

**“TWO CHAPTERS FROM UNPUBLISHED NOTES”
BY B. SADOVSKOY: THREE LEVELS OF READING**

Ieliseienko A. P.

INTRODUCTION

B. Sadovskoy was a writer, a poet, a literary critic, an employee of many magazines and newspapers of the first half of the XX century. Many contemporaries (Gumilev, Gorodetsky, Merezhkovsky, Khodasevich) have repeatedly noted the stylist talent of the writer, the ability to recreate the life and peculiarities of the previous era. B. Sadovskoy adhered to monarchist views. Despite the fact that at the beginning of the 20th century such views could lead to inevitable persecution and “expulsion” from literary circles, he repeatedly took part in radical right-wing publications hiding behind various pseudonyms. N.S. Gumilev wrote: “Boris Sadovskoy maintains the memory of the traditions of the Pushkin era, learning from its secondary poets without whom he would hardly have been able to free himself from the fetters of realism as by temperament he is not a conqueror”¹.

The ability of B. Sadovskoy to convey the spirit of previous era in a harmonious and multifaceted manner was also noted by Yu. Eichenwald: “As a storyteller B. Sadovskoy is distinguished by his love for the style of Russian antiquity. He kindred and sympathetically penetrates the everyday life of the not very distant past and unfolds a vivid panorama of a fading culture. He resurrects both historical figures and people unknown, skillfully reproduces their clothes and speeches, their external and internal everyday life”². The scientist believed that the description of the external state plays a more significant role for B. Sadovskoy than the depiction of psychology, the internal state of the heroes. “The most talented dictionary of words, master of writing, slightly archaic, the owner of skillful handwriting, literary calligraphy, our author draws his beautiful patterns on the canvas of his former life; smoothly and amusingly, his honey speech flows a little bit derisively, and if old people, inhabitants of obsolete eras were resurrected, they would recognize it, understand it, appreciate it”³.

B. Sadovskoy had a peculiar view of the reign of Paul I. The play by D.S. Merezhkovsky “Paul I”, the book “Regicide on March 11, 1801. Notes of participants and contemporaries” published by A.S. Suvorin, articles and notes

¹ Гумилев Н. Письма о русской поэзии. Москва, 1990. С. 111.

² Айхенвальд Ю. Слова о словах. Критические статьи. Петроград, 1916. С. 97.

³ Там само. С. 98.

published in the “Russian Archive” and “Russian Starina” became an object of study and rethinking for the writer. An unusual view of the image of Paul I was reflected in several of the author’s works (the play “The Knight of Malta”, the story “Under Paul’s Shield”), in particular in “Two Chapters from Unpublished Notes” first published in the newspaper “Rech” in 1910. A year later, they were included in the collection of stories “Cast Iron Pattern”.

1. “Two Chapters from Unpublished Notes” by B. Sadovskoy: the first level of reading

The first chapter tells about the childhood of the storyteller, who was at the same age as Sasha Pushkin and grew up as a “great lazy and mischievous boy”. Under the influence of his father and uncle, who returned in 1814 “together with the victorious army” from the capital of the Gauls with “George on chest and a cherished medal on a two-color ribbon” he was sent to study at the Corps of Pages.

The most important event “in his entire corps life” was the acquaintance with the future poet and at that time also a page – E.A. Baratynsky. Their meeting is discussed in the second chapter.

It is noteworthy that this second stylized story was mistakenly taken by the famous Norwegian Slavist G. Hetso for a real fact of the poet’s biography and was included in his book “Evgeny Baratynsky. Life and works”. This was reported by S.V. Shumikhin in the notes to “Two chapters from unpublished notes”. The first chapter of the notes is not commented at all.

S.V. Shumikhin points out that the source of B. Sadovskoy’s story could be letters from Y.A. Baratynsky to V.A. Zhukovsky in 1823 (“Russian Starina”, 1870, № 11). However, a mistake was made here, since the eleventh issue of Russian Starina does not contain letters from Y.A. Baratynsky, but N. Maksimov’s note regarding the numerous inaccuracies in these letters. The author of the note compares the data in the letters with the documents of the Corps of Pages. We should remind that Baratynsky was expelled from the corps. Therefore, as N. Maksimov determined, the purpose of Baratynsky’s letters was to provide information on the basis of which Zhukovsky could petition for Baratynsky’s forgiveness. The author of the note explains the reason of some inaccurate data in such way.

Baratynsky’s letters to Zhukovsky were published in the Russian Archive in 1868. In our opinion, this publication became the source of the second stylized note by B. Sadovskoy. An indirect confirmation of this hypothesis is the fact that Sadovskoy was a close friend of P. Bartenev, editor of the Russian Archive, repeatedly showed interest in historical materials published on the pages of this magazine, and also used articles and notes published in the Russian Archive to create stylized stories. For example, “The Lost

Swimmer” by B. Sadovskoy is based on the memoirs of E. Bibikova-Raevskaya, published in the sixth issue of the Russian Archive (1882).

