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Sergei Nikolaevich Sergeev (pseudonym Sergeev-Tsenskii) was born in September, 1875 and died in December, 1958. The sixty years of his literary career, which encompassed such momentous political upheavals in the history of Russia, were witness also to the most varied developments in literature, ranging from the experimentation of the Futurists to the enshrinement of Socialist Realism as the State literary Word. Such periods of change demand commitment to one or another political grouping or literary mode. It is rare to find a Russian writer whose life spanned these turbulent decades that could state in 1945: "I never belonged to any groupings of writers nor took part in any circles."1

Curiosity is further aroused when the writer is praised by such disparate critics as M. Gor'kii, R. Ivanov-Razumnik and G. Struve. In 1924, Gor'kii called the novel Valia "... the finest book of all that have appeared in Russia during the last twenty-four years."2 In an open letter to Romain Rolland published in Pravda in 1928, Gor'kii stated that "... at this time in the forefront of Russian literature stand two absolutely wonderful masters. They are Sergeev-Tsenskii and M. Prishvin."3 R. Ivanov-Razumnik includes the novels of Sergeev-Tsenskii in his list of the "summits" of Russian literature published after the Revolution.4 G. Struve writes that Sergeev-Tsenskii was "one of the outstanding representatives of Neo-Realism in pre-Revolutionary literature...."5

Led to delve further into the career of Sergeev-Tsenskii, the student soon finds that his works were the centre of lively and controversial critical interest in the decades preceding the Revolution, were
the subject of a spate of polemical articles spawned by the literary battles of the 1920's, were the cause of a spirited discussion of the genre of historical novels and of the fate of the fellow-traveller during the tightening controls of the 1930's. Sergeev-Tsenskii became the recipient of high State honours in the early 1940's, only to fall into official disfavour in the late 1940's. By the mid-1950's he had managed to stage a "come-back" and by the time of his death was regarded officially as one of the staples of Soviet literature.

In spite of his long and complicated career, no extensive studies of Sergeev-Tsenskii have been made by Western scholars; in fact, if he is mentioned at all in English-language histories of Russian or Soviet Russian literature, he is accorded only a few lines. During the last ten years, Soviet critics have published several monographs devoted, for the most part, to Sergeev-Tsenskii's post-1930 works. Recently his pre-Revolutionary stories have become a source of renewed interest; several Candidate dissertations and scholarly articles dealing with this period of his career have been published.

A comprehensive review of all of Sergeev-Tsenskii's works is beyond the scope of my present study; I have chosen, therefore, to concentrate on one large series of novels and short stories, the epopee, Preobrazhenie Rossii (Transformation of Russia). This cycle seemed an appropriate choice since it includes works written from 1910 to 1958 and ranges in genre from historical novels to stories set in contemporary Soviet Russia.

Since no biographical studies of Sergeev-Tsenskii are available in English, I have devoted the first chapter to a general outline of his life and works. In the second chapter I have attempted to
unravel the complicated history of the epopee during the forty-eight years of its development.

Soviet monographs on Sergeev-Tsenskii unroll to the reader an almost *deja vue* presentation of the development of the epopee and of his career. The peaceful transformation of a fellow-traveller to active proponent is somehow all too-familiar; no conflict has taken place, no reconsideration of previously-held convictions are revealed. However, the usual vague reference to a "complicated creative path" alerts the reader to the possibility of thorns along the way. The placid picture depicted by Soviet critics of an author calmly observing and recording the events of the thirty years of Russian history described in the epopee turns out on closer investigation to be not entirely valid.

Textual comparisons of different editions of works in the epopee and examination of journal articles of the 1920's and 1930's brought to light a rather more tumultuous genesis of the epopee and revealed some of the "complications" in the creative path of Sergeev-Tsenskii. The publication of one particular article in the journal *Na literaturnom postu* played an important role in the subsequent literary career of Sergeev-Tsenskii and in the development of the epopee, *Preobrazhenie Rossii*. In response to this article and the adverse criticism which was to follow, Sergeev-Tsenskii extensively revised parts of the epopee. This process is analysed in the third chapter of my study.
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CHAPTER I

S.N. SERGEEEV-TSENSKII -- LIFE AND WORKS

Sergei Nikolaevich Sergeev was born in September 1875 in the village of Preobrazhenskoe in the Tambov province. His father was a school teacher who had served as an Army officer during the Crimean War. His mother was a Cossack, and according to some sources completely illiterate.

In 1880 the family moved to the city of Tambov where Sergeev-Tsenskii lived until the age of seventeen. At the age of fifteen he had entered the preparatory course of the Ekaterininskii Teachers' Institute in Tambov but the death of his parents when he was seventeen prevented him from continuing his studies at that Institute. He enrolled at the Glukhovskii Teachers' Institute where it was possible to receive an education at public expense and in 1895 graduated with honours.

After graduating, he enrolled as a volunteer in the infantry regiment in the Ukraine and in 1896 qualified as an officer and became an Ensign in the Reserve Army. In the fall of that year he began his teaching career and for the next two years taught in village schools, first in Kamenets-Podol'sk and then in Kupiansk (near Khar'kov).

In the fall of 1898 he enrolled in the University of Khar'kov but early in 1899, the University was closed because of the political activity of the students and Sergeev-Tsenskii again began teaching school. For the next five years he moved from town to town teaching a short time in many different parts of Russia -- in the Riazan region, in Pavlograd (near Odessa), in Tal'sen (Latvia) and in Pavlovskii Posad (near Moscow). During these years he travelled extensively throughout Russia, to Siberia
and Central Asia.

The year 1904 marked the end of his teaching career. In the fall of that year he was called up for military service and served in Kherson and Odessa before being placed under house arrest and discharged from the Army for political activities in 1905. He had spoken out against the pogroms in Simferopol' in 1905, testifying in a court inquiry about the role of the police and Army in these pogroms.³ After his discharge he settled in the town of Alushta, a sea-side town in the Crimea, and in 1906 bought a piece of land there and built the home in which he was to live and work for more than fifty years.

He never again resumed a teaching career for he felt that the roles of a teacher and writer are incompatible except in very unusual cases:

A writer-artist all his life searches for the unknown—he is dynamic by his very nature; a pedagogue must deal with the already-discovered, the solidly established. He can perhaps be a virtuoso in his ability to teach one or another law of physics, for example, but he must not change anything in this law; on the contrary, he must repeat it year after year to each new group of pupils.⁴

In times of great need, as during the Civil War in the Crimea, he turned to raising cows as a source of income.

Sergeev-Tsenskii considered the year 1898 to be the beginning of his literary career. His "poem in prose", Polubor was published in an illustrated literary weekly, and the children's story Kovarnyi zhuravl' was published in a magazine for children. This story was reprinted in Lev Tolstoi's Krug chteniia. In the following year two more children's stories of Sergeev-Tsenskii were published in the magazine, Chital'nia narodnoi shkoly, and in 1901 a book of his poems, Dumy i grezy was published in Pavlograd. This year marks the assumption of his pseudonym, "Tsenskii", derived apparently from the river Tsna which flows through
Tambov; according to several sources Sergeev-Tsenskii felt an attachment for this river beside whose banks he had spent his childhood reading classics of Russian literature.⁶

In 1900 Sergeev-Tsenskii, as he put it, "dared to send"⁷ his stories to Russkaia mysl'. Of the three stories he sent, two were printed in that journal in 1903 (Zabyl and Tundra); the third appeared in 1902 in Russkii vestnik (Vret sud'ba). The story Tundra brought him immediate recognition and journals (Novyi put', Voprosy zhizni, Zhurnal dlia vsekh, Obrazovanie) began to request his stories.

The story Tundra is set in a large city which, in its coldness and indifference to human life, turns out to be as desolate and icy as the tundra itself. A humble seamstress finds a few moments of joy with a lover but is beaten to death by his wife and three other women. A student, the neighbour of the seamstress, observes her miserable life and compares the city to the tundra.

And all of them these people, they circle in it as if in an endless whirlwind, seeking an exit, and around them—a desert without end or bounds, and cold, and snow, and you can't see the sun, and the grey sky presses like a burial vault, and because of this it is so awful to live in the tundra, and so they killed her.⁸

In this early story is found a theme which was to occupy Sergeev-Tsenskii for many years. The world surrounding man, whether in the wilderness or in the city, is hostile to him and in his struggle with these surroundings man becomes as savage as nature itself. Man can expect only cruelty from both nature and his fellow man. A person may sometimes prefer to comfort himself, as does the student in the story Tundra, with the thought:

... somewhere there, far to the south, there is a pure high heaven, blazing sun, spring! And I thought that one could live there not seeing the sword hanging above one's head, and I re-
joiced for a second, like a young boy: there is a way out, somewhere far away there is.

But a hollow reminder follows:

The howling tundra beat at my window, and behind the wall lay the woman, beaten to death.  

The theme of the innate hostility of nature to man receives its fullest development in the story *Lesnaia top* (Forest Swamp, 1905). The forest represents the positive forces of nature which are overcome by the malevolent forces, symbolized by the swamp:

No one noticed when the swamp began to rise. Did it happen in the night, more deep and wise than the day, or in the light of day but far from man, shielded by the thick alder groves and pussy willows, or did the morning light guess the secret---the swamp had risen quickly and powerfully and inundated the forest. It seized from below the oaks and birches, as though they were not already in its power, and the trees became still more motionless and quiet than they had been; it triumphantly roared, rushing along ravines, bent the willows and broke the fragile branches; it crawled up onto the high paths and, lazy and satisfied like a dog after the hunt, rested there in the blazing sun damply looking into the sky with eyes dulled as if drunk on its own debauchery.

The heroine of the story, a peasant woman who loves and trusts the forest, loses her way on the swamp-covered paths. She comes upon the hut of a group of peat cutters, who

stood all day in the cold, icy water, cut the turf, cursed, damned the swamp, necessity and the artel owner for whom they worked, damned those people who would be warm because they were so cold.

These people of the swamp savagely rape and murder her, then dump her body into the waiting swamp.

In later stories, nature becomes less inimical to man. To Babaev, the tortured hero of the novel by the same name (1906-1907), the steppe becomes a place of refuge and renewal where he experiences almost mystical moments of oneness with nature and peace with himself.

The fields in *Pechal' polei* (The Sorrow of the Fields, 1907-1919), lie
The earth wanted to give birth to something—-to what?—-not forests not mountains, not clouds, wanted to give birth but could not.

Spring days of the fields—-days of languidly-luxuriant green hopes. They have almost lost faith, it scarcely glimmers, a thousand times deceived and mocked, but with tender love it is even ready to burst into flame. Each clump of black earth is revived by the power of the warm rain and bravely swells. Tender blades of grass chase each other everywhere, racing and laughing; they give the larks flight to the sky from their thickets; they drink the evening dews and stretch higher, higher up to the belly of a stocky shaggy farm horse, and then still higher. Until they stop suddenly and without looking around, frightened, begin to hurriedly finish blooming, to yellow and droop.

There where in the days of summer under the quiet sun the thick and heavy grain ripens, there where the threshing floors are pleased with the harvest, the fields grieve for their unborn. Listen——they complain to the deaf horizon: "It is not as it should be."

... And when they shear the fields like the wave of the swelled sheep are shorn, immediately they become somehow useless and empty, pitiful and oppressed, timid; and the fields beg the autumn clouds to have pity and wrap them from head to foot in snow and hide them from the sky laughing at them.  

The sadness of the fields is that they have asked to be defended by those who cannot give defence for the landowners themselves are barren:

The fields beyond the windows were not sleeping in the snow: they were reaching out from everywhere to that unnecessarily muffled-up house, they occupied the cellar. They came in through invisible cracks and stood along the walls, empty and frozen to the marrow, exactly as if they had come to seek defence at the hands of those who were unable to give defence.

The people in the house own the land, but will never really possess it; indeed, they fear it and finally desert it. And on the land remains the peasant Nikita, "a powerful being ignorant (temmoe) the tiller, the
sower, the harvester---who makes fruitful the fields who has something
of the wolf in him but who understands the fields and is understood by
them. But who cannot assuage the sadness of the fields.

The theme of man's cruelty to man was explored in several of Sergeev-
Tsenskii's pre-revolutionary works and continued to be a major theme for
some years after the revolution. Through psychological studies he attempt­
ed to find the motivations for individual acts of cruelty as well as for
mob violence.

In the novel Babaev the seemingly incompatible combination of high­
flown idealism and brutal sadism in an Army officer is explored.
Pledged to uphold a social system whose nature he understands and
detest, Babaev's idealism sours into destructive rage. His failure
to find anything meaningful in life leads him finally to carry out
orders he had earlier refused to accept---orders to shoot at rioting
peasants and to put down forcibly workers' demonstrations. His brutal­
ity and sadism, born of desperation, leads finally to his own destruction
when he is killed by a young girl, a member of the demonstrating workers
and students with whom he is in sympathy, but nevertheless fires upon.

Deriabin in the story Pristav Deriabin (Police Officer Deriabin)
finds justification for his cruelty in society:

Russia is a police state if you want to know and the police officer, its backbone. Try taking him away---nothing but jelly left....The police work all the time, don't sleep at night, only because of the police is there law and order.

. . . . It isn't the police that are scoundrels: the people are the scoundrels.17

But he prays each night before he goes to bed and explains: "I, my
friend, understand nothing about life, and therefore pray." And
continues his theme in the morning:
Cruelty is a necessity for us. A way of life, a way of life! Ha, we don't have any kind of way of life, by God . . . . We don't have hard bones, there's nothing to set any hopes on. We lie down and writhe on the ground, son of a bitch, and can't get up. Like now in the Far East---have you thought about it?¹⁸

But, says Deriabin to the young Army officer Kashnev, no one has any respect for the police officer in Russia, they don't give him a respectable place in society but "put him in the corner where the chamber pots stand."¹⁹ "You," he says, "wouldn't be here with me as a guest if you weren't on duty---without this necessity you would turn away from me with disgust---that's a fact."²⁰ For Deriabin cruelty has proven to be a double-edged weapon: it has placed him in isolation from society and then enabled him to take revenge on the society which has ostracized him.

The story Baten'ka (1904) is a study of the psychology of mob violence. A crowd of rioting workers by its defiant mockery of a group of soldiers forces the regimental commander, a gentle man who is fondly called "baten'ka" (old chap) by his men, to consider giving the order to fire. He is hit on the head by a rock thrown by the workers and unconsciously calls out "Fire!" The hatred of the crowd had so aroused the fury of the soldiers that they fire, not once, as commanded, but over and over.

This story, incidentally, found a publisher in pre-revolutionary Russia only with some difficulty. Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote to V. Mirolubov in 1905:

It seems that my story Baten'ka (theme---a workers' riot and its suppression by bullets) was looked over by the editors of your journal, but they sent it back, giving the reason that at the present time "it's no use even thinking about printing it." With similar success Baten'ka has travelled around several more editorial boards and now is resting in a desk or basket of the
journal *Nasha zhizn'.* It is a "story of protest" but the fate of similar protests I have for some time, unfortunately known only too well; to protest within the limits allowed by the censor is somehow even a bit laughable.  

The journal *Voprosy zhizni* printed the story in 1905, along with another of Sergeev-Tsenskii's stories of protest, *Sad* (The Garden), and was closed down by the censor for having done so.  

Ironically, Soviet censors did not like the stories either, though for completely different reasons: the workers in *Baten'ka* are not flatteringly described, and the hero of *Sad* assassinates an important landowner in an act of individual terrorism. Both the stories were published once in 1923, severely criticized by influential RAAP critics, and were republished again only after many years---*Sad*, in the *Sobranie sochinenii* of 1955-56 and *Baten'ka* in a collected works of 1963.  

The role of fate in human life---the collapse of a carefully-planned existence and ruin of security earned by hard work---is a theme of such stories as *Difterit* (*Diphtheria*) and *Dvizhenie* (*Motion*). In both these stories a man's life work, everything that had made his life valuable to himself as an individual, proves to be illusory and subject to the vagaries of fortune.  

The first story, *Difterit*, written in 1904, seems to affirm the powerlessness of man before fate. It ends with the words:  

> He, the bereft hero, stood malicious, crushed, uncomprehending, and greedily and cruelly beat and pursued the horses as if he wanted to overtake and crush Fate.  

*Dvizhenie*, written in 1910, is a comment on the worthlessness of false values which cannot withstand the terrible blows that life sometimes brings.  

The years preceding the First World War brought a new theme into
Sergeev-Tsenskii's work—the theme of transformation of a man's life by some act of violence. The novel, *Preobrazhenie* (Transformation) which Sergeev-Tsenskii worked on from 1912 to 1914 and the story *Naklonnaia Elena* (Tilted Elena) written in 1913, are detailed studies of the unbalanced state of mind of desperate men; both depict events which lead up to a violent crisis in these men's lives. The young engineer in *Naklonnaia Elena* observes the terrible working conditions in the mines, knows himself to be powerless to bring about any change in the miserable lives of the miners, does not see any possibility of change in a society which allows such horrors to exist and is led to the decision to end his own life. He is prevented from doing this when a miner, whom he had fired for cruelty to the horses in the mine, attacks him and attempts to kill him. His chance salvation breaks the train of events and state of mind which had brought him to the point of suicide and he emerges from the experience with a new belief in life and a feeling of fraternity with the miners who had tried to kill him. He writes at the end of the story:

... the only poetry I believe in now is the poetry of work, the most crude, the most rough kind of earthly labour which heals everything, brightens everything.26

This story was to be the first part of a novel but the First World War interrupted Sergeev-Tsenskii's work on it and the rather unsatisfactory ending, which leaves the reader wondering just where this new-found belief in honest toil is to lead the young engineer, remained unresolved until 1953 when Sergeev-Tsenskii added seven more chapters to the story and included it in the epopee *Preobrazhenie Rossii* with a new title, *Preobrazhenie cheloveka* (Transformation of a Man).

The novel *Preobrazhenie* which was to have been the first in a long
series of novels was similarly interrupted by the War. The fate of the main character, Diveev, whose obsession for avenging his wife’s tragic death leads him to the attempted murder of her former lover, an act of violence which was supposedly to transform his life, was also undecided, for Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote nothing during the years of the War. He commented later on his silence:

That most terrible and criminal of wars not only toppled over the love and respect for culture which had grown in me from childhood, but completely devastated me . . . . It was my opinion in those years that 'when the cannons speak, the muses should be silent' especially since it was impossible to write truthfully about the war or take a strongly anti-war stand because of the ferocity of the censor--and I could not think of anything else.\textsuperscript{27}

Except for one short story, written in November 1918, \textit{Kapitan Koniaev}, (Captain Koniaev) and one sketch, \textit{Khutor 'Baby'}, (The Womens' Farm) written in 1920, his silence continued through the difficult years of the Civil War and occupation of the Crimea.\textsuperscript{28}

These years of silence in Sergeev-Tsenskii’s creative life were not without events in his personal life. In August 1914 he was called up for military service and attached to a militia detachment of the Sebastopol garrison.\textsuperscript{29} He served there until August 1915 when he was freed from military service along with another writer of anti-military tendencies, A. I. Kuprin.\textsuperscript{30} He returned to his home in Alushta for what was to be a thirteen-year long stay. From the end of 1915 until the middle of 1928 he did not leave the Crimea at all.\textsuperscript{31}

At the end of 1919 he married a widow from Ekaterinoslav, Khristina M. Bunina and adopted her ten-year old daughter. Their life together and the death of their daughter a victim of typhus, were to be the subject of autobiographical stories of later years. (\textit{V grozu}, 1922 [\textit{Into the Storm}].)
His marriage took place amidst anxieties brought about by the uncertain political situation during those years in the Crimea.

In March, 1918, he was summoned by the Alushta town Soviet and on arrival there was surrounded by armed soldiers. Someone shouted at him to jump out of the window, otherwise he would be shot. He managed to escape and went into hiding. A few days later the central regional newspaper printed in Simferopol', Pravda Tavridy, revealed that this attempt on his life was the work of a local group of officials who were "preparing a Bartholemew's night for the intellectuals." Sergeev-Tsenskii's name headed the list of twenty-six proscribed intellectuals. The Sovnarkom of the Crimea condemned this "chistka". Shortly afterwards another attempt was made on his life by armed individuals who had been told that he was a Colonel of the White Army. In the autumn of 1918 when Wrangel's armies succeeded in occupying a large part of the Crimea, he refused to join the White Army and again had to go into hiding. In May of 1919 he received a mandate from the Military-Revolutionary Committee of the Crimean SSR placing him under the highest protection of Soviet power and was given a rifle by local authorities to use in self-defence. In November of 1920 the Red Army finally succeeded in establishing Soviet power in the whole of the Crimea.

The famines which followed the final defeat of Wrangel and the occupation of the Crimea by the Red Army forced Sergeev-Tsenskii in 1921 to try and sell his property. His selling price was 150 pounds of flour---but he could find no buyers at that price. He decided to go to Petrograd and wrote to Gor'kii in Moscow asking for his help. Gor'kii promptly replied with the following document:

Respected comrades! I urgently ask your assistance in helping the very famous writer S.N. Sergeev-Tsenskii to leave for Petrograd
where his presence is essential for literary work in Kompros.
I will be extremely thankful if you will do all that is poss­
ible to expedite and facilitate his move to Petrograd.
Greetings. 6/11-21. 33

Sergeev-Tsenskii did not make use of the document; his situation was
no doubt eased by a telegram signed by Kalinin and Lunacharskii to the
Revolutionary Committee in Simferopol' which was sent sometime in 1921:

We ask you to give protection to the writers Trenev, Shmelev,
Tsenskii, Elpat'evskii. In the event of any charges being laid
against any of them telegraph immediately to MOSCOW NR 1143;K. 34

A decree of the Praesidium of the Revolutionary Committee of the
Crimea, dated May 13, 1921, resulted in the issuance of a Charter of
Immunity to Sergeev-Tsenskii by the Soviet of People's Commissars of the
Crimean SSR on January 11, 1922. The Charter stated that his house and
books were not subject to requisition, gave him permission to use books
from all government institutions, provided for the issuance of any necessary
permits or travel documents, and, most important of all, allowed him to
receive the rations of food provided for academic workers. The last
sentence of the Charter gives some indication of the uncertain situation
still prevailing in the Crimea in 1922: "In the event of any instigation
of persecution against him, the Krymnarkompros should immediately be made
aware of it." 35

The decree of May 1921 afforded him enough security that after seven
years of almost complete silence, he again began to write stories depicting
the world he saw around him---the Crimea reeling under the successive
occupations of Wrangel's forces, the Red Army, again Wrangel, with all the
accompanying disorder that such changes of power bring. Cruelty, violence,
opportunism, starvation, revenge---these are the themes of his stories of
1921 and 1922, Chudo (A Miracle) Rasskaz professora (The Professor's Tale),
Zhestokost' (Cruelty), V grozu and of the play, Khoziain (The Landlord).

In June 1923, Gor'kii, who was living abroad by then, wrote urging Sergeev-Tsenskii to join him:

I think, Sergei Nikolaevich, that Shmelev and Umanskii frighten you in vain. You should come here if only for a short time in order to publish your books and in this way to strengthen your rights of ownership for them in Europe. . . . It is easy to work here. Abandon your cows, come here and publish. Never has Russian literature been as necessary as now, believe me.36

And evidently Sergeev-Tsenskii seriously considered not only going abroad for a short time, but immigrating for he wrote to the critic, A.G. Gornfel'd in 1923:

I have decided not to go anywhere abroad but to sit at home and write something interminable to keep away boredom. . . . I am now engaged in raising cows---in this way I manage to exist.37

That "something interminable" was the continuation of Preobrazhenie.

From 1918 to the beginning of 1926, Sergeev-Tsenskii published very few new works and those that were published appeared in regional almanachs and literary miscellanies. The only journal which published his works in these years was A. Lezhnev's privately-owned journal, Rossiia. In number 6, 1923, of Rossiia appeared a chapter from the novel Preobrazhenie, "Chelovek cheloveku" and in number 1, 1924, the amusing story of village life Khutor "Baby". The story Kapitan Koniaev was published in the literary miscellany, Otchizna (kn. 1, Simferopol', 1919) under the title Smes'. The 1921 story, Chudo, was first published under the title Donnaia mina in 1922 in Iuzhnii Al'manakh (kn. 1, Simferopol') and republished in 1923 by Grzhebin in Berlin.38 It has not been published again in the Soviet Union in spite of Gor'kii's comment on it:

I've just read your Chudo, an excellent piece of work! I'll persuade the Americans to translate it.39
The story *Rasskaz professoia* (1921) waited eight years before being published in full in 1928. Two chapters were published in a 1924 edition of the literary anthology, *Nedra* (kn. 4, M., 1924). The play *Khoziain* has not yet been published in full; some scenes were printed in the journal *Nauka i religiia* under the title *Million i odno ubiistvo* in 1960 (number 7).

