

The Moscow Art Theatre

Nick Worrall

Theatre Production Studies



**Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details**

THE MOSCOW ART THEATRE

The Moscow Art Theatre offers a detailed look at this famous theatre company and its founder Konstantin Stanislavsky, whose reputation as a theatre director and theoretician is unparalleled.

With descriptions of fifty Moscow Art Theatre productions between 1898 and 1917, Nick Worrall provides an account of the historical background of the company and the ways in which it ran its affairs, recruited its actors, established a repertoire and equipped its theatre buildings. He highlights the work not only of Stanislavsky and his well-known colleagues, but also the less well-known people who made an essential contribution to the artistic success and financial survival of the company. Worrall focuses in particular on four productions: Tolstoy's *Tsar Fedor Ioannovich*, Gorky's *The Lower Depths*, Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* and Turgenev's *A Month in the Country*.

Nick Worrall teaches English and European dramatic literature, as well as Russian and Soviet literature, at Middlesex University. He has researched widely in modern Russian/Soviet theatre, specialising in the work of theatre directors. His publications include *Nikolai Gogol and Ivan Turgenev*, and *Modernism to Realism on the Soviet Stage*.

THEATRE PRODUCTION
STUDIES
General Editor: John Russell Brown
University of Michigan

There has long been a need for books which give a clear idea of how the great theatre of the past worked and of the particular experiences they offered. Students of dramatic literature and theatre history are increasingly concerned with plays in performance, especially the performances expected by their authors and their audiences. Directors, designers, actors and other theatre practitioners need imaginative, practical suggestions on how to revive plays and experiment with rehearsal and production techniques.

Theatre Production Studies fills this need. Designed to span Western theatre from the Greeks to the present day, each book explores a period, or genre, drawing together aspects of production from staging, wardrobe and acting styles, to the management of a theatre, its artistic team, and technical crew. Each volume focuses on several texts of exceptional achievement, and is well illustrated with contemporary material.

Already published:

SHAKESPEARE'S THEATRE (second edition)
JACOBEAN PUBLIC THEATRE
BROADWAY THEATRE
GREEK TRAGIC THEATRE

Peter Thomson
Alexander Leggatt
Andrew Harris
Rush Rehm

THE MOSCOW ART THEATRE

Nick Worrall



London and New York

First published 1996
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2003.

© 1996 Nick Worrall

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from
the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-203-11443-4 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-16321-4 (Adobe eReader Format)

ISBN 0-415-05598-9 (Print Edition)

For
LENELY
(b. 1898)

This page intentionally left blank.

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>A note on transliteration and names</i>	<i>x</i>

Part I The Establishment of the Moscow Art Theatre

INTRODUCTION	3
1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	12
2 THE SOCIETY OF ART AND LITERATURE	23
3 THE CREATION OF A NEW THEATRE	30
4 THE HERMITAGE THEATRE ON CARRIAGE ROW	46
5 ACTORS, SALARIES, CONDITIONS OF SERVICE	55
6 SAVVA MOROZOV AND THE LIANOZOV THEATRE	65

Part II The Moscow Art Theatre Repertoire 1898–1917

7 FIRST SEASON: 1898–1899 <i>TSAR FEDOR IOANNOVICH</i> <i>The Sunken Bell, The Merchant of Venice, Despots, Greta's Happiness, The Mistress of the Inn, The Seagull, Antigone, Hedda Gabler</i>	82
8 SECOND SEASON: 1899–1900 <i>The Death of Ivan the Terrible, Twelfth Night, Drayman Henschel, Uncle Vanya, Lonely Lives</i>	108

