substitute for reality Even in his decision to commit suicide, Sergey Petrovich fails to escape his own passive nature Throughout the final scenes, Andreyev stresses that his hero is an executor of a will that is not his own

> так как не мозг, а чужая, неведомая воля управляла его поступками 231

> И похоже было, что это не Сергей Петрович думает, а чья-то гигантская рука быстро проволакивает перед ним самое жизнь и смерть в их непередаваемых красках 232

Indeed, Sergey Petrovich's own will only makes itself heard in the cry Ne khochu, ne khochu', which reflects his natural desire to continue living and, ironically, reveals how far he is from the Nietzschean Ya khochu to which he had aspired [233] Sergey Petrovich is yet another manifestation of the 'slavish faith', which Gorky had analysed in Dvadtsat' shest' i odna and it is, therefore, no accident that the epithet 'slave' is twice applied to Andreyev's hero [234] Of his faith we are told

> Вместо горячей и деятельной веры, той, что двигает горами, он ощущал в себе безобразный комок, в котором привычка к обрядности переплеталась с дешевыми суевериями Он не был ни настолько смел, чтобы отрицать бога, ни настолько силен, чтобы верить в него 235

This comment could be equally applied to Gorky's twenty-six, with whom Sergey Petrovich shares the same failings, passivity and a degrading faith in an illusory divinity Also important is Andreyev's reference to the 'burning and active faith', which is the antithesis of the 'slavish faith' and provides a clear hint of the author's positive ideal

Gorky and Andreyev continued their investigation into the nature of faith in two of their most famous and important works, Na dne and Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo Significantly, both works were completed during the period when relations between the two men were at their closest The question of faith had featured prominently in their discussions of these years In January, 1902, Gorky had written on

the subject to Andreyev

> Бога - нет, Леонидушка Есть - мечта о нем, есть вечное, неудовлетворимое стремление так или иначе объяснить себе себя и жизнь Бог - удобное объяснение всего происходящего вокруг и - только . Пока что бога и не требуется, ибо если его дать - мещане сейчас же спрячутся за него от жизни Ныне - бог ускользает от мещан, и они, сукины дети, остаются без прикрышки Так и надо' 236

As always in Gorky's vocabulary, the term 'bourgeois' here has a moral rather than a social connotation (hence the difficulty of rendering the title of his first play Meshchane in English) Andreyev understood his meaning perfectly In reply to Gorky's letter, he outlined the plan of a story which he was subsequently to utilize in his second play Savva The story has direct relevance to Gorky's statement on the need to destroy the faith of the 'bourgeois' An exiled student plans to destroy an icon in a provincial church in order to reveal the fallacy of those who believe in its miracle-working properties However, his plan to blow up the icon with dynamite is betrayed by one of his accomplices The explosion is allowed to take place, but the icon is removed to safety and replaced immediately after the blast to convince the believers that they have witnessed a miracle Of particular interest is the question posed by Andreyev at the end of this account "И тут вопрос да и нужно ли? Не лучше ли оставить бога - для этих трудящихся и обремененных?"[237] It is this very same question that Gorky attempts to resolve in Na dne, which was completed in the summer of the same year "Основной вопрос, который я хотел поставить", Gorky told the journalist, L Nemanov, "это - что лучше истина или сострадание?"[238] Fully understandable, therefore, is Andreyev's unqualified admiration for Gorky's play, which he expressed in a letter to Mikhaylovsky in August, 1902 [239] In the following year, he was to present his own variation on the theme of Na dne in Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo, a story which may well have owed its inspiration to a conversation with Gorky [240]

Despite its overtly naturalistic setting, Na dne is, in conception, a purely philosophical drama and, as such, it is unique amongst Gorky's plays [241] Yet, in another way, Na dne is Gorky's most 'typical' work, for it is at once the culmination of a number of themes which

had dominated his early fiction and the statement of a fundamental dilemma which forms the philosophical subtext of all his later works, even the most obviously 'political' The play opens with a scene which is reminiscent of the situation at the beginning of Dvadtsat' shest' i odna In each work, the picture of squalor suffering and degradation is essentially the same Similar also is the song, which transmits the yearning of those who inhabit Kostylyov's flop-house

Мне и хочется на волю эх'
Цепь порвать я не могу' 242

The theme of freedom, like the song itself, forms a leitmotif which runs through the whole play What we witness on stage are the efforts of a number of characters to 'break the chain' which binds them

The characters introduced in the opening scenes of the play are all familiar figures, although some appear in new guises At one end of the scale stand Bubnov, Kleshch and the Baron Their role in the play is comparable with the role of the Crows in O Chizhe, They are the soul of cynicism The paint which had once covered Bubnov's hands is symbolic of the illusions he had cherished but has now lost They have all submitted to the 'truth of facts' "Вот - правда' Работы нет силы нет' Вот - правда' Пристанища пристанища нету' Издыхать надо вот она, правда'", says Kleshch, one of Gorky's most unsympathetic characters [243] At the other end of the scale is the prostitute, Nastya Like Tereza, the heroine of an earlier story, Boles', she attempts to escape from the unpleasant reality of her profession into a world of fantasy, where she has a handsome and romantic lover In between these two extremes stand Anna, the Actor and Vas'ka Pepel, each of whom represents a seemingly lost cause, Anna is dying of consumption, the Actor an incurable alcoholic, and Vas'ka is trapped in a liaison with Kostylyov's wife, Vasilisa

Such is the environment which greets Luka, the wanderer His role in the play is summed up in the words the Actor recalls from a play in which he had once acted

Господа' Если к правде святой
Мир дорогу найти не умеет, -
Честь безумцу, который навеет
Человечеству сон золотой' 244

The 'golden dream' which Luka brings to the inhabitants of the flop-house takes on a number of forms For Nastya, it is simply encouragement

for the romantic fantasies she has invented, for the dying Anna it is faith in the after life For the Actor, Luka invents a hospital where he can be cured of alcoholism, for Vas'ka, he inspires the hope of a new life in Siberia together with Vasilisa's sister, Natasha In each case, the faith which Luka inspires is illusory and, inevitably, transitory All who respond to Luka's 'golden dream' are fated to experience the bitter disillusionment of the twenty-six but with even more tragic consequences Anna dies without faith in the after life, and, ironically, deprived by Luka of the faint hope that she might recover Vas'ka's attempt to escape results in the murder of Kostylyov, for which he will be imprisoned The Actor, aware that the fabulous hospital existed only in the imagination of Luka, finds the only solution in suicide These three deaths are intended as an indictment of Luka's activity and reveal him to be a false prophet

The key to the author's attitude to Luka is provided by the speeches of Satin, who emerges as the play's raisonneur in the final act Satin has considerable sympathy for Luka and accepts that his motives were honourable He even defends Luka against the criticism of the Baron and Kleshch "Старик - не шарлатан' Я - понимаю старика да' Он врал но - это из жалости к вам, черт вас побрал'"[245] Nevertheless, Satin cannot condone the philosophy of the 'golden dream', for, even if it were to bring man happiness, it can never bring man freedom In effect, Gorky is restating the conflict of Christ and the Grand Inquisitor in Dostoyevsky's Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore Notwithstanding his compassion and his continual references to Christ, Luka is a humanist, but no Christian Like the Grand Inquisitor, he places human happiness higher than freedom For him there is no absolute truth, just as their is no absolute God When Vas'ka asks if there is a God, he replies "Коли веришь, - есть, не веришь, - нет Во что веришь, то и есть "[246] Satin cannot accept this relativist view of truth, because it degrades man by depriving him of the freedom which makes him a man "Ложь - религия рабов и хозяев Правда - бог свободного человека'", proclaims Satin, reiterating the uncompromising Christian concept that truth must not be sacrificed to happiness, not even if the freedom it brings causes suffering to the majority of mankind [247]

Satin himself differs from the Christian viewpoint in one

essential aspect, he rejects the concept of a God existing outside of and above man In his famous drunken monologue, he states

> Человек - вот правда! Что такое человек? Это не ты, не я, не они . нет! - это ты, я, они, старик, Наполеон, Магомет . в одном! понимаешь? Это огромно! В этом все начала и концы. Все - в человеке, все для человека! Существует только человек, все же остальные - дело его рук и мозга! 248

Disappointed by the failure of contemporary critics to understand the character of Luka or to interpret correctly the positive message contained in Na dne,[249] Gorky developed Satin's monologue into the 'prose-poem' Chelovek Here he was able to clarify his idea of a 'new faith' based on the immutable principles of truth and freedom Although important as a statement of Gorky's positive ideal, Chelovek is too schematic in its representation of human nature, too facile in its resolution of the dilemma posed in Na dne Aware of these deficiencies, Gorky was to turn his efforts in future to a depiction of the 'new faith' in a form both compelling and psychologically convincing

Although Andreyev put aside temporarily the story of the student and the 'miracle-working' icon, the idea which inspired it was presented from a different angle in Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo At the centie of both works stands the concept of the 'miracle', a fact which, surprisingly, has been overlooked by Andreyev's critics Professor Kaun has seen the work in terms of a straightforward conflict between faith and reason,[250] whereas Dr Woodward, who provides a more thorough analysis of Vasily Fiveysky's character, interprets the story as a variation on the theme presented in Mysl' According to this latter view, the fate of Andreyev's hero is his punishment for the sin of 'self-assertion', which had been epitomized by Kerzhentsev [251] Both interpretations are valid as far as they go, but neither provides a satisfactory explanation of the 'miracle', which is central to the story's conception

Superficially, the story of Vasily Fiveysky resembles the biblical story of Job A village priest, for seven years Fiveysky enjoys a state of material and spiritual well-being, in which he perceives a sign of God's benevolence to mankind "И благословил бога, так как верил в него торжественно и просто как иерей и как человек с незлобивой душою" [252] The words are a deliberate irony, for in the next sentence we learn of a cruel blow of fate against

Fiveysky when his son is drowned in a swimming accident Remembering the case of Job,[253] the priest views his misfortune as a deliberate test of his faith by God However, a different interpretation of events is suggested in the very opening passage, where we are told of Fiveysky "Среди людей он был одинок, словно планета среди других планет" [254] Fiveysky's isolation epitomizes his sin His is the egoism born of contentment, which renders man insensitive to the suffering of his fellows The priest is presented with a hideous caricature of his own nature in the person of Ivan Koprov

> Сам Иван Порфирыч был богатый, очень счастливый и всеми уважаемый человек. У него было представительное лицо, с твердыми выпуклыми щеками и огромной черной бородою, и такие же черные волосы шли по всему его телу, особенно по ногам и груди, и он верил, что эти волосы приносят ему особенное счастье Он верил в это так же крепко, как и в бога, считал себя избранником среди людей, был горд, самонадеян и постоянно весел 255

In his subconscious, Fiveysky is already aware of the significance of Koprov

> Точно вся жестокая, загадочная судьба его воплотилась в этой огромной черной бороде, волосатых руках и прямои, твердой поступи, и если о Василий не сожмется весь, не посторонится, не спрячется за своими стенами, - эта грозная туша раздавит его, как муравья 256

Despite this premonition, Fiveysky remains unenlightened to the real meaning of his punishment at this stage His immediate aim is to recreate the happiness he has lost (and hence, unwittingly, perpetuate his sin) A new child is conceived by Fiveysky's wife and, with it, the hope that life will return to normal However, the hope is vain, Fiveysky's new son is born an idiot and his wife once more drowns her sorrow in alcohol

It is at this point that Fiveysky begins to undergo an important transformation

> До сих пор было так существовала крохотная земля, и на ней жил огромный о Василий со своим огромным горем и огромными сомнениями, - а других людей как будто не жило совсем Теперь же земля выросла, стала необъятною и вся заселилась людьми, подобными о Василия 257

Thus Fiveysky's grief has brought about his 'resurrection', in the same

way that the grief of others had led to the 'resurrection' of Aleksey Stepanovich in Na reke In Fiveysky's case, however, communion with his fellow men results in an intense spiritual crisis The confessions he hears from his parishioners combine to form a terrifying picture of a world dominated by senseless cruelty and suffering and provide a challenge to his faith in God's benevolence "Каждый страдающий человек был палачом для него, бессильного служителя всемогущего бога", we read, "и было палачей столько, сколько людей, и было кнутов столько, сколько доверчивых и ожидающих взоров" [258] Oppressed by a sense of personal responsibility for the suffering he witnesses, Fiveysky makes a desperate attempt to escape, he plans to leave the Church to start a new life elsewhere The idiot son Vasya, who serves as a continual reminder to Fiveysky of the cruel injustice of fate, is to be placed in care Again fate thwarts his efforts, Fiveysky returns home one day to find that his house has been destroyed by fire and his wife fatally injured Now convinced that he has been 'chosen' by God for some special purpose,[259] the priest sends his daughter away to school in order to remain alone with his idiot son, which signifies his determination to face the truth of life's injustice

In the final scenes of the story, the Job motif returns, but the roles are reversed It is not God who seeks to test Fiveysky's faith, but Fiveysky who seeks to test God's benevolence He does this first by entreating his parishioners to pray for God's mercy, an activity proved futile by the death of one of their number, Semyon Mosyagin, who is killed in a landslide To Fiveysky this is the ultimate mockery, for it was to the same Mosyagin that he had promised that God would heed his prayer for justice and mercy In desperation, he summons God to demonstrate his mercy by means of a miracle, to resurrect the corpse of Mosyagin When this act also fails, Fiveysky is finally disarmed both of his faith and of his reason His mind deranged, he demands that God address him via the dead body

> - Да говори же ты, проклятое мясо'
> Смотрит изумленно, остро - и в немом
> ужасе откидывается назад, выкинув для
> защиты напряженные руки В гробу нет Семена В гробу нет трупа Там лежит идиот 260

With this vision comes the final enlightenment there is no benevolent God, only fate, which is indifferent to the senseless suffering of mankind, symbolized in the inescapable figure of the idiot

In Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo, Andreyev introduced into his fiction a completely new type of character As he appears in the latter part of the story, after his 'resurrection', Vasily Fiveysky epitomizes the spirit of martyrdom, which is the highest form of altruism Unacceptable, therefore, is Dr Woodward's contention that the story 'issued logically from preceding works such as The Lie, Silence and Thought'[261] In each of the works named, Andreyev had depicted the tragedy of misguided rationalism, in Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo he depicts the tragedy of misguided faith Unlike Kerzhentsev, Fiveysky was inspired by an honourable motive, to relieve the suffering of mankind Although Fiveysky too is 'punished' with insanity, his 'crime' is of a totally different order to that of Kerzhentsev The clue to his 'crime' is contained in his challenge to God

> - Так зачем же я верил? Так зачем же ты дал мне любовь к людям и жалость - чтобы посмеяться надо мною? Так зачем же всю жизнь мою ты держал меня в плену, в рабстве, в оковах? Ни мысли свободной! Ни чувства! Ни вздоха! Все одним тобою, все для тебя Один ты! 262

These words are an endictment not of God, but of Fiveysky himself His faith is, on his own admission, that of a 'slave' In his 'love of people and pity', Fiveysky is perhaps closest of all to Gorky's Luka, but with the obvious difference that he has none of Luka's cynicism Yet, like Luka, he has pledged himself to the ideal of human happiness, which he places even higher than freedom and which he seeks to promote by means of inspiring faith in universal justice Both appeal to man's weakness rather than his strength Consider, for example, the description of Fiveysky's first confrontation with Mosyagin, where he induces the peasant to kneel down and pray

> - Молись!
> Сзади надвигалась пустынная и темная церковь, над головой сердитый поп кричал "Молись, молись!" И, не отдавая себе отчета, Мосягин быстро закрестился и начал отбивать земные поклоны. От быстрых и однообразных движений головы, от необычности всего совершающегося, от сознания, что весь он подчинен сейчас какой-то сильной и загадочной воле, мужику становилось страшно и оттого особенно легко Ибо в самом этом страхе перед кем-то могущественным и строгим зарождалась надежда на заступничество и милость 263

Mosyagin provides a perfect illustration to the assertion of Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor, that "нет у человека заботы мучительнее, как найти того, кому бы передать поскорее тот дар свободы, с которым это несчастное существо рождается"[264] Like Luka, Fiveysky gives the 'unfortunate creature' what he desires, a faith which will absolve him from personal responsibility for his fate Again like Luka, he promises a miracle (Luka, in fact, promises several), which the Grand Inquisitor had considered essential for the maintenance of faith Yet both Fiveysky and Luka are manifestly unsuccessful in their attempts to increase the sum of human happiness In Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo, as in Na dne, life itself thwarts the illusory 'miracle' and destroys the 'slavish' faith it had inspired However, Andreyev's work differs in one significant respect from Na dne Unlike Gorky, Andreyev gives no hint of a 'new faith' which could enable man to achieve the dual ideal of freedom and happiness

C Literature and politics The seeds of dissension

The preceding sections have been devoted to the question of thematic parallels in the early works of Gorky and Andreyev, from which certain important similarities in the development of their thought will have become apparent They provide an insight into the unique sense of comradeship experienced, despite the vicissitudes of their personal friendship, by both writers during the early years of their relationship and also serve as an indispensible introduction to their works of the revolutionary and post-revolutionary periods At this point, however, it is relevant to consider the attitudes of the two writers to the issue of literature and politics, which constituted the first, and most serious, threat to the future of their relations

Andreyev and Gorky had become acquainted at a time when Gorky's political beliefs were in a state of flux He had been closely involved with the revolutionary movement in Russia since the mid 1880s, when he had collaborated with Populist groups, first in Kazan' and, later, in Nizhniy Novgorod It was in the latter town that he suffered his first arrest, in 1889, in connexion with his revolutionary activities[265] However, from 1892 onwards, Gorky's political activity decreased as he concentrated his attention on his new career as a writer and journalist During the years of his literary apprenticeship, Gorky maintained his links with the Populist movement and also made contact with the Marxist groups which were soon to form the basis of the

Social Democratic Party (R S D L P) This latter circumstance resulted in a new arrest for the writer, which took place in Tiflis in May, 1898 [266] On this occasion, Gorky was soon released, due to the lack of substantial evidence against him

At the turn of the century, neither of the two major revolutionary movements could claim Gorky's full allegiance In November, 1899 he had remarked in a letter to Repin

> Никуда не принадлежу пока, ни к одной из наших "партий" Рад этому, ибо - это свобода А человеку очень нужна свобода, и в свободе думать по-своему он нуждается более, чем в свободе передвижения [267]

Significant here is the work poka , which suggests that Gorky was seriously contemplating the question of joining a political party, but had as yet to discover which was closest to his own views Despite his considerable experience of practical revolutionary work, Gorky was largely ignorant in questions of political theory and programme formulation Veresayev, who first met the writer at this time, and who had already become a convert to Marxism, stresses his political naivety "был он в то время образован очень поверхностно, в теоретических разговорах был слабоват" [268] The truth of this judgement is attested by Gorky's statement of the political purpose of Zhizn' Writing on this subject to Chekhov in January, 1899, he claimed ""Жизнь" имеет тенденцию слить народничество и марксизм в одно гармоническое целое" [269] These words, which would have been condemned as the utmost heresy by Populists and Marxists alike, reflect Gorky's intermediate position between the two movements

Gorky's attitude to the Marxists had at first been hostile In 1897, he had refused to publish his works in the journal Novoye slovo when he learnt that it had passed from Populist to Marxist control Referring to this event in his memoirs, Posse comments "Горький тогда не сочувствовал марксизму, который, по его мнению, принижал человеческую личность" [270] That his opinion had not altered radically by 1900 is testified by his depiction of the figure of Kropotov, in Muzhik, who is an unmistakable caricature of the contemporary Marxist By the following year, however, a considerable shift had occurred in Gorky's political development, which is again noted by Posse

> У Горького в Петербурге завязались связи с революционными кружками Определенной программы Горький в то время не придерживался Отрицательное отношение к марксизму у него прошло, - но правоверным марксистом он, во всяком случае, не был 271

Gorky's growing sympathy for the Marxist cause was accompanied by an increasingly critical attitude towards the Populists In 1900, he informed Chekhov of his unwillingness to contribute to a miscellany dedicated to the Populist Mikhaylovsky[272] and, in the following year, after the closure of Zhizn', he repeatedly refused lucrative offers to become a regular contributor to the Populist monthly, Russkoye Bogatstvo [273]

The early months of 1901 witnessed a sudden increase in Gorky's revolutionary activity On 11 January, the Russian government announced its decision to conscript 183 students for their part in a demonstration in Kiev The decision provoked a storm of protest amongst the radicals, who interpreted it as a deliberate challenge to the strength of the revolutionary movement The view of the R S D L P was presented in Lenin's angry article Otdacha v soldaty 183-kh studentov, which appeared in the second number of the newly formed Iskra Gorky followed developments with great interest On 12 January, he wrote to his wife in Moscow for news of the reaction to the government's announcement [274] In the middle of February, he took part in a demonstration on Nevskiy Prospekt and, on 4 March, he was also present at the famous Kazan' cathedral demonstration,[275] after which he wrote a protest against the brutality of the police, who had beaten the demonstrators with whips [276] A few days later, he composed another protest, in which he corrected the distorted official account of the affair which had appeared in the press [277] At the same time, Gorky was enlisted by the R S D L P to acquire a mimeograph machine, his first assignment for the party, which he fulfilled on 8 March [278]

Gorky's activities had not escaped the attention of the secret police, who were already making preparations to have him arrested It was presumably for this reason that Gorky decided to leave the capital on 8 March, returning, via Moscow, to Nizhniy Novgorod [279] Once in Nizhniy, Gorky found himself again at the centre of revolutionary events, writing proclamations, addressing demonstrations and participating in secret student organizations On 14 April, the local police filed the following report

> Революционная жизнь в Нижнем, с приездом Горького, совершенно затихшая после выставки, ныне опять бьет ключом, и все, что есть только революционного в Нижнем, дышит и живет только Горьким [280]

The inevitable arrest followed two days later, anticipating the fate of Gorky's colleagues on the editorial board of Zhizn', who had allowed the magazine's offices to be used as a headquarters by revolutionary groups during the recent disturbances Gorky's arrest was greeted by new protests Leaflets demanding the writer's release began to circulate in Nizhniy Novgorod On 6 May, Tolstoy added his voice to the campaign, writing letters to Minister of the Interior Svyatopolk-Mirsky and Prince Ol'denburgsky [281] As a result of this pressure, Gorky was transferred from prison to house arrest on 17 May [282] The eventual outcome of the affair was that Gorky was sentenced to exile from Nizhniy Due to health reasons, he was allowed to spend his exile in the Crimea, where he arrived in the middle of November [283]

This dramatic upsurge in Gorky's political activity, together with his growing allegiance to the R S D L P , had a considerable impact upon his views as a writer and editor on the role of contemporary literature With the closure of Zhizn', he began to seek a new outlet for his editorial ambitions The most obvious choice was the Znaniye firm, which had undertaken the publication of his collected works and of which he became a shareholder on 4 September, 1900 [284] The firm had been founded, in May, 1898 by K P Pyatnitsky, the publisher O N Popova and other members of her staff [285] The original aim of Znaniye had been to continue the tradition of the 'Committee of Literacy', which had been closed down by government order in 1895 [286] In the first two years of its existence the firm published a wide range of inexpensive but finely produced books by Russian and foreign writers on such subjects as astronomy, archaeology, history and geography The idea of publishing literary works presumably belonged to Pyatnitsky, for it was he who had extended the offer of publication to Gorky in December, 1899 [287] The enormous success of the venture encouraged the firm to consider publishing the works of other authors

Even before he became a shareholder, Gorky attempted to influence the policy of Znaniye in this direction His plan for a 'Cheap Library' of 'democratic' literature was supported by Pyatnitsky and put into operation with the publication of some of his own works [288]

There was, however, considerable opposition to such plans from other members of the board of Znaniye Gorky expressed his frustration in a letter to Pyatnitsky of January, 1901

> Подумываю о выходе из "Знания" Почему? А потому, что мне хочется затеять свое издательское дело Я хотел бы издавать книги Андреева, Чирикова, Скитальца и других ценных, с моей точки зрения, писателей, совершенно самостоятельно, а теперь в "Знании" это неудобно и стесняет меня 289

After the closure of Zhizn', Gorky began to increase the pressure on the other shareholders to accede to his wishes The confrontation resulted in victory for Gorky The shareholders gradually withdrew from the firm, leaving Gorky and Pyatnitsky in full control by 1902 [290] With Pyatnitsky charged with running the business side of affairs, Gorky had achieved his objective, he now had his 'own' publishing firm in which he alone was responsible for editorial decisions

Once in control, Gorky set about the task of attracting writers to the firm Amongst these were Bunin and Kuprin, to whom he explained the general purpose of the venture in 1902

> Настоящих хороших книг для широких демократических кругов читателей не хватает Надо, чтобы узнал и полюбил вас - всех вас, молодых талантливых писателей - новый громадный слой демократических читателей 291

The majority of writers approached found the proposition of publishing their works with Znaniye highly attractive, particularly as the firm was offering generous financial terms Gorky's main dilemma as editor centred on the problem of reconciling the demands of literary merit with those of his overall political aim A typical case was that of Bunin's lyrical story Antonovskiye yabloki, of which Gorky wrote to Pyatnitsky towards the end of 1901

> Я все думаю - следует ли "Знанию" ставить свою марку на произведения индиферентных людей? Хорошо пахнут "Антоновские яблоки" - да' но - они пахнут отнюдь не демократично, - не правда ли? 292

Bunin's story was published by Znaniye, but Gorky's doubts obviously remained By this time, he was already prepared to publish works of low artistic standard, provided their content was sufficiently 'democratic' This is clear from his remark on Skitalets' undistinguished poetry "Стих - груб, но настроение - ценное" [293]

Gorky's increasingly 'political' appreciation of literature was reflected in the nature of the advice he now offered to his protégés In his first letter to Andreyev, he had warned of the danger of heeding advice from any quarter, insisting that Andreyev rely on his own artistic integrity

> Пишите, однако, как вам кажется лучше, как вы хотите писать, не взирая ни на какие похвалы и порицания Запомните, пожалуйста, вот что самым строгим и беспощадным судьей своих работ должны быть - вы сами. 294

By April, 1901, however, he was already giving precise directions on the purpose of literature "Пишите, голубчик, что-нибудь в духе "В темную даль"", he wrote to Andreyev, "Пишите, ибо такие рассказы теперь нужны как хлеб, как воздух, как вино и женщина" [295] This request, which was repeated later in the year,[296] reveals Gorky's desire to interest his friend in social themes His hope was expressed fully in a letter to Chirikov of December, 1901, where he wrote of Andreyev

> Вот, брат, талант! Большущий талант, - увидишь! Даже теперь, когда его начинка - одно голое настроение, он уже звучит колоколом, а как его прихватит огоньком общественности, - он покажет публике коку с соком! 297

As in the case of Bunin, Gorky felt that talent alone was not enough to ensure that Andreyev realize his full potential as a literator (to use Gorky's own terminology)

Gorky's attempts to influence Andreyev's development as a writer could not have come at a worse time for his protégé The publication, in 1901, of his first volume of stories had brought Andreyev not only fame but also unexpected complications of a personal nature, to which he referred in a letter to Sredin, dated 3 November

> Мои дела идут довольно хорошо Книжка моя обратила на себя внимание и очень часто приходится прочитывать фразу "ждем от него, Леонида А-ва, много хорошего" Ох, пугает меня это самое "ждем"! Много возлагает оно обязанностей 298

Andreyev's major fear was that this sudden awareness of his 'responsibilities' would result in the sacrifice of his integrity as a writer, as he explained to Gorky the following month

> Меня приласкали, погладили по головке и, скажу правду, на некоторое время купили

> мою свободу Я садился за бумагу и чувствовал, что я уже не тот, что я не о правде своих слов думаю, а о том, понравится ли написанное тому-то и тому-то 299

Although these words may be seen, at least in part, as a reaction against Gorky's efforts to impose his own views upon Andreyev, it should not be assumed that Andreyev was alien to the concept of 'democratic literature' In effect, he was merely defending his right to interpret this concept in his own way

Andreyev had first come into contact with the revolutionary movement during his days as a student at the University of St Petersburg Before entering the University, he had, in his own words, 'cherished the dream of the broad public life' which he would lead in the capital [300] However, as Brusyanin notes, Andreyev's links with the student Marxist groups had the character of 'chance encounters' [301] At this time it was affairs of a personal nature, notably his disastrous relationship with Zinaida Sibileva, which dominated his attention Nevertheless, there is evidence that Andreyev had devoted considerable thought to the question of his political allegiances On 15 January, 1892 he had written to Zinaida from Oryol

> Вообще у меня дела с Орлом плохи Никак в тон попасть не могу Дураки считают меня за "сицилиста" и презирают Сицилисты считают за дурака и тоже презирают Должно быть оттого, что я не дурак, и не "сицилист", а просто Л.Н Андреев, т е всего понемножку 302

Andreyev's diary for 11 April contains a more serious and revealing account of his independent standpoint

> Меня считают индифферентистом Не знаю, верно ли это название, можно ли им охарактеризовать мое отношение к явлениям общественной жизни. Индифферентист - значит человек, безразлично относящийся к известной группе явлений Но я отношусь не безразлично Для меня не все равно, быть ли свободным или слышать на каждом шагу звон цепей оковывающих не только тело, но и душу Мне далеко не безразлично, изучать ли то русское право и полит(ическую) эк(ономию) приноровленные по мере возможности не к разрушению основ, а к поддержанию оных, или же изучать действительную науку, чуждую, в своей чистоте, всякой партийности 303

This statement provides support for the characterization of Andreyev

as a 'revolutionary fellow-traveller'[304] and also offers an insight into his motive for choosing the Faculty of Law at St Petersburg University It is no coincidence that many Russian revolutionaries, including Lenin himself, had also chosen to study law as their university career Although a member of no political party, Andreyev was considered politically untrustworthy by the authorities[305] His apartment was searched by the police in January, 1902, an event which provoked an immediate reaction from Gorky "И это хорошо, друг мой, ибо русский писатель не должен жить в дружбе с русским правительством"[306] However, the incident failed to bring about any fundamental change in Andreyev's political activity

Despite the obvious differences both in the degree and in the nature of their political allegiances, both writers were united, as we have seen, by a sense of a common literary purpose Nevertheless, their collaboration in Znaniye and elsewhere should not blind us to the fact that, even at this time, their views on the fundamental question of literature and politics were quite different This is nowhere more apparent than in their attitude to the Sreda group, to which Gorky had introduced Andreyev towards the end of 1900[307]

Sreda, so called because its members were in the habit of gathering on Wednesday evenings, had a long history It had its origins in the Parnas group, which had been founded in 1883 by the brothers N and S Teleshov, S Maklakov and a few others[308] From a narrow, 'family' circle the group had gradually expanded to include the Bunin brothers, Ivan and Yuliy and, by the turn of the century, it had become one of the most important literary societies in Russia The members of Sreda covered a wide spectrum, in terms of both social background and literary talent, but they shared a common belief in the superiority of realism over modernism as an artistic method Like its predecessor, Sreda had been intended by its founders as a purely literary society However, by the early 1900s there was already an apparent division over the question of the group's political standpoint In his unpublished memoirs, Yuliy Bunin recalls

> В это время некоторые члены "Среды" настаивали на том, чтобы внимание кружка сосредоточивалось не столько на вопросах литературы и искусства, сколько на вопросах политических Требование это не нашло, однако, отклика у большинства членов "Среды", которые, выражая сочувствие начавшемуся

> в обществе политическому брожению, полагали, что члены кружка не имеют общего политического кредо и что они могут находить полное удовлетворение своим политическим интересам и запросам в других кружках и организациях соответственно своим взглядам на текущий момент и своему социально-политическому миросозерцанию 309

Amongst those who wanted to introduce political discussions into the meetings of Sreda were Timkovsky and Veresayev [310] In his memoirs, the latter recounts his success in blocking Goloushev's candidacy for membership in the group on purely political grounds, much to the indignation of Ivan Bunin and Serafimovich [311]

Sreda was of great personal importance to Andreyev at this time The nature of his interest in the group is summed up in Teleshov's general comment "Все мы тогда были молоды, и дружеская поддержка была всем нам нужна и полезна "[312] At a time when he was experiencing profound doubts with regard to his powers as a writer, Sreda became Andreyev's artistic conscience He considered it his duty to read every new work to the group, who would then pass judgement on it "Без этого", he wrote to Teleshov, "никакую свою вещь не могу считать законченной" [313] Gorky's interest in Sreda was of a totally different order Although he too read some of his new works to the group, whose meetings he attended whenever he was in Moscow, Sreda was of importance to him primarily as a centre of 'democratic' literature "Чем ближе будем друг к другу, тем труднее нас обидеть", he told Teleshov [314] When he was planning the first Znaniye miscellany in 1903, it was to the members of Sreda that he turned automatically for contributions However, like Veresayev and Timkovsky, Gorky could not accept the 'Parnassian' principle upon which the group was founded For him, literature was inseparably linked with questions of a social and political nature, as he had told Chekhov some years earlier

> Как это хорошо, что вы умеете считать литературу первым и самым главным делом жизни Я же, чувствуя, что это хорошо, не способен, должно быть, жить, как вы - слишком много у меня иных симпатий и антипатий 315

It is interesting to note that, in Gorky's vocabulary, 'Parnassian' was a term of disapproval In his article Pol' Verlen i dekadenty, he had referred to the Parnassian movement as a 'cold school', whose

'soulless objectivism' 'accepted nothing above itself'[316] Accordingly, Gorky strove continually to raise the political consciousness of the Sreda members In 1901, he demanded some form of protest from the group against the so-called 'special rules' introduced by the government to deal with the student problem[317] In October, 1904, he convinced Andreyev of the need to take the Social-Democrats Bogdanov and Ladyzhnikov to a meeting of the group[318]

Under the circumstances, it is difficult to imagine how Sreda could have failed to become more overtly revolutionary as the events of 1905 grew nearer The group's enterprises, which had previously been philanthropic in character, like the literary evening organized by Andreyev in December, 1902, for the benefit of the Society for the Aid of Women Students,[319] now took on a more militantly oppositional purpose In autumn, 1904, Sreda issued a protest against the government's inhuman methods of dealing with student demonstrations and, in another protest, written at the end of the year, the group concluded that 'the existing regime can no longer be tolerated'[320] The outbreak of revolution early in 1905 caused the members of Sreda once again to discuss the question of the group's raison d'être As before, opinion was divided One of the group's members gave an account of the ensuing argument in his diary "Одни признавали интимность "Среды" желательной, занятия вопросами литературы и искусства интересными Другие находили все это скучным и недостаточным".[321] In the months which followed, it was the latter group which dominated the proceedings In February, 1905, Andreyev wrote to Veresayev "Литература в загоне - на "Среде" вместо рассказов читают "протесты", заявления и т п "[322] The group supported the revolutionary movement not only in words but also in their actions The proceeds from the literary miscellanies published by Sreda were donated to the strike fund of the Moscow Post Office and Telegraph workers[323]

Gorky and Andreyev did not come into conflict over Sreda but their differing attitudes to the group reveal that the arguments over the question of literature and politics, which were soon to destroy their relationship, were already present in embryo However, Andreyev remained faithful to his promise to 'serve honourably' under Gorky's 'banner'[324] He identified Gorky with the positive philosophy towards which he was developing, as he informed him in a letter of

September, 1903

> Я не могу представить чтобы в жизни мы пошли разными путями Если же это совершится, то для меня в известном смысле это конец - в смысле полного крушения того миросозерцания, к которому я начал приходить 325

But if Andreyev was convinced of his proximity to Gorky, he was also aware of the differences which threatened to destroy their relationship In the coming years, much to Andreyev's chagrin, circumstances were to conspire to bring the differences between the two writers to the forefront of their relationship, eventually destroying their friendship

CHAPTER ONE NOTES

1 ЛА, стр 72
2 Г-30, т 28, стр 22
3 ПССГ, т 16, стр 313
4 ЛН.72, стр 63
5 ibid.
6 ibid., p.64 It was presumably in reply to this letter that Gorky received the humorous reply to which he refers in his memoirs.
7 МИ.3, стр 21
8 Г-30, т.28, стр.42
9 С Смирнов, М Горький и журналистика конца XIX-начала XX вв , (Л , 1959), стр.65
10 ibid., p.67.
11 ГЧ 1958-1959, стр 11
12 For a detailed account of Gorky's activities as literary editor of Zhizn', see И Бутская, "Беллетристика и критика журнала "Жизнь" в период сотрудничества в нем А М Горького (1899-1901)", (Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Киев, 1953)
13 ЛН 72, стр 64.
14 Andreyev's first story, V kholode i zolote, was published on 19 April, 1892 Л.Иезуитова, "Первый рассказ Леонида Андреева", Русская литература, № 2 (1963), стр 184-185
15 see Горький и Короленко
16 И.Бунин, Воспоминания, (Париж, 1950), стр.123
17 М Куприна-Иорданская, Годы молодости, (М 1960), стр.230-232.
18 ЛН 72, стр 180
19 ЛА, стр.51,76
20 ЛН.72, стр.89
21 Е.Янтарев, "О Леониде Андрееве", Литературно-художественный альманах "Утро", кн.1, (Л , 1927), стр 242
22 ЛН.72, стр 124
23 К Селиванов, Русские писатели в Самаре и Самарской губернии, (Куйбышев, 1953), стр.58 Цит в ЛЖТ.1, стр.291
24 ЛН.72, стр.147
25 ibid., p.177.
26 В Муромцева-Бунина, "Италия", Дон, № 3 (1968), стр 167
27 ЛН.72, стр.72.
28 ibid., p.148.
29 АГ 4, стр 118-119
30 ibid., p.121.
31 see Gorky's letter to Pyatnitsky of 7-8 October, 1903, ibid., p.138.
32 ЛН 72, стр.173
33 ЛН.84, кн 2, стр 188
34 "Письма Л Н Андреева к А А Измайлову", Русская литература, № 3 (1962), стр 196
35 ЛН.72, стр 490
36 Л.Андреев, "Из моей жизни", Журнал для всех, № 1 (1903), стр 4
37 ЛН.72, стр 494
38 ibid., p.502.
39 А Измайлов, Литературный Олимп, (М., 1911), стр 249
40 Ф Фидлер, Первые литературные шаги, (М , 1911), стр 27-32.
41 С Венгеров (ред), Русская литература XX века 1892-1910, т 2, часть 2, (М 1915), стр 245

42 Л Клейнборт, "Встречи Леонид Андреев", Былое, № 4 (1924), стр 174
43 Woodward, Andreyev, p.40
44 ibid., pp.18-23, Kaun, Andreyev, pp.57-65.
45 On the extent of Gorky's influence on the editorial policy of Zhurnal dlya vsekh, see Смирнов, Горький и журналистика, стр 57-62
46 Woodward, Andreyev, pp.21-23
47 ЛН 72, стр.529.
48 see, for example: С.Скиталец, "Максим Горький (Встречи)", ВС, стр.163-164, А Серафимович, "Воспоминания о Горьком", ibid., p.66.
49 В.Львов-Рогачевский, Две правды Книга о Леониде Андрееве, (СПб , 1914), стр 36.
50 Афонин, Андреев, стр 78-94
51 В Гиляровский, "Москва газетная", в его кн Избранное, т 2, (М , 1960), стр.190
52 Л Андреев, "Цензура", Русская воля, 15 марта, 1917, цит в ЛН.72, стр 471
53 Н Фатов, Молодые годы Леонида Андреева (По неизданным письмам, воспоминаниям и документам), (М., 1924), стр 307-308
54 Цит в ЛН.72, стр.471 Note also the reference to Gorky's Byvshiye lyudi in the article Aktyor ПССА, т.6, стр 316
55 ПССА, т 6, стр.171,316
56 ibid., p.175.
57 ibid., p.284.
58 The affair is described in Н Телешов, Избранные сочинения в 3-х томах, т 3, (М , 1956), стр 97-99
59 ЛН 72, стр 471 For an account of Andreyev's meeting with Gorky during the latter's journey to exile, see Телешов, т 3, стр 105-107
60 Афонин, Андреев, стр 82
61 ПССА, т 6, стр.179
62 ПССГ, т 1, стр.46
63 ПССА, т 6, стр 190
64 see section 3 (d), below.
65 ПССГ, т.1, стр 425,426
66 ПССГ, т.4, стр.115-116
67 ibid., p.119.
68 ibid., p.124.
69 ЛЖТ.1, стр.246
70 ЛН 72, стр 78
71 ibid., p.72
72 ПССА, т.2, стр.102.
73 ПССГ, т.4, стр.121
74 see Gorky's article Pol' Verlen i dekadenty (Г-30, т.23, стр.126) and Andreyev's O pisatele (ПССА, т 6, стр.283)
75 ПССА, т 6, стр 204.
76 ПССГ, т.4, стр.168
77 ПССА, т 6, стр 282.
78 Г-30, т 23, стр 183
79 ПССГ, т 2, стр.322
80 ЛЖТ.1, стр 257.
81 Г-30, т 23, стр.306,312
82 Together with two other early articles by Andreyev, it has been republished in Дон, № 12 (1971), стр 182-184
83 ibid., p.183.

84 Gorky had formulated the concept of 'Romantic Realism' in Chitatel', where the devil had challenged the writer "можешь ли ты создать . . . хотя бы маленький возвышающий душу обман?" (ПССГ, т 4, стр.121)
85 ЛН.72, стр 121.
86 ПССА, т 6, стр 278
87 ibid., p.280.
88 ПРА, т 1, стр.677
89 Леонид Андреев, Метеор, Рассказ, Авторизованная рукопись, (Материалы редакции журнала "Русское богатство") Рукописный отдел Государственной публичной библиотеки им Салтыкова-Щедрина, Ф 211, Горнфельд, № 1325 Beneath the story's heading, Andreyev added by hand Chast' 1 The typescript also carries the notes chital s udovol'stviyem and prinyato in a hand which is presumably that of Gornfel'd
90 В.Беззубов, "А Чехов и Леонид Андреев", Ученые записки Тартуского университета, (Труды по русской и славянской филологии, вып.139) (1963), стр 181-222
91 В.Беззубов, "Лев Толстой и Леонид Андреев", Ученые записки Тартуского университета, (Труды по русской и славянской филологии, вып.104) (1961), стр.130-172
92 Л.Иезуитова, "Леонид Андреев и Вс.Гаршин", Вестник Ленинградского университета, № 8 (1964), стр 97-109
93 Львов-Рогачевский, Две правды, стр 38
94 С.Касторский, Статьи о Горьком, изд 2-ое (Л , 1955), стр 262
95 Л Андреев, Повести и рассказы, (М , 1957), стр XIV.
96 Б Михайловский, Избранные статьи о литературе и искусстве, (М , 1969), стр.355
97 Беззубов,"Андреев и Горький", стр 98-99
98 The term was coined by Zinaida Gippius See her article "Горький и "горькиада"", Новый путь, № 1 (1904)
99 Михайловский, Избранные статьи, стр 353-388
100 The story first appeared in Samarskaya gazeta in 1895 and was not reprinted in the earlier collections of Gorky's stories.
101 Львов-Рогачевский, Леонид Андреев, стр 9
102 Беззубов,"Андреев и Горький", стр 96
103 ЛН.72, стр 66
104 see Gorky's letter to Teleshov Г-30, т 28, стр 304
105 ПССА, т 1, стр 108
106 ЛН 72, стр 82
107 ibid., p.83.
108 Chirikov's story appeared in the second Znaniye miscellany
109 ЛН 72, стр 108
110 Kaun, Andreyev, p 104
111 Woodward, Andreyev, p 39.
112 ЛН.72, стр.114
113 ibid., p.118.
114 ibid., p.114.
115 ПССА, т.1, стр.146
116 Andreyev's reply to this letter is published in А Женевский, "Леонид Андреев и его "Стена"", Звезда, № 2 (1925), стр.257-258
117 Andreyev's article appeared in Kur'er on 21 September, 1901. Dr.Woodward wrongly dates the article 1902. Woodward, Andreyev, p.31.
118 ПССА, т 6, стр.336 My italics

119 Женевский, стр 218
120 А Ачатова, "Значение образа-символа в ранних рассказах Леонида Андреева", Ученые записки Томского университета, № 62 (1966), стр.215
121 Woodward, Andreyev, p 65.
122 Consider the following passage (my italics) "И на миг все лица обернулись к ним, и широкий, раскатистый хохот потряс здоровые тела".(ПССА, т.1, стр.142)
123 Иезуитова, "Андреев и Гаршин", В Чуваков, "О творестве Леонида Андреева", ПРА, т.1, стр 13
124 H.H.King, Dostoevsky and Andreyev. Gazers on the Abyss, (New York, 1936), p.31, R.L.Jackson, Dostoevsky's 'Underground Man' in Russian Literature, (The Hague, 1958), p 180 , see also Р.Иванов-Разумник, О смысле жизни, (СПб , 1908), стр 118-119
125 ПССГ, т 2, стр 47
126 Gorky's novel was completed some time before Stena, in January or February, 1901. It was serialized in Zhizn', where it appeared between November, 1900 and April, 1901. However, the ending of the novel was not published in this magazine, due to its closure. The novel was first published in full on 15 December, 1901. The possibility cannot be excluded that Gorky informed Andreyev privately of the novel's ending before this date and that this provided the stimulus for the wall symbol in Stena.
127 ЛН 72, стр 121
128 ibid., p 114.
129 Женевский, стр.258
130 ЛН.72, стр.118
131 Г-30, т.28, стр.267
132 А.Кауфман, "Л Н Андреев (К первой годовщине его смерти)", Вестник литературы, № 9 (1920), стр 3
133 Л.Андреев, "Бунт на корабле", Русская литература, № 3 (1971), стр 128-137
134 ibid., p.131.
135 С Маршак, "Три встречи", ВС, стр.411 .
136 Н Михайловский, "О г. Максиме Горьком и его героях", Русское богатство, № 9 (1898), его же, "Еще о г Максиме Горьком и его героях", Русское богатство, № 10 (1898)
137 Михайловский, "О г Максиме Горьком", стр.73
138 Михайловский, "Еще о г Максиме Горьком", стр 89.
139 М.Гельрот, Элементы ницшеанства в творчестве Горького, (М , 1903)
140 М Неведомский, "Максим Горький", в кн История русской литературы XIX в , (ред.Д.Н.Овсянико-Куликовский) (М., 1910), т 5, стр 230-259
141 Р Иванов-Разумник, История русской общественной мысли Индивидуализм и мещанство в русской литературе и жизни XIX в , т 2, (СПб , 1907), стр.395.
142 В Фриче, Леонид Андреев, Опыт характеристики, (М , 1909), стр.19
143 Н Урусов, Бессильные люди в изображении Леонида Андреева (критический очерк) (СПб , 1903)
144 А Волжский, "О мотивах страха смерти и страха жизни Леонид Андреев", в его кн Из мира литературных исканий, (СПб , 1906), стр 190-227
145 Kaun, Andreyev, pp.191,192.

146 В Львов-Рогачевский, Новейшая русская литература, (М , 1923), стр 180
147 ПССГ, т 1, стр 13
148 ibid., p.25.
149 ibid., p.26.
150 ibid., pp.81-82.
151 Г-30, т.23, стр 65,66
152 ibid., p.181 The same view had been expressed in Ob odnom poete, where the poet says "Я хочу обновить жизнь Я хочу указать зависимость всех от каждого и родство всех со всеми" (ПССГ, т 1, стр 424)
153 ПССГ, т.2, стр 344.
154 ibid., p.541.
155 ibid., p.542
156 ПССА, т 6, стр 276
157 Курьер, 27 января, 1902, стр 2
158 ПССА, т.6, стр.245.
159 ПССА, т 8, стр 41
160 ibid.
161 С.Семенов, Воспоминания о Льве Николаевиче Толстом, (СПб , 1912), стр 131-132, cited in ЛН 72, стр 421.
163 ЛН.72, стр.96
164 ПССГ, т 2, стр.260.
165 ПССГ, т 16, стр.325,326
166 История русской литературы, т.10, стр.611-612
167 Афонин, Андреев, стр.120.
168 Беззубов, "Андреев и Горький", стр 126-127 The most recent history of Russian literature endorses Bezzubov's view. (Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX вв 1901-1907, стр 131)
169 ЛН.72, стр.133
170 ibid., p.137.
171 Курьер, 27 января, 1902, стр 2
172 ПССА, т 7, стр.156
173 С Толстая, "Письмо в редакцию", Новое время, 7 февраля, 1903
174 Мария Федоровна Андреева Переписка Воспоминания Статьи Документы Воспоминания о М Ф Андрееве, 3-е изд , (М , 1968), стр 47
175 ЛН 72, стр 174
176 ПССГ, т.3, стр 64
177 ibid., p.110.
178 ПССГ, т 1, стр 478
179 ibid., p 424.
180 ibid., p.222
181 ПССГ, т 5, стр 381
182 ПССГ, т.2, стр 192
183 ПССА, т 2, стр.103.
184 ЛН.72, стр 146
185 ПССГ, т.2, стр.260.
186 ibid., p.495.
187 ПССА, т.2, стр 132.
188 ЛН.72, стр 150
189 Josephine Newcombe, Leonid Andreyev, (Letchworth, 1972), p.56. This conventional view now fails to command support in the Soviet Union. See Русская литература конца XIX-XX вв. 1901-1907, стр 132
190 Н Серебров (Тихонов), Время и люди Воспоминания, (М., 1955), стр.152-153
191 ПССГ, т.3, стр 458-459
192 ПССГ, т 6, стр 36

193 ibid., p.42
194 А.Гольденвейзер, Вблизи Толстого, т 1, (М , 1922), стр.129 Cited in ПССГ, т.6, стр.465
195 Н.Пиксанов, "Идейная история поэмы М Горького "Человек"", Вопросы русской литературы (Львов), вып 2, (1966), стр 5-18
196 ПССГ, т.6, стр 41
197 Г-30, т 24, стр 44-60
198 ПССГ, т.6, стр 464.
199 ЛН.72, стр 208
200 ibid., p.185
201 ПССГ, т.6, стр.38
202 Г-30, т 23, стр 169 (My italics)
203 ibid., p.66.
204 ibid., p.163.
205 ПССГ, т.1, стр.46
206 ibid., p.52.
207 ibid., p.53.
208 Г-30, т 23, стр.326
209 ibid., p.116.
210 Б Бялик, Судьба Максима Горького, (М , 1968), стр.121-122
211 ПССГ, т 5, стр 7
212 ibid.
213 ibid., p.11
214 ibid., p 10
215 ПССГ, т 5, стр 11,12
216 ibid., p.18
217 П.Андреев, "Воспоминания о Л Андрееве", Литературная мысль, кн 3, (Л 1925), стр 149
218 В.Брусянин, Леонид Андреев Жизнь и творчество, (М , 1912), стр.53
219 П.Андреев, стр 161
220 И Белоусов, Литературная среда Воспоминания 1880-1928, (М , 1928), стр.158-159
221 П Андреев, стр 158
222 ПССА, т.6, стр.334
223 ibid., p.335.
224 ПССА, т.1, стр 4.
225 ibid., p 11.
226 ibid., p.21.
227 ПССА, т 4, стр 157
228 Woodward, Andreyev, p.52.
229 ПССА, т 1, стр 66.
230 ibid.
231 ibid., p.78.
232 ibid., p.83
233 ibid., pp.83,67.
234 ibid., pp.72-73,79.
235 ibid., p.69.
236 ЛН 72, стр 129
237 ibid., p.131.
238 Л Неманов, "Разговор на пароходе с М Горьким", Петербургская газета, 15 июня, 1903, стр 4
239 ЛА, стр 55
240 For Gorky's account, see ПССГ, т 16, стр.319-320
241 On this subject, see Nicholas Moravcevich, 'Gorky and the Western Naturalists Anatomy of a Misalliance', Comparative Literature, vol 21 (1969), pp.63-75

242 ПССГ, т.7, стр.132
243 ibid., p.155.
244 ibid., p.146
245 ibid., p 173.
246 ibid., p.140
247 ibid., p.173
248 ibid., p.177
249 see Gorky's letter to Pyatnitsky Г-30, т 28, стр 279
250 Kaun, Andreyev, p.204.
251 Woodward, Andreyev, p.89.
252 ПССА, т.3, стр.20.
253 ibid., p.24.
254 ibid., p.20.
255 ibid., pp.24-25.
256 ibid , p.25.
257 ibid., p.37.
258 ibid., p.50.
259 ibid., p.60.
260 ibid., p.85.
261 Woodward, Andreyev, p.97.
262 ПССА, т.3, стр.84
263 ibid., pp.44-45.
264 Ф Достоевский, Собрание сочинений в 10-и томах, т 9, (М., 1958), стр 319
265 ЛЖТ.1, стр.68
266 ibid., p.210
267 Г-30, т 28, стр 101-102
268 Литературная Россия, 13 января, 1967, стр 8
269 Г-30, т 28, стр 56
270 В Поссе, Мой жизненный путь, (М -Л , 1929), стр 126
271 ibid , p 242
272 Горький и Чехов, стр 60
273 Смирнов, Горький и журналистика, стр 78-79
274 АГ 5, стр 74
275 ЛЖТ.1, стр 300,304
276 Published in МИ 2, стр 221-222
277 Рев путь Г, стр 44-45
278 ЛЖТ 1, стр.304
279 ibid , pp 304-306
280 Смирнов, Горький и журналистика, стр 76-77
281 М Горький в Нижнем Новгороде, (Нижний Новгород, 1928), стр 197-198
282 ЛЖТ 1, стр.322
283 ibid., p.350
284 Д Голубева, "Из истории издания русских альманахов начала XX века", Книга Исследования и материалы, сб 3, (М , 1960), стр 303
285 С Люблинский, "К истории возникновения товарищества "Знание"", Русская литература, № 2 (1972), стр 188
286 Ю Олейников, "М Горький и "Знание"", стр 126
287 В.Голубев, "М Горький и "Знание"", стр 222
288 ibid., pp.222-223.
289 АГ 4, стр 18-19
290 В Голубев, "М Горький и "Знание"", стр 223
291 Куприна-Иорданская, Годы молодости, стр 122
292 АГ 4, стр 53
293 АГ 7, стр 21
294 ЛН.72, стр 66

295 ibid., p.88.
296 ibid., p.113.
297 ibid., p.411
298 Дон, № 3 (1962), стр 188
299 ЛН.72, стр.118.
300 П.Андреев, стр.162
301 Брусянин, стр 46
302 Институт русской литературы (Пушкинский дом) (ИРЛИ), ф.9, оп 2, ед хр 26, лл 187-187 об
303 ИРЛИ, ф.9, оп 1, ед хр 16, л 9 об
304 see above, p 23
305 see Trepov's telegram to the Governoer-General of Kiev ЛН 72, стр.205
306 ibid., p.142
307 Телешов, т 3, стр 119
308 И Владыкин, "Новое о московском литературном литературном кружке "Парнас"", Научные доклады высшеи школы Филологические науки, № 3 (1963), стр 202
309 cited in М Шемелова, "Кружок писателей-реалистов "Среда" (1899-1909)", Вестник Ленинградского университета, № 20 (1962), стр 89
310 Белоусов, стр 118
311 В Вересаев, Собрание сочинений в 5-и томах, т 5 (М , 1961), стр 452-454
312 Телешов, т 3, стр 42.
313 ibid., p 43
314 ibid , p 97
315 Горький и Чехов, стр 36
316 Г-30, т.23, стр 124
317 Олейников, стр 135
318 ЛН.72, стр 229
319 Телешов, т 3, стр 50-52
320 Шемелова, "Кружок писателей-реалистов", стр 92
321 ibid.
322 Вересаев, т.5, стр 406
323 Шемелова, "Кружок писателей-реалистов", стр 96
324 ЛН 72, стр.173
325 ibid., p.180

CHAPTER TWO

CHAPTER TWO

MAKSIM GORKY AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1905

The marked increase in Gorky's commitment to political and editorial work in the years prior to the 1905 Revolution had a profound effect upon his activity as a writer Most notable was the rapid decline in his literary output following the completion of Na dne, which, significantly, had been written during the period of Gorky's enforced absence from the centre of political life However, the pressure of outside commitments, whilst providing Gorky with a convenient excuse for failing to respond to the requests of those like Bryusov, who had invited him to contribute to the Severnye tsvety almanacs,[1] does not fully explain the decrease in his literary productivity Indeed, only a few years later, on Capri, Gorky proved capable of combining intense political and editorial work with a prodigious output of literary works The decline in his productivity as a writer in the years before 1905 must be seen, therefore, not simply as the result of overburdenment with organizational work but as the symptom of a period of transition, during which Gorky was seeking to clarify his purpose as a writer

There is evidence to suggest that Gorky's major difficulty during the period in question was in reconciling his work as a writer with his endeavours as a political activist In particular, he felt that his extra-literary affairs were having a detrimental effect upon the quality of his writing He intimated as much in a letter to Andreyev of September, 1901 "Вот я - я стал умнее, и с той поры мой талант тупеет" [2] His evaluation of his own works, which had always been far from favourable, became increasingly negative [3] Typical are his remarks on O pisatele, kotoryy zaznalsya in a letter to Bryusov "Думаю, что моя реляция о писателе, к(ото)рый зазнался, не понравится вам, она плохо написана - раз, и написана на социальный мотив - два" [4] Yet despite the apologetic tone of this letter, which reveals Gorky's dissatisfaction with his attempts to endow his literary works with a clear social message, he could not support the position of the non-committed writer A few months later, in February, 1901, he wrote again to Bryusov about Bunin "не понимаю - как талант свой, красивый, как матовое серебро, он не отточит в нож и не ткнет им куда надо?"[5] It was at this time,

when he was attempting to reconcile the dictates of art and politics, that Gorky wrote his third play Dachniki

Begun in June, 1902 and completed only in November, 1904, after a break in composition of more than a year, Dachniki was the first of Gorky's works devoted exclusively to the subject of the Russian intelligentsia He outlined the purpose of his new drama in a letter to the German director Reinhardt, written soon after the play's completion

> Я хотел изобразить ту часть русской интеллигенции, которая вышла из демократических слоев и, достигнув известной высоты социального положения, потеряла связь с народом, родным ей по крови, забыла о его интересах, о необходимости расширить жизнь для него и - не нашла себе духовного родства в буржуазном и бюрократическом обществе, к которому она примыкает чисто механически, пока еще не сливаясь с ним в одно целое, как с классом имеющим свои задачи, свой взгляд на жизнь 6

In accordance with this intention, Gorky presents in Dachniki an unattractive picture of Russian provincial life The play depicts a series of unhappy marriages (possibly reflecting Gorky's own matrimonial problems at this time) and it is from the resulting conflict between the sexes that its dramatic tension derives As in Ibsen's A Doll's House, with which Dachniki has certain superficial similarities, the women in Gorky's play are revealed as the victims of a male-dominated world This is particularly apparent in the picnic scene in Act 3, during which the men eat, drink and make merry, oblivious to the ennui afflicting their wives

Trapped in a stifling environment which allows them no scope for personal fulfillment, the women sublimate their desire to escape in a number of ways Ol'ga Alekseyevna, wife of the odious Dudakov, immerses herself in the trivial details of household management and her own hypochondria Totally different is the reaction of Yuliya Fillipovna, who considers her drunkard husband Suslov an 'instrument of suicide' [7] Scornful of Ol'ga Alekseyevna's futile attempt at reconciliation with Dudakov, Yuliya Fillipovna prefers to indulge in illicit affairs, whilst maintaining the façade of her marriage to Suslov

The fate of Ol'ga Alekseyevna and Yuliya Fillipovna serves as a warning to Varvara Mikhaylovna, whose growing estrangement from her husband Basov provides Dachniki with its centre of dramatic interest

Varvara Mikhaylovna's evolution is directly comparable to that of Nora in Ibsen's A Doll's House It was with deliberate irony that, in an early version of the play, Gorky had Basov refer sarcastically to his wife as the heroine of a Norwegian drama [8] At the beginning of the play, Varvara Mikhaylovna is plagued by a vague sense of dissatisfaction which stems from her natural desire for fulfilling activity

> А мне вот хочется уйти куда-то, где живут простые, здоровые люди, где говорят другим языком и делают какое-то серьезное, большое, всем нужное дело 9

Her resolve to escape and begin a new life hardens as she learns of her husband's unprincipled conduct of his affairs as an advocate Once convinced of his culpability, she becomes Basov's most vociferous accuser and abandons him in favour of the new life she hopes to build elsewhere

Varvara Mikhaylovna's rejection of Basov and the provincial environment which he represents may be interpreted on a number of levels The question of women's liberation and, in particular, of equal opportunity for women was in itself an important social issue Furthermore, the revolutionary significance of Varvara Mikhaylovna's departure for the 'new life' would have required no explanation to the contemporary Russian audience raised on the tradition of seeking a social message in works of literature Equally important, although less obvious, is the play's ethical connotation On this level, the conflict between the sexes represents the clash between the principles of truth and falsehood and continues the enquiry begun in Na dne The issue is raised in an argument between Mar'ya L'vovna and Ryumin over the upbringing of children

> Марья Львовна нужно быть искренной с детьми, не скрывать от них правды не обманывать их
> Рюмин (усмехаясь) Ну, это, знаете, рискованно' Правда груба и холодна, и в ней всегда скрыт тонкий яд скептицизма Вы сразу можете отравить ребенка, открыв перед ним всегда страшное лицо правды
> Марья Львовна А вы предпочитаете отравлять его постепенно? 10

Ryumin's apology of the 'Consoling Lie', which is endorsed by Basov and Shalimov, exposes the fallacy upon which their well-being is founded Rather than face up to reality, they prefer to live in a world of hypocrisy and illusion This is revealed most clearly in Act 2, when the watchman Pustobayka chases off the beggars who threaten to

interrupt the play-acting of his masters Ultimately, however, they are forcibly confronted with the truth by Varvara Mikhaylovna and Mar'ya L'vovna, who explains the nature of their crime

> Мы все должны быть иными, господа! Дети прачек, кухарок, дети здоровых рабочих людей - мы должны быть иными! Ведь еще никогда в нашей стране не было образованных людей, связанных с массою народа родством крови . Это кровное родство должно бы питать нас горячим желанием расширить, перестроить, осветить жизнь родных нам людей, которые все дни свои только работают, задыхаясь во тьме и грязи . Мы не из жалости, не из милости должны бы работать для расширения жизни. мы должны делать это для себя для того, чтобы не чувствовать проклятого одиночества не видеть пропасти между нами - на высоте - и родными нашими - там, внизу, откуда они смотрят на нас, как на врагов, живущих их трудом! Они послали нас вперед себя, чтобы мы нашли для них дорогу к лучшей жизни а мы ушли от них и потерялись, и сами мы создали себе одиночество, полное тревожной суеты и внутреннего раздвоения Вот наша драма! 11

This speech, which Gorky indicated to Reinhardt as the 'key' to a proper understanding of Dachniki,[12] provides a statement of the author's own views on the duty of the Russian intelligentsia The true intelligentsia, as Varvara Mikhaylovna comes to realise, is made up not of those like Basov, Shalimov, Ryumin and Suslov, but of those who are prepared to face reality and work actively for a society based on the principles of truth, justice and equality It was upon this conception of the Russian intelligentsia that Gorky was to elaborate in his works of the following years

Dachniki provided Gorky with a convenient vehicle for the expression of his views not only on the role of the intelligentsia, but also on the social duty of the Russian writer Particularly impoitant in this context is his portrayal of the writer Shalimov We first hear of Shalimov from Varvara Mikhaylovna, who had known the writer in her youth and eagerly awaits his arrival in their provincial backwater

> Я видела его однажды на вечере я была гимназисткой тогда Помню, он вышел на эстраду, такой крепкий, твердый непокорные, густые волосы, лицо - открытое, смелое лицо человека, который знает, что он любит и что ненавидит знает свою силу 13

Shalimov's arrival proves to be a great disappointment to Varvara Mikhaylovna Instead of the romantic hero of her imagination she sees a portly, balding, middle-aged man Shalimov's image is deflated further by his connivance with Basov to swindle his late wife's family out of their rightful property As a writer, he is already an anachronism Early in the play, he complains to Basov

> Лет пять назад я был уверен, что знаю читателя и знаю, чего он хочет от меня. И вдруг, незаметно для себя, потерял я его Потерял, да В этом драма, пойми! Теперь вот, говорят, родился новый читатель Кто он? 14

Isolated from the 'new reader' and alien to the objectives of democratic literature, Shalimov is reduced to the cynical philosophy "надо кушать, значит, надо писать" [15] Having sacrificed his integrity in the pursuit of material prosperity, he is the absolute antithesis of Gorky's ideal

Equally important to the philosophy of art contained in Dachniki is Basov's sister Kaleriya, who writes poetry in her leisure hours Her poems, like the prose-poem Edelweiss, which she recites in Act 1, are imbued with the pessimism typical of the Modernist school After Kaleriya's recitation, Vlas remarks that her poem is 'like cranberry squash on a hot day',[16] reflecting Gorky's belief that such literary works provide moral sustenance to evil men like Basov and Ryumin The true purpose of art is put forward by Mar'ya L'vovna

> Мы живем в стране, где только писатель может быть глашатаем правды, беспристрастным судьею пороков своего народа и борцом за его интересы . Только он может быть таким, и таким должен быть русский писатель 17

This speech is intended both as a condemnation of Shalimov and Kaleriya and as a vindication of Gorky's own purpose of fusing art and social criticism in the play

There can be little doubt that Dachniki was deliberately designed to provoke a strong response from the Russian reading public It is unlikely, however, that Gorky could have foreseen the intensity of the reaction to his new play Even before its first production, it had been the cause of a violent disagreement between the author and Nemirovich-Danchenko of the Moscow Art Theatre The latter, who first heard the play in April, 1904,[18] took exception not only to its un-

deniable dramatic weaknesses, but also to what he considered an unjustifiably 'tendentious' and 'biased' depiction of the intelligentsia[19] He set out his views in a letter to Gorky, to which he received an uncompromising reply Accepting Nemirovich's criticism of the play's artistic faults, Gorky wrote

> Внимательно прочитав вашу рецензию на пьесу мою, я усмотрел в вашем отношении к вопросам, которые мною раз навсегда, неизменно решены, принципиальное разногласие Оно неустранимо, и поэтому я не нахожу возможным дать пьесу театру, во главе которого стоите вы 20

Despite Nemirovich's attempts to effect a reconciliation, Gorky remained intransigent and the play was subsequently offeied to the Komissarzhevskaya Theatre in St Petersburg, where it opened on 10 November, 1904[21]

The first performance of Dachniki proved to be an event unprecedented in the history of the Russian theatre The auditorium was filled to capacity not only by theatre-goers, but also by police spies, whose presence was dictated by official fears that the performance would provide the signal for a political demonstration like those which had attended recent performances of Meshchane[22] The production ran normally until the end of the third act, when, in accordance with contemporary theatrical tradition, the author and the cast came out on to the stage to take their bows A group of St Petersburg writers and journalists, headed by Merezhkovsky, Filosofov and Dyagilev, took this opportunity to express their criticism of the play by hissing the author Their action provoked another section of the audience noisily to demonstrate their support for Gorky Tikhonov, who was present at the theatre, recalls the incident in his memoirs

> Такого спектакля, как "Дачники", я никогда больше не видел, спектакль-демонстрация, спектакль-схватка двух политических партий. . Схватка началась после третьего акта, когда актеры вместе с автором вышли к рампе раскланиваться Партер встретил их шумом Испуганные актеры спрятались за занавес У рампы остался один Горький Не торопясь, он обвел глазами ряды партера, - шум падал под его взглядом, как скошенная трава, - дождался полной тишины, поддержал ее секунду в сжатых кулаках, затем бросил и быстро запахнул за собой полы занавеса. 23

The immense personal impact of the affair upon Gorky can be gauged from

his letter to Andreyev, written the following day, in which he described the première of Dachniki as 'the finest day of my incredibly long, interesting and good life',[24] a sentiment which is also found in a letter to his wife of the same date[25] Nevertheless, he fostered no illusions about the play's literary value In the same letter to Andreyev, he remarked ""Дачники" - это не искусство, но - ясно, что это меткий выстрел".[26] Yet he must have regarded the demonstration at the play's first performance as a sign of popular approval for his political standpoint and as a justification of his use of art for non-literary purposes On his return to Riga from St Petersburg, he completed three stories within the space of as many weeks The literary doldrums of the preceding years were finally at an end

A On the eve Tyur'ma, Bukoyomov, Karp Ivanovich and Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha

By the end of 1904, events within Russia had taken a critical turn The disastrous war against Japan had placed an unbearable strain on the Russian economy and had succeeded only in aggravating a political situation which was already potentially explosive As public opinion shifted against the government, a wave of strikes and political demonstrations swept the country, providing the first tangible warnings of the coming revolution Gorky, who had followed these developments with his customary interest, chose these events as the background for the first of his stories to be completed in Riga

The story, Tyur'ma, describes the fate of Misha Malinin, a student who becomes involved in a street demonstration The idea for the work may well have been provided specifically by the student demonstration which had taken place in St Petersburg on 28 November, 1904, and about which Gorky had collected 'many interesting facts', as he informed his wife the following month[27] Yet, despite the story's deliberately topical setting, it is not the events themselves, but the inner state of the central character which forms its proper subject

Malinin's participation in the political demonstration, for which he is arrested at the beginning of the story, is the product of chance rather than design He is prompted to action not by political conviction, but by a sense of moral indignation at the brutal treatment of a young woman demonstrator at the hands of the police Once in prison, however, he is forced to contemplate the significance of his

actions At first, the memory of his 'heroic' act is the source of considerable pleasure to Malinin, who savours the prospect of boasting of his exploits to his friends on his release But his initial complacency is soon threatened by the rigours imposed by his new environment, for which he has been totally unprepared by his sheltered, middle-class background The graffiti scratched upon the wall of his cell by one of its previous occupants, the semi-literate murderer, Usov, confront Malinin with a world of which he has no experience

> Он хотел представить себе Усова и не нашел для него человеческого образа, - этот спокойный убийца рисовался в его воображении бесформенным грозным пятном и в центре этого пятна горел тусклый, кроваво-красный огонь [28]

His inexperience is demonstrated further by his inability to communicate with the prison warders who turn to him for sympathy and advice Despite the barrier of incomprehension, the warders begin gradually to confide their hopes and fears to Malinin Their confessions have a profound impact upon the prisoner

> Миша как бы откачнулся куда-то в сторону от своего маленького прошлого, и самое яркое в этом - его "подвиг" - уже не так часто вспоминался ему В странной жизни тюрьмы он чувствовал отдаленный намек на что-то, пока еще недоступное его сознанию [29]

This vague awareness is the first stage in Malinin's spiritual transformation

The warders turn to Malinin not only as a confidant but also as a mentor Taking him for a revolutionary, they demand of him the solution to the 'accursed questions' which weigh upon their souls Like the old superintendent, Korney Danilovich, they present Malinin with a continual reminder of his responsibility as a man of learning "Вы - человек ученый Зачем же ужас и жестокость?", asks Korney Danilovich [30] Malinin now feels ashamed of his inability to provide the answer to such questions Although a student, he had deliberately fought shy of those of his contemporaries who 'talked in difficult, bookish language about various social questions' [31] Convinced of his error, Malinin now accepts his duty to guide his intellectual inferiors, only to feel frustrated at his own ignorance and impotence Significantly, it is at this point that he finally establishes contact with the political prisoners held in the same prison

At first unable to decipher the messages tapped out on the cell walls, he eventually learns the 'alphabet' which renders them intelligible and allows his spirit to escape the solitary confinement to which he has been committed

Despite certain artistic deficiencies, particularly in the portrayal of the police and prison officials, Tyur'ma transcends its purely topical interest Gorky himself considered the story 'most important',[32] a view which was endorsed by a number of critics, like N Korobka, who was inclined to see Tyur'ma as an important turning point in the author's fiction[33] Andreyev, who had been critical of Dachniki,[34] was especially appreciative of the new story "Милый мой друг", he wrote to Gorky at the first opportunity, "с каким наслаждением прочел я вчера "Тюрьму" Как это приятно, как это особенно по-горьковски"[35] Strangely enough, despite Andreyev's protestations to the contrary, Tyur'ma is in certain respects untypical of Gorky Consider, for example, the following passage

> Мише казалось, что вся жизнь людей окутана густой мутно-желтой тучей болезненно-напряженной жестокости Все поступки людей пропитаны неприятным, бессмысленным чувством озлобления друг против друга и противным желанием истязать, издеваться, мучить То открытое и грубое, то - глубоко спрятанное внутри человека - тонкое, хищное или тупое и тяжелое - это темное чувство окрашивает всю жизнь в угрюмый тон осенних сумерек, полных тоски и гнетущего холода И среди этой дикой свалки озлобленных людей пугливо мелькают, как снежинки в ночи, милые, добрые, бессильные люди, вроде Офицерова с его матерью 36

The highly-charged, emotive prose is very much in the Andreyev manner The comparison can even be extended to details of imagery The 'dense, turbid-yellow cloud' recalls the repeated image of the 'yellow fog' in Andreyev's V tumane, where it was employed for the same purpose to suggest the all-pervading power of evil which divides and isolates men It is interesting to note that this passage, along with others of a similar metaphysical nature was removed by Gorky when editing the 1922 collection of his works[37]

Tyur'ma also bears a distinct thematic resemblance to certain of Andreyev's works, in particular to Na reke The spiritual evolution of Gorky's Malinin is analogous to that of Andreyev's Aleksey Stepanovich

In each case, an isolated individual transcends his ego to take his part in a collective force In Gorky's story, however, the hero's spiritual transformation is specifically identified with his conversion to the cause of social revolution The dual significance of Malinin's evolution was suggested in the first edition of the story, which contained the following passage "Тюрьма - внутри людей, и вся жизнь вокруг них тоже тюрьма" [38] The inference is that man will only destroy the 'prison' of political oppression and social injustice when he has succeeded in destroying the 'prison' of self-interest It is only when Malinin has achieved the latter aim that he becomes a revolutionary in the sense understood by Gorky

Bukoyomov, Karp Ivanovich, the second story to be completed during Gorky's stay in Riga, also has a prison setting The prisoners in this story, however, are not political offenders but common criminals In the manner of Gorky's earlier fiction, Bukoyomov, Karp Ivanovich presents a conflict between two contradictory personalities Bukoyomov himself is a hardened criminal, a convicted murderer who has already served several terms of exile in Siberia Stern and taciturn by nature, he breaks his silence only to express his scorn for the younger, more inexperienced criminals, in whose company he is bound for a new period of exile Quite different is the attitude of Khromoy, Bukoyomov's adversary Himself a criminal no less hardened than Bukoyomov, Khromoy is nevertheless moved by compassion for the suffering of his fellows, whom he seeks to console by preaching the Christian principles of pity for the unfortunate and the equality of all in the face of God His speeches, which find a sympathetic hearing from the other prisoners, provoke a hostile reaction from Bukoyomov, who, on the basis of his own experience, has come to the cynical conclusion "Не видал я, брат, Хромой, жалости в людях и сам жалеть их не могу" [39] Khromoy makes no attempt to answer Bukoyomov and the story ends with the conflict between them unresolved

Gorky's new story immediately attracted the attention of contemporary critics Basargin, of the right-wing Moskovskiye Vedomosti, considered Bukoyomov to be 'an illustration to the Nietzschean motif that 'all is permitted to the strong man'' and concluded that the author's aim in writing the work had been to spread the pernicious influence of anarchism [40] This interpretation is unacceptable for a number of reasons First, there is nothing in the story to suggest that

Bukoyomov's views can be identified with those of the author, indeed, Bukoyomov's nihilism was totally alien to Gorky Secondly, Basargin's argument fails to take account of the fact that, despite its title, the story is concerned not simply with the character of Bukoyomov but specifically with his debate with Khromoy It is in this debate that the story's significance is to be discovered

Bukoyomov's argument with Khromoy is reminiscent of the debate between Satin and Luka in Na dne, with Bukoyomov providing the antidote to Khromoy's 'Consoling Lie' Gorky's emphasis in Bukoyomov, Karp Ivanovich, however, is quite different In Na dne the author had investigated the question of truth and falsehood in its relation to the concept of human freedom In Bukoyomov, Karp Ivanovich he confines himself to the simple confrontation of faith and nihilism, abstract idealism and concrete reality For all his cynicism, Bukoyomov is not entirely unsympathetic to Khromoy, as he admits in an unguarded moment "Люблю я тебе говорить, Хромой умеешь ты слушать а когда ты сам говоришь - не люблю я этого" [41] Bukoyomov's reminiscences of his childhood and youth reveal that his cynicism is the product of an innate idealism which has been offended by the injustices of life Thus, when he challenges Khromoy's speeches about justice and pity, it is not in the name of anarchism or any other positive ideal, it is the protest of a man who is only too clearly aware of the gulf between the ideal and reality Hence Bukoyomov's terse comment "Мало ли что сказано ты гляди, что сделано" [42] That Gorky should pose this problem on the eve of revolution is important as he saw Bukoyomov and Khromoy as the representatives of the two dominant moods in contemporary Russian society This same conflict, between faith and nihilism, was to form a dominant leitmotif in many of Gorky's works of the revolutionary and immediate post-revolutionary years

In Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha, the third of the 'Riga' stories, Gorky returned to his critique of the Russian liberal intellectual The story is based on a sketch written some six or seven years previously for the uncompleted Publika cycle [43] In its original form this had been the simple account of the unrequited love of a yardman, Platon Bugrov, for the daughter of his employer, which ends with Bugrov's rejection and attempted suicide Marred by its overt didacticism and crude characterization, the story was never published in Gorky's lifetime

The story of Platon Bugrov is incorporated almost unchanged in

Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha, with the one significant difference that, in the new version, Platon's suicide bid is successful The most notable difference between the two versions is in the narrative structure Instead of the 'transparent' narrator of the Publika sketch, the narrator in the new story is Filipp Vasil'evich, an intellectual with liberal aspirations Thus, as the title suggests, the emphasis in Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha is transferred from the story itself to the character of its narrator

In contrast to the simple narrative of the original version, Filipp Vasil'evich's account of Platon's tragic fate is continually interrupted by his own evaluative comments With pedantic thoroughness, he feels obliged to enlighten the reader, indicating the faults and weaknesses of those he describes When Platon makes a cynical comment about the daughter of his employer, the narrator remarks

> Мне не понравился этот отзыв о Лидии Алексеевне, - отрицательное отношение прислуги к хозяевам вполне понятно, но Платон - человек полуинтеллигентный и должен бы понимать, что таким отношением к своей хозяйке он опускается до психологии судомоек 44

Such digressions, intended quite seriously by Filipp Vasil'evich for the reader's benefit, reveal him instead as a pompous and slightly ridiculous figure and play an important part in his characterization

Although he sets himself up as a detached observer, Filipp Vasil'evich is also a participant in the events he describes It is he who initially finds employment for Platon and encourages his attempts to improve his education Furthermore, he is clearly, although indirectly, responsible for Platon's death, as it is from him that Lidiya learns of Platon's secret love for her Despite his attempts to show that his actions were inspired by the finest possible motives, there are signs which suggest that Filipp Vasil'evich's behaviour is by no means as exemplary as he would like to pretend His attitude to Platon, for example, is distinctly patronizing

> Я не заметил, чтобы он был тронут моим отношением к нему, и хотя, разумеется, не ждал благодарности, однако эта его сухость - или что-то другое - не очень понравилась мне Мы все обязаны ценить взаимные услуги друг другу, это необходимо в общежитии 45

Filipp Vasil'evich is equally jesuitical in his rationalization of his betrayal to Lidiya of Platon's confidence He justifies his action on the grounds that social inequality makes any relationship between Platon

and Lidiya impossible Thus, ostensibly, his interference is animated by a desire to spare Platon unnecessary suffering However, his true motive is exposed when, in conversation with Platon, he partially admits to a personal interest in Lidiya "И наконец Лидия Алексеевна любит меня" [46] In the light of this remark, Filipp Vasil'evich's continuous attempts to discredit Platon in Lidiya's eyes and his final act of betrayal become comprehensible as the acts of a jealous man, anxious to protect himself against a potential rival Hence, when Lidiya relieves her own sense of guilt for Platon's death by accusing the narrator, she is, unwittingly, stating the truth, for it is with him alone that the moral responsibility for the tragedy lies

Filipp Vasil'evich's culpability extends beyond the purely moral sphere By endowing his narrator with what he saw as the typical traits of a liberal intellectual, Gorky invested his story with an obvious social significance Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha illustrates Gorky's contention that the liberals, for all their fine ideals, are, in reality, false friends to the people, whose interests they neither share nor represent This political message is both implicit and organic to the story, qualities which Gorky was rarely to achieve in works of this kind With its finely controlled irony, Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha is, from the literary standpoint, the most satisfactory of the three stories written in Riga

Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha continues the anti-liberal tradition which had been a feature of Gorky's writing from the early days on Samarskaya Gazeta In this story, he explodes the myth of the liberal intelligentsia as a progressive force, stressing the gulf which separates the intellectual from the working masses It was to this fundamental social problem that Gorky was to return in his next major work, Deti Solntsa

B Martyr for the cause Gorky and the events of 9 January, 1905

Gorky's literary activity in Riga was interrupted by political events which once again began to dominate his attention By the latter part of 1904, Gorky was already contributing considerable sums of money to Bolshevik funds[47] and in December that year he visited St Petersburg with the aim of making preparations for the foundation of a Social-Democratic newspaper [48] It was presumably in this connection that Gorky returned to the capital early in the new year, an event which was to have dramatic and unforeseen consequences

Gorky arrived in St Petersburg on 4 January, 1905, by which time a strike of workers at the Putilov Ironworks was at its height The strike had been engineered by the priest Gapon, who, at a meeting held two days after Gorky's arrival, called upon the strikers to participate in a peaceful demonstration to present a petition to the tsar [49] Gapon's proposal met with enthusiastic support from the strikers and on 7 and 8 January, together with his supporters, he made a tour of St Petersburg assembly halls urging all working people to take part in the march to the Winter Palace

Gorky apparently knew of these plans on his arrival from Riga [50] and followed the developments with interest, although not intending himself to take any part in the demonstration His original intention was to leave the capital on 9 January, the day of the march [51] But, on the evening of 8 January, he heard rumours that the government was planning to employ force against the demonstrators and that police and military preparations were already under way Anxious to verify this information, he went at once to the offices of the liberal newspaper Nashi dni, where a large number of journalists had already gathered to discuss the situation [52] All were agreed that their primary purpose should be to ensure that bloodshed be avoided at all costs, to which end a delegation, comprising Gorky and nine others, was elected to present a protest to Prince Svyatopolk-Mirsky, the Minister of the Interior [53] The minister, however, refused to give them audience, and his assistant, Rydzevsky, with whom they did manage to confer, gave them to understand that the official decision was irrevocable As a last resort, the delegation sought a meeting with Witte, which served merely to convince its members that government inflexibility had made 'Bloody Sunday' a tragic inevitability

Frustrated by his experiences of the previous evening, Gorky rose early on the morning of 9 January to join the marchers in the Vyborg region of the city Thus it was as a participant that Gorky witnessed the bloody confrontation which is normally taken by historians as the beginning of the 1905 Revolution The atrocities he saw left an indelible impression upon his memory Even in Savva Morozov, which was written some seventeen years after the event, Gorky managed to recreate the mood of the day with extraordinary vividness and a similar description in Zhizn' Klima Samgina provided his last work with one of its most memorable passages

Under the immediate impact of the massacre, Gorky entered the Public Library, where he pronounced an impromptu speech criticizing the government's action [54] Returning home in the afternoon, he composed a protest addressed to 'All Russian citizens and the public opinion of the European states',[55] in which he enumerated the crimes committed by the Russian government and concluded with the warning "мы заявляем, что далее подобный порядок не должен быть терпим, и приглашаем всех граждан России к немедленной, упорной и дружной борьбе с самодержавием".[56] Armed with this protest, Gorky set off in the evening for a secret meeting of the Free Economic Society in the hope that the other members of the deputation of the previous day would put their names alongside his own Gorky's advocation of open revolutionary action was, however, particularly ill-suited to the liberal aspirations of the other participants After the writer had read out the text of his protest, Professor Kareyev and I E Kedrin both announced publicly their refusal to put their signatures to it [57] Gorky left the meeting embittered and alone [58] The reaction of the Free Economic Society caused his antagonistic attitude to the liberal intelligentsia to harden On the same evening, he wrote to his wife "будущий историк наступившей революции начнет свою работу, вероятно, такой фразой "Первый день русской революции - был днем морального краха русской интеллигенции", - вот мое впечатление от ее поступков и речей" [59]

On the evening of 10 January, Gorky left St Petersburg for Riga, where he was arrested by the local police the following day [60] The reason for this, Gorky's fifth, arrest was his participation in the deputation to Prince Svyatopolk-Mirsky The other members of the deputation, with the exception of K K Arsen'ev, a frail old man, were arrested at the same time, to be released a few days later [61] It was presumably only after the arrests that Gorky's authorship of the proclamation Vsem russkim grazhdanam came to the notice of the authorities Accused of this far more serious crime, Gorky was taken under guard to St Petersburg, where he was imprisoned in the Trubetskoy bastion of the Peter and Paul Fortress

Predictably, the arrest of Gorky, a figure of world eminence, did not long escape the attention of public opinion both inside and outside Russia Despite strict government control over the official press, news of the affair spread rapidly throughout Russia, and, inev-

itably, found its way into the foreign press On 15 January, just four days after the arrest, Berliner Tageblatt published an appeal to German writers, scientists, artists and politicians under the rubric 'Save Gorky' Within days, protests, both individual and collective, were pouring into Russia from all over the world In France, Anatole France, Mirbeau and Rodin signed a joint protest which was published in L'Humanité, whilst in England, Swinburne, Meredith and Hardy lent their support to the Gorky campaign The Russian government must have been surprised and alarmed by the intensity and unanimity of the foreign reaction to the Gorky affair At a time when Russia was facing a desperate economic crisis, necessitating large foreign loans, the ill will generated by Gorky's arrest could not be allowed to develop Submitting to the pressure of world opinion, the authorities had Gorky removed from the Peter and Paul Fortress on 12 February and, two days later, he was released from custody on bail of 10,000 roubles, supplied by Savva Morozov [62]

If the events of 9 January had convinced Gorky that the long-awaited revolution had at last begun, the world-wide response to his imprisonment made him realise his immense potential as a weapon of this revolution against the Russian government Overnight, he had become the martyr of a political cause and he was quick to seize the opportunity of fulfilling his ambition of actively promoting the revolution in Russia He had cherished this desire at least since January, 1902, when he had written to V A Posse motivating his refusal to participate in the publication of Zhizn' abroad

> Мое искреннейшее убеждение можно выразить так если бы в данный момент некто Горький был убит где-нибудь во время уличной драки, - этот факт был бы более полезен для так называемого русского общества, чем если бы тот же Горький задумал играть в Герцена, даже при условии успешного исполнения этой роли 63

Unwittingly, the Russian government had presented Gorky with the chance to put his words into action Knowing that world opinion was now following his every move, Gorky devoted himself to a new role on his release from prison, that of self-styled spokesman for the Russian revolutionary movement

Although his release had been secured by February, 1905, the case against Gorky was left open and formal proceedings were dropped only in October, when an amnesty was declared in an attempt to appease

popular discontent[64] For a short while it even seemed likely that Gorky would be brought to trial Much to the consternation of his friends, the writer himself was eager that the trial take place[65] and he hired a lawyer, O O Gruzenburg, to conduct his defence The latter, an eminent figure in the legal profession and a left-wing sympathizer, who was to defend the author on a number of occasions in the future, had spotted a loophole in the prosecution's case against Gorky and was certain of obtaining an aquittal In his memoirs, Gruzenburg even claims that the prosecution had employed deliberate delaying tactics before the amnesty spared them the embarrassment of losing their case[66] Thus, Gorky's treatment by the authorities, which Professor Kaun considered 'strikingly mild and considerate'[67] was perhaps so not by design but of necessity Deprived by the amnesty of the opportunity to use his own trial as an indictment of those who stood in judgement over him, Gorky was later to embody his own spirit of defiance in the figure of Pavel Vlasov, who realizes his creator's ambition in the novel Mat'

C Deti Solntsa the social and ethical problems defined

Although forcibly denied the opportunity of continuing his practical political activity, Gorky was determined that his month of imprisonment in the Peter and Paul Fortress be turned to some useful purpose As always, he ensured that he was more than adequately supplied with reading matter on the most diverse subjects,[68] after which he set about obtaining permission to write as well On 24 January, E P Peshkova made a formal application for her husband to be supplied with writing materials, a request which was immediately granted[69] A week later, Gorky himself applied for official permission to write a 'comedy'[70] On 5 February, this request was also approved, although with the proviso that, on completion, the play be delivered to the Department of Police for censorship[71] This remarkable leniency displayed by the police and prison authorities in complying with the requests of a man awaiting criminal proceedings for his seditious writings is symptomatic of official fears that to refuse Gorky such privileges would be to provide grist to the mill of those who were seeking to discredit the Russian government at home and abroad It was under these circumstances that the most unlikely product of Gorky's incarceration, the play Deti Solntsa, came to be written

The manuscript of the play, written in small and virtually illegible handwriting, (no doubt a deliberate attempt to discourage

over-zealous censorship officials) was handed over to the authorities for inspection on 14 February [72] Gorky expressed considerable concern over the fate of his play in his letters to Pyatnitsky,[73] to whom he delegated the task of ensuring the safe return of the manuscript Pyatnitsky, who had already something of a reputation for his ability to deal effectively with problems involving censorship, fulfilled Gorky's request within days and, by 27 February, the manuscript was with the author in Riga [74] Despite his intention to begin work immediately on a total revision of the play, ill-health (imprisonment had aggravated his tubercular condition) and other commitments prevented Gorky from completing this task before the beginning of June, when he read the new version of the play to a domestic circle in Finland [75] With certain alterations, it was this version which was staged in October, 1905 by the Komissarzhevskaya Theatre and by the Moscow Art Theatre [76]

Although completed only in 1905, Deti Solntsa had been conceived more than a year earlier The idea for the play had been supplied by Andreyev, with whom Gorky had originally planned to collaborate On 26 October, 1903, he had informed Pyatnitsky

> С Андреевым тоже буду писать пьесу "Астроном" Леонид вдохновился Клейном и хочет изобразить человека, живущего жизнью всей вселенной, среди нищенски серой обыденщины За это его треснут в 4-м акте телескопом по башке 77

By the following April, however, Gorky had already abandoned the idea of co-authorship, although he still hoped to write independently on the same subject [78] In defiance of Andreyev's insistence that he abide by their original agreement to work together,[79] Gorky had already decided to proceed with his own version of the play by May, 1904 [80] Thus, when Gorky sat down to write Deti Solntsa in the Peter and Paul Fortress, he already had a clearly conceived plan[81] Nevertheless, the play is of particular importance as a reflection of Gorky's immediate reaction to the onset of revolution in Russia as an expression of his personal interpretation of its nature and significance

Deti Solntsa is the second of Gorky's plays to depict the life of the Russian intelligentsia In contrast to Dachniki, however, where the majority of the characters had been exposed as worthless parasites, the hero of his new play, Protasov, is a man of unimpeachable integrity A chemist of world renown, Protasov has dedicated his life to scientific research Convinced that his work is essential to the progress of

mankind, he leads an ivory-tower existence, oblivious to the immediate circumstances of his everyday life Protasov's total absorption in his work blinds him to the fact that his wife, Elena, feels frustrated and neglected and that the artist Vagin is bent on making her his mistress He is equally unaware of the designs of Melaniya, a rich widow who is infatuated with him and hopes to win his affection

Elena's situation would seem to be analogous to that of Varvara Mikhaylovna in Dachniki Both are prey to a profound dissatisfaction which is the result of a marriage which has failed to provide the fulfillment they crave However, the cause of their dissatisfaction is, at root, very different Varvara Mikhaylovna's estrangement from Basov, as we have seen, was the product of her gradual awareness of her husband's hypocrisy, which offended against her own integrity Elena undergoes no such disillusionment In her case, it is Protasov's selfishness which brings her to contemplate deserting him Her husband is, in the words of Melaniya, a 'cruel child',[82] who is unable to appreciate the emotions or aspirations of others Consider, for example, his reaction to the serious illness of Egor's wife "У меня, знаете, холодильник сломался, черт его возьми, а у Егора жена заболела, починить некому, и я сегодня - не могу работать"[83] Similarly, when Elena informs him of her intention of leaving him, Protasov's first thought again is of his work

> Я понимаю, ты обижена прости, извини, забудь! Ведь если ты уйдешь, я буду думать, где ты, что с тобой а мои работы? Ты меня изувечишь, Лена как же мои работы? Ведь или работать или думать о тебе 84

Despite his intellectual awareness of his culpability before his wife, Protasov is incorrigible, there is no real possibility that he will show more concern for her in the future Thus Elena is confronted with a moral dilemma to leave her husband would be to destroy him, yet to stay with him would be to sacrifice any chance of achieving personal fulfillment In the event, she chooses the latter course, remaining with Protasov out of duty

Elena's altruistic act stands in marked contrast to the behaviour of her suitor, Vagin Unlike Protasov, who is an egoist malgré soi, Vagin is a militant individualist, totally committed to the amoral principle of absolute personal freedom "Какое мне дело до людей!", he declares, "Я хочу громко спеть свою песню один и

для себя" [85] Elena's feeling of moral responsibility towards Protasov is both alien and incomprehensible to him and he incites her to consider only the dictates of her own desires Although attracted by Vagin, Elena resists the temptation he offers her When Protasov asks her if she loves Vagin, she replies somewhat enigmatically "Нет Не так чтоб быть его женой" [86] Her words can be understood both literally and metaphorically, as Elena's ultimate rejection of Vagin signifies her unwillingness to espouse his philosophy of amoral individualism

Vagin's untiring pursuit of Elena is paralleled by Melaniya's determination to win the love of Protasov Like Vagin, she is ruthless and unprincipled in her efforts to achieve her objective In order to attract Protasov's attention, she feigns an interest in chemistry and even stoops to bribery For Melaniya, Protasov represents an antidote to the materialistic instinct which had prompted her in the past to enter into a marriage of convenience By placing her wealth and services at Protasov's disposal, she hopes to exculpate her sin Her humility in Protasov's presence does not, however, disguise the fact that her motives are primarily egoistic In an unguarded moment, she reveals her true aspiration "Да ведь я около него - царицей буду ему - служанка, а для всех - царица" [87] Predictably, Protasov is genuinely unconscious of Melaniya's intentions until the farcical scene in which she confesses her love to him Her failure to win Protasov's love, like Vagan's inability to shake Elena's loyalty to her husband, takes on the same ethical significance, as it represents the defeat of unprincipled egoism

The ethical problem posed by the conflict between egoism and altruism provides the subtext to the confrontation between two alien social classes, which is the major source of dramatic tension in Deti Solntsa Unlike Dachniki, where the major characters had been drawn exclusively from the intelligentsia, Gorky's new play also contains a gallery of types from the lower rungs of society The faithful nanny Antonovna, the artisan Egor, the drunken Troshin, the maids Fima and Lusha, and the nouveau riche capitalists Nazar and Misha are the embodiment of that force which had been felt only as a vague threat in Dachniki Between them, they epitomize the very worst human attributes greed, vice, ignorance, superstition, brutality and rancour, contradicting Protasov's abstract vision of humanity constantly striving

towards perfection

> Все, что растет, становится сложнее, люди все повышают свои требования к жизни и к самим себе . Когда-то под лучом солнца вспыхнул к жизни ничтожный и бесформенный кусок белка, размножился, сложился в орла, и льва, и человека, наступит время, из нас людей, из всех людей возникнет к жизни величественный, стройный организм - человечество' 88

The contrast between the fine ideals of the intellectuals and the dark instincts at work amongst the common people contributes to the play's tragic irony

The gulf between the intellectuals and the people in Deti Solntsa is suggested even before a word is spoken In the stage direction to Act 1, Gorky intimates the unspoken animosity between the two groups "На террасе под окном возится Роман и глухо, уныло поет песню Это пение беспокоит Протасова".[89] Later in the same act, when Protasov is prevailed upon to rebuke Egor for his brutal treatment of his wife, Gorky depicts the mutual inability to communicate which is symptomatic of the social disease

> Протасов Это зверство, Егор Это надо оставить вам Вы - человек, вы разумное существо, вы самое яркое, самое прекрасное явлечие на земле
> Егор (усмехаясь) Я?
> Протасов Ну да'
> Егор Барин' А вы бы спросили сначала за что я ее бью? 90

The inappropriateness of Protasov's words is comic, yet Egor's Barin' injects a note of warning and hints at the tragedy which underlies this brief exchange and which promotes Egor's drunken outburst at the end of the act "Стой' Меня никто не любит и никто меня не понимает И жена не любит А я хочу, чтобы меня любили, дьявол вас "[91] Although he values him highly as a skilled craftsman, Protasov fails to appreciate that Egor is a human being in desperate need of compassion and understanding

A similar barrier of incomprehension exists between Protasov and Nazar Their confrontation is reminiscent of the relationship between Lopakhin and Ranevskaya in Chekhov's Vishnyovyy sad Like Lopakhin, Nazar is a self-made man Having capitalized on Protasov's lack of business acumen by purchasing his house, Nazar hopes to help Protasov and himself by opening a cosmetics factory, to which the latter would

be attached as a technical advisor Much to Nazar's amazement, Protasov is unresponsive to this plan and seemingly unaware of his precarious financial situation, refusing to compromise his commitment to the cause of pure science Nazar's frustration with Protasov is mixed with resentment against his wife, who treats him with aristocratic disdain After one such humiliating confrontation, Nazar is even moved to utter a threat against Elena "Ишь такая гордионка! Подожди, я те хвост прижму!"[92] Although he comes to Protasov's aid in the cholera riot, Nazar represents a threat to the Protasov household which is no less real than the physical violence of Egor and Troshin Nazar protects Protasov as he would a vested interest, in the certain knowledge that he will soon be able to take his revenge in a manner far more insidious

The conflict between the intelligentsia and the people reaches its climax in the cholera revolt, which takes place in the final act The revolt is the product of ignorance and rancour Spurred on by superstitious rumours that Protasov is personally responsible for the cholera epidemic sweeping the region, an angry mob marches on his house For Egor, whose wife had been a victim of the epidemic, although largely due to his own negligence, the revolt provides an outlet both for his frustration with Protasov and his sense of guilt for the death of his wife Although the threat of violence passes without serious injury to either side, the play's conclusion is pessimistic The final act ends with a tableau, the two groups retire to opposite sides of the stage, the distance between them symbolizing the unbridgeable gulf which divides them The impression is of unstable equilibrium Protasov thus emerges, like Ranevskaya in Vishnyovyy sad, as the representative of a class which is doomed to extinction, either by the senseless violence of the mob, or else by the cunning intrigues of Nazar

It is against this background that Liza and Chepurnoy act out their tragic drama Their relationship is of especial importance as it provides a graphic illustration to the ethical and social questions raised in the play Liza and Chepurnoy occupy a 'no-man's-land' between the intelligentsia and the people Although they belong to the intelligentsia both by social background and by inclination, they are each bound to the people by virtue of their experience Liza, Protasov's sister, suffers from a nervous illness, which had been induced by the profound emotional shock of witnessing a brutal incident in which a man

was murdered [93] This traumatic experience was sufficient to destroy for ever her faith in her brother's abstract idealism, as she admits to Chepurnoy

> Когда-то и на меня Павел действовал вот так же Говорит, и с моих глаз, с мозга точно пелена спадает так ясно все, так стройно, загадочно и просто, ничтожно и огромно' А потом я узнала настоящую жизнь, полную грязи, зверства, бессмысленной жестокости душу мою охватил страх и недоумение и вот тогда я попала в больницу 94

Liza finds in Chepurnoy a kindred spirit, whose attitude to Protasov has undergone a similar evolution In his case, the process of disillusionment had been less sudden, resulting not in mental disorder, but in a profound cynicism He takes a masochistic pleasure in contradicting Protasov with nihilistic comments "Зачем же лгать?", he remarks after one of Protasov's passionate outbursts, "Люди грубы и жестоки, это их природа" [95] Yet, beneath his pose of cynical indifference, Chepurnoy remains an idealist at heart In the second act, he tells Liza of his recurrent nightmare

> Хочется мне что-то делать эдакое, знаете, геройское А что? Не могу догадаться . И все кажется мне идет по реке лед, а на льдине поросенок сидит, такой маленький, рыжий порося, и верещит, верещит' И вот я бросаюсь к нему, проваливаюсь в воду .. и спасаю порося' А оно - никому не нужно' 96

Chepurnoy's symbolic dream reflects his frustration in a world which allows him no outlet for his noble impulses In his relationship with Liza he sees an opportunity to realize his ambition of altruistic service of his fellows, which had presumably prompted him to take up the medical profession He admits to Liza "А мне хорошего человека полечить хочется" [97] Like the prophetic dream, however, real life also thwarts Chepurnoy's design Liza's illness proves incurable, she is unable to escape the morbid introspection induced by her tragic experience Finally convinced of his impotence, Chepurnoy commits suicide

Together, Liza and Chepurnoy present a challenge to Protasov, Elena and Vagin Their criticism is especially vocal in the debate which occupies the major part of Act 2 The debate begins with a discussion of art and its purpose, in which Elena, rejecting the concept of <u>l'art pour l'art</u> as advocated by Vagin, contends that the

aim of art should be to inspire men to strive towards the achievement of some ideal As an illustration of her argument she describes a picture which would fulfill her requirements

> . . среди безграничного моря - идет корабль, его жадно обнимают зеленые, гневные волны, а на носу его и у бортов стоят какие-то крепкие, мощные люди и, гордо улыбаясь, смотрят далеко вперед, готовые спокойно погибнуть по пути к своей цели . . Такая картина может вызвать у меня чувство гордости за людей, за художника, который создал их и она напомнит о тех великих людях, которые помогли нам уйти так далеко от животных и все дальше уводят к человеку 98

Elena's speech, with its unmistakable echoes of Chelovek, meets with an enthusiastic reception from Protasov and Vagin, who are impressed by her eloquence Their congratulations are cut short, however, by the intrusion of the drunken Troshin His appearance serves as a painful reminder to Liza that the 'animal' in man has yet to be subdued After Troshin's departure, she demands of Elena "А какое место в твоей картине, Лена, будут занимать вот эти люди?"[99] In reply to her question, Liza receives not one, but three, answers

> Елена Их там не будет, Лиза
> Протасов Они, как водоросли и раковины, присосутся ко дну корабля
> Вагин И будут затруднять его движение 100

These replies expose the fundamental differences which separate the three speakers, despite their seeming concurrence Elena is a true humanist, inspired by the desire to see all men raised to the level of 'Children of the Sun' [101] Protasov, the scientist, is more pragmatic, accepting the existence of such men as Troshin as part of the natural order Vagin, on the other hand, displays a Nietzschean disregard for the weak He is, in reality, attracted not by Elena's ideal, but by Elena herself He betrays his true interest later in the same scene "Да, к источнику жизни' . Там, вдали, среди туч, яркое, как солнце, лицо женщины" [102] Unlike her husband, who is puzzled by Vagin's reference to a woman, Elena immediately recognizes the significance of his words and rebukes him in biblical terms "Не сотвори себе кумира, ни всякого подобия его "[103] Thus, in this brief scene, Gorky has revealed the three basic attitudes amongst the intelligentsia to the plight of the Russian people genuine concern in the case of Elena, fatalism in the case of Protasov, and complete

indifference in the case of Vagin

Liza resumes her protest later in Act 2, when Protasov formulates his optimistic vision of the future of mankind She expresses her doubts in the form of a poem

Орел поднимается в небо,
Сверкая могучим крылом
И мне бы хотелось, и мне бы
Туда, в небеса, за орлом'

Хочу' Но бесплодны усилья'
Я - дочь этой грустной земли,
И долго души моей крылья
Влачились в грязи и пыли 104

Liza's verses provoke Vagin to reply with an impromptu poem of his own, utilizing the same imagery but with the purpose of defending Protasov's optimism Vagin emerges the victor from this verbal battle, causing Liza to turn to Chepurnoy for support

Лиза Ведь я хорошо сказала?
Чепурной С вами - правда
Лиза Со мной, да?