The 1922 stories, *Zhestokost'* and *V grozu* remained unpublished until 1926 and 1927 when they were accepted for publication in *Novyi mir*. The story *Zhestokost'*, which Polonskii, editor of *Novyi mir*, called "a powerful work" in a letter to Gor'kii, was evidently published in an abridged version for in 1926 Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote to the artist Repin: I am sending you a copy of the story *Zhestokost'*---you will have to use your imagination for eight pages in the middle."

These years, 1918 to 1926, were, as is well known turbulent years in the history of Soviet literature. They are characterised by grouping and re-groupings of writer, shiftings of opinion and alliances, fierce rivalries and disputes. For writers who chose not to ally themselves with one or another group, who remained isolated from even such undogmatic groups as the Serapion Brothers and Pereval, making the connections necessary for publication was no easy task. Sergeev-Tsenskii lived in the Crimea during these years and did not join any writers' groups or circles. It is not surprising then that few of his works were published in Moscow journals during these years; indeed, he apparently did not even submit his works to the one journal which consistently accepted works of the older pre-revolutionary writers, *Krasnaia nov'*. 
for Voronskii wrote to Gor'kii in 1925 in reply to Gor'kii's suggestion that Krug publish some works of Sergeev-Tsenskii:

We have exchanged letters I don't know how many times but besides one story which V.V. Veresaev found worthless (and that is the case), I can't get anything else out of him. In any case, I'll write once again.45

With the July, 1925 Resolution of the TSK RKP (b), "On the policy of the Party in the field of Belles-Lettres" the situation of fellow-traveller writers eased considerably. The appearance of new journals like Novyi mir (June 1925) gave them more opportunity to publish their works and gave to Sergeev-Tsenskii, judging from his sudden renewal of creative activity, encouragement to continue his literary career.47 V. Polonskii, on assuming editorship of Novyi mir at the beginning of 1926, invited Sergeev-Tsenskii to contribute to the journal. He wrote to Gor'kii on January 27, 1926:

I've managed to attract Sergeev-Tsenskii out of his Crimean seclusion. He is still the same—a little gloomy, philosophical, but a vivid and strong master of the language. . . . It turns out that he has written a lot in the last few years.48

In the next three years, 1926, 1927 and 1928, works of Sergeev-Tsenskii appeared in ten numbers of Novyi mir.49 Beginning in 1926 Krasnaia piva also began to publish his works regularly. In 1927, after long negotiations, Krasnaia piva began publication of Obrechennye na gibel' and in 1928 and 1929 published five short stories.50

Sergeev-Tsenskii's writings from 1925 on cover a very wide range of genres including historical novels, stories and plays, stories and sketches of contemporary life, articles on historical events and literary figures. A mere listing of these works would add nothing to our understanding of his literary career; a detailed analysis is outside the scope of the present study. I will not, therefore, give a year-by-year chronology of
works published but for the period 1925 to 1940 will approach the works in terms of their subject matter, and will concentrate on the more interesting ones. Parts of the epopee Prebrazhenie Rossii which were written during these years will be described in another section of my study.

Beginning in 1924 fictionalized accounts of the lives of Russian writers of the previous century became a popular subject for Soviet authors and after the publication of the 1925 Resolution "On the Policy of the Party in the Field of Belles-Lettres" which stated that the "party . . . must in every way possible struggle against frivolous and scornful attitudes to the old cultural inheritance. . . ." publication of such works became easier. Ol'ga Forsh published in Krasnia Nov' in 1925 (number 6) excerpts from her novel Sovremenniki about Gogol and his times; N. Ognev's story about the poet Polezhaev appeared in that journal in the same year (number 10). Iurii Tynianov's novel about V. Kiukhel'beker, Kiukhlia, was published also in 1925 and was followed by Smert' Vazir-Mukhtara, a novel based on Griboedov's life (Zvezda, 1927 and 1928).

The life of Lermontov attracted the pens of several authors. As Polonskii noted in a letter to Sergeev-Tsenskii dated 27 September 1928: "Lermontov has been very lucky: Pil'niak, Ognev, and D. Petrovskii have all written stories about his---yours was the first." Late in 1924 Sergeev-Tsenskii began writing a play about Lermontov, Poet i chern'; he completed it in 1925 and in that year wrote a story with the same title. In 1926 he wrote to Repin "In the fall one of the Moscow theatres plans to produce my play Poet i chern'." It was not staged however. The short story was published in Novyi mir in 1928 (Numbers 7 and 8) and the play in 1934. Two more stories about Lermontov followed; Poet i poet
(1929) and Poet i poetessa (1928). The three stories make up the trilogy-

ovel Mishel' Lermontov. As well, he wrote a short story about Gogol',
Gogol' ukhodit v noch', a novel about Pushkin, Nevesta Pushkina and three
plays, Zhenit'ba Pushkina, Pushkin v Tiflise and U groba Pushkina. The
story about Gogol' was to be the third part of a trilogy; the first two
parts were to be entitled Gogol' bezhit ot nochi and Noch' nastigaet
Gogolia. They were never written.

During the late 1920's and the 1930's works about classical authors
were considered to be an important part of the task of educating the
Russian people to appreciate their cultural heritage, and, as such, had
to present an 'image' of the author that would serve to inspire people in
the difficult struggles of the Five Year Plan periods. Writers had to be
super-human, not subject to the self-doubts and despair of the ordinary
mortal. But Sergeev-Tsenskii chose to depict writers as people and not
as catalogues of desired virtues. In a letter to Gor'kii, written in
1927, he emphasizes:

I wanted as far as possible to restore Lermontov as a person
and not depict a strutting theatrical personage.

He is even more explicit in a letter to G. Stepanov in 1950:

There should be something of the personality of a writer in a
story about him . . . a writer in a story should be a living
person and not a codex of social mores on wooden feet.

The critics of the time, however, did not agree with this point of
view and a glance at the titles of some articles shows the trend of the
critical response to Sergeev-Tsenskii's works on Lermontov, Pushkin and
Gogol': "Poeziia koshmarov i uzhasov", "Genii, prinizhennyi portretistom,"
"Bezdarnaia pachkotnia".

Many years later, in a letter written in 1950, Sergeev-Tsenskii
described the difficulties he had experienced working in this genre to a
young writer who had asked for his advice:

They shouted at me both verbally and in print: "You haven't given us our Lermontov, our Gogol' nor our Pushkin" (about the latter they shouted especially loudly). It came to the point that one type (he didn't tell me his name) said word-for-word the following: "You should have depicted to us our Pushkin! What is that? That is, since he was a gentleman of the Emperor's bed chamber and had access to the Court, you should have described the scene of Pushkin's assassination of Nikolai Palkin! ---so it didn't happen, are you sure of that? Or did it? What does that matter? It should have happened, otherwise what the hell use is your Pushkin to us!" And regarding Gogol', I was even warned not to take it into my head to actually write the two remaining parts of the trilogy Noch' i Gogol'. "We have commissioned," they said to me, "Comrade Shkap to write about Gogol'. He will write about him---you are not to do it." I have not written any more about our writers, not even about Gor'kii.63

In the light of this letter, Sergeev-Tsenskii's foreword to the story Gogol' ukhodit v noch', written in 1928 and first published in 1933, is not without its ironic aspects:

The story offered to the reader is the third part of the trilogy Noch' i Gogol' in which I, to the best of my powers, try to uncover the reasons for the tragedy of Gogol'---his inability to complete to the end his planned work, Mertvye dushi. By "noch" in my trilogy I mean Russia under Nicholas. 64

Sergeev-Tsenskii's stories dealing with the realities of life in the 1920's and 1930's are, in the main, ignored by recent Soviet studies of his works. Stories about the Civil War period and first years of Soviet power in the Crimea, if they are mentioned at all, are characterized as "aberrations in the creative work" of the author. 65 Stories such as Pavlin (date of writing unknown, first published in 1928) Nazad k predkam (written in 1926 and V poesde s iuga (date of writing unknown, first published in 1934) are recalled only in the Putevoditel' chronology and in bibliographies of the author's works. Many of these stories were published only once in a journal of the time and have not been re-published; others were included in selected works of the author once or twice during
the late twenties and early thirties and ignored after that. The Sobranie sochinenii v 12 tomakh published in 1967 includes eight stories from this period which waited at least thirty years, most often more, for re-publication. Unfortunately, at least ten more stories are still awaiting inclusion in a contemporary collected works of the author.

These stories are of greater literary value, in my opinion, than the published and re-published, praised and re-praised works of Preobrazhenie Rossii written during the last years of Sergeev-Tsenskii's life. Wanton cruelty, whether in the name of a political ideal or simply for its own sake (Staryi poloz, Zhestokost'), the dislocation of simple, harmless peoples' lives by political events of which they are barely aware and do not understand (Blistatel'naia zhizn'), the reduction of a society to primitive, almost primeval conditions and morality by hunger (Nazad k predkam), the seeming pointlessness of human existence (V grozu)---these are some of the themes which concerned Sergeev-Tsenskii during these years.

Many of these themes had occupied Sergeev-Tsenskii in his pre-revolutionary works. His concern with such problems as peasant brutality, and the viciousness of the mob, resulted in a certain fear of the peasant masses. This feeling was shared by other writers of the early twentieth century such as Gor'kii and Kuprin. We find in Kuprin, as in Sergeev-Tsenskii, vivid descriptions of peasant brutality; for example, the beating of Buzyga in the story, The Horse Thieves. Of Gor'kii, Bertram Wolfe writes:

Only the peasants he sometimes treated as an impersonal category, for he had seen and experienced so many bitter things among peasants. . . . at twenty-three he had been beaten into unconsciousness when he tried to save a naked women who was being horse-whipped publicly through a village street by her husband and followed by a howling mob, because she had been taken in adultery. These experiences of his young manhood made him fear the peasant
and hate him. In 1922 in his O Russkom Krestyanstve he sought to rationalize this hatred.67

Sergeev-Tsenskii's fear of brutality, especially when manifested in mob violence, did not end with the revolution and he continued to comment on the psychology of cruelty and mob brutality:

A man who has been beating [another man] walks away from his victim outwardly righteous and full of pride, but inwardly he sometimes even feels shame.

Now so a crowd. Delicate feelings are unknown to it. A crowd when it is howling does not clamour, but condemns; a crowd doesn't reason, but makes a judgement from two words; a crowd doesn't beat but executes and a person that suffers the beating of a crowd knows that he will not get up again.68

Passages such as these were met with something less than enthusiasm by many Soviet critics, and evoked Sergeev-Tsenskii's angry comment to Gor'kii about contemporary criticism:

... they criticize me because in one of my stories an eagle-owl devoured a peacock (evidently the peacock should have eaten the owl) and a former Red Army soldier killed a snake (it seems, the snake should have killed the former soldier). As a result of such nonsense my works are being forbidden.69

This 1929 letter to Gor'kii followed a telegram Sergeev-Tsenskii had sent to Moscow asking Gor'kii to intercede for him with the publishing houses who were holding up publication of his works. Since 1925 Gor'kii had been urging editors to publish Sergeev-Tsenskii's new works70 and in 1927 he appealed to Glavlit for a collected works. In that year the privately-owned publishing house, Mysl', in Leningrad, had begun publication of the complete collected works of Sergeev-Tsenskii in fourteen volumes. Only one volume was published before difficulties arose. In December 1927 Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote to Gor'kii:

I don't know if you received my letter and the book Zhestokost', the only one which Mysl' has published yet. The remaining new books have been rejected for publication. Even Pechal' polei---an old book---even that one for some reason is forbidden.71
Gor'kii answered immediately:

I shall write right away to Glavlit about your books. I am almost sure that there is some kind of mis-understanding.\textsuperscript{72}

And on the 30th of December he wrote the following letter to A.B. Khalatov, Chairman of the Board of Directors of Gosizdat:

Forgive me for bothering you again. I must call your attention to a grievous injustice committed by someone in relation to the excellent writer, Sergeev-Tsenskii.

His stories, his novel are being printed in \textit{Novyi mir}, one story in \textit{Krasnaia niva}, his novel \textit{Valia} is being published by Gosizdat. He is first-rate stylistically and our literary young people should learn from his novels.

And, you see, the publisher Mysl' wanted to publish a collection of his works, has published already one volume, and someone has forbidden them to publish the rest. Why?

If this marks the beginning of a struggle with the private publishers and Goslitizdat wants to publish valuable books themselves, then I understand. But is this so? Or do we have here a mis-understanding extremely insulting for this author?

And, moreover, he, like all writers, lives exclusively on literary earnings. Why treat badly a useful and valuable person who has been writing for twenty five years, has been translated into European languages.

I ask for you intercession in this matter. It would be wonderful to see Sergeev-Tsenskii being published by Gosizdat as excellently as is being published Mamim-Sibiriak, for example.\textsuperscript{73}

Khalatov replied on March 13, 1928:

Concerning the question of the publication of works of Sergeev-Tsenskii, the matter is more complicated and about that I shall be sending you in a few days a separate letter and material.\textsuperscript{74}

There is no further mention of Sergeev-Tsenskii in Khalatov's letters to Gor'kii. During the year 1928 Mysl' published six more volumes of the fourteen planned: the remaining volumes were not issued. Gor'kii continued to press for a Gosizdat edition of Sergeev-Tsenskii's Collected Works. He wrote to Sergeev-Tsenskii on the 5th of February, 1928:

I shall not stop nagging the authorities until I convince them to publish your collected works. I want so much to read them.\textsuperscript{75}
After his arrival in Moscow later that year he continued his efforts in person. G. Stepanov recounts the following incident in his book:

A.M. Gor'kii in 1928 was concerned with the publication of such grandiose things as *Istoriia molodogo cheloveka 19-ogo veka*, complete collections of works of Russian classics. In connection with this he was invited to visit the editorial board of GIKHL (State Institute of Artistic Literature). The Director of GIKHL at that time was Lebedev-Polianskii. He got up and said: "Comrades, it isn't usually accepted to call living writers, classics. But among us to-day is a living classic, Aleksei Maksimovich Gor'kii. And I suggest that we begin the publication of Russian classics with a full collection of the works of Gor'kii." Everyone, of course, applauded. But Aleksei Maksimovich suddenly got up and said: "Well, if it has been agreed to begin publication of Russian classics with living writers, then I suggest beginning not with me but with another of our living classics; namely, S. N. Sergeev-Tsenskii." "With whom, with whom," asked Lebedev-Polianskii, "It seems that I am not hearing right." "Well, if you didn't hear right then I shall repeat my words. I think it essential to begin publication of the classics with a full collection of the works of Sergeev-Tsenskii." "Are you joking, Aleksei Maksimovich?!" Lebedev-Polianskii said, leaning back with feigned laughter. "I didn't come here to joke!" said Gor'kii and angrily kicked aside his chair to a corner of the room and left the board meeting.

Sergeev-Tsenskii's revenge was long in coming, but nevertheless pleasurable, judging from his account of an incident in 1947:

Not long ago I was at a session of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR for a by-election of new members. Lebedev-Polianski was a candidate for active membership of the Academy. I voted against his election. Why? I saw that the current problems of our literature didn't interest him at all. He was born with a volume of Chernyshevskii between his teeth and hasn't let go of it once in his life. At last he plucked up courage and wrote a book about Dobroliubov. . . . Lebedev-Polianski has lived always with his eyes fixed on the past. However he was elected an Academician.

A collected works of Sergeev-Tsenskii was not printed until 1956-57.

There is one genre which is significantly absent from Sergeev-Tsenskii's literary works of the late 1920's and 1930's---sketches and stories on the theme of reconstruction. Aside from one sketch, Khar'kovskii traktornyi (*Izvestiia*, November 23, 1932) and one short story, Zagadka
koksa (1934) he took no part at all in "Five Year Plan literature." The pressure on writers to contribute to the success of the Five Year Plans started with the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Party on December 28, 1928 which stated:

The Central Committee considers it necessary to a greater extent than heretofore to see to it that mass literature be an instrument for the mobilization of the masses around the basic political and economic tasks (in the first instance, the industrialization of production, the raising of the productiveness of agriculture and of its socialist rebuilding).  

In mid-1929 Literaturnaia gazeta began to feature a regular section called "Na fronte sotsialisticheskogo stroitel'stva" where sketches written as a result of writers' trips to factories were published. The first such sketch by N. Ognev appeared on the 25th of June 1929 to be followed by sketches by V. Kataev (July 1), P. Pavlenko (July 8), A Karavaev (July 15) and others.  

E. J. Brown notes that by 1930  

For the fellow-travellers the most important result of the changed atmosphere was the pressure upon them 'to come into close contact with Soviet reality', or, in plain words, to offer literary support to the labours of the Five-year Plan....Trips around the country to visit various industrial enterprises were organized for them. Most of the leading fellow-travellers took part in these expeditions.  

New journals were begun, two of them under the editorship of Gor'kii---Nashi dostizheniia and Istoriia zavodov. The first was devoted entirely to sketches on socialist construction, the second to the history and development of factories under the Tsarist regime and during the Soviet period.  

Sergeev-Tsenskii's attitude to this literary genre is revealed in his article Moia perepiska i znakomstvo s A.M. Gor'kim. After describing his very friendly meetings with Gor'kii in the summer of 1928 when they spent many hours discussing literature, music and art, he goes on to say of their meeting in 1929 and after:  

I continued as before to be a writer-artist... but he was by
then the Gor’kii of \textit{Nashi dostizheniia, Istoriia grazhdanskoi voiny, Istoriia fabrik i zavodov}, and we talked not about literary topics but about others which occupied him solely for their own sake, but which I could treat only as material for literary works. However, I should add that this material was very difficult to use in fiction and there were very few talents who could master it as an artist should master his material.

I shall take as an example the Bolshevskii Commune of the OGPU \textit{Ob’edinennoe gosudarstvennoe politicheskoe upravlenie}. Gor’kii took me there in 1929 and secured for me the opportunity of going there independently and observing. But to say nothing of the fact that the re-birth of a man is the most difficult of all themes, here it was considerably even more complicated both by the great number of re-born people and, in general, by the novelty of this experience which demanded the serious verification of time. It would have been possible of course to write an article for a newspaper, that would have been very easy and simple, but I refused to write a long story on this theme and I was entirely right. For only a person who was capable of giving more than ten years of his life not only to educating, but to re-educating several hundred of the colonists of the Kharkov’skii Commune was capable of writing such a story. I have in mind, of course, A.C. Makarenko, author of \textit{Pedagogicheskaia poema}.

However, it was not only themes which dealt with the re-birth of people that Sergeev-Tsenskii found unsuitable for writing about on demand. He continues

\ldots the other themes suggested by Gor’kii were also very difficult, although the extreme abundance of works based on these themes has created the illusion that one can come to grips with them if there is the desire and enough stubborn work.

In the rough draft of this article which is quoted by N.F. Fediukova, Sergeev-Tsenskii was even more outspoken about the artistic merits of the Five Year Plan literature:

\textit{Alas, although there was plenty of new material, the laws of the construction of literary works remained old and immovable and that is why when writers seized upon this new material the works turned out to be, in the vast majority of cases, truthful from a factual point of view, but unfortunately not very artistic.}

It was not until 1935 that Sergeev-Tsenskii found a genre in which he could write works both satisfying to himself and which would prove to be eventually acceptable to the critics of the day. That genre was the
historical novel.

In 1934 and 1935 he wrote two novels about the First World War, Zauriad-Polk and Massy, mashini, stikhii. Critical response was varied: some critics praised them as objective depictions of the Tsar's Army during the First World War; more usually they were damned as falsification of history because no Bolsheviks appeared in them. These novels were to be the first two parts of a trilogy Slovo o polkakh tsarskikh; however, instead of writing the third part, Sergeev-Tsenskii, perhaps discouraged by the adverse criticism of these works about the First World War, began working on a novel describing another tragic war in the history of Russia, the Crimean War. Perhaps the popularity that A. Novikov-Priboi's novel, Tsushima, describing the rout of the Russian Navy in the 1905 war with Japan, enjoyed among the reading public made him feel that a novel about the Sebastopol defence might also succeed.

Sergeev-Tsenskii became acquainted with the novel before its publication when Novikov-Priboi discussed the manuscript with him in 1929. Tsushima was published in 1932 and in the beginning of 1933, Sergeev-Tsenskii published an article praising the novel and other works of Novikov-Priboi.

At least one critic traces the technique used by Sergeev-Tsenskii in Sevastopol'skaia strada to the method used by Novikov-Priboi:

The chief feature that Novikov-Priboi introduced to the historical novel was a type of narration, the chronicle-narrative: day after day, month after month, the most important and vital events and battles are described, from the first day of the formation of the sailors to the revolutionary vow of the repatriated sailors along the road to Vladivostok past the perished ships in the Gulf of Tsushima.

This narrative principle was later used with success by other Soviet writers (Sergeev-Tsenskii in Sevastopol'skaia strada and A. Stepānov in Port-Artur.)
Sergeev-Tsenskii had apparently at first intended to write a short sketch of the history of the city of Sebastopol for young readers, but as he said later:

The more familiar I became with the archival and literary materials, the deeper I delved into these materials, the more clearly was revealed the great picture of the Crimean War, with the defence of Sevastopol' in the centre of the events. The contours of a large historical novel became evident. He began working on the novel in 1936 and finished it in 1939.

It is well known that the the thirties, particularly the second half of that decade, saw the publication of many historical novels. Chapygin had popularized the genre in the twenties with Razin Stepan (1926). Publication of A. Tolstoi's Petr I began in 1929, the second volume was published in 1933. Besides the already-mentioned Tsushima, other notable historical novels of the period are Dmitri Donskoi by S. Borodin, Emel'ian Pugachev by V. Shishkov, A. Stepanov's Port-Artur and Sevastospol'skaia strada.

Some Western students of Soviet literature intimate that many of these novels, particularly those published after 1935, were written as if on order from the Party to encourage the growth of nationalism and patriotism in the face of the Nazi threat. This may be true of some works. However, to include, as does E. Simmons, Novikov-Priboi's Tsushima (1932-1935), Sergeev-Tsensky's Sevastopol'skaia strada and A. Tolstoi's Petr I in this category, gives a false picture of the literary history of the 1930's. M. Slonim suggests that since both Peter I and the Bolsheviks brought about revolutionary changes by brutal methods, A. Tolstoi's justification of Peter I's tactics "was, indirectly, a justification of Lenin and Stalin." He continues:

In the late 1920's and throughout the 'thirties and 'forties, the
purpose of Soviet historical novels was usually to show that the oppressed peasants and workmen had always nurtured revolutionary tendencies, and that Communism, therefore, had deep popular roots.

In this context, he discusses V. Shishkov's novels, mentioning that *Emelyan Pugachev* was a Stalin Prize book, Chapygin's novels, and Sergeev-Tsenskii's *Sevastopol'skaia strada*.

In reality, these novels were all greeted by adverse criticism; many of the most hostile articles were published in *Pravda* and *Literaturnaia gazeta*. K. Mironov's 1938 article "Ob istoricheskikh i psevdoistoricheskikh romanov" includes *Emelyan Pugachev* and *Sevastopol'skaia strada* in the latter category. "'Tsushima' nado peredelat" by I. Amurskii treats Novikov-Priboi's novel with something less than respect, as does K. Malakhov's article "Po. protorennoi dorozhke Ilovaiskih." A glance at the article "Sotsialisticheski realizm i istoricheskii roman", published in 1934 after Books I and II of *Petr I* had appeared shows the enthusiasm with which this novel was greeted in the first half of the thirties. All these novels, far from being praised for their patriotic spirit, were severely criticized because they were over-patriotic ("kvasnopatrioticheskii").

