A

SHORT HISTORY

OF

RUSSIAN LITERATURE

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
OF
SHAKHNOVSKI

WITH A SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTER BRINGING THE WORK
DOWN TO DATE (WRITTEN SPECIALLY FOR THIS BOOK)
BY
SERGE TOMKEYEFF

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & Co., Ltd.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & Co.
1921

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY.

The history of literature presents a progressive development of the art of writing in every country, and is correlated with the culture of the people. Therefore a historical treatise on literature must be a review of the productions of a people in chronological order, so as to illustrate the achievements in culture in which the spiritual endeavours have found expression and influenced its life and character. This literature at the outset may be oral, i.e., transmitted by word of mouth, but ultimately and generally it is written, and hence called literature.†

The Russian language is Slavonic, one of the branches of Indo-European. Other great branches are Greek, some Indian languages, Latin, Teutonic, etc.; but the nearest affinities to the Slavonic are Lithuanian, and possibly the earliest form of Celtic and Teutonic.

The Russian language is the dialect spoken in the principality of Moscow, and arose in its present structure after the Tatar invasion. The earliest Russian literature is in mediæval Russian, and originated at Kiev, where the first Russian State was founded by the House of Rurik. The first princes of Kiev were Scandinavians, who consolidated a Russian State. The language was called Russian from the time when the Slavs of Kiev under the rule of these Scandinavian princes (called Vaerings, or in Russian Variág) became united into this single State, which was called Rus. It is supposed that Rus was the appellation originally given to the Variág princes.

In prehistoric times all the Slavs must have spoken what was essentially one speech. There are now two main

†In Russian there are three words for *literature*, each emphasizing an aspect: slovésnost' (that it is language), pís'mennost' (that it is written), literatura (that it conforms to canons of art).

sections of the Slavonic languages: the Eastern branch comprises Bulgarian and Church-Slavonic, Serbian and its dialects; and Russian with its dialects; the Western includes Čech, Polish, and the Slav languages once spoken in Prussia and Saxony.

The oldest monuments of Slavonic speech are the *Ostromir Gospel*, the Čech poem *Sud Liubušy* (the trial of Ljubuša) and the Croat (in the Carpathians) or Slovene fragments of the Vth century; all of these show how very similar the Slav dialects then were. As to Russian literature: its first appearance as a separate literary language different from what the people spoke may be assigned to the XIII and XIV centuries.

CHAPTER I.

ORAL AND WRITTEN LITERATURE.

Russian literature falls under two heads, oral and popular, or learned and artistic.

The learned literature is divided into three periods of development—the ancient, the new, and the modern.

The ancient extends from the beginning of Russian literature to the eighteenth century; the new from the eighteenth century to the forties of the nineteenth century; the modern to our own times. The Russian renaissance came two centuries later than the Western.

THE ORAL LITERATURE.

The oral literature comprises the spontaneous productions of the mind and the imagination of the people, transmitted orally from generation to generation.

THE MYTHIC EPIC.

Man in prehistoric times distinguishing himself from the outer world perceived to the full his feebleness and helplessness face to face with the unconquerable forces which made him the hapless victim of light and dark, heat and cold, hunger and thirst, misfortune and grief. Placed in utter dependence on the external powers of Nature, he acknowledged Nature as the supreme will, as something divine, and prostrated himself in a spirit of resignation and childlike veneration. He accepted as a great miracle Nature's mysterious phenomena, whether in the calm of triumph or the terror of her anger. His observant mind was especially struck with the opposition of light and dark, heat and cold, the growth in springtime and the autumnal decay. In this wise the deities

of our ancestors evidently arose out of the gradual explanation of the import of heaven and its portents, according as they were kindly or harmful manifestations of Nature. At first he worshipped the Sun and the Moon, next the Dawn and the gloaming, thunder, rain the wintry cold and the renewal in the Spring, and so forth. Later, the early Slavs, as other peoples, began noticing these objects and half-unconsciously comparing them with other beings with which they were surrounded, such as animals; and then they began worshipping them in fantastic forms, and interchanging the attributes of natural phenomena with those of man and the animals. The first phase is called anthropomorphism, the second zoomorphism.‡

The adoration of the forces of Nature found expression in many festivals, especially at the beginning of spring and autumn. On these occasions there was a ceremonial accompanied with songs. Furthermore, man in his dependence on the actions of Nature was constrained at many moments in his life to implore the assistance of heaven, and put his desires into mysterious acts and words to which he ascribed magical power. The principal agents in this struggle were the heroes, or in Russian *bogatyri*, who represented the national power. Their feats are a very rich source for the history of the national poetry, in view of the epic myths they embody. But, there are still extant only a few fragments, which now enable us to elucidate this stage of the beliefs of the people. Such relics are (1) *Riddles* (e.g. the dawn, the maiden, the beautious damsel, walked in the woods and dropped her keys—the moon saw her and did not betray her: the sun saw her and revealed her); or again the two sisters, one bright, the other dark—she flies without wings, runs without feet, ails without wounds.(2) *Proverbs and Adages*, which exemplify the oral national style and serve to record an aspect of life and condition long past, and the character-

‡ So far as Shakhnovski; but other later writers, such as Rambaud, have proved that the Slavs had advanced very little from the vague worship of the natural powers before they were converted to Christianity. They never evolved anything like an Olympus.

istics of the habits of the hunters and shepherds (e.g. the grey wolf in the sky catches the stars; he lived in the woods and worshipped the trunks; from the hollow of the tree there flew the brown owl, the white-owl or Satan himself.) Vows and omens are found associated with the proverbs of the most ancient period, as also interpretations of dreams and medical prescriptions: and (3) there are, in connection with these last, *Incantations*, which are relics of the ancient heathen prayers and imprecations.

The most important of the remains of the mythical period are the (1) the *Ceremonial Songs*, which accompanied the family and communal holidays; (2) the *Mythical Songs* in which the people adores the powers of Nature; and (3) the *Heroic Songs* of the *bogatyri*, which are intimately allied with the popular traditions and legends, and constitute the transition from supernatural to ordinary beings.

From the mythical songs we know that Perún was the god of thunder, Volos or Veles the god of cattle, Dazhbog or Khors the god of the Sun, and Stribog the god of the winds.

THE HEROIC EPIC. When the people began in the course of its historic development to understand its own strength, it resolved to combat the hostile powers of Nature. These natural forces were emblematized as the gods of darkness: and the champions of the protectors were adored as bright and kindly gods with the attributes of human qualities and shapes. These kindly and gentle gods are the heroes or *bogatyri*.

The heroic songs of the Prince Vladímir and those of the epoch of the Tatar invasion represent actual events and are therefore called historic. The memory of the Tatars is conserved in such songs as those of Shchelkan Dudeltevich, Mikhailo Kozarinov, Tsar Kalin, Prince Román Dmitrievich and his wife Mária Yúrevna.

THE ELDER AND THE YOUNGER BOGATYRI.

The cycle of the heroic epics falls into two periods: (1) the Elder Bogatyri and (2) the Younger, or the Kievite *bogatyri*, the tales of whom are centred round Prince

Vladímir the 'red sun.' The former resemble rather supernatural beings: they are characterised by the power of transforming themselves into animals and possess such extraordinary strength that it becomes a burden even to themselves. The latter are more like men, do not transform their human stature: their strength, albeit not to the same degree as with the former is employed usefully in combating enemies in the persons of the peoples hostile to the Slav nations: and to these foes popular fancy has transferred many of the attributes of the elements.

THE ELDER BOGATYRI. There are still extant of these the legends of Svyatogór, of Volgá and Mikúla Seliáninovich, i.e. Nicholas the Villager's son.

Svyatogór is a *bogatyr* of titanic size, a giant of marvellous strength, which is a burden to himself. His inability to use it has made him immire himself in the earth to his knees, when he merely wanted to lift a double shoulder-bag. Svyatogór in due course handed to Iliá Múromets his strength and his steel sword. He is a symbol of the forces of Nature.

Volgá Busláevich has more human qualities. He typifies the habits of the hunter. Popular fantasy identified him with a historical personage, Olég the Wise (883-912 pp.). Volgá collects tribute from the subject peoples, and is occupied with catching wild beasts, fish, and birds, for which purpose he transforms himself into animals.

He wins a victory outside Constantinople in a miraculous way over the "Turkish Saltán."

Mikúla Seliáninovich typifies the agricultural man, whom the early Russians honoured above the warrior and the huntsman. This can be exemplified from this story: that Volgá is setting out to collect tribute and meets Mikúla on the way and proposes to him they should journey forth together. Mikúla agrees, but on the way remembers that he has left a plough in the ground. The companions of Volgá are first sent to fetch it, and then Volgá himself: but none of them can pull it up. At last Mikúla himself drags it out and herein shows the quality of his strength, his dexterity, patience, care and skill. Mikúla Seliáninovich

may be considered to be transitional to the Younger *Bogatyri* the contemporaries of Vladímir. Another mediate type is the person of the peasant Uiá Múromets, the champion of the people.

THE YOUNGER BOGATYRI. The Younger *bogatyri* are much more numerous than the Elder. They are also called *polenicy*, a word which has been derived from *pole* (field). They constitute in themselves almost a people scattered locally, though subsequently they were centred at Kíev around the gentle Prince Vladímir and then represented not only their original homes (e.g. Aliósha Popóvich of Rostóvj Dobrynia Nikitich of Riazáń, but also typified classes of society, the sons of priests—(in Russia parish priests are not celibate)—the *boyars* (nobles) the *druzhíny* (the retainers of noblemen) and the peasants.

The Prince Vladímir who takes the part of King Arthur in this Russian cycle is a historical character, but is a contamination of two princes of Kíev, Vladímir I and Vladímir II, who reigned 970-1015 and 1053-1126 respectively.

The principal of the Younger *bogatyri* are Dobrynia Nikítich Alyósha Popóvich, Churilo Polenkovich and above all the people's favourite Iliá Múromets, the beau idéal of the *bogatyri*.

Their characters are well and consistently developed in this cycle of legend: and the variety and liveliness of description constitutes this epic cycle one of the most remarkable products of any popular literature.

The various deeds of the *bogatyri* have come down to us in the heroic cycle of Kiev, of the Republic of Nóvgorod, and some independent poems. The Nóvgorod cycle springs from the separate history of that city-state and is quite distinct from the Kiev cycle. But in general these epic poems consist of short separate episodes, written in the unrhymed accentual metre of that time. These poems fall under two heads, the *bylina* (ballad) and the songs.

(1) The *bylína* is a name given by the people itself (derived probably from *byloe*, the past) and signifies a story of an event that really happened, as opposed to a legend (*skazka*) which is conceived of as a composition or invention.

Almost all *byliny* begin with a description of a feast in the capital city of Kíev, followed by stories of the feats of the *bogatyri*, whether visiting the Prince from afar, or journeying away from Kíev at the behest of the Prince.

(2) The songs generally contain none of these details, not even the name of the *bogatyr*, nor of the enemy, with whom he has fought, nor the details of the combat. In fact, the song gives a condensed and terse picture of the *bogatyr's* life, and may be classed as lyrical poetry, or as the epic style of the *bylina*, which is narrative. Both *byliny* and the lyrical songs in the matter of exposition bear the traces of popular composition. Besides the prevalence of the miraculous element they are characterised with a vast mass of exaggerated versions of facts, of positive and negative similes and standing epithets.

The metre presents difficulties, even to a Russian. It was essentially based on the musical accompaniment, on the one hand, and on the older Russian accentuation on the other, so that the feet of the verses might—within reason, consist of varying number of syllables. In English a similar feature exists to a limited extent in what is known as the Christabel metre.—The characteristic metre is a line of four or five chorics, always terminating in a dactyl. It is, however, impossible to illustrate this in English: and even the modern Russian imitations fail, for they are infected with the spoken regularity of modern lyrical verse. It may be added that there perhaps hardly exists any so beautiful and continuous folk-literature of the Russian. But it was not literature in the full sense : it had no form or idea and was not written. When exposed to higher forms, such folk-songs perish of inanition, for they are essentially non-adaptable.

CHAPTER II.

THE BEGINNINGS OF WRITTEN LITERATURE.

Christianity was introduced into Russia at the end of the X century by Prince Vladímir I, and a delegation was sent from Constantinople, the seat of the Eastern Empire and of the Orthodox Church to convert Russia. These missionaries brought with them the Bible and ecclesiastical books, which had already been translated into a Slav speech closely akin to Russian. Thus the Russians had from the first one great advantage, that from the earliest days of the introduction of Christianity, its message was delivered, not in Greek or Latin, which would have been unintelligible, but in a form comprehensible to the people. Thereby a secure foundation was laid for literacy and literature and a first step made towards the cultural training of Russia in letters. But before coming to the course of development of Russian literature, some reference must be made to the authors of Russian letters. Amongst others, Saint Cyril and Methodius had enormous influence on the fostering of Russian writing and literature.

SAINTS CYRIL AND METHODIUS. Saints Cyril and Methodius were the sons of a Greek governor Leo and were born at Salonica in Macedonia. Methodius was the elder brother: the date of his birth is not known, but he died in 855 A.D. He served in the army, was the administrator of a Greek district, in which there dwelt many Slavs. In the midst of his prosperity Methodius sacrificed everything, became a monk in one of the monasteries on Mount Olympus.

Cyril, the younger brother, who was called Constantine

until he entered a monastery, was born in 827 and died in 869. He received a thorough education at the Byzantine court with the Emperor Michael. He too threw over the Court and became a monk and ultimately librarian in the Cathedral of Saint Sophia. He loved solitude and left the capital, but returned to Constantinople at his friends' request and became a lecturer on philosophy. Even in his twenty-fourth year he had been an ardent evangelist, defending Christianity against the Mahometans amongst the Greeks of Little Asia, and against the Jews amongst the Khozars in the Crimea. His brother Methodius took a deep interest in the travels of his brother and shared with him in all his self-abnegations in the cause of the Faith and proselytism. Cyril one day heard that the Slavs living in Greece were after baptism reverting to heathendom, as they could not understand the Church service: and therefore he set himself to compose an alphabet to meet all the requirements of the Slavonic speech with its many sounds. His letters he took principally from the Greek alphabet, some from Hebrew, some Armenian and some from Coptic. Having made his alphabet, Cyril, with the assistance of his brother Methodius, translated into Slavonic the necessary books of ritual, and these were used amongst the Byzantine Slavs, and thence probably spread to the Bolgars (then a Finnish tribe) who were converted in the year 861.

The period of the greatest activity of the two brothers was during their residence in Moravia. The Moravian princes, seeing that the people were unable to apprehend even the elementary truths of Christianity, addressed themselves to the Byzantine Emperor Michael, who selected Cyril for the purpose. The success of the Slavonic mission in Moravia, aroused and alarmed the German Hierarchy which, dreading the loss of its influence on the Moravians impugned these first missioners before Pope Nicholas I. The Pope summoned the brothers to Rome for trial, but it was his successor Adrian II who heard them, and so far from letting them be tried, made Methodius a Bishop and sent him to Moravia where he lived for sixteen years more. Cyril, worn out with toil, died at Rome.

THE SPREAD OF LITERACY. The first endeavours to spread literacy in Russia are to be traced immediately after the conversion of Saint Vladímir (970-1015). The ancient Chronicles tell us how Vladímir built schools attached to the churches, at which he directed children were to be taught. Yaroslav I the Wise (978-1054) continued his father's work and, further, himself bought, read, copied and transcribed such books as were then considered pious, an action which was then considered pious and a step towards salvation. It was then that the ancient library at the Cathedral of Saint Sophia at Nóvgorod was founded.

It was a fertile soil for literature and as early as the first half of the XI century the first literary productions appeared. But, as Byzantium influenced Russia either directly, or indirectly through the Bulgarian Slavs, it followed that the first Russian models were merely Greek originals or translations and adaptations from the Bulgarian. The principal object of spreading the knowledge of letters in the first period was the desire to give the people literate priests, and therefore, the literates in Russia were mostly the clergy and the religious houses. Their aims in literary production were confined to the copying, translation and rewriting of the precepts, sermons and the epistles. The first authors in Russia were the Metropolitan of Kiev, Hilarion and the Bishop of Nóvgorod Zhidiáta Luka. Zhidiáta, the Bishop of Nóvgorod (died in 1060) is known by his admonition to the diocese of Nóvgorod " the Precept to our brethren " which contains an exposition of the obligations of Christianity the Christian to God, to his neighbour and himself. This admonition is remarkable for his language which is most pure colloquial Russian, and is the first example of precepts free from Byzantine rhetoric.

Hilarion, the metropolitan of Kiev, was the first Russian author " *on the Law given by Moses and on benevolence and truth which proceed from Jesus Christ* " : he included in his book a laudation of Saint Vladímir and forms of prayer. Hilarion manifests much knowledge of theology and displays oratorical art.

THE OSTROMIR GOSPEL. There is still extant a Manuscript of about 1050, a transcript of the gospel made by Deacon Gregory for the governor of Nóvgorod Ostromir. The MS. was finished in 1057, is written on a magnificent parchment, in a large hand-writing with gilded illuminations, decorated capitals, and four large paintings of the Evangelists. The Manuscript is now preserved in the Imperial Public Library at Petrograd, and is the oldest monument in Slavonic, and all Slav peoples look with reverence at this priceless example of the art of writing of early Russia, all the more as the Russians alone of the Slavs have been able to keep such a treasure of the ancient manuscript. The Ostromir Gospel is all the more important as it is written in the ancient Slav language almost uncontaminated in its most ancient style: even the departures from the necessities of this language are remarkable, as they indicate the peculiarities of two dialects, the southern or trans-Danubian, and the northern of Russia.

NESTOR. The tradition is that Nestor lived at the end of the XI and beginning of the XII century. He is considered the most ancient chronicler of Russia. His compilation of Chronicles is headed "These are the tales of the years in their seasons, whence came the Russian Land, who in Kiev ruled in Kiev and whence the Russian land hath arisen."

There is very little known about the history of Nestor. This much is reliable that he entered monastic life at the age of seventeen, about the year 1073 and therefore must have been born in or about the year 1056. In 1091 he was deputed to find the relics of Saint Theodosia Theodosius of the Pechchora (a sacred retreat near Kiev) and he carried out his mission. Modern savants have come to the conclusion that the author of the "*Tale of the years in their seasons,*" Nestor is a rather legendary being, just like the Igumen [head of a monastery the Greek ἡγούμενος.] Sylvester whose name is found in the registers . . . "further the name of the author" says one of the latest authorities, "is of no consequence: what is of much

greater importance is that this compilation in a fourteenth century manuscript is indisputably a production of the XII century, and that in the course of analysing it we find even more ancient sources." We have manuscripts of Nestor's Chronicles from the XIV to the XVII centuries. The most important is the Lavrentiski, and next the Radzivilovski, the Sofiski and the Nikonovski. The introductory Chronicle starts with a catalogue of the countries which were the heritage of the sons of Noah : there follows a sketch of geography as understood in antiquity : and then a history of the Slavs, their first life on the Danube, their migration from the Danube to the North East, their settlement in Russia, the formation in the new country of principalities different and independent, and of varying customs and habits. The Chronicle itself begins with the year 862 and concludes in 1110.

Nestor's sources were information from contemporaries (some of whom he names, such as Guriáta Rogovich on the far North, and the ninety year old Yan Uśmóvich, the son Vysháta) and information of foreign countries gathered by the monastery as well as local traditions. He also used the annual records of events, the existence of which is confirmed by his knowledge and mention of the years of the deaths of the princes : and these a chronicler could only find out from the sources indicated. Amongst other records some occur, the accuracy of which can be tested now, such as the fearful comet of the year 911. Other sources were first of all, the Byzantine chroniclers who expound biblical and ecclesiastical history, the history of the ancient people especially of Greece and Rome and from them the Russian Chronicler borrows the contemporary accounts of events in Russia : and secondly separate biographies in Bulgarian or even Russian such as the lives of Cyril and Methodius.

THE PALEI. [GREEK παλαιαί].

These were abbreviated stories from the Old Testament with interpretations by the Fathers of the Church. Thus the Chronicles is made up out of materials accessible at the time.

THE CHARACTER OF THE CHRONICLES. The character of the chronicles depends on the condition of culture and rank of standing of the chroniclers who utilized many sources without exercising much criticism, and even confused facts and deliberate inventions or fantasies.

The chroniclers were entirely ecclesiastics and generally monks: hence the chronicles are permeated with a profound religious feeling. The first pages are devoted to a description of the progress of Christianity in Russia. Much space is given up to the equipment of the Chronicles, to specification of the *icons*, the immersion of the Cross, and also to consecration for the copying of books.

THE EXPOSITION OF EVENTS IN THE CHRONICLE. The exposition is marked by terseness and the absence of coherence or connection: events are narrated in strict chronological order and the succession of the years is observed so strictly that the years are in some cases blanks, whole pages in the Chronicle are taken up with a list of the years.

The language is Church-Slavonic and Old Russian. Church-Slavonic is preserved in expressions with religious import or borrowed from Holy writ. In the current chronicle the language is Russian, which, owing to the epic tone of the Chronicle, approximates to the colloquial language. This language is especially valuable for philology, which traces in it the principal marks of Old Russian speech.

THE EXTENT OF RUSSIAN CULTURE. THE RELIGIOUS TREND IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE. THE FIRST ATTEMPTS TO FOUND A SECULAR LITERATURE. THE PRECEPTS OF VLADIMIR II. 1053—1126.

As literacy spread with Christianity, it was considered necessary not so much for the general development of the intellectual and spiritual faculties, as for the purpose of satisfying the demands of piety: hence the Russians in the XI and XII centuries, whilst collecting quite considerable libraries, and reading and transcribing from Greek or didactic books, confined themselves exclusively to religion.

Hence it may be understood that the first attempts at a secular literature in the XI and XII centuries were bound to bear the impress of a strong religious influence. This may be seen in the *Precepts of Vladímir II*, one of the first essays to create a secular literature.

Vladímir II was one of the most cultured and clear-sighted princes of his time. He was too wise not to see the serious position of the Russian period. He was always obsessed with the anxiety for the Land of Russia, torn and wracked with dissensions, and, above all, with fear for his own sons who would inherit from him.

He introduces his precepts with an account of the reasons for which he is writing. In 1099 he had only just terminated the brothers' feuds and conciliated the other rivalries, and was on his way home by the Volga, when he was greeted with an embassy from his cousins calling on him to fight the Rostíslavichi of Galicia. "Envoys from my brothers met me on the Volga and said: 'Come and join us: let us expel the Rostíslavichi and annex their lands: and if you will not join us, remain where you are: and we will act for ourselves.' I answered them 'Even though you be angry, I cannot come with you and break my oath.' The threat of the brothers to secede for his refusal to take part in the new feud bitterly offended Vladímir. Opening his favourite book with which he never parted, the psalter, his eye fell on the psalm "wherefore art thou afflicted, oh my soul, why dost thou confound me"?

The words of the psalm soothed him and he resolved to write an admonition for his sons. As a practical man, he strove to reconcile the Christian ideal with the obligations which the social and family relations of his time thrust on the man in the world.

This short manual is divided into three parts. In the first, he enjoins on his sons "to control their eyes, to restrain their tongue, to appease the mind, subdue the body, and repress anger and practice purity of thought." Next he preaches an evangelical gentleness, which was quite unusual in that remote epoch. He sees all evil in pagan practices, and therefore makes his religious attitude prom-

inent all through the book. Repentance, tears and alms are the best virtues wherewith to redeem sin: and the best prayer in Vladímir's eyes, is "Lord, have mercy on me a sinner." The second part of the instruction touches on the duties of the prince as a ruler. In this part he shows his fine qualities, which he wishes to see in his children. "Not to forget the poor, the orphaned, to assist widows, not to slay whether the just man nor the guilty, and not to bid others to slay them."

Knowing the heedlessness of the Russian, he advises him not to rely on a bailiff nor a henchman "in order that none may mock his house or his repast." Farther on he does not forget the duties of a warrior and advises princes to keep the sentry posts under their own scrutiny. Several times he repeats the words "be not slothful."

In the third part Vladímir enumerates his expeditions, the thirteen great ones and 83 little ones and tells of his toils in war and the chase.

The Manual is curious in this respect, that in the course of directions on the ideal duties of the prince as a Christian and ruler, it also gives pictures of the life of princes of that time and life in the Russia of the XIII century. The sympathy with children, the wish to do them good, the keen interest in the events of the time give the injunctions brevity, simplicity and naturalness.

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE PROFANE LITERATURE OF THE XI CENTURY AND THE BEGINNING OF THE XII.

The *precepts of Vladímir II*, though belonging to secular literature, bear the immediate trace of the ecclesiastical. And it is very significant that the authors of these productions were laymen who probably were the first to be moved by the conviction that the clergy, being preoccupied with the general human aspect, and problems exclusively religious and dogmatic, and being attracted by ideal endeavours after Christianity was ill-adapted to supply the needs of the contemporary Russian society. These first monuments of literature exposed the needs of the time and provide a very caustic disclosure of the deficiencies of society. The

mass of the people undeveloped, and to an extent of at least half practically heathens, was scarcely fitted to regard the problems of life consciously, and was entirely absorbed in the task of conserving its simple toilful existence from the dangers which menaced it from all sides. In the moments of leisure and rest popular imagination could not rise above the level of legends, the legacies of immemorial tradition, and heroic songs in which the pride was in telling of miraculous physical strength which served to safeguard a limited prosperity, whereby a few rude necessities were satisfied. Hence it is comprehensible that the first authors of secular literature in Russia were princes and noblemen whose material position was secure. They had a merry and plentiful existence with the princes who fed and clothed them and shared their booty with them. This rank of the druzhíny [the retainers] was in many respects privileged and advantageous, and made them the leading class, and the most important in the old Russian scheme of society, and conferred on them the possibility of taking a serious and conscious interest in the events of contemporary life, as they occurred. So that the best members of the druzhíny then sought their ideals, not in the masses of the people which were intellectually inferior to them, not in the clergy, which they deemed superior to every-day work, but in their noble and princely midst. As a consequence of this the minstrels of the Druzhína class fairly correctly ascribed the causes of the feuds to the lack of patriotism, to the preference for personal self-interests over the common interests of the whole of Russia, and surrounded with an aureole of glory the name of those princes who only shed Pagan blood not to injure, but to preserve Russia and to rescue her from foreign foes.

CHAPTER III.

THE MONUMENTS OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

The principal record of the conscious and proper relation of the druzhína in the life of Russia in the XII century is the *Tale of the expedition of Igor.* This tale is one of the best songs composed by the minstrels of the druzhíny in honour of those princes who stand for the ideal of the best tendencies of the petty Courts.

The Tale conserves remains of heathen beliefs and this was why a knowledge of a production so highly poetic was so little spread amongst the written literature in Russia and in time was completely forgotten ; it was only rediscovered at the end of the XVIII century by the well known litérateur and antiquary Count Musin-Pushkin. It was printed and published for the first time in 1805, but the incorrectness of the copyist, who probably could not read the ancient handwriting, caused many errors to creep into the text, and it could not be revised with the original, as the latter was burned in the fire together with the whole of Musin-Pushkin's library in the great fire of Moscow of 1812.

Nothing is known of the poet who was the author of the Tale. Some learned editors have opined that he was illiterate and that his poem was written down by a scribe from memory, in consequence of which the metre was distorted and some Church Slavonic elements introduced.

The author of the Tale described the conflict of the Olgovichi and Monomákhovichi (rival families, descendants of Vladímir II).

In 1176 Vsévolod Iúrevich grandson of Vladímir II was Grand Prince: but the seat of government had by then been removed to Vladímir (a city near Moscow), to which region the political centre of gravity was then definitely shifted. At Kíev there reigned the eldest of the Ólgovichi, Svyatosláv Vsévolodovich, who assumed the title of Grand Prince. The first years of Vsévolod's reign were occupied with savage warfare with Svyatosláv. Two princes, Riúrik and Davyd, stand out free from amongst the Monomákhovichi: and on the other side Igor and Vsévolod the sons of Svyatosláv. The former of these distinguished himself in a brilliant victory over the Khans (rulers) of the Pólovtsy (savage Turanian nomads who had been infesting Russia for some fifty years), Kobyák and Konchák in 1171, in the reign of the Grand Prince Andrew Bogoliúbski. But the Ólgovichi had often dishonoured themselves by availing themselves of the assistance of the Pólovtsy. Thus in 1181 Vsévolod was prominent in the ranks of the Pólovtsy, who had been hired by Svyatosláv to serve against the Grand Prince. Igor himself acted as the leader of these Pólovtsy, but was defeated near Kíev by a Monomákhovich, Riúrik Rostíslavich. Thus, this appeal to the Pólovsty had cast a slur on the Ólgovichi in the eyes of the people which was more attached to the descendants of the Monomákhovichi, who had always faced the Pólovtsy. In 1181 the southern Russian Princes had armed against the Pólovtsy. The expedition in which Igor, the prince of Nóvgorod Sěverski [a town near Kursk] and his brother Vsévolod of Trubech [another principality in the same region] refused to take part, was successful.

In 1185 Igor and Vsévolod themselves undertook an expedition against the Pólovotsy and there went with them Igor's son Vladímir the prince of Putívl, and Svyatosláv of Rylsk. It was this foray which served as the theme for the Tale. The Chronicle relates that the princes as they neared the Don saw the Sun standing like the moon: and they took this eclipse as an evil omen, and informed Igor accordingly, who, however, paid no regard to the portent and crossed the Don. At Oskolk he waited two

days for his brother Vsévolod from Kursk. The first battle with the Pólovtsy was favourable to the Russians and the Druzhína captured the whole of the enemies' camp as their booty. The second was unfortunate and terminated with the capture of the princes. The repentance of Igor as portrayed in the Chronicle finely set forth the frightful misery which the people had to endure from these feuds. Whilst Igor was in captivity a Pólovets Lávor came to him and advised him to flee, offering his help, but Igor declined, on the plea that he would not sully himself with an evil repute. But, on second thoughts, he followed the advice of the men and resolved on flight and succeeded in escaping. He returned with his son Vladímir (who had married a daughter of the Khan of the Pólovtsy) and with his brother Vsévolod.

A comparison of the story as told in the Chronicle and in the Tale shows that his poetic narrative is much sharper and circumstantial in depicting the epoch. Igor's expedition,—in itself an unimportant detail—was chosen by the poet owing to his patriotic feeling and his regard for the interests of his time. The poetry is especially strong in the Dream of Svyatosláv III and the Plaint of Yaroslávna.

In its language the Tale presents some resemblance in its epic turns with the modern Southern Russian poetry e.g., the simile of the battle as a banquet, or as the toil of the husbandman : the comparison of a weeping woman with a cuckoo (in the Plaint of Yaroslávna) or with a turtle-dove or some other bird. Ancient forms have been conserved in the language and fore-tokens of the Southern Russian dialect. It has been translated into modern Russian by Maikovski Mei and Minaev.

THE SERMON OF CYRIL TUROVSKI. Our preachers, fostered on the Bible and both Testaments, imbibed the conceptions and views there contained, and educated themselves to the so-called universal Christian spirit, whilst on the other hand, they followed the interpretations and explanations of the Byzantine writers and thus became imbued with their teaching and ideals, such as the ascetic attitude towards life, very

inappropriate to the conditions of the item. Thus Russian intellect and talent, striving towards the highest spiritual enlightenment, were seduced into an imitation of Byzantine models and practiced themselves in their style on Byzantine rhetoric which called for florid expression, allegories and symbolic images. It was the most gifted of the Russian preachers, Cyril, metropolitan of Turov (near Minsk) who was the most subservient to this influence. In his youth he renounced his inheritance, left his rich parents' house and led a stern, monastic life, whereby he attracted the notice of the inhabitants of Turov, at whose request he was raised to the episcopate.

He would not use his remarkable poetical talent in Russian work, but turned aside from active life to devote himself to lofty considerations of religion. Sermons constitute the greater part of Cyril's compositions, which however the masses did not hear, for they could not understand what the writer was protesting against. The object of Cyril's sermons was to portray and extol some event in the Gospels. What had been tersely put in the Gospel, he expatiates upon with glowing descriptions of the circumstances of the act, of conversations and sometimes with a dramatic method of exposition. He was called a Chrysostom for the flamboyance of his style.

CHAPTER IV.

THE MONUMENTS OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

DANIEL THE PRISONER. The prayer of Daniel the Prisoner is entirely made up of the *Parables of Solomon* and the *Books of the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach.* It is aimed at softening the heart of wrath of the prince of Pereyáslavl (near Kíev), who was a patron of Daniel. He neatly combines extracts from the books above mentioned with Russian proverbs, with reproaches at the events of the time in Russia which have a purely autobiographical interest. Who Daniel the Prisoner was we do not know. From his work, which very much pleased Russian *littérateurs* for the affectedness of the style, it is clear that he was on friendly terms with the Prince of Pereyóslavl, Yaroslávl Vsévolodovich, who became angry with him and banished him to Lake Lache (in the present province of Olónets). It is not known whether he received pardon.

From all of the foregoing we see that the soil for culture in Russia manifested itself very suitable, that literacy—which was the first stage—had no difficulty in penetrating all the upper ranks of society, and spread pretty evenly according to the classes, that the love of collection and transcribing books was the same in the clergy, amongst the princes and their druzhíny: but that the Tatar atrocities with their terrible results almost annihilated the beginnings of the ancient Russian civilization. This was the only body that kept alive these commencements of enlightenment on the national soil of Russia before the XIII century, the

Church : and this was why the nomad Tatars who so swiftly conquered the greater portion of the Russian dominions, were not to be attracted and struck by the picture of the settled civil life which they found in existence in Russia. But the superstitious imagination of the half-savage Horde was, as it were, amazed at the picture of the religious life of old Russia, by the multitude of magnificent churches and rich monasteries, the splendour and order of the outward ceremonial side of the divine service. Thus the effect was that a yarlyk [a Tatar word incorporated into Russian meaning something between charter or prerogative] was granted to the clergy, and promulgated the release of the Church from tribute, and conferred exemptions whereby the Tatar Khans evidently endeavoured to curry favour with the Church and to dispose of it to their advantage. Thus the clergy, secure behind the monastery walls occupied their time, not only with transcribing chronicles, miscellanies and translations of the XI, XII and XIII centuries, but also began working to raise the religious spirit and the morality of the masses. The clergy regarded the Tatar invasion, as they told their congregation in their admonitions, as a Divine chastisement for sin and observance of Pagan customs. Serapion, the Bishop of Vladímir, has left us some remarkable sermons in this arduous period of Russian history.

