

HELENA GOŚCIŁO

University of Pittsburgh

STAGE AND PAGE: DRAMA'S INCURSION INTO RUSSIAN FICTION OF
THE 1830s*

"If this were played upon a stage now, I
could condemn it as improbable fiction."

Twelfth Night

In its investigation of the novel's synthetic, heterogeneous origins, twentieth literary scholarship has explored the indebtedness of the comparatively modern to the venerable genres of the epic, the romance, and the picaresque.¹ Apart from those commentators who decry the classical five-act composition of tragedy in the structure of individual novels,² however, few critics have dwelled on the interplay between drama and the development of fiction,³ though, like Walter Allen in his perceptive survey, "The English Novel" /1954/, acknowledge that "the effect of the Elizabethan drama, and of Shakespeare above all, on the novel in England can scarcely be overestimated."⁴ During the early decades of the nineteenth in Russia, where the novel limped along desultorily until the 1860s⁵, drama exerted its weighty influence on the povest' and the short story. In fact, a stylistic earmark of Russian Romantic small-scale fiction, and particularly that of Mixail Lermontov and Evdokija Rostopčina, is its assimilation of devices conventionally associated with the stage.

That Russians of the 1830s consciously or otherwise fed drama into their prose was quite natural in light of the function that theatre then fulfilled. Performances staged at the Ermitaż Court Theatre, in private theatres on estates, and at the Imperial Theatres - the Aleksandrinskij in Petersburg⁶

and the Malyj in Moscow⁷ - represented one of the very few entertainments available to the educated Russian public. Opera, ballet, and concerts only partially purveyed alternate diversion,⁸ for the division of genres into drama, ballet, and opera, whereby each would enjoy an independent existence, was not accomplished until almost the end of the decade.⁹ Actors like Vasilij Karatygin /1802-53/ from the Aleksandrinskij and Pavel Močalov /1800-48/ of the Malyj were household names among the capitals' literati: A. Puškin and P. Vjazemskij, and later N. Gogol', V. Belinskij, D. Grigorovič, and A. Grigor'ev, regularly reviewed their performances and took sides in the widely publicized rivalries between actors and actresses that were then in vogue /e.g., the Močalov/Karatygin, Semenova/George, and Semenova/Kolosova disputes/.¹⁰ Numerous writers, including P. A. Katenin and N. I. Gnedič, belonged to "the left flank" - those theatre habitues who attended performances almost daily and whose knowledgeability about dramatic technique enabled them to influence productions and to promote or destroy reputations.¹¹ The playwright A. Saxovskoj, for instance, not only headed the repertoire section of the theatre management at the Imperial Theatre until 1826, but gave actors and actresses precise instructions regarding declamatory style, posture, dynamics, and so forth, which subsequently congealed into company rules and regulations. Both A. M. Kolosova /1802-80/ and E. M. Semenova /1786-1849/ studied with him before turning for less rigid professional guidance to Katenin and Gnedič, respectively.¹² Theatrical events, then, like receptions, dinners, and salon soirees, comprised a crucial part of nearly every writer's established routine and served as topics of heated conversation, polemical correspondence, and critical essays. If one also recalls how the Russian Romantics revered Schiller¹³ and, even more, Shakespeare /particularly his "Hamlet"¹⁴ and "Othello"¹⁵/, then one can begin to appreciate the degree to which the more sophisticated Russian mentality was steeped in live drama and its conventions.

Lermontov's fascination with the theatre never flagged. Treading in the footsteps of his grandfather, M. V. Arsen'ev, whose private home theatre in Tarxany was one the first to stage Shakespeare's "Hamlet" in translation /with Arsen'ev as the gravedigger/, Lermontov in his childhood created wax figures and short plays for his own marionette theatre.¹⁶ When he reached adolescence and adulthood, Lermontov authored five plays, eagerly embraced German "Sturm und Drang" drama /and hence favored Močalov over Karatygin/,¹⁷ frequented the theatre whenever afforded the opportunity, planned to rework F. Chateaubriand's "Atala" into a play, and made the acquaintance of M. S. Ščepkin /1788-1863/ in 1840.¹⁸ Rostopčina likewise wrote for the stage, attended both Moscow and Petersburg theatres, kept abreast of and participated in debates about stage personnel, and in later years received Ščepkin at her home. In their personal and professional involvement with the theatre, then, Lermontov and Rostopčina resembled the majority of their educated contemporaries.

Drama, or at the very least, its vocabulary, informed the philosophy of the time; for a presiding metaphor of Russian Romantic metaphysics conceived of existence as an unedited manuscript authored by an omnipotent power and enacted without rehearsal on the stage of human life. The concept of life as lived performance, as the execution of an assigned role - the outlines of which are sketched in, but which need to be fleshed out by the given actor/actress - expands on an image dear to Shakespeare and perhaps best captured by Jacques in the overquoted passage from As You Like It: "All the world's a stage; /And all the men and women merely players; /They have their exits and their entrances:/And one man in his time plays many parts."¹⁹ The Theatrum Mundi metaphor, which originally derived from the idea "that God was the sole spectator of man's actions on the stage of life,"²⁰ was, by the sixteenth century, a weary secularized topos traceable to Plato²¹ and Petronius.²² Shakespeare revived the image by transforming it "from a simple allegorical figure into a complex imaginative mode of expres-

sion,"²³ even though Cervantes in "Don Quixote" mocked its originality.²⁴ More than just a gaudy flash of rhetoric, the notion of life as the fulfillment of a predetermined role is not so frivolous as one may suppose once one realizes that during Romanticism it was harnessed to the largely sincere if flaunted Romantic belief that a transcendent force metes out a specific destiny to everyone at birth. Where Romantics failed to agree was whether destiny manifested itself as character or as a power external to and independent of it. If the vocabulary that gains currency in a given era involuntarily mirrors that era's ethos, it is worth remembering how heavily Romantic literature is larded with the words sud'ba, žrebič, and na čele napisano. They crop up in Rostopčina's povesti, "Činy i den'gi" /1838/ and "Poedinok" /1838/, approximately a dozen times, and even more frequently in Lermontov's fiction: "Vadim" /1834/, "Knjaginja Ligovskaja" /1836-7/, and "Geroj našego vremeni" /1840/.²⁵