However, there are also more obvious coincidences between the story of B. Sadovskoy and the letters from the Russian Archive. The narrator learns that “Eugene, disliking his commander, glued a piece of paper to his back with the inscription: “Drunkard”. (N.B. The late captain, indeed was a zealous lover of the gifts of Bacchus)”⁴. We learn from a letter to Zhukovsky: “I joined the Pages Corps at the age of 12. The head of my department was then a certain Kr-vich <...> a man limited in everything, except in his passion for wine. He did not love me at first sight, and from the first day of my entry into the corps, he already treated me like a noteworthy rascal. Affectionate with other children, he was especially rude to me. His injustice hardened me: children are no less proud of adults; offended pride demands revenge – and I decided to take revenge on him. In large calligraphic letters <...> I wrote the word drunkard on a piece of paper and stuck it to the broad back of my enemy”⁵.

E. Baratynsky, in a letter to Zhukovsky, informs about his passion for books, which told about the life of the robbers Glorioso, Rinaldo Rinaldini, especially Schiller. He writes that “the life of a robber” seemed “the most enviable in the world, and naturally restless and enterprising”, he decided “to form a society of thinkers, with the goal of torturing <...> authorities as much as possible”⁶. B. Sadovskoy’s narrator was one of the five “virtuous robbers, taking the famous Schiller hero as a model”. He reports that the Pages “swore to take revenge on the evil and unjust mankind, which was carried out <...> by the corps authorities”⁷.

E. Baratynsky notes in his letter: “There were five of us. We went to the attic every evening after supper. As a general rule, they did not eat anything at the common table, but carried away from there all the food supplies that could be carried away in their pockets, and then freely feasted in our shelter. It was here that we mourned our fate together, here we invented all sorts of leprosy, which afterwards we decisively set in motion”⁸.

E. Baratynsky is echoed by the narrator of B. Sadovskoy: “At night we all gathered in the attic, dragging our official dinner under the hollow, and here, with the pale flickering of a greasy cinder, shared stories about terrible ghosts and the exploits of real robbers”. The pranks of the imaginary robbers

⁴ Садовской Б. Две главы из неизданных записок. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 203.

⁵ Письмо Е.А. Баратынского к В.А. Жуковскому. *Русский архив*. 1868. Том 1. С. 148.

⁶ Там само. С. 149.

⁷ Садовской Б. Две главы из неизданных записок. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 204.

⁸ Письмо Е.А. Баратынского к В.А. Жуковскому. *Русский архив*. 1868. Т. 1. С. 147.

also coincide in many ways. These are the cut off scarves of the officers on duty and the hats nailed to the windows. “Eugene, as chieftain and leader of the gang always took on the most important tricks”. Further, it is mentioned about the new comrade Priklnsky, whose father was “a rich and important chamberlain”. This young man “already corrupted and secularly quite mature <...> had a lot of money”, as a result, attic dinners turned into Lucoll feasts”. As the narrator recalled, “Priklnsky brought us huge baskets of wonderful snacks and rare fruits; sweets and sweet cakes were consumed by us in abundance; finally, there was wine. Nobody suspected what money they were using for all these luxuries, except for Evgeny, who having made friends with Priklnsky sat next to him in class, preparing lessons together, and on Sundays he was allowed to go to his house”⁹. We learn in detail about his acquaintance with Priklnsky and about the “source of income” from Baratynsky’s letter: “A few time later (to my misfortune) we accepted another comrade into our society, namely the son of that kammerger, whom I think you know in my misfortune. We have noticed that he had too much money; it seemed incredible to us that his parents would give it to a 14-year-old boy 100 and 200 rubles every week. We became close friends and learned that he had picked up the key to his father’s office, where government bills were in large heaps, and that he took several pieces of paper from there every week. Having mastered his secret, of course, we began to use his money as well. Our attic dinners became much tastier than the previous ones: we ate pounds of candy”¹⁰.

A “fatal prank” is also associated with the name of Priklnsky after which neither Priklnsky nor Baratynsky could return to the corps. What exactly happened, we learn from Baratynsky’s letters. He received an invitation to visit the Priklnsky family, where he participated in the theft of money together with the son of the kammerger. E. Baratynsky in a letter says: “Our abduction did not remain secret, and we were both excluded from the corps in order not to be assigned to any service, unless we wish to join the military as privates”¹¹.

B. Sadovskoy, in turn, keeps intrigue and does not tell what the essence of the “fatal prank” is and why the Pages were excluded. It should be kept in mind that the story is presented from the words of a child who knows what is happening only partly and focuses not so much on the incident as on a secret resentment towards Eugene, who could “charm everyone and ferret out a

⁹ Садовской Б. Две главы из неизданных записок. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 205.

¹⁰ Письмо Е.А. Баратынского к В.А. Жуковскому. *Русский архив*. 1868. Т. 1. С. 151.

¹¹ Там само. С. 153.

completely alien soul without betraying his own”, and who “hardly loved anyone”¹².

So, Baratynsky was forced to serve as a soldier, first in the Jaegersky, then in the Neyshlotsky regiment. On this occasion, he informed Zhukovsky: “You know how unsuccessful were all the representations made about me by my superiors. From year to year I was introduced, from year to year the vain hope of an early forgiveness supported me; but now, I confess to you, I start to despair. – Not my service, to which I am accustomed; I am burdened by the contradictions of my position.