SERAPION. All that we know from the Chronicles for certain of this important personage of his time is that he was very learned and earnest in divine lore, and that in 1274 he was promoted from being archimandrite of the Kiev Pecherski monastery to be Bishop of Vladímir and in 1275 that he died. Seven of his treatises have come down to us. In them he exhorts his flock to repentence, to redemption from punishment and woe sent by the devil as a penalty for sin. Amongst the miseries he includes the Tatar incursion.

CHAPTER V.

THE MONUMENTS OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

THE ZADÓNSHCHINA. Some facts about the Tatar yoke stirred the minds and imaginations of contemporaries and these found expression in a whole series of tales which were called precatory on account of the impression they produced on the reader. The most remarkable of these are the tale of the slaying of Mamai and the Zadónshchina (derived from *Don*, the victory of Dmitri Donskói over the Tatars in 1380). These compositions, disregarding their more or less pretentious style are marked for their sincerity, their limitless hate of the Tatar and their fellow feeling with the Russian people which was the victim of the lamentable oppression. Special interest attaches to the Zadónshchina as an imitation of the Tale of the Expedition of Igor.

The Zadónshchina is only one of the narratives of the Battle of Kulikovo (1380).

It found for itself a worthy minstrel like the author of the Tale of Igor: it proceeds to find imitators of this poem and, truth to say, not artistic ones. For instance, the prolix farewell lament of Dmitri's wife is a flabby and vacuous plagiarism on the Lament of Yaroslávna. In the place of Boyán the Zadónshchina speaks of a wise Boyár, a marvellous fiddler in Kiev: the poetical image of the "nightingale of olden times" is turned into a "lark, a summer bird the joy of a summer day or a nightingale" which is invited to sing the glory of Dmítri Ivánovich

Donskói. This tale of the Zadónshchina is ascribed to a Boyár (noble) Sofroni.

APOCRYPHA. Amongst the productions of the XIV century are the so called apocryphal tales. These became part of Russian literature very early and lasted into the XVI century. They were spurious stories of religious content, such as *The Commandment of Adam, The Prayer of Seth, Enoch, Jacob's Ladder, The Commandment of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Journey of the Mother of God through Hell,* etc.

THE LITERATURE FROM THE TIME OF IVAN THE TERRIBLE TO THE MIDDLE OF THE XVII CENTURY.

The end of the XVI century marks the termination of the ancient period of Russian literature. It was a time when in society there was no original life, no positive interests, no respect for personal rights or public opinion. Political circumstances aided in concentrating power in the hands of the princes to the most perilous extent. Russian society up to this time had passed through this extremity in developing those principles which had informed its life: and surrounded on all sides with the most unfavourable conditions for any further evolution, severed from European influence by hostile and envious neighbours, it had to content itself with what it had worked out for itself by its own devices and scanted means. Hence it came about that in that part of society which was more prone to apathy and stagnation, another disease showed itself, not less serious, namely, a false and presumptuous notion of the import and value of everything Russian, as an indisputable model, not needing any modification: and together with this conviction the utmost revulsion from anything foreign, a mistrust and dread of any innovation however evidently advantageous. However, in opposition to these extreme connections there had also grown up under the influence of certain casual conditions, some distant echoes of the vast progressive movement which was guiding all of Europe in the XV and XVI centuries, known as the Renascence. At this epoch, one of strife of

various elements, it was the fate of Russia to possess one of the most notable of our social and literary actors of the XVI century.

MAXIM THE GREEK. This man was Maxim the Greek, a monk of Athos, who was invited to Russia to catalogue a large library of Greek manuscripts that had accumulated in the library of the Grand Prince Vasili Ioánnovich (1479-1533). Fortunately he lived in Russia the greater half of his life and acclimatized himself, was drawn with an intense longing to enlighten Russia, which was so rich in moral and intellectual powers: and thanks to his life of self-denial, he succeeded in educating a generation of new Russians qualified to divorce themselves from the dreadful activities of the XVI century to outdistance them and proceed farther on the road of a development more intellectual and ethical.

Maxim the Greek was invited to Russia in 1518, at the age of 38. He had spent the greater part of his youth in Northern Italy, which in the XV century was the refuge of the Greek savants who sought safety from the Turkish yoke. In Italy he taught the old classics whom he often called his first teacher: but he was equally familiar with modern languages, Italian and French. The famous Florentine reformer Savonarola, the vigorous upholder of early Christian ideals and morality against the luxury and profligacy of the manners of that day and the arbitrariness of the clergy, had beyond doubt great influence on Maxim. From Italy he returned to Greece and at Athos took his vows as a monk. On his arrival at Moscow he did not content himself with his modest position as a translator and corrector of ecclesiastical and sacred books, but directed his attention exclusively to polemics against false teachings which were current in the Russian Church and exposed the principal social insufficiencies.

The civil disorder during the reign of Basil Ioánnovich (1479 to 1533) and the minority of Iván IV (1530 to 1584) furnished ample material for the condemnatory work of Maxim. Altogether he wrote 140 works in Russia. Most of them were written to combat the Judaizing heresy in

Russia, as well as the attempts to Romanize and the attacks on orthodoxy, as also against the false interpretation by the orthodox of religious dogmas. Calumnies by his enemies consigned Maxim, as a heretic to the Volokolamski monastery. Iván the IV had him transferred to the Troítse-Sergíevski convent, where he died.

THE "DOMOSTRÓI."

A detailed account of the Domostróis (a translation into Russian of the Greek οἰκονόμος, the management of a house, whence the modern notion of economics) is of more importance to the history of the habits of that time than to literary history. As a literary product it is an expression of convictions and opinions prevailing in society. The Domostrói is ascribed to Pope (priest) Sylvester, the tutor and adviser in morality of Iván IV. It consists of 63 chapters and an introduction. The author expounds the rules according to which the lay should conduct themselves, manage their houses, their family life and their demeanour to those around them. The Domostrói covers the whole field of the higher and lower requisites in social behaviour and the needs and even the graces of manners. The most curious sections are the chapters describing the position of the Russian woman in the XVI century both in the upper and lower circles. A perusal of parts of the Domostrói is recommended to those who want to get a clear presentation of family life in Russia in the XVI century.

THE INTRODUCTION OF PRINTING INTO RUSSIA.

The scribes and commentators had grievously mutilated the Texts of Holy Writ. The Metropolitan Macarius persuaded Tsar Iván to introduce printed books into Russia, as the only means of providing against such corruption. With this object the first typographer was summoned from Denmark, and was assigned as assistants two deacons Iván Feódorov and Peter Timoféev Ménshalovtsev. Thus printing was first brought into Russia almost seventeen years after the first Slavonic book had been printed at Cracow and at least thirty years after there had been printing

in Slav languages and Cyrillic Slav type. The reason for this tardiness in introducing printing is not merely the mistrust and dread of any innovation, but also the special circumstances of society of that epoch regarding knowledge of letters and writing.

IVÁN IV AND ANDREW MIKHAILOVICH KURBSKI. Two of the principal figures of the second half of the XVI century were Iván IV and Andrew Mikhailovich Kurbski. The secular literature of this century reveals a lively picture of the actual conditions, of the conflict of two opposite principles, which obtained in the society of ancient Russia. Iván IV, as a writer, in many respects shows the influence on himself of his age of his severe and troubled childhood and his education. His literary work was a correspondence with Prince Kurbski and a message to Kozmá the *igumen* of the Monastery of Saint Cyril at Bĕloozëro. Both of these deserve special attention.

Iván's writings prove him to have been erudite, well acquainted with the Scriptures and translations of the Fathers of the Church the Russian Chronicles and chronographs, from which he derived knowledge even of universal history, that of Rome and Greece. This wide reading is combined with an astonishing lack of education: he often does not know how to use and arrange the store of information, facts and ideas which he treasured in his memory. Hence his exposition is confused, he lumbers up his paragraphs with a mass of citations apposite or inapposite: his style fails of lucidity wherever he tries to express his thoughts in bookish fashion, and disdains to use the simple popular manner in which he was adept. He wrote two letters to Kurbski, of which one is long enough to make a whole volume. Kurbski wrote Iván four letters. The correspondence ranges from 1573 to 1579. This famous correspondence started after the betrayal of Iván by Kurbski and the latter's flight to Livonia and entry into the service of the King of Poland.

In Kurbski's letters to the most powerful of the rulers of Moscovy one may detect the voice of a strong personality

that defends its rights against the authority that was sweeping all else before it and founds those rights on tradition, exactly as Iván pretended to base his claims to unlimited and terrible power. Kurbski upbraids Iván for misuse of his power and proves to him that his rule was good only so far as he was surrounded with good and honourable adjutants. One of Kurbski's most important and remarkable books is his history of Iván the Terrible.

The principal object is to propound the motives in the character of the Terrible Tsar of Moscow, as he says in a short introduction. His work is the first attempt at pragmatic history written by a Russian on Russia.

CHAPTER VI.

THE MODERN PERIOD.

Before entering on a review of the modern period in Russian literature, it is necessary to give some space to the rise of a new culture in South Western Russia in the XVI century, the progress of education in the XVII, to the schools and teachers of that time, and lastly to the new literary principles introduced at Moscow by learned men from Kiev.

During nearly the whole of the sixteenth century, all the conditions of home affairs at Moscow and in the Moscovite State continued most unfavourable for the acceptance and spread of culture, and consequently most of North Eastern Russia still languished in the deepest gloom of ignorance. Fortunately, the better and enlightened men of that time, to a greater extent than at any other began to recognise that ignorance saps the best forces of the people and is the cause of disorder moral, political and economic, such as was crushing the Russia of that period.

Just about that time on the South Western and Western borderlands of Russia a spark of culture was glowing which was destined to be refracted to good effect in the far distant North East. The moving factors in this borderland were the so-called Brotherhoods, which first took a purely philanthropic character, but subsequently, towards the end of the XVI century, began directing their efforts towards the raising of the standard of literacy in the people

to a very notable degree. These brotherhoods at the same time made themselves prominent as the saviours of the nation and the faith from the intrigues of the Jesuits. The parish schools of the Church at first taught only reading and writing, but towards the end of the XVI century began teaching languages, Greek, Slavonic, Russian, Latin and Polish, grammar, rhetoric, poetics, dialectics, theology and many other sciences. One *Prince Ostrozhski (so called after Ostrog in Volhynia) founded such a school in his proprietary village of Ostrog in 1580. About the same time similar schools were established at Lvov, Vilna, Brest, Minsk, Mogilev, and Kiev. (Most of these towns are in Poland on the Polish Russian frontier, on either side). It should also be stated that when Guttenberg's epoch-making invention of printing was arousing the crookedest interpretations and even superstitious doubts, at Moscow the very centre of Russian political life, the printing machine was bringing the greatest benefits to the Russian population.

One of the higher schools founded at Kiev and attached to the Church of the Epiphany was in 1594 called the School of Hellenic-Slavonic and Latin-Polish learning.

One Peter Mogila, the son of a Moldavian general (1597 to 1648) one of the most remarkable and enlightened personalities of that time enabled the School of the Epiphany to expand the sphere of its work. At his own expense he sent monks and laymen abroad to complete their education and qualify for the teaching profession.

In 1631 Peter Mogila reorganized the brotherhood school into the Kiev Mogilianski College and at his own expense built class-rooms, and used his large inheritance to endow the College and provide scholarships for the poorest pupils, he instituted a library, and, in pursuance of his efforts to raise the standard of education founded at Vinnica (in Podolia) a lower preparatory school to the College. Furthermore, Peter Mogila gave up all his leisure to compile manuals, school books and other similar pro-

* The title *Prince* is ambiguous in English. In English it signifies one of the Royal blood, but it is also used to translate the Russian *kniaz*, the German *Fürst*, a title of a large landed-proprietor.

ductions, such as according to contemporary pedagogic conceptions would be likely to be distinctly useful in the development and training of the pupils.

In the XVII century the Kiev College had become the model of all higher educational establishments in South-Western Russia, meeting in full the demands of the time, and reflecting the historical conditions under which this education had developed, against which all the workers had perforce to contend. The Kiev Mogilianski College, which was reorganized in 1707 into an Academy, rendered Russian education immense and invaluable services. After the re-annexation of Little-Russia to Russia (1667) the eloquent and artistic clerical orators who proceeded to Moscow brought with them new ideas, together with their educated love of knowledge and respect for it, and there they at last succeeded in implanting a consciousness of the necessity of education, and finally, through the terrific weapon of their eloquence, managed after a long and severe struggle to overcome the bleakness of the ignorance and prejudice of the religious and social scheme of old Russia, which voiced itself in cavillings and accusations of heresy.

The Kiev *savants* laid the first foundation of Russian classical literature: the schools which made their first appearance in Russia in the first half of the seventeenth century as also the Academy founded at Moscow towards the end of that century, used the manuals of Lavrenti Zizani Tustanovski (the first Slavonic grammar), of Meleti Smotricki (his grammar was used in the schools down to the time of Lomonósov), Cyril Trankvilion, Simeon Polocki and many others. All of these men had received their education in the South-Western schools and the Kiev-Mogiliánski Academy.

IGNORANCE AND THE PRESS-CORRECTORS.

The Moscovite State was closing its account with the past, but was still far from recognising that the time had come above all to grapple with the problem of introducing education into its dominions, already very spacious.

The people was still impressed with a vivid feeling of

the past. It had witnessed the fall of the nobility as a class under Iván the Terrible, and now saw those same *Boyars* in most indisputable mastery under the new dynasty of the Románovy. One consequence of this was that the people arrived at the conviction that all good or evil could only come from above, from the Tsar, and the higher classes, down to the lower. Hence it is understandable that it was only Moscow that could take any step forward on the road of moral and intellectual advancement. Unfortunately, the reverence for antiquity, exaggerated and carried to the point of the ridiculous, the love of tradition, the superstitious dread of any innovation hung like a fearful load on the spiritual and intellectual life of the Russian people, situated as it was, in extraordinary isolation and crippling confinement. The extreme illiteracy and general ignorance combined to make this tendency especially real with regard to religious subjects and questions of ritual.

The sacred books and books of Divine Service were printed almost as faultily and badly, as in former times before the introduction of printed books, when they were transcribed by scribes. The very slight knowledge of reading made it difficult to find a press-reader or corrector, to prevent the appearance of mistakes designed or undesigned. The press-readers, according to the monk Arsenik Glukhói (who was engaged by the Patriarch Philaret) to correct printed books were men who had no idea " of orthography or heterography " and did not even understand the distinction between vowels and consonants.

THE FIRST SCHOOLS IN MOSCOW. The disasters which overwhelmed Russia at the end of the XVI century and beginning of the XVII did much to shake the firmness of the faith of Moscow in its material power and importance.

Under Tsar Michael (1596-1645) it was not only workmen, craftsmen and manufacturers who were imported from abroad: the need of knowledge forced Russians to admit the pre-eminence of foreigners in science, and a long series of invitations of learned men from Western Europe prepared the soil for a very rapid evolution in the life of

Russian society, for an accelerated intercourse with Western Europe.

The recognition of the necessity of knowledge in Russia was manifested in the first place with the object of conserving Russian individuality from foreigners, and secondly, to safeguard the purity of the religious principles Russia had taken over from the Greeks.

Thus it was that Patriarch Philaret in 1633 founded the first higher school attached to the Monastery of the Miracle called the Chudovski or Greco-Latin School. The monk Arsenik Glukhói was set over this school: he was one of the most educated men of his time.

Some years later by Imperial *ukáz*, the complete Cosmography was translated from Latin by Ivan Doorn and Bogdan Lykov.

KOTOSHIKHIN AND IURI KRIZHANICH. Kotoshikhin and Krizhanich must be considered the most eminent writers of the second half of the XVII century. The former was a copyist at the ambassadorial office which was presided over by the General Prince Dolgoruki. During the second Polish war (in 1660) he did not agree with the General and fearing vengeance fled to Poland and thence to Sweden where he was punished for the murder of the master of the house in which he was staying—the quarrel arose over the mistress of the house. One book of his is extant, "On Russia under Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich." In this book Kotoshikhin demonstrates the incompetence of the *boyars* as governors and advisers of the Tsar, principally because many of them had not learned how to read nor had studied. He also speaks of the condition of the judicature and compares Russian institutions with those of Western Europe.

Iúri Krizhanich, a Croat by race, was a Catholic priest and arrived in Russia in 1659. He is noticeable as a propounder of the Union of the Churches: but of this he soon despaired and became absorbed with the idea of founding a vast Pan-Slavonic State, which, in his estimate should be established in the future under the immediate direct leadership of Russia.

Krizhanich came to Russia, as he says for three reasons: with three objects in view: "in the first place to foster the Slav Language, and write a grammar and lexicon so that we might write and speak correctly, secondly to compose a history of all the Slavs in which he wanted to refute the German lies and slanders: thirdly to expose the machinations and deceptions wherewith foreign peoples delude us Slavs."

Of these objects he accomplished the first and the last but even thus it was in banishment at Tobolsk, where he was sent by Tsar Alexis (1624-1676).

PATRIARCH NICON.

In any case, there were incomparably more who were devoted to the old order than there were champions of the new. Hence there was a party conflict: one party powerful in numbers, the other pre-eminent for ethical pre-eminence. This conflict started publicly under the patriarchate of Nicon (1605 to 1681). He presents one of the most remarkable types of that arduous period of transition in Russia between from towards the end of the XVII century before the opening of the epoch of reconstruction.

Nicon was the son of a peasant who, at the age of 12 ran away from his parents to a monastery, where notwithstanding his youth, he surprised the inmates with his feats.

His parents recalled Nicon from the monastery and forced him to marry, but he soon again left his family and returned to the monastery: he removed to the Bĕloe Ozëro where he became a simple friar at the Anzerski hermitage, and soon after he was made *igumen* of the Kozheezerski (in the province of Onéga) monastery. In 1646 Nicon happened to be in Moscow on the business of his monastery and was noticed by Tsar Alexis who was struck with the stately manner and unusual force of speech. He did not return North any more and in two years was made metropolitan of Nóvgorod and four years later Patriarch.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EPOCH OF RECONSTRUCTION.

How powerful was the party that loathed any innovation at the end of the XVII century in the reign of Peter I may be judged by the well-known will of Patriarch Ioákim, who tried to convince Peter I and John to expel all foreigners from Russia. Peter the Great really is like a bogatyr-Tsar, fighting the sluggishness of his day: he initiated the epoch of reconstruction.

There is no reason to enlarge on the importance of the epoch of Reconstruction: history has done this for us—but those aspects only of this great epoch must be reviewed which were re-echoed in the literature of the first half of the XVIII century and impressed themselves on the whole course of the subsequent enlightenment of Russia.

To begin with an account of the education of Peter the Great himself. His purely practical mind could not regard education otherwise than from a utilitarian point of view: hence it is comprehensible why the great reconstructor concerned himself so little to aggrandise such schools as the Slav-Greek Academy. The literary tendency was merely one of translations. Peter himself transcribed books, appointed translators and some times corrected the translations. In 1724 he founded the Academy solely for teaching languages: there were other schools equally practical: but none even thought of institutions for general education—the tendency was entirely practical.

Peter the Great founded the National Theatre for "willing spectators." In 1702 Iogan Kunsht reached Moscow as the "Director of Comedies of his Imperial Majesty." Kunsht, at Peter's command wrote a comedy

"on the victory and surrender to the Emperor of the Fortress of Orĕshek." (The episode relates to the capture of Nöteborg or Schlüsselburg in 1702).

IVAN TIKHONOVICH POSOSHKOV, a peasant writer (born about 1670) is a very interesting personality of the epoch of Peter the Great. He was more than a literate: he was really well-read and profoundly seised of the spirit of reform in his very heart. "From the frontiers of ardour to one's Country," to use his own expression, he began writing sketches and books, in which he tried to direct the attention of the Government to many social defects, and to indicate at the same time the right method of uprooting them. After Peter's death, Pososhkov on some pretext was arrested and imprisoned in the fortress of Petersburg where he died in 1726.

FEOFAN (THEOPHANES) PROKOPOVICH, Archbishop of Nóvgorod, (born at Kiev, 7th June, 1681) must be accounted one of the greatest collaborators and advisers of Peter the Great, and one of his most reasonable and zealous coadjutors.

He was educated in the Kiev-Mogilianski Academy, where he startled his superiors with his extraordinary talents, the liveliness and keenness of his mind and his attractive manner. After completing his course at the Academy he wished to continue his education abroad in the Polish schools, whither many of the Russian youth used to repair: but as there no one of the Oriental Faith was admitted, he had to become a Uniate. Feofan did not stay long at the Polish schools and travelled in Slav lands, and got as far as Italy and to Rome, the home of art. There he entered the famous College of St. Athanasius (founded by Pope Gregory XIII for young men from Greece and the Slav countries), where he made himself the favourite of the Jesuits who acted as teachers. About 1702 Feofan returned to Kíev where he became a monk and then became a teacher at the Kíev Academy. He wrote a manual of poetics and a tragi-comedy "Vladímir" which was acted on the stage of the Academy in 1705.

In 1716 Feofan was summoned to Petersburg. A whole series of sermons delivered by him after his arrival is noticeable for the freedom from religiosity: he himself, rather a lay than an ecclesiastical writer, expounds the contemporary political events and the actions of the Government. In fine it must be stated that Feofan in the history of Russian literature, science and enlightenment at the outset of the XVIII century is a very conspicuous figure. It is not only for the broad intellect, his brilliant knowledge and fervour for reform to which he devoted his entire life and activity: he is remarkable yet more for his complete divorce from all the old Russian spiritual and literary traditions, for his independence of them, and hence, despite his ecclesiastical rank, he is the first lay writer in Russia in this vital epoch of reconstruction.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE RECONSTRUCTION ON LITERATURE.

It has been stated how Peter, as a reconstructor, regarded science and literature. It was purely utilitarian, and as a consequence, there could not be established any proper outlook amongst *savants* and writers on the proper relations between science and literature. Many of them for instance deemed literature only a toy, a pastime more or less agreeable in hours of leisure, between times. Hence, for the whole of the period of our literature immediately following on the epoch of reconstruction, one common feature may be observed: science appears in the closest connection with the aims of literature, and all the Russian writers up to the reign of Elizabeth Petróvna (1741-1761) from Kantemir to the great genius Lomonósov are both writers and professors. Such too was the first of the Russian lay writers known to us in the full sense of the term, Feofan Prokopovich. He did not disdain the chance of giving up to literature a moment of leisure.

KANTEMIR. Prince Antiokh Dmitríevich Kantemir was born in Moldavia in 1708. His father Dmítri Kantemir was a Moldavian gospodar (nobleman) and migrated with his whole family and four thousand Moldavians into Russia after the disastrous expedition on the

River Pruth (1711). His son Antiokh was then three years old. Dmítri Kantemir, who after thus becoming a Russian subject, became one of the advisers of Peter the Great and travelled with him to Persia, and on the way there printed proclamations for circulation in Caucasia. How great was his love for knowledge may be gauged from his will, which bequeathes his inheritance only to those of his children who distinguished himself most in the sciences.

Antiokh was most influenced by his mother, a Greek by birth, and a woman of remarkable intellect and education. One of Kantemir's biographers says of her that " she was adorned with all the beautiful qualities of her sex, and that beauty in her seemed one of the least of her merits." She herself undertook the education of her children with the aid of a Greek Priest, Anastasius Contoides, who taught them Greek, Latin and Italian.

Antiokh was only ten years old, when he knew languages so well that he recited in church at the Moscow Academy in the presence of Peter an eulogy of St. Demetrius in Greek. Antiokh's first tutor was taken by Peter to translate books, and was replaced by a Russian teacher, Iván Iliínski who inspired Kantemir with a love of verse, or as it was then called, prosody. At the age of sixteen, Kantemir asked leave of Peter to go abroad to complete his education, but his request for some reason unassigned was refused. At the age of seventeen he had published his Symphony to the Psalter, in which he expressed a desire to assist in some practical way those who wished to refer to the Biblical dicta. At this time Antiokh was already serving in the Preobrazhenski lifeguards, and about this time came into contact with Feofan Prokopovich. At the end of Peter's reign Antiokh Kantemir found himself without any means of subsistence, as his elder brother, (who had married a daughter of one of the most powerful ministers of the Tsar, Prince Dmítri Mikhailovich Golitsyn used his father-in-law's position to convert his father's bequest to his own use. In 1731 Kantemir was appointed Resident in London; just before 1731 when Anna Ioánnovna (1730-1740) ascended the throne a portion of his inheritance was returned to him.

The Literary Work of Kantemir. Even before his departure to London Kantemir had written five satires, some fables and epistles. These were circulated in manuscript amongst the intellectuals of the Russian society of that day and secured the author an honourable repute. Kantemir preferred the form of satire not merely because of the influence on him of Horace and Boileau, whom he was thoroughly acquainted with, but also because he was under the sway of the period of transition in which he lived and worked.

Kantemir composed five satires whilst in Russia, and four when abroad. The first of them was a satire on *The Enemies of Learning.* The author addresses "his mind," and sets out with especial bitterness how the society of his day has no use for scientific or artistic occupations, as there are so many other roads to fame.

The types of Criton, Silvanus, Luke, Medor are borrowed from real life, of course under disguised names. They are sketched sharply and naturally and provide us with a pretty clear idea of the position of a writer and savant in society as it then was. In the satire *To my Muse, On the Danger of Writing in Satire,* he collects a variety of opinions on his own satires and their author. This, the fourth satire of Kantemir expresses with perfect clearness the author's view of his own literary work. The other satires of Kantemir are less noteworthy. In them he indulges in judgments on general subjects, borrows largely from Horace and Boileau,—in a word, does not stand as firmly on his, the Russian point of view.

The metre of Kantemir was something half-syllabic, half-stress: consisting of thirteen syllables, divided by a cæsura into two parts between the seventh and eighth syllables: in each half there is one strong accent. The rhythm shows a great monotony and poverty, but by way of compensation great euphony.

The metro-syllabic metre invented by Kantemir himself is used only in the sixth satire *On true happiness.* The first five are written in a purely syllabic metre. Kantemir died at Paris in 1774 in his thirty-fifth year.

TATISHCHEV. Vasili Nikitich Tatishchev one of the cultured co-operators in the reforms of Peter the Great, a friend of F. Prokopovich, was born in 1686 and died in 1750. He received his education partly at home, partly abroad, where he twice lived and stayed some considerable time. Tatischev first served in the artillery, and towards the end of his life was made governor of Archangel. Peter the Great knew him as a man competent for any work in hand, widely read and of broad culture, and once sent him to Sweden to recruit craftsmen for employment in mining and metallurgy. Tatishchev failed to accomplish the task set of compiling a geography of Russia, but has left us a huge historical work on Russia which he succeeded in elaborating very fully in five thick volumes.

Tatishchev published two very important works, *Russian Laws* and *The Code of Ivan IV*, to which he added commentaries. He also wrote *A Testamentary Injunction and Direction to his son Evgráf*, and a *Conversation of Two Friends on the use of Learning and Schools*. The *Testamentary Injunction* consists of a compilation of worldly wisdom as applied to the needs and views of his time.

Tatishchev spent his last years in his village of Boldin near Moscow under domestic arrest, on the charge of non-observance of some pettifogging regulations in the course of governorship of Archangel.

TREDIAKOVSKI. Vasili Kirillovich Trediakóvski was the son of a priest and born at Astrakhan in 1703. Catholic monks infused into him the desire of education: they had come to Astrakhan to spread Catholicism amongst the Armenians there. In 1723 he ran away from his parents' home to Moscow and there entered the Zaikonospasski School and at once entered to the class of rhetoric. Some years later he travelled abroad first to Holland, then to Paris, where he was under the patronage of Prince Kurakin. On his return home he went first to Moscow, and then found an opportunity of visiting Petersburg. There he was made secretary of the Academy of Sciences. He died in poverty, utterly forgotten by his contemporaries in 1769.

His Literary Work. The first production of Trediakovski was a translation of *The Voyage to the Isle of Love.* Trediakovski founded the first learned society of Lovers of Russian Speech. He had an honoured place in this society and opened its sessions with a speech " on the purity of Russian Style." The latter half of his literary life is more fruitful: in this period he wrote the following original works, *A Dialogue on Orthography,* a tragedy *Deidamia,* a translation in verse of Fénélon's *Télémaque* and a *Dialogue on Ancient Transitional and Modern Prosody.*

LOMONÓSOV. On the border of the epoch of reconstruction in the midst of the Russian learned and literary writers, there appears the giant personality of the genius of Lomonósov, the peasant and academician. His colossal form reflects all the features of the intellectual life of his time, and also carries all the promise and the seed of the development and growth that was to come.

Lomonósov's work should properly be referred to the close of the literary epoch which preceded him, and also to the beginnings of the new period.

He was the first to lead the attempt to free Russian literature and science from the heavy yoke of foreign culture, and he summoned forth the Russians to ascend the heights of independence. To him pertains the honour of creating a new literary language, and he rightfully won from his contemporaries and closest successors the title of Father of the modern Russian literature.

Thus he heads the new period of Russian literature, which, although it commences with the reign of Elizabeth, is accurately designated from the accession of Empress Elizabeth the Great.

Michael Vasílievich Lomonósov was born in 1712 in the village of Denísovka, in the province of Archangel near Kholmogorin. His father the peasant Vasíli Dorofeévich was engaged in fishing which he taught his son from early youth. The northern landscape, rude, barren and yet majestic, steeled the character of Lomonósov, and his mother Elena Ivánovna also had much influence. She was the daughter of the deacon of the village of

Matigara, in the same district. The first teacher of Lomonósov was the peasant Ivan Shubnói. After his mother's death, life at home became intolerable to young Lomonósov: what with the constant complaints of the stepmother tc his father at the time his son would waste on books, the boy was forced away to solitude and hunger and deprivation. He decided to go to Moscow, and secured from the local authorities a permit for one year: but, should he not then return, he was to be accounted a run-away serf. At Moscow Lomonósov first entered the School by the Sukhareva Tower, and then the Zaikono-Spasski School or Slav-Greek-Latin Academy. Before completing his course at the Academy, he was sent amongst the twelve best pupils who had completed their course to Petersburg, and thence abroad to finish his education and get information on certain special departments of knowledge.

At Marburg Lomonósov was taught under the guidance of Christian Wolff, and in Freiburg under Henker. In 1740 he married the daughter of a tailor, Elizabeth Christina Zilch. Severe monetary difficulties forced him to run away from Marburg: and near Düsseldorf he fell in with a party of Prussian recruiting agents who fed him, inscribed him as a recruit, took him to the fortress of Wesel, whence he again fled to Marburg, and thence at length returned to Petersburg in 1741. He died in 1764. Shortly before his death, the Empress Catherine II visited him with some of the most notable of her Court.

His Literary Work. Recognizing to the full the high importance of literature in society, but having no Russian literary models to hand, Lomonósov was obliged to use foreign models. As there was no possibility of creating anything independent on a Russian original, he had to follow the prevailing manner in Western Europe, *i.e.*, the pseudoclassic.

Pseudo-classicism consisted in a purely external imitation of the literary and poetic devices of the ancients, in an unnatural application of their conditions of their social and religious life to the contemporary European life of the

XVII and XVIII centuries, and also in an incorrect interpretation of the literary theories of the classical world.

One of Lomonósov's first poetic essays was an ode in pseudo-classical style in honour of the Russian arms. In this ode the only truths are the fact of victory and the patriotism of the author, and all the rest is false, founded on the false classical theory: we have Pindar with the Castalian key and muses, questions and exclamations devised to express the terror of the combat which the author had never seen. Yet, despite the artificiality of this ode it had in this time great significance. It finally settled the question of prosody over which Kantemir and Trediakovski had laboured so long. Lomonósov proved, not merely in theory but in practice the superiority of stress over syllabicism for Russian metre: and thenceforward syllabics began to drop out of Russian literature. Another important consequence of Lomonósov's ode was the purification of the literary Russian from superfluous Church Slavonic dictions: only some participial forms were kept: there was a careful selection of the words themselves out of the former literary language which teemed with Slavonicisms and foreign words. Pseudoclassicism was established for a long time in Russia through Lomonósov. All of his literary work was expressed in his poetry and in two eulogia to Peter the Great and Elizabeth. He wrote in every style of verse, epic and dramatic but is principally known for his odes. The characteristic of his lyrics may be found in two tragedies *Tamir and Selim* and *Demofont.*

His Scientific Work. Lomonósov was mainly engaged on chemistry and physics, but he also wrote a *Letter on the Rules of Russian Prosody, Rhetorics, a Grammar* and *Considerations on the Value of Church Books in the Russian Language.* All of his learned works are marked by their strict and methodical system, and the subordination of particular facts to laws.

The *Letter on the Rules of Russian Prosody* was sent by Lomonósov from Germany, together with his *Ode on the Capture of Khotin* (in Galicia). Its tone is political.

He resembles Trediakovski only in the elements and definitely parts company from him in details: thus for instance, Lomonósov sees no reason why hexameters and other metres should be limited by a definite number of syllables. Lomonósov's *Rhetoric* was for the first time written in Russian: up to then it had been taught in Latin: but it is not the independent work of the author. The sources for the rules given are derived from Kaussin, Holl, Gottsched and Wolff.

Up to Lomonósov's time there had been only one Russian grammar, by the student Adadurov: all the other grammars were Slavonic. Lomonósov largely used as his model the grammar of Meleti Smotricki, which had been built up on Greek and Latin models. Furthermore, he was the first to release grammar from being merely an annex to ecclesiastical affairs and to elevate to the rank of an independent science of itself. Lomonósov divides the literary language into two groups, the local dialects—or common speech, and the Church-Slavonic. The *Considerations on the Value of Church Books in the Russian Language* make it clear that Lomonósov could not altogether, for all his genius tear himself free from literary tradition and a scholastic tendency of taste, in which he had received his first education. In the *Considerations*, influenced by the good old times, he believes that style must be divided into three sorts; high, middle and low. Words common to Slavonic and Russian are high: Slavonic words that are little used but intelligible to all readers are middle. Pure Russian words are in the third category. A well-weighed use of words of the first constitutes a high style, of the second a middle style, and of the third a low style.