9	THIRD SEASON: 1900–1901 <i>The Snow Maiden, An Enemy of the People, When We Dead Awaken, Three Sisters</i>	117
10	FOURTH SEASON: 1901–1902 <i>The Wild Duck, Michael Kramer, In Dreams, The Merchant Class</i>	124
11	FIFTH SEASON: 1902–1903 <i>The Power of Darkness, THE LOWER DEPTHS, The Pillars of Society</i>	128
12	SIXTH SEASON: 1903–1904 <i>Julius Caesar, THE CHERRY ORCHARD</i>	147
13	SEASON SEVEN TO SEASON TEN: 1904–1908 <i>The Intruder, The Interior, The Blind, Ivanov, Ghosts, Children of the Sun, 'Tis Folly to be Wise, Brand, The Drama of Life, Boris Godunov, The Life of Man, Rosmersholm</i>	160
14	SEASONS ELEVEN AND TWELVE: 1908–1909 <i>The Blue Bird, The Government Inspector, A MONTH IN THE COUNTRY</i>	172
15	SEASON TWELVE TO SEASON TWENTY: 1909–1917 <i>Anathema, The Scoundrel, The Brothers Karamazov, The Imaginary Invalid, Nikolay Stavrogin, Stepanchikovo Village, Mozart and Salieri</i>	192
16	CONCLUSION	197
	<i>Notes</i>	202
	<i>Bibliography</i>	224
	<i>Index</i>	232

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to Professor Ted Braun of Bristol University for (I believe) recommending that I take on the task of writing this book; to the British Council for a research grant which took me to Moscow in 1988 when work on the book commenced; to Middlesex Polytechnic (now Middlesex University) for sabbatical leave which enabled me to continue the research and begin writing it; to Non Worrall for recommending the purchase of a word processor and for initiating me into its operational mysteries; to Zhenya Skvortsova for invaluable help in circumventing obstacles and for obtaining photocopied material from the Lenin Library; to staff at the STD (Theatre Workers' Union) Library in Moscow for their courtesy and help; to Professor Irina Maljutina of the St Petersburg Conservatoire for her long-standing friendship and an invaluable supply of books going back to the 1970s; to Professor Anna Obraztsova of the Moscow VNII (Institute for Artistic Research) similarly for friendship and a constant supply of irreplaceable books and for introducing me to Stanislavsky scholars in Moscow; to Professor Aleksey Bartoshevich of the STD and Milla Bartoshevicha for looking after our cats and, again, for supplying me with rare pre-revolutionary as well as more recent publications, all of which have helped a great deal with this project; and last but not least, to my editor, Professor John Russell Brown, go thanks for his advice, patience, and encouragement. Needless to say, none of the above people can be held responsible for any of the opinions expressed and some would, I know, wish to dispute them.

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND NAMES

Except in direct citations from Russian sources, Russian names are given in their accepted English forms—thus ‘Meyerkhol’d’ also appears as ‘Meyerhold’, ‘Gorky’ as ‘Gor’kiy’, and ‘Stanislavskiy’ as ‘Stanislavsky’ (as well as ‘Stanislavski’ where that version of his name has been used by others). The method of transliteration used in this book is based on the ‘Matthews’ system, with the occasional variation where a ‘y’ is prefixed to ‘e’—so that ‘Egorov’ (the painter and stage designer) is transliterated as ‘Yegorov’, ‘Epikhodov’ (a character in *The Cherry Orchard*) as ‘Yepikhodov’, and a word like *p’esa* (a play) appears as *p’yesa*. The Russian ‘yo’ has not been phoneticised so ‘Fedor’ is not transliterated as ‘Fyodor’. Soft-signs are indicated but hard-signs have been omitted from citations of pre-revolutionary sources. An attempt has been made to be consistent throughout.