Most Romantics, especially those converted to Byron's contradictory creed of fatalism,²⁶ accepted as axiomatic that one's destiny is ineluctable. That idea dominated Ludwig Tieck's early work /e.g., "Der Abschied", 1792, staged in Moscow in February 1840/ and generated an entire strain in German drama called the "Schicksalstragödie" /fate-tragedy/. Originating with K. P. Moritz's "Blunt, oder der Gast" /1871/, the Schicksalstragödie gained popularity in the 1810s and 1820s and was most successfully practiced not only by Tieck /"Karl von Berneck", 1795, "Genoveva", 1799, and "Kaiser Oktavianus", 1804/, but also by Zacharias Werner /"Der vierundzwanzigste Februar", 1810/15/, Adolf Müllner /"Die Schuld", staged in Petersburg in 1833/, and Ernst von Houwald /"Der Leuchtturm", 1821/. For these epigones of Schiller's "Die Braut von Messina" /1803/, fatalism paralyzes volition and leaves man impotently flailing in a sea of circumstance.²⁷ To his credit Lermontov in "Fatalist" attempts to reconcile the conflicting claims of will and fate /a problem that few writers of the time tackle head-on/, and arrives at a provocative, if decidedly inconclusive, insight. To grapple with the paradoxical balance between determinism and moral responsibility may be a task whose dimensions demand a St. Augusti

but Lermontov touches on that issue also in his portrayal of Pečorin in "Gerčoj". There, Pečorin, who for the bulk of the narrative seems to have cornered the market on will, takes refuge in self-excusatory reproaches against fate when disaster prevails: ". . . skol'ko raz ja uže igral rol' topora v rukax sud'by! Kak orudie kazni, ja upadal na golovu obrečennyx žertv, často bez zloby, vseгда bez sožaleniya . . ." ²⁸ Dol'skij in Rostopčina's "Poedinok" gives credence not only to destiny, but to the fatidic capacity of some to perceive its configuration. So he absolves Valevič of his death, in much the way Pečorin exculpates himself - as an unwitting instrument of inscrutable fate, who traverses a course mapped out by a higher authority, by a method and with consequences foreseen by an old gypsy /a phenomenon that reappears in C. Verdi's opera, "Un Ballo en Maschera"/. ²⁹ Dol'skij asserts:

"Vy postupili vopreki sebe samomu, no vidno tak suždeno . . . znaju, tverdo znaju, čto budu ubit vami zavtra. Dlja menja net udači ili neudači - mne uže naznačen mig sud'-by moej, v igre na žizn' i smert', nam predstojaščej. Slučaj ničego ne možet dlja menja sdelat'. Rok zaranee brosil kosti - vy budete tol'ko slepym orudiem ego . . ." and later he iterates, ". . . sud'by ne obejdeš!" ³⁰ Pečorin in "Knjažna Meri" similarly credits an old woman's prediction, made in his childhood, that his death will come "ot zloj ženy." Recalling the episode, he remarks: "Eto menja togda gluboko porazilo; v duše moej rodilos' nepredolimoe otvraščenie k ženit'-be . . . Meždu tem, čto-to mne govorit, čto ee predskazanie sbudetsja . . ." /104/ Comparable instances of Pečorin's explicitly articulated faith in an arbitrary but absolute destiny repeat themselves throughout the cycle.

Moving from metaphysics, with its comprehensive concept of life as a play, to the narrower sphere of psychology and social behavior, one sees that Romanticism's theatricality partially sprang from the self-consciousness that characterized its later phase /with age, after all, most art and thought tend to stray towards the self-referential/. If spontaneity prompts Romantic characters to act unreflectingly, constant awareness of an

audience constrains them from ceding to impulse without molding it into acceptable or impressive forms /a trait admirably exposed by L. Tolstoj in his depiction of Andrej Bolkonskij's fatal hesitation when faced with the grenade at Borodino/.³¹ People in Romantic fiction are too preoccupied with their image to engage in many authentic dialogues with themselves; instead they address audiences, 'stage' self-confrontations for the benefit of others, and muse aloud when the probability of being overheard verges on certainty.³² They write reams of letters, keep diaries that are invariably discovered and published, indulge in interminable confessions that mystify as much as they reveal, tc. At all costs they aspire to make a vivid impression while professing indifference to, or contempt for, public opinion. Impassioned 'self-expression,' or, more accurately, the creation of a dramatic image, precedes communication and analysis. One should remember in this regard that on stage the emotional effectiveness of a given moment often counts for more than the precision and depth of skillful dissection: one can turn a page in a book to reread a passage, but to freeze a sequence on stage is impossible. Moreover, since subtle effects reach only the first few rows, the stage calls for exaggeration - a heightening that is one of the mainstays of Romantic prose.³³ During the 1830s Russia, audiences evinced an appetite for overstatement and purple patches that surpassed the inherent hyperbole of the dramatic mode, as may be deduced from the popularity of melodramas by N. V. Kukol'nik /1809-68/ and N. A. Polevoj /1796-1848/ during Nicholas I's reign³⁴ and of adaptations from Eugène Scribe's melodramas and vaudevilles, which far outnumbered works by any other playwright staged throughout the 1830s.³⁵ In accordance with such relentlessly overblown taste, when individuals in Romantic fiction are silent, their ostentatiously paraded silence deafens; if they are distraught or excited, the psychological drama which registers that reaction is sufficiently extravagant to capture everyone's shaken attention. That is why Henry James in his marvelous parody of a wilting Romantic in "Washington Square" ridicules her "elaborate reserve" and her "significant silence,"³⁶ for they are