Sergeev-Tsenskii experienced great difficulty in finding a publisher for *Sevastopol'skaia strada*. He later described his efforts to G. Stepanov:

The first four parts of the epopee I submitted to the publishing house "Sovetskii Pisatel". The editors looked them over and absolutely rejected the manuscript as an overly-patriotic work. At that same time the editors of the journal *Oktiabr* were also looking over the manuscript. Six months went by from the date of my submission of the work to the journal. I completed writing two new parts and took them to Moscow. The editor-in-chief of *Oktiabr*, Fedor Panferov received me. I asked him if he would publish *Sevastopol'skaia strada*.

"You see," he began in an embarrassed way, "we called an editorial conference and almost all the members categorically
spoke out against finding a place for the epopee in our journal. They feel there is no reason for glorifying the feats of generals and admirals of the period of the Crimean War."

Sergeev-Tsenskii asked Panferov to return the manuscript to him but Panferov thought for a moment and asked permission to keep it for one more day. Sergeev-Tsenskii objected and inquired what good one more day would do when Panferov had not been able to convince the editorial board in six months. However he left the manuscript. Late that evening Panferov telephoned him and said:

I decided to take extreme measures, called an urgent meeting of the board and announced that I would take upon myself complete responsibility for the publication of the historical work of Sergeev-Tsenskii. One of the members of the board began to take exception, saying: "In this work there is not even a scent of Marxism." But I, half-jokingly, put him down: "Do you think Marxism is kerosene? Why must it necessarily smell?!" . . . Tomorrow we will give the manuscript to the type-setters. I am sure that the readers will like your Strada.99

The reading public may have liked it but not all critics were pleased. K. Mironov's article cited above, which appeared after scarcely one-quarter of the novel had been published, as well as classifying Sevastopol'skaia strada as "pseudo-historical", referred to it as "original" in quotation marks, and called it a "fictionalized chronicle" and a "photo-reproduction."100 Evgenii Petrov answered this attack with a spirited defence of the novel and of Sergeev-Tsenskii as a writer:

About what other author would they the critics allow themselves to write with such extraordinary ease that his new work is only a "pseudo-historical" novel and, not even a novel at all, but a "fictionalized chronicle" when only the very beginning of the work has been published as yet. But anything is allowed where Sergeev-Tsenskii is concerned. He is still continuing to work on it, but his uncompleted novel has already received a failing mark.101

Petrov's article evoked a lengthy polemic in the literary press about the historical novel in Soviet literature, and a series of acrimonious
comments on "the writer as literary critic."^102

Late in 1939, articles favourable to *Sevastopol'skaia strada* began to appear; they increased in 1940 and in 1941 Sergeev-Tsenskii was awarded a Stalin Prize of 100,000 roubles for the novel, in company incidentally with A. Novikov-Priboi (for *Tsushima*).^103* V. Shiskov's novel, Emelyan Pugachev received a Stalin Prize in 1946.

I have examined in detail only the criticism of Sergeev-Tsenskii's novel during 1938, 1939 and 1940. I would suggest, however, that the fate of the other historical novels I have mentioned was the same. Not until 1939 did favourable criticism appear to any great degree and not until 1940 and 1941 were they considered to be worthy additions to the Soviet historical novel genre.^104

*Sevastopol'skaia strada* became very popular with the reading public: to date, it has seen fourteen re-publications. More revealing, perhaps, than the number of editions and the official honours the author received for the book are the letters of soldiers and sailors defending Sevastopol which were sent to Sergeev-Tsenskii in 1942:

Your *Sevastopol'skaia strada* is fighting along with us. It is defending Sevastopol.^105

V. Nekrasov in his novel *V okopakh Stalingrada* mentions it as one of the books the soldier had with them in the trenches of Stalingrad:

I take a book from him. *Sevastopol'skaia strada*, volume III, Without the beginning and the end.^106

In 1940 at the request of the Central Theatre of the Soviet Army, Sergeev-Tsenskii prepared a stage version of the novel. On the 18th of September of that year, on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday, the directors of the theatre telegraphed him:

Work on *Sevastopol'skaia strada* is going successfully. The actors are rehearsing with enthusiasm. The stage set is excellent.^107
The stage version, however, was never produced. This dramatization of the novel consisted, according to one source, of six plays. One of the plays, *Khloponiny*, has been published in full; excerpts from a second play, *Vitse-admiral Kornilov*, have also appeared in print. The other plays remain unpublished.

Using historical materials he had gathered for the preparation of *Sevastopol'skaia strada*, Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote still another historical play, *Malakhov Kurgan*. This was to be the first of several historical plays apparently for at the end of 1940 he wrote:

I think in the coming year I shall write for the theatre since, unexpectedly, I have found in the theatre the real living personal interest which I haven't succeeded in evoking, unfortunately, from the publishing houses with my works of fiction.

*Sevastopol'skaia strada*, published by Goslitizdat in a minimum edition of ten thousand copies, is enjoying great success with its readers judging by the many letters I am receiving and even by articles which have been appearing in the press lately. Alas, it will not appear in a repeat edition.

Without pressing further into the reasons why it will not appear again in spite of the interest shown by the reading public in it, I am inclined to think that I would do better to abandon fiction, lay aside the work I have done on the two large epopees, *Preobrazhenie Rossii* and *Dvenadtsatyi God*.

In an article in March, 1941, Sergeev-Tsenskii said that the Malyi Theatre would stage the play, *Malakhov Kurgan*. The interest of the Malyi Theatre in his play proved to be, like the interest of the Theatre of the Red Army, a passing one and the play was never staged. It was published only after many years had passed---in 1955.

In spite of his professed intention, Sergeev-Tsenskii in 1941 returned to the writing of fiction (the award of the Stalin Prize no doubt encouraged him) and in that year wrote a series of stores based on historical themes and biographical sketches of military figures of the nineteenth
century, With the beginning of the War he became engaged in publicistic work like so many other Soviet authors.

The war years saw the addition of three novels about the First World War to the epopee Preobrazhienie Rossii as well as short stories on war themes.

In the spring of 1943 the degree of Doctor of Philosophical Sciences was awarded to him by the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and he was elected an Academician. The war years eased the publication problems of Sergeev-Tsenskii, and successive editions of Sevastopol'skaja strada were published as were editions of his novels of that period about the First World War. The end of the war, however, brought with it a familiar discouragement: Novyi mir refused to publish another of his novels about the First World War and hostile critical articles began appearing again in the literary journals. Zhdanovism had begun and Sergeev-Tsenskii's literary silence lasted from 1946 to 1951.

Although he wrote nothing except a diary in verse during these years, he continued to agitate for publication of previously-written works and, judging by his description of an incident in 1947, the seventy-two year old author did not go about it very tactfully:

Not long ago in Moscow I began to agitate for the publication of a full collection of my works. At GIKHL they said: "We would be more than willing to publish a full collection if they would give us paper." "And who gives?" I asked. "Go to the Central Committee to Comrade Aleksandrov." So I went to see him. He received me quite cordially and after sympathetically listening to all I had to say, said that the situation concerning paper was in reality very tight, and that even the central newspapers were being published in limited editions. I took it upon myself to tell him that once before the war I began to subscribe to all the central and local papers. An I would read through Pravda and pick up Izvestiia. I would see in Izvestiia the same stories as in Pravda. And in a third paper, the same as in the first two. Lastly, I would pick up Krasnyi Krym—in it the same as in the others. One reprint after another. And
I thought to myself: "Why the devil did I subscribe to all these newspapers when you can find out by reading one, what all the others have to say." I said all this to Alexandrov and asked: "Why do you publish hundreds of newspapers when it is possible to combine them into a single one? It might be then that paper could be found for a full edition." Alexandrov replied: "We, ourselves, are struggling constantly for variety of content in our newspapers, but what can you do when so many editors don't like very much to trouble themselves with resourcefulness?"

When he began writing prose again in 1951, he continued his work on the novels of the epopee Prebrazhenie Rossii. His only other works in prose during the last years of his life were articles on Russian classical writers, on Gogol', Turgenev, Goncharov and Lermontov, and articles on the role of a writer in society ("Slovo k molodym", "O khudozhestvom masterstve", "Zhizn' pisatea dolzhen byt' podvigom.")

The last years of his life saw many honours conferred on him, including the Order of Lenin awarded on his eightieth birthday. More precious to him perhaps was the ten volume Collected Works published in 1955-56 and the four volume edition of Prebrazhenie Rossii, three volumes of which appeared before his death on the 7th of December, 1958.
CHAPTER II

CREATIVE HISTORY OF THE EPOPEE

PREOBRAZHENIE ROSSII

In one of the few mentions of the epopee Preobrazhenie Rossii that exist in studies of Soviet literature published in English, G. Struve commented:

Sergeyev-Tsensky... published in 1923 Valya, first in a series of novels meant to constitute a vast canvas of Russian life between the eve of World War I and the present day... It was followed at rather long intervals by other volumes of the same series; several of them dealt with World War I and will be discussed later; their connection with Valya is somewhat tenuous, and the general pattern of the whole series--the title of which is Preobrazhenie (Transfiguration)--remains obscure.¹

The obscurity noted by G. Struve has not been clarified by Soviet criticism of the epopee. Only one Soviet study, a Candidate dissertation,² has been devoted solely to Preobrazhenie Rossii but the epopee has been discussed at some length in several lengthy accounts of Sergeyev-Tsenskii's life and works. These works are, however, of limited value to the reader who is attempting to trace the creative history of the epopee for the methodology of Soviet criticism has been to approach Preobrazhenie Rossii as a fait accompli and to deal with the novels and stories in terms of cycles depending on their story line and historical context. No Soviet critic has attempted to give an orderly account of the development of the epopee, to explore the author's changing conceptions of the work over its half-century long emergence, or even to place the works in the context of their author's development as a writer. This methodology has led to confusion rampant in Soviet studies of the epopee---contradictions and mis-understandings abound.
The task of tracing the development of the epopee has been made difficult by the lack of published material concerning the author's intentions at various times in his career. Articles by Sergeev-Tsenskii about the epopee, or published interviews with him contain little information. Only scattered letters have been published and none of his notebooks. The letters are gradually being published; the notebooks up to August 1941 have largely been lost. Post-1941 notebooks are quoted from occasionally in works about the author, but usually without note of the date of the entry.

Sergeev-Tsenskii published almost no autobiographical material; indeed, he felt that details of his biography were not needed by the reader. In answer to the request of a young writer and lecturer who was giving evening lectures to the general public on Sergeev-Tsenskii for such information, the author wrote:

As concerns my biography—-it is not complicated in the least, and I have written a bit about myself in my reminiscences of my friendships with Gor'kii and Repin. This information is quite sufficient for my readers.

In his official autobiographical sketch published in Sovetskie pisateli, Avtobiografii, the period from 1920 to 1958 is covered in one and one-half pages. The article contains several factual errors which will be noted later in my study when they concern works of Preobrazhenie Rossii. In Sergeev-Tsenskii's only account of the creation of the epopee, the article "Kak sozdavalas' epopeia Preobrazhenie Rossii," there are several inconsistencies in his outline of the history of the work. It would seem that Sergeev-Tsenskii had so little regard for biographical and bibliographical information that he could not even be bothered to give the correct facts.
Another factor which complicated the tracing of the epopee's development was the inaccuracies (one is tempted to say sloppiness) of many Soviet critics. The notes to the 1955-56 Sobranie sochinenii contain errors which quickly reveal themselves when one attempts to use these notes. Some of these errors will be noted in the text of my study. These notes distinguish themselves also by their inconsistency—sometimes they indicate when a work was written, sometimes they don't, sometimes the place of first publication is given, sometimes it isn't. I have had to resolve difficulties such as these by checking every piece of information in the notes, by leafing through journals of the 1920's and 1930's issue by issue, and by ransacking all available bibliographies of Soviet prose.

Critical articles, too, are often marred by errors in factual information. Instances of this I will note where they apply to works under discussion and have made the dating of a particular work almost impossible.

Errors regarding the titles and parts of a single novel are to be found for example in the article of V. Shcherbina, a respected and prolific Soviet critic who specializes in attacking Western scholars for what he considers to be their inaccuracies, while allowing such lapses of fact to creep into his work as stating that the novel Preobrazhenie cheloveka is made up of two parts, Part 1 being Naklonnaia Elena (which is correct) and Part 2 being Zagadka koksa (this work is Part 2 of the novel Iskat' vsegda iskat'!). Part 2 of Preobrazhenie cheloveka is entitled Sud. A few pages later he speaks of Liutaia zima and Massy, mashiny, stikhii as being separate novels. In reality they are the same novel; Massy, mashiny, stikhii was the first title of the novel Liutaia zima. I shall confine myself to mentioning only errors of such an obvious sort, however, errors
of a more subtle kind are widespread in the works by I. Shevtsov and N. Fediukova. 11

I have made wide use of the Guidebook to the Museum of Sergeev-Tsenskii12 for factual information. Since many published works on Sergeev-Tsenskii contain information not based on documented facts, it was decided at the Museum to include a chronology of the most important events in the author's life in the 1965 edition of the Guidebook ("Osnovnye daty zhizni i deiatel' nosti S.N. Sergeeva-Tsenskogo"). 13 This chronology was based on documented evidence; where such evidence was not available, information has not been included. The author's wife, Khristina M. Sergeeva-Tsenskaia, who died in 1965, was the editor of this chronology. It has been my policy, in this chapter of my study to use the chronology as a basic source for dates and, in the case of conflicting information, to use the chronology as the arbiter.

The history of the development of the epopee is a chronicle of works being added—new works being written, older works being revised, enlarged and added. It is a history of works being planned and not written, or of planned inclusion of earlier works which were, in the end, left out. Its theme, "transformation", was chosen early in the author's career—it was, Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote, "close to me from the first years of my creative life; the revolution of 1905 consolidated the theme for me." 14 But it proved to be a discouraging theme for the author suspended work on the epopee several times for periods as long as ten years. He nevertheless said of it:

I am the author of a single book— and that book is the many-volumed epopee Preobrazhenie Rossii. I had a single idea— I embodied it first in sketches, and later came to grips with it in real earnest." 15
The epopee began as a single novel (1914), evolved into a novel in eight parts (1923), into an epopee which was to contain at first ten novels (1929) and then sixteen (1941). In its final form it contains eleven novels, three stories and two etudes.

There have been two full editions of the epopee, the first published in the ten volume collected works of the author in 1955-56, the second published by Krymizdat in a separate edition in four volumes from 1956 to 1959. The last two volumes of this edition were published after Sergeev-Tsenskii's death. A partial edition of the epopee was published in 1963; it contained only five works of the epopee.

The epopee in its 1955-56 edition consists of the following works, ordered according to their date of writing. Two dates after a work indicates a revised or englarged edition.

Valia, 1914
Preobrazhenie cheloveka (The Transformation of a Man), 1914-1954
Obrechennye na gibel' (Doomed to Perish), 1923-1944
L'vy i solntse (The Lions and the Sun), 1931
Zauriad-Polk (An Ordinary Regiment), 1934
Iskat', vsegda iskat'! (See, Forever Seek!), 1934
Liutaia zima (Fierce Winter), 1935
Pushki vydvigaiut (The Guns Move Out), 1943
Pushi zagovorili (The Guns Speak), 1944
Utrennii vzryv (Explosion at Dawn), 1951 (Part 1)

The following works were added in the Krymizdat edition:

Pristav Deriabin (Police Office Deriabin), 1911-1956
Kapitan Koniaev (Captain Koniaev), 1918
Burnaia vesna (Stormy Spring), 1942
Goriachee leto (Blazing Summer), 1943
Lenin v avguste 1914 (Lenin in August 1914), 1957
Utrennii vzryv (Explosion at Dawn), Part KK, 1956
Vesna v Krymu (Spring in the Crimea), 1958
Svidanie (Rendezvous), 1958

Sergeev-Tsenskii's original conception of the theme "transformation" was less ambitious than its final realization. In 1914 publication of a novel Preobrazhenie began in the journal Severnye zapiski (numbers 1 to 6)
Sergeev-Tsenskii had apparently been planning the novel since 1908 for in that year was written a sketch entitled *Blagaia vest'*\(^\text{19}\) which is described in its 1916 publication as "An etude to *Preobrazhenie*.\(^\text{20}\)

Early in 1912 another sketch, *Okolo more*, appeared in *Zavety* (number 2); it was re-published in 1916 as an "*Etude to Preobrazhenie*"\(^\text{21}\) and, beginning with the 1923 edition of the novel,\(^\text{22}\) an amplified version of this sketch forms the first chapter of *Preobrazhenie*.

As early as 1912, M. Gor'kii had written to A.C Nedolin praising Sergeev-Tsenskii, whom he knew only through his published works. With perception he comments:

> About Tsenskii, you judge rightly: he is a very great writer, the most important, interesting and consistent figure in contemporary literature. The sketches which he is now writing are a preparation for an all-encompassing picture, and one can only hope that he will soon tackle it. I read his works with great pleasure and follow with great interest all that he publishes.\(^\text{23}\)

And it was in 1912 that Sergeev-Tsenskii began to write the novel *Preobrazhenie*. His work on the novel and its publication were interrupted by the beginning of the First World War. He wrote to an unnamed correspondent on July 20, 1914:

> You can be sure that there is no one now reading magazines and interested in some kind of *Transformation* on paper when life is transforming itself before one's very eyes.\(^\text{24}\)

It has been impossible to ascertain Sergeev-Tsenskii's original conception of the theme "transformation" and how it was to be developed in the novel *Preobrazhenie*. Was this novel to be the first of a series or was the personal transformation of the characters' lives to be symbolic of the possible transformation of life of pre-revolutionary Russian society? These questions cannot be answered for by 1923, when the first published source gives some indication of the author's plans, his original conception had changed.
Not only the author's conception of the novel, but also its date of writing remains uncertain for published information concerning the creative history of *Preobrazhenie* is contradictory, to say the least. Sergeev-Tsenskii himself states in one article that he finished writing it in 1914 but did not want to publish it in book form because there were threats of war and the time was not suitable. In another article he says that he completed writing it only after a year of service in the Army—he was called up in August 1914 and discharged in August 1915.

Soviet critics are equally contradictory about the genesis of the novel. N.F. Fediukova states that the War interrupted work on the novel and "the writer reconsidered the fate of his characters in working on the novel after October" (i.e. 1917). G. Makarenko says only that the first chapters of the novel appeared in 1914 but that the work remained unfinished and appeared in complete form in 1923. According to I. Shevtsov the novel "was written toward the end of 1912." V. Shcherbina states flatly that it was written and published in 1913. The chronology in the *Putevoditel'* indicates that Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote and published the sketch "*Okolo more*" in 1912, continued working on *Preobrazhenie* in 1913 and during the first half of 1914, and notes that its publication began in the latter year. The novel is not mentioned again until 1923 when its first publication in book form is noted.

It was in this edition, published in Simferopol' by Krymizdat, that Sergeev-Tsenskii indicated for the first time his conception of the theme and plan for the novel. In a foreword dated February 6, 1923 he wrote:

I began to write the novel *Preobrazhenie* in 1913 and in 1914 it began to be published in the monthly journal *Severnye zapiski*.

The World War interrupted its publication in the sixth number of the journal, and the revolution which had begun in Russia
showed me that the transformation of Russian life, which I had hoped for, had become too widespread for its artistic realization in the purely intimate images I had chosen—and a distinct possibility to widen the scope of the novel and thus more powerfully reflect the events taking place was presented to me, the observer. The first parts are devoted to depicting pre-war experiences, the middle parts—to the war, and the last parts—to the revolution.

_Preobrazhenie_ is described in this edition as a "novel in eight parts" with Part I to be entitled _Valia_. (_Preobrazhenie. Roman v 8-mi chastiah. Chast' I. Valia._) Beginning with the first central edition of the novel in 1926, the novel which had been previously entitled _Preobrazhenie_ was published under the title _Valia_ and will hereafter be referred to by that title. The title page in this edition reads: "_Valia_. Roman. Chast' pervaia. _Preobrazhenie._" 34

By 1929 when _Obrechennye na gibel'_, the second novel of the series was published, _Preobrazhenie_ had become an epopee instead of a long novel. In his foreward to _Obrechennye na gibel'_, Sergeev-Tsenskii describes his revised plans:

The novel _Obrechennye na gibel'_ is the second part of the epopee _Preobrazhenie_. Its first part, the novel _Valia_ has come out in its third edition. The first three parts of the epopee are devoted to the pre-War mood and existence of the different levels of Russian society; the three following parts depict the rout of this society during the period of the World War; the remaining four volumes are allotted to the depiction of the Revolution, civil war and the beginning of the building of the new socialist life.

This huge canvas which depicts, against the background of the active masses awakening to independent life, more than five hundred sharply defined characters. It is divided into ten almost entirely independent novels, in which only the last ten chapters serve to connect the parts into one whole—as is done in this book. 35

It has been difficult to determine exactly when _Obrechennye na gibel'_ was written. Most sources indicate that the 1929 version of the novel was completed in 1923 and that date stands at the end of the 1929 edition. The
Putevoditel' chronology states under the year 1923: "Wrote the main chapters of Obrechennye na gibel'" and indicates no further work on the novel until 1944. Shevtsov says that it was written "very quickly" in 1923. Sergeev-Tsenskii gives two contradictory accounts. In the article "Kak sozdavalas' epopeia Preobrazhenie Rossii" he says: "The novel Valia was published as a separate book in 1923 by Krymizdat. By that time I had already written the second novel Obrechennye na gibel'." In his official autobiographical sketch he writes that Gor'kii's enthusiastic response to the novel raised my spirits which had been very downcast due to material adversity and I began to write a lot (the novel Obrechennye na gibel', the stories Zhestokost', V grozu, and novels about Lermontov, Pushkin and Gogol').

Gor'kii's letter was written, however, in June 1923 but the dates "August 1922" and "November 1922" stand at the end of the stories V grozu and Zhestokost'.

N.F. Fediukova gives the most complete account of the genesis of the novel; her statements contradict all other published material:

By that time Sergeev-Tsenskii's idea of creating a many-volumed volume about the transformation of Russian life had become more definite. In it . . . he wanted to reflect three periods of the life of Russian society: pre-War, First World War and revolutionary periods. His intention was that three works, Valia, Morituri and Vypadaishchie iz gnezd, would be devoted to the pre-War period. At the beginning of 1926, the author completed work on Morituri. While negotiations were going on with journal editors about the publication of the novel, the author was busy with the re-writing of the third novel of the epopee Vypadaishchie iz gnezd. In the course of this work, Tsenskii united these two novels (Morituri and Vypadaishchie iz gnezd) into one work with the title Obrechennye na gibel'.

It would seem that Fediukova had access to archival sources untapped by other critics; her reluctance to give sources for her statements, however, makes it difficult to judge their accuracy.
The novel, *Obrechennye na gibel'* followed, like Sergeev-Tsenskii himself, what Soviet critics like to call "a complicated creative path". In its final form, first published in 1955, it consists of twenty-two chapters. The first ten chapters were published in Krasnaia nov', numbers 8 to 12, in 1927. In its 1929 edition the novel was enlarged by five additional chapters which connect the novel to *Valia*—we meet again the characters depicted in *Valia*. The 1955 edition presents the reader with seven additional chapters but according to the notes to this edition and the information in the *Putevoditel'* chronology, the last six chapters were written in 1944, and were first published under the title "*bor'ba za zhizn'" in the almanach *Sovetskii Krym*, no. 3, 1946.

The sixteenth chapter of the novel, "More" is thus left unaccounted for. In this "lost chapter" is depicted the death of one of the main characters in a storm at sea—it ends with his certain death, barring some sort of miracle. And such a miracle is depicted in the chapters written in 1944. After checking Sergeev-Tsenskii's works in the journals of the 1920's I discovered that this chapter, "More", was published as a sketch entitled "More" in *Novyi mir*, number 1, 1926. Since this sketch is not part of the 1929 edition of the novel, it must be assumed that by 1944 Sergeev-Tsenskii's conception of the novel had changed. This chapter which was originally to form part of another novel was appended to *Obrechennye na gibel'* in 1944 as a link to the six new chapters.