It was the Moscow Art Theatre which, going against tradition, first introduced the convention of referring to actors by their initials and surnames in their programmes and publicity-handouts, rather than referring to them as Mr and Mrs which had hitherto been the norm. Unlike England, where theatre programmes refer to actors by their first and surnames, the modern convention in Russia and in the Soviet Union has always been to refer to the surname only, prefaced by the initials of the first name and patronymic of the actor concerned. Thus, an internationally renowned actress such as Olga Knipper would always feature in theatre programmes as O.L.Knipper (her patronymic being Leonardovna), just as Stanislavsky would always appear as K.S. Stanislavsky. This meant that, often, the first names and patronymics of less prominent actors and actresses were never widely known, if at all, and public references to them were by initials and surname only. For this reason

the Russian practice has been observed in the notes on individual actors which appear at the end, where both the famous and the not-so-famous are identified by initials and surname only.

This page intentionally left blank.

Part I

**THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE MOSCOW ART
THEATRE**

This page intentionally left blank.

INTRODUCTION

The considerable impact of the Moscow Art Theatre, especially in Europe and North America, has largely been on the development of acting theory through the writings of Konstantin Stanislavsky, one of the Theatre's founders. However, although the Art Theatre began life in 1898, Stanislavsky did not concern himself seriously with acting theory until almost ten years later. A great deal of his theoretical work was written down during the 1930s, when his involvement in day-to-day theatre operations had ceased and the Theatre's own traditions were increasingly moribund.

Since the death, in 1943, of the Art Theatre's co-founder, Vladimir Nemirovich-Danchenko, and his successful revival of Chekhov's *Three Sisters* in 1940, the history of the Art Theatre has been undistinguished, despite attempts by disciples of both founders to sustain its values. Everything bequeathed by Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko as an on-going legacy to be nurtured by inheritors who had acquired their experience at first hand, remains undeveloped. Despite the availability of key theoretical works (albeit incomplete), the scrupulous records of Art Theatre productions, and studies devoted to both, there is little evidence of Stanislavsky's and Nemirovich-Danchenko's positive influence on Russian theatre practice. At the time of writing, the Moscow Art Theatre is split and in crisis, and this seems symptomatic of a long-term decline, held in check and disguised by a less than disinterested, centralised state artistic policy.¹ What went wrong, and where did things begin to go wrong? It is perhaps necessary, at the approach of the Theatre's centenary, to return to its origins in an attempt to discover why the creation of the Moscow Art Theatre was such an important event and why it remains of major historical and artistic significance.

When the Moscow Art Theatre first visited Britain in 1958, the cultural and political after-shock was negligible compared with that of the Berliner Ensemble's visit in 1956. This was the Art Theatre's ninth overseas tour and thirteen more were made, to various parts of the world, between 1956 and 1977. However, none of these tours made any real and lasting impression on the theatrical consciousness of the countries visited. We probably have to go back to the first European tour, in 1906 (an artistic success but a financial failure) and to the American tours of 1923 and 1924, to discover what made the Moscow Art Theatre one of the world's great theatrical institutions. Moreover, the productions taken to America, whose effects proved so influential, were, in some cases, already twenty years old—and had already toured Europe in 1906. The international reputation of the Theatre seems, then, to be very specifically connected with its origins, and its historical significance with its very earliest years.

Important productions were staged at the Art Theatre between 1905 and 1917, as well as during the Soviet period, but nothing to compare in significance with those of the very first years. Who, outside Russia, can name any significant Art Theatre production staged after 1917? The international reputation of the theatre since the Russian Revolution has been almost entirely attributable to Stanislavsky's theoretical writings and, in particular, to his two-part study 'An Actor's Work on Himself'.² Effectively, the appropriation of the Moscow Art Theatre as a cultural instrument of the one-party state and the canonisation of its exemplary realist methods served to seal the theatre off from any influence it might have exercised on the international theatre scene, especially from the late 1920s. Its only tour abroad between 1924 and 1956 was to Paris, in 1937. On the other hand, the proliferation of Stanislavsky's theories, at first or second-hand, in translations of varying quality and accuracy, has resulted in their almost canonical status in drama schools throughout the Western world. Apart from 'The Method', however, no genuinely innovative theatrical developments have stemmed directly from these theories, only in reaction to them. Of their enlarged or extended application there is little sign, even in their country of origin where Stanislavsky's writings have been regarded as virtually sacrosanct. (The terms 'method' and 'The Method' are used to describe the American adaptation of the Stanislavsky 'system' associated mainly with Lee Strasberg and the Actors Studio, which Strasberg founded in 1950.)

