



- **Институт мировой литературы им. А.М.Горького
Российской академии наук**
 - **Большие и малые вехи русского апокалипсиса:**
 - **Война и революция в русской литературе и искусстве**
 - **первой четверти XX века**
 - **Международная научная конференция**
 - 21–22 октября 2021 года
 - Организатор:
 - **Институт мировой литературы им. А.М.Горького РАН**
 - **Организационный комитет:**
- *Вадим Владимирович Полонский*, директор ИМЛИ РАН, член-корреспондент РАН, заведующий Отделом русской литературы конца XIX – начала XX века, главный редактор журнала «Известия РАН. Серия литературы и языка»
- *Михаил Васильевич Козьменко*, к.ф.н., ведущий научный сотрудник ИМЛИ РАН
- *Елена Валерьевна Глухова*, к.ф.н., старший научный сотрудник ИМЛИ РАН
- *Наталья Алексеевна Дровалева*, к.ф.н., старший научный сотрудник ИМЛИ РАН.
- *Вера Михайловна Введенская* (секретарь Оргкомитета), старший научный сотрудник ИМЛИ РАН.
- **Регламент выступлений: Доклад – 15-20 минут; обсуждение – 5 минут.**
 - **Все заседания будут проходить в zoom**

- 21 октября 2021 г.

- **Открытие конференции**

- 10.45

- Вступительное слово – директор ИМЛИ РАН, член-корреспондент РАН

Вадим Владимирович Полонский

- **Дневное заседание: 11.00 – 14.00**

- **Ведущий – Дровалева Наталия Алексеевна**

Молодяков Василий Элинархович (университет Такусёку, Токио, Япония). Образ Японии в русской поэзии конца XIX – первой четверти XX века: итоги

- **Барковская Нина Владимировна** (Уральский государственный педагогический университет, Екатеринбург). «Японская» составляющая в творчестве русских символистов

- **Савина Анфиса Даниловна** (ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). Материалы о Дальнем Востоке и Русско-японской войне в журнале «Весы» (1904-1905 гг.)

Орлицкий Юрий Борисович (РГГУ, Москва). Апокалипсис в стихах

Петров Валерий Валентинович (Институт философии РАН, Москва). Революция как апокалипсис в русской литературно-философской традиции начала XX века

Перерыв: с 14.00 до 15.00

- **Вечернее заседание: 15.00 -18.00**

- **Ведущий – Введенская Вера Михайловна**

- **Богданова Ольга Алимовна** (ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). Русско-японская война 1904-1905 гг. и новое осмысление наследия Ф.М. Достоевского
- **Андрущенко Елена Анатольевна** (ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). В ожидании «конца времен»: публицистика Д.С. Мережковского периода первой русской революции
- **Боева Галина Николаевна** (Институт бизнес-коммуникаций СПбГУПТД, Санкт-Петербург). Соглядатай, блудница и террорист как метагерои «русского апокалипсиса» («Штабс-капитан Рыбников» Куприна и «Тьма» Андреева)
- **Михайлова Мария Викторовна** (МГУ, ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). Повесть И.С. Шмелева «Гражданин Уклеikin» (1908) как декларация прав человека.
- **Кудрицкая Софья Владимировна** (МГУ, Москва). Художественное осмысление событий Первой русской революции в творчестве Александры Мирэ (Моисеевой) (1874–1913)

• **22 октября 2021 г.**

• **Дневное заседание: 11.00 – 14.00**

• **Ведущий** – Козьменко Михаил Васильевич

- **Стейнхольт Ингвар** (UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Тромсё, Норвегия). Andreev's Hyper-Realism: Krasnyi smekh and the ongoing war (доклад на английском языке)
- **Рогачевский Андрей Борисович** (UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Тромсё, Норвегия). Апокалипсис и любительская психиатрия: Попытка диагноза душевной болезни второго рассказчика в «Красном смехе» Л. Н. Андреева

- **Джулиани Рита** (Университет Сапьенца, Рим, Италия). «Мысль» Леонида Андреева как объект литературного и психиатрического анализа
- **Козьменко Михаил Васильевич** (ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). «Новые песни» для «нового читателя»: кристаллизация андреевского «праэкспрессионизма» в ранних редакциях пьесы «К звездам»
- **Сушила Ирина Константиновна** (ИОН РАНХиГС, Москва). Русско-японская война в рецепции писателей-современников (Л. Н. Андреев «Красный смех». Е. Н. Чириков «Тайна»)
- **Кнорре Елена Юрьевна** (ИМЛИ РАН, ПСТГУ, Москва). Мистика освобождения: революция 1905 года в восприятии Л. Толстого и Л. Андреева («Божеское и человеческое» и «Рассказ о семи повешенных»).