Чепурной А с ним - красота
Вагин А что лучше?
Чепурной. Да красота лучше а правда
- нужнее людям 105

In this exchange, Gorky elucidates the dilemma which forms the basis not only of this play, but also of his personal conception of revolution Essential to both is the problem of reconciling faith in the ideal with knowledge of reality

Deti Solntsa is, beyond doubt, one of Gorky's most pessimistic works The play ends on a note of unrelieved despondency Chepurnoy is dead, Liza has lost her reason, Elena remains out of duty with a husband she does not love, and the threat of renewed hostility is barely submerged Soviet critics, anxious to trace the development of 'revolutionary optimism' in Gorky's works of the period, almost invariably interpret the play as a socio-political drama revealing the irreconcilable class conflicts within Russian society on the eve of the Revolution of 1905 [106] Important as the social element is, this interpretation fails to indicate the underlying ethical problem which forms the true subject of Deti Solntsa The central theme, as Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky astutely remarked in 1906, is the question of 'love thy neighbour' [107] In this context, the role of Protasov is directly comparable to that of Ivan Karamazov Like the Dostoyevsky

character, Protasov is unable to translate his abstract love of humanity into practical concern for individuals Although he comes to appreciate the gulf which separates him from the common people, this awareness is purely intellectual At the end of the play, he is no closer to understanding the interests of the people than he was at the beginning His final words to Egor epitomize his sin "Я так высоко ценил вас, Егор вы прекрасно работаете да! Но ведь я хорошо платил вам? За что же вы?"[108] His inability to comprehend the motives of others renders Protasov's abstract humanism ineffective in practice

In contrast to Protasov, Elena is a humanist not only in principle but also in practice Sensitive to the suffering of others, her reactions are instinctive rather than intellectual When Egor's wife contracts cholera, Elena immediately undertakes to look after her, despite Protasov's warnings of the high risk of infection Equally unselfish is her sympathy towards Melaniya, which overrides her awareness of the latter's designs on her husband Appropriately, it is to Elena that Liza chooses to expound the ideal of altruism

> Лиза Нужны жертвы Нужно жертвовать собой
> Елена Да свободно, с радостью, с безумием восторга! [109]

Elena's qualification is all-important, she realises that Liza's desire for self-sacrifice is as much an abstract principle as Protasov's concern for his fellow men Of the characters in Deti Solntsa, it is Elena and Chepurnoy alone who display the intuitive altruism to which Elena refers and their fate is the inevitable fate of altruists in a world dominated by egoism

The critical response to Gorky's new play was swift The majority of contemporary critics tended to identify Deti Solntsa with its predecessor Dachniki as a simple critique of the intelligentsia [110] This view has been accepted by several generations of Soviet scholars, who have come to consider this play, along with Dachniki and Varvary, as a trilogy dedicated to the censure of Russian liberalism [111] However, the differences between these plays are, in many respects, more important than their superficial similarities In contrast to Dachniki, where Gorky's portrayal of the intelligentsia had been deliberately hostile, the author's attitude to the intellectuals in Deti Solntsa is distinctly dualistic Although Protasov emerges as an 'enemy of the people', the proximity between his ideals and those of his creator is

quite unmistakable More important still is the negative portrayal of the common people, who appear not as the unfortunate victims of capitalist exploitation, as in Dachniki, but as a blind, animal force, whose rebellion is the product of ignorance and an irrational desire for vengeance Gorky restated the problem in 1917, when he wrote in an article

> But, gradually moving away from the masses and being carried away by their own interests, tasks, and moods, the intelligentsia will deepen and widen the gap between intellect and instinct This gap is our misfortune, it is the source of our inability to work and of our failures in the creating of the new conditions of life 112

In 1905, as again in 1917, Gorky was aware of the threat presented to culture by the forces of anarchy In Deti Solntsa he had set out merely to state the social and ethical problems as he saw them In his subsequent works he was to seek a solution to these dilemmas in an attempt to define his own conception of revolution

D Publicistic enterprises Gorky and the Bolsheviks in 1905

Despite official fears of a political demonstration, the première of Deti Solntsa at the Komissarzhevskaya Theatre passed without incident However, when the play opened at the Moscow Art Theatre twelve days later, the reaction was startlingly different The first night audience was, in the words of Stanislavsky, 'anxiously awaiting some sort of promised scandal' [113] Kachalov, who played the role of Protasov, described the unexpected outcome of the performance in his memoirs

> Многие из публики, напуганные слухами, будто бы черносотенцы будут громить Художественный театр главным образом за то, что в нем ставятся пьесы Горького, пришли с револьверами И когда в третьем акте по ходу пьесы на сцену врываются участники холерного бунта а на сцену раздался выстрел (тоже по ходу действия) в публике произошло смятение Все думали, что это настоящие черносотенцы и что я ими убит В зале раздались крики "Качалов, встаньте!" Я встал, подчеркивая, что совершенно невредим Несколько раз выходил на сцену В И Немирович-Данченко, убеждал публику, что все в порядке 114

Gorky had not himself been present at the Moscow première, nor did he show any particular interest in the reports of the extraordinary audience reaction to his play According to Nemirovich, who had been responsible

for the production, Gorky had displayed a similar lack of interest when the play was in rehearsal "Звали Горького разрешить споры Он интересовался очень мало, был поглощен делами, далекими от театра" [115] Several years later, in his reminiscences of Andreyev, Gorky himself admitted that, during this period, 'there was no time to think seriously about literature' [116] For the remainder of the revolutionary year, Gorky was absorbed largely by questions of a practical nature arising from his involvement in political affairs

The main sphere of Gorky's activity during these months was journalism On his release from prison, he immediately resumed his publicistic endeavours On 27 February, he sent an open letter to Berliner Tageblatt, the German newspaper which had initiated the campaign for his release The letter thanked the newspaper for its concern and made a reference in passing to the Baku massacres of 6-9 February, indicating that this crime was perpetrated with the connivance of the Russian government [117] Shortly afterwards, Gorky devoted a complete article, O kavkazskikh sobytiyakh, to the same subject After charging the Russian government with having deliberately incited chauvinistic elements of the population to murder Tartars and Armenians, Gorky concluded the article with the appeal

> Да будет же между всеми нами равенство и братство, да просветит нас всех свет разума, сольемся в одну великую, непобоpимую волю и тогда - свобода' 118

This article, together with the open letter to Berliner Tageblatt, marked the beginning of a whole series of articles intended for publication in the European press [119] Primarily informational in purpose, these articles sought to discredit the tsar in the eyes of Western public opinion and to gain support for the revolutionary movement

Ill-health interrupted this resurgence of Gorky's journalistic activity Prison life had aggravated his tubercular condition [120] and his health continued to deteriorate alarmingly after his release In order to recuperate, Gorky went to Yalta, where he arrived on 29 March and received treatment for the next two months [121] With his health only partially restored, he left the Crimea in May for Kuokalla in Finland, which was far closer to the pulse of political life and where he was to remain for the rest of the summer In spite of such adversities, Gorky continued to support the revolutionary movement actively during the spring and summer months In Yalta, where he had been ordered by

his doctor to take a complete rest, he helped to organize a fund-raising literary evening in aid of the revolutionary parties at which he read Tyur'ma [122] Once he had settled in Finland, Gorky held open house not only for his literary colleagues, like Andreyev, Kuprin and Chirikov but also for prominent representatives of the RSDLP [123] Here also he organized a fund-raising literary evening, which took place on 30 July [124] However, it is in Gorky's extensive editorial and publishing work of this period that his support for the Social-Democratic cause is most evident

After the enforced inactivity of the spring and summer, Gorky was making regular contributions to Bolshevik publications by the autumn of 1905 The first of these was a series of articles, which appeared in the newly-founded newspaper, Rabochiy [125] From this time onwards all of Gorky's works written before his departure abroad were published within Russia in Bolshevik periodicals

Gorky was not content with the role of contributor and almost immediately began to make plans for publishing ventures of his own The first such plan was for the publication of a collection of articles about 'Bloody Sunday', which eventually had to be abandoned due to the poor quality of the material available [126] However, later in the year he put forward another scheme, which had considerably more success This was the suggestion that a new enterprise, Deshyovaya biblioteka, be established under the auspices of the Znaniye firm The purpose of the 'Library', as its name suggests, was to provide cheap editions of works by writers already published by Znaniye In all, 151 titles were eventually published in this series, which included works by Andreyev, Skitalets, Kuprin, Teleshov, Gusev-Orenburgsky, Yushkevich and Chirikov, as well as those by Gorky himself [127] Intended for a working-class audience, these works were selected for their 'democratic' content rather than their literary merit

Gorky's plans for Znaniye involved more than this single venture On 14 September, Pyatnitsky recorded in his diary that Gorky had raised the question of expanding the scope of Deshyovaya biblioteka to include political pamphlets by leading Russian and European socialists [128] The following month, he discussed this plan with representatives of the RSDLP in St Petersburg, [129] which resulted in the signing of an agreement between the Social-Democrats and Znaniye on 25 October [130] On the Znaniye side, this agreement was in fact

honoured by Gorky alone, as Pyatnitsky refused outright to finance the project out of Znaniye funds Expenses for the 59 brochures published were paid out of Gorky's own pocket [131]

Apart from these developments within Znaniye, Gorky also played a leading role in the foundation of three Social-Democrat satirical magazines, Zhupel, Zhalo and Adskaya pochta, which appeared briefly towards the end of 1905 and at the beginning of 1906 Each of these publications was extremely short-lived, suffering immediate confiscation by the authorities [132] Apart from providing material of his own for publication, Gorky also issued invitations to his Znaniye colleagues to provide contributions Far more important, however, both in terms of Gorky's direct contribution and of its influence on political life, was the foundation of Novaya Zhizn', the first official RSDLP newspaper to appear in Russia

The Social-Democratic party had been trying to infiltrate the legal Russian press for some time, a task in which Gorky had been actively engaged prior to his arrest in January, 1905 By mid-1905 it had become obvious that the authorities would not grant permission to publish a new newspaper to any known Social-Democratic sympathizer Accordingly, the party adopted new tactics Abandoning the idea of setting up a new newspaper, the Social-Democrats turned their attention to existing newspapers with a view to collaboration or, preferably, complete takeover The search for such a newspaper led them to Minsky, a Symbolist poet who had been given official permission to publish a paper in St Petersburg Once again it was Gorky who was entrusted with the task of representing the party's interest After lengthy discussions with Minsky, he succeeded in reaching an agreement and a contract was drawn up, in which Minsky and Gorky were named as joint editors and the newspaper's political standpoint was designated as 'Marxist' [133]

According to the contract, all policy decisions on Novaya Zhizn' were to be taken collectively by the members of the editorial board As this board was composed in the main of RSDLP sympathizers, Minsky had in effect signed away any influence he might have brought to bear on the paper's editorial policy His own standpoint was certainly not Marxist, nor even broadly socialist Like many others of the Symbolist movement, notably Blok, Bryusov and Bely, Minsky had become increasingly critical of the Russian government and sympathetic to the revolutionary

cause His moral support for the revolution was reflected in the poem Gimn rabochikh, which was published in the twelfth number of Novaya Zhizn' Minsky's views were perhaps closest of all to those of Merezhkovksy, who looked upon political revolution simply as an intermediary stage in the evolution of mankind towards mystical Christianity [134] Aware of the fundamental differences between himself and the Marxists, Minsky had hoped nevertheless to achieve a modus vivendi, whereby he would take responsibility for the literary and philosophical sections of the newspaper, leaving political and social affairs in the hands of the Marxists [135] The futility of this hope was immediately demonstrated by a confrontation in the editorial board over Gorky's article, Zametki o meshchanstve Having taken exception to the extreme opinions expressed in this article, Minsky had composed a critical reply to it, which he presented to the editorial board for publication in Novaya Zhizn' The board found Minsky's reply unsuitable for publication A similar fate awaited his rejoinder to Lenin's celebrated article Partiynaya organizatsiya i partiynaya literatura [136]

Minsky's short-lived career as editor of Novaya Zhizn' came to an end with the arrival of Lenin in St Petersburg on 8 November [137] Lenin's immediate concern was, in the words of Desnitsky, to achieve 'the liquidation of the poet Minsky as a member of the editorial board of Novaya Zhizn'' [138] Within days, Lenin's aim had been realized and Minsky suffered the humiliation of being hoist with his own petard Perhaps surprisingly, he retired from the scene quietly and without bitterness towards Lenin and his colleagues, who were henceforth in sole control of the newspaper [139]

The extent of Gorky's affiliations with the Social-Democratic press would seem to make it reasonable to assume (as Soviet scholars invariably do) that, by the latter half of 1905, he was an official member of the RSDLP There is, however, very little factual evidence to support this view We know that Gorky was not a member of the party at least until the middle of 1905 from his first letter to the Bolshevik leader, which contained the admission "считая Вас главой партии, не будучи ее членом" [140] The only positive statement on the subject is contained in a letter from Gorky to Sulerzhitsky, written in 1909, in which he declared that he had joined the party one year after the death of Chekhov [141] The issue is however complicated by Gorky's subsequent claim to Alexander Kaun that 'he had never belonged

to any political party'[142] In the absence of more reliable evidence, it is impossible to resolve this question satisfactorily The issue is at any rate of academic importance only, whether an official member of the RSDLP or not, there can be no doubt that Gorky gave his fullest support to the Social-Democratic cause

E Hopes and Fears Articles and stories to December, 1905

Gorky's revolutionary activity reached its zenith in the winter months of 1905 The period from October, 1905 to January, 1906 was crucial to the outcome of the revolution and encompassed both its greatest successes and its first major failure By this time, the centre of revolution had switched from St Petersburg to Moscow[143] It was there, on 6 October, that a strike of railway workers began, an act which precipitated the general strike of the same month Within a matter of weeks, the whole of Russia was at a standstill and the government, facing the most radical expression of popular discontent to date, was forced to take immediate measures to contain the situation On 17 October, the tsar issued a manifesto which granted elementary constitutional rights to the Russian people In the eyes of the moderates, this was a fundamental victory for the revolutionary movement To the more radical parties, however, acceptance of the manifesto would have been tantamount to a betrayal of the proletarian cause Sensing the vulnerability of the regime, they advocated further revolutionary action, which resulted in the outbreak of a new strike in Moscow on 7 December

Anxious that the new strike should not develop into a general stoppage, the government decided on this occasion to employ military force against the workers Meetings were broken up by armed detachments and numerous arrests followed in their wake These draconian measures provoked a hostile reaction from the strikers, who erected barricades in several working-class districts of Moscow For a week, workers and soldiers engaged in an armed conflict on the streets of the city The outcome was inevitable, poorly equipped and insufficiently organized, the strikers were forced to submit to the superior government forces The December insurrection proved to be an important turning point, although the revolution was by no means over, the government had won its first major victory and from this time onwards it was on the offensive

As in January, Gorky witnessed these important events at first

hand, having moved to Moscow in the autumn [144] On his arrival he had resumed his revolutionary activity, making anti-government speeches at various workers' meetings[145] and playing a prominent role in the demonstration which accompanied the funeral of Bauman, a Bolshevik who had been murdered by the Black Hundreds [146] During the December insurrection itself, Gorky's flat became a meeting point and organizational centre for the Bolsheviks [147] After the defeat of the insurrectionists, it became imperative that Gorky escape from Moscow as soon as possible, which he did on 13 December [148] The next few weeks were spent in St Petersburg, from where he left Russia for the relative safety of Finland early in the new year [149] A month later, in February, 1906, still pursued by police agents, Gorky was forced to depart for Europe proper and to begin a period of self-imposed exile which was to last until 1913 [150]

With the exception of the play Varvary, Gorky's literary endeavours during this period were largely confined to the field of journalism Although certain of his works (for example, Tovarishch', I eshchyo o chyorte, Sobaka, Devochka, Starik, Mudrets and others) are accorded the status of 'artistic productions' in the definitive Academy edition of Gorky's works, the distinction between these and the articles written for the Social-Democratic press is somewhat artificial The dividing line between artistic journalese and journalistic art is extremely fine and, for the purposes of the present discussion, no such distinction has been considered necessary Our concern is to discover the nature of Gorky's political and philosophical views as expressed in the stories and articles of these months

Appearing as they did in Social-Democrat publications, Gorky's works of this period correspond in certain obvious respects with the political platform of the RSDLP Particularly important is Gorky's attitude to the liberal Kadets, whom the Social-Democrats considered to be their greatest rivals amongst the opposition parties The moderate policies of the Kadets were exposed to especially vocal criticism after the publication of the October manifesto, which was accepted by many of their number as an alternative preferable to the violent opposition advocated by the Social-Democrats and the Socialist Revolutionaries

Gorky expressed his own critical attitude towards the liberals in a number of works, many of which were satirical in form In Pis'mo v redaktsiyu he parodied the vogue amongst liberals of writing letters

to the newspapers in which they publicly disassociated themselves from the violence committed by the revolutionaries and expressed their support for the government in its attempts to restore law and order These intellectuals had been profoundly shocked by the anarchy which had been unleashed by the revolutionary movement and which they considered alien to the achievement of social progress It was to them that Gorky addressed another article Po povodu, in which he suggested that such destructiveness was the 'inevitable retribution' of the people for which the intelligentsia, by its isolation from the masses, was indirectly responsible [151] In Gorky's view, the liberals had simply deserted the revolutionary cause which they had so recently supported, an opinion which found expression in his most caustic satire of this period I eshchyo o chyorte

I eshchyo o chyorte completes a cycle of works begun in 1899 Like the two earlier stories in the series, O chyorte and Eshchyo o chyorte, this work takes the form of a debate between an intellectual and a 'devil', who represents the intellectual's conscience and provides the author with a mouthpiece for his own views The 'hero' is Ivan Ivanovich Ivanov, a liberal, whose mediocrity is suggested by his very name Articulate and confident, Ivan Ivanovich is exposed to incisive criticism by the devil, who consistently undermines his complacency by reminding him of the revolutionary views he had recently held but which he now denied Under the pressure of the devil's inquisition, Ivan Ivanovich is symbolically stripped bare, revealing his hypocrisy and the inconsistency of his political standpoint

I eshchyo o chyorte differs from the earlier works in this series in that it is a clearly translatable political satire Soviet scholars have noted that certain of Ivan Ivanovich's speeches have been taken almost verbatim from contemporary liberal newspapers [152] Yet, despite their obvious topical significance, the views expressed in this work are by no means new to Gorky Some four years earlier, in Vesenniye melodii, he had taken the liberals to task for the very same hypocrisy (Significantly, this work, which was refused publication at the time of writing, was printed in several Social-Democratic newspapers in 1905 as part of the campaign against the liberals) [153]

Gorky's critique of Russian liberalism in his articles of this period is often taken by Soviet scholars as an indication of his

'ideological unity' with the RSDLP and, in particular, with Lenin [154] By comparing Gorky's views with carefully selected passages from articles by Lenin, it is possible even to suggest that his own statements were influenced by those of the Bolshevik leader Such an interpretation would seem exaggerated, considering that Gorky's political views in 1905 differed in no significant way from those expressed in earlier years Furthermore, even if the theory of Lenin's influence is accepted, this does not alter the fact that, despite obvious superficial similarities, Gorky's complex and highly personal conception of revolution was fundamentally different from that of Lenin

Gorky's primary interest, both in his journalistic articles and in his literary works of this period, is what might best be termed the 'psychology' of revolution In his view, the essential feature of social revolution was not the pursuit of a particular political or economic ideal but the attitude of those participating in that revolution The ideal revolution, according to Gorky, is one in which all men are united by a common rationality He had expressed this view in a letter to Andreyev of December, 1904 "Скажи еще, что пора уже превратить движение из стихийного в сознательное" [155] In a later pamphlet, he defined revolutionaries as 'people who are convinced of the victory of human reason over animal instincts' [156] Although he had castigated those liberal intellectuals who had been shocked by the senseless violence perpetrated in the name of revolution (in Po povodu), Gorky was by no means insensitive to the problem His own disgust at atrocities prompted by instinct and ignorance had been evident in earlier works, such as Vyvod and Pogrom and the same opinion was expressed in O kavkazskikh sobytiyakh, written in July, 1905 In this article, Gorky displayed particular concern at the way in which such brutal instincts can be manipulated by others "Меня не так угнетает жестокость, как глупость людей, не понимающих, что их темными страстями играет внешняя злая сила" [157] However, later in the same article, we read the following, seemingly contradictory, statement "Они (т е. хозяева, А Б) не понимают, что превратить народ в слепую, механическую силу так же невозможно, как обработать в кучу глины гранитные горы Кавказа" [158] This inconsistency is typical of Gorky In the first extract, he is writing as a realist, accepting that 'rabble-rousing' is an inescapable element in civil strife In the second, he is writing as an idealist,

expressing his faith in man's ability to control his base instincts This faith is elucidated further in Pis'ma k rabochim, a series of unsigned articles which appeared in Rabochiy [159]

Gorky's purpose in these 'letters' was to acquaint the workers not with the political or economic argument for Marxism, but with his own views on the 'psychology' of revolution In the second letter, he repeats his view that reason must prevail over instinct "Революция, товарищи, начинается в головах и уже потом приводит в движение руки" [160] In the same article, he recommends the RSDLP to the reader as the only political organization which appeals specifically to the mind, without playing on sentiments and prejudice [161] To Lenin, who read this article abroad, such an approach to political questions was anathema In particular, he must have been horrified by Gorky's reference in the article to the Russian intelligentsia as the embodiment of altruism and rationality, the sine qua non of revolutionary consciousness [162] This came at a time when Lenin himself was censuring the same intelligentsia for its incurably petty bourgeois tendencies In October, 1905, he wrote to the Central Committee of the RSDLP, informing them of his dissatisfaction with the article "Получил № 2 Рабочего О фельетоне собираюсь написать вам обстоятельно Не следов(ало) бы автору его такие темы брать выходит какой-то "сентиментальный" социализм, опасный зело" [163] Although Lenin never in fact wrote in detail on the subject of Gorky's article, his criticism is significant Always sensitive to deviations from Marxist orthodoxy, Lenin realized that in Gorky's terminology the terms 'intelligentsia', 'petty-bourgeoisie' and 'working class' referred not to definite social classes in the Marxist sense, but to abstract ethical categories This brief episode is especially illuminating when it is viewed in the context of the later conflict which was to arise between Lenin and Gorky over the theory of 'God-building' Although as yet only latent, it is clear that the essential difference between the two men was already present in 1905

Gorky's criticism of capitalist society was founded not on any political or economic theory, but upon beliefs which were primarily humanistic Again it was the psychological aspect which was Gorky's major concern In his opinion, capitalist society was evil because, being based on the concept of self-interest, it encouraged the development of antisocial attitudes, resulting in the alienation of the

individual Thus revolution was envisaged by Gorky first and foremost as a force for the unification of mankind, for the integration of the individual in society This hope is expressed at the end of the third 'letter to the workers'

> Товарищи! Организуйтесь в одну Всероссийскую семью рабочих, борцов за свободу, за человеческое достоинство, за ваше право - жить широкой, светлой, разумной жизнью В единении сила, товарищи 164

The idea of revolution as the crucial stage in the transition of mankind from an individualistic to a collective consciousness is developed in Tovarishch', which was written towards the end of 1905

Tovarishch' provides a schematic picture of social progress from capitalism to socialism as envisioned by Gorky In the first of its three sections, the author evokes the mood of despondency which hangs over capitalist society

> Всегда было скучно, всегда тревожно, порою страшно, а вокруг людей, как тюрьма, неподвижно стоял, отражая живые лучи солнца, этот угрюмый темный город . 165

In this depressing environment, the individual reverts to his animal origins, living a life bounded by the limits of his own selfish interests From this picture of modern urban society, Gorky shifts his attention, in the second part of the story, to the 'lone dreamers', who begin to appear in the city in increasing numbers They are, in Gorky's words, 'filled with faith in man', 'rebellious sparks from the distant fire of truth' [166] The 'truth' of which the new men are the bearers is embodied in the word 'Comrade'', which has a strong impact upon all those who hear it

> И чувствовали, что это слово пришло объединить весь мир, поднять всех людей его на высоту свободы и связать их новыми узами уважения друг к другу, уважения к свободе человека, ради свободы его 167

The final section depicts the translation of this ideal into reality On hearing the word 'Comrade'', the beggar and the prostitute, the extreme victims of capitalist society, are spiritually resurrected Similarly, the social barriers, which had hitherto hindered mankind, are now removed, allowing individuals to unite in a powerful collective force

In conception (although not, it is stressed, in form or literary merit), Tovarishch' may be compared to Dante's 'Divine Comedy', the

three parts of Gorky's work corresponding to the 'Inferno', 'Purgatory' and 'Paradise' of the Italian poet's masterpiece This same conception can be detected in a number of Gorky's full-length works of the following years, notably in Mat', Ispoved' and the unfinished 'Okurov trilogy' Like Tovarishch', each of these novels is concerned with the evolution of mankind towards a new, collectivist philosophy of life

Tovarishch' was written during a period when Gorky's optimism regarding the revolution was at its height His mood is reflected in a number of letters To Z K Sturmer he wrote in November, 1905 "Держу пари на миллион золотом за непрерывность революции" [168] A letter to Pyatnitsky written a month later during the Moscow armed insurrection reveals his conviction that he was witnessing the true revolution on the streets of the city

> Рабочие ведут себя изумительно!
> Ей-богу - ничего подобного не ожидал!
> Деловито, серьезно - в деле - при стычках
> с конниками и постройке баррикад, весело
> и шутливо в безделье [169]

Fully comprehensible, therefore, is Gorky's hostile rejoinder to the reports carried in the conservative press, identifying the revolutionary movement with acts of senseless violence and destruction In the pamphlet K rabochim vsekh stran he wrote, in reference to the Moscow armed insurrection

> На улицах Москвы инстинкт и эгоизм сражались рядом с сознанием И сражались ожесточенно, (одни), как дикие звери, другие как истые революционеры, героически, как люди, одухотворенные идеей [170]

For Gorky, the distinction between revolution and revolt was crucial If he was prepared to admit that certain acts of instinctive violence had been committed by supporters of the revolutionary cause, he was certainly not willing to bestow upon such people the title of 'revolutionary' In 1917 and 1918, it was Lenin's use of hooliganistic and other such elements in the Bolsheviks' drive for power that met with Gorky's strongest disapproval [171]

The discussion so far has been confined to the positive aspects of Gorky's revolutionary ideal as presented in his works and articles of the autumn and winter of 1905 Equally important, however, are those works which define the philosophy and psychology of 'Philistinism' (meshchanstvo) which Gorky identified as the greatest threat to the

victory of revolution

The word meshchanstvo is one which confronts the translator with considerable difficulties It has, as Ivanov-Razumnik has indicated,[172] both ethical and sociological connotations, which, incidentally, make the title of the play Meshchane practically impossible to render adequately in English In November, 1905, Gorky published two articles, O Serom and Zametki o meshchanstve, both of which are devoted to a definition of Philistinism in the context of the 1905 Revolution

In O Serom, Gorky depicts life as a battle between two irreconcilable forces the Black, with its 'indefatigable thirst for power over men',[173] and the Red, which is characterized by its 'burning desire to see life free, rational and beautiful' [174] In between these two forces stands the Grey, an amorphous element which has no concern in life other than material well-being To Gorky, the Grey is the most insidious evil as it hinders the inevitable conflict between the Red and the Black "Расплываясь в середине, он бездарно смешивает два основных света жизни в один тусклый, грязный, скучный "[175]

Zametki o meshchanstve develops the basic theme of O Serom into a full-length article in which Gorky attempts to give a sociological definition of Philistinism and an historical account of its evolution in Russia Again, Gorky begins with the definition of life as a battle between the forces of progress and reaction "Жизнь, как это известно, - борьба господ за власть и рабов - за освобождение от гнета власти" [176] The Philistine is the man who remains uncommitted in this struggle, interested only in his own welfare "Его любимая позиция", Gorky tells us, " - мирная жизнь в тылу наиболее сильной армии" [177] He then passes to a discussion of the influences which have encouraged the growth of Philistinism Beginning with a critique of the Orthodox Church, Gorky continues with censure of the Populist movement In the third part of the article he mounts his celebrated attack against Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, whom Gorky identifies as the ideological figureheads of Philistinism

> - Терпи' - сказал русскому обществу Достоевский своей речью на открытии памятника Пушкину
> - Самоусовершенствуйся' - сказал Толстой и добавил Не противься злу насилием' 178

Tolstoy had already provoked Gorky's anger as a result of his letter to The Times of February, 1905, in which he had publicly dissociated himself from the aims and methods of the Russian revolutionary parties [179] Most important in Zametki o meshchanstve, however, is not Gorky's criticism of Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, nor even his highly subjective interpretation of social history in nineteenth-century Russia Above all, this article, together with O Serom, is significant in that it identifies the ultimate barrier which must be broken down if revolution is to be truly successful This is not the physical barrier of political oppression but a spiritual barrier entrenched in human nature, from which political oppression draws its strength and which is thus the revolution's most insidious enemy

The articles and works reviewed in this section express Gorky's hopes and fears regarding the Revolution of 1905, hopes that the revolution would herald a new age of rationality and collective consciousness, fears that these promising beginnings would be swamped by the forces of Philistinism Although crude and naive in form, they contain the embryo of themes of considerable complexity which were to be developed in Gorky's major literary works of the post-1905 period The first signs of his deepening awareness of the problems raised by the phenomenon of revolution are already present in Varvary, Gorky's fifth full-length play, which was written during the summer and autumn of 1905 [180]

F Varvary False prophets of the new world

Varvary, was written during a relative lull in Gorky's revolutionary activity which provided him with the opportunity to reappraise his conception of revolution against the background of recent events The play had been originally conceived as a sequel to Dachniki and the author had written a detailed plan even before the outbreak of revolution On his release from the Peter and Paul Fortress, Gorky immediately wrote to Pyatnitsky, requesting that the latter send him this plan as soon as possible [181] Delayed by ill-health and his work on Deti Solntsa, Gorky began to write Varvary only in the summer of that year Between this time and the date of the play's first publication, in March, 1906, Varvary was substantially revised on a number of occasions The Soviet scholar, V Novikov, who recently undertook a detailed study of the manuscript versions of the play, [182] has revealed the fundamental nature of Gorky's revisions Novikov's discoveries led

him to the conclusion that 'the ideo-aesthetic conception of the play was formed under the influence of the revolution, reflecting the characteristic processes which arose in the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia'[183] Detailed study of the information contained in Novikov's well-documented article suggests even more far-reaching conclusions The manuscripts of Varvary, which span the entire period of the 1905 Revolution, provide a unique opportunity of tracing the evolution of the author's views at this crucial time

The first draft of Varvary comprises the text of three acts and several scenes towards a fourth[184] The first act displays a striking similarity to the opening scenes of Dachniki Once again, Gorky's subject is the provincial intelligentsia and the setting a sleepy backwater, the town of Verkhopol'e The characters are all somewhat familiar, the men are corrupt, hypocritical and cynical, committed to the maintenance of the status quo whilst the women, disillusioned by a life which allows them no outlet for their talents, embody a frustrated desire for a new and better existence As in Dachniki, the characters reveal their nature as they discuss the impending arrival of an 'outsider' in their town The 'outsider' in this play is the engineer, Cherkun, who comes, symbolically, to build a new railway for the town From the moment of his arrival, Cherkun presents a threat to the traditions of Verkhopol'e "Меня серьезно раздражает этот город", he tells his colleague Tsyganov at the beginning of the second act and promises, "ты увидишь, я переверну его кверху дном"[185] Much to the satisfaction of Lidiya, who is the extreme representative of the female attitude to Verkhopol'e, Cherkun is as good as his word At the end of the first act, he mercilessly exposes the mayor, Redozubov, as a pompous and tyrannical fraud, an unambiguous declaration of intent which is a significant moral victory for the engineer

In the following acts it is Cherkun who dominates the action Particularly important is the marital crisis which faces the engineer and his wife, Anna This crisis is more than a simple conflict of personalities, as the husband and wife are the representatives of two alien philosophies of life Cherkun's attitude is encapsulated in his words to Anna "Я ненавижу людей, которые смеют насиловать себе подобных я всегда буду бить таких людей их же орудием"[186] Unlike her husband, Anna advocates pity

and forgiveness rather than active struggle as the means to a better life, a rather transparent parody of the Tolstoyan doctrine of 'non-resistance to evil' The conflict, which is complicated by Cherkun's attraction to Lidiya, results in the departure of Anna for the Russian countryside, whence she returns at the beginning of Act 3 a new woman Horrified by the ignorance and poverty she had encountered in the villages, Anna is now convinced that her husband's policy of active resistance to evil is the only true path to progress Her new resolve is reflected in her determination to found a school for peasant children Noting this radical change in his wife's views, Cherkun is filled with admiration and a full reconciliation between them seems possible

This version was presumably closest of all to Gorky's original conception of Varvary Although the play was unfinished in this version, Cherkun emerges quite plainly as a 'positive hero', a 'new man' of the type that Varvara Mikhaylovna had sought in vain in Dachniki Cherkun is the vanguard of a force for change which threatens to destroy the old world of hypocrisy and corruption and promises to create a new world founded on the principles of truth, equality and justice

The original version of Varvary, conceived as a sequel to Dachniki was never completed Gorky's plan became more complex in the process of composition, causing him in particular to reevaluate the role of Cherkun As a result, the role of several secondary characters also underwent significant changes So extensive were these changes that Gorky abandoned his attempts to revise the original manuscripts in favour of writing a completely new version, which served as the basis for the final text of the play [187]

In its published version, the plot of the first act remained essentially the same as in the original text As before, the play opens with the inhabitants of Verkhopol'e awaiting the arrival of the railway engineers from the capital The situation is reminiscent of the opening scenes of Revizor Indeed, the influence of Gogol' can also be detected in Gorky's uncharacteristic use of farce, the grotesque and the device of humorous meaningful names (Redozubov, Veselkina) Like Gogol's officials, the local residents epitomize the evils of provincial Russian society Apart from Redozubov, who is the quintessence of bureaucratic corruption in the tradition of Skvoznyak-Dmukhanovsky, we encounter the scandal-monger Veselkina, the swindler Pritykin, the conniving Pavlin, Nadezhda, a provincial femme fatale, and her pro-

fligate husband, Monakhov The arrival of Cherkun and the other engineers at the end of Act 1 is thus invested with the same dramatic significance as the promised arrival of the government inspector in Gogol's play Cherkun's immediate challenge to Redozubov seems to be a promise of retribution, a promise which is voiced by Stepan, a student who makes up Cherkun's entourage "Вот построим новую дорогу и разрушим вашу старую жизнь" [188]

Despite these broad similarities with the original version of Act 1, there are certain elements in the published text which reveal the fundamental change in Gorky's conception of the play Particularly significant are those elements intended to deflate the image of Cherkun and hence cast doubt upon Stepan's optimistic statement Hence Lidiya, who, in the original version, had been captivated by Cherkun's personality and convinced of his power to destroy the Philistinism of Verkhopol'e, is considerably more reserved in her judgement of the engineer In reply to Tsyganov's question "Как вам нравится этот рыжий буян?", she answers simply "По совести - не очень" [189]

Lidiya's scepticism stands in marked contrast to the reaction of Nadezhda (whose role in the final version of the play is considerably expanded) Nadezhda had, on her own admission awaited the arrival of the engineers 'like a holiday' [190] Her words recall Varvara Mikhaylovna's statement prior to her meeting with Shalimov " Я жду его как весну'" [191] The parallel may well have been conscious, as Cherkun represents to Nadezhda what Shalimov had initially represented to Varvara Mikhaylovna the promise of an escape from an environment by which she feels oppressed Unlike Varvara Mikhaylovna, however, Nadezhda indulges in pure escapism In her imagination, the engineers are identified with the heroes of the cheap romantic novels for which she has a passion As Lidiya's aunt, Bogayevskaya, remarks "Она хотела бы видеть их верхами, в латах, в плащах" [192] Her point is emphasized by Pavlin, who brings the first news of the engineers to the townsfolk "Один пожилой, бритый, с усами и как бы уже несколько хмелен другой - помоложе и весьма рыжеват" [193] The contrast between this prosaic description and Nadezhda's poetic illusions adds a new element to the play, serving to reinforce our doubts about the 'new men'

In accordance with the author's new conception of the play, the second and third acts of the final version underwent more fundamental

revision Especially noteworthy are the changes introduced into the relationship between Cherkun and Anna Once again, the changes are intended to make the character of Cherkun less attractive His attitude to his wife is both callous and intolerant and he takes malicious pleasure in telling her home truths As in the original version, Anna leaves Verkhopol'e for the countryside, but her return does not signal any major change in her character Although shocked by her experiences, she makes no plans to deal actively with the evils of peasant life and remains to the end passive, submissive and utterly dependent upon Cherkun

Gorky's object in changing the Anna-Cherkun relationship is clear The reconciliation, with which the original version was to end, was intended as a vindication of Cherkun's philosophy of life By depriving him of this moral victory, the author again detracts from his image as a 'positive hero' Cherkun's inability to 'resurrect' Anna is a sign of his impotence, a truth with which Cherkun is confronted in Act 3

> Анна Ты должен научить меня
> Ты должен что-то дать мне взамен того,
> что взял
> Черкун Не знаю как я сделаю это .
> не знаю, Анна' Мне так неловко 194

The role of Anna has thus taken on a completely different significance, in contrast to the original version, she stands as a living condemnation of her husband, her fate illustrating his principal weakness Although Cherkun's 'truth' succeeds in destroying Anna's illusions, it provides nothing in return, leaving her prey to cynicism and despair

Cherkun also has to bear the moral responsibility for the tragedy of Nadezhda, who commits suicide at the end of the play Her death has a similar significance to the death of the actor in the final act of Na dne Infatuated with Cherkun, as the actor had been with Luka's promise of a hospital for alcoholics, Nadezhda is equally unable to come to terms with the disillusionment which comes with the realization that the engineer is not the romantic hero of her dreams Gorky increases his censure of Cherkun by making Nadezhda a more sympathetic character than her prototype Her naive romanticism betrays a more exalted side of her nature, of which the doctor, Makarov, is aware "Послушай ты, как земля, богата силой творческой ты носишь в себе великую любовь" [195] It is a further discredit to

Cherkun that he should cause the death of one of the few inhabitants of Verkhopol'e to seek salvation

Further doubt is cast upon Cherkun's character by his assocation with Tsyganov A cynic and bon-viveur, Tsyganov is the natural drinking companion for Monakhov and Pritykin Like them, he is amoral and self-seeking Not only is he directly implicated in the Pritykin fraud, but he is also indirectly responsible for the Drobyazgin theft, as it was he who gave the latter encouragement Similarly undesirable is Tsyganov's influence upon Redozubov's son Grisha, whom he introduces to vodka Even in love, Tsyganov is an unattractive character His desperate pursuit of Nadezhda is reminiscent of Svidrigaylov's attempts to win the love of Dunya in Dostoyevsky's Prestupleniye i Nakazaniye, and although Tsyganov does not commit suicide when finally rejected by Nadezhda, it is intimated that he will eventually kill himself with alcohol

When revising the play for publication, Gorky introduced a detail into Tsyganov's biography which emphasized his proximity to Cherkun In Act 2, Tsyganov refers to an incident from his past in conversation with Cherkun "Вдруг сегодня вспомнил эту брюнеточка такая . так ее звали? Хористка из оперетки она потом утопилась в Мойке" [196] The full significance of this seemingly chance remark becomes apparent only after Nadezhda's suicide By means of this deliberate parallel, Gorky suggests that Cherkun is closer to Tsyganov than appearances would give one to believe

Gorky's critique of Cherkun is made more explicit through the characters of Lidiya and Stepan, who play the role of raisonneurs in the play Of the two, it is Lidiya who is Cherkun's most vociferous critic As we have seen, she had been cautious in her appraisal of Cherkun from the outset Lidiya is particularly aware of the danger of overrating the engineer when he is seen only in the context of Verkhopol'e, as she informs her aunt

> Богаевская Скажи - он нравится тебе?
> Лидия Не очень Но среди других [197]

Accordingly, her main concern is to discover whether Cherkun is what he seems to be Cherkun himself is anxious to impress Lidiya and it is to her that he addresses his most unambiguous declarations of intent

> Мне очень нужно посчитаться с людьми за прошлое, очень' Во мне нет жалости к тем

> жадным и тупым животным, которые командуют жизнью И бессилие тех, которые подчиняются, меня приводит в ярость 198

Although these remarks on the nature of power would seem to concur with Lidiya's own views, the similarity is largely superficial In the case of Lidiya, who is of aristociatic background, her rejection of capitalist society is the result of rational consideration Cherkun's words reveal that his protest is, on the contrary, the protest of a peasant's son inspired primarily by an instinctive desire for vengeance against those who had formerly been his masters

As the play develops, Lidiya becomes increasingly dissatisfied with Cherkun's behaviour She constantly reminds him of his failure to live up to his early promises In the final act, she charges him directly

> Лидия А помните - когда-то вы хотели поставить город вверх дном?
> Черкун Хотел? Ну да хотел Так что же? Что вы хотите сказать?
> Лидия Я только напоминаю Я вот не вижу, чтоб жизнь обновилась благодаря вам а сами вы, мне кажется, немного потускнели 199

The Lidiya-Cherkun relationship is directly comparable to the Varvara Mikhaylovna-Shalimov relationship in Dachniki The parallel is particularly obvious in Lidiya's final declaration

> Я искала я думала, что найду стойкого, твердого человека, которого можно бы уважать Я давно ищу Я ищу человека, чтобы поклониться ему, чтобы пойти рядом с ним Пусть это мечта но я буду искать человека 200

Thus Cherkum, like Shalimov, is exposed as an imposter, he is not the 'new man' he pretends to be but a false prophet

If the role of Lidiya is essentially negative, having the purpose of criticising Cherkun, it is to Stepan that the role of 'positive hero' now falls In the original version of the play, Stepan had been portrayed as Cherkun's blind disciple, a naive and somewhat over-enthusiastic youth In the final text, however, Stepan emerges as a 'fellow-traveller' who is capable of independent thought and action His independence is stressed from the very beginning by the fact that he arrives in Verkhopol'e alone, before Cherkun and his entourage Although less ostentatious in his opposition to the spirit of Verkhopol'e

than Cherkun, Stepan proves that actions speak louder than words In the opening scene, we learn that he has already been imprisoned once for his revolutionary activities and, at the end of the play, he is threatened with a new arrest

The inevitable conflict between Stepan and Cherkun occurs in the final act, when Stepan confronts the engineers with the facts of Pritykin's fraud Like Lidiya, Stepan is an idealist who refuses to compromise his principles As a result, he is disappointed in Cherkun, whose reaction to the revelation is ambivalent Aware that Tsyganov is probably implicated in the affair, Cherkun is embarrassed by Stepan's indignation and his promises to investigate the matter further are merely a ploy By allowing his sense of truth and justice to be compromised by his feelings of friendship towards Tsyganov, Cherkun shows himself to be as corrupt as those he criticises, for which he earns the contempt of his former colleague

Stepan's strength of character is revealed in particular in his relationship with Redozubov's daughter Katya, which provides a counterpart to Cherkun's unsuccessful attempts to court Lidiya Like Lidiya, Katya finds the stifling atmosphere of Verkhopol'e abhorrent and seeks to rebel against it Aware of her mood, Stepan sees it as his duty to inspire her to leave the town and join the revolutionary movement

> Степан там горит великий огонь разума, и все честные, все умные люди видят при свете его, как грязно и скверно устроена жизнь
> Катя (негромко) Там много честных и умных?
> Степан (усмехнулся) Ну не очень Потому-то я и говорю - идите туда! Отдайте хоть два-три года вашей юности мечтам о новой жизни и борьбе за эти мечты 201

This scene differs significantly from the second manuscript version of Varvary, in which Stepan's reply to Katya's question was far more positive

> Степан (горячо) . Да, много И все они дружно готовятся к великой работе чтобы создать жизнь новую, светлую Там хорошо! 202

By replacing this optimistic statement with the more realistic admission of the final text, Gorky stresses that Stepan, unlike Cherkun, is not guilty of false pretences Katya's decision to follow Stepan is thus the result not of infatuation but of rational deliberation founded on

her knowledge of his strengths and weaknesses

From the point of view of structure, Varvary is one of Gorky's weakest plays The proliferation of characters, noted by Blok,[203] caused the author considerable technical problems, especially in the picnic scene, in which numerous entrances and exits are too obviously dictated by the need for the characters to confess their feelings The Tsyganov-Nadezhda-Cherkun-Lidiya situation is trite, and the final act, with an attempted murder and a suicide, smacks of melodrama It is little wonder, therefore, that the majority of contemporary critics concentrated on the play's artistic demerits [204] Of those who turned their attention to the content of Varvary many expressed confusion as to the significance of the term 'barbarism' as employed in the title Most critics concluded that the 'barbarians' were the intellectuals whom Gorky had already criticised in Dachniki and Deti Solntsa [205] However, Gornfel'd probably came closest of all to Gorky's conception when he gave the following definition of 'barbarism'

> Нет, варвары Горького - не интеллигенты, его варвары - везде, во всех слоях, на всяких ступенях общественной лестницы, во всех человеческих положениях Варварство - это насилие человека над человеком 206

As Gornfel'd suggests, Varvary is not so much a social drama presenting a critique of the intelligentsia as an enquiry into the nature of oppression and the means of combatting it

In Varvary, it is Cherkun and Stepan who present the most obvious threat to the 'barbarism' of Verkhopol'e For all his weaknesses, Cherkun sincerely detests the corrupting influence of power and fights against it to the best of his ability He attempts to help Grisha escape from his father and saves Stepa from the mercenary designs of her father and the peasant, Matvey Yet Cherkun, as we have seen, proves incapable of destroying 'barbarism' and even falls prey to it himself The reason for his failure is suggested in Act 3

> Катя Ну, что же делать?
> Анна Что нужно делать?
>
> Степан Открывайте глаза слепорожденным - больше вы ничего не можете сделать ничего!
> Черкун Надо строить новые дороги железные дороги Железо - сила, которая разрушит эту глупую, тесную, деревянную жизнь

Степан И сами люди должны быть как железные, если они хотят перестроить жизнь 207

This passage reveals the essential difference between Cherkun and Stepan, who emerge as the representatives of two opposite concepts of social progress Cherkun is a pure materialist, hence his faith in the power of material change in the form of the railway to effect a qualitative change in human society Stepan, on the other hand, is an idealist, who stresses that the motive force for social evolution must be provided by a spiritual change within man In his view, it is the task of the revolutionary to 'open the eyes' of the 'blind' in order that they become the 'men of iron' who will change society from within

Varvary marks a significant turning point in the development of Gorky's views on the nature of revolution The conflict between Cherkun and Stepan is resolved in favour of the latter and this may be seen as an implicit statement of Gorky's own rejection of the materialist standpoint The experience of 1905 had proved to him that the stimulus of external change, even in the most extreme form of political revolution, is in itself insufficient to guarantee that the ideal be realized Thus Professor Weil's contention that, at the time of the 1905 Revolution, 'Gorky was a deeply committed and dedicated Marxist'[208] must be disputed Whilst Gorky remained true to the Bolshevik cause after 1905 as he had done during the revolutionary year, he was at no time a Marxist by conviction His works of the following period, including Mat' and Vragi (held by Soviet critics to be masterpieces of Socialist Realism), develop further his essentially idealistic conception of revolution

Clearly, then, the advent of the 1905 Revolution had a profound effect upon Gorky both as a man and as a writer, indeed, it could hardly have been otherwise as he, perhaps more consistently than any of his contemporaries, had both predicted and eagerly awaited such a revolution for a good number of years First, the events of 1905 caused him finally to clarify his political standpoint and to declare his allegiance to the Social-Democratic cause Second, and as a direct corollary of the first, political developments exerted a marked influence on Gorky's conception of 'committed art', which was to have enormous implications in the years to come Third, the revolution was clearly identified with certain themes in Gorky's drama and fiction,

themes which were to dominate his entire literary output for the next six or seven years These were the social problem of the gulf between the intellectual and the people, the philosophical problem of alienation, and the psychological problem of the master-slave relationship In Gorky's view, it was the object of revolution to provide a solution to each of these problems and central to all of his works of this and the following period is the same pragmatic concern, which may be summed up in the question 'Can social revolution bring about a revolutionary change in human nature itself?' In the following chapter, in which we shall examine the impact of the 1905 Revolution upon Andreyev, we shall see that, despite important differences of political commitment and aesthetic philosophy, his literary works pose precisely the same question as Gorky's and are concerned with the same underlying social, philosophical and psychological problems

CHAPTER TWO NOTES

1 see Gorky's letter to Bryusov Г-30, т 28, стр 152-153 For an interesting discussion of Gorky's dealings with Bryusov, see Irwin Weil, 'Gor'kij's Relations with the Bolsheviks and Symbolists', Slavonic and East European Journal (New Series), vol 4 (1970), pp.201-219
2 ЛН 72, стр 97
3 For a detailed discussion of this subject, see: Т Мартынец, "Самооценка А М Горького в его письмах 1889-1904", Ученые записки Черновицкого университета, т 57 (1962), (серия филологические науки, вып 17), стр 25-37
4 Г-30, т 28, стр 141
5 ibid , p.153
6 ibid., p 345
7 ПССГ, т.7, стр 199
8 В Новиков, Творческая лаборатория Горького-драматурга, (М , 1965), стр 31
9 ПССГ, т 7, стр 192
10 ibid., p.202
11 ibid , p 278.
12 Г-30, т 28, стр 345
13 ibid., p 192
14 ibid , p 216
15 ibid
16 ibid , p 208
17 ibid , p 230
18 Л Фрейдкина, Дни и годы Вл И Немировича-Данченко, (М , 1962), стр 195
19 ibid , p 196
20 ibid.
21 ЛЖТ 1, стр 491 Gorky's relations with Nemirovich-Danchenko are discussed in the following articles Е Дубнова, "Накануне революции 1905 года (К истории первой постановки "Дачников")", Театр, № 3 (1968), стр 45-53, Г Зорина, "Горький и Немирович-Данченко", Ежегодник Института истории искусств, (М , 1959), стр 140-181
22 see Э Паина, "Использование пьесы М Горького "Мещане" в агитационных целях", Русская литература, № 2 (1959), стр 224-225
23 Дубнова, стр 52
24 ЛН 72, стр 239
25 АГ 5, стр 135
26 ЛН 72, стр 240
27 Г-30, т 28, стр 343
28 ПССГ, т 6, стр 68
29 ibid., p.79
30 ibid., p 85
31 ibid., p.73
32 АГ 4, стр.170
33 Н Коробка, "Последние рассказы М Горького", Вестник и библиотека самообразования, № 14 (1905), стр 438
34 Вересаев, т 5 стр 406
35 ЛН 72, стр 258
36 ПССГ, Варианты, т 2, стр 66
37 А Тарасова, "Работа А М Горького над рассказом "Тюрьма'', в кн Мастерство русских классиков, (М , 1959), стр 297

38 ПССГ, Варианты, т 2, стр 63
39 ПССГ, т 6, стр 121
40 А Басаргин, "Истомились мы ", Московские ведомости, 4 июля, 1905, стр 3
41 ПССГ, т 6, стр 119
42 ibid., p.122
43 ibid , p.522 ff A similar story is told by Kalinin in the story of the same title in the Po Rusi cycle ПССГ, т 14, стр 340-346
44 ПССГ, т 6, стр 102
45 ibid., p 100
46 ibid., p 106
47 ЛЖТ 1, стр 496,497,502 Gorky had been giving financial support to the RSDLP since 1902
48 АГ 5, стр 145
49 For details of the Putilov strike and of Gapon's involvement, see Sidney Harcave, First Blood The Russian Revolution of 1905, (London, 1965), pp.69-97 For the text of the petition, see АН СССР Институт истории, Начало первой русской революции Январь-март 1905 года, (М , 1955), стр 28-31 An account of Gorky's activities in 1905 is contained in Tova Yedlin, 'Maxim Gorky His Early Revolutionary Activity and His Involvement in the Revolution of 1905', Canadian Slavonic Papers, vol XVII, No.1 (Spring, 1975), pp 76-105.
50 Рев путь Г , стр 88
51 Г-30, т 28, стр 346
52 Gorky gave two accounts of his movements on 8 and 9 January. The first is contained in his pamphlet Vsem russkim grazhdanam i obshchestvennomu mneniyu evropeyskikh gosudarstv, the second in the memoir Savva Morozov
53 For the identity of the other members of the delegation, see Г и революция 1905 года, стр 27
54 И Кахновская, "Горький 9 января 1905 года", Новый мир, № 3 (1959), стр.218-221
55 С Балухатый, "Работа М Горького над пьесой "Дети Солнца"", МИ 1 стр 459
56 Г-30, т 23, стр 336
57 И Нович, "Еще о "деле" М Горького в 1905 году", Новый мир, № 3 (1959), стр 223
58 Кахновская, стр 221
59 Г-30, т 28, стр 349
60 ЛЖТ 1, стр 505
61 Нович, "Еще о "деле"", стр 222, И Эвентов и Н Трусова, "М Горький в 1905 году", Звезда, № 3 (1955), стр 131-132
62 "А М.Горький и события 9 января 1905 года", Исторически архив, № 1 (1955), стр 93 According to another source, bail was provided by Pyatnitsky out of Znaniye funds ЛЖТ 1, стр 518
63 Г-30, т 28, стр 231
64 "А М.Горький и события", стр 94
65 see Gorky's letter to Pyatnitsky of February, 1905 АГ 4, стр 177
66 О Грузенбург, Вчера, (Париж, 1938), стр 189-190
67 Kaun, Gorky, p 368
68 ЛЖТ 1, стр 507,509
69 ibid , p 511.
70 Рев путь Г , стр 91

71 ЛЛТ 1, стр 515
72 Рев путь Г, стр 91
73 АГ 4, стр 173-175
74 Г-30, т 28, стр 354
75 ПССГ, т 7, стр 652
76 For details of Gorky's revisions at various stages of the play's composition, see Балухатый, "Работа Горького над пьесой "Дети Солнца""
77 АГ 4, стр 143
78 ЛН 72, стр 210
79 ibid., p 213
80 ibid., p 214
81 Рев путь Г, стр 92
82 ПССГ, т 7, стр 306
83 ibid., p.356
84 ibid., p 365
85 ibid, p.331
86 ibid, p 365
87 ibid., p 335
88 ibid., p.338
89 ibid., p.297
90 ibid., p.301.
91 ibid., p 312.
92 ibid., p.346
93 S.Balukhatyy notes that Gorky personally had witnessed an event similar to that described in the play Балухатый, "Работа Горького над пьесой "Дети Солнца"", стр 462
94 ПССГ, т 7, стр 318
95 ibid., p.315.
96 ibid., p 330
97 ibid., p 303
98 ibid., p.331.
99 ibid., p.333.
100 ibid.
101 The phrase, from which the play takes its title, is Protasov's ibid., p.338
102 ibid, p.333
103 ibid., p 334
104 ibid, p 339
105 ibid, p.340
106 see, in particular, the works of Volkov, Desnitsky and Balukhatyy.
107 Д.Овсянико-Куликовский, ""Дети Солнца"", Истина, № 2 (1906), стр 53
108 ПССГ, т 7, стр 389
109 ibid, p.344.
110 Е Колтоновская, "Пристрастный суд ("Дети Солнца")", Полярная звезда, № 9 (1906), А.Редько, "Литературные наброски", Русское богатство, № 2 (1906), В.Львов-Рогачевский, "Общественная трагедия", Образование, № 4 (1906)
111 see, for example, И.Нович, Горький в эпоху первой русской революции, (М., 1955), стр.95-116
112 In the absence of the original article, I quote from the translation by Herman Ermolaev. Maxim Gorky, Untimely Thoughts, (New York, 1968), p 64
113 Constantin Stanislavski, My Life in Art, translated by J.J.Robbins, (Harmondsworth, 1967), p 406

114 ЛЖТ.1, стр 556
115 В.Немирович-Данченко, Из прошлого, (М , 1938), стр 210
116 ПССГ, т 16, стр 344
117 Г и революция 1905 года, стр 37-38
118 Г-30, т 23, стр 340
119 These articles span the period 1905-1907 and include K rabochim vsekh stran, Po povodu moskovskikh sobytiy, Ne davayte deneg russkomu pravitel'stvu, Vozzvaniye k frantsuzskim rabochim, Pis'mo Anatolyu Fransu, Delo Nikolaya Shmita, (Obrashcheniye k Anglii), (O 'Soyuze russkogo naroda').
120 The critical condition of Gorky's health was especially emphasized in the Western press and, as K.D Muratova suggests, it may well have been the crucial factor in precipitating the author's release К Муратова, Семинарий по Горькому, (Л , 1956), стр.47
121 ЛЖТ 1, стр 527
122 ibid., p.530
123 В.Цыцарин, "В Куоккалле", Г и революция 1905 года, стр 82-91
124 ЛЖТ 1, стр 542
125 В Орлова, "К вопросу об участии Горького в большевистской прессе 1905 года", Г и революция 1905 года, стр 236-274
126 А Белозерский, "Горькии и 9 января", Литературная газета, 20 января, 1930
127 Олейников, "Горький и "Знание"", стр 212
128 ЛЖТ 1, стр 549-550
129 Г Дереньковский, "О второй встрече В И Ленина с А М Горьким". Исторические записки, т 83 (1969), стр.226
130 ЛЖТ 1, стр 556
131 В.Десницкий, "Максим Горький в борьбе за идейность и партийность литературы в годы реакции", Звезда, № 9 (1946), стр 188
132 In all, seven issues were published (one of Zhalo, three each of Zhupel and Adskaya pochta). For further details of these publications and of Gorky's participation in them, see З Карасик, "М Горький и сатирические журналы "Жупел" и "Адская почта"", Г и революция 1905 года, стр 357-387, Ю Макарова, "Памфлеты Горького в сатирических журналах "Жало", "Жупел" и "Адская почта"", Ученые записки Московского педагогического института им В.П Потемкина, т.97, вып 2 (1959), стр 37-50, З Ганиева, "О сатире Горького в период первой русской революции", Литература Азербайджана, № 12 (1955), стр 62-68
133 Л Красин, "Как возникла "Новая жизнь"", Журналист, № 12 (1925), стр 9
134 Minsky's views found expression in his articles Pro domo sua (Новая жизнь, № 3 (1905)), "Идея русской революции" (Перевал (1906), № 1, стр 11-23, № 2, стр 34-48, № 3, стр.12-27)) The ideas of Merezhkovsky are discussed in C.H.Bedford, 'Dmitry Merezhkovsky, the Russian intelligentsia and the Revolution of 1905', Canadian Slavonic Papers, III (1958), pp.27-42
135 Н Минский, "История моего редакторства", Русь, № 54 (1906)
136 Б Мейлах, 'Символисты в 1905 году", ЛН 27-28, стр 186-188

137 ЛЖТ 1, стр 560
138 В Десницкий, М Горький Очерки жизни и творчества, (Л , 1935), стр 58-59
139 In his reminiscences, Minsky blamed only himself for the course of events Н Минский, На общественные темы, (СПб , 1909), стр.196
140 Ленин и Горький, стр 13
141 Г-30, т 29, стр 100
142 Kaun, Gorky, p 407
143 Harcave, First Blood, p.182
144 ЛЖТ 1, стр 548
145 ibid., p 554
146 ibid., pp 554-555 The funeral of Bauman may well have inspired the funeral scene in the second part of Mat'
147 For details, see Ф Драбкина, "В дни декабрьского восстания", Г и революция 1905 года, стр 92-96, Н Соколов, "В 1905 году", М Ф Андреева, стр 470-472
148 ЛЖТ 1, стр 571
149 ibid., p 577
150 ibid , p 585
151 Г-30, т 23, стр 370
152 ПССГ, т 6, стр 541-542
153 ibid., p.533. Only the final part of Vesenniye melodii (Pesnya o Burevestnike) was published at the time of composition
154 see, for example А Овчаренко, Публицистика М Горького, изд 2-ое (М , 1965)
155 ЛН 72, стр 253
156 Г и революция 1905 года, стр 39.
157 Г-30, т 23, стр 337
158 ibid , p 338
159 A recent Soviet scholar has put forward conclusive evidence that these articles were written by Gorky Орлова, стр 236-251
160 ibid., p.255
161 ibid., p.257
162 ibid., p.256.
163 ibid., p.241
164 ibid., p.261
165 ПССГ, т 6, стр 126
166 ibid.
167 ibid , p.127
168 Г и революция 1905 года, стр 54
169 Г-30, т 28, стр 400
170 Г-30, т 23, стр 279
171 see, for example, Gorky's articles in Novaya zhizn', 12 November, 1917 Gorky, Untimely Thoughts, pp.91-93
172 Иванов-Разумник, История русской общественной мысли, т 1, стр 14
173 ПССГ, т 6, стр 292
174 ibid.
175 ibid , p.294
176 Г-30, т 23, стр 342
177 ibid
178 ibid , p 353
179 For the text of Tolstoy's letter, see Л Толстой, Полное собрание сочинениий (Юбилейное), т 36 (М -Л , 1936), стр 156-165 Gorky wrote an open letter to Tolstoy in reply

to the article Never published, this letter criticised Tolstoy on the same grounds as those put forward in Zametki o meshchanstve Г-30, т 28, стр 357-361

180 ПССГ, т 7, стр 663
181 АГ 4, стр 176
182 В Новиков, Творческая лаборатория Горького-драматурга, стр 126-231
183 ibid., p.130.
184 ibid., p.133
185 ibid., p 139
186 ibid , p 141.
187 ibid., p.133
188 ПССГ, т 7, стр 414
189 ibid , p.412
190 ibid , p 402
191 ibid., p 193.
192 ibid., p 403
193 ibid.
194 ibid., p.452.
195 ibid , p.440
196 ibid., p.417
197 ibid., p.446
198 ibid , p.431
199 ibid., p.469
200 ibid , p 482
201 ibid , p.445.
202 Новиков, стр 204
203 А Блок, Собрание сочинений в 8-и томах, т 5 (М -Л , 1962), стр 175
204 see, for example А Басаргин, "Художник-варвар кистью сонной", Московские ведомости, 15 апреля, 1906, Зигфрид, "Эскизы ("Варвары" М Горького)", Театр и искусство, № 37 (1906)
205 see, for example "Сборник товарищества "Знание" за 1906, кн 9", Вестник Европы, № 5 (1906), стр 342-348, Н Тамарин, "Варвары", Слово, 30 марта, 1906
206 А Горнфельд, "Три драмы "Знания"", Наша жизнь, 19 апреля, 1906, стр 3
207 ПССГ, т 7, стр 450
208 Weil, Gorky, p.52

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER THREE

LEONID ANDREYEV AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1905

The year 1904 began for Andreyev as inauspiciously as it had for Gorky Still faced with the personal problems resulting from his rapid rise to fame, Andreyev was also encumbered by the responsibility of family life (he had married A M Veligorskaya in 1902), which necessitated a regular and sizable income To add to his troubles, Andreyev was suffering at this time from chronic neuralgia of the neck which was preventing him from writing, of which he complained to Gorky in February [1] In an attempt to recover from this affliction and to create an atmosphere conducive to literary pursuits, he left Moscow in the middle of the following month, settling with his family in the Crimea [2] However, the five months spent there failed to achieve any positive results, much to Andreyev's chagrin His despondency was reflected in a letter to Veresayev, written in the summer

> Для меня лето пропало Животный восторг первых дней прошел и начался длительный кошмар жары, солнца, убийственного безделия Два месяца не было дождя, и два месяца один день был похож на другой Первая осень, когда я ничего не пишу, и хуже того - ничего в мыслях не приготовил для работы, ибо не мог думать Боюсь, как бы не пропала зима от этого Неврастения - только усилилась 3

Although disappointing in terms of Andreyev's literary output, these months were not entirely wasted As the letter to Veresayev suggests, this was a period of intense introspection which afforded Andreyev the opportunity of discovering his own literary personality Evidence of his growing maturity and independence is provided by his correspondence with Gorky during these months

Andreyev had met Gorky briefly at the beginning of the year in Moscow, where they had both attended a meeting of Sreda, at which Gol'tsev had delivered part of a lecture on the philosophy of Nietzsche [4] The meeting had presumably been cordial and the correspondence of the following months suggests, both by its tone and frequency, that the unpleasantness of the previous year was now forgotten The reconciliation gave Andreyev the chance once more to solicit Gorky's opinion of his latest literary works In March, he wrote to Gorky, informing him of a 'story about Nebuchadnezzar', which he hoped to

finish in a few days and discuss with him in person prior to his departure for the Crimea[5] The meeting did not take place, however, and in April Andreyev despatched the manuscript of the story, known at various times under the titles of Tsar' and Iz glubiny vekov,[6] to Gorky

Andreyev had serious misgivings about his new story In his letter to Gorky which accompanied the manuscript he stated that the work was in urgent need 'either of revision or of complete abandonment'[7] Gorky's reply was characteristically blunt Taking exception to the story's 'excessively deliberate' style,[8] he went on to criticise the author's treatment of the theme

> по моему мнению, темой рассказа ты должен был поставить испытание царем глубины рабства людей - это тебе не совсем удалось, Леонид Ты слишком много обратил внимания на царя, но упустил из виду рабов А ведь пока что мы, писатели русские, должны внушить нашему читателю не стремление быть царем - куда уж ему' а хотя бы отвращение к рабству 9

Predictably, Gorky's letter provoked a hasty response from Andreyev Whilst he accepted the criticism of the story's considerable stylistic deficiencies, he objected strongly to Gorky's statements about the theme and its treatment

> На кой черт мне рабы? Мне царь нужен, мне нужен хоть и призрачный образ одинокого, свободного и смелого человека, который отверг славу, могущество, мудрость во имя чего-то лучшего, имени чего я не знаю 10

Andreyev was no doubt annoyed not only by Gorky's attempt to impose his own approach upon the story, but also by his interpretation of the work as a justification of man's animal instincts What is more, nothing could have been better calculated to arouse Andreyev's indignation than Gorky's sententious reference to the Russian writer's duty to his readers In his eyes, it was this very concept of the writer's social duty which formed one of the major barriers to the achievement of literary integrity His dissatisfaction grew when he received a second letter from Gorky which simply reiterated the views contained in the first[11] Such was Andreyev's anger that he did not reply to this letter, the correspondence was resumed by Gorky after a break of two months

Andreyev adopted an equally independent stance with regard to

the Znaniye miscellanies, which began to appear in the spring of 1904 [12] The initiative for the series had been provided by Gorky and, according to Kuprin's wife, his original intention had been for Andreyev to fulfil the duty of editor [13] Whatever the truth of this statement, Andreyev did not become editor and it was Gorky himself who eventually took on responsibility for the miscellanies

Andreyev's opinion of Gorky's new venture was unambiguously critical After receiving the first miscellany (which contained his own Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo), he wrote to Pyatnitsky with a review of the other contributions

> Вересаева вещь слабая, Гусева - положительно слабая Типичный образчик тенденциозно-обличительной литературы, лишенной глубины и оригинальности 14

A similar view is contained in a letter to Gorky of the same period, in which he wrote

> Прочел я "Человека", и вот что поразило меня. Все мы пишем о "труде и о честности", ругаем сытое мещанство, гнушаемся подлыми мелочами жизни, и все это называется "литературой" 15

These remarks are nothing less than an explicit rejection of the editorial policy pursued by Gorky in the Znaniye miscellanies For Andreyev, the objectives of art always lay outside the realm of socio-political propaganda and the concept of 'political usefulness' could never constitute a criterion for evaluating works of literature Not so Gorky, who, in May, 1903, had established 'usefulness' as a standard by which to measure writers Writing to Pyatnitsky, he noted

> Мы помогаем жить Чирикову, Андрееву, почему же не помочь и Юшкевичу? Он, на мой взгляд, конечно, неизмеримо талантливее Евгения Николаевича и нужнее Леонида 16

In the light of this remark, it is significant that Yushkevich's play Evrei, which was accepted by Gorky for publication in the second Znaniye miscellany, [17] was the subject of another argument between the two writers "Напишите, если удосужитесь, как понравились вам "Евреи" Юшкевича", Andreyev wrote to Bernshteyn in June, 1904, "Я сильно расхожусь в оценке Юшкевича с Горьким и некоторыми другими приятелями, и мне очень хотелось бы услыхать беспристрастный голос со стороны" [18]

Andreyev was thus particularly disturbed by Dachniki, which he

saw as the first example of Gorky subordinating art to the dictates of politics He wrote dismissively of the work to Veresayev ""Дачники" Горького оказались неудачной, слабой вещью, мелко обличительного характера" [19] Towards the end of the year, he was even suggesting to Gorky himself that the editorial policy of Znaniye be reviewed

> Вот еще вопрос каков должен быть характер ближайшего сборника "Знания"? Чисто художественный, или же треба подпустить злобы? Мне кажется - художественный, а злоба сама приложится 20

Andreyev's question remained unanswered, however, as political events immediately dominated the attention of both writers Nevertheless, it was this same question which was to feature prominently in the debate over the editorial policy of Znaniye in the post-revolutionary period

Andreyev's determination to maintain an independent standpoint is also apparent in his involvement in the so-called 'Mirolyubov affair' Mirolyubov was the editor of the democratic monthly magazine Zhurnal dlya vsekh, which numbered amongst its contributors Chekhov, Gorky, Andreyev, Veresayev, Kuprin, Serafimovich and a host of minor writers An ex-opera singer, Mirolyubov had become attracted to religion as a tubercular process had destroyed his singing voice Under the influence of his contacts within the Religious-Philosophical Society, of which he was a member, he began to introduce new elements into his magazine The first sign of change was the inclusion, in the December, 1903 number, of an article by Volzhsky, who mounted an attack against Marxism in defence of religion [21] Veresayev, who was, by his own admission,[22] especially sensitive to questions involving politics, immediately composed a letter of protest against Volzhsky's article, which was signed by Andreyev, Serafimovich, Belousov and V Dmitriyeva [23]

The situation was aggravated by the publication, early in the new year, of a second article by Volzhsky The subject of this article was Gorky[24] and Volzhsky took the unprecedented step of analysing his works solely from the religio-philosophical viewpoint, conspicuously refraining from any discussion of their social or political relevance For Serafimovich, this new article added insult to the previous injury and he despatched an angry letter to Mirolyubov

> Что такое Горький?
> Не только литературный факт, но и общественный Теперь против Горького открыли яростный поход и "Новый путь"

> и "Новое время" и многие другие
> Не надо курить фимиам, но не надо и невольно
> участвовать в походе нововременцев 25

Gorky had himself already withdrawn as a contributor to Mirolyubov's magazine in February, 1903, following the unauthorized publication of a photograph of the writer and his family [26] It was only on the insistence of Andreyev that he agreed to put his signature to a joint statement of intention to contribute to Zhurnal dlya vsekh in 1904 [27]

From the outset, Andreyev adopted a mediatory role in the debate which followed the publication of Volzhsky's articles Convinced of the magazine's importance in contemporary Russia, he was aware of the damage which would result from a protracted boycott by Gorky and others and his major concern was to discover an immediate practical solution to the dispute His own opinion of the Volzhsky articles was by no means as extreme as that of Veresayev or Serafimovich In a letter to Mirolyubov, he stresssed that he attached no importance to Volzhsky's statements on Gorky [28] His attitude was perhaps best understood by Volzhsky himself, who visited the writer in February, 1904,[29] and related his impressions to Mirolyubov

> Был, Виктор Сергеевич, я в Москве и надумал-таки зайти к Андрееву Впечатление у меня получилось самое хорошее Как я и предполагал, к марксизму он относится совсем-таки равнодушно и подписался под письмом из тех соображений, что ему враждебна проповедь христианства 30

In April, Andreyev attempted to reconcile the dispute without success due to the intransigence of both sides [31] By the autumn, however, Mirolyubov was prepared to be more flexible Since the change of editorial policy, circulation figures of Zhurnal dlya vsekh had shown a sharp decline These circumstances inspired Andreyev to renew his efforts to achieve an agreement with Mirolyubov, which was eventually concluded in October after a month of discussion [32] By the end of the year, Volzhsky had been dismissed as a contributor and the editorial policy reverted to its original line, allowing the magazine to become one of the foremost organs of radical thought during the revolution, for which it was suppressed upon the reimposition of censorship controls in 1906

Before he despatched his new plans for reconciliation to Mirolyubov, Andreyev had sent them to Gorky for comment [33] The plans reveal

Andreyev as the advocate of moderation

> Должен сказать, что компания в большинстве хотела уйти из "Журнала для всех" - но потом было решено сделать это условно Дело в том, что, по моему мнению, существует полная возможность выработать такой modus vivendi, при котором разность наших убеждении не будет служить препятствием к общему делу 34

The type of compromise suggested by Andreyev was totally alien to Gorky, who wrote sarcastically of these plans to Pyatnitsky

> Андреев - чудак' Он не согласился подписать мое и Вересаева заявление о выходе из журнала, а написал Миролюбову письмо, смысл которого такой
> Дорогой В С '
> Для вас гораздо выгоднее бросить приближение к "Новому пути" и возвратиться на старое
> Ваш Л Андреев 35

The 'statement' to which Gorky referred was never made public, nor has it subsequently been discovered,[36] but there can be no doubt of his solidarity with Veresayev in the rejection of Mirolyubov's anti-Marxist sympathies In his reply to Andreyev's letter, he expressed total unwillingness to support any compromise settlement [37] Despite continued efforts by Andreyev to ameliorate his inflexibility, Gorky refused to publish his works with Mirolyubov, even after a settlement had been reached This was Andreyev's first experience of such intransigence by Gorky over a question of political principle and, although open conflict was avoided on this occasion, the seeds of later dissension were already present

A The destruction of personality and the disintegration of society Andreyev's works on the eve of revolution

Andreyev's fears that the winter of 1904 would be unproductive proved unfounded The return to Moscow promoted a resurgence of his literary productivity and, despite a bout of influenza, he was already absorbed in his work by mid-September Within two months, he had completed three stories, Vor, Prizraki and the celebrated Krasnyy smekh

Vor, the first of these works, continues Andreyev's enquiry into the problem of identity, which he had begun in two earlier stories, Smekh and Net proshcheniya In each of these stories Andreyev had posed the existentialist dilemma of personality, which stems from the realisation by the individual of the dichotomy between the self and its

perception by others Like Krylov, in Net proschcheniya, and the unnamed narrator of Smekh, Fyodor Yurasov, the hero of Vor, adopts a 'mask', a disguise which he projects as his true personality A thief and social outcast, Yurasov assumes a pose of respectability in the guise of Heinrich Walter, a Russified German However, his masquerade is as unconvincing as the stone in his mock diamond ring, itself a symbol of his deception His fellow-passengers fail to be taken in by his seeming respectability, which causes Yurasov to ruminate on the reason for his lack of success

> И это неуловимое, непонятное, предательское, что видят в нем все, а только он один не видит и не знает, будит в нем обычную глухую тревогу и страх 38

In Yurasov's case, the fate of Andreyev's earlier heroes is reversed, in Net proshcheniya and Smekh the 'mask' had been accepted unquestioningly as the character's true self The outcome, however, is in each case the same, the individual is suddenly confronted with the awareness of his total isolation and the ego is turned in upon itself

Yurasov's desperate attempts to escape his sense of isolation meet with as little success as his early efforts to communicate with his fellow-passengers On every occasion, he is faced by a barrier of indifference or even of outright hostility, which greets him when he tries to participate in a dance which takes place close to a railway station at which Yurasov's train stops This barrier is symbolized by the 'wall' of human legs, which hinders Yurasov's progress through the train as he is pursued by the police "Как пружины, они сгибаются и выпрямляются вновь, грубо и мертво толкая Юрасова, наводя на него ужас своим бессмысленным и грозным сопротивлением" 39 The barrier proves insurmountable and Yurasov, the 'outsider', is driven inexorably to his death

Despite its tragic conclusion, Vor is less pessimistic than Net proshcheniya or Smekh in that Yurasov is presented with a fleeting vision of an escape from his dilemma The vision comes to Yurasov as he stands on an observation platform, to which he has retreated from the hostile atmosphere of his compartment From the platform, the thief watches the countryside as it flashes past "от прекрасных, молчаливо-загадочных полей на него повеяло тем же холодом отчуждения, как от людей в вагоне" 40 As this original impression subsides, Yurasov becomes slowly aware of a new, intangible idea, as

yet unformulated, which is suggested to him by the rattling of the train's wheels

> А по низу, под вагонами, стелется разноголосый грохот и шум то как песня, то как музыка, то как чей-то чужой и непонятный разговор - и все о чужом, все о далеком 41

Yurasov closes his eyes to his surroundings and yields to the hypnotic 'music' of the train, at which point the 'new truth' is revealed to him

> И колеса гулко и разноголосо подтверждали "конечно так, да, да" "Конечно так, да, да" И как будто так и нужно было не говорить, а петь, - Юрасов запел сперва тихонько, потом все громче и громче, пока не слился его голос со звоном и грохотом железа. 42

This moment of 'fusion' signifies Yurasov's transitory escape from mundane reality in the contemplation of universal harmony The impression of escape is strengthened by the use of a repeated simile

> Когда весною выпускают птицу на свободу, она должна лететь так, как этот голос без цели, без дороги, стремясь исчертить, обнять, почувствовать всю звонкую ширь небесного пространства 43

The 'cage' from which Yurasov is released is his ego, which is the cause of his suffering However, his escape is only momentary, the intrusion of the guard returns him to reality When he looks again, the red sunset, to which he had addressed his song, has faded and he sees instead a 'grey cobweb' [44] On his return to the compartment, Yurasov attempts to recreate the 'music' of the wheels, but instead he hears a song of a very different kind

> И такая жестокая власть была в этих жутко-бессмысленных словах, липких и наглых, что весь длинный поезд сотнею крутящихся колес подхватил их
> - Маланья моя, лупоглазая 45

The 'sticky' words of the popular ballad reinforce the 'cobweb' image, symbolizing the 'cruel power' of earthly existence, which ensnares Yurasov once more in the prison of his ego The impression is again endorsed by a simile "Поезд уносил Юрасова вперед, а эта наглая и бессмысленная песня звала его назад, в город, тащила грубо, как беглеца-неудачника, пойманного на пороге тюрьмы" [46]

Yurasov's fate is the tragedy of civilized man in microcosm Andreyev stresses the fact that his hero is the product of an urban

environment and the continual juxtaposition of town and country is a dominant feature of the story In Vor, as in the earlier Gorod, it is the author's intention to reveal the social disintegration which underlies the seeming unity imposed by the rigours of modern urban life The train itself is the symbol of an artificial environment which has been created by man but which threatens eventually to destroy him The same symbol recurs in Neostorozhnost', a story written in 1910,[47] in which a priest inadvertently sets a railway locomotive in motion

> И это уже не паровоз Паровоз, тот остался на станции, а это - оно, глухое, непреклонное, в страшной обнаженности своей выпирающее откуда-то из-под низу Над ним не властны ни молитвы, ни заклинания, оно совершается непреклонно и придает миру тот страшный и необыкновенный вид, в каком является мир взорам уходящего 48

In Andreyev's final, uncompleted work, Dnevnik Satany, the train image is again utilized to illustrate the self-destructiveness of civilization [49]

Gorky was fairly reserved in his opinion of Vor "Рассказ Андреева не очень великолепен", he told Pyatnitsky, to whom he nevertheless recommended the story for inclusion in the third Znaniye miscellany [50] To Andreyev he admitted that he found the style somewhat tedious, but did not insist on any changes, possibly wishing to avoid a repetition of the Tsar' incident [51] It is unlikely that he paid the work great attention, especially as he had just read Krasnyy smekh, a story of undeniably greater importance Nevertheless, Vor is of considerable significance to the present study, as it reveals a fundamental difference between Andreyev and Gorky in their appreciation of the problem of alienation Gorky had dealt with this problem in Tyur'ma, which was written at the same time as Vor In Gorky's story, as we have seen, Misha Malinin manages to escape the 'prison' of his ego by the rational acceptance of a common ideal, which unites him with the revolutionaries However, as Andreyev was undoubtedly aware, Tyur'ma, like his own Na reke, does not provide a solution to the existentialist dilemma, but simply begs the question Vor is his first attempt to explore this complex problem more deeply It is the first work in which he postulates the existence of a 'higher reality', which man must appreciate if he is to achieve a true community of spirit In such metaphysical speculation, Andreyev was closer to the second generation of Russian

Symbolists than to Gorky, to whom such notions of transcendence were alien

Andreyev continued his enquiry into the crisis of modern civilization in Krasnyy smekh, his famous response to the Russo-Japanese War The war had engrossed Andreyev's attention from the very beginning and he followed all subsequent developments with an interest unprecedented where affairs of a political nature were concerned Like most intellectuals, Andreyev was opposed to the war, which was barely two weeks old when he wrote to Gorky, expressing his disgust at the chauvinistic sentiment stirred up by government propaganda [52] Gorky himself was encouraged by this 'healthy' attitude, which he took as a sign of his friend's growing political awareness [53] However, it was not so much the political as the psychological aspect of war which most interested Andreyev In his letter to Gorky, he had written

> Я первый раз сознательно переживаю войну, и в сущности ужасно интересно Человек не то обнажается, не то что-то привходит, но становится он другим и переоцениваются некоторые ценности и проясняются дремавшие понятия [54]

For Andreyev, the war provided a valuable insight into the disease afflicting civilized man and it is this which, strictly speaking, forms the subject of Krasnyy smekh As contemporary critics were quick to point out, Andreyev's work is no documentary account of the war in the manner of Veresayev's Na voyne,[55] nor is it a rational critique of war in general, like Tolstoy's humanistic appeal Odumaytes'' [56] As the author himself informed Veresayev, his purpose in Krasnyy smekh was to convey 'the psychology of the present war' [57]

The artistic method employed by Andreyev in his new story was both innovatory and sensational Krasnyy smekh comprises nineteen 'fragments' from a manuscript supposedly written by the brother of an officer wounded at the front The fragments are divided into two parts, in the first, the brother reconstructs the officer's impressions of the war from his own words and describes his eventual decline into insanity and death In the second, he analyses the development of his own insanity By the topicality of its subject, the work could hardly have been better calculated to attract the attention of the Russian reading public The fact that Krasnyy smekh was the first literary response to the Russo-Japanese war also helps to explain its immense success on its publication in the third Znaniye miscellany However,

as was so often the case, the sensational nature of Andreyev's story ensured not only its success, but also the general failure of readers and critics alike to comprehend the deeper issues involved In March, 1905, Andreyev complained to S V Yablonovsky, the editor of Russkoye slovo

> Вообще критики не особенно порадовали меня отношением своим к этой вещи при обилии совсем ненужных и иногда даже обидных похвал, они обнаружили очень мало вздумчивости, скромности и серьезности 58

As Andreyev suggests, Krasnyy smekh is far more than a piece of anti-war propaganda, at its root lie questions of a philosophical nature which are essential to an understanding of his personal conception not only of war, but also of revolution

Although inspired by current events, Krasnyy smekh contains no specific references to identify the story with Russia's war against Japan Andreyev's purpose in this work was to give a universal picture of war in the manner of Raskol'nikov's apocalyptic dream from the epilogue to Prestupleniye i nakazaniye

> Ему грезилось в болезни, будто весь мир осужден в жертву какой-то странной, неслыханной и невиданной мировой язве, идущей из глубины Азии на Европу . Люди убивали друг друга в какой-то бессмысленной злобе Собирались друг на друга целыми армиями, но армии, уже в походе, вдруг начинали сами терзать себя, ряды расстраивались, воины бросались друг на друга, кололись и резались и ели друг друга 59

Like Dostoyevsky, Andreyev perceived war not as a battle between two opposing armies, but as a 'world-wide pestilence' threatening to destroy civilization from within In Krasnyy smekh, the officer is only one of many killed or mutilated by the fire of their own army, of which there are three separate instances in the story

The effect of war upon the individual is suggested by the impressionistic manner employed in the first part of the story The narrative point of view is strictly maintained, events are seen entirely through the eyes of the demented officer, creating the impression of the alienation which is the product of his situation In the opening 'fragment', the officer describes the army on the march

> Все молчали, как будто двигалась армия немых, и когда кто-нибудь падал, он падал молча, и другие натыкались на его тело, падали, молча поднимались и, не оглядываясь,

> шли дальше, - как будто эти немые были также глухи и немы 60

The similes in this passage convey the lack of communication between soldiers of the same army, who are 'deaf', 'dumb' and 'blind' to the suffering of their fellows Under the impact of war, man is stripped of his altruistic impulses and enters a new world dominated by the instinct of self-preservation The gulf between this 'new world' and the one that has been left behind is illustrated in the fourth fragment, where the officer describes a party, organized in the vain hope of returning to a semblance of normality

> Я тщетно искал в этой толпе растерянных людей знакомые лица - и не мог найти Эти люди, беспокойные, торопливые были новые, чужие люди, которых я не знал И голоса звучали по-иному И все было чужое Дерево было чужое, и закат чужой, и вода чужая, с особым запахом и вкусом, как будто вместе с умершими мы оставили землю и перешли в какой-то другой мир - мир таинственных явлений и зловещих, пасмурных теней 61

The repeated epithet 'alien' reflects the nature of the change which has taken place and which is the cause of the high incidence of insanity amongst the soldiers of both armies

The eclipse of reason is accompanied by the reversion of man to his animal origins, a process which is suggested by the complex system of animal imagery used by Andreyev A detailed analysis of this imagery lies beyond the scope of the present study, for which the following example will suffice

> К нам пришел сумасшедший солдат Он был раздет почти догола, избит, исцарапан и голоден, как животное . и был похож на дикаря, на первобытного человека, на обезьяну 62

An extreme example of such a metamorphosis is provided by the case of the officer whose letter is reproduced in the penultimate 'fragment' A cultured man, he describes how the war has transformed him from a civilized human being into a monster, without thought or feeling for his fellows

Krasnyy smekh can be seen as a restatement of the thesis, already illustrated in Bezdna and V tumane, that man, beneath the veneer of civilization, is still vulnerable to the latent power of animal instinct However, if the isolated cases of bestiality which form

the subject of the two earlier stories merely indicate a potential threat to civilization, in Krasnyy smekh the process has already assumed the proportions of a universal catastrophe which is actually destroying civilized man The sense of imminent doom is emphasized by the apocalyptic symbolism in which the story abounds and of which the 'Red Laugh' itself is the most obvious "Это был красный смех Он в небе, он в солнце, и скоро он разольется по всей земле, этот красный смех!"[63] The total collapse of civilization is suggested by more specific similes

> И что-то ужасное, похожее на падение тысячи зданий мелькнуло в моей голове Где-то звонил колокол, что-то рухнуло, как будто упал пятиэтажный дом 64

Thus war, in Andreyev's conception, is simply the first manifestation of a cataclysm which will engulf the whole world The immediacy of the threat is revealed in the second part of Krasnyy smekh, where the 'Red Laugh' begins to take possession of the civilian population

The structure of Krasnyy smekh is such that the two parts beg comparison Of almost equal length, composed of the same fragmentary impressions, each ends with insanity In addition, Andreyev introduced certain parallels intended to accentuate the affinities between the two parts In the fourteenth 'fragment', the brother imagines the reaction of a theatre audience to a fire in an auditorium

> Судорога безумия охватит их спокойные члены Они вскочат, они заорут, они завоют, как животные, они забудут, что у них есть жены, сестры и матери, они начнут метаться, точно пораженные внезапной слепотой, и в безумии своем будут душить друг друга этими белыми пальцами, от которых пахнет духами 65

The references to blindness, madness and bestiality echo the imagery of the war scenes and create the impression of the ubiquitous presence of the 'Red Laugh' Similarly, the final scene, in which the brother, already insane, imagines himself to be pursued by a maddened crowd, recalls the prophesy of the half-crazed doctor in the sixth 'fragment'

> Веселой толпой, с музыкой и песнями, мы войдем в города и села, и где мы пройдем, там все будет красно, там все будет кружиться и плясать, как огонь Те, кто не умер, присоединятся к нам, и наша храбрая армия будет расти, как лавина, и очистит весь этот мир Кто сказал, что нельзя убивать, жечь и грабить? 66

In his desperate flight from the mob, the brother imagines that he bites off the finger of one of his pursuers This is no chance detail, as it parallels a similar incident, to which the 'civilized' officer had referred in his letter By means of these deliberate parallels, Andreyev emphasizes his own personal conception of war as a battle not between two armies, but between reason and instinct, the alpha and omega of human nature

Despite its emphasis on scenes of 'madness and horror', Krasnyy smekh emphatically refutes the critical opinion of Andreyev as the apologist of the irrational On completing the story, he wrote to Gorky "Знаешь, что больше всего я сейчас люблю? Разум" [67] In a letter to Tolstoy, written at the same time, he stressed the immense importance he attached to Krasnyy smekh

> Это коренная ломка некоторых моих воззрений ломка, которой я обязан той же войне Так в новом освещении встают передо мной вопросы о силе, о разуме, о способах нового строительства жизни [68]

As these remarks suggest, Krasnyy smekh is indeed of crucial importance in the development of Andreyev's thought Particularly significant is Andreyev's reference to the new light shed by the war on the 'means of a new construction of life' In this context, Krasnyy smekh can be seen as a prelude to works in which Andreyev's purpose was to develop a positive philosophy of life For Andreyev, war was the extreme embodiment of irrationality and alienation and, as such, the negation of his own ideal for mankind It is interesting to note that, several years later, Andreyev planned to write another work on the subject of war, which was to form part of a series of symbolic dramas His plan was contained in a letter to Nemirovich-Danchenko

> За "Жизнью Человека" идет "Жизнь Человечества", которая будет изображена в четырех пьесах "Царь Голод", "Война", "Революция", "Бог, дьявол и человек" [69]

Although Tsar' Golod was the only play of this series to be written, the nomination of Revolyutsiya as the sequel to Voyna is in itself significant, as it reflects his conception of revolution as providing an antidote to the spiritual disease of war

B Prizraki A hidden polemic with Gorky

On completing Krasnyy smekh, Andreyev followed his usual practice and sent the manuscript to Gorky for comment The story had a great

impact upon Gorky, who replied without delay The very promptness of this reply indicates the importance he attached to the issues raised in the work Paying little attention to questions of style and form, about which Andreyev himself had expressed considerable concern,[70] Gorky concentrated upon the content of the story, pointing out those elements which might easily be interpreted by chauvinist critics as anti-Japanese propaganda, and hence detract from the effectiveness of the work as an anti-war piece In conclusion, he wrote

> В общем я считаю рассказ чрезвычайно важным, своевременным - все это так, - но для большего впечатления необходимо оздоровить его Факты - страшнее и значительнее твоего отношения к ним в данном случае 71

Once again, Andreyev took offence at Gorky's remarks The tenor of the letter, and especially the reference to the 'timeliness' of Krasnyy smekh, had convinced Andreyev that Gorky valued his story only as a piece of social criticism and he took the suggestion that the work be made more 'healthy' as a sign of Gorky's total failure to appreciate his intention In his reply, he took issue with Gorky over the question of 'facts'

> "Факты важнее и значительнее твоего отношения" - совершенно не согласен . Факты войны всегда приблизительно одинаковы, и только отношение к ним меняется Наконец, мое отношение - также факт, и весьма немаловажный 72

In view of the categorical nature of these statements it may be assumed that the argument over Krasnyy smekh was resumed when the two writers met in St Petersburg on 20 November [73] There can be certainly be little doubt that their essential differences were not resolved Andreyev's intransigence on this subject is clear from a letter to Dymov, which contains an oblique reference to his conflict with Gorky

> Некоторые - немногие впрочем - упрекают меня в том, что я взялся изображать то, чего не видел, такой упрек представляется мне положительным недоразумением При существовании "Божественной комедии", "Каина", "Фауста" и пр и пр это просто бестолково Хуже того - искусственно ограничить кругозор художника пределами реально-видимого и осязаемого Это значит посягать на самый дух творчества 74

Despite these altercations, Krasnyy smekh was accepted for publication in the third Znaniye miscellany, where it appeared alongside Gorky's

Dachniki

The argument between Gorky and Andreyev over 'facts' brings into focus an extremely important aspect of their differing attitudes to literature Gorky's reservations about Krasnyy smekh had stemmed from the insufficient clarity of its social message, which he felt could only be rectified by a more realistic approach to the depiction of facts Andreyev could not accept this argument Without rejecting the validity of realistic art (as many of his subsequent works were to demonstrate), he regarded Gorky's insistence on the realistic method with considerable misgivings In his view, undue concern for the realistic representation of facts detracted from the universal problems which form the true subject of literature Such was the substance of his criticism of Dachniki Earlier in the year, he had expressed his views in a humorous form in a letter to Gorky

> Сейчас есть проклятые вопросы, а тогда их не будет не потому чтобы они были решены, а просто потому что гармоничному существу они в голову не прийдут Хороший способ решить задачу выбросить за дверь задачник и лечь спать в трогательном убеждении, что других экземпляров задачника не существует 75

Andreyev saw in the realistic 'social literature' advocated by Gorky a tendency to reduce life to a simplistic formula, ignoring the 'accursed questions' of existence The point is illustrated in Prizraki, a story written in October, 1904, prior to Krasnyy smekh

Prizraki depicts the life of three inmates of an asylum for the insane Each suffers from a different disorder Egor Pomerantsev, a former civil servant, is an extrovert who is subject to illusions of grandeur, which give him the strength to accept life in the asylum without protest

> И с самого начала Егор Тимофеевич знал, что он в сумасшедшем доме, но не придавал этому никакого значечия, так как был уверен, что, по желанию, может делаться бесплотным и тогда может летать и ходить по всему миру 76

Egor's comforting illusions are not shared by Petrov, who, by contrast, suffers from a persecution complex His delusions are the source not of comfort but of suffering The nurse Mariya, who to Egor is a romantic heroine burning with unrequited passion for him, is transformed in Petrov's imagination into an evil and immoral woman, another 'enemy'

who threatens his security The contrast between the two is stressed by Dr Shevyrev, who tells Egor "А вы счастливейший человек, Георгий Тимофеевич" [77] To Petrov he says "Вы несчастнейший человек, Петров" [78] The rest of the story bears out the truth of the doctor's words, whilst Egor indulges happily in various activities within the asylum, Petrov sinks deeper into introspection which leads inexorably to his final tragedy

The contrast between Egor and Petrov is an allegory, the meaning of which is made clear by the case of the third inmate of the asylum, who is referred to simply as 'the one who knocks' He is described in the opening section of the story

> Это стучал в свою дверь больной, запертый в комнате где бы он ни находился, он отыскивал запертую или только приотворенную дверь и начинал стучать в нее, если дверь открывали, он находил другую запертую дверь и снова стучал - он хотел, чтобы все двери были открыты 79

The figure of 'the one who knocks' had been anticipated in Mysl', where Kerzhentsev illustrates an idea by means of the following example

> Представьте, что вы жили в доме, где много комнат . и вдруг вы узнали что там, в других комнатах, живут Вы хотите узнать, кто они, но дверь заперта, и не слышно за нею ни звука ни голоса И в то же время вы знаете, что именно там, за этой молчаливой дверью, решается ваша судьба 80

The 'one who knocks' embodies what Andreyev considered man's immortal will to explore the unknown, to break down the walls of illusion in the quest for ultimate truth Thus the fate of Petrov, who wants to see all doors bolted against possible intruders represents the fate of those who attempt to escape the mysteries of life in the seeming security of the familiar world Egor, on the other hand, is oblivious to the existence of 'the one who knocks' just as he is unaware of the problems which torment him

Gorky's memoirs of Andreyev provide an interesting sidelight on Prizraki

> А по поводу "Призраков" он сказал мне - Безумный, который стучит, это - я, а деятельный Егор - ты Тебе действительно присуще чувство уверенности в силе твоей, это и есть главный пункт твоего безумия и безумия всех подобных тебе романтиков, идеализаторов разума, оторванных

мечтой своей от жизни 81

Despite M Г Andreyeva's contention that Gorky was guilty in this passage of 'composing from himself',[82] there are certain elements which suggest that Gorky may well have served as a prototype for the character of Egor The details of Egor's physical ailments and, in particular, of his protracted coughing fits bring Gorky's tubercular condition to mind Egor's stoical attitude to illness is also typical of Gorky Furthermore, one can detect in the following passage an oblique reference to Gorky's self-assumed role of literary patron "Очень быстро он перезнакомился со всеми больными и занял среди них видное и вполне определенное положение покровителя" [83]

Prizraki therefore reads as an implicit criticism of Gorky's growing commitment to political activity, which, in Andreyev's view, was causing him to ignore the 'accursed questions' at the root of social problems

C Revolutionary optimism Andreyev and the events to autumn, 1905

Krasnyy smekh placed such a strain upon Andreyev's system that, on its completion, the writer was reduced to a state of physical and mental exhaustion By February, 1905 he was complaining to Veresayev that he had written nothing for three months,[84] and events were to keep him from writing until the autumn of that year

In the meantime, Andreyev became increasingly involved in the political developments taking place within Russia His observations on the war against Japan had caused him to speculate on the possibility of revolution at home as early as February, 1904, when he had written to Gorky "Как никак, а внутренняя война идет, по-видимому, с большим успехом, чем внешняя "[85] By May, he was convinced that the war would give way to social revolution, as he told Pyatnitsky

> Действительно, творится какая-то всероссийская чепуха Можно осатанеть от злости, живя в этой проклятой России, стране героев, на которых ездят болваны и мерзавцы Если война не закончится революцией, то наступит такая глухая, беспросветная реакция, от которой на стену полезешь 86

Despite these predictions, the news of the Bloody Sunday massacre and of Gorky's subsequent arrest came a profound shock to Andreyev His mood is reflected in a letter to M Г Andreyeva "События держат

мысль в таком напряжении, что ничего нельзя делать ни работать, ни отдыхать, ни сидеть дома, ни думать о чем-нибудь другом, кроме происходящего" [87] A month later, Andreyev's attention was still dominated by the revolution, as he informed Veresayev "Вы поверите ни одной мысли в голове не осталось кроме - революции, революции, революции" [88]

Andreyev greeted the outbreak of revolution with enthusiasm and his early statements were highly optimistic Accepting that chaos would inevitably follow in its wake, he was nevertheless convinced that this chaos would be only temporary and that the eventual outcome of the revolution would be a positive victory for the forces of progress He voiced his hopes in a letter to Pyatnitsky

> Хотя самое страшное, повидимому, впереди, и нынешняя весна много даст красных цветов Люди уже потеряли власть над событиями, начали действовать стихии, и что даст революция, умноженная на весну, на холеру, на голод - невозможно решить А в итоге будет хорошо - это несомненно [89]

A letter to Veresayev, written some five days later, contained a similarly optimistic prediction [90] Like Gorky, Andreyev was heartened by the response of the working class, whose heroism he singled out for particular mention in a letter to E M Dobrova "А какие дела-то в России творятся! Как хорошо держатся петербургские рабочие - откуда столько выдержки, неподкупности, политического смысла" [91]

Andreyev's sympathies for the revolutionary cause were expressed in deed as well as in word Although he was not directly affiliated to any political party, he was in touch with developments within the RSDLP Towards the end of 1904 he had been of practical assistance to Gorky in the latter's attempts to acquire a newspaper for party purposes, acting as a go-between for Gorky and Savva Morozov in their negotiations to buy Kur'er, Andreyev's old newspaper which was sold by auction due to immense financial losses resulting from censorship repression [92] It was presumably Andreyev's known sympathies for the revolutionary movement that inspired members of the RSDLP to use the writer's Moscow apartment for an illegal meeting on 9 February, 1905 [93] The outcome of this meeting was the arrest of Andreyev, together with the Social-Democrats, following a police raid Details of the arrest are contained in a letter from Andreyev's wife to her brother

> Дорогой мой братик! Да, Леонидка арестован. Это случилось следующим образом. Леонид дал разрешение одному малознакомому человеку собраться в своей квартире. Что это должно быть за собрание, он хорошенько и не знал. 9-ого февраля, в час дня, явилась полиция, как раз в то время, когда у нас сидели эти господа. Интереснее всего, что как Леонид, так и я, не знаем ни одного человека из этой компании. Этих господ, как говорил мне жандарм, ведущий это дело, обвиняют в принадлежности к Ц.К. социал-демократов.[94]

During interrogation, both Andreyev and the nine delegates of the RSDLP claimed, like Andreyev's wife, that not only had the author taken no part in the meeting, but that he had also been entirely ignorant of the illegal purposes for which his apartment was being used. Of the truth of the first statement there can be no doubt, as Andreyev was discovered resting in another room when the police arrived.[95] The second statement is less credible, however, and was probably designed to save Andreyev unnecessary imprisonment. (Indeed, his wife's letter, which corroborates this claim, may well have been written on the correct assumption that it would be intercepted by the secret police.) If not a direct participant in a revolutionary act, Andreyev was most probably a conscious accessory to it. Together with the nine members of the RSDLP and Skitalets, who had the misfortune to call at his apartment by chance during the police raid, the writer was remanded in custody pending the completion of enquiries into the case.[96]

Considering his popularity, Andreyev's arrest attracted very little attention from the press or public opinion. A possible explanation is that world-wide interest was still focussed on Gorky, who was released from prison some five days after Andreyev's arrest. Whichever the reason, Andreyev was spared the public outcry which had accompanied Gorky's arrest. His personal reaction to prison was equally different. Whereas Gorky had immediately devoted himself to the practical task of writing a play, Andreyev indulged his penchant for autoanalysis. His diary notes, written in Moscow's Tagan prison, where he was held, concentrate upon his reaction to his experiences. "А мыслей все нет, нет и страха, ничего", he wrote on an early occasion.[97] Much of his time was also given over to re-reading Dickens, one of his favourite authors. There is no evidence to suggest that Andreyev devoted particular attention at this time to political developments in the

country With the single exception of the letter to E M Dobrova, quoted above, Andreyev's correspondence contains no references to current events, even though some of these letters were smuggled out of the prison, avoiding the scrutiny of the authorities In the main, he was preoccupied by a natural concern for the safety of his wife and family following rumours of violent reprisals by the Black Hundreds against intellectuals

Much to the surprise of Gorky, who had feared that prison would have a harmful effect upon his friend's physical and mental state,[98] Andreyev emerged from the Tagan fortress 'bold and happy'[99] He had found the experience extremely valuable, as he informed Gorky in a letter written shortly after his release

> Воспоминание о тюрьме будет для меня одним из самых милых и светлых - в ней я чувствовал себя человеком На дне души моей, где-то очень глубоко, таится здоровенная гордость Как не пожалеть тюрьмы - в ней я был молод, здоров, мечтателен, готов на всякие глупости, как студент, как влюбленный И какое наслаждение - долго быть одному, почувствовать себя, без зеркала увидеть себя так, точно ты окружен зеркалами 100

Prison did, however, have a detrimental effect upon Andreyev's precarious health, for which reason he decided to leave Moscow again for the Crimea After two months' rest, which allowed him time to visit Gorky in Yalta early in April,[101] he returned to Russia proper On this occasion he settled not in Moscow, but in the village of Terioki, in Finland, (now Zelenogorsk), where he moved after spending a few days with Gorky in St Petersburg[102]

The summer months, spent in close proximity to Gorky, who was resident in the neighbouring village of Kuokalla (now Repino), proved to be a testing period in the relations between the two writers Although they continued to present a 'united front', supporting the revolutionary cause by participating together in a literary-musical evening organized by M F Andreyeva on 30 July,[103] their differences became increasingly pronounced Once again, the principal bone of contention was the question of the purpose of literature In his memoirs, V S Tsytsarin, who was in Kuokalla during this period, recalls an argument between Gorky and Andreyev

> - Алексей, не занимайся изучением марксизма, - с улыбкой сказал Андреев, обращаясь

> к Горькому - Эта теория объясняет все явления жизни и поведение людей Мы с тобой думаем, что наши герои и действующие лица ломают головы и размышляют над вечными вопросами, а оказывается ничего похожего - это только результат нашего невежества О чем ты заставишь говорить героев твоих пьес и рассказов, когда тебе все вопросы будут ясны?
> Алексей Максимович ответил ему, что он читает "Капитал" Маркса и ничего в этом плохого, мешающего ему писать, не видит 104

The echoes of the debate contained in Prizraki are unmistakable Equally clear is Andreyev's fear that Gorky's increasing allegiance to the Marxists would inevitably result in the degeneration of his art into mere 'social literature' It is against such a charge that Gorky seemingly defends himself in a letter to Andreyev, written early in the new year "Я социал-демократ, потому что я - революционер, а социал-демократическое учение - суть наиболее революционное. Ты скажешь "казарма"!"[105]

Gorky's interest in questions of political theory in the summer of 1905 was the logical progression from a principle formulated in February, 1904 "В тревожное и спутанное время нужно оперировать с точными принципами или мнениями", he had written to Andreyev[106] Andreyev himself was unwilling to accept the need for 'precise principles or opinions' Although a hostile opponent of the tsarist regime[107] and of the liberal parties,[108] he considered it essential that the writer remain unconstrained by the demands imposed by any political theory In 1912, he told the critic Brusyanin

> Русская жизнь сложилась так, что каждый русский гражданин, кому дорого будущее родины, должен быть или писателем-революционером, или писателем анализа и синтеза жизни и человеческого духа "Если хочешь быть революционером, - будь партийным" - говорили мне Но я, как и покойный Чехов, говорю "партийность для художника - смерть!" 109

Andreyev had, in fact, made clear his intention to be a writer of the second category in an interview with the editor of Le messager franco-russe in 1905 In this interview he had referred to himself as the descendent of Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky in the sense that, like them, he was primarily concerned with the 'accursed questions' which are the only true subject of literature[110]

Thus, by August, 1905, Andreyev had effectively rejected the Gorky line on literature At this time he wrote to Serafimovich with a word of warning "К суждениям Максимыча относись с осторожностью он стал очень прямолинеен и в некотором отношении фанатичен"[111] The implicit acceptance of Gorky's authority on literary matters, which had been a dominant feature of the early years of Andreyev's friendship with Gorky, was already at an end Andreyev was now prepared to pursue an independent line, as he told Chulkov later in the year "Я очень люблю Горького, но это не мешает мне иметь приятелей среди людей, к которым он отчосится враждебно"[112] To demonstrate his point, he chose to publish his story Tak bylo in Chulkov's new magazine Fakely rather than with Gorky's Znaniye Andreyev's story appeared in the first issue of the magazine, which was prefaced by the following declaration of intent

> Мы не стремимся к единогласию, лишь одно сближает нас - непримиримое отношение к власти над человеком внешних обязательных норм Мы полагаем смысл жизни в искании человечеством последней свободы Мы поднимаем наш факел во имя утверждения личности и во имя свободного союза людей, основанного на любви к будущему преображенному миру. 113

This definition of 'revolutionary art', advanced in the name of all contributors to Fakely, was perhaps closest to Andreyev's own An anarchist by nature, he placed his freedom as an artist higher than his friendship with Gorky It was only a matter of time before this essential difference of opinion put their entire relationship in jeopardy

D Khristiane the power of light and the power of darkness

Andreyev's defence of literature as the 'analysis and synthesis of life' did not entail the exclusion of social problems from the sphere of his literary works On the contrary, his next story, Khristiane which was written on his return to Moscow, in September, 1905,[114] is a critique of the inequalities inherent in Russian society of the day

Khristiane is the story of a prostitute who refuses to take the oath when called as a witness in a court case on the grounds that, by her very profession, she has relinquished her right to the title of 'Christian' The idea for the story had been suggested by Elpat'evsky, who had discovered a report of such a case in the newspapers[115] Drawing

on his experience as a barrister and as a court reporter for Kur'er (which had previously been reflected in Zashchita and Pervyy gonorar), Andreyev transformed this event into a powerful work of social criticism

Like Kuprin's story, Obida, Khristiane is a satire in which the traditional relationship between the socially respectable and unrespectable is reversed By refusing to compromise her principles, the prostitute Karaulova exposes the hypocrisy of the representatives of conventional law, morality, learning and religion who seek to deter her from her purpose Her moral superiority over those who stand in judgement is suggested by the whispered question of the presiding magistrate "Что, мы судим ее, что ли, или она нас судит?"[116] The resolution of the deadlock by means of a compromise on the part of the judges provides the answer to this question, signifying a moral victory for Karaulova

Karaulova represents not only a moral condemnation of the judges, but also a threat to their welfare In the opening words of the story, Andreyev stresses the comfort and security which the court provides for those who serve in it

> За окнами падал мокрый ноябрьский снег, а в здании суда было тепло, оживленно и весело для тех, кто привык ежедневно по службе посещать этот большой дом, встречать знакомые лица, раскрывать все ту же чернильницу и макать в нее все то же перо 117

The contrast between the 'wet November snow' and the warmth of the courtroom stresses the gulf between the court and the real world outside Karaulova's refusal to take the oath provides the court with an unpleasant reminder of this fact The artificiality of the court is suggested by its reliance upon the electric light, which is mentioned on a number of occasions It is switched on, for example, when Karaulova first defies the judge, as an attempt to return the proceedings to some semblence of normality Hence the judge's annoyance "Электричество горит, и все так хорошо, а она упрямится".[118] The electric light is mentioned again in the final words of the story, when all is seemingly well "Горит электричество. За окнами тьма Весело, тепло, уютно" [119] The implication is clear, the 'victory' of the court over Karaulova is as illusory as the power of the electric light to penetrate the darkness outside Like the darkness, Karaulova

embodies an irresistible natural force which threatens to overwhelm the court and all those who serve it

As Tolstoy noted, Khristiane is a 'satire on quasi-Christianity'[120] and, as such, anticipates the play Lyubov' k blizhnemu, written in 1908 The story also received great praise from Gorky, who was impressed by the restraint shown by Andreyev in the treatment of the theme [121] Unlike Vor and Krasnyy smekh, Khristiane reveals the author's concern for contemporary social problems No less than Gorky, he was acutely aware of the tremendous gulf between the privileged classes and the ordinary people in Russia Like Gorky also, Andreyev saw this gulf as the principal cause of the 1905 Revolution

E Gubernator punishment or vengeance?

"Революция тем хороша, что она срывает маски", Andreyev wrote to Veresayev in 1906 [122] His view is illustrated in Gubernator, the first of Andreyev's works to be inspired by the events of 1905 [123] It is also the first story in which he sought to examine the nature of the revolutionary process

Like Vor and Krasnyy smekh, Gubernator traces the 'disintegration of personality' which results from a profound emotional shock In the case of the governor, this shock is provided by the massacre of 47 political demonstrators, for which he bears direct responsibility Under the impact of this event, the governor begins to perceive his life in a new light and to re-examine the principles which he had hitherto accepted without question He becomes aware of the shabbiness of his home and of the hypocrisy of his religion, represented in the person of 'His Holiness Misail' The governor's transformation is emphasized by an interesting reversal of the traditional 'fathers and sons' motif The governor's son, who attempts to counteract the change in his father's behaviour, embodies the unshakable faith in conservative principles which the governor has come to reject "Все в мире было для него просто, все делилось без остатка" [124] He stands as a perpetual reminder to the governor of his own sin

As the governor re-evaluates the principles on which his life had been founded, he becomes increasingly conscious of the dichotomy between his real self and the image he projects to others

> И чувствует, что, пока он думал, он был просто человек, как всякий другой, Петр Ильич, а с первым же звуком голоса, с

> этим жестом он сразу же стал губернатором, генерал-майором, его превосходительством 125

This single insight brings to the governor a sudden awareness of his spiritual isolation The seemingly inseverable links of love and respect which had bound him to his family, friends and colleagues now appear to him as superficial formalities

> Только вежлив перестал он быть, и сразу распалась связь, соединившая его много лет с женою, детьми, окружающими, - как будто только улыбками и поклонами держалась она и исчезла вместе с поцелуями рук 126

The point is further proved by the governor's failure to break down the barrier of formality which prevents him from establishing informal human contact with the police chief and with his gardener

The governor's sense of moral guilt inspires him to seek methods of exculpating his crime before the people Much to the surprise and consternation of his colleagues, he begins to pay serious attention to the complaints of his petitioners, promising justice in the settlement of their claims The same desire is apparent in the governor's urge to meet the people, which results in his eventual assassination This urge is another manifestation of the governor's wish to escape his spiritual isolation, which is especially clear in the description of his passage through a working-class district on the way to his dacha "Губернатору хотелось кому-то ласково поклониться, но улица была пуста, как ночью, и даже не видно было детей" [127] Once again, the key to the passage is provided by Andreyev's choice of simile As the governor passes down the street, he is compared to a deserted house in which all the doors and windows had suddenly been thrown open The simile recurs at the end of the passage, when the governor contemplates his failure to make contact with the people

> Губернатор смотрел в сторону и молчал И лицо его медленно закрывалось - как будто вновь по одному закрывали все окна и двери в глухом, заколоченном доме 128

Unable to escape his isolation by 'opening his soul', the governor deliberately ignores the advice of those who aim to protect his life His eventual assassination is, therefore, tantamount to suicide

The tragedy of the governor is, as Dr Woodward has noted,[129] directly comparable to that of Yurasov, in Vor Gubernator, however,

differs significantly from the earlier work in that the personal tragedy here is presented not in isolation, but against the background of social events In this work, despite its title, Andreyev is concerned not only with the spiritual crisis of the governor, but also with the reaction of the people to his crime It is somewhat remarkable that, in previous studies of Gubernator, this important point has been largely ignored By rectifying this oversight, it is possible to offer a new interpretation of the author's intention

In the fifth part of Gubernator, Andreyev interrupts the description of the governor's moral crisis to deal with the state of mind of the people against whom he has sinned This is accompanied by a shift in the narrative viewpoint, the author now adopts a straightforward third-person nariative in place of the 'inner monologue' technique of the opening sections For the people, no less than for the governor himself, the massacre of 17 August provokes a fundamental 'reevaluation of values' Prior to the event, their attitude to the governor had been that of faithful slaves "И когда 17-ого августа на площади, сверкая в солнечных лучах, к ним вышел губернатор, они приняли его за самого седого Бога" [130] This slavish faith in authority is also noted by the revolutionary who writes a letter to the governor towards the end of the story Referring to the mood of the people on the day of the massacre, the revolutionary states

> Это пришли рабы воскресшие, которые строили пирамиды, пришли со своими тысячелетними мозолями и слезами за любовью, за советом и помощью, как к образованному человеку XX века 131

In the eyes of the people, therefore, the governor's act represents a betrayal of their faith and provokes an instinctive desire for vengeance against their divinity This desire, like their faith itself, is the expression not of reason, but of the irrational By rejecting the governor, the people have, in effect, transferred their faith from one deity to another The new god is the 'God of Vengeance', who now possesses the mind of the people

> Как будто сам древний, седой закон, смерть карающий смертью, давно уснувший, чуть ли не мертвый в глазах невидящих, - открыл свои холодные очи, увидел убитых мужчин, женщин и детей и властно простер свою беспощадную руку над головой убившего. 132

The new faith, like the old, is purely irrational "тщетно пытались

люди осветить его свечами своего разума" [133] The people are no more than instruments of a force over which they have no control Describing the growth of rancour amongst the masses, Andreyev wrote

> Это было новое чувство - чувство спокойного и бесповоротного осуждения, если бы топор мог чувствовать, он, вероятно, чувствовал бы себя так же - холодный, блестящий и спокойный топор 134

The simile, which is repeated on the same page, conveys the impression that the people are simply the instrument of execution controlled by a will which is beyond their comprehension This impression is reinforced in the final passage of the story

> Но за всеми речами, каковы они ни были, чувствовался легкий трепет большого страха что-то огромное и всесокрушающее, подобно циклону, пронеслось над жизнью, и за нудными мелочами ее, за самоварами, постелями и калачами, выступил в тумане грозный образ Закона Мстителя 135

The governor is thus the sacrificial victim of man's primitive instinct for vengeance

The concept of the 'God of Vengeance' derives, as Dr Woodward has indicated,[136] from Schopenhauer, a philosopher for whom Andreyev had a great regard Like Professor Kaun, who also noted the link with Schopenhauer, Dr Woodward interprets the governor's death as an act of divine justice Professor Kaun talks of a 'force of collective conscience',[137] of which the governor is not a part, whilst Dr Woodward refers to the 'collective subconscious',[138] a life force against which the governor has sinned and for which crime he is justly punished Both interpretations imply that Andreyev's intention is to justify the assassination Our discussion here, however, suggests the opposite conclusion, which is supported not only by the evidence of the story itself, but also by Schopenhauer's own remarks on the subject of punishment and vengeance in The World as Will and Idea

> All requital of wrong by the infliction of pain, without any aim for the future, is revenge, and can have no other end than consolation for the suffering one has borne by the sight of the suffering one has inflicted on another This is wickedness and cruelty and cannot be morally justified 139

In Schopenhauer's terms, the assassination of the governor is clearly an act of vengeance rather than an act of punishment, and it is as such that it is presented by Andreyev The sense of inevitability

which surrounds the governor's fate suggests the workings of the eternal power of instinct in human behaviour rather the presence of universal justice

This interpretation of Gubernator is supported not only by Andreyev's negative portrayal of the people, but also by the inclusion in the story of two letters which provide a commentary upon its meaning Each letter is written by a person who is immune to the predominating desire for vengeance In the first, a high-school girl displays a feeling of compassion for the governor which overrides her original indignation at his crime Intuitively, she senses his total isolation, of which she has a vision in a symbolic dream, and gives him a pledge of her sincere sympathy In the second letter, to which reference has already been made, a revolutionary worker writes to the governor, giving his own interpretation of events Unlike the schoolgirl, the revolutionary displays a rational rather than an emotional reaction to the desire for vengeance amongst the people Starting from the premise that life is a struggle between the 'hereditary masters' and the 'hereditary slaves', he declares his absolute disapproval of the governor's crime as an attempt to defend the power of the masters Nevertheless, he is opposed to demands that the governor be assassinated, which he identifies with the slave mentality and which are hence equally alien to his ideal of 'liberty, equality and fraternity' [140] "Побеждать нужно головой, а не руками", he states [141] The true revolution, he claims, will be achieved not by acts of thoughtless violence, but by education, which appeals to reason rather than instinct Together with the high-school girl, the revolutionary provides an antidote to the slavish thirst for vengeance and a pledge of a better society founded on the principles of reason and compassion

To the contemporary reader, the political identity of the revolutionary worker would have been in little doubt The rejection of terrorism in favour of a programme of propaganda was the distinguishing feature of the Social-Democratic movement Andreyev himself considered the RSDLP to be the 'most serious and important revolutionary force', as he informed Veresayev the following year [142] It is, therefore, hardly surprising that Gubernator should have been published in the Social-Democratic journal Pravda, which was immediately withdrawn from circulation by the authorities [143]

Despite these connotations, Gubernator is not a simple piece of

political literature Like Gorky, Andreyev was primarily interested in the psychology of revolution Indeed, his critique of the 'God of Vengeance' reads like an illustration to Gorky's views on revolution as expressed in Pis'ma k rabochim, which were written at about the same time For both men the ideal revolution was to be an act of 'punishment', inspired by positive, rational motives, and not simply the product of the instinctive desire for 'vengeance' Gorky, however, was unimpressed by Andreyev's new story, about which he wrote to Pyatnitsky at the end of September "Андреев написал своего "Губернатора" - озаглавив его "Бог отомщения" Вышло длинно, не очень сильно и вообще - не удалось, что он, к великому удовольствию моему, и сам понял "[144] He much preferred Khristiane, in which the social message was far more clearly expressed It is also possible that Gubernator, both in its style and in its central conflict between the 'hereditary slaves' and the lonely 'hereditary master', reminded Gorky of Iz glubiny vekov, a story which had already provoked his displeasure, as we have seen Andreyev himself may well have been dissatisfied with Gubernator, as Gorky's letter to Pyatnitsky suggests Within two months he had written another story on the same subject, Tak bylo, which was to place an even greater strain on his relations with Gorky

F Tak bylo Andreyev and the 'mystique' of revolution [145]

Unlike Gubernator, the inspiration for Tak bylo was provided not by current events within Russia, but by Andreyev's study of the French Revolution, a subject which had interested him for a number of years In September, 1904, he had written to Gorky "Читаю сейчас историю французской революции Вот люди, вот красота'"[146] A letter to A M Pitaleva, written two years previously had contained a similar reference "Много благородных людей погибло в Великую Революцию во имя свободы, равенства и братства, и на их костях воздвигла свои трон буржуазия" [147] Tak bylo is not, however, an historical story, despite the fact that, for the Stuttgart edition of 1906, Andreyev added the subtitle, 'A study from the epoch of the French Revolution' [148] The story was not intended as a specific study of a particular revolution, but rather as a statement on the nature of revolution in general

Like Iz glubiny vekov and Gubernator, Tak bylo depicts the conflict between the lonely ruler of men and the slaves who are his subjects

In style also, Tak bylo is reminiscent of the earlier, unpublished work, utilizing the same biblical tone and the device of repetition Consider, for example, the following passage from Tak bylo

> Над древним городом, где стояля башня, и над всею страною высоко поднимался один человек, загадочный владыка города и страны, и его таинственная власть, - одного над миллионами - была так же стара, как и город .
>
> в самом глубоком прошлом вырисовывался все тот же загадочный образ одного который повелевает миллионами. Была немая древность, над которой уже не имела власти человеческая память [149]

With their emphasis on the 'mysterious' and the 'eternal', these extracts correspond in both mood and content with extant passages of Iz glubiny vekov Particular note should be taken of the section, Bagrovye litsa Raby',[150] which is unmistakably a rewrite of a passage copied by Yantarev from the manuscript of the original story [151] There seems little doubt, therefore, that Tak bylo was based, at least in part, upon the earlier work

In reference to the Russian Revolution, Gorky wrote, in October, 1905 "Теперь для всех стало ясно, что сила, которая держала страну в страхе - призрак" [152] According to Andreyev also it is the universal awareness of the illusion of power which is the first stage of revolution However, the 'enigmatic rising of millions'[153] which destroys the power of the monarch in Tak bylo is portrayed by Andreyev as a force as inscrutable as the authority which it overthrows The revolt itself is the product of instinct rather than reason "И вдруг стал на дыбы - огромный, взъерошенный зверь, одною минутою свободного гнева мстящий укротителю за все годы унижений и пыток"[154] The animal imagery employed in this passage is sustained throughout the work, the people are likened, on separate occasions, to 'pigs', 'birds', and 'ants' [155] The comparison of the popular movement to 'lava', 'floodwaters' and an 'earthquake'[156] also emphasizes its irrational origin Furthermore, the specific reference to 'vengeance' in the passage quoted above suggests comparison with the assassination of the governor in Gubernator

In Tak bylo, as in Gubernator, Andreyev makes clear the distinction between the actions of the people and the aspirations of the revolutionaries In contrast to the 'marching chaos'[157] of the people,

the revolutionary deputies, who attempt to organize the spontaneous popular revolt are united by a clearly conceived ideal For them the revolution is of importance not in its own right, but as the prelude to a new era of freedom Their decision to execute the monarch is, therefore, an act of 'punishment' rather than 'vengeance', to return to Schopenhauer's all-important distinction For the people, on the other hand, the execution is an end in itself, the limit of their desire for vengeance The contrast is made clear in the description of the execution "Депутаты - те были очень серьезны, ужасно серьезны, даже бледны, вероятно их подавляла ответственность, но народ тихо веселился" [158] Ignorant of the responsibility imposed upon them by freedom, the people are a barrier to the realization of the revolutionary ideal, an idea which is suggested by a simile from the same scene Andreyev describes the people as they perch on the buildings surrounding the square "Целыми темными гнездами, как птицы, они лепятся на подоконниках, загораживая свет "[159] The words of the 'traitor' are thus prophetic "Король умер, - да здравствует король' Да здравствует Двадцать Первый" [160] Although they have escaped the tyranny of the 'Twentieth', the people remain true to their slavish origins, which are in themselves a pledge of future tyranny

The pessimistic message of Tak bylo exposes what Professor Schapiro has termed the 'mystique' of revolution that is, the belief that the overthrow of a tyrant of necessity replaces tyranny by freedom This view is neither original nor unique to Andreyev Five years earlier, Tolstoy had put forward essentially the same criticism of political revolution in Rabstvo nashego vremeni

> Все попытки уничтожения правительств насилием до сих пор всегда и везде приводили только к тому, что на месте сверженных правительств установились новые, часто более жестокие, чем те, которые они заменяли [161]

Unlike Tolstoy, however, Andreyev did not reject revolution per se, in Tak bylo he merely expresses his belief that social revolution brings not freedom itself, but merely the potential of freedom Such is the significance of the repeated comparison of freedom to a young bride who dies, her marriage unconsummated, on her wedding night

In his reminiscences, Gorky wrote that he considered Tak bylo to be the 'most sincere statement' of Andreyev's 'basic attitude to

political events',[162] interpreting the story as a critique of the revolutionary ethic This view has become a cornerstone of the Soviet critical attitude to Andreyev, according to which Tak bylo is invariably seen as the first indication of the author's 'desertion' of the revolutionary cause To cite the latest history of Russian literature "Мучительный перелом во взглядах, душевный "обрыв" Андреева выразился в его рассказе "Так было"" [163] This view, which has as yet been supported only by the most superficial discussion of the work, has several inherent weaknesses Of these, the most serious is the problem of reconciling the 'critique' of revolution in Tak bylo with the 'defence' of revolution in the later works, K zvyozdam, Iz rasskaza, kotoryy nikogda ne budet okonchen, and Ivan Ivanovich The majority of Soviet critics avoid this problem by begging the question at issue, and relate these 'contradictions' to the 'innate contradictions' of the author's character Here again, the authority is Gorky "Леонид Николаевич странно и мучительно-резко для себя раскалывался надвое - на одной и той же неделе он мог петь миру - "Осанна!" и провозглашать ему - "Анафема!" [164]

Tak bylo does not, it is repeated, imply a fundamental contradiction of Andreyev's conception of revolution as expressed in earlier works Analysis of the story has revealed that the author displays a critical attitude neither to the revolutionaries nor to their ideal In this respect, Tak bylo merits comparison with Kuprin's Tost and Bryusov's Respublika yuzhnogo kresta, two contemporary works which question the desirability of the revolutionary ideal In contrast, Andreyev's story reflects his growing doubt only as to the realizability of this ideal By the late summer of 1905, he had become far less sanguine in his predictions for the outcome of the revolution, for reasons which will shortly become clear Gorky's reminiscences of Leonid Krasin provide evidence of this change

> Однажды я сидел с доктором у Леонида Андреева в Грузинах, а Красин приехал туда за мною по какому-то делу Андреев был плохо настроен и, как-то неловко, неуместно заговорил, что он не может верить в благодетельное воздействие революции на людей [165]

In effect, Tak bylo was the expression of a fear shared by both Gorky and Andreyev that the events of 1905 should prove to be not a true revolution, but merely a revolt Gorky, however, could not condone a

work which presented a pessimistic view of revolution, especially at a time when he saw the primary role of the writer in promoting faith in that same revolution His own Tovarishch', written soon after he had read Tak bylo, can be seen as an 'antidote' to the pessimism of Andreyev's work In Tovarishch', the people are inspired by the example of the revolutionaires to become 'new men', reinforcing the 'mystique' of revolution challenged by Tak bylo

G K zvyozdam a pivotal work

Andreyev's apprehension increased during the autumn and winter of 1905 Whilst he remained in complete sympathy with the revolutionary cause, his personal life had become fraught with serious difficulties which reminded him of the less pleasant social effects of revolution A known 'sympathizer', Andreyev became a target for persecution both from the official and the unofficial defenders of 'law and order' Under continued police surveillance, he was also threatened by the notorious Black Hundred movement, whose aim was to counter sedition by means of terrorism By October, Black Hundred activity had reached its apex Gangs of their supporters, recruited from the lowest rungs of urban society and fired by patriotic slogans and liberal quantities of vodka, began to seek out intellectuals and 'free thinkers' [166] It was Andreyev's misfortune to be identified as an 'unpatriotic element and the following months were spent in constant fear both for his own safety and for that of his family On 24 October, he wrote to Pyatnitsky of the very real physical danger to which he was exposed

> Жизнь в Москве для меня становится невозможной И через участок, и другим путем (толпа, собирающаяся ночью у двери и выражающая желание "убить сволочь" и т п) Я получаю предостережения и уже два раза должен был перекочевывать с семьею на разные квартиры . Эти скверные избиения на автора "Кр(асного) смеха" производят впечатление ужасное. Далее не играя в революционном движении активной роли, я могу быть только пассивным зрителем, - я вовсе не хочу видеть этих истерзанных тел и озверевших рож 167

The distinction between an active revolutionary and a passive observer was indeed a crucial one At the very same time, Gorky, who was living in another part of the city, had been placed under the protection of a personal bodyguard of Bolshevik sympathizers, of which he informed Pyatnitsky on 2 November "Меня "охраняет" отряд кавказской

боевой дружины - 8 человек"[168] The very fact that Gorky should use the word 'protect' in inverted commas is indicative of the degree to which he was unaware of the serious danger threatening his friend

Under these circumstances, and fearing new arrest,[169] Andreyev decided to leave Moscow in mid-November for the safety of Germany[170] As he suspected, his departure from Russia 'at such a moment'[171] could easily be interpreted as a sign of 'cowardice', as indeed it was In his highly uncharitable memoirs, Skitalets remarked that Andreyev was 'almost the only writer who 'fled the revolution'',[172] implying that by leaving Moscow Andreyev had also deserted the revolutionary cause Skitalets's suggestion is extremely unjust, Andreyev's departure from Moscow was nothing more than a rational decision by a man who valued the safety of his family and whose presence in the city served no useful purpose

Such were the adverse conditions under which Andreyev worked on the manuscript of his first published play, K zvyozdam[173] He had referred to this work in the letter to Pyatnitsky, cited above "С рукописью под мышкой, я таскался по Москве, - и разными чернилами, в промежуток между 11 и 20 ок(тября), накатал 4-хактную драму"[174] On this evidence, there seems no basis for Dr Woodward's statement that the manuscript dated 20 October, 1905 'seems to have been written in the spring of 1904'[175] Inspection of the four manuscripts relating to the play, housed at the Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkinskiy dom), in Leningrad,[176] also gives no reason to doubt the author's date Furthermore, other statements by Andreyev indicate that he did not begin work on the play before October, 1905 In November, 1904 he had instructed Pyatnitsky to inform Gorky that he had abandoned his intention to write his own version of Astronom[177] A newspaper interview conducted the following July also revealed that no work had been done on the play, which Andreyev was now determined to write

> У писателя уже давно созрела мысль написать пьесу, сюжет которой хотя и еще не ясен для него, но совершенно ясна ее центральная фигура - ученого астронома, всей душой преданного своей науке 178

The subsequent history of the play's composition can be ascertained with far less assurance, however, owing to the general unreliability of the information available

On completion, the manuscript of K zvyozdam was read to Gorky and a select circle of friends, which included V P Troynov, Andreyev's brother-in-law According to Troynov, who described the reading in his memoirs, the play met with adverse criticism from Gorky, who suggested radical changes for its improvement

> Он выбросил немую старуху с трясущейся головой - к черту гамсуновские символы' - послал Николая на баррикады, рассорил семью и сотрудников Терновского, наметил двух рабочих, простых, но житейски мудрых людей, преданных делу пролетариата 179

Comparison of the original manuscript with the final version of the play would seem to suggest that Andreyev revised the manuscript with Gorky's comments in mind Judging from the alterations and additions to Act 3,[180] he began by making revisions to the manuscript, which were then abandoned in favour of writing a completely new version This supposition is supported by Andreyev's letter to Pyatnitsky of 3 November "Дело в том, что я уже написал пьесу, но поразмыслил - почеркнул ее всю А теперь пишу заново, совсем в иной концепции, и тороплюсь, чтобы начерно окончить до отъезда"[181] Troynov tells us that Andreyev succeeded in his efforts and that the new version was duly read to Gorky before the author's departure for Germany Although he was not present in person at this second reading, Troynov reports that Andreyev returned from it in a 'gloomy and irritable' mood[182] Gorky's impression of the new play was no more favourable than it had been of the original version In the second week of November, he wrote to Pyatnitsky "Андреев написал пьесу "К звездам" Очень плохо"[183] Despite Gorky's reaction, Andreyev persevered with the work, to which he returned after settling in Berlin Towards the end of the year, he wrote to his sister, Rimma "Завтра вечером сажусь работать - нужно окончить драму, чувствую, что скоро до того буду охвачен здешними впечатлениями, что к российским уже трудно будет вернуться"[184]

On the evidence available, it would seem that K zvyozdam passed through three stages of composition A first version was composed between 10 and 20 October, 1905 and read to Gorky soon afterwards Between 3 and 7 November, a second version was written, after which it was revised in Berlin to form the basis of the final, published text It would also seem that, whilst the first and second versions differed quite considerably, the second and third versions varied only on points

of detail [185] Clearly, the manuscripts in Pushkinskiy dom are only a part of the materials relating to K zvyozdam, of which only one [186] belongs to any period of composition other than the first For this reason, the following discussion is limited to an analysis of the original manuscript and the published text of the play

Although the original version of K zvyozdam corresponds largely to the plot of Astronom as outlined by Gorky to Pyatnitsky in October, 1903, [187] Andreyev's conception of the basic theme of his play had apparently undergone considerable alteration during the intervening period Even in the summer of 1905, as we have seen, the author had told a correspondent of Odesskiye novosti that his subject was not altogether clear [188] The same could not be said, however, of the image of the play's central character, which remained essentially unchanged from the original conception to the final execution The image of a man who is the 'son of eternity' first occurs in Iz glubiny vekov, where Andreyev describes the figure of the tsar in a passage which may well have provided the title for the later play

> Ночь полновластно владела землей и городом И всю ночь до утра над мрачной громадой безмолвного города неподвижно темнел одинокий силуэт человека К звездам было обращено его прекрасное и гордое лицо 189

Defending his story against Gorky's criticism in May, 1904, Andreyev further elucidated the significance of the tsar

> Мне царь нужен, мне нужен хоть и призрачный образ одинокого, свободного и смелого человека, который заглянул во все дыры мироздания, который отверг славу, могущество, мудрость во имя чего-то лучшего, имени чему я не знаю 190

Although Iz glubiny vekov was never finished, the image of the 'tsar' remained with the author to be embodied in the character of the astronomer, Ternovsky

In its original version, K zvyozdam is closer in theme to Gorky's Deti Solntsa than the final text As in Gorky's play, the action takes place in the Russian provinces and centres on the gulf between the privileged classes and the common people In the opening act, Andreyev suggests this social and intellectual gulf in a number of ways It is represented visually by the physical distance which separates the crowd from the unnamed He and She and from the high-school boy and girl

This visual impression is reinforced by the contrast between the refined conversation of the high-school boy and girl (a merciless satire on middle-class respectability) and the coarse remarks of the crowd A more serious social comment is implied by the contrast between the extreme poverty of the people and the affluence of Ternovsky's wife, who is able to offer ten roubles reward when her pet dog goes missing It takes the sudden appearance of the comet, however, before the privileged classes become alive to their tragic isolation from the people and also to their extreme vulnerability

> До сих пор, я знаю только город, а теперь вдруг почувствовала землю - и это точно страшно Что же это? Живешь, живешь, не думаешь ни о какой земле и о небе не думаешь - и вдруг оттуда приходит что-то и становится над головой 191

The comet inspires fear amongst the crowd and the privileged classes alike In the superstitious minds of the common people it is the sign of another misfortune designed by the rich to increase their suffering, to the privileged classes it raises the spectre of violent retribution

Throughout the opening scenes, Andreyev employs the device of 'anonymity' in his portrayal of both the crowd and the privileged classes The speakers are referred to not by name but by their external characteristics He, She, First Youth, Second Old Man, Tall Man, Thin Man, Groaning Voices, etc In this way Andreyev stresses the typicality rather than the individuality of the characters, each of whom represents a specific point of view He differentiates between the naive ignorance of the First Youth and the bold defiance of the Second, between the God-fearing religiosity of the Second Old Man and the conservatism of the First In the Groaning Voices, Andreyev suggests not only the suffering, but also the tolerance of the Russian people, whereas the figure of Ivan represents the sinister destructive instinct which lurks beneath the surface

This heterogeneous mass presents only a potential threat to the security of the privileged classes The crowd's growing protest, although vocal, lacks both direction and impetus This point is illustrated by a minor alteration to a speech by the Second Youth In a preliminary sketch, the speech read as follows "Будь моя сила, взял бы я эту барыню за голову, да хвостиком бы, как помелом, по земле" [192] Subsequently, this passage was changed to "Будь

моя сила, взял бы я эту комету, да хвостом бы, как помелом, по всей земле" [193] The substitution of the world kometa for barynya changes the emphasis completely In the first variant, the Second Youth had identified the 'lady' as a suitable target for his vengeance In the second, his vengeance, although no less strong, lacks any clear direction

It is the Tall Man and the Thin Man who are responsible for manipulating this latent force and inspiring the people to actual rebellion The Tall Man appeals to the crowd's religious instincts, conjuring the now familiar spectre of the 'God of Vengeance' "Воздвиг Господь знамение гнева своего и страх пошел по всей земле Очисти нас огнем твоим, Господи, не стало мочи жить' [194] He instructs the people to destroy the aristocracy of learning, which, he tells them, is the true source of their suffering This opinion is endorsed by the Thin Man, who directly incites the crowd to violence His true nature is revealed when he is recognized by one of his audience "Я его знаю Из ерошкиной компании Они нынешней зимой зверей хотели выпустить" [195] The implication of these words is obvious, the Thin Man's agitation amongst the people is another attempt to 'release the animals', although in this case the animals are human beings It is to this animal force that Ternovsky is sacrificed at the end of the play

The opening scenes are a fairly transparent comment on the Black Hundred movement and reflect the circumstances under which the play was written In the latter part of the act, the author turns his attention from the crowd to the individuals who make up the Ternovsky household Here also each character, although individualized, is a clearly recognizable 'type' Verkhovtsev,[196] who was designated a 'Social-Democrat or a Socialist-Revolutionary' in an early sketch,[197] is a philanthropist who is dedicated to the task of bringing enlightenment to the Russian people His practical concern for contemporary social problems renders him unsympathetic to the abstract study of astronomy, of which he speaks sarcastically Even more outspoken in her criticism of Ternovsky is the astronomer's daughter, Anna, who is actively involved in Verkhovtsev's publishing enterprise which aims to provide cheap editions of books for a mass audience (possibly a reference to Znaniye's 'Cheap Library') Anna's attitude to her father is unequivocal "Можно быть астрономом и не забывать своих

общественных целей".[198] On the other side stands Silitsyn, Ternovsky's assistant, who shares the astronomer's passion for his science and defends him against such criticism

In between these two extremes stand Ternovsky's son, Petya, and Marusya, the fiancée of his other son, Nikolay, a revolutionary Marusya also supports the revolutionary cause, although more out of emotional than rational considerations, for which she is rebuked by Anna "уже если взялась за дело, так делай, как следует, а все эти слезы, ахи да охи Нервы' Не берись, если нервы" [199] Initially, Marusya is capable of reconciling her active support for the popular cause with respect for Ternovsky and his experiments But, under the impact of the news of Nikolay's arrest and subsequent insanity, she comes to question the justification of the astronomer's indifference to his social environment Eventually, she too turns against Ternovsky, accepting Verkhovtsev's argument that his dedication to abstract science is alien to social progress

Like Marusya, Petya, whose role in the original version is more important than in the final text, undergoes a personal crisis which leads him to doubt all values The cause of Petya's crisis, as Verkhovtsev realises, lies in his inability to reconcile his abstract desire to help his fellows with his failure to translate this ideal into practical action "Он не любит людей, но за то как он любит человека" [200] Petya's dilemma reiterates the problem raised by Ivan Karamazov "я никогда не мог понять, как можно любить своих ближних Именно ближних-то, по-моему, и невозможно любить, а разве лишь дальних" [201] Petya expresses his rational desire to 'love his neighbour' in the parable of Buddha's sacrifice to the tiger,[202] an act which he attempts to emulate by his betrothal to the 'beautiful Helene', who epitomises the suffering and degradation of the people The attempt is a fiasco, which brings Petya to realise the hopelessness of his ideal and results in his attempted suicide The third act depicts Petya's 'resurrection', for which Ternovsky is responsible Once installed in his father's observatory, Petya is able to contemplate a totally different kind of service to mankind which is unaffected by his failure to 'love his neighbour'

In contrast to Acts 2 and 3, where the emphasis had been on the debate between Ternovsky and Verkhovtsev, the final act is filled with action Andreyev may well have had this act in mind when he wrote to

Gorky in March, 1904 on the subject of Chirikov's play Eviei, which also ends with an act of violence

> Здесь все должно быть поглощено погромом, ожиданием его Ведь ожидание смерти хуже самой смерти Пусть мечутся, плачут, говорят ерунду, молятся, проклинают, и все время твердят идут - идут - идут 203

Act 4 is constructed exactly to this formula Tension is generated by Silitsyn's 'countdown' of the minutes remaining before the eclipse and the continual reports of growing discontent amongst the crowd, which is preparing to march on the observatory The climax, on the other hand, is brief and the impact created by the brutal murder of Ternovsky is thus heightened The eclipse itself, like the comet in Act 1, is symbolic, as Petya's words suggest "Какая-то тьма поднимается оттуда Что же это' Сейчас будет темно и что не от затмения" [204] The murder of Ternovsky thus represents the 'eclipse' of reason by the power of instinct

In its original version, K zvyozdam betrays Andreyev's inexperience as a dramatist and reflects the troubled circumstances which surrounded its composition The play's principal fault lies in its stylistic and structural disjointedness, which in itself is a sign of insufficient clarity of conception Strictly speaking, the play has not one theme but two In Acts 1 and 4, Andreyev restates the problem of Gubernator and Tak bylo, depicting the destructive power of vengeance, whereas in the debates of Acts 2 and 3 he raises the totally different question of social progress and the means of its achievement No doubt aware of this weakness, Andreyev removed the opening scenes and the entire fourth act from the revised version of the play in order to expand and clarify the debate between Ternovsky and Verkhovtsev

Many of the elements removed from K zvyozdam in the course of Andreyev's extensive revisions were to reappear shortly in a number of works Stylistically, the opening scenes anticipate the technique of the later plays, notably Zhizn' Cheloveka and Tsar' Golod, where the devices of stylization and mnogogolosiye are employed to the same effect Thematically also, the original manuscript proved to be a melting pot from which many subsequent works were to emerge The satirical picture of the privileged classes in the opening scenes and particularly in the scene where Ternovsky's wife entertains her guest is developed, in Zhizn' Cheloveka and Lyubov' k blizhnemu, into a devastating critique

of bourgeois mores and convention The sacrifice of a man to the passions of the crowd forms the basis of Savva, Andreyev's next play, and recurs again in Anatema A Soviet critic has recently observed that many of the figures from the crowd correspond to characters in Tsar' Golod [205] The figure of Tsar' Golod himself is modelled on the character of the Thin Man The Tall Man, on the other hand, is a prototype for Tsar' Irod in Savva

In accordance with Andreyev's new purpose, the role of Petya was considerably reduced in the final version of the play However, his dilemma, which was in effect the dilemma of the entire Russian intelligentsia, continued to occupy Andreyev's thoughts The same problem is suggested in the figure of the 'Girl in Black' (Tsar' Golod) and forms the central theme of T'ma and Sashka Zhegulyov Another important feature of the original play removed from the final text was the conflict between Ternovsky and his wife The significance of this conflict was elucidated by Andreyev in an interview of July, 1905

> Человек говорит с человеком через стену веков, передает ему свою мысль и уверен, что она дойдет до того, для кого предназначается, а тут жена и говорит ему, что ситец, купленный для подарка прислуге, оказался линючим, и что в лавке нет порядочных огурцов, на этом контрасте я и думаю построить свою пьесу 206

This plan was eventually realized in Professor Storitsyn, where the dramatic conflict is provided by the incompatibility of Storitsyn, who lives on the plane of higher reality, and his wife, Lyudmila, who is the epitome of bourgeois materialism Some two years later, in Korol', zakon i svoboda, Andreyev re-used the opening scene of the original version of K zvyozdam

> У чугунной ограды, за которой даль, собрались испуганные женщины и смотрят на далекий пожар Кровавое, беспокойное зарево охватывает почти все небо, и только в зените небо темнеет по-ночному Отсветы зарева падают на предметы и людей, дают жуткие отражения в зеркальных стеклах немой и темной виллы Голоса звучат сдержанно и робко, частые паузы и продолжительные вздохи
>
> Женщины три
>
> Генриетта Боже мои, Боже мой, как это ужасно! Горит и горит, и нет конца огню
>
> Вторая женщина Вчера горела дальше и там, а сегодня ближе Оно становится ближе, о Господи!