It may seem heretical to suggest that Stanislavsky's main contribution to modern European theatre was complete by 1917. But theory begins to be divorced from practice or, at least, from the daily exigen-

cies of running a theatre, and this produced, by the 1930s, a divorce from social and political reality of a potentially disabling kind. If all that remained of Stanislavsky's inheritance was his theory (rather than both that and the record of his earlier practice) he might have gone down in history as an earnest, rather old-fashioned theoretician with a nineteenth- rather than a twentieth-century world outlook. The testing of his theories in the unreal conditions of secluded and private rehearsals (a privilege conferred by a totalitarian leader) lent public support, ironically, to the suppression of anything which appeared to challenge the premises of those theories. Stanislavsky's own 'modernist' experiments (mainly pre-1914) appear unsophisticated beside those of Edward Gordon Craig, Vsevolod Meyerhold, Antonin Artaud and others. His subsequent espousal of an apparently unproblematic notion of 'realism', based on the tangible reality of individual consciousness and emotional experience, seems both provisional and tenuous in a historical context which includes the philosophical perspectives of Luigi Pirandello, or post-modern ideas on the nature of the individual subject. When the 'humanist' elements of Stanislavsky's ideology are viewed, retrospectively, in the historical context of the inhuman, irrational politics of the *gulag* and the Holocaust, his commitment to narrow versions of realism and his immersion in theory and private rehearsal during the 1930s can seem either blinkered or complicit with a public process which had more to do with the mad-house than with nuances of psychological or emotional 'truth'.

Did Stanislavsky's fundamentally humanist theories, based on realist premises, have any relationship then with the inhumanity of the surrounding world? Did they connect with the actual practice of the Moscow Art Theatre after 1928, when he had effectively retired from day-to-day work in the theatre? What is the connection between the content of 'An Actor's Work on Himself', Stanislavsky's intense rehearsal work during his last ten years, and the life-and-death struggle being waged beyond the confines of his cloistered, state-funded rehearsal space?³ How is it that Stanislavskyan theory could, later, be made to serve the apparently contradictory interests of unfettered individualist self-expression (in the largely American-inspired transmission of his ideas) as well as the political interests of a totalitarianism masquerading as collectivism?

Brecht's main arguments against narrow versions of 'realism' were based on the tendency of realistic methods to underwrite the 'status quo' and reinscribe the contours of a 'given' reality within the consciousness of the perceiver, rather than to awaken new ways of seeing

and interpreting social reality, or challenge accepted orthodoxies. There is little doubt that the state's canonisation of the Moscow Art Theatre, and its espousal of Stanislavskyan versions of realism were devices used to underpin an orthodox promulgation of that state's self-image—ostensibly humane and considerate of individual thought and feeling—when the real world outside the theatre required definition in much more complex terms.

The problem has as much to do with the legitimisation of realist theory as with the beatification of Stanislavsky himself. In a modernist age (not to mention a post-modern one) Stanislavsky's seeming faith in a stable understanding of realism can seem culpably ingenuous. However, in his defence, it should be said that his version of realism was merely one among other, constantly evolving definitions. It fell to others to make a pernicious ideology of a single, static version—a form of 'naturalism' far removed from the idealism with which Stanislavsky sought to invest the term.

Stanislavsky's interest in late-nineteenth-century 'realist' method was, inevitably, related to the 'naturalistic' interests of others during that same period. This coloured his work at the Society of Art and Literature and his early years at the Art Theatre. But the introduction of the 'system' and Stanislavsky's dedication to the pursuit of truth in an altogether new, uncompromising humanistic and scientific vein reveal a spiritual discontent with the obsessional aspects of naturalistic disclosure. Stanislavsky's religion of realism inveighs against the reductionist perspectives of naturalism's faith in the absolutely material, against its belief in physiological and environmental determinants which reduce spirit to matter and desire to mere appetite in a spiritless universe.