Перерыв: с 14.00 до 15.00

- **Вечернее заседание: 15.00 -18.00**
- **Ведущий – Глухова Елена Валерьевна**
- **Левицкая Татьяна Владимировна** (независимый исследователь, Москва). «Школа патриотизма»: статьи Н.А. Лухмановой (1841-1907) о Японии
- **Федотова Светлана Владимировна** (ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). Литературный конкистадор: Корней Чуковский в 1905 году
- **Чэн Лян** (МГУ, Москва). «Мы плыли с тобою навстречу заре...» (Творчество Скитальца периода первой русской революции)
- **Шапкина Ольга Ивановна** (ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). Япония в жизни и творчестве М.А. Волошина (по материалам эго-документов)

- Глухова Елена Валерьевна (ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). Русско-японская война как факт биографии и поэтики Андрея Белого
- Дровалева Наталия Алексеевна (ИМЛИ РАН, Москва). Александр Яковлевич Брюсов: жизненные вехи и вехи русского апокалипсиса

Приложение.

Аннотация к докладу д-ра Ингвара Стейнхолта

Andreev's Hyper-Realism: *Krasnyi smekh* and the ongoing war.

*Dr Yngvar B. Steinholt,
Institute of Language and Culture
UiT – The Arctic University of Norway*

Summary

Andreev's portrayal of war in his short-story *Krasnyi smekh* (1905) has frequently been described as, generalised, hyperbolic and exaggerated, and marked by fin-de-siècle decadence and (ultra-) impressionism. Notably, scholarly commentary on this work by contemporary psychiatrists and psychologists came to a different conclusion. Dr. Mumortsev, writing in 1910, argued that the experience of war was *realistically* represented by Andreev through the minds of two brother characters suffering from developing mental illness. Based on Andreev's correspondence with Veresaev, Woodward asserts that Andreev was concerned with the ongoing war in particular and regarded it as "even more senseless and criminal" than previous wars. This suggests that a more direct comparison between Andreev's story and the theatre of war in the ongoing conflict is warranted. In the following, we therefore keep in mind that to the contemporary reader, the events and realities of the ongoing war were crystal clear. In Andreev's text, what today appears as scarce and subtle references to current events would have resonated with specific knowledge in the contemporary reader's mind. This is not to say that the author was necessarily always hinting at actual events. Rather, his vagueness enables his readers to associate the narrative with whatever knowledge *they* have of the war. Remarkably, *Krasnyi smekh* seems little affected by the amount of historical detail supplied by the reader. If the reader prefers, the text can be read as complementary to ongoing events, even chronologically.

Richard Connaughton's *Rising Sun and Tumbling Bear: Russia's War with Japan* (first published 1988) offers an exhaustive battle-for-battle account by a military historian for comparison. Bringing in archive material from Western observers, it complements and expands the picture drawn by the contemporary Russian sources discussed in Shiskina (2017). A reading of Andreev's and Connaughton's texts back to

back demonstrates how the message of *Krasnyi smekh* remains constant, independently of the author's and his reader's respective knowledge of the war. Let us then leave aside for a moment the question of what Andreev read and knew about the war, and see how his text responds to and accommodates detailed historical knowledge.

The Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05 introduced heavy artillery, machine guns, mines, trench battles, barbed wire, and chemical weaponry, often combined with dated military strategy. This deeply shocked contemporary observers, military and civilian leadership, and the respective civil societies. The accounts of Western observers often resonate with the same "madness and horror" found in concentrated form in Andreev's fictional text. Like the reports from Russian officers and war correspondents, they openly reflected on the cruelty and brutality witnessed and the immediate and long-term psychological effects. Japanese forces landed three battalions in Korea prior to the declaration of war on 10 February 1904, and from 17-22 February added three full divisions. At the earliest stages of the war, Russia relied on troops from its eastern provinces, but towards summer, the Russian Army began to increasingly bring in enforcements from the western regions via the Trans-Siberian Railway. This could explain why Andreev's main character, an artillery officer from the European part of Russia, is introduced to the reader in the midst of the summer heat. Just previously, by the end of May, after the fall of Nanshan on the Eastern Chinese Railway, the Japanese offensive had created two fronts, one pushing south-west towards the Russian naval base of Port Arthur (Liu Shun), the other advancing north along the railroad towards what would become sites of major battles: Telissu (13-15 May), Liaoyang (23 August - 5 September) and, ultimately, Mukden (March 1905).

