



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service    Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

*Sonata Pathétique* by Mykola Kulish and *The Days of the Turbins*

by Mikhail Bulgakov: A Literary Dialogue

By Maria Popovich-Semeniuk


A DISSERTATION

Presented to the School of Graduate Studies and Research of the University  
of Ottawa in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Slavic Studies.

University of Ottawa

Ottawa, Ontario

1990

 Maria Popovich-Semeniuk, Ottawa, Canada, 1990



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service    Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-68103-9

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA  
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the supervision of Dr. Myroslav Shkandrij, Head of the Department of Slavic Studies of The University of Manitoba. I am grateful for his expert advice and guidance, for making this hard work a real creative pleasure.

I should also express my gratitude to Dr. Werner Bausenhart, Chairman of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures of the University of Ottawa, who was always available with advice and assistance, to Professor Marko Pavlyshyn of Monarch University, Australia, for his valuable suggestions, to John Woodsworth, instructor in Russian at the University of Ottawa, for his editorial assistance.

To my readers Dr. Jaroslav Rozumnyj (external examiner), Dr. Vladimir Grebenschikov, Dr. Irena Makaryk, and Dr. Andrew Donskov I express my grateful appreciation.

I am also indebted to Nicole Charette of the School of Graduate Studies and Research of the University of Ottawa for her care and understanding, to the secretaries of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, Lydia Choulguine, Rejéanne Deslaurier, and Anna-Maria Bianchi for their kindness and support.

## Table of Contents

Note on Transliteration -----	1
Introduction -----	III
CHAPTER ONE -- Mikhail Bulgakov, Mykola Kulish, and Their Age -----	1
CHAPTER TWO -- Protagonists in Family and Society -----	36
CHAPTER THREE -- Structure and Artistic Devices -----	75
CHAPTER FOUR -- Symbols of National Culture in <i>The Days of the Turbins</i> and <i>Sonata Pathétique</i> -----	112
CHAPTER FIVE -- Stage History -----	151
CHAPTER SIX -- The Dialogue Cut Short. -----	198
CONCLUSION - -----	206
NOTES -----	209
BIBLIOGRAPHY -----	245

I  
Note on Transliteration

In this dissertation the following transliteration scheme, based on the Library of Congress System II has been used:

а - a	о - o
б - b	п - p
в - v	р - r
г - h (Ukrainian)	с - s
g (Russian)	т - t
г - g (Ukrainian)	у - u
д - d	ф - f
е - e (Ukrainian and Russian)	х - kh
є - ie (Ukrainian)	ц - ts
ж - zh	ч - ch
з - z	ш - sh
и - y (Ukrainian)	щ - shch
i (Russian)	ь - (hard sign) [not transliteration is given]
і - i (Ukrainian)	ы - y (Russian)
ї - i (Ukrainian)	ь - ' (soft sign)
й - i (Ukrainian and Russian)	о - e (Russian)
к - k	ю - iu
л - l	я - ia
м - m	' - ' apostrophe (Ukrainian)
н - n	

An exception has been in the case of Russian surnames ending in -ый/-ий and Ukrainian in -ий. These have been rendered -y in English. Some surnames and place names with already established English spelling have been retained: Gorky, Meyerhold, Khvylovy, Kiev, Odesa.

*Sonata Pathétique* by Mykola Kulish and *The Days of the Turbins*  
by Mikhail Bulgakov: A Literary Dialogue

Introduction

The history of Ukrainian-Russian literary relations has been a long and often intimate one. In the 17th and 18th centuries the flow of intellectuals and ideas was mainly from Kiev to St. Petersburg.<sup>1</sup> In the 19th and early 20th centuries Russian writing played a major role in shaping Ukrainian literature.

After the Revolution, with the rise of Ukrainian national consciousness, the relationship of Russian and Ukrainian literatures became a central issue in the Literary Discussion,<sup>2</sup> a public debate initiated by Mykola Khvylovy that took place in 1925-1928.<sup>3</sup> In early Soviet scholarship Pavlo Fylypovych, Mykola Zerov and others treated aspects of the Russian-Ukrainian literary relations.<sup>4</sup>

Studies of the two literatures in later Soviet criticism include O. I. Bilets'kyi and M. K. Hudzli, eds., *Rosiis'ka literatura ta Ukrains'ki literaturni zvi'iazky. Zibrannia prats' v p'iaty tomakh*, Vol. 4 (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1966); O. I. Bilets'kyi, *Braterstvo kul'tur. Zbirnyk materialiv z istorii rosiis'ko-ukrains'koho kul'turnoho iednannia*. (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1954); I. A. Dzeverin, ed., *Iednanie literatur* (Kiev, 1955); N. I. Kratkov, *Russko-Ukrainskie literaturnye svyazi* (Kiev, 1954); Ia. Pryima, *Shevchenko i russkaia literatura 80-90x rokiv* (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1966). There are many comparative studies in the more general field of culture, almost all of which subordinate

#### IV

Ukrainian to Russian literary history and are dominated by a teleological imperative -- to demonstrate the drive toward unification of these literatures and to show identical processes operating in the two literatures.

Some of the best Soviet studies of comparative Russian and Ukrainian literatures are contained in Oleksandr Bilets'kyi's *Zibrannia prats' u p'iaty tomakh*, (Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Naukova dumka," 1966, vol. 4). In a series of articles, Bilets'kyi criticizes colleagues who were trying to prove the full subordination of Ukrainian literature to Russian. He advances the idea that it is impossible for these two adjacent systems not to inter-relate, but their correlation does not mean in any way a full dependence of one literature on the other. In one of his articles "Do pytannia 'Ivan Franko' i rosiis'ka literatura" ("On the question of 'Ivan Franko' and Russian Literature") published for the first time in *Literaturna hazeta* on 9 September 1956, Bilets'kyi writes that "some scholars, while treating the subject of Ivan Franko and Russian literature, referred to any eminent Russian literary work, selected any analogical thoughts, themes, images, motifs to those found in Franko" and concluded that "if Franko had not read Chernishevskii, Belinskii, Dobroliubov, if he had not oriented himself to Russian literature and so on, he would not have become an important writer."<sup>5</sup> Among the works listed in the Bilets'kyi article is Franko's poem "Son kniazia Sviatoslava" ("The Dream of Prince Sviatoslav"), which he compares with Aleksandr Pushkin's drama *Boris Godunov*. Although Pushkin's drama served as a stimulus for the Ukrainian poet, Franko took a completely different approach to the treatment of the principal motif of the work. The people in Franko's poem are only the king's followers. There are no similarities either in the structure or in the versification (In Franko's

poem pentametre is closely observed, while in Pushkin's drama it is introduced only to underline certain motifs). Billets'kyi points to the fact that in Soviet textbooks Franko's poem "Moisei" ("Moses") is treated as a piece "devoted to the events of the Russian Revolution of 1905" although it is documented that Franko started to write his poem in 1891 as a reply to K. Ustynovych's poem "Moisei", published in 1881 in the magazine *Zoria (Star)*.

One can find many other poems in the early Franko that were written under Pushkin's influence.<sup>7</sup> Franko's *Tiuremni sonety (Prison's Sonnets)* can be juxtaposed with Dostoevsky's *Notes from the House of the Dead*. His novel *Perekhresni stezhky (The Crossing Pathways)*, adapts Dostoevskii's manner of psychological analysis in depicting the feelings of the sadist Stal'skyi and his maltreated wife, Regina. In Franko's lyrical cycle "Ziviale lystia" ("Withered Leaves") we find a scene where the hero, driven to despair, calls for the Devil, who appears "not as a ghost" but as an image of Ivan Karamazov. Many parallels can, of course, be drawn among the works of other Ukrainian and Russian writers.

In his article "Formal'nyi i real'nyi natsionalizm" ("Formal and Real Nationalism") Franko defines the Ukrainian-Russian literary relation as follows: "European literature always appealed to us, developed our aesthetic taste, our creative imagination, while Russian writings tormented us, aroused our consciousness, awakened in us a human being, a love, and a compassion towards the poor and the oppressed."<sup>8</sup> Thus, according to Franko, Russian literature has always provoked Ukrainian thinkers to respond, to open a dialogue.

Natalia Kuziakina's monograph *Lesia Ukrainka i Aleksandr Blok* (Kiev: "Radians'kyi pys'mennyk," 1980) presents an interesting work in the

field of comparative study that avoids the standard Soviet formulas in comparative literatures. Taking as her point of departure Blok's quotation, "poets are interesting not in how they resemble one another but in how they differ,"<sup>9</sup> Kuziakina shows how Blok and Ukrainka, two poets of opposite sexes and different cultural backgrounds, reflect the same historical events in their poetry, but do so through very different aesthetic systems.

Among the more interesting comparative studies in Western scholarship are the article by Valerian Revutsky "Between *Sonata Pathétique* and *Optimistic Tragedy*" (*Studia Ucrainica* No. 1, Ottawa: University Press, 1978) and a study by George G. Grabowicz, "Ukrainian-Russian Literary Relations in the 19th Century: A Formulation of the Problem" -- a paper delivered at the University of Ottawa in 1984. In his article Revutsky examines the influence of Kulish's *Sonata Pathétique* on other Soviet dramas of the 1930s, focusing on the technical devices used by the Soviet Russian writer Vsevolod Vishnevsky in the play *Optimistic Tragedy*. The latter is considered by many critics to be the most popular classic of the Soviet theatre. Grabowicz's paper, on the other hand, systematizes the principles and concepts of this field of study.

The political interference in cultural developments in the post-revolutionary era made the relationship between the two literatures far more problematic than either Soviet or émigré accounts often allow. Moments of tension and confrontation between Russian and Ukrainian cultural attitudes and between individual writers can be detected throughout this period. Even a writer as "progressive" as Maxim Gor'ky, in a letter to Oleksandr Slisarenko prohibited the translation of his novel into Ukrainian, considering Ukrainian a "dialect". He criticized Ukrainians for

imagining "their dialect to be a real language", and for "oppressing those Great Russians who were a minority", forcing them to speak that dialect." 10

Mikhail Bulgakov is an instructive example of the problematic confrontation between Ukrainian and Russian cultural attitudes after the Revolution. Born and raised in the capital of Ukraine, he showed little interest in Ukrainian culture. In his works, he reveals at times a hostile attitude toward the Ukrainian national movement and occasionally to the language itself (which he himself did not know).

The feeling of superiority on the part of some Russian intellectuals toward Ukraine was an attitude shared by the Communist Party of Ukraine, which in the early 1920s theorized a "struggle between two cultures", foreseeing the eventual victory of the superior urban Russian culture over the inferior peasant Ukrainian. Gor'ky's letter, as well as Bulgakov's works, must be seen in the context of this political and intellectual debate, which came to a head during the Literary Discussion.

An underlying motive to much Ukrainian writing after the Revolution was the desire of Ukrainian writers to produce works that would challenge dominant Russian attitudes to Ukrainian culture showing no signs of formal derivation from Russian literature. Perhaps the most interesting and sophisticated elaboration of this problem was expressed in the works of the dramatist Mykola Kulish.

This dissertation concentrates on two major works of the 1920s and early 1930s -- Kulish's *Sonata Pathétique* and Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Days of the Turbins* devoted to the Revolution and Civil War in Ukraine in 1918-1919. The study investigates the affiliation of both writers with Ukraine, as well as their attitudes toward historical events and different social

## VIII

groups. It also indicates how the artistic structure of each play is related to each writer's aesthetic position.

Artistically superior to other contemporary plays<sup>11</sup> and expressing much sympathy toward the defeated White Guards, *The Days of the Turbins* proved to be a great success with Russian playgoers when it was first staged on 5 October 1926. On the other hand, its interpretation of historical events in Ukraine, along with its evident scorn for the Ukrainian national movement, challenged Ukrainian writers, who were appalled by the play's enthusiastic reception. In reply to events taking place in cultural politics in general, and to Bulgakov's play in particular, Mykola Kulish wrote a trilogy: *The People's Malakhii* (1927), *Myna Mazailo* (1928-29), and *Sonata Pathétique* (1931). In *The People's Malakhii* Kulish touches only on general questions concerning Ukrainian national identity; in his *Myna Mazailo* he engages in a dispute with his Russian colleague primarily on the language question; in *Sonata Pathétique* he responds to Bulgakov on major political and aesthetic issues.

Set in Ukraine and responding to the same historical events, Bulgakov's and Kulish's plays are of a central importance to both playwrights' careers. Moreover, the two plays form an essential part of the history of Russian and Ukrainian drama: *The Days of the Turbins* was the play that helped re-launch the Moscow Art Theatre (MKhAT) after its post-revolutionary decline. *Sonata Pathétique*, though never staged in Ukraine during the writer's lifetime, was the culmination of a decade-long collaboration between two leading intellectuals of the Ukrainian renaissance of the twenties, Mykola Kulish and the director-producer Les' Kurbas.

A comparison of the two plays in this political and cultural context leads to a re-interpretation of both. It also raises a theoretical question with much wider implications. The plays are only part of a broader and continuing dialogue between Russian and Ukrainian literature: Russian literature has often functioned as a context for Ukrainian writing and as a stimulus for Ukrainian critics and writers; Ukraine, in turn, has provided material for many Russian works: Mikhail Bulgakov, Iurii Olesha, Valentin Kataev, Isaak Babel, Viktor Nekrasov, Iliia Il'f and Evgenii Petrov were born in Ukraine and wrote remarkable works often based on Ukrainian themes. The importance of such a contextualization and the "dialogic" character of much of this writing has never been addressed. The dissertation contributes to the analysis of a literary context and an inter-literary dialogue. Bulgakov's play, its reception, and Kulish's "answer" constitute one episode in an extensive discussion that was taking place during the 1920s but which had its roots in a wider debate between two intelligentsias and two literatures.

This study is based mainly on the final versions of Bulgakov's and Kulish's plays. Most quotations are from George S. N. Luckyj's translation of *Sonata Pathétique* (Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975) and Michael Glenny's translation of *The Days of the Turbins* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1979) which are based on these final versions. References to earlier versions of the plays are made in order to clarify certain problems raised by both writers which sometimes seem obscured, as the final editions were considerably censored. All translations from other Russian and Ukrainian sources are mine.

## Chapter One

Mikhail Bulgakov, Mykola Kulish, and Their Age

At first glance *Sonata Pathétique* by Mykola Kulish and *The Days of the Turbins* by Mikhail Bulgakov appear to be typical early Soviet epic dramas about the most popular theme of the time, the Revolution and the Civil War. However, they differ significantly from other mass-produced Soviet historical epics of the 1920s and 1930s because of their technical sophistication and the integrity with which the writers explore the central issues of the Revolution, the Civil War and the national problem.

Composed by authors of different national backgrounds who nonetheless bore witness to the same events, the two plays show fundamental differences in the sociological and aesthetic treatment of the same subject. The source of their philosophical differences -- which in turn shaped their aesthetic concerns -- is to be found in the intellectual dilemmas of the 1920s. Bulgakov belonged to the Russian intelligentsia that lived in Ukraine and supported the Monarchy, while Kulish belonged to the new Ukrainian intelligentsia that fought for the new régime, hoping to establish an independent Ukrainian state and to assert Ukrainian national culture. Writers of the day acted both as historical witnesses to extraordinary events and as artists who struggled for the creation of an adequate literary form to express their own concerns and viewpoints.

a) Creative History: from Novels to Plays.

Both writers attempted synthetic works that would impose an artistic unity on history. The terrible years of social cataclysm were followed by a struggle over both the political and artistic interpretation of events. These two controversial pieces of literature, each in its own way, express the tragedy of a generation. The authors' personal correspondence acknowledges the creation of their works, reveals their sincere intentions and prepare the readers for an appropriate reception of the describing events.

The idea of writing about the Civil War in Ukraine came to both writers independently and almost simultaneously: both writers originally intended to create an epic novel; both novels turned into plays. Bulgakov, nevertheless, succeeded in finishing at least a part of his planned prose trilogy,<sup>1</sup> about the Revolution and the Civil War, covering the period of 1918-1919, while Kulish never had the opportunity to complete his novel.

In his *Autobiography* of 1924 Bulgakov wrote: "I spent one year [1923] writing the novel *The White Guard*",<sup>2</sup> although the intention of writing a novel about the Civil War in Ukraine came to him earlier in his writing career. In a study of the novel's origins, V. A. Chebotareva confirms that it "was planned as a family chronicle whose peaceful course was interrupted by the events of the Revolution",<sup>3</sup> and some letters quoted in her study point out that early in 1921 Bulgakov was already working on the book. In February of that year Bulgakov wrote from Vladikavkaz to his cousin Kostia Bulgakov: "I am writing a novel, the only thing well thought out by me."<sup>4</sup> In another letter from Vladikavkaz to his sister Vera Afanasevna, dated 26 April 1921, he sends three extracts from a short novel entitled *Dan' Voskhishchenia (A Tribute of Admiration)* which are similar

to the first pages of the novel *The White Guard*. Though only some fragments of this work have survived, they clearly express the main problem raised by the writer -- the anxiety of a family whose son has not come home. According to Ellendea Proffer, "the roots of this story are the events in Kiev in 1918-19, when Kolya and Kostya Bulgakov [the writer's brothers mobilized into the White Guard army] were missing."<sup>5</sup> Nadezhda Mandel'shtam also confirmed that Bulgakov met her husband Osip Mandel'shtam in the Caucasian mountains in 1921 and asked whether he [Mandel'shtam] thought it was worth entering a novel in a Moscow literary contest.<sup>6</sup>

In their studies of the writer, Marietta Chudakova and Lidia Ianovskaia argue that Bulgakov began writing the novel as early as 1919 in Kiev when he made a draft for *Bolezn'* (*Illness*).<sup>7</sup> According to Colin A. Wright, further related stories appeared in 1922: "The Extraordinary Adventures of a Doctor" in *Rupor* (*Mouthpiece*), and, more importantly, a feuilleton in *Nakanune* (*On the Eve*) entitled "V noch' na tretee chislo" ("On the Night of the Third") from the novel *Alyi makh* (*The Scarlet Stroke*), referring to events of 1919 and Petliura's departure from Kiev.<sup>8</sup>

These two early stories share several distinctive features characteristic of *The White Guard* and *The Days of the Turbins*: an interest in social analysis; the protagonists' dissatisfaction with all the new changes in society; "the road to Calvary" theme, expressing the spiritual tortures of a Russian intellectual during the Revolution and in the post-revolutionary period; the theme of guilt and retribution; the defeat of the White Guard; the idea of a native home. In all of these works, according to Chebotareva, "the position of the author stands somewhere very close to his

heroes."<sup>9</sup> Anatolii Smelliansky is also convinced that "the art of Bulgakov is autobiographical throughout."<sup>10</sup>

The only evidence concerning Kulish's writing a novel is found in Antonina Kulish's "Spohady" (Memoirs)<sup>11</sup> and in the correspondence with his former school-friend Ivan Dniprovs'kyi. On 17 July 1924 Kulish wrote to Dniprovs'kyi:

I am writing a novel with the following a plot: the son of a shepherd, Trokhym Lemish, studying at home through the University extension... turns his hands to everything in order to survive. He falls in love with a rich young lady, Maryna Perots'ka, who, for a while, amuses herself with him, regarding Trokhym as a "queer fellow" and dropping him later.... At this point the 1914 mobilization starts. Lemish is mobilized as a soldier. He spends three years in the trenches but, as a true knight, lives only through his love for Maryna. The love lyrics interweave with lightning and the smoke of war. A whole chain of images of the war field. A whole line of real scenes where officers, soldiers, priests, Chinese, Galicians, members of the intelligentsia, workers, Jews appear (all this is to come from my own experience, from my own life.) Later: the Revolution. Lemish is thrown into life like a "chip". He goes a long way from his old ideology to the new communist one. Lemish's love does not die until Maryna appears as a member of a secret White Guard organization. She is arrested. Lemish takes part in the revolutionary tribunal. Maryna is condemned to death. One summer night, Lemish goes to the Cheka,<sup>12</sup> and somewhere underground kills Maryna with his own hands. This is the plot,

the frame... The War and the Revolution. A bare truth and a strict realism are needed here. No fictions of any kind, or superfluous tracteries, nor any hints of hypocrisy.<sup>13</sup>

In another letter to Dniprovskiy dated 24 December 1924, M. Kulish writes that he is working on

a major piece which demands a certain appropriate composition: one cannot fit such an epoch as the War and the Revolution (1914-1922) into one frame. Wouldn't it be a good idea to use a combination of lyrical digression, epistolary form (letters to a heroine), diary, and separate concise energetic short stories?<sup>14</sup>

Later, he plans to write his work in the form of a "cine-poem". Most importantly, Kulish wanted to compose the work "without any measure of hypocrisy", and to "solemnly address it to the proletarian people living in Ukraine and beyond its borders."<sup>15</sup>

Kulish's letters to Dniprovskiy are valuable not only because they are the only source of information about his novel but they also disclose the writer's nature: his sincerity, a concern of his reader and his literary motives.

In a letter of 27 January 1925 Kulish writes:

Last Sunday I read two first chapters of my novel at the *Hart*<sup>16</sup> literary discussion meeting. I wanted to put myself to the test of these people. They sincerely praised me, they even admired the novel, but they also scolded me. They said that the style was obsolete, it lacked dynamics; but, Jean, how can I write a 125-chapter-long novel? If you invigorate the dynamics, the movement, and you start to lacerate the reader's nerves right from the beginning, what will happen to him after, let's say, the

50th chapter? In this case the old style is needed.<sup>17</sup>

In the very same letter he underlines his determination to create "real heroes" and to write "only the truth".

On 16 February 1925 Kulish mentions his novel once again and his determination to finish it:

Concerning my novel: I will finish it. I will write it in such a sincere way that it will fill the readers with a warm and genuine feeling as soon as they touch it with their hands. It will be honest, with authentic guileless people, with naked truth, without hypocrisy...<sup>19</sup>

The final information about the novel is found in another letter dated 28 June 1925, while Kulish was finishing his play *Commune in the Steppes* composed at the party's request. Kulish writes:

My characters [in the play] are all real, dynamic. But, nevertheless, Jean, I am not satisfied with the play. It distresses me a lot... I feel wretched. It did not turn out the way I wanted it to.

... I long for my novel, and I cannot find time for it. But one day, if I don't die, I will finish it, Jean. The only thing I need is to untie my hands from these plays and to run away from Eldabexth<sup>19</sup> to be closer to all of you [writers].<sup>20</sup>

Unfortunately, the novel to which Kulish devoted so much of his life and thoughts was never finished. The manuscript has been lost.

#### b) The Staging and Reception of *The Days of the Turbins*

Staged on 5 October 1926 at the Moscow Art Theatre after many changes and adaptations to meet both stage and censorship requirements,

*The Days of the Turbins* evoked sharp debate among the critics and great interest in the public. As one critic put it,

this was not surprising... the Civil War had ended only five years before and the memory of the armed struggle against the defenders of the monarchy, the White Guards, was still fresh in people's minds. Yet here was the Art Theatre presenting the family of Alexei Turbin and his friends in far from dark colours.<sup>21</sup>

According to later Soviet critics, Bulgakov asserted the historical truth and inevitability of the Revolution. He achieved this by showing the realization among those members of Russian society opposed to Bolshevism and sincerely devoted to the "white banner" that the autocracy had collapsed. He portrayed it as being swept away by the tidal wave of popular discontent, he showed that the idea of homeland and autocracy had lost their credibility, but also that the protagonists believed their mission in life was to serve Russia, even the "new" Bolshevik one. Through their sufferings and struggles they underwent a spiritual renewal that gave them strength for a new future. Alla Mikhalkova believes that "Bulgakov gives a convincing picture of the crisis of the old ideas, the need for honest people to revise their stand in life... and this becomes the keynote of the play, its emotional appeal."<sup>22</sup>

In addition to this sympathetic portrayal of a White family, the public liked the play because it was written in the old Russian theatrical tradition. As A. Lunacharskii put it,

the way the heroes lived in their Chekhov-like apartments... their witticisms, jokes... the family life behind their cream-coloured blinds, and the Christmas tree... their songs to the

accompaniment of guitar..., and finally, the fact that it ends with a wedding...<sup>23</sup>

All these features and the positive portrayal of Russian officers made the play very different from the standard "agitkas" (the propaganda plays so widely staged in the 1920s) and helped it gain the approval of Russian audiences. According to Proffer's study, the play had such a powerful effect upon its spectators that it changed the negative opinions and attitudes of people who had previously felt hostile toward the Whites. As a result of the drama playgoers now began to view the White guards in a different light. During the intermissions some people discussed the play in whispers, others openly called it a conspiracy. The play had a divisive effect: when the Tsarist national anthem was sung, some of the audience stood up, while others objected to it as counter-revolutionary.<sup>24</sup>

Recalling the play that was the greatest event of the theatrical season, one witness to the events, N. Gorchakov, wrote:

There was a long line of Muscovites at the ticket window in the evenings. That part of Russian society whom the Bolsheviks had termed "former people" made their pilgrimage to the Moscow Art Theater. These were people who had lost relatives in the Civil War and in the terror... Such individuals hoped that this production heralded a peace between the Soviet regime and its enemies and an end to the terror of new repressive measures. They filled the auditorium of the Theater, eager to recognize with love and sadness the sufferings of individuals whom they held dear. Very often, after the scene with the White soldiers in the secondary school, some people in the audience would grow hysterical; the women would bewail their sons and husbands and

some fainted, and the ushers would carry them out to the snow in the theater courtyard.

These were not play-goers but palmers, and their pilgrimage was to see a stirring miracle in a land of terror and "class hatred..." One could make a pilgrimage to this presentation, for it was filled with the miracle of Christian forgiveness; it called for extending one's hand to the defeated enemy of yesterday.<sup>25</sup>

The *New York Times* correspondent Walter Duranty wrote a very favourable account about the play's impression on the public; he considered it a sensational theatrical event completely untypical of the Moscow theatre run-on. It was, according to Durante,

the first time since the Revolution that the revolutionary period had been presented, so to speak, "without prejudice" and as it really occurred.

This is what crowds the theater to the limit and creates such a demand for tickets that they are sold by lot. Those in the waiting queues are numbered, the numbers are put into a box and drawn out, and only those with low numbers need wait to buy tickets.

Behind the *New York Times* correspondent last night sat a young Communist who sneered audibly during the earlier part of the play. But Turbin's last speech and death in the next scene, when his desperately wounded young brother related the news to the family, literally made him weep.

"What's the matter, friend?" the correspondent asked him.

"I can't help it," he replied. "It is too real. I saw things like that myself."

There you have it, scarcely a person in last night's audience was not re-living similar scenes in his own memory.<sup>26</sup>

While sympathizing with the Whites living in Kiev and trying to "rehabilitate" them, Bulgakov showed a great disdain for the native Ukrainian people, misinterpreted some historical and social events, and re-opened, as Wright put it, "the complex problem of nationalities, after, in theory, it had been solved".<sup>27</sup> As one critic has written, "he threw down the gauntlet at the accepted presentation of the Civil War in Ukraine and at the most painful problems his contemporary Ukrainians were undergoing in the establishment of their political and cultural sovereignty."<sup>28</sup>

It is well understood that Stalin's government saw in this play a tool in its fight against national minorities.<sup>29</sup> The White Guards may have been defeated, but the Ukrainian resistance was still alive and here Bulgakov had offered a play that soothed the anger of Russian viewers, while portraying a common "external enemy".

c) The Political Situation in Ukraine at the Time and *The Days'*  
*Impact on the Ukrainian Intelligentsia.*

At the very time that *The Days of the Turbins* was so successfully staged in Moscow, Ukrainians were going through a great debate concerning the pace and extent of the Ukrainization that the Party had proclaimed in 1923. One group of cultural activists in Ukraine argued that the pace of Ukrainization in the civil service, media and educational system was excessively slow. Both Oleksander Shums'ky, the head of *Narkomos* -- (*Narodnyi komisariat* -- The People's Commissariat) -- the powerful ministry in charge of Ukrainization, and Mykola Khvyly'ovy, a leading writer,

spearheaded a campaign for accelerated Ukrainization. They also castigated anti-Ukrainian sentiment among large sectors of the government and party.

Mykola Kulish, as a member of the Ukrainian national communist movement, sympathized with this assault on the policy of Russian national supremacy. He was closely associated with the Literary Discussion's chief protagonist, the poet and writer Mykola Khvyly'ovy. In 1926 he took over the presidency of the literary organization VAPLITE (*Vil'na Akademiia Proletars'koi Literatury* -- Free Academy of Proletarian Writers), replacing its former leaders Mykola Khvyly'ovy, Mykola Ialovy and Oles' Dosvitni. Kulish struggled throughout 1926-1927 to defend VAPLITE and its members, who included many of the best Ukrainian writers. Finally, on 14 January 1928, the organization was forcibly dissolved.<sup>30</sup>

Kulish, like other members of VAPLITE, was interested in the national problem and attempted to portray the dilemmas of the Ukrainian intellectual. In 1929 during the dispute about the theatre he wrote: "In our literature we do not dare pass over such an important and painful question as the national problem... As a party member and citizen, I cannot ignore this problem, and I do not want to solve it white-gloved..."<sup>31</sup>

After the elimination of Vaplite and the persecution of its members, Kulish re-evaluated the nature of the Ukrainian revolution in its entirety, as well as the relationship between the Ukrainian and Russian cultures. At the same time he was deepening his knowledge of world theatre and drama, preparing himself for the writing of his major works: *The People's Malakhii* (1927-8), *Myna Mazailo* (1929) and *Sonata Pathétique* (1931) -- a trilogy that challenged both traditional Russian messianic views of cultural supremacy and the underestimation among some Ukrainian contemporaries of their own nation's cultural and spiritual values.

In 1928 Kulish felt a need to travel. The playwright visited Moscow, Leningrad and other Soviet cities. In Moscow, he had the opportunity to see Bulgakov's play, and on his return to Kharkiv he wrote his tragi-comedy *The People's Malakhii*, an indirect response to Bulgakov's play and to the whole Bolshevik régime. In Kulish's main character, Malakhii Stakanchyk, one can recognize the Ukrainian Philistine Vasilisa (Vasilii Ivanovich Lisovich) who is depicted in the novel and in the play *The White Guard* and in the two first editions of *The Days of the Turbins*. Malakhii hides from the main events and problems created by the Revolution, awaiting its end in order to decide his allegiance. Kulish parodies "the future" of Bulgakov's hero, who not only successfully survived the events of the Revolution and adjusted to the new regime, but also became its Messiah.

Having read Marx's *Capital* and having heard the "Internationale" (with which Bulgakov's play ends) Malakhii Stakanchyk starts feeling ashamed of himself. He decides to "destroy" his national identity, he abandons his family and develops a "brilliant" idea for the "immediate reform of the people", in order to fully "reform or to destroy the Ukrainian character". He anticipates the same for his own "slavish" country which he is determined "to transform or to kill".<sup>32</sup> In depicting the insane plans of Malakhii, Kulish ridicules the utopian folly of national nihilists<sup>33</sup> who objected to the idea of an independent Ukrainian state and a Ukrainian national identity.

#### d) Kulish's Answer to the Language Question.

In 1928 Kulish wrote his comedy *Myna Mazailo* in which he directly opposes the Russian writer, mainly on the language question. Bulgakov had ridiculed the prevailing pluralist language policy in "The Hetman's Palace"

scene of *The Days of the Turbins* and had put Ukrainian on stage in "The Headquarters", where it is spoken only by the barbarous officers of Petliura.

The language question was an extremely sensitive issue in Ukrainian politics during the 1920s. One Soviet critic has described the situation as follows:

The Ukrainian language was systematically and consistently persecuted for more than 250 years – from the Decree of Peter I concerning the censoring of church books issued in Kiev and Moscow in order that their language be the same, to the notes of Nicholas II who, in the summer of 1905, called for the postponement of talks on the freedom to publish in Ukrainian. The Ukrainian language found itself compared on an unequal footing with Russian. From this comparison emerged a mood of contempt toward it on the part of the chauvinistic bourgeois who formed a large percentage of the urban population in Ukraine; on the other hand, it nourished the nationalist tendencies of the populace.<sup>34</sup>

Bulgakov himself belonged to an environment of Russian intellectuals for whom, as Lidia Ivanovskaia puts it, "the Ukrainian language was of no concern at all; they did not respect it and, I can assure you, they did not know it."<sup>35</sup> He clearly expressed his hostility towards the Ukrainian language before staging *Days* in 1925 after a visit to his beloved Kiev, "the most beautiful city" of his "motherland", the "mother of Russian towns",<sup>36</sup> Bulgakov wrote a sketch, *Kiev-gorod* in which he openly stated his feelings toward the city, its history, people and culture. In a part of the sketch entitled "Sights", Bulgakov sarcastically and strongly denounced the use of the Ukrainian language even on signboards: "The sights of the city are the signboards. The

things one can see written there are beyond human understanding. I will state once and forever: I treat with respect all languages and dialects, but nevertheless, the Kievan signboards must be changed."<sup>37</sup> His reason was that the language was not standardized, not lexically sound and appeared to be grammatically confused. Bulgakov did not know the Ukrainian language nor did he sympathize with its speakers' desire for orthographical and grammatical standardization. In another part of the sketch, subtitled "Science, Literature, and Art", he dismisses the existence of Ukrainian with the single word: "net" [there is no such thing].

It should be pointed out that Kulish was not the only Ukrainian writer outraged by Bulgakov's play. In his feuilleton "Z zapysok konsula" ("From the Notes of a Consul"), written in March 1929, V. Piatnychenko mocked Bulgakov's popularity and his fear of Ukrainians. He portrayed a character, named "Dni Turbinykh", who happened to be "in this country [...] with such strange customs", and "who does not understand why its population, although knowing the English language well, refuses to speak it, insisting instead on its native [Spanish] language, and why this strange country is so supportive of the Socialist régime rather than the Monarchy?"<sup>38</sup>

In the same journal in another feuilleton, "Intermedia lekhovazhnosty" ("Interlude of Thoughtlessness"), Piatnychenko scoffs at the new Bolshevik "intellectuals" who do not know anything about contemporary Ukrainians. In one episode he describes Mykola Kulish's visit to Moscow, showing Kulish's discontent with the ignorance and insensitivity of the Moscow press-workers toward Ukrainians. Piatnychenko says:

...By the way, about Mykola Kulish. Maybe you have already heard how touchingly the Moscow press-workers thanked him for the pleasure he gave them with his novel *The Black Council*...<sup>39</sup>

They asked him: "How are your friends Ivan Franko, Shevchenko and Lesia Ukrainka getting on?"

They say that out of grief M. Kulish went to see *The Days of the Turbins*...<sup>40</sup>

In his comedy *Myna Mazailo* Kulish gives the Ukrainian perspective on the language situation in Ukraine. One of his protagonists provokes the discussion of the language question and each of the characters -- symbolically representing different social groups -- expresses his own conception of the problem. Kulish depicts Russian chauvinists, russified and de-nationalized Ukrainians, as well as Ukrainian nationalists and representatives of the modern "active nationalism" that characterized his generation's point of view.

The main hero of the play, Myna Mazailo, represents the type of the russified Ukrainian, a faceless petty-bourgeois, who after years of prudent cringing in front of his Russian superiors has grown to hate being regarded as a second-class man in society, and, in order to hide his identity, ends up changing his name into a Russian one. This kind of legal procedure became very accessible after the Revolution and encouraged many who felt like "second-class" citizens to reach a "higher standard" in society and to solve their "little tragedies" by russification. Antonina Kulish points to the fact that the changing of names at those times was an everyday occurrence in the ZAHS (Notary Public Office). Kulish uses this phenomenon of the times as a theme in *Myna*.<sup>41</sup>

Myna Mazailo is depicted as an inheritor of the national inferiority complex. He considers his language, his culture and even his own name as the main cause of his "misfortunes." His supporter, adviser, sister-in-law -- and to a certain extent, ruler -- Matriona Roztorgueva (known as Aunt

Motia),<sup>42</sup> who lives on the market in Kursk,<sup>43</sup> comes to Mazailo's home with a view to setting their moral standards, and deciding for them which name they will bear. For this woman, portrayed as foolish and impudent by Kulish, the Ukrainian language does not exist; even Ukraine itself is a fiction, "an Austrian invention", "a Great-Russian little tragedy";<sup>44</sup> in her opinion "it is more respectable to be raped than to be Ukrainized".<sup>45</sup> Matriona Roztorgueva invokes *The Days of the Turbins* to persuade her nephew to feel ashamed of his Ukrainian origins and to change his name:

*Aunt Motia ... Ah, my beloved, my beloved Days of the Turbins.*

It is such a magnificence, such a truth... if you could only see how hateful and disgusting your Ukrainians are on stage, you would reject your name ...tykes, savages!... Idiots! There was no one fit or, at least, decent among them. No one! And after this, Moka, after this, aren't you ashamed to remain Ukrainian, aren't you ashamed to rebel against your daddy's [new] name?

In *The Days of the Turbins* do you know how Al'osha expresses himself about Ukrainization? "All this is a fog, a black fog, he says, and all this will pass", and I too believe that it will disappear. Only the one and indivisible shall remain... And if only you knew what a disgusting broken language they spoke on stage. Do you Ukrainians indeed speak such a language...?<sup>46</sup>

The disdain expressed by Bulgakov toward the Ukrainian language was very much resented by Kulish. In his play he not only scoffs at those impudent Russians who come to dictate to the Ukrainians which language to speak and which name to bear, he also contrasts them with some

Russian-speaking Ukrainians, like Mazailo, who misuse the Russian language. Kulish's hero Myna Mazailo successfully changes his name into a Russian one, Mazenin, but he never succeeds in changing his Ukrainian accent. Although he dutifully attempts to learn the rules of "proper pronunciation" with an "old-fashioned" teacher, the unfortunate student cannot rid himself of his Ukrainian "h". He finds it impossible to pronounce the Russian "g" and ends up replacing it with the sound "k", leading to distortions in meaning and much humour.

One of the most revealing moments in this polemical comedy is the dialogue between Aunt Motia (a parody of Bulgakov's views) and Uncle Taras (who expresses Kulish's concerns):

*Aunt Motia:* I have a word to say... What a backward provincialism.

Oh! what a darkness. They debate about and they talk about some queer language. O God. In our Kursk there is nothing like this. Tell me, please, do even Party members speak that language in your country?...

*Mokii:* Yes. The Party members, and all nationally conscious Ukrainians.

*Aunt Motia:* I don't understand. Therefore you are living in some other country. Because in Kursk there is nothing like this... Everyone speaks Russian. In a beautiful Muscovite language, only it is a shame that the Jews have spoiled it a little, now that they allow them to live in Kursk. I regret, I regret a great deal that they don't perform *The Days of the Turbins* on your stages.<sup>47</sup>

Uncle Taras puts all his efforts into convincing Aunt Motia that the Ukrainian language existed long before Russian, that in 1596 when there

was not a single word printed in Russian, Ukrainians already had a dictionary composed by Lavryntii Zyzanii, but Aunt Motia refuses to understand and sees all life's "truth" in *The Days of the Turbins* <sup>48</sup>

All the polemics lead to the central ideological collision that the play between Aunt Motia and the conviction of the weak-willed Mazailo must change his name and his identity. In this evidently simple and primitive argument between two petty-bourgeois protagonists, surrounded by their kindred expressing different opinions about the importance of one's language and name, Kulish raises two of the most important questions of the time, national identity and the language question, which occupied an important place in the Literary Discussion of the 1920s.

e) Differences in the Appraisal of Social Events and Political Movements.

If in his "philological" play Kulish gives only one "answer" to Bulgakov's *White Guard* and *Days of the Turbins* concerning the question of Ukrainization and the language problem, in *Sonata Pathétique* he responds to the Russian writer on many other issues. Kulish takes up the same theme -- the social and political events in Ukraine during the Revolution and the Civil War -- and the same psychological threads as Bulgakov does, but puts forward his own understanding and appraisal of the social and political situation. Kulish treats them from a different perspective, from a Ukrainian point of view, attributing to the same solutions different or even opposite motivations. The polemic with Bulgakov starts first of all with the appraisal of the White Guard. Kulish, like Bulgakov, takes a family of Cadet officers: the father, General Perotsky, and his sons, Cornet André and Cadet George. The Perotskys do not have a mother; her place is occupied by a

housekeeper, Anette, who at the same time holds a position as the old general's friend. In this way, as Kuziakina puts it "a stupid and spoiled Anette, in the role of defender of the family's comfort, begins the debasement of that level of nobility, high decency, and culture to which Bulgakov raised his heroes on the stage of MKhAT."<sup>49</sup>

When talking about the moral corruption of the Russian White Guard, Kulish does not specifically stress their atrocities as Bulgakov does when depicting Petliura's officers. Instead, he points out that the Perotskys' crimes are committed wearing "white gloves". The old general does not himself kill: he causes people's deaths by falsely testifying against them. He sends Ovrarn (a cripple who lost his legs in the war fighting for the Russian Empire) to a trial that leads to his death. Ovrarn's death then leads to the destruction of his wife, Nastia. Perotsky's son André blesses the massacre of innocent people, and the General's younger son, Georges, fires at the unarmed, defenceless demonstrators shouting: "My motto is Russia! The Emperor! Hurrah!"<sup>50</sup>

If Bulgakov assigns a leading role in society only to White Guard families, Kulish places them side by side with a Ukrainian family of a politically moderate enlightener and teacher Stupay-Stupanenko, whose daughter Maryna is involved with the Ukrainian nationalists -- a movement that Bulgakov treated neither seriously nor sympathetically.

Another major disagreement between the two authors lies in their assessment of the defeat of the monarchy. Kulish sees the causes in the régime's segregation from the people -- in this case the Ukrainian people. According to Kuziakina,

the Perotskys and their like were immeasurably distant from the people, whose work and bread sustained them; they were hostile

to their culture and therefore segregated into a distinct caste of master-conquerors. As a result of this they were forced to sustain absolute political and moral defeat, because their discriminatory attitude and [their] reluctance to recognize the people around [them] was a problem as important politically as ethically.<sup>51</sup>

Kulich shows the monarchy's defeat through the demise of the Perotsky family is paralleled by the defeat of the nationalist movement. The Ukrainian people that rebelled against the German-appointed Hetman in 1918 are portrayed by Bulgakov as an amorphous, semi-criminal element. Bulgakov fails to draw any distinction between the patriotic Ukrainian troops loyal to the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR) and the various groups of rebels who recognized no central government.

Many progressive-minded Russian intellectuals of the time, including the Commissar of People's Education, Anatolii Lunacharsky, also did not accept Bulgakov's interpretation of historical and political events, pointing out that Bulgakov's passions frequently prevailed over historical truth and good taste. In his article "First News of the Season", right after the staging of *The Days* in December of 1926, Lunacharsky condemned such a "manifestation of class falsehood":

It is said that the artist does not have to penetrate the class nature of the occurrence, and so on. First of all, we decisively reject this idea and consider all kinds of artistic work laying claim to political significance to be very mediocre, if the author perverts the facts. Look at what brigands he [Bulgakov] depicted the Petliurists! It is very kind of the theatre to discard the loathsome scene from Bulgakov's play in

which he depicts the mockery and the torture of the Jewish merchant by Petliura's officers. How about the White Guards? Did they not torture, did they not mock the Jews? Did the White Guards not organize continuous massacres of the working population? Were not the most terrible forms of terror those applied by the Whites? But (according to Bulgakov) ... only the hands of Alexei, Nikolka and other "honest Russian officers" were the ones that remained the cleanest?

In the play we see them only in exceptionally idealistic conditions behind their cream-coloured curtains peacefully talking by their Christmas tree and drinking vodka... and wherever the Bulgakovs want to rehabilitate the memory of the middle and lower intelligentsia among the White Guards, right there they fall into a lie and they stop being historians and politicians...<sup>52</sup>

The actions of those ordinary bandits -- "Petliura's brigands" -- that in *The Days of the Turbins* are supposed to represent the emancipation movement against the Hetman are replaced in Kulish's play by scenes in the house of a member of the underground committee "The Golden Mace", Maryna Stupay-Stupanenko, who has as a goal the political and cultural liberation of Ukraine.

In his novel *White Guard* Bulgakov suggests the social genesis of the Petliura movement in the characterization of former school-teacher and colonel Kozyr-Leshko. Kulish takes this fact as his point of departure. His hero, Stupay-Stupanenko is also a school-teacher and enlightener, who takes part in the Ukrainian liberation movement, but he is no Petliurist officer and no fighter. Kulish's teacher, who is supposed to parallel Bulgakov's

legendary Kozyr-Leshko, from the novel, is a naïve, cranky peasant living only in the glorious memories of the Ukrainian Cossack past. In theory, he would like to see his country free of the Russian conquerors, and he is even willing to co-operate with the Bolsheviks as long as they will allow him to speak his mother tongue, but in the crucial moments he saves the life of his enemy, the Russian general Perotsky, whom he hides from the Bolsheviks.

Thus Kulish rejects Bulgakov's appraisal of the Monarchist defeat and portrays differently those insurgents who represented the Ukrainian emancipation movement against the Hetman and the Monarchy. He also shows that the rebels against the Russian monarchy were not barbarious brigands, but educated individuals willing to accept even the Bolshevik régime if it would help them obtain political and cultural self-determination.

#### f) The Debate on Cultural Issues.

One problem of major concern for both writers was that of cultural hegemony in Ukraine. It is understood from his works that Bulgakov failed to comprehend the cultural context in the country in which he was born. For him Ukrainians were either dull Vasillisas, Russianized Ukrainian pseudo-intellectuals without any authentic cultural life, who faithfully served the Russian élite, or else the cruel bandits of Petliura's army. And for Bulgakov the end of the Turbin family in Kiev meant the end of all intellectual life in Ukraine; as one critic put it: "the culture of the Turbins and the crassness of Petliura's officers were regarded as two extreme polarities, and the end of the White Guard [for Bulgakov] meant the end of culture."<sup>35</sup>

All the culture accumulated by the Turbins over generations, their material goods -- books, golden cups, silver, portraits, portières --

everything their parents bequeathed to them and their mother's dying admonition, "live in peace," -- all seemed doomed to Bulgakov. For the Russian writer the general depreciation of culture during the Civil War and the loss of the cultural élite (its custodians) appeared catastrophic. The Turbins accumulated the quintessence of national culture; their intellectuality was a result of a complex education. Who could take their place?

Kulich, on the other hand, interprets the heritage of the Perotsky family quite differently. In their "intellectuality", as Kuziakina puts it, he sees "a symbol of the conqueror's profanation of culture and an outrage against the principles of humanity..." On the other hand, he senses in the younger nationalists like Maryna Stupanenko "a high level of culture, although he clearly sees the social inequality that begets these refined cultural flowers".<sup>54</sup>

Kulich's important concerns were defending Ukrainian national culture and suggesting new orientations for those aiming to develop and advance that culture. As Commissar of People's Education in the early 1920s, he consistently addressed the feeling of inferiority and parochialism among his countrymen and believed in the potential of Ukrainian culture which had strong roots in folklore. One of the answers given by the Ukrainian writer to Bulgakov concerned the role of popular culture. In one of the scenes of *The Days of the Turbins*, Bulgakov's stage direction depicts a gloomy view of the Ukrainian national liberation fighters:

An empty, gloomy room. A sign: "Headquarters of the First Cavalry Division". A blue and gold flag. A kerosene lamp at the entrance. Evening. The clatter of horses' hooves outside the windows from time to time. A concertina softly playing familiar tunes.<sup>55</sup>

The concertina introduced in the scene is symbolic of the insurgents' unsophisticated and primitive level of culture. We know from his biographical feuilleton "Samogonnoe ozero" ("Moonshine Lake") that Bulgakov hated the concertina. The worst memories he held of his first months in Moscow in his "damned apartment 50", were of his drunkard-neighbour playing the concertina, abusing his child and beating his wife.<sup>56</sup>

It is to be noted that the concertina have never been Ukrainian folk instrument. It was brought to Ukraine after the Revolution by new settlers but it was never accepted by the populace. Even nowadays in Ukrainian the word "concertina" (*garmoshka*) is a synonym for a low-quality musical instrument or for unprofessionally played music.

By contrast, Kulish's hero Stupay-Stupanenko finds Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique" reminiscent of the Ukrainian steppes and Ukrainian folk music. He finds it unbelievable that the piece was composed by a foreign musician rather than by a Ukrainian. Stupay raises the question of the Ukrainian national instrument, the *bandura*, that symbolizes the Ukrainian cultural inheritance but finds itself despised and ignored by foreigners, who dictate their will to Ukrainian culture:

Father: ... Now every Ukrainian, before he goes to sleep, must think about Ukraine and must get up in the morning with his country as his chief concern. First, let's rebuild it and then we'll support internationalism. That's the way to do it, not the way you write about it, comrade Bolsheviks. How can internationalism exist without Ukraine, without the *bandura*?<sup>57</sup>

It is impossible to perceive the completeness of contemporary Ukrainian culture without a reference to this instrument. The *bandura*

became a symbol of Ukrainian culture. The *kobzari* or *lirnyky* (the *bandura* players) are, as Vasyli' Lytvyn calls them, "the conscience of the Ukrainian nation, its wisdom, the successors of the *boiane* [bards], lyricists, *husliari* [psaltery players] that are rooted in prehistoric time." Lytwyn suggests that *The Song of Igor's Campaign* could be also created by an ancestor of *kobzars*.<sup>58</sup> Taras Shevchenko's most popular collection of poetry also bears the name of *Kobzar* [an itinerant player on the *kobza*].

In the early 1930s during the mass annihilation of the Ukrainian intelligentsia the Bolshevik régime also began to abolish the *bandurists* or *lirnyks*, who served as standard-bearers of the national spirit, the Ukrainian nation's soul. In his *Testimony*, Kulish's contemporary, Dmitrii Shostakovich recalls:

I'm not a historian. I could tell many tragic tales and cite many examples, but I won't do that. I will tell about one incident, only one. It's a horrible story and every time I think of it I grow frightened and I don't want to remember it. Since time immemorial, folk singers have wandered along the roads of Ukraine. They're called *lirniki* and *banduristy* there. They were almost always blind men...