Генриетта Горит и горит и нет этому конца 207

The scene has been modified to suit Andreyev's new purpose, the ruddy glow in the sky is caused not by a comet, but by the fires kindled by the advancing enemy armies The apocalyptic significance of the glow and the sense of impending doom amongst the common people are, however, the same

From these examples it is clear that many of Andreyev's later works owe their inspiration to the intense period of composition in October, 1905, which produced the first version of K zvyozdam It is, therefore, no exaggeration to state that the majority of the author's works of the following years were conceived under the direct influence of revolutionary events

Andreyev's revisions to the original version of K zvyozdam resulted in a number of changes to the plot and dramatis personae of the play The action of the final text takes place not in a provincial Russian town, but in an unspecified foreign land and the topical references to the Russo-Japanese War are accordingly omitted Several of the characters differ significantly from their prototypes Ternovsky's wife, Inna Aleksandrovna, is transformed from the epitome of Philistinism to the embodiment of altruistic, maternal love [208] The characterless Silitsyn is remodelled into the pedantic Pollak and Verkhovtsev and Marusya are made less ambiguous In addition to these modifications, Andreyev introduced three completely new characters into the play - Treych, Zhitov and Lunts, probably on Gorky's suggestion [209]

By removing the crowd scenes and the tragic confrontation of the final act, Andreyev deprived K zvyozdam of its major dramatic conflict, leaving only the ideological conflict which had originally occupied Acts 2 and 3 Dramatic tension in the final version is provided entirely by action which takes place off-stage the progress of the revolution to which Nikolay has lent his support, his arrest and subsequent madness, the eventual defeat of the revolution by the forces of reaction, all of which the audience learns only by report, provides an essential background to the ideological dispute which occurs on stage The technique is essentially the same as that employed by Chekhov in Vishnyovyy sad, where off-stage events also provide a commentary to the conflicts of character on stage

The 'completely new conception' of the final version, of which

Andreyev spoke in his letter to Pyatnitsky,[210] is particularly clear in his approach to characterization With the exception of Ternovsky and Treych and a few minor characters, the characters in K zvyozdam fall into two distinct groups those whose reaction to events is essentially emotional, and those whose reaction is rational. Of the first group, Inna Aleksandrovna has no interest in the revolution beyond her son's involvement in it As her final words reveal, the fate of her son is in her eyes a far greater tragedy than the defeat of the entire revolutionary movement The same is true of Marusya, whose support for the revolutionary cause lasts only as long as Nikolay retains his freedom and his sanity For Ternovsky's assistant, Lunts, who is a Jew, the revolution serves only to remind him of the pogrom in which his parents were murdered Reduced to a state of hysteria, he rejects the cold abstractions of astronomy to which he had devoted his life Equally profound is the emotional effect of the revolution upon Petya, who is reduced to the fruitless contemplation of his inability to conquer his instinctive fear of violence and take an active part in the revolutionary struggle "Там великая борьба, а я Я не могу, я не могу!"[211]

In contrast to the four characters named, Verkhovtsev, Anna and Pollak remain true to their principles throughout As in the original version, both Verkhovtsev and Anna are practical revolutionaries who are prepared to risk their lives for their beliefs A materialist by conviction, Verkhovtsev can see no justification for Ternovsky's scientific experiments, which have no direct application on earth His views are shared by his wife, Anna, who gives them more articulate expression Anna is not only critical of her father for his indifference to events but also reacts strongly against her mother's 'sentimentalism' Her abstract humanitarianism is contradicted by her callous attitude to the old woman whom Inna Aleksandrovna shelters in her home Anna's extreme materialism renders her appreciative only of actions which promise an immediate and tangible result To her, Treych, who takes a more long-term view of the revolution, is simply a 'romantic' (fantazyor)[212] She defines her own conception of revolution in conversation with Lunts, who expresses his admiration for Marusya

> Лунц Какая девушка! Это - солнце! Это вихрь огненных сил! Это Юдифь!
> Анна Да, слишком много огня Революция не нуждается в ваших вихрях и взрывах, - это, если хотите знать, ремесло в которое

нужно вносить терпение, настойчивость и спокойствие А эти вихри 213

Of the other characters, Anna is closest of all to Pollak Despite the superficial difference of their chosen field of endeavour, each displays the same 'patience, persistence and calm' in the pursuit of their 'trade' Pollak is, in Ternovsky's words, 'very able'[214] and this is the faint praise that damns him The similarity between Anna and Pollak is especially clear in the final scene of Act 3, where Lunts finally breaks down

Лунц Позор! И вам не стыдно, Поллак? Наука! А это вы видите? Это моя мать, это моя мать
Поллак Я не понимаю

Анна Их надо всех в сумасшедший дом
Верховцев (с испугом) Анна, молчи! 215

Anna's insensitive remark reveals that she is as unaware of the gravity of Lunts's nervous breakdown as Pollak, and Veikhovtsev's 'alarm' stems from the sudden realisation of the proximity between his wife and the astronomer's assistant

Despite their obvious differences of temperament and outlook, all the characters discussed so far are, in Ternovsky's terminology, 'children of the earth', in that they are unable to transcend the narrow confines of their emotions or their immediate environment Not so Ternovsky and Treych, who alone merit the title 'children of eternity' As in the original play, it is the astronomer himself who most clearly embodies the author's ideal The essence of his argument remains the same, whilst sympathizing with the short-term aims of Veikhovtsev, Anna and Marusya, Ternovsky is convinced that, by devoting himself to science, he will make a far more important contribution to the long-term progress of mankind In the new version of the play Andreyev introduced elements which reveal the astronomer in a more favourable light For example, we learn that Ternovsky had left Russia after resigning from a lucrative position in protest against the interference of bureaucratic officialdom In addition, his devotion to science, which in the original version had made him seem indifferent to the suffering of others, is tempered in the final play by a degree of emotion His paternal instinct inspires him to sacrifice the three thousand roubles set aside for a scientific expedition to aid the bid to free Nikolay from prison The news of his son's fate, which had previously failed to disturb him, now provokes an emotional outburst,

which he only subsequently manages to control

As a result of these revisions, Ternovksy becomes a more credible figure and the danger of seeing him as a reductio ad absurdam is removed Also important in this respect is the introduction into the play of a new character, the revolutionary Treych Treych differs from the other revolutionaries in that he does not share their critical opinion of Ternovsky In the dramatis personae he is described as 'long-sighted',[216] a feature which suggests his affinity with the astronomer Just as Ternovsky is convinced that his work will be completed by future generations for the benefit of mankind, so Treych is optimistic about the eventual victory of the revolution

> Но надо итти вперед Если земля будет расступаться под ногами, нужно скрепить ее - железом Если она начнет распадать на части, нужно слить ее - огнем Если небо станет валиться на головы, надо протянуть руки и отбросить его - так' 217

His optimism contrasts with the gloomy premonitions of Lunts and also with the sober materialism of Verkhovtsev, who remarks "Вот это - астрономия Ах, чорт'"[218] The use of the word 'astronomy' with reference to Treych is only one of several cases which stress the similarity between the revolutionary and the astronomer Consider, for example, the following passages

> Верховцев Вот это - астрономия Ну, как, звездочет, нравятся вам такие астрономы?
> Сергей Николаевич Да Нравятся Его фамилия, кажется, Трейч?
>
> Верховцев Странная коллекция Вам бы ее в какой-нибудь музей пожертвовать' Не правда ли, Трейч?
> Трейч Мне нравятся друзья господина Терновского 219

The second passage is all the more important in that it follows Ternovsky's speech about his unknown 'friends' who will continue his work in the future Like Ternovsky, Treych also has the ability to see events in perspective The fact of Nikolay's madness fails to shake Ternovsky's faith in the ultimate perfectibility of man Similarly, the failure of one particular revolution does not alter Treych's conviction that the revolution will ultimately succeed Each sees himself as a small but vital part of the universal process and this is the source of their strength

K zvyozdam is, beyond doubt, the most positive statement to date

of Andreyev's ideal and provides an antidote to the spirit of doubt which had been present in Krasnyy smekh and Tak bylo, two of his most pessimistic visions of human society Andreyev had himself expressed concern at the negative trend in his thought in a letter to Veresayev of July, 1904 "Кто я? До каких неведомых и страшных границ дойдет мое отрицание? Вечное "нет" - сменится ли оно каким-нибудь "да"?"[220] K zvyozdam demonstrates that the author had at last discovered a positive philosophy and, what is more, that the Revolution of 1905 had been the primary stimulus for this discovery This point was endorsed by Andreyev in an interview with the editor of Le messager franco-russe on the subject of the revolution and its effect on Russian literature

> В точности относительно художественной литературы наше теперешнее время является переоценкой ценностей Все то, что писалось два года тому назад, носит теперь характер истории За эти два года мы пережили чуть ли не сто лет, и мне кажется, что я родился давно-давно и что мое первое произведение написано не восемь лет, а много лет тому назад То же самое мне говорил Максим Горький, что вещи, написанные им до революции, ему кажутся очень старыми . 221

For Andreyev, no less than for Gorky, the revolution had resulted in a 'reevaluation of values', allowing him to clarify the ideal towards which his thought had been gravitating over a number of years For each writer also the ideal was identified with the concept of revolution and provided a point of reference to which they were to return in a number of works of the post-1905 period

According to Andreyev, the essential feature of the truly revolutionary mentality lies in the ability to see beyond the superficial level of reality to comprehend the eternal process of which it is a part The same idea is developed in a letter to Zaytsev, written several years later, which contains a passage highly reminiscent of Teinovsky's monologues

> Немало на свете красивых людей, а расстояние между ними - словно между звездами и один еще не родился, а другой давно умер Пусть даже живет, но или он далеко бесконечно, либо говорит на другом языке, либо я совсем не знаю о его существовании Ведь все эти, кого мы любим и считаем настоящими друзьями, Данте, Иисус, Достоевский, существуют только в

> воображении нашем, во второй действительности, во сне 222

This concept of 'two realities', a concrete reality bounded by the limits of time and space, and a 'second' reality which allows man to contemplate the infinite, again puts Andreyev close to the theories of the younger generation of Russian Symbolists, notably Blok and Belyy The contrast contained in the final lines of K zvyozdam thus becomes fully intelligible

> Сергей Николаевич (протягивая руки к звездам) Привет тебе, мой далекий, мой неизвестный друг!
> Маруся (протягивая руки к земле) Привет тебе, мой милый, мой страдающий брат! 223

In the characters of Marusya and Ternovsky we have the extreme representatives of the two levels of perception

The victory to which Ternovsky and Treych look forward with calm assurance is the ultimate victory of human reason In the final act, Andreyev has the astronomer pronounce an appeal for the absolute freedom of reason

> Его мысль рождена птицей - могучей и свободной царицей пространств, а он связал ей крылья и посадил ее в птичник - с проволочными, бесстыдно лгущими стенами. И небо сквозь сетку дразнит ее, и она ссорится с другими птицами, тупеет, становится глупой - вместо того, чтоб летать 224

This passage provides the key to Andreyev's complex attitude to reason In this extended simile, he elucidates the tragedy of his ultra-rationalists, Sergey Petrovich and Kerzhentsev, whose reason was trapped within the 'cage' of the ego and hence rendered self-destructive The rationalism of Ternovsky and Treych is of a totally different order, as it is coupled with awareness of the 'second' reality, allowing them to transcend the ego and become part of a universal constructive force Theirs is not the stultifying logic which seeks to reduce life to an algebraic formula but a rational drive to understand more about life for the benefit of all

Andreyev's defence of rationalism in K zvyozdam caused one contemporary critic to see the play as an illustration to Gorky's Chelovek, from which he took a quotation as an epigraph to his article [225] Yet, despite this similarity, Gorky never revised his original, unfavourable opinion of Andreyev's play There were a number of reasons for Gorky's dissatisfaction Firstly, like Tak bylo, K zvyozdam describes the

course of an unsuccessful revolution and could hence, in Gorky's view, inspire a feeling of defeatism in the reader. Secondly, as Dr Woodward suggests, Gorky may well have seen in the character of Ternovsky a 'direct riposte' to his own portrayal of Protasov in Deti Solntsa[226] Certainly, Ternovsky carries no moral responsibility for the gulf between himself and the common people, indeed, in the final version, Andreyev seemingly justifies his indifference to social questions The depiction of Ternovsky and Treych as 'comrades in spirit' must have particularly offended against Gorky's view of the intelligentsia, whom he had consistently depicted as the antithesis of revolutionary consciousness What is more, Andreyev's drama displayed a distinct tendency towards dismissing the importance of revolutionary activity in the physical sense

Gorky must also have sensed in Andreyev's play an attempt by the author to vindicate his own position with regard to the revolution in Russia Several years earlier, Andreyev had defined his own 'revolutionism' in a letter to Gorky

> По натуре я не революционер, я не люблю шума, драки, толпы и теряюсь в них, не люблю тайны и болтлив, вообще в действии не гожусь ни к чему С другой стороны, люблю в тишине думать, и в области мысли моей задачи мои, как они мне представляются, революционные 227

Ternovsky is, in Andreyev's terms, a revolutionary 'in the sphere of thought', who, although not directly involved in revolutionary activity, was kindred in spirit to such active revolutionaries as Treych For Gorky, however, there could only be one sort of revolutionism, that which was expressed in terms of practical deeds His contempt for the intellectual 'revolutionaries in the sphere of thought' is contained in Zriteli, where he describes the revolutionary 'sympathizers' who look on as the revolution is crushed by the forces of reaction

K zvyozdam was read to the assembled company of the Moscow Art Theatre on 10 November, 1905 and was immediately accepted for production by Nemirovich-Danchenko[228] Early in the new year, however, word was received that the play had been declared 'unsuitable for production' by the censorship authorities[229] The reason for this decision was contained in the censor's report "Вся эта символическая драма, талантливо и с большим подъемом написанная, служит идеализации революции и ее деятелей"[230] The censor's fears proved

justified, Andreyev's play had a highly successful première in Vienna, where it provoked a positive reaction from the working class spectators[231] The success came as a surprise to the author, who wrote to Pyatnitsky ""К звездам" в Вене имели огромный успех - даже удивительно И приятно то, что ставились они в народном с(оциал)-демократическом театре, и публика-рабочие - лезла на сцену и вообще впала в раж".[232] One can detect in this letter more than the natural pride of an author at the success of his first play To Andreyev, this success was particularly important as it seemed to invalidate the criticism of those, like Gorky, who had rejected K zvyozdam on the grounds that it was insufficiently democratic This is clear from a second letter, which Andreyev wrote to his brother Pavel "Я не особенный любитель реклам, но на этот раз хочется похвастаться, особенно перед эсдерами и проч "[233]

According to one Soviet critic, K zvyozdam represents a 'temporary intensification of Andreyev's democratic mood' promoted by the 'upsurge of the liberation movement, the class struggle of the proletariat at the head of the bourgeois revolution of 1905'[234] In particular, so the same argument runs, the play contrasts with the message contained in Tak bylo and demonstrates the contradictory attitude of the author to the question of revolution Yet, in essence, these works are no more contradictory than Gorky's own statements of this period, as expressed in O Serom and Tovarishch', for example Tak bylo, like O Serom, expresses the author's fear that man's innate slavishness will stand as an invincible barrier to the achievement of revolution, K zvyozdam, like Tovarischch' embodies the author's positive ideal, his hope that society will eventually evolve to a higher state In each case, the ideal was virtually the same, revolution was conceived not simply in terms of social change but in terms of a revolutionary change in human nature itself, allowing mankind to rid itself of the heritage of its animal origins, to destroy the psychology of the slave and to develop a new collective consciousness which is the antidote to the all-pervasive alienation of modern society What is more, this remained the guiding ideal of both writers during the years that followed

For Gorky, however, the distinction between the pessimism of Tak bylo and the optimism of K zvyozdam was all-important By 1905,

his views on democratic literature had already undergone important changes Maintaining that the purpose of art is to inspire men to positive revolutionary action, he was convinced that works of literature should display 'revolutionary optimism' In his own works, particularly those written in the immediate post-revolutionary period, Gorky translated this theory into practice and 'Romantic Realism' took on a specifically revolutionary connotation Andreyev, on the other hand, was to develop in the opposite direction, examining in his own works those aspects of human nature which had led to the defeat of the Revolution of 1905

CHAPTER THREE NOTES

1 ЛН 72, стр 194
2 The Andreyevs arrived in Yalta on 22 or 23 March Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 161
3 Вересаев, т 5, стр 404
4 The first part of Gol'tsev's lecture was given on 28 January, its conclusion following at the next meeting of Sreda on 4 February, at which Gorky was not present ЛН 72, стр 197, ЛЖТ 1, стр 467-468
5 ЛН 72, стр 204
6 The manuscript was in the possession of Andreyev's eldest son, Vadim, in Geneva, at least until 1961,(ЛН 72, стр 206) although it may have passed into a Soviet archive together with other materials since that date Only one extract of the story was published during the author's lifetime (Л Андреев, "Царь", Весна, № 1 (1908), стр 4) Extracts from a manuscript entitled Iz glubiny vekov were published in Янтарев, стр 245-247 Both extracts are reproduced in the apperdix.
7 ЛН 72, стр 209
8 ibid., p.210
9 ibid.
10 ibid., p.212.
11 ibid., pp 213-214
12 The first miscellany appeared on 1 March ЛЖТ 1, стр 470
13 Куприна-Иорданская, Годы молодости, стр 155
14 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 161
15 ЛН.72, стр 208
16 АГ.4, стр 116
17 Yushkevich's play never appeared in Znaniye as it was rejected by the censorship committee
18 Янтарев, стр 248
19 Вересаев, т 5, стр.406
20 ЛН 72, стр 236
21 А Волжский, "Литературные отголоски По поводу книги г Булгакова (От марксизма к идеализму)", Журнал для всех, № 12 (1903)
22 Вересаев, т 5, стр 400
23 The text of this letter is cited in Олейников, "Горький и "Знание"", стр 138
24 А Волжский, "О некоторых мотивах творчества М Горького", Журнал для всех, № 1 (1904)
25 А Серафимович, Собрание сочинений в 7-и томах, т 7, (М , 1960), стр 388-389
26 Г-30, т 28, стр 280
27 The joint statement appeared in the final number of the magazine for 1903. For its text, see ЛА, стр 104
28 ibid., p.106
29 Andreyev mentions this meeting in a letter to Gorky of 16 February ЛН 72, стр 200
30 ibid., p 222.
31 ibid., p 209
32 Andreyev informed Nevedomsky of the success of his mission in October, 1904 Искусство, № 2 (1925), стр 266
33 ЛН 72, стр 222
34 ЛА, стр 106-107

35 Г-30, т 28, стр 305
36 ЛА, стр 109
37 ЛН 72, стр 224
38 ПССА, т 2, стр 9
39 ibid., p.19
40 ibid , p.10
41 ibid.
42 ibid., p.12
43 ibid.
44 ibid
45 ibid., pp13-14
46 ibid , p.14
47 Kaun dated this story approximately at 1912 Kaun, Andreyev, p.328. The fact that it was first published in Литературный сборник "Яма", (СПб , 1910) allows us to date it with greater accuracy (О Голубева, Литературно-художественные альманахи и сборники, т 1 (1900-1911 годы) (М , 1957), стр 174-175
48 ПССА, т.8, стр 59
49 ПССА, т 2, стр 272,278
50 Г-30, т.28, стр 340
51 ЛН 72, стр 247
52 ibid., pp.191-192
53 ibid., p.198
54 ibid., p.194
55 Veresayev's sketches were originally published in Znaniye miscellanies 17, 18, 19 and 20. For a comprehensive list of other works dealing with or inspired by the Russo-Japanese War and an account of the critical response to them, see П.Выходцев, "Русско-японская война в литературе эпохи первой русской революции", в кн Революция 1905 года и русская литература, (М -Л , 1956), стр.280-320
56 Andreyev's reaction to the war is compared with Tolstoy's in С.Варшавский, "Л Н Толстой и русско-японская война", Литературный современник, № 7 (1934), стр 147-151
57 Вересаев, т 5, стр 406
58 ЛН 7-8, стр 423.
59 Достоевский, т 5, стр 570
60 ПССА, т 4, стр 92
61 ibid., pp 100-101
62 ibid., p.113
63 ibid., p.98
64 ibid., pp.112,140.
65 ibid , p.129 The reference to a theatre audience is also employed by Andreyev in a later story, Lyubov', vera i nadezhda Альманах 17, (М , 1909), стр 36
66 ПССА, т 4, стр 114
67 ЛН 72, стр 236
68 Реквием, стр 63
69 В.Беззубов, "Леонид Андреев и Московский художественный театр", Ученые записки Тартуского университета Филологические науки, вып 209 (1968), стр 150
70 ЛН.72, стр 241
71 ibid., p.243.
72 ibid., p.244
73 ibid , pp.241-246, АГ5, стр 141-142
74 ЛН 72, стр 583
75 ibid., p.196

76 ПССА, т 2, стр 74
77 ibid., p 79
78 ibid., p.81
79 ibid., p.73
80 ibid., p.126
81 ПССГ, т 16, стр 337
82 М Ф Андреева, стр 359
83 ПССА, т 2, стр 75
84 Вересаев, т 5, стр 406
85 ЛН 72, стр 200
86 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 163
87 ЛН.72, стр 256
88 Вересаев, т 5, стр 406
89 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 168
90 Вересаев, т 5, стр 406
91 Звезда, № 8 (1971), стр.178
92 ЛН 72, стр 226
93 For details, see Ю.Пухов, "Л Андреев и Скиталец в революции 1905-1907 годов (По документам Департамента полиции)", Революция 1905 года и русская литература, стр 416-424
94 "Неизвестные письма Л.Андреева и его жены', Горьковский рабочий, 2 июня, 1972, стр 7
95 Пухов, стр 418
96 ibid
97 Вадим Андреев, Детство Повесть, (М , 1966), стр 9
98 Г-30, т 28, стр 352
99 ПССГ, т 16, стр 344
100 ЛН 72, стр 258
101 АГ 4, стр 184
102 АГ 5, стр.153
103 ЛЖТ 1, стр 542, М Ф Андреева, стр 100-103
104 Цыцарин, стр 88-89
105 ЛН 72, стр 265
106 ibid., p.190
107 see, for example, the final words of a letter to S.V Yablonovsky of 11 March, 1905, where Andreyev wrote 'Down with war, down with autocracy'' (ЛН 7-8, стр 423)
108 ЛН.72, стр 236, Вересаев, т.5, стр 407 Andreyev's attitude to the liberals later found expression in the scathing satire Prekrasnye sabinyanki
109 Брусянин, стр.15-16
110 "Из литературных бесед Леонид Андреев о русской литературе", Искры, № 47 (1906), стр 667
111 Московский альманах, кн.1 (1926), стр 291
112 ЛН 72, стр 514
113 Факелы, № 1 (1906), стр.3
114 ПРА, т 2, стр 683
115 С Елпатьевский, "Л Н Андреев Из воспоминаний", Былое, №№ 27-28 (1924), стр 281
116 ПССА, т 3, стр 12
117 ibid., p.3.
118 ibid., p.12
119 ibid., p 19.
120 Толстой, т 57, стр 372
121 Г-30, т 28, стр 386
122 Вересаев, т 5, стр 408

123 see Woodward, Andreyev, pp.110,111
124 ПССА, т 2, стр 36
125 ibid , p.28.
126 ibid , p.64
127 ibid , p 31
128 ibid , p 32
129 Woodward, Andreyev, p 116
130 ПССА, т 2, стр 50
131 ibid , p 59
132 ibid., p 46
133 ibid
134 ibid , p.51
135 ibid , p 71
136 Woodward, Andreyev, p 112.
137 Kaun, Andreyev, p.225
138 Woodward, Andreyev, p.114
139 A.Schopenhauer, The World as Will and Idea, tr by R.B Halbane and J.Kemp, (London, 1889), vol.I, book 4, p449.
140 ПССА, т 2, стр 56
141 ibid , p.57.
142 Вересаев, т 5, стр 407
143 ПРА, т 1, стр 681
144 Г-30, т.28, стр 386
145 The term 'mystique' was first employed in this context by Professor Schapiro L.Schapiro, 'The 'Vekhi' group and the mystique of revolution', Slavonic and East European Review, vol.34, no 82 (December, 1955), pp. 56-76
146 ЛН.72, стр 220
147 Женевский, стр 258
148 ПРА, т 1, стр 683
149 ПССА, т 4, стр 69
150 ibid., p.73.
151 Янтарев, стр 246
152 Г и революция 1905 года, стр 270
153 ПССА, т 4, стр 71
154 ibid.
155 ibid., pp.83,85,88
156 ibid., pp 81,85
157 ibid , p.81
158 ibid., p.85
159 ibid
160 ibid , p 90
161 Толстой, т.34, стр 186-187
162 ПССГ, т 16, стр 342
163 Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX века, 1901-1907, стр 227
164 ПССГ, т 16, стр 324
165 ПССГ, т 20, стр 60
166 Black Hundred activity is described in Kramola, a story by Teleshov Телешов, т 2, стр 22-61
167 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 169
168 Г-30, т 28, стр 394
169 ЛН.72, стр 579-580
170 The precise date of Andreyev's departure is unknown. His first letter from Berlin is dated 28 November, 1905 ЛН 72, стр.514
171 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 169

172 Скиталец, Повести и рассказы Воспоминания, (М , 1960), стр 392

173 Andreyev's previous attempts at writing a drama are discussed in Ю Бабичева, "Незавершенная драма Леонида Андреева "Закон и люди"", в кн Русская литература XX века (дооктябрьский период), (Калуга, 1968), стр 254-265

174 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 169

175 Woodward, Andreyev, p 132

176 The manuscripts are numbered Р III, оп 1, №№ 48,49,50, 51 Of these, No.48, which is the full text of the original version, is dated 11 October on the third sheet and 20 October on the final sheet. Nos 49 and 51 are sketches for the opening act written prior to the full manuscript. No 49 bears the date 10 October and No.51, although undated, was almost certainly written on the same day. These manuscripts are reproduced in the appendix. The fourth manuscript, No.50, is not included, as it belongs to a later period of composition and corresponds in all but a few insignificant details with part of the final act of the published text

177 ЛН.72, стр 510

178 "У Л Андреева в Финляндии", Одесские новости, 24 июля, 1905

179 В Тройнов, "М Горькии и Л Андреев (Из воспоминаний современника)", Литературная газета, 5 августа, 1937, стр 4

180 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 48, лл 48, 57-59

181 ЛН 72, стр 28 3 November was the date given by the author to the final version of the play. This is only one of several cases where Andreyev's date does not coincide with the actual completion of composition. Both Gubernator and Tak bylo were finally completed after the date given by the author.

182 Тройнов, стр 4

183 Г-30, т 28, стр 395

184 Русский современник, кн.4 (1924), стр 125

185 For example, Troynov states that the scene with the dumb woman, which is present in both the original manuscript and the published text, was missing from the intermediate version.(Тройнов, стр 4)

186 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 50

187 АГ 4, стр 143

188 Одесские новости, 24 июля, 1905

189 Янтарев, стр 247

190 ЛН 72, стр 212

191 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 48, л 3

192 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 51, л.2

193 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 48, л 5

194 ibid., sheet 13

195 ibid., sheet 11.

196 In the dramatis personae, the revolutionary is named Gorbatov, Verkhovtsev being the name of the astronomer This is not, however, consistent with the text, where the name Verkhovtsev is applied to the revolutionary. The astronomer is renamed Ternovsky in the final version of the play. To avoid confusion, these two characters are referred to throughout by the names they bear in the final

version of the play.
197 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 49, л 1
198 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 48, л 36
199 ibid , sheet 16.
200 ibid., sheet 39
201 Достоевский, т 9, стр 296
202 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 48, л 30
203 ЛН 72, стр 202
204 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 48, л 65
205 Ю Бабичева, Драматургия Л Н Андреева эпохи первой русской революции, (Вологда, 1971), стр.37
206 Новости дня, 21 июля, 1905
207 Л.Андреев, Собрание сочинений, т 16, (М , 1917), стр.155
208 It is possible that the new Inna Aleksandrovna was modelled on Andreyev's mother, to whom the final text was originally dedicated
209 Троинов, стр 4
210 ЛН 72, стр 28
211 ПССА, т 4, стр 200
212 ibid , p.208
213 ibid., p.212
214 ibid., p.215
215 ibid., p 230
216 ibid., p 192
217 ibid., p.216
218 ibid
219 ibid., pp.217,228
220 Вересаев, т 5, стр 404
221 "Из литературных бесед Леонид Андреев о русской литературе", Искры, № 47 (1906), стр.667
222 КЛА, стр 89
223 ПССА, т 4, стр 241
224 ibid., p.223.
225 Евг Жураковский, Трагикомедия современной жизни, (М , 1906), стр 152
226 Woodward, Andreyev, p 136
227 ЛН.72, стр 128.
228 Фрейдкина, стр 217
229 ibid., p.218.
230 Первая русская революция и театр, (М , 1956), стр 339
231 The premiere took place on 21 October, 1906 Altogether, the play ran for about thirty performances in Vienna Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 184 For details of the audience reaction, see П Звездич, "Пьеса Л Андреева в венском Свободном театре", Русские ведомости, 20 октября, 1906, стр 3
232 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 183
233 Русский современник, кн 4 (1924), стр 128
234 Андреев, Пьесы, стр 559

CHAPTER FOUR

CHAPTER FOUR

MAKSIM GORKY IN THE YEARS OF REACTION

A Bolshevik ambassador to Europe and America

When, in the new year of 1906, Gorky was forced to take refuge from the tsarist police in neighbouring Finland, he could hardly have foreseen that this temporary expedient was to be the prelude to seven years of self-imposed exile from his native land Despite the recent setback of the Moscow armed insurrection, hopes amongst revolutionary circles abroad were high and Gorky became infected by their faith that the revolutionary movement would soon be revived and that ultimate victory was imminent The combined disasters of war and revolution had indeed left the Russian government in a position of considerable economic and political vulnerability and prompted an official campaign to raise a large capital loan from abroad Aware of the crucial importance of this campaign to the outcome of the 1905 Revolution, the Bolsheviks immediately embarked upon a campaign of their own, seeking to discredit the Russian government in the eyes of public opinion abroad The arrival of Gorky in Europe at that very moment provided the Bolsheviks with the ideal spokesman for their cause Events of the previous year had shown that Gorky's popularity in the West had proved a powerful weapon in the struggle against tsarism and plans were immediately made for the writer to set out on a propaganda mission for the Bolsheviks Towards the end of January, he informed his wife of the scheme "Еду я в Германию, Францию, Англию и Америку Хочу устроить так, чтобы иностранцы давали деньги мне, а не правительству нашему, обалдевшему от страха" [1]

The idea for Gorky's 'grand tour' had come originally from Leonid Krasin[2] and, on the evidence of Burenin, who accompanied the writer in the capacity of treasurer, it received the fullest encouragement from Lenin [3] The purpose of the trip was clear to prevent at all costs the possibility of the Russian government securing a loan abroad and also to gather funds for the revolutionary movement

In the light of these objectives, Gorky's mission could hardly have begun on a more auspicious note On his arrival in Berlin at the beginning of March, he was accorded a hero's welcome and in the course of his stay he met the foremost representatives of the German Social-

Democratic movement and attended several public meetings where he addressed large audiences and gave readings from his works [4] In Switzerland, where Gorky broke his journey to France to visit Andreyev, he composed his famous protest Ne davayte deneg russkomu pravitel'stvu, which was widely circulated in the foreign press[5] and attracted particular attention in France, where the government had sought to suppress 'anti-loan' articles and where it provided the impetus for a nationwide campaign [6]

Gorky must have boarded the boat for America with great confidence and optimism The visits to Germany and France had been an unqualified success and the yield in terms of hard cash amply reflected his immense popularity Not surprising, therefore, is the overwhelmingly optimistic tone of his letters during this period Events had conspired to provide him with a cause to which he could dedicate himself entirely and in his letters to his family, Gorky continually stressed the sacred duty which rested upon him To his son, Maksim, he wrote "Ты еще не знаешь, что такое "долг перед родиной" - это, брат, не шутка" [7] A letter to his wife, written a month earlier, contains a remark which is even more illuminating "Так что по дороге туда, т е в Америку, я ничего не увижу, не узнаю, и лишь на обратном пути займусь собой".[8] Implicit in this statement is the suggestion that the trip to America represented for Gorky an opportunity to escape from problems of a personal nature As we shall see, these were not only marital problems, but also persistent doubts which were undermining his faith in the eventual victory of revolution For the time being, however, Gorky could ignore these doubts by concentrating his energies on serving the cause

As the facts of Gorky's ill-fated trip to America have been recorded in detail elsewhere,[9] our concern here will be to describe the impact of these experiences upon the writer From the moment of his arrival in New York, on 10 April, 1906 Gorky was surrounded by a blaze of publicity far in excess of anything he had encountered in Europe Overwhelmed by the scenes which had greeted him at the harbour, he could scarcely conceal his excitement from Andreyev, to whom he wrote on the following day

> Вот, Леонид, где нужно тебе побывать, уверяю тебя Это такая удивительная фантазия из камня, стекла, железа, фантазия, которую создали безумные великаны, уроды, тоскующие о красоте, мятежные души, полные

> дикой энергии Все эти Берлины, Парижи и прочие "большие города" - пустяки по сравнению с Нью-Йорком Социализм должен впервые реализироваться здесь - вот что прежде всего думаешь, видя эти удивительные дома, машины и пр. 10

These words are a testimony to Gorky's impressionability and also to his political naivety Within days, he was to learn to his own misfortune how tenuous is the distinction between fame and notoriety On 16 April, The New York World published a sensational article, in which the facts of Gorky's 'immoral' liaison with M F Andreyeva were disclosed to an incredulous American public To add insult to injury, The New York Times of the same date contained a telegram from Gorky expressing his solidarity with the American miners who were engaged at the time in a highly unpopular strike

Gorky presumably hoped at first to ride the storm of hostile public opinion He immediately wrote to his wife in Russia, requesting that she send a telegram to the American press explaining their marital situation [11] Within a fortnight, however, he had changed his tactics, instead of attempting to justify himself in the eyes of the American people, he chose openly to challenge public opinion and instructed his wife to ignore his previous request [12] Although understandably outraged by the shabby treatment he had received first at the hands of the press and then of such 'ardent admirers' as Mark Twain (who turned his back on the writer only hours after pledging himself to his campaign), Gorky remained confident that the setback was only temporary On 26 April, he wrote to Pyatnitsky

> Деньги - будут, как бы не мешало мне посольство, буржуа, с-ры, бунд и прочие штуки Меня отсюда или выгонят с полицией, или я уеду принцем, т.е. победителем - одно из двух А' Они думают - Америка? Я им покажу, что такое русский человек, да еще Горький 13

Events proved that Gorky had seriously underestimated the combined power of the American press, the Russian government and the other revolutionary parties, which were striving to discredit him before the American public By the end of May, after abortive visits to Boston and Philadelphia, he was forced to accept his impotence in the face of American conservatism, whose supporters had ensured that he was denied the facilities necessary for the conduct of his campaign [14]

Disillusioned by these failures, Gorky withdrew from the public

arena to the calm of the Adirondacks, where he stayed as the guest of John and Prestonia Martin until the early autumn [15] After a visit to the Great Lakes, he returned to New York, whence he departed for Europe on 13 October [16]

In the final analysis, the American campaign cannot be judged as anything but a failure, which even Burenin was prepared grudgingly to admit "порученная нам миссия была выполнена, хотя поездка не дала полностью ожидаемых результатов" [17] In financial terms, the campaign realized only ten thousand of the million dollars that Gorky, in his early optimism, had set as his target [18] It also seems unlikely that his activities had any influence on the Pierpoint Morgan Company's decision not to extend a loan to the Russian government [19] Furthermore, Gorky deliberately aggravated an already hostile public by publishing his notorious 'American Sketches', which served to alienate the American people further from the Russian revolutionary cause It is therefore difficult not to agree with Professor Kaun, who wrote that 'when at large, Gorky the politician was as tactful as a drunken muzhik' [20]

Soviet critics, inevitably, are inclined to see Gorky as the innocent victim of machinations by the capitalist press and tsarist agents, a conclusion which is certainly to be drawn from Burenin's account Yet although it would be a mistake to ignore entirely the complicity of the Russian embassy and the Socialist Revolutionaries in provoking the scandal, Gorky cannot totally be absolved of responsibility for the course of events The American campaign revealed for the first, but not the only, time that Gorky was singularly unsuited to the role of politician, for which he lacked the essential qualities of diplomacy, caution and guile A man of greater political experience would not have allowed a personal relationship to jeopardize his cause, nor would he deliberately have provoked further antagonism Gorky's attack on American society was not so much the expression of clearly formulated socialist principles as an emotional reaction against a country which had thwarted his intentions It is significant to note that, despite Professor Kaun's declaration that Gorky 'retained no bitterness' [21] towards America, the writer never revised the view of America contained in his 'American Sketches', and even repeated them later in life [22]

Together with the series <u>Moi interv'yu</u>, which was written at the

same time and contains two sketches about America, the 'American Sketches' must be considered among the weakest, if not the very weakest of Gorky's works Many years later, in reply to an enquiry by his biographer, Gruzdyov, the author admitted as much himself "Второй части "Американских очерков" не было Я был бы рад если б и первой тоже не было" [23]

An account by a contemporary tells us that, when Moi interv'yu was first read to Russian revolutionaries in Paris, 'irrepressible guffaws of laughter filled the auditorium' [24] Viewed from the distance of more than six decades, this reaction strikes the modern reader as somewhat exaggerated, although perhaps comprehensible within its historical context Certainly, neither series of sketches nowadays evokes the spontaneous laughter which was the purpose professed in the foreword to Moi interv'yu "Мне просто захотелось написать веселую, для всех приятную книгу" [25] Despite this claim, and the claim of certain Soviet critics that these sketches are 'masterpieces of revolutionary satire',[26] there is in fact little humour to be found in them Indeed, certain sketches contain no elements of satire at all, like Prekrasnaya Frantsiya, where Gorky loses all artistic restraint "Прими и мой плевок крови и желчи в глаза твои'"[27] Even in those sketches where elements of satire are detectable, they are invariably spoilt by a passage of explicit condemnation, which is alien to the very nature of satire In Odin iz koroley respubliki, Gorky betrays the satirical method further by exposing one of the principal tools at the satirist's disposal, namely, the device of mock seriousness "Он издевается надо мной - подумал я и внимательно взглянул в его лицо Нет . было видно, что он уверен в истине своих слов" [28] For these reasons Sinyavsky's reservations about Moi interv'yu should be endorsed "Боль, возмущение, гнев явно преобладают в этом цикле над язвительной сатирической усмешкой" [29]

Despite their artistic imperfections, the pamphlets written in America do provide a valuable insight into the development of Gorky's ideas prior to the composition of Vragi and Mat' This is particularly true of the 'American Sketches' themselves After reading Gorod Zhyoltogo D'yavola, one contemporary critic was inspired to remark that it contained 'too much Gorky and not enough America',[30] a comment which could equally be applied to most of the sketches in the series

With the exception of Tsarstvo skuki, where Gorky provides a finely observed description of New York's Coney Island, it is the author's subjective impression of America which dominates In Gorod Zhyoltogo D'yavola, for example, the description is quite obviously intended to illustrate the author's views on the dehumanizing effect of capitalist society in general, to the extent that little remains to identify the city described as New York

> И кажется, что все - железо, камни, вода, дерево - полно протеста против жизни без солнца, без песен и счастья, в плену тяжелого труда Все стонет, воет, скрежещет, повинуясь воле какой-то тайной силы, враждебной человеку 31

Equally 'anonymous' is the depiction of American society in Mob Here again, the source of Gorky's inspiration was not so much his observation of American life as an idea, which is contained in one of his notebooks "Mob - Моб Оттого, что не люди, а дроби, куски" [32] As this remark suggests, the mob is, in Gorky's conception, the antithesis of the revolutionary collective and hence the natural product of capitalist society The mob is bound together not by the rational appreciation of a common ideal, but by the power of instinct ""Mob" только ощущает, она только видит. Она не может претворять своих впечатлений в мысли, душа ее - нема и сердце - слепо" [33] The difference is made clear in The City of Mammon, where Gorky draws the distinction between 'socialism' and 'anarchism'

> Socialism is a stage of culture, a civilized tendency It is the religion of the future which will free the whole world from poverty and the gross rule of wealth To be rightly understood, it requires the close application of the mind and a general, harmonious development of all the spiritual forces in man Anarchy is a social disease It is a prison produced in the social organism by the abnormal life of the individual, and the lack of healthy nourishment for his body and soul The growth of anarchism requires no intellectual basis, it is the work of the instinct, the soil on which it thrives is envy and revenge 34

From this passage it is quite apparent that the terms 'socialism' and 'anarchism' as employed by Gorky, cannot be understood in their normal sense nor in the sense understood by Lenin in his article Anarkhizm i Sotsializm [35] This is not simply the distinction between two political theories, the very fact that Gorky should refer to 'socialism' as the 'religion of the future' and confuse the terms 'anarchism' and 'anarchy'

is ample indication that his terms have far wider connotations 'Anarchism', having its root in human instinct, is a force for evil as it results in total self-interest 'Socialism', on the other hand, is the embodiment of a new morality, of a collective consciousness, founded on the supremacy of reason This conflict between 'anarchism' and 'socialism', which issued directly from the ideas expressed in his works of the previous year, provides the philosophical basis for a number of works which were to follow

B In pursuit of the ideal

1 Vragi The conflict of 'anarchism' and 'socialism'

The summer months of 1906, spent on the Martins' estate, allowed Gorky the opportunity to retire from the public eye and devote himself to literature The first product of this period of 'feverish work', as M F Andreyeva described it in a letter to Pyatnitsky,[36] was the play Vragi[37]

Gorky had first begun work on the play some eighteen months previously, during his stay on the Riga coast,[38] although it is unlikely that he wrote anything other than a list of characters at this time[39] To judge from this list, which contains references to a number of characters not included in the final play, it would seem that Vragi was originally intended as a study of the provincial intelligentsia, in the manner of Dachniki and Varvary with the workers playing a subordinate role By 1906 however, Gorky's conception had changed radically Inspired by his experience of the strike movement in 1905 and, in particular, by events in Orekhovo-Zuyevo, where a factory manager had been murdered under circumstances analogous to those in the play,[40] Gorky set out to identify the forces of 'anarchism' and 'socialism' with existing social groups in contemporary Russia

Vragi opens on a minor note with a conversation between Kon' and Pologiy about the recent theft of cucumbers from the latter's allotment

> Пологий Но позвольте! Если вашу собственность нарушают, имеете ли вы право просить защиты закона?
> Конь Проси Сегодня огурцы рвут, а завтра головы рвать будут друг другу Вот тебе и закон! 41

Although introduced here on a mundane and trivial level, the question of the right to defend property by recourse to the law is the essential

issue at stake in Vragi To the brothers Mikhail and Nikolay Skrobotov, whose property is exposed to the most serious threat in the course of the play, Pologiy's question is an idle one Mikhail is an industrialist and Nikolay a lawyer who has a close interest in his brother's business (a transparent allusion to the interdependence of capital and the legal system in Russia at the time) In the eyes of Mikhail, the law has only one function to defend and maintain the status quo, hence conferring absolute power on the privileged whilst demanding absolute subservience from the deprived The concept of justice as the true foundation of the law is alien to Mikhail and Nikolay alike When Zakhar Bardin argues that Mikhail had acted unjustly in dismissing the worker Dichkov from his factoiy, he piovokes a hostile ieaction fiom the brothers

> Николай (сухо) Насколько я понимаю, здесь дело идет не о человеке а о принципе
> Михаил Именно! Стоит вопрос кто хозяин на фабрике - мы с вами или рабочие? 42

After the murder of Mikhail, Nikolay is prepared to defend this 'principle' by force He is supported by Boboyedov, the cavalry captain who is called in to restore order in the final act and who typifies the unthinking attitude of those whose job it is to enforce the law "закон установлен властью, и без него невозможно государство".[43] Equally important is the support Nikolay receives from the servile Pologiy, who is willing even to spy on his fellow workers in order to please his master The suggestion is that the law is maintained not only by those like Nikolay Skrobotov, who stand to benefit fiom the status quo but also by those who feai change more than subservience

If the Skrobotovs are the extreme representatives of the capitalistic mentality, their associates, Yakov and Zakhar Bardin, are typical of the liberal intelligentsia Unlike the Skrobotovs, who are self-made men, the Bardins are from the gentry and hence unsuited by background and outlook to the role forced upon them by the circumstance of their impoverishment Zakhar admits that he still feels 'more of a landowner than an industrialist'[44] and, like his brother Yakov, is repelled by the coarse materialism of the nouveau riche industrialists For them both, association with the Skrobotovs has therefore entailed a compromise with their principles, a compromise with which they are unable to come to teims Yakov seeks oblivion in alcohol, whilst

Zakhar attempts to represent the workers' interests with the Skiobotovs, as in the case of Dichkov's dismissal Zakhar's humanistic concern for the workers is only skin-deep, however After the murder of Mikhail, both he and his wife Polina, aware of the threat to their personal welfare, support Nikolay in his decision to use force against the workers, illustrating the truth of Levshin's aphoristic statement "И строгий - хозяин, и добрый - хозяин Болезнь костей не разбирает".[45]

The inability of the Bardins to translate their sympathy for the democratic cause into active support is further revealed by the example of Yakov's wife Tat'yana Tat'yana is attracted to Sintsov, a worker whose socialist views appeal to her intellectual desire for a just and equal society But, when she is asked by Sintsov to hide a stock of forbidden literature in order that he escape arrest, Tat'yana fails to act decisively and thus contributes to his betrayal Such is the liberal dilemma, which is raised to the level of tragedy in the scene of Tat'yana's parting with Yakov, where their mutual yearning for a new and better life is tempered by the realisation of their inability to achieve it The situation of the Bardins, with their vague aspirations, is analogous to that of Chekhov's three sisters, with their dreams of Moscow In each case, man's noble impulses are sacrificed to the vulgar power of materialism which is personified, in Vragi, by Mikhail Skrobotov's widow, Kleopatra By the end of the play, Kleopatra, in the tradition of Chekhov's Natasha, has exerted her influence over the entire Bardin household, as Polina notes with horror "Она положительно чувствует здесь себя хозяикой Вы посмотрите, как она себя ведет' Невоспитанная, грубая ."[46] Just like the Prozorovs, the Bardins find that their own acquiescence has allowed them to be dominated by an ugly force which they detest

In Tri sestry the sacrifice of idealism to the power of materialism had taken on the significance of a universal tragedy and, as such, is one of Chekhov's most pessimistic statements of the human predicament In Vragi, however, Gorky suggests that this tragedy is by no means inevitable Polina's niece, Nadya, finds the strength of will to reject material welfare in the name of her principles and to set out actively in the quest for the 'new life' She is yet another variation of the Varvara Mikhaylovna theme a woman ashamed of the hypocrisy of her milieu against which she reacts by pledging herself to a better future

> Татьяна (задумчиво) Как ты будешь жить? Не понимаю!
> Надя (обводя руками кругом себя) Не так! Ни за что - так! Я не знаю, что я буду делать но ничего не сделаю так, как вы! 47

The situation is familiar enough from Gorky's earlier plays, Nadya's departure at the end of the play corresponds exactly to the departure of Stepan and Katya at the end of Varvary

If the depiction of the liberal intelligentsia differs in no vital way from Gorky's earlier plays, then it is in the depiction of the proletarian characters that the novelty of Vragi is to be discovered In this play, for the first time, it is the workers who emerge quite clearly as 'positive heroes' This marks a total revision of Gorky's attitude to the working class In his early works, his depiction of the proletariat had been uniformly negative Consider, for example, the description of the harbour at the beginning of Chelkash

> Гранит, железо, дерево, мостовая гавани, суда и люди - все дышит мощными звуками страстного гимна Меркурию. Но голоса людей, еле слышные в нем, слабы и смешны И сами люди, первоначально родившие этот шум, смешны и жалки . Созданное ими поработило и обезличило их. 48

In contrast to the bold, amoral Chelkash, who is the spirit of freedom, the workers are the epitome of man's enslavement The same conclusion is to be drawn from the portrayal of workers in other early stories, such as Na soli, Dvadtsat' shest' i odna and Konovalov It is only in Meshchane, in the character of Nil, that Gorky introduces a proletarian hero for the first time Even here, Nil is not so much a 'positive hero' in the proper sense of the word as a mouthpiece for the author's criticism of the petty bourgeois mentality Only in Vragi is the working class identified with the author's positive ideal for society

If the strike in Vragi is compared with the 'cholera revolt' in Deti Solntsa it is clear immediately that the two movements are social phenomena of completely different types The strike is the product of rational commitment to a positive ideal and we return again to the distinction between 'revolution' and 'revolt', between 'punishment' and 'vengeance' (one senses that it is no coincidence that Vragi, like Andreyev's Gubernator, takes a political assassination as its subject) Despite Nikolay Skrobotov's attempt to discredit the workers as 'a crowd moved by greed, organized by the unity of its desire -

to devour',[49] their actions display a calmness which stems from the conviction that their cause is just Gorky takes pains to stress the calm rationality of his proletarian characters For example, the entrance of Sintsov is accompanied by the following stage direction "В его фигуре и лице есть что-то спокойное и значительное" [50] The same air of calm surrounds the workers in the midst of the excitement and confusion of the final act and attracts the attention of Yakov and Tat'yana

> Яков (тихо) Нравятся мне эти люди'
> Татьяна Да, но почему они так просты так просто говорят, просто смотрят . и страдают? Почему? В них нет страсти? Нет героизма?
> Яков Они спокойно верят в свою правду 51

Tat'yana's remarks reveal her failure to comprehend the collectivist ethic which inspires the workers in their struggle against capitalism 'Passion' and 'heroism' stem from the individual consciousness and have no place in the collective, hence Sintsov, who is the primary mouthpiece for the author's own views, disapproves most strongly of the murder of Mikhail Skrobotov, which is the result of passion rather than reason

The moral strength of the collective is displayed in the final act, when the workers present a united front against those who stand in judgement over them The contrast between the solidarity of the workers and the disarray of their accusers causes Kleopatra to proclaim

> Нужно, чтобы люди жили тесно, дружно, чтобы все могли верить друг другу' Вы видите, какие разбойничьи рожи у этих арестантов? Они знают, чего хотят, они это знают И они живут дружно, они верят друг другу А мы живем все враждуя, ничему не веря, ничем не связанные, каждый сам по себе 52

As these words suggest, the 'enmity' between the workers and the capitalists extends beyond the superficial level of 'class antagonism', the essential conflict is between two alien attitudes to life, the collectivist and the individualist or, to employ Gorky's unconventional terminology, 'socialism' and 'anarchism'

Vragi marks a crucial stage in Gorky's literary depiction of revolution as it is the first major work in which he attempts to state his positive ideal for society Previously, the ideal had been presented by implication only Varvara Mikhaylovna leaves her husband in the

name of a better future (Dachniki), Stepan and Katya set off together to join forces with the distant revolutionaries (Varvary) In Vragi, on the other hand, the better future is no longer distant, it is already a reality which is embodied in the characters of the revolutionary workers who demonstrate their moral superiority over the defenders of capitalism

That Gorky himself was aware of the importance of Vragi to the evolution of his views on revolution is attested by a letter from the writer to his wife, written soon after the play was completed

> Должен сказать тебе - я здесь многое понял и между прочим понял, что до сей поры я - революционером не был Я только становлюсь им Те люди, которых мы привыкли считать революционерами, - только реформаторы Самое понятие революции - должно углубить И возможно' 53

The distinction between the 'reformer' and the 'revolutionary' is a vital one To attempt merely to reform society by replacing one socio-political order with another was, in Gorky's view, insufficient What was needed was a 'revolution of the soul', which alone could guarantee the victory of 'socialism' over 'anarchism'

2 Mat' Resurrection and the two religions

In order to 'deepen the concept of revolution' as outlined in the letter to his wife, Gorky abandoned the dramatic form, which had dominated his literary output for the last two years, in favour of the novel The change of genre was significant, as the drama, which had proved ideal for the depiction of class antagonism in Russian society, was unsuitable for the type of psychological study of revolution which Gorky now had in mind This was not the only reason for the change of literary form Being comparatively short, the drama had allowed Gorky to provide an almost immediate commentary on contemporary events, also making for economy of effort at a time when the writer's services were in great demand More importantly, the theatre had temporarily provided the most effective forum for revolutionary propaganda, a unique opportunity which Gorky had exploited to the full

By 1906, in Gorky's eyes, the drama had largely outlived its usefulness Vragi was the first of Gorky's plays to be refused the right of performance in Russia, an indication not only of its overt political content, but also of the renewed vigilance of the censorship authorities after the anarchy of the previous year [54] Furthermore, now that he

was cut off from Russia and deprived of the possibility of furthering the cause in America, Gorky had the chance to view the revolution in retrospect, to analyse its development and contemplate its successes and failures With Mat' he began his most ambitious literary undertaking to write a history of the revolution in Russia

From a letter to Maurice Hillquith, in which Gorky promised that the second part of Mat' would be 'rich in events', taking the action 'up to the October days',[55] it would seem that the author's original intention was to depict the entire course of the revolution in Russia, an intention which was eventually abandoned in the course of composition, most probably because of his severe personal misgivings about the novel[56] In the event, Gorky limited the scope of Mat' to a depiction of the strike movement in the Sormovo district of his native Nizhniy Novgorod in 1902[57] Yet, despite this restriction of its historical scope, the novel provides an indispensable introduction to Gorky's 'History of the Russian Revolution', which was, significantly, to form the subject of all subsequent novels by the author, with the exception of the autobiographical trilogy[58]

There has been a tendency in Soviet critical studies of Mat' to concentrate upon Gorky's depiction of Pavel Vlasov, the prototype 'Positive Hero', whilst playing down the significance to the novel of the mother, Nilovna This distortion, although symptomatic of the central concern of Soviet scholars to discover elements of the new 'socialist man' in Gorky's works, fails to provide a convincing picture of the author's intention As even the most superficial reading of the novel and its very title alone suggest, it is the character of Nilovna which is of central importance in Mat' It is her life history which provides the novel with form, it is her spiritual transformation which illuminates the author's theme and it is upon the convincingness of her portrayal that Mat' ultimately stands or falls as a work of literature

The story of Nilovna is sufficiently well-known as to require no detailed exposition here Our major concern will be to analyse the psychological nature of Nilovna's evolution To the Marxist critic, and certainly to Lenin, whose admiration for Gorky's novel is common knowledge,[59] the question would seem an idle one Her transformation, it would be argued, is from passive acceptance of an unjust capitalist order to an active stuggle against it in the name of socialism This is the kind of oversimplification of which Gorky complained to Valentinov

Referring to Lenin's celebrated compliment to Gorky at the 1907 London conference of the RSDLP, Valentinov quotes the latter as saying

> Of course I thanked him for his compliment, but I must admit I was a bit annoyed To treat my work as if it were a kind of committee manifesto calling for the storming of the autocracy was after all quite unfitting You see, in this work I tried to treat some very large and very, very difficult problems 60

As these remarks suggest, it is not so much Nilovna's change of political standpoint as her spiritual evolution which is Gorky's central concern in Mat'

The essential feature of Nilovna's transformation from conservative to revolutionary is, as Professor Borras has pointed out, that she develops 'from one kind of religious outlook to another' [61] At the beginning of the novel, she has two prominent characteristics love for her son, Pavel, and a devout Orthodox faith, which is coupled with her passive acceptance of a cruel and ugly environment Thus Nilovna emerges at first as a classic illustration to the Marxist view of religion as the opiate of the masses However, two events combine to effect a radical change in Nilovna's life the death of her husband and the subsequent discovery that her son is a member of an underground socialist group The latter circumstance faces Nilovna with a conflict of interests which she is forced to resolve On the one hand, her religious background has accustomed her to look upon socialism as a source of evil, on the other hand, her maternal instinct will not allow her to accept that her son is capable of anything but good Predictably, her maternal instinct proves the stronger, prompting her not only to tolerate her son's beliefs but also to continue his revolutionary work after he has been arrested Nilovna is aware, however, that her motives in serving the revolutionary cause are totally different from those of Pavel and his comrades.

> Нечистая она, наша бабья любовь' . Любим мы то, что нам надо И все другие люди за народ страдают, в тюрьмы идут и в Сибирь, умирают. Девушки молодые ходят ночью, одни, по грязи, по снегу, в дождик . Кто их гонит, кто толкает? Любят они' Вот они - чисто любят' Веруют' А я - не умею так' Я люблю свое, близкое' 62

The distinction between 'pure' and 'impure' love is an extremely important one, as it provides the key to Nilovna's subsequent evolution This point was missed by the Marxist critic Vorovsky, who remarked in

an article of 1910 that Nilovna cannot be considered a revolutionary in the full sense of the word as her involvement in the revolutionary movement is nothing more than an extension of her love for her son As Vorovsky put it 'The social element is subordinated to the personal'[63] A close reading of the novel suggests that this interpretation is insupportable

Nilovna's evolution takes place on two levels, the intellectual and the psychological, the two levels corresponding almost exactly with the two parts of the novel Drawn into the revolutionary movement as a result of her maternal instinct, Nilovna is at first able to ignore the incompatibility between her sympathy for Pavel and his comrades and her faith in the teachings of the Church Constant contact with the revolutionaries, however, gradually erodes her traditional beliefs The process is initially subconscious, as Gorky suggests in the description of Nilovna at her prayers following a meeting of the socialists at her home

> Молилась без слов, одной большой думой о людях, которых ввел Павел в ее жизнь Они как бы проходили между нею и иконами, проходили все, такие простые, странно близкие друг другу и одинокие [64]

Conscious awareness of the threat to her Orthodox faith comes with the murder of Isay, a worker who had been suspected of spying on the socialists This incident, which was considerably longer in earlier versions of the novel than in the final authorized text,[65] raised the important moral issue of the end justifying the means For Andrey Nakhodka, who had actually committed the crime in the earlier versions, the question is simply resolved "За товарищей, за дело - я все могу' Я убью, хоть сына"[66] Although unable to endorse Nakhodka's views in such categorical terms, Nilovna finds that her old ethical precepts, inherited from the Church, no longer seem satisfactory She is torn between two opposite concepts of morality "Знаю, - грешно убить человека, а не считаю никого виноватым Господи Иисусе, - слышишь, Паша, что говорю я?"[67] The final words reflect Nilovna's sudden awareness of the enormity of the change that has taken place within her and of her alienation from the Orthodox Church

Nilovna's gradual abandonment of her traditional beliefs is augmented by her growing awareness of a new faith of which the revol-

utionaires are the bearers This dual process reaches its conclusion with the May-day demonstration Significantly, Nilovna is impressed not so much by Pavel's speech, which is a statement of political intent, but by the passionate words of Nakhodka

> Товарищи' . Мы пошли теперь крестным ходом во имя бога нового, бога света и правды, бога разума и добра' Далеко от нас наша цель, терновые венцы - близко' 68

This speech, with its religious references, recalls Gorky's definition of socialism as 'the religion of the future'[69] and elucidates the nature of Nilovna's conversion Equally illuminating are Nilovna's own words to her neighbour on hearing Nakhodka's speech "Это святое дело Вы подумайте - ведь и Христа не было бы, если бы его ради люди не погибали" [70]

Prior to the 'revelation' at the May-day demonstration, Nilovna had been a revolutionary malgré soi, shaken into action by the force of circumstance and a passive observer of the debates between Pavel and his comrades In the second part of the novel, however, she emerges a new woman inspired by an active faith in the revolutionary cause Part two begins, significantly enough, with Nilovna's symbolic dream, in which a priest denies his congregation refuge in his church, a transparent allegory on the inability of the Church to protect the interests of the Russian people Soon afterwards she notices for the first time that the local church is built of the same type of brick as the factory, a detail intended to suggest the interdependence of the Church and capitalism Like the peasant Rybin, Nilovna now perceives that 'the Church is the grave of God and man'[71] and dedicates herself wholeheartedly to the task of spreading revolutionary propaganda in the countryside Although this work leads her even further away from the Church, it also brings her closer to Christ

> Незаметно для нее она стала меньше молиться, но все больше думать о Христе и о людях, которые, не упоминая имени его, как будто даже не зная о нем, жили - казалось ей - по его заветам 72

Nilovna's impression is reinforced by the religious imagery in which the novel abounds and which constantly links the revolutionaries with a neo-Christian messianism (It is no coincidence, for example, that Vlasov and Nakhodka bear the names of the apostles Paul and Andrew) Nilovna, then, has abandoned one faith to discover another, which, unlike the old, is not passive but active Gorky returned to this

distinction in his reminiscences of Tolstoy "большинство верит в бога по малодушию, и только немногие - от полноты души" [73] Nilovna, clearly, has achieved this transition, she is no longer one of the 'majority' which has been linked in modern parlance with the epithet 'silent'

Nilovna's 'conversion' is not limited simply to the rational rejection of the Church in favour of socialism, nor even to the transition from fatalism to active faith More important still is her evolution from 'impure' to 'pure' love, to employ the distinction made by Nilovna herself Towards the end of the novel, Gorky returns to this essential problem of the conflict between personal and the suprapersonal interests

> Ее любовь - любовь матери - разгоралась, сжимая сердце почти до боли, потом материнское мешало росту человеческого, сжигало его, и на месте великого чувства, в сером пепле тревоги, робко билась унылая мысль "Погибнет пропадет' " 74

This passage provides an explicit statement of Gorky's collectivist ethic, in accordance with which even a positive human attribute such as maternal love can be considered a constructive force for good only when it has been purged of limited personal interests (The inherent danger of such limited maternal love is demonstrated most graphically in the 1910 version of Gorky's play Vassa Zheleznova) By the end of the novel, the author makes it plain that Nilovna has transcended this narrow maternal instinct to discover a truly collectivist mentality Such is the significance of Lyudmila's remarks to her "Вы говорите не о себе!"[75] The point is emphasized in one of Nilovna's final speeches

> Ведь это - как новый бог родится людям' Все для всех, все для всего' Так понимаю я всех вас Воистину, все вы - товарищи, все родные, все - дети одной матери - правды 76

The metaphor is all-important, the maternal is now identified with the cause, reflecting the fact that Nilovna's love for Pavel has become universalized To return to Vorovsky's argument, we can now see that the social element is not subordinated to the personal in Nilovna's behaviour and that any such discussion of 'subordination' is ultimately inappropriate By the end of the novel, the personal and the social have become one, this harmonious vision establishes beyond doubt Gorky's kinship with the utopian socialists [77]

One of the most frequent charges levelled against Mat' by Western critics is that the secondary characters in the novel are one-dimensional Making an exception of Vesovshchikov, Professor Weil states that 'the revolutionary characters are uncomplicated and almost unmarred by personal weaknesses of any kind',[78] echoing Professor Borras's opinion that the revolutionaries are 'models of noble behaviour'[79] To endorse such views is to overstate the case against Gorky's novel and to ignore the fact that a number of secondary characters in Mat' are also faced with the problem of resolving the conflict between personal and suprapersonal interests Thus, the murder of Isay forces Nakhodka to consider his own motive in beating the spy prior to his death had his action been prompted by a personal desire for vengeance or by the rational intention to defend the cause against its enemies? It is Nakhodka also who raises the crucial issue of personal fulfillment in conversation with Pavel

> - А помнишь, Николай Иванович говорил о необходимости для человека жить полной жизнью всеми силами души и тела помнишь?
> - Это не для нас' - сказал Павел - Как ты достигнешь полноты? Для тебя ее нет Любишь будущее - все отрицай в настоящем все, брат' 80

Pavel is an ascetic in deed as well as in word Convinced that the true revolutionary should renounce personal pleasure, he resists the temptation of love in the person of Sasha There is in Pavel's 'monk-like severity',[81] however, a considerable degree of pride, which casts doubt upon the value of his altruism The doubt is first raised by Nakhodka, to be reinforced by Pavel himself, when he takes vicarious pleasure in rejecting his mother's solicitude

> - Есть любовь, которая мешает человеку жить .
> Вздрогнув, боясь, что он скажет еще что-нибудь отталкивающее ее сердце, она быстро заговорила
> - Не надо, Паша' Я понимаю, - иначе тебе нельзя, - для товарищей
> - Нет' - сказал он - Я это - для себя 82

The suggestion that Pavel's asceticism is in fact inverted egoism is a dilemma of considerable ethical complexity and one which is directly relevant to the novel's central theme The dilemma is not, however, satisfactorily developed or resolved and the fact that Gorky accorded less attention to this aspect of Pavel's behaviour in the later versions

of Mat' may be seen as a tacit admission of this failing

Gorky adds yet another dimension to his central theme in his characterization of Vesovshchikov and Rybin, who together embody what the author considered to be the typical features of the peasant mentality For Vesovshchikov, revolution is reducible to a simple formula "Пришла пора драться, тогда некогда руки лечить'",[83] an attitude which he shares with Rybin The latter, whom the author characterized as 'the slave of his own hatred of the nobility'[84] in a letter to L'vov-Rogachevsky, represents the spirit of vengeance which dominates the Russian countryside Like the naive peasant lad who asks 'Is revolution revolt?',[85] none of the peasants in the novel is able to conceive of revolution other than in terms of their personal grievances Motivated only by the desire for vengeance, the peasants are, as Nakhodka realises, a purely destructive force In a passage which suggests the influence of Andreyev's Savva,[86] he imagines the inevitable result of a peasant revolt "Когда они поднимутся - они будут все опрокидывать подряд' Им нужно голую землю, - и они оголят ее, все сорвут'"[87] Nakhodka's fears prove to be unjustified, however By the end of the novel, both Vesovshchikov and Rybin have discovered the true revolutionary spirit After a brief period of imprisonment in the company of Pavel and his comrades, Vesovshchikov rejects his militant individualism The peasants also come to appreciate the broader significance of revolution as a result of the efforts of Nilovna and Sofiya, as Rybin is the first to acknowledge

> Хорошо говорите' Большое это дело - породнить людей между собой' Когда вот знаешь, что миллионы хотят того же, что и мы, сердце становится добрее А в доброте - большая сила' 88

No less than Nilovna herself, the peasants have overcome the barriers imposed by class and background to become a part of the collective

The barrier of class attitudes has to be overcome not only by the peasants but also by the intellectuals, with whom Nilovna comes into contact in the second part of the novel Although she admires Nikolay and Sofiya for their dedication to the revolutionary cause, she is quick to perceive that they suffer from the very opposite defect to the peasants Cut off by their background from the thoughts and aspirations of the working class in whose name they work, Nikolay and

Sofiya have developed a view of revolution which tends to be too abstract and theoretical Their essential weakness is indicated when Nilovna compares Nikolay with Nakhodka

> он говорил о людях беззлобно, считал всех виноватыми в дурном устройстве жизни, но вера в новую жизнь была у него не так горяча, как у Андрея, не так ярка 89

Constant contact with Nilovna introduces Nikolay and Sofiya to the actual condition of the working class and the process is hence one of mutual enlightenment The process reaches its culmination when the intellectuals 'go to the people', the social barriers finally crumble and intellectual and peasant are united by their faith in a common cause

Viewed in this context, Nilovna's 'resurrection' takes on a universal significance Hers is only one example of the transformation of mankind from an individual to a collective consciousness, of which Nakhodka speaks in an earlier version of the novel

> Все сердца разбиты различием интересов, все обглоданы слепой жадностью, покусаны завистью, избиты, изранены и сочатся гноем ложью, трусостью Все люди больные, жить боятся, ходят, как в тумане каждый знает только, как его зуб болит Но вот идет человек, освещает жизнь огнем разума и кричит, зовет Пора уже понять вам, что у всех один интерес, всем жить надо, все расти хотят' И по зову его, все сердца здоровыми своими кусками слагаются в одно огромное сердце, сильное, глубокое, чуткое, как серебряный колокол которого еще не было отлито' Вот оно благовестит нам, этот колокол - соединяйтесь люди всех стран в одну семью' Любовь - мать жизни, а не злоба' 90

Perhaps most interesting of all in this passage is the manner in which Gorky has rephrased the famous Marxist slogan Note that it is not just the proletarians but the 'people' of all nations who are called upon to unite The change of wording indicates a vital aspect of Gorky's conception of revolution and one which is particularly reflected in Mat' The socialist revolution, in his view, does not belong to any class, it is in itself classless and this classlessness is, moreover, its most important feature In 1917 and 1918, Gorky was to take the Bolsheviks to task over this very issue By deliberately exacerbating class hostility for their political ends the Bolsheviks had, in his eyes, betrayed the very essence of the socialist ideal

Gorky's original intention upon the completion of Mat' was to write a sequel, in which Pavel Vlasov was to be the central character "Составил план романа "Павел Власов" - в трех частях Ссылка, В работе, Революция", he informed Ladyzhnikov in February, 1907 [91] The novel, referred to elsewhere as Syn,[92] was never written, however In his following works he was temporarily to turn from the pursuit of the ideal in order to return to contemporary reality and, in particular, to come to terms with the defeat of the 1905 Revolution

Before passing on to this subject, however, it is appropriate to consider Andreyev's reaction to Mat' and the philosophy it contains Unlike the vast majority of his contemporaries, Andreyev was full of praise for Gorky's new novel Appropriately enough, his may even have been the first reported response to the work Quite recently, a Soviet scholar has unearthed a copy of the Turkestan newspaper Askhabad, dated 11 January, 1907, which contained the following notice

> "Мать" М Горького
> Нам сообщают из Капри (Италия), где в настоящее время живет М Горький, что он на днях закончил новую большую повесть "Мать" Один из молодых писателей с весьма крупным именем, ознакомившийся с этим произведением, дает о нем такой отзыв "Вещь замечательная Едва ли в русской художественной литературе есть другая вещь, которая с такой мощью представительствовала бы за народ и так глубоко, так страстно выражала его душу К Горькому я отношусь критически, последних вещей его не люблю, но это - праздник литературы и народа [93]

The assumption that the 'young writer' referred to is Andreyev is supported by the evidence of a letter to Chirikov written at the same time "Первая часть великолепна, единственное в своем роде, вторая - слаба А в общем значительно Точно сам народ заговорил о революции большими, тяжелыми, жестоко выстраданными словами" [94] A year later, Andreyev was publicly defending Gorky against his critics in an interview with a correspondent of the newspaper Rus' "Коснувшись Максима Горького и его последнего произведения "Мать", Леонид Андреев находит, что этот роман очень ценный и высокохудожественно написанный, критика не сумела его оценить, но, по его мнению, к нему еще вернутся в будущем" [95] Andreyev quite clearly approved of Gorky's attempt in Mat' to develop a new revolutionary philosophy The full significance of this standpoint will be appreciated in the following chapter, when

we will be concerned with the impact of Gorky's ideological development upon the entire relationship between the two men

C 1905 revisited Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka and Posledniye Mat' was finally completed not in America but on Capri, where Gorky arrived in October, 1906 [96] The return to Europe brought him closer to Russia in more than the geographical sense Once settled on Capri, he was able to bring himself up to date with the political situation in Russia through the medium of newspapers, magazines and books and, more importantly, through direct contact with the steady stream of visitors who began to make the pilgrimage to the island No longer isolated as he had been in America, Gorky was soon convinced of the profound changes that had overtaken his native land in his absence

According to Erenburg, the dominant features of post-1905 Russian society were 'weariness, disillusionment and emptiness'[97] which were reflected in all spheres of intellectual, social and political life The revolution, however differently it had been interpreted by the radical intelligentsia, had been the focus of the hopes of an entire generation and its defeat led, almost inevitably, to a mood of reevaluation Russian radical thought, which had previously enjoyed the support of the majority of the intelligentsia, now suffered a decline To quote a recent American historian "In 1905-6 it was shown that the radicals had substantially misjudged the temper of the country and after 1906 the price they paid for their miscalculation was the loss of much of the popular support which had seemed to be theirs during the revolutionary months" [98] This reaction was not confined to the sphere of political thought In philosophy, idealism and mysticism began to challenge materialism, the foundation upon which the theories of scientific socialism had been constructed In literature and art, realism was for the first time overshadowed by the works of the modernists, 'civic' literature, which had enjoyed wide popularity in the revolutionary months and which had filled the pages of Gorky's Znaniye miscellanies, gave way to a flood of escapist literature which ranged from historical novels and detective stories to erotic and pornographic tales Sanin, the hero of Artsybashev's controversial novel, with his apology of pseudo-Nietzschean individualism and sexual amorality, became the symbol of the new era in literature, displacing the selfless idealists who had figured so prominently in the works of

the 'democratic' writers

Gorky's reaction to these trends in literature was as quick as it was predictable Writing to Chirikov in March, 1907, he stated his own position quite unambiguously

> У меня странное впечатление вызывает современная литература, - только Бунин верен себе, все же остальные пришли в какой-то дикий раж и, видимо, не отдают себе отчета в делах своих Чувствуется чье-то чужое - злое, вредное, искажающее людей влияние, и порою кажется, что оно сознательно враждебно всем вам - тебе, Серафимовичу, Юшкевичу и т.д
> А с другой стороны на литературу наступают различные параноики, садисты, педерасты и разного рода психопатологические личности вроде Каменского, Арцыбашева и К° Чувствуется хаос духовный, смятение мысли, болезненная, нервозная торопливость 99

From the outset, Gorky was the sworn enemy of the 'spiritual chaos' of contemporary Russian literature and saw his own task in the defence of the democratic tradition Throughout the following years, both in his voluminous correspondence and in his public statements on contemporary literature (notably O tsinizme and Razrusheniye lichnosti) he constantly reiterated the views expressed in his letter to Chirikov It was with particular concern that Gorky noted the pernicious influence of modernist literature upon the work of his erstwhile Znaniye colleagues, whom he bombarded with letters criticizing this harmful trend One can assume that he repeated these opinions in person when the znan'evtsy visited Capri during 1907 Gorky wrote of one such visit to Ladyzhnikov

> Здесь много русских писателей - Вересаев, Айзман, Леонид - это мрачные люди, они сидят нахмурив лбы и молча думают о тщете всего земного и ничтожестве человека, говорят же они о покойниках, кладбищах, о зубной боли, насморке, о бестактности социалистов и прочих вещах, понижающих температуру воздуха, тела, души Вянут цветы, мухи дохнут, рыбы мрут, камни гримасничают, как будто их сейчас вырвет Увы мне' 100

The humorous tone of this letter should not blind us to Gorky's vexation at the growing estrangement between himself and the other contributors to the Znaniye miscellanies Within a year, his intransigent defence of 'civic' literature had alienated all the major znan'evtsy with the exception of Bunin We will return to this debate, in which Gorky and Andreyev played the central roles, in chapter five

Apart from his literary colleagues and acquaintances, Gorky was also visited on Capri by Desnitsky, who arrived early in April, 1907 to deliver an invitation for the writer to attend the fifth congress of the RSDLP, which was scheduled to be held the following month in Berlin [101] For Gorky, who had as yet had no opportunity to observe the workings of the Social-Democratic Party at first hand, the invitation came as welcome surprise Together with M F Andreyeva, he left Italy early in May, travelling first to Berlin and then to London, where the delegates moved due to the unexpected vigilance of the police in the German capital [102]

The trip to London came at an important psychological moment for Gorky Recalling the event in his memoir of Lenin, written in 1924, he referred to his 'holiday mood' on his arrival in England and went on to explain its cause "Праздничное мое настроение было вполне естественно и будет понятно читателю, если я скажу, что за два года прожитых мною вне родины, обычное самочувствие мое сильно понизилось" [103] Gorky attributed his depression to the poor impression he had gained of American and European socialists and also to the recent conflict with the znan'evtsy on Capri On this latter subject, he provided some interesting details

> Один гость из России, литератор, и - талантливый, доказывал мне, что я будто бы сыграл роль Луки из пьесы "На дне" пришел, наговорил молодежи утешительных слов, она мне поверила и набила себе шишек на лбу, а я - убежал Другой утверждал, что меня съела "тенденция", что я "конченый человек" . . [104]

Refraining from the natural desire to speculate upon the identity of these 'guests' (one of whom, one senses, must have been Andreyev), we need remain in no doubt as to some of the principal causes of Gorky's depression prior to the London conference The charges raised against him by his colleagues must have touched upon a live nerve, reinforcing his own doubts not only about the artistic merit of his recent works, but also about his overall involvement in the revolutionary movement and the value of 'Revolutionary Romanticism' as an aesthetic principle The trip to London was, therefore, of great personal importance to Gorky, being an attempt to escape the spiritual malaise that was threatening his peace of mind

Viewed in this context, the London trip was a success Gorky

returned from the congress invigorated, full of new optimism as to the future of the revolutionary movement His mood was reflected in a letter to Ladyzhnikov, written one week after his return to Capri

> Нам не надо терять веру в то, что мы одолеем, нам не следует забывать, что мы живем в эпоху революционную и что наша революция - начало общеевропейской, как об этом говорят событии во Франции, здесь, в Австрии и как скоро, я думаю, закричат о том же Ваши тяжелые немцы 105

Despite this euphoria, there are signs that Gorky's reaction to the congress itself was by no means entirely uncritical Although favourably impressed by Lenin, with whom he had come into close contact for the first time,[106] he was extremely reserved in his judgment on the formal proceedings of the congress As he admitted in V I Lenin "Но праздновал я только до первого заседания, до споров по вопросу о "порядке дня" Свирепость этих споров сразу охладила мои восторги "[107] The account of the day-to-day conduct of the congress which follows is in the vein of Tolstoy's famous description of the Zemstva elections in Anna Karenina In each case, events are seen through the eyes of an interested but naive observer, uninitiated in the practice of politics and somewhat repelled by it Gorky's description, like Tolstoy's, concentrates upon externals (Plekhanov's habit of twiddling his waistcoat button, Lenin's speech defect) rather than the substance of the arguments which he heard Indeed, the arguments over points of procedure were of no interest at all to Gorky, whose essentially non-political viewpoint is summed up in his own words "Не всегда важно - что говорят, но всегда важно как говорят" [108]

The London congress, although it succeeded in reviving Gorky's 'revolutionary optimism', served equally to convince the writer of his personal unsuitability for the practical conduct of politics It was presumably for this reason that he ignored Lenin's repeated requests for him to attend the seventh international socialist congress in Stuttgart that August [108] By this time, Gorky was already hard at work on his play Poslednіye and, as he intimated in a letter to his wife, considered his literary occupations far more important than party congresses [110]

In view of the subsequent conflict between Lenin and Gorky over the theory of 'God-building', one specific aspect of their relations at the London conference must be stressed To assume, as Soviet commentators do, that the friendship between the two men implies their

'ideological unity' at this time, is to present a thoroughly misleading picture[111] At the time of the congress, Gorky had, on his own admission, read very little of Lenin's work[112] What is more, nowhere do we find, either in the memoir or in his contemporary correspondence, any reference, positive or negative, to any of Lenin's views on ideology or party organization As the memoir itself testifies, Gorky valued Lenin primarily as a man and as a friend, his bitterness towards the Bolshevik leader after the confrontation over 'God-building' and the party school on Capri stemmed not from his realisation of their ideological incompatibility but from the feeling that Lenin had betrayed their friendship by his political ruthlessness[113] This point is of crucial importance as it belies the convention amongst Soviet critics and historians of interpreting these later arguments as a sign of Gorky's 'temporary ideological deviation' from Leninism

On his return from the London congress, Gorky began work on a new novel, Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka, in which he set out to describe the course of the 1905 Revolution and to analyse the reasons for its failure

In his two major works of the immediate post-revolutionary period (Vragi and Mat') Gorky had concentrated, as we have seen, upon the growth of revolutionary consciousness amongst the Russian working class and peasantry, this being the source of their 'revolutionary optimism' Quite explicit in both works is the moral victory of the revolutionaries over the forces of reaction There was, however, another side to the equation the 'Grey' power of 'Philistinism' which had been identified as the major threat to the victory of the revolution in O Serom and Zametki o meshchanstve Gorky had continued his enquiry into the nature of 'Philistinism' and its relation to revolution in a number of minor works written in Europe and America which can be seen as a prelude to the major study of the subject in Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka

The first such work was Zriteli, written as an immediate response to the defeat of the Moscow armed insurrection, but published only posthumously[114] In Zriteli, Gorky returned to the distinction, originally made in O Serom and repeated in Zametki o meshchanstve, between the 'Red', the 'Black' and the 'Grey' Written in the style of O Serom, the story is set against the background of the heroic efforts of the revolutionaries to defend their freedom against the forces of reaction (i e the Moscow armed insurrection) Gorky's interest focusses,

however, not upon the street fighting itself, but upon the reaction to the fighting of the 'spectators', who watch the battle from a safe distance Each of the 'spectators' typifies a common attitude the aesthete, the armchair philosopher, the believer in law and order, and each is able to justify his passivity and lack of commitment They are ultimately condemned in the final passage of the story The revolutionaries defeated, life in the city returns to 'normal'

> В домах за стеклами окон двигались робкие тени зрителей жизни, за ними снизу, с улицы, зорко и жадно следили глаза солдат - серые звери не знали, всех ли врагов истребили они, и, послушно ожидая приказа власти, смотрели в окна, где, им казалось, есть еще живые люди
> Но людей уже не было в этом городе, в нем осталась только власть и рабы, послушные орудия безумной, жалкой воли ее . 115

The 'spectators', in Gorky's view, are no better than the soldiers who unquestioningly carry out the orders of those who hold power, like them, they are no more than 'slaves' It should be noted, however, that the term 'slave' is used here in a different sense to that employed in Zametki o meschchanstve, where Gorky had spoken of life as 'the struggle of the masters for power and of the slaves for freedom from the yoke of power' [116] The 'slavery' to which Gorky was referring on that occasion was the slavery imposed by the total economic dependence of the worker upon his capitalist employer This is a purely external, physical slavery which is not incompatible with the active struggle for freedom The 'slavery' of the 'onlookers' and the soldiers in Zriteli, however, comes from within, it is a slavery of the spirit which is the very antithesis of the revolutionary mentality The term had been used in exactly the same sense by Andreyev in Tak bylo

> - Нужно убить власть, - сказал первый
> - Нужно убить рабов Власти нет - есть только рабство 117

The message of Zriteli is the same slavery is the product not of circumstances but of the passivity of the slaves in the face of tyranny The defeat of the revolution, therefore, for Gorky as for Andreyev, represented man's inability to overcome this spiritual slavery In view of Gorky's criticism of Tak bylo, it is significant that he never published Zriteli in his lifetime, its pessimistic conclusion ran counter to his conception of 'revolutionary art' Yet the very fact that the work came to be written at all reveals that Gorky was

susceptible to the same doubts as Andreyev, a point which indicates a new level of complexity in the relations between the two men and which incidentally suggests why Gorky was so vocal in his criticism of his friend

Although Zriteli itself was never published, the question of the slave mentality formed a leitmotif of a number of works written at about the same time In Gorod Zhyoltogo D'yavola, for example, Gorky suggests that the workers themselves are largely to blame for their enslavement by the 'Yellow Devil'

> Лица людей неподвижно спокойны - должно быть, никто из них не чувствует несчастья быть рабом жизни, пищей города-чудовища В печальном самомнении они считают себя хозяевами своей судьбы Свободы внутренней, свободы духа - не светится в глазах людей 118

In a subsequent passage, he links this spiritual slavery with the blind protest which is the opposite of conscious revolution

> Где много работы рабов, там не может быть места для свободной творческой мысли, там могут цвести только идеи разрушения, ядовитые цветы мести, буйный протест животного 119

Gorky returned specifically to the concept of the passive slave-mentality, as outlined in Zriteli, in Poslaniye v prostranstvo In this rhetorical address to the Russian revolutionary, it is again the slaves who are held responsible for the failure of the revolution Referring to the liberal parties and their 'betrayal' of the revolutionary cause, Gorky wrote "Ночь была временем славы их, среди сонного молчания рабов говорили они, рабы поклонились им, и рабы признали их вождями, - что тебе до них, если сам ты не раб?"[120]

Gorky continued his enquiry into the slave-mentality in Patrul' and 9-oye yanvarya, two works which were written at the same time as Vragi and Mat'[121] Patrul', which was subsequently to be linked with the story Iz povesti under the title Soldaty, deals with a highly topical subject, describing the attitudes of four soldiers whose platoon has been called upon to suppress a peasant revolt The experience provokes a different reaction in each of the four soldiers The first, Malov, is the epitome of blind subordination, he reduces life to a simple formula "Солдат обязан убивать врагов, присягу положил на себя в этом"[122] Totally incomprehensible to Malov, therefore, is the spirit

of doubt which afflicts his colleague, Yakovlev, who has suffered the profound emotional shock of being instrumental in the death of his fiancée's uncle Yakovlev's story evinces sympathy from Semyon, who is equally burdened by a sense of moral responsibility for his actions He speaks with regret of the peasants and revolutionaries who have been killed and even expresses a certain admiration for their cause The fourth soldier, Mikhail, however, refuses to accept his guilt Like Malov, he prefers to let the authorities bear the responsibility "Нас тоже господа посылают' Мы виноваты?"[123] Himself vulnerable to the doubts expressed by Yakovlev and Semyon, Mikhail is also aware of the far-reaching implications which they entail By accepting personal responsibility for their actions, Yakovlev and Semyon have implicitly rejected the concept of authority upon which army discipline is founded This is the same authority as that advocated by Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor, who promises to release man from 'the freedom of his conscience' in return for complete subordination to his will [124] Once the freedom of conscience has been rediscovered, Semyon comes to doubt even God, the supreme authority

> - Михаил Евсеич' Видит все это бог?
> Рыжий солдат долго шевелил усами, прежде чем глухо и увереньо ответил
> - Бог - должен все видеть, такая есть его обязанность 125

Mikhail's reply is extremely illuminating as it reveals his conception of God as an extension of that authority whose 'duty' it is to relieve him from the burden of conscience His is the faith which Gorky had described in an unfinished work of 1903, in which he had first attempted to characterize the 'Philistine' "Ему гораздо удобнее веровать - он хочет жить спокойно - он не любит мыслить" [126] True to this formula, Mikhail refuses to relinquish his faith in the God of authority, even though he realises that his peace of mind has been preserved only at the expense of reducing himself to level of Malov

In 9-oye yanvarya the tragedy of slavish faith is presented on a universal level Unlike Gorky's other writings on the subject of Bloody Sunday, this work is more than a straightforward documentary account Although the publicistic element is still strong, it is secondary to the main purpose, which is to depict the mentality of those who participated in the historic procession Consequently, the crowd, which had hitherto been presented as the innocent victim of tsarist oppression, is viewed in a far more critical light Many years later,

in V I Lenin, Gorky was to admit

> Я плохо верю в разум масс вообще Разум не организованный идеей, - еще не та сила, которая входит в жизнь творчески В разуме массы - нет идеи до поры, пока в ней нет сознания общности интересов всех ее единиц 127

The crowd in 9-oye yanvarya is exactly such a negative force, whose irrational nature is emphasized by Gorky's choice of imagery

> Толпа напоминала темный вал океана едва разбуженный первыми порывами бури Несколько человек оглянулось - позади их стояла плотная масса тел, из улицы в нее лилась бесконечным потоком темная река людей 128

Although not 'organized by an idea', this disparate, elemental force is united by one common factor faith in the paternal benevolence of the tsar The essence of this faith, Gorky tells us, is 'self-deception'[129] and the reader is reminded automatically of a host of characters from earlier works the bakers in Dvadtsat' shest' i odna, the prostitute in Boles', Nastya and the Actor in Na dne, each of whom had placed his faith in an illusory divinity The illusion is zealously defended against those like the 'bold man', who dares to cast doubt upon its sanctity only to be destroyed immediately the idol is put to the test The tsar, the 'divine and benevolent father', is exposed as a murderer, his troops open fire on the defenceless workers and Gorky comments "В огне волнения быстро истлевала вера в помощь извне, надежда на чудесного избавителя от нужды" [130] Without this faith to sustain them, the demonstrators panic and the seeming unity of the procession gives way to chaos "Тьма разрывала связь между людьми, - слабую связь внешнего интереса И каждый, кто не имел огня в груди, спешил скорее в свой привычный угол" [131] As the reference to those 'who have fire in their breast' suggests, the process of disintegration is not inevitable, however In contrast to the majority, who are unable to overcome the shock of disillusionment, there are some, like the 'bold man', who embody a faith of a more enduring nature "Голоса тех, кто веровал в свою внутреннюю силу, а не в силу вне себя, - эти голоса вызывали у толпы испуг" [132] It is this latter group which gathers its forces to organize resistance against those who threaten their faith

In essence, neither Patrul' nor 9-oye yanvarya adds much that is

new to the discussion of faith in Gorky's works, but their importance should not be underestimated 9-oye yanvarya, in particular, clarifies the all-important distinction between the 'two faiths', between 'faith in aid from without' and faith in 'one's own inner strength' Furthermore, these two different faiths are unmistakably linked with the success or failure of the revolution, a point which causes us to reflect on the ambiguity of both works under consideration here The ending of Patrul', for example, is deliberately inconclusive

> Становилось все холоднее. Снег перестал падать, и, должно быть, от этого тьма стала неподвижнее и гуще
> Вдали дрожал какой-то странный звук, неуловимый, точно тень 133

The conclusion of 9-oye yanvarya is equally ambivalent Despite the optimistic note introduced by the description of 'those with fire in their breast', the final curse 'slaves '[134] has an ominous ring, expressing not only contempt but also the fear that the slave might remain oblivious to the lesson to be learned from the experience of Bloody Sunday Again one is reminded of Andreyev the similarity with Tak bylo is too close to be coincidental and should need no further comment In each work, the distinction between the revolutionaries and the rabble is the same, in 9-oye yanvarya, however, Gorky significantly refrains from restating the pessimistic conclusion Tak bylo - tak budet [135] Although Gorky shared Andreyev's fear that the revolutionary movement would fail due to the inability of man to overcome his innate slavishness, he could never bring himself to express this fear in such an explicit and emphatic form Nevertheless, in Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka, his next major work, this pessimistic message is quite unmistakable

For his new novel, Gorky returned to the technique employed in his first full-length novels, Foma Gordeyev and Troye, where the narrative had taken the form of a'life-history' We should not, however, allow this purely formal similarity to blind us to the essential difference of purpose in Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka, a difference which becomes clear immediately the novel's central character, Evsey Klimkov, is compared with the heroes of the earlier works The key to Klimkov's character is to be discovered in the novel's title he is an 'unnecessary man' Gorky's original title for the work had been Shpion, which he was forced to change due to censorship considerations At the end of January 1908, he informed Ladyzhnikov "Повесть озаглавьте "Жизнь

ненужного человека"" [136] Ladyzhnikov, however, misinterpreted Gorky's instructions and the first edition of the novel appeared in Berlin under the title Zhizn' lishnego cheloveka [137] The mistake, although seemingly minor, is most instructive The 'superfluous man', of course, was a traditional feature of the Russian realistic novel and Ladyzhnikov's slip may well have derived from his familiarity with this term It may be assumed with even greater certainty, however, that Gorky's avoidance of this term was deliberate and hence that the terms 'unnecessary' and 'superfluous' were not synonymous in his vocabulary The 'superfluous man', in Gorky's view, was the man of action who expresses his dissatisfaction with contemporary life in impotent revolt, in his own fiction, the characters of Foma Gordeyev and Ilya Lunyov are the most obvious representatives of this type Although from different social backgrounds, they are united by their resolve to discover a new and better life, which endows their ultimate failure with a tragic nobility Evsey Klimkov belongs to a less noble breed, as Gorky's choice of the epithet 'unnecessary' was undoubtedly intended to suggest

The distinction will become clearer if we compare Klimkov with Ilya Lunyov, the hero of Troye The two characters have a number of features in common Both come from a deprived urban background and both are orphans (a recurrent autobiographical detail) Equally important for them both is the Orthodox church, which both provides a respite from the rigours of their environment and inspires a vision of a society founded on the principles of justice and equality Klimkov's desire to escape to a 'quiet and clean life'[138] reminds us of Lunyov's driving passion "Надо уйти куда-нибудь от всей этой грязной суеты и склоки, надо жить одному, чисто, тихо "[139] In Lunyov's case, this vision of the 'quiet and clean life' is translated into a rationally formulated ambition, which overrides all moral scruples Klimkov, however, possesses none of Lunyov's strength of character His desire to discover the 'quiet and clean life' is never more than a desire, being outweighed by his innate fear of his environment, which in turn arouses in him an obsessive preoccupation with his personal security As a child he asks his uncle "А можно жить так, чтобы и ходить везде и все видеть, только бы меня никто не видал?"[140] Unlike the bold, independent Lunyov, Klimkov is committed to follow the line of least resistance He takes no initiative and

hence feels no responsibility for his actions, preferring to let others control his life In this way, he simply drifts from one form of tutelage to another, from the benign guardianship of his uncle to the more sinister patronage of his first employer, subsequently falling under the influence of the secret police

Klimkov's first employment with the bookseller exposes the essential conflict at the root of his character On the one hand, his new position offers him exactly the security he craves, as his uncle is quick to appreciate He describes the move to the bookseller's in terms which were bound to appeal to the boy "Будешь ты жить за ним, как за кустом, сиди да поглядывай" [141] Although quite prepared to accept his subservient position without question (here again the contrast with Lunyov is apparent), Klimkov is troubled by the discovery that his employer is an agent provocateur, selling forbidden literature to radicals in order that they be arrested by the secret police This discovery offends against Klimkov's better nature and he is prompted to warn one of his master's potential victims of the danger which threatens This act of rebellion quite naturally arouses the wrath of the bookseller and Klimkov is forced to choose between the demands of his conscience and the desire not to endanger his personal security The latter instinct proves the stronger and Klimkov refrains from further acts of defiance, preferring to ignore the obvious inconsistency between his ideals and his actions by indulging his fantasy He deludes himself into believing that his master's paramour, the alcoholic prostitute Raisa Petrovna, is the embodiment of ideal femininity, despite the all too obvious evidence to the contrary It is only the inescapable fact of his own seduction by Raisa Petrovna which forces him to relinquish this 'consoling lie' Once this illusion is dispelled, Klimkov can escape from his conscience only by immersing himself in his work

Klimkov's progress from bookseller's assistant to police clerk and then to secret police agent, like his original move to the bookseller's, is the product not of active volition on his part but of circumstance, against which he feels powerless His new occupation as police spy seems at first to be admirably suited to his childhood ambition of passing through life as a mere observer "Ты должен всех замечать, тебя никто", a colleague explains [142] Once again, however, Klimkov falls prey to the conflict between his conscience and his duty

to obey the commands of his superiors Prompted by his conscience to warn a revolutionary of his role as agent provocateur, Klimkov is nevertheless obliged to fulfil his orders and sublimates his desire to escape the dilemma in his dreams of retiring to a monastery

Klimkov's 'escape' is only temporary and circumstances, in the form of the 1905 Revolution, confront him once again with the contradiction in his nature With his security under serious threat, Klimkov begins to display a tentative spirit of enquiry

> В голове Евсея тоже слабо засветилась бледная узкая полоса робкого огня, через нее медленно и неумело проползали осторожные, серые мысли, беспомощно цепляясь друг за друга, точно вереница слепых 143

The conflict between his natural sympathy with the ideals of the revolutionaries and his habitual obedience to the commands of his superiors is externalized in his relations with his colleagues Maklakov and Yakov Maklakov, in whom Klimkov senses a kindred spirit, has come to reject his activity as a police spy, which he sees as a betrayal of his true aspirations Consequently, he resolves to abandon his profession to take an active part in the revolutionary struggle Klimkov's admiration for Maklakov prompts him to emulate his symbolic act of 'confession' to the writer Mironov (an interesting self-portrait by the author) Gorky makes it clear, however, that Klimkov's 'confession' is quite different from Maklakov's Whereas Maklakov had 'confessed' in order to purge his soul of his past sins as a prelude to his new life as a revolutionary, Klimkov confides in Mironov simply to relieve himself from the burden of guilt which oppresses him He emerges from the writer's house prepared not for the new life, but for a return to the old

> Тяжело вздохнув, выпрямился, почувствовал себя точно вымытым изнутри, непривычно легко, приятно пусто, а сердце свое - готовым покорно принять новые приказы, новые насилия 144

It comes as no surprise, therefore, when Klimkov betrays the revolutionaries to the authorities, demonstrating his ultimate inability actively to perpetrate the good in which he believes

Although Klimkov lacks the strength of will to follow the example of Maklakov, he is equally unable to adopt the attitude of Yakov Like the soldier Malov in Patrul', Yakov is the epitome of unthinking subordination and, as such, he arouses an instinctive antipathy in Klimkov

If Maklakov is the voice of Klimkov's conscience, then Yakov is a constant reminder of the degradation to which he has been reduced When Klimkov, in a bout of drunkenness, strikes Yakov, this may be taken as a sign both of his hatred of the man and of his disgust at his own impotence to combat the Yakov in his own nature The contradiction remains unresolved, Klimkov chooses the only escape, which is suicide

Gorky's ultimate purpose in Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka, as in Foma Gordeyev and Troye, is to mount a critique of contemporary Russian society In the earlier novels, this was achieved by means of the traditional theme of the 'superfluous man' society is condemned because it has no place for such essentially noble characters as Foma Gordeyev and Il'ya Lunyov The tragedy of the 'superfluous man', in other words, stems from the conflict between the individual and the society in which he lives In Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka, on the other hand, Gorky is at pains to portray Klimkov as the typical representative of the society of his day This broad social implication is suggested by means of a parallel During the course of the revolution, Klimkov witnesses the brutal murder of a young revolutionary by a Black Hundred gang The act is also watched by a group of people, who, only a few moments before, had listened with sympathy to a speech by the very same revolutionary Klimkov observes this behaviour with understanding "Он хорошо чувствовал ничтожество этих беспокойно прыгающих людей, ясно понимал, что их хлещет изнутри темный страх, это страх толкает их из стороны в сторону" [145] Klimkov's sense of empathy with the crowd is all the more significant in the light of an episode from his own past, when he had stood by as Anatoliy, his boyhood hero, was savagely beaten In this way, Klimkov is identified with that spirit of acquiescence which had permitted the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, his tragedy is, by extension, the tragedy of post-revolutionary Russian society

The basic weakness of Klimkov (and, implicitly, of all the other 'spectators' of life) is exposed in a short exchange with Mironov, who asks the pertinent question

> - А вы верите в новую жизнь? Думаете - устроится она?
> - Да как же, - если весь народ хочет этого? А что? Не устроится? [146]

Klimkov here reveals himself to be unaware of the vital distinction between faith in the 'new life' and the mere desire to live in a better

society Without such faith, Mironov-Gorky implies, the 'new life' will never come about and the slave will remain true to his nature The point is demonstrated conclusively in the description of Klimkov's reaction to the events of 1905

> Ему казалось, что прошлое не воротится - явились новые хозяева, и если они могли сразу остановить ход жизни, значит, сумеют теперь устроить ее иначе, свободнее и легче для себя, для всех, для него 147

To look upon the revolutionaries simply as 'new masters' is to negate the very concept of revolution as Gorky understood it and here we come closest of all to an understanding of the epithet 'unnecessary' as applied to Klimkov Klimkov is 'unnecessary' because he can have no rightful place in the society for which the revolutionaries are fighting, he is irrevocably bound to the past and, for this reason, his death should give rise to celebration rather than mourning

As literature, Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka satisfies for the very reasons that Mat' does not The characters and scenes are credible and the psychology of Klimkov, especially in his ambiguous relations with the revolutionaries and Yakov, approaches Dostoyevskian profundity It is, therefore, all the more to be regretted that circumstances have conspired to make this one of Gorky's least-known novels The work was denied a large reading public within Russia due to a censorship ban after only ninety pages had been published in the twenty-fourth Znaniye miscellany [148] What is more, Gorky's insistence that the novel be published after his next major work, Ispoved', ensured that it passed relatively unnoticed in the critical storm which surrounded his celebrated study of 'God-building' Despite the inclusion of Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka in all Soviet editions of Gorky's collected writings, it has not been published in the mass separate editions accorded to Mat' and other selected works and it has been all but ignored in Soviet literary criticism [149] In order to appreciate this reticence on the part of Soviet critics, we need only refer to the relevant section of the Stalinist history of Russian literature

> В "Жизни ненужного человека" Горький разоблачал "достоевщину", субъективно-психологический метод Достоевского, вскрывая конкретную социально-историческую основу "психологии" героев из мира персонажей Достоевского, их абстрактных, существующих вне времени и социальных условий характеров Образом Евсея и других Горький показал, что индивидуалистические, упадочнические натуры

> - порождение продажного прогнившего полицейски-самодержавного режима, явление классового строя, где человек человеку волк, где сильный давит слабого, превращая его в раба, в жалкого эгоиста, всего боящегося и желающего как-то сохранить свое низменное бытие 150

None of these points is defensible, (significantly, no attempt is made to support this argument by detailed reference to the text), indeed, one would tend to state the exact opposite In Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka, it could be argued, Gorky is perhaps closest of all to Dostoyevsky, certainly, we cannot take seriously the claim that Gorky relates Klimkov's slavish nature to a 'concrete socio-historical base' On the contrary (and here Gorky is most certainly Dostoyevsky's follower), he reveals that such slavishness is rooted deep in human nature itself and, what is more, that it remains essentially unaffected by any change to the 'socio-historical base' As the above crude attempt to explain Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka in Marxist terms unwittingly suggests, Gorky's uncompromisingly anti-materialist conception of revolution is nowhere more apparent than in this novel, for this reason it is more conveniently ignored by those who wish to see the author as a Marxist

Gorky continued his enquiry into the spiritual malaise affecting post-revolutionary Russian society in Posledniye, a play upon which he began work in the summer of 1907 [151] Like Vragi, this new play deals with the disintegration of the family unit against the background of political events The subject of the play may well have been suggested in part by Andreyev's Gubernator As the Soviet critic Mikhaylovsky has pointed out, [152] Ivan Kolomiytsev, the central character, has a number of features in common with Andreyev's governor A high-ranking police officer, Kolomiytsev also has been responsible for the death of innocent citizens in the pursuit of his duties, for which he was singled out as a target by would-be assassins With this however, the similarities between them end Kolomiytsev undergoes no spiritual crisis of the type experienced by Andreyev's governor, preferring to follow an evasive course of action, similar to that advocated by the governor's pragmatic son in Andreyev's story

Ivan Kolomiytsev is, to use Byalik's words, a typical 'servant of autocracy' [153] His behaviour on stage and what we learn of his past actions are sufficient to characterize him as a corrupt and

unprincipled careerist He is not, however, a totally negative character, despite the arguments of Soviet critics to the contrary In the course of the play we learn that Kolomiytsev, who is of noble stock, had taken up his post in the tsarist police only out of financial necessity, having gambled away his estate He therefore looks upon his profession as a necessary evil which has to be tolerated for the sake of the family fortunes and the future of his children, the end, in Kolomiytsev's view, justifies the means This is not to say that he is indifferent to the moral compromise that his profession has forced upon him He admits as much in a candid conversation with his wife

> Иван При чем тут дети?
> Софья А если они осудят?
> Иван (возмущен) Они? Они мне судьи? Дети, кровь моя? Черт знает, что ты говоришь! Как же они смеют упрекнуть отца, который ради них пошел служить в полицию? Ради них потерял очень много и наконец едва не лишился жизни 154

Here, as on a later occasion, when she openly accuses her husband of having a pernicious moral effect upon their children, Sof'ya touches upon the quick, hence Kolomiytsev's irascibility To accept his wife's charge would be tantamount to an admission that his personal sacrifice had been to no avail For this reason, therefore, he chooses to ignore the obvious signs of discord within the family But this is self-deception, as Kolomiytsev is well aware In a moment of honesty, he asks himself "Откуда мог явиться в моей семье этот злой дух вражды?"[155] There is consequently a tragic irony in the final scene, where Gorky has Kolomiytsev, in the face of the total disintegration of his family, pompously declaim "Семья - вот наша крепость, наша защита от всех врагов"[156] In this final, pathetic attempt at self-justification, Kolomiytsev stands as a monument to misguided paternal instinct

To the question 'Where can the evil spirit of enmity in my family have appeared from?', the answer is, quite plainly, from Kolomiytsev himself Each of his children reflects, to a greater or lesser extent, the moral degeneracy of their father Kolomiytsev's elder son, Aleksandr affects a cynical indifference to his father's behaviour and devotes his life to debauchery In an unguarded moment, however, he drops the pose to reveal a profound ennui, which emanates directly from his inability to come to terms with his father's moral

crime

> А кто пожалеет распутного молодого человека - кандидата в помощники полицейского пристава? Мне предстоит бить морды человеческие, брать взятки понемногу и - получить в живот пулю революционера как вам нравится эта блестящая карьера? 157

Aleksandr's sister, Nadezhda, has none of this sensitivity A sensualist and materialist, she is completely amoral, together with her husband Leshch, she is prepared to destroy even her own family in the pursuit of her personal ambitions Different again is Lyubov', the second sister, whose physical deformity symbolizes the moral deformity affecting all of Kolomiytsev's children Lyubov' is yet another of Gorky's total cynics, who have no purpose in life other than to poison others with their own nihilism

Kolomiytsev's younger children, Pyotr and Vera, learn the truth about their father only during the course of the play For Pyotr, who had defended his father's honour against the insinuations of his schoolfriends, the revelation comes as a profound shock He reacts by associating with the revolutionary circles who oppose his father, only to discover his unsuitability for the role of revolutionary, an experience which causes him to turn to alcohol For his sister Vera also, life brings a similar disillusionment Yakorev, the 'hero' who had saved her from a marriage of convenience to the syphilitic Kovalev, turns out to be a calculating materialist By the end of the play, she has been transformed from a naive young girl into a sensualist of Nadezhda's type

The moral disease which eventually afflicts all of Kolomiytsev's children is not, however, the product of their father's influence alone As the play progresses, it becomes increasingly clear that a certain amount of the blame must also rest with Sof'ya, who fails to realise until it is too late the evil to which her children are exposed It is Sokolova, the mother of the revolutionary, who reminds Sof'ya of the maternal duty which she has failed to fulfil Her acquiescence in the presence of evil renders her in effect an accessory to it, an idea which is suggested in one of Pyotr's speeches "Оставим это, а то мне хочется говорить о жизни, в которой командуют несчастные слабые люди и о людях, которые позволяют командовать собой и как назвать таких людей?"[158] If Kolomiytsev quite obviously belongs to the category of 'unfortunate, weak people' who

command, then Sof'ya belongs to the second category, upon whose passivity the power of the first group rests

Seen in this light, the tragedy of the Kolomiytsev family is a readily translatable allegory on Russian society of the post-1905 era, in which Kolomiytsev represents the moral depravity of the ruling classes, his wife Sof'ya the cringing servitude of those who tolerate this rule and the children the degeneracy which is the inevitable 'offspring' of such 'parentage' As Gorky's letters and articles of this period testify, the author himself detected signs of this degeneracy in all spheres of contemporary Russian life, political, social, but most of all in the new trends taken in philosophy and the arts, a subject to which we will return later

Together with Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka, Posledniye reflects the profound disillusionment which afflicted Gorky during his first months on Capri, a disillusionment which stemmed directly from his observations on the failure of the revolution in Russia The composition of these works was to have a cathartic effect, however, they may be seen in retrospect as the prelude to a renascence of Gorky's 'revolutionary optimism'

D The return to the ideal Ispoved' and the philosopy of 'God-building'

The depressing picture of post-revolutionary Russian society contained in Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka and Posledniye should not be interpreted as an indication that Gorky had abandoned his faith in the revolutionary ideal per se His aim quite simply was to come to terms with the failure of the 1905 Revolution and to identify those elements which could be held responsible for the betrayal of the revolution But, as always, Gorky was highly sensitive to the effect such works might have upon the Russian reading public In November, 1907, he wrote to his wife complaining of the current vogue amongst Russians of writing their memoirs of the revolutionary period

> Эта литература воспоминаний о героиских побегах и прочих подвигах страшно надоела всем, а если еще не надоела - очень жаль Помнишь, когда-то я говорил, что тотчас же после революции нас задавят воспоминаниями о том, как ее делали - как плохо делали ее. Это случилось и даже превзошло мои ожидания Ужасно много, ужасно скучно - самодовольно пишут люди прошлого'
> А писать следует о том, как надо делать

революцию, как продолжать ее [159]

True to his convictions and determined not to be a 'man of the past', Gorky abandoned his own retrospective enquiry into the Revolution of 1905, turning his attention instead to the more important question of 'how to make and continue' the revolution in the future It was to this very question that Gorky devoted a whole series of novels written on Capri, beginning with Ispoved'

To the educated Russian reader, Gorky's new novel, by its title alone, must have suggested comparison with the celebrated work by Tolstoy and one senses that such was the author's intention The two works do indeed have certain essential features in common Like Tolstoy, Gorky considered that his Ispoved' contained an important lesson for his contemporaries, a point which is clear from the opening words of the novel "Позвольте рассказать жизнь мою, времени повесть эта отнимет у вас немного, а знать ее надобно вам" [160] The story which follows, again like Tolstoy's, is the story of a man's quest for a faith which will reveal the true meaning and purpose of human existence Furthermore, this quest follows essentially the same pattern in both works, the narrator passing from initial scepticism to traditional religion before discovering a new and more authentic faith capable of providing an answer to the questions which torment his soul We should be careful, however, not to press this comparison too far The faith which is eventually discovered by Matvey, the narrator in Gorky's novel, differs entirely from that advocated by Tolstoy On occasions one even detects a hint of a polemic with Tolstoy, as in Matvey's words "Никогда я о смерти не думал, да и теперь мне некогда", [161] almost certainly a reference to Tolstoy's well-known preoccupation with the problem of death

Gorky's choice of first-person narrative for Ispoved' leads us immediately to the question of considering the novel as autobiography Perhaps the best answer to this question was provided by the author himself in an interview with the critic Izmaylov

> Я написал ее (т е повесть А Б) только что, но мысль эту имел давно Искать прямо тут автобиографического в моем герое было бы неверно Это не мои искания Конечно, период, когда во мне остро сказывалось искание в религиозной области, в свое время и я пережил [162]

A few years later, in the first published variant of the story Geroy,

Gorky made a more precise reference to this religious phase in his own development "Года за три до этого я уже покушался на самоубийство, потом тяжело пережил взрыв религиозного настроения, шлялся по монастырям, беседовал со схимниками, - не помогло "[163] We should take Gorky at his word, however, and not seek to discover directly autobiographical features in his hero The autobiographical form should be seen primarily as an experiment in narrative technique and the life of Matvey as a literary device, through which the author sought to transform his personal experience into a universal statement on the human condition

The story of Matvey adheres to the traditional Christian sequence of original sin, repentance and final redemption Like Gorky's earlier heroes, Foma Gordeyev, Il'ya Lunyov and Evsey Klimkov, Matvey displays in his early youth a religious spirit which is inspired by the genuine desire to relieve mankind of suffering Disgusted by the injustices of life, Matvey is also critical of the Orthodox church, whose representatives have failed, in his estimation, to fulfil their sacred duty to the people His determination to correct this failing is expressed in his pledge "Был бы я попом, я бы так служил, что не токмо люди - святые иконы плакали бы!"[164] Matvey's resolve is put to the test, however, immediately he attempts to put his ideas into practice by assisting the priest Titov in the running of his parish Self-seeking and hypocritical, Titov uses his privileged position deliberately to exploit his parishioners, justifying his actions with an argument worthy of Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor

> Видел бог, что и при столь строгих законах его удается некоторым праведная жизнь А если бы ни одного праведника не было в Содоме - видел бы господь, что, значит, никому невозможно соблюдать законы его и, может, смягчил бы законы, не губя множество людей 165

Although repelled by Titov and his apologia of human weakness, Matvey proves unable to withstand the temptation to follow his example when confronted by Titov's daughter, Ol'ga His betrothal and subsequent marriage to her symbolize his espousal of Titov's philosophy, representing his fall from grace

Once married to Ol'ga, Matvey devotes himself to the relentless exploitation of his fellows, in which he even surpasses the greed of Titov himself This greed does not constitute the whole of his sin,

however Equally reprehensible is his refusal to bear the moral responsibility for his actions Rather than face his conscience, he prefers to blame God for his fall "Почто не поддержишь силою твоею падение мое, почто возложил на меня испытания не по разуму мне, али не видишь, господи, погибает душа моя?"[166] It is also against God that Matvey protests when he falls victim to a series of calamities which destroy his family and material prosperity The reader is reminded of the fate of Andreyev's Vasiliy Fiveysky, and it seems likely that this whole section was directly inspired by Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo This is no case of plagiarism, however, as Gorky adapted Andreyev's original story to suit his own purpose in Ispoved' Accordingly, the adversities which afflict Matvey are presented not as the workings of 'severe and mysterious fate'[167] but as an act of divine retribution, which opens the hero's eyes to the enormity of his crime and provokes his sincere repentance

Repentance alone is not sufficient to set Matvey on the path to redemption Even after he has repented, he still lacks the strength of will actively to seek his salvation It is only after his encounter with the prostitute Tat'yana that he fully understands what he must do Like Matvey, Tat'yana has, by the very nature of her profession, sinned against her ideals, but she has the moral strength to accept personal responsibility for her degradation "За свои грехи - я ответчица!"[168] Inspired by her example, Matvey no longer blames God for his sins and sets out to redeem himself by his actions

Matvey's pilgrimage in search of redemption leads him first of all to the Orthodox church, which allows Gorky to mount a critique of conventional religion no less devastating than that contained in Tolstoy's Ispoved' The majority of those who represent the Orthodox church in Gorky's novel are distinguished by their hypocrisy, from the village priest, who lines his pockets at the expense of his parishioners, and the monks, who look upon their monastery as a convenient shelter in which to indulge in the pleasures of the flesh, to the pompous archdeacon, who revels in the contemplation of his own exalted status Gorky's criticism, however, goes beyond a simple exposé of the multitude of sins committed by those who claim to be the servants of God, he even questions the very nature of the God they worship In conversation with the archdeacon, Matvey asks "На что вместо друга и помощника людям только судию над ними ставите?"[169] Matvey's question implies

the same distinction between the 'two religions' as that already encountered in Mat' and elsewhere In this way, Gorky suggests that the real evil of the Orthodox church lies not so much in its malpractices as in the very concept of a God of authority, upon which its religion is founded It is for this reason that the Church is unable to provide for the spiritual needs of those who sincerely seek an answer to the problems of existence, like Grisha (a latter-day Foma Gordeyev) and Matvey himself The ultimate sterility of the Church is symbolized by the silence of Nikodim and the total passivity of the hermit Mardariy, the latter being almost certainly a parody of Tolstoyan non-resistance to evil