the trappings of the Romantic italicizing mentality.

In brief, Romanticism is populated with exhibitionists of all stripes, and to achieve the antedated impact, their antics require an audience - i.e., voyeurs. Rostopčina alludes to that symbiotic bond in her introduction to "Očerki bol'sogo sveta", when she notes that salons contain spectators and actors /"zritel'i i dejstvujuščie"/ and that "blizkie zakulisnye mesta ot-kryty vsem i každomu."³⁷ Although the loophole through which these observers sidle to literary respectability is their professed desire for a richer understanding of life, they manifestly prefer to live vicariously, without risking ridicule for a mediocre performance.³⁸ In "Činy i den'gi," the zestless sisters of both protagonits - ideally blandopt for a viewer's seat as Vera and Svirskij's 'tragedy' unfolds; Valevič's comrades likewise cannot wait to be regaled with his drama, relived in flashback; and Miksim Maksimyc's experiences as a riveted witness in "Bela" mark the zenith of his existence; when he mounts the stage in the story bearing his name /and turns in a pathetic performance/, the itinerant military narrator promptly usurps his place and his function of voyeuristic reporter. All these onlookers expend their principal energies on watching and reacting. They are the audience whose literary strategy when they put pen to paper presupposes the rhetorical question: "Guess what play I saw last night?"

By contrast to these insipid spectators, some of the more rich-blooded central actors in Romantic prose have the drive to extend their domain and move beyond their allotted parts, to revise the divine script. Narratives that boast such creatures of demonic will /Milton's Satan resurrected/³⁹ often contain a play within a play, in the sense that the actor-manipulator improvises a script for an inner drama that he orchestrates and acts out, 'directing' his cast if they were puppets.⁴⁰ At the cathartic moment /commonly a duel/, the distinction between the two dramas dissolves or is rendered irrelevant; perhaps the divine and human scripts overlap as death provides the immutable denouement. At this juncture the functions of the manipulative figure splinter, multiplying as he dons a mask/

persona /the mask of Greek theatre or the Commedia dell'Arte, and of Puccini's Turandot/,⁴¹ orients the actions to the envisioned conclusion, yet also maintains the watchfulness of an observer. While he adjusts his part to propel his dupes in the necessary direction, he deludes them into believing that free choice guides their behavior. Operas, of course, with their use of masks and assumed identities, offer an obvious model here, as do Shakespeare's plays. Lermontov's and Rostopčina's familiarity with both is beyond question, as biographical data attest: Viardot, Rubini, and Tamburini were regular guests at the Rostopčina house - also graced by Liszt, Glinka, and V. Odoevskii - while Lermontov's references in "Kniaginja Ligovskaja" to Rossini⁴² and to D. Auber's "La Muette de Portici" /known as Fenella in Russia/ and the revealing comparison of Pečorin's valet to a Russian Figaro in "Maksim Maksimyč" suggest that opera was intimate ground to him.⁴³

His readiness to borrow from Shakespeare is evidenced in his frank imitation of "Othello", called "Maskarad", and his "Hamlet"-indebted play, "Strannyj čelovek".⁴⁴

In any case, when Rostopčina's Valevič sets the stage for his sadistic manipulation of Dol'skij and Julija, only to have Dol'skij temporarily deviate from the planned course of action. Valevič reports with chagrin: ". . . vremena šlo . . . a razvjazka ne nastupala." Identical vocabulary⁴⁵ is invoked in "Knjaginja Ligovskaja" /first conceived as the Schilleresque play "Dva brata"/ when Negurova refuses Pečorin entrance to her house because of the ostensibly anonymous letter denouncing his intentions toward her - which he himself sent. Lermontov informs us: "Pečorin ne udivilsja; on prigotovilsja k takoj razvjazke i daže želal ee." /268/

The later Pečorin of "Knjazna Mari" not only cites from Griboedov's "Gore ot uma"⁴⁶ when he recognizes the possibility of a directorial debut for himself, but speaks of his plot to enmesh Grušnickij and Mary in exactly the same language: "Zavjazka est'! . . . ob razvjazke etoj komedii my poxlopočem. Javno sud'ba zabotilas' o tom, čtob mne ne bylo skučno." /67/ And when he kills Grušnickij, Pečorin calls out, "Finita la

commedia!" /118/ /The cynical summation is echoed almost verbatim, in Tonio's announcement, "La commedia è finita," at the end of another work that interpolates the time-honored theatrical expedient of a play within a play - Leoncavallo's opera "I Pagliacci", 1892./ Shortly before he engineers the fatal climax, Pečorin, yet again in terminology that originated in the theatre, broods at the edge of his favorite escape clause:

"S tex por kak ja zivu i dejstvuju, sud'ba kak-to vseгда privodila menja k razvjazke čužix dram, kak budto bez menja nikto ne mog by ni umeret', ni prijti v otčajanie! Ja byl neobxodimoe lico pjatogo akta; nevol'no ja razzygryval žalkuju rol' palača ili predatelja." /93/

Elsewhere he refers to his coquettish games as "comedy" /"Taman'"/ and likens the amorous declarations he exchanges with Vera to opera lyrics: "znacenie zvukov zamenjaet i dopolnjaet znacenie slov, ksk v ital'janskoj opere." /74/ Steady doses of such a lexicon convey an aura of intense self-consciousness that shapes any action into a potential spectacle.