And then in the mid-thirties the First All-Ukrainian Congress of *Lirniki* and *Banduristy* was announced, and all the folk singers had to gather and discuss what to do in the future. "Life is better, life is merrier," Stalin had said. The blind men believed it. They came to the congress from all over the Ukraine, from tiny, forgotten villages. There were several hundred of them at the congress, they say. It was a living museum, the country's living history. All its songs, all its music and poetry.

And they were almost all shot, almost all those pathetic blind men were killed. 59

Rejecting Bulgakov's approach to Ukrainian national culture as an "empty , gloomy room" filled only by the sounds of a concertina, Kulish suggests that Ukraine had a rich popular culture, that if given a chance it could gain its deserved international recognition. Stalin's régime, however, understood the power of Ukrainian folklore and the impossibility of conquering the nation without getting rid of its old traditions.

#### g) The Rise of a "New Class"

Parallel to the sophisticated Ukrainian intelligentsia, aware of their country's history and national obligations, as portrayed by Maryna and her father Stupay-Stupanenko, Kulish brought to the stage a new stratum in revolutionary Ukrainian society -- a stratum completely overlooked in Bulgakov's work: the new intelligentsia, formed mainly from the poorest sectors of Ukrainian society. These people, like Kulish himself, were often talented, ambitious, thirsty for knowledge, yet politically improvident. According to Kulish, this class was destined to play a decisive role in the establishment of the new Ukrainian society.

A descendant of the lowest and poorest segment of landless peasants, Kulish began his writing career after a hungry childhood, a hard schooling, the war, and many years of educational work with derelict, homeless children. All this life-experience made him a sound observer of social processes and he could clearly see how poor the new Ukrainian proletarian party leadership was in terms of education and politics. There is a scene in *Sonata Pathétique* that expresses this opinion. During an eloquent conversation between the poet Il'ko and the refined musician Maryna about

beauty, art, eternal love, Petrarch, and poetry, the voices of some approaching revolutionary partisans are unexpectedly heard:

I am for internationalism, Mykesha. I am for all languages, you know, because I want to learn them all.

*Mykesha:* Such as?

*The First one:* Words like: Grand-hotel, agrarian, nationalization, proletariat – these are international.<sup>60</sup>

Members of the sophisticated Ukrainian intelligentsia, like Maryna, did not put any faith either in the new proletarian intellectuals or in the revolutionary proletariat; rather, they feared that these unknown and unexpected partisans had come "to whirl the revolution without stopping". They talk about some "international", says Maryna, about all languages but "don't know even their own..." Maryna calls them "riff-raff" and "a mob," she fears that they will drop "the [national] idea in the mud along with their soldier's caps and trample on it". In the name of their little "momy <sup>61</sup> revolution..." they would kill their own mother, Ukraine".<sup>62</sup> The new proletarian intellectuals welcomed the Revolution and hoped that these Red partisans would contribute to the new culture. The conflict between the sophisticated and the proletarian intelligentsia where Kulish himself belonged, the writer expresses in a dialogue between the proletarian poet Il'ko and Maryna after her defeat:

*She:* ... I would play for you, but they've separated me from my piano. What good is it to them? Who on their side can play? Tell me, who will play the piano?

*/:* Don't worry, they'll play.

*She:* Will they play the Pathétique?

The proletarian poet expresses his confidence in the revolutionaries and promises Maryna:

/: They will start with it.<sup>63</sup>

Although sometimes Kulish seems to hesitate between these two polarized political trends, it is obvious in the end that he is disappointed with that part of the intelligentsia which oriented itself toward the proletariat and permitted the Bolshevik authorities to harm Ukrainian interests. Despite his disappointment with the whole movement, Kulish nevertheless treats the revolutionary insurgents against the old régime with sympathy and understanding, trying to justify their conduct. He sees in this sometimes embittered mass not only a passion for vengeful destruction, but also a thirst for knowledge and an instinctive respect for culture and its bearers. The sailor Sud'ba, who spent a large part of his life in jail, is used to the despotism of the rich and bears in his soul a desire for revenge, yet he would not destroy the property of General Perotsky in order to save a teacher, Stupay-Stupanenko, who lived there. Kulish understands the reason for their rebellion as well as their elementary human desire for a better life, and he sees the root of all the evil they commit not in their present actions, but in the unfair treatment they received in the past.

Bulgakov's portrayal of the lower class, on the other hand, is less differentiated; he sees in it a savage, incorrigible bloodthirsty crowd, devoid of humanity, he cannot understand the reasons behind their rebellion. According to Victor Lakshin,

Bulgakov sees the Revolution as a snow-storm... raised from contradictions. He admits the rightness of the power of the crowd ... but fears this diffuses the real motives of historical power indiscernible to an artist. In the stormy sequence of

events during 1918 in the Ukraine the role of the Bolsheviks was only vaguely understood by Bulgakov ... but he clearly sees the growing discontent of the popular masses causing the changes on the surface...<sup>64</sup>

Bulgakov felt that social changes were inevitable, but because of his insensibility to the people surrounding him, he could not understand the reasons prompting people to demand those changes. Being himself a descendent of the poorest segment of social strata, Kulish knew about the discontent of popular masses and saw a great potential in the new rising class.

g) Disagreements on the Cause of the Revolution.

Another important disagreement between the writers concentrates around the cause of the Socialist Revolution. Bulgakov saw the reason for the Revolution mainly in the backwardness of the populace, who, like "a snow-storm", blindly, incapable of foreseeing future disasters, launched an assault on the foundations of life. The Ukrainian writer illuminates the question from two opposite social points of view in an encounter between the oldest representatives of the Ukrainian and Russian intelligentsia: the schoolteacher Stupay-Stupanenko and the Russian general Perotsky. The first blames the Revolution on Russian imperialism, the second on separatism.

*Perotsky:* That's what comes of your Austrian idea of an  
autonomous Ukraine!

*Stupay:* It is the fault of your united Russia.

*Perotsky:* Independent!

*Stupay:* Indivisible!<sup>65</sup>

The youngest generation of the Ukrainian intelligentsia was aware that this old altercation between Russian and Ukrainian would allow a third force to take power, and so they suggested a peaceful dialogue:

*Maryna*: Turn your back on the past. Or else they [the Bolsheviks] will kill you and us. Your mistake was that you tried to foment a "Russian movement" in Ukraine. Now we must correct this mistake.<sup>66</sup>

The irreconcilability of the older generation of Russian and Ukrainian intellectuals, acting as representatives of a ruling and a subdued nations, was the main source for the rise of the third power -- the Bolshevik movement. Despite some compromises that the new generation of the Russian and Ukrainian élite were prepared to undertake, they could not withstand the Bolsheviks.

#### h) The Inter-relationship between Russian and Ukrainian Cultures.

Finally, one of the most interesting problems raised by Kulish is the question of the inter-relationship of the Russian and Ukrainian cultures, a great concern in the post-revolutionary period and still very significant today. Over several generations many Russians have contributed to the history of Ukrainian culture, among them eminent writers like the Russian-born Marko Vovchok, who produced some of the finest portrayals of the Ukrainian peasantry in Ukrainian literature, as well as Bulgakov's own godfather Nikolai Ivanovich Petrov, who had written many scholarly works on Ukrainian literary history (such as *Ocherki Istorii Ukrainy XVIII veka* and *Istoria Ukrainskoi literatury XIX veka*). He was known and lauded among Ukrainian scholars for his refusal in 1911 to replace the word Ukrainian

(*ukrainskii*) with "little Russian" (*malorossiskii*) and for becoming, in 1919, one of the founding members of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.<sup>67</sup>

Ukrainians, on the other hand, had contributed to Russian culture since its early stages of development. The first Academy in St. Petersburg was founded by scholars from the Kievan Collegium (Academy) in 1724. A great contribution to Russian literature was made by writers of Ukrainian background such as Anton Chekhov, Nikolai Gogol', and Vladimir Korolenko; in music, there were composers of Ukrainian origin such as the founders of Russian opera Mikhail Glinka and Piotr Chaikovsky.<sup>68</sup> This complex inter-relationship between the Russian and Ukrainian cultures is brought out by Kulish through various interactions-- between the representatives of the older generation, Stupay-Stupanenko and General Perotsky, on the one hand, and Maryna, Il'ko, and André Perotsky on the other. On Easter morning, for example, Stupay-Stupanenko exchanges Easter greetings with his acquaintance:

*Stupay: (...picks up the telephone)..* Please, give me 17-00. I wish to speak to Major-General Perotsky!

14

*Perotsky, wearing a uniform, near the telephone.*

*Perotsky:* With whom do I have the honour?

*Stupay:* A Ukrainian, Ivan Stepanovych Stupay-Stupanenko, wants to wish you a Happy Easter. Ukraine has risen, your excellency!

*Perotsky: (waiting till his heart beats more quietly, then answering in Russian):* My reply is: Attention! Take your right marker, Ukrainians, on the one-and-indivisible Russia! quick march!

*Stupay:* It's different in Ukrainian, your excellency. Attention!  
A Russian general out of Ukraine, quick march! Maryna, play  
the piano! <sup>69</sup>

But on the other hand, Stupay extends his hand to save the general  
when he is fleeing from the Bolsheviks:

*Perotsky is on the doorstep:*

Excuse me, but the partisans are after me. I am in flight.  
May I come in?

*Stupay: (angrily):* It's high time you took to flight.

.....

*Perotsky:* I am fleeing from death. May I come in?

*Stupay: (hesitating):* Yes, do.<sup>70</sup>

A similar encounter is found between younger representatives of the  
Ukrainian and Russian intelligentsia. Maryna, a member of the Ukrainian  
liberation movement, who is much more bellicose and determined than her  
peaceful schoolteacher father, is very loyal to her opponent, a  
representative of Russian culture (but her intellectual equal), André  
Perotsky. When André's life is in jeopardy, she asks Il'ko to rescue him from  
the Bolshevik camp, as she does not wish to build her "castle" [culture and  
power] on the foundation of her opponent's destruction.

*She:* We must liberate André Perotsky! (It is dark. I draw back  
and remain silent.) I know it is difficult. But his corpse  
will fall upon your path. And the path that leads from me to  
you. Neither you nor I wanted him between us. But it  
happened that way.

I can't allow his corpse to separate us. He must be kept  
alive. Can't you possibly do it?

*I:* Do what?

*She:* Step over him to me?

*I:* I will try to rescue him.<sup>71</sup>

Maryna's alliance with André is political. Ukrainian constitutional-democrats were allied to Russian Cadets. Both groups were courted by the Skoropadskii régime during 1918. The Hetmanate régime hoped to develop a permanent ruling élite from the resulting fusion of these two groups. The question of language and culture, however, remained a stumbling block. For Ukrainian intellectuals the Ukrainian word was sacred, and in Stupay-Stupanenko's household Shevchenko's *Kobzar* is treated as a prayer-book.

*Stupay:* ... I'll tell the future for the last time. Not from the Bible, from the Kobzar.\* What will be, will be. For the last time! ... Will there or won't there be a Ukraine?<sup>72</sup>

The Stupanekos are convinced that the representatives of the old Russian Empire "would sooner commit suicide than say a word in Ukrainian",<sup>73</sup> but they soon realize that neither could they rely on their new Russian democratic allies.

Sent by his daughter, Maryna, to the detachment of her ally André Perotsky, the old naïve teacher discovers that the Cadets also lack any respect for the language of the country in which they live and in which they want to consolidate their power:

*Stupay:* ...they say there are many Ukrainians among them.

*(Seeing Maryna's interest in it)* Almost all of them are Ukrainian.

*Maryna:* And do they themselves know they are Ukrainians?

*Stupay:* Hm! *(After a pause)* As a matter of fact, only a few of them are Ukrainians. At the HQ I heard no Ukrainian spoken.

Some people are hostile toward it. Four out of five who were hanged were Ukrainians: Perhaps the red flag is better after all, Maryna?

.....

I will meet them [the Bolsheviks]...

*Maryna:* They will kill you.

*Stupay:* I have arms.

*Maryna:* What arms?

*Stupay:* The Ukrainian language.

*Maryna:* A language is only persuasive when it is backed by weapons.

*Stupay:* I will meet them and remind them of Shevchenko's sacred words: "Embrace, my brethren, the smallest one."

*Maryna:* Who will you remind of it? The Bolsheviks? The bandits? The bloodthirsty barbarians who are destroying our loftiest ideals?<sup>74</sup>

The new Western-oriented Ukrainian intelligentsia wished to see an independent Ukraine. They were scornful of their own irresponsible countrymen who acted as the unwitting cogs of history. Commenting on Mykeshka and his revolutionary friends who lack national pride and are confused by their conquerors Maryna says: "They forget about their mother and go to fight for all languages and nations, but their own."<sup>75</sup> She regards them as "targets" in the battle between more powerful foes.

In *The Days of the Turbins* Bulgakov concentrates on the contemporary social and political problems concerning his own class -- the Russian middle-class intelligentsia in Ukraine. The conflicts had been imprinted in his memory immediately after the Bolshevik Revolution and the Civil War;

the wounds of that social cataclysm were still fresh. Kulish answers the Russian writer, but also raises the important problems Ukrainians were facing in their struggle for survival as a nation. Being well aware of the problems his countrymen were facing, Kulish depicts them with greater objectivity and sympathy.

## Chapter Two

Protagonists in Family and Society

All the main problems raised in the plays reflect concerns with the destiny of people involved in a great historical upheaval and their responsibility for their own acts in crisis situations. The protagonist interests the author, according to Mikhail Bakhtin, "as a particular point of view in relation to the world and in relation to the hero himself, as the semantic and judgement-passing position of a man in relation to himself and to surrounding reality".<sup>1</sup> Both writers choose the life of a family to depict with greater clarity the position and role of individuals within a social unity.

The action of both plays occurs on two different levels: the personal and the social. On the one hand we have individuals in conflict with the family and the entire social group; on the other hand we are presented with personal decisions that are set against the prevailing political and historical background. The main characters, Alexei Turbin (in *The Days of the Turbins*) and Il'ko Iuha (in *Sonata Pathétique*) each reflect their writer's own *alter ego*, their origin and status in society, their place in history and their sense of duty as citizens.

The problem of the individual versus the family and society in Bulgakov's works may be traced to the very beginning of his writing career. In his story "Dan' voskhishcheniu" (A Tribute of Admiration"), published in 1920, Bulgakov shows the family's concern about their missing son. According to Ellendea Proffer, "the roots of this story are the events in Kiev in 1918-19, when Kolia and Kostia Bulgakov [the writer's younger brothers]

were missing."<sup>2</sup> The later story "The Red Crown" (published in *Nakanune*, 22 October 1922) that raises the same problem already contains central images developed in his novel *White Guard* and in the play *The Days of the Turbins*

As mentioned earlier, Kulish's play also reflects his personal experience. He builds his play on the conflict of human beings with social events, on the characters' struggle for life and their search for a solution. The lives of the heroes in both plays become entangled in a complex historical struggle, and, although they try to "go on living" and maintain their domestic traditions, "their lot would be to suffer and die".<sup>3</sup> Amid the chaos and conflict of the Revolution, the plays raise the question of who will preserve moral principles, who will not only survive physically, but will also carry his ideals to the very end.

The Turbins, a typical middle-class intellectual family of Russian extraction living in Ukraine, want the unity of the Russian Empire restored. They are depicted by Bulgakov with great sympathy against the background of several antagonistic groups: the right-wing government of Hetman Skoropadsky; the directorate of the Ukrainian national camp as personified by its commander-in-chief, Symon Petiura; and the Bolshevik power represented in the early unpublished version of the play by Lev Trotsky.

Bulgakov was one of the few writers in Soviet Russian literature who depicted the officers of the old tsarist army as decent human beings and not as enemies of the Russian people. In his novel *The White Guard* he expresses understanding and sympathy toward this class:

Only someone who has been defeated knows the real meaning of that word. It is like a party in a house where the electric light has failed; it is like a room in which green mould, alive and malignant, is crawling over the wallpaper: it is like the wasted

bodies of rachitic children, it is like rancid cooking oil, like the sound of women's voices shouting obscene abuse in the dark. It is, in short, like death.<sup>4</sup>

I. Nusinov indicates that Bulgakov entered literature with the consciousness of a "conquered class", and committed himself to tell about the Revolution and the Civil War from its point of view.<sup>5</sup> He tackles the psychological analysis of heroes whose main problem was the peculiar task of surviving the historical cataclysm, of moving ahead, either being reconciled to or resisting the new way of life. This was the main question raised by members of the old régime who had survived the Revolution and the Civil War, and "many of them, as was the case with Bulgakov himself, had not only settled down, but had reconciled themselves to the new régime."<sup>6</sup>

Some defenders of the Russian Empire, like the Turbins and their friends, came to terms with the Bolsheviks because they too stood for that same unity. This class, the defenders of the old régime, constitutes "the only power for which Bulgakov can speak in earnest in the first person."<sup>7</sup> For "real Soviet material [new classes, revolutionary movements] was not really accessible to him, as the whole Revolution in his perception was nothing but a 'ludicrous operetta' (the words of Colonel Talberg in *The White Guard*)."<sup>8</sup>

In his novel, Bulgakov gives a very thorough description of the representatives of his class who betrayed their cause, fled Petrograd and Moscow and were hiding in Kiev in 1918:

They came to Kiev "to fight" with the Bolsheviks, but instead they were living in revelry, hard drinking, debauchery, they feared and respected the Germans ... and they hated the Bolsheviks, but not

with the kind of aggressive hatred which spurs on the hater to fight and kill, but with a cowardly hatred which whispers around dark corners... Who were they? merchants, bankers, industrialists, lawyers, actors, landlords, prostitutes, ex-members of the State Council, engineers, doctors and writers that felt one thing in common -- hatred... Whom were they counting upon? ... Upon the Germans. They, the Russian patriots, who were supposed to hate the Germans oppressors, hid behind the shoulders of those 'oppressors' and jeered and growled "move off" at the distant Bolsheviks, who were furiously grinding their teeth on the other side of the barbed wire ..."<sup>9</sup>

This "move off" attitude, according to Nusinov, was applicable not only "to the Bolsheviks, but to the Ukrainian people, the Ukrainian village... which they hated very deeply".<sup>10</sup> Bulgakov himself admits that not a single person among the refugees "knew what was going on around and about the City [Kiev], in the real Ukraine, a country of tens of millions of people, bigger than France".<sup>11</sup>

In his novel, Bulgakov describes the attitude of the Russian upper classes toward the Ukrainian lower classes: the latter were "nothing but trouble".<sup>12</sup> He also notes that Ukrainians were absolutely ignored by Russian rulers until

one day on Nikolaevsky Street in broad daylight, just beside the cupstand, no less a person than the commander-in-chief of the German forces in Ukraine ... was shot dead! His assassin was, of course, a workman...; the incident ... did cause a number of intelligent people to have some startling thoughts about the event....<sup>13</sup>

In the Turbin house this deed was taken note of only because the following day their peasant-girl servant demanded a higher payment for the milk-can. When the Turbins' bourgeois neighbour Vasilisa threatened the peasant-girl, "Look out, or the Germans will teach you a lesson or two", the girl replied: "if they try and teach us a lesson we'll soon teach them it doesn't pay."<sup>14</sup>

The audacity of the peasant arouses the indignation of the inhabitants of the Turbin home, but their household fails to appreciate the national dimension in the political events of the day. The determination of the Ukrainian people in the struggle against its oppressors is seen by the Turbins as blind rage and senseless chaos, not as a national resistance.

If Bulgakov depicts the Ukrainian people as "blind rage and senseless chaos", he vividly portrays individual members of the Turbin family and their unique personalities. At the centre of the four-act play are the Turbin brothers: Alexei, a thirty-year-old artillery colonel and commander of the Volunteer Regiment, his brother Nikolka, an eighteen-year-old cadet, and their sister Elena, who is married to Captain Vladimir Talbert, a staff colonel at Hetman Skoropadsky's headquarters. All the dramatic historical events are reflected in their domestic haven. Captain Myshlaevsky's appearance in the first scene of the first act (following twenty-four hours' duty outside the city) introduces the dramatic events taking place in the City and in the country. Through Myshlaevsky's first-hand narrative of the battle, we learn of the situation on the front lines: chaos, lack of supplies, the formation of peasant guerilla movements strengthening Petliura's forces. The outside world, threatening and brutal, continuously closes in. The arrival of the cousin from Zhytomyr (who comes to Kiev at an inopportune time to enrol in the University and finds comfort at the Turbins' place) momentarily alleviates the tense dramatic atmosphere. His

appearance brings some hope of normal life. However, the arrival of Colonel Talberg with the news that he is abandoning the city and the family in a cowardly manner to leave for Berlin with the German troops, brings back the atmosphere of tension into the Turbins' apartment and reminds us once more of the war.

This friendly family is ready to give shelter and warmth to everyone who visits. Despite the turbulent times they entertain their guests, drink vodka and wine, play the piano, discordantly sing the Russian national anthem and toast the Tsar, even though more than a year has passed since his execution. The newly-arrived Lieutenant Shervinsky (formerly of His Majesty's Uhlan Regiment, but now personal aide to the Hetman) and Captain Studzinky enjoy a last meal before going into action the next day. Alexei reveals the political situation in Ukraine where he sees only two major opposing forces -- the White Volunteer Army and the Bolsheviks -- entirely neglecting the native Ukrainian movement. Petliura and the Ukrainian national camp are regarded only as "a myth, a shadow, a black fog."<sup>15</sup>

The central figure of the play, Alexei Turbin, the author's favourite character,<sup>16</sup> is transformed from an army doctor (like Bulgakov himself) in the novel to a colonel in the final version of the play. He incorporates the features of the former military physician as well as of Commanders Malyshev and Nai-Turs from *The White Guard*. Malyshev in the novel is not as heroic as Colonel Turbin in the play. Having disbanded the cadets at the Alexandrovsky High School, Malyshev hurries to his friend, Madame Anjou, to change his uniform for civilian clothing, announcing to Doctor Turbin: "I saved my soldiers and don't care about anything else."<sup>17</sup> In the play, however, Colonel Turbin dies as a hero at his own post after saving his cadets before Nikolka's eyes.

The number of characters was reduced in the play. The author incorporated the features of the eliminated character into the remaining ones in order to bring out his concerns more fully.

The character of the Turbins' young friend, Karas, is changed into an older man -- the inflexible right-wing officer Studzinsky, who remains in the ranks of the White Guard until its bitter end. The family cousin, Lariosik, occupies a far more important position than in the novel, where he was a mature, married man and appeared in the story only later. In the play he is the only naïve "teetotaller" among the bohemian officers gathering at the Turbins' place, and with his amusing innocence brings comic relief to the tense situation. Vladimir Talberg undergoes no changes: he is the only alien element in the Turbins' household.

The relationship of the characters to one another and their attitudes toward the historical events are brought into focus in the opening lines. The words of the song about machine guns and Petliura, sung by Nikolka at the opening, serve to pinpoint the historical moment; the short dialogue between the brothers Nikolka and Alexei "establish their individual traits and their positions in the family"<sup>19</sup> as well as in society. The brothers' witty dialogue is interrupted by the turmoil of the outside world: the sound and the song of a marching squadron, the darkness in the room where there is an electricity blackout, and the concern of their sister, who awaits her husband and seeks comfort and solace from her older brother. The tone of the brothers' conversation changes when Nikolka asks Alexei to send him to headquarters to investigate the situation. Alexei forbids this in an imperious tone, acting no longer as a brother, but as a commander.

**NIKOLKA:** ...Alyosha, why don't you send me to find out what's going on at the headquarters? I'd like to ride over.

ALEXEI: Of course, all they need is you. Please sit at ease.

NIKOLKA: Yes, sir, colonel, sir... People are fighting there... If only our division would be ready sooner.

ALEXEI: When I require your advice on the preparation of the division, I'll tell you. Understood?

NIKOLKA: I understood. Sorry, colonel, sir.<sup>18</sup>

His tone changes to tenderness when he consoles his sister:

ELENA: Alyosha, where's my husband?

ALEXEI: He will come, Lenchka.<sup>19</sup>

The older member of the Turbin family, Alexei, plays two roles in his exchanges with Nikolka and Elena: a strong, honoured and trusted head of the household, and a respected military superior.<sup>20</sup> Once loyal to the White Guard movement, Alexei Turbin will not lead the cadets against Petliura's forces, not only because the latter are stronger and fighting them would be suicidal, but also because he has lost faith in his cause -- the White Guard movement. Their leaders have abandoned their Army; the people no longer support them; and he realizes that he has no goal to fight for. When Studzinsky suggests taking the troops to the Don to join Denikin's regiment, Alexei refuses, as he is discerning enough to acknowledge that the White Guard cause is lost, and he has enough humanitarian concern for his subordinates not to lead them into pointless battle. He understands that there is no hope in a future built upon his class's beliefs. Therefore he decides to die rather than face the shame of defeat and the rule of the new Bolshevik régime. After the disbandment of his cadets at the Alexandrovsky High School, Nikolka guesses Alexei's decision:

NIKOLKA: ...I know why you are sitting there! I know you, commander, you're waiting for death to save you from disgrace,

that's what! Well, I am going to guard you then. Lenka would kill me.

ALEXEI: Sub-officer Turbin, throw heroism to the devil! (He falls silent.) 21

The second major figure in *The Days of the Turbins* is Captain Victor Myshlaevsky, an old family friend, a former tsarist officer who spent four years at the front and has continued to serve in the Hetman's army. Now he is willing to join the Reds. Myshlaevsky's manners and coarse language show that he spends "more time in the trenches than in society drawing rooms"; nevertheless he is part of the Turbin family. His relations with the brothers indicate a very old and comfortable friendship. He is protective of and benevolent toward Elena and paternal with Nikolka. His literary predecessors include the bohemian type of officer depicted in the classic tradition of Russian soldiers from Mikhail Lermontov's Maxim Maximich in *The Hero of our Times* and Lev Tolstoi's Denisov in *War and Peace* to Anton Chekhov's Vershinin in *The Three Sisters*. This type of heroic soldier was depicted in later Soviet literature in Alexei Tolstoi's trilogy *Khozhdenie po mukam* [*The Way to Cavalry*], *Sestry* [*Sisters*], *Vosemnatsatyi god* [*The Year 1918*] in the image of Roshchin; in the poem "Vasilii Terkin" by Nikolai Tvardovsky, and many other Soviet writers, including Mikhail Sholokhov and Nikolai Ostrovsky.

After Alexei's death Myshlaevsky not only assumes full responsibility for the protection of Elena and Nikolka, but also echoes Alexei's viewpoints. His faith in the White army is totally shattered and, in the name of the dead commander Alexei, he violently rejects the cause he fought for. Seeing the peasants joining the Bolsheviks, he, too, is ready to join them; he is by no

means ready to leave Russia. Myshlaevky prefers to remain in the army and serve his fatherland even if he has to re-evaluate the cause he serves.

The character of Studzinsky is a foil for Myshlaevsky. He is a patriotic officer of the old régime. His role in the play is designed to emphasize Myshlaevsky's political evolution from tsarist officer to adherent and defender of the Bolsheviks. Studzinsky retains his political and moral convictions. He will never compromise his conscience, will not accept the Bolsheviks, but will fight them even after his superiors desert or his colleagues surrender.

**MYSHLAEVSKY:** ...Let them [the Bolsheviks] mobilize me! At least I'll know that I'm serving in the Russian army. The people are not with us. The people are against us. Alyosha was right!

**STUDZINSKY:** What the hell kind of Russian army can there be when they've put an end to Russia?! And they'll shoot us anyway!

**MYSHLAEVSKY:** And they'll be right to do so! They'll deliver us to the Cheka, curse us, write us off. They'll feel more at ease and we will too....

**STUDZINSKY:** I am going to fight them! <sup>23</sup>

Unlike Myshlaevsky, who is willing to re-evaluate the principles and ideals to which he has devoted all his life, Studzinsky remains a rigid military man inflexibly dedicated to his cause:

He is a representative of the White officers, who had only one ideal and would not compromise under any circumstances, even at the urge of reason itself. Although his name indicates that he is of Polish descent, he is thoroughly russified in contrast to Talberg, who retains traits of his German background. <sup>24</sup>

Studzinsky is introduced in the first act and he, along with Alexei Turbin, refuses to toast the well-being and health of the Hetman of Ukraine during the last regimental meal at the Turbins. He retains this attitude of a soldier devoted to his cause even if it means his military defeat. In the last act of the play Studzinsky's role is significant in revealing the split in the Russian White Guard movement that was one of the main factors in its defeat. Whereas Myshlaevsky makes a complete conversion from the starting position at which we find him in the opening scenes, Studzinsky refuses to budge. According to Ershov's study, "such were the men who went with Denikin's divisions to the Don, knowing that they could not adjust to the new Soviet Russia."<sup>25</sup> In the advance of the Reds and in the playing of the "international", Studzinsky sees the "epilogue" to his movement, his fatherland and his own cause.

The youngest member of the Turbin family, the naive Nikolka, in many ways recalls Petia Rostov from Tolstoi's *War and Peace* <sup>26</sup> According to Ershov, "he has not formed any strong beliefs, for he is only beginning to learn his role in life, taking Alexei as a model."<sup>27</sup> Like Petia Rostov, he is very anxious to take an active part in battle, but his first encounter with the enemy turns out to be not a heroic fight, but an unfortunate flight. Unlike the other officers, he has not formed any strong allegiances and psychologically is not deeply affected by the political events. His role in the play is minor; he serves mainly as a commentator and a messenger on family relations or political events. He sets the mood through his songs, strumming his guitar, serving to enhance the motifs of the passing events. <sup>28</sup>

Lariosik is the only civilian among this group of White Guard servicemen. His family relationship with the Turbins confirms his class

affiliation. He is from the provinces and therefore significantly differs from his metropolitan relatives. In the play he is introduced as a very young man who has just finished high school and is set to enrol in university. According to his mother's letter to the Turbins, he is a very talented boy. Being the only son in the family, he has managed to avoid conscription and is interested in neither military nor political life. He is naïve and childish, but very concerned about people. The happiness of the members of the Turbin family matters to him more than the sweeping events ravaging Russia. His humble behaviour and misfortunes often provide comic relief in the tense atmosphere of the Turbins' home. Larlosik is a kind of Chekhovian figure, like Uncle Vania (*Uncle Vania*) or Liubov Ranevskaja (*The Cherry Orchard*) who never loses their human values.

The last member of the family to appear on stage is Elena's husband, Vladimir Talberg. Bulgakov's sympathies do not lie with this character, whom he portrays as lacking depth. One can fully agree with Ershov's statement that "he is a stock character with the characteristics of a villain. His origin is German, the foreign element in the play, and although russified, in time of danger he abandons his country as well as his wife, brushing off his loyalties and commitments."<sup>29</sup> In contrast to the Turbins, Talberg is formal and unemotional, even with his wife. Despite Elena's concern for him and her long wait he refuses a kiss from her when he arrives.

The doorbell rings.

**ELENA:** Who's there?

**TALBERG'S VOICE:** It's me, me. Open up, please.

**ELENA:** Thank god! Where've you been? I was so worried.

**TALBERG (entering):** Don't kiss me, I've just come in from outside, you might catch cold.<sup>30</sup>

This cold calculation clashes with Elena's warm reception and hospitality. Talberg does not care about Myshlaevsky's ordeals, nor about the fate of Larionik. The only feeling he expresses is discontent with their presence. When leaving his wife in such a dangerous situation, his only concern is that Elena should not besmirch the family name in his absence, a fact which deeply insults her and suggests the end of their relationship. Alexei Turbin shows full disapproval of Colonel Talberg's decision to leave the country at such a crucial moment by refusing to shake hands with him. Loyalty to the Empire is one of the main issues in the play: Alexei remains loyal; Talberg deserts.

Talberg is depicted as a foreign element not only in the country he serves, but also in the family with which he lives. His desertion upsets even its youngest member, Nikolka, who compares his flight to the symbol of a rat leaving a sinking ship.

**NIKOLKA:** Alyosha, how can he go away like that? ...At a time like this... (*Philosophically*) Alyosha, you know, I've noticed that he looks like a rat.

**ALEXEI** (*mechanically*) Quite right, Nikolka. And our house like a ship...<sup>31</sup>

Along with the question of honour and loyalty to one's country Bulgakov also raises the issues of value and culture. The question of who would carry on and preserve the culture accumulated by generations was a major concern for all Russian and Ukrainian writers living in Ukraine. Bulgakov assigns this extremely important mission to Leonid Shervinsky. Although he played an insignificant role in the novel and in the early editions of the play, in the final version of the play Leonid Iurievich Shervinsky becomes a leading character. He figures prominently in the love

motif and as a spokesman for the preservation of cultural values. His appearance on stage with a bouquet of flowers for Elena after Talberg's cold and selfish departure presages his substitution for Talberg. Elena is indifferent to his compliments and courting, as she is to his ability to exaggerate facts, yet she sees in him one asset -- his exceptional artistic talent. His main concern while at the Turbins' apartment is to impress with charm and wit, to conquer Elena's heart and to win the admiration of others. As a serviceman he is very loyal to the Hetman whom he serves as a personal aide-de-camp, and, even knowing the disapproval felt by his friends toward his superior, he toasts the Hetman's health in the Turbins' house.

In the Hetman's palace, Shervinsky realizes the hopelessness of his duty and the thought of leaving the country crosses his mind, but, unlike Talberg, he will not go without Elena. He is quick in adjusting to new situations and efficiently performs any role. As soon as the Bolsheviks take over, he borrows a "non-party line coat from a yard-keeper to look like a proletarian". The only thing this talented artist could not manage to master was the Ukrainian language, although his superior, the Hetman, insists that his adjutants "speak the language of the country" they serve. The absurd insistence of Shervinsky speaking Ukrainian, and his humbling the language, serves to parody the political situation and the Hetman's display of power which is ridiculous in itself, for the next moment we realize that the ruler has lost everything, and must flee.<sup>32</sup>

The character of Shervinsky caused the most controversy among Soviet critics, who saw him as the most morally ambiguous character for his bragging, lies, and theft -- for "slipping into his pocket" a cigarette case forgotten by the Hetman. However, tracing his personality to the end of the

final edition of the play one observes a moral development under the influence of the woman he loves. In the final scene we see Shervinsky not only as a fully established artist, but also as a changed person.

Elena is the only woman among the eight principal characters of the play. While the men are firmly delineated, wedded to a certain set of political and social ideals which are their main duties in life and which they defend or re-evaluate, Elena's function is that of a catalyst.<sup>33</sup> Throughout the play her devotion is to the concrete and practical. She is Tolstol's ideal woman character whose life is defined by the Russian proverb "from the stove to the threshold" [Babe doroga - ot pechi do poroga].<sup>34</sup> She is never seen involved in lengthy discussions; her comments are brief and tersely to the point; she is seen only in her apartment, and she is the last one to find out what is happening in the outside world. Though all the men express their admiration for her, she remains rather a symbol of the household: a good housekeeper, ready to feed and take care of the men, to comfort and sustain them. Every man sees in Elena one aspect of the ideal, and every one wishes to have her as a wife. Her husband Talberg sees her as a dutiful spouse, ready to accept any misfortune for his safety. Lariosik is impressed by her femininity, hospitality, and her ability to comfort even in the most turbulent times. For Lariosik Elena is his "ideal", she is "pure gold", and, seeing her lonely and sad, he offers to marry her. For the unsophisticated Myshlaevsky, Elena is highly intellectual.

**MYSHLAEVSKY:** She speaks English, plays the piano and in addition she knows how to set a samovar. Lena, I'd marry you myself with pleasure.<sup>35</sup>

Shervinsky, who treats her as an object of almost trite adoration, needs her for his moral stability, as an "accompanist" in his artistic career. Except

for the deep feelings aroused by Alexei's death that lead her to faint, Bulgakov does not depict her as subject to strong emotions. She reacts very coolly to her ex-husband's admonitions as well as to the compliments of her future husband. Her decision to marry Shervinsky is taken more out of bleak resignation rather than in expectation of joyful fulfilment.

**SHERVINSKY:** Divorce. Divorce him... A telegram to him and a letter saying it's over. Over!

**ELENA:** Well, all right! I am bored and lonely. Melancholy. All right! I agree...

The jabot suits you very much... You're handsome. What can I say....

**SHERVINSKY:** Lena... I'll sing, you'll accompany.<sup>36</sup>

One can agree with Ershov's statement that

The symbolic figure of womanhood that she represents overshadows her real personality and leaves little to say about her as a character in the play. She is at best the feminine soul of the play, the distributor of warmth and affection, the sister of mercy who is there to support and console the tired men rushed by the upheaval of events. She is therefore at her best when seen as a symbol.<sup>37</sup>

All these traits characteristic of a traditional old-fashioned Russian woman attributed to Elena, make her, in fact, too ideal to be perceived as an ordinary human being.

These characters, representatives of the pre-revolutionary Russian intellectuals, who had been tendentiously presented in early Soviet literature, are placed by Bulgakov at the centre of the play. Their psychology was depicted "with renewed strength", as Mustangova puts it,

"and only in this work the usually derisive and cynical Bulgakov turns into a sensitive lyrical poet. All references to the Turbins reveal admiration from the writer."<sup>38</sup>

Analysing the novel *White Guard* Bulgakov's contemporary critics noticed that he treats his heroes as the exponents of the best traditions of a noble past. Nusinov says that the Turbins

possess the finest bookshelves in the world full of books... gilded cups, silver, portraits, drapes... They are devoted to their motherland, ready to undertake any risk in life; they are the sanctity of the past, the greatest among Russians, and... it does not matter that Myshlaevsky curses the people, calling them "pilgrim bastards" ... it does not matter that he mockingly calls a peasant ... "an animal." These Turbins and Myshlaevskys alike have created a high culture; they have consolidated the external beauty, the music, the beauty of flowers; and no matter what happens in this world, the culture they have created will be eternal even after they have passed away...<sup>39</sup>

Mustangova also presents a similar defence of the Turbins:

there were "skunks" and "cocaine-addicted prostitutes" among the representatives of this class, and only they were guilty of the Turbins' failure, but they in no way stood for the essence of the White Guards... only the Turbins were the real creators of history; beauty and human life was expressed only by them.<sup>40</sup>

These observations point to the fact that Bulgakov stood firmly on the principles of the old Russian ideals, and although his heroes reconciled themselves to the Revolution they did so in order to retain their old values cultivated over generations, and the author justifies their choice.

To set off the high social position of the Turbins in the novel as well as in the first editions of the play, Bulgakov introduces the Lisovsky family: the house-manager Vasilisa and his silly wife Vanda, who, according to Bulgakov, represent the Ukrainian middle class. However,

a careful analysis reveals that the gap between these two classes the high intellectual status of the Turbins and the "low" materialistic one of the Lisovskis is very conditional. Both of them are "Philistines" with the difference that the Turbins are much more refined while Vasilisa is distinguished by his coarser manners.<sup>41</sup>

This insignificant fearful petty-bourgeois family (the only russified Ukrainian family introduced by Bulgakov) is depicted with a certain sympathy as the victim of its "own people". The real blame for the discomfort brought upon the main heroes is placed upon the Bolsheviks and those "short-witted bastard pilgrims," the Ukrainian peasants, who supported that mysterious "man with the guitar, ... Simon the one time Zemstvo official, ... the man-legend, a pure mirage."<sup>42</sup> This is Symon Petliura, whom Bulgakov had already cursed in this early feuilleton *Kiev-Gorod*.<sup>43</sup>

In his study of Bulgakov's writing, Nusinov refers to V. Shulgin's "well known, but shameful article 'Torture by Fear'". He writes:

In his novel Bulgakov depicts the Ukrainian people twice: first, heroically defending themselves from the German invaders; second, entering the city. He could have done that in the play. It would have been very natural to keep these two scenes, since the play originated from the novel, but Bulgakov discards them.

Instead of the fighting people overthrowing their tormentors and taking revenge for their tortures, he shows a people with animal instincts, a people with diabolical faces.

Forgetting the lessons learnt in 1918-1919, Bulgakov was compelled to depart from the content of the novel. The reality, nevertheless, remained in the content of the novel. The epilogue of the play suggests a fundamental departure from the novel, as the political evolution of Shervinsky, Myshlaevsky and Nikolai Turbin from *The White Guard* to reconciliation with the Bolsheviks is not convincingly shown and does not fully coincide with historical reality.

What happened with the surviving friends of the Turbin family after the occupation of Kiev by Petliura? They went to the Don and returned to Kiev for the second time at the end of 1919 with Denikin's army...<sup>45</sup>

Turning to the Bolsheviks after the defeat of Denikin was a natural course for the White Guards who wanted to remain in their motherland. However, their reconciliation with the Communists was not as easy to accomplish. Bulgakov converts his play into an 'agitka' just to fit the censorship requirements. It is obvious from his writings, however, that he never believed in the Bolsheviks' cause.

Bulgakov's portrayal of the Ukrainian people is more the result of an emotional impulse than a statement of reality. For him Petliura's men are, according to Ershov, "the invaders and 'enemies' of the refined Turbins".<sup>45</sup>

In a very brief episode in the second act Bulgakov brings to the stage "His Highness, the Hetman of the whole Ukraine". The stage direction tells us that he is dressed in a "a very rich Cossack jacket, raspberry red trousers

and Caucasian-type boots without heels or spurs. Glittering general's shoulder-straps. A short-clipped greying moustache, a smoothly-shaved head, about forty-five."<sup>46</sup> His colourful appearance as a sixteenth-century Cossack makes him look anachronistic and rather theatrical in the tense war atmosphere. He comes to his Government palace only to find himself in a ridiculous situation: he learns that his masters -- the commander of the Russian army, the chief of the garrison and the representatives of the German staff -- have deserted the country and left him in jeopardy without even letting him know about their departure.

If the Hetman, a puppet and a counterfeit, is at least shown as a histrionic character, neither Petliura nor his First Cavalry Division, commander Bolbotun, are physically present. They are invoked by the author as an unseen and terrifying power: only their men, the barbarous, physically violent guerillas are seen fulfilling their mythical commander's orders. In contrast to the Hetman, who speaks a refined Russian when he wishes, yet switches to Ukrainian for the sake of convention, Petliura's men, who are the common people, use only their native tongue. Their class origin is rendered evident by the coarseness of their expressions and the naïve and simplistic way in which they pass "judgements on a potential foe".<sup>47</sup>

Bulgakov concentrates all social events and historical problems around one class represented by one family of Russian intellectuals, a class to which he belonged himself. He ignores all other political protagonists involved in the social upheaval, thus distorting the historical picture, suggesting his own interpretation and his own appraisal of social events and social groups.

Kullish, by contrast, brings to the stage three antagonistic groups: the Russian Monarchists, the Ukrainian nationalists, and the Bolsheviki or

proletarians. Each one sees events from the standpoint of his own political convictions. The author places these groups in one building, symbolizing society as a whole, locating these social groups on different levels in the building, creating a visible symbol of the class structure. On the upper floor live the Monarchists (the ruling class in the Ukraine) and the owners of the house (the possessors of material goods). They are represented by the Russian Major-General Perotsky and his servicemen-sons. One storey below live the Ukrainian nationalists: the school-teacher and Ukrainian populist Stupay-Stupanenko and his artist-daughter. The attic of the building is occupied by a poor poet and a prostitute; the basement by the lowest class, the proletarians, represented by the working family of Ovrarn Kotliar, who has been mobilized by the Russian Empire as a soldier during the War, and his wife, the laundress Nastia. These groups of people represent the core of society, while other groups, such as the soldiers, intervene.

The explosion of class passion is expressed through the emotions of the characters and the tenor of their lives; their culture and social conscience are the writer's central concern. Kulish gives less importance to historical events than Bulgakov. His character depiction is not as straightforward as Bulgakov's: his heroes are psychologically complicated, they are in constant struggle with the surrounding world as well as with their own inner world. As Kuziakina suggests,

Kulish gives all his own thoughts as a poet, daydreamer and sceptic to his heroes and through them he reveals his own mistakes. The author imparts to his created artistic images his own feelings in order to be rid of them once and for all. Behind the controversies and discussions of the protagonists stands the

writer himself, although their thoughts do not belong to him alone, but rather express his generation's moods, born of the temper of the time.<sup>48</sup>

Kulish's protagonists play an equal part in the play; no character has a secondary role in the play's artistic system. One hero complements another; the presence of one helps to promote a better understanding of the other. Thus, for example, the laundress Nastia and the prostitute Zinka serve as a social contrast to the sophisticated Maryna; Maryna's father, Stupay-Stupanenko, a romantic, impractical day-dreamer, with his constant failures in the struggle to liberate his nation, is an ideological contrast to Maryna in her practical and persistent attachment to the goal of national independence.

This inter-relationship among the heroes helps clarify some existing aspects of the epoch of the 1920s, the characters' enthusiasm and idealization of the Revolution (and later disillusionment). Kulish adapts the same plot selected by Bulgakov, but gives his heroes motivations that often contradict Bulgakov's: The Ukrainian writer begins his response to his Russian colleague with an evaluation of the White Guard family members. Kulish takes as his main protagonists a family of cadre officers in which the father (Perotsky) is a Russian Major-General, his elder son André is a Cornet, and his younger son Georges, a Cadet. All are morally bankrupt, but Kulish does not accentuate the brutality of the members of this intellectual family: the consequences of their rule are brought out in the course of the play, showing that in the Perotsky building every inhabitant is in one way or another their victim. In a moment of malice the old general deliberately sends Ovrin to his death by falsely accusing him of spying for the Cheka against the Empire. This event drives Ovrin's wife Nastia to madness. It is

easy and simple for this "noble man" to destroy the life of his former maid Zinka and provoke her to prostitution. His youngest son, Georges, following his father's example, also comes to Zinka as a "landlord". Zinka's words underline the age of the young dissolute member of the Perotsky family, "a worthy son of his father":

*Georges rushes... and knocks on Zinka's door.*

*Zinka:* Who is it?

*Georges:* It's me. Can I see you?

*Zinka:* Why?

*Georges:* I've come. Don't you know why?

*Zinka:* Are you looking for a mother or have you lost your way?

*Georges:* I've come.... My father sent me. To collect the rent.

Father said he'd evict you if you don't pay today.

*Zinka (resigned):* Well, come in, Mr. Landlord.<sup>49</sup>

General Perotsky, who lives on the upper floor and has a balcony, represents a social and political type: those servicemen of the Russian Empire who held power and would not under any circumstances reconcile themselves to the thought of a Ukrainian state. One critic has commented that, like the Turbins and their friends, he "idealizes the past [of the Russian Empire] and despises the least mention of anything Ukrainian".<sup>50</sup> When Stupay-Stupanenko reminds him about the possibility of a "resurrection" of the Ukraine, the General orders the Ukrainians to take their cue from the "one-and-indivisible Russia".<sup>51</sup> Kulish mocks Perotsky's attitude toward the Ukrainian language and culture in the General's inadvertently comic recollection of a night he once spent in a Bolshevik prison cell:

*Perotsky:* It was a nightmare. At night a monk joined me in my

cell, and he prayed the whole night -- in Ukrainian. Imagine that! I couldn't sleep...<sup>52</sup>

Stupay-Stupanenko admits that "General Perotsky would sooner order his own death than utter a Ukrainian word."<sup>53</sup> Perotsky's anti-Ukrainianism is expressed in almost every scene in which he appears in the play. In his telephone conversation with his son André he re-tells a dream that upset him very much as it predicted the possible victory of the Ukrainian Revolution. In an "arrogant" dream he had seen Russia "as a deserted field with a stove and an icon in the middle. Then Stupay comes and sits on the stove ..."<sup>54</sup> This could mean that Stupay might have an important place in the Russian Empire, or could achieve a higher state position.

The uncontrolled temperament of General Perotsky's youngest son, his impulsive desire to fight in war, is reminiscent of Nikolka Turbin in *The Days of the Turbins*. While Nikolka and Larlosik were toasting the tsar with vodka at the regiment's last meal before going to fight against the Ukrainian liberation army, Georges shouts a loud hurrah for the tsar and for Russia, when shooting from the roof at unarmed demonstrators. Zinka compares Georges' attitude to people as if they were pigeons: "He once fired at a pigeon and hit a man."<sup>55</sup> Selfish and spoilt, Georges enjoys a high social standing but has no aim in life. He searches for shallow, earthly pleasures. Ironically, both the old general and his son at crucial moments seek refuge among those they mistreat or despise: Georges at Zinka's place, Perotsky at Stupay-Stupanenko's.

The elder son André represents the European Constitutional democrats known popularly as cadets. The Cadets, according to Dyky's study, were not intrinsically opposed to the idea of a Ukrainian state, they were primarily concerned with the plan of converting an absolute

monarchy into a constitutional one. Within the framework of a constitutional monarchy, the establishment of a separate Ukrainian state, perhaps in a federation of other non-Russian states, seemed feasible to many of them, but that matter was to be postponed to a later date. Some prominent Ukrainians agreed with the cadets since there were many Ukrainians who were convinced Ukraine was not yet mature for independence. To many Ukrainian nationalists, however, the Cadets were a potential means of military and political support in their struggle to win independence at the time.<sup>56</sup>

The fact that the immediate goal of the Cadets and the goal of the Ukrainian nationalists did not coincide is the source of some of the conflict in the play. Since the Cadets wanted to win the immediate support of the Ukrainian Nationalists, they uttered pro-Ukrainian platitudes. They also knew that the Ukrainian Nationalists had stocked arsenals which the Cadets needed in their fight against Bolshevik forces. In return, some Nationalists in their struggle for independence hoped to gain military and political support from the Cadets. They accepted the Cadets' support for a while, only to be deceived, however, soon thereafter. The loss of Ukrainian support did the Cadets great harm, and led to a great many Ukrainians join the Communist forces.

The cadet André is presented by Kulish in a positive light. He does not scoff at things sacred to others, he is capable of love, of feeling the beauty and the poetry of life. He holds out a promise for Maryna of concrete military and political aid for Ukraine; she accepts his love, while rejecting the poet's. André loves the country in which he lives, though with a special love. He admires the Ukrainian stars because they are "his own". As

Kuziakina puts it, "possibly his greatest crime is that he betrays his love for Maryna for the sake of his political career, for the victory of his Empire."<sup>57</sup>

If Bulgakov presents only the positive side of the White Guards, Kulish shows this class as doomed to fail because of its sumptuous existence, its scorn for the rest of humanity and its inherited insensibility to the human dignity of those who stood below it – the subdued people. This fact was expressed with much understanding in Bulgakov's novel *The White Guard*, though it disappears from *The Days of the Turbins*. Kuziakina suggests that for Kulish this was one of the ideas essential for an explanation of their defeat.