Matvey leaves the monastery no nearer a discovery of true faith than when he had entered Right outside the monastery gate, however, he is witness to a scene which provides him with a moment of profound enlightenment As he leaves the monastery, Matvey encounters a religious procession (krestnyy khod), in which he perceives, in microcosm, the spiritual disease afflicting mankind

> Мутно текут потоки горя по всем дорогам земли, и с великим ужасом вижу я, что нет места богу в этом хаосе разобщения всех со всеми, негде проявиться силе его, не на что опереться стопам, - изъеденная червями горя и страха, злобы и отчаяния, жадности и бесстыдства, рассыпается жизнь во прах, разрушаются люди, отъединенные друг от друга и обесиленные одиночеством 170

The procession also presents Matvey with a vision of his own isolation and of the futility of seeking personal salvation on an individual basis It is at this point that he meets Iegudiil, who introduces him to the concept of 'God-building'

The introduction of Iegudiil is the major artistic weakness of Ispoved' as it destroys the narrative viewpoint which had been so carefully maintained until this juncture From this moment onwards, Gorky ceases to 'show' Matvey's evolution, he simply 'tells' it Instead of realistic scenes, the reader is confronted with a succession of 'dialogues' which aie in reality no more than monologues intended to explain the author's meaning, the novel, which had been so promising, devolves into a didactic tract To understand the final stages of Matvey's evolution, therefore, we need only quote from the speeches of the 'God-builders' First Iegudiil, on the natuie of 'God-building' itself and its

difference from conventional religion based on faith in the God of authority

> Но люди делятся на два племени одни - вечные богостроители, другие - навсегда рабы пленного стремления ко власти над первыми и надо всей землей Захватили они эту власть и ею утверждают бытие бога вне человека, бога - врага людей, судию и господина земли 171

Then Mikhayla, the leader of a community of 'God-builders' whom Matvey visits at the Isetsky works, on the subject of the collective

> Началась, - говорит - эта дрянная и недостойная разума человека жизнь с того дня, как первая человеческая личность оторвалась от чудотворной силы народа, от массы, матери своей, и сжалась со страха перед одиночеством и бессилием своим в ничтожный и злой комок, который наречен был "я" Вот это самое "я" и есть злейший враг человека' 172

The 'miracle-working power' to which Mikhayla refers is no mere metaphor, in the final scene of the novel Gorky describes the miraculous power of collective humanity as a crippled girl is restored to health The scene demands comparison with Andreyev's play Savva, which ends, as we shall see, with a similar 'miracle' In Andreyev's play, however, the 'miracle' is a hoax, designed by church dignitaries to inspire faith in the Orthodox church In Ispoved' also there is a reference to such a hoax [173] The final miracle is of a totally different order, being the objective expression of a creative faith emanating from within man The idea had been formulated by Feuerbach

> The miracle is the characteristic object of faith, faith in essence is belief in the miracle That which objectively is the miracle or the miraculous force, subjectively is faith, the miracle is the face of faith, and faith is the soul of the miracle, faith is the miracle of the spirit, the miracle of feeling, which is objectified in outer miracles 174

The triumphant finale illustrates this view and is intended to demonstrate the superiority of the new faith over the old, the victory of the collective

The critical response to Ispoved', both inside and outside Russia, was far greater even than that occasioned by the publication of Mat' In January, 1909, A N Tikhonov wrote to the author "Ваша "Исповедь" не дает здесь никому покою Спорят о ней и во всевозможных "обществах", вплоть до черносотенных Большая и

поучительная разноголосица"[175] In the wake of these discussions, numerous articles began to appear, in which Gorky's new faith was subjected to close scrutiny The Symbolist critics, who had so recently proclaimed the 'end of Gorky',[176] now began to revise their opinion Filosofov, the author of the controversial Konets Gor'kogo article, wrote a review of the new novel, which he interpreted as a 'turning point' in the author's career, revealing his rejection of socialism in favour of an as yet uncleairly formulated mystical religiosity[177] The debate over Ispoved' and 'God-building' even attracted the attention of the St Petersburg Religious-Philosophical Society, which devoted four meetings to the subject,[178] much to Gorky's displeasure[179] Although opinion was divided on the crucial issue of 'God-building', the majority of Symbolist critics and writers were impressed by the language of Ispoved', although critical of its tendentiousness

In the socialist camp, the reaction was even more varied Some, like L'vov-Rogachevsky, wrote favourably of the novel's power and scope,[180] but most were obviously perplexed by the unmistakably religious message it contained Plekhanov, in a long and detailed analysis of Gorky's work, compared the author with Gogol', Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy, whose later works had also been marred, in his opinion, by a preoccupation with ieligious questions[181] Plekhanov's view was shared by Lenin, who was undoubtedly the fiercest critic of 'God-building' Lenin's attack was not directed specifically against Gorky, however, but rather against his former party colleagues, Bogdanov and Lunacharsky, whom he held primarily responsible for the 'ideological errors' contained in Ispoved'

The debate between Lenin and the 'God-builders' had begun as early as 1904, when the Bolshevik leader became aware that his allies Bogdanov and Lunacharsky 'were dabbling in some very suspicious philosophy', to quote Professor Ulam[182] Inspired by the ideas of Mach and Avenarius, Bogdanov and Lunacharsky had begun to question materialism, seeking to combine the pursuit of socialism with some sort of religious faith Lenin, although he felt obliged to condemn such heresies the following year in his article Religiya i sotsializm, was prepared to tolerate such deviations by Bogdanov and Lunacharsky inasmuch as both men were invaluable to the Bolshevik cause In the following period, however, the differences between Lenin and the 'God-builders' became so great that, by 1908, convinced of the threat to

party discipline and unity, the Bolshevik leader began to harden in his attitude It was Gorky's misfortune to become the unwitting catalyst to the inevitable confrontation between the two factions

Gorky became involved in the dispute early in 1908, when, in response to Lenin's repeated requests that he write something for the new party newspaper Proletariy,[183] he submitted for publication the draft of his article Razrusheniye lichnosti When Lenin read the work through, he was alarmed to discover in it unmistakable elements of 'God-building' At the meeting of the editorial board of Proletariy to discuss Gorky's article, he opposed its publication for this very reason Lenin's uncompromising attitude provoked a hostile reaction from Bogdanov, who insisted that Razrusheniye lichnosti be published The split, which had been threatening for so long, had become a reality

Anxious that he should not lose Gorky's support, Lenin wrote the writer a long letter, in which he explained the nature of his dispute with Bogdanov, Lunacharsky and Bazarov (the third of the so-called 'empiriocriticists')[184] Gorky himself was distressed by the news of the split, particularly in view of his own involuntary contribution to it Feeling it his duty to reconcile the warring factions for the good of the socialist cause, he invited the protagonists to Capri in order to discuss their differences From his letters it is clear that Gorky was convinced that agreement was possible[185] Unfortunately, this was to prove just another testimony to his political naivety Even before he went to Capri, Lenin warned Gorky that he was in no mood for conciliation 'A battle is absolutely inevitable', he wrote in March[186] His intransigence on this point is emphasized by the fact that he had already despatched his critique of the Bogdanov group (Materializm i empiriokrititsizm) to the publisher before setting out for the Capri meeting[187] It is no surprise, therefore, that the eventual meeting succeeded only in convincing all parties concerned that reconciliation was entirely out of the question

In the conflict between the two factions on Capri, Gorky sided with Bogdanov and Lunacharsky against Lenin, for reasons which will soon become apparent Thus, by the time he came to read Ispoved', the Bolshevik leader was already aware of the author's ideological defection from materialism But, although there can be no doubt that Lenin's reaction to the novel was critical, he deliberately refrained from attacking it in print A few years later, after his second visit to

Capri, Lenin admitted in a letter to Gorky that he had planned to write 'an embittered letter about Ispoved'' but that he had eventually decided that this would only make matters worse[188] He was equally circumspect in his references to Gorky in his articles of this period In O 'platforme' storonnikov i zashchitnikov otzovizma, for example, he numbers Gorky amongst the 'otzovists', but immediately tempers this criticism with the following statement "В деле пролетарского искусства М Горький есть громадный плюс, несмотря на его сочувствие махизму и отзовизму"[189] This uncharacteristically moderate tone was presumably dictated by Lenin's belief that Gorky's attraction to 'God-building' would soon pass and by his awareness, implicit in the passage quoted here, that Gorky's participation was indispensible to the success of Bolshevik publishing ventures Throughout the following years, the party leader was to press Gorky continually for contributions to his various newspapers and journals

Before discussing the salient features of 'God-building' in the context of Gorky's intellectual development, we should return for a moment to Andreyev No doubt unaware of the debates surrounding the novel within the Bolshevik party, Andreyev saw Ispoved' primarily as an answer to those critics who had attacked Mat' In an interview with the correspondent of Odesskiye novosti, he expressed his full praise for the novel "Его "Исповедь" на меня произвела прекрасное, чарующее впечатление Опять эта стальная, граненая, отчеканенная речь, яркие, красивые образы"[190] Even in 1913, by which time relations between the two men had reached a low ebb, Andreyev was repeating this opinion to the American translator, Bernstein[191] We will return to the entire question of Andreyev's attitude to Gorky's philosophical views in the next chapter

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the critical response to Ispoved' is the view, shared by Socialists and Symbolists alike, that the novel marks a turning point in Gorky's evolution as an artist and a thinker, invalidating in particular his recent defence of Marxism in Mat' and Vragi Consequently, a number of critics sought in their articles to discover the source of Gorky's 'new' ideology The majority, following Chulkov[192] and L'vov-Rogachevsky,[193] discerned in Gorky's defence of 'God-building' the influence of Feuerbach and Mach Yet Lenin was undoubtedly correct in identifying Bogdanov and Lunacharsky as the principal influences upon the development of Gorky's thought at

this time Bogdanov had been one of the first to visit Gorky on Capri and he immediately made a most favourable impression on the writer In November, 1906, Gorky wrote to Ladyzhnikov of his new acquaintance

> это чрезвычайно крупная фигура, от него можно ждать оглушительных работ в области философии, я уверен в этом' Если ему удастся то, что он задумал, - он совершит в философской науке такую же революцию, как Маркс в политической экономии Он меня просто с ума сводит' 194

A year later, he was writing in equally enthusiastic terms to Pyatnitsky about Lunacharsky "Вижу много интересных людей, особенно же интересен для меня Луначарский. Этот человек духовно богатый, и, несомненно, он способен сильно толкнуть вперед русскую революционную мысль" [195] Together, Lunacharsky and Bogdanov were instrumental in reviving Gorky's faith in the revolution During 1908 and 1909, all three men worked as a collective, co-operating in a number of publishing ventures and collaborating in the organization of the ill-fated 'Capri school', to which we will return in a later chapter

The degree to which Gorky himself identified his views with those of Lunacharsky and Bogdanov is revealed in a letter to Voytolovsky, in which he claimed "Всюду, где в данном письме стоит местоимение "я", вы можете заменить его другим - "мы", подразумевая под ним Анатолия Васильевича и Александра Алексанровича" [196] We should take care, however, not to overemphasize the influence of the two men on Gorky Although he was obviously attracted by Bogdanov's research into the collective mentality of the proletariat and Lunacharsky's conception of religious feeling as the basis for the practical application of Marxism, the influence of these theories was in reality quite superficial Lunacharsky states as much in his memoirs "Я не думаю, чтобы хотя один сколько-нибудь существенный элемент был прямо взят Горьким из моих статей или из наших разговоров" [197] Rather than being 'influenced' by Bogdanov and Lunacharsky in the true sense of the word, Gorky was simply attracted to them because they had given a theoretical formulation to views he had been developing independently over a great many years We will find support for this opinion if we look back into some of Gorky's earlier works

Although we encounter the term 'God-building' as such for the first time in Ispoved', Gorky had been introduced to the embryo of such a

theory long before he began his career as a writer As a young man, he had studied the works of V V Bervi-Flerovsky, a theorist of the Populist school, whose writings had contained elements of 'God-building' since the 1870's Consider, for example, the following passage from his book Tri politicheskiye sistemy

> Когда я обозревал беспредельное поле действия среди непочатого русского народа, тогда я убеждался, что успеха можно ожидать только тогда, когда охвативший молодежь взрыв энтузиазма будет превращен в постоянное и неискоренимое чувство Непрерывно думая об этом, я пришел к убеждению, что успех можно будет обеспечить только одним путем - созданием новой религии Я стремился создать религию равенства 198

Not only had Gorky read Bervi-Flerovsky's works but he had also met the author in person in 1892, when the two men had tramped the Caucasus together in the summer months [199] By the end of the decade, as we have seen, Gorky had come to reject the political philosophy of Populism, but the ethical content of Bervi-Flerovsky's teachings left a more enduring impression upon the young writer A number of his letters contain passages which anticipate the theory of 'God-building' and possibly reflect the influence of the older man In 1900, he defined his concept of God to Tolstoy "человек - вместилище бога живаго, бога же я понимаю, как неукротимое стремление к совершенствованию, к истине и справедливости".[200] Two years later, in a letter to Andreyev, Gorky was already drawing the contrast between the 'two religions' based on two opposite concepts of God

> Бог - удобное объяснение всего происходящего вокруг, и - только Пока что бога и не требуется, ибо если его дать - мещане сейчас же спрячутся за него от жизни Ныне бог ускользает от мещан, и они, сукины дети, остаются без прикрышки Так и надо!
> А когда они от холода и голода внутренно издохнут - мы для себя создадим бога великого, прекрасного, радостного, все и всех любящего покровителя жизни! Так-то! 201

That Gorky identified the creation of this new God with the victory of the socialist movement is already beyond doubt Three years later, when the revolution was at its height, he made the point even more plainly "Да здравствует социализм - религия рабочих! Социализм - религия свободы, равенства и братства" [202]

Clearly then, 'God-building' had deep roots in the development of Gorky's thought and to consider it a temporary 'ideological error'

inspired by his association with Bogdanov and Lunacharsky is demonstrably mistaken Indeed, we can see, on the contrary, that Ispoved' embodies a philosophy which is in no way incompatible with Gorky's previous studies of the working-class movement The workers at the Isetsky works in fact bear a close resemblance to the factory workers in Vragi In the novel, as in the earlier play, the collective solidarity of the workers prompts them to reject the concept of 'heroism', which is a product of individualism Similarly, the evolution of Matvey from the old faith to the new, revolutionary religion in Ispoved' is only too obviously a development from the central theme of Mat' Far from contradicting Gorky's earlier works, Ispoved' emerges as their logical conclusion and 'God-building' as the most explicit formulation of the author's conception of revolution

The term 'God-building' passed out of Gorky's vocabulary after the publication of Ispoved', probably as a result of the altercations between Lenin and the 'God-builders' on Capri The concept, however, remained with the author until the end of his life It formed the subject of an ambitious study, Proiskhozhdeniye bibleyskogo boga, upon which he worked for a number of years on Capri before eventually abandoning the idea in 1909 In this article, Gorky postulated the existence of an original religion based on man's collective consciousness and which had subsequently been contaminated and diverted from its true course by the teachings of the various churches

> Религия сначала была единственной организацией трудового опыта . В древней религии иудеев до периода судей и цареи элемент сверхъестественный, чудесный, мистический совершенно отсутствует, до этого периода религиозные догматы являются нам как простейшие нормы социальной и трудовой жизни 203

The article remains to be published in the Soviet Union, but the trend of Gorky's argument is clear enough from the passage cited here, 'God-building' represents a return to this natural religion of the past, a rediscovery of man's collective instinct

Strong elements of 'God-building' are also present in a number of Gorky's works written immediately after Ispoved' The novel Leto and the articles O tsinizme and Zemletryaseniye v Kalibrii i Sitsilii illustrate precisely the same philosophy, a fact which I A Korchagin, in the commentary to the ninth volume of Gorky's complete works,

ascribes to the author's continuing association with Bogdanov and Lunacharsky [204] The argument is invalidated, however, by the presence of 'God-building' in works written after Gorky had parted company with the two men in 1910 Once again, it was Lenin who quickly detected survivals of the heresy in Gorky's writings On reading the full version of the article Eshchyo o 'karamazovshchine' in Russkoye slovo on 27 October, 1913, he sent an indignant letter to the author, quoting the offending passages

> "А "богоискательство" надобно "на время" (только на время?) "отложить, - это занятие бесполезное нечего искать, где не положено Не посеяв, не сожнешь Бога у вас нет, вы еще" (еще!) "не создали его Богов не ищут, - их создают, жизнь не выдумывают, а творят"
> Выходит, что Вы против "богоискательства" только "на время"!! Выходит, что Вы против богоискательства только ради замены его богостроительством!! [205]

Gorky's reply to these charges has not been discovered but its tone may be divined from a second letter by Lenin on the subject, in which the Bolshevik leader sought once again to convince the writer of the reactionary nature of 'God-building' [206] Gorky was presumably offended by this second letter as it was the last to pass between them for over two years, until the correspondence was resumed by Lenin

Gorky showed equally little sign of recanting his religious approach to socialism in the years which followed In Vecher u Shamova, he used religious similes and metaphors to characterize his attitude to the revolutionary circles whose meetings he had attended as a youth "Эти вечера для меня, как всенощная для верующего их беседа для меня - богослужение" [207] He returned more specifically to a defence of 'God-building' in Nesvoyevremennye mysli, a series of articles on revolution and culture which appeared in 1917 and 1918 In these articles, Gorky developed the thesis that 'the new man cannot be formed by politics alone' [208] On this premise he mounted a critique of the Bolshevik Revolution, which, in his view, had failed to provide a new ethic, 'an idealism without which a revolution would lose its power to make man more socially conscious than he was before the revolution, an idealism without which a revolution would lose its moral and esthetic justification' [209] Even more explicit is the following passage from Gorky's introduction to Ivan Tachalov's Mrachnaya povest', written in 1919

> Если религию понимать, как связь человека с человеком и как стремление укрепить эту связь, - тогда учение о необходимости полито-экономического равенства всех людей "более религиозно", чем все религии 210

Not only had Gorky not abandoned the theory of 'God-building', it was the yardstick against which he measured the activities of the Bolsheviks and found them lacking

Although Gorky was later to admit that his initial response to the Bolshevik Revolution had been mistaken, a number of his statements of the Soviet period reveal that his attitude to 'God-building' remained unchanged In the 1922 story, Otshel'nik, for example he introduced the character of Savel, a latter-day Matvey, who has rejected the Orthodox church in favour of a new religion based on the principle of 'seeking God within man' [211] Five years later, in the article Desyat' let, he referred directly to the theory of 'God-building'

> Когда-то, в эпоху мрачной реакции 1907-1910 годов, я назвал его (т е. человека А.Б.) "богостроителем", вложив в это слово тот смысл, что человек сам в себе и на земле создает и воплощает способность творить чудеса справедливости, красоты и все прочие чудеса, которыми идеалисты наделяют силу, якобы существующего вне человека Трудом своим человек убеждается, что вне его разума и воли нет никаких чудесных сил, кроме стихийных сил природы, которыми он должен овладеть для того, чтоб они, служа его разуму и воле, облегчили его труд и жизнь 212

Gorky's tone here is one of justification rather than repentance In 1929 he even expressed indirectly his resentment of the hostile reception that Ispoved' had provoked in Lenin and other socialists Writing to Gruzdyov on the subject of Ol'ga Forsh's story Lurdskiye chudesa, he noted "исцеление в Лурде она трактует так же, как я в "Исповеди" А меня за нее ославили еретиком, мистиком, богоискателем, хотя я определенно говорил о строительстве, а не об искательстве. Я не жалуюсь, жаловаться не умею, да и - поздно!"[213] Despite his disclaimer, Gorky was obviously still moved by the issue of 'God-building' even some twenty years after his confrontation with Lenin and he remained a 'God-builder' to the end His notorious articles of the 1930s, such as O novom cheloveke, written in praise of the Stakhanovite movement, are 'God-building' in everything except name In these articles, Gorky expressed

his faith in the ability of the Soviet people to achieve a truly collective consciousness in the conditions of Stalin's Russia and, as such, they are a final testament to his innate optimism

As the most complete formulation of Gorky's views on revolution and, ultimately, on human nature itself, 'God-building' merits attention on a number of points Bertram D Wolfe has referred to the theory as yet another of the author's 'consoling lies',[214] an idea which had been suggested many years earlier by Izmaylov, who compared Matvey directly with the character of Luka from Na dne[215] This interpretation, although it expresses a justifiably sceptical opinion of 'God-building' as a panacea for the human predicament, cannot be accepted as an account of Gorky's own conception of the theory The author himself conceived of 'God-building' as an antidote to the 'consoling lie', it is a faith in man's ability to achieve salvation by his own efforts as opposed to a faith in a divinity existing outside of man Hence, 'God-building', unlike the 'consoling lie' is a source of strength, inspiring the individual actively to participate in the pursuit of progress

The 'God' which Gorky calls upon mankind to 'build' clearly has nothing in common with the traditional Christian concept of God The idea of a God who is omnipotent, omniscient and infinite was completely alien to Gorky, whose world-view was unashamedly anthropocentric In 1900, he had written to Tolstoy

> Глубоко верю, что лучше человека ничего нет на земле, и даже, переворачивая Демокритову фразу на свой лад, говорю существует только человек, все же прочее есть мнение Всегда был, есть и буду человекопоклонником 216

From the Christian viewpoint, Gorky had committed the ultimate heresy of worshipping the Man-God, for which he was taken to task by Merezhkovsky[217] Gorky's God is, in fact, none other than the 'Harmonious Man', the socially integrated individual, for whom the only divinity can be the collective of which he is a part

By denying God an existence outside the human consciousness, Gorky strips faith of its contemplative and transcendental features Unlike the Christian concept of faith, therefore, 'God-building' is essentially rationalistic The link between faith and logic is continually stressed in the speeches of Iegudiil

> "Ищите и обрящете" - хорошо это сказано, и не надо забывать этих слов, ибо это слова, поистине достойные разума человеческого . . . . вера - великое чувство и созидающее! А родится она от избытка в человеке жизненной силы его, сила эта огромна суть и всегда тревожит юный разум человеческий, побуждая его к деянию 218

Faith then, according to Gorky, is not the irrational prejudice which had been identified as one of the principal enemies of Thought in Chelovek[219] On the contrary, faith is Thought itself the rational acceptance by the individual of the need to work for the common good In this belief Gorky reveals himself as the direct heir to the utopian tradition of Saint-Simon and the young Renan, according to whom science was to provide mankind with total knowledge and hence the ability to perfect human society Gorky's defence of 'God-building', therefore, stands in direct opposition to Dostoyevsky, who had inspired the modern revolt against rationalism

If 'God-building' provides a clear statement of Gorky's views on faith and the nature of God, it is decidedly ambiguous as a philosophy of history Here we return to the distinction between materialism and idealism which had been broached at the end of chapter two Predictably, it was the ultra-materialist Lenin who first detected the ambiguity of Gorky's attitude towards materialism Even before the debate over 'God-building' had begun in earnest, he had informed the writer of his doubts "Насчет материализма именно как миропонимания, думаю, что не согласен с Вами по существу"[220] Subsequent events proved Lenin's suspicions to be substantially correct After the Bolshevik leader had visited Capri in April, 1908, Gorky explained his own position in a letter to Pyatnitsky

> Спор, разгоревшиися между Лениным-Плехановым, с одной стороны, Богдановым-Базаровым и К°, с другой - очень важен и глубок Двое первых, расходясь в вопросах тактики, оба веруют и проповедуют исторический фатализм, противная сторона - исповедует философию активности Для меня - ясно, на чьей стороне больше правды 221

Gorky could not accept historical materialism ('historical fatalism') or any other system of knowledge that relegated the individual to a secondary position in the historical process The insistence of the Marxist upon immutable scientific principles governing social development seemed to him to deny the importance of individual self-perfection,

without which, in his view, socio-political progress is ultimately impossible 'God-building', on the other hand, was to stimulate both individual self-perfection and social progress, a point which is clarified by the author's later remarks on Ispoved' "Герой "Исповеди" Матвей понимает под "богостроительством" устроение народного бытия в духе коллективистическом, в духе единения всех по пути к единой цели - освобождения человека от рабства внутреннего и внешнего".[222] This statement bears an uncanny resemblance to the final passage of Nikolay Berdyayev's article Filosofskaya istina i intelligentskaya pravda, from the Vekhi collection "Мы освободимся от внешнего гнета лишь тогда, когда освободимся от внутреннего рабства, т е возложим на себя ответственность и перестанем во всем винить внешние силы" [223] Yet, despite their obvious similarities, these two statements differ on one vital issue Berdyayev stresses that individual self-perfection is an essential prerequisite of social progress, whereas Gorky is more vague, suggesting that 'liberation of man from inner and outer slavery' is a parallel process

The question of individual self-perfection and its relation to social progress is of course central to Gorky's conception of revolution In 1902, he had written scathingly to Pyatnitsky of the Tolstoyan doctrine of 'self-perfection'

> Если бы вы знали, как мне противен этот поворот назад, к самоусовершенствованию' Я не оговорился - это назад' Теперь совершенный человек не нужен, нужен боец, рабочий, мститель. Совершенствоваться мы будем потом, когда сведем счеты 224

Two years later, however, in Tyur'ma, Gorky was already beginning to formulate his own version of self-perfection, which was ultimately elaborated in the theory of 'God-building' Yet, in Ispoved', the author failed to clarify the causal relationship between individual self-perfection and social revolution Towards the end of the novel, Matvey relates an argument between Mikhayla and himself

> Начал я вступать в споры с Михайлой, - доказываю, что сначала человек должен найти духовную родину, тогда он и увидит место свое на земле, тогда найдет свободу
> Но кончу я, - заговорит Михайло со своей спокойной улыбкой - и сотрет мои слова
> - Прав ты, когда говоришь, что в тайнах живет человек и не знает, друг или враг ему бог, дух его, но - неправ, утверждая,

> что, невольники, окованные тяжкими цепями повседневнего труда, можем мы освободиться из плена жадности, не разрушив вещественной тюрьмы 225

The debate between Matvey and Mikhayla reflects the duality inherent in Gorky's attitude to man On the one hand, like Matvey (and Berdyayev), he places the onus upon the individual, who must transcend his environment to achieve freedom and salvation On the other hand, like Mikhayla (and the Marxists), he was inclined to see the majority of men as the victims of their environment and hence incapable of individual perfection The same contradiction is present in Nesvoyevremennye mysli, where the idealist writes in April, 1917 "We must understand that the most dreadful enemy of freedom and justice is within us, it is our stupidity, our cruelty, and all that chaos of dark anarchistic feelings "[226] In May, the realist replies

> I have never been a demagogue and will not be one Reproaching our people for their tendency toward anarchism, for their dislike of work, for all their savagery and ignorance, I keep in mind they cannot be different The conditions in which they lived could foster in them neither respect for the individual, nor awareness of the citizen's rights, nor a feeling of justice And one must be amazed that, with all these conditions, the people nevertheless retained in themselves quite a few human feelings and some degree of common sense 227

Unlike the Marxists, Gorky was too much of an idealist to attribute bondage and injustice to purely environmental factors Yet he was also too much of a humanist and optimist not to compromise his idealism in the face of reality

The theory of 'God-building' establishes beyond doubt Gorky's affinity with the utopian tradition Like all utopians, Gorky sought to change not only the society in which he lived, but the very foundations of the human situation Although no Marxist, he developed his own variation of the dialectic, which is embodied in all of his novels from Mat' onwards In each of these works, from Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka to Zhizn' Klima Samgina, Gorky's view of history is cyclical rather than linear[228] events are depicted not as the unpredictable and haphazard interactions of individuals and circumstances but as part of an inexorable process towards mankind's perfection Again like all utopians, Gorky conceived of this perfection in collectivist terms individualism is destructive, only as a collective can mankind achieve true progress This is the truth that Matvey has learnt by the end of

Ispoved'

> Если, говоря людям, заденешь словом своим общее всем, тайно и глубоко погруженное в душе каждого истинно человеческое, то из глаз людей истекает лучистая сила, насыщает тебя и возносит выше их Но не думай, что это твоя воля поднимает тебя окрылен ты скрещением в душе твоей всех сил, извне обнявших тебя, крепок силою, кою люди воплотили в тебе на сей час . 229

This metaphysical concept of the individual will as the objectivization of the collective spirit, an idea which Gorky had almost certainly culled from Bogdanov, turns the Christian view of the peisonality on its head and offers a solution to the eternal dilemma of existence The solution is, of course, too facile, it does not so much resolve the dilemma as evade it In this respect, 'God-building' displays the contradictions inherent in all utopian systems which combine pessimism about the individual with optimisim about collective mankind, belief in unrestrained human freedom with the ideal of civic integration and a desire for ieligious faith with a conviction in the supremacy of reason Conceived under the impact of the 1905 Revolution, 'God-building' was the ultimate synthesis, the panacea not only for the ills of contemporary Russian society but for the human condition in general

The significance of 'God-building' to Gorky's view of man and society requires no further comment Yet the theory was of no less importance to Andreyev Although he never made any direct reference to 'God-building' by name, all of Andreyev's works of the post-1905 period, almost without exception, are addressed to one aspect or another of the theoiy As we shall see, 'God-building' was eventually to stand at the centre of all subsequent debates between the two writers

CHAPTER FOUR NOTES

1 Г-30, т 28, стр 408
2 Kaun, Gorky, p 569
3 Н.Буренин, "Поездка А М Горького в Америку", ВС, стр 223
4 ЛЖТ.1, стр 586,589
5 The appeal was published in Berliner Tageblatt on 24 March, L'Humanite on 27 March and in The Times on 10 April
6 For details, see J.W Long, 'Organized protest against the 1906 Russian loan', Cahiers du monde Russe et Soviétique, vol.XIII, no.1 (1972), pp.24-34
7 Г-30, т.28, стр 273
8 АГ5, стр 174
9 Kaun, Gorky, pp.569-601, Filia Holtzman, 'A mission that failed Gorky in America', Slavonic and East European Journal, VI, 3 (Fall, 1962), pp 227-235, С Бродская, "О деятельности М.Горького в Америке в 1906 году", Г и революция 1905 года, стр 388-408
10 ЛН 72, стр 267
11 АГ 5, стр 177
12 ibid., p.178. E P.Peshkova apparently fulfilled Gorky's request before receiving this second letter. A telegram from her to The New York Herald appeared in The Atlantis News on 14 May ЛЖТ, 1, стр 609
13 ibid., p 605.
14 Бродская, стр 397-398
15 For an account of Gorky's stay with the Martins, see Буренин, стр 230-239
16 ЛЖТ 1, стр 628
17 Буренин, стр.240
18 Holtzman, 'A mission that failed', p.233.
19 ibid.
20 Kaun, Gorky, p.601.
21 ibid
22 see Otvet na anketu amerikanskogo zhurnala On the subject of Gorky's attitude to America, the following statement by Andreyev in an interview with Herman Bernstein is of interest 'The most remarkable thing about the Gorky incident is that while in his stories and articles about America Gorky wrote nothing but the very worst about that country, he has never told me anything but the very best about America. Some day he will probably describe his impressions of America as he related them to me'. 'Satan's Diary' by Leonid Andreyev. Authorized translation with a preface by Herman Bernstein, (New York, 1920), p xii
23 АГ 11, стр 187
24 ЛЖТ 1, стр 617
25 ПССГ, т 6, стр 166
26 Ганиева, стр 62-68, М.Николаев, 'Сатира А М Горького в годы первой русской революции", Ученые записки Латвийского университета, т XI (1956), стр 139-170
27 ПССГ, т 6, стр 182
28 ibid., p.206
29 А Синявский, "Горький-сатирик", в кн О художественном мастерстве М Горького, (М , 1960), стр 139
30 Евг Л , "Сборник товарищества "Знание за 1906 год, кн XI", Вестник Европы, № 12 (1906), стр 836
31 ПССГ, т 6, стр 238

32 ibid., p 409
33 ibid., p.268.
34 ibid., p.428. Inasmuch as the Russian original of this article has never been discovered, I have preferred the English text published in Appleton's Magazine to the Russian translation provided in volume 6 of the 'Complete Works'.
35 В И Ленин, Собрание сочинений, 4-е изд , (М , б г), т 5, стр 300-303
36 М.Ф Андреева, стр 137
37 The standard Soviet text is the modified 1933 version For this reason all quotations from the play are taken from the original Znaniye version
38 ЛЖТ 1, стр 525
39 Л.Иокар, "Из творческой истории пьесы "Враги"", ГЧ 1961-1963, стр 71
40 ПССГ, т 7, стр 674
41 Сборник товарищества "Знание" за 1906 г , кн.14 (СПб , 1906), стр.3
42 ibid., pp.17-18.
43 ibid., p.143.
44 ibid., p.20
45 ibid., p.72.
46 ibid., p.137.
47 ibid., p.140
48 ПССГ, т 2, стр 7,8
49 "Знание", кн 14, стр 97
50 ibid , p.11
51 ibid., p.156
52 ibid , p 161
53 Г-30, т 28, стр 435
54 For the censor's report on Vragi, see Рев путь Г , стр 109-110
55 ГЧ.1959-1960, стр.11
56 see, for example, Gorky's letter to Ladyzhnikov of August, 1906 Г-30, т 28, стр 429
57 For details, see С Касторский, "Мать" М Горького Творческая история повести, (Л., 1940)
58 It could in fact be argued that the autobiographical trilogy itself is part of Gorky's 'History of the Russian Revolution'. It has been excluded here, however, on the ground that, unlike the novels, its historical subject matter dates exclusively to the pre-1905 period Furthermore, a study of the autobiographical trilogy from this point of view will add nothing to the central issues of the present work.
59 Lenin's reaction is outlined in ПССГ, т 8, стр 478-479
60 Quoted in: Wolfe, The Bridge and the Abyss, p. 31
61 Borras, p.110.
62 ПССГ, т.8, стр.88
63 Воровский, Литературно-критические статьи, стр.235
64 ПССГ, т.8, стр 74
65 The novel was first published in English, in the New York Appleton's Magazine between December, 1906 and June, 1907. The first Russian version, with considerable revisions, was published serially in the Znaniye miscellanies (Nos 16-21). A separate, uncensored Russian edition was published in Berlin in 1907.

66 ПССГ, т 8, стр 126
67 ibid., p 130
68 ibid , p 153
69 see, above, p.212.
70 ПССГ, т 8, стр.153
71 М.Горький, Мать, 2-ое изд , (Берлин, 1908), стр.64
72 ПССГ, т 8, стр 213
73 ПССГ, т.16, стр 263
74 ПССГ, т.8, стр 242
75 ibid., p.333
76 ibid., p 339
77 see, for example, Gorky's remarks on Fourier Г-30, т 25, стр.205, т 26, стр 24,310,332, т.27, стр.309
78 Weil, Gorky, p.54
79 Borras, p.109.
80 Горький, Мать, 2-ое изд , стр 45
81 ПССГ, т.8, стр 41
82 ibid , p.119.
83 ibid., p 30
84 ibid., p.478
85 ibid., p 138
86 see, below, pp 272-279
87 ПССГ, т 8, стр 139
88 ibid., p.205
89 ibid , p 209
90 Горький, Мать, 2-ое изд , стр 143
91 Г-30, т 29, стр 14
92 Г-30, т 30, стр 298
93 А Дун, "Праздник литературы и народа", Вопросы литературы, № 11 (1969), стр 247 For a similar report of an uncredited response by Andreyev, see А Афанасьев, "Неизвестный отзыв", Вопросы литературы, № 6 (1960), стр 163
94 ЛН 72, стр 522
95 ibid., p 527
96 ЛЖТ 1, стр 633
97 Эренбург, т 8, стр 45
98 Donald W. Treadgold, 'Russian radical thought 1894-1917', in Russia under the last tsar, ed.Stavrou, (Minneapolis, 1969), p.71.
99 Г-30, т.29, стр 17
100 ibid., p.18
101 В.Десницкий, М Горький, (Л., 1940), стр.104-105
102 For details, see ЛЖТ 1, стр.628-633
103 ПССГ, т.20, стр 9
104 ibid., p.12.
105 Г-30, т 29, стр 23
106 According to the memoir, the London meeting was the first between Gorky and Lenin. Soviet scholars have discovered evidence which suggests that the first meeting actually took place in December, 1905, in connection with Novaya zhizn'. This view is supported by Desnitsky on the evidence of Pyatnitsky's diary (Десницкий, Горький (1940), стр.99-104, see also Ленин и Горький, стр 596). The validity of this evidence has been questioned by Wolfe, who accepts Gorky's statement in the memoir at face value (Wolfe, The Bridge and the Abyss, pp 28-30). Given the general unreliability of Gorky's memoirs on precise dates, and the writer's own letter to the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in 1934 in support of the Desnitsky account, Wolfe's

scepticism may well be unfounded.
107 ПССГ, т 20, стр.13
108 ibid
109 Ленин и Горький, стр 14
110 АГ 9, стр 32
111 see, for example Н.Накоряков, "На пятом партийном съезде", Ленин и Горький, стр.408
112 ПССГ, т 20, стр 8
113 For a detailed discussion, see, below, pp 363-368
114 ПССГ, т 6, стр 559
115 ibid., p 389
116 Г-30, т 23, стр 342
117 ПССА, т.4, стр 90
118 ПССГ, т.6, стр 241
119 ibid , p 246
120 ibid , p.323
121 Patrul' was written in summer, 1906 and 9-oye yanvarya in November the same year
122 ПССГ, т 6, стр 134
123 ibid., p.136
124 Достоевский, т 9, стр.320
125 ПССГ, т.6, стр 140
126 ibid., p 384
127 ПССГ, т.20, стр.27
128 ПССГ, т.8, стр.349,353
129 ibid., p.349.
130 ibid., p 358.
131 ibid., pp 371-372.
132 ibid., p.360
133 ПССГ, т 6 стр 340
134 ПССГ, т.8, стр 373.
135 ПССА, т 4, стр 91
136 АГ.7, стр 174
137 ПССГ, т 9, стр 524
138 ibid., p.32
139 ПССГ, т.5, стр 109
140 ПССГ, т 9, стр 10
141 ibid., p.21.
142 ibid., p.89.
143 ibid., p.124.
144 ibid., p.179.
145 ibid , p 196.
146 ibid., p.180.
147 ibid., p.173.
148 For the censor's report, see МИ 3, стр 431
149 Among the mass of Soviet candidates' dissertations on Gorky, I have discovered only one which deals exclusively with this novel В Борисова, Повесть Горького "Жизнь ненужного человека", Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, (М , 1952)
150 История русской литературы, т 10, стр 338
151 For an account of the play's composition, see Б Бялик, М.Горький-драматург, (М , 1962), стр 237-244
152 Б.Михайловский, "Пьеса "Последние"", Г и революция 1905 года, стр 233
153 Бялик, Горький-драматург, стр.220
154 ПССГ, т.13, стр 32

155 ibid., p.24
156 ibid , p.83
157 ibid , p.17.
158 ibid., p.52
159 АГ.9, стр.40
160 ПССГ, т.9, стр 221
161 ibid., p.316.
162 А Измайлов, Литературный Олимп, (М , 1911), стр.227
163 ПССГ, т 14, стр 620
164 ПССГ, т 9, стр 224
165 ibid., pp.242-243.
166 ibid., p.248.
167 ПССА, т 3, стр.20
168 ПССГ, т.9, стр 268
169 ibid., p.263.
170 ibid., p.322
171 ibid., p.341
172 ibid., pp.354-355.
173 A similar hoax is described in a later story Nilushka
174 Translated from a quotation in Г Чулков, Покрывало Изиды, (М , 1909), стр.158-159
175 ГЧ.1953-1957, стр 71
176 Д Философов, "Конец Горького", Русская мысль, № 4 (1907), стр 122-141
177 Д Философов, "Евсей и Матвей", в его кн Слова и жизнь, (СПб , 1909), стр 97-104
178 On 29 October, 1908, G.Baronov read an address Obozhestvleniye naroda (po povodu 'Ispovedi' M.Gor'kogo), which prompted the now famous reply from Blok, Rossiya i intelligentsiya. Next to discuss the novel was Rozanov, whose paper, O narodobozhii, was read on 25 November. Finally, on 16 December, A Meyer spoke on the subject Religiya i kul'tura. (АГ 9, стр.311)
179 ibid , p.59
180 В.Львов-Рогачевский, "Новая вера", Образование, № 7 (1908), отд.3, стр.19-38
181 Г.Плеханов, "О так называемых религиозных исканиях в России", Современный мир, № 10 (1909), стр.193
182 Adam B. Ulam, Lenin and the Bolsheviks, (London, 1969), p.353.
183 Ленин и Горький, стр 20-21,23
184 ibid., pp.30-35.
185 see, for example, his letter to Lunacharsky of January, 1908. (ibid., p 272)
186 ibid., p.38.
187 А.Нинов, "Каприйские встречи", Вопросы литературы, № 7 (1965), стр 11
188 Ленин и Горький, стр 65
189 ibid., p.240.
190 ЛН.72, стр 531
191 H Bernstein, With Master Minds, (New York, 1913), p.164
192 Г Чулков, "Правда Максима Горького", в его кн. Покрывало Изиды, стр.154-163
193 Львов-Рогачевский, "Новая вера"
194 АГ.7, стр 148
195 Г-30, т 29, стр 32

196 Н.Трифонов, "А В.Луначарский и М Горький (к истории литературных и личных отношений до Октября), в кн М Горький и его современники, (Л , 1968), стр 118
197 ibid., p.131
198 Н Флеровский, Три политические системы, (Лондон, 1897), стр 297-298 Цит в статье М Шахнович, "А М Горький о происхождении религии", Ежегодник музея истории религии и атеизма, 1 (1957), стр 76-77
199 ЛЖТ 1, стр 86, 90, И Груздев, Горький и его время, 3-е изд , стр 347, Шахнович, стр 76-77
200 Г-30, т 28, стр 121
201 ЛН 72, стр 129
202 Рев путь Г , стр 109,106 The latter sentence is omitted in the 1953 edition of Gorky's works (Г-30, т 23, стр 377)
203 Шахнович, стр.80-81
204 ПССГ, т 9, стр 560
205 Ленин и Горький, стр 122
206 ibid., p.127.
207 ПССГ, т.14, стр 385
208 Gorky, Untimely Thoughts, p 174
209 ibid., p.208.
210 Шахнович, стр 77
211 ПССГ, т 17, стр 246
212 Г-30, т 24, стр.292
213 АГ 11, стр 204
214 Wolfe, The Bridge and the Abyss, p.54
215 Измайлов, Литературный Олимп, стр 190
216 Г-30, т 28, стр 121
217 Д Мережковский, "Сердце человеческое и сердце звериное", в его кн Полное собрание сочинений, т 14, (М , 1914), стр.92-101
218 ПССГ, т.9, стр.334,340
219 see, above, p.58
220 Ленин и Горький,стр.29
221 ibid., p.48.
222 ПССГ, т.9, стр.556.
223 Вехи Сборник статей о русской интеллигенции, (изд 2-е), (М , 1909), стр 22
224 АГ 4, стр 66
225 ПССГ, т 9, стр.363
226 Gorky, Untimely Thoughts, p 15
227 ibid., p.42.
228 The terms are those used in a recent study of Utopian thought Thomas Molnar, Utopia The Perennial Heresy, (London, 1972)
229 ПССГ, т 9, стр.384

CHAPTER FIVE

CHAPTER FIVE

LEONID ANDREYEV IN THE YEARS OF REACTION

The few years following the 1905 Revolution were to prove as crucial to the relationship between Gorky and Andreyev as they had been to Gorky himself Although temporarily united following the tragic death of Andreyev's wife in November, 1906, the two writers were already estranged by the end of 1907 By 1908, their attitudes had hardened into positive hostility and subsequent attempts at reconciliation served only to exacerbate their differences This total breakdown of relations may be ascribed to a number of causes, which will be examined in detail in the course of this chapter The personal tensions which had been in evidence in earlier years came to the surface again during Andreyev's stay with Gorky on Capri in the first months of 1907 and were aggravated by their renewed arguments over the purpose of literature These altercations were, however, only symptomatic of a more profound level of disagreement between the writers which derived directly from their differing views of revolution The hidden polemic which was already apparent in their works of 1905 was to develop, in the post-revolutionary period, into a conscious dialogue on the subject of man's ability to reform life on earth Faith and the collectivist ethic, the cornerstones of Gorky's 'God-building', were to constitute the main subject also of Andreyev's enquiry into human nature

Like Gorky, Andreyev began the new year of 1906 an exile from his native land From the safety of Europe, he continued to focus his attention on the events taking place within Russia "Трудно думать и говорить о чем-нибудь другом, кроме героической и несчастной Москвы", he wrote to Pyatnitsky from Berlin [1] Although unable to participate directly in these events, Andreyev demonstrated his solidarity with the revolutionary cause by giving a public reading of K zvyozdam before a Berlin audience and donating the proceeds, some 5000 Dm , to revolutionary funds [2] Throughout the initial period in Germany he was convinced that the revolution would be victorious, greeting the rumours that the Moscow armed insurrection had been suppressed with disbelief Early in the new year he wrote to Gorky for confirmation "Москва! Не знаю, может быть, я слишком оптимистичен, но я не верю в поражение Оттуда, из Москвы, доносятся сейчас очень унылые голоса, но я не придаю им

значения Скажи, как ты думаешь" [3] Andreyev's optimism regarding events within Russia was tempered by more sober reflections on the possibility of revolution in Germany In 1905, as again in 1917, it was widely felt in radical circles that the Russian revolution was destined to be only the first in a series of upheavals which would transform the whole of Europe Andreyev's first-hand observations of German society were enough to convince him that such hopes were unfounded In the same letter to Pyatnitsky, we read

> Как глубоко ошибался Алексей и другие, думая, что заграница - сочувствует, что заграница - сама накануне такой же революции С-демократы - да, но их так мало, они так незаметны, как капля воды, как слеза, они растворяются в море пресного мещанства 4

In the event, Andreyev's assessment of the political mood in Germany proved correct, the hoped-for revolution did not materialize By April, 1906, his predictions for Russia also were notably less optimistic Considering the possible alternatives for the outcome of the 1905 Revolution, he wrote to Veresayev

> Как человек благоразумный, гадаю надвое либо победит революция и социалы, либо квашенная конституционная капуста. Если революция, то это будет нечто умопомрачительно-радостное, великое, небывалое, не только новая Россия, но и новая земля. Если кадеты . . . наступит история длинная и скучная Власть укрепится, из накожной болезни станет болезнью органов и крови и мой ближайщий идеал - анархиста-коммунара - уйдет далеко . Будучи пессимистом, склоняюсь на сторону второго предположения победят кадеты Их опора - все мещанство мира 5

This passage is of interest not only as an unequivocal statement of Andreyev's political views at this time It also provides a valuable insight into the meaning of his play Savva which had been completed quite recently

A Savva The revolutionary and the Philistines

Andreyev set his new play in a Russian provincial town, a choice which was in itself important, as he explained later in a letter to Nemirovich-Danchenko

> Это попытка дать синтез российского мятежного духа в различных его проявлениях В противоположность "К звездам", где по существу задачи я должен был избегать специфически русского, "Савва" носит характер сугубо российский 6

The play bears a certain resemblance to the earlier story V tyomnuyu dal', depicting the conflict between a revolutionary and his family In this case, the head of the family, the inn-keeper Egor Tropinin is a pater familias in the tradition of Gorky's Vasiliy Besemenov (Meshchane) A strict authoritarian, Tropinin is a pillar of middle-class conservative values, of which the most obvious is his devout observance of the Orthodox faith Tropinin's faith, like the rest of his daily routine, is the product of habit, a reflex as automatic as the repeated gesture of crossing himself each time he yawns Quite different to Tropinin is his daughter Lipa, who is inspired by a faith of a more spiritual nature Unlike her father, Lipa is horrified by the suffering of mankind, which she hopes to alleviate by her own self-sacrifice "Я становлюсь на колени и молюсь, молюсь и говорю богу если нужна жертва, так возьми меня, но дай людям радость, дай им покой, дай им наконец забвение" [7] Yet Lipa's concern for humanity is ultimately sterile, in the very opening scene, the audience is confronted with the striking contradiction between her fine words and her insensitivity to the physical distress of the pregnant Pelageya Her impotence is further suggested by her inability to lift the heavy bucket to help her sister-in-law

A more sinister aspect of faith is presented by Andreyev in the figures of the monks who inhabit the local monastery Of these, the majority, like the grey-haired monk, are self-satisfied hypocrites who utilize the monastery to indulge their carnal desires For others monkdom simply provides the opportunity to escape the problems and responsibilities of life "С верою спокойнее", as the fat monk explains to Savva [8] However, for those like Speransky and the young novice Vasya, who enter the monastery in the hope of discovering a solution to their spiritual problems, the official church can provide nothing Repelled by its hypocrisy, Speransky has abandoned the monastery and with it his faith, like Savva's brother Tyukha, he is prey to an all-embracing cynicism This is the ultimate condemnation, in Andreyev's view, the Orthodox church not only fails to provide faith but actually destroys it It is hardly surprising therefore that the church authorities should have initiated a campaign against Andreyev's play on its publication in Russia [9]

It is against this fortress of traditional faith, as manifested variously by Egor Tropinin, Lipa, and the representatives of the Orthodox church, that Savva directs his challenge An atheist by conviction,

Savva shares with his sister Lipa a fanaticism which will allow no compromise He is totally dedicated to one single aim the liberation of man from slavery, both physical and spiritual, and is prepared to use any means to realize it His first task is to destroy the authority which stands between mankind and freedom, an authority which he identifies with the concept of God

> Липа А друзья у тебя есть? Товарищи?
> Савва Нет
> Липа А враги? Ну, такой враг, один, что ли, который бы ты особенно не любил, ненавидел?
> Савва Такой пожалуй, есть бог
> Липа (не доверяя) Что?
> Савва Бог, я говорю Ну тот, кого вы называете вашим спасителем 10

As Savva realises, faith in God is often nothing more than a hope for 'happiness', 'peace' and 'oblivion' in the life to come and hence presents a barrier to the improvement of conditions on earth The most typical representative of this escapist faith is Pelageya

> Липа Ты и на том свете полы будешь мыть
> Пелагея Нет, это ты будешь там полы мыть, а я буду барыней сидеть На том свете мы первые будем А тебя и твоего Савку за гордость и жестокосердие твое 11

Pelageya's faith is, in reality, nothing more than the sublimation of her natural desire for vengeance It is a faith which allows her to bear her present degradation with equanimity but which, paradoxically, precludes the possibility of her ever enjoying the justice she craves By destroying the 'miracle-working' icon Savva hopes to expose the misguidedness of such faith and to replace the traditional concept of God with the concept of the Man-God "И когда так будет разрушен десяток их идолов, они почувствуют, холопы, что кончилось царство ихнего бога и наступило царство человека" 12

The 'slaves' whom Savva holds in such contempt have an equally implacable enemy in the peison of Tsar' Irod A religious fanatic, Irod has certain features in common with both Savva and Lipa, although he is in full accord with neither Savva himself expresses sympathy for Irod's views,[13] and the proximity between them is emphasized by the similarity of their pronouncements

> Савва Вот обнимаю я глазами землю, всю ее, весь этот шарик, и нет на ней страшнее человека и человеческой жизни .
> Царь Ирод Видел я, парень, много плохого, а хуже человека, ничего не видал 14

However, Irod also shares Lipa's belief in martyrdom as a means of achieving mankind's salvation In Irod's case, Andreyev makes it plain that such willingness to be a martyr is in essence egoistic Irod has succumbed to the fourth temptation with which T S Eliot was later to confront Becket in Murder in the Cathedral the temptation 'to do the right deed for the wrong reason', to submit to martyrdom out of the desire to be a martyr [15] It is over this question that Irod turns against Savva

> Савва (тихо) Горе, дядя, удушить надо Сказать себе твердо не хочу горя, и не будет горя Человек ты, я вижу, хороший, сильный
> Царь Ирод Нет, парень, моего горя и смерть не возьмет Вот горе мое, видишь, какое - на земле такого не бывает, а призови меня бог и скажи "На тебе, Еремей, все царства земные, а горе твое отдай мне " - не отдам 16

Irod's desire for martyrdom is greater than his desire to see the kingdom of God on earth and it is for this reason that he strikes against Savva, 'from the side he did not expect' [17]

Savva's attempt to destroy slavish faith in authority by blowing up the icon fails due to no fault of his own but due to the duplicity of Kondratiy Forewarned of Savva's plan, the priests are able to turn it to their own advantage, the icon is removed before the explosion to be replaced immediately afterwards providing a convenient 'miracle' for the edification of the crowd Savva is hence confronted with the ultimate irony, he has strengthened the very faith he had sought so hard to destroy, a fact in which Lipa rejoices "И это ты, Савва, дал им чудо и тебе нужно благодарить" [18] Inspired by the 'miracle', the crowd wreaks its vengeance by murdering Savva for his audacity in threatening their divinity Andreyev presents this death as the sacrifice of a man to the animal lust for vengeance by means of the continual stage references to animals in the final scene and by Irod's words "Обрадовались, зверье окаянное!"[19]

In contrast to the crowd, whose faith in the miracle is reinforced by an elaborate deception, Lipa and Kondratiy are aware of the truth At first, the revelation that the 'miracle' was a hoax comes as a shock to Lipa, but her reaction changes after she witnesses the following exchange between Savva and Kondratiy

> Савва Но ты ведь понимаешь, Кондратий, - ты ведь умный человек, очень умный, - что

это чепуха Подумай, брат, подумай Ведь
икону вынесли - какое же тут чудо?
Кондратий А вы думаете - как чудо бы-
вает? Эх вы! Вот вы тоже человек умный,
а простой вещи сообразить не можете все
ведь вы сделали, а? Все и машинку мне дали,
и взрыв был Все. А икона-то цела! Цела,
я говорю, икона-то? Вот вы через это пере-
скочите с вашим умом-то! 20

Following Kondratiy's example, Lipa also prefers to reject the logic of Savva's argument in order to preserve her faith Once again we are confronted with faith as a 'consoling lie', a notion which has been recently defined by Wallace Stevens 'The final belief is to believe in a fiction, which you know to be a fiction, there being nothing else The exquisite truth is to know that it is a fiction and that you believe in it wittingly' [21] Kondratiy and Lipa are the ultimate slaves, they have abandoned truth to worship an idol they know to be false

The critical response to Andreyev's new play was generally unfavourable, with the majority of critics inclined to see Savva as the mouthpiece of the author's own political views The Marxist Friche even went so far as to compare Savva with Kerzhentsev, concluding that both, together with their creator, share the same philosophy of senseless destruction [22] Andreyev was quick to defend himself against such claims "Да и из публики, читателей, многие серьезно подумают, что это призыв к анархии", he complained to Stanislavsky and explained that his real purpose in the play was quite different, "А это - еще раз и еще раз трагическое жизни, тоска о светлом, загадка смерти" [23] On this point, one would tend to side with Andreyev and refute, in particular, the opinion of Friche Although Savva does indeed advocate destruction (in the famous formula of the 'naked man on a naked earth'),[24] this is advanced not as an end in itself but as the first stage in the construction of a new world Savva, then, is not the apologist of anarchy, but rather the 'ideologist of anarchism', as he was dubbed by Orlovsky [25] Unconvincing, therefore, is a more recent interpretation of the play as a 'repudiation of anarchism as a philosophy of destruction', according to which Savva's death is to be seen as a just retribution for his 'obsessive extremism' [26]

Andreyev's main preoccupation in Savva was, as he claimed to Stanislavsky, to illustrate 'the tragic of life', which he saw in the confrontation between the solitary lover of truth and freedom and the

multitude which worships a false authority The play is close in theme to Dostoyevsky's Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore Consider, for example, the Inquisitor's words to Christ

> Мы исправили подвиг твой и основали его на чуде, тайне и авторитете И люди обрадовались, что их вновь повели как стадо, и что с сердец их снят, наконец, столь страшный дар, принесший им столько муки Да, обрадовались, но обрадовались слабые души А те, - избранные, те, которые имел в виду Христос, сильные, самостоятельные, жаждавшие свободной веры, а не чудесной, - не могли, конечно, не стать в ряды бунтовщиков и не выступить активно против чудес 27

The fate of Savva demonstrates the truth of the Inquisitor's cynical philosophy Savva himself, despite his militant atheism, is one of the 'strong' and 'independent' men whom 'Christ had in mind' and who have no alternative but to protest against a faith founded on miracle, mystery and authority He is murdered by 'weak souls', the majority of mankind, who are not equal to the 'terrible gift' of freedom

Savva, then, is not Antichrist, which Kondratiy takes him to be,[28] but just the opposite, he is the envoy of Christ, a fact to which he refers obliquely "Я только посланный, пославший же меня (пригибаясь, как под страшною тяжестью) пославший же меня - бессмертен" [29] The stage-direction, as so often in Andreyev's drama, is all-important The 'terrible burden' to which the author refers is the burden of freedom which Christ had placed upon man and which Savva had sought to restore It is therefore a deliberate irony that the crowd should sing the traditional Easter hymn 'Christ is resurrected' immediately after the death of Savva The final act of the play is in effect a reenactment of the crucifixion (the fact that the action takes place at Easter is no coincidence) and illustrates the author's pessimistic notion, first stated in a Kur'er article[30] and repeated by Ternovsky in K zvyozdam,[31] that man has always killed his prophets

Savva's death is all the more tragic as it is depicted as inevitable The gulf between the 'chosen few' and the 'weak souls' is so great as to be unbridgeable The responsibility for Savva's death, therefore, lies not only with the crowd but equally with Savva himself His major weakness, as Dr Woodward has indicated,[32] is his short-sightedness, he is guilty of the same sin that Andreyev had discerned in the

character of Gregers in Ibsen's The Wild Duck "он . страдает глупостью умных и сильных, неспособных понять чужой слабости и маломыслия"[33] The problem was one which had also occupied Gorky A number of his early works, notably Chelkash, Pesnya o Sokole and Kain i Artem had focussed on the same conflict between the strong and the weak In each of the works mentioned the conflict had remained unresolved, leaving the reader to draw the pessimistic conclusion contained in Pesnya o Sokole "Рожденный ползать - летать не может!"[34] Yet, in the years that followed, Gorky remained true to his conviction that the task of the revolutionary was to resurrect the weak by the force of his example This view was formulated most clearly by Stepan in Varvary

> Анна Что нужно делать?
> Степан Открывать глаза слепорожденным - больше вы ничего не можете сделать . ничего! 35

Even if the ultimate responsibility for spiritual enlightenment rests with the individual, it is the duty of the revolutionary to set an example, to 'open the eyes of the blind', as Stepan puts it In Savva Andreyev presents a more pessimistic view, suggesting that the 'blind' are incurable

Savva gives artistic expression to the fear contained in Andreyev's letter to Veresayev cited above that the 'second variant' (i e the defeat of revolution by the forces of Philistinism) was the more likely outcome of the 1905 Revolution What is more, Andreyev presents the victory of Philistinism not simply as a temporary setback to the cause of freedom, but as the perennial tragedy of the human condition As such, Savva provides an antidote to the optimism of Gorky's works of this period Indeed, the play may well have been intended as a deliberate polemic with Gorky Pyatnitsky noted in his diary for 16 June, 1906 "В лице Саввы изображен Горький"[36] Andreyev had presumably intimated as much to Gorky himself In reply to a letter from Andreyev which has been lost, Gorky wrote "Что Савва похож на меня - сие не суть важно"[37] The figure of Savva does indeed bear certain physical resemblances to Gorky, both the stoop and the sparse growth of beard are unmistakable Savva's speeches also bear the imprint of Gorky's rhetoric

> Настало время! Настало время! Ты слышишь? Земля выбрасывает вас. Нет вам места на земле! Нет! Он идет!.. Я вижу его! Он идет, свободный человек! Он родился в

пламени! Он сам - пламя и разрушение! Конец рабьей земле! 38

Savva's 'free man' is of course none other than Gorky's 'Man', a point which led one contemporary critic to undertake a comparison of the play with Gorky's Chelovek [39] It may be even more fruitful to compare Andreyev's work with Na dne (It will be remembered that the original idea for Savva came to Andreyev when Gorky was at work on his play) [40] The two works have a number of important features in common In each case the drama emerges as the result of the intrusion of an outsider into an established community, by which he is eventually rejected In each case also the tragedy derives from the conflict between truth and falsehood, knowledge and faith The essential difference between the two plays lies in the nature of their central characters if Savva is the emissary of Christ, the defender of truth and freedom, Luka is his opposite in every respect Although both men are eventually rejected by those they had hoped to help, the final impression is quite different Despite its tragic outcome, Na dne presents an optimistic vision of human nature, demonstrating that man will not consciously submit to the 'consoling lie', even if the truth proves too heavy a burden In Savva the vision is pessimistic the death of Savva reveals that man is prepared to ignore the truth in order to preserve the security of the 'consoling lie' and that the Philistine is hence invincible

B To Finland and back The 'rape' of revolution

Andreyev acquainted Gorky with his new play in March, 1906 in Glion, Switzerland, where Gorky stopped over for a fortnight before proceeding with his tour of Europe [41] The meeting came at an important time and may well have been prompted in part by the need, accepted by them both, to discuss the changes that had affected their relations during the previous year [42] The summer months in Finland had resulted, as we have seen, in a conflict of opinion over the question of political commitment, causing Andreyev to demonstrate his independence by publishing Tak bylo outside Znaniye [43] Andreyev was particularly concerned at the polarization of writers into rival literary schools, a point to which he repeatedly returned in his correspondence with Chulkov The very concept of a literary programme was totally alien to his view of art, for which reason he was equally critical of Symbolists and Realists alike "Какими иногда рабами самих себя, рабами слов и названий кажутся мне и Брюсов с В Ивановым, с одной стороны, и Горький - с другой", he complained to Chulkov [44] Chulkov's

Fakely, with its declared policy of independence from any literary or political platform, was therefore the obvious choice for Andreyev as an outlet for his works It was only due to pressure from Pyatnitsky, who visited Andreyev in Finland in June, 1906, that Savva was eventually published in Znaniye rather than in Fakely, which was the author's original intention [45]

Superficially at least, the Glion meeting was a considerable success as it restored the cordiality that had been lacking from recent relations between the two men Shortly after Gorky's departure, Andreyev wrote to Veresayev of their reconciliation "Горький, кстати, третьего дня уехал с Марией Федоровной в Америку. Пробыл здесь, в нашем пансионе, две недели и был мил, как только может быть мил, когда захочет" [46] Andreyev's optimism was further boosted by Gorky's favourable response to Savva, of which he informed Veresayev in the same letter [47] Gorky's immediate impression was recorded in a letter to Ladyzhnikov written soon after his departure from Switzerland

> На днях Леонид пришлет вам свою новую пьесу Из его последних произведений это - самое крупное и интересное по задаче Основная мысль должна вызвать горячие споры Как пьеса - это гораздо выше предыдущей Есть изумительно написанные роли - например, странник "Царь Ирод", послушник Вася Очень хороши все монахи, и сильно сделан герои пьесы Савва 48

The evidence of this letter contrasts strikingly with Gorky's later account of the Glion meeting in his memoirs of Andreyev Referring to Savva and the young inventor Ufimtsev, whose attempt to destroy an icon in Ufa had provided the initial inspiration for the play, he wrote

> Мне было грустно и досадно видеть, что Андреев исказил этот характер, еще не тронутый русской литературой, мне казалось, что в повести, как она была задумана, характер этот найдет и оценку и краски, достойные его Мы поспорили . . 49

K D Muratova has suggested that this inconsistency is due to Gorky confusing this episode with the argument over K zvyozdam [50] It is equally possible that his opinion of Savva changed in the following years (one detects in this passage a hint of the later altercations over T'ma) [51] It may even be the case that Gorky deliberately distorted the truth to suit his polemical purpose in Leonid Andreyev, a point to which we will return in the conclusion

Despite the amicable tone of their discussions and Gorky's positive response to Savva, Andreyev was aware of the great differences that stood between them On the very day of Gorky's departure from Glion, with the memory of their conversations still fresh in his mind, Andreyev wrote to Amfiteatrov illustrating the nature of their differences by means of a colourful and memorable image "Горький сам - Красное знамя, а я - Красный смех, нечто в политическом смысле никакого значения не имеющее" [52] He developed the point further in the same letter

> Правда, по существу моей литературной деятельности - я революционер - но это не то революционерство, которое требуется моментом . Нужна программа, нужна определенность, нужна наглость, а ничего этого у меня нет Я даже ни к какой партии не принадлежу [53]

From this passage in particular one gains the impression that Andreyev had become infected with Gorky's enthusiasm and felt a sincere desire to emulate his example by offering his active support to the revolutionary movement He followed the news of Gorky's progress through Europe and America with great interest and registered his indignation over the New York scandal in no uncertain manner [54] When events finally provided him with the opportunity of lending his voice to the revolutionary cause in Finland later that year, Andreyev did not shrink from the challenge [55]

Andreyev's original intention had been to return to Russia itself but he decided against this plan following a campaign against him by a number of reactionary newspapers [56] Instead, he moved to Finland, following the advice of Gorky, who had himself passed through the country quite recently en route for Europe [57] By the time of Andreyev's arrival in the spring of 1906 Finland had become the last stronghold of revolutionary opposition in the Russian Empire A few days after his arrival, he witnessed a massive May-Day demonstration in Helsinki which convinced him that the revolution was by no means dead By late June he was writing to Gorky "Любопытное положение, при котором и направо, и налево, и впереди - всюду революция. Нельзя сделать шага, который не был бы полезен революции" [58] It was presumably this desire to be useful to the revolution that prompted Andreyev to attend the congress of the Finnish Red Guard, which took place in Helsinki on 9 and 10 July [59] On the second day of the congress the proceedings were interrupted by the news that the Duma had

been dissolved V Smirnov, who was present at the time, recalled the episode in his memoirs

> Во время самого митинга была получена телеграмма о разгоне царем Государственной Думы На трибуну поднялся взволнованный писатель Леонид Андреев со словами "Виселица Николаю 11" Так начал он свою ультрареволюционную речь 60

On the following day, together with members of the disbanded Duma, Andreyev was invited to address a protest meeting, at which the young Zamyatin was present [61] According to the police report of the meeting, Andreyev pronounced a speech 'highly seditious in content' in which he 'directly incited the people to armed revolt' [62] Like all radicals, Andieyev undoubtedly hoped that the dissolution of the Duma would prove to be the signal for renewed revolutionary activity leading to the complete overthrow of the Tsarist regime Such hopes were misplaced, however, as the revolutionary forces were quite uncoordinated and disorganized The abortive revolts at Sveaborg and Kronstadt proved beyond doubt that the government now had the situation under control

The defeat of the Sveaborg mutiny on 20 July made Andreyev's continued presence in Finland dangerous and, with the possibility of returning to Russia now positively out of the question, he went back to Berlin after spending two uncomfortable weeks in hiding [63] The Sveaborg defeat left an indelible impression upon him and it was with undisguised disillusionment that he wrote to Pyatnitsky latei in the year

> . во мне "прекрасная Финляндия" вызывала постоянную и энергичную тошноту - ибо в истории всяких предательств Свеаборг займет не последнее место Это была не случайная измена, ошибка - это было массовое, неудержимое и в значительной части своей сознательное движение по стопам Иуды 64

Soon afterwards, in a lettei to Gorky, he stated bluntly "Не на кого надеяться русской революции, мало друзей у свободы, и нет у нее горячих любовников" [65] In his eyes the events of the summer had confirmed the gloomy prophesy contained in Savva, he was convinced that he had witnessed the 'rape' of revolution, an idea which emerges quite clearly from Pamyati Vladimira Mazurina, a pamphlet written in September, 1906 [66]

Vladimir Mazurin, the subject of Andreyev's article, was a Socialist-Revolutionary who had been imprisoned in the Tagan prison at

the time of the author's brief incarceration in 1905 After his release, Mazurin had continued to conduct his terrorist activities, which included several daring 'expropriations' Eventually arrested on 29 August, 1906, Mazurin was executed three days later [67] Written under the immediate impact of Mazurin's execution, Andreyev's pamphlet is a highly emotional piece of writing The theme, as Chulkov has noted, is developed 'not socially (obshchestvenno), but personally' [68] Making no reference to Mazurin's political views, the author concentrates solely upon his human qualities, which win him the respect of his fellow-prisoners and captors alike The article ends on an emotive note

> Бедная Россия! Осиротелая мать! Отнимают от тебя твоих лучших детей, в клочья рвут твое сердце Кровавым всходит солнце твоей свободы, - но оно взойдет, оно взойдет! И когда станешь ты свободна, не забудь тех, кто отдал за тебя жизнь . Память Владимиру Мазурину, память 69

Pamyati Vladimira Mazurina is a humanistic appeal, a personal statement of the author's reaction to the defeat of the 1905 Revolution It is not a political pamphlet in the full sense of the word as can be appreciated by a comparison of Andreyev's work with Gorky's Delo Nikolaya Shmita which deals with a similar subject Unlike Andreyev, Gorky gives the details of Nikolay Shmidt's case in order to present a reasoned critique of police and judicial procedure in Russia, Shmidt is of interest to him not so much as an individual but rather as an innocent victim of injustice Andreyev's pamphlet, on the other hand, is a cri de coeur and Mazurin the symbol of desecrated freedom

C Zhizn' Cheloveka Man is dead, long live Man!

The spectre of Sveaborg was to haunt Andreyev throughout the following months in Germany Like Gorky, he was particularly horrified by the behaviour of the 'onlookers', who had contributed to the defeat of the revolution by adopting a philosophy of noninvolvement [70] Reviewing recent events in a letter to Pyatnitsky, he observed

> Несчастная Красная Гвардия . . открыла пропасть между финским пролетариатом и всей остальной Финляндией . Я говорю "всей остальной Финляндией", потому что не только буржуа по классу, но и бесштанные финские интеллигенты были на стороне невмешательства в "русские дела" и палили в красногвардейцев из ружей 71

Andreyev saw in the behaviour of the Finns yet another manifestation of the Philistine spirit he had encountered in Switzerland and Germany The news of Gorky's fate at the hands of American public opinion convinced him further that the disease was universal In the autumn he wrote to his brother Pavel

> Совершенно согласен насчет непроходимой глупости Это и есть ужасное, от чего скучно и противно жить А когда почувствуешь, что, кроме российской, есть глупость немецкая, французская, американская, всесветная, то становится обидно Не знаю, удастся ли мне когда-нибудь вылечиться от отвращения к человеку кажется, переходит в хроническое В соответствии с этим чувством объявляю человеку войну 72

Andreyev's first major offensive in his 'war on man' was the play Zhizn' Cheloveka in which he developed his 'disgust' with man's 'stupidity' into a devastating endictment of modern civilization

For his new play Andreyev chose a dramatic form in keeping with the universality of its theme, namely, that of a mystery play, an innovation which earned him the praise of such diverse critics as Gorky, Blok and Belyy [73] As the title suggests, Zhizn' Cheloveka presents a generalized scheme of human life in five 'pictures', each of which corresponds to a significant stage in the life of man The form may well have been suggested by such popular symbolic pictures as the one which Gorky describes in Troye The picture, entitled Stupeni chelovecheskogo veka is a source of inspiration to Il'ya Lunyov and epitomizes the Philistine concept of success and happiness to which he has dedicated his life

> Сидя за самоваром, Илья поглядывал на картину, и ему было приятно видеть жизнь человека, размеренную так аккуратно и просто От картины веяло спокойствием, яркие краски ее улыбались словно уверяя, что ими мудро написана, для примера людям, настоящая жизнь, именно так написана, как она должна идти 74

Andreyev's play, like Gorky's novel, sets out to challenge the sanctity of this bourgeois ideal

Zhizn' Cheloveka is in effect a grotesque parody of Lunyov's Stupeni chelovecheskogo veka In Andreyev's version, Man achieves fame and fortune only to be reduced ultimately to abject poverty and misery The result is precisely the opposite of that achieved by Lunyov's picture, if Stupeni chelovecheskogo veka encourages its owner in the

pursuit of worldly success, Zhizn' Cheloveka exposes the utter vanity of such aspirations Andreyev does not limit his attack against bourgeois complacency to the simple presentation of the transience of success and happiness More importantly, he exposes the essential worthlessness of the entire set of values by which success and happiness are measured This is particularly apparent in the third 'picture', Bal u Cheloveka, which supposedly represents the summit of Man's achievement Throughout this scene Andreyev stresses the disparity between illusion and reality the orchestra at the ball plays out of tune, the Friends, Relatives and Guests display neither friendship, kinship or interest, but rather hatred, envy or indifference to their host The life of Man, therefore, is not really life at all, it is merely the ritual observance of forms devoid of content, a truth which is revealed to Man in the final 'picture' In its original version, this picture was similar in style and purpose to the madhouse scene in Ibsen's Peer Gynt The sight of the Drunkards, each tormented by his own delirium, yet indifferent to the suffering of his fellows, presents Man with a terrifying insight into the real nature of a society dedicated to the pursuit of personal success

Despite the obvious difference of the form employed, Andreyev's critique of capitalist civilization in Zhizn' Cheloveka shares a number of common features with Gorky's indictment of American society in the 'American sketches' Andreyev himself had a high opinion of the 'Sketches', which he had read only a short time before he began work on Zhizn' Cheloveka On 18 September, 1906 he wrote to Pyatnitsky "Прочел здесь все вещи Максимыча От американских очерков в восторге сильно, красиво, жестоко Хорошо'"[75] It is not difficult to see why Gorky's criticism of American society for its dependence on material values (Gorod Zhyoltogo D'yavola), for its pursuit of worthless pleasures (Tsarstvo skuki) and the resultant alienation of the individual (Mob) should appeal to Andreyev as these are the very elements of modern society which he singles out for censure in Zhizn' Cheloveka

Yet Andreyev's purpose in this play extends beyond the critique of capitalist society outlined above to provide a statement on human nature itself Of central importance to this broader concern is the figure of 'Someone in Grey', whose ubiquitous presence is employed by the author to symbolize man's awareness of his mortality The figure

is vague and deliberately so, 'Someone-in-Grey' is given no specific name and no specific colour in order to stress the mysteriousness of the concept which he represents Far more tangible are the reactions of the various characters to 'Someone-in-Grey' In the majority, like the Old Women in the first picture, the presence of 'Someone-in-Grey' inspires a fatalistic attitude to life, which is reflected in the repeated refrain "Разве вам не все равно?"[76] Others, like the Wife of Man, are unable to tolerate such indifference Herself the victim of life's injustice (the tragic and senseless death of her son), Man's Wife finds solace in her faith in a higher justice, which she expresses in her prayers "Господи Боже! Будь нам милосердным и добрым Отцом"[77] Her development illustrates an idea contained in a letter of 1904 to Nevedomsky "Уверенность, что где-нибудь да должно быть справедливость и совершенное знание о смысле жизни - вот та утроба, которая ежедневно рождает нового бога"[78] This remark had been made in reference to Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo and Man's Wife clearly belongs to the same category as the hero of that story Her prayers are as demonstrably ineffective as those of Fiveysky, a point which is emphasized in the play by the silent presence of 'Someone-in-Grey', who is visibly unmoved throughout her impassioned appeal

Of the characters in Zhizn' Cheloveka Man alone adopts an active attitude towards 'Someone-in-Grey' Unable to accept the inevitability of fate, he is equally sceptical about the power of prayer Instead, he offers a proud challenge to 'Someone-in-Grey'

> Эй Ты, как Тебя там зовут рок, дьявол или жизнь, я бросаю Тебе перчатку, зову Тебя на бой! Малодушные люди преклоняются пред Твоею загадочною властью, Твое каменное лицо внушает им ужас, в Твоем молчании они слышат зарождение бед и грозное падение их А я смел и силен, и зову Тебя на бой 79

The success and happiness which Man achieves almost immediately after he has uttered these words would seem at first to vindicate his boldness and represent his victory over 'Someone-in-Grey' In the fourth picture, however, we discover the falsity of this 'victory', which was as much the product of chance as the tragic death of his son His eventual fall may be seen, therefore, as a punishment for his pride Andreyev makes it clear, however, that Man, although beaten, is not totally defeated In the original version of the final picture, one

of the drunkards remarks "Твердо уверен, что тут есть ошибка Когда из прямой линии выходит замкнутый круг, то это - абсурд" [80] The 'vicious circle' to which the drunkard refers is of course the 'iron circle of predestination' which 'Someone-in-Grey' depicts as the inescapable fate of all men [81]

The suggestion that Man has fallen victim to an 'absurd mistake' is developed far more clearly in the second version of the final picture, which was written, on Andreyev's own admission, to elucidate 'the basic conception of the play' [82] Of vital importance are the remarks (they can hardly be considered a 'stage direction') which precede Man's final curse in this new version

> И вдруг точно видит все Видит злобно насторожившихся старух, блудливо заигрывающих со смертью, видит разрушение, и мрак, и смерть, царящие вокруг, видит как будто впервые каменный лик Некоего в Сером и свечу копотно догорающую в руке Его 83

Andreyev had described a similar moment of enlightenment in an earlier article on Ibsen's When we dead awaken

> - Что непоправимо, мы видим лишь, когда мы, мертвые, пробуждаемся
> - Что же мы видим?
> - Мы видим, что мы никогда не жили 84

Man's final curse derives from the sudden realisation that 'he has never lived', that he has sacrificed his life to the pursuit of an empty form Significantly, it is at this point only that Man becomes fully aware of the insidious power of 'Someone-in-Grey' (hence the reference to Man seeing the face of 'Someone-in-Grey' 'as if for the first time') Man now realises that 'Someone-in-Grey' is the source of the Philistinism which has diverted human life from its true purpose and transformed it into living death (It is perhaps no coincidence that Gorky also chose grey as the distinguishing colour of Philistinism in O Serom and Zametki o meshchanstve) With his dying breath Man curses 'Someone-in-Grey' "Где мой оруженосец? - Где мой меч? - Где мой щит? - Я обезоружен' - Скорее ко мне' - Скорее' - Будь проклят'"[85] The final words of 'Someone-in-Grey', who proclaims that 'Man is dead',[86] are therefore ironical, Man's final enlightenment is a pledge of the immortal will to conquer the seemingly invincible

Despite his praise of Zhizn' Cheloveka as an 'attempt to create a new form of drama',[87] Gorky was critical of the play's content He took particular exception to the figure of Man, as he informed the

author himself towards the end of the year

> В жизни твоего человека - почти нет человеческой жизни, а то, что есть - слишком условно, не реально Человек поэтому вышел очень незначителен - ниже и слабее, чем он есть в действительности, менее интересен 88

In the light of his own allegorical depiction of human endeavour in O Serom and, particularly, in Chelovek, Gorky's criticism of Andreyev's play for being 'too abstract' and not 'realistic' is somewhat unexpected Furthermore, it would seem that Gorky, along with the majority of contemporary critics, was guilty of a total misreading of the author's purpose, interpreting the play as an expression of a fatalistic world-view Such a misunderstanding would be ironic, as a comparison of Zhizn' Cheloveka with Gorky's own Chelovek reveals an astonishing proximity between the two writers

Let us examine Zhizn' Cheloveka in the light of Gorky's Chelovek In Gorky's work, Man is presented as an individual isolated in a world dominated by prejudice and falsehood In his struggle to defend his freedom and to conquer the powers of evil that threaten him, his only weapon is Thought

> Вооруженный только силою Мысли, которая то молнии подобна, то холодна, точно меч, - идет свободный, гордый Человек Мысль для меня есть вечный и единственно неложный маяк во мраке жизни, огонь во тьме ее позорных заблуждений 89

Andreyev's Man also recognises his rationality as his most powerful weapon in the battle against 'Someone-in-Grey' The similarity is all the more striking as Andreyev's imagery echoes that employed by Gorky

> У Тебя каменный лоб, лишенный разума, - бросаю в него раскаленные ядра моей сверкающей мысли, у Тебя каменное сердце, лишенное жалости, - сторонись, я лью в него горячую отраву мятежных криков' Черною тучею Твоего свирепого гнева затмится солнце, - мы мечами осветим тьму 90

Apart from his reliance on Thought, Gorky's Man is also characterized by his 'sacred Pride' [91] "Я вижу его гордое чело . Но Мысль горда, и Человек ей дорог" [92] It is pride also which distinguishes Andreyev's Man from all the other characters in Zhizn' Cheloveka Even when persuaded by his wife to betray his convictions by praying for the life of his son to be spared, Man is unable to humble himself completely, as his wife herself is quick to appreciate "Я боюсь,

что не совсем смиренна была твоя молитва, мой друг В ней как будто звучала гордость" [93]

The parallels between Zhizn' Cheloveka and Chelovek do not end with the affinity in the characterization of Man as the repository of Thought and Pride Also common to both works is the conception of those powers which represent the greatest threat to Man In Chelovek, Gorky had identified the most dangerous enemies of freedom in the personified concepts of death, friendship, hope and faith Death is introduced as follows

> Она (т.е Мысль, А.Б) в борьбу вступает и со смертью ей, из животного создавшей Человека, ей, сотворившей множества богов, системы философские, науки - ключи к загадкам мира, - свободной и бессмертной Мысли - противна и враждебна эта сила, бесплодная и часто глупо злая 94

In Andreyev's play it is 'Someone-in-Grey' who corresponds exactly to the figure of Death in Chelovek, a 'sterile and often stupidly evil' power against which Andreyev's Man, just like Gorky's, 'enters into battle' Equally striking is Gorky's description of Friendship, which reads like a blueprint for Andreyev's portrayal of the Friends of Man in Zhizn' Cheloveka "Мысль освещает в дряблом сердце Дружбы ее расчетливую осторожность, ее жестокое, пустое любопытство и зависти гнилые пятна, и клеветы зародыши на них". [95]

The most serious threat to Man's pursuit of freedom in Chelovek is presented not by Death or Friendship, however, but by Faith and Hope Andreyev's Man also is exposed to the debilitating influences of hope and faith when confronted with the certain knowledge of his son's imminent death His prayer in fact signifies his momentary resignation to the temptation of hope, as 'Someone-in-Grey' notes with pleasure "Крепко и радостно уснул Человек, обольщенный надеждами" [96] The main weakness of Andreyev's Man, however, lies not in this temporary lapse but in his inability to perceive until the last moment the absolute worthlessness of the values by which he had lived This is the danger against which Gorky had warned specifically in Chelovek

> Но если Человек отравлен ядом Лжи, неизлечимо и грустно верит, что на земле нет счастья выше полноты желудка и души, нет наслаждении выше сытости, покоя и мелких жизненных удобств, тогда в плену ликующего чувства печально опускает крылья Мысли и - дремлет, оставляя Человека во власти его сердца 97

The 'Falsehood' to which Gorky refers is reflected in Man's dream of worldly success in the second picture of Zhizn' Cheloveka, which is founded on the same ideals of 'comfort', 'calm' and 'satiety' Hence the enlightenment of Man in the final scene of Andreyev's play corresponds exactly to the statement by Gorky's Man "Я вижу власть постыдна и скучна, богатство - тяжело и глупо, а слава - предрассудок, возникший из неумения людей ценить самих себя и рабской их привычки унижаться" [98]

Given the very considerable similarities between Zhizn' Cheloveka and Chelovek, Gorky's criticism of Andreyev's play would seem all the more inexplicable Yet we should avoid the temptation to interpret this reaction as a sign of his 'complete inability to appreciate Andreyev's purpose' [99] A closer reading of the letter from Gorky cited above reveals that he was, in fact, fully aware of the author's purpose and that his criticism was directed solely against the weaknesses in Andreyev's realization of this purpose in the finished work His advice to Andreyev is designed almost exclusively, therefore, to indicate those aspects of the play which make its overall meaning insufficiently clear

That Gorky's criticism was in the main quite justified is borne out by the subsequent fate of Zhizn' Cheloveka The overwhelming majority of contemporary critics saw the play as the embodiment of an unambiguously pessimistic philosophy, an impression which was created in particular by Meyerkhol'd's production at the Kommissarzhevskaya Theatre [100] Andreyev expressed his disapproval of this production publicly[101] and when he learnt of Stanislavsky's intention of staging the play at the Moscow Art Theatre, he sent the director a detailed letter in which he explained his exact view of how Zhizn' Cheloveka should be performed in order to correspond with his intentions [102] But even Stanislavsky's production failed to correct the fundamental misunderstanding of its meaning, as Andreyev noted with regret in a letter to Kipen [103] It was as a final effort to redress the balance that Andreyev rewrote the crucial fifth picture in 1908, the need for which had been indicated by Gorky some two years previously [104] Despite these changes the play was taken by his contemporaries as an apology of fatalism and, as such, it worked to the detriment of 'revolutionary literature', much as Gorky feared it would Within a year, however, Gorky was to adopt a more militant stance, claiming that Andreyev's works were 'anti-revolutionary' in conception Such was the profundity of the change which was to affect their relations in the early months of the following year, when

the two men were together on Capri

Zhizn' Cheloveka was intended by Andreyev as the introduction to a whole series of plays, as he informed Nemirovich-Danchenko in May, 1907

> "Жизнь Человека" является первою в цикле пьес, связанных односторонностью формы и неразрывным единством основной идеи За "Жизнью Человека" идет "жизнь человеческая", которая будет изображена в четырех пьесах "Царь Голод", "Война", "Революция" и "Бог, дьявол и человек" Таким образом "Жизнь Человека" является необходимым вступлением, как по форме, так и по содержанию, в этот цикл, которому я смею придавать весьма большое значение 105

This statement makes it quite plain that Zhizn' Cheloveka was of crucial importance to his conception of revolution Although only one of the plays in the projected series (Tsar' Golod) was completed, the author's overall intention can be further implied from the following remarks to Veresayev about the final play in the series

> Будет еще пьеса "Бог, человек и дьявол" Человек - воплощение мысли Дьявол - представитель покоя, тишины, порядка и закономерности Бог - представитель движения, разрушения, борьбы 106

Andreyev's remarks suggest the correctness of the present interpretation of Zhizn' Cheloveka and indicate the proximity with Gorky, who also saw mankind confronted with the choice between the powers of revolution and Philistinism

D Capri Faith and scepticism Iuda Iskariot i drugiye

Zhizn' Cheloveka was the last work to be completed by Andreyev during the lifetime of his first wife, who died in Berlin of a post-natal blood infection on 28 November, 1906 (N S) [107] This death was, in the words of a recent critic, 'the greatest tragedy of his life',[108] a view which is shared by the majority of the writer's biographers [109] According to Veresayev, who knew the couple well, the marriage had been 'exceptionally happy'[110] and Gorky wrote of Andreyev's wife that she combined wifely love with maternal solicitude, the highest compliment he could pay any woman [111] Veresayev even went so far as to suggest that she was the 'living embodiment' of her husband's 'artistic conscience',[112] an opinion which is endorsed by many of Andreyev's own statements [113] Her tragic death reduced Andreyev to a state of profound depression and emotional instability, which is described most graphically in Veresayev's

memoirs

> Смерть Александры Михайловны как будто вынула из его души какой-то очень нужный винтик, без которого все в душе пришло в расстройство Исчезла вера в себя и в свои силы, он жадно хватался за всякое одобрение и всякую весть об успехе его произведений. 114

It was in this frame of mind that, together with his mother and his son, Vadim, he left Berlin for Capri, where Gorky, on hearing of Aleksandra Mikhaylovna's death, had repeatedly urged Andreyev to join him[115]

It can have taken little persuasion to induce Andreyev to go back on his original intention of returning to Moscow and to undertake instead the journey to Capri, where he arrived at the end of the year[116] Despite his growing awareness of the serious differences threatening their relationship, Andreyev still regarded Gorky as a mentor and had missed him greatly during his absence in America Significantly, it was to Gorky alone that he had confided his innermost thoughts on the ultimate failure of the 1905 Revolution Indeed, when he heard of Gorky's return to Europe, it had been his immediate thought to visit his friend in Italy On 13 October, the day of Gorky's triumphal arrival in Naples,[117] Andreyev had written a long letter expressing the desire to discuss with him 'many important matters'[118] But in the tragic circumstances which precipitated his journey to Capri in December, 1906 it was not so much intellectual stimulation as emotional solace that Andreyev was to demand from his friend

In the event, Gorky proved by no means the ideal companion for Andreyev in his hour of need Although genuinely concerned for Andreyev's welfare, to which both his letters to Ladyzhnikov and the memoirs of his wife testify,[119] he was unable to provide the kind of consolation that Andreyev craved The early months on Capri were, as we have seen, a period of intense activity for Gorky His growing involvement in the affairs of the Bolshevik party and the resumption of his duties as editor of the Znaniye miscellanies left him little time for Andreyev's emotional problems What is more, he had himself firmly resolved not to allow matters of a peisonal nature distract him from what he considered to be more vital issues In October, 1906, he had written to his wife "Я живу отнюдь не для собственного удовольствия и если дорожу своей энергией, не желаю тратить ее драмы, так это потому, что я хочу и могу употребить ее с

большей пользой"[120] It was his hope that Andreyev, once on Capri, would be inspired to emulate his example and to seek oblivion by immersing himself in work Just a few days before Andreyev's arrival, he had written to Grzhebin "У Андреева умерла жена Но через десять дней он будет здесь, и я его попробую заставить работать"[121]

Gorky's expectations, however sincere, reveal his total inability or unwillingness to appreciate Andreyev's nature Always prone to instability, Andreyev had immediately lost confidence in his literary ability following the death of his wife and hence was a thoroughly unsuitable subject for Gorky's 'work therapy' He found an outlet for his grief not in literary activity, but in alcohol, a weakness he had inherited from his father and which he had managed to control mainly due to the efforts of his wife In a state of almost continual drunkenness he sank into morbid introspection which, in turn, intensified his depression To Gorky this behaviour was as inexplicable as it was exasperating Despite his sympathy for his friend, he found it impossible to condone his excesses and could not conceal his disgust at the scandalous affair which had taken place during his absence from the island in the spring of 1907,[122] following which Andreyev had found it expedient to make a hasty departure On his return to Capri, Gorky described the affair to Ladyzhnikov "Андреев напился и наскандалил здесь на всю Италию, черт его дери' Оттого он и сбежал столь скоропалительно Кого-то столкнул в воду, и вообще - поддержал честь культурного человека и русского писателя"[123] The incident obviously repelled Gorky for the same reason as the similar Nizhniy Novgorod scandal of 1903, which had led to a short break in their relations[124] For Gorky it was an article of faith that the Russian writer should set an impeccable moral standard not only in his writings but also in his actions[125] Although his letters of the following months reveal a continued concern for Andreyev's health and well-being,[126] he could not forgive him for his dishonourable conduct and personal relations between the two writers were never to regain their previous warmth

Andreyev himself was no less disappointed than Gorky in the outcome of the Capri meeting Only a few weeks after his arrival on the island, he hinted at the source of his discontent in a letter to Chirikov "Горький очень милый, и любит меня, и я очень люблю - но от жизни, простой жизни с ее болями он так же далек, как

картинная галлерея какая-нибудь Во всяком случае мне приятно - хоть часть души находит удовлетворение" [127] A similar complaint is to be found in a letter to Veresayev, to whom Andreyev confided that of all the people on Capri at that time it was to Pyatnitsky alone that he could 'open his soul' [128] The full degree of Andreyev's mortification can be judged from a letter to Gorky, written five years after the event

> Ты странный, я знаю, как ты не любишь аскетизм, а в то же время ты аскет я не встречал человека, который так упорно и жестоко умерщвлял бы личную жизнь, личный разговор, личные страдания. Почти полгода прожил я на Капри бок о бок с тобою, переживал невыносимые и опасные штурмы и дранги, искал участия и совета именно в личной, переломившейся жизни - и говорил с тобою только о литературе и общественности Это факт живя с тобою рядом, я ждал приезда Вересаева, чтобы с ним посоветоваться - кончать мне с собой или нет' 129

If Andreyev had failed Gorky as a writer, Gorky had failed Andreyev as a friend

Andreyev's distress at the deterioration of his personal relations with Gorky was augmented by his dissatisfaction with the latter's growing intransigence on the questions of literature and society which they discussed during these months on Capri Andreyev himself was in no doubt as to the cause of Gorky's growing inflexibility and a number of his letters of this period contain cryptic comments on this subject In a letter to Veresayev, for example, we find the following statement about his meetings with Gorky "Я вижу его часто и с большим удовольствием Видел бы еще чаще, если бы . но об этом можно говорить, а не писать" [130] Writing to Serafimovich, he was slightly more specific "Житьишко здесь - неважное Единственный человек - Горький, да и тот что-то не ладен Сузился он сильно, и путаница у него в мозгах изрядная - но об этом нужно говорить много и доказательно" [131] The 'narrowness' of which Andreyev complains in this letter is undoubtedly a reference to Gorky's political allegiances, of which he had warned Serafimovich back in the summer of 1905 [132] Gorky was visited by a number of prominent Bolsheviks during the period of Andreyev's residence on Capri, [133] a factor which no doubt contributed considerably to the latter's dissatisfaction In a letter to Chirikov he made the following dismissive remark about

Gorky's 'party comrades' "Остальное же, что вокруг Горького, только раздражает" [134] Andreyev had ample cause to resent the presence of the Bolsheviks on Capri On the one hand, Gorky was quite obviously prepared to devote more time to his party colleagues than he was to Andreyev and his personal problems On the other hand, he also looked upon the Bolsheviks as a 'corrupting' influence on Gorky, encouraging his extremist views at a time when he, Andreyev, was seeking to exert a moderating influence upon his friend's attitude to literature

At the centre of the debate on literature between Gorky and Andreyev during these months stood the question of the editorial policy of the Znaniye miscellanies So urgent was this problem that Pyatnitsky himself had also come to Capri to take part in the discussions [135] During 1905, Gorky had exploited the temporary lapse in preliminary censorship to publish works of an overtly revolutionary character, a trend which intensified in 1906 From the seventh miscellany onwards, the Znaniye volumes were devoted almost exclusively to the theme of the 1905 Revolution In prose, first-hand descriptions of events, such as Serafimovich's Na Presne (1906, X) and Kipen's V oktyabre (1906, XI), appeared alongside fictional works which depicted current developments in a realistic and, at times, naturalistic manner Serafimovich, Teleshov and Yushevich wrote of the revolution in the cities whilst Skitalets and Chirikov dealt with events in the Russian countryside In poetry, with the notable exception of Bunin's highly polished lyrics, 'revolutionary pathos' was very much the order of the day [136] Gorky himself had actively encouraged the Znaniye writers to concentrate on the theme of revolution[137] and had extensively edited many of these works during 1905 [138] The reimposition of censorship and the changed political climate of the post-revolutionary period made the continuation of this overtly revolutionary policy difficult, if not foolhardy Pyatnitsky, who had the unenviable task of steering the miscellanies through the ever more vigilant censorship network soon began to warn Gorky of the dangers involved Although none of Pyatnitsky's letters has been discovered, the substance of his views can be ascertained from Gorky's replies to them In October, 1906, for example, he sought to allay Pyatnitsky's fears as follows "Нас ругают? Ну, что ж? Так ли ругаются во Франции! То ли пишут в Америке! И что еще будут писать о нас!"[139]

Pyatnitsky could hardly have been moved by Gorky's bravado As business organizer of Znaniye, he was deeply concerned also by the sharp, although as yet not disastrous, fall in demand for the miscellanies [140] Probably more serious in his eyes was the reimposition of censorship and the increasing interest of the police in Znaniye affairs On 20 December, 1905, the offices of the firm were searched and the Marxist brochures in the Deshyovaya biblioteka series confiscated [141] This was the first in a long series of reprisals against Znaniye In the period between 1906 and 1913, the firm was taken to court no less than 23 times [142] There can thus be little doubt that, when Pyatnitsky arrived on Capri at the end of 1906, he hoped to convince Gorky of the need to abandon an editorial policy which was no longer in keeping with the changed circumstances in Russia

Andreyev's role in the discussions between Gorky and Pyatnitsky was predictable It will be remembered that he had always had considerable doubts about the tendentiousness of the miscellanies [143] His opinion of the more recent miscellanies can be deduced from the indirect evidence contained in a number of letters of this period Outlining the plan of a new drama Tsar' Golod to Stanislavsky, for example, Andreyev took great pains to emphasize its apolitical nature "Это отнюдь не какая-нибудь политическая злободневщина, которые (sic) я сам ненавижу" [144] His position is further clarified in a letter to Nemirovich-Danchenko, written at approximately the same time

> Эпохи я не оставляю, это уже факт, об этом свидетельствуют мои рассказы Но хорошие пьесы писать буду - это также факт. И как в беллетристике моей, я останусь в них все тем же ирреалистом, врагом быта - факта - текущего Проблема бытия - вот чему безвозвратно отдана мысль моя, и ничто не заставит меня свернуть в сторону [145]

Although Znaniye is not mentioned by name, the target of Andreyev's criticism is unmistakable

The outcome of the discussions on Capri was the decision, in January, 1907, that Andreyev should take over from Gorky as editor of the miscellanies later in the year [146] Chirikov even suggests that Andreyev went to Capri as the elected spokesman of the Znaniye writers to demand just that, [147] although this version of events seems unlikely, given the general untrustworthiness of Chirikov's memoirs, which were written with the transparent purpose of damaging Gorky's reputation [148]

Once established as editor elect of the miscellanies, Andreyev wasted no time in informing his fellow contributors of the changeover He was particularly anxious that his own editorial policy should not be confused with that pursued by Gorky In February, he wrote to Muyzhel' "В редактирование сборниками я вступлю только с осени, теперешние же сборники составляются целиком Горьким и Пятницким, и кажется материал набран вплоть до осени" [149] The basic principles of Andreyev's own editorial policy were set out in a letter to Bunin later in the year

> Программа простая и выполнимая давать только наилучшее. Несколько расширить и освежить состав сотрудников. Тенденцию свести к minimum'у, а то и совсем на нет Педерастией, скотоложством и онанизмом не заниматься [150]

The aim was to steer a middle course between the excesses of 'party literature', on the one hand, and the current vogue for literature dealing with sexual themes, on the other It was an attempt to revive the spirit of the Sreda group, whose guiding philosophy had been realistic art with a democratic tendency [151] Significantly, Andreyev's Sreda colleagues were the first to be invited to contribute to the new miscellanies

Gorky shared none of Andreyev's views on the future policy for the miscellanies and presumably accepted him as editor only under pressure from Pyatnitsky From the very outset he subjected Andreyev's plans to close scrutiny He was especially critical of Andreyev's intention to open Znaniye to a wider group of contributors, which was even to include writers of the Symbolist school In his memoirs of the Capri period, Desnitsky later wrote

> Я помню неоднократные горячие споры на эту тему между М Горьким и Л Андреевым во время их встреч на Капри Л Андреев отходил от Горького, указывая на упадок интереса публики к сборникам "Знание", настаивая на привлечении новых сотрудников, прежде всего символистов [152]

These arguments were not the end of the matter, within a few months, as we shall see in the next section, Gorky's interference proved sufficiently stubborn to cause Andreyev to abandon all plans for editing the miscellanies

In spite of (and perhaps even because of) the friction between the two writers over personal and literary affairs, the months on Capri turned out to be something of a 'Boldino autumn' in Andreyev's career

Between his bouts of drunkenness and depression he wrote or conceived a number of important works, a point which is stressed in Gorky's memoirs Referring to the story Iuda Iskariot i drugiye, he wrote

> Этим рассказом он начал один из наиболее плодотворных периодов своего творчества На Капри он затеял пьесу "Черные маски", написал злую юмореску "Любовь к ближнему", рассказ "Тьма", создал план "Сашки Жегулева", сделал наброски пьесы "Океан" и написал несколько глав - две или три - повести "Мои записки" 153

It is no exaggeration to suggest that almost all of Andreyev's works of the next few years were written under the impact of the months spent with Gorky on Capri The stories and plays completed during this period examine themes which are central to Gorky's own works of the same period, themes which had been inspired in both cases by the experience of 1905 Gorky dwells upon this point in his memoirs

> На "Собрании сочинений", которое Леонид подарил мне в 1915 г , он написал "Начиная с курьерского "Баргамота", здесь все писалось и прошло на твоих глазах, Алексей во многом это - история наших отношений"
> Это, к сожалению, верно, к сожалению - потому, что я думаю для Л.Андреева было бы лучше, если бы он не вводил в свои рассказы "историю наших отношений" А он делал это слишком охотно и, торопясь "опровергнуть" мои мнения, портил этим свои обедни И как будто именно в мою личность он воплотил своего невидимого врага 154

This statement raises two questions of vital importance First, to what extent do Andreyev's works reflect the 'history of his relations' with Gorky? Secondly, what justification is there for Gorky's conclusion that Andreyev identified in him 'his invisible enemy'? In the remainder of this chapter, we will attempt to provide an answer to these questions on the basis of Andreyev's works of the Capri and immediate post-Capri periods We will begin with Iuda Iskariot i drugiye, the first of Andreyev's works to be completed on Capri

Andreyev's new story provides a valuable insight into the nature of his creative process Unlike Kuprin, who undertook long and detailed research before embarking upon his own story on a biblical subject, Sulamif', Andreyev deliberately ignored the numerous scholarly and literary works devoted to the crucifixion [155] His principal concern was not with historical accuracy or sociological details but with a

psychological conflict of a timeless nature As a result, his approach to the subject is highly original Unlike the biblical account, Andreyev's story concentrates on the enigmatic conflict between Christ and Judas rather than Christ's relations with the other disciples

Iuda Iskariot represents a complete reevaluation of the traditional interpretation of the confrontation between Christ and Judas and the narrative structure employed in the story harmonizes perfectly with this aim In the opening sections of the story, Christ and Judas are viewed almost exclusively through the eyes of the other disciples Their attitude is typified by that of Thomas

> Он внимательно разглядел Христа и Иуду, сидевших рядом, и эта странная близость божественной красоты и чудовищного безобразия, человека с кротким взором и осьминога с огромными, неподвижными, тускло-жадными глазами угнетала его ум, как неразрешимая загадка 156

The emphasis on externals, which only too clearly identify Judas as Christ's antithesis, is maintained throughout the opening sections, indicating the superficiality of the disciples judgement and their inability to comprehend the 'insoluble enigma' which lies beneath the surface The disciples are encouraged in their view of Judas as Christ's enemy by the striking differences in their behaviour Christ is open and truthful, whereas Judas is secretive and dishonest, Christ inspires love and trust, Judas hostility and suspicion There would seem, therefore, ample justification for Thomas's outright condemnation of Judas "Теперь я верю, что отец твой - дьявол Это он научил тебя, Иуда" [157] Thomas's view coincides with the traditional interpretation of Christ and Judas as the embodiments of good and evil respectively, an interpretation which is seemingly demonstrated to be correct by Judas's subsequent betrayal of Christ into the hands of his executioners

As the narrative develops, however, the traditional view of Judas is consistently undermined and his relationship with Christ takes on a new significance This development is accompanied by a shift in the narrative viewpoint Having shown Judas as he is seen by the people around him, Andreyev gradually introduces the reader to his inner world This shift of viewpoint, which begins in the fifth section of the story, culminates in the description of the crucifixion and its aftermath, which are seen exclusively through the eyes of Judas In this way, the

reader is invited to appreciate the complexity of Judas's motives in betraying Christ and, at the same time, to reappraise his opinion of the other disciples As the story progresses, the latter are revealed in an increasingly unfavourable light Thomas emerges as an ignorant and unobservant positivist, Matthew as a pedantic bookworm, Peter and John as shallow egoists who compete foi the honour of being considered Jesus's iight-hand man The disciples are collectively discredited by their behaviour in the garden of Gethsemane, where they discuss mundane trivia and then sleep, oblivious to the impending tragedy, and then by their reaction to the airest itself, when Andreyev compares them to a 'bunch of frightened sheep' [158] Peter's rejection of Chiist and the acquiescence of the other disciples to the crucifixion itself aie the final condemnation, illustiating the truth of Judas's rhetorical question "Разве не всех учителей обманывали их ученики?"[159] Judas goes on to emphasize the gulf separating Christ and his disciples by means of a simile

> Когда дует сильный ветер, он поднимает сор
> И глупые люди смотрят на сор и говорят вот
> ветер' А это только сор, мой добрый Фома,
> ослиный помет, растоптанный ногами Вот
> встретил он стену и тихо лег у подножия ее,
> а ветер летит дальше, ветер летит дальше,
> мой добрый Фома' 160

Like dust swept along by the wind, the disciples are carried along by the impetus supplied by Christ and although they have adopted the form of Jesus's faith, they are alien to its essential nature The condemnation of the disciples is absolute and Andreyev makes no attempt to justify their behaviour nor to alleviate their guilt Significantly, he makes no mention of their subsequent role as apostles, which lies outside the scope of the story

If the author's approach to the characterization of the other disciples is iconoclastic, the converse is true of his depiction of Judas In the final analysis, Judas's betrayal of Christ is seen not as a simple act of treachery by an evil man but, paiadoxically, as a desperate attempt to save Christ from his inevitable fate Judas is the victim of a profound dualism which is reflected both in his contiadictory behaviour and in his outward appearance

> Двоилось также и лицо Иуды одна сторона
> его, с черным, остро высматривающим глазом,
> была живая, подвижная, охотно собиравшаяся
> в многочисленные кривые морщинки. На другой
> же не было морщин, и была она мертвенно-

> гладкая, плоская и застывшая, и хотя по величине она равнялась первой, но казалась огромной от широко открытого слепого глаза 161

The symbolic nature of this description becomes clear in the course of the story The 'live' half of Judas's face indicates his subconscious desire for faith, the 'dead' half his intellect, which continually questions the foundation of all faith Hence, his love of Christ, in whom he sees the promise of a new faith, is tempered by his knowledge of the evil reality of life which threatens to destroy it Judas undertakes the betrayal of Christ in order to resolve this conflict and to discover whether the good which Christ embodies has the power to overcome the evil of life

Judas is by no means indifferent to the outcome of his desperate experiment Although he 'preaches the sacrilegious lesson that man is naturally evil',[162] it is not out of a desire to see evil victorious On the contrary, Judas continually warns Christ and the disciples of evil in order that they should thwart the process he has set in motion Even after he has failed to incite the disciples to defend Jesus against his persecutors, Judas sustains the hope that either they or the crowd will realise the enormity of their crime and prevent the crucifixion from taking place It is with consummate irony, therefore, that Andreyev refers to Judas as the 'victor' after the death of Christ on the cross The victory, of course, is a Pyrrhic one, as the author suggests in an extended simile

> Так смотрит суровый победитель, который уже решил в сердце своем предать все разрушению и смерти и в последний раз обводит взором чужой и богатый город, еще живой и шумный, но уже призрачный под холодною рукою смерти И вдруг, так же ясно, как ужасную победу свою, видит Искариот ее зловещую шаткость 163

The 'victory' is the triumph of the intellect over faith and its 'ominous precariousness' stems from Judas's realisation that, by destroying the possibility of faith, he is reduced to total scepticism and hence deprived of any reason to go on living His suicide is the inevitable conclusion of this process

Andreyev's Judas emerges, paradoxically, not as Christ's mortal enemy but as his closest disciple The proximity between the two is particularly stressed from the moment of the betrayal

> И с этого времени до самой смерти Иисуса не видел Иуда вблизи Его ни одного из учеников, и среди всей этой толпы были только они двое, неразлучные до самой смерти, дико связанные общностью страданий, - Тот, Кого предали на поругание и муки, и тот, кто Его предал Из одного кубка страданий, как братья, пили они оба, Преданный и предатель, и огненная влага одинаково опаляла чистые и нечистые уста 164

In this way, Andreyev suggests that Judas's scepticism should be understood not as the antithesis of Christ's faith, but as a corollary of it Like Dostoyevsky's 'Underground Man', Judas has been reduced to scepticism as a result of a faith in the 'beautiful and the high' which has been offended by the reality of life

In Andreyev's defence of scepticism one senses an attempt by the author to justify his own standpoint and to place his conflict with Gorky within a broad philosophical framework Particularly revealing in this context are the author's remarks to Chirikov

> Читатель всегда ждет от писателя духовного подаяния . Ну а я ничего ему не даю Я отнимаю от него последнее Я ничего никогда не даю и всегда только отнимаю' И что я могу дать? Я, которого ни в детстве, ни в юности не научили молиться какому-нибудь Богу' Вот теперь наша интеллигенция занялась на старости лет богостроительством' Поздно' 165

The reference to 'God-building' makes it clear that Andreyev's remarks here are directed primarily against Gorky Later, in an interview with Pil'sky, he was to describe Gorky as a man who 'lives with real faith' [166] It is, therefore, quite possible that the conflict between the faith of Christ and the scepticism of Judas was intended by Andreyev as a commentary on his relationship with Gorky We should recall his earlier statement to Pyatnitsky on the influence of Gorky as that of a 'knight of the spirit on a hesitant and uncertain lover of that same spirit' [167] In the post-1905 period, these positions remained essentially unchanged Whilst Gorky was developing his revolutionary faith into an optimistic vision for the future of mankind, Andreyev was caught between the desire to share this faith (expressed in his support of Mat' and Ispoved'[168]) and the demands of reality, which forced him to acknowledge that human nature had thwarted the ideal Such was the substance of both Tak bylo and Savva Yet Andreyev undoubtedly felt that, for all his scepticism, he was, in the manner of Judas, Gorky's closest 'disciple'

and that his works were far closer to the spirit of Gorky than the superficial products of the more 'revolutionary' znan'evtsy A veiled reference to the latter may be detected in the depiction of the 'other' disciples, who adopt the form of Christ's teachings, without absorbing their significance

E Confrontation The Znaniye miscellanies and T'ma

From Capri Andreyev returned to Russia Despite fears that he might be arrested at the frontier for his part in the revolutionary disturbances in Finland, the journey was uneventful and he was even given permission to live in St Petersburg, where he continued to make preparations for assuming the editorship of the Znaniye miscellanies By the summer of 1907, however, he was forced to review his position after receiving a letter from Gorky, which reopened the argument over the editorial policy to be pursued by the miscellanies Gorky himself was particularly disturbed by Andreyev's intention to publish the works of Blok and Sologub, writers whom he considered to be 'anti-democratic' He summed up his views on the matter as follows

> Сборники "Знания" - сборники литературы демократической и для демократии - только с ней и ее силою человек будет освобожден Истинный, достойный человека индивидуализм, единственно способный освободить личность от зависимости и плена общества, государства, будет достигнут лишь через социализм, то есть демократию. 169

The question of 'democratic literature' had stood at the centre of the discussions on Capri and Andreyev must have seen this letter as a direct challenge to his promised independence as editor On the following day he informed Gorky of his decision to relinquish his post as editor[170] In his reply, Andreyev referred to their 'different attitudes to the very aim of the miscellanies',[171] which had convinced him of the futility of persevering with his endeavour He presumably made similar comments to Bogolyubov, who wrote to Pyatnitsky on 22 August

> Был у Андреева по возвращении его из Москвы . Слова Андреева "А сборники-то "Знания" я не буду редактировать, откажусь" . . . Затем Андреев зашел ко мне на дачу, передал о письме к нему Алексея Максимовича После этого, говорит, я не считал для себя возможным принять редакторство, привлечь новых авторов и т д 172

Andreyev's resolve must have been further strengthened by Kipen's subsequent revelation that Gorky had in any case been planning to continue

publishing his own 'democratic' Znaniye miscellanies, of which Andreyev had not been informed [173]

Gorky had obviously harboured serious misgivings about handing over the editorship of the miscellanies from the very beginning and his letter may well have been written with the express purpose of provoking Andreyev's resignation Certainly, he received the news of Andreyev's decision with relief

> Милый мой Леонид!
> Ты напрасно подумал, что обидишь меня отказом от редактуры сборников - мне только нравится твое решение Ведь, если ты вспомнишь, я не особенно горячо защищал необходимость для тебя занять позицию редактора 174

With Andreyev out of the way, he was now free to pursue his own course of action for the reorganization of the miscellanies

No less than Andreyev, Gorky was seriously concerned at the declining literary standard of the Znaniye miscellanies Later in the year, by which time many of the original contributors had withdrawn from the firm, he complained jokingly of this trend in a letter to Pyatnitsky "Видя, что Андреевы, Бунины и прочие осетры уплыли из вкусных вод "Знания", Тимковские, Брусянины, Измайловы и другие пескари осыпают меня творчеством Так много я читал рукописей и какие они все р-р-революционные, если бы вы знали!"[175] This is a tacit admission that artistic considerations are not well served by a definite political purpose, which was, of course, the essence of Andreyev's argument Gorky's remedy was, however, totally different Accepting that the majority of 'revolutionary literature' was of poor literary calibre, he was inclined to dispense with fictional works almost entirely and to transform the miscellanies into collections of publicistic articles on contemporary social and literary topics In effect, he was proposing that the miscellanies become a mouthpiece of Bolshevik ideology This is clear from a letter to Ladyzhnikov of March, 1908 "Завлекаем сюда Ильича, Богданова, Базарова, думаем о Троцком и о реформе сборников "Знания" - проектов горы!"[176] The idea of using Znaniye as a forum of Bolshevik views had been with Gorky for some time and at least since the end of 1906, when he was in correspondence with E K Malinovskaya, a Bolshevik who was trying to organize the publication of a literary-political almanac From one of Gorky's letters of February, 1907, it would seem that he had attempted without success to interest Andreyev in the

project[177] Eventually, Veresayev agreed to act as literary editor of the almanac,[178] of which Gorky notified Pyatnitsky at the end of the year[179] Although the proposed volume was never published, probably due to resistance from Pyatnitsky,[180] the episode is indicative of Gorky's willingness to use Znaniye for a party political purpose

Gorky's plans for the radical reorganization of the Znaniye miscellanies encountered considerable opposition from Pyatnitsky According to Kuprina-Iordanskaya, Pyatnitsky was first and foremost a businessman, who had been attracted to Gorky as he would to any favourable business proposition[181] As the financial controller of the firm, he was intent that at all times Znaniye should remain an economically viable concern He was therefore prepared to accept Gorky's editorial policy only as long as it was consistent with these practical considerations As we have seen,[182] Pyatnitsky had already clashed with Gorky over the publication by Znaniye of Marxist pamphlets in 1905 and by 1907 it would seem that he favoured the type of editorial policy advocated by Andreyev, which promised to attract a wider readership and to alleviate the growing pressure from the censorship authorities

The first signs of the conflict between Gorky and Pyatnitsky became apparent in January, 1908, when Gorky broached the question of including 'literary criticism and social philosophy' alongside literary works in the miscellanies[183] Pyatnitsky evidently ignored this question and Gorky was forced to repeat his request a number of times in his letters of the following months[184] In early April, finally exasperated by Pyatnitsky's silence, Gorky was obliged to draw the obvious conclusion "А ваше отношение, как я чувствую, отрицательно к этой задаче, столь важной и крупной, столь современной".[185] Aware of the possible outcome of a split with Pyatnitsky, Gorky was also keen to discover his opinion of the writers who had by now ceased publishing their works with the firm "Вы не можете себе представить как мне необходимо знать ваши отношения с Чириковым, с Леонидом и другими "товарищами""[186] Gorky's own viewpoint was abundantly clear, not only from his ironic reference to his former colleagues as 'comrades' but also from the increasingly vitriolic criticism of their works and behaviour in which his letters to Pyatnitsky abound

Once again, Pyatnitsky refused to be drawn, making no reply to

Gorky's question His position was made plain, however, in mid-April, when he sent Gorky a copy of the twenty-first miscellany This volume contained a story by Kuprin, entitled Uchenik, which had been included by Pyatnitsky without asking Gorky's approval Gorky immediately sent Pyatnitsky an angry letter, enclosing with it a press statement to the effect that he was no longer responsible for the contents of the Znaniye miscellanies [187] Although this statement never actually appeared in the press, relations between the two men remained strained throughout the spring and summer All this time Gorky's sense of frustration increased until it reached the proportions of a 'chronic frenzy', of which he wrote to Pyatnitsky

> Причины этой болезни - многообразны, в их числе и ваше странное молчание и характер последних сборников Я осыпан упреками за "Мать", - за то, что она так растянута, за то, что сборники скучны, за то, что "Знание" не дает отпора клике бесноватых, совершающих свои пляски в литературе. 188

The inevitable confrontation took place at the end of the year, a confrontation for which Andreyev was indirectly responsible On 8 October, Pyatnitsky informed Gorky that Andreyev had written a new play, Dni nashey zhizni, which he wished to submit for publication in the Znaniye miscellanies Gorky by this time had broken off relations with Andreyev for reasons which will be explained below and was therefore totally opposed to the idea He replied curtly "Андрееву следует отказать" [189] Pyatnitsky was unwilling to back down on this point of principle (significantly, neither man had yet read Andreyev's new play) and on 11 October he despatched another telegram, in which he asked Gorky to reconsider his decision [190] In the absence of any reply, he went ahead with his plan of publishing Dni nashey zhizni, which duly appeared in the twenty-sixth miscellany

Relations between Gorky and Pyatnitsky had already reached breaking point before Gorky learnt of the publication of Andreyev's play, however In December, 1908, Pyatnitsky had again ignored Gorky's specific instructions by including Skitalets's story Etapy in the twenty-fifth miscellany Gorky had personally rejected this story as unsuitable for publication and he responded to this blatant violation of his right of veto by issuing Pyatnitsky with an ultimatum "Поместив повесть Скитальца без моего ведома, заставляете меня публично протестовать против нарушения моих прав редактора Прошу

немедленно приехать или посылаю заявление о моем выходе из "Знания"" [191] Pyatnitsky ignored Gorky's threat and visited Capri again only in September, 1909, by which time Gorky had renounced his responsibilities as editor of the Znaniye miscellanies [192] He could not, however, withdraw completely from Znaniye due to the absence of a suitable alternative publishing outlet Throughout this period, he actively sought to initiate some new enterprise to publish both his own works and the articles of his Capri comrades, but was thwarted by a shortage of funds [193]

The altercations between Gorky and Andreyev over the editorial policy of the Znaniye miscellanies, which were reflected in Gorky's arguments with Pyatnitsky, were soon overshadowed by a far more serious controversy surrounding Andreyev's next story T'ma, which he completed on his return to Russia in the summer of 1907 Gorky himself stressed the impact of this story in his memoirs "с этого момента между мною и Андреевым что-то порвалось" [194] Let us examine the story which, on Gorky's own admission, caused him completely and irreversably to revise his attitude to Andreyev and his entire philosophy

T'ma is one of Andreyev's most important and complex works, 'a huge theme', as he stated in a subsequent interview [195] The title alone suggests the direct relevance of this story to other of his works on the subject of revolution, in which the symbols of 'light' and 'darkness' had formed part of a recurrent system of imagery In Khristiane, for example, we saw how the gulf between the common people and those who sit in judgement of them was emphasized by means of the contrast between the electric light which burns in the courtroom and the darkness outside its walls [196] In K zvyozdam, this imagery takes on a specifically political connotation in Ternovsky's remarks on the forces of reaction "Если бы солнце висело ниже, они погасили бы солнце, - чтобы издохнуть во мраке" [197] The same image recurs in an exchange between Treych and Lunts in the same play

> Трейч Но надо итти вперед, пока светит солнце
> Лунц Оно погаснет, Трейч'
> Трейч Тогда надо зажечь новое. 198

In this context, the contrast between 'light' and 'darkness' suggests the battle between the revolutionaries and their adversaries The symbolism was even more prominent in the original version of the play, which began with the ascendency of the power of light (the apparition

of the comet) and ended with the victory of the power of darkness (the eclipse of the sun) The imagery also served to illustrate the conflict between the instinctive ('dark') and intellectual ('light') sides of human nature It is in this same sense that the image of darkness is evoked by Savva before his death at the hands of the crowd "Тьма идет" [199] Consider also the speech by Tsar' Golod in the play of the same name, which was the next major work to be written after T'ma Tsar' Golod incites the hungry crowd to vent their lust for vengeance against the sated "Да разве теперь, спокойно сидя здесь, в подвале, вы не являетесь тем мраком, который гасит их огни? . Великий мрак идет от вас, дети мои, и безнадежно трепещут во мраке их жалкие огни" [200] The same imagery even permeates a statement by Andreyev on psychology, recorded by his brother Andrey

> Есть нечто пантеистическое в его объяснениях человеческой души Душа эта - по мнению Леонида - как бы рападается на три неравных части на огромнейшее - равное у всех людей - бессознательное, на подсознательное и самое сознание Равно богатое и большое у всех, бессознательное открывает свои сокровища сознанию лишь при некоторых особо удачных сочетаниях с ним Важнейшую роль, по мнениям Леонида, играет подсозчательное - размеры его, оно есть грань тьмы и света . Подсознательное - продолжал Леонид - это полуосвещенная комната. 201

T'ma is an ambitious attempt to combine these three basic elements in his imagery, the social (the conflict between the privileged and the underprivileged), the political (the conflict between the revolutionary and the anti-revolutionary) and the psychological (the conflict between the rational and the irrational) into an all-embracing statement on the nature of revolution Before proceeding with an analysis of this story, however, it is relevant to consider first another of Andreyev's works, the story Zemlya, which was written immediately before T'ma and throws direct light on its central theme [202]