I do not belong to any class, although I have some rank. No one’s hopes, no one’s pleasures are good for me. <...>

I dare not resign, although, having entered the service of my own free will, I should have the right to leave it whenever I decide; then such determination may be mistaken for selfishness. I am left with only remorse that I voluntarily put on too heavy chains”¹³.

P. Kicheev wrote about the contradictory position of Baratynsky in the Russian Archive (1868). According to him, once Baratynsky served in the palace in which Alexander I was staying. Having learned who “stood on the clock”, he approached the poet, “asked the name, patted on the shoulder and deigned to say kindly: serve! Another time, when the only son of a noble man <...> died, and the sovereign deigned to visit the grieved father, the latter began to ask the sovereign to return his son to him by forgiving me (Baratynsky – A. E), the sovereign again graciously deigned to respond: early, let him serve a little more”¹⁴. There is also a connection between the attitude of Alexander I to Baratynsky and Nicholas I to A. Polezhaev, when punishment by the tsar is of an educational nature and should lead to the correction of the guilty poet.

It should also be noted that Zhukovsky contacted A.N. Golitsyn with a request to show Baratynsky’s letter addressed to the Zhukovsky to emperor. In Baratynsky’s forgiveness, Zhukovsky saw an instrument of the Providence that the tsar could perform. He mentioned the biblical parable of the prodigal son and sick mother of Baratynsky. Zhukovsky achieved Baratynsky’s forgiveness. After some time, the poet was promoted to officer by decree of Alexander I, which testified to his “rehabilitation”.

In our opinion, in the text of “Notes” by B. Sadovskoy several levels of reading can be distinguished, which are revealed upon a closer study of the

¹² Садовской Б. Две главы из неизданных записок. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 204.

¹³ Письмо Е.А. Баратынского к В.А. Жуковскому. *Русский архив*. 1868. Т 1. С. 155.

¹⁴ Кичеев П. Еще несколько слов о Е.А. Баратынском. *Русский архив*. 1868. Т. 4–5. С. 870.

details of the story. We paid attention to the first level above. It is the most obvious and, in general, is devoted to fragments from the childhood of a child from a poor Moscow family, the most remarkable childhood event of whom was acquaintance and friendship with the future poet E. Baratynsky.

2. “Two Chapters from Unpublished Notes”: the second level of reading

The second level is more complicated and is connected with the mention in the first chapter of Sasha Pushkin and his nanny, who “regale” the boy with pears “on the bench from her hands,” the narrator – an offended boy who is forced to steal pears from the “pear man with a cart” and the young page Baratynsky.

So, in two “Notes” the connection between the childhood of A. Pushkin and E. Baratynsky is traced. The first, arouses the jealousy and envy of one-year-olds (later, contemporaries), the second is subjected to “persecution” by the authorities and is in an intermediate position and is forced to serve as a soldier.

The question of the relationship between the two poets has repeatedly attracted the attention of contemporaries and researchers. B. Sadovskoy dedicated an article to E. Baratynsky in the collection “Icebreaker”, where he noted that “Baratynsky like Delvig owes much of his fame to friendship with Pushkin; without him, both of them are inconceivable, although Baratynsky himself always gravitated rather towards Delvig, who was closer and understandable to him. It seems, – wrote B. Sadovskoy, – that if some Trilunny was considered a “friend” of Pushkin, like Baratynsky, or was approved by him in print, like Teplyakov, he probably would not have been so undeservedly and firmly forgotten”¹⁵. For B. Sadovskoy, E. Baratynsky was one of the first who appear as a “strict, pensive contemplator” “alongside inspired, half-crazy singers”. As you know, A. Pushkin repeatedly spoke approvingly of the work of E. Baratynsky, which B. Sadovskoy perceives as “complacency and condescension”, which is “characteristic of tsars and great poets in equal measure”¹⁶.

B. Sadovskoy opens the article “About Baratynsky” with a quote from a letter by N.S. Turgenev to S.T. Aksakov: “Baratynsky is not a poet in the only true Pushkin sense, but one cannot but respect his noble artistic honesty, his constant and disinterested striving for the highest goals of poetry and life. He had a lot of intelligence, taste and insight, maybe too much – every word of his is not only a chisel – a file, his verse never strives,

¹⁵ Садовской Б. О Баратынском. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 408.

¹⁶ Там само. С. 407.

does not even flow”¹⁷. Agreeing with N.S. Turgenev, B. Sadovskoy, nevertheless, notes that “as a literary phenomenon, this poet was almost the first of his kind in Russia” and acted as “a strict, pensive contemplator, artistically clothed his reflections in an elegant form”¹⁸.

L.G. Frizman, the author of the book “The creative way of E. Baratynsky” also mentions this review of Turgenev. According to the researcher, Turgenev’s letter “expressed a subtle artistic flair, a deep understanding of the peculiarities of the poet’s talent, whose innovation touched the very specificity of artistic generalization, which enriched poetry with new methods of mastering reality inherent in another form of social consciousness – science”¹⁹. L.G. Frizman in the creative heritage of A.S. Pushkin and E.A. Baratynsky finds the features characteristic of the Decembrist movement, and from this point of view that he compares the worldview concepts of the two poets.