The Perotskys and their ilk were very distant from the people with whom they were living, they segregated themselves in a caste of conquering noblemen and as a consequence they had to sustain an absolute political and moral failure, because the unwillingness to recognize the people surrounding [them] and the negligence toward these people was both a political and a moral problem.<sup>58</sup>

Parallel to the problem of the defeat of the Turbins and the Russian élite in the Ukraine, Bulgakov presents the defeated Ukrainian national movement in the image of Symon Petliura. On this question, as Kuziakina argues, Kulish also opposes Bulgakov, as the latter

presents this movement as an activity of ordinary bandits who in *The Days of the Turbins* were to represent the insurrectionary movement against the Hetman. Kulish opposes this misinterpretation of historical facts by bringing to the stage Maryna Stupay-Stupanenko, a member of the underground

committee *Zolota bulava* an organization of Ukrainian nationalists that fought the Hetman in alliance with the Russian Cadets. In his novel *The White Guard*, Bulgakov endeavours to show the social genesis of Petliura's movement in the character of a former teacher, and then a colonel, Kozyr-Leshko.<sup>59</sup>

Kulish takes this idea as a point of departure for his Stupay-Stupanenko, who is also a Ukrainian nationalist and a teacher. The author emphasizes Stupay-Stupanenko's naïveté, his passivity, his lack of aggressiveness. He refuses to see in Stupay-Stupanenko an active political figure; rather, he depicts Stupay's daughter Maryna as a new type of politician. Cultivated, possessed of a highly developed national consciousness, she represents the essence of the new Ukrainian activist - a new power unseen by Bulgakov.<sup>60</sup> In *The Days of the Turbins* Bulgakov condemns Petliura's men without taking into consideration the fact that all the rebels against the Hetman are somehow connected with Petliura. This very fact was expressed by Nikola Turbin in the novel *The White Guard*,<sup>61</sup> but in the play Bulgakov presents the culture of the Turbins and the barbarism of Petliura's men as antithetical, the latter being chiefly responsible for the failure of the Turbins.

Stupay-Stupanenko is a type of old-fashioned Ukrainian populist whose aim was to re-awaken the Ukrainian people's national consciousness by making them aware of their past. As Dyky noted,

At the time of the Ukrainian Revolution, Stupay does not identify himself with any particular party or movement. In love with Ukraine's past, he is lost in a vision of Zaporozhian Cossacks riding over the plains.<sup>62</sup>

Although he does not identify himself with any political movement, it is obvious that Kulish attributes his character to the *Prosvita*<sup>63</sup> members. The questions of internationalism and nationalism are opposed in Stupay's conception. Everything admirable, even the notion of beauty, in his opinion, is Ukrainian. Enchanted by the music of Bethoven's "Sonata Pathétique", he finds it hard to grasp the fact that it is not Ukrainian,

*Father:* ...Maryna has played some wonderful music the whole evening. It must be Ukrainian because I can hear in it how the Zaporozhians ride through the steppes seeking fortune for their Ukraine. Especially when she plays fast, like this: tam-tam-tam. (*He kisses her.*) Play it to me.

....

*Father:* Is this a sonata?

*She:* Sonata Pathétique.

*Father:* Who wrote it?

*She:* Beethoven.

*Father:* Not a Ukrainian?

*She:* A German.

*Father:* Then his mother was Ukrainian.

...He must have heard Ukrainian music. It's a Ukrainian sonata. The Russians stole Hlynka from us and say that he is their Glinka. He's not Glinka but Hlynka. A Ukrainian surname - he must be Ukrainian...<sup>64</sup>

Only the existence of a Ukrainian republic matters to him, regardless of its social or political structure. He even thinks about forming a coalition with the Bolsheviks as long as they will "allow the Ukrainian republic". Shevchenko's *Kobzar* is his Holy Scripture and the Ukrainian language is his

only "weapon" in this struggle. He even admires the Bolshevik sailor because the latter ordered him in Ukrainian "to prepare for death".<sup>65</sup>

Stupay believes that he can stop the war and the violence of the Bolshevik movement by simply quoting Shevchenko's words: "Embrace my brethren, the smallest one." Stupay's view is typical of those naïve, romantic and idealistic dreams that were crushed during the Civil War between two antagonistic forces -- the Bolshevik movement and the National movement. He is a humanist who does not adhere to any political organization for fear of fighting his own brother, who cannot decide which side to join since both are Ukrainian and both speak the Ukrainian language. His end is presented by Kulish with bitter sarcasm. He dies standing between two fighting forces, unaware from which side the bullet has come. According to Kuziakina the fate of Stupay-Stupanenko varied in different versions of the play.

In one of them the old man, after endless hesitations, finding himself in the cross-fire, decides to run away to his village and to wait until the Revolution ends... In the version of the play presented at the Kamernyi Theatre, Stupay dies on the street, appealing to Ukrainians to reconcile: "The bullets are flying for the international movement and against it, and how about Ukraine? (*Shouts*) Stop it! What are you doing? Hey, you! The ones over there and you over here, Ukrainians!... Having no target to shoot at together, you shoot at each other... In this particular shooting-ground you are only targets, that's all you are!..."<sup>66</sup>

Maryna, like her father, Stupay-Stupanenko, is a nationalist. She is caught in a symbolic love-triangle between André, the Cadet, and Il'ko, a member of the Ukrainian left, that goes over to the Communist side. André

holds out a promise for Maryna of concrete military and political aid for Ukraine; Il'ko offers her his dream of a humanist Ukraine, characterized in his own words as "the land of eternal love". Maryna represents those Ukrainian intellectuals who believed in military and political support from the cadets. Her performance of the "Sonata Pathétique" points to the fact that she belongs to the generation of sophisticated European-oriented Ukrainian intellectuals that believed themselves to be superior to the "peasant mentality". Therefore, she does not put much hope in her own people, considering them too politically immature to win the war of independence. This younger generation -- alienated from its own soil, educated in a foreign culture -- is unaware of the drama of the common people (the basement dwellers) and is unable to share the dreams of the young poet of their people, Il'ko.

Although she refers to herself as the Ukrainian Joan of Arc, Maryna does not act alone, she counts on her knight, André Perotsky, who will come to help free her land. Having neither real faith in the native population, nor a military force upon which to depend, nationalists like Maryna turned to the Cadets, who subsequently betrayed them. On the other hand, many Ukrainian nationalists were completely under the influence of socialist concepts and, after the betrayal of the Cadets, turned to the Bolsheviks. Through the character of Maryna, Kulish shows the potential and the weaknesses of the national movement.

In the last scene of Act Four, Maryna reveals her secret code name in a Ukrainian nationalist organization as "Seagull" [chaika]... This is a classic metaphor for Ukraine found in a poem by Mazeppa<sup>67</sup> where the country is depicted as a seagull's nest by the steppe highway trampled by anyone who crosses it from East to West or vice-versa. Kulish applies Mazeppa's

metaphor to Maryna, thereby making Maryna a symbol of a weak Ukraine at the mercy of more powerful forces.<sup>68</sup>

Both plays (*The Days of the Turbins* and *Sonata Pathétique*) raise the question of cultural hegemony in Ukraine. For Maryna, as well as for the Turbins, the piano is a symbol of the monopolistic possession of culture. Presenting Maryna as a leader of their Ukrainian national movement and an exponent of high culture, Kulish suggests that cultural development in Ukraine must be led by nationally conscious people. For the Ukrainian enlightener's daughter and piano soloist, the most painful question under the new régime is: "Who will play the piano?" Who will pass on cultural values?

The labourer Ovrarn and his wife Nastia represent the lowest class, those exploited by the old régime, the urban proletarians who were largely misunderstood by both Ukrainian nationalists with their dreams of an independent Ukrainian state and by the Ukrainian national Communists of the Il'ko type with their ephemeral dreams of an egalitarian cultural paradise in Ukraine.

At the turn of the century, Ukraine was an agrarian country and the proletariat as a class was not yet a strong political power. Moreover, this force in Ukraine was largely Russian or russified. Ignored by the Ukrainian political parties, it nevertheless existed and demanded a part in political life. Often it gravitated toward the Bolsheviks. As the play goes on, we see that the Bolsheviks and their Ukrainian follower Luka are the only ones to visit the inhabitants of the basement, using the premises to store their Bolshevik propaganda slogans. The lofty dreams of the Ukrainian intellectuals were often not fully understood by the common people, particularly those from the russified and de-nationalized urban proletariat.

In a brief encounter between the Ukrainian enlightener Stupay-Stupanenko and the bootblacks, the gap between the lower class and their populist intelligentsia is disclosed.

*Stupay (putting his leg in front of the first bootblack):* Go ahead and clean it. But wait a moment. Who are you?

*First:* What do you mean who? A bootblack. (*A crowd gathers*)

*Stupay:* Not that. What nationality are you?

*First:* I am a citizen of the Russian state.

....

*Stupay (withdrawing his foot and putting it in front of the second bootblack):* And what nationality are you?

*Second:* Whatever you like.

*Stupay (to Ovrām):* And you? (*Recognizing him*) Ah, our neighbour from below, Ovrām Kotliar. One of us, a Ukrainian! Go ahead and clean my boots (*puts his shoe in front of him*).

....

*First:* What does he want?

*Second:* He wants the nation to clean his shoes.

*Stupay:* We, Stupay-Stupanenkos don't want our nation to clean foreign shoes. Enough of that! It's time to be free! Let's ride our horses and race across the steppes with the eagle and the winds...

*Ovrām:* You may be all right but what are you going to do about us?<sup>69</sup>

In a later scene Ovrām discloses his position in society

*Ovrām:* For ten years I worked in a factory and for three years I was at the front. For that, as you see, they gave me a medal.

Now they offer me freedom -- to crawl with my medal into the grave. Liberty? I have no bread. Equality? I am lower than everyone else without my legs.<sup>70</sup>

The Bolshevik Luka uses this discontent of the proletariat for purposes of political agitation.

*Luka:* Our platform: All power to the Soviets! World revolution! Socialism! <sup>71</sup>

Seeing himself as the lowliest of citizens, Ovrarn joins the Bolsheviks who claim to defend his interests.

In a letter to Korneeva-Maslova, Kulish writes: "I always loved, always respected the unfortunate, the oppressed, the defiled. I feel for them and understand them above all others." <sup>72</sup> The sympathy of the writer assigns them the best traits. Ovrarn appears in his basement where his wife has long awaited him:

In the basement Nastia stands like a statue. In the doorway crawls a legless soldier wearing the ribbon of St George's Cross. Do you recognize your husband, Nastia? Hallo! As you can see, they've shortened me a bit, made me lower than everyone else... I am only half your husband. (*He crawls to the middle of the basement and cries.*)<sup>73</sup>

The scene of Ovrarn's arrival in his humid basement where the water constantly drips, reminds one very much of Myshlaevsky's arrival at the cozy Turbin apartment where his friends took care of his half-frozen legs. Ovrarn is depicted by the writer as a real hero. The fact that he comes back with the St George's Cross indicates his military reputation, since few soldiers in the Imperial army received such distinction. Although Kulish depicts Ovrarn as physically handicapped, he shows no sentimentality in the

scene. This war-hardened soldier has no feelings of pity for himself, but upon seeing his wife petrified by horror, he bursts into tears.

Nastia is the faithful wife who would wait for her husband even if he never returned. In Ukrainian folklore the image of a soldier's wife (soldatka) symbolizes a people's suffering and, according to Iurii Kobyletskyi, "the image of Nastia reminds one of the monumental sculpture from Dovzhenko's film, the sculpture of the motherland from the movie 'Arsenal'. She is a symbol of the woman-martyr: always sorrowful, always alive, inextinguishable, a woman who begets Titans of great deed".<sup>74</sup> This monumental image, placed by destiny in the basement, stands above the powerful ones as proof of the people's humanity, moral purity, and spiritual power.

In the attic of the building next door to the poet lives the unemployed seamstress, Zinka, a former maid to the old general. She too belongs to the exploited urban class and, like Ovrarn and Nastia, has been cast aside by society. Zinka must sell herself in order to exist, but she retains a strong sense of human dignity. She does not sleep for three nights, embroidering the new national emblem, waiting for the new society and believing that it will alter her life. She refers to that new state as "my darling," but, to her disappointment, the desired change, does not come.

*Zinka ( comes out of the crowd, a little tipsy):* And what about me? Back in the saddle or on the mattress? (*To the crowd*). They told me when freedom came it would be like your own mother. "Don't worry, girl, you'll be out of trouble. Life will be like a bed of roses, and your boyfriend will shine like the sun." Now, I am asking where is my boy?  
... I haven't sold everything. I've kept something for... my

Easter [resurrection] day.<sup>75</sup>

The writer does not give any evidence of Zinka's social background, but it was well understood that only peasant girls from very poor families or orphans came to the city to work as maids, dreaming of earning money for their dowry before getting married. After being disgraced by her landlord (the old general) Zinka does not dare to return home to discredit her family and thus ends up, like Il'ko, in the attic at the top of the building - a symbol of great unfulfilled dreams.

Il'ko Iuha, a counterpart to Alexei Turbin, in Bulgakov's work, is the central figure of Kulish's play. If Bulgakov's main character, Alexei Turbin, is a model for his younger brother, a support for his sister, an example for his friends, Kulish's central hero, Il'ko Iuha, personates the writer himself. Il'ko is the symbol of Kulish's lost illusions about the Revolution, his destroyed dreams, his unfulfilled goals. Both heroes -- Bulgakov's and Kulish's -- die tragically: Alexei on a battlefield for his Empire and his ideals; Il'ko in a complex psychological battle with himself.

If Bulgakov presents his tragic hero Alexei Turbin through the image of a serviceman who goes to war with the Ukrainian nationalist movement to save his Empire, Kulish chooses a poet as his tragic hero to show the hope of the Ukrainian national communists for a humanist order, for a peaceful and civilized society. Dyky considers that the image of a poet found in the play

is the image that was held during the period of Romantic literature. The poet is like a prophet of old who can foretell the future... Kulish wants to show here... that it was the poets, especially Shevchenko, who had previously, particularly in the

nineteenth century, sown the seeds of national revolution which were now coming to fruition.<sup>76</sup>

Kulich chooses Petrarch as Il'ko's ideal because just as Petrarch, through his poetry and his devotion to humanism, could reconcile the classical with the Christian world, Il'ko wanted to solve the problem of the future of the individual by combining humanism with communist philosophy.

Il'ko represents that third social group absent from *The Days of the Turbins*, the new proletarian intelligentsia who came from the poorest stratum of society, chiefly from the peasantry. Like Kulich himself, he is the son of a shepherd, a young man with no intellectual background but with glorious dreams about a beautiful future. He comes to the city to get an education in order to fulfil these dreams. In many ways, the daydreamer Il'ko reminds one of the old country school-teacher, Stupay-Stupanenko, who lives only with the desire to rehabilitate the past. Il'ko constructs visions of a brilliant new humanism, a future where "he who today beats his wife will become a Petrarch." During the Revolution and the Civil War, this idealistic and nationally conscious group laboured side-by-side with the Bolshevik-oriented working class, which often lacked an awareness of the national problem. Many representatives of the latter, like the bootblack in Act Three, scene 4, did not even know to which nationality they belonged. In Act Four, scene 8, in a sarcastic conversation with her father, Stupay-Stupanenko, Maryna reveals the fact that the most ignorant were turning to the "reds".

Upon his return from headquarters, Stupay describes to his daughter the situation at the front:

*Stupay:* ...The wind is straight from the front. From the  
partisans... They say there are many Ukrainians among

them. (*Seeing Maryna's interest*)... Almost all of them are Ukrainians.

*Maryna:* And do they themselves know they are Ukrainians?

*Stupay:* ... Perhaps the red flag is better after all, Maryna?

*Maryna:* Even if our yoke turns red it will still be a yoke... ??

Luka's main interest is in seizing power in the new society with no feeling of national identity. He believes that once the Revolution arrives, it will unite the proletariats of all nations and sweep away national boundaries and differences, bringing everyone together in an international universal community. Il'ko, like Mykola Kulish himself, was very much involved with the working class, but was seeking a Ukrainian solution to the class problem. He was undergoing an excruciating spiritual struggle as he strove to form his own social and political philosophy. This was, as Dyky puts it, "the crux of his problem and the tragedy of the Ukrainian communists who tried to settle the problem actively in their own way, not by passively relying upon others, on a foreign power".<sup>78</sup> Kulish chooses a poet with the ideas of Petrarch, who values the individual as a mouthpiece for his own concerns and those of the Ukrainian national communists, a trend which was embraced by many writers and artists of the 1920s.

The characters of Il'ko and Luka are developed in parallel as representing the two movements among Ukrainian communists: the national, idealistic one and the Bolshevik-oriented, practical one. Il'ko believes that the humanist reform must come first, and attempts to subvert the social change; he fears that should the humanist revolution not occur first, the social one could turn into terror, as actually happened. Il'ko's theory was not understood by Luka, who wanted to "allow the train of the revolution to

travel at full speed in order to arrive at socialism". He would not allow it to stop "at the station of eternal love."<sup>79</sup>

Il'ko's character, according to Kuziakina's study, underwent some modification in different productions of the play, but in all of them his end is a tragic one.

In the interpretation by the Kamernyi Theatre staged by Tairov, Il'ko reminds us of a madman: "I shoot at Maryna and push her down. There is a ringing in my ears. She slips down the steps. She is dead. Then I go to the attic. The window. The window looks like a burning red banner. I feel full of great enthusiasm."<sup>80</sup>

We know from the opening remarks of *Sonata Pathétique* that the story is about a "friend" of the narrator who is "now dead", but, if further developed, Il'ko's character would remind one of Khvylovy's protagonist from the story "I" (*Ia*), in which the narrator kills his own mother (symbolizing the motherland) for the sake of the revolution.

Kulish opposes Bulgakov's suggestion that the main reason for the fall of the Empire is the Ukrainian insurgency by bringing to stage sailors and soldiers of the socialist revolution, under the leadership of the one-eyed sailor Sud'ba, who comes to the building to arrest "the enemies of the people" and to take vengeance for his oppressed life and sufferings. Although Sud'ba speaks a broken Ukrainian, he and his soldier friends are not fighting for national dignity; they are for the "International", of which they have the vaguest idea, and come to the building as a blind, elemental "fate"(the meaning of Sud'ba's name). They are out to change Perotsky's building, to destroy the nature of the existing society. One guard says about

Sud'ba: "Watch out, citizens. Don't try to fool comrade Fate",<sup>81</sup> suggesting that the people's fate was inevitably foretold.

There is an eloquent scene in Kulish's play that contradicts Bulgakov's interpretation of the role of Ukrainians in the Empire, along with the consequences they were to pay for their loyalty to it. In the first edition of *The Days of the Turbins*, originally called *The White Guard*, Bulgakov portrays in one scene the mistreatment of a Jewish merchant by the guerillas, showing in this way the brutality of Petliura's men. The scene ends with the guerillas chasing the Jew out. Kulish echoes this scene by having the White Guard inflict punishment on the Ukrainian worker Ovrarn, who lost his legs fighting in war for the glory of imperial Russia. Major-General Perotsky accuses him of spying against the Empire and the White Guards condemn him to death.

It is clear that both plays discuss matters of great urgency for contemporaries. Ideological, social, and political messages are embedded in the character outlines. Both writers disapproved of social cataclysm but through their protagonists they expressed differing understandings of historical events, each defending his personal and national principles, his concern with human dignity and cultural affiliation.

## Chapter Three

Structure and Artistic Devices

Bulgakov's contemporaries criticized him for his "theatrically reactionary," "out-of-date," "derivative," Chekhovian play. Western critics pointed out that the structure of the *Days of the Turbins* "echoes the structure of Chekhov's dramas, with their intimate gatherings and more or less ceremonious social occasions."<sup>1</sup> *The Days of the Turbins*, indeed, resembles Chekhov's late plays (written from 1896 to 1903) defined by David Magarshack as "indirect-action plays" in which "the main dramatic action takes place off-stage and in which the action that does take place on the stage is mainly 'inner action'."<sup>2</sup>

The characteristic feature of such plays is its indirect or evocative impact on the audience, for the characters are usually introspective and while examining their own thoughts and feelings they arouse in the audience an emotional mood that prepares the latter for the development of the action. The evocation of mood aims not only to create a feeling of suspense but to maintain it. Tension in such plays is one of the main motive forces of action. Because of their evocative dialogues (or monologues) Chekhov called these plays "lyrical plays."<sup>3</sup>

Another impetus to action in such a play is the presence of an "invisible" or imaginary character (like the supernatural powers in a Greek play) that supplies a motive power for the action, as well as the "messenger" that keeps the audience informed about the chief dramatic incidents taking place off-stage and contributing to its development. The "messenger" serves the functional purpose of informing the audience about

events that have happened before the opening of the first scene, and at the end of the play helps sustain and satisfy the audience's curiosity.

The indispensable features of the indirect-action play are the elements of arrival and departure; the whole action of the play centres around this element. The characters themselves provide the moral judgement on the action, and in it the chorus element becomes an integral part of the whole play. 4

Elements of an indirect-action play can be found in *The Days of the Turbins* from its very opening. The first scene of Act One begins with the youngest Turbin brother, Nikolka, who acts as a messenger, playing a guitar and singing a song about Petliura, the invisible character, "coming to attack". The messenger (Nikolka) brings first-hand news of current events, letting the audience know his real attitude toward Petliura. Although the invisible character, Petliura, will never appear on stage, and will "perish" by the end of the play, he will be responsible for all the heroes' misfortunes and suffering. Nikolka's judgement of Petliura, expressed in his light song, expresses rather his innocent, immature ideas about the battle and the insignificance of the Petliura movement. The interior of the Turbins apartment with a hearth and a clock chiming a Boccherini minuet, creating a mood of warmth and comfort, suggests to the audience a mood of nostalgia for the refined past incompatible with the present situation.

As the play starts there are only two characters on stage: the Turbin brothers Nikolka and Alexei. Their sister, Elena, with her concerns about her absent husband, is introduced by the author right in the middle of the brothers' dialogue, and so the whole family, around whom the events will be taking place, is brought on stage. The brothers' feelings for Elena and her missing husband Talberg are made evident, and suspense is immediately

created: "where indeed is Elena's husband at this dangerous time?" The creation of suspense "usually by means of a series of false starts and delayed explanations" occurs quite often throughout the play - indeed right from the beginning.<sup>5</sup> Elena's anxiety and uncertainty about her husband's delay, combined with the flickering of the electric light, the sounds of distant cannon, the tramping of feet outside, are intended to create a mood of tension in the audience; the latter is expected to join Elena in her worry and expectations of the long awaited "hero." Elena's feelings are juxtaposed to Nikolka's absurd remarks and attitudes to Talberg which seem to be very inappropriate at that moment.

Juxtapositions and repetitions of situations (or sequences of events) occur throughout the play. The first one to knock at the door is Myshlaevsky, not the long-awaited Talberg; the second to arrive is the totally unexpected distant relative Lariosik; the third is, at last, Talberg, a cold, selfish and senseless man. The viewer is struck by the contrast between Talberg's cold behaviour and Elena's anxiety and solicitude for him -- this contrast of attitudes breaks the suspense created by the author, as the audience expected to meet a loving and caring husband.

From the very opening of the play until the closing cue in scene 2, there is drama counter-pointed by comedy: the amusing remarks of Nikolka are contrasted with the anxiety of Elena; the arrival of the semi-frozen Mishlaevsky bringing terrible news about the situation on the front and the unexpected arrival of the wretched Lariosik; the arrival and departure of Talberg and the entrance of Shervinsky. The dialogues at the dinner table also proceed through an alternation of serious and comic sequences.

Talberg brings all the information about the political situation in Kiev. He excuses himself for leaving the Army to the mercy of fate and presents

the viewer with an explanation of the Hetman's flight in the following act. The Hetman's flight points to the roots of the future failure of the whole White Guard movement. Talberg's attitude to his military and family duties, as well as the messages he brings, disappoint the audience who expect to see a real hero. The suspense created in the opening is destroyed. The exchanges between Talberg and Alexei when the latter refuses to shake hands (because of Talberg's betrayal of their cause) brings the scene to its dramatic climax. The tension, however, is relieved when the "hero" Talberg, during his shameful escape, ridiculously challenges Alexei to a duel upon his return. Alexei passes a moral judgement on the event, while in his dialogue with Nikolka, he allegorically compares their house with a sinking ship; this comparison re-creates the tension as it warns the audience that Talberg's flight may bring a disaster to the Turbins' home. The "highly dramatic confrontation between Alexei and Talberg", as Ershov puts it, "serves as a decompression and lead-in to the arrival of the frivolous Shervinsky", suggesting that the conflict between Elena and her husband has been concluded.<sup>6</sup>

The second scene opens like the first one, with music. In the first scene Nikolka with his song presents the political situation (the reason for the bad mood in the Turbin household where "everything was going wrong" and where there was "a total unHINGING of nerves...")<sup>7</sup> At the opening of the second scene, Elena, shaken and upset by her husband's departure, sits at the piano and "plays the same chord over and over", though "the table set for supper"<sup>8</sup> prepares the viewer for a pleasant development of the coming events. It takes Shervinsky's appearance to bring Elena back to life. Her tête-à-tête occurs in the same place as did her meeting with her husband, although it is quite different in character. His appearance with roses, his

boyish compliments, and his willingness to sit at her feet, all prepare the viewer for the more romantic development which takes place toward the end of Act One.

If the first scene of Act One reveals the political situation, the second brings to the viewer's attention the nature of the characters and the inter-relationship among them, along with their attitudes toward those events and their political leaders. In the relaxing atmosphere at the dinner table the position and nature of each character is defined; the heroes' most important concerns are expressed; the role of a family that protects and isolates the characters from the harshness of the outside is revealed; the real nature and concern of the dramatic hero Alexei (whose main concern is the fate of his motherland) are defined. The question of what should have been done to avoid the catastrophe threatening the country, and the disapproval of the puppet government of "the Hetman of the whole Ukraine"-- who could not save Ukraine from Petliura and the Ukrainian national movement -- are raised.

In this scene Bulgakov uses the chorus element to give expression to the sentiments evoked by the action of the play. As in Chekhov's play *Three Sisters* the main character, Alexei, provides the moral judgement on the action, bringing to the audience the tension created between the dramatic hero and his society. Alexei expresses his complete disapproval of the Hetman's flight and brings the scene to its dramatic climax by refusing to drink a toast to the Hetman as proposed by Shervinsky.

Bulgakov admires his heroes for their loyalty and dedication to their cause and destiny, but underlines the absurdity of their beliefs, using parody when juxtaposing the narrated entrance of "His Imperial Majesty" in the story told by Shervinsky with the entrance of Larlosik.

**NIKOLKA:** the emperor has been killed ...

**SHERVINSKY:** Gentlemen! The news of His Imperial Majesty and death...was fabricated by the Bolsheviks. Do you know what happened in Emperor Wilhelm's palace when the Hetman's entourage was presented? Emperor Wilhelm said: "And about everything else this man will speak to you ..." -- the curtains drew aside, and our sovereign walked out.

Lariosik enters.<sup>9</sup>

As the truth about the end of the Empire is revealed, chaos develops on stage, underlining the desperation and the moral emptiness of the group and of the White Guard movement as a whole. The teetotaler Lariosik is soon drunk and falls asleep while Elena -- the once-devoted wife, a symbol of the household -- commits everything to hell and betrays her husband upon whose name she has never previously so much as "cast a shadow":

**ELENA** ... I am drunk ... Our whole life is crashing down.

Everything is falling apart, being destroyed... Oh , let it all go to the devil! <sup>10</sup>

Her state of desperation is somewhat mitigated when Lariosik awakens and threatens to become violently ill. The resulting farcical mood breaks again; this brings back the motif of domestic nostalgia evoked by the clock which promptly strikes three and plays the minuet.<sup>11</sup>

The first scene of Act Two is built on formulaic conversations in which each phrase is prescribed by military and social conventions governing exchanges between a superior and his inferior. Bulgakov parodies the events, presenting them in a farcical succession of announcements about the defeat. The first person to know about the development of events is the servant Fiodor -- a recurrent character in Russian literature who, as Proffer

defines him, "knows, but seems not to know what is going on around him".<sup>12</sup> Fiodor reads the changes in Adjutant Novozhiltsev's face and the gathering of his personal belongings as evidence of the defeat of the Hetman and the retreat of the German allies. Fiodor gradually convinces his superior Shervinsky of the reality of the defeat. Shervinsky does not believe his inferior and accuses him of "going out of his mind", but a telephone call later confirms the fact that Petliura's troops are in the city. When the Hetman arrives at his palace a similar situation is repeated. This time Shervinsky is the subordinate, delivering to his chief, the Hetman, the news of the defeat and of Serdiuk's switch to Petliura's side, and now it is the Hetman who accuses Shervinsky of not being in his "right mind". These ironic reversals of situation serve as a comic parody of the political situation breaking the tension of the events and making the audience inclined to doubt the seriousness of the Hetman's cause.

The Hetman's ceremonious arrival and behaviour in his palace, his absurd instance that Shervinsky speak Ukrainian and the notion that he has humbled the language by doing so, made to seem ridiculous by the informal entrance of the German commanders who come to announce that they will not give military help to the Hetman and the only thing left for him is to escape. And moments later we see the unceremonious flight of the Hetman of all Ukraine in a German soldier's uniform.

Once again Bulgakov uses the element of a farcial succession of events to show not only the ridiculous semblance of the Hetman power, but the insignificance of the language he tries to impose on his subordinates. Bulgakov first parodies Adjutant Shervinsky's inability to pronounce a Ukrainian word, then introduces the macaronic language (a mixture of German and Russian) of the German allies who came to rescue the Hetman.

The Hetman's escape -- with no orders left for his subordinates -- touches off another succession of ridiculous events. Stopped on his way out by a telephone call from the field, he can only suggest to his army that they "slow the retreat" for at least half an hour, to give him time to flee. When Shervinsky leaves the palace and also stops to answer the phone, his response is simply to proclaim the cause lost and suggest that they "toss everything and get the hell out ..." After his departure the phone rings again. This time only the servant, Fiodor, is left in the Hetman's palace to answer and give orders. This he does using the exactly the same words as Shervinsky did. These ironic reversals of situation break the tension and effectively diminish the historical importance of the Hetman, whose significance could be compared to that of the servant Fyodor.

If in Act Two, scene 1, the dramatist exposes the unprincipled, ridiculous White Guards, in scene 2 he intends to show that the situation was no better within the Petliura forces. Scene 2 shifts us to the headquarters of the First Cavalry Division commanded by Bolbotun. The action takes place at contemporaneously with the Hetman's flight and the desertion of the Serdiuk regiments to Petliura's side. Not only in this scene but throughout the whole play, Bulgakov shows a superb sense of timing.

The scene consists of two "judging incidents",<sup>13</sup> as Ellendea Proffer puts it, the third, concluding episode was censored in the final version and it is missing in all published versions. According to Proffer's study, "it was structured with a similar sort of situation rhyme..." and depicted the cruelty of Petliura's men.<sup>14</sup> In the first "judging incident" Bulgakov shows the cruel treatment by Petliura's commanders of one of their own soldiers, who went to the infirmary for treatment of his frozen feet without reporting to his superior. Although Bulgakov condemns their cruelty, he justifies their

policy and does not pass judgement on the guerillas for the reason that they, like the Turbins, are true to their principles.<sup>15</sup>

The second "judging incident", in contrast to the first one, brings comic relief, as it shows an ordinary bootmaker, who is not only far removed from the military life but also not even aware who is actually in power. The man has no idea how to address the soldiers and does not know whether they are Bolsheviks or the Hetman's men. Bulgakov illustrates, through this character's ignorance, the chaos resulting from the rapid changes in the leadership of the country.

Moreover, the ruthless expropriation of the bootmaker's merchandise by Petliura's men illustrates their underlying Ukrainian peasant mentality; as Ershov puts it, they "do not burden themselves with a fine analysis of conscience and morality."<sup>16</sup> Bulgakov considered this plebeian Ukrainian mentality to be the primary material out of which the country's political chaos was woven.

While Acts One and Two introduce characters and establish them in particular situations, Act Three as a culmination of events is designed to elicit the audience's sympathetic response, since the latter now empathizes with the Turbins and their friends. The Act is divided into two scenes. The setting of the first scene is the Alexander High School where the young men were to be educated, but which is ironically turned into a battlefield. Though the action takes place outside the family house, the first scene opens (as scene one of Act One) with Nikolka singing a love song, this time joined by Cadets. However, the song proves very inappropriate to the context of the events presented, as the audience is already prepared for the tragic fate awaiting the heroes. The song is interrupted by Alexei's arrival from the palace after an emergency meeting to disband the division. The

colonel, Alexei Turbin, has refused to lead the Cadets against Petliura's forces - not because the latter are stronger, but because the leaders have abandoned them. Here again Bulgakov introduces choral comments (the dramatic hero gives essential information about the cause of his tragedy). Alexei's speeches are the ideological centre of the play. While his first speech is soldierly and impersonal -- brief and to the point -- his next one is far more human: he leads them to his main point by asking the question, "Whom do you think you are defending?"

**ALEXEI:** ... I am telling you, it's the end of the White movement in the Ukraine. It's the end of it in Rostov-on-the-Don, everywhere! The people are not with us. They are against us. That means it's over! ...<sup>17</sup>

The high tension of Alexei's speeches is relieved by the unexpected appearance of the school caretaker Maxim, expressing his concerns about the school furniture. But Bulgakov also uses the character of Maxim to express the feeling of ordinary human beings whose duties in the world are as important as those of military men. To care for and preserve from total destruction the heritage passed from generation to generation is also an important duty in life .

**MAKSIM:** Who's going to answer for this? Maxim answers for everything. All kinds have been here -- there've been ones for the tsar and ones against the tsar, hard-bitten soldiers, but breaking up the desks...<sup>18</sup>

The first scene ends with Petliura's soldiers, who mistreat their soldiers and ordinary people in previous scene, occupying the Nikolaevskaia High School. Alexei dies to save the life of his soldiers and to save himself

from the shame of disgrace, while his younger brother Nikolka reveals in a melodramatic way the reason for his death.

NIKOLKA. ...I know why you're sitting there! I know you, commander, you're waiting for death to save you from disgrace, that's what! Well, I'm going to guard you then.<sup>19</sup>

The second scene takes place in the Turbins' apartment about one-and-a-half hours later, at dawn. The events taking place outside are reflected in the apartment -- the electricity, which went out only briefly in Act One, is now permanently out ("a candle is burning on the dining room table"), and the atmosphere is disturbing. As in Act One the scene is built on suspense. The tension of expectation in this scene is similarly structured by a series of arrivals. The action begins as in Act One, with two people on stage: Elena, comforted by Lariosik, anxiously waits for her brothers' arrival.

The motif of flight is raised once again: Lariosik mentions Talberg (a name Elena never wants to hear again in her house), whose flight and cowardice may be perceived as one of the main reasons for the misfortune of the White Guard movement. Now, however, Talberg's name is set against Alexei's heroic death. "Throughout the scene Elena becomes the focal point on which all events converge", and, according to Ershov, "through her responses ... the spectator becomes once more involved with the tragic results of the 'outside' events."<sup>20</sup>

The events again are presented in a series of arrivals. The first character actually to appear is Shervinsky: he brings Elena the news of the Hetman's flight and the occupation of the city by Petliura's troops. While the audience already knows what has really happened, Shervinsky comforts Elena and Lariosik, assuring them that "everything is absolutely all right."<sup>21</sup>

The next to arrive are Myshlaevsky and Shervinsky not the more expected characters Alexei and Nikolka (a similar situation we find in Act One). This time Myshlaevsky comforts Elena, promising that her brothers will be here in an instant, although his tone and behaviour reflect his "inner" mood, that of a defeated soldier.

The quarrel between Myshlaevsky and Shervinsky about the Hetman's authority brings comic relief even though the subject is extremely serious, as "they are both given to hyperbole".<sup>22</sup> Myshlaevsky mulls over in his mind Alexei's speech at the last regimental dinner and it becomes clear that Myshlaevsky adopts Alexei's viewpoint. Another comic situation (in the series of ridiculous events) before the climax is the argument about the Hetman's cigar-case (this time in Elena's presence) -- a moment that not only reveals Elena's influence and power over Shervinsky, but also suggests to the audience the further development of their relationship. These moments of humour are followed by the return of the wounded Nikolka, (acting again as a messenger) and the climax of the play: the confirmation of the fact of Alexei's death.

While Act Three creates emotions of horror, the last Act serves to arouse pity and sympathy in the viewer. Act Four might be termed the anti-climax of the play, or an epilogue (note Studzinsky's final statement: "For some a prologue, but for others -- an epilogue.") The setting of Act Four is the Turbins' apartment, and the structure and the development of Act Four in many ways reminds us of Act One. The decoration of the Christmas tree indicates that two months have gone by since Alexei's death. As in the preceding scenes, two characters start the action and Lariosik's love for Elena sets the mood for a happy development of events. After dedicating his poetry to her, Lariosik asks Elena to marry him, but she confesses that she

is "already having a romance" with a "very well known young man". Lariosik brings up the name of Talberg, reminding the audience of his possible arrival.

This scene, like the previous ones, is built on a series of arrivals: Elena and Lariosik are waiting for guests. The first one to arrive is Shervinsky. As in Act One, he enters suddenly without knocking; the door is open for him again. In Act One Shervinsky enters after Talberg's flight; this time he arrives after Elena's rejection of Lariosik's marriage proposal. The next to come on stage is Nikolka; he enters on crutches. His appearance suggests the seriousness of the wound he sustained in battle: it has still not healed after two months and makes him feel that he will remain crippled forever. He is wearing a student's jacket, indicating the position he would normally occupy at his age. Nikolka's handicap and his concern about his uncertain future arouse a feeling of pity and indignation about the horrors of the civil war. This sentimental moment is interrupted by Lariosik's return and his breaking the "pressure" bottle of vodka he managed to get as a surprise for Myshlaevsky.

Next come the former White Guard officers Myshlaevsky and Studzinsky - they come together wearing civilian clothes, indicating their resignation from the military forces. They renew the conversation (from Act One) about whether to fight or not. Through this dialogue Bulgakov shows the final split among the White Guard officers: Myshlaevsky, the older experienced soldier who has fought for his motherland since 1914, is confident that a "new Russia will arise" under the new régime, while to Studzinsky the arrival of the Bolsheviks means "the end of Russia", and he can not bring himself to "love the country which is finished". This dialogue sets a pattern for the remaining characters' speeches, which testify to their

own weariness with the misery and inconvenience of the war. In one way or another they are ready to reconcile themselves to any régime as long as it will bring them peace. Myshlaevky refers to the dead Alexei, whose ideas of reconciliation with the new régime he has decided to follow. Bulgakov again uses choral comments to provide the mood, this time expressed by the dramatic hero, Myshlaevsky, who now takes Alexei's place in the play. Myshlaevky expresses his approval of Alexei's opinion about the White Guard's unpopularity among the people (very likely referring to the Ukrainian people): "The people are not with us. The people are against us. Alyosha was right." And, like Alexei in Act One, he provides the moral judgement on the action, justifying his getting mobilized by the Red Guards: "... Let them mobilize me! At least I'll know that I'm serving in the Russian army."<sup>23</sup> The uncertain fate of this once brave soldier and his willingness to give himself into the hands of the Bolsheviks diminish his image and places him in the ranks of defeated heroes.

The author creates a brief moment of suspense by bringing Talberg on stage right after his wife's decision to marry Shervinsky. Talberg once more re-establishes himself as a thoroughly repulsive character and is again rejected by Elena and her family. As soon as Talberg leaves, "the mood lightens", the Christmas tree is illuminated with electric lights, and the cosiness of the Turbins' apartment is restored. Nikolka begins to play the music to Pushkin's *Song of Oleg the Prophet*, but this time Myshlaevsky adapts the song to the new Soviet point of view, confirming his own change of ideology. Nikolka's song, together with Lariosik's speech, create a structural symmetry: it will be remembered that the play opens with Nikolka's singing and playing his guitar, and Lariosik makes a speech at "the regiment's last meal" in Act One. While the song in Act One expresses a

naïve sentimental feeling of mystery and uncertainty, its counterpart in Act Four suddenly bursts into a feigned joy which is quite at variance with Nikolka's crippled state and the content of Pushkin's lyrics.

Though major Soviet and Western critics interpret the end of *The Days of the Turbins* as a happy one, Nikolka's unfinished song which reverses the last stanzas of Pushkin's lyrics, suggests an uncertain end for the inhabitants and the frequenters of the Turbins' home; furthermore, reversed feelings and emotions are expressed by the whole group. After the announcement of Elena's wedding plans, everyone joins in congratulating her, though everyone seems to be left with something on his mind.

**MYSHLAEVSKY:** ... Congratulations lovely Lena, once and for all.

Forget about everything. And in general -- your health! (He drinks).

**NIKOLKA:** (Strums the strings of his guitar, sings).

Tell me, sorcerer, favourite of the gods,  
 What will my life be?  
 Will I be covered with earth in my grave,  
 To the joy of my enemies?  
 Then louder, music, play a victory,  
 We have conquered and the foe is running,  
 running, running!

**MYSHLAEVSKY:** (Sings).

So, for the Soviet of People's Commissars ...

(All except Shervinsky take up the tune...)

We thunder aloud "Hurrah! Hurrah! Hurrah!"

**STUDZINSKY:** Well, what the hell is this?! You should be ashamed!

**NIKOLKA:** (Sings on).

From the dark forest

The inspired sorcerer goes to meet him... <sup>24</sup>

The moralistic ending of the final version of the play (dated June - September 1925) is different from the previous version (dated June 1925) in every way. The last episode of the previous version closes with everyone playing cards, the military music playing behind the Turbins' cosy apartment, while the crippled Nikolka sings a symbolic song based on Puskin's lyrics expressing the universal uncertainty about their future. In the final version, Larosik's speech and Nikolka's song serve to close the structural frame of the play. In Act One, Nikolka, acting as a messenger, informs the audience about "Petliura coming to attack"; at the end of the play he concludes the events proclaiming them as "a great prologue to a new historical play."<sup>25</sup>

Larosik's unexpected appearance in Act One not only brings a release to the tense atmosphere in the Turbins' home, but reminds them of the importance of family ties at such a troublesome time. His final speech is a mixture of humour and seriousness. Larosik's quotation from *Uncle Vania* - "We will rest, we will rest" symbolises the current mood of restlessness, as everybody in the circle knows that they are to face a different end.

The final (June-September, 1925) revised edition of the play has a "happy ending" in conformity with the demands of Socialist realism: a gun salutes the Soviet victory in the city, the "International" is heard in the background, and all the "heroes" but the "lonely" and isolated Studzinsky, remind the audience that this ending represents an epilogue to the old Russia, and the beginning of a new one.

Although both plays share their writers' aspiration to express the inner world of their heroes, Bulgakov measures the structure of his play in

already developed dramatic forms while Kulish "creates a theatrical spectacle combining in an original manner the most effective features of symbolist and expressionist drama, a rich verbal texture, and a fragmental structure".<sup>26</sup> This combination of features (symbols, expressing the incomprehensive meaning of things and events and the characters' inner psychological realities) in *Sonata Pathétique* helps bring to the viewer's attention the complexity of historical events and all the social groups involved in that particular historical time. The name of the play is symbolic on its own. Beethoven dedicated his "Sonata Pathétique" to the French Revolution of 1799, Kulish devotes his play to the October Revolution of 1917.

Bulgakov concentrates his attention on a single social group -- the Turbin family and their friends -- those decent, cultured representatives of the Russian élite in Kiev, whose days are at an end. He contrasts them only briefly with the coarse Ukrainian nationalists, described by Lindheim as "peasant bandits" interested more "in sack and pillage than in national liberation".<sup>27</sup>

Kulish, as has been stated, places on stage the three important historical forces involved in the Revolution and Civil War in the Ukraine: the adherents of Revolution in the form of a group of revolutionary Bolshevik internationalists; a counter-revolutionary movement in the form of a family of military men who wanted Russia to remain either a monarchical or constitutional empire (these two wings are expressed by two generations, in the image of father and son); and, finally, the three wings of the Ukrainian nationalist movement, represented by (a) the enlightener Stupay-Stupanenko, (b) his right-wing nationalist daughter, Maryna, and (c) the new type of Ukrainian proletarian intelligentsia in the image of "I"/I'iko.

The central theme and the main problems developed in the play are presented through numerous structural and technic devices that make "the dramatic composition similar to the structural principles of contemporary musical polyphony",<sup>28</sup> where several themes run simultaneously. Kulish structures his play in the tradition of the Ukrainian *vertep* (puppet theatre), in which various actions run simultaneously on different parts of the stage.

The *vertep* was a popular genre at the end of the 17th and during the 18th century in Ukraine, especially among the peasants, and was very popular until the First World War. Even now it remains popular in Ukrainian villages, having experienced a general revival after the 1960s and a second revival in the Western Ukraine (especially in the L'viv region) toward the latter part of the 1980s.

The *vertep* was originally associated with Christmas pageants and rituals. While in the original *vertep* all the evil forces vanish with the end of the performance, leaving place only for the good, the reverse is true in Kulish's play: by the end of the play all the positive heroes are doomed to die.

The *vertep* itself was a box-like structure of about 2.5 metres high and 1.5 metres wide made of thin wooden boards and of cardboard. It consisted of two levels or floors more rarely three levels. Only religious aspects of the pageants were acted out on the upper floor scenes with angels, the Magi, shepherds, etc.<sup>29</sup> On the lower level stood Herod's throne; to one side there was a bell, rung by the sexton. The floor was lined with fur to hide the crevices which allowed the puppeteer to bring the puppets out and manipulate them by means of wires from below the stage. The puppeteer himself stood behind the back wall of the wooden box speaking in different voices while manipulating the wooden dolls. Behind the stage a

choir sang carols and spiritual songs or chanted prayers. The puppets' singing or dancing was accompanied by a violin.<sup>30</sup>

Originally only religious figures played a role in the *vertep*, but gradually puppets representing different social classes and various nationalities (the Gypsy, the Pole, the Jew) were introduced. Eventually the *vertep* is divided into two parts: the religious or the "serious" part and the lighter presentation known as the "intermedia". The serious part devoted to the religious spectacle was presented on the upper floor, while the secular presentation of the folk and national character was played on the lower floor. The structure of the *vertep* with two different divisions symbolically represented heaven and earth. This latter form of the *vertep* was widely developed and popularized by members of the Kiev Mohyla Academy.<sup>31</sup>

Kulish used the *vertep* as a model for the setting of *Sonata Pathétique*, whose action takes place on two floors of the same building (to which he added the attic and the basement, thereby delineating the social strata more precisely). In the production, the set represented a building with its front wall removed.

While the levels of the *vertep* represented heaven and earth and the tradition was concerned with the Christmas vigil, Kulish emphasized the contrast in subject matter and theme by presenting the events of his drama during the Easter vigil <sup>32</sup> and used the levels of Major-General Perotsky's residence to represent symbolically different strata of Ukrainian society under Russian rule. Each level of action is set on a different floor of the building, each has its separate course of development, and yet all levels are interdependent and united by the whole dramatic action of the play. Their interaction begins from the very start. The staging enables the director to

present various scenes of the play simultaneously or in rapid sequence, providing a faster moving pace for the play. The changing of action within the same scene points to the synchronicity of the flow of events and maintains the interest of the audience. All the scenes are logically connected but, as in a polyphonical musical work, not directly linked to each other.

Just as in the *vertep* theatre where all action is concentrated around its unifying element -- the puppeteer, in *Sonata Pathétique* all the action occurs around the main unifying element -- Il'ko Yuha or "I" in the same person who shares in many ways the author's concerns and worries, his broken dreams and disappointments. "I"-Il'ko's concerns could be attributed to many representatives of Kulish's generation of Ukrainian intelligentsia. This presentation of a hero embodying the history and aspirations of a nation could define the genre of the play as that of an epic, dramatic poem.

Unlike Bulgakov, who stays above his heroes, admiring, hating or passing judgement on them, Kulish develops the action of his *Sonata Pathétique* in a monologue frame with a central lyrical character -- "I". The narration of the play is in the first person singular. The narrator in the play is given a dual role: he is referred to by the first person singular "I" throughout the play yet becomes "Il'ko Yuha" when addressed by his friend -- the Bolshevik Luka. This duality of roles, as pointed out by Dyky, enables the narrator "to unite the divergent themes and actions and different characters in the play".<sup>33</sup> "I" as a narrator stands outside of the action of the play, witnessing the tragedy of characters as an observer, and at the same time "I" takes an active part in the play, he is part of the action. In Act One, scenes 1-3, "I" narrates the events, but in scene 4 he is a part of the play, when carrying on a dialogue with the "unemployed milliner Zinka".

"By means of this relation between narration and action the structure of the play is unified and made stronger."<sup>34</sup> Maryna's role is also many-sided; her role is presented through three different conventions. When she represents the narrator's dream or when she symbolizes the Ukraine -- she is presented as "She"; when she talks with her father she is just Maryna or Marynka.

According to Onyshkevych-Zaleska's study on "Existentialism in Modern Ukrainian Drama", the introduction of the first-person singular narrative in Kulish's drama also "draws attention to the subject problem of I, of the individual man, of his essence", and "the use of parallel musical composition serves to augment the problem of man's self-fulfilment", as each movement of Beethoven's Sonata interwoven throughout the action of the play reflects that individual search for his self, his own individual truth and identity, his attitude toward God, his responsibility for others, his distrust of the community that follows from his feelings of powerlessness and lack of freedom of choice caused by the political instability, autocracy, dictatorship and wars.<sup>35</sup>

While Bulgakov uses music in his play only as a means of suggesting certain emotions and introducing certain political events through the lyrics of songs, Kulish's play is *integrated* with a musical composition. Kulish declared his intention for "the music to be an organic part" of his work, "to fill in the unspoken words".<sup>36</sup> In her memoirs Antonina Kulish confirms that her husband arranged the episodes of the play to fit the texture of Beethoven's Sonata -- an idea which came to him as he was listening to his daughter playing the work (op.13, No.8 in C minor). Indeed, critics point out that this combination of a play and a musical work is a unique occurrence in Western dramaturgy.<sup>37</sup> Movements of Beethoven's Sonata appear as symbols of movements and actions within the play and at the same time serve as

integral components of the dramatic action. Maryna's playing on the piano not only reflects the action of a particular moment in the play but also shows the action as presented in the music; the music in the play also serves to foreshadow events.