CHAPTER VIII.

SUMARÓKOV AND THE LITERARY WRITERS UNDER CATHERINE II.

With the broad outlines of the personality of Lomonósov that series of learned literary men is concluded who represent a feature only to be found at the epoch of reconstruction. In the course of this momentous epoch, literature and science succeeded in liberating themselves completely from the tutelage of the clergy and the religious orders, but could still not altogether part company and take their places as two independent and mighty social forces. At this point, together with Lomonósov who was deeply penetrated with the consciousness of his great genius and scientific value of his services to his country, there comes to the fore a much less remarkable personality, his constant enemy and literary antagonist, Sumarókov. Sumarókov may unquestionably be placed among the signs of the time, pointing to the transition from the epoch of reconstruction to the brilliant age of Catherine II.

Just as in the epoch of reconstruction, F. Prokopoviĉh was called "the lay writer in Russia" Sumarókov may beyond doubt, deserve the title of the first Russian literateur in the sense now usually attached to this word.

SUMARÓKOV. Alexander Petrovich Sumarókov was born in November, 1717 and died in October 1777. By birth he came of highest rank of Russian Society of that day. At the age of fifteen he entered the corps of the infantry cadets of the nobility, which had been founded at the instance of Field Marshal Münnich (1683-1767) in

1730. It is hard to say what Sumarókov was taught in the corps, and in general how great was the education he received in that scholastic establishment. His certificate, granted to him at the end of his course of science in the corps runs :—" In geometry he has learned geometry, trigonometry, he explains and translates from German into French : *in universal history he has completed Russia and Poland :* in geography he has learned Giebler's atlas : he can compose letters and orations in German : he has passed Wolff's ethics up to the third chapter : he has started Italian," and so forth.

Sumarókov received his first stimulus to literary work, when still in the corps. It is supposed that there existed there special conditions which favoured the development of literary talent.

At the age of 22 he entered the military service. He had the entrée to the highest society by reason of his birth, and there his " gentle songs " enjoyed great success. Subsequently he became an aide-de-camp to Count A. G. Razúmovski, the commander in the days of Elizabeth, and thus became known to the Empress herself.

His Literary Work. Sumarókov's literary work, whilst in military service is obscure almost up to the date of the publication of this first tragedy " Khorevi " in 1747. This tragedy so pleased the Empress that she after hearing it " ordered Trediakovski and Lomonósov to write tragedies." Lomonósov was the censor of the first productions of Sumarókov.

THE BIRTH OF THE RUSSIAN THEATRE.

When Anna Iványovna (1730-1740) ascended the throne, she gave performances by a troupe of Italian actors who had been sent to Petersburg from Dresden by Augustus, the King of Poland. These performances so pleased the Empress that she at once summoned another troupe from abroad which acted opera and drama.

In the reign of Elizabeth Petrovna (1741-1761) who passionately loved every kind of merriment, a French troupe reached Petersburg, and this was the signal for the beginnings of French influence on Russian society, which

eagerly subjected itself to this school after so long and heavy a German rule. Towards the end of Elizabeth's reign a ballet troupe arrived at Petersburg directed by Locatelli. It was this and under the influence of the acting of the French troupe that Sumarókov wrote the pseudo-classic tragedy Khorev. Just about then, at Yaroslávl (in South Russia) one Fiódor Grigorievich Volkov, a son of a merchant, had established a troupe of his own, which performed pieces written in Russian. Whilst in Yaroslávl this troupe already performing in its own theatre, which could seat up to a thousand spectators, private plays were being performed at Petersburg by the officers of the Nobles' Corps. Then, at last, Volkov's company was summoned by Imperial decree from Yaroslávl, and acted at the Court stage in the presence of the Empress, : it performed the pieces *Khorev, Hamlet, Sinav* (*i.e.* Sineus one of the first Scandinavian brothers who ruled Russia) and *Trovor* and *The Repentant Sinner.*

The most competent members of the Yaroslávl company remained in the capital and were assigned to the "Noble Academy," i.e. the aristocratic corps to teach languages and literature.

In 1756, Sumarókov was appointed director of this Russian theatre which was recognised and firmly established.

THE LITERARY WORK OF CATHERINE II.

Towards the end of the fifties of the XVIII century there was a growing demand in Russian society for reading, and naturally the circle of workers amongst Russian littérateurs was bound to expand : yet, this tendency might never have come to fruition had there not been at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth (1741-1761) favouring conditions. Catherine the Great, who was endeavouring to endow Russia with all the advantages of Western civilization, and to import into Russia the best principles of social conditions of the West, could not but see in literature a mighty tool to achieve her end. That is why she tried to encourage the development in Russia of literature and journalism, and also herself devoted much

time to a lively newspaper polemic and painted a vivid picture of contemporary manners in a whole series of comedies and satirical sketches.

By the year 1790, Catherine had written fourteen comedies, nine operas, seven compositions made up out of proverbs. There have come down to us only eleven comedies, seven operas and five such compilations.

The chief comedies of Catherine are *The Birthday of Mrs. Vorchalkina* and *What a time*! These comedies are particularly interesting for us, especially in comparison with the comedies of Von Visin, which in their content closely resemble the comedies of Catherine: but Von Visin's are more graphic and give a sharper picture and present their subject more sharply owing to his great talent.

Towards the end of her literary career, Catherine again turned her attention to ordinary topics and wrote an entire series of satirical sketches, under the general title of Actualities and Fantasies: these were published in the "proceedings of the Lovers of Russian Literature" which were issued at the expense of the Academy of Sciences under the editorship of Princess Dashkova, who was then directress of the Academy.

PETROV, famous under the soubriquet of Catherine's pocket-poet, was educated in England. The epistles he addressed to Prince Pótiómkin are marked for their friendly tone, which is foreign to the servile adulations of other writers of that time.

The famous satire of Petróv *The Adventure of Gustavus III, King of Sweden*, typifies the attitude then adopted towards the war with Sweden. The style is clumsy, the wit rough, often descending to abusiveness. Catherine, who was then at war with Turkey, rejected the immoderate demands of Gustavus, and started a war with him on very insufficient resources. However, success soon crowned the first actions of the Russians against Gustavus on June 6th, 1788, at the first naval encounter off Gothland, and the Swedes were beaten and forced to retire to Sveaborg: it is to this moment in the war that Petróv's satire refers. The satire relates that Gustavus' pretext to war was his

desire to copy Charles XII. The metre is accentual, and not unlike the later popular ballads.

" Gustavus wearied of sitting in peace, bestirred himself to war with Russia : he cut his hair like Charles to affright the cities and villages of Russia : and, to consume his expenses in safety, he donned armour, like the ass in a lion's skin : he looked a terrific giant. How should he serve his giddy fate ? He besieged Neuschlot with cannon, and embarked on the high seas with a powerful fleet."

The personality of the King, his appearance and character are admirably depicted in his endeavours to imitate Charles XII. When the shade of Charles approaches Gustavus with reproaches for having stirred up a useless war, Gustavus says that he began the war because he thirsted for glory and desired to resemble his grandfather : Gustavus replies to the doubts expressed by his grandfather :—

" ' What I am not my grandfather ' Gustavus cried out loud, ' I have wanted to be my grandfather every hour, and have made myself into him and exerted all my strength. Look at Gustavus and you will see yourself ! But Charles reminds Gustavus that foolhardiness without sense is a great hindrance in war."

Gustavus gets angry, and turning to his grandfather in a long speech reminds him of how luck veers in war.

" You remember that rout, that blow by Poltáva when you for ever bade farewell to glory, from the fray you scampered away with all your might, and only kept your trousers on the spot where they should be."

The satire concludes with baleful prognostications of Charles on the deference with which he would have to beg for peace and how at the last his own subjects will rise up against him.

One woman, Catherine Románovna Dashkova, out of all the contemporaries of Catherine II made herself conspicuous. Her maiden name was Vorontsóv, and she was born in 1743 at Petersburg, and died in 1810. She received an excellent education at the house of her uncle Vorontsóv All of her leisure was given up to learning : she read Beyle, Montesquieu, Boileau and Voltaire. She was soon intro-

duced to Court life and had no small share in the revolution of 1762 and the accession of Catherine II. After her removal from the Court she spent much time in travelling, and after her return from abroad, was appointed directress of the Academy of Sciences and President of the Russian Academy which had then been re-established.

CHAPTER IX.

VON VISIN.

Von Visin was the foremost writer of the golden age of Catherine. He, in his remarkable talented fashion, reflects all the best aspects of the social types of that time.

DENIS IVÁNOVICH VON VISIN was born in 1744 and died in 1792 : he was descended of an ancient knightly family. One of the ancestors of Denis Ivánovil, Baron Peter Von Visin, was taken prisoner during the Livonian War (under Peter the Great, 1709 to 1710) together with his son Denis and settled with him in Russia. The grandson of Baron Peter embraced the orthodox faith in the reign of Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich (1645), and thereafter the family was thoroughly Russianized. We know something of Denis Ivánovich's father from the autobiographical notes he wrote in imitation of Jean Jacques Rousseau, calling them "a frank confession." From these notes we know that his father, though a man of sound judgment, had his education limited to a reading of Russian history, of Cicero's Opinions and similar translations. But he was also a highly honourable man, and in an age when bribery was rampant, he used, as his son tells, to speak to his clients in this wise: "My dear sir! a head of sugar is no reason to for impugning your rival: please take it away and bring me a lawful evidence of your title." Von Visin says of himself and his relations with his father in that being, as a sentimental boy, he one day heard his father tell him the story of the beautiful boy Joseph, which so affected him that he cried. It may be concluded from this that his

education was conducted on very regular lines: that his parents aimed at developing in their children both mind and heart, and that the Russian setting of the parental home soon contributed towards bringing out in Denis Iványovich a temperament of vigour and zeal.

There was founded in 1755, the School of Nobility attached to the University, and there Von Visin was sent to be educated. His memoirs made it clear that for the first years of his residence there, this school was in a very pitiable condition. When in this establishment, Von Visin translated *Moral Fables, with notes by Baron Holberg*, which were published by the bookseller who was engaged on exploiting the most capable of the young men who had studied at the University. Thus he required translations of them, and repaying them with books, had the astuteness to conform with the taste and years of the youths who were consigned to him for exploitation. Denis Iványovich says in his memoirs that he was promised books worth 50 roubles in return for a translation of *Holberg's Fables*. The bookseller kept his word, but the books were illustrated with sensuous and nasty pictures, and disgusted his youthful imagination and disturbed his young mind. Von Visin, without completing his course at the University entered the Semiónovski Regiment, to which he was destined from the very cradle, like all noble children of that time. His capacities were remarked and he was soon sent abroad on an important mission. In 1766 he was appointed to a post in the Foreign College. Later on, when he began to live his own life, he used to have with him Bogdanovich Derzhavin, Kniazhnín and the actor Dmitrévski, with whom he had become acquainted from early youth.

His Literary Work. In 1782 after a long journey abroad, Von Visin wrote his comedy *The Minor*, which was enthusiastically received as something unprecedented in Russian literature. After this he wrote famous questions to the editor of *Actualities and Fantasies* and a *Court Grammar*, which was not published in the *Proceedings*, on account of its acerbity. *The Brigadier*, written at the very beginning of his career in service, shows his remarkable observation

and satirical talent, and portrays the same social types which had already been animadverted on by his predecesors but sketched in with the greatest clearness and moving with constituting living beings. "Thus Akúlina Timoféevna seemed related to every one, and the lady adviser and Iványushka seemed to neighbours and friends or even relatives, and to repress a perfect caricature of superficial culture and an unreasoned aping of foreigners." In Iványushka there may be caught an echo of the ideas that had been evolved in the serious compositions of French literature, on morality, equality and the natural rights of man: but they had reached Iványushka at second hand and therefore were not grasped and are deformed and take the form of a caricature of the new tendencies of the Russian.

The comedy, *The Minor*, in lively colours paints those monstrous beings whom serfdom produced in Russia, by frustrating all the benevolent intentions of the Government. The force of serfdom is depicted in such broad touches that it produces a tragic terror, despite the comic humour of many scenes which are made up of occasions invented by the author to keep up the action in a comic direction. In this comedy the whole nature of man is the victim of the loathsome serfdom which controls his mind and feelings and passions, swallows up all that is good and inculcates an arbitrariness unrestrainable by law.

DERZHÁVIN. Sumarókov, who outlived his time and once said that a Horace was essential to the reign of Augustus, did not idly imagine himself as the Horace to whom it was adjudged to sing the glories of the age of the new Augustus, Catherine. But his place was taken by that inspired poet of Catherine, who devoted the best period of his poetic work to the glorification of her age and in a whole series of brilliant pieces left posterity a poetic chronicle of the fame, the feats, and triumphs of the age of Catherine.

His Personality. Derzhávin, as a man, shows all the imperfections of the writers of that day, but at the same time, some personal excellencies which constitute his real

merit and differentiate him sharply from the other writers, who contemporaneously with him moved in the highest circle of Russian Court life and administrative in the XVIII. century.

Derzhávin was naturally of a weak and soft character, such as might give way to evil influences. Whilst often leaving the road of rectitude, he yet all through his life never ceased honouring the straight road, to which he always strove to return. Consequently, Derzhávin, whilst often currying favour from powers that were and contemporaries, and playing up to them, would often be filled with a deep hatred of their injustice, avarice, and narrowness, and would run amok in the opposite direction, proceeding to extremities and exaggerating their defects.

Gabriel Románovich Derzhávin was born near Kazáń in July, 1743. His father, a poor nobleman, was an officer in the army, but was compelled by illness to stay at Orenbúrg, where the greater part of the poet's childhood and boyhood was passed. After his mother's death he again moved to Kazáń and just managed to subsist on his scanty means ; he became involved in a lawsuit with his neighbours and could hardly provide for the education of his children. Not one of his sons ever received even a tolerable training.

At Orenbúrg, Gabriel Románovich was taught by priests how to read and write, and was then taught in a pension kept by the exiled German, Roos, who was really an utter ignoramus.

At Kazáń he learned arithmetic and geometry from the commander of the garrison, Lebedev, and from the artillery officer, Poletaev. At the age of fourteen his mother sent him to Moscow to register her children with the Heralds' College, but, after losing the last of her means in getting evidence of her indisputable rights of nobility, as a descendant of Bagrim Murzá, was obliged to return to Kazáń after a fruitless journey.

Luckily for Derzhávin, a gymnasium was opened in 1758 at Kazáń, where he and his brothers were sent. But even here he learned but little, owing to the lack of good teachers.

In 1762 Derzhávin entered the army in the Preobrazhenski Regiment, and there, having no relatives, had to lodge at the barracks with the soldiers.

After ten years' service he was promoted to the rank of ensign. He himself paints his youth in most melancholy colours. Between 1764 and 1772 Gabriel Románovich often saw himself on the verge of ruin, having indulged in unrestrained profligacy and cardplay. He was surrounded with a rout of boisterous boon companions, sunk in debauchery; and card-sharpers, having won off him their fill, next taught him all the wiles of their art. But the hard nature of the poet bore him through this severe school, and he carried only the strongest desire, whatever it might cost, to keep within himself the consciousness of his own moral dignity.

At the time of Pugachóv's rebellion (1744—1775) he was a member of a secret commission charged to suppress uproar at Kazáń and Orenbúrg. Subsequently, through his acquaintance with Prince Viázemski, he succeeded in getting a post in the Senate as an usher in the first Department. His marriage with a poor girl broke off his relations with the Prince. Then Derzhávin became an assiduous courtier, sometimes fell into disgrace, and again received higher posts, and died in retirement on his estate in July, 1816.

His Literary Work. Derzhávin began devoting himself to literature with especial keenness after his quarrel with Viázemski. About this tine he finished his ode, *God*, and wrote *The Vision of Murza.* When dismissed from his post as Governor, and not receiving any other, he had recourse to his pen as a means for obtaining a post; on the 2nd September, *i.e.*, the day of the Empress' coronation, he handed in for presentation, whenever suitable, the ode *The Picture of Felitsa.*

His first publications, after the rebellion of Pugachóv, were the *Odes on the Death of Prince Meshchenski* and *On the Birth in the North of a Boy born to the Purple.* Both of these productions revealed the author's talent.

The ode *Felitsa* was written in imitation of the tale by

Catherine of Tsarévich Khlor, who, at the behest of his father, the Kirgiz Khan, sought the rose without thorns.

Towards the end of his life Derzhávin increased his literary work; he succumbed to the influence of Horace, Anacreon, and Ossian, dwelling on the moral of life or the epicurean infatuation. The direction and all the peculiarities of Derzhávin's poetry can only be thoroughly acquired after a perusal of his works.

KHERASKOV, BOGDANOVICH, KHEMNITSER, KAPNIST.

Kheraskov and Bogdánovich may serve as living evidence of how gradually and consequentially the development goes on of literature in any society. New generations of literary writers arise, grow, come to maturity, and come on to the stage with new outlooks, and enact their parts at the same time as the old school with their outworn and ancient representatives.

Michael Matvêevich Kheraskov was born in 1733 and died in 1807, and came of the Roumanian family of the boyars Cherascu. His father emigrated to Russia at the same time as Kantemir. In his tenth year Kheraskov was sent to the Corps of Noble Infantry. After concluding his course there he served for some time in the army and thence went into the service of the College of Commerce, and was given a post on the new university at Moscow. Kheraskov, moderate, precise, and laborious in all matters in the course of his life, shows the same qualities in his literary works. The mass of his extant works is constructed on the basis of rules handed down by the pseudo-classic theory and is a very close imitation of such models; they are conspicuous for the lack of any independent creativeness.

Contemporaries regarded it as a great merit of his that he was the first to transplant to Russian soil models of pseudo-classic epic which he wrote according to all the rules of the prevailing literary theory, and he fully satisfied the taste and comprehension of the times.

The public of those days had managed to assimilate Derzhávin in lyric as the Russian Pindar, and in drama as

the Russian Racine; but it lacked a Russian Homer, and this rôle Kheraskov took upon himself in his *Rossiad* and *Vladimir*. The *Rossiad* appeared in 1779, but his first productions were the *Fruits of Science* and *The Venetian Nun*. Further, Kheraskov edited the journals *Useful Diversion* and *Leisure Hours*. Shortly before his death a tragedy of Kheraskov, written for a competition, was performed, "Zerida and Rostíslav."

BOGDANOVICH. Hippolytos Fiódorovich Bogdánovich was born "in the happy climate of Little Russia" at Perevolochna. At the age of eleven he was taken to Moscow and made a cadet at the College of Justice. After reading Lomonosov and other poets, he felt a passionate desire to go on the stage, and at the age of 15 applied to the director of the Moscow theatre to be entered amongst the actors. The director gathered from his conversations with him his longing for learning and poetry, and had him entered on to the books of the University and took him to his own home. That director was Kheraskov, and Bogdanovich's talents ripened under his influence. Countess Dashkov (whom Bogdanovich came to know when with Kheraskov) gave him the post of a translator in the Foreign College, and thus assisted him to transfer to Petersburg, where he was already well-known to readers for his short translations, poems, and for the version of Voltaire's poem *On the Destruction of Lisbon*; he there published his first little poem, *Double Happiness*. In this poem, which was divided into three parts, Bogdanovich depicted an image of the golden age, the successes of the civil life and the sciences, the abuse of passion, the redemption effected by law and the authority of the Church. One great success with his contemporaries he secured from his fable *Dúsheńka*, adapted from Lafontaine's *Love of Psyche and Cupid*.

IVAN IVANOVICH KHEMNITSER was born in the beginning of 1745 and died in the beginning of 1784. He was one of the few writers of the century of German family and origin, though of an entirely Russian outlook and direction in literature. His father was a

Saxon, born at Freiburg, Johann Adam Chemnitzer; it is not known when he came to Russia, and held the post in the forties of the XVIII. century of military medical officer in the province of Astrakhan. There Ivan Ivanovich was born, who was to be famous as the author of Russian fables. His first education Khemnitser received from his parents; he was next confided to the local Lutheran pastor, Neubauer, who at once directed attention to the boy's talents. In 1755 Khemnitser left the service at Astrakhan and removed to Petersburg. There he placed his son to be taught Latin, Geography, and History with the teacher of the medical school, which was subsequently in 1783, re-named the Medical Surgical Institute. At the age of 13 Khemnitser, despite his father's wish to make him a physician, entered the military service, but relinquished it after ten years, having attained the rank of lieutenant. His friend Lvov, who had great influence on a circle of the best known *littérateurs* of the time, enabled young Khemnitser to become acquainted with Derzhávin. It is remarkable that he, for a long time, only spoke German and wrote German verse up to mature years, and yet in a short time so mastered Russian as to take one of the highest ranks amongst Russian writers of the age of Catherine.

Khemnitser's first production was a rather dull one written to commemorate the capture of the Turkish fortress, Zhurzha. Next he published a translation of the heroic poem of C. J. Dorât, *The Letter of Barivelle to Troumand in Prison*. Most of his time just then was taken up with his service, which left him very little leisure; such as he had he devoted to Lafontaine, and, in imitation of him, tried to lay a foundation for a school of Russian fables. Even Derzhávin often submitted his writings to the criticism of Khemnitser, whose intellect and education he admired; he used to speak of him as a man who showed him the right road in composition. In 1779 Khemnitser was persuaded by his friends to publish his fables and tales. His fable, *Metaphysics*, is still a favourite Russian fable of educated readers.

VASILI VASILIEVICH KAPNIST was a friend of Lvov and Khemnitser and one of the most prominent men in the literary circle of Derzhávin. He was born in 1757 and died in 1824. The ancestors of Kapnist had been the Italian Counts Capnissi ; one of them, Peter Khristoforovich, arrived in Russia in the reign of Peter the Great with his son, Vasili, who became the father of our Kapnist. Kapnist's father's life is a series of strange adventures and wonderful feats of war. These last were the pretext on which his enemies accused him of treason, a charge on which he was committed for trial and imprisoned. However, Kapnist's father, hard and intrepid on the field of battle, proved his innocence and was acquitted and released and rewarded with the rank of brigadier ; and six years later was killed at the battle of Egersdorf (1757). He married Sofia Andréevna Dunina Burkovskaia, and from this marriage there sprang Vasili Vasilievich, who was born at one of the estates granted in the village of Obukhov, in Poltava, granted to his father as an emolument. This village he afterwards celebrated in verse. Nothing is known of his childhood and first education, and save that Kapnist was indebted for his education to his own efforts. At the age of fifteen he was made a corporal in the Izmaílovski regiment and then a sergeant in the Preobrazhenski, and two years later an officer in the latter. In 1777 he had already gained some literary fame for his satire *On Manners,* in which he paraphrased with some skill the popular saying that fools are neither reaped nor sown : they sprout of themselves.

Science is strong and arts may flourish there,
Authors are born, but fools, fools everywhere !
As on a field enriched by toil, to scorn
The work, tares grow amid the ears of corn,
And maim the seedling, spoil the ripened fruit ;
So fools spring up in freedom absolute.
They are not sown, but grow apace like weeds :
Set evil precepts, darken wholesome redes.

The literary work of Kapnist was always comparatively

simple, and for some time there only appeared a few lyric poems, mostly triumphant and sonorous odes; contemporaries were particularly attracted by the odes *On Slavery* and *On the Destruction in Russia of the Title of Serf by Empress Catherine II.* But it is the elegies and little lyric pieces which are much more deserving of attention than the grandiose odes, and many of these are really light or graceful; the well-known translation of the Monumentum exegi of Horace is fully equal in merit to the translation by Derzhávin or even of Pushkin, and is also nearer than either to the original. Kapnist's chief work was his tragedy, *Iápeda*, which contained a trenchant condemnation of provincial Russian manners and the monstrous procedure of red-tape and bribery which was a necessary incident to every case. The types whom Kapnist puts on the stage are very faithfully sketched, and, even if not portraits, are borrowed from experience of the provinces which Kapnist could readily gather, as a cool and impartial observer.

CHAPTER X.

THE FIRST RUSSIAN PERIODICALS.

It has already been stated that at the beginning of the reign of Catherine II. conditions were very favourable to the development in Russia of social life, the spread of culture, and a softening of the asperities of manners. Catherine II., striving to obtain Russia all the advantages of Western social conditions, could not but see in literature an efficacious means towards her ends, and therefore the growth of literature and journalism in Russia was encouraged at Court.

Even towards the end of Elizabeth's reign (1741 to 1761) the first periodicals had made an appearance. Müller, the professor at the Academy of Sciences, had published the monthly journal, *Essays for the Use and Diversion of Public Servants*, and Sumarókov had started *The Laborious Bee*. In this case, Sumarókov, the first Russian *littérateur*, was also the first Russian journalist in the real sense of the term, the first to voice that change which, under the influence of the general European movement, was proceeding in his time in the manners and views of society, which had already found full expression only in the publicists of the epoch of Catherine. Very many followed in the traces of Sumarókov and, as soon as ever the *Laborious Bee* ceased publication, there appeared some journals at Petersburg and Moscow published by private individuals and learned societies on the model of Sumarókov's journal. In 1760 the Corps of Noble Infantry issued a weekly, *Leisure Usefully Employed*. Sumarókov himself took an active part in the last-named paper. Two journals were

also published by the University of Moscow, called *Useful Diversion* and *Hours of Freedom*.

This swift growth in Russia of journalism, following so soon on the first effort made by Sumarokov, testifies to the advent of a new significant period in the history of Russian literature, as also to the quick growth of a demand for reading material, which again, in its turn, contributed to the increase in Russia of professional *littérateurs* as a specific occupation. There congregated around every editor his especial circle, more or less wide, of writers, who procured a subsistence by this kind of work and thereby helped in the abolition of the false aspect of literature as a service to the Muses, as a conception connoting leisure and serving rather to delight or amuse, than to satisfy the positive moral capacities of an enlightened and developed majority of society.

In 1770 other new journals appeared, the *Whispers of Parnassus*, the *Chatterbox*, the *Laborious Ant*; in 1772 and 1773 *Evenings: Cato-Scarronic Medley*, and *The Artist*. *The Artist* was edited by one of the most prominent factors in contemporary journalism, N. Novikóv, who, in 1774, began editing the paper, *The Purse*. It should be added that the prevailing tone of Russian journalism in the XVIII. century was satire.

NIKOLAÏ IVANOVICH NOVIKÓV was a conspicuous literary and social figure of the XVIII. century, a witty and talented editor of the best satirical journals. He was born in 1744 and died in 1818. His home was in the village of Tikhvin, in the Bronicki district of the province of Moscow. Very little is known of the education of Novikóv or of his youth. As a child he was taught, like so many of his contemporaries, by the deacon of the parish, and then in 1755, when the University of Moscow was founded, together with two gymnasia, he spent about four years in the university gymnasium of Moscow, where he received a very unequal education, and perhaps learned very little, because, as he confesses, he did not know one foreign language; and thus he was largely self-taught.

In 1760 he was expelled from the University Gymnasium for idleness and playing truant, and the fact was, in accordance with custom of that day, published in the *Moskovskia Vêdemosti* [a periodical that continued down to the November Revolution in Russia] for all to read and mark. However, the conditions of his home-training had been sufficiently favourable to develop Novikóv's riches, intellectual and moral.

In his seventeenth year he entered the military service in the Izmáilovski Guards, and steadily, without losing time, went on his own course. He was a passionate reader and a frequenter of cultured society, and soon managed to supplement the blanks of scanty education, and, according to one of his biographers, even in 1767 was becoming famous for his predilection for literature, especially Russian, and his successes in it.

He started his literary career as editor of the journal *The Drone*, in 1760, and about that time left the service and gave himself up to literature exclusively; and his success was such that he startled everyone with the originality and boldness of his invention, with his restraint, conscientious finish, wealth of material, and remarkable practicality, and great comprehension of how to meet the most essential needs of the day. Then in 1772 he began an *Essay of a Historical Dictionary of Russian Writers.*

This book constituted the first attempt at a critical estimate of the productions of Russian literature, spiritual and profane, and consolidated the fame of Novikóv as a *littérateur.*

In 1792 Novikóv was arrested and imprisoned in the Schlüsselburg fortress, whither he was conveyed under strong guard. On the accession of Emperor Paul (1796 to 1801) he was released and returned to his village of Tikhvin, decrepit, bent, and dressed in a torn sheepskin. His family greeted him—according to one friend of Novikóv —as well as all the peasants, not only of his village but those from distant settlements, with tears of joy, for they remembered that in the year of famine they had, through him, received great assistance.

He died quietly on 31st July, 1818, in his seventy-fifth year, and was buried in the parish churchyard. He was able to make himself a force at a time when power could be had only through Imperial service or Court favour, but he relied on neither of these expedients. He is almost the first example of the power of the community, independent alike of Court and Government.

CHAPTER XI.

N. Y. KARAMZIN.

KARAMZIN. "At the time of Catherine, the Russians began to express their thoughts clearly to the reason, pleasantly to the ear, and taste became general"; this is how Karamzín defined the significance of the age of Catherine in literature in his *Historic Eulogy of Catherine II.*

This definition is not quite accurate, inasmuch as Karamzín attributes to the age of Catherine characteristics of what was only the later period, after the close of Catherine's reign; and notable for the work of a school of younger writers, the chief of whom was Karamzín as journalist, *littérateur*, poet, and savant. The authorship of Karamzín falls into three very sharply bounded periods. What he wrote before his travels in Western Europe consisted almost entirely of translations and may be termed his 'prentice stage. On his return to Russia at the age of 25, towards the end of the reign of Catherine II., he all at once reveals himself as the master of his art, as a journalist and writer of independent outlook on language and literature; he began writing as none before had ever written, and won over to his side most of the community; lastly, his work on Russian history, to which he devoted 23 years of his life, is a creation which may be called monumental, eternizing him for all time. The 23 years on his *History of the Russian Empire* constitute the third and final period of Karamzín's life.

Unfortunately very little is known of the first period of Karamzín's life and work, and there many deplorable

lacunae. Even the year of birth has been recently disproved. It used to be accounted the year of Lomonósov's death (1765). Now it is sufficiently certain that Nikolai Mikháilovich Karamzín was born on 1st December, 1766, in the province of Simbirsk, where his father had a freehold holding. The family of Karamzín was in straight line of descent from Karamurza, a Tatar princelet who was baptized under one of the Moscovite Tsars and entered the Moscovite service and received a grant of land in the province of Nízhegorod. One of his ancestors, Michael Egórovich Karamzín, was granted a portion of land in the province of Orenbúrg (now the province of Samára), where he served as an officer in one of the battalions quartered there. Nikolái Mikháilovich was the son of his first marriage. Karamzín was educated under the eye of his stepmother, but inherited the character of his mother, who died in his childhood. His boyhood was passed on the banks of the Volga and the steppes of Orenbúrg. At the age of fourteen he was taken to Moscow and placed in the best educational establishment of the time, in the boarding school of Schaden, the professor of the University of Moscow. Karamzín had previously passed through the hands of various teachers, but it is most likely that he was but ill-prepared for serious study, and therefore Schaden prescribed for him a course of a general nature, and not specialised; thus it is known that Karamzín was never taught the ancient languages, and only learned the modern languages thoroughly in after-life on his journey through Western Europe. His passion for reading was manifest in his youth, and no one put any bars in the way of satisfying this desire, and thus his development was precocious. Schaden's powerful influence on Karamzín may be seen in that both teacher and pupil laboured at very many problems almost in a single spirit. In 1783 he entered on military service and went to his home country, where he led a dissipated life; but his fellow-countryman, I. P. M. Turgénev, sorry at the futile waste of time, by the gifted youth, persuaded him to return with him to Moscow, where they arrived in 1785.

Here Turgénev introduced Karamzín to Novikóv, who had founded a "Friendly Club"; Karamzín made the acquaintance of the gifted Petróv, who was called in jest "the pocket poet of Empress Catherine." Petróv's faculty of sane criticism and his knowledge of ancient and modern languages, enabled him to gain great influence on Karamzín, to tutor him in the acquisition of various subjects, and to train him in æsthetic feeling. In 1789 Karamzín travelled abroad and spent eighteen months visiting Germany, Switzerland, France, and England. His diary is well-known under the title, *Letters of a Russian Traveller*; they were addressed to Moscow, to the family of Pleshchéev where he often stayed, and he afterwards married Pleshchéev's sister-in-law. In 1804 he started on his *History of the Russian State*, and through the mediation of Muráviev, then Assistant Minister of National Instruction, succeeded in getting a pension of 2,000 roubles a year. In 1815 there were already eight volumes of the History ready, which he personally presented to the Emperor. The Emperor granted him for his work the Order of Saint Anna of the First Class and 60,000 roubles for the printing of the work. The next four volumes appeared between 1818 and 1826.

On the 22nd of May, 1826, Karamzín died and was buried at the Alexandro-Nevski monastery. On his tombstone are engraved the words, "Blessed are the pure in heart." A monument has been put up to him at Simbirsk. The centenary of his birth was celebrated in many places on 1st December, 1866.

Literary Work. Karamzín's work was in the main in the transformation of the literary language, the introduction in Russian literature of sentimentalism, and his labour in the compilation of the *History of the Russian State.*

His Reform of the Literary Language. The reform of the literary language effected by Karamzín in the literature may be tested by comparison with the conception of style as laid down in the essay, *On the Use of Ecclesiastical Books.* In this reform two aspects are to be distinguished, the sytatic and in the matter of vocabulary. With regard to

syntax, Karamzín, unlike Lomonósov, deemed it proper to write, not in long periods, but in short propositions not dragged out, and to dispose words in accordance with the flow of thought and laws of the language. With regard to vocabulary he limited the use of Slavonicisms, and thus brought the two ingredients of the Russian language, Russian and Slavonic, into more definite relations. Further, he introduced many foreign words into Russian to express new ideas, approximated literary style to educated conversation according to the fundamental rule of this reform : " Write as you speak (*i.e.*, of educated speakers), but try to write like the model writers." Thus Karamzín imported into Russian literary style simplicity, naturalness, and vigour, logical sequence and exquisite finish.