In a more immediate sense, one of the most striking features of Romantic prose linking it to stage is its highly visual nature. People's visible responses, as noted earlier, are detailed with a heavy hand: they pale, shudder, bang their fists on tables, hold their head in their hands, slap their foreheads, catch at each other's arms, and the like. An illustrative instance from Lermontov's "Knjaginja Ligovskaja" involves Pečorin's receipt of a calling card from his examour and her new spouse. His reaction adheres to what the Romantic canon prescribes in such moments of emotional tension: 1/ he starts 2/ his eyes flash 3/ he paces back and forth across the room 4/ he smiles and frowns in turn 5/ he rushes to retrieve the card from the fire into which it fell earlier 6/ he slumps into an armchair and covers his face with his hands. In short, the card unsettles him! But outside of the theatre such a succession of seismic signals is grossly overdrawn. It is all the more regrettable, therefore, that Svirskij in Rostopčina's "Činy i den'gi" reacts in like fashion when apprised that his peerless idol has become

engaged to baron Hochberg.⁴⁷ These descriptive elements are all stage directions, and in a theatre their execution would not appear overdone if handled by a gifted actor. In prose they smack of bargain basement melodrama partly because to describe a gesture in words lends it excessive weight, whereas such physical gestures and tics of behavior in the flesh might conceivably seem natural.⁴⁸ That fiction of the 1830s resorted to such awkward stage ploys testifies that it was still a fledgling genre searching for self-definition.

The visual tendency and its debt to drama also surface in the emphasis placed on costume by both the Romantic fictionist and his dramatic personae. Apparel harmonizes with personal image not only by authorial fiat, for people themselves insist on donning outfits that befit the specific demands of a prearranged occasion. For example, when Pečorin stages his sham farewell to Bela, he puts on Circassian garments, dressing up for the scene; although he ridicules Grušnickij's adolescent craving for epaulettes, he later admits to being a true dandy whenever he rides horseback. Pečorin's duel with Grušnickij, in fact, is first rehearsed through sartorial oneupmanship.⁴⁹

Thirdly, because of its stress on the visual, Romantic prose of the 1830s does not scorn props that are essential to the dynamics of the narrative. Such objects, on which psychological states and plot reversals hinge, are a stock device of drama and opera. Dramatists as dissimilar as Shakespeare, Schiller, and Oscar Wilde /and composers as divergent as Puccini and Verdi/ habitually incorporate them into their script, and the public has come to regard them as necessary, or at least unexceptionable, stage conventions: the handkerchief in Shakespeare's and Verdi's "Ot/h/ello", the fan in Puccini's "Tosca" and Wilde's "Lady Windermere's Fan", the miniature in Schiller's and Verdi's "Don Carlo/s/" and Verdi's "La Forza del Destino", the bracelet in Lermontov's "Maskarad", etc. Prose is a different matter, however, and the identical device in small-scale fiction does violence to readers' sensibilities and strains their credulity. Rostopčina particularly sins in this respect.

In "Poedinok" not only the heroine's glove but also her handkerchief, which, moreover, bears her initials and the intriguing word "abracadabra", figure prominently in the plot. These items dwell too long in the spotlight and thereby acquire a disproportionate significance, especially as they spark off the duel that blights Valevič's and Julja's life and ends Dol'skij's. Lermontov exercises some uncharacteristic restraint here, for though in "Knjaginja Ligovskaja" he invests such foregrounded objects as Pečorin's portrait, Vera's earrings, and Krasinskij's "how to" volume /"The Easiest Way To Become Rich and Happy Forever"/ with clumsy psychological meaning, he stops mercifully short of transforming them into plot catalysts or overly eloquent emblems. And in "Knjažna Meri," through Pečorin's jaundiced perspective, he derides the engraved ring that Grušnickij receives from Mary instead of loading it with connotation.

He compensates for that self-control through other excesses, however: eavesdropping, a device of indirect exposition⁵⁰ rendered acceptable in the theatre by the inherent limitations of stage space, seems artificial in prose. Yet "Geroj našego vremeni", whatever Nabokov's strained effort to justify Lermontov,⁵¹ abuses the ploy unconscionably. "Taman'", "Bela", and "Knjažna Meri" contain thirteen instances conversations overheard accidentally or by design. Such a number implies authorial sloppiness or scantiness of resources rather than thematic intent.