B. Sadovskoy wrote: “When you are rereading Baratynsky, you clearly feel that poetry has never been an impregnable temple for him, a refuge in the world of everyday worries from which he had no need to escape. A philosopher at heart, he looked at poetry only as an elegant craft, as a means for the most convenient expression of beautiful and bright thoughts. Baratynsky is not forgotten for a minute. With his penchant for reasoning, he is sometimes somehow unpleasantly clever. He is, in essence the same everywhere, and just as even, clear and simple in mournful elegies and gracefully cold madrigals, as in his most boring poems. In the very warehouse of his verse, tension is noticeable: this is not an easy soaring, but hard work, work in the sweat of the brow”²⁰.

B. Sadovskoy reproaches E. Baratynsky for the intellect, insight, coldness of verse and reminds the parallel well known to his contemporaries – between “God’s mercy to a poet” for whom inspiration and Muse are “a tool of labor” and a hardworking craftsman who is able to learn the craft by his own labor. “There is a legend,” wrote B. Sadovskoy, “that Pushkin in Mozart and Salieri portrayed Baratynsky and himself. Researchers understood this parallel in the sense that the great poet suspected that Baratynsky was envious of his genius. In Pushkin’s literature, this assumption is rightly refuted, and indeed, there is no reason to suspect Baratynsky of personal envy of Pushkin. One must think that Pushkin, creating Salieri had an indirect goal in mind: to show how much a working

¹⁷ Письмо И.С. Тургенева С.Т. Аксакову, 31 мая 1854 г. *Вестник Европы*. 1894. № 2. С. 484.

¹⁸ Садовской Б. О Баратынском. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 407.

¹⁹ Фризмман Л.Г. Творческий путь Баратынского. Москва, 1966. С. 95.

²⁰ Садовской Б. О Баратынском. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 408.

artist (“not a poet in the only true, Pushkin’s sense”) with his “mind”, “taste” and “discernment”, with all perseverance and ability to work, in vain efforts to soar immeasurably lower than the poet inspired by the grace of God <...> Artifice in art”– this is what Pushkin never had. You can admire Baratynsky’s poems and their external beauty, like a beautiful marble body of statues, but singing them, living them, loving them as they love a living person with all his features and shortcomings is impossible”²¹.

It is noteworthy that five years later B. Sadovskoy published a collection of articles “Ozim”, where Fet was classified as a “mozartest” of Russian poets, as opposed to “salierism” of Bryusov, who “decided to replace the lack of creative talent with the mind”²². The author of the collection of articles believed that “Salieri is a martyr of his art: for him Apollo is only a beautiful corpse, spread out on an anatomical table. He remembers by heart the name of every muscle, every ligament, he can open the heart and examine the brain, but he cannot make a dead man live. That is why Salieri’s poems are always easy to distinguish from Mozart’s: they clearly show a superbly prepared anatomical preparation, according to which future “salieris” can learn the art of versification”²³.

3. The historical context in “Two Chapters from Unpublished Notes” by B. Sadovskoy

The third level of reading is the most difficult. It includes the historical context in which the story is placed. We should recall that the storyteller’s father served as an aide-de-camp under Paul I and, therefore, the first chapter tells about Paul’s reign. The chapter opens with an indication of the date of birth of the narrator – May 6, 1800, which coincided with the day of the “death of the great Suvorov”.

I. Andreeva in her article “At the crossroad of two roads...” pointed out an interesting feature in B. Sadovskoy’s correspondence: “Any date that Sadovskoy puts at the end of the letter turns into a hole punched into the past strangely connected with the present. Thus, ending the letter to A.A. Blok, he outputs: “February 18, 1913”, and under the number he signs: “Date of death of Emperor Nikolai Pavlovich”; January 27, 1914 brings the memory of another day: “The Day of Pushkin’s Duel”. Even in a tragic letter to his parents, where he reports a relapse of unhealed syphilis, he does not forget to

²¹ Там само. С. 409.

²² Садовской Б. Озимь: статьи о русской поэзии. Петроград, 1915. С. 36.

²³ Там само. С. 16.

write under the number: “Exactly 18 years since we moved to the village for the first time to our home”²⁴.

Such accuracy in terms of dates indicates the author’s desire to focus the readers’ attention on the historical event that happened on that day. The narrator’s father was in such sadness that “from this circumstance the midwife drew the conclusion” that the boy “would not survive”.

The mention of the father’s grief over the death of Suvorov is not accidental. 1800 year. Less than a year remains until the end of the reign of Paul I. It is known that the great commander had the great authority in the army, the love of the people, which aroused jealousy on the part of Paul I.