When placing Stanislavsky and the Art Theatre in the context that produced them and examining aspects of Russian and European theatre history that can assist in an understanding of the Art Theatre's emergence, it is also necessary to demonstrate the inextricable connection between the ideal and the real, the elevated and the everyday. The idealistic tones of Stanislavsky's address to the band of disciples who gathered at Pushkino on 14 June 1898, to begin rehearsals for the Theatre's opening that October, appear idly high-minded if divorced from the daily round which is the lot of any theatrical enterprise. Among those who ensured that the curtain rose on the successful first night (in fact it parted in the middle) were not only luminaries such as Stanislavsky, Nemirovich-Danchenko, Ivan Moskvín, Meyerhold and Olga Knipper, but also 373 others—the total complement of staff employed by the

Moscow Public-Accessible Art Theatre (as it was initially called) during its first season.

Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko came together in the first place in order to create a theatre both 'public' and 'accessible'. For them the theatre was no idle, incidental pastime for a select few but, like the great theatres of the past—the Greek or the Elizabethan—was a fundamental part of the spiritual life, and health, of the community as a whole, as well as a profession worthy of the dedication of a lifetime's spiritual and material effort.

The first part of what follows deals with the historical background and sequence of events which led to the founding of the Moscow Art Theatre and focuses on the early years. The latter part attempts a summarising overview of the theatre's repertoire from 1898 until 1917. The total number of productions staged at the Art Theatre during this period was around seventy, which would be impossible to treat equally; therefore, four productions have been selected for treatment in detail—*Tsar Fedor Ioannovich* (1898), *The Lower Depths* (1902), *The Cherry Orchard* (1904) and *A Month in the Country* (1909)—and some justification of this particular selection seems necessary.

As well as being one of the most successful productions in the Art Theatre's history, Aleksey Tolstoy's historical drama, *Tsar Fedor Ioannovich*, was also its first. Amongst other things, it serves to illustrate the influence of the archaeological-naturalist movement in European theatre, to which Stanislavsky was exposed through contact with the Meiningen Court Theatre productions of historical plays. The historical and ethnographical authenticity which marked the production of *Tsar Fedor* were in stark contrast to the clichéd, stereotypical versions of the historical past which had been the hallmark of earlier attempts, by the Imperial Theatres and others, to stage Russian and foreign history plays. One of the most telling comments on the production of *Tsar Fedor* was made by the Imperial Theatre actress, Mariya Yermolova, who stated that, henceforth, anyone wishing to stage historical plays with any degree of artistic integrity would need to learn from the Art Theatre's example.⁴

The production was also significant in that it marked the advent of the *director* into both the Russian and, to an important extent, the European theatre. Prior to this, Russian critics and commentators invariably spoke of 'performances'; henceforth they would speak of 'productions', with all the implications this had for ensemble, unity of intellectual conception and aesthetically integrated, effective *mises-en-scènes*. With this production, Stanislavsky might be said to have been making a

deliberate bid for a place in theatre history in a manner conscious both of his own and its historical significance. He was not merely following in the footsteps of Ludwig Chronegk as a stager-of-crowd-scenes, but staking a claim for the importance of the role of the director as overall organiser of the production.⁵

Tsar Fedor not only proved to be the most popular production during the Theatre's first season but was also immensely popular in the long-term, despite undergoing many structural alterations and changes of personnel. It was given its 700th performance in 1944 on the occasion of the actor Ivan Moskvín's 70th birthday, when he repeated the performance as Fedor which he had first given forty-six years previously. The production was even to outlive Moskvín himself and record one thousand performances—perhaps not many by London West End standards but a considerable number in terms of the Russian repertory system.