Read alongside Connaughton's account, Andreev's fragmented narrative appears to fall into step with historical events some time during the retreat following the battle of Telissu and the events leading up to, and including, the battle of Liaoyang, where in Fragment VI, the main character and first narrator loses both legs in a friendly fire incident. These first fragments do not resist a direct comparison with the events of the ongoing war. Then, in Fragment VII, we learn in retrospect from a third party that the train evacuating the wounded hit a mine, killing everybody on board. This introduces a move away from the initial eyewitness account as well as away from factual historic events.

Artillery played a decisive role in the battle of Telissu, and continued to do so at Liaoyang, also in the intense fighting around Manju Yama (Rice Cake Hill). This may have motivated the occupation of Andreev's first narrator. The beginning of the summer heat, interspersed with fog and rain, also complements such a timeline. The Japanese had just changed from their blue winter into khaki summer uniforms. Notably, Andreev does not refer to the "correct" uniform colour. Instead, in Fragment VI, the narrator describes the enemy khaiki uniform as "orange", the Russian grey as "red". Keeping in mind that the narrator describes all colours as affected by the red

light from the overpowering sun of Fragment I, this choice is not necessarily an impressionist one. It could be part of Andreev's *realistic* portrayal through madness.

A first potential match between Andreev's and Connaughton's narratives occurs on 24 July when, during the Russian withdrawal towards Liaoyang, temperatures exceeded +40° C. Issued with hats that failed to protect them from the sun, Russian soldiers succumbed to heat exhaustion and cases of death from sunstroke were reported. In Andreev's narrative, heat and sunstroke becomes the first source for the madness affecting the soldiers. Andreev's main character is introduced during a withdrawal in extreme heat. The effect of heat and exhaustion on the mental condition of the artillery officer and his fellow soldiers is portrayed as a first, individual stage in the development of madness. Fragment II, set in a sudden pause in the battle, created by a sudden downpour, elaborates on this development, introducing another source of severe mental stress: the duration of battle and continuous noise of artillery over several days and nights. Previously, actual battles seldom lasted more than a day. The battle of Liaoyang spanned two weeks, from 23 August until 5 September 1904. In one day, the same soldiers could be involved in several major attacks. A Russian officer's noted after Liaoyang: "Our soldiers were falling with fatigue and exhaustion; their nerves failed to perform their duties; we were compelled to take into account this psychological factor".

From Fragment III onwards, the individual madness that the main character observes in himself and in his comrades, develops into a collective madness. This mass madness is elaborated upon in Fragments IV and V, before Fragment VI depicts a friendly fire incident, in which the main protagonist is seriously wounded. Again, without excluding other, similar incidents, Andreev's narrative shows considerable overlaps with historical events. During the third week of battle around Liaoyang, on 2 September, the severely wounded Major General V.I. Orlov attempted to gather the remains of his brigade by Post 8 on the railroad, halfway between the frontline and Liaoyang. A group of soldiers approaching the meeting point from the east mistook those already gathered there for the enemy and opened fire.

Perhaps more striking than any potential matching detail is how the military historian's account vibrates with the same sentiment of madness and horror isolated and cultivated in *Krasnyi smekh*. To connect Fragment VI to this or another high-profile friendly fire incident is a possibility left entirely to the reader. Very much in line with Woodward's observations, whilst boiling down the narrative to aspects of "madness and horror" and focusing on madness as a response to war, Andreev makes numerous, more or less subtle allusions to the particular, ongoing conflict. The Russo-Japanese war is indeed on his mind, to the point that a speculative reading could set the first part of his narrative between 24 July and 2 September 1904. Yet, his focus on the development in the mental state of his protagonists not only kept his narrative open for individual interpretation. It is tempting to assume such a move was also beneficial for helping *Krasnyi smekh* pass censorship and reach publication.