The action of the play begins with Maryna's playing "the first movement, the deep and mighty *Grave* full of starry pathos".<sup>38</sup> The anguish expressed in the chords of the C minor key not only sets the mood, but also integrates the feelings of the characters with the music. For example, in scene 1 we see "I" -- a poor student in the semi-attic of the building who has but "a starry sky for a curtain". He struggles for survival while dreaming of converting all human beings into humanists like Petrarch and his country into a Helicon<sup>39</sup> -- a country where beautiful art will flourish. On the other side of the semi-attic the poor unemployed milliner Zinka, having given herself to prostitution in order to make a living, waits for her love -- the man of her dreams. Her inappropriate laughter, set against the sad *Grave* (played by Maryna) foreshadows the catastrophe of her dreams. "A coiled boa-like brass helicon"<sup>40</sup> shining in the corner of Il'ko's room serves as a warning to the dreamer poet about the irrelevance of his grandiose dreams and intentions.

Below, in the general's apartment, the clock strikes "as if from a distant age, evenly, nostalgically, elegiacally" -- marking the passing of time. In Bulgakov's play the clock signifies the nobility and refined culture of the Turbin family. Kulish uses the same device to suggest that their time is already over. The first moments of the *Grave* introduce elements of insecurity and anxiety; these are intensified in scene 4 when Zinka comes to see Il'ko to express her love for him. She wants to write about it, but she

finds Il'ko involved in writing of his own: he is composing the one hundred and thirty-first letter to the girl of his dreams.

Scene 5 concentrates on the "dark basement" at the bottom of the Perotsky building, where the poorest and most depressed live. These people are at ground level. They have no dreams or high expectations, their time is measured by the dripping of water from the unrepaired ceiling into a bucket - its rhythm is reflected in the left-hand chords of the melancholy *Grave*. In the basement, at the lowest point in the building that is an emblem of society, Kulish positions an active social group -- the working class, a class which Bulgakov did not mention in his play. Here lives a laundrywoman, Nastia, who awaits her husband's return from war. Also in the basement Kulish introduces the "professional revolutionary" Luka and the "old man" Hamar. They are "sorting illegal literature"; they are ready to "distribute literature! Organize! Agitate! ... fire the world ..." The dramatist points out that here from this "dark bottom" of society, though ignored by everyone, the volcano of social cataclysm is about to erupt.

In scene 6 Luka comes to persuade the poor poet (the "I") to join the cause of the Revolution, to send "to hell" his "eternal love" and "to let the train of the revolution go full speed to socialism".<sup>41</sup> While Luka openly scorns and questions Il'ko's position, the *Grave* is still sounding. The "annoyed and offended" Il'ko's condemns and accuses his "comrade Luka" for "misunderstanding the whole problem" of the revolutionary movement. The *Grave* reaches its final movement as Zinka is forced to let her "landlord" in. Like Beethoven in the first cycle of his "Sonata Pathétique", Kulish raises the question about the extremity of people's discontent with their life and their search for a solution. The peremptory movement of the mighty *Grave* "raises a voice of discontent, and demands an answer, a quick one. It is

impatient. It does not want to wait."<sup>42</sup> Thus the dramatist brings the theme of the dwellers' discontent with life to its climax.

In scene 9 at the approach of "I" to Maryna's door, "the first wave of the brilliant *allegro molto e con brio* brings on an exciting and romantic atmosphere, and again the movement of the musical work and the action of the drama are interwoven. Again, as in Bethoven's Sonata the development seems to bring an answer, but this answer "is shy and evasive, it contains only suffering and pain, but no decision."<sup>43</sup>

Throughout scenes 9-16 all the characters of the play are introduced and all the main ideas of the play are expressed. In scene 9 Il'ko makes his final decision to bring Maryna his love-letter as he listens to "the poem's tone of rebellious spirit, the eternal song of love" of the "Sonata Pathétique." The music -- the second movement of *Allegro molto e con brio* -- sets a mood of inspiration and high hopes as Maryna and her father express their "triumphant review of the Ukrainian Revolution and struggle for independence", but as Il'ko approaches the door of the apartment where "She" lives with her father, the *allegro* "suddenly stops", warning Il'ko about his failure.

Before the scene closes Maryna, at her father's request, plays again. "I" /Il'ko's uncertain position in the Ukrainian nationalist struggle, in which Maryna and her father play the leading role, is defined as being "behind the door".

She plays. A wave of sounds rises to the starry skies. Behind it, the corner of the room seems to float under the taut sail of the curtain: Shevchenko's bust, the flowers, she, bent over the piano, her father with his chronicle and I, behind the door. We are like

the Argonauts on a journey to the wonderful lands, each in search of his own golden fleece.<sup>44</sup>

The "wave of sounds" of the Sonata raises Il'ko "to the starry skies". The *Allegro molto e con brio* reveals the inspiring mood of the three wings of the Ukrainian nationalist movement and the goals set by each of them. The music and the action of the character's inner drama interact and support one another.<sup>44</sup>

Scene 12 is based entirely on the movements of Beethoven's Sonata. After the *Allegro* the theme of the *Grave* comes again. In Beethoven's Sonata, the *Grave* is the pivotal movement (a bitter struggle and heart-rending conflict) and it comes in again to introduce the development of the action. Kulish uses the *Grave* to set up the developing events in precisely the same order as it appears in Beethoven's work: discontent with life; demand for an answer; inspiration-search; disappointment. In scene 12 the *Grave* is muffled by Easter bells and the choral singing of the traditional "Christ is Risen!" which underlines that it is indeed an Easter Sunday but in very sombre and sad times. "The universe is in a swirl in the [pathétique] concert", but the narrator warns that behind that festivity "over the horizon there hangs under the crescent moon the crucified Christ."<sup>46</sup>

In the next scene Stupay, full of romantic feelings, returns from his (inappropriate to the time) elucidatory mission and insists on Maryna's playing the *Allegro molto e con brio* in celebration of his getting three new members (a school-teacher, a carpenter and a watchman) into his *Prosvita* organization. In his dreams "Ukraine is rising from the dead", "the Zaporozhians are rising from the graves." He is convinced that the revolution will triumph thanks to the resurrection of a knowledge of the

past in the consciousness of the people, to which Maryna pragmatically replies:

Maryna: (Plays). You won't win with any help from the grave.

Father, we need partisans, youth ...

.....

Instead of your dreams, father, we need cannons and machine guns! 47

The following scenes, the exchange of Easter greetings between Stupay-Stupanenko and General Perotsky, bring some comic relief before the tragic ending of Act One. Though comic, these scenes express a significant concept: "to each his own"<sup>48</sup> -- a statement very strongly felt by the Ukrainian writer to be the main pivot of the Ukrainian-Russian political and literary discussion, the main goal of which was to free their culture from Russian influence and to orient that culture to the West. These views were expressed in Khvylovy's *Polemical Pamphlets*.<sup>49</sup>

Although the last two scenes of Act One do not fit into the framework of Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique," they still serve to develop the conflict initiated by the exposition. In scene 15 the "graduate of the Cadet officer corps" Georges Perotsky writes a receipt to their former chamber-maid Zinaida [Zinka] Masiukova in which he reveals the real nature of the Perotsky family and their attitude toward their subordinates: Georges pays Zinka for his own first visit, as well as for his father's first visit at Easter of 1913. The scene closes with Zinka sending Georges out, taking a guitar and playing and praying at the same time. In her prayer she expresses her powerlessness, her loneliness and her distrust of God.

While scene 15 leaves in the audience a feeling of pity toward all the tenants of the Perotsky's building, the concluding scene of Act One has no

hint of sentimentality or any attempt to affect the viewer emotionally; it is short, strong and terrifying.<sup>50</sup> "In the basement Nastia stands like a statue. In the doorway crawls a legless soldier wearing the ribbon of the St. George's cross..."<sup>51</sup>

When Act Two begins it is daytime, and Maryna plays not "the starry *Grave* or the brilliant *Allegro*, but ... the gay *Adagio Cantabile*" which reminds Il'ko of "flowers in the sun" before their fading, a state that attaches a feeling of decadence to the scene. Il'ko's helicon, however, still gleams in the sun", as he still believes in his dream. In this solemn movement of Beethoven's "Pathétique", "I/Il'ko still visualizes the symbolic images of "an endless steppe [symbolizing Ukraine] and above, in the Argonaut boat, she [the leader of the independent movement] floats ... her eyes deep blue, and there are flowers and dew on the oars." Even though a dreamy atmosphere predominates, the minor key of the music warns of an unhappy end for Il'ko and Maryna's dream. In addition, we witness the full "depersonalization of Luka, Il'ko's best friend, who turns into an all-obedient, non-thinking party man", and breaks his old friendship with Il'ko in order to go along with the crowd.

In scene 3 -- the anti-climax of Act One -- Maryna realizes André's value to her cause and incorporates him into her revolutionary plans, while he promises her to break the "two rusty locks that hang on the gate" -- the one with a white eagle (representing the Polish national emblem) and the other with a two-headed eagle (the emblem of tsarist Russia). André favours the "three-cornered hat" of the Russian military dictatorship which Maryna proposes to replace with "a Hetmans' mace". The agreement is settled, but, as Onyshkevych puts it,

the tone now is of a heavy, resigned, even regrettable acceptance interwoven with moments of recollections, dreams, and longing. The mood is that of an unhappy wedding and it represents Maryna's choice well, as she compromises her dream with the need of the community.<sup>52</sup>

Il'ko's despair about Maryna's accepting André instead of him is reflected in the final four bars of the minor key of the *Adagio Cantabile*. Act Three consists of only four scenes. The whole act, a kaleidoscope of fast-moving episodes, takes place in the same street of the "old provincial city" in the summer time. The Perotskys' house is shown from the outside. The sound of a distant "Marseillaise" and the bootblacks' song replace Beethoven's Sonata. A light and witty dialogue of two arguing bootblacks sets the mood and prepares the viewer for the fiery though meaningless speeches to be given by the political leaders. The whole act focusses on the lowest class of society, on the people from the street. As the sound of the "Marseillaise" grows louder, among the crowd appears the ugly one-eyed sailor Sud'ba (Fate) who comes to play a decisive role in the people's destiny. His symbolic figure also suggests an unpredictable future for the lower class -- the hopeless end into which they are being led.

Act Four consists of thirty-two scenes and brings all the problems raised in the previous acts to their climax. The whole act takes place in the same street and town, but this time in the autumn, in late October. While Act Three finishes with the crowd cursing the old régime ("You just wait, you just wait. Your time will come too!"),<sup>53</sup> Act Four exposes the viewer to the October Revolution in action. The mood in Act Three was set by the sounds of the distant "Marseillaise" as a call for the Revolution, whereas in Act Four the artillery firing and the secret outpost led by the Red partisans

are in the spotlight. The events presented in Act Four are very tense, and the scenes change very frequently, bringing the events to their climax by the end of the Act.

A man half-buried by the White Guard soldiers becomes a centre around which all judgements about the White Guards are passed by other groups. In Scene 5 the relationship between Beethoven's "Pathétique" and Kulish's play is integral. In "Sonata Pathétique" the *Rondo* "tries to banish the sorrow of the preceding movement with its rhythmic impetuosity. In the *Sonata* of Kulish the *Rondo* plays the same part."<sup>53</sup>

While in Act Two, scene 1 we notice the beginning of Il'ko's split personality, in Act Four we see him in full confusion: he loses his ground. "I"/Il'ko, the poet, becomes a soldier of the revolutionary movement: he is on guard duty. There is no longer any mention of his helicon, although his ideal love for Maryna still lives in him and it is reflected in the sound of music that still touches him. The atmosphere is very tense, "dull artillery fire can be heard in the distance",<sup>54</sup> Maryna is disquieted, her father has left on a dangerous mission and she tries to calm herself by playing fragments of the *Rondo*. This is another instance of the interaction between the musical work and the drama.

In Beethoven's "Sonata" silence plays as important a role as sound; similarly, in Kulish's *Sonata* silence is as important as speech. Beethoven exploited silence in his "Sonata" as never before. He made silence part of his musical argument as Kulish made it part of his literary-dramatic argument. Especially dramatic in Beethoven's "Sonata" is the silence that precedes the *Grave* as it appears in different keys at crucial points of development.<sup>55</sup>

In Kulish's *Sonata* silence precedes part of the *Rondo* to highlight Maryna's mood, as an attempt to create an impression of the seagull impatiently circling round and round "in the middle of this anxious black night, disturbed by the wind". The narrator symbolically verbalizes the important (and perilous) role Maryna plays in this particular political situation, where the fate of the Ukraine was to be defined. "Yes, she is playing. Let her boat, full of music, float in the middle of this anxious black night disturbed by the wind."<sup>56</sup>

Act Four, scene 6 is almost entirely interwoven with music that reflects the hero's confusion and predicts his future. As Il'ko stands on guard at the secret insurgent committee, the sounds of the *Rondo* "flow around" him. "Maryna lifts the edge of the tapestry in the window," and he sees her yellow-and-blue light "swept away by the wind and the music of the "Pathétique", signifying the failure of the nationalist movement under her blue-and-yellow banner. "She moves away from the window and plays the *Grave*"<sup>57</sup>

Suddenly the music of the *Rondo* is heard once more and takes him away in his dreams "to the land of eternal love", where she is waiting for him. As she goes downstairs to meet Il'ko, they "are engulfed by the silvery serpentine melody of the *Rondo*". He wants to tell her about his heavenly love, but "she floats away", seeming to be in a boat. While she parts he hears "once more the *Grave*", which replaces the *Rondo*. She "stands under the sail ... under a yellow and blue flag." Although Il'ko still is "engulfed by the silvery serpentine melody of the *Rondo*," he already "can feel the wind and see the night."<sup>58</sup>

The appearance of Luka with his red banner "round as the moon" brings Il'ko back to reality and reminds him of his standing on guard in front of the

basement; where the Bolsheviks will be launching their final meeting (in the following scene) before the attack, which is to take place with the rising of the moon.

The *Grave* occurs in Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique" after the *Rondo* in a moment of reflection -- as it does in Kulish's drama. It brings in the final cadence in Beethoven's "Sonata" as it does in that of Kulish, "the yielding of the *Rondo* to the *Grave* sets the mood and foreshadows the most moving and most violent part of the play that takes place in scene 22."<sup>59</sup>

The following scenes bring the climax of the play, revealing the characters' most tense feelings and frustrations: Act Four, scene 9 takes us to the Perotsky apartment and raises their concerns. The scene is reminiscent of Act Three, scene 2 of the *Days of the Turbins*: the results of outside events are reflected by the permanent electricity blackout; the maid Anette, like Elena in the *Days*, holds a candle; the old general is concerned about Georges, who goes to try his wings on the battlefield. Kulish brings comic relief to the tense situation, ridiculing Perotsky's worries experienced in the "arrogant dream" he describes in his telephone conversation with his older son. The short relief ends with the reflection of the red moon in the mirror predicting the Perotskys' end, while Ovrarn welcomes the socialist revolution in scene 10.

The silent scene 12 presents the fleeting White Guards "tripping over the legs of the half-buried man, while the Red partisans in the following scene decide to take revenge and to turn the "house into a coffin." In the middle of Act Four Kulish brings in some traits of humour to bring some comic relief before the tragic end. In scene 16 the Red partisans burst into Perotsky's residence; the dialogue between Perotsky and his house-maid (at

the moment of their rushing out the door) raises the motif of flight and mocks the theme of the end of Russia from the *Days of the Turbins*.

Anette: ... We must flee! To Russia!

Perotsky: To Russia from Russia? Does this mean there is no  
Russia? <sup>60</sup>

While Perotsky is fleeing from his residence in scene 17, Stupay tells his daughter of his intention to back the socialists, not only because they had ordered him "to go to death" in Ukrainian, but because the "Northern Winds ... will sweep through out ... the Perotskys!" At this very moment (Scene 18) Perotsky is at his door looking for help. Stupay hesitates, but lets him in when he realizes that Perotsky's life is in danger.

The "fires burning in the street" in scene 19 signify a state of complete chaos and point to the fact that the Reds have seized power under their one-eyed commander Sud'ba. After André's arrest, Maryna lets André know (in scene 20) that she will send "comrade Yuha" to rescue him.

In scene 22 "I" suddenly and unexpectedly meets Maryna, he feels "the "Sonata Pathétique" race through his blood "with its enchanting chords," and just as in the conclusion of Beethoven's "Sonata", there are outbursts of uncontrolled rebellion. A dialogue between Maryna and Il'ko follows where Kulish uses the same techniques of split personality, as Maryna does not speak from herself but in the name of a symbolic girl (a girl she used to be). In their dialogue "She" reveals through emotional imaginative forms her patriotism and depicts her country's future as she wishes it to be. Il'ko does not share her view, however, regarding it as impractical and futile. This dialogue marks the end of the romantic poet "I" and his trust in a national revival. This end is expressed by the symbolic image of changing

horses from Il'ko's "hobby horse" to the "flaming", revolutionary one, when he sees the "black Cossack horses" in the museum.<sup>61</sup>

In scene 24 "She" comments about the future of her country if it falls into the hands of the red revolutionaries: "they will drop the idea in the mud along with their soldiers' caps and trample on it." Il'ko defends the revolutionaries, though "in the name of the eternal love" he agrees to liberate his enemy André Perotsky. As she admits that the girl still trusts the poet, and guards her love for him, "I"/Il'ko once more hears music rising to the skies "when looking into her blue eyes".

Scene 28, in which he realizes his grave mistake in freeing André, is the turning point in Il'ko Yuha's life. While warming himself at the fireside with the partisans, Il'ko hears "the early legato of a hoarse cock". The ill-fated call is heard three times. Recalling "the biblical myth about the apostle Peter" betraying Christ, he realizes that he has betrayed the idea of the Revolution.

Scenes 29-31 culminate in the tragedy of Georges, who looks for refuge in Zinka's place, while at the same time Kulish shows the collapse of Zinka's simple woman's dream of getting married and bearing children. At first Zinka hesitates: she wants to save him, Georges, but after he calls her "Virgin Mary" and "mother", she realizes that her life is ruined and that she will never be a mother herself, and Zinka gives Georges up into Fate's hands. The end of Perotsky's son, Georges, signifies the end of the monarchist movement in the Ukraine.

Act Five consists of seven scenes. It takes place in the summer, as "the street is lined with fragrant acacias." It opens with Zinka's singing of a Russian folksong (of a rather vulgar nature) while Nastia is embroidering a red flag. The sad tune of the song as well as the red flag suggests

something incompatible with the poet's dream about the beautiful country and Petrarch's love. The setting as a whole creates an atmosphere of total devastation, quite at variance with the musical accompaniment. Here Beethoven's sonata does not find its reflection in the action. Luka is the only person who feels happy in this atmosphere. He regrets that Il'ko can not see the flag. Zinka finally discovers who Il'ko was dreaming about and wants to "take a close look at her".

A very tense moment occurs in the play in Act Five, scene 3, when Maryna and her father see a man light a pipe beneath their window - a sign that the Ukrainian Revolution is to begin. In her excitement Maryna "rapturously plays some chords from the "Sonata Pathétique". The *Allegro con brio* in Beethoven's "Sonata" is the movement of the imaginary Herculean struggle. Her dreams are still alive, the "Sonata Pathétique" still motivates her in her life achievement. Once more the interaction of the *Sonata* and the drama may be noted." <sup>62</sup>

One of the most moving events in the play occurs in scene 9 when Maryna's father "stands at the crossroads hesitating" as to which side to join, under which flag to go"; at this point a bullet hits him and as he gradually lapses into unconsciousness, it seems to him that he hears music from the *Allegro molto* of the "Pathétique", and "the fleeing Red guards step over Stupay but he thinks they are the old Zaporozhians on horses."<sup>63</sup> The movement of the *Allegro molto* of Beethoven's "Pathétique" represents the movement of the Herculean struggle. The vanishing of his beautiful romantic vision of life against the sounds of the *Pathétique* is contrasted with the beginning of the new Bolshevik order of life, to the accompaniment of Zinka's song "A maiden sits on the shore..." In the following scenes

(10,11,12, and 13) - the changing of flags symbolically shows the change of power.

In scene 12 Maryna goes to meet André with a bouquet of flowers. This scene contrasts with Act Four, scene 22 where Maryna mentions to the poet "we should meet among flowers", where the poet, following his humanist dream about Petrarch's love, frees the military man, André. André, on the other hand, does not free the land of Maryna's dream. Jingling bells, which she compares with Easter bells of the Resurrection, do not predict Maryna's victory but solemnly toll for her father's and her own death. The symbolic death of the dreamer and enlightener Stupay-Stupanenko is set against the falling of the yellow-and-blue flag and the end of national liberation movement in Ukraine. The death of Stupanenko is opposed to André's victory and the raising of the Imperial Russian tricolour at the end of Act Five.

Act Six consists only of three scenes which take place under the régime of the White Guards. This Act echoes Act Three, scene 2 of the *Days* where Bulgakov depicts the cruelty and the atrocities of Petliura's men in power. The act takes place "outside of the building" where "a crowd gathers". The atmosphere is festive. Members of the highest society (among them Zinka's visitors and their wives) exchange greetings. The mood of festivity is set by the "solemn ringing of bells... heard from the churches", that make those present compare this day with the "Rising of Christ", although they have gathered here to witness the trial of the members of the national liberation movement. In scenes 2 and 3 Kulish contrasts the dainty public supporting the monarchy to the Ukrainian proletarian Ovrarn and the prostitute Zinka, endowing the latter with great human dignity. These two people -- one doomed to crawl, the other to prostitute herself -- rise over

the refined gentlemen and ladies celebrating the return of the power of their monarchy.

Act Seven provides an epilogue to the play. It confirms the revolutionary saying: that one who was no one has become every one...: The Comrades from the basement now occupy the Perotskys' building. The act consists of only four scenes and takes place at night. There is no light in the building and no music in the setting. The former romantic poet has become a frightened pawn in the hands of the Bolsheviks. Luka, carrying a "half-burned flickering candle", sets a mood of uneasiness; his voice sounds to Il'ko "like a death warrant" when he tells about his discovery of the organization of the insurgents under the command of Ensign Perotsky. However, the identity of the "seagull" is still a mystery.

In the final scene -- the *finale* -- Maryna, once flying over the steppes, is now living in the basement, deprived of her piano. The former poet, that one-time promoter of Petrarch's humanistic ideas, comes to interrogate his dream. His language is blunt, prosaic while Maryna, like Ibsen's Solveig from *Peer Gynt*, adheres steadfastly to her belief. She is like "a little girl, her hands clutching her apron".<sup>64</sup> Though living in the basement she has "planted a garden of love and built a fountain from the dripping water" while waiting for the poet who will liberate her and her country. Faithful to the eternal song of love expressed in the "Sonata Pathétique", "she faces the scaffold" and the truth about herself.<sup>65</sup>

The play ends, just as it begins, with music. The final act contains many symbolic features. The structural frame of the play closes with Maryna making the same movements as if she were playing the *Grave* when sitting at the piano and writing a letter to the poet in Act One. "I" hears part of the *Ronda* In the *con moto* section we hear the drops of water

falling down into the bucket again, this time counting the time for Maryna. She attempts a final communication with "I" (probably to the accompaniment of the *molto expressiono*). To "I's sharp question (In *sempre crescendo*) she admits the truth about her role as the "Seagull". The last bars played *con fuoco* present an irreversible verdict." Maryna sees herself "as the eternal holocaust of history".<sup>66</sup> While Maryna is down in the basement "facing the scaffold", Il'ko "can hear the cosmos playing a symphony pathétique, first on helicons and trombones, then on clarinets, flutes and violins ..."<sup>67</sup> Having rid himself of his dream, he feels happy with the victory of the Revolution.

The ending of the play underwent fundamental changes before staging. In all the later versions Kulish gives an indefinite fate to "I"/Il'ko. The only uncontentious interpretation that one can place on Il'ko's development is that by the end all his romantic dreams and his belief in Petrarch and his Helicon (the country of beauty and eternal love) have vanished.

The structure of each play reflects in many ways the writer's personal view of the world. Bulgakov's conservatism, his resumption and preservation of the nineteenth-century dramatic forms, in many ways matches his reactionary content, while Kulish, participating in an essentially modern literary debate, searches for new ways of expression to reflect modern views of the world and creates a unique genre of modern epic, dramatic poem. Its modern structure, nevertheless, remains very close to Ukrainian national traditions as he derives inspiration from the traditional Ukrainian *vertep* while embodying in an original structural principle of a Western musical work.

## Chapter Four

Symbols of National Culture in *The Days of the Turbins* and  
*Sonata Pathétique*

Although the structure and style of *The Days of the Turbins* and the *Sonata Pathétique* differ markedly, an examination of the meaning and function of their symbols reveals much common ideas. In both plays the characters themselves may be considered to have symbolic significance. They can be regarded, as Colin Wright puts it, "memorable and sharply distinguished types" bearing a special symbolic meaning.<sup>1</sup> The objects surrounding them, as well as their language, overflow with symbols. The actions, destiny, and setting of each character reveal a particular attitude to the topic of central concern -- the cultural heritage of each social group depicted in both plays.

Each character in the Turbins' circle represents a different aspect of the whole stratum of the Russian intelligentsia living in Ukraine; each of them reacts somewhat differently to various events, but all of them still believe in their cultural values, and are sentimentally attached to Russia's past, of which the monarchy is the enduring symbol. The people of this circle, as Wright puts it, "share a realization of all that is valuable in the Russian past. Their cultural heritage is symbolized in part by the school they attended."<sup>2</sup> They find themselves defending this heritage in their crucial moment of history.

According to Liudmila Ershov,

As the play opens the men are wedded to a certain set of ideals,  
and as the play ends, they have opted to live under the new régime

without seeming to be traitors or opportunists... Their acceptance of the new régime is a lesser conflict than the loss of their old values and ideals.<sup>3</sup>

Alexei Turbin appears as a symbolic figure of the traditional old-fashioned Russian leader -- the strong, noble Russian man -- whose sense of duty and honour prevails over other things; he is the ideal of a perfect officer and family man. In addition, he acts as a prophet, who predicts Russia's future. All ideal features generalized in his character make him the most respected man in his society. Even after his death he still remains a symbol of the highest authority whose ideals and thoughts people will always cherish.<sup>4</sup> Bulgakov has even chosen the school as a symbolic place for his death -- the hero departs from this life defending his cultural heritage. His death can be regarded as a spiritual victory over the disgrace of his physical defeat.

Next to Alexei, who "symbolizes the honourable side of the whole 'White Guard' movement",<sup>5</sup> stands Captain Studzinsky, the inflexible and dedicated White Guard officer, who, while acknowledging his defeat, does not surrender. Unlike Alexei, who accepts his defeat and death as symbolically marking the end of the White Guard movement, Studzinsky is determined to continue the struggle against the Bolsheviks. Although ignored by Soviet and Western critics for not being a positive character, Studzinsky can be viewed as the most heroic figure, a staunch fighter for the movement and, if viewed from the standpoint of the old régime, the real hero of the play, a symbol of Russian patriotism and dedication to the Russian Empire.

Myshlaevsky is a protagonist in Russian classic literature widely depicted in the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russian literature.

He is a serviceman who is used to a life of hardship, discomfort, and discipline, but who keeps his spirits high. In the Turbin family circle he is viewed as an older brother and, in terms of Christian faith, a spiritual brother to members of the Turbin family. Socially, he is closer to the people of his country and more sensitive to them than any other member of the group. He will not leave Russia, since for him it would mean abandoning his nation at its most troubled time. Therefore he re-evaluates his decision to serve in the White Guard in order to remain in his country and share the problems of his people. On the battlefield he is the inspirer, who encourages his fellow soldiers before the offensive. His deep patriotism to Russia, his devotion to people, his refusal to reconcile himself with either Talberg's or Petliura's adherents, make Myshlaevsky a symbol of the eternal living Russia.

Talberg is a foil to the positive characters making up the intellectual entourage of the Turbins' circle. He symbolizes the cold, unsteady and prudent foreign element among the Russian intelligentsia, with no loyalty to Russia. He has never adjusted to the warmth of the Turbin surroundings. He easily betrays his cause to serve as a Colonel of the General Headquarters, thereby remaining in Germany during the crucial battle between his Army and Petliura's forces. Bulgakov hyperbolizes the scene of his departure by showing Talberg leaving his wife in the occupied city and asking her to "make decisions" for him and herself. When neglected by the Germans, he quickly returns to the warm hearth of the Turbin home. His return to Elena only to get a slap from Myshlaevsky again bears a symbolic meaning. This scene is introduced to reduce Talberg's role as a warrior to its extreme and to show him in the role of the defeated captor of Elena Prekrasnaia from the Russian folk-tale.<sup>6</sup>

Nikolka, the youngest character in the play, is a symbol of youth, innocence, and idealistic exuberance, who knows life only from fiction and thinks that battles are as glorious as the ones described in the "chocolate books" (the old books with a smell of chocolate described in the novel *White Guard*) preserved in their family library. He is very anxious to take an active part in the events, and solve all problems immediately. Nikolka could be compared with Petia Rostov from Tolstol's *War and Peace*, one of the most popular characters in Russian fiction, who is well known and imitated by Russian young people. Acting mostly as a messenger in the play, he reveals some symbols of essential meaning.

The clumsy Lariosik with his literary pretensions who "opposes the horrors of the civil war" and the "spilling of blood"<sup>7</sup> brings to the capital from the remote regions of Little Russia his naïve populist philosophy. He is a member of the provincial Russian intelligentsia who is aware of his social inferiority and is awed by life in the capital. Lariosik worships life "behind the cream-coloured curtains"<sup>8</sup> and faithfully follows the pattern set by his relatives living there. In turn, his relatives are touched by his good nature, his lovable personality, his poetry and well-timed enthusiasm. Lariosik's thirst for peace -- as well as the fact that he carries a copy of Chekhov's complete works directly from the provincial town of Zhitomir during the war -- points to his innate intellectuality. The reference to Chekhov at the end of the play by this "little fellow with great abilities"<sup>9</sup> or "shy devil", as Myshlaevsky describes him, who came to the capital to become a poet or a writer, suggests that he, like Shervinsky and Elena, will carry on the cultural heritage created by the greatest writers. Associating this character with Chekhov's writing, Bulgakov makes him a symbolic exponent of Russian culture, reminding us that Chekhov also came from

remote Little Russia to become the pride of Great Russian culture. Though Lariosik is negatively regarded by some major critics, Bulgakov expresses (through the comments of Myshlaevsky, Elena, and Nikolka) an obvious liking for this character, who symbolizes a healthy human spirit so deeply rooted in Russian nature and widely depicted by Russian classics.

The multi-faceted Shervinsky is much less of a stereotype than the other characters in the group despite two symbolic meanings attached to him. He is a cunning expert in survival that makes out no matter what happens; he is also the frivolous society fop. However this boaster and extrovert is a likeable rogue in Bulgakov's play. He bears much in common with Bulgakov's later Begot and Begemot from the *Master and Margarita*. The writer endows his hero with the happiness he desires, and through Myshlaevsky he explains Shervinsky's lies as the product of a rich imagination.<sup>10</sup> Ershov compares Shervinsky to Mercury, who brings flowers and likes to talk and brag.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, Shervinsky is the exponent of artistic heritage as embodied in music. In his artistic nature there is also something mysteriously Mephistophelian. Admiring his quick wit, Nikolka explains: "Shervinsky! The Demon!"<sup>12</sup> making an allusion to the romantic hero of Lermontov's narrative poem who, although he seduces a mortal, is regarded by Lermontov in a positive light, as a romantic rebel. This mysterious demoniacal feature appears with Shervinsky's arrival at the Turbins' home. While everyone arrives at the apartment "preceded by the ringing of the doorbell, Shervinsky, like the crafty demon he is, enters quietly, without ringing a bell."<sup>13</sup> If Elena can be compared with the fairy-tale heroine Elena Prekrasnaia, a source of inspiration to the artist, Shervinsky is the refined literary Demon – the artist himself.

Being the only woman in the play, Elena (as Ershov puts it)

appears at times as a shimmering translucent personality, a somewhat amorphous symbol. She is like a many-faced gem, which reflects light falling on it from the outside, reflecting the traits and characteristics that the others see in her.<sup>14</sup>

Bulgakov omits the housekeeper Anuta from his play *The White Guard* who plays a significant role in the plot of the novel. He omits mentioning the name of Turbin's mother -- the "glorious queen" -- who was in his novel the symbol of maternal nobility; instead, he incorporates all the features of housekeeper and mother into Elena's character, thereby reducing the scope of the play and at the same time creating the most ideal woman of his writing.

According to Ershov, Bulgakov's many references to *Faust* describe another dimension of Elena. She is symbolic of Helen of Troy -- in the oldest version of the *Faust's* story -- that was "reshaped through the prism of Goëthe's romanticism into a symbol of timeless beauty, of tender love of the heart as well as of the senses".<sup>15</sup> Romanticizing Elena, Bulgakov makes her not only a symbol of eternal femininity but, while comparing her to music, also makes her a symbol of the cultural heritage. Bulgakov's Elena embodies a civilization that men (with the exception of Talberg) are willing to fight for in order to preserve it.

To the symbolic image of Elena are related many objects in the play that eventually function as secondary symbols themselves: the apartment in which Elena is dominant and the only place where she is seen; her piano -- "a symbolic tool of the aesthetic education of mankind"<sup>16</sup> and a reminder of cultural achievement; the hearth -- a symbol of comfort and peace, a place where Elena is protected from the cold and devastation of the outside, and where the frozen, exhausted men come to warm themselves; the samovar --

a symbol of Russian hospitality and well-being; the cream-coloured curtains which protect the characters from the harshness of the outside world. All these are symbolic of the inner life, which remains unaffected by political events. The cream-coloured curtains indicate the refinement of their owners; they also provide a background suggesting a privacy and stability in the Turbins' life that goes on regardless of the political changes taking place beyond them. The table set for dinner symbolizes abundance, peace, and family unity; the friends gathered at the family table witness the respect and love of its members. Flowers brought to Elena by Shervinsky are an act of idealization and beauty. Nikolka, comforting Lariosik who was rejected by Elena, says:

She is red-haired, Larion, red. A real misfortune. She's red-haired, that's why everyone likes her. As soon as someone sees that, they start dragging in bouquets. So that we always have bouquets in the apartment, standing around like little brooms. And Talberg used to get furious....<sup>17</sup>

Elena is "eternal femininity", the "ideal woman" that, according to Ershov, "symbolizes the warmth of the hearth with the continuous allusion to her bright hair and the flame of its coloring".<sup>18</sup> The only one who would neither bring flowers nor express his admiration is the cold Talberg.

One of the most important secondary symbols associated with Elena is the lighted candle which she carries in at her first appearance on stage: "Coming out carrying a candle, Elena stops and listens. A distant cannon shot."<sup>19</sup> Here Elena illuminates the house in spite of the distant cannons shooting outside. The lighted candle points to her as a symbol of individual light, and consequently of the life of an individual as opposed to the cosmic and universal life, in this case opposed to the life of society. "Light is

traditionally equated with spirit", and is also "a manifestation of morality, of intellect, and the seven virtues",<sup>20</sup> that could also point to Elena's chastity. This association of Elena with light is later developed by the heroes in the play. For example, Lariosik calls her "pure gold", and Myshlaevsky says:

Golden Lena! Have some white wine. My Joy! Red-headed Lena...<sup>21</sup>

Bright [svetlaia] Lena, allow me I'll hug and kiss you.<sup>22</sup>

The symbolic image of Elena becomes the focal point on which all the events converge, the source of light needed to illuminate the characters' paths.

The clock in the Turbins' apartment seems to have a life of its own and is indicative of something immortal. In his novel Bulgakov says that the father who bought it died a long time ago, but the clock still goes on <sup>23</sup> -- it stands for continuity and peace as in contrast to the chaos of war and the brevity of human life.

Although they are not all developed in the play and lack any understanding of cultural values, the servants Fyodor and Maxim express very important symbolic meanings. The servant Fyodor symbolizes the new class grasping political power. If he is not the real founder of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he at least is the tool with which the *real* "proletarians" will build it. In the short but significant scene in the Hetman's palace, Fyodor is shown passively sizing up the power so willingly transferred to him by his superiors without knowing what to do with it.

The chain of transfer of power from the hands of the Hetman to his adjutant Shervinsky, and from the adjutant to the servant Fyodor -- all in the space of one evening -- captures the political instability in Kiev in the winter of 1918-1919 which, according to Bulgakov, occurred fourteen times.<sup>24</sup> As the scene starts, we see Fyodor "at the door receiving orders"

and being told by his superiors to keep away and mind his own little business. By the time the scene ends, this representative of the "lower order" is sitting at the Hetman's desk, answering the telephone, and giving orders to his former superiors.

Maxim, the school janitor, although an episodic character, raises one of Bulgakov's important concerns: the meaning and value of life. With his unexpected and inappropriate appearance during the height of the fighting before Alexei's death, Maxim not only relieves the tense atmosphere, but also forces the audience to reflect on the question of sacrifice. On that particular winter day when the events take place, the breaking and burning of school desks was a matter of survival for the frozen soldiers, who came to fight for their Empire and their political convictions. Preserving "the school property" was, however, Maxim's concern and duty, as he had undertaken to keep them in good condition for the generations of students to come. Besides, he had promised the Director "to keep everything in good order." While the soldiers are there to give their lives for political ideas, Maxim is ready to die for "official property". His view of the value and meaning of life is revealed in the dialogue between Alexei and Maxim:

**ALEXEI.** Get the devil out, they'll kill you here.

**MAXIM.** Where would I go, Your Excellency? I've got no reason to leave official property...

**ALEXEI.** Get away from me, old man.

**MAXIM.** You can slash with a sword, but I won't leave. I was told by Mr. Director...

**ALEXEI.** Old fellow, do you understand Russian? They will kill you. Go somewhere to a cellar, hide there, so that there's no sign of you.

MAXIM. Who's going to answer for things? Maxim answers for everything. All kinds have been here - there've been ones for the tsar and ones against the tsar, hard-bitten soldiers, but break up the desks...<sup>25</sup>

While Fyodor is the "knowledgeable" proletarian seizing power either to pass it on or to keep it in his own hands, Maxim symbolizes the worker who considers it his duty to obstinately preserve the "official property" no matter who assumes the reins of government, no matter whose soldiers pass through the schools, through the temples of science. At the same time he represents a servile submissiveness so well depicted in Lermontov's poem "Proshchai nemytaia Rossia", and in works by Gogol' and Chekhov.

The characters' actions, destiny, and surroundings create a primary symbolic system. It is re-inforced by several key images dealing with stability and de-stabilization. One of the main symbolic images in the play, revealing the most important theme in *The Days of the Turbins* -- the failure of the White Guard movement -- is the image of the ship and it is associated with three characters.

The ship is first introduced by Alexei as a warning of the catastrophe about to come upon their home. Alexei compares their home to a ship, to a disaster which he predicts after he sees the rat-like Talberg leaving their doomed ship. When describing her "prophetic dream" to Shervinsky, Elena talks about "a ship bound for America" carrying all the members of the Turbin circle abroad. However, despite the stormy weather, the rising waves and the multitude of rats swarming around, they remain in their "troublesome boat". The stormy weather, of course, symbolizes the impending disaster created by the political storm; the rats swarming around

are the traitors who set out on the stormy sea which caused the chaos and the Turbins' sufferings.

In his last speech at the dinner table, Lariosik echoes the image of the ship "blowing about"<sup>26</sup> on the waves of the Civil War. The ship can be seen as both the defeated class and their troubled life. The image of the ship, in its broadest meaning signifying, perhaps, one's journey in life, is reminiscent here of Homer's *Odyssey*. Like Odysseus after a long voyage, the Turbins triumphantly return to their hearth and home to start a new life.<sup>27</sup> In the same speech Lariosik once again refers to the cream-coloured curtains as a symbol of protection from the outside world behind which the Turbins will rest after their difficult journey.

The reference to Pushkin's "Song of Oleg the Prophet" reminds one of the Turbins' uncertain fate and their place in history. The Turbins, like Oleg the Prophet of the tenth century, are unsure of their destiny but instinctively sense their impending death. Nikolka and Lariosik wish to ask an imaginary soothsayer to predict their destiny as they do not believe they have any future left. At the last meeting before the offensive, which Nikolka calls "the last supper of the division" -- a symbolic prediction of the end of the White Guard movement -- he sings Prince Oleg's address to the soothsayer: "Tell me the whole truth, don't be afraid..." thereupon Alexei reveals the situation of the White Guard movement and prophetically predicts its end.

During the singing of the song, Bulgakov's characters -- Nikolka and Lariosik -- begin their recitation from Oleg's address to the soothsayer. The Prince's image and his deeds are applicable to every member of the Turbins' circle: each of them symbolically is a prophetic prince going to fight the "unwise khazars"-- the Bolsheviks and Petliura's men who have

come to destroy the foundation of their existence. The theme of Oleg's fate in the history of Kievan Rus' (taken from the *Chronicles*) serves to remind the viewer of the terrible past Kiev experienced many centuries ago, as well as to point to the fact that history repeats itself.

In his novel *The White Guard* Bulgakov uses various descriptive stylistic devices peculiar to the ancient epos (and similar to those in the *Song of Igor's Campaign*) to transmit the significance of the historical reality he and his contemporaries were witnessing, while directly comparing present reality to that of ancient times.

As events unfold, history and Nature become symbols of inscrutable and relentless destructive powers. To the Turbins, whose world lies in chaos, history seems to be a series of fatal accidents: they become disillusioned with the Whites; they fear the "ignorant" and cruel Petliura men; they hate the Germans and the spineless Hetman; they have mixed feelings about the Bolsheviks, but have no other choice except to join them.

History and Nature (the latter symbolically represented by storm and snow) revolt against people's wishes and strength. The storm of the Revolution and the Civil War captures people and unexpectedly disposes of them as it sees fit. At times it seems that Bulgakov's heroes are toys in the hands of elemental forces. Even the wisest among them, Alexei Turbin, seems to surrender himself to these external forces. At the "last supper of the division" Alexei clearly explains the political situation in the country, but has a very vague idea about his own future: "...yesterday on the square ... Snow was falling, fog in the distance ... you know, I seemed to see a coffin..."<sup>28</sup> It may be recalled that Bulgakov took an extract from Pushkin's novel *The Captain's Daughter* as one of the epigraphs for his novel *The White*

*Guard*. It describes the snowstorm as symbolic of Nature's power and people's weakness.

According to Proffer's study "The Major Works of Mikhail Bulgakov", the writer's allusion to the blizzard in *The Captain's Daughter* by Pushkin carries a metaphorical meaning, depicting conditions at the time of the Civil War in Pugachev's time, which were not unlike those of the Civil War in Petliura's time.<sup>29</sup> Alexei compares Petliura's image to a snowstorm and a shadow, perhaps the shadow of the once-existing Pugachev: "...Do you know who this Petiura of yours is? He's a myth, he's black fog. He does not exist at all. Take a look out the window, look what's there. The snowstorm is there, some shadows..."<sup>30</sup>

Moments before the utter defeat of the White Guard in *The Days of the Turbins* the Cadets (while breaking and sawing the school desks in order to burn them and warm themselves) sing "A Winter Evening" -- a song based on Pushkin's lyrics describing a storm, representing the unknown power they are to face.

CADETS. (...sing.) Through the sky a storm is sweeping,  
Whipping snowy whirlwinds round;  
It resembles childish weeping,  
or a wild beast's wailing sound.<sup>31</sup>

These words bring to mind not only the actual winter weather, but also the driving storm of the Revolution and history itself. In some cases the storm is directly compared with the Revolution and the Civil War. When Myshlaevsky arrives at the Turbins' apartment in Act One, Nikolka enquires as to the situation in the city:

Tell us, what's going on down by the Inn?

MYSHLAEVSKY. There's storm at the Inn. That's what's there. And

I'd send the storm, the freezing cold, the German bastards, and  
Petlyura straight to....<sup>32</sup>

An abstract/conditional/notional(?) symbol related to the snowstorm is the cold found in the character of Talberg, in his prudent deeds and thoughts. The cold is introduced with the arrival of the "frozen" Myshlaevsky at the Turbins' apartment. Talking about the situation in the city he condemns "the storm, the freezing cold, the Germans, and Petlyura". The word "cold" will be among the first words uttered by Talberg when he arrives: "Don't kiss me, I've just come in from the outside, you may catch a cold."<sup>33</sup> There is also something cold in his attitude toward people, in his calculations and his personality. When leaving home he repeats: "Don't see me off my dear, you'll catch a cold." To which Alexei replies, "in an unpleasant voice: Elena, you'll catch cold."<sup>34</sup> Re-telling her prophetic dream, Elena herself refers to the symbols of cold and rats as an allusion to the Revolution and her husband: "We were sitting in the cold. And then a gale. The wind howls. It's cold, oh so cold. Waves... And suddenly rats..."<sup>35</sup>

One might argue with Bulgakov's historical accuracy, with his "historical objectivity and the parallel he draws", but "Bulgakov's artistic presentation is intended to make Petlyura a symbol of raw, senseless violence, and doom."<sup>36</sup> The play opens with Nikolka's direct reference to the "worst news" about "Petlyura's coming to attack",<sup>37</sup> and the arrival of the frozen Myshlaevsky from the battlefield alludes to the misfortunes brought by the Civil War (thanks to those who went to fight on Petlyura's side). Myshlaevsky admits: "I send the storm, the freezing cold, the Germans and Petlyura straight to..."

The constant references to Pushkin's as well as to Chekhov's works carry a symbolic meaning of their own, since they point to the Turbins'

once-secure life and their cultural inheritance. Although the old order have fallen apart, these same Turbins will carry out all the best their ancestors had created, while they start a new life.

Whereas the symbolic structure of *The Days of the Turbins* follows a recognizable and traditional pattern, that of *Sonata Pathétique* is constructed on more complex principles. Kulish's symbols have several meanings. The very choice of Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique," is symbolic of the Ukrainian Revolution, as much as the Beethoven sonata was the symbol of the French Revolution. It was a thing full of pathos, of suffering, of ebbing passion and power, which brought great hope and inspiration to the French people, but at the same time pain and sadness to them. Kulish was experimenting with new dramatic forms in an attempt to synthesize musical rhythm and dramatic action.

The fact that the set itself is patterned after the Ukrainian *vertep* theatre -- a traditional Christmas folk puppet theatre symbolizing the events on three levels, heaven, earth, and hell -- already provides it with a secondary symbolic system as it symbolizes a national cultural tradition. In the traditional folk *vertep*, a choir or violin would often accompany the singing of carols or sacred songs. Kulish uses a European masterpiece of musical composition to orchestrate the play in its various actions and moods, while emphasizing the orientation of Ukrainian cultural movement of his time.

As previously stated, both plays take place in the city. Neither play reveals the name of the city although in *The Days of the Turbins* there are many references to historical places and historical personae that situate the action in Kiev: the Hetman's Palace where the change of powers take place, Kreshchatik Street where the headquarters' guard-officers sit in the

cafés, the "square" where the crowd gathers to greet Petliura (an obvious reference to St Sophia's square <sup>38</sup> so colourfully described in the novel *The White Guard*).

Kulich sets the action of his play in one building, symbolizing a city or a society. He begins his play with a stage direction: ("Imagine, my friends, ... a street in an old provincial city...")<sup>39</sup> indicating that the action could take place in any Ukrainian city. But later in the play, while indirectly promising her love to André, Maryna says: "My darling, my long awaited one!... She will lead him, like a Hetman, into her living room. And she will say: let the bells of St Sophia ring out so that people won't hear me kissing my lover..."<sup>40</sup> The bells of St Sophia's Cathedral are an obvious indication that the events of the play are taking place in Kiev itself. Before the Revolution Ukraine was regarded by many Russians as a province of the Great Russian Empire, while the ancient city of Kiev was viewed as just "an old provincial city".

In social origin all the Ukrainian dwellers living in the building are from the country. Even the Stupay-Stupanenkos, occupying almost the same level in the building as its owners (the Perotskys), come from the village. Kulich saw that his countrymen were predominantly villagers, remote from urban life, and often, consequently, not ready to form and maintain a strong political power. And yet Kulich was at pains to illustrate the intricacy and complexity of the village/city relationship. It is a major binary symbol that runs through his treatment of action, destiny, and the surrounding. Although it is in the city in *Sonata Pathétique* that the real kernel of the revolution is formed, the heroes are products of the village (even Maryna, who was educated in the same high school as her "chevalier d'amour, André",<sup>41</sup> and snares with him many ideas based on a common knowledge of Western

culture and Western revolutionary philosophy). Maryna's Western-oriented education is expressed in her interpretation of one of Beethoven's masterpieces and in the European romantic philosophy of national self-determination. Despite the fact that she is also from the country and childishly loves her father, she is in constant conflict with him, with his naive and unstable conceptions. In a manuscript version of the play preserved in the archives of the Lunacharsky Theatre library in Leningrad, Maryna orders her father Stupay-Stupanenko to go to his farmstead, to stay away and not to confuse her and her revolutionary plans.

Stupay-Stupanenko: ...Shall I go with the Reds, but no, Kulish <sup>42</sup> wrote that Zaporozhans had only red crosses. To go to the ones under the blue and yellow flag - again, the Zaporozhians Cossacks did not have them. To offer them a quilted red one? If they would be willing to listen!... I will rather choose the third field, as Marynka ordered: To my own farmstead. I will hide there and I will sit out this revolution, and then we'll see which side to take. (He runs away.)<sup>43</sup>

Even though Stupay-Stupanenko possesses his own farmstead in the country, he conducts educational activity in the city. He is introduced into the play during the writing of "a chronicle".<sup>44</sup> He informs Maryna about his recruitment of members to the organization *Prosvita*;<sup>45</sup> we also see him ... canvassing on the streets.<sup>46</sup> All these facts show that the main intellectual and political role in Ukraine during the Revolutions was still played by intellectuals of a pacifist political background, not ready to face the real fight for political power.