The choice of a play by Maxim Gorky, and *The Lower Depths* in particular, may not seem to justify itself so clearly. However, its production needs to be seen in the context of a history in which Gorky was not only a romantic modifier of the naturalist tradition, but also the first Russian 'proletarian' playwright. Moreover, this production was staged at a theatre which had christened itself 'public-accessible' with the specific aim of appealing to working-class audiences. Somewhat ironically, by the time it staged *The Lower Depths* the Art Theatre no longer carried the phrase 'public-accessible' as part of its title and audiences in its new, 1902, premises were drawn from an increasingly affluent constituency.

Although Gorky became the 'house playwright' (the Art Theatre was officially named in his honour in 1932), this obscures the fact that the Theatre did not stage a single one of his plays between 1905 and 1933, despite ample opportunity. Moreover, the Theatre's relations with Gorky had cooled as a result of rows over the rejection of *Summerfolk* and controversy surrounding productions of work by Dostoyevsky, of whom Gorky disapproved.⁶ Most characteristic of the Art Theatre's relationship with the plays of Maxim Gorky during the author's own lifetime was its meagre involvement with their staging.

The conferral, in the 1930s, of a 'special relationship' with Gorky was officially promulgated to endorse the Art Theatre's exemplary realist methods, now offered as models for general imitation at a time when an ideological war was being waged against 'modernism' and 'formalism'. The elevation of Gorky to 'socialist realist' status was both a political and an aesthetic promotion. It followed his decision to turn his back on 'bourgeois' Europe and opt for permanent settlement in the Soviet

Union. Prominent among the official welcoming party on his return, in 1931, was Stanislavsky, whose last association with Gorky had been his production of *Children of the Sun*, in 1905, as a vehicle for élitist rather than socialist propaganda.

The association with the work of Gorky, once established, became persistent. Beginning with productions of *The Merchant Class* and *The Lower Depths* in its fourth and fifth seasons, the Art Theatre went on to stage a further ten of Gorky's plays between 1933 and 1976, including excellent productions by Nemirovich-Danchenko of *Yegor Bulychev and Others* (1934) and of *Enemies*, in 1935. Following Gorky's return, it became customary to confer retrospective ideological respectability on his earlier works. This was inevitably the fate of his novel *Mother*, with its clearly defined socialist theme of which Lenin approved, but it was also the case with an otherwise apolitical-seeming play like *The Lower Depths*.

By the mid-1930s, Stanislavsky's official status in the Soviet theatrical pantheon had begun to rival that of Lenin and Stalin in Soviet politics. Some attempt to explain this phenomenon is offered as part of the conclusion to this book and may be seen to derive, in part, from the ideology implicit in many of Stanislavsky's own productions, and from his deliberate espousal of realism. Moreover, it had been the (ostensibly bourgeois) Art Theatre which originally gave 'the first proletarian writer' a theatrical hearing and had been prepared to descend with him into 'the lower depths' of life. From these same depths Satin's hymn to 'Man' in Act Four had rung out like a socialist clarion call—a paean delivered originally by Stanislavsky himself. A canonical work of socialist realism was seen to have been given a canonically realist interpretation. Gorky's play and its production, as well as Stanislavsky's performance, became hagiographic reference points for Soviet theatrical culture. Hence the retrospective significance of that 1902 production, however pragmatically the Art Theatre may have embarked on its staging.

The importance of Chekhov in the history of the Art Theatre is well-known. Precisely what his fate as a dramatist would have been had not the Theatre championed his cause is uncertain. What seems clear is that, had the 1898 production of *The Seagull* been a failure, Chekhov would probably have kept his vow never to write another play so long as he lived.⁷ Thus, the generally accepted view that Chekhov is one of the most important dramatists of the last hundred years depended, crucially, on the public rehabilitation of *The Seagull* after the debacle of 1896. This then generated the writing of *Three Sisters* and *The Cherry*

Orchard. Despite being one of Chekhov's most frequently performed plays, the original production of *The Cherry Orchard* is one of the least well-documented. *Uncle Vanya* has possibly an equal claim for attention but, unfortunately, the production score remains unpublished. As distinct from *Uncle Vanya*, however, which is a re-working of an earlier play *The Wood Demon*, the importance of *The Cherry Orchard* is that it is a completely original play which, like *Three Sisters*, was composed specifically for the Art Theatre with known actors in mind.