Other devices borrowed by Lermontov and Rostopčina from the theatre and opera include stock characters, such as the captain of dragoons in "Knjažna Meri" and the Klirmovs in "Činy i den'gi";⁵² 'set pieces' scattered throughout the narrative - such bravura passages as Kazbič's song and that of the mermaid in "Taman'";⁵³ and a demonstrable concern with the physical disposition of characters.⁵⁴ One might justifiably argue that novel as a synthetic genre drew on a multitude of diverse sources, but the stage element in Russian prose of the 1830s is a sui generis phenomenon that goes beyond the general question of fiction's hybrid genesis. After all, one must take

into account that none of the writers who applied their talent to drama or fiction in the 1830s could be classified as a bona fide dramatist or fictionist cultivating a single genre. Most customarily tried their hand at poetry, drama, and fiction. Indeed, the most informed and insightful music critic of the time was V. Odoevskij,⁵⁵ whose name, however, is traditionally linked with the development of the povest'. Specialization in the 1830s was absent and boundaries between genres were extremely fluid. Both Lermontov and Rostopčina, who clearly advocated literary vagrancy on a domestic scale, allowed entire passages from their own works to migrate from poem to play to novel. They likewise did not hesitate to appropriate devices from the live stage and to transplant them into their prose narratives, a practise indicative of Romantic fiction's receptivity to the best and the worst that contemporary drama had to offer.

NOTES

* This essay is a revised version of a talk delivered at the 1981 AAASS Convention in Asilomar, California.

- ¹ For the latest contribution to research in this key, see Walter L. Reed, *An Exemplary History of the Novel* /Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1982/, passim, and especially pp. 1-42, for a critical summary of the existent scholarship on the topic.
- ² For instance, K. Močul'skij's reading of Dostoevskij's *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*. Konstantin Močulski, *Dostoevsky*, trans. with intro. by M.A. Minihan /Princeton:Princeton University Press, 1967/, p. 300 ff.
- ³ Reed briefly comments on connections between the novel and drama. Reed, pp. 89-90. The work which most originally explores the relationship between the two is Goethe's theatrical novel, *Wilhelm Meister Lehrjahre* /1795-6/ and *Wilhelm Meister Wanderjahre* /1821-9/.

- ⁴ Walter Allen, *The English Novel* /New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1954/, p. 7
- ⁵ The years 1846-7, however, witnessed a crop of promising large- or mediumscaled narratives: F. Dostoevskij's *Bednye liudi* and *Dvojniki*. A. Gercen's *Kto vinovat?*, I. Gončarov's *Obyknoennaja istorija*, A. Družinin's *Polinka Saks*.
- ⁶ Under Aleksandr I, the Imperial Theatre was the centre of elegant social life. Writers, officers, and government officials always visited actresses backstage and maintained active ties with the latest theatrical discoveries. Puškin, who from his childhood evinced an affection for the theatre and developed a passion for the opera, and especially Rossini /particularly during his Odessa period/, had more opportunity to mix with people from the theatre than did Lermontov, given the latter's repeated exiles to the south. See Ernest J. Simmons, *Puškin* /New York: Vintage Books, 1937/1964/, p. 74. With the construction of the Aleksandrinskij by K. I. Rossi on 31 August 1832, that trend of socializing at the theatre and hobnobbing with performers continued. See *Istorija russkogo dramatičeskogo teatra*, ed. N. G. Zograf, Vol. III 01.1977/, pp. 13-4.
- ⁷ Though the troupe of the Malyj /Moscow's oldest theatre/ dates from the 1750s, the Malyj Theatre received its name and a new building in 1824.
- ⁸ Marc Slonim, *Russian Theater From the Empire to the Soviets* /New York: Collier Books, 1961/2/, p. 32. For a thorough survey of the theatre and its repertoire during the 1830s, see *Istorija russkogo dramatičeskogo teatra*.
- ⁹ Slonim, p. 49
- ¹⁰ B.V. Varneke, *History of the Russian Theatre* /New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951/, pp. 265-7. See Puškin's article, "Moi zamečania ob russkom teatre," where he raises the Semenova/George and Semenova/Kolosova issue. A. S. Puškin, *Sobranie sočinenij v 10-i tt.*, Vol. VI /M. 1962/, pp. 249-53. On the Russian perception of what constituted the dis-

tinguishing features of George's acting, style, see V. Wsevolodskij /Gerngross/, *Istorija ruskogo teatra v dvux tt.*, Vol. I /L./M., 1929/, pp. 474-8, and T. Rodina, *Ruskoe teatral'noe iskusstvo v načale XIX veka /M. 1961/*, pp. 237-47. For further details on the acting style of Močalov and Karatygin, see S. S. Danilov, *Russkij dramatičeskij teatr XIX veka*, Vol. I /L. M., 1957/, pp. 178-94 and Varneke, pp. 247-68. On the foremost participants in the controversy raging over the two actors, see the references as cited in the memoirs of Karatygin's brother, P. A. Karatygin, *Zapiski /L., 1970/*, pp. 308-9

- 11 These cognoscenti acquired their label because they invariably occupied their favorite seats in the front rows on the left side.
The correspondence between Kolosova /who later married Karatygin/ and Katenin, exiled to his Kostroma estate for hissing at a Semenova performance, testifies to his profound understanding of, love for, and intimacy with the stage. Varneke, p. 156, and Vsevolodskij, p. 494.
- 12 Varneke, pp. 157-8. For additional information on Saovskoj's theatrical activities, see Varneke, pp. 157-68, 176-82, and Danilov, pp. 36-40, 126-7
- 13 F. Schiller's *Die Räuber* /1781/ /between 1830 and 1839 staged thirtyeight times in Petersburg and twenty-five times in Moscow/, *Kabale und Liebe* 1784/, *Don Carlos* /1787/, *Wallenstein* /1798-9/, and *Wilhelm Tell* /1804/ won the reverence of Russian readers and theatre audiences alike. In the spring of 1829, Lermontov wrote a glowing report to his aunt, M. A. San-Girei, of the Moscow Theatre's production of *Die Räuber*, with Močalov in the role of Karl Moor. Possibly under the impact of Močalov's powerful performance, Lermontov planned to write a tragedy after *Die Räuber* and *Kabale und Liebe*. The Moscow productions of both *Die Räuber* and *Kabale und Liebe* are referred to in Lermontov's own play, *Strannyj čelovek*. On