Significantly, the Ukrainian proletarian poet living in the attic, like a nineteenth-century European bohemian, also comes from the village. He

shares much in common with Stupay, and, like Petrarch, professes humanism -- a philosophy incompatible with the political situation of his time. Therefore both Stupay and Il'ko are doomed to lose their battle during the Bolshevik Revolution. There is one version of the play presented in Russian theatres in which Il'ko reveals his origin while describing a vision:

I/Il'ko: In front of my eyes I see a fog covered by the sun like a plaster. But now it is of a strange red colour causing pain to my eyes. Now I recognize it. This is the steppe, I know so well, my steppe at the sunset! Covered by dust a flock slowly moves across it. Behind it hardly dragging his feet, making slow steps goes my father. Only a crown of grey and yellow hair rings his bald head like a halo. He hardly drags his feet. He looks tired. "When will you finish your study, my little son, I am getting old, and hardly can earn my bread, and I want to ask you something: if you have some old clothes, some old shirts or trousers, send them to me. They say, in the city there is a revolution, but here we hardly hear anything about it. Is it ever going to reach us? People are waiting." I am recalling my father's letter.<sup>47</sup>

Even the professional worker, Luka, while severing his relations with Il'ko, admits he also is a student of peasant stock. Ukrainian workers, like Luka, were not mature enough to make their political decisions. They, therefore, ended up joining the Bolsheviks:

Luka: ...you had better realize, Il'ko, that I've come to you for the last time and for the last time I'm telling you: we wrote verses together, you taught me arithmetic and geography,

we read books together and we were friends, but if you won't come out into the street now and choose the path of the Revolution, I'm no longer your friend, and you are not mine...<sup>48</sup>

Zinka, who also represents the younger generation of workers in Ukraine, has no definite status in society; she prostitutes herself to make a living. Nevertheless, she has high hopes for a happy future and believes that the Revolution will bring freedom. In a symbolic scene where representatives of all classes gather in the street under the sounds of the Marseillaise to express their positions and ideology, Zinka speaks for her class.

... I lit a candle and put on my blue dress... Then I thought I'd go to see a neighbor who's unhappy, too. But he keeps writing letters. Then I decided to go out into the street to look for my beloved.<sup>49</sup>

Having lost their hope for any guidance from their intelligentsia, who keep "writing letters" and looking for a better way out of the despair situation they were in, the working class turns to the Marxist-oriented Bolsheviks who were taking over the political power, but they too had nothing to offer except promises.

Zinka: Could you give me some work now?

Luka: We shall! There'll be plenty of work. Not during the first stage of the revolution when fighting and destruction are going on. But after that there'll be work. As soon as reconstruction begins we'll even be able to think of love...<sup>50</sup>

The older generation of the working class (symbolized by the worker Ovrarni and the laundress Nastia) have already lost their peasant background,

although they have kept their Christian faith. The image of the legless worker Ovrarn symbolizes the low standing of the working class that during the Revolution had found itself crippled by the Marxist-oriented Bolsheviks, and the only thing they had left for them, as Ovrarn admits, was to crawl into their grave. His wife the hard-working Nastia, characterizes her position in society, her empty, goal-less life. She admits: "My head is like a sieve. My whole life is like a sieve."<sup>51</sup> Although this older generation helps the cause of the revolution, they have neither high hopes nor "blue dreams" about the bright future under the new régime. Their status as a childless family also suggests that they have no future.

Kulich attaches secondary symbols to all his heroes. Zinka is introduced while combing her hair. Long hair in eastern cultures symbolizes a girl's innocence and maiden modesty and underlines her unmarried status, in Zinka's case, her loneliness. According to tradition, women cut their hair only after their marriage. Zinka's lighting of the candle symbolizes her hope for a brighter future; her blue dress, a symbol of innocence and purity, could also be associated with the ironical "blue dreams of socialism" expressed and propagated by the half-mad Malakhii Stakanchyk - a hero from Kulich's earlier play *The People's Malakhii*; <sup>52</sup> Zinka's embroidery of the flag of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic with red bunting, contrasts with Maryna's embroidering of the Ukrainian Independence flag in blue and yellow. Zinka's eyes eventually turning red, signalling the end of her "blue dreams".

Luka, the professional revolutionary, who maintains friendly relations with Il'ko in order to use him as an additional power in "moving the train of the revolution" to its final stop, is a disciplined cadre. He is a gunman, a foil for Il'ko who is all feeling. The Bolshevik Luka is a profanation of human

feeling and love. He never succeeds in understanding the philosophy of Petrarch and his blasphemy of love is hyperbolic.

Luka: ... As soon as reconstruction begins we'll even be able to think of love. Because love is not an escape and a dream as it was with Il'ko, but a function. (*He flexes the muscles of his arm*) Yes, a function! That reminds me, I have a meeting where I am to talk about the new functions of my sub-sections....<sup>53</sup>

The friendship between Luka and Il'ko is a symbolic one. Il'ko even calls Luka "my brother" -- they symbolize the two different orientations of communism in the Ukraine during the Revolution: Luka -- the Marxist-oriented movement with its chief interest in power, Il'ko -- the Ukrainian national communism whose main interest was the reform of the individual. The rupture of these two friends is symbolic of the severance of these two parties before the Bolsheviks assumed power. Il'ko represents the intelligentsia of the Kulish epoch, which wanted to build a socialism not according to the Marxist revolutionary philosophy, but a Petrarchan humanist one, based on "eternal love" without use of violence.

Among the secondary symbols attached to Il'ko as a humanist poet is the helicon, an instrument often used allusively of poetry and poets. The poet Il'ko uses it symbolically to show poetry as an uplifting force. Inspired by Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique", Il'ko feels "as tall and bright as the sky", and pointing to the helicon, he promises his friend Luka that he will learn to play it well enough to blow out the stars in the sky. According to Dyky, Kulish

also uses the helicon as a symbol of his hope in the victory of

humanism over darkness, as a sort of light of a belated Renaissance over the darkness of the past ... It is a symbol of Kulish's hope for a bright future, of a humanist revolution above a purely national, social or economic one.<sup>54</sup>

Introduced in the first stage direction at the very beginning of the play as "shining in the corner" of the poet's room, the helicon on a larger scale symbolizes the philosophy of the literary circle to which Kulish belonged during the 1920s. Originally conceived as "Urbino", it became the organization "Vaplite", then "Literaturny iarmarok" and "Prolitfront". Naming their literary circle after Raphael's birthplace (Santi da Urbino) they followed the example of Goethe, who had named one of his residence's rooms after Urbino. Raphael's painting was popularized in intellectual circles in the early 1920s by A. Arenskii's <sup>55</sup> opera *Raphael*,<sup>56</sup> in which the composer glorifies art above life, basing his ideology on the famous aphoristic expression of Hippocrates' "vita brevis est -- ars longa, (occasio autem praeceps, experimentum periculosum, iudicium difficile)." The idea of the glorification of art expressed in Arenskii's opera inspired creative activity in a number of artists and writers, among them Pavlo Tychyna, who in 1921 wrote his beautiful love poem "La bella Fornarina" in a rich, melodious Ukrainian.<sup>57</sup>

Khvylovy was convinced that it would be impossible to create a contemporary culture without a knowledge of Renaissance and classical culture, without an understanding of the "School of Athens" or "Parnassus" by Raphael. In 1925 Khvylovy wrote:

...The powerful Asiatic renaissance in art is approaching and its forerunners are we, the "Olympians." Just as Petrarch, Michelangelo, Raphael and others in their time from a tiny corner

of Italy set Europe afire with the flame of Renaissance, in the same way the new artists from the once-oppressed Asiatic countries, the new artist-communards who are travelling with us will climb the peak of Mount Helicon and place there the lamp of the Renaissance, and, under the distant thunder of fighting on the barricades, it will cast the light of its fiery purple-blue pentangle over the dark European night.<sup>58</sup>

Relations between Kulish and Khvylovy were very close. It is not surprising therefore that Khvylovy's ideas found expression in *Sonata Pathétique*, and that many of Khvylovy's metaphors occur in the play. Reflected in the poet's room we see a "gas lamp" and "a shining helicon"; and we also hear through all the play the philosophy of Petrarch. Khvylovy's reference to Ukrainians as the "forerunners" and "Olympians" of the Asiatic Renaissance also finds an echo in Maryna's address to her fellow-countrymen when she is compared with Pythia (the herald) sitting on the stone Omphalos -- the latter here symbolizing the Ukraine, "the centre of the earth", where the cultural renaissance was to take place. In Maryna's expression:

Omphalos, Omphalos! The pipes have been lit! ... No matter how strong the wind from the north, it won't blow out the fire. No, it will intensify it.<sup>59</sup>

The lighted Cossack's pipes could represent "the lamp of the Renaissance" for the Ukrainians, illuminating the path to the new culture.

Coming from the lowest stratum of society, Kulish always defended the poor, and sympathized with their striving for knowledge and education. While he supported the new proletarian writers and their organizations, he fully agreed with the Urbino-Vaplite movement that no culture could be

built on ignorance, and that any new culture must be organically linked with the achievements of the past.

There are echoes in his play of the great Literary Discussion of 1925-28. In the image of Maryna the dramatist presents an adherent of Khvylovy's theory of "orientation to the West", and the "two men" represent the "-enkos" who, lacking any basic culture, nevertheless aim at taking over the leadership in culture.

23

Two men pass... One of them boasts:

I'm for internationalism, Mykesha. I am for all the languages, you know, because I want to learn them all.

Mykesha: Such as?

The First One: Words like: Grand Hotel, agrarian, nationalization, proletariat -- these are international.

24

She: Are you in favor of internationalism too?

I: Yes, I am. Are you?

She: I'm not against it. But I know too that ideas can only be victorious if the people who hold them are ready to go to gallows and face death. What about your people?

I (*quietly*): They will face it.

She: Who, this riff raff and mob? One setback and they'll scatter to the four winds, will drop the idea in the mud along with their soldiers' caps and trample on it...<sup>60</sup>

The chasm between the intelligentsia and common people was painfully evident to Kulish. He saw the main reason for the defeat of the Ukrainian

revolution in the contempt of Ukrainian higher society for their poor, uneducated countrymen.

Many symbols attached to the heroes in *The Days of the Turbins* find their echo in Kulish's play. The ship that symbolizes the Turbins' failing class and the heroes' troublesome life, appears in Act One, scene 8, as "the ship Argo" symbolizing the Ukrainian quest for the "golden fleece" -- a national renaissance. The path of the Ukrainian revival is a dominant symbol which unites several related images. All the residents of Major-General Perotsky's home are "in a pathetic movement" (Act Two, scene 1), which reminds Il'ko of the movement of the deep and mighty *Grave* of Beethoven's sonata; and the "wind-blown curtain" of Maryna's apartment is "a sail". This stagnant "residence" where "the clock strikes as if from a distant age, evenly, nostalgically, elegiacly", suddenly sets sail; and each resident, like an Argonaut, sails in search of his "golden fleece", each armed with his favourite ideal: Maryna with her goal of an independent Western-oriented Ukraine, Il'ko with his goal of Ukrainian national communism, and Stupay-Stupanenko with his dream of a re-incarnation of the Zaporozhian past in twentieth-century Ukraine. The poet Il'ko describes them: "We are like the Argonauts on a journey to wonderful lands, each in search of his own golden fleece."<sup>61</sup> According to Dyky's study,

The Argo is here also a symbol of the quest for Ukraine being blocked from two sides, as the mythological Argo had to pass between the symplegades, or Clashing Islands, two great cliffs which moved upon their bases and crushed everything that ventured to pass between them, the two rocks symbolizing in this case, Russia and Poland, the two powers that were ready to crush

any resurgent Ukrainian nation.<sup>62</sup>

At the end of the play Kulish introduces the real pirate, the sailor Sud'ba (Fate), who comes to capture the *Argo* and dispose of the residents' lives.

One of the most frequently repeated images in the *Sonata Pathétique* is the steppe, an image of the Ukraine.<sup>63</sup> Usually it is presented as a space over which horsemen ride (in Il'ko's imagination, a young man; in Stupay-Stupanenko's old Zaporozhians', both "seeking the land of eternal love", -- the ideal Ukraine -- or "rising from their graves and saddling their horses" and resurrecting the old 17th-century style Ukrainian state under the Cossacks' *bulava* <sup>64</sup> Even in his agonizing death Stupay-Stupanenko sees a vision of the steppe and the fleeing Red Guards are perceived as "old Zaporozhians on horses" -- the reverse image of his dreams.

Maryna's high ideals and political conceptions are seen by the poet as floating above the steppe, as being a dream too impossible to realize.

Maryna is playing the same Sonata Pathétique, but today I can't hear the starry *grave* or the brilliant *allegro*, but the gay *adagio cantabile* like flowers in the sun. As usual, I can visualize a limitless steppe and above, in the Argonaut boat, she floats with her left eyebrow raised, her eyes deep blue, and there are flowers and dew on the oars.<sup>65</sup>

Her "ship" is decorated with flowers and covered with dew. Flowers symbolize the idealistic path chosen through "the steppe", while dew is a symbol of the freshness and newness of her ideas in contrast to Stupay's and Il'ko's. According to Jean Chevalier, flowers always denote a peaceful beginning <sup>66</sup> -- probably, of their naive fantasy world.

The horseman is another repeated image. The poet on horseback, while referring to the poet Il'ko, symbolizes the weakness of the Ukrainian national communists' position: they were leaders of a working class that

as yet scarcely existed; while "the grey-haired Zaporozhians rising from their graves and saddling their horses" symbolize the absurdity of the ideas of the old-fashioned *Prosvita* ideologists who aimed to return the country to its past.

The symbolic image of a horseman is also used by André. He says on behalf of the Cadets: "We should saddle horses and race to the west and to the east" -- i.e., to spread the Cadets' ideas of the immediate conversion of their Empire into a constitutional monarchy, without changing their borders either in the west or in the east. This symbol (attached to André) of a horseman riding to the east and to the west, convinced of the certainty of achieving his goal, contrasts with the image of changing horses attached to Il'ko, who, disillusioned with his humanistic ideas, exchanges his "hobbyhorse" for "the one with the flaming mane. The horse of revolution" (Act Four, scene 21).

If Bulgakov depicts the Revolution as an elemental, destructive force through the images of the storm and wind mercilessly sweeping away the old regime, causing incurable harm to innocent people, Kulish's imagery is far more ambiguous and subtle. Whereas Bulgakov openly expresses his full disapproval without really understanding the nature of their movement, or claiming not to, Kulish disguises his message while presenting his commissar in action. In *The Days of the Turbins* the writer's favourite hero Myshlaevsky "takes out his mauser" and wants "to shoot the commissars". He uses the word "commissar" derogatively as an insult to Elena's husband Talberg. Calling her a "commissar's wife", he draws an analogy between the traitors to the White Guard's cause and the Bolsheviks: both are seen as a foreign element in contrast with "real" Russians.

Kuishi, following Les' Kurbas's advice, presented Commissar Hamar without emotion, giving the spectators the freedom to judge and express their own feelings about him. He does not call his hero a commissar in the play. In some versions of his play, Hamar is presented in the cast of characters as "a Bolshevik agitator". First, the author introduces the "Bolshevik agitator" as a nameless "Elderly Man" who uses the poor and the most ignorant people in society as a tool for his political activities, refusing to deal with educated ones. When the communist Luka suggests enlisting the student Il'ko in the Bolshevik movement, Hamar "makes a wry face" of disapproval until he finds out that Il'ko is a poor young man "studying at home through university extension".<sup>67</sup>

In a symbolic scene where the magnanimous, religious Nastia offers the blessed Easter meal to the ones she believes will bring her salvation, the writer discloses the real Bolsheviks' goal and their historical mission.

...Nastia gives him a piece of Easter cake and some Easter eggs.

She whispers.

Take it. You can eat in on the way.

Luka: What's that? (*To the elderly man, pointing to the Easter eggs*) shall we take it, comrade Hamar? It's religious!

Elderly Man: Take it. We'll eat it all the same!<sup>68</sup>

The Easter bread and eggs are symbolic of spiritual nourishment which the Bolsheviks are on their way to destroy. In later scenes the Bolshevik Hamar appears under his real name. His real activities always take place either in a dark basement or at night during a full moon, and are all associated with the wind.

Luka, upon returning from reconnaissance, admits:

...I ran as fast as I could because the moon is already rising...  
and this devilish wind...

Hamar (*enthusiastically*): It is our moon and the wind is on our side. Wait a little longer – the whole world will be ours... We'll take the crosses and bury them, along with capitalism, in cemeteries. We will march forward to the dawn of socialism! <sup>69</sup>

In Slavic folk tradition the rising of the moon is always associated with the appearance of an evil power on earth. In Shevchenko's and Gogol's works all the sins committed by their heroes take place at night during the full moon, for only those allied with evil spirits act at night or turn into devilish images. The night itself is symbolic of ominous deeds. In his poem "May" the Czech poet Karel Hněvkář (1810–1836) depicted the moon as a pale, death corpse, making the moon a symbol of a human death.

The moon is a very important symbol in Kulish's play; the sun, by contrast, does not appear directly in the play, but only as a reflection: "the helicon shines like the sun" – a hope for the victory of humanism; "it is sunny" when Nastia embroiders "in gold" the red flag of the Revolution; there is "a sunny building on a corner", but "a cloud over the golden-domed cathedral" appears when "the distant sound of the Marseillaise is heard";<sup>70</sup> the *Allegro* movement of Beethoven's "Sonata" is referred to as "sunny bright" -- a gleam of hope for victory over darkness.

The moon appears for the first time as a "pale, chipped crescent moon" along with the image of the crucified Christ. The "pale chipped crescent moon" develops through the play into a full red moon. On another occasion it appears together with the red flag. "Luka comes to meet us. Bent over, he carries a red banner on his back. For some reason it is as

round as the moon." <sup>71</sup> This time the appearance of the moon reminds Il'ko of his abandonment of the Bolshevik watch. For the first time he feels "shame, restlessness, and fear". The red banner symbolizes communism and its becoming round "like a moon" perhaps signifies global universality and the appeal of Communist Revolution.<sup>72</sup> The latter has different meanings for Luka and Il'ko. In scene 7 the moon appears in Il'ko's perceptions "unsettled by the wind" (meaning the influence of the Bolsheviks) -- a trend alien to Il'ko, who did not want the Revolution to be forced upon people or to be imposed by any power from the outside. The suggested image of the North wind and the rising moon symbolizing the Bolshevik Revolution appear as an alarming sign foreshadowing the defeat of Stupay-Stupanenko's and Maryna's movements as expressed in their dialogue:

*Maryna:* Well, how is it there?

*Stupay:* The moon is rising.

*Maryna:* O God! He's on about the moon.

*Stupay:* And the wind! Maryna do you hear?

*Maryna (ironically):* From the south?

*Stupay:* From the north.

*Maryna:* A pity. We need a western wind. <sup>73</sup>

In Hebrew culture, according to Cirlot, the word *ruth* (wind) is also used in the sense of "breath" or "spirit" - attributable to the power of fertility or life's renewal; on the other hand in the Egyptian and Greek cultures the wind acquires a malicious aspect after the destruction of Xerxes's squadron by the storm. <sup>74</sup> It is obvious that Kulish uses the notion of a wind in the latter meaning, as Kulish's attitude toward the Bolshevik's movement was completely reversed after his disappointment with the result of the Revolution.

In later scenes the moon appears together with the wind to symbolize the Revolution, reminiscent of the storm in *The Days of the Turbins*. At the end of Act Four, scene 7, both the moon and the wind appear again as triumphant symbols of the Bolshevik revolution.

The moon alone appears as a warning sign of defeat for the White Guard movement. When the electric light goes out in the Perotsky's room, the "artillery barrage grows louder. Anette drops the candles. Perotsky is in the dark ... The red moon in the sky casts a reflection in the mirror [i.e. candlestick]".<sup>75</sup> The dropping of the candle symbolizes the end of hope for the White Guards. (The stage directions for this scene remind one of Act One, Scene 1, in *The Days of the Turbins* discussed above.)

The moon and the wind are also symbolic of the revolutionary chaos as expressed in scene 12 which consists entirely of the narrator's words.

Along the street the Whites are fleeing in groups and individually. Someone again trips over the legs of the half-buried man and swears. There is a feeling of desolation. There are no lights in the windows, no voices in the street. Distant firing is heard. Moon. Wind.<sup>76</sup>

The wind also figures in combination with the night. In Act Four, scene 6, as we see Maryna's candle (as a symbol of hope) being blown away by the wind, Il'ko the narrator states: "Behind the black horizon, near the blue window she is waiting for me... I can feel the wind and see the night."<sup>77</sup> The night here stands for the end predicted by the poet.

The candle appears on a number of occasions: as a symbol of hope for Zinka, who places her hope in the Ukrainian intelligentsia and in the new Ukrainian state; as a symbol of a lost hope for Maryna (for a nationalist victory). During the fighting between the nationalists and the Communists,

Maryna and Il'ko appear as two hostile forces and Maryna loses. The narrator says: "A yellowish streak of light flashes somewhere ... and disappears with a blue afterglow. It is swept away by the wind... (She moves away from the window and plays the *grave*)"<sup>78</sup> The "yellowish" and "blue" light from the candle symbolizes the Ukrainian nationalist's hope for victory which is extinguished by the symbolic wind of the Bolshevik revolution.

Again, small candles are lit when André is being tried by the Red partisans. The lighting of three candles is considered an offence against the Holy Trinity; on the other hand, "the Russian Orthodox church still has three candles for a funeral".<sup>79</sup> The lighting of three candles by the Bolsheviks during their interrogation symbolizes the death of the one being tried.

The candle has quite a different meaning in the last act. Maryna is condemned to die and is held in the dark basement where all the misery occurs. When the poet opens the door, he sees her "holding a candle". The candle lit by Maryna in the dark basement symbolizes the light of freedom, her hope for a national state.

Flags in both plays symbolize the political régime and its political philosophy. In Bulgakov's play "the blue and gold flag" is brought on stage in only one scene to symbolize the Ukrainian national state under Petliura's government, and is used to set off the atrocities taking place under its rule. By contrasting one flag with another, Kulish conveys to the audience the change of political régimes. In Act Four, scene 6, the colours of the flags reveal the political parties the heroes belong to. Il'ko joins Maryna while she is sailing in the *Argo*, but he notices that she is under a blue-and-yellow flag, symbolizing the Ukrainian national state. Luka comes to meet them carrying a red flag on his shoulder, a symbol of communism. At the beginning of Act Five "a red flag flies on the balcony of the Perotsky's home

as a symbol of the Bolshevik régime in power. The proletarians, Zinka and Nastia, are embroidering a red banner and singing a Russian street song, symbolizing the Bolshevik orientation of the Ukrainian proletarians, rather than Ukrainian national communism. The embroidered red flag is approved by the Bolshevik-oriented Luka.

In scene 3 of the same Act Maryna brings out a hidden blue-and-yellow flag as a symbol of the Ukrainian nationalist state, saying: "We want our own state under this flag... Under this flag!"<sup>80</sup> while Stupay-Stupanenko, on the other hand, expresses his complete lack of awareness of political parties and their philosophies along with his desire for any state, whether communist or nationalist, as long as it is Ukrainian.

*Stupay alone:*

This is a flag and that is a flag. I am thinking of making the following proposal: on the yellow-and-blue background the lettering should be "Long Live Soviet Ukraine." Let it be socialist, if only it's a Ukrainian republic. Or else: on the red background two strips, yellow and blue...<sup>81</sup>

In scene 10 a blue-and-yellow flag replaces a red one as a symbol of the temporary resurgence of the Ukrainian nationalists; in scene 12 of the same Act the blue-and-yellow flag is replaced by the tsarist *tricolor*, symbol of the accession of the short-lived restorationist régime. Further manifestations of this power are symbolized by the "monastery" and the "northern star" -- meaning Russia.

The concept of a Russian constitutional régime, in André's opinion, is symbolized by the three-corned hat -- a symbol of the French revolution as opposed to Monomakh's fur cap as a symbol of monarchy, a proof of André's favouring of the military dictatorship over tsarist autocracy.

*André*: ...What we need now is a three-corned hat rather than Monomakh's fur cap.<sup>82</sup>

André's promotion of a Napoleon-style Russia with a Constitutional Monarchy is also underlined by the sounds of the "Marseillaise" (stage direction) in Act Three, where André delivers his eloquent speech full of democratic enthusiasm. Maryna intends to substitute André's three-corned hat with the Hetman's sceptor, meaning that André could help bring back the Ukrainian Hetmanate.

On several occasions Kulish uses the hat or cap as a symbol of authority or personal power in *Sonata Pathétique*. When the Bolshevik agitator Hamar admits that "the wind and moon" are on his "side" he "fixes his cap more firmly on his head".<sup>83</sup> The Bolshevik, who comes with the sailor Sud'ba (Fate) to take over Perotsky's home is referred to as the "comrade in the fur cap". The "comrade's" fur cap carries a significant symbolic meaning as it reminds one of the hat of Monomakh, emphasizing the totalitarian nature of Bolshevik power. While assuming power in the building, Hamar and his fellow Red partisans also wear caps. In a laconic stage direction in Act Four the caps symbolize not only the power of people who wear them, they also point to the position in which they hold the Ukrainian worker during the upheaval.

1

Imagine, my friends, the same street and town late in October. Artillery firing is heard in the distance. A windy night....

2

The window in the basement is shut. An oil lamp flickers. Water drips from the ceiling. Hamar is writing. He is wearing a cap. Next to him a partisan, also in a cap, waits impatiently. Ovrarm

sits in the corner; next to him like a shadow, Nastia.<sup>84</sup>

When André is led to trial, "he is without his cap"; fleeing from the Bolsheviks, Georges "is running capless". In both cases the lack of a cap symbolizes complete loss of authority. Expressing her repugnance at the soldiers of the Bolshevik Revolution, Maryna predicts: "...this riff-raff and mob... One setback and they'll scatter to the four winds, will drop the idea in the mud along with their soldiers' caps and trample on it. All they can do is kill unarmed people, put gallows in every home!"<sup>85</sup>

Death in *Sonata Pathétique* as well as in Bulgakov's play appears a symbol of victory. In *The Days of the Turbins* only Alexei Turbin dies; at the same time he saves the lives of his soldiers and protects his school. Although Alexei's death marks the end of the White Guard movement, it saves his name from disgrace and honours him with the highest respect of the survivors. He dies a martyr for his cause.

In Kulish's play all the "heroes" are, in one way or another, annihilated by the end of the play. Every "hero" in *Sonata Pathétique* (except for General Perotsky and his son) dies with great dignity for his deeds and dreams. As the play begins, everything on the premises of Major-General Perotsky has its routine; every protagonist occupies a specific place. The life of all the representatives of both the higher and lower orders follows its own course. Nothing and no one is perfect in the building; there is much disagreement among the residents (of a national, social, cultural, and moral nature), but despite the clashes and discord, all of them fit properly under the same roof. Except for the General and his degenerate son, Georges, all protagonists are treated with considerable sympathy; Kulish is at pains to portray them with dignity. All are united by the same destiny, symbolically

expressed by the Easter holiday which they are ready to celebrate, each one in his or her own way.

If Bulgakov associates the power causing the end of his movement with a primordial force -- a snowstorm that wipes away his hero's life -- the fate of Kulish's heroes is linked to the images of the wind and moon. "I", Il'ko the poet, the writer's *alter ego*, foresees not only his physical, but also his spiritual end, which he expresses with the evoked vision of the crucified Christ while listening to Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique".

For the third time I hear the Sonata Pathétique. Suddenly the accompaniment to the *grave* resembles a fugue of Easter bells. I look out the little window. Belfries as tall as poplars. From the nearest one there comes a chorus: Christ is Risen! Comet-like the stars shine red, blue and green. The universe is in a swirl in this concert. Only low over the horizon there hangs under the crescent moon -- the crucified Christ.<sup>86</sup>

The symbol of the crucified Christ is used along with the Easter feast. As the play begins Il'ko, the hopeful poet, inspired by the touching music of his dreams, associates the "Revolutionary spring" with Easter (*veiykaen'* - the great day) that will bring a national resurrection for Ukraine and the victory of his humanist ideas. But as he hears the "Sonata Pathétique" "for the third time" (like the cock crowing three times for Peter), the vision of the crucified Christ warns him that his dreams of the resurrection of Ukraine will be doomed to ruin; his dreams betray him as he himself later betrays her for the cause of the Revolution.

In both plays important symbolic meaning is conveyed by the writers' reference to other writers as proof of their previous cultural achievement. Bulgakov constantly refers to Pushkin and Chekhov while Kulish mentions

not only Panteleimon Kulish and Shevchenko, but also Ukrainian *dumy* (epic folk songs from the 17th century). On certain occasions Kulish's reference to Shevchenko is virtually identical to Bulgakov's use of Pushkin; Shevchenko was as important to the formation of the contemporary Ukrainian culture as Pushkin was to the Russian. Many terms, metaphors, and historical place-names are used in *Sonata Pathétique* to show the glorious Ukrainian past. Shevchenko's lines of brotherly reconciliation: "Embrace, my brethren, the smallest one",<sup>87</sup> quoted in the play, echo Petrarch's humanist philosophy. Bulgakov's characters Nikolka and Lariosik turn to Pushkin's poetry as they would to a prayer book, searching for a solution to their national and cultural self-preservation, much as Stupay-Stupanenko clutches at Shevchenko in order to save his language, culture and national identity.

While Kulish shows Maryna's father, Stupay, as a self-admiring Ukrainian nationalist looking to Shevchenko as the essence of Ukrainian cultural life, striving to preserve and spread his cultural inheritance only among his fellow-Ukrainians, his highly educated daughter sees in their culture a greater world-wide potential. Compared by her father to Pythia, she replies:

*Maryna:* If you say so, yes! Ancient writers said that Pythia ... sat in the temple on the stone Omphalos, which means the centre of the earth. There was an inscription on the gate: "Know thyself". So I shall now invoke it: "Ukrainian, know thyself..."<sup>88</sup>

Comparing herself to Pythia, Maryna compares Ukraine to Omphalos, which could become "the centre of earth". One may see in this a hope for a literary, artistic, and scientific revolution -- one as powerful as that

associated with the mountain of Urbino (Santi da Urbino) in the sixteenth century which became a centre for the European Renaissance.

Important symbols of the Ukrainian historical past are also attached to Maryna. Maryna refers to herself as the "lonely girl" locked under "two rusty bolts" (the "Muscovite" and the "Polish" ones), who "has been waiting... as in the blue mists of past ages for someone from beyond the Dnieper, or from the three Cossack mounds, from the Zhovti Vody or the Sich"<sup>89</sup> She clearly sees herself as a symbol of Ukraine. The "Three mounds", "Zhovti Vody", and "Sich" have their source in Ukrainian history and, according to Dyky, "they refer to the power the Ukraine once held and the victories she enjoyed, and are therefore symbols of the many possibilities of liberation which the liberator [of Ukraine] can find in the Ukrainian past."<sup>90</sup>

The term the "three Cossack mounds" refers to Shevchenko's poem "Velykyi l'okh", where the poet foretells the coming of a messiah who will come to liberate Ukraine by liquidating three graves, symbolizing past Ukrainian catastrophes related to its political dependence on Russia: one grave belonged to a "supporter" of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'ky (for giving him drink when he was on his way to sign a treaty for unification with Russia); the second belonged to the one who "supported" (gave drink to) the "Muskovite tsar" Peter the Great on his way from Poltava, after he defeated Mazeppa; the third grave belonged to the one who smiled on the Tsarina Catherine II.<sup>91</sup> Zhovti Vody is the site of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky's victory on the battlefield over the Poles in 1648. Zhovti Vody here is a symbol of Ukrainian victory over the Poles. Sich, the cradle of Cossackdom, the beginning of the free Cossack era, can be seen as the freedom Maryna is attempting to win for her nation.

Maryna's references to Ukrainian history, her striving for national independence, and her eventual condemnation and placement in the basement are reminiscent of the tragic fate of the last otaman of the Zaporozhian Sich, Petro Kalnyshevsky (1690-1800), who after the destruction of the Sich in 1775 was exiled to Solovki (Arkhangelsk) and was imprisoned in a monastery cave.

Finally, the seagull, associated with Maryna, as already mentioned, may be seen as a metaphor for Ukraine:

Kulich applies Mazeppa's metaphor to Maryna, thereby making Maryna a symbol of a weak Ukraine which is being trampled by forces both from the East and the West.<sup>92</sup>

The abundant use of symbols in both plays enables the writers to reveal their aesthetic conceptions more fully, to elaborate their attitudes toward their respective countries and their national cultures.

## Chapter Five

Stage History

*The Days of the Turbins* and *Sonata Pathétique* share a similar pre-stage and initial stage history. They underwent similar extensive revisions -- processes that caused their writers a great deal of frustration and misfortune. *The Days of the Turbins* and *Sonata Pathétique* were central to Bulgakov's and Kulish's literary and political destinies. Each play's stage life mirrors the writer's personal career.

Following the Revolution, the Russian theatre underwent a major crisis. Some of the famous companies such as the Marinetti, the Russian Futurists, the Imperial Theatre Monopoly were gone forever. After its return in 1924 from a two-year tour abroad, the eminent Moscow Art Theatre (MKhAT), made popular by its successful performances of Chekhov's plays, was forced to accommodate itself to Soviet ideology. Many of its members decided not to return from its last tour abroad and the troupe itself was accused by the *repertkom* of not keeping pace with the new Soviet reality -- for not staging plays on themes of the day.

Soviet theatre in the 1920s was undergoing a crisis in repertoire: by then Russian theatre possessed excellent directors and an established stage tradition, but it lacked major playwrights. The critics and the director Vsevolod Meyerhold attacked the old-fashioned academic theatres, but the head of the People's Commissariat for Enlightenment, Anatolii Lunacharsky, stood firmly for the preservation of the Russian traditional theatre as exemplified by MKhAT -- the Moscow Art Theatre .

In order to save MKhAT and keep the theatre's academic traditions, its founder, Konstantin Stanislavsky, launched a search for new plays by young

Soviet writers. By the end of 1924 Bulgakov had written his first novel *The White Guard* and the story *Heart of a Dog*. Being a part of journalistic Moscow himself, Bulgakov was very aware of the desperate need for new plays. As a result, in January 1925 he began the adaptation of his novel *The White Guard* into a play. According to Elendea Proffer,

Among the readers of the parts of *White Guard* published in *Russia* was one of the directors at the Art Theater, Boris Ilich Vershilov. Since, as one of the other members said, the theater needed a good contemporary play "like it needed air", Vershilov immediately went to Pavel Markov, head of the theater's literary section. Markov also expressed interest in the book, and Bulgakov was invited to come to the theater to discuss the idea of making his novel into a play.<sup>1</sup>

Bulgakov, who had already started to re-write his novel into a play, gladly accepted the offer. Thus his life-long relationship with MKhAT began. He found at the beginning of his writing career that the theatre was in accord with his own temperament, for Bulgakov's own roots and professed tastes in his early writings were in the realist tradition. As Colin Wright observes, Bulgakov was "attracted to the theatre's insistence on authentic interpretation by the actor", and by "the great importance accorded to visual and sound effects" in creating the atmosphere on stage.<sup>2</sup> These features were prominent characteristics of Stanislavsky's school of theatre, and differed from Meyerhold's, which "was absorbed first and foremost by the external -- visual and aural, sculptural and musical -- side of the theatre."<sup>3</sup>

Markov and Vershilov first contacted Bulgakov in June 1925. The writer spent the entire summer writing his play, and by September 1925 he had finished his first version. As critics noted, this turned out to be a

"most Chekhovian play with its great stress on individual psychological characterization that fitted in perfectly with the Art Theatre's customary manner of presentation".<sup>4</sup> Vershilov took the text of the play to the producer Ilya Sudakov who immediately seized upon it. The reading of the play took place 1 September 1925 in the lower foyer of the Art Theatre, with such legendary figures as Stanislavskii, outstanding actors and theatre directors Mikhail Chekhov, Alexei Popov, Pavel Markov present.<sup>5</sup>

Although certain parts of the play were highly praised, its length and scope were not acceptable. Immediately after the reading, the directors and the writer came to an agreement concerning changes and the young actors were assigned their future roles. Bulgakov also read his play at the Moscovite Association of Dramatists (MAD). The reading of the play at MAD was very important as it was to define to a great extent the future of Bulgakov's career as a playwright. Although, according to critics, members of MAD, like many other Muscovian literary men, "were not favorably inclined to the Kievan writer",<sup>6</sup> they nevertheless agreed to organize the reading. Among the members of MAD were playwrights such as Vladimir Bill-Belotserkovsky and Alexei Faiko, who played an important role in the capital's theatrical world and helped many new writers in their literary careers. Bill-Belotserkovsky, like Bulgakov, was also from Kiev, but had a different temperament and ideology. In the Civil War he had fought as a sailor for the Revolution. His plays did not emphasize individual characterization as Bulgakov's did, but were almost exclusively of the agit-prop type centred on crowd scenes, which were meant to depict Soviet reality on a large scale -- without the emphasis on a specific philosophical concept.

During this reading at MAD, Bulgakov and Bill-Belotserkovsky became life-long enemies.<sup>7</sup> No critic has ever been able to give a reason for the writers' mutual animosity, but one must suppose that they disagreed over substantial issues, either in the treatment of political or historical events, or both. Perhaps Alexei Faiko's description of Bulgakov as a *smenovekhovets* from *Smena vekh* (Changing Landmarks) -- a person who had accepted the new régime out of Russian patriotism -- explains some of the mutual discord that existed between the writers.<sup>8</sup>

The play presented at the first reading was mainly a "kaleidoscope of scenes", but its originality and Bulgakov's courageous personal ideological approach to the described events served to pacify the mutual dislike between Bulgakov and the leading Moscow dramatists, as well as to smooth over the numerous controversies over the play's length and philosophy. The writers appreciated Bulgakov's work and they gave him their suggestions and needed support. The main points discussed during both readings concerned the play's length and the need to focus on action.

The real polemics and problems with the casting and re-writing lay ahead when the powerful *repertkom*, the censors and the critics, each took their turn criticizing the play. Leopold Averbakh, one of the founders of VAPP (All-Russian Association of Proletarian Writers, later RAPP -- Russian Association of Proletarian Writers) and a member of the editorial board of the literary journal *Na Postu* (*On Guard*), accused Bulgakov of being a "fellow-traveller".<sup>9</sup> Knowing that the Art Theatre was going to produce a play based on the novel *The White Guard* and aware of the importance given it by stage directors and actors, Averbakh rushed to "reveal" in *Izvestia* (20 September, 1925) Bulgakov's "counter-revolutionary disposition," while analysing his novel *Diavoliada* (*Diaboliad*). At the same

time the September issue of the journal *Pechat' i revoliutsia (Press and Revolution)* published an article by Lirov attacking Bulgakov's story *Rokkovye jaitsa (The Fatal Eggs)*<sup>10</sup> (included in *Diavoliada* for its ambiguous allegory about the dangers of re-making the world overnight through revolution.

Despite the onslaught and the negative reviews in the press, Bulgakov received much needed support from Vikentii Veresaev and Maxim Gorky, who valued his talent and political integrity. Gorky also shared Bulgakov's attitude toward national minorities.

A rumour about a new and unusual play quickly spread through the theatres of Moscow, and Bulgakov soon received many offers to stage his play in other theatres. At the request of the representatives of the Vakhtangov Theatre, Alexei Popov and Vasiliï Kuza, Bulgakov committed himself to write a comedy *Zoikina kvartira (Zoyka's Apartment)* which he finished in December 1925.<sup>11</sup> Unlike *The Days of the Turbins*, which emotionally and physically exhausted Bulgakov and took an entire year to complete, *Zoyka's Apartment* was immediately accepted and written in the space of few weeks.

Bulgakov's overwhelming initial problem in re-writing *The Days* was how to leave out what he believed were vital elements of the work. The original manuscript he presented to the theatre in September 1925 was essentially a dramatization of *The White Guard*. According to Proffer's version and account, it contained 13 scenes and ran to 139 typed pages.<sup>12</sup>

After the first reading of the play, Bulgakov, Sudakov, and Markov began work on what is now referred to as the "first" version of the play dated June–September 1925. In their study of the adaptation of the novel to the play, Ia. Lur'e and I. Sermon point out that major changes were made in

collaboration with Bulgakov's assistants Markov and Sudakov, as well as director Stanislavskii, and the censors.<sup>13</sup> In his autobiographical novel *The Black Snow* Bulgakov sarcastically suggested that he re-wrote the play "just to suit the trolley schedule in Moscow".<sup>14</sup>

In early October the second version of the play was ready for production. This version no longer conveyed the atmosphere of the Civil War in Kiev through a whole kaleidoscope of images but rather focussed on a single family. The city (one of Bulgakov's favourite images) receded in importance, some peripheral characters were dropped, some plot lines (the religious imagery of the Apocalypse, Elena's prayer for a miracle) were removed, while others were strengthened. The main characters (Nai-Turs and Doctor Turbin) also underwent changes.

The first major adjustment of the play to the ideological requirements of Soviet censorship was caused by the death of Mikhail Frunze in 1925. During the ensuing period, Stalin consolidated his hold on the Party. Trotsky was under attack and was finally declared an enemy of the people. References to Trotsky in the play (who symbolized the whole Bolshevik movement in the first version) had to be omitted as they could have resulted in the prohibition of the play.

In a letter dated 5 October 1925 the stage director Ia. Sudakov reported to Bulgakov that the "producers have been assigned" (Sudakov and Vershilov) and the "roles were distributed". Lunacharsky had read the play, found it "magnificent and saw no obstacle to its production". With all aspects of the production going well, Sudakov promised to stage the play in March 1926.<sup>15</sup>

However on 12 October 1925 the Commissar for People's Enlightenment, Lunacharsky, wrote to a staff member of the Art Theatre,

Alexandr Luzhsky, that he had "carefully re-read Bulgakov's play *The White Guard*." Although he found it acceptable from a political point of view, he labelled it "uninteresting and completely uninspired". He stated that "not even an average theatre would accept this play because of its dullness, its lack of dramatic expression and the extreme inexperience of the author".<sup>16</sup>

Bulgakov, in consultation with the staff of the Art Theatre, once again began to alter and re-write much of the play. In this re-working several characters were omitted. In the October version, still entitled *The White Guard*, Alexei remained a doctor who makes a recovery from his wounds at the end. His dream is unchanged: a nightmarish figure discusses with Alexei the fate of Russia by showing him Bolbotun's troops approaching.<sup>17</sup> Sudakov and Stanislavsky persuaded Bulgakov to combine the characters of Malyshev and Nai-Turs with that of Alexei in order to make the play shorter and more compact.<sup>18</sup> In the re-working, the play was simplified, and the entire comic-foil Vasilisa theme (Vasilisa and Vanda) was omitted. However, this theme was retained in both the German (1927) and English (1928) translation of the play entitled *The Turbin Family*,<sup>19</sup> which contains four acts and two scenes. In the second Russian version the religious images of the Apocalypse, Alexei's dream-states, Elena's prayer for a miracle to bring about Alexei's recovery, were all eliminated. The October version portrays Captain Myshlaevsky still not ready to join the Bolsheviks. In the end he leaves the field of action and it is Talberg who "changes landmarks" and joins the Bolsheviks. All the final variants, in accordance with the theatre's *repertkom* (repertory committee) request, were made by the end of January 1926, though it will probably never be known how willing Bulgakov was to change the emphasis of his play.

Preparations for the staging of the play were announced in the newspaper *Vecherniaia Moskva* as early as January 1926, and the third version of the play was read with its new complement of actors on 29 January. The new and final version of the play was available to the theatre on 24 February and a copy was sent to *Glavrepertkom* (Central Bureau in Charge of Repertory) headed by Lunacharsky, which was responsible for the censorship of theatrical performances.

From the rehearsal diary we find out that Stanislavsky was present at the Art Theatre 26 March. He praised the artists' performance and considered the work a "good and necessary one",<sup>20</sup> expressing full satisfaction with some scenes -- especially those in the high school and the scene of Petliura's supporters. Later on 13 May 1926 Stanislavsky's only concern remained the title of the play. It was obvious that it could not be called *The White Guard*. His suggestions for alternatives were numerous: *White December 1918*, *The Taking of the City*, *The White Snowstorm*. However, in order to keep the play from being banned, at the last meeting of the *repertkom* he advised that it be called *Before the End*.<sup>21</sup> At this same meeting Stanislavsky also suggested cutting the provocative "Petliura scene", which was entirely in Ukrainian. Although the scene, according to Proffer, "is often left out of current Soviet productions",<sup>22</sup> Stanislavsky's justification for eliminating it was that it stood apart from the rest of the play, since none of the Turbins or their friends appeared on stage. As to the scene in the Hetman's palace, it could stay, for it was connected with Shervinsky's fate.

Bulgakov would not accept any further changes; he felt that he had already made sufficient concessions to his critics and in his letter of 4 June 1926 written to the Council and Directorate of MKhAT, he expressed

his refusal to delete the scene with the Petliura supporters and to change the play's name to *Before the End*. He was determined to withdraw the play if his demands were not met.<sup>23</sup> Bulgakov decided to end the play in a Chekhovian spirit with a stress on the acceptance of the inevitable, rather than on an unrealistic hope for the future. The writer aimed to end his play in a pessimistic way; the positive hero Myshlaevsky was to leave the stage after making his final speech: "For some this is a prologue, but for me -- an epilogue."<sup>24</sup> The villain Talberg's action of joining the Bolsheviks was intended to emphasize the fatalistic mood established by the Revolution.

On 16 June 1926 representatives of MKhAT, Markov, Sudakov, and Luzhsky discussed the fate of the play with a member of the Repertory Committee, Pel'she. Among the members of the ideological section of the Repertory Committee were Chekina, Krunim, Russo, and Biroy. Although V. Blum, the head of the Theatrical Section, was not present, he had previously expressed his opinion that *The White Guard* served as an apology for the White Guard movement. This sentiment was taken into account by members of the ideological section at the meeting. Blum also thought that all the latter scenes of the play -- from the high school setting to the death of Alexei -- were unacceptable.

Bulgakov was not present at this meeting of the Committee, so the MKhAT representatives took it upon themselves to delineate "concrete suggestions" for changes. In the end, they agreed to re-write the play. Orlinsky then gave several suggestions. He approved Sudakov's idea of making Nikolka the character who starts to accept the Bolshevik cause, since he was the youngest of the Turbins, therefore the most impressionable. Orlinsky, as well as a number of other critics who later made a career of criticizing *The Days of the Turbins*, suggested that the play

be presented for official viewing without the suggested changes. The MKhAT people did not agree, knowing that in this condition the play would be banned once and for all. The members of the theatre administration excused themselves, claiming lack of time to adequately prepare themselves for the official viewing on such short notice. At the end of the meeting the Theatre's Committee agreed to the changes.

Evidence is not available of the way the theatre personnel persuaded Bulgakov to agree to re-work the play anew. It is most likely that Bulgakov desired above all to have his play performed and that the young group of actors wanted for the opportunity to show off their talent. But in the rehearsal journal entry dated 24 August 1926 we discover that during the conference with Stanislavsky and the play directors Sudakov, Markov, and Luzhsky, it was Bulgakov himself who agreed to re-work the play, to remove "the most provocative parts", and to make the changes suggested by the Repertory Committee. By 7 September significant changes were made. Bulgakov's favourite scenes -- "At the high school" and "At the Hetman's palace" -- were re-worked, and the fourth act was shortened. Myshiaevsky became a "fully positive" character who welcomed the Bolsheviks. Anti-Bolshevik attitudes were transferred to the episodic character Studzinsky.

On 14 September the preliminary dress rehearsal of the collectively reworked play took place. The controversial title was changed in turn from *The White Guard* to *White December, 1918*; *The Taking of the City*; *The White Snowstorm*; *Before the End*; *The End of the Whites*; *The Turbin Family*; and finally to *The Days of the Turbins*

After all the suggested changes were made, a full rehearsal with an audience took place 17 September in front of the Repertory Committee. Nevertheless, this showing was followed by still more changes. At the 23

September performance the scene showing the murder of a Jew by Petliura's men was taken out. The sound of the "International" at the end was increased in volume. On 27 September the performance which was to decide whether the play could be publicly presented took place. An audience composed of Stanislavsky, members of the Art Theatre, high-ranking Soviet officials, the press, and the Repertory Committee was to make the final decision. In the end Lunacharsky's personal opinion was that "the play could and probably would go on."<sup>25</sup>

It is apparent that the play was actually approved prior to this "decisive performance". In a letter sent to Stanislavsky 26 September 1926, Meyerhold congratulated him on having the play passed.<sup>26</sup> These numerous changes were very painful to Bulgakov. The final edition of the play differed drastically -- ideologically and aesthetically -- from both the novel and the first stage version. It also took away the elements which made the work original, interesting and typically Bulgakovian. Some critics bitterly but accurately noted that Bulgakov was only one of the many authors of the play.<sup>27</sup> But this was only the beginning of the real battle that followed between Bulgakov and the critics. By attacking Bulgakov's play the most aggressive critics, V. Blum and A. Orinsky, sought to publicly prove their "political vigilance".

Immediately after the official approval of the play, a discussion concerning the "Theatrical Prospects of the Season" was held at the *Dom Pechati* (Press House) on Nikitinsky Boulevard. Orinsky of the *Glavrepertkom* took this occasion to denounce *The Days of the Turbins* on ideological grounds. He claimed that there was not one representative of the working class in the play.<sup>28</sup> In another public rehearsal 20 October the Party members in the audience left the theatre to demonstrate their protest

of the play. Later that same evening further public talks on the theme of "Theatrical Policies of Soviet Power", developed into a discussion of *The Days of the Turbins*. Once again Orlinsky, who had previously demanded most of the changes to the play, was its most bitter opponent. But the Commissar of Public Education Lunacharsky, and even Bulgakov's ideological opponent Mayakovsky, stood against its prohibition. Lunacharsky did not agree to ban the play because "the theatre had already spent many thousands on it, and the actors had learnt their parts."<sup>29</sup>

The meetings at the *Dom Pechati* 27 September were devoted to "Theatrical Prospects of the Seasons" and, as Proffer puts it:

there was something for everyone to dislike in the play.