Another original feature of *The Cherry Orchard* is its rather unusual form. Written at a time when Chekhov was interested in the work of Maurice Maeterlinck, the play can be seen as one of his most abstract and symbolic, where conventional reality (of character and situation) is questioned; This was never a major problem in staging *Three Sisters*, although disagreements existed between the Theatre and Chekhov over questions of mood and genre. These disputes were more pronounced in the case of *The Cherry Orchard*, which Stanislavsky read as a 'tragedy', Meyerhold thought was a Maeterlinckian 'Dance of Death', and Chekhov described as a 'farce'. Although Chekhov never saw the final production in its entirety, his letters leave little doubt that the reports he received led to his feeling that the Theatre, and Stanislavsky in particular, had 'ruined' his play.

The three productions mentioned above belong to the first five years of the Art Theatre's history and, in differing ways, are striking examples of the Theatre's predominantly naturalistic approach during this period, although the nature of some of the production scores can seem to challenge this straightforward definition. The choice of a later production, from 1909, has been dictated by a number of factors. Most importantly, Stanislavsky's production of Ivan Turgenev's *A Month in the Country* marked his first major attempt to move away from acting technique inspired by external fidelity to character and milieu to concentrate, instead, on inner psychological mood. It is ironic that, almost at the precise historical moment that modernist artists were moving away from a view of human character imagined 'individualistically', or conceived as ontologically 'real', Stanislavsky attempted to resuscitate the notion of a meaningful human psychology and a humanly knowable 'truth'. His method was to explore the inner life of the living actor, viewed as a creature reducible to flesh, blood, nerve and sinew, in the investigative spirit of a forensic, scientific naturalism, but, equally, as a being capable of transcending these reductionist definitions.

Where modernists were contriving to suggest something unknowable, relativistic, metaphysical, abstract, or myth-laden about

humankind and, in the process, were devastating the ground of nineteenth-century artistic practice, it was precisely here that Stanislavsky chose to pitch his ideological tent—on terrain which the modernists had not only abandoned but had identified as fundamentally unstable. Stanislavsky sought to negotiate the flux, the relativity, the contingency of human reality and to found it on some inner, psychological and ascertainable ‘truth’, convinced that this was no idealist mirage or spiritual fiction. This was the reason for the development of his ‘system’ and for his choice of Turgenev’s play for experimental purposes.

This raises questions about the nature both of this particular play and of plays in general. If ‘truth’ was not discernible in an actor’s performance, Stanislavsky was in the habit of crying ‘*Ne verju!*’ (‘I don’t believe it!’). But could the ‘system’ make intellectual and dramatic sense of any worthwhile play if what the work itself imagines, or constitutes, is not a single, verifiable truth at the level of a traceable human psychology, but is actually engaged in the production of ‘meanings’ which are either contradictory or extremely complex and which may diverge to produce simultaneously different and equally valid levels of ‘reality’ or ‘truth’? Is drama, as a genre, more like Greek tragedy or Jonsonian comedy than it is ever like a naturalistic play or a play interpreted as if it were a version of a nineteenth-century novel? Does even a ‘novelistic’ play, like Turgenev’s, defy any attempt to have the categories of a Stanislavskyan ‘system’ imposed upon it? These are questions which go beyond the limits of this study, which simply aims to make available some of the material on the basis of which such questions can be asked. It therefore attempts to describe how the Moscow Art Theatre came into being, how it was managed and financed during its formative years, how its productions were staged and how audiences and critics responded to them.