As N. Eidelman wrote, “it is well-known that Suvorov was humiliated by jealous Paul. <...> In the Kamera-Furyev magazine on May 9, 1800, there was no mention of any honor given by the tsar to the deceased commander. Meanwhile, the funeral of the Generalissimo stirred up national feelings”. The historian cites the memoirs of Grech, who talked about how he went to say goodbye to Suvorov. “We couldn’t get to his house. All the streets were cluttered with carriages and people. Not the government, but Russia mourned Suvorov. <...> The people of all classes filled all the streets when his body was transported, and paid tribute to the great genius of Russia”²⁵.

Derzhavin dedicated the poem “Bullfinch” to the commander the oppositional character of which is beyond doubt. A leader capable of “conquering everything with a handful of Russians”, bringing “scepters” and not receiving due recognition and rewards is opposed to tsars and their neglect.

According to N. Eidelman, “it was the first funeral in the new Russian history <...> that turned into opposition demonstrations, an expression of feelings of personal, national, and political dignity. Paul, seemingly so scrupulous about the issues of honor, national glory does not notice at all, does not want to notice what the St. Petersburg farewell to Suvorov expresses: the degree of national enlightened maturity that Russian society has reached...”²⁶.

Even during Suvorov’s lifetime, Paul I undermined, first of all, his authority obliging the great commander to learn new maneuvers on a par with soldiers and officers. From the notes of A.N. Velyaminov-Zernov it is known that Paul I “established a tactical class in the palace, where he ordered some schoolchild from the fencing teacher to give lectures to all old and honored generals. Suvorov himself was forced to listen to these lessons.

²⁴ Андреева И. На перекрестке двух дорог. *Некрополь. Литература и власть. Письма к Б.А. Садовскому*. Москва, 1996. С. 448.

²⁵ Эйдельман Н.Я. Твой восемнадцатый век. Грань веков. Твой девятнадцатый век. Москва, 2017. С. 416.

²⁶ Там само. С. 419.

It seemed that it did not irritate Suvorov, who made fun of it extremely sharply, as the whole nation, which was proud of its victories and the genius of its generals, and especially Suvorov. The nation resented this unworthiness; Emperor Paul became ridiculous in its eyes”²⁷.

The narrator tells about a bet in which his father took part, pointing to the character of the emperor: “It must be explained that the extraordinary severity of the sovereign, which was the cause of a number of exiles and persecutions seemed to be more conducive to frivolity and fearlessness in other people. Those who live near a volcano are so careless”. In the rank of adjutant wing of the Preobrazhensky regiment, he “made a bet with his friend Kopyev, that at the ceremonial performance, being in the royal box behind the sovereign, he would pull Pavel Petrovich by the braid”. Seeing the emperor’s gaze “with wrathful amazement” the narrator’s father “felt as if an abyss had opened under his feet, but restraining himself with his last strength, he answered firmly”: Your Majesty’s braid was not in shape, and I dared to correct it”. Pavel Petrovich, nodding graciously smiled and turned to the scene where at that moment a gilded curtain with an eagle soared and opened the first picture”²⁸. The prank remained disclosed, but as the narrator says, the father “was ashamed in front of the sovereign” and when he returned home, he immediately sent a letter of resignation.

In our opinion, the case with the prank of the adjutant is anecdotal and was well known to contemporaries of B. Sadovskoy. A similar bet is described in the novel by D.S. Merezhkovsky “Alexander I”, where the nephew of Prince A.N. Golitsyn Valerian recalled a story “heard from his uncle himself, how once in his youth, as a camera-page, he bet that he would pull the braid of Emperor Paul I. And, indeed, standing behind the sovereign’s chair, during lunch, he contrived – pulled. The Emperor turned around. “Your Majesty, the braid has crooked, I have corrected.” – “Oh, thank you, friend!”²⁹.

As N. Eidelman wrote, a significant number of anecdotal short stories have the following structure: “Someone was guilty or spoke in a risky way with a formidable tsar, things seem to go to inevitable punishment, but everything ends well” [p. 380]. The historian cites several stories with a tinge of “possible plausibility”, among which there is a similar bet: “Chief of Police Vaksin bet that he would pull Paul by the braid at the big exit. When the king passed, he took him by the tip of his braid. Paul without turning

²⁷ Царевубийство 11 марта 1801 года. Записки участников и современников. Санкт-Петербург, 1907. С. 115.

²⁸ Садовской Б. Две главы из неизданных записок. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 202.

²⁹ Мережковский Д.С. Александр I. Петербург – Москва, 1913. С. 12.

asks: “Who is there?” “The braid is not at the seam,” Vaksin replies. Paul thanks, the bet is won”³⁰.

The appearance of such anecdotes is associated with strict rules that were introduced by Paul I and required impeccable adherence to elements of form, structure and regulation. The step, the size of the braid, its direction along the seam were not less important for the tsar than the country’s foreign policy issues. A second important reason was Paul’s character, characterized by “unexpected hesitations, often leading to exactly the opposite actions: great anger was followed by generous kindness; extreme suspicion – and complete credulity”³¹.

This feature of the sovereign is reflected in many works reflecting his reign. In the play by D.S. Merezhkovsky “Pavel I” there is a fragment in which the sergeant major, a colleague of Suvorov was sentenced to four hundred blows of sticks for the fact that his braid was “out of measure”, instead of “nine vershoks – seven”. This punishment led to the death of the soldier the next day.