Part Two continues to make references to events that may well also allude to the Battle of Liaoyang, but these are increasingly detached from the first protagonist's eyewitness accounts and related to rumours and media reports. The comparison of the Part One storyline and actual events during the battle of Liaoyang might have alerted us to certain key connections between Andreev's work and the ongoing war, but with these connections come a false illusion of order in the chaos. The fragmented form and brutal scenes of *Krasnyi smekh* seek to enhance this sense of chaos. Notably, Connaughton's account of the battle produces a similar effect and the British observer, General Sir Ian Hamilton, in his description of the Russian dead after the battle of Manju Yama, also compliments Andreev's depictions of mass madness. Even the military professional, faced with the horrors of modern warfare, has to resort to concepts of madness in order to describe what he has witnessed.

Andreev takes this concept to its logical conclusion: if war is madness, the rational human brain is ill-suited to describe it. This is where *Krasnyi smekh* expands from the depiction of the ongoing conflict and becomes timeless. The storyline and scenes break down into fragments and the narration is taken over by the mad, who experience a total breakdown of civilisation: a mass madness represented by the infectious Red Laugh. The two brothers' insanity is a visionary one, which allows them to recognize the full threat of war to human civilisation. Our investigation suggests that Andreev's two madmen are not so much vehicles of "fin-de-siècle decadence and (ultra-)impressionism" and the portrayal of the war not so much "hyperbolic and exaggerated" but reliable, as suggested above by the good Dr. Mumortsev: "realistic" or, we suggest, *hyper-realistic*. Faced with an all-absorbing mass madness, where objective accounts become impossible and the most natural and human response to events is to go insane, the most reliable and truthful account of war becomes that of the visionary madman.

Список работ В.Э.Молодякова об образе Японии в русской поэзии

1. Япония и русский символизм: отражение и влияние // Вестник МГУ. Серия: Востоковедение. 1990. № 2. С. 40-48.
 2. Концепция двух Востоков и русская литература Серебряного века // Известия Академии наук СССР. Отделение литературы и языка. Т. 49. 1990. № 6. С. 504-514.
 3. «Восток Ксеркса». (Япония в философии истории Владимира Соловьева и Андрея Белого) // Проблемы Дальнего Востока. 1991. № 1. С. 61-68. (про стихи тут тоже есть).
 4. «В лимонной гавани Иокогама». Япония в русской советской поэзии 20-х годов // Вестник МГУ. Серия: Востоковедение. 1993. № 3. С. 15-21.
 5. Япония в русской поэзии 20-30-х годов // Япония. 1993. Ежегодник. М. 1994. С. 160-167.
 6. Образ Японии в Европе и России второй половины XIX – начала XX веков. М.-Токио. 1996. 183 С. (про символизм лучше читать здесь).
 7. Япония в русском сознании и русской культуре конца XIX – начала XX века // Россия и мир глазами друг друга: из истории взаимовосприятия. Вып. 2. М.: 2002. С. 325-342 (обобщение).
 8. «В лимонной гавани Йокогама». «Живописная Япония» в русской поэзии Серебряного века // Родина. 2005. № 10. С. 58-60 (популярное изложение).
 9. Россия и Япония: имиджевые войны. М.: АСТ, Астрель, Хранитель, 2007. 480, [32] С. (В соавт. с А.Е. Кулановым). Часть 1. Главы 5 и 6 (плюс подборка текстов, включая редкие).
 10. Россия и Япония: Золотой век (1905-1916). М.: Просвещение, 2008. 176 С. (Серия «На грани мира»). Глава 6. "Влюбись в Японию, поэт!"
 11. Сны о Японии. (Предисловие и публикация) // Российский японоведческий журнал. № 1 (2010). С. 113-116. Интернет-издание (ссылка в первом комментарии).
 12. «Где гейши веселы, там весел звон...». Экзотическая Япония глазами русских поэтов. (Предисловие и публикация) // Российский японоведческий журнал. № 2 (2011). С. 102-107.
 13. Русские танка и хайку Серебряного века. Предисловие и публикация // Российский японоведческий журнал. № 3. С. 94-98.
 14. Япония в поэзии «русского Китая» Предисловие и публикация // Российский японоведческий журнал. № 4. С. 92-96.
-