Lermontovskaja enciklopedija, ed. V. A. Manujlov /M., 1981/, pp. 624-5; A. V. Fedotov, "Lermontov i Šiller," Fridrix Šiller: Stat'i i materialy /M., 1966/, pp. 62-77, Edmund K. Kostka, Schiller in Russian Literature /Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965/ pp. 49-80

- ¹⁴ N. A. Polevoj's translation of Hamlet, which mutilated and trivialized Shakespeare, was staged in January 1837, with Močalov as Hamlet and M. S. Ščepkin as Polonius. Varnere, pp. 243-4, Between 1837 and 1839 Hamlet was performed in Petersburg twenty-to times, and in Moscow, twenty-three Times. Polevoi in his capacity as editor of the journal Moskovskij telegraf from 1825 to 1834 tirelessly championed Romantic dram and Shakespeare on its pages, and regularly printed translations of Balzac, Hugo, and Sand.
- ¹⁵ Othello appeared in I. I. Panaev's translation from the French. See I.I. Panaev, Literaturnye vspominanija /M., 1950/, p. 57. On the popularity of Shakespeare in Russia during this period, see Istorija ruskogo dramatičeskogo teatra, Vol. III, pp. 36-40. Predictably, German Romantics, and especially the young Schiller, also glorified Shakespeare, and above all Hamlet. On this, see H. M. Waidson T. M. Holmes, "The Shakespearen Strain," The German Theatre, ed. Ronald Hayman /London: Oswald Wolff, 1975/, pp. 27-58.
- ¹⁶ Goethe's interest in theatre was similarly awakened /at the age of four/ by the gift of a puppet theatre from his paternal grandmother. See John Prudhoe, The Theatre of Goethe and Schiller /Totowa, N.J.:Rowman & Littlefield, 1973/, p. 24.
- ¹⁷ Mocalov was identifield with Schiller, Karatygin with Kukol'nik. Lermontovskaja enciklopedija, p. 569. See Lermontov's letter of 1829 to his aunt.
- ¹⁸ M. S. Ščepkin /1788-1863/ was an actor who from 1824 was connected with the Malyj Theatre and advocated acting principles that anticipated K. Stanislavskij's theories.

- 19 Act II, Scene VIII, lines 139-42. Shakespeare also the image in King Lear, Macbeth, The Merchant of Venice, and Romeo and Juliet.
- 20 Elizabeth Burns, *Theatricality: A Study of Convention in the Theatre and In Social Life* /London: Longman, 1972/, p. 143.
- 21 In *Philebus* and *The Laws*. See Burns, p. 8.
- 22 *Totus mundus agit histrionem* clearly embraces the idea. See Burns, p. 8.
- 23 Burns, p. 10. For a detailed examination of the topic, see A. Richter, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* /Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962/.
- 24 Burns, p. 9.
- 25 The word *sud'ba* occurs 278 times in Lermotov's oeuvre, 143 times in his poetry, 84 in his plays, and 47 in his prose. See *Lermontovskaja ènciklopedija*, p. 756. Lermontov's technique in his so-called novels, which lack a sturdy, sustained structure, essentially consists of patching together several *povesti*. Whenever Lermontov scrambles to camouflage the jointures, as in *Vadim* and *Knjaginja Ligovskaja*, the narratives simply disintegrate. In *Geroj nasego vremena*, by contrast, Lermontov resourcefully converts this technical weakness into a key feature of the conscious design by overtly linking the autonomous but related stories into a quasi-novelistic cycle. Nevertheless, the individual units may be read as independent stories and Lermontov originally published "*Bèla*" /March 1839/, "*Fatalist*" /November 1839/ and "*Taman'*" /February 1840/ as such.
- 26 Byron's men of will, like Byron himself, plunge headlong and willfully into action, but invariably mourn the curse of an inescapable fate that has branded them at birth. Byron, with his Scottish Calvinist upbringing and all its concomitant superstitions and guilt, was convinced that

his physical deformity - a limp caused by the unequal length of his legs - was destiny's arbitrary punishment. On this, see the biographies by Peter Quennell, Leslie Marchand, etc.

- 27 See Henry & Mary Garland, *The Oxford Companion to German Literature* /Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976/, pp. 757
- 28 Mixail Ju. Lermontov, *Sobranie socinenij w 4-x tt.*, IV /M. 1965/, 110. All citations from Lermontov refer to the fourth volume of this edition and hereafter will be identified by page number in parenthesis in the body of the text.
- 29 It is no accident that Verdi in his dramatic operas likewise turned to Schiller, Byron, and Shakespeare for inspiration. The libretti for his *Giovanna D'Arco* /1845/, *I Masnadieri* /1847/, *Luisa Miller* /1849/ and *Don Carlo* /1867/ are based respectively on Schiller's *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*, *Die Räube*, *Kabale und Liebe*, and *Don Carlos*; his *I Due Foscari* /1844/ and *Il Corsaro* /1848/ on Byron's *The Two Foscari* and *The Corsair*; and his *Macbeth* /1847/, *Otello* /1887/ and *Falstaff* /1893/ on Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, *Othello*, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* /with elements from *Henry IV*, Parts I and II, and *Henry V*/. Verdi also drew on Victor Hugo, so admired during the 1830s, for *Ernani* /1844/ and *Rigoletto* /1851/, and collaborated with Eugène Scribe, Verdi's librettist for *I Vespri siciliani* /1855/.
- 30 E. Rostopčina, *Sočinenija*, Vol. II /St. Petersburg, 1890/, 88. All citations from "Poedinok" and "Činy i den'gi" refer to this volume and hereafter will be identified by page number in parenthesis in the body of the text.
- 31 See Chapter XXXVI of Part II, Vol. III in Lev Tolstoj, *Wojna i mir*, Vol. II /M., 1966/, 225.
- 32 In drama, likewise, soliloquies are "revelations of protagonists' ... thoughts which the spectator overhears."