The discovery of the aforementioned anecdote in B. Barkov’s book “Once Stalin told Trotsky, or Who are the horse sailors. Situations, episodes, dialogues, anecdotes” seems unexpected and testifies the prevalence of this story.

It is remarkable that in the stories in which Paul I is mentioned a parallel is repeatedly drawn with the reign of his mother – Catherine II. In the first chapter of “Unpublished Notes” it is mentioned that “the guards’ pranks under Pavel Petrovich were much more desperate than under the Great Catherine”³², which, in turn, led to “frivolity and fearlessness in other people”. In the story “Under Paul’s Shield” a comparison is also provided, but the severity of the emperor is justified and attention is focused on the advisability of such an approach in governing the country. As the narrator notes: “The copper horse of autocracy suddenly snored under Paul’s iron bridle. <...> Jealous of justice, mercy and the good of the common, the sovereign exacted mercilessly from the guilty, and they used to say that Siberia immediately became much closer to us than it was under Mother Catherine, in a word, Pavel Petrovich pushed it close to Petersburg... The number of coachmen were not enough to transport the exiles, and the couriers shaking day and night on the checkpoints, beat off their insides to death. The Emperor having established a petition box under the window of

³⁰ Эйдельман Н.Я. Твой восемнадцатый век. Грань веков. Твой девятнадцатый век. Москва, 2017. С. 380.

³¹ Там само. С. 195.

³² Садовской Б. Две главы из неизданных записок. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 201.

his office, every evening deigned to read the complaints and denunciations; regardless of ranks and titles the court was strict and fair. If you are to blame, all the same whether you are a warrant officer or a general, first of all you will taste own royal cane, then you will have a glass of lafita at Count Palen's, that is to say, you will sit in a dungeon with rats; darling, belly with a belt so that the guts do not shake, they will put the courier on a cart, and ay! Stolbovy tract directly to Siberia to the settlement"³³.

Another important element of the subtext that is pointed out by the author is the desire of Paul I to honor the memory of his Father Peter III, who was overthrown by Catherine II. One of the first decrees of the emperor concerned the reburial of Peter III, whose coffin was ordered to be carried to Orlov, the favorite of Catherine the Great, one of the murderers of Father of Paul I. N. Eidelman wrote: "Paul hates the deceased mother so much that he "destroys" the proof of her innocence in the murder of her husband, Peter III"³⁴ (It is said concerning Orlov's note).

In the first chapter of "Two chapters" it is mentioned that the narrator's father, "unexpectedly for himself, went up on career ladder and was soon presented with an aide-de-camp; it is not known why"³⁵. We find a similar promotion "no one knows why" in the story "Under Pavlov's Shield", where an elderly corporal dismissed "for his inability" under Catherine II, "smoked for thirty-five years in his village", until suddenly by the decree of Paul I he was granted "the village, and the ranks, and whatever came of it". The sovereign's mercy was shown to him precisely because "Pavel Petrovich painfully honored his parent, and therefore he rewarded his servants beyond measure"³⁶.

N. Eidelman pointed out that Paul I took the principles of his father's government as a model, considering the reign of his mother Catherine II to be "Jacobinism" and striving for maximum centralization of power. N. Eidelman wrote: "The tsar strove to completely change the spirit of the Russian nobility, to completely re-educate it. Instead of a rather free, cheerful, luxurious life, which the privileged class led during the long reign of Catherine II, a gloomy, harsh time came: for the slightest offense they deprived of the nobility, exiled to Siberia; the aristocrats were imposed with taxes, while the peasants even received some indulgences"³⁷.

³³ Садовской Б. Под Павловым щитом. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 242.

³⁴ Эйдельман Н.Я. Твой восемнадцатый век. Грань веков. Твой девятнадцатый век. Москва, 2017. С. 192.

³⁵ Садовской Б. Две главы из неизданных записок. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 201.

³⁶ Садовской Б. Под Павловым щитом. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 243.

³⁷ Эйдельман Н.Я. Твой восемнадцатый век. Грань веков. Твой девятнадцатый век. Москва, 2017. С. 205.

B. Sadovskoy's interest in the image of Paul I also requires some explanation. It is known that during the life of Paul I and after his death there were no unambiguous assessments regarding his reign. Many contemporaries considered him a madman, capable of both unprecedented generosity and merciless punishment for the slightest offense. Apparently, with the release of the play by D. Merezhkovsky "Paul I" and with its subsequent banning for "impudent disrespect for the Supreme Power" special interest of contemporaries in assessing this emperor is determined. D. Merezhkovsky sought to reveal the essence of the anti-Christian nature of the Russian autocratic system. He formulated the main idea of "Paul I" in 1905 in a conversation with Z. Gippius: "Autocracy – from the Antichrist".