1

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

As we approach 1998 and the centenary of the Art Theatre's opening, there has been a return in the former Soviet Union to the kind of market conditions which gave rise to the Theatre's original foundation. In many respects, its origin is similar to that of The Theatre, constructed by James Burbage in 1576 and run on shareholding lines. There are other historical parallels between the two events. Just as England was experiencing the rise of capitalism and the decline of feudalism at the end of the sixteenth century, so a similar process was occurring in Russia towards the end of the nineteenth. The spread of entrepreneurial activity was centred in Moscow, whilst St Petersburg remained the bureaucratic centre of a crumbling Empire, whose tsar was to lose absolute feudal authority under the impact of new historical pressures exerted by a rising merchant class.¹ The revolutions and civil war of 1905 and 1917 can, in this context, be seen to have a parallel in the rise of middle-class power and the resultant revolution/civil war in mid-seventeenth-century England. Just as, in England, the conflicts and tensions of the period were anticipated and reflected in revolutionary theatrical practice and in innovatory dramatic writing, so the theatre of Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko also mirrored the innovativeness and social awareness of its Elizabethan/Jacobean counterpart and acquired its own 'Shakespeare', or in-house dramatist, in the person of Chekhov.

From the mid-nineteenth century, a class of capitalists began to emerge in Moscow amongst whom were many with 'progressive' attitudes. Not unlike Elizabethan London, Moscow produced a group of wealthy benefactors (in this case factory owners and merchants) who were prepared to vie with one another in the foundation, construction

and provision of hospitals, schools, printing presses, churches, theatres and people's leisure centres. Some were exceptionally enlightened patrons of the arts, who collected art works and provided generous subsidies for artists. Others were more actively involved, such as Savva Mamontov, who created the first private opera in Russia and managed to attract several talented stage designers and many foreign singers.² Chaliapin made his debut on the Mamontov stage in 1896. Stanislavsky was a friend of Mamontov's and took part in his productions. The Art Theatre's chief designer, V.A. Simov, gained his first working experience with Mamontov.³

The theatrical situations in Moscow and St Petersburg were comparatively distinct, although the repertoire of the Aleksandrinskiy Theatre, in St Petersburg, was similar to that of the Malyy, in Moscow. Aleksey Suvorin's private, commercial theatre, founded in St Petersburg in 1895, was in many ways similar to that of Fedor Korsh in Moscow, founded in 1882.^{4,5} On the other hand, traditions in 'the theatre of Ostrovsky'—Moscow's 'second university', as the Malyy was called—tended to be more democratic than at the Aleksandrinskiy, where the tastes of the aristocracy still held sway. The situation in Moscow thus seemed more susceptible to reform although, at the end of the 1880s and the beginning of the 1890s, the professional stage did not present a very encouraging picture. Perhaps because of this, theatrical amateurism developed apace.

By the 1890s, 80 per cent of the industrial enterprises in Moscow had been established in the period since 1861, following the abolition of serfdom. The textile industries led the way in turning Moscow into a major banking centre, bringing increased political power to the merchant class. Pavel Tret'yakov, in addition to art collecting, which became the basis of the Moscow gallery named after him, was also a member of the Moscow City Council, as was Mamontov.⁶ Referring to the 'rapprochement' between art and capital, Chekhov noted in 1897 that: 'the intelligentsia goes to meet capital and capital is not averse to meeting it halfway' (Chekhov 1974–83: vol. 6:297). People like Savva Morozov, so influential in supporting the Art Theatre financially, also founded schools, hospitals and libraries. From this group were to emerge great patrons of the arts such as S.I. Shchukin and A.A. Bakhrushin.^{7,8} Nemirovich-Danchenko was an astute businessman, and tales of Stanislavsky's comparative commercial naivety do not square with the kind of business acumen which, by the end of the century, had helped to place his family firm of gold- and silver-thread manufacturers at the forefront of world markets.