Burns, p. 167. That a certain degree of conscious self-presentation comes naturally to all people who find themselves in group situations forms the thesis of an original, provocative sociological study by Erving Goffman which borrows dramaturgical terminology to bring its points home. Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* /Garden City, N.Y.:Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959/.

- 33 "Drama," as Burns points out, ". . . is a heightened form of fiction." Burns, p. 231.
- 34 Varneke, p. 240.
- 35 See the repertoire listing for this period in *Istorija russkogo dramatičeskogo teatra*, Vol. III, pp. 220-338. For additional information on melodrama of this period, see Danilov, pp. 159-62 and Varneke, pp. 239-45; likewise, for vaudeville, see Danilov, pp. 195-208 and for a thorough treatment of the topic, A. Gozenpud, *Muzykal'nyj teatr v Rossii* /L. 1959/, pp. 551-657. Gozenpud discusses the absorption into vaudeville of operatic music composed by Weber, Rossini, Auber, Cherubini, Mozart, Meyerbeer, Bellini, et al. /p. 626/ and the popularity of certain operas in the 1830s /p. 685/.
- 36 In his hilarious depiction of Lavinia Penniman in *Washington Square* /New York: Signet Books, 1960/, p. 111
- 37 She goes on to distinguish between those who perceive with their mind and those their heart, respectively, noting, "pervomu svet - zrelisce; dlja poslednego - on drama!" E. Rostopcina, *Ocerki bol'sogo sveta* /St.Petersburg, 1939/, pp. iii, v.
- 38 On these spectators as "partless actors," see Burns, p. 11.
- 39 On the basis of the underlying empathia between Romanticism and Satanism, the English Romantics turned to the putative villain of John Milton's *Paradise Lost* and fashioned from Satan a heroic symbol that spawned not only the Byronic hero, but also some of the most memorable figures in nineteenth-century Romantic literature. For a survey of the

Satanic will in European literature, see Mario Praz, *The Romantic Agony* /Oxford/London/New York: Oxford University Press, 1933/1970/, especially pp. 53-94. For an all too short but marvelously incisive comment on the post-Miltonic daemonic archetype, see Dorothy van Ghent. *The English Novel* /New York: Harper & Row Publications, 1953/, pp. 163-

-4

- 40 One of outstanding antecedents for the Romantic 'play within a play' is to be found, of course, in Hamlet, where the Danish prince not only assumes the role of a madman and 'creates scenes' both literally and figuratively, but also arranges the 'mouse-trap' sequence in Act III, Scene ii to expose Claudius' guilt.
- 41 The complex question of masks and the related phenomenon of masquerades deserves a separate treatment. It is surely not fortuitous that dozens of Romantic prosaists /among them Jean Paul Richter, Lermontov, Pavlov/ introduce the motif of the mask and the masquerade into their works.
- 42 G. Rossini's operas enjoyed considerable popularity in Russia at this time, and A.M. Vereščagina reported in a letter of 18 August 1835 that Lermontov sang a duet /presumably with someone else! / from the composer's *Semiramide* /1823/. See *Lermontovskaja enciklopedija*, p. 477
- 43 In addition to Lermontov's unrealized intention to produce an opera libretto for Puškin's poem *Cygany*, evidence of his preoccupation with opera abounds. His letter of 1827 from Moscow to his aunt shows that he saw the 'magic opera' *Knjaz'-Nevidimka* by C.A. Cavos /1775-1840/ that year. Thereafter he attended *Pan Tvardovskij* by A.N. Verstovskij /1799-1862/, probably *Rusalka* by S.I. Davydov, *Žizn' za carja* by M.I. Glinka, *Der Freischütz* by C.M. von Weber, *Robert le Diable* by G. Meyerbeer, and possibly operas by G. Donizetti and G. Rossini. Just how well-versed Lermontov was in opera may be gauged by the skillful use he makes in *Knjaginja Ligovskaja* of Auber's *La Muette de Portici*,

which was staged at the Aleksandrinskij in 1833/4. In Chapter II of the novel, while Krasinskij seeks to restore his slighted honor by confronting Pecorin, his social superior, outside the theatre, simultaneously on stage in Act II of the opera the fisherman Masaniello vows to lead an uprising against his mute sister Fenella's seducer, the viceroy's son Alfonso d'Arcos. For the plot of the opera, see the New Kobbé's Complete Opera Book, edited and revised by the Earl of Harewood /New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1919/76/, p.p. 714-7, and Lermontovskaja Enciklopedija, p. 313