Sergeev-Tsenskii's original intentions for the novel *Obrechennye na gibel'* and for the further development of the themes and characters presented in that novel must remain unclear until further information is published. Sharp attacks greeted the journal publication of the novel in 1927 and continued with renewed fervour after the 1929 edition in book form. The 1955 edition of the novel differs considerably from the earlier
editions; not only were seven new chapters added, but also the original chapters have undergone extensive revision. (The critical articles and subsequent revision of the novel will be described in the last part of my study.) During the period from 1929 to 1944, when the original chapters were revised, Sergeev-Tsenskii's conception of several characters had changed; the future that had been implied for them in the title *Obrechennye na gibel'* had altered with the passing years and the author's changing outlook. The "doomed to perish" were resuscitated and became active supporters of the revolution and socialism; the characters who seemed to be the most likely to survive and carry through all adversities their humanistic point of view, perished in the vicissitudes of the First World War.

It was only with great difficulty that Sergeev-Tsenskii found a publisher for *Obrechennye na gibel*. In 1925 he evidently wrote to Gor'kii asking for his assistance for on June 18, 1925, Gor'kii wrote to A.K. Voronskii, the editor of *Krasnaia Nov*:

> Why don't you publish Sergeev-Tsenskii's *Preobrazhenie* at the Krug publishing house? He has already written the second and third volumes. If they are even half as good as the first---it will be an event! I consider *Preobrazhenie* to be the best book of any written in the last twenty five years. It is real Russian art. Even the Americans are enthusiastic and it's very difficult to get them excited about anything except Chaliapin and Pavlova.

In his reply to this letter Voronski wrote:

> I have nothing against the publication of Sergeev-Tsenskii's novel but---and you will forgive me---I don't believe that he has finished two more volumes.... In any case, I'll write again.

And on the 3rd of March, 1926, Voronskii noted:

> Sergeev-Tsenki sent me two days ago several chapters from the second part of *Preobrazhenie*. I haven't read them yet.

In a letter written on July 24, 1926, Gor'kii again reminded Voronskii of.
the still-unpublished work:

It surprises me that Preobrazhenie of Sergeev-Tsenski isn't being published. Krug was to have re-published the first volume published originally by Krymizdat.50

Krug however did not re-publish the first volume of Preobrazhenie, for toward the end of 1926 Gosizdat published this novel and was to have published Obrechennye na gibel' in that same year. We find Sergeev-Tsenskii complaining to I.E. Repin in his letters of 1926 about the difficulties of publishing the two novels:

April 20, 1926: I am sending you . . . an excerpt from the novel Preobrazhenie, a novel much larger in size than Voima i mir and embracing the period of Russian life from the end of 1913 to the end of 1920. When the first two volumes come out (of the sixteen volumes)---and that will be, it seems, not later than July---I'll send them to you without fail.51

July 6, 1926: I wanted to send you this summer my new novel ---I thought it would be published---not very likely! They'll be thinking about it for another hundred years!52

September 17, 1926: The novel Preobrazhenie is unlikely to see the light of day, but if it emerges all the same, I shall send it to you first off without fail.53

By December of 1926, Sergeev-Tsenskii had lost patience and again appealed for Gor'kii's intercession with the "tyranny of the publishers" in order to secure publication of Obrechennye na gibel' by Gosizdat:

The thing is that the first part was published by one editor, a certain Nikolaev, and now there is another one there, a certain Beskin---and the courteousness of the first is equalled only by the Olympian inaccessibility of the second.54

Gor'kii advised him to try the Krug publishing house:

Have you not submitted Preobrazhenie to the Krug publishers? The editor there is A. N. Tikhonov, a very literate man, with good taste. He is an old friend of mine---we worked together on Letopis' and Vaemirnaia literature.55

But neither Gosizdat nor Krug published Obrechennye na gibel'. After the first part was finally published in 1927 in Krasnaia nov', two years passed before the publication in book form of the novel was achieved, again after
appeals for Gor'kii's help. In 1929 Sergeev-Tsenskii sent the following telegram to Gor'kii who was then in Moscow:

I urgently request you to promote the issuing of my novel Obrechennye na gibel' by MTP/Moskovskoe Tovarishchestvo Pisatelei'. Rosental', the assistant of Kerzhentsev, is holding it back. We may assume that Gor'kii's intervention with Kerzhentsev resulted in the 1929 publication of the novel by MTP.

The sequel to Valia and Obrechennye na gibel', which Sergeev-Tsenskii indicated in the 1929 foreword to the latter novel was to be the third part of the section of the epopee "devoted to the pre-War mood and existence of the different levels of Russian society", was never written.

After the adverse criticism of Obrechennye na gibel', initiated in 1927 by an article later described as "in essence ... a police denunciation," Sergeev-Tsenskii apparently decided that it was wisest to avoid further mention of his epopee Preobrazhenie. Works which had been published as "Etudes to Preobrazhenie" were no longer identified as such. The story Kapitan Koniaev was called "An Edute to the ninth part of Preobrazhenie" when it was published in 1926 in Novyi mir (numbers 8 and 9). This subtitle was omitted when the story was included in anthologies in 1936 and 1937. It was not until 1959, when a revised version appeared, that the story became part of the epopee again.

New works written during the 1930's were not published was part of the epopee even though characters from the earlier novels appeared in them. Sergeev-Tsenskii had indicated in his foreword to Obrechennye na gibel' that he would use the device of introducing characters from preceding novels in the last chapters of new novels of the epopee in order "to connect the parts into one whole." Three novels, he wrote, would be devoted to depict-
ing the period of the World War. Two novels written during the 1930's, *Zauriad-Polk* and *Massy, mashiny, stikhii*, depict events of the World War period: in both appear characters from *Valia* and *Obrechennye na gibel*. Nevertheless neither novel is identified with the epic *Preobrazhenie*. They are, Sergeev-Tsenskii noted, the first two parts of the trilogy *Slovo o polkakh tsarskikh*. It was not until 1944 that Sergeev-Tsenskii listed these novels among the works of the cycle *Preobrazhenie*.

*Zauriad-Polk* was first published in 1934 (*Znamia*, numbers 9 to 12) and subsequently appeared in book form in 1935. Twenty years were to pass before it was published again in the *Sobranie sochinenii* of 1955-56, when, in a slightly revised version, it became part of that edition of *Preobrazhenie Rossii*.

According to the *Putevoditel'* chronology and other sources, *Zauriad-Polk* was written in the first part of 1934. Sergeev-Tsenskii stated in a notebook in 1943 that he had completed seven signatures, half of the novel *Zauriad-Polk*, in the month of November, 1934. Since the novel was published in the fall of 1934, it seems that he may have been thinking of its sequel, *Massy, mashiny, stikhii*, when he noted this.

Once incident—Livenstev's denunciation of a higher officer who had struck a soldier during training in 1904—was taken by Sergeev-Tsenskii from an earlier work and, with minor revisions, incorporated in the novel *Zauriad-Polk*. The passage had originally been part of the story *Pristav Deriabin*, a work written in 1910 and first published in 1911.

*Zauriad-Polk* describes the formation and training of a regiment during the early months of 1914; *Massy, mashiny stikhii* depicts the
disastrous campaigns of 1914-1915 on the southwestern front.

Massy, mashiny, stikhii was written during September, October and November of 1935 according to the date at the end of its initial publication in 1936. Evgenii Petrov considered it to be "an outstanding novel . . . the best work of Soviet literature about the 1914-1918 war." In spite of such favourable responses by more than one reader, no further editions of the novel appeared until its publication in the 1955-56 Sobranie sochinenii. Under a new title, Liutaia zima, it was then included in the epopee Preobrazhenie Rossii.

Chapter 23 of Liutaia zima is based on an incident which had been described earlier in the story Khutor'Baby' (published in 1924 and 1929). This sketch "a sparkling piece of writing according to Gor'kii, formed the second half of a story, Polevoi sud, which was published separately in 1936 (Oktyabr' no. 5), and then incorporated into the novel Liutaia zima. Other excerpts from the novel were published in the magazine Krasnoarmeets-krasnoflotets in 1936.

Two other works written by Sergeev-Tsenskii during the years 1930 to 1940 were later included in Preobrazhenie Rossii in its 1955 edition in the Sobranie sochinenii. There is no evidence that Sergeev-Tsenskii intended to include them in the epopee while he was writing them; however, it seems best to discuss them in the context of works written during the 1930's.

The story L'vy i solntse was written in January, 1931, and first published in Novyi mir (number 5) in 1933. It was thereafter included in several collections of short stories and, in 1955, became part of the epopee. The main hero of the story was introduced as a secondary character in a novel written in 1951-1956, Utrennii vzryv, thus connecting
the 1931 story to a long novel of the epopee. L'vyi solntse is set in St. Petersburg in February, 1917 and describes the events of four days of that revolutionary month through the eyes of a complete politically-disinterested speculator-businessman.

The novel Iskat', vsegda iskat'! was to become part of the epopee after a prolonged period of transformation and re-incarnation. Sergeev-Tsenskii called it "my 'industrialization novel'" in a letter to Gor'kii. But as an 'industrialization novel' it was not only a rather late-blooming variety of that genre, but also reveals itself to be something of a hybrid. It is made up of two parts, the story Pamiats serdtsa, first published in Oktiabr' in 1934 (number 9) and the story Zagadka koksa first published in 1935 Oktiabr' (numbers 7 and 7). Zagadka koksa, in turn, incorporates as its first chapter a story written in 1907 and first published in 1908 in Sovremennyi Mir (number 12)—the story Nebo. To add to the complications of the history of the novel, after the emergence of Iskat', vsegda iskat'! in 1935 thanks to Goslitizdat's publication of the two parts as one whole, the story Pamiats serdtsa was included in several collections of stories independently of its sequel, Zagadka koksa, while, at the same time, appearing in subsequent replications of Iskat', vsegda iskat'! as the first part of that novel. After its solo debut in 1935 under the title Zagadka koksa and its marriage in the same year to Pamiats serdtsa, the story was later published again as an independent work with the title Lenia Slesarev. Meanwhile Iskat', vsegda iskat'! was re-published more than once as separate novel. It was evidently originally intended to be the beginning of a series of novels for at the end of the 1935 edition stand the words "The end of the first book of a novel."
Pamiats serdtsa is a lyrical story of love found and lost during the years of the revolution and civil war. Zagadka koksa describes the contribution made by a young scientist and his wife to the production of coke by their discovery of the plastometric method of determining the coking properties of coal.

The story is based on material gathered by Sergeev-Tsenskii during a trip to Dnepropetrovsk in 1934 where he visited an old friend, the artist Mikhail Sapozhnikov. The artist's son, Leonid Sapozhnikov, is the prototype of the main hero of Zagadka koksa, Leonid Slesarev. The story Nebo had described Leonid Sapozhnikov as a young boy; to this story Sergeev-Tsenskii added a description of Sapozhnikov's mature life and his career as a scientist and Doctor of Chemistry. Many of the characters in Zagadka koksa are based on actual figures—scientists and professor who were working in the institutes of Dnepropetrovsk in 1934. The young daughter of the heroine of the story Pamiats Serdtsa appears in the story Zagadka koksa as the wife of Leonid Slesarev.

In 1939, after favourable articles on Sevastopol'skia strada began appearing, Sergeev-Tsenskii apparently felt it was possible to recall again in print his plans for the epopee Preobrazhenie Rossii. A small note entitled "O zamysle novogo romana epopei Preobrazhenie Rossii" was published in Literaturnaia gazeta (February 10, 1939). Thereafter in various articles written by Sergeev-Tsenskii, or in interviews with him, frequent references were made to the progress of the epopee, sometimes called simply Preobrazhenie, sometimes referred to as Preobrazhenie Rossii.

In October, 1940, Sergeev-Tsenskii said that after completing a long novel about the War of 1812, he would start work again on the epopee. He added that he wanted to resume writing it in spite of the prolonged
interruption because Gor'kii had so warmly supported the project with his flattering reviews of Valia. This interview indicates that the only part of the epopee already written and published was the novel Valia. Obrechennye na gibel' is not mentioned. 75

In an article in 1941 Sergeev-Tsenskii mentioned that five novels of the epopee had been published but identified only the novel Iskat', vsegda iskat'! by title:

The new year is beginning with work on themes of our socialist reality. I shall be exchanging historical material for work on the stirring biographies of our renowned Stakhanovites, and on stories of the heroes of socialist labour. Thus accumulates material for a series of new novels of Preobrazhenie. The new series starts with the already-published novel Iskat', vsegda iskat'! about the people who created the socialist coking industry... Of sixteen novels which will make up Preobrazhenie I have succeeded in writing and publishing only five. 76

In another article published in 1941 after he had received the Stalin Prize for Literature, he mentions Obrechennye na gibel':

Long ago I began the epopee Preobrazhenie (about the transformation of pre-revolutionary Russia into the country of Soviets). The epopee is a cycle of novels, sixteen in number. Besides these novels, Preobrazhenie contains also several stories. ... The first series, two novels of which have already been published—Valia and Obrechennye na gibel', describes pre-War Russia. The second series embraces the participation of Russia in the World War. 77

A pattern seems to emerge from an examination of these interviews. All mention of the epopee had to be dropped after the hostile attitude of important critics to Obrechennye na gibel' in 1927 and succeeding years. The success of Sevastopol'skaia strada reflected in some favourable articles in 1939 allowed a cautious mention of the existence of the epopee. The recalling of Gor'kii's seal of approval on Valia in the 1940 article paved the way for the more detailed outline in 1941. Here the optimistic novel Iskat', vsegda iskat'!, which glorifies young Soviet scientists,
is emphasized as a major part of the epopee. Only after the security afforded by his Stalin Prize could the anathematized *Obrechennye na gibel'* be safely mentioned by name.

By 1942 Sergeev-Tsenskii was at work on his continuation of the second series of novels he had mentioned—the depiction of "the participation of Russia in the World War." *Burnaia vesna* and *Goriachee leto* were written in quick succession in 1942 and 1943. The novels were not originally published as part of the epopee nor included in the 1955-56 edition in spite of the fact that Sergeev-Tsenskii mentioned them in an outline of the epopee in 1944:

Thus the first half of the epopee *Preobrazhenie* will consist of eight books: *Valia, Obrechennye na gibel', Pushki vydvigaiut, Pushki zagovorili, Zauriad-Polk, Liutaia zima, Burnaia vesna* and *Goriachee leto.*

Undoubtedly Sergeev-Tsenskii had intended that they be included in the epopee for the main hero of *Zauriad-Polk* and *Liutaia zima*, Lieutenant Liventsev, appears as one of the main characters of the later novels. Space limitations perhaps prevented their inclusion in the 1955-1956 edition.

The main chapters of *Burnaia vesna* appeared in *Novyi mir* in 1942 (numbers 8, 9 and 10); an excerpt was published in *Trud* (28 July, 1942) under the title "Rota idet v ataku". The first journal publication of *Goriachee leto* was also in *Novyi mir* (numbers, 1, 2-3 and 4, 1943) with excerpts appearing in *Krasnoflotets* in 1943 (number 3-4 with the title "Na rechke Pliashevke"; number 7 with the title "Diviziia na otdykhе"). In 1943 the two novels were combined into a "historical novel in two parts" and published as *Brusilovskii proryv.* In this form the novels saw two further publications in 1944 and 1945. With their inclusion
in the epopee, the title *Brusilovskii proryv* was dropped and the original titles appeared again. The two novels describe the hard-fought campaigns of 1916 when part of the Russian Army led by General A.A. Brusilov succeeded in breaking through the Austro-German lines on the south-western front and re-capturing lost territory. As Soviet and Western critics have noted, historical novels and plays describing victorious battles of the Russian military past were a characteristic feature of the literature written during the years 1941 to 1945. *Brusilovskii proryv* is such a work and its successive re-publications attest to its popularity during these years.

Sergeev-Tsenskii completed in 1943 and 1944 two more novels devoted to the period of the First World War: *Pushki vydvigaiut* and *Pushki zagorvorili*. As their titles indicate, the novels deal with the beginning of the War. *Pushki vydvigaiut* was published in *Novyi mir* in 1944 (numbers 1-2, 4-5 and 6-7) and appeared in book form in the same year. *Novyi mir* refused to publish *Pushki zagorvorili* and, except for an excerpt which appeared in the almanac *Sovetskii Krym*, the novel remained unpublished until the 1955-56 *Sobranie sochinenii*. The critic I. Shevtsov makes the following rather curious statement about this event.

Immediately after the end of the Great Fatherland War in our literature and art certain aesthetic and cosmopolitan groups became too active---for the Sergeev-Tsenskii was like the "fifth wheel on a cart"... The journal *Novyi mir* refused to print one of the last novels of *Preobrazhenie Rossii. Pushki zagorvorili.* He notes that "the then chief editor of *Novyi mir*, K. Simonov, refused to print the novel in 'his own' journal." In 1944 Sergeev-Tsenskii had undertaken the task of revising *Obrechennye na gibel'* and writing six new chapters for a new edition of the novel. It proved impossible to publish this new edition. In 1957
Sergeev-Tsenskii mentioned this incident in a letter to the writer G. Stepanov:

The novel Obrechennye na gibel' I submitted to Krymizdat in 1945, but the well-known to you Vikhrov vetoed it, and until 1956 it and the other novels of the epopee Preobrazhenie remained unpublished. 85

The refusal of publishers to print his new works of the epopee, and the hostile articles which began to appear, no doubt discouraged him from continuing work on it. As G. Stepanov notes:

The malevolent criticism bothered the Russian writer [i.e. Sergeev-Tsenskii] greatly and it is natural that the unjust attacks on a whole series of novels from Preobrazhennie86 were so killing for him that he stopped working on the further development of the great canvas. This, of course, was not an insignificant drama in the creative life of Sergeev-Tsenskii and he began writing only poetry. He worked intensively on his diary in verse, Dnevnik poeta, but didn't submit his verses to a single publisher. 87

In 1951, after six years of silence, Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote and published a new novel of the epopee, Utrennii vzryv. The story line of Obrechennye na gibel', Pushki vydvigaiut and Pushki zagovorili is continued in this novel which depicts the development of the painter Syromolotov's tendency to a socialist realist style of painting and his increasing involvement with society around him. The novel was published in the almanac Krym (book 7, 1951), and in book form by Krymizdat in 1952.

The response of the critics to this novel was limited in size; Sergeev-Tsenskii mentions this in a letter to G. Stepanov of September 19, 1952.

You are surprised that nothing is being written about Utrennii vzryv, but our critics know their business: if there's nothing to curse, then you can't praise either. Thank you for your kind words. Several other writers wrote similar things to me, but Utrennii vzryv, having been published by Krymizdat, will not be re-published. I personally connect this with the very difficult times in which we are living.83

Utrennii vzryv, in its 1952 edition, was included in the 1955-1956 Sobranie
sochinenii. In 1956 the author wrote eight new chapters and the edition of the novel that appears in the Krymizdat publication of the epopee incorporates these chapters.89

In 1913 Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote a story about the conditions in the coal mines of the Donbas and a young engineer's horrified reaction to the hopeless life of the miners. The story was first published under the title Inzhener Matiets in Russkaia Mysl' (books I, II and III, 1914), and republished with a new title, Naklonnaia Elena, in the pre-revolutionary Sochinennia of the author.90 It was thereafter published in various collections of stories and appeared as late as 1956 under the latter title.91 In 1953, Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote a second part, Sud, and added it to the original story; to the combined parts he gave the new title, Preobrazhenie cheloveka, and in 1955 Krymizdat published the resultant novel in book form. The novel was included in the epopee in the 1955-56 Sobranie sochinenii. In the new version the name of the young engineer has been changed from Matiets to Matiitsev.

There is some indication that Sergeev-Tsenskii had intended introducing Matiitsev as one of the main characters in the epopee at a much earlier date, for the hero of the first part of Iskat', vsegda iskat' bears a resemblance to Matiitsev, although he is called in that novel, Dautov. It is to be assumed, although it is never clearly stated, that Dautov was a pseudonym chosen by the young engineer-turned-revolutionary.

After writing Sud in 1953, Sergeev-Tsenskii added no new works to the epopee until 1956. Indeed, during this three-year period the wrote little, and experienced the already all-too-familiar difficulties in publishing what he did write. On the literary situation in 1953 he
commented to G. Stepanov:

Yes, now they are searching for new writers in the provinces since the old Moscow writers are playing the silence-game, and Novyi mir, for example, can't find enough material for their issues in Moscow and is going after material, sometimes to the brother republics and sometimes to Italy,--acting in accordance with the proverb: "The further you go, the more peaceful it will be". 92

Encouraged, perhaps, by the publication of his Sobranie sochinenii in ten volumes which began in 1955, the year of his eightieth birthday, Sergeev-Tsenskii in 1956 set to work again on the epopee. He had indicated in 1955 that he was working on a new novel depicting the February revolution of 1917, Doloi tasaria', 1956, however, found him working on the already-mentioned second part of the novel Utrennii vzryv. As well, he wrote the etude, Lenin v avguste 1914, which first appeared in Ogonek in 1957 (number 42) and was included in the epopee in the 1956-1959 Krymizdat edition. At the same time, he prepared an enlarged edition of the story Pristav Deriabin for inclusion in the epopee. This story was originally written in 1910 and first published in 1911(Shipovnik, book 14). After the 1934 inclusion of an incident from this story in the novel Zauriad-Polk (already mentioned earlier in connection with the latter novel), the story was published in a slightly revised version in several collections of stories. Sergeev-Tsenskii prepared a more extensively revised version for the 1955-56 Sobranie sochinenii. The notes to that edition indicate that: "In this publication the text of the story is given in a new version prepared by the author as an etude to Preobrazhenie Rossii." 94 In 1956 Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote nine new chapters which were added to the story when it appeared as part of the epopee in the 1956-59 Krymizdat edition. 95 The main character of this story, the police-officer Deriabin, figured in the novels Pushki zagovorili and Utrennii Vzryv as a secondary character.
In 1957 and 1958, almost to the day of his death, Sergeev-Tsenskii worked on two new additions to the epopee, the novel *Vesna v Krymu* and the story *Svidanie*. Both these works remained unfinished at the author's death but were, nevertheless, included in the epopee in the 1956-59 edition published by Krymizdat. Still another story, written in 1918, and later revised, was included in the latter edition—the story, *Kapitan Koniaev*. 96

In an entry made in one of his notebooks in 1943, Sergeev-Tsenskii indicated that he hoped to finish the epopee *Preobrazhenie Rossii* by the end of 1944. 97 Plans for the novels *Zrelaia osen', Utrennii vzryv, Priezd Lenina* and *Velikii Oktiabr',* which were to continue the epopee, were already worked out. He noted;

I shall have to write *Zrelaia osen'* in three months—December, January and February—which is entirely possible if I write five signatures a month. 98

*Zrelaia osen'*, which was to depict the further fate of Liventsev an officer in the Tsarist Army, 99 was not completed by the author although we find it mentioned along with *Priezd Lenina* and *Velikii Oktiabr'* as late as 1957 in the author's plans for the epopee. 100 In 1944, as we have seen, Sergeev-Tsenskii, instead of beginning work on these new novels, wrote six new chapters of *Obrechennye na gibel'* and revised the first part of the novel. After a long period of silence, when, in 1951, he again started work on the epopee, he chose to continue the depiction of the artist hero of *Obrechennye na gibel*, *Pushki zagovorili* and *Pushki vydvigaiut—Syromolotov*—in the novel *Utreennii vzryv*. It would seem that Sergeev-Tsenskii preferred to develop this character rather than tackle the difficult subject of October 1917 and the portrayal of Lenin. From 1951 to his death we find him promising in printed interviews and articles an early completion of *Priezd Lenina* and *Velikii Oktiabr'* or of other
novels dealing with the October Revolution and the Bolshevik Party:

In the following novels will be depicted the events which are the most outstanding in the history of mankind---the Great October Socialist Revolution and the activity of the Bolshevik Party. The depiction of this colossal task occupies the chief place in my epopee *Preobrazhenie Rossii*.101

The creative plans of the writer include two novels on the theme of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the beginning of the Civil War.102

G. Makarenko in 1957 mentions four novels which will be devoted to these topics, the already-mentioned *Priezd Lenina* and *Velikii Oktiabr'*, and two more works entitled *Iiul'* and *Oktiabr' v Moskve*.103

The author's private plans for the epopee would seem to have been at variance with the public version. In the 1963 edition of the *Putevoditel'* is published a photo-copy of a hand-written plan, identified as "one of the variants of a plan for the epopee *Preobrazhenie Rossii*." No mention is made of the October cycle of novels:

*Preobrazhenie Rossii*--- an epopee in eight volumes.