Litovsky said that in putting on this play MKhAT has taken a big step to the right. In vain was the name changed to *Days of the Turbins*. It was, is, and will remain *White Guard*. Orlinsky blamed the Theatre for "slavishly" carrying out the author's ideas, the playwright Vladimir Kirshon criticized the way in which Ukrainians were made fun of.<sup>30</sup>

The official première took place 5 October 1926. Fearful of the critical onslaught, the Theatre's administration decided not to invite the writer to the première. The accounts of the first performance vary significantly; the only points of agreement are the fact that there was full house and that the performance of the younger members of the troupe was brilliant. As Wright puts it, even though the young actors were

aware of playing people who, from the point of view of the new society were enemies, they showed sympathy and understanding... The reactions of the audience were indicative of the arguments that would go on for several years. To some, the sympathetic

portrayal of the White family was unthinkable, an outrage, but many of those present belonged to the same intellectual class as the Turbins and saw the play as a justification of at least their motives.<sup>31</sup>

Even in its final form *The Days of the Turbins* was still a play good enough to inspire a resounding box-office success and, eventually, something of a theatrical legend. As a result a new generation of young actors was integrated into the theatre ensemble, an ensemble that continued the acting tradition of the Russian theatre.

Critics emphasize the importance of Lunacharsky's article *Novosti teatralnogo sezona (News from the Theatre Season)* in *Krasnaia gazeta (Red Gazette)* of 5 October 1926 as justification for passing the play and exculpating Bulgakov. Lunacharsky defended the point that although Bulgakov had shown the enemies of communism in such a positive light, he did not fail to show the inevitability of the Whites' acceptance of communism,<sup>32</sup> however, Komsomol groups protested the play for placing a romantic halo over the White Guard.<sup>33</sup> Orlovsky wrote a series of articles in *Pravda* and *Novyi zritel' (New Audience)* where he coined the word *bulgakovshchina* ("bulgakovism"). Blum and other critics joined him in the attack.<sup>34</sup>

Although the press commentary was largely negative, all the performances were sold out, and the play was an overwhelming success whenever it was performed. According to some critics it deserved the title "the new *Seagull*", in the sense that it marked a new epoch for both the theatre and the playwright...<sup>35</sup> In much the same way that Chekhov's *Seagull* in 1898 was the founding play -- both artistically and financially -- of the newly formed MKhAT, *The Days of the Turbins* financially re-established

MKhAT after the lean years following the Revolution and introduced a second generation of young, talented artists. According to a report in "Moskovskie teatral'nye pis'ma" of May 22, 1927,

the theatre that had suffered a 25,000-ruble deficit in the season of 1926-27 made a 50,000-ruble profit, thanks to *The Turbins*. Despite many years of ban or non-production, the play was performed 987 times from 1926 to 1941 at the MKhAT alone.<sup>36</sup>

The success of *The Days of the Turbins* was like a double-edged sword in Bulgakov's life. His name simultaneously became a legend among theatre lovers as well as "a visible target" for abuse. Orinsky's term *bulgakovshchina* came to be commonly-applied to a number of anti-soviet movements, supporters of the old régime.

The writer took criticism oversensitively. According to critics and observers,<sup>37</sup> he collected all review articles very carefully. By 1930 there had been 301 reviews of his work, 298 of which were negative, most unfair. The most destructive ones were from Blum, Orinsky, and Litovsky. Blum used his powerful position as editor of *Novyi zritel'* (*New Audience*), a guide to theatrical events, to discredit the play and its writer. Litovsky, a staff writer of the *Komsomol'skaia pravda* (*Komsomol's Truth*), attacked Bulgakov for idealizing the White Guard, and Orinsky, a member of the *Repertkom*, criticized the playwright for being an enemy of Soviet society.

On 22 December 1927 the Maly Theatre presented the première of K. A. Trenev's *Liubov' Iarovaia*, a mediocre play about a woman who betrayed her White Guard husband in order to prove her loyalty to the Bolsheviks. In an article published in *Izvestia*, Lunacharsky suggested that Trenev's play was an answer to *The Days of the Turbins*.<sup>38</sup> This comparison was bound to be

repeated in other articles and discussions. On 7 February 1928 an open discussion of the two plays took place in the Meyerhold Theatre in the presence of Bulgakov and important personalities such as Lunacharskii, as well as the author's most fierce opponents. At the time, Lunacharsky spoke of "the play's faults", he stated that *Liubov' Iarovaia* was a better work aesthetically. Though there are a number of articles written about this discussion, the impressions left on the witnesses present at that meeting differ significantly. There is some disagreement among the most important accounts as to whether Bulgakov spoke at length or said only a few words.<sup>39</sup> The only common ground in all the articles recalling the event concerns Bulgakov's expression of contempt for Orlinsky.

Both plays were reviewed again in May 1927 at the *Agitprop* (Party Conference on Agitation and Propaganda Department). Among those present were Lunacharsky and Bulgakov's critics Orlinsky, Litovsky and Averbakh. The discussion focussed on whether the play should have been allowed at all. Lunacharsky still maintained that *The Days of the Turbins* had at least not been harmful.<sup>40</sup> Orlinsky claimed his criticism resulted in successfully discrediting the tsarist national anthem which was sung movingly in the play, but thanks to Orlinsky's remarks, they started singing it with everyone drunk, demeaning its significance. He also pointed out that the younger spectators "staged protests against the play, which prevented the sale of tickets".<sup>41</sup>

The attacks waged by the critics formed only a part of the protest; they were supplemented by an orchestrated campaign of letters from workers and the general public to the press. Nevertheless, *The Days of the Turbins* continued to be a success; some people loved it, others hated it, but everyone wanted to see it. The play ran successfully for two seasons,

although critics did not give up attacking it. By the beginning of 1929 critics violently attacked Bulgakov's other plays, *Zoyka's Apartment* and *The Crimson Island*, as well as his prose works, portraying him as the enemy of Soviet society. Victor Nusinov even accused Bulgakov of being an internal émigré.

According to some critics, the controversial play was kept in the repertoire mostly out of financial necessity. In March 1929 the Art Theatre opened a play called *Blokada* (*Blockade*) by Vsevolod Ivanov, and *The Days of the Turbins* was immediately banned; but on 18 February 1932 Bulgakov's play was re-staged in Moscow. Many critics believed that that it was at Stalin's personal request, who, as Wright noted, "did not seem to object to it".<sup>42</sup> It is noteworthy that according to the records of the Art Theatre (which has a tradition of well-documented stage records) Stalin attended fifteen of its performances. In a letter to Bill-Blotserkovsky dated 2 February 1929, Stalin wrote that *The Days of the Turbins* left a favourable impression on the Bolsheviks, for it showed that even people like the Turbins "are compelled to lay down their arms and to submit to the will of the people, realizing that they cannot do anything against the Bolsheviks, for they are invincible, therefore the play has more good sides than bad ones".<sup>43</sup> The play, as mentioned above, remained in the repertoire until June 1941, when the set burned in an air raid on Minsk after its 987th performance.

According to Wright's study, *The Days of the Turbins* became known abroad mainly in its second version, which included the Vasilisa and Vanda scenes and the less positive, pessimistic ending<sup>44</sup> -- the positive hero, Myshlaevky, remaining loyal to the White Guards and the villain Talberg joining the Bolsheviks. The play was performed in many countries. In 1927

it was performed in Riga at the Theatre of Russian Drama; in 1928 it was staged in German translation in Berlin and Breslau. The Prague Group of the Moscow Art Theatre (the group that was left in Prague during the 1923-24 tour) took the play to London. Its staging in the Kingsway Theatre was a great success. It was also shown in Warsaw in 1933 in the Narva theatre. In 1935 the Art Theatre took *The Days of the Turbins* to New York.

The play was staged in English translation in March 1934 by the Yale University Dramatic Association, and in London, England at the Phoenix Theatre in 1928. It was performed under its title of *The White Guard* in 1937 at the Ambassadors' Theatre, Swiss Cottage, London, in a translation by Rodney Ackland. In January 1960 it was produced by BBC television with Marius Goring as Alexei. The première of the Ackland translation took place in 1969 at the Aldwych Theatre, London, in a production by the Royal Shakespeare company. In 1964 it was produced in Czechoslovakia.<sup>45</sup>

In the 1950s the play was staged in the Stanislavsky Theatre in Moscow, produced by V. Yanshin and directed by S. Tumanov. In 1955 it was staged in Tbilisi at the Griboedov Theatre, where it was produced by L. Varpakhovsky. In the same year the play was published for the first time in the Soviet Union in its final (1926) version. Since 1960 *The Days of the Turbins* has remained in the repertory of Soviet theatres, and in 1976 a special celebration marked the fiftieth anniversary of its première. Since the publication of the play Soviet critics have agreed that the former judgements (the criticism of the 1920s) were too harsh and that the Art Theatre had done a great deal of work with Bulgakov to "overcome the incorrect tendencies" of *The White Guard*.<sup>46</sup>

Until 1988 no critic had discussed the staging of the play in terms of the audience's perception of the events portrayed and Ukrainians' attitude

towards the writer. In the new collection of writings on Bulgakov, *M. A. Bulgakov - -dramaturg i khudozhestvennaia kul'tura ego vremeni. Sbornik statei* (Moscow: Soiuz teatral'nykh deiatelei RSFSR, 1988), M. Kal'nitsky and T. Rogozovskaia shed some light on this particular "blank spot" of Bulgakov's life history. According to Kal'nitsky and Rogozovskaia, Bulgakov "made attempts to take part in the cultural life of Kiev..." Although "there is no evidence of Bulgakov's visiting Kiev from 1924 to 1935", they assume that he might have stopped there on his way to Odessa in 1928.<sup>47</sup> There are many documents, however which confirm the staging of the *Days* in Kiev as well as Bulgakov's visiting the city in 1935 and 1936 during the Art's Theatre tour in Kiev. Mikhail Prudkin, an actor of the Art Theatre, recalls:

One can never forget Mikhail Afanas'evich during our tour in Kiev, where *The Days of the Turbins* were staged. He took us on a tour and with great enthusiasm he showed us the places, the streets, and houses connected with the events of *The Day of the Turbins*. I especially remember Mikhail Afanas'evich at one moment, when we came into the building of the former high school, which is now some official institution. And here without any embarrassment from the present workers he played for us the whole scene "In the High School" from *The Days of the Turbins*. He played the part of Alexei Turbin, his brother Nikolka, and Petliura's soldiers. He gave us, the actors, a new fund of imagination for our future performances in the play.<sup>48</sup>

The presence of MKhAT attracted the attention of the Kiev media. In their collective interview in *Bil'shovyk (Bolshevik)* of 29 May 1936 and in *Komsomolets Ukrainy (Ukrainian Komsomol)* of 30 May 1936, right before the beginning of the tour, the leading actors Victor Kachalov and Nikolai

Khmelev expressed their concern with the future reception of *Days* in Kiev.<sup>49</sup> The play, according to Kal'nitsky and Rogozovskaia, "was a great success" and "was staged eleven times during the MKhAT's tour in Kiev". The critics point out that Bulgakov "was very interested in staging his plays by Kiev's companies".<sup>50</sup> In 1926 while rehearsals were taking place in Moscow's MKhAT, expenditures for the staging spade-work of the *Days* were made by the Kiev Theatre of Russian Drama, but by special "instruction from Kharkiv, the rehearsals of the play in its version *The White Guard* were called off". In October 1926 the play *Zoikina's Apartment* was also abolished because of the same "instruction from Kharkiv" after its sixth performance.<sup>51</sup>

The article "Spor o bege" ("Dispute about The Flight") in *Vechirni Kyiv* (*Evening Kiev*) of 25 October 1928 described the difficulties faced by the director of the Kiev's Russian theatre, V. A. Nelli, who attempted to stage Bulgakov's *Beg* (*The Flight*). Nelli's efforts to stage *Molière* also ended unsuccessfully. In August 1934 Bulgakov signed a contract with the Ukrainian film studio for the cinema production of his adaptation of Gogol's *The Inspector General*. However, director M. Karostin kept changing the screen version until January 1936, when all the expenses budgeted for the film were exhausted, and production did not go further than a trial shooting. In over 60 years only two plays by Bulgakov -- *The Last Days* and *The Cabal of Hypocrites* -- were staged by Ukrainian theatres, the Lesia Ukrainka Theatre in Kiev and the TIUZ (Teatr iunogo zritel'ia -- Youth theatre) in Leningrad.<sup>52</sup>

The fate of Kulish's *Sonata Pathétique* was far more difficult. By the end of 1929 Les' Kurbas made it publicly known that Kulish's plays *Zakut* (*The Corner*) and *Sonata Pathétique* were in rehearsal and would be

presented by Berezil' in the new theatre season.<sup>53</sup> Both plays were submitted for production on the stages of leading Ukrainian theatres, but permission was denied by the chief of the *Repertkom*. Antonina Kulish recalls that

it was a habit of Mykola to invite his friends and read them his newly finished play. Some friends were afraid that the play was too daring and would not be allowed. In order to receive official approval for the play on Berezil's stage, Mykola sent it to the Repertory Committee's administrator, Andrii Khvyliia. Having read it, Khvyliia declared that such a play could not appear on the Ukrainian stage. And the play was not approved. But Mykola did not despair...<sup>54</sup>

Kulish wrote his play as a mature dramatist, after many years of constant struggle with critics and censors over his previous plays. He was prepared to face them again. In 1925 after his return from Georgia, where he was invited to the twenty-fifth jubilee performance of his play *Commune in the Steppes*, produced by Mardjanishvili in Tbilisi, critics began their attack on Kulish. Antonina Kulish writes that

critics were full of suspicion, unfair conjecture, and allusions.

Mykola was disturbed, but sometimes he would say:

-- It is good that they scold me. Let them dress me down, but I know what I am doing.

The scribblers wrote many unfavourable things about Mykola, but theatres were performing *The Commune in the Steppes* and *The 97* with great satisfaction. <sup>55</sup>

Criticism of Kulish's plays became even more intense after his staging of *Myna Mazailo* (1927) and *The People's Malakhii* (1928). Kulish was very

much aware of the disagreements in the demands of audiences, theatres, critics, and the Party. According to his wife, he knew that what was impossible in Kiev could be pushed ahead by his Russian colleagues in Moscow. Therefore he asked the well-known translator of Ukrainian works Pavel Zinkevych to produce a Russian text of *Sonata Pathétique*.<sup>56</sup>

Zinkevich did more than simply translate it; he used every means in his power to have the play produced in the best Russian theatres. The unusual nature of this play impressed Alexandr Tairov, the director and producer of the Kamernyi Theatre in Moscow. He immediately telegraphed Kulish and asked his permission to stage it. The writer consented, yet he doubted that the Kamernyi Theatre could obtain permission from the censors for its actual production. The Repertory Committee, however, consented. These facts are not documented, but one can assume that this occurred toward the end of 1930, for in January 1931 Kulish was called to Moscow in order to read his play to the artists of the Kamernyi Theatre. According to Kuziakina, Tairov's interest in the *Sonata Pathétique*

rested on his desire to find a play that would fulfil his new artistic objectives for the theatre. For the Kamernyi Theatre was constantly developing specific theatre forms, far removed from academic ones. Tairov believed that the formula "theatre for theatre's sake" was in no way equivalent to the formula "art for art's sake".<sup>57</sup>

In an attempt to reflect the contemporary problems of the post-revolutionary years on stage, the Kamernyi Theatre underwent many complex changes. Like Les' Kurbas with his Berezil' troupe, Tairov and his troupe experimented with outstanding plays of all epochs and styles. In the 1920s Tairov staged Racine's *Phèdre* and *Jirolfé-Jirolfé*, Eugene O'Neill's

*Desire Under the Elms* (1926), *All the God's Children Got Wings* (staged as *The Negro*, 1927), and Charles Leacock's *Days and Nights*, as well as some plays by Berthold Brecht and Kurt Weill.<sup>58</sup> Although some of these attempts were considered failures, Tairov, along with Kurbas in Ukraine, did succeed in raising the standards of modern Russian theatre to those found in the best Western theatres.

Tairov also wanted a Soviet play to maintain and to further develop his theatre's unique style, based on musical concentricity. Most of Tairov's contemporary playwrights offered realistic plays based on everyday life. The themes, conflicts, and characters in these works bore a remarkable resemblance to each other. On 7 January 1931, Tairov lectured the actors on the creative method of the theatre, saying:

our theatre lately has in almost every case worked with the same dramatic material... We discussed this topic in detail with Kulish during our last conversation and we agreed that all the plays look very much alike; in all of them there are a certain number of more or less pre-ordained standard masks [ordinary characters].<sup>59</sup>

*Sonata Pathétique* was a windfall for Tairov. It was very different from the standard types of dramas written to please the *Repertkom*; it also contained all the features for which the Kamernyi Theatre was searching, and at the same time, it raised complex contemporary issues.

On 24 May 1931 the Art and Political Committee [Khudozhestvenno-politicheskii sovet] of the Kamernyi Theatre held a meeting to discuss *Sonata Pathétique*. Though the play's unusual form was of great concern to some Committee members, the most troublesome question was that of the social problem, especially in its national aspect.

The minutes of the meeting lists the following Committee members present: Bogomolov, Ginzburg, Margolin, Mikhnevich, Riabinkin, Slucker, Sumarokov, and Tairov. Their comments were varied and highly controversial. Riabinkin remarked that

the play has a tremendous number of gaps and it displays a double-edged spirit of chauvinism. The chauvinists' sides are shown with extreme force... yet the author fails to prove and justify his criticism of chauvinism with great satisfaction from the process of development of living personae. This inadequacy reflects the failure of the play.

Bogomolov believed that

the play is imbued with such chauvinism that it is frightening ... And, besides, it contains numerous love lyrics, which gives sufficient reason to criticize the work. Why do we need such a play? To obstruct our path in the building of socialism, especially when such devilish constructions are implemented?

Slucker spoke out in defence of the play:

I want to take the play under my protection, even though it does not need it... I am Ukrainian, and I know that in those days Ukrainianization did flourish, that it was a tremendous movement. In fact, he [Kulish] does not picture it as vividly as it really was.

Margolin also defended *Sonata Pathétique*, interpreting it from a Russian viewpoint:

... I want to say that it is not true that the chauvinist mood is predominant in this play. This is false. In Ukraine they devote much thought to this and for many theatres it seems very

risky to stage such a play... but what appears to be a problem in Ukraine loses its meaning and importance in the RSFSR.

Other members of the Committee also considered the play's national problem. Summing up the meeting, Tairov agreed that there were "risky moments" and recalls that

the play is very much a contemporary one and the national question is not only yesterday's question, but very much today's and tomorrow's. Do not forget one simple thing: that the two major powers fighting in the world today are our International and fascism, fascism being extreme nationalism.<sup>60</sup>

Tairov perceived *Sonata Pathétique* as a play with a great epic plot, with generalized symbolic characters who personified "contrasted great powers". It is in these contrasts that he recognized the virtue of the play. In his concluding remarks at the meeting, Tairov observed:

Kulich is a great artist, he creates such splendid comparisons. Look at the way Avram [Ovram] dies, and consider the way Maryna dies... Or take the scene of the meeting. Look at how beautifully it is done: André gives a speech... And suddenly it is superseded by a comment... This is brilliantly done. The tenor of André's whole speech is "to hell with it all..." Or look at the juxtapositions of the one trial with the other. No, this is wonderful.<sup>61</sup>

The majority of members on the Artistic and Political Committee as well as the artists of the Kamernyi Theatre supported the production of *Sonata Pathétique*. The Committee approved the staging of the play for the 1931-1932 theatrical season with stage design by the artist V. Ryndin and the orchestration of Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique" by I. Metner.

On 7 October 1931 Tairov published an article in *Literaturnaia gazeta* entitled "What the Kamernyi theatre is working on", in which the director gave an account of his work on the play,

The problems the play raises are extremely complicated but nonetheless interesting. The texture of the play, its architectonics, in my opinion, outlines new paths for Soviet drama. Before us lies the tempting task of creating a great synthetic performance which, through its new stage techniques and scale would be adequate to the extraordinarily moving content of the Civil War itself.<sup>62</sup>

It was only after the play had passed the censorship of the *Repertkom* in Moscow and the staging had been decided by the Kamernyi Theatre that Kulish made an attempt to get support from the Ukrainian literary world. On 9 March 1931 in the Blakytyny building, a public reading and a discussion of *Sonata Pathétique* took place. The author read the play in the presence of such writers and literary critics as Iaroslav Mamontov, Dmytro Hrudyna, Kost' Burevii, Ostap Vyshnia, Mykhailo Kachaniuk, Ivan Mykytenko, Ivan Dniprovsky, and Petro Mohyla. The critics expressed their opinion and concerns. After the open discussion Kulish took the opportunity to comment on his own play.

Only a very short account of the discussion appeared in the paper *Literaturna hazeta*. The comments were very discreet and evasive. It was said that "Kulish's play was a very original piece of contemporary dramatic literature and it brought a number of new features into the literary world." The opinion expressed in the article was that "It was too difficult to give a more detailed analysis of the work without first doing a closer, more fundamental study of it."<sup>63</sup> While some critics were quite negative and

openly criticized the play, others were far too muted in expressing their positive opinions about it.

Hrudyna found the play highly ambiguous with "every word possessing a double meaning, forcing one to listen very carefully to it". Very critical of the characters, Hrudyna argues that they were all miserable. Despite this, he was the first one to raise the possibility of staging the play in Ukrainian theatres. Mamontov found it impossible to deny Kulish's talent. He found some scenes of the play brilliant, but he could not accept it because of its "impressionistic method" (a term he was probably confusing with "expressionistic"). Mamontov personally opposed impressionism in Soviet drama and, according to him, the impressionism presented in Kulish's play was not suitable for Ukrainian theatres. In general he considered that Kulish "was distorting the main problems [as outlined in the play] by the lyrical digressions contained within the drama".<sup>64</sup> Mykytenko, who arrived late and did not even hear the beginning of the play, made "several comments as to the creative method" employed in the drama. In some scenes he clearly saw a "dialectical accordance", but in others he noticed only extreme polarities: "The lyrical digressions in some moments of the play are not dialectically structured. But in general the play, from a formal point of view, is well composed."<sup>65</sup>

Kachaniuk spoke in support of Kulish's play against those who criticized the author for obscuring its ideological aims, but he did condemn Kulish for his use of eloquent language. Kachaniuk praised the work as "a great event", and saw the new expressionist features introduced by Kulish as "a reflection of the problems of the time". He rejected the accusation of impressionism as "absolutely wrong". Although indirectly, Vyshnia also came to Kulish's defence. He objected to Hrudyna's complaint of "miserable

heroes", and emphasized that "the Bolsheviks in the play were not miserable at all."<sup>66</sup>

Dniprovsky also defended Kulish. He expressed his admiration for the uniqueness of Kulish's play and told the critics that they must be congenial to the writer in order to criticize the work, for "Kulish's play soars above all other contemporary plays because of its originality and artistic power." Dniprovsky emphasized that Kulish "integrated the historical material of 1918-1919 into a dramatic poem based on versatile artistic scenes". In Dniprovskii's opinion the only objection to the play rested on the fact that the "motive power of the Revolution needed more development".<sup>67</sup>

In his closing remarks Kulish commented on the meaning of his characters, their inter-relationship and their opposition to each other. In response to Hrudyna's charge of showing "miserable" heroes, Kulish said that he tried first of all to show "touching characters". Hrudyna's criticism that the Bolsheviks, Luka and Hamar, looked miserable, was absolutely erroneous. The legless worker Ovrarn, the prostitute Zinka, and all the insurgent partisans were all filled with revolutionary pathos. Their physical defects, along with the misery expressed by the individual characters, resulted from capitalism and the Imperialist War. The author had no choice but to expose them.

This discussion of the merits of *Sonata Pathétique* held at the Blakytny building did not bring about the results Kulish desired. His work was neither popularized in wider literary circles nor was it published or shown to playgoers. And, as Kuziakina stated, "the doors to the Ukrainian stage were never opened to *Sonata Pathétique*."<sup>68</sup>

Unlike the stage history of Bulgakov's *The Days of the Turbins* which is recorded in great detail and is easily accessible, the material concerning

the initial staging of the *Sonata Pathétique* in the Kamernyi Theatre is scattered. The only evidence available about the decision to stage *Sonata Pathétique* is found in an article by O. Litovsky "K nachalu teatral'nogo sezona" ("The Beginning of the Theatre Season") in *Pravda* of 8 September 1931. Among the plays for the coming season, the article include the *Sonata Pathétique*.<sup>69</sup> The staging of a play by a Ukrainian writer was a unique occasion in Russia, a fact that exemplifies the importance given to *Sonata Pathétique* by the staff of the Kamernyi Theatre and other Russian theatres.

The première of the play took place on 20 December 1931 at the Kamernyi Theatre. The theatre's acclaimed actress Alissa Koonen played the lead role of Maryna. The play was also simultaneously staged at the Pushkin Theatre in Leningrad and other Russian theatres.

The artist A. Ryndin offered the Kamernyi Theatre a simple, figurative generalized stage design with the silhouette of the building reminiscent of the raised lid of a grand piano. In its expressionistic generalization the design was very poetic. But the addition of realistic everyday objects (doors, chairs, etc.) to the scenery overloaded the set and destroyed its poetic character. The tree symbolic of spring, was lost in the background of the realistic scenery. This realism robbed the play of its poetic, allusive, suggestive character. The symbolic expression of dramatic action was now dependent exclusively on the play's musical score. Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique" in a piano interpretation was introduced right at the beginning of the second scene where the *Grave* defines the main motif of the play -- its tragic prediction. The *Allegro* was used to express Maryna's theme, while Stupay-Stupanenko and Perotsky's characters were depicted by the *Rondo*. In addition to the piano played by Maryna, there was also a piano behind the set, as well as a string orchestra. The excerpt from Beethoven's

"Egmont" played by the symphonic orchestra, reflecting the rhythm of the Revolution, whose finale coincides with Il'ko's moving declamation about the everlasting symphony of the Revolution, was presented at the end of the play. *Sonata Pathétique* in Tairov's and L. Lukianov's production emphasised the highly emotional relationship developed among the characters, who by their very communication revealed and intensified the contradictions of the existing social and class problems.

Tairov's intention of developing the play as an epic, heroic and moving play was revealed in an extreme individualization of all the characters -- even the episodic ones such as the partisans and the Bolsheviks. According to Kuziakina's study, "the producers created brilliant mass scenes with extremely clear symbolism. Some scenes were added by the producers, more likely against the author's will..."<sup>70</sup> The scene, for example, of the war victims meeting the luxurious crowd of rich philistines that had gathered at Easter Eve to celebrate the resurrection of their Redeemer was built on the principle of contrast: "in the foreground a solemn procession descended the steps while on the opposite side of the building the figures of the disabled soldiers appeared, their crippled shadows thrown on the backdrop of the stage."<sup>71</sup> The set was meant to indicate that the people framed by the backdrop had fought to preserve the privileges of the wealthy. The same principle of contrast was used again for Ovrām's trial. The same righteous crowd of philistines was now full of hatred demanding the death of their defender Ovrām. The final scene was meant to convey the monumental significance of the historical event. All the partisans in the *Revkom* took up their arms and their banners. At a distance of one or two steps, with their rifles ready for action, they advanced with a firm step to protect their conquest: the people's rights.

Tairov stressed the individualization of Ukrainian partisans, aiming to give them a local Ukrainian colouring, but in this respect, as Kuziakina points out,

the theatre did not succeed. One of the Ukrainian partisans was reminiscent of a Tartar or a Kalmyk: his head clean shaven, his wadded pants and his shaggy sheepskin coat covering his bare body made his figure very imposing; however, his exorbitant exotic aspect spoiled the director's intention. Other partisans were characterized more or less by some Ukrainian elements in their costume and make-up.<sup>72</sup>

*Sonata Pathétique* was the first Ukrainian drama ever staged in the Kamernyi Theatre and the Russian actors did not have any real knowledge of Ukraine and its people. It is possible that the scenographer and set designer portrayed the Ukrainian insurgents as described in Bulgakov's novel *The White Guard* as a stereotype for the Ukrainian insurgents in the play. Bulgakov himself, born and brought up in the capital of Ukraine, knew very little about Ukrainians. In his novel he gives a mistaken anthropological and spiritual picture of them as Asian descendants.<sup>73</sup>

In order to interpret *Sonata Pathétique* as a heroic play about the Revolution and Civil War, the directors removed the romantic love story between Il'ko and Maryna and its tragic dénouement. Alissa Koonen interpreted Maryna as a tragic heroine expressing a furious hatred of the crowd. The victory of the Revolution was bringing on her death and she used all her strength and wisdom against these two forces of change --the crowd and the Revolution. Her strong and complicated character as the high-spirited enemy gives way to hatred, yet at the same time she attracts admiration and respect. Zinka was also misinterpreted in her

characterization by the actress F. Ranevska. She was not presented in the manner designed by the writer: "Ranevska's Zinka was impudent, she lost the softness of her Ukrainian nature, and her hatred of the dominant class was instead stridently expressed."<sup>74</sup>

The Kamernyi Theatre's production left a very vivid and controversial impression on spectators. Tairov's presentation of the play was both a heroic drama and an epic with many "mass scenes" in which forty-five actors took part. The staging, however, was incompatible with the writer's intention of portraying the poet's love as the supreme value of mankind, for the writer himself stated that the play was "about love and the Revolution".<sup>75</sup>

Kulich's play, like Bulgakov's work, underwent extensive revisions. In one letter to Pavel Zinkevich dated 8 February 1931, Kulich writes:

I am sending you the re-worked version of *Sonata Pathétique* I still consider it unfinished (the third act and especially the end needs more work) but I have no longer strength nor time. Even this version was frustratingly difficult. I forced myself, I compelled myself. I was unwilling to get down to it. Whenever I approached it, I felt as if I had to take castor oil.<sup>76</sup>

Nevertheless, Kulich continued to revise until the end of 1931, almost up to the time of the final production. It seemed that in order to keep the play on stage, the producers were forced to adapt it to the critics' demands. On 17 September 1931 in another letter to Zinkevich, the dramatist states:

Without straightening my back, in the course of a few hours I have been re-writing the third version of the play. I wanted it to reach you while you are still in Moscow. In this version you will

notice small but very significant changes and revisions, especially in the lines of Stupay and Maryna.<sup>77</sup>

In this version Maryna orders her father to return to his village and to wait until the Revolution is over; this statement completely diminishes Stupay's role as an enlightener.

Because of all the revisions and changes, the play was never published during the author's lifetime. The variations kept by S. Svobodina (the wife of the translator Pavel Zinkevich) were never compiled; they differ significantly from the copies kept in the archives of the Moscow Kamernyi Theatre. The copies in the Leningrad Theatre Library also have considerable changes.<sup>78</sup> Only by comparing the available copies does one become fully aware of Kulish's long and intensive search for a dénouement that would solve the main conflict without impoverishing the psychological portrayal and without simplifying the overall concept of his play. There are three extant, known variations of the final scenes of *Sonata Pathétique*. On 1 February 1931 Dniprovsky wrote in his diary:

From 8:00 to 10:00 in the evening Klaus<sup>79</sup> presented the "arbitrator" with two versions of the ending of *Sonata Pathétique*. They were witty, brilliantly profane, and delightful. We have chosen the second variant because it was Kulish's own and grew out of his own desires rather than those of Tairov's.<sup>80</sup>

It is likely that all the versions of the Russian translation have been preserved, according to traditions of theatre museums. In the variant existing in the Kamernyi Theatre, Maryna is denounced as a counter-revolutionary leader and is condemned to death; she was already confined to the basement when Il'ko returned from the front. Il'ko confesses to Luka that he has rescued Perotsky and agrees to accept any punishment the

Revolutionary tribunal feels he deserves. The last conversation of Maryna and Il'ko takes place in the basement where Maryna is caught between love and hatred of Il'ko. Though she is afraid of death, she will proudly face it. Il'ko detects in Maryna's staunchness a hatred toward people, and kills her.

The Leningrad Theatre offered the directors two script-variants to choose from. One text, preserved in typewritten form, portrays Il'ko as coming to the basement where Maryna is being held and asking her to go with him to confess that she is the "Seagull". In order to gain his sympathy and compassion, Maryna pretends to be in love with Il'ko. Il'ko succumbs to her love and calls to Luka for help. Maryna is taken away and this time Il'ko is accused of being a traitor and is locked in Perotsky's basement with the knowledge that tomorrow he will be taken before a martial tribunal. He contemplates the sunrise which appears like a fiery banner. The second variant, in manuscript form, is of all the extant copies, probably, the most symbolic in dealing with human and moral failure. In this copy Maryna pretends to blow out a candle, reproaching Il'ko: "Do you want to blow out the candle of my life?" She tries to escape. Il'ko cannot kill her, he calls Luka for help, but suddenly he fires and Maryna falls dead. Il'ko, now the murderer, addresses Luka: "This is me, and that (pointing at Maryna's body) is my dream -- the Seagull." Unmoved by Il'ko's words, Luka blames him for not bringing Maryna in alive, for her death makes more difficult the exposure of the "Golden Bulava" organization she led.

All these hesitations and changes in the dénouement, as Kuziakina puts it,

are typical features of Kulish's work: they show his feeling for the diversity of reality, where a shift in interpretation could change a comedy into tragedy or vice-versa. It looks as if the

changing course of events, the thoughts and feelings of his heroes surprised the dramatist and he did not dare take one side lest he spoil all the others.<sup>81</sup>

On the other hand, the constant changes of the dénouement were obviously dictated by the desires of the producers and critics who imposed their own views. Finally, the ending of the play with all its complexity was, as far as we can judge from his correspondence with Zinkevich, a very arduous task for Kulish and caused him a great deal of trouble. Most versions of the dénouement appear inconsistent with the events described in the play, a fact which makes it virtually impossible to define which one of them is closest to the writer's heart. In Kuziakina's opinion, the most suitable ending is that of the typewritten text, in which Il'ko hands Maryna over to Luka and confesses his fault,<sup>82</sup> for this version coincides with the one the writer planned for his novel. The manuscript, on the other hand, is the most symbolic variant (the poet kills his dream), and closely relates to a reality in which many poets and artists compromised their vocation in order to survive.

All these changes did not diminish the value of Kulish's play. *Sonata Pathétique* was successfully received in all versions performed. The play seemed to appeal even to some high-ranking Party members. In Antonina Kulish's memoirs we find out that

Mykola went to Moscow for the première. He sat in the same theatre box with Bud'enny, who introduced his wife to him. After the performance Bud'enny addressed Mykola with the words. "Thank you for the play. We had never seen such a play in Moscow", and invited him to his place for tea.<sup>83</sup>

Critical comments concerning the public reaction to *Sonata Pathétique* did not appear in Moscow right after its first staging. It is very likely that the media awaited orders from the Party to express its opinion. However, Antonina Kulish recalls that

the *Sonata Pathétique* played in Moscow with great success. They congratulated Mykola, they presented him with flowers, they took pictures of him. After the première of the play the music of Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique" was constantly played on the radio and it was heard in any place where there was a piano. It became almost impossible to find the score of the sonata in the music stores ... but most important of all, people hurried to buy tickets to the Kamernyi Theatre for the performance of the play.<sup>84</sup>

The first public comments started to appear on 30 December 1931, almost two weeks after the première. Critics disagreed completely over the evaluation of the individual roles or scenes, as the play was not only very complicated in itself, but its staging too was quite controversial. Most Muscovite critics not only evaluated the play incorrectly but failed to see in Kulish the founder of Ukrainian Soviet drama. Instead they viewed him as "a fellow-traveller" and compared his play with Iurii Olesha's *Zagovor Chuvstv* (*The Conspiracy of Feelings*), based on his novel *Zavist'* (*Envy*) and *Spisok blagodeian'* (*The List of Benefits*). Critics also saw in Kulish a follower of Leonid Leonov and associated *Sonata Pathétique* with his play *The Thief* (*Vor*), influenced by Dostoevsky's psychological analysis and concerns about the purity of the soul. There were also references to Alexei Faiko's *Ievgraf - iskatel' prikliuchenii* (*Ievgraf - the Adventurer*) who

depicted his heroes' frustration and estrangement (*otstranenie*) and their desire to escape from reality.<sup>85</sup>

Almost every critic blamed Kulish for misunderstanding the class problem and for his inadequate portrayal of human nature. Iu. Iuzovsky, for instance, could not understand the complexity of the social situation described in the play any more than the complicated human nature of the heroes. He would have preferred to have "the question solved" in a very simple manner through "Soviet realism". In his article "Pateticheskaia Sonata -- p'esa N. Kulisha v Kamernom teatre" in *Literaturnaia Gazeta* of 4 January 1932, Iuzovsky attempted to blame his misunderstanding of the play on Kulish's "errors". Analysing the character of Il'ko, Iuzovsky wrote that

he cannot overcome his past, for in his repudiation of the past, there is an element of sacrifice, a realization that he must part from his nationalistic past. He still does not take a firm stand on ideological proletarian grounds. All this also makes his parting a romantic one..."<sup>86</sup>

On the other hand Iuzovsky admits that both the ideology and form of the play constitute rather "complicated material", and that the Kamernyi Theatre was faced with a challenge simply in performing it.

N. Oruzhenikov also underlines the challenge faced by the Kamernyi Theatre in staging a play with such "innovative form", whose uniqueness consists in "its colourful language, and the use of music not merely as an accompaniment, but as an essential element of the play".<sup>87</sup>

An assessment by members of the Repertory Committee appeared in the journal *Sovetskoe iskusstvo (Soviet Art)* of 14 January 1932, signed by Skliar, Savransky, and Terk:

the main virtue of the play lay in the novelty of its form: the

combination, in the image of Il'ko, of both the leading character in the play and the narrator of the action; the effective use of lighting; the consistency in transferring the action of the different scenes grounds. The unusual complexity of the play at times somehow interfered with its main purpose, but in general it fulfils the theatre's goal of finding new plays with innovative form which possess important social significance.<sup>68</sup>

Another analysis of the play by B. Alpers appeared in the journal *Sovetskii teatr* of February 1932. This devastating article was written in the Orlynsky-Blium style of *ad-hominem* attack. It aimed at destroying Kulish, much as Orlynsky and Blium tried to destroy Bulgakov. Alpers compared Kulish's work with plays by "fellow-travellers", and *Sonata Pathétique* with *Goroda i gody (Cities and Years)* by Konstantin Fedin. In Alpers' view:

Kulish literally almost repeats Fedin's novel ... while Kurt from Fedin's novel personifies the conscience of the Revolution and in its name executes his friend, Kulish replaces this staunch revolutionary warrior by a lenient Luka, who in a moment of fierce combat wastes his time pursuing his dreamy friend.<sup>69</sup>

Comparing Il'ko with Kulish himself and hypothesizing that they are one and the same, Alpers labelled the writer a petty bourgeois incapable of repressing the peculiarities of his manner of thinking and accused Kulish of displaying sentiments of "national chauvinism" while erroneously idealizing Maryna. The critic also saw that Kulish "constructed his play on the basis of a conflict between a man and the Revolution (the latter being an independent power foisted upon the world). Alpers concluded that "for Kulish a hero is not a representative of a certain class but... just an individual human being."

He accused Kulish of being an counter-revolutionary writer whose "decadence and prejudice betray not only temporary setbacks in his creative development: they are at the root of his creative practice and the ideology of the artist."<sup>90</sup>

On 9 February 1932 another article by members of the censorship committee of the newspaper *Pravda* appeared, signed by B. Reznikov, H. Vasil'kovsky, I. Ierukhimovich, N. Bogovoi, and A. Nazarov, giving a fairly objective criticism of *Sonata Pathétique*. Admitting that the main problem raised in the play was that of national identity during the Revolution, they gave full support to Kulish, who "showed and proved that the question concerning national liberation is one of the central questions of the proletarian revolution". On the other hand, they accused the playwright and the theatre of overstating the role of the main hero Il'ko, whose personal drama seemed to be placed above the major problem of the era. The brigade also criticized the portrayal of the Ukrainian revolutionaries who looked more like *sans-culottes*<sup>91</sup> than Ukrainian workers. According to the critics, the artistic image of Maryna was proof that "the writer wanted to provoke audience hatred" toward this character. Nevertheless, the critics concluded that *Sonata Pathétique* "was among the best plays of the season", and praised the Kamernyi Theatre for its successful staging of a "such a complicated play" in which "some moments were brilliantly performed ..." as well as for its admirable attempt "to recognize the new demands of the proletarian audience".<sup>92</sup>

Four days earlier, on 16 January 1932, the première of *Sonata Pathétique* took place at the Leningrad Bol'shoi Dramaticheskii Theatre (Leningrad Bol'shoi Theatre of Drama). The play was staged by K. Tverskoi, who took upon himself the responsibility of "re-working" Kulish's play. He

believed that by "giving a proper solution" to a number of "extremely complicated problems" raised by the writer, he "could help to guide this remarkable piece of proletarian dramaturgy in the proper direction". Before staging the play Tverskoi wanted to change the structure of the play, to reduce Il'ko's role to a minimum, so that the Revolution would not be seen through his eyes, to straighten out both Maryna's romanticism and Stupay-Stupanenko's vacillating uselessness; to make Zinka "less romantic", and the partisans real heroes. "In general the theatre aimed to create a monumental synthetic performance, exposing the complicated and the controversial situation existing during the Civil War in Ukraine."<sup>93</sup>

Natalia Kuziakina, examining the manuscript of the play in Leningrad Bol'shoi Dramaticheskii Teatr, states the following:

the text of *Sonata Pathétique* which belonged to the Bol'shoi Dramaticheskii Theatre was an eloquent simplification. Many sections of the text were crossed out with a blue pen; Il'ko's role was extremely reduced; all the lyrical stage directions, and the theme of eternal love, and [Il'ko's] humanist dream about the beautiful human being, were removed. Maryna's part was also very simplified."<sup>94</sup>

Tverskoi himself admitted that no less than twenty-five per cent of the text underwent revision during the rehearsals. In a letter to Ievhen Chesnokov dated 23 February 1932 Zinkevich writes:

I am sending you the final version of Kulish's *Sonata Pathétique*. As you can see, the author has fulfilled almost the whole of the theatre's request: the revolutionary element is intensified (the part of Luka is now the leading one). The character of Maryna is more clearly defined, and the end of the play is completely

changed. In general, most of the scenes are re-worked. All General Perotsky's dangerous words about Georges' execution have been erased.<sup>95</sup>

The artist V. Dmitriev offered the theatre two stage designs. The one chosen by the theatre was a construction of two movable circles that pictured a cut-away of a building with a street in front of it. In order to conform to the changes, the composer A. Butskoi introduced into the structure of the play snatches of different melodies, like the tune of the White Guards' song, Ukrainian folk melodies, and others. At the end of the play Butskoi introduced Beethoven's "Ninth Symphony", making it an organic part of the play, thus substituting the "Sonata Pathétique's" structural and textual meaning.

Despite all these changes, the Leningrad media poorly received the play. Ten days after the première, an article by V. Golubkov appeared in the Leningrad evening paper *Krasnaia gazeta* (*Red Paper*) in which the critic blamed Kulish for falsifying the historical events in the Ukraine:

The play, which set itself the task of disclosing and analysing the collision of social powers and the struggle of different class groups in the Ukrainian Civil War situation, falsifies historical reality, degrades this reality, [and] makes it primitive.<sup>96</sup>

Another article written by S. Tsymbal in the journal *Smena* (*Change*) stated that the theatre "ought not to have staged the play at all".<sup>97</sup> But the successful performances of the play continued. In the space of two months the play was staged in the Leningrad Bol'shoi Dramaticheskii Theatre thirty-five times, until the article by an anonymous critic named the "Ukrainian" (*Ukrainets*) -- *Pravda*, 4 March 1932 -- sounded the death knell for *Sonata*

*Pathétique* This article attacked the play in the most bitter terms, calling it a fascist and nationalistic work, and scolded those who in the past voiced a favourable opinion of Kulish's play. The date of 24 March 1932 marked the last time that Kulish's play was presented in either Moscow or Leningrad .

*Sonata Pathétique* was staged in other Russian cities such as Kostroma and Baku, and got as far as the rehearsal stage in Kazan'. The play was also in preparation for staging in Berlin in a German translation by F. Wolff, but for some unexplained reason the actual production was never realized.<sup>98</sup>

The identity of "The Ukrainian" [*Ukrainets*] who so effectively cut off productions of *Sonata Pathétique* remains a mystery to this day. However, there is a supposition that he was Lazar Kaganovich, Stalin's strongman and Party Secretary in the Ukraine from 1925 to 1928, who led a fierce struggle against the powerful representatives of Ukrainian national culture and political life such as Oleksandr Shumsky, Mykola Khvylovy, and the literary organization Vaplite. In Stalin's infamous and élite group of right-hand men, Kaganovich was considered the most informed on Ukrainian affairs. As well there were two Ukrainian Bolshevik writers, the critic Andrii Khvyliia and Ivan Kulyk, who represented the faction favouring centralization in the Ukraine and who were also responsible for preventing the production of the play on Ukrainian stages. To this day there is no concrete conclusive evidence to prove the truth of either supposition.<sup>99</sup>

The popularity of *Sonata Pathétique* spread very quickly throughout Russian theatres, but by then the Bolshevik authorities came to realize that Kulish's play was a rebuttal to *The Days of the Turbins*. While the Bolsheviks mercilessly destroyed the Ukrainian population and culture, the anti-Ukrainian mood expressed in Bulgakov's play became, according to

Stalin, "a necessary and useful tool"<sup>100</sup> in that destructive war. By the beginning of January 1932, after the appearance of Osinsky's and Alpers' articles it was obvious that the stage-life of *Sonata Pathétique* would be cut short. At the same time, according to critics, the production of *The Days of the Turbins* "was unexpectedly and hastily renewed".<sup>101</sup> Bulgakov himself was surprised by the news and in his letter to P. Popov dated 25 January 1932 Bulgakov writes:

Do you already know? Did the news reach you in Leningrad and Tiarleve? Not yet? Then here you are: On 16 January I received a call from the theatre and they informed me that *The Days* will be quickly revived. I am pleased to admit the announcement took me by complete surprise. I lost my physical strength. A joy rushed from within me, but suddenly a melancholy took over. O my heart, my heart!<sup>102</sup>

In another letter to Popov of 24 April 1932 Bulgakov states:

The play was staged on 18 February. From Tverskaia [Blvd] to the theatre people were standing and constantly repeating: "Do you have an extra ticket?" The same was happening on the Dmitrovka [Street] side. I was not in the audience [during the performance]. I was behind the scenes and the actors were so very excited that their excitement infected me ... the play was received with delight. The actors were called back twenty times to take a bow.<sup>103</sup>

After its "rehabilitation" in 1932 *The Days of the Turbins* continued to be staged (with some interruptions) to the present day. No discussion concerning its political harmfulness to Soviet society was ever made after its re-staging. *Sonata Pathétique*, on the other hand, was put on stage only

during the thaw on 29 December 1958 under the direction of Nikolai Orlov in an Odessa theatre named after the October Revolution. Even during the thaw, however, *Sonata Pathétique* was never presented according to Kulish's original conception. Orlov, like his counterpart Tairov, presented the play as an heroic-revolutionary play, but he minimized to an even greater extent the lyrical role of Il'ko, focussing instead on the mass scenes and the class and national conflicts. The scenery by M. Martovych was similar to those of V. Ryndin in the Kamernyi Theatre (featuring a cut-away of a four-storey building). The main emphasis in the play was on the characters of Ovrarn and Zinka, the Bolsheviks Luka and Hamar, and the sailor Sud'ba. The character of Il'ko was given a secondary role. The stage director eliminated all of Il'ko's lyric parts, obliterating his poetic image in favour of greater emphasis on the secondary character of the Bolshevik Hamar, turning him into a prophet of the future. Similar to Konstantin Fedin's character Kurt from the novel *Goroda i gody (Cities and Years)*, Hamar proclaims words uttered by those of future generations, living fifty years after the Revolution, and envying its participants. Luka, Hamar, and Sud'ba were also given different interpretations from those found in Kulish's original manuscript. Their words resounded with "Soviet historical truth".<sup>104</sup>

As to the music in the production of the Odessa theatre, Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique" was replaced by fragments of his other works, in particular his music for Goethe's tragedy *Egmont*, thereby changing the main function of the musical score. The "Sonata Pathétique" was no longer fully incorporated into the textual web of Kulish's play. Neither the *Adagio* nor the touching *Grave* (included in the stage direction as revealing Il'ko's inner world) were played. In fact Il'ko's character lost its significance completely. According to Kuziakina, "the text of the original *Sonata*

*Pathétique* was hardly recognizable in the play. Even the name of the play lost its meaning."<sup>105</sup>

This version of the play resulted in the appearance of only a few reviews, all of them quite positive. Ivan Duz' in his article "Pro zlist' i prozrinnia narodu" (About People's Anger and Enlightenment") in the Odessa's paper *Chornomors'ka komuna* (*The Black Sea Commune*) of 11 January 1959 praised the production for "raising the role of the people", and making "Hamar the soul, the leader and the organizer of the people in their fight for a better life".