The Letters of a Russian Traveller. This was the record of Karamzín's journey abroad. It provided the model of a new style and laid the foundations of a new tendency in the Russiam memoirs of travel. The principal content of the Letters is exact accounts of writers and *savants*, their compositions and lectures, of learned institutions, schools, libraries, and museums. The traveller personally made the acquaintance of the celebrities of the time in literature and science, conversed with Kant, Wieland, Bonnet, and Lavater, and for this reason it is intellectual advance, the facts of Western enlightenment that are made prominent in the Letters, which further are penetrated with the keenest and liveliest sympathy with the makers of the arts. For teaching purposes it is better to divide the Letters into four sections, those relating to Germany, to Switzerland, to France, and England.

The Appearance of Sentimentalism in Russian Literature. This is explicable, on the one hand by the natural sensitiveness of Karamzín, and on the other to the prevalence of this tendency in Western literature. Sensitiveness, in his opinion, must characterize any writer. The sentimental tendency came to the fore, not only in the *Letters*, but in other works of his as well, and principally in two stories, *Poor Liza* and *Natalia, the Boyar's Daughter.* The extra-

ordinary success of these tales is due to their being the first writings in this genre of narrative art.

The History of the Russian State. Before the appearance of Karamzín's *History* there were the *Russian History* of Tatíščev, which went as far as the reign of Fiódor Ioánnovich and that of Prince Shcherbatov. The former merely compiled and annotated the *Chronicles*; the latter had some comprehension of history as a sequence of cause and effect, but did not look for these causes in the community itself; to him it was more or less casual. In the light of this comparison of the unsatisfactory condition of Russian history prior to Karamzín, with the work of Karamzín a clear view is obtained of the value of his contribution. The idea of the historical work of Karamzín is that the autocracy conferred unity on the Russian State and power, independence, education, and political importance. He distinguishes three periods in the historical development: (1) Russia was founded as a unity; (2) was ruined by dissension; and (3) was saved by the autocracy. The first period is from Rurik to Yaroslávl (978 to 1054), the second from the death of Yaroslávl to Iván III. (1440 to 1505), and is the epoch of national and administrative aberration, marked by the system of appanages, civil feuds, and the Tatar yoke, which overthrew the former greatness and independence of Russia. This period of error passed away, and the truth re-appeard—re-emerged at the beginning of the third period under Iván III (1440—1505), who made a great stride forward and freed Russia from the Tatars and initiated unlimited monarchy or despotism. The style of the *History* is clear, precise, and eminently vivid. The narrative is frequently illustrated with old words and phrases borrowed from the *Chronicles* and other ancient written monuments, used to add colour to the story. One of the characteristics of his manner is the dactylic ending to phrases and statements, in consequence of which adjectives are placed after their nouns [which in Russian, unlike Polish, is not the general practice]. The characterizations of the personalities of Ivan III., Ivan IV., the Metropolitan Philip, Godunóv, Shuiski,

Prokopi, Liapunov, are amongst the most noticeable. The narrative of the siege and capture of Kazáń is one of the most graphic and brilliant pictures.

DMITRÍEV AND OZIÓROV AS FOLLOWERS OF KARAMZÍN.

THE VALUE OF DMITRÍEV AND OZIÓROV.

The immediate followers of Karamzín, who represented the sentimental tendency in Russian Literature and as writers laid the foundation of a new literary style and language were Dmitríev and Oziórov. The former, brought sentimentalism into Russian epic and lyric and at the same time under Karamzín's influence perfected Russian prosody and the constitution of a light poetic style. The latter, under the same influence and moving in the same direction assisted in finally expelling from the Russian stage the pseudo-classic ideals and dramatic productions constructed on rigid theory. The former's services were defined even by contemporary criticism in this wise : Karamzín provided the models of prose literature and Dmitríev those in verse, or, in other words Dmitríev invested verse with the same qualities which were possessed by the prose style of Karamzín, an unlaboured construction, fluidity and pleasantness.

IVAN IVANOVICH DMITRÍEV

was born in 1760 and died in 1837. He has left in his book, *A Retrospect on my Life.*, detailed memoirs of his life, which are in many respects curious. These memoirs constitute a very valuable historical and literary source, for they not only bring to our knowledge the contemporary view of literature, but also transport us entirely into the midst of the conceptions and opinions common to all the Russian sentimental school of writers. Dmitríev passed his childhood with his uncle Beketov at Kazáń. He had a scanted education : at first he was taught French, arithmetic and drawing at a French private school, then he was consigned to an incompetent garrison sergeant. Later he went to a school at Simbirsk to a retired lieutenant who had been the teacher in the Corps of Cadets, one Kabrit. At the age

of fourteen, Dmitríev went to the school o the Semiónov ifeguards. His passion for writing verse came to light at about the age of seventeen. In 1773 he was made an officer, and proceeded with the Guards to Finland. In 1795 he exchanged the military for the civil service. In 1806 he was a senator and was even offered the post of rector of the University of Moscow, but wisely declined, and three years later became Minister of Justice.

His Literary Work. Dmitríev wrote tales, poems, ballads, satires and epigrams. His poems had great vogue, as they appealed to the prevailing taste for sentimentalism. His tales *The Fashionable Wife* and *The Faddist* are imitations of Voltaire, from whom Dmitríev borrowed largely. As a writer of fables he translated Lafontaine.

VLADÍSLAV IVANOVICH OZIÓROV was born in 1779 and died in 1816. He was born in the district of Zubtsóv in the province of Tver and lost his mother when quite young. He was educated in the same aristocratic infantry Corps as Sumarokov and so many other Russian writers of the XVIII century. He finished his course in 1787 and was appointed aide-de-camp to Count de Balmen, with whom he assisted in the capture of Bender (in Bessarabia) by Potiómkin. Prince Alexis Borísovich Kurakin transferred Oziórov to the department of Forests where he enjoyed the special patronage of Admiral Ribas. He entered on literature in 1794 with a heroic poem *Eloise to Abélard.* On retirement from office he settled in his village of Krasny Yar in Kazáń. He was distracted with untoward circumstances and died of a softening of the brain.

His Literary Work. Oziórov wrote five tragedies, the best known of which are *Oedipus at Athens, Fingal,* and *Dmitri Donskói.* The first two are imitations of the French tragedy, but are written in metre so good as had never before been seen on the Russian stage, the verse is smooth, powerful, penetrated with the sense of tragedy : and these plays produced a great effect on the audience. The subject of Fingal is taken from the life of the ancient Gauls. In Fingal, Oziórov aimed at depicting the Achilles

of the Northern Lands. Fingal is the chiefs of the Morven who has conquered the ruler of Lochlinstarn, taken him captive and released him. Starne's heart was full of pride and bitterness : he plotted to murder his conqueror, the only rival to his power. To carry his object out, he invited Fingal and offered him the hand of his daughter. The daughter, out of love for the hero, reveals to him the threatening danger. The angry father kills his daughter, then Fingal summons his band of warriors, surprises the Lochlins, carries the body of his lady-love away on a ship and buries her on one of the crags of his homeland.

The tragedy of *Dmitri Donskói* appeared in the heat of the war of Russia with Napoleon. Russian patriotism was then strongly stirred against France, and an upshot of this feeling was a whole series of patriotic writings. In *Dmitri Donskói*, everyone read Alexander, and in Mamai Napoleon and with all their hearts and souls desired victory to the Russian arms : and everyone was blind to the faults and inconsistencies of the tragedy in which the heroic foundation was wildly perverted by the attempt of the author to give the first place in the tragedy to the sentiment. To suit this attitude of mind, Dmitri in the tragedy is unmarried and in love with Xenia, a princess of Nizhegorod. At the time when he is going into battle on which depends the fate of the country, Dmitri is unable to repress the voice of love, and pusillanimously gives way to jealousy of the Prince of Tver, to whom Xenia has been betrothed. The Prince of Tver graciously renounces Xenia.

CHAPTER XII.

ZHUKÓVSKI.

VASÍLI ANDREEVICH ZHUKÓVSKI was born in the province of Túla in 1783 and died in 1852. His father, Athanasius Ivánovich Bunin was a rich Russian gentleman. His mother was a Turk, by name Salkha, who had been brought from Turkey by the serfs of Bunin (who had been sent there as canteen keepers with the army).

A friend of Bunin, a noble with a small estate, Andrew Grigórevich Zhukóvski, who lived in Mishenski (where the poet was born) proposed to adopt Salkha's son and suggested to Maria Grigorevna Bunina that she should allow her daughter Varvara Afanásevna to baptize the new-born infant, as Vasíli Andreevich Zhukóvski, Maria Grigorevna Bunina took the baby into her family and educated him as her own child. The father Bunin died in 1791, and on his deathbed, entrusted the eight-year old Zhukóvski and his mother to his wife who assumed the duty of bringing up the boy with a pure maternal affection. Further, by the will of Bunin each of his four daughters was bound to assign 2,500 roubles each out of their inheritance to Vasili Andreevich. The godmother of young Zhukóvski married one Yushkov, and it was in this family that Zhukóvski passed most of his childhood. He learned French, German, etc., with the children of Mrs. Yushkova, and was later on sent to a German boarding-school at Túla to one Christian Philippovich Rode. From the German's *pension* he was soon taken and thence put in the popular school of Túla, in which the senior teacher

was Pokrovski, doctor of philosophy and writer of historical philosophic essays in a paper under the name of the philosopher of the mountain of Alaun.

In 1797 Zhukóvski entered the noble pension attached to the University of Moscow, where he did some translations of tales of Kotzebue *The Boy and the Stream* and *Don Quixote* from the French translation of Florian for a bookseller. In 1802 Zhukóvski translated Gray's *Elegy in a Village Churchyard*, and this translation put nim at once in the ranks of the best poets. He settled in the town of Bêlevo with one other of his sisters, Mme. Protasova, and fell in love with one of her daughters, Mary, who taught history, literature, and modern languages. From 1808 to 1810, Zhukóvski was editor of the journal *Véstnik Evropy ;* the ballad *Liudmila*, was printed in one of the parts of this journal and impressed the public as much as fifteen years previously Karamzín's *Poor Liza* had impressed them.

The essay *Who is a Truly Good and Happy Man* ? indicates the idealistic temperament of the author, and is important in that it depicts his views on the essential boons of life. In 1812 he proposed to Maria Andreevna Protasova : but her mother refused assent on grounds of kinship (which in reality did not exist). Zhukóvski in August of that year entered the Moscow militia and was at the Head-quarters of Kutuzov. Both his pupils Maria and Alexandra Protasova married : and he then settled at Petersburg, where in 1815 he was presented to Empress Maria Fiódorovna, with whom he remained as a reader. On the accession of Emperor Nicholas he was appointed tutor to the heir apparent.

The translation of the Indian poems *Nala* and *Damayati*, according to one of the biographers of Zhukóvski is on the border-line between the two periods of his life : for after concluding his duties as tutor of the heir apparent, he travelled to Germany, where in 1841 he married the daughter of an old friend, Colonel Reutern, who lived with his family at Düsseldorf. This marriage realised the happiness the poet had striven for from his youth, to be cheated of it by fate. He died in 1852 at Baden-Baden :

his body was transferred to Petersburg and buried at the Alexandronevski Monastery, next to that of Karamzín.

His Literary Work. Zhukóvski's literary work falls into two periods, the first of forty years up to 1840. This first period is the more important in Russian literature. Zhukóvski principally translated extracts from German and English poets, all in the romantic direction. This is why he himself called himself the father of romanticism in Russia. Romantic literature derives its name from the incident that its first productions were in the Romance languages, i.e., those formed from popular Latin in the countries of Latin civilization. This is the poetry of the new Christian world, as opposed to that of the ancient Greco-Roman world. Romanticism, shaping itself under Christian influence, sub-ordinated the physical to the spiritual, the earthly to the celestial: to poets of the romantic school the ideal of beauty was the spirit of man, his thoughts and feelings and desires. Not being able to discover the ideal on earth, the romantic poet remains unsatisfied and therefore betrays a melancholy, an unquenable source of themes for poetry with a Christian outlook.

Zhukóvski's compositions of the first period may be further sub-divided into three stages, the patriotic odes, the elegies and the ballads. The patriotic odes belong to the school of Derzhavin. Such are the *Song of the Bard over the Grave of the Slav Victors* and the *Minstrel in the Ranks of the Russian Warriors.*

The last poem with its echo of the general patriotism earned the author the title of the Russian Tyrtæus, and contains much lyrical beauty and expressions of personal feelings, on home and brotherhood, friendship, love and poetry. The style is artistic and terse, (a quality rare in Derzhavin). The two remaining features of this period are translations and imitations, principally from Schiller, Goethe, Uhland, Bürger, Gebel, Seidlitz, and other German poets, and Gray, Southey, Goldsmith, Walter Scott, Byron, and Moore, amongst the English. However, it is unjust to call Zhukóvski a translator in the ordinary sense of this term. His translations are reconstructions with

deep feeling and artistic spirit and ought rather to be accounted original writings. The following elegies had great influence on contemporary literature and characterize the poet at his best: Gray's *Village Churchyard*, *Theon and Aeschines*, *The Traveller*, *Ye are here again*, *The Charm of Departed Days*, *The Prisoner*, *The Secret Visitor*, *The Fleusynian Fields*. In *Theon* and *Aeschines*, the romantic ideas of Zhukóvski are grouped together: the fashioning of the spiritual side of man independently of the time and place of his existence, the quest of the ideal in himself and not in the external world, the eternity of the feeling of love, the elements of happiness: for the heart what has passed away is eternal, and suffering in parting is just the same love, and the loss to the heart is null: hence the solace of reminiscence, the charm of grief in the present, the hope of the after-life reunion with the ideal in the future, the unrelaxable aspiration of the soul to heaven, the conviction that the earthly path leads to an exalted and beautiful goal: and, to one who recognises this object, the universe seems fair and life seems holy.

The ballads obtained the poet a popularity as their fanciful content made them comprehensible and stirred the imagination. *Světliána*, an original ballad of Zhukóvski, although not borrowed from any source, is only Russian in name and place of action, in spirit and type it belongs entirely to the series of German romantic ballads in which visions, apparitions from the dead, and, in general, the fantastic and miraculous play the principal role.

In the second period of his work Zhukóvski changes from a romantic dreamer into a sober classic: from elegies and ballads he turned aside to an even and quiet narration. During this period he translated *Undine* (by the German de Lamotte-Fouqué), *Nala and Damayanti* by Rückert, and the heroic tale of *Rustem and Zohrab*. His principal work was the translation of the *Odyssey*, not from the original: a German professor gave him a version with a German translation under every Greek word and under every German word the grammatical meaning of the original.

ARZAMAS. In 1815 a club was founded called Arzamas, consisting of a circle of young men who devoted themselves exclusively to a polemic with the Shishkovists (the antagonists of the reform of Karamzín). Gibes and parodies and satires and caricatures were the principal weapons of Arzamas. The members of the Club bore names derived from the titles of Zhukóvski's ballads, thus Pushkin was called Sverchka, Bátiushkov Achilles and even Zhukóvski took the title of Svêtliána. The services rendered by Zhukóvski consist mainly in his acquainting Russia with the various productions of foreign authors and thus enabling Russians to judge of their value. In his translations verse and language attained a high perfection, simplicity and exquisiteness. He was the first to create a Russian style of verse, poetic and truthfully artistic, and had shown a great mastery of Russian, using the most various metres in his verse.

MERZLIAKOV (1778-1830) translated from the original, the *Odes* of Pindar, the *Tragedies* of Euripides, the *Idylls* of Theocritus, the *Eclogues* of Virgil, and the *Odes* of Horace. He understood the spirit of ancient poetry and possessed a poetic talent, but in obedience to the influence of a false theory he shortened and transformed the original, made the text bombastic or glorified it or sentimentalized it, introduced many Slavonic words, which were unsuitable to the simplicity of the original, and he was contented to translate extracts trusting that this would prove a sufficient acquaintance with the original. The best translations are those of the *Idylls* of Theocritus the *Eclogues* of Virgil, and the *Poetics* of Horace.

GNEDICH is famous for his translation in 1829 of the *Iliad*. This, with the *Odyssey*, is of value, not merely for knowledge of the plastic outlook of the Greeks, but also provides abundant material for the history of the theory of ethics, and of the life of mankind in primitive times. Gnědich's translation is very close to the original, and Homer's style is exactly rendered. But whilst conserving the force of the Homeric diction, Gnědich did not always keep to the simplicity of his author. He still

could not redeem himself from the old-fashioned conception of a poem, according to which it must have some solemnity and pomp. Sometimes this conviction, sometimes the wish to conserve the very phrases of the original, made him often use participles and Slavonic expressions, and, generally speaking, sonorous, fine words in the stead of simple ones: and this is the more peculiar as in conjunction with such words there are found expressions adopted from colloquial speech, for instance, false rhymes, and unsuitable collocations of style. His hexameters are melodious and smooth, in so far as any such artificial metre can be in Russian.

CONSTANTINE NIKOLÁEVICH BÁTIUSHKOV was born in 1787 and died in 1855. He came of a house of ancient nobles of Nóvgorod who in 1683 were the proprietors of the picturesque village of Danilovskoe in the Ustiuzhinski district which had been bestowed on them by the Emperors Iván and Peter Alexĕevich (1666–96 and 1682–1725) to Matthew Bátiushkov, one of the poet's ancestors. He from early childhood was consigned to strangers: he scarcely knew his mother, as she had to be separated from her children in consequence of insanity. His education he received from his uncle, first cousin once removed, M. N. Muráviev, whose wife he all his life regarded with filial feeling and deep affection. Muráviev's exertions secured to Bátiushov admission to the boarding school of Jacquinot, where he learned modern languages. Later on he was sent to another foreigner, I. A. Tripoli who made him thoroughly conversant with French, German and Italian. Muráviev himself no doubt exercised a beneficial instructive influence on the development of Bátiushkov's mind and intellect, as a moralist and cultured writer, as also did a circle of littérateurs and artists who constantly met at the house. In 1806 Bátiushkov finished his education and entered service at the chancellery of the ministry of public education, but was very soon afterwards made secretary to his second cousin Muráviev, then assistant minister. In 1807 Bátiushkov volunteered for the rifle

battalion of the Petersburg regiment and was wounded in the foot at the Battle of Heidelberg. In 1808 and 1809 he took part in the perilous expedition against the Aaland Isles over the frozen seas of the gulf of Bothnia. In the midst of the forests, and all through the anxious camp-life Bátiushkov was studying Tasso and Petrarch. After the war he entered the public service in the Imperial Public Library where two other authors had also found a shelter, Krylóv and Gnědich; in the War of Liberation of 1812 he could not enlist at first, but in 1813, when satisfied with regard to the family of his benefactress, Mme. Murávieva, he joined the forces, and together with the hero Raevski went through the whole campaign. In 1816 Bátiushkov retired and was again made honorary librarian in the Public Library where he zealously occupied himself with literature. In 1818 he travelled to Italy and in 1822 returned to Russia in a condition of intellectual conturbation.

His Literary Work. Although the service rendered by Bátiushkov to Russian literature is not as evident and great as that of Zhukóvski and Gnědich, in the history of literature, he deserves a high and honourable place. Under the influence of the romanticism of the time, Bátiushkov wrote the poems *A Friend's Shadow, The Dying Tasso, On the Ruins of a Castle in Sweden,* (a translation of Friedrich von Matthisson: 1761 to 1831). These poems show the qualities of his poetry, sensitiveness, plasticity in which feature he is in sharp contrast with indefiniteness of form in Zhukóvski. His translations from Tibullus, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Evariste Désiré Desforges Parny (1753 to 1814) were strange to the life of his day, but expressed a real feeling stirred by actualities.

CHAPTER XIII.

KRYLÓV AND THE JOURNALISM OF THE ROMANTIC EPOCH.

THE LITERARY IMPORTANCE OF KRYLÓV.

Krylóv in Russian literature takes rank as an altogether exceptional figure. His name is on the lips of every literate Russian, and his writings have acquired a popularity and significance comparable with that of Homer in ancient Greece. It is remarkable that Krylóv, who entered on the stage of literature almost at the same time as Karamzín kept himself altogether aloof from the trend which the latter innovated into Russian literature: it is also observable that he remained adverse and almost hostile to the romantic development that had as its representatives two such giants as Zhukóvski and Pushkin. Krylóv thus survived two literary periods those of Karamzín and Pushkin, and yet stood aside from the definite trend of Russian literary life that was being enacted, and neither following anyone nor having any followers, indisputably occupied in literature, a position higher than that of any of his predecessors or contemporaries, and stood on a level with Karamzín and Pushkin.

Iván Andréevich Krylóv was born at Moscow in 1763 and died in 1844. He spent the first eight years of his life at Orenbúrg where his father, an officer in the army, was on service. In 1779 his father died at home at Tver, where he had been engaged on service after his retirement from the army and left his wife and children almost destitute. Fortunately the mother, Maria Alexéevna Krylóva,

was one of those splendid Russian women who were prepared for any sacrifice for the sake of her children. Notwithstanding extreme penury and need she found time to teach her son all she knew and also to discover means for supplementing her scanty resources. Iván Andréevich was hardly fourteen years old when he was forced for sheer poverty to enter service as a mere copyist in the Kaliazinski district Court, whence he soon was transferred to the magistracy at Tver in which his father had served up to the time of his death. In 1783 Maria Alexéevna, with her son, removed to Petersburg, where the latter entered service in the Treasury with a salary of two roubles a month. Soon afterwards he was promoted to the Cabinet of the Empress where he stayed a long time. His mother died in 1788 and he then quitted the service and, full of the energy of youth and hope in his strength and prospects, devoted himself exclusively to literature.

Krylóv's First Compositions. His first art of authorship was in his fourteenth year. From 1797 to 1801, Krylóv lived near Kíev on the estate of S. F. Golítsyn who was then in disgrace. When Prince Golítsyn was nominated Governor of Riga he took Krylóv with him as the first secretary of the chancellery. In 1803 Krylóv threw up this service. Where he passed the interval between 1804 and 1805 is not known and has not been ascertained, only this much is certain that, at the end of the year 1805, Krylóv arrived in Moscow and handed to the author Dmitríev a translation of *Fables* of Lafontaine, *The Oak and the Reed, The Fastidious Bride, The Old Man and his Three Sons.* A little later he again reached Petersburg, where he for a while entered the service of the mint, and then became assistant-librarian at the Imperial Public Library, and finally Librarian.

The centenary of his birth was celebrated in both capitals and in many provincial centres in the year 1868.

His Literary Work. Krylóv's literary work falls into two periods. The first embraces the editing of journals and the second the composition of two comedies and the Fables. Both periods are similar in that the predominating

tendency is towards an allegorical form of thought and that the gist is the same. In the second period the allegory took the form of fable.

The journal *The Post of the Spirits* was of a condemnatory tone. The foreign education of Russian nobility was scoffed at. In the journal, *The Spectator*, articles by the editor were published, such as *Kaib* (an Eastern tale), *An Eulogy to my Grandfather*. The first depicts the servility of the vizir to his commander and is a satire on the composers of odes and idylls. The second ironically praises the virtues of the squire, his love of dogs and horses, whereby he is able in a very short time to squander all that his peasants had laboriously collected for him in the course of years.

In the comedy *The Fashionable Shop*, he makes a mockery of the infatuation for French fashions and customs, the position of French governesses, tutors who can adroitly take advantage of the credulity of the inhabitants of the capital.

Fables have existed in almost all peoples and have merely varied in their orientation. Krylóv's *Fables* have the same tendency as Lafontaine's. Both ascribe an equal importance both to the narrative and to the moral. The animals in them are not mere allegories but living beings, only each has its own unalterable character. As to the spirit and aim of Krylóv's *Fables*, it is apposite to mention that latterly they have been subjected to much censure and adverse criticism. Many blame him for his coldness, his ultra conservatism and sceptical attitude towards learning and education, the preference he shows to wit and common sense as against profound theoretic sciences. The reply to all such condemnations is that the moral of Krylóv's *Fables* is remarkably near that current everyday form in which it has been distilled in the Russian people in the course of many centuries.

It is allowable not to like Krylóv's outlook, to decry his moral standpoint as obsolete and crabbedly conservative or even to agree with Wiegel who says that in Krylóv there was expressed all the character of the simple people of Russia, such as had been produced by the Tartar subju-

gation, the tyranny of Iván IV, serfdom and the iron hand of Peter the Great. But, in any case, there can be no denial of the fact that all the work of Krylóv, as a fabulist, is one of the most brilliant phenomena of that inexhaustible genius which lies dormant in the masses of the Russian people beneath the heavy layers of age-long stagnation and apathy.

Krylóv's *Fables* in their content may be divided into the instructional, such as the *Education of the Lion, The Peasant and the Snake, The Bottle, The Cuckoo and the Turtle-dove;* the satiric, such as *The Cock and the Pearl, The Marmoset and the Spectacles, The Pig under the Oak and the Besom.* In the fables *The Ducat, The Diver, The Coffer, The Gardiner, The Philosopher, The Peasant and the Fox, The Man who was Curious, The Author,* and *The Pirate.* Krylóv condemns theoretic learning, prefers common-sense and sagaciousness to goody-goody moralizing. Such a philosophy is not very instructive and the unpleasant impression is redeemed only by the artistic value of the fable.

THE HISTORICAL NOVEL.

Sir Walter Scott was the founder of the historical novel. In Russia he had many imitators, who unfortunately did not avail themselves of the original sources, the *Chronicles* and oral popular traditions: for they had material ready to hand, Karamzín's history. They extracted from that book the subject for their novels and romances and unconsciously were carried away by the opinions and predilections of the historian and imparted into their productions a sentimentality, a feeble comprehension of the life of the mass of the people, and further, in their imitation of the new romanticism they added extraneous elements of marvellous endeavour, strong passions and ideal virtues. Such were the narratives of Karamzín *Martha the Governor's Wife* and the historical novels of Polevói and Pogodin (1796 to 1846 and 1800 to 1875). Zagóskin and Laznéchnikov are the most gifted authors in this generation whose works we now read.

Zagoskin's principal work is *Yuri Miloslavski* (1829; bearing on the time of the Interregnum). Zagoskin's other novels are replicas of *Yuri Miloslavski*, and if Roslávlev at that time was very popular it was because it dealt with the very recent epoch the War of 1812. Lazhéchnikov's works from an artistic point of view rank much higher than Zagoskin's. Of his three novels *The Infidel, The Apprentice* and *The House of Ice*, the last is considered the best.

THE JOURNALS OF THE ROMANTIC EPOCH.

Karamzín founded the *Věstnik Evropy* (*The Courrier of Europe*), which has continued its brilliant career. The conflict between classicism and romanticism had its organs in the *Teleskop* of Nadezhdim and the *Telegraf* of Polevoi. Nadezhdin defended classicism, Polevoi was the champion of romanticism and had great influence with society owing to the negativity which accords with the feeling of the time and the talent of the editor. The *Telegraf* was based on ideas elaborated by German critics hostile to classicism. Izamaílov's paper *Good Intentions* published extracts from German philosophy and aesthetic writers. The most important of the other journals was the *Patriotic Memoirs* issued from 1829 onwards by one Svinín, which principally published materials and learned articles on Russian history. From 1825 onwards Bulgarin and Grech edited *The Northern Bee*.

CHAPTER XIV.

A. S. PUSHKIN AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

ALEXANDER SERGEEVICH PUSHKIN was born on May 26th, 1799 at Moscow, and died January 29th, 1837. He came in direct line of descent from the boyar Gregory Gavrílovich Púshkin who served under Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich (1645 to 1676) : his mother was a grand-daughter of Abraham Petróvich Hannibal who became known to Russia as the Negro of Peter the Great. As soon as Pushkin had learned how to read, he was taught Russian by one Schiller and then was consigned to various French tutors who for a time made him forget that he was a Russian. Being very unimpressionable up to the age of seven this education had no effect. At the age of ten, Pushkin changed, and, although not very studious, began to devour books feverishly. His brother Leo says that Pushkin at the age of eleven knew all French literature by heart, and a biographer agrees that these words may be accepted with some reservations. Hence his first verses were in French. At the age of twelve, Pushkin passed the entrance examination into the Lycée (1811) as one of 33 who were to constitute the first pupils.

The educational conditions at the Lycée were the most favourable possible for the development of the poet's talents : the association with others did the young poet great good and weakened the French influences of his home. Several manuscript journals were published in the Lycée, such as *The School Sage, For Pleasure and Use, The Tyro,* and in them his schoolmates and Pushkin himself took an

active part : and further, the members of this schoolboy club had every evening in turn to make up a story and start one leaving it to be concluded three or four evenings later by other narrators. And, in the midst of this environment, Pushkin, who was first called a Frenchman in this Lycée, left off writing French verse and began writing Russian. The first of his schoolboy poems was a dedication to his sister. These youthful poems did not show any originality, but disclosed his talents to such an extent as to attract the attention of such writers as Karamzín and Zhukóvski, the best writers of the day.

Karamzín and Zhukóvski encouraged Pushkin in his poetry when he was still sitting on his school bench, and Zhukóvski handed Pushkin's verses to Karamzín to read, trusting the latter's fine ear more than his own experience. It is very interesting that even Pushkin accounted himself as a pupil of Zhukóvski, whom he copied least of anyone, as his poetry was in spirit and form much nearer to that of Bátiushkov, which was freer from misty dreaminess and in touch with reality and rich in graceful images. In 1817 Pushkin finished his course at the Lycée and in 1818 at the meetings of the Arzamas and at Zhukóvski's evening parties he had already begun reading the first verses of Russian and Liudmila, in which any dispassionate hearers could not but see a novel and unprecedented event in Russian literature. But, the susceptible young poet was abandoning himself to dissipation and even debauchery in the whirl of society. At the age of twenty he had allowed himself great freedom of speech and denounced whatever aroused his anger, and the storm would have burst on his head, save for the earnest mediation of Karamzín and other friends : but for this he might have been exiled to the island of Solovka : instead of this he was transferred from the Foreign Ministry to the Chancellery of the principal superintendent of colonists of the South and in May, 1820 was already on his way South to Ekaterínoslavl. From 1820 to 1824 Pushkin stayed in South Russia and surrendered himself to the influence of Byron, who had already captured most of the poets of Europe.

Byron's influence is manifested in *The Caucasian Captive, The Fountain of Bakhchi-Sarai,* and partly in *The Gypsies,* with whom he lived and wandered for some time.

At Ekaterínoslavl, Pushkin fell ill of a fever, and the family of General Raevski secured him the right of journeying to the Caucasus. In Bessarabia Pushkin's genius attained its maturity. There he wrote *The Muse, To Ovid, Napoleon, The Song of Olég the Wise,* and some first stanzas of *Evgéni Onĕgin.* In 1824 he was released from the service and relegated for residence to the village of Mikhailobskoe in the province of Pskov. In 1826 he was allowed to return to Moscow, and presented to Emperor Nicholas I, who took it on himself from thenceforth to be the censor of his works.

There exists a legend that the Emperor at a ball said to Count Bludov, "To-day I had a talk with the most sensible man in Russia." In 1834 the poet married N. N. Goncharóva. The last years of his life Pushkin spent in editing *The Contemporary.* On January 27th, 1837, he was mortally wounded in a duel with Baron George Gekeren Dantés and carried home by his second, Danzas: two days later he died surrounded by his friends and universally mourned. His body was buried in the Svyatogorski Uspenski monastery, and a monument to him put up in Moscow in 1881.

His Literary Work. To understand the significance of Pushkin's literary work, attention must be directed first to his lyric compositions. Even in his first attempts, his poems in anacreontic and other Greek metres one characteristic of his style may be observed peculiar to him: that each fleeting impression is expressed with unaccustomed lightness and vigour, and playfulness and variety of style.

Pushkin, in the form of his lyric, resembles Zhukóvski and Bátiushkov: save in that, whilst they abolished the ancient theory of borrowing and imitating, Pushkin created for himself, and derived his images from the impressions of his own life. His poetry, like an echo, responded to all the moods of life: the peaceful friendly rejoicing, the dreams of war, ephemeral intrigues, the ideal adoration

of beauty, the simple minded old nurse, the excited aristocrat Tatiána, the picturesqueness of the Caucasus, the poverty of Russian villages, the rainy autumn—anything equally attracted him and was expressed as a simile, full of harmony and charm.

He was, as has been said, strongly influenced by Byron. This sympathy in him found utterance in the beautiful poems *To the Sea*, and *Day's Beacon has expired.*

The descriptions of Nature show us that Nature does not fret Pushkin, does not transport him into the realm of mysterious questions of life and fate, but merely calms his soul, and reanimates the feeling of beauty. Some poems may be especially noted, *The Fleeting Clouds are thinning, The Caucasus, The Landslip, The Demons, The Winter Evening, The Winter Road, Autumn.*

The polished poems *The Poor, To the Poet, Echo, The Monument*, express the poet's perturbation amidst men who ask of him not what he can give and aspires after. The public of his day and the critics could not be satisfied with Pushkin, as all his productions were artistically beyond the æsthetic development of that time. He was appreciated by the descendants of the forties and fifties. Belínski, the gifted critic grasped the great value of Pushkin's poetry, and proved how great had been his services to Russian literature.

Thus, in defining the character of Pushkin's lyrics, we may divide them into two categories: those written about 1820, which represent the influence of Byron: and the later ones that are the outcome of an æsthetic enjoyment of the exquisite phenomena of the human soul. In other species of poetry, the same tendency may be observed as in the lyrics. The prose is a model of live observant narrative and a light style, very different from that of Karamzín.

Ruslan and Liudmila was the first poem that attracted the interest of the public. It was finished about 1820, now some great faults are found with it: first, it is a medley of the variegated elements, reminiscences of Russian tales and medieval Italian fantasies, of Zhukóvski's romanticism

and the light poetry of the Frenchman Parny: secondly, it has no defined idea nor specific character, it is rather a leisurely diversion with sharp transitions from soft or passionate scenes to terrible and military from the ridiculous to the sad. Of the characters, the best defined are the feminine in which Puskhin excelled: and, thirdly, the poem as a composition shows some confusion in the relation of the actors and connection of the episodes.

The *Caucasian Captive* has left his country: he has retired from the world and fled to a far country as a friend of Nature with the joyous portent of freedom. Such a disenchantment was in part an imitation of Byron, and in part a reflex of Pushkin's own experience when he visited the Caucasus. The poet's own feelings are plainly expressed but the hero's character still remains undefined: it is not evident what precisely compelled him to abandon his home: and his petty selfish nature in our eyes forfeits any charm.