Written in the form of a parable, Zemlya expands upon a theme presented in embryo at the end of K zvyozdam in the final words of Teinovsky and Marusya In this clash of personalities, Andreyev had illustrated one of the principal dilemmas confronting the revolutionary, the need to combine selfless devotion to the future ideal with a practical concern for the present suffering of mankind In Zemlya

this problem is presented in the form of a debate between God and one of his angels, who had been despatched from heaven in order to observe and report back on the way men live on earth The angel had returned with a depressing account of the evil and suffering which he had witnessed and which had caused God's previous envoys to renounce heaven and remain on earth In the course of the angel's story it emerges that he had avoided the fate of the other angels by observing the earth only from a distance, fearing to sully his white raiments by landing on the surface This revelation provokes God's wrath and an explanation of the angel's sin "Пойми и запомни, миленький, что белая одежда обязательна для тех, кто никогда еще не покидал неба, но для тех, кто был на земле, такая вот чистая одежда, как у тебя - срам и позор" [203]

Andreyev's allegory is a variation on the traditional Russian theme of the gulf between the intellectual and the common people, a recurrent subject of his Kur'er articles In O rossiyskom intelligente he had written

> Оторванный от народной трудящейся массы, вознесенный куда-то в беспредельную высь, объевшийся до расстройства желудка хлебом духовным, опившийся уксусом и желчью своего бесцельного и беспутного существования . сидит он в какой-то чудной баче и во всю мочь парится веником вечного и дикого покаяния 204

The target of Andreyev's criticism here is the 'repentant intellectual' a twentieth century version of Tolstoy's 'repentant nobleman' In Zemlya, however, Andreyev's purpose is more serious and the satirical manner of his early journalism inappropriate His allegory is directed not against those effete intellectuals whose abstract concern for the people is not translated into any positive action but, on the contrary, against those who are actively seeking to improve the life of the people by revolutionary means The work reflects Andreyev's fear that the new generation of revolutionaries might unwittingly perpetuate the traditional gulf between the intelligentsia and the people in Russia The revolutionaries, committed to an idealistic vision of a better future, might easily prove to be blind to reality and unaware of those in whose name they profess to speak Even worse, their altruism could in fact be nothing more than inverted egoism, a truth which is contained in God's words to the angel "Себя, я вижу, ты берег в высокой мере, а людей, к которым послан, не берег, и противен ты Мне за

это" [205] Such is the magnitude of the ethical dilemma facing the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia, a dilemma which is illustrated in the confrontation between the terrorist Aleksey and the prostitute Lyuba in T'ma

In the course of Andreyev's story the revolutionary Aleksey undergoes the kind of transformation of which Shestov writes in his illuminating essay on Dostoyevsky and Nietzsche

> when it turns out that idealism could not withstand the pressure of reality, when a man, who by the fates has collided head-on with real life, suddenly sees to his horror that all his fine a priori judgements were false, then for the first time only is he seized by that irrepressible doubt that instantly destroys the seemingly very solid walls of the old air castles At precisely this point begins the philosophy of tragedy 206

The case of Aleksey is exactly such a tragedy Forced 'by the will of the fates' to take refuge from the police in a brothel, he 'collides head-on' with 'real life' in the person of Lyuba to be seized with an 'irrepressible doubt' in the 'a priori judgements' which had led him to follow the course of revolutionary terrorism Like Andreyev's earlier heroes Kerzhentsev and Sergey Petrovich, Aleksey is an intellectual 'Man in a Case' The parallel with Chekhov may even have been conscious Consider, for example, the choice of simile in the passage describing the impact of events upon Aleksey's world-view "И распадалась жизнь, как плохо склееный запертый ящичек, попавший под осенний дождь" [207]

Aleksey does not, however, submit to the 'pressure of reality' immediately He overcomes his initial instinctive disgust at the brothel by resorting to his 'fine a priori judgements', a process which Andreyev describes with undisguised irony "И, взглянув на нее (т е Любу, А Б), как она стояла, он понял, что ее надо пожалеть и как только понял, тотчас же искренно пожалел" [208] Aleksey's 'compassion', then, is the product of logic and allows him to preserve his sense of moral and intellectual superiority He is shocked out of his complacency, however, by Lyuba's unexpected accusation, 'it is shameful to be good', [209] which strikes at the very foundation of his ethical system Lyuba's words echo Nietzsche's insight in Thus Spoke Zarathustra 'Truly, I do not like them, the compassionate who are happy in their compassion they are too lacking in shame' [210] This simple truth destroys the edifice of Aleksey's firmly held con-

victions and he is forced to turn to Lyuba for advice

> - Люба Что же делать'
> - Оставайся со мною Со мною оставайся - ты ведь мой теперь
> - А они?
> Девушка нахмурилась
> - Какие еще они?
> - Да люди, люди же'
> - Что я - собака? И все мы - собаки? Миленький, поостерегись' Попрятался за людей, и будет 211

In this brief exchange Andreyev has distilled the tragedy of the Russian radical intellectual, whose abstract concern for humanity was, by its abstract nature, a barrier between him and those he sought to help

In order that Aleksey expiate his sin, Lyuba demands that he 'plunge into the darkness', a symbolic act which at once represents his introduction to the reality of life and his rejection of the moral code by which he had previously lived His degradation is not, however, absolute, it is the prelude to his resurrection and here Andreyev departs from Shestov's pessimistic notion of the 'philosophy of tragedy' By sacrificing himself to Lyuba, Aleksey has fulfilled her earlier command "Раз пришла к тебе правда, поклонись ей низко".[212] Their subsequent union is thus symbolic of Aleksey's new awareness of the 'truth of life'

The confrontation between Aleksey and Lyuba is a process of mutual enlightenment No less than Lyuba herself, Aleksey also represents a 'new truth', which had hitherto failed to penetrate her social environment "Приходила к женщине новая правда, но не страх, а радость несла с собою" [213] Aleksey's idealism, his dedication to the cause of social progress introduce a totally new element into her life and offer the promise of a better future The spiritual bond which grows between the two is put to the test in the final scene, when they are confronted by the policeman who comes to arrest Aleksey The symbolic nature of this encounter is clear from Andreyev's description

> И стояли они друг возле друга, три правды, три разные правды жизни старый взяточник и пьячица, жаждавший героев, распутная женщина, в душу которой были уже заброшены семена подвига и самоотречения, - и он 214

The policeman, who embodies the spirit of cynicism to which Lyuba had so recently been prey, at first threatens to destroy the bond between

the prostitute and the terrorist Lyuba's flirtatiousness towards the policeman is a sign of her indecision, but when she finally throws herself at Aleksey's feet she displays her commitment to the 'new truth' and her rejection of the old Her final words express her determination to oppose the forces of cynicism "Миленький! да зачем же ты револьвер отдал . . Да зачем же ты бомбу не принес Мы бы их. . мы бы их всех "[215] It is at this point that the full significance of an earlier image becomes clear When Aleksey had first walked through the brothel with Lyuba, he had been struck by their reflection in a mirror, which suggested two contradictory images

> И так необычна была их черная, строгая пара среди белых стен, . . что он в изумлении остановился и подумал как жених и невеста Впрочем, от бессоницы, вероятно, и от усталости соображал он плохо, и мысли были неожиданные, нелепые, потому что в следующую минуту, взглянув на черную, траурную пару, подумал как на похоронах Но то и другое было одинаково неприятно [216]

In the course of the story, the reader has witnessed both a 'wedding' and a 'funeral', inasmuch as he has observed the 'death' of the old Aleksey and Lyuba, who are subsequently 'reborn' through their 'marriage'

T'ma must be seen, therefore, as an ambitious attempt to solve the fundamental ethical and social problems raised by the revolution The 'marriage' between Aleksey and Lyuba is intended to represent the synthesis not only of two social classes but of two approaches to life, the rational and the intuitive, promising the eventual fusion of the ideal and reality

T'ma was published in the third Shipovnik miscellany, which appeared in November, 1907 [217] It would seem from Gorky's reminiscences, however, that he had been acquainted at least with the outline of the story since the spring and that the projected work had already been the cause of a serious argument with Andreyev on Capri [218] He had certainly read the story, presumably in typescript, before its publication Towards the end of October, he wrote to Ladyzhnikov of Andreyev's latest works, T'ma and Proklyatiye zverya "А рассказы Леонида - оба плохи "Тьма" же - отвратительна".[219] A similar view is to be found in a letter to Pyatnitsky, in which Gorky set out at some length his general opinion of Andreyev

> Этот жалкий, больной малый носит в себе животное, он весь - во власти животного и

> вот почему тоскует о звере Зверь - не по силам, а животного он боится, когда трезв Животное в нем всегда, и всегда оно понуждает его отрицать, бороться с человеческим, - чистую поэтически настроенную девушку велит изнасиловать, революционера - свалить в грязь, человека вообще - нарисовать пошлым, мелким, бессильным И все это - гнусно, все это - пакость
> Очень талантлив Л(еонид) вообще - не в данных рассказах, - очень велик он, как нарыв во всю спину, но он нам чужой
> Поймите это, он чужой Его дорога - круто направо Его задача - показать во всяком человеке прежде всего скота, - социальная ценность такого намерения и вредна и погана 220

This letter belies Gorky's contention in his memoirs that the major cause of his dissatisfaction with T'ma lay in the author's unjustified distortion of a real event [221] In his letter to Ladyzhnikov, Gorky had even admitted that Rutenburg, the real-life prototype of Andreyev's Aleksey, 'deserved such a depiction' [222] Kuprina-Iordanskaya later suggested that Gorky had taken Andreyev to task for betraying a confidence, having undertaken not to use Rutenburg's story in his work [223] Although this may have been true, it is abundantly clear from the lengthy passage quoted above that Gorky's criticism went much deeper than this and derived from the philosophy which he discerned in the work itself

Like the majority of critics of his time, Gorky understood T'ma literally, identifying the author's purpose with Lyuba's dictum 'It is shameful to be good' Aleksey's debasement, according to this argument, represents the sacrifice of man to the 'beast' and hence embodies an ideology alien to the revolutionary idea In accordance with this conviction, Gorky totally revised his opinion of the author, whom he now consigned to the ranks of the reactionaries Most significant in this respect is the reference, in the letter to Pyatnitsky to Bezdna, a work which, it will be recalled, Gorky had praised as a 'fine blow' against bourgeois morality back in 1902 [224] By 1907, however, Bezdna also had become, in Gorky's eyes, an example of Andreyev's 'praise of the beast'

To Gorky T'ma was the product of the 'cynicism' which he had identified, in his article O tsinizme as the prevailing spirit in contemporary Russian society A year later, in a more lengthy exposition

of this idea, the article Razrusheniye lichnosti, he actually singled out T'ma, together with the works of Artsybashev and Sologub, as a specific example of the contemporary trend towards reviling the revolutionary ethic [225] It should be noted in Gorky's favour that he was not alone in linking T'ma with the anti-revolutionary tendency in literature The same conclusion is to be derived from an article by a critic of such vastly different views as Merezhkovsky, for example [226] Yet even a superficial comparison of T'ma with the works of Artsybashev or Sologub is sufficient to reveal a fundamental difference of purpose The revolutionary Svarozhych in Artsybashev's Sanin, for example, is only too obviously a foil for Sanin himself Weak and hypocritical, Svarozhych is mercilessly exposed by Artsybashev's hero in order to demonstrate the author's view that the revolutionary ethic has been discredited and eclipsed by the amoral philosophy of 'Saninism' Sanin, then, is a truly anti-revolutionary novel, as it rejects the concept of altruism as sheer hypocrisy advocating in its stead the 'honest' pursuit of unalloyed individualism T'ma contains no such philosophy Unlike Artsybashev, Andreyev has not rejected the principle of altruism entirely, indeed, the very purpose of his story had been to distinguish between its true and false manifestations

Gorky's conviction that Andreyev had gone over to the enemy camp hardened when he read the Shipovnik almanac in which the story appeared and of which Andreyev himself had been the literary editor In December, he wrote again to Pyatnitsky "Отвратительное впечатление произвел на меня роман Сологуба в 3-м "Шиповнике". И рядом с ним Андреев, - странно и позорно совпадающий в своем парадоксе с блевотиной гнусного старикашки" [227] The Sologub novel was Tvorimaya legenda (the first part of Nav'i chary), an erotic work of dubious literary merit Its publication by Shipovnik was, therefore, further proof to Gorky that Andreyev had deserted the cause of democratic literature Early in the new year, he tried to convince him of the error of his ways "Бросай, пока время, всю эту сологубовщину, пойми, что непристойно тебе, с твоим талантом, невольно поддаваться их заразному влиянию и писать такие вещи, как "Тьма"" 228

Predictably, Gorky's advice served only to irritate Andreyev, who was already exasperated by the universal failure of his contemporaries to appreciate his purpose in T'ma His annoyance with Gorky in

particular had been aggravated by the recent publication of Literaturnyy raspad, a collection of articles by writers of socialist sympathies on the decline of Russian literature in the post-1905 period The source of Andreyev's dissatisfaction was not so much Gorky's own contribution to the volume, the article O tsinizme, but the fact that this article had appeared alongside Lunacharsky's T'ma, which contained a detailed critique of Andreyev's latest works as a 'slander on the revolutionary movement' Interpreting this as an implicit acceptance by Gorky of Lunacharsky's extremist views, Andreyev attempted to justify his position in his reply to Gorky's letter

> Дорогой мой Алексеюшка' Ведь я не изменился, не меняйся и ты ко мне голубчик И в "Тьме" (откидываю ее слабую форму), и в "Царе-Голоде" я все тот же, что был и в "Савве" и в "Иуде" И в "Шиповнике" я тот же, каким был в "Знании" 229

Regarding the criticism of his editorial policy, he hastened to assure Gorky that he too was disgusted by the Sologub novel and intended to discontinue its publication in the Shipovnik miscellanies In fact, this issue brought him into immediate conflict with his colleagues on Shipovnik, who insisted that the novel remain Realising the futility of his hope of imposing his own literary standards on the Shipovnik miscellanies, Andreyev eventually resigned as editor at the end of the following year [230]

Andreyev's protestations presumably made little impression on Gorky, who in any case failed to reply to his letter Andreyev, for his part, took this as a tacit admission by Gorky that he was in agreement with Lunacharsky At this point, with each writer convinced, rightly or wrongly, that he had been betrayed by the other, the correspondence between them broke off, to be resumed only in the summer of 1911 The significance of this break cannot be overemphasized, as relations between the two men were never to return to their former cordiality and, indeed, in the years to 1919, even deteriorated into open hostility

In view of Gorky's unremittingly hostile reaction to T'ma and its enormous implications for the entire relationship between the two writers, it is ironic to discover that Andreyev's story is very close in theme and conception to a number of Gorky's own works of this period The second part of Mat', for example, includes a scene in which Nilovna, much in the same way as Andreyev's Lyuba, confronts the

intellectuals Nikolay and Sof'ya with the 'truth of life' of which they had hitherto been ignorant "Мне казалось - я знаю жизнь'", exclaims Nikolay, "Но когда о ней говорит не книга и не разрозненные впечатления мои, а вот как, сама она, - страшно'"[231] As in T'ma, the confrontation results in mutual enlightenment and a new synthesis between the intellectuals and the people The same theme forms the subject of Iz povesti, a story which was written in October, 1907 and which may even have been intended as a riposte to Andreyev's T'ma, which Gorky had read in the same month

The heroine of Iz povesti, Vera, like Andreyev's Aleksey, is a young dedicated revolutionary who has had little direct experience of life She has been entrusted with the task of spreading socialist propaganda amongst the soldiers who have been called in to suppress the peasant rebellions which were common during and after the 1905 Revolution Vera's first encounter is with Shamov, a young soldier, who is easily convinced by her arguments Yet, despite this success, Vera's victory is only superficial, as it fails to break down the psychological barrier which separates her from Shamov In spite of herself, Vera feels a certain aristocratic scorn for the simple peasant, who, in turn, cannot hide his embarrassment in the presence of a 'lady'

Vera's complacency is challenged when she meets Avaeyev, one of Shamov's comrades who is himself a socialist with long experience of propaganda work He is critical of intellectuals like Vera, whom he accuses of egoism "Говорят - всем, а думают - нам' И покуда человек работает с ними - брат, а добились они своего - он им враг"[232] This type of situation had been described by Gorky in Foma Gordeyev, in which the journalist Ezhov had been responsible for spreading socialist ideas amongst the workers The integrity of Ezhov's motives, however, is continually exposed to question He seems inordinately proud of his superiority as mentor to the workers and reacts spitefully when his supremacy is challenged Such is the charge which Vera is forced to answer for and which she seeks to disprove by addressing a group of soldiers the following day

The meeting with the soldiers has the same profound importance for Vera as the confrontation with Lyuba had for Aleksey in Andreyev's T'ma For the first time in her life she is made to realise how great is the gulf, both social and psychological, which separates her from the common people To her horror she finds that her rational arguments

simply arouse the antagonism of her audience She is saved from humiliation only when Avdeyev intercedes on her behalf, explaining to the soldiers Vera's bravery and dedication to the revolutionary cause Avdeyev's speech breaks the tension and the barrier of hostility is removed "Теперь, когда она сама была испугана и обижена, люди стали как будто понятнее, менее страшны, и она внутренно подходила к ним" [233] Vera establishes real contact with the soldiers only when fear has eroded her sense of superiority, allowing her to address her audience as equals In his final words to Vera, Avdeyev stresses that this equality is vital to the victory of the revolution "Все внушают, все заставляют - верь не верь, а поступай по-нашему Каждый внутри себя - начальство для другого, что бы он ни говорил' А тут не внушать надо, надо объяснить так, чтобы уж я сам видел, что для меня нет другого пути" [234] This is yet another formulation of the 'new synthesis' between the intellectual and the people Precisely the same idea is implied by Andreyev at the end of T'ma, when Aleksey rejects his former comrades and refuses to take Lyuba to meet them

> - Я не пойду Я не хочу быть хорошим.
> Молчание
> - Они господа, - как-то странно и одиноко прозвучал его голос
> - Кто? - глухо спросила девушка
> - Те, прежние 235

Aleksey's words are to be understood not as a repudiation of the revolutionary ethic per se, but simply as a statement of his determination to resist the temptation of establishing his moral and intellectual superiority, which he now recognizes as the principal threat to the victory of the revolution

From our discussion so far it would seem that Andreyev was justified in his resentment of Gorky's radical change of attitude towards him following the publication of T'ma Gorky's criticism of the work was based on a fundamental misinterpretation of its purpose, which seems all the more remarkable in the light of Iz povesti Indeed, we might even be forgiven for suggesting that Gorky was guilty of a deliberate misrepresentation of Andreyev's views, a conclusion which is supported by the evidence of Gorky's reaction to a number of subsequent works by Andreyev, as we shall see In order to appreciate fully the reasons for Gorky's reappraisal of Andreyev's work, however, we must refer back to the circumstances of his life on Capri at this time

The early years on Capri were a period of great stress for Gorky Apart from his formidable literary output he was also committed to a vast amount of editorial work, not to mention the demands placed on him by his allegiance to the Bolshevik party In addition, he had to find time to study the theories of his colleagues Bogdanov and Lunacharsky As a result, Gorky's reading of contemporary literature became of necessity hasty, as he admitted in a letter to Lunacharsky of December, 1907 "Посылаю "Царь-Голод". Мне не очень понравилось это. Чего-то нет и что-то дано в излишке Быть может, я не прав, - читал один раз и наспех, хотелось послать вам поскорее" [236] Even more significant is Gorky's uncharacteristic refusal in this letter to commit himself to an opinion of Andreyev's play This indecision stands in marked contrast to the unequivocal condemnation of Tsar' Golod contained in a letter to Pyatnitsky written some three months later, by which time Gorky had learnt of Lunacharsky's opinion "Неужели "Царь-Голод" может кому-нибудь нравиться? . . Как "произведение пера" "Царь-Голод" - реакционная вещь" [237] The degree of Gorky's reliance on the views of his Capri colleagues on contemporary literature is further illustrated by his request to Ladyzhnikov in January, 1909 "я очень прошу вас прислать корректуры драм Андреева, - было бы весьма важно прочитать их теперь же, пока здесь Богданов" [238] By May, he was even informing Ladyzhnikov of the 'collective' opinion of Bogdanov, Lunacharsky and himself of Andreyev's Anatema, which the three men read together on Capri [239] Under the influence of Lunacharsky in particular, Gorky's articles and the Capri school lectures on Russian literature[240] are based on a rectilinear division of literature into 'revolutionary' and 'reactionary'

Gorky never subsequently altered the opinion of T'ma contained in his letters and Razrusheniye lichnosti Writing to Karzhansky in September, 1910, he equated Andreyev's story with Savinkov's novel Kon' blednyy as an attempt 'to fall in with the tone of the triumphant Philistine' [241] Even as late as 1924, in his memoirs of Lenin, Gorky referred specifically to T'ma and summarized its message as follows "Люди живут плохо - значит, я тоже должен плохо жить" [242] Apart from such direct references, there are a number of passages in Gorky's literary works which suggest that the author is conducting a deliberate polemic with the supposed ideology of T'ma For example,

in the memoir of the Populist writer Karonin-Petropavlovsky, written in 1911, we read

> мое представление о русском писателе сложилось в красивый, сказочный образ это суровый глашатай правды, он одинок среди людей, никем не любим, обладает несокрушимою силою сопротивления врагам справедливости, и, хотя враги усердно вымораживают ему душу, она неистощимо пламенна и -"дондеже есмь" возжигает свет во тьме 243

The oblique reference to T'ma in this context is especially significant as this memoir had been written with the specific purpose of defining Gorky's view of the Russian writer and his social duty [244] One of the major charges against Andreyev in Razrusheniye lichnosti had been what Gorky saw as his betrayal of the sacred role of the Russian writer [245] Similar veiled references to T'ma are to be found in the Po Rusi cycle, again in passages where the narrator is defining his literary credo

> Хочется видеть всю жизнь красивой и гордой, хочется делать ее такою, а она все показывает острые углы, темные ямы, жалких раздавленных, изолгавшихся Хочется бросить во тьму чужой души маленькую искру своего огня, - бросишь, она бесследно исчезает в немой пустоте .
>
> Иду во тьме и сам себе свечу, мне кажется, что я живой фонарь, в груди моей красным огнем горит сердце, и так жарко хочется, чтобы кто-то боязливый, заплутавшийся в ночи - увидал этот маленький огонь. 246

This striking recurrence of imagery may not, of course, have been deliberate or even conscious but there can be no doubt of the hidden polemic contained in other works by Gorky

In the autobiographical Khozyain we discover a passage which provides a commentary to the view that 'It is shameful to be good' Having related in detail the inhuman conditions of the bakery in which he once worked and their inexorable effect upon his fellows, Gorky wrote in this work

> Видеть это безумие так мучительно, что хочется с разбега удариться головой о стену Но вместо этого, закрыв глаза, сам начинаешь петь похабную песню, да еще громче других, - до смерти жалко человека, и ведь не всегда приятно чувствовать себя лучше других 247

The final words suggest that the desire to 'immerse oneself in darkness'

is quite natural but that it should nevertheless be resisted, as it represents surrender to the very power of evil which must be eradicated The same theme is treated in greater depth in Vsyo to zhe, an unfinished story in which the parallels with T'ma are even more prominent Set in the Russian provinces, Vsyo to zhe depicts the 'disintegration of personality' amongst the local revolutionary intelligentsia At times, the experiences of the central character Smagin (an early prototype of Klim Samgin) correspond quite closely to those of the author In the following passage, for example, one detects an echo of Gorky's disillusionment following the 'desertion' of his former Znaniye colleagues

> Он вспоминал, как фокуснически быстро изменялись его товарищи и люди, которым он верил как проповедники действенного отношения к жизни превращались в равнодушных скептиков, а пламенный интерес к вопросам общественным сменялся торжеством социального нигилизма, восточным равнодушием к великому делу жизни 248

One of the main representatives of this trend towards 'social nihilism' is Shchukin, whose similarity with Andreyev's Aleksey is suggested immediately by the repeated comparison to a 'lamp snuffed out by darkness' [249] The parallel becomes unmistakable later in the story when Shchukin reveals to Smagin his decision to sacrifice himself to a local prostitute

> А может, хоть одному человеку помогу, а? Знаете я так чувствую, что обязан за всех обиженных женщин одну какую-то божественно любить' Пускай я помучаюсь за человека, ведь больше ничего не сумею сделать в жизни, так вот - хоть помучаюсь, а? 250

Gorky makes his own opinion of Shchukin's 'sacrifice' clear from Smagin's reaction "Помучиться - умеем, а помочь - не научились' Видно - легче помучиться, чем действительно помочь" [251] Hence Gorky has utilized the central situation of T'ma to illustrate an entirely opposite conclusion

Gorky's polemic with Andreyev (although not specifically over T'ma) was also present in Ispoved' The importance of the final scene of Gorky's novel in this context has already been noted,[252] the miracle in Ispoved' is the very antithesis of the false miracle with which Andreyev's Savva had ended Closer examination reveals a less obvious, yet more profound reflection of the author's argument with Andreyev, which is to be found in the confrontation between Matvey and the monk Antoniy The similarity between Antoniy and Andreyev is immediately suggested by the reference to his handsome appearance, and, especially,

his bouts of drunkenness Gorky has Antoniy propound a philosophy identical to that which he himself discerned in Andreyev's latest works "Я тебе вот что скажу существует только человек, все же прочее есть мнение Бог же твой - сон твоей души Знать ты можешь только себя да и то - не наверное" [253] Matvey's reaction to Antoniy's cynical view of human endeavour also reflects Gorky's recently stated opinion of Andreyev "Жизнь одевал он (т е Антоний, А Б) в серое, показывал мне ее бессмысленной, люди для него - стадо бешеных свиней, с разной быстротой бегущих к пропасти" [253a] Initially attracted by Antoniy for his independent views and his unremittingly hostile attitude to the monastery, Matvey eventually comes to the conclusion that he is a false mentor, whose positive attributes have been diverted to a mistaken purpose This is in essence the charge which Gorky was repeatedly to lay at Andreyev's door, finding its most complete formulation in the memoir Leonid Andreyev

Once convinced that Andreyev, infected by the spirit of the times, had succumbed to the anti-revolutionary mood prevalent amongst contemporary Russian intellectuals, Gorky proceeded to subject all subsequent works by the author to the same criticism In the sections which follow, we will examine a number of major works completed by Andreyev in the years 1907-1910 Our aim in studying these stories and plays, which had been either begun or conceived during the months spent in the company of Gorky on Capri, is to discover to what extent Gorky's extreme opinion of them is justified and also to indicate the degree to which they touch upon themes present in Gorky's own writings of this time

Г 1 Proklyatiye zverya The individual and the collective

As we have seen in the previous section, Gorky received the manuscript of Proklyatiye zverya at the same time as that of T'ma and from his comments it is clear that the two works were probably equally instrumental in convincing him that Andreyev was now alien to the revolutionary cause The story had been begun in the spring of 1907, immediately after the author's return to St Petersburg from Capri, but was finished only in October that year [254] In a later interview, Andreyev stressed the immense personal significance of the work "Много моих личных мучительных переживаний, моей ненависти к городу - в "Проклятии зверя"" [255] In particular, the story reflects Andreyev's

decision to leave the Russian capital for the peace and isolation of the Finnish countryside, where, Dr Woodward tells us, he was 'more or less permanently resident' by the spring of 1908 [256]

Proklyatiye zveirya continues the tradition of a number of earlier works by Andreyev (e g Gorod, Molchaniye, Bol'shoy shlem) which had contained a powerful critique of the modern urban environment as the source of social alienation and depersonalization Unlike these earlier works, however, Proklyatiye zverya utilizes the contrast between the town and the countryside, a device common in nineteenth century Russian literature As in Tolstoy's Anna Karenina, for example, the contrast is employed not only for its literal significance, but also for a structural and symbolic purpose The key to this latter, symbolic purpose is to be discovered in Bezumstvo khrabrykh, an article written during Andreyev's Kur'er days In this article, the author had identified the city with the 'despotism of habits'

> Жизнь в большом городе, жизнь обеспеченная, создает незаметно целую армию привычек, одна за другой вторгающихся в свободную область души и, в конце концов, оккупирующих ее. Есть души, для которых свобода - лишнее бремя те с готовностью подчиняются деспотии привычек 257

Here, the city is held directly responsible for the enslavement of modern man, who lives in a 'prison, the key to which is in his own pocket' [258] Yet, in this article, Andreyev derives hope from the irrepressible urge of the urban dweller to escape periodically to the countryside, to the dacha, to which he refers as a 'semi-hint of freedom' [259] Man's instinctive desire for freedom is submerged, but not totally dead "Но есть души другого порядка те в которых неистребимо начало свободного самоопределения, но у которых нет сил для прямого и смелого восстания против ига привычек и самоправил". [260]

In Proklyatiye zverya, Andreyev depicts precisely such a conflict between a man 'in whom the principle of free self-determination is ineradicable' and those 'for whom freedom is a superfluous burden' The narrator of the story is a freedom-lover (symbolized by his love for the young woman) who returns to the city from the solitude of the countryside The urban environment initially appeals to his gregarious instinct, satisfying his urge to escape his sense of isolation and become part of a community

> Поскорее стать одною из этих маленьких

> волн, умалиться их малостью, растворить свое одинокое, сумасшедшее "я" в однородности всех этих таких же одиноких сумасшедших "я", сделавшихся "мы" 261

By conforming to the norms of urban society, however, the narrator gradually becomes aware of the threat of depersonalization, of which he encounters the extreme embodiment in those who surround him in the enormous restaurant he visits Comparing his own 'inner uneasiness' with the patrons of the restaurant, who are 'inwardly calm, patient, submissive',[262] he realises that the sense of community he desires can only be achieved at the expense of his individuality Unwilling to make this ultimate sacrifice, the narrator returns to his beloved and to the solitude of nature

The conflict of freedom and spiritual slavery, already encountered in a number of Andreyev's works, is inextricably linked in Proklyatiye zverya with the broader issue of individualism and collectivism The subject was one which had concerned Andreyev for a number of years and which had provided the subtext of many of his earlier works, as we have seen However, the author's statements of the post-1905 period suggest that the problem had taken on a new importance for him In November, 1906, for example, he had written to Veresayev "Вопрос об отдельных индивидуальностях как-то исчерпан, отошел, хочется все эти разношерстные индивидуальности так или иначе, войною или миром, связать с общим, с человеческим" [263] Some seven years later, in a review of Bernard Kellermann's novel Der Tunnel, we encounter essentially the same view

> События развиваются в бешеном темпе, года мелькают, как спицы в вертящемся колесе, личность с кратковременностью ее бытия поглощается массою, коллективом, народом Вообще с личностью кончено, песенка ее спета 264

At first sight, it would seem difficult to reconcile these statements with the Kafkaesque depiction of corporate life in Proklyatiye zverya and in particular with the narrator's complaint "казалось, я что-то потерял, и это потерянное есть мое я" [265] However, we should note that Andreyev's hero is defending his individuality and not the principle of individualism Furthermore, the community this hero rejects is quite clearly no 'collective' in the sense implied by his creator On this latter point, Andreyev had been quite explicit to his brother Andrey "Анархический строй . . не может скоро осуществиться . . . Анархизм наступит, когда люди внутренно

будут к нему готовы, когда в голову никому не придет оскорбить другого, учинить насилие и т п "[266] It is this anarchist ideal of a community comprised of free individuals that the narrator of Proklyatiye zverya had sought in the city and his failure to discover such a community illustrates the fundamental contradiction contained in the anarchist vision Once again, Andreyev is questioning not the desirability of the ideal but the possibility of its realization

Gorky's reaction to Proklyatiye zverya was more vague than to T'ma, although the general tenor of his remarks make his position apparent In October, 1907, he had told Pyatnitsky that the story was 'badly written' and 'not worth talking about' [267] More informative was his lengthy diatribe against Andreyev to the same correspondent which we have already had occasion to cite in full [268] The reference to Andreyev as being 'completely in the power of the animal' in this letter,[269] together with the other numerous references to the 'beast', leave little doubt that Gorky had interpreted Proklyatiye zverya as an apology of man's baser instincts, a standpoint to which we know he was diametrically opposed

To interpret Proklyatiye zverya as an 'apology of the beast' is to misrepresent entirely the author's purpose This is clear from the allegorical zoo scene which stands at the centre of the work Throughout the story, Andreyev builds up to this scene by means of similes and metaphors (the houses in the city are described as 'stone cages' and the restaurant compared directly with a zoo) [270] As a result, the zoo may be seen as a microcosm of the urban environment The full significance of the scene becomes apparent in the description of the eagles' cage

> И только немногие пытались лететь, большинство же, привыкшее к неволе или даже рожденное в ней, цепко держалось когтями за грязные, загаженные перекладины или обрубленные сучья коротких, вкопанных в землю стволов, и когда те пробовали лететь - эти, обеспокоенные, возмущенные, начинали клеветать, браниться яростно, быть может, даже звали полицию [271]

The final anthropomorphic comment suggests beyond doubt that the conflict between the few eagles who still try to escape from their cage and the majority who are resigned to their captivity is an allusion to the story's human context The 'curse of the beast', then, is to be understood as the voice of man's natural yearning for freedom

Despite Gorky's criticism of the story, there are elements in Proklyatiye zverya which correspond to views expressed by Gorky himself, particularly on the dehumanizing effect of modern civilization In an early article, Sredi metalla, for example, he had described the unpleasant human consequences of a technological society and a number of his literary works also depict the pernicious influence of the urban environment upon the individual Particularly noteworthy is Matvey's speech in Ispoved', which was written the year after Proklyatiye zverya

> Городов я не любил Жадный шум их и эта бесшабашная торговля всем несносны были мне, обалдевшие от суеты люди города - чужды Кабаков избыток, церкви - лишние, построены горы домов, а жить тесно, людей много и все - не для себя каждый привязан к делу и всю жизнь бегает по одной линии, как пес на цепи 272

K D Muratova has suggested that the influence of Gorky's 'American sketches' may be detected in Andreyev's story[273] and it may well be no coincidence that the zoo had been utilized by Gorky as an endictment of contemporary American society in Tsarstvo skuki [274] But these similarities should not blind us to the vital difference in Gorky's and Andreyev's statements on collective humanity

Gorky's views on the subject of collective humanity were outlined at this time in O tsinizme, an article which was begun towards the end of November, 1907, just a few weeks after reading Proklyatiye zverya [275] Although Andreyev's work is nowhere mentioned by name, a brief summary of the main points of Gorky's argument in this article should be sufficient to demonstrate that it may have been conceived as an antidote to the 'cynicism' he detected in Proklyatiye zverya Beginning with the assertion that mankind is 'on the eve of a festival of the universal Renaissance of the popular masses',[276] Gorky proceeds to launch a new attack against the Philistines who resist the evidence of this inevitable change "Рабы перерождаются в людей - вот новый смысл жизни'",[277] states the author, who depicts the Philistine hiding from this 'new truth' in his 'favourite corners', 'God, metaphysics and cynicism' [278] Of these, Gorky argues, cynicism is by far the most insidious evil as it detracts from the ideal towards which mankind is inexorably moving Dealing first with those cynics who put forward the view that life has no purpose and then with those who claim its only purpose is the 'service of beauty' (an obvious reference to the Symbolists), Gorky turns to the cynicism embodied in the contemporary cult of the

individual

> Цинизм прикрывается и свободой - исканием полной свободы - это наиболее подлая маска его
> Литература, устами наиболее талантливых писателей, единогласно свидетельствует, что, когда мещанин, устремяясь к полной свободе, обнажает свое "я", - перед современным обществом встает животное 279

That Andreyev was one of the 'talented writers' Gorky had in mind there can be little doubt, particularly when we read the final statement on the subject of individualism "Не "я", но - "мы" - вот начало освобождения личности'"[280] In these words, Gorky refutes the view, contained in Proklyatiya zverya, that the synthesis of the individual and the collective ethic is impossible The same purpose may be discerned in Ispoved', where Matvey achieves exactly what Andreyev's narrator had failed to do he discovers his true individuality only when he has become part of the collective

2 Revolt or revolution? From Tsar' Golod to Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh

Gorky's contention that Andreyev had deserted the revolutionary cause, which was founded largely on his reading of T'ma and Proklyatiye zverya, has to be measured against the evidence of Andreyev's other literary works of this period Between September, 1906 and March, 1908, apart from T'ma, he wrote four works directly on the subject of revolution Iz rasskaza, kotoryy nikogda ne budet okonchen, Tsar' Golod, Ivan Ivanovich and Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh We will begin by considering the first and third of the works mentioned as they share a number of common features Being written in the more realistic style of his earlier stories, they are short and relatively uncomplicated and both are set against the background of the Moscow armed insurrection

Iz rasskaza, kotoryy nikogda ne budet okonchen takes the form of reminiscences, supposedly written by a man who had participated in the building of the barricades in Moscow The revolutionary events themselves do not form the subject of the story, however, the account ends with the narrator leaving his house to join the revolutionaries on the streets The narrative focusses rather on the psychological impact of revolution on the narrator and his wife and the transformation it brings about in their relationship The nature of this transformation is at first unclear The narrator looks into his wife's eyes to dis-

cover that they are 'unfamiliar'

> Уже десять лет я смотрел в них и знал их лучше, чем свои, а теперь в них было новое, чего я не умею назвать Гордость - назвал бы я это, но там было другое, новое, совсем новое 281

The enigma is sustained by linguistic means throughout the early sections

> Значит это - правда оно пришло . Мы перегнулись через подоконник и там в прозрачной темной глубине увидели какое-то движение Не людей, а движение Что-то ломали, что-то строили. Кто-то двигался, неуловимый, как тень 282

Once again, it is Andreyev's use of simile which provides the key to the significance of this mysterious 'movement' "Они стучат, и как будто падают, падают какие-то стены - и так просторно, так широко, так вольно'"[283] This repeated image needs no explanation to those who have read the earlier Stena and stresses the vital importance of Andreyev's entire symbolic system to a proper understanding of his works Equally significant is the following description of the transformation which has affected the city

> Уже несколько дней стояли без работы фабрики и железные дороги, и свободный от угольного дыма воздух пропитался запахом поля и цветущих садов, быть может, росы И ни одного фонаря, и ни одного экипажа, и ни одного городского звука над бесконечной каменной поверхностью, - если закрыть глаза, то, правда, можно подумать, что это деревня 284

The repeated image of the city reverting to its natural origins reminds us of the urban/rural contrast and its symbolic connotations already discussed with reference to Proklyatiye zverya

As the importance of the events they are witnessing becomes clear to the narrator and his wife, a vital change takes place in their relationship Their love for each other now transcends its former limited scope to become part of the universal 'movement' of which the building of the barricades is part For the first time they become aware of each other as human beings and not simply as husband and wife The process reaches its conclusion when they refer to each other as 'Comrade''[285] At this point one is reminded of Gorky's Tovarishch' and, indeed, Andreyev's story illustrates precisely the same revolutionary transformation Also of interest in this context is the metamorphosis which affects the maternal instinct of the narrator's wife, who is suddenly

prepared even to forsake her children for the good of the cause "Еще вчера она не знала ничего другого, кроме детей, и полна была страха за них, еще вчера она с ужасом ловила грозные признаки грядущего, - что сталось с ней?"[286] The answer to this question is, of course, that the narrator's wife has undergone the same evolution as Nilovna in Gorky's Mat' her maternal instinct has been diverted from the narrow, personal level to the universal service of mankind

Despite its unmistakably Gorkyesque depiction of the growth of revolutionary consciousness, Iz rasskaza, kotoryy nikogda ne budet okonchen is a work by no means as optimistic as either Tovarishch' or Mat' In Gorky's works, even when the revolutionaries suffer a temporary defeat (as at the end of Mat'), the ultimate victory of the revolution is never in any doubt Andreyev's exposition in Iz rasskaza is far more sceptical Towards the end of 1906, he had written to his brother Pavel and sister Rimma about his plans to write a story entitled Revolyutsiya "Потом пусть снова рабство, что угодно, важно одно - баррикады Важен момент"[287] In Iz rasskaza (which was almost certainly the realization of this conception), the narrative structure itself provides a clear indication that the revolutionary euphoria described in the story was indeed only temporary, to be succeeded by the return of 'slavery' At one point, the narrator shifts the viewpoint to comment "Давно уже было то, о чем я пишу, и те, кто спит сейчас тяжелым сном серой жизни и умирает не проснувшись, - те не поверят мне в те дни не было времени"[288] In this way the meaning of the title is made apparent like Tak bylo it suggests that the vacillation between the power of revolution and Philistinism is an eternal feature of human existence, a story 'which will never be completed' The inevitable reaction of the Philistine against the threat of revolution provides the subject of Andreyev's second story to be inspired by the Moscow insurrection, Ivan Ivanovich

Ivan Ivanovich, the hero of the story, which was published in February, 1908,[289] is the absolute antithesis of the narrator in Iz rasskaza Like the character in Gorky's O chyorte series (who, significantly, is also named Ivan Ivanovich), he is mediocrity personified A policeman by profession, Ivan Ivanovich is captured by a group of revolutionaries, who force him to participate in the construction of the barricades His capture provokes some disagreement among the revol-

utionaries On the one extreme is Petrov, an experienced worker, who disapproves of the leniency shown towards Ivan Ivanovich by his younger comrades In his eyes, the policeman is an enemy, whose hostility to the revolutionary cause is incorrigible and who should be physically annihilated He is dissuaded from this intention by one of the young revolutionaries, who puts forward a behaviourist view "Напрасно вы так, товарищи Он ей-богу ничего Конечно, невежественный, темный, а когда- нибудь и он поймет Все поймут".[290] This idealistic prediction proves unjustified in the case of Ivan Ivanovich, however Although he cooperates with his captors, he remains true to his Philistine nature and takes malicious pleasure in their arrest at the end of the story

Strangely enough, neither of these stories drew any comment from Gorky at the time of their publication Both were published in newspapers, and it may well be that Gorky had no access to them during his sojourn on Capri He does mention Iz rasskaza in his memoirs, however, in a passage which merits attention "Он печатал рассказы "Марсельеза", "Набат", "Рассказ, который никогда не будет кончен", но уже в октябре 1905 г прочитал мне в рукописи "Так было""[291] The mistake in Gorky's chronology is revealing, by grouping Iz rasskaza with Marsel'eza and Nabat, he implicitly accepts that it is a 'revolutionary' work but, by misdating it, he denies that the author could have displayed any sympathy for the revolutionary movement in the post-1905 period Having already formed the opinion that Andreyev was now a reactionary, Gorky was no longer capable of viewing his works objectively This is demonstrated even more convincingly by his reaction to Tsar' Golod

As we have seen, Tsar' Golod had been conceived in 1906 as the next in the series of symbolic dramas to be united under the title Zhizn' chelovecheskaya, of which Zhizn' Cheloveka was the first The title may well have been inspired by A N Bakh's influential book Tsar' Golod, which was an early statement on the plight of the working class in Russia from a socialist viewpoint[292] Like Bakh's book, Andreyev's play concentrates on the conflict between the privileged and the underprivileged classes in contemporary Russian society, between the 'sated' and the 'hungry' as they are designated by the author The play is no social tract, however, but rather an attempt by Andreyev to condense and clarify his view of revolution into a universal statement

Andreyev's intention in Tsar' Golod was not, strictly speaking, to write a play about revolution That was to be the subject of a separate play in the series (a plan which was never realized) The subject of Tsar' Golod, as the author was to insist on a number of subsequent occasions, was revolt He explained this point in an interview with Izmaylov

> Идею "Царя-Голода" поняли как объявление банкротства революции Может быть, я сам до известной степени виноват, что я так понят Я не дал ясно понять, что здесь идет речь толкьо о простом бунте, а не об истинной революции. Если бы знали весь план моей работы, знали, что за "Миром и войной", о которых я думаю сейчас, идет специальная часть "Революция" - этого упрека мне бы не сделали Пожалуй, меня упрекнут даже в чрезмерном оптимизме Может быть мне следовало бы прямо оговорить это в предисловии или примечании, но я этого не сделал Вот всегдашняя невыгода выдавать труд частями. 293

Andreyev's statement that he had not made his purpose sufficiently clear is somewhat surprising in the light of the only too obvious message of the following dialogue in the fourth picture of Tsar' Golod

> Это революция'
> Не оскорбляйте революцию. Это бунт 294

The distinction between revolution and revolt had been implicit in both Gubernator and Tak bylo, as we have seen In each work, Andreyev had distinguished between the concepts of 'punishment' and 'vengeance' as the alpha and omega respectively of human rationality [295] The 'revolt of the hungry' in Tsar' Golod is only too obviously an act which belongs to the latter category

Andreyev had first attempted to depict the revolt of the underprivileged against the privileged classes in the original version of K zvyozdam and it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that Tsar' Golod owes its genesis to the earlier work We have already noted certain stylistic similarities between the two plays and also the proximity between the figure of Tsar' Golod and the character of the Thin Man Other details suggest the same conclusion The confrontation between the 'hungry' and the 'sated' is foreshadowed in the opening scene of the K zvyozdam manuscript, which concurs in a number of details with the text of Tsar' Golod (e g the irrational desire of the mob to destroy the achievements of learning,[296] the idea of releasing animals from their cages)[297] In each case also, the underprivileged are depicted as

a blind mob, in the full sense implied by Gorky in his own study Mob

What is new to Tsar' Golod is the figure of the title character, who, although he bears a certain resemblance to the figure of the Thin Man from the manuscript version of K zvyozdam, is elevated in the later play to the status of a universal concept, alongside Death and Time What, then, is the nature of this concept and what is its significance to the overall meaning of the play? To begin with, it is quite plain that we are dealing here with a concept far less easily defined than that of death or time Indeed, Tsar' Golod is as elusive a symbol as the opening stage direction suggests "Царь Голод движется беспокойно и страстно, так что трудно составить представление о его фигуре".[298] His actions in the play in no way help to clarify the matter In the first two pictures he incites the 'hungry' to revolt but in the third he appears as their judge In the fourth picture he seems to be on the side of the 'hungry' but in the fifth he swears his allegiance to the 'sated' No wonder, therefore, that one of the sated should state "Еще неизвестно, с кем он, с нами или с мятежниками!"[299] Blok, who perhaps came closest of Andreyev's contemporaries to an understanding of the figure of Tsar' Golod, referred to him as a 'universal provocateur' (vsenarodnyy provokator),[300] possibly inspired by the numerous examples of such activity uncovered in the post-1905 period However, even Blok's interpretation suggests that Tsar' Golod owes his allegiance to either one or the other of the conflicting parties and hence misses the vital point In fact Tsar' Golod owes allegiance to neither side, whilst having power over both Let us look again at the play to discover the meaning of this seeming paradox

Apart from the obvious circumstance of their social status and material well-being, the 'hungry' and the 'sated' display remarkably similar characteristics, which Andreyev emphasizes by means of certain structural devices For example, in the second picture, the stage is divided into an upper and a lower part, where the 'sated' and the 'hungry' respectively indulge in their various entertainments The parallel is suggested further by the stage direction at the end of the picture, in which it is stated in reference to the 'hungry' "Получается дикое сходство с обыкновенной мещанской вечеринкой"[301] The 'sated' and the 'hungry' are equally alien to the cultural heritage and are in fact equally responsible for its destruction during the

revolt Concerned only with the immediate problem of their own welfare, the 'sated' can only be amazed at those like the Artist and the Professor, who risk their lives to rescue works of art and scholarship threatened by the revolt of the 'hungry' The same meaning is to be discovered in the engineer's disclosure that the National Gallery had been set on fire not by the insurrectionists but by the shells of those who were fighting against them Another parallel is furnished by the 'hymn to the cannon' that the 'sated' compose following the successful suppression of the revolt [302] The reader is immediately reminded of the 'hymn to the machine' of the workers in the opening picture [303] The 'sated' and the 'hungry', Andreyev suggests, are enemies only in the "superficial" social sense, beneath the skin they display the same spiritual characteristics

The similarity between the 'sated' and the 'hungry' is nowhere more apparent than in their attitude to Tsar' Golod In the second picture, Tsar' Golod addresses the mob "Но ждите, дети мои Пробегут короткие дни, и Время снова ударит в колокол всполоха И тогда - на улицы, в дома!"[304] His audience, like a congregation repeating the words of a priest, provides the refrain

На улицы!
В дома! В их спальни! [305]

In the final scene, we witness the same process amongst the 'sated', when Tsar' Golod pronounces his speech on their victory Addressing himself to the defeated insurrectionists, he asks "Чего добились, безумцы? - Куда шли?"[306] and the 'sated' respond

Куда шли?
Чего добились? [307]

We are now aware of Tsar' Golod's significance he is the symbol of authority upon which the slave, whether 'sated' or 'hungry', depends This interpretation is supported by a brief episode in the grotesque scene of the 'Trial of the Hungry' In the midst of those condemned is a man whose only crime is that he does not display the characteristics of the slave Tsar' Golod explains "Он раб, - и для раба он слишком силен и честен Уже одним этим он оскорбляет нас как людей утонченной культуры и следовательно - не сильных" [308] Although he seems to be talking for the 'sated', Tsar' Golod is in fact talking for himself, as it is the existence of such 'strong' men that is the greatest threat to his authority

Tsar' Golod ends on a note which suggests that the central

character has no reason to fear for his power Amidst the conversation of the 'sated' there are two statements which are obviously symbolical

> А в городе невозможно оставаться от грохота и лязга железа
> Да, везде куют цепи К сожалению, это необходимо
>
> Мне всю ночь снилась бесконечная железная цепь, которая облегает земной шар 309

The 'endless iron chain' symbolizes the universal existence of slavery which, in turn, guarantees the eternal authority of Tsar' Golod, an authority which is not even threatened by the specture of future revolts

Despite its pessimistic conclusion, Tsar' Golod does contain a hint of an alternative solution In the first picture, we encounter the Second Worker, an idealist, who resists Tsar' Golod's call to revolt "Есть другой царь, не Царь Голод Но я не знаю как его зовут" [310] More interesting is the figure of the 'former barrister' in the second picture, who offers the following alternative to violent revolt

> В некоторых случаях, при так называемых волнениях или народных бедствиях, одному из членов нашей почтенной корпорации приходится вступить в интимные отношения с одной из тех (указывает наверх) дам или девиц, результатом чего является плод Так как же полагает собрание относительно детей, родящихся от подобного морганатического брака? 311

The idea of a 'morganatic marriage', dismissed as irrelevant by the assembled company, is taken up by the Girl in Black in the third picture, who wishes to sacrifice herself to the 'hungry' man accused of rape We are reminded of T'ma and the new synthesis achieved by Aleksey and Lyuba as a result of their liaison Tsar' Golod achieves the very opposite, by exacerbating class antagonism, he ensures that man remains subject to his authority

Andreyev's depiction of revolt in Tsar' Golod and the distinction between revolution and revolt differs in no essential way from Gorky's distinction between 'socialism' and 'anarchism' contained in his sketch The City of Mammon The point is made even more clearly in Mat', both in the words of the naive peasant lad who asks 'Is revolution revolt?'[312] and in Pavel Vlasov's speech "Вы видите - мы не бунтовщики" [313] Indeed, one of the major themes in the novel had been to distinguish true revolution from mere revolt Such considerations make

Gorky's outright rejection of Tsar' Golod all the more baffling, particularly when we bear in mind Zvontsov's words on the 1905 Revolution in the later play Egor Bulychov i drugiye "В пятом был - бунт, а не революция"[314]

Why, then, did Gorky react as he did to Andreyev's play? Certainly, we should not overlook the fact that he had read the work somewhat inattentively and that his opinion had been shaped under the influence of Lunacharsky, as we have already noted above More important, perhaps, was the fact that Isar' Golod, like Zhizn' Cheloveka before it, was only too obviously a pessimistic work By this time Gorky had already purged himself of such pessimism (which had found expression in Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka and Posledniye) to embark upon a conscious policy of what might be termed 'revolutionary romanticism' In Ispoved' (and, as we shall see, in a number of works which followed) Gorky was intent on depicting only the positive features of revolution and, in particular, the growth of a new revolutionary consciousness Such works, he felt, could be of practical use during the period of reaction, whereas those like Andreyev's could only breed cynicism or indifference But perhaps most important of all was the fact that Gorky had by this time become convinced, rightly or wrongly, that Andreyev was an 'anti-revolutionary' writer and hence was unable to approach his works with an open mind This alone can serve as an explanation of Gorky's seemingly perverse desire to misconstrue the purpose of almost all Andreyev's subsequent works

Understandably distressed by the deterioration of his relations with Gorky, Andreyev tried on a number of occasions to convince him that he had in no way deserted the revolutionary ideal In February, 1908 he even spoke of a more sanguine view he had developed since his return to Russia "Если при успехах революции я смотрел мрачно и каркал так было, так будет, то сейчас, живя в лесу виселиц, я чувствую и радость, и непоколебимую уверенность в победе жизни".[315] The 'unshakable certainty in the victory of life' to which Andreyev refers found its fullest expression in Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh, perhaps the best-known of all his prose works

Like the earlier Gubernator, to which it bears a superficial resemblance, Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh was based on an actual event, in this case the attempted assassination of the Minister of Justice on 7 February, 1908, which was thwarted due to the duplicity of Azef[316]

As with the earlier work, however, the real-life event simply provided Andreyev with a convenient vehicle for a more searching enquiry into the nature of revolution Although he began, as Dr Woodward has indicated,[317] with the aim of denouncing the contemporary wave of violent repression against revolutionaries conducted by the Russian government, this polemical element plays a very minor role in the completed story[318] At the centre of Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh lies a problem which had occupied the author for a number of years the existentialist dilemma of personality The introduction to the first American edition of the story contained the following statement by Andreyev 'The misfortune of us all is that we know so little, even nothing, about one another, - neither about the soul, nor the life, the sufferings, the habits, the inclinations, the aspirations of one another'[319] In Vor, he had hinted at a solution to this problem in Yurasov's moment of spiritual communion with nature and in K zvyozdam, he presented two characters, Ternovsky and Treych, who had succeeded in transcending their individuality to become 'children of the universe', suggesting that this is the true nature of revolution Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh, can be seen, therefore, as the culmination of this tendency in Andreyev's thought

In his new story, the author confronts his characters, ranging from the minister to the Estonian peasant Yanson with the prospect of immediate death The situation (in a slightly different form) was one which he had utilized before In Tsar' Golod, for example, the 'sated' reveal their total lack of principle only when their lives are threatened by the 'revolt of the hungry'

Тут погибнут люди, а они о картинах'
Тут можем погибнуть мы, вот что важно'

Ах, пожалуйста, реформы, все что угодно
Мы можем погибнуть, вот что важно

Я хочу жить - жить' А кто мне даст жизнь,
Бог или дьявол - мне все равно 320

Man's instinctive fear of death, which forces him, as in the case cited here, to value his personal survival higher than any ideal represents the most serious threat to the possibility of mankind achieving some sort of corporate identity

The same message is contained in Eleazar, a story written in 1906, which Gorky considered the finest study of death in world literature[321]

Harnessing the biblical story of Lazarus to his own purpose, Andreyev depicted in this work the devastating effect of the spectre of death upon collective humanity This is suggested in the opening scene of the feast held to celebrate Lazarus's return from the dead Suddenly aware of the enigma which Lazarus represents, the guests at the feast fall silent

> Равнодушно думали, что надо, вероятно, итти домой, но не могли преодолеть вязкой и ленивой скуки, обесиливавшей мышцы, и продолжали сидеть, все оторванные друг от друга, как тусклые огоньки, разбросанные по ночному полю. 322

Significantly, of those whom Lazarus encounters during his second life, it is Augustus alone who has the power to withstand the terrifying truth he embodies Augustus's salvation derives from his awareness of his responsibility to the people who live under his rule, this altruistic thought spares him the fate of those like the artist Aurelius, who is utterly destroyed by his confrontation with Lazarus

The suggestion, only hinted at in Eleazar, that man can transcend his earthly existence (and hence lose his fear of death) is developed to its logical conclusion in Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh As Dr Woodward has noted in his fine analysis of the story,[323] each of the characters confronted with death (the minister, the five revolutionaries and the two common criminals) occupies a definite position on a scale bounded by the extremes of uncontrollable fear, on the one hand, and the total absence of such fear, on the other The story proceeds according to its own dialectic Hence we see first the abject fear of the minister and of the unfortunate Yanson, pass on to the cases of the Gipsy, Kashirin and Golovin, who manage in varying degrees to control their fear, before encountering Tanya and Musya, who have succeeded in totally conquering any fear of death Finally, we discover in Werner the ultimate synthesis, the 'child of eternity' who has the vision of life and death merging into one

> С тем удивительным просветлением духа, которое в редкие минуты осеняет человека и поднимает его на высочайшие вершины созерцания, Вернер вдруг увидел и жизнь и смерть, и поразился великолепием невиданного зрелища Словно шел по узкому, как лезвие ножа, высочайшему горному хребту и на одну сторону видел жизнь, а на другую видел смерть, как два сверкающих, глубоких, прекрасных моря, сливающихся на горизонте в один безграничный широкий простор 324

Werner achieves this vision only when he escapes the narrow confines of his own intellect, epitomized by the chess problems he solves mentally during the trial Although the source of his strength and calm, Werner's intellect also isolates him from the others who stand accused Like his comrade Golovin, Werner comes to appreciate the limitations of logic Compare, for example, the description first of Golovin's moment of enlightenment

> Святотатственною рукою была отдернута завеса, сызвека скрывающая тайну жизни и тайну смерти, и они перестали быть тайной, - но не сделались они и понятными, как истина, начертанная на неведомом языке Не было таких понятий в его человеческом мозгу, не было таких слов на его человеческом языке, которое могли бы охватить увиденное 325

with that of Werner

> Он не пытался, как прежде, запечатлеть словами увиденное, да и не было таких слов на все еще бедном, все еще скудном человеческом языке 326

At this moment, we are told, Werner feels as if he 'has just emerged from some prison' [327] The prison, of course, is his ego, which he has transcended in order to become a part of collective, immortal humanity Significantly, it is at this point only that he begins to use the word 'comrade' [328]

Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh combines and concludes a number of themes from Andreyev's earlier works It contains what the author undoubtedly felt to be the solution to the problem of alienation, which derives, in his view, from the problem of mortality In this work, his conception of the 'two realities', already present in K zvyozdam,[329] is developed into a positive, revolutionary philosophy of life

Despite the obviously sympathetic depiction of the revolutionaries and the final sunrise, symbolizing the birth of the new life, Andreyev's story failed to satisfy Gorky, who in fact singled the work out for special criticism in Razrusheniye lichnosti

> Революционеры "Рассказа о семи повешенных" совершенно не интересовались делами, за которые они идут на виселицу, никто из них на протяжении рассказа ни словом не вспомнил об этих делах. Они производят впечатление людей, которые прожили жизнь неимоверно скучно, не имеют ни одной связи за стенами тюрьмы и принимают смерть, как безнадежно больной ложку лекарства. 330

Gorky's comments are hardly unexpected, coming at a time when the writer himself was actively involved in practical revolutionary work (the organization of the Capri school for party workers) [331] Compared with the revolutionaries in his own works, Ispoved' and Leto (upon which he had just begun work), Andreyev's terrorists are indeed abstract and somewhat unreal figures Furthermore, the concept of 'comradeship' which Werner comes to appreciate at the end of the story was clearly far more mystical than Gorky's own and smacked somewhat of the transcendentalism popular amongst some of the Russian Symbolists. Also symptomatic of his attitude are the words of Matvey from Ispoved', written before Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh, but nevertheless peculiarly appropriate to it "Смерть - тоже загадка, а я - разрешение жизни искал" [332] Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh did not satisfy Gorky as it failed in his view to provide exactly what he felt was demanded of literature at that time, namely 'the solution of life'

3 Freedom and the slave Moi zapiski

One of the manuscript versions of Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh had ended with the words "люди, люди, как долог и мучителен ваш путь к совершенству - как долго вам еще идти'"[333] Although removed from the published work, the phrase reads like a subtitle to Moi zapiski, a story which was completed in September, 1908 and to which Andreyev referred in 1913 as his 'best work' [334]

Like Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh, Moi zapiski utilizes the symbolic image of a prison as the vehicle for its philosophical message In form, however, it resembles Dostoyevsky's Zapiski iz podpol'ya and comprises the 'notes' of a 'hero' who only too clearly embodies a philosophy alien to his creator Andreyev outlined the central idea of the work in an interview with a correspondent of Birzhevye vedomosti, who, like a number of contemporary readers, was perplexed by the story's hero In particular, the correspondent was anxious to discover whether or not the hero was guilty of the multiple murder for which he has to serve a life sentence Although he provided no answer to this specific question, Andreyev suggested a way in which the story might be approached Murder, he stated, is an act dictated almost invariably by the subconscious, which the conscious mind subsequently often fails to accept (This idea had already been illustrated in Mysl', of course) The only escape from this truth is to create an imaginary world from

which it may be eliminated The hero of Moi zapiski, Andreyev concluded, is a 'genius of adaptability', a supreme example of the mind's ability to construct a rational scheme to exclude the promptings of the subconscious[335]

Although ostensibly intended as an essay in self-justification, Moi zapiski, true to the Dostoyevskian tradition, is in reality an unwitting act of self-endictment With undisguised pride, the hero recounts his transition from despair in his early years of incarceration (recorded in his 'Diary of a Prisoner') to the peace and harmony which came with his discovery of the 'philosophy of the iron grille'

> Почему небо так красиво именно сквозь решетку? - размышлял я, гуляя - Не есть ли это действие эстетического закона контрастов, по которому голубое чувствуется особенно сильно на ряду с черным? Или не есть ли это проявление какого-то иного, высшего закона, по которому безграничное постигается человеческим умом лишь при непременном условии введения его в границы, например, включения его в квадрат? 336

Viewed in this way, the hero's imprisonment is no longer a curse but a blessing and necessity has become a virtue Convinced of his messianic role as the bearer of a 'new truth', the 'genius of adaptability' becomes the apologist of his own captivity, inventing new devices to perfect the efficiency of the prison and providing yet another illustration to Andreyev's pessimistic notion of slavery being self-imposed

In order to sustain his vision of the prison as the materialization of a 'higher law', the hero of Moi zapiski is consistently forced to ignore the evidence of reality He closes his eyes to the executions which take place in the prison and, more humorously, fails to draw the obvious conclusion from the fact that the governor refuses his request for a plan of the prison His subsequent act of destroying the 'Diary of a Prisoner' and his later refusal to see any link between himself and the suicide of his former fiancée are further signs of his self-delusion

The conflict between fact and fantasy reaches its culmination in the hero's encounter with his former fiancée following his release from prison Like her counterpart in the earlier story U okna (whose central character, Andrey Nikolayevich, is himself a less articulate advocate of self-incarceration) the ex-fiancée symbolizes the 'living life' which the hero has abandoned in favour of his delusive philosophy

The meeting has a profound effect upon the hero

> И я упал перед ней на колени и плакал долго, и тихо шептал о каких-то страданиях, о тоске одиночества, о чьем-то сердце, разбитом жестоко, о чьей-то поруганной, искалеченной, изуродованной мысли 337

At this moment the reader sees the narrator as he really is a tormented soul who has devised an insane theory to discover peace of mind (It is this same real self that the artist K perceives and depicts in his portrait of the hero) But, despite this brief interlude of enlightenment, the hero finds fact less attractive than fantasy The day after the meeting he resolves to return to prison, this time of his own free will, preferring the serenity of his logical construction to the uncertainties of real life

Professor Kaun tells us that a number of Andreyev's contemporaries detected in Moi zapiski a polemic with Tolstoy [338] Such a view would seemingly be supported by the facts of Tolstoy's withdrawn existence at Yasnaya Polyana and his role as moral teacher to a band of loyal disciples (the hero of Moi zapiski, under the illusion that he is a new messiah, is given every opportunity by the prison authorities to preach his 'gospel') However, it is difficult to reconcile this interpretation of the story with Andreyev's reverence for Tolstoy, expressed on a number of occasions in public and private [339] Although he was never in full accordance with Tolstoy's philosophy, Andreyev considered him a moral example, a giant among men (a metaphor he developed himself in Smert' Gullivera, his personal response to the writer's death in 1910) Nevertheless, it is possible to detect in Moi zapiski a polemic if not against Tolstoy, against Gorky That none of Andreyev's contemporaries thought of looking in this direction was almost certainly because the rift between the two men was not as yet common knowledge

Moi zapiski contains a number of features which suggest the presence in the work of a veiled polemic with Gorky Several years earlier, Andreyev had written to Chulkov expressing the view that Gorky had become the 'slave' of a theory "Какими иногда рабами самих себя, рабами слов и названий кажутся мне и Брюсов с В Ивановым, с одной стороны, и Горький - с другой И какие это прилежные и старательные рабы'"[340] In the hero's role of preacher one can also detect a hint of Gorky's didacticism, which had become such a prominent feature of his writing in the post-1905 period Of especial interest

in this context is the following passage from Gorky's memoirs, which relates to the Capri meeting of the writers

> - Прежде всего, брат, я напишу рассказ на тему о деспотизме дружбы, - уж расплачусь же я с тобой, злодей!
> И тотчас, - легко и быстро, - сплел юмористический рассказ о двух друзьях, мечтателе и математике, - один из них всю жизнь рвется в небеса, а другой заботливо подсчитывает издержки воображаемых путешествий и этим решительно убивает мечты друга 341

Although the work to which Gorky refers was never completed by Andreyev in this form, the conflict between the two friends was realised in the confrontation between the hero and the artist K in Moi zapiski

The artist K is the absolute antithesis of the hero, representing man's free creative spirit Much to the hero's disappointment, K refuses to submit to the 'higher law' of the prison or to recognise its laws The only outlet for his creative instinct is the blackboard on which he draws incessantly but which ensures that he must destroy every work of art before embarking on the next This leads K to the verge of insanity and gives the hero a new idea for converting the artist to the 'philosophy of the iron grille' The idea is that K be engaged to paint portraits of the prison officials and their families, a task to which the artist devotes himself diligently at first Within a short time, however, the hero finds that K has returned to his blackboard In a final desperate effort to divert the artist from his intentions, the hero smashes the blackboard, which in turn causes K to commit suicide

The conflict between the hero and K is quite clearly an allegory on the subject of artistic freedom If K represents Andreyev's own ideal of total independence, the hero embodies a different principle, advocating that art be placed in the service of an extra-artistic cause That the fate of K illustrates Andreyev's views on the question of committed art is undoubted and it is equally certain that the target of the author's criticism was Gorky This view is further supported by a hint of Gorky's arguments with Andreyev over the issue of verisimilitude in art in the discussion between the hero and K of the prison governor's portrait

> После некоторого молчания я рассеянно заметил
> - Ваш портрет господина начальника пользуется большим успехом Хотя некоторые из видевших

> и утверждают, что правый ус несколько короче левого.
> - Короче?
> - Да, короче Но в общем находят, что сходство схвачено весьма удачно 342

In this respect Moi zapiski can indeed by seen as an attempt by Andreyev to 'pay Gorky back' for their recent altercations over the purpose of literature in the Znaniye debate

Whether Gorky detected any such polemic in Moi zapiski is impossible to say, although he made his opinion of the work plain enough In 1911, reviewing the causes of the breakdown of their relationship, Gorky made specific reference to the story in a letter to Andreyev "Затем - "Мои записки" - вещь тоже обидная, во-первых, потому, что совпадает с "философией" бездарного Чулкова, во-вторых, потому, что является проповедью пассивного отношения к жизни - проповедью неожиданной для меня и тебе несвойственной" [343] Gorky had expressed himself in similar terms in October and November, 1908 in his correspondence with his wife,[344] Malinovskaya[345] and Amfiteatrov [346] That he should so consistently have missed Andreyev's ironic purpose in Moi zapiski can possibly be explained by reference to his article O tsinizme, which had contained a statement seemingly contradicted by Andreyev's story "Рабы перерождаются в людей - вот новый смысл жизни'"[347]

Had Gorky been inclined to view Moi zapiski more tolerantly, he would have discovered that Andreyev's story is in essence a restatement of the conflict between the grass-snake and the falcon in Pesnya o Sokole In Gorky's work, the grass-snake, having found to his discomfort that 'he who is born to crawl cannot fly', rationalizes his failure in his earth-bound philosophy

> Смешные птицы' Но не обманут теперь уж больше меня их речи' Я сам все знаю' Я - видел небо Взлетал в него я, его измерил, а только крепче в себя я верю Пусть те, что землю любить не могут, живут обманом Я знаю правду. 348

Consider now the following 'footnote' by the hero of Moi zapiski on the subject of aviation

> И, вместо того, чтобы радоваться успехам воздухоплавания, как это делают мои современники, я предложил бы им серьезно задуматься над вопросом, не лучше ли для человека полная неподвижность, в крайнем случае твердое и верное ползание по земле, нежели обманное порхание в клетке? 349

The parallel is even closer in the second of the 'anecdotes' later published by Andreyev under the title Moi anekdoty as a supplement to Moi zapiski Here the hero reports the case of an aviator who had died in an air crash and comments with unfeigned delight "Здесь смешно то, что безвредно побывав на высоте четырех тысяч метров, доступной только орлам, юноша погиб на двух метрах, что нельзя даже считать высотою!"[350]

Gorky was not alone amongst Andreyev's contemporaries in misreading the meaning of Moi zapiski Dr Woodward cites the example of Zakrzhevsky's study Podpol'e Psikhologicheskiye paralleli which found that Andreyev's story proved 'mathematically the horror and uselessness of our whole lives'[351] Always sensitive to the critical response to his works, Andreyev had been particularly annoyed by the prevalence of critical misconceptions about his fiction in the post-1905 period In one case already (that of Chyornye maski, whose difficult symbolism had completely baffled the majority of critics) he had actually resorted to explaining its meaning in the course of Moi zapiski, utilizing the subterfuge of a 'footnote'[352] One can detect the same intention in two of the author's later stories, Den' gneva and Polyot, both of which return to the central theme of Moi zapiski and provide a commentary on it

The first of these stories, Den' gneva, was written in 1910 Inspired by the Sicilian earthquake of December, 1908,[353] the story describes the experiences of a bandit locked away in an impenetrable fortress Worn down by his long years of incarceration, the bandit comes close to accepting the 'philosophy of the iron grille', as he recounts in his 'notes' "И я привык к железу решеток, и к камню стен, и они казались мне вечными, а тот кто их построил - самым сильным на свете"[354] The illusion of permanence is shattered by the earthquake, which destroys the fortress and returns the hero briefly to freedom Although he is soon recaptured, the hero no longer believes in the invincibility of the prison in which he is captive "Но я не верю в твою тюрьму, господин мой, человек Но я не верю в твое железо, - не верю в твой камень

То, что я видел разрушенным, вновь не срастется никогда"[355] This bold statement challenges the boast by the hero of Moi zapiski "Я воздвиг стройное здание, в котором живу ныне радостно и спокойно, как царь Разрушьте его - и завтра же я

начну новое и обливаясь кровавым потом, построю его'"[356]
Yet even this optimistic vision of the indominable urge for freedom was unsufficient for Gorky "Избави нас боже от свободы по Андрееву", he wrote of Den' gneva to M K Iordanskaya in November, 1910, "ибо имя ее - нигилизм в мысли, а в действии - анархизм" [357]

In Polyot, written in the latter part of 1913, Andreyev returned, as the title suggests, to the subject of aviation, which had provided an important leitmotif in Moi zapiski The story was probably based on the actual story of L M Matsiyevich, an acquaintance of the author, who died in an accident on 25 September, 1910, after establishing an altitude record [358] We may assume that this was the same incident as had inspired the second 'Anecdote' discussed above, but the treatment in Polyot is entirely different If the accident had been interpreted by the hero of Moi zapiski as a justification of his 'philosophy of immobility', then in Polyot it becomes a symbol of man's communication with the infinite, which is, in the author's view, the ultimate freedom During his last flight, the pilot, who is named Pushkaryov, has a vision of a new freedom which he has achieved by soaring high above the earth

> Здесь не было наезженных путей, и в вольном беге божественно свободной сознала себя воля, сама окрылилась широкими крылами
>
> "Вот и сбылся мой счастливый сон, вот уже я и в святом жилище моем, хожу среди моих высоких зал, и нет со мною никого, только свет один Но что же милое я вижу? Я один ведь Но что же такое милое я чувствую? Такое милое, такое, такое Счастье мое, моя душа, мое счастье Я люблю тебя ужасно" 359

We are reminded of Werner's moment of enlightenment in Rasskaz o semi poveshennykh (the repetition of the epithet milyy in both contexts is particularly striking) [360] As in Werner's case, the new truth of which Pushkaryov has become aware is beyond the comprehension of the intellect alone Once aware of this truth, death is no longer the source of apprehension The final crash results in the death of the body only, but not of the spirit, which has achieved immortality

The work in which Andreyev depicted most clearly his conception of the 'two realities', Polyot was of particular importance to the author, as he revealed in a letter of December, 1916 to Goloushev "Ко мне есть ворота, откуда удобнее совершить обозрение

Это мои рассказ "Полет", или "Надсмертное"" [361]

4 The 'stiong' and the 'weak' the pragmatic concern in Anatema and Okean

In the majority of the works so far discussed in this section Andreyev had confined himself primarily to an examination of the 'revolutionary' and the 'slave' mentalities Like Gorky, he was convinced that social progress was dependent upon the eradication of the slave mentality from human nature and the ascendency of the revolutionary In Anatema, the next in his series of symbolic dramas, completed in December, 1908,[362] Andreyev turned to the pragmatic problem of how this fundamental change in human nature is to be effected

This problem was of course by no means new to either Andreyev or Gorky The pragmatic concern had been prominent in a number of Gorky's earlier works, culminating in Na dne, where the author had postulated two solutions the way of compassion and the way of truth, represented, respectively, in the figures of Luka and Satin By discrediting Luka Gorky clearly suggested that truth alone could ensure the resurrection of the slave, a view made quite explicit, as we have seen, in Chelovek From Chelovek it was a straight line of development to Ispoved' and the theory and practice of 'God-building' as a new faith founded on truth

Andreyev's own enquiry into the central theme of Na dne had been developed in Savva, a play in which he had questioned the supposition upon which 'God-building' was founded, namely, the power of truth to destroy the slave ieligion Anatema forms the second part of this enquiry, focussing upon the alternative solution, the way of compassion

The link between Anatema and Savva is nowhere more apparent than in the similarity of their plot Each play is a variation on the story of Christ, the drama deriving from the sacrifice of an altruistic individual to a crowd which fails to comprehend the natuie of his endeavour In Anatema the biblical parallels are far more obvious than in the earlier play, a fact which did not escape the attention of Andreyev's contemporaries The theatre critic of Moskovskiye vedomosti in a typical review characterized the play as a 'mad caricature of Christianity',[363] an opinion which lay at the root of the vigorous campaign by the Orthodox Church to have Anatema banned from the Russian stage, a campaign which was eventually successful [364]

The essence of the Church's argument against Anatema was that Andreyev had depicted Christ not as the son of God but as the envoy of the devil with the purpose of denigrating the entire Christian movement [365] This conclusion issued logically from an analysis, in strictly biblical terms, of the relationship between the Christ-figure (David Leyzer) and Anatema Although interesting as an example of the growing suspiciousness of the Church authorities towards Andreyev, this interpretation is founded upon a serious misconception of the author's purpose As in earlier cases (e g Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo, Ben Tovit, Eleazar, Iuda Iskariot i drugiye) the biblical story was merely a convenient vehicle for a theme which was Andreyev's own Contrary to the assertions of the author's Church critics, Anatema was not intended as a parody of the story of Christ Indeed, although the biblical allusions in the play are quite undeniable, there are a number of elements to suggest that it owes its genesis only indirectly to the biblical story of Christ and that its direct source may well have been the story of Ivan Karamazov

The tragedy of Anatema, as a number of critics have noted,[366] bears a certain similarity to the Satan legend, a view which is supported by the continual references to Anatema as the devil In the very opening scene, for example, Anatema dubs himself the 'Prince of Darkness' [367] However, as Dr Woodward has indicated, the similarity is entirely superficial, there being no real correspondence between the figure of Anatema and such literary prototypes as Milton's Satan or Geoethe's Faust [368] In Andreyev's interpretation, Anatema is simply the embodiment of human rationalism and, as such, his fate is a restatement of the author's attack against pure reason With Andreyev's earlier super-rationalists Anatema shares a total unwillingness to recognise any limitation to the power of human thought In the opening scene this is represented symbolically in confrontation between Anatema and the guardian of the Iron Gates which are the 'limit of the cognizable world' [369] Anatema is linked specifically with Ivan Karamazov in that his protest against God emanates from his rational rejection of a world in which injustices are permitted In order to prove his point, he decides to make an example of David Leyzer "Раб мой, Давид твоими устами возвещу я правду о судьбе человека" [370]

The story of David Leyzer, which occupies the major part of Anatema, takes as its source the biblical account of Christ's temptation

in the desert (Matthew, 4 1-11) as used by Ivan Karamazov in Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore The entire episode tests the Grand Inquisitor's hypothesis that man's life would be better if Christ's deed were corrected Leyzer himself epitomizes the eudemonistic principle which lies at the basis of the Grand Inquisitor's teaching "не учить людей, а радовать их я пришел" [371] That this is a complete reversal of the Christian principle is emphasized by the repeated reference to the upturned bible which lies on Leyzer's desk [372]

Leyzer is the perfect subject for Anatema's cruel experiment In his sincere desire to alleviate the suffering of mankind by distributing the four million dollar inheritance he receives at the beginning of the play he is totally naive His inability to predict the natural forces unleashed amongst the people by his act of charity is matched by his incredulity as he witnesses his deification by the ever-growing crowd which hopes to benefit from his charity Finally aware of his responsibility, he succumbs to Anatema's temptation "они несут могущество и власть - и силу творить чудеса - не хочешь ли стать их богом, Давид?"[373] At this point, the play diverges from the biblical account, as Leyzer, like Vasily Fiveysky, is a mere mortal unable to perform the miracle to which he aspires Exposed as an 'imposter' in the eyes of the crowd he becomes another victim of the natural thirst for vengeance

To Anatema, the death of Leyzer at the hands of the crowd is the culmination of his experiment, the ultimate proof of the world's injustice However, when he returns to the Iron Gates, the Guardian confronts him with the unexpected revelation that Leyzer has achieved immortality This is the ultimate irony as it invalidates Anatema's entire experiment, indicating the workings of a supreme justice inaccessible to the power of reason The paradox is stated by the Guardian "Погибший в числах, мертвый в мере и весах, Давид достиг бессмертия в бессмертии огня" [374] Trapped by the limitations imposed by logic, Anatema is unable to perceive David Leyzer's redeeming quality, the compassion which inspires his altruistic sacrifice Writing to Amfiteatrov in October, 1913, Andreyev stressed this aspect of Leyzer's character "Тот же мистический Давид Лейзер есть только утверждение подвига, самоотвержения - протест против личного во имя общего, людского" [375] Although naive and misguided in his actions, Leyzer has transcended his ego to

serve mankind and this alone is sufficient to ensure his immortality

Notwithstanding Leyzei's 'victory' over Anatema, Andreyev's play is essentially a pessimistic work Like Savva, it suggests that the barrier between the prophet and the crowd is insurmountable In each play the crowd is typified by its thirst for the miracle, which for Andreyev is the identifying feature of the 'slave' mentality Although they aie killed for different reasons (Savva for challenging the miracle, Leyzer for failing to provide it) the hero of each play is the victim of man's innate slavishness The pragmatic problem is not merely unsolved, it is insoluble The same message emerges from Okean, a play completed two years after Anatema [376]

In Okean Andreyev provides as it were a synopsis of Savva and Anatema, incorporating into the new play virtually unchanged his analysis of the 'way of truth' and the 'way of compassion' presented separately in the two earlier woiks The first drafts of the play, it will be remembered, had been completed on Capri,[377] a fact which led Dr Woodward to suggest the possibility of a direct influence by Gorky on its foim [378] Dr Woodward detected a specific sign of this influence in the similarity between the 'symbolic framework' of Andreyev's play and Vagin's monologue fiom the second act of Deti Solntsa [379] However, Andreyev's symbolic use of the contrast between land and sea in Okean suggests a far more profound level of similaiity than that suggested by Dr Woodward The symbolic contrast between land and sea is a prominent leitmotif in a number of early woiks by Goiky, being fully developed for the first time in Chelkash, where the 'man of the sea' Chelkash clashes with the 'man of the land', the peasant Gavrila If Chelkash represents the bold spirit of freedom, Gavrila is a negative character, enslaved by the exigencies of the mundane struggle for survival The difference between them is brought out in a short exchange

> - Хорошо море? - спросил Челкаш
> - Ничего Только боязно в нем, - ответил Гаврила 380

The same conflict is reenacted in Mal'va, where the heroine, the 'daughter of the sea', triumphs over the peasants Vasiliy and Yakov who compete for her favours The contrast is present again in Pesnya o Sokole, in which the grass-snake, the apologist of Philistinism, proclaims "Земли творенье - землей живу я",[381] whilst the waves sing out their famous hymn of praise to the freedom-loving falcon "безумству храбрых поем мы славу'"[382] It is precisely this same symbolism

that Andreyev uses in the confrontation between the 'children of the sea' and the 'children of the land' in Okean

The two opposite forces in human nature have their extreme representatives in the figures of Khorre and Dan Khorre, a daring pirate, who raised his captain Khaggart from childhood, is the epitome of bold individualism Totally amoral, he scorns the pathetic creatures he encounters on the shore and fails to understand Khaggart's motives for delaying his return to the ocean Dan, on the other hand, lives in perpetual fear of the ocean, the noise of which he seeks to drown with the pitiful music of his organ, the emblem of his religion His physical shortsightedness suggests his narrowminded attitude to life which is founded on the Philistine values of peace and security It is not surprising, therefore, that he and Khorre are from the outset sworn enemies, the latter taking particular pleasure in destroying Dan's instrument before returning to the ocean at the end of the play

Between these two extremes stand the figures of Khaggart and the Abbot, the play's principal protagonists Khaggart, the pirate captain is, like Khorre, a 'child of the sea', his 'firm tread'[383] contrasts with the 'quiet and uncertain steps'[384] of Dan He too is initially scornful of the pathetic slaves who live in the village, yet he is drawn by an irresistible force to adopt the life of the fishermen, marrying the Abbot's daughter, Mariet and fathering a son, Noni The Khaggart-Mariet relationship is another variation on the 'morganatic marriage' motif employed elsewhere by Andreyev to symbolize the union of opposites The test of this union is the child, Noni In Act 3, Mariet complains to Khaggart of Khorre who has been giving Noni gin and dipping him in cold water

(Мариет) Мальчик очень слаб
(Хаггарт) Я не люблю, когда ты говоришь
о слабости Наш мальчик должен быть силен 385

The exchange is of importance as it reveals that at heart Khaggart remains a 'child of the sea' who hopes that his son will inherit his strength Although he manages for a time to control his contempt for the weak, his subconscious antipathy towards the 'children of the earth' inevitably reasserts itself, driving him to murder one of their number, the fisherman Filipp

Khaggart's attitude to life becomes particularly clear in his conflict with the Abbot Himself a man of considerable moral strength,

having abandoned papal ritual in favour of his own more simple form of religion, the Abbot is characterized by his compassion for the weak souls who are his parishioners "Они мои дети Они работали Они устали. И пусть отдохнут "[386] Compassion is the Abbot's dominant feature and it causes him, on occasion, to ignore all moral scruples This is demonstrated most graphically by his behaviour at the inquest into the murder of Filipp Although Khaggart openly confesses to this brutal crime, the Abbot is prepared to let him go unpunished on the condition that he sacrifice his bounty to the fishermen This cavalier attitude to truth and justice is unacceptable to Khaggart, who had already told Mariet of his dislike of the 'lying tongues of priests'[387] He challenges the Abbot "А ты, аббат, совсем как фокусник на базаре и в одной руке у тебя правда, и в другой руке у тебя правда, и все ты делаешь фокусы"[388] To this pragmatic concept of truth he contrasts his own philosophy "Мои отец учил меня "Эй, Нони, смотри' Одна правда и один закон у всех и у солнца, и у ветра, и у волн, и у зверя - только у человека другая правда, бойся человеческой правды, Нони'""[389] It is the awareness that everyone, even Mariet, is infected by this 'human truth' that prompts Khaggart to return to the elemental truth of the ocean

Andreyev's conviction that the 'two truths' are ultimately irreconcilable is manifest in the final act of Okean At first it would seem that the synthesis of the land and the sea has been realized as Khaggart prepares to sail away in his black-sailed ship, Mariet states her willingness to accompany him She is diverted from her purpose, however, by the brutal murder of her father by Khorre The crime places Khaggart in the position of judge, a parallel which forces comparison with the attitude to justice displayed by the Abbot in the previous act To Mariet's great consternation, Khaggart makes only a token gesture at punishing the culprit, for which he receives her curse Yet, despite its seeming immorality, Khaggart's action accords entirely with his principles The murder of the Abbot is, in his eyes, no real crime, on the contrary, it is essential if his truth is to conquer the falsehood which perpetuates the slavery of the weak In his own terms, therefore, his unwillingness to punish Khorre is totally justified Mariet, however, is unable to condone this cruel concept of justice, true to the tradition of her father, she sees Khaggart's

act as a crime against compassion and returns to the land where she belongs

In an interview with a newspaper correspondent in 1910, Andreyev suggested that Okean marked the beginning of an important new development in his thought "Я постепенно, долгим путем, шел к идее разрушения И я чувствую, что теперь я на новом пути я подошел к созиданию, и моя трагедия "Океан" - начало нового пути"[390] On the evidence of the play, however, there seems little basis for this claim Even if we accept Dr Woodward's view that the child, Noni, embodies an 'optimistic note of belief in the possibility of synthesis',[391] this constructive note stands in marked contrast to the dominant mood of the play The final act ends with two images which suggest a far more pessimistic conclusion, as the ship with black sails sets off on its voyage we have a last glimpse of Dan, who rummages in the debris to salvage the wreckage of his organ If Khaggart's departure symbolizes man's immortal pursuit of truth, the latter image suggests that the power of Philistinism is equally immortal Significantly, the 'optimistic note' which Dr Woodward discerned in the figure of Noni is neither repeated nor developed in Andreyev's subsequent works

In conclusion, we should return to the questions raised at the end of section E Let us deal first with the second of those questions From the present analysis of Andreyev's works it is plain that Gorky's claim that these stories and plays contain the 'history of their relationship' is substantially correct These works not only contain unmistakable allusions to personal relations between the two men but also touch upon the central issues of Gorky's own fiction of this period, taken together, they provide a critical commentary to the assumptions upon which the theory of 'God-building' had been founded It is less easy, however, to provide such a clear-cut answer to the other question, viz was Gorky justified in labelling Andreyev a reactionary on the evidence of the works discussed in this chapter? The problem here is one of definition Certainly, the temptation is simply to support Andreyev against such a charge, indicating the obvious fact that Gorky was guilty of both misunderstanding and misrepresenting the purpose of these works written by Andreyev in the post-Capri period As we have seen, the ideas expressed in these works issue logically from those contained in earlier stories by the author and are by no means incompatible with his revolutionary

sympathies What is more, these ideas often correspond closely with those expressed in Gorky's own works Yet, in his own terms, Gorky was not totally unjustified in declaring Andreyev a reactionary In his eyes, the distinguishing feature of the truly revolutionary writer in the years of reaction was 'revolutionary romanticism' According to this view, works like Andreyev's could not possibly serve the revolutionary cause, as their scepticism could only promote doubt in the realizability of the ideal Once convinced that Andreyev's works were reactionary in this sense, Gorky could only see them as a harmful phenomenon, which he sought to prove even by distorting the author's views From this point onwards the bitter polemic of the final years was already an inevitability

CHAPTER FIVE NOTES

1 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 172
2 ibid
3 ЛН 72, стр 262
4 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 172
5 Вересаев, т 5, стр 407-408
6 Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып 119 (1962), стр 385-386
7 ПССА, т 4, стр 253
8 ibid., p 264.
9 For details of the Church's reaction to all Andreyev's plays of this period, see Чудновцев, Церковь и театр, стр.69-72
10 ПССА, т 4, стр 256
11 ibid., p.244
12 ibid., p.273
13 ibid., p 268.
14 ibid., pp 253,267
15 T.S Eliot, Murder in the Cathedral, (London, 1953), p.44
16 ПССА, т 4, стр 269
17 ibid., p.308
18 ibid., p.301
19 ibid., p.309
20 ibid., p.306
21 Wallace Stevens, Opus Posthumous, (New York, 1957), p.163. Quoted in Damian Grant, Realism, (London, 1970), p.70.
22 В Фриче, Леонид Андреев (опыт характеристики), (М , 1909), стр 25
23 Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып 119 (1962), стр 382
24 ПССА, т 4, стр 255
25 П.Орловский, Из истории новейшей русской литературы, (М , 1910), стр 46
26 Woodward, Andreyev, pp.143-144, 143
27 Достоевский, т 9, стр 323
28 ПССА, т 4, стр 307 The critic Negorev took Kondratiy at his word, using this comment as the basis of his analysis of the play Н Негорев, "Савва Антихристов", Театр и искусство, № 38 (1906), стр 583-585
29 Сборник товарищества "Знание" за 1906 год, кн 11 (СПб , 1906), стр.306 The stage direction was removed from subsequent publications of the play
30 Джемс Линч, "Москва (Мелочи жизни)", Курьер, 27 января, 1902, стр 2
31 ПССА, т.4, стр 237
32 Woodward, Andreyev, pp 142-143.
33 ПССА, т.6, стр.337
34 ПССГ, т.2, стр 46
35 ПССГ, т 7, стр 450
36 ЛН.72, стр.270
37 ibid., p.265
38 ПССА, т 4, стр.294
39 Б.Сильверсван, "Заметка о "Савве"", Театр и искусство, № 39 (1906), стр 599
40 see, above, p 68.
41 Gorky arrived in Switzerland on 8 March, departing on 21 March ЛЖТ 1, стр 590,593

42 see, in particular, Gorky's letter to Andreyev of early March, 1906. ЛН 72, стр 265-266
43 see, above, p.172
44 Письма Леонида Андреева, (Л , 1924), стр.20
45 ibid., p.28.
46 Вересаев, т 5, стр 408
47 see also Andreyev's letter to Pyatnitsky of 27 April, 1906. Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр.177
48 АГ 7, стр.136-137
49 ПССГ, т.16, стр 346
50 ЛН 72, стр.28
51 see, below, pp 312-321
52 ЛН 72, стр 518
53 ibid
54 see Andreyev's letters to Serafimovich of May, 1906 and to his brother Pavel Московский альманах, кн 1 (1926), стр 293, Русский современник, № 4 (1924), стр 126
55 Andreyev travelled via Berlin to Helsingfors, where he arrived late in April, 1906 ЛН.72, стр.277
56 see Andreyev's letter to Pyatnitsky of April, 1906 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 178
57 ibid.
58 ЛН.72, стр 269
59 ibid., p.277
60 В.Смирнов, Из революционной истории Финляндии 1905, 1917, 1918 гг., стр.49
61 Zamyatin's impressions are recorded in his contribution to Kniga o Leonide Andreyeve КЛА, стр.109-111
62 Революция 1905 г. и русская литература, стр 423, Афонин, Андреев, стр.150
63 А.Рубцов, Из истории русской драматургии конца XIX-начала XX века, (Минск, 1970), стр 171-172
64 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 180
65 ЛН.72, стр.275
66 Л.Андреев, Памяти Владимира Мазурина Из частного письма, (СПб , 1906) The article was subsequently included in Историко-революционный альманах издательства "Шиповник", (СПб., 1907), a publication which was immediately confiscated and destroyed by the authorities. It was eventually republished in Календарь русской революции, (Пг , 1917) Owing to the inaccessibility of these editions, the text of the 1906 publication has been reproduced in the appendix.
67 ЛН.72, стр 277
68 КЛА, стр 70
69 Андреев, Памяти Леонида Андреева, стр 4
70 see, above, pp.232-234
71 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 180
72 Русский современник, № 4 (1924), стр 128
73 see ЛН 72, стр 278, Блок, т.5, стр.186-193, А Белый, "Смерть или возрождение?", в его кн Арабески, (М , 1911), стр.491-497 On the subject of the play's form, see M.Baring, 'A Russian Mystery Play', in Russian Essays and Stories, (London, 1908), pp.136-157.
74 ПССГ, т 5, стр.230
75 Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 182, see also Письма Леонида Андреева, стр 19

76 ПССА, т 1, стр 174,176
77 ibid , p.186
78 Искусство, № 2 (1925), стр 267
79 ПССА, т.1, стр 190
80 ibid., p.217
81 ibid., p 173.
82 ibid., p 221
83 ibid., pp 229-230
84 ПССА, т 6, стр 329
85 ПССА, т 1, стр 230
86 ibid.
87 ЛН 72, стр.278
88 ibid.
89 ПССГ, т 6, стр 35-36,41
90 ПССА, т 1, стр 181
91 ПССГ, т.6, стр 39
92 ibid., pp 35,39.
93 ПССА, т 1, стр 209
94 ПССГ, т 6, стр 38
95 ibid
96 ПССА, т.1, стр.211
97 ПССГ, т 6, стр.39-40
98 ibid., pp 41-42
99 Woodward, Andreyev, p.158.
100 Meyerkhol'd's production opened on 22 January, 1907 Андреев, Пьесы, стр 565. For an account of the various productions of the play, see J.B.Woodward, 'Leonid Andreyev and 'conventionalism' in the Russian theatre', Modern Language Review, vol.66, no 2 (1971), pp 365-378.
101 Сегодня, 2 сентября, 1907
102 Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып 119 (1962), стр 382-383
103 Андреев, Пьесы, стр.566 For Stanislavsky's view, see Stanislavski, My Life in Art, pp 455-459.
104 ЛН 72, стр.269
105 Андреев, Пьесы, стр 563
106 Вересаев, т 5, стр 413.
107 ЛН 72, стр 283
108 Woodward, Andreyev, p 160
109 The most notable exception is Professor Kaun, who underplays the significance of Andreyev's first wife, stressing instead the importance of his second wife, who, incidentally, provided Kaun with much valuable material for his pioneering work Kaun, Andreyev, pp.77-80,84-86.
110 Вересаев, т.5, стр 400
111 ПССГ, т.16, стр.342
112 Вересаев, т.5, стр 401
113 see, for example, Andreyev's letters to L'vov-Rogachevsky and his son, Vadim, cited in Woodward, Andreyev, pp 161-162.
114 Вересаев, т 5, стр.413
115 Gorky extended his invitation through the person of Ladyzhnikov See. АГ 7, стр 149, Г-30, т 28, стр.442
116 ЛН 72, стр 424
117 ЛЖТ.1, стр 628
118 ЛН.72, стр.276

119 АГ.7, стр 149, Г-30, т 28, стр 442, ЛН 72, стр 565-566
120 АГ.9, стр 20
121 ЛН 72, стр 424.
122 Gorky left Capri on 20 April, returning on 19 May ЛЖТ.1, стр 658,665
123 Г-30, т 29, стр 19 Gorky wrote in a similar vein to his wife. In his memoirs, however, he chose, somewhat more charitably, to forget the incident, remarking simply that Andreyev's departure from Capri was 'unexpected' АГ 9, стр 29, ПССГ, т 16, стр 353
124 see, above, pp 18-19
125 Gorky was critical of other writers for exactly the same reason. See, for example, his strictures against Kuprin Г-30, т 29, стр 54-55,57,63,64
126 see Gorky's letters to Ladyzhnikov of August and September 1907. АГ 7, стр 166, ЛН 72, стр 428
127 ЛН.72, стр 521
128 Вересаев, т 5, стр.411
129 ЛН.72, стр.324 The version of this letter published in the authoritative Literaturnoye nasledstvo volume supports Veresayev's suggestion that the first published version contained a misprint in the final sentence, which read "кончать мне с тобой или нет" (Вересаев, т 5, стр.421) It is this incorrect version that Dr Woodward cites in his study Woodward, Andreyev, p.163.
130 Вересаев, т 5, стр.410
131 Московский альманах, кн 1 (М , 1926), стр 299
132 see, above, p 172
133 Bogdanov was on Capri in November and December, 1906 Burenin was on the island until 8 February, 1907. Andreyev would also have met Desntisky, who delivered Gorky's invitation to attend the London conference ЛЖТ 1, стр 637,649,655
134 ЛН.72, стр 521
135 Pyatnitsky arrived in late December, 1906· ЛЖТ.1, стр 641
136 Most of this poetry has been reprinted in М Горький и поэты-"знаньевцы", изд.2-е, (Л., 1958)
137 see Teleshov's letter to Bunin of September, 1905, in which he refers to Gorky's instructions regarding his story Nadziratel' "Велел скорее переписать и давать в восьмой сборник, не стесняясь темой" ("А М Горький и современники", Вопросы русской литературы, вып 1(7) (1968), стр 39 My italics)
138 see Н Гамалий, "Редакторская деятельность А М Горького в издательстве "Знание" (1900-1906 годы)", Ученые записки Московского областного педагогического института им Н.К.Крупской, т 54 (1957), стр 148-159
139 АГ 4, стр 206
140 In 1904, two miscellanies had been published, with a total circulation of 81,000 copies, of which 78,821 were sold. The corresponding figures for the following years were as follows

1905	5 miscellanies,	248,000 copies,	234,344 sold
1906	7 miscellanies,	220,000 copies,	200,070 sold
1907	5 miscellanies,	150,000 copies,	123,019 sold

(Олейников, "М Горький и "Знание"", стр 210) Full details of the circulation figures for the miscellanies are contained in С Балухатый, Горьковский семинарий, (Л ,

1946), стр 158 The above figures do not take into account the second printing of the first miscellany and the publication of Nizhegorodskiy sbornik, both of which were issued in 1905 with a combined circulation of 40,500 copies.

141 ЛЖТ.1, стр 573

142 Голубева, "Из истории издания русских альманахов", стр 306 For further details of the difficulties facing Znaniye during these years, see Голубев, "Горький и "Знание"", стр.228

143 see, above, p.152.

144 Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып 119 (1962), стр 384

145 ibid., p 386

146 The first mention of the decision is contained in Andreyev's letter to Serafimovich of 22 January, 1907 Московский альманах, кн 1 (М , 1926), стр 299

147 Е.Чириков, "Леонид Андреев", Русские сборники, кн 2 (София, 1921), стр 67

148 see also Чириков, Смердяков русской революции

149 ЛН 72, стр 522

150 Вопросы литературы, № 7 (1969), стр 170.

151 see Andreyev's letter to Serafimovich of January, 1907 Московский альманах, кн 1 (М , 1926), стр 299

152 Десницкий, "Горький в борьбе за идейность и партийность литературы", стр.187

153 ПССГ, т 16, стр 348

154 ibid., pp.335-336

155 В.Десницкий, "М Горький и Л Андреев", Литературный современник, № 8 (1933), стр 144, ПССГ, т 16, стр 348-349

156 ПССА, т.3, стр 109

157 ibid., p 116.

158 ibid., p.143

159 ibid., p 124

160 ibid , p 125

161 ibid., p 107

162 Woodward, Andreyev, p.173

163 ПССА, т 3, стр 151

164 ibid., pp.144-145

165 Чириков, "Андреев", стр 61

166 ЛН 72, стр 529

167 ibid., p.494.

168 see, above, pp 227, 254

169 ЛН 72, стр 288

170 ibid., pp 289-295.

171 ibid., p.290

172 ibid., p.429.

173 ibid., p.578

174 ibid., p.296.

175 АГ 4, стр 223

176 АГ 7, стр 173

177 ЛН 72, стр 426

178 ibid., pp.426, 427

179 АГ.4, стр.221

180 Голубева, "Из истории издания русских альманахов", стр 307

181 Куприна-Иорданская, Годы молодости, стр 115

182 see, above, pp 122-123
183 Г-30, т 29, стр 48
184 ibid., pp.54,57
185 ibid., p.59
186 АГ.4, стр 238
187 Г-30, т 29, стр 63-65 For the text of Gorky's protest, see· АГ 4, стр 377
188 АГ.4, стр 249
189 ibid , p.265.
190 Т Кулова, "Л Андреев и М Горький Размежевание сил русской литературы", Ученые записки Московского областного педагогического института им Н К Крупской, т 161 (1966), стр 69
191 Г-30, т 29, стр 83
192 see Gorky's letter to Pyatnitsky of May, 1909 АГ 4, стр 271
193 see, for example, Gorky's letters to V.Keltuyala of September 1908 and to Lacyzhnikov of January, 1909 Вопросы литературы, № 4 (1966), АГ.7, стр 185
194 ПССГ, т 16, стр 352
195 Петербургская газета, № 235, 1908
196 see, above, pp 172-174
197 ПССА, т 4, стр.239
198 ibid., p.216.
199 ibid., p.307
200 ПССА, т.5, стр 216
201 А.Андреев, "Из воспоминаний", Красная новь, № 9 (1926), стр 221
202 Zemlya, from the series Skazochki ne sovsem dlya detey, bears the author's date 26 August, 1907 T'ma is dated 20 September. ПССА, т 7, стр 77, ПССА, т 2, стр 182
203 ПССА, т 7, стр.70
204 ПССА, т 6, стр 174
205 ПССА, т.7, стр 70
206 Lev Shestov, 'Dostoevsky and Nietzsche the philosophy of tragedy', in Essays in Russian Literature. The Conservative View, ed.Spencer E. Roberts, (Ohio, 1968), p.57.
207 ПССА, т.2,стр.163
208 ibid., p.150
209 ibid , p 163
210 F Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra, translated by R J. Hollingdale, (Harmondsworth, 1969), p.112
211 ПССА, т 2, стр 164
212 ibid , p 162.
213 ibid , p 172.
214 ibid , p.181.
215 ibid., p 182
216 ibid., p.141
217 Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX века 1901-1907, стр 544-545
218 ПССГ, т.16, стр 351-352
219 Г-30, т.29, стр 30
220 ibid , pp.28-29.
221 ПССГ, т.16, стр 351
222 Г-30, т.29, стр 30
223 Куприна-Иорданская, Годы молодости, стр 300
224 ЛН 72, стр 137 See, above, p 50

225 Г-30, т 24, стр 63-64
226 Д Мережковский, "В обезьяних лапах", в его кн В тихом омуте, (СПб , 1908), стр 60
227 Г-30, т 29, стр 43
228 ЛН 72, стр 305
229 ibid., p 307
230 ibid , p.310
231 ПССГ, т 8, стр 184
232 ПССГ, т 6, стр 149
233 ibid., p.159
234 ibid., p.164.
235 ПССА, т 2, стр 176
236 ЛН.72, стр.432
237 АГ.4, стр.236-237
238 АГ.7, стр.188
239 ibid., p.193
240 For an account of the Capri school, see below, pp 363-367
241 ЛН 72, стр 443-444
242 ПССГ, т.20, стр 39
243 ПССГ, т.11, стр 64
244 On this subject, see К Муратова, Горький на Капри 1911-1913, (Л , 1971), стр 70-74
245 Г-30, т 24, стр 63.
246 ПССГ, т 14, стр 269,351
247 ibid., p 15
248 ПССГ, т 11, стр 406
249 ibid., pp.392,393
250 ibid., p.418.
251 ibid., p.420.
252 see, above, p.251
253 ПССГ, т 9, стр 304
254 Русское слово, 5 октября, 1907, стр.2
255 А Измайлов, "О Леониде Андрееве", Русское слово, 8 апреля, 1908, стр 3
256 Woodward, Andreyev, p 189
257 ПССА, т 6, стр 210
258 ibid
259 ibid., p.211
260 ibid , p 210.
261 ПССА, т 8, стр 117
262 ibid , p.126
263 Вересаев, т 5, стр 409.
264 Андреев, Собрание сочинений, т.15, стр 100
265 ПССА, т 8, стр 120
266 А.Андреев, стр 215
267 Г-30, т 29, стр 29
268 see. above, pp.312-313
269 Г-30, т 29, стр 28-29
270 ПССА, т 8, стр 114,127
271 ibid , p.133.
272 ПССГ, т.9, стр.332-333
273 ЛН 72, стр.29
274 ПССГ, т 6, стр 261
275 ЛЖТ 1, стр 685
276 Г-30, т 24, стр 5
277 ibid , p 6.
278 ibid., p 7
279 ibid., p.14
280 ibid., p 18.

281 ПССА, т 4, стр 145
282 ibid., pp.145,146.
283 ibid., p.147
284 ibid., p.146.
285 ibid., p.148
286 ibid , p 147
287 ПРА, т 2, стр 414
288 ПССА, т 4, стр 147
289 ПРА, т 2, стр 420
290 ПССА, т 8, стр 172
291 ПССГ, т 16, стр.345
292 А Бах, Царь Голод, 2-е изд , (1884)
293 Измайлов, "О Леониде Андрееве", стр 3
294 ПССА, т.5, стр 238
295 see, above, pp 174-182
296 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 48, лл 12-13, ПССА, т 5, стр.210
297 ИРЛИ, Р III, оп 1, № 48, л 11, ПССА, т 5, стр 211
298 ПССА, т.5, стр 193
299 ibid., p.236
300 Блок, т.5, стр 348
301 ПССА, т.5, стр 218
302 ibid., p.250
303 ibid., pp.198-199.
304 ibid., p 217.
305 ibid.
306 ibid., p 251
307 ibid
308 ibid., p.231
309 ibid., pp.250, 251.
310 ibid., p.203
311 ibid , p.215.
312 ПССГ, т.8, стр.138
313 ibid., p.315
314 ПССГ, т.19, стр 18
315 ЛН 72, стр 304
316 On the factual basis of the story, see Л Васильева, "По следам "Рассказа о семи повешенных"", Советские архивы, № 4 (1971), стр 96-103, В Вильчинский, "Правда истории, художественный отбор и произвольный домысел ("Рассказ о семи повешенных" Л Андреева)", Русская литература, № 1 (1970), стр 157-162
317 Woodward, Andreyev, pp 190-191
318 see Л.Андреев, "О казнях (Из частного письма)", Эпоха, 15 сентября, 1908
319 Cited in W.L.Phelps, Essays on Russian Novelists, (New York, 1911), p.270
320 ПССА, т 5, стр 240,241,244
321 ЛН 72, стр.280
322 ПССА, т.3, стр.90
323 Woodward, Andreyev, pp.190-196.
324 ПССА, т 4, стр 51-52
325 ibid., pp.43-44.
326 ibid., p.52
327 ibid., p.51.
328 ibid., pp.52,53.
329 see, above, pp 195-197
330 Г-30, т 24, стр 63
331 see, below, pp 363-367

332 ПССГ, т 9, стр 259
333 ПРА, т 2, стр 416
334 Kaun, Andreyev, p 328.
335 А I, "Леонид Андреев о своей повести "Мои записки"", Биржевые ведомости, 6 ноября, 1908 (веч), стр 3
336 ПССА, т 3, стр 199
337 ibid , pp.246-247
338 Kaun, Andreyev, pp 92, 273
339 For a discussion of this subject, see В Беззубов, "Лев Толстой и Леонид Андреев", Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып.104 (1961), стр.130-172
340 Письма Леонида Андреева, стр 20
341 ПССГ, т.16, стр 348
342 ПССА, т.3, стр 227.
343 ЛН.72, стр 318.
344 АГ 9, стр 57
345 ЛН 72, стр 438
346 ibid.
347 Г-30, т.24, стр 6
348 ПССГ, т.2, стр 46
349 ПССА, т 3, стр 199
350 Андреев, Собрание сочинений, т 17, стр 8
351 Woodward, Andreyev, p 198.
352 ПССА, т.3, стр.223
353 Gorky's own response to the disaster is contained in Zemletryaseniye v Kalabrii i Sitsilii. See, below, pp 374-5
354 ПССА, т 4, стр 169
355 ibid., p 177.
356 ПССА, т 3, стр 207
357 ЛН.72, стр 444,445
358 ПРА, т 2, стр 425
359 ibid., pp 230,231.
360 ПССА, т 4, стр 52,53 "то, что казалось ужасным в людях, непростительным и гадким, вдруг стало милым "Милые вы мои'" - Милые товарищи мои' - шептал он и плакал горько - Милые товарищи мои' И жалел ли он их, своих милых товарищей "Милые товарищи мои' Милые вы, товарищи мои'""
361 Реквием, стр 133
362 Letter from Nemirovich-Danchenko to Stanislavsky, 27 December, 1908 Фрейдкина, стр 248
363 Московские ведомости, 7 октября, 1909
364 For full details of this campaign see Беззубов, "Андреев и МХАТ", стр 191-198
365 This is the substance of the argument in. Протопоп Н Вознесенский, "Анатема" разбор трагедии Л.Андреева, (Благовещенск, 1910)
366 e.g. S.Persky, Contemporary Russian Novelists, (London, 1914), p.243.
367 ПССА, т 3, стр.261
368 Woodward, Andreyev, p 214.
369 ПССА, т.3, стр 258
370 ibid., p.263
371 ibid , p.293.
372 ibid., pp 304,315.
373 ibid., p.313.
374 ibid., p.329
375 ЛН.72, стр 541

376 ibid., p.336.
377 ПССГ, т 16, стр 348
378 Woodward, Andreyev, p.217.
379 ПССГ, т 7, стр.333
380 ПССГ, т 2, стр 20
381 ibid., p.46
382 ibid., p.47.
383 ПССА, т.2, стр.189
384 ibid., p.191.
385 ibid , p.218.
386 ibid., p.244.
387 ibid., p.205
388 ibid., p.239.
389 ibid., p.240.
390 В.Басильевич, "Леонид Андреев", Всеобщий журнал искусства, науки и общественной жизни, № 1 (1910), стр 88
391 Woodward, Andreyev, p.221.