The Odessa's critics M. Levchenko and A. Nedzvids'ky also praised Orlov's production for its aesthetic-ideological assumptions of Soviet realism: for "bringing the people fighting for the Revolutionary cause to the front", while "removing the traitor Il'ko" to the secondary plan. They approved the converting of it into a play "about people deciding their fate", not into a play "about Il'ko and his mistakes". Nedzvids'ky concluded that "time helped [one] better understand the meaning of the play."<sup>106</sup>

*Sonata Pathétique* was staged for the first time in Kiev in 1966 in the Ivan Franko Theatre. The production took form under the watchful eye of a group of directors with D. Alexidze in charge. In its staging he and his assistant directors (P. Sergienko, G. Makaruk, and M. Merzlikin) treated the play according to the already established heroic-revolutionary style. Alexidze went as far as "to add to and to simplify the text of Kulish's play using his own judgement."<sup>107</sup> Such important scenes as Stupay's fortune-telling and his command to Perotsky: "A Russian general out of Ukraine, quick march!" were omitted. Others were misinterpreted: the shoemakers were converted into active revolutionaries distributing leaflets. The dialogue between Mykesha and his friend who wanted to learn every

language, presented with mild humour by Kulish, was transformed into a scene of two degenerate drunkards. All of these changes, taken together, impoverished Kulish's play. The real hero that emerged from the Ivan Franko Theatre production was Ovrám. Kulish's well-meaning Stupay-Stupanenko, who wanted to reconcile Ukrainians of all political conceptions was changed into a silly, foolish little man who was teased by everyone, even by his daughter Maryna. The heroine Maryna, whose portrayal determines the whole nature of the play, was highly simplified. In Alexidze's interpretation, she loved neither Il'ko nor André but used them both in order to achieve her political goals. This most lyrical and tragic character in the play (Maryna) was reduced to a shrew, slapping André's face for proclaiming the supremacy of Russian power in Ukraine.

The most noteworthy and creative part of the 1966 production was the innovative (for the 1960s) decorative design by D. Lider. Similar to the 1931 production of the Kamernyi theatre, the artist showed a cut-away of a many-storeyed building. He also depicted the changing seasons: spring with fresh colouring, autumn with a waning moon and the backdrop to depict the sky. However the artist was not successful in creating a symbol for the entire play. The church's cupola rising behind the building looked inappropriate and incomprehensible. The composer Vsevolod Rozhdestvensky incorporated into the play different revolutionary marches in order to adjust them to the new revision. As one observer noticed, "It appears as though neither the director nor the composer wanted to convey an adequate reading of Kulish's play."<sup>108</sup>

The reviews of the Franko Theatre production were mainly positive. Mykhailo Ostryk supported the play's revival but did not comment on its

production.<sup>109</sup> At the discussion during the theatre tour in Moscow, the critic I. Vishnevskaiia praised the play highly . She found that

the play is not only well written and interesting, it towers above many other plays we have seen before, as it encompasses the philosophy of its time, and it gives us a chance to think about things that move us in the present.<sup>110</sup>

The play was staged by N. Oporkov in the Krasnoiarsk Youth Theatre after the publication of *Sonata Pathétique* and *Maklena Grassa* in Russian by the *Iskusstvo* publishing house in 1964. This production was considered by far the closest interpretation to Kulish's motivating idea, as it presented its full pathos while at the same time in Il'ko's story conducted a dialogue with young contemporaries about one's responsibility to the motherland. Il'ko was depicted not only as a passive dreamer, but as a humanist full of love for people; even his saving of his betrayer André's life is motivated by universal human love. Maryna is a very strong character prepared to make any sacrifices in order to achieve her goals. The theme of Ukraine raised in the scenes of revolutionary battles and ideological clashes almost completely loses its momentum. Nevertheless the theme of the moral worthlessness of the ancien regime's defenders was enhanced and amplified, thus strengthening the importance of the figures of General Perotsky and his son Georges.

Unlike other theatres, the Krasnoiarsk Youth Theatre did not emphasize or give vivid expression to the mass scenes. The production received positive reviews in Leningrad during the company's tour in May 1966. In his article "Pateticheskaiia sonata na stsene TIUZa" ("*Sonata Pathétique* in the Stage of TIUZ") in the paper *Krasnoiarskii rabochii* (*Krasnoiarsk Worker*) of 26 May 1966 V. Rube gave a fair review of the play

for being close to the writer's conceptions. His only negative criticism was about its political-aesthetic conception: the depiction of "poor mass scenes which diminished the role of people in the Revolution".

According to Les' Taniuk, the play was also staged and well received in the Lithuanian capital Vilnius in 1972.<sup>111</sup> The stage director Iurii Strega managed to relate the problem of Ukrainian nationalism versus the individual and society to similar problems facing contemporary Lithuanians.

The stage history of *The Days of the Turbins* and *Sonata Pathétique* not only shows the fate of two interpretations of the Revolution in Ukraine and two artistic programmes, but it also reflects the struggle of the two writers to save their plays. On a larger scale it bears witness to the destiny of a whole generation of artists who wasted so much of their talent adjusting their works to the demands of censorship and party members.

## Chapter Six

The Dialogue Cut Short

One can say that the writers underwent similar troubles and experience at the pre-staging and initial-staging periods of their plays. Like many writers of their times, who openly expressed their beliefs, they had to compromise their views and talents with the Bolshevik régime in order to have their works either published or produced on stage. With the constant interference of the Bolshevik régime in writers' work and lives, it became inevitable that the dialogue initiated between these two writers of kindred cultures would suffer obtrusive interruption from the Party.

After the re-habilitation of *The Days of the Turbins* in April of 1932, the future started to look more promising for Bulgakov. He was married for the third time, this time to a very influential woman from the new "Soviet élite". In July 1932 Gor'ky (who was always impressed by Bulgakov's talent) commissioned him to write *Zhizn' gospodina de Mol'era* (*The Life of Monsieur de Molière*) for the series "The Life of Remarkable People", started by Gor'ky in 1930. In early March 1934, Bulgakov moved to "a wonderful building",<sup>1</sup> and, according to S. Ermolinskii, his "nervous excitement ... had disappeared, as if his affairs had taken a sharp and sudden turn for the better, as if the dangers and threats had gone, and life had at last taken a quiet turn."<sup>2</sup> His financial situation seemed quite good at that time: he was receiving honoraria from abroad<sup>3</sup> where, according to his letter to Veresaev of 26 July 1943, he hoped to go himself that summer.<sup>4</sup>

In August 1934 the newly founded Union of Writers organized the first Congress of Soviet Writers. Although he was freely allowed to work in

subjects he himself had selected, Bulgakov was not invited to the Congress,<sup>5</sup> very likely to keep him out of possible trouble. The precaution was a wise one. Soon after the proceedings Osip Mandel'shtam, for example, was arrested for criticizing the Congress.

By the end of 1934, after Stalin organized the assassination of Kirov, the great repression which took the lives of thousands of intellectuals and other innocent people began. Bulgakov's writing career, however, continued to flourish. In February 1935 he took a trip to Kiev probably, as Proffer suggests, "to help him in his adaptations of Gogol."<sup>6</sup>

In the same time, the successful première of his play *Molière* took place at MKhAT, and by 11 February, Bulgakov had made his final decision to write a play about Stalin. Scholars disagree about the circumstances surrounding the decision to undertake this project; his exact reasons still remain unknown. "His detractors", as Proffer puts it, "sometimes like to imply that Bulgakov admired Stalin",<sup>7</sup> but "some close to Bulgakov had declared ... that it was essentially his wife's [Elena Shilovskaia's] idea, prompted by the thought that Bulgakov might become publishable once more."<sup>8</sup> Avril Pyman thinks that "perhaps ... the romantic streak in his nature and the mass hypnosis of the time led him [Bulgakov] to see Stalin himself as a man of truer greatness than appears to have been the case."<sup>9</sup> Interest in the subject was also connected to Beria's "History of the Bolshevik Organization in the Caucasus", a report delivered 21-22 July 1935.<sup>10</sup> At the time Bulgakov was writing a textbook on the history of the USSR for Soviet high schools. In the second volume of the *History*, Bulgakov devoted many pages to the subject of Stalin's early political activities in the city of Batumi (Georgia).<sup>11</sup> The play *Batum* (originally named *The Monk*) was to be staged in 1939 as a present for Stalin's sixtieth

birthday, but Stalin himself refused to have the play staged, saying (according to Chudakova), "All young people are the same."<sup>12</sup> Avril Pyman states that while Stalin had enjoyed the play, he disliked the idea "of allowing a mere actor to represent him on the stage", and this led to his prohibiting any performance.<sup>13</sup>

In the fall of 1936 Bulgakov left MKhAT and accepted a position at the Bolshoi Theatre as a librettist. He wrote the libretto for Asafiev's opera *Minin and Pozharskiĭ*; he also worked with eminent composers like Shostakovich and Prokofiev. Although his play *Ivan Vasilevich* continued to run at the Satirical Theatre and *The Days of the Turbins* enjoyed success on the stage of MKhAT, Bulgakov (according to V. Lakshin) understood that the time for plays was over,<sup>14</sup> and he turned to what he thought was his best genre - prose.

At the end of March 1936 Bulgakov again went to Kiev where MKhAT was on tour with *The Days of the Turbins*, although no comment was ever made about its reception. In a letter to Gdeshinsky the writer expressed his possessive love of the city: "When I walked in the parks during the days, a strange feeling struck me. My land! Sadness, sweetness, anxiety!"<sup>15</sup>

Following Maxim Gor'ky's mysterious death on 18 June 1936, the Kamenev-Zinoviev show-trial opened in August, exposing the "enemies of the people" charged with plotting the death of Kirov and Stalin; it ended with the execution of sixteen of Kamenev's and Zinoviev's defenders, among them well-known writers and intellectuals labelled "White-Guardists". Bulgakov, however, survived this event.

During the final years of his life he wrote his *Theatrical Novels* and his masterpiece *The Master and Margarita*. He also spent a great deal of

time adapting his favourite works by Gogol' for the stage and translating Molière.

In Russian literature Bulgakov is a special case, he belongs to the very few successful careers in Soviet literature. Proffer states.

Some writers died in their prime before they could produce a solid body of work. Other writers began brilliantly and ended by compromising their talent. Far too many simply turned away from their real vocation and wrote anything but literature, and survived -- but not as writers... Bulgakov managed to have what can be called a career. He wrote throughout his adult life, right up until months before his death. In his country's carnivorous age he, a former member of the White Army, a true enemy of radical revolution, died in bed.<sup>16</sup>

Bulgakov's death was noticed -- even resented -- by Stalin himself. Pyman mentions "a curious epilogue" about Bulgakov's death recounted by his friend Yermolinsky:

On 10 March at four o'clock in the afternoon he [Bulgakov] died. For some reason it always seems to me as though it had been at dawn. The next morning -- or perhaps the same day, time has become confused in my memory, but I think it was the next morning -- the telephone rang. I answered it. It was from Stalin's Secretariat. A voice asked: 'Is it true Comrade Bulgakov is dead?' 'Yes, he is dead.' The receiver was replaced in silence.<sup>17</sup>

One can fully agree with Proffer's conclusion of Bulgakov study, when she says,

A writer is judged two ways: by posterity and in the context of

his own times. Posterity does not consider Bulgakov's career enviable in any way. If we look at Bulgakov's life in the context of his times, however, it is hard to see a martyr of Soviet literature, as Bulgakov is sometimes painted. He made his most loved characters live on the stage of his favorite theater, he finished what he knew was his major work, and he died in bed. He was a lucky man.<sup>18</sup>

Bulgakov's contemporary, Kulish, came to literature through the Socialist Revolution. Unlike Bulgakov, he fought against the old régime in the name of revolutionary ideals. Shortly after the banning of his play *Sonata Pathétique* on the night of 12-13 May 1932 in the "Slovo" building in Knarkiv, where many Ukrainian writers and artists resided, his close friend M. Ialovyj was arrested. That very day Kulish's close associate and inspirational force, Khvylovy, committed suicide. Although the Ukrainian writers understood that their end was coming, Kulish promised his wife that he would find "the strength to fight to the end."<sup>19</sup> Antonina Kulish recalls that in a private conversation with her husband, Hryhorii Epik said, "Now, Mykola, whatever we write, they will not pay attention to us, our end has already come."<sup>20</sup>

In 1933 the Union of Ukrainian Writers was formed, but Kulish was not admitted. Considered by then the founder of Ukrainian Soviet drama, Kulish, like Bulgakov, was not invited to the Congress of Soviet Writers taking place in Moscow in August 1933. According to his wife's recollection, Kulish had great hopes for the Congress, as he was preparing himself to discuss common problems with his Russian colleagues and to reach a better mutual understanding.<sup>21</sup> Zinkevich wrote to Kulish after the Congress expressing his surprise at Kulish's absence, but at the end of 1933,

this promoter of Ukrainian literature and Kulish's personal friend was also exiled.

In September 1934 another crucial event took place in Kulish's life, a meeting "to purge the Writer's party organization". A member of the Communist Party since 1922 and its devoted servant, Kulish was accused, according to documents quoted by Sviatoslav Hordynskyi, of "unethical behaviour in a co-operative settlement",<sup>22</sup> and of "refusing to pay a visit to the countryside."<sup>23</sup> As a result of the "purge" he was excluded from the ranks of the Communist Party.

In December 1934 Kirov was assassinated. That very same night in the "Slovo" building a number of writers were arrested, among them: O. Vysnna, H. Epik, V. Pidmohyl'nyi, V. Polishchuk, M. Voron'ko, V. Gzhytskii, M. Pidubnyk, O. Dosvitnii, and A. Richetskii. The last two were executed immediately after the arrest. The same day Kulish's school-mate and best friend Iv. Dniprovskyi died in Yalta (from tuberculosis). Kulish went to Yalta to take his friend's body back to Kharkiv. On 6 December, on his way to Dniprovskyi's funeral, Kulish was arrested.

Following his arrest, on 8 December 1934, NKVD <sup>24</sup> officers conducted a six-hour search of his home. According to Antonina Kulish, they "turned their house upside down, they undid the pillows and the mattresses".<sup>25</sup> Among the items confiscated from his apartment were Kulish's most valuable things, his photographs, his passport and his party membership card, his last and probably best play *Taki (Such)* which has never been found. This search irrevocably sealed Kulish's fate. A few days after the arrest, his family was evicted from their home, their personal belongings were confiscated, and their daughter Ol'ha (like Maryna Stupay-Stupanenko) was deprived of her piano.

Before being deported to the Solovetski Islands in the White Sea, Kulish underwent interrogations and torture. During her last meeting with her husband in Kiev on 26 June 1936, Antonina Kulish recalls her husband saying:

Tell everyone in the free world outside, my little old lady, that here they do not interrogate or torture. All these are lies ... He looked into my eyes, and I understood that they were interrogating him, that they were torturing him, and that he was forcing himself to pronounce each single word. His whole appearance was telling me that.<sup>26</sup>

No one knows where Kulish ended his days. According to the Ukrainian stage director Les' Taniuk, it was rumoured that the Ukrainian writer died along with the eminent stage director Les' Kurbas and "other Ukrainian prisoners of the Solovetski Island camp on 9 October 1937. It was alleged that "a large group of prisoners was taken out on the White Sea in a barge, shot, then thrown into the waters with weights around their feet."<sup>27</sup>

In his last letter written to his wife, dated 17 June 1937, it is evident that Kulish was aware of his coming end. He wrote:

...Don't worry about me, my darling, don't bother sending me money, I don't need it, I still have 10 roubles from last year, and that will be enough for three or four months. When I need it, I will write to you. I worry that I haven't received your letters and I worry about the health of the children. I miss you so much and my wretched state is worse than an illness ... I am sending you and the children a *poor wretch's*<sup>28</sup> greeting. I think about you every minute and wish you and the children all the health and good one can imagine, my darling little old lady!<sup>29</sup>

The writer was anxious about his family, since family members of exiled dissidents were often arrested or exiled themselves. Mykola Kulish was rehabilitated as a writer in 1957, but his ideas were never rehabilitated. His plays were staged either in an unrecognizable context, greatly distorted by stage directors, or treated with great caution. In contrast, Bulgakov's plays are freely staged both in the Soviet Union and by Western theatres.

The Ukrainian Young Theatre directed by Les' Taniuk was to open its 1988 theatre season in the city of L'viv with Kulish's play *Myna Mazailo*. The tickets were sold out long before the opening, but the city administration cancelled the production in order to avoid nationalistic demonstrations, as the problems raised seemed to outpace the current democratic changes in the U.S.S.R.

### Conclusion

Artistically superior to the plethora of early Soviet plays, *The Days of the Turbins* and *Sonata Pathétique* raise the complex problems of co-existence and parallel development faced by Russian and Ukrainian cultures. They respond to the political and intellectual debate between these two neighbouring and kindred nations.

Bulgakov and Kulish founded their works upon the already existing literary traditions of their cultures. Bulgakov based his writing on the tradition of Russian classical drama from Alexandr Ostrovsky to Anton Chekhov. Kulish found inspiration for his drama in the sources of Ukrainian folklore and the baroque *vertep* (puppet theatre), but was also affected by the penetration of contemporary European theatrical modernism into Ukrainian literature.

Bulgakov, while remaining within the tradition of the classic Russian drama injected into his writing some features of the new Soviet realism. Kulish, however, was influenced by Khvylovy's ideas of developing Ukrainian culture apart from Russian influence and orienting it toward that of the West. This created, as Friedrich Wolf pointed out, "a unique piece of art having no immediate literary match in Western dramaturgy." Kulish uses the music of Beethoven's "Sonata Pathétique" which is interwoven with the action of the play to reflect an individual's search for personal truth and a national identity.

Both Bulgakov and Kulish were able to depict the events in Ukraine through aesthetic and philosophical systems that captured the views of many intellectuals in their circles. Each author's personal feelings and understanding of the epoch are synthesized in the dramatic form. It is clear

that both Bulgakov and Kulish hoped that the historical events unleashed upon their nation would take a different course from the tragic one depicted. Both writers, however, strove to portray the revolutionary forces with personal honesty and artistic integrity.

The plays illuminate numerous historical relationships and problems existing between the two cultures; these had been developing for more than two and half centuries under a powerful, oppressive régime that had gradually imposed the political and cultural dominance of Russia over Ukraine. Bulgakov and Kulish were, each in his own way, intellectual products of this régime. Bulgakov fought to preserve the dominance of the Russian culture in Ukraine and in his play he assigns a messianic role to the White Guards as carriers and protectors of this culture. At the same time he did not express any feeling of sympathy for the native people and underestimated the role and, indeed, the rights of other social and political groups involved in the historical upheaval. Kulish tried to examine the existing problems and events in Ukraine as an objective socio-political viewer without "any traces of hypocrisy". The Ukrainian writer strove to do justice to all co-existing and struggling political and social forces, and to give them a degree of attention proportionate to their weight in the complex historical process, although a definite emphasis is placed on the rising new social classes -- the new intelligentsia, descended from the poorest social strata and the working class.

Although the plays share some characteristics in terms of their treatment of characters and artistic devices, the uniqueness of their formal qualities, the differences in their styles, and their incompatible approaches to the same subject, serve in themselves as a refutation of Russian and recent Soviet teleological imperatives that stress the future unification of

the two cultures and the past derivation of Ukrainian literature from that of Russia.

This study, which focusses on a single historical event depicted in literature -- the Revolution and the Civil War of 1917-1919 in Ukraine -- is a small contribution to the discussion of the larger and more contentious subject of the co-existence and development of the Ukrainian and Russian literatures. Further studies in comparative analysis of the two literatures are required for a better understanding of their relationship, their common roots as well as the different dynamics operating in each. It is impossible to equate the formal system and philosophical conviction of the two writers, Bulgakov and Kulish. In much the same way one cannot blur the differences between the two literatures, however tempting such an exercise appears, by virtue of cultural proximity. The dialectic of literary development owes as much to antithesis as it does to synthesis.

## Notes to Introduction

<sup>1</sup> The best studies on the impact of Ukrainian culture on Russian during that period have been done by George S. N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol and Shevchenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine, 1798-1847* (Munich 1971) and David Saunders, *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture 1750-1850* (Edmonton 1985).

<sup>2</sup> The literary debates and currents of the twenties have been analysed in George S. N. Luckyj, *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934* (New York 1956) and Iurii Lavrinenko, *Roztriliane vidrodzhennia: Antolohia, 1917-1933* (Munich, 1957), Myroslav Shkandrij, "The Literary Discussion in Ukraine, 1925-1928" (Ph. D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1980). Valuable commentary can be found in Hryhorii Kostyuk's edition of Mykola Khvylovy's *Tvory v piat'okh tomakh* (New York- Baltimore-Toronto, 1978-1986), and in his *U Sviti idei i obraziv: Vybrane; Krytychni ta istoryko-literaturni rozdumy, 1930-1980* (Sucasnist', 1983). Indispensable critical studies are to be found in Ivan Koshelivets, *Suchasna literatura v URSS* (New York, 1964); Iurii Sherekh, *Ne dlia ditei: Literaturno-krytychni statti i esei* (New York, 1964), and *Druha cherha: Literatura, teatr, ideolohii* (Sucasnist, 1978); Iurii Lavrinenko, *Zrub i parosty: Literaturno-krytychni statti, esei, refleksii* (Sucasnist, 1971), *Chorna purha ta inshi spomyyny* (Sucasnist, 1985).

<sup>3</sup> See Mykola Khvylovy, *The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine. Polemical Pamphlets, 1925-1926* Translated, Edited and Introduced by Myroslav Shkandrij. (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986).

<sup>4</sup> See: Pavlo Fylypovych, "Ukrains'ke literaturnoznavstvo za desiat' rokiv revoliutsii," in Vseukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk, Komisia novitnoho ukrains'koho pys'menstva, *Literatura, Zbirnyk 1*, ed. by S. Iefremov, M. Zerov, and P. Fylypovych (Kharkiv 1928): 5-28 and Mykola Zerov, *Lektsii z istorii ukrains'koi literatury (1789-1870)*, ed. Doreen W. Gorsline and Oksana Solovey (Oakville: Mozaik Press, 1977).

Zerov's studies concentrate mainly on Ukrainian themes in Russian literature.

<sup>5</sup> Oleksandr Bilets'kyi, *Zibrannia prats' u p'iaty tomakh*, Vol. 4. (Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Naukova dumka", 1966) 623.

<sup>6</sup> Bilets'kyi, *Zibrannia prats'* 624.

<sup>7</sup> Ivan Franko, *Poezii i poemy*, Vol XI (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Khudozhn'oi literatury, 1952) 439-497.

<sup>8</sup> Ivan Franko, "Formal'nyi i real'nyi natsionalizm" in *Ivan Franko Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatydesiaty tomakh*, Vol 27 (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1980) 355.

<sup>9</sup> Natalia Kuziakina, *Lesia Ukrainka and Aleksandr Blok* (Kiev: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1980) 5.

<sup>10</sup> See Mykhailo Drai-Khmara, *Z literaturno-naukovoï spadshchyny* (New York-Paris-Sydney-Toronto: Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1979) 342. The letter had been printed in the magazine VAPLITE while Mykola Kulish was its editor, it was reprinted several times in different editions and periodicals such as: Hryhorii Kostliuk *Zustrichi i proshchannia. Spohady. Knyha persha* (Edmonton: Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987) 281, and in *Ukrainian news* 18 May 1987: 3. This letter was Gorky's reply to the editor-in-chief of the Kharkiv "Knyhospilka," Oleksa Andriievych Sliarenko, who wrote to the Russian writer asking his

permission to edit in a condensed form the Ukrainian translation of his novel *Mat' (Mother)*. The copy of the letter was widely known among Ukrainian writers, and reads as follows:

Dear Aleksei Andreevich,

I flatly refuse the simplification of my novel *Mat'*. I also think that its translation into the Ukrainian dialect is unnecessary. The fact surprises me that some people, while following the same goal, do not only confirm the differences in dialects, but try to prove that dialects are "languages" themselves. While doing so they also oppress those Great Russians (*velikorusskie*) who are a minority in those regions where that dialect is used. During the old regime I strongly protested against such a phenomenon. I believe that during the new regime it is necessary to eliminate everything that prevents people from helping each other. It is strange that some are trying to create an "international language," while others do the opposite.

A. Peshkov [Maxim Gorki]

<sup>11</sup> Ralph Lindheim, "Intro. to Mykola Kulish's *Sonata Pathétique*", ed. George S. N. Luckyj, trans. George S. N. and Moira Luckyj. (Colorado: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975) 1-3. Ludmila Duca Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright," diss. U. of Stanford, 1981, 87-9. Eliendea K. Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* (Ardis: Ann Arbor, 1984) 204. Antony Colin Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov: Life and Interpretations* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978) 91, and others.

## Notes to Chapter One

Mikhail Bulgakov, Mykola Kulish, and Their Age

<sup>1</sup> Lidia Ianovskaia, *Tvorcheskii put' Mikhaila Bulgakova* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983) 23-55. Ianovskaia states that in the Journal *Nakanune* of 9 March 1924 Iurii Si'ozkin acknowledges that *The White Guard* was the first part of a trilogy planned by the writer, covering the period of 1918-1919. Bulgakov planned to create a "big thing... to fit the epoch of Civil War and Revolution. It was the first attempt ever to reflect that great epoch in literature."

<sup>2</sup> Mikhail Bulgakov, "Avtobiografia," *Sovetskie pisateli. Avtobiografii*, 3 vols. (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966) 3: 86.

<sup>3</sup> V. A. Chebotareva, "K istorii sozdania 'Beloi Gvardii'," *Russkaia literatura*, March 1974: 148.

<sup>4</sup> Chebotareva, "K istorii sozdania 'Beloi Gvardii'" 148.

<sup>5</sup> Ellendea Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* (Ardis: Ann Arbor, 1984) 140.

<sup>6</sup> Chebotareva, "K istorii sozdania 'Beloi Gvardii'" 149.

<sup>7</sup> Marieta Chudakova, "K tvorcheskoi biografii M. Bulgakova 1916-1923," *Voprosy literatury*, July 1973: 243. Lidia Ianovskaia, *Tvorcheskii put' Mikhaila Bulgakova* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983) 23-55.

<sup>8</sup> Anthony C. Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretations* (University of Toronto Press, 1978) 65.

<sup>9</sup> Chebotarova, "K istorii sozdania 'Beloi Gvardii'" 151.

<sup>10</sup> Anatolii Smellanskii, *Mikhail Bulgakov v Khudozhestvennom teatre* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983) 12.

<sup>11</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" in *Mykola Kulish. Tvory* (New York: The Ukrainian Akademy of Arts in the U.S.A. 1955) 408.

<sup>12</sup> *Cheka* – Bolshevik political police of the War Communism period (1917–1921).

<sup>13</sup> Mykola Kulish, "Letter to I. Dniprovs'kyi of 17. VII, 1924," *Prapor*, July 1958: 87.

<sup>14</sup> Kulish, "Letter to I. Dniprovs'kyi of 17.VII 1924" 96.

<sup>15</sup> Kulish, "Letter to I. Dniprovs'kyi of 24. XII 1924" 96.

<sup>16</sup> *Hart (Tempering)*– the first union of Ukrainian proletarian writers led by Vasyl' Ellan-Blakytnyi, existed from January 1923 until the autumn of 1925.

<sup>17</sup> Kulish, "Letters to I. Dniprovs'kyi" 98.

<sup>18</sup> Kulish, "Letters to I. Dniprovs'kyi" 98.

<sup>19</sup> Eldabexth – a popular name for the city of Odessa.

<sup>20</sup> Kulish, "Letters to I. Dniprovs'kyi" 101.

<sup>21</sup> Alla Mikhailova, Introduction, "Nine Plays out of Many," *Classic Soviet Plays*. Trans. Yuri Kopylov. (Moscow: Progress, 1979) 15.

<sup>22</sup> Mikhailova, "Nine Plays of our Many" 15.

<sup>23</sup> A. V. Lunacharskii, *Sobranie Sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1964) 3: 328.

<sup>24</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 201–3.

<sup>25</sup> N. Gorchakov, *The Theatre in Soviet Russia*, trans. Edgar Lehrman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957) 186–7. Quoted in Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and interpretation* 90.

<sup>26</sup> Walter Duranty, "Red Intelligentsia is Stirred by Play," *New York Times* 7 November 1926, 20:1.

<sup>27</sup> Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 68.

- <sup>28</sup> Natalia Kuziakina, *Mykola Kulish dramaturh* (Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1970) 254.
- <sup>29</sup> Bohdan Nahailo, "Bulgakov and the Ukrainians: Background to a Current Dispute," *The Ukrainian Weekly*, No.51 (20 Dec. 1987): 12.
- <sup>30</sup> George N. S. Luckyj, *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine 1917-1934* (New York: Columbia University Press) 41-59. Myroslav Shkandrij, "The Literary Discussion in Soviet Ukraine, 1925-1928," Diss. University of Toronto, 1980. Myroslav Shkandrij, Introduction, "Mykola Khvylovy and the Literary Discussion," *The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine* by Mykola Khvylovy (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986) 1-26.
- <sup>31</sup> Iurii Lavrynenko, *Roztriliane vidrodzhennia* (Munich: Institut Literatski, 1959) 654.
- <sup>32</sup> Mykola Kulish, *Narodnyi Malakhii* (New York: The Ukrainian Academy of Arts in the U. S. A., 1955) 178.
- <sup>33</sup> National nihilists -- Ukrainian intellectuals who rejected the importance of their national heritage and gave priority to Russian culture.
- <sup>34</sup> Kuziakina, *Mykola Kulish dramaturh* 253.
- <sup>35</sup> Lidia Ianovskaia, *Tvorcheskii put' Mikhaïla Bulgakova* 12-3.
- <sup>36</sup> M. A. Bulgakov, "Kiev-gorod" in *Sobranie Sochinenii* (Ardis: Ann Arbor, 1982) 330.
- <sup>37</sup> Bulgakov, *Sobranie Sochinenii* 336.
- <sup>38</sup> V. Piatnychenko, "Z zapysok konsula" (From the Consul's Notes) *Literaturnyi Iarmarok*, 3 (1929): 178-83.
- <sup>39</sup> *Chorna Rada (The Black Council)* -- the first Ukrainian historical (Scottian) novel written in 1857 by Panteleimon Kulish, T. Shevchenko's contemporary and a member of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood.

- 40 Piatnychenko, "Intermedia lehkovazhnosty" *Literaturnyi larmarok*, 3 (1929): 176-7.
- 41 Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 408.
- 42 *Roztorgueva* originates from the Russian *rostorgovat'*- to resell someone else's merchandize.
- 43 Kursk - a provincial town in Russia.
- 44 M. Kulish, *Myna Mazailo* (Praha: Vydavnytstvo "Kolos," 1940) 65.
- 45 Kulish, *Myna Mazailo* 65-6.
- 46 Kulish, *Myna Mazailo* 66.
- 47 Kulish, *Myna Mazailo* 65-6.
- 48 Kulish, *Myna Mazailo* 62.
- 49 Kuziakian, *Mykola Kulish dramaturh* 329.
- 50 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 71.
- 51 Kuziakina, *Mykola Kulish dramaturh* 331.
- 52 Lunacharskii, *Sobranie Sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*, 3: 327-8.
- 53 Kuziakina, *Mykola Kulish dramaturh* 331.
- 54 Kuziakina, *Mykola Kulish dramaturh* 331.
- 55 Mikhail Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins*, transl. Michael Glenny (London: Eyre Methuen, 1979) 52.
- 56 Mikhail Bulgakov, "Samogonnoe ozero" ("Moonshine Lake") in *M. A. Bulgakov, Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 1 (Ardis: Ann Arbor, 1982) 344.
- 57 Mykola Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique*, Trans. George S. N. and Moira Luckyj (Colorado: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975) 51.
- 58 "Os' de, liudy, nasha slava..." Dialogue between the writer Oles' Berdnyk and the *kobzar* Vasyli' Lytwyn about the fate of the *kobzars*; *Literaturna Ukraina* 3 Nov. 1988: 8.

<sup>59</sup> Dmitri Shostakovich, *Testimony. The Memoirs of Dmitri Shostakovich* as related to and edited by Solomon Volkov, transl. Antonina W. Bouis (New York: Limelight Editions, 1984) 214-5.

<sup>60</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 81-2.

<sup>61</sup> momy revolution - from the word *mama* - a term used by thugs and bandits to tell places where they could fit or find refuge and shelter.

<sup>62</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 82.

<sup>63</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 109.

<sup>64</sup> V. Lakshin, "O proze Mukhailla Bulgakova i o nem samom," Intro. *Mikhail Bulgakov. Izbrannaia proza* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia Literatura, 1966) 15.

<sup>65</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 88.

<sup>66</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 88.

<sup>67</sup> Ianovskaia, *Tvorcheskii put' Mikhaila Bulgakova* 11-2.

<sup>68</sup> David Saunder, *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture 1750-1850* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studied, 1985).

<sup>69</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 78.

<sup>70</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 82.

<sup>71</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 78.

<sup>72</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 91.

<sup>73</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 78.

<sup>74</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 73-5.

<sup>75</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique*, Quoted from Natalia Kuziakina, *Mykola Kulish dramaturh* 326.

## Notes to Chapter Two

Protagonists in Family and Society

- 1 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, transl. T. W. Rostel. (Ardis: Ann Arbor, 1973) 38.
- 2 Ellendea Catherine Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Works* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984): 140.
- 3 M. Bulgakov, *The White Guard*, transl. Michael Glenny, ed. Eyre Methven (London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971): 12.
- 4 Bulgakov, *The White Guard* 72.
- 5 I. M. Nusinov, "Put' Mikhaila Bulgakova," *Pechat' i revoliutsia* 18. 1-6 (1927): 40.
- 6 Nusinov, "Put' Mikhaila Bulgakova" 40.
- 7 Nusinov, "Put' Mikhaila Bulgakova" 40.
- 8 E. Mustangova, "Mikhail Bulgakov," *Pechat' i revolutsia* 14. 4-6 (1927): 87.
- 9 Bulgakov, *The White Guard* 58-59.
- 10 Nusinov, "Put' Mikhaila Bulgakova" 42.
- 11 Bulgakov, *The White Guard* 62.
- 12 Nusinov, "Put' Mikhaila Bulgakova" 42-3.
- 13 Bulgakov, *The White Guard* 70.
- 14 Bulgakov, *The White Guard* 65.
- 15 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins*
- 16 Mikhail Afanasevich Bulgakov, "Avtobiografia." In *Sovetskie pisateli. Avtobiografii*, Vol. 3 (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966) 90.

- 17 Bulgakov, *The White Guard* 65.
- 18 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 86.
- 19 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* Trans. Michael Glenny, (London: Eyre Methven Ltd., 1979), 13.
- 20 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 13.
- 21 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 86.
- 22 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 93.
- 23 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 87.
- 24 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 110.
- 25 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 111.
- 26 Mustangova, "Mikhail Bulgakov" 82.
- 27 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 111.
- 28 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 112.
- 29 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 113.
- 30 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 19.
- 31 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 24.
- 32 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 93.
- 33 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 107.
- 34 *Poslovitsy russkogo naroda* Sbornik V. Dalia, (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia Literatura, 1957), 350.
- 35 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 79.
- 36 Bulgakov, *The Days of The Turbins* 83.
- 37 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 106.
- 38 Mustangova, "Mikhail Bulgakov" 82.
- 39 Nusinov, "Put' Mikhaila Bulgakova" 44. See also: Bulgakov, *The White Guard*, 11, 26, 62.
- 40 Mustangova, "Mikhail Bulgakov" 83.

- 41 Mustangova, "Mikhail Bulgakov" 83.
- 42 Bulgakov, *The White Guard* 70-71.
- 43 M. A. Bulgakov, *Sobranie Sochinenii v Desiati Tomakh*, 10 Vol. (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1982) 1: 365.
- 44 Nusinov, "Put' Mikhaila Bulgakova" 49-50.
- 45 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 94.
- 46 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 43.
- 47 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright" 94.
- 48 Natalia Kuziakina, *Dramaturh Mykola Kulish* (Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1962): 112.
- 49 Mykola Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* Trans. George S.N. and Moira Luckyj, (Little Town, Colorado: Ukrainian Academy Press, 1975) 49.
- 50 Luba M. Dyky, "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique' by Mykola Kulish," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.* 12.1-2 (1964-68): 159.
- 51 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 55.
- 52 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 102.
- 53 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 54.
- 54 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 74.
- 55 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 103.
- 56 Dyky, "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique' by Mykola Kulish" 159-60.
- 57 Kuziakina, Natalia. *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha: literaturna i stsenichna istoria* (Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1970), p. 325.
- 58 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 330.
- 59 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 330.
- 60 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 331.

<sup>61</sup> Bulgakov, *The White Guard*

<sup>62</sup> *Prosvita* was a popular enlightenment society allowed to exist briefly after the 1905 Revolution and revived in 1917 following the overthrow of the tsarist regime. It was liquidated by the Soviet authorities in the early twenties.

<sup>63</sup> Dyky, "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique' by Mykola Kulish" 162.

<sup>63</sup> Kulish, *Sonatha Pathétique* 51.

<sup>64</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 75.

<sup>65</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 326.

<sup>66</sup> Ivan Mazepa – became Hetman of Ukraine on September 1689 after Hetman Samoilovych's exile to Siberia. Educated in Jesuit schools and European universities, Mazepa was one of the most erudite and intelligent people of his time. His life's goal was to liberate Ukraine from the Russian Empire, a task to which he consecrated all his talent. In order to develop a Ukrainian state he founded many schools and churches, and constructed a large building for the Kiev Academy. His alliance with Karl XII of Sweden led to a defeat by Peter I.

According to the Ukrainian historian Vasyli' Marochkin, who studied the notes of Mazepa's contemporary the French diplomat Jean Bluse, Mazepa's distinguished latitudinarianism was the romantic image of Voltaire's writings.

See also: Hubert F. Babinski. *The Mazepa Legend in European Romanticism* (New York and London, 1974).

<sup>68</sup> Dyky, "Some aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique' by Mykola Kulish" 162.

<sup>69</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 64.

70 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 66.

71 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 66.

72 Mykola Kulish, "Letter to Korneeva-Maslova from 2.V. 1925."

Quoted from Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 336.

73 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 56.

74 Kobyletsky, Jurii, "Revoliutsieiu narodzhenyi." Afterword, *P'esy*.

*Lysty* by Mykola Kulish (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1969) 22.

75 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 65.

76 Dyky, "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique'" 172.

77 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 73-4.

78 Dyky, "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique'" 167.

79 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 47.

80 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 342.

81 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 83.

## Notes to Chapter Three

Structure and Artistic Devices

<sup>1</sup> Lesley Milne, Intro. to Mikhail Bulgakov. *The Days of the Turbins*, trans. Michael Glenny. (London: Eyre Mathuen, 1979) XIII-XIV.

<sup>2</sup> David Magarshack, *Chekhov the Dramatist* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1960) 53.

<sup>3</sup> Magarshak, *Chekhov the Dramatist* 53.

<sup>4</sup> Magarshak, *Chekhov the Dramatist* 159-189.

<sup>5</sup> Ludmila Duca Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright," diss. U. of Stanford, 1981, 87.

<sup>6</sup> Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright," 89.

<sup>7</sup> Mikhail Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins*, trans. Michael Glenny (London: Eyre Methuen, 1979) 12.

<sup>8</sup> Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 24.

<sup>9</sup> Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 35.

<sup>10</sup> Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 39.

<sup>11</sup> Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 40.

<sup>12</sup> Elleandea K. Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* (Ardis: Ann Arbor, 1984) 204.

<sup>13</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 208.

<sup>14</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 208. The expression "judging incident" used by Elleandea Proffer is very appropriate, as the play as a whole reflects Bugakov's personal attitude to, and judgement of, the Ukrainian people.

<sup>15</sup> Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 92.

<sup>16</sup> Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 95.

- 17 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 66.
- 18 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 67.
- 19 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 69.
- 20 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 99.
- 21 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 71.
- 22 Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 212.
- 23 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 87.
- 24 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 87.
- 25 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 93.
- 26 Lindheim, "Intro. to Mykola Kulish's *Sonata Pathétique*", ed. George S. N. Luckyj, trans. Georges S. N. and Moira Luckyj (Colorado: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975) 7.
- 27 Lindheim, "Intro. to Mykola Kulish's *Sonata Pathétique*" 8.
- 28 R. Cherkasyn, "Naperedodni zolotoho iuvileiu," *Literaturna Ukraina* 21 August 1972: 4.
- 29 Irena R. Makaryk, *About the Harrowing of Hell (Slovo o zburieni u pekla). A Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian Play in its European Context*. Ed., Translated and Introduced by Irena R. Makaryk. (Edmonton and Ottawa: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1989) 47-9. Also, see Luba M. Dyky, "Some Aspects of the *Sonata Pathétique* by Mykola Kulish." *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 11.1-2: 116. For a detailed study of *vertep* see Ievhen Markovs'kyi, *Ukrains'kyi vertep* (Kiev: Akademia Nauk URSR, 1929) and I. Iu. Fedas, *Ukrains'kyi narodnyi vertep* (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1987).
- 30 Mykhailo Vozniak, *Istoria Ukrains'koi literatury* 6 vols. (L'viv: Prosvita 1924) 3: 250-57.

<sup>31</sup> Kiev's Mohyla Academy was the leading centre of higher education in 17th and 18th century Ukraine. It exerted significant intellectual influence over the entire Orthodox world at the time. It was established in 1632 by the merging of the Kiev Epiphany Brotherhood School (which had existed since 1615) with the Kievan Cave Monastery School (founded in 1631 by Petro Mohyla). In founding the school, Mohyla's purpose was to harness the intellectual skills and learning of contemporary Europe for the defense of the Orthodox faith: the school was to compete on an equal footing with Polish schools run by the Jesuits. In 1694 the Kievan Mohyla College was granted the privileges of an Academy and in 1701 it was recognized officially as an academy by Peter I. Many distinguished members of the Academy like Feofan Prokopovych and Ioan Maksymovych played instrumental roles in Peter I's educational reforms in Russia. The Moscow academy was patterned after the Kievan one and numerous Russian schools were organized by bishops who were graduates of the Kievan Academy.

In 1686 the Patriarch of Moscow attempted to end the intellectual influence of Kiev forbidding the publication of heretical books in Ruthenian. After Ivan Mazepa's defeat at Poltava in 1709 the authority of the Academy declined. After Peter I's death it revived again until Catherine II's abolition of the Hetmanate in 1764, when the Academy was reduced to an eparchial seminary. In 1817 it was closed and a theological academy was opened in its place.

<sup>32</sup> Iurii Lavrynenko, "Mykola Kulish: Literaturna syl'vetka," *Roztriliane vidrozhennia: Antalohia 1917-1933. Poeziia, proza, drama, esei* (Munich: Institut literatski, 1959) 641-57.

<sup>33</sup> Dyky, "Some Aspects of the *Sonata Pathétique*" 118.

<sup>34</sup> Dyky, "Some Aspects of the *Sonata Pathétique*" 119.

- <sup>35</sup> Larissa M. L. Onyshkevych-Zaleska, "Existentialism in Modern Ukrainian Drama," diss. U. of Pennsylvania, 1973, 72.
- <sup>36</sup> "Komentar do 'Patetychnoi sonaty'", in *Mykola Kulish. Tvory*, (New York: Ukrains'ka Vil'na Akademiia Nauk v SShA, 1955) 454.
- <sup>37</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 334; Cherkasyn, "Naperedodni zolotoho iuvileiu" 4; Onyshkevych, "Existentialism in Modern Ukrainian Drama" 86; Dyky, "Some Aspects of the *Sonata Pathétique*" 121.
- <sup>38</sup> Mykola Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique*, trans. George S. N. and Moira Luckyj, ed. George S. N. Luckyj (Colorado: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975) 42.
- <sup>39</sup> Helicon -- in this context not so much the abode of the muses, as the place where in 1337 Petrarch, disappointed with Christianity, initiated his epistles propagating the humanist ideas of antic pagan philosophy.
- <sup>40</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 43.
- <sup>41</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 47.
- <sup>42</sup> Boris Kremniev, *Betkhoven*. (Moscow: Molodaia gvardia, 1961) 71.
- <sup>43</sup> Kremniev, *Betkhoven* 71.
- <sup>44</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 51.
- <sup>45</sup> Dyky, "Some Aspects of the *Sonata Pathétique*" 123.
- <sup>46</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 54.
- <sup>46</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 55.
- <sup>48</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 55.
- <sup>49</sup> Mykola Khvylovy, *The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine. Polemical Pamphlets* Transl. Ed. and Intr. by Myroslav Shkandrij (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986) 227-32.
- <sup>50</sup> Iu. Kobyletsky, "Revoliutsieiu narodzhenyi," Intro. to *Mykola Kulish. P'esy. Lysty* (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1969) 23.

51 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 48.

52 Onyshkevych-Zaleska, "Existentialism in Modern Ukrainian Drama"

88.

53 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 67.

54 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 68.

55 Dyky, "Some Aspects of the *Sonata Pathétique*" 125. Dyky's study is based on the manual *Man and His Music* by A. Herman and W. Millers (New York: New York University Press, 1962).

56 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 70.

57 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 71.

58 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 77.

59 Dyky, "Some Aspects of the *Sonata Pathétique*" 126.

60 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 70.

61 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 80-1

62 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 93.

63 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 97.

64 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 107.

65 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 107.

66 Dyky, "Some Aspects of Sonata Pathétique" 126.

67 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 110.

## Notes to Chapter Four

Symbols of National Culture in *The Days of the Turbins* and  
*Sonata Pathétique*

- 1 Antony Colin Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov: Life and Interpretations*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978) 96.
- 2 Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov: Life and Interpretations* 70.
- 3 Liudmila Duca Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright," diss., U. of Stanford, 1981, 107-108.
- 4 Ellendea Catherine Proffer, "The Major Works of Mikhail Bulgakov," diss. U. of Indiana, 1971, 137.
- 5 Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov: Life and Interpretations* 97.
- 6 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 114.
- 7 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* Trans. Michael Glenny (London: Eyre Methven, 1979) 87.
- 8 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 30 and 92.
- 9 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 17.
- 10 Bulgakov, *The Days of Turbins* 74.
- 11 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 89.
- 12 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 25.
- 13 Proffer, "The Major Works of Mikhail Bulgakov" 117.
- 14 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 104.
- 15 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 106.
- 16 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 106.
- 17 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 85.
- 18 Ershov, "Mikhail Bulgakov as a Playwright" 104-105.

- 19 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 13.
- 20 *A Dictionary of Symbols* by J. E. Cirlot, trans. Jack Sage, 2nd ed. (1962, New York: Philosophical Library Inc.) 38.
- 21 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 28.
- 22 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 84.
- 23 Bulgakov, *The White Guard*, trans. Michael Glenny, ed. Eyre Methuen (London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971): 11.
- 24 Lidia Ianovskaia, *Tvorcheskii Put' Mikhaila Bulgakova* (Moscow: Sovetskii Pisatel', 1983) p.
- 25 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 67.
- 26 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 92.
- 27 *A Dictionary of Symbols* 294.
- 28 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 33.
- 29 Proffer, "The Major Works of Mikhail Bulgakov" 95-96.
- 30 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 33.
- 31 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 61.
- 32 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 15.
- 33 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 19.
- 34 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 24.
- 35 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 36.
- 36 E. Proffer confirms her statement referring to E. H. Carr *The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923* (Edinburgh, 1950) Vol. I, pp. 293-304 where Carr presents Petliura as an adventurer (similar to Pugachev) lacking a sincere Ukrainian nationalism. See Proffer, "The Major Works of Mikhail Bulgakov" 97.
- 37 Bulgakov, *The Days of the Turbins* 11.

38 Luba M. Dyky, "Some Aspects of the ' *Sonata Pathétique* ' by Mykola Kulish," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 12. 1-2 (1964-68): 191.

39 Mykola Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique*, trans. George S. N. and Moira Luckyj (Little Town, Colorado: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975) 42.

40 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 60.

41 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 53.

42 Pantaleimon Kulish (1819-97) a Ukrainian writer and scholar.

43 Natalia Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* (Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1970) 326.

44 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 58.

45 *Prosvita* was a popular enlightenment society allowed to exist briefly after the 1905 Revolution and revived in 1917 following the overthrow of the tsarist regime. It was liquidated by the Soviet authorities in the early 1920s.

46 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 50.

47 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 324.

48 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 64.

49 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 65.

50 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 90.

51 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 44.

52 M. Kulish, "Narodnyi Malakhii," *Mykola Kulish, Tvory* (New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the USA, 1955)

53 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 90.

54 Dyky, "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique'" 172.

55 Arenskii, Anton Stepanovich (1861-1906) Russian composer, pianist and conductor, one of the most eclectic Russian composers of his

generation. Author of three operas, one ballet, many chorales, piano and violin concerts, chamber, keyboard and vocal pieces.

<sup>56</sup> *Raphael*- opera by Arenskii, libretto by Kriukov dedicated to the I Congress of painters held in Moscow 24-25 April 1894 and staged for the occasion in The Moscow Conservatory.

<sup>57</sup> Tychyna, Pavlo. *Vybrani tvory. Poezii*, 3 vols. (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Khudozhnoi literatury, 1957) 1: 103.

<sup>58</sup> Mykola Khvylovy, "On the 'Satan in a Barrel' or On Graphomaniacs, Speculators And Other Prosvita-Types (A First Letter to Literary Youth) in Mykola Khvylovy *Polemical Pamphlets 1925-1926*, trans. and introduced Myroslav Shkandrij (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986) 65-66.

<sup>59</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 92-3.

<sup>60</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 81-2.

<sup>61</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 51.

<sup>62</sup> Dyky, "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique'" 170.

<sup>63</sup> In Ukrainian folklore and literature, especially in poetry, Ukraine is widely represented by the image of the steppe.

<sup>64</sup> *Bulava* -- a type of mace 50-80 cm in length consisting of a handle and head in a shape of sphere or octahedron. The *bulava* was known among Eastern people and came into widespread use in the Ukraine in the 13th century, first as a weapon and then as a symbol of authority. In the 16th-18th centuries Cossack officers bestowed the *bulava* on the elected hetman. The Russian tsar also endowed hetmans with the *bulava*. A smaller type of *bulava*, known as *pernach* or *shestoper*, was carried by cossack colonels.

<sup>65</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 57.

- 66 Jean Chevalier, *Dictionnaire des symboles* (Paris: Robert Laffont/Jupiter, 1869) 447.
- 67 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 45.
- 68 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 47.
- 69 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 72.
- 70 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 71.
- 71 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 72.
- 72 Dyky, "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique'" 178.
- 73 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 73.
- 74 Juan-Eduardo Cirlot, *Diccionario de símbolos* (Barcelona: Editorial Labor, S.A., 1982) 476.
- 75 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 74.
- 76 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 75.
- 77 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 71.
- 78 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 71.
- 79 Ad de Vries, *Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery* (Amsterdam, London: North Holland Publishing Co., 1974) 79-80.
- 80 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 93.
- 81 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 94.
- 82 The Monomakh's cap. The fur cap of Vladimir II (1053-1125) great prince of Kiev from 1113-1125, that served as a Russian regalia until the last Romanovs.
- 83 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 72.
- 84 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 68.
- 85 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 81-82.
- 86 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 54.
- 87 Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 75.