The Gypsies. Aleko, the hero of the Gypsies, exhibits the same disenchantment as *The Caucasian Captive,* but the character is better defined, the reasons that compelled the hero to flee from civilized society are set forth. The gypsy-woman Zemfira, with her frank and seductive nature, her characteristic song of her old harsh husband is especially natural and simple.

Evgĕni Onĕgin is a novel in verse describing the disillusioned hero as applied to the life of Russia: the reason of this disenchantment is the superficial worldly education and the vanity of the civilized life.

In this romance there are pictures of the brilliant worldly education, images of the life and dandified ways in the capital, of days spent in eating and idle chatter.

SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL TYPES CREATED BY PUSHKIN.

Onĕgin, a Russian gentleman, with splendid faculties and potentialities is marked for his sparkle, sincerity and honour. His education has been in the French sense brilliant, superficial and without national predispositions. He passes his time in Society at balls and in masquerades,

and everywhere shines for his fragmentary knowledge; his wit and he triumphs on the stage of "gentle passions." When weary of his victories in Society, he goes home to his village to busy himself on the management of his estates: but soon he is bored with this as well: and he finds the romantic aspirations of his neighbour Lenski just as tiring: the rapturous love of the village Lady Tatiána interests him to a certain extent, and for love of her he quits his own cold and reasoned counsels and sets out abroad to divert his morbidity. *Onĕgin* is permeated with Byronism, and Byron's ideas are often cited: but he has mostly only heard them in Society where he has spent more time than at home. He is a man sensitive, attracted by ideas which he cannot reconcile with life and has therefore become indolent and splenetic.

Lenski is in all respects the opposite of Onĕgin, and therefore his romanticism is quite different. Lenski possesses no special strength of mind nor will-power, but has a kind, sympathetic heart, born for love and friendship: he thinks that life is given to us for happiness, and that everyone is only concerned with doing his neighbour good. He has been educated in Germany, has read Kant and Schiller, has yearned and written poetry. He meets Onĕgin in the village and confides to him all his noble dreams He falls in love with Olga, Tatiána's sister, walks with her in the garden, smiles and gazes at the moon and stars and reads Schiller. He is wholly unpractical, has not understood Olga's behaviour at the ball, is ruffled with Onĕgin and challenges him to a duel, is slain and carries to his grave his splendid dreams which he has never been able to bring to fruition, for he never had sufficient sense nor character. In this hero Pushkin intended representing the unattractive side of romanticism.

Tatiána possesses the best features of this new element. There is much natural resemblance between Tatiána and Lenski, but Tatiána has more will-power. She has been brought up by a nurse who has trained her imagination with the tales of the simple people. The novels of Richardson and Rousseau have something to do with the formation

in her of a certain outlook on mankind. At the sight of Oněgin, she realizes his superiority over the other visitors to the village and decides forthwith he is her ideal and writes him a letter. The cold response offends her but leaves the ideal untouched, and it is pleasant to her to consider herself as a victim or heroine, to dream and muse on Oněgin.

Having found the books he read and had annotated, she tries to guess what manner of man he is: but she never grasped his Byronism and ended with a comparison of him with the ideal of her favourite authors (such as Grandison) of a man suffering from the excess of his good qualities. The acts of her lover clearly prove to her the contrary, whereupon doubts arise in her mind depriving her of the energy necessary to combat ill-success or sorrow. After this she submits to her mother and marries some general. [In Russia *General* is not necessarily a military title].

In Tatiána, Pushkin has succeeded in portraying many touching aspects of the feminine character: gentleness, ingenuousness and sincerity; a passionate curiosity of a mind that is tortured by inaction, obstinate struggle after the ideal which might afford a moral satisfaction in life. The picture of Tatiána is a vivid presentation of the fate of the Russian woman educated in the epoch described by Pushkin.

Olga, the sister of Tatiána, is very much happier. She possesses a kindly and affectionate soul, and from the first has attached herself to Lenski, but when he is killed, suffered awhile, and then consoles herself and marries some Uhlan. In a word she is the daughter of her mother from whom she never departs afar. She is altogether unperturbed by what agitates the souls of Oněgin, Lenski and Tatiána. In her person, Pushkin depicts a girl of his time of whom hundreds existed: of whom there are many now who are happy.

The weakness of the novel consists in that it merely presents a series of pictures in simple and masterly form without any sign of an inner development of character

dependent on the influence exerted by the scene of action.

Boris Godunóv. The artistic talents of Púshkin were attracted by the historical aspect of the Russian people as well as by contemporary society, and always sought for ideals for poetical conception. Such is the historical drama of *Boris Godunóv,* in which the inspired poet thus imagines the fate of Godunóv : after slaying the Tsarévich, he has attained his goal and has mounted the throne. Thereby the moral law is infringed : the culprit is unchastised : all the more as he has been accepted as Tsar by the general consent of the people. But popular judgment has been replaced by the higher judgment of God, who has avenged the offender in the name of the Tsarévich he has killed. The Pretender appears merely as the instrument of Providence, which proclaims the penalty due from the guilty Tsar : that is why he triumphs so easily, notwithstanding his other almost impracticable plans, and all his frivolous notions and the contemptible handful of men which defeats the Moscovite armies. An invisible force guides him ahead as a divine avenger. Borís feels the Divine judgment hanging over him, acknowledges his powerlessness and dies, hoping that his innocent son will come to the throne as of right and fend off the punitive hand of the inscrutable judge. When the same frightful fate overtakes the son as well, the people respond with a general silence, thereby showing that here there is no place for human judgment, when the supreme court of God has acted.

As to the artistic aspect of the drama, it may be observed that the influence of Karamzín's history and acquaintance with the Chronicles is evident in most of the separate scenes and characters, which are faithfully reproduced and remind the reader of pre-Petrine Russia. In the development of the action and in many monologues, in the variety of persons and events, in the medley of good and bad qualities in the same persons the influence of Shakespeare is manifest.

The poems *Poltáva* relate to the epoch of Peter the Great, as also *The Knight of Bronze* and the unfinished tale *The Slave of Peter the Great.* In *Poltava* Púshkin

expressed the idea that those who combine their personal interests and desires with the aims of humanity or the nation leave behind them a memorial in the shape of their energy and deserve the respect of posterity: whilst those who, on the contrary, are guided in their actions only by selfish motives are soon forgotten by posterity, however great their renown during their lives. The persons of Peter, Kochubéi, his daughter, Mazeppa, etc., are linked together with interests, which conflict and are decided at the Battle of Poltáva.

The Knight of Bronze commemorates the melancholy fate of the poor official *Evgéni*, who at the time of an inundation of Petersburg in 1824 lost his bride: he was so shattered that he went mad, and had the hallucination that he was being pursued by the bronze statue of Peter I, in front of which he utters bold language against the founder of Petersburg.

The Captain's Daughter is a good introduction to the external side of the events of the insurrection of Pugachóv.

Iván Kuzmích and Vasilísa Egórovna, folks of the old order and born bachelors, are successfully and faithfully depicted: and the type of Savélich, with his grumbles and slavish devotion is equally fine. But the principal character Pugachóv, Grinev Shvabrin and Maria Avánovna are too broadly drawn. Shvabrin is the ordinary type of the romantic blackguard whose life has no other object than to pester Maria Ivánovna, a thoroughly moral and modest maiden. Grinev is a generous lover, a *Bayard sans peur et sans reproche* and everything he puts his hand to goes smoothly. In Pugachóv's person the national character is traced feebly and superficially.

The services rendered by Púshkin are principally that he, after fully mastering the living language of Russia used it with the art of genius to express the most various impressions, the greatest refinements of feelings and thus enriched the literary language: appositeness, terseness, vigour of expression in the homely speech of Russian, together with playfulness, delicacy and grace—these are the marks of Púshkin's style.

The successors of the Púshkin school. Not one of the Russian poets ever created such a revolution in literature as Púshkin. At the beginning of the thirties, he already saw around him a number of young literary workers who had developed and grown up under the influence of his fertile and inexhaustible resources in poetry in all its varieties. Some merit mention in a history of literature such as Kozlóv, Délvig, Barátynski, Yazykóv, Venevítinov and Podolínski.

Kozlov (IVAN IVANOVICH, 1799-1840) is so far remarkable that he became a poet only after his blindness. Misfortune made him into a poet, and thus a deep melancholy characterizes his verse, and emerges in all his poems and conveys to them a monotony which cannot escape notice even at the first reading.

The poems *Chernéts* and *Natalia Dolgorúkaia* used to be learned by heart before they were printed, and circulated in manuscript.

ANTON ANTONOVICH DÉLVIG was born at Moscow in 1798. His descent was from one of the most widely spread families of the Baltic Barons. He went to the same lycée with Púshkin. Púshkin's memoirs acquaint us with some facts of Delvig's childhood: he entered in the year 1811, his faculties developed slowly: his memory was weak, his intellect sluggish. One day Délvig told his companions that he had taken part in the campaign of 1807 and his narrative so affected his audience that for some days he gathered around him a circle of eager listeners who begged for a repetition of the tale. The Director came to hear of this and himself wanted to hear from Délvig the story of his adventures in the war. Délvig successfully repeated his narrative to the staff. Subsequently he owned to his comrades that it was all imagination and in general Délvig showed a great aptitude for such inventions. Nevertheless he never told a lie to justify himself in any wrong he had done, so as to avoid punishment. He fell ill in 1830 of a mental disorder and died in 1831. His poetic talent was accounted slight. He wrote romances, plagiarized popular songs, and involuntaily gave them a

drawing-room tone. The best of his poems are *To-day I Feast with you, My Friends.*

EVGÉNI ABRÁMOVICH BARÁTYNSKI was born in 1800 on the estate of his father, Adjutant General A. A. Barátynski, in the village of Viazhla, in Tambóv. His mother had completed her course at the Smolny Institute at Petersburg, and was a fraulein in attendance on Empress Maria Feódorovna. Barátynski died at Naples in 1844. His body was transported to Russia and buried in the Alexandro-Nevski Monastery next to that of Krylóv and Gnědich.

His literary work, and his lyrics, like those of most of Púshkin's contemporaries, is characterized by lugubriousness. In his poem *The Last Poet* he expressed the thought that the prose of life crushes poetry, hearts harden, and people concern themselves only with utilitarian objects. The poet dreads the development of reason, the strengthening of the spirit of research, the triumph of science, which in his opinion must ruin poetry. But this false view is put in beautiful verse.

In his poem, *The Last Death*, he says that life is the booty of death, and reason the foe of sentiment, and truth the devastator of happiness. This poem, too, expresses the poet's fear of the fate of poetry. His ideal was the combination of poetry with life, as he expressed it in the poem *On the Death of Goethe.* In the poems *Eda, The Ball, The Gypsy*, there are many spots of beauty but the thought is unsustained. All the fine points of Barátynski and his weaknesses proceed from the same cause, that though a real poet, with a high appreciation and understanding of his profession, he had no definite outlook on life, no strong and live idea.

YAZYKOV (NIKOLAI MIKHÁILOVICH) was born in 1803 in the province of Simbírsk. There is nothing known of his childhood. In his eleventh year he was taken to Petersburg and placed in a school of mining engineers where he stayed six years and learned very little. The only inclination he showed was towards literature and reading, and this was at last developed in him,

thanks to the teacher of literature at the Institute Alexis Dmitríevich Márkov. After completing his course at the Institute, Yazykóv entered the School of Engineering, but soon left it and began, in the common phrase, to live. About then he began inserting his first literary attempts in the *Literary News* and *Partisan of Culture.*

The novelty, vigour, and boldness of his poetic speech provided clear indications of an ingenuous youthfulness, and readers' attention was at once directed towards him. His residence at the University of Dorpat, together with his irregular life, had an evil influence on the young poet. Premature old age with all its burden, disease, pain, voyages afloat and futile waste of time on pretended cures soon brought him to his grave. There is a record of the long roamings abroad preserved in a whole series of nature pictures in such poems as *The Lighthouse, Gastuno, The Sea-bather, The Ship,* and *The Sea.*

His literary work. During his life he published three volumes of verse. Bělínski, who was stern and severe in his criticism, says " Yazykóv in a short time succeeded in making himself very famous. Everyone was astounded with the originality in form and content of his poetry, its melody, clarity and energy of style. His name will always be part of Russian literature and will not be effaced from its pages, even when the public shall have ceased from reading poetry: it will remain known to students of the history of the language and literature. Yazykóv even in his shortcomings rendered Russian literature the greatest services, he was daring and this quality was a service. Until then Russian writers had been markedly timorous: anything novel or original in expression that might occur to them of themselves frightened them. But the bold verse of Yazykóv in its originality had the same effect on public opinion as the rose of Merlin: it emboldened everyone to write, not like everybody else, but according to his own aptitudes, and therefore gave everyone the chance of being himself in his own verse. This was the task of the whole of the Romantic epoch in Russian literature, and this was now successfully resolved."

VENEVITINOV (DMITRI VLADIMIR, 1805-27) is a poet who died at the age of twenty-one, but succeeded in awakening generally sympathy and promising the most brilliant prospects. He is noticeable for his love and thorough grasp of contemporary German philosophy, and this feeling found expression in his verse. He was more of a philosopher than a poet. Further, had he survived, he would probably have abandoned poetry for philosophy and done great service in that field.

PODOLINSKI, a godson of Púshkin, was deeply influenced by Byron, and completely unacquainted with life. His poems *Barski* (the Rich Man), *The Poor Man*, *The Div and the Peri*, abound in richness of feeling and poetic passages, but are weak in content, and disconnected.

CHAPTER XV.

GRIBOIEDOV, LERMONTOV.

ALEXANDR SERGÉEVICH GRIBOIEDOV

belonged to the highest circle of Moscow Society. With his extraordinary capabilities, at the age of 17 he finished his course at the University and entered as a cornet in the Saltykov Hussars, but in 1816 retired and entered the Foreign Office. He began his literary career with an article in the *Viěstnik Evropy* on a regimental festival, and then, after coming into contact with a circle of actors began writing little comedies, either alone or in collaboration with A. A. Zhandr (the director of the Admiralty, 1789 to 1873). Thus in 1816 there was played on the Petersburg stage Griboiědovs first comedy *The Young Consorts*, and next year *Infidelity Simulated*. In 1818 Griboiědov was offered the post of Ambassador in Persia where he sketched out the famous comedy depicting the highest ranks of Moscow society which he had the opportunity of observing so closely during his residence at Moscow. He served in Georgia under Generals Ermolov and Paskevich. In 1827, after the conclusion of peace with Turkey, he was appointed plenipotentiary Minister in Persia, where he reluctantly departed. To serve his mission he surrounded himself with men well acquainted with Eastern customs and those of Georgia and Armenia: but they used the flattering opportunity merely for their own advantage and began agitating for the return of relatives who were in captivity. Intrigues came about and collisions between the Russian Embassy and the natives which terminated in an unexpected riot. The

enraged populace of the town invested the building of the Embassy, killed the suite and inhumanly assassinated the Ambassador himself. Griboiědov's body was buried in the monastery of Saint David to the West of Tiflís. His wife erected a monument over the grave.

His literary work. The Mishaps of Wit, Griboiědov's principal production will long continue to satisfy the æsthetic taste of society, and its historical significance is assured for all time. In this comedy there is portrayed a man who, permeated with the new ideas, has entered on the conflict with the obsolete prejudices, the struggle between the generation in power, and those arising. The Powers that be fall into two circles. The members of one belong to the old nobility of Moscow, who are educated in the French spirit, are preoccupied with petty cabals and slander and have no ambition save to conserve a good repute and to maintain their connections. The other set represented on the stage by Repetilov constitute the salt of the intellectual youth. The obsolescent decaying generation is typified by many various persons who are very true to life.

Fámusov, the father of Sofia, is an anxious father and an industrious official, is eager to give his daughter a good education, as then understood, and then to secure for her a proper match, i.e., with a rich and well-connected husband. He regards his official duties from the point of view of his personal interests.

Chátski, who in Fámusov's opinion utters nonsensical ideas, is a dangerous man, a Voltairean and *carbonario.* It is his uncle Maxim Petróvich who has managed with all his repute and wealth to stoop and bend himself double, so as to attain his lofty rank and orders, that is Fámusov's ideal and model.

Molchalin possessed all the qualities of Fámusov, but in riper form : his composure, moderateness, punctiliousness and closeness, his cringing to bigwigs and faculty of drawing advantage out of everyone—with these characteristics he travels far.

Skalozub is a profitable bridegroom, for he is a colonel :

he is utterly ignorant, but has made good use of his specialities on service, without ever departing far from them.

Platon Mikhaílovich is a kind, backboneless husand, very subservient to his wife, and without hesitance complying with the counsel of fools.

Zagorětski is a consummate liar, a cardsharper and thief, but a past master of the art of obligingness and therefore received everywhere. The news of Chátski's madness delights him as gossip for the town, a means of upholding his prestige in society.

The ladies say little but are sketched with great skill e.g., *Natalia Dmitrėevna*, the wife of Platón Mikhailovich. She typifies the empty-headed fashionable woman with romantic sensibility. Her virtue and affectionate regard for her husband are coarse hypocrisy and lies. Really she is stupid, pampered, and only interested in dressing for balls, plays fast and loose with her characterless husband, and during balls forces him to " be at his post after midnight and at command at the dance."

Khlestova, the aunt of Sofia, is an old lady in her dotage, only interested in gossip, never separated from her lapdogs which she needs as toys.

Repetílov's circle represents the youth which has but one aim, to throw dust in people's eyes and to parade their liberalism. They play the part of the Englishman, but resemble him only in the parting of the hair; and the nature of another member is summed up as "passing topics." In general the members of the English Club do not resemble the circle of Fámusov. It consists of people who have reached some of the peaks of culture, but conserved in their naked unsightliness the manners and profligacy of the nobility. Even Fámusov looks on this set with some contempt, as chattering fools, incapable of making careers for themselves.

Chátski typifies the rising generation the ideal of Griboiědov. His pretensions are absolutely the opposite of those of Fámusov and Repetilov; he requires that the young generation should receive more than a superficial

encyclopædic education. The official must not be more than a formalist : the law must rank for something higher than kinship and friendly relations. He is irritated that the interests of society should cover only cards, gossip, dances and prattle. His convictions are sincere and honourable. Chátski's persuasion must be admitted to be truthful and productive.

MICHAEL IVRIEVICH LÉRMONTOV was born in 1814 and died in 1841. His family was a poor noble house in the province of Túla. His birthplace was Moscow, but he was educated with his grandmother Arsénievna in the village of Tarkhań where he was taken as an infant. His mother died when he was only two and a half years old. Practically nothing is known of his father. His grandmother spared nothing for the upbringing of her grandson, but this was just as French as that of Pushkin. Lérmontov also wrote his first verse in French and tells that he once said angrily " what a pity that my mother was German and not Russian : I never heard any popular tales and fancy there is more poetry in them than in all French literature." One of the impressions of Lérmontov as a boy must be noted : that he travelled with his grandmother to the Caucasus at the age of ten and quite seriously fell in love with a light-haired and blue-eyed maiden of ten. About 1826 Lérmontov was sent to the school of the nobility attached to the University of Moscow. A poem has been preserved composed by Lérmontov when quite a lad, that shows how early he was able to express his impressions in verse. At this boarding school he remained five years and completed the course, received the first prize at the public examination for composition and history, and entered the University where he however did not long remain. He became involved in some students' affair and was excluded from the university together with other students. In 1832 he entered the Petersburg school of ensigns, and in two years became an officer of the guard, but in 1837 was transferred to the Nizhegorod Regiment in the Caucasus. In October, 1837, he was ordered back to Petersburg and appointed to the Grodno Hussars Regi-

ment. About this time he wrote the famous *Song of Tsar Ivan Vasílievich and the Valiant Merchant Kalashnikov.* In 1840 Lérmontov had to travel to the Caucasus for the third time to fight a duel with Baron de Barant, a French historian attached to the Russian Court. In April, 1841, he again spent a short time at Petersburg, but on 15th July of that year returned to the Caucasus and was killed in a duel with a fellow officer Martynov. His body was carried to the province of Pénza and buried at Tarkhan.

His Literary work. This is closely linked up with the episodes of his life. His lyrics are penetrated with artistic truth and may serve as a genuine reflection of his mental attitude. They reveal to us the tempestuous soul of the poet, its impulsiveness, its longing for the beautiful, its proud consciousness of his powers, his contempt of anything, mean, feeble and outworn.

Lérmontov was keenly sensitive to Nature. In his descriptions of scenery he is not the inferior of any of the world poets, as foreign critics acknowledge. Púshkin's influence on him is plain, even in the earliest of his productions: there are the same impressions of the Causasus and mountain life, the same sympathy with Nature and free unshackled forces working in freedom. Lérmontov differs from Púshkin in the degree of the influence exerted by Byron: Lérmontov was infected with Byronism and carried it to an extreme point, and is therefore the leading representative in Russian literature of Byron's poetry.

His great poem *The Demon* is based on the idea of negation. The poem *Mtsyri* portrays another side of Byronism, sympathy with Nature.

A comparison of Lérmontov with Púshkin in the matter of artistic form will show that the latter had much more variety in his sources in the spheres of life and literary, whilst Lérmontov's satire predominates, serious,and devoid of any jocular element.

Lérmontov is marked for his lightness and simplicity, as also for the greatest melodiousness: his verse has a ring of pure metal: his style is clear and vivid and brings out the subject with the greatest clearness.

ALEXIS VASÍLIEVICH KOLTSOV was born at Vorónezh in 1809, the son of a burgher who had gained a sufficient competence. One of the Vorónezh seminarists taught him reading and writing and he completed his course at the local school. Even when half-literate he was a passionate reader and at the age of 16, the desire arose of writing verse. A book-seller of Vorónezh, Dmítri Antónovich Kashkin was the first tutor of Koltsóv in poetry. He provided him with books from his shop, amongst them he gave him a Russian prosody published for the University School of Nobility. Serébrianski, the teacher at the Vorónezh seminary, also had great influence on Koltsóv. An unfortunate love-affair with a girl led to his poetic attempts becoming fervid poems of love and hatred, gloomy and truthful expressions of grief and sorrow, and full and melodious responses to the impress of his outer world. At the time of his poetic development fate brought Koltsóv into contact with Stankevich, who, in 1835 also published the first volume of his poetry. This little volume in itself was sufficient to prove that Koltsóv possessed a native and really remarkable talent. In 1842 in October, this popular Russian poet died, the one who was the son of a cattle-dealer.

His literary work. Koltsóv's poems *The Young Harvester, The Ring, The Season of Love,* paint the inner psychological side of love, its secret birth in the soul. The last named poem is very important as it shows amongst other features how the poet regarded Nature, which in popular lyric plays a very important part. In the poems *The Bitter Lot, The Second Song of the Coachman Kudriavich, The Reflections of a Villager, The Path, In Stormy Weather, The Counsel of the Hawk, The Cross-roads,* he analyses misfortune deeply, as an irresistible fore-ordained power: it is a feeling of inconsolable misery. The cause of the misery is poverty, but often there arises the bitter feeling of discontent even in a man healthy and strenuous, rich in moral qualities and ready to fight his battle against misfortune. The thought in these poems is the hunger for reality and the feeling of a power which a man does

not know how to use. It is the same discontent as the other poets conceived under the veil of Byronism. As a counterpart he also presents an attractive picture of village toil and contentment in the poems *The Song of the Ploughman*, *The Peasants' Merry-making*, and *The Harvest*.

CHAPTER XVI.

GOGOL.

From the year 1830 the novel and the romance assume ever increasing prominence in the scheme of Russian literature. An entire series of authors makes its appearance who imitate some one or other of the Western writers: some still display romantic tendencies, others follow in the wake of Scott. But they all show a more or less successful attempt to frame scenes from Russian life of the past or the present, with pretensions to effects, comic, satiric or humorous. About this time there came upon the scene Gogol, who took the first place in this literary movement and established by his great genius the school which even now and for a long while will predominate in Russian literature.

NICHOLAS VASÍLIEVICH GOGOL-IANOVSKI was born on 19th March, 1809, in the province of Poltáva, in the hamlet of Sorochnitsy. His father was the son of a regimental secretary (one of the honorary posts in the Ukrainian corps) and his grandfather was a representative of the waning generation of the Cossacks: and Gogol does not idly refer to him in the *Evenings in a Farm-house*, for he owed to him half of his Little-Russian stories. Gogol was taught his letters by a seminarist. In 1821 Gogol was entered in a gymnasium, just opened, of the Higher Sciences at Nĕzhina (near Bezborodko). But there he learned nothing but drawing, but he read widely and even on his schoolboy's bench became acquainted with all the Russian poets. In 1828 he finished his course, and in 1829 went to Petersburg and became a

secretary at some government office, but soon gave this up, travelled abroad, lived about a month at Lübeck, and returned to Petersburg again and sought employment. He tried the stage and was examined for the purpose and rejected. He was also a teacher of Russian literature, and then a professor of Russian history, but all to no effect, and finally he devoted himself to literature. He died in 1852 of a severe illness.

His literary work. The Evenings in a Farm-house were published in 1831 and favourably received by the public, and approved by the poets of that time, amongst them by Púshkin. In 1832 Gogol returned from his home and brought back with him his *Old-world Squire*, *The Quarrel of Iván Ivánovich with Iván Nikíforovich*, and *Tarás Bulbá*. The last tale was the fruit of research of Little-Russia, a history of which he intended writing. All of these productions were published and their splendid success aroused in Gogol the consciousness that his real vocation was authorship: he began contemplating books which should have significance for all of humanity, or, at least, for all of Russia. This aspiration to create a first-class artistic book, to bring him substantial profit never left him. His long residence at Petersburg resulted in many fine stories, *The Nevski Prospekt*, *The Great-coat*, *The Portrait* and others in which beyond the depiction of life, his characteristic humour is observable, the laughter with sobs in the voice.

Dead Souls took shape in his mind under the influence of as great a genius as Púshkin. When Púshkin died, Gogol, who felt towards him the deepest respect and gratitude, did not forget the plan of a great poem for all of Russia, regarding the fulfilment of it as an oath and hallowed vow, to fail in which would have been sacrilege to the great poet.

Gogol in his literary work was a contemporary of Púshkin and Lérmontov, and belonged to the same school, and was not unaffected by its romanticism, yet he was the first to cast off its fetters, to leave off the seeking of ideals of the beautiful and to aim elsewhere. He painted

the happenings in Russian society that departed from the ideal and created not rogues but commonplace everyday persons, with all of their pettinesses; and whilst telling of their declension from the ideal, did not relate the feelings stirred up in him by their deficiencies. His types create an irresistible impression on the reader, who feels that the author is not laughing at the types he depicts, but feels in his heart the deepest sympathy with them. This is the impression which raises Gogol above Von Visin and Krylóv and Shchedrín: it is called humour.

Gogol's talent, as it developed, divided his works into three periods, first, the tales of Little-Russian life, secondly, tales of the middle class at Petersburg and, thirdly, the comedy the *Revisor* and the poem (in prose) *Dead Souls*.

The tale *Vi* is satiric at first and recalls Narĕzhny's (1780 to 1826) romance *Bursak;* a description of the "bourse" with its grammars and rhetoricians and philosophies and theologians. One of the philosophers meets a fearful witch, who appears to him in various shapes, now as an hag, and then as a beauteous maiden: he kills her and then happens to be the Psalm-reader over her body and sees such horrors that he dies of fear.

Tarás Bulbá is a splendid story, and is marked for the predominance in it of the tragical element, derived not from fancy but from the incidents of the narrative. Bulbá is one of the old warriors of the Cossack border such as are sketched to us in the ancient historic Cossack songs. His education was life in the brunt of the savagery of the steppes in incessant skirmishes with Tatars or Poles, and his eldest son Ostáp was of the same type. The younger one, Andrew, unlike his father and brother, has their energy but also a softness of sensibility little valued in the stern age of fierce forays.

Tarás' wife is a touching type of the mute woman, condemned to eternal solitude in her farm, with but one solace, to think and mourn for her children.

The tales *The Old-world Squires*, and *The Quarrel of Iván Ivánovich with Iván Nikíforovich* bridge the transition

to the tales of Petersburg. In them there appears for the first time in full form the subtle humour of Gogol, although as yet it does not bite deep into the essence of life. The lives of these old-world squires, idle, irresponsible, is spent in eating, hospitality, walks in their gardens, and futile chatter. The constant anxiety on diet awakens mockery and compassion. Paltry as were these lives, the causes which induced serious upheavals were no less paltry: Pulkheria Ivánovna was upset when her lost cat suddenly returned, and, after a hasty meal, vanished anew. It seemed to this lady as though this were a prognostication of coming death. The thought of this shattered her puny health, and the death of the lady and the husband's solitary life are movingly described by Gogol.

The Nevski Prospekt is a good account of the life in the luxurious capital in its opposite effects on Pirógov and Pískarev. Ensign Pirógov had no other object than to play pranks with frivolous young ladies of the middle class, to shine at the tea-parties of officials and to flaunt his victories over women's hearts. Pískarev is a young artist with an ardent soul, a deep feeling for beauty to whom any prank becomes a serious entanglement: he stands quite aloof from the interests of the paltry existence and perishes in its slough, because the milieu, on which he wishes to act in pursuance of his noble aspirations, is too rude and unpromising for gentle sentiments, and even a youth, as a man developed under the influence of such surroundings can only be excited, can only dream and remain inactive.

The Portrait tells of another type of artist in conflict with life. The artist Chartkóv is the hero of the tale: he is devoted to his work, serves art with self-abnegation and therefore undergoes frightful poverty. He lives in an unheated room, and has not even the means of paying for it. He is turned out by the landlord. By chance he gets some money and sets out visiting the restaurants and leases a splendid flat in the Nevski, bribes a journalist to write a grand article about him and has thus become a fashionable artist. Success in the world, the degraded

claims he has to satisfy, have destroyed any lofty strivings in him: and they are replaced by a desire for money and ephemeral renown in the world. His talent has been ruined by the corruption of Society. The first part of the tale describes the development of the character as influenced by his social surroundings. The second is much less notable: for the fantastic in it is almost monstrous; and it shows that Chartkóv has not emancipated himself from the fateful effect of the fear of the eyes of the usurer, although he was a most sensible and hard man and had met in society with every inducement to honest work. This feature shews Gogol's romantic outlook on art.

The Greatcoat and *The Memoirs of a Madman*, display another side of the life of the middle classes of Petersburg. The hero in *The Great-coat*, Bashmachkin, a poor modest official has no other occupation nor interest or even distraction than his book-keeping. Shyness, timidity, and unusual heedlessness are the main features of his character. But together with these aspects he combines a natural gentleness and kindliness, conscientiousness and rare industry and even inclination to create an ideal out of what constitutes a man's life. Thus conditioned, he might in a modest sphere have been a useful worker.

But he has become dulled, has lost any individuality and is merely the butt of general mockery. This is the result of his beggarly position in society, of the dead forms that have enshackled all of his life and of his extreme poverty. The author concentrates all the interests of Bashmachkin on his great-coat which he must have, to save him from freezing.

Beside Bashmachkin there is introduced a type of person whose rule in life is sternness. He is naturally kind and gentle, but an important rank has completely bewildered him. In him too, there may be seen the same stupidity and attrition, the same servility to empty forms, owing to the lack of any fundamental thought and serious work, just as with Bashmachkin, only in another aspect.

In the *Memoirs of a Madman* the hero is Póprishchin. His insanity began from his being privileged to sit in the

Director's Cabinet and clean his pens. He is excited at the decoration of the room, the majestic aspect of the Director and the beauty of his daughter. Dazzled with all this splendour he goes mad and falls in love with the Director's daughter. In a condition of lunacy, he temporarily recovers a sound judgment on mankind and a recognition of human dignity, since now there had been extinguished in him his servile terror of the Director. These healthy notions Póprishchin expounds not as from himself, but from the person of the Director's dog Medoc. There he sees men in the actual world, understands that they are even of less account than ordinary men, and that it is only high rank and orders that place them over Póprishchin. His dreams become broader and wider, and at last turn into disordered shapes, although he ever conserves his kindliness and sensibility.

The comedy of the *Revisor* is very simple both in content and construction. The characters of the play are sketched with great diversity and exactitude. The principal parts are the Provost and Khlestakov.

The Provost has grown old in service, as he says, by no means a fool, though willing to be bribed: he conducts himself decently, is sufficiently serious and at times can hold his own in argument. His features are heavy and rough, as with all who began their official careers in the lower ranks. He is an experienced rogue, who has mastered and carried to a fine point all the tricks of the service. Further, his ignorance is laid bare in his superstitious dread at dreaming of two mice, and in his belief in stupid portents on the basis of which Dobchinski and Bobchinski took Khlestakov to be the Revisor (a superior Inspector sent from the Central authority). The crudity of his character comes in passages where he says how he will live after attaining a Generalship. His fear for his peccadilloes is so great, that it blinds him, despite all his experience (for he had bamboozled three governors) he does not recognise in Khlestakov a nobody, a filthy parasite, a dirty clout, as he calls him at the end of the play.

Khlestakov is one of the most striking characters created

by Gogol. His is a generous temperament: but he has gambled away his fortune at cards and has been subdued and tamed: he endures the rudeness of his servant Osíp patiently, and timorously begs him to go to the buffet to secure another meal somehow on tick. His ordinary device, as though challenging a nobleman, is to go to the house of some squire in a hackney carriage with Osíp in livery, and this he will do in the most desperate circumstances. Together with simplicity and rudeness there is to be seen in this empty-headed man a combination of every kind of falsehood, which has grown into habit in him, into a necessity and therefore as natural as the truth. He cheats and invents, because he believes in the lie he is telling. Various passages in the play show how such a character was formed: developed in the atmosphere of the capital where formerly everything tended to ostentation, where one passion predominated to make a show of oneself, to glitter, albeit only for the instant. Wealth, descent and rank are the only qualifications for respect. The petty persons who are caught in this whirlpool, have striven with all their might and would spend their last farthing at least to collect even the crumbs that drop from the table of fashion and vanity. Such is the character of Khlestakov, in which all the degrading features of the life of the coxcomb of the capital are expressed without any trappings or embellishments. Khlestakov is a magnificent tool for the moral object of the play. The mayor is severely punished, not because he pays dear, but in that he is fooled by the emptiest of vagabonds. The secondary characters of the play, Artémi Filípovich, the guardian of the ecclesiastical foundations, is a comfortable, solemn rogue. His first act, on appearing before the Revisor is to whisper in his ears and make reports against his fellow servants. The judge Amos Fiódorovich takes bribes in the shape of racing dogs, but is not reluctant to enliven himself from other occasions as well. He judges of all matters from a lofty standpoint, and is a freethinker, because he has read a few books.