ADDENDUM

253a ПССГ, т 9, стр 301

CHAPTER SIX

CHAPTER SIX

GORKY AND THE CAPRI SCHOOL THE DISILLUSIONMENT WITH POLITICS

From our discussion in the previous chapter, it would seem that Andreyev was largely justified in his claim that he had not betrayed the revolution in his stories and plays of the post-1905 period and that Gorky's classification of T'ma, Proklyatiye zverya, Tsar' Golod and Moi zapiski as 'reactionary' works was founded on a total misinterpretation of his purpose Annoyed and perplexed by this steadfast refusal to accept him as a revolutionary writer, Andreyev reacted quite naturally by holding Gorky entirely responsible for the ensuing break in their relations Writing to Pyatnitsky in 1910 on the subject of his withdrawal from Znaniye, he referred to Gorky with unconcealed bitterness

> Идейная связь со "Знанием" у меня давно уже нарушена Виновником разрыва я считаю исключительно М Горького в то время, когда я, плохой или хороший, оставался все тем же в духе работ своих, каким был и в дни близости, М Горький публично выступил против меня с обвинениями чуть ли не в ренегатстве 1

Implicit in this statement, which was written soon after the publication of Razrusheniye lichnosti, is the conviction that Gorky himself was the one whose entire outlook on literature had changed, a change which Andreyev inevitably identified with the writer's growing political allegiances since leaving Russia Whilst he approved of the positive philosophy contained in Gorky's revolutionary works (witness his praise of Mat' and Ispoved'), he could not accept the concept of 'revolutionary romanticism', which demanded that literature should provide an inspiring legend for the Russian reading public

In Andreyev's eyes, then, Gorky was a lost cause Cut off from Russia by virtue of his self-imposed exile, he had fallen under the adverse influence of those, like Bogdanov and Lunacharsky, who caused him to look upon revolution through the rose-coloured spectacles of an idealistic philosophy Just as Gorky never changed his opinion of Andreyev as a man who had betrayed the revolution, so Andreyev himself never subsequently altered his view of Gorky as the slave of Bolshevik ideology and the advocate of utopianism Here we are confronted with the ultimate irony of the Gorky-Andreyev relationship, as the final years on Capri saw a fundamental change not only in Gorky's relations with the

Bolsheviks, but also in his aesthetic philosophy In order to appreciate fully the irony of this situation, we should look briefly at the Capri school affair and its influence upon Gorky's political and literary activity

Although Gorky had played no active part in practical politics since his return from the London congress in the spring of 1907, he was clearly not content to serve the revolution by his writing alone It was with typical enthusiasm, therefore, that he welcomed the opportunity of renewed activity when it was decided to organize a school for revolutionary Russian workers on Capri It is not certain who was the original architect of the scheme, which had presumably been mooted during Gorky's discussions with Bogdanov and Lunacharsky in 1908, but the real impetus for its realization was provided by the arrival on the island of Mikhail Vilonov, a Bolshevik from the Urals, in the new year of 1909 [2] In Gorky's eyes, Vilonov was the embodiment of an ideal, the pledge of a new enlightened working class which was to create and inherit the collectivist society of the future Writing to Ladyzhnikov in mid-January, he made no effort to conceal his optimism

> Приехал один рабочий уралец изучать философию Какой, между прочим, великолепный парень этот рабочий, какую интеллигенцию обещает выдвинуть наша рабочая масса, если судить по этой фигуре 3

A month later Gorky and Vilonov were already immersed in the detailed planning of the school's organization [4] Finance was provided by both Gorky and M F Andreyeva, who also succeeded in persuading Shalyapin, Amfiteatrov and others to make generous contributions [5] The school was to provide introductory courses in philosophy and political economy, and other related subjects, with Gorky responsible for lectures on the history of Russian literature [6] During the spring invitations were extended to prominent socialists, including Plekhanov, Kautsky and Trotsky, to participate in the school's programme [7]

The most significant omission from the list of those invited to Capri was Lenin, whose recent altercations with Bogdanov and Lunacharsky placed the question of his participation well beyond the bounds of possibility In typically aggressive style, he made known his own position on the issue even before the school began to function A June issue of his newspaper Proletariy carried a statement to the effect that the Bolshevik centre (Lenin's group in Paris) collectively disowned all responsibility for the conduct of the proposed party school [8] Lenin did

not, of course, disapprove of such a school in theory, indeed, the need for a similar enterprise had been accepted unanimously by the delegates to the fifth congress of the RSDLP in December, 1908 [9] However, the prospect of a school organised by those whose 'revisionism' he had only recently castigated provided an obvious threat to his authority, which he naturally sought to protect at all costs When, in August, 1909 a group of students themselves wrote to him requesting his presence on Capri, he refused categorically, insisting instead that they come to Paris to attend his own lectures [10]

Lenin's disruptive tactics had little effect upon the smooth functioning of the Capri school during the initial stages In September, Gorky informed his wife of the arrival of another twenty workers from Russia[11] and wrote enthusiastically to Kotsyubinsky "Приехавшая сюда рабочая публика - чудесные ребята, и я с ними душевно отдыхаю и - вообще - хорошо с ними моей демократической душе!"[12] His jubilation was soon disturbed, however, by a new and more serious offensive by Lenin The new attack was contained in the article Beseda s peterburgskimi bol'shevikami,[13] in which the party leader ridiculed the claim of the Capri school organizers that their enterprise was non-fractional in purpose [14] This time Lenin's words had the desired effect Within a few weeks, a number of students had begun to voice criticism of Bogdanov's political standpoint, a development which culminated in the departure, on 10 November, of five workers for Paris Three days later, they were followed by a second group, which included Gorky's favourite, Vilonov Having split the ranks of the opposition, Lenin sensed that victory was his Early in December he published Pozornyy proval, an article in which he publicly danced on the grave of the ill-fated Capri school,[15] whose predicted demise occurred shortly afterwards with the departure for Paris of the few remaining students [16]

The demoralizing effect of these events upon Gorky can scarcely be overestimated The Capri school had held for him a personal significance far in excess of its direct value to the revolutionary movement Above all it provided him with the opportunity to translate the theory of 'God-building' into a practical philosophy of collective living The desire to suboordinate his ego to the will of the collective had been a continual refrain in his letters to his wife of late 1906 and early 1907

> вообще полагаю, что в наши дни деятельность личности - всякой - не имеет большого значения
>
> "Меньше возись с собой самим" - вот принцип, следуя которому жизнь становится легче для человека Смотри и думай больше об общем 17

In his collaboration with Bogdanov and Lunacharsky, and in the Capri school in particular, Gorky finally realized his desire to become part of a collective, a desire which had been present at least since 1889, when he had tried, unsuccessfully, to join a Tolstoyan commune [18]

The Capri school affair convincingly demonstrated yet again Gorky's unsuitability for the role of practical politician As Bertram D Wolfe puts it 'Poor Gorky, who detested politics and factionalism and who had organized the school on Capri to solace his loneliness for Russia and to further the culture of the Russian workingman, was thus forced into the very centre of party political squabbles''[19] In fact, the irony was even more bitter than Wolfe suggests From Gorky's letters to Lenin[20] it emerges quite clearly that he believed himself capable of healing the split within the Social-Democratic party Despite his open allegiance to Bogdanov and Lunacharsky, he strove continually throughout this period to reconcile the warring factions, for which purpose, as we have seen, he had invited Lenin to Capri in 1908 [21] It is a mark of his political naivety that even this meeting failed to convince him that reconciliation was impossible Unlike Lenin, on the one hand, and his Capri colleagues, on the other, Gorky refused to accept the inevitability of a split in the party, even when such a split was an obvious reality No doubt embarrassed by Gorky's persistence, Lenin was eventually obliged to write him a letter explaining the impossibility of any agreement between the two factions and declining the writer's insistent invitations to visit Capri for further talks [22]

In the light of Gorky's behaviour it is difficult not to agree with a remark by Lenin in a letter of 1916 "Горький всегда в политике архибесхарактерен и отдается чувству и настроению" [23] As Lenin suggests, the writer's attachment to the Bolsheviks had always been as much emotional as ideological and his reaction to the Capri school affair was typically impetuous Having devoted his energies almost entirely to his party commitments for a number of months, he now dissociated himself completely from Bolshevik affairs He ignored invit-

ations from his erstwhile colleagues Bogdanov and Lunacharsky to join the Vperyod group, which had responded to Lenin's challenge by organizing a second school in Bologna [24] Indeed, Gorky had already broken off relations with the latter in October, when the idea of forming a separate, oppositional group had first been suggested [25] He remained equally aloof from Lenin and the Bolshevik centre in Paris, despite attempts by the party leader, both in private letters[26] and in articles[27] to win back his trust Lenin even undertook a second visit to Capri in the summer of 1910, presumably with the same purpose [28] It would seem, however, that these overtures were to no avail Early in the new year, during preparations for a trip to Paris to see his wife,[29] Gorky specifically stated his desire to avoid contact with the Bolsheviks in the French capital "И не в Париж, где нам станут мешать стада знакомых и могут погонять меня "товарищи" с репортерами? Репортеров - я боюсь, как и раньше, а товарищи стали нестерпимо пресны" [30] His enduring animosity towards the Paris group is detectable in a letter to Tikhonov of March, 1913 "Елена Малиновская говорит, что я от России не отстал и знаю ее лучше парижан Спасибо ей" [31]

There can be little doubt that the 'organic aversion to politics' to which Gorky refers in his reminiscences of Lenin[32] dates to this period Writing to Malinovskaya in November, 1910 he was already stressing his unwillingness to 'play at politics' and complained of 'various people' who were hindering him from his work with their 'trivialities' [33] True to his word, he maintained his independence from party affairs until the October Revolution, his much-vaunted collaboration with the Bolsheviks after that date was almost certainly the product of necessity rather than choice [34]

By 1910 the euphoria of the previous year had given way to a profound depression which became increasingly apparent in his correspondence with his wife Two brief quotations should suffice to convey this radical change of outlook

> Одинок я, в конце концов, как дьявол
>
> Путаюсь я в каком-то тумане, устаю сильно
> и - не то чтобы теряю вкус к жизни, а
> как-то лень мне жить, думать лень [35]

It would be mistaken to insist, however, that this mood is attributable solely to the collapse of the Capri school, although this was almost certainly the most important factor Ever since he had settled on Capri

Gorky had been exposed to almost intolerable pressure, which had forced him on at least one occasion to the brink of a breakdown [36] By the end of 1910, his health, always fragile, was again severely affected In October, M F Andreyeva informed Amfiteatrov of the writer's critical condition and enumerated the factors she considered responsible

> Нервы А М в ужасном состоянии, он почти не спит, ест еще меньше обычного, бледен Прошлогодняя школа - нравственный разрыв с Луначарским, Богдановым усиленная работа при условии, что чуть ли не каждую написанную страницу у него из рук рвет К П , тогда как самому А М хотелось бы задержать ее, поработать еще и многое еще другое ежедневное, мелкое, но волнующее и неприятное. . А главное и прежде всего - общее положение дел в России, падения и крушения, общее положение литературы русской и гг литераторы - все это доконало даже и его крепкую натуру 37

Andreyeva's letter provides a good impression of the diverse pressures to which Gorky was subjected at the time Amongst the events in Russia which had a particularly marked effect upon him were the revelation, in January, 1909, of the Azef affair,[38] and the publication, three months later, of Vekhi, which Gorky characterized as the 'most vile little book in the entire history of Russian literature' [39] Affairs within Znaniye had also reached a dire state As the reference to Pyatnitsky ('К Р ') suggests, the firm was now in serious financial difficulties What is more, as we saw in the previous chapter, serious disagreement between Gorky and Pyatnitsky over editorial policy had destroyed the tenuous modus vivendi established after the debates of 1907 [40]

An additional problem not mentioned by Andreyeva was the serious decline in Gorky's own fortunes The rapid publication, in 1910 and 1911, of six Znaniye miscellanies (Nos 31-36) made up almost entirely of works by Gorky was in fact a desperate effort by the writer to restore fluidity to his finances Nor was this the limit of his personal concerns A number of his letters to E P Peshkova allude to 'personal affairs',[41] which his widow was understandably reluctant to elucidate in her commentary to the ninth volume of Arkhiv Gor'kogo containing their correspondence of these years Nevertheless, it is quite obvious from subsequent developments that the source of these personal problems was M F Andreyeva, with whom the writer had been

living since 1904 [42]

A staunch Social-Democrat, Andreyeva had given up a highly successful career as an actress in order to devote herself to the revolutionary cause The accounts of her contemporaries give the impression that she was not the most ideal companion for Gorky Bunin's widow remembered with distaste the ostentation with which she displayed her concern for Gorky's well-being [43] More seriously, her personal antipathy for Lunacharsky's wife was such that the latter refused to live on Capri, thereby causing considerable inconvenience to both Lunacharsky and Gorky She also clashed on a number of occasions with Mikhail Vilonov [44] As to her relationship with Gorky we can only surmise, although it is significant that from the end of 1909 the writer was expressing the desire to be reunited with his wife During the following three years the couple maintained a regular correspondence, meeting several times in France and Italy Andreyeva herself remained on Capri until November, 1912, Gorky's wife arrived on the island just nine days later, having been immediately notified of Andreyeva's departure by her husband [45]

A Gorky's literary works of the later Capri period

1 'God-building' continued Leto and Zemletryaseniye

Given the harrowing personal experiences of the later years on Capri, it is hardly surprising that they should have left an imprint on Gorky's literary works of that period The first of these works was the novel Leto, which was written whilst Gorky's collaboration with Bogdanov and Lunacharsky was still at its height [46]

Leto takes as its theme a subject which had increasingly occupied Russian writers since 1905 the peasantry For many intellectuals, no doubt the heirs of idealistic notions inspired by the Populist tradition, the anarchy and destruction unleashed by the advent of revolution in the Russian villages had come as a profound shock Their disillusionment had found expression in a number of literary works of the post-1905 period, of which the most notorious was Rodionov's novel Nashe prestupleniye, published in 1909 Always sensitive to new developments on the literary scene, Gorky viewed this trend with particular concern His opinion, expressed initially in his private correspondence,[47] was later developed in Razrusheniye lichnosti, where he criticised those who gave a pessimistic picture of rural life

> Насколько обрисован мужик в журнальной и альманашной литературе наших дней - это старый, знакомый мужик Решетникова, темная личность, нечто зверообразное И если отмечено новое в душе его, так это новое пока только склонность к погромам, поджогам, грабежам 48

Gorky's criticism of naturalistic 'peasant literature' in this article signifies a considerable change in his attitude to the peasantry Certainly, in his early works, he had hardly been renowned for his sympathetic depiction of the Russian village His Chelkash had been refused publication in Mikhaylovsky's Populist journal Russkoye bogatstvo for its negative portrayal of the peasant mentality in the figure of Gavrila [49] In a number of other sketches and articles for the provincial press he presented a picture of peasant ignorance and cruelty no less disturbing than that of Rodionov [50] His uncompromising stance was aptly summarised in his review of Tolstoy's Vlast' t'my

> Л Н Толстого не раз упрекали в том, что он в своей драме слишком сгустил краски и утрировал, - жизнь оправдывает его от этих упреков Мало того, она говорит, что может быть и хуже того, что изображено в драме Льва Николаевича 51

By 1908, then, Gorky was defending a totally opposite view to that which he had held previously Whilst he remained as before intolerant of the old peasant attitudes, he was convinced that the 1905 Revolution must have engendered in certain sectors of the peasantry a new psychology, destined to replace the old This belief is firmly expressed in Razrusheniye lichnosti "Лет пятьдесят мужика усиленно будили, вот - он проснулся, - каков же его психологический облик?"[52] Leto represents Gorky's attempt to provide an answer to his own question and to depict the 'psychological features' of the new revolutionary peasant

Composed in the same first-person-narrative form as Ispoved', Leto describes the events of one summer (evidently that of 1906) through the eyes of a socialist propagandist living on a forged passport in a remote Russian village The novel comprises his reminiscences of encounters with the local peasants and of his attempts to disseminate revolutionary ideas amongst them The result of this narrative structure (and this constitutes the novel's great weakness) is that scenes of direct action are few, the bulk of the work being given over

to an account of the lengthy discussions between the narrator and the peasants

Gorky's purpose in Leto is to illustrate the division within the peasantry which has emerged as a result of the revolutionary events of the previous year The peasant Yegor Dosekin is only too obviously a mouthpiece for his creator when he states "Настало время разорваться деревне надвое и никакими канатами, ни цепями не скрепить ее теперь" [53] The nature of the polarization to which Dosekin refers becomes clear in the course of the novel On the one hand, there are those upon whom the revolutionary experience has left no profound impression and who represent the 'traditional' peasant mentality To this category belong Andrey, whose greed proves stronger than his revolutionary sympathies, Gnedoy, the epitome of blind anarchy, and Milov, who sinks into apathy On the other hand, there are those in whom the revolution has induced a profound psychological change, a 'reevaluation of values' which signifies the birth of the 'new' peasant mentality of which Gorky had written in Razrushenie lichnosti

The most prominent representative of the 'new' peasantry is Yegor Dosekin, who had been spreading socialist propaganda amongst the peasants even before the narrator's arrival in the village Dosekin is an uncompromising materialist, convinced of the immutable truth of his atheistic philosophy His dedication to the revolutionary cause is absolute Himself prepared to make any personal sacrifice for the cause (as in the case of his love for Varvara), he is the advocate of asceticism "нужны люди крепкие, стойкие, железных костей люди" [54] Although Dosekin's socialist views command considerable support amongst his fellows, his asceticism inspires serious doubts, the most important of which is voiced by Avdey Nikin "Вот указывается, что христианство объединило и бедных и богатых, а социализм - может?" [55] The question is quite unmistakably Gorky's own and it reflects his continuing tendency to view socialism not simply as a political theory but as a complete practical philosophy of life It is upon this question that the subsequent debates concentrate

The central role in these debates belongs not to Dosekin but to Pyotr Kuzin, who displays a far more unorthodox attitude to socialist doctrine Prior to 1905, Kuzin had been a church reader and a member of the reactionary Black Hundreds organization However, the advent of revolution and, in particular, the arrest of his son-in-law had led

him to renounce his past and begin a new life as a revolutionary Kuzin's unorthodox attitude to socialism is evident from his language alone, which abounds in Old Church Slavonicisms and biblical imagery Referring to himself as a 'fisher of men',[56] he sees the key to the future not in the abstract theories of scientific socialism but in the ability of socialists to evolve a religion founded on a new understanding of God "Должен быть бог един для всех Тот бог настоящий и верный, у которого люди хороши Где же он, Христос-то? Начало любви и кротости - где он?"[57] Predictably, it is Dosekin who challenges Kuzin's heresy, defending the atheistic principle

> - Когда все головы научатся думать, тогда
> и ошибки все обнаружатся А сказки - бросить,
> они не пугают'
> Старик сомнительно качает головой
> - Запутаете вы себя во тьме вещных знаний
> ваших' - усмехался он - По-моему, бог -
> слово, миром не договоренное до конца,
> вам бы и надлежало договорить-то
> его 58

This exchange captures the essence of the debate between Lenin and the 'God-builders' over the question of socialism and religion It is most significant, therefore, that it should be Kuzin and not Dosekin who has the greatest impression upon the peasants By the end of the novel, Alyosha is repeating Kuzin's words as his own "Помогите, говорит, богу' Что это значит? Он же всесилен? Воистину так, - а вы есть рассеянные крупницы и части силы его необъятной и, соединяясь, увеличиваете мощь его, разъединяясь - уменьшаете" [59] The narrator also echoes Kuzin's ideas after his arrest "А еще я знаю, что пришла пора, когда всякий человек, кто жить хочет, - должен принять мою святую веру в необоримость соединенных человеческих сил" [60] From these passages it is clear that, although Gorky judiciously avoided the term 'God-building' in Leto, the novel was written in defence of that theory against the strictures of Lenin Implicit to Leto, as to Ispoved', is the view that revolution must entail more than the intellectual appreciation of political and economic theories and that the majority of people are attracted to socialism in the same way as the narrator of Leto "У меня не было времени пристально заняться самообразованием, я человек, образованный разгромом народного восстания, взявшийся за дело объединения людей по непобедимому влечению сердца" [61] In Leto, as in Ispoved', it is 'God-building' alone which is able to satisfy this urge

and hence to prove the power of socialism to succeed Christianity as a positive force for unity

The majority of contemporary critics overlooked the ideological link between Leto and Ispoved' Like Izmaylov, most felt that in his new novel Gorky had once more put on the 'party fetters'[62] which had been notably absent from Ispoved' It was possibly this universal insistence that Leto marked a retreat from the non-partisan philosophy of Ispoved' that caused Gorky to make a rare complaint about his critics in a letter to his wife ""Лето" - ругают с напряжением, достойным более серьезной цели Никто из критиков, видимо, не мог одолеть книгу, и мотивы, почему она написана, - никому не ясны"[63] Most Soviet critics also have failed to note the link between Leto and Ispoved', suggesting, on the contrary, that in the later work Gorky had corrected the 'ideological errors' contained in the first This view, formulated by Kastorsky,[64] is still endorsed in the latest history of literature, which nevertheless refers to 'certain survivals of Ispoved'' in Leto, to which it ingeniously attributes the failure of the novel to achieve popularity[65]

The failure of Leto is perhaps more convincingly ascribed to its severe artistic weaknesses Given that Gorky's talent always lay in the sphere of description rather than invention, these weaknesses are quite understandable Despite the writer's own claim that the novel was based on authentic material,[66] there are obvious signs that on a number of occasions he was forced to invent psychological and sociological details As A I Belen'ky has noted, there is no explanation of how the peasants, in mid-summer, always have ample time to devote to their party activities[67] Examples of 'invented' psychology are numerous Consider, for example, the narrator's reaction to the growing independence of thought amongst the peasants

> Все у них выходит крепче моего и хотя жестоковато, обнаженно, но ясно и стройно, - это я вижу, вижу и рад, что они так быстро переросли меня Что ж - я свое дело сделал, если ж я не успеваю за ними - это не обидно мне[68]

Like Dosekin's ability to 'forget' his love for Varvara, the narrator's good nature here is too simplistic to carry conviction and too obviously designed to fit a preconceived notion of human behaviour

Not all the characters in Leto are idealized, however True to the tradition of his earlier works, Gorky makes no attempt to defend the representatives of the 'old' peasant mentality In Gnedoy's

reminiscences of the 1905 Revolution, the actions of the peasants are described in a highly unfavourable light "Обозлились, все ломаем, стекла бьем, людей разных, сами себя тоже бьем - мочи нет терпеть, все как бы пьяные, а то сошли с ума"[69] Equally reprehensible is the peasants' behaviour when Gnedoy is arrested by the policeman Semyon In this scene they play the role of passive onlookers, which Gorky had exposed as one of the essential features of the slave mentality in Zriteli and Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka

The optimism of Leto, as opposed to the pessimism dominant in contemporary 'peasant' literature, stems not from an idealization of the peasantry as a whole but from the fact that, as in Ispoved', the new revolutionary mentality is inevitably victorious over the old The foremost representative of the old mentality is the policeman Semyon and his suicide (the finest scene in the entire novel) symbolizes the collapse of the system of power which feeds on man's slavishness It is the failure of the revolutionaries to display such slavishness which leads to Semyon's spiritual crisis, as he admits to Varvara "Коли страха нету больше - все кончено! Все рушится, все нарушено! Мир только страхом и держался!"[70] The destruction of the old world is also evident in the final scene, where the revolutionaries succeed in arousing the sympathy of their captors and break down the artificial barriers to reveal an underlying community of interests This is the 'resurrection' to which the final words of the novel refer "С праздником, великий русский народ! С воскресением близким, милый!"[71]

The process of 'resurrection', as depicted variously in Mat', Ispoved' and Leto, found its apotheosis in Zemletryasenie v Kalabrii i Sitsilii, a work written early in 1909 in response to the earthquake which had devastated large areas of southern Italy Ostensibly an objective account of the disaster and its consequences, the work is in fact a restatement by Gorky of his vision for the future of mankind Central to the conception of Zemletryasenie is an idea found in an earlier brief article on the San Francisco earthquake of 1906

> Несчастья должны учить нас братству, они должны нам показать, как мы зависимы от природы и тайных ее сил Несчастья должны соединять нас в одну семью, в семью борцов с природой, врагом человека, в семью упорных исследователей ее тайн [72]

In Zemletryasenie this hope is accorded the status of reality

The earthquake, in Gorky's account, emerges not so much as a calamity but as a triumph for mankind as it teaches the 'brotherhood' of which he had spoken in San Frantsisko "Но в тот день пали социальные перегородки, разъединяющие людей, не было более богатых, бедных - явился объединенный общим горем великий народ" [73] The transformation of society into a collective is identified with the revolutionary aspirations of the Italian people During a 'typical' conversation we encounter the figure of the 'man with the calm face'

> Со стороны вмешивается какой-то человек со спокойным лицом
> - Извините' Вами было упомянуто о революции 89 года, дни, переживаемые нами, я ставлю выше их по значению Не о революции 89 года мы должны говорить, а - о другой, той, которая будет, охватит весь мир, весь' 74

Significantly, it is the same revolutionary who challenges the authority of the Church in the name of a 'new Renaissance'

> - Возвратитесь к богу' - зовут священники
> - Вперед, к народу' - назревает в стране новый великий призыв, увлекая сердца к равенству, справедливости и любви И чувствуешь в этом взрыве, как много сил в прекрасной стране, и веришь, что она накануне нового "Возрождения" 75

Zemletryasenye reinforces the apology of 'God-building' contained in Gorky's other works of this period It is perhaps the most extreme example of Gorky's 'Revolutionary Romanticism', the tendency to invent reality to demonstrate a theory Particularly noteworthy in this respect is his refusal to give credence to the eye-witness acounts of looting and anarchy, preferring his own vision of collective humanity

2 The 'Okurov cycle' and 'Revolutionary Romanticism'

Gorky's endeavour to write a 'history of the Russian revolution' entered a new and more ambitious phase with the publication, in 1909 and 1910, of Gorodok Okurov, the first novel of an intended trilogy normally referred to as the 'Okurov cycle' In the four novels written just prior to this work (Mat', Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka, Ispoved' and Leto) his attention had focussed on the impact of revolution upon the individual with the purpose of elucidating the theory of 'God-building' as a practical philosophy of revolution In the 'Okurov cycle' Gorky set himself the more difficult task of depicting the impact of revolution upon an entire social milieu the Russian provinces

In accordance with this shift of emphasis, Gorky chose for his new novel a narrative technique different from that employed in his recent works Abandoning for the moment both the 'life-story' form and the first-person narrative with which he had experimented in Ispoved' and Leto, he constructed Gorodok Okurov around the conflict of two contradictory characters, a structural device common in his early stories

The two protagonists are Vavilo Burmistrov and Sima Devushkin, whose competition for the love of the prostitute Lodka provides a variation on the traditional Gorky motif of the strong and the weak Burmistrov epitomizes brute strength which is deprived of any conscious purpose "Вот тридцать годов мне, сила есть у меня, а места себе не нахожу такого, где бы душа не 'ныла'", he tells Lodka early in the novel [76] His frustration finds expression in a number of unpremeditated acts of violence, of which the most extreme is the murder of the unfortunate Devushkin In his desperate search for his 'place in life', Burmistrov stands one day at the head of a revolutionary demonstration only to reappear later as the leader of a Black Hundred mob, just like Mel'nikov in Zhizn' nenuzhnogo cheloveka He is the slave of his own instincts as he senses in a symbolic dream, in which he has a vision of himself with his hands bound behind his back [77] This image of Burmistrov as a captive is sustained throughout the novel so that his imprisonment in the final scene appears not as the chance result of external factors but as the inevitable product of his own nature Such is the significance of Burmistrov's final act of informing his gaoler that his cell door has been left unlocked [78]

In contrast to Burmistrov, Sima Devushkin is physically weak and unattractive, a contemplative type, whose sensitivity to suffering is reflected in his poetry

Боже - мы твои люди
А в сердцах у нас - злоба
От рождения до гроба
Мы друг другу - как звери'

С нами, господи, буди'
Не твои ли мы дети?
Мы тоскуем о вере,
О тебе, нашем свете [79]

The poem reveals Devushkin's innate passivity, which is the most characteristic feature of his behaviour Just like the 'philosopher' Yakov in Troye, who is his spiritual brother, Devushkin is pitifully

inadequate when confronted by the evil he hopes to see eradicated from life His murder at the hands of Burmistrov is presented by Gorky as a tragic inevitability, demonstrating the essential impotence of his passive approach to life

Despite their obvious differences, Burmistrov and Devushkin are not truly opposites Both are 'superfluous men' and, as such, they represent the two extremes of the spiritual disease which afflicts, to a greater or lesser extent, all of the town's inhabitants The stultifying environment of Okurov provides no constructive outlet either for the natural energy of Burmistrov or for the humanistic idealism of Devushkin Significantly, it is Tiunov, the only character in the novel to have spent long periods of time away from the town, who is aware of pernicious atmosphere of Okurov and who alone manages to raise himself above his environment and actively to fight against it

Tiunov's biography is in many respects reminiscent of that of Matvey in Ispoved' Like the earlier character, Tiunov had spent much of his life tramping Russia, evolving from haughty individualism, for which he was beaten brutally in his youth,[80] to the collectivist views of his mature years In conversation with Devushkin, he pronounces a eulogy to the Russian people worthy of Kuzin "И скажу тебе от сердца слово - хорош есть на земле русский народ' Дикий он, конечно, замордованный и весьма несчастен, а - хорош, добротный, даровитый народ' Хорош народ' И - аминь'"[81] Tiunov shares with Gorky's earlier 'prophets' a missionary fervour which prompts him to teach both Burmistrov and Devushkin the error of their ways In the same way, when political events disturb the calm of Okurov, it is Tiunov again who attempts to awaken the town's inhabitants to the social and ethical significance of revolution

In each endeavour Tiunov is ultimately unsuccessful He is unable to prevent the tragedy of Burmistrov and Devushkin and his efforts to convert the inhabitants of Okurov prove equally ineffective The events of 1905 serve only to prove the truth of Burmistrov's ironic remark "Мещан политика не касается'"[82] When news of the revolutionary events in the capital first reaches Okurov it inspires only fear or indifference The prevailing concern of the local population is voiced by Pistolet "Я драться не хочу - за что мне драться? Мой интерес, чтобы тихо было, это я люблю"[83] Even when Okurov itself experiences revolutionary disturbances, these fail

to leave any lasting impression on the life of the town The final sound of the cooper's hammering (a recurrent detail both in Gorodok Okurov and its sequel Zhizn' Matveya Kozhemyakina) symbolizes the town's militant resistance to the spirit of change

> И все работал неутомимый человек, - где-то на Петуховой горке, должно быть, он точно на весь город набивал тесный, крепкий обруч, упрямо и уверенно выстукивая
> - Тум-тум-тум Тум-тум 84

Restricted by the 'tight, strong hoop' of Philistinism, Okurov emerges as a seemingly invincible force which stands in the path of revolution Within the 'Okurov cycle' as a whole Gorodok Okurov fulfills the role of Inferno, the Purgatorio being presented in Zhizn' Matveya Kozhemyakina

Strictly speaking, Zhizn' Matveya Kozhemyakina is not a 'sequel' to Gorodok Okurov as it does not take the story of the earlier novel any further The relationship between the two novels is that of the microcosm (Zhizn' Matveya Kozhemyakina) to the macrocosm (Gorodok Okurov) In the second novel of the series, Gorky simply shifts his viewpoint, providing a picture of Okurov through the biography of one of the town's least typical inhabitants Matvey Kozhemyakin is a latter-day Foma Gordeyev, a merchant's son who rejects his background and comes to challenge the environment in which he lives It is the conflict between Kozhemyakin and the dominant spirit of Okurovshchina which is the source of the novel's dramatic impetus

The essential features of Kozhemyakin's character are already intimated by the fleeting references to him in Gorodok Okurov, where we hear that he occupies a position close to that of Tiunov[85] Kozhemyakin shares with many of Gorky's earlier heroes a religious spirit (which, in fact, leads him to a monastery in Part 4 of the novel) and an instinctive disgust at the evil to which he is exposed by virtue of his provincial environment He first manages to escape this evil in his illicit sexual relationship with his young step-mother This brief idyll is shattered, however, by the return of his father, who beats his wife to death only to die of a stroke himself before he can punish his son in like manner The contrast between the two scenes is emphasized by Gorky's tone, the erotic description of Kozhemyakin's growing love for Palageya and its eventual consummation is countered by the gross, naturalistic details of his father's bestiality The episode typifies Kozhemyakin's tragedy His idealistic impulses are

continually thwarted by the reality of Okurov, a conflict which recurs throughout the novel, as later in Part 1, when he indulges his vision of the 'brotherhood of man'

> Ему казалось, что если все, что он видит и слышит, разложить в каком-то особенном порядке, разобрать и внимательно обдумать, - найдется доброе объяснение и оправдание всему недоброму, должно родиться в душе некое емкое слово, которое сразу и объяснит ему людей и соединит его с ними 86

Kozhemyakin's thoughts are interrupted by a scene of senseless brutality which shocks him profoundly, alienating him still further from the inhabitants of Okurov By the end of the first part of the novel he is convinced that his hopes of discovering an antidote to Okurovshchina are futile and he retreats from reality, adopting the life of a recluse

The remainder of the novel is devoted to Kozhemyakin's relations with the succession of characters who come to disturb the calm of his ostrich-like existence The first of these is Mansurova, a revolutionary who comes to lodge at Kozhemyakin's house Mansurova's first act on arrival is to become involved in a debate with Markusha on the subject of fate Her outspoken rejection of the latter's fatalism presents in effect a challenge to Kozhemyakin himself, who had found in Markusha's philosophy a justification of his own acquiescence

> его речи о тайных необоримых силах, которые управляют жизнью людей, легко и плотно сливались со всем, о чем думалось по ночам, что было пережито и узнано эти речи усыпляли душу пытавшуюся порою приподняться, заглянуть дальше завтрашнего дня с его клейкой привычной скукой 87

Mansurova categorically rejects fatalism, advocating in its stead a policy of active resistance to evil Her optimism and faith in her ability to achieve her objective reawaken in Kozhemyakin the long-dormant desire to challenge the spirit of Okurovshchina However, from the outset Gorky introduces an element of doubt into his characterization of Mansurova Her faith is culled not from her experience of life but from books - hence her use of theoretical language incomprehensible to Kozhemyakin [88] Ironically enough, her subsequent fate demonstrates the truth of her own warning to Kozhemyakin "Надо знать жизнь, а не выдумывать" [89] Mansurova's faith in socialism is totally abstract and unable to withstand the crucial test of reality

Exposed first to the horrifying account of life in Okurov contained in Kozhemyakin's diary and then to the hero's attempt to rape her, Mansurova proves unequal to the task she had set herself Her tragedy is confirmed by Mark Vasil'ev, who brings Kozhemyakin news of her life after leaving Okurov "Ушиб ее ваш городок!"[90]

It is the same Mark Vasil'ev who takes up the challenge to Okurov begun by Mansurova He too is the bearer of faith, indeed, he is twice compared to an 'apostle'[91] Unlike Mansurova, however, Vasil'ev is of proletarian background and hence fully accustomed to the realities of Russian provincial life His reaction to Kozhemyakin's diary is therefore quite different Unsurprised by the graphic details it contains, he criticizes the diary for its negativity and impresses upon Kozhemyakin the need for a totally different account of life

> Не внушайте человеку, что он и дела его, и вся жизнь на земле, все - скверно и непоправимо скверно, навсегда! Нет, убеждайте его ты можешь быть лучше, ибо ты - начало всех деяний, источник всех осуществлений! 92

Yet for all his optimism, Vasil'ev is unable to inspire Kozhemyakin as Mansurova had once done His faith, by its very immutability, renders him intolerant of those, like Kozhemyakin, whose weakness leads to scepticism Lacking the compassion of Mansurova, Vasil'ev simply condemns Kozhemyakin for his passivity without attempting to analyse its cause and hence alienates the person he had hoped to save

The third of the characters to enter Kozhemyakin's life is Lyuba Matushkina, whose presence dominates the fourth and final part of the novel Another socialist, Matushkina combines Vasil'ev's strength with Mansurova's compassion, which together are capable of stimulating Kozhemyakin's spiritual regeneration Here again it is the reaction to Kozhemyakin's diary which provides the key to Matushkina's character On hearing extracts from the work, Matushkina is immediately aware of its significance both as an historical record and as a medium through which Kozhemyakin can at last purge his soul of Okurovshchina On her recommendation, Kozhemyakin sets about the task of writing his memoirs, which he recognizes as his own contribution to the revolutionary movement

It is no coincidence that Matushkina's appearance in the novel comes at the same time as the advent of the 1905 Revolution, as it is she who represents Gorky's ideal of a revolutionary who is able not

only to preach social change but also to inspire the spiritual regeneration of the individual, without which (in his view) social change is impossible Although the novel ends with Kozhemyakin's death, the conclusion is optimistic, as he dies, symbolically, at dawn, the task of writing his memoirs complete Thus the impression is created that, with Kozhemyakin's death, the reader is witnessing also the death thioes of Okurov itself and the dawn of a new era

The importance of Lyuba Matushkina is stressed by the fact that she was intended as the heroine of the final novel in the 'Okurov cycle', Bol'shaya lyubov' Although this work was never completed, the rough drafts being abandoned by Gorky in 1912,[93] its general conception may be divined from the extracts which have survived and from the related work Zapiski d'-ra Ryakhina, which was probably to have been part of the novel The two fragments develop a parallel theme, describing, respectively, the childhood of Lyuba Matushkina and of Dr Ryakhin, the cynical profligate who had made brief appearances both in Gorodok Okurov and Zhizn' Matveya Kozhemyakina The two characters emerge as the products of two totally different types of upbringing[94] Ryakhin, whose mother had died when he was a young child, had been left to the care of his father, who instils in the boy distrust of others Ryakhin records an important exchange between himself and his father in his notes

> - Любишь меня?
> - Да
> - Ну - молчи! Ладно?
> - Ладно
> - Я тебя - тоже! Молчок!
> Почему необходимо было для нас любить
> друг друга молча - я этого не пони-
> мал, но это мне нравилось, я его любил
> и чувствовал, что он тоже любит меня 95

Ryakhin's experience contrasts strikingly with that of Matushkina, whose mother advocates the very opposite principle "Надо любить так, чтобы всем, кто на вас взглянет, хорошо и радостно было и захотели бы люди сами крепко любить!"[96] Although the potential conflict between Matushkina and Ryakhin is not fully developed in the extant fragments of Bol'shaya lyubov', Gorky's intention may be extrapolated fairly reliably from the evidence of Gorodok Okurov and Zhizn' Matveya Kozhemyakina Matushkina, clearly, was to be the embodiment of the 'great love', which is capable of resurrecting even such seemingly hopeless individuals as Matvey Kozhemyakin, whilst Ryakhin was to

represent cynical individualism which leads him inevitably to self-lacerating introspection This conclusion is supported by the evidence of Fal'shivaya moneta, a play conceived in 1910 and completed in its first version three years later [97]

The dramatic conflict in Fal'shivaya moneta derives from the confrontation of two radically different attitudes to love For the majority of the characters, notably Yakovlev, Glinkin, Kirik and, initially, Sozhitelev, love is no more than the gratification of sexual desire To Yakovlev's wife Polina, however, love transcends the level of personal interest to encompass the whole of mankind "Мне так хочется что-то нежное, хорошее всем говорить, так бы я всех обняла, успокоила Мне для всех хочется нянькой быть, матерью. "[98] Polina's reference to the mother reminds us, naturally, of Nilovna, whose evolution towards this new collectivist understanding of maternal instinct had formed the central theme of Mat' Significantly, it is in Mat' that we find the first mention of the 'great love', which stirs within Nilovna "Глубоко внутри ее рождались слова большой, все и всех обнимающей любви "[99] It is this same 'great love' which inspires Polina in Fal'shivaya moneta "Мне теперь никто худа не сделает, моей души никому не задеть Окрепла душа моя большой любовью и ничем ее не разобьешь "[100] The rest of the play demonstrates the victory of the 'great love' over the prevailing spirit of cynicism amongst the men True to the tradition of Varvara Mikhaylovna (Dachniki), Polina rejects her environment and sets off in search of the 'new life' Her victory over the jealous Yakovlev and the self-seeking Kirik is stressed by the repentance of the former and the suicide of the latter

From the above discussion it is plain that Bol'shaya lyubov' was to have been the Paradiso of the 'Okurov cycle', the ultimate statement of Gorky's philosophy of revolution In conception, then, the cycle represents the zenith of 'Romantic Realism' in the writer's work and the culmination of his tendency to use literature as the vehicle for his personal conception of 'God-building'. That the 'Okurov cycle' was never completed and Fal'shivaya moneta never published must be seen therefore as a sign of a major change in Gorky's attitude to art and to 'Revolutionary Romanticism' in particular In order to justify this statement we should examine Chudaki, a play written in the spring and summer of 1910

3 Chudaki The retreat from Utopia

Although Gorky's decision not to publish Fal'shivaya moneta and his failure to complete Bol'shaya lyubov' could be explained simply by reference to his dissatisfaction with their literary quality, it would seem that there were other, more important, factors at work Especially significant is the fact that the break in the composition of the 'Okurov cycle' corresponded almost exactly with the time of Gorky's disillusionment with politics following the collapse of the Capri school The failure of this project led him to review not only his political affiliations but also his credo as a writer The profound nature of the self-analysis which resulted may be judged from the following statement in a letter from Gorky to his wife, written in 1912 "Мне вообще трудно живется, Катя, и все трудней Кажется, я теряю главное, чем жил, самое дорогое мое - веру в Россию, в ее будущее" [101] The first tangible sign of this loss of faith and its vital consequences for Gorky's literary development is the play Chudaki

Writing to his wife on the occasion of the unsuccessful première of his new play in St Petersburg,[102] Gorky referred in particular to its uncharacteristically 'personal' nature "Никогда меня не трогали эти провалы, а на сей раз заело! Почему? Потому ли, что нездоровится, или потому что в пьесе есть, против обыкновения, нечто личное?"[103] The personal element in Chudaki is indeed difficult to overlook Mastakov, the play's central character is a famous writer, whose statements on the purpose of literature bear an unmistakable resemblance to views expressed recently by Gorky himself Consider, for example, the following exposition de foi from the first act "Я верю, что победит светлое, радостное - человеческое Я ищу вокруг себя этих явлений Мне нравится указывать людям на светлое, доброе в жизни, в человеке" [104] Mastakov's philosophy of art finds its embodiment in a projected story about a mother (which again invites comparison with Gorky, whose preoccupation with the theme of the mother has already been noted) [105] The story provokes a hostile reaction from Dr Potekhin, whose is Mastakov's principle ideological adversary in the play Whilst he appreciates Mastakov's noble motives, Potekhin cannot accept any work of literature which is 'invented' and hence not true to life "Не хочу никакой лжи никаких утешений и обманов! Не хочу и того, что так

весело и беззаботно возвещаешь ты, Константин, не верю в эту твою сказку о матери "[106] The conflict is reminiscent of the debate between the Siskin and the Woodpecker in Gorky's earlier allegory O Chizhe, kotoryy lgal, i o Dyatle-lyubitele istiny Like the Siskin, Mastakov refuses to relinquish his 'beautiful dream', even if this means that he must deliberately ignore reality He challenges Potekhin

> Зачем они нужны, эти маленькие правды
> чему они служат? Никогда я не понимал их
> назначения Ну, вот - моя старуха -
> это ложь, скажут мне, уж я знаю, что ска-
> жут Таких старух нет, будут кричать Но
> сегодня - нет, а завтра - будут [107]

The success of Mastakov's defence of 'Romantic Realism' has to be measured against his performance in the play as a whole

The plot of Chudaki bears a very close resemblance to that of Deti Solntsa, with Mastakov playing a role essentially the same as that of Piotasov Like the hero of the earlier play, Mastakov reveals a child-like dependence on his wife (also called Elena) and a vulnerability to the calculating Ol'ga (Melaniya in Deti Solntsa) Elena, like her namesake, is forced to choose between an affair with the amoral Potekhin (Vagin in the earlier play) and her husband, to whom she is bound by her sense of duty The denouement also adheres to the pattern of Deti Solntsa, Elena remains with her husband, who, like Piotasov, remains essentially unchanged by what has occurred Mastakov is finally discredited, both as a writer and as a man, by Medvedeva, a real-life mother who, in the course of the play, is faced by a drama of which he is totally unaware In Act 2, she confronts Mastakov with the inescapable truth "Вы милый человек, хороший вы человек, ну а материнское - вам неведомо и непонятно Мук моих вы не знаете, слез не видите, думушки мои бесконечные неведомы вам "[108] This is the ultimate condemnation of both Mastakov and his art, his idealism, being totally divorced from life, can serve no useful purpose

Chudaki represents, therefore, a complete revision by Gorky of the philosophy of art exemplified by the majority of his works of the post-1905 period Although it is obviously not a vindication of Potekhin's cynicism, the play challenges the fantasy of 'Romantic Realism' in the name of a literature which provides a more faithful, although less encouraging, picture of reality No longer concerned to depict the ideal as reality (the distinguishing feature of 'Romantic Realism'), Gorky himself turned in his subsequent works to the technique of 'Critical

Realism'[109]

The change from 'Romantic' to 'Critical' realism is quite apparent in Vstrecha and Vassa Zheleznova, two plays written in swift succession after the completion of Chudaki The first is highly untypical of Gorky's drama and displays the influence of Gogol', satirizing the foibles of a group of merchants who gather at a provincial railway to await the arrival of a prince, from whom they hope to buy a forest Gorky uses the situation to provide a biting attack on the hypocrisy, greed and ignorance of mankind Vassa Zheleznova is even more important, as it provides an antidote to Mastakov's proposed story of the mother Unlike Gorky's ideal mother figures (particularly Nilovna), Vassa Zheleznova remains prey to the narrow maternal instinct which is the antithesis of the 'great love' capable of inspiring true collective consciousness The play is, in essence, a twentieth century version of Fonvizin's classic drama of misplaced parental instinct, Nedorosl', the mother in each play being rejected by her degenerate offspring in the final scene

Vassa Zheleznova and Vstrecha differ from Gorky's preceding works in that neither contains a 'positive hero' or raisonneur Yet we should not assume that this implies a reaction against the positive philosophy expressed in Gorky's earlier works Indeed, both plays display the author's enduring moralistic purpose, each drama results in evil being punished (Vassa is rejected by her son, the merchants in Vstrecha discover that their efforts have been in vain as the forest is already sold) Gorky's 'Critical Realism' does not contradict his 'Romantic Realism', the author remains inspired by the same ideal but with the obvious difference that, in 'Critical Realism', the ideal remains implicit only This is the basis of Gorky's own defence of 'Critical Realism' in the now famous passage from Detstvo, written a few years later

> Вспоминая эти свинцовые мерзости дикой русской жизни, я минутами спрашиваю себя да стоит ли говорить об этом? И, с обновленной уверенностью отвечаю себе - стоит, ибо это - живучая, подлая правда, она не издохла и по сей день. Это та правда, которую необходимо знать до корня, чтобы с корнем же выдрать ее из памяти, из души человека, из всей жизни нашей, тяжкой и позорной 110

Gorky's autobiographical writings, which dominated his literary output for more than a decade to come are as much a defence of his revolutionary

philosophy as the more overtly didactic pieces of the immediate post-revolutionary period The change of approach was, however, both significant and lasting Gorky never returned in his fiction to the technique of 'Romantic Realism' An artistic method born of his experience of revolution, it eventually proved unsatisfactory to the dominantly retrospective focus of his descriptive talent

B Echoes of revolution 'Critical Realism' in Gorky's works to 1917

The transition from 'Romantic' to 'Critical' realism is particularly notable in Gorky's works on revolution written during the final years on Capri Although the 'Okurov cycle' was the last of Gorky's major works devoted to the theme of the 1905 Revolution for many years, certain aspects of this theme recur in his works of the pre-Soviet period One such motif is the 'disintegration of personality' which appears on a number of occasions In each case, as in the famous Razrusheniye lichnosti article, the process of moral degeneracy is specifically linked to those who had occupied a reactionary or non-revolutionary position during the period 1905-1907 Thus we read of Dr Ryakhin that in 1905 "На его желтом лице не отражалось ни радости, ни любопытства, ни страха, ничего - чем жили люди в эти дни "[111] In Zhaloby, a series of stories written in 1910 and 1911,[112] cynicism and degeneracy are again the heritage of those who betrayed the revolution, whether by active resistance, as in the case of the soldier, the merchant and the policeman, or by acquiescence, as in the case of the liberal intellectual The most extreme manifestation of the 'disintegration of personality' is presented in Posledniy den', a story in which Gorky gave voice to his critique of the 'Sanin' cult of amoral individualism The 'hero' of the story is Pamorkhov, who reviews the course of his life from his death-bed His ideas are unmistakably a parody of those contained in the works of Artsybashev and a number of other vogue writers of the day "А я старался расширить пределы запрещенного в самых основах жизни, в морали и прочее там Против каждого "нельзя" я ставил свое "почему?""[113] Pamorkhov's physical illness is the external sign of his moral sickness and his ugly death reflects the author's judgement on him

None of these works is a new departure in Gorky's fiction They simply endorse views expressed elsewhere in his articles, stories and plays, amplifying his implacable critique of the enemies of revolution In Gorky's stories about revolutionaries, on the other hand, certain

important new elements are detectable, indicating a shift in his attitudes since the downfall of the Capri school

In a number of stories of this period Gorky examined the question which had first been raised by Avdey Nikin in Leto "Вот указывается, что христианство объединило и бедных и богатых, а социализм - может?"[114] The first work in which Gorky returned to this problem was Romantik Originally intended as a part of the continuation of Mat', but eventually written as a separate story early in 1910,[115] Romantik depicts a conflict of personality between two revolutionary workers, Aleksey Somov and Foma Varaksin Somov typifies an approach to revolution which is essentially intellectual Extremely well-versed in the theoretical works of socialist writers, to which he continually refers in his arguments with others, he is scornful of those, like Varaksin, whose appreciation of revolution is ethical or, in his terms, 'romantic' For Varaksin, it is the ethical values which are the most important, as he tells Somov "Внушение любви и совести, Алеша, вот главное, как я понимаю' Верно?"[116] The story ends with the total disillusionment of the 'romantic' Varaksin, who severs his connections with the revolutionary movement, and almost certainly reflects the author's own failure to find an outlet for his humanistic philosophy within the Social-Democratic party In this context, it is interesting to note a later statement by Gorky in Zametki

> В И Ленин говорил мне
> - Вы анархист и романтик Вы смотрите
> на мир детскими глазами [117]

It is quite possible that Lenin's words, which obviously left a deep impression on Gorky, served as the inspiration for Romantik

Gorky's defence of his 'romantic' conception of revolution is continued in Mordovka The hero of the story is Pavel Makov, a committed socialist outlawed by his family, who want no part of his revolutionary activities The situation places a tremendous strain on Makov, who discovers that socialist theory, which he had hitherto considered capable of solving all problems, can provide him with no help in facing his personal dilemma He confides his discovery to Mordovka, a woman he encounters by chance as he wanders aimlessly through the town

> - Пробовал я говорить - отвечают по книжке, - книжку я сам прочитаю' Люди стыдятся говорить откровенно о себе Многие, наверно, тем же болят, что и я, - тем, что нигде не написано, - только в сердце написано, о чем - стыдно сказать, а - надо

выговорить это, ведь оно - мучает' [118]

It is Mordovka, not Makov's party colleagues, who proves able to give him the moral support he needs The significance of their liaison is clarified in the following extract "Слова ее вызвали в душе Павла снисходительное чувство к ней и как бы протянули между ее скромной верой и его суровым знанием некую тонкую нить, сближавшую их" [119] Once again, Gorky openly expresses his view that, without faith, socialism remains a dry theory, incapable of solving basic human problems

Gorky's critique of scientific socialism was developed further in the manuscript of an unfinished work, entitled provisionally Ya vam ne pomeshayu? Written in the form and manner of Dostoyevsky's Zapiski iz podpol'ya, this work comprises the reminiscences of a revolutionary who recounts his development from an idealistic youth to a fully-fledged revolutionary Identifying the transition with his initiation into the theoretical basis of socialism, the narrator notes in retrospect that his intellectual pursuits caused a profound split in his personality "Но я начал чувствовать, что мои мечты - мечты юноши - не сливаются с моими знаниями и - враждебны им" [120] His awareness of the conflict between the promptings of his nature and his intellectual appreciation of socialist theory is heightened by the experience of 1905

> Историческая необходимость, стихийная сила уничтожения - все это отодвинулось куда-то в угол, за кулисы событий, стало невидимо и забыто Всюду реяли радужные птицы великих надежд, отовсюду стекались мощные силы, силы, готовые все разрушить, все создать [121]

Together with Romantik and Mordovka, Ya vam ne pomeshayu? provides an important post-script to Gorky's previous depiction of revolutionaries In these works the revolutionaries appear for the first time as truly credible characters faced with realistic personal problems As before, Gorky illustrates his belief that socialism without faith is impotent as a revolutionary force but with the vital difference that in these works the revolutionary movement itself is depicted in a less than favourable light In Mat', Vragi, Ispoved' and Leto the development of the new revolutionary faith had occurred within the revolutionary movement, however, in the three works under consideration here it is suggested that the revolutionary movement is alien to anything but a purely intellectual

reduction of life to a set of theoretical principles This shift of faith away from the revolutionary movement (although not, of course, from the revolutionary ideal) may be seen as the most tangible reflection in his literary works of Gorky's recent experiences at the hands of Lenin and the Bolsheviks

A corollary of Gorky's more critical examination of the revolutionary movement was his review of the crucial theme of the 'intelligentsia and the people' This theme was, as we have seen, vitally important to Gorky's conception of the revolution as a whole His views on the subject are stated quite explicitly in a letter to Lunacharsky "Мысль ваша о революционерах, как о мосте, единственно способном соединить культуру с народными массами родная и близкая мне"[122] This 'bridging' function of the revolution had been prominent in a number of Gorky's earlier works, notably Mat' and Iz povesti, where the confrontation between the intellectual and the people had resulted in a new synthesis[123] In the works of the post-1910 period, however, this idealistic vision of unity is exposed to doubt

In order to illustrate this point we should return in more detail to Romantik and Foma Varaksin Central to this story is the relationship between Varaksin and Liza, a young woman of higher social origin The latter, a newcomer to the revolutionary movement, is acutely aware of the distance that separates her from the working class she claims to represent and her friendship with Varaksin is prompted by her intellectual desire to understand the working-class mentality Varaksin misinterprets Liza's interest as a sign of emotional attraction and, against the advice of the realist Somov, confesses his love to her with the inevitable embarrassing consequences As in Rasskaz Filippa Vasil'evicha, the class barrier proves insurmountable In this case, however, even a unity of interests is unable to provide the vital 'bridge', as Varaksin himself notes "Единство интересов хорошо-с а откуда же одиночество и нестерпимая тоска подчас?"[124] In this way the illusion of harmony between workers and intellectuals created in Gorky's earlier works is replaced by a more pessimistic version of reality

The message of Romantik is repeated in Vecher u Shamova, a story from the Po Rusi cycle Based on the author's own experiences in Kazan', the story again stresses the isolation of the intellectuals from the aspirations of the common people, who are represented by the narrator The tension between the two groups is clear from the very first page,

where the narrator talks of the evenings he spends in the company of the revolutionary intellectuals who gather at Shamov's home

> Эти вечера для меня, как всенощная для верующего Люди, которые служат ее, во многом чужды мне, мое отношение к ним - мучительно неясно нравятся они мне и - нет, восхищают и - злят, иногда хочется сказать им слова сердечно-ласковые, а - через час - мною овладевает нестерпимое желание нагрубить этим красивым дамам, приятным кавалерам 125

More commonly, Gorky expresses his views through the mouthpiece of a negative character Consider, for example, the following passage from Zhaloby, in which the army officer relates his experience of the revolutionary movement "Социалисты, которые терпеть не могут друг друга, не уважают личности, товарища, который, скажем, картавит, произнося имя Марксово . ну какой там социализм'"[126] These remarks could be taken directly as Gorky's own response to his dealings with the socialists, especially as the reference to the speech defect almost certainly hints at Lenin's own deficiency [127] One again detects the author's own voice in Karamora, where the revolutionaries also come in for criticism

> Быт их противоречил "убеждениям", "принципам", - догматам веры Это противоречие особенно резко обнаруживалось в приемах фракционной борьбы, во вражде между людьми одинаковой веры, но различной тактики Тут находил себе место бесстыднейший иезуитизм, допускались жульнические подвохи и даже подленькие приемы азартных игроков, увлеченных игрою до самозабвения, играющих уже только ради процесса игры 128

Written in 1923, this passage suggests the extent to which the Capri school affair remained a live issue for Gorky

The final years on Capri, therefore, witnessed vital changes both in Gorky's attitude to the revolutionary movement and in his aesthetic theory, changes which should have promoted at least the possibility of a rapprochement with Andreyev Yet, when the two writers did eventually attempt reconciliation in 1911, the result, as we shall see in the following chapter, was simply to provoke a new confrontation For this several explanations may be suggested Perhaps the most convincing is the fact that Andreyev was almost certainly unaware of the changes affecting his friend on Capri The years 1909 and 1910 had seen no direct contact between the two men and, although it may be assumed that

Andreyev read Gorky's new works as they appeared in the Znaniye miscellanies, it would seem that they made no marked impression upon him Certainly, one searches in vain for references to Gorky's works in his letters of this period Still convinced that he was the injured party in the altercations of the previous years, he was as unlikely to change his opinion of Gorky than Gorky himself had been to revise his view of Andreyev By this time, the acrimony which had accumulated as a result of earlier arguments made it impossible for either writer to view their relationship with any sort of objectivity This intransigence, displayed equally by both men, was to prove the ultimate barrier to understanding between them in the years to 1919

CHAPTER SIX NOTES

1 ЛН.72, стр 534
2 ЛЖТ.2, стр.61
3 АГ 7, стр.188
4 see Vilonov's letter to his wife of 15 February, 1909, cited in Б Мейлах, "Из темы Ленин и Горький (эпизод с "каприйской школой")", в его кн Вопросы литературы и эстетики, (М , 1959), стр 113.
5 Нинов, "Каприйские встречи", стр 13
6 Published in АГ 1
7 Kaun, Gorky, p.420.
8 "О партийной школе, устраиваемои за границей в NN(о Капри)", КПСС в резолюциях и решениях съездов, конференций и пленумов ЦК , ч 1, (М , 1953), стр 228
9 Мейлах, стр 113
10 Ленин, т 15, стр 431-432
11 АГ.9, стр.72
12 Г-30, стр 29, стр 97.
13 Ленин, т 16, стр.56-57
14 The statement had been published in August ЛЖТ 2, стр.91
15 Ленин, т 16, стр.70
16 see Gorky's letter to his wife of 20 December, 1909 АГ.9, стр.80
17 ibid., pp.24,25
18 Груздев, Горький и его время, стр.198-216
19 Wolfe, The Bridge and the Abyss, p.49.
20 According to the editors of the Lenin-Gorky correspondence, the majority of Gorky's letters to Lenin have never been found Their content may be fairly reliably ascertained, however, from Lenin's replies, which often quote from them liberally.
21 see, above, p.253
22 Ленин и Горький, стр.53-54
23 ibid., p.245
24 Трифонов, стр.146
25 Entry in Pyatnitsky's diary for 30 October, 1909, cited in Трифонов, стр.145 In his letter to Gorky of 16 November, Lenin refers to a conversation with Vilonov and mentions the split between the 'fractionary' and 'non-fractionary' elements on Capri Ленин и Горький, стр 49
26 ibid., pp 49-50, 52-54, 56-59.
27 In December, 1909, Lenin wrote an article Basnya burzhuaznoy pechati ob isklyuchenii Gor'kogo, in which he defended the writer against the claim of Utro Rossii that Gorky had been expelled from the RSDLP. The following year, Gorky was singled out for praise in O platforme storonnikov i zashchitnikov otzovizma ЛЖТ 2, стр 102-105, Ленин и Горький, стр.236-240
28 ЛЖТ.2, стр 135
29 Gorky visited Paris between 13 and 25 February, 1911 ibid , pp 182-183
30 АГ 9, стр 109 The desire to keep the visit secret from his 'comrades' is repeated in a second letter ibid., p.111
31 ГЧ 1953-1957, стр.39
32 Ленин и Горький, стр 312
33 Трифонов, стр 146

34 For a fine account of Gorky's relations with the Bolsheviks during the Revolution and Civil War, see Wolfe, The Bridge and the Abyss, chapters 7,8,9.
35 АГ 9, стр 76,79
36 see M.F Andreyeva's telegram to Pyatnitsky of 24 December, 1908 АГ.4, стр 386
37 М Ф Андреева, стр 185-186
38 АГ.9, стр.59
39 ibid., p.65.
40 see, above, pp 305-307
41 АГ.9, стр 81
42 Despite the euphemistic reference to Andreyeva as Gorky's 'second wife', standard in Soviet works, the writer remained legally married to E P.Peshkova throughout his life.
43 Муромцева-Бунина, "Италия", стр.167-168
44 Трифонов, стр 147-148
45 ЛЖТ 2, стр.309,312, АГ.9, стр.149
46 Begun in the winter of 1908, the novel was completed, after a break, in the spring and summer of 1909 ПССГ, т.9, стр 569
47 see, for example, Gorky's statements on the work of Muyzhel' and Rodionov. Г-30, т 29, стр 70,156-157
48 Г-30, т 24, стр 75
49 ПССГ, т 1, стр 581
50 see, for example, Vyvod, O zhene, prodannoy za 40 rubley, and the review of Chekhov's V ovrage
51 Г-30, т 23, чтр 105
52 Г-30, т 24, стр 74
53 ПССГ, т.9, стр 501
54 ibid., p.432.
55 ibid., p.398.
56 ibid., p.462.
57 ibid , p.460
58 ibid., p.481
59 ibid., p.504.
60 ibid., p 511.
61 ibid., p.466.
62 А Измайлов, "В партийных цепях", Русское слово, 11 декабря, 1909
63 АГ 9, стр 82
64 С.Касторский, "Повесть "Лето"", МИ 4, стр 48-109
65 Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX века. 1908-1917, стр 42,43
66 ПССГ, т 9, стр.569.
67 Е Беленький, "О повести М Горького "Лето"", Русская литература, № 3 (1969), стр.190
68 ПССГ, т.9, стр.451-452
69 ibid., p 430
70 ibid , p 491.
71 ibid., p 513.
72 ПССГ, т.6, стр 321
73 ПССГ, т 11, стр.277
74 ibid., pp.288,289
75 ibid., p.290.
76 ПССГ, т.10, стр.39
77 ibid , p.34.
78 ibid , p 114

79 ibid., p 21.
80 ibid., p.15
81 ibid., p.60
82 ibid., p.24.
83 ibid., p.95.
84 ibid., p.122
85 In Gorodok Okurov, reference is made to Kozhemyakin's 'History of Okurov', his speeches on the war with Japan and his attitude to the Revolution of 1905 ibid., pp.30, 26,85
86 ibid., p.228.
87 ibid., p.305.
88 ibid , p.306.
89 ibid., p.296.
90 ibid., p.424.
91 ibid., pp.421,482.
92 ibid., p.422
93 З Карасик, "О незаконченной повести Большая любовь"", ГЧ 1953-1957, стр 315
94 Gorky's preoccupation at this time with the question of children's upbringing is reflected in his letters to his wife, in which he continually refers to the problems relating to the education of his son, Maksim. His views were subsequently published in an article, Obshcheye razvitiye rebyonka, which appeared under the title Skazka zhizni in П Ариан, Первый женский календарь на 1911 год, (СПб , 1911), стр 101-103
95 ПССГ, т.10, стр 666
96 ibid., p 656.
97 The play was published in an extremely revised version in 1927. For the details of its composition, see В Нечаева, "Работа Горького над пьесой "Фальшивая монета"", ЛН 74, стр.58-69
98 ibid., p.97.
99 ПССГ, т 8, стр 163
100 ЛН 74, стр 113.
101 АГ.9, стр.135
102 The premiere took place at the New Dramatic Theatre on 24 September, 1910 ПССГ, т 13, стр 509
103 АГ.9, стр 98.
104 ПССГ, т 13, стр 93
105 The theme of the mother in Gorky's work is one of great psychological and philosophical importance. Deriving no doubt in part from his own childhood circumstances, the image of the mother as the embodiment of selfless love is often identified with his ideal for the collective mentality. A full study of this theme lies outside the scope of the present work.
106 ПССГ, т.13, стр 106-107.
107 ibid., p.103.
108 ibid , p.109
109 The term is borrowed unashamedly from Soviet criticism, which staunchly defends the view that Gorky remained a 'Socialist Realist' (i e 'Romantic Realist') from the composition of Mat' onwards.
110 ПССГ, т 15, стр 193
111 ПССГ, т 10, стр 622

112 ПССГ, т 11, стр 528-529
113 ibid., p.328.
114 ПССГ, т 9, стр 398
115 ПССГ, т 8, стр 505-506
116 ibid., p 376
117 Ленин и Горький, стр 390
118 ПССГ, т 8, стр 413
119 ibid., p 412
120 ПССГ, т.10, стр 688
121 ibid., p 691
122 Трифонов, стр 136
123 see, above, pp 225-226, 316-317
124 ПССГ, т.8, стр 383.
125 ПССГ, т 14, стр 385
126 ПССГ, т 11, стр.23
127 Gorky mentions Lenin's speech defect in V I Lenin
ПССГ, т 20, стр 8
128 ПССГ, т.17, стр 398

CHAPTER SEVEN

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE YEARS TO 1919

A Sashka Zhegulyov attempted reconciliation

Direct communication between Gorky and Andreyev had ceased, as we have seen,[1] in March, 1908, following the dispute over T'ma From that time onwards, Gorky's attitude to Andreyev had become increasingly hostile, as the writer himself explained in a letter to E K Malinovskaya at the end of the year

> писать Андрееву не буду, ибо после "Тьмы" решил прекратить с ним личные отношения, а "Семь повешенных" и "Записки" - утвердили меня в решении этом Очень грустная история и не легкая для меня - я его любил и считаю талантливейшим писателем современности Но человек, который употребляет дар свой и силы свои для того, чтобы спекулировать на глупости и пошлости публики для ради завоевания вящей популярности - чужд мне и жалок и - более [2]

At the time of writing Gorky had already completed Razrusheniye lichnosti, the first article to make public his attack on the reactionary nature of Andreyev's recent works [3]

Although he refrained for the time being from further public criticism of Andreyev, Gorky continued to make unfavourable references to his former colleague in his private correspondence of 1910 and 1911 Quite typical is the response to Den' gneva contained in a letter to M K Iordanskaya

> Рассказ Андреева прочитал, красиво написано и не без намерения поднять репутацию, но - избави нас боже от свободы по Андрееву Мы ее имеем издревле, она-то, главнейше, и мешает нам жить по-человечески, ибо имя ее - нигилизм в мысли, а в действии - анархизм [4]

Yet despite his criticism of Andreyev's ideological standpoint and of his public image, Gorky continually maintained in these letters that his principle feeling towards Andreyev was one of 'pity' [5] Indeed, both the frequency and the tone of his comments on his friend suggest that he was sincerely grieved by the rift which had developed between them

Andreyev, for his part, had been at first perplexed and then angered by Gorky's determination to interpret his latest works as a

'slander on the revolution' In September, 1908, he wrote Pyatnitsky a letter full of recriminations against Gorky, whom he held solely responsible for the situation [6] His public statements, however, contained no such elements of complaint On the contrary, Andreyev seemed all the more willing at this time to express his support for Gorky In August, 1908, for example, Novaya Rus' carried a report of an interview by Pil'sky, who cited Andreyev's enthusiastic comments on Gorky

> Да! Горький! Это громадная душа, необыкновенное сердце! Ведь мы с ним разных, в сущности, и литературных манер и эстетических миросозерцаний Некоторое влияние на меня он имел и мог иметь Естественно было бы желание перевоспитать меня или переделать, или, по крайней мере, чуть-чуть изменить мое направление Ничего подобного у Горького Все время он умел меня только окрылять и бодрить [7]

If these remarks seem particularly charitable in the light of Gorky's only too blatant attempts to 're-educate' his colleague, they may perhaps be explained as an attempt by Andreyev to win back Gorky's favour by a display of loyalty The same purpose can be discerned in a later interview with Tsetlin, which contained great praise for Ispoved', a novel which Andreyev interpreted as a sign of Gorky's ascendency over his Symbolist critics [8]

In view of his own determined efforts to display publicly his solidarity with his friend, Andreyev must have seen the publication of Razrusheniye lichnosti as a deliberate and unwarranted act of betrayal by Gorky Even so, Andreyev refused to answer Gorky's criticism in print In an autobiographical sketch, written for Fidler's Pervye literaturnye shagi in 1910, he continued to express his gratitude to Gorky for his advice and support Almost inevitably, however, Andreyev's comments here are more reserved than usual and contain an unmistakable reference to recent arguments "Только известная сдержанность по отношению к нему заставляет меня удержаться от более горячего выражения чувства признательности и чувства глубокого, единственного уважения" [9]

That Andreyev withheld from public criticism of Gorky even after the publication of Razrusheniye lichnosti seems again to suggest that he continued to hold out hope for the possibility of reconciliation in the future This supposition is supported by the fact that, in August, 1911, Andreyev wrote Gorky a long letter with the avowed purpose of discovering

the cause of their disaffection The letter is a testimony to the conflicting emotions which the breakdown of relations had aroused in Andreyev Whilst he was moved, on the one hand, to declare his sincere desire to resurrect their friendship, he was also at pains to defend himself against the charges that Gorky had raised in his letters and public statements The essence of his argument remained exactly the same as three years earlier "Повторяю, я не изменился Каким ты любил меня когда-то, таким я и остаюсь - ни одной новой черты, тебе враждебной, не проложила жизнь ни на душе, ни на лице моем" [10] However honest his desire for peace, Andreyev had not forgiven Gorky, reconciliation for him was conditional upon Gorky's admission that his earlier criticism had been unjustified

Andreyev's letter provoked a somewhat dualistic reaction from Gorky On 12 September, he wrote to his wife

> Недавно получил большущее письмо от Леонида - молчок об этом' - шутит Леонид, а сквозь шутки - слышен этот надрывающий душу вой затравленного волка Скоро, вероятно, увижусь с ним, многими - Куприным, Ценским и т д Сказать им у меня есть что, на велик толк не надеюсь, а кое чего добьюсь, уверен [11]

This brief passage is no less revealing than the lengthy letter to which it refers Despite the hint (in his words on the 'howl of the wolf at bay') of his usual exasperation with Andreyev's desire to 'open his soul', Gorky was by no means opposed to the idea of reconciliation The previous year he had been sadly disappointed that his friend had not visited him on Capri whilst holidaying in Italy [12] Although understandably reserved as to the outcome, he obviously welcomed the opportunity of reconciliation promised by Andreyev's letter Perhaps the most hopeful sign, in his eyes, was the suggestion by Andreyev that the democratic writers of Russia should again unite as they had in the early days of Znaniye Reviewing the deplorable state of contemporary literature, Andreyev had written

> Подлинная реакция та, что живет в усталом сердце, уже кончилась, пред нами далеко уже маячит гребень той волны, на которую снова и снова предстоит нам взбираться Вид России печален, дела ее ничтожны и скверны, а где-то уже родится веселый зов к новой, тяжелой, революционной работе Далеко не все это сознают, но даже и те, кто не сознают, тянутся друг к другу, ищут сближения, требуют новых

> объединительных лозунгов, ибо над старыми уже лежит печать раздора и вражды Кто соберет? - вот в чем только дело Живи ты сейчас в России, ты для разбредшейся литературы повторил ту же роль, что и тогда со сборниками "Знания", - ты опять собрал бы народ 13

The passage has been quoted in full as it was incorporated, with the exception of the final sentence, into an article written by Gorky in October, 1911 and entitled V shir' poshlo [14] Without mentioning Andreyev by name, Gorky used this passage to illustrate his view that the political and social climate in Russia was beginning to show signs of improvement

Andreyev's call for a new union of revolutionary writers came at a time when Gorky himself was attempting to establish a forum for democratic literature in his native land through the medium of Sovremennik, a journal with which he was involved periodically between October, 1910 and March, 1913 [15] From the letter to his wife, it would seem that Gorky had hopes, however tentative, of involving not only Andreyev but others, like Kuprin and Sergeyev-Tsensky in this project

Gorky did not reply to Andreyev's letter immediately, which may be taken as a sign of the conflicting emotions that it aroused Just like Andreyev, he sincerely regretted the rift in their relations but felt unable to retract any of his earlier arguments In his reply he cited four reasons for the breakdown of their relations Of these the first two concerned T'ma and Moi zapiski The latter work in particular earned his disapproval as a 'sermon on a passive attitude to life' [16] Thirdly, Gorky noted with displeasure that Andreyev had let his fame go to his head with the result that he had brought the writer's profession into disrepute He reminded Andreyev "Русский писатель должен быть личностью священной, в России нечему удивиться, некому поклониться, кроме как писателю".[17] Finally, he took Andreyev to task for the telegram of congratulation he had sent to Yasinsky, a writer of conservative views, on the occasion of the latter's fortieth jubilee in January, 1911 Summing up, Gorky made quite plain that he had no intention of recanting his previous opinions

> Таким образом, как ты видишь, я с Луначарским согласен, обругал он тебя правильно, что хочешь говори факт остается фактом - в общей пляске над могилами и ты принял некое участие, в общей "путанице" и ты запутался до признания

> Ясинского человеком, достойным твоего внимания Все это, право же, не похвально, все - цепь ошибок - заторопился ты и - понизил себе цену, понизил внимание к тебе 18

Despite his intransigence over the central issue of Andreyev's claim to be a revolutionary writer, Gorky stated his willingness to forget the past in an attempt to set their relationship on a new footing Taking up Andreyev's suggestion that democratic writers should organize themselves for battle, he invited his friend to arrange a meeting at which they could discuss in detail the possibility of collaboration

Andreyev must have been sorely disappointed by Gorky's letter His own reply suggests once more the importance he attached to the views expressed by Gorky in Razrusheniye lichnosti Although he decided not to send the long letter of recrimination which he had originally drawn up, his bitterness is still quite apparent

> Алексей! Написал я большое письмо и решил не посылать Действительно не стоит При том глубоком отчуждении и непонимании, каким дышит каждое слово твоего письма - мои справедливые упреки не дойдут до сердца и только подольют масла в огонь 19

For all his good intentions, Andreyev could not refrain, however, from 'just reproaches' with regard to Gorky's remarks on T'ma and Moi zapiski, sensing that these might well prove to be a serious obstacle to true reconciliation Convinced that such reconciliation would be possible only if Gorky accepted his claim to be a revolutionary writer, Andreyev suggested the following experiment to test his friend's good will

> Сейчас я заканчиваю роман "Сашка Жегулев", и как только выйдет, пришлю тебе эта вещь - я думаю - может способствовать окончательному выяснению наших писательских товарищеских отношений Возможно, что ты примешь ее, и я буду очень рад, но возможно, что и отвергнешь - тогда и толковать не о чем 20

Before considering the result of this experiment, we must take a look at Sashka Zhegulyov, a novel which was indeed to provide the 'final clarification' of literary relations between Gorky and Andreyev

Like a number of Andreyev's previous works on the subject of revolution, Sashka Zhegulyov had its basis in historical fact The years following 1905 had witnessed a growing wave of so-called 'expropriations' by extremist groups operating in the Russian provinces It

was this phenomenon that provided the background to Andreyev's novel L'vov-Rogachevsky has even suggested that the story of Sashka Zhegulyov was based on a specific case, that of Aleksandr Savitsky [21] Savitsky, the son of a minor excise official, had been a Socialist Revolutionary Expelled from high school in 1905, he left the party to form an independent terrorist group His activity reached its peak in 1908, when he conducted a number of raids in Mogilyov province The following year, he was betrayed by one of his followers and killed in a pitched battle with a detachment of troops [22]

The case of Savitsky, which was well reported in the contemporary press, may well have inspired a number of similar episodes in Andreyev's novel, but, as always, the historical material was modified by the author to serve his own particular purpose In outline, the story of Sasha Pogodin, the hero of the novel, is very similar to that of his real-life prototype Pogodin, the son of a general, comes to reject his social background to take up the life of a terrorist In the second part of the novel, under the assumed name of Sashka Zhegulyov, he carries out a series of daring raids before his eventual betrayal, arrest and execution Andreyev utilized this simple plot to illustrate his overall view of the 1905 Revolution and its significance

The basic idea of Sashka Zhegulyov, as a number of critics have noted,[23] is close to that of T'ma Yet, although both works deal with the general theme of the intellectual and the people, it is mistaken to identify too closely their central concern Sasha Pogodin does, of course, share with the hero of T'ma a number of common features Both are political extremists, idealistic youths from an intellectual background who display moral purity and a propensity for ascetic sacrifice Yet, in essence, the tragedy of Sasha Pogodin is quite different from that of Aleksey In the earlier work, as we have seen, Andreyev concentrated on the dilemma facing a man whose rationally conceived ideal is shattered by the pressure of reality Sasha, on the other hand, is no super-rationalist He is attracted to revolutionary activity not by logic but by a nebulous emotion inspired by his first acquaintance with the Russian countryside The impact of nature, the 'wise tutor' of the third chapter,[24] is revealed in the following passage about the garden in which the young Sasha used to play

> Без него, пожалуй, не узнал бы Саша так хорошо, ни что такое Россия, ни что такое дорога с ее чудесным очарованием и маня-

щей далью И если Россию он почувствовал
в ночном гуле мощных дерев, то и к от-
кровению дороги привел все тот же сад
взлез однажды Саша на забор
и вдруг увидел - дорогу Две стены ветхого
забора и свесившихся дерев, а посредине
две теплые, пыльные, пробитые в ползучей
траве колеи идут далеко, зовут с собою
Саша свято поверил в дорогу, душою
принял ее немой призыв 25

The open road, which appeals not to Sasha's intellect but to his soul, is obviously the symbol of freedom With this freedom as his ideal and love of Russia as his inspiration, Sasha is far from the dry intellectualism of Aleksey

The difference between Andreyev's concern in Sashka Zhegulyov and that in T'ma will become quite plain if we consider the meaning of Sasha's relationship with the peasant Kolesnikov The latter, like Lyuba in T'ma, represents the 'conscience of the people' (a term which is actually applied to Kolesnikov in the course of the novel) [26] In Sashka Zhegulyov, however, the confrontation of the two social classes has an entirely different significance Unlike Aleksey and Lyuba, Sasha and Kolesnikov inspire immediate trust in each other and share a conviction in 'something joyous and unusually important' which they must achieve together [27] It is Kolesnikov, the seasoned revolutionary, who provides Sasha with a plan of action which is founded on a philosophy totally opposite to Lyuba's dictum 'It is shameful to be good' When Sasha confesses his shame at his own cleanliness, Kolesnikov protests vehemently

А что такое революция? Кровь же народная,
за нее ответ надо дать - да какой же
ты ответ дашь, если ты не чист?
Нет, ты будь чист, как агнец' Дай
мне чистого человека, и я с ним на разбой
пойду 28

Sasha, then, is to be a human sacrifice, his terrorist activity in the second part of the novel is the realization of Kolesnikov's plan

Kolesnikov is attracted to Sasha not only because of the latter's 'cleanliness', however, and here Andreyev introduces into Sashka Zhegulyov an element missing from T'ma Towards the end of the first part of the novel, Kolesnikov reveals the true reason for his choice of Sasha He compares Sasha with the sailor, Andrey Ivanovich, who, although pure of heart, is unsuitable for his purpose " Я б и тебя тревожить не стал, одним бы матросиком обошелся, да повелевать

он, того-этого, не умеет О, проклятое рабье племя - даже и и тут без генеральского сына не обойдешься'"[29] Kolesnikov recognizes in Sasha one of the strong, a 'master' whose duty it is, in his view, to lead the 'slaves', amongst whom he counts himself "Ну долго ли мой отец был крепостным, а я всю жизнь, того-этого, послушанием страдаю" [30] The master-slave relationship is the source of the love-hate feelings between Sasha and Kolesnikov

The transformation of Sasha Pogodin into Sashka Zhegulyov involves not only a change of name but also a change of character, which is revealed in the evolution of his attitude to his parents For his mother, Elena Petrovna, to whom he initially bears a striking resemblance, Sasha cherishes feelings of love and respect which are, however, complicated by his gradual rejection of her middle-class values during the first part of the novel Equally contradictory is his attitude to his dead father Whilst he hates him both for his cruelty to Elena Petrovna and for the reactionary political views he represented, the memory of the general nevertheless inspires in Sasha a fatal fascination By the second part of the novel we find that Sasha, having left his mother's home, now bears a closer resemblance to his father Struck by the change in Sasha's face, Kolesnikov is drawn to this conclusion even though he had never known the general, nor seen his photograph [31] In the same chapter, Sasha himself ruminates on the nature of this change

> "Да что же это? Вот я и опять понимаю!" - думает в восторге Саша и с легкостью, подобной чуду возрождения или смерти, сдвигает вдавившиеся тяжести, переоценивает и прошлое и душу свою, вдруг убедительно чувствует несходство свое с матерью и роковую близость к отцу 32

That the ascendency of the 'paternal' element in Sasha's character coincides with his role as leader of the peasant band is quite natural, as it is from the general that he inherited the ability to command

Sasha's leadership provokes conflicting reactions amongst the peasants The majority typify the 'slave' mentality, accepting Sasha's overlordship with unquestioning faith "все взывали к святому имени Сашки Жегулева и терпеливо ждали огня".[33] On the other hand, there is the figure of Vas'ka Solov'yov, who comes to resent Sasha's leadership and eventually establishes a rival gang of his own The rise of Solov'yov's gang places great pressure on Sasha and his followers and raises the vital question of their motivation In the

course of events, the peasants prove unable to distinguish between Sasha's motives and those of the cut-throat Solov'yov Inspired by the desire for vengeance, they are attracted to the form of revolt without understanding its meaning This signifies the failure of Kolesnikov's plan, he has not made revolution, he has simply created anarchy, a point which is stressed by means of an extended simile

> То, что издали, в широком обхвате глаза, казалось понятным и достижимым, вблизи утеряло свой ясный смысл, разменялось на тысячу маленьких действий, разговоров, смутных настроений, частичных выкладок и соображений Так с берега смотрит пловец на бушующее море и видит ясный порядок, в котором движутся валы, и соображает, как плыть, но вот он в воде - все изменилось, на месте порядка хаос, взамен закона - своеволие 34

Observing the chaos and anarchy for which he is responsible, Kolesnikov realises that his entire endeavour has lost its justification "Зачем же тогда чистота, зачем бескорыстие и эти ужасные муки? - кто догадается о жертве, когда потерялся белый агнец в скопище хищных зверей и убойного скота, погибает под ножом безвестно!"[35] With the failure of the peasants to appreciate the importance of Sasha's sacrifice, Kolesnikov's entire philosophy is discredited It is in recognition of his mistake that he instructs Sasha in his dying breath to return to Elena Petrovna

At this point the full significance of an earlier passage becomes clear Towards the end of the first part of the novel, Kolesnikov had supported his argument for the sacrifice of Sasha by a simile "Да, того-этого, никакой дурак в трубе углем не пишет, а мелом Так-то, Саша, мел ты мой белейший"[36] The colour imagery is revived a few pages later when Kolesnikov himself is described by the adjective 'black'[37] With the colours black and white firmly linked to the characters of Kolesnikov and Sasha respectively, the description of the turnpike on the highway, which occurs just a few lines after the comparison of Sasha to chalk, takes on symbolic connotations

> И особенно похоже было на сон полосатое бревно шлагбаума, скупо озаренное притушенным фонарем что-то невыносимо-ужасное, говорящее о смерти, о холоде, о беспощадности судьбы, заключали в себе смутные полосы черной и белой краски 38

By linking the colours black and white (the stripes on the turnpike)

with the concept of a barrier, Andreyev suggests that the master-slave relationship (the relationship between 'white' Sasha and 'black' Kolesnikov) is a barrier to the achievement of freedom That this meaning was intended consciously by Andreyev is supported by the fact that the turnpike image reinforces the 'open road' motif from the beginning of the novel It may be noted in passing that this complex interweaving of intellectually conceived symbols is one of the most typical features of Andreyev's use of language

Following the death of Kolesnikov, Sasha also comes to question the value of his sacrifice "Нужна ли была его жертва? Кому во благо отдал он всю чистоту свою "[39] From this moment on he is drawn irresistibly by the idea of returning to his mother, an urge which reflects his subconscious desire to exculpate his sin Sasha now turns from the asceticism which had prompted him to reject the love of his mother and of his fiancée, Zhenya Egmont, to a new appreciation of love "Все дальше уходила жизнь, и открывался молодой душе чудесный мир любви, божественно-чистой и прекрасной, какой не знают живые в надеждах люди" [40] Despite Sasha's failure to find his mother and his inevitable death, the novel ends with a eulogy to love in the figures of the three women, Elena Petrovna, Zhenya Egmont and Sasha's sister Linochka

Gorky read Sashka Zhegulyov in December, 1911, even before its publication in the sixteenth Shipovnik miscellany His impression is recorded in a letter to his wife "Читала "Сашку Жегулева"? Очень плохо, я глубоко огорчен Леонид становится каким-то уличным писателем Жалко его - до смерти, а помочь нельзя "[41] A few months later he wrote to L'vov-Rogachevsky with more detailed criticism of Andreyev's novel

> Жегулев затеян широко, в его лице, как мне кажется, предполагалось дать некоторое историческое лицо - человека нам знакомого, русского интеллигента, который приносил себя в жертву на алтарь служения интересам народа Мать этого стремления - Византия, христианство, а Саша Погодин - воплощение его - и вот он попадает в среду безличную, в среду гнедых, которые и есть русский народ Эта среда, принимая его, убивает в нем Погодина, человека, вызывая к жизни Жегулева-зверя В конце концов - доказана бесплодность жертвы, - бессмысленность единоличных усилий ввести в жизнь творческое, облагораживающее начало [42]

In other words, Gorky could not accept Andreyev's claim that Sashka Zhegulyov was a 'revolutionary' novel He was understandably reluctant, however, to inform Andreyev of his views For four months no letter passed between the two men until, at the end of February, Andreyev wrote again to Gorky enquiring about the novel, which he feared might have been mislaid in the post [43] Unable to forestall the inevitable any longer, Gorky was obliged to send a review of the novel in the middle of the following month

Gorky's letter contained three major complaints about Sashka Zhegulyov The first concerned the novel's language, which he considered 'bad, dull and patchy' [44] Reserving praise only for the character of Linochka, he passed on to the figure of Sasha

> А сам Сашка - деревянная болванка, знакомая издавна, это все тот же изжеванный русской литературою "агнец", - то есть барак, - приносящий себя в жертву за "грехи мира", возлагающий на себя бремя неудобносимое и охающий разно-голосно, но всегда одинаково и в 80-х, и в 10-х годах, - под игом своим, якобы добровольно взятым на рамена [45]

Finally, Gorky turned to his usual criticism of Andreyev's works for their historical inaccuracy Referring to the evidence of legal documents and the testimony of witnesses at the trials of various 'expropriators' which contradicted the picture presented in Andreyev's novel, he concluded "с действительностью надо бы обращаться более серьезно, чем это допускаешь ты" [46] It is also most likely that Gorky was annoyed by the deliberately fatalistic tone of the novel which created the impression that the defeat of the revolution was inevitable Furthermore, he may well have seen the work as a polemic with his own depiction of the revolutionary peasantry in Leto Whatever the case, he made it plain that, in his view, any reconciliation between them was absolutely out of the question "Разошлись же - и расходимся все более - мы с тобой не потому, что у нас не возникли личные отношения, а потому, что они не могли возникнуть Слишком различны мы" [47]

Gorky's uncompromising letter gave rise to a flurry of correspondence which continued until the end of the year Andreyev, who was naturally disappointed at his friend's reaction to Sashka Zhegulyov, now gave vent to all his anger and frustration in a long and emotional reply Taking particular exception to the crude tone of Gorky's letter,

he presented a lengthy defence against all his strictures and noted with unconcealed bitterness

> Как трагический курьез, до которого не доходили даже военно-полевые судьи, - ты сделал в конце письма заявление, что все мои попытки оправдаться будут бесполезны Другими словами, ты не только не выслушал обвиняемого, прежде чем поставить приговор, но и заранее отказался выслушать его 48

Andreyev's accusations placed Gorky on the defensive and with each successive letter the mutual recriminations grew Over the months, however, Andreyev began to ameliorate his criticism By April, he was suggesting to Gorky that reconciliation was still possible and that they should meet in person to clear up the misunderstanding Gorky, on the other hand, was far less sanguine Although he welcomed the idea of Andreyev visiting him on Capri, he continued to stress the important differences which stood between them Both agreed that there was little point continuing their correspondence until their meeting and the summer and autumn passed by with no communication between them until November, when Andreyev first made tentative arrangements for the trip to Capri

Andreyev eventually left Finland for Italy on 27 December,[49] arriving on Capri on 6 January, 1913 [50] With the benefit of hindsight it is easy to see that the meeting was doomed to failure from the beginning Rather than facilitate reconciliation, the talks on Capri served only to prove quite conclusively that the two men were poles apart Bunin's nephew, N A Pusheshnikov, who was on the island at the time, gave an insight into the nature of their talks in his diary, where he recorded his impressions of an embarrassing confrontation which he was unfortunate enough to interrupt [51] Although we have no details of the substance of their discussions, it seems reasonable to suppose that they touched upon the same live issues that had been raised in their recent correspondence Quite certain, however, is the effect of these talks on Andreyev Returning home after just five days on Capri, he wrote a letter to A A Smirnov in which he gave an account of his trip

> Ах, дорогой Александр Александрович, какое скверное чувство унес я с Капри от свидания с Горьким Этому свиданию предшествовала длительная и явно безнадежная переписка, но все думалось авось это только на бумаге так плохо выходит, а заговорит живой - и польются, как встарь, глаголы

живой жизни' Но нет заматорел Максимыч учительствует сухо и беспрерывно и, учительствуя, имеет вид даже страшный человека как бы спящего или погруженного в транс
И все на высшей политике, и все поза и игра, и тут же десяток молодых полуписателей, эмигрантов, и внимающих
Печальная жизнь' Но не жалость вызывает Горький, а возмущение глубокое 52

For Andreyev, then, the second visit to Capri was the final disillusionment Convinced now that he and Gorky had parted for good, he was prepared finally to accept that they were enemies

That Gorky at no time considered reconciliation with Andreyev a serious possibility is evident both from his private correspondence and from his articles written during 1912 In a letter to Tikhonov of 8 May, for example, he used Andreyev's name as a synonym for poor literary style and intimated that he already looked upon his friend as a lost cause [53] The same impression is to be gained from Gorky's articles Even if we accept his claim that his deprecating remarks on the vogue of the Judas Iskariot theme in O sovremennosti intended no personal slight against Andreyev,[54] the explicit criticism contained in the fifth of his articles in the series Izdaleka is indisputable The article in question was written in response to a questionnaire on the subject of suicide which had been sent out to a number of prominent writers by the newspaper Birzhevye vedomosti, in which eleven replies were subsequently published Gorky, who had already expressed his own views on the subject in O sovremennosti, was particularly incensed by the fact that none of the replies to appear in the newspaper suggested any remedy to what was a social phenomenon of alarming proportions His article concentrated on the replies of three writers Andreyev, Artsybashev and Sologub Beginning with criticism of the first two for suggesting that the right of the individual to commit suicide is sacrosanct and hence beyond the bounds of ethics, he accuses all three of aggravating the problem by the pessimistic philosophy embodied in their literary works His remarks on Andreyev are especially disparaging In addition to the mocking reference to him as the 'great Rhetor',[55] Gorky also mentions Tak bylo as a work which could not have been written by a 'spiritually healthy, cultured person' [56]

It is remarkable, bearing in mind Andreyev's well-known interest in all public statements about himself and his work, that Gorky's attack

passed without reply and it can only be assumed that he never saw the newspaper in which it was published For his own part, he still felt duty-bound not to criticise Gorky in print, wishing to spare them both the inevitable scandal which would result [57] His only lapse had been the unmistakable reference to Vragi in the first of his Pis'ma o teatre

> Даже плохие драматурги, плохая публика современности начали понимать, что внешнее оказательство борьбы есть наименее в борьбе драматическое Не тот момент драматичен, когда по требованию фабриканта уже прибыли солдаты и готовят ружья, а тот, когда в тишине ночных бессонных размышлений фабрикант борется с двумя правдами и ни одной из них не может принять ни совестью, ни издерганным умом своим [58]

The first real test of Andreyev's will to resist public criticism of Gorky came, however, in September, 1913, with the publication of Gorky's notorious article O 'karamazovshchine'

Gorky's attack against 'karamazovshchina' was inspired by the news that the Moscow Art Theatre was planning a dramatization of Dostoyevsky's Besy in the coming theatrical season In a letter which accompanied the manuscript of his article, the author made his position quite plain "Я глубоко убежден, что проповедь со сцены болезненных идей Достоевского способна только еще более расстроить и без того уже нездоровые нервы общества" [59] Expounding this argument in his article, Gorky stated that by staging Dostoyevsky's 'sadistic and sick' novel, the Moscow Art Theatre would simply 'help the dozing public conscience to fall even more soundly asleep' [60] Referring to Dostoyevsky as Russia's 'evil genius', [61] he claimed to detect only two themes in his work sadism and masochism, which, presented on stage, could only have a harmful effect upon the audience As a further mark of his protest, he refused to allow the theatre to produce his latest play, Zykovy [62]

Gorky's protest provoked a generally hostile reaction from his contemporaries, who defended the Moscow Art Theatre and Dostoyevsky against his criticism [63] The theatre itself published an open letter in reply to Gorky's article on 26 September [64] Andreyev's sympathies throughout the affair were firmly on the side of the theatre He had already questioned Gorky's interpretation of Dostoyevsky the previous year In his letter on Sashka Zhegulyov, Gorky had written

> Показывать миру свои царапины, чесать их публично и обливаться гноем, брызгать

> в глаза людям желчью своей, как это делают многие, - и отвратительнее всех делал злой гений наш Федор Достоевский, - это гнусное занятие и вредное, конечно 65

Andreyev, although more concerned at the time with his own relationship with Gorky, could not allow these remarks to go unchallenged In his reply, he offered a totally different opinion of Dostoyevsky

> Запад отравил твои глаза приемами своей борьбы, и ты перестал понимать, что наши приемы борьбы совсем другие и что злой гений наш Достоевский есть именно бунтарь, учитель активности и тебя научивший бунту. Лощеное мещанство Запада, как и всякое мещанство, распадается в прах перед лицом Достоевского, а это и есть самая доподлинная и самая постоянная революция 66

Yet although he sympathized with the Moscow Art Theatre, Andreyev refused to add his name to the public protest against Gorky Explaining his motives for this decision to Nemirovich-Danchenko, he wrote "Противно, когда приходится рукоплескать Арцыбашеву, ставящему в угол М Горького Хотел я и сам писать, да теперь уж не знаю" 67

Although Andreyev never actually composed a protest against Gorky, his views were nevertheless made public On the very same day as Moscow Art Theatre published its collective reply to O 'karamazovshchine', Utro Rossii carried the following editorial statement

> Нам сообщают, что Л Н Андреев намерен выступить с защитою постановок Художественным театром Достоевского По мнению Андреева, такие корифеи русской литературы, как Достоевский или Толстой, не могут быть рассматриваемы в узких пределах современного общественного движения Их значение глубже и шире, и задачи, решаемые ими, не суть элементарные задачи сегодняшнего дня, но задачи мировые и общечеловеческие Интерес к стихийным творениям Достоевского, в частности, может свидетельствовать лишь о зрелости общественной мысли не боящейся соблазна реакционных взглядов Достоевского Да и самые взгляды эти, по мнению писателя, могут иметь для нас глубокий психологический и исторический интерес 68

The promised statement never materialized, but the following year, in the second of his Pis'ma o teatre, Andreyev could not refrain from observing that Gorky's article had, rather ironically, succeeded in restoring public interest in the Moscow Art Theatre [69] It is quite

possible also that the 'karamazovshchina' affair was one of the influences which prompted Andreyev to write Milye prizraki, a play based on the life of the young Dostoyevsky, in 1916 The fact that Andreyev chose for his theme the young Dostoyevsky of the pre-Siberia period may in itself be seen as a hidden polemic with Gorky, who concentrated exclusively in his criticism upon the reactionary views the writer came to hold in his later years He explained the aim of his play in a letter to Nemirovich-Danchenko "Романтична основная идея, которую я стремился провести, о высоком и благородном назначении писателя, как друга всех труждающихся и обремененных" [70]

By the end of 1913, Gorky and Andreyev, living at opposite ends of Europe, were already irreconcilable enemies It needed only the outbreak of war and the return of both writers to their native land for their hostility to take on a more public character

B From the First World War to the Revolution The 'two poles' of Russian literature

After a total of eight years spent in self-imposed exile, Gorky returned to Russia on 31 December, 1913, some ten months after the declaration of an amnesty for certain political offenders in conjunction with the three-hundredth anniversary of the Romanov dynasty [71] On hearing the news, Andreyev immediately wrote to Gorky offering him the use of his house, which was unoccupied[72] Gorky, however, ignored this friendly overture and did not bother to send a reply, preferring to settle with the Kitts in Mustamaggi [73] He did not in fact meet Andreyev until the early summer, indeed, from the evidence of a letter from Yu A Zhelyabuzhsky to M F Andreyeva, it would seem that Gorky deliberately avoided such a meeting for as long as possible "мне (он) несколько раз говорил, как тут хорошо, тихо - никто не мешает работать и как приятно не видеть . всех этих Танов, Андреевых, Сологубов, Мамонтов-Дальских и т д "[74] When the meeting between the two men did eventually take place it was, almost inevitably, the source of further disagreements According to Gorky's memoirs, the disagreements on this occasion centred on the question of his 'disturbed and sceptical attitude to the fate of the Great Russian people',[75] a subject which was to give rise to a fierce public debate between the two men in the near future For the time being, however, their arguments remained private, and no further meetings ensued between them for some time

Under more normal circumstances it is quite possible that relations between Gorky and Andreyev might have simply devolved into mutual disinterest However, the outbreak of war, on 19 July, 1914, immediately brought new differences into sharp focus Andreyev's reaction to the war with Germany has been recounted elsewhere,[76] and it will suffice here only to note the salient features of his highly vocal patriotism His initial response has been recorded in the memoirs of his son Vadim, who wrote "Он принял войну с ужасом и радостью, личное отошло в его жизни на второй план, у него появилось то новое, все поглощающее чувство, которое я не умею назвать иначе, как болезнь Россией" [77] It was this intense patriotism that inspired Andreyev to write a whole series of articles in support of the war effort It should, however, be noted that although Andreyev supported the Russian government on the war issue, he remained sincerely committed to the revolutionary ideal In a letter to Shmelyov of September, 1914, he stressed that his support for the government was only temporary [78] Convinced that a Russian military victory alone could ensure the success of revolution, he saw the war in terms of a battle between the forces of democracy and despotism In the same letter to Shmelyov, he wrote

> Для меня смысл настоящей войны необыкновенно велик и значителен свыше всякой меры Это борьба демократии всего мира с цезаризмом и деспотией, представителем каковой является Германия Если бы у нас наверху были умнее, они дрались бы с Вильгельмом против Франции и Англии, и наша реакционная пресса, обычно настроенная шовинистически и по всякому поводу готовая к войне, - и в этом разе уже начинает бить отбой, намекать о мире и прославлять Вильгельма Они животом чувствуют, что разгром Германии будет разгромом всей европейской реакции и началом целого цикла европейских революций 79

For those socialists who were opposed to war and who considered the defeat of Russia the 'lesser evil', Andreyev had nothing but scorn In August he had written "Ненавижу тех узких и мертвых, что не видят ни себя, ни всего народа из-за старых партийных мозолей" [80]

To this category of the 'narrow and dead' Andreyev must have relegated Gorky, whose attitude to the war had been formulated long before the actual outbreak of hostilities His major argument against the war

is contained in the first of the Izdaleka articles, published in December, 1911 Convinced of the inevitability of war between Britain and Germany, Gorky, like many other European socialists, viewed the impending conflict as an example of the malignant influence of capitalism upon mankind

> Я полагаю, трудно оспаривать тот факт, что современные завоевательные и бесчеловечные тенденции Европейского и Американского капитализма угрожают существованию культуры и цивилизации, во всяком случае капитализм способен создать и уже создает все условия, способные задержать процесс превращения европейской культуры в культуру общечеловеческую, планетарную 81

Praising those intellectuals in Europe who had expressed their opposition to capitalism, Gorky devoted the remainder of his article to the objectives of a newly formed organization, the 'International League' The League, which claimed the support of Wilhelm Oswald, Richard Demel, Upton Sinclair and Frederick van Eden, was an anti-war organization with whose aims Gorky was in great sympathy Quite naturally, therefore, when war was finally declared, Gorky occupied an uncompromisingly antimilitarist position He was particularly critical of those Russian writers who had placed their talent at the service of chauvinistic elements In December, 1914, he wrote an article entitled Nesvoyevremennoye which was in fact not published due to censorship considerations In this article he quoted from the recent articles of Sologub, Artsybashev, Kuprin and Andreyev For the latter he reserved his most acid comments

> Не особенно давно Л Андреева интересовали идеи высшей справедливости, и он посильно служил этим идеям своим талантом, своей фантазией Справедливость требует, чтобы раньше, чем судить виноватого, были расследованы мотивы его вины Этого требует не высшая, а примитивная справедливость, знакомая даже русскому мужику Тем более она должна быть знакома писателю Но Л Андреев, потеряв себя в путанице событий, повторяет с улицей те слова, которые умножают ненависть 82

Although Andreyev never read these words, he was in no doubt as to his former colleague's attitude In October, 1914, he had referred to Gorky's standpoint as 'extremely shocking' in a letter to his brother [83] It is quite ironic, therefore, that the war, upon which the two writers held such different opinions, should have provided them with the opportunity

for collaboration in a joint venture

The joint venture was the 'Russian Society for the Study of Jewish Life', which was established in December, 1914 Anti-Semitism, which had always been one of the gravest social problems in Russia, had flared up again with the explosion of chauvinistic sentiments in the early months of the war and it was the aim of the Society to alert public opinion to the plight of the Jews It was presumably to discuss this venture that Gorky and Andreyev met early in December [84] Towards the middle of the month, Gorky informed his wife of the project

> Сегодня вернулся из Питера, где пробыл почти неделю Кое-что затеял, но - увы' Из моих затей последнее время ничего не выходит Ты, вероятно, скоро будешь удивлена, увидев мою подпись рядом с именами людей очень чуждых мне Андреева и Сологуба Каково? Мы затеваем анкету по вопросу об антисемитизме, а? не веришь? Может быть даже и более того затеем.
> [85]

The unlikely partnership of Gorky, Andreyev and Sologub was extremely active In February, 1915 invitations were sent out to many prominent intellectuals asking them to attend lectures and discussions on the Jewish problem The opinion survey to which Gorky referred had been published in Birzhevye vedomosti on 3 February and on 1 March a number of major newspapers carried a protest entitled Vozzvaniye k russkomu narodu signed by about three hundred public figures [86] In September, the three writers published Shchit, a miscellany devoted to the struggle against anti-Semitism and on 12 December, at the first general meeting of the Society, both Gorky and Andreyev were elected to its council [87]

As a result of this joint action, Gorky and Andreyev were brought once again into close contact and personal relations between them resumed their earlier friendly character Beneath the surface, however, there lingered a doubt and scepticism which had not been present previously On 31 December, 1914, Andreyev wrote to his brother of recent developments "Видаюсь с Горьким, отношения наладились мирные и с его стороны даже с намеком на чувство, не знаю, искренен он или играет, но для мира я принимаю все за чистую монету" [88] Whether or not Gorky was sincere in his display of feeling for Andreyev, relations between them continued in the same vein for more than a year Towards the end of 1915, Gorky even resumed his role of literary mentor to Andreyev, providing detailed and constructive criticism of his play

Samson v okovakh [89]

Even at the height of their collaboration there was no question of true reconciliation between the two writers Writing to Nemirovich-Danchenko in January, 1915, Andreyev was at pains to point out that his basic disagreement with Gorky remained unresolved "Я сейчас в довольно хороших отношениях с Горьким, а все-таки скажу, что горьковщине уступать не надо Если искусство, так уж искусство" [90] Three months later, in a letter to the same correspondent, he predicted the rapid demise of his relations with Gorky following the return of M F Andreyeva to Russia [91] Yet despite the underlying pressures, Gorky and Andreyev maintained their friendship until the end of the year In his memoirs, Vadim Andreyev refers to a 'final meeting' between the two writers which took place at Andreyev's dacha sometime in the winter of 1915-1916 [92] Shortage of information makes it impossible to date this meeting accurately or to establish beyond doubt the subject of the argument which Vadim Andreyev interrupted It is almost certain, however, that the meeting took place after 7 December, 1915 On that date Andreyev wrote to his brother "Провел у меня вечер и ночевал Максимыч Как тебе сказать - по виду он совсем любит меня, как встарь, держится прекрасно, очаровал даже Анну" [93] As no mention is made in this letter of an argument with Gorky, it may be assumed that this was not the meeting of which Vadim Andreyev writes It is most likely, therefore, that the 'final meeting' occurred somewhat later, either towards the end of December or even in the January of 1916 If this is the case, then it is almost certain that the source of their argument was Gorky's article Dve dushi, which had appeared in the first issue of Letopis' on 18 December, 1915 [94]

Dve dushi was Gorky's response to the neo-Slavophilism which had typified the reaction to war in Russia The argument of the article was as follows Contemporary Russian society, according to Gorky, was exposed to two opposite influences the European and the Asiatic Identifying the Asiatic spirit with mysticism, superstition, pessimism and anarchism, Gorky stated that the 'man of the East' is the 'slave of his fantasy' [95] The European, on the other hand, is the 'master of his thought', with the result that he is a man of action, to whom the passivity of the East is totally alien Turning to the Russian context, Gorky detects these two influences in the 'two souls' of the Russian people the Mongol (Asiatic) and the Slav (European) The crux of his

argument (to which the majority of his contemporaries took exception) was the conclusion that the Russian people were dominated by the Mongol soul

> "Ум дряхлого Востока" наиболее тяжко и убийственно действует в нашей, русской, жизни, его влияние на русскую психику неизмеримо более глубоко, чем на психику людей Западной Европы Русский человек еще не выработал должной стойкости и упрямства в борьбе за обновление жизни, - борьбе, недавно начатой им Мы, как и жители Азии, люди красивого слова и неразумных деяний, мы отчаянно много говорим, но мало и плохо делаем, - про нас справедливо сказано, что "у русских множество суеверий, но нет идей", на Западе люди творят историю, а мы все еще сочиняем скверные анекдоты [96]

To support this extremely pessimistic conclusion Gorky cited the various manifestations of the Mongol soul in Russian life escapism, the cult of the individual, mysticism, neo-romanticism, the doctrine of 'self-perfection', 'God-seeking' (but not, significantly, 'God-building')

Although none of the opinions expressed in Dve dushi was particularly new (the contrast between the Asiatic and the European spirit was present in O sovremennosti, for example),[97] the article provoked a storm of criticism That Gorky's views had escaped such public condemnation before this time can be explained by a number of factors First, the views contained in the article had never before been expressed in such an extreme form Secondly, as it appeared in the much publicised first number of Gorky's new journal Letopis', Dve dushi naturally attracted a very large audience Thirdly, and most importantly, in the wartime situation Gorky's views were bound to strike the majority as unpatriotic, if not downright seditious

Andreyev, who had always avoided participation in public criticism of Gorky in the past, was very quick on this occasion to publish a riposte to Gorky's article The two men had already quarrelled over the subject of the Russian people in the summer of 1914 [98] Andreyev's views had subsequently found expression in a number of articles Typical of these is Voskhozhdeniye, which begins "Есть два новых факта в русской жизни, таких радостных и чудесных, что на них страшно даже останавливаться мыслью" [99] The two facts to which he refers are

the decrease of alcoholism in Russia and the new-found unity of Russia and Poland, both of which are seen as the direct result of the country's war effort Clearly, then, Gorky's article, which denied any such 'ascension' of the Russian people, was bound to provoke a hostile response from Andreyev

Andreyev's response came in the form of an article, entitled O 'Dvukh dushakh' M Gor'kogo and published in Sovremennyy mir in January, 1916 The only distinguishing feature of Gorky's article, Andreyev argued here, was that it represented an oversimplification even more gross than that encountered in his other recent articles Leaving aside the question of the distorted account of Eastern culture (which had been adequately discussed in a number of other articles on Dve dushi), Andreyev concentrated on Gorky's pessimistic conclusion that the Russian nation is dominated by the Asiatic spirit The essence of his argument was to indicate a contradiction between Gorky's professed antagonism to Asiatic pessimism and the very pessimism of his own article

> Он сам, с своими "Двумя душами" и своей "Летописью" не оказывается ли тем пассивным и бездеятельным славянином, мрачный пессимизм, слабоволие и пассивность которого столь настойчиво противополагается яркой активности воюющего Запада? 100

Andreyev saw a similar contradiction in the fact that Letopis' also contained extracts from the diaries of Tolstoy, whose attitude to the East was notoriously different to that of Gorky

For once, Gorky went against his usual practice and set about answering his critics in Pis'ma k chitatelyu Defending the main points of his argument, he added a few new details of which the most interesting was the causal relationship he now drew between the defeat of the 1905 Revolution and the rise of aziatshchina Although he mentioned none of his critics by name, it is difficult not to see a direct reference to Andreyev in the following remarks

> Меня - скажу прямо - возмущает маниловский оптимизм неожиданных "патриотов", которые еще вчера были яростными нигилистами и, принося всякую дисциплину, всякую организацию в жертву произволу человека "из подполья", сеяли в мозгах русской молодежи болезненный "мистический анархизм", отвлекая ее от решения проблем общественного реального бытия 101

Considering this 'Manilov optimism' to be 'criminal', Gorky advocates

instead that the Russians 'look straight in the eyes of the severe truth', which alone, in his opinion, could ensure the defeat of the Asiatic spirit[102]

Perhaps the most curious feature of the debate over Dve dushi is the fact that, almost imperceptibly, the positions occupied by Gorky and Andreyev have been completely reversed Following the 1905 Revolution Gorky, with his optimistic vision of Russian society, had charged Andreyev with pessimism By the First World War period, however, it was Andreyev who was sanguine about the prospect of revolution in Russia, with Gorky sounding the note of scepticism Their attitudes were to remain essentially unchanged until the February Revolution

The Dve dushi affair firmly established Gorky and Andreyev as public opponents and it is hardly surprising that their collaboration within the Russian Society for the Study of Jewish Life came to an end shortly afterwards There had been tension within the Society for some time, the source of which was the personal antipathy between Gorky and Sologub Sologub had attempted unsuccessfully to obtain election to the Society's committee in January, 1916, Andreyev being the only member of the five-man committee to support him[103] Despite this failure, Sologub went ahead with his decision to invite Bordyayev to contribute an article for the next Shchit miscellany On reading the article, Gorky rejected it on the grounds that it was anti-Semitic in content and demanded that it be removed from the miscellany The secretary of the editorial board, S V Pozner, complied with Gorky's wishes, which in turn provoked a strong protest from Sologub The affair was resolved in March at a special meeting of the Society, following which Sologub resigned his membership[104] Andreyev, whose sympathies throughout had been with Sologub, also took this opportunity to withdraw from the Society, hence severing the last tenuous link between himself and Gorky

The publication, in December, 1915, of the first issue of Letopis' was the culmination of incessant attempts by Gorky to secure an outlet for his works in which he had control over the editorial policy He set out the aim of the journal in a letter to K A Timiryazev of October "Цель журнала - может быть, несколько утопическая - попытаться внести в хаос эмоций отрезвляющие начала интеллектуализма"[105] To the majority of Gorky's contemporaries, incensed by the views expressed in Dve dushi, Letopis' was little more than the 'organ of some sort of special neo-Westernism', as it was scornfully described in Kiyevskaya mysl'[106]

To Andreyev in particular, the very existence of the journal was a constant source of aggravation His letters of this period abound in complaints about the 'repulsive Gorky Letopis'.[107] Thus, when, in June, 1916, he was offered the editorship of the literary, critical and theatre sections of Russkaya volya, a newspaper being organized in St Petersburg, Andreyev readily accepted the chance of exerting his own influence on current affairs His excitement at the new venture is clear in a letter to his brother

> Я вошел в члены редакции новой большой и очень богатой петроградской газеты, основываемой целой ассоциацией капиталистов и банков Вошел я лишь после того, как убедился, что газета будет широко прогрессивного направления, а в договоре с издателями всячески огородил свою самостоятельность и влияние на физиономию газеты Специальное мое дело я заведую тремя отделами беллетристики, критики и театра, имею сколько угодно помощников и приглашаю кого угодно, независимо от редакции Иными словами влияя на общее положение дел, я имею в газете как бы свои собственный журнал по вопросам, наиболее мне близким и важным 108

That he specifically intended to use his position in Russkaya volya to counteract the influence of Letopis' is evident from a letter to V G Sakhnovsky, in which he outlined suitable themes for discussion in the critical section of the newspaper "тут и кризис символизма, возрождение (сборники "Слова" и Горький) кургузого и одноглазого реализма, честно и морализующего как финн-кондуктор в скором поезде" 109 When Russkaya volya eventually began publication on 15 December, 1916,[110] its pages contained a constant and often vitriolic campaign against Gorky and Letopis' both in articles by Andreyev himself and by other contributors [111]

Gorky's reaction to the campaign by Russkaya volya was surprisingly restrained His attitude to Andreyev's involvement in the newspaper, which was financed by ten large banking firms and had a definite anti-revolutionary purpose,[112] was throughout one of regret rather than anger Towards the end of October, he had written to Korolenko "Очень меня мучает Л Андреев Я его люблю, считаю крупным талантом, но наши отношения вдребезги испорчены, и я не могу указать ему, что он не должен валандаться с протопоповской газетой" [113] Like Korolenko, he was obliged to make public his own position with regard to the paper, following a false announcement that he would be a

contributor,[114] but otherwise he studiously avoided any reference either to Russkaya volya or to the person of Andreyev

The historic events of 1917 were greeted very differently by Gorky and Andreyev Andreyev's reaction to the news of the February Revolution is recorded in the reminiscences of his son, Vadim "Веселый и возбужденный, он казался помолодевшим на несколько лет" [115] On 28 April he was enlisted by the Provisional Government as a writer of propaganda, the most notable result of which was the pamphlet Gibel' [116] Gorky, on the other hand, was far more reserved in his judgement of recent events Writing to his wife on 1 March, he noted cautiously "Происходят события внешне грандиозные но - смысл их не так велик и величественен, как это кажется всем Я исполнен скептицизма, хотя меня до слез волнуют солдаты, идущие к Государственной думе с музыкой" [117] Gorky's scepticism found expression in Nesvoyevremennye mysli, in which he continually voiced his fears about the future of Russian culture and protested vigorously against the wild anarchy unleashed by the outbreak of revolution

On one point both men were agreed, however, and that was their opposition to Lenin and the Bolsheviks Gorky's attitude to Lenin at this time is well-known[118] and his newspaper Novaya zhizn' maintained its anti-Bolshevik stance right up until its forcible closure on 16 July, 1918 [119] Andreyev's views were contained in Veni creator, an ironic address to the Bolshevik leader which appeared in Russkaya volya on 15 September Yet, despite their common antipathy to the Bolsheviks, the two men continued to drift apart Although both were living in Petrograd, they moved in separate circles, meeting only occasionally at public functions

The Bolshevik seizure of power in October, 1917 put the final seal on relations between Gorky and Andreyev For Andreyev, the Revolution brought with it the demise of Russkaya volya Deprived of the newspaper, to which he had devoted his energies for the best part of a year, he left Petrograd for the relative calm of Finland, where he remained until early in the new year His attitude to the Revolution did not clarify at once, however Even after a brief return to Petrograd, his attitude to the Whites who had settled in the neighbourhood was one of uncompromising hostility, as his son Vadim remembered [120] The real turning point came only with the news of the peace settlement with Germany con-

cluded by the Bolsheviks on 3 March, 1918 Like so many of his compatriots, Andreyev saw this as a betrayal of Russia and he joined forces with the Whites in their fight against the Bolsheviks

The tragic story of Andreyev's final years and his collaboration with the White émigrés has been related by a number of his contemporaries [121] At very best, his dealings, with the Whites were a marriage of convenience, inspired by their common antipathy to the Bolsheviks Thus, while his articles (most notably the famous 'S O S ' appeal)[122] were consonant with the aims of the counter-revolutionaries, his behaviour often revealed a deep-seated lack of harmony with his erstwhile colleagues, an example of which is cited by Fal'kovsky The episode to which he refers is a meeting at which a number of the emigre community indulged in criticism of Gorky for 'selling his soul' to the Bolsheviks According to Fal'kovsky, Andreyev refused to listen to such speeches and did not return to the same house for about a month [123] The episode is typical of Andreyev's conflicting feelings about Gorky in the last years of his life Of his attitude to Gorky in general it is Fal'kovsky again who writes

> О Горьком он вообще избегал говорить и своими впечатлениями он делился только в тесном кругу родных и близких друзей он не любил Горького и говорил о нем не со злобой, а с разочарованием, с каким говорят о друге, о брате, предавшемся врагу [124]

Like so many other intellectuals of his day, Andreyev did indeed consider that Gorky had 'gone over to the enemy' Although it is perhaps easy to accept Gorky's collaboration with the Bolsheviks in retrospect as a brave compromise by a man who was above all concerned at the fate of culture in his native land, it is equally easy to see why so many at the time saw his actions as a simple betrayal of his convictions Certainly, this was Andreyev's view, as the following entry in his diary makes plain "Моя ненависть и презрение к Горькому останутся бездоказательными нужно целый обвинительный акт, чтобы доказать преступность Горького, степень его участия в разрушении и гибели России" [125] Accordingly, when he was approached by a representative from Gorky's Vsemirnaya biblioteka publishing house with the offer of work and money, Andreyev declined abruptly [126] This was the last sad scene in their long and contradictory relationship On 12 September, 1919, Andreyev died of a heart attack The news of his death provoked little reaction in his native land which was torn with

the strife of civil war One of the few recorded responses belongs, appropriately enough, to Gorky When he heard the news, he told Chukovsky "Как это ни странно, это был мой единственный друг Единственный"[127]

CHAPTER SEVEN NOTES

1 see, above, p 315
2 ЛН.72, стр 439
3 see, above, pp 337-338
4 ЛН 72, стр 444-445
5 see, for example, his letters to Malinovskaya and Amfiteatrov ibid., p.438.
6 ibid., p.530
7 ibid., p.529
8 ibid., pp 531-532
9 ibid , p.535
10 ibid., p.313.
11 ibid , p.448.
12 Andreyev was in Italy in December, 1910. Having learnt of this proposed trip, Gorky had already noted sadly the month before "Думаю, что мы не увидимся" АГ 9, стр 108
13 ЛН 72, стр 314-315
14 Г-30, т.24, стр 144
15 For a detailed account of Gorky's dealings with Sovremmenik, see Муратова, Горький на Капри, стр 15-60
16 ЛН.72, стр 318
17 ibid., p.319.
18 ibid
19 ibid., p.322.
20 ibid.
21 Львов-Рогачевский, Леонид Андреев, стр 50
22 ЛН 72, стр 406
23 Kaun, Andreyev, p.246, Woodward, Andreyev, p.178
24 ПССА, т 5, стр 8
25 ibid., p.9
26 ibid , p.72.
27 ibid., pp 30-31
28 ibid , p 47
29 ibid., p 65.
30 ibid.
31 ibid., p.88
32 ibid., pp.93-94.
33 ibid., p.105.
34 ibid., p.145.
35 ibid., p 146
36 ibid., p.65
37 ibid., p.76
38 ibid., p 65-66
39 ibid., p.167
40 ibid , p.171
41 ЛН 72, стр.450
42 ibid. This letter is certainly misdated in Literaturnoye nasledstvo, where it bears the date December, 1911 First, Gorky refers to L'vov-Rogachevsky's article on Sashka Zhegulyov, which appeared in the January, 1912 issue of Sovremennyy mir. Secondly, the reference to Gorky's reply to Andreyev, which was written only in March, 1913, suggests that the letter to L'vov-Rogachevsky must have been written after that date.
43 ibid., p.326
44 ibid., p.327.
45 ibid., pp.327-328.

46 ibid., p.328
47 ibid.
48 ibid., p.329.
49 ibid., p.351
50 ЛЖТ 2, стр 331
51 ЛН 72, стр 592
52 ibid., p.538
53 ГЧ 1953-1957, стр 24
54 Gorky's article, published in Russkoye slovo on 2 and 3 March, 1912, contained the following passage

> Мне кажется, что основная тенденция современной литературы сводится, более или менее, к переоценке деятельности Иуды Искариота Сей последний объявлен "непонятым братом", и вот какие комплименты вызывает его, всем памятное, торговое дельце
>
> Пусть гнусы о предательстве кричат,
> Их мысли тупы, на сердцах их плесень'
>
> (Горький, Статьи 1905-1916 гг , изд 2-е, (Пг 1918), стр 89) In reply to Andreyev's protest against these remarks, Gorky hastened to assure him that the statement was intended in criticism of those like Roslavlev (from whose poem Iude the quotation is taken) and regretted that he had not specifically excluded Andreyev's work from criticism ЛН 72, стр.333,338

55 Горький, Статьи 1905-1916 гг , стр.140
56 ibid., p 145
57 see Andreyev's letter to Gorky of April,1912 ЛН 72, стр 339-341
58 ПССА, т.8, стр 188.
59 Г-30, т 24, стр.538
60 ibid., p.146
61 ibid., p.147
62 ЛЖТ.2, стр 372
63 For details, see ЛН 72, стр.538-540, Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX вв 1908-1917, стр.557-558
64 The letter was published in Russkoye slovo on 26 September, 1913. For its text, see ЛН 72, стр 539
65 ЛН 72, стр 327
66 ibid., p.334
67 ibid., p.538
68 Утро России, 26 сентября, 1913, стр.5
69 Литературно-художественные альманахи издательства "Шиповник", кн.22 (СПб , 1914), стр 247
70 Андреев, Пьесы, стр.584
71 ЛЖТ 2, стр.342,394
72 ЛН.72, стр.352
73 ЛЖТ 2, стр.398.
74 ibid., p.455.
75 ПССГ, т.16, стр 354
76 Kaun, Andreyev, pp.131-136, Woodward, Andreyev, pp 241-247
77 В Андреев, Детство, стр 93
78 ЛН 72, стр 547
79 ibid.
80 О Цехновицер, Литература и мировая война, (М , 1938), стр.104
81 Горький, Статьи 1905-1916 гг , стр 101
82 Г-30, т 24, стр 160-161
83 ЛН 72, стр 546
84 see Gorky's letter to E P.Peshkova ibid., p.454.