<sup>88</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 92-93.

<sup>89</sup> Kulish, *Sonata Pathétique* 52.

<sup>90</sup> Dyky, "Some Aspects of 'Sonata Pathétique'" 18-4.

<sup>91</sup> Taras Shevchenko, *Kobzar* (Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury, 1960) 233-7.

<sup>92</sup> Dyky, "Some Aspects of 'Sonata Pathétique'" 161-2.

## Notes to Chapter Five

Stage History

<sup>1</sup> Ellendea Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* (Ardis: Ann Arbor, 1984) 167.

<sup>2</sup> Anthony Collin Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978) 80.

<sup>3</sup> Konstantin Rudnitsky, *Russian and Soviet Theatre. Tradition and Avant-Guard* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988) 22-3.

<sup>4</sup> Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 82. Lesley Milne, Intro. to *The White Guard* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1979) XII.

<sup>5</sup> Marieta Chudakova, "Arkhiv M. A. Bulgakova," *Zapiski Otdela Rukopisei. Vypusk 57* (Moscow, 1976) 58-9.

<sup>6</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 170.

<sup>7</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 170.

<sup>8</sup> Alexei Faiko, "Zapiski starogo teatral'shchika," *Teatr*, No. 6 (June 1975): 139-43

<sup>9</sup> Fellow Travellers (*poputchiki*) -- a term coined by Trotsky in 1923 to designate Soviet writers of non-proletarian and non-revolutionary background who were nevertheless willing to work for the socialist order. The attitude of the Party from the beginning was favourable to fellow-travellers. After the death of Frunze and the disagreement between Trotsky and Stalin, this designation was used for virtually every good writer of the period who went along with the Revolution, but was not "Party minded."

<sup>10</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 185.

- 11 Chudakova, "Arkhiv M. A. Bulgakova" 59. Liubov' Belozerskaia. *O med vospominanii* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1979) 29.
- 12 Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 184. Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 79.
- 13 Ia. Lur'e and I. Serman, "Ot Beloi gvardii k Dniam Turbinykh," *Russkaia literatura* 2 (1965): 194-203.
- 14 Mikhail Bulgakov, *The Black Snow [Theatrical Novel]* transl. Michael Glenny. (New York: 1967) 53.
- 15 Bulgakov, *Neizdanyi Bulgakov* 75.
- 16 Bulgakov, *Neizdanyi Bulgakov* 76.
- 17 E. Proffer, ed. "Mikhail Bulgakov: Documents for a Biography." *RLT* 7 (1974): 445-74. E. Proffer, "An Unpublished Scene from the Original *Days of the Turbins (White Guard)*" *RLT* 7 (1974): 475-9.
- 18 I. Sudakov, "Rannie roli N. P. Khmeleva," *Ezhegodnik MknATA 19-45 (M. 19-48)* 11 38 (Quoted from Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 187).
- 19 Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 186.
- 20 Bulgakov, *Neizdanyi Bulgakov* 77.
- 21 Chudakova, "Arkhiv M. Bulgakova" 55-9, Note 75.
- 22 Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 190.
- 23 Bulgakov, *Neizdanyi Bulgakov* 80.
- 24 Bulgakov, *The White Guard* (München: Sagner, 1983) 57.
- 25 Bulgakov, *Neizdanyi Bulgakov* 77-82.
- 26 V. F. Meierkhold, *Stat'i, pis'ma, rechi: chast' II. 1917-30* (Moscow. Sovetskii pisatel', 1968) 103.
- 27 Avrii Pyman, "Mikhail Afanasyevich Bulgakov," Intro. to *Selected works of A. Bulgakov* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1967) XXXIV.

- <sup>28</sup> E. Mindlin, *Neobyknovennye Sobesedniki: Kniga vospominanii*. "Nakanune," "Mikhail Bulgakov" (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1963-67) 116-43, 144-55.
- <sup>29</sup> A. V. Lunacharskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*, 2nd ed., 8 vols. (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1963-67) 7: 511.
- <sup>30</sup> Described in V. Mayakovskii "Vystuplenie na dispute Teatral'naia politika sovetskoi vlasti 2 Octiabria 1926." *Literaturnoe nasledstvo, Vol. 55* (Novoe o Mayakovskom) (Moscow, 1958), Part I, 37-42. *Novyi zritel'* (October 19, 1926) 4. (Quoted from Proffer. *Bulgakov. Life and Work*) 197.
- <sup>31</sup> Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 88-9.
- <sup>32</sup> A. V. Lunacharskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*, 2nd ed., 8 vols. (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1963-67) 3: 323-31.
- <sup>33</sup> "Protest protiv 'Dnei Turbinykh'," *Krasnaia gazeta* 5 October 1926, late ed.: 3. (Quoted from Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation*) 89.
- <sup>34</sup> V. Blium, "Eshcho o 'Dniakh Turbinykh'," *Programmy gosudarstvennykh akademicheskikh teatrov*, 57 (1926): 5. A. Orliinskii, "grazhdanskaia voina na stsene MKhATA." *Pravda* 8 October 1926: 6. A. Orliinskii, "Protiv Bulgakovshchiny." *Novyi zritel'*, No. 41 12 October 1926. 3-4
- <sup>35</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Work* 199.
- <sup>36</sup> Report in "Moskovskie teatral'nye pis'ma," *Nizhegorodskaia kommuna* (Nizhnii Novgorod) 22 May 1927. Quoted from Milne, Intro. to *The White Guard* XI.
- <sup>37</sup> L. E. Belozerskaia-Bulgakova, *O ned vospominanii* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1979) 29.

<sup>38</sup> Lunacharskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*, 2nd. ed., 8 vols. (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 163-67) 3: 344-6.

<sup>39</sup> Victor Petelin, "M. Bulgakov i 'Dni Turbinykh'." *Ogoniok* 11 March 1969: 25-7; Sergei Ermolinskii, "O Mikhaile Bulgakove." *Teatr*, No. 9 Sept. 1966: 79-97; "Dni Turbinykh i Liubov' Iarovaia (Otchet o dispute v teatre Meierkhol'da)" *Na Literaturnom postu* 20 Feb. 1971; Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 91.

<sup>40</sup> Lunacharskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*, 3: 323-31.

<sup>41</sup> Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 92.

<sup>42</sup> Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 92.

<sup>43</sup> I. V. Stalin, "Reply to Bill-Belotserkovsky 2 February 1929." *Works* 9 vols (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1954) 9: 341-4.

<sup>44</sup> Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 93-4.

<sup>45</sup> Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 94.

<sup>46</sup> N. Abalkin, "Sorok let spustia. Dni Turbinykh v khudozhestvennom teatre." *Pravda* 8 February 1968: 3; N. Golikova, "Snova i po-novomu: Mikhail Bulgakov i *Dni Turbinykh* MKhAT, 1968." *Literaturnaia Rossiia* 1 March 1968. 17; N., "Wright, *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretation* 94

<sup>47</sup> M. Kal'nytskii, T. Rogozovskaia, "M. Bulgakov i kul'turnaia zhizn' Kieva 1920-1930" in *M. Bulgakov - dramaturg i khudozhestvennaia kul'tura ego vremeni* (Moscow: Soiuz teatral'nykh deiatelei RSFSR, 1988) 260.

<sup>48</sup> Bulgakov, *Neizdanyi Bulgakov* 64-5. Kal'nitskii, Rogozovskaia, "M. Bulgakov i kul'turnaia zhizn' Kieva 1920-1930" 260-70.

<sup>49</sup> Kal'nitskii, Rogozovskaia, "M. Bulgakov i kul'turnaia zhizn' Kieva 1920-1930" 263.

<sup>50</sup> Kal'nitskii, Rogozovskaia, "M. Bulgakov i kul'turnaia zhizn' Kieva 1920-1930" 264.

<sup>51</sup> Kal'nitskii, Rogozovskaia, "M. Bulgakov i kul'turnaia zhizn' Kieva 1920-1930" 265.

<sup>52</sup> Kal'nitskii, Rogozovskaia, "M. Bulgakov i kul'turnaia zhizn' Kieva 1920-1930" 170. Kal'nitskii and Rogozovskaia assume that the main reason for refusing the staging of Bulgakov's plays in Kiev was the widely spread rumour about him shooting at Ukrainian students while in the ranks of the White Guard. See Iurii Smolych, *Ia vybyraiu literaturu* (Kiev: Dnipro, 1970) 131.

In a private conversation the well-known scholar of Soviet theatre Nelli Kornienko acknowledge that Bulgakov's last wife Elena [Shilovskaia] Bulgakova transferred his manuscripts to the archives in Moskovskii Institut Russkoi literatury, Rukopisnyi otdel [IRL] under a condition that documents concerning his attitude towards Ukraine would not made publicly known.

One can fully agree with Proffer's regret when she says: "I fear the necessary material will never be made available to scholar who is free to use it as it deserves." (See: Proffer, *Bulgakov. Life and Works* 185).

<sup>53</sup> Les' Kurbas, "Teatr musyt' vplyvaty, vesty i vykhovuvaty hliadacha" *Hart* (Kharkiv) September 1929: 181.

<sup>54</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady pro Mykolu Kulisha" in *Mykola Kulish. Tvory* (New York: Vil'na Akademia Nauk u S. Sh. A.) 412.

<sup>55</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 402.

<sup>56</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 403.

<sup>57</sup> Natal'a Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha. Literaturna i stsenichna istoria* (Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1970) 355.

<sup>58</sup> Konstantin Rudnitsky, *Russian and Soviet Theatre Tradition and Avant-Guard*, transl. Roxane Perman, ed. Lesley Milne (London: Thomas and Hudson, 1988) 15-19.

<sup>59</sup> Fonds TSHALI, file 2328, op. 1, p. 3. Quoted in Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 356.

<sup>60</sup> Fonds, Quoted in Kuziakina *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 356-7.

<sup>61</sup> Fonds, Quoted in Kuziakina *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 358.

<sup>62</sup> A Tairov, *Literaturnaia gazeta* 7 Feb. 1931. Quoted in Kuziakina, *Mykola Kulish dramaturh* 359.

<sup>63</sup> M. K. "Patetychna sonata' M. Kulisha," *Literaturna hazeta* 30 March 1931. 3.

<sup>64</sup> M. K. "Patetychna sonata' M. Kulisha" 3.

<sup>65</sup> M. K. "Patetychna sonata' M. Kulisha" 3.

<sup>66</sup> M. K. "Patetychna sonata' M. Kulisha" 3.

<sup>67</sup> M. K. "Patetychna sonata' M. Kulisha" 3.

<sup>68</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 322.

<sup>69</sup> O Litovskii, "K nachalu teatral'nogo sezona," *Pravda* 8 September 1931 4

<sup>70</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 360.

<sup>71</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 362.

<sup>72</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 366.

<sup>73</sup> M. Bulgakov, *Belaja Guardia* (Letchworth: Bradda, 1969) 49.

<sup>74</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 36.

<sup>75</sup> M. Kulish, "Lysty do I. Dnirovs'koho." *Prapor* July 1958: 87.

<sup>76</sup> Fonds 148/471, 474. Quoted in Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 322.

<sup>77</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 322.

<sup>78</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 323.

<sup>79</sup> Klaus - a German equivalent of the Ukrainian Mykola. It was Kulish's nickname used by his school fellows.

<sup>80</sup> I. Dniprovs'kyi, "Diary." Quoted in Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 341

<sup>81</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 342.

<sup>82</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 343.

<sup>83</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 412.

<sup>84</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 413.

<sup>85</sup> N. Osinskii, "'Pateticheskaia sonata' (Kamernom teatr)," *Izvestia* 3 January 1932: 4.

<sup>86</sup> Iu. Iuzovskii, "'Pateticheskaia sonata'. P'esa N. Kulisha v Kamernom teatre." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 4 January 1932: 4.

<sup>87</sup> N. Oruzhenikov, "Kazn' illiuzii. 'Pateticheskaia sonata' v Kamernom teatre" *Sovetskoe iskusstvo* 30 December 1932: 3.

<sup>88</sup> Rabochaia brigada glavrepertkoma: Skliar, Savranskii, Terk, "Razoblachenie intelligentskoi romantiki," *Sovetskoe iskusstvo* 14 January 1932. Quoted in Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 368.

<sup>89</sup> B. Alpers, "Sud'by liricheskoi dramy 'Pateticheskaia sonata' v Moskovskom Kamernom teatre." *Sovetskii Teatr* February 1932: 14-15.

<sup>90</sup> Alpers, "Sud'by liricheskoi dramy" 15.

<sup>91</sup> *sans-culottes* - a term applied to the extreme partisans of the French Revolution.

<sup>92</sup> "Pateticheskaia sonata," *Sbornik statei k prem'ere spektakliia* (Leningrad: GBDT [Gosudarstvenyi Bol'shoi Dramaticheskii Teatr], 1931) 15.

<sup>93</sup> "Pateticheskaia sonata," GBDT, 18.

<sup>94</sup> Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 372.

- 95 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 372.
- 96 V Golubkov, "Pateticheskaia sonata" Bol'shoi dramatičeskii teatr" *krasnaia gazeta* (Leningrad) 27 December 1931, evening ed. Quoted in Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 373.
- 97 S. Tsymbal, "Pateticheskaia sonata" *Smena* 26 December 1931: 22.
- 98 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 373.
- 99 "Komentar do 'Patetychnoi sonaty,'" in *M. Kulish. Tvory*, op. cit., 453-456.
- 100 Stalin, *Works* XI: 326-7
- 101 Milne, Intro. to *The White Guard* XIII.
- 102 M. Bulgakov, "Pis'mo P. S. Popovu" in Lesley Milne, "K biografii M. A. Bulgakova," *Novyi Zhurnal*, vol. III, June 1973. 163.
- 103 M. Bulgakov, "Pis'mo Popovu," Milne, "K biografii M. A. Bulgakova" 165.
- 104 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 374.
- 105 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 374.
- 106 M. Levchenko, "Pateticheskaia sonata," *Znamia kommunizma* (Odessa) 11 January 1959. Quoted in Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 376.
- A Nedzvid's'kyi, "Shiatak pochynavsia v Odesi," *Chornomors'ka komuna* (Odessa) 6 January 1962. Quoted in Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 376.
- 107 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 377.
- 108 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 378-9.
- 109 Ostryk, "Shukannia, porazky i peremohy," *Literaturna Ukraina* 5 May 1966: 4, I. Kysel'ov, "Pravda, domysly, mity," *Pravda Ukrainy* 2 April 1966 3.
- 110 Kuziakina, *P'esy Mykoly Kulisha* 379.

111 The information was obtained in a private conversation with the writer, translator, and stage director Les' Taniuk.

## Notes to Chapter Six

The Dialogue Cut Short Conclusion

- <sup>1</sup> M. Bulgakov, Letter to V. Veresaev, 6 March, 1934. Quoted in Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 367.
- <sup>2</sup> S. Ermolinski, "O Mikhaile Bulgakove," *Teatr* 9 (1966): 79.
- <sup>3</sup> M. Bulgakov, "'Ne vse li ravno, gde byt' nemym...'" Pis'ma M. A. Bulgakova bratu N. A. Bulgakovu" (Correspondence with brother Nikolai), *Druzhba narodov* 2 (1989). 199-223.
- <sup>4</sup> E. S. Bulgakova, "Mikhail Bulgakov, V. Veresaev. Perepiska po povodu p'esy 'Pushkin' ('Poslednie dni')," *Voprosy literatury* 3 (1965): 162.
- <sup>5</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 383.
- <sup>6</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 392.
- <sup>7</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 515.
- <sup>8</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 515.
- <sup>9</sup> Avriil Pyman, "Mikhail Afanasyevich Bulgakov," Intro. *Selected Works. M. A. Bulgakov* (New York: Pergamon Press) XXI.
- <sup>10</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 515.
- <sup>11</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 516.
- <sup>12</sup> M. Chudakova, "Arkhiv M. A. Bulgakova" (Zapiski Otdela rukopisei, Vyp. 37, Moskow, 1976) 121.
- <sup>13</sup> Pyman, "Mikhail Afanasyevich Bulgakov," XXI.
- <sup>14</sup> Vladimir Lakshin, "Uroki Bulgakova," *Pamir* 4 (1972): 59.
- <sup>15</sup> Bulgakov, Letter to Gdeshinsky, *Neizdanyi Bulgakov* 41.
- <sup>16</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 582.
- <sup>17</sup> Pyman, "Mikhail Afanasyevich Bulgakov," XXI.
- <sup>18</sup> Proffer, *Bulgakov: Life and Work* 585-6.

<sup>19</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady," in *Mykola Kulish. Tvory* (New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1955) 419.

<sup>20</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 419.

<sup>21</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 419.

<sup>22</sup> Sviatoslav Hordynsky, "Ideas on the Scaffold," *The Ukrainian Quarterly* 5.4 (1949): 331. Kulish's "unethical behaviour," according to this document, consisted in his using the word "zhyd" in a conversation which was subsequently reported to the Party. While "zhyd" is the only word for "Jew" in both Ukrainian and Polish, it has an offensive meaning in Russian. Because of this, the word "zhyd" was forbidden by the Soviets and the Russian word for "Jew" ("evrei") was introduced instead. Curiously enough, the word "yevrey" in its Russian pronunciation has a slightly offensive meaning in Ukrainian, so the Ukrainians came to use the word "evrei" only in official parlance, still using the word "zhyd" in private conversation.

<sup>23</sup> In 1933 during the famine in Ukraine, Kulish refused to engage in a propaganda campaign in the country. See. S. Hordynsky, "Ideas on the Scaffold" 331, Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 415-6.

<sup>24</sup> NKVD -- People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, assumed political police functions under Stalin, successor of GPU and ancestor of KGB

GPU -- Bolshevik political police during the 1920s and early 1930s, replaced the *Cheka* (Bolshevik political police of the War Communism period 1917-1921) and was latter renamed by the NKVD.

<sup>25</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 425.

<sup>26</sup> Antonina Kulish, "Spohady" 428.

<sup>27</sup> Les Taniuk, "The Berezhil Theatre of Les Kurbas Beneath the Snows of Siberia" in *Echoes of Glasnost in Soviet Ukraine*, ed. by Romana M. Bahry. (Toronto: Captus Press Inc., 1989) 234.

<sup>28</sup> The word "serdechnyi" in Ukrainian means "heartly, cordial, warm-hearted," while "serdeshnyi" means a "poor wretch." Kulish found the second meaning better suited his state of mind on the Solovki islands.

<sup>29</sup> kulish, "Lysty do druzheny," *Mykola Kulish. Tvory* (New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1955) 360-1.

BibliographyBibliographies

- Biletskyi, Oleksandr, I. gen. ed. *Ukrains'ki pys'mennyky: Bio-bibliohrafichnyi slovnyk u piaty tomakh*. 5 vols. Kyiv: "Dnipro," 1965.
- Hamant, Yves. "Bibliographie de M. Bulgakov." *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique* Paris: Mouton et Co., 1970.
- Leites, A., and M. Iashek. *Desiat' rokiv ukrains'koi literatury (1917-1927)* 3 vols. Kharkiv: Derzhavne Vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1928.
- Proffer, Ellendea. *International Bibliography of Works by and about Mikhail Bulgakov*. Ann Arbor. Ardis, 1976.

Primary Sources on Mikhail Bulgakov

- Mikhail Bulgakov. "Avtobiografiia." *Sovietskie pisateli. Avtobiografii*  
Vol. 3. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966, 45-46.
- . *Belaia Gvardiia*. Letchworth: Bradda, 1971.
- . *Black Snow [Theatrical Novel]*, trans. Michael Glenny. New York: 1967.
- . *The Days of the Turbins* Trans. Mikhael Glenny. London: Eyre Methuen, 1979.
- . *Dni Turbinykh* Letchworth: Bradda. 1970.
- . *The Early Plays of Mikhail Bulgakov*. Ed. and intro. E. Proffer. Transl. C. R. Proffer and E. Proffer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.
- - "Kiev-gorod." In *M. A. Bulgakov: Sobranie sochinenii*. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1982, Vol. 1, 327-36.
- . *La Fuite. Les Journée des Turbins* Ed. et intr. Robert Lafont. Traduit par Paul Kalinine. Paris: Editions Robert Laffont, 1971.
- . *Neizdannyi Bulgakov*. Ed. and Introduced by Elleandea Proffer. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1982.
- . "Ne vse li ravno, gde zhit' nemym..." Pis'ma M. A. Bulgakova bratu N. A. Bulgakovu." *Druzhba narodov* 2 (1988): 199-223.
- . "Pis'ma-protesty M. Bulgakova, A. Solzhenitsyna i Voznesenskogo." *Grani* 66(1966): 155-61.
- . [Pis'ma] "Mikhail Bulgakov, V. Veresaev. Perepiska po povodu p'esy Pushkina (Poslednie dni)." *Voprosy Literatury* 3(1965): 151-71.
- . "Pis'mo k pravitel'stvu SSSR." *Voprosy literatury* 9 (1966): 55-56.
- . "An Unpublished Scene from the Original *Days of the Turbins*" *Russian Literature Triquarterly* 3(1974): 475-80.

---. *The White Guard* Transl. Michael Glenny. London: Eyre Methuen, 1979.

Selected Secondary Sources on Mikhail Bulgakov

Abaikin, N. "Sorok let spustia. 'Dni Turbinykh' v Khudozhestvennom theatre."

*Pravda*, 8 Feb. 1968: 3.

Abashidze, S. "Teatr i zritel'." In *Bol'shoi dramaticheskii teatr*. Leningrad:

Edition of the Gorki Grand Dramatic Theatre, 1935, 275-321.

Al'tshuier, A. M. "Gorkii i problema stilevykh poiskov poslerevoliutsionnoi

prozy i dramaturgii (A. M. Gorkii o M. A. Bulgakove)." In *M. Gorkii i*

*rusaskaia literatura. Uchenye zapiski Gor'kovskogo gos. universiteta*

vyp. 118 (1971), 158-66.

Belozerskaia-Bulgakov, Lubov E. *O med vospominanii*. Ann Arbor: Ardis,

1979.

Berzer, A. "Vozvrashchenie мастера." *Novyi Mir* 9 (1967): 259-264.

Blum, Victor. "Eshche o 'Dniakh Turbinykh'." *Programmy gosudarstvennykh*

*akademicheskikh teatrov* 57 (1926): 5-11.

---. "Pravaia opasnost' i teatr." *Ekran* 7 (1929): 5-9.

Bulgakova, E. S. "Mikhail Bulgakov, V. Veresaev: Perepiska po povody p'esy

'Pushkin' ('Poslednie dni')." *Voprosy literatury*, 3 (1965): 151-71.

Chebotareva, V. A. "K istorii sozdaniia 'Beloi gvardii'." *Rusaskaia literatura*

4 (1974): 148-51.

Cnudaakova, Marieta. "Arkhiv M. A. Bulgakova." *Zapiski Otdela Rukopisei*,

Vypusk 37 (1976): 25-151.

---. "K tvorcheskoi biografii M. Bulgakova." *Voprosy literatury* 7 (1973):

231-55.

- Duranty, Walter. "Red Intelligentsia Stirred by Play." *New York Times* 7 Jan. 1926, 20. 1.
- El'sberg, Zh. "Bulgakov i MKhAT." *Na literaturnom postu* 2 (1927): 44-49.
- Ermakova, T. A. "Dni Turbinykh M. Bulgakova i polemika vokrug p'esy." *Uchenye zapiski Moskovskogo oblastnogo ped. instituta* Vol. 187, vyp. 8 (1967): 89-102.
- Ermolinskii, Sergei. "O Mikhaile Bulgakove." *Teatr* 9 (1966): 85-101.
- Furonskii, Mark. "Teatr Bulgakova." *Russkaia Mysl'*; 5 (1969): 8
- Goliakova, N. "Snova i po-novomu. Mikhail Bulgakov i 'Dni Turbinykh.' MKhAT, 1968." *Literaturnaia rossia* 3 (1968): 17.
- Ianovskaia, Lidiia. *Tvorcheskii put' Mikhaila Bulgakova* Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1983.
- Kal'nytskyi, M., Rogozovskaia, T. "M. Bulgakov i kul'turnaia zhizn' Kiev 1920-1930-x godov." *M. A. Bulgakov-dramaturg i Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura ego vremeni. Sbornik statei.* Moscow. Soiuz teatral'nykh deiatelei RSFSR, 1988, 260-270.
- Kalinin, Paul. Introduction. *La Fuite. Les Journées des Turbines de Mikhaïl Bulgakov.* Paris. Editions Robert Laffont, 1971, 7-52.
- Kaverin, V. "Zametki o dramaturgii Bulgakova." *Teatr* 10 (1956): 69-73.
- Lakshin, V. "O proze Mikhaïla Bulgakova i o nem samom." Introduction. *Izbrannaia proza. Mikhail Bulgakov.* Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1966.
- . "Uroki Bulgakova." *Pamir*; 4 (1972): 57-62.
- Lindres, S. "Russkii pisatel' ne mozhet zhit' bez rodiny..." (Materialy k tvorcheskoi biografii M. Bulgakova.) *Voprosy literatury* 9 (1966): 134-39.
- Litovskii, O. "K nachalu teatral'nogo sezona." *Pravda* 8 Sept. 1931: 4.

- Lur'e Ia., and I. Sermon. "Ot 'Beloi gvardii' k 'Dniam Turbinykh'." *Russkaia literatura* 2 (1965): 194-203.
- Mikhailova, Alla. "Nine Plays Out of Many." Introduction. *Classic Soviet Plays* Trans. Yurii Kopylov. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1979.
- Milne, Lesley. Introduction. *The Days of the Turbins* London: Eyre Methuen, 1979, V-XIV.
- . "K biografii M. A. Bulgakova." *Novyi zhurnal* 111 (1973): 151-174.
- Mindlin, E. *Neobyknovennnye sobesedniki: Kniga vospominanii*. "Nakanune," 116-43; "Mikhail Bulgakov," 144-55. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1968.
- Mustangova, E. "Mikhail Bulgakov." *Pechat' i revoliutsia* 4 (1927): 81-87.
- Natov, Nadine. *Mikhail Bulgakov*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975.
- Nekrasov, Victor. "Dom Turbinykh." *Novyi Mir* 8 (1967): 133-42.
- Ninov, A. ed. *M. A. Bulgakov - dramaturg i khudozhestvennaia kul'tura ego vremeni*. Moscow: Soiuz teatral'nykh deiatelei RSFSR, 1988.
- Novikov, Vasilii. "M. A. Bulgakov - dramaturg." *P'esy*. By Mikhail Bulgakov.
- Nusinov, I. M. "Put' M. Bulgakova." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 4 (1929): 40-50.
- Orlinkii, A. "Grazhdanskaia voina na stsene MKhATa." *Pravda* 8 Oct. 1926. 6.
- . "Protiv Bulgakovshchiny." *Novyi zritel'* 12 Oct. 1926: 3-4.
- Paustovskii, Konstantin. "Bulgakov i teatr." *Sobranie sochinenii v 8 tomakh. Literaturnye portrety. Ocherki. Zametki* Vol 8. Moscow: "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1967, 131-42.
- . "Bulgakov." *Teatral'naia zhizn'* 14 (1962): 28-31.
- Petelin, Victor. "M. A. Bulgakov i 'Dni Turbinykh'." *Ogonek* 11 (1969): 25-27
- Proffer, Ellendea. *Bulgakov. Life and Work* Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984.

- . "Mikhail Bulgakov: Documents for a Biography." *Russian Literature Triquarterly* 7 (1974): 47-74.
- Pyman, Avril. "Mikhail Afanasievich Bulgakov. Introduction. *Selected Works* By M. A. Bulgakov. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1967, IX-XLIV.
- Rice, Elmer. Introduction. *Six Soviet Plays* Preface by Eugene Lyons. New York: Greenwood Press Publisher, 1968.
- Rudnitskii Konstantine. "Bulgakov's Plays." *Russian Literature Triquarterly* 15 (1978): 123-66.
- . "Primechaniia: Biograficheskaia spravka." In M. Bulgakov *Dramy i komedii*. Moscow: "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1965, 578-96.
- Schultze, Sydney. "The Epigraphs in *White Guard*" *Russian Literature Triquarterly* 15 (1978): 293-311.
- Sidorov, Ievgen. Introduction. *Mikhail Bulgakov. Izbrannoe* Moscow: "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1980, 2-8.
- Siezkin, Iurii. "Poka zhiv - budu verit' i dobivat'sia." *Voprosy literatury* 9 (1979). 205-27.
- Smelianskii, Anatolii. *Mikhail Bulgakov v Khudozhestvennom teatre*. Moscow. Iskusstvo, 1986.
- Smirnova, V. "Mikhail Bulgakov - dramaturg." *Sovremennye portrety i stat'i*. Moscow: "Sovetskii pisatel'," 1964, 282-332.
- Strasberg, Lee. "Russian Notebooks (1934)." *The Drama Review* 17 (1973). 106-21.
- Voronskii, A. "Pisatel', kniga, chitatel'." *Krasnaia nov' 1* (1927): 226-39.
- Wright, Anthony Collin. *Mikhail Bulgakov. Life and Interpretations* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Zorkaia, N. "Dni Turbinykh." *Teatr* 2 (1967): 14-22.

Primary sources on Mykola Kulish

- Kulish, Mykola. "Avtobiohrafiiia." Mykola Kulish. *P'esy. Lysty*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1969, 408-10.
- . "Dekret pro rivnopravnist' mov na Ukraini." *Iuzhnyi selianin* (Odessa), 6 Dec. 1926, 4.
- . *Die Beethovensonate: Ein Stück aus der Ukraine 1917*. Deutsche Buchverfassung von Friedrich Wolf. Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag A.-G., 1932.
- . *Knulii Khuryyna* Kharkiv: "Utodik," 1926.
- . "Krytyka chy prokurors'kyi dopyt?" *Vaplite* 5 (1927): 146-57.
- . "Lysty do I. Dniprovs'koho." *Prapor* 7 (1958). 84-102.
- . "Lysty Mykoily Kulisha." *Vitchyzna* 8 (1959): 178-90.
- . *Myrna Mazaila* Praha: Vydavnytstvo "Kolos," 1940.
- . "P'esy. Lysty." Kyiv: *Dnipra*, 1961.
- . *Pateticheskaia sonata. Maklena Grassa: Pesy*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1964.
- . *Patetychna sonata* Kharkiv-L'viv: Ukrain's'ke vydavnytstvo, 1943.
- . "Promova na Vseukrains'kii naradi dramaturhiv." *Literaturna hazeta* 1 (1933): 3.
- . "Promova v 'Epilozi'." *Literaturnyi iarmarok* 139 (1929): 26-28.
- . *Tvory*. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the USA, 1955.
- . "Vystup M. Kulisha na teatral'nomu dysputi." *Radians'kyi teatr* 2-3 (1929).
- . "Z lystiv Mykoily Kulisha (Lysty M. Kulisha do Korneevoi-Maslovoi)." *Literaturna Ukraina* 8 Sept. 1972: 4.

Selected Secondary Sources on Mykola Kulish

- Alpers, V. "Sud'ba liricheskoi dramy. 'Pateticheskaia sonata' v Moskovskom Kamernom teatre." *Sovetskii teatr* 2 (1932): 14-21.
- Anon. "Bogatstvo ukrainskoi literatury: S tvorcheskikh obsuzhdenii v Soiuze pisatelei SSSR." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 24 Nov. 1960, 1-3.
- Bertenson, M. "Vzvoinovanyi pryzyv." *Moskovskaia pravda* 22 April 1966: 4.
- Butskoi, A. "Muzyka v dramaticheskome teatre." *Bol'shoi dramaticheskii teatr*. Leningrad. Edition of the Gorki Grand Dramatic Theatre, 1932.
- Bznes'kii, Roman. *Politychni idei tvoriv Mykoly Kulisha*. München: Krytychna biblioteka, 1955.
- Chaplenko, Vasyi'. "Dramatychna tvorchist' Mykoly Kulisha." *Propashchi svly: Ukrains'ke pys'menstvo pid komunistychnym rezhymom 1920-1933*. Seria Literature: 6. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1960, 75-97.
- Cymbai, S. "Pateticheskaia sonata." *Smena* 6 Dec. 1931.
- Deich, Aleksandr. "O Mikole Kulishe." Introduction. *M. Kulish. P'esy*. Transl. P. Zinkevich and S. Svobodina. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1964, 1-14.
- Derzhavin, V. "Dramatychna tetralohiia M. Kulisha." *Chervonyi shliakh* 1 (1928): 75-92.
- Domnytska, Halyna. "Nova zustrich z dramaturhom." *Vitchyzna* 2 (1962): 204-7.
- Duz', Ivan. "Spektakl' pro hliv i prozrinnia narodu." *Chervona Komuna* 11 Jan. 1959. 3.
- Dyky, Luba M. "Some Aspects of the 'Sonata Pathétique' by Mykola Kulish." *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the*

- United States* New York: Vol. XI, 1-2 (31-32), 1964-68, 109-29 and Vol. XII, 1-2 (33-34), 1969-72, 158-91.
- Getz, Semen. "Ukrains'kii teatr 'Berezil'." *Zhizn' iskusstva* 15 Sept. 1929: 8-9.
- Golubkov, V. "'Pateticheskaia sonata.' Bol'shoi dramaticheskii teatr." *Krasnaia gazeta* 27 Dec. 1931: 4.
- Hakkebush, V. "Dvi patetychni." *Mystetstvo* 4 (1959): 30-32.
- Hordyns'kyi, Sviatoslav. "Ideas on the Scaffold (M. Kulish and his Sonata Pathetique)." *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. 5, 1949.
- Iaremenko, Vasyl'. "Chervonyi zaspiv ukrains'koi dramaturhii." Introduction. Mykola Kulish. *Tvory*. Kyiv: "Molod'," 1968: 3-29.
- Iuzovskii, Iurii. "'Pateticheskaia sonata.' P'esa N. Kulisha v Kamernom teatre." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 4 Jan. 1932: 4.
- Knvyiovy, Mykola. *The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine. Polemical Pamphlets, 1925-1926* Ed., Translated and Introduced by Myroslav Shkandrij. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986.
- knvyliia, Andrii. "Zustrich." *Krytyka* 5 (1929): 3-24.
- kobylets'kyi, Iurii. "Revoliutsiiei narodzheni." Introduction. Mykola Kulish. *P'esy: Lysty*. Kyiv. Dnipro, 1969, 3-27.
- koonen, Alisa. "Stranitsy iz zhizni. Vospominania." *Teatr* 6 (1969): 95-106.
- Kotko, Kost'. "Nimec' v plishku. (Myna Mazailo' M. Kulisha, teatr 'Berezil'.)" *Komunist* 21 April 1929: 3.
- kruti, I. "Ukrainskii teatr segodnia." *Izvestia* 27 Oct. 1929: 3-4.
- kulyk, Ivan. "Pidsumky i perspektyvy." *Chervonyi shliakh* 4 (1933): 92-100.
- kurbas, Les'. "Shliakhy 'Berezolia'." *Vaplite* 3 (1927): 141-65.

- . "Teatr musyt' vypravliaty, vesty i vykhovuvaty hliadacha." *Hart* 9 (1929). 181-184.
- Kuziakina, Natal'a. "Chuttia muzychnoi tochnosti." *Robitnycha hazeta* 24 March 1966: 4.
- . *Dramaturh Mykola Kulish* Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1962.
- . "Mohutnii talant: Do 70-ric'hchia z dnia narodzhennia M. Kulisha." *Literaturna Ukraina* 10 Dec. 1962: 3.
- . "Mykola Kulish u 'Harti', URBINO I VAPLITE." *Literaturna Ukraina* 4 Feb. 1988: 6; 11 Feb. 1988: 6; 25 Feb. 1988: 6; 3 March 1988: 6.
- . *Piesy Mykoly Kulisha: Literaturna i stsienichna istoriia* Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1970.
- Kuziakina Natal'a, and Mikhaïl Ostryk. "Z neopublikovanykh lystiv M. H. Kulisha." *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo* 8 (1972): 71-78.
- Kyseï'ov, Iosyp. "Dramaturh - novator (Do 70-ric'hchia z dnia narodzhennia)." *Mystetstvo* 1 (1963): 15-16.
- . *Dramaturhy Ukrainy. literaturni portrety*. Kyiv: "Dnipro." 1967, 106-292.
- . "Obraz i prykmety chasu." *Vitchyzna* 11 (1960): 177-85.
- . "Pro odnu povchal'nu p'esu." *Vitchyzna* 8 (1959): 173-78.
- . "Pravda, domysly, mify." *Pravda Ukrainy* 2 April 1966: 4.
- . "Zaokeans'ki faïsyfikatory." *Dnipro* 1 (1958): 45-52.
- Lavrynenko, Iurii. "Mykola Kulish: literaturna syl'vetka." *Roztriliane vidrodzhennia. Antolohiia 1917-1933. Poezia, proza, drama esei*. Biblioteka Kul'tury, No. 37. Munich: Instytut Literacki, 1959, 641-57.
- Levchenko, M. "Pateticheskaia sonata." *Znamia kommunizma* 11 Jan. 1959: 3.
- Lindheim, Ralph. Introduction. *Sonata Pathétique* Ed. and Translated by George S. N. Luckyj. Toronto: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1977.

- M. K. [Kachaniuk, M.]. "Patetychna sonata' M. Kulisha (na dyskusii v budynku Blakytneho.)" *Literaturna nazeta* 30 March 1931:
- Manning, Clarence A. "Mykola Kulish and the Ukrainian Communists." *The Ukrainian Quarterly* 15 (1955): 256-63.
- Mykytenko, Ivan. "U borot'bi za Voappivs'ku iednist'." Reprint of speech at the second Plenum of VOAAPP. *Hart* 7-8 (1931): 89-107.
- Osinskii, K. "Pateticheskaia sonata' (Kamernyi teatr.)" *Izvestiia* 3 June, 1932: 4.
- Ostryk, Mykhailo. "Do tvorchoi biohrafii M. Kulisha." *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo* 11 (1982): 30-34.
- . "Dramaturhiiia M. Kulish." *Literatura v shkoli* 4 (1959): 17-26.
- . "Mykola Kulish." *Ukrains'ki radians'ki pys'mennyky*. 6 Vols. Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk 1960, 178-223.
- . "Shukannia porazky i peremohy." *Literaturna Ukraina* 5 April 1966: 4.
- Piatnychenko, V. "Intermediia lehkovazhnosti," "Z zapysok konsula." *Literaturnyi iarmarok* 3 (1929): 170-89.
- Pikulyk, Romana Bahrii. "The Expressionist Experiment in Berezil': Kurbas and Kulish." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 14 (1972): 324-43.
- Pinchuk, Stepan. "Zhovten' v ukrains'kii radians'kii dramaturhii." *Zhovten'* 11 (1957): 120-34.
- Reshetar, John S., Jr. "The Ukrainian Revolution in Retrospect." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 2 (1968): 116-32.
- Reznikov et al. "Neudavshaiasia patetika." *Pravda* 9 Feb. 1932: 4.
- Revutsky, Valerian. "Between Sonata Pathetique and Optimistic Tragedy." *Studia Ukrainica* 1 (1978): 111-116.
- . "Mykola Kulish in the Modern Ukrainian Theatre." *Slavonic and East European Review*, XLIX 116 (1971): 335-64.

- . "The Prophetic Madman." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 1 (1956): 45-57.
- Rube, V. "'Pateticheskai sonata' na stsene TIUZa." *Krasnoiarskii rabochii* 26 May 1966: 4.
- Rulin, Petro. *Na shliakhakh revoliutsiinoho teatru* Ed. Pavlo Perepelytsia. Kyiv: Mystetstvo, 1972.
- . "Mynulyi syzon 'Berezolia.'" *Zhyttia i revolutsia* 6 (1926): 68-76.
- Shakhovky-Pankeev, V. "Cherez tri desiatiletia." *Teatr* 8 (1965): 81.
- Sherekh, Iurii. "Shosta symfonia Mykola Kulisha." *Ne dlia ditei: literaturno-krytychni statyi i eseii* New York: Proloh, 1964, 64-82.
- . "Z krytychnoho shchodennyka." *Novi Dni* 7-8 (1956): 13-16.
- Snevchenko, Iona. "Mynulyi teatral'nyi syzon." *Chervonyi shliakh* 7-8 (1927): 287-97.
- . "Nozhytsi v teatri." *Kryvka* 7 (1927): 96-117.
- Skliar et al. (Rabochaia brigada glavrepertkoma.) "Razoblachenie intelligentskoi romantiki." *Sovetskoe iskusstvo* 3 (1932):
- Smolych, Iurii. *Rozpovidi pro nespokii nemaie kintsia* Kyiv. "Radians'kyi pys'mennyk," 1968.
- Starynkevych, Ievhen. Introduction. *Mykola Kulish. Tvory*. Kyiv. Khudozhnia literatura, 1960.
- Tairov, A. "Nad chem rabotaet Kamernyi teatr." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 7 Oct. 1931. 3.
- Tkach, Virlana. "The Golden Dissonance: Pavlo Tychyna's Poetic Imagery in Mykola Kulish's Narodnyi Malakhii." *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies* 2 (1977): 3-17.
- Ukrainets, I. "O 'Pateticheskoi sonate' Kulisha." *Pravda* 4 March 1932: 3.
- Young, Christopher. "Operatic Satire on Stalinism Tested on Moscow audiences." *The Ottawa Citizen* 10 Oct. 1988, B. 7.

Zatons'kyi, V. "Cherhovi zavdannia." *Chervonyi Shliakh* 1 (1927). 1-VII.

Dissertations

Ersnov, Ludmila Duca. "Mikhail Bulgakov as Playwright." Diss. Stanford U, 1981.

Iinytskyj, Oleh Stepan. "Ukrainian Futurism, 1914-1930: History, Theory and Practice." Diss., Harvard U, 1983.

Miine, Lesley. "The Emergence of Mikhail Bulgakov as a Dramatist." Diss. Cambridge U, 1975.

Onyshkevych, Laryssa M. L. Zaleska. "Existentialism in Modern Ukrainian Drama." Diss. U of Pennsylvania, 1973.

Proffier, Ellendea Katherine. "The Major Works of Mikhail Bulgakov." Diss. Indiana U, 1971.

Sakandrii, Myroslav. "The 'Literary Discussion' in Soviet Ukraine, 1925-1928." Diss. U of Toronto, 1980.

Theory of Drama. Encyclopaedias.

Berdyaev, Nicholas A. "The Destiny of Man." *The Worlds of Existentialism. A Critical Reader*. Ed. Maurice Friedman. New York: Random House, 1964, 37-39.

Brockett, Oscar G. *History of the Theatre* 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1977.

Clark, Barrett, H. *European Theories of the Drama* New York. Crown Publishers, 1947.

*Crowell's Handbook of Contemporary Drama* Michael Anderson et al, eds New York: Crowell, 1971.

*Diccionario de simbolos de Juan Eduardo Cirlot* Barcelona Editorial Labor S A, 1982.

*Dictionary of Symbols and Imagery by Ad de Vries* Amsterdam, London. North-Holland Publishing Co., 1974.

*Dictionnaire des symboles de Jean Chevalier*. Paris. Robert Laffont, 1969.

*Entsiklopedicheskii Muzykal'nyi slovar'*: 2nd. ed. Moscow. Sovetskaiia Entsiklopediia, 1966.

Ewen, David *The Complete Book of Classical Music* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey Prentice Hall Inc., 1965, 296.

Gassner, John, and Edward Quinn, eds. *The Reader's Encyclopaedia of World Drama* New York: Crowell, 1969.

Gozenpud, A., ed. *Opernyi slovar'*: Moscow, Leningrad. "Muzyka," 1965.

Herman, Alec, and Wilfrid Mellers. *Man and his Music* New York: New York University Press, 1962, 636.

Jung, C. C. *Man and his Symbols* New York. Doubleday & Co., 1964.

- Ukraine. A Concise Encyclopedia.* Edited by V. Kubijovyc. 2 Vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963. S. V. "History of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic 1917-41," "Theatre" by V. Holubnychy.
- Pratiaw, Myron. *Modern World Drama. An Encyclopædia* New York: Dutton, 1972.
- The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians in Twenty Volumes* Edited by Stanley Sade. Vol. I. London: Macmillan, 1980.
- Rudnitsky, Konstantin. *Russian and Soviet Theatre. Tradition and Avant-Guard* Trans. Roxana Perman, ed. Lesly Milne. London: Thomas and Hudson, 1988.
- Scherman, Thomas K., and Louis Biancoffi, eds. *The Beethoven Companion.* New York: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1972, 267-73.

General Works

- Anastasev, A. ed. *Istoriia sovetskogo dramaticheskogo teatra v shesti tomakh*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Nauka, 1968.
- Antonovych, A. *Trysta rokiv Ukrain's'koho teatru 1619-1919*. Prague: Ukrain's'kyi hromads'kyi vydavnychi fond, 1925.
- Belinskii, Vissarion Ivanovich. *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*. Vols. 2-3. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1948.
- Boguslavskii, A., and V. Div. "Bor'ba za dramaturgicheskii epos." *Russkaia sovetskaia dramaturgiia*. Moscow: AN SSSR, 1963.
- Čornii, Stepan. *Ukrains'kyi teatr i dramaturhiia*. Monograph Series, No. 30. Munich: Ukrainian Free University, 1980.
- Dorosnkevych, O. *Pidruchnyk istorii ukrains'koi literatury*. Kharkiv: knyhospiika, 1930.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Hirniak, Yosyp. "Birth and Death of the Modern Ukrainian Theatre." *Soviet Theatres. 1917-1941*. Edited by Martha Bradshaw. New York: Research Program on the USSR, 1954, 250-338.
- . *Spomyny*. Edited by Bohdan Boychuk. New York: Suchasnist', 1982.
- Hrudyna, Dmytro. "Ukrains'kyiadians'kyi teatr za 15 rokiv." *Krytyka* 58 (1932): 40-67.
- Iosyperko, M. ed. *Shliakhy i problemy rozvytku ukrains'kohoadians'koho teatru*. Kyiv: Mystetstvo, 1970.
- knyvylia, Andrii. "Do orhanizatsii literaturnykh syl." *Komunist* 22 Jan. 1927: 5.
- . "Iasnoiu dorohoju." *Komunist* 15 May 1927: 2-3.

- "Pro nashy literaturni spravy." *Komunist*, 24 April 1926. 2, 28 April 1925: 2-3.
- Kirshon, Vladimir. *Stat'ii rechi o dramaturgii, teatre i kina* Moscow: "Iskusstvo," 1962.
- Koshelivets, Ivan. *Suchasna literatura v URSS* New York: Proloh, 1964.
- Kostiuk, Hryhorii. *Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine: A Study of the Decade of Mass Terror (1929-1939)* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960.
- *U sviti idei i obraziv (Vybrane). Krytychni ta istoryko-literaturni rozдумы 1930-1980* Munich: Suchasnist', 1980.
- Kostomarov, Mykola. *Dvi rus'ki narodnosti*. Leipzig: Ukrains'ka nakladnia, 1923.
- Kuziakina, Natal'ia. *Narysy ukrains'koi radians'koi dramaturhii* Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk. Vol. 1 (1917-1934), 1958.
- Leites, A. *Renesans ukrains'koi literatury*. Khar'kov: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo Ukrainy, 1925.
- Luckyj, George S. N. "The Battle for Literature in the Soviet Ukraine: a Documentary Study of *Vaplite* (1925-1928)." *Harvard Slavonic Studies* 3 (1957): 227-46.
- *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine (1917-1934)* New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.
- ed. *The Vaplite Collection*. Toronto: Mosaic Press, 1977.
- Lunacharskii, Anatolii Vasilevich. *Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*. Vol. 3. Moscow: "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1964.
- *O teatre i dramaturgii*. Vol. 1. Moscow: "Iskusstvo," 1958.g
- Samilenko, Polina. *Nezabutni dni horin'*. Kyiv: Mystetstvo, 1970.
- Segel, Harold B. *Twentieth-Century Russian Drama (From Gorky to the Present)*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.

- Sneveiov, George Y. *Ukrains'ka mova v persnii polovyni dvadtsiatoho stolittia (1900-1941). Stan i status* Trans. Oksana Solovey. Munich: Suchasnist', 1987.
- Shkandrii, Myroslav. "Dvi ukrains'ki literatury, Mykola Khvylovy i suchasnist'." *Dialogue* 7-8 (1982): 103-22.
- . "Introduction. Mykola Khvylovy and the Literary Discussion." In *The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine: Polemical Pamphlets 1925-1926*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986, 1-30.
- Sniapak, Dmytro. "Suchasna dramaturhiia: Podykh onovlennia." *Literaturna Ukraina* 23 (1986): 1-8.
- Shostakovich, Dmitrii. *Testimony. The Memories of Dmitri Shostakovich* (as related to and edited by Solomon Volkov.) Transl. Antonina W. Bouis. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Skrypnyk, Mykola. *Statti i promovy*. München. Suchasnist', 1974.
- Smolych, Iurii. *Pro teatr: zbirnyk statei, retsenzii, narysiv*. Kyiv: Mystetstvo, 1977.
- Stanishevsky, Yurii. *Theatrical Art of Soviet Ukraine* Trans. Anatole Bilenko. Kyiv. Mystetstvo, 1979.
- Stanislavskii, Konstantine. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 8 vols. Moscow. "Iskusstvo," 1961. Vol. 8.
- Starynkevych, Ievhen. *Ukrains'ka radians'ka dramaturhiia za 40 rokiv*. Kyiv. Vydavnytstvo AN URSSR, 1957.
- Thompson, Boris. *The Premature Revolution. Russian Literature and Society 1917-1946* London: Weidenfeld, 1972.
- Vishnevskii, Vsevolod. *Sochineniia* 6 vols. Moscow: "Sovetskii pisatel'," 1961. Vol. 6.

vozniak, Mykhailo. *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury*. 3 vols. L'viv: Prosvita,  
1924. Vol. 3, part 2.