The school inspector, Luká Lukích is an utterly timid

being. As the enlightener of youth, they suggest to him he should first interview the Revisor, but he replies that he dare not speak to anyone higher than him in rank.

The ingenuous postmaster who opens letters out of sheer curiosity is essential to the dénouement, for it was only he who could have unsealed Khlestakov's letter.

The ragamuffins, Bobchinski and Dobchinski, are also essential, as town gossips and idle inhabitants without any occupation, and for lack of anything else, scandal-mongers. It is vacuity of living interest that explains the conduct of the wife and daughter of the Provost on the occasion of the arrival of the Revisor. Both display their qualities in their dispute how to dress. Many other characters, introduced by the author, though they say and do little, in a few words define their characters and make it clear how they would behave elsewhere.

Historically *The Revisor* takes the next rank after *The Mishaps of Wit* but artistically there is no comparison.

Dead Souls depicts another world. There is unfolded to us the character of Chíchikov, an official of mature years and notable appearance: a careful and experienced self-seeker with broad plans, indefatigable in the pursuit of them. The officials of the province (not of the district) are not in such an excited condition as in the Revisor. Chíchikov's enterprise will not mean for them imprisonment nor retirement, but merely a novelty, the occasion of astonishment. From this point of view, Gógol presents the ladies of this circle, and like a true artist, dwells on their differences. The master of police and two ladies are especially pointedly depicted, the one "simply charming" and the other "charming in all aspects." The principal characteristics are petty feminine self-love, a faded sentimentality together with a genuine adoration of the golden idol, a senseless love of dress, carried to the point of madness, a longing for scandals and anything novel, an imagination always idle, occupied with nothing but trifles, a stupid complacency and affection. The principal part is taken up with the lyrics. Gógol describes their characteristics in general and particularly the

impression produced on then by the unexpected and strange visit of Chichikóv.

Manílov is the type of idle squire, sentimental to the point of simulation. All he does is to smoke his pipe, sit at his balcony in his room, and dream of friendship, make impracticable projects, such as to build a subterranean passage from the house, or a stone bridge over the pond with shops on both sides, etc. He neglects the management of his estate, and besotted in the village in aristocratic sloth has become vacuous, and leaves everything to an agent who is either drunk or asleep. He is naturally a peaceful man; phlegmatic and sentimental novels such as those of Marmontel (1723-1799), which he has read once upon a time have merely incited his imagination and misdirected his feelings. He is content with anything, aflame at anything: the stupidest phrase will evoke from him his tears. His wife has been educated at a boarding school but can now only knit little purses and other knick-knacks, and, like her husband, is quite content with her lot.

Koróbochka is a woman of native character, developed in the remote country-side, and without any reflection of European culture. She lives alone and does not know what is happening thirty versts away. Her furniture is antediluvian and her estate conducted on the ancient model: there is plenty of everything, all accounts are accurately kept, as she supervises everything. She utterly fails to understand Chíchikov's explanation as to the dead souls and is quite inaccessible to him. She believes in divination by cards, sees the devil in her sleep, but the lust for gain, a penny-wise wisdom, the fear of losing a reliable customer, overbear any such terrors and she is amenable to Chíchikov and even moderate in her price.

Nozdrióv is vigorous and alert and like Khlestakov, only more energetic and not a parasite or dirty rogue. He typifies in all its strength the bold Russian valour, born not of the luxury of the capital, but in the wild horizons of the steppe and drinking bouts and under the ancient conditions of serfdom. The attitude of Nozdrióv to

Chíchikov's enterprise is very significant; he forces the schemer to a frank avowal, not out of malice, but simply in consequence of his unrestraint of speech: he blurts out what he means. When incomes diminish, characters like Nozdrióv become rare, but some scattered features of this type will long survive in Russian society with all its varieties.

Sobakévich is a man self-centred and unconvinceable. He is always clumsy, awkwardly silent and powerfully built. All of his husbandry is rough but sound. He is a plain direct man, and does not like light French cooking, and wants a lot of everything, prepared simply without any foreign trappings. He at once grasped Chíchikov's proposal but at first asked a frightful price, which he gradually abated in this respect, behaving more honestly than the swindling close-fisted extortioners called *kulaki* in Russia. He is keen only for profit, and scolds out loud at every one: and calls the most gentle people brigands. His rude nature is incapable of fine dissimulation: he acts simply, outright, without deceit, he clasps hard and without compassion. Gogol calls him a kulák (a fist) which will not open its palm. If learning to any extent open him, he will take a more prominent place and show himself to anyone who really knows anything thoroughly.

Plyúshkin, in Gogol's opinion, is exceptional in Russia, where everyone loves to expand: that is why the features of this type are drawn too sharply, and a little unnaturally especially the conversation with Chichikóv. The appearance of the miser is graphically described.

Gogol's influence is so significant that the literature of the forties is almost entirely coloured by him. Like Púshkin, Gogol depicted the life of Russian educated circles, the squires and officials, but first, his attention was directed primarily to the mean aspects of this life: and, secondly, he portrayed them with striking faithfulness, neither softening his colour, nor shading his picture, without really analysing his types: and thirdly, the impression he conveys on the reader is beneficial, it is laughter through tears, sympathy with the actors in the tale, whom

the writer has humanized. Gogol has rendered yet this service to discover an untouched well of poetic inspiration in the middle and lower classes of society.

CHAPTER XVII.

MODERN LITERATURE: THE SCHELLINGISTS, SLAVOPHILS AND WESTERNIZERS.

About 1825 there was formed at Moscow, philosophical groups of Schellingists. Schelling's philosophy had been twice translated into Russian, had leading patrons in Russian society, journalism and the universities, especially in that of Moscow and brought into Russian literature new ideas of the proper bearing of literature to popular life. Schelling's doctrine that the literature of every country ought to be native, just like its civilization: and should express in its entirety the spirit of the people, the idea it carries with it and works out for itself. Every truly poetic production, according to Schelling is a model expression of an idea which, in its effort to thrust itself into the outer world, appears amongst other forms of appearance in art and fuses in the poet's soul with forms identical with it. Thus it happens that the poet, the child of his people and his age, can attain the unconditional idea only from that aspect of it in which it appears in a given people, at a given time and he realizes and realizes the idea in such forms as surround the poet. These propositions suggested to the Russian Schellingists, questions of the value and character of Russian literature, of the necessity of basing it entirely on a national self-dependent footing. The Schellingists considered that Russian literature, beginning at Lomonósov down to Púshkin, had been an imitative literature, a slavish echo

of Western letters and in no wise expressive of the essence of the Russian spirit. Consequently, it is natural that the Schellingist groups inclined towards utterly denying the very existence of a Russian literature.

The considerations enumerated were the reason of the division of Russian society into two camps, the Slavophils and the Westernizers. These parties had existed previously, but had not gone any farther than to discuss questions of the purity of the Russian language or a sentimental devotion to elements Russian or foreign: now both parties discovered a theoretical philosophical basis for their doctrines, and at the same time occupied themselves with the decision of problems affecting the fate of the Russian people.

SERGEI TIMOFEEVICH AKSÁKOV was born before Púshkin and Gogol and began his literary work very much earlier than either of them, but the character of his literary productions is extraordinarily original and even strange, and will not in any way follow any chronological rules. In fact, his literary work and life falls into two halves in strong contradiction: during the first he is a partisan of pseudo-classicism, an enthusiastic disbeliever and champion of literary traditions outworn long before Púshkin, and in the later after a long interval, he steps on the scene with descriptions of nature and recollections of the past, and very soon gained the reputation of a talented and original writer. The second period is from about 1840 to 1859, and for this reason he is assigned to modern literature.

Sergĕi Timofĕevich was born in 1791 at Ufá. The family of Aksákov is very ancient and is derived from one, Simon Afrikánovich, who arrived in Russia under Prince Yaroslav (1027) from the vikings' country with three thousand vassals.

His first education he received at home from his beloved mother who was well-educated; he was next sent to the gymnasium of Kazáń and lastly to the University of Kazáń, where his artistic sensibilities developed. His success on the stage and in declamation was very great,

and, even in mature years he continued to be one of the best actors in private theatricals at Petersburg and Moscow. Towards the end of 1807, he arrived at Moscow with his family, and occupied himself principally with the stage. In the spring of 1808 the family of the Áksákovs reached Petersburg and stayed there about two months: Sergěi Timofěevich himself stayed on in the public service as a translator for the Legal Commision. In 1820 he removed to Moscow and took a closer part in the literary and theatrical world. About then there was published his translation of Boileau's Tenth Satire, and he was elected a member of the Moscow society of Russian literature. He also wrote verse in the *Viěstnik Evropy*. From 1827 to 1833 he was engaged in official work as censor, and during this time translated Molière's *Ecole des Hommes*, and *L'Avare*. In 1834 he was made inspector of the Moscow School of Surveyors which under him was re-named the Constantine Institute of Surveying. But up to this time his talents had lain dormant or had not found a proper channel. They developed in maturity and for this fortunate circumstance he is largely indebted to Gogol.

His literary work. This consisted in depicting the life of the steppes which he had seen during his journeys over its vast stretches, hunting or fishing. Aksákov's first essay in this manner was *Buran*, and about this time he was planning his *Family Chronicle*. In 1847 he published *Notes on Angling*, in 1852 *Memoirs of a huntsman in Orenburg*, *Tales and Reminiscences of a Huntsman* and *The Family Chronicle* in 1858 and in 1858 the *Childhood of the Grandson of Bagrov*. *The Family Chronicle* made a very strong impression, and all the more as, at the time of publication, Russian literature was showing a great revival. The author's principal merit was considered to be pictures of life with their faithfulness to type and broad powers of reproduction. It is well known that the history of the Bagrov family was based on real persons. The death of this writer in 1859 was universally regretted by all classes without distinction: his death robbed Russia of a generous independent and powerful writer.

B. G. BELINSKI. This great critic was bred under the influence of the German philosopher Schelling, and was the chief representative of the intellectual movement of the forties. He was the son of a staff physician Vissarion Grigorevich Bĕlínski, and was born in 1811, and died in 1848. He passed his youth in the remote district of Chembarski (in Penza), amongst the provincial officials, in an atmosphere of petty scandals, bribery and wild drinking-bouts. About 1820 he entered the local school, and thence after completing the course, went to the lower class of the Pénza Gymnasium. The books of this institution record that Bĕlínski was not advanced, because he played truant, and later on his name was struck out in the local gazette for this reason. Some influential friends enabled him to enter the University of Moscow, where he also did not complete the course: for in 1832 he left it with the certificate "of slight capacity, negligent." The development of his critical powers was aided by Pávlov's and Nadézhdin's lectures, the literary and learned disputations of the students who frequented N. V. Stankevich (the son of a rich squire of Vorónezh). Stankevich was a sickly and silent dreamer: of a sort that might look to his friends like a being really not of this world, and a genius ethereal and disembodied, full of sensibility and gentle appreciations. He had absolute sway over all the foremost young men of Moscow, not so much by the force of his strength of will and dialectic powers, as by his natural keenness for anything fine or humane. Besides Stankevich, there belonged to this group of students Bĕlínski, Botkin, Ketcher Granovski, Konstantin Aksakov, Kudriavtsev Herzen and others. Bĕlínski died of consumption on 28th May, 1848, at the age of 38.

His critical work. Bĕlínski, in Stankevich's circle represented the criticism of literature. In twelve volumes of small print he reviewed all of Russian literature, guided partly by Hegel's conceptions, partly by his own artistic talent which had been fostered by German philosophy. His criticism may be divided into two periods, according

to the place, that of Moscow from 1834 to 1839 and Petersburg from 1839 to 1848.

The first critical writing of Bělínski, *Literary Dreams*, was printed in an unimportant paper of Moscow *Molva* (speech) and proved that there was no Russian literature. The boldness and incisiveness of it provoked a great impression. The tales of Gogol as they appeared forced Bělínski to admit that the position of Russian literature was not altogether hopeless, as he put it in his article *Something about Nothing*. The most characteristic article of the Moscow period was *On the Russian Story*, and the *Tales of Gogol*. The critic savagely attacks German romanticism as illusionary and opposed to reality. His principal object was to defend Gogol and the natural school which he had founded. The best article of the Petersburg period is on Griboědov's comedy *The Mishaps of Wit*. Bělínski, as typifying artistic criticism defined the value of literary productions to art and social life, as the relation to two unchangeable conditions of literary productivity. He affirmed the artistic interpretation of life as the unalterable and only foundation of art. Starting from this pre-supposition, he unreservedly rejected both idealization as foreign to life as the vapours of lifeless conjectures and the dry realism, which never surmounted the every-day facts of life so as to enlighten them by art. The names of Homer, Dante, Shakespeare and Goethe recur constantly and he utters very brilliant reflections on them. His best critical essays are considered to be on Hamlet, Menzel, Derzhávin, Zhukóvski, Bátiushkov, Púshkin (on him one whole volume) on *The Hero of Our Time* (by Lérmontov), and the *Literary Review of Some Recent Years*.

The importance of Bělínski for Russian literature can thus be defined: first, he expressed a proper estimate of the older and later writers, states the significance of Lomonósov, Sumarókov, Derzhávin and other later authors, and their inter-relations. Secondly, he lowered the public repute of many second-rate writers who enjoyed an undeserved vogue. Thirdly he indicated the road to

advance for Russian literature, defining the principal epochs, and delimiting them and finally he upheld the naturalistic and Slavophil school against their antagonists, and showed the necessity of these phases in a rising literature.

CHAPTER XVIII.

LATER POETS AND THE GREAT NOVELISTS.

The same conditions as produced Bělínski, bred also the following writers, all of them more or less prominent: Iskander, Goncharóv, Turgénev, Dostoévski Grigórovich and Písemski. A. I. Herzen (1812-1870) wrote some articles remarkable for their breath of intellect, talent, wit, originality of outlook and expressiveness, such as *Dilettantism in Learning, Letters on the Study of Nature, On the Subject of Drama, The Letters of Doctor Krupov, The Memoirs of a Young Man, The Thieving Magpie.* The three last-named are stories. Most of his work is permeated with a feeling of sorrow, a discontent with the environment of facts, which sometimes becomes melancholic despair.

NICHOLAS PLATÓNOVICH OGARIOV (1813-1877) was a poet with a gentle but sad heart, ardent to love and believe, and dismayed at the discrepancies of reality. The desire to discover consolation in the enticement of musings destroys life and thought. In the eyes of truth his peace and personal pride vanished, leaving behind them the yearnings of love with senseless grief. A disconsolate feeling also fills those poems of his where he depicts the world around him, the gloomy pictures of poverty, penury and the wretched betrayal of love. Ogarióv reminds the reader of Lérmontov, but the predominating feature of the latter is a more artistic form and the ability to seek for rays of hope under the darker clouds of life.

THE LYRICAL POETS: MAIKOV, FET

Discontent with reality and at the same time, faithful to the bequest of Púshkin, the conviction that the principal task of poetry is to sing of the beauties of Nature "that mysterious world"—these tendencies had many representatives amongst the poets of the forties.

The best of them, Apollón Nikolas Maíkov (1811-1897) and Afanasi Afanásievich Shenshin (1820-1892) wrote verse, beautiful in its poetic and artistic form, but just as from the time of Púshkin fluidity and beauty of style had become essentials of Russian poetry, in Maíkov our attention should be directed to his subjects: and in this respect his best poems are accounted those which belong to the anthological type. Such are *Octaves and Art*, the basic thought of which is that nature is the tutor and inspirer of the poet and that he must take lessons from her first of all in the art of composing smooth verses. The following poems are also written in the anthological direction, *The Muse The Goddess of Olympus*, *The Dream*, *On this Wild Headland*, *My Child*, and *There are no more those Blessed Days*.

In the verses of Fet, two tendencies are sharply discernible: the one consists of translations of Horace, and beautiful anthological poems in which the vividness of the images, the clearness of expression and truth of feeling may be observed. The best in this vein are *Evening and Night*, which breathe forth a perfect tranquillity of mind. In the *Songs to Ophelia*, *The Melodies on the Snow*, and others Lérmontov's influence is evident.

POLONSKI.

The originality of the poetry of Polonski is its reflectiveness, melancholy but not inconsolate, and the languid fantastic colour. The verse is timid, even clumsy and sometimes rough, but a fine perception of nature makes itself felt, and a thorough merging of the facts from without, with imagery and impulses from within. The tale *The Statue of Spring* tells how Iliúsha fell in love with this statue, shattered it to pieces and what afterwards ensued in his feverish imagination and weak organism. In the humorous poem *The Musical Blacksmith*, it may be seen how Polonski animates nature. The

subject of the poem is the love of the smith and a woman, the betrayal of the woman by the smith, and her love for a nightingale which sometime later kills her. The smith has searched for the sylphid and buried her, and had ardently loved her. In this humorous and fantastic story there may be observed the poet's dissatisfaction, his grieving at a world in which no complete happiness may be found.

KHOMYAKÓV AND TIÚTCHEV. The poems of Khomyakóv are mostly patriotic and marked for their melodious and brilliant style. Almost all of his works are to celebrate the old pre-Petrine Russia. But, as in him there is no deep feeling, all his brilliance has the cold emptiness of rhetoric, and there is much inexactitude and want of definition. His tragedy *Ermák and Dmítri, The Pretender* in the manner of exposition, is reminiscent of the pseudo-classic tragedy and there is much unnatural romanticism in the characterization of the principal actors.

Tiútchev sang the beauty of Nature, and expressed his feelings in splendid verse, beautiful imagery, such as is always to be found in Maíkov and Fet. But Tiútchev's verse also contains an element of Panslavism, the sympathy with the subject Slavs of the West.

ALEXIS TOLSTÓY. Count Alexis Tolstóy became ever famous for his drama *The Death of Iván the Terrible.* Most of his verse is inspired with the live stream of popular life and written in a style which evidently marks an approximation to the popular language. His best poems are considered to be those of historic and fabulous content, such as *The Wolves, Strange Woe, Prince Michael Repnin,* and the *Aged Chieftain.* The historical romance, *Prince Serébryani,* gives a series of pictures of the epoch of Iván the Terrible depicted with great talent.

IVAN ALEXANDROVICH GONCHARÓV was the son of an opulent merchant, and was born at Simbirsk in 1812. He lost his father at the age of three and was thus in the charge of his mother who

was one of the women who could devote their lives to their children. She spared nothing towards the training of her son, and did much to assist the growth of his natural powers. Goncharóv was first educated at home, and then in a private boarding school and ended his education at the University of Moscow. In 1852 he sailed on the frigate *Pallada* to Japan as secretary to Putiátin, who was proceeding there to negotiate a commercial treaty (concluded in 1855). The outcome of this voyage appeared in a very artistic description of the journey entitled *The Frigate Pallada.*

His literary work. Goncharóv's first literary predictions appeared in a little manuscript journal of Maíkov. In addition, from time to time he published in various contemporary papers his translations, thus continuing to work at his education. At the beginning of the forties he began to write this *Commonplace Story*, a mournful story of youthful fervour, soon to be cooled in the stern experience of the Russian life of that date, that tended to degrade the young men from their dreams of progress and perfection to the ideal of official formalism. *Oblómov* appeared in serial form in the *National Memoirs* of 1858 and 1859 and produced a great impression on the public. What surprised readers most of all was the art with which this author managed to conjoin in the character of Oblómov, as a magnificent artistic whole, all the unattractive aspects of the type the effect of the inconspicuous activities of Russian squiredom, the apathy of the isolated life of the landowner, together with all the best and most pleasant aspects of Russian life in its essence. Together with the decaying type of Oblómov, Goncharóv displays another character, that of the splendid Russian woman in Olga. The novel Oblómov was published in the *Vestnik Evropy* in 1868 to 1869 and as a book in 1870. Further in a little book of criticisms *A Million Grievances* Goncharóv threw an altogether new light on Griboëdov's *Mishaps of Wit*, and indicated several features in the character of Chatski unnoticed by previous critics.

His other great novel *The Precipice* is also powerful

and less cruel study of Russian landowners before the emancipation of the serfs (1863): and Goncharóv must be ranked among the great writers of this period.

IVAN SERGEEVICH TURGÉNEV was born at Oriól on 28th October, 1818. By descent he belongs to an ancient noble family. His home education was conducted by various tutors, not one of whom was a Russian. It was a serf of his mother's who first acquainted the author with Russian books and poetry, an ardent reader and devotee of Kheráskov: it was he who brought to the notice of his young master the *Rossiad* which was one of the first Russian books Turgénev read. In 1834 he entered the University of Moscow, but 1835 went to that of Petersburg where after qualifying in the faculty of philosophy, he proceeded abroad to finish his education. He died in 1883 at Paris. His body was transported to Petersburg and buried in the Volkov monastery.

The literary works of Turgénev, even before he had completed his course, were printed through P. I. Pletnev, professor of Russian literature. The *Memoirs of a Huntsman* and some short stories and tales which appeared between 1844 and 1850, created a great name for the author. The best books of Turgénev are *Rudin, The Nest of Nobility, Fathers and Sons* (1855 to 1862). The characters of the dreamer Rudin, of Liza and Elena with their masterly portrayal and artistic reproduction, raised Turgénev to a height amongst Russian writers as yet unattained.

Turgénev's characters, Karataev, Radilov, Chertopkhanov and Nedopiuskin are endowed with force they cannot put into action. These features come best to the forefront in *The Hamlet of Shchigrov District.* Hamlet is an educated man, who has spent three years abroad, has read Hegel, knows Goethe by heart, but is devoured with reveries. His cowardliness proceeds, not from poverty, not from low rank, but from his self-conceit. A brilliant education abroad has profited him nought, because it is inapplicable to Russian life, which he knew nothing of and could not easily learn. His confidence in his own

perfection has been shaken by failure, his contempt of the mob, and the gibes of a captain of police finally convinced him that he was futile and superfluous. The analogy with Hamlet is intended to be ironical. In the story *Quietude*, the two prominent characters are Astakhov and Verétiev. The former is miserly, cold and calculating; the latter possesses effervescent force, a fiery temperament, unmistakeable talents and lofty ambitions, but all of these qualities thrust themselves to the surface and are wasted on trivialities for lack of strength of feeling and practicality, and it all ends in philosophizing, a sense of grievance at the absence of outlets from his position and the longing for forgetfulness in which to drown repining.

Verétiev is reminiscent of Pechorin, but Turgénev's hero has less activity and more Russian characteristics.

The *Memoirs of a Hunter* and the stories *The Inn* and *Mumu*, depict the habits of the peasantry and the squirearchy. Turgénev's great talent rescued him from the perils of sentimentalism and bucolicism, and all the characters created by the author arouse a deep feeling of sympathy in the reader.

Rudin, permeated with ambitions of progress at every step, preaches the power of love, the higher calling of man, the conditions favourable to the attainment of prosperity: but at this point he stops dead, for lack of energy and strength to step forward to the combat for his ideas or to support himself in the struggle in some other way. The character of Lavretski (in *The Nest of Noblemen*) is not so full of tragic irony as that of Rudin. The drama of the situation of the Lavretski consists not in conflict with his own feebleness, but in the collision with conceptions and customs to overcome which would really baffle the most energetic and daring of men.

The idea of the famous novel *Fathers and Sons*, is the analysis of nihilism, the subject of which has become all precedent life and institutions, and established principles.

Bazarov, the hero of this novel, in his quarrel with the representatives of the dying generation, tries to prove that there exist no principles, that feelings are a process of

psychology without any ideal content: that only natural science, in application to the business of life medicine, deserves study and no others. Bazarov talks a great deal of work for communal, personal and objects, and considers luxury to be almost a vice. The object of the novel is to prove that the nihilists in denying everything, fly in the face of Nature.

ALEXANDER NIKOLÁEVICH OSTRÓVSKI, (1823-1886), the son of a hereditary noble, was born at (Moscow in 1823. He received no education at home, and his first training was at the first gymnasium of Moscow, which in those good old days could not furnish him with very much knowledge, all the more as Ostróvski, like so many gifted Russians, was not distinguished particularly by assiduity. He passed his examinations at the gymnasium successfully and then proceeded to the University, which he left in his third term in 1843, in consequence of some unpleasant incidents: afterwards he entered the public service as a Collegiate registrar in the commercial court of Moscow.

Ostróvski's first literary work was *Scenes and Manners outside Moscow* and *Sketches outside Moscow*, published in contemporary papers in 1847. His first and best comedy, *Accounts Between Friends are easily Settled*, appeared under the impression of his service in the Commercial Court. The valuable part of this comedy consists in that the author for the first time succeeded in lifting the veil, which up to then had concealed from general knowledge the special habits, so singular as, and so profoundly hidden from any observer of the merchants, a class widely spread in Russian society and of great importance. The attempt to introduce on to the stage this fresh class of society and to present it in the fullness of its moral deformity was exceedingly bold, was an innovation so unheard of in Russian literature, that many of the characters introduced by Ostróvski seemed to be exaggerations of the author's own invention, impossible and non-existent. The end of this comedy, in which the wily son-in-law Podkhaliuzin, enriched through the engineering of his father-in-law Bolshóv, very

quietly puts it into the debtor's prison and then turns to the public, inviting them to visit his little shop, and assures them that not even a child would be cheated in the matter of an onion—this final phrase, which is so truly characteristic and intimately connected with the whole plot, seemed to many so extraordinary, that Ostróvski was obliged subsequently to alter the ending and add a scene in which the virtuous officer of police appears very inappositely, and will not accept Podkhaliuzin's "gratitude," and the wicked son-in-law has to undergo the same punishment as his wicked father-in-law.

From 1852 to 1859, Ostróvski wrote several long comedies —*Poverty is not a Crime, Mind your own Business, The Poor Bride, Life is not all Beer and Skittles, How to Feather One's Nest, The Unwilling Scapegoat, The Foundling*, and *The Storm*. In this series of pictures he paints a gloomy picture of family life and social conditions in the ranks of the merchant-class, as yet unenlivened by rays of culture.

Sloth, apathy, in which whole generations grow up, grow old and stagnate heedless of the advancing movements of the times are well depicted by the author. According to Dobroliubov (1836-1861), Ostróvski can pierce into the depths of a man's soul, distinguish what is nature from all the external abnormalities: and therefore the pressure from without, the weight of circumstance that crushes men are all felt in his productions very much more forcibly than in many stories, which may be shocking in their content, but from their externality, and official tone, completely shut out the inner aspects of man."

Ostróvski was most successful in depicting the wilful fool, and the honour of creating this type in Russian literature belongs to him.

Dobroliúbov devoted an entire series of articles entitled *The Kingdom of Darkness* to the criticism and interpretation of Ostróvski's comedies.

CHAPTER XIX.

GRIGORÓVICH AND OTHER NOVELISTS.

Of the novels of DMITRI VASILIEVICH GRIGÓROVICH (born 1822), the following should be noticed: (1) *The Ploughman.* This is notable as revealing the attitude of the author, his sincere love of the people, of agricultural life in which alone the peasant can conserve fine qualities inherited from his ancestors: whereas industrial life and factories to the author's mind corrupt the manners of the simple people.

(2) *The Village,* which describes the obverse side of the medal, the bad peasant and wastrel who causes the kindly folk suffering. Here he portrays the prototypes in his sketches of the master, the merchant and the manufacturing vagabond.

(3) *The Four Seasons.* This contains many pictures of nature, and scenes of peasant life with its hardships and penury.

(4) *The Passer-by.* A picture of the village at Christmas.

(5) The story of *Anton the Unfortunate,* has brought Grigórovich great fame: the success is comparable to Mrs. Beecher-Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin.* The hero of the story, a harried, depressed peasant is in a desperate situation, oppressed by serfdom, which takes the principal place in the story.

(6) The *Smedovski Valley,* one of the best books, rich in artistic pictures and brimming with dramatic features.

(7) The story *The Fisherman,* first depicts the fishermen's lives and then the manufacturer hands. Glĕb the fisherman is considered the artistic and best of any of Grigórovich:

he combines all the best that the writer could find in the habits of the worker and peasant. The second part was designed to show the dark side of industrial life, which is represented by Zákhar.

(8) *The Emigrants*, a very long novel, abounding in fine pictures of Nature, national types, various adventures and personalities dramatically and faithfully rendered.

Dmitri Vasílievich Grigórovich was educated in a French boarding-school at Moscow, at the age of thirty entered the engineering school, and subsequently the school of art. In 1858 to 1859 he travelled in Western Europe. His literary career began in 1846.

VLADIMIR IVANOVICH DAL (1801 to 1872), was born at Lugansk in the province of Ekaterínoslavl. He served in the navy and also became an army physician, in 1838 was made a correspondent member of the Academy of Science for his work in natural history, and from 1849 devoted himself entirely to literature. He wrote under the pseudonym of the *Lugansk Cossack*. He is considered the best writer on peasant conditions in all parts of Russia.. He was in the fullest sense experienced, and knew where industries were carried on and by whom, the customs, habits, dishonesties and the good aspects. He was also conversant with the popular language and oral literature, and was then able to compile a good anthology and occupy himself with the explanation of the actual language of Great-Russia. In one of his best productions, *Physiological Studies*, Dal appears not merely as an expert, but also as an observant writer and artist. His best stories are *The Concierge*, *The Batman*, *The Porkbutcher*, *The Hucksters*.

ALEXIS FEOFILÁKTOVICH PÍSEMSKI was born 10th March, 1820, and died on 21st January, 1881. He served at Kostromá, Petersburg and Moscow: in his youth was a good actor and ultimately became a mathematical lecturer at the University of Moscow. His literary career began in 1848 with the story *Nina*, which was published in the *National Spectator*. His repute was gained for his truthful pictures of the middle class in

Russia. His first productions date to the beginnings of the fifties, and amongst these there are accounted *The Woodman,* and *The Petersburgher. The Woodman* describes the frauds of a squire's bailiff. The name was given because the bailiff made use of popular superstition to ascribe his secret acts to the Woodman [a form of goblin]. In *The Petersburgher* the characters are well sustained: there are more peasants than in Grigórovich and they resemble peasants, but the author's judgment is weak and the individuals poorly portrayed. The novel *A Thousand Souls* presents a very clear picture canvas of provincial manners. It is the history of Kalinovich, who started as an inspector of the district school and by hook or crook has succeeded in enriching himself and has risen to the rank of a vice governor in the same town: he boldly and frankly persecutes the evil practices of those who hindered his promotion and in the end, is ruined through the intrigues of the provincial authorities.

The best passages of the novel are the peaceful picture of the old-fashioned customs in the capital of the district, the splendid personality of the former overseer of the school, the aged Godniov: the characterization of Liúbov, the hero and of Nastenka is very good: the conflict of the two powerful characters, in which all the sacrifices and petty dissensions and reconciliations of the lovers, fall to the lot of age and go to make up a greater love and self-renunciation, despite the many hardships and inconveniences. There is an interesting picture of the village festival in the hamlet of Prince Iván and of the house of the General's wife. All the exterior is decorous and serious, to cover a reality of loathliness, stinginess and inhumanity. Kalinovich is in his way a 'hero of our time,' representing a man not virtuous, but a contemporary with all the values and demerits.

The *Old Man's Sin* shows how great was Písemski's knowledge of life, and capacity of seizing the typical features and combining them into interesting conclusions. Písemski's productions may be termed revelatory with a tendency to satire. He may be called the first representa-

tive of the natural school and the disciple of Gogol, but lacks the latter's depth and serious humour. The *Carpenter's Union* and the drama *The Bitter Destiny* provide perspicuous pictures of peasant habits. The former contains the portrait of the carpenter Peter, which is sketched very fairly and lit with gleams of powerful authorship, with unmistakeable adherence to reality. The object of the latter drama is to show that a consciousness of honour outraged calls forth from the soul of man all its powers in defence of natural rights, without regard to distinctions of civil life. To carry out his idea the author selected a subject full of dramatic force and touched on all sides of peasant life.

MIKHAIL EVGRAFOVICH SALTYKOV (also known under his pseudonym of SHCHEDRIN) (1826 to 1889) came of an aristocratic family of Tver. His first tutor was a serf, the painter Paul, and in 1844 he attended the Tsarskoselskoie Lycée. His literary career began almost in his schooldays with poetry, which he however soon abandoned. In 1844 he was given a post in the War Office, in 1858 was made Vice-Governor of Riazáń, in 1862 retired and settled in Petersburg to devote himself entirely to literature. He is the first writer whose name is associated with the accusatory literature of Russia. His first productions of weight were *The Provincial Sketches*, and next *Signs of the Time*, and *Provincial Letters*. Shchedrin shows talent not merely in reproductions of decaying forms of life and holding them up to ridicule, but also receptivity of new ideas and demands: he has great, if sometimes coarse humour, and a certain degree of artistic power. The fault that prevents him from ranking with writers of the highest category is the vagueness of his ideals.

NICHOLAS ALEKSEIEVICH NEKRASOV (1821-1875) In 1839 he attended the University of Petersburg, and also collaborated in the *Literary Supplement* to the *Russki Invalid* and wrote vaudevilles. His first poetic essays in the romantic style (1840) were condemned by Bělínski. In

the following years he was employed on various editorial posts at Petersburg. In particular, as the editor of *Sovremennik* (The Contemporary) together with Dobroliúbov and Chernyshevski, he made that journal the organ of the progressists and inserted in it some of the best of his poetry.

Nekrásov's poetry in matter of style is unequalled: he is melodious and poetic, but sometimes prosaic and awkward. But he is the first and best representative of the revelatory lyrical school. His verse shows a wealth of content, a depth of feeling, a sensitiveness to the needs of contemporary life and withal a disregard of form. Nekrásov in nowise, whether in subject or form, belongs to the school of Púshkin, for he is the poet of deprivation, sorrow, humiliation and vice: and his verse is one long protest against the bitterness of reality. The satires *The Poor Girl and the Fashionable Lady, The Weather, At the Portico, The Princess, Masha, The Unfortunates, The Philanthropists, In the Hospital*, are merciless denunciations of life in the capital.