I  
*V tishi u moria (Valia)*. Novel. 10.5 sig.  
*Obrechennye na gibel'*. Novel. 22.5 sig.

II  
*Pushki vydvigaiut*. Novel. 16 sig.

III  
*Pushki zagovorili*. Novel. 20 sig.  
*Zauriad-batal'on* Novel. 17 sig.

IV  
*Liutaia zima*. Novel. 16 sig.  

V  
*Goriache leto*. Novel. 18 sig.  
*Utrennii vzryv*. Novel. 10 sig.

VI  
*Doloi tsaria!* Novel. 15 sig.  
*Mart v Krymu*. Story. 6 sig.  
*Doloi voini*! Novel. 15 sig.

VII  
*Vrangelia v more!* Novel. 12 sig.  
Several stories of the period of the Civil War. 20 sig.
The plan is undated but mention is made of one novel completed in 1953, *Preobrazhenie cheloveka*, and of another, *Utrennii vzryv*, the first half of which was completed in 1951, the second half in 1956. I have attempted to determine the approximate date of this plan by calculating the number of author's signatures in the printed version and comparing it with the figure given in the plan, my assumption being that if the two tally, a work mentioned in the plan was not a projected one, but one already completed. My results are inconclusive. *Preobrazhenie cheloveka* in the printed version works out to 13.5 author's signatures; the figure in the plan is 14. This would seem to indicate that the novel had already been completed when the plan was made up; that is, after 1953. However, on checking the number of author's signatures in the printed versions of *Utrennii vzryv*, I found that the first version, completed in 1951, had six author's signatures and the second version, completed in 1956, had twelve. The figure on the plan, it will be noted, is ten author's signatures. It would thus appear that the plan was made after the first part of the novel had been completed but before the second version was ready, and after the completion of *Preobrazhenie cheloveka*, that is, between 1953 and 1956.

The plan introduces some new titles to the epopee—*Doloi tsaria!*, *Mart v Krymu*, *Doloi voinu!* and *Vrangelia v more!*. *Mart v Krymu* is undoubtedly the novel later entitled *Vesna v Krymu* which continues further the story-line of Syromolotov. The novel *Doloi tsaria!* was mentioned in 1955 by Sergeev-Tsenskii:

The recently-published story *Utrennii vzryv* brings the reader to
the events of February days of 1917. They will be the theme of the novel *Doloi tsaria* on which I am now working.\textsuperscript{105}

Since this reference to it, nothing more has been heard of the novel.

*Doloi voinu* has a more complicated history. In 1954 an inter-

viewer noted:

Now Sergei Nikolaevich is working on the novel *Doloi voinu* which is dedicated to the period of the February revolution. His story *L'vy i solntse* is an etude to this novel.\textsuperscript{106}

and in an article at the beginning of 1955, Sergeev-Tsenskii mentioned the novel:

The continuation of the epopee will be the novel on which I am now working, *Doloi voinu*.\textsuperscript{107}

The *Putevoditel* chronology notes under the year 1955:

In the journal *Sovetskaia Ukraina* was published the prologue to an epopee in verse, *Doloi voinu*.\textsuperscript{108}

On checking bibliographies I found that in number 12 (1955) of the journal *Sovetskaia Ukraina* (pages 5-18) a work by Sergeev-Tsenskii entitled *Doloi voinu* had been printed. Under the year 1956, the chronology notes that Sergeev-Tsenskii was writing "a verse drama *Podgotovka k boiu*, part of the epopee in verse, *Doloi voinu*". Another checking of various bibliographies turned up the information that in a 1964 selected works of the author was published a play in verse entitled *Doloi voinu*.\textsuperscript{109} It was identified then as "An epopee in eight parts with a prologue and an epilogue." It was not fate, however, to be included in any of the editions of the epopee *Preobrazhenie Rossii*.

Of the other works mentioned in this plan, we have seen that all of them, with the exception of a novel to be entitled *Vragelia v more*, eventually became part of the epopee. Of the latter novel, nothing more has been heard. The novel *Iskat', vsegda iskat'* came into the epopee
with two parts instead of three. Until the 1955-56 Sobranie sochinenii this novel had always been published with the note "End of the first book of a novel." After 1955 this note no longer appears. It may be that when the author spoke in 1954 and 1955 of the final novel of the epopee being entitled Tvorit' noviyu zhizn', he had in mind an enlarged version of Iskat', vsyegda iskat'.

Mention of the "several stories of the period of the Civil War" which were to be part of volume VII in this plan of the epopee brings us to another unanswerable question concerning the evolution of the epopee. Other sources indicate that Sergeev-Tsenskii wanted to include in the epopee several stories written during the 1920's and 1930's. G. Makarenko mentions specifically the stories, Chudo, V grozu, Zhestokost' and Rasskaz professoira. Popovkin mentions the story Chudo, and refers to the "Krymskie rasskazy" as being part of the epopee. The stories mentioned by Makarenko are all included in the "Krymskie rasskazy" and were harshly criticized during the late 1920's and 1930's for their depiction of the hunger, brutality and treachery which characterized the years of Occupation, Civil War and establishment of Soviet power in the Crimea. None of them were ever re-printed after 1930—none were included in the 1955-56 Sobranie sochinenii. Sergeev-Tsenskii, it seems, was not willing to submit these stories to the revision which would be needed if they were to be included in the epopee for he felt that this part of the story of the transformation of Russia should be honestly told. G. Makarenko reports the following conversation with the author on this topic:

When I visited the writer on the 6th of July, 1956, we talked a lot about the interpretation of the theme of the revolution and Civil War in the epopee Preobrazhenie Rossii. I drew his attention to the fact that in the tales and stories of the twenties treating the epoch of the Civil War, a great deal of attention is
paid to the difficulties of that time, for example, in Groza ['sic] and Zhestokost'. Sergei Nikolaevich answered: "I must take the nation through the crucible of calamities which led to the great victories... The great feat of October wasn't a gala procession of the revolutionary masses. It was a difficult path full of misery".116

Sergeev-Tsenskii's decision to omit these stories was prompted certainly by political rather than aesthetic considerations for the stories provide a very necessary link in the history of the establishment of Soviet control. Their omission typifies the difficulties confronting Soviet writers who want to portray these years in a way satisfactory to themselves as honest observers but at the same time acceptable to the readers and critics who judge their works. At least two critics viewed with approval the "missing" of these links:

By calling the Krymskie rasskazy etudes and sketches to the epopee about the transformation of his motherland, Sergeev-Tsenskii in our view, indirectly acknowledged the precariousness of his literary position in the beginning of the twenties. Some years went by before the writer found the true path of depiction of the new reality, mastered the method of socialist realism.117

It should be left, I feel, to a Soviet scholar to pose the questions which inevitably arise on studying the evolution of Preobrazhenie Rossii. Until archival materials are made accessible to both Soviet and Western scholars, no student of Sergeev-Tsenskii can come to more definite conclusions:

Indeed, with what is connected, for example, the strange metamorphosis undergone by the epopee Preobrazhenie Rossii? To the edifice of a two-voluted novel Preobrazhenie (1927), which captivated Gor’kii with its unity and wholeness, were later added new floors and annexes. (For example, the novel Zauriad-Polk (1935) originally was the first part of a trilogy Slovo o tsarskikh polakh; a corresponding sub-title characterized the novel Massy, mashiny, stikhii as the second part of this trilogy, but subsequently both books were included in Preobrazhenie Rossii.) Along with expressive scenes and characters, arises in the books a sort of cold window dressing, as if a prescribed scope is reached by long-windedness.
Either Tsenskii saw in the epopee form the crowning glory of contemporary art, evidence of its maximum development, and launched such an extensive reconnaissance in the regions of the epic genre, that he was no longer in a position to notice how the organic connections between its landmarks had weakened. Or else still much has yet to be said about the drama of a writer's fate, a drama caused by the pressure of the 'cult of personality', and, thus, much is explained by the Stalinist bent for things monumentally-majestic, pompous.118.
CHAPTER III
CRITICISM AND REVISION OF
PREOBRAZHENIE ROSSI

The history of Soviet literary criticism during the 1920's is characterized by an increasing emphasis on the ideological content rather than the artistic merit of works of literature. In the second half of that decade serious critical discussion of an author's works often dissolved into polemics between critics of the various literary groups. A brief survey of the more important reviews of Sergeev-Tsenskii's work during the early 1920's reveals this progressing interest in ideology and leads finally to the heart of one of the major battles of the late twenties, that of the Pereval critics and the Na literaturnom postu group.

The first articles which appeared in response to post-revolutionary publications of Sergeev-Tsenskii's works were concerned more with questions of genre and literary merit than with the author's political point of view. Iurii Tynianov in his article reviewing the 1923 edition of Preobrazhenie, for example, finds that Sergeev-Tsenskii neglected to "transform" a short story into a novel as well as failing to show any "transformation" in his characters' lives.¹

V. Pereverzev's review of two chapters from the story Rasskaz professora marks the beginning of fifteen years of articles concerned primarily with the ideological content of Sergeev-Tsenskii's works. More gentle and restrained in tone than the articles which were to follow, Pereverzev writes that the story is interesting because it reveals a
psychological, "even psychopathological" reaction to the revolution which is displayed by a few individuals, an incorrect reaction but interesting nevertheless. He comments favourably on Sergeev-Tsenskii's work from an artistic point of view, as do practically all the critics after him except for the most dogged witch-hunters like E. Usievich.3

Sergeev-Tsenskii's artistic mastery, the colourfulness and exactness of his language in descriptions, whether of people or landscapes, is acknowledged by the most varied critics:

Sergeev-Tsenskii has a penetrating and unswerving gaze, able to catch characters and objects from a new, unexpected side. The characters of his stories are not only remembered by the reader but are etched ineradicably in his memory.4

It is difficult to find in contemporary literature another writer who possesses Sergeev-Tsenskii's ability for detailed realistic description.5

When the author becomes again an artist and gives himself up to his colourful pen, he gives us wonderful pages.6

Stylistically, then, Sergeev-Tsenskii's works generally found favourable critical response;7 ideologically, he was successively categorized with a ferocity increasing as the years went by as: "a writer with obviously counter-revolutionary attitudes",8 "a typical relict of the bourgeois intelligentsia",9 "an enemy of Soviet power from whom we must tear off the mask",10 "an ideological agent of the class enemy",11 "a slanderer of the people, defender of the kulak's and purveyor of a hostile ideology"12 and finally as "a typical representative of the vekhovskaja intelligentsia surviving in the West as smenovekhovtsy---a remains of the dirty scum of the culture of the past."13 E. Usievich's typification marks the crescendo of the labelling process; Zh. El'sberg's signals the beginning.14

In fact, the fate of Sergeev-Tsenskii as a Soviet writer, his reception by Soviet critics during the important decade of the 'thirties,
was determined by this one article of El'sberg's written in 1927, published in *Na literaturnom postu*, and eloquently entitled "Kontrrevoliutsionnyi allegoricheskii bytovizm." The most interesting aspect of this article is that it is directed as much against another critic as against Sergeev-Tsenskii, whose works thus seem to have become a sort of battleground for critics representing the different approaches to literature in the late 'twenties. Sergeev-Tsenskii, himself, became a victim of the disputes raging at that time—particularly of the battle between the VAPP (later RAPP) group who published mainly in *Na literaturnom postu* and the more liberal critics grouped around the journals *Novyi mir* and *Krasnaia novi*, many of them members of the Pereval school. Sergeev-Tsenskii's fate is certainly not unique. The stamp put upon other writers by members of the critical group who could shout the loudest in the late 'twenties survived long after the dissolution of the groups involved. Detailed study of the critical literature of the 'twenties about other writers (I have in mind M. Prishvin among others) would probably be worthwhile in this respect.

El'sberg, who was a RAPP critic and regular contributor to *Na literaturnom postu* until 1930, wrote his article in response, on the one hand, to the publication of *Obrechennye na gibel'* in *Krasnaia novi* and, on the other hand, to an article of Dmitrii Gorbov, a review of a collection of short stories of Sergeev-Tsenskii.*16* Gorbov was a member of Pereval who had in various articles criticized VAPP and the *Na literaturnom postu* group.*18* V. Polonskii calls him a "young, but in every way well-qualified critic."*19* His most well-known works are his studies of emigre literature and the famous *Poiski Galatei*, which H. Ermolaev calls "one of the most reverent and valiant defences of art ever made against the pernicious impact of RAPP's theories and practices."*20*
In his review of Sergeev-Tsenskii's stories Gorbov praises him as "a strong master of realistic detail, a creator of a true-to-life image" (sozdatel' zhivogo obraza), but adds that he fails to understand Sergeev-Tsenskii's point of view since he consistently seems to underline the "weakness of man before natural forces---whether human in the guise of a peasant mir or the revolution, or a force of nature---the sea." Incidents which in themselves are fully probable thus become generalizations of the human condition. He cites the story Zhestokost', a portrayal of the brutal murder of six Commissars by peasant mir leaders during the Red Army retreat from the Crimea. This incident, he feels, is entirely probable but is presented in such a way that it seems quite typical of the whole Civil War period, and "in such a role, stops being probable for life has shown that the last word remained not for the force (stikhiia) of the kulak village, but for others." Sergeev-Tsenskii's "true-to-life image" becomes false when incorrect generalizations are made from specific incidents:

In such a type of generalization . . . consists the living (zhiznennyi) and consequently, also, the artistic untruth.22

Reality, as Sergeev-Tsenskii had witnessed it during the Civil War period in the Crimea, then, must be supplemented by a footnote from the author warning the reader not to take his witness as a generalization of the prevailing situation everywhere. Literature is assuming a didactic role---an author can no longer give his "immediate impressions" of an incident without taking into consideration the readers' conclusions.

It is not on these grounds, however, that El'sberg attacks Gorbov's article. El'sberg feels that Sergeev'Tsenskii not only lays too much emphasis on the "weakness of man before natural forces" but deliberately sets out to discredit the revolution. He masks his true intentions by creating allegories which are so
heavily loaded with naturalistic detailed descriptions that the reader fails to realize the true significance of these allegories. Gorbov's failure to understand Sergeev-Tsenskii's intent results from a basic fault in his approach to literary analysis combined with a lack of vigilance. This basic flaw is his use of the "true-to-life image" concept of the Voronksii school of criticism. El'sberg deliberately misinterprets Gorbov's use of this term to discredit the whole concept of the "true-to-life image" and justify the "living man" concept of the RAPP literary theoreticians. The two concepts become, as it were, shibboleths in the hands of RAPP critics like El'sberg during the intense literary battles of the late 'twenties in the same way that the "living man" concept was to be used by the Litfront opposition to RAPP beginning in 1930.

E.J. Brown has outlined the development and importance of the "living man" concept in RAPP literary theory and the use Litfront made of what they called "the incorrect slogan of the 'living man'".

The concept of the true-to-life image is less well-known. It stems from A.K. Vorontsii's views on the nature and function of literature which he outlines in his article "Iskusstvo kak poznanie zhizni i sovremennosti." Art, to Vorontsii, meant cognition of life:

Art and science both have one subject of study—life, reality. But science analyses, art synthesizes; science is abstract, art is concrete; science is directed toward the intellect of man, art to his sensuous nature. Science gains an understanding of life through conceptions, art through images, in the form of live (zhivoi), sensuous contemplation.

Voronkii felt that the image of an artist must be examined for its value as an objective portrayal of reality:

In evaluating a work of art aesthetically we determine to what extent its content . . . is faithful to objective artistic truth; for the artist thinks in images, and his image must be artistically truthful, that is, it must be faithful to the nature of that which is portrayed.
It is in these terms that Gorbov evaluates Sergeev-Tsenskii's works:
"In such a type of generalization . . . consists the living and consequently also, the artistic untruth."

Voronskii's literary views became the foundation of the platform of the Pereval group; in fact, according to Ermolaev, Pereval was organized under the auspices of Voronskii. In his sketch, Polonskii writes that Pereval was an attempt on the part of the writers and critics belonging to it to defend themselves against VAPP (and later RAPP) "imperialism". "Pereval'tsy became, as it were, 'anti-napostovtsy'' and were to become "anti-nalitpostovtsy". Thus Gorbov, who with A. Lezhnev, was the leading theoretician and critic of Pereval, was a prime target for a RAPP attack, particularly if the Voronskii-Pereval method of literary criticism could be discredited at the same time. El'sberg's article is such an attempt. He writes:

If the episode Zhestokost' is in itself 'probable' if Sergeev-Tsenskii is a 'master of realistic detail, a creator of a true-to-life image' (if this can be said to be an exhaustive definition), then why, when 'set in a larger context' will the episode 'stop being probable'. And how is a larger context relevant? A 'true-to-life, probable image', even if presented with maximal detailization, can never become improbable, not true-to-life. At this point El'sberg leaves this line of argument and when he later returns to it, he chooses to misinterpret the concept of the 'true-to-life image'.

Now we must pause to consider the question of the 'true-to-life images' (an expression of Gorbov) in the works of Sergeev-Tsenskii, that is, mainly, the question of the psychological deepening uglublenie of his characters by the author. The expression 'true-to-life image' is used only in the singular by Gorbov, but El'sberg now begins to use it in the plural and to equate it with psychological depiction of characters. Sergeev-Tsenskii, he writes, by means of detailed and expert description of the exterior of people, their
surroundings and the characteristic peculiarities of their speech
creates a complete illusion of 'true-to-life images'. But only
an illusion. It is true that in small segments of his works
one or another character can seem to be a real 'living man'.
But this is a shortlived deception.

Having equated the 'true-to-life image' with the 'living man', El'sberg
is now in a position to use his own criteria in judging the success or
failure of an artistic work. He concludes:

Not only true-to-life eyes and moustaches but also separate
psychological moments create a living man .... The 'master
of realistic detail' is in no way a master of the 'true-to-life
image'.

(The word 'image' he uses again in the singular.)

This double-edged polemic against both Gorbov and Sergeev-Tsenskii
then widens into a protest against the publication of Sergeev-Tsenskii in
literary journals:

But still Sergeev-Tsenskii is allotted space in contemporary
literature, in current monthlies, more space than I. Novikov or
M. Bulgakov. ... his works have appeared in Krasnaia nov' and
Novyi mir in the last few months.

El'sberg contends that Sergeev-Tsenskii, in his works written after
the revolution, poses and answers the following questions:

1. About the building of socialism---answer: it is the work
   of beggars and idiots, comforting themselves with the fact
   that a rosy-golden halo shines above them.
2. About Communists---answer: they are people not capable of
   working, capable only of killing and destroying. They enjoy
   special privileges and exploit the workers who do not belong
to any party.
3. About the ideological essence of Communists---answer: they
   are people accidentally caught up in revolutionary forces,
   who have the possibility to satisfy their personal desires
   and inclinations. ...

Ideologically, then, Sergeev-Tsenskii's position, according to El'sberg is
the following: The revolution was a force capable only of destruction---
nothing positive could come from it. The corollary to this is that
revolutionaries are beasts and sadists, or at best, opportunists. The mass of the people are also a destructive force, one to be feared, for they are incapable of enlightenment or human feelings. Their greatest capacity is for self-deception. Socialism is a means of deceiving the masses into thinking that their condition is being improved. Sergeev-Tsenskii's philosophical position, El'sberg feels, is one of pessimism about the human condition and constant emphasis on the senselessness of life in the face of fate and elemental forces (stikhiinye sily). These charges, which El'sberg initiates, at least in Soviet criticism, are to be re-iterated ad nauseam by critics in succeeding years who play, as it were, a "variation on a theme by El'sberg."

El'sberg took advantage of an opportunity to attack D. Gorbov and by association, the Pereval school, as well as the journals, Krasnaia nov' and Novy mir. (It was at the end of 1927 that Voronskii was expelled from the Communist Party and exiled; the last number of Krasnaia nov', which he signed as editor came out in October, 1927.39) He used the works of Sergeev-Tsenskii as his weapon, utilizing in his analysis of Gorbov's position, evidence from a work which Gorbov himself had not mentioned in his review. This work is Obrechennye na gibel'. It is in this novel that he finds the clearest evidence of Sergeev-Tsenskii's counter-revolutionary ideology; the passages which he cites and analyses, are to be cited again and again by other critics, and in the revised edition of the novel are to be expunged or re-written.

The passage in the novel which evokes the most detailed and scathing comments of El'sberg and succeeding critics is the description of the triptych painted by the hero of the novel, an artist identified as a member of the "peredvizhniki" school, the elderly, but still vital,
Syromolotov. The painting embodies, in El'sberg's view, Sergeev-Tsenskii's use of allegory to disguise his true attitude to socialism. In quoting the description of the painting, "The Golden Age", from the first edition of Obrechennye na gibel', I have indicated by square brackets portions which are to be revised or omitted in later editions.

The huge painting-triptych, which occupied one wall of the large studio, was illuminated from above. The first two parts of the triptych were painted in strong, grey old-Syromolotov type tones, but in the third part, the largest, almost twice as big as the other two, a very skillfully done rainbow immediately struck the eye. It even shone iridescently under the light from above, as if the artist had mixed broken glass into the paint, and this third part of the picture was flooded with the golden shine of the rainbow; separate rosy-lilac-tinged golden strands of light broke through from the third part into the second part like a reflection of distant summer lightning.

From the foreground of the first part of the triptych a new, glistening, grey-coloured touring car, life-sized, rushes straight at the viewer. It is small, a four-seater; in front sits a clean-shaven chauffeur in goggles. There are two men and two women in the car, dressed in summer clothes, and behind them is a summer Russian scene. The horizon is high. Standing on the horizon in a whitish strip is a village church, but there is a very ominous view to this whitish strip above the horizon---above the strip moves a cloud saturated with pelting rain. Both the women and men in the car are beautiful, very beautiful---especially the women, but there is some sort of tension written on all these four faces. It is portrayed somehow very subtly: too wide are the eyes, too elevated are the heads and brows, too engrossed are these faces with their half-open mouths in something that is going on in front of them---their anxiety is evident, and even the chauffeur sits bent, merging with the forward rush of his new car like a jockey at gallop merges with the speed of his horse.

A very unsettled light, like that just before a storm, was poured into this part of the picture, and the impressionable Father Leonid said afterwards that the car was exactly true to life, that one even wanted to step aside---so real was it; Vania looked at this very unsettled trembling light, trying to understand how his father had created it. On the panama hats of the men, on the white ostrich-feathers of the ladies' hats, on the chauffeur's grey cap---everywhere was felt this faltering unsettled light; even behind, where a wide Russian field was spread out, a view known to everyone; a village shone greyly in the distance; nearer, an estate, white, half-hidden by a garden; to the side were visible the red roofs of some kind of factory with a high smokestack; a herd grazed in the common pasture, white willows
stretched along the high road. A line of peasant wagons hauled something from the factory, the car had overtaken and covered it with dust and the three first peasants had very evil, sneering faces—one was bearded, one clean-shaven and the third had a soldier's moustache; perhaps they were shouting curses at the car which had covered them with dust. Even the first horse in the line, who had perhaps just sneezed from the dust, had a very hostile look.

And above everything—the cloud, damp, saturated with moisture—the kind of cloud about which is said: "It's pressing down"—so heavy and low was it. The cloud was painted with great realism—it alone could have been a picture. It almost moved, dove-grey, with dark tinges, swelling, bulging, ripening. Probably there had been a clap of thunder for the fourth peasant had taken off his cap, lifted up his head and was crossing himself.

It is bulging, swelling, ripening, threatening—any moment it would stifle them—all seven viewers felt the same. They shuffled their feet, moved nearer the wall.

It was threatening—and in the second part of the triptych, in all its fury, the storm roared. A zigzag of lightning was very sharp, almost blinding.

The landscape was the same as before in its basic features, its intentional details; there was a string of carts on the same road only now it didn't move—it stood, and especially noticeable on it was the play of two kinds of light—daylight and the gleam of lightning. The string of carts stood, but the drivers were now not near the carts: they were all in the foreground near the stopped car, and the chauffeur with terror on his clean-shaven face cringed against it. A panama hat, crushed by a dusty boot, was rolling to the left corner and in the middle [next to those killed already by the men with stakes, they were beating the women. Above someone's stooped back, stuck out a leg in a white, half-off stocking, and a face, horror-stricken, struggled out between the heavy boot, a face which would now be broken by the stake raised above, like a china vase.]