85 ibid., p.548.
86 ibid.
87 Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX вв 1908-1917, стр.620,626
88 Русский современник, № 4 (1924), стр 142
89 ЛН.72, стр.358-359
90 ibid., p.549.
91 ibid., p.550
92 В.Андреев, Детство, стр 114-116
93 Русский современник, № 4 (1924), стр.145
94 ЛЖТ 2, стр 530
95 Горький, Статьи 1905-1916 гг , стр 174
96 ibid., pp.183-184
97 ibid., pp 77,91
98 see, above, p.411
99 Л.Андреев, "Восхождение", Отражения Около войны, (М., 1915), стр.132
100 Л.Андреев, "О "Двух душах" М Горького", Современный мир, № 1 (1916), стр.110
101 Горький, Статьи 1905-1916 гг , стр 192
102 ibid
103 see Andreyev's letter to Sologub of 12 January ЛН 72, стр 553
104 ibid., p.554 Sologub's official letter of resignation was printed in Birzhevye vedomosti on 18 April, 1916.
105 Г-30, т 29, стр 341-342
106 Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX вв 1908-1917, стр.632
107 ЛН 72, стр 555
108 Ю Оксман, ""Русская воля", банки и буржуазная литература", ЛН 2, стр.181
109 ЛН 72, стр 52
110 Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX вв 1908-1917, стр 659
111 ЛН 72, стр 52
112 Оксман, стр.163-186
113 Горький и Короленко, стр 80
114 see Gorky's letter to the editor of Den', 6 August, 1916, also В.Короленко, "Старые традиции и новый орган", Русские записки, № 8 (1916), стр.249-267
115 В.Андреев, Детство, стр 164
116 Л Андреев, Гибель (Что ждет Россию), (Пг , 1917)
117 АГ 9, стр.194
118 see. Wolfe, The Bridge and the Abyss, chapters 6-9.
119 Gorky, Untimely Thoughts, p viii.
120 В Андреев, Детство, стр.208
121 Ф Фальковский, "Предсмертная трагедия Леонида Андреева (Из воспоминаний), Прожектор, № 16 (1923), стр.27-30, И.Гессен, "Последние дни Леонида Андреева", Архив русской революции, изд 2-е, т 1, (Берлин, 1922), стр.309-331, М.Куприна-Иорданская, "Эмиграция и смерть Леонида Андреева (Воспоминания)", Родная земля, сб 1 (Нью-Йорк, 1920), стр 44-63
122 Л Андреев, S O.S., (Helsingfors, 1919)
123 Фальковский, стр.29
124 ibid.
125 Чириков, Смердяков русской революции, стр 3
126 Woodward, Andreyev, p 273
127 К Чуковский, "Леонид Андреев", в его кн Люди и книги, изд 2-е, (М , 1960), стр.513

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

In October, 1906 Gorky had written to Andreyev "тебя будут не только читать, но и изучать"[1] and in the early Soviet period it was Gorky himself who was perhaps most responsible for promoting the growth of Andreyev scholarship in his native land On 26 October, 1919, just over a month after the writer's death, he organized a memorial evening for Andreyev on which occasion he gave the first public reading of his reminiscences [2] On Gorky's initiative also Kniga o Leonide Andreyeve, the first major collection of memoirs about the writer, was published in Berlin in 1922 Three years later, when Sashka Zhegulyov was produced in a new American translation, he readily supplied an introductory article for the volume [3]

Apart from his own active contributions, Gorky also offered suggestions for other projects connected with Andreyev's life and works In November, 1927, for example, he wrote to the writer's widow suggesting that she publish Andreyev's diaries, to which he offered to write the introduction [4] The following month, when the new Deshyovaya biblioteka series was announced, Gorky enquired of Gruzdyov why Andreyev's name had been omitted from the list of authors to be published [5] But the importance he attached to the serious study of Andreyev can be best judged perhaps from his reaction to Professor Fatov's book, Molodye gody Leonida Andreyeva Based on the reminiscences of friends and family who had known the writer in his early years, Fatov's work presented a picture of Andreyev which was extremely unreliable, if not downright libellous Gorky's impressions are recorded in a letter to Khodasevich "книга сделана плохо и так, что, прочитав ее, я рассердился, не спал ночь" [6]

Despite the evidence of Gorky's sincere desire to encourage the study of Andreyev in the Soviet Union, his own contributions have, in the main, had a detrimental influence on andreyevovedeniye His statements on Andreyev, beginning with the memoir Leonid Andreyev, first published in 1919 and subsequently revised twice, in 1922 and 1923, respectively,[7] are characterized by an unmistakably polemical intention, which is to depict the writer as the representative of a philosophy totally alien to Gorky himself So marked was this intention that the editors of Zhizn' Iskusstva, where Gorky's memoir was first published, considered it necessary to warn the reader that the reminiscences

> имеют характер легкого, внешнего очерка, в них идет речь скорее о плоти, а не о духе знаменитого писателя Может быть, поэтому личность Андреева в изображении Горького кажется очень несложной и даже грубоватой 8

Even without this warning, there are few readers who would not be put on their guard by the remarkable footnote which Gorky added to subsequent editions of the memoir "Весьма вероятно, что в ту пору я думал не так, как изображаю теперь, но старые мои мысли - неинтересно вспоминать" [9] To the student of the Gorky-Andreyev relationship, whose primary concern is precisely the 'old thoughts' which Gorky dismisses, this admission is tantamount to an instruction to treat the memoir with even greater scepticism than that generally accorded to reminiscences The unreliability of Gorky's memoir has been noted on a number of specific instances and needs no amplification here Our present purpose is to discover exactly what picture of Andreyev emerges from the memoir and Gorky's subsequent statements on the writer This leads naturally to a discussion of Gorky's influence on Soviet criticism of Andreyev, which in turn will serve as a useful starting point for some general conclusions on the Gorky-Andreyev relationship and its significance

Perhaps the most striking feature of Leonid Andreyev is Gorky s insistence throughout to depict his relationship with Andreyev in terms of conflict After a brief introductory passage on their initial acquaintance, he states quite baldly "Не было почти ни одного факта, ни одного вопроса, на которые мы с Л Н смотрели бы одинаково" [10] The rest of the memoir provides ample evidence to support this contention In the course of his account, Gorky refers to disputes on all manner of subjects, from literature and philosophy to revolution and war

The polemical element in Gorky's memoir is most evident in the devices he employs to win the reader's support for his own views whilst discrediting those of Andreyev First, he characterizes his opponent as a contradictory type "Леонид Андреев странно и мучительно-резко для себя раскалывался надвое на одной и той же неделе он мог петь миру - "Осанна!" и провозглашать ему "Анафема!"" [11] For himself, on the other hand, he reserves the image of open-minded objectivity, which he fosters by seeming to denigrate his own point of view "Может быть, я романтизирую и преувеличиваю творческую

силу мысли, но это так естественно в России, где нет духовного синтеза, в стране язычески чувственной" [12] (The self-justification here points to the insincerity of the pose) Having seemingly established his own credibility, Gorky now resorts to the normal polemical device of misrepresenting the views of his opponent

> Андрееву человек представлялся духовно нищим, сплетенный из непримиримых противоречий инстинкта и интеллекта, он навсегда лишен возможности достичь какой-либо внутренней гармонии Все дела его - "суета сует", тлен и самообман А главное, он - раб смерти и всю жизнь ходит на цепи ее 13

In order to further prejudice the reader against Andreyev, he reports unpleasant details of his personal behaviour We learn of his inordinate love of fame,[14] of his uncritical attitude to himself[15] and of his rapid changes of mood [16] It is interesting to note that the two major additions to the 1923 version of the memoir (the detailed account of a drunken bout in St Petersburg[17] and the reference to Andreyev's insincere attitude to the Jews)[18] both serve to intensify this unfavourable impression Finally, Gorky presents himself as the injured partner in the relationship, disclaiming responsibility for the breakdown of their friendship "Разногласия умозрений не должны бы влиять на симпатии, я никогда не давал теориям и мнениям решающей роли в моих отношениях к людям Л Н Андреев чувствовал иначе" [19]

Gorky's subsequent statements on Andreyev became progressively more hostile, particularly after his return to the Soviet Union The views expressed reiterate the main arguments contained in Leonid Andreyev although in an increasingly crude form They are cited here without comment

> Л Андреев говорил
> "В разуме есть что-то от шпиона, от провокатора"
> И - догадывался
> "Весьма вероятно, что разум - замаскированная старая ведьма - совесть"
> (А А Блок, 1923) 20

> Для Леонида Андреева мысль была врагом человека, причем он понимал ее как "начало чувственное", как особый вид эмоции
> (О мещанстве, 1929) 21

> И естественно, что в конце концов самодовлеющая личность весьма легко становится на колени перед "враждебной силой мира"

> или - у Арцыбашева Л Андреева - приходит к пессимизму, к самоотрицанию, кричит "Жить не интересно, человечество - глупо, человек - ничтожен"
> (Беседы о ремесле, 1931) 22

> Следует упомянуть о пьесах Леонида Андреева О них, быть может, несколько зло, но правильно было сказано "Нельзя же ежедневно питаться только мозгами, да и к тому же они - всегда недожарены!"
> (О пьесах, 1933) 23

> Ему грозит опасность подпасть под влияние Леонида Андреева, человека, который отрицал силу знания потому, что не пытался увеличить небогатый запас своих знаний Он был романтик "эмоциональный", верил, что "подсознательное" и "воображение" - это все, что нужно литератору Ему казалось, что в отношении людей к миру интуиция преобладает над разумом
> (Беседа с молодыми, 1934) 24

> Проповедовали "эрос в политике", "мистический анархизм", хитрейший Василий Розанов проповедовал эротику, Леонид Андреев писал кошмарные рассказы и пьесы и в общем - десятилетие 1907-1917 вполне заслуживает имени самого позорного и бесстыдного десятилетия в истории русской интеллигенции
> (Советская литература, 1934) 25

The identification of Andreyev with the 'shameful decade', present in the passage from Sovetskaya literatura, found its fullest expression in Zhizn' Klima Samgina, which contains Gorky's most uncharitable portrait of his former friend

In Gorky's last novel Andreyev is presented as the most typical representative of the bourgeois intelligentsia Significantly, there are few references to the writer in the earlier parts of the novel dealing with the years prior to the 1905 Revolution, hence Andreyev's name becomes synonymous with the period of reaction A number of characters are typified by their response to Andreyev's works, which are rejected by the revolutionaries and defended by the reactionaries At times the author's own voice is clearly detectable in the opinions of his characters, particularly in the reaction of Samgin to T'ma ("истерический и подозрительный пессимизм"[26]) and to Mysl' ("враждебное отношение автора к разуму"[27]) The polemic against Andreyev reaches its height, however, only towards the end of the fourth

volume, when the writer himself makes his first appearance The setting is Andreyev's Petrograd flat shortly before the February Revolution and the occasion a literary soirée Gorky makes full use of the scene to deflate the writer's image, surrounding him with pseudo-intellectuals, hypocrites and sycophantic hangers-on His negative attitude to Andreyev is displayed throughout the scene When the writer begins to speak, for example, we read "Большинство людей пригворялось, что они заинтересованы речами знаменитого литератора" [28] At the centre of the scene, however, stands the confrontation between Andreyev and the unnamed worker (obviously a Bolshevik) who sits in the corner of the room The cause of the conflict is the writer's speech on the nature of revolution "Люди почувствуют себя братьями только тогда, когда поймут трагизм своего бытия в космосе, почувствуют ужас одиночества своего во вселенной, соприкоснутся прутьям железной клетки неразрешимых таин жизни, жизни, из которой один есть выход - в смерть" [29] To this speech the worker retorts "Космические вопросы эти мы будем решать после того, как разрешим социальные И будут решать их не единицы, устрашенные сознанием одиночества своего, беззащитности своей, а миллионы умов, освобожденных от забот о добыче куска хлеба, - вот как!"[30] Thus Andreyev emerges as the enemy of the working class, which is, in Gorky's terms, the ultimate condemnation

In short, Gorky's portrayal of Andreyev, beginning with the memoir Leonid Andreyev and ending with Zhizn' Klima Samgina, is both one-sided and deliberately misleading On a number of points, however, his account must be accepted Certainly, the disagreements between the two writers on a wide range of issues, faithfully recorded in Gorky's memoir, were a most important feature of their relationship, to which we will return in due course Equally, there must be few who would disagree with Gorky's strictures against Andreyev's carelessness as a writer In Leonid Andreyev his argument is illustrated by a simile

> Он относился к своему таланту, как плохой ездок к прекрасному коню, - безжалостно скакал на нем,но не любил, не холил Рука его не успевала рисовать сложные узоры буйной фантазии, он не заботился о том, что развить силу и ловкость руки [31]

Even the best of Andreyev's works often show signs of the haste with which they were almost invariably composed and the majority would

certainly have benefited from careful revision

Yet, on balance, Gorky's statements on Andreyev written in the Soviet period must be challenged on three major points First, as the footnote to the first publication of Leonid Andreyev clearly shows, they are anachronistic The entire course of the relationship is presented in the memoir from a position of hindsight, Gorky's account of the early years is certainly distorted by his knowledge of the arguments which were to follow Secondly, Andreyev was by no means as contradictory in his opinions as Gorky would like us to believe As we have seen in chapter five, the interpretation of Andreyev as a man who 'betrayed' the revolution in such works as T'ma, Tsar' Golod and Moi zapiski is fundamentally misconceived Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly of all, Gorky himself was far less consistent in his view of revolution than is commonly accepted The findings of chapter four and six support the opinion expressed by Trotsky in his obituary on Gorky

> Горький никогда не был революционером Он был сателлитом революции, связанным с нею непреодолимым законом тяготения и всю свою жизнь вокруг нее вращавшимся Как все сателлиты, он проходил разные "фазы" солнце революции освещало иногда его лицо, иногда спину Но во всех своих фазах Горький оставался верен себе, своей собственной, очень богатой, простой и вместе сложной натуре 32

For these reasons the simplistic distinction between Gorky and Andreyev as the representatives of the 'revolutionary' and 'reactionary' camps, respectively, stands in need of substantial revision

The influence of Gorky's views upon the critical study of Andreyev in general and of relations between the two writers in particular has been truly remarkable L'vov-Rogachevsky, in the first major work on Andreyev to be written in the Soviet period, devoted the first chapter to a comparison of the two writers Developing the thesis he had advanced in an earlier book,[33] this critic arrived at the straightforward conclusion that Gorky and Andreyev were as different as 'day and night'[34] The same argument is to be discovered in a study of Gorky by A Z Lezhnyov

> В эмиграции умер и Леонид Андреев, этот "властитель дум" интеллигенции предреволюционного десятилетия, собравший в себе все то, что было противоположно, чуждо, враждебно Максиму Горькому неверие в разум, в силу человеческого ума, воли, труда, - пессимизм, мистику одинокого,

оторвавшегося от коллектива отчаявшегося человека 35

Kugel', writing of Andreyev's drama in 1933, chose a more succinct expression for the now standard view ""Человек - это звучит гордо!" - говорится у Горького "Человек - это звучит жалко!" читаем у Л Андреева" [36] Later critics have developed this line of reasoning, inherited directly from Gorky himself, to its logical conclusion, Gorky and Andreyev have become canonized as the figureheads of two opposing movements in the history of twentieth-century Russian literature First expounded by Desnitsky,[37] this view continues to find support amongst more recent Soviet critics [38]

The standard interpretation of the Gorky-Andreyev relationship is a typical product of the traditional Soviet approach to the history of early twentieth-century Russian literature In recent years, however, there have been signs that this traditional approach is coming under attack Criticism of the rigid classification of writers into 'schools' is now quite common and some of the more obvious over-simplications of the Stalin era have been exposed and corrected Attention has been focussed primarily on the question of terminology and in particular on the use of such generic terms as 'realist' and 'modernist' The 'revisionists' (if the critics of the traditional approach may be so called) claim that these terms are fraught with difficulties as their frame of reference has never been adequately defined Their argument is, in fact, very similar to views expressed by the Formalists during the literary debates of the 1920s Tomashevsky indicated the imprecision of the term realism in his Kratkiy kurs poetiki[39] and in his earlier Teoriya literatury he had castigated those 'naive historians of literature' who use the word 'realist' simply as the 'highest praise of a writer' [40] The position of the new generation of Soviet critics is perhaps best identified with the view expressed by Eykhenbaum in Teoriya formal'nogo metoda, where he set out the essence of the Formalists' argument against 'primitive historicism', in which

> the chief role was played by such general and somewhat vague notions as 'realism' and 'romanticism' (realism was said to be better than romanticism), evolution was understood as gradual perfection, as progress (from romanticism to realism), succession as the peaceful transfer of the inheritance from father to son But generally, there was no notion of literature as such, material taken from the history of social movements, from biography, etc had replaced it entirely 41

In other words, the revisionists, like the Formalists before them, are challenging a history of literature based on non-literary criteria

The conflict between the revisionists and the traditionalists is quite evident in a collection of articles on the 'typology' of Russian realism, which was the outcome of a conference on the subject held at the Gorky Institute of World Literature in the spring of 1967 [42] Of particular interest are two articles O tipologicheskom uzuchenii literatury by Yu M Lotman, perhaps the most celebrated of the new generation of Soviet literary theorists, and Realizm v russkoy literature nachala XX stoletiya, by A I Ovcharenko, a long-standing authority on Gorky Lotman's article, which proclaims the need for a clearly defined metalanguage to deal with the theoretical problems of 'typology', contains an unmistakable critique of the guiding principle of Soviet criticism, viz that the history of art is by definition the history of Socialist Realism, the highest art form Lotman develops his argument by means of an analogy If we are studying the history of the theatre, he says, we would not wish to present this history solely from the viewpoint of those developments which culminated in the achievement of Stanislavsky "Тогда все факты из истории передо мной выстроятся, как "путь к Станиславскому" а все, что не будет вести к этой, заданной мне самой методикой изучения, цели, получит вид "уклонении с пути", "случайных" и "незначительных" фактов" [43] The implications of this argument to the traditional study of twentieth-century Russian literature are quite obvious

Ovcharenko's article reads like a defence of the traditionalist standpoint against the heresy of Lotman Accepting the fact that developments in early twentieth-century realism are indeed far more complex than the traditional histories of literature suggest, he nevertheless diveiges little from the standard approach When it comes to the crucial question of classifying the movements within realist fiction, Ovcharenko takes Kastorsky as his authority and cites the following passage from the Stalinist history of literature as his guiding principle "Ставить вопрос о реализме на рубеже двух веков вполне законно, но говорить при этом надо не о распаде или конце его, а о зарождении в нем новых качеств, новых принципов наиболее раскрытых в творчестве Горького" [44] Gorky, then, as the 'founder of Socialist Realism', must be the yardstick against which all other writers

of his generation are to be judged It is little surprise, therefore, to find Ovcharenko subsequently contrasting Gorky with Andreyev, to whom he refers as a tragic example of a writer who deserted 'Critical Realism' for 'Neo-realism'

The critique of the traditionalist position has been taken a step further by L Dolgopolov in a review article on recent developments in the study of Russian literature in the period 1890-1917 [45] Dolgopolov's article contains a number of interesting and stimulating ideas, suggesting certain fundamental revisions to existing studies of the period in question He is especially critical of the tendency amongst scholars of the traditionalist school to identify literary movements with particular political views, according to which Realism is labelled 'progressive' and Symbolism 'reactionary' He supports this view by reference to the examples of Kuprin and Bunin, whose realism did not result in their acceptance of the 1917 Revolution, and of Blok, Bely and Bryusov, Symbolists who remained in the Soviet Union

As an example of the mixed criteria so much deplored by Dolgopolov, I quote the following passage on Andreyev from a recent study of Russian realism

> Творчество Андреева в целом резко противостоит творчеству Чехова, Куприна и Бунина Экспрессионизм, неореализм, фантастический реализм, мрачный неоромантицизм, реальный мистицизм и т д - все эти определения, прилагаемые по отдельности и вместе к художественному методу Андреева, затрудняют его восприятие в одном ряду с художниками, реализм которых менее "отягощен" влиянием других методов и стилей 46

Although no-one would want to challenge the validity of the first sentence, the remainder of this passage seems to me to illustrate the severe methodological problem at the root of much Soviet criticism Even if we leave aside the question of defining such pseudo-generic terms as Neo-realism and Neo-romanticism, we must surely protest at the introduction of such concepts as 'mysticism' and 'gloominess' which are singularly inappropriate to what is purportedly a study of purely formal aspects of prose fiction

In his review of recent work on the subject of Russian realism, Dolgopolov reserves praise for just one study, Russkiy realizm nachala dvadtsatogo veka, by V Keldysh,[47] in which he detects an original and fruitful approach to the problem Instead of adopting the traditional

chronological approach and the rectilinear division of writers into 'Socialist Realists', 'Critical Realists' and 'Modernists', Keldysh deals with four major themes, which he introduces under the headings 'Personality and milieu', 'Philosophy and history', 'Questions of style', 'Realism and Modernism' Yet despite its new approach, Keldysh's study falls some way short of providing the type of history of literature demanded by Lotman The author fails to establish a 'metalanguage' of the type advocated in Lotman's work and hence such terms as 'Critical Realism' and 'Neo-realism' still tend to be used as general expressions of approval or disapproval of a particular writer's artistic method The section on Andreyev is especially revealing, as Keldysh succeeds only in perpetuating the critical convention of portraying the writer as a man who 'deserted the revolutionary cause' [48] Nevertheless, the thematic approach is an extremely fruitful one, as it allows a far more sensitive scale of judgement than the crude division of writers into 'revolutionary' and 'anti-revolutionary' groups In the following pages, I intend to adopt a thematic approach in order to pass some general remarks on the Gorky-Andreyev relationship, remarks which may be subsumed under three main heads politics, aesthetics and philosophy

Before dealing with the details of Gorky's and Andreyev's differences in the three spheres mentioned we would do well first to recall the considerable affinities between the two men, affinities which are easily overlooked in the light of their later arguments Chirikov, for example, when he wrote of the Gorky-Andreyev relationship in 1921, stated that the collaboration of the two writers in Znaniye was 'completely accidental' and 'purely superficial', concluding that "Это были случайные попутчики до первой станции" [49] It has been one of the main purposes of this thesis to contest such a view and to suggest, on the contrary, that Andreyev's collaboration with Gorky was neither accidental nor even less superficial When they first met, the two writers had a number of features in common Both belonged to the radical section of the Russian intelligentsia and were united in their opposition to the despotic tsarist regime More specifically, they both believed in a literature committed to advancing the cause of freedom in Russia and condemned those movements which denied the writer's social duty in the name of 'pure art' This central concern with the question of freedom explains why Gorky and Andreyev, more than any other contemporary writers, were totally absorbed by the subject of revolution, both before and after the historic events of 1905 Chirikov's statement that Andreyev's entire

career as a writer 'passed under the sign of revolution'[50] could be applied with equal justification to Gorky

Despite the obvious differences in artistic technique which were to become particularly pronounced in the post-1905 period, there is an important sense in which Gorky and Andreyev were writers of a similar type This similarity is best seen against the prevailing spirit of naturalism in the fiction of their day Both Gorky and Andreyev were the declared enemies of byt Although they were vitally concerned with the condition of contemporary Russian society, neither considered the purpose of fiction to be confined to mere sociological description, neither set out to be a mere chronicler of his times Accordingly, we look in vain in the works of either writer for a detailed account of the mores and conventions of Russian society Characters in their works are never simply representatives of social classes, they are invariably the embodiment of abstract notions In this sense both are the followers of Dostoyevsky rather than Tolstoy their characters act in obedience not to the demands of plot or of social reality but to the demands imposed by the idea that the particular work sets out to illustrate It is the intellectual conception of works by both writers which justifies the critical approach adopted throughout this study It is interesting to note in this context that the majority of Tolstoy's strictures against the works of both Gorky and Andreyev concern what he termed 'invented psychology', which offended against his own realistic method of characterization Although we would agree with Tolstoy that such 'invented psychology' is often a fault with both Gorky and Andreyev, we should recognise that the intellectual organisation of their works indicates an important level of affinity between them

The affinities between Gorky and Andreyev were reflected in the remarkable similarity of the themes encountered in their fiction during the period of their closest relations (1900-1908) Both began with the problem of alienation, which they saw as the root of the modern predicament, both individual and social, and as the fundamental barrier to the achievement of freedom The primary task of revolution, therefore, was to provide an antidote to the spirit of alienation and to promote the growth of a new mentality upon which a truly collective society could be founded This conception of revolution, shared by both writers, raised a number of important questions which run throughout their works First, there was the question of faith, its nature and its ability to raise the

individual to the level of collective consciousness Secondly, there was the question of reason and man's capacity for organizing his life on rational principles Thirdly, there was the psychological question does revolution automatically produce a profound change in human nature or should individual evolution be an essential pre-requisite for successful revolutionary change? Even if the two men were sometimes to provide different answers to these questions, (sometimes even contradicting themselves) we should always remember that the questions they posed were essentially the same This is the key to their turbulent relationship

Inevitably, the Revolution of 1905 proved to be a crucial factor not only in the intellectual and literary evolution of both writers but also in the development of relations between them The advent of revolution immediately raised the question of political commitment, a question which was resolved quite differently by the two men For Gorky, who had been involved actively with various revolutionary groups since his youth, it was unthinkable that he should not place his services at the disposal of the revolutionary cause, and his close collaboration with the Bolsheviks in 1905 and beyond was the natural course of action For Andreyev 1905 proved a more testing experience Although sympathetic to the revolutionary cause, as he demonstrated most vocally in Finland, he remained convinced that the writer's role was incompatible with party politics and this conviction grew ever stronger in the post-1905 period There can be no doubt that he held the Bolsheviks responsible for the breakdown of his relations with Gorky, whose growing inflexibility on literary matters he identified with his party affiliations, a conclusion with which few people, I think, would quarrel Certainly, Gorky's condemnation of T'ma and subsequent works by Andreyev owes more than a little to his collaboration with Lunacharsky, as we have seen That the issue of political commitment remained a live source of antagonism between the two writers is attested by a note written by Gorky towards the end of his life The note contained the details of a conversation between Gvozdyov and Andreyev

> - А вот Горькии делает, что может
> - Ну, положим, он делает не то, что может
> Он писать может, а честолюбие толкает его
> в политику
> - Разве он честолюбив?
> - Ну, а кто же честолюбив, если не он? 51

At this point in the conversation, Gorky notes that he interceded in his

own defence

> - Ты серьезно, о честолюбии-то?
> - Мое дело - серьезно или несерьезно Представь, что я хочу насолить тебе, подмарать репутацию социалиста, демократиста, хочу видеть тебя неистовым Вот - каламбурчик! А? 52

Andreyev's pun, faithfully recorded by Gorky, suggests the essence of his argument, like a great many of his contemporaries, he felt that political commitment had made Gorky the slave of doctrine, the foremost practitioner of 'party literature' in the derogatory sense

We should beware, however, of following Andreyev's argument too closely Although there were important differences between the two writers on aesthetic matters, we must remember that Gorky's relations with the Bolsheviks were far more contradictory than Andreyev ever appreciated and that Gorky's views on literature altered radically during the last years on Capri Bearing in mind the important philosophical debate between Gorky and Lenin over the question of 'God-building', which revealed the gulf between the political and the humanist conception of socialism, it is perhaps better to avoid the term 'party literature' with reference to Gorky Nevertheless, it is possible to isolate two aspects of Gorky's views on literature which were clearly affected by the experience of revolution and which brought him into direct conflict with Andreyev

The first was the concept of 'Revolutionary Romanticism', which, as we have seen, was the guiding principle of Gorky's fiction in the years 1906-1910 Put simply, Gorky's purpose was to inspire faith in the revolution by presenting the socialist ideal as historical reality, at least amongst certain sectors of the Russian population To this literary principle and its practice Andreyev was not opposed As his early remarks in Dikaya Utka and his review of Rostand's Cyrano de Bergerac clearly show, he was sympathetic to works of literature which set out to counter the prevailing spirit of cynicism by creating a 'Wild Duck', an inspiring illusion for the edification of his contemporaries [53] That he was of the same opinion in the post-1905 period is demonstrated by his praise of Mat' and Ispoved', the two outstanding products of Gorky's 'Revolutionary Romanticism' Where Andreyev differed from Gorky, however, was over the latter's insistence, during the period in question, that 'Revolutionary Romanticism' was the only acceptable mode for revolutionary literature and that any other modes were, by definition, 'anti-

revolutionary' This was the essence of the Znaniye debate By 1911, of course, Gorky's position had changed, although he never abandoned the revolutionary ideal, 'Revolutionary Romanticism' was never again to be the dominant feature of his literary works (It could be claimed that the notorious articles of the 1930s mark a resurgence of 'Revolutionary Romanticism', a view which is not totally incompatible with the claims of Western critics that Gorky was the conscious apologist of Stalin's atrocities) [54] In his works of the period 1911-1917, he presented a far more critical study of human nature but by this time any thought of reconciliation was out of the question Just as Gorky remained convinced that Andreyev was an 'anti-revolutionary' writer, so Andreyev was still referring dispairagingly to 'Gorky-Veresayev optimism' in 1913, despite the contradictory evidence of Gorky's recent works [55]

The second area of disagreement between Gorky and Andreyev was the question of realism as an artistic method It had always been Gorky's view that for literature to be truly democratic it should be realistic in form, this being the most accessible type of literature to the 'new reader', the Russian worker, who had only recently become literate in many cases For the experiments of his contemporaries, like Bely and Remizov, he had no patience and the same was true of his attitude to Andreyev's formal innovations in his post-1905 drama Such experimentation detracted from the direct appreciation of the author's social message and was, in Gorky's eyes, rendered 'undemocratic', an inflexible attitude which contributed to the deterioration of his relations with Andreyev Gorky admitted as much in June, 1931, when he wrote to A Bezvestny with his views on the play Pobeda zhizni, which the latter had submitted for comment

> Я - реалист, и эта ваша форма - мало сказать чужда, она враждебна мне Ѣсли я, в юности, прибегал к аллегориям, это вызывалось условиям цензуры, вообще же я совершенно уверен, что все, что хочешь сказать, можно сказать просто, ясно, не прибегая к символам На почве отношения к символике я и разошелся с Андреевым 56

Andreyev himself could never understand this attitude In October, 1913, he had expressed his perplexity in a letter to Amfiteatrov, where he asked "Неужели одна форма может сделать нас врагами?" [57] In the same letter he had defined his own views on the subject

> В противоположность тому теперешнему категорическому утверждению формы, по которому она является первоначалом и источником содержания, - для меня форма была и есть только граница содержания, им определяется, из него естественно вытекает Выражаясь грубо сперва человек, а потом его брюки 58

Tempting as it is to see Gorky and Andreyev as the advocates and exponents of two opposite literary philosophies, of what are commonly termed 'impure' and 'pure' art respectively, such a conclusion is not supported by the evidence available Even a superficial comparison of the Gorky-Andreyev debate with the celebrated quarrel between H G Wells and Henry James should be sufficient to reveal that the differences between the two Russian writers were by no means as great as those separating the English and American authors [59] (A more precise parallel to the Wells-James dispute is provided by Gorky's debate with the Symbolists) Both Gorky and Andreyev followed in the nineteenth-century Russian tradition and considered it the writer's duty to be responsive and responsible to the society of their day Both, to quote Berdyayev's words on the great Russian novelists, 'created not from the joy of creative abundance, but from a thirst for the salvation of the people, of humanity and the whole world, from unhappiness and suffering, from the injustice and slavery of man' [60] What is more, both writers identified the panacea for the ills of society and mankind in revolution Their arguments were not over two different types of literature, but over two types of revolutionary literature and this alone is sufficient to explain the vehemence of their argument As such it may be seen as a preliminary skirmish to the full-scale war which was to develop over this same issue in the 1920s

As Zola remarked in his essay La Republique et la Litterature, 'at the bottom of all literary quarrels there is always a philosophical question'[61] and the case of Gorky and Andreyev is no exception Once again, as in the case of politics and aesthetics, it was the Revolution of 1905 which brought these differences into focus

At the centre of the debates of the post-1905 period stood the question of history A great number of Gorky's strictures against Andreyev concern the historical accuracy of his works, an aspect to which he accorded particular importance in his own novels of this period In May, 1905, he had noted in a letter to Dobrovol'sky "содержанием

литературы являются трагические противоречия действительности"[62] and for a number of years his literary works were entirely subject to the 'direct invasion of history', as a recent Soviet critic has termed the dominating factor in Russian literature at this time[63] Between 1906 and 1910, as we saw in chapter four, Gorky's entire literary output was dedicated to the task of writing the 'history of the Russian revolution' This endeavour was accompanied by a philosophy of history which was entirely new to Gorky In each of the major novels of this period, beginning with Mat', history is depicted as being purposeful, working in accordance with the dialectic expressed in its crudest form in Tovarishch', the first of Gorky's works to depict the process of human development towards socialism, the ultimate synthesis In essence, these novels adhered to the principle laid down in Lenin's Partiynaya organizatisya i partiynaya literatura, which had demanded from the writer a 'true and historically concrete depiction of reality in its revolutionary development'[64] The same philosophy of history is at work even in those works written after the period of 'Revolutionary Romanticism', notably the autobiographical trilogy, Delo Artamonovykh, and Zhizn' Klima Samgina

Andreyev, on the other hand, saw no such teleological principle at the root of contemporary events Although he too was vitally concerned by the issues raised by the 1905 Revolution and shared with Gorky the same Utopian ideal, his view of history was totally different Tsar' Golod contains the following exchange, which may be taken as a response to the Gorky view

> - Ах, это так шатко история Разве мы знаем настоящую историю?
> - И это говорите вы, историк?
> - Я знаю только одно, что это ужасно [65]

Just like the historian in this extract, Andreyev also denied the existence of any purpose in history His cyclical view of histoiy is reflected both in the titles of his works (e g Iz rasskaza, kotoryy nikogda ne budet okonchen, Tak bylo) and in their form In contrast to the epic sweep of Gorky's post-1905 novels, Andreyev's stylized dramas of the same period are essentially static, hence their division into 'pictures', rather than acts His stories of this period also lack any sense of historical progress It is therefore doubly significant that when Andreyev came to write his only historical novel, Sashka Zhegulyov, the entire work was to be permeated by a sense of fatalism, suggesting the ultimate vanity of any hope for the victory of

revolution, and that it was to this element that Gorky took particular exception This fatalistic element had been present in Andreyev's works from the start, being especially prominent in Zhizn' Vasiliya Fiveyskogo But in this story the concept of fate had been introduced only to convey the illusory nature of the deity Fiveysky worships In the works of the post-1905 period, on the other hand, Andreyev's fatalism takes on a far more pessimistic aspect As his obsession with the Christ-myth shows, he had by this time come to believe history nothing more than a cyclic repetition of human weakness and stupidity With the exception of his patriotic works of the early First World War period, his final works convey the same sense of hopelessness, depicting life as an unequal struggle between man's "higher instincts" and the indomitable forces of Philistinism His final unfinished novelle, Dnevnik Satany, is perhaps the ultimate testimony to the nihilism of Andreyev's thought in the last years of his life

A necessary ancillary to Gorky's teleological view of history was his belief in the perfectibility of human nature In November, 1899, he had made his opinion quite clear in a letter to Repin "Я уверен, что человек способен бесконечно усовершенствоваться" [66] Once again, Andreyev occupied a more sceptical position One senses a deliberate parody of Gorky's views in the speech of the Elderly Gentleman in the first picture of Zhizn' Cheloveka "Мы создаем лучшего человека, и медленно, но верно, движемся к конечной цели существования - к совершенству" [67] By putting these words into the mouth of an elderly man Andreyev may well be suggesting that such a belief in the perfectibility of man belongs more to the past than to the present Certainly, Gorky's views place him squarely in the tradition of the nineteenth century with its faith in the ability of science to solve all human problems Andreyev, on the other hand, belonged to the twentieth century and embodied a distrust of science which suggests a malaise that is a part of modern living altogether Andrey Sinyavsky noted a similar distinction between the two writers in his essay Chto takoye sotsialisticheskiy realizm? Talking of irony, 'the invariable companion of faithlessness and doubt', he indicated the almost total lack of irony in Gorky's work but counted Andreyev as one of the 'final representatives of the ironic culture' in Russia [68]

The discussion would, I feel, be incomplete without an attempt to resolve the essential paradox which lies at the heart of the Gorky-

Andreyev relationship, a paradox at which Gorky himself hinted in conversation with Desnitsky not long before his death Referring to his friendship with Andreyev, he remarked on this occasion "Да, вот любили друг друга, и разошлись И никто из писателей не был мне так близок И не будет "[69] How, we might ask, are we to reconcile this certainty that no writer could be closer to him than Andreyev with the memoir Leonid Andreyev, which suggests the very opposite conclusion? The answer, I think, is to be discovered in the central importance of faith to the life and work of both writers Merezhkovsky formulated the problem when he wrote of the characteristic feature of his age "Никогда еще люди так не чувствовали сердцем необходимость верить и так не понимали разумом невозможность верить" [70] Andreyev expressed essentially the same view to Gorky, when he noted, with typical cynicism "Надо найти себе бога и поверить в мудрость его" [71] Yet we should refrain from the simple identification of Gorky and Andreyev as the extremes of faith and scepticism, respectively As we have been constantly reminded in the course of this study, the life and works of both writers displayed a continual tension between faith and scepticism Hence Andreyev, even at a time when his own faith in the revolution was at its lowest ebb, reserved praise for the idealistic vision of Mat' and Ispoved' The idealistic side of his nature had found expression in such works as Na reke and K zvyozdam and resurfaced again briefly in the early months of the First World War, when he was convinced that mankind was on the path to resurrection Even in his most pessimistic statements of the final years there is always the suggestion that, like his own Judas in Iuda Iskariot i drugiye, he would like his doubt to be proved unfounded

Gorky himself underwent similar periods of uncertainty His discovery of 'God-building', the ultimate expression of his faith in human perfectibility, was followed by years of intense doubt, which found its fullest reflection in the article Dve dushi Particularly revealing is the following remark from a letter to Stefan Zweig of May, 1925, in which he said of the Russians "мы всегда слишком торопимся верить и верим всегда слепо" [72] Here we are confronted with the contradiction at the root of Gorky's personality, the realist is passing judgement on the idealist If Gorky was for Andreyev the embodiment of that faith to which he continually aspired, then Andreyev was for Gorky a reminder of that worm of doubt which persisted throughout his life Each

was in this sense the other's alter ego and this was the source of the contradictory emotions each inspired in the other during periods of friendship and hostility alike Even when they adopted radically different positions in the later years, they were always united by this common bond In retrospect, Andreyev's comment in a letter to Gorky of June, 1902, seems remarkably prophetic and serves as an admirable epitaph to the history of their relations

> Так посмотреть на нас, мы совсем не похожи, но корень у нас один Ты видал, как к яблоне прививают иногда грушу? - ствол общий, а на одной ветке груши, на другой яблоки И эти живущие одними соками яблоня и груша должны, мне кажется, с особенной яркостью чувствовать свое коренное родство То же вероятно и у меня Ты родишь яблоки, я - груши, а соки у нас одни ненависть, презрение, великая любовь и великое отчаяние По нашим писаниям люди со стороны могут принять нас за врагов ты храбрый, я трус ты нападаешь на жизнь, я обороняюсь, ты свободный, я раб - но они не знают того, что твоя храбрость идет из того же источника, как и моя трусость из бездонного колодца великого отчаяния и великой любви 73

CONCLUSION NOTES

1 ЛН 72, стр 279
2 ПССГ, т.16, стр 592
3 L Andreyew, Sachka Gigouleff, translated from the Russian by Lila Hicks Edited and with an introduction by M. Gorky, (New York, 1925)
4 ЛН.72, стр 462-463
5 ibid., p.464
6 ibid., p.458
7 ПССГ, т 16, стр 591-592
8 ibid., p.592
9 ibid., p.313
10 ibid., p 316
11 ibid., p.324
12 ibid., p.325
13 ibid., p.326
14 ibid.. p 320.
15 ibid. p.324.
16 ibid., p.322
17 ibid., pp.326-335.
18 ibid., pp.355-357
19 ibid., p.357
20 ПССГ, т 17, стр 222
21 Г-30, т 25, стр 23
22 ibid., p 357
23 Г-30, т 26, стр 422
24 Г-30, т 27, стр 229
25 ibid., p 316
26 ПССГ, т 23, стр.326
27 ibid., p.327
28 ПССГ, т 24, стр 519
29 ibid
30 ibid., p 522.
31 ПССГ, т 16, стр 350-351
32 Л.Троцкий, "Максим Горький", Бюллетень оппозиции, № 51 (июль-август, 1936), стр 9.
33 В Львов-Рогачевский, Две правды
34 Львов-Рогачевский, Леонид Андреев, стр 8
35 А Лежнев, "Творчество М Горького", Литературные будни, (М , 1929), стр.114
36 А Кугель, Русские драматурги Очерки театрального критика, (М , 1933), стр 153.
37 Десницкий, "Горький и Андреев", стр 142-147, Десницкий, "Горький в борьбе за идейность и партийность литературы", стр 183-191 , Десницкий, "М Горький и Л Андреев в их переписке", в его кн. М Горький Очерки жизни и творчества, (М , 1959), стр.218-244
38 Т Кулова, "Л.Андреев и М.Горький", Ученые записки Московского педагогического института им Н К Крупской, т 129 (1963), стр 115-144, М Ермакова, "Проблема человека в творчестве М Горького и Л Андреева", Ученые записки Горьковского педагогического института, вып.110 (1968), стр 176-189
39 Б.Томашевский, Краткий курс поэтики, (М.-Л , 1930), стр 116
40 Б Томашевский, Теория литературы, (Л , 1925), стр 150

41 Russian Formalist Criticism. Four Essays, Translated and with an introduction by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J Reis, (University of Nebraska, 1965), p.133
42 Проблемы типологии русского реализма, (М , 1969)
43 ibid , p.125
44 ibid , p 152
45 Л Долгополов, "Русская литература конца XIX-начала XX века как этап в литературном развитии", Русская литература, № 1 (1976), стр.93-109
46 Развитие реализма в русской литературе, т 3, (М , 1974), стр 148
47 В Келдыш, Русский реализм начала XX века, (М , 1975)
48 ibid , pp.212-262
49 Е Чириков, "Леонид Андреев", стр.68
50 ibid., p 73
51 ЛН 72, стр 464
52 ibid
53 see, above, p.29
54 see М Геллер, Концентрационный мир и советская литература, (Лондон, 1974), стр 84-95, 129-133
55 ЛН 72, стр 546
56 ibid., p 467
57 ibid., p.541
58 ibid , p.540
59 see. Henry James and H G Wells A Record of their Friendship, their Debate on the Art of Fiction, and their Quarrel, edited with an introduction by Leon Edel and Gordon N Ray, (London, 1958)
60 N Berdyayev, The Russian Idea, tr R M French, (London, 1947), p.25
61 Grant, Realism, p.24
62 Г-30, т 28, стр.371
63 Долгополов, стр 05
64 James, p.ix.
65 ПССА, т.5, стр 237
66 Г-30, т 28, стр.101
67 ПССА, т 1, стр 180
68 Фантастический мир Абрама Терца, (Лондон, 1967)
69 Десницкий, "Горький в борьбе за идейность и партийность литературы", стр 186
70 Мережковский, Полное собрание сочинений, т 15, (СПб -М., 1914), стр 244
71 ПССГ, т 16, стр 337
72 Г-30, т 29, стр 429
73 ЛН 72, стр 151-152

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Леонид Андреев "К звездам" Пьеса (Вариант) Рукопись
Институт русской литературы (Пушкинский дом) Р III.Оп I №48

1 К звездам

Дело происходит в небольшом губернском городе, известном своей обсерваторией

Сергей Николаевич Верховцев Астроном 52 года, но кажется моложе Черные, с легкой проседью, борода и волосы, от виска через всю голову проходит серебристая прядь Одет красиво и спокойно Движения плавные, спокойные и очень точные, также сдержан и точен в жестикуляции - ничего лишнего Вежлив, внимателен, но от всего этого отдает холодом

Инна Александровна Жена его, тех же почти лет и также моложава Сухая, стройная, корректная Строгая Любит порядок

Анна Дочь, 27 лет, похожа на мать но не так красива И одета некрасиво, не к лицу Пенснэ

Николай Сын, 25 лет В тюрьме

Петя Сын, 18 лет, гимназист Нежен, мягок, легко вспыхивает

Маруся Невеста Николая, 20 лет Красивая

Василий Васильевич Житов Помощник Верховцева, неопределенных лет. Велик, волосат, медведеобразен Влюблен в Верховцева При своей внешней медлительности очень деятелен

2 Валентин Алексеевич Торбанов Приятель Николая, что-то вроде/ жениха Анны. Лет 30 Самоуверен, повелителен, иногда груб В разговоре принижает собеседника легкой иронией

Шмидт Молодой человек, с растерянными движениями Постоянно что-нибудь ропщет Восторжен Служит в казенной палате

Евмен Сторож при обсерватории. Надменен

Старуха

Толпа

3 11 октября 1905

Первый акт

Толпа Вперед толкаются тени, молчание - неясный говор, вздохи

Он Сядем здесь Здесь хорошо

Она Все равно Я никуда не могу уйти от нее и лучше здесь, когда она прямо перед глазами, чем подстерегать ее у окна, чувствовать за спиной Когда она выходит из-за крыш, она еще страшнее. Крыши ведь это так просто, так человечно - и вдруг она!

Он Какой кровавый свет! Как огромны! окровавленный нож! Не даром связывают ее с войною

Она До сих пор я знаю только город, а теперь вдруг почувствовала землю - и это точно страшно почувствовать маленькую, крохотную, кругленькую землю Что же это? Живешь, живешь, не думаешь ни о какой земле и о небе не думаешь - и вдруг она оттуда приходит что-то и становится над головой

Он Прежде люди умирали от страха, когда появлялась комета Какой ужасный год Голод, болезни

Она Что же это? Жить становится страшно Все умирают - вы подумайте, сколько смертей за один этот год Того и нет, другого нет

Он Светлов умер

Она Светлов умер Лидочка умерла Отчего она умерла? Ей всего было 19 лет

Он Чем больше смотришь, тем она страшнее Вначале как будто понимаешь, а потом перестаешь понимать Сколько народу!

4 И/ все еще подходят И вы заметили на улицах тоже народу больше обыкновенного
Она Дома хуже
Голос в толпе А ведь она больше стала'
Другие голоса Нет Больше' Такая же, что пугаешь
Первый голос Верно говорил, что больше Вчера она была вот досюда близка, а теперь смотри хвост куда раскинулся' Пойти домой сказать
Она Нет не могу Пойдемте отсюда
Он Куда же идти?
Голос в толпе Думал талафеевские амбары горят Взлез на крышу, взглянул Господи ты Боже мой'
Второй голос У нас собака всю ночь выла, такую жуду (?) нагнала, хоть в петлю полезай Зачем ее в подвале, а и оттуда слышно Не придумала, что с нею сделают
Третий голос Ничего и не сделаешь Думаешь у одного тебя собаки воют? Они по всему городу воют
Она Нет, пойдемте Куда-нибудь, все равно, но только пойдемте
Он Ну давайте руку Да не волнуйтесь же так Ведь это же ребячество

Уходят

Первый молодой А может она на землю упасть?
Второй молодой Кто ее знает Говорят, что может
1-ый молодой Сгорит тогда все
5 2-ой молодой А тебе-то что? Ну и пускай горит Это тем страшно/ у кого есть что беречь, а у нас ничего не пропадет Будь моя сила, взял бы я эту комету, да хвостом бы, как помелом, по всей земле Гори все'
1-ый старик Верно Прежде хоть в деревне с голоду дохли, а нынче и в городе то же пошло Город' Вчера (нрзб) курицу продавать, насилу-то за двугривенный сбыл
1-ый молодой А мне жалко будет, если все сгорит
2-ой старик Воистину прогневался Господь'
1-ый молодой Что это такое?
2-ой молодой Что?
1-ый молодой Да вот звезда эта Откуда она? Отчего прежде ее не было?

Пауза

2-ой старик Грех много, вот откуда

Пауза

2-ой молодой Нынче в типографии публикацию читали пропала собака, кличка "Миледи", кто найдет, тому 10 рублей
2-ой старик Ничего не боятся Такое знамение, а они о собаке
2-ой молодой Кого им бояться, сами себе господа
1-ый молодой А церкви тоже сгорят?

Пауза Приближается низкий, уродливый, что-то на плече

Низкий (тихо) Работки не найдется?
1-ый молодой Ты, дядя, очумел? какая тебе работа?
Низкий Дровокол я Два дня хожу, очень уморился Ни хлебушка нету
2-ой старик Какая тут работа?
2-ой молодой А ты, дядя, пойди собаку поищи, собака про-
6 пала Все/ равно ходишь ты, так ты ее поищи Десять целковых дадут
Низкий Собак много, разве ее найдешь?
1-ый молодой А ты ее покличь Милади, Милади, Миладюшка' (хохочет)

Низкий Так нету, говоришь, работки?
1-ый старик Чего грохочешь, бесстыдник? Бога не боишься?
1-ый молодой А чего мне его бояться?
2-ой старик Сколько народу-то пропадает, Господи! Вот мы тут стоим, папироски курим, а там тысячи убивают Да она еще идет
1-ый молодой (любопытно) Какая она?
Пауза
1-ый старик (сурово) Не знаешь, так молчи Но обо всем зубами (нрзб) Да цигарку ты бы бросил, дома накуришься
Кто-то (подходит) О чем разговор?
2-ой старик О чем нам говорить? Все о том же
Кто-то И вы, значит, слыхали?
2-ой старик (уклончиво) Мало ли говорят
Кто-то Ну, да Весь, говорят, простой народ уничтожать будут По всей земле. Как где есть бедные или больные или неимущие, так всех
2-ой молодой А работать кто будет?
Кто-то А работать машины
2-ой молодой Машина одна не может, при ней тоже человек нужен.
Кто-то Ну не знаю, может и оставят кого А только чрезмерно лишнего народу народилось, теснота, безобразие, воровство Вот они посоветовались, посоветовались и порешили
7 1-ый молодой Кто они?
1-ый старик Все ты (нрзб), все в очереди лезешь Не знаешь, так молчи, сам догадывайся
Кто-то И порешили извести народ не сразу а помаленьку, чтобы незаметно было А то если сразу так народ может сопротивление оказать Так вот, значит, войной начали, как будто воюют, перебьют сколько надо и тут значит - голод Хлеба-то много, миллион, но однако он в подземельях схоронен и стерегут его солдаты с ружьем, кто билет предъявит, тому дают, а кто без билета того роди! - по голове И вот значит, когда народ (нрзб) тогда и ее пустят
Толпа растет Возгласы, удивление и страх
1-ый молодой Пустое ты говоришь
Голос Не мешай Дай сказать! Уходи если не нравится
Кто-то Вот увидишь, недолго осталось Мне что, я сам в первую голову пойду, такой же Но однако она не всех заберет, у нее тоже силы, сколько ей полагается, и вот тогда - сделают они по всей земле темноту на три дня и на три ночи, и всех, какие остались, прикажут
1-ый молодой Кто сделает-то?
Кто-то (показывая на комету) А кто ее сделал?
Все молча смотрят на комету
Голоса Страшная такая! Господи
Пойти лучше домой, все будто спокойней
Иван! Где ты Иван?
Все небо загородило хвостищем
А что, солнушко-то взойдет либо нет?
Конец народу приходит, конец
8 1-ый молодой Не может этого быть
Кто-то А кому ты нужен, скажи пожалуйста! Ты что делаешь-то? Какое твое занятие?
1-ый молодой Ручку у машины верчу
Кто-то Ручку верчу! Приведут к твоей ручке ремень, вот

тебе и все Нет, умно это придумано, нечего и говорить. Если даже бродячих собак не убивать, так сколько расплодится, людям житься не будет

1-ый молодой Мы тоже люди

Кто-то Сказал' Эх, ты

Сдержанный хохот, и некоторые отходят

Кто-то Люди' Ты себе на рожу-то взгляни - разве у людей такая бывает? Нет, ей-Богу, хорошо это придумано Ну, кому мы нужны, скажи на милость? Живем мы, хуже нельзя, пьянство, дебоширство, драки, зверье (нрзб) Нет, нужно землю очистить, хорошо это придумано

Ропот

2-ой молодой Ну и очищай, а я не желаю

Кто-то Так тебя и спросят'

2-ой молодой Да и не спрашивай у самих руки есть

Кто-то Руки?

Пьяный (где-то кричит) Наплевать мне на твою комету'

Голос Молчи, дурак Нехорошо

Пьяный Сам дурак' Люди добрые пожалеют меня, у меня жена утопилась

Голос Где? Как? Что он говорит?

Пьяный Не знаю где Вчера из дому ушла и нету (плачет громко, завывая) У-у-у' Дал я ей водку но, говорит, лей,
9 а она валила/ кулаками себя по пузу Брюхатая она, но по шестому ребеночку и давай кулаками по пузу, а потом ушла Где же она? Что теперь я буду делать без нее? (Плачет) Только приду, я тебе покажу, как уходит

1-ый старик Увел бы ты его Нехорошо Вправду утопилась?

Провожатый А кто ее знает? Пойдем, будет, водки куплю

Пьяный (идет) Не надо мне водки Где жена' Постой что это такое на небе гилю-ми-нация? Наплевать мне на иллюминацию Где жена? (Уходит)

Женский голос До чего народ низок, тут последние дни приходят, а он пьян Господи, Господи'

Говор Гимназист и гимназистка садятся на скамью

Гимназистка Я боюсь, тут пьяные

Гимназист Ничего, они не тронут Зато здесь хорошо видно Какая красивая комета Вам нравится?

Г-ка Да, нравится Оставьте мою руку

Г-ст Ниночка'

Г-ка Меня зовут Нина Петровна

Г-ст Вы боитесь кометы?

Г-ка Боюсь

Г-ст Она похожа на классную даму сверх ногами

Гимназистка тихо смеется "оставьте руку" и проч

Г-ст А будешь меня жалеть, если я на войну пойду?

Г-ка Нет

Г-ст Ниночка'

Г-ка Меня зовут Нина Петровна

10 Г-ст Знаешь что? Правда, здесь очень людно Пойдемте еще куда-нибудь. Вы согласны, Нина Петровна?

Уходят направо, спешно, "Оставьте мою руку"

Голос 1-ый Передушить бы их всех, дьяволов'

Голос 2-ой А если светопредставление, то как оно начнется?

Голос 3-ий Вот так и начнется.

Голос 4-ый Братцы, а ей-Богу она падает Гляди, гляди, хвостом ворочает'

Голоса Ври больше, Смутьян'
Дай ему по шее'
Да ты что? Я-то при чем?

Женский плач Кое-кто уходит
Голос 1-ый Терпения моего нету что же это такое? Иван, где ты там, дьявол?
Иван (широкоплечий, говорит медленно и трудно) Вот он я, чего орешь? Надо бы разломать все это'
Голос 1-ый Да что разломать-то? Дьявол несуразный
Иван Все это разломать
Голос 1-ый Ах ты - да что?
Иван Да все Чего пристал Почем я знаю, что Ты же сам давеча говорил
Голос 1-ый Говорил'
Тонкий (с приятностью) Надо бы пожарчики Если бы в местах в четырех сразу. Очень хорошо бы вышло
Ропот изумления и страха, одни продвигаются, другие уходят
Голоса Кто это?
А шут его знает
Что он говорит? Пожары? Где пожары?
11 Тонкий Да что вы, я нарочно В шутку
Голос Нашел шутку
Голос 2-ой Я его знаю Из ерошкиной кампании Они нынешней зимой зверей хотели выпустить Зверинец приезжал так они (нрзб) хотели клекти пораскрывать Я его знаю
Голоса Ага' Так это ты, брат
Пусть'
Не трогай, у него нож'
Пусть, говорю
Господи, Господи, что же это Пойдем от греха
Идем'
Тонкий (высвобождаясь) Вы скажете что и комету я выпустил Дураки
Голос А кто? Говори Нечего народ морочить
Тонкий Когда захочу, тогда и скажу Слушай ты, Иван, что ли, пойди-ка на пару слов
Отходят к авансцене, шепчутся
Тонкий Ты этого, что в трубку смотрит, знаешь?
Иван. Какого?
Тонкий Ну, что дом-то с колпаком
Иван Дом знаю На горке
Тонкий Ну?
Иван (не понимая) Ну?
Тонкий А ну тебя к черту' Гривенник есть?
Иван Нету Да и не дам я пьянице
Тонкий с ругательством отходит, за ним медленно идет Иван
Детский голос Тятенька, я боюсь Звезда такая странная'
Голос 5-ый А что теперь там делается, не приведи Господи?
12 Голос 3-ий Где там?
Голос 5-ый А в других местах Панашево, рассказывают, третьи сутки горит А где, говорят, уж она пришла - конец народу'
Высокий (костлявый, без шапки, говорит громко) От книги все Книги нужно жечь От книг все Много книг, много народу горя Книг не было - лучше жили А теперь везде книги
Голос Везде - нельзя без грамоты То-то ты ушел

Высокий Вы меня послушайте, я все понимаю От книг вся неправда на земле Какой человек книгу почитает, так сейчас становится барин, одевается по-другому, лицо другое У кого все книги? - у господ Не будь книга, не было бы господ Барин не тот, кто богат, а у кого книжки есть Я все понимаю, у меня сын ученый Выгнал я его и проклял - проклятием родительским ненарушимым

Голос И евангелие - книга

Высокий Нет Христос книг не писал, это после него сочинили А Христос книг не любил книжники вы, говорит, и лицемеры Я все понимаю У меня от сердца одна труха осталась, я все понимаю Научи собаку читать так она с другими собаками жить и не захочет В книгах - говорит - ум А вы зачем, говорю, ум у народа ограбили? Иди наводи (нрзб) не хочу Выгнал И говорю я вам послушайте меня скоро весь народ подымется Не стало мочи терпеть Ограбили! Всю кровушку высосали! Рыданьем земля выдает, слезьми обмывается Придет сын, убью перед Богом, убью, рука не дрогнет (Чей-то плач)

13 Стонущие голоса Трудно жить Смерть легче, чем жизнь такая Доколе терпеть, о Господи Нет правды, жалости нет в людях Пойти где в омут головой и броситься

Высокий Убью!

Стонущие голоса К кому пойти, кому пожаловаться Сироты мы несчастные, закидыши мы горькие Господи, Господи, доколе терпеть, о Господи

Высокий Воздвиг Господь знамение гнева своего и страх пошел по всей земле Очисти нас огнем твоим, Господи, не стало мочи жить Ограбимые мы, голодны мы, нищи, как Лазарь

Входят Верховцев (1) и Петя и, незамеченные, садятся на скамейки

Голос Молиться надо Страшно тут Домой Говоряг, идет Все говорят, идет Больше стала

Высокий Убью! (Уходит)

Верховцев (Пете) Однако вашему родителю сюда не безопасно С кем он там идет, долго как

Петя С Марусей Как это ужасно, Вал Алекс Вы послушайте, что они говорят

Голос Ну и старик! Чей он? В темноте-то не разглядишь Будто Сазонов

2-ой голос Он самый Как прогнал сына, так чисто помешался По лавкам все ходит

3-ий голос Что же, он правду говорит Сколько этого страху над народом! (Уходит)

14 Голос Что-то завтра будет. Вчера она меньше была, это верно

Понемногу расходятся Среди оставшихся местами тихий говор и местами молчат

Петя Им бы нужно объяснить, что это не опасно

Верх. Погодите, Петя, все придет Теперь это полуживотные, будет время, людьми станут, как и мы

Петя Как вы это говорите, В А Они тоже люди Вы любите народ?

Верх (тихо смеется) Какой вы чудак! Петенька! Хороших людей я люблю, а скотов нет А вы разве скотов любите?

---

1 В списке действующих лиц, Верховцев намечен, как астроном Здесь, очевидно, под фамилией Верховцева подразумевается Валентин Алексеевич Торбанов А Б

Петя Я давно хотел сердечно поговорить с вами, В А
Верх Зачем-же дело стало?
Голос Одиннадцать пробило. Айда
Многие из толпы уходят
Петя В чем цель жизни?
Верх (свистит) Вот оно что
Петя Вы не смейтесь Анна вот сердится - говорит работать А зачем работать, когда все умрут? Вы умрете, отец, я, вот они - зачем же работать? Я боюсь смерти В А
Верх Нормальный человек не боится смерти
Петя Да я собственно не боюсь, может быть даже сам убью себя, но я ее не понимаю
Верх Да и понимать нечего. Смерть это факт, как и эта комета Жизнь - это другое дело, над жизнью подумать стоит Но только не искать ее цели, это ненормально Когда человек разумно устроит свою жизнь, приспособил себя к настоящему делу, он также мало думает о цели жизни, так и о цели еды, когда ест
15 Петя А я думаю зачем же я ем?
Верх Ну, вот Все это пустяки и некоторое обострение общего процесса А вам о какой работе говорила сестра?
Петя Говорит, что сперва надо учиться, а потом я сам найду дело Она вас очень уважает, В А Правда, что вы, как и Коля, три года в тюрьме сидели?
Верх Ваша сестра неглупая девушка Вы почаще разговаривайте с нею - это будет для вас полезно
Петя Она со мною не любит говорить, она сердится Маша говорит отчего вы не женитесь на Анне Вы против брака?
Верх (смеется) А отец что говорит?
Петя Ну отец (видя приближающихся Анну, Силицына и Шмидта, быстро) А все-таки я, должно быть, убью себя
Анна Все о смысле жизни, а из гимназии скоро выгонят
Верх Ну не велика беда А астронома нашего все еще нет?
Анна Стоит где-нибудь на дороге и поучает
Силицын Повторяю, А В вы несправедливо относитесь к отцу Его чтит вся Европа как одного из самых выдающихся ученых, у него
Анна Мне совершенно безразлично, чтит его Европа или нет
Сил Не знаю, быть может, конечно, я сам несколько увлекаюсь, но я положительно преклоняюсь перед его могущим умом Какой ум!
Анна Тем хуже если такой ум тратится на пустяки
Шмидт А В , что вы говорите!
Верх Да вы, Анна, немного слишком Астрономия тоже наука и весьма почтенная
Анна Знаю, знаю (нрзб) а меня это положительно воз-
16 мущает Сидит в своем стеклянном колпаке, а что делается/ на земле ему совершенно безразлично Его поведение, когда арестовали Николая, я ему никогда не прощу
Верх Ну, положим, это сантиментальность Что он мог сделать?
Анна Он мог выразить сочувствие
Верх Он и выражал Но в истерику не падать
Сил Какая красота! Да вы посмотрите, господа, пришли на комету смотреть, а никто и не взглянет
Верх Да, недурно
Анна По-моему, и от нас хорошо видно, не понимаю, зачем мы сюда пришли
Верх Ну, ну, не сердитесь, моцион вещь полезная Были вчера у Николая?

Анна Нет Маруся была
Сил Славная девушка' Такая милая, простая
Верх Ничего себе Ну, что Николай?
Анна Меня это положительно возмущает уже если взялась за дело, так делай, как следует, а все эти слезы, ахи да охи Нервы' Не берись, если нервы Я не понимаю, что Николай нашел в этой Марусе Он такой умный, энергичный
Верх Да, парень с головой Правда, что он так нездоров?
Анна Нет Я не верю Марусе, она всегда преувеличивает Может быть и есть легкое нездоровье, просто от скверного воздуха, а Бог знает, что представляется
Петя (сердит) Маруся славная
Анна (не отвечая) Шмидт, о чем задумались?
Шмидт Я думаю, что всякий должен быть сильным
Верх Ого'
17 Шмидт. А если он не сильный, то он не имеет право жить
Верх Ого' А брюки отвернули?
Шмидт (сконфуженно смеется) Я так уважаю вас, В А., а вы все смеетесь
Верх Вы знаете, господа, он когда приходит, так всегда забывает отвернуть брюки На балу однажды танцевал так
Шмидт Это неправда, я совсем не танцую
Анна А Верховцев, значит, сильный?
Шмидт Да, очень
Анна Это интересно А я?
Шмидт. Вы? Вы тоже сильная Но я очень, очень уважаю Всевол Ник - он чрезвычайно сильный
Анна Чем это? Я не понимаю
Сил (поспешно) А вы сами, Яков Васильевич, сильный?
Шмидт (грустно) Нет Я мог бы быть сильный, но природа при моем рождении лишала меня некоторых свойств, которые составляют силу У меня слабое здоровье и я не выношу вида крови
Петя Он лягушек боится
Смех
Верх (медленно) Да, если кто боится крови, тому жить плохо Анна, вы сделали, что я вам говорил?
Анна Типография задержала Десять книг готовы для выпуска, но этого мало Завтра опять поеду
Верх Нужно поторопиться
Шмидт У вас книгоиздательство для народа - какая эта трогательная и сильная вещь
18 Верх Ну' Трогательного я тут ничего не вижу, да и сильного мало Просто приходится повертывать упущенное время Как во время экзаменов, когда за нас проходит то, на что другие потратили годы Конечно, все это не настоящее и самое существование особых книг для народа - только свидетельство о нашей бедности Но ничего не поделаешь
Шмидт Меня трогает эта бескорыстная любовь к меньшому брату .
Верх Ах, оставьте' Какие пошлости' Меньшой брат, любовь' Мне просто противен глупый и невежественный человек, мне ненавистны дикари, которые толкуют здесь о светопредставлении, и я хочу, чтобы этого не было Они действуют на меня самого, они и меня делают немного дикарем, и вообще они задерживают ход поступательного процесса
Сил А какая цель этого процесса?
Верх Я не люблю говорить о целях, это все старая буржуазная

закваска Почем я могу знать, я, человек XX века, какая цель поставить себе человечество XX11 века? Я просто вижу ряд явлений, задерживающих развитие человека невежество, экономическое неравенство, и стараюсь их уничтожить, а что они, будущие, сделают с своей свободой, со своим развитием - это их дело'

Анна Если бы вы все так думали и работали, и не искали каких-то метафизических целей, то давно бы не было тех гадостей, какие делаются И меня глубоко возмущает

Сил (умоляюще) А В ' Перед вами такое огненное напоминание о вечности как эта комета, а вы привязываете человека к минуте Это - это самоубийство

Анна Ну, вы тоже - астроном С вами я никогда не сговорюсь А меня глубоко возмущает эта ваша астрономия Каждая наука
10 дала что-нибудь/ человечеству, а что дала ваша?

Верх Календарь

Анна Кому оно нужно? Солнце вокруг земли, земля ли вокруг солнца - какое это имеет значение для жизни?

Сил Торжество разума

Анна (перебивая) По-моему, разум торжествовал бы больше если бы не было голодных

Верх Недурно'

Петя Тише, папа идет.

Анна Пусть идет, я ему тоже скажу

Пауза На заднем плане на фоне неба появляются силуэты В Н и Маруси

В Н Да, здесь хорошо видно Как это красиво' Когда я смотрю у себя, меня охватывает чувство силы, чувство страшного покоя, а отсюда - что-то новое есть в этих силуэтах зданий прижавшихся на земле в мглистом темном небе, таком испуганном и древнем Вы посмотрите, Маруся, можно ли сказать, что все это (нрзб), что это сегодня, а не вчера, не 5000 лет тому назад? И в себе я чувствую что-то первобытное мне и страшно, как будто, и хорошо точно я потерял границы моего тела и лечу куда-то Как я счастлив, Маруся' Это она' Потерянная в небе еще 80 лет назад, она вернулась, как ей приказал Галлей Где она была? В каких безднах пространства среди каких неведомых миров пролагала она свой стремительный, бешеный путь? Какие глаза смотрели на нее? Да, он прав, Маруся Я так рад, я не могу сидеть дома

Маруся Кто прав?

В Н Галлей Глупцы, они сомневались

20 Маруся Где он?

В. Н (рассеянно) Он умер лет полтораста назад Когда минута в минуту, в назначенный момент, в назначенном ей месте неба она смутно блеснула в стекле, я, Маруся, я не знаю, я хотел бежать куда-то

Петя (громко) Папа, мы здесь Мы тебя ждем

В. Н медленно подходит

Верх Ну как у вас на небе, многоуважаемый звездочет?

В Н Как видите Любуетесь кометой? Не правда ли, какая божественная красота?

Анна Нет

Петя (поспешно) Тут, папа, было много народу, когда мы пришли с В А Какие глупости они говорили'

В. Н Да? Вероятно выражали страх Комета всегда вызывает в людях ужас Они смутно чувствуют ужас бесконечности, если бы они не так привыкли к звездам, они чувствовали бы то же самое каждый вечер

Анна. Просто они невежественны, оттого и боятся Если бы их

побольше учили, они тоже бы находили красоту'
В. Н Да Будет время, когда появление кометы будет праздником для земли Будут устраивать торжественные процессии, петь соответствующие песни
Верх Астрономическая фантазия, В Н Умирающий или голодный едва ли возрадуется, глядя на вашу комету
В Н Да? Умирать, конечно, неприятно Но когда перед глазами встает в своем величии вечность, смерть, как уничтожение индивидуума, теряет значение
Анна Да, кстати ты знаешь, папа, что Николаи болен? Мы
21 только что/ говорили о нем.
В. Н Да? Маруся мне говорила Бедный мальчик, ему, вероятно, очень там надоело. Маруся, в какую сторону выходят его окна?
Маруся Не знаю, кажется на запад
Анна Меня удивляет, как ты это говоришь надоело Вообще тебя нисколько повидимому не возмущает это варварское насилие .
В. Н Меня ничто не возмущает Ты, Анна, должна это знать особенно хорошо
Анна А если Николай умрет в тюрьме, ты тоже останешься спокоен?
В Н Да? Разве так серьезно?
Маруся Нет, нет, В Н. Анюта говорит так в шутку Я ведь знаю, я видела его Нельзя так шутить, Анюта Это так страшно
В Н Да - и тогда останусь спокоен
Верх Вы лжете на себя, В Н
Маруся. Конечно, это неправда В Н говорит нарочно
Шмидт Но это было бы очень сильно'
В Н Какой смешной народ' Каждую секунду на земле умирает по человеку, вероятно, во вселенной каждую секунду умирает по целому миру - и вы хотите, чтобы я терял рассудок из-за смерти одного человека'
Анна Это бесчеловечно'
Верх Не волнуйтесь, Анна Вы просто неправильно поставили вопрос В Н не понял вас Смерть, В Н , может быть естественная и смерть может быть насильственная, о первой мы говорить не станем, это понятно, а вот о второй И родственные отношения также оставим - это только затемняет дело А вам позвольте привести вот пример здоровый, грубый человек
22 душит ребенка Как это - оставит вас спокойным/ или вызовет в вас чувство здорового, активного возмущения?
В. Н (задумчиво и нерешительно) Не могу сказать, чтобы я остался совершенно спокоен, я не могу, к сожалению, управлять своими нервами и слезными железами, но по существу, да - я останусь спокоен
Анна Вот, видите, я говорила'
Верх. Гм' Расширим вопрос Вы признаете, конечно, что наш социальный строй полон жестоких несправедливостей, богатство и нищета, знание, ученость и дикое невежество
В Н Да, да Очень неразумно
Верх Это - возмущает вас?
В. Н Да нет же Конечно нет.
Шмидт Как это сильно
Верх (пренебрежительно) Да - я тоже склонен тогда думать, что астрономия довольно вредная наука, по крайней мере для некоторых
Сил Астрономия здесь не при чем Вы сами втаскиваете вопрос в узкие рамки морали и удивляетесь ответу В. Н Всякий ученый

ответит также, потому что наука не знает чувств возмущения и негодования

Верх (грубо) А если у ученого жена сбежит с тенором - он тоже останется спокоен? Нет тут дело не в науке а кое в чем другом Анна, идемте Шмидт, вы с нами?

Маруся В. Н , что же вы молчите?

В. Н А? Я задумался немного Да, да, вы совершенно правы, В А , совершенно правы

Верховцев, смеясь, уходит с Анной, за ним идут Силицын и Шмидт, и Петя

Маруся. Подождите, я тоже с вами Вы идете, В Н ?

В Н Нет Я хотел бы еще немного посидеть здесь Останьтесь
23 со/ мною, Маруся

Маруся (нерешительно) Мне тоже нужно идти Уже поздно

Остальные, разговаривая, уходят

В Н (берет Марусю за руку) Останьтесь Вы такая милая Я вам хотел еще рассказать о моих работах вы знаете, июля будет полное солнечное затмение? Так вот

Маруся (тихо отнимая руку) Как вы можете говорить об этом? Вам сделали такой серьезный упрек, а вы

В. Н Ах, они мне так надоели с этими возмущениями, они все время говорят об этом Жужжат, как мухи

Маруся Извините, В Н., но я тоже удивлена Как вы можете так относиться к Николаю? Он так вас любит, гордится вами и постоянно твердит Маруся, не оставляй отца А вы

В. Н Да, да Хороший мальчик, я тоже горжусь им Так вот

Маруся Ведь он в тюрьме! Неужели вы не понимаете этого тюрьма. Стена, решетка, мучительное, унизительное чувство сознавать себя запертым. Мы вот гуляем, дышим, теперь всем так хорошо

В Н. Да, да Бедный мальчик, он такой хилый У нас почему-то все хилые, вот Петя тоже. Только одна Анна очень здоровая девушка Итак, мы говорили

Маруся Прощайте (Идет)

В. Н Куда же вы? Маруся!

Маруся (останавливается, гневно) Неужели вы не понимаете, как вы возмутительны? Это или старческий эгоизм или такая сухость сердца, что можно - убить вас Два часа мы ходили и вы все о звездах, звездах, звездах, а у меня в голове
24 тюрьма, тюрьма, тюрьма. Вы ничего не видите, как/ самый обыкновенный эгоист Вы смотрите в трубу, а под самым носом у вас погибает Петя, милый, славный мальчик, который не ныне, завтра убьет себя Да, да убьет, он говорил мне. Вы великий ученый, а вас в доме все презирают - и я тоже, да! Только один Коля, благородный, великодушный Коля, любит вас, не зная за что! Если бы он знал! И вся семья ваша ужасная, противная! Все говорят о хорошем, о звездах, о книгах, о людях, и если зимою кто постучится к вам в дом, так замерзнет, а не достучится У вас на кухне два месяца умирает какая-то старуха, ее прислуга приютила, а из вас никто даже не знает о ней И когда кто-нибудь идет в кухню, проходит, старуха переползает в темный угол, боится, что выгонят! Ученый! Если бы в Европе знали, какой вы ученый!. (плачет) Милый Коля, как мне его жаль Милый Коля (Быстро уходит)

В Н стоит, опустив голову Потом медленно подходит к краю обрыва и останавливается там Вдали воют собаки Комета царит нераздельно

В Н Он прав Великий Галлей Ты прав!

Занавес

25 Акт второй

Столовая, обставленная мещански богато Висячая лампа Окна в сад раскрыты

О. А (1) (за самоваром) Другие ездят на дачу, а нам нельзя Всев Н и на день один не может расстаться с своей обсерваторией У меня именье было, так я продала Когда сам не смотришь, так все идет кверху ногами

Гостья У вас и так хорошо, никакой дачи не нужно Кто у вас цветами занимается? Каждый год смотрю и завидую

О А Не знаю (со вздохом) Прежде Коля с ними возился, а теперь уже и не знаю кто Платим садовнику 15 р в месяц, на нашем содержании, а так ли он делает, не знаю Я в цветах ничего не понимаю

Петя (отрываясь от книги) Маруся за цветами смотрит

Гостья Славная барышня, я ее еще гимназисткой знала Только семья уж очень несчастная отец пьяница, там энергичная женщина но разве одна с такой семьей управишься?

О. А Да, она ничего себе Только сантиментельна очень Анюта часто ее поругивает за это Да и по делам дома есть нечего, а он бесплатно уроки дает Брал бы хоть по полтиннику Жизнь теперь дорогая вот и у нас народу как будто и не много, а (нрзб) В. Н этого не понимает, а у меня сердце болит, как погляжу на наши расходы Вот его тоже дело - плохое дело В позапрошлом году на (нрзб) он ездил, какое-то там затмение было, а пришлось командировочным своим две тысячи доплатить Теперь хочет какую-то свою трубку купить, министерство денег
26 не даст, так он/ на свои хочет Но я тоже не дам У нас дети растут, мы не имеем право их грабить И то Коля свою часть, что от бабушки ему досталось, почти всю уже (нрзб) Вот Анюта (нрзб) - она молодец, как решила капитала не трогать, так одними процентами и пользуется. По совести сказать, очень боюсь я этого В , В. А

Петя. Ах, мама, какие ты глупости говоришь

О А Да я не говорю ничего Он очень хороший человек Открыл он компанией книжное дело - книжки для народа

Петя В А все свои деньги туда отдал

О. А Свои отдал а Анютиных не тронул, вот это я в нем и ценю Бранит он меня мещанкой, а я и не сержусь на него, вижу, что хороший человек.

Гостья Он шутит В А всегда шутником был

О А А кто его знает их теперь не разберешь, шутит или нет Вот шутил, шутил Николай скоро меня мамочка, в тюрьму посадят, а там хвать и посадили, да вот второй год уже сидит

Петя И я, мамочка, скоро убью себя (Смеется)

О А Глупо мой друг Сын ты великого ученого, а быть тебе пастухом Вы знаете в седьмом классе на второй год оставили?

Гостья Как же это вы так? Я вас своему в пример ставила, всегда вы первым учеником шли

О А Там шел, а вот и перестал идти

Гостья Уж не влюблен ли?

Петя (серьезно) Да, (нрзб), когда все соберутся, я покажу свою невесту

О. А Шалости все Что еще (нрзб) Что это ты как будто и
27 чай/ разлюбил? Прежде, поверите ли, по 10 стаканов в вечер пил.

Гостья А собачки ваши как?

---

(1) В списке действующих лиц, имя и отчество жены астронома - Инна Александровна

О. А И не говорите' (.нрзб) Вчера слышу, лает на улице какая-то собака и голос знакомый, пошла, посмотрела, а это Жужу (нрзб)
Гостья Да и украсть могут Миледи (нрзб.)?
О. А. Нет Сколько денег на объявления потратила и все без толку Приносили много, да все других Петя, позвал бы ты отца чай пить, самовар уже остыл
Петя. Сам знает, когда чай
О. А. Трудно ходить'
Гостья. Что, В Н наблюдения производит? Как это интересно'
О А Нет Вычисляет что-то. Вот, я вам скажу, каторжная работа видела я у него эти самые листы Вот этакой лист и весь подряд цифрами исписан, голова кружится смотреть И меньше нет, как миллион или миллиард Прежде он мне много объяснял, да теперь устарела я, плохо понимаю - да и неинтересно это, цифры
Гостья Да, это не наше хозяйство булочнику 12 р'
О А Какое там'
Гостья А Н В давно видели?
О. А Давно Очень уж тяжело туда ездить, смотрители эти, да надзиратели, да замки, прямо тоска У него каждое воскресенье Маруся бывает Вот и сегодня была, придет - расскажет Икры ему послал (нрзб) Носила как-то Маруся цветы, да не принимают
Гостья. Ну что цветы (нрзб) сделают? Какая жестокость
О. А Уж и не говорите, сердце у меня изболелось А вот и Анна.

28 Входят Анна и Верховцев Оба хмуры Анна здоровается и прямо проходит к себе

Верх. (хмуро) Здравствуйте, теща
О А. Вы сперва женитесь, а потом и величайте тещей
Звонит, чтобы дали новый самовар
Верх (берет у Пети книжку) Что читаете? Шопенгауэра' Вот так выкопал' И охота вам этой ерундой голову себе забивать Уж если так захотелось философии, так взяли бы Ницше А лучше совсем на нее наплевать, здоровее будет Как насчет цели-то жизни?
Петя (сердито) Вы не тактичны, В А
Верх. (сухо смотрит на Петю, раздраженно) Что же, скоро у вас чай будет?
О. А Что это (нрзб) вас за муха укусила?
Верх Не муха, а целый слон Маруся не приходила?
О. А. Нет еще
Верх А астроном где? В комнате?
Петя пристально смотрит на Верховцева, снова читает Гостья уходит О А. провожает ее Верховцев быстро ходит по комнате
Верх Эх, философы' Тут чорт знает что происходит, а он
Шмидт (нрзб) Хороши будут работнички'
Петя молчит и делает вид, что читает
Верх (ходит) Собачья старость' Жить еще не начал, а уже о смерти думает (нрзб)'
Петя Вы забываете, В А , что я не мальчик, которого можно ставить в угол Мне 18 лет, и я прошу вас оставить меня в покое
Верх Скажите, пожалуиста' В 18 лет рабочие целые семьи содержат , а не тунеядствуют

29 Анна (входит) Что тут такое? Опять философия?
Верх (кивает головой в сторону Пети) Да, вот'..
Анна Как не надоест. Я скорее примирилось бы, если бы они ухаживали за девчонками, это по крайней мере естественно, хотя и глупо, но эта вытянутая ме-та-физическая физиономия Киснет, киснет'
Петя Я тебе не мешаю, когда ты куполы из бумаги отрезаешь, а у тебя физиономия тогда тоже не из приятных Оставь меня в покое
Анна Дурак'
Входят О А с гостьей, за ними Шмидт и Силицын
Гостья Ангелы, а не собачки
О А А как умны Заболел у Мимишки живот, так она, поверить трудно, (шепчет) Остальные здороваются
Верх Теща, чаю' Шмидт, опять брюк не отвернули?
Шмидт отвертывает брюки
Сил. (щурится) Когда постоянно над головою звезды, как странно вдруг увидеть лампу и потолок
Гостья Вот у вас еще высокие потолки, а у нас с антресолями, так просто беда Хотим квартиру менять - из-за низких потолков
Шмидт. Он сейчас извощика нанимал и говорит "Извощик на заезжую 20 биллионов'"
Сил (смеется) Нет, правда когда изо дня в день имеешь дело с биллионами верст и миллионами лет, как-то перестаешь правильно оценивать действительность Все кажется таким маленьким, коротким - странно маленьким, ни с чем сравнить нельзя Берешь стакан с чаем, не чувствуешь его веса и крепко, изо всеи мочи, держишь руками. Или едешь на извощике - версту десять минут и думаешь а за это время комета Белла сделала 500-1000-
30 100 000 верст. Вы/ представляете себе, В А , быстроту 500 в в секунду?
Верх (сухо) Нет Налейте-ка еще
Сил Когда я был маленький, я очень любил ходить на высоких ходулях Так вот когда слезешь, бывало, такое же странное чувство земля точно под самым носом и все, трава, сучки, (нрзб) кажется большим и в то же время поразительно маленьким. Нет, господа, напрасно вы нападаете на астрономию Прекрасная наука
Верх Но что лучше (нрзб) заменяет ходули
Сил Нет, сердце, вы знаете, удивительный факт среди людей занимающих астрономией, совершенно нет самоубийств?
Верх А если серьезно, так ее к черту, вашу астрономию Тут такое делается, ей-Богу, не до астрономии
Гостья Да, скажите пожалуйста, что такое делается в уезде? Приходят такие ужасные слухи, я не (нрзб) верить
Верх (сухо) А то, что у людей терпение лопнуло А поесть вы, О А , ничего не дадите?
Анна (отводит Шмидта на авансцену, тихо) Шмидт, я знаю, вы порядочный человек
Шмидт (растроганно) А В '
Анна Так вот, прежде всего никому не говорите, о чем я вас попрошу За В А гонятся, понимаете? Его каждую минуту могут арестовать Накрыли одну ну да это для вас неинтересно Верх нельзя ночевать дома, я оставила бы его у нас, но меня и самое могут, понимаете?
Шмидт Боже мой'
Анна Голубушка Шмидт, не можете ли вы на эту ночь, только

на эту ночь, приютить его у себя Вы человек вне всяких
31 подозрений, а завтра мы его/ устроим Я очень прошу вас
Шмидт Многоуважаемая А В '
Анна Ну?
Шмидт Я был бы счастлив, но Я живу в тихом немецком семействе и я дал слово не водить к себе собак, женщин и (нрзб.) чтобы никто не ночевал Они меня самого не пускают, если я прихожу после одного часа ночи у нас такое условие
Анна Ах, Господи' Ну один-то раз ничего
Шмидт А В , они поднимут скандал, они за полицией пошлют Диван у них обит новым шелком и они каждый вечер смотрят, не лежит ли кто-нибудь человек на нем, А В
Анна Это вы ницшеанец' Силицын?
Сил. Здесь
Анна Можно у вас переночевать одному человеку? В. А-чу?
Сил Понимаю Можно
Верх (громко) Вы слыхали, господа всех, кто пойдет на улице после 10 ч , будут обыскивать и сажать
Гостья Вы все шутите, а мне и правда пора
Прощается, уходит Верховцев останавливает
О. А
Верх. (громким шепотом) Охота вам пускать к себе таких идиоток? У вас муж великий ученый, а вы
О А укоризненно машет рукой и идет за гостьей
Сил А Марии Сергеевны нет? Что-то она редко ходить стала?
Анна Она сегодня будет
Сил. (Пете) Что читаете? Вот так мудрец' В саду соловьи поют а он Шопенгауэра читает'
32 Петя (сердито, захлопывает книгу) Как вы мне надоели'
Анна А сам всем надоел
Сил Что В А , у вас серьезно?
Верх Весьма Вы что-нибудь слыхали?
Сил Да, слышал
Верх Ну, ладно (поднимается, подходит к Пете - кладет руку ему на плечо) Петя, Петушка, вы не сердитесь на меня, ей-Богу не стоит А? Не сердитесь? Ведь, ей-Богу, противно? Ну, мировая, что ли? Руку, товарищ'
Петя (хмуро протягивает руку) Я не сержусь Только очень обидно
Сил Вы выпейте за брудершафт
Верх Я ни с кем не говорю на ты Когда переидешь с человеком на ты, он через полчаса скажет "голубчик", через час "дурак", а через два часа его нужно выталкивать вон Мы и так с Петушкой друзья Верно?
В. Н (входит) Кто с кем? Я люблю слово друг это самое лучшее слово изо всех человеческих слов Друг'
Верх Мы с Петушкой Ну, как у вас на небе, достоуважаемый звездочет?
В. Н. Хорошо А у вас на земле?
Верх Довольно скверно На земле всегда скверно г звездочет беспорядок, дисгармония (нрзб) кто-то кого-то ест, кто-то плачет Нам далеко до "гармонии небесных сфер" А разве у вас есть друзья, что вы так пламенно говорите о них?
В Н Да Много Но представьте, я их никогда не видал . Один живет на Этне, у него обсерватория, другой в Бразилии, а третий - не знаю где
Верх Пропал?

В Н. Он умер лет полтораста назад А еще один есть, того
33 я/ совсем не знаю, хотя очень люблю - так этот еще не родился Он должен родиться приблизительно через 750 лет Я уже поручил ему проверить кое-какие мои наблюдения
Верх Уверены, что он сделает?
В. Н Да
Верх Странная коллекция - но мне она нравится А как вы относитесь к (нрзб)?
В. Н Ненавижу'
Верх Значит у вас там (неопределенно поводит по воздуху рукой) есть и враги?
В. Н. О, да. Мало, но есть Как низко висит лампа'
Анна Ты, папа, говоришь это всякий раз, как приходишь сюда
В Н А Маруси нет?
О. А (входя) Она пришла, раздевается Опять ты, Всеволод, опоздал, самовар потух Целый день самовар со стола не сходит

Петя идет навстречу Маруси и возвращается с чею

Все Ну что? Как Николай?
Маруся Ничего Кланяется всем Вас, мама, целует, благодарит за икру (целует О. А , потом, В Н-чу) Вам кланяется, спрашивает, как ваша работа?
В Н. Милый мальчик Нужно будет съездить к нему
Маруся Он просит вас не беспокоиться, он знает, как вы заняты
В Н Да, это верно Ужасно занят Книги ему оставили?
Маруся. Да, он очень рад Он сейчас занимается да, английским языком занимается Говорит, хорошо идет дело
Петя (тихо Шмидту) Маруся врет, я вижу По лицу вижу, что Николаю плохо Вы не уходите, я сегодня ей сюрприз приготовил
34 О А (плачет) Бедный мой Колюшка
Верх Ну что, мать, как распустили? Экая беда, подумаешь Посидит и вернется, чего там. Еще понравится в тишине-то
В. Н. (пьет чай) Да, В. А - это движение, о котором я слышу - очень серьезно или это только вспышка?
Верх А по звездам как выходит?
В. Н А я вас серьезно спрашиваю
Верх Серьезно, серьезно' (вскакивает, бледный) Все вы серьезны, а как посмотришь на всех вас, так умереть со смеху можно Вы слыхали, у нас там одну штучку открыли - так знаете, кто нас предал? Я до сих пор поверить не могу'
Шмидт Изменников нужно карать смертью
Верх Душа народа Лжец и обманщик тот, кто говорит, что знает душу народа. Ему, этому зверю, сердце свое отдашь, мозг свои отдашь, а она (нрзб) и растерзает того, кто отдал ему все Народ' Стадо глупцов и трусов'
Анна Вы раздражены В , вы говорите гадости'
Маруся Они несчастны, их нужно прощать
Сил Вы забыли, В А , о вашем будущем человеке.
Верх Нет я не забыл Если бы я забыл, я сегодня ме Человек' я верю в него, я знаю, он придет и очистит землю от этой слякоти А эти'
Маруся Верховцев, среди них есть герои, у которых мы недостойны поцеловать руку
Верх Герои - в тюрьме Позорно человечеству - его герои всегда в тюрьме
Петя Это уже что-то по-Шопенгауэру
35 Верх. А хоть бы по самому чорту'
Анна Вы никогда, Валентин, не отличалсиь особенным оптимизмом

и меня удивляет, откуда это ожесточение? ' Представьте его (нрзб) и (нрзб), у которых действительно разбивает его кумиры (?), а мы люди трезвого дела никогда, кажется, и не рассчитывали иметь дело с ангелами Процесс изменения форм совершается медленно - это не сказка, в которой все делается по щучьему велению, и герои - это по моему мнению тоже совершенно лишние. Они много кричат и о них много кричат, а жизнь делает средний человек и вот на выработку этого типа, на его организацию, мы и должны обратить все наши силы Раньше вы, кажется, были согласны со мною

Верховцев ходит

В. Н Вал А , вы знаете надпись на фронтоне обсерватории Haec domus Uraniae est Curae procul este profanae. Temnitur hic humilis tellus Hinc ITUR AD ASTRA Вы понимаете?

Верховцев на ходу кивает головой

Анна Что это значит, переведите

В Н Это дом Урании Прочь низменные и суетные заботы' Попирается здесь низкая земля - отсюда идут к звездам' Буквально так Красивее сказать отсюда путь к звездам

Верх. А что вы изволите подразумевать под словом низменные заботы?

В Н. Предательство, низость, скотство и тупость большинства

36 Верх Так говорит человек, в безопасности сидящий на своей крыше. А если бы вы сидели в тюрьме

В Н Галилей умер в тюрьме, Джордано Бруно погиб на костре Если говорить о мученичестве, так путь к звездам тоже орошен кровью

Верх (иронически) Впрочем и о вас кое-где поговаривают, что это вы призвали на землю комету, а с нею все тысячи зол Смотрите, как бы не спустился и заботы не ворвались и к вам'

О. А. Как это глупо думать, что человек может притащить комету Что же, он за хвост ее, что ли?

Сил Да вы это упустили из виду, В А Если бы астрономия была таким ничтожным делом как вы полагаете, ее не преследовали бы целыми столетиями

Верх Мало ли что раньше преследовали' Вот и христиан преследовали, а это не помешало им сесть на шею человечеству и жечь невинных астрономов на костре

Анна Можно быть астрономом и не забывать своих общественных обязанностей

Шмидт Обязанность - это рабство, человек должен говорить я хочу

Петя (конфузясь) Я тоже не согласен с папой

Верх Ого' Петя заговорил' Ну, ну, Петушек, смеите Так, так

Петя Молодой Будда, когда увидел голодную тигрицу, так отдал ей себя Он не сказал я бог, я занят важными делами, а ты только голодный зверь, а отдал ей себя Вот так нужно по-моему Я сказал

Верх Ну, Петенька, сели в лужу Это тоже метафизика и не из важных

Маруся Как вы любите от всего отделаться этим словом метафизика Это не возражение.

Анна Тут и возражать нечего Мы не из общества покровитель-

37 ства/ животным, чтобы кормить голодных львиц.

Верх (хмуро смеется) А кто знает вот сегодня я чувствую себя положительно прогорающим содержателем зверинца или (нрзб) укротителем

Сил. Но мы не даем сказать В Н

В Н А я ничего, я слушаю Мне очень нравится то, что вы говорите
Анна Очень великодушно
В Н Да? Нет, это не великодушно Я очень люблю хороший разговор Во всех речах я вижу искорки света - и это так красиво как млечный путь Очень жаль, что люди большею частью говорят о пустяках
Верх А я бы всех ораторов в один мешок, да в воду
В Н Нет, зачем же Слово - это образ мысли, а мысль - это все
Анна Да, красивыми словами люди часто отделываются от работы
Петя куда-то уходит Неловкое молчание
В Н Опять я, кажется, здесь лишний Вы не стесняйтесь гг я могу уйти
Сил (поспешно) Нет, нет, что вы, В Н
Верх (сухо) Да вы никому не мешаете Скажите, В Н , вот вы никогда не возмущаетесь, даже не обижаетесь, кажется, - а случалось ли вам плакать? Конечно, я беру не тот счастливый возраст, когда вы ходили без панталон, а вот теперь
В Н О да Я очень слезлив
Верх Вот как - я не знал.
В Н Когда я увидел Беллу, комету, предсказанную Галлеем, я долго не мог удержаться от слез Вообще, я часто плачу, иногда очень глупо
Верховцев сухо смеется За дверью какой-то шум, голос Пети
38 О. А Что это там Петя напроказничал?
Распахиваются двери Входят Петя и старуха Она перегнулась пополам и еле идет - ужасный образ нищеты, старости и горя Петя рядом с нею выступает торжественно
Петя Позвольте представить вот моя невеста - прелестная Эллен
Возгласы недоумения, досады
Верх Какая глупая шутка!
О А Что это? Откуда? Что это за безобразие!
Маруся Эта старуха уже три месяца живет у вас на кухне
О А А я и не знала!
Петя (громко) Прелестная Эллен, поклонитесь собранию
Старуха кланяется
Петя Так Теперь поговорит моя прелестная Эллен Вам сколько лет?
Старуха молчит и трясет головой
Верх Оставьте, это бесчеловечно!
Петя. Нет, вы теперь оставьте! Вам сколько лет, очаровательная девица?
Сил Семнадцать
Петя Граф, ваш отец и графиня, ваша мать, согласны на наш брак?
Старуха шамкает и трясет головою
Петя Как я счастлив, прекрасная Эллен! Вы слышите запах роз? Вы слышите, как заливается в саду соловей - это о нашей любви поет он, прелестная Эллен!
Старуха трясет головою
О А (смеется) Оставь, Петя, нехорошо смеяться над старым человеком
Петя Ваш благоухающий ротик, прелестная Эллен, ваши (нрзб)
39 зубки, ваши нежные щечки, - я влюблен в вас безумно, прелестная Эллен Зачем так скромно потупили вы очаровательные глазки

ваши? Выпрямите ваш стройный стан и гордо объявите себя моею женою, очаровательная Эллен. В ваших объятиях найдет вечный покой мое беспокойное сердце!

Старуха трясет головою

Анна Он с ума сошел! Верховцев, остановите его!

Петя Моя очаровательная невеста Позвольте представить вам собравшихся гостей Это - мой отец Он великий ученый, и когда у него умрет внезапно сын, он скажет очевидно прошла еще секунда, потому что умер человек Свои часы он ставит по смертям А это - моя мать, очень милая женщина, любит хозяйство, и когда внезапно умрет ее сын

Маруся Петя, оставьте

Петя А это, видите ли - девушка, которая любит цветы, о ней мы говорить не станем А вот это, позвольте вам представить, мой лучший друг Верховцев Он не любит людей, но за то как он любит человека

Верх Так, так

Петя Боюсь прекрасная Эллен, что он не оценит вашей красоты она выходит из границ нормального, но я хотел бы, чтобы вы его поцеловали аромат вашего жгучего поцелуя, я думаю, и ему вскрутил бы голову

Старуха трясет головою

Петя Как хотите, прелестная Эллен А это - сестра моя Анна Как это ни странно, но зовут ее Анна Больше ничего не смею прибавить

Анна Какой отвратительный дурак

Петя Она груба немножко (Маруся пытается увести старуху, но Петя не дает) Она суха, как кашель и когда умрет ее брат,
40 она скажет какой/ отвратительный дурак! (В Н берет старуху и осторожно доводит до дверей, он - высокий и прямой, она - перегнутая пополам, отдает горничной и остается у порога)

Они все как камни! 16 окт 1905

Они хороши для могилы а живым от них больно Я не знаю, что со мною происходит, я мучаюсь, я схожу с ума и потерял смысл жизни, я не понимаю зачем все это зачем молодые, зачем старые, зачем жизнь, зачем смерть Я ничего не понимаю, а они смеются только Анна даже сейчас улыбается, я видел, даже сейчас Уже полгода я твержу вам, что убью себя а вы не верите, смеетесь, браните меня психопатом Это нечестно, ведь я тоже человек!

Анна. Когда здоровые, жизнеспособные люди живут в таких ужасных условиях, нам некогда возиться с д с психопатами

Петя (с отчаянием) Вот опять что ни скажешь, все психопат, метафизика, буржуйство (кричит) Я не понимаю, что такое психопат, вы мне ответите зачем жить Вот как убью себя, тогда пожалеется, да поздно будет

Анна Надоел!

Петя Что? (Смотрит на Анну)

Верх А что В Н , я что-то не поняю кометы как движутся, по элипсу или по параболе?

Петя Вы не смеете придираться к папе Он лучше вас всех хоть не врет, что любит людей

В Н Ты ошибаешься, Петя, я люблю людей

Петя (не слушая, Верховцеву) А вас я ненавижу с вашими шуточками, с вашим спокойствием, которым вы только хвастаетесь (с усмешкой) Спокоен, спокоен, а как самого укусил, так заорал не хуже всякого психопата Обманщик, лжец!

Маруся Петя, Петечка!

41 Анна (поднимается) Я ухожу
Верх Когда вы успокоитесь, я с удовольствием с вами поговорю, о чем хотите, хоть о цели жизни А больных и бешеных я действительно не люблю
Анна У него сейчас начнется истерика Дайте ему валерьянки'
Петя Трус' Его оскорбляют, а он улыбается Я вас' (бросается на Верховцева, Маруся и Силицын удерживают его) Нет, оставьте меня, Маруся, оставьте'
О А Петенька, Петенька, да что же это' В Н , хоть бы ты, ведь ты же отец'
Петя Когда так, я Я не я же (вырывается, бежит сперва к одной двери, поворачивает и выбегает через террасу в сад За ним с восклицаниями выбегают Маруся, Силицын Выходит О А Последним, крутыми шагами, выходит В Н)
Шмидт (с ужасом) Он застрелится
Верх У него дрожат руки промахнется
В саду глухой выстрел
Шмидт (поднимает руки и застывает в позе ужаса)
Верх Как все это глупо, глупо, глупо'
Занавес

42 Акт третий
В правом от зрителя углу сцены купол обсерватории в (нрзб), вокруг него балкон с каменной балюстрадой Низ сцены - верхушки деревьев, все остальное огромное, синее пространство неба Созвездия Тишина, еле слышное постукивание часового механизма Лампа под зеленым абажуром На лестнице, ведущей снизу, вверху Силицын, ниже Евмен, сторож Говорят негромко

Сил Ольге Андреевне хочется на тебя жаловаться В Н-чу
Евмен Пускай жалуется
Сил Ведь В Н велел пускать, если О А разрешит
Евмен Мало ли что он велел
Сил Вот он тебе задаст'
Евмен Посмотрим Сам понимает, что не дай Бог сломают что или так исковеркают
Сил А ты следи
Евмен Стоило того Разве они понимают что? Я бы весь этот народ, что сюда таскается, во три бы (нрзб) Смотрит в шестидюймовой на Урань ох, звезда' - планета а не звезда
Сил А ты все знаешь'
Евмен Всего-то и вы не знаете А нас что с такого всякую звезду объясню
Сил А сколько весит солнце?
Евмен Сто двадцать две тысячи миллионов пудов
Сил Молодец' А публику все-таки пускай, когда велят
Евмен Ну это еще поглядим Давеча полицейский приходил - три револьвера сторожам нашим роздал, это же насчет публики
43 Публика, говорит,/ и так вашей кометой очень недовольна а вы еще затмение устраиваете Смотрите, как бы чего ни на есть не вышло Дурак' Думает, что солнце как фонарь на улице захотел зажег, захотел потушил
Сил Неприятно Нужно бы объявления расклеить, объяснить, что такое затмение
Евмен Ни к чему Я этот народ знаю, они - в ведьмов верят
Сил А ты веришь?
Евмен В ведьмов? Нет Я в нечистую силу совсем не верю А

этих подлецов надо бы нагайкой вместо разных объявлений - разве их, дураков, словом образумишь? Скоты и больше ничего
Сил Ну уж ты того, Евмен Стыдно так говорить сам ты из простых людей, а такое говоришь Их нужно учить а не бить
Евмен Дурака, сколько ни учи, все такой будет Если дурака не бить, он в Бога перестанет верить, отцу с матерью спуску не даст Дурак только одно и понимает
Сил (нрзб)' А ты вот что скажи вправду могут они напасть, например, на обсерваторию?
Евмен Не посмеют Поставить на низу одного хожалого, так они от него, как воробьи от пугала
Сил. Неприятно, все-таки Надо бы предупредить В Н
Евмен. Вы и вправду этой глупости не сделайте Зачем его беспокоить? Мало ли что дуракам в голову взбредет, как к нему со всем этим и лезть, тоже сказали' У него, я думаю, забот-то поболе нашего

По лестнице поднимаются В Н и Петя
Здороваются с Силицыным

В Н Вы, Евмен, пожалуйста впускайте сюда тех, о ком скажет О А
Евмен Хорошо Нужно будет, позовите, я внизу буду

Уходит

44 Сил Я тоже пойду, В Н Я вам не нужен
В Н Нет, добрейший В В , идите пожалуйста Да, позабыл совсем Приезжал ко мне сегодня полицмейстер, просит, чтобы составить коротенькое описаньице затмения, для народа. Расклеивать будут Нужно, конечно, популярным языком А то, говорит, брожение в народ
Сил Ох, уже этот популярный язык' Читал я одну такую брошюрку для народа "Труба - это продолговатый, голый внутри цилиндр"
В Н Да, трудно, на разных языках говорим Но вы уже пожалуйста, постарайтесь
Петя Папа, хочешь, я сотавлю объявление? Я сегодня же напишу?
В Н Ты сможешь? Ну, пусть же он В В , поработает для астрономии А вы завтра рано придете? Нужно устанавливать девятидюймовый
Сил Я рано приду У меня теперь бессонница смешно сказать, но так я волнуюсь, В Н , как в жизни еще не волновался Если бы можно было заснуть и проснуться только 16-ого утром
В Н. Я тоже не совсем спокоен Как барометр?
Сил Да что барометр? А вдруг облака? Вдруг облака? От одной мысли я прихожу в бешенство Ведь, что им стоит вылезут и все тут, а через полчаса уйдут
В Н Ну уж с этим ничего не поделаешь Подождем тогда следующего затмения
Сил Это 26 лет ждать'
В Н. Вам-то что? Я еще могу не дожить, а вы и доживете и переживете Впрочем, нужно отметить и интересное явление средняя облачность в дни солнечных затмений - нормальная Урания покровительствует нам
45 Петя Неужели, папа, это правда?
В Н Как людям хочется таинственного'
Сил Ну я не буду вам мешать До свидания' (Уходит)
Петя Папа, а я тебе не помешаю, если я тут сяду писать? Я не люблю на низу
В Н Нет, садись
Петя Ты только правду скажи не помешаю? А то лучше я уйду Я теперь больше в комнате Николая, она такая уютная А, в

общем, папа, какое у нас мещанство в обстановке! Вот я уже и начал тебе мешать

В. Н Да, нет Вот стол В В - тут все есть, садись и пиши

Оба рассаживаются Тишина В Н не работает, а думает о чем-то

В Н Да Люди так жадно ищут таинственного, выдумывают его, (нрзб) себя и природу - смешные люди, обливают себя водой из пригоршни, сидя на дне великого океана Великая тайна!

Петя внимательно прислушивается

В Н В бесконечность уходят миры Огромное и маленькое, гигантны Сириус и атом, рождающееся и умирающее Кольца Сатурна и мертвая, холодная луна, млечный путь и капля воды - все сливается в одну великую гармонию жизни - гармонию тайн Ничего лишнего, ни одной фальшивой ноты, - какой великий музыкант вселенная Ты любишь музыку, Петя?

Петя Я ее не понимаю, папочка, у меня нет слуха Я люблю только грустные вальсы

В. Н Я люблю, и так жаль, что нет Николая, он вечером, в это время, играл для меня, когда был свободен

Петя У него большой талант, папа?

В. Н Когда человек перестанет считать себя чем-то исключи-
46 тельным/ в природе и свою жизнь особенно, единственной, достойной внимания и интереса, с ним произойдет то же, что с слепым от рождения, когда он прозрел откроется новый мир Человек думает только о человеке и оттого его жизнь такая плоская, такая скучная - мертвая жизнь Он - как блоха, заблудившаяся в склепе, как содержатель огромного музея восковых фигур, деревьев из бумаги, днем он болтает с посетителями, и ночью - он один среди смертей, неживого, бездушного Если бы он знал, что всюду - жизнь!

Петя (задумчиво) Мне теперь так хочется жить, папа. Отчего это? Ведь цель жизни я и теперь не знаю, но только мне все равно Когда я был болен Зачем ты положил меня здесь, а не внизу - ты нарочно сделал это?

В. Н Нет Но когда что-нибудь мне очень мило, мне хочется поднять его сюда У меня, Петя, смешное убеждение, что здесь не может быть страданий, болезни Тут (поводит рукой) звезды

Петя Раз, ночью, я проснулся и увидел тебя ты смотрел на звезды И вот тогда я что-то подумал - нет, почувствовал Не знаю что Как будто во всем мире мы одни ты, я и звезды Но оттого, что мы одни, не было ни скучно ни страшно, а весело, как на балу на каком-то Ты знаешь, та старуха умерла? Но ты работай, пожалуйста, мы-то с Марусей так мешаем тебе

В Н Меня волнует немного затмение Правда, вдруг облака

Петя Вот еще что отчего ты со мною говоришь как со взрослым? Вообще ты со всеми говоришь странно одичаково Вот Силицын - он по-одному говорит с мамой, по-другому с Евменом и со мной,
47 по-третьему с тобой, а ты со всеми одинаково / Вообще ты ужасно смешной человек, папа Ты с маленькими собаками разговариваешь, как с барышнями

В. Н (улыбается) Да? Разве?

Петя. И ты (смеется) вежлив со стульями Нет, это правда ты вежлив с предметами Когда ты берешь что-нибудь в руки, ты делаешь это как-то вежливо Я не умею объяснить Ты очень рассеянный, а ты ходишь так ловко, что никогда ничего не зацепишь, не толкнешь, не уронишь Когда стулья, стаканы, шкафы собираются ночью, как у Андерсена, и начинают разговаривать

они вероятно очень хвалят тебя
В. Н. Однако, ты меня изучил'
Петя. Я влюблен в тебя, папа
В. Н. Ну, ну А это мне очень нравится, что разговаривают Это очень хорошо Да, да, они разговаривают
Петя Шкаф говорит басом и его все зовут многоуважаемый
В. Н. Да, да
Петя А у тебя все, что здесь есть, не разговаривает, а поет Ты слышишь?
В. Н. Все говорит, все поет, все живет Вот когда бросят читать глупые романы и будут изучать астрономию и химию, им станет весело жить, как грекам Весь мир станет живым явятся снова дриады и нимфы и эльфы запляшут в лунном свете Человек будет ходить по лесу и разговаривать с березками и цветами Он будет смотреть на звезды - он будет слушать, что поют ему звезды
Петя Как здесь тихо, папа Правда, слышал, как поют звезды И как хорошо, что здесь нет Анны и Верховцева Вот кого стулья уже не похвалят'
В. Н. А ты откуда это знаешь? Анна любит мебель
48 Петя Это не то, папа Она правда, любит, у нее поставлено и повешено, как на базаре, но она невежлива с вещами Ну папа, я больше не буду - я работаю
В. Н. И я
Пауза Оба приспособляются к работе
Петя. Тебе весело, папа?
В. Н. Весело, а тебе?
Петя Весело
Пауза Постукивает часовой механизм
Петя Затмение будет кольцеобразное или полное?
В. Н. Полное
Пауза Слышна снизу тихая музыка
В. Н. (встает) Что это? Николай?
Петя. (удивленный) Нет Этого не может быть Это должно быть Маруся Она играет (нрзб), что и Николай
В. Н. Но почему же она играет сегодня?
Петя Может быть ты говорил ей что-нибудь
В. Н. (успокаиваясь) Может быть Как хорошо'
Петя Да' Но только Коля лучше играет
Пауза Работают Музыка (1)
С. Н. Петя, послушай, как пел Хандель песню солнцу
Петя Ну?
С. Н. О солнце' Я вызываю к тебе на светлом небе Ты обитаешь (нрзб) Стены твои на горных (нрзб) Ты - желанный всех стран земных все, о владыка', ждут твоего прихода Свет твой лучезарный проливает сияние свое на все страны земные Ты расточаешь ложь, разрушаешь действие злых знамений, сновидений, чар и призраков, ты зло обращаешь к добру О Солнце' Над землею возвысил ты славу твою' Ты наполнил сиянием своим все неизмеримое пространство небесное и все страны земные
Петя Да, очень хорошо Но как трудно писать о затмении

---

(1) Следующие реплики, до слов "трудно писать о затмении" - вставка Андреева на обороте 47-ого листа Очевидно, эта вставка относится к другому периоду работы, потому, что здесь имя и отчество астронома - Сергей Николаевич, как и в последнем варианте пьесы А Б

Пауза

Петя А то лучше я схожу узнать? Правда, почему она сегодня вздумала играть?

В Н работает, не слышит Пауза

Петя Я сейчас приду, папа

Уходит Пауза Музыка отрывается Пауза

Входят Петя и Маруся

Петя (шепотом) Он работает, видишь Ты помешаешь ему,
49 Маруська / Играла бы лучше Отчего ты сегодня такая зеленая?

Маруся Нездоровится Пусть работает, я так, постою на балконе

Петя Да не мешаи папе, пожалуиста Верховцев внизу?

Маруся. Внизу

Кто-то наигрывает собачий вальс

Петя (сердито) Зачем ты не закрыла рояль?

Маруся Он перестанет сейчас

Петя Нашел время Завтра я запру рояль и ключ спрячу к себе Маруся, ты, кажется, плачешь? Маруська, что с тобой?

Маруся. Так, так Молчи Нездоровится, нервы расстроены

Петя Как у меня раньше Ну это ничего, пройдет Ступай на балкон - надо работать

Музыка внизу смолкает Петя садится за стол, предостерегающе подняв палец Маруся выходит на балкон, смотрит вниз, потом на небо - (нрзб) руки в позе отчаяния Пауза

В. Н (встает) Ты еще тут, Петя? Не кончил

Петя Маруся пришла Я сейчас кончу Очень трудно объснить, что такое полнолуние.

В Н Маруся? Где?

Петя Не знаю На балконе

В Н (выходит на балкон) Здравствуйте, Маруся

Маруся (шутливо) Я, как низменная забота, все вторгаюсь к вам и мешаю

В Н Как вы хорошо играете, я и не знал Да вы и сами - как музыка, как богиня Урания

Маруся Ну и какая я богиня?

50 В. Н И стулья должны очень хвалить вас

Маруся Какие стулья, я не понимаю

В. Н Нет, это так, мы с Петей говорили Вы знаете, какой он, оказывается, интересный мальчик' Он напоминает Николая, только в нем много женственного Николай - тот такой энергичный - смельчак

Маруся Да

В Н Я не помню, чтобы Николай когда-нибудь плакал, впадал в отчаяние Это прекрасный образчик человека мужественного, красивая форма, которую природа разбивает сама - чтобы не было повторении

Маруся Да Разбивает

В. Н Странно Почему он так живо вспоминается сегодня? Это вы, Маруся, музыкой вашей нагнали воспоминания Как в нем все гармонично и странно, как нежно и сильно' Меня не удивляет, что его все так любят, даже Анна в нем необычная сила притягательности, чего-то пленительного, чарующего И он так красив' Вам, Маруся, покажется это нелепо он мне напоминает звездное небо Звездное небо перед зарею

Маруся Да, звездное небо перед зарею

В. Н Я уверен, что и в этой глупой тюрьме он остался тот же нежный, очаровательный Даже странно как могут его держать какие-то железные решетки и ржавые замки они должны улыбнуться и дать ему дорогу, как молодому, счастливому принцу

Петя (кричит) Папа, я кое-как кончил, завтра перепишу Ты посмотри пожалуйста, я у тебя на столе положу А сейчас побегу ужинать - я теперь постоянно хочу жрать, как волк Маруська, ты пойдешь?

51 Маруся Нет, я не хочу

Петя Что?

Маруся. Я не хочу, ступай

На лестнице Петя сталкивается с Евменом

Евмен Разве тут можно так бежать? Уроните что-нибудь Горничная внизу ждет ужинать идите Сюда, дура, хотела идти каждый раз ее пугал так нет Дура!

Петя. Она за вами ухаживает, Евмен

Евмен Вот я ее поухаживаю!

Уходят

В Н Когда я смотрю на Николая, мне вспоминается все то дурное, что говорят о человеке как он ничтожен, бесцелен, дисгармоничен И я думаю а вот есть один, который утверждает другое А может быть там (показывает вниз), много таких, строящих жизнь красивую, светлую, солнечную жизнь Звездное небо перед зарею

Маруся (падая на колени, со стоном) Отец, отец, какой это ужас!

В. Н Что ты, Маруся?

Маруся Разбита прекрасная форма! Отец - разбита, разбита прекрасная форма (Плачет, уткнувшись в колени В Н)

В Н Он умер? Маруся, да говори же, он умер? Маруся!

Маруся Разум разум покинул его

Пауза В Н тихо гладит голову Маруси

Маруся (вскакивая) Что же это! Проклятая жизнь! Где же Бог этой жизни, куда он смотрит? Проклятая жизнь! Изойти слезами, умереть уйти! Зачем жить, когда лучшие погибают, когда разбита прекрасная форма! Ты понимаешь это, отец Нет оправдания жизни,

52 нет ей/ оправдания!

В. Н Расскажи мне все, Маруся Расскажи мне все, деточка моя, моя бедная деточка!

Маруся (с сдержанной страстью) Отец, ты знаешь, как я любила людей Я отдала им сердце, я отдала им все - я ничего не оставила себе Мой Николай - он знаменем был моим Когда люди поклонялись ему, я плакала от гордости, от радости за людей Когда варвары бросили его в тюрьму - я думала но ведь это варвары, а он солнце Я думала вот сейчас поднимутся все те, кто любит его, и разрушат тюрьму - и снова засияет мое солнце! Мое солнце!

В. Н Как это случилось Я не могу понять

Маруся Я видела все это, но я не знаю, как это случилось. Как гаснет звезда? Как умирает птица в неволе? Перестал петь - стал бледен и грустен, но успокаивал меня Раз только сказал я не могу понять железной решетки Что такое железная решетка - она между мною и небом

В Н (повторяет) Между мною и небом

Маруся А тут их избили (Умолкает)

В Н Избили? Кого?

Маруся Их Они подняли бунт в тюрьме В их камеры ворвались тюремщики и били их - по одному Били руками, ногами, их топтали, уродовали лица Долго, ужасно их били - тупые, холодные звери Не пощадили они и твоего сына когда я увидела его, уже долго спустя, его лицо было ужасно Милое, прекрасное лицо, которое улыбалось всему миру Чуть не выгвали глаз - глаз,

когорый видел только прекрасное Ты понимаешь это отец? Ты
можешь это оправдать?
53 Маруся Они говорят идиотизм
В. Н Николай - идиот?
Маруся Да
В Н Он может долго жить?
Маруся Да Очень долго Он станет равнодушен, он будет много пить
и есть, потолстеть - он проживет долго Он будет счастлив
Пауза (1)
В Н Ты очень огорчена, Маруся?
Маруся Что за странный вопрос, отец? Ты говоришь точно
о разбитой вазе или сломанной игрушке Или ты притворяешься
равнодушным, или снова я перестаю понимать тебя
В Н Нет, я не притворяюсь, я не умею притворяться Мне
очень жаль Николая, но
Маруся Здесь не может быть никакого "но"
В. Н Милая моя девочка! Я боюсь, что ты опять рассердишься
на меня, как тогда на обрыве, но я не могу иначе думать Я
не могу не думать о прошлом и о будущем, и о земле и о тех
звездах - обо всем, обо всем Меня часто упрекают в холод-
ности, говорят, что у меня нет сердца - и я не знаю, может
быть, это правда Хотя в молодости я был другой, я был
немножко похож на Николая, но только он лучше, гораздо лучше
- но теперь я не могу не думать обо всем А когда я думаю
обо всем
Маруся Что же тогда? Мне интересно, что ты скажешь?
В. Н Вот ты уже сердишься! Милая девочка моя, я знаю, что
тебе очень, очень больно
Маруся Да ведь сын ли ваш Николай?
54 В Н Ну вот ты то же сын Конечно, он сын, и Петя сын Но
я не понимаю какую (2) создает это между ними и другими
людьми? Вообще сын и все это (чрзб.) - никакого значения не
имеет, скажу тебе прямо, Маруся И умри, например, Анна, я
и минуты бы думать об этом не стал Умерла и умерла - экая
важность Если говорить, что я должен жалеть Николая, потому,
что он сын, то - ты не имеешь права жалеть его, потому, что
он - не сын и не брат твой
Маруся. Я люблю его
В Н Ну да И любишь, вероятно, больше чем своего отца, и
это так и нужно, потому что Николай был настоящий человек
Уверяю тебя, Маруся, это все пустяки есть брат, отец Есть
только хорошие люди, которых мы любим, и дурные, о которых
не стоит думать
Маруся Как это холодно!
В Н Поверь, мне очень, очень жаль Николая Мне всегда
бывает жаль, когда я вижу гибель молодого, красивого строй-
ного Мне жаль, когда в букете срезанный цветок, мне жаль
даже разбитого красивого бокала - но Но я думаю обо всем
И в тумане прошлого я вижу мириады погибших и в тумане буду-
щего я вижу мириады тех, кто погибнет, и я вижу Вселенную,

---

(1) Весь следующий текст, до 56-ого листа включительно,
зачеркнут Андреевым
(2) Здесь явный пропуск По смыслу, полагается, что пропу-
щенное слово - "разницу" А Б

и я вижу жизнь везде - и мне становится немного грустно, но спокойно Может быть сейчас, пока мы говорим, у кого-нибудь родился сын, такой же, как Николаи, даже лучше
Маруся Родился для гибели - для безумия Ты это хочешь сказать?
В Н. Да, вероятно, он погибнет (нрзб) жизнь, как и садовник срезает лучшие цветы, но их благоуханием полна
55 земля Дикие люди, звери, только/ недавно поднявшиеся на задние ноги, топчут цветы, а они растут вновь и вновь - все такие же чистые и святые Никогда не исчезнут звери - но никогда не исчезнут и цветы, такие прекрасные в самой гибели своей Да разве есть гибель, есть смерть? Животное, бесконечно повторяя само себя, живет одною неразрывною жизнью, так будет жить и человек, когда он будет думать обо всем
Маруся Но Николая нет'
В. Н Он есть Он в тебе, во мне, он в сотнях людей, которые свято хранят благоухание его души. Разве умер Джордано Бруно? Разве умер Сократ? Взгляни на звезды. Тысячи лет тому назад на них смотрели человеческие глаза и думали - а я, живущий ныне, знаю эти мысли, и для меня нет времени, нет смерти Одно великое - бесконечное - Космос Все живет

Тихо входит Петя, садится около Маруси, обнимает ее Та взглядывает - Петя целует ее в щеку

Петя Сиди, Марусечька, сиди Я все знаю, сиди
Маруся Родной ты мой мальчик (обнимает Петю и плачет)
Петя Не плачь, Марусечька, не плачь, милая моя, дорогая ты моя сестренька Я всегда буду с тобой
Маруся (плача) Что мне до этих звезд?
Петя (тоже плачет) Да ну их к черту' Ты не плачь, Маруся Папа, да успокой же ты ее
Маруся Оставь его Не надо Я успокоюсь сама Это так, это пройдет
Петя. Маруся, я не знаю почему, но ей-Богу не надо (нрзб)
В Н Маруся, я старею и жизнь моя гаснет, и мне уже изменяет мысль Скоро придет настоящая старость, и слабоумие и смерть,
56 и я/ знаю это - но жизнь остается Жизнь всюду Жизнь всегда
Маруся. (вставая) Нет, отец Сегодня мы расходимся с тобою навсегда Быть может, ты и прав, но правда твоя холодна, как лед, безобразна, как отчаяние Что мне до звезд' Земля дышит ужасом Там стоны и плач, там скрежет зубной как в аду - и я пойду в эту несчастную жизнь. Как святыню, сохраню я то, что осталось от Николая - его мысль, его чуткую любовь, его нежность Пусть снова и снова убивают его во мне - высоко над толпою понесу я его чистую, непорочную мысль
В Н Ты идешь к звездам Зачем ты отказываешься от меня, ты же тоже идешь к звездам
57 (1) там будут изъеденные язвами, разбитые параличем. И дома будут такие же, как жители кривые, горбатые, слепые, изъеденные, и у них будет постоянный голод И город этот я назову "К звездам"
С. Н Бедная моя Маруся'
Маруся Зачем ты жалеешь меня? Ты сына не жалеешь
С Н Маруся, я же говорю тебе у меня нет детей Для меня одинаковы все люди

---

(1) Этот вариант конца третьего акта относится к более позднему периоду Здесь астроном назван Сергеем Николаевичем Без существенных изменений, эта часть рукописи воспроизведена в четвертом действии окончательного текста (см ПССА, т 4 стр 239) А Б

Маруся Как это бездушно! Нет, я никогда не пойму тебя!
С Н Это оттого, что я думаю обо всем Я думаю о прошлом и о будущем, и о земле и о тех звездах - обо всем И в тумане прошлого я вижу мириады погибших, и в тумане будущего я вижу мириады тех, кто погибнет, и я вижу космос, я вижу везде торжественную, безбрежную жизнь - и я не могу плакать об одном

Тихо входит Петя, садится около Маруси и обнимает ее Та оборачивается - он целует ее в щеку

Петя Сиди, Марусеночка, сиди Я все знаю, сиди
Маруся Родной ты мой мальчик (обнимает Петю и плачет)
Петя Не плачь, Маруся, не плачь, милая моя, дорогая моя сестренечка Я всегда буду с тобою
Маруся (плача) Что мне до этих звезд
Петя (тоже плачет) Пускай их Ты не плачь, Маруся Папа, да успокой же ее
Маруся. Оставь его Не надо Я успокоюсь сама Это так, это пройдет.
С. Н. Да не нужно плакать Быть может, сейчас, в эту минуту на свете родится кто-то - такой же, как Николай, даже лучше, ибо природа не повторяется
58 Маруся Родится для гибели, для безумия Ты это хочешь сказать?
С Н Да, вероятно, он погибнет Жизнь, как и садовник, срывает лучшие цветы - но их благоуханием полна земля Взгляни туда, в этот беспредельный простор, в этот неиссякаемый океан творческих сил Там тихо - но если бы ты могла слышать сквозь пространство и видеть сквозь вечность, быть может ты умерла бы от ужаса, и быть может - сгорела бы от восторга С холодным бешенством, покорив железные силы тяготения, несутся в пространстве по своим путям бесконечные миры, - и над всеми ими господствует один великий бессмертный дух
Маруся Я не верю в Бога
С. Н Я говорю о существе, подобном нам, о том, кто также страдает и также мыслит и также ищет, как и мы Я его не знаю, но я люблю его как друга, как товарища Когда при случайной встрече двух неведомых сил загорелась первая жизнь - маленькая, крохотная жизнь амебы, протоплазмы - уже в этот момент все эти сверкающиеся громады нашли своего победителя Это мы - те, кто здесь, и те, кто там И когда моему взору удастся проникнуть дальше, чем проникал когда-либо человеческий взгляд, и когда мне удастся разгадать еще одну маленькую от века сокрытую тайну, я радуюсь и говорю привет тебе мой неизвестный и далекий друг!
Маруся Но смерть, безумие? Отец, я не могу уйти от земли она так несчастна! Она дышит ужасом и тоскою, но я ее дочь, я в крови своей ношу страдание земли. Мне чужды звезды, и твоя правда холодна, как лед, безотрадна, как отчаяние
С Н Смерти нет
Маруся Но Николай!
59 С Н Он в тебе, он в Пете, он во мне Он во всех, кто свято хранит благоухание его души Разве умер Джордано Бруно?
Маруся Он был велик
С Н Умирают только звери, у которых нет лица Человек живет бесконечно В некоторых храмах древних поддерживался вечный огонь Сгорало дерево, выгорало масло - но огонь поддерживался вечно Разве ты не чувствуешь его тут - везде? Разве в себе

не ощущаешь ты его чистого пламени? Кто дал тебе эту нежную душу - ты можешь сказать, что эта душа - твоя? (протягивает руку к звездам) Привет тебе мой далекий, мой неизвестный друг!

Маруся Я пойду в жизнь

С Н Иди! Ты погибнешь, как погиб Николай, как погибнут все, кому душой своею суждено поддерживать вечный огонь Но в гибели твоей ты обретешь бессмертие К звездам!

Петя Ты плачешь, отец? Дай поцеловать мне руку. Дай!

Маруся Я пойду. Как святыню сохраню я то, что осталось от Николая - его мысль, его чуткую любовь, его нежность Пусть снова и снова убивают его во мне - высоко над головой понесу я его чистую, непорочную душу

С Н Привет тебе мой далекий, мой неизвестный друг!

Петя (повторяет) Привет тебе мой далекий, мой неизвестный друг!

Маруся (повторяет) Привет тебе мои далекии, мои неизвестный друг!

Занавес

60 Четвертый акт

Декорация 3-его действия Солнечное утро Силицын нервно расхаживает по балкону, со стороны солнца и часто глядит вверх и потом на часы В Н просматривает бумаги Евмен, также нервно, как и Силицын, расхаживает взад и вперед и смотрит на часы Снизу вбегает Петя

Петя (громко) Папа, а толпа растет!

Евмен (загораживая дорогу) Ну-ну, чего там? Ну, народ и народ.

В. Н Евмен, вы все сделали?

Евмен Так точно. Ворота закрыты, сторож и садовник там

Петя А отчего ты не позвал полицию, папа?

В. Н Пустяки Ничего не будет

Петя (тихо) Евмен, а у меня револьвер

Евмен У меня тоже! Сунься-ка

Петя Я буду стрелять вверх

Евмен Вот еще, порох изводить Надо прямо в голову, чего их, дураков, жалеть

Петя А мне страшновато А вам?

Евмен А мне чего? А вы только потише, не (нрзб) Время серьезное

Петя А отчего у вас руки трясутся?

Евмен Руки-то? А кто их знает? Время-то серьезное а вдруг оно и не состоится?

Петя Вот так астроном! Как-то может оно не состоится

Сил. (с балкона) Тридцать две минуты

В Н Как небо?

61 Сил Пока хорошо, В. Н , Бог даст, пройдет хорошо

В Н Я уверен в этом

Входят Верховцев и Анна

Верх Вот как тут у вас Недурно!

Евмен Папиросу бросьте

Верх А что?

Евмен А то Пожару наделайте, да и так нехорошо, аппарату вредно

Анна Какой вы грубый, Евмен

Евмен Какой есть В В , прикажите им бросить папиросу Ту не конюшня. А то вон наружу идите

В. Н. Евмен, оставьте В А в покое

Верх В. Н ' А нам стеклышек (нрзб) не найдется? тоже и нам любопытно
В Н Возьмите у Силицына В. В , дайте им
Издали слышен гул толпы
Верх Ого' Суетные-то заботы - беспокоятся А что они не помешают вам, уважаемый звездочет? Я видел там (нрзб) весьма предосудительного свойства И даже с кольями
Петя (беспокоино) Папа, хочешь, я по телефону вызову полицию?
Анна И по-моему следовало бы Мало ли что может случиться
В Н Нет, пустяки Это продлится несколько минут и в крайнем случае успеют только сломать ворота
Верх Верно' А полиция только ускорит процесс
Евмен. Да она и сама боится И чего, говорит, ваш барин пугается? Одно беспокойство Дураки'
62 Сил Двадцать одна минута Гг , вы мешаете В Н
Верх Пойдемте на балкон Мы сейчас уйдем, не волнуйтесь
Верх , Анна и Петя выходят на балкон
Верх. Однако, народу-то порядочно Взгляните, Анна'
Анна И подумать, что все это - несчастные невежды Сколько их Вот где сразу видишь, что нужны книги, книги, книги
Петя Они парламентера присылали для переговоров чтобы не было затмения А Евмен, он такой грубый, чтобы поговорить, побил его
Верх. Ваш Евмен образцово глуп
Петя. Он очень предан папе и любит астрономию
Анна Как они машут кольями И смотрите, еще идут, это целая осада
Сил Семнадцать минут'
Верх Да и теперь полиция не поможет
Петя Однако, жутко' У меня холод по спине
Верх Вот что, Анна Вы ступайте-ка вниз, успокойте там и я побуду здесь Отсюда удобнее смотреть
Анна Я не пойду
Верх (сухо) Я прошу вас
Петя А где Маруся? Вы не знаете?
Верх Черт ее знает, где Пропала
Сил Четырнадцать минут
Верх Идите, Анна
Анна Я боюсь за вас
Верх Какие глупости' Ничего со мною не будет'
63 Анна Но ведь это дикари, Верховцев Для них нет ничего святого
Верх Это вы того, жизнь, что ли, называете святынею? Тронут, но еще более удивлен Не мешало бы нам, Анна, смотреть на вещи потрезвее. Здесь две стороны весьма почтенныи и безобидный астроном, которому нужно наблюдать затмение, и группа быть может также ничтожных но невежественных и глупых людей, которые желают ему в этом невинном занятии помешать Я, конечно, на стороне астронома - а вы идите вниз, потому что помочь ничем не можете, а мешать будете
Анна Вы не любите меня, Верховцев
Верх А вы, Анна, не уважаете здравого смысла это гораздо хуже
Сил Одиннадцать минут'
Анна Хорошо, я ухожу - но только берегите себя, Валентин'
Верх Хорошо, хорошо Я ценю мою шкуру, вероятно, не меньше, чем вы ее цените
Анна Я боюсь'

Верховцев пожимает плечами и отворачивается
Гул толпы возрастает

Анна Если вас убьют, я

Верх Ну-с?