LEO NIKOLAEVICH TOLSTOY. The great Tolstóy was born on 28th August, 1828, and died in 1910. He was educated in his boyhood by a German tutor who subsequently appeared in *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth* as Karl Ivánovich. After attending the University of Moscow he served in the Caucasus: he also served in the Crimean campaign and went through the siege of Sebastopol. On this episode he wrote his *Tales of Sebastopol*. Later he became an intermediary for peace, and also worked at the institution of schools for the peasantry. The greater part of his works are most brilliant artistic value. Even in the first *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth, Tales of War, the Memoirs of a Billiard Marker*, close observation, exact natural descriptions, marked simplicity of style and a delicate psychological analysis of the development of spiritual changes may be noted, however deep down such alteration smight be. *Childhood and Boyhood* may be compared with the *Years of Childhood of the Grandson of Bagrov:* but Tolstóy's narrative has less repetitions, less

monotony and greater depth of psychological analysis.

The *Tales of War*, dealing mainly with the Crimean War, give splendid and impartial pictures of life in the field. In the *Memoirs of a Billiard Marker* the gradual perversion and degradation of the young Prince Nekliudov, who had been a generous and noble youth.

In the famous novel *War and Peace*, the author's convictions are clearly stated. This novel is a variegated and diverse series of pictures, its subject-matter is of striking beauty, but it is so broad and many-sided that it is almost impossible to appreciate at once all its value and a long survey is necessary to grasp the connection between the separate parts. The object of the author is to present the cultivated aristocratic society of Russia at the beginning of the XIX century with the two opposite aspects of its nature at this transitional period: on the one hand the strength in its flower, fortune and the triumph of a young people, and on the other the lack of character, servility, lack of self-respect, and the scandalous moral serfdom. But although the faults of the Russian of this transitional period are brought fully to light, the novel as a genuinely artistic product is penetrated with a kindly sympathy, a live fellowship with the men thus depicted. The author in describing the old-time squires of Russia, has not spared them and has uttered more cruel truths than did many of the professional denouncers of the old-time despots. The plastic and artistic manner of narration prevails over its dramatic and lyric content. The whole of the position is, above all, a picture. The number of brilliant colours used by the author of varied scenes and characteristic figures portrayed by him from their visual and personal aspects, the series of marvellous landscapes and descriptions of scenes of all sorts, to be found in this huge book at every step—it is this feature which makes the pictorial consideration predominate.

In 1850, he published his *Lucerne*, in which he expressed his disenchantment with European culture. His *Three Deaths*. After his marriage in 1862 opens a new period, *The Family Happiness* may be considered weak, but was

followed up with *War and Peace* (1869). *Anna Karenina* (1873 to 1876) which brought him European fame.

In this novel the discontent with the paltriness of life is expressed and the desire to find a meaning for life. Tolstóy sought an answer to the problems which were tormenting him in religion, philosophy and the exact sciences. He tried to make his life ever simpler, ever truer to nature and peasant life. This tendency of thought he expressed in a series of stories of various kinds, such as the *Kreutzer Sonata, The Power of Darkness, The Confession*, etc. In his last great novel *Resurrection*, he reveals himself as the great artist of War and Peace. But he also shows a tendencious side of his character, the results of his thinking. As a moralist he was proscribed by the Holy Synod in 1901.

[*The next chapter, written specially for this book by Mr.* SERGE TOMKEIEFF, *contains a fuller account of* TOLSTOY.]

CHAPTER XX.

RUSSIAN LITERATURE FROM LEO TOLSTÓY TO THE PRESENT DATE.

(WRITTEN BY SERGE TOMKIEFF).

In the second half of the nineteenth century, two giants arise in Russian literature and their fame spread not only in Russia, but all over the world. Leo Tolstóy and Theodor Dostoevski; both different in life, character, psychology, literary style, but at the same time there was something in common, something that is a genuine feature of Russian character as a red thread all through the Russian literature and this is the instinctive desire to seek after a better moral life and to find a right path in accordance with God's laws. Marching to the same goal, but by different roads, they seem to be polar to each other, but the same time, taken as a whole they form a complete expression of Russian character.

These writers' works are so closely bound up with their lives, their writings are in such degree a reflection of their own experiences, that it is almost impossible to understand them, without knowing their biographies.

L. Tolstóy, educated and bred in luxurious surroundings, among the old Russian land nobility, having spent his youth in military adventures, and social frivolity, with plenty of money, happy family life and a comfortable home—yet from his early childhood he raised a tormenting question: "What is life and how is one to live better?" This continual struggle of his conscience against his wealth and position in society as imposed on him, is a dominant

factor in all his life. On the contrary, Dostoevski's life is endless misery and suffering.

Born in poverty, he was poor all his life. He lived among "poor and oppressed" and knew their suffering and needs. He was unjustly arrested and condemned to death, but the sentence was remitted and he was relegated to Siberia, where he spent many years in "The House of the Dead." This arduous life fostered Dostoevski's genius as a writer, a deep psychologist of human nature and suffering. Tolstóy gave alms, Dostoevski received them. Tolstóy wanted to lead a simple life, Dostoevski lived not only a simple, but a hard one. Tolstóy passed along the high road, and Dostoevski was dragged along the low one. But both had the same desire, the same impulse:—to make their lives pure and good, to reach the Kingdom of God in their hearts.

COUNT LEO TOLSTÓY was born in 1828 in his country estate Yásnaya Poliána, near the town of Túla. His mother died soon after his birth, and his father when he was nine years old. L. Tolstóy, together with his brothers and sister, was brought up by a distant relative of the family. Her tenderness and affection to the children, played a very important part in building the character of the future writer. After receiving elementary education at home, Tolstóy went to the University of Kazáń. After spending a few years in irregular studies, he left the University and went to St. Petersburg, where he plunged into the whirlpool of society life. His eldest brother Nicholas, seeing the danger menacing L. Tolstóy, persuaded him to join the army and go to the Caucasus. His departure from St. Petersburg in 1851, marks a new period of life. The wonderful scenery, healthy adventurous life and rustic charm, made a deep and refreshing influence on Tolstóy, and it is there that he began to write. *Childhood*, a partly autobiographical story, was the first that he published. He next published some Caucassian tales, *Boyhood and Youth*.

In 1853, Tolstóy left the Caucasus for Crimea and served in Sebastopol during the siege of 1854. In the masterful

Tales of Sebastopol, he displayed fully his artistic and psychological gift and made himself a name in literature. He then went abroad for a time, where he studied the theory of education. His brother Nicholas died in 1860, and this event made a deep impression on Tolstóy. Returning home he tried to apply educational methods to the peasants' children on his own estate. In 1862 he married and began to manage his estates. He had a large and happy family, and in this period he wrote his best novels: *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina.* Towards the end of the seventies, a crisis passed over Tolstóy's life. He began to be dissatisfied with his life and looked for one simplified and better. Tolstóy-artist changed into Tolstóy-moralist, and Christian ascetic. Having no courage to break his family ties, he lives a secluded life as a peasant and moral teacher, in the midst of the domestic life of his family.

The deeper the political life of Russia was plunged into morass and stagnation, the brighter grew Tolstoy's idealism and faith. Finally he emerged as a founder of a new teaching, placing him among the highest religious thinkers. His ideal was a pure and simple life, guided by the " Sermon of the Mount." He glorified the simple life of a peasant, proclaimed all material culture, the state, the laws, the church, art and literature as sinful and against human nature.

The climax in his religious evolution was reached in 1910, when he left his home for ever and, on his way to the unknown future, died at a lonely railway station. All Russia was deeply affected by his death. A well renowned critic wrote that time: " The whole world was his admirer, but he had few followers, even in his family. He was blessed and loved by everybody, even by people that he denied, and the liberals, and the workmen, and the socialists and the ' intelligencia,' because in him they saw the consciences of the world."

In Tolstóy's early work *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth,* we see the twofold aspect of his nature, the love of animal life and the quest of a higher moral standard. These two antagonistic principles, run parallel all through

his life, often in conflict. In the first literary period, the psychology of animal, instinctive life, predominate.

Besides some short stories like *The Two Hussars, Three Deaths, The Morning of a Landed Proprietor,* Tolstóy wrote an admirable sketch of life in Sebastopol during the war. The individual psychology of a soldier interested Tolstóy more than the general issue of this heroic deed. For him the war was not a glorious episode, but a place of suffering and death. The same idea passed into *War and Peace.*

The Cossacks is the brightest story of his early period. It depicts a young man, tired of urban life, who went with the army to the Caucasus. The descriptions of the wild primitive nature are wonderfully fresh and realistic. Olénin, the hero of the story, is quite changed morally and physically, but his attempt to enter into the life of the Cossacks, became a failure and he is rejected by the girl he loves.

War and Peace is the greatest masterpiece of Tolstóy. It is more than a novel—it is an epic, full of vivid colour, an almost Hellenic joy of life, a fine individualization in the midst of great crowds set in motion. The great epoch of Napoleon's wars of 1805-1812 as seen through the eyes of different people, together with the history of several families living during this period, form the subject of *War and Peace.* Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* may be taken as an example of this kind of novel, but except for the general character, *War and Peace* has nothing in common with it, being quite different in psychology and idea. A whole gallery of types passes before the reader. Andréy Volkónski, Nicholas Rostóv, Pierre Bezúkhov, remind us of the many-sided nature of Tolstóy. The types of women, like Natásha Maria, are very realistic and full of charm, although Tolstóy never attained the high mark of Turgénev's feminine characters. The real hero of *War and Peace* is not a great man, like Napoleon, or Kutúzov, but a simple, illiterate peasant—Platón Karatáev, whom Pierre Bezukhov met in captivity with the French army. In Platón, Tolstóy put all his ideals of a truly Christian man, with a boundless love for all the world, absolute altruism and the

doctrine of non-resistence to all evil. Pierre was deeply impressed by his lofty soul, and for all his life since then was guided by these Christian principles. The evolution of Pierre's life, reminds us of that of Tolstóy himself.

The treatment of history is peculiar. Tolstóy pays no attention whatever to the so-called great men in history like Napoleon or Alexander the First, and thinks that all historical process is due to the unconscious mass-movement, in which every one has his share, but at the same time, everyone is dragged along by the irresistible current.

But above all, above Napoleon, war and politics, we see the uprising figure of victorious life, and it is a hymn to the family and the mother that Tolstóy ends his book with.

The moral idea of *War and Peace* is still more developed in Tolstóy's next novel *Anna Karénina*. Here Tolstóy depicts the life of two families of the higher society of St. Petersburg. Anna, while a young girl, marries Karénin, an old bureaucrat. It is a *mariage de convenance* and Anna secures a good position in society and plenty of money, but after a few years feels that her life is intolerable and tries to get out of it by loving a young but quite mediocre officer, Vronski. She has not courage enough to break with his family; and after passing through terrible sufferings, she throws herself under a passing train. Parallel to the history of Anna, Tolstóy gives a picture of happiness in another family: Levin, like Pierre Bezukhov passed through a moral evolution and finally came to the conclusion that life for one's own family, constant work, healthy natural surroundings, is all that a man should desire. The motto of this novel is taken from the Bible: "Vengeance is mine, I will repay." God is the law of nature and who goes against nature is punished. This was the case with Anna.

After Tolstóy's religious crisis of 1879, we observe a decided change in his works. Pessimism begins to predominate. The former joy of life is vanished altogether. Life has no meaning, culture is a corruption of human nature, and only by self sacrifice and love, can we accom-

plish our aim in life. Tolstóy the preacher takes the place of Tolstóy the artist.

The story *The Death of Iván Ilyích* is a tragedy of an average man who knows that he is to die. He is alone in the whole world, has no sympathy from anyone and understands the insignificance of his life. Just before his death, a ray of hope pierces the dark clouds, and he dies as a happy man believing in future life.

The Power of Darkness is a terrible drama of peasant life. The next play: *The Fruits of Civilization* is rather a satire on the educated upper classes.

In the story *Kreutzer Sonata*, Tolstóy appears to impugn his former idea of love and family. With the fierce fanaticism of a puritan he attacks and denounces not only family and love, but woman herself, and proclaims the ideal of absolute chastity as a remedy against all the calamities associated with the sexual life.

Father Sergius has a similar idea to the *Kreutzer Sonata*.

Resurrection is the last of Tolstóy's novels. Here he is on his highest level as a preacher, but his old artistic temperament is still great. The state, laws, church, conventional morals, are severely attacked. Nekhlyúdov, a rich nobleman, while a juror for a trial of a case of crime, recognises in the accused, a girl he had seduced in his early youth. Overcome with remorse, he leaves everything and follows her in her exile in Siberia. She refuses his offer of marriage and after the expiration of her sentence marries another man. But meanwhile, Nekhlyúdov is converted to a new life, and through love, mercy and self abdication, goes to his salvation.

Tolstóy wrote quite a number of articles on education, morals, religion, art, etc. From a religious point of view, he may be called a pure Christian, repudiating Church and all dogmas. His political outlook is anarchistic. State, law, and all values of material progress are denied by Tolstóy.

THEODOR DOSTOEVSKI was born in Moscow in 1821. His family was very poor and from his early youth till his death he had a terrible struggle for

existence, often living on the margin of starvation. He began to write, while a cadet in the School of Engineering. After resigning his commission, he devoted himself to literature. His first novel *Poor Folk* written in 1845, produced a big success in the literary world. *White Nights, Netochka Nesvanova* and a few other stories followed shortly. In 1848, after the Revolutionary movement in Europe, a kind of radical-socialistic society was formed in St. Petersburg. Dostoevski took part in it, but in 1849 he was arrested, together with the other members. They were condemned to death. "Being the third in the row," writes Dostoevski, "I concluded I had only a few minutes to live before me." But just before the execution they were reprieved and sent to Siberia. He spent four years in the terrible condition of a convict prison, which he described in his book *The House of the Dead.* He returned to St. Petersburg in 1859. His career as an editor of a newspaper was a series of failures, and he had to escape abroad, where he lived in misery until 1871. His last years of Petersburg life were happier. He died in 1881.

Struggling in the grip of poverty and bad health, Dostoevski had never enough time to bring his style to perfection. His language is hasty, neglected; the whole of his words are shapeless, fantastic, personages are moving in a spaceless and timeless void.

The critics called him "a cruel genius." "I depict all the soul's depths" he once wrote. Like E. Poe, he went into the deepest region of human psychology when the human soul is on the margin of normal consciousness.

In his first novel *Poor Folk,* Dostoevski put down the main idea of his future writings. The plot there is quite simple. A humble and poor minor clerk, gave all his heart and soul to a girl poor as himself. She is for him a light in the darkness. His love is so great, that, when the girl marries another rich man, he accepts this fact with a perfect self-sacrifice and kindness. In this novel Dostoevski depicts his own ideal of a healer and comforter of all downtrodden and oppressed. He proves

himself a perfect altruist, raising hope and preaching forbearance and resignation. This ideal runs through all the writings of Dostoesvki.

The *White Nights* is melancholy, but full of charm, a study of love in "the most fantastic of all cities," grey and gloomy St. Petersburg.

The House of the Dead, relating to the terrible experiences that Dostoevski had in the convict prison, is the most human book ever written in Russia. He penetrates the depths of the human soul, and found God's image in the worst of the criminals. The whole impression of this book, in spite of the dark images of prisoners' lives, is highly optimistic.

The *Insulted and Injured* is the same story of poor humble folk, struggling in the gloom of a big town. They are described with limitless sympathy and tenderness.

In *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevski raises deeper moral questions. A poor student Rasholnikov, for his mother's and sister's sake, decide to kill an old pawnbroker woman. If a man like Napoleon, thinks Rasholinikov, could kill thousands of people for the sake of his idea, why he, Raskolnikov, could not kill one useless moneylender, for the sake of his family. "Well, I ceased reflecting, and killed her, following the example of my authority." Raskolnikov, passing on "the other side of good and evil" trampled the human conventions and made his own moral code. But the real crisis came after he committed the crime. He understood, that instead of killing "a principle" he merely killed an "old woman," and had not "gone beyond" because his conscience revolted against it as he was not a superman but an ordinary weak man. A superman "succeeds in taking further steps, and therefore they are justified: I did not succeed and therefore perhaps I had no right to take the first step." In this conflict between his new reasoning moral and his human conscience, the latter won and he gave himself up into the the hands of justice. The sufferings in the prison he accepted as the price of redemption.

The Idiot, besides being a picture of insanity, or what

people call mental insanity (but really may be a higher state of brain activity), depicts a type of a wonderful man.

Prince Myshkin (the idiot) is a simple, naive, tender-hearted man with a compassion and love of everybody. He would love a spirit among the grotesque material world and influence everybody with whom he came in contact.

The Possessed or *Devils*, is a novel with a very entangled plot, trying to represent the revolutionary circles. Dostoevski was a Slavophil, i.e., he believed in the sacred mission of Russia in the world, religion and politics. He disliked socialism in which he saw an absence of religious principle and a moral materialism.

Kirillov is the leader of the revolutionary party. He has a strong will and powerful personality. He dreams of a radical revolution when "there will be a new life, a new man; everything will be new . . . then they will divide history into two parts: from the gorilla to the annihilation of God and from the annihilation of God to . . ." "The Gorilla?" "To the transformation of the earth and man physically. Man will be God . . . "

But the revolutionists are defeated morally and physically.

The last masterpiece *The Brothers Karamazov* was never finished, but in the first completed part, Dostoevsky gave a fine analysis of Russian life and character. The plot is rather simple, but the whole is extremely complicated. The old Karamazov, a wretched sensualist, has three sons: Dmitri, Ivan, and Alyosha. The first two have inherited their father's passion, Alyosha is meek and kind. The quarrel between the father and his son about a girl that both want to possess form the narrative. The old Karamazov is killed. A trial ensues. And from all this dirt, troubled spirit and reign of flesh, emerges the pure soul of Alyosha, who follows his teacher's, the monk Zosima's advice: "Love all God's creation,—every grain of sand."

The great period of reform, which followed on the

Crimean war, so called "the political spring-time of Russia," brought about a refreshing influence on social life and literature, but was short-lived. Most of the political betterment was superficial, and the bureaucratic autocracy regained power after the death of Alexander II in 1881. The best aspirations of the Liberals were shattered and deep depression and disillusion penetrated all classes of society. The "people's party" (*Narodovtsy*), so full of activity and hope, after the liberation of the serfs, declined rapidly, and under the unfavourable external pressure, were losing faith in the peasant and in their own principles. The beautiful dream of a land communism and of an ideal structure of future society, passed away like a castle in the air, and the Russian "intelligencia" awoke with a broken heart, a paralysed will, inactive, deeply pessimistic and with a fatalistic indifference to the rising tide of reaction.

It seemed that the bright torch of liberalism, lighted by the best Russian minds, was extinguished, and the people fumbled helplessly in the dark. We have already noted the striving transition from optimism to pessimism in Tolstóy's psychology, but the best reflection of the life in this period we find in the tales of Garshin, Chekhov and the sad poetry of Nadson.

VSEVOLOD GARSHIN (1855-1888) was born in the south of Russia. He was educated at the University of Petersburg, where he wrote his first tales. In 1877, whilst still a student, he joined the army as a private, moved by the patriotic desire to fight for the liberation of Bulgaria. Passing all through the Russo-Turkish war, he keenly observed the psychology of the soldier; and his tales, describing the war, can be compared only with those of Tolstóy. He was wounded, and was invalided home to St. Petersburg, where he started his literary works. His death was partly due to a mental disease.

His early tale *Four Days*, the diary of a young man, volunteer in the Army, wounded in battle and left helpless in the sun-scorched field, alongside a dead corpse of his enemy—a Turk. The agony of the wounded man, nearly

dead of thirst, and hunger, his thoughts about the horrors of the war and his deep humanitarian feelings, are described by Garshin with great skill and profound understanding of human nature.

Garshin lived at a time when the two Russian schools of thought, one realistic or positivistic and the other—idealistic, were giving way to a new individualism. He still was true to the old moral ideals, but in his writing we observe a strange dualism between rationalism and idealism. His heroes listen to the voices of their reason and their heart, but their tragedy consist in the inability to find the right way of action.

The Coward is one of such tales, where the man's heart protests against the war, but the same time his reason tries to justify it. The same idea pervades through the *Diary of Private Ivanov.*

Nadezhda Nikolaevna, a girl, the heroine of a story of this name, is again a victim of a similar tragedy. Love rational, and love emotional, are brought into a sharp conflict, the result of which is the death of the girl and her lover.

In *The Night,* a man overwhelmed by his introspectiveness, ends his life by suicide.

The impossibility of an individual raising himself above the mean life, to reach a higher moral value, is depicted in the allegorical story *Attalea Princeps.* A palm-tree, growing in a conservatory, trying to reach the sunshine and open air, breaks the glass roof of its prison. This heroic attempt is its death.

His last story *The Red Flower,* is an exasperated protest against the world-wide indifference and coldness. A man goes insane, having no more power to endure the human suffering of his fellow creatures without being able to help them. In the asylum, he builds in his insane brain a new theory of good and evil. According to this theory good and freedom always subsisted throughout the ages, but now the world was overshadowed by the evil. In a red poppy, growing in the garden of the asylum, he sees the incarnation of the world's evil. The rapidly

growing desire to exterminate this evil, as well as his pathological psychology is masterly. Gathering all this moral strength, the patient roots out the terrible red flower and then dies, clasping the flower in his hand, with the face of a martyr and hero.

In another story, Garshin discusses the value of art, and finally came to the conclusion that true art must arouse feelings in mankind not only of beauty, but those of good and truth. In spite of his pessimistic style, he deeply believed in humanity and in future progress, " The Knight of a noble conscience " was a name given to him by the critics.

ANTÓN CHÉKHOV is the most conspicuous writer of the period. He was born at Taganróg in 1860. His father came from a family of liberated serfs. After receiving a degree of a Doctor of Medicine at the University of Moscow, he started his literary career by sending short humorous sketches in a newspaper. Gradually he started writing longer stories ; but his sense of humour altogether disappeared. His life was very quiet and uneventful. In 1890 he visited the convict prisons on the Island of Sakhalin. In a later period he wrote a number of theatrical plays. He died of consumption in 1904.

" Sad and melancholic as the silent Russian landscape, grey as the Russian autumn sky, tremulous and tender as the northern sunset, deep and mysterious as the quiet summer night, a song of a grey sky and an open land, of a miserable life and unknown happiness," such is Chékhov's art in the opinion of a Russian critic. Chékhov, with his true artistic character, with his keen observation and boundless human sympathy, living in a time of moral depression and political stagnation, could not write anything else, but a grey song of sorrow. He is often compared to G. de Maupassant, by being like the latter, a masterful writer of short stories, deep penetration into the human nature and profound pessimism, but studying both authors closely, we can find a great difference in their psychology. Maupassant saw in a man only an

animal and cynically laughed at every act of hypocrisy; Chékhov in the deepest pitfalls of humanity sought a presence of love and hope. He sometimes laughed; but he never was a bitter satirist.

In his short stories, Chékhov presents us the whole Russian life in its manifold manifestations. He takes his types straight from life, and they are always ordinary people, saying commonplace things, living commonplace lives. No exaggeration, no bright colours. They are snapshots from life. But at the same time all these little fragments as a whole, give us an undivided artistic value of a mosaic with one idea running all through.

The Russian character, welded between the two millstones of Western and Eastern civilization, shows a great intricacy, but the predominant feature is the persistence of a religious sentiment, an intuitive faith in something that will guide home. In the '60's men believed in Darwin, Herbert Spencer, physiology and chemistry, in the '70's in the people, village communism, the mission of Slavonic races, etc.: later on, Marx became a gospel for the Russian intellectuals, and all this was taken with the same enthusiasm, the same blind faith, the same ignoring of reality.

The Russian literature is *par excellence* philosophical, and every reader expects to find in it a clue to the right path in life.

What answer does Chékhov give on the "cursed" questions of mankind? Is he an ardent teacher of morals, does he preach some new faith, does he accuse somebody? No, he was never a preacher, he was only an artist. He gave us life as he saw it and always tried to find a living flame deeply buried somewhere in the human heart. He wanted just to show that the misery of life is something transitional, that life is worth living, if not for our own sakes, then for the sake of future generations, because he believed that in a few hundred years time, life will be full of joy and happiness.

The moral evolution of Chékhov, from a deep pessimist, after observing life as it is, to an optimistic faith in progress, can be clearly traced all through his works.

It would take a long time to describe Chékhov's tales, but from a few examples the main idea may be followed. Life seems to be a terrible muddle; people no longer understand each other: aimless and blind they continue to drudge in the dark land of sorrow. The hero of a little story, *The Kiss*, Ryabovich, sees in life only a series of accidents without any connection and idea. "And the whole world, the whole of life, seemed to Ryabovich an unintelligible, aimless jest . . ." Some people, like a teacher in *The Man in a Case* tried to escape from it by living an isolated, internal life, and shutting himself from the rest of the world in an inpenetrable shell. "Reality irritated and frightened him."

Everybody is perplexed by the mystery of life and his helplessness. A sybaritic bureaucrat (*An Anonymous Story*) believing in nothing, having no aim, no desires, assumes an ironical attitude of life which serves him as an armour, and he fills up his time reading novels, playing cards and in adventurous love. A revolutionist, who from a political reason, was engaged as butler to this gentleman, before leaving his house writes him: "Why I am prematurely weak and fallen is not hard to explain, Like the biblical strong man, I lifted the Gates of Gaza to carry them on the top of the mountain . . . but why have you fallen? . . . why you, before even starting your life, have cast away God's image and transformed yourself into a cowardly brute?" "Why we, so passionate and strong at first, so noble and full of faith, are at thirty or thirty-five complete bankrupts?" But at the same time he confesses a passionate desire to live, to make his whole life holy, high and solemn like the blue vault of heaven.

Another man, an old distinguished professor with world fame (*The Dreary Story*), devoted to sciences, when he reaches his old age feels a terrible emptiness of soul. Everything seems to him disgusting, he is lonely and not understood even in his own family. His science, his life's work, seem to him meaningless and isolated from life, because he cannot find in all this what is called — a general idea, or the God of a living man.

*Ward N.*6 is the same story about dull, weak people suffering in the midst of a tangled and introspective complicated life.

Everywhere Chékhov sees this misery and desolation. In the numerous tales of peasant's life we see a dark picture of poverty-stricken, dull, uneducated people. "The life of our common people, workmen and peasants is a black night, built up of ignorance, pauperism and all kinds of prejudices." The rising and growing capitalism in Russia, appeared to Chekhov as a monster with crimson eyes, the devil himself," who was controlling and deceiving both the owners and the workmen." The provincial life of little officials, doctors, clergy, merchants is depicted with the same dark colours.

Happiness seems only a day-dream and exists only in imagination. In a beautiful story *The Black Monk*, we see a young man, a Doctor of Philosophy, a dreamer, who hates the ordinary life of the human herd and believes that he is a genius. A vision of a black monk follows him everywhere, and his genius seems to be allied to madness. He despises healthy and normal people, and isolates himself from common life, breaking his wife's heart. But dying "he called Tanya, called to the great garden with the beautiful flowers, sprinkled with dew, . . . called to his wonderful learning, his youth, courage, joy,—called to life, which has been lovely" and " . . . an unspeakable infinite happiness filled his whole being."

In the last story we see a turning point in Chékhov's thought. What he seeks for is faith. Faith in good, faith in life and progress. "If a Russian do not believe in God, it means that he believes in something else" (*On the Way*). "It seems to me, that the man must believe, or must seek a faith, otherwise his life is dull, empty . . ."(*Three Sisters*). "The calling of all mankind is in a spiritual activity, in a constant search for truth and meaning of life . . . his satisfaction may be only religion, science, arts . . . Sciences and arts, when they are real, tend not to transitional, not to private aims, but to the

eternal, general,—they seek after the truth, after the meaning of life, seek God, soul."

The absurdity and misery of life form the background of his every story. As a real artist, he gave a true picture of life in all its manifestations. All forms of social evil, family life, dreary village life, found a reflection in his works. All Chekhov's personages are suffering from a paralysis of will, from a tender nature, from a lack of self-control, they are ready to commit suicide or find consolation in wine every time that life exacts from them something definite or energetic. They have no practical ideals and cannot work. What they can do is only to spin a fragile fabric of dreams. Their life is full of illusions, which breaks down sooner or later, leaving the dreamer or maker of them helpless in the midst of the real life. The hero of the play *Uncle Vania*, is a type of such kind of idealists. His eyes open to face the bare reality too late, and when his ideals are shattered, he feels himself too old and too helpless to start life anew.

In another play *The Seagull* we see people who desire more than they can possibly get and succeed in nothing. "We sink in the morass of life" is their explanation. But in most cases such a philosophy of fatalism is a mere excuse for idleness. Coming to the conclusion that in life "nothing is nothing no more" they tried to escape from it by imagining life "not as it actually is, and not as it ought to be, but as we could imagine it in our fancy."

In his last play *The Cherry Orchard*, Chékhov foresees the approaching storm which will destroy all this decaying, useless society, unless men will realise that "to live in the present, they have to redeem their past," and to start a new life, full of incessant work.

"The time is now at hand, something great is moving in us all, a violent storm is approaching, which is already coming, is very near and soon will blow down from our society, the laziness, the indifference, prejudice to the work and the rotten tedium." (*Three Sisters*).

Chekhov, as we stated before, was more of a realistic painter, and his aim was to show life as it is, than to preach

a new salvation. But still all through his work we can trace his moral ideal, which is so near to the foundation stone of true Christianity, and at the same time is at the base of every democracy. As in N. Gogol, deep sorrow about the destiny of man, lofty aspirations to the ideal of good, are the main idea of Chekhov's writings. For him, every human being is something of a great value, and cannot and ought not to be considered merely as a means.

The notion of all persistent moral ideals guiding human life is very well expressed in the story *The Student*, "The past," he thought, "is linked up with the present by a continuous chain of events, flowing one out of another . . . that truth and beauty, which have guided the human life in the garden and the yard of the high-priest, has continued, uninterruptedly to this day, and evidently, had always been the main thing in human life and in all the world; and the feeling of youth, health, strength—he was only twenty-two years old, and the inexpressible sweet expectation of happiness, the unknown, mysterious happiness, filled him little by little and life seemed to him enchanting, marvellous and full of lofty meaning."

The same melancholic note and vague expectation of a better future may be observed in the many novelists and poets of this period of reaction. Some of them were banished or deported, the others were left paralysed by the political regime and the consequent deep depression of society. Having lost all hope in finding their way in the dense mass of life, they turned their attention to the problem of the individual inner side of man. Few of them carried the flame of the old idealism or had courage to be active fighters, but one of such idealists was V. Korolenko.

VLADIMIR KOROLENKO was born (in 1853) in South Western Russia. His childhood passed in a little provincial town on the Russian-Polish border. Like many of the Russian writers, he could not obtain any higher education on account of the political situation, and the movements in which the students took part. First he

was expelled from the Moscow Agricultural School and was afterwards arrested and sent into exile. He spent more than six years in a far-away corner of Siberia, suffering greatly from loneliness and privation. When allowed to return to Russia he settled down at Nizhni-Novgorod, where he edited a review, the popularity of which has subsisted to the present time in Russia.

The deep humanitarian idealism, which fill all the stories of Korolenko, did not prevent him from remaining a true artist of realism, and carrying on the traditions of the old realistic school. His stories *In Bad Society* and *The Blind Musician* derived from his impressions of childhood, transport us into the life of the Polish border, dirty little towns, miserable people; but at the same time the stories are full of bright colours and an irresistible charm and beauty. The stories taken from Siberian life, *The Dream of Makar* are more gloomy, but the deep sympathy of the author with every person he describes, the bright light of hope which he carries all through the dark forest of life, make us feel in Korolenko a warm and tender heart and an irresistible impulse towards the higher ideal of love and mercy.

Korolénko stands alone in the level plain of literature of the eighties and the nineties. The old representatives of the land nobility were non-existent, except OERTEL (1855-1908) who wrote about the ancient but decaying glory of the country squires (*The Gardenins*), the triumphant march of the new growing middle class (*Changing Guards*), and peasantry. His vivid sketches give us a complete picture of the life in the agricultural line of the southern provinces, depicted before by the slightly romantic pen of DANÍLEVSKY (1829-1890).

N. LIESKOV (1831-1895) who started his literary career during the period of reforms, by criticizing the Liberals (*Nowhere*), afterwards turned his attention on simple stories of clerical life and religious moral problems. His style was very original, and in his stories we can see a strange mixture of a true narrative with a fiercely imaginative faculty.

P. BOBORYKIN (born 1836) was not a deep writer and did not try to solve moral and political questions With a photographic accuracy and profound gift of observation, he depicted the different stages of evolution of Russian life. His style of writing was journalistic, but nevertheless he gave a vivid image of the turbulent life of Russian society. The rise of the capitalistic class, its corrupted psychology and greed for money, the gradual merging of the "intelligentcia" into the ranks of the bourgeoisie, were described by Boborykin in his many novels (*Evening Sacrifice, Business Men, China-town.*)

AVSEENKO, POTAPENKO, SHELLER-MICHAILOV, STANYUKOVICH described the life of the middle classes, idealising a new type of a practical man, of average ideas and ambition. The later writer, Stanyukovich made his name in literature by writing stories depicting the life of sailors of the Navy (where he himself served as an officer).

V. SMIDOVICH, who wrote under the name of VERESAEV, stands quite apart from the rest of his contemporaries. Born in 1867, he received his medical education in two universities, and all through his life never ceased to be a practical physician in addition to his literary occupation. He took part in fighting the cholera epidemic and went with the Army during the Russo-Japanese War. *The Diary of a Doctor*, written under the impressions of his medical practice, raised a storm of indignation in medical circles. Veresaev shared the psychology of Chekhov, saw people with "no road," "no banner" and did not believe in the ideals of the "people's party." In his novels *On the Turn of the Trail* and *Those who Grew Cold*, he provides a series of types, who were left on the road of life, with no light in front but still clinging to the old idealism. But Veresaev went further than Chekhov. Like Gorki, he saw new men arising from among the ruins of the old. These fresh men, full of energy and ideals were the Marxian Socialists. As a pure Marxian himself he did not believe in free individual will, but thought that all mankind is drawn along by a terrific,

unknown, cosmeric flow which we may call " the economical forces."