In 1900 the book "The Regicide on March 11, 1801 was published. Notes of participants and contemporaries" published by A.S. Suvorin became a bestseller and was widely known among writers. An attempt to overestimate the methods of government, domestic and foreign policy of Paul I was made. Some of the "Notes" asserts the idea that the emperor was the victim of a "gang" of insidious courtiers. A.N. Velyaminov-Zernov noted: "Emperor Paul the First is a striking example of a monarch who being endowed by nature with many high qualities of spirit is full of an honest and noble striving for the good of his people, nevertheless, for a whole century in the minds of all remains a frightening image of a tyrant and madman; Emperor Paul is an example of an autocrat who being an unlimited ruler of millions and a vast empire, possessing such power that his decisions could change the fate of peoples and the map of Europe could not defend himself from a gang of regicides and a court camarilla from several low intriguers, experienced in meanness and mischief, and he died terribly and pitifully and caused no regret to his fate in the European community"³⁸.

A similar point of view was shared by Sadovskoy for whom autocracy is the only form of government capable of preserving the originality and integrity of Russia. The article "Holy Reaction" reflects the author's ideological ideas regarding the origin and role of the monarchy: "The reactionary community is based on the commandments of faith, love and peace: the Church of Christ. The Heavenly King hands over his rod to the earthly one to protect the Church. Hence the divine origin of the monarchy"³⁹.

V. Khodasevich wrote about B. Sadovskoy's monarchism in his article "In Memory of B. Sadovskoy", mistakenly suggesting that the writer is no longer alive: "the reason for his troubles with writers was Sadovskoy's political inclinations. I deliberately say inclination not views, because views,

³⁸ Царевубийство 11 марта 1801 года. Записки участников и современников. Санкт-Петербург, 1907. С. XLVII.

³⁹ Садовской Б. Святая реакция. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 432.

i.e. beliefs based on theory on a strictly deliberate historical study, he perhaps did not have. However, he loved to emphasize his monarchism, his extreme reactionary character. It seems to me, I repeat, that here he was guided rather by an aesthetic admiration for the old, great-power Russia, even by falling in love with it than by a seriously considered political worldview. Monarchism in the era of 1905–1917 was too unpopular and for the writer could not pass with impunity. Sadovskoy even teased. He appeared in a bohemian liberal cafe on Tverskoy Boulevard in a noble cap with a red band; then to the most faithful Socialist-Revolutionary, just a little wink he painted the vastness of his estates (in reality – insignificant); with the most radical lady he started talking about the delights of serfdom; pretended to be an anti-Semite, and confessed to me that in reality he did not like only baptisms; when I translated Bialik, Chernikhovsky – Sadovskoy admired their poetry”⁴⁰.

In the writer’s stories the severity of the emperor is justified, the desire of Paul I to be closer to the people, to patronize them in a fatherly way is repeatedly mentioned. It is no coincidence that one of the stories is called “Under Paul’s Shield”, and the epigraph is taken from V. Kapnist’s lines “Under Paul’s Shield we are completely unharmed”⁴¹. Sadovskoy once again seeks to “protect”, to justify the autocracy, to point out the positive aspects of the monarchical system. The main hero of the stylized story is one of the future assassins of the emperor – P. Uvarov, who taking advantage of Paul I’s affection for Anna Lopukhina is in a love relationship with her stepmother. P. Uvarov fraudulently achieves promotion and becomes one of the closest and most influential courtiers of the emperor. Contemporaries noted in this story “inappropriate and already boring eroticism”⁴². In our opinion, the goal of B. Sadovskoy was precisely to show the cunning nature of P. Uvarov.

Other contemporaries of B. Sadovskoy also tried to overestimate the image of Paul I. For example, Khodasevich wrote to the author of “Two Chapters...” in May 1913: “I started something: it can bring me: 1) work pleasure, 2) coins, and 3) the sad glory of a Black Hundred like yours. I’ll tell you a secret topic: Prince Hamlet and Emperor Paul. I read about Paul quite well, and he attracts me very much. Much was lied about him (psychologically). I would like to justify him. slightly I began to read it, surprised that no one had thought to compare him with Hamlet. And suddenly I learned that in 1781, in Vienna some actor refused to play Hamlet in his presence. I also found another indirect confirmation of the fact that

⁴⁰ Ходасевич В. Некрополь. Литература и власть. Письма к Б.А. Садовскому. Москва, 1996. С. 327.

⁴¹ Садовской Б. Под Павловым щитом. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 242.

⁴² Gumilev N. Northern Flowers for 1911. *Apollo*. 1911. № 8.

some of his contemporaries guessed about his “Hamletism”. Descendants made him an idiot and a monster. If hunger doesn’t hurt, I’ll work in the summer. If my thoughts are confirmed, I will perform with “difficulty” in the fall. But please – not a word to anyone about this: they’ve already stolen several topics from me”⁴³.

It is interesting to trace the connection between the “sad glory of the Black Hundreds” and Khodasevich’s desire to write about Paul I. Some of the contemporaries suspected his connection with the Black Hundreds. V. Kozhinov notes in the book “Black Hundreds and the Revolution,” “The ideology of the “Black Hundreds” was wholly based on the unconditional, so to speak innate Orthodox Faith, which was still preserved by the beginning of the 20th century in the souls of millions of Russian people; true monarchism is unthinkable without Faith, for the monarch must appear as the “anointed of God” who is on the throne by the Highest (and not human) will”⁴⁴.