Анна Я ухожу Дайте мне руку

Верх Извольте

Анна трясет руку и, оглядываясь на него, уходит Вбегает Петя, бледный

Петя В. А ' сторож сказал они пробрались по ту сторону сада, там низкая ограда, он уже видел несколько человек в саду.

Верх Так что же?

Петя Останьтесь здесь Я боюсь

Верх Да я останусь

64 Петя Я дам вам свой револьвер

Верх У меня есть А вы, Петенька, в случае чего, не вздумайте сантиментальничать Вы стрелять умеете?

Петя Немножко умею

Верх Ну, так цельте в живот Понимаете? А то берете вверх

Петя Я не хотел убивать

Верх Ну, мало ли что вы не хотели Эй, Евмен' Ты, почтенный, загородил бы дверь внизу

Евмен Загорожено

Верх А чего это у тебя руки дрожат? Струсил?

Евмен (сурово) Что? (Уходит)

Сил. Восемь минут, В Н., восемь минут'

В Н. Я знаю

Верх А вы знаете, коллега, что ваше положение довольно серьезное?

Сил Да, да, как же

Верх А вы понимаете, о чем я говорю?

Сил. Да, да, как же Небо чисто, В Н., слава Богу' Но я не в состоянии двигать руками так дрожат

Верх Вы бы валерьянки выпили

Сил. Пил' Два раза' Ничего не поможет' Шесть минут, господа

В. Н Вам пора, В В

Занимают места В Н у рефрактора, Силицын у фотографического аппарата

Верх (закуривая папиросу) Кажется, кого-то бьют

Петя Да, да Какой ужас (Закрывает лицо)

Верх Кого бы это? Ничего не разберешь за деревьями

Петя Кто-то приехал, я видел извощика

65 Верх Очень удачный визит. Ничего не понимаю Кажется, стихало

Петя (покачнувшись) Мне страшно

Верх Какой вы трус, Петя Как не стыдно, вы должны защищать отца, а как раскисаете

Петя Мне страшно'

Верх Ну вот' Эх'

Петя Я на смерти

Евмен Три минуты

Петя Мне вдруг представилось что-то Эти люди Я вдруг понял Ведь это ужас Что они хотят? Что они хотят?

Верх Вы видите, что они хотят

Петя Да, да Но что же это? Какая-то тьма поднимается оттуда Что же это? Сейчас будет темно, и что не от затмения Это оттуда идет Снизу Мне страшно

Внизу торопливый стук в дверь

Петя (почти кричит) Идут'
Верх Да нет же, это кто-нибудь свой, по делу Евмен, пойдите, там стучат
Евмен Я никого не пущу Две минуты
Верх Если ты не пойдешь, я тебя сейчас спущу с лестницы, старого болвана Значит нужно, если стучат
Евмен идет Постукивание часового механизма, возрастающий тревожный гул толпы Внизу голоса
Вбегает Шмидт, платье порвано, на лице кровь
66 Шмидт (кричит) Спасайтесь' Толпа идет' Спасайтесь'
В Н Евмен, уберите этого молодого человека, он мешает
Верховцев вытаскивает Шмидта на балкон
Верх (грубо) Чего орете? Однако разукрасили вас
Шмидт (машет руками) Спасайтесь' Вас хотят уби
Верх. (зажимает ему рот рукою) Ну и гарнизон'
Петя (нервно хохочет) Шмидт. Вот кого не ожидал
Верх Если вы не будете орать, я вас отпущу А то свяжу руки и рот заткну платком
Шмидт (махнет головою, когда Верх опускает руку) Не буду Но вас хотят убивать Я слышал это в городе, но не поверил и поехал сюда, но меня чуть не убили
Верх У вас есть оружие?
Шмидт Нет, я не умею стрелять
Верх Шли бы вы назад
Шмидт (энергично) Ни за что Там меня опять убьют.
Петя (смеется) Какой смешной'
Евмен Тридцать секунд
Верх (невольно говорит тише) Нелепый вы человек, Шмидт Трус, а лезете, куда не нужно Сидели бы в своем тихом немецком семействе
Шмидт Человек должен быть смелым Но я никогда не оправлюсь от этого потрясения Что они сделали со мною' Они хватили меня за горло, разорвали галстух, жилет Кто-то очень сильный ударил меня по лицу
Евмен Десять секунд
Шмидт (тише) Но тогда я вдохновился и сказал милостивые люди,
67 меня послал сюда губернатор, чтобы не было затмения
Евмен Одна секунда
Верх Жаль, что вас не убили
Шмидт Но
Верх Тише'
В первую минуту уменьшения света почти незаметно Потом свет гускнеет и в течении дальнейшего доходит до полной темноты
Петя Темнеет'
Верх Пока не чувствую Шмидт, нате стекло, глядите
Шмидт покорно берет стекло
Петя А вы?
Верх Меня больше интересует земля
Шмидт Я не могу смотреть, у меня прыгает
Верх (прислушиваясь) Что же они там?
Голоса смутные. Ломай, чего глядишь?
Сюда, сюда
Бей его'
Ворота вали Давай нам Скорее'

Выстрел

Верх Началось'
Петя Темнеет'
Шмидт Они идут, я видел людей с этой стороны Между деревьями
Рев Несколько выстрелов Верховцев вынимает и
68 осматривает револьвер./ Слышен треск чего-то ломающегося
Верх Петя, сами не можете стрелять, спрячьтесь куда-нибудь
Петя (решительно) Нет, не могу (вынимает револьвер) Сейчас стемнеет, они не найдут входа
Шмидт Я боюсь'
Голоса близкие Ребята, вали сюда
Давай топор
Сюда Вот они
Ломай'
Внизу удары, трески В стену ударит камень
Где-то звенит стекло.
Верх. Евмен' Стреляйте в каждого, кто будет подниматься по лестнице
Евмен Знаю
Внезапная темнота Зажигаются звезды
Верх Ну, здесь нам нечего делать Туда' Петя, где вы? Как темно.
Петя Я здесь
Верх Не трусьте В живот, в живот стреляйте
Ломают двери Рев, отдельных криков не слышно
В Н (кричит) Что же это' Задержите их на несколько минут'
Верх Постараюсь
Треск прекращается По лестнице грузный топот
Ряд выстрелов, падение тяжелого, крики боли
Голос Ай, батюшки, убили'
Голос Они убивают народ Вали их Бей'
Голос Ай, батюшки
Верх Нет, подожди'
Выстрел, падение тела, новые крики
Петя У меня все патроны'
Верх Бегите' Нет, подожди' А ты, вот так'
Выстрел
Евмен Дьяволы' Стой'
69 Голос. А ты, вот - он Р-раз'
Падают тела Хрип Крики сдавленные В темноте что-то мечется.
В. Н (кричит) Только три минуты' Три минуты'
Сил (кричит) Что вы де . ай'
Верх Не могу У меня один патрон Бегите' На, получи, скотина Бегите'
Треск ломающего дерева, разбиваемых стекол
Голос Ломай' Все ломай' Р-раз'
Голос Круши'
Голос Чтобы камня не осталось от дьяволова гнезда
Голос. Убийцы' Отравители'
Голос Погасили солнце' Нет, живыми не дадимся А это кто, ну?
В Н (гневно) Не смей трогать моих стекол'
Голос Ага'
Удар, падение тела Внизу частные выстрелы и разбегающиеся крики страха

Голос Ребята, наших бьют Начали'
Голос Спаси, Господи'
Голос Конец, Господи' Спасайся, ребята Конец пришел' Обсерватория пустеет Внизу редкие выстрелы, крики Удаляются Слышно становится, как тикает уцелевший механизм Внезапно вспыхивает свет, необыкновенно яркий после тьмы Картина разрушения, несколько трупов Свет становится ярче Пауза
Евмен ((нрзб), поднимает окровавленную качающуюся голову, тупо смотрит) Вот оно, солнце-то' (Падает)
Голос Верховцева Петя, где вы' Петя Петя'
Занавес

20 октября 1905

Леонид Андреев "К звездам" (Вариант первого действия)
Рукопись Институт русской литературы (Пушкинский дом)
Р III Оп I № 49

1 10 октября 1905

Дело происходит в небольшом городке с знаменитой обсерваторией, / / (1) голод, болезни, бунты Астроном (Всеволод) (2) Николаевич, европейская знаменитость (нрзб), член / / и академии 54 года
Помощники Силицын, 26
Евмен
/ / Ольга Андреевна (урожденная графиня 50) (2)
Николай (вольноопределяющийся, на воине) (2), 24
Петр, 18 л
Анна, 26 л
Маруся Невеста Николая, 18 л
Верховцев, с-д или эсер, друг Петра, влюбленный в Анну 30 л
Шмидт
Старуха
Толпа

1

Обрыв. Слева спадающей черной линией уходят куда-то вниз здания, в некоторых смутные огоньки. Впереди, на авансцене, кустики / / листки из-за кулис выглядывают голые узловатые ветви - ранняя осень За низкой линией обрыва - огромное пространство неба с царящею на нем кометой Внизу небо мутнеет и почти сливается с землей Люди - в виде черных странных силуэтов на фоне неба

2 Первое действие

Апрельский вечер, часов 9 Высокий обрыв недалеко от обсерватории, обычное место гулянья для городской публики Слева уходят вниз два-три дома, в одном желтеет мутный огонек Справа (нрзб) небольшие, еще голые деревцы, две скамейки Над всем - огромное пространство неба с несколькими бледными звездочками и огромной царящей кометой Внизу, у линии земли, и люди кажутся маленькими черными силуэтами на фоне неба Разбросанные кучки людей, смотревших вверх, тихий говор, прерываемый частыми паузами и длительными вздохами
Старческий голос Да расточатся врази твои, Господи Спаси Господи, и помилуй
Молодой женский голос Спаси и помилуй, Господи Страшно как'
Кто-то Погоди еще не то будет' Вчера она меньше была
Первый молодой голос Да Вчера она вот докуда была, а нынче на все небо раскинулась
Женский голос Что же это будет? Господи'
Пауза
Старческий голос Трудно жить
3 Первый молодой голос Страшно жить
Женский голос. Господи'
Второй старческий голос У нас хлеба нет
Женский голос. У нас больны все
Первый молодой голос Куда пойти?
Пауза

---

(1) Первый лист рукописи сохранился не полностью Тремя точками / . / указаны отсутствующиеся части рукописи
(2) Зачеркнуто Андреевым

Первый старик Чем прогневали мы Господь?
Детский голос Тятенька, я звезды боюсь
Грубый голос Молчи, девочка, молчи, милая Сейчас домой пойдем
Детский голос Тятенька, я звезды боюсь, какая страшная'
Грубый голос. Ну, поидем, пойдем, какая глупая'
Суровый голос Вот говоришь ты чем прогневали мы Господь? А ворует кто? А кто пьянствует? А кто Бога забыл? Вот и воздвиг Он свое знамение
Первый старик Не вор я, голубчик, и не пьяница я Спина у меня кривая, руки у меня мозолистые - рад бы согрешить, да ведь некогда
Суровый голос В церковь не ходишь. Богу не молишься
Первый старик Милый мой, да ведь некогда' У людей хоть праздник есть
Второй женский голос (перебивает) Вот и брожу я, вот и хожу я, день да ночь, день да ночь Удавилась бы, да силы нет, греха боюсь Выгнал он меня и домой не велел приходить, а дома горшки, а дома дети Вот и брожу я, вот и хожу я Тоскою сердце сжимается, удавилась бы я, да силы нету
Первыи женский голос Господи, Господи'
4 Суровыи голос Муж бьет?
Второй женскии голос Да Озверел совсем Ногами бил, коленом бил, все волосы повыдергал. (нрзб) мое телушко, высосал мою кровушку. А тут и совсем и прогнал уходи, а придешь назад, в конец убью' Вот и хожу я, места ищу
Суровый голос Вот он - грех-то наш'
Первый старик Ты бы к соседям шла Приютили бы
Второй женский голос И у соседей была, и в поле была, и где я только не была, православные Вчера в поле сижу я на камне, а тут звезда взошла, а я и говорю ей звездушка, милая, вот тебя люди страшатся, боятся, а я тебе рада Пади ты на голову мою непокрытую, сожги ты сердце горемычное
Негодующий голос Взял бы я звезду эту за голову, да хвостом бы ее как помелом дьявольским, по всей земле гори все' Гори все, когда правды нет Гори до последнего'
Суровый голос Правда у Бога'
Негодующий голос Вот он и послал (нрзб) Надоело и Богу смотреть, как тут дьявол ворочает'
Второй женский голос Вот и брожу я, вот и хожу я (уходит)
Суровый голос Но к ночи будь сказано Молчал бы ты, паренек, не поминал бы нечистого
Негодующий голос А кто же, как не он, все и делает' Отдана, братцы, земля дьяволу, царюет он над ней повсеместно Пойди ты в город их анафемский, погляди на дома их окаянные вездето он из окошек выглядывает, да подманывает, да подхихикивает
Женский голос Господи, Господи'
5 Суровый голос Брось Не пугай народ'
Первый старик И так напуганы, перепуганы Брось, миленький, не (нрзб) людей
Женскии голос Ай'
Голоса Чего ты? - Кто кричит? - Что случилось там?
Женский голос Так, почудилось Я домои пойду Проводи меня, Аннушка, возьми за руку Как вдвоем идешь (Уходят)
Первыи старик Напуган таки'
Негодующии голос А слыхали вы, что она идет?
Суровый голос Ты опять свое Посдержался бы
Негодующий голос Идет она Писали мне Молчат об неи

Первый старик (также шепотом) А где она?
Негодующий голос Да близко уж
Женский голос О Господи! Конец пришел
Кто-то И я слыхал Идет сюда Косой косит, как рожь валит
Второй старческий голос А хлеба нет
Кто-то А хлеба нет
Первый старик О Господи!
Второй старческий голос А хлеба нет
Кто-то Хлеб есть Он заперт весь
Второй мужской голос Где?
Старик Заперт?
Второй старик. Кем?
Голоса Молчи! - Молчи!
Первый старик О Господи! Конец пришел
Пауза Некоторые тихо уходят
6 Мужик Вой стоит у нас над деревнею Воют, воют - мы как окаменные. Горюшко, горюшко!
Суровый голос В деревне худо
Первый старик Чего уж там!
Женский голос И лес кругом Вот жить не стала бы
Мужик Воют, воют псы, как сбесились И бабы все, горе чистое Как взойдет она, как завоют псы - так с двора бабий плач пойдет Позажмурятся, закачаются - и начнут вопить, (нрзб) грустные
Второй мужик И скотина ревет
Первый мужик Ну, то с голоду Вот беда пришла, православные!
Суровый голос А зачем вы здесь? По делам пришли?
Второй мужик Лошадей привели, да вот третий день с ними маемся Не берет никто
Первый мужик (нрзб) Пропадать совсем
Кто-то Я сам мужик и средство дам, как вам избавиться, когда оно придет На духов день сгони всех баб, раздень их догола, напой их водкою Пусть взявшись за руки идут, поют слова зазорные А тои, что впереди, надень хомут и соху дай, пусть борозду ведет вокруг селения А сзади две, одна чтобы с образом, другая с хлеб-солью и по всему полю зажги костры - пусть прыгают
Первый мужик И с образом
Кто-то И с образом Не веришь, что ли? Мы делали
Женщина (тихо причитает, повторяясь) Сироты мы несчастные, закидыши мы горькие, на кого нас покинули, на кого нас оставили Люта тоска сердце грызет, не глядели бы на свет (нрзб) Сироты мы несчастные, закидыши мы горькие
7 Кто-то из пришедших Какая страшная! Иван, ты где? Иди сюда
Суровый голос А они смехом смеются
Наивный голос Кто?
Первый молодой голос Они Не знаешь, что ли?
Второй старик Молчи Что зря болтать?
Суровый голос И так молчишь
Женщина (тихо причитает) Сироты мы несчастные, закидыши мы горькие
Высокий, костлявый, без шапки (провожаемый неясным говором входит в толпу) А! И здесь народ!
Кто-то Сюда пришел!
Молодой голос Боюсь его!
Кто-то Пойдем домой!

Молодой голос Да уж послушаем
Женщина На кого нас покинули, на кого нас оставили
Высокий Молчи, баба Эй, молчите все Ну'
Первый старик Чего кричишь?
Высокий И буду кричать На весь мир буду кричать, чтобы все слышали, чтоб они слышали Ограбили' Обидели' Все жилы повымотали' Эй, послушайте' Я все понимаю
Кто-то Да говори, видишь - слушаем
Высокий Я все понимаю От книги вся неправда Были люди равны, а выдумал дьявол книгу, и стали господа Это верно, я все понимаю, я сына из дому выгнал
Второй молодой. У кого деньги, тот и господин
Высокий Молчи' Неверно Барин тот, у кого книга Научи собаку читать, она с собаками жить не захочет
Голос Верно' - не захочет' - Да у них и собаки другие'
8 Высокий А я что говорю? От книги все
Чей-то голос Евангелие тоже книга
Высокий Неверно' Христос книг не писал, это после придумали А Христос книг проклял книжники вы, говорит, и фарисеи Я все понимаю У меня от сердца одна труха осталась Вот я кто'
Женщина Сироты мы горемычные
Высокий Молчи, баба' Книги у меня сына отняли Какой был сын Золото' Молчал я Терпел Ждал А потом - выгнал - иди, говорю, и не ворочайся Был ты мне сын, а стал (нрзб) злой Проклинаю'
Женский голос Господи' Сын-то'
Высокий Неверно' Нет у меня сына. Чего ты, говорит, отец, обижаешься? Я такой же, как был - Врешь, рожа не та' У меня рожа человеческая, а у тебя господская - Я, отец, кормить тебя буду Кормить? Нет, шалишь, откуда у тебя хлеб? Награбил? Не хочу я твоего дьяволова хлеба Кормить буду' У меня у самого руки есть А (1)

---

(1) Здесь рукопись обрывается

Леонид Андреев "К звездам" (Вариант сцен) Рукопись
Институт русской литературы (Пушкинский дом) Р III Оп I № 51

1 Над обрывом несколько молчаливых силуэтов - смотрят
Мужчина в шляпе и накидке Здесь хорошо видно В городе дома - мешают Вы не устали? Постоим немного здесь
Дама Какой ужасный год! Война, голод, болезни, всякие ужасы, и тут еще эта комета
Мужчина Какие пустяки, Настасья Петровна. Неужели вы верите?
Дама. Она мне действует на нервы. Конечно, я знаю, что все это пустяки, просто звезды и ничего тут нет опасного, но понимаете, когда нервы и так расстроены Вы знаете, у Лидочки муж, кажется, убит?
Мужчина Какой Лидочки?
Дама. Впрочем, вы ее не знаете Это моя подруга по гимназии, только год назад вышла замуж Вы посмотрите, какой у нее хвост!
Мужчина Похоже на меч Только все это пустяки Комета и комета, их много бывает
Дама А почему она пришла именно теперь?
Мужчина. Простое совпадение
Дама Ну да, а почему она всегда приходит при каком-нибудь несчастьи? Нет, не говорите Вчера ночью я отдернула занавеску - так это ужас! Тишина, все спят и этот ужас Я разбудила Ивана Алексеевича
Мужчина Вот небойсь ругался
Дама Да вы все шутите, а посмотрели бы, что с нашей прислугой делается Плачут, молятся, Анисья в деревню просится, уверена,
2 что это начинается/ светопреставление
Мужчина. А у меня окна, к сожалению, в другую сторону Ничего не видно Вчера мы с крыши пробовали смотреть, да Архамольская колокольня мешает
Голос в толпе, испуганно Эх-хе-хе! Господи, Батюшка Помилуй нас, Господи!
Дама. Собака наша всю ночь воет. Нет, я не могу, пойдемте отсюда
Мужчина Животные всегда беспокоятся, когда какие-нибудь знамения Это пустяки
Дама Вам все пустяки, а по-моему животные иногда бывают умнее человека Вы можете узнать вашего директора по запаху?
Мужчина смеется Уходят В толпе неясный говор
Первый молодой А может она на землю упасть?
Второй молодой А кто ее знает? Должно, может
1-ый молодой Тогда ведь сгорит все
2-ой молодой (нрзб), милый Ну и пускай горит! Нам-то что? Это вот его высокородию есть что беречь, да и то поди застраховано (силуэт в шляпе молча отходит) А нам-то что? Ох! Будь моя сила, взял бы я эту барыню за голову, да хвостом бы, как помелом, по земле! Гори все!
Старик Верно Прежде хоть в деревне с голоду дохли, а нынче и во городе на туже стать пошло. Город! Вчера (нрзб) курицу продавать, так насилу за двугривенный отдал
1-ый молодой А мне жалко, если все сгорит
Старик Воистину прогневался Господь! Смотри, какое воздвинул знамение на страх человекам
3 Кто-то Греха много
Пауза
2-ой молодой Нынче публикацию читали ежели кто найдет собаку,

по кличке Моську, там тому будет дано 10 р
Кто-то Ничего не боятся За собаку-то - 10 р '
2-ой молодой Чего им бояться Сами себе господа'
1-ый молодой А церкви тоже сгорят?
Пауза Приближается низкий, лохматый, что-то на плече Тихо
Низкий Работки нету?
2-ой молодой. Ты, дядя, очумел? Какая тебе работа?
Низкий Дровоколы мы Два дня хожу (нрзб) уморился На хлебушко нету. Работки не найдется, а?
2-ой молодой А ты поди собаку поищи, 10 целковых получишь Собака вот у господ пропала
Низкий Собак много, разве ее найдешь?
2-ой молодой А ты ее покличь Мосинька, Мосинька' (хохочет)
Низкий Так нету, говоришь, работы?
Старик Чего грохочешь, бездельник? Бога не боишься?
Кто-то Греха-то сколько, Господи, Господи' Народу-то пропадает, Господи' Вот мы тут стоим, балагурим, папироски курим, а там тысячи убивают А тут она еще идет
1-ый молодой (любопытно) Какая она?
Старик (сурово) Не знаешь, так молчи Не обо всем зубами ляскай'
1-ый молодой Вот животное тоже воет отчего оно воет?
Тихий (подходит) А вот еще слышал я, братцы вы мои родные,
4 будто затеяли господа весь простой народ изничтожить тесно, говорят, жить стало и дух плохой
2-ой молодой Пустое говоришь А работать кто будет?
Тихий А работать будто машины
2-ой молодой При машине - тоже человек нужен
Тихий Не знаю, милый, как тебя, может кого и оставят А только лишнего народу много стало Вот они и войну затеяли, а теперь вот голод Хлеба-то много, то однако он в подземельи спрятан и солдаты его караулят Кто билет предъявит, тому дают, а без билета нет А потому как народ (нрзб) ослабнет, они ее пустят
1-ый молодой Кого?
Тихий Ее, говорю, пустят
5 Первый голос Господи' Какое чудище'
Второй голос Да Эта с тобой разговаривать не станет
Третий голос А она туда больше стала Вчера вот до этого места была, а нынче на все небо раскинулась' Гляди, гляди'
1-ый голос Вижу Что же это? Кончина мира, что ли?
2-ой голос А кто ее знает Может и кончина Разве кто знает?
Тонкий голос. Думал я, тимофеевские амбары горят Взлез на крышу, взглянул и Господи ты Боже мой' Как и скатился, не помню
6 2-ой голос Скатится'
1-ый голос (со вздохом) Да, да Сколько лет на свете живу, а такого страха не видал Нет
2-ой голос То ли еще будет
Тонкий голос А что, дядя, будет?
2-ой голос Других спроси, а я не знаю
1-ый голос. Не знаешь, а говоришь Зачем народ пугать
2-ой голос Не я пугаю, а она пугает А свое время придет, тогда и увидишь
Женский голос Надо бы по всем церквам молебни По всей земле

2-ой голос Служили

Пауза

Авторитетный голос Старики рассказывают, что перед войною это

Пауза

1-ый голос Сколько на земле страху' Живут люди, живут, ничего не знают, а тут вдруг этакая, и за что? Кому надо?

2-ой голос Значит надо

Тонкий голос. А может она на землю упасть?

Авторитетный голос Может Подойдет близко и готово

2-ой голос А тебе жалко?

3-ий голос Что же это будет? Господи

Тонкий голос Как-то не жалко Конечно жалко Странны люди, странны

2-ой голос А чего выстрелил?

Тонкий голос Как чего? Мало ли чего.

Молодой голос Вот вы говорите жалко Конечно, постройки
7 там/ разные, и все это - а будь моя сила, взял бы эту звезду за голову, да хвостом я, хвостом ее, как помелом по всеи земле Гори все' Гори до последнего'

Возмущенные голоса Что говоришь Бога побойся
Грех-то какой'
Кто это говорит? Звезду-то' И так страшна, а он
Пойти домой Тут (нрзб)' Народ'

Тонкий голос (удивленно) Какие люди бывают'

Авторитетный голос Оттого Господь и знамение свое воздвиг, что перестали его бояться Вот какие вот выскакивают, а ты за них в ответе

Молодой голос Дикий вы народ' Ну вас совсем, и с звездою с вашею

Авторитетный голос Полегче, смотри, как бы чего не вышло'

Молодой голос Ей-Богу, тоска'

1-ый голос А другим, думаешь, легче? Вот ты рассуждаешь, а ты погляди глазами ведь что же это' Ведь это же кончина' Ты говоришь помирать Помирать не страшно, а ты вот пойми за что это? Кому надо? Ну живу я, никого не трогаю, а тут вдруг она Ну, кому это надо?

2-ой голос А они смеются

3-ий голос Как не смеяться'

2-ой голос Боишься, говорит, Иван, звезды? Не то чтобы боюсь, говорю, а страшно Ну то-то, смотри, говорит, (нрзб)

1-ый голос Шутят'

3-ий голос Смеются'

Авторитетный голос Им-то что' Они вывернутся

Тонкий голос Ну, как вывернуться Небоись не вывернешься
8 Авторитетный голос А так и вывернутся Они свое знают, у тебя спрашивать не пойдут

1-ый голос Что же это будет, Господи' Куда пойти? Домой пойдешь - бабы воют - (нрзб) жуткая И хлеба нет Кому надо?

Кто-то в толпе. Хлеба нет Нет хлеба, это верно

1-ый голос Я и говорю кому это надо? Вот она стоит - а кому это надо?

Авторитетный голос Богу почаще молись, вот что У простого человека только и есть, что Бог

1-ый голос И молюсь, и молюсь Да что'

2-ой голос Помирать надо, вот и все Что толковать'

Пауза

Кто-то А слыхал я, что все это нарочно

Тонкий Что нарочно?

Кто-то Да вот это - звезда А потом голод будет и мор

Авторитетный голос Ну?

Кто-то А потом по три дня и по три ночи темноту по всей земле пустят Тогда и порешать - в темноте-то

Чей-то голос Что говоришь!

2-ой голос Я и говорю, помирать надо

Авторитетный голос Это и я слыхал, это правда Идет она, от моря идет

Тонкий голос От моря! Господи!

Пауза

Голоса Пойдем домой
И я. Господи!
Погоди, и я Вместе-то веселее
9 Теперь озолоти меня, чтобы ночью одному на двор выйти - не выйду Ну ее
Да и страшно же! Откуда это только берется?
У Бога всего много Идем!
А что завтра будет? Доживем ли?

Уходят

Молодой голос Как погляжу я на все это, так выть хочется, как собака Кто со мною в трактир? (Уходит)

Авторитетный голос Уходи-ка, уходи Не место тебе тут

Горбатый А у нас так делали. На духов день - согнали всех баб в селе, раздели их догола и пьяными напоили И чтобы ручка за ручку, а две бабы, одна с образом, а другая с хлебом-солью А одну запрягли в соху и нужно чтобы вокруг всего села борозду И тоже нужно по всему полю костры и чтобы они через костры прыгали Через эту борозду она перейти не может

Тонкий голос Да - ну? И помогло?

Горбатый Кто ее знает? Много народу померло, а отчего неизвестно

Авторитетный голос Глупости это Невежество деревенское

Горбатый Кто ее знает Однако, сказывают, в других местах помогло

Суровый голос Передушить бы их всех, дьяволов!

1-ый голос Вот то же и это кому надо? Живут люди по шалости своей, а тут прошла она и давай косить За что?

Авторитетный голос Греха много

1-ый голос А если греха много, так надо рассудить А она всех крутит без разбору Кому надо? Вот тоже у меня на той неделе двое ребят померли затрепыхались(?), затрепыхались - и померли А отчего неизвестно Жили, жили - и померли Так и померли, да Что же, может и правду говорят люди
10 пора/кончаться миру

Тонкий голос А правда, что который человек на себя руки положит, тот в ад пойдет? У нас кровельщик на сеновале удавился

Авторитетный голос Правда А отчего удавился? С пьяну?

Тонкий голос Нет Задушиваться стал, а тут эта самая - звезда

3-ий голос Много она беды наделает! Господи, Господи!

Пауза

Кто-то Вот ты и живи, как хочешь Облегло тебя, как тучею

2-ой голос И помирать не смей Ну это погоди, она свое покажет

Чей-то голос Что же это Боже мой, Боже мой!

Детский голос Тятенька, я звезды боюсь Страшная такая (Плачет)
Авторитетный голос Вот еще голова ребенка приволок Тут и
Чей-то голос Ну, ну, пойдем Не плачь, говорю, пойдем Она ничего, она добрая
Детский голос Боюсь
1-ый голос Может, оставить не на кого, вот и приволок
Авторитетный голос Ну и сидел бы дома Небойсь, и там видно
Тонкий голос На люди-то, дяденька, тянет Дома еще хуже Дома теперь от одних баб сбежишь Что это за народ такой, Господи!
Неизвестный (с приятностью) Хорошо бы сейчас пожарчик
Голоса Что? Кто это?
Неизвестный Да нет, это я так пожарчик бы хорошо, говорю Подложить бы эго солонки, керосинцем полить, ну там, тряпочек, что ли, это как кто понимает
Авторитетный голос Да ты шутишь?
Неизвестный Да я ничего, я что же Так говорю, смешно это конечно Или вот то же еще хорошо бы
11 Тонкий голос Ну?
Голос Договаривай! Это еще откуда?
Неизвестный Да я ничего, так к слову пришлось. Зверинец тут стоит, приехал
Голос Ну?
Неизвестный Так зверей бы выпустить. Свернуть на клетках замки да выпустить Замок у них дешевый, я видел
Пауза (1)

---

(1) Здесь обрывается рукопись

APPENDIX 2

Леонид Андреев "Из глубины веков" (Отрывки)
Е Янтарев, "О Леониде Андрееве", Лит -худ альманах "Утро", кн 1, (Л.1927), стр 245-247

245 И лицо его было прекрасно

Глубокой ночью, когда погаснет свет, и тьма полуночи разрушит чары времен, раскрой широко глаза и смотри долго, и смотри долго Заволнуется бесшумно мрак и родит из себя бледный и печальный образ, бледный, печальный и строгий, как песок пустыни, побеленный луной Тускло взглянут на тебя огромные глаза, и смутен и призрачен будет строгий и прекрасный вид - ведь тысячи лет прошло с тех пор, как умер владыка мира, могучий и славный царь

246 Он был красив и силен, и ясен умом, но ему захотелось быть мудрым мудростью бога - и он убил свою темную, человеческую душу. Он долго боролся с ней, пока победил Он сделал ее рабыней и положил на нее ярмо и цепи, и она плакала, как плачут рабы, и пела песню на чуждом и странном языке - и в этих слезах и в этих загадочных песнях хранила свободу Он выколол ей очи и язык вырвал - но звоном цепей она отравляла тишину ночей его Тогда он поразил ее смертью и над трупом ее воздвиг дивный саркофаг стройных мыслей, светлых желаний и чувств

На восьмой день, когда уже дольше они не могли ждать, они все сразу пошли к жене царя, самой любимой из всех жен, просить у нее помощи и защиты Так еще молода она была, что у нас ты назвал бы ее девочкой, а там была она женщиной и царицей это было давно, тысяча лет прошло с тех пор, как она умерла, и никто не скажет, как она была прекрасна Но взгляни на прозрачное небо, когда на нем только что показался остророгий месяц, прислушивайся звездной ночью, как тихо спит в колыбели твое дитя, переживи снова твою печаль о прекрасном и чистом - и ты можешь сказать я видел молодую и прекрасную царицу, ту, что умерла ужасною смертью тысячу лет тому назад

Ничего не сказало ее сердце Ты видал людей веселые идут они по улице, смотрят на небо, смотрят на себя и радуются, и еще не успеет рассеяться на небе облачко, - этих людей несут по той же дороге назад, холодных, обезображенных, мертвых Смерть ждала их за углом, а они не знали и весело шли ей навстречу

Первоначальная редакция

Первым вышел самый старший и за ним остальные по порядку

Через час царь пожелал прогуляться по городу, и на высоких носилках его подняли рабы и понесли Народ гнул спины и приветственно кричал Вертелись между ног тощие голодные собаки, и горячий помет золотился на солнце И царь спокойно смотрел на собак, на помет, на безлицый, громко кричащий народ и шептал бескровными устами

- Рабы, рабы

Последняя редакция

Они вышли, и царь остался один Один в своей палате Один в городе Один в целом мире

- Рабы!

Глава У111

Далеко позади дворцов и храмов, осыпая их дождем золотисто-красных искр, позади приземистых и плоских жилищ народа и рабов, кутая их в лиловую дымку и совсем ровняя с землей, далеко за пределами песчаной почерневшей пустыни - опустилось в неведомую бездну гаснущее солнце Черный край земли уже вычерчивал на нем свою прямую и тяжелую линию, и видно было, как огромно оно, как пламенно и грозно И тишиной грядущей ночи дышало оно, и тихими стаями реяли над городом последние звуки, блаженно умирающего дня Где-то молились и пели жрецы, и сдержанной страстью, подобной гаснущему солнцу, темнели их низкие и глубокие голоса, внизу, на невидимых террасах, нежно и грустно рокотали струны многочисленных арф, и, возносясь над землей и городом, попирая ногами пышную красоту его храма
247 и песнопений, близкий/ к небу, равный солнцу, одинокий стоял на кровле своего дворца могучий и мудрый царь Огромными глазами царя он обнимал город, землю и небо, и тихой нежностью того, кто понял все, трепетало его царственное сердце Как мать, любил он прекрасную землю и как дитя свое, любил ее

Пусть спит спокойно в грядущей ночи и человек, и зверь, и камень Пусть спит спокойно в грядущей ночи все злое, все доброе, все мертвое и живое Усните спокойно, коварно красивые змеи, и в черных грезах жальте врагов Усните, рабы, и в сонном видении вновь переживайте ужасы бича и вновь мечтайте о свободе Усни, великая пустыня

А они, те, что внизу, томились и пели, и в неведомую бездну погрузилось солнце, тихою мглою убиралась земля, погасли золотистые искры на дворцах и храмах и бесследно исчезли во мраке плоские жилища народа и рабов Огромными тихими шагами бежала, согнувшись, высокая ночь и сдирала с неба его обманчивый, голубой покров обнаженное оно величаво сверкнуло на землю миллиардами своих таинственных миров, и грозным голосом самой бесконечности была его великая тишина и крохотными, рассеянными огоньками, одинокими, как души, ответил черный город

Ночь крепла Все ярче блистало небо и все темнее становилась земля утихли сонные звуки, один за другим умирали сонные огоньки, и усталая тьма обволакивала город Скоро в тишине и мраке исчез он совсем, как призрак, который является только днем, и, казалось, что у самых ног царя начинается молчаливый и бездонный провал и уходит в неведомую глубину И откуда-то из черной глубины, долетали к нему усталые звуки одинокой арфы Кому-то не спалось, кому-то было грустно Нежные пальцы блуждали по струнам, и струны мелодично звенели и посылали во тьму ту дивную, светло-правдивую речь души, для которой нет слов на живом человеческом языке Звенели струны, смеялись и плакали о чем-то

Кто-то умер Умолкла одинокая арфа Ночь полновластно владела землей и городом И всю ночь до утра над мрачной громадой безмолвного города неподвижно темнел одинокий силуэт человека К звездам было обращено его прекрасное и гордое лицо

(Списано с оригинала 25 августа 1904 г)

APPENDIX 3

Леонид Андреев "Царь"
Лит -худ альманах "Весна", № 1, (1908), стр 4

Он жил недолго, как всякий человек, и умер давно тысячи лет прошли с тех пор, как он умер, и вот от всей жизни его, от его царства и великих дел осталось в мире столько, сколько остается от громко сказанного слова Все поглотило великое безмолвие времени, и только странное имя его живет среди нас как призрак, лишенный плоти, как мертвец, безнадежно ищущий могилы И мне жаль его чуждое всем и никому не нужное, печально бродит оно по чуждой земле, среди чуждых людей, покорно является на редкий и равнодушный зов, - и снова уходит, печальное, одинокое, как мертвец, ищущий могилы

Гордое и несчастное имя, пусть останется оно добычею забвения Был царь Он жил недолго и умер давно Тысячи лет прошли с тех пор

У него было красивое и сильное тело, соразмерное во всех частях своих, и, лежал ли он спокойно, отдаваясь царственной думе, или бешено гнался за дикими зверями пустыни, всегда казалось, что музыка играет И лицо его было прекрасно Глубокой ночью, когда погаснет свет и тьма полуночи разрушит чары времен, раскрой широко глаза, и смотри долго Заволнуется бесшумно мрак и родит из себя бледный и печальный образ, бледный, печальный и строгий, как песок пустыни набеленный луною Тускло взглянут на тебя огромные глаза, и смутен и призрачен будет строгий и прекрасный лик - ведь тысячи лет прошли с тех пор, как он умер

Лучший из людей, он был властителем города лучшего из городов, какие стояли на земле Глубокою ночью, когда погаснет свет и тьма полуночи разрушит чары времени, уйди в пустыню и стань недвижимо, и слушай долго Вздрогнет безмолвие ночи и смутным гулом бесчисленных голосов всколыхнется зыбкий воздух пустыни Ликующие, смелые крики и яркий смех и протяжные долгие вопли, звон цепей, лязг оружия, воинственные и дикие завывания труб, голос женский и нежная песня, беспокойная, нежная песня о чем-то далеком-далеком о радости мгновенных встреч, о горечи вечной разлуки, о чьей-то жизни, о чьей-то смерти. Много скажет пустыня тому, кто понимает шорох песка, взметаемого ветром, и тревожный лепет гибкого тростника, кто в долгие часы одинокого раздумья внимал тысячеустому говору морской волны, болтливой хранительницы нераздельных тайн

Но бледны, но призрачны и печальны будут протяжные голоса - ведь тысячи лет прошли с тех пор, как умер большой и веселый город, и все, кто жили в нем

Остались безыменные камни На них греются под солнцем властительницы змеи, а ночью, когда луна озарит пустыню и к небу вознесет ее туманные границы, тяжелые камни сделаются воздушными и молчаливо-звонкими, как легкие сны, близкие к пробуждению И станут они рядами и примут личину величественных зданий и храмов, и черную тень бросят на голубой песок И неподвижные, округло-ломанные тени затрепещут призраком далекой и чуждой жизни в фантастических очертаниях своих они явят образ людей и животных, и много увидишь ты странно знакомых лиц, неподвижно распростертых на песке Есть там камень, исщербленный обломок колонны, он бессильно и тяжко оперся на другие округлые камни, и каждую ночь, когда светит луна, он послушно чертит на песке огромный и грозный образ умершего царя Вот прямая, строго прекрасная линия носа и лба, вот

скорбно стиснутые царственные губы, вот черная борода в округлых завитках - огромная, грозно красивая голова на гордо изогнутой шее

Так в таинственном полете времен роднится со смертью жизнь

Леонид Андреев

15 февраля 1904

APPENDIX 4

Леонид Андреев "Памяти Владимира Мазурина (Из частного письма) (СПб 1906)

2 Впервые узнал я Владимира Мазурина в той же Таганской тюрьме, в которой его повесили Среди других политических - большею частью молодых рабочих и студентов - он сразу выделялся энергичным лицом своим, смелою простотой и какой-то особенной внушительностью Заметно было, что не только на товарищей своих, но и на тюремную низшую администрацию он действовал покоряюще все его знали, все внимательно прислушивались, когда он говорил, и советовались с ним Тюремные сторожа, те самые, вероятно, что впоследствии строили для него эшафот, ласково называли его Володей, говорили о нем с улыбкой, ибо был он весел и любил шутить, - но и с некоторым опасением в то же время Спокойно и уверенно отводя других заключенных в их камеры после прогулки, Володю они мягко упрашивали, и случалось, что все уже заперты, а он один ходит по корридору и заглядывает к товарищам в окошечки подморгнет, весело покажет белые зубы и крикнет что-нибудь такое простое, дружеское, иногда смешное даже, отчего легче станет на сердце И чаще всего он забегал к новичкам И в других отношениях он заботился о товарищах доставал им бумагу, устраивал переписку с родными, снабжать "телефоном"

По виду Владимир Мазурин был скорее похож на рабочего, чем на студента, носил пиджак поверх синей рубахи и небольшой серый картузик Росту он был среднего, но широкоплеч, коренаст и, видимо, очень крепок и голос имел звучный и сильный И еще только пробивались борода и усы В Таганку он был переведен из Бутырской тюрьмы, где его с некоторыми товарищами подвергли зверскому избиению у одного из избитых началась чахотка, а Мазурин вообще стал слабее здоровьем и уте не мог петь А раньше пел

По утрам, когда тюрьма просыпалась, первым товарищи начинали выкликать Мазурина просто, должно быть, хотелось услыхать его всегда добрый и как-то звуком своим обнадеживающий голос И когда на прогулку он выходил, то об этом можно было
3 догадаться по крикам,/ которые, сквозь решетки окон, падали к нему во двор и возвращались назад веселым эхом

После вечерней проверки, когда тюрьма затихала, Мазурин читал газету Начиналось это с того, что одно за другим хлопали окна и чей-нибудь голос протяжно и певуче выкликал

- Товарищи, собирайтесь!

К нему присоединялся другой голос, такой же протяжный и певучий И десятки голосов, переливаясь, многократно повторяясь эхом, таким сильным среди гладких тюремных стен, сливались в неясный, музыкальный клик

- Товарищи, собирайтесь!

Было это зимою, и на подоконники все взлезали тепло одетые Один только Мазурин оставался в своем неизменном пиджаке и рубахе. Возле себя он ставил лампочку и начинал читать заранее отмеченные им места - по условиям места каждое слово нужно было выкрикивать отдельно, большою паузой ограничивая его от следующего слова, и прочесть все было невозможно

Я никогда раньше не думал, что газету можно читать так интересно, как читал ее Владимир Мазурин Каждое слово он произносил своеобразно, резко подчеркивая и смешное, и нелепое, и трагическое в тишине ночи, когда внизу только скрипел заржавленный фонарь, простые газетные слова взрывались, как бомбы, звучали, как смех сатаны Особенно старательно выгова-

ривал Мазурин громкие титулы, не выпуская из них ни слова - и сколько не писать дурного об этих титулах и ничтожных носителях их, хуже того, что получалось у Мазурина, - не будет

Как раз в это время вышел февральский манифест и началось газетное ликование по поводу дарованных свобод В тюрьме, куда праздничные слова приходили сквозь железную решетку, особенно чувствовалась их наивная, слепая ложь, - а когда читал их Мазурин, ко лжи присоединялся оттенок такого же наивного и слепого предательства Однажды случилось уже поздно вечером, что по тюрьме прошел какой-то беспокойный шум, и многие начали тревожно выглядывать из окон и расспрашивать о причине И Мазурин крикнул

- Успокойтесь, товарищи Это очевидно редакторы пришли за нами, чтоб пригласить нас в народные представители! Он верно понимал значение дарованных свобод и гаденького дешевого ликования по поводу их

4 Таким был Владимир Мазурин в тюрьме, и даже уголовные, эти больные и слабые дети, любили его Но так и не вышел он из Таганской тюрьмы Когда его судили в первый раз, он держался с судьями резко и говорил правду, т е., что нельзя же всего этого считать и вправду судом Раздраженные судьи приговорили его к высшей мере наказания, какое ему полагалось - к полутора или двум годам заключения Сидел он в Орловской тюрьме, потом попал в московский участок, а оттуда раненый при сопротивлении полиции - все в ту же Таганку Не знаю, как он держался при вторичном разбирательстве, но думаю, что по прежнему он не принадлежал к числу покорных, и русское правосудие, как и русскую полицию, встречал одинаково - оружием Полицейских он не рачил, а из судей кого-нибудь, быть может, и задел словом, и они его - убили

Казнили его в Таганке, на одном из тех дворов, откуда так часто перекликался он с товарищами, в Таганке, где в одной из камер сидел в то же время его младший брат, Николай Он был болен - у него еще не зажила и гноилась рана - сильно исхудал и последние слова его были передай же матери, что я умер спокойно За деньги был нанят убийца, один из уголовных арестантов, и его жалкими подкупленными руками была прервана жизнь Владимира Мазурина Через 15 минут тело было положено в гроб и немедленно отправлено на Ваганьковское кладбище Так достойно самого себя завершил суд свое дело

Да, он умер спокойно Бедная Россия! Осиротелая мать! Отнимают от тебя твоих лучших детей, в клочья рвут твое сердце Кровавым всходит солнце твоей свободы, - но оно взойдет, оно взойдет! И когда станешь ты свободна, не забудь тех, кто отдал за тебя жизнь Ты твердо помнишь имена своих палачей - сохрани в памяти их доблестных жертв, обвей их лаской, омой их слезами Награда живым - любовь и уважение, награда павшим в бою - славная память о них Память Владимиру Мазурину, память

Леонид Андреев

APPENDIX 5

Леонид Андреев Письмо Н В Дризену 12 XI 1910 Машинопись (Отрывки)
Рукописный отдел Государственной Публичной Библиотеки им М Е Салтыкова-Щедрина Ф 263 Н В Дризен № 61 (1)

Я внимательно просмотрел роль Аббата, вычеркнул все, что мало-мальски звучит резко, и сделал две-три пояснительные вставки И делая все это, я еще раз убедился, насколько велико недоразумение, насколько неправа цензура, если в этом отменном человеке, искреннем христианине и прекрасном пастыре, она может усмотреть что-либо враждебное православной церкви или христианству

Вот мои соображения по существу дикому Хаггарту, который является носителем некоего, неорганизованного космического начала, я противопоставляю твердо религиозного человека, в известном смысле организованную душу Только этим я могу сохранить равновесие враждебных начал и не дать в руки Хаггарта слишком легкую победу. Если бы я ограничился противопоставлением Хаггарту оффициального священника, строгого блюстителя канонических правил, я оказал бы плохую услугу церкви и проявил бы ту скрытую но в то время и заметную тенденциозность, против которой вооружается цензура Мой поп - человек очень хороший То, что он грубоват в выражениях, объясняется как средою, так и временем ведь дело происходит в 1780 году, в глухом местечке Бретанского побережья

. .

Вообще, если Вы всмотритесь без предубеждения в моего Аббата, то Вы не сможете не отметить той настойчивости и твердости, с какой Аббат проводит свое религиозно-любовное отношение к людям Каждый несчастный, кто бы он ни был, одинокий Хаггарт в башне или ограбленные Хаггартом же рыбаки, вызывает в нем чувство активного сострадания и к каждому он стремится на помощь Осуждая рыбаков за то, что они берут деньги, он не может не сострадать их бедности, усталости от работы .
И наконец, в последнюю минуту, забывая о себе, (он теряет дочь) он просит Хаггарта все о тех же обиженных им людях

. . .

Мне очень жаль, что мой мирный философский труд, столь далекий от непосредственных житейских битв, встречает такие неожиданные препятствия

---

(1) В этом письме речь идет о драме Андреева "Океан" А Г

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography lays no claim to completeness. Only those works are included to which reference has been made in the main body of the thesis or which have proved useful during its preparation

I. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL GUIDES

БАЛУХАТЫЙ, С.Д., Горьковский семинарий, (Л , 1946)

БАЛУХАТЫЙ, С Д , Критика о М Горьком Библиография статей и книг 1893-1932, (Л , 1934)

БАЛУХАТЫЙ, С Д , Литературная работа М Горького Список первопечатных текстов и авторизованных изданий 1892-1934, (М , 1936)

БАЛУХАТЫЙ, С.Д., МУРАТОВА, К Д , Литературная работа М. Горького Дополнительный список текстов и авторизованных изданий 1889-1936, (Л , 1941)

БАЛУХАТЫЙ, С Д , МУРАТОВА, К Д , М Горький Справочник, (Л , 1938)

ВЛАДИСЛАВЛЕВ, И.В , Русские писатели 19-20 стол Опыт библиографического пособия по новейшей русской литературе, изд 2-е, доп , (СПб , 1913)

ГОЛУБЕВА, О Д , Литературно-художественные альманахи и сборники, т 1 (1900-1911 годы), (М , 1957), т 2 (1912-1917 годы), (М , 1958)

ГРИНБЕРГ, З Г , ЗДОБНОВ, Н В , Библиография М.Горького, (М., 1940)

ЛИНИН, А М , "Библиография воспоминаний о Л Андрееве", Известия Азербайджанского университета, т 2 (1928), стр 9-14

ЛИНИН,А.М , "Библиография социологической критики о Л Андрееве", Известия Азербайджанского университета, т 10 (1926), стр 53-79

ЛИНИН, А.М., "Проблемы изучения Леонида Андреева", Известия педагогического факультета Азербайджанского университета, т 16 (1929), стр 283-329

МУРАТОВА, К Д , (ред), История русской литературы конца XIX-начала XX вв Библиографический указатель, (М -Л., 1963)

МУРАТОВА, К Д , Семинарий по Горькому, (Л , 1956)

II WORKS BY MAKSIM GORKY

a) In Russian

АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК СССР ИНСТИТУТ МИРОВОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ им А М ГОРЬКОГО, Архив А М Горького, т 1, История русской литераратуры, (М , 1939), т 2, Пьесы и сценарии, (М , 1941), т 3, Повести, воспоминания, публицистика Статьи о литературе, (М , 1951), т 4, Письма к К П Пятницкому, (М , 1954), т 5, Письма к Е П Пешковои, (М , 1955), т 6, Художественные произведения Планы Наброски Заметки о литературе и языке, (М , 1957), т 7, Письма

к писателям и И П Ладыжникову, (М., 1959), т.8, Переписка А М Горького с зарубежными писателями, (М , 1960), т 9, Письма к Е П.Пешковой, (М , 1966), т 10, М Горький и советская печать, кн 1, (М , 1964), кн 2, (М., 1965), т 11, Переписка А М Горького с И А Груздевым, (М., 1966), т 12, Художественные произведения Статьи Заметки, (М , 1969), т 13, М Горький и сын Письма Воспоминания, (М , 1971)

ГОРЬКИЙ, М, "Враги", Сборник товарищества "Знание" за 1906 г , кн 14, (СПб 1906)

ГОРЬКИИ, М, Мать изд 1-е, (Берлин, 1907)

ГОРЬКИЙ, М, Мать, изд 2-е, (Берлин, 1908)

ГОРЬКИИ, М, "Письма М Горького В А Келтуяле", Русская литература, № 4 (1966), стр 187-189

ГОРЬКИЙ, М, Письма о литературе, (М , 1957)

ГОРЬКИЙ, М, Полное собрание сочинений, (М , 1968-)

ГОРЬКИЙ, М, "Сказка жизни", в кн АРИАН, П Н , Первый женский калечдарь на 1911 год, (СПб , 1911), стр 101-103

ГОРЬКИЙ, М, Собрание сочинений в 30-и томах, (М , 1949-1953)

ГОРЬКИЙ, М, Статьи 1905-1916 гг , изд 2-е, (Пг , 1918)

b) In languages other than Russian

GORKY, MAXIM, Untimely Thoughts, translated from the Russian with an Introduction and Notes by Herman Ermolaev, (New York, (1968).

III. STUDIES DEVOTED TO THE LIFE AND WORKS OF MAKSIM GORKY

a) In Russian

АБАРДОВ, М.И , ""Варвары" М Горького", Вестник знания, № 8 (1906), стр.363-372

АББАДОНА, (АМФИТЕАТРОВ, А В.), "Отклики", Русь, 9 мая, 1904, стр 2-3

АКИМОВ, П., "Горький и Серафимович", Простор, № 6 (1963), стр 92-94

АЛЕКСИНСКАЯ, Т , "Из записок социал-демократки на Капри у А М Горького", Мосты, №№ 13-14 (1967-1968), стр 352-363

АЛИ, ""Дачники"", Новости дня, 13 ноября, 1904, стр.2

"А М Горький в переписке современников", Вопросы литературы, № 3 (1958), стр 67-99

А М Горький и В Г Короленко Переписка Статьи Высказывания, (М , 1955)

"А.М Горький и события 9 января 1905 года", Исторический архив, № 1 (1955), стр 94-116

"А М Горькии и современники (Из дореволюционных газет и писательских архивов 1900-1916 гг)", Вопросы русской литературы (Львов), вып.1 (1968), стр 36-42

БАЛУХАТЫЙ, С Д , (ред), М Горький и А Чехов Переписка, статьи, высказывания, (М. -Л , 1937)

БАЛУХАТЫЙ, С Д , (ред.), Горький и театр, (М , 1933)

БАСАРГИН, А , "Истомились мы ", Московские ведомости, 4 июля, 1905, стр 3

БАСАРГИН, А , "Художник-варвар кистью сонной", Московские ведомости, 15 апреля, 1906, стр 3

БАСКЕВИЧ, И , "Очень своевременная книга", Подъем, № 3 (1968), стр 140-147
БАССАЛЫГО, Дм , "Незабываемые встречи", Октябрь, № 4 (1956), стр 82-85
БАТЮШКОВ, Ф., ""Дачники" - сцены М Горького в драматическом театре В Ф Комиссаржевской", Мир Божий, № 12 (1904), стр 14-23
БЕЛЕНЬКИЙ, Е И., "О повести М Горького "Лето"", Русская литература, № 3 (1969), стр 190-195
БЕЛЯЕВ, Ю , ""Дети Солнца"", Новое время, 14 октября, 1905, стр 5
БОНДАРЕВ, Л А , "Критика А.М Горьким реакционных идей в России начала XX в ", Научные доклады высшей школы Философские науки, № 2 (1968), стр 107-112
БУГАЕНКО, П , "А В Луначарский и А М Горький", Волга, № 12 (1967), стр 135-146
БУРЕНИН, Н , "Критические очерки", Новое время, 15 августа, 1904, стр 4
БЫКОВЦЕВА, Л , Горький в Италии, (М , 1975)
БЯЛИК, Б , "В И.Ленин и М Горький", Знамя кн.4 (1967), стр.212-231
БЯЛИК, Б , "Достоевский и достоевщина в оценках Горького", в кн. Творчество Ф М Достоевского, (М , 1959), стр 65-100
БЯЛИК, Б , М Горький - драматург, (М , 1962)
БЯЛИК, Б , Судьба Максима Горького, (М , 1968)
ВАЙНБЕРГ, И , "Жизнь Клима Самгина" М Горького Историко-литературный комментарий, (М , 1971)
ВАЛЬБЕ, В , "1905 год в "Жизни Клима Самгина"", Звезда, № 6 (1955), стр 159-164
ВЕРЕСАЕВ, В В , "Максим Горький Из воспоминаний", Литературная Россия, 13 января 1967, стр 8
"Вокруг Достоевского и Горького Сводка откликов на статьи Горького "О "карамазовщине"" и "Еще о "карамазовщине"", Бюллетени литературы и жизни, N 4 (1913), стр 199-210, № 7 (1913), № 10 (1914)
ВОЛЖСКИЙ, А С , "О некоторых мотивах творчества Максима Горького", в его кн Из мира литературных исканий, (СПб , 1906), стр 130-162
ВОЛКОВ, А , М Горький и литературное движение конца XIX-начала XX века, (М , 1954)
ВОЛКОВ, А , М Горький и литературное движение советской эпохи, изд 2-е, доп , (М., 1971)
ВОРОБЬЕВ, В , "В И.Ленин и А М Горький", Подъем, № 2 (1968), стр 115-120
ВОРОНСКИЙ, А , "Встречи и беседы с Максимом Горьким (Из воспоминаний)", Новый мир, № 6 (1966), стр 212-224
ГАЗЕР, И , "А М Горький и современники (Из дореволюционных газет и писательских архивов 1900-1916)", Вопросы русской литературы (Львов), вып 1 (1968), стр 36-42
ГАМАЛИЙ, Н В , "Редакторская деятельность А М Горького в издательстве "Знание" (1900-1906 годы)", Ученые записки Московского областного педагогического института им Н.К Крупской, т 44, вып 1 (1957), стр 131-163
ГАНЕЛИН, Р , "М Горький и американское общество в 1906 году", Русская литература, № 1 (1958), стр 200-211
ГАНИЕВА, З , "О сатире Горького в период первой русской революции", Литература Азербайджана, № 12 (1955), стр 62-68

ГЕЛЬРОТ, М , Элементы ницшеанства в творчестве Горького, (М , 1903)
ГИППИУС, З , "Выбор мешка", в ее кн Литературный дневник (1899-1907), (СПб , 1908), стр 173-186
ГИППИУС, З , "Горький и "горькиада"", Новый путь, № 1 (1904)
ГИППИУС, З , "Летние размышления", в ее кн Литературный дневник (1899-1907), (СПб , 1908), стр 273-281
ГИППИУС, З , "Углекислота", Новый путь, № 1 (1904), стр 256-261
ГОЛУБЕВ, В З , "М.Горький и "Знание"", Звезда, № 10 (1938), стр 216-230
ГОРБАНОВ, Н А., ""Враги" М Горького в оценке Г В Плеханова", Научные доклады высшей школы Филологические науки, № 3 (1967), стр 56-65
ГОРНФЕЛЬД, А , "Литературные беседы (Кончился ли Горький?)", в его кн. Книги и люди, (СПб , 1908), стр 102-111
ГОРНФЕЛЬД, А , "Три драмы "Знания"", Наша жизнь , 1° апреля, 1906, в его кн Книги и люди, (СПб , 1908), стр 41-49
Горьковские чтения, 1938-1939 (М.-Л , 1940), 1947-1948 (М.-Л , 1949), 1949-1950 (М., 1951), 1949-1952 (М , 1954), 1953-1957 (М., 1959), 1958-1959 (М , 1961), 1959-1960 (М., 1962), 1961-1963 (М , 1964), 1964-1965 (М , 1966), 1968 (М , 1968)
ГРЕЧНЕВ, В Я , Жанр литературного портрета в творчестве М Горького, (М -Л , 1964)
ГРИГОРЬЕВ, М , Горький драматург и критик, (М., 1946)
ГРУЗДЕВ, И А , Горький и его время, изд 3-е, доп (М , 1962)
ГРУЗДЕВ, И А , Короленко и Горький, (Горький, 1946)
ГРУЗДЕВ И А , (ред), О Горьком - современники Сборник воспоминаний и статей, (М , 1928)
ГУС, М., ""Зыковы" и "Варвары"", в его кн Литература и эпоха, (М , 1963), стр.350-362
ДЕРЕНЬКОВСКИЙ, Г М , "О второй встрече В И Ленина с А М Горьким (декабрь, 1905)", Исторические записки, т 83 (1969)
ДЕСНИЦКИЙ, В , М Горький, (Л., 1940)
ДЕСНИЦКИЙ, В , М Горький Очерки жизни и творчества, (М , 1959)
ДЕСНИЦКИЙ, В , "Максим Горький в борьбе за идейность и партийность литературы в годы реакции", Звезда, № 9 (1946), стр.183-191.
ДУБНОВА, Е , "Накануне революции 1905 года К истории первой постановки "Дачников"", Театр, № 3 (1968), стр. 45-53
ДУН, А ,"М Горький и Скиталец", Русская литература, № 3 (1960), стр.166-169
ДУН, А , "Праздник литературы и народа", Вопросы литературы № 11 (1969), стр.247-248
ЕГОРЕВ, И , "А М Горький в Гельсингфорсе в январе 1906 года", Резец, № 15 (1936), стр 15-16
ЕЛИЗАРОВ, С , "Борьба М Горького против реакционных тенденций в литературе (1892-1904)", в кн Статьи о Горьком Сборник, (М., 1957), стр 270-347
ЕРЕМИН, А А , ""Лето" М Горького - повесть о деревне в эпоху реакции", Ученые записки Горьковского университета, вып 18 (1950), стр 157-178

ЖУРАВЛЕВ, И , "Буревестник русской революции в США", Простор, № 3 (1968), стр 52-57
ЗЕРНИЦКАЯ, Е И , (ред), Горький и театр, (М , 1968)
ЗИГФРИД, "Эскизы ("Варвары" М Горького)", Театр и искусство, N 37 (1906), стр 563-566
ЗИГФРИД, "Эскизы ("Дачники" М Горького)", Петербургские ведомости, 12 ноября, 1904, стр 3
ЗОРИНА, Г., "Горький и Немирович-Данченко", Ежегодник института истории искусств 1959 Театр, (М , 1959), стр 140-181
ИГНАТОВ, "Литературные отголоски Отражение современного момента в литературе "Варвары", "Огарки"", Русские ведомости, 29 августа, 1906, стр 2-3
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А , "В партийных цепях", Русское слово, 11 декабря, 1909
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А , "История ненужного человека Новая повесть М.Горького", Биржевые ведомости, 17 июля, 1908
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А., "Литературные заметки", Биржевые ведомости, 25 марта, 1905, стр 2
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А , "Партийные кандалы Новая повесть Горького "Лето"", Биржевые ведомости, 11 декабря, 1909, стр 6
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А., "У М Горького на о Капри", Биржевые ведомости, 6 июля, 1908, стр 6
И.К , "Богостроительство М Горького ("Исповедь")", Московский еженедельник, № 35 (1908), стр 3-16
ИЛЮХИН, И Г , "Пьеса Горького "Дети Солнца"", Труды филологического факультета Харьковского университета, т 7 (1959), стр 65-90
КАСТОРСКИЙ, С , Драматургия М Горького, (М -Л , 1963)
КАСТОРСКИЙ, С , "Ленин и Горький", Русская литература, № 1 (1959), стр 7-26
КАСТОРСКИЙ, С , "Мать" М Горького Творческая история повести, (Л , 1940)
КАСТОРСКИЙ, С., "М Горький в борьбе с литературным декадансом", Звезда, № 6 (1947), стр 159-170
КАСТОРСКИЙ, С., "М Горький и писатели-реалисты конца XIX-начала XX века", Звезда, № 6 (1948), стр.166-173
КАСТОРСКИЙ, С , "М Горький о своей повести "Мать"", Звезда, № 3 (1957), стр 166-174
КАСТОРСКИЙ, С , Статьи о Горьком, изд 2-е, (Л , 1955)
КАХНОВСКАЯ, И , "Горький 9 января 1905 года", Новый мир, № 3 (1959), стр 218-221
КОЛЕСНИКОВА, Е А , "Сатирическая трилогия Горького о черте", в кн. Тезисы докладов четвертой научной конференции горьковедов Поволжья, (Горький, 1961)
КОЛТОНОВСКАЯ, Е , "Пристрастный суд ("Дети Солнца")", Полярная звезда, № 9 (1906), стр 656-662
КОРОБКА, Н , "Последние рассказы М Горького", Вестник и библиотека самообразования, № 14 (1905)
КРАНИХФЕЛЬД, В , "Праздник любви у М Горького ("Исповедь")", Современный мир, № 3 (1910), отд 2, стр 110-125
КРАСНОВСКАЯ, Е , "Горький и рабочая пресса о Достоевском в 1913 г ", На литературном посту, № 15 (1931), стр 7-9
КУЗНЕЦОВА, Н.А , "Пьеса М Горького "Дачники"", Ученые записки Ленинградского университета, т 230 (1957), стр 59-86
КУЛОВА, Т , "Новая правда о человеке М.Горький и дооктябрьская драматургия", Театр, № 3 (1968), стр 29-36

КУНИНА, А.А , САХАРОВА, Е М , Горький глазами современников, (М , 1958)
КУСКОВА, Е Д , "Трагедия Максима Горького", Новый журнал, т 38, стр 224-245
ЛЕХНЕВ, А З , "Творчество М Горького", в его кн Литературные будни, (М , 1929)
Летопись жизни и творчества А М.Горького, вып 1 (М., 1958), вып 2 (М , 1958), вып 3 (М., 1960), вып 4 (М , 1960)
ЛИТВИН, Э.С , "Горький и Брюсов (К истории личных и литературных отношений)", Труды Ленинградского библиотечного института им Н К Крупской, т 2 (1957)
Литературное наследство, т 70, Горький и советские писатели Неизданная переписка, (М., 1963)
ЛУНАЧАРСКИЙ, А.В , Статьи о Горьком, (М , 1938)
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , "М Горький (К характеристике современных исканий)", в его кн На рубеже, (СПб , 1909), стр. 146-173
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , "Новая вера (По поводу "Исповеди" М Горького)", Образование, № 7 (1908), отд 3, стр.19-38
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , "Общественная трагедия", Образование, № 4 (1906)
МАКАРОВА, Ю И., "Памфлеты Горького в сатирических журналах "Жало", "Жупел" и "Адская почта"", Ученые записки педагогического института им В.П Потемкина, т 97, вып 2 (1959), стр.37-50
МАРТЫНЕЦ, Т Д., "Самооценка А М Горького в его письмах, 1889-1904", Ученые записки Черновицкого университета, т 56 (1962), филологические науки, вып 17, стр 25-37
МЕЙЛАХ, Б , "Из темы Ленин и Горький (Эпизод с "каприйской школой", в его кн Вопросы литературы и эстетики, (М , 1958), стр 106-125
МЕРЕЖКОВСКИЙ, Д , "Не святая Русь (Религия Горького)", Русское слово, 11 сентября, 1916
МЕРЕЖКОВСКИЙ, Д , "Сердце человеческое или сердце звериное?", Речь, 8 февраля, 1909
М.Горький в воспоминаниях современников, (М , 1955)
М.Горький в Нижнем Новгороде, (Нижний Новгород, 1928)
М Горький в эпоху революции 1905-1907 гг , (М , 1957)
М Горький и А Чехов Переписка Статьи Высказывания, (М -Л , 1951)
М.Горький и его современники, (Л , 1968)
М.Горький Материалы и исследования, т 1 (М -Л , 1934), т 2 (М -Л , 1936), т 3 (М -Л., 1941), т 4 (М -Л , 1951)
МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ, Б.В , Драматургия М Горького эпохи первой русской революции, изд 2-е, (М , 1955)
МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ, Б В , Творчество М Горького и мировая литература 1892-1916, (М., 1965)
МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ, Н К , "О г Максиме Горьком и его героях", Русское богатство, № 9 (1898)
МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ, Н К , "Еще о г. Максиме Горьком и его героях", Русское богатство, № 10 (1898)
МУРАТОВА, К Д , Горький на Капри 1911-1913, (Л , 1971)
МУРАТОВА, К Д , "К спорам о русском характере в канун пролетарской революции", Русская литература, № 3 (1968), стр 52-65
МУРАТОВА, К Д , М.Горький в борьбе за развитие советской литературы, (М -Л , 1958)

МУРОМЦЕВА-БУНИНА, В.Н , "Италия (О встречах А М Горького и И А Бунина на Капри)", Дон, № 3 (1968), стр 163-168
"На дне" М Горького Материалы и исследования, (М -Л., 1940)
НЕВЕДОМСКИЙ, М , ""Дачники" М Горького", Наша жизнь, 12 и 20 ноября, 1904 , стр 3
НЕГОРЕВ, Н., ""Варвары"", Театр и искусство, № 15 (1906), стр 234-235
НЕМАНОВ, Л , "Беседа на пароходе с М Горьким", Петербургская газета, 15 июня, 1903, стр 4
НИКОЛАЕВ, М П "Сатира А М Горького в годы первой русской революции", Ученые записки Латвийского университета, т 11 (1956), стр 139-170
НИНОВ, А , "За строками одной статьи", Вопросы литературы, № 7 (1970), стр 146-153
НИНОВ, А , "Каприйские встречи (Ленин и Горький в 1908-1910 годах)", Вопросы литературы, № 7 (1965), стр 3-26
НИНОВ, А , "Мастер революционной сатиры О стиле сатирических циклов М Горького "В Америке" и "Мои интервью"", Нева, № 3 (1955), стр 159-162
НИНОВ, А , М Горький и Ив Бунин История отношений Проблемы творчества, (Л , 1973)
НОВИКОВ, В В , Творческая лаборатория Горького-драматурга, (М , 1965)
НОВИЧ, И , "Еще о "деле" М.Горького в 1905 году", Новый мир, № 3 (1959), стр 221-225
НОВИЧ, И , М Горький в эпоху первой русской революции, (М , 1955)
ОВСЯНИКО-КУЛИКОВСКИЙ, Д , ""Дети Солнца"", Истина, № 2 (1906), стр 52-59
ОВЧАРЕНКО, А , Публицистика М Горького, изд 2-е, доп , (М., 1965)
ОЛЕЙНИКОВ, Ю М , "М Горький и "Знание"", Ученые записки Ленинградского педагогического института им А И Герцена, т.58 (1947), стр 123-239
ПАВЛОВ, Л , "Повесть М Горького "Мать" и религиозно-философская полемика начала XX века", Север, № 2 (1968), стр 97-103
ПАИНА, Е , "Использование пьесы М Горького "Мещане" в агитационных целях", Русская литература, № 2 (1959), стр 224-225
ПИКСАНОВ, Н К , "Идейная история поэмы М Горького "Человек"", Вопросы русской литературы (Львов), вып 2 (1966), стр 5-18.
ПИКСАНОВ, Н К , "Толстой и Горький Личные, идейные и творческие встречи", Ученые записки Горьковского университета, т 56 (1961), стр 5-36
ПЯТНИЦКИЙ, К П., "М Горький и время московских баррикад 1905 г ", Красная газета, 12 июня, 1928 (веч), стр 4
РАСКИНА, Э С., "Разоблачение декаденства в творчестве А М Горького", Записки Ташкентского театрально-художественного института, вып 3 (1959), стр 211-224
Революционный путь Горького По материалам Департамента полиции, (М -Л , 1933)
РЕГИНИН, В , "Из беседы с Максимом Горьким", Биржевые ведомости, 22 июня, 1905 (веч)
РЕДЬКО, А Е , ""Варвары" М Горького", Русское богатство, № 5 (1906), отд 2, стр 97-106

РЕДЬКО, А Е , "Литературное наброски", Русское богатство, № 2 (1906)
РОЗЕНБЛЮМ, Н Г , "М.Горький в письмах современников", Русская литература, № 2 (1970), стр 134-140
РУДНЕВ, В В , Горький революционер, (М , 1929)
СЕМЕНОВСКИЙ, Д Н , А М Горький Письма и встречи, (М , 1940)
СЕРЕДА, Т , Опыт критического разбора драмы Горького "Дети Солнца",(СПб , 1907)
СИНЯВСКИЙ, А Д , "Горький-сатирик", в кн О художественном мастерстве М Горького Сборник статей, (М , 1960)
СКИТАЛЕЦ, "Великий художник пролетариата", в кн Горький в Самаре, (М , 1938), стр 214-253
СМИРНОВ, С В., М Горький и публицистика конца XIX-начала XX века, (Л , 1959)
СОКОЛОВ, А Г , "Горький и прогрессивная сатирическая журналистика первой русской революции", Известия Академии наук СССР Серия литературы и языка, т 15, вып 1 (1956), стр 26-37
СТРАХОВА, Л.А , "Опыт анализа пьесы А М Горького "Враги" как художественного отражения революции 1905-1907 г ", Ученые записки Северо-осетинского педагогического института, т.21, вып 2 (1956), стр 143-170
СУМАРЕВ, П И , А М Горький о религии, (М , 1960)
ТАМАРИН, Н , ""Варвары"", Слово, 30 марта, 1906
ТАРАСОВА, А , "Работа А М Горького над рассказом "Горьма"", в кн Мастерство русских классиков, (М , 1959), стр 276-307
ТРОЦКИЙ, Л Д , "Максим Горький", Бюллетень оппозиции, № 51 (1936), стр 8-9
ТРУБЕЦКОЙ, С Н , Сверхчеловек в произведениях Горького, (СПб , 1904)
УСПЕНСКАЯ, В Е , А М Горький в первой русской революции, (Горький, 1955)
ХОДАСЕВИЧ, ВАЛЕНТИНА, "Таким я знала Горького (Воспоминания)", Новый мир, № 3 (1968), стр 11-66
ХОДАСЕВИЧ, В С , "Горький', в его кн Некрополь Воспоминания, (Брюссель, 1939), стр 228-277
ЧИРИКОВ, Е Н , Русский народ под судом Максима Горького, (М., 1917)
ЧИРИКОВ, Е Н , Смердяков русской революции (Роль Горького в русской революции), (София, 1921)
ЧУКОВСКИЙ, К , "Заметки читателя ("Рассказ Филиппа Васильевича")", Одесские новости, 17 марта, 1905, стр 2
ЧУЛКОВ, Г , "Правда Максима Горького", в его кн Покрывало Изиды, (М , 1909), стр 154-163
ШАХНОВИЧ, М.И , "А М Горький о происхождении религии", Ежегодник музея истории религии и атеизма, (М , 1957), стр 75-143
ШИШКИНА, А.Н , "У истоков мастерства (Тема крестьянства у А М.Горького)", Ученые записки Ленинградского педагогического института им А И Герцена, т 376 (1968), стр 45-78
ШКЛОВСКИЙ, В , Удачи и поражения Максима Горького, (Тифлис, 1926)
ШУБ, Д , "Максим Горький и коммунистическая диктатура", Мосты, № 1 (1958)
ЭВЕНТОВ, И , Сатира в творчестве М.Горького, (М -Л , 1962)
ЭВЕНТОВ, И , Сила сарказма Сатира и юмор в творчестве М Горького, (Л , 1973)

ЭВЕНТОВ, И , ТРУСОВА, Н С , "М Горький в 1905 году", Звезда, № 3 (1955), стр 128-139
ЮЗОВСКИЙ, Ю , Максим Горький и его драматургия, (М , 1959)

CREDO, "Не пьеса ("Дачники"), Русь, 14 ноября, 1904, стр 1
HOMO NOVUS, ""Варвары" М Горького", Русь, 3 апреля, 1907, стр.5
HOMO NOVUS, ""Дети Солнца" Горького", Русь, 13 октября, 1905, стр 5

b) In languages other than Russian

BERBEROVA, N, The italics are mine, (London, 1969).
BORRAS, F.M., Maxim Gorky the writer. An interpretation, (Oxford, 1967).
GOURFINKEL, N., Gorky, (London, 1960)
HARE, R , Maxim Gorky Romantic realist and conservative revolutionary, (London, 1962).
HOLTZMAN, F., 'A mission that failed Gorky in America', Slavonic and East European Journal, vol.6, no.3 (Fall, 1962), pp.227-235
HOLTZMAN, F , The young Maxim Gorky, 1868-1902, (New York, 1948).
ILIE, P., 'Anamuno, Gorky, and the Cain myth toward a theory of personality', Hispanic Review, vol.29 (1961), pp 310-323.
KAUN, A., Maxim Gorky and his Russia, (New York, 1968).
KHODASEVICH, V.S., (ed.), 'The letters of Maxim Gorky to Khodasevich, 1922-1925', Harvard Slavic Studies, vol. 1 (1953), pp 279-334.
LEVIN, D., Stormy petrel The life and works of Maxim Gorky, (London, 1965).
LUKACS, G , 'The human comedy of pre-revolutionary Russia', in Studies in European Realism, (London, 1950), pp.206-241
MORAVCEVICH, N , 'Gorky and the Western Naturalists Anatomy of a misalliance', Comparative Literature, vol 21 (1969), pp.63-75
MUCHNIC, H , 'Circe's swine Plays by Gorky and O'Neill', Comparative Literature, vol 3 (1951), pp.119-128
OLIVA, L.J , 'Maxim Gorky discovers America', New York History Society Quarterly, vol 51 (1961), pp.45-60
PACHMUSS, T , 'Zinaida Gippius as a literary critic with particular reference to Maksim Gorky', Canadian Slavonic Papers, vol 7, pp.127-142
PRITCHETT, V S., 'The young Gorky', in The working novelist, (London, 1965), pp.140-146
TURNER, C.J.G., ''Iconoclasm' as a structural device in three of Gorky's stories', Modern Language Review, vol.67 (1972), pp.143-150
WEIL, I., Gorky. His literary development and influence on Soviet intellectual life, (New York, 1966)
WEIL, I., 'Gorky's relations with the Bolsheviks and the Symbolists', Slavonic and East European Journal (N.S.), vol.4 (18) (1960), pp.201-219

WOLFE, B D., The bridge and the abyss. The troubled friendship of Maxim Gorky and V.I.Lenin, (London, 1967)
YEDLIN, T., 'Maxim Gorky his early revolutionary activity and his involvement in the Revolution of 1905', Canadian Slavonic Papers, vol 17, no.1 (Spring, 1975), pp 76-105.

IV. WORKS BY LEONID ANDREYEV

a) In Russian

АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Автобиография", в кн ФИДЛЕР, Ф , Первые литературные шаги Автобиографии современных русских писателей, (М , 1911), стр 27-32
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Бунт на корабле", (пуб Л Иезуитовой), Русская литература, № 3 (1971), стр 128-138
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Восхождение", Отражения Около войны, (М , 1915), стр 132-135
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , Гибель (Что ждет Россию), (Пг , 1917)
АНДРЕЕВ, Л., "Из моей жизни", Журнал для всех, № 1 (1903), стр 3-4
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Любовь, вера и надежда (Этюд)", Альманах 17, (СПб , 1909), стр 33-40
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Маленький фельетон Письмо героя "Бездны"", Курьер, 6 марта, 1903, стр 3
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Москва Мелочи жизни", Курьер, 27 января, 1902, стр 2
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "О "Двух душах" М Горького", Современный мир, № 1 (1916), отд 2, стр 108-112
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "О казнях (Из частного письма)", Эпоха, 15 сентября, 1908
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Ответ на анкету "Самоубийство"", Биржевые ведомости, 8 мая, 1912, стр 6
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , Памяти Владимира Мазурина (Из частного письма), (СПб , 1906)
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , Повести и рассказы, (М , 1957)
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , Повести и рассказы в двух томах, (М , 1971)
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , Полное собрание сочинений в восьми томах, (СПб , 1913)
АНДРЕЕВ, Л., Пьесы, (М , 1959)
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , Рассказы, (СПб 1901)
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , Собрание сочинений в семнадцати томах (СПб -М , 1911-1917)
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Царь", Весна, № 1 (1908), стр 4
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , S.O.S , (Helsingfors, 1919)
"Забытые фельетоны "Джемса Линча"", (пуб В Чувакова), Дон, № 12 (1971), стр 181-184
"Из писем Л Андреева-К П Пятницкому", (пуб В Чувакова), Вопросы литературы, № 8 (1971), стр 160-184
"Леонид Андреев Письма", Русский современник, кн 4 (1924), стр 122-164
"Письма Л Андреева Л Средину", Дон, № 3 (1962), стр 188-190
"Письма Л Андреева и И Бунина", (пуб И Газера), Вопросы литературы, № 7 (1969), стр 162-193
Письма Леонида Андреева, (ред , Г Чулков), (Л , 1924)
"Письма Леонида Андреева А Р Кугелю", Рабочий и театр, № 27 (1934), стр 18

"Письма Леонида Андреева из Таганской тюрьмы", Звезда, № 8 (1971), стр 168-183
"Письма Леонида Андреева к М П Неведомскому", Искусство, № 2 (1925), стр 265-271
"Письма Леонида Андреева к невесте", Звезда, № 1 (1968), стр 179-207
"Письма Л Н Андреева к А А Измаилову", Русская литература, № 3 (1962), стр 193-201

b) In languages other than Russian

ANDREYEV, L , Satan's diary, authorized translation with a preface by Herman Bernstein, (New York, 1920)
ANDREYEW, L , Sachka Grgouleff, translated from the Russian by Lila Hicks Edited and with an introduction by M. Gorky, (New York, 1925)

V STUDIES DEVOTED TO THE LIFE AND WORKS OF LEONID ANDREYEV

a) In Russian

АДРИАНОВ, С., "Куда идет Леонид Андреев?", Жизнь для всех, № 12 (1909), стр 127-131
А И , "Л Андреев о своей повести "Мои записки"", Биржевые ведомости, 6 ноября, 1908, стр 3
АМФИТЕАТРОВ, А , "Талант во тьме", в его кн Против течения, (СПб , 1908), стр 176-203
АНДРЕЕВ, А Н , "Из воспоминаний о Л Андрееве", Красная новь, № 9 (1926), стр.209-223
АНДРЕЕВ, В Л , Детство Повесть, (М , 1963)
АНДРЕЕВ, П Н , 'Воспоминания о Л Андрееве", Литературная мысль, кн 3 (1925), стр 140-205
АФОНИН, Л , Леонид Андреев, (Орел, 1959)
АФОНИН, Л , "Леонид Андреев", сб "На родной земле", (Орел, 1956), стр 345-369
АЧАТОВА, А А , "Значение образа-символа в ранних рассказах Леонида Андреева", Ученые записки Томского университета, № 62 (1966), стр 202-216
БАБИЧЕВА, Ю В , "Богоборческая драма Леонида Андреева "Анатэма"", Русская литература XX века, сб 2 (Калуга, 1970)
БАБИЧЕВА, Ю В , Драматургия Л Н Андреева эпохи первой русской революции, (Вологда, 1971)
БАБИЧЕВА, Ю.В , "Иронические драмы Л Андреева", Вопросы истории и теории литературы, вып 1 (Челябинск, 1966)
БАБИЧЕВА, Ю В "Леонид Андреев толкует библию", Наука и религия, № 1 (1969), стр 38-42
БАБИЧЕВА, Ю В , "Незавершенная драма Леонида Андреева "Закон и люди"", Русская литература XX века (дооктябрьский период), (Калуга, 1968), стр 254-265
БАСАРГИН, А , "Талант особого рода (Леонид Андреев и его критик-панегирист из "Мира Божьего")", Московские ведомости, 10 мая, 1903, стр 3-4
БАСИЛЬЕВИЧ, В , "Л Н Андреев", Всеобщий журнал искусства, науки и общественной жизни, № 1 (1910), стр 65-90
БАТЮШКОВ, Ф , ""Жизнь человека" Леонида Андреева", Современный мир, № 3 (1907), стр 80-84

БАТЮШКОВ, Ф , "Трагедия анархизма ("Так было" и "Савва" Л Андреева)", Речь, 17 декабря, 1906, стр 3
БЕЗЗУБОВ, В И , "А Чехов и Леонид Андреев", Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып.139 (1963), стр181- 222
БЕЗЗУБОВ, В И , "Лев Толстой и Леонид Андреев", Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып 104 (1961), стр 130-172
БЕЗЗУБОВ, В И , "Леонид Андреев и Московский художественный театр", Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып 209 (1968), стр 122-242
БЕЗЗУБОВ, В И , "Неизданные письма Леонида Андреева (К творческой истории пьес периода первой русской революции)", Ученые записки Тартуского университета, вып 119 (1962), стр 378-393
"Беседа с Л Н Андреевым", Новая Русь, 19 февраля, 1909,стр 6
БЕССОНОВ, М , "Заметка о современной журналистике (Беллетристы последней формации гг Л Андреев и Скиталец)", Волынь, 27 апреля, 1902, стр 2
БИТНЕР, В , "Леонид Андреев Рассказы", Научное обозрение, № 12 (1901), стр 321-325
БОСТРОМ, А , "Что говорит родительскому сердцу рассказ Андреева "В тумане"", Образование, № 12 (1903), отд 2, стр 62-83
БОЦЯНОВСКИЙ, В Ф , "Богоборцы Леонида Андреева", в ег кн Богоискатели, (СПб -М , 1911), стр 188-242
БРУСЯНИН, В В , Леонид Андреев Жизнь и творчество, (М , 1912)
БУГРОВ, Б С ,"На путях отрицания реализма ("Жизнь Человека" и "Царь Голод" Л Андреева)', Русская литература XX века (дооктябрьский период), (Калуга, 1968),стр 266-288
БУГРОВ, А , Повесть Л Андреева "Иуда Искариот и другие" (Психология и история предательства Иуды), (Харьков, 1911)
БЫСТРЕНИН, В Н , "Новая правда ("Тьма)", Московский еженедельник, № 33 (1908), стр 3-13, № 34 (1908), стр 20-31
БЭН, ""Анатэма"", Московские ведомости, 7 октября, 1909,стр 2
ВАЛЕНТИНОВ, П , Мы еще придем! О современной литературе "Жизнь Человека" и "Царь Голод" Л Андреева, (М , 1908)
ВАРТАНЯН, В , Л Н Толстой и Леонид Андреев (как идеологи трудящихся классов), (Баку, 1909)
ВАСИЛЬЕВА, Л М , "По следам "Рассказа о семи повешенных"", Советские архивы, № 4 (1971), стр 96-103
ВИЛЬЧИНСКИЙ, В П , "Правда истории, художественный отбор и произвольный домысел ("Рассказ о семи повешенных" Л. Андреева)", Русская литература, № 1 (1970), стр 157-162
"Возмутительные пьесы", Русское знамя, 25 октября, 1909, стр 2
ВОЗНЕСЕНСКИЙ, А , ""Человек"Л Андреева", Одесские новости, 3 мая, 1907, стр 1
ВОЗНЕСЕНСКИЙ, Н , "Анатэма" разбор трагедии Л Андреева, (Благовещенск, 1910)
ВОЙТОЛОВСКИЙ, Л , "Социально-психологические типы в рассказах Л Андреева", Правда, № 8 (1905), стр 123-140.
ВОЛЖСКИЙ, А С , ""Иуда" Леонида Андреева", Живая жизнь, № 2 (1907), стр.20-39
ВОЛЖСКИЙ, А С , "О мотивах страха смерти и страха жизни Л Андреев", в его кн Из мира литературных исканий, (СПб , 1906), стр 190-227
ГАНЖУЛЕВИЧ, Т.Я , Русская жизнь и ее течения в творчестве Л.Андреева, изд 2-е, (СПб -М , 1910)

ГЕККЕР, Н , Леонид Андреев и его произведения, (Одесса, 1903)
ГЕОРГИЙ, Епископ, "Индивидуалистическое миросозерцание Леонида Андреева (Литературно-богословско-философский очерк)", Вера и разум, №№ 9-10 (1909), стр 285-310
ГЕССЕН, И В , "Последние дни Леонида Андреева", Архив русской революции, изд 2-е, т 1 (Берлин, 1922), стр 309-311
ГОЛОТИНА, Г , "Первые драмы Л.Андреева ("К звездам", "Савва")", Ученые записки Ленинградского педагогического института им А И Герцена, т 362 (1968), стр 228-238
ГОРНФЕЛЬД, А Г , ""Тьма"", в его кн Книги и люди, (СПб , 1908)
ГРИГОРЬЕВ, А Л , "Леонид Андреев в мировом литературном процессе", Русская литература, № 3 (1972), стр 190-205
ГРОССМАН, Л , "Беседы с Леонидом Андреевым", в его кн Борьба за стиль Опыты по критике и поэтике, (М , 1927)
ГУЖИЕВА, Н , "Драматургия Леонида Андреева 1910-х годов", Русская литература, № 4 (1965), стр 64-79
ДАНИЛИН, Я , Леонид Андреев и общественная реакция, (М , 1909)
ДОБРОХОТОВ, А , Карьера Леонида Андреева, (М , 1909)
ДРЯГИН, К В , Экспрессионизм в России (Драматургия Леонида Андреева), (Вятка, 1928)
ЕВРЕИНОВ, Н , "О "кривом зеркале" Как Леонид Андреев смеялся в бороду", Новый журнал, т 35, стр 190-207
ЕЛПАТЬЕВСКИЙ, С., "Л Н Андреев Из воспоминаний", Былое, №№ 27-28 (1924), стр 275-281
ЕРШОВ, П , ""Анатэма" Леонида Андреева", Новый журнал, т 56, стр132-147
ЖЕНЕВСКИЙ, А , "Леонид Андреев и его "Стена"", Звезда, № 2 (1925), стр 257-258
ЗВЕЗДИЧ, П , ""К звездам" Пьеса Андреева в венском Свободном театре", Русские ведомости, 20 октября, 1906, стр 3
ИВАНОВ, И В , "Л Андреев о театре", Маски, № 4 (1913-1914), стр 50-64
ИВАНОВ-РАЗУМНИК, Р В , "Леонид Андреев", в его кн О смысле жизни, (СПб , 1908), стр 86-161
ИЕЗУИТОВА, Л А , "Л Андреев в оценке марксистско-ленинской критики 20-х годов", Вестник Ленинградского университета, № 20 (1970), стр 82-91
ИЕЗУИТОВА, Л.А , "Леонид Андреев и Вс Гаршин", Вестник Ленинградского университета, № 8 (1964), стр 97-109
ИЕЗУИТОВА, Л А , "Рассказы Л.Андреева конца 1890- начала 1900-х годов' (У истоков его творческого метода)", Ученые записки Ленинградского университета, № 339, серия филологических наук, вып 72 (1968), стр 26-61
ИЕЗУИТОВА, Л А , "Первый рассказ Леонида Андреева", Русская литература, № 2 (1963), стр 184-185
"Из литературных бесед (Андреев о влиянии революции 1905 г на литературу)", Искры, № 47 (1906), стр 667
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А , "О Леониде Андрееве", Русское слово, 8 апреля, 1908, стр 3
ИОРДАНСКАЯ, М К , "Эмиграция и смерть Леонида Андреева", сб "Родная земля", кн 1 (Нью-Йорк, 1920), стр 44-63
ИОФФЕ, И , "Л Андреев", в его кн Культура и стиль, (Л , 1927), стр 324-328
КАУФМАН, А , "Л Н Андреев (К первой годовщине его смерти)", Вестник литературы, № 9 (1920), стр 2-4
К-КИЙ, Л , "Казнь Молчалина ("Нет прощения" Рассказ Л Андреева)", Дочская речь, 1 февраля, 1904, стр 1
КЛЕЙНБОРТ, Л , "Встречи Леонид Андреев", Былое, № 24 (1924), стр 163-182

Книга о Леониде Андрееве, (Пг -Берлин, 1922)
КРАНИХФЕЛЬД, В , "Леонид Андреев и его критики", Образование, № 10 (1902), стр 47-69
КУГЕЛЬ, А Р , "Леонид Андреев", в его кн Русские драматурги Очерки театрального критика, (М , 1933), стр 148-162
КУЛОВА, Т К , "Творческие искания Леонида Андреева", в кн Критический реализм и модернизм, (М , 1967), стр 254-285
"Леонид Андреев contra М Горького", Утро России, 26 сентября, 1913, стр 5
"Леонид Андреев о современных вопросах", Русь, 27 февраля, 1908, стр 4
ЛУНАЧАРСКИЙ, А В , "Борьба с мародерами", Литературное наследство, т 2 (1932), стр 101-104
ЛУНАЧАРСКИЙ, А В , "О настоящих анархистах", Образование, № 11 (1906), отд 2, стр 19-38
ЛУНАЧАРСКИЙ, А В , "Социальная психология и социальная мистика (статья вторая)", Образование, № 6 (1906), отд 2, стр 40-50
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , Две правды Книга о Леониде Андрееве, (СПб , 1914)
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , "Иван Карамазов русской литературы", в его кн Новейшая русская литература, (М , 1923), стр 179-182
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , Леонид Андреев Критический очерк с приложением хронологической канвы и библиографического указателя, (М , 1923)
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , "Литературные заметки К жизни (По поводу драмы Л Андреева "К звездам")", Образование, № 7 (1906), отд 2, стр.45-66
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , "С одной стороны, с другой", Образование, № 12 (1906), отд 2, стр.62-74
ЛЯЦКИЙ, Е , "Между бездной и тайной ("Елеазар", "Иуда Искариот")", Современный мир, №№ 7-8 (1907), стр 64-68
МЕРЕЖКОВСКИЙ, Д , "В обезьяних лапах (О Леониде Андрееве)", в его кн В тихом омуте, (СПб , 1908), стр 3-65
МИРСКИЙ, В , "Наша литература (Рассказы Леонида Андреева)", Журнал для всех, № 1 (1902), стр.99-108.
МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ, Б.В , "Путь Л.Андреева", в его кн Избранные статьи о литературе и искусстве, (М , 1969), стр 353-388.
МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ, Н К , "Литература и жизнь Рассказы Л Андреева Страх смерти и страх жизни", Русское богатство, № 11 (1901), стр 58-74
НЕВЕДОМСКИЙ, М , "Леонид Николаевич Андреев", в кн История русской литературы XIX в , (ред Д Н Овсянико-Куликовский), т 5, (М , 1910), стр 260-272
НЕГОРЕВ, Н , "Савва Антихристов", Театр и искусство, № 38 (1906), стр 583-585
НЕМИРОВИЧ-ДАНЧЕНКО, В И , ""Анатэма"", Ежегодник МХАТ 1943, (М , 1945), стр 364-368
НОВИК, И Д , "Леонид Андреев (Материалы для биографии)", Русский эмигрант, №№ 3, 4 (Берлин, 1920)
ОКСМАН, Ю Г , ""Русская воля" и буржуазная литература", Литературное наследство, т 2 (1932), стр 179-186
ОРЛОВСКИЙ, П , "Андреев и русская интеллигенция", Одесское обозрение, 8 апреля, 1908, стр 2
ОРЛОВСКИЙ, П , "Из истории новейшего романа Леонид Андреев", в его кн Из истории новейшей русской литературы, (М , 1910), стр 36-58

ПЛЕХАНОВ, Г В , "План разбора драмы Леонида Андреева "Жизнь Человека"", Литературное наследство, т 1 (1931), стр 90-94
ПОТЕМКИН, А , "У Леонида Андреева", Петербургская газета, 27 августа, 1908, стр 2
РЕДЬКО, А Е , "Литературные наброски", Русское богатство, № 11 (1906), стр 116-142
РЕДЬКО, А Е , "Литературные наброски (Л Андреев Рассказы т 2 Мелкие рассказы, т 3 Так было)", Русское богатство, № 7 (1906), отд 2, стр 40-50
РЕДЬКО, А Е , "Об "Анатэме" в связи с общим жизнеотношением Л.Андреева", Русское богатство, № 12 (1909), отд 2, стр 75-94
РЕДЬКО,А Е , ""Хорошие" и "плохие" у Л Андреева", Русское богатство, № 6 (1908), отд 2, стр 1-19, № 7 (1908), отд 2, стр 1-17
Реквием Сборник памяти Леонида Андреева, (М , 1930)
РЕЙСНЕР, М А , Андреев и его социальная идеология Опыт социологической критики, (СПб , 1909)
СЕМЕНОВА, Г П , "Г В Плеханов о творчестве Леонида Андреева", Русская литература, № 3 (1970), стр 139-148
СИЛЬВЕРСВАН, В , "Заметка о "Савве"", Театр и искусство, № 39 (1906), стр 599
СИЛЬВЕРСВАН, В , ""К звездам"", Театр и искусство, № 32 (1906), стр 488-489
СКРИБА, "В Ясной Поляне", Одесские новости, 17 июля, 1903, стр 2
СМИРНОВ, А , "Трагедия анархизма ("Савва" Л Андреева "Знание" XI)", Образование, № 11 (1906)
СМОЛЕНСКИЙ, А , "На первом чтении "Рассказа о семи повешенных"", Биржевые ведомости, 12 марта, 1909, стр 2
СТОЛЯРОВ, М , "Заметки на полях Леонида Андреева", Россия, № 4 (1925), стр 252-261
ТАЛЬНИКОВ, Д , "Леонид Андреев и его "Царь Голод"", Одесское обозрение, 8 и 10 апреля, 1908, стр 2
"У Леонида Андреева в Финляндии", Одесские новости, 24 июля, 1905, стр 2
УРУСОВ, Н Д , Бессильные люди в изображении Леонида Андреева (Критический очерк), (СПб , 1903)
ФАЛЬКОВСКИЙ, Ф , "Предсмертная трагедия Леонида Андреева", Прожектор, № 16 (1923), стр 27-30
ФАТОВ, Н Н , Молодые годы Леонида Андреева (По неизданным письмам, воспоминаниям и документам), (М , 1924)
ФИЛОСОФОВ, Д , "Вокруг и около Андреева", Речь, 2 апреля, 1908, стр 2
ФИЛОСОФОВ, Д., "Разложение материализма ("Жизнь Человека")", Товарищ, 15 мая, 1907, стр 3
ФРИЧЕ, В , Леонид Андреев (Опыт характеристики), (М , 1909)
ЦИТРОН, И , "В гостях у Леонида Андреева", Одесские новости, 28 ноября, 1908, стр 2
ЧИРИКОВ, Е Н , "Леонид Андреев", Русские сборники, № 2 (София, 1921), стр 57-75
ЧУКОВСКИЙ, К , Леонид Андреев большой и маленький, (СПб , 1908)
ЧУКОВСКИЙ, К , "Об Иуде Искариоте и г Скитальце", Речь, 24 июня, 1907, стр 2
ЧУКОВСКИЙ, К , О Леониде Андрееве, (СПб , 1911)
Эс Пэ, "У Леонида Андреева", Русское слово, 5 октября, 1907, стр 2

ЭТТИНГЕР, Е , Некто в сером и некие в красном у Л Андреева, (Киев, 1908)
ЯНТАРЕВ, Е , "О Леониде Андрееве", Литературно-художественный альманах "Утро", кн 1 (Л , 1927), стр 240-252

b) In languages other than Russian

ANDREEV, N , 'Leonid Andreev and his destiny as a writer', in Горски виjенац, ed R Auty, et al , (Cambridge, 1970), pp.1-11
BARING, M , 'A Russian mystery play', in Russian Essays and Stories, (London, 1908), pp 136-157.
BERNSTEIN, H., 'Leonid Andreyev', in With Master Minds, (New York, 1913), pp 156-170
KAUN, A., Leonid Andreyev. A critical study, (New York, 1924)
KARANCSKY, L., 'Léonide Andréiev après la révolution de 1905', Slavica (Debrecen), vol 10, pp 173-185
KING, H H., Dostoevsky and Andreyev Gazers upon the abyss, (New York, 1936)
NEWCOMBE, J.M., Leonid Andreyev, (Letchworth, 1972)
PELTIER-ZAMOYSKA, H , 'Leonid Andreev et le mal du siecle', Cahiers du monde Russe et Soviétique, vol 4, part 3, pp.205-229
TURKEVICH, L , 'Andreev and the mask', Russian Literature Triquarterly, no 7 (Fall, 1973), pp 267-284
WOODWARD, J B , 'Devices of emphasis and amplification in the style of Leonid Andreyev', Slavic and East European Journal, vol 9, no 3 (1965), pp 247-256
WOODWARD, J.B , Leonid Andreyev A study, (Oxford, 1969).
WOODWARD, J B , 'Leonid Andreyev and 'conventionalism' in the Russian theatre', Modern Language Review, vol 66, no 2 (1971), pp 365-378
WOODWARD, J B., 'Leonid Andreyev's 'Divine Comedy'', Canadian Slavonic Papers, vol 6 (1964), pp 59-79
WOODWARD, J.B., 'Structure and characterization in the short stories of Leonid Andreyev', Scando-Slavica, vol.15 (1969), pp 13-20

VI STUDIES DEVOTED TO THE GORKY-ANDREYEV RELATIONSHIP

a) In Russian

БАТЮШКОВ, Ф , ""Дети Солнца", "К звездам"", Мир Божий, № 7 (1906), стр 15-29
БЕЗЗУБОВ, В И , "Леонид Андреев и Максим Горький", Ученые записки Таргуского университета, вып 217 (1968), стр 85-169
ВАСИЛЬЕВ, А В , "Литературный портрет Л Андреева в воспоминаниях А М Горького", в кн Заметки о послеоктябрьской творчестве А М Горького, (Пятигорск, 1957)
ДЕСНИЦКИЙ, В , "М Горький и Л Андреев", Литературный современник, № 8 (1933), стр 142-147
ЕРМАКОВА, М Я , "Проблема человека в творчестве М Горького и Л Андреева", Ученые записки Горьковского педагогического института, вып 110 (1968), стр 176-189
ЖАК, Л , "Портрет-полемика (Очерк "Леонид Андреев")", в его кн От замысла к воплощению, (М , 1963), стр 89-161
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А , "Литературный календарь Первая пьеса Л Андреева

"К звездам" Поправки Андреева к "Детям Солнца"", Биржевые ведомости, 9 июня, 1906, стр 5

КУЗНЕЦОВА, Н А , ""Дети Солнца" М Горького и "К звездам" Л Андреева", Вестник Ленинградского университета, № 2 (1959), вып 1, стр 104-117

КУЛОВА, Т К , "Л Андреев и М Горький", Ученые записки Московского областного педагогического института им Н К Крупской, т 120 (1963), стр 115-144

КУЛОВА, Т К , "Л Андреев и М Горький Размежевание сил русской литературы", Ученые записки Московского областного педагогического института им Н К Крупской, т 161 (1966), стр 61-87

КУЛОВА, Т К , "Л Андреев и М Горький Революция 1905 г Размежевание сил русской литературы", Ученые записки Московского областного педагогического института им Н К Крупской, т 157 (1965), стр 3-40

Литературное наследство, т 72 Горький и Леонид Андреев Неизданная переписка, (М , 1965)

РЕДЬКО, А Е , ""Враги" М Горького и "Жизнь Человека" Л Андреева", Русское богатство, № 6 (1907), отд 2, стр 106-114

РЕДЬКО, А Е , "Литературные наброски (М Горький "Дети Солнца" Скиталец "Полевой суд" Л Андреев "Христиане")", Русское богатство, № 2 (1906), отд 2, стр 1-25

РЕДЬКО, А Е , "М Горький о виноватых и Л Андреев о неповинных", Русское богатство, № 2 (1905), отд 2, стр 47-61

РЕЙСНЕР, М.А., Пролетариат и мещанство (Две души русского народа в учениях Л Андреева и М Горького), (Пг , 1917)

СОКОЛОВ, П А , "Две ночлежки ("На дне" Горького и "В подвале" Л Андреева)", Приднепровский край, 28 марта, 1903, стр 2, 4 апреля, 1903, стр 2-3

ЯБЛОНОВСКИЙ, С В , "Свет и тени Из жизни текущей", Русское слово, 24 апреля, 1902, стр 2

b) In languages other than Russian

SALGALLER, E., 'Gorky's letters to Pyatnitsky A sidelight on his attitude to Leonid Andreyev', American Slavonic and East European Review, vol.18, no.4 (December, 1959), pp.579-589

YERSHOV, P., (ed), Letters of Gorky and Andreyev, 1899-1912, (New York, 1958)

VII. OTHER WORKS CONSULTED

a) In Russian

АБРАМОВ, К , "Революция 1905 года в художественной литературе", Ученые записки Ульяновского педагогического института, вып 7 (1955), стр 198-213

АЙХЕНВАЛЬД, Ю , Силуэты русских писателей, 4-е изд , т 3, (Берлин, 1923)

АНДРЕЕВИЧ, Е , Опыт философии русской литературы, (СПб , 1905)

АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК СССР, ИНСТИТУТ ИСТОРИИ, Начало первой русской революции , (М , 1955)

АЧАТОВА, А А , "Проблема героя и стиля в творчестве писателей-реалистов начала XX века", Ученые записки Томского университета, т 77 (1969), стр.157-168

БАЗАРОВ, В , "Богоискательство и богостроительство", сб "Вершины", кн 1 (СПб , 1909)
БАТЮШКОВ, Ф , "Литература и политика", Речь, 3 и 10 декабря, 1906
БАХ, А Н , Царь Голод, изд 2-е, (б м , 1884)
БЕЛОУСОВ, И , Литературная среда Воспоминания 1880-1928, (М , 1928)
БЕЛЫЙ, А , Арабески, (М , 1911)
БЕЛЫЙ, А , Между двух революций, (Л , 1934)
БЕРДЯЕВ, Н , "Революция и культура", Полярная звезда, № 2 (1905), стр 146-155
БЛОК, А А., Собрание сочинений в восьми томах, (М -Л , 1960-1963)
БОЦЯНОВСКИЙ, В Л , "Литература и революция", Театр и искусство, № 48 (1906), стр 746-748
БУГРОВ, Б С , "Драматургия "знаньевцев" эпохи первой русской революции", Научные доклады высшей школы Филологическая серия, № 3 (1960), стр 40-53
БУНИН, И А , Воспоминания, (Париж, 1950)
БЯЛИК, Б А , (ред), Русская литература конца Х1Х-начала ХХ века, (М , 1968, 1971, 1972)
ВАРШАВСКИЙ, С , "Л Н Толстой и русско-японская война", Литературный современник, № 4 (1934), стр 147-151
ВЕНГЕРОВ, С , (ред), Русская литература ХХ века 1892-1910, т.2, часть 2, (М , 1915)
Вехи Сборник статей о русской интеллигенции, изд 2-е, (М , 1909)
ВЛАДЫКИН, И И , "Новое о московском литературном кружке "Парнас"", Научные доклады высшей школы Филологические науки, № 3 (1963), стр 201-207
ВОЙТОЛОВСКИЙ, Л , Очерки истории русской литературы Х1Х и ХХ веков, (М -Л , 1928)
ВОЙТОЛОВСКИЙ, Л , Текущий момент и текущая литература (К психологии современных общественных настроений), (СПб , 1908)
ВОЛЖСКИЙ, А С , "Литературные отголоски По поводу книги г Булгакова ("От марксизма к идеализму")", Журнал для всех, № 12 (1903)
ВОЛКОВ, А , "Между двух стульев", Вопросы литературы, № 10 (1962), стр 184-187
ВОЛКОВ, А , Русская литература и революция 1905-1907 годов, (М., 1955)
ВОЛКОВ, А ,"Творчество А И Куприна в годы реакции", Вопросы литературы, № 12 (1960), стр 155-165
ВОРОВСКИЙ, В , Литературно-критические статьи, (М , 1948)
ВОРОНКОВА, Е.М , "Революция 1905 года и художественная литература", Ученые записки Кабардинского педагагогического института, вып 9 (1956), стр 197-207
ГЕРАСИМОВ, Л , "Наша литература и пресса после революции", Образование, № 2 (1908), отд 3, стр 1-12
ГИЛЯРОВСКИЙ, В , Избранное, (М , 1960)
ГИППИУС, З , Литературный дневник 1899-1907, (СПб , 1908)
ГОЛУБЕВА, О Д , "Из истории издания русских альманахов начала ХХ века", Книга Исследования и материалы, вып 3 (М , 1960), стр 300-334
ГРУЗЕНБУРГ, О О , Вчера, (Париж, 1938)
ДЕСНИЦКИЙ, В А , МУРАТОВА, К Д , (ред), Революция 1905 года и русская литература, (М -Л , 1956)

ДМИТРИЕВА, В И , Так было (Путь моей жизни), (М -Л , 1930)
ДОЛГОПОЛОВ, Л К , "Русская литература конца Х1Х-начала ХХ века как этап в литературном развитии", Русская литература, № 1 (1976), стр 93-109
ДОСТОЕВСКИЙ, Ф М , Собрание сочинений в десяти томах, (М , 1956-1958)
Драматургия "Знания", (М , 1964)
ДРЕЙДЕН, С , "Театр 1905-1907 годов и царская цензура", Театр, № 12 (1955), стр.104-109
ЖЕГАЛОВ, Н Н , (ред), Критический реализм и модернизм, (М , 1967)
ЖУРАКОВСКИЙ, Е , Трагикомедия современной жизни, (М , 1906)
ИВАНОВ-РАЗУМНИК, Р В , История русской общественной мысли Индивидуализм и мещанство в русской литературе, (СПб , 1906)
ИВАНОВ-РАЗУМНИК, Р.В , Русская литература от семидесятых годов до наших дней, изд 6-е, (Берлин, 1923)
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А , Литературный Олимп, (М., 1911)
ИЗМАЙЛОВ, А., Помрачение божков и новые кумиры Книга о новых веяниях в литературе, (М , 1910)
История русской литературы, (М -Л , 1954)
КАМЕНСКИЙ, В В , Путь энтузиаста, (М , 1931)
КЕЛДЫШ, В А , Русский реализм начала ХХ века, (М , 1975)
Комиссаржевская Письма, воспоминания, материалы (М -Л , 1964)
КОРОЛЕНКО, В , "Старые традиции и новый орган", Русские записки, № 8 (1916), стр 249-267
КПСС в резолюциях и решениях съездов, конференций и пленумов ЦК, часть 1, (М , 1953)
КУГЕЛЬ, А.Р , Листья с дерева, (Л , 1926)
КУЛЕШОВ, Ф , "Прав ли А Волков?", Дальний Восток, № 2 (1962)
КУПРИНА-ИОРДАНСКАЯ, М К , Годы молодости, (М , 1960)
ЛАВКОНЕН, Н И , "Революция 1905 года и русская литература", Вестник Ленинградского университета Серия истории, языка, и литературы, № 12 (1955), стр 121-123
Литературное наследство, т 84 Иван Бунин, (М , 1973)
Литературно-эстетические концепции в России конца Х1Х-начала ХХ века, (М , 1975)
Литературный архив Материалы по истории литературы и общественного движения, (М -Л , 1960)
Литературный распад, кн 1 (СПб., 1908), кн 2 (СПб , 1909)
ЛУНАЧАРСКИЙ, А В , Религия и социализм, (СПб , 1908)
ЛЮБЛИНСКИЙ, С Б., "К истории возникновения товарищества "Знания", Русская литература, № 2 (1972), стр 188-190
ЛЬВОВ-РОГАЧЕВСКИЙ, В , Новейшая русская литература, (М., 1923)
Мария Федоровна Андреева Переписка Воспоминания Статьи Документы Воспоминания о М Ф Андрееве, изд 3-е, (М , 1968)
М Горький и поэты-"знаньевцы", изд , 2-е, (Л , 1958)
МЕЙЛАХ, Б , "Лев Толстой в годы первой русской революции", Русская литература, № 3 (1959), стр 51-68
МЕЙЛАХ, Б , "Символисты в 1905 году", Литературное наследство, тт 27-28 (М , 1937), стр 167-196
МЕРЕЖКОВСКИЙ, Д , Полное собрание сочинений в 24 томах, (М , 1914)
МИНСКИЙ, Н , "Идея русской революции", Перевал, № 1 (1906), стр 11-23, № 2 (1906), стр 34-48, № 3 (1907), стр 12-27

МИНСКИЙ, Н , "История моего редакторства", Русь, 23 февраля, 1906
МИНСКИЙ, Н , "Pro domo sua", Новая жизнь, № 3 (1905)
МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ, Б.В , "Вопросы изучения русской литературы конца Х1Х-начала ХХ вв ", Научные доклады высшей школы Филологические науки, № 1 (1958)
МИХАЙЛОВСКИЙ, Б.В , Избранные статьи о литературе и искусстве, (М , 1969)
М-ОВ, Л , "Религия и марксизм", в кн На рубеже (Критический сборник), (СПб , 1909), стр 3-37
МУРАТОВА, К.Д , Возникновение социалистического реализма в русской литературе, (М -Л , 1966)
МУРАТОВА, К Д , "Изучение русской литературы конца Х1Х-начала ХХ века", Русская литература, № 1 (1969), стр 189-194
МУРАТОВА, К Д , (ред), Судьбы русского реализма начала ХХ века, (Л , 1972)
МЯСНИКОВ, А С , "Проблема реализма в эпоху первой русской революции", Известия АН СССР Отделение литературы и языка, т 14, вып 6 (1955), стр 485-513
НАЗАРЕВСКИЙ, Б , Сумерки русской литературы, (М , 1912)
НЕМИРОВИЧ-ДАНЧЕНКО, В., Из прошлого, (М , 1938)
НЕМИРОВИЧ-ДАНЧЕНКО, В , Статьи Речи Беседы Письма, (М , 1952)
ОВСЯНИКО-КУЛИКОВСКИЙ, Д Н , (ред), История русской литературы Х1Х в , (М , 1910)
ОДНОБЛЮДОВ, В , Трагедия современного интеллигентного общества, (Елец , 1915)
ОПУЛЬСКАЯ, Л Д , "Толстой и русские писатели конца Х1Х-начала ХХ в ", Литературное наследство, т 69 (М , 1961), часть 1, стр 103-140
ОРЛОВСКИЙ, П , (ред), Из истории новейшей русской литературы, (М , 1910)
Очерки философии коллективизма, сб 1 (СПб , 1909)
Первая русская революция и театр Статьи и материалы, (М , 1956)
ПЕРЦОВ, В О , "Реализм и модернистские течения в русской литературе начала ХХ века", в его кн Писатель и новая действительность, (М , 1958), стр 305-330
ПОССЕ, В А , Мой жизненный путь Дореволюционный период (1864-1917), (М.-Л , 1929)
Проблемы реализма русской литературы начала ХХ века, (М , 1974)
Проблемы типологии русского реализма, (М , 1969)
"Революция и литература", Свобода и жизнь, 5, 12, 20 ноября, 3 декабря, 1906, стр 3
РЕДЬКО, А Е , Литературно-художественные искания в конце Х1Х-начала ХХ в , (Л , 1924)
РОЖДЕСТВЕНСКИЙ, Вс , Страницы жизни Из литературных воспоминаний, (М -Л , 1962)
РУБЦОВ, А Б , Из истории русской драматургии конца Х1Х-начала ХХ века, (Минск, 1960)
"Сборник товарищества "Знания" за 1906 г кн 9", Вестник Европы, стр 342-348
СЕРАФИМОВИЧ, А С , Собрание сочинений в семи томах, (М , 1959-1960)
СЕРЕБРОВ, А , Время и люди Воспоминания, (М , 1955)
СИНЯВСКИЙ, А , Фантастический мир Абрама Терца, (Лондон, 1967)
СКИТАЛЕЦ, Повести и рассказы Воспоминания, (М , 1960)
СЛУЦКИЙ, М И , Смысл жизни человека по произведениям Андреева, Сологуба, Горького, Метерлинка и решение его в христианстве, (Харьков, 1910)

Смена литературных стилей На материале русской литературы XIX-XX вв , (М , 1974)
СМИРНОВ, В , Из революционной истории Финляндии 1905, 1917, 1918 гг , (Л , 1933)
СТАРИКОВА, Е В , "Реализм и символизм", в кн Развитие реализма в русской литературе, т 3, (М , 1974), стр 165-246
ТЕЛЕШОВ, Н Д , Избранные сочинения в трех томах, (М , 1956)
ТОЛСТОЙ, Л Н , Полное собрание сочинении в 90 томах, (М -Л , 1928-1958)
ТОМАШЕВСКИИ, Б , Краткий курс поэтики, (М -Л , 1930)
ТОМАШЕВСКИИ, Б , Теория литературы, (Л , 1925)
ФИЛОСОФОВ, Д , Слова и жизнь Литературные споры новейшего времени, (СПб , 1909)
ФРЕЙДКИНА, Л , Дни и годы Вл И Немировича-Данченко, (М , 1962)
ЦЕХНОВИЦЕР, О , Литература и мировая война, (М , 1938)
ЧУДНОВЦЕВ, М И , Церковь и театр Конец XIX-начало XX в , (М 1970)
ЧУКОВСКИЙ, К , От Чехова до наших дней, (СПб , 1908)
ЧУЛКОВ, Г И , Годы странствий Из книги воспоминаний, (М , 1930)
ЧУЛКОВ, Г И , Покрывало Изиды, (М , 1909)
ШЕМЕЛОВА, М И , "Кружок писателей-реалистов "Среда" 1899-1909", Вестник Ленинградского университета, № 20 (1962), стр 86-98
ШИШКИНА, Л И , "Образ коллективного героя в творчестве писателей-"знаньевцев"", Русская литература, № 1 (1976), стр 181-192
ЭНГЕЛЬГАРДТ, М А , "Литературные заметки Подъем литературного творчества в 1905-1907 и его особенности", Вестник знания, № 4 (1908)
ЭРЕНБУРГ, И , Собрание сочинений в девяти томах, (М , 1962-1967)

b) In languages other than Russian

BEDFORD, C H., 'Dmitry Merezhkovsky, the intelligentsia and the Revolution of 1905', Canadian Slavonic Papers vol 3 (1958), pp 27-42
BERDYAYEV, N , The Russian Idea, translated from the Russian by R M French, (London, 1947)
LEON, E., RAY, G N., (ed), Henry James and H.G Wells A record of their friendship, their debate on the art of fiction and their quarrel, (London, 1958)
ELIOT, T S , Murder in the Cathedral, (London, 1935)
GRANT, D , Realism, (London, 1970)
HANSOT, E , Perfection and progress two modes of Utopian thought, (Cambridge, Mass , 1974)
HARCAVE, S., First blood The Russian Revolution of 1905, (London, 1965)
HAYWARD, M , LABEDZ, L , Literature and revolution in Soviet Russia, (Oxford, 1963)
JAMES, C V , Soviet Socialist Realism Origins and theory, (London, 1973)
LONG, J.W , 'Organized protest against the 1906 Russian loan', Cahiers du monde Russe et Soviétique, vol 13, no.1 (1972), pp.24-34

LUKACS, G , The meaning of contemporary realism, (London, 1969).
MOLNAR, T., Utopia, the perennial heresy, (London, 1972)
MUCHNIC, H , From Gorky to Pasternak Six modern Russian writers, (London, 1963)
NIETZSCHE, F , Thus spoke Zarathustra, translated by R J Hollingdale, (Harmondsworth, 1969)
PERSKY, S , Contemporary Russian novelists, translated from the French by Frederick Eisemann, (London, 1914)
PHELPS, W.L , Essays on Russian novelists, (New York, 1911)
POLTORATZKY, N P., 'The 'Vekhi' dispute and the significance of 'Vekhi'', Canadian Slavonic Papers, vol 9, no 1 (1967), pp 86-107
RUHLE, J., Literature and revolution A critical study of the writer and communism in the twentieth century, (London, 1969).
Russian Formalist Criticism Four essays, translated and with an introduction by Lee T Lemon and Marion J Reis, (Nebraska, 1965)
SCHAPIRO, L., 'The 'Vekhi' group and the mystique of revolution', Slavonic and East European Review, vol 34 (1955-1956), pp.56-76
SCHOPENHAUER, A., The world as will and idea, translated by R.B.Halbane and J Kemp, (London, 1889)
SETON-WATSON, H , The decline of imperial Russia, (London, 1968).
SHESTOV, L., 'Dostoevsky and Nietzsche the philosophy of tragedy', in Essays in Russian literature The conservative view, ed Spencer E.Roberts, (Ohio, 1968), pp 3-183
SIMMONS, E J., Russian fiction and Soviet ideology, (New York, 1958)
STANISLAVSKI, C., My life in art, translated by J J Robbins, (Harmondsworth, 1967).
STAVROU, G., (ed), Russia under the last tsar, (Minneapolis, 1969)
STRUVE, G , Soviet Russian literature, (Oklahoma, 1951)
TOMPKINS, S R , The Russian intelligentsia makers of the revolutionary state, (Oklahoma, 1957)
TROTSKY, L D., Literature and revolution, translated from the Russian by R Strunsky, (London, 1925)
ULAM, A B , Lenin and the Bolsheviks, (London, 1969).

VIII DISSERTATIONS CONSULTED

БЕЗЗУБОВ, В И , "Леонид Андреев и русский реализм начала XX века", (докторская диссертация, Тарту, 1968)
БОРИСОВА, В А , "Повесть Горького "Жизнь ненужного человека", (кандидатская диссертация, Москва, 1952)
БУТСКАЯ, И А , "Беллетристика и критика журнала "Жизнь" в период сотрудничества в нем А М Горького (1899-1901)", (кандидатская диссертация, Киев, 1953)
КУЛОВА, Т К., "Леонид Андреев и Максим Горький (Из истории литературных отношений)", (кандидатская диссертация, Москва, 1967)

ИЕЗУИТОВА, Л А , "Творчество Леонида Андреева (1891-1904)", (кандидатская диссертация, Ленинград, 1967)
ШЕМЕЛОВА, М И , "Кружок писателей-реалистов "Среда" (1899-1909)", (кандидатская диссертация, Ленинград, 1962)

IX. ARCHIVE MATERIALS CONSULTED

а) Институт русской литературы (Пушкинский дом)

АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Дневник Март-сентябрь, 1892", ф 9, оп 1, ед хр 16
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , ""К звездам" Пьеса Вариант", Р III, оп 1, № 48
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , ""К звездам" Вариант первого действия", Р III, оп 1, № 49
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , ""К звездам" Вариант сцен", Р III, оп 1, № 51

б) Рукописный отдел Государственной Публичной библиотеки им М Е Салтыкова-Щедрина

АНДРЕЕВ, Л , ""Метеор" Рассказ Авторизованная рукопись", Материалы редакции журнала "Русское богатство", ф 11, Горнфельд, № 1325
АНДРЕЕВ, Л , "Письмо Н В Дризену 12 ноября 1910", ф 263, Н В Дризен, № 61 (1)