One one side of the picture, to the left, the factory was burning, and on the other side, to the right, the estate of the gentry; terror-stricken, the herd stampeded wildly, lifting up their tails. The background in this part of the triptych was illuminated by the brilliance of lightning, so momentary and weird in broad daylight, when that constant light of day is growing dull. By this use of light, neither the middle part nor even the background of the picture faded away. [On the contrary, it widened the horror of the foreground, the horror grew from the viewer into the distance, and in this distance seemed to be that same horror to the very horizon—there was no end to horror.

The body of one of the passengers in the car was depicted in a weirdly life-like way: it lay prone, doubled-up, its smashed
head at the lower end of the picture, with an arm twisted back strangely, broken at the elbow, fingers cramped.

Some sort of small person in a cap stretched out a key, red with blood, to the clean-shaven chauffeur, also in a cap, who cringed back, frightened by his own key.)

In the original edition of the novel, the description of the third part of the triptych reads as follows. In later editions of the novel, this portion appears in a completely re-written form.

The third part of the picture was wide and contained much. Under the rosy-golden-violet rainbow it was difficult to recognize the same wide Russian scene of the first parts.

The high road was overgrown with grass dried out by a drought, and the white willows had been chopped down by some kind of very dull axes, perhaps even made of stone. There was no village in the distance: only several widely spaced huts. There were ruins in the place where the estate had been: it was entirely bare, as if there had been no garden around it. The factory could still be seen, half-burned, its chimney still aimed at the sky. There were no carts and no herd. A large flock of crows, rose-coloured from the rainbow flew overhead, their wings bent. And in the foreground—a vast calmness: about ten people not going anywhere, entirely innocent in appearance, holy. They were almost naked but, it seemed, not ashamed; they were almost people, but the dull eyes of none of them shone with thought (since any thought is in great part sinful, and they were pure). Several men, unshaven for a long time, several women, bare-headed and tattered, and three children. One of the women wore a blue velvet skirt (this old threadbare velvet was of good quality) but nothing covered her sunburnt back and dry breasts; on one of the men were the remains of a jacket, also of velvet but brown-coloured, and nothing covered his hairy, bony legs. But on the fingers of all of them were many golden rings, in the ears of all women, golden earrings; on the naked, hairy chest of one man shone a golden magistrate's chain and he was straightening it with his pock-marked sinewy hand.

The three children, all about five years old, were entirely naked and it was not cold---on the contrary---drought, dryness, and if it had just rained, then not much; if there had been rain, the dry earth had greedily soaked it up and only in the air was there still enough moisture necessary for a rainbow.

Some sat, others stood, but no one was going anywhere, they didn't have packsacks or walking sticks. The eye sought a campfire: perhaps the group had stopped to make some food---but there was no fire. One woman was scratching her leg---she had twisted it back sharply---and another woman was looking at this
leg with dull, as if sightless, eyes. The children listlessly
dug the earth.

But all were portrayed in a rosy-golden fairy-tale light, and
from that of course came this insouciance, innocence of the faces;
however, so hopelessly eerie was this innocence that the eyes of
the seven viewers could not long stand to look at this part of
the picture; their eyes slid away to the lightning in the cloud,
or to the beautiful womens' faces in the grey, new touring car.
Men weren't killing men on the canvas of the third part of the
triptych; on the contrary, a rainbow, full of joy, shone with a
rose-coloured light, but this frightened even the meek Father
Leonid more than the scene of the second part and, having taken
one glance, he even covered his eyes with his hand.

Noticing this and coughing so that his voice would be clearer,
Vania leaned toward his father and asked: "What have you called
the picture, father?" "The painting, yes, well, I have called it---", Syromolotov looked at the other six for some reason very
severely, sullenly, and finished the sentence, leaning his head
back: "I have called it 'The Golden Age'."40

The significance of this painting was apparently questioned soon
after the publication of that part of the novel for in number 12 of
Krasnaia nov' an article was printed to accompany the final chapters of
Obrechennye na gibel'. We can only surmise what prompted the publication
of such a 'sputnik', but one critic of that time felt that 'The editors
of Krasnaia nov' were forced, it seems, to justify the printing of
Obrechennye na gibel' and in conjunction with the publication of the end
of the novel appeared an article by S. Lopashev.41 In this article, Lopashev
wrote:

Sergeev-Tsenskii seems to speak ironically of wild beasts bedecking
themselves with gold. He seems to describe starving masses,
living near factories in the villages, catered to by plump-
bodied herds, but depriving themselves of all these blessings,
bartering them for valuable trinkets, seems to describe them as
dull and stupid. The masses have been deceived, the masses are
witless---is this what Sergeev-Tsenskii wants to say?42

El'sberg in his article (which appeared simultaneously with Lopashev's)
does not question the meaning of the painting. He states that the descrip-
tion of the "rosy-golden halo shining over the misery and idiocy in the so-
called 'Golden Age' is counter-revolutionary libel."

The critics of the thirties are in full agreement with El'sberg. A. Efremin writes:

The triptych absolutely unambiguously describes the three stages of the revolution. March, 1917 and October of the same year are allegorically presented in the first two parts. The third part, naturally, reveals the prospects of victorious socialism. The artist has depicted, under the arc of a glittering rainbow, a 'wide Russian landscape' of complete desolation, roads overgrown with grass, burned-out estates, half-destroyed factories.

It isn't necessary to remind the reader of the source of Sergeev-Tsenskii's description of the 'socialist paradise': the White Guard press has been outdoing itself at this sort of thing since the first days of the proletariat revolution. Tsenskii reveals himself to be an unskilled pupil of his emigre teachers. Note that the degenerate people, the monsters, the foster-children and victims of socialism—all were bathed in the tender rosy-golden fairy-tale light of the rainbow. The reader is supposed to understand that under the caressing light of Bolshevism is taking place an undisturbed return to savagery of the remains of human individuals, the foster-children of socialism.

E. Usievich finds the passage so inflammatory that she quotes it in full in her article, and says that it represents Sergeev-Tsenskii's final central statement about the revolution, that it was

an onslaught of the stupid, greedy and ferocious, who once and for all destroyed the culture and beauty created by the weak, complicated and refined.

She finds that Sergeev-Tsenskii's attitude is that of the vekhovskaia intelligentsia during the years of reaction, 1907-1909, that the fury of the people must be guarded against and repressed, that the bayonets and prisons of the Tsarist authorities must be given full support. She finds a "complete embodiment of this attitude in the painting, 'The Golden Age'."

The revised edition of the novel, published in 1956, contains significant changes in the depiction of the triptych. The sentences in square brackets at the end of the description of the second part of the
The description of the third part of the triptych has been completely re-written. The new variant is as follows:

The third part of the picture contained much and in size was almost twice as big as each of the other parts of the triptych.

The artist had forced the viewer to look as if from the twentieth floor downwards.

In the foreground of the picture was vividly depicted the wall of a skyscraper, facing on the street. Only eight rows of windows and balconies were visible, but one felt that above these eight floors towered not less than eight more since the building had twelve rows of windows and still was not completely depicted on the canvas, and only the third building of fifteen stories showed its roof.

And behind these, penetrating far into the depths of the picture, stood the same kind of giant buildings, and since the horizon was high and the picture wide, to the very horizon as if having no end, was spread out a huge town—a fairy-tale of stone and steel.

The street was filled with a continuous stream of cars and the car nearest the viewer was undoubtedly the same one which had been pictured in the first two parts of the triptych. Another stream—human—moved along the sidewalks.

That it was summer, anyone could tell by the spots of bright light-weight suits in the crowd, and that rain had just poured down was obvious by the remains of dark clouds in the sky and by the rainbow, generously illumining the distance with its seven colours.

In this same distance rose here and there factory chimneys, high and slender in comparison with the mighty buildings of the foreground.

The chimneys were smoking in a workman-like way in the distance but what attracted the eye of the viewer who looked attentively and not fleetingly was this: the outline and colour of the factory which the car with the two men and two beautiful, well-dressed women had just left were that of the same factory which was shown in the first parts of the triptych.

It was as if the huge town which had arisen in the middle of the
empty land had kept, had preserved, as if they were museum pieces, both the factory which had stood there in the old days, and even the car which had then belonged to the owners of the factory.

Neither the one nor the other were covered with a glass case—they worked along with the other factories and cars, which were, of course, more in tune with the times, and other people used them now—those millions who moved along the sidewalks and on wheels in never-ending streams.

The triptych was conceived on such a grand scale, the technical mastery of the artist was so bold and sure, the details so life-life and clear, that, of course, not even a small part of the richness of the picture could be transmitted in words just as it is impossible to express in words a sonata of a great composer; each of the viewers could only perceive this canvas to the degree of his personal ability to understand a painting and be affected by it.

Coughing hollowly so that his voice would be clearer, Vania leaned toward his father and asked: "What have you called the painting, father?" "The painting? Well, I have called it—" Syromolotov looked at the other six for some reason very severely, sullenly, and finished the sentence, leaning his head back: "I have called it "The Golden Age.""47

El'sberg, as we have seen, contended that Sergeev-Tsenskii raised and answered three questions in his post-revolutionary works. The painting of the Golden Age was Sergeev-Tsenskii's answer to the first question about the building of socialism. The second and third questions concern the nature of the revolution and the ideology of Communists. Over and over El'sberg emphasizes that "Sergeev-Tsenskii doesn't see in the revolution anything but destructive forces."48 Communists are "people not capable of working, capable only of killing and destroying."49 To support these contentions, El'sberg draws mainly on Sergeev-Tsenskii's depiction of the revolutionary, Irtyshev, in the novel Obrechennye na gibel' and on Syromolotov's comments about Irtyshev. These comments are typical, in El'sberg's view and in the view of later critics, of the attitude of most of the intelligentsia toward the revolution and since Sergeev-Tsenskii is presumed to be using Syromolotov as a mouth-piece for his own opinions, he
becomes thus a spokesman of the class enemy.

Before examining these passages in detail, it is necessary to recall the main story line of the novel, and the depiction of Syromolotov, of his son, Vania, and of Irtyshev. Vania is also a painter but had spent several years earning his living as a circus wrestler both in Russia and in Europe. Vania's latest paintings all depict scenes of impending tragedy and death. The most striking one is entitled the Pheasant Garden. In it, a man dressed in white, a cook, is entering the garden; only his back is visible and a long, sharp kitchen knife in a holster hanging from his waist. The pheasants sit, golden and plump, just awakened from drowsing and the cook stretches out his big hand to the neck of one of them.50

Vania's studio occupies the top floor of his house; the lower floor he has rented to a doctor who runs a rest-home for mentally unbalanced people, an interesting collection of types including a futurist poet, an old priest, a rabid Slavophile, and an agitated revolutionary, Irtyshev. It is this last figure who brings the plot of the novel to a climax and insults the sensibilities of Soviet critics: at a viewing of the painting Golden Age he suddenly produces a knife and slashes the picture, plunging the knife deep in the hairy chest of the beggar wearing a golden magistrate's chain. Syromolotov is restrained with difficulty from killing Irtyshev. It is decided to allow Irtyshev to leave without turning him over to the police—he has already spent some years in exile as a political prisoner and would face severe punishment. As the first version of the novel ends, Irtyshev takes leave of his friend, a school teacher, with whom he discusses his revolutionary activities and after an unpleasant meeting with his fourteen year old son, a hooligan and pick-pocket, leaves town.

In the original version of the novel it seems clear to the reader that
Irtyshev is a bona fide revolutionary and active member of a conspiratorial party even if he does seem at times to be a little over-wrought. During a discussion of the machinations of bankers in St. Petersburg who manipulate the stock market he screams:

And those bankers—we'll destroy them, you can be sure of that! Annihilate them! They are like beavers to us. And we are the hunters, they are the beavers. We'll annihilate them!51

In a discussion about painting he says to Vania:

We tolerate painting. We will encourage painting. But if it produces all those sorts of aesthetic dribblings—not for anything. We'll appropriate it and put the spurs to it.52

He discusses with his friend, the school teacher, the fact that "we have workers' papers now—they come out freely in St. Petersburg!"53 and goes on to say that "we are now working in an organized way and with dead certainty." He adds:

We'll show them the name of the game! We're hammering away at them---tuk, tuk---wearing them down like water wears away rock . . . . We are gathering all the hatred of masses into our money-box, we'll build an infernal machine out of all this hate! We'll blow them up---it's inevitable, like spring comes after winter.54

There seems to be little doubt that Irtyshev's son also belongs to an underground political party. In talking of him with the other patients in the clinic Irtyshev says:

I entrusted him to you [i.e. to society] and you made him a hooligan and thief. But keep in mind, I beg you to keep in mind, this will not prevent him from doing great things in our ranks! He is brave all the same and you are not! When at thirteen years old he doesn't take into consideration your laws—that is a sign! . . . Something will come of people like him in time. He is not trash like you!55

And when his son manages to find him and demands money, Irtyshev asks with surprise how he happened to be in town. The son answers: "They gave me a document there." Irtyshev asks: "Where is this 'there'? The party or the police?" "Of course, the party!" his son answers. "They accepted you into
the party?" asks Irtyshev. "They accepted me." is the reply. 56

The depiction of Irtyshev, the only revolutionary in the novel, as an inmate of a clinic for the mentally ill and as an uncultured destructive fanatic with a morally degraded son, also a party member, led critics to the conclusion that Sergeev-Tsenskii viewed revolutionaries as criminal and immoral monsters. They found proof that Sergeev-Tsenskii saw in the revolution only a destructive force in Syromolotov's comments about Irtyshev and about the meaning of his painting, the Golden Age, for they felt that Sergeev-Tsenskii was expressing his own views through the medium of his literary creation, Syromolotov. The relevant passages are quoted below; the extracts that are enclosed in square brackets were to be removed from the novel in its revised version: Syromolotov is speaking of Irtyshev with his son, Vania:

Syromolotov: "You say that he's a sick man. Let's say it more simply—he should be wearing a muzzle. Your doctor is guilty: he shouldn't have allowed him to visit me without a muzzle. And what's more: he should have warned me: "You see, he bites." I wouldn't have waited for him to slash my picture. I'd have kicked him off my porch, literally, kicked him off if he'd dared to show his face. But I wasn't even warned about it. And now I can't turn him over to the police—you say he's a "political". And "political" means healthy, too healthy, more than healthy: he's supposed to infect everybody around him with his health! Why when he maims me am I condemned to stand with my hands folded? That is the cardinal question as far as I'm concerned! [It was to pose this question that I painted my picture.] Only that, only that—keep it in mind! And why has he alone a patent on liberalism, why don't I have one? Do you think I paint my pictures for the sake of the great princes? Not for them—no, but for myself! They're for my own account—my own personal, and not for the princes! They're at Syromolotov's expense—and Syromolotov is an artist. That is my right as an artist. Understand? And are you painting your pictures in vain? You've only gone as far as your Pheasant Garden while I've stepped over your Pheasant Garden. [I've gone further than your Pheasant Garden and seen the Golden Age! After your Pheasant Garden. Right after. Immediately!] Are you able to understand? You thought that the Pheasant Garden is over there somewhere? The Pheasant Garden is right here (he waved his hand around). And your cook is the red-haired one. Do you understand? He has long arms, like a
monkey! And red hair. And a knife! A knife! And he carries his knife in his pocket. Further—it isn't the pheasant who executes the cook, it's the cook who butchers the pheasant!"

Can you understand? So who was it that you defended with such fervour?"

"With what sort of fervour?"

"So fervently that you almost tore off my arms and practically broke my back—-that fervently!"

"I have often wrestled, you know that, and I know what a person is capable of. I could scarcely hold you back. You would not have maimed him—you would have killed him outright. I did well in shouting: Run away!"

"I don't know if I would have killed him. I don't know. But I would have defended myself! Understand? While I am still alive I should be able to—-should dare to defend myself. Dare!—-that's the word. And you don't dare. You sit in your pheasant garden and wait for them to slit your throat!"

"Why my throat?"

"Yours, yours! Yours, and not mine! They won't slit my throat of course! [I won't live to such ignominy—-and can't agree to live and see it—-but you, it's you they'll slaughter. I'm talking about you. You have saved your own executioner. You didn't save me but my executioner—-and your own, of course. You saved him! That's the marvelous thing about it. That's what's really a marvel—-you people humour along your own executioners, make them multiply, save them! Give them a place to take root, feed them. He'll eat up well, my son, and then slash! He'll chop off the heads of the pheasants."

"What are you saying, father?"

"What do you mean, what am I saying? Look, he's just been here and right here in my home before my very eyes he's prepared to slash up my picture: what will he do with it in a gallery, this red-haired type, when he seizes the galleries?"

Vania remembered Irtyshev the evening Khudoleev opened the clinic and said slowly: "Well, he isn't able to say very much!" "He's able to act, not speak," shouted the old man. "He acts and he will act! It's not in vain that he's so tall, like a three-metre measure. [He is a straight line. He's going toward his own Golden Age, and he'll get there, he'll get there! And those peasants, my peasants with the stakes—-they'll help him, of course. Like you helped him to-day."

"If I hadn't helped him you would have killed him. I've said that already and I'll say it again."
"So what, then there'd be one cook less."

"Well, in that case you yourself would have become a cook for the sake of that cook!" smiled Vania. "What would be the good of that? And you know, you've been asking me all the time if I understand. I understand you—and I understand your picture, and I also understand the red-haired type."

"So what then?"

"I've decided... [not to hinder him!]

"You're going to fold your hands on your belly? Or on your chest? In such a noble pose you're going to stand and wait until they swallow you up? And what are you going to do—you are a fighter. That Aberg of yours—how about him?" The old man, almost begging, with almost terrified eyes, looked at his son. "I loved you during this fight—and for being a wrestler too. I saw some meaning in that. Wrestling, I thought, it is good. Let him wrestle. Let him learn in the circus how to fight—it will be useful in life. But it was useful for you only to break your own father—who is almost sixty now. Only for that. But how about Aberg?"

"Aberg—will remain Aberg, and the people's business—let it stay the people's business."

"Are you going to give it over to them? To the red-haired types? Why are you giving up?" The old man was almost struck dumb.

"It seems that they are more suited for it..."

"More suited for what? To slash pictures?" The old man became pale and began to blink his eyes.

"More suited to lead the masses—" haltingly answered Vania.

"You mean they are in the right—the red-haired types? Yes? Right? The ones with the knives?"

Vania makes no reply and his father drives him out of his house and tells him not to return.

As noted earlier, it was El'sberg's article which provided the ammunition for the critics who were to follow his lead. He quotes the passage reproduced above and Irtyshov's earlier-cited allegations about the intentions of his party and says:

All this is necessary to show the revolution and socialism as
misery, destruction and plundering because, of course, the half-mad Irtyshevs and their hooligan-children can only destroy.  

M. Bochacher writes:

Irtyshev, as a revolutionary, is capable only of destruction — and aimless destruction at that.  

According to Bochacher, Irtyshev's act of slashing the painting is necessary to Sergeev-Tsenskii for the following conclusion put forward by Syromolotov: 'Look, he's just been here and right here in my home before my very eyes he's prepared to slash up my picture: what will he do with it in a gallery, this red-haired type, when he seizes the galleries.' Don't forget that the novel was written during the revolutionary years when this 'red-haired type' had already seized all the picture galleries. The above-quoted phrase is, thus, a re-broadcast of the wailing of the emigre press about the destruction of art by the barbarian-Bolsheviks.  

A. Efremin assumes that Irtyshev is a Bolshevik, although this is not stated in the novel, and continues in the same vein as El'sberg and Bochacher.  

E. Usievich comes to the same conclusions as the others about the slashing of the painting and the seizure of the galleries; she adds a new bar, however, to the variations on a theme with her interpretation of the relationship between Irtyshev and his son:

At the time when Irtyshev had to go into hiding and seek a refuge, his son appears and to this appearance the author considers it essential to apportion a separate chapter under the title "Father and Son". And here the author pours out his petty soul in full contentment: if Irtyshev-senior is both red-haired and coarse and can't conduct himself properly at mealt ime, throws crumbs into his mouth and is, in general, in every way unpleasant, then Irtyshev-junior, is simply a horror. His face is flabby and bloodless, his nose is long, his hair hangs on his forehead in red tangles and even his teeth are smoke-stained (at fourteen!) . . . This monster having sought out his father immediately begins to blackmail him and his father gives him ten roubles and having kept back five roubles for himself, goes off into the night, so to speak, not thinking and not enquiring about what will happen to his child in the future. So, the author says, they talk about human happiness, prepare to re-construct the world and they themselves are moral monsters and everything surrounding them is rotting, spiritual impoverishment prevails.
This outlook is further proof to Usievich of Sergeev-Tsenskii's *vekhoverkvaia* philosophy, further proof that will lead her to the conclusion at the end of the article that Sergeev-Tsenskii is part of the "dirty scum of the culture of the past."^63^  

It will, by now, be obvious to the reader that Sergeev-Tsenskii could not go on peacefully writing the sequel to *Obrechennye na gibel'* and developing the characters in the way he had originally planned. I have indicated in the previous chapter that no mention was made of any intention to continue the epopee *Preobrazhzenie* until 1939 although characters from the earlier novels did appear in *Zauriad-Polk* and *Massy, mashini, stikhii*. Syromolotov is not mentioned, nor is Irtyshev. When Sergeev-Tsenskii undertook the revision of the novel and its continuation in 1944 several important changes were made in his conception of these characters. Syromolotov's painting was revised, as we have seen, and the most provocative of his remarks were removed, he has become reconciled with his son and in general has calmed down and become more sociable. He has begun to read newspapers and to understand that art may have some social significance and that an artist does not paint purely for his own satisfaction. This softening of his outlook is necessary for the transformation which takes place in his character in the novels *Pushki vydvigaiut* and *Pushki zagovorili*. When we meet him in these novels he is painting a huge pictorial representation of a workers' uprising, which is to develop under the encouragement of a seventeen-year old revolutionary-minded maiden whom he meets and marries, into a masterpiece entitled "The Storming of the Winter Palace."

The problem of Irtyshev could not be so easily solved. His place in the novel was too central to allow his removal entirely without a complete re-writing of the novel, but his attack on the painting, even in
its revised version, could not be considered worthy of an underground revolutionary worker. We discover, therefore, in one of the chapters added to the novel, that he was an agent of the Tsarist Okhranka masquerading as a revolutionary.

It should not be discounted that perhaps this was Sergeev-Tsenskii's original intention when he wrote the novel in 1923 for in an article written in 1936 and published in 1940, "Moia perepiska i znakomstvo s A.M. Gor'kim," he indicates that this is the case. Gor'kii after reading the manuscript of the novel in early 1927 noted in a letter to Sergeev-Tsenskii:

You won't mind if I say that Irtyshev is depicted, I think, a little unnecessarily subjectively. You have imparted to him something of Smerdiakov; writers of anti-socialist attitudes have always sinned and will continue to sin in this regard, but for you, a writer spiritually free, this is somehow unsuitable. You will forgive me for this remark?64

Sergeev-Tsenskii writes that he explained later to Gor'kii that

the character Irtyshev was not a revolutionary but a provocateur serving in the Okhranka and that revolutionaries would be introduced in succeeding volumes.65

In spite of the fact that Irtyshev was to prove to be a police agent at the end of the revised version of the novel, all references to his and his son's party membership were expunged as well as all references to the destruction and annihilation that the revolution would bring.

The 'real revolutionary', whom Sergeev-Tsenskii indicated to Gor'kii was to be portrayed in a later novel, was the figure Matiitsev-Dautov in the novel, Iskat', vsegda iskat'! Dautov, although the result of a not entirely successful transformation, is nevertheless a sympathetic figure, strong and virile. The depiction of this character presented Sergeev-Tsenskii with a problem not new to him and not uncommon, of course, in Soviet literature: the problem of the revolutionary as a fanatic. It was
stated in *Obrechennye na gibel* in the figure of Irtyshev and resolved in the case of that character by the revelation that he was an agent of the Okhranka. With Dautov it could not be so easily solved. In Dautov's three different answers in the passages quoted below are revealed Sergeev-Tsenskii's quandary and the impossibility, given the strictures placed upon Soviet writers, of dealing honestly with this sensitive problem.