CONCLUSIONS

Almost the same ideas were expressed by B. Sadovskoy: “Tomorrow is the Sacred Day of the Name Day of His Imperial Majesty the Emperor Nicholas II Alexandrovich. I am proud to be under the rule of an autocrat, not a lousy king who cannot utter a word without the consent of his Reichstag or parliament, which gives him the means to live; not under the rule of an eccentric republic, the stupidest state in the world, but the anointed of God, whose fathers, grandfathers and great-grandfathers also ruled over our ancestors”⁴⁵.

We think that there is an emphasis on the monarchist views of B. Sadovskoy, for which he was repeatedly reproached with Black Hundreds. We wrote about this in detail in the article “Social and political views of B. Sadovskoy: from Black Hundreds to Bolshevism”⁴⁶.

SUMMARY

Thus, “Two Chapters from Unpublished Notes” is a multilevel text. At the first level, children’s images of the storyteller and page E. Baratynsky are revealed. On the second level the relationship between A. Pushkin and E. Baratynsky as a poet was highlighted. The third level is the historical context (the reign of Paul I, as opposed to Catherine’s and Alexander’s). In the story,

⁴³ Ходасевич В. Некрополь. Литература и власть. Письма к Б.А. Садовскому. Москва, 1996. С. 337.

⁴⁴ Кожин В. Черносотенцы и революция. Москва, 2016. С. 14.

⁴⁵ Садовской Б. Заметки. Дневник (1931–1934). *Знамя*. 1992. № 7. С. 174.

⁴⁶ Елисенко А.П. Общественно-политические взгляды Б. Садовского: от черносотенства до большевизма. *Наукові записки ХНПУ ім. Г.С. Сковороди*, 2019. № 3 (93). С. 67–81. DOI. 10.34142/2312-1076.2019.3.93.06.

you can clearly trace the dual approach to creating images: the narrator – E. Baratynsky, A.S. Pushkin – E. Baratynsky, Paul I – Catherine II, Paul I – his son Alexander I, who made a promise in his manifesto to reign the state in the spirit of the immortal Catherine.

B. Sadovskoy as a master of stylized prose refers to the images of the previous era. The writer attempts to reevaluate the period of the reign of Paul I, citing the narrator's memories that reflect the methods of the emperor's government. The dual approach to depicting images makes it possible to compare different historical events to create a historical context in stylized stories. The life of the heroes is examined through the prism of the era in which they lived.

REFERENCES

1. Гумилев Н. Письма о русской поэзии. Москва, 1990. С. 111.
2. Айхенвальд Ю. Слова о словах. Критические статьи. Петроград, 1916. 158 с.
3. Садовской Б. Две главы из неизданных записок. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 200–205.
4. Письмо Е.А. Баратынского к В.А. Жуковскому. *Русский архив*. 1868. Т. 1. С. 147–156.
5. Кичеев П. Еще несколько слов о Е.А. Баратынском. *Русский архив*. 1868. Т. 4–5. С. 866–872.
6. Садовской Б. О Баратынском. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 407–409.
7. Письмо И.С. Тургенева С.Т. Аксакову, 31 мая 1854 г. *Вестник Европы*. 1894. № 2. С. 484.
8. Фризман Л.Г. Творческий путь Баратынского. Москва, 1966. 144 с.
9. Садовской Б. Озимь: статьи о русской поэзии. Петроград, 1915.
10. Андреева И. На перекрестке двух дорог. *Некрополь. Литература и власть. Письма к Б.А. Садовскому*. Москва, 1996. 464 с.
11. Эйдельман Н.Я. Твой восемнадцатый век. Грань веков. Твой девятнадцатый век. Москва, 2017. 795 с.
12. Царевбийство 11 марта 1801 года. Записки участников и современников. Санкт-Петербург, 1907. 376 с.
13. Мережковский Д.С. Александр I. Петербург-Москва, 1913. 337 с.
14. Садовской Б. Под Павловым щитом. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 242–248.
15. Садовской Б. Святая реакция. *Лебединые клики*. Москва, 1990. С. 429–436.
16. Ходасевич В. Некрополь. Литература и власть. Письма к Б.А. Садовскому. Москва, 1996. 464 с.
17. Гумилев Н. «Северные цветы» на 1911 год. Аполлон. 1911. № 8.

18. Кожин В. Черносотенцы и революция. Москва, 2016. 304 с.
19. Садовской Б. Заметки. Дневник (1931–1934). *Знамя*. 1992. № 7. С. 172–194.
20. Елисеенко А.П. Общественно-политические взгляды Б. Садовского: от черносотенства до большевизма. *Наукові записки ХНПУ ім. Г.С. Сковороди*. 2019. № 3 (93). С. 67–81. DOI. 10.34142/2312-1076.2019.3.93.06.

Information about the author:

Ieliseienko A. P.,
PhD, Associate Professor,
Head of Foreign Languages Department
Kharkiv State Zooveterinary Academy
1, Akademichna str., Kharkiv, 61198, Ukraine