- ⁴⁴ Lermontov's attachment to Shakespeare unambiguously reveals itself in his enthusiastic and well-informed letter of 1831 to his aunt about Shakespeare's Hamlet, which /to his indignation/ had been 'transformed' by the French translator J.F. Ducis /1733-1816/. with the French version serving as the basis of the Russian translation by S. Viskovatov /1786-1831/ before being mounted on the Russian stage /from 1810 to 1837/. For the text of Lermontov's letter, see Lermontov, 366-7. In his last known letter to E.A. Arsen'eva /his grandmother/, Lermontov voiced a desire for the complete works of Shakespeare in English. Lermontov, 438. For the importance of Shakespeare to Lermontov, see Lermontovskaja enciklopedija, pp. 622-3
- ⁴⁵ A modest but useful commentary on Lermontov's introduction of dramatic terminology into his Geroj našego vremeni is offered by Gary D. Cox, "Dramatic Genre As a Tool of Characterization in Lermontov's A Hero of Our Time," Russian Literature, Vol. XI, /1982/, pp. 163-72
- ⁴⁶ Although A. Griboedov completed Gore ot uma in 1825, performance of the play in full was delayed until 1831. Repeated fifty-nine times during the 1830s /Istorija ruskogo dramatičeskogo teatra, Vol. III, p. 236/, the witty social satire had an incalculable impact on the prose social tale of the 1830s and inspired Rostopčina's rather idiosyncratic dramatic 'continuation.' Vozvrat Čackogo v Moskvu /1856/

For the history of the problems Griboedov encountered with the play and details of the early production, see Danilov, pp. 87-102. As Danilov points out, shades of Čackij may be found in the personality of Arbenin in Lermontov's Maskarad, especially in his bitter denunciations of society. Danilov, p. 175.

- 47 Dostoevskij, a devotee of Schiller and a budding dramatist in his youth, imitates these lamentable practises in most of his novels. See, for instance, Xozjajka and Prestuplenie i nakazanie.
- 48 Belinskij, mourned, however, that "poetic dramas" which enraptured the majority of Aleksandrinskij audiences were "translations of monstrous Greek dramas composed of sentimentalities, trivial effects, and false situations. or homespun compositions in which inflated phraseology and soulless exclamations degrade time-honored historical names. Songs, dances, opportunely or inopportunely providing a favorite actress with a pretext for singing or dancing, as well as insanity scenes, are inevitable componets of this kind of drama, which evokes clamors of delight and rages of applause." Varneke, p. 295. For Belinskij views on theatre, and especially the Karatygin/Močalov controversy, see the extracts from his journalism collected in V.G. Belinskij, O teatre /M., 1961/.
- 49 Perhaps some of the preoccupation with clothes and their suitability /!/ for a given occasion or 'role' may be ascribed to the influence of the English, who in the 1810s cultivated dandyism. The Romantics' costume, of course, frequently symbolizes their apartness, their uniqueness, as does Werther's yellow waistcoat in Goethe's Die Leiden des jungen Werthers /1774/, the cloak of Byron's morose solitaires, and the like.
- 50 Burns, p. 57.
- 51 Nabokov claims that "the author's use of this device is so consistent throughout the book that it ceases to strike the

reader as a marvelous vagary of chance and becomes, as it were, the barely noticeable routine of fate." Not this reader. See Nabokov's introduction to his translation, Mikhail Lermontov, *A Hero of Our Time* /Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958/, p. x.

- 52 Nabokov acknowledges that the captain of dragoons is a stock character of comedy. Lermontov, *A Hero of Our Time*, p. xviii. The Klirmovs in "Činy i den'gi" resemble the parental opposition to true love that is standard in both tragedy /*Romeo and Juliet*/ and comedy /*Nedorosl'*/.
- 53 These awkward insertions which fracture the novel's progress have an analogue in the arias written by composers specifically as showpieces for particular singers intent on showing off their vocal virtuosity: e.g., Mozart's coloratura aria "Al desio di chi t'adora" in *Le Nozze di Figaro* was added especially for the soprano Ferrarese /alias Adriana Gabrielli del Bene/, and Bellini's "Son vergin vezzosa" in Act of *I Puritani* was composed for Maria Malibran, with whom he was briefly infatuated, etc.
- 54 Lermontov, a pictorial artist with a sensitive eye for the placement of objects in a landscape, takes special care the positioning of his characters in order to enable his reader to visualize the scenes in his narratives. See, for example, the details that go into the scenes between Ol'ga and Vadim in *Vadim*, the minutiae documenting the relative placement of Pečorin and Mary in "*Knjažna Meri*", and other 'confrontation scenes' in his prose.
- 55 For an intelligent treatment of Odoevskij's contributions to music criticism, see David Lowe, "Vladimir Odoevskii as Opera Critic," *Slavic Review*, XL, No. 2 /Summer 1982/, 306-15.

WPLYW DRAMATURGII NA PROZĘ ROSYJSKĄ LAT 30 WIEKU XIX

Streszczenie

Autorka przyjmuje w artykule generalną tezę o oddziaływaniu dramaturgii na rozwój form prozatorskich w literaturze europejskiej, w tym także rosyjskiej, gdzie w latach 30-tych XIX wieku tacy autorzy jak M. Lermontow i J. Rostopczyna pisali sztuki, jednocześnie zacierając granice między poszczególnymi gatunkami literackimi w rezultacie wprowadzenia do swoich małych form prozatorskich licznych środków i chwytów zapożyczonych z dramaturgii /sceniczność rosyjskiej prozy romantycznej przejawia się m.in. w dużej wizualności opowiadań, uwypukleniu roli rekwizytów, kostiumu i przesadnym reagowaniu na słowa i wydarzenia, podsłuchiwanie itp. chwytach/.