In the novel *The Tide*, he expounds Marx's theory and its practical applications and predicts the success of this mass-movement in Russia.

In the story *In the War*, written under the impress of the unfortunate Manchurian campaign of 1905, Veresaev exposed the frightful conditions under which the Russian armies had to fight, and relates his own experiences.

The poetical literature also left the old tradition. Nekrasov, the poet of vengeance and grief, was the last to sing of the life of the people and to call to political activity. Alexis Tolstóy (1817-75) has opened a new epoch in poetry. Art for art's sake was the motto of this school. The ordinary life seemed too ugly, too commonplace and dull to be sung. MAIKOV (1821-1897), POLONSKI (1820-1898), FET (1820-1892) and APUKHTIN (1841-1893) revealed anew the beauty of Russian verse, introduced new poetical images and originality. They were lyrical poets par excellence.

A little apart from this group stands the poet NADSON (1862-1887). He died very young of consumption. Belonging also to the school of " pure art poetry," he nevertheless could not enjoy it fully facing the dreary reality of life. In his verses we see a Chekhov's grey melancholy and despair, it was a song of a dying warrior, a song of sorrow and disappointment. He was very popular and widely read by the young generation of his time, which saw in him an expression of their own feelings and broken aspirations.

Like a refreshing storm after a close, suffocating day, or a door opened in a prison, out of which pale prisoners escape into the fresh air, M. Gorki's writings came on Russian society. Neither Chekhov nor other writers could find any ideal of a strong personality and a new way of life. All of their books pleaded guilty to weakness and the futility of rising above the morass of life.

Every class on whom the aspirations might be based were one by one disqualified. The golden nugget, to which

Gorki may be compared was found in the lowest strata of human society.

The second half of the XIXth century was a period of rapid industrial and capitalistic progress. The primitive village commune, which had been the hope of the Russian intellectuals before and after the liberation of the serfs, was falling to pieces; a new class of people—artisans, workers, town proletariate, came into play. The ideas of Karl Marx gradually replaced the old Russian communal Socialism. Gorki was a child of his age. He was a self-made man and in his works we do not find any learned didacticism. Young, simple, bracing like the fresh wind of the steppes, full of joy, resolution and anger, full of bright colours and new ideas, the stories of Gorki opened up a new and wonderful world.

ALEXIS PESHKOV (GORKI is the pseudonym) was born in 1868 in Nizhni-Novgorod on the River Volga. His father, a poor upholsterer died soon after his birth, and his mother went to live with her parents. Peshkóv's stern grandfather, gave him his first education, which consisted of reading Psalms enforced with blows. While a young boy he was sent in a cobbler's shop and soon ran away, and entered into service on a river steamer. His master, the cook, encouraged his reading, on which the boy was very keen. Later on he became a baker, street porter, hawker, and at last found a refuge as a lawyer's clerk. But the spirit of unrest overtook him again and he joined the homeless tramps to wander all over Russia. He passed along the shore of the Black Sea right down to the Caucasus and it was there that he published his first sketch of tramp life in 1892. His reputation as a writer grew rapidly and soon after some more publications, he became the most popular author in Russia. Korolenko, whom he met on his return to N. Novgorod, deeply influenced him. In 1905 he took part in the revolution and had to flee from Russia. Since then he lived in Italy, where he continued to write. After the Revolution of 1917, Gorki returned to Russia and devoted himself to spreading education among the people.

" I love, my dear friend, this tramp's life. Sometimes I am cold, sometimes hungry—but the freedom is great! Nobody lords it over me. I am my own master." This is what one of Gorki's heroes says. A sedentary life in a town or village cannot satisfy a tramp. An instinctive desire for freedom, contempt for every kind of culture, laws, obligation, communal morality, make Gorki's tramp a kind of Nietzschean superman. In his numerous sketches from life we always see the figure of this independent tramp, slightly idealized and unmistakably a reflection of the writer himself. The spirit of unrest pervades every one of his types. They are cosmic in their impulses, organically blended with the whole universe. From the artificial structure of society they escape into the great kingdom of Nature, where they find a rest and satisfaction. In distinction from Chékhov, Nature predominates in Gorki's words. We feel her presence always, she is one with all human feelings and it is a mystical closeness between man and nature. Gorki has a kind of Hellenic sense of nature, his descriptions are always expressive and personified. " The sea laughed," " The wind caressing the mighty bosom of the ocean," etc.

In *Malva* we see a girl indifferent and even sick of life, who loves nature more than any man that she met. Urban culture seems to a tramp a big dung hill on which the people is suffocating. " The men have built towns, houses, live there in herds, pollute the earth, are suffocating, press each other—what a life! " (*Konovalov.*)

Gorki's tramps are sincere, they speak as they think, and lack the hypocrisy of civilized man. They do not complain and are not depressed. They take life as it comes in all its manifold complexity of good and evil. Sometimes they are cruel, but in general generosity is prevalent.

In the story *Emelian Pilyai* we see a derelict of society who is waiting to kill a merchant, and does not stop to save a girl from drowning. " Chelkash " a thief, drunkard, smuggler, a homeless tramp, shows his generosity towards his companion, a stupid, cowardly peasant Gavrila, by giving him all the money he got by stealing.

The idealism and love of some kind of goodness and right way in life is seen in every tramp. In *Twenty-six Men and One Girl* we are transported in a stuffy, damp and dark cellar, where bakers work from morning till night. The monotonous and hard work would kill everything human in them, if they had not one bright ideal and love, personified in a girl who came occasionally to visit them. A new man, cynical and corrupted, but handsome, appears among the twenty-six. No girl can resist him, but the twenty-six are sure that the "One" will remain pure. They bet on her . . . and lose. A strong and bold man took their ideal of purity, the ideal which was a ray of light in their gloomy life, and all of them were left again in the darkness. Perhaps in this story Gorki wanted to show how the best stories of humanity, the faith that inspires many is often soiled by handling in dirty hands of corrupted persons.

In another story, *The Orlóvs*, we see a cobbler and his wife living a miserable life. A cholera epidemic awakens the Orlóvs, who devote themselves to work in a hospital, with a great enthusiasm. But Orlóv, weakened by his previous life, soon cools down and plunges again in the waste sea of tramps' life.

Konovalov, A Trio, Creatures that once were Men, and many small stories, give some more pictures of tramps' life.

Foma Gordyéyev is a powerful story about the peculiar class of Volga merchants. The same egoistic, wild types of human shame, as we see in the plays of Ostrovski, are described by Gorki.

The ideal of many Russian writers, which we saw in Chékhov, to find a general unifying feeling of life—a God of a living man, is seen here and there in Gorki's writings. "I discovered in myself many good feelings and desires,—a fair proportion of what is usually called goōd; but a feeling which could unify all this—a well-founded clear-cut thought, embracing all the phenomena of life—I did not find in myself . . . let us try; maybe imagination will help man to rise for a moment above the earth and find there his true place, which he has lost." (*The Reader*).

In his drama *The Lower Depths*, he shows us the dregs of society living in a dirty doss-house, every one of them cherishing some illusion, which carries him on through the misery of life. And from this lower depth we hear a radiant hymn to a free, strong and pure Man.

After the Revolution of 1905 the rushing torrent of Gorki's thought grows into a broad, steady river. Separated from his native land, he trys to penetrate more deeply into the process of life and more definitely to formulate his ideals. In a clear and simple narrative he wrote his reminiscences *Childhood*, *In the World*, without omitting any single detail of his changeable life. A number of novels, written during the last 15 years, show a real artistic and mature talent.

Mother, a big novel, written under the impression of the Russian revolution, presents a very interesting picture of the roaring sea of the revolutionary movement. Everything in this novel is new and significant. The separate characters and the minor details are painted with a powerful brush. We see a gradual intellectual development of the working classes, their increasing political self-consciousness and aspiration. A young workman, thirsty for knowledge and new ideas, became an active member of the revolutionary party. His mother, a simple peasant woman, is gradually overtaken by the new ideas and is transformed into an active socialistic worker, dying like a martyr.

The Summer is also deeply penetrated with socialistic ideas. Here Gorki describes the Russian village, but not from his former uncompromising point of view, and without that antipathy to a settled life he had had before, but with a vision of a calm, regulated life of a happy community. No idealization of peasants is seen in this novel, but at the same time a new, fresh impression is derived from contemplation of the young generation of peasants, full of energy, desirous to learn and to be active workers in life.

The Little Town Okurov is a much more darker picture of a provincial town. Gorki, as a fine realist, shows us the miserable, wild, and absurd life of people who have no ideals, no moral principles. The idea of the

absence in life of any light and love, of the non-existence of a basis for action, dominates in this novel. But at the same time, over this immeasurable ocean of evil, loneliness of soul, disbelief and bitterness, Gorki rises as an optimist believing in bright, glorious future: "the new workers in life, having hearts filled with love . . . they will plough up the field of God . . . and like a new shining sun, the earth will prosper for all, and everybody will be happy in the new glorious current of life."

Gorki's work is not yet over. Latterly he has published in Russia a play, *Slovotekov the Workman*, which describes the workman's life under the present Russian Government, and in this he touches on the two tendencies of Russian political life. The play has not yet been published in English.

During the last thirty years we can observe a very great change in the whole aspect of Russian literature. This change is also noticeable in the literature of Western Europe, but in Russia, it assumes much more conspicuous and extreme forms. Art and literature are the reflections and, at the same time, the expression of leading ideas of the life-process. As life rapidly passes through a series of changes, followed by industrial, political and social revolutions, the same course is reflected in literature.

The transition of a feudal agricultural country, like Russia into a modern industrial state, involved a precipitate complication of customs, an acceleration of evolution and a great breakdown of old traditions. But, at the same time, we must bear in mind, that all these changes were going under the old autocratic political system, and to this fact may be attributed those grotesque contrasts that we observe in modern Russian literature. Gorki and Andreev, two men writing at the same time; but what a contrast in their ideas and form of expression!

It looks as though the broad and large river of Russian literature were breaking up into a multitude of small gushing streamlets, running in all directions and entirely disconnected.

The new industrial classes were growing steadily and

overtaking the class of the landed nobility. The people itself was gradually emerging from its inertness and ignorance, was acquiring a sense of dignity, personality and strength. The rôle of the intelligencia as a nurse of the people, was practically over: the baby could stand on its own feet and express his own desires. The intelligencia felt itself lost and useless in the midst of events. With frightened eyes they looked upon this incomprehensible progress of life, listened to mysterious voices and were contemplating the new forces rising into being. The result as we see in Russia and elsewhere, was a general tendency to isolate oneself from life, to surround oneself with a fence of æstheticism, individualism, anarchism, mysticism and what not? The names of Oscar Wilde, F. Nietzsche, Huysman, M. Maeterlinck, Andreev, Sologub, Balmont, speak for themselves to illustrate these modern tendencies. The individual became the goal in itself and the justification of life in life itself. The old idols were destroyed, the faith shaken; and the intellectuals were left like blind men in the desert. Do not seek the distant goal, take the nearest to you, enjoy life as if nothing were happening in the world, this was the new gospel of life. The words of M. Maeterlinck can better illustrate this idea: "We live" writes Maeterlinck in *Wisdom and Destiny*, "in the bosom of great injustice; but there can be, I imagine, neither cruelty, nor callousness, as though injustice had ended; else should we never emerge from our circle. It is imperative that there should be some who dare speak, and think, and act as though all men were happy."

This Parnassian aloofness, this aristocratism of mind, is perhaps better expressed by Sologub: "I take a piece of life, coarse and poor, and create a sweet legend, because I am a poet, remain stagnating thou dull commonplace life, or rage with a furious fire; over thee, life, I—the poet, will erect the created legend of all that is charming and beautiful!"

D. MEREZHKOVSKI was one of the first Russian writers, who broke with the traditions of Russian literature. He was born (1866) of an aristocratic

family and received a good education. The first poems that he wrote were influenced by the prevailing liberal ideas, but soon (1892) he passed into the camp of symbolists and proclaimed "the joy of life" above all, and the sovereign rights of the individual as higher than the communual idea. The influence of classical Epicurean literature and of Nietzsche are very marked in all of his his works. A trilogy, consisting of three novels: *Julian the Apostate, Leonardo da Vinci,* and *Peter and Alexis* is one of the masterpieces of Merezhkovski. There he describes three transitional periods, whence, according to Nietzsche or Carlyle the superman or the hero arises. The idea that runs all through the three novels is the undying struggle between the antique Paganism and Christianity. Christ and Anti-Christ are the thesis and antithesis of life-evolution but we see Merezhkovski on the side of Paganism. The novels are written in a clear, realistic style, are full of movement and give us a wonderful picture of historical events. The personages are very numerous and well defined and the whole matter is thoroughly studied by the author.

A few years later we see a total change in Merezhkovski's outlook. In his essay *The Coming Ham* he appeals to the purified Christianity "as the only one salvation" from an approaching bourgeoisie, the "conglomerate of mediocrity," as J. S. Mill called it, which will bring the ruin of moral and æsthetic ideals by spreading the "positivist" materialistic doctrine of life. Only the true spiritual Christianity, purified from the influence of Church and State could save the world. We must notice, that this was written after 1905, whence the materialistic doctrine of Marx secured a strong footing in Russia.

The most brilliant expounder of modern Russian thought is undoubtedly Leonid Andréev. Although he cannot solve the numerous questions that troubled the mind, does not give any real ideals , nor find a rational explanation of existence, he is widely read and admired by his contemporaries, who saw in him the interpretation of their own sickliness of mind and troubled spirits. His heroes have lost all connection with the whole of mankind, are

desperately lonely and miserable. His unfaithful attitude of life, standing apart from reality, grasps only its faint reflection and symbols.

LEONID ANDRÉEV (1871-1919) was born of a humble family in Central Russia. His father, a schoolmaster, died before L. Andréev had finished his education. Lack of money did not hinder his entering the University at St. Petersburg, where he earned his livelihood by giving lessons. His life was full of hardship and hungering, and he once attempted suicide. In 1897 he got his Laws Degree in Moscow and started his career as a reporter of Law Court cases. His first short stories (written in 1898) brought him into prominence.

"We saw a new star rising on the horizon. It pierced the mist of the early morning and was shining with its beautiful and mysterious light," wrote one of the critics in the beginning of Andréev's literary work. The later stories and plays brought him enormous success and widespread popularity. Since then he has lived in Finland, near Petrograd, where he died in December, 1919.

In his first stories we see the unmistakeable influence of Chekhov and Gorki; but at the same time the depression of those authors has been transformed into a deep melancholy and profound pessimism. The lonely hero of his stories sees only the ruins of old ideals, cannot find a nook for himself, cannot live, but at the same time, life attracts him, and the desire of happiness and the impulse for good are not dead within him. Andréev is universal, cosmopolitan in spirit. His despair is a world-sorrow. The impossibility of a man attaining the ideal, knowing the truth, the whole relativity of our knowledge led Andréev to adopt the symbolical method to illustrate his ideas. However, observing life and mankind as through the X-rays, he gives only the skeleton, but not the living faces and images.

The principal idea, we see in Andréev's works, is the conception of the irresistible, mysterious force, called Life, Destiny, the Unknown, which produced in man "a fear which runs alongside his life." In the stories *The Wall*, *By the Window*, *The Shadows*, we feel this terrible Unknown,

which like the *Being in Grey* and in the *Life of a Man* follows and strangles every human being. The art of Andréev is quite peculiar. In every story he gives an illustration of some idea ; the characters have no real living individuality but seem to wear painted masks, representing hypertrophied passion or qualities. His dramas resemble a pantomime with masks intentionally grotesque.

In the story *Thought*, we see how the whole being of man is condensed into an intense operative thought, the labour of ever increasing and deepening, trying to grasp the whole universe and finally passing the line which divides the normal from the abnormal. To prove the independent and masterly position of his thought, Dr. Kerzhencóv kills his friend in the presence of his wife. To escape punishment, he simulates insanity. But, while in prison, an idea comes into his head : " it is quite possible that Dr. Kerzhencóv is really insane. He thought he was pretending but all the while was really a madman." And this leads him in despair : " I loved the human thought ; my freedom. I never knew anything higher than my thought—and the thought deceived me." In this story Andréev endeavours to show the peril of isolation. The human thought is a collective product and may become a dangerous weapon in the hands of an egoistic individual.

The problem of faith is expounded in the story *The Life of Vasili Fiveyski* a kind of modernized *Book of Job*. " Over the whole of the life of Vasili Fiveyski there impended a cruel and mysterious destiny "—thus the story opens. Like the biblical Job, he struggles with his destiny and makes a superhuman effort to preserve his faith, even in the most dark periods of life. His life is a successive number of misfortunes. His beloved son was drowned and his wife, for sheer despair, began to drink. With a revolting heart, the priest goes in a cornfield to find a rest to his soul, and there facing the high, burning sky he says : " I believe." Another child is born, but this child is an idiot. One day his besotted wife set fire to the house and dies from burns. But the priest still keeps his old faith. He isolates himself. His faith increases every day,

till one day he believes in his own power to do miracles. A workman died and his body is ready to be buried. "And he directed his steps to the black, silent, waiting coffin. The people, overcome with terror, run away from the church and in the ominous silence sounded his powerful prophetical voice: 'I tell you: arise!' An outburst of despair follows when he sees the ghastly reality of the immovable corpse. "Then why have I believed?" "Then why hast Thou kept me in prison, in slavery, in chains?" the priest cries aloud. Death comes in time to put an end to his misery.

The duality of the bestial instinct of man and his ideal aspirations, the deep psychological realism and analysis of social evil is presented in the stories, *The Gulf* and *In the Fog*.

The horrors of the war are depicted in a ghastly story, *Red Laugh*. "Madness and Horror!" is the cry of a suffering humanity protesting against the absurdity of the war. The real and unreal, normal and insane, are intermixed in this story, which has a veritable Edgar Allan Poe touch in it.

The 1905 Revolution also found a reflection in Andréev's work. A very good sketch of the collective psychology and fatality of the revolutionary movement is given in the story, *The Governor*. A symbolical story, *It Was*, shows us a cosmical aspect of the revolutionary movement, where the persons are only powerless marionettes, carried by the irresistible current. *The Seven Who Were Hanged*, written after the revolution, is a work of artistic merit and full of emotion and sympathy. The individual psychology of each of the seven martyrs is exposed with a wonderful clearness. *The Darkness* is a story of an idealistic revolutionary who saw the ugly reality of life, and is struck by a new idea, "how he can be good when so many people are bad." And he plunges into darkness. The optimistic tendency is exposed only in the play, *Towards the Stars*, in which we are transported to a mountain observatory, where an idealistic rationalist professor is working. In the valley below a revolution is in full swing. The professor's only son, an active revolutionary, is

mutilated in prison and becomes insane. But the idealism of his father keeps him above all personal suffering. "Like a gardener, life plucks the best flowers, but their fragrance fills the earth. . . . Is Giordano Bruno dead? Only beasts die, those who have no personality. Only those who kill, will die. . . . There is no death to the Man, no death for the Son of Eternity!"

A very powerful, but fantastic tragedy, *King Hunger*, gives us the picture of the social unrest. The tragedy of revolution, as a result of the eternal struggle of poor and rich, is given in a symbolical way. Every personage wears a mask, and is rather a walking shadow than a living creature. The whole play is a ghastly chiaroscuro of the future.

Individualistic anarchism *versus* social life was always a characteristic feature of transitional periods. In the play, *Savva*, we see such an anarchist who would destroy the whole fabric of present society to make room for a new happy world. "There will be no more rich people, because it will be no more partitions, nor houses, nor money. The weak, sick, and peace-loving people will perish and only the brave and free people will remain on the earth!" Savva starts his work of destruction by putting a clockwork bomb behind a sacred image in a church. The plot is discovered before the explosion occurs, and the image is safely removed and replaced after the explosion. Instead of destroying the idol of Religion, Savva helped to produce a miracle. The social instinct wins and the reformer who wanted to destroy everything, without giving anything in return, loses.

The field of literary achievement of Andréev is extensive and broad. No problems of human mind have been neglected by him. The loneliness of men in the midst of a great town is described in *Curse of a Beast, By the Window, Serge Petróvich*; the tragedy of death—in *The War* and the *Grand Slam*; the psychology of children—in *Petka in the Country, The Angel*, etc.

The tragedy of the human soul is given in many stories and dramas. The symbolical drama, *The Life of Man*,

provides something like a synthesis of Andréev's art. In allegorical pictures, he presents the stages of the life of Man. The silent and mysterious Being in Grey, representing the blind and merciless Fate, always stands behind the Man. In the prologue The Being in Grey is standing, with a lighted candle in his hands." This is the life of Man. . . . Resistlessly dragged on by time, he will inevitably tread all the stages of human life, upward to its climax and downward to its end. . . . And in his blind ignorance, worn by apprehension, harassed by hopes and fears, he will submissively complete the iron round of destiny." And the whole life of Man passes before us. The man is born, he struggles with poverty when he is young, he reaches glory and wealth, but happiness passes away like a shadow, and the man dies lonely and poor.

The *Black Maskers* is a purely psychological play, where the internal dualism of soul, its struggle with passion and the dark realism of life, is represented by the allegoric feast in the castle of Duke Lorenzo. We may see here also an idea of deeper social meaning. The people in the castle are the aristocracy of mind, who have a glorious feast among the ignorant mankind left in darkness. " Lights are dangerous in the night! To those who are abroad? No, to him who lights them." The brilliant castle is finally overrun by the black maskers, coming in countless numbers, from the dark spaces, and the lights go out.

Anathema is a mystical and symbolic tragedy. Again we are confronting the irresistible Fate—" Someone guarding the Gate." Anathema, the evil spirit, the incarnation of reason and logic, wishes to pass through the Gate of Destiny, but the stern guardian replies with dignity: " My face is open, Anathema, but Thou will not see me, because Thou hast no heart!" In revenge, Anathema disguises himself as a man, and selects a poor Jew, whom he enriches and then ruins, in order to see him cursing the Invisible One. But Anathema does not succeed: the poor Jew dies like a martyr and passes through the Gate. The poor Jew, an incarnation of love and patience, passes where reason does not penetrate.

This acceptance of intuitive faith and love as the basis of life is very characteristic of the development of Andréev's thought.

The commonplace life is represented by Andréev in numerous plays, such as *Gaudeamus* and *Days of Our Life*, where he describes the student's life, *Anfisa*, *Professor Storitsyn*, etc., gives true realistic pictures of the life of Russian educated classes.

In the beginning of the Great War, Andréev wrote a patriotic play in honour of Belgium, *For King, Law, and Liberty*, and a story, *The Yoke of War*, giving a diary of a plain man, for whom war seems to be a calamity.

Andréev is a great writer, expressing the thoughts and aspirations of the vast multitude living in our transitional epoch. The old idols were broken and the man was left in a dreary void of life. "To fill this dreary void, he imagines many beautiful and glorious things, but even in this imagination the thought of death, of the reality of life, comes to him again and again, and his fear grows. And he began to be like a keeper of a museum of wax figures. In day-time he chats with the visitors and takes money from them, but at night he walks alone, overwhelmed with terrible fear, among these dead, soulless creatures" (*Towards the Stars*).

Present society, with its unceasing conflict of individualistic interests, where *Bellum omnium contra omnes* seems to the lonely man to be a mysterious, dreadful, veiled Being, ready to crush him. And he listens to his inner voice as the only guide in the midst of "the horrible reality of human life."

In the field of fantasy and imagination, Andréev was followed by another contemporary writer, Feodor Sologub. By his unsurpassed magic of words, he created a new atmosphere and a genre of his own.

FEODOR TETERNIKOV (the real name of F. SOLOGUB) was born in 1864. By profession a schoolmaster, he began to be known as a poet in 1895, when he published his first book of verse. His success as a novelist was produced by the publication of

The Little Devil in 1905, and since then he has written numerous tales, some novels, and dramatical plays.

Together with Merezhkovski, he may be called the founder of Russian Modernism, but his talent developed quite differently from the other modernists. Like the boy of Andersen's tale, he got in his eye a little piece of the devil's mirror, in which everything is distorted. In his novel, *The Little Devil*, he gives a type of a man, mean, narrow-minded, corrupted, whose life, miserable as himself, is a continuous endeavour to satisfy his petty ambitions. In his blind selfishness he ignores the means, and acts only under the influence of his bestial nature, symbolized by the "little Devil." This type can also be found in Chékhov (*The Man in the Case*) and Andréev (*No Pardon*), but nowhere else is he depicted with such a powerful sense of contrast.

All the writings of Sologub present a curious mixture of reality and fantasy, and some of his tales (*Turandina* and others) can only be compared with those of Anatole France. In *The Charms of Navai* he represents the horrors of the reactions and the general absurdity of life, contrasted with the fantastical and mysterious happenings in the estate of Trirodor, surrounded by "the silent boys."

Queen Ortruda is another novel written in a queer style, where Sologub attains the extreme limit of imaginative creation.

The short stories and tales of Sologub are of unsurpassed charm. In his stylisations of ancient Russian legends he has but one rival—ALEXIS REMISOV.

The greatest representative of the mystical modernism is undoubtedly B. BUGAEV, who writes under the name of ANDREY BIELY. He was born in 1880, and published his first verses in 1904. He introduced new methods of expression, and his prosaic and poetic styles are very peculiar. His big novel, *Petersburg*, published in 1916, is a long, drawn-out work, very artificial and monotonous, but full of a certain musical charm of words and symbolic conceptions.

Other modernist poets are very numerous in contemporary Russia. All sorts of schools of poetry: decadents,

acmeists, futurists, ego-futurists, etc., are to be found, mostly ephemeral. The greatest poets are: K. BALMONT (born 1867), V. BRUSOV (born 1873), A. BLOCK (born 1880), V. IVANOV, M. STRUVE, Mme. Z. HIPPIUS. They all belong to the aristocrats of mind, standing above common life, singing the joy of individual existence and immersing life in a sea of unlimited imagination.

In spite of the development of modernistic literature, the old realistic school still persisted and worked along a line of its own. We have already described the works of Gorki, Korolenko, but their ideology belongs more to the XIX. century. We cannot pass without mentioning T. BUNIN (born in 1870), who is a poet and writer of the silent desolation and ruin of old Russian traditions. His thought is all in the sweet recollections of former happy days. His sorrow is tender and his attitude to the life is full of docile reconciliation and submissiveness. He wrote numerous stories of peasant life and he sung the desolation of the ruined nests of gentlefolk. One of his last stories, *Gentlemen from San Francisco*, written in 1916, is a short but masterful sketch of an American millionaire, who, after a strenuous life, goes to Italy and dies there, lonely. The transatlantic liner which carries his body back to America presents a symbol of the vanity of human life.

A. BUDISHCHEV and E. CHIRIKOV are, like Bunin, keen observers of life, and possess a deep, tender feeling of nature. Their miniature stories and novels are full of a certain freshness and joy of life, hidden under a thin veil of sorrow.

The most prominent of the realists is ALEXANDER KUPRIN. He was born in 1870 and had a military education. Disgusted with military life, he retired in 1897, and devoted his time to literature. His first big novel, *The Duel*, written in 1905, produced a sensation in society. His life was irregular and adventurous. He studied life in taverns, slums, peasant cottages, factories, lived with fishermen, smugglers, and thieves. His subjects are taken directly from life, his style is fresh and clear, and

his whole attitude is full of optimism. He presents a strange contrast in the midst of neurasthenic, pale literature of his contemporary writers. His novel, *The Duel*, together with other stories from military life, reveals the true aspect of a corrupt and disgraceful army, officers treating private soldiers like animals, drinking, playing cards, sensual and cowardly.

Moloch is a picture of factory life, where everyone is a victim of the dreadful idol of capitalism. In the story, *The Marsh*, we see a poor girl dying in an unhealthy surrounding. The children are often described by Kuprín with a deep tenderness.

Every story of Kuprín provides a contrast between the poor, unhealthy life that the people make for themselves, and an ideal, natural life, where the man is healthy and strong.

Kuprín loves life with Hellenic enthusiasm. He fell in love with the whole of Nature, adored every tree, every flower, adored every healthy creature. Like Knut Hamsun, the Norwegian writer, he sings a hymn to life according to nature and shrinks away from artificial town culture. In his big novel, *The Pit*, where he transports the reader in the most dreadful places in a big town, we see the spirit of beautiful and healthy life rising among these human visions. "Man is born for great joy, for an unceasing creative activity, in which he must be like God in his unlimited love for everything: for the tree, for the sky, for the man, for the dog, and for the dear, kind, and beautiful world: most of all to the world, with its charming motherhood, its mornings and nights, with its lovely, perpetual miracles."

Kuprín is a singer of beautiful love, love which is stronger than death, and which is the alpha and omega of the whole life. Nobody in Russia has painted such a picture of purely idealistic love, devoid of selfishness and sensualism, as Kuprín in the story, *The Garnet Necklace*.

Neglecting the advice of Byron, that it is no use to gild pure gold and paint white the lily, Kuprín wrote a charming story called *Sulamite*, where he simply retold

the Song of Solomon. But this modern interpretation still possesses the primitive Eastern atmosphere of brightly-coloured life full of passionate love and happiness. The whole story is a glorious apotheosis of love; "for love is divinely beautiful, for the woman who loves is a queen, for love is as strong as death!"

Another writer who raises the question of love is M. ARTSYBASHEV (born in 1878), but what a contrast to the idealistic Kuprín! All his subjects are full of erotic tendencies, and he approaches French naturalism in describing the low instincts of the "bête humaine." The heroes of his stories belong to the declassed elements of modern bourgoise circles, full of sensual feelings, desire of self-assertion and independence of actions. They are all moral anarchists, dictating their capricious will to the mankind. "Sanin" is his principal novel, which produced quite a sensation in 1907, when the Russian young generation, disillusioned in their revolutionary attempts, directed their energy and thought on the problems of the individual. *Pasha Tumanov* and *At the Last Stage*, written later, raises the same questions, treating with contempt the idealism and glorifying the cult of the flesh.

A. KAMENSKI and M. KUZMIN also write in the style of Artsybashev.

The healthy realism, but slightly touched by modern influence, is represented by SERGEEV-TSENSKI. In his first stories we see the influence of Chékhov and Andréev, but soon he founded his own method of expression and style of writing. *Fluctuations* is one of the best novels. It is written in an original style, full of colour and movement, and presents us a grey country life with its various fluctuations, where the man is powerless to accomplish anything by himself. A deep sorrow envelops all the thoughts of Sergéev-Tsenski, who, losing his way in life, appeals to nature for help and guidance. "Fields of mine, here I stand facing you, alone, barefooted. I cry unto you, do you hear me? . . . I stand among you lonely and lost. . . . I feel you with all my heart like a deep wound. . . . Only a word, only a single word,

I know—you are alive. . . . But not, everything is empty before me, you are silent still and your sorrow is mine. . . ." (*The Sadness of the Fields*).

B. ZAITSEV is also a painter of nature, village and quiet country life. But he is less satisfied with life and sees more desolation in nature. A strong desire to fly away from this life into an unknown future is characteristic to his heroes. "Whatever happen to-morrow, I welcome you, the coming To-morrow!"

Among others, writing about country life and village, should be mentioned MOUYZHEL, RODIONOV, GUSEV, TELESHOV, SESAFIMOVICH, OLIGER and A. TOLSTOY (a new writer); have also contributed much to the study of modern Russian life. Novikov and Slezkin are quite young authors with a very promising future.

Our survey of modern Russian literature would not be complete without mentioning B. SAVINKOV, writing under the name of V. ROPSHIN. Some time ago he was an active member of the Terrorist revolutionary party, but after the revolution of 1905 a profound crisis happened, not only in him but in the whole of the Russian revolutionary movement. His novels, almost autobiographical, give us the best illustration of the psychology of the later revolutionaries. His first novel, *The Pale Horse*, appeared in 1909, and was called by D. Merezhkovski the most Russian book of the period.

It takes the form of a diary written by a Terrorist. This type was often described by the Russian authors. The most striking figure of a revolutionary is given by Stepniak in the 'nineties. It was then a clearly defined character, with internal reasoning, simply pursuing his ideal in which he had an absolute faith. Ropshin's hero is a different kind of man. He is no longer a believer, his mind is unbalanced, unsettled, full of doubts and indecisions. Hamletism has spoken its last word in *Pale Horse*.

Gogol wrote *Dead Souls*, but the revolutionarics of Ropshin could be called "the living dead." "I understood," says the hero of *Pale Horse*, "that I do not want

to live any more. I am tired of my words, my thoughts, my wishes. I am tired of men and this life." In his isolation he despises and hates the people and sees no reason, "Why is it right to kill for the sake of an ideal, for one's country, and not for one's own sake? Who can answer me?" He looks with contempt on his former friend, an ardent revolutionary. "The world to him is simple as an alphabet. There are slaves on one side, masters on the other. The slaves revolt against the masters. It is right that a slave should kill. It is wrong that a slave should be killed. A day will come when the slaves shall conquer. Then there will be a paradise on earth. All men will be equal, all be well fed, and all will be free. Excellent indeed. I don't believe in a paradise on earth, and don't believe in a paradise in heaven. I don't want to be a slave, not even a free slave!" The revolutionary is transformed into a philosophical rationalist with an admixture of a religious mysticism. He broke with society and is "standing alone" in the "night which is incomprehensibly silent." "I have walked a hard road. Where is the end? . . ." he asks. Suicide is the only way left for a man who said: "I am with nobody," because life gets its strength from society and the individual perishes in his beautiful isolation. It is what Andreev told us before (*Thought, Black Maskers*).

In 1912, Ropshin published his next novel, *The Tale of What Was Not* where he again describes the crisis of revolutionary spirit, the psychology of the crowd, and the powerlessness of an individual.

But we must remember that Ropshin gave the changing spirit of the old Russian People-Socialist Party and not the young Social-Democratic, supported by the ever-increasing town proletariat and constantly growing in strength. The present revolution undoubtedly will evolve a new and fresh manifestation of Russian spirit.

INDEX

ST. STEPHEN'S PRINTING WORKS, BRISTOL, ENGLAND.