Fanaticism versus humanism, revolution versus evolution, means justifying the end—such problems are implied in Dautov's answers to a statement of a person who is trying to understand how he can justify what seems to be wanton cruelty. In the three versions can be perceived Sergeev-Tsenskii's dilemma and the dilemma of many writers of the pre-Revolutionary generation who chose to stay and work in their native land—and for their native land—whatever the convolutions of its historical path; who tried to understand and, when necessary, to justify the trials of their land:

Original version first published in 1934:

"You are evidently some kind of fanatic!"

"Yes, I would die for our ideas. And everyone who wants what I want is always ready to die for our cause. It is in this that we are strong while our opponents, the Mensheviks, have only a weak-willed haze in their minds." 

Second version as published in 1956:

"You are evidently some kind of fanatic!"

"No, but I would die for our ideas. And everyone who wants what I want is always ready to die for our cause. It is in this that we are strong."

Third version published in 1959:

"Your are evidently some kind of fanatic!"

"Yes, I am a fanatic! And everyone who wants what I want is also an irreconcilable fanatic. It is in this that we are strong, that we believe in fanaticism while our opponents have only a weak-willed haze in their minds."
In the original version, the conversation continues:

"Why then do the workers fear you? I read about it somewhere—or heard of it."

"There are hardly any of this sort."

"You, it seems, are simply dreamers, poets!"

"No, we are prose-writers. But we have not only a clear plan of action but also leaders of genius."

"And if for you plan—in order to carry it out—you will have to shed oceans of blood?"

"What can be done about it? We'll shed it. [And step over it]."

"Perhaps you are even like saints, but you have a very terrible sanctity."

"Does it frighten you?"

"You don't frighten me personally."

In the second version, 1956, the conversation ends with the words "leaders of genius"—the following sentences are deleted.

In the third version, 1959, the original conversation appears again with one omission, the words enclosed in square brackets "And step over it." Obrechennye na gibel' was the most extensively revised of the works of Preobrazhenie Rossii written before the beginning of the Second World War. The novels written during the War and afterwards have undergone no revision. As was the case with Obrechennye na gibel', revisions of other pre-War works were prompted by critical articles of the late 1920's and 1930's. The revisions are in many cases insignificant; they do not change the concept of the novels as they did in Obrechennye na gibel'. In the later editions of the novel, Zauried-Polk, for instance, comments about the nature of war and its effect on the human character have been removed. Such comments as the following appeared in the original version of the novel:
What is war but simply men hunting down men. ... And the more men you kill, the more medals you get. And bandits shoot one another not only with impunity but in obedience to an oath of allegiance. . . . What does war create? Millions of dead men, millions of cripples and millions of sadists who have lost any sort of resemblance to human beings.72

Reflections of an excessively pessimistic nature which appeared in pre-revolutionary editions of a work were removed when this work was included in the epopee. We find an example of this in the first part of Preobrazhenie cheloveka, the story Naklonnaia Elena, where the following paragraph is removed from the story as it appears in the epopee:

Perhaps every man is born with the possibility of eventually committing suicide, just as on any foot a corn can grow—a narrow shoe is all that is needed—and who knows whether to condemn this possibility or to be glad of it.73

Omissions in some of the other earlier works are of a more amusing nature. In the original version of the sketch Okolo moria, which was to form the first chapter of the novel Valia the following passage occurs in a description of the small seaside town where the novel is set:

Every evening a priest, a policeman and the village elder, the Tatar Umerov, could be seen walking along the sea-shore. The lean Umerov, who wore a cap embroidered with gold, leaned toward the left; the stolid policeman with a face like a Cossack sergeant leaned to the right, his neck bent; the monumental and majestic priest from the single church in town stalked along in the middle, a staff in his hands.

Some wag, a stranger to the town, had called this threesome "Russia" and the title had stayed with them.74

In the 1926 edition of the novel Valia, the reference to "the single church in town" has been taken out; otherwise, the passage is the same.75

In the 1956 edition, the town elder's name has become Ivan Gavrilych; he is no longer a Tatar but is described as "an important property owner" and no longer wears a cap embroidered in gold. The final sentence of the passage quoted above has been dropped—the trio are no longer known as "Russia."76
The change of nationality of the Tatar is incidentally paralleled by the same change in the later edition of the story *Pamiats serdtsa*. "Local Tatars" used to ride around the town in cars; they later became "local inhabitants." What had been a Tatar village becomes just a village. The line-ups for bread which had existed in the 1936 edition have disappeared by the 1959 edition along with the Tatar women who got their bread without lining-up.

The Tatar women with babies at their breasts, with bluish-black braids and hollows above their collar-bones, sunburnt and demanding, always went up to the counter without waiting in line. They had become like that only recently. Tania could remember the time when they sat invisible and mysterious beside their braziers and made coffee.

Changes of a more substantial nature took place in the story *Kapitan Koniaev* between its early publications and the 1959 edition.

*Kapitan Koniaev* depicts the atmosphere of the first months of 1917 in Sevastopol as seen through the eyes of a retired naval officer, Captain Koniaev. He had suffered a head injury in the Russo-Japanese War, had never been quite normal since and is obsessed with the idea that anything and anyone Russian can be nothing but good and that all the ills of Russia are the fault of German or other influences. Disturbed to find that the majority of the people in Sebastopol are not of pure Russian blood, he shudders at the sight of the Tatars, Jews, Greeks, and Germans he sees around him. The Russians he does find all bear revealing characteristics of other races in their speech or appearance. He calls such people the "mishmash" (*smes*) but uses the word with such scorn that its effect is that of calling someone a "mongrel." He demands that all the sailors and soldiers salute him and treat him with great respect. However, when the Tsar abdicates the tables are soon turned; soldiers and sailors cruise the streets in cars accompanied by the town prostitutes and a group of
them assault Captain Koniaev, tear off his badges of rank and leave him unconscious in the street. One of them comments:

Comrade Fel'dman told the truth at the meeting; these kind of people won't stop demanding to be saluted until we kill them. 78

In the story, as first published, Captain Koniaev ends his days in a clinic for the mentally ill in the company of three demented Social Democrats, war-weary officers and assorted paranoiacs, maniacs and hypochondriacs. In the revised version of the story (1959) he is left unconscious on the street.

The original description of the mental asylum contained incidents which inflamed one critic to the point of calling the story "a witless lampoon of the Bolsheviks" typical of "the class enemies of the proletariat." 79

Many critics mentioned the story's evident anti-revolutionary, anti-internationalist or anti-socialistic tendencies. The characterization depended on the time of writing of the review. El'sberg (1927) finds in it "sick nationalism", 80 M. Bochacher (1931) sees reflected in it Sergeev-Tsenskii's view of the revolution as both a personal and class tragedy symbolized by Captain Koniaev's fate. 81 E. Usievich unearths in this story, as in all the rest of Sergeev-Tsenskii's works, evidence of transgression of almost every socialist precept. Pessimism, hostility to the masses, counter-revolutionary attitudes, nostalgia for by-gone... comforts, Philistine animosity of the sort which "considers the lack of straight pins at the market to be the most convincing evidence of the failure of socialism," and so the list goes. 82

In the 1959 edition of the story Sergeev-Tsenskii removed all references to soldiers and sailors riding around in cars with prostitutes, adds three pages in which Koniaev is enlightened about the meaning of
the Tsar's abdication and about the defects of his Great Russian chauvinism, and deleted the two pages which ended the story in its original version. The "lampoon of the Bolsheviks" of which Efremin speaks is in these pages describing the patients in the asylum:

Three of them are together all the time and talk heatedly with each other. They are all haggard, black-bearded, similar to Georgians or others of that type---there is something very Eastern about them; the one with the burning eyes and brown bags under them is perhaps tubercular. They are S.D.'s Social Democrats. They often used to hide spoons, salt-cellars and towels with the aim of socialization of household articles, but these things were taken away from them and now the attendants watch them. The one with the tubercular eyes is the chairman of the group and on every slip of paper which falls his way he writes orders for the others.

It happens sometimes that the Captain suddenly stops what he is doing, raises his right hand as if he is holding a glass and says: "Glory to Russia. Hurrah!"

"Hurrah!" the two soldiers shout and jumping to their feet throw themselves against the wall. They are, to look at them, sturdy lads, both young officers; one a student, the other a former village school-teacher---their nerves could not stand the horrors of war.

"Hurrah!" shouts the Captain getting more and more excited, his hands shaking. "Hurrah!" shout the worn-out paranoiacs---there are four of them; and soon everyone is shouting "Hurrah!" except the three S.D.'s. These dark, raw-boned people, deeply sure of themselves, look at the Captain contemptuously and the Captain notices this and begins to get violent: "Aha! You don't want to salute! For Russia you don't want to!" and with the very strongest of Russian curses throws himself on the tubercular chairman whom he considers to be his greatest enemy.

Usually as soon as the "Hurrahs" resound in the garden the guards rush in and drag the Captain away from the S.D.'s; three or four brawny lads, former front-line soldiers, take him away while he struggles with all his might. Bearded, dishevelled, his face distorted with pain, he becomes similar to Laocoon entwined with snakes.

His condition is bad---very bad---hopeless. They will take him to a cell, put him in a strait-jacket, beat him up a bit and lay him on a hard cot. Here it will seem to him that he has been shoved into some black, narrow, sloping, bottomless pit and that he will slide down without fail and that Russia will slide down there with him.
He will shout with terror, beat the cot with his feet, then will fade away into unconsciousness. When they later let him walk in the garden again, it will be the same thing once more: "Glory to Russia! Hurrah!"

Soviet critics tended to see this depiction of an insane asylum as a disguised representation of Soviet reality. Usievich says: "In the madhouse all the lunatics continue to do what they were doing when they were free" and to back up her opinion cites the description of the soldiers:

There are some who are mad about war---two of them. They hide behind bushes and dig the earth with slivers, or sometimes with their bare hands. The pits they make are no bigger than the tracks of a man in the sand but these are their trenches. They sit in them and gaze into the sky: are airplanes approaching or will there be an attack? Sometimes they shoot, using the same slivers with which they had dug the earth.

Assuming that the soldiers continue their usual activities, Usievich then sees the Social Democrats' socialization of teaspoons as a disguised slander of the program of socialism. It is only one step more to interpret Koniaev's attack on the Social Democrats, while shouting "Glory to Russia", as Sergeev-Tsenskii's own concealed antipathy to the regime.

The literary device of using an insane asylum to satirize one or another aspect of reality was, of course, not new to Russian literature. Chekhov and Garshin immediately come to mind; they are to be succeeded by Il'f and Petrov, Pil'niak and, more lately, Tarsis. A case could be made for including Bulgakov in this list. Sergeev-Tsenskii, as we have seen, depicted an asylum and its inhabitants once very sketchily in Kapitan Koniaev and again, in great detail, in Obrechennye na gibel'. In the latter work, Sergeev-Tsenskii did portray extreme examples of tendencies of thought current in pre-Revolutionary Russia.
The Slavophile, the demented priest and the futurist poet all carry to ridiculous lengths their own particular mania. The futurist poet lays claim to having composed what might be said to be the "last word" in Futurist poetry. His poem entitled Pesn' kontsa (Canto of the End) consists, when he recites it, of describing the figure zero in the air. It was apparently to be identical in printed form with Vasilisk Gnedov's Poema kontsa written in 1913, which appears as a title printed at the top of a blank page. (One could thus say that Sergeev-Tsenskii plagiarized Gnedov's poem!) Irtyshev's fanaticism leads him to take revenge on works of art.

A satire on Soviet reality was not, however, the aid of this description of a 1913-era insane asylum. It seems to me that the same is true of the asylum in Kapitan Koniaev notwithstanding the fact that the story is set in post-revolutionary Sebastopol. The point is that fanatics exist both inside and outside the wall; the fanaticism of the former is easier to control.

Lest this account of critical ire and textual revision create the impression that Sergeev-Tsenskii spent a large part of his life revising his works to please the critics, it should be noted that he undertook no textual revisions of his works until 1944 when he revised and enlarged Obrechennye na gibel'. Until that time works which had been especially severely criticized remained unrevised and unpublished. Denied recognition or even serious discussion of his work during the 1920's and 1930's he nevertheless continued to work on the themes which had occupied him since the beginning of his literary career. Evgenii Petrov wrote in his defence of Sergeev-Tsenskii, "Replika pisatelia" in 1938:

Sergeev-Tsenskii's strength of will, writer's discipline and love
for work is amazing. Finding almost no serious or worth-while criticism of his works, which were all attacked by evil critical gnats, he not only has remained one of the most fruitful Soviet writers, but also has without interruption perfected his great talent.88

Recognition did come with the Stalin Prize (now referred to as the State Prize) in 1941, and it was after this Prize was awarded that the sixty-six year old writer began to take an active part in the war effort with his works of a publicistic nature. It was then also that he apparently began to see the role of an artist in society in a different light and to portray the transformation in the character of Syromolotov, the pivotal figure of a large number of the late works of Preobrazhenie Rossii.

It is difficult to determine Sergeev-Tsenskii's original plans for the characters in Obrechennye na gibel'. Certainly Syromolotov's post-1944 fate was not that envisaged by the author in the early 1920's. The second variant of Syromolotov's painting, "The Golden Age", represents a definite reconsideration of the novel's theme and Syromolotov's attitude to society. Any conjectures about Sergeev-Tsenskii's initial conception of Syromolotov's role in the novel must centre around the possible interpretations of this painting.

The 'over-vigilant' critics of the 1920's and 1930's who saw in the first variant of the painting an allegory slandering the revolution and socialism reveal more about their engrossment with seeking out enemies of the Soviet State than about their concern with literary criticism. "The Golden Age" is in my estimation a reflection of Syromolotov's pessimistic view of the human condition, a view once held by Sergeev-Tsenskii.

Many years earlier, in a letter written to a friend in 1901, Sergeev-Tsenskii, at that time an avid amateur artist, described a painting:
I want to paint a picture like this: a crowd of cripples, beggars, drunkards—the rabble of humanity; it is twilight; rain drizzles; autumn; on the road there are dirty puddles; in front of the crowd is Christ, with a beggar's sack and a staff, a cross on his shoulders. He shines in the mist and his brilliance envelops the nearest cripples. In the distance a wretched village is barely visible——dirty, rotting huts. Everyone is walking——where, why——no one knows.

However——this is all pessimism.

The similarities of this outlined painting to the third part of the triptych are striking: the same wretched crowd aimlessly walking; the same gloomy atmosphere lightened not by Christ, but by the magnificent rainbow.

Many critics have commented on the feeling of hopelessness in Sergeev-Tsenskii's early works. In such stories as Tundra, Lesnaia top', Difterit, Skuka (all written before 1905), the mood is anything but cheerful. Later stories (Pechal' polei, Naklonnaia Elena, among others) leave open the possibility for a more hopeful future. It would not have been surprising if, during the troubled years of the early 1920's, Sergeev-Tsenskii had again assumed a position of utter pessimism. There is no reason to believe that this was the case; on the contrary, the depiction of Syromolotov and his painting, "The Golden Age," represent a rejection of this outlook.

In the original edition of Obrechennye na gibel!, the impression is given that Syromolotov is one of the "doomed to perish." Living in self-imposed exile in Simferopol', this former Professor of the St. Petersburg Academy of Art has estranged himself from everyone and rejected all new developments in art. He takes no interest in politics, refuses to read the newspapers, and observes that when he does venture out of his house, all he sees around him on the streets are "idiots, decrepit wrecks and neurasthenics!!" The latter represent to him the future——the people of "The Golden Age."
Vania, his son, embodies a more optimistic point of view. He, it would seem, was intended by Sergeev-Tsenskii in his initial plans for Obrechennye na gibely to be an active participant in the struggle for a better world. In arguments with his father, when Syromolotov condemns cubism as "befouling mutilations and distortions," Vania replies that if man changes and art does not, then art will become unnecessary and man will cast it aside and go on without this excess baggage. It is Vania who, albeit hesitantly, defends Irtyshev as "more suited to lead the masses" and thus casts his lot with the destruction of Syromolotov's "Golden Age."

In the re-written version of the early chapter of Obrechennye na gibely, and in the post-1944 chapters, the theme of the novel and the position of the characters has been completely reconsidered. The painting, "The Golden Age," has been transformed from a representation of decadent pessimism to an example of bumptious socialist realism. Irtyshev has turned out to be a rogue revolutionary, a secret police agent in disguise. By the end of the novel, Syromolotov is advising Vania to paint pictures of historical battles or of athletes and real workers. He has suddenly become very interested in the world around him, avidly reads the newspapers and looks with favour upon the possibility of a revolution in Russia. The way is thus prepared for Syromolotov's transition in the later novels of the epopee to a politically-committed artist ready to place his talents at the service of the proletarian movement. Entranced by a seventeen-year old "political activist" who is to become his wife, he starts turning out pictures which progress from radiant optimism ("A Morning in May" in Pushki vydvigaiut) to political involvement ("A Workers' Demonstration" in Pushki zagovorili) to final political partisanship ("The
Storming of the Winter Palace" in Vesna v Krymu).

In the final chapters of Obrechennye na gibel', Vania has become unsure of himself and wonders if he should continue his artistic career. He becomes an officer during the First World War and appears, from time to time, in the novels of the epopee dealing with this period. In Vesna v Krymu, he returns home from the front, his right arm amputated after an accident. Effectively emasculated as an artist, he nevertheless wants to continue his career and after being fitted with an artificial arm, manages to paint backdrops for stage settings.

It is pointless, I feel, to trace further the inconsistencies which occur in the portrayal of Syromolotov and of other characters who are to symbolize the transformation of Russia. Their transformation is, to put it bluntly, crudely contrived and achieved. Only Liventsev, the former mathematician and army officer in Zauriad-Polk, Liutaia zima, Burnaia vesna and Goriachee leto, continues to carry throughout the War his innate humanism, his concern for the fate of his men and for Russia as a whole. It is perhaps telling that in the unfortunate etude, Svidanie, published after Sergeev-Tsenskii's death, Liventsev is portrayed as a chronic alcoholic who is just winning his struggle with the cynicism and disillusionment brought about by the many tragic events he had witnessed and personal losses he had suffered.

The transformation of Syromolotov from an artist alienated from his own society to an enthusiastic participant has been interpreted by many Soviet critics as a reflection of Sergeev-Tsenskii's own development from a fellow-traveller to a writer fulfilling his task in the building of Socialism. This is a convenient representation and, perhaps, not without basis in fact. The only consideration overlooked, at least in my opinion,
is that Syromolotov was not mentioned in any works written by Sergeev-Tsenskii for thirty years. During this prolonged period, the author could not deal honestly with the development of this character. When he finally returned to the depiction of the "transformed" Syromolotov, it was during a time of extreme patriotism---in the midst of the struggle against fascism.

Sergeev-Tsenskii's projected portrayal of the transformation of Russia was irretrievably interrupted, first by the World War and then by the Revolution and years of turmoil which followed. Periods of extreme social change demand from the intellectual an immediate declaration of position; we can now, from afar, compare such differing reactions as those of Bunin and Maiakovskii. The situation of the intellectual who is not temperamentally suited to fervid partisanship, who prefers to stand aside and observe before judging, is more difficult. To all is not given the tenacity to maintain their individuality in a situation demanding complete commitment. To still fewer is given the gift of tenacity and genius, for though detachment may be sustained, the possibility of realizing their talent is denied. The thwarted potential of such artists is deserving of recognition and sympathy. It is my conviction that Sergeev-Tsenskii was such an individual.

At least three Russian writers who belonged to the pre-Revolutionary intelligentsia have attempted to portray the transformation of Russia in a novel or series of novels. Aleksei Tolstoi, the "committed artist", failed in the second and third parts of Khodenie po mukham to convey the drama and emotion of the events portrayed. The uncommitted
writer of the first part of the novel evokes in the reader sympathy and understanding for the characters who are to become, in the remaining parts, wooden and unrealistic.

Boris Pasternak was able to write after many years of seeming alienation, but which were in reality years of deep involvement, a masterpiece. He succeeded in *Doctor Zhivago* in incorporating immediate events and yet conveying the eternal significance of human life. Historical circumstances determine the fate of the characters, but the human situation personified in Lara and Zhivago transcends the contemporary and becomes the eternal striving of the individual for fulfillment and union.

Sergeev-Tsenskii succeeded in the earlier parts of *Preobrazhenie Rossii* in weaving a gripping and well-integrated picture of characters with differing backgrounds and convictions. To take only one example, the Syromolotov of the early chapters of *Obrechennye na gibel'* is a fighter, an individual. We may disagree with everything he stands for but he is alive and responsive. His son is carrying on the eternal revolt of the son against the father, an embodiment of this sometimes meaningful, sometimes petty struggle. The steadfast rock of the status quo is attacked by the waves of change personified in the liberal thinker, Vania, and in the extremist, Irtyshev. Of this situation could have been developed in literary form the long struggle which still continues in Russia between rationalism and fanaticism. Forced to discontinue work on the portrayal of this conflict, Sergeev-Tsenskii returned to it at another moment in the history of Russia which demanded the most wholehearted support for the State from every intellectual. Detachment gave
way to precipitate affirmation. The resultant rejuvenated Syromolotov, emasculated Vania and turn-coat Irtyshev cannot be considered to be artistically successful developments of the original characters.

Of Preobrazhenie Rossii, as of so many other works of Soviet literature, can be said: "But for circumstances, it might have been a masterpiece." Much in the life of the individual and in the history of the human race depends on that phrase "might have been." Recognition of the potential, if not the complete success, should be given to the epopee Preobrazhenie Rossii in evaluating the history of twentieth century Soviet Russian literature.
FOOTNOTES TO ABSTRACT


2. S.N. Sergeev-Tsenskii, Sobranie sochinenii v 10 tomakh (Moscow, 1955-56), III, 575.

3. 23 March, p. 1.


6. The term "epopee" is no longer widely used in English literary terminology and some clarification of its meaning in both English and Russian is desirable. Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language (2nd edition, 1960) gives the following definitions: "1. Epic poetry; the epic genre; also an epic poem. 2. A series of events or a narrative of epic character." The Russian word "epopeia" is widely used in reference to both poetry and prose in modern criticism. In poetic terminology it describes, as in English, poetry of the epic genre. Its usage in reference to prose is more complicated. Soviet critics make a distinction between the prose genres of the novel and the epopee and the question of the difference between the two genres has been a point of dispute for many years among Soviet critics. It is generally accepted that the main hero of an epopee is the people (narod) rather than any one individual. *Tikhii Don* is solemnly canonized as an epopee; the narod, and not Grigorii Melekhov, is advanced as the chief hero. Rather more plausible examples of this genre are *Port-Artur* (A. Stepanov) and *Zheleznyi Potok* (A. Serafimovich). *Preobrazhenie Rossii* can, by no stretch of the genre, be classified as an epopee if the generally accepted Soviet critical standards are to be used. Detailed discussion of the question of genre classification of epopees and novels may be found in the following works: A.V. Chicherin, Vozviknovenie roman-epoei (Moscow, 1958), pp. 3-58; L.M. Poliak, "Zhanrovye osobennosti trilogii A.N. Tolstogo Khozhdenie po mukham," Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta (Istoriko-Filologicheskaia seriia), no. 7 (1957), pp. 26-35; S.M. Petrov, Russkii Istoricheskii Roman XIX veka (Moscow, 1964), pp. 224-225 and pp. 318-330. In connection with *Tikhii Don* see the works of L.G. Iakimenko (Tvorchestvo M.A. Sholokhova (Moscow, 1964) and *Tikhii Don M. Sholokhova* (Moscow, 1958). For a dissident view see L.M. Timofeev, Osnovy teorii literatury (Moscow, 1966), p. 350 ff.
FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER I

1. The most easily accessible and reliable source for biographical information about Sergeev-Tsenskii is G. Makarenko's Sergei Nikolayevich Sergeev-Tsenskii, Kritiko-biograficheskii ocherk (Simferopol' 1957). I have used this source for the facts contained in my sketch and have checked them with the chronology, "Osnovnye daty zhizni i deiatel'nosti S. N. Sergeeva-Tsenskogo", given in the guidebook to the museum of Sergeev-Tsenskii in Alushta: Zdes' zhil i rabotal S. N. Sergeev-Tsenskii, Putevoditel' po gosudarstvennomu literaturno-memorial'nomu muzeiu S. N. Sergeeva-Tsenskogo v Alushte, ed. Kh. M. Sergeeva-Tsenskaia (Simferopol', 1965), pp. 65-75. Where I have taken material from other sources or cited facts of a controversial nature, I have given the reference in a footnote. The guidebook will hereafter be referred to in the footnotes as Putevoditel'. There are two editions of the guidebook, one in 1963 and one in 1965; the year of publication will therefore be specified in each footnote.

2. Ivan Shevtsov, Orel smotrit na solntse (Moscow, 1963), p. 17.


4. S. N. Sergeev-Tsenskii, Sobranie sochinenii v 10 tomakh (Moscow, 1955-1956), III, 610. I shall hereafter refer to this collected works of Sergeev-Tsenskii as Sob. soch. v 10 t.


6. There is in existence one of those annoying portraits of the socialist realist school of painting portraying "Serezha Sergeev on the banks of the Tsna" executed by E. V. Riabinskii. See Putevoditel', 1965, p. 9 for a photograph of the painting.


8. Sob. soch. v 10 t., I, 32.

9. Ibid., p. 35.

10. Ibid., p. 291.

11. Ibid., p. 299.

12. Ibid., p. 523 and 489.
103


15. Ibid., p. 419.


17. S. N. Sergeev-Tsenskii, Preobrazhenie Rossii, 4 vols. (Simferopol', 1956-1959), II, 22. There have been two main editions of the epopee Preobrazhenie Rossii, the first in the Sob. soch. v 10 tomakh, vols. VII, V III, IX and X, and the second edition referred to here. Since this second edition contains added novels, I shall cite this edition when referring to works of the epopee.

18. Ibid., p. 43.

19. Ibid., p. 22.

20. Loc. cit.


25. Sob. soch. v 10 t., I, 112.


27. Sob. soch. v 10 t., III, 567 and 569.

28. Contrary to the evidence of other critics who state that Sergeev-Tsenskii wrote nothing except the two works mentioned from the outbreak of the war to 1921, N. Fediukova states in her monograph that "in the first months of the existence of the young Soviet republic, Sergeev-Tsenskii took part in active literary-political work." See N. Fediukova, Epopeia S.N. Sergeeva-Tsenskogo "Preobrazhenie Rossii," (Minsk, 1963), p. 30. She goes on to say that in 1918 and 1919 he wrote children's tales (basni) which "denounce the time-serving of the landowners, the obscurantism of the clergymen, and the crimes of the kulaks." (Page 30). Such
tales as these (Volk-kommunist, Moshchi, Kulatskii khleb) and others devoted to such subjects as the freeing of the Ukraine from the Germans, the condemnation of Skoropadsky government, and the building of socialism in the new republic, were published in various newspapers---Zemlia, Vechernie izvestii, Golos kommunista. Moshchi was distributed in the villages in copies issued by the Russian telegraph agency---it and the other tales are written in the "explanatory-agitational" (raz'iasnitel'no-agitatsionyi) style of Demian Bednyi (page 31). It has been impossible to verify this information and it is my opinion that other Soviet critics who have written articles after Fediukova would have mentioned these facts in their biographical sketches if they could be backed with documentation. Since the information comes from a monograph which has been characterised in the Soviet press as a "collection of absurdities" (E. Permin, A. Priamkov, "Sobranie nelepostei," Lit. gaz., June 6, 1963 p. 1), I feel that further verification is necessary.

30. Shevtsov, p. 159.
33. Sob. soch. v 10 t., III, 570.
34. Shevtsov, p. 169.
35. Ibid., p. 170.
36. M. Gor'kii, Sobranie sochinenii v 30 tomakh, XXIX, 410-411. I shall hereafter refer to this edition of Gor'kii's Collected Works as "Gor'kii, Sob. soch. v 30 t.". The reader will note that Gor'kii's letters to Sergeev-Tsenskii have been published also in Sergeev-Tsenskii's article "Moia perepiska i znakomstvo s A.M. Gor'kim" (Sob. soch. v 10 t., III, 565-626). However, the texts of the letters differ in some cases. Where possible I have cited the letters as they appear in Gor'kii's Sob. soch. v 30 t. since the texts of the letters, with a few exceptions, are more complete in the latter publication.

37. Quoted in Shevtsov, p. 172.
38. Chudo. Iz serii Krymskie rasskazy (Berlin, 1923).
40. In the collection Poet i poetessa (Moscow, 1928).
41. Zhestokost' appeared in numbers 2 and 3, 1926 and V grozu in numbers 9 and 10, 1927.
42. *Arkhiv A.M. Gor'kogo, X, M. Gor'kii i sovetskaia pechat',* kn. 2 (Moscow, 1965), p. 90. Hereafter referred to as *Arkhiv Gor'kogo, X, kn. 2.*


44. Works of A. Tolstoi, V. Shishkov, M. Prishvin and V. Veresaev were published almost from the first issue of *Krasnaia Nov'* in 1921.

45. *Arkhiv Gor'kogo, X, kn. 2, p. 22.*


47. This would appear to be the case also with M. Prishvin, who wrote to Gor'kii: "Thanks to the support of Polonskii, I've written a new link of Kashcheeva tsep'." (*Gor'kii i sovetskie pisateli. Literaturnoe nasledstvo, LXX* (Moscow, 1963), p. 391.)


49. *More,* no. 1, 1926; *Zhestokost',* nos. 2 and 3, 1926; *Kapitan Koniaev,* nos. 8 and 9, 1926; *Zhivaia voda,* no. 4, 1927; *V. grozu,* nos. 9 and 10, 1927; *Poet i chern',* nos. 7 and 8, 1928.

50. *Staryi poloz,* no. 8, 1927; *Prakh Adzhi-Osmana,* no. 7, 1928; *Pavlin,* no. 10, 1928; *Slivy, vishni, chere'shni,* no. 11, 1928; *Blistet'naia zhizn',* no. 3, 1929.

51. *Izvestiia,* July 1, 1925, p. 1.


53. Kundirenko, p. 56.

54. *Poet i chern'. Drama v 5-ti d. i 13-ti kart.*, (Moscow: Tsedram, 1934).

55. *MisheI' Lermontov* (Moscow: Moskovskoe Tovarishchestvo Pisatelei, 1933).

56. Moscow: Moskovskoe Tovarishchestvo Pisatelei, 1934.

57. Moscow: Sovetskaia Literatura, 1934.

58. *Zhenit'ba Pushkina, Drama* (Moscow: Tsedram, 1936); *U groba Pushkina, Drama v 5-ti d.; i 9-ti kart.*, Oktiabr', no. 1 (1937); excerpts from *Pushkin v Tiflise* were published in the journal *30 Dnei,* nos. 3, 9 and 10 (1936).

60. Quoted in Shevtsov, p. 191.


64. "Predislovie," *Gogol' Ukhodit v Noch'*, (Moscow, 1934), p. 3.

65. Shevtsov, pp. 180-181 about *Zhestokost'* and *Rasskaz professora*.


67. *The Bridge and the Abyss* (New York, 1967), p. 33. Gor'kii's article "O Russkom Krestianstve" was published in Berlin in 1922 and has never been included in the collected works of Gor'kii in the Soviet Union.


69. Quoted in Shevtsov, p. 250. The letter was apparently written in 1929.

70. See letters to Voronskii and Zozulia in *Arkhiv A. M. Gor'kogo*, X, kn. 2, pp. 21, 40, 111.

71. Quoted in *Arkhiv A. M. Gor'kogo*, X, kn. 2, p. 104.

72. Gor'kii, *Sob. soch. v 30 t.* XXX, 55.

73. *Arkhiv A. M. Gor'kogo*, X, kn. 2, p. 103.

74. Ibid., p. 108.

75. *Sob. soch. v 10 t.*, III, 593.


77. Ibid., p. 135.


80. E. J. Brown, "The Year of Acquiescence" in *Literature and Revolution*

82. A "model" penal colony according to V. Serge, Memoirs of a Revolutionary, 1901-1941 (London, 1963), p. 279. P. Istrati's comment on visiting the colony was: "A pity that you can't have all this comfort and such a wonderful system of work unless you've murdered at least three people!" (Serge, loc. cit.).


84. Ibid., 624.

85. Fediukova, p. 37.


88. "Tsushimo rozhdenny," Novyi mir, no. 1 (1933). The notes to the Sob. soch. v 10 t. mistakenly state that this article was first published in the almanach Krym, no. 8 (1952). The article that appeared there, "Rozhdenie Tsushimy", was a revised edition of the 1933 article.


93. Ibid., p. 247.


96. Pravda, June 5, 1938. The articles of K. Mironov and K. Malakhov were so vicious that one critic feels they shortened Shishkov's life. He apparently never fully recovered from the shock of these unjust attacks. See Iu. Andreev, op. cit., p. 143.
97. Ts. Fridland, Oktiabr', no. 7 (1934).
98. Stepanov, p. 111.
104. Their fate was the same as that of other historical novels of the period. See Iu. Andreev., op. cit., p. 123: "It is interesting that the great social significance of such novels as V. Kostylev's Koz'ma Minin, S. Borodin's Dmitrii Donskoi, V. Ian's Chingis-Khan, became clear to the critic not when they first appeared---their publication was noted by small, one might say, cool reviews. But how strikingly the pre-war opinions of these novels differ from the evaluations made during war-time. "The Book is a Weapon"---such is the title of the review of V. Il'enkov of Dmitrii Donskoi (Oktiabr', no. 9, 1942), and this thesis-title can be attributed to a whole series of historical novels written spontaneously before the war. It should be noted that these works took their place in the history of literature with the evaluation given them during the war years."
106. Moscow, 1948, p. 149.
108. Andreev, p. 132.
111. Quoted in Shevtsov, p. 252.
112. "Budu rabotat' skol'ko khvatit sil!", Pravda, March 17, 1941, p. 4.


115. Stepanov, pp. 136-137.
FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER II


7. The most accurate and complete bibliography of Soviet prose authors that I have found is the Leningrad Public Library bibliography: Leningradskaiia Publichnaia Biblioteka, Russkie sovetskie pisateli prozaiki: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel', 4 vols. (Moscow, 1959-1967).

8. See article "Poet revoliutsii" in the book Epokha i chelovek (Moscow, 1961), pp. 121-202, where R. Jakobson, Z. Folejewski and H. Muchnic, among others, find their way into his line of fire.


10. Ibid., p. 256.


12. Zdes' zhil i rabotal S.N. Sergeev-Tsenskii: Putevoditel' po gosudarstvennomu literaturno-memorial'nomu muzeiu S.N. Sergeev-Tsenskogo v Alushte (Simferopol', 1965), Hereafter referred to as Putevoditel'.

13. Ibid., pp. 65-75.


20. S. N. Sergeev-Tsenskii, **Sochineniia**, 7 vols. (Moscow, 1910-1916), VII, 179. Hereafter referred to as "Sochineniia".

21. Ibid., p. 165.

22. **Preobrazhenie** (Simferopol', 1923).

23. **Sob. soch v 10 t.**, III, 566.

24. Quoted in N.F. Fediukova, op. cit., p. 34.

25. **Sob. soch. v 10 t.**, III, 606.


31. **Putevoditel',** 1965, p. 68.

32. Ibid., p. 69.

33. Page 3.

34. **Valia** (Moscow-Leningrad., 1926).

35. (Moscow, 1929), p. 4.

36. Page 69.

37. Loc. it.


40. See M. Gor'kii, **Sob. soch. v 30 t.**, XXXIX, 411-412.
41. Sovetskie pisateli. Avtobiografii (Moscow, 1959), II, 360.

42. It is not clear from the text whether the phrase "by that time" refers to 1923 or 1926.

43. Pages 34-35.

44. Sob. soch. v 10 t., VII, 201-604.

45. The notes to the 1955-56 Sob. soch. v 10 t. mistakenly state that Obrechennye na gibel' was published in numbers 1 and 10 of Krasnaja nov', 1927. See vol. III, p. 605.

46. Preobrazhenie was published in English in New York in 1926 with the title Transfiguration.

47. Arkhiv A.M. Gor'kogo, X, M. Gor'kii i sovetskaia pechat', kn. 2 (Moscow, 1965), p. 21. Hereafter referred to as Arkhiv Gor'kogo.

48. Ibid., p. 22.

49. Ibid., p. 28.

50. Ibid., p. 40.


52. Ibid., p. 59.

53. Loc. cit.

54. Quoted in Shevtsov, p. 249.

55. Sob. soch. v 10 t., III, 575.

56. Quoted in Shevstov, p. 250.

57. They were undoubtedly acquainted for Kerzhentsev was the Soviet Plenipotentiary (predpol) in Italy in 1925 and 1926, had joined the Bolshevik Party in 1904 and worked as a correspondent for Pravda and Prosveshchenie in 1912 and 1914, as the assistant editor of Izvestiia TSIK from 1918 to 1920 as well as with the Proletkult. In 1927 and 1928 he was the assistant director of the TSSU of the USSR and from 1928 to 1930, the assistant director of Kul'tpropom of the Central Committee of the Party. Thereafter he directed various cultural and academic institutes and committees. It was his article in Pravda ("Chuzhoi teatr," 17 Dec., 1937) which spelled the beginning of the end for Meyerhold.

58. Shevstov, p. 249.

59. (Moscow, 1929), p. 4.
60. Massy, mashiny, stikhii (Moscow, 1936). On the title page appear the words "Part Two of the Trilogy Slovo o polkakh tsarskikh."

61. "Predislavie", Pushki vydvigaiut (Moscow, 1944). p. 3.


63. There are two types of "signatures", the author's signature (avtorskii list) and the printer's signature (pechatnyi list). The first equals 40,000 characters, the second, sixteen printed pages. See R.A. Maguire, Red Virgin Soil (Princeton, 1968). p. 13.

64. Quoted in Shevtsov, p. 259.

65. See Preobrazhenie Rossi, III, 144-148 and Pristav Deriabin, Sochineniia, VI, 96-103.


67. Rossiia, no. 1. (1924) and Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (Leningrad, 1928-1929), vol. VIII.

68. Sob. soch. v 10 t., III, 575.


70. The notes to the Sob. soch. v 10 t., X, 615, give the year of publication in Novyi mir as 1930. This is incorrect.


72. Cf. L. Leonov, Sot', 1930; M. Shaginian, Gidrotsentral', 1931; V. Kataev, Vremia, vpered', 1932.

73. For further information including the names of the scientists who were the prototypes of characters in the novel, see the article by V.K. Kozlov and F.V. Putnin, "Pevets Preobrazheniia Rossi," Maiak v tumane (Simferopol', 1965), pp. 567-568.


77. "Budu rabotat' skol'ko khvatit sil!," Pravda, Mar. 17, 1941, p. 4.
78. "Predisloviie," Pushki vydvigaiut (Moscow, 1944), p. 3.
79. (Khabarovsk, 1943) and (Moscow, 1943).
81. It was translated and published in London during the war: Brusilov's Breakthrough, tr. H. Altschuler (London, 1945).
83. Shevtsov, p. 260.
84. Ibid., p. 244. Shevtsov allied himself with the conservative group in the literary debates of the early 1960's. In 1961 he published a novel entitled The Ends of the Earth in which the positive heroes "visit the Russian Museum, . . ., read the magazine Neva, and bear simple Russian names" while the negative character "prefers the Hermitage, reads New World and Foreign Literature, and has a name that is not quite Russian, along with thick brows and a slightly hooked nose. The liberal wing is thus crudely identified with intellectual sophistication and 'cosmopolitan' tastes." (E.J. Brown, Russian Literature Since the Revolution (New York, 1963), p. 278). In his book on Sergeev-Tsenskii there are several instances where Shevtsov speaks of critics with Jewish names in a disparaging tone.
85. Stepanov, p. 216.
86. See E. Usievich, "Roman o pervoi mirovoi voine," Znamia, no. 11 (1945), and "Dva romana S. Sergeeva-Tsenskogo" in her book Knigi i zhizn' (Leningrad, 1949), pp. 111-148.
87. Stepanov, p. 165.
88. Ibid., p. 203.
91. Izbrannoe (Moscow, 1956).
94. Sob. soch. v 10 t., II, 579.
Kapitan Koniaev was first published under the title Smes' in the collection Otchizna, Literaturnyi sbornik, kn. 1 (Simferopol', 1919), pp. 29-63. The title was changed when it was printed in Novyi mir, no. 8 and 9 (1926).

Shevtsov, p. 258.

Ibid., p. 259. See footnote number 63 to this chapter for an explanation of the term "signature."

Shevtsov, p. 300.


Makarenko, p. 179.

Page 30.


Putevoditel', 1965, p. 75.

Loc. cit.

In Povesti i rasskazy: Roman 'Vesna v Krymu': Iz dnevnika poeta: P'sesy: Stat'i i vospominaniia: Pis'ma (Simferopol', 1963).


Makarenko, p. 179.


"Krymskie rasskazy" refers to a group of stories written in the 1920's which depict the Civil War years and first years of Soviet power in the Crimea.

Two of these stories, V. grozu and Zhестokost', are included in the recently-published Sobranie sochinenii v 12 tomakh (Moscow, 1967), vol. II.

v zhizni i tvorchestve (Tambov, 1963), p. 125.


FOOTNOTES: CHAPTER III

7. Comments such as these invite a detailed stylistic analysis of Sergeev-Tsenskii's works. His style was not static; throughout his career, he continued to experiment using different methods and devices according to the nature of his subject matter. This very diversity of style makes it impossible to comment briefly on his development as an artist; a lengthy examination is beyond the scope of my present study. It is to be hoped that some future student of twentieth century Russian literature will undertake such an investigation. One particularly intriguing possibility deserves further examination. According to V. Shklovskii, Maiakovskii was well-acquainted with Sergeev-Tsenskii's prose style and his later poetry was influenced by Sergeev-Tsenskii's imagery, (Quoted in N. Zamoshkin, "Sorokaletie. O S.N. Sergeevem-Tsenskom," Oktiabr', no. 11 (1940), p. 165.)
14. It should be noted that during these years of relentless critical attack, one critic wrote consistently objective and favourable analyses of Sergeev-Tsenskii's works. In 1926, Sergeev-Tsenskii
wrote to Gor'kii: "Evidently because of the influence of your opinion about me an article by N. Zamoshkin appeared in no. 12 of Novyi mir greeting Obrechennye na gibel' with warmth and even with praise."

(Quoted in I. Shevtsov, Orel smotrit na solntse (Moscow, 1963), pp. 249-250.) Nikolai Zamoshkin was a member of Pereval until at least the middle of 1929 according to G. Glinka (Na Perevale (New York, 1954), p. 19 and p. 35). His articles were published mainly in Novyi mir, Krasnaia niva and Krasnaia nov'.


22. Loc. cit.

23. Page 77 ff.

24. El'sberg's attack on the sinister significance of the use of allegory foreshadows the denial of any place in socialist realist literature to symbolic devices like metaphor and allegory. See H. Ermolaev: "By 1933 many writers considered allegory 'to be a device for masking ideas critical of the Soviet political system!'" (Soviet Literary Theories, p. 187). As late as 1966 the use of these devices is described (in Z. Kedrina's article on Siniavskii) as "a dazzling disguise for his basic ideas . . . hackneyed anti-Soviet propaganda." (Quoted in On Trial, ed. and tr., Max Hayward (New York, 1966), p. 165.)

25. The Proletarian Episode, pp. 77-80.

26. Ibid., p. 151.

27. Krasnaia nov', no. 5 (August, 1923).


29. Quoted in Brown, The Proletarian Episode, p. 27.


32. Polonskii, p. 163.
33. El'sberg, p. 75.
34. Ibid., p. 78.
35. Loc. cit.
36. Ibid., p. 79.
37. Ibid., p. 80.
38. Ibid., p. 79.
41. F.K., p. 61.
43. Page 82.
44. Page 205.
45. Page 94.
46. Page 89.
47. Preobrazhenie Rossii, 4 vols. (Simferopol', 1956-1959), I, 300-301.
49. Page 79.
52. Ibid., p. 81.
53. Obrechennye na gibel' (Moscow, 1929), p. 177.
54. Ibid., p. 179.
55. Krasnaia nov', no. 10 (1927), pp. 78-79.
58. Page 82.
59. Page 45.
60. Loc. cit.
61. Page 212.
63. Ibid., p. 112.
64. M. Gor'kii, Sobranie sochinenii v 30 tomakh, XXX, 14.
68. Preob. Ross., IV, 277.
70. Sob. soch. v 10 t., X, 360.
72. Zauriad-Polk (Moscow, 1935), p. 188.
73. Russkaiia mysl', no. 3 (March 1914), p. 22.
77. Izb. proiz. (1936-1937), II, 381.
78. Ibid., II, 37.
80. Page 78.
81. Page 46.
82. Pages 85-86 and 89.
84. Page 85.


91. Ibid, I, 226.
LITERATURE CITED

WORKS OF S. N. SERGEEV-TSENKII


Brusilovskii proryv. Moscow: Sovetskii Pisatel', 1943.

"Budu rabotat' skol'ko khvatit sil!" Pravda, Mar. 17, 1941, p. 4.

"Budushchie knigi (o romanakh tsikla Preobrazhenie Rossii.)" Literaturnaia gazeta, Mar. 3, 1945, p. 5.


Gogol' ukhodit v noch'. Moscow: Moskovskoe Tovarishchestvo Pisatelei, 1934.

Iskat', vsegda iskat'!. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1935.


Massy, mashiny, stikhii. Moscow, Goslitizdat, 1936.

Mishel' Lermontov. Moscow: Moskovskoe Tovarishchestvo Pisatelei, 1933.

"Moi tvorcheskie plany (o rabote nad tsiklom romanov Preobrazhenie Rossii.)" Smena, No. 4, 1941, p. 30.

"Moi tvorcheskie zamysly." Literaturnaia gazeta, Jan. 1, 1955, p. 3.


Obrechennye na gibel'. Moscow: Moskovskoe Tovarishchestvo Pisatelei, 1929.

Poet i chern'. Moscow: Tsedram, 1934.


Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. Vols. I-III, V-VIII. Leningrad: Mysl', 1928. Vol. IV and volumes IX to XIV were not published as planned.

Povesti i rasskazy--Roman "Vesna v Krymu"--Iz dnevnika poeta--P'esy--Stat'i i vospominaniia--Pis'ma. Simferopol': Krymizdat, 1963.


Preobrazhenie. Moscow: Moskovskoe Tovarishchestvo Pisatelei, 1929.

"Preobrazhenie (o svoei rabote nad epopei)." Izvestiia, Jan. 16, 1941, p. 4.


Pushki vydvigaiut. Moscow: Sovetskii Pisatel', 1944.

Sevastopol'skaia strada. 3 vols. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1939-1940.


Sobranie sochinenii. Vols. I, IV-VII. Moscow: Knigoizdat'stvo Pisatelei, 1910-1916. (Vols. II and III were not published.)


Zhenit'ba Pushkina. Moscow: Tsedram, 1936.

OTHER REFERENCES


"S.N. Sergeev-Tsenskii (40 let literaturnoi delatel'nosti)." Literaturnoe obozrenie, No. 21, Nov. 5, 1940, pp. 50-52.


Fokht, U. "Lermontov v sovremennoi belletristike." Pechat' i revoliutsiia, No. 9, 1929, pp. 86-95.


Goffenshefer, V. "Dvizhenie na meste." Literaturnyi kritik, No. 3, 1933, pp. 134-137.


Kundirenko, G.P. "K istorii druzhby S.N. Sergeeva-Tsenskogo i I. E. Repina," in Materialy konferentsii posviashchennoi 90-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia S. N. Sergeeva-Tsenskogo. (See under "Alushta.")


Pereverzev, V. "Novinki belletristiki." Pechat' i revoliutsiia, No. 5, 1924, pp. 134-139.


Polonskii, V.P. (pseud. V.P. Gusin) Ocherki literaturnogo dvizheniia revoliutsionnoi epokhi. Moscow: Gosizdat, 1929.


"Roman o pervoi mirovoi voine." Znamia, No. 11, 1945, pp. 62-80.


Zamoshkin, N. "Sva romana o vcherashnem zne." Novyi mir, No. 12, 1926, pp. 149-156.


